THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE

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 VI.

LONDON:

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

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

CONTENTS

OF THE

SIXTH VOLUME.

A HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

CHAP.		PAGE.
I.	GENERAL DENOMINATIONS OF THE COLLECTION OF SACRED BOOKS RECEIVED BY CHRISTIANS	3
II.	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS UPON THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	13
III.	OF THE METHOD IN WHICH THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT HAS BEEN FORMED	25
IV.	OF THE TIME OF WRITING THE GOSPELS, ESPECIALLY THE FIRST THREE	31
V.	ST. MATTHEW, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST	44
VI.	OF THE TIME WHEN THE APOSTLES LEFT JUDEA TO GO AND PREACH THE GOSPEL IN OTHER COUNTRIES	65
VII.	ST. MARK, EVANGELIST	77
VIII.	ST. LUKE, EVANGELIST	104
IX.	ST. JOHN, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST	156
X.	THE QUESTION CONSIDERED, WHETHER ANY ONE OF THE FIRST THREE EVANGELISTS HAD SEEN THE GOSPELS OF THE OTHERS BEFORE HE WROTE	223
XI.	ST. PAUL	234
XII.	ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES	301
XIII.	THAT THE EPISTLE INSCRIBED TO THE EPHESIANS WAS WRITTEN TO THEM	416
XIV.	THAT THE CHURCHES OF COLOSSE AND LAODICEA WERE PLANTED BY THE APOSTLE PAUL	457
XV.	OF THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES	465
XVI.	ST. JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER	468
XVII.	THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES	502
XVIII.	ST. PETER	509

CHAP.		PAGE.
XIX.	THE TWO EPISTLES OF ST. PETER - - -	562
XX.	THE THREE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN - - - -	583
XXI.	ST. JUDE, AND HIS EPISTLE - - -	607
XXII.	THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN - - -	627
XXIII.	THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT -	639
XXIV.	THAT THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, CONSISTING OF A COLLECTION OF SACRED WRITINGS, IN TWO PARTS, ONE CALLED GOSPEL, OR GOSPELS, OR EVANGELICON; THE OTHER CALLED EPISTLES, OR APOSTLE, OR APOSTLES, OR APOSTOLICON, WERE EARLY KNOWN, READ, AND MADE USE OF BY CHRISTIANS - -	650
XXV.	THE QUESTION CONSIDERED, WHETHER ANY SACRED BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT HAVE BEEN LOST	663

A PLAN

OF THE

TIMES AND PLACES

Of writing the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul's Epistles, the seven Catholic Epistles, and the Revelation.

GOSPELS, &c.	PLACES.	A. D.
St. Matthew's.	Judea, or near it.	about 64
St. Mark's.	Rome.	----- 64
St. Luke's.	Greece.	about 63 or 64
St. John's.	Ephesus.	about 68
The Acts of the Apostles.	Greece.	about 63 or 64

EPISTLES.			
To the Romans.	Corinth.	about February	58
1 Corinthians.	Ephesus.	beginning of	56
2 Corinthians.	Macedonia.	about October	57
Galatians.	Corinth or Ephesus.	near the end of or the beginning of	52 53
Ephesians.	Rome.	about April	61
Philippians.	Rome,	before the end of	62
Colossians.	Rome.	before the end of	62
1 Thessalonians.	Corinth.		52
2 Thessalonians.	Corinth.		52
1 Timothy.	Macedonia.		56
2 Timothy.	Rome.	about May	61
Titus.	Macedonia, or near it.	before the end of	56
Philemon.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Hebrews.	Rome, or Italy.	in the spring of	63
Epistle of St. James.	Judea.	61, or beginning of	62
Two epistles of St. Peter.	Rome.		64
St. John's first epistle.	Ephesus.	about	80
His second and third epistles.	Ephesus.	between 80 and	90
Epistle of St. Jude.	Unknown.	64 or	65
The Revelation of St. John.	Patmos, or Ephesus.	95 or	96

A Table of St. Paul's Epiſtles, in the order of time, with the places where, and the times when, they were written.

EPISTLES.	PLACES.		A. D.
1 Theſſalonians.	Corinth.		52
2 Theſſalonians.	Corinth.		52
Galatians.	Corinth, or Epheſus.	near the end of	52
		or the beginning of	53
1 Corinthians.	Epheſus.	the beginning of	56
1 Timothy.	Macedonia.		56
Titus.	Macedonia, or near it.	before the end of	56
2 Corinthians.	Macedonia.	about October	57
Romans.	Corinth.	about February	58
Epheſians.	Rome.	about April	61
2 Timothy.	Rome.	about May	61
Philippians.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Coloſſians.	Rome,	before the end of	62
Philemon.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Hebrews.	Rome, or Italy.	in the ſpring of	63

ERRATA.

Page. line.
25 10 *insert* [i] *after* Wherefore
77 8 from bottom, *for* V. Teſtimonies, *read* IV. Teſtimonies
86 15 *insert* [n] *after* tranſcribed
90 5, 6 *dele* the inverted commas
101 19 *read* to St.
131 11 *dele* the comma at the end of the line
138 5 from bottom, *read* Theophilus
141 4 —— ſuppoſititious
223 2 *for*, any of, *read* any one of
231 23 —— loaves
290 2 —— Paul
450 15 *insert* [z] *after* as
586 22 *read* conſtitutions ſay, he was

In the Notes.

Page.		*read*
140 note [l]	——	p. 135, 136
152 col. 1. l. 2	*for* mer, ——	rem
153 col. 2. l. 3	——	αὐτῳ αὐτη
184 col. 2. l. 4	——	p. 173
215 col. 2. l. 14	——	Exercita
216 col. 2. from bottom	——	p. 213
235 col. 2. l. 3. from bottom		Moſhem.
250 note [x]	——	p. 236
252 col. 2. l. 5.	*for* lo —	lum
315 note [i] *after* vol.	——	I.
352 bottom	——	[f] As before, p. 322
482 note [x] l. 1. *for* Ex	——	Et
508 col. 2. l. 9. *for* regionis	—	regiones
574 col. 2. l. 3. from bottom, *for* provinciani	——	provinciam
615 col. 1. l. 4 *for* υπαξ	——	υπες

A

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE SECOND PART OF THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;

CONTAINING A HISTORY OF THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS,

WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:

In which the EVIDENCES of the GENUINENESS of the FOUR GOSPELS, the ACTS of the APOSTLES, the EPISTLES, and the BOOK of the REVELATION, and the Times when they were written, are repreſented in a Light ſuited to all Capacities:

WITH REMARKS AND OBSERVATIONS

UPON EVERY BOOK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

Uſeful for all who deſire to underſtand the CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

[FIRST PUBLISHED IN THREE VOLUMES—VOL. I. AND II. IN MDCCLVI. AND VOL. III. IN MDCCLVII.]

A

HISTORY

OF THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS,

WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAP. I.

General Denominations of the Collection of ſacred Books received by Chriſtians. I. *Scripture.* II. *Bible.* III. *Canon.* IV. *Old and New Teſtament.* V. *Inſtrument.* VI. *Digeſt.* VII. *Goſpel.*

I. ONE of the general denominations of the ſacred books is Scripture, or Scriptures, literally or primarily ſignifying writing. But by way of eminence and diſtinction the books in higheſt eſteem are called Scripture, or the Scriptures.

This word occurs often in the New Teſtament, in the goſpels, the Acts, and the epiſtles. Whereby we perceive, that in the time of our Saviour and his apoſtles this word was in common uſe, denoting the books received by the Jewiſh people, as the rule of their faith. To them have been ſince added by Chriſtians the writings of the apoſtles and evangeliſts, completing the collection of books, received by them as ſacred and divine.

Some of the places, where the word ſcripture is uſed in the ſingular number for the books of the Old Teſtament, are theſe: 2 Tim. iii. 16. *All ſcripture is given by inſpiration of God.* And Luke iv. 21. John ii. 22. Acts i. 16. viii. 32, 35. Rom. iv. 3. Gal. iii. 8. James ii. 8. 23. 1 Pet. ii. 6. 2 Pet. i. 20. Scriptures, in the plural number, in theſe following, and many other places. Matt. xxi. 42. xxii. 29. xxvi. 54. Luke xxiv. 27, 32, 45. John v. 39. Acts xvii. 2, 11. xviii. 24, 28. 2 Tim. iii. 15. 2 Pet. iii. 16.

St. Peter applies this word to the books of the New as well as of the Old Teſtament, to St. Paul's epiſtles in particular: 2 Pet. iii. 16.... *as alſo in all his epiſtles... which they that are unlearned wreſt, as they do alſo the other ſcriptures,*

unto their own destruction. Plainly denoting, that * St. Paul's epistles are scriptures in the highest sense of the word.

II. Bible is another word, which has now been long in use among Christians, denoting the whole collection of writings received by them as of divine authority.

The word, primarily, denotes book: but now is given to the writings of prophets and apostles by way of eminence. This collection is the Book or Bible, the book of books, as superior in excellence to all other books. The word seems to be used in this sense by Chrysostom in a passage already [a] cited. 'I therefore exhort all of you to procure 'to yourselves Bibles, βιβλια. If you have nothing else, take 'care to have the New Testament, particularly the Acts 'of the apostles, and the gospels, for your constant instruc-'tors.' And Jerom says, 'That [b] the scriptures being all 'written by one spirit, are called one book.' We likewise saw formerly a passage of Augustine, where he informs us, 'That [c] some called all the canonical scriptures one book, 'on account of their wonderful harmony, and unity of 'design throughout.' And I then said: 'It is likely, that 'this way of speaking gradually brought in the general 'use of the word Bible, for the whole collection of the 'scriptures, or the books of the Old and New Testament.'

In short, the ancient Christians were continually speaking of the divine oracles, and the divine books, and were much employed in reading them, as Chrysostom directs in a passage transcribed [d] below: where he recommends the reading the divine books daily, forenoon and afternoon. At length the whole collection was called the Book, or the Bible.

Dr. Heumann has an epistle, or short dissertation [e] concerning the origin of this name of our sacred collection

* Hac parte (quod bene notandum est) Petrus canonizat, ut ita loquar, id est, in canonem sacrarum scripturarum ascribit, atque canonicas facit epistolas Pauli. Dicens enim, *sicut & cætteras scripturas*, utique significat, se etiam illas in scripturarum numero habere. De sacris autem scripturis cum loqui, in confesso est. Est. in loc.

[a] Vol. V. p. 141.

[b] Ibid. p. 65.

[c] Ibid. p. 104.

[d] Ἀλλα δει παιδια καιρου επιτηδειον ηγεισθαι προς την των πνευματικων λογων διαλεξιν. . . . Δυνησομεθα και επι οικιας διατριβουσες, και μετα την εσιασιν, και προ της εσιασεως μετα χειρας λαβουσες τα θεια βιβλια την εξ αυτων καρπεσθαι ωφελειαν. In i. Gen. hom. x. T. IV. p. 81. C. Bened.

[e] De origine nominis Bibliorum: Heum. Poecile. Tom. I. p. 412—415.

of books. And for ſome while he was of opinion, that [f] it was ſo called, as being the moſt excellent of all books: in like manner as the Jews had before called their collection the Scriptures, by way of eminence. So Acts xviii. 24 and 28. But [g] afterwards he ſuſpected, that the origin of this name was in thoſe words of Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 13. *The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comeſt, bring with thee, and the books:* και τα βιβλια. For he believed, that thereby the ancient Chriſtians underſtood the ſacred code. But he afterwards acknowledgeth, that he had not found any inſtance of that interpretation in ancient writers. It ſeems to me therefore, that this conjecture ſhould be dropt, as deſtitute of foundation: and that it ſhould be better for us to adhere to the forementioned origin of this name, which appears to have in it a good deal of probability.

III. Canon is originally a Greek word, ſignifying a rule or ſtandard, by which other things are to be examined and judged.

As the writings of the prophets and apoſtles and evangeliſts contain an authentic account of the revealed will of God, they are the rule of the belief and practice of thoſe who receive them.

Sometimes canon ſeems equivalent to a liſt or catalogue, in which are inſerted thoſe books, which contain the rule of faith.

Du Pin ſays, 'This [h] word ſignifies not only a law or rule, 'but likewiſe a table, catalogue, liſt. Some have ſuppoſed, 'that the canonical books were ſo called, becauſe they are the 'rule of the faith. But though it be true, that they are the 'rule of our faith; yet the reaſon of their being called cano-'nical, is, becauſe they are placed in the catalogue of ſacred 'books.'

Perhaps, there is no need to diſpute about this; for there is no great difference in thoſe two ſenſes: and there may

[f] Suſpicari deinde cœpi, ideo biblia dictum eſſe ſacrum codicem, quod tanquam liber omnium præſtantiſſimus κατ' εξοχην dictus ſit τα βιβλια. Suppetias conjecturæ huic ferre videbatur illa appellatio, qua idem divinum opus vocari ſolet αι γραφαι. e. gr. Act. xviii. 24, 28. Id. ib. p. 413.

[g] Ib. p. 414.

[h] Le mot ſignifie non ſeulement une loi, une regle, mais auſſi une table, un catalogue, une liſte..., Quelques uns ont cru, que les livres canoniques étoient ainſi appellez, parcequ'ils ſont la regle de la foi. Mais quoique cela ſoit vrai, ce n'eſt pas ce qui leur a fait donner le nom de canoniques, qu'ils n'ont que parceque l'on a nommé canon le catalogue des livres ſacrez. Diſſ. Prelim. I. 1. ch. I. § 2.

be paſſages of ancient writers, where it would be difficult to determine, which of them is intended.

St. Paul has twice uſed the word canon, or rule. Gal. vi. 16. *As many as walk according to this rule.* Upon which verſe Theodoret's comment is to this purpoſe: 'He [i] calls 'the forementioned doctrine a rule, as being ſtraight, and 'having nothing wanting, nor ſuperfluous.' Again, ſays St. Paul, Philip. iii. 16. *Whereunto we have already attained, let us walk according to the ſame rule.* Where he ſpeaks of the doctrine of the goſpel in general, or of ſome particular maxim of it: not of any books containing the rule of faith. However, his uſe of the word may have been an occaſion of affixing that denomination to the books of ſcripture: for it is of great antiquity among Chriſtians.

Irenæus, ſpeaking of the ſcriptures, as the words of God, calls [k] them the rule, or canon of truth. Here canon is not a catalogue, but the books, or the doctrine contained in the books of ſcripture.

Clement of Alexandria, referring to a quotation of the goſpel according to the Egyptians, ſays with indignation: 'But [l] they who chooſe to follow any thing, rather than the 'true evangelical canon [or the canon of the goſpel] inſiſt 'upon what follows there as ſaid to Salome.' In another place he ſays: 'The [m] eccleſiaſtical canon is the conſent 'and agreement of the law and the prophets with the teſ-'tament delivered by the Lord.'

Euſebius, as [n] formerly quoted, ſays of Origen: 'But 'in the firſt book of his Commentaries upon the goſpel of 'Matthew, obſerving [o] the eccleſiaſtical canon, he declares 'that he knew of four goſpels only.'

I ſhall add a few more paſſages from later writers, chiefly ſuch as have been already quoted in the foregoing volumes:

[i] Κανονα εκαλεσε την προκειμενην διδασκαλιαν, ως ευθυτηλι κοσμουμενην, και μητε ελλειπον τι, μητε περιττον εχουσαν. Theod. in loc.

[k] Nos autem unum et ſolum verum Deum doctorem ſequentes, et regulam veritatis habentes ejus ſermones, de iiſdem ſemper eadem dicimus omnes. Iren. l. 4. c. 35. al. 69. f. p. 277.

[l] See vol. II. p. 235.

[m] Κανων δε εκκλησιαστικος η συνωδια και η συμφωνια νομου τε και προφητων τη κατα την δι κυριε παρουσιαν παραδιδομενη διαθηκη. Cl. Strom. l. 6. p. 676. C.

[n] Vol. II. p. 466.

[o] . . . τον εκκλησιαστικον φυλατλων κανονα. Ap. Euſeb. l. 6. c. 25. p. 226. B.

to

to which paſſages therefore the reader may eaſily have recourſe.

Athanaſius [p] in his Feſtal Epiſtle ſpeaks of three ſorts of books, the canonical, the ſame which are now received by us, ſuch as were allowed to be read, and then of ſuch as are apocryphal: by which he means books forged by heretics.

In the ſynopſis of ſcripture, aſcribed to him, but probably not written till above a hundred years after his time, near the end of the fifth century, is frequent mention [q] of canonical and uncanonical books.

The council of Laodicea, about 363, ordains, that [qq] 'no 'books, not canonical, ſhould be read in the church, but 'only the canonical books of the Old and New Teſtament.'

Rufinus, enumerating the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, makes [r] three ſorts of books; ſuch [s] as are included in the canon; ſuch as are not canonical, but eccleſiaſtical, allowed to be read, but not to be alleged for proof of any doctrine; and laſtly, apocryphal books, which were not to be publicly read.

Jerom likewiſe often ſpeaks of the canon of ſcripture, as we ſaw in his chapter, where he ſays: 'Eccleſiaſticus, 't Judith, Tobit, and the Shepherd, are not in the canon:' and 'that [u] 'the church reads, or allows to be read, Judith, Tobit and the 'Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical 'ſcriptures: and that they, and the books of Wiſdom and 'Eccleſiaſticus, may be read for the edification of the peo-'ple, but not as of authority for proving any doctrines'. And for the Old Teſtament he recommends [x] the true Jewiſh canon, or Hebrew verity. I refer below to [y] another place relating to the books of the New Teſtament.

The third council of Carthage, about 397, ordains,

[p] Vol. IV. p. 283, 284.
[q] Ib. p. 290—292.
[qq] The ſame, p. 308.
[r] See vol. V. p. 76, 77.
[s] Hæc ſunt, quæ patres intra canonem concluſerunt, & ex quibus fidei noſtræ aſſertiones conſtare voluerunt.... Sciendum tamen eſt, quod alii libri ſunt, qui non ſunt canonici, ſed eccleſiaſtici a majoribus appellati ſunt.... Quæ omnia legi quidem in eccleſiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Cæteras vero ſcripturas apocryphas nominarunt, quas in eccleſiis legi noluerunt. Rufin. citat. ubi ſupra, p. 185. note g.
[t] Vol. V. p. 17.
[u] ... p. 18. [x] p. 22.
[y] p. 35, 36.

'that [z] nothing beſide the canonical ſcriptures be read in 'the church under the name of Divine Scriptures.'

Auguſtine, in 395, and afterwards, often [a] ſpeaks of canonical ſcriptures, and the [b] whole canon of ſcripture, that is, all the ſacred books of the Old and New Teſtament. We 'read of ſome, ſays he, that *they ſearched the ſcriptures daily,* 'whether thoſe things were ſo, Acts xvii. 11. What ſcrip- 'tures, I pray, except the canonical ſcriptures of the law 'and the prophets? To them have been ſince added the 'goſpels, the epiſtles of apoſtles, the Acts of the apoſtles, 'and the Revelation of John.' Of the ſuperior authority of the canonical ſcriptures to all others, he ſpeaks frequently in paſſages afterwards alleged [d] in the ſame chapter.

Chryſoſtom, in a place already cited, [e] ſays: 'They [f] fall 'into great abſurdities who will not follow the rule (or 'canon) of the divine ſcripture, but truſt entirely to their 'own reaſoning.' I refer to another place [g] to the like purpoſe.

Says Iſidore of Peluſium, about 412: 'that [i] theſe things 'are ſo, we ſhall perceive, if we attend to the rule [canon] 'of truth, the divine ſcriptures.'

And Leontius of Conſtantinople, about 610, having cited the whole catalogue of the books of ſcripture from Geneſis to the Revelation [k] concludes: 'Theſe [l] are the ancient and 'the new books, which are received in the church as 'canonical.'

By all which we diſcern, how much the uſe of theſe words, canon and canonical, has obtained among Chriſtians, denoting thoſe books which are of the higheſt authority, and the rule of faith; as oppoſed to all other whatever, particularly to eccleſiaſtical, or the writings of orthodox and learned catholics, and to apocryphal, the productions, chiefly of heretics, which by a ſpecious name

[z] ... p. 79. [a] p. 84.

[b] Totus autem canon ſcripturarum ... his libris continetur. Ib. note r. ibid.

[c] ... p. 103.

[d] See p. 103—109.

[e] Vol. V. Recapitulation of chap. cxviii.

[f] Ὁρᾳς, εις οσην ατοπιαν εμπιπλασιν οι μη βλεποντες τῳ της θειας γραφης κατακολουθειν κανονι κ. λ. In Gen. cap. 33. hom, 58. T. IV. p. 566. B.

[g] Vid. hom. 33. in Act, Ap. ſub fin.

[i] Οτι δε ταυτα ουτως εχει, τον κανονα της αληθειας, τας θειας φημι γραφας, κατοψευσωμεν. Iſid. ep. 114. l. 4.

[k] See vol. V. p. 311.

[l] Ταυτα εστι τα κανονιζομενα βιβλια εν τη εκκλησια, και παλαια και νεα. Citat. ibid. p. 380. note e.

and

and title made a pretenſion to be accounted among ſacred books.

IV. The moſt common and general diviſion of the canonical books is that of ancient and new, or the Old and New Teſtament. The Hebrew word *berith*, from which it is tranſlated, properly ſignifies [m] covenant. St. Paul 2 Cor. iii. 6—18. ſhowing the ſuperior excellence of the goſpel covenant, or the diſpenſation by Chriſt, above the legal covenant, or the diſpenſation by Moſes, uſeth the word teſtament, not only for the covenant itſelf, but likewiſe for the books in which it is contained. At leaſt he does ſo in ſpeaking of the legal covenant. For, repreſenting the caſe of the unbelieving part of the Jewiſh people, he ſays, ver. 14. *Until this day remaineth the ſame vail untaken away in reading the Old Teſtament.*

It is no wonder therefore that this way of ſpeaking has much prevailed among Chriſtians. Melito, biſhop of Sardis, about the year 177, went into the eaſt, to get an exact account of the books of the law and the prophets. In his letter to his friend Oneſimus, giving an account of his journey, and reckoning up the books in their order, he calls them [n] the ancient books, and [o] the books of the Old Teſtament. Euſebius calls it [p] 'a catalogue of the acknowledged ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament.' Our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian elſewhere [q] ſpeaks of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament. I ſhall remind my readers of but one inſtance more. Cyril of Jeruſalem, introducing his catalogue of ſcriptures received by the chriſtian church, ſays: 'Theſe [r] things we are taught by the divinely inſpired ſcriptures 'of the Old and New Teſtament.' Many other like examples occur in the preceding volumes of this work.

V. Inſtead of teſtament, Latin writers ſometimes uſe the word inſtrument, denoting writing, charter, record. We find it ſeveral times in Tertullian, reckoned the moſt ancient Latin writer of the church now remaining. In a

[m] Notandum, quod Berith, verbum Hebraicum, Aquila *συνθηκην*, id eſt, pactum, interpretatur: LXX ſemper *διαθηκην*, id eſt, teſtamentum: et in pleriſque ſcripturarum locis teſtamentum non voluntatem defunctorum ſonare, ſed pactum viventium. Hieron. in Malach. cap. ii. T. III. p. 1816.

[n] Ετι δε και μαθειν την των παλαιων βιβλιων εξακριβωσιν. κ. λ. Ap. Euſeb. l. 4. c. 27. p. 148. D.

[o] . . . Και ακριβως μαθων τα της παλαιας διαθηκης βιβλια. Ib. p. 149. A.

[p] Ibid. p. 148. D.

[q] See vol. IV. p. 271.

[r] The ſame, p. 299.

paſſage

paſſage already [s] cited he calls the goſpels, or the New Teſtament in general, the evangelic inſtrument. And ſays: 'How [t] large chaſms Marcion has made in the epiſtle to 'the Romans, by leaving out what he pleaſes, may appear 'from our entire inſtrument:' or our unaltered copies of the New Teſtament, particularly of that epiſtle. Speaking of the ſhepherd of Hermas, he ſays, it [u] was not reckoned a part of the divine inſtrument: thereby meaning, as it ſeems, the New Teſtament: which paſſage was quoted by us [x] formerly. He calls [y] the law and the prophets the Jewiſh inſtruments: that is, writings or ſcriptures. He ſpeaks of the antiquity [z] of the Jewiſh inſtruments or ſcriptures. He [a] ſeems in one place to uſe the word inſtrument, as equivalent to ſcriptures, containing the doctrine of revelation, or the revealed will of God.

VI. Digeſt is another word uſed by Tertullian in ſpeaking of the ſcriptures. 'Luke's [b] digeſt, he ſays, is often aſcribed to Paul.' He calls [c] the goſpels, or the whole New Teſtament, 'our digeſt,' in alluſion, as it ſeems, to ſome collection of the Roman laws digeſted into order. Thoſe two paſſages were cited in the chapter of Tertullian. I now tranſcribe the latter below [d] more at large, it having alſo the word inſtrument, as equivalent to the New Teſta-

[s] See vol. II. p. 256.

[t] Quantas autem foveas in iſta vel maxime epiſtola [ad Romanos] Marcion fecerit, auferendo quæ voluit, de noſtri Inſtrumenti integritate patebit. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. 13. p. 601.

[u] Sed cederem tibi, ſi ſcriptura Paſtoris — divino inſtrumento meruiſſet incidi. . . . De Pudicit. cap. 10. p. 727. A.

[x] See vol. II. p. 284.

[y] Aut nunquid non juſti Judæi, & quibus pœnitentia non opus eſſet, habentes gubernacula diſciplinæ & timoris inſtrumenta, legem & prophetas. De Pudicitia. cap. 7. p. 722. B.

[z] Primam inſtrumentis iſtis auctoritatem ſumma antiquitas vindicat. Apol. cap. 19. p. 19. B.

Sed quoniam edidimus, antiquiſſimis Judæorum inſtrumentis ſectam iſtam eſſe ſuffultam. Apol. cap. 21. in. p. 20.

[a] Sed quo plenius et impreſſius tam ipſum, quam diſpoſitiones ejus et voluntates adiremus, inſtrumentum adjecit literaturæ, ſi quis velit de Deo inquirere. Apol. cap. 18. p. 18. C.

[b] See vol. II. p. 258.

[c] The ſame, p. 280.

[d] Si vero Apoſtoli quidem integrum evangelium contulerunt, de ſola convictus inæqualitate reprehenſi, Pſeudapoſtoli autem veritatem eorum interpolârunt, et inde ſunt noſtra digeſta: quod erit germanum illud Apoſtolorum inſtrumentum, quod adulteros paſſum eſt? Adver. Marc. l. 4. cap. 3. p. 504. B.

ment.

ment. He likewiſe calls the Jewiſh ſcriptures [c] 'Sacred Digeſts.' He ſeems to uſe the word digeſt [f] elſewhere, as equivalent to writing, or work in general.

I ſhall not take notice of any other general denominations of the ſacred ſcriptures.

VII. My chief concern is with the New Teſtament, which, as is well known, conſiſts of goſpels, the Acts, and epiſtles. The only word that needs explanation is the firſt.

Goſpel is a tranſlation of the Greek word ευαγγελιον, the Latin word, *evangelium*, which ſignifies any good meſſage or tidings. In the New Teſtament the word denotes the doctrine of ſalvation, taught by Jeſus Chriſt, and his apoſtles: which indeed is goſpel by way of eminence, as it is the beſt tidings that ever were publiſhed in this world. Says Theodoret upon Rom. i. 1. 'He [g] calls it goſpel, 'as it contains aſſurance of many good things. For it 'proclaims peace with God, the overthrow of Satan, the 'remiſſion of ſins, the aboliſhing of death, the reſurrection 'of the dead, eternal life, and the kingdom of heaven.'

Says St. Matthew iv. 23. *And Jeſus went about all Galilee, teaching in their ſynagogues, and preaching the goſpel of the kingdom.* Και κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας· Mark xiii. 10. *And the goſpel* [το ευαγγελιον] *muſt firſt be preached to all nations.* Ch. xvi. 15. *Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature.* Κηρυξατε το ευαγγελιον. It is called *the word of truth, the goſpel of your ſalvation*, Eph. i. 13. And in like manner in other places.

But by goſpel, when uſed by us concerning the writings of the evangeliſts, we mean the hiſtory of Chriſt's preaching and miracles. The word ſeems alſo to be ſo uſed by St. Mark i. 1. *The beginning of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt.* Which

[c] Sed homines gloriæ, ut diximus, et eloquentiæ ſolius libidinoſi, ſi quid in ſanctis offenderunt digeſtis, exinde regeſtum pro inſtituto curioſitatis ad propria verterunt. Apol. cap. 47. p. 41. B.

[f] Elegi ad compendium Varronis opera, qui rerum divinarum ex omnibus retro digeſtis commentatus, idoneum ſe nobis ſcopum expoſuit. Ad Nation. l. 2. cap. i. p. 64. C.

[g] Ευαγγελιον δε το κηρυγμα προσηγορευσεν, ως πολλων αγαθων υπισχνουμενον χορηγιαν. Ευαγγελιζεται γαρ τας τυ θευ καλλαγας, την τυ διαβολυ, καλαλυσιν, των αμαρτηματων την αφεσιν, τυ θανατυ την παυλαν, των νεκρων την αναστασιν, την ζωην την αιωνιον, την βασιλειαν των υρανων. In ep. ad Rom. T. III. p. 10. B.

may

may be understood, and paraphrased thus: 'Here [a] begins 'the history of the life and doctrine of Jesus Christ the Son 'of God, and Saviour of mankind.'

St. Luke, referring to the book of his gospel, says, Acts i. 1, 2. *The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began to do and teach, until the day in the which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen.* But St. Luke, as it seems, there puts the principal part for the whole. For he has therein written also the history of our Lord's miraculous birth, and divers extraordinary events attending it: and likewise the history of the birth of John the Baptist, and divers circumstances of it, and his preaching and death.

In this sense the word gospel is frequently understood by us. A gospel is the history of Jesus Christ, his doctrine, miracles, resurrection, and ascension: not excluding the history of his fore-runner, who [b] also is said to have preached the gospel, that is, the doctrine of the gospel, or the kingdom of God.

The gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, is the history of Jesus Christ, as written by those several evangelists.

[a] That is Dr. Clarke's paraphrase. But I am sensible, it will not be allowed by all. Œcumenius says, that by gospel Mark does not intend his own writing, but Christ's preaching. Μαρκ@, αρχη, φησι, τε ευαγγελιε ιησε χριςε, αλλα ε την εαυτε συγγραφην καλει ευαγγελιον, αλλα το τε χριςε κηρυγμα. Œcum. in Act. Ap. He proceeds to say, that the faithful afterwards called the writings of the evangelists gospels, as truly containing the gospel, that is, the doctrine of Christ. See vol. V. p. 324.

[b] Matt. iii. 1, 2. *In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying: repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.* Compare Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 1, 2. And says St. Luke iii. 18. *And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.* Πολλα μεν ουν και ετερα παρακαλων, ευηγγελιζετο τον λαον. Which may be literally rendered thus: *And exhorting many other like things, he evangelized* [or *preached the gospel to*] *the people.*

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

General Obſervations upon the Canon of the New Teſtament.

I. THE canonical books of the New Teſtament, received by Chriſtians in this part of the world, are the four goſpels, the Acts of the apoſtles, fourteen epiſtles of St. Paul, ſeven catholic epiſtles, and the Revelation.

II. There may be different canons of the New Teſtament among Chriſtians.

Indeed, there have been in former times, and ſtill are different ſentiments among Chriſtians, concerning the number of books to be received as canonical. The [a] canon of the Syrian churches is not the ſame as ours. Jerom tells us, that [b] in his time ſome of the Latins rejected the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and ſome of the Greeks the book of the Revelation. From Chryſoſtom's works we perceive, that [c] he did not receive the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter, nor the ſecond and third of St. John, nor the epiſtle of St. Jude, nor the Revelation. And there is reaſon to think, that [d] Theodoret's canon likewiſe was much the ſame with Chryſoſtom's, and that of the churches in Syria. Nevertheleſs, we have obſerved in the courſe of this work, that about the ſame time the Egyptians, and the Chriſtians in divers other parts of the world, had the ſame number of canonical books that we have.

But to come nearer our own time. Calvin, [e] Grotius, [f] Le Clerc, [g] Philip Limborch, [h] and ſome other learned moderns, have not admitted the epiſtle to the Hebrews to have been written by St. Paul: though [i] they were willing

[a] See vol. IV. p. 441. Vol. V. p. 268, 269.

[b] Vol. V. p. 49.

[c] The ſame, p. 138.

[d] p. 195, 196

[e] Ego ut Paulum agnoſcam auctorem, adduci nequeo. Calvin. argum. in ep. ad Hebr.

[f] Facillima refutatu eſt poſtrema hæc opinio, ideo quod Paulinæ epiſtolæ inter ſe ſint germanæ, pari charactere ac dicendi modo: hæc vero manifeſte ab iis diſcrepet, ſelectiores habens voces Græcas, leniuſque fluens, non autem fracta brevibus inciſis, ac ſalebroſa.... Grot. Prooem. in ep. ad Hebr.

[g] Hiſt. Ec. Ann. 69. p. 455—461.

[h] Prolegom. in ep. ad Hebr.

[i] Hiſce argumentis utrinque attente expenſis dicendum videtur, Paulum epiſtolæ hujus ſcriptorem non videri... Quis vero illius ſcriptor ſit, incertum eſt. Alii eam

willing to allow it to be the work of an apoſtolical man, and a valuable part of ſacred ſcripture. But I cannot ſay, that they were in the right in ſo doing. For it appears to me to have been a maxim of the ancient Chriſtians, not to receive any doctrinal or preceptive writing, as of authority, unleſs it were known to be the work of an apoſtle. Conſequently, the epiſtle to the Hebrews, if written by an apoſtolical man only, ſhould not be eſteemed canonical.

Grotius [k] likewiſe ſuppoſed the ſecond epiſtle aſcribed to Peter, not to have been written by the apoſtle Simon Peter, but by Simeon, choſen biſhop of Jeruſalem after the death of James the juſt, whoſe epiſtle we have. Which Simeon lived to the time of Trajan, when he was crucified for the name of Chriſt. Upon which I only obſerve at preſent, that if this Simeon be the writer of this epiſtle, it ſhould not be a part of canonical ſcripture.

The ſame learned man ſuppoſeth [l] the ſecond and third epiſtles, called St. John's, not to have been written by John the apoſtle, but by another John, an elder or preſbyter, who lived about the ſame time, and after him at Epheſus.

And the epiſtle called St. Jude's, he thought [m] to have been written by one of that name, who was biſhop of Jeruſalem in the time of the emperor Adrian, and not till after

eam Lucæ, alii Barnabæ, alii Clementi adſcribunt. . . . Interim divinam hujus epiſtolæ autoritatem agnoſcimus, multiſque aliis, quas ab Apoſtolis eſſe ſcriptas, conſtat, ob argumenti quod tractat præſtantiam præferendam judicamus. Limb. ibid. Vid. et Calvin. ubi ſupra.

[k] Jam olim veterum multi credidêre, non eſſe apoſtoli Petri, argumento tum dictionis ab epiſtola priore multum diverſæ, quod agnoſcunt Euſebius & Hieronymus, tum quod multæ olim eccleſiæ hanc non receperint. . . . Scriptorem autem hujus epiſtolæ arbitror eſſe Simeonem ſive Simonem, epiſcopum poſt Jacobi mortem Hieroſolymis, ejuſdemque Jacobi, cujus epiſtolam habemus, ſucceſſorem & imitatorem. . . . Unde etiam conſtat, vixiſſe hunc poſt excidium Hieroſolymitanum ad Trajani tempora, & tunc pro nomine Chriſti crucifixum. Annot. in Ep. Petri ſecund.

[l] Hanc epiſtolam, & eam quæ ſequitur, non eſſe Johannis Apoſtoli, veterum multi jam olim crediderunt, a quibus non diſſentiunt Euſebius & Hieronymus. Et magna ſunt in id argumenta. Nam duos fuiſſe Johannes Epheſi, apoſtolum, ac preſbyterum ejus diſcipulum, ſemper conſtitit ex ſepulchris, alio hujus, alio illius: quæ ſepulchra vidit Hieronymus. Grot. Annot. in ep. Joan. ſecund.

[m] Quare omnino adducor, ut credam eſſe hanc epiſtolam Judæ Epiſcopi Hieroſolymitani, qui fuit Adriani temporibus, paulo ante Barchochebam. Id. in Annot. ad ep. Judæ.

there

there had been ſeveral other biſhops of that church, ſince the death of the forementioned Simeon. If ſo, I believe all men may be of opinion, that this epiſtle ought not to be placed in the canon of the New Teſtament.

It may not be thought right, if I ſhould here entirely omit Mr. Whiſton, whoſe canon conſiſted of the [n] Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, and divers other books, as ſacred, beſide thoſe generally received: and [o] the Conſtitutions, in particular, as the moſt ſacred of all the canonical books of the New Teſtament.

Concerning which I beg leave to obſerve; Firſt, that the receiving the Conſtitutions as a ſacred book, and part of the rule of faith, would make a great alteration in the Chriſtian ſcheme. Some might be induced to think it no great bleſſing to mankind, and ſcarcely deſerving an apology. Secondly, Mr. Whiſton's canon is not the canon of the chriſtian churches in former times; as is manifeſt from the large collections made by us in the preceding volumes, from eccleſiaſtical writers of every age to the beginning of the twelfth century. Thirdly, Mr. Whiſton, notwithſtanding all his labours, made few converts to this opinion: which I impute to the knowledge and learning

[n] 'The ſacred books of the New 'Teſtament ſtill extant, both thoſe 'in the 85th canon, and thoſe 'written afterwards, are the ſame 'which we now receive; together 'with the eight books of Apoſto-'lical Conſtitutions, and their epi-'tome, the Doctrine of the apoſtles; 'the two Epiſtles of Clement, the 'Epiſtle of Barnabas, the Shepherd 'of Hermas, and perhaps the 'ſecond book of apocryphal Eſdras, 'with the Epiſtles of Ignatius and 'Polycarp.' Eſſay on the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, ch. i. p. 70, 71.

[o] 'If any one has a mind to ſort 'the ſeveral books of the New 'Teſtament, he may in the firſt 'place ſet the Apoſtolical Conſti-'tutions with its extract, or Doc-'trine of the apoſtles, as derived 'from the body, or college of the 'apoſtles met in councils. In the 'next place he may put the four 'goſpels, with their appendix, the 'Acts of the apoſtles. The Apo-'calypſe of John alſo cannot be 'reckoned at all inferior to them, 'though it be quite of another 'nature from them. In the third 'rank may ſtand the epiſtles of the 'apoſtles, Paul, Peter and John. 'In the fourth rank may ſtand the 'epiſtles of the brethren of our 'Lord, James and Jude. In the 'fifth and laſt rank may ſtand the 'epiſtles and writings of the com-'panions and attendants of the 'apoſtles, Barnabas, Clement, Her-'mas, Ignatius, Polycarp. All 'which, with the addition perhaps 'of apocryphal Eſdras, and of the 'Apocalypſe of Peter, and the Acts 'of Paul where now extant, I look 'upon, though in different de-'grees, as the ſacred books of the 'New Teſtament.' Ibid. p. 72, 73.

of

of our times. And as the christian religion is built upon facts, the study of ecclesiastical antiquity will be always needful, and may be of use to defeat various attempts of ingenious, but mistaken and prejudiced men.

III. A short canon of scripture is most eligible.

Religion is the concern of all men. A few short histories and epistles are better fitted for general use, than numerous and prolix writings. Besides, if any writings are to be received as the rule of faith and manners, it is of the utmost importance, that they be justly entitled to that distinction: otherwise men may be led into errors of very bad consequence. If any books pretend to deliver the doctrine of infallible, and divinely inspired teachers, such as Jesus Christ and his apostles are esteemed by Christians; great care should be taken to be well satisfied, that their accounts are authentic, and that they are the genuine writings of the men whose names they bear. The pretensions of writings, placed in high authority, to which great credit is given, ought to be well attested.

Dr. Jortin, speaking of the work called Apostolical Constitutions, says: 'The [p] authors of them are, it is pretended, 'the twelve apostles, and St. Paul gathered together, with 'Clement their amanuensis.

'If their authority should appear only ambiguous, it would 'be our duty to reject them, lest we should adopt as divine 'doctrines the commandments of men. For since each gospel 'contains the main parts of Christianity, and might be sufficient to make men wise to salvation; there is less danger 'in diminishing, than in enlarging the number of canonical 'books: and less evil would have ensued from the loss of 'one of the four gospels, than from the addition of a fifth 'and spurious one.'

In my opinion, that is a very fine and valuable observation.

And I shall transcribe again an observation of Augustine, formerly [q] taken notice of: 'Our canonical books of scrip-'ture, which are of the highest authority with us, have been 'settled with great care. They ought to be few, lest their 'value should be diminished: and yet they are so many, that 'their agreement throughout is wonderful.'

IV. I have been sometimes apt to think, that the best canon of the New Testament would be that which may be

[p] Dr. Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, vol. I. p. 229.

[q] See vol. V. p. 117.

collected

collected from [r] Euſebius of Cæſarea, and ſeems to have been the canon of ſome in his time.

The canon ſhould conſiſt of two claſſes. In the firſt ſhould be thoſe books which he aſſures us were then univerſally acknowledged, and had been all along received by all Catholic Chriſtians. Theſe are the four goſpels, the Acts of the apoſtles, thirteen epiſtles of St. Paul, one epiſtle of St. Peter, and one epiſtle of St. John. Theſe only ſhould be of the higheſt authority, from which doctrines of religion may be proved.

In the other claſs ſhould be placed thoſe books of which Euſebius ſpeaks, as contradicted in his time, though well known: concerning which there were doubts, whether they were written by perſons whoſe names they bear, or whether the writers were apoſtles of Chriſt. Theſe are the epiſtle to the Hebrews, the epiſtle of James, the ſecond of Peter, the ſecond and third of John, the epiſtle of Jude, and the Revelation. Theſe ſhould be reckoned doubtful, and contradicted: though many might be of opinion, that there is a good deal of reaſon to believe them genuine. And they ſhould be allowed to be publicly read in chriſtian aſſemblies, for the edification of the people: but not to be alleged, as affording, alone, ſufficient proof of any doctrine.

That I may not be miſunderſtood, I muſt add, that there ſhould be no third claſs of ſacred books: foraſmuch as there appears not any reaſon from chriſtian antiquity to allow of that character and denomination to any chriſtian writings, beſide thoſe above-mentioned.

In this canon the preceding rule is regarded. It is a ſhort canon. And it ſeems to have been thought of by ſome about [a] the time of the reformation.

V. Nevertheleſs

[r] Vol. IV. p. 224—231.

[a] We learn from Paul Sarpi's Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, that one of the doctrinal articles concerning ſacred ſcripture, extracted, or pretended to be extracted out of Luther's works, was this: 'That no books ſhould be 'reckoned a part of the Old Teſta-'ment, beſide thoſe received by the 'Jews: and that out of the New 'Teſtament ſhould be excluded the 'epiſtle to the Hebrews, the epiſtle 'of James, the ſecond of Peter, 'the ſecond and third of John, the 'epiſtle of Jude, and the Reve-'lation.' And there were ſome biſhops in that council, 'who 'would have had the books of the 'New Teſtament divided into 'two claſſes: in one of which 'ſhould be put thoſe books only, 'which had been always received 'without contradiction: and in the 'other

V. Nevertheleſs that which is now generally received, is a good canon.

For it contains only thoſe books, which were acknowledged by all in the time of Euſebius, and from the beginning, and ſeven others, which were then well known, and were next in eſteem to thoſe before-mentioned, as univerſally acknowledged: and were more generally received as of authority, than any other controverted writings. Nor is there in them any thing inconſiſtent with the facts, or principles delivered in the univerſally acknowledged books. And moreover, there may be a great deal of reaſon to think, that they are the genuine writings of thoſe, to whom they are aſcribed, and that the writers were apoſtles. This evidence will be carefully examined, and diſtinctly conſidered as we proceed.

In this canon likewiſe the above-mentioned rule is regarded. It is a ſhort canon. For out of it are excluded many books, which might ſeem to make a claim to be ranked among ſacred and canonical ſcriptures.

VI. There are not any books, beſide thoſe now generally received by us, that ought to be eſteemed canonical, or books of authority.

I ſuppoſe this to be evident to all, who have carefully attended to the hiſtory in the ſeveral volumes of this work; and that there is no reaſon to receive, as a part of ſacred ſcripture, the epiſtle of Barnabas, the epiſtle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Recognitions, the Clementine Homilies, the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, the Goſpel of Peter, or Matthias, or Thomas, the Preaching of Peter, the Acts of Peter and Paul, of Andrew, and John, and other apoſtles, the Revelation of Peter and Paul, their Travels or Circuits. That theſe books were not received as ſacred ſcripture, or a part of the rule of faith, by Chriſtians in former times has been ſhown: nor can they therefore be reaſonably received by us as ſuch.

The only writing of all theſe, that ſeems to make a fair claim to be a part of ſacred ſcripture, is the epiſtle of St. Barnabas, if genuine, as I [s] have ſuppoſed it to be.

'other thoſe which had been re-
'jected by ſome, or about which at
'leaſt there had been doubts.' And Dr. Courayer, in his notes, ſeems to favour this propoſal. See his French tranſlation of the Hiſtory of the Council of Trent. Liv. 2. ch. 43. tom. I. p. 235. and ch. 47. p. 240. and note i.

[s] See ch. i. vol. II. p. 12—14.

nevertheleſs,

Nevertheleſs, I think, it ought not to be received as ſacred ſcripture, or admitted into the canon for theſe reaſons.

1. It was not reckoned a book of authority, or a part of the rule of faith, by thoſe ancient Chriſtians, who have quoted it, and taken the greateſt notice of it.

Clement of Alexandria has [t] quoted this epiſtle ſeveral times, but not as deciſive, and by way of full proof, as we ſhowed: nor is it ſo quoted by [u] Origen; nor is the epiſtle of Barnabas in any of [x] Origen's catalogues of the books of ſcripture, which we ſtill find in his works, or are taken notice of by Euſebius. By that eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, in one place it is reckoned [y] among ſpurious writings, that is, ſuch as were generally rejected and ſuppoſed not to be a part of the New Teſtament. At other times it is called by him [z] a Controverted book, that is, not received by all.

Nor is this epiſtle placed among ſacred ſcriptures by following writers, who have given catalogues of the books of the New Teſtament. It is wanting, particularly, in the Feſtal Epiſtle [a] of Athanaſius, in [b] the catalogue of Cyril of Jeruſalem, of [c] the council of Laodicea, of [d] Epiphanius, [e] Gregory Nazianzen, [f] Amphilochius, and [g] Jerom, [h] Rufinus, [i] the council of Carthage, and [k] Auguſtine. Nor has it been reckoned a part of canonical ſcripture by later writers.

2. Barnabas was not an apoſtle.

For he was not one of the twelve apoſtles of Chriſt: nor was he choſen in the room of Judas; nor is there in the Acts any account of his being choſen into the number of apoſtles, or appointed to be an apoſtle by Chriſt, as Paul was. What St. Luke ſays of Barnabas is, *that he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghoſt, and of faith*, Acts xi. 24. And in ch. xiii. 1. he is mentioned among prophets and teachers in the church of Antioch. But St. Luke ſpeaks in the like manner of Stephen, of whom he ſays, he was *a man full of faith, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, ch. vi. 5. *full of faith*

[t] p. 232, 233.
[u] p. 497, 498.
[x] p. 465, &c.
[y] Vol. IV. p. 227, 258.
[z] p. 227, 228.
[a] p. 283, 284.
[b] p. 300.
[c] p. 309.
[d] p. 313.
[e] p. 408.
[f] p. 413, 414.
[g] Vol. V. p. 32.
[h] p. 76.
[i] p. 79.
[k] p. 85, 86.

and power, ch. v. 8. *full of the Holy Ghoſt*, ch. vii. 55. And all the ſeven were *full of the Holy Ghoſt, and wiſdom*, ch. vi. 3.

That Barnabas was not an apoſtle, I think, may be concluded from Gal. ii. 9. where Paul ſays: *And when James, and Cephas, and John, who ſeemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given to me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowſhip.* By grace I ſuppoſe St. Paul to mean the favour of the apoſtleſhip. So Rom. i. 5. *By whom we have received grace and apoſtleſhip*, that is, the favour of the apoſtleſhip. Ch. xii. 3. *For I ſay, through the grace given to me*, meaning the eſpecial favour of the apoſtleſhip. And ſee ch. xv. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 10. Eph. iv. 7. compared with ver. 11.

If Barnabas had been an apoſtle, in the fulleſt ſenſe of the word, St. Paul would not have ſaid in the above cited place from the ſecond to the *Galatians, when they perceived the grace given to me*, but, *when they perceived the grace given to me, and Barnabas.* And in the preceding part of the context, particularly, in ver. 7, 8. he twice ſays me, where he would have ſaid us, if Barnabas had been an apoſtle; for he had been mentioned before, in ver. 1.

Indeed, in the Acts, where Paul and Barnabas are mentioned together, Barnabas is ſometimes firſt named, as Acts xi. 30. xii. 25. xiii. 1. 2. and 7. xiv. 14. xv. 12. 25. which, I think, not at all ſtrange, among perſons, who were not intent upon precedence: when too Barnabas was the elder in years and diſcipleſhip. But in ſeveral other places Paul is firſt named, as in Acts xiii. 43. 46. xv. 2, 22, 35. of which no other reaſon can be well aſſigned, beſide that of Paul's apoſtleſhip.

Moreover, wherever they travelled together, if there was an opportunity for diſcourſing, Paul ſpake. So at Paphos, in the iſland of Cyprus, Acts xiii. 6—12. And at Antioch in Piſidia, ch. xiii. 15, 16. See alſo ch. xiv. 12.

And that Paul was the principal perſon, appears from that early account, after they had been in Cyprus, ch. xiii. 13. *Now when Paul and his company looſed from Paphos, they came to Perga, in Pamphylia.*

However, there are ſome texts, which muſt be conſidered by us, as ſeeming to afford objections.

Acts xiv. 4. *But the multitude of the city was divided. Part held with the Jews, and part with the apoſtles:* that is, Paul and Barnabas, who were then at Iconium. And

afterwards,

afterwards, at Lyſtra, ver. 14. *Which when the apoſtles, Barnabas and Paul, heard,* ... Here Barnabas is ſtyled an apoſtle, as well as Paul.

To which I anſwer, firſt, Both being now together, and meeting with the like treatment, might be called apoſtles; though only one of them was, properly, ſo. Secondly, it is not unlikely, that Barnabas and Paul are here ſtyled by St. Luke apoſtles, in regard to what had been done at Antioch, as related by him, ch. xii. 1—4. when by an expreſs order from heaven, they were ſent forth from the church at Antioch, upon a ſpecial commiſſion, in which they were ſtill employed. That deſignation, however ſolemn, did not make either of them apoſtles of Chriſt in the higheſt ſenſe. It was not the apoſtolical, which is a general commiſſion. But it was a particular commiſſion, as appears from that whole hiſtory, and from what is ſaid at the concluſion of the journey, which they had taken, Acts xiv. 26. *And thence they ſailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work, which they had fulfilled.* Nevertheleſs, they are not unfitly called apoſtles upon account of it. So 2 Cor. viii. 13. *Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner, and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be enquired of, they*[1] *are the meſſengers of the churches,* literally, apoſtles of the churches, *and the glory of Chriſt.* If thoſe brethren, which had been appointed by the churches to go to Jeruſalem, with the contributions, which had been made for the relief of the poor ſaints in Judea, might be called apoſtles; there can be no doubt, but Paul and Barnabas might be called apoſtles in regard to the work, to which they had been ſolemnly appointed by the church at Antioch.

Again 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6. *Have we not power to lead about a ſiſter, a wife, as well as other apoſtles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only, and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?*

Some may think, that Barnabas is here ſuppoſed to be an apoſtle. I anſwer, that though Barnabas was not an apoſtle properly, or equally with himſelf, yet Paul, out of an affectionate reſpect to his friend, companion, and fellow-labourer, might be diſpoſed to mention him, upon this occaſion, in the manner he has done. This is ſaid, ſuppo-

[1] αποστολοι εκκλησιων.

sing all before-mentioned to have been apostles of Christ, in the highest sense. But, secondly, it is not certain, that all, before-mentioned, were strictly apostles. It seems to me more likely, that by the brethren of the Lord some are intended, who were not apostles. If so, Paul might reasonably, and without offence, gratify his friendly disposition: and insert here the name of Barnabas, who had shared with him many fatigues and difficulties in the service of the gospel, though he was not an apostle.

I do not therefore discern any good reason from the New Testament, why Barnabas should be reckoned an apostle; but quite otherwise.

The sense of the primitive Christians is agreeable hereto. Few or none of them have thought Barnabas an apostle.

Clement of Alexandria has quoted Barnabas[m] five or six times. Twice he calls him apostle. In another place he calls him the apostolic Barnabas, who was one of the seventy, and fellow-labourer of Paul. These are the highest characters, which he intended to give to Barnabas, and what he means, when he calls him apostle, as is fully shown in the place just referred to.

By Tertullian, as cited by us[n] formerly, Barnabas is plainly reckoned no more, than[o] a companion of apostles.

Eusebius, in a chapter concerning those who were disciples of Christ, says: 'The[p] names of our Saviour's apos-'tles are well known from the gospels: but there is no 'where extant a catalogue of the seventy disciples. How-'ever, it is said, that Barnabas was one of them, who is 'expressly mentioned in the acts, and in Paul's epistle to the 'Galatians.' That learned writer therefore did not know, that Barnabas was an apostle. In[q] another place of the same work, his Ecclesiastical History, he quotes a passage from the seventh book of Clement's Institutions or Hypotoposes, where Barnabas is styled one of the seventy. In his Commentary upon Isaiah[r] Eusebius computes fourteen apos-

[m] Vol. II. p. 232.

[n] p. 270.

[o] Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam Magistrorum. Exstat enim & Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos. Tertull. de Pudicit. cap. 20 p. 741.

[p] . . . Των δε εβδομηκοντα μαθητων καταλογος μεν ουδεις ουδαμη φερεται Λεγεται γε μην εις αυτων βαρναβας. κ. λ. H. E. l. 1. cap. xii.

[q] L. II. cap. i. p. 38 D.

[r] Comm. in Es. p. 422.

tles,

tles, meaning the twelve, and Paul, added to them, and equal to them, and James the Lord's brother, biſhop of Jeruſalem, whom Euſebius did not think to be one of the twelve. Nor does he here ſay, that[s] he was equal to them, or Paul. However, from all theſe places we can be fully aſſured, that our learned eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian did not ſo much as ſuſpect Barnabas to have been an apoſtle, in the higheſt ſenſe of the word.

Jerom, in the article of Barnabas, in his book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, ſays, 'he[t] was ordained with Paul an apoſtle of the gentiles.' But authors, who write in haſte, as Jerom often did, do not always expreſs themſelves exactly and properly. Jerom did not think, that Barnabas was equally an apoſtle with Paul. This may be concluded from what there follows: 'He wrote an epiſtle for the edification 'of the church, which is read among the apocryphal 'ſcriptures.' If Barnabas had been an apoſtle, ſtrictly ſpeaking, Jerom would not have ſaid, 'he wrote an epiſtle for the edification of the church:' which any man might do. Nor would his epiſtle have been reckoned apocryphal, as Jerom here, and elſewhere[u] calls it. When Jerom ſays, that 'Barnabas was ordained with Paul an apoſtle of the gentiles;' it is likely, he refers to the hiſtory in Acts xiii. 1—4. of which I have already ſaid all that is needful.

Theodoret, as formerly quoted, ſays: 'The[x] all-wiſe 'Deity committed the culture of a barren world to a few 'men, and thoſe fiſhermen, and publicans, and one tent-'maker;' and to the like purpoſe often: which ſhows, that he did not reckon Barnabas an apoſtle in the fulleſt meaning of the word. If he had, he muſt have added, 'and one Levite.' The ſame obſervation may be applied to Chryſoſtom, who[y] in his many paſſages ſhowing the wonderful progreſs of the goſpel, often mentions the apoſtles Peter, a fiſherman, and Paul a tent-maker, but never Barnabas a Levite.

If then Barnabas was not an apoſtle, an epiſtle written by him cannot be received as canonical, or a part of the rule of faith: foraſmuch as no men, beſide apoſtles, have the privilege of writing epiſtles, or other works, preceptive,

[s] See vol. IV. p. 252, 253.
[t] See vol. V. p. 58.
[u] Ibid.
[x] Ibid. p. 198—201.
[y] p. 148, 149.

and doctrinal, that ſhall be received by the churches, in that quality. This has been ſaid ſeveral times in the courſe of this [z] work. And I ſtill think it right.

Mark [a] and Luke, apoſtolical men, may write hiſtories of our Lord's and his apoſtles preaching, and doctrine, and miracles, which ſhall be received as ſacred, and of authority. But no epiſtles, or other writings, delivering doctrines and precepts, (except only in the way of hiſtorical narration) can be of authority, but thoſe written by apoſtles.

Says Jerom of St. John: 'He [b] was at once apoſtle, 'evangeliſt, and prophet: apoſtle, in that he wrote letters 'to the churches as a maſter: evangeliſt, as he wrote a 'book of the goſpel, which no other of the twelve apoſtles 'did, except Matthew: prophet, as he ſaw the Revelation 'in the iſland Patmos, where he was baniſhed by Domitian.'

Frederic Spanheim, in his Diſſertation concerning the twelve apoſtles, readily acknowledgeth this to be one prerogative of apoſtles: 'That [c] they may write epiſtles, which 'ſhall be received as canonical, and be of univerſal and 'perpetual authority in the church.'

3. Barnabas does not take upon himſelf the character of an apoſtle, or a man of authority.

Near the beginning of the epiſtle he ſays: 'I [d] therefore, 'not as a teacher, but as one of you, ſhall lay before you a 'few things, that you may be joyful.' And ſomewhat lower: 'again, 'I entreat you, as one of you.'

He writes as a man, who had gifts of the ſpirit, but not that full meaſure, which was a prerogative of apoſtles. 'He [f] who put the engrafted gift of his doctrine in us, 'knows, that no man has received [or learned] from me a 'truer word. But I know, that you are worthy.'

[z] See apoſtles in the alphabetical Table of principal matters.

[a] See vol. II. p 234.

[b] Vol. V. p. 42.

[c] Decimus nobis character apoſtolicæ υπεροχης eſt poteſtas ſcribendi ad eccleſias plures, vel ad omnes, τοις καθολικ πιστοις, hujuſmodi epiſtolas, quæ in canonem referri mererentur, id eſt, quæ forent canonicæ, univerſalis et perpetuæ in Eccleſia auctoritatis. Diſſ. prima de Apoſtol. Duod. num. xi. Opp. T. II. p. 310.

[d] Ego autem non tanquam doctor, ſed unus ex vobis, demonſtrabo pauca, per quæ in plurimis lætiores ſitis. Barn. ep. cap. i.

[e] Adhuc & hoc rogo vos, tanquam unus ex vobis. Ib. cap 4.

[f] Ὁιδεν ο την εμφυτον δωρεαν της διδαχης αυτ θεμεν@ εν ημιν εδεις γνησιωτερον εμαθεν απ εμ λογον. Αλλα οιδα, οτι αξιοι στε υμεις. Cap. 9.

I ſhall

I ſhall add a few more very modeſt expreſſions, not ſuitable to an apoſtle.

'Thus [g] as much as in me lies, I have written to you 'with great plainneſs. And I hope, that according to my 'ability, I have omitted nothing conducive to your ſalva- 'tion in the preſent circumſtance.'

In the laſt chapter: 'I [h] beſeech you: I aſk it as a favour 'of you, whilſt you are in this beautiful veſſel of the body, 'be wanting in none of theſe things.' And ſtill nearer the concluſion. 'Wherefore I have endeavoured to write to you, according to my ability, that you might rejoice.'

Upon the whole, this epiſtle well anſwers the character given of Barnabas in the Acts, particularly, ch. xi. 24. *He was full of the Holy Ghoſt.* The writer of this epiſtle had the gift of the ſpirit, though not that meaſure, which was peculiar to apoſtles. *He was full of faith.* The writer of this epiſtle had an earneſt zeal for the truth and ſimplicity of the goſpel. He was alſo *a good man.* In this epiſtle we obſerve the mildneſs and gentleneſs, by which Barnabas ſeems to have been diſtinguiſhed: but we do not diſcern here the dignity and authority of an apoſtle.

Conſequently, this epiſtle may afford edification, and may be read with that view. But it ought not to be eſteemed by us, as it was not by the ancients, a part of the rule of faith.

CHAP III.

Of the Method in which the Canon of the New Teſtament has been formed.

THE canon of the New Teſtament is a collection of books, written by ſeveral perſons, in ſeveral places, and at different times. It is therefore reaſonable to think, that it was formed gradually. At the riſe of the Chriſtian Religion there were no written ſyſtems or records of it. It was firſt taught and confirmed by Chriſt himſelf in his moſt glorious

[g] Ἐφ' οσον ην εν δυνατῳ και απλοτητι δηλωσαι υμιν ελπιζει μϐ η ψυχη τῃ επιθυμιᾳ μϐ μη παραλελοιπεναι με τι των ανηκοντων υμιν εις σωτηριαν, εγραψα. Cap. 17.

[h] Ἐρωτω υμας, χαριν αιτουμενος. κ. λ. Cap. 21.

[i] Διο μαλλον εσπευδασα γραψαι, αφ' ων ηδυνηθην, εις το ευφραναι υμας. Ibid.

miniſtry;

miniſtry; and was ſtill farther confirmed by his willing death, and his reſurrection from the dead, and aſcenſion to heaven: afterwards it was taught by word of mouth, and propagated by the preaching of his apoſtles and their companions. Nor was it fit, that any books ſhould be written about it, till there were converts to receive and keep them, and deliver them to others.

If St. Paul's two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians were the firſt written books of the New Teſtament, and not written till the year 51, or 52, about twenty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion, they would be for a while the only ſacred books of the new diſpenſation.

As the Chriſtians at Theſſalonica had received the doctrine taught by Paul, *not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God*, 1 Theſſ. ii. 13. they would receive his epiſtles, as the written word of God. And himſelf taught them ſo to do, requiring, that they ſhould be ſolemnly *read unto all the holy brethren*, 1 Theſſ. v. 27. He gives a like direction, but more extenſive, at the end of his epiſtle to the Coloſſians, iv. 16. requiring them, after they had read it *amongſt themſelves, to cauſe it to be read alſo in the church of the Laodiceans: and that they likewiſe read the epiſtle, that would come to them from Laodicea.*

All the apoſtle Paul's epiſtles, whether to churches or particular perſons, would be received with the like reſpect by thoſe to whom they were ſent, even as the written word of God, or ſacred ſcriptures: and in like manner the writings of all the apoſtles and evangeliſts.

They who received them would, as there were opportunities, convey them to others. They who received them, were fully aſſured of their genuineneſs by thoſe who delivered them. And before the end of the firſt century, yea not very long after the middle of it, it is likely, there were collections made of the four goſpels, and moſt of the other books of the New Teſtament, which were in the hands of a good number of churches and perſons.

From the quotations of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and other writers of the ſecond century, of Origen in the third, and of Euſebius in the fourth century, it appears, that the greateſt part of the books, which are now received by us, and are called canonical, were univerſally acknowledged in their times, and had been ſo acknowledged by the elders and churches of former times.

And

And the reſt, now received by us, though they were then doubted of, or controverted by ſome, were [a] well known, and approved by many. And Athanaſius, who lived not long after Euſebius (having flouriſhed from the year 326, and afterwards) received all the ſame books, which are now received by us, and no other. Which has alſo been the prevailing ſentiment ever ſince.

This canon was not determined by the authority of councils: but the books, of which it conſiſts, were known to be the genuine writings of the apoſtles and evangeliſts, in the ſame way and manner that we know the works of Cæſar, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, to be theirs. And the canon has been formed upon the ground of an unanimous, or generally concurring teſtimony and tradition.

In the courſe of this long work we have had frequent occaſion to obſerve, that the canon of the New Teſtament had not been ſettled by any authority univerſally acknowledged, particularly, not in the time of [b] Euſebius, nor of [c] Auguſtine, nor of [d] Coſmas, nor of [dd] Caſſiodorius: but that nevertheleſs there was a general agreement among Chriſtians upon this head.

That the number of books to be received as ſacred and canonical had not been determined by the authority of any council or councils, univerſally acknowledged, is apparent from the different judgments among Chriſtians, in ſeveral parts of the world, concerning divers books, particularly, the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation: which were received by ſome, rejected, or doubted of by others: not now to mention any of the catholic epiſtles. There was no catalogue of the books of ſcripture in any canon of the council of Nice. Auguſtine [e] giving directions to inquiſitive perſons, how they might determine what books are canonical, and what not, refers not to the deciſions of any councils. Caſſiodorius, in the ſixth century, has [f] three catalogues, one called Jerom's, another Auguſtine's, another that of the ancient verſion: but he refers not to the decree of any council, as deciſive. And it ſeems to me, that in all times, Chriſtian people and churches have had

[a] See Euſebius vol. IV. p. 217, 218.
[b] Vol. IV. p. 231.
[c] Vol. V. p. 84—86.
[d] 270, 271.
[dd] p. 282, 283.
[e] Vol V. p. 84, 85.
[f] p. 280—282.

a liberty

a liberty to judge for themſelves according to evidence. And the evidence of the genuineneſs of moſt of the books of the New Teſtament has been ſo clear and manifeſt, that they have been univerſally received.

The genuineneſs of theſe books, as before ſaid, is known in the ſame way with others, by teſtimony or tradition. The firſt teſtimony is that of thoſe who were cotemporary with the writers of them: which teſtimony has been handed down to others.

That in this way the primitive Chriſtians formed their judgment concerning the books propoſed to be received as ſacred ſcriptures, appears from their remaining works. Says Clement of Alexandria: 'This [g] we have not in the 'four goſpels, which have been delivered to us, but in that 'according to the Egyptians.' Tertullian may be ſeen largely to this purpoſe, vol. II. p. 256—259. I paſs on to Origen, who ſays: 'As [h] I have learned by tradition 'concerning the four goſpels, which alone are received 'without diſpute by the whole church of God under 'heaven.' So Euſebius, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, often obſerves, what books of the New Teſtament had been quoted by the ancients, and what not. And having rehearſed a catalogue of books univerſally received, and of others controverted, he ſays: 'It [i] was needful to put down 'theſe alſo; diſtinguiſhing the ſcriptures, which according 'to eccleſiaſtical tradition are true, genuine, and univerſally 'acknowledged, from thoſe which are controverted, and yet 'appear to have been known to many: that by this means 'we may know them from ſuch as have been publiſhed 'by heretics, under the names of apoſtles. Which books 'none of the eccleſiaſtical writers in the ſucceſſion from the 'times of the apoſtles have vouchſafed to mention in their 'writings.' I may not tranſcribe, but only refer to [k] Athanaſius in his Feſtal Epiſtle, to [l] Cyril of Jeruſalem, [m] Rufinus, and [n] Auguſtine.

However, beſide obſerving the teſtimony of writers in former times, they criticiſed the books, which were propoſed to them: examining their ſtyle and contents, and

[g] Vol. ii. p. 221.
[h] p. 466.
[i] Vol. IV. p. 228, &c.
[k] 283.
[l] p. 299, 300.
[m] Vol. V. p. 76, 77.
[n] p. 84, 85.

comparing

comparing them with thoſe books, which had been already received as genuine upon the ground of an unanimous teſtimony, and undoubted tradition. Says honeſt Serapion, biſhop of Antioch, in an epiſtle to ſome, who had too much reſpect for a writing, entitled the Goſpel of Peter: 'We [o] 'brethren, receive Peter, and the other apoſtles, as Chriſt: 'but as ſkilful men, we reject thoſe writings, which are 'falſly aſcribed to them: well knowing, that we have re-'ceived no ſuch.' And he adds, that upon peruſing that work, he had found the main part of it agreeable to the right doctrine of our Saviour: but there were ſome other things of a different kind. And Euſebius adds in the place tranſcribed above: 'The [p] ſtyle alſo of theſe books is en-'tirely different from that of the apoſtles. Moreover the 'ſentiments and doctrine of theſe writings differ from the 'true orthodox Chriſtianity. All which things plainly 'ſhow, that they are the forgeries of heretics.'

It has been ſometimes ſaid, that the council of Laodicea firſt ſettled the canon of the New Teſtament. But it may be juſtly ſaid to have been ſettled before. At leaſt there had been long before a general agreement among Chriſtians, what books were canonical, and what not: what were the genuine writings of apoſtles and evangeliſts, and what not. From the decree of the council itſelf it appears, that there were writings already known by the title of canonical. That council does nothing in their laſt canon, but declare, 'That [q] private pſalms ought not to be read in the church, 'nor any books not canonical, but only the canonical books 'of the Old and New Teſtament.' After which follows a catalogue or enumeration of ſuch books. The ſame may be ſaid of the third council of Carthage, whoſe forty-ſeventh canon is to this purpoſe: 'Moreover [r] it is ordained, that 'nothing beſide the canonical ſcriptures be read in the 'church, under the name of divine ſcriptures.'

I ſhall now tranſcribe below a long and fine paſſage of Mr. Le Clerc, wherein he ſays: 'We [s] no where read of a council

[o] Vol. II. p. 247.
[p] Vol. IV. p. 228.
[q] Vol. IV. p. 308, 309.
[r] Vol. V. p. 78, 79.
[s] Nuſquam quidem legimus, Collegium Apoſtolicum, aut cœtum ullum Rectorum Eccleſiarum Chriſtianarum coactum eſſe, qui pro auctoritate definierint hunc numerum Evangeliorum eſſe admittendum, non majorem, nec minorem. Sed nec opus fuit, cum omnibus conſtaret,

'a council of the apoſtles, or of any aſſembly of the gover-
'nors of chriſtian churches, convened, to determine by
'their authority, that ſuch a number of goſpels, neither
'more nor fewer, ſhould be received. Nor was there any
'need of it, ſince it is well known to all from the con-
'curring teſtimony of cotemporaries, that theſe four goſ-
'pels are the genuine writings of thoſe whoſe names they
'bear: and ſince it is alſo manifeſt, that there is in them
'nothing unworthy of thoſe, to whom they are aſcribed,
'nor any thing at all contrary to the revelation of the Old
'Teſtament, nor to right reaſon. There was no need of
'a ſynod of grammarians, to declare magiſterially what
'are the works of Cicero, or Virgil. . . . In like manner the
'authority of the goſpels has been eſtabliſhed by general and
'perpetual conſent, without any decree of the governors
'of the church. We may ſay the ſame of the apoſtolical
'epiſtles, which owe all their authority, not to the deciſions
'of any eccleſiaſtical aſſembly, but to the concurring teſti-
'mony of all Chriſtians, and the things themſelves, which
'are contained in them.

Mr. James Baſnage [t] has ſeveral chapters, ſhowing how the canon of the New Teſtament was formed, without the authoritative deciſions of councils. I likewiſe refer to [u] Mr. Jones upon this ſubject. I muſt alſo remind my readers of [x] Auguſtine's excellent obſervations, in his arguments with the Manichees, concerning the genuineneſs and integrity of the books of the New Teſtament. I ſhall tranſcribe from him here a

ſtaret, ex teſtimonio et conſenſu æqualium, quatuor hæc Evangelia eorum vere fuiſſe, quorum nomina præferunt: cumque nihil in iis legatur quod ſcriptoribus dignum non ſit, vel revelationi Veteris Teſtamenti, rectæve rationi, vel minimum adverſetur: aut quod inferius ævum, recentiorumque manus ullo modo reſipiat. Non opus fuit ſynodo Grammaticorum, qui, pro imperio, pronunciarent ea ſcripta, verbi cauſſa, Ciceronis et Virgilii, quæ eorum eſſe non dubitamus, re verâ tantorum ingeniorum fœtus fuiſſe, et poſteritati ea in re conſulerent. Omnium conſenſus, non quæſitus, non rogatus, ſed ſponte ſignificatus, prout occaſio tulit, reſque ipſæ omnibus, qui poſtea vixere, dubitationem omnem anteverterunt. . . . Sic et Evangeliorum auctoritas merito conſtituta eſt, et invaluit, perpetuo conſenſu, ſine ullo Rectorum Eccleſiæ decreto.

Idem dixerimus de Epiſtolis Apoſtolicis, quæ nullius eccleſiaſtici conventus judicio, ſed conſtanti omnium chriſtianorum teſtimonio, rebuſque ipſis, quas complectuntur, auctoritatem omnem ſuam debent. Cleric. H. E. ann. 100. num. iii. iv. Vid. et ann. 29. num. xcii.

[t] Hiſt. de l' Egliſe. l. 8. ch. v. vi. vii.

[u] New and full Method, part I. ch. v. vi. vii.

[x] See vol. III. p. 523—526.

few

few lines only, which are very much to the preſent purpoſe. ‘We [y] know the writings of the apoſtles, ſays he, as we ‘know the works of Plato, Ariſtotle, Cicero, Varro, and ‘others; and as we know the writings of divers eccleſiaſtical ‘authors: foraſmuch as they have the teſtimony of co-‘temporaries, and of thoſe who have lived in ſucceeding ‘ages.’

Upon the whole, the writings of the apoſtles and evangeliſts are received, as the works of other eminent men of antiquity are, upon the ground of general conſent and teſtimony. Nor does the canon of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament owe its eſtabliſhment to the deciſions of councils: but it is the judgment of chriſtian people in general; and ſo far as we are able to perceive, after a long and careful examination, it is a right and reaſonable judgment. And it may induce us to believe, that if men were encouraged to think freely, in other matters alſo, and to judge for themſelves, according to evidence, and proper aſſiſtances were afforded them, it would not be at all detrimental to the intereſts either of truth or virtue.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Time of writing the Goſpels, eſpecially the firſt three.

SECT. I.

That the Goſpels are not mentioned, nor referred to, in the Epiſtles of the New Teſtament.

Eusebius intimates, that [a] many before him ſuppoſed, that when Paul in his epiſtle ſpeaks of his own goſpel, he intended the goſpel according to Luke. We will therefore conſider thoſe texts, and ſome others of a like kind.

I. St. Paul ſays, Rom. ii. 16.... *in the day, when God ſhall judge the ſecrets of men, according to my goſpel.* The ſame phraſe occurs again, ch. xvi. 25. and 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember, that Jeſus Chriſt, of the ſeed of David, was raiſed from the dead, according to my goſpel.* In all which places, I apprehend, it muſt be reaſonable to underſtand, not any written goſpel,

[y] p. 525, 526.

[a] Φασι δε, ως αρα τε κατ' αυτον ευαγγελιε μιμησονευειν ο παυλος ειωθεν, οπωικα ως περι ιδιε τινος ευαγγελιε γραφων ελεγε, κατα το ευαγγελιον με. Euſ. H. E. l. 3. c. 4. p. 73. D.

or

or hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt: but the doctrine of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, which had been preached by Paul. Which is alſo the opinion of learned modern interpreters in general.

II. 2 Cor. viii. 18. *And we have ſent with him the brother, whoſe praiſe is in the goſpel, throughout all the churches.* Many have been of opinion, that St. Luke is the brother here intended, and that St. Paul refers to Luke's written goſpel. This [b] is ſaid to be Origen's interpretation; but I do not clearly perceive it. Origen [c] ſpeaking of the four goſpels, ſays: 'The [d] third is that according to Luke, the goſpel commended by Paul.' I ſay, I do not perceive it to be clear, that Origen had an eye to 2 Cor. viii. 18. He might intend Rom. ii. 16. or xvi. 25. or 2 Tim. ii. 8. However, whether it be Origen's interpretation of that text or not, it is Jerom's: who writing the hiſtory of St. Luke in his book of Illuſtrious Men, ſays: 'He [e] wrote a goſpel, of which Paul makes 'mention, ſaying: *And we have ſent with him the brother, 'whoſe praiſe is in the goſpel.*' To the ſame purpoſe [f] alſo in the prologue to his Commentary upon St. Matthew; and likewiſe in [g] his Commentary upon the epiſtle to Philemon.

Chryſoſtom upon the place ſpeaks after this manner. 'And 'h who is this brother? Some ſay, Luke: and think, that 'the apoſtle refers to the hiſtory written by him. Others ſay, 'Barnabas. For by goſpel he intends unwritten preaching.' Theophylact [i] ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. Theodoret [k] by the brother underſtood Barnabas: and therefore could not think of any written goſpel, no ſuch work having been aſcribed to him by the ancients. Œcumenius's note is to this purpoſe. 'Many [l] ſay, this brother is Luke, mentioned upon account

[b] 'Who this brother was, is 'much conteſted. Antiquity has 'carried it for St. Luke, worthy of 'praiſe in all the churches for the 'goſpel which he wrote. The au- 'thority of this aſſertion ſeems to 'reſt upon the words of Origen, the 'interpolated Ignatius, and St. 'Jerom.' So Whitby upon the place.

[c] Και τριτον το κατα λουκαν, το υπο παυλου επαινουμενον ευαγγελιον. Ap. Euſ. l. 6. cap. 25 p. 226. C.

[d] See vol. II. p. 406.

[e] See vol. V. p. 39.

[f] p. 35.

[g] De quo [Luca] et in alio loco: Miſi, inquit, cum illo fratrem, cujus laus eſt in evangelio per omnes eccleſias . . . &c. In Philem. T. IV. P. I. p. 454.

[h] Και τις ουτος εστιν ο αδελφος; τινες μεν τον λουκαν. Και φασι, δια την ιστοριαν ην επεμψε. Τινες δε τον βαρναβαν. Και γαρ το αγραφον κηρυγμα ευαγγελιον καλει. In 2 epiſt. ad Corinth. hom. 18. tom. X.

[i] In loc. p. 389.

[k] Τον τρισμακαριον βαρναβαν τα ειρημενα χαρακτηριζει. Theod. in loc. T. III. p. 243.

[l] Œcum. in loc. Tom. I. p. 663.

'of

'of the goſpel compoſed by him. Many others ſuppoſe him 'to be Barnabas: for, as they ſay, unwritten preaching is 'here called goſpel; which is the more likely: for what 'follows is more ſuitable to Barnabas: *whoſe praiſe is in the 'goſpel.* As much as to ſay, he not only preaches, but com-'mendably.' And afterwards. 'The meaning is, he not only 'evangelizeth, and preacheth the goſpel admirably, and com-'mendably, but he has been choſen to travel with us, with 'this grace alſo.' Such are the ſentiments of the ancients upon this text.

Let us now obſerve the interpretations of ſome judicious moderns.

Grotius ſays: 'he [m] does not diſlike the opinion of thoſe, 'who think Luke to be here intended: but he does not 'think, that St. Paul refers to his book of the goſpel, 'which was not then publiſhed: but to the office of an 'evangeliſt, which Luke had diſcharged in ſeveral places, 'or to his preaching the goſpel. And he ſays, that in the 'goſpel may be the ſame as by the goſpel. So in ch. x. 14. 'of the ſame epiſtle.'

Eſtius likewiſe ſays, that [n] by goſpel is to be underſtood preaching: not St. Luke's goſpel, which we are not certain was then publiſhed.

Le Clerc, in his French Teſtament, tranſlates in this manner: *one of our brethren, who is praiſed on account of the goſpel in all the churches.* And in his notes ſays, 'that gene-'rally St. Luke is here ſuppoſed to be intended: though 'St. Paul refers rather to his preaching the goſpel, than to 'the book of his goſpel.'

Beauſobre tranſlates after this manner: *one of the brethren, who has made himſelf famous in all the churches by* [preaching] *the goſpel.* And ſays in his notes: 'that though ſome of 'the ancients have hereby underſtood St. Luke, and his

[m] Mihi non diſplicet ſententia illorum, qui hic Lucam deſignari putant: ita tamen ut per evangelium non intelligatur liber, qui tunc editus nondum erat, ſed ipſum munus evangeliſtæ, quod Lucas Pauli vice multis in locis fideliter obierat, ſive ipſa evangelii prædicatio, ut infra x. 14. ἐν *in* pro διὰ *per*. Grot. ad 2 Cor. viii. 18.

[n] Neque enim Paulus de Evangelio ſcripto loquitur, ſed quo modo paſſim alibi, de evangelio prædicato. Deinde, nec ſatis conſtat, Evangelium Lucæ tum editum fuiſſe, quando Paulus hanc epiſtolam ſcripſit. Eſt. in loc.

'goſpel; he thinks, that by the goſpel is here intended the 'preaching of the goſpel. Beſides, there is no proof, that 'St. Luke had as yet written his goſpel: it is rather rea-'ſonable to think, he had not.'

Upon the whole, though we cannot certainly ſay, who is the brother, whoſe praiſe was in the goſpel: whether [o] Luke, or Barnabas, or Silas, or Apollos: I preſume we are ſufficiently warranted to ſay, that by goſpel is here intended neither the goſpel according to Luke, nor any other written goſpel whatever.

III. 1 Tim. vi. 20. *O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy truſt.* Hereby ſome have been diſpoſed to underſtand a written goſpel: but they are not favoured by the beſt interpreters. Grotius ſays, that [p] this depoſit, or thing committed to Timothy's truſt, is the ſacred doctrine of the goſpel. Eſtius [q] ſays the ſame. I place below likewiſe [r] a part of Beza's note upon this text. Le Clerc in his notes explains it thus: 'the doctrine of the goſpel, which was a ſacred depoſit, committed by the apoſtles to their diſciples.' And Beauſobre thus: 'the doctrine, which had been committed to, or entruſted with Timothy.' See alſo, ſays he, 1 Tim. i. 18. and 2 Tim. ii. 2. I ſay no more to this text.

IV. 2 Tim. i. 13, 14. *Hold faſt the form of ſound words, which thou haſt heard of me.... That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghoſt, which dwelleth in us.*

Hereby ſome may underſtand a written goſpel, or hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt. Nevertheleſs, I think, I need not add much here to what has been already ſaid of the preceding text, it being nearly parallel. The meaning of both is much the ſame. Timothy is here again exhorted, and required, to retain with all fidelity thoſe ſound words, that pure doctrine of the goſpel, which he had been taught by the apoſtle, and had often heard from him.

[o] Vid. Eſt. in 2 Cor. viii. 18. et Beauſobr. in ver. 18. et 23.

[p] Vocat autem depoſitum ſacram doctrinam evangelii, quia et res eſt alterius, nempe Chriſti, et paſtoribus fida ejus cuſtodia incumbit. Grot. ad 1 Tim. vi. 20.

[q] Iterum ſerio et graviter admonet, ut acceptam fidei doctrinam conſervet, ne locum relinquat ulli peregrino dogmati. Nomine depoſiti metaphorice ſignificatur doctrina ſucceſſori credita, ac per manus tradita. Eſt. in loc.

[r] Depoſitum proculdubio vocat ſanam evangelii doctrinam, et dona quæcunque ad Eccleſiæ ædificationem, veluti depoſitum, Deus commiſerat Timotheo. Bez. in loc.

It

It does not appear, then, that there are in the apoſtolical epiſtles of the New Teſtament any references to written goſpels, or hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt. I do not ſay this is a proof, that no ſuch hiſtories were then written. Nevertheleſs, I have thought it not improper to ſhow, that there is no notice taken of any ſuch hiſtories in theſe epiſtles: and therefore they cannot afford any evidence of their being then written and publiſhed. I think likewiſe, that it was not amiſs to embrace this occaſion to ſhow the true meaning of ſome texts, which have been often miſinterpreted.

SECT. II.

Obſervations of ancient Chriſtian Writers, leading to the true time, when the goſpels were written.

1. Says Irenæus, as formerly [s] quoted, 'For [t] we have 'not received the knowledge of the way of our ſalvation from 'any others, than thoſe, by whom the goſpel has been 'brought to us: which goſpel they firſt preached, and after-'wards by the will of God committed to writing, that for 'time to come it might be the foundation and pillar of our 'faith. Nor may any ſay, that they preached before they 'had a complete knowledge of the doctrine of the goſpel. 'For after that our Lord roſe from the dead, and they [the 'apoſtles] were endowed from above with the power of the 'Holy Ghoſt coming down upon them, they received a per-'fect knowledge of all things. They then went forth to all 'the ends of the earth, declaring to men the bleſſing of hea-'venly peace, having all of them, and every one alike, the 'goſpel of God.'

[s] See vol. II. p. 158.

[t] Non enim per alios diſpoſitionem ſalutis noſtræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, poſtea vero per Dei volũntatem in ſcripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum. Nec enim fas eſt dicere, quoniam ante prædicaverunt, quam perfectam haberent agnitionem, ſicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes, emendatores ſe eſſe Apoſtolorum. Poſtea enim quam ſurrexit Dominus noſter a mortuis, & induti ſunt ſupervenientis Spiritus Sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti ſunt, & habuerant perfectam agnitionem, exierunt in fines terræ, ea quæ a Deo nobis bona ſunt evangelizantes, & cœleſtem pacem hominibus annunciantes: qui quidem & omnes pariter & ſinguli eorum habentes evangelium Dei. Iren. Adv. Haer. l. 3. cap. 1.

He then proceeds to ſpeak of the goſpels of the four evangeliſts ſeverally, and the times and occaſions of writing them. All which will be taken down by us hereafter in proper places. Here is ſufficient to induce us to think, that the written goſpels, or hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt, were not publiſhed till ſome good while after our Lord's aſcenſion. For the apoſtles firſt preached, he ſays, before they wrote.

2. Says Euſebius in a long paſſage formerly quoted: 'Thoſe '[u] admirable and truly divine men, the apoſtles of Chriſt,—— 'neither knew, nor attempted, to deliver the doctrine of their 'Maſter with the artifice and eloquence of words.... Nor 'were they greatly concerned about the writing of books, 'being engaged in a more excellent miniſtry, which is above 'all human power. Inſomuch that Paul, the moſt able of all 'in the furniture both of words and thoughts, has left nothing 'in writing, beſide a few epiſtles.... Nor were the reſt of our 'Saviour's followers unacquainted with theſe things, as the 'ſeventy diſciples, and many others, beſides the twelve apoſ-'tles. Nevertheleſs of all the diſciples of our Lord, Mat-'thew and John only have left us any memoirs: who too, 'as we have been informed, were compelled to write by a 'kind of neceſſity.' And what follows.

3. This paſſage ſhould be compared with another of [x] Origen: and they who pleaſe may alſo conſult our remarks* upon what has been now tranſcribed from Euſebius. Which may be of uſe to caution us, not to be too precipitate in giving a very early date to the goſpels, as if they were written immediately after our Lord's aſcenſion: when there is reaſon to think, they were not written, till after numerous converts had been made, who expreſſed their deſires to have written hiſtories of what they had heard, for refreſhing their memories.

4. Says Theodore, biſhop of Mopſueſtia, in the latter part of the fourth century, about the year 394. 'After [y] the 'Lord's aſcenſion to heaven the diſciples ſtayed a good while 'at Jeruſalem, viſiting the cities in its neighbourhood, preach-'ing chiefly to the Jews: until the great Paul, called by the 'divine grace, was appointed to preach the goſpel to Gen-'tiles openly. And in proceſs of time Divine Providence, 'not allowing them to be confined to any one part of the

[u] Vol. iv. p. 225.
[x] See vol. II. p. 466.
* Vol. IV. p. 239—245.
[y] Ib. p. 511, 512.

'earth,

'earth, made way for conducting them to remote countries: 'Peter went to Rome, the others elsewhere. John in par-'ticular, took up his abode at Ephesus, visiting however at 'seasons the several parts of Asia.... About this time the 'other evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, published 'their gospels, which were soon spread all over the world, 'and were received by all the faithful in general with great 'regard.'.... He proceeds to say, 'that nevertheless, the 'Christians in Asia, having brought those gospels to him, 'earnestly entreated him to write a farther account of such 'things, as were needful to be known, and had been omitted 'by the rest: with which request he complied.'

This remarkable passage, upon which divers observations were made, when it was first quoted, may dispose us to think, that all the four gospels were written about the same time, and that none of them were published till after, or about the sixtieth year of our Lord's nativity.

5. By divers ancient Christian writers it is said, that [z] Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the desire of the brethren of Rome, wrote a short gospel, according to what he had heard related by Peter. So Jerom [a] beside others, as before quoted, in his book of illustrious Men.

St. Peter, I reckon, did not come to Rome before the reign of Nero, probably, not till the second time that Paul was in that city, in the year 63, or 64. And yet, at this time, the Christians at Rome desired Mark to give them in writing an account of Peter's preaching, for refreshing their memories concerning what the apostle had said of Christ, and his doctrine. The consequence is manifest. They had not then any written gospel in their hands; nor did they know, that there was one. 'The truth is,' says Mr. Jones,[b] 'if St. 'Mark, or any one else, had had St. Matthew's gospel, at 'Rome, there would have been no need of St. Mark's 'writing.'

These are general observations in the ancients, or deduced from them, which may be of no small use to lead us to the true time of writing the first three gospels.

[z] See vol. II. p. 111, 112, 210—218. Vol. IV. p. 314. Vol. V. p. 171, 172.

[a] Vol. V. p. 38.

[b] Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's gospel, p. 54. chap. vi.

SECT. III.

That the firſt three Goſpels were publiſhed before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which happened in the year of the Chriſtian epoch LXX.

CONCERNING this I tranſcribe below [c] a very good argument of Le Clerc from his diſſertation upon the four evangeliſts.

The Jewiſh war began, according [d] to Joſephus, in the month of May, in the 66th year of the Chriſtian epoch, and ended in September, in the year 70, in the deſolation of the city of Jeruſalem and the temple. And I think, it may be ſhown to be very probable, that the firſt three goſpels were written before the year 66, when the final troubles and calamities of the Jewiſh people were coming on.

This muſt appear to have a great deal of probability from the predictions therein recorded concerning the deſtruction of the temple, the overthrow of the city of Jeruſalem, the ruin of the Jewiſh ſtate and people in Judea, together with divers circumſtances of theſe events, and many troubles and calamities preceding them. Theſe predictions are recorded in the hiſtories of our Saviour's miniſtry, which we call goſpels, without any the leaſt hint, either expreſs and deſigned, or accidentally dropping from the writers, that thoſe predictions had been fulfilled and verified, or that the things ſpoken of had happened. Thoſe prophecies are recorded in Matt. xxiii. 34—39, and xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi. St. Luke has alſo elſewhere recorded the affectionate concern, which our Lord

[c] Quinetiam, ſi ex Veterum nonnullorum teſtimoniis antea adductis, de re judicemus, affirmabimus, Matthæum, Marcum, et Lucam, ante ultima Neronis tempora, quibus occiſi ſunt Petrus et Paulus, Evangelia ſcripſiſſe. Quod non levi argumento confirmari poteſt, ducto ex Matt. cap. xxiv. Marc. xiii. Luc xxi. ubi narratur Jeroſolymæ excidii prædictio, quaſi rei etiamnum futuræ, eo tempore, quo Evangelia ab iis ſcribebantur. Si enim eam prædicationem poſt eventum ſcripſiſſent Evangeliſtæ memorati, verbulo ſaltem monuiſſent, prædictionem fuiſſe eventu confirmatam. Quod tantum abeſt ut faciant, ut Matthæus et Marcus hac admonitione, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοειτω, *qui legit, intelligat*, quam ſubjiciunt præſagiis Jeroſolymitanæ cladis, admonere videantur Chriſtianos in Judæa viventes, ut diligenter futura illa præſagia attendant, quo poſſint vitæ ſuæ conſulere. Vide Matt. xxiv. 15. Marc. xiii. 14. et ad ea loca interpretes. Cleric Diſſ. iii. de quatuor Evangeliis. num. vii. p. 541.

[d] Vid. Joſeph. Antiq. Jud. l. 20. cap. xi. n. c. &c. B. I. l. 6. cap. x.

expreſſed

expreſſed in the view and proſpect of thoſe impending evils, ch. xiii. 34, 35. and xix. 41—44. Theſe things are alſo referred to, and ſpoken of, in divers other diſcourſes, ſome plain, ſome parabolical, or otherwiſe figurative: as Matt. xxi. 33—46. xxii. 1—7. Mark xii. 1—12. Luke xiii. 1—9. xx. 9—20. xxi. 5—13. In none of all which places does there appear any intimation, that the things ſpoken of were come to paſs. And in recording the preſages of this final and total overthrow of the Jewiſh nation, the hiſtorians have inſerted warnings and admonitions, proper to excite the attention of readers, and induce thoſe who lived in Judea, to take care of their own ſafety without delay. Matt. xxiv. 15—18. *When ye therefore ſhall ſee the abomination of deſolation, ſpoken of by Daniel the prophet, ſtand in the holy place (whoſo readeth, let him underſtand:) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains. Let him which is on the houſe-top not come down to take any thing out of his houſe. Neither let him which is in the field, return back to take his clothes.* And what follows. And to the like purpoſe in Mark xiii. 14—16. When theſe diſcourſes were recorded, the things ſpoken of had not yet come to paſs. There were men living, to whom theſe admonitions might be uſeful for ſecuring their ſafety.

Moreover, though theſe predictions muſt have been recorded, before they were accompliſhed; I think, the fulfilment was then near at hand, and not far off. This ſeems to be implied in that expreſſion: *Let him that readeth, underſtand.* And indeed it muſt have been difficult and hazardous to publiſh ſuch things in writing. How offenſive theſe ſayings muſt have been to the Jewiſh people, and perhaps to ſome others likewiſe, is eaſy to conceive from the nature of the things ſpoken of; and it may be confirmed by divers inſtances. When our Lord had ſpoken the parable of the vineyard, let out to huſbandmen, recorded in Luke xx. 9—18. it is added by the evangeliſt, ver. 19, 20. *And the chief prieſts, and the ſcribes, the ſame hour ſought to lay hands on him, but they feared the people; for they perceived, that he had ſpoken this parable againſt them. 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.* And among the odious charges brought againſt our Saviour by falſe witneſſes, this was one, *that he ſaid: I am able to deſtroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days,* Matt. xxvi. 61. With this he was reproached

likewiſe, when hanging on the croſs, ch. xxvii. 40. The like offenſive charges were brought againſt Stephen. Acts vi. 14. *We have heard him ſay, that this Jeſus of Nazareth ſhall deſtroy this place, and ſhall change the cuſtoms, which Moſes delivered to us.* And, poſſibly, he did ſay ſomewhat not very different. So likewiſe St. Matthew, and the other apoſtles, might repeat in the hearing of many what Chriſt had ſaid to them, and in part to others alſo, concerning the overthrow of the temple, and the Jewiſh ſtate: yea, very probably, they had often repeated theſe things to attentive hearers. But ſpeaking and writing are different: and I apprehend, it could not have been ſafe, nor prudent, to record theſe predictions (many of which are very plain, and all intelligible) ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion.

Theſe prophecies therefore of our Lord, as recorded in the firſt three goſpels, afford at once an argument, that they were written and publiſhed before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem: and that they were not publiſhed many years before it, or however, not many years before the commencement of the war at the time above-mentioned.

SECT IV.

An Argument ſhowing the true Time of writing the Goſpels, taken from the Acts, and the beginning of St. Luke's Goſpel.

NONE can ſuppoſe that the book of the Acts of the apoſtles was compoſed before the year 62, or 63, as the hiſtory is there brought down to the period of St. Paul's two years' impriſonment at Rome.

And, very probably, the goſpel, to which St. Luke refers at the beginning of that book, had not been written long before. This I ſuppoſe to be now the common opinion of learned men. And for giving the greateſt ſatisfaction to all my readers, I ſhall tranſcribe below at large the ſentiments of ſeveral to this purpoſe, ſuch as that of the late [e] Mr. Jones, and

[e] 'Hence we ſee near to what 'time this hiſtory of the Acts was 'written: viz. either in the year '62, or not long after: it being 'altogether probable, that St. Luke 'would not defer writing long after 'his departure from St. Paul. 'Which ſeems to have been now, 'when the apoſtle was ſet at liberty 'from his confinement at Rome....

'That

and [f] Eſtius, [g] Mill, * Dodwell, and [h] Baſnage; though the thing appears to me very obvious: and if ſo, we have gained very nearly the date of one of the four goſpels.

Grotius ſuppoſeth, that [i] when Paul left Rome, he went into Spain: and that at the ſame time Luke went into Greece, and there wrote both his goſpel and the Acts. Jerom ſuppoſeth, that [k] the book of the Acts was written at Rome. But that makes no difference in point of time: ſince he allows, that it reaches to the end of St. Paul's two years' impriſonment at Rome.

This one conſideration, ſo far as I am able to judge, overthrows the opinion, that St. Luke's goſpel was written about fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion. Yea, it evidently ſhows, that it was not written till the year 60, or afterwards.

And the beginning of St. Luke's goſpel affords an argument, that the other two goſpels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were not written ſooner: for this evangeliſt knew nothing of them. Conſequently, they were not then written

[e] That he wrote both the goſpel and 'the Acts in the ſame year, ſeems 'very probable: as it is certain, 'that one of them is only to be 'looked upon as the ſecond part, 'or continuation of the other.' Jones' New and Full Method, &c. Part IV. ch. xvi. vol. III. p. 158. See him alſo ch. xi. p. 115.

[f] Deinde, nec ſatis conſtat, Evangelium Lucæ jam tum editum fuiſſe, quando Paulus hanc epiſtolam ſcripſit. Nam Acta quidem Apoſtolica ſcripſiſſe videtur ſtatim poſt Evangelium, tanquam ejuſdem voluminis libros primum et ſecundum. Scripſit autem Acta poſt biennium Pauli Romæ commorantis, id eſt, multis annis poſt hanc epiſtolam. Quare circa idem tempus Evangelium ab eo ſcriptum fuiſſe, credibile eſt. Eſt. ad 2 Cor. viii. 18.

[g] Voluminis hujus D. Lucæ partem poſteriorem, ſeu λογον δευτερον quod attinet, librum dico Actuum Apoſtolorum, haud dubium eſt.... quin is ſcriptus ſit ſtatim poſt λογον πρωτον, ſive Evangelium. Mill. Prol. num. 121.

* Sunt enim Acta δευτερος ejuſdem operis λογος, cujus πρωτον λογον ipſe ſuum agnoſcit Evangelium. Act. i. 1. Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. i. num. xxxix.

[h] Non multum vero interjectum fuiſſe temporis inter Actorum Apoſtolicorum et Evangelii confectionem, conjectura ex præfatione ad Theophilum duci poteſt. *Primum quidem librum confeci....* Actuum ergo liber continuatio eſt, ſerieſque Evangelii,... Multum vero abiiſſe temporis antequam a priore libro omnibus numeris expleto ad poſteriorem tranſiret Lucas, nulla ratione cogimur ad credendum, &c. Baſnag. Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

[i] Librum autem et hunc, et qui de Actibus Apoſtolorum, ſcriptum arbitror, non multo poſtquam Paulus Româ abiit in Hiſpaniam. Nam in id tempus deſinit Actuum liber, qui ſi ſerius ſcriptus eſſet, in ulteriora etiam tempora narrationem protenderet. Puto autem, Româ iiſſe Lucam in Achaiam, atque ibi ab eo conſcriptos quos habemus libros. Grot. Pr. in Evang. Lucæ.

[k] See vol. V. p. 39.

and

and publiſhed, or, but lately; every word of his introduction ſhows this: let us obſerve it.

Foraſmuch as many have taken in hand to ſet forth in order a declaration of thoſe things which are moſt ſurely believed among us.... It ſeemed good unto me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt, to write unto thee in order, moſt excellent Theophilus: that thou mighteſt know the certainty of thoſe things, wherein thou haſt been inſtructed.

When St. Luke ſays, that many had undertaken to write hiſtories of our Saviour, he cannot mean Matthew alone, nor Matthew and Mark only: for they are not many. He muſt intend them, and others, or ſome different from them: which laſt will appear moſt likely, if we conſider what there follows.

Of thoſe many he ſays, they 'had taken in hand,' undertaken, or attempted. St. Luke would not have ſpoken thus of Matthew, or Mark. Indeed, we may ſuppoſe, that [l] thoſe narrations, to which St. Luke refers, were not falſe and fabulous, nor heretical: but they were defective.

Grotius ſays, the [m] word is of a middle meaning; and that it does not neceſſarily imply, that the writers, here intended, had failed to perform what they undertook.

Nevertheleſs the ancient Chriſtians, to ſeveral of whom the Greek language was natural, underſtood the word differently. And their judgments muſt be of value in this caſe. Origen's obſervations upon St. Luke's introduction may be ſeen, vol. II. p. 503, 504. where he ſays, 'St. Luke's expreſſion, '*taken in hand*, implies a tacit accuſation of thoſe, who, with-'out the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, took upon them to write 'goſpels. For Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John, 'did not take in hand to write: but being full of the Holy 'Ghoſt, wrote goſpels.' In which words, and afterwards, continually, he diſtinguiſheth the four evangeliſts from the

[l] Quod iſtos ait Lucas, non ſatis commode præſtitiſſe: minime tamen, opinor, fabuloſas, immo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem Eccleſiæ, ſub Nicodemi, ... Thomæ, Ægyptiorum nominibus impudentiſſime obtruſas. Nec tamen hic recte colligunt, Lucam poſt Matthæum et Marcum hanc ſuam hiſtoriam edidiſſe. Bez. in Luc. cap. i. ver. 1.

[m] Επεχειρησαν. *aggreſſi ſunt*. Bene notavit vir eruditiſſimus, vocem eſſe mediam: neque enim ex ea colligi poſſe, non præſtitum ab illis ſcriptoribus quod aggreſſi ſunt. Grot. in loc.

writers,

writers, referred to by St. Luke. To the like purpose [n] Ambrose, who either copied, or closely imitated Origen. And, says Eusebius, 'Luke [o] at the beginning assigns the reason of 'his writing, declaring, that whereas many others had rashly 'undertaken to compose relations of the things which were most 'firmly believed, he therefore thought himself obliged, in 'order to divert us from the uncertain relations of others, 'to deliver in his gospel a certain account of those things, of 'which he was fully assured.' Which passage was transcribed by us [p] formerly. And Epiphanius, whom [q] I now place below, plainly affixed a disadvantageous meaning to this word.

Beausobre readily allows, that [r] we ought to follow the ancients in their interpretation of this word, and to suppose that St. Luke here speaks of some attempts, and essays, that had not been well executed.

This may be sufficient to satisfy us, that St. Luke does not speak of any of our evangelists, Mr. * Dodwell was of the same opinion.

But we may have yet farther assurance of it by observing what St. Luke says of himself, and his own design; which is to this purpose, 'That it had seemed good to him to send to Theo-'philus in writing a distinct and particular history of Jesus 'Christ; that he might better know, and be more fully con-'firmed in the truth of those things, in which he had been 'instructed by word of mouth.'

In my opinion this implies a supposition, that Theophilus had not yet in his hands any good written history of the words and works of Jesus Christ.

[n] See vol. IV. p. 449.

[o] . . . δηλων ως αρα πολλων και αλλων προπετεστερον επιτηδευκοτων διηγησιν ποιησασθαι ων αυτος πεπληροφορητο λογων, κ. λ. Euseb. l. 3. c. 24. p. 96. C.

[p] Vol. IV. p. 226, 227.

[q] . . . φασκων, επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν· ινα τινας επιχειρητας δειξη· φημι δε τους περι κηρινθον, και μηρινθον, και τους αλλους. H. 51. num. vii. p. 428.

[r] Ce mot Grec, επεχειρησαν, est certainment tres equivoque, et peut fort bien signifier *des tentatives malheureuses, des efforts qui ont mal réussi.* St. Epiphane ne l'a pas entendu autrement. Origene de même, dans sa preface sur S. Luc. et après lui la plupart des Interprêtes Grecs. Quand il s'agit de la signification des termes Grecs, et que les auteurs Grecs, qui les expliquent, n'ont aucun interet à leur donner des sens forcés, ces derniers semblent dignes de creance. Beaus. Remarques sur Luc. ch. i. p. 100.

* Ut plane alios fuisse necesse sit evangelicæ historiæ scriptores a Luca visos, a nostris, quos habemus Evangelistis. Diss. Iren. i. num. xxxix.

Consequently,

Conſequently St. Luke at the year 62, and poſſibly ſomewhat later, did not know of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's goſpels: and therefore we muſt ſuppoſe that they were not yet written and publiſhed, or however but lately. For if they had been publiſhed ſeveral years, St. Luke, who had accompanied Paul in Greece, Aſia, Paleſtine and Rome, could not have been unacquainted with them.

This argument appears to me valid: at leaſt I cannot diſcern where it fails. It has long ſeemed to me a clear and obvious argument, that the goſpels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were not written till the year 60, or afterwards. For if they had been written ſooner, they would by this time have been in the hands of St. Luke and Theophilus, and all the faithful in general: and St. Luke could not have expreſſed himſelf, as he does in this introduction; nor indeed would he have written any goſpel at all.

CHAP. V.

ST. MATTHEW, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST.

I. *His Hiſtory.* II. *Teſtimonies of ancient Writers to his goſpel.* III. *Remarks upon them, for diſcerning the Time of this Goſpel.* IV. *Characters of Time in the Goſpel itſelf.* V. *The Language, in which it was written.*

I. MATTHEW [a] called alſo [b] Levi, ſon of [c] Alpheus, was a publican, or [d] toll-gatherer under the Romans. He was, undoubtedly, a native of Galilee, as the reſt of Chriſt's apoſtles were:

[a] The hiſtory of our Lord's calling this diſciple is in Matt. ix. 9—13. Mark ii. 13—16. Luke v. 27—32.

[b] This evangeliſt, in his account of his being called by Chriſt, names himſelf Matthew, ch. ix. 9. But St. Mark and St. Luke in their accounts of it call him Levi. Mark ii. 14. Luke v. 27 & 29. This has induced Grotius to argue, that Matthew and Levi are different perſons: though he cannot deny, that the circumſtances of the hiſtory lead us to think, one and the ſame perſon to be intended. Video omnes hodie ita exiſtimare, hunc eundem eſſe, quem Marcus & Lucas Levi nominant. Et ſane congruunt circumſtantiæ. Grot. ad Matt. ix. 9. It is obſervable, that Heracleon, the Valentinian, as cited by Clement of A. Str. l. 4. p. 502. reckons among apoſtles, who had not ſuffered martyrdom, Matthew, Philip, Thomas and Levi.

By

were: but of what city in that country, or of which tribe of the people of Iſrael, is not known.

As he ſat at the receipt of cuſtom, by the ſea ſide, in the city of Capernaum, or near it, *Jeſus ſaid unto him; follow me: and he aroſe, and followed him.* Which needs not to be underſtood to imply, that Matthew did not make up his accounts with thoſe, by whom he had been employed and entruſted.

Afterwards [e] he made an entertainment, at his houſe, where Jeſus was preſent, and likewiſe divers of his diſciples. And there

By Levi, probably, Heracleon meant Lebbeus, otherwiſe called Thaddeus. Vide Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. 5. T. III. p. 126. Cotelер. Annot. in Conſtitut. l. 8. cap. 22. Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. i. n. 24. It is certain, that Euſebius and Jerom thought Matthew and Levi to be only two names of one and the ſame perſon. See in this work, vol. iv. p. 222. vol. V. p. 35, 37. Moreover in the catalogues of the apoſtles, which are in Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13. is the name Matthew. It is likely, that Levi was the name, by which the apoſtle was called in the former part of his life: and Matthew the name, by which he was beſt known afterwards.

[c] That is ſaid by St. Mark only, ch. ii. 14. But we do not perceive who Alpheus was. Tillemont obſerves to this purpoſe. 'St. Mark 'gives him the ſurname of Alpheus: 'του τε αλφαιε. Which may have 'been the name of his father. 'This has given occaſion to ſome 'of the ancients, and to all the 'modern Greeks, to ſay, that 'James the ſon of Alpheus was his 'brother: though it be entirely 'deſtitute of all probability. Quoi-'qu'il il n'y ait en cela aucune 'apparence.' Tillem. S. Matt. init. Mem. T. I.

Dr. Doddridge, Family Expoſitor, ſect. 44 vol. I. p. 280. ſays roundly, 'that Matthew, otherwiſe 'called Levi, was the ſon of Al-'pheus, and the brother of James. 'Compare Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. '15. Acts i. 13.' But I do not think, thoſe texts can afford ſufficient proof, that Matthew, and James the ſon of Alpheus, had the ſame father, and were brothers. If that had been the caſe, their relation to each other would have been hinted, or plainly declared in the goſpels.

I do not love bold conjectures in others, and would not indulge myſelf in them. But I ſuſpect, that theſe words in Mark ii. 14. *ſon of Alphæus*, του τε αλφαιε, are an interpolation, ſome how or other, undeſignedly, and accidentally inſerted in that place. What is truly ſaid of James, has been alſo applied to Matthew. The curious may do well to conſider, whether this conjecture be not countenanced by the ſingularity of the thing, ſaid no where elſe, and by the various readings of that text, which may be ſeen in Beza, Mill, and Wetſtein.

[d] 'His office ſeems more particularly to have conſiſted in ga-'thering the cuſtoms of commodi-'ties, that came by the ſea of Ga-'lilee, and the tribute, which paſ-'ſengers were to pay, that went 'by water.' Cave's Lives of the Apoſtles, p. 177.

[e] That this entertainment was not made by Matthew on the very day that Chriſt called him to attend on him, is argued by Mr. Jones in his Vindication of the former part of

there ſat at table with them many publicans, and others, of no very reputable character in the eye of the phariſees, who were ſtrict in external purifications, and other like obſervances. Matthew, it is likely, was willing to take leave of his former acquaintance in a civil manner. He was likewiſe deſirous that they ſhould converſe with Jeſus, hoping, that they might be taken with his diſcourſe. And Jeſus, with a view of doing good, and to ſhow, that he did not diſdain any man, made no exceptions to this deſign of his new diſciple. Nor is it unlikely, that the ends aimed at were obtained, in part at leaſt. Matthew's former friends did, probably, diſcern ſomewhat extraordinary in Jeſus, ſo far as to induce them to think it was not unreaſonable in him to leave his former employment, for the ſake of the company of Jeſus, and the advantages, which in time he might receive from him. The phariſees made reflections: but our Lord vindicated himſelf. And all the three evangeliſts have recorded this inſtance of our Lord's amiable familiarity and condeſcenſion, which is one of the diſtinctions of his ſhining character. And it is a proof, that at the time of their writing, ſeverally, their goſpels, they were moulded into the temper and principles of him, whoſe hiſtory they wrote.

Jeſus now called Matthew to be with him, to be a witneſs of his words and works, and he put him into the number of his apoſtles. Thenceforward he continued with the Lord Jeſus; and after his aſcenſion, he was at Jeruſalem, and partook of the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, with the other apoſtles. Together with them he bore teſtimony to the reſurrection of Jeſus: and, as may be ſuppoſed, preached for ſome while at Jeruſalem, and in the ſeveral parts of Judea, confirming his doctrine with miracles, which God enabled him to perform in the name of Jeſus.

In his own catalogue of the twelve apoſtles, ch. x. he is the eighth in order. In St. Mark's, ch. iii. and St. Luke's, ch. vi. he is the ſeventh. He is alſo named in the eighth place, Acts i. 13. Nor is there any particular account in the goſpels of the call of any of the apoſtles, except his and four

of St. Matthew's Goſpel, p. 129—137. and by Dr. Doddridge, Family Expoſitor, vol. I. ſect. LXXI. note *a* who ſays, 'It is certain, the 'leaſt was after the day of his call-'ing, perhaps ſome months after: 'when he had made up his ac-'compts, and regularly paſſed his 'buſineſs into other hands: which, 'to be ſure, from a principle of 'juſtice, as well as prudence, he 'would take care to do.'

other,

others, Andrew and Peter, and the two ſons of Zebedee, who were called before.*f*

Clement of Alexandria ſays, that [a] the apoſtle Matthew uſed a very ſparing diet, eating no fleſh, but only vegetables. But perhaps this is ſaid upon the ground only of ſome uncertain tradition not well atteſted.

Socrates, in the fifth century, ſays, that [b] when the apoſtles went abroad to preach to the gentiles, Thomas took Parthia for his lot, Matthew Ethiopia, and Bartholomew India. And it is now a common opinion, that Matthew [c] died a martyr in Ethiopia, in a city called Nadabbar, or Naddaver; but by what kind of death is altogether uncertain. However, ſome others ſpeak of his preaching and dying in Parthia or Perſia: and the diverſity of thoſe accounts ſeems to ſhow, that they all are without good foundation.

I think it may be of uſe to take here at length a paſſage of Euſebius, at the beginning of the third book of his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, after having in the preceding book ſpoken of the many calamities in Judea, when the war was juſt breaking out. 'This,' ſays he, 'was the ſtate of things with the 'Jews. But the holy apoſtles and diſciples of our Saviour 'being diſperſed abroad, preached in the whole world. 'Thomas, as we learn by tradition, had Parthia for his lot; 'Andrew Scythia; John Aſia, who having lived there a long 'time died at Epheſus. Peter, as it ſeems, preached to the 'diſperſed Jews in Pontus, and Galatia, Bithynia, Cappa-'docia, and Aſia: at length coming to Rome, he was cruci-'fied, with his head downward, as he had deſired. What 'need I to ſpeak of Paul, who fully preached the goſpel of 'Chriſt from Jeruſalem to Illyricum, and at laſt died a mar-'tyr at Rome, in the time of Nero? So ſays Origen expreſsly 'in the third tome of his expoſitions of the book of Geneſis.'

f St. John ſays, ch. i. 43. *The day following, Jeſus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and ſaith unto him: follow me.* If Philip was then called by our Lord to be an apoſtle, he ought to be added to the others above-named.

[a] Ματθαιος μεν ην ο αποστολος σπερματων, και αμπελουργων, και λαχανων, αυευ κρεων μετελαμβανεν. Clem. Pæd. l. 2. p. 148. D.

[b] Ἡνικα οι αποστολοι κληρω την εις τα εθνη πορειαν επωιειτο, Θωμας μεν την παρθων αποστολην υπεδεχετο· ματθαιος δε αιθιοπιαν. κ. λ. Socr. H. E. l. 1. c. 19.

[c] See Cave's Lives of the Apoſtles, and his Hiſt. Lit.

Thus

Thus writes our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian. But, as Valeſius obſerves, it [d] is not eaſy to determine exactly where the quotation from Origen begins.

However, from this paſſage, as it ſeems, we may conclude, that at the beginning of the fourth century, there were not any certain and well atteſted accounts of the places, out of Judea, in which many of the apoſtles of Chriſt preached: for if there had, Euſebius muſt have been acquainted with them. In particular, we may hence infer, as I apprehend, that there was no certain account, whither Matthew went, when he left Judea; for there is no notice taken of him in this paſſage. Nor does Jerom in his article of St. Matthew, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, formerly [e] tranſcribed at large, take any notice of the countries, in which he preached: nor do I recollect, that in any other of his genuine works he has ſaid any thing of the travels of this apoſtle.

Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, in the ſecond century, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, reckons [f] Matthew among thoſe apoſtles, who did not die by martyrdom; nor does Clement contradict him.

It is alſo obſervable, that [g] Chryſoſtom has a commendation of Matthew, conſiſting of divers articles: his humility; mercifulneſs or liberality; piety; general benevolence; writing a goſpel; finally, fortitude, inaſmuch as *he came from the preſence of the council rejoicing:* referring, I ſuppoſe, to Acts v. 41; but ſays nothing of his martyrdom. Which may induce us to think, that there was not any tradition about it among Chriſtians at that time, or that it was not much regarded.

II. Having thus given the hiſtory of this apoſtle, I proceed to the conſideration of his goſpel, one of the univerſally acknowledged books of the New Teſtament. Two things principally are to be the ſubjects of our inquiry, the time of writing it, and the language in which it was written. And I propoſe to recite here briefly all, or moſt of the authors,

[d] Cum Euſebius hic dicat, ſuperiora ex libro tertio Explanationum Origenis in Geneſim eſſe deſumpta, dubitari merito poteſt, unde incipiant Origenis verba, &c. Valeſ. Annot. in l. 3. cap. 1.

[e] Vol. V. p. 37.

[f] Ου γαρ παντες οι σωζομενοι ωμολογησαν την δια της φωνης ομολογιαν, και εξηλθον· εξ ων ματθαιος, φιλιππος, θωμας, λευις, και αλλοι πολλοι. Clem. Str. l. 4. p. 502. B.

[g] In Matt. hom. 48. al. 49. T. VII. p. 491.

that

that have been largely quoted in the former volumes, ſo far as relates to thoſe two particulars.

Papias, biſhop of Hierapolis, about A. D. 116, by ſome ſuppoſed to have been acquainted with John the apoſtle, by others with John the elder only, in his five books, entitled Explications of the Oracles of the Lord, which ſeem to have been collections of ancient ſtories and traditions, makes [h] expreſs mention of Matthew's goſpel, and ſays, that he wrote the Divine Oracles in the Hebrew tongue.

Irenæus, biſhop of Lyons, about the year 178, who was born in Aſia, and in his youth was acquainted with Polycarp, diſciple of St. John, ſays: 'Matthew [i] then among the 'Jews wrote a goſpel in their own language, while Peter 'and Paul were preaching the goſpel at Rome, and found-'ing [or eſtabliſhing] the church there. And after their 'exit, [that is, death, or departure] Mark alſo the diſ-'ciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing, 'the things that had been preached by Peter. And Luke, 'the companion of Paul, put down in a book the goſpel 'preached by him. Afterwards John, the diſciple of the 'Lord, who leaned upon his breaſt, likewiſe publiſhed a 'goſpel, whilſt he dwelt at Epheſus, in Aſia.' In another place he ſays, 'the [k] goſpel according to Matthew was delivered to the Jews.'

Origen, about 230, ſays, 'that [l] according to the tra-'dition received by him, the firſt goſpel was written by 'Matthew, once a publican, afterwards a diſciple of Jeſus 'Chriſt: who delivered it to the Jewiſh believers, com-'poſed in the Hebrew language.' And in another place he ſays, 'that [m] Matthew wrote for the Hebrews.'

Says Euſebius, about 315, 'Matthew [n] having firſt 'preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to 'other people, delivered to them in their own language the 'goſpel according to him, by that writing ſupplying the 'want of his preſence with thoſe whom he was leaving.'

[h] See of this work, vol. II. p. 169.

[i] Ὁ μεν δη ματθαιος εν τοις εβραικοις τη αυτων διαλεκτῳ και γραφην εξηνεγκεν ευαγγελιε, τε πετρε, και τε παυλε εν ρωμῃ ευαγγελιζομενων και θεμελιεντων την εκκλησιαν. κ. λ. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. i. Et ap. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 8. And in this work, vol. II. p. 158.

[k] p. 159.

[l] p. 466.

[m] p. 486.

[n] Vol. IV. p. 225, 263.

Athanaſius, in his Feſtal Epiſtle [o] does not ſay, where, or in what language Matthew wrote. But in the Synopſis, aſcribed to him, it is ſaid, 'that [p] Matthew wrote his goſpel in Hebrew, and publiſhed it at Jeruſalem.'

Cyril of Jeruſalem ſays, 'that [q] Matthew wrote in Hebrew.'

Epiphanius likewiſe ſays, 'that [r] Matthew wrote in Hebrew.' And afterwards. 'Matthew [s] wrote firſt, and Mark ſoon after him, being a follower of Peter at Rome.' If Mark did not write till after Peter came to Rome, and Matthew but a little before him; it follows, that Matthew's goſpel was not written ſo ſoon, as many later writers have ſuppoſed.

Gregory Nazianzen, in his catalogue, ſays, 'that [t] Matthew wrote for the Hebrews.'

And Ebedjeſu, 'that [u] Matthew, the firſt evangeliſt, publiſhed his goſpel in Paleſtine, written in Hebrew.'

Theodore of Mopſueſtia ſays, 'that [x] for a good while 'the apoſtles preached chiefly to Jews in Judea. After-'wards Providence made way for conducting them to 'remote countries. Peter went to Rome, the reſt elſe-'where, John, in particular, took up his abode at Epheſus. '... About this time the other evangeliſts, Matthew, Mark, 'and Luke, publiſhed their goſpels, which were ſoon ſpread 'all over the world.' This ſuppoſeth a late date of the goſpels, as was argued vol IV. p. 512, that is, after the beginning of Nero's reign, when Peter went to Rome, and not long before the war in Judea, which broke out in 66, about which time John left that country, and ſettled at Epheſus.

Says Jerom in the prologue to his Commentary upon St. Matthew: 'The [y] firſt evangeliſt is Matthew, the pub-'lican, ſurnamed Levi, who wrote his goſpel in Judea, 'in the Hebrew language, chiefly for the ſake of the Jews 'that believed in Jeſus, and did not join the ſhadow of the 'law with the truth of the goſpel.' To the like purpoſe in the article of St. Matthew, in his book of Eccleſiaſtical

[o] p. 283.
[p] p. 293.
[q] p. 301.
[r] p. 314.
[s] Ευθυς δε μετα τον ματθαιον ακολουθος γενομενος ο μαρκος τω αγιω πετρω εν ρωμη. Citat. ib. p. 305.
[t] Vol. IV. p. 408.
[u] p. 439.
[x] p. 511.
[y] Vol. V. p. 35.

writers:

writers: 'Matthew [z] called alſo Levi, of a publican made 'an apoſtle, firſt of all wrote a goſpel in Judea in the He-'brew language, for the ſake of thoſe of the circumciſion, 'who believed. Who afterwards tranſlated it into Greek, 'is uncertain.'

Chryſoſtom in the introduction to his homilies upon this goſpel: 'Matthew [a] is ſaid to have written his goſpel at the 'requeſt of the Jewiſh believers, who deſired him to put 'down in writing what he had taught them by word of 'mouth: and he is ſaid to have written in Hebrew.' He ſpeaks with heſitation, and is not poſitive about the occaſion of writing this goſpel, or the language in which it was written. Afterwards he ſays: 'In [b] what place each one of the evangeliſts wrote, cannot be ſaid with certainty.'

Coſmas of Alexandria, about the year 535, ſays: 'Mat-'thew 'is the firſt evangeliſt that wrote a goſpel. There 'being a perſecution, when Stephen was ſtoned, and he 'alſo being about to go from that place, the believers 'entreated him to leave with them a written inſtruction, 'with which requeſt he complied.' And what follows.

The author of the Imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, in the ſixth century, about the year 560, obſerves to this purpoſe: 'The [d] occaſion of Matthew's writing is ſaid to be 'this. There being a great perſecution in Paleſtine, ſo that 'there was danger, leſt all the faithful ſhould be diſperſed: 'that they might not be without teaching, though they 'ſhould have no teachers, they requeſted Matthew to write 'for them a hiſtory of all Chriſt's words and works, that 'wherever they ſhould be, they ſhould have with them the 'ground of their faith.' This writer does not ſay, that this was the perſecution that aroſe about the time of the death of Stephen. He ſeems to ſpeak of a later, and more general perſecution and diſperſion, ſuch as may be well ſuppoſed to have been in Judea, near the war in 66; when moſt, or all of the apoſtles, and many of the Jewiſh believers removed, and were diſperſed into other countries.

In the Paſchal Chronicle, a work compoſed in the ſeventh century, as formerly cited, it is intimated, that 'St. Mat-

[z] p. 37.
[a] p. 128.
[b] Ibid.
[c] Vol. V. p. 265.
[d] p. 290.
[e] See vol. IV. p. 263.

thew publiſhed his goſpel in Paleſtine, about fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion, and ſoon after the council at Jeruſalem, of which an account is given Acts xv.

And, to draw to a concluſion of this liſt of writers. Theophylact, in the eleventh century, ſays: 'Matthew 'then [f] firſt wrote a goſpel in the Hebrew language, for the 'ſake of the Hebrew believers, eight years after our Savi-'our's aſcenſion.'

Euthymius in the beginning of the twelfth century: 'That [g] Matthew's goſpel was the firſt, and written in 'Judea, in Hebrew, for the Jewiſh believers, eight years 'after our Lord's aſcenſion.'

Nicephorus Calliſti, in the fourteenth century, ſays: 'Matthew [h] having preached the ſaving word to the Jews, 'when he was about to go abroad to the Gentiles, thought 'it beſt to write in his native language an account of his 'preaching, to ſupply the want of his preſence: which he 'did at about fifteen years after our Saviour's aſcenſion.'

III. Who now of all theſe writers deſerves the greateſt regard? Irenæus, I think, as being the moſt ancient. And with him agree Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopſueſtia, and the author of the Imperfect Work, as it ſeems. Nor is he contradicted by Euſebius of Cæſarea, ſo far as I can [i] perceive: he ſays, 'that when Matthew was about to go to 'other people, he delivered his goſpel to the Hebrews in 'their own language.' But the does not ſay in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, nor any where elſe, when this apoſtle left Judea. Some [k] may have underſtood him to mean about eight years after our Saviour's aſcenſion, and others about fifteen years after it, as Nicephorus, and perhaps the Paſchal Chronicle; but himſelf has not expreſsly mentioned the time: and he may have been undetermined in his mind about the time, when Matthew left Judea. Moreover, he has inſerted [l] in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory the paſſage of Irenæus above quoted, upon which we inſiſt. And a late date of the goſpels is agreeable to his own, and other's obſervations, before taken notice of, that the apoſtles of Chriſt did not write many books, and were not very forward to write, but as they were compelled by a kind of neceſſity.

[f] Vol. V. p. 326, 327.
[g] p. 333.
[h] p. 335, 336.
[i] See vol. IV. p. 263.
[k] p. 262—264.
[l] L. 5. cap. 8. p. 172. C.

There

There are divers learned moderns of good judgment in theſe matters, who pay a great regard to this teſtimony of Irenæus, particularly, [m] Fabricius, [n] Mill, [o] S. Baſnage, and before them [p] Martin Chemnitius.

Mill ſuppoſed it to be highly probable, that [q] Irenæus had this account from Papias. Le Clerc [r] likewiſe ſeems to have thought, that Irenæus found this in the five books of Papias: but that is only conjecture. Euſebius quoting Papias obſerves, that he ſaid, Matthew wrote in Hebrew. But he does not ſay, that Papias mentioned the time of writing his goſpel. However, it was the opinion of Irenæus; and it may be reckoned not improbable, that he had a tradition to that purpoſe, which he relied upon as right, for he ſpeaks of it without heſitation. It might be derived from ſeveral, one of whom was Papias.

Irenæus ſays, that 'Matthew publiſhed his goſpel when Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome:' that is, ſays [s] Mill in the year 61. 'For,' adds he, 'I underſtand him of the firſt time, that Paul was at Rome.' But if Irenæus ſays right, it muſt have been at the ſecond time that Paul was at Rome; for we have no reaſon to believe that Peter was at all in that city when Paul was ſent thither by Feſtus: but, very probably, Peter and Paul were there together afterwards, and ſuffered martyrdom there about the ſame time. That is the ſeaſon to which we ſhould be led for fixing the writing of St. Matthew's Goſpel, if Irenæus may be relied upon. Accordingly Baſnage [t] in his annals ſpeaks of

[m] De tempore, quando ſcripſerit, cui potius fidem habeamus, quam S. Irenæo, temporibus illis proximo, qui tradit eum edidiſſe Evangelium, τϐ πετρϐ και τϐ παυλϐ εν ρωμη ευαγγελιζομενων και θεμελιωντων την εκκλησιαν. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. 5. T. 3. p. 126.

[n] Prolegom. num. 61.

[o] A. 64. n. xii.

[p] Examen Concil Trid. p. 16.

[q] Tamen Irenæus l. 3. c. 1. expreſſe dicit, ex auctoritate Papiæ, nullus dubito, qui παραδοσιν hanc a Johanne Preſbytero, Apoſtolorum familiari, acceperat, Matthæum Evangelium ſuum edidiſſe, *cum Petrus et Paulus evangelizarent Romæ, et fundarent eccleſiam.* Proleg. num. 61.

[r] Vid. Diſſ. de iv. Evang. ſub init.

[s] Atque hoc ipſo quidem anno LXI. prodiiſſe videtur Evangelium Matthæi.... Ego quidem de priori adventu intelligendum Irenæum omnino arbitror. Ib. num. 61, 62.

[t] Quo tempore Petrus Pauluſque Romæ operam dabant evangelio, Matthæus, ſi creditur Irenæo, Evangelium exaravit ſuum.... Annum tamen perinde atque locum, ubi a Matthæo conditum eſt, in incerto eſſe, facile patimur.... Nos nonniſi Neronе rerum domino editum fuiſſe, perſuaſum habemus, etſi de anno

of St. Matthew's goſpel at the year 64. And though, as he ſays, he does not know the year, nor the place, where St. Matthew's goſpel was publiſhed, yet he expreſſeth himſelf, as if he was inclined to think it was not written till Nero's reign was ſomewhat advanced in the year 64. or 65. the time of that emperor's perſecution of the Chriſtians.

Other learned men are for an earlier date: whoſe opinions alſo, undoubtedly, ought to be taken notice of, and conſidered by us.

Cave thought that [u] St. Matthew's goſpel was written about the fifteenth year after our Saviour's aſcenſion, in the year 48, a ſhort time before the council of Jeruſalem, or ſoon after it.

Baronius was of opinion, that [x] this goſpel was publiſhed in the year 41, ſoon after that Peter had begun to preach to gentiles at the houſe of Cornelius in Cæſarea.

Grotius [y] and G. I. Voſſius [z] were likewiſe of opinion, that St. Matthew's goſpel was written about eight years after Chriſt's aſcenſion.

Tillemont argues, 'That [a] St. Matthew wrote his goſpel 'about three years after the crucifixion of Chriſt: for it muſt 'have been written before the apoſtles left Judea. The time 'of their going abroad, as he owns, is uncertain: but it 'muſt have been about the year 36, foraſmuch as it appears,

anno locove divinare non poſſumus. Nulla tamen ſe magis veri ſpecie commendat chronologia, quam illa Irenæi: quod nempe Paulo et Petro Romanos inſtituentibus, ſcribendo Matthæus operam dederit: ut Eccleſiæ aliquid monumenti eſſet, quo ob ortum ex perſecutione Neronis dolorem leniret, ſanctorumque Apoſtolorum eo fluctu oppreſſorum faciem in Evangelio videre ſibi videretur Eccleſia. Baſn. Ann. 64. n. xii.

[u] Scripſiſſe Evangelium ſuum viii. a Chriſti reſurrectione anno vulgo dicitur. Quod tamen ad annum a Chriſti aſſumtione 15 referunt auctor Chr. A. et Nicephorus. Et ſane eum ante annum a paſſione Chriſti 12. Apoſtolis Judææ finibus egredi non licuit, vix ante ann. 15. chr. 48. finita ſynodo Hieroſolymitana, ad ſuam quiſque ſortem abierunt, adeo ut paulo ante Matthæus Evangelium ſuum condidiſſe videtur. H. L. in Matthæo, p. 13.

[x] Baron. Ann. 41. num. ix, xvi.

[y] Grot. Pr. ad Matth.

[z] Si quidem Matthæus in Paleſtina ſcribebat, idque intra proximum a paſſione Chriſti octennium. Voſſ. de Gen. J. C. cap. iv. § 2.

[a] Il ſemble meſme neceſſaire de dire, que S. Matthieu a écrit trois ans ſeulement après la mort de J. C.... Le temps de cette diviſion des Apôtres eſt incertain. Il ſemble neanmoins, que ç'a été vers l'an 36. puiſqu'il paroiſt, qu'il n'y avoit aucun Apoſtre à Jeruſalem, lorſque S. Paul vint en 37. hors S. Pierre, et S. Jacque le mineur. S. Matthieu. Mem. T. I.

'that

'that in the year 37, when Paul came to Jeruſalem, there 'were no other apoſtles there beſide Peter, and James the 'Leſs.' But that argument is of no value. For the apoſtles might be all at Jeruſalem, or in its neighbourhood, though Paul ſaw none, beſide the two juſt mentioned.

Mr. Jones earneſtly contends, that [b] this goſpel was written about eight years after our Lord's aſcenſion, in the year 41. But I do not think it needful to take any farther notice of his arguments, than has been done [c] already.

Mr. Wetſtein has lately declared in favour of the ſame opinion. 'And [d] hence,' ſays he, 'we diſcern the reaſon 'why this evangeliſt has inſerted ſo many diſcourſes about 'the Jewiſh ſuperſtitions: which could be of little or no 'uſe to other people, and among other nations, when the 'temple was once deſtroyed, or was near being deſtroyed.' But I am not able to diſcern any force in that way of reaſoning, becauſe I perceive not any ſuperfluities in this, or any of the evangeliſts. Our Lord's reproofs of Jewiſh ſuperſtitions, his declarations of the ſuperiority of moral virtue, or righteouſneſs and true holineſs, above the righteouſneſs of the ſcribes and phariſees, his cenſures of the pride and covetouſneſs, falſe mixims, and hypocritical conduct of the ſame men, will be uſeful to all people ſo long as the world ſtands. As our Lord was a Jew, and his miniſtry was employed among thoſe people in Judea; it is no wonder, that in his diſcourſes, recorded by St. Matthew, whenever he wrote, there ſhould be frequent alluſions to their laws, cuſtoms, and worſhip. The like [e] are in the other two firſt evangeliſts:

[b] New and full Method. &c. vol. III. ch v. p. 59—64.

[c] See vol. IV. p. 262—264.

[d] Magno conſenſu perhibent Patres, Matthæum in gratiam credentium ex Judæis in Palæſtina Evangelium ſuum exſcripſiſſe, et quidem, ut multi addunt, Hieroſolymis, octavo poſt aſcenſionem Chriſti anno, qui Claudii Imperatoris primus fuit. Cur illorum teſtimonium in dubium vocetur, cauſam non video: quin iſta hypotheſi admiſſa, plurima non infeliciter exiſtimo explicari poſſe, quorum aliter ratio vix invenitur. Hinc enim intelligimus, cur Matthæus primum in ordine Evangeliſtarum occupet locum, quia nimirum primus omnium ſcripſit: cur item tam multas de Judæorum ſuperſtitionibus referat diſputationes, quibus apud alias nationes, vel templo jam everſo, vel paulo poſt evertendo, locus vix fuiſſet. Wetſt. N. T. Tom. I. p. 223.

[e] When Mr. Wetſtein ſpeaks of the many diſcourſes about Jewiſh ſuperſtitions, which are in St. Matthew's goſpel: I imagine he may particularly refer to Matt. xxiii. 1—30. Nevertheleſs divers of thoſe things

evangeliſts: and in St. John's goſpel, the laſt of the four are as long diſcourſes with the cavilling Jews, as in any of the reſt.

I therefore readily aſſent to thoſe who think that this goſpel was written in the time of the emperor Nero, not till about thirty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion. I am not able to aſſign the year in which it was written; but I am ſomewhat inclined to the year 63, 64, or 65, of the vulgar epoch. This is agreeable not only to the teſtimony of Irenæus, and ſome other ancients, but to the circumſtances of things. At the year 64, or thereabout, the goſpel had been propagated in many gentile countries, the times were troubleſome in Judea, and the war was coming on: ſeveral of the apoſtles were dead, others of them, who ſurvived, were gone, or going abroad, and many of the Jewiſh believers were about to ſeek ſhelter elſewhere: now was a proper time to write a hiſtory of Chriſt and his miracles. Moreover in this goſpel are recorded divers plain predictions of the miſeries and deſolations of Jeruſalem, and the overthrow of the temple, and the Jewiſh ſtate, beſide many other figurative intimations of the ſame things in many of our Lord's diſcourſes and parables. Which could not be well publiſhed to all the world in writing, till about this time. The ſuitableneſs of St. Matthew's goſpel to the ſtate of the chriſtian religion, and of the Jewiſh people, about the year 64, or 65, leads to that time. And however unwillingly, from private apprehenſions and prejudices, we may admit the thought of protracting ſo long the writing the hiſtory of our Lord's miniſtry; the circumſtances of things will conſtrain us to acquieſce in this ſeaſon, as the moſt likely.

IV. This leads me now to obſerve ſome characters of time in the goſpel itſelf.

It is well known, and allowed by all, that [f] for a while our Lord's diſciples laboured under Jewiſh prejudices: and

things occur alſo in the goſpels of St. Mark and St. Luke. See Mark xii. 38—40 Luke xi. 42—52. and xx 46, 47. And both Mark viii. 14—21. and Luke xii. 1, 2. have recorded our Lord's injunctions, *to beware of the leaven of the Phariſees and Sadducees, or Herodians,* as well as Matthew xvi. 6—12. Not now to mention any other like things.

[f] There are many proofs of this in the goſpels. See particularly John xvi. 7—14 and likewiſe the hiſtory in the Acts, ch. x.

that

that they did not fully underſtand all his diſcourſes at the time when they were ſpoken. They did not, they could not, clearly diſcern the comprehenſive deſign of the evangelical diſpenſation, till after Peter had been at the houſe of Cornelius, and there received into the church gentile converts, without circumciſion: nor till after the goſpel had been preached abroad in foreign countries by Paul, and other apoſtles and miniſters. Let us therefore now obſerve the book itſelf of St. Matthew, and ſee what knowledge he appears to have had of the ſcheme of the goſpel.

1. His account of the commiſſion which our Lord gave to the twelve apoſtles is in ch. xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore into all the world, and teach all nations.* Matthew did not then think that the apoſtles of Jeſus were to teach Jews only, but that they were required to teach all people, and all nations in general.

2. I ſuppoſe that he fully underſtood our Lord's doctrine, when he recorded that ſummary account of it which is in the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh chapters of his goſpel. The beatitudes at the beginning are a proof of it. And at the concluſion, they who *heard and did thoſe ſayings*, are compared to *a man that built his houſe upon a rock*; though there had been nothing ſaid to enforce the rituals of the Moſaic law.

3. And that he well underſtood the ſpirituality, and the freedom of the goſpel, appears from what he has recorded ch. xv. 10—20.

4. His clear diſcernment of the deſign of the goſpel-diſpenſation appears even in his account of our Saviour's nativity, particularly, in what he ſays ch. i. 21. of the meſſage of the angel to Joſeph. *And thou ſhalt call his name Jeſus. For he ſhall ſave his people from their ſins.*

5. If he had not known that our Saviour was deſigned to be, or was already become a bleſſing to gentiles, he would ſcarcely have thought of inſerting the hiſtory of the Magi coming from the eaſt to Jeruſalem, to inquire after the birth of the King of the Jews, chap. ii.

6. It is alſo very likely, that he underſtood thoſe words of John the Baptiſt, recorded by him ch. iii. 9. *God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up children to Abraham.*

7. St. Matthew's knowledge of the calling of the gentiles and the rejection of the Jews, may be concluded from many things recorded by him. In the hiſtory of our Lord's healing

healing the Centurion's ſervant at Capernaum he inſerts our Lord's commendation of his faith, and that declaration: *Many ſhall come from the eaſt and the weſt, and ſit down with Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom ſhall be caſt out,* ch. viii. 10—12.

8. The admiſſion of the gentiles to equal privileges with the Jews muſt be intimated in the parable of the labourers hired into the vineyard at ſeveral hours of the day. ch. xx. 1—16.

9. The calling and acceptance of the gentiles, and the rejection of the Jewiſh people, and even their overthrow, are plainly declared in the parable of the vineyard, let out to huſbandmen, and the diſcourſe which follows. ch. xxi. 33—46. The ſame things are intimated in the parable of the king that made a wedding feaſt for his ſon, which is at the beginning of the next chapter. ch. xxii. 1—14.

10. I might likewiſe take notice of the hiſtory of our Lord's curing the daughter of the woman of Canaan. ch. xv. 21—28.

11. It is alſo very likely that St. Matthew had ſome good knowledge, and a diſtinct apprehenſion of the extent of our Lord's kingdom, and the progreſs of his doctrine, when he recorded thoſe parables in the thirteenth chapter of his goſpel: where our Lord has compared the kingdom of heaven, or the preaching his goſpel, to a grain of muſtard-ſeed, the leaſt of all ſeeds, but becomes a tree: to leaven, by which a large lump is leavened: to a net, that was caſt into the ſea, and gathered of every kind. And, explaining the parable of the tares, our Lord ſays, ver. 37, 38. *He that ſoweth the good ſeed is the ſon of Man. The field is the world.* And what follows.

12. It is probable, that this evangeliſt had ſome knowledge of the goſpel having been preached out of Judea, when he put down that declaration of our Lord concerning the woman, that poured the rich ointment upon his head: *Whereſoever the goſpel ſhall be preached in the whole world, there ſhall this alſo, that this woman has done, be told for a memorial of her,* ch. xxvi. 13.

13. In his account of the inſtitution of the euchariſt, ch. xxvi. 28. our Lord ſays: *This is my blood of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many,* that is, for all men, *for the remiſ-*

ſion

ſion of ſins. And in ch. xx. 28. our Lord ſays: *The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ranſom for many.*

14. There is alſo an expreſſion uſed by him once or twice, intimating, that it was ſome conſiderable ſpace, ſince the time of the event and his writing about it. ch. xxviii. 8. *Wherefore that field was called the field of blood to this day.* Having related the affair of the ſoldiers, and the directions given to them by the Jewiſh council to ſay, that *his diſciples came by night, and ſtole him away*, he adds: *And this ſaying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day*, ver. 15. Such an expreſſion does not denote any certain period: but one would think, that, in this caſe, thereby muſt be intended a conſiderable ſpace of time, more than eight, or ten, or fifteen years.

15. I formerly [8] ſhowed divers advantages of the late publication of the goſpels. The life of Jeſus could not be forgotten in thirty, or forty years. His life and death were very public, as well as very extraordinary. His reſurrection and aſcenſion were moſt publicly atteſted by his apoſtles, and others, as we know from the book of the Acts. And from that time forward there were many, who were continually ſpeaking of the things ſaid and done by him, and of the evidences of his reſurrection and exaltation. They were ſoon known to multitudes of people, ſmall and great, and men of all ranks and characters. As St. Paul ſays to Feſtus, in a very great aſſembly. Acts xxvi. 26. *For the king knoweth of theſe things, before whom alſo I ſpeak freely: for I am perſuaded, that none of theſe things are hidden from him; for this thing was not done in a corner.* And was it not the cry at Theſſalonica? Acts xvii. 6. *Theſe that have turned the world upſide down, are come hither alſo.* The account of St. Paul's manner of living at Rome, about the years 61, and 62, is, that *he dwelt two whole years in his own hired houſe, and received all that came in unto him, . . . teaching thoſe things, which concern the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, Acts xxviii. 30, 31. Whilſt there were men, who at the hazard of their lives taught, and others that embraced, the things concerning the Lord Jeſus, they could not be forgotten. And if about thirty years after our Lord's aſcenſion, his hiſtory was written by eye-witneſſes, or their companions, it was ſoon enough: yea, it was the fitteſt time of all. At the year

[8] See vol. IV. p. 240—245.

ſixty,

ſixty, of our Lord's nativity, according to the vulgar æra, and later, there certainly were enough ſuch perſons, as thoſe juſt mentioned, ſtill living, to record his words and works, and more, who were willing, and deſirous to read written hiſtories of him, than before: and alſo more to tranſcribe and copy out thoſe hiſtories for their own uſe, and for the uſe and benefit of others, than in any preceding time.

V. It remains, that we conſider in what language this goſpel was written: becauſe many of the ancients, whoſe teſtimonies have been lately recited, though they allow the other goſpels to have been written in Greek, have delivered it as their opinion, that this goſpel was written in Hebrew.

Of this I have already ſpoken ſeveral times, particularly, in the chapter of [h] Papias, and in the chapter of [i] Origen, and [k] of Euſebius of Cæſarea; where alſo the opinions of divers learned moderns were alleged, who think it was written in Greek. To them I now add [l] Le Clerc, who has an argument upon his head, proper to be conſulted by thoſe who have leiſure, but too long to be inſerted here: and his learned ſucceſſor Mr. Wetſtein, who ſays, 'Here '[m] we are of opinion, that the Fathers do not ſo properly 'bear teſtimony, as deliver their own conjecture: which 'needs not to be admitted, if it be not ſupported by good 'reaſons, or may be refuted by probable arguments. Sup-'poſing, and taking it for granted, that Matthew wrote 'for the Jews in Judea, they concluded that he wrote in 'Hebrew. But there is no weight in that reaſon. The

[h] Vol. ii. p. 110.
[i] p. 541—543.
[k] Vol. IV. p. 266—268.
[l] Diſſ. iii. De iv. Evangeliis.
[m] Neque tam facile aſſentimur ſententiæ eorundem Patrum ſtatuentium, Matthæum ſcripſiſſe Hebraice, hoc eſt, Syriace, ſive Chaldaice, quâ linguâ tunc temporis Judæi in Palæſtina utebantur.... Exiſtimamus enim Patres hic jam non teſtimonium dicere, ſed conjecturam ſuam in medium proferre, non admittendam, ſi aut idoneis rationibus non ſit ſulta, aut veriſimilibus argumentis refutari poſſit. Quod enim putant neceſſe fuiſſe ut Hebræis ſcribens Hebraice ſcriberet, verum non eſt: cum conſtet eo tempore linguam Græcam per totum Imperium Romanum, et in Judæa præſertim, in uſu fuiſſe.... Videntur ergo vetutiſſimi Patres, et inter eos Papias, homo ſimplex et credulus, re non explorata, inani Nazaræorum jactantiæ fidem habuiſſe.... Nullum ſane in noſtro Matthæo reperitur indicium, unde colligi poſſit, ex alia in aliam linguam fuiſſe converſam. Plurima vero aliud ſuadent. Wetſten. N. T. tom. I. p. 224.

'Greek

'Greek language was at that time much uſed throughout 'the whole Roman empire, and particularly in Judea. 'Papias, who firſt advanced this opinion, was a weak and 'credulous man. Nor are there in our Greek goſpel any 'marks of its being a tranſlation from another language.'

Mr. Jones [n] has a long argument, well deſerving to be read, ſhowing, that this goſpel was originally written in Greek.

Mr. Baſnage [o] is of the ſame ſide, and has argued exceeding well for it: I ſhould tranſcribe him if I had room; as I have not, I refer to him.

Says [*] Dr. Jortin: 'In the time of Chriſt and his apoſtles 'the Greek was really the univerſal language: the New 'Teſtament is a proof of it, if proof were wanting. And this 'is one reaſon amongſt many others, why St. Matthew 'probably wrote his goſpel in Greek. See Weſtein's N. T. p. 224. St. Matthew, ch. v. 47, 48. ſays: Οι τελωναι ουτω ποιουσιν. Εσεσθε ουν υμεις τελειοι ... that is, be not τελωναι, but τελειοι. Videtur autem Matthæus vocem τελειοι hic adhibuiſſe, ut τελωναις opponeret. Wetſtein. Add to this, that τελωνης and τελειος are both derived from the ſame word, τελος. So again, ch. vi. 16. we find an antitheſis in the words, αφανιζουσι τα προσωπα, οπως φανωσι. Eleganter dicitur: *Tegunt faciem, ut appareant, &c.* Wetſtein.

And many others of the ſame ſentiment might be mentioned, who are men of great learning and good judgment.

I ſhall now propoſe ſome obſervations relating to this point.

1. If St. Matthew did not write till about thirty years after our Lord's aſcenſion, we muſt be led to think, he would uſe the Greek language. That he did not write ſooner, I ſuppoſe to have been ſhown to be very probable. If indeed there were good reaſons to think, his goſpel was written within the ſpace of eight years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, we might well conclude, that he wrote in Hebrew. But, to me it ſeems, that we may be fully ſatisfied, that Matthew did not write within that ſpace, nor ſo ſoon as fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion, nor till ſome good while afterwards.

[n] See his Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's goſpel, ch. 17—19, p. 180—186.

[o] Ann. 64. n. xiii.

[*] See his Diſcourſes concerning the Chriſtian Religion, p. 176. note (o) the third edition.

wards. St. James, reſiding at Jeruſalem, writes an epiſtle about the year of Chriſt 60, as is ſuppoſed: it is addreſſed *to the twelve tribes ſcattered abroad*; and he writes in Greek, as is allowed. Why, then, ſhould not St. Matthew uſe the ſame language?

2. There was very early a Greek goſpel of St. Matthew. It is quoted, or referred to by Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Juſtin Martyr, not now to mention any others: none of whom intimate, that they made uſe of a tranſlation.

3. Though many of the ancients ſay, that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, they ſeem not to have fully believed it: for they have ſhown very little regard to the Hebrew edition of it. This has been particularly ſhown in the chapters of [p] Origen, [q] Euſebius of Cæſarea, and [r] Jerom, the moſt likely of any of the ancients to make uſe of that edition, if they had been perſuaded, that it was authentic and original.

4. There are not in our Greek goſpel of St. Matthew any marks of a tranſlation: ſo ſaid Mr. Wetſtein in the paſſage juſt tranſcribed; and this obſervation was before made by us in the chapter of [s] Papias.

5. There is no where any probable account, who tranſlated this goſpel into Greek. No particular tranſlator was mentioned by Papias, as may be concluded from the accounts given of his books by Euſebius. Nor is any tranſlator of this goſpel named by Irenæus, Euſebius, or any of the writers of the firſt three centuries, that are come down to us. Nor is there any reaſon to think, that he was named in any other: foraſmuch as no notice is taken of him by Euſebius, or Jerom, who ſaw many writings of ancients now loſt, both catholics and heretics. Jerom having ſaid, that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, preſently adds: 'Who [t] afterwards tranſlated him into Greek, is uncertain.' And all the accounts of a tranſlator, ſince given, are too late to be credited, and are likewiſe very improbable. In the Synopſis aſcribed to Athanaſius, but not written till long after his time, it is ſaid, 'That [u] Matthew's goſpel was tranſlated into Greek by James, the firſt biſhop of Jeruſalem.'

[p] Vol. II. p. 541—543.
[q] Vol. IV. p. 266—268.
[r] Vol. V. p. 70.
[s] Vol. II. p. 110.
[t] Vol. V. p. 37.
[u] Vol. IV. p. 293.

Which

Which is very improbable. It would be more reaſonable to imagine, that he tranſlated it out of Greek into Hebrew. But as that is not ſaid by the ancients, ſo neither have we reaſon to ſay it. Moreover, the ſame reaſons, as one may think, which would induce James to make a Greek tranſlation, ſhould have induced Matthew to write in Greek. Nevertheleſs Dr. Mill [x] has pitched upon that perſon for the tranſlator, and formed an argument thereupon: which only ſerves to ſhow, that there is nothing, for which ſomething may not be ſaid by thoſe, who indulge themſelves in ſuppoſitions without ground. Theophylact informs us, that [y] in his time it was ſaid, that John tranſlated this goſpel into Greek: but it was only a common report; and indeed it could be no more. However, out of a regard to ſuch reports and teſtimonies, Mr. Lampe [z] has very properly reckoned a tranſlation of this goſpel among the works falſly aſcribed to St. John.

6. Once more, I apprehend, we may diſcern the origin of this opinion, that St. Matthew's goſpel was written in Hebrew. There was ſoon made a tranſlation of his Greek goſpel into Hebrew. We have ſeen proofs, that [a] in very early days of Chriſtianity there was a Hebrew goſpel: and many, not examining it particularly, nor indeed being able to do it, for want of underſtanding the language, imagined, that it was firſt written in Hebrew. Jerom expreſsly tells us, that [b] by many in his time the goſpel according to the Hebrews

[x] Quis in Græcum transfuderit, incertum eſt. Papias de hoc nihil ab Ariſtione aut Joanne preſbytero accepit, aut tradidit. Auctor Synopſeos S. Scripturæ Jacobo fratri Domini diſerte adſcribit hanc verſionem. Theophylactus, ex fama dantaxat, Joanni Evangeliſtæ. Ego ad priorem illam ſententiam, ſeu magis veriſimilem, accedo. Satis enim probabile eſt, Evangelium in Hebræorum uſum linguâ ipſorum patriâ primum exaratum, ab ipſorum Epiſcopo primario Jacobo, Epiſcopo Hieroſolymitano, in ſermonem Græcum, per provincias, in quas diperſi erant ex gente ilia plurimi, Judæis pariter ac aliis in uſu familiari, tranſlatum fuiſſe, &c. Proleg. num. 66.

[y] Μετεφρασε δε τυτο ιωαννης απο της εβραιδος γλωττης εις την ελληνιδα, ως λεγυσι. Theoph. Pr. in Matt. p. 2. D.

[z] Matthæi Evangelium Græce a Joanne Evangeliſta verſum eſſe, refert Eutychius, tom. I. Annalium, p. 328. et Nicetas præfatione ad Catenam in Matthæum. Lampe Prolegom. in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num. 31.

[a] See vol. II. p. 144.

[b] In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo ſermone tranſtulimus, et quod vocatur a pleriſque

Hebrews was reckoned the true and authentic goſpel of Matthew.

To this Hebrew tranſlation of St. Matthew's goſpel, poſſibly, are owing divers things ſaid by the ancients: as that Matthew publiſhed his goſpel at Jeruſalem, or in Judea, for the Jewiſh believers, and at their requeſt, before he went abroad to other people: I ſay, I do ſuſpect the truth of theſe, and ſome other like things, ſaid of St. Matthew, and his goſpel; all which may have had their riſe from the Hebrew edition of his goſpel, which they imagined to be the original. For I think, that St. Matthew's, and all the other goſpels were written, and intended, for believers of all nations. His goſpel was written for the Jews, but not for them only, but for Gentiles alſo: as manifeſtly appears from the goſpel itſelf, or the things contained in it.

I am alſo ready to ſay, with [c] Mr. Baſnage, that I do not know where it was publiſhed, whether in Judea, or ſomewhere elſe. But as I think, the Nazarene goſpel to be St. Matthew's goſpel tranſlated from Greek, with [d] the addition of ſome other things, taken from the other goſpels, and from tradition: ſo I reckon, that the goſpel of Matthew, written in Greek, was the goſpel which came firſt into their hands, and which they gladly received, and made uſe of it. I ſay again, the notion of St. Matthew's writing in Hebrew, probably, had its riſe from the Hebrew edition of his goſpel. For allowing that date of his goſpel which to me appears moſt probable, I cannot conceive the reaſon, why Matthew ſhould write in Hebrew any more than any of the other evangeliſts. For it may be reckoned highly probable, or even certain, that he underſtood Greek, before he was called by Chriſt to be an apoſtle. Whilſt a publican, he would have frequent occaſions both to write and ſpeak Greek; and could not diſcharge his office without underſtanding that language.

que Matthæi authenticum. Hier. in Matth. cap. xii. T. IV. P. I. p. 47.

In Evangelio juxta Hebræos . . . quo utuntur uſque hodie Nazareni, ſecundum Apoſtolos, ſive ut plerique juxta Matthæum. Adv. Pelag. l. 3. ſub in T. IV. p. 533.

[c] Annum tamen perinde atque locum, ubi a Matthæo conditum eſt, in incerto eſſe, facile patimur. Ann. 64. num. xii.

[d] Diſtinguendum enim inter hoc Evangelium, quale initio fuit, et illud, quale paullatim fiebat, Nazaræis varia addentibus. . . Primitus nihil habuit, niſi quod in Græco nunc legimus. . . . Porro Nazaraei pluſcula ſuis locis interſeruerunt, quæ ab Apoſtolis vel Apoſtolicis viris, fando accepiſſent. G. J. Voſſ. De Geneal. J. C. cap. ii. num. i.

This

This Hebrew goſpel may likewiſe have been the cauſe, why ſo many ancient chriſtian writers ſay, that Matthew wrote firſt. This may be true: but I do not think it was ſaid upon the ground of any certain knowledge, or good information. I apprehend it not to be eaſy to ſay, which goſpel was firſt written; for all the firſt three goſpels were written about the ſame time: and St. Luke's, for any thing that I know, may have been written firſt; which [c] was the opinion of Mr. Baſnage.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Time, when the Apoſtles left Judea, to go and preach the Goſpel in other Countries.

As many ancient chriſtian writers, whom we have lately quoted, ſay, that St. Matthew, having preached ſome while in Judea, was deſired by the believers there, to leave with them in writing, before he went away, a hiſtory of what he had taught by word of mouth: this may not be an improper place to inquire, how long it was after the aſcenſion of Jeſus, before Matthew, and the other apoſtles left Judea, to go abroad into foreign countries.

And firſt of all, we will obſerve ſome remarkable paſſages of ancient writers, relating to this matter. And then, ſecondly, we will conſider what light the book of the Acts may afford upon this ſubject.

Clement of Alexandria, about 194, quotes from a work, entitled the Preaching of Peter, this paſſage: 'Therefore [a] 'Peter ſays, that the Lord ſaid to the apoſtles; if any Iſraelite 'will repent, and believe in God through my name, his ſins 'ſhall be forgiven. After twelve years go ye out into the 'world, that none may ſay: we have not heard.'

[c] Ann. 60. num. 31.

[a] Δια τετο φησιν ο πετρος, ειρηκεναι τον κυριον τοις αποστολοις· Εαν μεν εν τις βελησῃ τω ισραηλ μετανοησαι [forte μετανοησας] δια τε ονοματος με πιστευειν επι τον θεον, αφεθησονται αυτῳ αμαρτιαι. Μετα δωδεκα ετη εξελθετε εις κοσμον, μη τις ειπῃ· Ουκ ηκουσαμεν. Clem. Str. l. 6. p. 636. Conf. Cav. H. L. T. I. . . 5. et Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 67.

The next paſſage is that of Apollonius, undoubtedly, in part cotemporary with Clement, and placed by Cave at the year 192, by me at 211, as near the time of his writing againſt the Montaniſts. 'Moreover, ſays [b] Euſebius, he 'relates as from tradition, that our Saviour commanded his 'apoſtles, not to depart from Jeruſalem for the ſpace of 'twelve years.' Which paſſage has been already cited in this [c] work.

By theſe two paſſages Cave was induced to think, that [d] for twelve years after Chriſt's aſcenſion the apoſtles did not depart from the neighbourhood of Jeruſalem. Suppoſing our Saviour to have been crucified, and to have aſcended to heaven in the year 29 of the vulgar æra, which was a common opinion of the ancients, theſe twelve years ended in the year 41. Suppoſing thoſe great events to have happened in the year 33, which is a common opinion of learned moderns, thoſe twelve years would reach to the year 45.

Beſide thoſe two paſſages alleged by Cave, and other learned men, I ſhall take notice of ſome others alſo.

Origen ſays in general, 'That [e] when the Jews did not receive the word, the apoſtles went to the gentiles.'

Chryſoſtom in a homily upon Acts xi. 19. and what follows, ſpeaks to this purpoſe. 'They heard, that Samaria had 'received the word, and they ſent Peter and John. They 'heard what had happened at Antioch, and they ſent Barna-'bas; for [f] that was at a great diſtance. And it was not fit, 'that the apoſtles ſhould go ſo far as yet, leſt they ſhould have 'been eſteemed deſerters, and thought to have fled from their 'own people. But it then became neceſſary for them to 'ſeparate, [or go from thence] when the Jews ſhowed them-'ſelves to be incurable.'

In the Paſchal Chronicle are theſe expreſſions, ſpeaking of Paul. 'Afterwards [g] he coming to Jeruſalem with Barnabas, 'and

[b] H. E. l. 5. cap. 18. p. 136.

[c] Vol. II. p. 371.

[d] Hiſt Lit. T. I. p. 5. et 13.

[e] . . . μη παραδεξαμενων ιουδαιων τον λογον, απεληλυθεσαν εις τα εθνη. In Matth. T. I. p. 225. E. Huet.

[f] Πολυ γαρ το διαστημα, και ουκ εδει τους αποστολους τοτε χωρισθηναι εκειθεν, ινα μη νομισθωσιν ειναι φυγαδες, και τους αυτων πεφευγεναι· τοτε αναγκαιως χωριζονται, οτε λοιπον ανιατα εχειν εδοκει τα κατ' αυτες. In Act. hom. 25. tom. IX. p. 202, 203.

[g] Μετεπειτα ελθων εις ιεροσολυμα μετα βαρναβα, και ευρων πετρον και τους λοιπους αποστολους αμα ιακωβω τω αδελφοθεω κυριω, γραφουσιν επιστολην οι αποστολοι εις αντιοχειαν της συριας, διεμειναντες τη

'and finding there Peter, and the rest of the apostles, with 'James the Lord's brother, the apostles send an epistle to 'Antioch in Syria, establishing their church. And Paul and 'Barnabas carry the epistle to Antioch, as the Acts show. By 'this it appears, that the apostles then wrote their catholic 'epistles before their dispersion.'

Such are the passages of ancient writers, which must be reckoned to be of some weight.

Let us now observe the history in the Acts. And it seems to me, there is reason to conclude, that the apostles stayed in Judea, till after the council at Jerusalem, of which an account is given in the xvth chapter of that book. For St. Luke does continually speak of the apostles, as being at Jerusalem, or near it. Acts viii. 1. *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.* One of those persons, who then left Jerusalem, was Philip the deacon and evangelist: who went to Samaria, and preached Christ unto them, and with good effect. Whereupon, at ver. 14. *Now when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John.* This needs no comment. Here is proof, that when the rest of the disciples were scattered abroad, Peter and John, and the other apostles, were still at Jerusalem.

In Acts ix. 26—30. is St. Luke's account of Paul's coming to Jerusalem, after his conversion: where he says, that *the disciples were afraid of him.... But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles.* St. Paul, speaking of the same journey, Gal. i. 18, 19. says: *Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.* Here we find, that at this time, three years after his conversion, Paul saw two apostles only, Peter and James. But St. Luke's words, as seems to me, imply, that all the apostles were then at Jerusalem, though Paul saw two only, the rest for some reasons declining to show themselves in person to him. Dr. Doddridge has this note upon ch. ix. 27. 'Paul

την αυτων εκκλησιαν, και διακονουσι την επιστολην εις αντιοχειαν αυτος παυλος και βαρναβας, ως δηλουσιν αι πραξεις. Εκ τουτου δεικνυται, οτι και τας καθολικας αυτων οι αποστολοι τοτε γραφουσιν, προ της διασπορας αυτων. Chr. Pasch. p. 233. B. C.

 'himself

'himſelf tells us, that upon his going up to Jeruſalem, he 'ſaw no other apoſtles but Peter and James. Gal. i. 19. 'Beza well obſerves, we are quite uncertain on what occaſion 'the reſt were then abſent from Jeruſalem. Had they been 'there, though Paul ſtayed but about a fortnight, he would 'no doubt have ſeen them.' Nevertheleſs the ſolution of this difficulty appears to me very eaſy. The apoſtles were now all at Jeruſalem, or near it: but they lived privately, becauſe it was a time of perſecution. The great perſecution againſt the church, which began with the death of Stephen, was not yet over; the apoſtles therefore could not appear abroad without danger: and it was ſufficient, that they ſpoke to Paul, and received him by Peter and James; which I take to be the true import of St. Luke's expreſſion: *But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apoſtles.*

After Peter had been at the houſe of Cornelius, it is ſaid, Acts xi. 1. *And the apoſtles and brethren that were in Judea, heard, that the gentiles alſo had received the word.* Another proof, that all the apoſtles, or moſt of them, were ſtill at Jeruſalem. But I do not ſuppoſe, that the apoſtles, like many other of the Jewiſh believers, were offended at what Peter had done. Or, if they were at firſt ſomewhat offended, they were ſoon, and eaſily ſatisfied, and were very willing to teſtify their approbation of Peter's conduct.

From the twelfth chapter of the Acts we know, that James ſon of Zebedee, and brother of John, and Peter, were at Jeruſalem, in the year 44, or thereabout, near the end of the reign of Herod Agrippa: the former of whom was beheaded, and the other impriſoned. And at ver. 17, is mention made of another James, ſuppoſed to be the Lord's brother, and always reſident at Jeruſalem.

From the account of the council of Jeruſalem, and of the occaſion of it, all the apoſtles appear to have been then in Judea, and at Jeruſalem, or in its neighbourhood. Acts xv. 2. *When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no ſmall diſſenſion and diſputation with them, they determined, that Paul, and Barnabas, and certain others of them, ſhould go up to Jeruſalem, unto the apoſtles and elders about this queſtion* Ver. 4. *And when they were come to Jeruſalem, they were received of the church, and* or even *the apoſtles and elders....* Ver. 6. *And the apoſtles and elders came together,* that is, met in council, *for to conſider of this matter....* Ver. 22. *Then pleaſed it the apoſtles, and elders, with the whole church, to ſend choſen men of their own*

company

company to Antioch.... Ver. 23. *And they wrote letters by them after this manner: the apoſtles, and elders, and brethren ſend greeting....* Ver 33. *And after they had tarried there a ſpace,* that is, at *Antioch, they were let go in peace from the brethren unto the apoſtles.*

In all theſe places the apoſtles muſt intend all the apoſtles, or the apoſtles in general: for how can the expreſſion be underſtood otherwiſe?

If it ſhould be ſaid, that the apoſtles might be at the council at Jeruſalem, though ſeveral of them had been before in other countries: I think, that would be ſaid without ground and reaſon. It does not appear, that the apoſtles were ſent to, invited, or called in from abroad, to attend this council: but the Chriſtians at Antioch ſuppoſed, or rather knew, that the apoſtles were at Jeruſalem, and therefore directly ſent thither to them.

Indeed none of the apoſtles are expreſsly named as ſpeakers in the debates of the council, beſide Peter and James: but all the reſt may have been there. So upon divers other occaſions in the goſpels, and at the beginning of the Acts, Peter only ſpake, though all the reſt were preſent. In Gal. ii. 8, 9, 10. St. Paul giving an account of a journey to Jeruſalem, ſuppoſed to be the ſame with this to the council, ſpeaks of conferences, which he had with three, namely, James, Cephas, and John, who ſeemed to be pillars. Here * is one more mentioned as preſent at Jeruſalem, beſide the two before taken notice of. And there muſt have been others beſide theſe three, who ſeemed to be pillars, or were the moſt eminent.

The firſt time, that we meet with the mention of any one of the twelve, as being out of Judea, is that in Gal. ii. 11, after this council, as is generally allowed, when Peter was at Antioch. It is very obſervable, Acts xi. 19—22. when *tidings came to the ears of the church at Jeruſalem,* that many gentiles had been converted at Antioch by ſome of thoſe who were ſcattered abroad by the perſecution, *they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch.* None of the apoſtles went, not ſo much as one, to accompany him. And afterwards ch. xiii. 1—3, in the account of the extraordinary miſſion of

* Theodoret has a like argument: Ἐξ ὧν ῥᾴδιον κατιδεῖν. ὡς γοῦν καταλελοιπεν τὴν ἰουδαίαν ὁ θεῖος ἀποστολος ἰωαννης. Theodr. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. Tom. III. p. 290.

Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Cyprus, and other parts, there is no mention made of any apoſtle, as preſent at Antioch; and it is plain, there was not one there.

All theſe conſiderations induce me to think, that none of the twelve apoſtles left Judea to teach either Jews or Gentiles in other countries until after this council.

Having now, as I apprehend, ſhown this to be very probable, I ſhall mention ſome remarks; whereby there may be an opportunity for anſwering objections, though ſeveral have been already obviated.

1. There was a fitneſs in it. It was very proper, and even expedient, that the apoſtles ſhould ſtay a good while in Judea, to aſſert and confirm the truth of Chriſt's reſurrection by teaching, and by miraculous works, and do their utmoſt to bring the Jewiſh people to faith in Jeſus as the Chriſt.

2. As this was fit, it is likely, that they had received ſome command from Chriſt himſelf, or ſome direction from the Holy Ghoſt to ſtay thus long in Judea.

3. There were conſiderations that would incline them to it, and induce them to do what was fit to be done, and was agreeable to the mind of Chriſt. One was the difficulty of preaching the goſpel in foreign countries. This would induce them to ſtay in Judea till the circumſtances of things facilitated their farther progreſs, or called them to it. Another thing was their affection for the Jewiſh people, their countrymen, eſpecially thoſe of Judea, with whom they had been brought up, and among whom they dwelt, together with a perſuaſion of the great value of the bleſſing of the goſpel. This laſt conſideration, I apprehend, would induce them to labour in Judea, with earneſt deſires, and ſome hopes of bringing all, or however many, to faith in Jeſus. This influenced Paul alſo to a great degree, and for a good while. Nor was he without hopes of perſuading his brethren and countrymen to what appeared to himſelf very certain and evident: ſo he ſays in his ſpeech to the people at Jeruſalem. Acts xxii. 17—20. He aſſures them, that whilſt he was worſhipping at Jeruſalem, in the temple, he had a trance or ecſtaſy: that he there ſaw Chriſt, who ſaid to him, *Make haſte, and get thee quickly out of Jeruſalem; for they will not receive thy teſtimony concerning me.* Paul pleaded, that they muſt needs pay a regard to his teſtimony, who was well known to have been for ſome while very zealous in oppoſing his followers, and was now convinced and perſuaded. But the Lord ſaid unto him, *Depart; for I will*

I will ſend thee far hence unto the gentiles. This trance, or viſion, ſeems to have happened in the year 44, after that Paul had preached at Antioch with great ſucceſs among gentiles. Nevertheleſs he had an earneſt deſire to make one attempt more among the Jews of Judea, where was the body of that people: and if they could have been perſuaded, many abroad would follow their example. And it required an expreſs and repeated order from Jeſus Chriſt, in viſion, to induce him to lay aſide that deſign, and to proceed to preach to gentiles in remote parts.

It is a moſt affectionate concern, which he expreſſes for the Jewiſh people in divers places of the epiſtle to the Romans, written ſo late as the year 58. ch. ix. 1—5. x. 1, 2. xi. 4. *if by any means*, ſays he, *I may provoke them to emulation which are my fleſh, and might ſave ſome of them.* Nor can it be queſtioned, that the like ſentiments prevailed in the other apoſtles. If it needs any proof, let St. Peter's diſcourſes at the beginning of the book of the Acts be conſulted, particularly ch. ii. 38—40. iii. 22—26; not to refer to any other.

4. There were many advantages attending the ſtay of the apoſtles in Judea. Many more Jews were by this means converted, than otherwiſe there would have been. St. Luke ſays, Acts iv. 4. that *the number of the men was five thouſand.* But when Paul came to Jeruſalem ſome years afterwards, James ſays to him, *Thou ſeeſt, brother, how many thouſands of Jews there are which believe*, ch. xxi. 20. And it is very likely, that the Jewiſh believers had better, and freer principles, than otherwiſe they would have had. They were, it is true, for obſerving the law themſelves, ver. 20: but they agreed, that the gentiles were under no ſuch obligations, ver. 25. Farther, by this means every ſtep taken in planting the Chriſtian religion, and ſpreading the goſpel in the world, had the ſanction of all the apoſtles, and of the whole church of Jeruſalem.

Upon occaſion of the perſecution at Jeruſalem, many were *ſcattered abroad, who went every where preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Chriſt unto them*, Acts viii. 5. *Now when the apoſtles, which were at Jeruſalem, heard, that Samaria had received the word of God, they ſent unto them Peter and John.* This was the firſt ſtep taken in carrying the goſpel to any, beſide native Jews, and proſelytes to their religion. And what had been done by Philip at Samaria, was approved and ratified by all the apoſtles.

The next ſtep was preaching to gentiles, which work was ſolemnly allotted to Peter. *And the apoſtles and elders that were in Judea, heard that the gentiles alſo had received the word of God*, ch. xi. 1. Upon Peter's rehearſing to them the whole affair, and what had happened at the houſe of Cornelius at Cæſarea, all were ſatisfied. *They glorified God, ſaying: then hath God alſo to the gentiles granted repentance unto life*, ver. 18.

Soon after this, ſome of thoſe who were ſcattered abroad upon the perſecution, went to Antioch, and there *ſpake to the Greeks*, or Gentiles, *preaching the Lord Jeſus. And a great number believed, and turned to the Lord. Then tidings of theſe things came unto the ears of the church, which was at Jeruſalem; and they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch*, ver. 19—22. This ſtep therefore was alſo approved and ratified by the whole church of Jeruſalem, including the apoſtles.

And henceforward no objections could be made by wiſe men againſt preaching to gentiles, and receiving them, but what aroſe from the difficulty of the work. Nevertheleſs ſome good while after this, there was a diſpute raiſed at Antioch by ſome bigotted Jews, who aſſerted it to be neceſſary, that the gentile believers *ſhould be circumciſed after the manner of Moſes*. This occaſioned the council of Jeruſalem; where the controverſy was fully determined by the apoſtles and elders: which was a great advantage. By this means the manner of receiving gentiles was fixed, and ſettled beyond diſpute, and beyond oppoſition: or, if any ſhould be made afterwards, it could not be ſucceſsful, nor very troubleſome. And we may be aſſured, that all the apoſtles, and their diſciples, would be harmonious, and preach the ſame doctrine to Jews and Gentiles, whereſoever they went.

5. There was a neceſſity of the apoſtles ſtaying in Judea, till about this time. Otherwiſe, they could not have ſufficiently teſtified the doctrine concerning Jeſus in Judea, nor have fully taught the Jewiſh people, ſo as to render them inexcuſable, if they did not believe, and repent.

If we conſider the ſtate of things in Judea, we may diſcern, that in the year 44, the apoſtles had not had an opportunity to fulfil their miniſtry in that country. It muſt be evident to all from the hiſtory in the Acts, that for ſome while, ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion, the apoſtles were grievouſly haraſſed, and hardly uſed by the Jewiſh council or rulers: which

was

was the more ſo, becauſe of the weakneſs of Pilate's government, for ſome time before he was diſmiſſed from the province. And afterwards, about the time of his removal, Stephen was ſtoned, and a great perſecution began: which, as I apprehend, continued from the beginning of the year 36, to the beginning of the year 40; when the churches had reſt: of which reſt undoubtedly the apoſtles made good uſe. St. Luke's words are: *Then had the churches reſt throughout 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*, ch. ix. 31. After which follows an account of Peter's paſſing throughout all quarters, his going to Lydda, and there healing Æneas, then to Joppa, where he raiſed Tabitha: and from thence to Cæſarea, and there preaching to Cornelius, and his company: and of ſome other matters, reaching to ch. xi. 26. How long that reſt, or peace and tranquillity continued, in all its fulneſs, we cannot ſay exactly: perhaps it laſted a year, or more. And it is not unlikely, that in that ſpace of time other apoſtles, beſide Peter, travelled in Judea, and the ſeveral parts of it, preaching the goſpel, and confirming the diſciples. But upon Herod Agrippa being made king of all Judea by Claudius in the year 41, that peace would be abated, if not interrupted. From the beginning of his reign, eſpecially from his arrival in Judea, and during the remainder of it, the diſciples muſt have been under many difficulties and diſcouragements, prince and people being of one mind. And toward the end of his reign he became an open and violent perſecutor, till Divine Providence ſmote him, that he died. After his death Judea came to be in the hands of Roman procurators, Cuſpius Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, Cumanus, Felix, Feſtus: when, probably, the diſciples of Jeſus had for ſeveral years together more liberty, than they had had at any time, ſince the reſurrection of Jeſus, excepting the interval of reſt and tranquillity, before taken notice of. For thoſe governors, or procurators, had no orders from the Roman emperor to perſecute or diſturb any Jews. And that thoſe governors were not diſpoſed to diſturb the Chriſtians, may be argued from the treatment given to Paul by Felix, and Feſtus, and the officers under them. Now therefore from the year 44, to the time of the council in 49, or 50, and afterwards, the apoſtles went on fulfilling their miniſtry. All of them, as I apprehend, ſtayed in Judea till the time of the council: ſoon after which ſome did, probably, go abroad.

abroad. However, ſeveral of them might ſtay there a good while longer, and not remove, till a little before the commencement of the Jewiſh war in 66.

6. We may now perceive the benefit of the early choice and call of Paul to be an apoſtle. Who having been ſeveral years employed and exerciſed in preaching to Jews in Judea, and out of it, was ready to preach to Gentiles likewiſe, as ſoon as a door was opened for applying to them at Antioch, and other places: as there was, after Peter had received Cornelius at Cæſarea: whilſt it was not as yet fit for any of the twelve apoſtles to leave the land of Iſrael.

7. We now obtain ſome aſſiſtance for interpreting thoſe expreſſions of Paul, Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9. *When they ſaw that the goſpel of the uncircumciſion was committed unto me, as the goſpel of the circumciſion was committed unto Peter. For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apoſtleſhip of the circumciſion, the ſame was mighty in me toward the gentiles. And they gave unto me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowſhip, that we ſhould go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumciſion* And Rom. xi. 13. *inaſmuch as I am the apoſtle of the gentiles, I magnify mine office.* Thoſe expreſſions cannot be intended to ſignify that Paul was apoſtle of the gentiles only, and excluſive of the Jews: or that Peter, and the other of the twelve, were apoſtles of the circumciſion only, excluſive of the gentiles. For an apoſtle is a teacher or maſter of the whole world. They were appointed to be ſo by Chriſt: nor could their commiſſion be limited by any compact among themſelves. Our Lord's commiſſion given to his twelve apoſtles, is in Matthew to this purpoſe: *Go ye therefore and teach all nations,* ch. xxviii. 19. and in Luke xxiv. 46, 47. *be ſaid to them, that repentance and forgiveneſs of ſins ſhould be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jeruſalem.* And Acts i. 8. *And ye ſhall be witneſſes unto me in Jeruſalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermoſt part of the earth.* And Mark xvi. 15. *And he ſaid unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature.* And ver. 20. *And they went forth and preached every where.* Of Paul the Lord ſays in a viſion to Ananias at Damaſcus: *He is a choſen veſſel unto me, to bear my name before the gentiles, and kings, and the children of Iſrael.* Acts ix. 5. And Paul ſays to king Agrippa: *I was not diſobedient to the heavenly viſion; but ſhowed firſt unto them of Damaſcus, and at Jeruſalem, and throughout all the coaſt of Judea, and then to the gentiles, that they ſhould repent, and turn*

to God. ch. xxvi. 19, 20. Moreover we know from the hiſtory of Paul's preaching recorded in the Acts, that he always firſt addreſſed himſelf to Jews, in all the places where he came, if there were any, and if they had there a ſynagogue.

It ſhould be obſerved likewiſe, that Peter had actually preached to gentiles in Judea, and was the firſt diſciple of Jeſus that did ſo. There is a particular account of it in the book of the Acts, ch. x. and xi. And himſelf takes notice of it in his ſpeech at the council of Jeruſalem. ch. xv. 7.

The reaſon therefore why the goſpel of the circumciſion is ſaid to have been committed unto Peter, and the other apoſtles with him, is, that for a good while their miniſtry was ſolely, or however very much, and chiefly employed among Jews in Judea: though afterwards they preached very freely to gentiles in ſeveral parts of the world. And Paul is called the apoſtle of the gentiles, and the goſpel of the uncircumciſion is ſaid to have been committed unto him, becauſe he got the ſtart of all the reſt in preaching to gentiles, and had laboured among them for a good while in divers countries, with great ſucceſs, and had formed many churches in divers places: whilſt they were ſtill in Judea teaching Jews, and had made no addreſſes to gentiles abroad in other countries.

It may be alſo implied in what St. Paul ſays in the epiſtle to the Galatians, that [h] ſeveral of the firſt twelve apoſtles intended to ſtay ſtill ſomewhat longer in Judea. This they were the more willing to do, being fully ſatisfied with the preaching of Paul in foreign countries: inſomuch that they encouraged him to proceed as he had begun.

8. Once more, we may now be reconciled to the ſuppoſition of the late date of the goſpels. For they were not to be publiſhed till the doctrine concerning Jeſus had been preached in divers parts, and many converts had been made, to whom they would be uſeful, for whom they would be needful, by whom they would be received with joy, be highly valued,

[h] Alterum, quod ex dicto Pauli ad Galatas colligimus, illud eſt, Joannem etiam poſt diſceſſum Pauli cum duobus collegis per aliquod temporis intervallum Hieroſolymis, et in Judæa ſubſtitiſſe. Gentium enim converſione Paulo et Barnabæ demandata, ipſi inter Judæos ſe operam porro locaturos declarant. Quæ etiam cauſſa eſt, cur Joannis et ſociorum in Actis Apoſtolicis vix mentio occurrat, quia poſtquam primordia Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ inter Judæos memorata erant, nihil amplius videbatur addendum, niſi ut narretur, quomodo primitiæ Gentium eſſent introductæ. Lamp. Proleg. in Jo. l. 1. cap. 3. § vii.

frequently

frequently read, and often copied. Written hiſtories of Jeſus could be little wanted by the Jewiſh believers in Judea, whilſt all the apoſtles were ſtill in that country, and there were alſo ſtill living among them many ſincere followers of Jeſus, and eye-witneſſes of his perſon and miniſtry. Very probably, therefore, there was no written goſpel till after the council at Jeruſalem.

Still there may be objections which ſhould be ſtated and conſidered.

Obj. 1. It may be ſaid: was not the progreſs of the goſpel by this means much retarded? I anſwer: no. And this objection, methinks, ſhould be of little moment now, after all that has been ſaid of the many advantages of the apoſtles' ſtay in Judea.

However, ſome conſiderations ſhall be here added to what has been already ſaid. Though the apoſtles did not leave Judea themſelves, they encouraged thoſe who did, who preached the goſpel abroad, whether to Jews or Gentiles. Of this there is an inſtance with regard to the church of Antioch, related Acts xi. 19—22. And there may have been ſome other like inſtances. Moreover the apoſtles were very uſeful by their ſtay in Judea, as has been already ſhown. They made many converts among the Jews. During their ſtay in that country, if there was any meaſure of public liberty for the believers, the apoſtles would all, or moſt of them, be at Jeruſalem at the great feaſts, to which there was a general reſort of Jews from all countries. Here the inquiſitive of that people would have an opportunity of converſing with the apoſtles: and if they were convinced, and perſuaded by them, they would carry the doctrine of the goſpel into the places of their uſual reſidence, and propagate it there.

Obj. 2. But, if the apoſtles had attempted to make a long ſtay in Judea, it ſeems that they muſt have been all deſtoyed. I anſwer, that doubtleſs they met with many and great difficulties. What they were from the time of our Lord's aſcenſion to the year 44, was briefly rehearſed juſt now. After that, for ſeveral years, as I apprehend, their difficulties would not be ſo great as they had been. Yea, during that ſpace would be the beſt opportunity that ever they had to promote the intereſts of the goſpel, as I ſaid before. For [1] the Jewiſh people

[1] Contra perſuaſum habeo, hoc emblema ſupponere, Eccleſiam jam longo admodum tempore fuiſſe afflictam . . . Ne jam dicam, non conſtare

people had not the power of life and death in their own hands. And the Roman procurators were not diſpoſed to give any men diſturbance upon account of difference of opinion in religious matters. Finally, the apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt, we have reaſon to think, had an eſpecial direction, and an eſpecial protection. They, who were employed in teaching ſo important a doctrine, and were enabled to work miracles upon others for confirming it, may be reaſonably ſuppoſed to have been the ſubjects of ſome wonderful interpoſitions of Providence. And it muſt be reckoned very probable, that affairs would be ſo over-ruled and influenced, as that theſe choſen men ſhould be upheld and enabled to fulfil their miniſtry, and bear ſuch a teſtimony to Jeſus, as ſhould be ſufficient to lay a good foundation for the eſtabliſhment of his church in the world, and leave all thoſe of the Jewiſh people, who did not receive him as the Meſſiah, abſolutely inexcuſable.

CHAP. VII.

ST. MARK, EVANGELIST.

I. *That the Evangeliſt is the ſame as John Mark, and Nephew to Barnabas.* II. *His Hiſtory from the New Teſtament.* III. *From other Writers.* V. *Teſtimonies to his Goſpel, in ancient Writers.* V. *Remarks upon them.* VI. *The Time of writing his Goſpel, according to theſe ancient Writers, and the Sentiments of learned Moderns.* VII. *Characters of Time in the Goſpel itſelf.* VIII. *Obſervations upon this Goſpel.*

I. It is generally, or even univerſally allowed, that Mark, mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13. is the evangeliſt. But it has been doubted, whether he be the ſame as John Mark mentioned in

conſtare ex hiſtoria Eccleſiæ, quinam illi ſint Martyres, quorum ſanguis, præter eum Stephani, et utriuſque Jacobi, de quorum altero ex Luca, altero ex Joſepho liquet et Hegeſippo, a Judæis fuſus fuerit. Iudæi enim, excepto brevi interſtitio regni Agrippæ, rerum ſuarum non erant domini: et licet in Chriſtianos peſſime affecti fuerint, a præſidibus tamen Romanis prohibebantur, pro lubitu in innocuos Jeſu Chriſti diſcipulos ſævire. Quæ enim junior Ananus tentavit in Jacobum fratrem Domini, et τινας ετερους, *quoſdam alios*, Chriſtianæ profeſſionis homines, ut conſtat ex Joſepho, Feſto mortuo, et Albino adhuc in itinere agente, peracta ſunt. Campeg. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. vi. ver. 12. § xxx. p. 303.

the

the Acts, and ſome of St. Paul's epiſtles; and it appears from our collections out of ancient authors, that there were doubts about this in the minds of ſome in former times.

Divers learned moderns are perſuaded, that they are different perſons. Of this number are [a] Cave, [who nevertheleſs thinks him [b] the ſame Mark, that is mentioned by St. Paul in his ſecond epiſtle to Timothy] [c] Grotius, [d] Du Pin, and [e] Tillemont. Which laſt, in his Eccleſiaſtical Memoirs, makes two different articles for this name: one entitled St. Mark the evangeliſt, apoſtle of Egypt, and martyr: the other, St. John Mark, diſciple and couſin of St. Barnabas. On the other hand they are reckoned one and the ſame by [f] Jer. Jones, [g] Lightfoot, and [h] Wetſtein.

I ſhall now without delay conſider the reaſons of thoſe, who think there are two Marks mentioned in the New Teſtament.

1. They ſay, that Mark the evangeliſt was converted and baptized by Peter, becauſe he calls him his ſon. 1 Pet. v. 13. But there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe this of John Mark.

To which I anſwer. That needs not to be reckoned the conſtant meaning of the expreſſion. It may denote only great affection and tenderneſs, and a reſpect to faithful ſervices: in like manner as Paul ſays of Timothy, Philip. ii. 22. that *as a ſon with the father he had ſerved with him in the goſpel.*

[a] S. Marcus Evangeliſta, quem cum Joanne Marco, de quo Act. xii. 12. male nonnulli confundunt. H. L. T. I. p. 24.

[b] Cum enim illum epiſtolâ ſecunda ad Timotheum — Romam accerſiverat Paulus — Id. ib.

[c] Gr. Pr. in Marc.

[d] Diſſ. Prelim. l. 2. ch. ii. § iv.

[e] Mem. Ec. Tom. II.

[f] New and full Method, vol. III. ch. vi. p. 65—70.

[g] Lightfoot is making obſervations upon the firſt epiſtle of St. Peter. 'He ſends this epiſtle, ſays he, by Silvanus, Paul's old attendant, but now with Peter.... His naming of Mark with him calls our thoughts back to what has been mentioned of Mark heretofore: his being with Paul at Rome, and his coming from him into the eaſt. To ſuppoſe two Marks, one with Peter, and another with Paul, is to breed confuſion where there needeth not.... It is eaſily ſeen how John Mark came into familiarity with Paul and Peter. And other Mark we can find none in the New Teſtament, unleſs of our own invention.... He it was that wrote the goſpel. Lightfoot Harm. of the N. T. vol. I. p. 336.

[h] Nihil vetat, quo minus ſimpliciter cum Victore et Theophylacto hunc eundem Marcum intelligamus, quoties illius nomen in Actis et Epiſtolis reperimus. Wetſt. Pr. in Marc. tom. I. p. 551.

Grotius

Grotius [i] and Du Pin [k] who mention this reaſon, ſeem not to have judged it concluſive. Moreover, if Mark was a convert of Peter, it does not follow, that he was not an early believer; for he might be one of that apoſtle's converts at his firſt preaching the goſpel at Jeruſalem. Mark the evangeliſt, upon that ſuppoſition, could not be one of the ſeventy: but he might be among the firſt believers, and the ſon of Mary. However, I chooſe not to inſiſt upon this, but chiefly upon what was before mentioned: that the appellation, my ſon, needs not to be underſtood rigorouſly, as meaning a convert begotten to the faith of the goſpel.

2. It is ſaid, that [l] Mark, the companion of Paul, was called John: but the evangeliſt is never ſo called by the ancients, who mention him.

To which I anſwer. It is true, that Paul's companion is ſometimes called John, as Acts xiii. 5, and 13. But we are alſo informed that he was ſurnamed Mark. So Acts xii. 12. *And when he had conſidered the thing, he came to the houſe of Mary, the mother of John, whoſe ſurname was Mark.* And ver. 25.... *and took with them John, whoſe ſurname was Mark.* And he is ſeveral times mentioned by the ſurname, Mark only. Acts xv. 39. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Col. iv. 10. Philem. ver. 24. Secondly, ſuch of the ancients, as ſuppoſed Mark, the evangeliſt, to have been the ſame with him mentioned in the Acts, muſt alſo have ſuppoſed that he was called John as well as Mark, though they have generally mentioned him by his ſurname.

3. It is ſaid that [m] John Mark was much with Paul, Mark the evangeliſt, with Peter: ſo ſay the ancients in general.

I anſwer:

[i] Adde quod Joannes Marcus inter primos Chriſtianos: Marcus hic ut videtur, Petri opera converſus. 1 Pet. v. 13. Nam tales peculiariter *filios ſuos* Apoſtoli vocabant. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Gal. iv. 19. Gr. Pr. in Marc.

[k] Il y a plus d'apparence, qu'il a reçû l'evangile de S. Pierre, qui l'appelle fils, peutêtre parcequ'il l'avoit engendré en J. C. Diſſ. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § iv.

[l] Joannes quoque ille Mariæ filius, Barnabæ conſanguineus,... Marcus vocabatur: quem multi hunc noſtrum ſcriptorem putant. Quibus quo minus aſſentiar, moveor veterum auctoritate, qui hunc ſcriptorem Joannem nunquam, Marcum ſemper vocant... Grot. Pr. in Marc.

L'Evangeliſte n'eſt appellé nulle part du nom de Jean, qui étoit le nom propre de celuici. Du Pin. ubi ſupra.

[m] Et ita Petro addunt [Veteres] comitem, ac diſcipulum, ut non tantum de Barnaba, ſed et de Paulo, quem

I anſwer: it is not at all impoſſible but that Mark might be ſometimes with Paul, at other times with Peter; as may appear by and by.

As theſe reaſons therefore do not appear to me concluſive, I rather think that there is but one Mark in the New Teſtament, John Mark, the evangeliſt, and fellow-labourer of Paul, and Barnabas, and Peter.

II. I now proceed to write the hiſtory of John Mark from the New Teſtament, mentioning, as they offer, ſome obſervations, ſhowing his acquaintance with Peter as well as with Paul: after which I ſhall take notice of ſome other things ſaid of him by the ancients.

He was the ſon of Mary, a pious woman at Jeruſalem, and an early believer, at whoſe houſe the diſciples uſed to meet, and that in troubleſome and difficult times, as well as at other ſeaſons. Peter having been delivered out of priſon by an angel, *came to the houſe of Mary, mother of John, whoſe ſurname was Mark, where many were gathered together praying*, Acts xii. 12. So that the very firſt mention of John Mark aſſures us of Peter's intimacy in that family.

That deliverance of St. Peter happened in the year 44, about the ſame time that Paul and Barnabas came to Jeruſalem from Antioch with contributions for the relief of the brethren in Judea in the time of a famine, or ſcarcity. And it is ſaid at the end of that chapter: *And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jeruſalem, when they had fulfilled their miniſtry, and took with them John, whoſe ſurname was Mark.* This, with ſome other things to be hereafter mentioned, may diſpoſe us to think that this John Mark is the ſame who in Col. iv. 10. is called *ſiſter's ſon to Barnabas.*

Mark therefore went now from Jeruſalem to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas: and, when ſome ſhort time afterwards they went abroad to other countries, Mark accompanied them as their miniſter. Acts xiii. 5. They went to Cyprus, and preached the word in that country. But when they returned to the continent, and came on ſhore at *Perga in Pamphylia, he departed from them, and returned to Jeruſalem*, ver. 13. He therefore did not attend them in their farther progreſs to Antioch in Piſidia, Iconium, and other Places, but went to Jeruſalem.

quem Joannes Marcus poſt illud friguſculum ſectatus eſt . . . nihil meminerint. Grot. ibid.

Il étoit diſciple de S. Pierre, et attaché à lui, dans le tems que l'autre étoit avec S. Paul, et S. Barnabe. Du Pin. Ibid.

And

And now, very probably, he converſed again with Peter and the other apoſtles, and was preſent with them at their diſcourſes and their devotions. For, as I apprehend, all the apoſtles were ſtill in Judea, except James the ſon of Zebedee, who had been beheaded by Herod Agrippa, in the beginning of the year 44.

Paul and Barnabas having finiſhed their progreſs, returned to Antioch, and there abode. Whilſt they were there, debates aroſe about circumciſing gentile converts; which determined Paul and Barnabas to go to Jeruſalem. That controverſy being decided, they returned to Antioch.

Some time afterwards *Paul ſaid unto Barnabas: let us go again and viſit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word, and ſee how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whoſe ſurname was Mark. But Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who had departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work.* Barnabas, however, perſiſted in his reſolution, and went with Mark to Cyprus: and Paul choſe Silas to accompany him. Acts xv. 36—41.

Hereby we perceive the good temper of Mark. He was now at Antioch, and was willing to attend Paul and Barnabas in their journies, and actually went with Barnabas to Cyprus. And though Paul would not now accept of his attendance, he was afterwards fully reconciled to him. Mark is mentioned in ſeveral of his epiſtles ſent from Rome, during his confinement there. I ſuppoſe, I ſhall hereafter ſhow, that St. Paul's ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was written in the ſummer of the year 61, not long after Paul's arrival at Rome. In that epiſtle he writes to Timothy, to come to him; and he deſires him to bring Mark with him. 2 Tim. iv. 11. *Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the miniſtry.* Where Mark then was, does not clearly appear. It is probable, that he was either at Epheſus, or at ſome other place, where Timothy would find him in his journey from Epheſus to Rome: and, unqueſtionably, Mark did come with Timothy. He is mentioned in two of the epiſtles written by the apoſtle at Rome. Philem. ver. 24. and Col. iv. 10. *Ariſtarchus ſalutes you, and Mark, ſiſter's ſon to Barnabas, touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him.* Mark is not mentioned in the epiſtle to the Philippians. Perhaps he was not acquainted there, or upon ſome occaſion was abſent from the apoſtle, when that epiſtle was written:

or rather, he is comprehended in thoſe general expreſſions. ch. iv. 21. *The brethren that are with me, greet you.* For in the epiſtle to the Philippians St. Paul does not mention his fellow-labourers by name, as he does in the epiſtles to the Coloſſians, and to Philemon. Nor is he mentioned in the epiſtle to the Epheſians. To thoſe who admit the true date of that epiſtle the reaſon will be obvious: it was written and ſent away, before Mark came to be with St. Paul at Rome.

This is all we can ſay concerning St. Mark from the New Teſtament. But from that we can collect his excellent character, and may conclude, that after this time he no longer attended on Paul. It is not improbable, that going now into Aſia, he there met with St. Peter, and accompanied him, till that apoſtle came to Rome, where he ſuffered martyrdom: where likewiſe Mark wrote, and publiſhed the goſpel that goes by his name.

III. We will now inquire, whether there is any thing in other writers to illuſtrate the hiſtory of this evangeliſt.

Cave ſays, without heſitation, that [n] Mark was a Levite; but he does not ſay upon what authority. I do not remember that it is in any of the writers of which I have given a particular account, excepting [o] Bede. It is alſo in a commentary upon St. Mark's goſpel, uſually joined with Jerom's works, though [p] allowed not to be his. That writer ſays, that [q] Mark was a Levite and a prieſt. It is not unlikely that this was inferred from Mark's relation to Barnabas, who was a Levite of Cyprus. Comp. Acts iv. 36. and Col. iv. 10. But then Cave ſhould not have denied, as he does in the ſame place, that Mark the evangeliſt is the ſame as John Mark mentioned in the Acts: for that, as I apprehend, is to remove out of the way the ſole ground of this opinion.

[n] S. Marcus, Evangeliſta, quem cum Joanne Marco, de quo Act. xii. 12. male nonnulli confundunt, erat Levites. H. L. T. I. p. 24.

[o] Tradunt autem hunc, natione Iſraelitica, et ſacerdotali ortum proſapia, ac poſt paſſionem ac reſurrectionem Domini Salvatoris, ad prædicationem Apoſtolorum evangelica fide a ſacramentis imbutum, atque ex eorum fuiſſe numero, de quibus ſcribit Lucas, quia multa etiam turba ſacerdotum obediebat fidei. Bed. Prol in Marc.

[p] Vid. Benedictin Monitum, et Petav. Animadv. ad Epiph. H. 21. num. vi. p. 88.

[q] Marcus Evangeliſta Dei, Petri diſcipulus, Leviticus genere, et ſacerdos, in Italia hoc ſcripſit Evangelium. Præf. in Marc. ap. Hierom. T. V. p. 886.

By

By Euſebius we are informed, it [r] was ſaid, that Mark going into Egypt, firſt preached there the goſpel, which he had written, and planted there many churches. And afterwards in another chapter, he ſays, that [s] in the eighth year of Nero, Anianus, the firſt biſhop of Alexandria after Mark, the apoſtle and evangeliſt, took upon him the care of that church. Of which Anianus he gives a great character, as beloved of God, and a wonderful man.

Epiphanius ſays, that ſoon after Matthew, Mark, companion of Peter, compoſed his goſpel at Rome. And having [t] written it, he was ſent by Peter into the country of the Egyptians.

Jerom, in his article of St. Mark, as [u] before quoted, after other things, ſays: 'Taking [x] the goſpel, which himſelf had compoſed, he went to Egypt, and at Alexandria 'founded a church of great note. . . . He died in the eighth 'year of Nero, and was buried at Alexandria, where he 'was ſucceeded, as biſhop, by Anianus.'

From all theſe accounts, I think, it muſt appear to be probable, that if indeed Mark preached at all in Egypt, and founded a church at Alexandria; it muſt have been after he had written his goſpel, and after the death of Peter and Paul at Rome. Nevertheleſs, when preſently afterwards Euſebius, and Jerom likewiſe, ſpeak of Mark's converts, and Philo's Therapeuts, as all one, they ſeem to have imagined, that Mark had very early preached in Egypt. But what they ſay upon that head is exceedingly ſtrange and unaccountable. For they both ſuppoſe, that Mark had written his goſpel at Rome, before he went into Egypt: and that his goſpel was not written before the reign of

[r] Τουτον δε μαρκον πρωτον φασιν επι της αιγυπτου τειλαμενον, το ευαγγελιον ο δη και συνεγραψατο κηρυξαι, εκκλησιας τε πρωτον επ' αυτης αλεξανδρειας συνιστασθαι. κ. λ. H. E. l. 2. cap. 16.

[s] . . . πρωτος μετα μαρκον τον αποστολον και ευαγγελιστην, της εν αλεξανδρεια παροικιας ανιανος την λειτουργιαν διαδεχεται· ανηρ θεοφιλης ων και τα παντα θαυμασιος. Ib. cap. 24.

[t] . . . και γραψας αποστελλεται υπο του αγιου πετρου εις την των αιγυπτιων χωραν. H. 51. num. vi.

[u] Vol. V. p. 38.

[x] Aſſumpto itaque Evangelio, quod ipſe confecerat, perrexit ad Ægyptum, et primus Alexandriæ Chriſtum annuntians conſtituit eccleſiam . . . Denique Philo . . . videns Alexandriæ primam eccleſiam adhuc judaizantem, quaſi in laudem gentis ſuæ, librum ſuper eorum converſatione conſcripſit. De V. L. cap. 8.

Nero. If therefore Mark went at all to Alexandria, it was later, in the ſame reign: and Philo's Therapeuts could not be Chriſtians, nor Mark's converts: but were a ſort of people, who had a being, and had formed their inſtitution, before the goſpel could be publiſhed in Egypt, and before the riſe of the chriſtian religion.

By Baronius [y] and many others, it is ſaid, that St. Mark died a Martyr. This is admitted by [z] Cave, and the [a] late Mr. Wetſtein: but it is diſputed by [b] S. Baſnage; and as ſeems to me, with good reaſon. For St. Mark is not ſpoken of as a Martyr by Euſebius, or other more ancient writers: and Jerom, as before quoted, ſays, St. Mark died in the eighth year of Nero, and was buried at Alexandria. He does not ſay, that he was crowned with martyrdom: as he would have done, if he had known of it: and his expreſſions ſeem to imply a natural death. Fabricius [c] in his account of St. Mark, ſays nothing of his having been a martyr.

IV. Having thus written the hiſtory of St. Mark, I ſhall now recollect the teſtimonies to his goſpel, which we have ſeen in ancient writers, particularly, with a view of aſcertaining the time of it: obſerving likewiſe whatever may farther lead us into the knowledge of his ſtation and character, and whether he was one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples or not.

The firſt writer to be here taken notice of is Papias, about A. D. 116. He ſays, 'That [d] the elder, from whom 'he had divers informations, ſaid, Mark, being the inter-'preter of Peter, wrote what he remembered: but not in 'the order in which things were ſpoken and done by 'Chriſt. For he was not a hearer of the Lord, but after-'wards followed Peter.'

Irenæus, as before [e] cited, about 178, ſays: 'After the 'death of Peter and Paul, Mark, the diſciple and inter-'preter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that

[y] An. 64. § i. ii.

[z] Alexandriæ primus Epiſcopus factus Martyrium ibi ſubiit: quo vero anno, mihi hactenus incompertum. H. L. p. 24.

[a] Tandem vero in Ægyptum conceſſiſſe, atque Alexandriæ linguæ ſuo doctrinam Chriſti commaſſe, hiſtoria eccleſiaſtica teſtatur. J. J. Wetſten N. T. tom. I p. 551.

[b] Ann. 66. num. xix. xx

[c] Vid. Fabr Bib. Gr. l. 4 cap. v. n. iii. tom. III. p. 130—132.

[d] Vol. II. p. 109.

[e] Vol. II. p. 158.

[f] p. 159.

'ha[d]

'had been preached by Peter.' In another place [f] he calls Mark 'the interpreter and follower of Peter.'

Clement, of Alexandria, about the year of Chriſt 194, ſays: 'That [g] Peter's hearers at Rome, not content with a 'ſingle hearing, nor with an unwritten inſtruction in the 'divine doctrine, entreated Mark, the follower of Peter, 'that he would leave with them in writing a memorial of 'the doctrine, which had been delivered to them by word 'of mouth: nor did they deſiſt, until they had prevailed 'with him. Thus they were the means of writing the goſ-'pel, which is called according to Mark. It is ſaid, that 'when the apoſtle knew what had been done, he was pleaſed 'with the zeal of the men, and authoriſed that ſcripture to 'be read in the churches.' That paſſage is cited from Euſebius' Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

Again, Euſebius ſays: 'Clement [h] informs us, that the 'occaſion of writing the goſpel according to Mark was 'this. Peter, having publicly preached the word at Rome, 'and having ſpoken the goſpel by the ſpirit, many who 'were there, entreated Mark to write the things that had 'been ſpoken, he having long accompanied Peter, and re-'taining what he had ſaid: and that when he had compoſed 'the goſpel, he delivered it to them, who had aſked it of 'him: which when Peter knew, he neither forbade it, nor 'encouraged it.'

Many remarks were [i] formerly made upon theſe accounts of Clement, which cannot now be repeated. But it may be needful to ſay ſomething here for reconciling Irenæus and him. Irenæus ſaid, that Mark publiſhed his goſpel after the death of Peter and Paul: whereas Clement ſuppoſes Peter to have been ſtill living, and that this goſpel was ſhown to Peter, who did not diſapprove of it; but the difference is not great. Clement ſays, that Mark's goſpel was written at Rome at the requeſt of the Chriſtians there, who were hearers of Peter. If ſo, it could not be compoſed long before Peter's death. For I take it to be certain, that Peter did not come to Rome, until the reign of Nero was far advanced, nor very long before his own death. So that it may be reckoned not improbable, that Mark's goſpel was not publiſhed, or did not become generally

[f] p. 159. [g] p. 210. [h] p. 211, 212. [i] p. 111, 112, 212—220.

known, till after the death of Peter and Paul, as Irenæus ſays.

Tertullian, about the year 200, ſpeaks of Mark as [k] an apoſtolical man, or companion of apoſtles: and ſays, 'That [l] 'the goſpel, publiſhed by Mark, may be reckoned Peter's, 'whoſe interpreter he was.'

Says Origen, about 230. 'The [m] ſecond goſpel is that 'according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter dictated it to 'him: who therefore calls him his ſon in his catholic epiſ- 'tle.' See 1 Peter v. 13.

Euſebius, about 315, may be ſuppoſed to agree in the main with Clement and Irenæus, whoſe paſſages he has tranſcribed, and inſerted in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. And in a long paſſage of his evangelical demonſtration, formerly tranſcribed by us, he ſays: 'Peter out of abundance of 'modeſty thought not himſelf worthy to write a goſpel. 'But Mark, who was his friend and diſciple, is ſaid to have 'recorded Peter's relations of the acts of Jeſus.' At the end of which paſſage he ſays: 'And [o] Peter teſtifies theſe 'things of himſelf: for all things in Mark are ſaid to be 'memoirs of Peter's diſcourſes.' He likewiſe ſays, 'that Mark was not preſent to hear what Jeſus ſaid.' Nor [q] does, it appear, that he thought the writer of the goſpel to be John, ſurnamed Mark, nephew to Barnabas. But unqueſtionably he ſuppoſed him to be the ſame that is mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13.

Mark is mentioned among the other evangeliſts by [r] Athanaſius, without other particularities. But in the Synopſis, aſcribed to him, and by many ſuppoſed to be written by another Athanaſius, biſhop of Alexandria, near the end of the fifth century, it is ſaid, 'That [s] the goſpel according 'to Mark was dictated by Peter at Rome, and publiſhed 'by Mark, and preached by him in Alexandria, and Egypt, 'and Pentapolis, and Lybia.'

The author of the Dialogue againſt the Marcionites, about 330, ſays, that [t] Mark was one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples.

[k] p. 256—260.
[l] p. 258.
[m] p. 466.
[n] Vol. IV. p. 223, 224.
[o] p. 224.
[p] p. 223.
[q] p. 248.
[r] p. 283.
[s] p. 293.
[t] p. 295.

Epiphanius,

Epiphanius, about 368, ſays: 'Matthew [u] wrote firſt, 'and Mark ſoon after him, being a companion of Peter at 'Rome.' Afterwards he ſays, 'That [x] Mark was one of 'Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, and likewiſe one of thoſe who 'were offended at the words of Chriſt, recorded John vi. '44. and then forſook him: but he was afterwards recovered 'by Peter, and being filled with the ſpirit wrote a goſpel.'

Upon the laſt paſſage of Epiphanius, Petavius ſays: 'Mark [y] might, poſſibly, have ſeen Chriſt, and have been 'one of the ſeventy: but it is ſaid by very few ancient 'writers of the church.'

In the Conſtitutions, Mark [z] is reckoned with Luke a fellow-labourer with Paul: which may induce us to think, that the author ſuppoſed Mark the evangeliſt to be John Mark, mentioned in the Acts, and ſome of St. Paul's epiſtles.

Gregory Nazianzen ſays, 'that [a] Mark wrote his goſpel for the Italians,' or in Italy.

Ebedjeſu ſays, 'the [b] ſecond evangeliſt is Mark, who preached [or wrote] in Latin, in the famous city of Rome.'

Jerom's article of this evangeliſt, in his book of illuſtrious men, is to this purpoſe: 'Mark, [c] the diſciple and 'interpreter of Peter, at the deſire of the brethren, at 'Rome, wrote a ſhort goſpel, according to what he had 'heard related by Peter: which when Peter knew, he ap-'proved of it, and authorized it to be read in the churches: 'as Clement writes in the ſixth book of his Inſtitutions, and 'alſo Papias, biſhop of Hierapolis. Peter alſo makes men-'tion of this Mark in his epiſtle written at Rome, which 'he figuratively calls Babylon.... Taking the goſpel, which 'himſelf had compoſed, he went to Egypt, and at Alexan-'dria founded a church of great note.... He died in the 'eighth year of Nero, and was buried at Alexandria; where 'he was ſucceeded as biſhop by Anianus.'

[u] p. 314. [x] Ibid.

[y] Diſſentit Papias apud Euſebium.... Quod autem aſſerunt nonnulli, Marcum non vidiſſe Dominum, viderit necne non affirmo. Videre quidem potuiſſe, temporum ipſa ratio perſuadet. Neque vero damnanda eſt Epiphanii ſententia, dum illum e LXXII diſcipulorum numero fuiſſe tradat, etſi contrarium alii patres tradant. Petav. ad loc. Animadv. p. 88.

[z] Vol. IV. p. 351.

[a] p. 408.

[b] p. 439.

[c] Vol. V. p. 38.

In the prologue to his commentary upon St. Matthew, Jerom ſays: 'The [cc] ſecond evangeliſt is Mark, interpreter 'of the apoſtle Peter, and the firſt biſhop of Alexandria: 'who never ſaw the Lord himſelf, but related things as he 'had them from his maſter, very truly, but not exactly 'in the order in which they were done.'

In his commentary upon Philem. ver. 24. he ſays, 'He '[d] thinks that Mark there mentioned is the writer of the 'goſpel.' That Mark may be well ſuppoſed to be John Mark, mentioned in the Acts, and in Col. iv. 10. where he is ſtyled nephew to Barnabas. Whether that Mark was the evangeliſt was doubted of by ſome; nor was Jerom poſitive: but he was inclined to think him the ſame.

Auguſtine [e] calls Mark and Luke diſciples of apoſtles; and ſays, that [f] Mark follows Matthew as his abridger: upon which ſome remarks were [g] made.

By Chryſoſtom [h] Mark is ſaid to have written his goſpel in Egypt, at the requeſt of the believers there. However, at the end of that paſſage he ſays: 'In [i] what place each one of the evangeliſts wrote, cannot be ſaid with certainty.' He likewiſe [k] calls Mark diſciple of Peter, and Peter his maſter. He muſt have ſuppoſed him the ſame that is mentioned 1 Peter v. 13. But I do not recollect him to have any where ſaid that he was the ſame as John Mark.

Victor, writer of a commentary upon St. Mark's goſpel, about the year 401, ſays: 'He [l] was alſo called John: that 'he wrote a goſpel after Matthew, and was the ſon of Mary, 'mentioned Acts xii. For a while he accompanied Paul, 'and his relation Barnabas: but when he came to Rome, 'he joined Peter, and accompanied him. For which rea- 'ſon he is mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13. Mark is alſo mentioned 'by Paul, Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. . . . When he was 'obliged to go from Rome, and was earneſtly deſired by 'the believers there to write a hiſtory of the preaching of 'the heavenly doctrine, he readily complied. This, as he 'adds, is ſaid to have been the occaſion of writing the goſ- 'pel according to Mark.'

[cc] p. 35.
[d] p. 38.
[e] p. 93.
[f] Ibid.
[g] p. 95, 96.
[h] p. 128.
[i] Ibid.
[k] p. 129.
[l] p. 171.

Coſmas,

Coſmas, of Alexandria, about 535, ſays: 'Mark, [m] the 'ſecond evangeliſt, wrote a goſpel at Rome by the direction 'of Peter.'

By Iſidore, of Seville, about 596, Mark [n] is ſaid to have written his goſpel in Italy. Afterwards he ſeems to ſay, it 'was written at Alexandria: but perhaps no more is meant than that Mark preached at Alexandria the goſpel which he had written.

Œcumenius, about 950, upon Acts xiii. 13. ſays: 'This '[o] John who is alſo called Mark, nephew to Barnabas, 'wrote the goſpel according to him, and was alſo diſciple 'of Peter, of whom he ſays in his firſt epiſtle, Mark, my 'ſon, ſaluteth you.'

Theophylact flouriſhed about 1070. His preface to St. Mark is to this purpoſe: 'The [q] goſpel according to Mark 'was written at Rome ten years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, at 'the requeſt of the believers there. For this Mark was 'a diſciple of Peter, whom he calls his ſon ſpiritually. His 'name was John. He was nephew to Barnabas, and was 'alſo a companion of Paul.'

Euthymius, about 1110. ſays: 'The [r] goſpel of Mark 'was written about ten years after our Lord's aſcenſion, at 'Rome, as ſome ſay, or in Egypt, according to others.' He ſays, 'that at firſt Mark was much with his uncle Barna- 'bas, and Paul. Afterwards he was with Peter at Rome, 'as the firſt epiſtle of the apoſtle ſhows, whom he there 'calls his ſon: from whom alſo he received the whole 'hiſtory of the goſpel.'

Nicephorus Calliſti, about 1325, ſays: 'Two [s] only of 'the twelve, Matthew and John, have left memoirs of our 'Lord's life on earth: and two of the ſeventy, Mark and 'Luke.' And ſomewhat lower: 'After this Mark and 'Luke publiſhed their goſpels by the direction of Peter and 'Paul.'

I add here one author more, not particularly mentioned in the preceding part of this work, Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, in the tenth century: who ſays, 'that [t] in the 'time

[m] p. 266.
[n] p. 306.
[o] p. 309.
[q] p. 324.
[r] p. 327.
[s] p. 333.

[s] p. 335, 336.
[t] Et tempore Neronis Cæſaris ſcripſit Petrus, Apoſtolorum princeps, Evangelium Marci, dictante Marco, lingua Romana, in urbe Romæ: ſed attribuit illud Marco. Eutych.

'time of the emperor Nero, Peter the prince of the apoſtles, 'making uſe of the pen of Mark, wrote a goſpel at Rome, 'in the Roman language; and he publiſhed it under Mark's 'name.' By the Roman, probably, meaning the Greek 'language, which then very much prevailed in the Roman 'empire, as [u] Selden has obſerved.

V. Let us now briefly recollect what has paſſed before us, in ſeveral articles.

1. All the ancient writers in general ſuppoſe, the evangeliſt Mark to have been a companion of Peter in the latter part of his life, and to have had great advantages from that apoſtle's preaching for compoſing a goſpel.

2. Though ſome have doubted, who Mark was, many have been of opinion, that he was John Mark, ſon of Mary, a pious Jewiſh woman, and an early believer, of Jeruſalem, and nephew to Barnabas.

3. If Mark the evangeliſt be John Mark, as ſeems to me very probable, he was well acquainted with Barnabas and Paul, and other apoſtles, and diſciples, eye-witneſſes of Jeſus, beſide Peter.

4. Some of the ancient writers, quoted by us, thought Mark to have been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples: which, I apprehend, cannot be either affirmed, or denied with certainty. But, if he was not one of them, he was an early believer, and an early diſciple and companion of apoſtles, and intimately converſant with them: whereby, and by hearing Peter preach in Judea, and other places, and laſtly at Rome, he was well qualified to write a goſpel.

S. Baſnage has ſome obſervations upon this point, which deſerve to be taken notice of. 'Epiphanius [x] and the

Eutych. Ann. p. 335. Conf. ejuſd. Origines. p. 35.

[u] Vid. Selden in Eutych. Origin. not. 28. p. 152.

[x] Marcum de LXX diſcipulis unum fuiſſe, credidit Epiphanius. ... Nobis tamen non arridet ea ſententia cum incredibile ſit, Petrum Marco filii nomen addidiſſe, ſi de ſeptuaginta diſcipulis unus fuiſſet, quos Chriſtus ipſe legaverat, quique ab omni fere parte æquales erant Apoſtolis. Papias quoque vetuſtus ille auctor LXX diſcipulis Marcum eximit.... Ex Tertulliano quoque ſcimus, Marcum interpretis officio functum fuiſſe, quod infra LXX dignitatem fuit.... Neque LXX diſcipulis eum appoſuit Origenes, cujus non minimi ponderis eſt teſtimonium.... Nobis tamen eſt admodum probabile, Marcum unum fuiſſe quingentorum fratrum, qui Chriſtum a morte revocatum contemplati ſunt: cuique, ut teſti oculato, commiſſa eſt ſcribendi Evangelii provincia. Baſn. Ann. 66. num. xvii.

'author

'author of the Dialogue againſt the Marcionites, ſuppoſe, 'Mark to have been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. But 'that opinion, ſays he, does not appear to me well ground-'ed. It ſeems incredible, that Peter ſhould call Mark his 'ſon, if he was one of the ſeventy, who had a commiſſion 'from Chriſt himſelf, and were almoſt equal to apoſtles. 'That ancient writer, Papias, excludes him from that 'number, ſaying, that Mark was not a hearer or follower 'of the Lord.... And Tertullian calls Mark Peter's in-'terpreter, which office would be below the character of one 'of the ſeventy.... Nor does Origen make him one of the 'ſeventy, whoſe authority muſt be of great weight.... 'However, it ſeems to me very probable, that Mark was 'one of the five hundred brethren, who ſaw Chriſt after his 'reſurrection: and having been an eye-witneſs of that, 'he was qualified to write a goſpel.'

Upon which I obſerve: the ſuppoſition, that Mark might be one of the five hundred, ſpoken of by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6. is a mere conjecture, without any authority, either in ſcripture, or antiquity. But I would add a thought or two for ſtrengthening the argument, that Mark was not one of the ſeventy diſciples. Euſebius [y] in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, has a chapter concerning the diſciples of our Saviour; but Mark is not there named, as one of them: nor does Jerom ſay any thing of it in his book of Illuſtrious Men; nor elſewhere, that I remember. The ſilence of Origen, Euſebius, and Jerom, upon this head, muſt amount to an argument of no ſmall weight, that there was not in their times any prevailing tradition, that Mark was one of the ſeventy. It may be alſo reckoned an argument, that he was not of that number, in that he has not in his goſpel taken any notice of them, or of the commiſſion given to them: which is in St. Luke only, ch. x. 1—17.

I therefore conclude with ſaying, that Mark was an early believer, and an early diſciple and fellow-labourer of apoſtles. But that he ever ſaw, or heard the Lord Jeſus is not certain.

5. The general account of the above-named writer is, that Mark wrote his goſpel at Rome. In this there is a remarkable agreement, with a very few exceptions. Chry-

[y] H. E. l. 1. cap. xii.

ſoſtom

ſoſtom indeed ſpeaks of its being written in Egypt; but he is almoſt ſingular. That it was written at Rome, or in Italy, is ſaid not only by Epiphanius, Jerom, Gregory Nazianzen, Victor, and divers others; but the Egyptian writers likewiſe all along ſay the ſame thing: that it was written by Mark at Rome, in the company of the apoſtle Peter. So ſay Clement of Alexandria, Athanaſius, the ſuppoſed author of the Synopſis of ſcripture, Coſmas, and Eutychius, all of Alexandria. Ebedjeſu likewiſe, in his catalogue of Syrian writings, ſays, that Mark wrote at Rome. And the Latin author of the commentary upon St. Mark's goſpel, quoted ſome while ago, ſays, that it was written in Italy.

6. This leads us to think, that St. Mark's goſpel was not written before the year 63, or 64. For we cannot perceive any good reaſon to think, that St. Peter was at Rome, till about that time. And this date is ſupported by the teſtimony of that ancient writer Irenæus, that Mark publiſhed his goſpel after the deceaſe of Peter and Paul.

VI. Theſe are obſervations which the above cited teſtimonies ſeem naturally to afford. But before we proceed any farther, it will be fit for us to take notice of the ſentiments of learned moderns concerning the time of St. Mark's writing his goſpel.

Cave ſuppoſes St. Mark to have publiſhed his goſpel at Rome, in the year of Chriſt 65. His argument for it I place [z] below.

Mr. Jones's opinion was, that [a] this goſpel was publiſhed between the year 64 and 67, or 68: when, according to his computation, Peter and Paul ſuffered martyrdom.

[z] Rogatus Romæ a fratribus, ſcripſit Evangelium, a Petro approbatum, idque Græco ſermone Romanis ſatis familiari. Factum id circa ann. 65, Petro et Paulo jam morte ſublatis. Cum enim illum epiſtola ſecunda ad Timotheum non longe ante martyrium ſcripta, Romam accerſiverat Paulus, probabile eſt, Marcum vel eodem, vel ſaltem ſequenti anno illuc veniſſe, ibique Evangelium vel primum condidiſſe, vel prius conditum in publicum edidiſſe. Certe Irenæus, l. 3. cap. i. et apud Euſebium, l. 5. c. viii. S. Marcum μετὰ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Evangelium ſuum conſcripſiſſe diſerte tradit. Cav. H. L. T. I. p. 24.

[a] Mr. Jones' words are theſe: 'Theſe, with ſome other reaſons, 'make it evident to me, that St. 'Peter was not at Rome, till the 'year of Chriſt 63 or 64, and 'conſequently, that the goſpel of 'St. Mark was not written before 'this time, but between that and 'the martyrdom of this apoſtle and 'St. Paul, in the year of Chriſt 67 'or 68.' New and full Method, vol. III. p. 88.

J. A.

J. A. Fabricius [b] was for the year of Chriſt 63, the ninth of Nero.

Mill ſays, that [c] St. Mark publiſhed his goſpel at Rome, in the year of Chriſt 63, after that the apoſtles Peter and Paul had been gone from thence, as Irenæus ſays.

But here I beg leave to obſerve, that, probably, Irenæus does not ſpeak of theſe two apoſtles removal from Rome, but of their deceaſe. Secondly, Dr. Mill has no reaſon to ſuppoſe that Peter was at Rome during the time of Paul's two years impriſonment there, eſpecially at the period of it; but there is a great deal of reaſon to think otherwiſe: for we have ſeveral epiſtles of St. Paul, written near the end of that confinement, in which no notice is taken of Peter.

Baſnage [d] cloſely following Irenæus, ſays, Mark's goſpel was publiſhed in the year 66, after the deceaſe of Peter and Paul; whoſe martyrdoms, according to him, happened in [e] the year 65.

So that it has been of late the opinion of many learned men, of the beſt judgment in theſe matters, that St. Mark's goſpel was not publiſhed till after the year of Chriſt 60. I readily aſſent to them ſo far. And as I am diſpoſed to place the martyrdoms of theſe two great apoſtles at Rome, in the latter part of the year 64, or in 65, it ſeems to me probable, that St. Mark's goſpel was compoſed in the year 64, or 65, and made public by him the firſt fair opportunity, ſoon afterwards, before the end of the year 65. That I mention as the lateſt date. I do not preſume to ſay the time exactly; for it might be finiſhed, and publiſhed in the year 64.

I hoped to have had aſſiſtance from Mr. Wetſtein in this diſquiſition. But have been ſomewhat diſappointed. In his preface to St. Mark's goſpel he concludes from Col.

[b] Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 124 et 131.

[c] Poſt Pauli ac Petri ἔξοδον, ſeu diceſſum ab urbe Roma. . . . *Marcus diſcipulus et interpres Petri, et ipſe quæ a Petro annuntiata erant, perſcripta tradidit.* Inquit Irenæus. . . . Scripſit igitur Marcus Evangelium, juxta Irenæum, paulo poſt horum duorum Apoſtolorum diſceſſum a Roma, qui accidiſſe videtur anno æræ vulgaris lxiii. Mill. Proleg. num. 101.

[d] De Marci Evangelio legimus apud Irenæum . . . *Poſt vero horum exceſſum* . . . Quæ traditio magis apud nos valet, quam alia quælibet de tempore editi a Marco Evangelii chronologia. Baſn. ann. 66. n. xii.

[e] Vid. ann. 65. num. ix.

iv. 10. and Philem. ver. 24. that [f] St. Mark had been with the apoſtle Paul at Rome, in the time of his confinement there: that from thence he went to Coloſſe, and afterwards returned to Rome, where he is ſaid to have written his goſpel. Accordingly, as one would think, St. Mark's goſpel could not be publiſhed before the year 64, or 65. But in his preface to St. Luke's goſpel the ſame learned writer expreſſeth himſelf to this purpoſe: 'According [g] to ſome 'eccleſiaſtical writers Luke publiſhed his goſpel fifteen, 'according to others two and twenty years after Chriſt's 'aſcenſion.... That he tranſcribed many things from Mat-'thew, and yet more from Mark, is manifeſt.'

But if St. Luke wrote within two and twenty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and tranſcribed a great deal from St. Mark; St. Mark's goſpel muſt have been firſt publiſhed, and very early. If St. Mark's goſpel was not publiſhed till the year 64, and St. Luke tranſcribed from him; St. Luke could not write till a good while after two and twenty years from Chriſt's aſcenſion. I do not perceive therefore that Mr. Wetſtein had any determined opinion concerning the date of theſe two goſpels. Nor can I, as yet, perſuade myſelf, that any of the evangeliſts tranſcribed each other.

VII. I will now obſerve ſome characters of time in the goſpel itſelf, like thoſe before taken notice of in St. Matthew.

1. From chap. vii. 14—23, it appears, that St. Mark fully underſtood the ſpirituality of the doctrine of Chriſt, recommending righteouſneſs and true holineſs, without an obligation to Jewiſh ritual ordinances and appointments.

2. His hiſtory of the Greek or gentile woman, in the ſame chap. vii. 24—30, who beſought Jeſus to heal her daughter, and obtained her requeſt, deſerves notice here.

3. The call of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the Jews, as a people, are intimated in ch. xii. 1—12. in the parable there recorded of the houſeholder, who planted a vineyard,

[f] Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum inviſit. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 24. Inde ad Coloſſenſes abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. ubi Evangelium conſcripſiſſe ... dicitur. Wetſten. N. T. tom. I. p. 551.

[g] Evangelium autem edidit xv. aut ſecundum alios xxii. poſt Chriſti adſcenſionem annis.... Lucam multa ex Matthæo, ex Marco plura deſcripſiſſe, ex collatione patet. Ib. p. 643.

and

and let it out to huſbandmen: to whom after a while he ſent ſervants, and then his ſon, to receive from them the fruit of the vineyard. But they abuſed the ſervants, and killed the ſon. It is added, *What therefore will the Lord of the vineyard do? He will deſtroy the huſbandmen, and will let out the vineyard unto others.* And what follows.

4. In ch. xiii. are predictions concerning the deſtruction of the temple, and the deſolations of the Jewiſh people. And, particularly, at ver. 14—16. are remarkable expreſſions, intimating the near approach of thoſe calamities, and ſuited to excite the attention of ſuch as were in danger of being involved in them.

5. In his account of the inſtitution of the euchariſt, our Lord ſays: ch. xiv. 24. *This is my blood of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many:* that is, for all men, not for Jews only, but for Gentiles alſo.

6. In ch. iv. 30—32. is the parable of the *grain of muſtard ſeed, the leaſt of all ſeeds, which becometh greater than all herbs:* repreſenting the ſwift and wonderful progreſs of the goſpel in the world: of which it is very likely, St. Mark, at the time of writing, had ſome knowledge.

7. It is manifeſt, that he well underſtood the extent of our Saviour's commiſſion to the twelve apoſtles: for he has recorded it in theſe words, ch. xvi. 15. *Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature:* or the whole creation, that is, Jews and Gentiles, all mankind of every denomination.

8. Yea, it appears from the concluſion of his hiſtory, that before he wrote, the apoſtles (at leaſt divers of them) had left Judea, and had preached in many places. Ver 20. *And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with ſigns following.*

9. Ch. xvi. 18. *They ſhall take up ſerpents.* Some may think, that here is a reference to the hiſtory, which we have in Acts xxviii. 3—6. I do not ſay there is. But allowing it, I ſhould not reckon it an objection to the genuineneſs of this part of that chapter: it would only be an argument for the late date of this goſpel; and it has been ſo underſtood by ſome. For my own part, I cannot ſay, that St. Mark has

[1] Poſtremo, in ipſis Evangeliis ex quibus ea ſero eſſe conſcripta quædam exſtare videntur criteria, colligi poteſt. Phraſis μεχρι της σημερον,

has referred to it. But I make no queſtion, that he was acquainted with the event there related, when he wrote his goſpel.

VIII. I ſhall conclude this chapter with ſome obſervations upon St. Mark's goſpel.

1. It confirms the accounts given by the ancients, that it is the ſubſtance of Peter's preaching. This was taken notice of juſt now in our recollection; but I chooſe to enlarge upon it here, and ſhow, that the goſpel itſelf affords evidences of its being written according to that apoſtle's diſcourſes, or according to informations and directions given by him to this evangeliſt.

1.) In the firſt place I would here remind my readers of a long paſſage of Euſebius, the learned biſhop of Cæſarea, formerly tranſcribed, of which I take here a very ſmall part only.

Having obſerved ſeveral things very honourable to Peter, related in the other goſpels, he adds: 'Though [i] ſuch things 'were ſaid to Peter by Jeſus, Mark has taken no notice of 'them: becauſe, as is probable, Peter did not relate them 'in his ſermons. For he did not think fit to bear teſtimony 'to himſelf by relating what Jeſus ſaid to him, or of him; 'therefore Mark has omitted them. But what concerned 'his denial of Jeſus, he preached to all men, becauſe he 'wept bitterly.... For all things in Mark are ſaid to be 'memoirs of Peter's diſcourſes.'

2.) And [k] Chryſoſtom, reconciling Matthew's and Mark's accounts of Peter's denying Chriſt, ſays: 'Theſe things 'Mark had from his maſter; for he was a diſciple of Peter. 'And what is very remarkable, though he was a diſciple of 'Peter, he relates his fall more particularly than any of 'the reſt.'

3.) The [l] ſame great preacher explaining the hiſtory of our Lord's paying the didrachm or tribute-money to the temple, which is in Matt. xvii. 24—27. and particularly

σημερον, uſque ad hunc diem. Matt. xxviii. 15. juſtum ſpatium inter Chriſti reſurrectionem et Evangelium exaratum poſtulare videtur. Ita quæ Marcus cap. xvi. 18. de ſerpentibus a Chriſti diſcipulis fine damno tollendis habet, ad Paulum, Romam tendentem, et quod ei in itinere in inſula Mileto contigit, reſpicere videntur. Herman. Venema Diſſ. ſecund. de titulo ep. ad Epheſ. cap. v. num. iv.

[i] Vol. IV. p. 223.

[k] Vol. V. p. 329.

[l] Ibid.

thoſe

thoſe words: *That take, and give unto them for me and thee* ſays, 'Mark, who was a diſciple of Peter, omits this, be-'cauſe it was honourable to that apoſtle. But he relates the 'hiſtory of his denial of Chriſt. And perhaps his maſter 'forbid him to inſert ſuch things, as tended to aggrandize 'him.'

4.) No one has more largely treated this point than Mr. Jones, who has [m] a catalogue of ſeveral places in the goſpels, containing things tending to Peter's honour, which are not mentioned in St. Mark's goſpel.

(1.) The account of Chriſt's pronouncing Peter bleſſed, when he had confeſſed him: Chriſt's declaring, that he had his faith and knowledge from God: the promiſe of the keys, and of that large power, which is made to him: are omitted by St. Mark, though the former and the ſucceeding parts of this diſcourſe are both told by him. See Matt. xvi. 16—20. compared with Mark viii. 29, 30.

(2.) The relation of St. Peter's being commiſſioned by Chriſt to work the miracle, by getting money out of the fiſh's mouth, to pay the tribute-money, is told by St. Matthew, ch. xvii. 24—28. but omitted by St. Mark: though the preceding and ſubſequent ſtories are the very ſame as in St. Matthew. See Mark ix. 30—33.

(3.) Chriſt's particular expreſſions of love and favour to St. Peter, in telling him of his danger, and that he prayed particularly for him, that his faith might not fail, is omitted by St. Mark, but related Luke xxii. 31, 32.

(4.) St. Peter's remarkable humility above the reſt of the apoſtles expreſſed in an unwillingneſs, that Chriſt ſhould waſh his feet, which none of the reſt did expreſs, with Chriſt's particular diſcourſe to him; John xiii. 6. &c. is omitted by Mark.

(5.) The inſtance of St. Peter's very great zeal for Chriſt, when he was taken, in cutting off the high-prieſt's ſervant's ear, John xviii. 10. is not mentioned by Mark in particular, but only told in general, of a certain perſon that ſtood by. Mark xiv. 47.

(6.) St. Peter's faith in caſting himſelf into the ſea, to go to Chriſt. John xxi. 7. is not mentioned by St. Mark.[a]

[m] See New and full Method, part 3. p. 79—81.

[a] There is a like thing, and more extraordinary, related by Matthew only, ch. xiv. 28—31. I do not know, why Mr. Jones omitted it.

(7.) Chriſt's diſcourſe with Peter concerning his love to him, and his particular repeated charge to him, to feed his ſheep: John xxi. 15. is omitted by St. Mark.

(8.) Our Saviour's predicting to Peter his martyrdom, and the manner of it: John xxi. 18, 19, is not related by St. Mark.

'Theſe, adds that diligent author, are ſome inſtances of 'things, tending to St. Peter's honour, recorded by the 'other evangeliſts, none of which are ſo much as hinted 'by St. Mark. . . . All which cannot be accounted for any 'way more probable, than ſuppoſing, that this apoſtle did 'not publiſh thoſe circumſtances, which were ſo much to 'his honour.'

Indeed, I think, they do confirm the accounts given of this goſpel by the ancients. For theſe omiſſions cannot be ſo well aſcribed to any thing, as to St. Peter's modeſty and reſervedneſs, who had not mentioned ſuch things in his preaching, and diſcouraged the putting them down in writing: inſomuch, that as Tertullian ſays, the [n] goſpel publiſhed by Mark, may be ſaid to be Peter's.

5.) Nevertheleſs I muſt acknowledge, that there are ſome things in St. Mark's goſpel honourable to Peter, which are not in any other: I ſhall mention two or three.

Says St. Mark, ch. i. 36. *And Simon, and they that were with him, followed after him.* If thereby be intended the whole company of the apoſtles, that way of deſcribing them is very honourable to Peter. But ſome may ſuppoſe, none to be intended, beſide thoſe mentioned, ver. 29. If ſo, it reſembles Luke ix. 32. *But Peter, and they that were with him:* meaning John and James, and referring to ver. 28.

In Mark xiv. 3. Peter is mentioned, as one of the four apoſtles to whom our Lord addreſſed himſelf, when he foretold the deſtruction of the temple, and the calamities attending it: which is a paſſage peculiar to St. Mark.

And ch. xvi. 7. The meſſage, which the angels ſent to the diſciples by the women at the ſepulchre, is thus expreſſed: *But go your way. Tell his diſciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee.* Peter is not mentioned, upon this occaſion, by Matthew xxviii. 7. nor by any other of the evangeliſts.

Upon this text Whitby ſays very well: 'Peter is here 'named, not as prince of the apoſtles, but, as the fathers

[n] See vol. II. p. 258.

'ſay,

'ſay, for his conſolation, and to take off the ſcruple, which 'might be upon his ſpirit: whether by his three-fold denial 'of his maſter, he had not forfeited his right to be one 'of Chriſt's diſciples.'

I now proceed to another obſervation.

2. St. Mark's goſpel, as is evident to all, is the ſhorteſt of the four. Jerom, as before cited, ſays, Mark [o] wrote a ſhort goſpel. And Chryſoſtom obſerved, that [p] Mark had the conciſeneſs of Peter, following his Maſter.

3. Nevertheleſs there are in St. Mark many things peculiar to himſelf, not mentioned by any other evangeliſt.

I ſhall here put down ſeveral ſuch things, and not thoſe, which are omitted by Matthew, but ſuch things as are in Mark, and in no other of the evangeliſts.

1.) In the account of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderneſs, St. Mark ſays, ch. i. 13, *and was with the wild beaſts:* not mentioned by any other evangeliſt, and yet very proper to ſhow the hardſhips which our Lord underwent at that ſeaſon.

2.) Ch. i. 20. In the account of the call of James and John, the ſons of Zebedee, he ſays, *they left their father in the ſhip, with the hired ſervants:* a circumſtance not mentioned by any other.

3.) Ch. i. 29. *And forthwith, when they were come out of the ſynagogue, they entered into the houſe of Simon, and Andrew, with James and John.* In Matt. viii. 14. it is only, *come into Peter's houſe.* In Luke iv. 38. *and entered into Simon's houſe.*

4.) Ch. i. 33. *And all the city was gathered together at the door.* Not in any other evangeliſt. Compare Matt. viii. 16. Luke iv. 40, 41.

5.) Ch. i. 35. *And in the morning riſing up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a ſolitary place, and there prayed.* Ver. 36. *And Simon, and they that were with him, followed after him.* Ver. 37. *And when they had found him, they ſaid unto him: all men ſeek thee.* This is not at all in Matthew, and is here much fuller, and with more particulars, than in Luke iv. 42.

6.) Ch. i. 45. Of the leper, cured by our Saviour, he ſays: *But he went out, and began to publiſh it much, and to blaze abroad the matter.* Not particularly mentioned by the other evangeliſts. Compare Matth. viii. 4. Luke v. 14, 15.

[o] See here, p. 175.

[p] See vol. V. p. 130.

7.) In the cure of the paralytic. ch. ii. 2. *And ſtraightway many were gathered together, inſomuch that there was no room to receive them, not ſo much as about the door.* 3. *And they come unto him, bringing one ſick of the palſy, which was borne of four.* 4. *And .... they uncovered the roof....* No other evangeliſt has ſo particularly deſcribed the crowd. In Mark only is it ſaid, that this ſick man was borne of four. He likewiſe more particularly deſcribes the uncovering the roof. Compare Matt. ix. 1, 2. Luke v. 18, 19.

8.) In the hiſtory of the man with *a withered hand*, cured in the ſynagogue, on a ſabbath; ch. iii. 5. *And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardneſs of their hearts, he ſaith unto the man: ſtretch forth thy hand.* Not ſo full in any other evangeliſt. Compare Matt. xii. 9—13. Luke vi. 6—11.

9.) Ch. iii. ver. 6. *And the phariſees went forth, and ſtraightway took counſel with the Herodians againſt him.* Matt. xii. 14. mentions phariſees only. Luke vi. 11. mentions no perſons by name.

10.) Ch. iii. 17. *And James the ſon of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he named them Boanerges.* Not in any other evangeliſt.

11.) Ch. iii. 19.... *And they went into the houſe.* 20. *And the multitude cometh together again, ſo that they could not ſo much as eat bread.* 21. *And when his friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold of him. For they ſaid: he is beſide himſelf.* Whether that expreſſion *he is beſide himſelf*, is to be underſtood of Chriſt, or of the multitude, this paſſage is peculiar to St. Mark.

12.) Ch. iv. 26. *And he ſaid: ſo is the kingdom of God, as if a man ſhould caſt his ſeed into the ground,* 27. *and ſhould ſleep and riſe night and day, and the ſeed ſhould ſpring and grow up, he knoweth not how* 28. *For the earth bringeth forth fruit of itſelf, firſt the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.* 29. *But when the fruit is ripe, immediately he putteth in the ſickle, becauſe the harveſt is come.* This parable is peculiar to St. Mark. See Whitby upon the place, and likewiſe [q] Grotius.

13.) After the parable of the grain of muſtard-ſeed, beſide other things common to him and Matthew, he adds,

[q] Hæc parabola, aliis omiſſa, cum ſuam hic explicationem non habeat, explicari debet ex ſimili comparatione, quæ eſt apud Matt. xiii. 24. Grot. ad Marc. iv. 26.

ch. iv.

ch. iv. 34. *And when they were alone, he expounded all things to his diſciples.* Compare Matt. xiii. 31—34. This particular leads us mightily to think, that either Mark was an eye-witneſs, or had the beſt and fulleſt information of things.

14.) Mark iv. 36. *And when they had ſent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ſhip.* This circumſtance, peculiar to St. Mark, enables us to account for our Lord's faſt ſleep in his paſſage to the country of the Gadarenes. We perceive from St. Mark, that this voyage was undertaken in the evening, after the fatigue of long diſcourſes in public, and without any refreſhment. Our Lord's ſleep in the midſt of a ſtorm is mentioned by all three evangeliſts. Matt. viii. 24—26. Mark iv. 37, 38. Luke viii. 23, 24. But this evangeliſt alone leads us to diſcern the occaſion of it.

15.) Farther, in the ſame ver. 36, of ch. iv. *And there were alſo with him ſeveral other little ſhips.* A particular, peculiar St. Mark.

16.) And in the account of this voyage croſs the ſea, he ſays ver. 38, that our Lord was *in the hinder part of the ſhip, aſleep on a pillow:* two circumſtances, wanting in the other evangeliſts.

17.) Certainly, theſe and other things are ſufficient to aſſure us, that either Mark was an eye-witneſs: or, that he wrote things as related to him by an eye-witneſs, even Peter himſelf, as all the ancients ſay.

18.) In Matt. viii. 28—34. Mark v. 1—19. Luke viii. 26—39. are the ſeveral accounts of our Lord's healing the dæmoniac, or dæmoniacs, in the country of the Gadarenes; for Matthew ſpeaks of two, Mark and Luke of one only. In St. Mark's hiſtory are divers things not in the other goſpels. In him alone it is ſaid, that *the man was always night and day in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himſelf with ſtones.* And he only mentions the number of ſwine that periſhed in the ſea, ſaying, *they were about two thouſand.*

19.) All the firſt three evangeliſts have given a hiſtory of our Lord's raiſing the daughter of Jairus, and healing the woman with an iſſue of blood, both in connection. Matt ix. 1—26. Mark v. 22—43. Luke viii. 41—56. St. Mark has ſeveral things which are in neither of the other. Of the woman he ſays, ver. 26, *ſhe had ſuffered much of many*

phyſicians . . . and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worſe. At ver. 29, *And ſhe felt in her body, that ſhe was healed of that plague.* At ver. 41, he inſerts the very words which Jeſus ſpake when he raiſed the daughter of Jairus: *Talitha Kumi.* I have omitted ſome other things peculiar to St. Mark in the account of theſe two miracles.

20.) Ch. vi. 13. In the account of the commiſſion given to the twelve by Chriſt in his life-time, he ſays, *they anointed many with oil, and healed them:* which is mentioned by no other evangeliſt, as was obſerved of old by [r] Victor.

21.) Mark vii. 2, 3, 4. What is there ſaid of the Jews waſhing themſelves, when they come from the market, before they eat: and of their *cleanſing, cups, pots, brazen veſſels, and tables,* is peculiar to St. Mark. Comp. Matt. xv. 1, 2.

22.) Ch. vii. 21, 22. Are the things that defile men. St. Matthew, ch. xv. 19, mentions ſeven things only. St. Mark has thirteen: and two of them, *an evil eye,* and *fooliſhneſs,* are very ſingular.

23.) Ch. vii. 31—37. Our Lord beſtows hearing and ſpeech upon a deaf and dumb man.

24.) Ch. viii. 22—26. Our Lord cures a blind man at Bethſaida.

Theſe two miracles are peculiar to St. Mark, being related by no other evangeliſt.

25.) Ch. x. 46—52. is the account of the miracle on the blind man near Jericho. St. Mark, ver. 46, calls him blind Bartimeus ſon of Timæus: not mentioned by the other evangeliſts. See Matt. xx. 29—34. Luke xviii. 35—43. And at ver. 50. *he caſting away his garment, roſe, and came to Jeſus:* a circumſtance peculiar to St. Mark. Which ſhows his exact knowledge of the hiſtory, as did likewiſe his calling the man by his name.

26.) Ch. xi. 13. *For the time of figs was not yet:* that is, the time of gathering was not yet come. A moſt uſeful obſervation peculiar to this evangeliſt, ſhowing, that as there were leaves, it was reaſonable to expect fruit on this fig tree, if it was not barren. Upon this text might be conſulted [s] biſhop Kidder, and [t] Mr. Hallet.

27.) Ch. xiii. 3, 4. *And as he ſat upon the mount of Olives, over againſt the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew,*

[r] See vol. V. p. 173.
[s] Demonſtration of the Meſſiah, part II. ch. ii. p. 38, 39.
[t] Notes and Diſcourſes, vol II. p. 114—125.

aſked

aſked him privately . . . When ſhall theſe things be? No other evangeliſt has mentioned the names of the diſciples, who put this queſtion to our Saviour. Comp. Matt: xxiv. 1—3. Luke xxi. 5.

28.) In Mark xii. 41—44. and Luke xxi. 1—4. is the account of the people caſting their gifts into the cheſts of the treaſury in the temple. St. Mark ſays: *And Jeſus ſat over againſt the treaſury.* In which expreſſion there is great propriety. And he alone mentions the value of the poor widow's two mites, ſaying, *which make a farthing.*

29.) Ch. xiv. 51. *And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body. And the young men* [the guards] *laid hold on him.* Ver. 52. *And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked.* A particular, in no other evangeliſt, yet very fitly taken notice of, as intimating the uſual noiſe and diſturbance, when a man is taken up in the night-time as a malefactor, and is carried before a magiſtrate. By " the noiſe of the people paſſing along that young perſon was excited to come haſtily out of the houſe where he was, to inquire what was the matter. Mr. Le Clerc, in his French Teſtament, has an uſeful note upon this place. He obſerves the natural ſimplicity of the evangeliſt's narration; which, as he juſtly ſays, confirms the truth of their hiſtory.

30.) Ch. xv. 21. *And they compel one Simon, a Cyrenian, who paſſed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus to bear his croſs.* That particular, *the father of Alexander and Rufus,* is in no other evangeliſt. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 32. and Luke xxiii. 26.

31.) Ch. xvi. 3, 4. *And they ſaid among themſelves, who ſhall roll us away the ſtone from the door of the ſepulchre: for it was very great.* In no other evangeliſt.

32.) Ch. xvi. 7. *But go your way, tell his diſciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee.* The mention of Peter is peculiar to St. Mark. For in Matt. xxviii. 7. it is, *Go quickly, and tell his diſciples.* St. Luke has not recorded that meſſage.

33.) I add nothing more of this kind. I have omitted many things, which are in this goſpel and no other, being apprehenſive, that if I enlarged farther, I ſhould be charged with prolixity.

" Non de Apoſtolorum grege . . . ſed ex villa aliqua horto proxima, ſeptia militum excitatus, et ſubito accurrens, ut conſpiceret, quid ageretur. Grot. ad Marc. xi. 51.

34.) The particulars that have been alleged, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that St. Mark is not an epitomiſer of another author: and that he was well acquainted with the things of which he undertook to write a hiſtory. He writes as an eye-witneſs, or as one who had full and authentic information at the firſt hand. In a word, St. Mark's goſpel, though ſhort, is a very valuable and maſterly performance.

4. It may be proper for me to add one thing more: that I ſuppoſe the twelve verſes at the end of the ſixteenth chapter to be a genuine part of this goſpel. If any doubt of it, I would refer them for their ſatisfaction to Dr. Mill, and to the obſervations of Grotius at the beginning of that chapter, and to Beza upon the ninth verſe. And for explaining thoſe twelve verſes, and reconciling them with the other evangeliſts, I refer to Grotius, and other commentators.

CHAP. VIII.

St. Luke, Evangelist.

I. *His Hiſtory from the N. T.* II. *Teſtimonies of ancient Chriſtian Writers to St. Luke, and his two Books, his Goſpel, and the Acts.* III. *Remarks upon thoſe Teſtimonies.* IV. *The Time of writing his Goſpel and the Acts.* V. *Internal Characters of Time in the Goſpel.* VI. *The Place, where it was written.* VII. *A general recollection of St. Luke's Character.* VIII. *Obſervations upon his Goſpel.* IX. *Obſervations upon the Book of the Acts.*

I. The firſt time that we find any mention of St. Luke in the books of the New Teſtament is in his [a] own hiſtory. Acts xvi.

[a] From ſome words in the Cambridge manuſcript Bp. Pearſon has argued, that Luke was in Paul's company from the year 43. Dein peragrat [Paulus] Phrygiam et Galatiam, et per Myſiam venit Troadem, ubi ſe illi comitem adjunxiſſe indicat Lucas xvi 10. Qui antea etiam Antiochiæ cum Paulo fuit, et jam cum Troade aſſecutus eſt: ut colligere licet ex Act. xi. 28. ubi Codex Cantabr. habet, συνεσραμμενων δε ημων. Ab anno igitur 43. per octennium diſcipulus fuerat Antiochiæ. Annal. Paulin. p. 10. But it is not ſafe to rely upon one manuſcript only, different from all others, and of no great authority. As Mr. Tillemont took notice of this obſervation of Pearſon, I tranſcribe his thoughts about it. Selon le manuſcrit de Cambridge S. Luc dit qu'il eſtoit avec S. Paul à Antioche, des l'an 43. ce que Pearſon a receu. Mais il ne ſeroit pas ſeur de ſier à un manuſcrit different

Acts xvi. 10, 11. Whereby it appears, that he was in Paul's company at Troas, before the apoſtle took ſhipping to go into Macedonia: in which voyage St. Luke was one of the company. ver. 8. *And they paſſing by Myſia, came to Troas.* Ver. 9. *And a viſion appeared to Paul in the night: There ſtood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, ſaying, come over into Macedonia, and help us.* ver. 10 *And when he had ſeen the viſion, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, aſſuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us to preach the goſpel to them.* ver. 11. *Therefore looſing from Troas, we came with a ſtraight courſe to Samothracia.*

In that journey St. Paul went from Samothracia to Neapolis, and thence to Philippi. 11—17. So far St. Luke ſpeaks in the firſt perſon plural. But having finiſhed his account of the tranſactions at Philippi, which reaches to ver. 40, the laſt of that chapter: at the beginning of the next ch. xvii. 1. he [b] changeth the perſon, and ſays: *Now when they had paſſed through Amphipolis, and Apollonia, they came to Theſſalonica, where was a ſynagogue of the Jews.*

Nor does he any more expreſsly ſpeak of himſelf, until Paul was a ſecond time in Greece, and was ſetting out for Jeruſalem with the collections, which had been made for the poor ſaints in Judea, Acts xx. 1—6. *And after the uproar* [at Epheſus,] *was ceaſed, Paul called unto him the diſciples, and*

different de tous les autres. Et quand cela ſe pourroit en quelques occaſions, ce ne ſeroit pas à l'égard du manuſcrit de Cambridge, qui eſt plein d'additions et alterations contraires au veritable texte de S. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2. S. Luc. note iii. Some may argue from theſe words, that Luke was a Gentile, converted by Paul at Antioch. And others might argue, that he is the ſame as Lucius, mentioned Acts xiii. 1. But I ſhould think it beſt for neither ſide to form an argument from this reading. Mr. Wetſtein has referred us to a place of St. Auguſtine, where this text is quoted very agreeably to the Cambridge manuſcript. In illis autem diebus deſcenderunt ab Jeroſolymis Prophetæ Antiochiam. Congregatis autem illis, ſurgens unus ex illis, nomine Agabus, &c. De Serm. Dom. l. 2. c. 17. But it is obſervable, that Irenæus l. 3. c. 14. init. a more ancient writer, enumerating St. Luke's journeys in St. Paul's company, begins at Troas. Acts xvi. 8—10. I preſume, it muſt be beſt to rely upon him, and the general conſent of all manuſcripts, except one, in the common reading.

b Nevertheleſs it is ſuppoſed by many, that Luke continued with Paul. Irenæus calls him Paul's inſeparable companion, after his coming to be with the Apoſtle at Troas. Adv. H. l. 3. c. 14. So likewiſe Cave. Cujus perinde ſectator erat, et omnis peregrinationis comes. H. L. T. i. p. 25. See alſo Tillem. St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2.

embraced

embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over thoſe parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to ſail into Syria, he purpoſed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Aſia, Sopater of Berea.... Theſe going before, tarried for us at Troas. And we ſailed away from Philippi.... and came unto them at Troas in five days, where we abode ſeven days. So that Luke accompanied Paul, at that time, from Greece through Macedonia to Philippi, and alſo went with him from thence to Troas.

And it appears from the ſequel of the hiſtory in the Acts, that Luke was one of thoſe, who accompanied the apoſtle to Jeruſalem, and ſtayed with him there. And when the apoſtle was ſent a priſoner from Cæſarea to Rome, he was in the ſame ſhip with him, and ſtayed with him at Rome during the whole time of his two years impriſonment there, with which the hiſtory of the Acts concludes.

From St. Paul's epiſtles written at Rome, in the time of that confinement, we have proofs of Luke's being with him. He is mentioned as with the apoſtle. 2 Tim. iv. 11. an epiſtle written, as I ſuppoſe, in the ſummer, after the apoſtle's arrival there. In Philem. ver. 24. he is one of thoſe, who ſend ſalutations to Philemon, and is mentioned by the apoſtle, as one of his fellow-labourers. And, if Luke the beloved phyſician, mentioned Col. iv. 14, be the evangeliſt, that is another proof of his being then with the apoſtle.

St. Luke is alſo ſuppoſed by ſome to be *the brother, whoſe praiſe is in the goſpel throughout all the churches*, 2 Cor. viii. 18. but that is not certain.

As I think, that all St. Paul's epiſtles, which we have, were written, before he left Rome and Italy, when he had been ſent thither by Feſtus; I muſt be of opinion, that the New Teſtament affords us not any materials for the hiſtory of St. Luke, lower than his own book of the Acts, which brings us down to the end of that period.

II. I now therefore proceed without farther delay, to obſerve what light may be obtained from ancient Chriſtian writers. And as St. Luke's two books, his goſpel and the Acts, were all along univerſally received; I intend here, for avoiding prolixity, to allege, chiefly, ſuch paſſages only, as contain ſomething, relating to the hiſtory and character of St. Luke, or the time of writing his two above-named works.

Irenæus,

Irenæus, as before quoted: 'And [a] Luke, the companion 'of Paul, put down in a book the goſpel preached by him.' And the coherence ſeems to imply, that this was done after the writing of St. Mark's goſpel, and after the death of Peter and Paul. In a paſſage formerly cited [b] at length, Irenæus ſhows from the Acts, as we did juſt now, that Luke attended Paul in ſeveral of his journies and voyages, and was his fellow-labourer in the goſpel. He likewiſe ſays: 'that [c] Luke was not only a companion, but alſo a fellow-'labourer of the apoſtles, eſpecially of Paul.' Again, he calls him 'a [d] diſciple and follower of the apoſtles.' 'The '[e] apoſtles, he ſays, envying none plainly delivered to all 'the things which they had learned from the Lord. So 'likewiſe Luke, envying no man, has delivered to us what 'he learned from them, as he ſays: *Even as they delivered* '*them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witneſſes and* '*miniſters of the word.*' By all which it ſeems, that Irenæus reckoned Luke to have been a diſciple of the apoſtles, not a hearer of Jeſus Chriſt himſelf.

Clement of Alexandria has borne a large teſtimony to this goſpel, and the Acts, as well as to the other books of the New Teſtament. And as we learn from Euſebius, 'in '[f] his Inſtitutions he mentions a tradition concerning the 'order of the goſpels, which he had received from preſby-'ters of more ancient times, and which is to this purpoſe. 'He ſays, that the goſpels containing the genealogies were 'written firſt:' according to that tradition therefore St. Matthew's and St. Luke's goſpels were written before St. Mark's. Which, according to the ſame Clement, and the tradition received by him, was written at Rome, at the requeſt of Peter's hearers, or the Chriſtians in that city.

Tertullian [g] ſpeaks of Matthew and John as diſciples of Chriſt, of Mark and Luke as diſciples of apoſtles: therefore I think he did not reckon theſe to have been of the ſeventy, or hearers of Chriſt. However, he aſcribes a like

[a] Vol. II. p. 158.
[b] p. 161, 162.
[c] p. 162.
[d] p. 161.
[e] Sic Apoſtoli ſimpliciter nemini invidentes quæ didicerant ipſi a Domino hæc omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas nemini invidens, ea quæ ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, ſicut ipſe teſtatur dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et miniſtri fuerunt verbi. Adv. H. l. 3. cap. 14. n. 2.
[f] Vol. II. p. 211.
[g] p. 261.

authority

authority to theſe, and ſays, 'that [h] the goſpel, which 'Mark publiſhed, may be ſaid to be Peter's, whoſe inter- 'preter Mark was. For Luke's digeſt alſo is often aſcribed 'to Paul. And indeed it is eaſy to take that for the maſter's 'which the diſciples publiſhed.' Again: 'Moreover 'Luke was not an apoſtle, but apoſtolical; not a maſter, 'but a diſciple: certainly leſs than his maſter, certainly ſo 'much later, as he is a follower of Paul, the laſt of the 'apoſtles.' This likewiſe ſhows Tertullian's notion of St. Luke's character.

Origen mentions the goſpels in the order now generally received. 'The [k] third, ſays he, is that according to Luke, 'the goſpel commended by Paul, publiſhed for the ſake of 'the gentile converts.' In his commentary upon the epiſtle to the Romans, which we now have in a Latin verſion only, he ſays, upon ch. xvi. 21. 'Some [l] ſay Lucius is Lucas the 'evangeliſt, as indeed it is not uncommon to write names 'ſometimes according to the original form, ſometimes accord- 'ing to the Greek or Roman termination.' Lucius, mentioned in that text of the epiſtle to the Romans, muſt have been a Jew. Nevertheleſs, as Origen aſſures us, ſome thought him to be Luke the evangeliſt. The ſame obſervation we ſaw in [m] Sedulius, who wrote a commentary upon St. Paul's epiſtles, collected out of Origen and others.

Euſebius of Cæſarea, as tranſcribed formerly, ſpeaking of St. Paul's fellow-labourers, ſays, 'And [n] Luke, who 'was of Antioch, and by profeſſion a phyſician, for the moſt 'part a companion of Paul, who had likewiſe a more than 'ſlight acquaintance with the reſt of the apoſtles, has left us in 'two books, divinely inſpired, evidences of the art of heal- 'ing ſouls, which he had learned from them. One of theſe 'is the goſpel which he profeſſeth to have written, as they 'delivered it to him, *who from the beginning were eye-witneſſes* '*and miniſters of the word:* with all whom, he ſays likewiſe, 'he had been perfectly acquainted from the very firſt. The 'other is the Acts of the apoſtles, which he compoſed now, 'not from what he had received by the report of others, but

[h] p. 258.
[i] p. 261.
[k] p. 466.
[l] Sed et Lucium quidam perhibent eſſe Lucam Evangeliſtam, qui Evangelium ſcripſit, pro eo quod ſoleant nomina interdum ſecundum patriam declinationem, interdum Græcam Romanamque proferri. In Rom. T. 2. p. 632. Baſil. 1571.
[m] Vol. V. p. 232.
[n] Vol. IV. p. 230.

'from

'from what he had ſeen with his own eyes.' And in another place, cited [o] alſo formerly, he obſerves, 'that [p] Luke had 'delivered in his goſpel a certain account of ſuch things, as 'he had been well aſſured of by his intimate acquaintance 'and familiarity with Paul, and his converſation with the 'other apoſtles.' From all which, I think it appears that Euſebius did not take Luke for a diſciple of Chriſt, but of apoſtles only.

In the Synopſis, aſcribed to Athanaſius, it is ſaid, 'that 'the goſpel of Luke was dictated by the apoſtle Paul, and 'written and publiſhed by the bleſſed apoſtle and phyſician 'Luke.'

The author of the Dialogue againſt the Marcionites, ſays, 'that [r] Mark and Luke were diſciples of Chriſt, and of the number of the ſeventy.'

Epiphanius [s] ſpeaks to the like purpoſe.

Gregory Nazianzen ſays, 'that [t] Luke wrote for the Greeks,' or in Achaia.

Gregory Nyſſen ſays, 'that [u] Luke was as much a phyſician for the ſoul as for the body:' taking him to be the ſame that is mentioned Col. iv. 14.

In the catalogue of Ebedjeſu is ſaid, 'that [x] Luke taught and wrote at Alexandria, in the Greek language.'

The author of the Commentary upon St. Paul's thirteen epiſtles ſeems to have doubted whether [y] the evangeliſt Luke be the perſon intended Col. iv. 14.

Jerom agrees very much with Euſebius, already tranſcribed: nevertheleſs I ſhall put down here ſomewhat largely what he ſays. 'Luke, [z] a phyſician of Antioch, not 'unſkilful in the Greek language, a diſciple of the apoſtle 'Paul, and the conſtant companion of his travels, wrote a goſ-'pel,—and another excellent volume, entitled the Acts of the 'Apoſtles. . . . It is ſuppoſed that Luke did not learn his 'goſpel from the apoſtle Paul only, who had not converſed 'with the Lord in the fleſh, but alſo from other apoſtles:

[o] p. 227.

[p] . . . Τον ασφαλη λογον ων αυτος ικα-[illegible] [illegible] αλεθειαν κατειληφει, εκ της αμα [illegible] [illegible], τε και διατριβης, και [illegible] [illegible] αποστολων ομιλιας ωφελη-[illegible] [illegible] τε ιδιε παρεδωκεν ευαγγελιε. H. E. l. 3. c. 24. p. 96. c.

[q] Vol. IV. p. 293.

[r] p. 295.

[s] p. 314.

[t] p. 408.

[u] p. 416.

[x] p. 439.

[y] p. 498.

[z] Vol. V. p. 38, 39.

'which

'which likewiſe he owns at the beginning of his volume, 'ſaying, *Even as they delivered them unto us, who from the 'beginning were eye-witneſſes and miniſters of the word.* There- 'fore he wrote the goſpel from the information of others: 'but the Acts he compoſed from his own knowledge.' So writes Jerom in his book of illuſtrious men.

In the prologue to his Commentary upon St. Matthew, he ſays, 'The [a] third evangeliſt is Luke, the phyſician, a 'Syrian of Antioch, who was a diſciple of the apoſtle Paul, 'and publiſhed his goſpel in the countries of Achaia and 'Bæotia.'

He obſerves elſewhere, 'that [b] ſome ſaid Luke had been 'a proſelyte to Judaiſm, before his converſion to Chriſti- 'anity.' He ſpeaks of St. Luke in many other places, which 'I need not now take notice of.

Auguſtine ſays, 'that [c] two of the evangeliſts, Matthew 'and John, were apoſtles . . . Mark and Luke diſciples of 'apoſtles.'

Chryſoſtom in the Synopſis, probably his, ſays, 'Two '[d] of the goſpels were written by John and Matthew, 'Chriſt's diſciples, the other two by Luke and Mark, of 'whom one was diſciple of Peter, the other of Paul. The 'former converſed with Chriſt, and were eye-witneſſes of 'what they wrote: the other two wrote what they had re- 'ceived from eye-witneſſes.' And to the like purpoſe in [e] his firſt homily upon St. Matthew. Again, he ſays, 'Luke [f] had the fluency of Paul, Mark the conciſeneſs of Peter, both learning of their maſters.' And upon Col. iv. 14, he ſays, this [g] is the evangeliſt.

Upon Col. iv. 14. Theodoret ſays, 'this [h] perſon wrote the divine goſpel, and the hiſtory of the Acts.' He ſays the ſame upon [i] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

Paulinus [m] celebrates Luke, as having been firſt a phyſician of the body, then of the ſoul.

Here I would refer to the author of Quæſtiones et Reſponſiones, probably written in the fifth century, who

[a] p. 35.
[b] p. 40.
[c] p. 93.
[d] p. 126.
[e] p. 127, 128, and ſee 131.
[f] p. 130.
[g] Οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ εὐαγγελιστης. In Col. hom. 12. T. XI. p. 412.
[h] See vol. V. p. 193. note *(a.)*
[i] In 2 Tim. T. III. p. 505.
[m] Vol. V. p. 177.

reckons

reckons both [n] the evangelists, writers of the genealogies, that is, Matthew and Luke, to have been Hebrews.

According to Euthalius,[o] Luke was a disciple of Paul, and a physician of Antioch.

Isidore of Seville, says, "of [p] the four evangelists, the first 'and last relate what they had heard Christ say, or had seen 'him perform. The other two, placed between them, 'relate those things, which they had learned from apostles. 'Matthew wrote his gospel first in Judea; then Mark in 'Italy; Luke the third, in Achaia; John the last, in Asia.' In another place, he says, 'Of [q] all the evangelists Luke, 'the third in order, is reckoned to have been the most skil-'ful in the Greek tongue. For he was a physician, and 'wrote his gospel in Greece.'

In Theophylact are these things. In his preface to St. Matthew's gospel he says, 'that [r] there are four evangelists, 'two of which, Matthew and John, were of the choir of the 'twelve apostles: the other two, Mark and Luke, were of 'the number of the seventy. Mark was a disciple and com-'panion of Peter, Luke of Paul.... Luke wrote fifteen 'years after Christ's ascension.' In the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke he says, 'that [s] from that intro-'duction it appears, Luke was not from the beginning a 'disciple, but only afterwards. For others were disciples 'from the beginning, as Peter, and the sons of Zebedee, 'who delivered to him the things which they had seen or 'heard.' Upon which some remarks were made by us in the place referred to. In his comment upon the history of the two disciples, whom Jesus met in the way to Emmaus, one of whom is said to be Cleopas. Luke xxiv. 18. Theophylact says: 'Some [t] have thought the other to be Luke 'the evangelist, who out of modesty declined to mention 'himself.' In his preface to the Acts Theophylact says: 'The [u] writer is Luke, native of Antioch, by profession a 'physician.'

Euthymius says: 'Luke [x] was a native of Antioch, and 'a physician. He was a hearer of Christ, and, as some say, 'one of his seventy disciples, as well as Mark. He was

[n] See vol. II. p. 119.
[o] Vol. V. p. 243.
[p] p. 306.
[q] p. 307.
[r] p. 326, 327.
[s] p. 327.
[t] p. 328.
[u] p. 329.
[x] p. 333, 334.

'afterwards

'afterwards very intimate with Paul. He wrote his goſpel, 'with Paul's permiſſion, fifteen years after our Lord's 'aſcenſion.'

So Euthymius. But I ſhould think, that very few, who ſuppoſed Luke to have been a native of Antioch, could likewiſe reckon him a hearer of Jeſus Chriſt. But Euthymius, as it ſeems, puts together every thing he had heard or read, without judgment or diſcrimination.

What Nicephorus Calliſti ſays, is, briefly, to this purpoſe. 'Two [y] only of the twelve, Matthew and John left memoirs 'of our Lord's life on earth: and two of the ſeventy, Mark 'and Luke. . . . Matthew wrote about fifteen years after our 'Saviour's aſcenſion. Long after that Mark and Luke 'publiſhed their goſpels by the direction of Peter and Paul. 'The ſame Luke compoſed alſo the book of the Acts of 'the apoſtles.'

To theſe authors I now add Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, in the tenth century, who ſays, 'In [z] the time of the 'ſame emperor, (that is, Nero) Luke wrote his goſpel in 'Greek to a notable and wiſe man of the Romans, whoſe 'name was Theophilus: to whom alſo he wrote the Acts, 'or the hiſtory of the diſciples. The evangeliſt Luke was 'a companion of the apoſtle Paul, going with him wherever 'he went. For which reaſon the apoſtle Paul in one of his 'epiſtles ſays: *Luke, the phyſician, ſalutes you.*'

III. Having thus recited the teſtimonies of all theſe writers concerning the evangeliſt Luke, I ſhall now make ſome remarks.

1. We hence perceive, that the notion, that St. Luke was a painter, is without foundation, no notice having been taken of it in theſe ancient writers. Indeed this is ſaid by one of our [a] authors, Nicephorus Calliſti, in the fourteenth century, from whom a paſſage was quoted in the way of a ſummary concluſion. But we do not rely upon him for any thing not confirmed by other writers, more ancient, and of

[y] p. 335, 336.

[z] Etiam tempore hujus Imperatoris ſcripſit Lucas Evangelium ſuum Græce, ad virum nobilem ex ſapientibus Romanis, cui nomen Theophilus, ad quem item ſcripſit Acta ſeu Diſcipulorum hiſtoriam. Erat autem Lucas Evangeliſta comes Pauli Apoſtoli, quocumque per aliquod tempus manſit. Unde eſt, quod Paulus Apoſtolus in quadam epiſtola ſua dicit. Lucas Medicus vos ſalutat. Eutych. Annal. p. 335, 336.

[a] . . . ακριως δε την ζωγραφην τεχνην εξεπισαμενος. Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. T. I. p. 210.

better

better credit. Nor is this account received by [b] Tillemont, or [c] Du Pin, but rejected by them, as altogether fabulous, especially the latter; though our Dr. Cave [d] was somewhat inclined to admit one testimony to this affair, whilst he rejected the rest. For a farther account of St. Luke's pretended pictures of the Virgin Mary I refer to [e] Mr. Bower.

2. We learn also, what judgment ought to be formed of the account given of St. Luke by [f] Hugo Grotius, and [g] J. J. Wetstein: which is, that he was a Syrian and a slave, either at Rome, or in Greece: and that having obtained his freedom, he returned to his native place, Antioch; where he became a Jewish proselyte, and then a Christian. Which those learned interpreters endeavour to make out in a somewhat different manner. But neither has alleged any ancient writer, saying, that the evangelist Luke was once a slave, and afterwards became a free-man. Some slaves indeed

[b] Saint Luc. Mem. Ec. T. II.

[c] Nicephore et les nouveaux Grecs le font Peintre. Et il y a en differens endroits des images de la Vierge, qu'on donne pour l'ouvrage de S. Luc. Ce sont des fictions, qui n'ont ni verité ni apparence. Du Pin Diss. I. 2. ch. 2. § 5.

[d] Of more authority with me would be an ancient inscription, found in a vault near the church of S. Mary in via lata at Rome, supposed to be the place, where S. Paul dwelt: wherein mention is made of a picture of the B. Virgin. Una ex vii. a B. Luca depictis: one of the seven painted by St. Luke. Cave's Lives of the Apostles, in English, p. 222.

[e] See his Lives of the Popes, vol. III. p. 205, 206.

[f] Nostro autem nomen quidem Romanum fuisse arbitror, sed aliquanto longius.... Quare et Lucas, si quid video, contractum est ex Romano nomine, quod suspicor fuisse Lucillium. Nam ea gens tum Romæ florebat.... Erat noster hic Syrus, ut veteres consentiunt, et medicinam fecit.... Syria autem multos Romanis servos exhibebat. Et medicina, ut ex Plinio atque aliis discimus, munus erat servile. Manumissi autem nomen patroni induebant, ut Comædiarum scriptor, Afer cum esset, dictus est a patrono Terentio Terentius.... Ita hic a Lucillio Lucillius, et contracte Λουκας. Credibile est, cum Romæ medicinam factitasset aliquamdiu, acceptâ libertate, rediisse in patriam, &c. Grot. Pr. in S. Lucam.

[g] Exercuisse medicinam Paulus ad Colossenses testatur, Eusebius autem et Hieronymus addunt fuisse natione Syrum Antiochenum.... Interpretes porro conjectura probabili, tum ex nomine, tum ex arte quam profitebatur, colligunt, fuisse servum manumissum. Observant enim primo, nomen ejus in compendium fuisse redactum, ut pro Lucillio vel Lucano vocaretur Lucas.... Observant secundo, servos et præcipue Syros medicinam factitasse.... Quod vero quidam existimant, eum Romæ servuisse, et a domino, qui ipsum manumiserit, nomine Lucam appellatum fuisse, non satis certum videtur. Nam præter familiam Lucilliam, quæ Romana fuit, etiam Græcis illud nomen fuit impositum, ut ex Anthologia constat. Wetst. Pr. ad Luc. T. I. p. 643.

were ſkilful in the art of medicine, and practiſed it in the families of their Roman maſters. But does it follow, that becauſe Luke was a phyſician, that he was alſo a ſlave? This therefore being entirely deſtitute of foundation in antiquity muſt be eſteemed the fiction of ſome learned critic, who was much delighted with his own ingenious ſpeculations.

3. The account given of this evangeliſt by Euſebius, and Jerom after him, that he was a Syrian, and native of Antioch, may be juſtly ſuſpected. We do not find it in Irenæus, nor Clement of Alexandria, nor Tertullian, nor Origen, nor in any other writer before Euſebius. Probably, therefore, it is not founded in any general, or well atteſted tradition: but was the invention of ſome conjectural critic, who having firſt imagined, out of his own head, that Luke was originally a gentile, at length determined, that he was converted by Paul at Antioch. But all this was taken up without any good ground, or ſufficient authority: and Luke may have been a believer, before either Paul or Barnabas went to Antioch. The ſame account is in Jerom: but he only follows Euſebius. He does not ſeem to have had any information about it from any others: which is an argument, that there was not any early tradition to this purpoſe.

This ſtory, I ſay, is in Euſebius, and Jerom, and ſome others after them, but not in all ſucceeding writers. Some of the ancients, as Epiphanius, and others, ſuppoſed Luke to have been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples; which is inconſiſtent with his being a native of Antioch. If any did not ſee this inconſiſtency, and allowed both, it muſt have been owing to want of due attention and conſideration. And the ſuppoſition, made by ſome, that Luke was one of the ſeventy, ſhows, that there was no prevailing, and well atteſted tradition, that he was a native of Antioch. For if there had been any ſuch tradition, it is not eaſy to conceive, how any ſhould have held the opinion, that he was one of the ſeventy.

It was formerly obſerved, that [h] Chryſoſtom no where ſays in his remaining works, that Luke was of Antioch. Indeed, we [i] have loſt one of his homilies upon the title and beginning of the Acts of the apoſtles. Nevertheleſs it ſeems, that in ſome of his many homilies, ſtill remaining upon that book, or elſewhere, we ſhould have ſeen this particular, if it had

[h] Vol. V. p. 133. [i] p. 131.

been

been known to him. He takes notice, that [k] there might be ſeen in his time the houſe, in which Paul dwelled at Antioch. And he often ſpeaks of the prerogatives of that city, in his homilies preached there. Methinks this alſo ſhould have been mentioned as one: that Luke, whom (as is well known) he often celebrates, was a native of that city. If this had been then known, or generally believed, it is reaſonable to expect, that it ſhould have been frequently mentioned by Chryſoſtom, a native and preſbyter of Antioch, who ſhined there as a preacher twelve years. This has diſpoſed me to think, that in his time there was not at Antioch any prevailing tradition to this purpoſe.

Cave ſays, it [l] is likely, that Luke was converted by Paul at Antioch. Mill [m] ſays the ſame, rather more poſitively: which may now be the opinion of many. I have gueſſed, that it might be the opinion of the perſon, who firſt gave riſe to the account, that Luke was a Syrian, of Antioch, mentioned in Euſebius. But I do not remember, that this is expreſsly ſaid by any of the ancient writers, out of whom I have made ſo large collections in the preceding volumes; and the thing is altogether unlikely. If Luke had been a gentile, converted by Paul, he would have been always uncircumciſed, and unfit to accompany Paul, as he did. For the apoſtle would not have allowed the Greeks, or gentiles, of Antioch, or any other place, to receive that rite. Nor are there in the Acts, or Paul's epiſtles, any hints that Luke was his convert. Whereas, if he had been ſo, there [n] would have appeared ſome tokens of it in the affectionate expreſſions of Paul toward him on the one hand, or in the reſpectful and grateful expreſſions of Luke toward Paul on the other hand.

[k] p. 150.

[l] . . a D Paulo, dum Antiochiæ ageret, (uti veriſimile eſt) converſus. Hiſt. Lit. T. I. p. 25.

[m] Scriptor operi huic ſuſcipiendo, ſi quis unquam, ſumme idoneus: utpote qui ab ipſo tempore converſionis, quæ contigit circa annum [illegible] vulgaris XLI. Ipſum enim [illegible] illis, qui magno numero Antiochiæ converſi ſunt, [Act. xi. 20] omnino adnumerârim. Prol. n. 112.

[n] This thought occured to Dr. Whitby, who in his preface to St. Luke's goſpel ſpeaks to this purpoſe: 'We are told, that Luke was 'converted by Paul at Thebes. 'Anſwer. But this we have only 'from Nicephorus. And it is the 'leſs credible, not only becauſe it 'comes to us ſo late: but alſo be'cauſe it appears not from any cre'dible author, that St. Paul ever 'was there. It is more probable 'from the ſilence of St. Luke, and 'St. Paul, who never calleth him 'his ſon, that he was a Chriſtian, 'or a believer, long before.'

4. It has been reckoned doubtful by divers learned men, whether the evangeliſt Luke was a phyſician.

This particular is different from the foregoing. Nor has it any connection with it. Luke may have been of Antioch, and not a phyſician. He may have been a phyſician, and not of Antioch. The queſtion is, whether Luke, the beloved phyſician, mentioned by St. Paul, Col. iv. 14. be the evangeliſt. Divers of the ancients, as we have ſeen, have ſuppoſed him there intended. Chryſoſtom's expreſſions are theſe: 'This [n] is the evangeliſt: but he does not diminiſh him by 'naming him ſo late; he extols him, as he does Epaphras. 'It is likely, that there were others called by that name.' This laſt particular, perhaps, may deſerve to be taken notice of. He affirms, that this is the evangeliſt; but he ſuppoſeth, that there were others of the ſame name.

That diſtinguiſhing character, beloved phyſician, not given to the apoſtle's companion, and fellow-labourer, in any other epiſtle, has induced divers learned and inquiſitive moderns, to doubt, whether one and the ſame perſon is intended. Among theſe are [o] Calvin, [p] Sam. Baſnage, [q] Dr. Heumann, whoſe obſervations and arguments I tranſcribe below. On the other hand [r] Eſtius, and [s] Mr. Jones, ſtrongly argue, that the

[n] Ὁυτος εστιν ο ευαγγελιστης . . . εικος ειναι και αλλας καλουμενους τω ονοματι τουτῳ. Chry. in Col. iv. hom. 12. T. XI. p. 412.

[o] Non aſſentior iis, qui Lucam Evangeliſtam intelligunt. Nam et notiorem fuiſſe judico, quam ut opus fuerit tali indicatione, et ſplendidiore elogio fuiſſet inſignitus. Certe coadjutorem ſuum, aut fidum ſaltem comitem, et certaminum participem vocaſſet. Potius conjicio, hunc abfuiſſe, et alterum medici epitheto ab illo diſcerni. Quamquam non contendo, ut de re certa, ſed tamen conjecturas affero. Calvin. in Col. iv. 14.

[p] Sunt tamen in Scripturâ Lucam Evangeliſtam a Luca Medico diſtinguendi cauſæ, &c. Baſnag. Ann. 60. n. xxxiii.

[q] Lucam Evangeliſtam fuiſſe Medicum, Hieronymus aliique probari poſſe creaunt ex Col. iv. 14. Sed ex hoc ipſo loco confirmari poſſe puto contrarium. Si enim iſto loco Paulus innuiſſet comitem ſuum omnibus notum, Lucam Evangeliſtam, ſimpliciter vocaſſet Lucam, uti fecit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. At ut ſignificaret, ſe de alio Luca loqui, diſcriminis cauſa addit ο ιατρος. C. A. Heuman. Ep. Miſc. T. II. p. 518.

[r] Sunt qui in dubium revocent, num de Luca Evangeliſta loquatur Apoſtolus. Hunc enim dicunt notiorem fuiſſe, quam ut artis nomine eum deſignaret. Ac ſaltem, inquiunt, eum coadjutorem ſuum, aut fidelem comitem vocaſſet. Verum, ut vetus et communis, ita probatiſſima ſententia eſt. . . . Lucam Evangeliſtam, Medicum fuiſſe, et eum ipſum, cujus hic mentio eſt: (neque enim alium Lucam Paulo familiarem ulla prodit hiſtoria) Quod vero tacuit hoc loco adjutorem, id diſerte expreſſit ad Philemonem ſcribens, *Demas et Lucas adjutores mei.*

Non

the ſame Luke is here intended, who is mentioned by St. Paul in ſome other epiſtles, even our evangeliſt.

Upon the whole it muſt be acknowledged, that this diſtinguiſhing character, *beloved phyſician*, has occaſioned a difficulty. Nevertheleſs, I would hope, that it is not inſuperable. It is allowed, that in all other places of St. Paul's epiſtles by Luke is intended the evangeliſt. We know from the book of the Acts, that Luke, the writer of it, went with Paul to Rome, and ſtayed with him to the end of his captivity there; nor is there any reaſon to ſurmiſe, that at the time of writing this epiſtle he might be abſent from the apoſtle upon ſome ſpecial occaſion: for he joins in the ſalutations in the epiſtle to Philemon of Coloſſe, ſent at the ſame time with this epiſtle to the Coloſſians, where alſo he is ſtyled a *fellow-labourer*. Philem. ver. 24. So that I cannot but think it probable, that Luke the evangeliſt was by profeſſion a phyſician.

5. St. Luke was a Jew by birth, at leaſt by religion.

None of the writers, out of whom we have made collections, call him a Gentile. Some, in Jerom's time; whoſe names we do not know, ſaid, Luke had been a Jewiſh proſelyte, that is, had been converted from Gentiliſm to Judaiſm, and afterwards became a Chriſtian: but none, that I remember, expreſsly ſay that he was converted from Gentiliſm to Chriſtianity; unleſs we ſhould make an exception for Nicephorus Calliſti, who in one place ſays ſo. But he is too late, and of too little credit to be much regarded: eſpecially if he be ſingular. All our writers, who ſpeak of Luke as a companion and diſciple of apoſtles, muſt have ſuppoſed him to be a Jew: and ſome have ſaid that he was one of the ſeventy, as we have ſeen.

That Luke was a Jew by birth, or at leaſt by religion, may be argued from his being a conſtant companion of Paul in many places, particularly at Jeruſalem. If Luke had been an uncircumciſed gentile, ſome exceptions would have been made to him. Nevertheleſs nothing of that kind appears either in St. Paul's epiſtles or in the Acts. Another thing

Non enim putavit Apoſtolus rem latis notam ubique inculcandam eſſe. Ubi illud obſervandum eſt, Apoſtolum aſſidue Lucam cum Dema nominare, tam hoc loco, et ad Philemonem, quam etiam in ſecunda ad Tim. epiſt. cap. iv. Quis ergo dixerit, alium atque alium eſſe Lucam cum eodem Dema nominatum? Com. in Col. iv. 14.

[s] See Mr. Jones's New and Full Method, vol. III. p. 103, 104.

leading to this ſuppoſition is his [t] following the Jewiſh computations of times: ſuch as the paſſover, pentecoſt, the faſt. Of all which inſtances may be ſeen in Acts xii. 3. xx. 6 and 16. xxvii. 9.

Here it will be objected, that *Luke the phyſician*, mentioned Col. iv. 14. muſt have been a gentile, becauſe at ver. 10, 11. the appoſtle had mentioned *all thoſe of the circumciſion, who were his fellow-workers, and had been a comfort to him.* To which I anſwer. It is not certain, that Luke, the evangeliſt, is the *beloved phyſician*, there ſpoken of: we juſt now ſaw the reaſons of doubting about it. But there is another ſolution. St. Paul [u] needs not to be underſtood to ſpeak abſolutely: there might be ſeveral exceptions to that propoſition. Timothy was one, who joins with the apoſtle in ſending the epiſtle: but he and Luke were ſo well known to all, as faithful to the apoſtle, that they needed not to be there mentioned. And Luke and Demas follow afterwards, ſomewhat lower, nearer the end of the epiſtle, very properly, ver. 14, *Luke the beloved phyſician, and Demas greet you.* And I ſhould be unwilling from this text, and the coherence, to conclude, that Demas was a gentile. Says the apoſtle: Philem. ver. 24. *There ſalute thee Marcus, Ariſtarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers.* The two firſt named were certainly Jews: I ſuppoſe, the other two were ſo likewiſe. Salutations from believers, of the Jewiſh people, would be very acceptable and encouraging to gentile converts.

St. Luke ſays, Acts i. 19, *inſomuch as that field was called in their proper tongue Aceldama:* whence ſome may argue, that he was not a Jew. But it might be obſerved, that none of the evangeliſts, when they ſpeak of the Jews, ſay any thing, to denote they were of that people. Says St. Matthew ch. xxviii. 15. *And this ſaying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.* Mark vii. 3. *For the Phariſees, and all the Jews, except they waſh their hands, eat not.* John i. 19. *The Jews ſent prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem,* ch. v. 1. *After this there was a feaſt of the Jews.* See alſo ch. xix. 40—42. And does not St. Paul ſay 1 Theſſ. ii. 14, 15. *Ye became followers*

[t] Quis vero cum veri ſpecie aliqua Lucam Evangeliſtam unum ex Judæis fuiſſe neget? Lucam qui in deſignandis temporibus Judæorum diligentiam adhibet, Pentecoſtem feſtiet, jejunium, tertiam noctis vigiliam. Quæ omnia ex Judaico more petuntur. Baſnag. An. 60. n. xxxiii.

[u] Adde, quod iſte ſermo, hi ſoli, non eſt ita rigide accipiendus, ut abſolute excludat omnes alios, ſed benigno ſenſu: hi fere ſoli ſunt adjutores. Eſt. ad iv. Col. 11.

of

of the churches of God in Judea. For ye alſo have ſuffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they of the Jews: who both killed the Lord Jeſus, and their own prophets. It might be not amiſs to obſerve alſo Acts xxviii. 17—91. And I might refer to other places.

That this evangeliſt was a Jew, is the opinion of many learned and judicious moderns; particularly Mr. S. Baſnage, whom I have cited at note (t) and J. A. Fabricius, who * likewiſe is clearly of the ſame opinion. Indeed I think it ought not to be queſtioned.

6. Luke the evangeliſt was probably an early Jewiſh believer, ſoon after Chriſt's aſcenſion, if not a hearer of Chriſt, and one of the ſeventy diſciples.

Our moſt ancient writers, as we have ſeen, ſpeak of Luke as a diſciple of the apoſtles. Some have reckoned him one of the ſeventy, others have thought him to be Lucius, mentioned by St. Paul in the epiſtle to the Romans, and others have ſuppoſed that he was one of the two diſciples that met Jeſus in the way to Emmaus.

The large accounts which Luke has given in the book of the Acts of ſeveral below the rank of apoſtles, has made me think, that he was one of the ſame rank, and poſſibly one of them. There are three inſtances of this kind. The firſt is Stephen, one of the ſeven deacons, who, as we learn, *was full of faith and power, and did great wonders and miracles among the people:* againſt whom there aroſe a ſtrong oppoſition, ſo that he was the very firſt martyr for Chriſt and his doctrine, and of whom St. Luke has recorded a long diſcourſe before the Jewiſh council, ch. vii. The ſecond is Philip, another of the ſeven, of whom St. Luke writes, that he firſt preached Chriſt to the Samaritans. ch. viii. 5—8. *ſo that the people with one accord gave heed to thoſe things which Philip ſpake, hearing and ſeeing the miracles which he did*; and what follows. The ſame Philip afterwards, having firſt explained the ſcriptures to him, and brought him to ſincere faith in Jeſus as the Chriſt, baptized the chamberlain and treaſurer of the queen of Ethiopia, a Jewiſh proſelyte, and a man of great diſtinction. ver. 26—40. The third inſtance of this kind is

* Lucas, ſive Lucius, . . . incertum, num idem cum Luca Medico (Col. iv. 14 quin Judæus fuerit, at antequam Chriſto nomen daret, ne dubito quidem, præcipue ſi verum eſt quod legas in Origenis ſive Adamantii cujuſdam dialogis, adverſus Marcionitas, et Epiphanii LI. II. eum fuiſſe e numero LXX. diſcipulorum. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. v. T. III. p. 132.

that of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, *who travelled as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only.* Who ſoon after their coming to *Antioch, ſpake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jeſus. And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord,* ch. xi. 19—21. Theſe were the men who firſt preached to Gentiles out of Judea: as Peter was the firſt who preached to gentiles at the houſe of Cornelius in Cæſarea, ch. x. and not long before them. We have, as it ſeems, the names of three of thoſe men. Ch. xiii. 1. *Simeon, called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen.* The ſecond perſon here named may be our evangeliſt.

A like argument may be formed in favour of St. Luke's having been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, in that he, and he only of all the evangeliſts, has inſerted in his goſpel an account of the commiſſion which Chriſt gave unto them. ch. x. 1—20. And indeed ſome learned men of later times, as well as formerly, have been of opinion that Luke was one of the ſeventy. Among theſe is our Dr. Whitby, who [b] reckoned both Mark and Luke to have been of that number. J. A. Fabricius [c] was inclined to be of the ſame opinion. And in favour of it refers to the paſſages of Adamantius and Epiphanius, before taken notice of by us. This likewiſe was the ſentiment of [d] Mr. Baſnage.

Dr. C. A. Heumann has lately publiſhed a diſſertation concerning Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, containing many curious obſervations: and he ſuppoſeth that * theſe ſeveral following were of that number. Matthias, choſen in the room of the traitor, Joſeph, called Barſabas, ſurnamed Juſtus, and probably the ſeven deacons, or however ſome of them, and the four teachers and prophets of Antioch, Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, whom he thinks to be our Luke the evangeliſt, and Manaen. Acts. xiii. 1. His argument is to this purpoſe. We have not in the goſpels the

[b] See his Preface to St. Luke's goſpel.

[c] . . . præcipue, ſi verum eſt, quod legas in Origenis ſeu Adamantii cujuſdam Dialogis adverſus Marcionitas, et Epiphanii H. LI. n. xi. Neque adeo repugnat et Lucam et Marcum ex illis fuiſſe, licet Veteres miro conſenſu, ut Marcum Petri, ita Lucam tradunt Pauli fuiſſe interpretem et ſectatorem. Haud dubie enim Apoſtolorum etiam præ LXX. illis magna prærogativa erat, &c. Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. v. T. III. p. 133.

[d] Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

* Diſſertatio de Septuaginta Chriſti Legatis. ap. Nov. Syllog. Diſſertat. part. I. p. 120—154.

names

names of thoſe diſciples; nor did Chriſt form a college or company of them, as he did of the twelve, becauſe it was a temporary office, which ſubſiſted for a ſhort time only. They were but once ſent forth; and when they were returned their commiſſion was at an end. Nevertheleſs they hereby became qualified for public ſervice: and it may be reckoned very probable, that if an opportunity was afforded, they would be very willing, after Chriſt's aſcenſion, to exert themſelves in his cauſe. And it is very likely that ſome of theſe ſeventy were choſen, and employed by the apoſtles as men who had been already exerciſed in the ſervice of the goſpel, and were thereby fitted for farther uſefulneſs.

So that learned writer. And it muſt be acknowledged, that this is a ſpecious argument: but it is rather founded in an ingenious ſpeculation, than in the authority of teſtimony; which, in this caſe, would be more valuable.

Indeed Epiphanius, beſide the places [e] formerly alleged, where he ſays, Mark and Luke were of the ſeventy, has another, where [f] he mentions a great many, who were ſaid to be of that number: as the ſeven deacons, all whom he mentions by name, and alſo Matthias, Mark, Luke, Juſtus, Barnabas, Apelles, Rufus, Niger. And therefore, we cannot deny, that in the time of Epiphanius there were ſome, who entertained an opinion, that all theſe were of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. Nevertheleſs we do not find it in Irenæus, or Clement of Alexandria, or Origen, or any others of the higheſt antiquity, and beſt credit: nor in Euſebius, or Jerom, that I remember, who were acquainted with the writings of thoſe ancient authors, and many others, which are not come to us. Euſebius has a chapter concerning the diſciples of our Saviour: he ſays, the names of Chriſt's twelve apoſtles were well known; but [g] there was no where any catalogue of the ſeventy. However, he mentions Barnabas, Matthias, and the diſciple put up with him, and one or two more, who were ſaid to be of the ſeventy: but he takes not here any notice of Mark, or Luke, or of any of the ſeven deacons.

Matthias and Barſabas certainly were ſuch men, as are deſcribed Acts i. 21, 22. and they may have been of the ſeventy: but we cannot be certain, becauſe we have not been

[e] Har. LI. num. vi. xi.
[f] H. 20. num. iv.
[g] Τῶν δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν κατάλογος μὲν οὐδεὶς οὐδαμῆ φέρεται. H. E. l. i. c. 12.

assured

aſſured of it by any accounts, that demand full aſſent. Some of the ſeven deacons may have been of the ſeventy, as Stephen and Philip; but we do not know, that they were. It is very probable, that all thoſe deacons were not of the ſeventy, particularly, Nicolas, a proſelyte, of Antioch. If Luke, the evangeliſt, be the ſame as Lucius, of Cyrene, there ariſeth a ſtrong objection againſt his having been one of the ſeventy. Simeon, called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned, Acts xiii. 1. and *the men of Cyprus and Cyrene*, (of whom thoſe two juſt mentioned, were a part) were early believers, after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and they may have heard and ſeen the Lord in perſon: but they cannot be well ſuppoſed to have been of the ſeventy. Chriſt's twelve apoſtles were of Galilee: it is likely, that the ſeventy alſo were of the ſame country, or near it. Chriſt ſent them forth from him, to go over the land of Iſrael, and to return to him in a ſhort time, where he ſhould be: and his uſual reſidence was in Galilee. It does not appear to me at all probable, that our Lord put into that commiſſion any men, who were born, and uſually reſided abroad, in other countries, out of the land of Iſrael.

Hitherto, then, we have not any full proof, that our evangeliſt was one of the ſeventy. Let us proceed.

St. Luke ch. xxiv. 13—34. relates how two diſciples met Jeſus after his reſurrection, as they were going to Emmaus. And he ſays, that the name of one of them was Cleopas. Theophylact in his comment upon this place, as [h] formerly ſhown, obſerves: 'Some [i] ſay, that one of theſe two was Luke 'himſelf: but that the evangeliſt concealed his own name.' Nicephorus Calliſti [k] in one place, makes no doubt, that Luke was the other diſciple not named. It is likely, that he had met with it in more ancient writers. Sam. Baſnage [l] readily declares himſelf of the ſame opinion. Indeed, I think, it has

[h] Vol. V. p. 328.

[i] Τινες τον ενα τουτων των δυο αυτον τον λουκαν ειναι φασι· διο και αποκρυψε το εαυτου ονομα ο ευαγγελιστης. Theoph. in Luc. cap. xxiv. p. 539.

[k] Τοις περι λεκτιν και κλεοπαν την οδον παριουσι γνωριζεται, προς εσπεραν εις δειπνον αυτους συγκατακλιθεις. Niceph. l. i. c. 34. p. 117.

[l] Nulla ſane magis idonea ratio obſervatur animo, cur Cleopæ, non alterius, Lucas meminerit: quomodo Joannes, ubi de ſe mentionem agitat, nomen diſſimulat ſuum. Si de grege Apoſtolorum fuiſſent, aut virorum multa laude in Evangelio celebratorum, uti Nathanæl, quod Epiphanio viſum, iterum atque iterum dicemus, tam ejus quam Cleopæ nomen fœneraſſet. Ann. 33. num. CL.

a great

a great appearance of probability. It is much more likely, than the tradition, or interpretation in Epiphanius that [m] it was Nathanael. The ſame Baſnage ſays, that if Nathanael had been the other, St. Luke would have named him.

St. Mark, ch. xvi. 12, 13. has a like account, but briefer, of two, to whom Chriſt appeared as *they were walking into the country*. He does not name either of them. Grotius [n] allows that Mark's and Luke's hiſtories are of the ſame perſons. Both the evangeliſts ſpeak of theſe as two of them. They were not of the twelve, but yet they were of their company, ſuch as had been with Jeſus; as is allowed by [o] Grotius, and [p] Beza. Nevertheleſs they ſay that [q] Luke is not the other. He is excluded, as they ſay, by the tenour of his introductions both to his goſpel, and the Acts. Their reaſonings will be conſidered preſently.

However, ſuppoſing Luke to be the perſon here intended, I do not think that he is thereby ſhown to be one of the ſeventy. Cleopas and the other were diſciples of Chriſt and eye-witneſſes: but it does therefore follow that they were of the number of the ſeventy.

We proceed. Among the ſalutations in the epiſtle to the Romans are theſe, ch. xvi. 20. *Timothy my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jaſon, and Soſipater my kinſmen, ſalute you.* All theſe were Jewiſh believers, and the three laſt mentioned, as it ſeems, were the apoſtle's relations. That by Lucius ſome ſuppoſed the evangeliſt Luke to be intended, we have been informed by ſo ancient a writer as Origen. And it is very likely that St. Luke's name was written differently: Lucas, Lucius, and Lucanus. There is the more reaſon to think

[m] See vol. IV. p. 319.

[n] Quare immerito Euthymius hic aliam putat hiſtoriam indicari, quam eam, quæ a Luca copioſe deſcribitur. Grot. ad Marc. xvi. 12.

[o] . . . ἐστιν ἐκ αὐτων.] των μετα ιησε γενομενων, ut ſupra dixit, ver. 10. Nam hoc nomine etiam alii extra xii. cenſentur, præcipue qui de numero erant illorum ſeptuaginta. Grot. ad Marc. xvi. 11.

[p] Ex iis, ἐξ αὐτων, nempe diſcipulis, non autem ex Apoſtolis. Aliorum enim præter Apoſtolos mentio facta fuit præcedente verſu 9. Bez. in Luc. xxiv. 13.

[q] Alterum fuiſſe hunc noſtrum Lucam, quidam ex veteribus arbitrantur, quorum opinio refellitur ex præfatione Actis Apoſtolorum præpoſita. Bez. ad Luc. xxiv. 18.

Duo ex illis, nempe eorum, quos modo λοιπων, *cæterorum* nomine deſignarat, e ſectatoribus Chriſti. Probabiliter ſentiunt Veteres, fuiſſe hos de numero LXX. . . . Nomen alterius infra exprimit Lucas, Cleopam vocans. Alterum ipſum Lucam multi putârunt, quos ſatis ipſe refellit in Evangelii anteloquio, ab oculatis teſtibus ſe ſeparans. Grot. ad Luc. xxiv. 13.

that

that the evangeliſt is here intended, becauſe he muſt have been with the apoſtle at the time of writing the epiſtle to the Romans. Says Mr. Tillemont, 'Many [r] believe that St. Luke 'is he whom St. Paul in his epiſtle to the Romans calls Lu-'cius, making his name a little more Latin. And it is the 'more likely, inaſmuch as the Acts aſſure us, that St. Luke 'was then with St. Paul. If that be ſo, he was related to this 'apoſtle.' Grotius, who ſuppoſed our evangeliſt to have been of Antioch, taking notice of the above mentioned obſervation of Origen, ſays, that [s] Lucius in Rom. xvi. is the ſame as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned Acts xiii. 1.

Fabricius [t] eſteemed it ſomewhat probable that Lucius is the evangeliſt.

Dr. Heumann ſuppoſes [u] this Lucius to be St. Luke, and the ſame as Lucius of Cyrene, whom [x] he computes to be one of the ſeventy diſciples, as before ſeen.

Mr. Baſnage likewiſe argues very ſtrongly, that [y] Lucius is our evangeliſt.

[r] Mem. Ec. tom. II. S. Luc.

[s] Docet nos Origenes, in annotationibus epiſtolæ ad Romanos, fuiſſe qui crederent Lucium eum, qui in eadem epiſtola nominatur. xvi 21. eſſe hunc ipſum Lucam, et Lucium dici flexione Romana, Lucam Græca. Ego Lucium illum, cujus ibi meminit Paulus, puto non alium eſſe a Cyrenenſi, quem noſter hic nominat Actor. xiii. 1. Grot. Præf. ad Evang. S. Luc.

[t] Fuerunt enim jam olim, qui teſte Origene Lucam eundem putârunt cum Lucio, quem Paulus inter συγγενεις ſuos refert Rom. xvi. 21. Neque veriſimilitudine deſtituitur hæc ſententia. Fab. Bib. Gr. ubi ſupra. p. 132.

[u] Lucas non eſt verum, id eſt, pure expreſſum nomen Evangeliſtæ, ſed vel Lucanus, (quem in modum et ex Silvanus factum eſt Silas) vel Lucius. Ac perveriſimile eſt, Evangeliſtam noſtrum eſſe Lucium illum Cyrenæum, cujus fit mentio Act. xiii. 1. Quem nec diverſum eſſe credo ab illo Lucio, quem Paulus Rom. xvi. 21. vocat cognatum ſuum, ſimulque teſtatur, cum in ſuo comitatu fuiſſe. Heuman. Ep. Miſc. T. II. p. 519.

[x] Jure igitur credimus, et hos quatuor [Act. xiii. 1.] fuiſſe e ſeptuaginta illorum diſcipulorum numero. Jam inter hos ſi Lucius non eſt alius quam Lucas Evangeliſta, merito et Lucam noſtrum recenſemus inter ſeptuaginta illos diſcipulos. Diſſ. de LXX. Chriſti Legat. § 20. p. 149.

[y] Lucam Evangeliſtam Paulo conſanguineum fuiſſe veriſimilitudinis multum habet. Lucium ſane, cujus nomine Romanos ſalutat Apoſtolus, ex ipſius cognatis unus erat. Sunt vero non pertenues conjecturæ, quibus adducamur ad exiſtimandum unum eundemque virum cum Luca Lucium eſſe. Quæ antiqua ſane ſententia fuit, cujus meminit Origenes in Rom. xvi. . . . Silam quidem Paulus ipſe Silvanum vocat. Aderat etiam Paulo comes Lucas, cum miſſa eſt ad Romanos epiſtola, quem in ſalutatos præteriiſſe, prorſus fit incredibile: quod tamen factum fuiſſet, ſi Lucius eſt a Luca diverſus. Baſn. ann. 60. n. xxxiii.

Indeed

Indeed this opinion cannot be well ſaid to be deſtitute of probability: ſince there is a good deal of reaſon to think that Luke was in the apoſtle's company when he wrote the epiſtle to the Romans. And if Lucius be not he, no mention is made of him; which is very unlikely.

If this be our evangeliſt, we hence learn that he was a Jew, and related to the apoſtle. And if this be Lucius of Cyrene, we know his character, and, in part, his hiſtory, from Acts xi. 19—21. and xiii. 1—4. He was an early Jewiſh believer after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and together with others was very ſerviceable in early preaching the goſpel to Jews and Gentiles out of Judea. And, once more, if the other, who accompanied Cleopas in the way to Emmaus, be Luke the evangeliſt, he was a diſciple and eye-witneſs of Jeſus Chriſt: but I do not ſay one of the ſeventy.

Now we come to conſider the objection of Beza, Grotius, and divers others: who have ſuppoſed, that St. Luke, in the introduction to his goſpel excludes himſelf from the number of eye-witneſſes. But though this has been a difficulty with many, there have been of late divers learned men, remarkable for inquiſitiveneſs and good judgment, who are not much moved by it. One of them is Dr. Whitby, in his preface to St. Luke's goſpel, already taken notice of by us. Another is [a] Fabricius, a third [a] Baſnage, the fourth Heumann: who in his forecited Diſſertation obſerves, that [b] St. Luke's introduction imports no more, than that he was not an eye-witneſs from the beginning, nor an apoſtle. But he may have been for ſome while a follower of Chriſt, very conſiſtently with what he there writes: and, probably, he was ſo. But he

[a] Neque obſtat porro, quod Lucas affirmat, ſe ea ſcribere, quæ acceperit ab illis, qui fuiſſent απ αρχης αυτοπται. Nam non de omnibus [illegible] hoc poterat, quod Act. i. 21. [illegible] ad Apoſtolum requiri- [illegible] Bib. Gr. T. III. p. 133.

[illegible] 60. num. xxviii.

[b] Repugnare quidem videri poſſit [illegible] Lucas cap. i. 2. ſcribens, ſe [illegible] accepiſſe α τοις απ αρχης [illegible]. Verum non ſe negat fu- [illegible], qui negat, ſe αυτοπτην απ αρχης fuiſſe. Concedimus itaque [illegible] initio ſtatim, uti Apoſtoles, quos υπηρετας του λογου appellat, interfuiſſe rebus a Chriſto geſtis Lucam. Sed aliquo jam tempore functo ſuo munere Meſſiæ ſe applicuiſſe Lucam, et poſtea ſemper in ejus comitatu fuiſſe, quo minus credamus, hoc ipſius teſtimonium minime impedit. Accedit, quod modeſtiæ erat, Apoſtolorum potius, quam ſuum ipſius teſtimonium commendare, jubereque lectores, ſi forte ſibi crediturі ſint ægrius, fidem habere Apoſtolis, teſtibus nulli obnoxiis exceptioni Heum. Diſſ. ib. num. xx.

very

very fitly puts the credit and authority of his history upon the testimony of the apostles.

I shall likewise transcribe below a passage of Petavius [c] from his animadversions upon Epiphanius, though it be somewhat long. I do it the rather, because he is an older author than any of those hitherto cited in behalf of this interpretation. He is considering what Epiphanius says of Luke's being one of Christ's seventy disciples. The sum of what he advanceth is to this purpose: 'He dares not affirm, that Luke was a 'disciple of Christ, because many of the fathers have thought 'otherwise. But he says, there is nothing in St. Luke's in-'troduction to induce us to think, he was not a disciple of 'Christ, or that he had not seen a large part of the things 'related by him: but rather the contrary. And he was wil-'ling to show, that Epiphanius is not contradicted by St. 'Luke himself.'

7. St. Luke was for a good while a constant companion of St. Paul. But he was also acquainted with other apostles.

Tertullian and Chrysostom, as we have seen, call St. Paul Luke's master. But they need not be understood to intend that Luke learned nothing from other apostles. So Irenæus said: 'Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel that had been preached by Paul.' But in another place he says, 'That * Luke was a fellow-labourer of the

[c] Quod Lucas & discipulorum numero fuerit, asserit et Dorotheus in Synopsi . . . Sed contra sentiunt plerique, et id ex ipsis Lucæ verbis colligunt, cum ait: Ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ . . . Sed tantum abest, ut hæc discipulum Christi fuisse, ac non pleraque, cum ab eo gererentur, oculis usurpasse negent, ut contrarium potius hinc eluci possit. Verbum enim παρακολουθειν nonnunquam ad eam notitiam refertur, quæ oculis ipsis, ac propria intelligentia comparatur, non aliorum sermonibus. Ut cum Demosthenes εν τω περι παραπρεσβειας, de Æschine, cujus in legatione comes fuerat, sic loquitur: Και ο τοτε πνευματα ειδως, και παρηκολουθηκως απασι κατηγορω. Sic igitur Lucas ανωθεν παρηκολουθηκεναι πασιν ακριβως dicitur, hoc est, comperta, exploratague, ac spectata etiam, habuisse. Ac videri potest, et nonnulla hæc antithesis esse, ut cum superiore versu dixerit: Quemadmodum multi res a Christo gestas scribere aggressi sunt, καθως παρεδοσαν ημιν οι απ αρχης, statim subjiciat: Ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ παρηκολουθηκοτι, hoc est, qui non, ut illi εκ παραδοσεως, sed ex propria id scientia comperierim. Cæterum tametsi ad eum sensum accommodari Lucæ verba nihil prohibet, non idcirco tamen Christi discipulum fuisse certo pronunciare ausim: cum huic adversari sententiæ longe plures Patres intelligam. Sed ista commemoravi, ut ne Lucæ ipsi de se testanti refragari quisquam Epiphanium arbitretur. Petav. Animadv. in Epiphan. Hær. LI. num. xi. p. 89, 90.

* Quoniam non solum prosequutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit Apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli. Iren. l. 3. c. 14. n. 1. p. 201. b.

apostles,

apoſtles, eſpecially of Paul. And in another place he calls Luke** 'a follower and diſciple of the apoſtles. And Euſebius ſaid: 'Luke was for the moſt part a companion of Paul, 'but had alſo more than a ſlight acquaintance with the other 'apoſtles.' And Jerom ſays: 'It was ſuppoſed, that Luke 'did not learn his goſpel from the apoſtle Paul only, who 'had not converſed with the Lord in the fleſh, but alſo from 'other apoſtles. Which alſo he acknowledgeth at the be-'ginning of his volume, ſaying, *Even as they delivered them 'unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witneſſes of the word.*'

That muſt be right, I think, becauſe it is agreeable to the writer's own words in the introduction to his work. I always conſider Paul as an eye-witneſs: but he was not an eye-witneſs from the beginning; nor a miniſter of the word from the beginning. He muſt have had a diſtinct knowledge of all things concerning the Lord Jeſus. Chriſtianity, as has been often and juſtly ſaid, is founded in facts. In order to preach it, Paul muſt have had a knowledge of Chriſt's life, preaching, miracles, death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion. As he was not inſtructed by other apoſtles in the doctrine preached by him, he muſt have had it from revelation. And I ſuppoſe that a man, who, like Luke, often heard Paul preach, might have compoſed a goſpel or hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt from Paul's ſermon's, preached in divers places, and to men of all characters: and the ancients ſeem to have ſuppoſed that Luke had thereby great aſſiſtances for compoſing his goſpel; which I do not deny. Nevertheleſs it ſeems fairly to be concluded from his own introduction, that he had conſulted others alſo.

It might not be amiſs, if I had room for ſuch obſervations, to compare St. Luke's goſpel and the hiſtorical parts of St. Paul's epiſtles, and alſo of his diſcourſes recorded by Luke himſelf in the book of the Acts. It is reaſonable to think, that wherever any diſciples of Jeſus preached the chriſtian religion, they gave an account of the things concerning Chriſt. Wherever the apoſtles, or others, preached, in order to induce faith in Jeſus and his doctrine, their firſt diſcourſes muſt have been hiſtorical. The reaſon of the thing leads us to this; and we are aſſured of it from their diſcourſes, of which we have an account. We perceive this in the diſcourſes of St. Peter at Jeruſalem. Acts ii. 22—36. ch. iii. 12—16. ch. iv. 10.

** Lucas autem ſectator et diſcipulus Apoſtolorum. Ibid. cap. x. [al. xi.] in p. 189.

and

and at the houſe of Cornelius in Cæſarea, ch. x. 34—43. from Paul's diſcourſes in the ſynagogue at Antioch in Piſidia, Ch. xiii. 23—38. at Athens, ch. xvii. 31. at Corinth, ch. xix. 8. before the governor Feſtus, and king Agrippa, ch. xxvi. and at Rome: though then many years had paſſed, ſince the aſcenſion of Chriſt, and ſince his religion had begun to be preached, and propagated in the world. St. Luke's general account of Paul there is thus: *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*, ch. xxviii. 30, 31. 'That is, ſays [d] Grotius, his 'miracles, doctrine, death, reſurrection, and the miſſion of 'the ſpirit: by which things men were aſſured, that the hea-'venly kingdom was ſet up.' And this may have been the occaſion of the frequent uſe of thoſe expreſſions, *preaching Chriſt, and preaching Jeſus Chriſt*, as equivalent to preaching the chriſtian religion, or the doctrine of the goſpel.

I muſt own, that in the ſurvey of St. Luke's goſpel, and St. Paul's diſcourſes and epiſtles, I have not diſcerned any ſuch ſpecial agreement, as to be induced to think that one of them had copied the other.

St. Paul ſays, at Antioch in Piſidia, Acts xiii. 23. *Of this man's ſeed has God raiſed unto Iſrael a Saviour, Jeſus.* And 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember, that Jeſus Chriſt, of the ſeed of David, was raiſed from the dead, according to my goſpel.* Theſe things are agreeable to St. Luke's goſpel: but they are alſo in St. Matthew's; and muſt have been taught by all the apoſtles, and all preachers of the goſpel.

Acts xx. 35. *And to remember the words of the Lord Jeſus, how he ſaid, it is more bleſſed to give than to receive.* That ſaying of our Lord is not recorded by St. Luke in his goſpel, nor by any other of the evangeliſts.

1 Cor. xv. 5—7. *And that he was ſeen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that he was ſeen of above five hundred brethren at once . . . After that he was ſeen of James, then of all the apoſtles.* St. Luke's account of our Saviour's appearances after his reſurrection are in ch. xxiv. and Acts i. 1—12. And if they are obſerved, I ſuppoſe that no remarkable agreement between Paul and Luke will be diſcerned, but rather the con-

[d] Miracula ejus, et præcepta, et mortem, et reſurrectionem, et miſſionem Spiritus Sancti. Per quæ certificebant homines de regno illo cæleſti. Gr. ad Act. xxviii. 31.

trary.

trary. The five hundred brethren, mentioned by St. Paul probably ſaw Jeſus in Galilee: where, as in Matt. xxvi. 32. xxviii. 7. and Mark xvi. 7. he appointed to meet the diſciples: but of this there is nothing in St. Luke. And all our Saviour's appearances to the diſciples, mentioned by him, were at Jeruſalem, or in its neighbourhood. Nor does Luke give any hint of that particular appearance to James mentioned by St. Paul: not now to add any thing farther.

However, I ſhall tranſcribe below [e] ſome obſervations of Mr. Wetſtein, relating to this matter.

8. It may be reckoned probable, that St. Luke died a natural death: foraſmuch as none of the moſt ancient writers, ſuch as Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Origen, Euſebius, Jerom, ſay any thing of his martyrdom. Gregory Nazianzen, in [f] one of his orations, ſeems to put Luke among martyrs. Nevertheleſs, as is well obſerved by [g] Tillemont, Elias Cretenſis, in the eighth century, famous for his commentaries upon Gregory, ſuppoſeth it certain, that [h] Luke did not die a martyr any more than John, the apoſtle and evangeliſt: but that after having ſuffered much in the cauſe of Chriſt, and the goſpel, he returned in peace to the God of peace. Gaudentius, biſhop of Breſcia, about 387, obſerves, that [i] in his time it was generally ſaid, that Luke and Andrew finiſhed their courſe at Patræ in Achaia. He does not ſay, in the way of martyrdom. I do not perceive Paulinus, about the year 403, to [k] celebrate Luke, as a martyr, but rather Nazarius, mentioned in the next verſe. If martyr belongs to Luke, it may

[e] Si Lucas vel Pauli hortatu, vel peculiari Spiritus Sancti afflatu ad ſcribendum impulſus fuiſſet, rem memoratu tam dignam . . . ſilentio neutiquam tranſiiſſet. Quod vero quidam exiſtimant, ex locis 2 Tim. iv. 8. et 1 Cor. xv. 4. collatis cum Luc. xxiv. 7, 34. probari, Lucæ, quod dicitur, Evangelium ad Paulum potius auctorem eſſe referendum, nobis parum ſit veriſimile. Wetſten. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 3. tom. I. p. 644.

[f] Orat. 3. p. 76.

[g] St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. II.

[h] Quippe ne longe abeam, Joannes . . . et item Lucas haudquaquam interempti fuere, verum cum permultas propter Chriſtum et ejus evangelium calamitates pertuliſſent, in pace ad eum qui pacis Deus eſt, reverſi ſunt. El. Cr. Annot. p. 322, 323.

[i] Andreas et Lucas apud Patras, Achaiæ civitatem, conſummati referuntur. Gaud. Serm. 17. ap. Bib. PP. tom. V. p. 969. C.

[k] Hic pater Andreas, et magno nomine Lucas,
Martyr et illuſtris ſanguine Nazarius.
Paulin. Ep. 32. p. 210. Conf. Annot. p. 75. Paris, 1685.

be underſtood in a general ſenſe, as equivalent to confeſſor, or a great ſufferer for the goſpel.

9. Cave ſays, that [l] Luke lived a ſingle life, and died in the 84th year of his age, about the year of Chriſt 70, but of what death, is uncertain. And it is true, that Nicephorus, in the fourteenth century, ſays, that [m] Luke died in the 80th year of his age. And in ſome editions of Jerom's book of illuſtrious men there is a paſſage, near the end of the article of St. Luke, importing, that he lived 84 years in celibacy. But Martiany, the learned Benedictine editor of Jerom's works, ſays, that [n] paſſage is not in any manuſcripts: nor does he know whence that ſilly fiction was borrowed. Fabricius confirms that account.

IV. There is no great difficulty in ſettling the time of St. Luke's writing his goſpel. The Acts of the apoſtles were publiſhed in 63, or 64, and not long after his goſpel, as is generally allowed. Accordingly Dr. Mill [p] ſuppoſeth thoſe books to have been two parts of one and the ſame volume, and to have been publiſhed in the year of Chriſt 64. This argument was repreſented at length [q] formerly. The reader is referred to it, that I may not enlarge upon it in this place.

V. However, I cannot forbear to obſerve ſome marks of time in the goſpel itſelf.

1. The occaſion of writing it, as St. Luke aſſures us in the introduction, was, that many had already publiſhed narrations of theſe things. But it cannot be reaſonably thought, that many ſhould have written hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt preſently after his aſcenſion, nor indeed till many years after it.

[l] Vitam egit cœlibem, ac mortuus eſt anno ætatis 84. circa annum (ut nonnulli volunt) 70. Quo vero mortis genere incertum eſt. Hiſt. Lit. p. 25.

[m] Ὀγδοηκοντα ετων γενομενος, ως φασιν. Niceph. l. 2. c. 43.

[n] Falſo additur in hoc loco: *Vixit octoginta et quatuor annos, uxorem non habens.* Nullum exſtat veſtigium horum verborum in manuſcriptis codicibus. Neque novi, unde putida hæc commenta fluxerint. Martian.

[o] Sed illa Eraſmus, Martinus Lipſius, et Suffridus Petri, in exemplaribus ſuis mſſ. non invenerunt. Fabr. in loc. ap. Bib. Eccleſ.

[p] Voluminibus hujus D. Lucæ partem poſteriorem, ſeu λογον δευτερον quod attinet, librum dico actuum Apoſtolorum, haud dubium eſt, quin is ſcriptus fuerit ſtatim poſt λογον πρωτον, ſive Evangelium. Proleg. num. 121.

[q] See in this volume, ch. iv. ſect. iv. p. 40—44.

2. There

2. There are ſeveral things in the goſpel, from which it may be fairly argued, that it was not written, till after Peter and Paul, and perhaps other apoſtles likewiſe, had preached to gentiles, and received them into the church, without their embracing the peculiarities of the law of Moſes.

3. In ch. ii. 10. the angel ſays to the ſhepherds near Bethlehem: *I bring you good tidings of great joy to all people.* At ver. 30—32. Simeon ſays, at the preſentation of Jeſus in the temple: *Mine eyes have ſeen thy ſalvation, which thou haſt prepared before the face of all people: a light to lighten the gentiles, and the glory of thy people Iſrael.* In ch. iii. 8. ſays, John the baptiſt: *God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up children to Abraham.* And I might here refer to ch. i. 78, 79. I ſuppoſe, that when St. Luke recorded theſe things he underſtood them: which he could not do, till after the goſpel had been freely and fully publiſhed among gentiles.

4. That St. Luke underſtood the ſpirituality of the doctrine of the goſpel, may be concluded from the account, which he has given of our Lord's diſcourſe, recorded ch. vi. 20—49. I might for this refer to ch. i. 74, 75. and other places.

5. Ch. vii. 9. When our Lord had heard the centurion's profeſſion of faith, *he marvelled at him, and ſaid: I have not found ſo great faith, no not in Iſrael.* In Matt. viii. 11, 12. is a farther enlargement. The like to which may be ſeen in Luke xiii. 28—30.

6. In ch. xiii. 6—9. is the parable of *the fig-tree, ſpared one year more:* repreſenting the ruin of the Jewiſh church and people as near, if they did not ſpeedily repent.

7. In ch. xi. 48—51. are predictions of the calamities coming upon the Jewiſh people. In ch. xiii. 34, 35. are our Lord's lamentations over the city of Jeruſalem, in the view of the calamities coming upon it. See likewiſe ch. xvii. 22—37. ch. xix. 11—27. ch. xx. 9—18. ch. xxi. 5—11. and ver. 20—35. As St. Luke enlargeth ſo much in his accounts of theſe predictions, it may be argued, that the accompliſhment was not far off when he wrote.

8. In ch. xiv. 16—24. is the parable of *a great ſupper*; when they who were firſt invited, refuſed to come; whereupon the invitations were enlarged, and made more general. And in the end he who made the ſupper declares, that *they who were firſt bidden, ſhould not taſte of it:* repreſenting the

call of the gentiles, and the general rejection of the Jews for their unbelief.

9. In ch. xiii. 18—21. are the parables of the *grain of muſtard-ſeed* and *leaven*, repreſenting the wonderful progreſs of the goſpel; of which, probably, St. Luke had been witneſs, when he recorded them.

10. Ch. xxiv. 46, 47. . . . *And he ſaid unto them . . that repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jeruſalem.* When St. Luke wrote this, it is very likely, that he well underſtood the commiſſion of the apoſtles, as reaching to men of all denominations, throughout the whole world.

11. But I need not enlarge farther on theſe internal characters of time, the other argument being ſufficient and ſatisfactory.

VI. I muſt ſay ſomething concerning the place where St. Luke's goſpel was written.

Jerom, as before [r] quoted, in the prologue to his commentary upon St. Matthew, ſays, that [s] Luke, the third evangeliſt, publiſhed his goſpel in the countries of Achaia and Bœötia. In his book of illuſtrious men he ſays, the Acts were written at Rome. Gregory Nazianzen ſays, that [u] Luke wrote for the Greeks, or in Achaia. And ſpeaking of the provinces of divers of the apoſtles and evangeliſts, he [x] aſſigns Judea to Peter, the gentiles to Paul, Achaia to Luke, Epirus to Andrew, Epheſus or Aſia to John, India to Thomas, Italy to Mark: in which country, undoubtedly, many of the ancients believed this laſt mentioned evangeliſt to have written his goſpel. Chryſoſtom does not ſay, where Luke wrote: but only that [y] he wrote for all in general.

We are told by [z] Philoſtorgius, that in the reign of the emperor Conſtantius St. Luke's reliques were tranſlated from Achaia to Conſtantinople. It muſt therefore have been the general perſuaſion in thoſe times, that St. Luke had died, and had been buried in Achaia. Nicephorus

[r] Vol. V. p. 35.

[s] In Achaiæ Bœotiæque partibus volumen condidit, p. 34.

[t] p. 39.

[u] Vol. IV. p. 408.

[x] Ἐγω πετρε η ιεδαια, τι παυλῳ κοινον προς τα εθνη, λεκα προς αχαιαν . . . μαρκῳ προς ιταλιαν; Gregor. Or. 25. p. 438. A.

[y] Vol. V. p. 128.

[z] Vol. IV. p. 133.

ſays,

ſays, that [a] when Paul left Rome, Luke returned to Greece, where he preached the goſpel, and converted many: where alſo he ſuffered martyrdom, and was buried. Soon afterwards he ſays, that [b] in the reign of Conſtantius, Luke's body was tranſlated from Thebes to Conſtantinople. The connection leads us by Thebes, to underſtand Thebes in Greece.

Grotius ſays, he thinks, that [c] about the time that Paul left Rome, Luke alſo went thence into Achaia, and there wrote his books, which we have, as Jerom likewiſe ſays. Cave thought, that [d] both St. Luke's books were written at Rome, and before Paul's captivity there was at an end.

But by Mill, Grabe, and Wetſtein, it is ſaid, that Luke publiſhed his goſpel at Alexandria, in Egypt. Let us obſerve their proofs.

Firſt of all [e] Mill and [f] Wetſtein quote Œcumenius, as ſaying, that Luke preached at Thebes in Egypt. Nevertheleſs I do not find it in Œcumenius. And I ſuppoſe, that Simeon Metaphraſtes, a writer of no great credit, in the tenth century, in his life of St. Luke, is their authority: for he is the writer quoted by [g] Grabe, though he does it cautiouſly. Nor does Metaphraſtes ſay, that St. Luke publiſhed his goſpel in Egypt: he ſuppoſeth it to have been written before he went thither. For he ſays, that [h] when Luke preached there, he ſometimes argued from the Old Teſtament, and ſometimes from the goſpel, which he had written.

[a] Συνδιαγων δ' εν ρωμη τω παυλω, επηκει τη ελλαδι αυθις. κ. λ. Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. p. 210.

[b] Ibid. C.

[c] Puto autem Româ iiſſe Lucam in Achaiam, atque ibi ab eo conſcriptos quos habemus libros. Quod et Hieronymus prodidit. Grot. Præf. in Evang. Luc.

[d] Utrumque anno Chriſti 59. S. Paulo nondum ex carcere dimiſſo, ſcripſiſſe videtur. In Luca II. L. p. 25.

[e] Certe poſt diſceſſum a Româ Libyam petiiſſe noſtrum hunc Evangelistam, ac apud Thebanos verbum prædicaſſe, teſtatur Œcumenius comment. in Lucam. Mill. Prol. n. 111.

[f] . . . vel ſecundum Hieronymum . . . in Achaiæ Bœotiæque finibus, qui tamen Thebas Ægyptias, ubi teſte Œcumenio Lucas prædicavit, pro Bœotiis accepiſſe videtur. Wetſt. N. T. tom. I. p. 643.

[g] Taceo recentiores, veluti Simeonem Metaphraſten, qui in Vita S. Lucæ Græce et Latine edita ad calcem commentariorum Œcumenii. p. 857. D. ita ſcribit: totam Libyam percurrens in Ægyptum pervenit, &c. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 33.

[h] Και νυν μεν απο της παλαιας παραγων γραφης, νυν δε αφ ων αυτος ανεταξατο ευαγγελιε διερμηνευων αυτοις τα περι χριςε. Sim. Metaphr. de Vit. S. Lucæ, p. 858. B.

It may be reckoned probable therefore, that this journey of St. Luke into Egypt is a mere fiction, a thing without ground aſcribed to him by ſome, after he had left Paul, and after he had written his goſpel.

Nevertheleſs thoſe learned men [i] have been pleaſed to argue from this paſſage of Metaphraſtes, that Jerom miſtook Thebes in Bœötia for Thebes in Egypt: which appears to me to be altogether arbitrary. I ſhould rather think, that ſome later writer miſtook the place, and inſtead of Thebes in Bœötia, thought of Thebes in Egypt, a very famous city, and better known to himſelf than the other.

It may be of uſe to take here more at large the paſſage of Nicephorus, in part quoted juſt now. 'Luke [k] ſays he, 'was born at Antioch, which is in Syria, by profeſſion a 'phyſician, and alſo well ſkilled in painting. He came to 'Paul at Thebes with its ſeven gates: where renouncing the 'error of his anceſtors he embraced the chriſtian doctrine, 'and of a phyſician for the body, became a phyſician for the 'ſoul. He likewiſe wrote a goſpel, as Paul dictated it to 'him, and alſo the Acts of the apoſtles. Whilſt Paul was 'at Rome [or, when Paul had been at Rome,] he returned 'into [d] Greece.' This, I think, muſt confirm our ſuppoſition, that ſomebody miſtook Thebes in Egypt for Thebes in Bœötia. It is plain, that Nicephorus means Thebes of Greece. And he ſeems to have ſuppoſed, in this place, that Luke was converted about the time that he came to be with Paul in Macedonia and Greece. See Acts xvi. 10. He ſays, Luke returned into Greece. Therefore the Thebes before-mentioned muſt have been in that country: nor was Paul ever at Thebes in Egypt. Luke therefore could not meet him, and be converted by him there. He calls it

[i] Neque aliunde in aliam ſententiam ductum arbitror Hieronymum, qui in Achaiæ Bœotiæque finibus hoc Evangelium conditum ait, quam quod ſeu lecto, ſeu ex traditione alicubi accepto, Lucam apud Thebanos prædicaſſe, ac conſcripſiſſe Evangelium, incolas iſtos fuiſſe exiſtimarit Thebarum Bœotiarum, non autem Thebarum urbis Ægypti ſuperioris. Mill. Prol. n. 115. Vid. et Wetſten. citat. ſupra note *(f)*

[k] Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. p. 210. A. B.

d All muſt be ſenſible that this ſtory of Nicephorus is very ſtrange. For in one place he without heſitation ſpeaks of St. Luke, as the companion of Cleophas, mentioned Luke xxiv. 18. lib. I. cap. 34. p. 117. A. And he ſeveral times ſpeaks of Mark and Luke, as two of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. Lib. II. cap. 43. in et cap. 45. p. 213. B. *και εκ των ο δυο στερες, μαρκον και λυκαν.*

Thebes

Thebes with its ſeven gates: ſo [l] Thebes in Bœötia was ſometimes called.

Secondly. Another argument, that St. Luke's goſpel was written at Alexandria, is, that [m] it is ſo ſaid in the Syriac verſion.

But thoſe titles are of no great weight. Before the three catholic epiſtles, received by the Syrians, is a title or inſcription, importing, that [n] they were written by the apoſtles, James, Peter, and John, witneſſes of our Saviour's transfiguration, taking James to be the ſon of Zebedee: whereas the epiſtle of James could not be written till long after his death, who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa, as related Acts xii. 1, 2. And St. Paul's ſecond epiſtle to Timothy [o] is ſaid by the ſame Syrians, to have been written at Rome, and ſent by Luke: which is manifeſtly contrary to the epiſtle itſelf. See 2 Tim. iv. 11, 12.

St. Luke's goſpel is alſo ſaid in the Perſic verſion, [p] to have been written at Alexandria. But then it is allowed, that this verſion was made from the Syriac, not from the Greek.

Thirdly, it is alſo urged, that there are *epigraphai* or inſcriptions in ſome manuſcripts, at the end of this goſpel, where it is ſaid, that it was written in the great city of Alexandria.

But it is well known, that thoſe inſcriptions at the end of the books of the New Teſtament are of little value, divers of them containing manifeſt miſtakes: and they are in late manuſcripts only, or however, ſuch as are not of the higheſt antiquity.

Fourthly. Grabe [q] likewiſe inſiſts upon a paſſage in the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, where the apoſtles are brought in, relating

[l] Vid. Cellar. Geogr. Antiq. lib. II. cap. 13.

[m] Ita quippe ſonat titulus ejus in verſione Syriaca, ante mille annos edita: Evangelium Lucæ Evangeliſtæ, quod protulit et evangelizavit Græce in Alexandria magna. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 33. Conf. Mill. Prol. n. 114.

[n] Sanctorum Apoſtolorum, Jacobi, Petri, Joannis, transfigurationis Chriſti ſpectatorum, epiſtolæ ſingulæ.

[o] Ad Timotheum vero ſecunda Romæ ſcripta, fuit miſſa per eundem Lucam Medicum et Evangeliſtam. Ebedjeſu Catal. ap. Aſſeman. Bib. Or. T. III. p. 12.

[p] Et in verſione Perſica, quam tamen non ex Græco, ſed Syriaco textu tranſlatam exiſtimat admodum R. Waltonus: Evangelium Lucæ, quod lingua Græca Ægyptiaca in Alexandria ſcripſit. Grab. ubi. ſupr. p. 33.

[q] Atque hoc non parum confirmatur

relating what biſhops had been appointed by them in their own time. And it is ſaid, that in Alexandria, Anianus, the firſt biſhop, was ordained by the evangeliſt Mark, and Abilius by Luke, alſo evangeliſt. And [r] Mill in like manner quotes the conſtitutions, after Grabe, though almoſt aſhamed ſo to do.

But it ſhould be conſidered, that the author of that work is anonymous, and unknown, and his time not certain. He ſays what he pleaſeth: and has been convicted of falſhood in ſuch accounts [s] as theſe, as well as in others. It has very much the appearance of fiction, that the firſt biſhop of Alexandria ſhould be ordained by Mark, and the ſecond by Luke: and poſſibly it is a fiction of the writer himſelf; for I do not recollect, that this is ſaid any where elſe. Epiphanius, as well as more ancient writers, muſt have been totally unacquainted with this ordination, and with St. Luke's journies in Egypt: for he ſays, that [t] this evangeliſt preached the goſpel in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy, and Macedonia, but eſpecially in Gaul.

Du Pin having taken notice of what is ſaid relating to this matter in the inſcriptions, which are in ſome manuſcripts, the titles in the Syriac and Perſic verſions, Metaphraſtes, and the Conſtitutions, concludes: 'All [u] theſe 'monuments deſerve no credit. We ought to adhere to 'what is ſaid by Jerom, as moſt probable: that this goſpel 'was compoſed in Achaia, or Bœötia.'

Upon the whole, there appears not any good reaſon to ſay, that St. Luke wrote his goſpel at Alexandria, or that he preached at all in Egypt. It is more probable, that when he left Paul, he went into Greece, and there compoſed, or finiſhed, and publiſhed his goſpel, and the Acts of the apoſtles.

VII. I would now offer ſomething by way of character of this evangeliſt: but I ſhall do it briefly, and cautiouſly; and

firmatur ex eo quod, lib. vii. Conſt. Apoſt. Clement. cap. 46 Lucas dicatur Alexandriæ fuiſſe, ibique Epiſcopum Avilium ordinaſſe. *Urbis Alexandrinorum Anianus primus a Marco Evangeliſta ordinatus eſt, ſecundus vero Avilius a Luca, et ipſo Evangeliſta.* Grabe ibid.

[r] Et ſi Conſtitutionum Apoſtolicarum ſeu auctori ſeu conſarcinatori fides, in eccleſia Alexandria, a Marco primum fundata. . . . Avilium Aniani primi Epiſcopi ſucceſſorem, ordinaverit. Mill. Prol. n. 141.

[s] See in this work vol. IV. p. 333, 334.

[t] Haer. L. I. num. xi. p. 433.

[u] Diſſerta. ſur la Bible. liv. 2. ch. 2. § v. p. 39.

if

if I mention doubtful things doubtfully, I may hope to eſcape cenſure. It is probable, that he is Lucius, mentioned Rom. xvi. 21. If ſo, he was related to St. Paul the apoſtle. And it is not unlikely, that that Lucius is the ſame as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned by name. Acts xiii. 1. and in general with others. ch. xi. 20. It appears to me very probable, that St. Luke was a Jew by birth, and an early Jewiſh believer. This muſt be reckoned to be a kind of requiſite qualification for writing a hiſtory of Chriſt and the early preaching of his apoſtles to advantage; which, certainly, St. Luke has performed. I do not perceive ſufficient reaſon to believe, that Luke was one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. But he may have been one of the two, whom our Lord met in the way to Emmaus, on the day of his reſurrection, as related Luke xxiv. 13—35. He is expreſsly ſtyled by the apoſtle *his fellow-labourer*, Philem. ver. 24. If he be the perſon intended, Col. iv. 14. (which ſeems very probable) he was, or had been, by profeſſion a phyſician. And he was greatly valued by the apoſtle, who calls him beloved: which muſt be reckoned much to his honour. For nothing could be ſo likely to recommend any man to St. Paul's eſteem, as faithfulneſs to the intereſts of pure religion. It is undoubted, that he accompanied Paul, when he firſt went into Macedonia, Acts xvi. 8—40. And though we are not fully aſſured, that he continued to be with him, conſtantly afterwards: we know, that he went with the apoſtle from Greece through Macedonia, and Aſia, to Jeruſalem, and thence to Rome, where he ſtayed with him the whole two years of his impriſonment in that city. This alone makes out the ſpace of above five years. And it is an attendance well becoming Lucius of Cyrene: to which no man could be more readily diſpoſed, than one of the firſt preachers of the goſpel to the gentiles. We do not exactly know, when St. Luke formed the deſign of writing his two books: but, probably, they are the labour of ſeveral years. During St. Paul's impriſonment in Judea, which laſted more than two years, and was a time of inaction for the apoſtle, St. Luke had an opportunity for completing his collections, and filling up his plan. For in that time unqueſtionably Luke converſed with many early Jewiſh believers, and eye-witneſſes of the Lord, and ſome of the apoſtles, who were ſtill at Jeruſalem. And I make no doubt, but that before that ſeaſon he had converſed with

ſeveral

ſeveral of the apoſtles, and other eye-witneſſes of our Lord's perſon and works. Nor can any heſitate to allow the truth of what is ſaid by ſome of the ancients, that Luke, who for the moſt part was a companion of Paul, had likewiſe more than a ſlight acquaintance with the reſt of the apoſtles. Whilſt he was with Paul at Rome, it is likely, that he had ſome leiſure for compoſing, and writing. When St. Paul left Rome, I imagine, that Luke accompanied him no longer: but went into Greece, where he finiſhed, and publiſhed, one after the other, his two books. Which he inſcribed to Theophilus, an honourable friend, and a good Chriſtian in that country. Here Luke died, and, perhaps ſomewhat in years. Nor need it to be reckoned an improbable ſuppoſition, that he was older than the apoſtle.

VIII. I ſhall conclude this chapter with ſome obſervations upon St. Luke's goſpel, and the Acts of the apoſtles. But thoſe upon his goſpel will chiefly relate to the introduction: though ſome were mentioned formerly.

1. St. Luke's two books, his goſpel and the Acts, are inſcribed to Theophilus: whereby ſome underſtand any good Chriſtian in general, others a particular perſon.

Epiphanius [x] ſpeaks as if he was in doubt, whether thereby ſhould be underſtood a particular perſon, or a lover of God in general. Salvian [y] ſeems to have ſuppoſed it to be only a feigned name.

Auguſtin [z] and Chryſoſtom, [a] and many others, have thereby underſtood a real perſon. Theophylact expreſſeth himſelf after this manner: 'Thophilus [b] to whom Luke 'wrote, was a man of ſenatorian rank, and poſſibly a 'governor: foraſmuch as he calls him moſt excellent, the 'ſame title, which Paul uſeth in his addreſſes to Felix and 'Feſtus.' Œcumenius ſays, 'that [c] Theophilus was a pre-

[x] Ἐιτ' αν τινι θεοφιλω τοτε γραφων τουτο ελεγεν, η παντι ανθρωπω θεου αγαπωντι. Epiph. Haer. LI. n. vii. p. 429. A.

[y] Poſitus itaque in hoc ambiguæ opinionis incerto, optimum fere credidit, ut beati Evangeliſtæ ſacratiſſimum ſequeretur exemplum: qui in utroque divini operis exordio Theophili nomen inſcribens, cum ad hominem ſcripſiſſe videatur, ad amorem Dei ſcripſit: hoc ſilicet digniſſimum eſſe judicans, ut ad ipſum affectum Dei ſcripta dirigeret, a quo ad ſcribendum impulſus eſſet. Salvian. ad Salon. ep. 9. p. 215.

[z] De Conſenſ. Evan. l. 4. c. 8. T. III.

[a] Chryſ. in Act. Hom. i. T. IX. p. 3, 4.

[b] See vol. V. p. 327, 328.

[c] Ἡγεμων ην ουτος ο θεοφιλος, &c. Comm. in Act. T. II. p. 2. C.

ſect

'fect or governor.' However, we have no particular account in the ancients, who he was, or of what country.

Cave [d] ſuppoſed Theophilus to have been a nobleman of Antioch. And in his Lives of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts [e] written in Engliſh, he refers to the recognitions: where is mentioned a rich man of Antioch of this name. But I do not eſteem that to be any proof, that St. Luke's Theophilus was of Antioch. That fabulous writer is not ſpeaking of Paul, nor of Luke, but of Peter: who, as he ſays, in [f] ſeven days converted ten thouſand people at Antioch. And Theophilus, the greateſt man in the city, turned his houſe into a church. Moreover, ſuppoſing him to intend St. Luke's Theophilus, his authority is of no value. A writer at the end of the ſecond century does not ſpeak of his own knowledge. And if St. Luke publiſhed his books in Greece, which to me ſeems probable, I ſhould be inclined to think, that Theophilus, to whom they are addreſſed, was a man of the ſame country.

2. It may be of more importance to inquire, whom St. Luke means by the many, who before him had attempted to write hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt. Epiphanius ſays, that [g] St. Luke intended Cerinthus, Merinthus, and others. How Origen [h] expreſſed himſelf concerning this, in his preface to St. Luke's goſpel: and how Jerom [i] in his preface to St. Matthew, may be ſeen by thoſe, who are pleaſed to look back. They ſay, that many attempted to write goſpels, as Baſilides, Apelles, and others. And they mention divers goſpels, not received by the church: ſuch as the goſpel of Thomas, and Matthias, the goſpel of the Egyptians, and of the twelve. But it is not neceſſary to be ſuppoſed by us, that they thought, that all, if any of thoſe goſpels were written before St. Luke's, or that he ſpoke of them; for Baſilides and Apelles could not write goſpels before the

[d] Utrumque opus inſcripſit Theophilo optimati (ut credere fas eſt) Antiocheno. Hiſt. Lit. in Luca.

[e] p. 224.

[f] Et ne multis immorer, intra ſeptem dies, plus quam decem millia hominum credentes Deo baptizati ſunt, et ſanctificatione conſecrati: ita ut omni aviditatis deſiderio Theophilus, qui erat cunctis potentibus in civitate ſublimior, domus ſuæ ingentem baſilicam, eccleſiæ nomine conſecravit. Recogn. l. x. cap. 71.

[g] . . . φασκων επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν· ινα τινας μεν επιχειρητας δειξη, φημι δε τες περι κηρινθον, και μηρινθεν, και τες αλλες. H. LI. n. vii. in.

[h] See vol. II. p. 503, 504.

[i] See Vol. V. p. 57, 58.

ſecond

ſecond century: and they might ſuppoſe, that ſeveral, if not all the others, mentioned by them, were written after St. Luke's. The meaning of what theſe ancient writers ſay, is, that the church receives four goſpels only. There were many others. But to them may be applied the words of St. Luke: they only took in hand, or attempted. They did not perform, as Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John did. And they might expreſs themſelves in that manner concerning goſpels written after St. Luke's, as well as before it.

However, Theophylact, as was formerly [k] obſerved, in the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke, expreſſeth himſelf, as if he thought, the evangeliſt referred to the goſpels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve.

3. We will now obſerve the judgments of ſome learned moderns. Grabe [l] allows, that St. Luke did not refer to the goſpels of Baſilides, or Thomas, or ſome others, mentioned by Origen: for they were not publiſhed, till after St. Luke's death. But he thinks, that St. Luke might refer to the goſpels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve, and ſome others not known.

That St. Luke might refer to the goſpel according to the Egyptians, he thinks for the following reaſons, which I ſhall conſider.

The firſt is, that [k] St. Luke's goſpel was written in Egypt. To which I anſwer: that is ſaid without ground, as has been lately [l] ſhown.

Grabe's ſecond argument is, that [m] Clement of Rome, or ſome other, in the fragment of the ſecond epiſtle aſcribed to

[k] Vol. V. p. 327.

[l] Reliqua quippe ab Origene et Ambroſio nominata falſa Evangelia, veluti Baſilidis, aliudque Manichæorum, Apoſtolo Thomæ perperam adſcriptum, procul omni dubio poſt S. Lucæ obitum prodiere: adeo ut ea in primis Evangelii verbis, in quorum explicatione Origenes et Ambroſius iſta afferunt, reſpicere haud potuerit. Contra vero haud eſt abſimile, iſta ſecundum Hebræos et Ægyptios ante fuiſſe ſcripta, atque ad ea, una cum aliis pluribus jam ignotis, Lucam intendiſſe digitum, dum præfatus eſt, &c. Gr. Spic. T. I. p. 31, 32.

[k] Evangelium, de quo agitur, ab Ægyptiis editum fuiſſe ante Lucæ Evangelium, huncque iſtud inter alia, ſi non præcipue, reſpexiſſe, dum in proœmio plures hiſtorias evangelicas memorat, ad quas emendandas, et defectus eorum ſupplendos, ſuam literis conſignaſſe ſe innuit, probabile redditur ex eo, quod Lucas Evangelium ſcripſiſſe dicatur Alexandriæ in Ægypto. Id. ib. p. 33. in.

[l] See before, p. 273—277.

[m] Accedit, quod jam Clemens Romanus,

to him, has quoted the goſpel according to the Egyptians. Which argument, as one would think, might have been ſpared: ſince Grabe himſelf allows that [n] ſecond epiſtle to be ſuppoſitious, and not to have been compoſed till about the middle of the third century. If that be the true date of the epiſtle, it is too late a thing to warrant the ſuppoſition, that St. Luke referred to the goſpel according to the Egyptians.

I ſhall take no farther notice of Grabe. But I imagine that the goſpel, according to the Egyptians, was not compoſed before the ſecond century. Clement of Alexandria is the firſt known catholic author that has cited it; and in his time it was very obſcure and little known. This [o] was ſhown formerly.

Dr. Mill does not much differ from Grabe. He thinks, that [p] of the many narrations, to which St. Luke refers, the two pricipal were the goſpels according to the Hebrews, and according to the Egyptians.

The general account which Mill gives of thoſe memoirs or narrations, ſeems to be very juſt and reaſonable; and I intend to tranſcribe him here largely, 'About [q] the year 58,

Romanus, vel quiſquis eſt auctor ep. 2. ad Corinthios, certe antiquiſſimus, iſto Evangelio uſus eſſe ex fragmento mox recitando, colligatur. Ibid. p. 34.

[n] Cæterum quæras, quando epiſtola illa Clementi ſuppoſita fuerat, reſpondeo, id ſeculo iii. et quidem medio, factum eſſe. Ib. p. 269. in.

[o] See vol. II. p. 235, 236.

[p] Ex dictis autem hiſce hiſtoriolis . . . duæ præ cæteris celebratæ erant, quæ et ipſæ Exangelia appellabantur, ſecundum Hebræos alterum, alterum ſecundum Ægyptios. Proleg. n. 38. vid. et n. 39—41. et n. 112. &c.

[q] Sub hoc quidem tempus, annum dico LVIII. ſeu etiam aliquanto ante, contextæ fuere a fidelibus quibuſdam illius ævi διηγησεις evangelicæ, ſeu hiſtoriolæ de rebus Chriſti. Patet hoc ex Evangelii D. Lucæ proœmio: . . . Exinde col igimus, in primis equidem, πολλας hoſce, qui hiſtorias conficiebant, alios prorſus fuiſſe ab Evangeliſtis noſtris, Matthæo et Marco. Erat enim Matthæus unus ex αυτοπταις, ideoque nec ab iſtorum traditionibus pendebat, ſicut hi quos memorat Lucas. Ne dicam, quod duos duntaxat nemo πολλας dixerit. Deinde vero notandum, eos narrationes ſuas inſtituiſſe περι των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματων, hoc eſt, ut ego lubens interpretor, *de rebus apud primos fidei profeſſores*, quorum numero ſeipſum accenſet Lucas, a Chriſto impletis ſive geſtis. Denique liquet ex verbis modo citatis, traductas fuiſſe naratiunculas iſtas ſeu proxime, ſeu mediate ſaltem, ab Apoſtolis ipſis, eorumque in opere evangelico adjutoribus. Manifeſtum eſt igitur, fuiſſe e primis Chriſtianis nonnullos, qui ante Lucam, [addo etiam Matthæum et Marcum] res Chriſti, (ſeu Evangelia) ex apoſtolicis traditionibus undecunque acceptas,

'58, or ſomewhat ſooner,' ſays Mill, 'were compoſed by 'ſome of the faithful evangelical narrations, or ſhort hiſto-'ries of Chriſt. This appears from St. Luke's introduc-'tion to his goſpel. From which we learn, in the firſt place, 'that they were not our evangeliſts, Matthew and Mark: 'for Matthew was an eye-witneſs; nor can two be called 'many. In the next place it is to be obſerved, that theſe 'narrations conſiſted of things moſt ſurely believed among 'us, that is, as I underſtand it, of the things fulfilled and 'done by Chriſt among the firſt profeſſors of the faith; of 'which number Luke reckons himſelf. Laſtly, from the 'words of that introduction it appears, that thoſe narrations 'were received either from the apoſtles themſelves, or from 'their aſſiſtants in the work of the goſpel. It is therefore 'manifeſt, that there were ſome of the firſt Chriſtians, who 'before Luke (and alſo, as we may ſuppoſe, before Mat-'thew and Mark) wrote hiſtories of the things done by 'Chriſt, and received from apoſtolical traditions: and that 'not with a bad or heretical deſign, as many inſinuate, who 'comment upon this introduction of St. Luke, but with 'the ſame deſign as our evangeliſts; that Chriſtians might 'have at leaſt ſome account in writing of the Lord's actions. 'Nevertheleſs it may be alſo inferred from what St. Luke 'here ſays, that their hiſtories were inaccurate and imper-'fect, there were in them ſome things not certain, or well 'atteſted, and poſſibly here and there ſome miſtakes. For 'which cauſe it ſeemed good to him, who had attained to 'full information, to write a complete and copious hiſtory 'of the things done by Chriſt.'

If this account be right, ſome conſequences may be deduced, which will be of uſe to us.

ceptas, conſcripſerant: idque non ſtudio aliquo maligno, ſeu hæretico, quod inſinuant fere qui in hoc Lucæ proœmium commentati ſunt: ſed eodem plane fine, quo Evangeliſtæ noſtri: ut haberet ſcilicet Eccleſia rerum a Domino noſtro geſtarum qualem notitiam. Cæterum cum in iis quæ ſequuntur apud Lucam, ſingula Chriſtianæ rei hiſtoriam ſpectantia accurate ſe aſſecutum eſſe dicat Evangeliſta... haud obſcure quidem hinc colligi videtur, των πολλων iſtorum διηγησεις minus accuratas fuiſſe, minuſque perfectas: ita quidem, ut in his, quæ tradiderant, aliqua hinc inde occurrerint parum certa, ne dicam a vero aberrantia. Unde omnino viſum ſit ipſi plenariam hiſtoriæ hujuſce cognitionem conſecuto, integrum jam et luculentum rerum a Chriſto geſtarum Commentarium ſcribere. Mill. Prolog. num. 35—37.

And

And indeed it ſeems to me to be very right. There were ſeveral hiſtories of Chriſt, to which St. Luke here refers. They were compoſed with a good view, like to that of our evangeliſts. But they were defective and inaccurate. If there were any miſtakes, I would imagine that they were not numerous, nor in things of the greateſt importance. Nor were the writers ſufficiently qualified for the work which they had undertaken. This, I think, to be intimated by St. Luke, though modeſtly, and without cenſorioufneſs, in what he ſays of himſelf, *that he had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt:* which, probably, could not be ſaid of the compoſers of the narrations, to which he refers. They were men who had an honeſt zeal; but they had written too haſtily before they had obtained full information: for which reaſon their hiſtories could not anſwer the end aimed at.

Theſe things being allowed to be right, ſeveral conſequences may be deduced by us.

In the firſt place, and in particular we hence learn, that the goſpel, according to the twelve, or according to the Hebrews, was not one of thoſe narrations, or memoirs, to which St. Luke refers. For theſe were very ſhort hiſtories [*hiſtoriolæ* as Mill calls them:] that was a full goſpel, or large hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt. Many, in Jerom's time, ſuppoſed it to be the authentic goſpel of St. Matthew: which, certainly, is not a ſhort and imperfect memoir. From the notice taken of that goſpel by ſeveral ancient writers, eſpecially by Jerom, it appears to me very probable (and I ſhould think muſt appear very probable to others likewiſe) that the goſpel according to the twelve, or according to the Hebrews, either was St. Matthew's original Hebrew goſpel, with additions; or his original Greek goſpel, tranſlated into Hebrew, with additions. But this laſt ſeems to me moſt likely, as has been often ſaid already upon divers occaſions.

Secondly. Another thing to be deduced from Mill's account, if right, is, that [e] the goſpel according to the Egyp-

[e] I am not ſingular in ſuppoſing, that the goſpel according to the Egyptians is not intended by St. Luke. Beza ſays the ſame ſtrongly. And, as I imagine, he juſtly aſſerts it not to have been written, till after St. Luke's goſpel. Quod iſtos ... Lucas, non ſatis commode præſtitiſſe: minime tamen opinor, fabuloſas, imo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem Eccleſiæ ſub Nicodemi, Nazaræorum, Thomæ, Ægyptiorum, nominibus impudentiſſime obtruſas. Bez. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 1.

tians

tians was not one of the narrations, to which St. Luke refers. For that goſpel was not compoſed upon the ſame principles with thoſe of our evangeliſts. It was an heretical goſpel, as appears from the fragments of it, collected by Grabe, and [r] probably it was compoſed in the ſecond century, by ſome encratites, enemies of marriage.

Thirdly. I add one thing more, whether it be a conſequence from what has been already ſaid, or not: that nothing remains of the narrations, to which St. Luke refers, not ſo much as any fragments, they not being quoted in any chriſtian writings now extant.

3. I ſhall now tranſcribe a part of Dr. Doddridge's remarks upon St. Luke's introduction. 'This [s] muſt refer 'to ſome hiſtories of the life of Chriſt, now loſt. For Mat- 'thew and Mark, the only evangeliſts that can be ſuppoſed 'to have written before Luke, could not with any propriety 'be called many. And of theſe two, Matthew at leaſt wrote 'from perſonal knowledge, not from the teſtimony of others. 'I conclude, that the books referred to are loſt: as I am 'well ſatisfied that none of the apocryphal goſpels, now 'extant, publiſhed, particularly by Fabricius and Jones, 'can pretend to equal antiquity, with this of St. Luke.... 'And St. Luke ſeems to allow theſe hiſtories, whatever 'they were, to have been honeſtly written, according to in- 'formation received from capable judges.'

4. Mr. Beauſobre, ſpeaking of theſe memoirs, ſays 'The 'life of our Saviour was ſo beautiful, his character ſo ſub- 'lime and divine, his doctrine ſo excellent, and the mira- 'cles by which he confirmed it, were ſo ſhining and ſo nu- 'merous, that it was impoſſible but many ſhould undertake 'to write memoirs of them. This produced many hiſtories 'of our Saviour, ſome more, others leſs exact. It is great 'pity that they are loſt: for we might have conſulted them, 'and could have judged for ourſelves concerning the character 'of the writers, and their compoſitions. St. Luke, who 'ſpeaks of narrations, or goſpels that had preceded his own, 'intimates indeed, that they were defective, but he does 'not condemn them as fabulous, or bad.'

5. That is right. Thoſe memoirs were not bad, nor fabulous: but they were imperfect, as I apprehend, to a great

[r] Vid. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 31—37.

[s] See his Family Expoſitor, vol. I. p. 1.

[t] Hiſt. de Manich. tom. I. p. 449.

degree;

degree; nor do I lament the loſs of them. I can pay ſo much deference to the judgment of chriſtian antiquity, eſpecially the earlieſt of all, as to believe, that thoſe many narrations to which St. Luke refers, did not deſerve to be preſerved, or to be much taken notice of, after the publication of the goſpels of our firſt three evangeliſts. I imagine, that when once theſe came abroad, the former appeared to the faithful ſo low, and mean, and defective, that they could not bear to ſee, or read them.

IX. I ſhall now make ſome obſervations upon the other work of our evangeliſt.

1. The book of the Acts was written, according to [u] Mill, in the year 64. And from what has been argued by us in ſeveral places, that muſt appear to be as likely a time as any. It could not be written till after St. Paul's confinement at Rome was come to a period; I ſuppoſe it to have ended in the former part of the year of Chriſt 63. And I think it probable, that St. Luke finiſhed this book the ſame, or the next year, either at Rome, or in Greece.

2. It cannot be diſagreeable to recollect here ſome of the obſervations of ancient writers upon this book, the only book of the kind which we have, containing a hiſtory of the preaching of Chriſt's apoſtles after his reſurrection.

3. Tertullian [x] often ſpeaks of the importance of this book, as ſhowing Chriſt's fulfilment of the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt to his diſciples.

4. 'The [y] Acts of the apoſtles,' ſays Jerom in his letter to Paulinus concerning the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, 'ſeems 'to promiſe a bare hiſtory, and an account of the early in-'fancy of the church: but if we conſider, that the writer is 'Luke the phyſician, we ſhall at the ſame time diſcern, that 'every word is ſuited to heal the maladies of the ſoul.'

5. Says Auguſtin: 'Luke [z] after having written a goſpel, 'containing a hiſtory of Chriſt's words and works to the 'time of his reſurrection and aſcenſion, wrote ſuch an ac-

[u] Prolegom. num. 121.

[x] See vol. II. p. 261.

[y] Actus Apoſtolorum nudam quidem ſonare videntur hiſtoriam, et naſcentis Eccleſiæ infantiam texere. Sed ſi noverimus, ſcriptorem eorum Lucam eſſe Medicum, cujus laus eſt in evangelio, animadvertemus pariter, omnia verba illius animæ languentis eſſe medicinam. Ad Paulin. ep. 50. al. 103. T. IV. P. II. p. 574.

[z] See vol. V. p. 96, 97.

'count of the Acts of the apoſtles, as he judged to be 'ſufficient for the edification of believers. And it is the 'only hiſtory of the apoſtles, which has been received by the 'church: all others having been rejected, as not to be 'relied upon.'

6. I beg leave to refer my readers to the paſſages of Chryſoſtom, already [a] tranſcribed, relating to this book: and to the whole of his firſt homily upon it. I add now only one paſſage more out of the ſame homily. 'The [b] gof-'pels,' ſays he, 'are the hiſtory of the things which Chriſt 'did and ſpake. The Acts the hiſtory of the things, which 'another Paraclet ſpake and did.'

7. It is not needful for me to make a diſtinct enumeration of the things contained in this book. Every one who has peruſed it with care, cannot but know, that it contains an account of the choice of Matthias to be apoſtle in the room of the traitor, of the wonderful and plentiful pouring out of the gift of the Holy Ghoſt upon the apoſtles, and other diſciples of Jeſus at Jeruſalem, at the Pentecoſt next ſucceeding his crucifixion, and of the teſtimony borne by the apoſtles to his reſurrection and aſcenſion in their diſcourſes, and by many miracles, and various ſufferings: their preaching firſt at Jeruſalem, and in Judea, and afterwards by themſelves, or their aſſiſtants, in Samaria: and then to Gentiles in Judea, and afterwards out of it, as well as to Jews: and of the converſion of Paul, and his preaching, miracles, labours, ſufferings, in many cities and countries, parts of the Roman empire, and the polite world, and at length in Rome itſelf.

8. If we were to indulge ourſelves in making remarks upon this uſeful and excellent performance, nothing, perhaps, would be more obſervable than its brevity and conciſeneſs: by which means many things muſt have been omitted, which happened during the period of that hiſtory. For it is very true, which Chryſoſtom ſaid, that [c] Luke leaves us thirſting for more.

9. Says Le Clerc: 'Luke's [d] apoſtolical hiſtory relates the 'beginnings of the preaching of the goſpel among Jews and 'Gentiles,

[a] Ibid. p. 131—133.

[b] Τα μεν ουν ευαγγελια ων ο χριστος εποιησεν και ειπεν ιστορια τις εστιν· αι δε πραξεις, ων ο ετερος παρακλητος ειπε και εποιησε. In Act. Hom. i. tom. IX. p. 9. B.

[c] Vol. V. p. 132.

[d] Hic vero definit Lucæ Hiſtoria Apoſtolica,

'Gentiles, chiefly by the miniſtry of Peter and Paul: for of 'the other apoſtles he is almoſt entirely ſilent. . . . I wiſh,' ſays he, 'that ſome other apoſtolical man, of like judgment 'and integrity, had written the hiſtory of the other apoſtles, 'and had undertaken to ſupply what was wanting in Luke's 'hiſtory, and that this work had come down to us.' But, however deſirable it may now appear to us, we cannot perceive from eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, that ever ſuch a work was publiſhed.

10. Eſtius imagined, 'that [e] Luke, poſſibly, intended to 'write a third book, to ſupply, particularly, the omiſſions of 'the two years, which St. Paul ſpent at Rome.' But I verily believe, there is no ground at all for that conjectural ſuppoſition.

11. Again: Le Clerc, above-mentioned, thinks, 'that [f] 'Luke breaks off the hiſtory of St. Peter, of whom he had 'ſaid ſo much before, very abruptly, in thoſe words, Acts 'xii. 17. *And he departed, and went to another place.*' Nevertheleſs St. Luke afterwards drops St. Barnabas in a like manner. ch. xv. 39. And in the end he will take his leave of the apoſtle Paul himſelf without much more ceremony.

12. Thoſe omiſſions are no reflection upon the writer, nor any diſparagement to his hiſtory. The proper deduction to be made by us is this: we hereby perceive, that it was not the deſign of St. Luke, to aggrandize Peter, or Paul, or any of the apoſtles, nor to write their lives: but to record the evidences of our Saviour's reſurrection, and to write a hiſtory of the firſt preaching and planting the chriſtian religion in the world. This deſign he has admirably executed: and having filled up his plan, he concluded.

Apoſtolica, quâ initia prædicationis evangelicæ apud Judæos, Ethnicoſque, et miniſterio quidem Petri et Pauli potiſſimum ſcribere adgreſſus eſt. De cæteris Apoſtolis altum ubique apud eum eſt ſilentium. . . . Utinam vero, vir quiſpiam apoſtolicus, pari judicio et fide, cæterorum res geſtas literis mandaſſet, quæ narrationi Lucæ deſunt ſupplere voluiſſet, idque opus ad nos perveniſſet! Cler. H. E. An. 61. n. iv.

[e] Sed proculdubio multa actorum Pauli a Luca *ſunt* omiſſa. . . . Ac fortaſſe Lucas meditabatur tertium librum, in quo repeteret acta illius biennii . . . ſicut Act. i. quædam expoſuit tacita ultimo capite Evangelii. Eſt. ad Act. Ap. xxviii. 30.

[f] Mirum eſt, Lucam, poſtquam liberationem Petri e carcere narravit cap. xii. 17. eumque *in alium locum*, hoc eſt, extra Ieroſolymam, iviſſe dixit, ne verbulum quidem de eo habere, de quo tam multa alia dixerat. Id. ibid.

13. However, undoubtedly, many things are omitted by St. Luke: ſome of which we may learn from St. Paul's epiſtles. I ſhall obſerve ſome omiſſions.

14. St. Luke has not in the courſe of his hiſtory, mentioned the writing of any of St. Paul's epiſtles. It is probable, that he was at Corinth, when the apoſtle wrote thence his large epiſtle to the Romans. Nevertheleſs he takes not any notice of it, nor of the epiſtles written by St. Paul at Rome, when he certainly was with him, nor indeed of any other. By comparing the epiſtles themſelves, and St. Luke's hiſtory of the apoſtle in the Acts, we are enabled to trace the time and place of divers of thoſe epiſtles: but they are no where particularly mentioned by the hiſtorian.

15. In Acts ix. 19—26. St. Luke, after the account of St. Paul's converſion, ſpeaks of his being at Damaſcus, and his preaching there, and of the oppoſition, which he there met with from the Jews, and his eſcape thence, and then going to Jeruſalem. But St. Paul Gal. i. 17, 18. informs us, that after his converſion he went into Arabia, and then returned to Damaſcus: and that three years paſſed between his converſion and his going to Jeruſalem. This is an inſtructive inſtance: for the omiſſion is certain, and undoubted. I am of opinion, that St. Luke did not omit the journey into Arabia, becauſe he did not know of it: but deſignedly, and becauſe he did not judge it neceſſary to be mentioned. Jerom [g] has taken particular notice of the omiſſion of that journey into Arabia.

16. Like omiſſions are in St. Luke's goſpel. I ſhall take notice of two.

1.) Having given the hiſtory of our Lord's preſentation at the temple, he ſays, ch. ii. 39. *And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth.* Nevertheleſs, I think the holy family did not now go directly from Jeruſalem to Nazareth, but to Bethlehem. There, as I ſuppoſe, our Lord received the homage of the magians. And afterwards, to avoid the perſecution of Herod, they removed thence to

[g] Lucam vero idcirco de Arabia præteriſſe, quia forſitan nihil dignum apoſtolatu in Arabia perpetrarat: et ea potius compendioſa narratione diviſſe: quæ digna Chriſti evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc ſegnitiæ Apoſtoli deputandum, ſi fruſtra in Arabia fuerit: ſed quod aliqua diſpenſatio et Dei præceptum fuerit, ut taceret. Hier. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 235.

Egypt,

Egypt, and then returned to Nazareth. All which is recorded Matt. ii. 1—13.

The viſit of the Magians muſt have been after the preſentation at the temple. If it had been before, and if they had preſented *their gifts, gold, and frankincenſe, and myrrh:* mentioned Matt. ii. 11. Mary would not have made the leſſer offering for her purification, mentioned Luke ii. 23, 24. Nor could the child Jeſus have been ſafely brought to Jeruſalem, or ſuch notice have been taken of him at the temple, as St. Luke particularly relates, ch. ii. 25—38, if *Herod, and all Jeruſalem,* had been juſt before alarmed by the inquiries of the Magians: *Where is he that is born king of the Jews?* Matt. ii. 1, 2. Omitting therefore all thoſe things, St. Luke ſays, as above obſerved, and afterwards they returned to Nazareth, the place of their uſual abode: which is agreeable to Matt. ii. 22, 23.

2.) Another thing obſervable is, that all our Saviour's appearances to his diſciples, after his reſurrection, recorded by St. Luke, ch. xxiv. were at Jeruſalem, or near it. He takes not any notice of our Saviour's meeting the diſciples in Galilee, ſo particularly mentioned Matt. xxviii. 7. and Mark xvi. 7. St. John alſo, ch. xxi. 1—23. ſpeaks of our Saviour's ſhowing himſelf to the diſciples at *the ſea of Tiberias.* And St. Paul aſſures us, that our Lord was ſeen *of above five hundred brethren at once,* 1 Cor. xv. 6; which, probably, was in the ſame country. And though at the beginning of his book of the Acts, St. Luke reſumes the account of our Saviour's ſhowing himſelf to the diſciples after his reſurrection; there is nothing more about Galilee, than in the former relation. Inſomuch that, if we had St. Luke's hiſtories only, we might have been apt to conclude, that all the appearances of our Saviour to his diſciples were at Jeruſalem, or near it, and no where elſe.

17. St. Paul's epiſtles inform us of many things omitted by St. Luke. But we ſhould have known many more, if we had had a parallel hiſtorian. A compariſon of St. Luke's hiſtory of our Saviour with that of the other evangeliſts may aſſure of this.

18. In the eleventh chapter of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, St. Paul mentions divers viſions and revelations, with which he had been favoured: but St. Luke has not taken notice of any of them. St. Paul in his ſpeech to the people at Jeruſalem, recorded by St. Luke Acts xxii. 17. mentions a trance, which he had in the temple. But St. Luke has no

where told us the exact time of it; nor has he otherwiſe mentioned it.

19. I do not think that theſe things were omitted by St. Luke, becauſe St. Paul concealed them from him; or becauſe by ſome other means he was unacquainted with the time and place of them: but it was a regard to brevity that induced him to paſs them over. They were not neceſſary to be inſerted in his hiſtory: without them he has recorded ſufficient atteſtations of Paul's apoſtolical authority, and of the truth and divine original of the doctrine taught by him.

20. Says St. Paul, unwillingly, and conſtrained by the diſadvantageous inſinuations and charges of ſelf-intereſted and deſigning men. 2 Cor. xi. 23. *Are they miniſters of Chriſt? (I ſpeak as a fool:) I am more. In labours more abundant, in ſtripes above meaſure, in priſons more frequent, in deaths oft.*

In priſons more frequent. Therefore before writing this epiſtle, in the year 57, Paul had been impriſoned ſeveral times: though St. Luke has mentioned before this time one impriſonment only, which was at Philippi. Acts xvi. 23—40. Upon which Eſtius [h] obſerves, that Paul did and ſuffered many things not mentioned in the Acts. And Rom. xvi. 7. *Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinſmen and my fellow-priſoners ... who alſo were in Chriſt before me.* Paul was not a priſoner when he wrote the epiſtle to the Romans, in the beginning of the year 58. But [i] he had been in priſon before with thoſe two early Chriſtians, his relations: but where, or when, we cannot exactly ſay.

21. Ver. 24. *Of the Jews five times received I forty ſtripes ſave one.* Nevertheleſs St. Luke has not mentioned one of thoſe times. Eſtius conjectures that [k] Luke omitted theſe, and many other things, becauſe he was not with the apoſtle

[h] De Paulo autem incarcerato ante hanc epiſtolam, in Actis Apoſtolorum non legimus quidem, niſi cap. xvi. ubi a Philippenſibus in carcerem miſſus legitur. Sed permulta Paulus et fecit et paſſus eſt, quæ in Actis non ſcribuntur. Eſt. ad 2 Cor. xi. 23.

[i] Porro concaptivos intellige, quod aliquando communia cum Paulo vincula pro Chriſto paſſi fuiſſent. Ubi tamen, aut quando factum ſit, ignoratur. Eſt. ad Rom. xvi. 7.

[k] Sed cur Lucas in Actis ne unius quidem flagellationis ex quinque meminit? Ideo videlicet, quod de Paulo pene ea ſola, quibus ipſe præſens fuit, ſigillatim recenſeat: alia vero vel ſilentio pertranſeat, vel ſummatim ac breviter referat.... Qua in re notanda humilitas Pauli, qui ſuas tot et tam graves pro Chriſto paſſiones Lucæ comiti ſuo non aperuerit, ne hic quidem recitaturus, niſi coëgiſſet eum amor ſalutis Corinthiorum. Id. ib. ad ver. 24.

when

when they happened, and Paul out of modesty forbore to tell him of them. I rather think that Luke was fully acquainted with Paul's history: but he aimed at brevity, and judged the things mentioned by him to be sufficient.

22. Ver. 25. *Thrice was I beaten with rods:* meaning, I suppose, by Roman magistrates. But St. Luke has mentioned one instance only of this; which was at Philippi, when Paul and Silas both underwent this hard usage. Acts xvi. 19—40. Of this [l] likewise Estius has taken notice in his Commentary.

Once was I stoned: undoubtedly meaning at Lystra in Lycaonia, as related by St. Luke Acts xiv. 19, 20.

Thrice I have suffered shipwreck. St. Luke has recorded but one instance, which was not until after this time, in the apostle's voyage from Judea to Rome: Acts xxvii. which therefore must have been the fourth.

A night and a day have I been in the deep. At one of those times I escaped with the utmost difficulty, by getting on a plank, and floating in the sea a night and a day, or a whole day of four and twenty hours.

23. Ver. 26. *In journeyings often, in perils of waters,* or rather *rivers.* Which [m] are sometimes very dangerous. But St. Luke has not recorded any dangers of the apostle upon rivers, either in crossing them, or sailing upon them.

24. Says Tillemont in his life of St. Paul: 'The [n] greatest 'part of interpreters think, that St. Paul made no voyages, 'but those, which are taken notice of in the Acts. . . . Nevertheless we must necessarily acknowledge, that beside what St. 'Luke informs us of the sufferings of St. Paul, this apostle 'was five times scourged by the Jews, twice beaten with rods, 'and thrice shipwrecked. All this happened before he wrote 'his second epistle to the Corinthians; that is, in the time of 'which St. Luke has written the history. Nevertheless St. 'Luke says nothing of all this. It is certain therefore, 'that either he has omitted the circumstances of the most 'remarkable events which he relates, or that St. Paul made 'several voyages, of which he has taken no notice.'

[l] *Ter virgis cæsus sum:* a Gentilibus. Erat enim Romanis consuetum, virgis cædere nocentes. . . . Porro Lucas tantum semel meminit hujus contumeliæ Paulo illatæ: scilicet Act. xvi. ubi scribit eum una cum Sila virgis cæsum a Philippensibus. Est. in loc.

[m] *Periculis fluminum:* quæ interdum non minus periculosa sunt navigantibus, quam mare. Est. in loc.

[n] Mem. Ec. T. i. St. Paul, note xviii.

25. The reaſon of St. Luke's ſilence here I take to be the ſame that has been already aſſigned of his ſilence upon other occaſions: it was not neceſſary, that theſe things ſhould be related. To have written an account of all the apoſtle's journies and dangers, would have rendered the work more voluminous and prolix than was judged proper. When St. Luke ſet about compoſing and publiſhing this book, he had all the materials before him, and his plan was formed. Agreeably to which, he determined to write at large the hiſtory of St. Paul's voyage from Judea to Rome, in which are many remarkable incidents, and to omit ſome other of the apoſtle's journies and voyages: though divers of them likewiſe were attended with affecting circumſtances.

26. The chapter, from which I have juſt now tranſcribed ſeveral things, concludes in this manner. Ver. 31—33. *The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is bleſſed for evermore, knows that I lie not. In Damaſcus the governor under Aretas the king, kept the city of the Damaſcenes with a garriſon, deſirous to apprehend me. And through a window in a baſket was I let down by the wall, and eſcaped his hands.*

I have often reflected with great ſatisfaction on St. Luke's not omitting this dangerous attempt upon the apoſtle's liberty and life: with which himſelf was ſo much affected, and which he has here mentioned with ſuch ſolemnity. The hiſtory of it may be ſeen in Acts ix. 23—25.

I now proceed to ſome other things.

27. St Paul aſſures us Gal. ii. 1—3. that when he went up to Jeruſalem upon occaſion of the debate concerning the manner of receiving gentile converts, he took Titus with him: which is not ſaid by St. Luke Acts xv. though he gives a particular account of Paul's going from Antioch to Jeruſalem upon that occaſion. Nor indeed has St. Luke once mentioned Titus in his hiſtory: though St. Paul wrote an epiſtle to him, and has mentioned him ſeveral times in his epiſtles ſent to others.

28. Gal. ii. 11—21. St. Paul ſpeaks of Peter's being at Antioch, before he and Barnabas had ſeparated: but St. Luke ſays nothing of it. Jerom, in his Commentary upon the epiſtle to the Galatians, ſays: 'We [o] are not to wonder, that 'Luke has taken no notice of this. For by the uſual privilege

[o] Nec mirum eſſe, ſi Lucas hanc mer tacuerit, quum et alia multa, quæ Paulus ſuſtinuiſſe ſe replicat, hiſtoriographi licentiâ prætermiſerit. In Gal. cap. ii. T. IV. p. 244.

'of

'of hiſtorians he has omitted many things performed by Paul, 'and which we know from himſelf.'

29. Rom. xvi. 3, 4. St. Paul applauds an action of great generoſity in Aquila and Priſcilla: but St. Luke has not informed us of the place, or occaſion of it. Doubtleſs he did not omit it, for want of reſpect to thoſe excellent Chriſtians, whom he has mentioned more than once. ch. xviii. 18, and 26. But that particular did not come within the compaſs of his deſign.

30. Many things, not expreſsly mentioned by St. Luke, may be argued, and concluded to have been done, from thoſe which he has recorded.

1.) In Acts iv. 23—30. is recorded a prayer of the apoſtles, in which they requeſt, that they may be enabled to work miracles for farther confirming the doctrine taught by them. And unqueſtionably their prayer was heard, and their requeſt granted, and they did work many miracles in the name of Chriſt, more than are related by St. Luke.

2.) Acts v. 12. *And by the hand of the apoſtles were many ſigns and wonders done among the people:* and what follows. Whence it may be concluded, that [p] many miracles were wrought, not only by Peter and John, but alſo by the other apoſtles alſo, beſide thoſe which are particularly recorded. See alſo ch. ii. 43.

3.) Says Mr. Biſcoe: 'Many [q] and great miracles are re-'lated in the hiſtory of the Acts to be wrought by St. Paul 'and his fellow-labourers in their preaching the goſpel to the 'gentiles. And agreeably hereto St. Paul ſays, 2 Cor. xii, 12. '*Truly the ſigns of an apoſtle were wrought amongſt you in all 'patience, in ſigns and wonders, and mighty deeds.* And to the 'Romans, ch. xv. 18, 19.... I make no doubt, ſays that 'learned writer, but the apoſtles wrought miracles in every 'city, where they came with a view to preach the goſpel, 'and make converts. St. Luke is ſo very ſuccinct in his 'hiſtory of the Acts, that he often omits them. He gives an 'account of only a miracle or two wrought at Philippi in his

[p] Œcumenius ſays, that Luke omitted many miracles wrought by the Apoſtles for avoiding oſtentation. Πολλων δε θαυματων επιτελεμενων υπο των αποστολων, ως και ανωτερω εμνησθη ο ταυτα γραφων λουκας, [cap. ii. 43.] εκεινος εκεινων ονομασι μνημονευει, αλλ' εκεινο γραφει μονον αφ' ε παντες εκινηθησαν.... η και οτι ε κομπε χαριν η συγγραφη αυτ ωαυτη εσπευδασθη. Œcum. in Act. Cap. iii. tom. i. p. 25. A. B.

[q] The Hiſtory of the Acts confirmed. ch. xi. § 8. p. 407, 408.

'whole

'whole relation of St. Paul's journey from Antioch to the 'weſt, when he converted a great part of Macedonia and 'Achaia: though it is evident from St. Paul's own epiſtle, 'already quoted, that he at that time did many ſigns and 'wonders at Corinth. And that he did the ſame at Theſſalo-'nica is not obſcurely intimated in his firſt epiſtle to the 'Theſſalonians, ch. i. 5. We read nothing in the Acts of 'the apoſtles of what St. Paul did in Galatia the firſt time, 'more than that he went through it. Acts xvi. 6. And all 'that is added the ſecond time he was there is, that *he went 'over all the country of Galatia, ſtrengthening all the diſciples*, 'ch. xviii. 23, Which indeed is an intimation, that the firſt 'time he was there he preached the goſpel among them, and 'made converts. But from his epiſtle to the Galatian 'churches it is fully evident that he wrought miracles among 'them, and conferred on them gifts of the Holy Spirit. For 'he aſks them: *He that miniſtreth to you the ſpirit, and work-'eth miracles among you, doth he it by the works of the law, or 'by the hearing of faith?* Gal. iii. 5. That he means himſelf, 'is manifeſt from the whole tenor of the epiſtle. See ch. i. 6. 'ch. iv. 11, 13, 14, 19.'

There follow other like obſervations, which I may not tranſcribe.

4.) Mr. Biſcoe, as above, makes no doubt but the apoſtles wrought miracles in every city, where they came, with a view to preach the goſpel, and make converts. I am of opinion, that this may be truly ſuppoſed of Paul particularly, and that it may be concluded from what St. Luke has written. For, according to him, Paul wrought miracles in Cyprus. Acts xiii. 11. at Lyſtra. xiv. 10. at Philippi. xvi. 16—18. See alſo 25, 26. and very many at Epheſus. xix. 11—17. And at Troas he raiſed Eutychus to life. xx. 9—12. In his voyage from Judea to Rome he wrought many miracles. xxviii. 3—6. and 7—10. From theſe miracles, recorded by St. Luke, it may be well argued, that St. Paul wrought miracles in all, or moſt other places, where he went and made any ſtay, preaching the goſpel. In particular, it may be argued, that Paul wrought miracles at Athens and at Rome. What they were we cannot ſay, becauſe they have not been recorded by St. Luke, nor by any other credible writer. But that miracles were performed by the apoſtle in thoſe cities, appears to me very probable.

5.) St.

5.) St. Luke [r] has not given any account of St. Paul's appearing before the emperor Nero at Rome, when he was ſent thither by Feſtus. Nevertheleſs, that Paul was brought before Nero ſoon after his arrival at Rome, is highly probable. And though St. Luke has not expreſsly ſaid ſo, it may be concluded from what he has ſaid. For he has again and again ſufficiently intimated that Paul was certainly to appear before the emperor, to whom he had appealed. See Acts xxv. 10, 11, 12, 21, xxvi. 32. xxvii. 24. xxviii. 19. The apoſtle therefore was brought before Nero, and pleaded before him. But St. Luke forbore to give a diſtinct account of it, becauſe he had already given a particular account of Paul's pleadings before Felix, and Feſtus, and Agrippa: and from them may be concluded what was the tenor of his apology before the emperor himſelf.

6.) St. Paul, in his epiſtle to the Chriſtians at Rome, ſays, ch. i. 11. *I long to ſee you, that I may impart unto you ſome ſpiritual gift, to the end ye may be eſtabliſhed.* And ch. xv. 29. *I am ſure, that when I come unto you, I ſhall come in the fulneſs of the bleſſing of the goſpel of Chriſt.* And unqueſtionably, the event was agreeable to theſe wiſhes and expectations.

7.) St. Luke has not particularly recorded thoſe things in his hiſtory: but from what he has ſaid they may be inferred. Says our hiſtorian. Acts xxviii. 13—16. *And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were deſired to tarry with them ſeven days. And ſo we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the three taverns. Whom when Paul ſaw, he thanked God, and took courage. 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.* And ver. 30. *Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired houſe.*

8.) From the things here ſaid it may be fairly concluded, that during the apoſtle's ſtay at Rome, there was a very delightful communication of civil and religious offices between him and the believers there, according to the abilities, and the exigences of each. Before he left Rome, the Philippians ſeem to have ſent him a ſupply by Epaphroditus. Philip. iv. 10—18. But it may be well ſuppoſed, that the price of his

[r] Mirum, quod Lucas hic nullam faciat mentionem primæ defenſionis Pauli, de qua ipſe 2 Tim. iv. Quam factam fuiſſe primo anno, quo Romam venit, non dubitandum. Eſt. ad Act. xxviii. 30.

lodging,

lodging, and the expences of his maintenance, were provided for, chiefly, by the Chriſtians, whom he found at Rome, when he came thither, and by the converts, which he made afterwards. The ſoldiers likewiſe, who by turns attended upon him, would expect to be conſidered, if they carried it civilly toward their priſoner. All which, we may ſuppoſe, was taken care of by the good Chriſtians at Rome: who, as St. Luke aſſures us, went out to meet him, and conducted him into the city.

CHAP. IX.

St. John, Apostle and Evangelist.

I. *His Hiſtory from the N. T.* II. *His Age.* III. *When he left Judea, to go to Epheſus.* IV. *His Hiſtory from eccleſiaſtical Writers.* V. *The Time, when he was baniſhed into Patmos.* VI. *How long he was there.* VII. *Teſtimonies of ancient Writers to his Goſpel.* VIII. *Opinions of learned Moderns concerning the Time, when this Goſpel was written.* IX. *An Argument, to prove, that it was written before the Deſtruction of Jeruſalem.* X. *Objections conſidered.* XI. *Obſervations upon this Goſpel.*

I. John was the ſon of Zebedee, a fiſherman upon the ſea of Galilee, probably [a] of the town of Bethſaida, and [b] Salome. John was the younger brother: for James is always [c] mentioned firſt, except in Luke ix. 28. and John is generally reckoned the youngeſt of all Chriſt's diſciples.

Though Zebedee was by trade a fiſherman, he needs not be reckoned poor: for, as St. Mark has particularly obſerved, he was not only maſter of a boat, and nets, but had *hired ſervants*, ch. i. 20. Moreover, we may recollect what Peter ſaid to Chriſt, who alſo had been a fiſherman upon the ſame ſea: *We have left all, and followed thee*, Matt. xix. 27. They

[a] Zebedæum gente Galilæum fuiſſe ex loco commorationis circa lacum Gennesareth ſuſpicamur. Incertius autem, Bethſaidenſem pronunciare, ut plerique faciunt: cum id nitatur tantum teſtimonio Evangelii, ſociis Andreæ ac Petro hoc oppidum adſignantis. Neque tamen argumenta ad manus ſunt, quibus vulgatam hanc opinionem impugnemus. Lampe Prolegom. in Johan.

[b] Compare Matt. xxvii. 56, with Mark xv. 40, and xvi. 1.

[c] So Matt. iv. 21. ch. x. 2. Mark i. 19. ch. iii. 17. ch. x. 35. Luke v. 10. Acts i. 13.

left

left their employments, by which they gained a ſubſiſtence: and for the preſent there was ſelf-denial in their attendance upon Jeſus.

It is not unlikely, that Zebedee died not long after theſe two brothers were called to be apoſtles. However, the circumſtances of the family may be collected from what is ſaid of their mother, who is mentioned Matt. xxvii. 55. and Mark xv. 40. among *thoſe women, who followed Jeſus out of Galilee, and miniſtred unto him.* That miniſtry is deſcribed Luke viii. 3. To which might be added, that ſhe is mentioned among thoſe women that bought ſweet ſpices to embalm the body of Jeſus, Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiii. 55. And our Lord, having recommended his mother to this diſciple, it is ſaid, that *he took her to his own home*, John xix. 27.

If Salome was related to our Lord in the manner ſuppoſed by Theophylact, or ſome other way, with which we are not diſtinctly acquainted; that may have been, in part, the ground and reaſon of ſeveral things mentioned in the goſpels: as the petition of theſe two brothers, diſciples, for the firſt two places in Chriſt's kingdom: John's being the beloved diſciple, and friend of Jeſus, and being admitted to ſome freedoms denied to the reſt: and, poſſibly, [c] performing ſome offices about his perſon: and, finally, our Lord's committing to him the care of his mother, ſo long as ſhe ſhould ſurvive him.

In Acts iv. 13. It is ſaid of Peter and John, that they were ignorant, and unlearned men. Which, indeed, is nothing elſe, but that they were neither [f] doctors, nor magiſtrates, but men of private ſtations, who had not been educated in the ſchools of the Rabbies: or, as Dr. Doddridge has happily tranſlated this text, illiterate men, and in private ſtations of

[c] See vol. V. p. 328.

[e] Opus ſcilicet erat ipſi aliquo, quem interdum ad matrem mitteret, (quod non ita raro factum eſſe, facile intelligitur,) quo uteretur ad lavandos ſibi pedes, ad induendos ſibi et exuendos calceos. [vid. Matt. iii. 11. Marc. i. 8. Luc. iii. 16. Joan i. 27.] qui ſibi præſto eſſet ad mandata ſubita, qui in cubiculo ſibi acjaceret dormienti, qui alia ſibi præſtaret minuta officiola domeſtica, qui propterea perpetuus ſibi eſſet pediſſequus, nec niſi juſſus ab ipſo recederet. Heuman. Diſſ. Syll. tom. II p. 338.

[f] Ἀγράμματοι, *ſine literis*: id eſt, non verſati in doctrinis thalmudicis, quales illiterati Hebræis. Nam ſcripturas ſacras Apoſtoli et legerant, et memoria tenebant. Καὶ ἰδιῶται. Idiotæ ſunt Hebræis, qui neque Magiſtratus ſunt, neque Legiſperiti. Grot. in loc.

life.

life. So Œcumenius ſays, that [g] St. John in ſending a letter to Gaius had Paul for an example, who wrote to Timothy, and Titus, and to Philemon, an idiot: that is, a man of a private ſtation: whereas Timothy and Titus had a public character in the church, as they were evangeliſts.

There can be no doubt, that Zebedee's ſons, as the children of all pious Jews at that time, were well acquainted with the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament. They had read them, and had heard them read and explained in the ſynagogues. They had alſo been accuſtomed to go to Jeruſalem at the feaſts, and had diſcourſed with many upon the things of religion. They now were in expectation of the appearing of the Meſſiah, foretold in the law and the prophets: but, undoubtedly, were in the common prejudice of the nation, that it would be, in part at leaſt, a worldly kingdom. And it is very likely, that they had heard John preach: though they did not attend ſtatedly upon him as his diſciples: for all the people of Judea, in general, went to John's baptiſm.

Says St. John, i. 35, 36. *Again, the next day after, John ſtood, and two of his diſciples. And looking upon Jeſus as he walked, he ſaith: behold the lamb of God*... From ver. 40. we learn, that one of theſe two, which heard John ſpeak, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. And [h] ſome have ſuppoſed, that our evangeliſt, who writes this, was the other: which I do not look upon as certain, though I do not deny it.

Whether the other was John, or not, it ought to be reckoned unqueſtioned, that before he was called to be an apoſtle, he had ſeen and heard the Lord Jeſus, and had been witneſs of ſome miracles wrought by him. It appears to me very probable, that [i] he was one of the diſciples, who were preſent at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, where water was made wine. John ii. 1—11.

The call of James and John, to attend upon Jeſus ſtatedly, is related Matt. iv. 21, 22. Mark i. 19, 20. Luke v. 1—10.

St. Mark putting down the names of the twelve apoſtles, when he mentions James and John, ſays, that our Lord *ſur-*

[g] Προς δε γαιον ενα γραφων εχει παυλον τιτω γραφοντα και τιμοθεῳ, και προς φιλημονα δε ιδιωτην. Œcum T. II. p. 606. C.

[h] Duorum alter ver. 41. nominatur. Alter videtur ipſe Evangeliſta noſter fuiſſe, uti viſum in vita ejus. Lib. I. cap. 2. Lampe in Joh. cap. i. ver. 35, 36.

[i] However, Baſnage diſputes this. Neque probabile admodum, Joannem his interfuiſſe nuptiis. Quod ſi concederetur, &c. Baſn. Ann. 30. num. xxxviii.

named

named them Boanerges, which is, ſons of thunder, ch. iii. 17. By which it ſeems unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that our Lord intended to reproach them with ſome fault in their natural temper, as if they were fierce and furious: though [k] a learned writer has intimated ſo much. That [l] name muſt have been very honourable, prophetically repreſenting the reſolution and courage with which they would openly and boldly declare the great truths of the goſpel, when fully acquainted with them. How John anſwered this character, we know from what is ſaid of him in the book of the Acts, and from his own writings, and from things recorded of him in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. How well James, the other brother, anſwered that character, may be concluded from his being beheaded by Herod Agrippa at Jeruſalem, not many years after our Lord's aſcenſion. Which, we cannot doubt, was owing to an open and ſteadfaſt teſtimony to the reſurrection of Jeſus, and to other ſervices for the church: whereby he had greatly ſignalized himſelf in the ſhort period of his life after our Lord's aſcenſion. Poſſibly [m] he had, with a freedom, not a little offenſive, ſpoken of the calamities coming upon the Jewiſh people, if they did not repent, and believe in Jeſus as the Chriſt: as alſo John the Baptiſt had declared in his preaching, Matt. iii. 7—12. Luke iii. 17. and Stephen in his, Acts, vi. 13, 14. James [a] was the firſt martyr for Chriſt among the apoſtles;

[k] 'However it was, our Lord, I 'doubt not, herein had reſpect to 'the furious and reſolute diſpoſition 'of thoſe two brothers, who ſeem 'to have been of a more fierce 'and fiery temper than the reſt of 'the Apoſtles.' Cave's Life of St. James the Great. num. 5. p. 142.

[l] Vid. Fr. Lamp. Prolegom. l. i. cap. 2. num. vii—xv.

[m] Accedit altera ratio, quæ eos adhuc proprius ſpectabat, nempe quod in ſcopo miniſterii ſui præ cæteris Apoſtolis Baptiſtæ ſimiles eſſent futuri. Nempe ſicut Baptiſta in ea totus erat, ut per tonitru præconii ſui judicium jam tum Judæis imminens indicaret et averteret; ita et miniſterium fratrum horum potiſſimum ad Judæos ſpectaturum erat. Quibus quidem ea fini poſt adſcenſionem Domini nunquam, quod ſcimus, ab Hieroſolyma diſceſſit, donec pro fide martyrium ſubiret. Hoc vero ei eveniſſe, quam maxime probabile eſt, quia invidioſa præ cæteris ejus concio fuit, periculum inſtans incredulorum ex Judæis omni data occaſione ingeminans, &c. Lamp. ib. l. i. cap. 2. num. xv.

[a] It has long been the general opinion of the people of Spain, that this James, the ſon of Zebedee, planted the goſpel in that country. Gaſpar Sanctius, a learned Spaniſh jeſuit, wrote a treatiſe in defence of it, beſide what he ſays in his Commentary upon the Acts of the apoſtles. But it is inconſiſtent with the hiſtory in the Acts: none of the Apoſtles left Judea ſo ſoon; nor is this opinion founded on the teſtimony

apoſtles; and bids fair for obtaining his petition, in a higher ſenſe, than it was at firſt intended: of *ſitting on the right hand or the left hand of Chriſt in his kingdom.* And the other brother ſurviving all the other apoſtles, bore the longeſt teſtimony to the truth of the goſpel.

This account of that name is agreeable to [n] what Grotius ſays in his Annotations. But Dr. Heumann [o] has another thought. He obſerves, that Simon, to whom Jeſus gave the name of Peter, is often ſo called: but we do not read that the two ſons of Zebedee were any where elſe ſpoken of by the name Boanerges, either by themſelves or others. He thinks that the words ſhould be thus rendered: 'And he had ſurnamed them Boanerges:' that is, upon a particular occaſion he ſo called them. That occaſion [q] he ſuppoſes to be the hiſtory related Luke ix. 52—56. That is an ingenious conjecture. But if this name had been given them in the way of reproof and cenſure, as Chriſt once called Peter Satan, Matt. xvi. 23. Mark viii. 33. one would ſcarcely expect to ſee it here. The place, as ſeems to me, leads us to think the name honourable, as well as Peter. Which has been the general opinion of all times.

teſtimony of any ancient writers, of good credit; and it is now generally given up, even by Popiſh writers. Vid. Baron. A. D. 41. num. i. Tillemont S. Jaques Le Majeur, et note vi. Mem. Ec. tom. I. I tranſcribe here the Judgment of Eſtius. Deinde, quando occiſus eſt, vixdum cœperat evangelium gentibus prædicari, ut ex præcedentibus et ſequentibus patet. Nec dum Apoſtoli diſperſi erant in remotas gentes: ſed ejus rei commodum tempus exſpectabant. Denique nullus ſcriptor antiquus certæ fidei refert, Jacobum Hiſpanias vidiſſe. Eſt. in Act. Ap. Cap. xii. ver. 2.——Vid et Baſnag. Ann. 44. num. iv. v. et Dictionarie de Moreri. S. Jaques le Majeur.

[n] Omnino mihi videtur Chriſtus, in hujus nominis impoſitione reſpexiſſe ad Aggæi vaticinium. cap. ii. 7. . . . Quod de evangelii prædicatione exponit Scriptor ad Hebræos. xii. 26. Ad hanc ergo maximam rerum mutationem ſignificat Chriſtus, Zebedæi filios eximios ſibi miniſtros fore. Et certe diſtinatam illis excellentiam quandam inter ipſos Apoſtolos vel hoc oſtendit, quod cum Petro ſeorſim a cæteris multarum rerum teſtes ſunt aſſumti. Adde jam quod Jacobus primus Apoſtolorum omnium ſanguine ſuo Chriſti doctrinam obſignavit; et quod Johannes omnibus Apoſtolis ſuperſtes diutiſſime teſtimonium perhibuit veritati. Grot. ad Marc. iii. 17.

[o] Nova Sylloge Diſſert. part. I. p. 254—259.

[q] Legimus, et adverſus Petrum indigne ſe gerentem, in hæc verba erupiſſe Chriſtum: Apage, Satana. Jam uti Satanas non factum eſt ordinarium Petri cognomen, ſic nec Zebedæi fratres niſi ſemel nominati ſunt Boanerges. Nec proinde laudis hoc nomen eſt, (quæ quidem inveterata eſt opinio,) ſed nomen vitii. Non eſt, inquam, appellatio honorifica, ſed invectiva. Ib. p. 259.

In

In Suicer's Theſaurus, at the word Βροντη may be ſeen the obſervations of many ancient writers upon this name. I take Theophylact's only; who ſays, that [r] when Chriſt called theſe two diſciples ſons of thunder, he intimated that they would be great preachers, and eminent divines.

From the time they were called by Chriſt, they ſtatedly attended upon him. They heard his diſcourſes, and ſaw his miracles.

They were two of the twelve, whom [s] Chriſt ſent forth upon a commiſſion, to preach in the Land of Iſrael; which was of great uſe to them: thereby [t] they learned to truſt in God, and were prepared for the greater difficulties of their apoſtleſhip afterwards.

John addreſſed himſelf to Chriſt, ſaying, *Maſter we ſaw one caſting out dæmons in thy name; and we forbade him, becauſe he followeth not with us....* So in Luke ix. 49, 50. And more at large in Mark ix. 38—41. But it was a thing, in which ſeveral were concerned. For John ſays: *We ſaw one caſting out dæmons, in thy name; and we forbade him.* The hiſtory, as recorded by the evangeliſts, led me to think ſo: and Mr. Lampe [u] was of the ſame mind. Moreover, it might be done ſome while before.

Our Lord was going from Galilee, to Jeruſalem before the feaſt of tabernacles, as ſome think, or before the feaſt of the dedication, as [x] Dr. Doddridge argues. And, as he was to paſs through the country of *Samaria, he ſent meſſengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. But they did not receive him, becauſe his face was, as though he would go unto Jeruſalem. When his diſciples, James and John, ſaw this, they ſaid: Lord, wilt thou, that we command fire to come down from heaven, and conſume them, even as Elias did. But he turned, and rebuked them, and ſaid: ye know not what manner of ſpirit ye are of.... And they went to another village*, Luke ix. 51—56. Some have been of opinion, that the meſſengers ſent by our Lord, to prepare entertainment for him, were theſe two diſciples. If ſo, this propoſal might be ſuſpected to proceed as much

[r] Τους δε βροντης ονομαζει τους τα μεγαλα κηρυκας και θεολογους. In Marc. tom. I. p. 205. C.

[s] See Matt. x. 6. Mark vi. 7. Luke ix. 1.

[t] See Luke xxii. 35.

[u] Ubi ſupr. l. i. cap. 2. num. 18.

[x] Family Expoſitor, vol. II. p. 183.

from reſentment of an injurious treatment of themſelves, as of their maſter. But to me that is not certain: I rather think, that thoſe meſſengers were different perſons. So [y] likewiſe argues Mr. Lampe.

The two brothers, James and John, were ambitious of high poſts of honour and dignity in Chriſt's kingdom: which, with others, they eſteemed to be of a worldly nature. The petition was preſented by their mother, but at their inſtigation. And they ſeem to have been preſent at the ſame time: for our Lord's anſwer is directed to them, Matt. xx. 20—23. Mark x. 35—40.

The two brothers, James and John, and Peter, were the only diſciples that were admitted to be preſent with our Lord at the raiſing of the daughter of Jairus, Mark v. 37. Luke viii. 51. The ſame three diſciples were taken up by Chriſt into the mount, when he was transformed in a glorious manner, and Moſes and Elias appeared talking with him, Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 28. The ſame three were admitted to be preſent at our Lord's devotions in the garden, when he retired from the reſt. But they all failed to watch with their Lord, as he had deſired, Matt. xxvi. 36—45. Mark xiv. 32—42.

Says St. Mark xiii. 1, 2. *And as he went out of the temple, one of his diſciples ſaith unto him, Maſter, ſee what manner of ſtones, and what buildings are here. And Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto him, ſeeſt thou theſe great buildings! There ſhall not be left one ſtone upon another, that ſhall not be thrown down.* Compare Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. It follows in Mark xiii. 3, 4. *And as he ſate on the mount of olives, over againſt the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, aſked him privately: tell us, when ſhall theſe things be? and what ſhall be the ſign, when all theſe things ſhall be fulfilled?* Whereby we perceive, that to thoſe four diſciples, eſpecially, our Lord addreſſed himſelf, when he delivered the predictions concerning the great deſolation coming upon the Jewiſh people, recorded in that chapter, and in Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi.

[y] Cui tamen in eo non accedimus, quod filios Zebedæi ipſos illos legatos putat fuiſſe, quos Jeſus in vicum Samaritanorum hoſpitium rogaturos miſerat. Unde ob illatam ſibi injuriam videntur exacerbati eſſe, ſed textus legatos illos a filiis Zebedæi ſatis clare diſtinguit. Accedit, quod Jeſus ad illos τραφεὶς converſus fuerit. Quod indicat, illos, cum Domino conſilium proponerent, non fuiſſe Domino obvios, ſed pone eum ſequentes. Lampe Poleg. l. 1. cap. 2. n. xix. not. (b).

This

This apoſtle and Peter were the two diſciples whom Jeſus ſent to prepare for eating his laſt paſſover. Luke xxii. 8. Compare Matt. xxvi. 17—19. Mark xiv. 13—16.

Our Lord ſitting at ſupper with his diſciples ſaid, *one of you will betray me.* Peter beckoned to John, who leaned on the boſom of Jeſus, *that he would aſk, who it ſhould be of whom he ſpake:* which he did. And our Lord gave him a ſign, by which he might know, whom he intended, John xiii. 21—26. This is an inſtance of the freedom which John might take, as the beloved diſciple and friend of Jeſus.

When our Lord was apprehended by the Jewiſh officers, we are informed by St. Mark xiv. 51, 52. *And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body: and the young men laid hold of him. And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them.* Some have thought that this young man was John. Cave [z] gives a good deal of countenance to that ſuppoſition. Others [a] have thought him to be James, the Lord's brother. But Grotius, and juſtly, wonders, that [b] any ſhould have been of opinion that he was one of the apoſtles.

That Peter followed our Lord at a diſtance, and was admitted into the hall of the Jewiſh high prieſt, we are aſſured from all the goſpels. It has been ſuppoſed by many, that John ſhowed the like teſtimony of affection and reſpect for his Lord; for he ſays, ch. xviii. 15. *And Simon Peter followed Jeſus, and ſo did another diſciple. That diſciple was known to the high prieſt, and ſpake to her that kept the door, and brought in Peter.*

Nevertheleſs it may be queſtioned, whether John hereby intends himſelf. Chryſoſtom [c] ſuppoſeth him to be meant, and that St. John concealeth his name out of humility and

[z] 'Indeed upon our Lord's firſt apprehenſion, he fled after the other apoſtles: it not being without ſome probabilities of reaſon, that the ancients conceive him to have been that *young man*, that followed after Chriſt, *having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body:* whom when the officers laid hold upon, he left the linen cloth, and fled naked away.' Cave's Life of St. John, num. ii. p. 151.

[a] See Whitby upon Mark xiv. 51.

[b] Non de Apoſtolorum grege. Quod miror, veteribus in mentem venire potuiſſe. Nec e domo, in quam Chriſtus in urbe diverterat, ſed ex villa aliqua horto proxima, ſtrepitu militum excitatus, et ſubito accurrens, ut conſpiceret, quid agerent. Grot. ad Marc. xiv. 51.

[c] Τις εστιν ο αλλος μαθητης; Ὁ ταυτα γραψας, κ. λ. Chr. in Joan. hom. 83, al. 82. T. VIII. p. 491.

modeſty. To the like purpoſe alſo [d] Theophylact. Nor had [e] Jerom any doubt here. But Auguſtine [f] was cautious in ſaying who it was; though he thought it might be John.

Let us now obſerve the ſentiments of moderns. Whitby upon the place ſays: 'He ſeems not to be John: for he 'being a Galilean as well as Peter, they might equally have 'ſuſpected him upon that account.' However, to this it might be anſwered, that John being known to the high prieſt, he was ſafe. But then another difficulty will ariſe; for it may be ſaid, how came John to be ſo well known to the high prieſt and his family, as to be able to direct the ſervant to admit a ſtranger, as Peter was, and at that time of night?

Grotius likewiſe thought that [g] this other diſciple could not be John, or any one of the twelve; but rather ſome believer, an inhabitant of Jeruſalem, and, poſſibly, the perſon at whoſe houſe our Lord had eaten the paſchal ſupper.

Lampe [h] heſitates: and at length allegeth the ſentiment of a learned writer, who conjectured that this other diſciple was

[d] Τις ην ο αλλος μαθητης; Αυτος ουτος ο ταυτα γραψας· αποκρυπτει εαυτον δια ταπεινοφροσυνην. κ. λ. Theoph. in Joh. xviii. p. 809.

[e] Unde et Jeſus Joannem Evangeliſtam amabat plurimum. Qui propter generis nobilitatem erat notus Pontifici, et Judæorum inſidias non timebat: in tantum ut Petrum introduceret in atrium, et ſtaret ſolus Apoſtolorum ante crucem, matremque Salvatoris in ſua reciperet. Ad Princip. virg. ep. 96. al. 16. T. IV. p. 780.

[f] Quiſnam iſte ſit diſcipulus, non temere affirmandum eſt, quia tacetur. Solet autem ſe idem Joannes ita ſignificare, et addere, quem diligebat Jeſus. Fortaſſis ergo hic ipſe eſt. Quiſquis tamen ſit, ſequentia videamus. In Joann. Evang. Tr. 113. T. III. P. 2.

[g] Et ſane non eſt probabile, aut ipſum Joannem hic intelligi (cur enim Galilæus cum eſſet, minus interrogaretur ab adſtantibus, quam Petrus?) aut aliquem ex Duodecim, ſed alium quendam Hieroſolymitanum, non æque manifeſtum ſautorem Jeſu: quales multi erant in urbe, ut ſupra didicimus, xii. 42. Valde mihi ſe probat conjectura exiſtimantium, hunc eſſe eum, in cujus domo Chriſtus cœnaverat, ob id quod legitur. Matt. xxvi. 18. Grot. ad Joh. xviii. 15.

[h] Scripſeram hæc, cum J. Caſp. Merhenii Obſervat. Crit. in Paſſ. J. C. . conſulens, novam ab eo hypotheſin proponi deprehenderem, . . . quæ notatu non indigna eſt. Ipſum ſiquidem Judam proditorem pro hoc diſcipulo habet, quem Joannes nominatu poſt turpiſſimum proditionis crimen indignum cenſuit.... Id autem quod potiſſimum in rem ſpectare videtur, neque a noſtra ſententia, quam de conſilio Judæ in prodendo ſervatore fovemus, abludit, ita habet: *Judam poſt commiſſum ſcelus pudore ſuffuſum pedetentim cohortem ſuiſſe ſecutum, atque in Petrum ita incidiſſe, cui ſcelus ſuum excuſare, qui negare potuit, ſe ea mente Chriſto ope-*

lari

was Judas the traitor. For Judas, he thinks, was ſoon touched with remorſe for what he had done: and he might follow Jeſus to the high prieſt's, hoping, that by ſome means he might eſcape out of the hands of thoſe to whom he had betrayed him. Judas being there himſelf, might be very willing to let in Peter. Whether this conjecture be ſpecious or not, I cannot ſay: but it does not ſeem to me very likely, that St. John ſhould characterize Judas by the title of *another diſciple*, after he had betrayed his Lord and Maſter.

After all I am not able to determine this point. At firſt reading this place of St. John, we are naturally enough led to think, that by *the other diſciple* ſhould be meant himſelf. But upon farther conſideration there ariſe difficulties that may induce us to heſitate.

Whether he followed Jeſus to the hall of Caiaphas, or not, we are aſſured that he attended the crucifixion, and ſeems to have been the only one of the twelve that did ſo. John xix. 25—27. *Now there ſtood by the croſs of Jeſus his mother.... When Jeſus therefore ſaw his mother, and the diſciple ſtanding by, whom he loved, he ſaith unto his mother, woman, behold thy ſon. Then ſaith he to the diſciple, behold thy mother. And from that hour that diſciple took her unto his own home.* There might be ſeveral reaſons for that determination: as John's being a relation, the ſweetneſs of his temper, and his having ſomewhat of his own. He had been the beloved diſciple or friend of Jeſus; and therefore was the moſt proper to be thus truſted: and doubtleſs this deſignation was perfectly agreeable to our Lord's mother.

John ſaw his Lord expire on the croſs; and ſtill farther: *One of the ſoldiers with a ſpear pierced his ſide, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that ſaw it bare witneſs; and his record is true*, ch. xix. 34, 35. And undoubtedly he alſo ſtayed afterwards, and ſaw the body of Jeſus laid in the ſepulchre, and the ſtone placed at the mouth of it; as related

[illegible], *at Chriſtum proderet, ſed [illegible] ſeipſum manifeſtaret, et ſe [illegible]. Fine de eo vix dubitamus, Judam pœnitentiâ ſceleris jam tum [illegible] tactum, atque conſcientiæ ſtimulos propter agitatum facile poſſe eo conſilio Jeſum captum ſequi, ut reſciret, annon aliquâ ratione, pro ſolito, Jeſus manus captorum evaſurus eſſet. Liberam jam lectori optionem relinquimus. Lampe in Evang. Joann. cap. xviii. tom. III. p. 523. note (f)*

by himſelf ch. xix. 38—42. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 53—60. Mark xv. 45.—47. Luke xxiii. 50—56.

Early in the morning, on which our Lord roſe from the dead, Mary Magdalene and other women, came to the ſepulchre, and ſaw it was open, the ſtone having been taken away. Mary Magdalene knowing where ſhe could find the two apoſtles, Peter and John, went back to the city, and told them that *they had taken away the Lord out of the ſepulchre: and*, ſays ſhe, *we know not where they have laid him. So they ran both together to the ſepulchre.* And by what they ſaw there, they were led to the perſuaſion that Jeſus was riſen from the dead; as related John xx. 1—10.

John was preſent with the other diſciples when Jeſus ſhowed himſelf to them in the evening of the day on which he aroſe, and likewiſe eight days after, ch. xx. 19—29.

He has alſo particularly related the hiſtory of our Lord's ſhowing himſelf to ſeveral diſciples at the ſea of Tiberias; when they had an extraordinary draught of fiſhes, in number one hundred and fifty three. There were preſent at that time *Simon Peter*, *Thomas*, *Nathanael*, *the ſons of Zebedee, and two other diſciples*, ch. xxi. 1—23. Beſide other things which I omit, our Lord having had diſcourſe with Peter, and having foretold his martyrdom: Peter put to him a queſtion concerning John, ſaying, *Lord, what ſhall this man do? Jeſus, ſaith unto him: if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this ſaying abroad among the brethren, that that diſciple ſhould not die. Yet Jeſus ſaid not unto him: he ſhall not die: but if I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* Thus checking, as I apprehend, Peter's curioſity. However, it has been ſuppoſed by judicious commentators, that here is an intimation that John ſhould not die before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. Nor is there any doubt but he ſurvived that event, which few or none of the other apoſtles did. Though [i] our Lord's words may be underſtood to contain only an obſcure intimation, that whereas Peter's days would be ſhortened by martyrdom, this diſciple ſhould be preſerved till he died in the ordinary courſe of nature.

[i] Ita obſcure ſignificat, Johannem, non, ut Petrum morte violenta moriturum, ſed tali, quâ, ſine hominum vi ſolveretur, ubi Chriſtus tempus idoneum judicaſſet. Quod et contigit, ut Veterum plures conſentiunt. Grot. ad Joan. xxi. 22.

From

From all which we perceive, that [k] St. John was preſent at moſt of the things related by him in his goſpel: and that he was an eye and ear-witneſs of our Lord's labours, journeyings, diſcourſes, miracles, his low abaſement even to an ignominious death, and his being alive again, and then aſcending to heaven.

Having [l] been preſent with the reſt of the apoſtles at the Lord's aſcenſion, he [m] returned with them from mount Olivet to Jeruſalem, and continued with them, joining with them in their devotions, and in the choice of another, to ſupply the place of Judas: and [n] partook in the plentiful effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt upon the apoſtles and their company on the day of Pentecoſt next enſuing.

Peter and John, who often accompanied each other, healed the lame man at the temple, and upon that occaſion preached to the people who aſſembled about them. For which they were brought before the Jewiſh council, and after ſome debates, were diſmiſſed, with orders not to preach any more in the name of Jeſus, Acts iii. and iv. 1—22.

Some while after this, the number of believers ſtill increaſing in Jeruſalem, John and the reſt of the apoſtles were apprehended, and put in the common priſon. But they were the ſame night delivered by an angel, who commanded them to *go and ſpeak in the temple to the people*; which they did *early in the morning:* whereupon they were again taken up and brought before the council, who conſulted

[k] Ex ipſa hiſtoria evangelica Joannis probabile fit, omnibus eventibus, itineribus, miraculis, concionibus ſervatoris noſtri ipſum interfuiſſe . . . cum probabile fit, illum fuiſſe inter diſcipulos duos Joannis Baptiſtæ, a quibus collectionis diſcipulorum initium Jeſus fecit, uti L. i. cap. 2. § ii. oſtendimus, inde colligimus, Evangeliſtam noſtrum ſatim ab initio rebus, quæ ſcribit, interfuiſſe et hanc eſſe veram rationem, cur non altius filum hiſtoriæ ſuæ inciperet. Ex omnibus quoque ſequentibus narrationibus nulla eſt, in qua abſentem Evangeliſtam certum ſtatuamus fuiſſe, niſi forte excipere velis illa, quæ in palatio Annæ et Caiaphæ acciderunt. Cap. xviii. 13—17. De quibus tamen res eſt dubia, quia definiri accurate nequit, annon diſcipulus, qui Petrum in Palatium Caiaphæ introduxerit, ipſe Evangeliſta noſter fuerit. Sed licet ille præſens non perceperit, a Petro tamen, ſocio intimo, ſtatim proculdubio audivit. Et forte per ejus relationem excitatus eſt, ut ad Prætorium Pilati ſummo mane advolaret, atque ita cum reliquis mulieribus Jeſum ad crucem ſequeretur. . . . Ex quo patet, quantâ cum emphaſi præ cæteris apoſtolis et evangeliſtis dicere potuit: Quæ audivimus, quæ vidimus. 1 Jo. i. 1, 2. Lamp. Proleg. l. 2. cap. 4. num. vi.

[l] Mark xvi. 19 Luke xxiv. 50—53. Acts i. 1—12.

[m] Acts i. 12—26.

[n] Acts ii. 1—13.

how they might put them to death. But by the advice of Gamaliel that deſign was laid aſide. *And when they had beaten them, they commanded that they ſhould not ſpeak in the name of Jeſus, and let them go. Whereupon the apoſtles departed from the preſence of the council, rejoicing.... And daily in the temple, and from houſe to houſe, they ceaſed not to teach and preach Jeſus Chriſt.*

Afterward, there being a violent perſecution at Jeruſalem, many were ſcattered abroad. Philip, one of the ſeven, went down to Samaria, and preached to them, and wrought many miracles, inſomuch that great numbers believed. When the apoſtles, who were at Jeruſalem, heard of this, they ſent unto them Peter and John, that they might receive the Holy Ghoſt. Having performed that ſervice, they returned to Jeruſalem: and in their way preached the goſpel in many villages of the Samaritans, Acts viii. 5—25.

From what St. Paul ſays in the ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the Galatians we perceive, that John was preſent at the council of Jeruſalem: of which an account is given Acts xv. Which council was held in the year 49, or 50, or thereabout. And it may be reckoned probable, that till that time John had ſtayed in the land of Iſrael, and had not been abroad in any gentile countries.

I would add, that though no miracles are related to be done by St. John beſide thoſe which have been here taken notice of; I reckon it very probable, that many miracles, beſide thoſe particularly mentioned by the hiſtorian, were wrought by him and other apoſtles during their ſtay in Judea. This may be inferred from general expreſſions of St. Luke in ſeveral places. *And many ſigns and wonders were done by the apoſtles*, Acts ii. 43. *And with great power gave the apoſtles witneſs of the reſurrection of the Lord Jeſus*, ch. iv. 33. *And by the hands of the apoſtles were many ſigns and wonders wrought among the people*, ch. v. 12. Comp. iv. 29, 30.

From the book of the Revelation, ch. i. 9. we learn, that St. John was for a while in the iſland called Patmos, where he was favoured with viſions and revelations.

Thus far we have endeavoured to collect the hiſtory of this apoſtle from the New Teſtament.

II. From eccleſiaſtical hiſtory we learn, that St. John lived to a great age, and that in the latter part of his life he reſided

reſided in Aſia, particularly at Epheſus, the chief city of that country.

Concerning his abode in Aſia we have divers teſtimonies of good credit. Irenæus in [o] two places of his work againſt hereſies, both [p] cited by Euſebius, ſays, that John the apoſtle lived in Aſia till the time of Trajan, [who ſucceeded Nerva in the year of Chriſt 98.] Euſebius [q] underſtands Clement of Alexandria to ſpeak to the like purpoſe. Origen alſo ſays, that [r] John having lived long in Aſia, died at Epheſus. Polycrates, biſhop of Epheſus, about 196, is an unexceptionable witneſs, that [s] John was buried in that city. Jerom [t] in his book of Illuſtrious Men, and in his books againſt Jovinian, ſays, 'that the apoſtle John lived in Aſia, 'to the time of Trajan; and dying at a great age, in the 'ſixty-eighth year after our Lord's paſſion, was buried near 'the city of Epheſus.' Suppoſing our Lord to have been crucified in the year 32, of the vulgar æra, which [u] ſeems to have been Jerom's opinion, ſixty-eight years will reach to the year 100, or the third of Trajan: at which year of that emperor the death of St. John is placed by Jerom in his [x] Chronicle.

What was John's age, when called by Chriſt, we are not informed. Baronius [y] thought he might then be about 22 years of age. Having been with Chriſt three years, he was about 25 years of age when our Lord was crucified. Tillemont [z] ſuppoſes St. John to have been about 25 or 26 years of age when called to be an apoſtle. Lampe [a] thinks, that he was about the ſame age with our Saviour. For my part, I cannot perſuade myſelf, that any of Chriſt's apoſtles, when called to attend upon him, that they might be his witneſſes to the world, were much under the age of thirty. If it hence follows, that John was a hundred years of age, or thereabout when he died, it is not at all incredible, nor unlikely.

[o] Iren. adv. Hær. l. 2. cap. 22.
[p] v. p. 148. ed Maſſ. et l. 3. cap. 3. p. 178.
[q] Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in.
[r] Vid. Euſeb. Ibid.
[s] Ap. Euſeb. l. 3. cap. 1.
[t] Ap. Euſeb. l. v. cap. 24. in.
[u] Vol. V. p. 41, 42.
Vid. Baſnag. Ann. 101. num. ii.
[x] p. 165. ex ed. Scalig.
[y] Ann. 101. num. ix.
[z] S. Jean. l' Evangeliſte. art. x. et note xv. Mem. tom. I.
[a] Quare nihil impedit, quo minus ejuſdem ferme ætatis cum ſervatore noſtro fuerit. Prolegom. in Jo. l. i. cap. 2. num. i. note *(a)*

III. As

III. As it is an allowed point, that John dwelt in Aſia in the latter part of his life; we may be reaſonably deſirous to know, when he ſettled in that country: and for determining this, the books of the New Teſtament may afford good hints. For [b] in all St. Luke's hiſtory of the preaching and travels of Paul, particularly in Aſia, no mention is made of John: which may induce us to think, that he was not there at that time. Nor are there any ſalutations ſent to John in any of St. Paul's epiſtles written at Rome: ſeveral of which were ſent to Epheſus, or other places, not very remote from it: as the epiſtle to the Epheſians, the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, probably, at Epheſus, the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, and the epiſtle to Philemon, at Coloſſe.

I will now obſerve the opinions of ſome learned moderns. Baronius thought, that [c] this apoſtle did not come to reſide in Aſia, until after the death of St. Peter, and St. Paul. Du Pin ſays: 'we [d] do not exactly know, when he came into Aſia: perhaps it was about the year 70.' Tillemont was of opinion, that [e] St. John did not come to reſide in Aſia, till about the year 66. But he ſuppoſeth, that upon ſome occaſion, he had before that been in that country, without making a ſtay there: which laſt, as I apprehend, is ſaid without any good authority. Mr. Lampe was of opinion, that [f] John did not leave Judea, till after the death of James, called the Leſs, and but a ſhort time only before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

To me it ſeems not unlikely, that St. John came into Aſia about the time that the war broke out in Judea, in the year 66, or a ſhort time before, when, probably, St. Peter and Paul had been before crowned with martyrdom.

As St. John ſtayed a good while in Paleſtine, it may be reaſonably concluded, that the virgin Mary did not go with

[b] 'In the diviſion of provinces, 'which the apoſtles made among 'themſelves, Aſia fell to his ſhare, 'though he did not preſently enter 'into his charge. Otherwiſe, we 'muſt have heard of him in the 'account, which St. Luke gives of 'St. Paul's ſeveral journies into, 'and reſidence in thoſe parts.' Cave's Life of St. John, § iv.

[c] A. d. 97. num. ii.

[d] Du Pin Diſſ. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § vi.

[e] St. Jean art. iv.

[f] Poſt ejus (Jacobi Minoris) exceſſum neminem ex των δωδεκα grege et conſtantius et diutius Hieroſolymis ſubſtitiſſe noſtro Apoſtolo: ita ut vix exiguo ante exordium intervallo, inde ſe avelli paterctur. Proleg. l. i. cap. 2. n. xv. p. 29.

him

him to Epheſus, as [g] Baronius and ſome others have thought, but died before he went thither: which was the opinion of [h] Cave, and [i] Baſnage.

IV. St. John having had a long life, many things have been ſaid of him, ſome true, others falſe. Moſt of them have been already taken notice of in ſeveral chapters of this work: it may not be improper to recollect them here, with ſome remarks.

1. Apollonius, who wrote againſt the Montaniſts, and flouriſhed about the year 211, ſays, in a fragment preſerved by Euſebius, 'That [k] by the divine power John raiſed up a dead man to life at Epheſus.' Which miracle is alſo taken notice of by [l] Sozomen, and [m] Nicephorus, and may have been really done. But if we had had a more circumſtantial hiſtory of it, and if it had been mentioned by ſome other early writers, beſide Apollonius, it would have been more credible.

2. There was a book forged with the title of the Travels of Paul and Thecla by a preſbyter, who was depoſed for ſo doing, as related by Tertullian. Jerom ſays that he was a preſbyter in Aſia, and that he was convicted before St. John of being the author of it, and for that reaſon was depoſed. Of this matter we have already ſpoken diſtinctly, and therefore refer to what was then ſaid.[n]

3. It is alſo related of our apoſtle, that going to bathe at Epheſus, and perceiving that Cerinthus, or, as others ſay, Ebion was already in the bath, he came out again haſtily, and would not make uſe of the bath. The probability of which account was examined formerly.[o]

4. It is ſaid, that by order of the emperor Domitian, St. John was caſt into a caldron of boiling oil at Rome, and came out again, without being hurt. The [p] truth of which ſtory likewiſe has been conſidered by us.

5. Polycrates, biſhop of Epheſus in the latter part of the ſecond century, ſays, that John was Chriſt's high prieſt,

[g] A. d. 44. n. xxix.

[h] 'Probable therefore it is, that 'he dwelt in his own houſe at 'Jeruſalem, at leaſt till the death 'of the bleſſed Virgin.' Cave's Life of St. John, § iv.

[i] Vid. Baſnag. An. 46. num. xxviii.

[k] See vol. II. p. 371.

[l] Soz. l. 7. cap. 27. p. 750.

[m] Niceph. l. 4. cap. 25.

[n] See vol. II. p. 285, 286, 311, 312.

[o] See vol. II. p. 86, 87. note *(b)* and vol. V. p. 44.

[p] See vol. II. p. 268, 269. note *(e)* and vol. V. p. 44.

wearing

wearing on his forehead a golden plate: which account [q] has been conſidered, and the judgments of divers learned men upon it alleged.

6. Euſebius has a ſtory, from a work of Clement of Alexandria, of a young man in a city of Aſia, not far from Epheſus, who after having been inſtructed in the chriſtian religion took to evil courſes, and became profligate: but nevertheleſs was afterwards brought to repentance by our apoſtle. This account is inſerted at large by Euſebius [r] in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. It has been repeated in like manner by Simeon Metaphraſtes in his life of St. John. Chryſoſtom [s] has referred to it. It is alſo briefly told in the [t] Paſchal Chronicle. I have already taken ſome notice of this [u] ſtory. S. Baſnage [x] thinks it to be a fable, or feigned apologue, compoſed to convey uſeful inſtruction. Mr. Lampe [y] is favourable to this hiſtory. And, perhaps, it may be true, abating ſome circumſtances; which are not ſeldom added to ſuch accounts, to render them the more entertaining.

7. Jerom has given an account of St. John's method of preaching, when he was of a great age, and was not able to make a long diſcourſe. This [z] was taken notice of by us in a proper place: nor is the truth of it, though related by Jerom only, diſputed, either by [a] Lampe, or [b] Le Clerc.

8. It is generally ſuppoſed, that [c] John is one of thoſe apoſtles, who lived a ſingle life: it is ſaid by [d] Tertullian,

[q] See vol. V. p. 43, 44.

[r] L. 3. cap. 23.

[s] Ad Theodor. Lapſ. T. I. p. 31. ed. Bened.

[t] Chr. Paſch. p. 251. D.

[u] See vol. V. p. 44.

[x] Apologo quam hiſtoriæ videtur eſſe propior. . . . Ac ſane neſcimus, ſi vera hiſtoria eſt, cur Clemens μυθε, fabulæ, nomen ipſi primum impoſuerit. Fabula fuit ratione rei ſignificantis, veritaſque reſpectu rei ſignificatæ, quæ mentibus proponebatur, nempe eximii paſtoris officium, ac vis pœnitentiæ. Non inſolens erat antiquis, uti apologis ejuſmodi ad informandos mores. . . . Si cui tamen placet de Joanne Clementis narrationem veram hiſtoriam eſſe, quia ſic Veteribus viſum, de hac re quidem contendere nolumus. Baſn. ann. 97. num. x.

[y] Prolegom. l. i. cap. v. num. iii—ix.

[z] Vol. V. p. 42.

[a] Licet enim Hieronymus ſolus hujus narrationis auctor ſit, nihil tamen occurrit, quod non cum more Joannis, ut cum ratione Eccleſiæ ejus temporis apprime convenit. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. v. n. xi.

[b] H. E. ann. 99. num. i.

[c] Vid. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. i. num. xiii.

[d] Joannes Chriſti ſpado. De Monog. cap. 17. p. 688.

and

and Jerom; which laſt affirms, that [e] eccleſiaſtical hiſtory aſſures us of it; and he makes it the ground of all the peculiar privileges of this apoſtle.

9. Another thing, ſaid of John, is, that he was baniſhed into Patmos, an iſland of the Mediterranean ſea, not far from the coaſt of Aſia. And, if he is the writer of the book of the Revelation, which we do not now diſpute, the thing is unqueſtioned. But I have deferred the conſideration of this particular, till now, becauſe learned moderns are not agreed about the time of it.

V. I ſhall therefore firſt put down the accounts of ancient authors, and then obſerve the opinions of learned men of later times.

Irenæus ſays of the Revelation, 'that [f] it was ſeen no 'long time ago, but almoſt in our age, at the end of the 'reign of Domitian.' And though Irenæus does not ſay, that St. John was then in Patmos, yet ſince he ſuppoſeth him to be the perſon, who had the revelation, he muſt have believed him to be then in Patmos, as the book itſelf ſays, ch. i. 9.

Clement, of Alexandria, in his book, entitled, Who is the rich man that may be ſaved, as cited by Euſebius, ſpeaks [g] of 'John's returning from Patmos to Epheſus, after the death of the tyrant:' by whom, it is probable, he means Domitian.

Tertullian, in his apology, ſpeaks of Domitian, as [h] having baniſhed ſome Chriſtians, and afterwards giving them leave to return home: probably intending St. John, and

[e] Talem fuiſſe eunuchum, quem Jeſus amavit plurimum, Evangeliſtam Joannem, eccleſiaſticæ tradunt hiſtoriæ: qui recubuit ſuper pectus Jeſu: qui, Petro tardius ambulante, elatus virginitatis alis cucurrit ad Dominum: qui in ſecreta divinæ ſe nativitatis immergere auſus eſt dicere: in principio erat Verbum, &c. In Iſ. cap. LVI. T. III. p. 410.

Joannes vero noſter, quaſi aquila, ſublimia volat, et ad ipſum Patrem pervenit, dicens: in principio erat Verbum, &c. Expoſuit virginitatem, quod nuptiæ ſcire non poſſunt. Et ut brevi ſermone multa comprehendam, docuamque, cujus privilegii ſit Joannes, imo in Joanne virginitas: a Domino virgine, mater virgo virgini diſcipulo commendatur. Adv. Jovin. l. i. T. IV. P. II. p. 169. Vid. et ad. Princip. virg. ep. 96. al. 16. ib. p. 780. *f.*

[f] See vol. II. p. 169.

[g] Επειδη γαρ τε τυραννε τελευτησαντος, απο της νησε μετηλθεν εις την εφεσον. κ. λ. Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. p. 92.

[h] Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate. Sed qua et homo facile ceptum repreſſit, reſtitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. 5.

ſome

ſome others. In another work he ſays, 'that [i] John having 'been ſent for to Rome, was caſt into a veſſel of boiling 'oil, and then baniſhed into an iſland:' in the time of Domitian, as is moſt probable.

Origen, explaining Matt. xx. 23. ſays: 'James [k] the brother of John, was killed with a ſword by Herod. And a 'Roman emperor, as tradition teaches, baniſhed John into 'the iſland Patmos for the teſtimony, which he bore to the 'word of truth. And John himſelf bears witneſs to his 'baniſhment, omitting the name of the emperor, by whom 'he was baniſhed, ſaying in the Revelation: *I John, who alſo 'am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jeſus Chriſt, was in the iſle of Patmos, for 'the word of God, and for the teſtimony of Jeſus Chriſt.* And [l] 'it ſeems, that the Revelation was ſeen in that iſland.'

Victorinus, biſhop of Pettaw about 290, again and again ſays, that [m] John was baniſhed by Domitian, and in his reign ſaw the Revelation.

Euſebius, giving an account of Domitian's perſecution, ſays: 'In [n] this perſecution, as it is ſaid, John, the apoſtle 'and evangeliſt, being ſtill living, was baniſhed into the 'iſland Patmos for the teſtimony of the word of God.'

Epiphanius, as formerly [p] ſhown, ſays: 'John propheſied in the iſle of Patmos, in the reign of Claudius.' And in another place, then only referred to, he ſays: 'John wrote 'his goſpel in his old age, when he was more than ninety 'years old, after his return from Patmos, which [q] was in 'the time of Claudius Cæſar.'

Jerom, in his book of illuſtrious men, as [r] formerly cited, ſays: 'Domitian in the fourteenth year of his reign raiſing 'the ſecond perſecution after Nero, John was baniſhed into 'the iſland Patmos, where he wrote the Revelation.' And in another work, alſo cited [s] formerly, he ſays again: 'John 'was a prophet, as he ſaw the Revelation in the iſland Pat-

[i] ...habes Romam,...ubi Apoſtolus Joannes, poſteaquam in oleum igneum demerſus, nihil paſſus eſt, in inſulam relegatur. De Pr. Hær. cap. 36. p. 245.

[k] Comm. in Matt. T. I. p. 417. Huet.

[l] Και εοικε την αποκαλυψιν εν τη νησω τεθεωρησεναι. Ibid. C.

[m] See vol. III. p. 301.

[n] H. E. l. 3. cap. 18.

[p] Vol. IV. p. 316.

[q] ...την επι κλαυδιε γενομενην καισαρος. Hær. 51. num. xii.

[r] See vol. V. p. 41.

[s] p. 42.

'mos,

'mos, where he was baniſhed by Domitian.' And I ſhall now tranſcribe below [t] in his own words, without tranſlating them, his comment upon Matt. xx. 23. where he ſpeaks of St. John's having been baniſhed into Patmos: but does not name the emperor, by whom he was baniſhed.

Sulpicius Severus ſays, 'that [u] John, the apoſtle and 'evangeliſt, was baniſhed by Domitian into the iſland Pat-'mos: where he had viſions, and where he wrote the book 'of the Revelation.'

Arethas in his commentary upon the Revelation, ſuppoſed to be written in the ſixth century, ſays, upon the authority of Euſebius, that [x] John was baniſhed into Patmos by Domitian.

Iſidore, of Seville, near the end of the ſixth century, ſays, 'Domitian [y] raiſed a perſecution againſt the Chriſtians. In 'his time the apoſtle John having been baniſhed into the 'iſland Patmos ſaw the Revelation.'

We may now make a remark or two.

1. All theſe teſtimonies are of uſe, whether they name the iſland where John was baniſhed, or the emperor by whom he was baniſhed, or not. They all agree that St. John was ſent thither by way of puniſhment, or reſtraint, for bearing witneſs to the truth: which confutes the opinion of Lightfoot, 'that [z] John travelling in the miniſtry of the 'goſpel, up and down, from Aſia weſtward, comes into 'the iſle Patmos, in the Icarian ſea, an iſland about thirty 'miles compaſs: and there on the Lord's day he has theſe 'viſions, and an angel interprets to him all he ſaw.'

2. All theſe writers, who mention the time of the Revelation, and of the baniſhment, ſay, it was in the time of Domitian, and that he was the emperor, by whom St. John

[t] Quæritur, quomodo calicem martyrii filii Zebedæi, Jacobus vi-[illegible]et et Joannes, biberint: quum ſcriptura narret Jacobum tantum Apoſtolum ab Herode cæpite trun-[illegible]um: Joannes autem propria mor-[illegible] vitam finierit. Sed ſi legamus eccleſiaſticas hiſtorias, in quibus [illegible]ror, quod et ipſe propter mar-[illegible]rium ſit miſſus in ferventis olei [illegible]um, et inde ad ſuſcipiendam [illegible]nam Chriſti athleta proceſſerit, [illegible]que relegatus in Patmon in-[illegible]m ſit, videbimus, martyrio ani-mum non defuiſſe, et bibiſſe Joannem calicem confeſſionis. Comm. in Matt. tom. IV. P. I. p. 92.

[u] See vol. V. p. 164.

[x] Ἐξόρισον δὲ αὐτον γενεσθαι εν πατμῳ τῃ νησῳ υπο δομετιανε, ευσεβιος ο παμφιλε εν τῳ χρονικῳ αυτε βιβλιῳ παρατιθεται. Andr. in Apoc. ap. Œcum. tom. II. p. 654. D.

[y] Vol. V. p. 309.

[z] Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 341.

was

was baniſhed: except Epiphanius, who ſays it was in the time of Claudius. As he is ſingular, it ſhould ſeem that he cannot be of any great weight againſt ſo many others.

Nevertheleſs, as ſome learned men, particularly Grotius, have paid great regard to Epiphanius in this point, it is fit we ſhould conſider what they ſay.

Says Grotius in a tract, entitled, A Comment upon divers Texts of the New Teſtament, relating to Antichriſt: particularly upon the tenth verſe of the ſeventeenth chapter of the Revelation: 'John [a] began to be illuminated with 'divine viſions in the iſland Patmos, in the time of Clau-'dius; which was the opinion of the moſt ancient Chriſ-'tians. See Epiphanius in the hereſy of the Alogians. 'Claudius, as we learn from Acts xviii. 2. *commanded all* '*Jews to depart from Rome.* Under the name of Jews, 'Chriſtians alſo were comprehended, as has been obſerved 'by many learned men. And it cannot be doubted, but 'many governors of the Roman provinces followed that ex-'ample. So therefore John was driven from Epheſus.'

That argument was long ago examined by [b] David Blondel, who ſays, 1. It is not true, that the moſt ancient writers ſaid that St. John was ſent into Patmos by Claudius. It is Epiphanius only who ſays ſo: he is altogether ſingular. There are no ancients, either before or after him, who have ſaid this. 2. As Epiphanius is ſingular, he ought not to be regarded. 3. There was no perſecution of the Chriſtians in the reign of Claudius. There is no proof from any ancient monuments, that Chriſtians, as ſuch, ſuffered baniſhment under that emperor. It is allowed that [c] Nero

[a] Cœpit autem Joannes in Patmo eſſe, et Dei viſis illuminari Claudii temporibus, quæ vetuſtiſſimorum Chriſtianorum eſt ſententia, non Domitiani, ut volunt alii. Vide Epiphanium in Hæreſi Alogorum. Claudius Judæos, ſub quorum nomine tunc et Chriſtiani cenſebantur, ut multis viris doctis obſervatum eſt, Roma pepulerat, Act. xviii. 2. Quod exemplum non dubium eſt, quin imitati ſint multi Præſides Romanarum provinciarum. Ita Epheſo expulſus Joannes. Grot. Commentatio ad loca quædam N. T. quæ de Antichriſto agunt, aut agere putantur. Opp. tom. III.

[b] Des Sibylles l. 2. ch. iii. p. 145—148. á Charenten. 1649.

[c] Conſulite commentarios veſtros. Illic reperietis, primum Neronem in hanc ſectam, cum maxime Romæ orientem, Cæſariano gladio ferociſſe. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis noſtræ etiam gloriamur. Tertull. Ap. cap. vi.

Nerone imperante. . . . Qui dignus exſtitit, qui perſecutionem in Chriſtianos primus inciperet. Sulp. Sev. Hiſt. Sacr. l. 2. cap. 39.

Nam primus Romæ Chriſtianos ſuppliciis et mortibus affecit. P. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 7. Vid. et Euſeb. H. C. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 67.

was

was the first Roman emperor who persecuted the Christians. 4. The edict of Claudius only banished the Jews from Rome. It did not affect the Jews in the provinces, as appears from the New Testament itself, particularly Act xviii. and xix. It is manifest from the history in the Acts, that in the reign of Claudius, in other parts of the empire out of Rome, the Jews enjoyed as full liberty as they did before. Paul and Silas, Aquila and Priscilla, dwelt quietly at Corinth; where the men of their nation had their synagogue, and assembled in it according to custom without molestation. 5. Nor could the governors of provinces banish either Jews or Christians out of their governments, without order from the emperor: and that they had no such order, is apparent. Neither Jews nor Christians were molested by them at Ephesus, as may be perceived from the history in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. That they were not molested by them at Corinth, appears from the preceding chapter. 6. St. John could not be banished from Ephesus by Claudius, or the governors under him: for he was not in that city during the reign of that emperor, nor in the former part of the reign of Nero, as has been shown. He did not come thither till near the end of the reign of the last mentioned emperor: therefore he could not be sooner banished from Ephesus.

These observations, if I am not mistaken, are sufficient to confute the opinion of Grotius.

Sir Isaac Newton was of opinion, that [b] St. John was banished into Patmos, and that the Revelation was seen in the reign of Nero, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

[b] Sir Isaac Newton's opinion is much the same with that of John Hentenius of Mechlin, confuted by David Blondel in the same work, and in the next chapter to that, in which he confuted Grotius. Hentenius and Newton argue much alike. It may be suspected, that Newton incautiously borrowed some of his weak arguments. Says Blondel: 'Jean Hentenius en sa preface sur le Commentaire d'Arethas . . a le discours, qui suit: *Il me semble, que Jean . . . a esté relegué par Neron a Patmos au mesme temps que celui là a esté dans Rome. . . . Pierre et Paul. Tertullien, voisin des temps des mesmes Apostres, asseure cela mesme en deux lieux. Eusebe aussi traitte la mesme chose au livre de la Demonstration Evangelique, combien qu'en ses Chroniques, et en l' Histoire Ecclesiastique il dit que cela est arrivé sous Domitien: ce que aussi Saint Hierome et plusieurs autres suivent. Mais à ces livres cy, comme escris és annees precedentes, si grande authorité n' est pas attribuée, qu' à celui de la Demonstration Evangelique, veu qu'il a esté depuis, et plus correctement élabouré.* Blondel des Sibylles. l. 2. ch. iv. p. 148, 149.

'Euſebius,' ſays he, [d] 'in his Chronicle, and Eccleſi-'aſtical Hiſtory follows Irenæus: (who ſaid the Apocalypſe 'was written in the time of Domitian:) but afterwards in 'his Evangelical Demonſtration he conjoins the baniſhment 'of John into Patmos, with the deaths of Peter and Paul.'

To which I anſwer, firſt, that [e] the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory was not written before the Evangelical Demonſtration, but after it: for the Demonſtration is referred to at the end of the ſecond chapter of the firſt book of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. Secondly, Euſebius in his Demonſtration is not different from himſelf in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. In his Demonſtration, having ſpoken of the impriſonment of all the apoſtles at Jeruſalem, and of their being beaten, and of the ſtoning of Stephen, the beheading of James the ſon of Zebedee, and the impriſonment of Peter, he adds: 'James 'the Lord's brother, was ſtoned, Peter was crucified at 'Rome with his head downward, and Paul was beheaded, 'and John baniſhed into an iſland.' But he does not ſay, that all theſe things happened in the time of one and the ſame emperor. It is plain, that it is not his deſign to mention exactly the time of the ſufferings of all theſe perſons. Nothing hinders our ſuppoſing, that the apoſtles Peter and Paul were put to death by order of Nero, and John baniſhed by Domitian, many years afterwards, agreeably to what himſelf writes in his Chronicle and Hiſtory.

It follows in Sir Iſaac Newton. 'And [g] ſo do Tertul-'lian, and Pſeudo-Prochorus, as well as the firſt author, 'whoever he was, of that very ancient fable, that St. John 'was put by Nero into a veſſel of hot oil.'

I place below [h] the words of Tertullian, to which Sir Iſaac refers. And I anſwer: it is true, that Tertullian ſpeaks of the death of Peter and Paul, and of John's being caſt into boiling oil, and then baniſhed, all together: but he does not ſay, that all happened in the ſame reign. St. John's

[d] Newton's Obſervations upon the Apocalypſe of St. John, chap. i. p. 236.

[e] See in this work, vol. IV. p. 206. Valeſ. Annot. in Euſeb. p. 8, 9. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 5. cap. iv. tom. VI. p. 57—59.

[f] . . . και πετρος δε επι ρωμης κατα κεφαλης σταυρεται παυλος τε αποτεμνεται, ιωαννης τε νησω παραδιδοται. Dem. Ev. l. 3. p. 116.

[g] As before, p. 236.

[h] Iſta quam felix eccleſia, ubi Petrus paſſioni Dominicæ adæquatur: ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur: ubi Apoſtolus Joannes, poſteaquam in oleum igneum demerſus, nihil paſſus eſt, in inſulam relegatur. De Præſcr. cap. 36. p. 245.

baniſhment

baniſhment is the laſt thing mentioned by him: and, probably, it happened not, till after the death of Peter and Paul. It is likely, that Tertullian ſuppoſed it to have been done by the order of Domitian; for in another place he ſpeaks of the perſecution of that emperor, as [i] conſiſting chiefly in baniſhments.

'... and Pſeudo-Prochorus.' What place of Prochorus, who pretended to be one of the ſeven deacons, and is called by Baronius [k] himſelf a great liar, Sir Iſaac Newton refers to, I do not know. But in his hiſtory of St. John he is entirely againſt him. For [l] he particularly relates the ſufferings, which St. John underwent in the ſecond perſecution of the Chriſtians, which was raiſed by Domitian. That emperor ſent orders to the proconſul at Epheſus, to apprehend the apoſtle. When the proconſul had got St. John in his power, he informed Domitian of it; who then commanded the proconſul to bring him to Rome. When [m] he was come, the emperor would not ſee him, but ordered him to be caſt into a veſſel of ſcalding oil, and he came out unhurt. Then Domitian commanded the proconſul to have St. John back again to Epheſus. Some time [n] after that, by order of the ſame Domitian, John, and others at Epheſus, were baniſhed into Patmos. Domitian [o] being dead, they returned to Epheſus with the leave of his ſucceſſor, who did not perſecute the Chriſtians. So Pſeudo-Prochorus.

Since the great Newton has been pleaſed to refer to ſuch a writer, I ſhall take notice of another of the like ſort; I mean Abdias, who aſſumed the character of the firſt biſhop of Babylon. What he ſays, is to this purpoſe: that [p] John, who ſurvived

[i] Tentaverat et Domitianus ... ſed quâ et homo, facile cœptum repreſſit, reſtitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. 5.

[k] —in multis mendaciſſimus hic auctor fuiſſe convincitur. An. 92. num. i.

[l] Secundam vero perſecutionem Domitianus excitârat, cujus temporibus Joannes Epheſi morabatur. Imperator autem Domitianus epiſtolam miſit Epheſum ad Proconſulem civitatis... Proch. de Vit. Joan. cap. 8. Ap. Bib. Patr. Ludg. T. II.

[m] Audiens autem Domitianus de adventu ejus, noluit impius Cæſar videre faciem Apoſtoli. Et juſſit, ut Proconſul duceret ad Portam Latinam, et in ferventis olei dolium illum vivum dimitti, &c. Ibid. cap. 10.

[n] Ibid. cap. 14.

[o] Mortuo autem Domitiano, qui nos tranſmiſerat, in exilium, ſucceſſor ejus non prohibebat Chriſtianos. Et cum audiſſet de bonitate et ſanctimonia Joannis, quodque fuiſſet injuſte à prædeceſſore ſuo exilio relegatus, per literas nos revocavit ab exilio. Ib. cap. 45.

[p] Eſt igitur et hoc ipſum amoris Salvatoris

survived the other apostles, lived to the time of Domitian, preaching the word to the people in Asia. When Domitian's edict for persecuting the Christians was brought to Ephesus, and John refused to deny Christ, or to give over preaching, the proconsul ordered that he should be drowned in a vessel of boiling oil: but John presently leaped out unhurt. The proconsul would then have set him at liberty, if he had not feared to transgress the emperor's edict. He therefore banished John into Patmos, where he saw and wrote the Revelation. After the death of Domitian, his edicts having been abrogated by the senate, they who had been banished, returned to their homes: and John came to Ephesus, where he had a dwelling, and many friends.

Then follows an account of St. John's visiting the churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. Where is inserted also the story, formerly taken notice of, concerning the young man, as related by Eusebius from Clement of Alexandria: and as happening, not after the death of Nero, but of Domitian.

Newton proceeds: 'as well as the first author, whoever he 'was, of that very ancient fable, that John was put by Nero 'into a vessel of hot oil, and coming out unhurt, was banished 'by him into Patmos. Though this story be no more than 'a fiction, yet it was founded on a tradition of the first 'churches, that John was banished into Patmos in the days 'of Nero.'

Who was the first author of that fable, I do not know. But it does not appear, that Tertullian, the first writer who has mentioned it, thought it to be in the time of Nero. He might mean, and probably did mean, Domitian, the same who banished John into an island: as did also the two writers just taken notice of, Prochorus and Abdias, to whom we were led

Salvatoris in beatum Joannem indicium non vulgare, quod vitâ reliquos omnes superaverit, et, ut dictum est, ad Domitiani Imperatoris ætatem usque in Asia verbum salutis populis adnunciarit.... Cui Proconsul loci cum edictum Imperatoris, ut Christum negaret, et a prædicatione cessaret, legisset, Apostolus intrepide respondit.... Ad cujus responsionem motus Proconsul jussit eum velut rebellem in dolio ferventis olei demergi. Qui statim ut conjectus in æneo est, veluti athleta unctus, non adustus, de vase exiit. Ad quod miraculum Proconsul stupefactus, voluit eum libertati suæ reddere. Et fecisset, nisi timuisset edictum Cæsaris Mitiorem igitur pœnam cogitans, in exilium eum relegavit, in insulam, quæ dicitur Patmos. In qua et Apocalypsin, quæ ex nomine ejus legitur, et vidit, et scripsit. Post mortem autem Domitiani, quia omnia ejus decreta Senatus infringi jusserat, inter cæteros,

led by Sir Isaac. Jerom, who [q] in his books against Jovinian, mentions this story, as from Tertullian, according to some copies, says, it was done at Rome, according to others, in the time of Nero. However in the same place, as well as elsewhere, Jerom expressly says, that John was banished into Patmos by Domitian. And [r] in the other place, where he mentions the casting St. John into boiling oil, he says: 'and presently afterwards he was banished into the island Patmos.' Therefore that other trial, which St. John met with, was in the same reign, that is, Domitian's. And indeed Jerom always supposes St. John's banishment to have been in that reign: as he particularly relates in the ninth chapter of his book of illustrious men. Let me add, that if the story of St. John's being put into a vessel of scalding oil be a fable, and a fiction, it must be hazardous to build an argument upon it.

It follows in Newton: 'Epiphanius represents the gospel 'of John as written in the time of Domitian, and the Apo-'calypse even before that of Nero.' I have already said enough of Epiphanius in considering the opinion of Grotius. However, as one would think, Sir Isaac Newton had little reason to mention Epiphanius, when he does not follow him. He says, that St. John was banished into Patmos in the time of Claudius: Sir Isaac, not till near the end of the reign of Nero.

'Arethas,' says [s] Sir Isaac, 'in the beginning of his com-'mentary quotes the opinion of Irenæus from Eusebius, but 'does not follow it. For he afterwards affirms, that the 'Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, 'and that former commentators had expounded the sixth seal 'of that destruction.'

To which I answer. Arethas does indeed say, that [t] some interpreters had explained things under the sixth seal, as relating

[illegible], qui ab eo relegati fuerant, et ad [illegible] remeabant, etiam sanctus [illegible] Ephesum rediit, ubi et [illegible]dum, et multos amicos habe-[illegible] Abd. Hist. Apostol. cap. v. [illegible] Fabr. Cod Apocr. N. T. p. [illegible]-536.

[illegible] enim in Patmos insula, [illegible] fuerat a Domitiano principe [illegible], Apocalypsin.... Refert [illegible] Tertullianus, quod Romæ, [illegible] Nerone] missus in ferventis olei dolium purior et vegetior exierit, quam intravit. Adv. Jovin. l. i. tom. 4. p. 169. [r] Sed si legamus ecclesiasticas historias, in quibus fertur, quod et ipse propter martyrium sit missus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad suscipiendam coronam Christi athleta processerit, statimque relegatus in Patmos insulam sit, &c. Comm. in Matt. xx. 23. tom. 4. P. i. p. 92. [s] As before, p. 236. [t] Τινες δε ταυτα

lating to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by Veſpaſian: but they were ſome only, not the moſt. Yea, he preſently afterwards ſays, that the moſt interpreted it otherwiſe. Nor does he ſay, that any of thoſe commentators were of opinion, that the Apocalypſe was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. Arethas ſeems to have been of opinion, that things, which had come to paſs long before, might be repreſented in the Revelation. Therefore immediately before that paſſage, explaining Rev. vi. 12, 13. he ſays: 'What [u] is the opening of 'the ſixth ſeal? It is the croſs and death of the Lord, fol- 'lowed by his reſurrection, deſirable to all faithful and under- 'ſtanding men. *And lo, there was a great earthquake.* Mani- 'feſtly denoting, ſays he, the ſigns that happened during the 'crucifiction, the ſhaking of the earth, the darkneſs of the 'ſun, the turning the moon into blood. For when it was full 'moon, being the fourteenth day, how was it poſſible, that 'the ſun ſhould be eclipſed by its interpoſition?'

However, I muſt not conceal what he ſays afterwards, in another chapter of his [x] Commentary. He is explaining Rev. vii. 4—8. 'Theſe, ſays he, who inſtructs the evangeliſt, will 'not partake in the calamities inflicted by the Romans. For 'the deſtruction cauſed by the Romans had not fallen upon 'the Jews, when the evangeliſt received theſe inſtructions. 'Nor was he at Jeruſalem, but in Ionia, where is Epheſus: 'for he ſtayed at Jeruſalem no more than fourteen years.—— 'And after the death of our Lord's mother, he left Judea, 'and went to Epheſus, as [y] tradition ſays: where alſo, as is 'ſaid, he had the revelation of future things.' But how can we rely upon a writer of the ſixth century for theſe particulars; that John did not ſtay at Jeruſalem more than fourteen years: that he left Judeà upon the death of our Lord's mother, and then went to Epheſus: when we can evidently perceive from the hiſtory in the Acts, that in the fourteenth year after our Lord's aſcenſion, there were no chriſtian converts at Epheſus: and that the church at Epheſus was not founded by St. Paul, till ſeveral years afterwards? What avails it, to refer to ſuch paſſages as theſe? Which when looked into, and examined,

εις την υπο ουεσπασιανε γινομενην πολιορκιαν εξελαδον παντα τα ειρημενα τροποποιησαντες. Οι δε πλειστοι των ερμηνευταν. κ λ. Areth. cap. 18. p. 709. A. [u] Τις δε η λυσις της εκτης σφραγιδος; Ο σαυρος τε κυριε και θανατος, οις ηκολεθησεν η ευκταια πασι πιστοις τε και αισθητοις αναστασις. κ. λ. Cap. 18. p. 708. C. D. [x] Cap. xix. p. 713, 714. [y] . . . αλλα πως εφησεν μεταστηναι αυτον λογος. καθ' ην, φησι, ειρηται. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 714. in.

contain

contain no certain aſſurances of any thing. And Sir Iſaac Newton himſelf ſays: 'It [z] ſeems to me, that Peter and John 'ſtayed with their churches in Judea and Syria: till the Ro-'mans made war upon their nation, that is, till the twelfth 'year of Nero.' or A. D. 66.

We proceed with this great man's arguments, who adds: 'With [a] the opinion of the firſt commentators agrees the tra-'dition of the churches of Syria, preſerved to this day in the 'title of the Syriac verſion of the Apocalypſe, which title is 'this: *The revelation, which was made to John the evangeliſt by 'God in the iſland Patmos, into which he was baniſhed by Nero 'Cæſar.*' But how comes it to paſs, that the tradition of the churches of Syria is alleged here, when the apocalypſe was not generally received by them? Moreover in the titles of the books of the New Teſtament received by them, there are manifeſt errors. Nor [b] can we ſay, when the Syriac verſion of the apocalypſe was made: nor [c] is it impoſſible, that the authors of that title might mean Domitian by Nero. It is not a greater error, than that of ſuppoſing the epiſtle of James to have been written by James the ſon of Zebedee.

Again, ſays the celebrated Newton: 'The [d] ſame is con-'firmed by a ſtory told by Euſebius out of Clemens Alexan-'drinus, and other ancient authors, concerning a youth, whom 'St. John ſome time after his return from Patmos committed 'to the care of the biſhop of a certain city. This is a ſtory 'of many years, and requires, that John ſhould have re-'turned from Patmos rather at the death of Nero, than at 'that of Domitian.'

But, firſt, if this be only a feigned ſtory, or apologue, as ſome have thought, contrived to convey moral inſtruction; circum-

[z] As before, p. 243.

[a] p. 236, 237.

[b] Ad Neronis imperium hoc exilium Syrus refert. Verum incerta eſt quam maxime hujus verſionis ætas, nulloque gaudet ſocio. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. 4. § vii.

Quapropter nihil in hiſce eſt, quod Syrum ab erroris culpa liberare poſſit: quemadmodum nec ſupra erat, quod Epiphanium in nomine Claudii tueretur. Illud tantummodo adnotatum volo Syriacam Apocalypſeos verſionem haud æquam cæterorum librorum interpretationi videri, uti nec primi codices in Europam adlati appoſitam habuerunt, quam demum Ludovicus de Dieu MDCXXVII. in lucem primum produxit, &c. Ch. Cellarius de ſeptem eccleſiis Aſiæ num. xvii. p. 428.

[c] Sed forſan aliquis, honoris interpretis Syri ſolicitus et cupidus, poſſet in illius gratiam aſſerere, illum non Neronem, ſed Domitianum, alterum Neronem, ſeu portionem Neronis, ut vocatur Tertulliano, &c. Le Moyne. Var. Sacr. tom. II. p. 1019.

[d] As above, p. 237.

ſtances ought not to be ſtrained, nor the truth of hiſtory be founded upon it. Secondly, we muſt take the ſtory, as it is related by Clement, and other ancient authors. Clement placeth it after the death of the tyrant, by whom John had been baniſhed: and Euſebius [e] ſuppoſeth him to mean Domitian. Thirdly, if St. John lived in Aſia two, or three, or four years after his return from Patmos, that is time enough for the events of this ſtory.

Sir Iſaac adds in the ſame place: 'And John in his old age 'was ſo infirm, as to be carried to church, dying above ninety 'years old: and therefore could not be then ſuppoſed able to 'ride after the thief.'

Nevertheleſs in the original account, which we have of this affair, St. John is expreſsly called [f] an old man: Sir Iſaac therefore has no right to make him young; for that would be making a new ſtory. If a man allows himſelf ſo to do, and argues upon it; the neceſſary conſequence is, that he deceives himſelf and others.

Upon the whole, I ſee not much weight in any of theſe arguments of Sir Iſaac Newton; and muſt adhere to the common opinion, that St. John was baniſhed into Patmos, in the reign of Domitian, and by virtue of his edicts for perſecuting the Chriſtians, in the latter part of his reign. Says Mr. Lampe: 'All [g] antiquity is agreed, that St. John's baniſhment was by order of Domitian.'

VI. We ſhould now inquire, when St. John was releaſed, or how long his baniſhment laſted.

According to Tertullian, Domitian's perſecution [h] was very ſhort, and the emperor himſelf, before he died, recalled thoſe whom he had baniſhed. Hegeſippus likewiſe ſays, that [i] Domitian by an edict put an end to the perſecution which he had ordered.

Euſebius ſays, 'that [k] after the death of Domitian, John returned from his baniſhment.' And before, in another chapter

[e] H. E. l. 3. cap. 23.

[f] . . . επιλαθομενος της ηλικιας αυτου . . . τι με φευγεις . . . τον γυμνον, τον γεροντα; προσελθοντα δε τον γεροντα περιελαβεν. κ. λ. Clem. ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. p. 93.

[g] Tota antiquitas in eo abunde conſentit, quod Domitianus exilii Joannis auctor fuerit. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. 4. § viii.

[h] cœptum repreſſit, reſtitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. v. vid. Supr. p. 355. note *(b)*.

[i] . . . καταπαυσαι δε δια προσταγματος τον κατα της εκκλησιας διαγμον. Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B.

[k] . . . απο της κατα την νησον μετα τον

ter of the same book, he said more largely: 'After [l] Domitian 'had reigned fifteen years, Nerva succeeded him, and the 'Roman Senate decreed, that the honourable titles bestowed 'upon Domitian should be abrogated, and moreover, that 'they who had been banished by him might return to their 'homes, and repossess their goods, of which they had been 'unjustly deprived. This we learn from such as have written 'the history of those times. Then therefore, as our ancestors 'say, the apostle John returned from his banishment, and 'again took up his abode at Ephesus.'

Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men, says: 'When [m] 'Domitian had been killed, and his edicts had been repealed 'by the Senate, because of their excessive cruelty, John re-'turned to Ephesus in the time of the emperor Nerva.'

I place below a passage of [n] the martyrdom of Timothy in Photius, and another [o] of Suidas, saying, that after Domitian's death, when Nerva was emperor, St. John returned from his banishment.

This is also agreeable to the general accounts in [p] Dion Cassius, and [q] the author of the Deaths of Persecutors.

Indeed, Hegesippus and Tertullian, as before observed, intimate, that the persecution of Domitian ended before his death. But it is very remarkable, that Eusebius [r] having quoted both of them, gives a different account, as we saw just now. And, as learned men have observed, it is a great prejudice to their authority in this point, that Eusebius does not follow them, but presently afterwards differs from them.

It seems probable therefore, that St. John, and other exiles, did not return from their banishment, until after the death of Domitian: which [s] is the opinion of Basnage, and likewise of [t] Cellarius.

Domitian

τη δομετιανε τελευτην εσανελθων φυγης. Euf. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in.

[l] H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B. C.

[m] See vol. V. p. 41.

[n] Νερβα δε τε ρωμαιων κρατος το δευτερον αιαδεδεγμενου, ο θεολογος ιωαννης της υπερορια φυγης αφεθεις κατηλθε προς εφεσον, ης και προτερον απο δομετιανε πεφογαδευτο. Ap. Phot. Cod 254. p. 1404.

[o] Vid. Suid. voce Νερβας.

[p] Και ο τερτυλλος τες τε κρινομενες επ ασεβεια αφηκε, και τες φευγοντας κατηγαγε. κ. λ. Dio. l. 62. in. p. 769.

[q] De M. P. cap. 3. [r] H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. [s] Utrum Domitianus decretum revocarit, difficilis quæstio est. Sic enim antiquorum nonnullis visum. Hegesippus . . . Hegesippo assentitur et Tertullianus . . . Contra vero nobilis historicus Dio, qui rerum Romanarum Hegesippo peritior erat, et Tertulliano, disertissime testatur, Nervæ indulgentia

Domitian [u] is computed to have died Sept. 18. A. D. 96. after having reigned fifteen years, and ſome days. Nerva [x] died the 27th day of Jan. 98, after having reigned one year four months, and nine days. Therefore Trajan began his reign Jan. 27. A. D. 98.

If the perſecution of Domitian began in the fourteenth year of his reign, and St. John was ſent to Patmos that year, and reſtored in the beginning of the reign of Nerva, his [y] exile could not laſt more than two years, perhaps not much above a year.

If St. John's life reached to the third year of the reign of Trajan, which is the opinion of Cave [z] and many others, he lived three years after his return from Patmos: if it reached to the fourth year of Trajan, as [a] Baſnage thought, he muſt have lived four years after his return.

Or, in other words: if St. John returned about the end of the year 96, or the beginning of 97, and did not die till the year 101, he lived four years in Aſia, after his return from Patmos. If he died in the year 100, he lived three years after his return.

VII. Having now ſaid of St. John all that is needful by way of hiſtory, we come to his writings, of which there are five generally aſcribed to him: a goſpel, three epiſtles, and the Revelation: two of which, the goſpel, and the firſt epiſtle, are univerſally received as genuine.

Now I ſpeak of the goſpel only. And here in the firſt place I ſhall recite the accounts of the ancients, but chiefly ſuch, as

indulgentia revocatos fuiſſe Chriſtianos: *Nerva autem eos qui damnati erant impietatis abſolvit, exuleſque reſtituit.* Neque alia mens Lactantio de Mort. Perſ. cap. 3. Baſnag. ann. 96. num. iv. [t] Cellar. de Septem. eccleſiis Aſiæ. cap. xvii.—xx. [u] Baſnag. ann. 96. n. xiii.

[x] Baſn. A. D. 98. i. Pagi. ann. 98. ii. [y] In alterum tantum annum ad ſummum duravit, quando Nerva ſuccedens Domitiano exules revocavit, et cum eis Joannem, uti ex vetuſtiorum fide refert Euſebius, l. 3. H. E. cap. 20.... Quæ quidem eo majorem fidem merentur, quia ipſe Dio, ſeu ex eo Xiphilinus, revocationem exulum Chriſtianorum Nervæ tribuit. Lampe Prol. l. 1. cap. 4. § ix. Vid. et Cellar. ubi ſupra cap. xvii.

[z] Interfecto Domitiano Epheſum rediit ann. Chr. 97. in qua, ut et in regionibus circumvicinis, reliquum vitæ tranſegit, et ... anno Chr. 100. Trajani 3. juxta Euſebium et Hieronymum, anno uno aut altero centenario major... in Domino placide obdormivit. Cav. H. L. T. I. p. 16.

[a] Cæterum cum ex antiqua traditione hauſtum videatur, Joannem ſenio confectum, 68, poſt paſſionem anno mortuum eſſe, quæ in 33 æræ noſtræ incidit, probabilis eſt conjectura, Joannem anno labente finem hujus lucis inveniſſe. Baſn. A. 101. n. ii.

concern

concern the time when it was written; omitting many other teſtimonies, as not neceſſary to be mentioned now, though very valuable in themſelves: after which we will obſerve the the judgments of learned moderns concerning the ſame point; I mean, the time when it was written.

Irenæus having ſpoken of the goſpels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, adds: 'Afterwards [b] John the diſciple of the Lord, 'who alſo leaned upon his breaſt, likewiſe publiſhed a goſpel, 'whilſt he dwelled at Epheſus in Aſia.'

In another place he ſays: 'John [c] the diſciple of the Lord 'declaring this faith, and by the publication of the goſpel 'deſigning to root out the error, which had been ſown among 'men by Cerinthus, and long before by thoſe who are called 'Nicolaitans——thus began in the doctrine, which is accord-'ing to the goſpel: *In the beginning was the Word.*'

In another place of the ſame ancient writer are theſe expreſſions: 'As [d] John the diſciple of the Lord aſſures us, 'ſaying: *But theſe are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have 'life through his name.* [ch. xx. 30.] Foreſeeing theſe blaſphe-'mous notions that divide the Lord, ſo far as it is in their 'power.'

In the preceding paſſage Irenæus ſpeaks, as if St. John's goſpel was written after the riſe of Cerinthus, and other hereſies: but here he ſeems to ſay, that it was written before them, and foreſeeing them. In like manner afterwards, in the ſame chapter, he ſays of Paul: as [e] he ſays: *It is Chriſt that died, 'yea rather that is riſen, who is at the right hand of God.* Rom. 'viii. 34. And again, *Knowing that Chriſt being raiſed from*

[b] See vol. II. p. 158.

[c] Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini diſcipulus, volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inſeminatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ, qui ſunt vulſio ejus, quæ falſo cognominatur ſcientia. . . . Sic inchoavit in ea quæ eſt ſecundum evangelium doctrina. In principio erat verbum, &c. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. p. 188. Bened.

[d] —— quemadmodum Joannes Domini diſcipulus confirmat, dicens, *Hæc autem ſcripta ſunt, ut credatis, quoniam Jeſus eſt Filius Dei, et ut credentes vitam æternam habeatis in nomine ejus:* providens has blaſphemas regulas, quæ dividant Dominum quantum ex ipſis attinet, ex altera et altera ſubſtantia dicentes eum factum. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 16. n. 5. p. 206.

[e] —— quemadmodum ipſe ait: *Simul autem Chriſtus mortuus eſt, immo et reſurrexit*——Et iterum: *Scientes quoniam Chriſtus reſurgens a mortuis, jam non moritur.* Prævidens enim et ipſe per Spiritum ſubdiviſiones malorum magiſtrorum, et omnem ipſorum occaſionem diſſenſionis volens abſcindere, ait quæ prædicta ſunt. Ibid. n. 9. p. 207.

'*the*

'*the dead, dies no more*, ch. vi. 9. For he alſo foreſeeing by 'the ſpirit, the diviſions of evil teachers, and being deſirous to 'cut off from them all occaſion of diſſenſion, ſays what has 'been juſt quoted.'

Clement, of Alexandria, ſpeaking of the order of the goſpels, according to what he had received from preſbyters of more ancient times, ſays: 'Laſt [f] of all John obſerving, that 'in other goſpels thoſe things were related, which concern the 'humanity of Chriſt, and being perſuaded by his friends, and 'alſo moved by the ſpirit of God, he wrote a ſpiritual goſpel.' Here it is ſuppoſed, not only, that St. John wrote the laſt of the four, but likewiſe, that he had ſeen the goſpels of the other three evangeliſts.

Origen [g] ſpeaks of all the four goſpels in our preſent order, that is, Matthew's firſt, and John's laſt.

A long paſſage of Euſebius concerning St. John's goſpel may be ſeen vol. IV. p. 224—227. It cannot be omitted here. 'But it ſhall be abridged. 'And that it has been juſtly placed 'by the ancients the fourth in order, and after the other 'three, may be made evident.——For Matthew delivered his 'goſpel to the Hebrews.——And when Mark and Luke alſo 'had publiſhed the goſpels according to them, it is ſaid, that 'John who all this while had preached by word of mouth, was 'at length induced to write for this reaſon. The three firſt 'written goſpels being now delivered to all men, and to John 'himſelf, it is ſaid, that he approved them, and confirmed the 'truth of their narration by his own teſtimony, ſaying: There 'was only wanting a written account of the things done 'by Chriſt, in the former part, and near the beginning of his 'preaching——And, certainly, that obſervation is true——'.

Epiphanius [h] ſpeaks of St. John's goſpel, as the laſt of the four. He alſo ſays, that St. John wrote it, after he had long declined ſo doing through humility, when he was ninety years of age, and when he had lived in Aſia many years, after his return thither from Patmos, in the time of the emperor Claudius. He moreover ſays in ſeveral places, that this goſpel was occaſioned by the errors of the Ebionites, the Cerinthians, and other heretics.

According to [i] the Syrian churches, St. John wrote his goſpel at Epheſus.

[f] See vol. II. p. 212. [g] p. 466. [h] See vol. IV. p. 314, 315. [i] p. 439.

My

My readers are again referred to the noble paſſage [k] of Theodore, biſhop of Mopſueſtia, concerning the four goſpels, and to the remarks upon it.

Jerom, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, ſays: 'John [l] the 'apoſtle wrote a goſpel at the deſire of the biſhops of Aſia, 'againſt Cerinthus, and other heretics, and eſpecially the 'doctrine of the Ebionites, then ſpringing up, who ſay, that 'Chriſt did not exiſt before his birth of Mary: for which 'reaſon he was obliged to declare his divine nativity. Another 'reaſon of his writing is alſo mentioned; which is, that after 'having read the volumes of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 'he expreſſed his approbation of their hiſtory as true: but 'obſerved, that they had recorded an account of but one year 'of our Lord's miniſtry, even the laſt, after the impriſonment 'of John, in which alſo he ſuffered. Omitting therefore [very 'much] that year, the hiſtory of which had been written 'by the other three, he related the Acts of the preceding time, 'before John was ſhut up in priſon; as may appear to thoſe, 'who read the four evangeliſts: which may be of uſe to 'account for the ſeeming difference between John and the reſt.'

According to [m] Auguſtine, St. John is the laſt of the four evangeliſts.

Chryſoſtom [n] aſſigning the reaſons of St. John's writing his goſpel, ſuppoſeth that he did not write till after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

Paulinus ſays: 'It [o] had been handed down by tradition, 'that John ſurvived all the other apoſtles, and wrote the 'laſt of the four evangeliſts, and ſo as to confirm their 'moſt certain hiſtory.' And he obſerves, 'that [p] in the be-'ginning of St. John's goſpel all heretics are confuted, par-'ticularly, Arius, Sabellius, Marcion and the Manichees.'

Coſmas of Alexandria, ſays, 'that [q] when John dwelt at 'Epheſus, there were delivered to him by the faithful, the 'writings of the other three evangeliſts. Receiving them he 'ſaid, that what they had written was well written: but ſome 'things were omitted by them, which were needful to be 'related. And being deſired by the faithful, he alſo publiſhed 'his writing, as a kind of ſupplement to the reſt, containing 'ſuch things as theſe: the wedding at Cana; the hiſtory of 'Nicodemus; the woman of Samaria; the nobleman, [or

[k] p. 511—513. [l] Vol. V. p. 40, 41. [m] p. 93. [n] p. 127, 130. [o] p. 176. [p] p. 177. [q] p. 266.

'courtier,

'courtier, John iv. 46—54.] the man blind from his birth; 'Lazarus; the indignation of Judas, at the woman that 'anointed the Lord with ointment; the Greeks that came to 'Jeſus; his waſhing the diſciples' feet; and ſuitable inſtruc-'tions upon ſeveral occaſions, and the promiſe of the Com-'forter; and concerning the Deity of Chriſt, expreſsly and 'clearly at the beginning, and premiſing that, as the foun-'dation of his work: all which things had been omitted 'by the reſt.'

Iſidore of Seville, ſays, that [r] John wrote the laſt in Aſia.

Theophylact computed, that [s] St. John wrote about two and thirty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion.

Euthymius, that [t] it was not written until many years after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

Nicephorus Calliſti ſays, that [u] John wrote laſt of all, about ſix and thirty years after the Lord's aſcenſion to heaven.

VIII. Having ſeen theſe teſtimonies of the ancients to St. John's goſpel, and the time of it, I would now obſerve the judgments of learned moderns.

According to [x] Mill's computation St. John wrote his goſpel at Epheſus, in the year of Chriſt 97, about one year before his death.

Fabricius [y] ſpeaks to the like purpoſe.

Le Clerc [z] likewiſe placeth the writing of this goſpel in the year 97.

Mr. Jones argues, that [a] it was written about the year 98, and not before 97.

The late Mr. Wetſtein thought, that [b] this goſpel might be written about the year 32, after our Lord's aſcenſion: and diſlikes the ſuppoſition, that it was written by St. John in decrepit old age.

[r] Vol. V. p. 306.

[s] p. 328. [t] p. 334.

[u] p. 335. [x] Et quidem Epheſum ab exilio reverſus Joannes uno ante mortem anno ſcripſit Evangelium. Mil. Prol. num. 181.

[y] Evangelium Græce edidit Epheſi, omnium poſtremus, jam nonagenario major, cum e Patmo reverſus eſſet poſt Domitiani necem, quæ anno 96. contigit. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. T. III. p. 139.

[z] Hiſt. E. An. 97. num. i.

[a] New and Full Method, vol. III. p. 139. [b] Hinc etiam conſequitur, Evangelium Joannis non ab eo decrepito, et fere centenario, et poſt mortem Clementis, ſed diu antea fuiſſe editum, adeoque inſcriptionem Codicum Græcorum, qui illud Evangelium anno triceſimo ſecundo poſt aſcenſionem Chriſti, ſcriptum fuiſſe teſtantur, ad verum proprius accedere: præcipue cum ratio nulla ſit, cur Joannes ſcriptionem in tam longum tempus differre debuerit. Weſt. Proleg. ad duas Clement. Ep. ſub. fin.

Baſnage

Basnage [c] was inclined to think, that this gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. His reasons will be alleged, and considered by and by.

Mr. Lampe was of opinion, that [d] this gospel was written in the latter part of the reign of Nero, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

IX. I shall now propose an argument concerning the date of this gospel.

There are two considerations, principally, which lead me to think, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, or about the time of that event: these I shall first mention, and then take notice of divers others, observable in learned moderns.

1. It is likely, that St. John wrote in a short time after the other evangelists. Their gospels were soon brought to him: and if he thought fit to confirm them, or to write any thing by way of supplement, he would do it in a short time. The first three gospels, very probably, were written and published before the end of the year 64, or in 65, at the farthest. If they were brought to St. John in 65, or 66, he would not defer more, or not much more, than a year, or two, to publish his history of Jesus, and make the account complete.

I do not presume to say exactly the year in which this gospel was written: but I think it might be written and published in the year 68.

This argument offered itself to Mr. Whiston's thoughts, and is thus expressed by him: 'That [e] occasion of John's 'writing his gospel, mentioned by the ancients, viz. the bring-'ing the other three gospels to him, and his observing their 'deficiency, as to the acts of Christ before the Baptist's im-'prisonment, does much better agree with this time, just after 'the publication of those gospels, than with that above thirty 'years later, to which its writing is now ordinarily ascribed.'

And is it not a strange supposition, that all the other three gospels should have been written by the year 60, or thereabout, and St. John's not till the year 97, or 98, that is, more than thirty years after the others? When likewise he must have been of a very great age, and scarcely fit for such a work as this.

[c] Ann. 97. num. xii. [d] Putem ergo non contemnandas esse rationes, quæ ante excidium Hierosolymitanum Evangelium nostrum sub extremis forte Neronis temporibus conscriptum esse persuadent. Proleg. l 2 cap. 2. num. ix.

[e] Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 38, 39.

2. The

2. The ſecond conſideration is the ſuitableneſs of St. John's goſpel to the circumſtances of things before the overthrow of the Jews, or about that time.

Mr. Lampe has obſerved, that [f] the great deſign of St. John in writing his goſpel ſeems to have been, to ſhow, how inexcuſable the Jews were in not receiving Jeſus as the Chriſt, and to vindicate the providence of God in the calamities already befallen, or now coming upon them. If that appear to be the deſign of St. John in writing his goſpel, it will very much ſtrengthen the ſuppoſition, that it was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem was completed.

St. John ſays, ch. xx. 31. *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* That is, 'This 'hiſtory has been written, that they who believe, may be con- 'firmed in their faith, and that all others, who yet believe not, 'may believe in Jeſus, as the Chriſt, the Son of God, and 'obtain that life, which he promiſeth to thoſe who believe in 'him, and obey him.'

That is the deſign of all the evangeliſts; and their hiſtories are a ſufficient ground and reaſon of this belief. But St. John's goſpel contains an ample confirmation of all that they have ſaid, with valuable additions, and more plain and frequent aſſurances, that Jeſus is not only a prophet, and meſſenger of God, but the Chriſt, the Son of God, or that great prophet, that ſhould come into the world: whereby all are rendered inexcuſable in rejecting him, and eſpecially the Jews, among whom he preached, and wrought many miracles, and whom he often called to receive him as the Chriſt. This [g] runs through

[f] Totam porro œconomiam hujus Evangelii ita eſſe digeſtam, ut ad convincendos ac ἀναπολογήτους reddendos Judæos ſpectaret, capite ſequenti oſtendemus. Prolegom. in Joan. l. 2. cap. 3. § ii.

Imminens etiam Judææ pernicies occaſionem maxime opportunam conſcribendo libro dabat, in quo Joannis animus erat hujus ipſius judicii imminentis æquitatem defendere, et tentare, an Judæi ex hoc Reipublicæ naufragio magno agmine in Aſiam enatantes, ad recipiendum unicum mundi Salvatorem hoc medio permoveri poſſint. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. § xv. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 3. num. iii. not. *(b)*.

[g] Priora duodecim capita evidentiſſime ea commemorant, quæ ſeverum et tremendum illud Dei in Judæos judicium defendunt. Talia enim facta et dicta continuo ordine proponunt, quæ non in obſcuro angulo, ſed coram tota gente Judaica edita ſunt, nullamque exceptionem patiuntur. —— Atque hæc eſt ratio, cur Joannes ſecundum feſta Judæorum hiſtoriam evangelicam digerat. Inde enim innoteſcit, Jeſum ea diligenter

through St. John's gospel from the beginning to the end, or near the end of the twelfth chapter.

Even in the introduction, he says, ch. i. 7. *John came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe.* Ver. 8. *He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light.* Ver. 9. *That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* 'That is, 'he was designed to be an universal blessing: and he has done 'all that was fit to be done, to enlighten all men in the know-'ledge of God, and true religion.' Ver. 14. *And we beheld his glory,* we his disciples, and all who impartially attended, *beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father:* that is, the glory peculiar to the promised Messiah. Again, at ver. 18. he styles him *the only begotten son.* Here St. John may be supposed to declare his present faith, or to make a profession of the faith, which he had at the time of his writing. Having so done, he proceeds in the history. Ver. 19, 20. *And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, who art thou.* He answered, that he was not the Christ, but his harbinger, or fore-runner, the person spoken of by Isaiah. And he declares the transcendent greatness of him, who was about to appear, and was already among them. Ver. 21—28. Then at ver. 29. *The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith: behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.* Undoubtedly, by that character meaning the Messiah, and understood by all so to mean. See also ver. 30, 31, 32, 33. Then at ver. 34. *And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God:* or the Christ. And ver. 35, 36. *again, the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples. And looking upon Jesus, as he walked, he saith: behold the Lamb of God.* He tells every body, that Jesus is the Christ, though not always in the same terms. And, to finish our account of John the Baptist. In ch. iii. 25—36. is the last testimony borne by him to Jesus: and it is very strong and full. He declares, he was not himself the Christ, *but was sent before him. To him,* says he, *God giveth not the spirit by measure. The*

---

ligenter frequentasse, atque in iis publice coram toto populo Judaico se satis superque manifestasse. Illud enim Evangelistæ nostro plane primum est, ut ea potissimum narret, quæ a Domino nostro Hierosolymis, quæ in ipso templo gesta atque dicta sunt: paucis tantum interjectis, quæ eum etiam Judæam, Samariam, Galilæam, radiis gloriæ suæ cœlestis abunde illustrasse, atque ita nullam partem regionis Judæorum vacuam reliquisse, probant. Lamp. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 4. num. xxxiii. xxxiv.

Father loveth the Son, and hath put all things into his hands.—— He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Having gone through the Baptist's testimony, as here recorded, we look back to ch. i. 4—42. where Andrew finds his brother Simon, and says to him: *We have found the Messiah.* Then ver. 45—51. *Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith to him: we have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth.* Nathanael likewise is convinced, and says: *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel.* So writes St. John, showing, that the pious, and well disposed among the Jews, readily received Jesus as the Christ. And thereby showing likewise the great unreasonableness, and extreme perverseness of those who did not believe in him after all the proofs, which he set before them in the course of his most powerful ministry. As the evangelist most justly says, near the conclusion of this part of his gospel. Ch. xii. 37. *But though he had done so many miracles among them, yet they believed not on him.* And see what follows there.

Ch. ii. 11. After the account of the miracle at Cana. *This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory:* that is, the glory of the Messiah; *and his disciples believed on him:* or were confirmed in their belief, that he was the Christ.

Soon after this, Jesus went up to Jerusalem at the passover, and cleansed the temple, saying: *Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise,* ch. ii. 13—17. By the work itself, and by his words, manifesting himself to be the Messiah. I omit other things in the remaining part of that chapter, which an attentive reader will take notice of.

Then, ch. iii. 1—21. is the history of Nicodemus, who, whilst Jesus was this time at Jerusalem, made him a private visit. He immediately professeth faith in him, as a prophet. But our Lord tells him plainly, that he was the Messiah, and demands a suitable regard from him. He likewise sets before Nicodemus the nature of his design, for preventing, or for removing all worldly expectations from him. He likewise intimates the call of the Gentiles, and the judgments coming upon the Jewish people, if they should persist in unbelief. *For,* says he, *as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.*—— *For God*

God ſent not his Son, the Meſſiah, *into the world, to condemn the world: but that through him the world*, Gentiles as well as Jews, *might be ſaved.* And what there follows.

Jeſus going through Samaria from Jeruſalem, in his way to Galilee, meets with a woman of that country. Ch. iv. 19. *The woman ſaith unto him: Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.*——And ver. 25, 26. *The woman ſaith unto him: I know that the Meſſiah cometh*, or is ſoon to appear.——*Jeſus ſaith unto her: I that ſpeak unto thee am he.*——The woman left him, and went into the city, *and ſaith unto the men: come, ſee a man that has told me all things that ever I did. Is not this the Chriſt?* Afterwards ver. 42. *Many of that place ſaid unto the woman: now we believe, not becauſe of thy ſaying: for we have heard him ourſelves, and know, that this is indeed the Chriſt, the Saviour of the world.* Here is another inſtance of our Lord's freely declaring himſelf to be the Chriſt, and of his accepting a profeſſion of faith in himſelf, as ſuch. And the ready faith of theſe Samaritans aggravates the continued unbelief of the Jews, on whom more culture had been beſtowed.

Ch. v. i. *After this there was a feaſt of the Jews, and Jeſus went up to Jeruſalem.* By many this is thought to be the paſſover. By others it is reckoned ſome other feaſt between the laſt mentioned, and the next paſſover of our Lord's miniſtry. However that may be, at this ſeaſon our Lord healed the lame man at the pool of Bethesda, on the ſabbath day, and bid him carry his bed, and go home. *Therefore did the Jews perſecute Jeſus, and ſought to ſlay him, becauſe he had done theſe things on the ſabbath day. But Jeſus anſwered them: my Father worketh hitherto. And I work*, ver. 16, 17. The Jews charge him with blaſphemy. Our Lord vindicates himſelf, and claims the character of the Meſſiah in high terms: and aſſures them, *that all judgment had been committed unto the Son*, meaning himſelf, the Meſſiah: *that all men might honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, ver. 21—23. And, for proof, he refers to their ſcriptures, the teſtimony of John, and the works, which he had wrought among them, in the Father's name, ver. 24—47.

Ch. vi. 1—3. We perceive, our Lord to be in Galilee, whither he had gone from Judea. Then at ver. 4. *And the paſſover, a feaſt of the Jews, was nigh.* After which follows the miracle of the five loaves and two fiſhes, for feeding five thouſand. *Then, thoſe men, when they had ſeen the miracle,*

which Jeſus did, ſaid, this is of a truth that prophet which ſhould come into the world: or the expected Meſſiah. Their notion of the kingdom, belonging to that character, being worldly and carnal, and they looking for worldly advantages, *would have come, and taken him by force, to make him a king:* ſo that our Lord found it needful to *depart into a mountain himſelf alone.* The diſciples in the mean time took ſhipping, and he came to them walking upon the ſea. When they had received him, *immediately the ſhip was at the land, whither they were going,* ver. 14—21. The people having been diſappointed, came to him as ſoon as they could at Capernaum; where our Lord takes an opportunity to reprove their carnal temper, and inſtructs them in the deſign of the Meſſiah, and the nature of his kingdom. And ſtill taking upon himſelf that character, and requiring faith in him as ſuch, he ſays: *I am the bread of life.——And this is the will of him that ſent me, that every one which ſeeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlaſting life.——I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat this bread, he ſhall live for ever. And the bread that I will give him is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world.——Many therefore of his diſciples went back, and walked no more with him.* But Peter, in the name of the twelve, and poſſibly, in the name alſo of ſome others, followers of Jeſus, ſaid: *To whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are ſure, that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God,* ver. 22—69.

Ch. vii. 1, 2. *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Judea, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him. Now the Jews' feaſt of tabernacles was at hand.*——ver. 14. *Now about the midſt of the feaſt, Jeſus went up into the temple, and taught.* ver. 25, 26. *Then ſaid ſome of them of Jeruſalem.——Do the rulers know indeed, that this is the very Chriſt?* ver. 31. *And many of the people believed on him, and ſaid: When Chriſt cometh, will he do more miracles than theſe, which this man has done?* ver. 37, 38. *In the laſt day, the great day of the feaſt, Jeſus ſtood, and cried: if any man thirſt, let him come to me, and drink.*——He ſpeaks of himſelf in the character of the Meſſiah, and calls on all men to come to him, as ſuch, and receive the great bleſſings, which he is able to beſtow. And at ver. 40, 41. *Many of the people therefore, when they heard this ſaying, ſaid: this is the prophet. Others ſaid: this is the Chriſt.*

Ch. viii. 12—23. Our Lord is ſtill at Jeruſalem. And at ver. 12. *Then ſpake Jeſus unto them, ſaying: I am the light of*

of the world: claiming the character of the Meſſiah, and declaring alſo the advantages of believing in him, and the ſad conſequence of not receiving him. ver. 21. *Then ſaid Jeſus again unto them; I go my way, and ye ſhall ſeek me, and ſhall die in your ſins.* ver. 24. *I ſaid therefore unto you, that ye ſhall die in your ſins. For, if ye believe not, that I am he,* the Meſſiah, *ye ſhall die in your ſins:* that is, ye will bring upon yourſelves heavy judgments and calamities. Ver. 47. *He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, becauſe ye are not of God.*——ver. 56. *your father Abraham rejoiced to ſee my day.* ——Does not our Lord in all this propoſe himſelf to them, as the Meſſiah, require their faith in him, as ſuch, and plainly intimate the calamities, that would befall them, if they ſhould continue to reject him?

Nor is there any inconſiſtency in what is here obſerved, and the accounts of the other evangeliſts. After Peter had made a profeſſion of his faith, it is ſaid, Matt. xvi. 20. *Then charged he his diſciples, that they ſhould tell no man that he was the Chriſt.* And compare Mark viii. 30. and Luke ix. 21. Nevertheleſs, he was not unwilling to be thought of in that character. When Simon Peter had ſaid by way of anſwer to the queſtion that had been put to the diſciples, *thou art the Chriſt, the ſon of the living God:* our Lord was greatly pleaſed, and pronounced him bleſſed upon that account: and he was deſirous, that all ſhould receive him as the Meſſiah. It was the deſign of his own, and his fore-runner's preaching, as recorded in all the evangeliſts, the firſt three, as well as St. John. They called upon all men *to repent, for the kingdom of heaven,* or of God, by the Meſſiah, *is at hand.* So Mark i. 14, 15. And himſelf ſays, Matt. xii. 28. *If I caſt out dæmons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you.* And Luke xvii. 21. *Behold the kingdom of God is among you,* or in the midſt of you, not within you, as we render it: but he tells them that the kingdom of the Meſſiah was already begun to be ſet up among them. When our Lord was baptized, *there came a voice from heaven, ſaying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed.* Or, this is the Meſſiah: as recorded by all the firſt three evangeliſts: Matt. iii. 17. Mark i. 11. Luke iii. 22. And in them our Lord accepts applications to him, and confeſſions of faith in him, in the character of *the Son of David,* and *the Son of God,* both which are the ſame as the Meſſiah. Of the former there are many

inſtances: of the latter I mention one. Matt. xiv. 33. *Then they that were in the ſhip, came, and worſhipped him, ſaying: thou art the Son of God.* And when he entered into Jeruſalem, he accepted the acclamations of the multitude, which cried, *Hoſanna to the Son of David: bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: bleſſed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord,* Matt. xxi. 1—16. Mark xi. 1—11. Luke xix. 28—40. He ſometimes laments the ſmall ſucceſs of his preaching, and that ſo few received him. But acquieſceth in the event. As in Luke vii. 31—35. Matt. xi. 16—26. Luke x. 21—24. And he even expreſſeth a ſurpriſe, that the phariſees and others, did not diſcern the ſigns of the time. Matt. xvi. 1—4. Mark viii. 11—13. Luke xii. 54—57. And every one may eaſily perceive the reaſon, why he did not allow the diſciples, or ſome others, to ſay publicly, that he was the Meſſiah. For conſidering that the Jewiſh people in general, and the diſciples themſelves, expected a worldly kingdom, and worldly advantages from the Meſſiah; there needed ſome diſcretion, leſt men ſhould have been led to make tumults and diſturbances, which might have been offenſive to the magiſtrate. But when our Lord ſpoke of himſelf, as the Meſſiah, he always inculcated the true deſign of his coming, and gave aſſurances of ſpiritual and heavenly bleſſings, and ſuch only.

Our Lord ſtill continues at Jeruſalem. Ch. ix. 1—41. is the hiſtory of the man blind from his birth, whom our Lord healed, anointing his eyes with clay, moiſtened with his ſpittle. *And it was the ſabbath day, when Jeſus made the clay, and opened his eyes.* The man being brought before the phariſees, and examined by them, ſaid, that he who had opened his eyes was a prophet. *And they caſt him out. Jeſus heard that they had caſt him out. And when he had found him, he ſaid unto him: doſt thou believe on the Son of God? He anſwered, and ſaid: who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? Jeſus ſaid unto him: thou haſt both ſeen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he ſaid: Lord, I believe, and he worſhipped him.* All this needs no comment. Afterwards at ver. 39—41. are intimations given to the phariſees of the ſad conſequences of rejecting him. And indeed in this hiſtory the bad temper of the Jewiſh rulers is very manifeſt.

Ch. x. Our Lord ſpeaks of himſelf as *the true ſhepherd*, or the Meſſiah. Ver. 11. *I am the good ſhepherd: the good ſhepherd giveth his life for the ſheep.* Ver. 16. *And other ſheep I have, which are not of this fold.* Ver. 22—24. *And it was at Jeruſa-*

lem

lem the feaſt of the dedication, and it was winter. And Jeſus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and ſaid unto him: how long doſt thou make us to doubt! If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witneſs of me. A very proper anſwer, certainly. And what follows to ver. 38. deſerves to be conſulted.

Ch. x. 39—42. *Therefore they ſought again to take him, but he eſcaped out of their hand. And went away beyond Jordan, unto the place where John at firſt baptized: and there he abode. And many reſorted unto him, and ſaid: John did no miracles: but all things, that John ſpake of this man, were true. And many believed on him there.*

I ſuppoſe this retreat of our Lord to a place beyond Jordan, to be the ſame that is mentioned Matt. xix. 1. and Mark x. 1. upon which ſome remarks were made [h] many years ago. What paſſed during that interval in that country, is recorded Matt. xix. to xx. 16. and Mark x. 1—31. Nor was St. Luke unacquainted with this retreat. For he has inſerted in his goſpel at ch. xviii. 15—30. ſome of the ſame diſcourſes, which are in the other two evangeliſts, whilſt our Lord was there: I ſay, I ſuppoſe, that St. John and the other evangeliſts ſpeak of one and the ſame receſs. But St. John ſeems to mention more particularly the occaſion of it, in the verſes juſt recited.

In this place and interval, our Lord lived ſomewhat more privately than he had done before. He received all who came to him, either for inſtruction, or to be healed by him. But he did not go about the cities and villages of Judea, preaching publicly, as he had done for ſome while before.

I always ſuppoſed, that our Lord's living thus, in that place, at no great diſtance from Jeruſalem, had in it a kind deſign. He intended thereby to afford to the Jewiſh people, eſpecially, their prieſts and rulers at Jeruſalem, an opportunity to conſider, and calmly reflect upon all the wonderful things that had happened among them in the ſpace of a few years, the preaching and baptiſm of John, and all the things ſaid and done by himſelf in the courſe of his miniſtry; particularly, the miracles which he had wrought among them, the claims, which he had made of being the promiſed

[h] See the Vindication of our Saviour's three Miracles of raiſing the dead, vol. XI. p. 1—77.

Meſſiah, whom all ought to receive, and the intimations that had been given of impending ruin and miſery.

Here our Lord waited, willing to reſt the proof of his miſſion upon the teſtimonies, that had been given to it. And if the rulers of the Jewiſh people had now come, and ſolemnly owned him in the character, he bore, and with which God had clothed him, how joyfully would they have been received! But they were not ſo diſpoſed. Great multitudes of the people came to him there, and *he healed them.* The *phariſees alſo came unto him:* but it was *tempting him.* Matth. xix. 1, 2, 3. Mark x. 1, 2.

But beſide what is recorded by the other evangeliſts, St. *John* aſſures us, that in this interval our Lord came to Bethany about fifteen furlongs, or two miles, from Jeruſalem, and there raiſed Lazarus to life. ch. xi. 1—44. *Then many of the Jews, which came to Mary, and had ſeen the things which Jeſus did, believed on him:* that is, that he was the Chriſt. *But ſome of them went their way to the phariſees, and told them, what things Jeſus had done.* ver. 45, 46. *Then gathered they a council.——Then from that day forth, they took counſel together, for to put him to death.* ver. 47—53. This ſhows, that they were inflexible, and not to be gained by any conſiderations. It follows in ver. 54. *Jeſus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews: but went thence into a country near the wilderneſs, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his diſciples.* Which * I ſuppoſe, was not far from the place, from which our Lord came laſt. And from this city, called Ephraim, our Lord came to Bethany again, by the way of Jericho, a ſhort time before the next paſſover, as related by the other evangeliſts. We proceed.

Say St. John ch. xi. 55—57. *And the Jews' paſſover was nigh at hand.——Now both the chief prieſts and the phariſees had given a commandment, that if any knew where he was, he ſhould ſhow it, that they might take him.* That is a proof of a determined purpoſe to accompliſh their evil deſigns againſt Jeſus.

The whole following xiith chapter of this goſpel deſerves attentive regard. I muſt tranſcribe a part, though it adds to the length of theſe extracts. *Then Jeſus, ſix days before the paſſover, came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, who had been dead, whom he raiſed from the dead,* ch. xii. 1. *Much people of the*

* Vid. Reland. Palæſt. l. i. cap. 56. tom. I. p. 377. et Lenfant ſur S. Jean. ch. xi. ver. 54.

Jews

Jews therefore knew, that he was there. And they came, not for Jeſus' ſake only, but that they might ſee Lazarus alſo, whom he had raiſed from the dead. But the chief prieſts conſulted, that they might put Lazarus alſo to death: becauſe that by reaſon of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jeſus. ver. 9—11. And here is an account of ſome Greeks, or Gentiles, who were deſirous to ſee Jeſus. ver. 20—22. Whoſe readineſs, accompanied with humility, may be reaſonably underſtood to caſt a reflection upon the pride and obſtinacy of thoſe, who were unmoved by the moſt powerful arguments, and the moſt gracious invitations. The remainder of that chapter, from ver. 35 to 50, is a moſt proper concluſion of this part of the goſpel, in which are theſe things very obſervable. *Then Jeſus ſaid unto them: Yet a little while the light is with you; walk while ye have the light, leſt darkneſs come upon you——While ye have the light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.——But though he had done ſo many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the ſaying of Eſaias might be fulfilled.——Jeſus cried, and ſaid: he that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me. I am come a light into the world, that whoſoever believeth on me, ſhould not abide in darkneſs.——I have not ſpoken of myſelf, but the Father which ſent me, he gave me a commandment, what I ſhould ſpeak. And I know, that his commandment is life everlaſting. Whatſoever I ſpeak therefore, even as the Father ſaid unto me, ſo I ſpeak.*

Then in the xiii, xiv, xv, xvi and xviith chapters our Lord inſtructs and comforts, prays with and for his diſciples: ſhowing [1] tokens of the tendereſt affection, and the moſt faithful concern for thoſe, who had paid a due regard to the evidences of his miſſion, and adhered to him under difficulties and diſcouragements. So begins the next, that is, the thirteenth chapter: *Now before the feaſt of the paſſover, when Jeſus knew, that his hour was come, that he ſhould depart out of the world unto the Father: having loved his own, which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.*

And indeed it was very natural for the evangeliſt, who had largely ſhown the unreaſonableneſs, and the aggravated

[1] Sicut vero hactenus ſeveritatem Domini in Judæos defendit Evangeliſta, ita in ſequentibus a capite xiii. ad finem uſque fidelitatem Chriſti imbutam, quam diſcipulis ſuis adhibuit, ex ultimis verbis adſerit. Hæc intentio haud obſcure addiſcitur ex nova, quæ alteri hujus Evangelii parti præfigitur, præfatiuncula. cap. xiii. 1.——Lamp. Prol. l. 2. c. 4. num. xxxvi.

guilt

guilt of the Jews, who did not believe in Jeſus, but rejected him, to give alſo a particular account of our Lord's kind acceptance of thoſe who believed in him, and perſevered in their faith. So that the deſign of ſhowing, how inexcuſable the Jewiſh people were, in rejecting Jeſus, and of vindicating Divine Providence in the calamities brought upon them, is what produced the whole order and economy of this goſpel.

The two following chapters, the xviiith and xixth contain the account of our Lord's proſecution, condemnation, death, and interment. In the two laſt chapters the xxth and the xxiſt are the accounts of our Lord's reſurrection, and the evidences of it, with many tokens of kind regard for his diſciples, who had followed him in the time of his abode on this earth, and were now to be his witneſſes in the world, and to preach, under many difficulties, the ſame doctrine which he had taught.

There is another thing, which may induce us to think, that one great deſign of St. John in writing his goſpel was to ſhow the unreaſonableneſs, and the great guilt of the Jews, in rejecting Jeſus: that in his goſpel are inſerted more inſtances of their attempts upon our Lord's life, than in the other goſpels. Some ſuch things there are in them. Accounts of the phariſees conſulting, how they might deſtroy Jeſus, may be ſeen in Matt. xii. 14. Mark iii. 6. Luke vi. 11. beſide their laſt attempt: when they were permitted to accompliſh their evil deſign. But there are more ſuch inſtances in St. John's, than in any of the other goſpels. As John vii. 1. *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee. For he would not walk in Judea, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.* However, he came up to Jeruſalem at the next feaſt of tabernacles, ver. 2. And their deſigns were renewed. Ch. vii. 25. *Then ſaid ſome of them at Jeruſalem: is not this he, whom they ſeek to kill?*—Ver. 31, 32. *And many of the people believed on him, and ſaid: when the Chriſt cometh, will he do more miracles, than theſe, which this man has done? The phariſees heard, that they murmured ſuch things concerning him: and the phariſees and chief prieſt ſent officers to take him.* But the officers, overcome by the excellence of his diſcourſes, could not perſuade themſelves to apprehend him: for which they were reproached by the council in a moſt outrageous manner; but Nicodemus ſtrove to allay their reſentment. ver. 45—52. And ch. viii. 20. *Theſe words ſpake Jeſus, in the treaſury, as he taught*

taugh: in the temple : and no man laid hands on him, becauſe his time was not yet come. Ver. 37. *I know, that ye are Abraham's ſeed: but ye ſeek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth, which I have heard of God. This did not Abraham.* Ver. 59. *Then took they up ſtones to caſt at him.*—And ch. x. 39. 40. *Therefore they ſought again to take him : but he eſcaped out of their hand. And went away beyond Jordan.* And when our Lord propoſed to go to Bethany, upon occaſion of the ſickneſs and death of Lazarus, the diſciples go unwillingly, and would have diſſuaded him from that journey, being apprehenſive of the imminent danger therein both to him and themſelves. ch. xi. 7—16. See likewiſe ver. 45—57. All theſe are things quite omitted by the other evangeliſts. As is alſo what is ſaid, ch. xii. 10, 11. And in their laſt perſecution of Jeſus before Pilate there are ſome very aggravating particulars mentioned by St. John, which the other evangeliſts have not taken notice of. See ch. xviii. 29—32. ch. xix. 1—15.

Our bleſſed Lord, preparing his diſciples for afflictions, reconciling their minds to them, and encouraging them to endure them patiently, ſays, ch. xv. 21—24. *All theſe things will they do unto you for my name's ſake, becauſe they know not him that ſent me. If I had not come, and ſpoken unto them, they had not had ſin : but now they have no excuſe for their ſin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father alſo. If I had not done among them the works, which no other man did, they had not had ſin : but now have they both ſeen, and hated both me and my Father.* That is a ſtrong, but juſt and true repreſentation of the heinouſneſs of the guilt of the Jewiſh people. For which reaſon I could not forbear to allege it here, though it ſhould be thought out of place.

And now having, as I ſuppoſe, ſhown this deſign of the evangeliſt, let me mention an obſervation, or two, by way of corollary.

Firſt. We ſee the reaſon of St. John's recording the miracle of raiſing Lazarus, omitted by the other evangeliſts. There was no neceſſity, that they ſhould mention it: for without it they have recorded ſufficient evidences of our Lord's miſſion and character. Nor was it poſſible, without an improper prolixity to record all our Saviour's diſcourſes and miracles, as St. John himſelf has obſerved. Moreover the firſt three evangeliſts have chiefly inſiſted upon the moſt public part of our Lord's miniſtry: for which reaſon this miracle did not come ſo directly in their way. But St. John could

could not omit it. His deſign neceſſarily led him to relate this great miracle, done ſo near Jeruſalem, and with all its circumſtances. For it manifeſtly ſhows the perverſe and incorrigible temper of the Jewiſh prieſts and rulers.

Secondly. None ought any more to make a queſtion, whether our Lord twice cleanſed the temple, or once only. It was cleanſed by him at the time of his laſt paſſover, as related by the firſt three evangeliſts. But it was very proper for St. John to record that done at the firſt paſſover of our Lord's miniſtry: it affording an alarming evidence of his being the expected Meſſiah, which ſhould have been taken notice of by the Jewiſh rulers at Jeruſalem. It was an early and open claim of the character of the Meſſiah. And their neglecting that, and ſo many other claims and evidences of the ſame great truth afterwards, manifeſts the obſtinacy of their unbelief: which was fitly ſhown by this evangeliſt.

I now proceed to ſome other arguments.

3. One argument, that St. John's goſpel was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, is taken from ch. v. 2. *Now there is at Jeruſalem, by the ſheep-market,* or ſheep-gate, *a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches.*

On this paſſage inſiſt both [k] Baſnage and [l] Lampe. St. John does not ſay, as they obſerve, there was, but there is. And though the pool might remain, it could not be ſaid after the ruin of the city, that the five porches ſtill ſubſiſted.

Mr. Whiſton argues in this manner. 'St. John's [m] ſpeaking of the pool of Bethesda in the preſent tenſe, better agrees to the time here aſſigned, A. D. 63, before the

[k] Porro quod tam ſero ſcriptum Joannis Evangelium tradamus, id ex ſententia potius veterum, quam ex rei veritate fecimus. Ex ipſo quippe Evangelio naſcitur argumentum ad exiſtimandum, lucem prius aſpexiſſe, quam Hieroſolyma everteretur. *Eſt*, inquit, *Hieroſolymis ad portam ovium piſcina.* Stetiſſe ergo videtur urbs ſancta, Joanne ea verba ſcribente. Secus, non præſens, *eſt*, ἐστι, ſed præteritum adhibuiſſet. Baſn. An. 97. n. xii. [l] Habetur igitur hic non tantum mentio *portæ ovium*, tanquam tunc adhuc exſtantis, cum ſcriberet Evangeliſta, ſed etiam ædificii ex quinque porticibus conſtantis, quales ſtructuræ poſt dirutam a Romanis Hieroſolymam illic fruſtra eſſent quæſitæ. Licet enim piſcinam ſupereſſe velint itineraria, portæ tamen ac muri ſolo æquata erant. Inde igitur colligimus, ſtetiſſe urbem ſanctam, Joanne ea verba ſcribente. Secus non præſens *eſt*, ſed præteritum adhibuiſſet. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. num. xi.

[m] Eſſay on the Conſtitutions, ch. i. p. 38.

'deſtruction

'deſtruction of Jeruſalem, when that pool and porch were 'certainly in being, than to the time afterwards, when pro-'bably both were deſtroyed.'

Dr. Whitby likewiſe was ſomewhat affected by this text, and ſays: 'If *there is* be the true reading, as the conſent 'of almoſt all the Greek copies argues, it ſeems to intimate, 'that Jeruſalem and this pool were ſtanding, when St. John 'wrote his goſpel: and therefore, that it was written, as 'Theophylact, and others ſay, before the deſtruction of 'Jeruſalem, and not, as the more ancient fathers thought, 'long after.'

But Mr. Jones, beſide other things, ſays, 'that [n] in all 'probability the pool was not filled up, but was ſtill in the 'ſame ſtate, after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, as before.' To which, however, it might be anſwered, that ſuppoſing the pool not to have been filled up, it would not be reaſonable to think, that the porches and the gate ſtill ſubſiſted, after the deſtruction of the city. But then Mr. Jones adds: 'Suppoſing the pool was deſtroyed, and St. John to 'have known it, there is no impropriety in uſing the verb '*is*: nothing being more common among writers, than to 'uſe verbs in the preſent tenſe, to denote the preterperfect.'

Having repreſented this argument, as it has appeared to divers learned men, I leave every one to judge of it.

4. In ch. xxi. 18, 19. Chriſt foretels, that Peter would die by martyrdom. Then it is added: *This ſpake he, ſignifying, by what death he ſhould glorify God.* Some may hence argue, that [o] Peter was not yet dead when this was written: or that St. John did not then know of it. But others may be of opinion, that [p] though Peter had ſuffered martyrdom a good while before, and St. John knew it very well; yet he was not obliged to take notice of it, but might write as he does.

[n] New and Full Method, vol. III. p. 141.

[o] Poſt Petri martyrium editum eſſe Joannis Evangelium conſenſus eſt Patrum omnium. Fit tamen in ea re ſcrupulus. Petro Chriſtus mortem diverſe portendit. cap. xxi. 18. —— Quæ ſi ſcripta ſunt, jam miſſo ad ſuorem Petro, injici de ea re mentio debebat, ut et completi oraculi cognitio caperetur, et martyri Chriſti laus ſua concederetur. Baſnag. Exercit. p. 384.

[p] Locus ex Joh. xxi. 18. non magni in hac cauſſa momenti eſt. Nullam enim video neceſſitatem, cur mortem Petri commemoraret, ſi vel actu notitiam ejus habuiſſet, quia ſic per ſe ſatis veritas prædictionis Jeſu innotuiſſet, &c. Lamp. ib. l. 2. c. 2. § xiii.

Indeed,

Indeed, I am of opinion, that St. John could not take notice of Peter's death. It was not a thing within his province. As an Evangeliſt, he wrote the hiſtory of our Saviour, not of his Apoſtles.

5. A like argument may be taken from the following verſes, 20, 21, 22. *Peter ſeeing John, ſaith to Jeſus: Lord, and what ſhall this man do? Jeſus ſaith unto him: if I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this ſaying abroad, that that diſciple ſhould not die. Yet Jeſus ſaid not unto him, he ſhall not die: but if I will, that he tarry, till I come, what is that to thee?* If by Chriſt's coming be here intended the overthrow of Jeruſalem, as many think, it may be ſuppoſed reaſonable by ſome to expect, that St. John ſhould have taken ſome notice of it here, if he wrote after that event. Nevertheleſs, I humbly apprehend, that this is not an argument of much weight. I do not think, that as an evangeliſt he was obliged to give an account of the fulfilment of Chriſt's prediction, though he had been a witneſs of it.

6. *This is the diſciple, that teſtifieth theſe things, and wrote theſe things. And we know, that his teſtimony is true.* By theſe laſt words Mr. Lampe [q] ſuppoſed, to be meant ſome Jews, then living in Aſia, who were eye-witneſſes of our Lord, and his miniſtry: which might well be, if St. John's goſpel was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem: but would not be reckoned likely, if it was written not before the year of the vulgar epoch 97, or 98. They who confirm the teſtimony of another, ought to have the ſame certain knowledge of the thing teſtified, as he who ſpeaks, or writes. But after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, it is not reaſonable to think, there were many to bear witneſs to things done forty or fifty years before. Theſe Jews, eye-witneſſes of our Lord, Mr. Lampe ſuppoſeth to have been believers of that nation, who accompanied John into Aſia, when he left Judea.

I have thought it proper, not to omit this argument of that learned writer: but it depends upon his interpretation of this verſe; which is not certain. For ſome have ſuppoſed, that [r] it is the church of Epheſus, which here ſpeaks: and others think it to be [s] St. John himſelf. The change of

[q] Ibid. l. 2 cap. 2. num. ix.

[r] *Et ſcimus*] Loquitur eccleſia Epheſina. *Scimus*, aiunt, *fide dignum*, ex vitæ ſcilicet puritate, et miraculis ab eo editis. Grot. in loc.

[s] 'The evangeliſt had ſaid before 'ch. xix. 35. *He knoweth, that he ſaith 'true.* Here in this place he changeth 'the

of number and person, of *we* for *I*, is no valid objection. So 1 John i. 1—5. *That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes.*—3 epist. 12. *Yea, and we also bear record, and ye know that our record is true.* And St. Paul 1 Thess. ii. 18. *Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindred us.* Chrysostom [t] and Theophylact [u] understood St. John to speak here of himself, as an eye-witness, who had been present at almost every thing related by him in his history.

7. It is said: 'The three epistles of St. John do ever suppose, the gospel of St. John to have been written long before, and to be well known by those, to whom he wrote. And they are written with a constant view and regard to the contents of the same gospel.' That is an argument of Mr. Whiston, which, with what he adds by way of confirmation, is referred to the reader's consideration.

8. Some have argued for an early date of this gospel, or at least, that it was written before the Revelation, which was seen in Patmos, because [y] it is said at the beginning of that book, ch. i. 1, 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things which he saw.* They suppose, that therein St. John refers to his gospel, and what he had written in it. But to me the most reasonable account of those words appears to be that which [z] was given formerly: that they are most properly understood of that very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer there says, very pertinently, in his introduction, that in that book he had discharged the office

[t] the person, saying: *We know, that 'his testimony is true.'* Lightfoot upon John xxi. 24. vol. II. p. 627. See likewise Whitby, Lenfant, and Doddridge upon the place.

[t] Και οιδα, φησιν, οτι αληθη εστιν α λεγει. —— Και πασι δε παρην, και ουδε σαρκομενου απολιμπανετο, και την μητερα ανοχοιριθη. Chrys. hom. 88. al. 87. T. VIII. p. 588. C. D. E.

[u] Και οιδα, φησιν, οτι αληθη λεγει, τουτεστι. πληροφορηθεις εγραψα, α εγραψα, ατε πασι παρων, και τοις εργοις, και τοις λογοις, και τοις παθεσι, και τοις μετα την αναστασιν. Αγαπητος γαρ ημην, και ουκ απελιμπανομην, ωστε παρρησιαζομαι, και περι εμαυτου λεγω, οτι αληθευω. Theophyl. in Jo. tom. I. p. 847.

[x] See his Commentary upon St. John's three Catholic Epistles, p. 8. &c.

[y] Ipsum porro audiamus Evangelistam idem non obscure, uti nobis videtur, subindicantem, quando Apoc. i. 2. se ita circumscribit: ας εμαρτυρησε τον λογον του θεου. —— Et versu 9 —— Plurimi optimi interpretes in eo consentiunt, quod in his verbis ad Evangelium respiciatur, licet in modo demonstrandi differant, &c. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. § viii.

[z] See vol. III. p. 118, 119.

assigned

assigned him: having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jesus Christ, and all the visions which he had seen.

9. Once more it is argued from inscriptions, at the end of this gospel, in divers manuscripts, that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem: it being there said, that this gospel was written in the time of Nero, at thirty years, or about two and thirty years after our Saviour's ascension. Upon these insisted [a] Mr. Wetstein in a passage quoted from him some while ago. Upon them likewise insists [b] Mr. Lampe.

For my own part I lay not any stress at all upon these inscriptions, at the end of Greek or Arabic, or other manuscripts of the New Testament, written in the ninth or tenth century, or later. They [c] are of no authority: for there is no proof that this account was derived from the testimony or tradition of ancient authors. The early date of the gospels was popular. Some having without reason determined the time of writing the other gospels at eight, or ten, or fifteen years after our Lord's ascension, pitched upon the year 30, or 32, for the time of St. John's gospel: but it was done upon no other ground and foundation, but mere fancy and conjecture.

X. It is upon the two first mentioned arguments that I chiefly rely. However, there are objections, which deserve to be considered.

1. Obj. Chrysostom was of opinion, that St. John did not write, till after the destruction of Jerusalem. For in a homily upon Matt. xxiv. he says, 'John [d] writes not of any 'of these things, lest it should be thought, that he took an 'advantage from the event. For he was living a good 'while after the destruction of Jerusalem. But the other

[a] See before p. 190.

[b] Accedit multarum glossarum et versionum in id consensus, quod sub Nerone Evangelium sit exaratum. Licet enim authoritates hæ sequioris ævi sint, ob earum tamen frequentiam et harmoniam valde est credibile, quod in antiquiori traditione fundatæ sint——Id tamen observavi discrimen, ut quædam numero rotundo XXX post Christi adscensionem, aliæ XXXII nominent. Lampe ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. num. xii. Vid. et num. xiv.

[c] Neque ordo, qui nunc receptus est epistolarum, sequitur ordinem temporis, neque antiqua sunt illa, quæ sub finem sunt addita, ad significandum, unde et per quos missæ sunt.——et illæ in fine annotatiunculæ, seræ sunt, ex conjectura, aut tenui fama. Grot. Comm. in loca quædam N. T. sub in. tom. III. p 457.

[d] See vol. V. p. 130.

'evangelists,

'evangeliſts, who died before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, 'and ſaw none of thoſe things, record theſe predictions.'

To which I anſwer, that St. John's omitting our Saviour's predictions concerning the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which are recorded by the other evangeliſts, is no proof that he did not write until after they were fulfilled. For if he wrote at the time ſuppoſed by us, when that event was near; it is very likely, that he would omit theſe predictions: eſpecially, having obſerved, that they were ſufficiently recorded already. And we plainly ſee, that it is not St. John's method to repeat what had been recorded before. However, he has inſerted in his goſpel divers expreſſions, containing warnings and intimations of the miſeries coming upon the Jewiſh people, if they did not receive the Lord Jeſus as the Meſſiah. John the Baptiſt may be ſuppoſed to intend this in words, recorded John iii. 36. Our Lord intimates it in his diſcourſe with Nicodemus, ch. iii. 18, 19. and upon divers other occaſions, already taken notice of by us in this goſpel, ch. viii. 12, 21, 24. ch. ix. 39—41. ch. xii. 35, 36.

2. Obj. Mr. Whiſton in [e] his Short View of the Harmony of the Evangeliſts, ſays, 'that St. John uſeth the 'Roman or Julian beginning of the day in his goſpel, the 'ſame that we uſe at preſent, and reckons the hours from 'midnight and noon. He refers to John i. 39. xix. 14. 'and xx. 19. Which he reckons an argument, that St. 'John wrote his goſpel long after the deſtruction of Jeruſa-'lem, and the period of the Jewiſh polity at Epheſus, a 'place remote from Judea, and under the Roman govern-'ment.'

To which I anſwer, 1. It does not appear to me, that St. John computes the hours of the day after the Roman, but rather after the Jewiſh manner. 2. Suppoſing St. John to have uſed the Roman method of computation, it does not follow, that he wrote after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the period of the Jewiſh polity. We allow, that St. John's goſpel was written at Epheſus, at a diſtance from Judea. And, if he thought fit, he might uſe the Roman way of reckoning, eſpecially, when the period of the Jewiſh commonwealth was near, though not quite accompliſhed.

Thus I have endeavoured to ſolve this objection. What was Mr. Whiſton's own ſolution, I do not know: but I

[e] p. 115, 116.

ſuppoſe, that he afterwards overcame this difficulty. For in his later writings he maintains a very different ſentiment concerning the date of St. John's goſpel, pleading, that it was written about the year of Chriſt 63, a good while before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. So he argues in his Eſſay upon the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, publiſhed in 1711, and in his Commentary upon St. John's Epiſtles, publiſhed in 1719. His Harmony of the four Evangeliſts was printed at Cambridge in the year 1702.

3. Obj. It is farther objected, that many ancient writers ſpeak of a late date of St. John's goſpel, and that he wrote with a deſign to confute divers heretics: who cannot be ſuppoſed to have appeared, till after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the overthrow of the Jewiſh people.

To which I anſwer, that this may have been owing to a miſtaken apprehenſion. Many heretics, they ſaw, might be confuted by St. John's goſpel. Therefore they concluded, that he did not write, till after they had appeared in the world: whilſt the truth might be no more than this, that ſuch and ſuch heretics might be confuted out of his goſpel: though they had not appeared in the world till long after. Paulinus ſays, 'that [f] in the beginning of St. John's goſpel 'all heretics are confuted, particularly, Arius, Sabellius, 'Photinus, Marcion, and the Manichees.' And in Mr. Wetſtein's preface to St. John's goſpel, written not long ago, in our time, are theſe expreſſions. Having before quoted Irenæus, he adds, 'Which [g] if they be compared 'with thoſe things, which Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, 'Saturninus, Baſilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, have ſaid 'of angels, and æons: among whom were Charis *grace*, 'Alethea *truth*, Monogenes *only begotten*, Logos *word*, Zoe '*life*: it muſt be manifeſt, that John ſo oppoſed his doctrine 'to them, as to uſe the forms of expreſſion received by 'them.' Surely, this is very incautious and inaccurate. Muſt it not be ſo, to ſay, that St. John oppoſed thoſe heretics, moſt of which are heretics of the ſecond century?

[f] Vol. V. p. 177.

[g] Quæ ſi comparentur cum iis, quæ Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, Baſilides, Valentinus, et Marcion de angelis et æonibus, inter quos erant Charis, Alethea, Monogenes, Logos, Zoe, item de Chriſto, non vere, ſed δοκησει paſſo, tradiderunt: ſatis manifeſtum erit, Joannem doctrinam ſuam illis ita opponere, ut loquendi formulis apud illos receptis utatur. Wetſt. Teſt. Gr. tom. I. p. 832.

If

If St. John's goſpel be genuine, it muſt have been written before the end of the firſt century. Yea, Mr. Wetſtein ſays, it was written at about two and thirty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion. How then could St. John oppoſe them, or write againſt them, but in the way of prophecy or prevention? But to ſay, he oppoſed his doctrine to them, or wrote againſt them, does not ſeem very proper. And if the ancient writers ſpeak not more accurately than this learned modern; an argument taken from them, upon this head, cannot be of much weight.

It is the teſtimony of Irenæus, which ought principally to be regarded by us, upon account of his antiquity, and his having been acquainted with Polycarp in the early part of his life. He ſays, as before tranſcribed, 'that by the publication 'of his goſpel John deſigned to root out the error that had 'been ſown among men by Cerinthus. But it is obſervable, that in another place, alſo tranſcribed above, he ſays: 'John 'foreſeeing thoſe blaſphemous notions that divide the Lord, 'ſo far as it is in their power,' wrote his goſpel. For this paſſage I am indebted to Mr. Whiſton, who argues, that St. John's goſpel was written about the year 63, and before this apoſtle's three epiſtles. 'Nor,' ſays [h] he, 'ſhall I need 'to ſupport this obſervation from any other argument, than 'that from Irenæus, who ſuppoſeth this goſpel, and St. Paul's 'epiſtle to the Romans, ancienter, and theſe epiſtles later, 'than the riſe of the hereſy of Cerinthus:' referring to the paſſage of Irenæus, before taken notice of by us.

If then we put together the ſeveral paſſages of Irenæus, he does not contradict the ſuppoſition of an early date of St. John's goſpel: or, that it was written before the riſe of thoſe hereſies, which may be confuted by it.

It may be judged preſumptuous to oppoſe the prevailing opinion of learned men, who have ſuppoſed that ſome heretics were particularly ſtruck at in the beginning of this goſpel. Nevertheleſs Mr. Lampe, [i] whom I have often quoted, has preſumed

[h] Commentary upon St. John's epiſtles, p. 8.

[i] Nos ut ſalva, quam viris magnis, — debemus, exiſtimatione, libere animi ſenſa proferamus, an Evangelio ſuo Joannes controverſiam tractare, hæreticoſque in Eccleſia ſui ævi ullos refutare voluerit, dubitamus admodum. Neque enim id titulus generalis Evangelii libro præfixus admittit, neque id commode per librum ad methodum hiſtoriæ compoſitum fieri potuit, neque illius rei vel vola vel vestigium ullum apparet: quod tamen et ſcriptoribus elenchticis in

preſumed to oppoſe this opinion, and has largely argued, that St. John did not write againſt Cerinthus, or other heretics in his goſpel. And though another learned German [k] has ſince written againſt Mr. Lampe, I cannot ſay that he has confuted him.

I ſhall therefore take the liberty to mention ſome thoughts relating to this matter, which offer themſelves to my mind.

Firſt: To me it ſeems below an evangeliſt to write againſt heretics in the hiſtory of his Lord and Maſter. Nor do any of the evangeliſts enter into a particular account of things after our Lord's aſcenſion. St. John proceeds no farther than his reſurrection, and the evidences of it, without particularly mentioning his aſcenſion: nor has St. Matthew proceeded any farther. However, undoubtedly, it is implied in what they write, that our Lord was raiſed up to an endleſs life, and to univerſal power in heaven and on earth. St. Mark, ch. xvi. 19. and St. Luke xxiv. 50, 51. relate our Saviour's aſcenſion to heaven.

This has oftentimes appeared to me exceeding remarkable, that none of the evangeliſts ſhould in their goſpels give an account of the preaching of the apoſtles after our Lord's aſcenſion, and the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon them. Take the earlieſt date of the goſpels that can be thought of, or aſſigned by any; all muſt allow, that before any of them were written, many miracles had been performed by the apoſtles, and many converts muſt have been made from among Jews, if not alſo from among Gentiles; and many promiſes of our Lord muſt have been accompliſhed: and we can perceive from their goſpels, that they had a knowledge of ſuch things; nevertheleſs there is no particular account of them in any of the goſpels. St. Mark is the only evangeliſt that has ſaid any thing in his goſpel of the miniſtry of the apoſtles; and he enters not into any detail: his whole account is in a few words only, the laſt verſe of his goſpel.

Conſidering this method of all the evangeliſts in their hiſtories of our Lord and Saviour, it appears to me probable that though St. John had not written his goſpel before the

more conſtanti poſitum eſt, et e re admodum erat, ut eo certius tela ferirent, et eo evidentius argumentorum pateſceret robur. Lampe Prolegom. in Joann. l. 2. cap. iii. num. xiii. Vid. ib. num. xiv. xv. xvi. et ſeq.

[k] G. L. Œderus de ſcopo Evangelii S. Jo. Ap. certiſſime Hæreſi Cerinthi et Ebionis oppoſiti. Adverſus V. C. Fr. Ad. Lampe. Lipſiæ 1732.

year

year 96, or 97, as ſome have ſuppoſed; he would not have taken notice of heretics, or vouchſafed to argue with them. St. John did not write the hiſtory of the apoſtles, as is evident: how then could he take notice of heretics.

Secondly: Another thing of no ſmall moment is this. I ſee nothing of this kind in the reſt of St. John's goſpel. Why [l] then ſhould we imagine that there is any ſuch thing in the introduction? If St. John's goſpel is not written againſt heretics, why ſhould the beginning of it be ſo? What St. John ſays in the introduction, appears to me agreeable to the main deſign of his goſpel, as it has been before largely repreſented. He therein ſhows, that Jeſus came and acted by the authority of God, the creator of the world, the God, and ſupreme lawgiver of the Jewiſh people. The [m] eternal word, reaſon, wiſdom, power of God, which is God himſelf, by which the world had been made, by which he dwelled among the Jews in the tabernacle, and the temple, [n] dwelled and reſided in Jeſus in the fulleſt manner: ſo [o] that we his diſciples, and others who believed in him, ſaw, and clearly diſcerned him to be the promiſed Meſſiah, the great prophet that ſhould come into the world.

[l] Ex quibus clare, ut putamus, patet, in prologo compendium contineri rerum, quas Evangeliſta toto Evangelio demonſtrare volebat, nempe Jeſum non tantum eſſe Filium Dei et redemtorem mundi, [ver. 1—4] ſed etiam qua talem ita plene in mundo demonſtratum eſſe, ut ab una parte Judaei plane redditi fuerint αναπολογητοι, [ver. 4—11.] ab altera autem fideles ſufficiens fidei firmamentum acceperint, ver. 12—18. Lamp. Prol. l. 2 cap. 4. num. xxv.

[m] Quaeris veram hujus nominis interpretationem, de qua variæ exſtant eruditorum virorum ſententiæ? Non vindico mihi ejus rei arbitrium: tantum, quod hic ſentio, modeſte, ſalva diſſentientium exiſtimatione et amicitia, profero. Vertendum eſſe hoc nomen Ratio, vel Sapientia Dei: etſi receptam phraſim Sermonis Dei, in verſione retinendam cenſuerim. —— Conſtat cuique, prologum Evangelii legenti, alludere Joannem in toto illo prologo — ad caput octavum Proverbiorum Salomonis, — ut proinde talem eligere oporteat interpretationem, quæ affinis ſit voci Sapientiæ, Vitring. in Apoc. cap. xix. ver. 13. p. 1109.

[n] Ut celebratiſſimo loco legitur: Και ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο. Quod recte redditur: Et Verbum, ſive ſermo, homo factus eſt, ſive humanam naturam induit. Et εξ εργων νομε δικαιωθησεται πασα σαρξ: i. e. homo quiſquam. Rom. iii. 20. ut Pſ. cxliv. 22. al. cxlv. 21. και ευλογειτω πασα σαρξ το ονομα αυτε. Pearſon. Prolegom. ad verſion. lxx. Cantab. p. 13. [o] 'We ſaw his glory, as what 'became the only begotten Son of 'God. He did not glitter in any 'worldly pomp and grandeur, ac-'cording to what the Jewiſh nation 'fondly dreamed their Meſſiah would 'do: but he was decked with the 'glory of holineſs, grace, truth, 'and the power of miracles.' Lightfoot's Exercitations upon St. John, vol. II. p. 521.

The apoſtles in their addreſſes to the Jewiſh people never fail to give aſſurances, that Jeſus Chriſt had acted by the authority of the one true God, the God of their anceſtors. So Acts ii. 22. *Ye men of Iſrael. hear theſe words: Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles——which God did by him in the midſt of you.* And ch. iii. 13. *The God of Abraham, of Iſaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers has glorified his Son Jeſus.*——See alſo ver. 22—26. ch. v. 30. *The God of our Fathers has raiſed up Jeſus.*——The epiſtle to the Hebrews begins in this manner: *God, who at ſundry times, and in divers manners, ſpake in time paſt unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in theſe laſt days ſpoken unto us by his Son.*

Indeed, this is neceſſary for the ſatisfaction of all men, both Jews and Gentiles: for there is no other God but one, even the God of the patriarchs and prophets: nor can any true revelation come from any but him.

In all the goſpels our Lord aſcribes all his miracles, and all his authority, to the one God, *his Father who is in heaven*, Matt. xii. 28. *If I caſt out dæmons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you*, Luke xi. 20. *If I by the finger of God caſt out dæmons. no doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you*, Matt. xi. 27. *All things are delivered unto me by my Father.*——Comp. Luke x. 22. Matt. xv. 13. *Every plant, which my heavenly Father has not planted, ſhall be rooted up*, Matt. xvi. 27. *For the Son of man ſhall come in the glory of his Father.*——Comp. Mark viii. 38. And the like in many other places.

But in none of the goſpels does our Lord ſo frequently and expreſsly aſcribe all his authority to God the Father, as in St. John's goſpel: thereby plainly ſhowing the guilt of thoſe who did not receive him. John v. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do.*——Ver. 30. *I ſeek not my own will, but the will of the Father who hath ſent me.* Ver. 36, 37. *But I have greater witneſs than that of John. For the works, which the Father hath given me to finiſh, the ſame works that I do, bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me.*—— Ver. 43. *I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not.*——And at ver. 45—47. our Lord appeals to Moſes and his writings, which were allowed to be of divine original, as bearing teſtimony to him. Then ch. vi. 27.——*him hath God the Father ſealed.* Ch. vii. 16. *I am not alone. But I, and the Father, that ſent me.* Ch. x. 36. *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the world: thou blaſphemeſt: becauſe*

becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God? And, to add no more, ch. xi. 41, 42. When he wrought that great miracle of raiſing Lazarus from the dead, *Jeſus lift up his eyes, and ſaid, Father, I thank thee, that thou haſt heard me: and I knew that thou hearеſt me always; but becauſe of the people which ſtand by, I ſaid it, that they may believe that thou haſt ſent me.*

Agreeable to all this is the introduction, where, beſide other, are theſe expreſſions: *He came to his own. And his own received him not.——The word was made fleſh, and dwelled among us——And we ſaw his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.——The law was given by Moſes; but grace and truth came by Jeſus Chriſt. No man hath ſeen God at any time: the only begotten Son, who is in the boſom of the Father, he has declared him.* So ends the introduction. And it is what St. John has largely and fully ſhown in his goſpel.

But it will be aſked: whence came it to paſs, that St. John made uſe of that term, *the Word?*

I anſwer: I am of opinion, that it was not out of regard to Philo, or any Platonic writers. But I ſuppoſe, this [p] way of ſpeaking to have been very common with the Jewiſh people, and, perhaps, more eſpecially with thoſe of them, who were moſt zealous for the law, and moſt exempt from foreign, and philoſophical ſpeculations. Who by *the Word*, or *the Word of God*, underſtood, not a ſpirit ſeparate from God, and inferior to him, but God himſelf, as St. John [q] does.

Numb.

[p] Plerique obſervant, ſimilem locutionem frequenter occurrere in Paraphraſibus Chaldaicis, quæ veterum Hebræorum catecheſin, et antiquas loquendi formulas, exhibent. Quoties de Deo nobiſcum converſante ſermo eſt, toties vero Targumiſtæ, pro Deo, vel Jehova, ſubſtituerunt verbum Jehovæ. Pro exemplo hæc paucula ex innumeris ſunto. Gen. xxi. 20. Deus fuit cum illo. Onkelos. Verbum Domini fuit illi auxilio. Ib. comm. 22. Deus eſt tecum. Onkelos. Verbum Domini enim tibi ſubſidio. Deut. xx. 1. Ne timeto ab eis. Nam Deus tuus tecum eſt. Onkelos. — eo quod Jehova Deus tuus, Verbum ejus auxilio tibi eſt, quod eduxit te ex terra Ægypti. Num. xi. 20. Eo quod reprobaſti Jehovam. Onkelos. Eo quod faſtidiſtis Verbum Domini, cujus Shechinah Divina Majeſtas habitat in vobis. Exod. xvi 8. Non contra nos murmurationes veſtræ, ſed contra Jehovam. Onkelos.—ſed contra Verbum Jevæ. Infinita ſunt ſimilia. Unde colligitur, receptum eo tempore Hebræis fuiſſe, ut Deum, quatenus cum populo ſuo agit, Verbum vocaverint: cui ea attribuerunt, quæ Dei ſunt. Witſ. Miſcell. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 88. 89. Exorcita. iii. περι τε λογε. § ii.

[q] Omnia igitur talia conſcribere volens diſcipulus Domini, et regulam veritatis conſtituere in Eccleſia quia eſt unus Deus Omnipotens, qui per Verbum ſuum omnia fecit, et viſibilia, et inviſibilia: ſignificans quoque, quoniam per Verbum,

Numb. xxiii. 8. *How ſhall I curſe, whom God has not curſed? or, how ſhall I defy, whom the Lord has not defied?* Upon which verſe Patrick ſays, 'In the Jeruſalem Targum this verſe is 'thus paraphraſed: *How ſhall I curſe the houſe of Iſrael, when 'the Word of the Lord has bleſſed them? Or, how ſhall I diminiſh 'the family of Iſrael, when the word of the Lord has multiplied 'them?*'

It is well known, that in the Chaldee paraphraſes, it is very common to put Mimra Jehovah, the word of the Lord, for Jehovah, or God. When thoſe paraphraſes were made, is not certain; whether before, or after the time of our Saviour: but their great antiquity is generally allowed. And it is very probable, that this way of ſpeaking was common, and much uſed before. 'It is likely, ſays a learned friend, that Mimra 'Jehovah was uſed before the paraphraſes were committed to 'writing, becauſe it would be an unreaſonable thing to uſe a 'phraſe, which the common people did not underſtand: for it 'is ſuppoſed, that the paraphraſes were chiefly made for them.'

Let me add, that the uſe of this phraſe, *the Word of God*, or *the Word of the Lord*, as equivalent to God himſelf, ſeems to be founded in the original language of the Old Teſtament. In behalf of which I would allege the following texts. Gen. i. 1. *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.* Ver. 3. *God ſaid: let there be light. And there was light.* Comp. Pſ. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the breath of his mouth.* And Pſ. cv. 19. *Until the time that this word came: the Word of the Lord tried him.*

When St. John ſays, ch. i. 1, 2, 3. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The ſame was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.* He ſeems to allude to [r] what Solomon ſays of wiſdom in the book of Proverbs, particularly, the eighth chapter. And how

Verbum, per quod Deus perfecit conditionem, in hoc et ſalutem his qui in conditione ſunt, præſtitit hominibus: ſic inchoavit in ea, quæ eſt ſecundum Evangelium, doctrina: In principio erat Verbum. Iren. l. 3. cap. xi. in Maſſuet.

Et Cerinthus autem quidam in Aſia, non a primo Deo factum eſſe mundum docuit, ſed a Virtute quadam valde ſeparata, et diſtante ab ea Principalitate, quæ eſt ſuper omnia. Id. l. 1. cap. xxv. al. 26 in.

Deus autem totus exiſtens mens, et totus exiſtens logos, quod cogitat, hoc et loquitur: et quod loquitur, id et cogitat. Cogitatio enim ejus logos, et logos mens, et omnia concludens mens, ipſe et Pater. Id. l. 2. cap. xxviii. n. 5. p. 57.

[r] See the paſſage of Vitringa quoted juſt now, at note *(m)* p. 434.

wiſdom

wiſdom ought to be underſtood as ſpoken of by Solomon, was ſhown formerly, if I may be allowed to ſay ſo, in [s] a diſcourſe upon Prov. viii. 17. Moreover the beginning of St. John's goſpel ſhould be compared with the beginning of his firſt epiſtle, particularly, ch. i. 1, 2.

According to the account now given, what St. John ſays at the beginning, is a very proper introduction to his goſpel: where he largely ſhows the guilt of thoſe, who rejected the manifeſtation [t] of the wiſdom, the word, the will of God, in the perſon of Jeſus.

Upon the whole, I ſee no reaſon to think, that, in the introduction to his goſpel, St. John oppoſed any Chriſtian hereſies, or had any regard to them.

Conſequently, the foregoing argument, that St. John's goſpel was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, or about the time of that event remains entire.

XI. I ſhall now mention ſome obſervations upon this goſpel.

1. There is no need to ſhow here, particularly, from the goſpel itſelf, as we did of the former evangeliſts, that St. John did not write his goſpel, till after converts had been made from among gentiles: becauſe it is allowed by all, that St. John did not write, till after the other evangeliſts, about the time of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, or afterwards: before which time the apoſtles muſt have left Judea, to go abroad, and preach to gentiles. Nevertheleſs one ſignal paſſage may be here taken notice of, which is not far from the beginning of this goſpel. Ch. i. 11, 12, 13. *He came to his own, and his own received him not: but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the ſons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the fleſh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* That is, 'he came to the 'Jews, and firſt appeared, and taught among them, and they 'generally rejected him. But upon all who believed in him, 'whether Jews or Gentiles, of whatever country, or nation, or 'people they were, he beſtowed the privilege of being the 'people of God, and all the bleſſings appertaining to them.'

2. Euſebius ſays, 'The other three evangeliſts have 'recorded the actions of our Saviour for one year only, after 'the impriſonment of John the Baptiſt.' Jerom ſpeaks to the like purpoſe in his book of Illuſtrious Men, juſt now [u] tranſcribed. But it ſhould have been ſaid, 'one year, and ſome-

[s] See vol. X. p. 173, 174.
[t] See vol. III. p. 76.
[t] See vol. IV. p. 226.
[u] See before, p. 189.

what

what more:' meaning the time and actions of our Lord's moſt public miniſtry. For it ſeems to me, that the ancients ſuppoſed our Lord's miniſtry to have laſted, in the whole, ſomewhat more than two years; as was ſhown vol. II. p. 423, 424. Euſebius indeed computed [x] our Lord's miniſtry to have conſiſted of three years and a half, and ſuppoſed St. John's goſpel to have in it four paſſovers. He ſeems to have been the firſt Chriſtian, who advanced that opinion: and he is now generally followed by harmonizers of the goſpels, and by eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians. Sir Iſaac Newton [y] however computes five paſſovers in our Saviour's miniſtry; as does likewiſe Dr. Edward Wells in his Hiſtorical Geography of the New Teſtament. And others may be of the ſame opinion, or make more. But none of theſe opinions appear to me, to have any foundation in the goſpels. The opinion of Euſebius, and thoſe who follow him, is much more probable, than theirs who yet farther enlarge the number of the paſſovers of our Saviour's miniſtry. The firſt paſſover in St. John is that mentioned by him ch. ii. 13. At ch. v. 1. it is ſaid: *After this there was a feaſt of the Jews, and Jeſus went up to Jeruſalem.* They who follow Euſebius, and make four paſſovers in our Lord's miniſtry, reckon this feaſt to be a paſſover. But they who compute his miniſtry to have laſted only two years, and ſomewhat more, ſuppoſe this to be ſome other feaſt, poſſibly, the feaſt of tabernacles, next ſucceeding the paſſover, mentioned ch. ii. 13. At ch. vi. 4. *And the paſſover, a feaſt of the Jews was nigh:* this, according to different computations, is either the ſecond, or the third paſſover in our Lord's miniſtry. The third, or, according to others, the fourth, is that mentioned by all the evangeliſts, at which our Lord ſuffered. It is mentioned by St. John, ch. xi. 55. and xii. 1.

3. St. John has omitted the greateſt part of thoſe things, which are recorded by the other evangeliſts: which much confirms the teſtimony of ancient writers, that the firſt three goſpels were written, and publiſhed among the faithful before St. John wrote; that they were brought to him, and that he affirmed the truth of their relations, but ſaid, that ſome diſcourſes and miracles of our Saviour were omitted by them, which might be uſefully recorded.

Indeed, there is little or nothing in his goſpel, which is not new and additional, except the account of our Saviour's pro-

[x] See vol. IV. p. 264. [y] Obſervations upon Daniel, p. 156, 157.

ſecution,

ſecution, death and reſurrection, where all four coincide in many particulars: though even here alſo St. John has divers things peculiar to himſelf. In St. John's goſpel is no account of our Saviour's nativity, nor of his baptiſm by John; though, undoubtedly, it is there ſuppoſed, and referred to. He takes no notice of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderneſs, nor of the call, or names of the twelve apoſtles, nor of their miſſion in our Saviour's life time, nor of our Lord's parables, or other diſcourſes of his, recorded by them, nor of our Saviour's journies, of which they give an account, nor any of thoſe predictions relating to the deſolations of Jeruſalem, which are in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Nor has he any miracles recorded by them, excepting only, that one of the multiplication of ſmall proviſion for feeding five thouſand, with the extraordinary circumſtances of the return to Capernaum from the country, where that miracle had been wrought, ch. vi. 4—21. And it is likely, that this miracle was recorded by him, for the ſake of the diſcourſes, to which it gave occaſion, and which follow there, ver. 22—71.

However, it ſhould be obſerved, that he has one thing recorded by all the evangeliſts, Peter's ſtriking a ſervant of the high prieſt, and cutting off his ear. Ch. xviii. 10. *Then Simon Peter having a ſword, drew it, and ſmote the high prieſt's ſervant, and cut off his right ear. The ſervant's name was Malchus.* Which, as St. Luke informs us, Jeſus touched, and healed. ch. xxii. 51. Peter's action is mentioned by all the three evangeliſts, Matt. xxvi. 51. Mark xiv. 47. Luke xxii. 50. But St. John alone mentions Peter by name, and the name of the ſervant. I thought proper to take notice of this, though St. John does not particularly mention the miracle of healing.

St. John likewiſe, ch. ii. 14—22. gives an account of our Lord's cleanſing the temple at his firſt paſſover, when he went to Jeruſalem. All the other evangeliſts have a like account of our Lord's cleanſing the temple at his laſt paſſover, Matt. xxi. 12, 13. Mark xi. 15, 16. Luke xix. 45, 46. But I ſuppoſe them to be quite different actions, and that our bleſſed Lord twice cleanſed the temple, as already ſhown.

4. Though the firſt three evangeliſts have not particularly recorded our Saviour's ſeveral journies to Jeruſalem, as St. John has done, but have only given a particular account of his preaching there at his laſt paſſover, they were not unacquainted with them.

This

This may be concluded from divers things in their hiſtories. To thoſe, who came to apprehend him, our Lord ſaid: *I ſat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.* Matt. xxvi. 55. And compare Mark xiv. 49. Luke xxii. 53. And among the accuſations brought againſt him by the Jewiſh Rulers before Pilate, they ſay: *He ſtirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee to this place,* Luke xxiii. 5. Peter preaching at Jeruſalem, ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion, ſays: *Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and ſigns: which God did by him in the midſt of you, as yourſelves alſo know,* Acts ii. 22. And at the houſe of Cornelius, in Cæſarea: *That word, you know, which was publiſhed throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee,* Acts x. 37.——*And we are witneſſes of all things, which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and at Jeruſalem,* ver. 39. And it appears from their hiſtories, that our Lord's fame had early reached Jeruſalem. Many attended him in Galilee from thence, and from other parts. Says St. Matthew: *And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan,* ch. iv. 25. Comp. Mark iii. 7, 8. Again: *And the ſcribes, which came from Jeruſalem, ſaid: He has Belzebub.*——Mark iii. 22—30. Compare Matt. ix. 34. Luke xi. 14—26. *Then came to Jeſus ſcribes and phariſees, which were of Jeruſalem,* Matt. xv. 1. Compare Mark vii. 1. And ſays St. Luke, ch. v. 17. *And it came to paſs on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were phariſees, and doctors of the law ſitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judea, and Jeruſalem; and the power of the Lord was preſent to heal them.* And in every one of the evangeliſts we may meet with ſcribes and phariſees, oppoſing our Lord, watching his words and actions, cavilling with him, and reflecting upon him, and his diſciples.

Moreover in St. Luke, ch. ix. 51—56. is an account of a remarkable incident, when our Lord was going from Galilee through Samaria to Jeruſalem, at one of their feaſts: ſuppoſed by [z] ſome to be the feaſt of tabernacles, by others [a] the feaſt of dedication, preceding his laſt paſſover. See likewiſe Luke xiii. 22. and xvii. 11.

However, after all, I do not think it was needful, that our Lord ſhould go often to Jeruſalem, or that all his journies

[z] Vid. Cleric. Harmon. p. 234. 235. [a] See Dr. Doddridge's Family Expoſitor. Sect. 127. Vol. II. p. 183.

thither

thither, and diſcourſes there, ſhould be recorded. It was indeed highly expedient, that his miniſtry ſhould be public: ſo it might be, without going often to Jeruſalem. John the Baptiſt was a man of great reputation, though he never went up to Jeruſalem during the time of his ſhowing himſelf unto Iſrael, that we know of, Luke i. 80. And it is manifeſt from the firſt three Evangeliſts, as well as from St. John, that our Lord's miniſtry was very public, and well known in all parts of Judea, and the regions round about, and to men of all ranks therein. In them we find our Lord to have been notified before-hand by John the Baptiſt. He ſent out once his twelve apoſtles, and then ſeventy other diſciples, *two by two, to go before him, and prepare men for him, in every city and place where he ſhould come.* In them we find him teaching in ſynagogues, in cities, and villages, and deſert places, crowded by throngs, attended by multitudes of people, and miraculouſly feeding at one time five thouſand, at another four thouſand men, beſide women and children.

It was fit, that our Lord's miniſtry ſhould be very public; it is manifeſt, from all the four evangeliſts, that it was ſo; which cannot but be the ground of great ſatisfaction to us.

5. The genuineneſs of the twenty-firſt or laſt chapter of St. John's goſpel ought not to be conteſted.

Grotius indeed was of opinion, that [b] St. John concluded his goſpel with the words, which are at the end of the twentieth chapter: and that what is in the twenty-firſt chapter was added after St. John's death by the church of Epheſus.

Againſt that opinion the general, or [c] even univerſal conſent of manuſcripts and verſions is a great objection. For it is very probable, that this goſpel was publiſhed before St. John's death. And if there had been an edition without this chapter,

[b] Omnino arbitror, quæ hic ſequuntur concluſionem eſſe totius operis, et ibi finiiſſe Joannem librum, quem edidit. At ſicut caput ultimum Pentateuchi, et caput ultimum Joſuæ poſt Moſis et Joſuæ mortem additum eſt a Synedrio Hebræorum: ita et caput quod ſequitur poſt mortem Joannis additum ab Eccleſia Epheſina, hoc maxime fine, ut oſtenderetur impletum quod de longa vitate ac non violenta morte Joannis Dominus prædixerat, &c. Grot. ad Joh. xx. 30.

[c] Cæterum in tanto codicum et verſionum conſenſu, eoque prorſus univerſali, cogitari non debebat, caput hoc ab Eccleſia demum Epheſina acceſſiſſe. Quis enim negare tuto poteſt, Evangelium Joannis ante ipſius obitum, adeoque ante additum hoc, quod creditur, ſuppiementum acceſſiſſe? Et quis crediderit, vel ſic omnes codices in exhibendo iſto capite tam conſtanter conſentire potuiſſe? Wolf. in Joh. cap. xxi. in.

it

it is very likely, that it would have been wanting in ſome copies. To which may be added, that we do not find, that any of the ancient chriſtian writers ever made a queſtion, whether this chapter was compoſed by St. John, or by another. Finally, [d] the ſtyle is St. John's. In chapter xix. 35. *And he that ſaw it bare record; and his record is true: and he knoweth, that he ſays true.* Here xxi. 24. *This is the diſciple, which teſtifieth of theſe things, and wrote theſe things; and we know, that his teſtimony is true.* Compare likewiſe ver. 7. and 20. The laſt words of the chapter, at ver. 25. are theſe: *And there are alſo many other things, which Jeſus did: the which if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe, that even the world itſelf could not contain the books that ſhould be written.* Which clauſe evidently is from the ſame perſon, who wrote ver. 30, and 31, of ch. xx. Here the evangeliſt ſeems to check himſelf, and to determine not to proceed any farther. For if he ſhould attempt to commit to writing every thing which Jeſus had ſaid and done, he ſhould never come to an end.

Says Dr. Whitby upon ch. xx. 31. 'Some think, that St. 'John here ended his goſpel, and that the following chapter 'was written by ſome other hands. But theſe words give no 'ground for that imagination: ſince other apoſtles, after they 'ſeem to have concluded their epiſtles, add ſome new matter: 'as may be ſeen in the concluſions of the epiſtles to the 'Romans, and to the Hebrews.' See Rom. ch. xv. and xvi. Heb. xiii. 21—25. I would likewiſe refer to Mr. Lenfant's note upon ch. xxi. 24. who alſo aſſerts the genuineneſs of this laſt chapter.

[d] Rejicimus hic ſententiam eorum, qui ab alia manu, quam ipſius Joannis Evangeliſtæ hoc caput eſſe adjectum putant. Nam ita clare ſtilum redolet Apoſtoli, ut ſi aliquis alius id adjeciſſet, non ſine impoſtura iſtud facere potuiſſet. Neque enim ſe Joannem vocat, ſed more ſuo diſcipulum, quem Jeſus amabat. ver. 7. 20. Tum hæc addit: Hic eſt diſcipulus ille, qui de his teſtatur, et hæc ſcripſit. ver. 24. Quæ defendi non poſſunt a mendacio, ſi quiſquam alius præter Apoſtolum hoc caput adjeciſſet. Adde, quod diligentiſſimi circa tales circumſtantias Patres, Euſebius, Hieronymus, atque alii, non ita plene ſilentio id involviſſent, &c. Fr. Lamp. in Jo. Evang. cap. xxi. tom. III. p. 720, 721. Vid. et Mill. Proleg. num. 249, 250.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The Question considered, whether any of the first three Evangelists had seen the Gospels of the others, before he wrote.

HERE I shall in the first place mention the different sentiments of learned moderns concerning this point. And then I intend to consider the merits of the question.

Calvin [a] in the preface to his Harmony of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, declares it to be his opinion, that St. Mark was so far from having abridged St. Matthew's gospel, that he thinks he had never seen it: which he also supposes to have been St. Luke's case.

This likewise must have been the opinion of Basnage. For he supposeth [b] St Luke's to have been the first written of all the gospels. Consequently this evangelist could not borrow either from St. Matthew, or St. Mark.

Mr. Whiston in [c] his Harmony of the four Evangelists called St. Mark the epitomizer of St. Matthew. Mr. Jones, in his Vindication of St. Matthew's gospel, well, and largely argued against that opinion.

Mr. Dodwell declared his opinion upon this subject after this manner: 'That [d] none of the first three evangelists had seen 'the others' gospels. Otherwise there could not have been in

[a] Mihi certe magis probabile est, et ex re ipsa conjicere licet, numquam librum Matthæi fuisse ab eo inspectum, cum ipse suum scriberet: tantum abest, ut in compendium ex professo redigere voluerit. Idem et de Luca judicium facio. Calvin. argum. in Evangel. &c.

[b] Basn. Ann. 60. num. xxxi.

[c] P. 102.

[d] Sic latuerant in illis terrarum angulis, in quibus scripta fuerant. Evangelia, ut ne quidem resciverint recentiores Evangelistæ, quid scripsissent de iisdem rebus antiquiores. Aliter foret ne tot essent *εναντιοφανη*, quæ fere a prima usque canonis constitutione eruditorum hominum ingenia exercuerint. Certe S. Lucas si genealogiam illam Domini in Matthæo vidisset, non aliam ipse, nihilque fere habentem commune, produxisset, ne quidem minima consilii tam diversi edita ratione. S. Matthæus, qui solus e nostris Luca erat antiquior ipse erat *αυτοπτης* —— S. Joannis Luca longo erat intervallo in scriptione junior. Junior etiam S. Marcus, si quidem S. Lucas eo scripserit anno Evangelium, quo Acta terminavit Apostolorum. Quod ego sane puto verisimillimum. Sunt enim Acta *δευτερος* ejusdem operis *λογος*, cujus *πρωτον λογον* ipse suum agnoscit Evangelium. Act. i. 1. — Ita quo anno scriptum est a S. Luca Evangelium secundus fluxerit Apostolo Paulo annus captivitatis Romanæ. Eo enim usque Actorum historia perducta est. S. autem Marcus, seu post obitum Petri, seu non multo ante, scripsisse videtur. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. num. xxxix.

'them

'them ſo many ſeeming contradictions, which have exerciſed 'the thoughts of inquiſitive men almoſt ever ſince the form- 'ing of the canon of the New Teſtament. Certainly, if St. 'Luke had ſeen the genealogy of our Lord, which is in St. 'Matthew, he would not have publiſhed another ſo very dif- 'ferent, without aſſigning any reaſon for it.——St. Matthew is 'the only one of our evangeliſts, who wrote before St. Luke. '——St. John did not write till long after St. Luke. Nor did 'Mark write till after St. Luke, if he wrote his goſpel in the 'ſame year that he finiſhed the Acts of the apoſtles; which 'ſeems to me very probable: for the Acts are the ſecond book 'of the ſame work, as is evident from what himſelf ſays Acts i. 'i. St. Luke's goſpel therefore was written in the ſecond year 'of the apoſtle Paul's impriſonment at Rome; for ſo far the 'hiſtory of the Acts reaches. But St. Mark ſeems not to have 'written until after the death of St. Peter, or not long before 'it.' This then is the order of the four evangeliſts, accord- ing to Mr. Dodwell; Matthew the firſt, Luke the ſecond, Mark the third, and John the fourth.

How Mr. Le Clerc argued on the ſame ſide, was [e] ſeen formerly.

On the other hand, Grotius ſays, it [f] is manifeſt from com- paring their goſpels, that Mark made uſe of Matthew.

Mill has ſpoken largely to this point in his Prolegomena. 'He ſays, it [g] was not the deſign of St. Mark, to make an 'abridgment of St. Matthew's goſpel, as ſome have ſuppo- 'ſed. For he does not always follow St. Matthew's order, as 'an abridger would have done: and he is oftentimes more 'prolix in his hiſtories of the ſame thing than St. Matthew, 'and has inſerted many additional things, and ſome of great 'moment for illuſtrating the evangelical hiſtory.——Nay [h] ſo

[e] See vol. V. p. 95, 96.

[f] Uſum eſſe Marcum Matthæi Evangelio apertum facit collatio. Grot. ad Marc. cap. i. ver. 1.

[g] Ipſam Evangelii ſtructuram quod attinet, neutiquam Marco inſtitutum fuit, quod nonnullis videtur, Evangelium Matthæi in epitomen redigere. Præterquam enim quod ſervatum a Matthæo ordinem non ubique ſequatur, quod ſane epitomatoris foret, in ejuſdem rei narratione Matthæo haud raro prolixior eſt, ac plurima paſſim inſerta habet, eaque ſubinde magni ad elucidandam hiſtoriam momenti. Proleg. num. 103.

[h] Imo certe adeo nihil Marco erat in animo de abbreviando Matthæi Evangelio, ut haud deſint magni nominis auctores, qui exiſtimant, a Marco ne quidem viſum fuiſſe Evangelium Matthæi.... Cæterum contrarium evincit, Evangelium imprimis Matthæi et Marci quod attinet, iſtorum phraſeos, ipſiuſque contextus ſimilitudo. Ibid. n. 107.

'ſar

'far was Mark from intending to abbreviate St. Matthew's 'gospel, that there have been men of great fame, as Calvin, 'and our Dodwell, who were of opinion, that St. Mark and 'Luke had never seen Matthew's gospel. However, Gro- 'tius was of a different opinion. And indeed the great resem- 'blance of the style and composition of these two Evangelists 'manifests the truth of it.'

Of St. Luke Mill says: 'Nothing [i] is more evident, than 'that he made use of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. For 'he has borrowed from them many phrases and expressions, 'and even whole paragraphs word for word.'

But there is not sufficient foundation for such strong asser- tions, in the account which Mill himself gives of the time of writing the first three gospels: for, according to him, St. Matthew's gospel was published in [k] the year 61, St. Mark's [l] in 63, St. Luke's [m] in 64; which is but one year later. Nor has Mill made it out, that St. Mark's was published so soon as the year 63. For he owns, that it was not written till after Peter's and Paul's departure from Rome; which could not be, till after the year 63. How then could St. Luke make so much use of St. Mark's gospel, as is pretended?

I allege but one author more, relating to this point. Mr. Wetstein says, that [n] Mark made use of Matthew: and of St. Luke he says, 'that [o] he transcribed many things from Matthew, and yet more from Mark.'

But may I not say, that before Mr. Wetstein asserted such things, he should have given at least some tolerable account of the times, when the evangelists wrote, and that St. Mark was prior in time to Luke? Which I do not perceive him to have done. St. Matthew's gospel, indeed, he supposes to have been written [p] in the eighth year after our Lord's ascension. But of St. Luke he observes, that [q] ecclesiastical writers say, he published his gospel at about fifteen, or as

[i] Certe evulgatum fuisse illud post editionem Evangeliorum Matthæi et Marci, ex collatione trium horum inter se luce clarius apparet. Nihil scilicet evidentius, quam D. Lucam Evangeliorum Matthæi et Marci ipsa ῥητεις, phrases et locutiones, imo vero totas pericopas, in suum nonnunquam αυτολεξει traduxisse. Ib. num. 116. [k] Proleg. num. 61. [l] Ibid. num. 101. [m] Ibid. num. 112. [n] De Marco ap. T. Gr. T. I. p. 552. [o] Lucam multa ex Matthæo, ex Marco plura descripsisse, ex collatione patet. De Luca ibid. p. 643.

[p] Ibid. p. 223. [q] Ibid. p. 643.

others about two and twenty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion. His account of St. Mark is, 'that [r] he was with 'Peter at Babylon. Thence he came to Rome, and was 'with St. Paul during his captivity there, Col. iv. 10. 'Philem. 23. Then he went to Coloſſe. Afterwards at 'the deſire of the apoſtle he came to him thence to Rome, '2 Tim. iv. 11. Where he is ſaid to have written his goſ'pel, abridging St. Matthew, and adding ſome things, 'which he had heard from Peter.' A very fine character of our evangeliſt, truly! But according to this account of St. Mark's travels, and of the place, where his goſpel was written, it could not be publiſhed before the year 64, or 65. How then could St. Luke make uſe of it, if he wrote ſo ſoon as fifteen or two and twenty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion?

I proceed now to ſpeak more diſtinctly to the merits of the queſtion.

1. It does not appear, that any of the learned ancient chriſtian writers had a ſuſpicion, that any of the firſt three evangeliſts had ſeen the other hiſtories, before they wrote. They ſay indeed, 'that when the three firſt written goſpels 'had been delivered to all men, they were alſo brought 'to St. John, and that he confirmed the truth of their nar'ration: but ſaid, there were ſome things omitted by them, 'which might be profitably related:' or, 'that he wrote 'laſt, ſupplying ſome things, which had been omitted by 'the former evangeliſts.' After this manner ſpeak [s] Euſebius of Cæſarea, [t] Epiphanius, [u] Theodore of Mopſueſtia, and [x] Jerom. Not now to mention any others. Auguſtine indeed about the end of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth, ſuppoſeth [y] the firſt three evangeliſts not to have been totally ignorant of each other's labours, and conſiders Mark's goſpel as an abridgment of St. Matthew's. But, as [z] formerly obſerved, ſo far as I know, he is the firſt, in which that opinion is found: nor does it appear, that he was followed by ſucceeding writers.

[r] Poſtea videtur Petro adhæſiſſe, et cum eo Babylone fuiſſe. 1 Pet. v. 13. Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum inviſit. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 23. Inde ad Coloſſenſes abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. ubi Evangelium conſcripſiſſe, et Matthæum quidem in compendium redegiſſe, nonnulla vero, quæ a Petro audiverat, adjeciſſe dicitur. Ibid. p. 551. [s] See vol. IV. p. 225, 226. [t] p. 315. [u] p. 512. [x] Vol. V. p. 41. [y] p. 93. [z] p. 96.

2. It

2. It is not suitable to the character of any of the evangelists, that they should abridge, or transcribe another historian.

St. Matthew was an apostle, and eye-witness: consequently, he was able to write of his own knowledge. Or, if there were any parts of our Lord's ministry, at which he was not present, he might obtain information from his fellow-apostles, or other eye-witnesses. And as for other things, which happened before the apostles were called to follow him, concerning his nativity, infancy, and youth; as Augustine [a] says, these the apostles might know from Christ himself, or from his parents, or his friends and acquaintance, who were to be depended upon.

St. Mark, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples, was an early Jewish believer, acquainted with all the apostles, Peter in particular, and with many other eye-witnesses: consequently, well qualified to write a gospel. Mill [b] himself has been so good, as to acknowledge this.

St. Luke, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples, nor an eye-witness, was a disciple, and companion of apostles, especially of Paul, as is universally allowed: and he must therefore have been well qualified to write a gospel. Moreover, as [c] has been shown, it is manifest from his introduction, that he knew not of any authentic history of Jesus Christ, that had been yet written. And he expressly says of himself, *that he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first*, and he professeth *to write of them to Theophilus in order*. After all this to say, that he transcribed many things from one historian, and yet more from another, so far as I am able to judge, is no less than a contradiction of the evangelist himself.

[a] p. 93. [b] Marcus ille, quisquis fuerit, ad Evangelium conscribendum abunde instructus accedebat. Si enim filius fuit Mariæ, civis istius Hierosolymitanæ—ei sane jam a tempore conversionis tam frequens intercesserat, ac plane familiare cum ipsis Apostolis commercium, ut vix aliqua ætatis suæ pars ipsorum consortio vacarit: ita ut quotidie ab illis petere licuerit de dictis ac factis Domini παραδοσις, quas conferret in commentarium. Sane, quisquis fuerit hic Marcus, apud Veteres plane convenit, fuisse cum D. Petri comitem et interpretem: ipsumque comitatum fuisse Romam usque—adeo ut ex Apostoli κηρυσσομενοις acceperit necesse sit plenissimam et exactissimam historiæ totius evangelicæ cognitionem. Mill. Proleg. n. 102.

[c] See before, p. 42—44.

3. The nature and deſign of the firſt three goſpels manifeſtly ſhow, that the evangeliſts had not ſeen any authentic written hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt.

This is one of the obſervations of Le Clerc relating to this point: 'We [d] can ſcarcely doubt, whether St. John had 'ſeen the other three goſpels. For as he is ſaid to have 'lived to a great age, ſo it appears from his goſpel itſelf, 'that he took care not to repeat things related by them, 'except a few only, and thoſe neceſſary things. But I do 'not ſee how it can be reckoned certain that Mark knew 'of Matthew's having written a goſpel before him: or that 'Luke knew, that they two had written goſpels before him. 'If Mark had ſeen the work of Matthew, it is likely that 'he would have remained ſatisfied with it, as being the 'work of an apoſtle of Chriſt, that is, an eye-witneſs, which 'he was not.' And what there follows. . .

I muſt enlarge upon this obſervation. I forbear to inſiſt now on the genealogies, which are in St. Matthew and St. Luke only. But I ſay, that the writings of all and each one of theſe three evangeliſts contain an entire goſpel, or a complete hiſtory of the miniſtry of Jeſus Chriſt: or, to borrow St. Luke's expreſſions, Acts i. 1, 2. a hiſtory of *all that Jeſus both did and taught, until the day, in the which he was taken up to heaven.* For in all and every one of them is the hiſtory of our Lord's fore-runner, his baptiſm, preaching, and death, and of our Lord's being baptized by him: when, by a voice from heaven, he was proclaimed to be the Meſſiah. Then follows our Lord's temptation in the wilderneſs. After which is an account of our Lord's preaching, and his beginning to gather diſciples, the choice of the twelve apoſtles, and their names: and our Lord's going over the land of Iſrael, preaching the doctrine of the kingdom, attended by his twelve apoſtles, in ſynagogues, and in cities and villages, working all kinds of healing and ſaving miracles, upon all ſorts of perſons, in all places, in the preſence of multitudes, and before ſcribes and phariſees, as well as others. A particular miſſion of his apoſtles, in the land of Iſrael. Our Lord's transfiguration on the mount, when there appeared Moſes and Elias talking with him, and there came a voice from heaven, ſaying: *This is my beloved Son. Hear him.* His going up to Jeruſalem, and making a public entrance into the city, then cleanſing the temple, where

[d] See vol. V. p. 96.

he

he often taught the people, and preached the goſpel, and openly aſſerted his authority and character: keeping the paſſover with his diſciples, and inſtituting a memorial of himſelf: his laſt ſufferings, and death, with the behaviour of Judas, the traitor, Peter, and the reſt of the diſciples: his burial, reſurrection, with the evidences of it, and the general commiſſion to his apoſtles, to preach the goſpel in all the world, and to all ſorts of perſons therein.

Here are all the integrals of a goſpel. And they are properly filled up. And all theſe things are in all and every one of the firſt three evangeliſts: which ſhows, that they did not know of each other's writings. For it cannot be thought, that they ſhould be diſpoſed to ſay the ſame things over and over, or to repeat what had been well ſaid already. St. John, who had ſeen the other three goſpels, has little in common with them: almoſt every thing in his goſpel is new and additional. So it would have been with every other writer in the like circumſtances.

And if St. Matthew's goſpel had been written at about eight, or fifteen, or twenty years after our Lord's aſcenſion, and had become generally known among the faithful, (as it certainly would, ſoon after it was written:) it is not improbable, that we ſhould have had but two goſpels, his and St. John's. Or if there had been ſeveral, they would all, except the firſt, have been in the manner of ſupplements, like St. John's, not entire goſpels, like thoſe of the firſt three evangeliſts.

This conſideration appears to me of great moment, for ſhowing that our firſt three evangeliſts are all independent witneſſes. Indeed it ſeems to me to be quite ſatisfactory, and deciſive.

4. There are in theſe three goſpels, as was obſerved juſt now by Mr. Dodwell, many ſeeming contradictions: which have exerciſed the ſkill of thoughtful men to reconcile them. This is another argument, that theſe evangeliſts did not write by concert, or after having ſeen each others goſpels.

5. In ſome hiſtories, which are in all theſe three evangeliſts, there are ſmall varieties and differences, which plainly ſhow the ſame thing. I ſhall allege two or three inſtances only.

1.) In Matth. viii. 28---34. Mark v. 1---20. Luke viii. 26---40. is the account of the cure of the dæmoniac, or dæmoniacs, in the country of the Gadarenes. It is plainly

the ſame hiſtory, as appears from many agreeing circumſtances: nevertheleſs there are ſeveral differences. St. Matthew ſpeaks of two men, St. Mark and St. Luke of one only. In Mark alone it is ſaid, that the man was always night and day in the mountains, crying, and cutting himſelf with ſtones. And he alone mentions the number of the ſwine that were drowned. He likewiſe ſays, that the man beſought our Lord much, that he would not ſend them away out of the country. St. Luke ſays: the dæmons beſought him, that he would not command them to go out into the deep, or abyſs. Surely theſe evangeliſts did not abridge, or tranſcribe each others writings.

2.) In Matt. xvii. 1 — 13. Mark ix. 1 --- 13. Luke ix. 28 — 36. are the accounts of our Lord's transfiguration on the mount. Where St. Matthew ſays: *his face did ſhine as the ſun, and his raiment was white as the light.* St. Mark: *And his raiment became ſhining, exceeding white as ſnow, ſo as no fuller on earth can white them.* St. Luke: *And as he prayed, the faſhion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glittering.* It is plain, I think, that none had ſeen what the other had written. In the deſcription of the ſplendor of our Lord's perſon, and garments, each one follows his own fancy. In St. Matthew and St. Mark are compariſons; but they are different. In St. Luke there is no compariſon at all.

3.) The third inſtance ſhall be what follows next in all the three evangeliſts, after our Lord was come down from the mount. Matt. xvii. 14 — 21. Mark ix. 14 — 29. Luke ix. 37 — 42. In this hiſtory of the healing the young man, who had the epilepſy, where St. Mark is more particular and prolix, than the other evangeliſts, there are many differences: I take notice of a very few only. In St. Matthew the father of the child ſays: Lord, have mercy on my ſon, for he is lunatic, and ſore vexed: and the healing him is thus related. *And Jeſus rebuked the dæmon, and he departed out of him. And the child was cured from that very hour.* In St. Mark the father of the child ſays to our Lord: *Maſter, I have brought unto thee my ſon, who has a dumb ſpirit.* And when our Lord healed him, *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.* And what follows. In St. Luke the father ſays: *Maſter, I beſeech thee, look upon my ſon, for he is my only child.*

Certainly,

Certainly, he who obſerves theſe things, muſt be ſenſible, that theſe hiſtorians did not borrow from each other: there are many other like inſtances: to mention them all would be endleſs.

I ſhall add a conſideration or two more, which muſt be allowed to be of ſome weight in this queſtion.

6. There are ſome things in St. Matthew's goſpel, very remarkable, of which no notice is taken either by St. Mark, or St. Luke.

I intend, particularly, the viſit of the Magians, with the cauſes of it, and its circumſtances, and then the conſequences of it, our Saviour's flight into Egypt, and the ſlaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, and near it. Matt. ii. The dream of Pilate's wife. ch. xxvii. 19. the affair of the Roman guard at the ſepulchre. ch. xxviii. 11—15. *an earthquake, rending of rocks*, and *the reſurrection of many ſaints, who came out of their graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many*. ch. xxvii. 51—53.

Theſe are as extraordinary things, as any in the goſpels: and if St. Mark, or St. Luke, had written with a view of abridging, or confirming St. Matthew's hiſtory, ſome, or all of theſe things, would have been taken notice of by them. It is alſo very obſervable that St. Luke has no account of the miracle of feeding *four thouſand with ſeven leaves and a few little fiſhes*, which is in Matt. xv. 32—39. Mark viii. 1—9.

And what has been juſt now ſaid of St. Matthew, particularly, may be alſo applied to St. Luke, ſuppoſing his to have been the firſt written goſpel: for in him alſo are many remarkable things, not to be found in the other goſpels. And if St. Matthew or St. Mark had written with a view of abridging or confirming St. Luke's hiſtory, thoſe things would not have been paſſed over by them without any notice.

7. All the firſt three evangeliſts have many things peculiar to themſelves: which ſhows, that they did not borrow from each other, and that they were all well acquainted with the things, of which they undertook to write a hiſtory.

Many ſuch things are in Matthew, as is well known to all: I therefore need not enlarge on them; and a few of them were juſt now taken notice of.

St. Mark likewiſe has many things peculiar to himſelf, not mentioned by any other evangeliſt: a catalogue of them was made by us [c] formerly, though far from being complete.

[c] See before, p. 99—104.

The ſame is true of St. Luke. As much was obſerved by Irenæus, who ſays, 'there are many, and thoſe neceſſary 'parts of the goſpel, which we know from Luke only.' His brief enumeration of thoſe things was tranſcribed by us into this work [f] long ago. Let me alſo rehearſe them here ſomewhat differently. His general introduction, the birth of John the Baptiſt, and many extraordinary things, attending it. The Roman cenſus made in Judea, by Cyrenius, or before that made by Cyrenius, which brought Joſeph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem; the mean circumſtances of our Lord's nativity; the notification of it to ſhepherds by an angel; his circumciſion; Mary's purification at the temple; the prophecies of Simeon and Anna there; our Lord's going up to Jeruſalem at the age of twelve years. ch. ii. The names of the emperor and other princes, in whoſe time John the Baptiſt and our Lord began to preach, and our Lord's age at that time; a genealogy different from Matthew, ch. iii. In St. Luke are alſo divers miracles, not recorded elſewhere. A numerous draught of fiſhes, ch. v. 4—9. The cures of Mary Magdalene, Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's ſteward, and Suſanna, ch. viii. 2, 3; giving ſpeech to a dumb man. ch. xi. 14; a woman healed in a ſynagogue of an infirmity, under which ſhe had laboured eighteen years. ch. xiii. 10—17, the man cured of a dropſy on a ſabbath day, in the houſe of a phariſee, ch. xiv. 1—4. Ten lepers cured at once, ch. xvii. 12—19. the ear of Malchus healed, ch. xxii. 50, 51; the ſon of a widow of Naim raiſed to life, in the ſight of multitudes, when he was carried out to burial, ch. vii. 11—17; a miracle of reſurrection, related by no other evangeliſt. In him alone is the miſſion of the ſeventy diſciples, ch. x. 1—20. Divers beautiful parables ſpoken by our Lord, which are not to be found elſewhere: the parable of the good Samaritan, ch. x. 25 — 37; the parable of the loſt piece of ſilver, and the prodigal ſon, ch. xv. 8—32; of the unjuſt ſteward, xvi. 1—12; the rich man and Lazarus, ver. 19—31; the importunate widow, xviii. 1—8. the phariſee and publican, that went up to the temple to pray, ver. 9—14. To St. Luke alſo are peculiar our Lord's entertainment at the houſe of a phariſee, where came in a woman that was a ſinner, ch. vii. 36—50; his entertainment at the houſe of Martha, ch. x. 38—42; the hiſtory of

[f] Vol. II. p. 159—161.

Zaccheus,

Zaccheus, ch. xix. 1—10; our Lord's agony in the garden, ch. xxii. 43, 44; the penitent thief on the croſs, ch. xxiii. 39—43; and a particular account of the two diſciples going to Emmaus, ch. xxiv. 13—35.

All theſe, and many other things, which I omit, are peculiar to St. Luke. And did he tranſcribe many things from St. Matthew, and yet more from St. Mark?

Mill's argument, taken from the ſimilitude of ſtyle and compoſition, to prove, that theſe evangeliſts had ſeen each other's writings, appears to be inſufficient. And himſelf allows, that [g] two authors writing upon the ſame ſubject in the Greek language may eaſily agree very much in expreſſion.

I have inſiſted the more upon this point, becauſe I think, that to ſay the evangeliſts abridged and tranſcribed each other, without giving any hint of their ſo doing, is a great diſparagement to them: and it likewiſe diminiſheth the value and importance of their teſtimony. Said Mr. Le Clerc, before quoted, 'They [h] ſeem to think more juſtly, who 'ſay, that the firſt three evangeliſts were unacquainted with 'each other's deſign. In that way greater weight accrues 'to their teſtimony. When witneſſes agree, who have firſt 'laid their heads together, they are ſuſpected. But wit-'neſſes, who teſtify the ſame thing ſeparately, without know-'ing what others have ſaid, are juſtly credited.'

This is not a new opinion, lately thought of: nor has it been taken up by me, out of oppoſition to any. I have all my days read, and admired the firſt three evangeliſts, as independent, and harmonious witneſſes. And I know not how to forbear ranking the other opinion among thoſe bold, as well as groundleſs aſſertions, in which critics too often indulge themſelves, without conſidering the conſequences.

[g] Verum quidem eſt, eum eſſe linguæ hujus, quæ Evangeliſtis in uſu erat, Helleniſticæ genium, eam indolem, ut in unum ferme eundemque dicendi characterem, quoties de una eademque materia agitur, ſeſe efformet: ita ut diverſi in hoc genere ſcriptores, unum idemque aliquod argumentum particulare tractantes, ſtylo ac ſermonis tenore haud abſimili uſuri eſſent, &c. Prol. num. 108.

[h] See Vol. V. p. 95.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

ST. PAUL.

I. *His Hiſtory before his Converſion, and his general Character.* II. *The Time of his Converſion.* III. *Obſervations upon his Converſion, and the Circumſtances of things at that time in Judea.* IV. *His age at the Time of his Converſion.* V. *When he was made an Apoſtle.* VI. *The Hiſtory of his Travels, and Preaching: particularly, from the Time of his Converſion and Apoſtleſhip, to his coming from Damaſcus to Jeruſalem, the firſt time, after his Converſion.* VII. *From his coming firſt to Jeruſalem to his being brought to Antioch by Barnabas.* VIII. *To his coming up to Jeruſalem with the Contributions of the Chriſtians at Antioch.* IX. *To his coming to the Council at Jeruſalem about the year* 49. X. *To his coming to Jeruſalem with Contributions of divers Gentile Churches, in the year* 58, *when he was apprehended, and impriſoned.* XI. *To the End of his impriſonment at Rome.* XII. *To the time of his death.*

I. SAUL, called alſo PAUL, by which name he was generally called, after his preaching in gentile countries, and, particularly, [a] among Greeks and Romans, a deſcendant of the patriarch Abraham, one of God's ancient choſen people of Iſrael, of the tribe of Benjamin, was [b] a native of Tarſus, then the chief city of Cilicia. He was alſo by birth a [c] citizen of Rome. How he became entitled to that privilege, has been diſtinctly ſhown [d] in another place. His father [e] was a phariſee, and himſelf was of the ſame ſect. He had a ſiſter, whoſe ſon was a Chriſtian, and a

[a] Acts xiii. 9. *Then Saul, who alſo is called Paul*] Σαυλος δε ο και Παυλος. Id eſt, qui ex quo cum Romanis converſari cœpit, hoc nomine, a ſuo non abludente, cœpit a Romanis appellari. Sic qui Jeſus Judæis, Græcis Jaſon: Hillel, Pollio:—— apud Romanos Silas, Silvanus, ut notavit Hieronymus. Grot. in Act. xiii. 9.

Hoc primum loco cœpit Apoſtolus a Lucâ Paulus dici, quem ubique antea Saulum vocavit. Nec deinceps alio, quam Pauli nomine uſquam vocabit.—— Alii igitur apoſtolum jam inde ab initio binominem fuiſſe putant, ut ex altero homine Judæus, ex altero Romanus civis eſſe intelligeretur. Alii cum religione nomen eum mutaſſe putant, cum ex Phariſæo fieret Chriſtianus.—Sunt demum qui a Sergio Paulo Proconſule ad Chriſtum converſo hoc cognomen adeptum eſſe putent.——Ac facile mihi quidem perſuadeo, primum a Proconſulis Romani familiâ ita vocari cœpiſſe. Bez. Annot. in Act xiii. 9. See likewiſe Dr. Doddridge's Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 198. note *(k)* or upon Acts xiii. 9.

[b] Acts xxi. 39. xxii. 3. [c] Acts xvi. 37, 38. xxii. 25—29. xxiii. 27. [d] See vol. I. p. 229. [e] Acts xxiii. 6. xxvi. 5. Philip. iii. 5.

diſcreet

diſcreet perſon, who [f] was of great ſervice to his uncle Paul, when a priſoner at Jeruſalem. His conduct cannot be thought of without admiration and gratitude. Some others of his relations are mentioned by him in his epiſtle to the Romans, who alſo were believers in Jeſus, and ſeveral of them had been ſo before himſelf: which may be reckoned a proof of the virtue and piety of this family. Their names are Andronicus, and Junia, whom he calls *his kinſmen.* συγγενεις μου. Rom. xvi. 7. By [g] which he muſt mean ſomething more than their being his countrymen. He ſpeaks in the like manner of Herodian, ver. 11. and alſo of Lucius, Jaſon, and Soſipater, ver. 21. It may be reckoned very probable, that (A) he was educated in Greek literature in his early life at Tarſus. It is certain, that [h] he was for a whiile under the inſtructions of Gamaliel, at Jeruſalem, a celebrated Jewiſh Rabbi, and that [i] he made great proficiency in the ſtudy of the law, and the traditions, much eſteemed by that people. He ſeems to have been [k] a perſon of great natural abilities, of quick apprehenſion, ſtrong paſſions, and firm reſolution, and thereby qualified for ſignal ſervice, as a teacher of ſuch principles, as he ſhould embrace, whatever they were. He appears likewiſe to have been always unblameable in his life, and ſtrictly faithful to the dictates of his conſcience, according to the knowledge,

[f] Acts xxiii. 16—22. [g] *Cognatos ſuos*, id eſt ejuſdem ſecum generis vocat, ut multi exponunt, quia Judæi erant, quemadmodum ſupra ix. 3. de Judæis in univerſum dixit, *qui ſunt cognati mei ſecundum carnem:* et ita eum loqui, ut Judæorum qui Romæ erant gratiam ſibi conciliet. Verum quia multi Romæ erant Judæi Chriſtiani, et proinde hac generali ratione Paulo cognati: idcirco putant alii, cognatos hic dici magis proprie, ut qui fuerint Paulo contribules, id eſt, de tribu Benjamin: aut forte etiam propriore ſanguinis vinculo conjuncti. Eſt in Rom. xvi. 7.

(A) This may be argued from the place of his nativity, Tarſus, which was celebrated for polite literature, and from St. Paul's quotations of ſeveral Greek poets. Acts xvii. 28. 1 Cor. xv. 33. Tit. i. 12. Dr. Bentley begins his third ſermon at Boyle's Lecture, which is the ſecond upon Acts xvii. 27, 28. in this manner, 'I have ſaid enough in my 'laſt, to ſhow the fitneſs and per-'tinence of the apoſtle's diſcourſe '——and that he did not talk at 'random, but was thoroughly ac-'quainted with the ſeveral humours 'and opinions of his auditors. And, 'as *Moſes was learned in all the wiſ-'dom of the Egyptians*, ſo it is mani-'feſt from this chapter alone, if 'nothing elſe had been now ex-'tant, that St. Paul was a great 'maſter in all the learning of the 'Greeks'

[h] Acts xxii. 3.

[i] Acts xxii. 3. xxvi. 5. Gal. i. 14. [k] ——ſecta Phariſæum, excellenti magnoque ingenio præditum, literarum Judaicarum imprimis peritum, nec Græcarum expertem. J. L. Maſhem. de Reb. Chriſtian. ante Conſtantin. ſect. 1. n. xv. p. 80.

which

which he had. Of this all muſt be perſuaded, who obſerve his [l] appeals to the Jews, upon this head, when they were greatly offended with him: and from [m] the undiſſembled ſatisfaction, which he expreſſeth upon a ſerious recollection of his former and later conduct. For ſome while, after the firſt appearance of Chriſtianity in the world, he was a bitter enemy, and furious oppoſer of all who made profeſſion of it. Nevertheleſs he perſiſted not long in that courſe: but was in a very extraordinary manner converted to that faith himſelf: and ever after he was a ſteady friend, and zealous advocate for it, and very ſucceſsful in defending and propagating it, diligently improving the gifts and qualifications extraordinarily vouchſafed him for that purpoſe. Theſe things are recorded in thoſe writings, which are in the higheſt eſteem, and reckoned ſacred among Chriſtians, and indeed are well known to all the world.

II. I am deſirous to do my beſt to ſettle the time of St. Paul's converſion. If we can do that with ſome good degree of probability, we ſhall attain to a near knowledge of the time of St. Stephen's martyrdom: concerning both which events there have been very different opinions in former and later ages. Valeſius, in his Annotations upon Euſebius's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, mentions divers opinions of ancient writers [n] about the time of St. Stephen's death. As the paſſage may be acceptable to ſome, I have placed it below.

Among moderns, Cave thought that [o] Stephen was ſtoned, and Paul converted in the year of our Lord's aſcenſion, the year 33, or the beginning of the year following. Pearſon ſuppoſeth that [p] Stephen was ſtoned in 34, and Paul converted

[l] Acts xxiii. 1. xxvi. 4, 5.

[m] Philip. iii. 6. 1 Tim. i. 13. 2 Tim. i. 3.

[n] Quo anno Stephanus martyrii coronam adeptus ſit, non convenit inter omnes. Alii eodem anno, quo paſſus eſt Chriſtus, lapidatum illum volunt. Ita diſerte ſcribitur in Excerptis Chronologicis, quæ cum Euſebii Chronico edidit Scaliger. pag. 68. Et hæc videtur fuiſſe Euſebii ſententia, ut ex hoc loco apparet. —— Alii vero triennio poſt Chriſti mortem martyrium Stephani retulerunt. —— Ita ſcribit in Chronico Georgius Syncellus. Multi etiam ulterius proceſſerunt, et Stephanum anno ab ordinatione ſua ſeptimo paſſum eſſe ſcripſerunt. Inter quos eſt Evodius apud Nicephorum, et Hippolytus Thebanus, et auctor Chronici Alexandrini, qui anno Claudii primo martyrium Stephani adſignat. Valeſ. Annot. in Euſeb. l. 2. cap. i. [o] —— ad fidem Chriſti converſus, diſcipulus ſit et Apoſtolus A. C. 33. exeunte, vel ſaltem ineunte proximo. Hiſt. Lit. T. I. in S. Paulo. [p] Annal. Paulin. p. 1—4.

in

in 35, near the end of the year. Having been three years in Arabia, and at Damaſcus, he came to Jeruſalem, near the end of 38; in which year, or the beginning of the following, he went to Tarſus; where, and in Syria, he was four years, that is, 39, 40, 41, 42. Which appears to me a long ſpace of time. In 43, he came to Antioch. And having ſpent a year there, he came to Jeruſalem in 44. So Pearſon.

Frederic Spanheim, who alſo has beſtowed great pains in examining this point, placeth [q] the converſion of Paul in the year 40, the laſt of Caius Caligula: and was inclined to defer it to the firſt of Claudius, the year 41. Him [r] Witſius follows. And J. A. Fabricius [s] declares his aſſent to the ſame opinion.

Lenfant and Beauſobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epiſtles, place his converſion in the year 36, and his firſt coming to Jeruſalem after it in 39; which opinion I believe to be nearer the truth than any of the foregoing.

There is an event mentioned in the Acts, about which we may receive light from external hiſtory. I mean, *the reſt of the churches throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria,* Acts ix. 31.

In the former part of this work [t] it was ſhown to be very probable, that this reſt of the churches of Chriſt was owing to the ſtate of things in Judea, when Petronius, preſident of Syria, publiſhed the orders which he had received from Caius, to erect his ſtatue in the temple of Jeruſalem, in the year of Chriſt 39, or 40. Which account was afterwards followed by Dr. Benſon in his [u] Hiſtory of the firſt planting the chriſtian religion. Dr. Doddridge [x] likewiſe declared his approbation of it.

When I formerly argued, that this reſt of the churches was occaſioned by the above-mentioned order of the emperor Caius; I did not know that any one had aſſigned that as the occaſion of it. But ſince, I have perceived, that [y] S. Baſnage

[q] ——in anno converſionis Pauli, quam non anteriorem eſſe Caii ultimo, audacter pronunciamus. De Converſion. Paulin. Epocha. num. ſix. Opp. T. II. p. 321.

[r] De Vita Pauli. Sect. ii. n. 22. ap Miletem. Leyd. p. 34. [s] Tantum noto in præſenti, me ſequi eorum rationes, qui Paulum conver-

ſum eſſe exiſtimant anno quarto ſive ultimo Caii. ann. 40. et capite truncatum A. C. 68. Neronis xiv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. III. p. 151. *(f)*.

[t] See vol. I. § xii. p. 86—100. eſpecially near the end of that ſection. [u] See of that work B. I. ch. 9. ſect. iii. at the end. [x] Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 147. [y] Mira hæc,

Baſnage had thought of it, and ſpoke to it very well. I was led to my obſervations by reading Philo, and Joſephus: from whom I formed the argument, and overlooked the juſt mentioned eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian.

I ſuppoſed, that [z] Petronius publiſhed his order in the year 39, or 40. Baſnage [a] and Tillemont [b] ſay, in the year 40. By whom I am not unwilling to be determined.

It is allowed, that Petronius was ſent governor into Syria by Caius in the third year of his reign, A. D. 39. And it is ſuppoſed by them, that [c] Petronius came into the province about autumn in the year 39. And Joſephus ſays, 'that [d] 'Caius, greatly incenſed againſt the Jews for not paying 'him the ſame reſpect that others did, ſent Petronius 'governor into Syria, commanding him to ſet up his ſtatue 'in the temple: and if the Jews oppoſed it, to march into 'the country with a numerous army, and effect it by force.'

Whenever Petronius publiſhed that order, whether in the year 39, or 40, I think it was the occaſion of the tranquillity of the churches of Chriſt, ſpoken of by St. Luke. And I perſuade myſelf, that moſt people will readily be of the ſame opinion.

We will now take a paragraph or two in the Acts, ch. ix. 26—31. *And when Saul was come to Jeruſalem, he aſſayed to join himſelf to the diſciples.——And he was with them, coming in, and going out, at Jeruſalem. And he ſpoke boldly in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and diſputed againſt the Grecians. But they went about to ſlay him. Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæſarea, and ſent him forth to Tarſus. Then had*

hæc, et præter omnium expectationem exorta rerum viciſſitudo fuit. Cui non minimum contulit infelix Judæorum ſtatus, quibus a Caligulâ vexatis, timentibuſque templi violationem Petronio mandatam, Chriſti diſcipulorum perſecutioni vacare non licuit. Cum enim conſtituendæ eccleſiarum paci ſæpenumero Dei ſapientiâ occaſionibus utatur, atque humanis auxiliis; probabilis utique affertur conjectura, eo ſopitum fuiſſe Judæorum furorem, quia propriis preſſi miſeriis ab inferenda Eccleſiæ calamitate prohibebantur.—— Nec inopinatæ tranquillitatis aptior ulla ratio reddi poteſt. Ann. 40. num. xvi.

[z] See the place referred to above at note *(t)*. [a] Ubi ſupra num. v.

[b] Ruine des Juifs. art. xviii. xix. Hiſt. des Emp. tom. I. [c] Sed ex Joſephi hiſtoria conſtat, illum in provinciam anno tertio Caii adveniſſe, circa autumnum. Noriſ. Cenot. Piſan. Diſſ. 2. p. 371. Conf. Uſſer. Ann. 39. [d] Γαιος δε εν δεινῳ φερων, εις τοσον δε υπο ιουδαιων περιωφθαι μενων, πρεσβευτην επι συριας επεμπει πετρωνιον—— κελευων χειρι πολλη επεξελλοντι εις την ιουδαιαν, ει μεν εκοντες δεχονται, ιναν αυτον ανδριαντα εν τῳ ναῳ τε θεε· ει δ' αγνωμοσυνῃ χρωντο, πολεμῳ κρατησαντα τουτο ποιειν. Antiq. l. 18. cap. ix. n. 2. al. cap. xi.

the

the churches reſt throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified.

This reſt, we may ſuppoſe, was not complete, or made extenſive and univerſal, till the year 40 perhaps, not till near the middle of it. But when did Paul come to Jeruſalem? Before this reſt? or, not till after it was commenced? Baſnage [c] thinks, that Paul came to Jeruſalem in the year 40. Let us however make a few remarks.

The peace, of which we are ſpeaking, ſeems not to have commenced, nor the perſecution to have ceaſed, when Paul arrived at Jeruſalem from Damaſcus. For when *he ſpake boldly in the name of the Lord Jeſus*, and diſputed with the Grecians, *they went about to ſlay him:* as we have ſeen in the paragraph juſt tranſcribed. And the brethren found it needful to conduct him with care to Cæſarea, and ſend him thence to Tarſus. Moreover, Peter was at Jeruſalem, when Paul arrived there, and *he abode with him fifteen days*, Gal. i. 18. But when the peace of the churches was eſtabliſhed, Peter left Jeruſalem, and viſited the ſaints in the ſeveral parts of Judea: as we learn from the hiſtory immediately following, Acts ix. 31—43. Once more, it appears from the above cited paragraph, and the courſe of St. Luke's narration, that this reſt of the churches in Judea did not begin, until after Paul had been ſent thence. And if it had commenced ſooner, in all probability he would have been induced to ſtay longer there among the Jews, for whoſe converſion he was ardently concerned. St. Luke's words are, as above: *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.*

I apprehend it to be probable, then, that Paul came to Jeruſalem, at this ſeaſon, near the end of the year 39, or in the beginning of the year 40. We now proceed.

St. Paul ſays, Gal. i. 15—18. that *when it pleaſed God by his grace to reveal his Son in him,——he went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damaſcus. Then after three years I went up to Jeruſalem to ſee Peter.* For the time of Paul's converſion therefore we muſt look back *three years.* And if thoſe three years are to be underſtood complete, and he came to Jeruſalem in the year 40, he was converted not long after the

[c] Ann. 40. num. xv.

beginning

beginning of the year 37, where it is placed by [f] Baſnage. If he came to Jeruſalem before the end of the year 39, he might be converted near the end of the year 36.

Let me add. Paul ſays, *after* [g] *three years I went up to Jeruſalem:* which may be well underſtood to mean ſomewhat more than three years. And then, though Paul ſhould be ſuppoſed not to have returned to Jeruſalem till the beginning of the year 40, he may have been converted before the end of the year 36.

Shall we now look ſomewhat farther back, and inquire how long this might be after the death of Stephen? Lewis Capellus [h] and Fr. Spanheim [i] ſuppoſed that two years paſſed between the death of Stephen and Paul's converſion. And for certain there was ſome good ſpace of time between Stephen's martyrdom, and Paul's journey to Damaſcus. This appears from St. Luke's hiſtory, who ſays, Acts vii. 58. *And they caſt Stephen out of the city, and ſtoned him. And the witneſſes laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whoſe name was Saul.*——It follows in ch. viii. 1—4. *And Saul was conſenting unto his death. 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.*——*As for Saul he made havock of the church, entering into every houſe, and haling men and women, committed them to priſon.* After which, at ver. 5—40. is an account of the preaching of thoſe who were *ſcattered abroad*, particularly, of Philip's going to the city Samaria, and preaching there with great ſucceſs, and of the apoſtles, who were at Jeruſalem, hearing of this, and ſending to Samaria Peter and John: and then, how Philip taught and baptized the chamberlain of Candace, queen of Ethiopia. After which Philip preached in all the cities from Azotus, till he came to Cæſarea by the ſea ſide. Still Saul was a perſecutor. For it follows, 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,*

[f] Ann. 37. n. 48.

[g] —— μετα ετη τρια. [h] Porro interim —— Saulus, qui Stephani morti conſenſerat, cum per biennium Eccleſiam Dei Jeroſolymis vaſtaſſet.——Lud. Capel. Hiſt. Apoſt. p. 7. [i] Ex dictis conſtare arbitramur —— rurſum anni minimum unius decurſum, ſi non verius biennii (quale et Lud. Cappellus poſt Danæum noſtrum, alioſque, ſtatuit) a cæde hujus ad Sauli profectionem Damaſcenam ſupponendum eſſe. Spanh. Diſſ. de converſ. Paulin. Epoch. n. xx.

to

to the ſynagogues; that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jeruſalem. To all which might be added, that Paul's ill treatment of the diſciples at Jeruſalem was well known at Damaſcus, before he arrived there, as appears from Acts ix. 13.

Nevertheleſs I do not think, that there is ſufficient reaſon to protract this ſpace ſo long as two years: but would hope, it might be reduced within the compaſs of a year, and perhaps to little more than half a year. So thought Baſnage. Who [k] therefore placeth the martyrdom of Stephen and the baptiſm of Paul in one and the ſame year.

I am the more inclined to think, that Paul's courſe of oppoſition againſt the believers did not exceed the ſpace of a year, at the utmoſt: becauſe it ſeems to have been confined to the city of Jeruſalem, until he undertook to go to Damaſcus, and did not reach into the cities of Judea and Samaria. This will lead us to place the martyrdom of Stephen in the year 36, and not far from the beginning of it, or elſe near the end of the year 35.

Indeed that is a very likely ſeaſon, and much confirmed by the ſtate of things in Judea about this time, as diſtinctly repreſented by us long ago in the firſt part of this work, when we treated of affairs and perſons, occaſionally mentioned in the books of the New Teſtament. It was then ſhown, that [l] Pontius Pilate was removed from his government in Judea, before the paſſover of the year 36, probably, five or ſix months before that paſſover, in September or October, A. D. 35, about a year and half before the death of Tiberius. It was alſo ſhown, that [m] after the removal of Pilate, no governor, or procurator, with the right of the ſword, or the power of life and death, was ſent into Judea, neither in the remaining part of the reign of Tiberius, nor in the reign of Caius. Which [n] afforded the Jews an opportunity to be licentious, and to do many things, which otherwiſe they could not have done, and to be extremely troubleſome to the diſciples of Jeſus.

Thus then Paul was converted in 37, or poſſibly, before the end of the year 36. And Stephen was ſtoned in the beginning of the ſame year, or, at the ſooneſt, near the end of the year 35.

[k] A. D. 37. num. 48.
[l] See vol. I. p. 374.
[m] Ibid. p. 86—89.
[n] p. 95.

III. Having diſtinctly conſidered theſe things, and produced ſuch probable evidence, as offers, I beg leave, to mention ſeveral obſervations.

1. The perſecution, which began at the death of Stephen, continued four years.

The diſciples of Jeſus, as appears from the firſt chapters of the book of the Acts, were much harraſſed by the Jewiſh council from the beginning. But now, after Stephen was ſtoned, a more open and violent perſecution came on which †‡ laſted a good while. I am not able to aſſign a more likely time for the commencement of it, than the beginning of the year 36, or the latter part of the year 35, about which time Pilate was removed after his government had been for ſome good while very feeble among the Jews. The ſame perſecution reached into the year of our Lord 40, the fourth and laſt year of the reign of Caius; when Petronius publiſhed the orders which he had received, to ſet up the emperor's ſtatue in the temple at Jeruſalem: which threw the Jewiſh people, throughout all that country, into a general conſternation, and fully employed them about their own affairs.

It ſeems to me therefore, from this calculation, that the perſecution laſted, at leaſt, four years. To which might be added, that it muſt have begun about a year before Paul's converſion, after which he was three years in Arabia. And when he returned to Jeruſalem, the perſecution was not at an end: nor did the peace of the churches come on, till after he had been ſent away from Judea to Tarſus.

2. Notwithſtanding the violence, and the length of this perſecution, the church of Chriſt was not diminiſhed, but increaſed during that period.

This may be argued from the deſcription of the peace which ſucceeded it. Acts ix. 31, 32. *Then had the churches reſt throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified.——And it came to paſs, as Peter paſſed through all quarters, he came to the ſaints which dwelt in Lydda.* Now

†‡ Here I tranſcribe a paſſage from Lightfoot's Commentary upon the Acts, ch. ix. 27. of his works, vol. I. p. 815. 'And thus,' ſays he, 'that perſecution that began 'about Stephen, had laſted till this 'very ſame time of Paul's coming 'to Jeruſalem. For, ſo it is appa-'rent, both by the fear and ſuſpi-'cioufneſs of the diſciples at Jeru-'ſalem, as alſo by the clauſure of 'the text, ver. 31. *Then had the 'churches reſt.* The length of this 'perſecution, by the computation 'of the times, as they have been 'caſt up before, ſeemeth to have 'been about three years and a half.'

therefore there were churches in Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria. And I make no queſtion, but moſt, or all of them were planted during thoſe troubleſome times. For before that period we read not of any churches out of Jeruſalem. And St. Paul ſpeaking of ſome things after his converſion, and his return to Jeruſalem, ſays, Gal. i. 22. *He was unknown by face to the churches of Judea, which were in Chriſt.*

This increaſe of converts in thoſe countries might be owing to ſeveral things: the patience and fortitude of the diſciples: their diſcretion in avoiding needleſs offence, and in declining dangers; their zeal and intrepidity in aſſerting the reſurrection of Jeſus, and other articles of the doctrine of the goſpel: the miraculous powers, with which they were endowed, and their exerting them on all fit occaſions.

It might be alſo, in part, owing to the circumſtances of things. For a while, as it ſeems, this perſecution was confined to Jeruſalem, and did not extend to other parts of Judea. So ſays St. Luke, Acts viii. 1. *At that time was a great perſecution againſt the church which was at Jeruſalem.* Paul's injuries were confined there, till he went to Damaſcus. He ſpeaks not of any thing done by him againſt the diſciples of Jeſus any where elſe. Acts xxvi. 10, 11. *Which thing I alſo did in Jeruſalem—— and being exceedingly mad againſt them, I perſecuted them even unto ſtrange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damaſcus.*

The perſecution became more extenſive afterwards. As may be gathered from thoſe words of St. Luke, juſt cited: *then had the churches reſt throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria,* Wherein it is implied, that the believers in thoſe countries had been diſturbed: though, perhaps, the perſecution was not there ſo violent, as in Jeruſalem and near it.

But ſo long as Paul continued in his courſe of oppoſition, the perſecution either was confined to Jeruſalem, or was not very violent in many other parts, if in any. This may be evidently concluded from Acts viii. 1. *And they were all ſcattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea, and Samaria, except the apoſtles.* Many of the diſciples, therefore, who left Jeruſalem, found ſhelter in Judea, and Samaria. This was ſoon after the death of Stephen, and before Paul went to Damaſcus. Yea it is added, ver. 4, 5. *Therefore they that were ſcattered abroad, went every where, preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Chriſt unto them.* And what follows to ver. 40. clearly ſhowing the truth of what we are now arguing.

Moreover, it ſhould be remembered, that the Jewiſh council had not the power of life and death. The death of Stephen therefore was irregular and tumultuous. That no others ſuffered in a like manner during this period, I would not ſay; conſidering the great conciſeneſs of St. Luke's hiſtory, and what St. Paul ſays Acts xxvi. 10. *And when they were put to death, I gave my voice againſt them.* But if any, beſide Stephen, were put to death, I apprehend, not many, and thoſe of lower rank only, none of a ſtation in the church, equal to that of Stephen. The Roman officers in Judea did not join in any part of this perſecution. They had no orders ſo to do. And if the Jewiſh council had aſſumed authority to put men to death, it would have been complained of, and they would ſoon have been checked.

If the Jewiſh council had had the power of life and death for theſe four years, it would indeed have gone very hard with the chriſtian intereſt, throughout the whole country of Judea: the number of believers would have been much leſſened: nor could any new converts have been made. Such a perſecution the church was not able to endure in its very infancy.

In like manner, a four years' perſecution by Herod Agrippa would have extirpated it. All the believers in general muſt have periſhed, throughout the whole extent of his dominions, without ſafety to any but thoſe who eſcaped into other countries. When therefore that proud and bigoted prince (whom we allow to have had ſupreme power throughout all the land of Iſrael) began to perſecute the church, and had ſlain James, and impriſoned Peter; Providence interpoſed, and miraculouſly delivered Peter out of priſon. And that prince, not obſerving the hand of God therein, nor being intimidated thereby: as appears from his ordering the innocent guards to be immediately executed: and growing ſtill more and more proud and arrogant, he fell under the hand of God himſelf. Of whoſe death, ſoon after, St. Luke has left an affecting hiſtory, ch. xii. 19—23, confirmed alſo by [o] Joſephus.

3. The firſt notice which we have of Paul, is in the account of Stephen's martyrdom. And it ſeems likely, that he had not long before made his appearance in the world.

And, if we conſider Paul's ſituation and circumſtances, we ſhall diſcern the proper vindication of his moral character. It may be reckoned probable, that he had not ſeen Jeſus in the time of his abode on this earth. Poſſibly, he did not come

[o] See vol. I. p. 21—25.

to

to Judea from Tarſus, till after the period of our Lord's miniſtry. It may be likewiſe ſuppoſed, that he had not a perſonal acquaintance with any of Chriſt's apoſtles, nor had ſeen any miracles done by them, before he became a perſecutor. And after that, he would not admit of inſtruction from the followers of Jeſus. However, it is not improbable, that he ſaw the ſplendour of Stephen's countenance before the Jewiſh council, Acts vi. 15. as well as was witneſs of the wonderful patience and meekneſs of his death. ch. vii. 55—59. But then, as may be well ſuppoſed, he was not only prejudiced, but enraged. See ver. 54, 57. and ch. xxvi. 11.

How long he had been in Judea, and under the tuition of Gamaliel, cannot be certainly ſaid. But it is well known, that ſtudents, whilſt under the government of tutors, are ſtrictly guarded, and much reſtrained. None leſs acquainted with what is done in the world, than they. Among the ancients, eſpecially, ſtudents of the law and philoſophy, were required to pay a ſtrict regard to their maſters' inſtructions, and their's only. It may be ſuppoſed, then, that Paul, ſo long as he was with Gamaliel, knew little of the public affairs of Judea, though he was in that country. Coming from the ſchools, animated with an earneſt zeal for the law of Moſes, and all its peculiarities, and for the traditions of the elders: and finding a number of men, called followers of Jeſus of Nazareth, whom they ſpake of as the Meſſiah, and raiſed from the dead, and greater than Moſes himſelf: he was filled with indignation, and thought, he was obliged to oppoſe them to the utmoſt: which he did, till Jeſus met him, and reclaimed him. It is not unlikely, that he conceived of them, as the deluded followers of an impoſtor, like others that appeared in Judea about that time, and therefore deſerving of no regard from any wiſe men.

Paul ſays, among other humbling conſiderations, that he was *injurious*, 1 Tim. i. 13. And he has mentioned ſeveral inſtances of it. Acts xxvi. 10. But even then, as we may well ſuppoſe, he would not have injured any man in his perſon, or property, from worldly conſiderations. In what he did againſt the followers of Jeſus he was not actuated by envy, malice, covetouſneſs, or any worldly view. It was a falſe zeal for God and religion, by which he was induced to be a perſecutor: which in ſome perſons, and in ſome circumſtances, is conſiſtent with integrity. It is very likely to have been ſo in Paul, a young man, little acquainted with the world, and

just come fresh from the study of the law, and the Rabbinical interpretations of it. Chysostom makes this difference between Paul and the Jews. He [p] had a sincere zeal for religion, according to his knowledge at that time. They had no concern for the welfare of Jerusalem, and aimed at nothing but their own honour.

All this has been said for showing, that Paul was sincere in what he had done, and that he did not act contrary to conviction. But †‡ he cannot be justified. He should have examined. He should have taken care to be well informed. If, when he first came abroad in the world, and met with those who professed faith in Jesus, as the Messiah, he had inquired into the grounds of their persuasion: if he had attentively observed, whether they wrought any miracles, like those of Moses, and the ancient prophets, recorded in the Old Testament: if he had attended to the prophecies concerning the Messiah, which they alleged, for showing, that the character of Jesus was answerable to them, and that they were fulfilled in him; he might have received satisfaction, and might have been prevented from acting that part against Jesus, and his disciples, which he afterwards bewailed.

But prejudices are very strong in some. They were so in this young man. Persuaded of the divine original of the law, and of the importance of the traditions of the elders, in which he had been lately instructed, and which he had received, and held, as a most valuable branch of science, he had a sovereign contempt for this new sect, and was of opinion, that nothing could be said by them, which deserved consideration.

Such were his prejudices, that they were not to be overcome in an ordinary way. Without something more than common to awaken his attention, he was in danger to have proceeded much farther in the wrong course, which he was in.

But though Paul was greatly prejudiced, he was not obstinate. The Lord Jesus saw this. He knew Paul to be tractable, and open to conviction. Otherwise, he would not have met him in the way to Damascus, as he did: nor would he have called to him: *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* But he well knew, that those words, together with the glory

[p] Ουτος μεν ȣν ουτως εποιει, ουχ ως ιȣδαιοι· μη γενοιτο. Οτι γαρ ζηλῳ εποιει, δηλον εκ τȣ εις τας εξω πολεις απιεναι· εκεινοι δε ουτε κᾳν των ιεροσολυμοις εφροντισαν· αλλ' ενος εγενοντο μονȣ τȣ τιμης απολαυειν. In Act. Ap. hom. 19. T. IX. p. 155. D.

†‡ See Dr. Doddridge upon 1 Tim. i. 13. note *(b)* Family Expositor, vol. V. p. 443.

of

of the appearance ſurrounding him, would change his heart, and melt him down to ready obedience.

Openneſs to conviction is a moſt neceſſary diſpoſition in ſuch weak, ignorant, fallible, ſinful creatures as we are. Without it there can be no alteration for the better: no change of error for truth, or vice for virtue. Of the conceited and obſtinate there is no hope. But they who are attentive to reaſon and argument, and are willing to be determined by evidence, may do great things. Of ignorant they may become knowing. Inſtead of being erroneous, they may have juſt ſentiments. And they will proceed fron one meaſure of knowledge and virtue to another, till they attain to great perfection in both.

This was Paul's diſpoſition. It is very manifeſt in him. With what enmity againſt the diſciples of Jeſus he ſet out for Damaſcus, and how ſoon he was changed, the hiſtory ſhows. *And as he journeyed, he came near to Damaſcus. And ſuddenly there ſhined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice ſaying unto him: Saul, Saul, why perſecuteſt thou me?* Acts ix. 3—6. Whereupon he trembles, and acquieſces. All his rage is ſubdued, and he becomes a diſciple of Jeſus.

Upon occaſion of an abuſe, which he received from the high prieſt, before whom he ſtood, he expreſſed himſelf with rather too much warmth and reſentment. But having been admoniſhed of it by thoſe who ſtood by, he anſwers with great mildneſs: *I wiſt not*, I did not conſider, *brethren, that it was the high prieſt. For it is written: thou ſhalt not ſpeak evil of the ruler of thy people.* Acts xxiii. 1—5.

He was once offended with John Mark, becauſe he declined a ſervice, which he thought reaſonable to be performed. Acts xiii. 13. xv. 38. But he was afterwards reconciled to him, and deſired his company: perſuaded, that he would be *profitable to him for the miniſtry.* 2 Tim. iv. 11.

So much did this temper prevail in him, and ſo reaſonable and beneficial did it appear to him, that he thought, no men could be deſtitute of it, and that all men muſt be willing to hearken, and to yield to evidence. This we perceive from what he ſays, Acts xxii. 17—21. *When I was come again to Jeruſalem, I was in a trance, and ſaw him ſaying unto me: make haſte, and get thee quickly out of Jeruſalem: for they will not receive thy teſtimony concerning me. And I ſaid: Lord, they know, that I impriſoned and beat in every ſynagogue them that believed on thee.*

thee.——And he ſaid unto me: depart. For I will ſend thee far hence unto the gentiles. He imagined, that an account of his converſion, who once was ſo oppoſite, and the reaſons of it, if fairly laid before them, muſt perſuade them. But Jeſus, who knew the hearts of all men, ſaw, that the people of Judea were ſo hardened, that nothing would work upon them. Inſtead therefore of labouring unprofitably among them, the Lord renewed his orders to Paul, without delay, to proceed in the work of preaching to gentiles, as he had already begun to do.

4. It was very gracious in the Lord Jeſus, to call to Paul at the time he did, and not to ſuffer him to continue any longer in his career of raſh, and inconſiderate, and injurious zeal, without control. As yet he was tender, and tractable. Afterwards he might have been hardened: or, upon conviction, he might have ſunk into deſpair.

5. We have reaſon to think, that there was an over-ruling Providence in diſpoſing the perſon and concerns of Paul about this time, as well as in the other parts of his life.

He reflects with gratitude, that *God had ſeparated him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace*, Gal. i. 15. There was great wiſdom, as well as goodneſs, in the ſeaſon of his call, as juſt ſhown.

It was likewiſe a very happy and favourable circumſtance, that he did not return into Judea preſently after his converſion: foraſmuch as the violent perſecution, which began about the time of Stephen's death, had continued at leaſt three years after Paul left Judea to go to Damaſcus.

It was alſo well for him, that he was out of Judea, during the three or four years' reign of Herod Agrippa, when he was king of all Iſrael. It was, indeed, owing to a violent onſet of the Grecians, as they are called, that the diſciples were induced to convey him to Cæſarea, and ſend him forth to Tarſus. Acts ix. 29, 30. But it was over-ruled for his good. By this means he was out of Judea, during the reign of that proud and cruel prince: which appears to have been a troubleſome time to the followers of Jeſus in that country, till near the end it broke out into the greateſt violence. As we learn from the hiſtory in the twelfth chapter of the Acts.

IV. What was Paul's age at the time of his converſion, is not certain. Witſius ſuppoſeth, that [q] he was born near the end

[q] At in neutram vaſtationem incidit pueritia Pauli, quem natum eſſe oportet circa mortem Herodis. Quod ita conficitur. Ipſe ſe *ſenem* fuiſſe

end of Herod's reign, about the ſame time with our Saviour. It is obſervable, that in the epiſtle to Philemon, ver. 9, written about the year of the vulgar æra 62, he calls himſelf Paul the aged. Which, I think, muſt lead us to ſuppoſe, that he was then ſixty years of age, or not much leſs.

In the account of the martyrdom of Stephen he is called a young man. Acts vii. 58. But it is well known, that among the ancients the word youth is uſed with latitude. Some things ſaid of him about that time may induce us to think him arrived to years of maturity, or diſcretion. For he ſeems to have been one of the principal agents in the perſecution of the believers after the death of Stephen: and to have been entruſted by the Jewiſh rulers in carrying it on. As he ſays to king Agrippa. Acts xxvi. 10. *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 it is well known, being [r] again and again related, that he had a commiſſion from the high prieſt, when he went to Damaſcus. And it is alſo mentioned afterwards in the farther account of himſelf to Agrippa. ver. 12. *Whereupon as I went to Damaſcus with authority and commiſſion from the chief prieſts.*——And there were ſeveral others with him at the ſame time, who may be ſuppoſed to have been officers under him. All which ſhows the regard that was paid to him.

Mr. Biſcoe [s] thinks, that before his converſion Paul had been ordained elder, or rabbi, or doctor. And he ſuppoſeth, that this may enable us to account for Paul's being never excommunicated by the Jews. 'It may ſeem ſtrange to ſome,' ſays he, 'that St. Paul was not excommunicated by the Jews, 'after he turned Chriſtian. For St. John tells us, ch. ix. 22. '*The Jews had agreed, that if any man did confeſs, that Jeſus was* 'the Chriſt, *he ſhould be put out of the ſynagogue.* St. Paul, 'notwithſtanding, entered boldly into their ſynagogues, where-'ever he came, and preached that Jeſus was the Chriſt. He 'was often ſcourged by them, 2 Cor. xi. 24. But we no 'where read of his being excommunicated. The Talmud ex-'plains this to us: foraſmuch as thence it is abundantly evi-

fuiſſe docet, quando evangelii cauſſa vinctus Romæ detinebatur a Nerone. Philem. comm. 9. Neque tamen admodum ſenex eo tempore fuit, quum νεανιας dicatur in martyrio Stephani. Unde neceſſe eſt, ejuſdem propemodum cum Chriſto ætatis fuiſſe. De Vita Pauli. ſect. i. n. iii. [r] See Acts ix 1, 2, 14. xxii. 8. [s] The Hiſtory of the Acts confirmed, p. 269, 270.

'dent,

'dent, that they were very backward to excommunicate the 'diſciples of the wiſe, the doctors, and teachers of the law.'

Whether that be certain or not, I think it may be inferred from what was before ſaid, that at the time of his converſion, Paul was of an age when men are able to judge of the evidence of things, and to form a reaſonable determination concerning their future conduct.

V. It may be now fit for us, before we proceed any farther, to conſider when Paul became an apoſtle.

It has generally been the opinion of learned men, that Paul was called to the apoſtleſhip at the time that he was converted, or very ſoon after. So ſays [t] Spanheim, and [u] Witſius, who follows him. So likewiſe ſay divers others, who alſo have carefully conſidered this point, particularly [x] Cave, [y] Pearſon, [z] Baſnage. To whom I muſt add my late much valued friend [a] Mr. Hallet. Who, in his diſcourſe on ordination, had occaſion to conſider Acts xiii. 2, 3. as well as ſome other texts.

That Paul was now made an apoſtle, and fully inſtructed for preaching the goſpel, is evident from the account of his converſion

[t] Id vero ante omnia in diſquiſitionis hujus limine ſupponimus: idem omnino eſſe tempus vocationis Paulinæ ad apoſtolatum, quod fuit ad Chriſtum, annum adeo eundem utriuſque ac menſem. Spanh. ubi ſupra. § iv. p. 314. [u] Quo tempore ad Chriſtianiſmum, eodem ad Apoſtolatum vocatus eſt Paulus. Actor. ix. 15. xxiii. 15. xxvi 17. &c. Witſ. de Vit. Pauli. ſect. ii. num. xxi. [x] See before, note *(o)* p. 6. [y] Tiberii 22. A. D. 36. Saulus in Arabia moratur, ubi per Revelationem accepit plenam a Deo notitiam evangelii, ad quod prædicandum immediate vocatus eſt. —— A. D. 37. Saulus ex Arabia redit Damaſcum, ſatis in officio per revelationem inſtructus. Pearſon. Ann. Paulin. p. 2. [z] His peractis, Paulus relicta Damaſco, in vicina loca aliquantiſper receſſit, ut ab ipſo Chriſto αμεσως inſtitueretur, quod et ipſe tradit, Gal. i. 15—17. In eo igitur receſſu non ab hominibus edoctus eſt, ſed ab ipſo Chriſto per revelationem didicit evangelium, et creatus eſt Apoſtolus, &c. Baſnag. Ann. 37. num. lxii.

[a] 'From this view of the hiſtory 'of St. Paul's life after his con-'verſion to Chriſtianity, it is plain, 'that many years (thought to have 'been ten) had paſſed, during 'which he had been a preacher, 'and an apoſtle, before the time 'mentioned Acts xiii. At the be-'ginning of thoſe ten years, juſt 'after his converſion, Chriſt made 'him a miniſter and an apoſtle, and 'particularly gave him a commiſ-'ſion to preach to the gentiles, 'when he appeared to him from 'heaven, and ſaid, as in Acts xxvi. '16, 17, 18. —— When therefore, 'ten years after this, the prophets 'at Antioch ſeparated Paul for the 'work to which he was called, by 'prayer, and faſting, and impoſi-'tion of hands, it is evident they 'did not give him any authority. 'He had received the full apoſto-'lical authority, and that, as the

'apoſtle

converſion given by the evangeliſt [b] Luke, and from all the accounts, which he gives of himſelf in his diſcourſes in Judea, to [c] the Jewiſh people, and [d] to Feſtus, and Agrippa, and from his epiſtle to the Galatians, and from the manner of his ſpeaking of himſelf at the beginning of divers of his epiſtles.

What he ſays of himſelf to the Galatians, in particular, implies his having had a full knowledge of the goſpel-revelation, and his being inveſted in the apoſtolical character, before the time of his firſt coming to Jeruſalem, after his converſion. Gal. i. 11, 12. *But I certify you, brethren, that the goſpel, which was preached of me, is not after men. For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt*——ver. 15, 18. *But when it pleaſed God, (who ſeparated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace) to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with fleſh and blood: neither went I up to Jeruſalem, to them which were apoſtles before me. But I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damaſcus. Then after three years I went up to Jeruſalem, to ſee Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.*

Paul muſt have been an apoſtle, and qualified to preach the goſpel, before he came to Jeruſalem, and ſaw Peter: or what he ſays here cannot be reckoned material, and to the purpoſe, about which he is ſpeaking.

Undoubtedly, for ſome good while Paul preached to Jews only. And when he began to preach to gentiles alſo, he may have had ſome farther revelations from Chriſt. But it does not follow, that he was not an apoſtle before that. Peter, and the reſt, had been apoſtles ſeveral years, before they were required, or qualified to preach to gentiles.

Paul ſeldom ſpeaks of his being an apoſtle, or *called to be an apoſtle*, as he often does at the beginning of his epiſtles, but he ſeems to refer to, and intend his early call, when he was converted, and put into the miniſtry. Rom. i. 1. *Paul, a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, ſeparated unto the goſpel of God.* 1 Cor. i. 1. *Paul, called to be an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, through the will of God.* See alſo 2 Cor. i. 1. but eſpecially Gal. i. 1. *Paul, an apoſtle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jeſus Chriſt, and God the Father, who raiſed him from the dead.* See likewiſe 1 Tim. i. 12. ch. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11.

'apoſtle of the gentiles too, long 'before this, immediately from 'Chriſt himſelf.' Hallett's Notes and Diſcourſes, vol. II. p. 321, 322.

[b] Acts ix. 15—22. [c] Ch. xxii. 6—16. [d] Ch. xxvi. 13—24.

One

One requiſite qualification of an apoſtle appears to have been, that he ſhould ſee Chriſt in perſon, and that after his reſurrection. This was manifeſtly one privilege of the firſt twelve apoſtles, and of Matthias, choſen in the room of Judas, Acts i. 21, 22. Accordingly, we find, that Paul alſo, claiming the character of an apoſtle, ſpeaks of his having ſeen Chriſt, and as of a well known, and unconteſted thing. 1 Cor. ix. 1, *Have I not ſeen Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord?* And largely in the xv. chapter of the ſame epiſtle, rehearſing divers appearances of our Lord, after his reſurrection, to the apoſtles, and others, he ſays, ver. 8, 9. *And laſt of all he was ſeen of me alſo, as of one born out of due time. For I am the leaſt of the apoſtles, who am not worthy to be called an apoſtle, becauſe I perſecuted the church of God.*

It is plain, then, that Paul had ſeen Chriſt, and after he was riſen from the dead, as the other apoſtles had done. But where did he ſee him? It is generally [c] ſaid, and, I think, rightly, in the way to Damaſcus. Then, as ſeems to me, Chriſt perſonally appeared to him. It is evident from St. Luke's account of Paul's converſion. Acts ix. 3—6. *And as he journeyed, he came near to Damaſcus, and ſuddenly there ſhined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth,*

[c] Vide Witſ. de Vita Pauli. ſect. ii. num. v. vi. vii. et Baſnagius ann. 37. nnm. lviii.

Qu. 2. Qualis erat hæc apparitio? *Reſp.* Indubie corporalis: quia ſe, ut cæteros, teſtem oculatum adducit. Qu. 3. Quando, et ubi Chriſtum vidit? *Reſp.* Dum iret Damaſcum. Act. ix. Obj. At Paulus tunc excæcatus erat. *Reſp.* Prius tamen Dominum vidit, cujus maxima claritate periſtricti ſunt ejus oculi, ut fit ſolem intuentibus. Poli Synopſ. ad 1 Cor. xv. 8.

Jam quod ad hanc apparitionem Dominicam Paulo factam attinet, quæ ſine dubio poſt aſcenſionem Domini contigit, illud etiam indubitate tenendum eſt, talem fuiſſe quâ Chriſtus ſemet ipſum corporaliter atque oculis corporeis videndum Paulo oſtenderet: ad quem modum et aliis omnibus ſupra memoratis viſus eſt. Nam niſi talis viſio fuiſſet etiam hæc de quâ nunc Paulus loquitur, quomodo ſe perinde ut cæteros teſtem adduceret oculatum ad probandam veritatem reſurrectionis Chriſti? —— Nam Paulo illo tempore ſuæ converſionis, quum iret Damaſcum, non tantum audiviſſe Dominum loquentem, ſed etiam vidiſſe, ex ſubſequenti narratione clarum eſt. Dicit enim ad cum Ananias ix. 17. *Dominus miſit me, Jeſus qui apparuit,* Græce ὁφθείς, qui viſus eſt, *tibi in via.* Et cap. xxii. 14. *Deus præordinavit te, ut videres juſtum, et audires vocem ex ore ejus.* Rurſum cap. ix. 27. Barnabas de eo narrat Apoſtolis, quomodo in via vidiſſet Dominum, et quia locutus eſt ei. Sed et Dominus ad Saulum proſtratum, ipſo referente, cap. xxvi. 16. *Ad hoc enim apparui,* ὤφθην, *viſus ſum tibi, ut conſtituam te miniſtrum et teſtem eorum, quæ vidiſti.* Et quæ ſequuntur. Eſt. in 1 Cor. xv. 8.

and

and heard a voice, ſaying unto him: Saul, Saul, why perſecuteſt thou me? And he ſaid: who art thou, Lord? And the Lord ſaid: I am Jeſus, whom thou perſecuteſt.——And he trembling, and aſtoniſhed, ſaid: Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord ſaid unto him: ariſe, and go into the city. And it ſhall be told thee, what thou muſt do. When Ananias, by ſpecial order, entered into the houſe, where Paul was, and put his hands upon him, he ſaid: ver. 17. *Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jeſus, who appeared to thee in the way, as thou cameſt,* ὁ ὀφθεὶς σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. *hath ſent me.* Compare ch. xxii. 14. And ch. ix. 27. *Barnabas brought him to the apoſtles, and declared unto them, how he had ſeen the Lord in the way, and that he had ſpoken unto him.* Paul likewiſe in his own accounts of his converſion uſes words expreſſive of a perſonal appearance to him. So Acts xxii. 6—8. in his ſpeech to the people of Jeruſalem, where truth and exactneſs were very requiſite. *And it came to paſs, that as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damaſcus, about noon, ſuddenly, there ſhone from heaven a light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and heard a voice ſaying unto me: Saul, Saul, why perſecuteſt thou me. And I anſwered, who art thou, Lord? And he ſaid unto me: I am Jeſus of Nazareth, whom thou perſecuteſt.* So likewiſe Acts xxvi. 12—19. very ſtrong and expreſſive, indeed. To which the reader is referred.

If Paul did not ſee Jeſus in perſon at the time of his converſion, when did he ſo ſee him? Some may ſay, at the time mentioned, Acts xxii. 17—21.——*And it came to paſs, that when I was come again to Jeruſalem, even when I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance, and ſaw him ſaying unto me: make haſte, and get thee quickly out of Jeruſalem: for they will not receive thy teſtimony concerning me.*

Some think, that [f] Paul had this trance when he firſt came to Jeruſalem, at the end of three years after his converſion. Others rather think, that [g] it happened, when he and Barnabas came to Jeruſalem from Antioch, with the contributions of the Chriſtians there for the ſupport of the believers in Judea, in the time of the dearth in the reign of Claudius, and in the year

[f] Ver. 17. *Retourné à Jeruſalem.*] Ne pas d'abord. Voyez. Gal. i. 18. mais après ſon voyage en Arabie et ſon ſejour à Damas. Ibid. ver. 18. Lenfant ſur Actes. xxii. 17. See likewiſe Dr. Doddridge in the ſame place, in his Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 355. ſect. L.

[g] Et tum, opinor, Saulus raptus eſt in tertium cœlum, poſt quod tempus anno xiv. ſcripſit ſecundam ad Corinthios epiſtolam. cap. xii. 2. Pearſon. Ann. Paulin. A. D. 44. p. 6.

of

of Chriſt 44. Of which an accont is given Acts xi. 27—30. ch. xii. 25. Others [h] heſitate.

But I cannot perſuade myſelf, that this is what Paul intended, when he ſaid to the Corinthians: *am I not an apoſtle? ——Have I not ſeen Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord?* nor when he ſays afterwards in the ſame epiſtle: *And laſt of all he was ſeen of me alſo, as of one born out of due time.* For [i] there, as I apprehend, he muſt mean ſeeing Jeſus Chriſt in perſon, waking, and with eyes open. Which is quite different from what happens in a dream, viſion, trance, ecſtaſy.

The [k] ſame anſwer will ſuffice for the ſeaſon of his being *taken up into paradiſe, and into the third heaven.* For ſuch things are viſionary. Nor did Paul himſelf certainly know, whether it was *in the body, or out of the body,* 2 Cor. xii. 1—3. that is, whether he was then perſonally tranſported into paradiſe, or whether the repreſentation was made in his mind without any local removal. And the things, which he then

[h] Witſius, De Vita Pauli. ſect. 3. num. xi. is in doubt, at which of thoſe times Paul had this trance or viſion.

[i] Saulo Damaſcum proficiſcenti Jeſum factum conſpicuum, nulli dubitamus.——Nobis aperte favent Ananiæ verba: Act. ix. 17. Illud ipſum teſtatur Barnabas eo capite, ver. 27. ſed et ipſe Paulus talia voce refert. Act. xxii. 24.——Comparatum ita erat, ut nemo apoſtolatus officio fungi poſſet, qui corporeis Chriſtum oculis non aſpexiſſet. Itaque in eâ collatâ ſibi gratiâ exultat Paulus, atque triumphat. *Nonne Jeſum Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum vidi?* Quandonam porro vidit, ſi non vidit, dum Damaſcum proficiſceretur? Non ſane in ea viſione, cujus meminit. Act. xxii. 17—21. Fuit enim exſtaſis, quæ non ſufficiebat apoſtolatui. Neque ad raptum ad tertium uſque cœlum referri poteſt ea manifeſtatio, quæ Apoſtolo neceſſaria: ſive quia dubitat Paulus, utrum corpore fuerit, an ſpiritu: ſive etiam quia multos ante annos munus obiit Apoſtoli, quam mirandus ipſi raptus contigerit. &c. Baſnag. A. D. 37. n. lvii. vid. et n. lviii.

[k] Quod vero multi præter viſionem, quæ in via Damaſcena contigit, etiam mentionem huc ingerunt illius viſionis, quam Paulus ſibi Hieroſolymam reverſo, et in templo oranti, narrat oblatam fuiſſe. Act. xxii. 17. tanquam illud reſpiciat hoc loco: ſatis illud refellitur, ex eo quod, ipſo Paulo teſte, exſtatica fuerit illa viſio: ſive, ut Interpres noſter vertit, *in ſtupere mentis* facta. Jam autem oſtendimus viſionem corporalem hic intelligi debere. Sed neque ad raptum in tertium cœlum, atque in paradiſum, de qua ſcribit. 2 Cor. xii.——referenda eſt hæc viſio.——Non tamen ibi ſcribit, ſe Dominum vidiſſe. Et ut vidiſſet, neſcire tamen ſe dicit, utrum in corpore, an extra corpus ipſi raptus ille et viſio contigerit: et ut in corpore contigerit, quod eſt probabilius, exſtaticam tamen fuiſſe, mente videlicet a ſenſibus corporeis abſtracta, convenit inter Theologos. Nec, ſi per ſenſum oculorum facta fuiſſet ea viſio, Paulus id neſcire potuiſſet. Hic vero certum perhibet teſtimonium, ſe corporaliter, ut alios Apoſtolos, Chriſtum vidiſſe. Eſtius ad 1 Cor. xv. 8.

ſaw

ſaw and heard, were not to be revealed. He ſeldom ſpeaks of ſuch matters. When he does, it is not without an apology. For, as it ſeems, they were, chiefly, for his own encouragement under the many and great difficulties which he met with. This rapture into the third heaven and paradiſe had been concealed by him above fourteen years, and not mentioned at all, till now in this his ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians: as has been obſerved both by [l] ancients, and [m] moderns. But the ſeeing Chriſt, for qualifying him to be an apoſtle, had been often, and openly mentioned by him.

But it may be objected, that long after his converſion Paul is numbered among prophets. Acts xiii. 1. *Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers: as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen——and Saul.*

To which I anſwer, 1. If Paul ſhould be allowed to be here ranked among prophets, it will not follow, that he was not more than a prophet, even an apoſtle. St. Peter ſtyles himſelf an elder, though, undoubtedly, he was alſo an apoſtle. 1 Pet. v. 1. Mr. Le Clerc has a fine obſervation relating to this matter in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: that [n] though Paul is mentioned laſt, he was ſuperior to the reſt in point of gifts. But, ſays he, the firſt Chriſtians were not ſolicitous about titles and pre-eminence.

2. It is not clear, that Paul is here reckoned among prophets. He ſeems rather to be diſtinguiſhed from them. For, very probably, it is not without ſome reaſon that Paul is not put firſt, nor next to Barnabas, but laſt of all. The meaning appears to be this. 'Now there were in the church at Antioch certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon, 'and Lucius, and Manaen, and alſo Saul, whoſe character and 'ſtation in the church is well known from the preceding 'hiſtory of him in this book.' Whereby indeed he evidently appears to be an apoſtle.

[l] Δια τουτο και τον χρονον εθηκε των δεκατεσσαρων ετων· ουδε γαρ απλως αυτα μεμνηται, αλλα δεικνυς, οτι ουκ αν ο τοσουτος καρτερησας χρονον, νυν αν εξειπεν, ει μη πολλη ην αναγκη. Chryſoſt. in 2 Cor. hom. 26 T. X. p. 681. D.

[m] See Dr. Doddridge's Family Expoſitor, vol. IV. p. 522.

[n] Cæterum, ſi ex Spiritus Sancti donis, ſublimibuſque revelationibus, Prophetarum, Doctorumque, qui memorantur, ordo conceptus eſſet, ſine dubio, primum omnium Saulum collocari oportuiſſet. Sed iis temporibus nondum de prima ſede, dignitateque contentiones erant inter Chriſtianos: et qui meritis in rem Chriſtianam omnium erant primi, ii ſe, ex Domini præcepto, quaſi minimos gerebant, nec ultimos appellari refugiebant. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 45. num. i.

3. I add

3. I add one thing more, that I may fully clear up this point. The deſignation, mentioned ch. xiii. 2, 3. could not be to the apoſtleſhip. For *Paul was not an apoſtle of men, neither by man, but by Jeſus Chriſt, and God the Father*, Gal. i. 1. Moreover, it is here expreſsly ſaid, that this ordination, or appointment, at Antioch, was to a particular work or ſervice. *As they miniſtred to the Lord, and faſted, the Holy Ghoſt ſaid, ſeparate me Barnabas and Saul for the work, whereunto I have called them. And when they had faſted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they ſent them away.* And it might be ſaid, that [o] here is no conſecration to an office, but rather a benediction for the particular work upon which they were now ſent.

As Mr. Hallett ſays, in the place before quoted, 'They 'were not now ſeparated for the work of the miniſtry in ge- 'neral, but were ſeparated from the other teachers at Antioch, 'to go abroad and propagate the goſpel in other countries. 'When they went out upon this important work, nothing 'could be more agreeable, than for the church at Antioch 'to pray God to give Barnabas and Paul good ſucceſs: which 'accordingly they did. They now *recommended them to the 'grace*, or favour *of God*, as St. Luke ſays concerning this ſo- 'lemn tranſaction, ch. xiv. 26. And after this again, when 'Paul was ſent abroad another time to preach the goſpel where 'he had preached it before, he was in the ſame manner re- 'commended to the grace of God, as it is written ch. xv. 40. '*Paul choſe Silas, and departed, being recommended by the bre- 'thren to the grace*, or favour *of God*. Since therefore both 'times, when Paul went out from Antioch, to preach the 'goſpel to the ſame people, the evangeliſt ſays, in the ſame 'words, that he was *recommended to the grace of God*; we can- 'not ſuppoſe that he was any more firſt made an apoſtle of 'the gentiles at the former, than at the latter time of his 'being recommended.'

Upon the whole, it appears to me highly probable, from all the accounts which we have of Paul's wonderful converſion, in Acts ix. xxii. and xxvi. that he received his apoſtolical commiſſion from the mouth of Chriſt in perſon, when he called to him from heaven, and ſpoke to him in the way to Damaſcus. And eſpecially does this appear from Acts xxvi. 15—20. where

[o] Porro, vere ut dicamus, nil ordinationis eſt in Antiochenſium Prophetarum χειροθεσια.——Eam ergo Paulus Barnabaſque manuum ſuſceperunt impoſitionem, quæ benedictionis eſt, non conſecrationis. S. Baſnag. Ann. 45. num. iii.

[p] Vol. II. p. 323.

Paul

Paul expreſsly relates his commiſſion, and the time of it, and declares, as ſeems to me, that all which had been hitherto done by him, in preaching the goſpel to the very time when he was impriſoned, had been done in virtue of that commiſſion. *And he ſaid. I am Jeſus, whom thou perſecuteſt. But ariſe, and ſtand upon thy feet: for I have appeared to thee for this purpoſe, to make thee a miniſter, and a witneſs, both of thoſe things which thou haſt ſeen and of thoſe things in which I will appear unto thee: delivering thee from the people, and from the gentiles, unto whom I now ſend thee,* εις ους νυν σε αποστελλω, *to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkneſs to light.——Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not diſobedient unto the heavenly viſion: but ſhowed 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, and do works meet for repentance.*

This alſo exactly ſuits the manner, in which the other apoſtles were appointed. They were apoſtles from the time that Jeſus Chriſt called them to attend upon him. See Matt. iv. 18—22. Luke vi. 13. And he often diſcourſed to them concerning their commiſſion in its full extent, and the difficulties they would meet with in the diſcharge of it: giving them alſo various directions, relating to their conduct, when they ſhould come abroad in the world. See Matt. x. throughout, and xvi. 18, 19 and many like places in the other goſpels. And before he left them, he expreſsly ſaid: *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations*, Matt. xxviii. 19. But they did not at firſt underſtand the full extent of their commiſſion, nor preſently execute it. At the firſt they preached to Jews only. And it was ſeveral years after Chriſt's aſcenſion before they preached to gentiles. So Paul was from the beginning called, and appointed to be an apoſtle: and by degrees he was qualified for it as his commiſſion opened. And in time he was called out by Divine Providence to the full execution of it. But all along he was an apoſtle, and acted, and taught as ſuch: firſt preaching to Jews at Damaſcus, and Jeruſalem, and Judea, and other parts, and then to gentiles. So he plainly ſays to Agrippa in the place recited juſt now.

VI. Having thus ſettled the time of Paul's converſion and apoſtleſhip according to the beſt of my ability, I now intend to give an account of his travels in the ſervice of the goſpel. This I do for the ſake of ſhowing the date of his writings. And it would be ſhorter, and more agreeable on divers accounts, to take in his epiſtles as we go along. But there being

debates about the time of ſeveral of them, I think it will be preferable to write his hiſtory, without interruption, as briefly as we can, and then obſerve the order of his epiſtles.

Paul, having been baptized by Ananias at Damaſcus, ſtayed a ſhort time with the diſciples there, and then went into Arabia: where, it is very likely, he might meet with ſome believers. For Arabians are expreſsly mentioned Acts ii. 11. among the Jews and proſelytes, who heard the apoſtle Peter's firſt ſermon at Jeruſalem after the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt. At which time many were converted to a faith in Jeſus Chriſt. Acts ii. 41.

Whilſt Paul was in Arabia, it is reaſonable to think, that he was fully inſtructed, by ſpecial †‡ revelation, in the doctrine preached by Jeſus Chriſt, when here on earth, and all the things ſaid and done by him, and his ſufferings, crucifixion, reſurrection and aſcenſion, the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies in Jeſus, the Chriſt, the ſon of David, and the ſon of Abraham, and received alſo the Holy Ghoſt, in a meaſure equal to that of other apoſtles. Whereby he was qualified to preach the goſpel, and to teſtify the reſurrection of Jeſus, and to prove him to be the Chriſt, without receiving either inſtruction or gifts from other apoſtles.

Having been ſome time in Arabia, he returned to Damaſcus. *And ſtraightway he preached in the ſynagogues, that Jeſus is the Chriſt*, or *the Son of God*. This he did with ſuch ſtrength and cogency of argument, as to *confound the Jews, which dwelt at Damaſcus*. They being greatly provoked, and forming a deſign upon his life, the diſciples found means to provide for his eſcape. Whereupon he went to Jeruſalem, Acts ix. 20—25.

Some think that Paul preached at Damaſcus, ſoon after he had been baptized by Ananias, and that he alſo preached in Arabia, and that [q] he had preached three years, before he came to Jeruſalem, after his converſion. Pearſon [*], ſuppoſeth that Paul, whilſt in Arabia, received by revelation, a full knowledge of the goſpel. And ſays, that when

†‡ Concerning the manner of the revelations now vouchſafed to Paul, may be ſeen Lightfoot in his Comm. upon Acts ix. 1 in the firſt volume of his works, p. 791.

[q] Il veut montrer, qu'il avoit prêché l'evangile trois ans avant que d'avoir vû aucun Apoſtre, &c. Beauſ. ſur Galat. i. 18.

[*] Saulus in Arabiâ moratur, ubi per revelationem accepit plenam a Deo notitiam evangelii, ad quod prædicandum immediate vocatus eſt.

Saulus ex Arabiâ redit Damaſcum, ſatis in officio per revelationem inſtructus. Annal. Paulin. A. D. 36. 37. p. 2.

he

he returned from Arabia to Damaſcus, he preached there. But I do not perceive him to ſay, that Paul preached in Arabia, or at Damaſcus, preſently after his converſion.

To me it ſeems, that Paul did not preach at Damaſcus preſently after he had been baptized, but firſt went into Arabia, and then returned to Damaſcus. And being now qualified by divine revelation, and by diligent reading the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament, during his receſs in Arabia, and being fully determined, after a competent time of humiliation for paſt conduct, and ſerious meditation, in which he had well weighed the difficulties of the work he was entering upon, he began to preach Chriſt in the ſynagogues of Damaſcus. I am confirmed in this opinion by the interpretation of an author, whoſe words I place [r] below. Nor does St. Paul, that I remember, any where ſay that he preached in Arabia. He makes a large, and, ſeemingly, very particular enumeration of places and people, to whom he had preached, in his diſcourſe before Agrippa, without taking any notice of Arabia. Acts xxvi. 20. *I 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.*

Jerom obſerving, that St. Luke had ſaid nothing of Paul's being in Arabia, is inclined to think that [s] he did not diſcharge any part of his apoſtolical office in that country.

[r] 'St. Paul being reſtored to his 'ſight by Ananias, ſtayed not long 'at Damaſcus, but retired forthwith into Arabia, as he himſelf 'tells us, Gal. i. 16, 17. Whereas 'it is ſaid Acts ix. 19, 20. *And 'when he had received meat, he was 'ſtrengthened Then was Saul certain 'days with the diſciples at Damaſcus, 'and ſtraightway he preached Chriſt 'in the ſynagogues.* Here the word, 'ſtraightway, does not relate to 'Saul's firſt coming to Damaſcus, 'but to his return thither, after he 'had been in Arabia. For Acts ix. '19, 20. are to be rendered and 'paraphraſed thus: *And when he 'had received meat, he was ſtrengthened.* Preſently after which, according to Gal. i. 16. he went 'into Arabia, and having been 'there inſtructed in the goſpel by 'the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, according to Gal. i 12 he returned 'again to Damaſcus. *Then*, or *now*, *was Paul certain days with the diſciples at Damaſcus, and ſtraightway*, 'namely, after his return out of 'Arabia, *he preached Chriſt in the ſynagogues.*' Dr. Edw. Wells's Hiſtorical Geography of of N. T. part. II. p. 20, 21.

[s] Lucam vero idcirco de Arabia præteriſſe, quia forſitan nihil dignum apoſtolatu in Arabia perpetrarat: et ea potius compendioſa narratione dixiſſe, quæ digna Chriſti evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc ſegnitiæ Apoſtoli deputandum, ſi fruſtra in Arabiâ fuerit: ſed quod aliqua diſpenſatio et Dei præceptum fuerit, ut taceret. Hieron. in Gal. i. 17. T. IV. P. I. p. 235.

But then, if Paul was ſilent there, he thinks it was not owing to the apoſtle's backwardneſs to ſpeak: but the divine wiſdom appointed that it ſhould be ſo.

Theophylact obſerves, that [t] the deſign of the Jews at Damaſcus to deſtroy Paul, was not formed preſently after his converſion to the faith: but after his return thither from Arabia, at the end of three years, juſt before his going to Jeruſalem.

Indeed, it is very likely, that if Paul had preached at Damaſcus, ſoon after his firſt arrival there, he would have met with a moſt violent onſet. And as nothing of that kind is particularly taken notice of, it may be concluded, that he did not then publicly preach in any ſynagogues: nor was it fit, or becoming, that he ſhould. It was highly proper, that ſome time ſhould be allotted for retirement, after ſuch a courſe, as he had been in, before he began to preach and teach publicly in the name of Jeſus.

Though St. Luke has not mentioned the journey into Arabia, nor the time of Paul's abſence from Damaſcus, he knew it very well, and has hinted it, ſaying, *And after many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counſel to ſlay him*, Acts ix. 23.

Mr. Beauſobre ſays, that [u] Paul's journey into Arabia ſhould be placed between ver. 22 and 23, of the ninth chapter of the Acts. I ſhould rather place it between ver. 19 and 20, of that chapter.

This period of three years, or three years and ſomewhat more, from Paul's converſion to his coming to Jeruſalem, reaches, according to our computation, from near the end of the year 36, to near the end of 39, or the beginning of the year 40, or from the beginning of the year 37, to the former part of the year 40.

I cannot allow myſelf to ſpeak poſitively, where there is not the evidence of certainty. I do not know in what month Paul was converted, or came to Jeruſalem. Of ſuch things as theſe it is ſufficient to ſay, that they happened in ſuch a year, or thereabout.

VII. Paul having been full three years at Damaſcus, and in its neighbourhood, and in Arabia, he came to Jeruſalem. Gal. i. 18. *And when he was come thither, he aſſayed to join him-*

[t] —— οτι η επιβουλη εν δαμασκῳ ου ευθεως μετα το πιστευσαι γεγονεν· αλλα μετα το αυελθειν αυτον απο αραβιας μετα ετη τρια. Και ουτως γεγονεν η προς τα ιεροσολυμα ανοδος. Theoph. in Act. Ap. p. 94.

[u] Comment. ſur Gal. i. 17.

ſelf

ſelf to the diſciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a diſciple, Acts ix. 26.

This may ſeem ſtrange to ſome. But now we diſcern the reaſon of it from the account that has been lately given of the continuance of the perſecution in Judea after the death of Stephen, and alſo of Paul's retired way of life, for ſome while, in Arabia. Paul had but lately begun to preach openly in the name of Jeſus, in the ſynagogues of Damaſcus. And †‡ the believers in Judea being much harraſſed by the perſecution which they met with at home, had not received any intelligence about what had paſſed at Damaſcus, and in the way thither. Nor were the Jewiſh rulers forward to publiſh the loſs of ſo active a ſervant as Paul had been.

Acts ix. 27—30. *But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apoſtles, and declared unto them, how he had ſeen the Lord in the way, and how he had preached boldly at Damaſcus.*

There have been different conjectures concerning the reaſons, why Barnabas, in particular, brought Paul to the apoſtles. Some have imagined that * he and Barnabas had ſtudied together under Gamaliel: or ** at leaſt, that they had been acquainted formerly. But I ſee no ground for ſuch a ſuppoſition in the hiſtory. If that had been the caſe, there would have been ſome intimation of it; which there is not. I therefore rather think, that it was entirely owing to the circumſtances of things. When Paul came to Jeru-

†‡ Says Lightfoot in his Commentary upon Acts ix. 26. vol. I. p. 814. 'Some cannot conceive, 'how it ſhould be poſſible, that he 'ſhould have been a convert three 'years, and yet his converſion and 'preſent qualities ſhould be un-'known to the church at Jeruſalem. 'But theſe two or three conſidera-'tions may help the ſcruple. 1. The 'diſtance between Damaſcus and 'Jeruſalem. 2. The perſecution 'that continued ſtill upon the church 'of Judea, which would keep the 'diſciples of Damaſcus from going 'thither. And, 3. The juſt fear 'that might poſſeſs the diſciples at 'Jeruſalem, in the very time of 'perſecution. For though it was 'ſaid before, that the church of 'Jeruſalem, and of Judea, enjoyed 'a great deal of reſt and tranquil-'lity after the converſion of Paul, 'their great perſecutor, in com-'pariſon of what they had done 'before, yet was not the perſecu-'tion of the church utterly extinct 'to the very time of Paul's coming 'up to Jeruſalem, but continued 'ſtill. And therefore it is the leſs 'wonder, if the diſciples there be 'the more fearful and cautelous.'

* On pretend, qu'il avoit étudié avec Saul ſous Gamaliel. Lenfant for Actes. ix. 27. See alſo Pool's Engliſh Annotations upon the place.

** Forte Barnabas Saulum ante converſionem noverat, credebatque ei ut minime mendaci. Grot. ad loc.

ſalem, it was a time of perſecution, as before obſerved, and the apoſtles lived privately. Paul endeavoured to join himſelf to the diſciples, and be acquainted with them. But they were all ſhy of him. And poſſibly they were deſirous that he ſhould be approved by ſome of the apoſtles, before they took notice of him. However, he met with Barnabas, and gave him an account of his converſion, and of every thing that had happened to him, ſince he went from Jeruſalem. And Barnabas gave credit to his account. Nor is it impoſſible, but that ſome believers might come from Damaſcus, and confirm the truth of it. Whereupon Barnabas was willing to introduce him to the apoſtles. Unqueſtionably, they placed full confidence in Barnabas, and he might know where they were. However, it is evident he had acceſs to James. To him he brought Paul: and James brought him to Peter: ſo Paul had communion with all the apoſtles. After which he was readily received by the diſciples, or believers in general. *And he was with them, coming in and going out at Jeruſalem. And he ſpake boldly in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and diſputed with the Grecians*, or Greeks: meaning proſelytes to the Jewiſh religion, in whom we ſee the true ſpirit of the Jewiſh proſelytes about this time, as declared by our Saviour himſelf, Matt. xxiii. 15. *But they went about to ſlay him. Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæſarea, and ſent him forth to Tarſus.*

By Cæſarea I ſhould be apt to underſtand *Cæſarea by the ſea ſide*, mentioned before, ch. viii. 40. But ſome learned men, particularly [x] Witſius, and [y] Dr. Doddridge, hereby ſuppoſe to be intended Cæſarea Philippi. If we could be aſſured of that interpretation, perhaps it might lead us to the meaning of that expreſſion of Paul in his ſpeech to Agrippa, cited not long ago: *throughout all the coaſts of Judea.* And indeed it may be reckoned probable, that therein Paul refers to what was now done by him. For we cannot think of any more likely ſeaſon for it, conſidering how ſhort a ſtay he

[x] —— Hieroſolymam reliquit, et a fratribus Cæſaream deductus eſt, non maritimam illam, quæ et Turris Stratonis dicta, de qua ſupra cap. viii. 40. ſed Cæſaream Philippi, quæ ſita erat circa montem Libanum, ad confluentem Jor et Dan, unde Jordanes originem ducit, quæ olim Lachis, deinde Dan appellata fuit, de qua Jud. xviii. Cujus pomœrii quum Rex Agrippa proculiſſet, mutato nomine in honorem Neronis vocavit Neroniada. Joſeph. Antiq. 20. viii. Witſ. de Vita Pauli ſect. 3. n. ii. [y] See the Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 146. upon Acts ix. 30.

generally

generally made in Judea, whenever he came thither after his converſion. It is very probable, that as he travelled with the diſciples, who accompanied him, he was not ſilent. Though he made no long ſtay in any one place, he would embrace every opportunity that offered, to ſpeak of the doctrine, which now lay with ſo much weight on his mind.

The brethren, as St. Luke ſays, *brought him down to Cæſarea, and ſent him forth to Tarſus.* And St. Paul himſelf ſays, Gal. i. 21. *Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia.* Tarſus was now the chief city of Cilicia, and Paul's native place: where he had not been, ſince he firſt came up to Jeruſalem, to ſtudy the law under Gamaliel. Poſſibly, Paul now found ſome of his relations, and likewiſe ſome others, who were diſciples of Jeſus before him. See Rom. xvi. 7. 11. Poſſibly alſo, while he travelled now in theſe countries of Cilicia and Syria, he met with ſome of thoſe dangers and difficulties, which are entirely omitted by St. Luke, but are mentioned, or hinted by the apoſtle in his epiſtles, eſpecially the eleventh chapter of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians.

In thoſe countries Paul was the remainder of the year 40, and all 41, and likewiſe all 42, or the greateſt part of it, till about the beginning of the year 43, preaching, undoubtedly, in the name of Jeſus to native Jews, and to proſelytes of the Jewiſh religion.

Afterwards he went to Antioch, and began to preach to gentiles, as we ſhall ſee preſently.

The churches having peace, and being no longer diſturbed by a violent perſecution, Peter viſited the diſciples in the ſeveral parts of Judea. Acts ix. 32—43. Before he returned to Jeruſalem, whilſt he was in the city of Joppa, *where he tarried many days*, he received an order from heaven to go to Cæſarea. And in ch. x. and xi. 1—18. St. Luke gives a diſtinct account of St. Peter's going to the houſe of Cornelius at Cæſarea, and there preaching to gentiles, and of the defence, which he made of his conduct to the apoſtles and brethren at Jeruſalem, and their acquieſcence therein, upon which I do not now enlarge.

Afterwards, at ver. 19, 20. St. Luke ſays, *Now they which were ſcattered abroad upon the perſecution that aroſe about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only. And ſome of them were men of*

Cyprus and Cyrene: who when they were come to Antioch, ſpake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jeſus.

Theſe men had preached the goſpel to Jews, and the proſelytes to Judaiſm, in Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch. But ſome time after their arrival at Antioch, hearing of Peter's having opened the door of the kingdom of heaven to gentiles at the houſe of Cornelius, they began to preach alſo to the Greeks at Antioch, that is, the †† people of the country: who might, poſſibly, ſome few of them, be pious men like Cornelius, who even before his converſion was a worſhipper of the true God, the God of Iſrael: but the greateſt part of them muſt have been heathen idolaters, as all the people of the earth, except the Jews, generally were, till the coming of Chriſt, and the preaching of his goſpel[z] among them.

Ver. 21. *And the hand of the Lord was with them.* God graciouſly accompanied their miniſtry with miraculous works, which he enabled them to perform in the name of Jeſus. Whereby they who ſaw them were awakened and convinced. And thoſe evangeliſts likewiſe were greatly encouraged, being thereby fully ſatisfied, that what they did was approved by God himſelf. *And a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.*

Ver. 22—26. *Then tidings of theſe things came unto the ears of the church, which was at Jeruſalem: and they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch. Who when he came, and had ſeen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted*

†† ——*that is, the people of the country.* Acts xix. 10.——*ſo that all they which dwelt in Aſia, heard the word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks.* and ver. 17. *And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks alſo dwelling at Epheſus.* It is common with all authors about that time, to call the people, who inhabited the cities of Aſia, and Syria, Greeks. Ὁι δε μετ αυτον —— παντα τοις επ αντιοχειας ιουδαιοις απεδοσαν, —— και συνεχωρησαν αυτοις εξ ισου της πολεως; τοις ελλησι μετεχειν. Joſ de B. J. l. 7 cap 3. n. 3. p. 1299. Hudſon. Iter igitur ita per Aſiam feci.——Nullo judicio, nullâ contumeliâ, auctoritate et cohortatione perfeci, ut et Græci, et cives Romani, qui frumentum compreſſerant, magnum numerum populis pollicerentur. Cic. ad Att. l. 5. ep. 21. et paſſim.

[z] Ut ut ſit, Gentiles hic intelligi, res ipſa clamat. Atque hoc primum exemplum eſt evangelii publice Gentibus prædicati Nam alterum illud Cornelii non niſi domeſticum fuit. Quum vero Dei favorem in ſancto hoc opere inſigniter experirentur fideles illi Cypri ac Cyrenenſes, multuſque Græcorum numerus fide ipſis habita converteretur ad Chriſtum, non potuit tantæ rei fama Hieroſolymitanæ eccleſiæ proceres diu latere. Winſ. de Vita Paul. ſect. 3. n. iii.

Item

them all, that with purpoſe of heart, they ſhould cleave unto the Lord.——Then departed Barnabas to Tarſus, for to ſeek Saul. And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch.

VIII. If Peter preached to Cornelius, in the year 41, and about the middle of that year, as is probable; it would be near the end of the year 42, or the beginning of the year 43, when Paul was brought by Barnabas to Antioch.

During this time of Paul's being at Antioch, in the year of Chriſt 43, he might have the rapture, mentioned by him 2 Cor. xii. It ſeems to me to have happened ſoon after he came to Antioch, when he firſt began to preach to gentiles, who hitherto had preached to Jews only.

Ver. 26. *And it came to paſs, that a whole year they aſſembled themſelves with the church, and taught much people; and the diſciples were called Chriſtians firſt at Antioch.*

This whole year, I think, muſt be part of the years 43, and 44, according to the vulgar computation. It may have reached ſome way into the year 44. Indeed, I apprehend, the whole year, mentioned by Luke, to have expired not long before the time that Paul and Barnabas went up to Jeruſalem, with the contributions made at Antioch, for the relief of the believers in Judea, in the approaching famine. For that is what St. Luke immediately proceeds to relate in ver. 27—30. that is, to the end of the chapter. And in this year, 44, I ſuppoſe the believers in Jeſus to have obtained this denomination.

And the diſciples were called Chriſtians. Which [a] ſome think to have been done by a divine admonition. And they tranſlate after this manner: *And* [b] *the diſciples were by divine appointment firſt named Chriſtians at Antioch.*

Witſius [c] does not diſcern any particular emphaſis in the word, and readily admits the interpretation of Grotius, that the

[a] See Dr. Benſon's Hiſtory of the firſt planting the Chriſtian religion, vol. I. ch. i. ſect. vi. p. 241. firſt ed. p. 248 ſecond ed. [b] That is Dr. Doddridge's tranſlation. Family Expoſitor, vol III. p 178.

[c] Quod nomen Latinâ non Græcâ formâ a Chriſto deflexum, a Romanis Antiochiæ degentibus impoſitum illis fuiſſe, conjectat in Annalibus ſuis Uſſerius. Nec deſunt, qui emphaſin quæriant in voce χρηματισαι, quâ Lucas utitur. Scilicet talem volunt nominationem eo vocabulo deſignari, quæ publico edicto, et juſſu Reipublicæ fit.——Non invideo ſane obſervationes iſtas doctiſſimis auctoribus ſuis: modo mihi dubitare liceat, an tam ſolidæ quam ſubtiles ſint. Simplicior videtur annotatio Grotii: χρηματιζειν, pro nominari, eſt vox melioris Græcitatis, quam et Polybius non ſemel uſurpat: et Paulus. Rom. vii. 3.

αρα

the Greek word, according to its uſual meaning in the beſt Greek writers, and in the New Teſtament itſelf, ſignifies named, or called. And he inclines to the conjectures of Abp. Uſher, that this appellation was given to the believers by the Romans then at Antioch.

Suicer in his Theſaurus explains [d] the original word, and underſtands this text, exactly as Grotius did.

Dr. Heumann has [e] a Diſſertation concerning the origin of the name of Chriſtians. Wherein [f] he largely ſhows it to be very probable, that this name had not its riſe from the Jews. Nor did the diſciples of Jeſus take it to themſelves. But, probably, they were firſt ſo called by heathens, particularly the Romans: as Abp. Uſher had argued, the name not having a Greek, but a Latin termination.

This will overthrow the obſervation of Chryſoſtom, formerly [g] mentioned, 'That St. Paul gave us this name.' And indeed Dr. Heumann ſhows, that both [h] St. Luke, and

αρα ουν ζωντος τε ανδρος μοιχαλις χρηματισει. Ubi hæc jactata vocis emphaſis? Witſ. ubi ſupr. ſect. 3. num. iv.

[d] *χρηματιζω* ſignificat nominor, vocor, appellor. Ita ſumitur Acts xi. 26. —— *Factum eſt autem, ut primum Antiochiæ diſcipuli nominarentur vel appellarentur Chriſtiani.* *χρηματισαι* hic eſt *ονομασθηναι, προσαγορευθηναι, λεχθηναι, κληθηναι.* Suicer.

[e] De ortu nominis Chriſtianorum. Diſſ xi. ap Primit. Gotting. p. 130—147. [f] Satis nunc cognovimus, Chriſtianorum appellationis auctores fuiſſe non ipſos Chriſti cultores, ſed Ethnicos. —— Illud præterea hinc diſcimus, Latinum potius eſſe nomen Chriſtianorum, quam Græcum. Ac proinde facile ſubſcribimus ſententiæ Uſſerii, in Annalibus ſuis pronunciantis: *Nomen Chriſtianorum Latina non Græca forma a Chriſto deflexum, a Romanis Antiochiæ tum agentibus impoſitum illis fuiſſe videtur.* Nec Rex Agrippa Act xxvi. 28. appellatione Chriſtianorum utens, cum eſſet in domo Feſti, Romani præſidis, alio credi poteſt nomine uſus eſſe, quam quod uſurpabant Romani. Ac certe in univerſa Laertii Hiſtoria Philoſophorum Græcorum, ne una quidem ſecta occurrit, cujus nomen terminationem *anus* nactum ſit: neque e. g. Platoniani dicuntur Platonis aſſeclæ, uti Ciceronianos dixiſſent Latini et Catonianos, ſed Platonici. ——Illud adjicio, etiam Herodianis hoc nomen impoſuiſſe non Græcos aut Judæos, ſed Romanos. Heum. ib. num. ix. p. 140. [g] See vol. V. p. 145, 146. [h] Nec vero ſolum non probari poteſt, primum uſos eſſe Chriſtianorum appellatione Chriſti diſcipulos: verum etiam gravibus id negari poteſt argumentis. ——Primum enim Lucam ſequentibus in capitibus hujus ſui libri uti oportuiſſet hac appellatione, ſi Chriſtiani Antiocheni hoc nomen ipſi ſibi impoſuiſſent. Jam vero id ne ſemel quidem ab eo factum eſt, ſed, uti antea Chriſtianæ religionis profeſſores modo *μαθητας* vocavit. cap. i. 15. vi. 1, 2, 7. ix. 1, 10, 19, 25, 26, 36 modo *αδελφους* ix. 30. x. 23. xi. 1, 12. ſemel etiam *τους πιστευσαντας.* iv. 32. ac ſemel *τους αγιους.* ix. 32. ſic poſt mentionem de ortu nominis Chriſtianorum eos ſemel appellavit *τους πεπιστευκοτας.*

xxi.

and [i] St. Paul ſeem to have declined the uſe of it: poſſibly, leſt our Saviour ſhould have been eſteemed an ordinary leader of a ſect, like the philoſophers at that time much celebrated among the Greeks and Romans.

However, it was not long, before it obtained, and was very acceptable to the followers of Jeſus. It is uſed by St. Peter 1 iv. 16. And ſome [k] have thought it to be the *worthy name*, intended by St. James, ch. ii. 7. And it is certain, that afterwards it was much, and juſtly valued by thoſe, who bore it. In the epiſtle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, giving an account of their late ſufferings, it is ſtyled [l] an honourable, and glorious, and reviving appellation.

xxi. 25. cæteris in locis aut μαθητας. xi 29. xiii. 52. xiv. 20, 28. xvi. 1. xviii. 23, 27. xix. 1, 9. xx. 1, 7, 30 xxi. 4, 16. aut ἀδελφες xi. 29. xii 17. xv. 1, 3, 22, 23, 32, 33, 40. xvi. 2, 40. xvii. 6, 10, 14. xviii. 18. xxi. 7, 17. xxviii. 14, 15. Ubi ſupr. num. vi. p. 137.

[i] Deinde, ſi eo tempore, quo Paulus Antiochiæ docuit, Chriſti diſcipuli hoc nomen ſua ſponte adciviſſent, dubitari non poteſt, quin is Apoſtolus uſurpaturus hanc appellationem fuiſſet ſuis in epiſtolis. Semper autem alio is utitur nomine. In exordiis ſolet eos τες αγιες vocare. Nactus quoque opportunam occaſionem eos appellandi τες χριστιανες. Cf. gr. Rom. viii. 9. Gal. v. 24. tamen dicere maluit τες τε χριστε. Imo cum Agrippa Act. xxvi. 28. ad ipſum hanc vocem edidiſſet: *Prope abeſt, ut et ego fiam* χριστιανος· quam refugiens appellationem hanc, non ita reſpondet: *Vellem fias Chriſtianus*, ſed hiſce verbis: *Vellem fias tales, qualis ego ſum.* Notabilis et ille locus Gal. i 22.——At non ait ibi Paulus: ταις εκκλησιαις χριστιαναις, ſed ταις εν χριστω. Eodem modo. 1 Tim. v. 16. ubi dicere poterat, *fidas Chriſtianas vel chriſtiana mulier*, ille locutus eſt: ει τις πιστος η πιστα. Imo ſi Eccleſia ipſa auctor fuiſſet hujus appellationis, an eâ tam facile ſe abſtinere potuiſſe Paulum credi poteſt? Memini, etiam, Iſidorum Peluſiotam olim hanc propoſuiſſe quæſtionem. lib. IV. ep. 61. Cur nuſquam Paulus nomen uſurparit χριστιανε: nihil autem ad eam reſpondiſſe. Nos vero videmur nobis juſtiſſima reſponſione defuncti eſſe. Ibid. num. vii. p. 138.

Nomine illo Chriſtianorum nec Paulum uſquam nec Lucam uſum eſſe, cum ſupra obſervaverimus, nunc diſceptemus, age, cur hic Apoſtolus, una cum Miniſtro ſuo ſocioque ſacri itineris id fecerit: cur item non ita multo poſt in civitatem Chriſtianam recepta fuerit ea appellatio. Abſtinuiſſe ſcilicet eâ hanc ob cauſam videtur Paulus, ne Chriſtus hoc pacto in ordinem redigeretur doctorum ſapientiæ των φιλανθρωπων, cum ſit θεανθρωπος. &c. Ib. num. xi. p. 142.

Ad ultimum non dubitabant ipſimet Chriſtiani pervulgato uti hoc nomine.—— Cujus rei etſi unum duntaxat exemplum in N T. codice, in prioris videlicet Petri epiſtolæ capite quarto, unum tamen illud exemplum eſt inſtar ſexcentorum. Ib. num. xii. p. 142, 143.

[k] Vid. Grot. et Wolf. Curæ in loc. [l] —— την παντιμον, και ενδοξον, και ζωοποιον προσηγοριαν. Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 5. cap. i. p. 160. D. Vid. et p. 158. A.

It

It may be hence concluded, that the believers at Antioch were now numerous. Otherwiſe, heathen people had not taken ſo much notice of them. And indeed St. Luke had before ſaid, that when the men of Cyprus and Cyrene *were come to Antioch and ſpoke to the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jeſus, the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord,* ver. 20, 21. and that upon the coming of Barnabas, and his preaching there, *much people was added unto the Lord,* ver. 24. It is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that after Paul came thither, farther additions were made, at which time they received this new name.

It follows Acts xi. 27—30. *And in thoſe days came prophets from Jeruſalem unto Antioch. And there ſtood up one of them, named Agabus, and ſignified in the ſpirit, that there ſhould be great dearth throughout all the world* [or all the land meaning Judea.] *Which came to paſs in the days of Claudius Ceſar. Then the diſciples, every man according to his ability, determined to ſend relief to the brethren, who dwelt in Judea. Which alſo they did. And ſent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.*

Then follows in the twelfth chapter an account of the perſecution, and death of Herod Agrippa: in the laſt verſe of which chapter it is ſaid: *And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jeruſalem, when they had fulfilled their miniſtry. And they took with them John whoſe ſurname was Mark.*

Of this famine we ſpoke [m] formerly. And as Agrippa died in 44, and Barnabas and Paul ſeem not to have performed this ſervice, nor to have returned to Antioch, until after his death; it was argued, that this commiſſion of the church of Antioch was not finiſhed by them till near the end of that year.

At this time of Paul's being at Jeruſalem, in the year 44, I ſuppoſe, he had the trance mentioned by him in his ſpeech to the Jewiſh people, Acts xxii. 17—21. For it was in that city, and in the temple, as he expreſsly ſays: *And it came to paſs, that when I was come again to Jeruſalem, even while I was praying in the temple, I was in a trance.——And he ſaid unto me: depart For I will ſend thee far hence unto the gentiles.* And we ſhall preſently ſee, that ſoon after this, Paul and Barnabas left Antioch, and made a farther progreſs in preaching the goſpel to gentile people.

[m] See vol. I. p. 240—246.

I ſuppoſe

I ſuppoſe this period to be about two years, from the time of Paul's coming firſt to Antioch, and beginning to preach there to gentiles, to his return thither again, after he had been at Jeruſalem upon the commiſſion above-mentioned: that is, from near the end of the year 42, or from the beginning of the year 43, to the end of the year 44.

IX. I now intend to take in the hiſtory of Paul and Barnabas from that time to their coming again to Jeruſalem, and returning thence to Antioch.

Says St. Luke, Acts xiii. 1—3. *Now there were in the church that is at Antioch certain prophets, and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and Saul. And as they miniſtred unto the Lord, and faſted, the Holy Ghoſt ſaid: ſeparate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had faſted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they ſent them away.*

Pearſon ſuppoſeth, that [n] at this time, which, according to his computation, was the year 44, Paul had the rapture mentioned by him 2 Cor. xii. 1—4. But firſt, I ſuppoſe it to have been now the year 45, where alſo this miſſion is placed by [o] Baſnage. Secondly, that rapture muſt have happened before the year 44. The ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians was written, according [p] to Pearſon, in the year 57. St. Paul's expreſſion, ſpeaking of this rapture, is above fourteen years ago. Which †‡ will carry us back to the fifteenth year, conſequently, to the year of Chriſt 43, for the ſooneſt. At which time I ſuppoſe Paul was come to Antioch, and was beginning to preach the goſpel there to gentiles, together with Barnabas. Baſnage [q] placeth this rapture in the year 41.

[n] Dum ibi Prophetæ et Doctores miniſtrarent Domino, Saulus et Barnabas ſegregati ab illis ſunt in opus ad quod aſſumſit eos Spiritus Sanctus. Acts xiii.

Et tum, opinor, Saulus raptus eſt in tertium cœlum, poſt quod tempus anno xiv. ſcripſit ſecundam ad Corinth. ſuam epiſtolam. xii. 2. Pearſon. Ann. Paulin. p. 6. ad ann. Chriſti p. 21. vulg. 44.

[o] Ann. 45. num. iii. iv. &c. Annal. Paulin. p. 15

†‡ 'That rapture, or trance, was ſomewhat above fourteen years before he wrote his ſecond epiſtle to Corinth. 2 Cor. xii. 2. Now in that he ſaith, it was προ ετων, before, or above fourteen years ago, he ſpeaketh not of an indefinite time,——but that it was a little above that ſpace, though it were ſomewhat above exact fourteen years,' &c. Lightfoot vol. I. p. 792.

[q] Vid. Ann. 41. num. xxi. xxii.

Acts

Acts xiii. 4. *So they being ſent forth by the Holy Ghoſt, departed unto Seleucia, and thence ſailed to Cyprus.*

Antioch upon the Orontes was the capital city of Syria. Seleucia was a city lying about twelve miles lower upon the ſame river, a port upon the mediterranean ſea, a few miles above the mouth of the Orontes. There Paul and Barnabas took ſhipping, and ſailed to Cyprus, which lay weſtward. They went aſhore at Salamis, a city at the eaſt end of the iſland. Where finding Jewiſh ſynagogues, *they preached the word of the Lord to them.* After which they went through the iſland to Paphos, at the weſt end, where was the ſeat of the proconſul. His name was Sergius Paulus; who ſent for Barnabas, and Saul, deſiring to hear the word of God. He being a man well diſpoſed, and ſeeing the miracle wrought by Saul upon Elymas the ſorcerer, whom he ſmote with blindneſs for a ſeaſon, believed, or embraced the doctrine of the goſpel, taught by Saul and Barnabas. And hence-forward St. Luke writes the apoſtle's name Paul, whom he had hitherto called Saul.

It may be thought, that the chief reaſon of their going now to Cyprus, was, that it was the native country of Barnabas, as we know from Acts iv. 36. But beſide that, I imagine, there was another reaſon, and more influencing. For we perceive, that ſome of them who left Jeruſalem upon account of the perſecution, that followed the death of Stephen, were men of Cyprus, and had been there preaching to Jews only, as well as at Antioch. And it might be reckoned very proper, when the goſpel was to be preached to gentiles, as well as to Jews, that theſe ſpecial meſſengers ſhould go directly to a country, where an addreſs had been already made to Jews: and where ſome of them, as may be reaſonably ſuppoſed, had been converted to the faith of the goſpel.

Leaving Paphos, they came back to the continent, and landed at Perga in Pamphylia. Where Mark, who hitherto had accompanied them, left them, and returned to Jeruſalem.

From Perga they went to Antioch, the chief city of Piſidia, lying north of Pamphylia. St. Luke has given a large account of Paul's diſcourſe in the Jewiſh ſynagogue there, and the ſucceſs of it. Acts xiii. 14—52. From Antioch they went to Iconium, the chief city of Lycaonia. Where they alſo taught in the Jewiſh ſynagogue: *ſo that a great*

great multitude both of the Jews, and alſo of the Greeks believed. Many miracles likewiſe were wrought by their hands, during their ſtay in that city, xiv. 1—4. But at length a deſign being formed, both by Jews and Gentiles, and their rulers, to ſtone them to death, and they receiving intelligence of it, when it was almoſt ripe for execution, went thence: and preached the goſpel at *Lyſtra, and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and in the region round about*, ver. 6, 7. meaning, perhaps, Iſauria, ſometimes reckoned a part of Lycaonia. At Lyſtra, Paul healed a man lame from his birth. Which raiſed great admiration in the people. And, if not reſtrained, they would have offered a ſacrifice to Paul and Barnabas. Nevertheleſs by artifices of unbelieving Jews, who came thither from Antioch and Iconium, the minds of the people were ſoon changed, and they *ſtoned Paul, and dragged him out of the city, ſuppoſing he had been dead. Howbeit, as the diſciples*, who had not left him, *ſtood round about him, he roſe up, and came into the city. And the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe. Where having preached the goſpel, and taught many, they returned again to Lyſtra, Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the diſciples* there, *and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and letting them know, that we muſt through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had ordained them elders in every city, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed.* From Antioch they went to Pamphylia. *And when they had preached the word in Perga*, where they had been before, but probably made no ſtay, *they went down to Attalia*, a maritime city of the ſame country. *Thence they ſailed to Antioch, whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work which they had fulfilled. And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearſed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles. And there they abode long time with the diſciples*, ver. 8—28.

For this journey Pearſon[r] allots three years, that is, 45, 46, 47, and ſomewhat more. For he placeth their ſetting out, and going to Salamis in the year 44. Tillemont[s] thinks this journey might be performed in two years, that is, according to his computation, part of the year 44, all 45, and part of 46. From which time to the council at

[r] Annal. Paulin. p. 67. [s] S. Paul. Art. xii—xv.

Jeruſalem

Jeruſalem, next mentioned by St. Luke, might be, as he thinks, about five years. In which ſpace of time, he ſuppoſeth Paul to have gone into Illyricum, and alſo to have preached *throughout all Judea:* as mentioned Acts xxvi. 20. and likewiſe in Cilicia.

I likewiſe am of opinion, that this Journey of Paul and Barnabas in the ſeveral countries juſt mentioned, might be performed in two years. I think they could not ſet out from Antioch before the beginning of the year 45: and, probably returned in the former part of the year 47: but if any are rather for three years, and think this journey was not completed before the beginning of the year 48, I ſhould not reckon it worth while to diſpute about it.

But I do not ſee any reaſon to believe, that they undertook any more Journies, before they went up to the council at Jeruſalem. They might judge it very proper to make a long ſtay at Antioch, where was the firſt gentile church: as the other apoſtles made a long ſtay at Jeruſalem, and in Judea. However, this church of Antioch, I ſuppoſe, with [t] Witſius, to have conſiſted partly of Jews, and partly of Gentiles. Nor do I think that Paul and Barnabas would, as yet, extend their miniſtry farther than they had done, without an expreſs divine appointment. What they had already done, was a great deal; and muſt have exceeded the moſt raiſed expectations, till they had ſeen the event. Their ſtay at Antioch muſt have been very uſeful, probably expedient. It was proper to ſecure what they had gained. And they might there receive applications from the ſeveral countries in which they had been, and impart counſel and encouragement. If they had ſoon gone hence again, ſome might have arrived, that ſhould unſettle the minds of new converts. We plainly perceive, that from Judea came ſeveral to ſee this new colony at Antioch. Some might come with good views, to encourage and confirm the believers there: or to ſatisfy themſelves concerning the truth of what they had heard with great pleaſure. But others might come with a deſign to inſtil narrow principles, and diſturb their minds with different ſentiments from thoſe, which had been taught them by Paul and Barnabas. St. Luke, notwithſtanding the conciſeneſs of his hiſtory, has

[t] Erat enim urbs Gentilis, et eccleſia ibidem collecta omnium prima, quæ partim Judæis, partim converſis Gentilibus conſtabat. Ubi ſupr. ſect. iii. num. v.

informed

informed us of two viſits made here from Judea: the firſt, in the year 43, or 44, when *there came prophets from Jeruſalem to Antioch*, ch. xi. 27. Afterwards *there came men from Judea, who taught the brethren, that unleſs they were circumciſed, they could not be ſaved*, xv. 1. Of which more preſently.

If Paul and Barnabas went any where, we might think of Cilicia: the rather, becauſe we can perceive, that ſoon after this there were gentile believers there: though, when Paul firſt preached in that country, we ſuppoſe him to have applied to Jews only. And it is well obſerved by Tillemont upon the caſe now before us: 'it [u] is certain, that Chriſtianity had been eſtabliſhed among the gentiles in Cilicia, 'before the council of Jeruſalem.' Acts xv. 23. Nevertheleſs, I ſhould rather think, that Paul and Barnabas did not now leave Antioch, after their return thither, before they went up to Jeruſalem. For ſome of Cilicia might learn the doctrine of the goſpel by coming to Antioch. Or ſome of the prophets and evangeliſts of Antioch, may have gone to Cilicia, with the approbation, and by the direction of Paul and Barnabas.

In this way of arguing I am encouraged by thoſe words of St. Luke, juſt cited: *And there they abode long time with the diſciples.* We now proceed.

Acts xv. 1—5. *And certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren: except ye be circumciſed after the manner of Moſes, ye cannot be ſaved When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no ſmall diſſenſion and diſputation with them, they determined, that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, ſhould go up to Jeruſalem, unto the apoſtles and elders, about this queſtion —— And when they were come to Jeruſalem, they were received of the church, and of the apoſtles and elders. And they declared all things, that God had done with them. But,* (they ſaid) *there* (B) *had riſen*

[u] As before, Art. xv.

(B) Many have miſtaken thoſe words, as if they were St. Luke's, who obſerved, that there were at Jeruſalem ſome of the ſect of the phariſees, who inſiſted upon impoſing the law upon the gentiles. So thought Dr. Doddridge, Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 233. So likewiſe Tillemont, whoſe words are theſe: Ils furent bien reçeus à Jeruſalem. Mais ils y trouverent les meſmes troubles, qui agitoient l'egliſe d' Antioche, et dont ils venoient chercher le remede. Car quelques Chretiens, qui avoient été Phariſiens, vouloient qu'on obligeaſt les Gentils à la circumciſion, et à l'obſervation de la loi. S. Paul. art. xvi. Grotius himſelf ſeems to have underſtood theſe words in the ſame manner. Sicut Antiochiæ quidam e judæis facti Chriſtiani, ita et Hieroſolymis quidam

riſen up certain of the ſect of the phariſees, which believed, ſaying, that it was needful to circumciſe them, and to command them to keep the law. Thus they delivered their meſſage, and propoſed the queſtion, which they were deſirous to have determined.

And the apoſtles and elders came together to conſider of this matter. Having in that aſſembly, after many debates, formed ſome reſolutions, they ſent them in a letter *to the brethren, which are of the gentiles, in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia*, ver. 6—31.

Thoſe determinations were intended for all believers in general from among the gentiles, containing, as it were, the terms, upon which all gentiles were to be admitted into the church of Chriſt. But the epiſtle was directed, particularly to the gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, becauſe among them the controverſy had ariſen, and they were the perſons, who had ſent a ſolemn deputation to the apoſtles and elders at Jeruſalem, to have their opinion upon it.

This journey to Jeruſalem, related by St. Luke Acts xv. I ſuppoſe to be the ſame with that mentioned by St. Paul himſelf, of which he gives an account to the Galatians, ch. ii. 1—10. Indeed, he mentions ſome circumſtances, wanting in Luke. But, as I apprehend, they are not ſuch as need induce us to think two different journies to be ſpoken of.

From Paul therefore we ſhall endeavour to find out the time of it. *Then fourteen years after*, ſays he, *I went up again to Jeruſalem, with Barnabas, and took Titus with me alſo. And I went up by revelation.* In the preceding chapter of the

dam duriorem illam defendebant ſententiam. Grot. in ver. 5. Whereas, upon due conſideration, I think, all muſt be ſenſible, that they are not the words of the hiſtorian, but of the meſſengers of the church of Antioch, repreſenting to the apoſtles and elders at Jeruſalem the caſe, or ſtate of the queſtion, about which they were ſent, and which they deſired to have now fully reſolved, and determined. This is the interpretation, which Beza preferred. Hunc locum video omnes perinde interpretari, acſi eſſent verba Lucæ, quaſi cum ſuam expeditionem narrarent Paulus ac Barnabas, inſurrexerint, qui circumciſionem urgerent. Quod mihi non fit admodum probabile. Sed potius illos, expoſita ſua expeditione, ſubjeciſſe controverſiam illam Antiochiæ excitatam, cujus cauſſa ipſi Hieroſolymam venerant. Puto igitur, eſſe illorum verba, non Lucæ. Bez. in loc. Lenfant follows Beza. And Whitby, if I do not miſtake him, gives the ſame interpretation. And Dr. Doddridge, upon my telling him how I underſtood the place, readily acquieſced, as I well remember. For he was always open to conviction, therein giving a good example to all inquirers after truth.

epiſtle

epiſtle to the Galatians, Paul had related his converſion in the way to Damaſcus, and then his *going up to Jeruſalem, after three years, to ſee Peter, and abiding with him fifteen days*, ch. i. 18. Where are we to date the beginning of thoſe fourteen years? at his converſion? or at his coming to Jeruſalem, to ſee Peter? Pearſon is clearly of opinion, that [x] the computation muſt be made from the time of his converſion. So likewiſe ſay [y] Eſtius, and [z] Baſnage.

Says St. Paul, Gal. i. 18. *Then after three years I went up to Jeruſalem, to ſee Peter.* Thoſe three years cannot be computed from his return to Damaſcus, out of Arabia, though it be the thing mentioned immediately before in ver. 17. But muſt be reckoned from his converſion. In like manner muſt be underſtood thoſe words in ch. ii. 1. *then fourteen years after I went up to Jeruſalem.* We muſt take the ſame date or epoch for the *three years*, and for the *fourteen years*. They both begin from the ſame time, that is, St. Paul's converſion.

The council deputed with their epiſtle two choſen men of their own number, Judas and Silas, to go to Antioch, together with Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 22, 23. After they had tarried there awhile, Judas returned to Jeruſalem, but Silas abode there ſtill, ver 32—34.

This council at Jeruſalem, according to [a] Pearſon, and, I ſuppoſe, many others, was held in the year of Chriſt 49 Baſnage, ſuppoſing Paul to have been converted in 37, placeth [b] this council in the year 50.

As I cannot ſay exactly, when Paul was converted, whether in 36, or 37, I am led to heſitate about the time of the council. But if he was converted before the end of the year 36, the council, as I apprehend, may be computed to have been held in the year 49. St. Paul ſays, Gal. i. 18. *then after three years I went up to Jeruſalem.* επειτα μετα ετη τρια. Which, I think, implies full *three years*, or ſomewhat more, as before obſerved. But the expreſſion in Gal. ii. 1. is different. We tranſlate:

[x] Anno xiv. a converſione S. Pauli congregatum. Hunc enim eventum ſuum narrat Apoſtolus Gal. 1, 2. et tempus ipſum determinate exprimit. —— Quod autem Apoſtolus ad epocham converſionis ſuæ referat annos, quos ibi narrat, manifeſtum eſt ex ſcopo capitis i. et ii. —— *Deinde, poſt annos quatuordecim rurſus aſcendi Hieroſolymam.* Idem enim horum verborum ſcopus, eadem annorum epocha. Vox enim επειτα, *deinde* non conjungit hæc verba cum illis de triennio, quaſi a fine illius triennii initium ſumerent. Aliud enim επειτα inter hæc et illa intercedit. Annal. Paulin. p. 89.

[y] Eſt. in Gal. ii. 1, 2.

[z] Ann. 50. num. iii.

[a] Annal. Paulin. p. 8, 9, 10.

[b] Ann. 50. num. xxi, xxii.

Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem. Ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ετων παλιν ανεβην εις ιεροσολυμα. Which, I think, may be thus rendered: *Then in about fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem.* The *three years*, above-mentioned, are complete: but the *fourteen years* need not be so understood. And, probably, were not complete. If therefore Paul be supposed to have been converted in the year 36, this council might be held, accordingly, in 49.

This period, from Paul's setting out with Barnabas from Antioch, to go to Cyprus, in the beginning of the year 45, to their coming up to the council at Jerusalem, and returning thence to Antioch, near the end of the year 49, or the beginning of 50, is the space of about five years.

X. The next period will reach from this time to St. Paul's coming again to Jerusalem, when he was apprehended, and imprisoned.

Soon after the return of Barnabas and Paul to Antioch, Peter, as it seems, came thither, as related by St. Paul, Gal. ii. 11—21. Nevertheless that occasioned not their making any long stay at Antioch. For, says St. Luke, Acts xv. 36. *And some days after*, that is, I think, after their being come back to Antioch, or after Judas had gone away to Jerusalem, and the controversy, which had been troublesome for some while before, was fully composed, *Paul said unto Barnabas: let us go again, and visit our brethren, in every city, where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark.* By which we perceive, that Mark, who before had left Paul and Barnabas, and gone to Jerusalem, was now come again into this country, and was willing to have again accompanied them. Possibly, he came hither with Peter. *But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp, that they departed asunder one from the other. So Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus. Paul chose Silas, and departed——and went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches.* Acts xv. 33—41.

I am inclined to think, that it was in the beginning of the year 50, that St. Paul now set out from Antioch. Pearson[c] likewise, and [d] Basnage, place it in the same year.

Witsius thinks, that [e] at this time Paul went from Cilicia to

[c] Ann. Paul. p. 10. [d] Ann. 50. num. xlvi. [e] Ex Cilicia vi-

to Crete: and that not being able to ſtay long there himſelf, he left *Titus, that he might ſet in order the things that were wanting, and ordain elders in every city*, ch. i. 5. Pearſon [f] placeth Paul's Journey into Crete in the latter part of the apoſtle's life, in 63, or 64, after the deliverance from his impriſonment at Rome. But Witſius ſays, it is not likely, that the preaching of the goſpel in Crete ſhould have been deferred ſo long: when all Achaia, Macedonia, Aſia, Cyprus, Syria, had been already inſtructed in the doctrine of the goſpel. And he obſerves, that not long after Paul was come from Cilicia, he took Timothy into his attendance, to ſupply, as he thinks, the want of Titus, lately left in Crete.

Though I cannot ſay, that Paul now went from Cilicia to Crete, I readily own myſelf to be of opinion, that the apoſtle's journey into Crete was performed, and his letter to Titus written, before his impriſonment at Rome. But of this more hereafter.

Having gone through Syria and Cilicia, confirming *the churches, Paul came to Derbe, and Lyſtra:* where they had been before. Here they found Timothy, who, as may be ſuppoſed, had been converted, when Paul and Barnabas were there together. Timothy having a good character, *from the brethren at Lyſtra and Iconium, Paul would have him to go forth with him*, Acts xvi. 1—3.

Afterwards they came into Phrygia. And it may be reckoned very probable, that now Paul preached in the chief cities of that country, Hierapolis, Laodicea, and Coloſſe. He alſo went into Galatia, and there founded many churches. But they were forbidden to preach in Aſia, properly ſo called. St. Luke's words are ver. 6, 7. *Now when they had gone through Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghoſt to preach the word in Aſia, after they were come to Myſia, they aſſayed to go into Bithynia: but the ſpirit ſuffered them not.*

detur Paulus in Cretam navigaſſe, et prædicato ibi evangelio, quoniam alio properabat, Titum reliquiſſe, ut quæ deſunt corrigeret, atque oppidatim preſbyteros conſtitueret. Quæ Lucæ omiſſa, ex epiſtola ad Titum ſupplenda eſſe, et huic tempori optime convenire, opinatur L. Capellus. At Pearſonus ad poſtrema Pauli tempora refert, eaque ejus itinera, quæ ſolutionem ex vinculis Romanis conſecuta ſunt —— Capelli tamen rationes potiores hic mihi videntur. Non enim veriſimile eſt, ad illud uſque tempus ignoratum fuiſſe Chriſtum in Creta, quum tota Achaia —— perſonarent evangelii præconio. —— Deinde Derben et Lyſtram venit. Ibi in Timotheum incidit, fidiſſimum ſibi abhinc omnium itinerum ſuorum futurum comitem, &c. De Vita Paul ſect. v. num. i. [f] Ann. Paulin. p. 21.

Then it follows, ver. 8—10. *And they paſſing by Myſia, came to Troas. And a viſion appeared to Paul in the night: there ſtood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, ſaying: come over into Macedonia, and help us. And after he had ſeen the viſion, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, aſſuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us to preach the goſpel unto them.*

By which manner of ſpeaking we perceive, that Luke was now in Paul's company. It is likely, that he met them at Troas. Which ſeems to have been the name of a country, and of a city, the chief of the country, ſituated upon the ſea coaſt.

Ver. 11, 12. *Therefore looſing from Troas, we came with a ſtraight courſe to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis: and thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony. And we were in that city abiding certain days.*

Samothracia was an iſland, over againſt Thrace, bordering upon Macedonia. Neapolis was a town upon the ſea coaſt, on the Thracian ſide of the Strymonic bay, which ſeparated Macedonia and Thrace. Here, I ſuppoſe, they landed, but made no ſtay. Thence they went by land to Philippi. Here they ſtayed ſome while, and ſeveral remarkable occurrences in that city are related by St. Luke. Lydia, a ſeller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, in Aſia, attended to the things that were ſpoken of Paul, and was baptized, both ſhe and her houſehold. She ſeems to have been a merchant, of no ſmall dealings, and probably had with her many ſervants, and other attendants. Here likewiſe Paul healed the young maiden, ſaid to be *poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of divination.* After which Paul and Silas were apprehended, beaten, and impriſoned. But they were ſoon ſet at liberty. Whereupon they left that city, ver. 13—40.

From thence they paſſed through Amphipolis, and Apollonia, and came to Theſſalonica, where was a ſynagogue of the Jews, Acts xvii. 1.

Amphipolis and Apollonia were cities of Macedonia. And Theſſalonica was the chief city of that country. Here being a Jewiſh ſynagogue, *Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three ſabbath-days reaſoned with them out of the ſcriptures. ——And ſome of them believed, and conſorted with Paul and Silas.* Whilſt he was here, believed alſo, *of the devout Greeks,* that is, of the people of the country, who were well diſpoſed,

a great

a great multitude, and of the chief women of the city *not a few.* But the unbelieving Jews made a great diſturbance, ver. 2—9.

The brethren therefore immediately ſent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea, where many of the Jews, and many of the men, and honourable women of the place believed. But ſome Jews came from Theſſalonica, and *ſtirred up the people* there alſo, ver. 10—13.

The brethren therefore immediately ſent away Paul, and conducted him to Athens, with Luke, it is likely, the writer of this hiſtory. *But Silas and Timothy abode ſtill at Berea.* St. Luke then gives an account of the apoſtle's preaching at Athens. The event was, that *ſome mocked. Howbeit ſome adhered to Paul, and believed. Among which was Dionyſius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them.*

Acts xviii. 1, 2. *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.*

The council of Jeruſalem, as before ſaid, was held in the year 49, or 50. And it was ſuppoſed by us, that Paul might ſet out from Antioch in the year 50, before it was far advanced. If ſo, he might come now to Corinth, before the end of the year 51. For as Baſnage computes, the apoſtle's journeyings, after leaving Antioch till his coming to Corinth, need not take up more than a year and a half. I put below [s] his brief enumeration of all the places, which have been lately taken notice of by us. But he did not think of the journey into

[s] Redux a ſynodo Paulus, poſt dies aliquot moræ Antiochenæ, mox in Syriam et Ciliciam proficiſcitur. Quibus peragratis, continuo in Piſidiam, Lycaoniam, Phrygiam penetravit, haud longâ uſquam morâ, ut verbo διελθων oſtenditur. Hinc ſolvens Troade, per Samothraciam delatus eſt Macedoniam, ubi dies non multos exegit. Mox per Amphipolim, et Apolloniam, Theſſalonicam, Macedoniæ metropolim, pervenit, ubi per ſabbata tria diſſeruit. Motâ ſeditione, Beream nocte petiit: qua ſalutatâ, eâ diſceſſit propter adventum Judæorum ——et Athenas pervenit: quâ poſt aliquantulam temporis moram relictâ, Corinthum anno 51, ingreſſus eſt. Noſtram non minimum adjuvat chronologiam adventus Aquilæ in hanc urbem Româ nuper edicto Claudiano pulſi: quod probabiliſſimâ ſane conjecturâ anno Claudii xi. promulgatum eſſe colligitur. Ut a ſynodo ad peregrinationem uſque Corinthum ſeſquiannus circiter elapſus ſit. Baſn. ann. 50 num. xxii. Vid. et ann. 51. n. lxviii. lxix.

Crete, mentioned by Witſius. Nor do I ſuppoſe it to have been then performed. This computation ſuits Paul's finding Aquila and Priſcilla at Corinth. For he thinks, that edict of Claudius to have been publiſhed in the eleventh year of his reign, which began on Jan. 24th in the year 51.

At Corinth Paul tarried a year and ſix months, ch. xviii. 11. that is, as I ſuppoſe, the remainder of the year 51, and all 52, and part of 53.——*And then he took 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 entered into the ſynagogue, and reaſoned with the Jews. When they deſired him to tarry longer time with them, he conſented not: but bade them farewel, ſaying, I muſt by all means keep this feaſt at Jeruſalem:* meaning, as I apprehend, the feaſt of pentecoſt in the year 53. *But I will return again unto you, if God will. And he ſailed from Epheſus. And when he had landed at Cæſarea, and gone up, and ſaluted the church.* namely, at *Jeruſalem, he went down to Antioch. And after he had ſpent ſome time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order,* that is, viſiting the churches, formerly planted by him in thoſe countries, *ſtrengthening all the diſciples,* ver. 18—23.

In this ſpace of time, after Paul had left Epheſus, there came thither *Apollos, born at Alexandria*: who received from Aquila and Priſcilla farther inſtructions concerning the chriſtian religion, beyond what he knew before, and then went away to Corinth, ver. 24—28.

Ch. xix. 1. *And it came to paſs, that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having paſſed through the upper coaſts,* meaning the country of Galatia and Phrygia, before-mentioned, *came to Epheſus:* that is, as I apprehend, before the end of the year 53, poſſibly, in October, or November.

I hope, I have allowed time enough for all the journies hitherto mentioned: and that I have not brought Paul to Epheſus too ſoon.

Ver 8—10. Says St. Luke: *And he went into the ſynagogue, and ſpake boldly for the ſpace of three months, diſputing, and perſuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but ſpake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and ſeparated the diſciples, diſputing daily in the ſchool of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the ſpace of two years; ſo that all they which dwelt in Aſia,*

Aſia, ſtrictly [h] ſo called, the country of which Epheſus was the metropolis, *heard the word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks.* St. Paul, afterwards, Acts xx. 31. in his diſcourſe to the elders of Epheſus, at Miletus, ſays, he had been with them the ſpace of three years. Which may be a round number. Three months, at leaſt, he had diſputed in the Jewiſh ſynagogue, and two years in the ſchool of Tyrannus, and, poſſibly, ſomewhat more, making, in the whole, a good deal above two, which St. Paul might call three years.

I think, that Paul might come to Epheſus, before the end of the year 53, in October, or November, as before ſaid. There he continued the remainder of that year, and the whole of the years 54, and 55, till the year 56, about pentecoſt. However, let us obſerve the hiſtory.

From ver. 11. to 41. the end of the forecited xixth chapter of the Acts is St. Luke's account of the ſpecial miracles wrought by Paul at Epheſus, and divers remarkable events, and then of a tumult raiſed by Demetrius, a ſilverſmith, and *other workmen of like occupation.*

Then Acts xx. 1.—6. *And after the uproar had ceaſed, Paul called unto him the diſciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over thoſe parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece: and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to ſail into Syria, he purpoſed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Aſia Sopater of Berea and of the Theſſalonians Ariſtarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy, and of Aſia, Tychicus and Trophimus. Theſe going before tarried for us at Troas. And we ſailed away from Philippi, after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode ſeven days.*

There is not, perhaps, any part of St. Paul's travels attended with more difficulties, than this period, of his leaving Epheſus, and ſetting out upon his voyage to Jeruſalem, with the collections made in the churches of Greece and Macedonia, and

[h] Atque hinc diverſæ notiones vocis Aſiæ oriuntur, ut latiſſima tertiam orbis terrarum Continentem ſonet, Europæ ab ortu oppoſitam: latior magnam peninſulam inter Ponticum et Mediterraneum mare: latior Aſiam cis Taurum, vel intra eum montem. Deinde ſtricte eſt provincia proconſularis: ſtrictius media pars illius provinciæ, circa Epheſum et Lydiam propriam: ſtrictiſſime, Homerica notione, parvus tractus ad Cayſtrum fluvium. Sacris ſcriptoribus ſignificatio illa placuit, quam ſtrictiorem modo diximus, uti ex iis, quæ varie adhuc dicta ſunt, elucet. Cellar. Diſſ. de ſept. eccleſ. Aſiæ § ix.

ſome

ſome other places. St. Luke is very diſtinct and particular in the account of the journey from Troas to Jeruſalem. But from Epheſus to Troas he has mentioned but one city only, which is Philippi. Otherwiſe, as we have ſeen in the paſſage juſt tranſcribed, he ſpeaks only of the countries of Macedonia, and Greece.

We will therefore endeavour to ſettle the time, when Paul left Epheſus, and then conſider, how long he might be in Macedonia, or other places, before he went to Troas.

After having related Paul's preaching at Epheſus for a good while, and the ſucceſs of it, St. Luke ſays in the forecited xixth. 21, 22, 23. *After theſe things were ended, Paul purpoſed in the ſpirit, when he had paſſed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jeruſalem, ſaying: after I have been there, I muſt ſee Rome. So he ſent into Macedonia two of them that miniſtred to him, Timothy and Eraſtus. But he himſelf ſtayed in Aſia for a ſeaſon. At the ſame time there aroſe no ſmall ſtir about that way:* meaning the tumult cauſed by Demetrius, as before mentioned.

Lightfoot has a happy thought upon this place. 'Paul's 'thoughts, ſays [i] he, of going to Rome argue the death of 'Claudius, who had baniſhed all the Jews from thence; Acts 'xviii. 2. and that by the coming in of Nero, a new emperor, 'that decree was extinct, and freedom of acceſs to Rome 'opened to them again. For it can be little conceived, that 'Paul ſhould think of going thither, when he could neither 'find any of his nation there, nor himſelf come thither without 'certain hazard of his life: as the caſe would have been, if 'Claudius and his decree were yet alive. It is therefore 'agreeable to all reaſon, that the death of Claudius, and the 'ſucceſſion of Nero, were now divulged. And Paul there-'upon knowing, that it was now lawful again for a Jew to go 'to Rome, intendeth to take a farewell journey and viſit to 'Macedonia, Achaia, and Jeruſalem, and then to go and 'preach there.'

Claudius died Oct. 13, in the year 54. It might be the beginning of 55, before the tidings of the death of Claudius and the acceſſion of Nero reached Epheſus. Upon which, or ſoon after, the thought of going to Rome entered Paul's mind. But he intended firſt to go to Macedonia, and Greece, and Jeruſalem.

[i] Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 299.

So,

So, ſays, St. Luke, *he ſent into Macedonia two of them that miniſtred unto him, Timothy and Eraſtus. But he himſelf ſtayed in Aſia for a ſeaſon.*

By which we are led to think, that thoſe meſſengers were ſent into Macedonia in the year 55. After they were gone, came to Paul at Epheſus, from Corinth, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, 1 Cor. xvi. 17. By them he ſends his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, written, as I ſuppoſe, in the beginning of the year 56. And it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11. that Timothy, who, as before ſeen, had been ſent into Macedonia, was alſo to go to Corinth. For there the apoſtle ſays: *now if Timothy come, ſee that he may be with you without fear. For he worketh the work of the Lord, as I alſo do. Let no man therefore deſpiſe him: but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me. For I look for him with the brethren.* Paul therefore was in expectation of Timothy's coming to him at Epheſus. Which I ſuppoſe he did, before Paul removed thence. Paul ſays, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9. *But I will tarry at Epheſus, until pentecoſt. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me. And there are many adverſaries.* The pentecoſt, there mentioned, I ſuppoſe to be that of the year 56.

Some time therefore in the year 56, before pentecoſt, or about that ſeaſon, Paul left Epheſus to go into Macedonia. So ſays St. Luke in his account of Paul's removal from Epheſus. He firſt mentions Macedonia, and then Greece, Acts xx. 1, 2. And from what Paul ſays, 2 Cor. ii. 12. it is argued, that [k] he did not ſail away directly from Epheſus to Macedonia: but travelled by land to Troas, and then went over to Macedonia by ſea. If ſo, he went now into Macedonia by the ſame way that he had done, when he was firſt there, Acts xvi. 11, 12.

But how long was Paul now in Macedonia and Achaia? or what ſpace of time was there between his leaving Epheſus, and Troas, and his return to Troas, in his way to Jeruſalem? If it was a year only, or ſomewhat leſs, the paſſover mentioned, Acts xx. 6. and the pentecoſt, mentioned ver. 16. were in the

[k] Sed quid interea Paulus, poſtquam Epheſo profectus eſt, ut iret in Macedoniam? Per Minorem Aſiam iter faciens, venit Troadem nobiliſſimam civitatem, quæ adjacet Helleſponto: ubi quærens Titum, cum non inveniſſet, tranſmiſſo freto abiit in Macedoniam, 2 Cor. ii. Baron. ann. 57. num. clxxxv.

Paul ne s'embarqua pas à Epheſe, mais il vint à Troade dans le deſſein d'y preſcher l'evangile. Tillem. S. Paul. art. 31.

year

year 57. But if Paul's journey from Epheſus, round about by Troas, Macedonia, and Achaia, and Macedonia again, to Troas, in the way to Jeruſalem, took up two years, or thereabout, then the pentecoſt mentioned Acts xx. 16. was in the year of Chriſt 58. And, if I miſtake not, there are ſeveral conſiderations, leading us to think, that theſe journeyings took up more, than the ſpace of a year.

It need not to be doubted, that Timothy returned from Corinth to Paul, before the apoſtle removed from Epheſus. And that Paul left him there, will be manifeſt from that, which is called the firſt epiſtle to Timothy. *As I beſought thee to abide ſtill at Epheſus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mighteſt charge ſome, that they teach no other doctrine,* 1 Tim. i. 3. Paul therefore left Timothy at Epheſus, for weighty reaſons: and ſome time after his coming into Macedonia, wrote him a letter, for his direction and aſſiſtance in the arduous work lying before him. But Timothy was with Paul, at writing the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians. For it begins thus: *Paul an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt——and Timothy our brother unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the ſaints in all Achaia.* That letter was ſent from Macedonia, a little before Paul went to Corinth. But ſome good while muſt have paſſed between Paul's leaving Timothy at Epheſus, and writing to him, and this ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians. Paul, it is very probable, did not ſend for Timothy to come to him from Epheſus preſently after he had left him there. I might add, that there muſt have been ſome emergent occaſions, that induced Paul to call Timothy to him from Epheſus, where his preſence was of great importance. What thoſe occaſions were Luke has not at all hinted. But they may be ſuppoſed. However, I do not now ſtay to hint what they were.

Paul in his ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, ch. i and xiii. 1. apologizeth for his deferring ſo long to come to them. But there could have been no occaſion for ſuch apologies, if he had come to them in the ſame year that he wrote his firſt epiſtle.

Paul ſays, 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6. *Now I will come unto you, when I ſhall paſs through Macedonia——And it may be, that I will abide, yea, and winter with you.* But Paul did not abide, and winter with them, according to this propoſal, as here intimated. If he had, there could have been no ground for ſuch apologies, as are in the ſecond epiſtle. Nevertheleſs the apoſtle did ſpend *three months* with them, not very long before a paſſover.

paſſover. Which muſt have been partly in ſome winter. As they could not be in the year 56, when the firſt epiſtle to them was written, they muſt have been in the year after, that is about the end of the year 57, and the beginning of the year 58. See again Acts xx. 1—6.

St. Paul ſays, 2 Cor. ix. 2. *For I know the forwardneſs of your mind For which I boaſt of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago And your zeal has provoked very many.* Which plainly ſhows, that it was now above a year ſince writing the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, which was ſent from Epheſus. For there he ſays, ch. xvi. 1, 2. *Now concerning the collection for the ſaints, as I have given directions to the churches of Galatia, ſo do ye. Upon the firſt day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in ſtore, as God has proſpered him: that there be no gatherings when I come.* Theſe directions were then ſent to the Corinthians. They therefore were not ready then. They could not be ready till ſome while after. And yet, at the time of writing the ſecond epiſtle to them from Macedonia, they had been *ready above a year.*

This ſhows, that Paul was above a year in Macedonia, or near it. Moreover after ſending away this ſecond letter, Paul went to Corinth, and ſtayed there *three months*, and afterwards went thence through Macedonia to Troas.

Conſequently there was the ſpace of two years, or almoſt two years, between Paul's leaving Epheſus and coming to Troas, in his way to Jeruſalem.

As Paul did not winter at Corinth in the year 56, we are led to think of Nicopolis, mentioned Titus iii. 12.

Before I proceed, I muſt take ſome farther notice of the words of 2 Cor. i. 15, 16. *And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before*, or firſt, *that you might have a ſecond benefit: and to paſs by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia to you, and of you to be brought on my way toward Judea* Hence it may be concluded, that in the beginning of the year 56, before Paul left Epheſus, he once had hopes of getting to Judea in the year following, that is, in the year 57, probably at paſſover, or pentecoſt, and that he had been prevented. He then intended to go from Epheſus to Corinth, thence to Macedonia, and to return from Macedonia to Corinth, that by the Chriſtians there he might be brought on his way to Judea. But by ſome means he had been carried into a different courſe. He had not yet been in Judea: nor was he yet come to Corinth, though he had been in Macedonia. And, probaby,

probably, he did not get into Judea before the pentecoſt in 58. Theſe word stherefore muſt induce us to think, that there was a longer ſpace of time between Paul's leaving Epheſus, and coming to Corinth and Jeruſalem, than has been generally ſuppoſed of late.

Baronius ſays, that [l] during this period Paul was in Crete, as well as in Macedonia and Achaia, as does [m] Lightfoot; who alſo ſuppoſeth [n] Paul to have been now in Illyricum.

Dr. Benſon [o] thinks, that Paul might ſay as he does, Rom. xv. 19. that he had preached the goſpel from Jeruſalem round about unto Illyricum, 'upon account of his being, and that 'more than once, in Macedonia, which bordered upon Illyri-'cum, the Scardican mountains, and the river Drilo, being the 'boundaries between them.' And after the like manner Witſius, who thinks that [p] Paul did not intend to ſay, that he had preached in Illyricum, for he only makes it the boundary of his labours. However, he ſays, that Appollonia was a city of Illyricum.

Wall upon Acts xx. 2. [q] ſays, 'St. Paul did many great 'things in that nine months time. [So he computes.] It 'muſt have been during that ſpace, I think, that he made an 'excurſion into Illyricum, and preached the goſpel there.'

Mr. Biſcoe delivers his thoughts in this manner: 'In [r] the 'ſame epiſtle he ſays: *From Jeruſalem round about unto Illyricum, 'I have fully preached the goſpel of Chriſt.* Which is a general 'confirmation of the whole hiſtory of his travels in the book 'of the Acts. For in that hiſtory he is ſaid to have gone

[l] Ann. 57. num. ccix. [m] Lightfoot. Harm. of the N. T. vol. I. p. 309. [n] Ibid. p. 307. [o] Upon the Acts, vol. II. p. 174. firſt edit. p. 194. the ſecond edit.

[p] Deinde iter fecerunt per Amphipolim urbem Philippis vicinam, et Apolloniam quæ eſt Corinthiorum et Corcyræorum colonia, civitas Illyriæ. Sic enim Stephanus.—— Verum id noſtræ nunc potiſſimum conſiderationis eſt, quod Apollonia urbs Illyrica ſit. Pertinet hoc ad illuſtrationem illius quod Paulus Romanis ſcripſit xv. 19.—— Multorum iſte locus ingenia fatigavit, non invenientium, quo tempore Paulus evangelium, in Illyrico, quod ſupponunt, prædicavit.—— Sed quid laboramus in caſſum? Primo enim Illyricum non comprehendit Paulus ſuis itineribus, quaſi id quoque evangelium prædicando peragraverit: ſed Illyricum ſtatuit itinerum ſuorum terminum. Venit enim ad limites Illyrici, quando venit Apolloniam. Optime Grotius ad Rom. xv. 19. Macedonia, quam peragravit Paulus, Dalmatiam attingit, quæ pars Illyrici, et ipſum mare Illyricum. In eo tractu eſt Apollonia, nominata Act. xvii. 1. Witſ. de Vit. Paul. ſect. v. num. xi. [q] Wall's Notes upon the N. T. p. 205.

[r] Upon the Acts, p. 424, 425.

'through

'through Syria, Cilicia, and moſt, if not all the countries in 'Peninſular Aſia, to have gone over into Europe, and to paſs 'through Macedonia into Greece. Now Berea, the laſt city, 'in which St. Paul is ſaid to have preached in Macedonia, 'could not be far from Deſſaretia, which was part of the 'ancient Illyricum. At the ſame time I muſt own, it does 'not ſeem at all improbable to me, that St. Paul might in one 'of his journies through Macedonia (for St. Luke relates his 'paſſing through Macedonia three times) make an excurſion 'into ſome of the nearer parts of Illyricum, and plant the 'goſpel among them, though not taken notice of in the 'hiſtory of the [s] Acts. It is certain however, that during St. 'Paul's life the goſpel was preached even in the remoter parts 'of Illyricum, and not improbably by the apoſtle himſelf, 'after his releaſe from his firſt impriſonment at Rome. For 'in his ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, written when he was a 'ſecond time priſoner in that great city, he informs him, that 'he had ſent Titus into Dalmatia.'

If I were to alter the latter part of that paragraph, agreeably to my apprehenſions, it would ſtand thus: 'It is certain, 'that during St. Paul's life the goſpel was preached even in 'the remoter parts of Illyricum, and more than probable by 'the apoſtle himſelf, and that before his impriſonment at 'Rome, when he was ſent thither from Judea by Feſtus. For 'in his ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, written during that his 'impriſonment at Rome, he informs him, that he had ſent 'Titus into Dalmatia.'

The ſecond epiſtle to Timothy having been written at that time, if any argument can be fetched from it, it muſt prove, that Paul had been in Illyricum, before he went to Jeruſalem, and probably, at the time, which we are now ſpeaking of.

It appears to me very probable, that at this time Paul was in Illyricum, and Crete. But I cannot digeſt the order of his journies, ſince St. Luke has not related them. St. Luke ſays nothing of Paul's going to Troas. He only ſays, that Paul went from Epheſus to Macedonia, and then came into Greece.

[s] 'All that St. Luke ſays of his 'ſecond journey is this: *And when 'he had gone over thoſe parts, and had 'given them much exhortation, he came 'into Greece*, Acts xx. 2. All that 'is ſaid of the third journey is, that 'whereas he intended to have ſailed 'from Greece into Syria, knowing 'that the Jews laid wait for him, 'he changed his mind, and paſſed 'through Macedonia, ver. 3—6. 'At either of theſe times he might 'make an excurſion into Illyricum, 'but moſt probably in his ſecond 'journey.' That is a note of Mr. Biſcoe at p. 425.

Though

Though Paul was preparing for his journey to Jeruſalem, with contributions of gentile churches, he was not in a hurry. Nor were thoſe collections his only concern. Notwithſtanding the tumult at Epheſus, he took leave of his friends there with a good deal of deliberation. St. Luke's words are, Acts xx. 1. *And after the uproar was ceaſed, Paul called unto him the diſciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia.* Nor does St. Luke repreſent the apoſtle in great haſte in that country. For he ſays, ver. 2. *And when he had gone over thoſe parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece.*

It is now a common opinion, that [t] St. Paul did not go directly to Macedonia from Epheſus, but went by land to Troas, and there croſſed over to Macedonia. It is evident, that before he wrote his ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, from Macedonia, he had been at Troas. For 2 Cor. ii. 12. he ſays, *he came to Troas, to preach Chriſt's goſpel, and that a door was opened to him of the Lord.* There is no abſurdity in ſuppoſing that St. Luke, who ſays nothing of Paul's having been then at Troas, and omitted the apoſtle's journey into Arabia, and indeed many other things, has omitted an account of his going to Crete and Illyricum. Wall, and others, who compute no more than nine months between Paul's leaving Epheſus, and coming to Troas, in the way to Jeruſalem, may find a difficulty in admitting what we contend for. But I think I have ſhown it to be a ſpace of almoſt two years, or about a year and three quarters. This alone will render it probable, that ſomewhat was done by Paul, beſide what is mentioned by St. Luke in Acts xx. 1—6.

St. Paul's words, in the epiſtle to the Romans, written at Corinth, in this period, are very remarkable: *ſo that from Jeruſalem, and round about, unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the goſpel of Chriſt.——For which cauſe alſo I have been much hindred from coming unto you. But now having no more place in theſe parts, and having a great deſire theſe many years to come unto you*, ch. xv. 19, 22, 23. He ſeems now, as it were, at eaſe, knowing what he had done, and conſidering, that there was nothing more left to be done by him in thoſe parts. And why ſhould not Illyricum be underſtood in the ſame manner

[t] 'He did not go directly from 'Epheſus to Macedonia, that is, 'he did not take ſhipping at Ephe- 'ſus (that was not ſafe): but e- 'ſcaped by land to Troas, as he 'ſays 2 Cor. ii. 12. and from 'thence took ſhip to Macedonia.' Wall's Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 205.

epiſtle

as Jeruſalem? He had been at Jeruſalem: and conſequently, I think, in Illyricum likewiſe. And I ſhould apprehend, that now was the time when Paul could firſt ſay ſo much as he here does.

Jerom had no doubt, but that Paul was in Illyricum. 'Chriſt, ſays [u] he, was with Peter at Rome, with Paul in Illyricum with Titus in Crete.' That opinion, it is likely, was built upon this text in the epiſtle to the Romans. Conſequently, it is to be ſuppoſed, that Paul had been in Illyricum, before writing that epiſtle. Nor can any ſeaſon be thought of more likely, than this period, between his leaving Epheſus, and coming to Troas, in the way to Jeruſalem.

I ſuppoſe Theodoret to be of the ſame mind with us, and to confirm what we are now ſaying, in his comment upon Rom. xv. 19. 'He [x] ſhows, to how many people he had 'preached: ſo that *from Jeruſalem, and round about unto Illyri-* 'cum, *I have fully preached the goſpel of Chriſt.* As if he had 'ſaid, I have not cultivated the nations in a ſtraight line only; 'but going round about I have planted the doctrine of the goſ- 'pel in the eaſtern countries, and alſo in Pontus, and likewiſe 'in Aſia and Thrace. That is what he intends by *round* '*about.*'

And Euthalius, in his prologue to St. Paul's fourteen epiſtles, reckons †‡ Illyricum among the countries where Paul had preached, and ſays, that he converted a large part of it to the faith of Chriſt.

It may be not improper for us to give here ſome attention to the hiſtory of Aquila and Priſcilla. They were with Paul at Epheſus, when he wrote his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, in the ſpring of the year 56. For he ſends their ſalutations in theſe words: *The churches of Aſia ſalute you. Aquila and Priſcilla ſalute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their houſe,* 1 Cor. xvi. 19. The Jews having been baniſhed from

[u] Erat igitur uno eodemque tempore et cum Apoſtolis quadraginta diebus —— cum Thoma in India, cum Paulo in Illyrico, cum Tito in Creta, cum Andrea in Achaia. Ad Marcell. T. IV. P. I. p. 167. Bened.

[x] Δδασκει δε και ποσοις εκηρυξεν εθνεσιν —— ου γαρ τα κατα την ευθειαν εθνη παρωκειμενα εθνη εγεωργησα μονα, αλλα και κυκλω περκων, τατε εωα, και τα ποντικα μερη, και προς τετοις τα κατα ασιαν, και την θρακην, της διδασκαλιας επληρωσα. Τετο γαρ δηλοι το κυκλω. Theod. in loc. T. III. p. 111, 112.

†‡ —— πολλας μεν πολεις, πολλας δε χωρας περιενοστησεν, μικρω δε το ιλλυρικον απαν των της εις χριστον ευσεβειας δογματων ενεπλησε. Euthal. ap. Zac. p. 520.

Rome by an edict of Claudius, they came to Corinth, a ſhort time before Paul, Acts xviii. 1—3. When Paul went from Corinth to Epheſus, and Jeruſalem, they went with him as far as Epheſus, and tarried there, ver. 18, 19. When Paul wrote the epiſtle to the Romans, at the end of his ſecond peregrination in Macedonia and Achaia, in the ſpring of the year 58 (as we ſuppoſe) they were at Rome. For Paul ſends his ſalutations to them, Rom. xvi. 3. Afterwards they returned to Epheſus. For Paul ſends his ſalutations to them in his ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, then at Epheſus, 2 Tim. iv. 19. which epiſtle I think to have been written in the ſummer of the year 61, ſoon after Paul's coming a priſoner to Rome. And it has been ſuppoſed, that they continued at Epheſus the remainder of their life: which to me ſeems not improbable. It is likely, that ſoon after Paul went from Epheſus to Macedonia, which he did in April or May 56, they alſo went from Epheſus to Rome. They might return thither, with a view to ſettle ſome ſecular affairs, they having before left Rome in a hurry, in compliance with the edict of Claudius. Or they returned to Rome with a deſign to continue there. For they ſeem to have had their family with them. Says St. Paul, in the place before referred to, Rom. xvi. 3—5. *Salute Priſcilla and Aquila,—— and the church in their houſe.* Mr. Biſcoe [y] explaining theſe words, *the church in their houſe*, ſays, 'they had, it is probable, 'a conſiderable number of ſervants to carry on their trade. 'Theſe, doubtleſs, were taught by them the chriſtian faith: 'by which means they had a church in their houſe, wherever 'they ſettled.' And ſpeaking of their being at Corinth, he ſays, 'they [z] came from Rome, and ſettled at Corinth: in 'whoſe houſe at Corinth St. Paul took up his lodging, and 'wrought with them at their trade of tent making.'

What I would obſerve is this; that there is nothing in the hiſtory of theſe two excellent Chriſtians, Paul's helpers, inconſiſtent with the account which we have juſt given of this peregrination of Paul: which is to this purpoſe. Paul removed from Epheſus in the ſpring of the year 56, and went into Macedonia. But which way he went, I cannot tell, whether by the way of Troas, or ſome other courſe. He alſo was in Crete, and Illyricum about this time. Having ſpent the winter of 56 at Nicopolis, either in Thrace or Epirus, he came into Macedonia: where he ſtayed ſome while. And near

[y] Upon the Acts, p. 433. [z] The ſame, p. 432.

the

the end of the year 57, in November, or December, he came into Achaia, and particularly to Corinth, where he ſtayed three months. Hence Paul intended to have ſailed to Syria. But underſtanding *that the Jews laid wait for him*, he returned again to Macedonia. *And ſailed away from Philippi, after the days of unleavened bread, and came to his friends at Troas in five days*, Acts xx. 3—6. That paſſover, which Paul kept at Philippi, we ſuppoſe to have been in the year 58. At Troas Paul ſtayed ſeven days.

It is not needful for us to purſue diſtinctly Paul's Journey thence to Jeruſalem, it being very clearly laid down by St. Luke, in the remaining part of ch. xx. and the beginning of xxi. I obſerve a few things only, ch. xxi. 13. *And we went before by ſhip to Aſſos* [from Troas] *there intending to take in Paul. For ſo he had appointed, minding himſelf to go afoot.* By which, I apprehend, we need not ſuppoſe that Paul walked all that way: the original word, as ſeems to me, importing no more than that Paul choſe to go ſo far by land; whilſt the reſt of the company went by water.††

Ch. xx. 16. *For Paul had determined to ſail by Epheſus, becauſe he would not ſpend the time in Aſia. For he haſted, if it were poſſible for him, to be at Jeruſalem the day of pentecoſt.* As I ſuppoſe he was, though it is not particularly mentioned by St. Luke. So ſays [a] Lightfoot: 'St. Paul cometh to Jeruſalem at the feaſt of pentecoſt, when the city was now full 'of a confluence to that feſtival.' Whereby we may be able to apprehend the greatneſs of the multitude of the people, as intimated by St. Luke xxi. 27—36. and the extremity of the apoſtle's danger, and the terrifying circumſtances of it.

We have now gone through a period of about eight years, from Paul's leaving Antioch, not far from the beginning of the year 50, to his coming to Jeruſalem at the pentecoſt in 58.

XI. I ſhall next obſerve the apoſtle's hiſtory from this time to his deliverance from his impriſonment at Rome.

Paul was about two years in Judea. He came to Jeruſalem, as juſt ſaid, at the feaſt of pentecoſt in the year 58. And he was ſent away to Rome near the end of the year 60. St. Luke's account of what happened to Paul in that ſpace of time is in

†† Μεταμεληθηναι δ' αυτος εν παντι πεζευσαι· την δε τριτην, οτι μιαν ημεραν ου δυο τρεις μεταμελειας· μιαν μεν επι αδιαβετος εμεινεν. Plutarch. Vit. M. Catoni Maj.

[a] As before, vol. I. p. 319.

ch. xxi. 17.——ch. xxvi. 1—32. For when he had been a few days at Jeruſalem, he was ſeized by a rude and enraged multitude, who would have killed him, if he had not been reſcued out of their hands by Lyſias, a tribune, and the chief officer at Jeruſalem, under the Roman governor; who ſecured him in the caſtle of Antonia, binding him with two chains to two ſoldiers. But before Paul was carried into the caſtle, he made a ſpeech to the people, as he ſtood upon the ſtairs going up into it. But the people not being at all mollified, and ſtill ſhowing great rage, the chief captain ordered that Paul ſhould be brought into the caſtle. The next day he looſed Paul from his bonds, and brought him before the Jewiſh council. But a great diſſenſion ariſing in the council between the members of it, the captain was obliged *to take him by force from them, and bring him into the caſtle.* The day after the captain being informed of a conſpiracy to aſſaſſinate Paul, he prudently ſent him from Jeruſalem, under a ſtrong guard, to Cæſarea by the ſea ſide, where the governor Felix reſided. After two years impriſonment Porcius Feſtus came in the room of Felix, who, to gratify the Jews, left Paul bound. In a ſhort time Feſtus brought his priſoner's cauſe to a hearing at Cæſarea. And the Jews ſtill proſecuting him with great earneſtneſs, Paul appealed to Cæſar. *Then Feſtus, when he had conferred with his council, anſwered, haſt thou appealed to Cæſar? Unto Cæſar thou ſhalt go.* A while after which Paul, and other priſoners in that country, were delivered to Julius, a centurion, to be conducted by ſea to Italy.

Whilſt Paul was in Judea, he made a ſpeech to the people at Jeruſalem, already taken notice of, when he freely declared his principles and conduct. He was alſo brought by Lyſias before the whole Sanhedrim, or Jewiſh council. He pleaded before Felix in anſwer to the accuſations of Tertullus, and the Jews who employed him. He preached before Felix and his wife Druſilla, and was ſeveral times in the preſence of Felix. And before he was ſent away to Rome, Feſtus gave him an opportunity to appear, and plead before himſelf, and king Agrippa, and Bernice, and the tribunes, and principal men of Cæſarea: when Paul gave that auguſt aſſembly an account of his doctrine, and of himſelf from his converſion to that time. And it is manifeſt, that Paul's diſcourſe was well received. And both he and his doctrine were acquitted from all the charges and accuſations of the Jews. For when the company had withdrawn,

withdrawn, they ſaid among themſelves, where certainly they could ſpeak with freedom: *This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds.*

Indeed, it muſt be owned, that Paul was civilly treated by all the Roman officers in Judea, Lyſias, Felix, Feſtus, Julius. They all behaved as magiſtrates ought to do. They gave their priſoner and his accuſers a fair hearing, that they might know the truth of the caſe. Felix was a bad man. Nevertheleſs, *he commanded a Centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he ſhould forbid none of his acquaintance to miniſter, or to come to him*, ch. xxiv. 23. And he left Paul bound, when he ſhould have releaſed him. But it was only out of compliance to the Jews, of whom he was afraid. And if there was any other defect of juſtice toward Paul, in the behaviour of the Roman officers; it may be fitly imputed to the powerful influence of the Jews, the people of the country: to whom governors, ſent in from abroad, would be obliged to ſhow a great regard from political conſiderations.

In ch. xxvii. and xxviii. 1—16. is an account of Paul's voyage to Rome, which St. Luke has related very diſtinctly. As it was near winter, when they ſet out; they met with bad weather, and were wrecked on the iſland Melita, now called Malta, lying ſouth of Sicily. There they ſtayed *three months.* xxxviii. 11. and then ſailed for Italy in a ſhip of Alexandria. They landed at Puteoli, and ſo went for Rome. Paul and the other priſoners were delivered by the centurion to the captain of the guard. How the other priſoners were diſpoſed of, is not particularly related. *But Paul was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf with a ſoldier that kept him*, ver. 16. And as Paul had appealed to the emperor, I ſuppoſe, that he was ſoon brought before him, and that the method of his confinement was ordered by the emperor himſelf. Of which I may ſay more hereafter, when we come to the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy.

Says [b] Lightfoot: His accuſers, that were come from 'Judea to lay in their charge againſt him (for we can hardly 'ſuppoſe otherwiſe, but that ſome ſuch were come) would 'be urgent to get their buſineſs diſpatched, that they might 'be returning to their own home again. And ſo would 'bring him to trial as ſoon as they could.——As he ap-

[b] As before, p. 322.

'pealed to Nero himſelf, ſo Nero himſelf heard his cauſe. 'Philip. i. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 16.'

So Lightfoot. And it appears to me very ſtrange, that any ſhould think, Paul's cauſe was not heard at all at Rome, during his two years ſtay there. And yet it has been the opinion of ſeveral learned men, particularly of [c] James Capellus, and [d] Dr. Doddridge, whoſe words I have placed below. And Fr. Spanheim ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. But his ſentiments are rejected by his friend [e] Witſius, as no better than trifling.

Paul came to Rome in the ſpring of the year, as all will readily think. Some learned men place his arrival there in [f] February, others [g] in April. Here Paul *dwelled two whole years in his own hired houſe.* Therefore he was releaſed from his confinement in the ſpring, two years after.

I ſuppoſe, Paul to have come to Jeruſalem at the pentecoſt of the year 58, to Rome in the ſpring of the year 61, and to have been releaſed in the former part of the year 63. This period therefore is about the ſpace of five years.

XII. We are now to write the hiſtory of our apoſtle from this time to his death. But in this period we have no aſſiſtance from St. Luke, very little from the other books of the New Teſtament, nor very much from ancient authors, which can be depended upon as certain.

Whither Paul went, after he had obtained his liberty, has been debated. Some think, that [h] he went from Rome to

[c] Redit Romam cauſam acturus, quod in prima Romæ manſione non comparuiſſent accuſatores. Jac. Cap. Compendioſ. in Apoſtol. Hiſtor. Chronolog. Tab.

[d] 'After this Paul continued 'two whole years at Rome in his 'own hired houſe, before he was 'heard by Cæſar, or his deputy, 'upon his appeal.' Upon Acts xxviii. 30. Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 434.

[e] Celeberrimus Spanhemius noſter ad Hiſtoriæ Chriſtianæ ſeculum i. —— hæc habet: *Dimiſſus nempe fuerat Paulus, ea lege, ut in Aſiâ coram accuſatoribus ſuis ſiſteretur, aut Romæ rurſus ſe ſiſteret, quam ante nulli in ipſam Romam miſſi a Judæis eſſent. Ea occaſione adiit Corinthum.* —— *Sed apparentibus Hieroſolymâ Judæis, Romam redire coactus eſt, anno, ut videtur, ſequente: ubi conjectus in vincula, ibidemque ultima Pauli certamina, &c.* —— Quæ quam debili nitanter fundamento, non puto mihi eſſe oſtendendum. Witſ. de Vit. Pauli. ſect. xii. num. xl.

[f] Ita Paulus, poſtquam per tres menſes Melitæ hiemaſſet, per Syracuſas, Rhegium, et Puteolos, Romam venit menſe Febr. Neron. vii. Pearſon. Ann. Paul. p. 18. A. D. lxi.

Ita tandem Paulus, poſt tot caſus, poſt tot rerum diſcrimina, Romam venit, anno vii. Neronis, menſe Februario. Witſ. ib. ſect. xii. n. i.

See likewiſe Tillemont. S. Paul. art. 42.

[g] Baſnag. ann. 62. num. x.

[h] Adveniente Timotheo,

to Spain. Others ſee not ſufficient reaſon for that ſuppoſition. Among theſe are [i] Lenfant and Beauſobre, [k] Baſnage, and [l] Cellarius, and †* Du Pin.

That Paul went into Spain, has been argued from an expreſſion of Clement in his epiſtle to the Corinthians, who there ſays of Paul, 'that [m] having taught the whole world righte-'ouſneſs, and having come to the borders of the weſt, and 'having ſuffered martyrdom, he went to the holy place.' Which ſome have rendered *the utmoſt bounds of the weſt*, and argue, that [n] hereby is meant Spain. I rather think, that Clement only meant Italy, or Rome, where Clement was, and where Paul ſuffered. From a note of Le Clerc upon the place we learn, that [o] Bp. Fell ſo underſtood Clement. The word *coming* alſo leads to this ſenſe. If Clement had thought of Spain, or Britain, or any other places beyond that, in which himſelf was, he would not have ſaid *και ελθων*, *and having come*, but *πορευσαμενος*, or ſome other equivalent word, *and having gone to the bounds of the weſt*. Lenfant and Beauſobre in their general preface to St. Paul's epiſtles ſay,

theo, ex Italia profectus eſt in Hiſpaniam, quo iturum ſe dixerat in epiſtolâ ad Romanos. Pearſon. ib. p. 20. [i] Quelques anciens peres ont dit, que ſaint Paul ayant été mis en liberté, alla faire le voyage d'Eſpaigne, dont il avoit formé le deſſein cinq ou ſix ans auparavant. Rom. xv. 24. Mais outre que ces temoignages ſont du quatriéme ou du cinquiéme ſiecle, il ſemble que ces peres n'ont parlé de ce voyage, que ſur ce qui S. Paul en a dit dans l'epitre aux Romains. C'eſt au moins tout ce que S. Jerome allegue. —Auſſi les epitres, que S. Paul écrivit durant ſa captivité, temoignent, qu'il ne penſoit qu' à retourner en Gréce et en Aſie, des qu'il ſeroit deliyré. Pouvoit il avoir dans l'eſprit un voyage en Eſpagne, lorſqu'il mandoit à Philemon, *de lui preparer un logement?* Lailſant donc une tradition, au moins fort incertaine, &c. Lenf. et Beauſ. Pref. generale ſur les epiſtres de S. Paul. § liv. p. 33.

[k] Ann. 46. num. xlvi—l.

[l] Eruditis placet, et admodum eſt probabile, Paulum prima captivitate, quam Lucas ſcripſit, liberatum in Græciam et Aſiam revertiſſe, adeoque bis Romæ fuiſſe: in Hiſpaniam autem penetraſſe, credibile non eſt. Chr. Cellar. de Itineribus S. Pauli Apoſtoli. § xxviii.

†* Il arriva à Rome au commencement de l'an 61. Il en ſortit au bout de deux ans. Pluſieurs ont crû, qu'il avoit alors fait le voïage d'Eſpagne. Mais nous avons fait voir ailleurs, que cela eſt fort incertain. Il eſt plus vraiſemblable, qu'il revint dans l'Aſie, et dans la Gréce. Du Pin. Diſſ. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

[m] *δικαιοσυνην διδαξας ολον τον κοσμον, και επι το τερμα της δυσεως ελθων, και μαρτυρησας επι των ηγεμονων.* ——*κ. λ.* Clem. cap. v. [n] Et certe eam regionem vidit, quam Clemens Romanus ejus itinera commemorans appellat *το τερμα της δυσεως*. Pearſon. ibid. [o] Romæ, hoc eſt in Heſperia, ſive Italia. Fell.

the bounds of the weſt [p] ſignify nothing but the weſt. It is an expreſſion, they ſay, borrowed from the ſcriptures, in which the borders of a country denote the country itſelf. In like manner by thoſe words Clement intended Italy.

However, another ground of this opinion is what St. Paul himſelf ſays, Rom. xv. 24. *Whenſoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you. For I truſt to ſee you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if firſt I be ſomewhat filled with your company.* But Paul's meaſures had been broken by his impriſonment at Rome, and the conſequences of it. And it was now at leaſt five years, ſince writing the epiſtle to the Romans. It is more likely, that [q] when Paul left Rome, he went into the eaſt, and Greece. For in his letters, written near the end of his confinement there, he expreſſeth hopes of ſo doing. Philip. ii. 23, 24. ſpeaking of Timothy, he ſays: *Him therefore I hope to ſend preſently, ſo ſoon as I ſhall ſee, how it will go with me. But I truſt in the Lord, that I alſo myſelf ſhall come ſhortly.* Compare i. 20—25.——And he ſays to Philemon, an inhabitant of Coloſſe, ver. 22. *But withal prepare me a lodging: for I truſt, that through your prayers, I ſhall be given unto you.* And in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, probably, written by Paul to the Jews of Judea, and Jeruſalem, he ſays, ch. xiii. 18, 19. *Pray for us.——And I beſeech you the rather to do this, that I may be reſtored to you the ſooner.* And lower, ver. 23. *Know ye, that our brother Timothy is ſet at liberty. With whom, if he come ſhortly, I will ſee you.* Moreover, it is not impoſſible, but that Paul may have taken care of Spain by ſending thither ſome of his fellow-labourers, whilſt he was priſoner at Rome.

As I ſuppoſe the epiſtle to the Hebrews to have been written after that to Philemon, I am apt to think, that Paul came from Rome to Jeruſalem, as ſoon, and as directly as he could. But he made there a ſhort ſtay only. From Judea I think it likely that he went to Epheſus, and there left Timothy: whom about two years before he had ſent for

[p] Num. liv. p. 33. [q] Nos tamen præcipue movent petita ex Scripturis argumenta, quibus aperte liquet, Paulum egreſſum Romanorum carcere, in Orientem ſe contuliſſe. Documento ſane magno, mutatum eſſe jubente Deo Pauli conſilium, quo in Hiſpaniæ tractum ex civitate Romana proficiſci ſtatuerat.——Illud etiam nobis eſt vero proximum, peregrinationem Pauli Hiſpanicam ex verbis Pauli fabricatam.——Unde collegerunt, quod decreverat, illud executioni eſſe mandatum. Quæ tamen non eſt apta argumentandi ratio, &c. Baſng. Ann. 46. num. xlix.

to come to him from Epheſus to Rome. From Epheſus Paul might go to Laodicea and Coloſſe. And, poſſibly, he returned to Rome by Troas, Philippi, and Corinth.

Some have heſitated to allow, that Paul ever came again into this country, becauſe he ſays, Acts xx. 25. *And now, behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, ſhall ſee my face no more.* But Lewis Capellus [r] has well removed that difficulty. I therefore have placed below a part of his obſervations. And ſays Wall [s] upon the place: 'Εγω οιδα, *I know*, when ſpoken of 'things future, does not (as it is uſed by St. Paul) always 'ſignify a certain knowledge, or a prophetic certainty: but 'often means only thus much: *I take it for granted: I am fully 'perſuaded: I foreſee it highly probable: I have no other expec-'tation.* And the like.' See alſo what there follows.

They who think, that Paul did come again into this country, but nevertheleſs was not at Epheſus, ſeem not to attend to St. Paul's expreſſions, who does not ſay to the elders of Epheſus: *I know that you will ſee me no more.* But his words are theſe: *And now, behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, ſhall ſee my face no more.* The apoſtle then thought, that he ſhould never more come into thoſe parts. Conſequently, he might, as well come to Epheſus, as to Coloſſe: which he probably did, and certainly hoped, and intended to do. See Philem. ver. 22.

Beſide Capellus, and Wall, already alleged, I might refer to others, who heſitate not at all to allow, that Paul came again into this country, particularly Le Clerc, and Lenfant and Beauſobre, upon Acts xx. 25. and [t] Pearſon. Not now to mention any more.

[r] Sed reſponderi poteſt, Paulum non ſemel ex humana conjectura, atque ex humano ſpiritu, conſilio, et propoſito, multa ejuſmodi cogitaſſe, putaſſe, propoſuiſſe, ac dixiſſe. Quæ tamen poſtea, Deo ita diſponente, aliter ceciderunt.—— Itaque mirum videri non debet, ſi cum Spiritus Paulum oppidatim moneret vincula et afflictiones graves manere eum Jeroſolymis, ſentiretque ſe Spiritu ligatum, ut eo nihilominus proficiſceretur, neſciens quænam eſſent illic ſibi eventura, deſperaverit de reditu ſuo ad eos, quos poſt ſe relinquebat, licet Deo ita diſponente——res aliquot poſt annis ceciderit aliter, quam ipſe tum credebat. Non eſt itaque tam validum adverſus nos argumentum illud, ut eo ſubvertatur ſententia noſtra de Pauli reditu in Orientem, poſt ſoluta Romana ejus vincula. Lud. Capel. Hiſt. Apoſt. Illuſtrat. p. 34—36. [s] Notes upon the N. T. p. 255.

[t] Paulus venit Miletum, &c. Ann. Paulin. p. 24. A. D. lxvi.

I ſaid

I said just now, that, probably, Paul went to Jerusalem, as soon as he could, after he was set at liberty. And say Lenfant and Beausobre in their [u] general preface to St. Paul's epistles: 'We have seen, that the apostle was accus-'tomed to go from time to time to Jerusalem, and to take 'the opportunity of solemn festivals. So long as the tem-'ple subsisted, the Jewish Christians did not neglect the 'ordinances of the law. St. Paul himself did not neglect 'them, that he might give no offence to the Jews.' I readily assent to what they say about the apostle's going to Jerusalem. I could almost think, that Paul was desirous to go thither, to praise God in his temple for the favourable circumstances of his imprisonment at Rome, and for his deliverance from it. Paul's case at Rome very much resembled what had happened to him at Corinth. After (c) which, we find, he had a vow, and went from Corinth to Ephesus, and hastened to Jerusalem, Acts xviii. 9—22. In like manner, I imagine, that now Paul went to Jerusalem, as soon as he could. But he made no long stay there. It had not been his custom so to do, since his conversion.

Having been at Jerusalem, I suppose, as before said, that he visited divers churches, which had been planted by him, and then returned to Rome. St. Paul, though a prisoner, had lived very comfortably at Rome. And he had there had great success in his services for the gospel. It seems to me, that he now considered that city, as the most proper place for him to reside in the remaining part of his life. It was the most conspicuous place in all the world, and the place of the greatest resort from all Parts. There he hoped to be more useful, than in any other place.

But things do not always fall out exactly according to human expectations. For, as I suppose, the apostle had not been long returned to Rome, before he was called out to resign his life for the name of Christ.

In the year of Christ 64, as we learn from [x] Suetonius,

[u] p. 34. (c) A particular account of that journey from Corinth to Jerusalem may be seen in the first volume of this work, p. 208—212.

[x] Nam quasi offensus deformitate veterum ædificiorum, et angustiis flexurisque vicorum, incendit, urbem. —— Per sex dies septemque noctes eâ clade sævitum est. —— Hoc incendium e turri Mæcenatiana prospectans, lætusque flammæ, ut aiebat, pulcritudine, *ἁλωσεως* Illii in illo suo scenico habitu decantavit. Sueton. Neron. cap. 38.

and

and [y] Tacitus, heathen hiſtorians, as well as from others, was a dreadful fire at Rome, which continued ſix or ſeven days. It was thought by many people, that the city had been ſet on fire by the emperor's orders. But ſoon after the Chriſtians were moſt cruelly treated by him, as if they had been the authors of the conflagration. So ſays Tacitus. The fire is ſaid to have begun on [z] the 19th of July. And the perſecution of the Chriſtians began, as is ſuppoſed by ſome, in [a] November following, by others [b] in Auguſt. Which to me ſeems not ſo likely.

It is the opinion of [c] Pagi, and [d] Baſnage, that Peter and Paul ſuffered martyrdom in the year of †† Chriſt 65. They argue in this manner. Oroſius [e] having given an account of Nero's perſecution of the Chriſtians, and of the death of the two apoſtles in it, adds, that it was followed by a peſtilence in the city, and other diſaſters. And Tacitus [f] ſpeaking

[y] Sed non ope humana, non largitionibus Principis, aut Deûm placamentis, decedebant infamia, quin juſſum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero ſubdidit reos, et quæſitiſſimis pœnis affecit, quos per flagitia inviſos, vulgus Chriſtianos appellabat. —— Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti, &c. Tacit. Ann. 15. cap. 44. [z] Fuere qui annotarint, xiv. Calendas Sextiles principium incendii hujus ortum, quo et Senones captam urbem inflammaverant. Tacit. Annal. 15. cap. 41. —— cujus initium in medium menſem Novembrem A. 64. cadit. Mofhem. de Reb. Chriſtian. ſec. i. cap. 34. [b] Vid. Toinard. ad lib. de Mort. Perſecut. cap. ii.

[c] Vid Pagi ann. 64, 65, 67.

[d] Inchoatam ſuperiore anno perſecutionem currente continuavit Neronis furor, qui Petri Paulique ſanguine reſperſus eſt. Baſn. an. 65. n. ix. †† That alſo was the opinion of Du Pin, not now to mention any others. Quoiqu'il en ſoit, il eſt certain, qu' étant revenu à Rome avec ſaint Pierre, il y eût la tête tranchée dans le temps de la perſecution de Neron, et probablement la 65. année de Jeſus Chriſt, comme nous l'avons fait voir en un autre endroit. Du Pin. Diſſ. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii. [e] Nam primus Romæ Chriſtianos ſuppliciis et mortibus adſecit, ac per omnes provincias pari perſecutione excruciari imperavit: ipſumque nomen extirpare conatus, beatiſſimos Apoſtolos, Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit. Mox acervatim miſeram civitatem abortæ undique clades. Nam ſubſequente autumno tanta urbi peſtilentia incubuit, ut triginta millia funerum in rationem Libitinæ venirent. Oros. l. 7. c. 7.

[f] Tacitus lib. XVI. cap. 13. loquens de iis quæ Nerva et Veſtino Coſſ. geſta, ſic narrationem ſuam concludit: *Tot facinoribus fœdum annum etiam Dii tempeſtatibus, et morbis, inſignivere. Vaſtata Campania turbine ventorum, qui villas, arbuſta, fruges paſſim disjecit, pertulitque violentiam ad vicina urbi. In qua omne mortalium genus vis peſtilentiæ depopulabatur, nullâ cœli intemperie, quæ occurreret oculis.* Petrus itaque et Paulus eo anno morti traditi, quo urbem peſtilentia

ing of affairs, when Nerva and Veſtinus were conſuls, which was the year of Chriſt 65, mentions a peſtilence in the city, violent ſtorms in ſome parts of Italy, and other calamities. So Pagi. And Baſnage [g] argues in the like manner from that paſſage of Oroſius.

The laſt mentioned learned chronologer likewiſe obſerves, that [h] Sulpicius Severus having given an account of the fire at Rome, and Nero's perſecution of the Chriſtians, and of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul therein, adds: 'Whilſt 'theſe things were doing at Rome, the Jews being uneaſy 'under the oppreſſions of their governor Geſſius Florus, be-'gin to rebel.' Upon which Baſnage obſerves: the [i] Jewiſh war began in May 66. Therefore the martyrdoms of the apoſtles happened in the year before, that is, 65. To which, perhaps, might be added, that [k] Suetonius, having ſpoken of the fire, the peſtilence, and thoſe calamities, which are mentioned by Tacitus, and Oroſius, takes notice, that at the ſame time Syria was difficultly kept from breaking out into a rebellion: intending, probably, the uneaſineſs of the Jewiſh people in 65, and 66.

Baſnage obſerves alſo, that [l] Epiphanius placeth the

peſtilentia afflixit. Quare, cum teſte Tacito, anno Chriſti ſexageſimo quinto peſtis Romæ graſſata fuerit, Principum Apoſtolorum martyrium perperam a Baronio ad præſentem annum dilatum. Pagi Ann. 67. n. iii.

[g] Jam vero ſæva hæc lues in Nervæ et Veſtini conſulatum incidit. Baſn. ann. 65. n. ix.

[h] Interea abundante jam Chriſtianorum multitudine, accidit, ut Roma incendio conflagraret, Nerone apud Antium conſtituto. Sed opinio omnium invidiam incendii in Principem retorquebat, credebaturque Imperator gloriam innovandæ urbis quæſiſſe. Neque ulla re Nero efficiebat, quin ab eo juſſum incendium putaretur. Igitur vertit invidiam in Chriſtianos, actæque in innoxios crudeliſſimæ quæſtiones. —— Hoc initio in Chriſtianos ſæviri cœptum. Poſt etiam datis legibus, religio vetabatur: palamque edictis propoſitis, Chriſtianum eſſe non licebat. Tum Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati: quorum uni cervix gladio deſecta, Petrus in crucem ſublatus eſt. Sulp. Sev. l. 2. c. 41.

Dum hæc Romæ geruntur, Judæi, præſidis ſui Geſſii Flori injurias non ferentes, rebellare cœperunt. ib. cap. 42.

[i] Bellum autem Judaicum incœpit anni ſequentis menſe Maio. Proindeque Apoſtolorum martyrium in præſens tempus conferendum. Baſn. an. 65. n. ix.

[k] Acceſſerunt tantis ex Principe malis, probiſque quædam et fortuita: peſtilentia unius autumni, quo triginta funerum millia in rationem Libitinæ venerant: Clades Britannica, —— ægreque Syria retenta. Sueton. Neron. cap. 39.

[l] —— μετα την τε αγιε πετρε και παυλε τελευτην την επι τω δωδεκατω ετει νερωνος γενομενην. Hær. 27. num. vi.

death

death of Peter and Paul in the twelfth year of Nero: part [m] of which, as he ſays, fell in the year 65.

I am the more inclined to this date, becauſe we do not find in the epiſtles of the New Teſtament any notice taken of the perſecution of the Chriſtians at Rome, or of the devaſtations in Judea, after the commencement of the war. If Peter and Paul had been in any of the provinces, and had ſurvived the terrible perſecution at Rome in 64, and 65, we ſhould have had ſome epiſtle, or epiſtles of theirs, concerning it, to the Romans, or to the Chriſtians of ſome other place.

I do not preſume to aſſign poſitively the year of the martyrdom of theſe two apoſtles. I have mentioned the ſpecious and probable arguments of two very eminent chronologers, in favour of the year 65. Nor do I think the apoſtles ſurvived that year. But I cannot ſay, whether their martyrdoms happened in the year 64, or 65. Pagi ſays, that [n] Peter and Paul were taken up and impriſoned in 64, and put to death in the year 65. But I know nothing of the impriſonment of the apoſtles at this time. There may be in late and fabulous authors large and particular accounts of their impriſonment, juſt before their martyrdoms. But there is little or no notice taken of it by the moſt ancient writers. If Peter and Paul were come to Rome before the city was ſet on fire, and before the perſecution of the Chriſtians began (which is not improbable) they might be taken up, and ſoon put to death, before the end of the year 64.

CHAP. XII.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

I. *The Introduction.* II. *The two Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians.* III. *The Epiſtle to the Galatians.* IV. *The firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians.* V. *The firſt Epiſtle to Timothy.* VI. *The Epiſtle to Titus.* VII. *The ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians.* VIII. *The Epiſtle to the Romans.*

[m] Pars autem anni Neroniani duodecimi ad præſentem ſpectat, utpote Octobris tertio et decimo incipientis. Baſn. an. 65. n. ix.

[n] Præterquam quod, cum perſecutio adverſus Chriſtianos anno lxiv. decreta fuerit, ac inſequenti continuata, non dubium, quin priori anno Petrus et Paulus in carcerem conjecti ſint, ac poſteriori necati. Ann. 67. num. iii.

IX. *The*

IX. *The Epiſtle to the Epheſians.* X. *The ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy.*
XI. *The Epiſtle to the Philippians.* XII. *The Epiſtle to the Coloſſians.*
XIII. *The Epiſtle to Philemon.* XIV. *The Epiſtle to the Hebrews.*

§ I. *The* INTRODUCTION.

I SHALL now endeavour to ſettle the time of St. Paul's epiſtles, of which Origen ſaid: 'If [a] any man reads them 'with attention, I am perſuaded, he will admire the writer's 'abilities in expreſſing great things in vulgar language: or, 'if he does not admire them, himſelf will appear ridiculous.'

It cannot but afford ſatisfaction, to know the order of time, in which they were written. It will not only be attended with pleaſure, but will alſo contribute to the right underſtanding of them. For wrong dates have been the occaſion of many miſtakes. Baronius obſerves, that ſome have imagined the ſhipwreck at Melita, related in Acts xxvii. to be one of the three, mentioned by St. Paul 2 Cor. xi. 25. not conſidering, that the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians had been written ſeveral years before. I have put the paſſage [b] in the margin, as quoted by Lewis Capellus. The author of the commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epiſtles, in the fourth century, made [c] the ſame miſtake, and

[a] See vol. II. p. 472.

[b] Quantum juvet, quamque ſit utile, certo tenere tempus, quo Pauli epiſtolæ ab eo fuerunt ſcriptæ, recte obſervavit Baronius ad A. C. 58. § xlii. Sed hic, inquit ille, et illud neceſſario monendum putamus lectorem, nonnullis accidiſſe, ut temporum ignoratione in maximos errores incidant, putantes nimirum naufragium apud Melitam paſſum, quod Lucas narrat Act. xxvii. unum e tribus fuiſſe a Paulo enumeratis 2 Cor. xi. non animadvertentes, ſecundam iſtam epiſtolam ad Corinthios longe ante illud naufragium eſſe ſcriptam. Quamobrem ſcrupuloſa, quæ videtur, in hiſtoria temporum indagatio quantum conferat ad veram atque germanam Divinæ Scripturæ interpretationem, quiſque facile judicabit. —— Hæc rectiſſime Baronius. Itaque hac in parte operam noſtram ejuſmodi indagatione poſt alios collocavimus. Lud. Cap. Append. ad Hiſt. Apoſt. p. 63. [c] *Nocte et die in profundo maris fui.*] Hoc factum eſt, quando miſſus eſt Romam, cum appellaſſet Cæſarem. Tunc deſperatione vitæ in alto, id eſt, in profundo maris fuit, mortem ante oculos habens. —— *Periculis in mari.* Jam ſuperius dixit: *Ter naufragium feci, nocte et die in profundo maris fui.* Quod aliud periculum fuit in mari. Sed hoc eſt periculum, quando in mari, hoc eſt, in navi, milites cogitaverant, omnes cuſtodias occidere, ne quis enatans effugeret. Quod periculum centurio prohibuit inferri, ne Paulus occideretur, ut eum vivum Romam produceret. In 2 ep. ad. Cor. xi. 25, 26. p. 202. ap. Ambroſ. in App. tom. II.

ſeveral

ſeveral others of a like kind, in explaining the paragraph of 2 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

Of St. Paul's fourteen epiſtles, thirteen have been generally received by catholic Chriſtians in all times. I therefore need not now allege the teſtimonies of ancient chriſtian writers, which may be ſeen in the preceding volumes of this work. But as the epiſtle to the Hebrews has been ſometimes doubted of, I ſhall obſerve the evidences of its genuineneſs. With regard to the others, I ſhall do little more than ſhow the time when they were written. And I would take it for granted, that they who are diſpoſed to examine the arguments in this chapter, have firſt read the hiſtory of St. Paul, in the preceding chapter: which will be of great uſe, and prevent the trouble of numerous references.

§ II. *The* TWO EPISTLES *to the* THESSALONIANS.

The firſt and ſecond epiſtles to the Theſſalonians are now generally allowed by learned interpreters and chronologers to be the two firſt written epiſtles of St. Paul. The time and place of writing them may be deduced from the epiſtles themſelves, and from the hiſtory of St. Paul's travels in the book of the Acts. Some have thought, that [d] the firſt at leaſt, if not alſo the ſecond, was written at Athens. But I ſuppoſe it to be now generally allowed, that [e] both theſe epiſtles were written at Corinth: whereby we are alſo aſſured of their time. For it was formerly ſhown to be probable, that [f] St. Paul came to Corinth before the end of the year 51, and ſtayed there till the beginning of the year 53.

In the Synopſis aſcribed to Athanaſius, the [g] firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, is ſaid to have been written at Athens, and [h] the ſecond, very abſurdly, at Rome.

Theodoret, as [i] before quoted, ſaw theſe to be the two firſt written epiſtles of the apoſtle. The [k] firſt he ſuppoſed to have been written at Athens, and the ſecond not long after, either at Athens or Corinth. For he does not ſeem to ſay diſtinctly, at which of theſe two cities the ſecond was written.

[d] Ante Pauli vincula omnium prima ſcripta eſt ad Theſſalonicenſes utraque. Scriptæ autem omnino videntur duæ iſtæ epiſtolæ Athenis. Lud. Cap. Hiſt. Ap. p. [illegible]. [e] Pearſon. Ann. Paulin. p. 11—13. Mill. Proleg. num. 4. et 6. [f] See before, p. 279, 280. [g] Synopſ. S. S. n. 66. ap. Athan. T. II. p. 196. [h] Num. 67. ib. p. 197. [i] Vol. V. p. 193. [k] Præf. in Ep. Pauli. T. III. p. 3.

written. Nevertheless I suppose it may be shown that they were both written at Corinth. St. Paul came from Thessalonica to Berea: which place he left in haste, because of the violence of the Jews, who came thither from Thessalonica, and *stirred up the people*, Acts xvii. 10—13. *And then, immediately*, says St. Luke, *the brethren sent away Paul, to go as it were to the sea. But Silas and Timothy abode there still. And they that conducted Paul, brought him unto Athens. And receiving a commandment unto Silas and Timothy to come to him with all speed, they departed*, ver. 14, 15. Accordingly, as we may suppose, Silas and Timothy did soon come to him. And Paul, having great concern for the Thessalonians, whilst he was at Athens, sent Timothy to them. As he says, 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2. *Wherefore, when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone. And sent Timothy, our brother and minister of God, and our fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and comfort you, concerning your faith.* From Athens Paul went to Corinth, where he stayed a year and six months. There Timothy came back to him from Thessalonica. Comp. Acts xviii. 5. and 1 Thess. iii. 6. And Silas, or Silvanus, and Timothy are joined with the apostle in the inscription of the epistle.

Near the end of this epistle, ch. v. 27. are these remarkable words: *I charge*, or adjure, *you by the Lord*, ορκιζω υμας τον κυριον, *that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.* It is likely, that from the beginning all christian assemblies had readings of the scriptures of the Old Testament. Paul, knowing the plenitude of the apostolical commission, now demands the same respect to be paid to his writings, with those of the ancient prophets. This is a direction fit to be inserted in the first epistle written by him. And the manner, in which it is given, suggests an argument that this was his first apostolical epistle.

The second epistle to the Thessalonians appears to have been written soon after the first, and at the same place. And Silvanus and Timothy are joined together with the apostle in the inscription of this epistle, as well as of the former.

These two epistles therefore I suppose to have been written at Corinth, in the year of Christ 52. Which is also the opinion of [1] Mill, and others. But by whom these epistles were carried to the Thessalonians, we do not perceive.

[1] Prolegom. num. 4—7.

Some

Some objections have been made againſt the above-mentioned date of theſe two epiſtles. But the point is ſo clear, that I do not think it worth the while to prolong this argument in examining them. They who are curious, may ſee thoſe objections well anſwered by Dr. Benſon, in the ſecond edition of * his hiſtory of the firſt planting the chriſtian religion.

§ III. *The* EPISTLE *to the* GALATIANS.

THE epiſtle to the Galatians is inſcribed after this manner: *Paul, an apoſtle,——and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia.* Upon which Jerom obſerves: 'In [n] other epiſtles Soſthenes and Silvanus, and ſometimes 'alſo Timothy, are mentioned at the beginning: but in 'this, for adding the greater weight and authority, are put '*all the brethren:* who, perhaps too, were believers of the 'circumciſion, and not deſpiſed by the Galatians. And the 'conſent of many is of great uſe to ſatisfy people. *To the 'churches of Galatia.* Here alſo, as he proceeds, it is to be 'obſerved, that in this place only, Paul writes in general, 'not to the church of one city only, but to the churches of 'a whole province: and that he calls them churches, whom 'afterwards he reproves as corrupted with error. Whence 'we learn, that a church may be underſtood in a two-fold 'manner: both of that which has no ſpot, or wrinkle, and 'is indeed the body of Chriſt: and of that which is aſſem-'bled in the name of Chriſt, without complete and perfect 'virtues.'

Tertullian [n] ſeems to have thought this one of St. Paul's firſt

* Vol. II. p. 119—122.

[n] In aliis epiſtolis Soſthenes et Silvanus, interdum et Timotheus, in exordio præponuntur: in hac tantum, quia neceſſaria erat auctoritas plurimorum, omnium fratrum nomen aſſumitur. Qui et ipſi forſitan ex circumciſione erant, et a Galatis non contemptui ducebantur. Plurimum quippe facit ad populum corrigendum multorum in una re ſententia atque conſenſus. Quod autem ait, *Eccleſiis Galatiæ*, et hoc notandum, quia hic tantum generaliter non ad unam eccleſiam unius urbis, ſed ad totius provinciæ ſcribat, eccleſias: et *eccleſias* vocet, quas poſtea errore arguat depravatas. Ex quo noſcendum, dupliciter eccleſiam poſſe dici: et eam, quæ non habet maculam aut rugam, et vere corpus Chriſti ſit: et eam, quæ in Chriſti nomine abſque plenis perfectiſque virtutibus congregetur. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 225.

[n] ——ab illo certe Paulo, qui adhuc in gratia rudis, trepidans denique, ne in vacuum cucurriſſet, aut

firſt written epiſtles: as has been obſerved by Grotius, [o] who tranſcribed the paſſage, though long, into his preface to the epiſtle to the Galatians. Fabricius [p] likewiſe has taken notice of it.

Theodoret, [q] the [r] Synopſis of ſacred ſcripture, aſcribed to Athanaſius, and [s] the author of the Argument in Œcumenius, reckon this among the epiſtles written at Rome, and conſequently a late epiſtle. But I ſee no ground for that opinion, there not being in the epiſtle any notice taken of an impriſonment at the time of writing it.

However Lightfoot [t] was alſo of the ſame opinion. He ſuppoſeth this to have been the firſt epiſtle written by St. Paul after his arrival at Rome. He ſays it was carried by Creſcens, arguing from 2 Tim. iv. 10. Which epiſtle to Timothy he thinks was written at Rome ſoon afterwards.

Chryſoſtom [u] ſays, this [x] epiſtle was written before that to the Romans. And in like manner [y] Theophylact, probably, borrowing from him.

Divers learned moderns have thought, that this epiſtle was written at Epheſus, after Paul's arrival there from his journey, related in Acts xviii. 23. and xix. 1. conſequently, after that the apoſtle had been a ſecond time in Galatia. To

aut curreret, tunc primum cum anteceſſoribus Apoſtolis conferebat. Igitur, ſi ferventer, ut adhuc neophytus, adverſus Judaiſmum aliquid in converſatione reprehendendum exiſtimavit, paſſivum ſcilicet convictum, poſtmodum et ipſe uſu omnibus omnia futurus, ut omnes lucraretur, Judæis quaſi Judæus, et eis qui ſub lege, tanquam ſub lege: tu illam ſolius converſationis, placituræ poſtea accuſatori ſuo, reprehenſionem, ſuſpectam vis haberi, etiam de prædicationis erga Deum prævaricatione. Tertull. adv. Marc. l. i. cap. 20. p. 443.

[o] Tertullianus in primo adverſus Marcionem, hanc epiſtolam inter primas Pauli fuiſſe exiſtimat. &c. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Gal.

[p] Scripſiſſe hanc epiſtolam adhuc neophitum, et in gratia rudem, adeoque inter primas non dubitat affirmare Tertullianus. — Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 155. [q] Τας μεν δη αλλας απο της ρωμης απεστειλε, και ταυτην μετηγαγε την προς γαλατας γραφηναι. Theod. Præf. in ep. Paul. T. III. p. 5. B. [r] Ap. Athan. T. II. p. 194.

[s] Arg. ep. ad Gal. ap. Œcum. T. I. p. 713. [t] Vol. I. p. 325.

[u] See of this work, vol. V. p. 134. [x] Δοκει δε μοι και η προς γαλατας προτερα ειναι της προς ρωμαιους. Chryſ. Proœm. ep. ad Rom. T. IX. p. 427. D. [y] Αλλα και η προς γαλατας προτερα εστι ταυτης προς ρωμαιους. Theoph. Arg. ep. ad Rom.

this

this purpoſe [a] Lewis Capellus, [a] Witſius, and [b] Wall. This likewiſe ſeems to have been the opinion of [c] Pearſon. For he placeth this epiſtle in the year 57, after the firſt to the Corinthians, and before Paul left Epheſus. But I do not diſcern his reaſons for ſo doing.

Grotius [d] thought it difficult to aſſign the time, when this epiſtle was written: but conjectures, that it was written about the ſame time with that to the Romans.

Fabricius ſays, 'the [e] deſign of the epiſtle is to diſſuade 'the Galatians from putting their neck under the yoke of 'the Moſaic law. And,' ſays he, 'to the like purpoſe the 'apoſtle writes to the Romans. But them he had never 'ſeen, and he treats them very reſpectfully, and enlargeth 'upon the doctrine of the goſpel with greater prolixity. To 'the Galatians he writes more briefly, and as their maſter, 'and not without ſome ſeverity in his reprehenſions. He 'adds, that he is inclined to their opinion, who ſuppoſe 'this epiſtle to have been written not long after that to the 'Romans, and in the way to Jeruſalem, in the year of 'Chriſt 58.'

Mill being a man of great judgment in theſe things, and what he ſays appearing at firſt ſight plauſible, I ſhall tran-

[a] Per idem tempus, nempe ſub finem bienii Epheſini videtur omnino ſcripta epiſtola ad Galatas. &c. Cap. Hiſt. ap. p. 69.

[a] Epiſtola ad Galatas temporis ſui hos characteres habet. Primum, quod non diu poſt Pauli ab iis diſceſſum ſcripta eſſe videatur. Sic enim ipſe cap. i. 6.—— Affuerat autem iis Paulus paullo antequam proficiſceretur Epheſum. Act. xviii. 23. coll. cum cap. xix. 1. Unde probabiliter ſaltem infertur Epheſi eſſe datam. Specialius, datam eſſe *fub finem bienii*, quod Paulus Epheſi exegit, inde colligit Capellus.—— Witſ. de Vit. Paul. ſect. viii. num. xxxii. [b] 'About this time, 'A. D. 55, when Paul had been at 'Epheſus a little while, he is ſup-'poſed to have written his epiſtle 'to the Galatians.' Wall's Notes upon the N. T. p. 164.

[c] Scribit primam ad Corinthios epiſtolam.——Scribit epiſtolam ad Galatas. Per Demetrium Epheſo pellitur. Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. 57. [d] Tempus, quo ſcripta eſt hæc epiſtola ad Gallogræcos epiſtola, ſicut deſignate indicare non poſſum, ita videre mihi videor, non longe abfuiſſe ab eo tempore, quo ad Romanos ſcripta eſt epiſtola. Gr. Pr. ep. ad Galat.

[e] Argumentum epiſtolæ eſt, Galatas dehortari, ne jugo Legis Moſaicæ iterum collum animaſque ſupponerent. Idem diſſuaſerat Romanis, ſed ad illos, quos nondum præſens ille docuerat, et ſcribit minus familiariter, et prolixius iis capita Chriſtianæ fidei exponit. Ad Galatas vero, et brevius omnia, et tanquam doctor ipſorum, ita ut nec a gravi increpatione ſibi temperet. ——Non poſſum tamen improbare eorum ſententiam, qui non diu poſt epiſtolam ad Romanos in itinere Hieroſolymam verſus A. C. 58. exaratam hanc epiſtolam arbitrantur. Fabr. ubi ſupra. p. 155.

ſcribe it below. He thinks, that [f] this epiſtle was not written, until after that to the Romans, probably, at Troas, or ſome other place in Aſia, as Paul was going to Jeruſalem. And he thinks, that Paul refers to the collections lately made in Macedonia and Greece, Gal. ii. 10. And the apoſtle writes not only in his own name, but alſo in the name of all the brethren, mentioned Acts xx. 4. who were with him at Troas, and accompanied him to Jeruſalem. Moreover, this epiſtle was written by the apoſtle with his own hand, and the more eaſily, and readily, though in a journey, becauſe he had juſt before treated the ſame argument in his epiſtle to the Romans. This epiſtle therefore is placed by Mill at the year 58.

Upon all which I beg leave to remark, as follows. Firſt, that thoſe words, *all the brethren which are with me*, need not to be underſtood of thoſe who were with Paul at Troas, and were ſetting out with him for Jeruſalem. Thereby may be intended the brethren of ſome other place, where Paul was. Secondly, the apoſtle Paul was able at any time to repreſent the doctrine of the goſpel to any churches, ſuitably to their particular caſe and circumſtances: whether he had juſt before treated of it in an epiſtle, or not. So that the agreement between the epiſtles to the Romans and the Galatians is no proof, that they were written very ſoon one after another. Thirdly, when Paul ſays, ch. ii. 10. *The ſame which I alſo was forward to do:* he cannot intend the collections made in Macedonia and Greece, with which he

[f] Paulo poſt dictatam hanc, quæ Romanis inſcripta eſt, ſcripſit Paulus epiſtolam ad Galatas, ut appareret ex cap. ii. 10. ο και εσπευδασα αυτο τουτο ποιησαι. His enim verbis aperte indicat Apoſtolus, epiſtolam hanc poſt miniſterium ſeu ſtudium, quod eleemoſynis pro eccleſia Hieroſolymitana colligendis impendebat, ſcripſiſſe ſe, dum aoriſto utitur, εσπευδασα —— ποιησαι. In itinere itaque verſus Hieroſolymam verſatus D. Paulus alicubi hanc epiſtolam exaraſſe videtur, et quidem Troade fortaſſis, ubi ſeptem dies moratus eſt; poſtquam in Aſiam veniens comperiſſet Galatas ad aliud evangelium ετω ταχεως tranſlatos fuiſſe. Auditâ nempe, jam ut videtur ab appulſu ejus in Aſiam, iſtâ αποστασια, arrepto calamo, propriâ manu, contra quam factum in aliis epiſtolis, (excepta forte unâ ad Philemonem) totam iſtam ſcripſit epiſtolam, acrem et objurgatoriam, nomine ſuo, omniumque, qui cum ipſo erant fratrum jam Troade, Sopatri, Ariſtarchi, Secundi, Gaii, Tychici, Trophimi, Titi, Silæ, aliorum. Scripſit autem eo celerius, et feſtinantius, quod idem argumentum in hac epiſtola proſequeretur, quod tractaverat paulo ante in epiſtola ad Romanos, cujus fere ſenſus in hanc transfundit. —— Scripta eſt ſtatim, ut dixi, poſt epiſtolam ad Romanos, anno æræ vulgaris lviii. Proleg. num. 30, 31.

was

was going to Jeruſalem. If that had been his meaning, he would have expreſſed himſelf more particularly, like to what he ſays to the Romans, ch. xv. 25—27. What he ſays here, he might have ſaid, when at Epheſus, before he ſet out for Macedonia, and indeed at any time, and in any place. For he had been always mindful of the poor in Judea. I apprehend, that the apoſtle's words are to be interpreted in this manner. *The ſame, which I alſo had endeavoured to do*, or *had been careful to perform*: referring to his conduct, even before that propoſal of the three apoſtles at Jeruſalem: and intending, probably, in particular, the contributions brought by himſelf and Barnabas from Antioch to Jeruſalem, ſome while before, as related Acts xi. 29. Which contributions, as may be well ſuppoſed, had been promoted by our apoſtle's exhortations. Fourthly, St. Paul ſays to the Galatians in this epiſtle. ch. i. 6. *I marvel, that ye are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Chriſt, unto another goſpel.* Thoſe expreſſions cannot poſſibly ſuit the date aſſigned by Mill, that is, after the paſſover of the year 58. Which muſt have been above four years after even Paul's ſecond journey in the country of Galatia.

Another opinion has been propoſed by the ingenious and thoughtful author [g] of Miſcellanea Sacra, and embraced by Dr. Benſon: that the epiſtle to the Galatians was written at Corinth, when the apoſtle was firſt there, and made a long ſtay of a year and ſix months. Whilſt Paul was there, he received tidings of the inſtability of his converts in Galatia, with which he was much affected. Whereupon he wrote this epiſtle, and ſent it by one of his aſſiſtants. At that ſeaſon he might well ſay at the beginning of his addreſs to them: *I marvel, that ye are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Chriſt.* Nor is there in the epiſtle any hint of his having been with them more than once. The epiſtle therefore was written at Corinth, or perhaps at Epheſus: when Paul was firſt there, in his way to Jeruſalem, as mentioned Acts xviii. 19—21.

This opinion is propoſed by the above-mentioned author, as his own. And I make no doubt, that it was ſo, and the fruit of his own inquiries and obſervations. Nevertheleſs it is not quite new. Say Lenfant and Beauſobre in their general

[g] See there the Abſtract of the Scripture Hiſtory of the Apoſtles, p. 31. and the Poſtſcript to the Preface, p. 56—58.

[h] Hiſtory of the firſt planting the Chriſtian Religion. B. 3. ch. v. § xi. vol. II. p. 118, 119. firſt edit. p. 136, 137. ſecond edit.

preface to St. Paul's epistles: 'We [i] find not in the epistle 'to the Galatians any mark, that can enable us to determine 'with certainty, at what time, or in what place, it was written. 'It is dated at Rome in some printed copies, and manuscripts. 'But there is nothing in the epistle itself, to confirm that 'date. Paul does not here make any mention of his bonds, 'as he does in all his epistles, written at Rome. He says 'indeed ch. vi. 17. that *he bears in his body the marks of the* 'Lord Jesus. But he had often suffered, before he came to 'Rome. There are therefore [k] some learned chronologers, 'who place the epistle to the Galatians immediately after the 'two epistles to the Thessalonians. They think, it was writ- 'ten between the third and fourth journey of Paul to Jeru- 'salem, and between his first and second journey into Galatia. 'This opinion appears to me very probable. For since the 'apostle says, *he wonders, that they were so soon turned unto ano-* 'ther gospel, this epistle must have been written a short time 'after he had preached in Galatia. Nor can we discern in the 'epistle any notice of the second journey, which St. Paul made 'into this country. For this reason it is thought, that the 'epistle to the Galatians was written at Corinth, where the 'apostle made a long stay, or else, in some city of Asia, par- 'ticularly Ephesus, where he stayed some days in his way to 'Jerusalem. Acts xviii. 19—21. Therefore, in all probability, 'the epistle to the Galatians was written from Corinth, or 'from Ephesus, in the year 52, or 53.'

Nothing could be said more properly. And I think, this date may be farther confirmed by some other considerations. Paul says to the Corinthians, xvi. 1. *Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, so do ye.* Which shows, that at the writing of that epistle to the Corinthians, in 56, he had a good opinion of his converts in Galatia, and that he had no doubt of their respect to his directions. Which, probably, had been sent to them from Ephesus, during his long abode there, by some one or other of his assistants. This good temper of the Galatians may be supposed owing to the letter sent to them some time before, and to his second visit to them, related Acts xviii. 23.

[i] § xlii. p. 24—26. [k] Here, in the margin, are put the names of Usher and L. Capellus, without any references. Nor have I found the places, where this opinion is maintained by them.

And

And now we ſhall be better able to account for what appears very remarkable. When Paul left Corinth, after his long ſtay there, he went to Jeruſalem, having a vow. In his way he came to Epheſus. Acts xviii. 19—21. *And when they deſired him to tarry longer with them, he conſented not. But bade them farewell, ſaying: I muſt by all means keep this feaſt that cometh at Jeruſalem. But I will return again unto you, if God will.* When we read this, we might be apt to think, that Paul ſhould haſten back to Epheſus, and return thither preſently after he had been at Jeruſalem. But inſtead of ſo doing, after he had been at *Jeruſalem, he went down to Antioch. And after he had ſpent ſome time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, ſtrengthening the diſciples*, ver. 22, 23. We now ſeem to ſee the reaſon of this courſe. At Corinth he heard of the defection of many in Galatia. Whereupon he ſent away a ſharp letter to them. But conſidering the nature of the caſe, he judged it beſt to take the firſt opportunity to go to Galatia, and ſupport the inſtructions of his letter. And both together had a very good effect. Gal. iv. 19, 20. *My little children, of whom I travel in birth again.——I deſire to be preſent with you, and to change my voice. For I ſtand in doubt of you:* or, I am perplexed for you. Now, then, we ſee the reaſon of the apoſtle's not coming directly from Jeruſalem to Epheſus. However, he was not unmindful of his promiſe, and came thither, after he had been in Galatia.

Upon the whole, the epiſtle to the Galatians is an early epiſtle. And, as ſeems to me moſt probable, was written at Corinth, near the end of the year 52, or at the very beginning of the year 53, before St. Paul ſet out to go to Jeruſalem by the way of Epheſus. But if any ſhould rather think, that it was written at Epheſus, during the apoſtle's ſhort ſtay there, in the way from Corinth to Jeruſalem, that will make but very little difference. And ſtill, according to our computation, this epiſtle was written at the beginning of the year 53.

Ch. vi. 11. *Ye [l] ſee how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand.*

Hereby ſome underſtand the apoſtle to ſay, that this, with what follows to the end of the epiſtle, was written with his own hand. So [m] Jerom, and [n] Grotius. Others underſtand St. Paul

[l] Ἴδετε πηλικοις υμιν γραμμασιν ἐγραψα τῃ ἐμῃ χειρι.

[m] Hi qui circumcidi Galatas volebant, diſſeminaverant, alia Paulum facere, alia prædicare.—— Hanc opinionem quia non poterta Paulus

St. Paul to speak of the whole epistle. So thought [o] Chrysostom, and [p] Theophylact, and [q] Theodoret, and [r] the author of the commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles. Which interpretation is approved by [s] Wolfius.

——*How long a letter I have written unto you.* Which some interpret after this manner: *in what large letters I have written unto you,* intending the deformity, or inelegance of the characters. Which sense is also found in [t] divers ancient authors.

But it is not approved of either by [u] Beza, or [x] Wolfius. They say, that this is as long as any of St. Paul's epistles, excepting

Paulus apud omnes præsens ipse subvertere —— seipsum per literas representat. Et ne aliqua suppositæ epistolæ suspicio nasceretur, ab hoc ipso usque ad finem manu sua ipse perscripsit, ostendens superiora ab alio exarata. Hieron. in ep. ad Gal. T. IV. p. 314. [n] In aliarum epistolarum fine quædam scribebat suâ manu. 1 Cor. xvi. 21. 2 Thess. iii. 17. et Col iv. 18. cætera manu aliena, ut videre est Roman. xvi. 22. Hic vero Paulus suâ manu scripsit omnia quæ sequuntur, ut recte putat Hieronymus. Id autem multum erat in homine adeo occupato, et, ut videtur, non multum assueto Græce scribere, *Qantis literis,* id est, *quam multis.* Solent adjectiva magnitudinis poni pro adjectivis ad numerum pertinentibus. Sic Græcum τοσοι, *tanti,* utroque sensu usurpatum. Grot. ad Galat. vi. 11.

[o] Ευταυθα ȣδεν αλλο αινιττεται, αλλ' οτι αυτος εγραψε την επιστολην απασαν, ο πολλης γνησιοτητος σημειον ην. κ. λ. Chr. in loc. T. X. p. 727. B.

[p] In loc. T. II. p. 492.

[q] Πασαν, ως εοικε, την δε την επιστολην αυτος εγραψε. Theod. in loc.

[r] Auctoritatem dat epistolæ suæ. —— Ubi enim holographa manus est, falsum dici non potest. In loc. ap. Ambros. in App. p. 250.

[s] Idem vero [Grotius] quamvis præunte Hieronymo, errat, quando hæc verba non ad totam hanc epistolam, sed ad ea tantum, quæ inde usque ad finem leguntur vult referri. Rectius Chrysostomus. —— Addit idem causam, cur totam epistolam sua manu exararit, ut nempe omnis νοθειας suspicio ιδιογραφῳ hoc præcideretur iis, qui dicere alioquin poterant, nonnulla illi inserta, quæ Apostoli sententiæ non responderent. Wolf. in loc.

[t] Το δε πηλικοις, εμοι δοκει ȣ το μεγεθος, αλλα την αμορφιαν των γραμματων εμφαινων λεγειν, μονονȣχι λεγων· οτι ουτε αριστα γραφειν ειδως, ομως ηναγκασθην δι εμαυτȣ γραψαι, ωστε των συκοφαντων εμφραξαι το στομα. Chr. ubi supr. p. 727. C.

Το δε πηλικοις γραμμασι, τινες, μεν μεγαλοις, τινες δε φαυλοις ηρμηνευσαν. Εγω γαρ φησιν, εγραψα την επιστολην, καιτοι μη γραφων εις καλλος. Theod. in loc. [u] *Quam longis,* πηλικοις. Ad verbum *quantis.* Vulgata *qualibus.* In quo explicando miror cur se tantopere torqueant interpretes, dum alii —— ad sublimitatem sententiarum referunt, ut Hilarius, alii ad ipsa literarum elementa, quæ grandiuscula fuerint, —— alii ad deformitatem characterum, quasi Paulus imperitus fuerit pingendarum literarum, ut exponit Theophylactus, Chrysostomum secutus. —— Sunt autem sane longiores epistolæ Romanis et Corinthiis inscriptæ, sed aliena manu exaratæ &c. Bez. ad loc. [x] *Ecce quantis,* i. e. *quam multis literis vobis scripsi.* Ita recte Grotius, addens, adjectiva

excepting the epiſtle to the Romans, the two epiſtles to the Corinthians, and that to the Hebrews. I may add another thought: that according to our computation this is the third apoſtolical epiſtle, written by St. Paul, and is much longer than either of thoſe to the Theſſalonians, which had been written before. However, undoubtedly, the apoſtle has regard to the quantity of his own hand-writing. The reſt of his epiſtles were written by others, while he dictated, (as is generally done by eminent men, much engaged,) and himſelf wrote only a few words, or ſentences, at the end: whereas this epiſtle was all in his own hand-writing.

And the original word is elſewhere uſed for epiſtle, or letter. Acts xxviii. 21. *We* [y] *have not received letters out of Judea concerning thee.*

So far therefore as I am able to judge, our Engliſh verſion is very right. *Ye ſee how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand.*

That is [z] Beza's tranſlation. Le Clerc [a] in his French Teſtament, and [b] Beauſobre tranſlate in the like manner.

In Beauſobre's remarks upon the New Teſtament, publiſhed after his death, is this note upon the text, we are conſidering: 'How [c] *large a letter*, πηλικοις γραμμασι. Some, ſays Theodoret, 'explain this of the largeneſs of the letters, others, that the 'letter was ill written: as if the apoſtle had ſaid: *I have written to you with my own hand, though I do not write well.* St.

jectiva magnitudinis pro adjectivis, ad numerum pertinentibus, poni ſolere, quemadmodum et Græcum πηλικος utroque ſenſu uſurpetur. —— Longius autem a vero aberrant, qui τα πηλικα ad deſignandam *characterum*, quibus uſus ſit, *magnitudinem*, ſpectare putant, ut πηλικα γραμματα ſint literæ majuſculæ. —— Addit [Le Cene] Apoſtolum hanc epiſtolam non potuiſſe appellare πηλικην reſpectu longitudinis, cum longiores ſcripſerit alias. Imo vero ſcriptionem non tam multorum verborum, quam quod eam totam ſuâ manu ſcripſerat, qui alias cæteris pauca quædam ſubſcribere conſueverit, longam appellat. Præterea hæc ad Galatas, ſi tres priores, et unam ad Hebræos exceperis, reliquas omnes longitudine excedit. Wolf in loc.

[y] Ημεις ουτε γραμματα περι σου εδεξαμεθα απο της ιουδαιας.

[z] Videtis quam longis literis vobis ſcripſerim mea manu. Bez.

[a] Voyez quelle grande lettre je vous ai écrite de ma main. Le Clerc.

[b] Voyez quelle grande lettre je vous ai écrite de ma propre main. B.

[c] *Quelle grande lettre.* Quelques uns, dit Theodoret, expliquoient ce mot de la grandeur des lettres, et d'autres de ce que la lettre étoit mal écrite, les caracteres mauvais: *Je vous ai écrit de ma main, quoique s'écrive mal.* St. Jerom dans ſon Commentarie ſur cet endroit, dit d'avoir ouï dire quelque choſe d'approchant, à quelqu'un dont il ne paroit pas approver la penſée. Beauſ. Remarques ſur le N. T. p. 466.

[c] Jerom

'Jerom, in his commentary upon this place, says, he had heard 'somewhat of the like kind from some body. But he does 'not seem to approve of it.' I transcribe at length [d] below the passage, referred to. But Jerom, having mentioned that observation of some learned man of his time, does himself seem to trifle, when he adds, 'That St. Paul's letter to the 'Galatians was great for the sense. And so were all his letters, 'though short.' However, this interpretation may be approved by some. It is in the note of Beza, above * transcribed.

§ IV. *The* FIRST EPISTLE *to the* CORINTHIANS.

THE first epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus, as all may perceive. Says the apostle 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9. *But I will tarry at Ephesus, until pentecost. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me. And there are many adversaries.* And ver. 19, he says: *The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord.* Those two good Christians had come with Paul from Corinth to Ephesus, when he was first there, and stayed but a short time. As appears from Acts xviii. 18, 19. And there they continued, as we suppose, till after Paul left Ephesus, to go into Macedonia.

This epistle is placed by [e] Pearson in the year 57. Mill thinks [f] it was written before the passover of the year 57.

According to our computation [g] of St. Paul's times and travels, this epistle was written at Ephesus, in the spring of the

[d] *Videte qualibus literis scripsi vobis:* non quod grandes literæ fuerint [hoc quippe in Græco sonat παλικοις:] sed quod suæ manus essent eis nota vestigia: ut dum literarum apices recognoscunt, ipsum se putarent videre, qui scripserat. In hoc loco vir apprime nostris temporibus eruditus, miror quomodo rem ridiculam loquutus sit. Paulus, inquit, *Hebræus erat, et Græcas literas nesciebat. Et quia necessitas expetebat, ut manu sua epistolam subscriberet, contra consuetudinem curvos tramites literarum exprimebat: etiam in hoc suæ ad Galatas indicia caritatis ostendens, quod propter illos id quoque quod non poterat, facere conaretur.* Grandibus ergo Paulus literis scripsit epistolam, quia sensus erat grandis in literis. —— Grandes Paulus literas non solum tunc ad Galatas, sed etiam hodie scribit ad cunctos: et quamvis parvi sint apices, quibus ejus epistolæ conscribuntur, tamen magnæ sunt literæ, quia in literis magnus est sensus. Hieron. Comm. in Gal. T. IV. p. 315. * See note *(u)* p. 313.

[e] Scribit primam ad Corinthos epistolam, cum Sosthene respondens epistolæ Corinthorum. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 15. Anno lvii.

[f] Quando igitur? Haud diu sane antequam ex Asia abiret anno æræ vulgaris. lvii. et quidem ante illius anni festum paschale. Prolog. num. 9. [g] See here, p. 254.

year

year 56. Which [h] was also the opinion of the French commentators before named, Lenfant and Beausobre. Some have argued from ch. v. 7. *For Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us*, that it was now the time of the Jewish passover, or that it was just over. But to me it seems, that the apostle might make use of that expression, and build an argument, or exhortation, upon it in any part of the year. And when a year was begun, he might speak of staying where he was, till some distant feast. And supposing the epistle to have been written early in the spring, he might think of continuing at Ephesus, till pentecost. This letter was carried to Corinth by Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaichus, mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18. who had come to the apostle from the Corinthians, and are supposed to have brought a letter with them. See 1 Cor. vii. 1. It was after writing this epistle, that the tumult happened, which was caused by Demetrius. For as Lightfoot [i] says: 'Between ver. "22 and 23 of this xixth chapter of the Acts falleth in the time of St. Paul's writing the first epistle to the Corinthians.' Consequently, this epistle was sent away, before the tumult raised by Demetrius, and other silversmiths, related by St. Luke Acts xix. 23—41. nevertheless, after Paul had fought with beasts at Ephesus, as he says, 1 Cor. xv. 32. When that tumult of Demetrius was appeased, Paul seems to have been at rest. And though he did not judge it prudent to stay any longer there, he took leave of his friends with deliberation. *And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia*, Acts xx. 1.

The first epistle to the Corinthians, therefore, according to our account, was written at Ephesus, in the beginning, or the spring, of the year 56.

§ V. *The* FIRST EPISTLE *to* TIMOTHY.

THE first epistle to Timothy was written, according to [k] Pearson, [l] Whitby, [m] Basnage, [n] Cave, [o] Fabricius, [p] Mill, and others, in the year of Christ 64, or 65, some while after St. Paul's

[h] La i. Epistre aux Corinthiens fut écrite d'Ephese au printemps de l'année 56. Pref. Gen. sur les ep. de S. Paul. § 45. p. 27.

[i] Vol. p. 299.

[k] Pearson Annal. Paulin. An. 64. p. 22.

[l] Wh. in his preface to the epistle.

[m] Ann. 62. n. vii.

[n] Cav. H. L. in Paulo.

[o] Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. T. III. p. 157.

[p] Proleg. num. 123.

Paul's releaſe from his confinement at Rome. In [q] Lightfoot this is the epiſtle written next after the firſt to the Corinthians. It is the ſame in [r] Baronius, and [s] Eſtius. Who ſay, that this epiſtle was written in Macedonia, when Paul was there the ſecond time. In this date agree in the main [t] Dr. Benſon, and [u] Dr. Doddridge. This alſo was the opinion of Hammond, as may be ſeen in his preface to this epiſtle. Witſius, after having conſidered the reaſons of Lightfoot and Pearſon in behalf of their ſeveral opinions, heſitates [x] and cannot ſay, exactly, when this epiſtle was written: though he does not judge it needful to defer it ſo long, as Pearſon did, that is, till after St. Paul's deliverance from his impriſonment at Rome. Lewis Capellus was in doubt, which was firſt written, whether [y] the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, or the firſt epiſtle to Timothy. However, he thinks, that both were written not long after St. Paul had left Epheſus, to go into Macedonia. Conſequently his opinion was not very different from that of Lightfoot, Baronius, and Eſtius, before recited.

According to Theodoret, in his general preface to St. Paul's epiſtles, the firſt four are the two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, and the firſt and ſecond to the Corinthians. 'The [z] fifth, ſays 'he, is the firſt epiſtle to Timothy. For after the introduction 'he ſays: *As I beſought thee to abide ſtill at Epheſus, when I went 'into Macedonia, that thou mighteſt charge ſome, that they receive*

num. 123. [q] See Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 307. [r] An 57. num. 187. [s] Scripta eſt autem hæc epiſtola, poſteaquam Paulus, Epheſo relictâ, ſicut habetur initio xx. cap. Actorum, profectus eſt in Macedoniam. Id quod ipſius epiſtolæ verba ſtatim initio declarant. Unde cum Cardinale Baronio colligimus, in Macedonia ſcriptam eſſe. Eſt. arg. 1 ep. ad Timoth. p. 758.

[t] Hiſtory &c. B. 3. ch. vii. ſect. v. p. 167. &c. firſt edit. p. 184. &c. ſec. edit. See alſo his preface to the firſt ep. to Tim. ſect. iii.

[u] See Family Expoſitor, vol. III. p. 305. note *(e)* p. 319. note *(b)* p. 332. note *(r)*.

[x] Non tamen æque conſtat, ſcriptionem epiſtolæ differendam eſſe ad ſolutionem Pauli a Romanis vinculis. Neque enim omnia Pauli itinera deſcripſit Lucas, ſed notabiliora quædam. —— Pronunciemus itaque, de tempore, quo ſcripta eſt prior Pauli ad Timotheum epiſtola, non liquere. Witſ. de Vit. Paul. ſect. 9. num. v.

[y] Poſterior ad eoſdem Corinthios epiſtola, et prior ad Timotheum, certant de proprietate, et ſub judice lis eſt. Utraque autem ſcripta eſt paullo poſtquam Paulus Epheſo diſceſſiſſet, adeoque dum Macedoniam peragraret. Sed utra tempore præcedat, non liquet. Lud. Cap. Hiſt. Ap. p. 72.

[z] Πεμπτην ηγεμαι των προς τιμοθεον την προτεραν. Μετα γαρ δε το πρωτον ετω φησι· Καθως παρεκαλεσα σε προσμειναι εν εφεσω, πορευομενος εις μακεδονιαν. —— Δηλον τοινυν, ως και το δευτερον απο της εφεσου παρεγενετο εις μακεδονιαν ο μακαριος παυλος, τοτε τα παντα αριστον τιμοθεον εκει καταλελοιπως, εις επιμελειαν των δεξαμενων το σωτηριον κηρυγμα. Præf. in ep. Paul. T. III. p. 3, 4.

'It

'*no other doctrine*, 1 Tim. i. 3. It is manifest therefore, that 'when Paul went the second time into Macedonia, he left the 'most excellent Timothy at Ephesus, to take care of those who 'had received the salutary doctrine.'

I shall now endeavour to show at length the grounds of this opinion.

St. Luke expressly says, Acts xx. 1. *And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia.* And St. Paul says, in the place just cited, 1 Tim. i. 3. *As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia.* And St. Luke informs us, ch. xix. 21, 22. *After these things were ended, Paul purposed in spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia to go to Jerusalem.——So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministred unto him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for some season.* Then follows an account of the tumult at Ephesus. Some while after those messengers, Timothy and Erastus, were gone to Macedonia, and Greece, Paul, as it seems, wrote, and sent away his first letter to the Corinthians. From which letter we plainly perceive, that Timothy was in those parts. For so it is said in 1 Cor. iv. 17. *For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy.* And ch. xvi. 10, 11. *Now, if Timothy come, see that he may be with you without fear.——Let no man therefore despise him, but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me. For I look for him with the brethren.* Whence it appears, that at concluding that letter Paul was in expectation of Timothy's return to Ephesus. And very probably he did return before Paul went thence. Moreover St. Luke said just now, that after Timothy and Erastus had been sent into Macedonia, *Paul himself stayed in Asia for a season.*

St. Paul, in the place above cited, says, 1 Tim. i. 3. that he *besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia.* Does not that term, beseeching, or entreating Timothy, imply some difficulty in the service required of him? And do we not see, what apprehensions Timothy might be under upon being left at Ephesus, where Paul had met with much opposition, and some very lately? 'A [a] soft word,' says Beza upon the place, 'to be used by one of much supe-'rior authority.' But if we consider the dangers of our sup-

[a] Παρακαλέσα. *Sum precatus, vel* quens quibusvis, in maxima etiam *rogavi.* Blando vocabulo utitur, auctoritate constitutis. Bez. in loc. egregiæ modestiæ exemplum relin-

posed

poſed time, we may ſee the reaſon of Paul's ſpeaking in that manner to Timothy.

Again. 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15. *Theſe things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee ſhortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayeſt know, how thou oughteſt to behave thyſelf in the houſe of God.* Words, which mightily ſuit the preſent time. St. Paul went into Macedonia, with a deſign to forward the collections for the poor ſaints in Judea, and then to go to Jeruſalem. And it may be well ſuppoſed, that he had then hopes of calling in at Epheſus, in his way to Judea, and there ſeeing Timothy. However, he could not yet ſay the time. Which alſo is plainly agreeable to the apoſtle's circumſtances at this ſeaſon. For we perceive from what St. Luke writes in the Acts, and from the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, written ſome while afterwards in Macedonia, that Paul was not then able long before hand to fix reſolutions about the time of journies to be undertaken by him.

Farther, the time aſſigned by Pearſon, and thoſe who agree with him, muſt be wrong. It appears from Acts xx. 17.— that when Paul was going to Jeruſalem in the former part of the year 58, there were elders at Epheſus, and probably, in the neighbouring cities of Aſia. But when Paul wrote this epiſtle, there ſeems to have been a want of ſuch officers at Epheſus, or thereabout. For a main deſign of it appears to be, to inſtruct Timothy in the proper qualifications of ſuch men, and to admoniſh him to uſe great care and caution in the choice of them.

Once more, I am of opinion, that the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was written, ſoon after Paul had been brought to Rome a priſoner from Judea. Therefore, if this epiſtle be prior to it, it muſt have been written, before Paul went to Jeruſalem, with the contributions of the Chriſtians of Greece, and Macedonia, and other places.

There is, however, a difficulty attending our ſuppoſition. For Timothy is joined with Paul in the inſcription at the beginning of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, generally allowed to have been written in Macedonia. And in Acts xx. 4. Timothy is mentioned among thoſe, who accompanied Paul into Aſia, when he was going to Jeruſalem with the above-mentioned contributions. All which may induce ſome to think, that either Timothy did not return to Paul, before he left Epheſus: or that Paul took Timothy with him, when he went into Macedonia.

To

To which I anſwer: we have ſhowed it to be very probable, that Timothy returned to Epheſus before Paul left it. The apoſtle therefore might ſend Timothy this letter from Macedonia, and afterwards ſend for him, to come thither to him, having ſome ſpecial occaſion for his aſſiſtance. And though this was not entirely agreeable to the apoſtle, he might be the rather diſpoſed to it, hoping, that as he went to Jeruſalem, he ſhould have an opportunity to leave Timothy at Epheſus. Which, as I apprehend, he did, when he came to Miletus.

Farther, this difficulty is very much abated by the account formerly given of this period of our apoſtle's hiſtory. For it was then ſhown, that there was a ſpace of almoſt two years between St. Paul's going from Epheſus, when he went into Macedonia, and his coming to Troas, in the way to Jeruſalem. Timothy therefore may have reſided at Epheſus above a year, and yet be with the apoſtle at the writing of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, which was not ſent to them till near the end of the year 57.

Dr. Benſon [b] ſuppoſeth this epiſtle to have been written at Troas, ſoon after the apoſtle was come from Epheſus. And indeed, many learned men think, that Paul now went into Macedonia by the way of Troas. This has been collected from 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. But that appears to me a difficult text. And it may be diſputed, whether Paul there refers to his journey from Epheſus. For it is difficult to conceive, how the apoſtle could have reaſon to expect Titus at Troas at that ſeaſon: conſidering, that his removal from Epheſus had been ſudden, or however, ſomewhat ſooner than he had intended. How then was it poſſible for him to have made an appointment for Titus to meet him at Troas punctually at the time of his arrival there.

But allowing Paul to have gone from Epheſus to Macedonia by the way of Troas, it will not follow, that this epiſtle was written there. It may be concluded from 1 Tim. i. 3. that the apoſtle was now in Macedonia, or had been there, ſince he left Epheſus. Accordingly, Lightfoot, Baronius, and Eſtius, before named, ſuppoſe this epiſtle to have been written in Macedonia. Says [c] Lightfoot: 'It is apparent from 1 Tim. 'i. 3. that this epiſtle was written after Paul's ſetting out from 'Epheſus for Macedonia.——Now it cannot be conceived

[b] See his preface to the firſt epiſtle to Timothy, ſect. iii.

[c] Harmony of N. T. vol. I, p. 307.

'to

'to have been written, when he was going toward Macedonia. 'For then he was but newly parted from Timothy. And it is 'not likely, that he would ſo write to him, when he was but 'newly come from him. —— Therefore it cannot but be con- 'cluded, that this epiſtle was written whilſt he was in Mace- 'donia, or the parts thereabout, at this time that we are 'upon.' To which I readily aſſent.

I ſhall add only, what is alſo already hinted by Lightfoot, that it is very improbable, that the apoſtle ſhould uſe thoſe expreſſions. 1 Tim. iii. 14. *hoping to come and ſee thee ſhortly*, before he had been in Macedonia. St. Paul was much more likely to ſay this, when he had been ſome months abſent from Epheſus, than when he had been come away but a few days only.

I ſhould now ſay more particularly, when this epiſtle was written. And I think, it muſt have been written in the year 56. In the beginning of that year, according to our account, Paul wrote the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians. Before pentecoſt in that year he left Epheſus. And before the end of that year, I ſuppoſe, he might write this epiſtle to Timothy. The place is not abſolutely certain. Before writing this epiſtle the apoſtle had been in Macedonia, ſince he left Epheſus. But whether he was now in that country, cannot, I apprehend, be fully determined by thoſe expreſſions, 1 Tim. i. 3. However, this may be reckoned very likely, that the apoſtle was either in Macedonia, or near it. Lewis Capellus, as before obſerved, was in doubt, which was firſt written, this epiſtle, or the ſecond to the Corinthians. About that I have no doubt. We ſhall ſoon ſee clear proof, that the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians was written not long before the end of the year 57. This firſt epiſtle to Timothy was written in the year 56, and probably, ſome good while before the end of it.

§ VI. *The* Epistle *to* Titus.

Says Theodoret immediately after what was tranſcribed from him above concerning the firſt epiſtle to Timothy: 'After that, [d] as I think, was written the epiſtle to Titus. 'For being ſtill in thoſe parts, he deſired Titus to come to

[d] Μετα ταυτην υπολαμβανω την προς τιτον γεγραφθαι· εν εκεινοις γαρ ετι διαγων τοις μερεσι, καταλαβειν αυτον παρηγγυηκε. Λεγει δε ουτως· ὅταν πεμψω αρτεμαν. —— Την δε μακεδονιαν θρακικην μεν πολιν ειναι φασι, τη δε μακεδονια πελαζειν. Theod. T. III. p. 4. C.

'him,

'him, ſaying: *When I ſhall ſend unto thee Artemas, or Tychicus, 'be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis. For I have determined 'to winter there,* Tit. iii. 12. They ſay, that Nicopolis is a 'city of Thrace, nigh unto Macedonia.' So writes Theodoret in his general preface to St. Paul's epiſtles. And in his note upon Tit. iii. 12. he ſays, 'Nicopolis [e] is a city of Thrace, 'nigh unto Macedonia. It is manifeſt therefore, that he 'wrote this epiſtle when he was in Macedonia and Achaia.'

Following the opinion of this learned ancient, which I think to be very right, the epiſtle to Titus was written in the year 56, and Paul ſpent the winter of that year at Nicopolis.

If it be aſked, when was Paul in Crete? I anſwer, in general: a ſhort time, before he wrote this epiſtle, as may appear from thoſe words: *For this cauſe left I thee in Crete, that thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed thee,* ch. i. 5. More particularly, I ſuppoſe, that Paul had been in Crete in this year 56, ſince he came from Epheſus, to go into Macedonia. About this time, I think, he was in Crete, and Illyricum, as well as in Macedonia. But as I do not indulge myſelf in making conjectures, I do not attempt to deſcribe the order of the apoſtle's voyages. It was before ſhown to be probable, that [f] between Paul's leaving Epheſus in the ſpring of the year 56, and his coming to Troas, after the paſſover, in the year 58, in his way to Jeruſalem, there was the ſpace of about two years. In that time Paul might do, and probably did more than is particularly related by St. Luke. Few learned men, conſidering the conciſeneſs of St. Luke's manner of writing, can make any difficulty to allow, that [g] he has not related all the apoſtle's journies. It is obſervable, that Titus was the perſon, who was ſent by Paul into Dalmatia, when he was come to Rome. As appears from 2 Tim. iv. 10. Which may be reckoned an argument, that he had been there before.

About this time the epiſtle to Titus was written, according to the opinion of divers learned men, to whom I refer: as [h]

[e] Της θρακης εστιν η νικοπολις, τη δε μακεδονια πελαζει. Δηλον τοινυν ως και εκειση του καιρου, καθ' ον εν τη μακεδονια και αχαια διετριβεν, εγραψε τη επιστολην. Ibid. p. 515. A.

[f] See before, p. 284—286.

[g] Neque enim omnia Pauli itinera deſcripſit Lucas, ſed notabiliora quædam. Witſ. de Vita Pauli. Sect. 9. num. v.

[h] Baron. Ann. 57. num. ccix.

Baronius, [i] Capellus, [k] Hammond, and [l] Lightfoot. Eſtius [m] could not determine the time of this epiſtle exactly: but he thought, it was written before the apoſtle's impriſonment at Jeruſalem, and Rome.

Cave in his [n] Hiſtoria Literaria placeth this epiſtle in the year 63. But, when he wrote the lives of the apoſtles, he [o] ſuppoſed it to have been written ſoon after the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians.

Mill [p] placeth this epiſtle in the year 64. Pearſon [q] in 65. Paul having, as he ſuppoſes, been in Crete, and left Titus there the year before, that is, in 64. And many others may be of the ſame opinion.

But this appears to me too late a date. All that is ſaid of Paul's going into Spain, and Crete, and ſome other places, after being releaſed from his impriſonment at Rome, is mere conjecture, without any good authority, either from the books of the New Teſtament, or very early antiquity. It is not likely, that Paul, who in his epiſtle to Philemon calls himſelf *aged*, ſhould after that undertake new work. It is more probable, that he went to ſuch places, where he had been before, and where he had diſciples already: as he intimates in his epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, Philemon, the Hebrews. Nor is it at all likely, that [r] the Cretans ſhould have been ſo long without being inſtructed in the doctrine of the goſpel, as Pearſon ſuppoſeth.

I have already ſhown the moſt probable date of the firſt epiſtle to Timothy. It is likely, that the epiſtle to Titus was written about the ſame time. For the ſtate of things in both appears to be very ſimilar. In both are inſtructions concerning the qualifications of elders, or biſhops, and deacons. So

[i] Lud. Capell. Hiſt. Ap. p. 16. et 66. Vid. et Jacob. Cap. Compend. in apoſt. hiſt. Chronol. Tab.

[k] Præf. in ep ad Tit. [l] Lightfoot's Works, vol. I. p. 309, 310.

[m] Quando ſcripta ſit hæc epiſtola, non liquet, nec facile ex Actis Apoſt. colligi poteſt, quod in iis non legatur Paulus Cretam ingreſſus fuiſſe. Veriſimile eſt, ante captivitatem Apoſtoli, quia vinculorum hic nulla mentio. Imo, cum dicit cap. iii *ibi enim ſtatui hyemare*, plane ſignificat, non eſſe vinctum. Eſt. Argum. ep. ad Tit.

[n] Epiſtola ad Titum —— data anno 63. e medio aliquo loco inter Macedoniam et Nicopolim Illic enim hyemare decreverat. H. L. in Paulo. [o] See there the Life of St. Paul, ſect. iv. num. ix.

[p] Proleg num 122. [q] Ann. Paulin. p. 20—22.

[r] Non veriſimile eſt, ad illud uſque tempus ignoratum fuiſſe Chriſtum in Creta: quum tota Achaia, Macedonia, Aſia, Cyprus, Syria, perſonarent evangelii præconio. Witſ. de Vita Pauli. ſect. v. num. i.

1 Tim. iii. and Tit. i. Nor is it reaſonable to think that Paul ſhould have occaſion, ſo late as the Year 64, or 65, to ſend to his aſſiſtants and fellow-labourers ſuch particular directions concerning that matter, as are in theſe two epiſtles. It is probable, that inſtructions of that kind had been given ſooner. Moreover, the like errors are guarded againſt in both theſe epiſtles. 1 Tim. i. 4. *Neither give heed to fables, and endleſs genealogies.*——Ch. iv. 7. *But refuſe profane and old wives' fables.*——Ch. vi. 20. *Avoiding profane and vain bablings.*—— Tit. iii. 9. *But avoid fooliſh queſtions, and genealogies, and contentions, and ſtrivings about the law. For they are unprofitable and vain.* See alſo ch. i. 10—14. In both are like directions for paying a proper regard to civil magiſtrates. 1 Tim. ii. 1—6. and Tit. iii. 1—3. There are alſo like directions concerning relative duties, particularly thoſe of maſters and ſervants, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2. Tit. ii. 9, 10. Timothy and Titus are in a like manner exhorted, to take heed to themſelves, and their doctrine, and to be examples of virtue. 1 Tim. i. 18, 19. iv. 6, 16. Tit. ii 1—8. I might add, that near the concluſion of each epiſtle the practice of good works is in a very ſimilar manner enjoined upon the converts to Chriſtianity.

It appears from many texts of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, written in Macedonia, that about this time Paul had the aſſiſtance of Titus in thoſe parts. And Tychicus, mentioned Tit. iii. 12. was likewiſe with Paul at this time: for he was one of the company that went with him into Aſia, Acts xx. 4. And therefore, probably, not he, but Artemas, had been ſent into Crete, to relieve Titus. Moreover, Apollos was at Epheſus, a little before Paul left that city, to go into Macedonia. That is manifeſt from 1 Cor. xvi. 12. And it may be reckoned very probable, that he did not ſtay long at Epheſus after Paul: but either went with him into Macedonia, or came into thoſe parts ſoon afterwards. So that Paul might now have occaſion to recommend him to Titus, in Crete, together with Zenas, Tit. iii. 13.

There are not in this epiſtle any tokens of Paul's great age, or of his being near the period of his miniſtry. He is plainly at liberty at the time of writing this epiſtle. Nor are there any intimations of his having as yet endured any long impriſonment.

This letter may be the ſhorter, becauſe, probably, Paul had lately written at length upon the ſame ſubject to Timothy. Moreover, Titus was older, and might have more experience. Chryſoſtom judged [s] the brevity of this epiſtle to be an argument of the ability of Titus. 'He did not need a long exhortation. A few hints were ſufficient.'

St. Paul ſays, Tit. iii. 12. *When I ſhall ſend Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis. For I have determined there to winter.* Thereby Theodoret underſtood Nicopolis in Thrace, as ſeen above. So likewiſe Chryſoſtom. [t] But Jerom [u] ſuppoſed the apoſtle to mean Nicopolis in Epirus. Neither of theſe interpretations is any prejudice to our argument. In which-ſoever of thoſe countries Nicopolis was ſituated, the apoſtle was as likely to be there at the time ſuppoſed by us, as at any other.

At Nicopolis the apoſtle wintered, in the year 56, according to my computation. Conſequently, this letter was written ſome time before, in the ſame year 56. When the winter was over, Paul came into Macedonia, where he had been before, ſince he came from Epheſus. From Macedonia he came into Greece.

§ VII. *The* SECOND EPISTLE *to the* CORINTHIANS.

WHILST the apoſtle was in Macedonia, at this time, he wrote the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, A. D. 57.

Concerning this there can be no doubt, if we attend to the epiſtle itſelf. From which it plainly appears, that the apoſtle was then in Macedonia, and was going to Greece, particularly to Corinth. So 2 Cor. ix. 1—5. *For as touching the miniſtring to the ſaints, it is ſuperfluous for me to write unto You. For I know the forwardneſs of your mind, for which I boaſt of you to them of Macedonia: that Achaia was ready a year ago —— Yet have I ſent the brethren —— leſt haply, if they of Ma-*

[s] —— βραχειαν δε ποιει την επιστολην, εικοτως. Και τουτο δε της αρετης του τιτου τεκμηριον ην, το μη δεισθαι λογων πολλων, αλλ' ωσπερ τινος υπομνησεως. In. Tit. hom. i. tom. XI. p 730. B.

[t] Ἡ δ' νικοπολις της θρακης εστι. Chryſ. in Tit. hom. 6. ib p. 766. B.

[u] Scribit igitur Apoſtolus, ò Paula et Euſtochium, de Nicopoli, quæ in Actiaco littore ſita, nunc poſſeſſionis veſtræ pars vel maxima eſt. &c. Hieron. Pr. in ep. ad Tit. T. IV. P. I. p. 407.

Nicopolis ipſa eſt, quæ ob victoriam Auguſti, quod ibi Antonium et Cleopatram ſuperârit, nomen accepit. Id in Tit. cap. iii. ib. p. 439.

[x] Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. lvii.

cedonia

cedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we ſay not you) ſhould be aſhamed in this ſame confident boaſting. Therefore I thought it neceſſary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your bounty.——See alſo ch. viii. and ch. xiii. 1. *This is the third time I am coming to you.*

According to Pearſon [x] this epiſtle was written in Macedonia, in the year 57, according to [y] Mill, near the end of that year. I likewiſe think that it was written in the year 57, probably, in September, or October. For the apoſtle, plainly, was ſoon to go to Corinth, where he might arrive, as I apprehend, in November.

I ſuppoſe it was now above a year ſince writing the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians. The reaſons of that ſuppoſition were mentioned [z] formerly. And need not to be repeated here.

Timothy was with Paul at writing this epiſtle: for his name is in the inſcription. It is likely, that [a] he had come from Epheſus to the apoſtle in Macedonia, either upon occaſion of ſome affairs of that church, or at the deſire of the apoſtle, who needed his aſſiſtance. As before ſaid.

§ VIII. *The* Epistle *to the* Romans.

The epiſtle to the Romans is dated by [b] Pearſon in the year 57, by [c] Mill in the year 58. According to our computation of Paul's journies there can be no reaſon to heſitate about either the time, or the place of this epiſtle. It was written at Corinth in the beginning of the year 58, before Paul ſet out on his journey to Jeruſalem.

As St. Luke's few words in Acts xx. 1, 2, 3. afford great light, and are a ſure guide, I recite them here. *And after*

[x] Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. lvii.
——ſub finem, ut videtur, anni æræ vulgaris lvii. Proleg. num. 21.

[z] See before, p. 284, 285.

[a] Fateor, cum Paulus eſſet in Macedonia, una cum illo fuiſſe Timotheum. 2 Cor. i. 1. et poſtea hyemem tranſegiſſet in Epiro. Tit. iii. 12. ac per tres menſes commoratus in Græcia. Act. xx. 2, 3. reverſuſque eſſet in Macedoniam, illi adfuiſſe Timotheum. Act. xx. 4. ac recta cum illo iviſſe Troadem. Quæ omnia contingere potuerunt, poſtquam Paulus reliquiſſet Timotheum Epheſi: ex qua urbe tamen iverit ad Paulum, ſive propter negotia Epheſinæ eccleſiæ, de quibus Paulum conſuli ab eo oporteret, vel ut pareret Paulo, quem, ut videmus, et poſtea inviſit, longiore itinere, Romam uſque. 2 Tim. iv. 9. Hammond. Præf. in 1 ep. Timoth. ex verſione Clerici.

[b] Annal. Paulin. p. 15.

[c] Proleg. num. 26.

the uproar was ceaſed, Paul called unto him the diſciples, and embraced them, and departed [from Epheſus] *for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over thoſe parts, and given them much exhortation, he came into Greece. And there abode three months.* In the ſpace of theſe three months was written the epiſtle to the Romans.

According to Theodoret the epiſtle to the Romans [d] is the ſeventh in order of time, having been written by the apoſtle after the two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, and to the Corinthians, the firſt to Timothy, and the epiſtle to Titus. He adds: 'That [e] the epiſtle to the Romans was written 'from Corinth, is manifeſt from the concluſion. For there 'the apoſtle recommends Phœbe, calling her *deaconneſs of the 'church in Cenchrea*, which was a borough of the Corinthians, 'Rom. xvi. 1. Beſides, he ſays: *Gaius, my hoſt, and of the 'whole church, ſaluteth you*, ver. 23. By *hoſt* he means the 'perſon, who entertained him. And that Gaius was a 'Corinthian, we learn from the firſt epiſtle to the Corin-'thians. For thus he writes to them: *I thank God, that I 'baptized none of you, but Criſpus, and Gaius*, 1 Cor. i. 14. 'The epiſtle to the Romans therefore is the laſt of the 'epiſtles written from Aſia, and Macedonia, and Achaia: 'and is the ſeventh in order, as has been ſhown. The reſt 'were ſent from Rome.' So Theodoret. Who might have added, as a proof, that this epiſtle was written at Corinth, what follows in ver 23. *Eraſtus, the chamberlain of the city, ſaluteth you.* For by *the city* I ſuppoſe to be meant Corinth. But whether this Eraſtus be the ſame, who is mentioned by St. Luke Acts xix. 22. as one of St. Paul's aſſiſtants, I cannot ſay certainly.

The time of writing this epiſtle is farther manifeſt hence. It was written after that Paul had completed his collections in Macedonia, and Achaia, and when he was ſetting out for Jeruſalem. For ſo he writes, ch. xv. 25, 26. *But now I go unto Jeruſalem, to miniſter unto the ſaints. For it has pleaſed them of Macedonia, and Achaia, to make a certain contribution for the poor ſaints, which are at Jeruſalem,*——ver. 30, 31. *Now I beſeech you, brethren,*——*that ye ſtrive together with me, in prayers to God for me: that I may be delivered from them that do*

[d] Ἐδόμην τὴν πρὸς ῥωμαίους ἐπιστειλε· μετὰ γὰρ δὴ ταύτας ἁπάσας ταύτην αὐτὸς γεγραφέναι διδάσκει, κ. λ. Theod. T. III. p. 4. C.

[e] Ibid. p. 5.

not

not believe in Judea, and that my ſervice, which I have for Jeruſalem, may be accepted of the ſaints.

Conſequently, it is probable, that it was now near the end of the *three months*, that the apoſtle ſtayed in Greece. Whence *he returned to Macedonia, and after the days of unleavened bread, ſailed from Philippi, to Troas*, upon the continent of Aſia, Acts xx. 3—6. And then went to Jeruſalem, where he arrived about the time of pentecoſt in the year 58.

If St. Paul came to Corinth in November 57, the epiſtle to the Romans might be ſent thence in the month of February, in the year 58.

§ IX. *The* EPISTLE *to the* EPHESIANS.

CONCERNING St. Paul's epiſtles, written during his impriſonment at Rome, particularly, the epiſtle to the Epheſians.

Soon after writing the epiſtle to the Romans, as was before hinted, Paul ſet out from Corinth, on his journey to Jeruſalem. In a ſhort time after his arrival there, he was apprehended. And he was kept a priſoner in that country, till he was ſent to Rome.

During his ſtay in Judea, we know not of his correſponding with any churches, or particular perſons, by writing. But at Rome, though a priſoner, he wrote divers letters. Grotius ſays, that [f] though all St. Paul's epiſtles are excellent, he moſt admires thoſe written by him, when a priſoner at Rome. And of the epiſtle to the Epheſians he ſays, it [g] ſurpaſſeth all human eloquence.

It is generally ſuppoſed, that St. Paul wrote there four epiſtles: to the Epheſians, the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon. Jerom has twice [h] ſpoken of theſe four epiſtles, as written at Rome. Theodoret having ſpoken of the epiſtle to the Romans, as the ſeventh in order, and

[f] Omnes epiſtolæ Pauli egregiæ ſunt: ſed omnium in primis, quæ Româ ex vinculis miſſæ ſunt. Gr. Pr. in ep. ad Col. [g] —— rerum ſublimitatem adæquans verbis ſublimioribus, quam ulla unquam habuit lingua humana. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. [h] Quod Romæ in vincula conjectus, hanc epiſtolam miſerit eo tempore, quo ad Philemonem, et ad Coloſſenſes, et ad Philippenſes, in alio loco ſcriptas eſſe monſtravimus. Hieron. in Eph. cap. iii. T. IV. p. 347.

Scribit igitur ad Philemonem Romæ vinctus in carcere, quo tempore mihi videntur ad Philippenſes, Coloſſenſes, et Epheſios epiſtolæ eſſe dictatæ. In Philem. ib. p. 445, in.

the laſt of thoſe that were ſent from Aſia, Macedonia, and Achaia, ſays: 'The [i] reſt were ſent from Rome: the firſt 'of which I take to be that, written to the Galatians.' Lightfoot [k] likewiſe ſuppoſed the epiſtle to the Galatians to have been written at Rome, and the firſt of thoſe that were written there. That is a wrong computation, as muſt appear from what has been already ſaid. But beſide the four above-mentioned, the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy might be written at this ſeaſon. The epiſtle to the Hebrews likewiſe, if it be Paul's, was, probably, written about this time, either during the apoſtle's impriſonment, or ſoon after it, before he left Rome, and Italy.

St. Paul's impriſonment, from the time of his being apprehended at Jeruſalem, to his coming to Rome, was the ſpace of almoſt, or quite three years. For a ſhort time he was confined in the caſtle of Antonia at Jeruſalem. Thence he was ſent to Cæſarea by the ſea-ſide, the ſeat of the Roman governor, who at that time was Felix. Where he was kept in Herod's judgment hall, Acts xxiii. 35. And though afterwards there was an order for enlarging the firſt ſtrictneſs of his cuſtody, *and that his acquaintance ſhould be permitted to come to him, and miniſter to him*, ch. xxiv. 23. I ſuppoſe, he was ſtill confined in the above-mentioned priſon. And, perhaps, this new order imported little more, than leave for his friends to bring him needful refreſhments, and take care of his health. It does not appear, that during the ſpace of two years, and ſeveral months, whilſt he was in Judea, he wrote any letters, or received any, as before intimated. Says [l] Wall: 'Thoſe two years of impriſonment 'under Felix ſeem to have been the moſt unactive part of 'St. Paul's life. There is no account of any preachings, 'or diſputations, or of any epiſtles written in this ſpace.' Indeed, conſidering the violent oppoſition made by the Jews throughout the whole ſpace of the apoſtle's being in that country: I apprehend, there was no attempt made by Paul, or his friends, to procure him intelligence from the chriſtian churches abroad: and that the Roman governor could not allow of any ſuch thing. He would rather have ſet Paul at liberty, and let him go quite away. But when

[i] Τας γαρ δη αλλας απο της ρωμης εστειλε· και πρωτην μεν ηγημαι την προς γαλατας γραφηναι. T. III. p. 5.

[k] Lightf. vol. I. p. 323.

[l] Notes upon the N. T. p. 267, 268.

Paul

Paul was brought to Rome, though he was under a guard, he was *ſuffered to dwell by himſelf, in his own hired houſe*, Acts xxviii. 16—30. where he was two years. Having ſuch liberty, he wiſely improved it, not only by diſcourſing with all thoſe who came to him, but alſo by writing ſeveral epiſtles.

Of all theſe epiſtles the firſt written ſeems to me to be that to the Epheſians. I think, it was drawn up by the apoſtle, as ſoon as conveniently could be, after his friends at Rome had taken a lodging for him, and he was ſettled in it. A. D. 61.

The epiſtle is inſcribed *to the ſaints which are at Epheſus, and to the faithful in Chriſt Jeſus.* But I apprehend, that the apoſtle thought of the Chriſtians throughout Aſia, properly ſo called, whether living at Epheſus, the chief city of the country, or not. To the like purpoſe [m] Hammond: and alſo Mr. Pyle, who paraphraſeth the firſt verſe of the epiſtle in this manner: 'Paul, called to be an apoſtle, ſendeth 'this epiſtle to the church of Epheſus, and to all the Chriſ-'tians of the leſſer Aſia, thoſe faithful Chriſtians, that firmly 'rely upon the chriſtian religion for ſalvation, without the 'obſervation of the Moſaical ceremonies.' We are led to this ſuppoſition by what St. Paul ſays near the concluſion of his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, written at Epheſus: *the churches of Aſia ſalute you*, 1 Cor. ch. xvi. 19. And that epiſtle to the Corinthians is addreſſed *to the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus, called to be ſaints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord, both theirs, and ours.* And the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians is addreſſed *to the church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the ſaints, which are in all Achaia.*

After the ſalutation of theſe Chriſtians, at the beginning of the epiſtle, he praiſeth God for the goſpel-diſpenſation, now made known to all men, agreeably to the gracious purpoſe, long ſince formed in the divine counſels. *Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who has bleſſed us with all ſpiritual bleſſings in heavenly places in Chriſt: according as he hath choſen us in him, before the foundation of the*

[m] Epheſum fuiſſe primam Metropolim Lydiæ, vel proconſularis Aſiæ, oſtendimus in notis ad Coloſſ. iv. 16. Itaque epiſtola hæc, Epheſis inſcripta, non eſt putanda ad eos ſolos pertinere, verum etiam ad alias urbes provinciæ, imo et totius Aſiæ. Hammond. Præf. in ep. ad Eph.

world,

world, ver. 3, 4, to the 12. He then reminds them of their firſt faith in the goſpel, and the circumſtances of it. *In whom ye alſo truſted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the goſpel of your ſalvation: in whom alſo, after that ye believed, ye were ſealed with that holy Spirit of promiſe. Which is the earneſt of our inheritance*——ver. 13, 14. After which he lets them know, that in his confinement, ſince he came to Rome, he had heard of the continuance of their faith, and of their love for all Chriſtians in general: which had filled him with tranſports of joy and ſatisfaction. *Wherefore I alſo having heard of your faith in the Lord Jeſus, and love unto all the ſaints, ceaſe not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers: that the God of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Father of glory, may give unto you the ſpirit of wiſdom:* or that they might be more and more illuminated, and eſtabliſhed in the principles of true religion, ver. 15, 16. and to ver. 23.

The account that had been brought him of the Chriſtians at Epheſus by Tychicus, as may be ſuppoſed, having been very agreeable, the apoſtle does not cenſure them for any great irregularities in conduct as he does the Corinthians, nor for any remarkable deviations from the ſimplicity of the goſpel, or inſtability therein, as he does the Galatians. But he treats them with mildneſs. However, he ſends them a pathetic exhortation to perſevere in a converſation, becoming their profeſſion and their privileges, and to guard againſt the temptations which they might meet with either from heathen idolaters, or corrupt and ſelf-intereſted Chriſtians.

At the end, he tells them, that he had ſent Tychicus, who would give them information concerning his affairs, and comfort them, ch. vi. 21, 22. And then adds: *Peace be to the brethren, and love, with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt,* ver. 23. *Peace be to the brethren,* that is, the brethren with you at Epheſus, to whom the epiſtle is directed. So 1 Theſſ. v. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this epiſtle be read to all the holy brethren:* meaning the brethren, or Chriſtians at Theſſalonica. So to the Philippians, ch. iv. 21. *Salute every ſaint in Chriſt Jeſus,* meaning, undoubtedly, the Chriſtians at Philippi. And then at ver. 22. *All the ſaints ſalute you:* meaning all the Chriſtians in general at Rome. It was not needful to ſay, of this place. The meaning is obvious.

The

The concluding words of this epiſtle are theſe at ver. 23. *Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jeſus Chriſt in ſincerity:* which, I think, may be underſtood and paraphraſed after this manner. 'And grace be with all thoſe, who, like you, love the Lord Jeſus Chriſt in ſincerity.'

That is a brief and general account of the epiſtle itſelf. I muſt add ſomewhat in behalf of the early date of it, which is here aſſigned by me.

There might be many conſiderations, inducing the apoſtle to write to the Epheſians, ſoon after his arrival at Rome. Epheſus was a place of great importance, being the chief city of Aſia, where was a great reſort of merchants, and all other people. Here the apoſtle choſe to ſettle that eminent diſciple of his, Timothy. Here alſo St. John took up his reſidence, after he had left Judea. It was the place where Paul had been longer than in any other city, except Antioch. Here alſo he had wrought many and ſpecial miracles, and had great ſucceſs in his preaching. Acts xix. Moreover, he had intended them a viſit. 1 Tim iii. 14. But had been prevented. When he went to Jeruſalem, it is likely, that it was earneſtly deſired, and confidently expected by the Chriſtians at Epheſus. Such expectations are ſufficiently intimated by St. Luke, Acts xx. 15—17. *The next day we came to Miletus. For Paul had determined to ſail by Epheſus, becauſe he would not ſpend the time in Aſia: for he haſted, if poſſible, to be at Jeruſalem the day of pentecoſt. And from Miletus he ſent to Epheſus, and called the elders of the church.* Where having made a pathetic diſcourſe, all preſent were much affected, and gave teſtimonies of a fervent and high eſteem. Theſe things muſt have made impreſſions upon the apoſtle, and have been well remembered by him: and may have induced him to think of writing firſt to this church upon his coming to Rome, and having liberty of correſpondence.

There might be likewiſe ſome other reaſons for this determination. The epiſtle is carried by Tychicus, who was of Aſia, and, probably, an Epheſian. Mr. Biſcoe [n] thought, that Tychicus accompanied the apoſtle in his voyage to Rome. But for that I ſee no ground. I rather think, that like divers others of his fellow-labourers, Tychicus had come to Rome of his own accord, to meet Paul, and to attend upon him: or had been ſent by the

[n] Upon the Acts, p. 435.

Epheſians,

Epheſians, to pay their reſpects to him, and inquire into the ſtate of his affairs. It ſeems to me, that Tychicus was one of the firſt, who came to the apoſtle, and very ſoon after his arrival at Rome. Yea, poſſibly, Tychicus was got thither before him, as ſome other of the apoſtle's friends likewiſe might be. However, Tychicus being now at Rome, he was a very fit perſon to go with a letter from the apoſtle to Epheſus.

If we duly attend to the apoſtle's ſituation, after having been above two years in a cloſe confinement at Cæſarea, we may be able to diſcern the reaſon of ſeveral things. Particularly, we may perceive, why this is a kind of general epiſtle, not much concerning itſelf with the affairs and circumſtances of any church: but delivering, firſt, the doctrine of the goſpel, and then the duties of it, with a fulneſs, ſcarcely equalled in any other of the apoſtolical epiſtles. As Theodoret ſaid: 'The former part of the 'epiſtle contains the doctrine of the goſpel, the latter part a 'moral admonition.' Or as a learned modern ſays: 'Being ſomewhat in the manner of an inſtitute.' The apoſtle might well judge it beſt to write thus in his firſt letter, written after a long ſilence: and in this manner, to remind his friends and converts in Aſia of the principles of the goſpel, and their obligations, as Chriſtians.

We are likewiſe hence led to diſcern the great beauty and propriety of the ſeveral places of this epiſtle, where the apoſtle ſpeaks of his bonds, ch. iii. 1. *I Paul, the priſoner of Jeſus Chriſt for you gentiles.* That for their cauſe, he was now in bonds, appears from the hiſtory of his impriſonment, as related by St. Luke in the Acts, and particularly, from what is ſaid ch. xxii. 21, 22. and the following verſes. There is an eſpecial ſuitableneſs in that expreſſion of the apoſtle, in a letter written ſoon after his arrival at Rome, and eſpecially, if it be the firſt letter written by him after his being apprehended, as I think it is. And having enlarged ſomewhat farther upon his having been appointed an apoſtle by Chriſt, for forwarding the goſpel among gentiles, he goes on, and endeavours to comfort theſe Chriſtians, and all gentile converts in general, with regard to the afflictive diſpenſation, which he was under, and which might appear very ſtrange to many, ver. 13. *Wherefore I*

[a] See vol. V. p. 194.

deſire,

deſire, that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. Again: iv. 1 *I therefore the priſoner of the Lord beſeech you.* And ch. vi. 20. he calls himſelf *an ambaſſador in bonds.* How ſuitable is this to the apoſtle's circumſtances, if we conſider him now lately arrived in the city of Rome, the capital of the Roman empire, and the ſeat of the emperor.

I cannot forbear tranſcribing that paſſage, ch. vi. 18—20. *Praying for all ſaints,——and for me, that utterance may be given to me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the myſtery of the goſpel. For which I am an ambaſſador in bonds: that I may ſpeak boldly, as I ought to ſpeak.* Wherein I do not think, the apoſtle ſo much deſires theſe Chriſtians to pray for his enlargement, as that he might diſcharge his commiſſion aright: and ſpeak with the freedom and boldneſs of an ambaſſador from a great prince: though he was chained as a priſoner, and had not the outward pomp and ſtate, uſual with men of that high character. This was very proper at the time of his arrival at Rome, where he was likely to continue ſome while.

There is a like paſſage in Col. iv. 3, 4. which, I think, ought not to be underſtood very differently.

It is alſo an argument, that this epiſtle was written by the apoſtle ſoon after his coming to Rome: that here are no expreſſions, denoting hopes of enlargement, as there are in the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon: written, as we ſuppoſe, not long before his deliverance. Nor does he here take any notice of ſucceſſes obtained at Rome, or give any intimations of converts made by him there, as he does Philip. i. 12, 13, 14. iv. 22. He ſeems indeed to have pleaſed himſelf with a proſpect of recommending the goſpel in his preſent ſituation, ch. iii. 7—10. like to what he ſays 2 Tim. iv. 17. an epiſtle written about the ſame time. But he does not intimate any advantages obtained as yet. Nor does he at the end of this epiſtle ſend ſuch ſalutations, as at the end of the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon. All which muſt lead us to think, that the circumſtances of the apoſtle at writing this epiſtle were different from his circumſtances at writing thoſe epiſtles: when his captivity, as is allowed, was near its period.

Says St. Paul 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus.* It is likely, that the apoſtle there refers to the epiſtle,

epistle, of which we are now speaking. He had just sent, or was sending away Tychicus to Ephesus with this epistle. I think, I shall presently show, that the second epistle to Timothy was written in the first year of the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, and not very long after his arrival there. Consequently this epistle, being there referred to, must have been sent about the same time.

That the epistle to the Ephesians is here referred to, has been the opinion of many. So thought [p] Tillemont. Who supposing, that the second to Timothy was written in a second imprisonment of the apostle at Rome, placeth the writing of this to the Ephesians in the year 65. Whitby in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians, observes, 'In his 'close of this epistle St. Paul speaks thus to them, ch. vi. '21, 22. *That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.*——*Ty-* '*chicus shall make known unto you all things.*——And in the 'second epistle to Timothy he saith, *Tychicus have I sent unto* '*Ephesus*, 2 Tim. iv. 12.' So Whitby. But forgetting, as it seems, what he had said in some other places. However, this shows, how natural and easy it is, to think the epistle to the Ephesians intended in that place of the second to Timothy. And it is what most would think, if not biassed by some prejudice.

Theodoret, in his general preface to St. Paul's epistles, says, 'The [q] apostle sent to the Ephesians and the Colossians at the same time, and sent them by the same messenger,' meaning Tychicus. But in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians, having quoted Eph. vi. 21, 22. he goes on: 'And [r] that he sent Tychicus from Rome, he shows in his 'second epistle to Timothy, saying, do thy diligence to 'come to me shortly.——And Tychicus have I sent to Ephe-'sus,' 2 Tim. iv. 10—12. So Theodoret, without considering the consequence. For he supposed the second to Timothy to have been written but a short time before the apostle's martyrdom. But if the epistle to the Ephesians was written when the apostle was first at Rome (as Theodoret allows) and if he refers to it in his second epistle to Timothy; it will follow, that this was written soon after

[p] Saint Paul. Art. 49. et Note 58. Mem. Ec. tom. I.

[q] Και μεν τοι και εφεσιοις και κολοσσαευσι κατα τον αυτον εγραψε χρονον, ενι των επιστολων διακονω αμφοτερων χρησαμενος. Theod. T. III. p. 5.

[r] Τον δε μακαριον τυχικον απο της ρωμης απεστειλε· και τουτο εν τη προς τιμοθεον δευτερα διδασκει. κ. λ. Ib. p. 292. A.

that

that to the Epheſians, and when the apoſtle was firſt at Rome.

However, there are difficulties attending this opinion, which muſt be conſidered.

Firſt, it is ſaid, that the epiſtles to the Epheſians and the Coloſſians were ſent by the ſame meſſenger. Comp. Eph. vi. 21, 22. Col. iv. 7, 8. The epiſtle to the Coloſſians was ſent away from Rome, when the apoſtle had hopes of enlargement. Conſequently, the epiſtle to the Epheſians was written about the ſame time.

I anſwer, that this is no proof. For Tychicus might be ſent twice into the ſame country, in the time of the apoſtle's two years impriſonment. Tychicus might be ſent to Epheſus, with this letter to the Epheſians, ſoon after the apoſtle's arrival at Rome, and come back to him, and be able to take another journey into thoſe parts a year after, when the apoſtle was about to be ſet at liberty.

Secondly, it is ſaid, that there is a great agreement between the epiſtle to the Epheſians and that to the Coloſſians. This laſt, as is allowed, was written in the ſecond year of the apoſtle's confinement, and when it was near its end. Conſequently, the epiſtle to the Epheſians was written about the ſame time.

To which I anſwer: undoubtedly, there is an agreement between theſe epiſtles in ſeveral things, taken notice of by [s] Grotius, and others. But it does not therefore follow, that they were ſent away together. For, as has been obſerved by [t] Lightfoot, it is likely, that the apoſtle kept copies of his letters. If ſo, it might be eaſy for him to write after the ſame manner at different times, to people not very remote from each other, and whoſe circumſtances were much alike. Indeed, without keeping copies of his letters, I believe it would be no difficult matter for St. Paul to repeat the chriſtian principles, and exhortations to chriſtian virtues, at ſeveral

[s] Proxima huic et argumento, et verbis etiam, eſt illa ad Coloſſenſes, eodem, ni fallor, ſcripta tempore. Grot. Præf. in ep. ad Eph. vid. et ejuſd. Pr. in ep. ad Coloſſ.

[t] 'It may be the *parchments*, '2 Tim. iv. 13. were the originals 'of thoſe epiſtles that he had 'already written. For that he ſent 'tranſcripts, and reſerved the ori- 'ginals, may be collected from 'theſe paſſages. *I Tertius, who 'wrote out this epiſtle*, Rom. xvi. 22. 'See alſo 1 Cor. xvi. 21. Col. iv. '18. 2 Theſſ. iii. 17 For all the 'epiſtle beſide was written with 'another hand.' Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 316.

times,

times, in like expreſſions, if the circumſtances of men required it.

And there are ſeveral things in the epiſtles themſelves, which afford good reaſon for thinking, that they were not written, and ſent away at the ſame time: and that the epiſtle to the Coloſſians was written ſome while after that to the Epheſians. From what is ſaid in the ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, concerning the worſhipping of angels, and other matters, it may be concluded, that the apoſtle had received from thoſe parts ſome intelligence, which he had not, when he wrote the epiſtle to the Epheſians. For there thoſe matters are not at all touched upon.

And though there is a reſemblance between theſe two epiſtles, they are very different. For the epiſtle to the Epheſians, is a good deal longer than that to the Coloſſians, though the foremention article in the ſecond chapter to the Coloſſians is entirely wanting: and in thoſe places where there is an agreement, there are differences.

Nor is there in the epiſtle to the Epheſians any notice taken of Timothy, or Epaphras, or Mark, ſo expreſsly mentioned in the epiſtle to the Coloſſians. Which muſt be reckoned a very ſtrong, and even a demonſtrative argument, that theſe two epiſtles were not written, and ſent away at the ſame time.

In this date of the epiſtle to the Epheſians I have [u] followed Lightfoot: from whom I have had great aſſiſtances in ſettling the time of St. Paul's epiſtles. I have likewiſe had, in this inſtance, aſſiſtances from [x] Baronius, [y] Eſtius, [z] Hammond, and [a] Witſius.

Baronius [b] and Lightfoot firſt ſpeak of the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy: though they do not deny the epiſtle to the Epheſians to have been written before it. But as we are now inquiring into the order of time, I have judged it beſt to adhere to that ſtrictly. A few weeks, yea a few days, might make a great alteration in the apoſtle's circumſtances at this time. And ſome of his friends and aſſiſtants might be daily coming to Rome from the provinces, and getting acceſs to him in

[u] As before, p. 325. [x] Annal. 59. num. xv. Vid. et num. xx.

[y] Præf. in ep. ad Eph. [z] Præf. in ep. ad Epheſ. [a] Witſ. de Vit. Paul. ſect. xii. num. vi. et ix.

[b] Hæc cum ita ſint, nos tamen primum egimus de ipſa ad Timotheum ſcripta epiſtola, eo quod multa in ea de rebus ſuis Romæ geſtis ipſe ſignificet, ex quibus intexeretur hiſtoria: quarum nulla eſt mentio in epiſtola ad Epheſios. Baron. Ann. 59. num. xv.

his

his apartment. By comparing theſe two epiſtles I am led to think, that when the apoſtle wrote the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, he had been longer at Rome, and was better acquainted with the world about him, than when he wrote the epiſtle to the Epheſians.

Baſnage is ſingular in his ſentiment concerning the time of this epiſtle. 'That [c] it was written at Rome, when Paul was 'priſoner there,' he ſays, 'is manifeſt. But he thinks it to 'have been the laſt epiſtle which was ſent thence by the apo-'ſtle. He argues well enough, that it was not ſent with the 'epiſtle to the Coloſſians. And he ſuppoſeth, that Tychicus 'was ſent twice into theſe countries by the apoſtle from Rome.' He ſhould therefore have concluded, that this letter to the Epheſians, was carried by Tychicus, not after thoſe other epiſtles, but before them.

Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus.* I ſuppoſe the apoſtle here to refer to the epiſtle to the Epheſians, which was carried from Rome to Epheſus by Tychicus. But ſtill, perhaps, it may be queſtioned, whether thoſe two epiſtles, that to the Epheſians, and the ſecond to Timothy were ſent away together. Baronius [d] ſays, they were. He ſays, the apoſtle puts the preterit for the preſent. So Eph. vi. 21, 22.——*That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.*——*Tychicus*——*ſhall make known unto you all things, whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe.* And unqueſtionably, that way of ſpeaking is not uncommon. Inſtances are obvious. So Philem. ver. 12. *Whom I have ſent again.* Which may be rendered: *whom I am ſending again* to you,

[c] Epiſtolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apoſtolus, ea quæ ad Epheſios ultima eſſe videtur. Ludovico enim Capello non aſſentimur, qui eodem tempore ad Coloſſenſes et ad Epheſios, epiſtolam ſcriptam eſſe ſtatuit.—— Agebat Romæ Epaphras, dum Paulus ſcribit Coloſſenſibus. Col. i. 8. Urbe autem aberat, cum ad Epheſios miſit epiſtolam, in qua ne verbulo quidem meminit Epaphræ. Quinetiam non ut ad Coloſſenſes hæc et ad Epheſios nomine ſuo et Timothei ſcribit. Præterea per Tychicum miſſa eſt epiſtola. Eph. vi. 21. Quæ de alia prorſus Tychici profectione intelligenda ſunt, quam cujus meminit ad Coloſſenſes iv. 12. Alioquin Timothei ac Epaphræ mentionem quoque injeciſſet. Ann. 61. num. vii.

[d] Verum eidem Tabellario, nempe Tychico, dedit etiam tunc Paulus epiſtolam ad Epheſios. Licet in ea ad Timotheum dicat: *Tychicum miſi Epheſum:* tamen præteritum tempus pro præſenti uſurpaſſe videtur, ſicut cum ad Epheſios de eodem ſcribens ait: *Ut autem et vos ſciatis, quæ circa me ſunt—— nota faciet Tychicus——quem miſi ad vos ad hoc ipſum.*——Bar ann. 59. num. xv.

times, in like expreſſions, if the circumſtances of men required it.

And there are ſeveral things in the epiſtles themſelves, which afford good reaſon for thinking, that they were not written, and ſent away at the ſame time: and that the epiſtle to the Coloſſians was written ſome while after that to the Epheſians. From what is ſaid in the ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, concerning the worſhipping of angels, and other matters, it may be concluded, that the apoſtle had received from thoſe parts ſome intelligence, which he had not, when he wrote the epiſtle to the Epheſians. For there thoſe matters are not at all touched upon.

And though there is a reſemblance between theſe two epiſtles, they are very different. For the epiſtle to the Epheſians, is a good deal longer than that to the Coloſſians, though the forementioned article in the ſecond chapter to the Coloſſians is entirely wanting: and in thoſe places where there is an agreement, there are differences.

Nor is there in the epiſtle to the Epheſians any notice taken of Timothy, or Epaphras, or Mark, ſo expreſsly mentioned in the epiſtle to the Coloſſians. Which muſt be reckoned a very ſtrong, and even a demonſtrative argument, that theſe two epiſtles were not written, and ſent away at the ſame time.

In this date of the epiſtle to the Epheſians I have [u] followed Lightfoot: from whom I have had great aſſiſtances in ſettling the time of St. Paul's epiſtles. I have likewiſe had, in this inſtance, aſſiſtances from [x] Baronius, [y] Eſtius, [z] Hammond, and [a] Witſius.

Baronius [b] and Lightfoot firſt ſpeak of the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy: though they do not deny the epiſtle to the Epheſians to have been written before it. But as we are now inquiring into the order of time, I have judged it beſt to adhere to that ſtrictly. A few weeks, yea a few days, might make a great alteration in the apoſtle's circumſtances at this time. And ſome of his friends and aſſiſtants might be daily coming to Rome from the provinces, and getting acceſs to him in

[u] As before, p. 325. [x] Annal. 59. num. xv. Vid. et num. xx.

[y] Præf. in ep. ad Eph. [z] Præf. in ep. ad Epheſ. [a] Witſ. de Vit. Paul. ſect. xii. num. vi. et ix.

[b] Hæc cum ita ſint, nos tamen primum egimus de ipſa ad Timotheum ſcripta epiſtola, eo quod multa in ea de rebus ſuis Romæ geſtis ipſe ſignificet, ex quibus intexeretur hiſtoria: quarum nulla eſt mentio in epiſtola ad Epheſios. Baron. Ann. 59. num. xv.

his

his apartment. By comparing theſe two epiſtles I am led to think, that when the apoſtle wrote the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, he had been longer at Rome, and was better acquainted with the world about him, than when he wrote the epiſtle to the Epheſians.

Baſnage is ſingular in his ſentiment concerning the time of this epiſtle. 'That [c] it was written at Rome, when Paul was 'priſoner there,' he ſays, 'is manifeſt. But he thinks it to 'have been the laſt epiſtle which was ſent thence by the apo-'ſtle. He argues well enough, that it was not ſent with the 'epiſtle to the Coloſſians. And he ſuppoſeth, that Tychicus 'was ſent twice into theſe countries by the apoſtle from Rome.' He ſhould therefore have concluded, that this letter to the Epheſians, was carried by Tychicus, not after thoſe other epiſtles, but before them.

Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus.* I ſuppoſe the apoſtle here to refer to the epiſtle to the Epheſians, which was carried from Rome to Epheſus by Tychicus. But ſtill, perhaps, it may be queſtioned, whether thoſe two epiſtles, that to the Epheſians, and the ſecond to Timothy were ſent away together. Baronius [d] ſays, they were. He ſays, the apoſtle puts the preterit for the preſent. So Eph. vi. 21, 22.——*That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.*——*Tychicus*——*ſhall make known unto you all things, whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe.* And unqueſtionably, that way of ſpeaking is not uncommon. Inſtances are obvious. So Philem, ver. 12. *Whom I have ſent again.* Which may be rendered: *whom I am ſending again* to you.

[c] Epiſtolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apoſtolus, ea quæ ad Epheſios ultima eſſe videtur. Ludovico enim Capello non aſſentimur, qui eodem tempore ad Coloſſenſes et ad Epheſios, epiſtolam ſcriptam eſſe ſtatuit.—— Agebat Romæ Epaphras, dum Paulus ſcribit Coloſſenſibus. Col. i. 8. Urbe autem aberat, cum ad Epheſios miſit epiſtolam, in qua ne verbulo quidem meminit Epaphræ. Quinetiam non ut ad Coloſſenſes ſic et ad Epheſios nomine ſuo et Timothei ſcribit. Præterea per Tychicum miſſa eſt epiſtola. Eph. vi. 21. Quæ de alia prorſus Tychici profectione intelligenda ſunt, quam cujus meminit ad Coloſſenſes iv. 12. Alioquin Timothei ac Epaphræ mentionem quoque injeciſſet. Ann. 61. num. vii.

[d] Verum eidem Tabellario, nempe Tychico, dedit etiam tunc Paulus epiſtolam ad Epheſios. Licet in ea ad Timotheum dicat: *Tychicum miſi Epheſum:* tamen præteritum tempus pro præſenti uſurpaſſe videtur, ſicut cum ad Epheſios de eodem ſcribens ait: *Ut autem et vos ſciatis, quæ circa me ſunt—— nota faciet Tychicus—— quem miſi ad vos ad hoc ipſum.*——Bar ann. 59, num. xv.

See alſo ver. 19—21. and Philip. ii. 28. So here in 2 Tim. iv. 12. The words may be rendered: *And Tychicus I am ſending to Epheſus.* Nevertheleſs, as that interpretation, in this place, is not certain, I would not be poſitive. The epiſtle to the Epheſians, I think, was carried from Rome by Tychicus, either at the ſame time with the ſecond to Timothy, or a ſhort time only before it.

And according to my calculation, the epiſtle to the Epheſians was written at Rome, ſoon after the apoſtle's arrival there, in 61, and before the ſummer of that year. It was the firſt epiſtle written by the apoſtle in that city. And it was ſent away a ſhort time before the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, of which I ſhall ſpeak next, or together with it.

§ X. *The ſecond* Epistle *to* Timothy.

We come now to the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, which we ſuppoſe to have been ſent away together with that to the Epheſians, or ſoon after it, A. D. 61.

Many learned men ſpeak of a ſecond impriſonment of Paul at Rome, and ſuppoſe, that this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was then written, in 67, or 68. But I do not know, that we have any good account of a ſecond impriſonment of Paul at Rome. He ſuffered martyrdom there, as ſome think, in 64, or 65, or as others, in 67, or 68. But that he might do, without a previous impriſonment of any duration. For he might be apprehended on a ſudden, and be put to death preſently. Which may be reckoned as likely, as not.

Before I proceed to the proofs, that this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was written during Paul's impriſonment at Rome, when he was ſent thither from Judea by Feſtus, I would premiſe, that I ſuppoſe, with moſt learned moderns, that Timothy was now at Epheſus.

It has been thought, that Timothy was not there, becauſe it is ſaid, ch. iv. 12. *Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus.* But that argument is of no force. There was no need to ſay: I have ſent Tychicus to you. There are many ſimilar, or parallel ways of ſpeaking in St Paul's epiſtles. 1 Cor. xv. 32. He ſpeaks of his having *fought with beaſts at Epheſus:* where he certainly was at that time, as appears from xvi. 8. And 2 Tim. i. 17. he ſays: *When Oneſiphorus was at Rome, he ſought me out very diligently.* He does not ſay, when he was here.

Lightfoot

Lightfoot [e] obſerves, that from the epiſtle itſelf it may be concluded, that Timothy was at Epheſus. For 1. He directs him to ſalute the houſhold of Oneſiphorus, ch. iv. 19. who was an Epheſian, ch. i. 16—18. 2. He directs Timothy to take Troas in his way to him, ch. iv. 13. which was the way that Paul had gone from Epheſus, 2 Cor. ii. 12. and to Epheſus again, Acts xx. 5. 3. He warns him of Alexander, ch. iv. 14. who was an Epheſian. 1 Tim. i. 20. Acts xix. 33. So Lightfoot. To which, I think, may be added, 4. Paul's ſalutation of Priſcilla and Aquila, ch. iv. 19. who, probably, were now returned to Epheſus, and ſettled there, where they had been formerly. Acts xviii. 18, 19—26. and 1 Cor. xvi. 19. For certainly they were not now at Rome, where Paul himſelf was: though they were there, when he wrote the epiſtle to the Romans, ch. xvi. 3, 4.

Here it may be aſked: when did Timothy come to Epheſus? And how long had he been there? I anſwer, that by a very eaſy and probable conjecture, it may be concluded, that he was left there, when Paul was going up to Jeruſalem, with the collections, which he had made among the gentile Chriſtians, for the poor ſaints in Judea. For Timothy is expreſsly mentioned by St. Luke among the apoſtle's company in that journey. Acts xx. 3, 4, 5. *And as he was about to ſail into Syria, he purpoſed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Aſia, Sopater of Berea——and Timothy, and of Aſia, Tychicus, and Trophimus.* Timothy therefore was in Paul's company, and went with him as far as Aſia, in which Epheſus ſtood. And ſo far, I ſuppoſe, all above-mentioned accompanied Paul, but not into Syria. I apprehend, that Timothy and Tychicus ſtayed in Aſia. For we have not any intimations from St. Luke, or St. Paul, or any way, that theſe two were with the apoſtle at Jeruſalem.

Every one is here able to recollect, that when Paul went into Macedonia in the year 56, about the time of pentecoſt, he left Timothy at Epheſus, 1 Tim. i. 3. But for ſome reaſons, which may be well ſuppoſed to have been good and ſufficient, he came from thence to Paul in Macedonia. For he is joined with Paul in the ſalutation, at the beginning of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians. And, as has been juſt ſeen, he attended Paul, when he left Macedonia, to proceed to Jeruſalem. But no man can doubt, that Paul would be willing

[e] Vol. I. p. 324.

to replace Timothy at Ephesus, where his presence was of great importance, if an opportunity should offer. Such an opportunity there now was. And, very probably, it was embraced. And Paul parted with him at Miletus, where he had sent for the elders of the church of Ephesus to meet him.

Tillemont says: 'It [f] is not said, what became of Timothy, during the two years that St. Paul was prisoner in Judea.' I think, I may presume to say, he was all that time at Ephesus, and parts adjacent in Asia. Du Pin was of the same opinion, whose words I transcribe [g] below.

Tillemont adds presently afterwards: 'It is however certain, 'that Timothy was at Rome, when the apostle wrote to 'Philemon, the Philippians, and the Colossians: forasmuch as 'he is named jointly with him in the titles of those three 'epistles.' How Timothy came to be then at Rome, we shall see presently.

Paul therefore parted with Timothy at Miletus, as just said. And I think, that when the elders of Ephesus where come to Miletus, Timothy joined himself with them, and stood at the head of them: and consequently was one of those, of whom it is said: *And they all wept sore, and fell on Paul's neck, and kissed him: sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him to the ship*, Acts xx. 37, 38.

Of this Paul takes notice in the most affectionate manner, 2 Tim. i. 4. *Greatly desirous to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy.* Doubtless Paul was much affected by the tears of all the rest, but especially Timothy's: and was now *greatly desirous to see him*, who had been so deeply struck with the thoughts of never seeing his face any more.

Timothy, then, was at Ephesus, when this epistle was sent to him. And he had been there from the time that Paul left Miletus, to go to Jerusalem, and during his imprisonment in Judea.

[f] S. Timothée Mem. T. II.

[g] On pourroit dire neanmoins, et je ne m'eloignerois de ce sentiment, que S. Paul le laissa à Ephese, quand s'etant arrêté à Milet, il envoya querir les prêtres de l'eglise d'Ephese. Act. xx ver. 17. Car nous lisons, que comme S. Paul partoit pour aller en Asie par Macedoine, Timothée fut un de ceux qui l' accompagnerent en Asie. ch. xx. 4. Et nous ne trouvons plus Timothée à sa compagnie, ni à Jerusalem, ni pendant sa prison de Cesarée. Si cela est, Timothée aura été établi par S. Paul pour gouverner les eglises d'Asie en 58. Du Pin Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

The

The obſervation, that Paul here refers to the tears, ſhed by his friends at his parting with them at Miletus, appears to me very obvious: though it has been hitherto entirely overlooked, ſo far as I know. And it will directly lead us to the true date of this epiſtle. It is a moſt proper beginning of a letter ſent by Paul to Timothy at Epheſus, ſoon after his arrival at Rome from Paleſtine, at the time we ſuppoſe: but it is very unlikely to be taken notice of in an epiſtle written ſeveral years afterwards, and after there had been an interview: as there certainly was, when Paul was at Rome.

I ſhall now obſerve divers particulars, confirming the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul's ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was written, during the apoſtle's impriſonment at Rome, and near the beginning of it.

1. The circumſtances of the apoſtle's impriſonment at Rome, when ſent thither by Feſtus, and at the time of writing this epiſtle, are exactly the ſame.

Says St. Luke, Acts xxviii. 16. *Paul was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf, with a ſoldier that kept him.* And ver 30. *Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired houſe, and received all that came in unto him.*

Here are two remarkable particulars. Firſt, that Paul *dwelt by himſelf, with a ſoldier that kept him:* that is, after the manner of the Romans, by an iron chain, of convenient length, he was faſtened to a ſoldier, who had one end of the chain upon his left hand, and Paul the other end upon his right hand, as was largely ſhown [h] formerly. To this St. Paul refers in this his ſecond epiſtle to Timothy i. 16. ſpeaking of Onefiphorus: *He oft refreſhed me, and was not aſhamed of my chain.* So exactly, Acts xxviii. 20. *Becauſe for the hope of Iſrael, I am bound with this chain.*

Secondly. The other remarkable particular is, that when at Rome, *Paul dwelt in his own hired houſe, and received all who came in unto him.* Such alſo was his caſe at writing this epiſtle, as appears abundantly from ch. iv. 10. and other places. He had with him Demas, Creſcens, Titus. The firſt was gone to Theſſalonica, without his approbation: the others were gone, whither he had ſent them, as it ſeems. And Luke was ſtill with him. And at ver. 21. he ſends ſalutations to Timothy from divers perſons, and from the church at Rome in general, ſaying: *Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens,*

[h] See vol. I. p. 230—235.

and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren. Which ſhows, that people had free acceſs to the apoſtle, when he wrote this epiſtle.

1. Obj. However, it has been objected, that [i] when Oneſiphorus came to Rome, Paul was cloſe ſhut up, and Oneſiphorus had much difficulty in finding him. Which is different from the impriſonment, of which St. Luke has given an account.

To which I anſwer, that Oneſiphorus had no uncommon difficulty in his acceſs to Paul, whoſe words are, 2 Tim. i. 16, 17. *The Lord give mercy to the houſe of Oneſiphorus. For he oft refreſhed me, and was not aſhamed of my chain. But when he was at Rome, he ſought me out very diligently, and came unto me:* that is, I think: 'Oneſiphorus has been often with 'me, and refreſhed me, with preſents, and with his converſa-'tion, without being at all aſhamed of me, though I had a 'chain upon me.' Which ſhows, that Oneſiphorus might come to viſit the apoſtle, when he pleaſed: and might give him as much relief, as he ſaw good. 'Yea, ſays the apoſtle, 'as ſoon as he came to Rome, he made inquiries after me, 'and came to ſee me without delay.'

Here appear not any tokens of Paul's being under a very ſtrict confinement. But here are evidences of his being in ſuch a condition, as that repreſented by St. Luke, when he had been brought from Judea to Rome. Oneſiphorus ſeems to have come to Rome, ſoon after the apoſtle's arrival there. In order to find him out, and know where he was, it was needful to make ſome inquiries. How elſe ſhould any man find a ſtranger in a great city? Whether he was quite at liberty, or in one of the priſons of it, ſome inquiries would be needful. And when Oneſiphorus had found the place, where Paul was, he came to it without any difficulty.

Witſius [k] ſpeaks exactly to the like purpoſe. And ſuppoſeth, that after ſome inquiries (ſuch as are needful, when a man

[i] In ſecundis vinculis alia ſtatim rerum facies fuit. Tunc enim *Oneſiphorus*, inquit, *cum Romam venisſet, ſolicite me quæſivit, et invenit.* i. 17. An opus erat, ut Oneſiphorus σπουδαιοτερον, et cum tanto ſtudio ac ſolicitudine quæreret Paulum, et ex tam ſedula inquiſitione inveniret, ſi Apoſtolus aut in eadem domo, aut cum eadem libertate, et non in arcta et abdita cuſtodia prædicaſſet? Pearſon. De Succeſſ. primor. Rom. Epiſcop. Diſſ. i. cap. 9. n. viii.

[k] Quando Oneſiphorus Paulum Romæ quæſitum venit, non videtur inveniſſe in carcerem conjectum, arctaque cuſtodia detentum, ſed militi ſuo alligatum, in diverſiolo. Sic enim Paulus: Και την αλυσιν με

man comes to a large city, and wants to ſee a ſtranger newly arrived) Oneſiphorus found Paul with the ſoldier, in his own hired houſe.

The caſe I take to be this. Oneſiphorus came to Rome upon his own ſecular buſineſs. He knew very well, that Paul had been carried thither, as a priſoner. But what was become of him, he did not know: whether he had been ſet at liberty, or was ſtill a priſoner, or had been put to death. Upon coming to Rome therefore, not long after Paul had been brought thither, he made anxious inquiries after him. And hearing where Paul was, he readily came to him, notwithſtanding his diſgraceful circumſtances, being chained to a ſoldier. And ſo long as he ſtayed in Rome, he made the apoſtle frequent viſits, and afforded him ſuch refreſhment, as was in his power.

2. Obj. But it is urged, that St. Paul ſays, 2 Tim. ii. 9. [1] *——Wherein I ſuffer, as an evil doer, even unto bonds.*

To which I anſwer, that the word, here rendered bonds, is the ſame that is uſed in other epiſtles, written during the apoſtle's impriſonment at Rome, when ſent thither by Feſtus. Col. iv. 18. *Remember my bonds.* Μνημονευετε μυ των δεσμων. The ſame word is uſed at leaſt four times in the epiſtle to the Philippians, ch. i. 7, 13, 14, 16. and in Philem. ver. 10. and 13. Hebr. x. 34. And to the Epheſians he ſays, ch. iii. 1. *I Paul, the priſoner of Jeſus Chriſt.* ο δεσμιος. And ch. iv. 1. *The priſoner of the Lord.* Not to mention any other places. When Paul was ſo bound, he had reaſon to ſay, *he ſuffered as an evil-doer*, or malefactor, *even unto bonds.* He was not a malefactor, or notorious offender, nor a criminal: but was innocent in the view of the Roman laws, as well as in point of reaſon, juſtice, and equity. But he ſuffered, *as an evil-doer.* Had he not reaſon to ſay ſo, when he was ſent bound from Judea to Rome? Had he not been proſecuted, as a malefactor? Did not the Jewiſh multitude, who firſt laid hold of him, intend to kill him? Acts xxi. 31—36. xxiii. 27. xxiv. 6. Did not the multitude, who heard him with patience for a

ουκ επισχυνθη.——Et ſane quamvis vincula Pauli nota fuerint in toto Prætorio, non tamen inde conſequitur, Pauli domum ita notam omnibus fuiſſe, ut homini peregre advenienti, in urbe quæ orbis compendium erat, ad captivi Judæi domum inveniendam diligenti inquiſitione non fuerit opus. Præſertim ſi attendamus, facta hæc eſſe initio vinculorum Pauli, antequam eum celebritatis gradum eſſet nactus. Witſ. ubi ſupra. ſect. 12. num. vi.

[1] Ἐν ῳ κακοπαθω μεχρι δεσμων, ως κακουργος.

while, at length say: *Away with such a fellow. For it is not fit, that he should live?* ch. xxii. 22. Does not Festus say to king Agrippa, and the large assembly at Cæsarea? *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,* ch. xxv. 24. So that he was prosecuted as a malefactor all the while that he was in Judea. Nor does it appear, that there was any likelihood of his escape, but by appealing to the emperor. And was he not after all sent bound to Rome, with many obnoxious persons under the command of a centurion? Certainly, I think, these things afforded sufficient ground for Paul to say what he does in this place to Timothy.

But to insinuate from these expressions, that Paul was now in some close confinement, his friends debarred access to him, and himself forbid the use of pen, ink, and paper, I humbly conceive, is altogether without foundation. It is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the epistle, and with the apostle's writing, or enditing, and sending such a letter as this to Timothy. Wherein too he desires Timothy to come unto him.

St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus, was occasioned by his zeal for the liberty of the gentiles, as is manifest from Acts xxii. 21, 22. Of which he also takes notice, Eph. iii. 1. saying: *I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for you gentiles.* His imprisonment at Rome, at the time of writing this epistle, was owing to the same thing. For he says here, ch. i. 11, 12. *Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the gentiles. For the which cause I also suffer these things.* This is very observable. And indeed the twelve verses at the beginning of this epistle are a most proper introduction to an epistle, sent to Timothy by Paul, at the time, for which we argue.

Thus the circumstances of Paul's confinement at the time of writing this epistle, compared with the circumstances of that confinement at Rome, of which St. Luke has given a general account, and in which it is allowed, that St. Paul wrote epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, show it to be one and the same imprisonment, and that this epistle also was written about the same time with them.

2. St. Luke was with the apostle at Rome, when he wrote this epistle, 2 Tim. iv. 11. And we know from the Acts, that he went with Paul from Judea to Rome, when he was sent thither by Festus. He is likewise mentioned in the epistles to the

the Coloſſians, and Philemon, written during this impriſonment. But it would be preſumption to ſay, that St. Luke was with the apoſtle at Rome, in another impriſonment, three, or four, or five years after this: eſpecially, when we ſee, that his hiſtory of St. Paul in the book of the Acts concludes with the account of his two years impriſonment at Rome, when ſent thither by Feſtus.

3. Since the apoſtle's coming to Rome, he had had with him, beſide Luke, who accompanied him, Demas, Creſcens, Titus, Tychicus, four of his aſſiſtants and fellow-labourers. Which might be likely enough to be expected, when Paul was ſent from Judea to Rome. But it cannot be ſaid to have been likely at any other ſeaſon. But at this it was. For Paul's impriſonment in Judea had laſted above two years. And it muſt have been known to all gentile Chriſtians throughout the world, and obſerved by them with aſtoniſhment, and grief. And his laſt appearance before Feſtus, and others at Cæſarea, was a very remarkable thing, and muſt have ſoon come to the knowledge of all Chriſtians in Syria, Aſia, Greece, and Italy. At that aſſembly it was determined, that Paul ſhould go to Rome. He took ſhipping at Cæſarea with others. He had a long and dangerous voyage. And after ſuch an impriſonment in Judea, as that related by St. Luke, with all its circumſtances, it may be reckoned highly probable, that ſome good number of the apoſtle's affectionate friends, eſpecially his fellow-labourers, if not too much engaged, ſhould form a deſign, and do their utmoſt, to meet him at Rome. It ſeems to me very likely, that ſome ſuch perſons ſhould with this view get to Rome, before Paul himſelf. Accordingly, we have ſeen four ſuch perſons mentioned by Paul in this epiſtle. It is a ſtriking circumſtance, and exceedingly favours our argument for the time of this epiſtle.

4. Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 20. *Eraſtus abode at Corinth:* which is agreeable to the account of St. Paul's journey to Jeruſalem, as related by St. Luke. For Acts xix. 22. Eraſtus is expreſsly mentioned as *one of thoſe who miniſtred to Paul,* whom he ſent from Epheſus to Macedonia. Nor is Eraſtus among thoſe who went with Paul from Macedonia, Acts xx. 4. It is therefore very likely that he ſtayed at Corinth, and did not go with the apoſtle to Jeruſalem. This Timothy knew

[n] *Eraſtus remanſit Corinthi.*] Fuerat in Macedoniam miſſus a Paulo. Acts xix. 22. Deinde Corinthum redierat, ibique manſerat, nec venerat Romam. Grot. in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

very

very well. Nevertheless, it [n] is very properly mentioned together with other particulars, showing Timothy the reasonableness of his coming to him, and the need which the apostle had of his presence.

We should here recollect what was formerly said of the apostle's situation at Rome, after a long and close confinement in Judea. And then we shall easily account for Paul's mentioning to Timothy divers things which had happened some good while before. In a word, Paul may take the same notice of several things, which had happened before parting with Timothy at Miletus, in the same manner that he would have mentioned them, supposing him to have stayed but a few weeks at Jerusalem, and then sailed from Cæsarea to Rome, and soon after his arrival at Rome, had written to Timothy to come to him. For all the time of the apostle's close confinement in Judea had been sunk and annihilated in his computation.

5. In the same verse. *Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick.* Another particular, leading to that date of this epistle, for which we argue.

We know from Acts xxi. 29. that Trophimus was with Paul at Jerusalem. It may be reckoned probable, that he set out with Paul from Cæsarea to go to Rome. St. Luke indeed, Acts xxvii. 2. mentions not expressly any companions of Paul in his voyage, beside himself and Aristarchus. Nevertheless Trophimus likewise may have embarked with him. The reason of not mentioning him may be, that he did not complete the voyage, having fallen sick, and therefore had been left at Miletus. This Timothy might know very well. Nevertheless it is fitly taken notice of by Paul, in a letter written soon after finishing the voyage, and when writing to Timothy to come to him.

But when was Trophimus left at Miletus? Beza [o] was inclined to read here Μελιτη, *Melita, Malta,* instead of Μιλητῳ, *Miletus:* which conjecture is approved by [p] Grotius. But if Miletus should be reckoned the true reading, Beza supposeth

[n] Quod Erastum Corinthi mansisse scribit, non tanquam rem novam incognitamque Timotheo renunciat: refert tamen, uti attinentem ad scopum suum, &c. Witsius de Vit. Pauli sect. xii. n. vi.

[o] Nempe in illa tarda navigatione cum præterveheretur littus Asiæ, sicuti narratur. Act. xxvii. 7. Quamquam potius conjicio legendum εν μελιτη, in Melita. Quod vocabulum facile fuit in μιλητῳ depravare. Bez. in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

[p] Omnino assentior doctissimo Bezæ legenti εν μιλητη. —— In itinere Hierosolymis Paulus Meliten attigit, non Miletum. Grot. in loc.

that

that Trophimus might be ſet on ſhore in the time of that ſlow ſailing, mentioned Acts xxvii. 7. Lightfoot[q] concludes from what is in Acts xxvii. 2. that Paul had a good opportunity to leave Trophimus at Miletus.

This will be farther confirmed, if we admit the interpretation given by Wall, without any view to the uſe, which we are about to make of it. 'Acts xxvii. 2. *Meaning to ſail by 'the coaſts of Aſia.* Μελλοντες πλειν τους κατα την ασιαν τοπους. The 'ſhip meant to call at ſome places in Aſia. This is a differ-'ent phraſe from that, ch. xx. 16. παραπλευσαι Ἐφεσον. *to ſail 'by Epheſus*, that is, to leave it, to paſs by it, without call-'ing. It is, then, a very eaſy and natural ſuppoſition, that Paul might have an opportunity of ſetting Trophimus on ſhore at Miletus.

6. St. Paul deſires Timothy to come to him ſhortly, ch. iv. 9. And unqueſtionably he did ſo. We find his name in the ſalutations at the beginning of the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, Philemon, written during this impriſonment, and near its period. Witſius[r] obſerves, that in the Acts there is no account of Timothy's accompanying Paul to Rome. Timothy therefore not being there at the beginning of the apoſtle's captivity in that city, he might have occaſion to ſend a letter to him, at the time ſuppoſed by us. This

[q] 'But when was he left? Not 'when Paul went toward Jeruſalem, 'and ſent for the elders of Epheſus 'to Miletus. Acts xx. For Tro-'phimus went, and was with Paul 'at Jeruſalem. xxi. 29. But it 'was, when Paul returned from 'Jeruſalem, as has been ſaid, 'though it be not particularly men-'tioned, that he touched there. '——Luke ſays plainly, that at 'Paul's coming away from Judea 'in his voyage to Rome, it was 'their reſolution *to ſail by the coaſts 'of Aſia.* Acts xxvii. 2. Which 'would have been a fairer ground 'to have concluded upon, that 'Paul was at Miletus in this voy-'age, ſince that was a part of thoſe 'Aſian coaſts, than to change 'Miletus into Melita, upon no 'ground at all. And certainly the 'very ſcope of the apoſtle in that 'paſſage will not admit of that 'change. For he is not telling 'Timothy of Eraſtus' abode at 'Corinth, or of Trophimus's ſick-'ſtay at Miletus, as things un-'known to him, but as things very 'well known, yet mentioned to 'him, as making to the apoſtle's 'purpoſe.' Lightfoot's Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 324.

[r] Pro certo habent, Timotheum initio priorum Pauli vinculorum Romæ non fuiſſe. Etenim in Actibus Apoſtolicis nihil ultra de Timotheo dicitur, quam quod Paulum Hieroſolymam proficiſcentem in Aſiam fuerit comitatus, cap. xx. 4. Exinde nulla Timothei mentio: de itinere Hieroſolymitano, nedum de navigatione Romana, εδε γρυ. Quia vero res ipſius adeo Pauli rebus innexæ fuere, ipſeque tam eximiam ſuſtinuit perſonam, vix videtur præteriri potuiſſe in tanta rerum quæ Paulo acciderunt varietate, &c. De Vit. Pauli. ſect. 12. num. v.

particular

particular is well enforced by Witſius at the beginning of his argument upon the date of this epiſtle.

7. Ver. 11. St. Paul ſays, *Take Mark, and bring him with thee.* And doubtleſs Timothy did bring Mark to Rome. For he is mentioned with others, Col. iv. 10. and Philem. ver. 24. and comprehended in thoſe general expreſſions, Philip. iv. 21.

Grotius in [s] his notes upon 2 Tim. iv. 9, 11. ſays the ſame of Timothy, Luke, and Mark, that I have done. It is ſtrange, that he did not diſcern the conſequence, which is ſo obvious: that this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy muſt have been written before the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon. But that he diſcerned this conſequence, does not appear clearly from his preface to this epiſtle. Whether he did, or not, he admits our interpretations. And the conſequence is unavoidable. It follows alſo from what he ſays upon ver. 20. of Trophimus having been left at Melita, in Paul's voyage from Judea to Rome, as before obſerved, and from ſome other things ſaid by him in his annotations on this epiſtle. Which may be taken notice of hereafter.

8. Ver. 13. *The cloak, that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comeſt, bring with thee, and the books, eſpecially the parchments.*

As St. Paul went to Jeruſalem by the way of Troas, we are hereby led to the time of this impriſonment: eſpecially when we conſider, that Timothy accompanied the apoſtle in that Journey as far as Aſia. And Paul here ſeems to write to Timothy, as knowing Carpus, and that theſe things had been left with him.

If it be objected, that [t] Paul had at that time ſeveral friends with him, who might be willing to take care of thoſe things: we [u] readily anſwer: it is true. Nor need it be ſuppoſed, that

[s] Σπευδασον ελθειν προς με ταχεως· nempe Romam. Et hoc fecit Timotheus, ut apparet. Coloſſ. i. 1. Philem. i. Hebr. xiii. Philip. ii. 19. Grot. in 2 Tim. iv. 9. vid. et in ver. 11.

Λουκας εστι μονος μετ' εμου. Nam poſt iter illud, quod ſine Actorum deſcripſit, manſit in Italiâ cum Paulo. Col. iv. 14. Philem. ver. 24.

Μαρκον αναλαβων αγαγε μετα σεαυτου. —— Et hoc deſiderium Pauli impletum eſt. Vide Philem. 24. Coloſſ. iv. 10. Id. in ver. 11.

[t] Quia jubet ſibi adferri penulam, quam Troade apud Carpum reliquerat, et libros. —— Ineptum autem eſt vel cogitare Paulum hæc Troade reliquiſſe, quum tot ſecum haberet comites, et collectas Hieroſolymam perferendas, et navem ubique conduceret. Ap. Witſ. ibid. ſect. 12. num. iv.

[u] Reſpondetur: non magis ineptum eſſe cogitare, Paulum penulam ſuam cum libris quibuſdam et membranis Troade reliquiſſe in illo itinere,

that in any other journey Paul was without a ſufficient number of friends, to perform for him any needful ſervice of that kind. There might be other reaſons for leaving thoſe things behind him.

We need not inquire, what were thoſe reaſons, nor what were thoſe things. However I ſhall obſerve here what Lightfoot ſays of the word, rendered *cloak*, in his account of St. Paul's journey from Troas to Jeruſalem: 'when [x] he goes 'now from thence, it is moſt likely, was the time when he 'left his cloak and parchments with Carpus, 2 Tim. iv. 13. 'His *cloak*. For he was now going among his own nation in 'Judea, and there he was to wear his Jewiſh habit. And he 'left his Roman garb here, till he ſhould come into thoſe 'Roman quarters again.'

9. The progreſs of the goſpel at the time of writing this epiſtle, and the other epiſtles, confeſſedly written in the time of St. Paul's impriſonment at Rome, when ſent thither from Judea, appears to be the ſame, or very much alike.

To the Philippians he writes, ch. i. 12, 13. *I would, ye ſhould underſtand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me, have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the goſpel: ſo that my bonds in Chriſt are manifeſt in all the palace, and in all other places.* See alſo ver. 14—18. In this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, he ſays, ch. ii. 9.——that *though he ſuffered unto bonds, the word of God was not bound.* And ſee ch. iv. 16. 17. And at ver. 11. he deſires, that Mark would come to him: *for*, ſays he, *he is profitable to me for the miniſtry*: ſuppoſing, that he ſhould have employment for him, wherein he might promote the intereſt of the goſpel. Paul could ſpeak more diſtinctly of his ſucceſſes, and of the oppoſitions which he met with at Rome, in the epiſtles written a ſhort time before his enlargement. But even now he appears to have had in proſpect thoſe things, which were afterwards accompliſhed.

10. At ch. iii. 11. he reminds Timothy of *the perſecutions, and afflictions which he had endured at Antioch, Iconium, Lyſtra*, all well known to Timothy. Which is very proper and ſeaſonable, at our ſuppoſed time of writing this epiſtle: more

nere, quod Lucas meminit, quam in alio, quod ſupponitur, quocumque. Si enim id conſulto factum ſit, ratio conſilii æque nobis in obſcuro manet: quippe nullibi tradita. Si per oblivionem aliquam aut negligentiam ejus qui Paulo miniſtrabat: quo plures erant, majoriſque momenti ſarcinæ, eo facilior eſſe videtur unius alicujus, et vilioris, forſan, neglectus, &c. Witſ. ib. ſect. 12. num. vi. [x] As before, p. 298.

ſeaſonable,

ſeaſonable, than it would have been ſeveral years afterwards.

Some, perhaps, may think it reaſonable to expect more notice taken of the apoſtle's impriſonment in Judea, and at Rome. But we ſuppoſe, that to be the very impriſonment, which he was now under, and of which he often ſpeaks in this epiſtle, ſaying, that he *ſuffered trouble, even unto bonds:* that *he endured all things for the elects' ſake*; that *Oneſiphorus was not aſhamed of his chain:* that he had *made an apology, when all men forſook him.* But if this letter had been written ſeveral years after his impriſonment in Judea, and at Rome; it would have been reaſonable to expect ſome references to it, as a thing paſt, in his exhortations to Timothy, in ſpeaking of perſecutions and afflictions formerly endured by him.

11. Ch. ii. 22. *Flee alſo youthful luſts.* An exhortation to Timothy more ſuitable now, than ſeveral years afterwards. Indeed, this whole epiſtle is an admonition to Timothy, as a Chriſtian, and a miniſter, better ſuiting the time of St. Paul's impriſonment at Rome, when ſent thither from Judea, than any later time.

12. Ch. iv. 16, 17. *At my firſt anſwer no man ſtood with me, but all men forſook me.—— Notwithſtanding the Lord ſtood with me, and ſtrengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the gentiles might hear. And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.*

Theſe words afford a ſtrong argument, that this epiſtle was written, when Paul was ſent bound from Judea to Rome. For it is much more reaſonable to think, that Paul would ſpeak of ſuch an apology in an epiſtle written ſoon after it was made, than in an epiſtle written five or ſix years afterwards. That Paul ſpeaks of an apology made at the time ſuppoſed by us, is very probable. And this text was ſo underſtood by ſeveral ancient writers, Euſebius, Jerom, Chryſoſtom, and Theodoret. The words of [y] Euſe-

y —— τοτε μεν ουν απολογησαμενον, αυθις επι την τε κηρυγματος διακονιαν λογος εχει στειλασθαι τον αποστολον· δευτερον δε επιβαντα τη αυτη πολει τω και αυτον τελειωθηναι μαρτυριω: εν ω δεσμοις εχομενος την προς τιμοθεον δευτεραν επιστολην συνταττει, ομου σημαινων την τε προτεραν αυτω γενομενην απολογιαν, και την παραποδας τελειωσιν. —— Εικος γουν κατα μεν αρχας ηπιωτερον τε νερωνος διακειμενε, ραον την υπερ τε δογματος τε παυλε καταδεχθηναι απολογιαν· προελθοντος δε εις αθεμιτας τολμας, μετα των αλλων, και τα κατα των αποστολων εγχειρισθηναι. H. E. l. ii. cap. 22. p. 62. A. et D.

bius

bius I tranſcribe below in his own language. Jerom's words were tranſcribed by us [z] formerly, and are fit to be repeated here. They repreſent the ſame ſentiment with that in Euſebius: from whom, probably, and from ſome other ancients, he learned it. 'It [a] ſhould be obſerved, ſays he, 'that at the time of his firſt apology, Nero's government 'not being yet quite degenerated, nor diſgraced with the 'horrible wickedneſs, which hiſtorians ſpeak of, Paul was 'ſet at liberty, that he might preach the goſpel in the 'weſtern parts of the world: as himſelf writes in the ſecond 'epiſtle to Timothy, dictated by him in his bonds, at the 'time he ſuffered.' And what follows.

And Chryſoſtom in a homily upon the fourth chapter of this epiſtle: 'How,' ſays [b] he, 'ſhall we underſtand this firſt 'apology? He was at firſt brought before the emperor, 'and eſcaped. But when he had converted his cup-bearer, 'then he was beheaded.'

Theodoret is very expreſs in his comment. 'When [c] 'upon his appeal, he was ſent to Rome by Feſtus, having 'apologized for himſelf, he was diſmiſſed as innocent, and 'went into Spain, and other nations.——By the firſt apo-'logy therefore he meaneth that which was then made. '*And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.* So he calls 'Nero, as being emperor, and a cruel man.'

Indeed this defence, or apology, cannot relate to any other time. For he ſays: *But the Lord ſtood with me, and ſtrengthened me: that by me the preaching might be fully known, and all the gentiles might hear.* This could not be ſaid at any ſuppoſed ſecond impriſonment, when the apoſtle was near his end. But muſt relate to the proſpect of ſucceſs, which he had ſoon after he was brought from Judea to Rome. At that time theſe expreſſions were exceedingly proper, and

[z] See vol. V. p. 45, 46.

[a] Sciendum autem, in prima ſatisfactione, necdum Neronis imperio roborato, nec in tanta erumpente ſcelera, quanta de eo narrant hiſtoriæ, Paulum a Nerone dimiſſum, ut evangelium Chriſti in Occidentis quoque partibus prædicaret. Sicut ipſe in ſecunda epiſtola ad Timotheum, eo tempore quo et paſſus eſt, de vinculis dictans epiſtolam, &c. De V. I. cap. 5.

[b] Πῶς δὲ πρώτην ἀπολογίαν λέγει; Παρεση ηδη τῳ νερωνι, και διεφυγεν. Επειδη δε τον οινοχοον αυτε κατηχησε, τοτε αυτον απετεμεν. In 2 ep. ad Tim. cap. iv. hom. 10. T. XI. p. 722. B.

[c] Ηνικα τῃ εφεσει χρησαμενος εις την ρωμην υπο τε φησε παρεπεμφθη, απολογησαμενος ως αθωος εφειθη. —— Πρωτην τοινυν απολογιαν την εν εκεινῃ τῃ εκδημια γεγενημενην εκαλεσε. κ. λ. In 2 ep. Tim. iv. 16. tom. III. p. 506.

his

his expectations were fully anſwered. As may be collected from Philip. i. 12—20. and ch. iv. 22. Witſius has ſome obſervations upon this place, which [d] deſerve to be tranſcribed. So do likewiſe the obſervations of another learned writer, [e] they being well ſuited to illuſtrate this text.

For farther clearing up this point, I muſt ſtay ſomewhat longer here. I cannot but think it very evident, that Paul was now brought before the emperor, and that he here refers to it. Lightfoot ſuppoſeth, 'that [f] in thoſe words, *at my firſt anſwer*, Paul does not ſo much refer to what, or how 'many anſwers he was called to: but intimates, that even at 'the firſt pinch and appearance of danger, all that ſhould 'have been his aſſiſtants ſtarted from him.' And that may be the meaning. Nevertheleſs it is not impoſſible, that Paul might make two apologies, one ſoon after the other, at the firſt of which all forſook him: whereas, at the ſecond, there were ſome, who appeared with him, and ſpoke in his behalf. But however that may be, I am of opinion, that Paul was brought before Nero himſelf, and that he here

[d] Puto hæc ad ea quæ Romæ tunc geſta ſunt referenda eſſe. Ibi enim conſtitutus tunc fuit Paulus, ut in ſummo totius mundi loco, unde evangelii ab ipſo prædicati ſonus, non tanquam buccinæ, ſed tanquam tonitru, quaquaverſum audiretur. —— Porro ea, quæ Romæ, quæ in Prætorio, quæ ad tribunal Cæſaris dicebantur, vel agebantur, in tanta confluentium multitudine, celeri fama, per omnes totius propemodum orbis gentes vulgata fuere. Quibus non parum ponderis ex eo acceſſit, quod captivus iſte, tam mirabilium rerum anunciator, a popularibus quidem ſuis accuſatus, ſed a Cæſare abſolutus, vel certe non damnatus eſſet. Witſ. de Vit. Paul. § 12. num. xxxii.

[e] Idem jam a Paulo indicatum, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. *In prima mea defenſione nemo mihi adfuit, ſed omnes*, nimirum Chriſtiani, Romæ tum Pauli aggregati, *me deſeruerunt.* —— *Dominus autem mihi adfuit, et confortavit me, ut per me promulgatio evangelii compleretur, et omnes gentes* illud *audirent: Etenim liberatus fui ex ore leonis*, quocum jamjam mihi erat depugnandum. —— Paulus docet, ſeſe, adjuvante Deo, ab intentata ſibi cum leone depugnatione fuiſſe ereptum: ſeſe cauſſam ſuam ita dixiſſe, ut liber et inviolatus fuerit dimiſſus e Prætorio: Deum hoc pacto promulgationem evangelii promoviſſe, et in celebritatem deduxiſſe, ac ad ſecuritatem. Securitas adnuntiationis ſita eſt in voce πληροφοριας, quæ a nave, plenis velis ac liberrime invehente, eſt deſumta. Eum igitur finem liberationis ſuæ Numen Supremum volucrat eſſe proprium, ut Paulus in poſterum eo liberius doctrinam evangelii evulgaret. Roma erat locus celeberrimus. Quidquid ibi gerebatur, id putabatur agi in luce orbis terrarum. Cauſſa itaque Pauli inde innotuit ac increbuit paſſim, ac quicunque de ea aliquid audiebant, avidi fuerunt redditi doctrinæ quoque ipſius, quam docebat, audiendæ et cognoſcendæ. J. Ch. Harenberg. Otia Ganderſhem. Obſerv. S. iii.

ſpeaks

ſpeaks of it. Several [8] moderns have perceived this. But though this opinion had never had the patronage of any great names, I apprehend, it might be deduced with certainty from St. Luke's hiſtory in the Acts. He is very conciſe in what he ſays of Paul after his arrival at Rome. Nor has he ſaid, that Paul was brought before Nero. But it may be argued, and concluded from what he has ſaid.

When Paul was firſt brought before Feſtus at Cæſarea, after he had been left bound by Felix, at the end of two years impriſonment, and Feſtus propoſed, that he ſhould *go up to Jeruſalem, and be there judged before him: Paul ſaid, I ſtand at Cæſar's judgment-ſeat, where I ought to be judged*, Acts xxv. 9, 10. *Then Feſtus, when he had conferred with his council, anſwered, haſt thou appealed unto Cæſar? Unto Cæſar ſhalt thou go*, ver. 12. Therefore that was now determined. When Feſtus firſt ſpoke to king Agrippa about Paul's affair, he ſaid to him, *But when Paul had appealed to be reſerved to the hearing*, or judgment, *of Auguſtus, I commanded him to be kept, till I might ſend him to Cæſar*, ver. 21. And when Feſtus actually brought Paul before Agrippa, and the reſt, he ſaid, *He himſelf having appealed unto Auguſtus, I have determined to ſend him*, ver. 25. After Paul had pleaded before Feſtus, and Agrippa, and that great company at Cæſarea, it is ſaid, ch. xxvi. 31, 32. *And the king roſe up, and Bernice, and they that ſat with them. And when they had gone aſide, they talked between themſelves, ſaying, this man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds. Then ſaid Agrippa unto Feſtus: this man might have been ſet at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæſar.* After his appeal therefore the ſending Paul to Rome was unavoidable. If Agrippa and the reſt of that great company did not dare to diſmiſs him, though they thought him innocent, but judged it needful, that he ſhould go to Rome, it may be reckoned probable, that he was actually brought before the emperor. And Feſtus wrote a letter concerning Paul to the emperor himſelf, as may be concluded from

[8] I ſhall cite an author or two here, though they may not agree with me about the time of Paul's appearance before the emperor.

'Acts xxvii. 24. *Thou muſt be 'brought before Cæſar.* By this, and 'by what Paul ſays, 2 Tim. iv. 17. 'it ſeems, that he had a perſonal 'hearing before Nero himſelf.' Wall's Crit. notes upon the N. T. p. 271.

Nous ne ſaurions douter au moins que S. Paul n'ait comparu devant Neron peu de temps avant ſa mort, comme on le voit par ſa ſeconde epiſtre à Timothée. Tillem. S. Paul. note 40. Mem. T. I. p. 531. Paris.

ch. xxv. 26, 27. And while Paul was in the voyage to Rome, he had a viſion. *An angel ſtood by him, ſaying: fear not, Paul, thou muſt be brought before Cæſar*, ch. xxvii. 23, 24. Certainly, therefore, he was brought before him. And that is what he intends, when he ſpeaks of his apology. Which is alſo confirmed by what follows: *And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.* Whereby muſt be meant Nero himſelf.

And now we may be able to underſtand thoſe expreſſions: *No man ſtood with me: but all men forſook me.* St. Luke's hiſtory of Paul's arrival at Rome will give great light to thoſe words. Acts xxviii. 13—15. *And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were deſired to tarry with them ſeven days: and ſo we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the three taverns: whom when Paul ſaw, he thanked God, and took courage.* The affectionate and reſpectful viſit of ſo many Chriſtians from Rome was very refreſhing and comfortable to him, after all the fatigues of his voyage, and in the diſgraceful circumſtances of his appearance. But when he was preſented to the emperor, *no man ſtood by him: but all men forſook him.* And theſe are the men, whom he intends: theſe, and other Chriſtians then at Rome. None of them had courage to appear in his favour, and plead in his behalf, as they might have done. But all drew back, and left him alone. *Notwithſtanding the Lord ſtood with me, and ſtrengthened me.*

Let me now repreſent the progreſs of this affair, as it appears to me, after having conſulted [h] Lightfoot, and others.

[h] 'Julius, the Centurion, that 'had brought Paul, and the reſt of 'the priſoners from Judea, had been 'his friend and favourer from his 'firſt ſetting out, and ſo continued, 'till his ſettling at Rome.—His 'accuſers, that were come from 'Judea, to lay in the charge againſt 'him, [for we can hardly ſuppoſe, 'but that ſome were come:] would 'be urgent to get their buſineſs 'deſpatched, that they might be 'returning to their own homes 'again; and ſo would bring him to 'his trial, as ſoon as they could. 'And that his trial was early this 'year, appears by his own words in 'the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, 'where he ſpeaketh of his anſwer, 'and requireth Timothy to come 'to him before winter, 2 Tim. 'iv. 16, 21.

'As he appealed to Nero him-'ſelf, ſo Nero himſelf heard his 'cauſe, Philip i. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 16. 'And here it was poſſible for Paul 'and Seneca to ſee each other. At 'which time all that had owned 'him before, withdrew themſelves 'for fear, and dared not to ſtand by 'him, or appear with him in his 'danger.' Lightfoot, as before, p. 322.

When

When the prisoners from Judea were brought to Rome, they were all delivered to the captain of the guard, or prefect of the prætorium. At the same time Julius the centurion, to whose charge they had been committed, and who had all along *courteously entreated Paul*, [Acts xxvii. 3.] spoke honourably of him to the prefect, or delivered in a written memorial of his voyage, and the several prisoners, whom he had brought with him, inserting, particularly, some things in favour of this prisoner, and also put into his hands the governor's letter to the emperor, concerning Paul. The tenor of which, as may be concluded from the letter of Lysias to Felix, ch. xxiii. 25—30. and from other things afterwards recorded in the Acts, omitting the usual forms, not needful to be mentioned here, was to this purpose: 'My Lord, when I came into this province, committed to 'my charge by thy favour, I found a prisoner, named Paul, 'left bound by my predecessor Felix, after he had been two 'years in custody. In a short time grievous complaints 'were made against him by the chief men of the nation, 'desiring me to pass sentence of condemnation upon him. 'Whereupon I appointed them a hearing. And being sat 'on the judgment-seat, I commanded the man to be brought 'forth. But when the accusers stood up, they alleged no 'proofs of any thing that could render him criminal in the 'eye of our laws. They had only certain questions against 'him of their own religion, and concerning one Jesus, who 'had died, and whom Paul affirmed to be alive. At this 'time the man expressed a desire to be heard at thy tri-'bunal. And having conferred with my council, and con-'sidering, that he is a citizen of Rome, his appeal was 'allowed to be valid. Whereupon I resolved to send him 'unto thee, as soon as I could. In the mean time, king 'Agrippa and Bernice came to the place of my residence. 'Who being Jews by nation and religion, and willing to 'hear the man, I set him before them, that I might be the 'better informed concerning him myself. In their pre-'sence, and before me, and many others, Roman officers, 'and principal men of this city, he without reserve declared 'his doctrine, and his concern to promote it, and indeed 'his whole life from the beginning. After which, when 'the assembly, (as honourable as can be expected to be seen 'in any of the provinces) were gone aside, they talked 'between themselves. And they were all agreed, saying,

'this man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds: and 'he might have been ſet at liberty, if he had not appealed 'to Auguſtus. To thee therefore I now ſend him. And 'to thy cognizance his cauſe is referred.'

When Burrhus, the prefect of the prætorium, brought Paul before the emperor, and delivered the governor's letter; it is not improbable, that he might add ſome hints in favour of the priſoner, from the character given of him by Julius, either by word, or in his memorial. At this audience muſt have been preſent, beſide †‡ Burrhus, divers other courtiers, of the greateſt eminence and diſtinction, and perhaps Seneca. It may be likewiſe ſuppoſed, that ſome Jews delegated by the council at Jeruſalem, appeared, to plead againſt Paul. If there were none, it muſt have been underſtood to be a diſreſpect to the emperor; and a great prejudice to the cauſe of the accuſers. If there were any ſuch here, it would ſhow the reaſonableneſs of Paul's expectation, that ſome of the Chriſtians at Rome ſhould have attended likewiſe.

At this time (unleſs there was another audience ſoon after) the emperor pronounced ſentence upon Paul, and ſigned the order of his confinement: ſuch as is related by St. Luke, Acts xxviii. 16, 30, 31. And though Paul was not acquitted, nor ſet at liberty, it may be eſteemed a favourable deciſion.

It was after this audience of the emperor, and this ſentence, that Paul ſent for the Jews at Rome to come to him. But when he laid before them his caſe, and ſpoke of the proceedings againſt him in Judea, and of his appeal to Cæſar; they were very humble, and even low ſpirited, and did not chooſe to enter into diſcourſe upon the matter.

Paul ſays, Acts xxviii. 19. *But when the Jews ſpake againſt it, I was conſtrained to appeal to Cæſar: not that I had ought to accuſe my nation of.* Theſe laſt words may be underſtood by ſome, as if he had ſaid, 'Not that I have any cauſe of complaint againſt my nation.' Which would be great complaiſance indeed, after he had received ſo much hard uſage from the Jews. But the words may be thus rendered: 'Not that I have a deſign to accuſe my nation of any thing.' And in

†‡ Burrhus is computed to have died in the year of Chriſt 62, and Seneca in the year 65. Vid. Baſn. Ann. 62. num. i. et Ann. 65. num. iv.

that

that manner they are rendered by [i] Le Clerc, and [k] Lenfant, in their French tranſlations. And it is agreeable to [l] Beza's annotation upon the place, who is another good judge. This ſenſe is very becoming Paul, and was very ſuitable to his circumſtance and ſituation at that time. It was very proper to pacify the Jews at Rome, who might have been apprehenſive of Paul's making uſe of his intereſt in the emperor's court againſt them, after he had been ſo ill uſed in Judea. But all he aimed at was the vindication of his own innocence, that he might with greater liberty preach the goſpel.

Here we ſee the ground of the difference between Paul's impriſonment in Judea, and at Rome. The difference is manifeſt. Whilſt in Judea, it does not appear that he had any communication with other churches out of it. He is wholly engaged in his own defence, and does but juſt ſecure his life againſt the violence of the unbelieving Jews, and their council. But when he came to Rome, and his apology was over, he was permitted to live by himſelf, in his own hired houſe. There he receives intelligence by meſſengers of the churches, who come to him from divers parts. He makes converts, and writes letters, and has fellow-labourers, whom he ſends abroad, as he pleaſeth. We now ſee the ground of this. As [m] Jerom ſays, 'the 'apoſtle being ſent to priſon by the emperor, he becomes 'acquainted with the emperor's family, and makes the per-'ſecutor's houſe a church.' Referring to Philip. iv. 22. When Paul was in Judea, he was the governor's priſoner, whoſe good will was reſtrained by the influence of the people of the country. Now he is the emperor's priſoner, who allows what liberty he pleaſeth. And when granted, none dare to control, or abridge it in any meaſure. Hence all the advantages of this impriſonment, and the happy concluſion of it. Having ſo much liberty, and being able to receive all who came to him, he makes many converts and

[i] Mais les Juifs s'y oppoſant, j'ai été contraint d'en appeller à Ceſar: ſans que j'aye neanmoins deſſein d'accuſer ma nation, en quoi que ſe ſoit. Cl. [k] —— ſans que j'aye deſſein neanmoins d'accuſer ma nation, en quoi que ce ſoit. Lenf.

[l] Eſt autem hoc additum a Paulo, ne putarent Judæi ipſum conſtituiſſe criminari gentem ſuam apud Cæſarem: cum hoc unum potius ageret, ut nullo hoſtium incommodo cauſſam Chriſti et innocentiam ſuam tueretur. Bez. [m] A Cæſare miſſus in carcerem, notior familiæ ejus factus, perſecutoris domum Chriſti fecit eccleſiam. In ep. ad Philem. T. IV. p. 445. in.

many friends, some in the emperor's own family, and near his person. Says the apostle in this very epistle, ch. iv. 16, 17. *At my first answer no man stood with me.——Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and all the gentiles might hear.* It is a case much resembling that of our apostle before at Corinth, Acts xviii. 9—11. *Then spake the Lord unto 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: for I have much people in this city. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them.* And though he was brought before Gallio the governor, and accused; he was acquitted, and continued there yet a good while. In like manner here, *the Lord stood by Paul, strengthened him, and delivered him.* And he afterwards *dwelt two whole years at Rome, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus, no man forbidding him.* Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

Some may say, that during this space several of the apostle's friends and fellow-labourers were apprehended and imprisoned: which seems inconsistent with the supposition of his being committed by the emperor, with an order for allowing him all the liberty which he enjoyed. For Aristarchus is spoken of as his fellow-prisoner, Col. iv. 10. and Epaphras, Philem. ver. 23. And Timothy is said to have been set at liberty, Heb. xiii. 23. Who therefore must have been confined.

To which I answer, that these imprisonments of some of Paul's friends and fellow-labourers do not at all weaken our supposition, but confirm it: forasmuch as Paul's liberty was not abridged, but continued the same all along, until he was quite enlarged: which affords reason to think that the method of his confinement was appointed and ordered by an authority above control. And it is easy to conceive, how it came to pass that some of Paul's friends were imprisoned: when it is considered that he must have had many enemies, and some of his friends acted imprudently, and there were others, who from envy and ill-will were prompted to behave irregularly, with a view of bringing him and his best friends into danger, by exposing them to general resentment, and especially the resentment of men in power. As we learn from Philip. i. 15—17. And yet it does not appear that any of Paul's fellow-labourers endured a long imprison-

impriſonment. It is not unlikely, that they were taken up, and impriſoned by ſome inferior officers, to gratify the fury of the common people, who did not dare to keep them long in cuſtody, nothing material appearing againſt them. As Jerom[n] obſerves, ſuch frequent, ſhort impriſonments and ſpeedy releaſes were common at the firſt riſe of the chriſtian religion, before Nero became an open perſecutor, and before the publication of ſuch edicts, as affected the lives of the followers of Jeſus.

All theſe conſiderations cannot but be of great weight, to determine the time of this epiſtle. However, there are ſome difficulties that ought to be taken notice of.

1. Obj. *For I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand,* 2 Tim. iv. 6.

Theſe expreſſions led [o] Euſebius of Cæſarea, and [p] Jerom, who followed him, and [q] Chryſoſtom, though he did not follow either, to ſay that this was the laſt epiſtle of St. Paul, written only a ſmall ſpace of time before his martyrdom. And many learned moderns have been of the ſame opinion, as is well known.

But let us attend to Lightfoot. 'There [r] is one paſſage,' ſays he, 'in this epiſtle, which has cauſed ſome to doubt 'about the time of its writing. That is what he ſays ch. 'iv. 6. *I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my de-* 'parture is at hand. Which would make one think, that he 'was now ready to be martyred, and taken away. And it 'has made ſome believe, this was the laſt epiſtle that ever 'he wrote. But when we compare his own words again, 'ver. 17, 18. and Philip. i. 25. and Philem. ver. 22. it 'maketh, paſt controverſy, that he ſpeaketh not of his ſud-'den martyrdom, but that he is to be underſtood in ſome 'other ſenſe. —— And indeed the reſolution of the difficulty

[n] Quod autem crebro Paulus in carcere fuerit, et 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. Necdum enim ſuper nomine Chriſtiano ſenatus conſulta præcefferant: necdum Chriſtianum ſanguinem Neronis 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 et furore depoſito, laxabantur —— id agente Domino, ut in toto orbe nova prædicatio diſſeminaretur. In Philem. ver. 22. T. IV. p. 453.

[o] H. E. l. 2. cap. 22.

[p] Quoted vol. V. p. 45, 46; from De V. I. cap. v. [q] Quoted likewiſe before, vol. V. p. 135.

[r] Vol. I. p. 324.

'lies open and conſpicuous in the very text itſelf. Paul 'looked upon Timothy, as the prime and choice man that 'was to ſucceed him in the work of the goſpel, when he 'himſelf ſhould be dead and gone: as being a young man, 'not only of ſingular qualifications for that work, but of 'whom there had been ſpecial prophecies to ſuch a purpoſe. '1 Tim. i. 18. He exhorts him therefore in this place, to 'improve all his pains and parts to the utmoſt *to do the work* '*of an evangeliſt, to make full proof of his miniſtry*, ch. iv. 5. for 'that himſelf could not laſt long, being now grown old, 'and worn out with travail, and beſide all that, in bonds 'at preſent, and ſo in continual danger. Therefore muſt 'Timothy be fitting himſelf daily to take his work, when 'he is gone.'

So Lightfoot, and, as ſeems to me, very properly. To the like purpoſe Eſtius upon the ſame text. Whom[s] I tranſcribe below.

I likewiſe place below[t] a part of Baronius's ſolution of the ſame difficulty, which appears to me very ſufficient.

That Paul had now no certain and prophetic view of ſuffering martyrdom immediately, is apparent from ſeveral things in this epiſtle: particularly from his deſiring Timothy to come to him, and to bring Mark with him, as *pro-*

[s] Quare quæ hic ab Apoſtolo dicuntur non ita ſunt accipienda, quaſi plane ſentiat ſeſe jam jam rapiendum ad martyrium: præſertim cum alia quædam ejuſdem epiſtolæ repugnent huic intellectui. ——Sed tantum ſignificant, ipſum, etſi de tempore mortis et paſſionis incertum, tamen per carceres et tribunalia parari ad victimam.—— Quocirca non apparet hæc a Paulo dicta fuiſſe per revelationem aliquam de inſtante martyrio ſibi factam.—— Illud etiam conſiderandum eſt, Paulum loqui, ut jam ſenem, et laboribus confectum, qui proinde non multum vitæ tempus ſibi reliquum arbitretur. Ac quoniam non dubitat, ſe martyrio finiendum, idcirco, et de eo tanquam brevi futuro loquitur: *Ego enim*, inquit, *jam delibor*. ——Senſus et connexio eſt: Idcirco, cum tam ſeria obteſtatione te diſcipulum meum officii tui admoneo, quod jam ſenex ſim, et incertus quamdiu futurus ſuperſtes. Jam enim tanquam victima Chriſto deſtinata, per hos carceres, et graviſſimos quos patior adverſariorum impetus immolari incipio. Eſt. ad 2 Tim. iv 6. [t] ——eo enim ſenſu hæc putant accipienda eſſe verba, quaſi proxime eſſet Paulus martyrio coronandus, ſicque ab eo ſpiritu prophetico eſſe pronunciata.—— Sed dicant velim: Nonne idem ipſe Paulus in eadem teſtatur epiſtola, ſibi Dominum apparuiſſe, dum in ſummo illo diſcrimine verſaretur, hortatumque eſſe, ac fore prædixiſſe, ut per ipſum in omnes Gentes prædicatio impleretur? Quomodo igitur hæc ſibi cohærent, ut inſtans Pauli conſummatio eſſet, idemque ipſe ſic a periculo liberandus, in omnes Gentes prædicationem evangelii propagaturus eſſet? Et reliqua. Ann. 59. n. xiii, xiv.

fitable

fitable to him for the miniſtry. He ſuppoſed therefore, that he ſhould have an opportunity to employ him in the ſervice of the goſpel. He likewiſe muſt have hoped to receive, and uſe the things left at Troas, which he deſired Timothy to bring to him.

Obj. 2. St. Paul ſays, ch. iv. 18. *And the Lord ſhall deliver me from every evil work, and will preſerve me unto his heavenly kingdom.* By which many have ſuppoſed, that the apoſtle does not expreſs any hope of being now delivered from death, or the preſent danger, or any other temporal evil, but from ſin, and from all unworthy conduct of his own. So ſay [u] Le Clerc and [x] Whitby. *Paul had been delivered out of the mouth of the lion.* But he did not now expect any ſuch deliverance. He only hoped to be preſerved from ſin, and to be brought to God's heavenly kingdom.

But I do not think, that to be St. Paul's meaning. It is inconſiſtent with what he had juſt ſaid: that *the Lord had ſtood by him, and ſtrengthened him, that by him the preaching might be fully known, and that all the gentiles might hear.* Which could not be done preſently. But muſt require ſome time. To me it clearly appears, that the apoſtle's words expreſs faith in God, and hope of the divine protection in future difficulties and dangers: or, that God would ſtill deliver him, and uphold him in his ſervice, againſt all the deſigns of evil men. And when he had done the work, ſtill remaining for him to do, and fulfilled his teſtimony to the goſpel, he ſhould be *brought ſafe to God's heavenly kingdom.* Accordingly, he was preſerved for ſome good while after this, enjoying, ſo far as we know, as much freedom in preaching the goſpel, as ever he did, till a period was put to his life by martyrdom. As before obſerved, what the apoſtle ſays here at ch. iv. 16—18. much reſembles what is ſaid Acts xviii. 9—17. And the apoſtle's circumſtances at Corinth and Rome were much alike.

3. Obj. Once more, it may be ſaid, the ſtate of things ſhows, this epiſtle to have been written many years after the

[u] Non de la mort, mais des mauvaiſes actions, qu'il auroit fallu que S. Paul fit pour l'eviter. Clerc.

[x] Dr. Whitby's note upon ver. 18. is, 'If he will deliver him', as Chryſoſtom ſays, why does he ſay, '*I am offered?*' Obſerve therefore his words. He ſays not, he will again deliver me *out of the power of the lion:* but only, that *he will preſerve me from every evil work, and to his heavenly kingdom.* The place of Chryſoſtom, which I ſuppoſe to be here referred to, may be ſeen: on 2 ad Tim. cap. iv. hom. x. tom. XI. p. 722. Ed. Bened.

firſt

firſt epiſtle to Timothy, and when Paul was near his death. For he ſays here, ch. i. 15. *This thou knoweſt, that all they which are in Aſia be turned away from me. Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.* Which implies, that great corruptions now prevailed in Aſia, particularly in the church of Epheſus.

To which I anſwer: that if the Aſiatics, here ſpoken of, were now at Rome, or had been lately there; we are not hereby led to think diſadvantageouſly of the Chriſtians at Epheſus, and in Aſia, in general. That ſuch are the perſons here intended, has been the opinion of many, and is very probable. It was formerly obſerved, that [y] Chryſoſtom hereby underſtood ſuch as were at Rome. Eſtius, upon the place, ſays, this [z] was the general opinion of the Greek writers. And indeed it is in [a] Œcumenius, who expreſsly ſays, that they which are in Aſia is the ſame, as they which are of Aſia. To the like purpoſe Theophylact: 'They [b] in Aſia are ſuch of Aſia as were then at Rome.' Dr. Hammond's paraphraſe is to this purpoſe, 'Thou 'haſt 'heard, I believe, that in my affliction, I have been de-'ſerted by all the Aſiatic Chriſtians at Rome, excepting only 'Oneſiphorus.' So that this interpretation is confirmed by the connection, it following immediately afterwards, *The Lord give mercy to the houſe of Oneſiphorus. For he oft refreſhed me, and was not aſhamed of my chain. But when he was at Rome, he ſought me out very diligently, and found me.* Rightly does Hammond ſay, that Timothy had heard of this. It was likely, that before this letter came to Timothy's hands, he might have heard in general, how the Chriſtians at Rome, particularly thoſe of Aſia, had carried it toward his great maſter, now in bonds. But it ſeems by the apoſtle's way of ſpeaking, that he thought he gave Timothy ſome farther information, eſpecially, when he added, *Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.* Beauſobre was for the late date of this epiſtle. Nevertheleſs he ſuppoſeth [d] the apoſtle to ſpeak

[y] Vol. V. p. 145. [z] Porro ſecundum Græcorum expoſitionem, non eſt ſermo de iis, qui Paulo hæc ſcribente in Aſia erant, ſed qui ex Aſia Romam venerant. Eſt. in loc.

[a] Οἱ ἐν τῇ ασιᾳ· τουτεστιν οἱ ἐκ τῆς ασιας· Œcum. in loc. T. II. p. 261.

[b] Κατ[illegible]ον αυτον οἱ παντες, ἐν τῇ ασιᾳ, τουτεστιν οἱ ἐκ τῆς ασιας ἐνδημουντες τῇ ρωμῃ. Theoph. T. II. p. 806.

[c] Audivilli, ut opinor, ab Aſiaticis Chriſtianis, qui erant Romæ, excepto ſolo Oneſiphoro, me deſertum fuiſſe, in mea calamitate. Hammond. in loc. ex verſione Cleric.

[d] Il y a de l'apparence, que quelques

ſpeak

ſpeak of ſome Aſiatics, who had been with him at Rome, but were returned to their own country. Mr. Moſheim [e] ſpeaks largely to this place. He underſtands hereby ſome Aſiatics, who had left Paul, and were gone home. He thinks, they were guilty of unkindneſs, and are chargeable with inconſtancy: but he does not ſuppoſe, that they forſook the apoſtle's doctrine, or endeavoured to make innovations.

There is no ground therefore to ſuppoſe, that Paul here ſpeaks of a general corruption, and defection of the Chriſtians in Aſia.

I know not of any other objections, that deſerve conſideration. From what has been argued therefore I conclude, that this epiſtle to Timothy was written at Rome, when Paul was ſent thither by Feſtus in the year 61.

For determining the time of the year we may receive aſſiſtance, not only from thoſe who are for this early date, but from thoſe likewiſe, who are for a later date of this epiſtle.

From Paul's deſiring Timothy to come to him, before winter, Tillemont [f] concludes, that this epiſtle was written near the middle of the year. Witſius thinks, it [g] was written in the beginning of the ſummer. So likewiſe [h] Baronius.

It

ques Aſiatiques, qui avoient ſuivi S. Paul à Rome, l'avoient abandonné, et s'en étoient retournez dans leur païs. Beauſ. upon the place.

[e] Diſceſſerant hi ſine dubio, et in patriam reverterant, quod, Paulo Romæ in vincula conjecto, vitæ ſuæ metuebant, deſperabantque, fore aliquando, ut is libertati reſtitutus itinera, quæ meditabatur, perſequeretur. In hoc vitii eſt aliquid: fratrem enim, et multo magis Dei legatum, cui præſidio et ſolatio eſſe poſſis, in vitæ diſcrimine poſitum, relinquere, animi levis eſt, et chriſtianæ diſciplinæ immemoris. Verum nihil habet hæc inconſtantia, ex quo intelligi poſſit, ideo hos homines domum rediiſſe, ut quæ ex Paulo perceperant, dogmata oppugnarent, novaſque res inter Chriſtianos molirentur. Moſhem. De Reb. christian. ante Conſtantin. Sec. i. num. lx. in notis.

[f] Il y prie S. Timothée de le venir trouver avant l'hiver, Ainſi ce ne pouvoit pas etre plutard que vers le milieu de l'année. S. Paul art. 49. Mem. tom. I.

[g] Obſervant, juſſiſſe hac epiſtola Paulum, ut feſtinato ad ſe accederet, et, ſi fieri poſſet, ante hiemem, aſſumto ſecum Marco. Venit autem Paulus Romam, menſe, ut creditur, Februario. Pone, ſcriptam hanc epiſtolam eſſe ineunte æſtate, potuit Timotheus cum Marco ante hiemem Romæ eſſe: ubi fuit, quando illæ ſcribebantur epiſtolæ, quibus præfixum illius nomen eſt: quemadmodum et Marcus ibi fuit, quo tempore ſcribebatur illa ad Coloſſenſes, et ad Philemonem. Quidquamne probabilius eſt, quam omnia iſta ex mandato Pauli eſſe facta? Ubi ſupra. ſect. 12. num. v.

[h] Sed et cum illud admonet, ut ante hiemem ſe Romam conferat: certe,

It seems very probable, that Paul came to Rome, about the end of February, or soon after, before April, or at the utmost in the beginning of it. But before the writing of this letter several things had passed. His apology before the emperor was over. Onesiphorus had made the apostle divers visits. Several of the apostle's assistants or fellow-labourers had been with him, since his arrival, and had taken directions from him. Demas was gone to Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. The epistle to the Ephesians likewise, I suppose to have been written before, and, if it had not been sent away, it lay ready, at least, to be carried by Tychicus, together with this to Timothy. If therefore Paul came to Rome in March, this letter might be sent away in May, or the beginning of June. The direction, ch. iv. 21. *Do thy diligence to come before winter*, might proceed from tenderness for Timothy, the apostle himself having lately felt the inconveniences of a winter-voyage; and may also lead us to think, there would be need of Timothy's making despatch, after the receipt of this letter, lest he should be overtaken by bad weather.

In dating this epistle at the time I have done, I have followed [i] Lightfoot, [k] Baronius, [l] Estius, [m] Hammond, [n] Witsius. Who have all well asserted this date. Witsius, the last mentioned, has an argument upon the point, which he has all along conducted with great candour, and concluded [o] with much modesty: though to me he seems to have removed every difficulty in a very satisfactory manner. And he speaks of Salmero, as being of the same opinion. And besides, in the course of the argument cites from Cocceius, and Solomon Van Till, (with whose writings

certe, si quis exacte consideret tempus, et locum ipsum, Timotheumque agentem in Asia, ut ejusmodi reddi posset epistola, et ipse Troadem ad sumendam penulam proficisceretur, ac Romam ante hiemem se conferret: plane inveniet, hoc ipso anno, ineunte æstate hanc ad Timotheum scriptam epistolam. Baron. ann. 59. num. x.

[i] Harmony of the N. T. in his Works, vol. I. p. 324.

[k] Annal. 59. num. x.

[l] Praef. in 2 ad Timoth.

[m] Praef. in 2 ep. ad Timoth.

[n] De Vita et Rebus Pauli Apost. sect, xii. apud Meletem. Leyd. p. 182, &c.

[o] Mea si desideretur *επικρισις* fateor equidem aliquamdiu me in rationum conflictu animi ancipitem hæsisse, quæ quibus anteponendæ sint. Omnibus tamen perpensis, non dissimulo, eo me magis propendere, ut scriptionem hujus epistolæ ad priora Pauli apud Romam vincula referendam esse arbitrer. Ib. sect. 12. num. viii.

I am

I am but little acquainted) divers obſervations, confirming the ſame opinion. Cave likewiſe was of this opinion, when he wrote the Lives of the Apoſtles, and the firſt volume of the Lives of the primitive Fathers, in Engliſh: expreſſing himſelf very clearly, and properly, both in [p] the life of Paul, and [q] the life of Timothy. But when he wrote his Hiſtoria Literaria, he ſpeaks in the article of St. Paul, as [r] if he had quite changed his mind: though in the article of St. Peter, as it ſtill ſtands in the new edition at Oxford, he ſpeaks exactly as he had done before.

If he altered his mind, I ſuppoſe it muſt have been in compliance with Pearſon, who of late has been followed in this particular by many; who, if they had careſully read the above named authors, might eaſily have diſcerned the ſuperiority of their arguments.

To him [s] likewiſe I ſuppoſe, it muſt be chiefly aſcribed, that by the apoſtle's firſt anſwer, or apology, many of late have underſtood an apology made in a ſecond impriſonment at Rome. Which, as [u] before ſhown, is contrary to the

[p] 'It is not improbable, but that 'about this time St. Paul wrote his 'ſecond epiſtle to Timothy. I 'know, that Euſebius, and the an-'cients, and moſt moderns after 'them, will have it written a little 'before his martyrdom, induced 'thereto by that paſſage in it, that 'he was *then ready to be offered, and* '*the time of his departure was at hand.* 'But, ſurely, it is moſt reaſonable 'to think, that it was written at 'his firſt being at Rome, and that 'at his firſt coming there, preſently 'after his trial before Nero. In it 'he appoints Timothy ſhortly to 'come to him, who accordingly 'came, and his name is joined 'together with the apoſtle's, in the 'front of ſeveral epiſtles, to the 'Philippians, Coloſſians, and Phile-'mon.' Cave's Life of St. Paul, ſect. 7. num. v. p. 103, 104.

[q] Life of Timothy, num. vii.

[r] Epiſtolam ſecundam ad Timotheum ſcriptam eſſe Romæ, in prima Pauli captivitate contendit cl. Hammondus. Sed errat omnino vir eruditiſſimus. Quiſquis enim totius epiſtolæ contextum, omneſque hujus temporis circumſtantias ſerio perpenderit, quin ſcripta ſit anno 64, paullo ante Apoſtoli martyrium, dubitare nequit. De S. Paulo. Hiſt. Lit. tom. I. p. 12.

[s] Durante biennali captivitate Paulus inde ſcripſit quatuor vel quinque epiſtolas, ad Coloſſenſes, Epheſios, Philippenſes, et Philemonem, in quibus nullæ notæ, nulla indicia, unde vel divinando quis aſſequi poſſet, Romæ Petrum tunc fuiſſe.——In poſteriori ad Timotheum, quam hoc etiam tempore ſcriptam eſſe, maxime eſt probabile. ——Carcere Romano liberatus, dum adhuc in Italia hæreret, ſcripſit epiſtolam ad Hebræos. De Petro. H. L. p. 9. [t] Paulus Romæ [A. D. lxvii.] e carcere in diſcrimen vitæ vocatur ab altero Nerone, et apologiam habet, ſive *defenſionem ſuam*, vel *ſui*, quod in prioribus vinculis factum non eſt: ubi habuit tantum *defenſionem et confirmationem evangelii*, adverſus Judæos ſcilicet. Annal. Paulin. p. 24. [u] See before, p. 350—354.

general

general opinion of ancient chriſtian writers: and indeed appears to me a [x] very unlikely meaning. And to him I ſuppoſe it to be entirely owing, that [y] Paul's lion, whom [z] all Chriſtians in general had hitherto underſtood to be the emperor Nero, has on a ſudden dwindled into [a] Elius, or Helius, the emperor's freed-man and favourite.

Upon the whole, it appears to me very probable, that this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was written at Rome, when Paul was ſent thither by Feſtus. And I cannot but think, that this ought to be an allowed, and determined point. Accordingly, I now proceed to mention ſome obſervations in the way of corollaries.

1. This ſecond epiſtle to Timothy affords not any argument, that Peter was not at Rome, when Paul came thither a ſecond time, and ſuffered martyrdom.

Upon theſe words, ch. iv. 16. *At my firſt anſwer no man ſtood with me, but all forſook me.* Beza ſays: 'Where [b] was Peter 'then if he was at Rome? Did he deſert Paul in the time 'of

[x] Euſebe, S. Jerome, S. Chryſoſtome en quelques endroits, et Theodoret, ont entendu cette premiere defenſe de ſonpremier voyage. S. Chryſoſtome s'en eloigne en d'autres endroits, et l'entend d'une premiere comparition de S. Paul devant Neron dans ſon dernier voyage. Mais l'autre ſentiment eſt plus autoriſé, et fondé ſur le ſens le plus naturel du texte. &c. Du Pin. Diſſ. Prelim. P. II. l. 2 ch. ii. § viii. p. 53. [y] In qua defenſione tantum erat, et Pauli, et ſuorum periculum, ut omnes ſui cum deſererent, et nemo illi adeſſet, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. Sed ereptus eſt ex ore leonis, nempe Helii Cæſareani. Ann. Paulin. ibid. [z] I refer to the collections of Grotius upon 2 Tim. iv. 17. whereby it appears to have been common to give ſuch denominations to bad princes, not to their officers. And I ſhall tranſcribe here a curious paſſage, to which he only refers, ſhowing, that Nero, for his bad temper, was early called a lion. Adde hæc Scholiaſtis, in Juvenalis Sat. v. Seneca ſub Claudio, quaſi conſcius adulteriorum Juliæ, Germanici filiæ, in Corſicam relegatus, poſt triennium revocatus eſt. Qui etſi magno deſiderio Athenas intenderet, ab Agrippina tamen, erudiendo Neroni, in palatium adductus, ſævum immanemque natum et ſenſit cito, et mitigavit, inter familiares ſolitus dicere: non fore ſævo illi leoni, quin, guſtato ſemel hominis ſanguine, ingenita redeat ſævitia. Lipſius in notis ad Tacit. Ann. l. 12. cap. 9.

[a] Nobis ſane non probatur conjectura doctiſſimi Pearſon, qui communis ſententiæ pertæſus, Helium Cæſareanum deſignatum fuiſſe exiſtimat in Annalibus Paulinis. Neronis potius et furor et dignitas, aptâ eâ metaphorâ ſignificatur; quomodo defuncto Tiberio Marſias Agrippæ libertus dixit domino ſuo Mortuus eſt Leo. Baſnag. ann. 64. n. vi.

[b] Ubi tum Petrus, ſi Romæ erat? Num enim quæſo Paulum deſeruiſſet? Sed quod in genere dicitur, etſi non temere ſic loquitur Paulus, ita tamen accipiendus eſt, ut aliqui excipi

'of his difficulty?' But the good man adds: 'That Paul's 'general expreſſions need not to be underſtood abſolutely, 'without any exception.' That is very charitable and benevolent. But indeed, if Peter had then been at Rome, he could not have afforded any aſſiſtance to his brother apoſtle. Nor would Paul have expected it of him. For Peter was himſelf an obnoxious perſon. Paul [c] refers only to ſuch, as by their ſtation were likely to be of ſome uſe to him, if they had appeared with him, and had exerted themſelves in his behalf.

But though Peter's not appearing upon that occaſion affords not any argument, that he was not then at Rome: the entire ſilence concerning him throughout this epiſtle affords good reaſon to think, he was not then at Rome. For ch. iv. 2. Paul ſends ſalutations from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia. If Peter had been then at Rome, he would have been mentioned likewiſe. We do juſtly argue from St. Paul's omitting Peter among his ſalutations ſent to divers of the Roman Chriſtians, ch. xvi. that Peter was not then in that city. It is alſo rightly argued from the ſilence concerning Peter in the epiſtles to the Epheſians, Philippians, Coloſſians, and Philemon, that Peter was not at Rome, when they were written. To which ought to be added this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, as farther confirming the ſame thing, if written about the ſame time. But then, if it was written in the year 61, as I ſuppoſe, it will not afford any argument againſt Peter's being at Rome in 64, or 65, and then ſuffering martyrdom there. About which there ought not to be any doubt. That Peter ſuffered martyrdom at Rome, is ſaid by the ſame writers, that ſpeak of the martyrdom of Paul there. The [d] martyrdoms of both the apoſtles have a like degree of credibility. For neither is Paul's martyrdom at Rome founded upon the teſtimony of any ſacred book of the New Teſtament. If

excipi potuerint, ſed perpauci. Bez. in loc. [c] Loquitur de iis qui prodeſſe poterant, et qui gratiâ valebant apud aulicos, —— Poteſt et ita exponi: *Omnes*, id eſt, pene omnes. Eſt. in loc.

[d] Denique ſi mentitur traditio de loco Petrini martyrii atque ſepulchro, quo nobis indicio liquebit Paulum Romæ interfectum fuiſſe atque conditum? Unum nobis eſt argumentum fama conſtans, in quo etiam fundamento collocatur quæ per animos invaſit, de Petri in urbem et adventu et morte, immota exploratagque Veterum ſententia. Baſnag. ann. 64. num 'x.

this

this second epistle to Timothy was written at the time here argued for, we have no proof from scripture, that Paul was a second time at Rome. Nevertheless, he must have been there a second time, if he suffered martyrdom there, as ecclesiastical history says. Consequently, the martyrdom of Paul at Rome has no other, nor better evidence, than the martyrdom of Peter in the same city.

2. We cannot conclude from this second epistle to Timothy, that St. Luke was qualified to write the history of the apostle Paul, for the space of several years lower than he has done in the book of the Acts.

Whitby says upon ver. 11. of the fourth chapter of this epistle: 'Hence it appears, that Luke must be alive in the '12th or 13th year of Nero, when this epistle was endited.' St. Luke might be then alive. But this epistle, if written in the 7th or 8th of Nero, affords not any proof, that Luke lived to the 12th or 13th of Nero, or that he was then with Paul. And it may be reckoned probable, that St. Luke did not accompany the apostle after his release from his imprisonment at Rome.

Again, says Wall upon Acts xxviii. 30, 31. 'St. Luke 'wrote this book about the year 63.——It is a wonder, 'that he did not add the history of the rest of his life, 'whither he went, when he was set free, and what he did 'in the five years afterwards. One might have guessed, 'that Luke died about this time. But it was not so. He 'was with Paul a little before Paul died; as appears from '2 Tim. iv. 11.' But, that St. Luke was alive, and with Paul in the year 67, or 68, cannot be inferred from this epistle, if it was written in the year 61.

3. We are now able to vindicate the character of Demas. Says Wall upon 2 Tim. iv. 10. 'At the former impri- 'sonment, five years ago, Demas was one of Paul's fellow- 'labourers. As we learn from Philem. ver. 24.' But that remark will appear preposterous, if the second epistle to Timothy was written before that to Philemon, as I think it was.

Upon our order of the epistles the case will stand thus. Some time after Paul's coming from Judea to Rome, upon the appearance of some unexpected difficulties, Demas, who had come to Rome to meet Paul, was discouraged. He did not apostatize from the christian religion. But

out

out of too great regard for his own ſafety, he abſented himſelf from the apoſtle, and went where Paul had rather he ſhould not have gone. This is what St. Paul intends, when writing to Timothy, he here ſays: *Demas hath forſaken me, having loved this preſent world, and is departed unto Theſſalonica*, ch. iv. 10. But it was not very long before he returned. Accordingly, Paul makes honourable mention of him, Col. iv. 14, and Philem. 24. epiſtles, written near the end of his confinement at Rome.

How diſagreeable to think, that a fellow-labourer of Paul, who had attended him in his bonds, near the end of a two years' impriſonment at Rome, ſhould afterwards forſake him! According to our account his fault, whatever it might be, was firſt, and his repentance laſt: and ſo ſincere and complete, that Paul readily accepted of it, and joins him with his beſt friends in the ſalutations ſent to Coloſſe, and Philemon. And, perhaps, Demas had been very uſeful at Theſſalonica, though the apoſtle did not ſend him thither.

Grotius upon 2 Tim. iv. 10. ſays: 'we [e] conclude from 'Philem. ver. 24. and Col. iv. 14. that Demas repented of 'his fault.' But that is inconſiſtent with the late date of the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy. For if thoſe texts prove Demas's repentance, the ſecond to Timothy muſt have been written before thoſe two epiſtles: as [f] Beza perceived, when he allowed the repentance of Demas.

4. Cave's [g] argument for the time of St. Mark's writing his goſpel, built upon the ſuppoſition, that this ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, in which that evangeliſt is mentioned, was written juſt before St. Paul's martyrdom, is of no value.

5. This ſecond epiſtle to Timothy affords not any argument againſt the ſuppoſition, that the epiſtle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul in the year 63, about the time of his being releaſed from his confinement at Rome.

Le

[e] Vide hic etiam bonos interdum metu aut malis exemplis mutari. *Quare qui ſtat, videat ne cadat.* Sed et culpæ hujus pœnituiſſe Demam colligimus ex loco Philem. 24. et Coloſſ. iv. 14. Grot. ad 2 Tim. iv.

[f] Videtur ille poſtea reſipiſcens ad Paulum revertiſſe, cum fiat ejus mentio in epiſtola ad Philemonem, quam probabile eſt poſt hanc ſcriptam fuiſſe, cum in ea fiat mentio Timothei ipſius in inſcriptione, atque etiam Marci, quaſi jam cum Paulo verſantis. Bez. ad 2 Tim. iv. 10.

[g] Factum id circa annum 65. Petro et Paulo jam morte ſublatis. Cum enim illum epiſtola ſecunda ad Timotheum non longe ante martyrium ſcripta Romam accerſiverat Paulus: probabile eſt, Marcum vel eodem,

Le Clerc in his French edition of the New Testament, in his notes upon Heb. xiii. 23. says: 'Nothing [h] of that 'kind happened to Timothy, during the life of St. Paul, if 'it had, he would not have failed to take notice of it in his 'second epistle to him, written a very short time before his 'death. And he would have thence taken occasion to say 'something to Timothy, by way of commendation and 'encouragement, or otherwise. If then Timothy was not 'imprisoned, during Paul's life; the mention of these his 'bonds, and his release, proves this epistle to the Hebrews 'not to have been written, till after Paul's death.' Le Clerc speaks also to the like purpose in his [i] Ecclesiastical History. And some before Le Clerc must have been affected with this difficulty. As may be concluded from Beza's notes upon Heb. xiii. 23.

To which I answer, first, that the original word, rendered by us, *set at liberty*, may signify [k] *sent abroad on an errand.* But upon that I do not now insist, and therefore say, secondly, the epistle to the Hebrews is now generally supposed to have been written by Paul in the year 63, soon after his release from his imprisonment at Rome. And we know, from the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon that Timothy was with Paul at that time, when his imprisonment was near the period. It is not at all improbable, that Timothy might be imprisoned, and soon set at liberty again: as divers of Paul's fellow-labourers were. But it is unreasonable to expect, that any notice should be taken of these things, in either of the epistles to Timothy: one of which was written before Paul's first imprisonment, as it is called: and the other soon after the beginning of it.

eodem, vel saltem sequenti anno illuc venisse, ibique Evangelium vel primum condidisse, vel prius conditum edidisse. H. L. T. I. p. 24. in Marco.

[h] Il n'étoit rien arrivé de semblable à Timothé, pendant la vie de S. Paul, qui lui écrivit sa 2 epitre tres peu de tems avant que de mourir, et qui n'auroit pas manqué d'en parler en quelque occasion. &c. Notes sur Heb. xiii. 23.

[i] Mentio sit Timothei in vincula conjecti et dimissi. cap. xiii. 23. Quod non contigerat ante posteriorem ad Timotheum, ubi nulla ejus rei, uti nec in priore, vel minima mentio. Quam tamen Paulus non prætermisisset, si quid simile contigisset, cum ad laudem Timothei, et constantiam in eo augendam, multum faceret. Itaque in vincula, post conscriptas demum ad eum epistolas, aut etiam post mortem Pauli, conjectus fuerit. H. E. A. D. 69. p. 459.

[k] Vid. Mill. Prolegom. num. 68, 69.

6. There

6. There can be no ground from this epiſtle to conclude a ſecond impriſonment of Paul at Rome. For it was written in the time of his impriſonment in that city, when he had been ſent thither from Judea by Feſtus.

7. There may be many other things ſaid upon a ſuppoſition, that this epiſtle was written in a ſecond impriſonment of Paul at Rome, in the year 67, or thereabout. All which muſt now fall to the ground.

It is often ſaid, that error is endleſs. And it is certain, that one error is productive of another. This in particular is ſo. It has occaſioned forced and wrong interpretations of divers texts of this epiſtle, and many falſe and groundleſs ſuppoſitions, contrary to the truth of hiſtory. I ſhall take notice of but one more, beſide thoſe, which have been already mentioned. Tillemont in his hiſtory of St. Paul's affairs, in the year 65, ſome while after he had been ſet at liberty from his captivity at Rome, ſays: 'It[1] was, perhaps, at this time, that he ſuffered 'at Antioch in Piſidia, at Iconium, and Lyſtra, the afflictions, 'which he mentions in general, in his ſecond epiſtle to Timo-'thy, ch. iii. 11.' Which to me appears very abſurd, and I had almoſt ſaid, ridiculous.

I ſhall now mention one obſervation more, of a different kind.

8. We have no reaſon upon the whole, to regret St. Paul's impriſonment at Rome.

When we read the opinion of that great company, which had heard Paul's pleading at Cæſarea. Acts xxvi. 31. *This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds:* and what Agrippa ſaid to Feſtus, in the next verſe. *This man might have been ſet at liberty, if he had not appealed to Cæſar:* we may be diſpoſed to wiſh, that appeal had not been made, thinking, that in that caſe he might now have been ſet at liberty. But if we conſider things maturely, we ſhall perceive it to have been neceſſary. It was, indeed, prudently made, being the only probable means of his eſcape from the continued perſecutions of the enraged Jews.

But beſide that, there are very many advantages attending it: which ought to reconcile us to it, and induce us to acknowledge the over-ruling providence of God in it. Without that appeal Paul would not have been mentioned to Agrippa. Nor ſhould we have had that excellent apology

[1] St. Paul. art. 47. Mem. Ec. T. I.

for himſelf, and his doctrine, which he made before Agrippa, and Feſtus. We ſhould not have had the fine hiſtory of the apoſtle's voyage to Rome, in which are ſo many affecting incidents. And though he came to Rome as a priſoner, he had there a great deal of liberty. *Nor was the word of God bound.* As he was able to ſay in this epiſtle, written ſoon after his ſettlement at Rome. 2 Tim. ii. 9. And in his epiſtle to the Philippians, ch. i. 12—14. written afterwards, are theſe remarkable words, *But I would, ye ſhould underſtand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me, have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the goſpel. So that my bonds in Chriſt are manifeſt in all the palace, and in all other places. And many of the brethren waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to ſpeak the word without fear.* Says St. Luke, *Two whole years Paul dwelt 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. 30, 31.

Jerom thinks, it [m] was a handſome dwelling, in which was a ſpacious room, where Paul could receive a good deal of company, and diſplay his apoſtolical gifts to advantage. So he beforehand wrote to Philemon, *to prepare him a lodging,* ver. 22. Not that he ſhould want many things for his own accommodation. But he wiſhed to have a dwelling in a frequented part of the city of Coloſſe, and large enough to admit conveniently all who were deſirous to be informed concerning his doctrine.

Paul had a great deſire to go to Rome, and teſtify there the goſpel of Chriſt. He thought, it is likely, that he ſhould there have a good opportunity to propoſe it to Jews and

[m] *Simul autem et præpara mihi hoſpitium.* Non puto tam divitem fuiſſe apoſtolum, et tantis ſarcinis onuſtum, ut præparato egeret hoſpitio, et non una contentus cellula, breves corporis ſui ſpatio ædes ampliſſimas exiſtimaret.——Si autem hoc non diſpenſatorie, ſed vere quis exiſtimet imperatum, apoſtolo magis quam Paulo hoſpitium præparandum eſt. Venturus ad novam civitatem, prædicaturus crucifixum, et inaudita dogmata delaturus, ſciebat ad ſe plurimos concurſuros: et neceſſe erat, primum, ut domus in celebri eſſet urbis loco, ad quam facile conveniretur. Deinde ut ab omni importunitate vacua, ut ampla, quæ plurimos caperet audientium: ne proxima ſpectaculorum locis, ne turpi vicinia deteſtabilis: poſtremo, ut in plano potius ſita eſſet, quam in cœnaculo. Quam ob cauſſam cum exiſtimo etiam Romæ in conducto manſiſſe biennio. Nec parva, ut reor, erat manſio, ad quam Judæorum turbæ quotidie confluebant. Hieron. in Philem. ver. 22. T. IV. p. 453.

Gentiles,

Gentiles, of inquisitive tempers, and distinguished characters. Rom. i. 9, 10.——*Without ceasing making mention of you always in my prayers: making request (if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God) to cóme unto you.* And ver. 14, 16. *I am debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation,——to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.* See likewise ch. xv. 28—32. Well, Paul's desire was fulfilled. He was brought to Rome: and although not in the way, and in the circumstances which himself would have chosen: yet I suppose, that in the end he had good reason to be well satisfied. Indeed, I think, that the time of his abode at Rome, must have been, upon the whole, as comfortable, and honourable, and useful, as any period of the like duration, since his conversion to the faith of Christ. He was bound, and was guarded by a soldier. But it needs not to be supposed, that the chain was always upon his hand. And notwithstanding the disgraceful circumstance of his bonds, and the disadvantage of his outward appearance in some respects: such were the dignity and importance of his behaviour, such the superiority of his discourse above that of all other men, and such the works, which God enabled him to perform, as could not but secure him the regard of all serious and discerning men. And [n] success in his work would alleviate all his sufferings. For which reason we also ought to rejoice in them, and on account of the testimony thereby given to the truth and innocence of the christian doctrine.

In the introduction to the first part of this work, where our concern was with facts occasionally mentioned in the books of the New Testament, I said; 'Here is withal an account of 'proceedings and sentences of courts of judicature, in cities of 'the first rank, and most general resort: and of some discourses 'made before persons, next under the Roman emperor, of the 'highest rank and distinction:' referring to the history in Acts xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxvi. But now I should choose to say: 'And of some discourses made before persons of the highest

[n] Simul autem admirandum de magnanimitate apostoli, et in Christum mente ferventis. Tenetur in carcere, vinculis stringitur, squalore corporis, carorum separatione, pœnalibus tenebris coarctatur: et non sentit injuriam, non dolore cruciatur, nihil novit aliud, nisi de Christi evangelio cogitare. Hieron. in Philem. tom. IV. p. 450. m.

'rank and distinction, not excepting the Roman emperor himself.' For from what has been just now argued, it appears to be very probable, that Paul, when brought to Rome, pleaded once, if not twice, before Nero. And though those pleadings may have been very short; yet from thence, and from the treatment, which Paul had presently afterwards in the imperial city, ariseth a very forcible argument for the innocence of the christian doctrine, and its teachers.

Every one perceives, that St. Paul's pleadings upon the occasions before referred to, in the presence of the Jewish council at Jerusalem, and before Felix, and Festus, and Agrippa, at Cæsarea, do us great honour. Particularly, in this last mentioned apology, the doctrine, which Paul preached, as received from heaven, was reported to those great personages, and the honourable company attending them. He lays before them the history of his life, from his youth up, before he was a Christian, and afterwards. He plainly declares his doctrine, and the zeal, with which he had spread and propagated it every where, among Jews and Gentiles, and his unwearied diligence in the cause, in which he was engaged. And in the end all acknowledge, that he did nothing contrary to the peace of society: and that he might have been set at liberty. But having appealed to the emperor, it was now requisite, that the cause should be referred to his tribunal, and be finally determined there.

Here therefore is another testimony to the innocence of Paul, and his doctrine. Festus, the governor of Judea, certainly wrote a letter to the emperor, giving an account of Paul. Of this all may be satisfied, who observe what is said. Acts xxv. 24—27. So Lysias, the tribune, and commanding officer at Jerusalem, when he sent Paul to Felix at Cæsarea, wrote a letter, containing an account of the prisoner, and the proceedings against him hitherto, ch. xxiii. 25—30. In like manner now acted Festus. Nor can it be imagined, that any governor should presume to falsify, prevaricate, or disguise, in such a letter. It might be very respectful to the emperor, and favourable to the prisoner. But there could be nothing but truth. And there must have been all the truth, that was needful to give a just notion of the cause. And yet Paul is not condemned, but obtains an order for such a custody, as leaves him at liberty to *dwell by himself, in his own hired house,* and to receive all who came to him, and to discourse to them of his doctrine. Here he was two years: during which time

he

he had no moleſtation. And at length he was releaſed. He was all that time in one place. And the place of his abode was well known. He might have been called for at any time. But there were no complaints made againſt him, or none ſuch, as could induce thoſe in power to change the order firſt given.

When Paul lay bound in the caſtle of Antonia at Jeruſalem, after he had been brought before the Jewiſh council, and his life was in imminent danger; *the night following, the Lord ſtood by him, and ſaid, be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou haſt teſtified of me in Jeruſalem, ſo muſt thou bear witneſs alſo at Rome,* Acts xxiii. 11. Which word of our Lord was fully accompliſhed: as we are aſſured in the hiſtory, which St. Luke has given of the apoſtle's going to Rome, and dwelling in that city two whole years, and in the epiſtles, written by himſelf, during that period. Which by the Divine goodneſs are ſtill preſerved to us.

According to the preceding argument, the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy was ſent away from Rome, about the ſummer of the year 61, probably, in May, or June.

§ XI. *The* EPISTLE *to the* PHILIPPIANS.

THERE ſtill remain three epiſtles of St. Paul to be conſidered by us, which are generally allowed to have been written during the time of his impriſonment at Rome: the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon. And I ſhall ſpeak of them in the order, in which they have been juſt named.

The epiſtle to the Philippians was written in the ſecond year of the apoſtle's impriſonment. Timothy, who had come to him from Epheſus, according to his deſire, 2 Tim. iv. 9—21. is joined with the apoſtle in the inſcription at the beginning of the epiſtle. It ſeems to have been written not long before the end of his two years impriſonment. For he had ſome hopes of a releaſe, ch. i. 24, 25. *Nevertheleſs to abide in the fleſh, is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know, that I ſhall abide, and continue with you all, for your furtherance, and joy of faith.* Yea he expreſſeth hopes of making the Philippians a viſit, ver. 26. *That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jeſus Chriſt for me, by my coming to you again.* And ch. ii. 19. *But I truſt in the Lord Jeſus, to ſend Timothy ſhortly unto you*—— and ver. 23, 24. *Him therefore I hope to ſend preſently, ſo ſoon as I ſhall ſee, how it will go with me. But I truſt in the Lord, that I alſo myſelf ſhall come ſhortly.* But though he had hopes of

obtaining his liberty, he was not yet certain of it. As appears from thoſe words juſt cited, *ſo ſoon as I ſhall ſee, how it will go with me:* and from what he ſays, ch. ii. 17. *Yea, if I be offered upon the ſacrifice and ſervice of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.* See alſo ch. i. ver. 20. In the mean time, he ſends back to them Epaphroditus, who had come to Rome, with a kind preſent from the Chriſtians at Philippi, and who had been dangerouſly ſick, but was now recovered. And it is likely, that by him this epiſtle was carried. So it follows in ver. 25—30. of the ſecond chapter. *Yet I ſuppoſed it neceſſary, to ſend to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, but your meſſenger, and he that miniſtred to my wants.——I have ſent him therefore the more carefully: that when ye ſee him again, ye may rejoice.* Of their kind regard to him he ſpeaks again, ch. iv. 10—19. In the end of the epiſtle he ſends ſalutations to the Philippians from *the brethren that were with him*, and from *all the ſaints, chiefly thoſe of Cæſar's houſhold.* Who may be ſuppoſed to be the apoſtle's converts, and the perſons, who chiefly contributed to his being ſet at liberty, and had already given him hopes of it, and may likewiſe have been friendly to him in other reſpects. And at the beginning of this epiſtle, ch. i. 13. ſpeaking of the progreſs of the goſpel, he ſays: *So that my bonds in Chriſt are manifeſt in all the palace, and in all other places.*

The ſalutations in this epiſtle are ſingular, being different from thoſe at the end of the other epiſtles, written about the ſame time. Firſt it is ſaid, *The brethren which are with me greet you:* intending, as I apprehend, Mark, and others, the apoſtle's fellow-labourers, mentioned by name near the end of the epiſtles to the Coloſſians, and Philemon, but not ſo mentioned here. Then it is added, *All the ſaints ſalute you:* meaning all the Chriſtians at Rome in general, *chiefly, they that are of Cæſar's houſehold.* The kind preſent from the Philippians, it is likely, had recommended them to the notice of all at Rome. That teſtimony of reſpect for the apoſtle was highly pleaſing, and very edifying to the Chriſtians in that city. It ſeems to have been a handſome ſum. And it may be reckoned probable, that the collections made for the apoſtle at Rome, and the contributions brought in from abroad, were all put into one bank, and lodged in the hands of ſome perſon or perſons of good credit and ſubſtance. Poſſibly, there was now a ſuperfluity. For St. Paul ſays to theſe Philippians, *I have all, and abound. I am full.* If there was any thing ſuperfluous,

fluous, beyond what was requiſite for his maintenance at Rome, it would be of uſe for defraying the expences of the journies, which he had in view. And this may be one reaſon, why this epiſtle is inſcribed *to all the ſaints, which are at Philippi, with the biſhops and deacons.* For there muſt have been ſuch officers in many of the churches, to which the apoſtle ſent letters, though they are not mentioned. But the biſhops and deacons at Philippi had encouraged the contributions made for the apoſtle, and had aſſiſted in conveying them to him. And therefore they could not be omitted.

St. Paul came to Rome, as I ſuppoſe, in the ſpring of the year 61. *There he dwelled two whole years in his own hired houſe,* Acts xxviii. 30. Conſequently, his captivity ended in the ſpring of the year 63.

Hereby I am led to think, that this epiſtle to the Philippians was written in the year 62. It was carried by Epaphroditus. Some time after he was gone, I ſuppoſe, (as [o] does Mill likewiſe) that St. Paul ſent Timothy to Philippi, agreeably to his deſign, mentioned ch. ii. 19—23. And when he wrote the epiſtle to the Hebrews, in the ſpring of the year 63, he was in expectation of Timothy's return to him. Heb. xiii. 23. According to this computation, the epiſtle to the Philippians was written, and ſent away, in the year 62, and ſome while before the end of it.

§ XII. *The* EPISTLE *to the* COLOSSIANS.

THE epiſtles to the Coloſſians, and Philemon, were ſent away together. Chryſoſtom as [p] formerly obſerved, thought, that the epiſtle to Philemon was firſt written. That he concluded from Col. iv. 7—9. However, I ſhall firſt ſpeak of the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, according to the order in which the epiſtles lie in our volume of the New Teſtament.

The epiſtle to the Coloſſians was carried by Tichycus and Oneſimus, as we perceive from ch. iv. 7—9. *All my eſtate ſhall Tychicus declare unto you.——Whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe, that he might know your eſtate, and comfort your hearts: with Oneſimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who*

[o] De viſendis enim Philippenſibus, ubi primum e carcere evaſerit, omnino cogitat.——Et quidem paullo poſt miſſas haſce literas libertatem adeptus, Timotheum in Macedoniam miſit, uti liquet ex Hebr. xiii. 23. &c. Mill. Prol. num. 68.

[p] See vol. V. p. 134.

is

is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things (which are done) *here.*

These two letters, as before said, were sent away at the same time. But it is likely, that the letter to Philemon was first delivered. For till Onesimus had been received by his master, he could not be a fit person, to join in delivering a letter to the church of Colosse.

Timothy joins with the apostle at the beginning in the salutation *to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse.* Near the end of the epistle are salutations from Aristarchus, said by the apostle to be his *fellow prisoner*, from Mark, *Jesus called Justus, Epaphras, Luke the beloved physician, and Demas.*

It might have been expected, that this letter should be carried by Epaphras, who had come to the apostle at Rome from Colosse, ch. i. 7, 8. But he was now the apostle's *fellow-prisoner*, as is said, Philem. ver. 23. However he and Aristarchus may have been set at liberty about the same time with St. Paul. Such things were frequent in the early days of the gospel, and before Nero became a persecutor, according to an observation of Jerom in his commentary upon the epistle to Philemon, ver. 22. cited by us [q] not long ago.

As Timothy joins with the apostle in the salutation at the beginning of this epistle, he was still at Rome, and not yet sent away to Philippi. I therefore conclude, that this epistle was written about the same time with that to the Philippians, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

§ XIII. *The* EPISTLE *to* PHILEMON.

PHILEMON was a citizen of Colosse, in Phrygia. Paul writes this epistle to him in behalf of Onesimus, a slave, who had robbed his master, and run away. Him Paul had converted to the christian faith at Rome, during his bonds, which are several times mentioned in this epistle.

Timothy is joined with Paul in the salutations at the beginning of the epistle. At ver. 23, and 24, the apostle

[q] See before, p. 359.

[r] Totum autem, pro quo rogat, illud est: Onesimus, servus Philemonis, fugam furto cumulans, quædam rei domesticæ compilarat. Hic pergens in Italiam, ne a proximo facilius posset apprehendi, pecuniam domini per luxuriam prodegerat, &c. Hieron. in Philem. T. IV. p. 449. Vid. et Theodoreti argum. in ep. ad Philem. T. III. p. 516.

sends

ſends ſalutations from Epaphras, then his *fellow-priſoner*: from Mark, whom Timothy had brought with him to Rome, according to Paul's deſire. 2 Tim. iv. 11. from Luke and Ariſtarchus, who had accompanied the apoſtle in his voyage from Judea to Rome, and had continued with him ever ſince: and from Demas, who had departed from the apoſtle for a while, but was now returned. Compare 2 Tim. iv. 10.

From ver. 19. it is argued by [s] Jerom, as well as by ſome learned commentators of late times, that the whole of this epiſtle was ſent in the apoſtle's own hand writing.

St. Paul had now good hopes of obtaining his liberty. For he ſays, at ver. 22. *But withal prepare me alſo a lodging. For I truſt, that through your prayers I ſhall be given unto you.* Nevertheleſs, as Timothy joins with the apoſtle in the ſalutations at the beginning of the epiſtle, I think, it was not yet fully determined. For Paul ſays to the Philippians, ii. 23. that *he hoped to ſend him to them preſently, ſo ſoon as he ſhould ſee, how it would go with him.* As Timothy was ſtill at Rome, and not ſent away to Philippi; it may be argued, that the apoſtle did not yet certainly know the ſucceſs of the attempts made uſe of by his friends to procure his liberty. I therefore conclude, that this epiſtle was written about the ſame time with that to the Philippians, in the year 62, and ſome while before the end of it.

Theſe three epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon, are alſo placed by Mill [t] in the year 62.

I will now add a few obſervations concerning the epiſtle to Philemon.

Philemon's ſtation is not certainly known. Grotius thought, he [u] dwelt at Epheſus, and was one of the elders of that church. Beauſobre in his notes upon the firſt verſe of this epiſtle ſpeaks of Philemon, as [x] one of the paſtors of the church of Coloſſe.

To me it appears evident, that Philemon was an inhabitant of Coloſſe. For his ſervant, Oneſimus, is recommended by

[s] Quod dicit, tale eſt. Quod Oneſimus furto rapuit, ego me ſpondeo redditurum. Cujus ſponſionis epiſtola hæc et manus teſtis eſt propria. Quam non ſolito more dictavi, ſed mea manu ipſe conſcripſi. Hier. ib. p. 452.

[t] Vid. Prolegom. num. 68—70. et 80—82. [u] Philemoni dilecto.] videtur habitaſſe Epheſi, ubi Oneſimus poſtea epiſcopatu functus eſt, ut et Ignatii literæ, et alii ſcriptores tradunt.——*Et adjutori meo.*] id eſt uni Preſbyterorum illorum, qui Epheſi plures erant. Act. xx. 17. Grot. in Philem. ver. 1. [x] Il paroit par là, que Philemon étoit un des Paſteurs de l'egliſe de Coloſſes. Beauſ.

St.

St. Paul to the church in that city, and ſaid to be *one of them*, ch. iv. 9. And the Chriſtians at Coloſſe are required by the apoſtle to *ſay to Archippus, take heed to the miniſtry, which thou haſt received*, ver. 17. Which Archippus is ſaluted in the epiſtle to Philemon, ver. 2.

Theodoret expreſsly ſays, that [y] Philemon was a citizen of Coloſſe, and that the houſe in which he dwelt, was ſtill remaining there. Theophylact [z] calls him a Phrygian. Jerom likewiſe ſays, he [a] was of Coloſſe. But he beſtows ſo many words to make it out, that we may be led to think, there were ſome in his time who diſputed it.

Philemon, therefore, was a Coloſſian. But whether he was an elder there, or only a private chriſtian, in good circumſtances, is not ſo certain. The inſcription is,——*unto Philemon, our dearly beloved, and fellow-labourer.* Which laſt expreſſion is ambiguous. It may imply, that Philemon was an elder in the church of Coloſſe. Or no more may be intended thereby, than in general, that Philemon was ſome way uſeful, in helping forward the goſpel. In the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions [b] Philemon is ſaid to have been ordained biſhop of Coloſſe by the apoſtles. But their teſtimony is of very little weight. I do not perceive Jerom to ſay expreſsly, that [c] Philemon was biſhop, or elder at Coloſſe. Perhaps he was not poſitive about it in his own mind. The author of the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epiſtles, by ſome reckoned to be Hilary, deacon of Rome, ſays, that [d] Philemon had no eccleſiaſtical

[y] Πολιν δε ειχε τας κολοσσας. Και η οικια δε αυτυ μεχρι τυ παροντος μεμενηκε. Theod. arg. ep. ad Philem. T. III. p. 516.

[z] Theoph. ep. ad Philem. T. II. p. 861. [a] Si autem Philemon, ad quem hæc epiſtola ſcribitur, Oneſimi dominus eſt——et ad Coloſſenſes refertur, quod ex iis ſit, ratio nos ipſa et ordo deducit, quod et Philemon Coloſſenſis ſit, et eo tempore communem ad omnem eccleſiam Oneſimus epiſtolam tulerit, quo privatas et ſui commendatrices ad dominum literas ſumſerat. Eſt et aliud indicium, quod in hac eadem epiſtola et Archippus nominatur: cui hic cum Philemone ſcribitur: *Dicite*, inquit *Archippo: Videte miniſterium, quod accepiſti a Domino, ut illud impleas.*——Ex quo puto, aut Epiſcopum fuiſſe Coloſſenſis eccleſiæ, cui admonetur ſtudioſe et diligenter præeſſe, ut evangelii prædicatorem. Aut ſi ita non eſt, illud mihi impræſentiarum ſufficit, quod et Philemon, et Archippus, et Oneſimus ipſe, qui literas perferebat, fuerint Coloſſenſes, &c. Comm. in Philem. T. IV. p. 445.

[b] Conſt. Ap. l. 7. cap. 46.

[c] Scribunt igitur Paulus et Timotheus Philemoni cariſſimo et cooperatori: qui ideo cariſſimus dictus eſt, quod in eodem Chriſti opere verſetur. In ep. ad Philem. p. 446.

[d] Philemon nulla erat eccleſiaſticæ ordinationis prædītus dignitate, ſed

eccleſiaſtical dignity, but was one of the laity. And Œcumenius, in his prologue to the ſecond epiſtle of St. John, formerly [e] cited, appears alſo to have thought Philemon to be a man in private ſtation.

Perhaps ſome have been the rather unwilling to allow, that Philemon was a biſhop, or elder, becauſe he had a wife, whoſe name was Apphia, and becauſe he was a man of ſubſtance, who had one ſlave at leaſt, if not more. Nevertheleſs we have juſt obſerved two learned men, of very good judgment, Grotius and Beauſobre, who were not much ſwayed by thoſe conſiderations. One of whom thought Philemon to have been an elder in the church of Epheſus: the other, one of the paſtors of the church of Coloſſe. To them I can now add [f] Dr. Doddridge.

However, as the thing is of no great importance, ſo I muſt acknowledge, that it is not very eaſy to be decided. St. Paul's expreſſion, *fellow-labourer*, as before obſerved, is ambiguous. His manner of addreſs, which is very earneſt, farther induces me to heſitate. If Philemon had been an elder, he muſt have known his duty. And could not have needed ſo preſſing an exhortation to receive a penitent, and him one of his family.

Oneſimus, unqueſtionably, was received by the church of Coloſſe, as a good Chriſtian, upon the apoſtle's recommendation. It is as reaſonable to think, that Philemon was reconciled to him: and, probably, gave him his freedom. In the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions [g] he his ſaid to have been biſhop of Berea in Macedonia. When Ignatius wrote his epiſtle to the Epheſians, about the year 107, their biſhop's name was Oneſimus. And Grotius [h] thought him to be the ſame, for whom Paul interceded with Philemon. But that [i] is not certain.

§ XIV. *The* EPISTLE *to the* HEBREWS.

I SHALL inquire, 1. To whom it was written. 2. In what language. 3. By whom. 4. The time and place of writing it.

I. In the firſt place let us conſider, to whom this epiſtle was written, A. D. 63.

Sir Iſaac Newton thought, 'that [k] this epiſtle was written 'to

ſed vir laudabilis, unus ex plebe, &c. Proleg. in ep. ad Philem.

[e] See before p. 158.

[f] See his preface to Philemon. p. 585. and his Paraphraſe of the firſt verſe. p. 589. of the Family-Expoſitor. vol. V.

[g] Lib. VII. cap. 46.

[h] See before, note *(n)* p. 379.

[i] Vid. Baſnag. Ann. 60. num. xxvii..

[k] 'The epiſtle to the 'Hebrews,

'to Jewish believers, who left Jerusalem about the time that the 'war broke out, and went into Asia.' According to this account, the epistle could not be written, till some while after the breaking out of the war in Judea, in the year 66. But it will be difficult to show, that Paul, whom Sir Isaac allows to be the writer, lived so long. Not now to mention any thing else.

Dr. Wall was inclined to the same opinion, or somewhat not very different. 'I [l] agree, says he, that the epistle was 'written to Hebrews, that is, to the Hebrew Christians of 'some place. But for the place or country, I think, they were 'rather the Hebrew Christians of Asia (Ephesus, Miletus, 'and thereabout) Macedonia, Greece, &c. where St. Paul 'had spent most of his time, than that they were those of 'Jerusalem, &c.'

The late Mr. Wetstein conjectured, that [m] the epistle was written by Paul to the Jewish believers at Rome, soon after he had been released from his confinement in that city. Which conjecture, I believe, will be followed by very few. And as it has no ancient authority, and is destitute of all appearance of probability; I suppose, it need not be confuted.

Lightfoot thought, 'That [n] this epistle was sent by Paul 'to the believing Jews of Judea, a people, says he, that had 'been much engaged to him, for his care of their poor, get-'ting collections for them all along in his travels.' He adds: 'It is not to be doubted indeed, that he intendeth the dis-'course and matter of this epistle to the Jews throughout their 'dispersion.—Yet does he endorse it, and send it chiefly to 'the Hebrews, or the Jews of Judea, the principal part of the 'circumcision, as the propereſt centre, to which to direct it, 'and from whence it might be best diffused in time to the 'whole circumference of the dispersion.'

'Hebrews, since it mentions Timo-'thy, as related to the Hebrews, 'must be written to them, after 'their flight into Asia: where Ti-'mothy was bishop, and by con-'sequence after the war was be-'gun.' Newton's Observations upon the Apoc. of St. John. ch. i. p. 244.

[l] Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 317, 318.

[m] Si conjecturæ locus est, existimaverim potius ad Judæos qui Romæ degebant, et Christo nomen dederant, scriptam fuisse: quo admisso, facile intelligitur, qui factum, tum ut Paulus, qui Româ quidem, sed non Italiâ, excedere jussus erat, brevi se rediturum speraret, tum ut Itali Romanos salutarent. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 386, 387.

[n] Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 340.

Whitby,

Whitby, in his preface to the epiſtle to the Hebrews, is of the ſame opinion, and argues much after the ſame manner with Lightfoot.

So likewiſe [o] Mill, [p] Pearſon, [q] Lewis Capellus, and Beza in his preface to this epiſtle, and the editors of the French N. T. at Berlin, in their general preface to St. Paul's epiſtles, and in their preface to this epiſtle in particular. Of this Mr. Hallet had no doubt, who in his Synopſis of the epiſtle, ſays: 'This epiſtle was particularly deſigned for the Hebrew Chriſ-'tians, that dwelt in one certain place, and was ſent thither, 'as appears from the apoſtle's ſaying, ch. xiii. 19, 23. *I be-'ſeech you the rather to do this, that I may be reſtored to you the 'ſooner.——I will ſee you.* And what particular place can 'this be ſuppoſed to be, but Judea? There the Chriſtians 'were continually perſecuted by the unbelieving Jews, as we 'read in the Acts of the apoſtles, and as St. Paul takes notice '1 Theſſ. ii. 14. Hebr. x. 32—36. ch. xii 4, 5. By theſe 'perſecutions the Hebrew Chriſtians were tempted to apoſta-'tiſe from Chriſtianity, and to think, there was ſtrength in 'the arguments urged by the perſecutors in favour of Judaiſm. 'The apoſtle therefore ſets himſelf to guard againſt both theſe 'dangers.' And what follows.

This appears to me to be the moſt probable opinion.

For 1. It is the opinion of the ancient chriſtian writers, who received this epiſtle.

It may be taken for granted, that this was the opinion of Clement [r] of Alexandria, and [s] Jerom, and [t] Euthalius, who ſuppoſed this epiſtle to have been firſt written in Hebrew, and afterwards tranſlated into Greek. It may be allowed to have been alſo the opinion of many others, who quote this epiſtle, as written to Hebrews, when they ſay nothing to the contrary. Nor do I recollect any ancients, who ſay it was written to Jews living out of Judea.

[o] Per Hebræos autem iſtos potiſſimum fideles Hieroſolymitanos intelligit, apud quos ante duos annos verſatus fuerat. Hinc illud, ἵνα ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν. cap. xiii. 19. Mill Proleg num. 83. [p] Annal. Paulin. p. 20, 21. [q] Ex quibus conjicere licet, hanc epiſtolam a Paulo ſub finem priorum vinculorum Româ ſcriptum fuiſſe ad Hieroſolymitanos Judæos, qui in Chriſtum crediderant. L. Capel. Hiſt. Ap. p. 80

[r] Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 14. [s] Scripſerat ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraice, id eſt, ſuo eloquio diſertiſſime. De V. I. cap. v. [t] Argum. ep. ad Hebr. ap. zac. p. 670.

Chryſoſtom

Chryſoſtom ſays, that [u] the epiſtle was ſent to the believing Jews of Paleſtine. And ſuppoſeth, that the apoſtle afterwards made them a viſit. Theodoret [x] in his preface to the epiſtle, allows it to be ſent to the ſame Jews. And Theophylact [y] in his argument of the epiſtle expreſsly ſays, as Chryſoſtom, that it was ſent to the Jews of Paleſtine. So that this [h] was the general opinion of the ancients.

2. There are in the epiſtle many things eſpecially ſuitable to the believers in Judea. Which muſt lead us to think, it was written to them. I ſhall ſelect divers ſuch paſſages.

1.) Hebr. i. 2.——*Has in theſe laſt days ſpoken unto us by his Son.*

2.) Ch. iv. 2. *For unto us was the goſpel preached, as well as to them.*

3.) Ch. ii. 1—4. *Therefore we ought to give the more earneſt heed to the things that we have heard——how then ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo great ſalvation, which at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God alſo bearing them witneſs with ſigns and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Does not that exhortation, and the reaſon, with which it is ſupported, peculiarly ſuit the believers of Judea, where Chriſt himſelf firſt taught, and then his diſciples after him, confirming their teſtimony with very numerous and conſpicuous miracles?

4.) The people, to whom this epiſtle is ſent, were well acquainted with our Saviour's ſufferings, as they of Judea muſt have been. This appears in ch. i. 3. ii. 9, 18. v. 7, 8. ix. 14, 28. x. 11. xii. 2, 3. xiii. 12.

5.) Ch. v. 12. *For when ye ought to be teachers of others,* and what follows, is moſt properly underſtood of Chriſtians in Jeruſalem, and Judea, to whom the goſpel was firſt preached.

6.) What is ſaid, ch. vi. 4—6. and x. 26—29. is moſt properly applicable to apoſtates in Judea.

7.) Ch. x. 32—34. *But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflic-*

[u] Πῳ δε σοιν επιστελλει; Εμοι δοκει εν ιεροσολυμοις και παλαιστινη ——Δυο μεν ων ετη εποιησεν εν ρωμη δεδεμενος· ειτα εφειθη, ειτα εις τας σπανιας ηλθεν· ειτα εις ιουδαιαν εδη, οτε και ιουδαικης ειδε. Και τοτε παλιν ηλθεν εις ρωμην, οτε και υπο νερωνος ανηρεθη. Pr. in ep. ad Hebr. T. XII. p. 2.

[x] Vid. Theodoret argum. ep. ad Hebr.

[y] Τοις εν παλαιστινη δε και ιεροσολυμοις επιστελλει. Theophyl. arg. ep. ad Hebr. p. 872.

[h] Voyez la pref. de Beauſobre ſur l'epiſtre aux Hebr. num. xxxviii.

tions

tions——to the end of ver. 34. This leads us to the church of Jeruſalem, which had ſuffered much, long before the writing of this epiſtle, even very ſoon after they had received the knowledge of the truth. Comp. Acts viii. i. ix. 1, 2. xi. 19. and 1 Theſſ. ii. 14. Grotius [i] ſuppoſeth as much.

8.) Thoſe exhortations ch. xiii. 13, 14. muſt have been very ſuitable to the caſe of the Jews of Jeruſalem, at the ſuppoſed time of writing this epiſtle, a few years before the war in that country broke out.

9.) The regard ſhown in this epiſtle to the rulers of the church, or churches, to which it is ſent, is very remarkable. They are mentioned twice or thrice: firſt in ch. xiii. 7. *Remember your rulers, who have ſpoken unto you the word of God: whoſe faith imitate, conſidering the end of their converſation.* Theſe were dead, as [k] Grotius obſerves. And Theodoret's note is to this purpoſe: 'He [l] intends the ſaints that were 'dead, Stephen the proto-martyr, James the brother of John, 'and James called the Juſt. And there were many others, 'who were taken off by the Jewiſh rage. Conſider theſe,' ſays he, 'and obſerving their example, imitate their faith.' Then again, at ver 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit yourſelves. For they watch for your ſouls.*——And once more, ver. 24. *Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the ſaints.* Upon which Theodoret ſays: 'This [m] 'way of ſpeaking intimates, that their rulers did not need 'ſuch inſtruction. For which reaſon he did not write to 'them, but to their diſciples.' That is a fine obſervation. And Whitby upon that verſe, ſays: 'Hence it ſeems evident, 'that this epiſtle was not ſent to the biſhops or rulers of the 'church, but to the whole church, or the laity.' And it may deſerve to be conſidered, whether this repeated notice of the rulers among them does not afford ground to believe, that ſome of the apoſtles were ſtill in Judea? Whether there be ſufficient reaſon to believe that, or not, I think theſe notices very proper and ſuitable to the ſtate of the Jewiſh believers in Judea. For I am perſuaded, that not only James, and all

[i] Poſt Stephani mortem vehementer vexati fuere illi in Judæa Chriſtiani, ut videre eſt Act. xi. 19. 1 Theſſ. ii. 14. Grot. ad Heb. x. 34.

[k] Loquitur autem de iis, qui jam obierant, ut oſtendunt ſequentia. *Qui vobis locuti ſunt verbum Dei:* nempe in diverſis oppidis: forte etiam diverſis temporibus, cum mortuis alii ſucceſſerint. Id. ad Hebr. xiii. 7.

[l] In ep. ad Hebr. cap. xiii. tom. III. p. 459. D.

[m] Αινιττεται ο λογος, ως οι προσατευοντες αυτων τοιαυτης διδασκαλιας ουκ εχρηζαν· ου δη χαριν ουκ εκεινοις επεστειλεν, αλλα τοις μαθηταις. Ibid. p. 462. D.

the other apoſtles, had exactly the ſame doctrine with Paul: but that all the elders likewiſe, and all the underſtanding men among the Jewiſh believers, embraced the ſame doctrine. They were, as I apprehend, the multitude only, πλῆθος, plebs, or the men of lower rank among them, who were attached to the peculiarities of the Moſaic law, and the cuſtoms of their anceſtors. This may be argued from what James and the elders at Jeruſalem ſay to Paul. Acts xxi. 20—22. *Thou ſeeſt, brother, how many thouſands of Jews there are that believe. And they are all zealous of the law.——What is it therefore? The multitude muſt needs come together.*——It is hence evident, that the zeal for the law, which prevailed in the minds of many, was not approved by James, or the elders. That being the caſe, theſe recommendations of a regard for their rulers, whether apoſtles, or elders, were very proper in an epiſtle ſent to the believers in Judea.

For theſe reaſons I think, that this epiſtle was ſent to the Jewiſh believers at Jeruſalem, and in Judea.

But there are objections, which muſt be conſidered.

1. Obj. Ch. vi. 10. *God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love,——in that ye have miniſtred to the ſaints, and do miniſter.* Upon which Dr. Wall [n] remarks: 'Here again we are put upon thinking, to what church, or 'what Chriſtians, this is ſaid. For as to thoſe of Jeruſalem, 'we read much in Paul's former letters, of their poverty, 'and of their being miniſtred to by the gentile Chriſtians of 'Galatia, Macedonia, Corinth: and in the Acts, by the 'Antiochians: but no where of their miniſtring to other 'ſaints. If it is of them that St. Paul ſpeaks this, it muſt 'be meant of their miniſtring to their own poor. For that 'they were famous at firſt, when their rich men ſold their 'lands, and brought the money to the apoſtles, and they had 'all things in common, and none lacked. But in the time 'ſince that, they were very poor, and were relieved by other 'churches.' The late Mr. Wetſtein, whoſe [o] words I place below, argued much after the ſame manner with Dr. Wall. This objection, perhaps, might be ſtrengthened from Heb.

[n] Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 306.

[o] Secundo, non poſſunt intelligi, qui Hieroſolymis degebant. Hi enim pauperiores erant, et opus habebant, ut eorum inopia ab aliis eccleſiis ſublevaretur. —— Iis vero, ad quos hæc epiſtola ſcripta eſt, commendatur beneficentia. xiii. 16. vi. 10. Erant ergo tales, non qui ſtipem accipere, ſed qui dare debebant, ſolebantque. Wetſt. ubi ſupr. p. 368. fin.

xiii. 2. *Be not forgetful to entertain ſtrangers.* And from ver. 16. *To do good, and to communicate, forget not.*

Anſw. But the poverty of the Jews in Judea, and the contributions of the gentile churches for their relief, are no reaſons, why ſuch admonitions as theſe ſhould not be ſent to them. They are properly directed to all Chriſtians, that they may be induced to exert themſelves to the utmoſt. The gentile churches, among whom St. Paul made collections for the ſaints in Judea, were not rich. As he ſays, 1 Cor. i. 26. *For ye know your calling, brethren——not many mighty, not many noble, are called.*——And of the churches in Macedonia, he ſays, 2 Cor. viii. 2.——*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.* In like manner there might be inſtances of liberality to the diſtreſſed, among the believers in Judea. There is a very fine example recorded, Acts ix. 36—39. Nor was there ever any city or country in the world, to whom that exhortation, *be not forgetful to entertain ſtrangers*, or *be not unmindful of hoſpitality*, της φιλοξενιας μη επιλανθανεσθε, could be more properly given, than Jeruſalem and Judea. For the people there muſt have been much accuſtomed to it at their feſtivals, when there was a great reſort thither from all countries. And the writer of an epiſtle to the Chriſtian inhabitants of Jeruſalem and Judea would naturally think of ſuch an admonition: being deſirous, that they ſhould not fall ſhort of others in that reſpect. And we may here not unfitly recollect the hiſtory of St. Paul's going to Jeruſalem, and how he, and his fellow-travellers, were entertained at Cæſarea, in the houſe of Philip the evangeliſt, and at Jeruſalem, in the houſe of Mnaſon, an old diſciple. As related Acts xxi. 8—16.

2. Obj. Upon ch. xiii. 18, 19. the ſame [p] Dr. Wall ſays, 'One would think, that Paul ſhould have prayed and purpoſed to go any whither, rather than to Jeruſalem, where he had been ſo uſed: and where he fell into that five years impriſonment, from which he was but juſt now delivered.' To the like purpoſe alſo [q] Mr. Wetſtein.

But there is not any improbability, that Paul might now deſire to ſee his countrymen in Judea; if he might go thither with ſafety, as I think he might. Almoſt three years had now paſſed, ſince he left Judea. And his trial, or

[p] As before, p. 316. [q] Ubi ſupra. p. 386.

apology, had been over two years. And he was now set at liberty by the emperor himself. No man, not very presumptuous, would admit a thought of disturbing him. However, I suppose, that the apostle would behave discreetly: so as to give no needless provocation to any, and that he would stay but a short time in Judea, and then go to Ephesus. There have been men of good sense, who have supposed, that Paul went to Jerusalem about this time, particularly Chrysostom [r] among the ancients, and [s] divers moderns, one of whom is [t] Pearson.

3. Obj. 'St. [u] Peter's epistles were written to the Hebrew 'Christians, scattered in Asia, and Pontus, Galatia, Cappa-'docia, and Bithynia. St. Paul must have written an 'epistle to those Hebrew Christians, to whom St. Peter 'writes his two epistles. For St. Peter, 2 epist. iii. 15. cites 'to them what *Paul had written unto them.* No epistle of 'Paul was written to Hebrews particularly, but this. So that 'these must be the Hebrews of the above named countries.'

To which I answer, that St. Peter's epistles were not sent to Jews, but to Gentiles, or to all Christians in general, in the places above-mentioned, as will be clearly shown hereafter. When St. Peter says, *as Paul has written unto you,* he may intend Paul's epistle to the Galatians, and [x] some other epistles written to gentiles. If he refers at all to this epistle to the Hebrews, it is comprehended under that expression, ver. 16. *as also in all his epistles.*

4. Obj. This epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been written in Greek. But if it had been sent to the Jewish believers in Judea, it would have been written in Hebrew.

To which I answer, that allowing the epistle to have been written in Greek, it might be sent to the believers in Judea. If St. Paul wrote to the Jewish believers in Palestine, he intended the epistle for general use, for all Christians, whether of Jewish or Gentile original. Many [y] of the Jews in Judea understood

[r] See before, p. 384. [s] Lud. Capell. Hist. Apost. p. 39. Lenfant et Beausobre Pref. generale sur les epitres de St. Paul. num. lv.

[t] Paulus e Creta cum Timotheo in Judæam navigat. Heb. xiii. 23. Annal. Paulin. p. 21. A. Chr. 64.

[u] Wall, as before, p. 318, 319.

[x] Videtur respicere Petrus ad Rom. ii. 4. ubi de Dei *longanimitate* similia habet his quæ docet hic Petrus: dicercque ad Asiaticos scriptam epistolam, quæ ad Romanos data, eo quod epistolæ Pauli, quamquam ad singulas ecclesias, et homines singulos, missæ, omnium Christianorum illius ævi communes jure haberentur. Cleric. H. E. A. 69. p. 459.

[y] Ils n'ont point eu d'autre raison

underſtood Greek. Few of the Jews out of Judea underſtood Hebrew. The Greek language was almoſt univerſal, and therefore generally uſed. All St. Paul's epiſtles are in Greek, even that to the Romans. And are not both St. Peter's epiſtles in Greek? and St. John's, and St. Jude's? Yea, did not St. James likewiſe write in Greek, who is ſuppoſed to have reſided at Jeruſalem, from the time of our Lord's aſcenſion, to the time of his own death? His epiſtle is inſcribed *to the twelve tribes, ſcattered abroad.* But I preſume, that they of the twelve tribes, who dwelt in Judea, are not excluded by him, but intended. Nor could he be unwilling, that his epiſtle ſhould be read and underſtood by thoſe, who were his ſpecial charge. The epiſtle written by Barnabas, a Levite, or aſcribed to him, was written in Greek. Not now to mention any other Jewiſh writers, who have uſed the Greek language.

II. Thus we are unawares brought to the inquiry, in what language this epiſtle was written. For there have been doubts about it among both ancients and moderns. So that we are obliged to take ſome particular notice of this point. But I ſhould have deferred the conſideration of it, till we had obſerved the writer of the epiſtle, if the juſt mentioned objection had not brought this inquiry in our way in this place.

And it may be recollected, that [z] I formerly alleged divers learned and judicious moderns, who have been of opinion, that Greek, and not Hebrew, was the original language of this epiſtle. To them I now add ſeveral others: [a] James Capellus, [b] S. Baſnage, [c] Mill in his prolegomena to the New Teſtament, and [d] the late Mr. Wetſtein, and alſo Spanheim

ſon de croire, que S. Paul avoit écrit en Hebreu, que celle qu'il écrivoit à des Hebreux. Or cette raiſon, toute vraiſemblable qu'elle paroit, n'eſt point convaincante, parcequ'il eſt certain, que la langue Grecque étoit entenduë dans la Judée, quoiqu'elle ne fût pas la langue vulgaire. Tous les auteurs du nouveau Teſtament ont écrit en Grec, bien qu'ils écriviſſent pour tous les fideles, ſoit Hebreux, ſoit Gentils. Beauſ. Pref. ſur l'epitre aux Hebreux. num. xv.

[z] See vol. IV. p. 268, 269.

[a] Jacob. Capell. obſervat. in ep. ad Hebr. § ii. et iii. [b] Ann. 61. num. vi. [c] Et ſane magis adhuc futilis eſt eorum ſententia, qui hanc epiſtolam Paulo quidem Hebraice ſcriptam volunt ab alio autem aliquo traductam fuiſſe in ſermonem Græcum. Nihil enim clarius atque evidentius, quam eam lingua Græca primitus conceptam fuiſſe, &c. Prolegom. num. 95—98. [d] Ad hæc obſervamus, 1. epiſtolam ad Hebræos, quæ nunc Græce exſtat, non eſt interpretis, ſed ipſius auctoris. Qui putant ad Hebræos non aliter quam Hebraice ſcribi debuiſſe, manifeſto falluntur.

Spanheim[c] in his Dissertation concerning the author of this epistle, which well deserves to be consulted. One argument for this, both of [f] Spanheim, and [g] Wetstein, is taken from the Greek paronomasias in the epistle, or the frequent concurrence of Greek words of like sound. Which seems to be an argument, not easy to be answered.

Some ancient Christian writers were of opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written in the Hebrew language, and [h] translated into Greek by Luke, or Clement of Rome. Jerom [i] in particular, seems to have supposed, that this epistle was written in Hebrew. And Origen also is sometimes reckoned among those, who were of this opinion. But I think, I have shown it to be probable, that [k] he thought it was written in Greek. It seems likewise, that they must have been of the same opinion, who considered the elegance of the Greek language of this epistle as an objection against its having been written by St. Paul. For if the Greek epistle had been supposed to be a translation, the superior elegance of the style of this epistle above that of the other epistles of Paul could have afforded no objection against his being the author of it.

Indeed the ancients, as Beausobre said [l] formerly, had no other reason to believe, that St. Paul wrote in Hebrew, but that he wrote to the Hebrews. So likewise says [m] Capellus.

Omnes enim novi fœderis libri, etiam Matthæi, ut ad ipsum vidimus, lingua Græca scripti sunt. Hanc linguam plerique Judæi norant. Wetstein. T. Gr. T. II. p. 385.

[c] Spanh. De Auctore epist. ad Hebr. Part. III. cap. ii. tom. II. p. 245—252.

[f] Nono, decretorium fere argumentum est a Græcorum idiotismis, hac in epistola passim conspicuis. Pauca hæc de multis. Auctor cap. v. versu 8. elegantem adhibet *παρονομασιαν*. Scil. *Ἐμαθεν αφ' ων επαθε*, qualem Hebraismus non ferebat. Græci contra mire sibi in talibus placent, &c. Spanh. ubi supr. n. xii. p. 249.

[g] Porro manifestæ reperiuntur paronomasiæ, et *ομοιοτελευτα*, quæ si in aliam linguam convertantur, pereunt. Hebr. v. 8.—— et ver. 14. *καλοτε και κακα*. vii. 3. *απατωρ, αμητωρ*. xi. 37. *επρισθησαν, επειρασθησαν*. ix. 10. *βρωμασι και ποσμασι*. xiii. 14. *μενουσαν και μελλουσαν*. Talia auctor potius sectatur quam interpres. Wetst. ib. p. 385.

[h] See vol. II. p. 26, 211, 219. and vol. IV. 249—251.

[i] vol. V. p. 46.

[k] See vol. II. p. 477. and vol. IV. p. 268.

[l] vol. IV. p. 269. See likewise here p. 388. note *(y)*.

[m] Qui volunt hanc epistolam Hebraice scriptam, hos decepit titulus. Cum enim ad Hebræos scribebatur, Hebraice quoque scribi debuisse sunt opinati. Sed meminisse debuerant, etiam Hierosolymis magnum fuisse linguæ Græcæ usum. Cis Hierosolymam paucissimi Judæi aliter quam Græce loquebantur. Jacob. Capel. Observat. in Nov. Testam. p. 109.

The

The title deceived them. And becauſe it was written to Hebrews, they concluded it was written in Hebrew. For none of the ancients appear to have ſeen a copy of this epiſtle in that language.

III. I now proceed to the third inquiry, who is the writer of this epiſtle. And many things offer in favour of the apoſtle Paul.

1. It is aſcribed to him by many of the ancients.

Here I think myſelf obliged briefly to recollect the teſtimonies of ancient authors, which have been produced at large in the preceding volumes. And I ſhall rank them under two heads: firſt the teſtimonies of writers who uſed the Greek tongue, then the teſtimonies of thoſe who lived in that part of the Roman empire, where the Latin was the vulgar language.

There are ſome paſſages [n] in the epiſtles of Ignatius, about the year 107, which may be thought by ſome to contain alluſions to the epiſtle to the Hebrews. This epiſtle ſeems to be referred to by [o] Polycarp biſhop of Smyrna, in his epiſtle, written to the Philippians in the year 108, and [p] in the relation of his martyrdom, written about the middle of the ſecond century. This epiſtle is often quoted as Paul's by [q] Clement of Alexandria, about the year 194. It is received, and quoted as Paul's by [r] Origen, about 230. It was alſo received as the apoſtle's by [s] Dionyſius biſhop of Alexandria in 247. It is plainly referred to by [t] Theognoſtus, of Alexandria, about 282. It appears to have been received by [u] Methodius, about 292, by [x] Pamphilus, about 294, and by [y] Archelaus, biſhop in Meſopotamia, at the beginning of the fourth century, by [z] the Manichees in the fourth, and [a] by the Paulicians, in the ſeventh century. It was received, and aſcribed to Paul by [b] Alexander, biſhop of Alexandria, in the year 313, and by [c] the Arians in the fourth century. Euſebius, biſhop of Cæſarea, about 315, ſays, 'There [d] are fourteen epiſtles of Paul, manifeſt and 'well known: but yet there are ſome, who reject that to the 'Hebrews, alleging in behalf of their opinion, that it was 'not received by the church of Rome, as a writing of Paul.' It is often quoted by Euſebius [e] himſelf, as Paul's, and

[n] See vol. II. p. 79, 80. [o] p. 316, 317. [p] p. 344. [q] p. 374. [r] p. 101. [s] p. 211, 224. [t] p. 506. [u] p. 547. [x] Vol. [y] p. 467, 472, 473. [z] p. 101, IV. p. 104. [a] p. 117, 118. [b] p. 277. [c] p. 229, 233. [d] p. 250, 251.

ſacred ſcripture. This epiſtle was received by [g] Athanaſius, without any heſitation. In his enumeration of St. Paul's fourteen epiſtles, this is placed next after the two to the Theſſalonians, and before the epiſtles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. The ſame order is obſerved [h] in the Synopſis of ſcripture aſcribed to him. This epiſtle is received as Paul's by [i] Adamantius, author of a dialogue againſt the Marcionites in 330, and by [k] Cyril of Jeruſalem, in 348, by [l] the council of Laodicea, in 363. Where St. Paul's epiſtles are enumerated in the ſame order, as in Athanaſius, juſt taken notice of. This epiſtle is alſo received as Paul's by [m] Epiphanius, about 368, by [n] the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, about the end of the fourth century, by [o] Baſil, about 370, by [p] Gregory Nazianzen, in 370, by Amphilochius [q] alſo. But he ſays, it was not received by all, as Paul's. It was received by [s] Gregory Nyſſen, about 371, by [t] Didymus of Alexandria, about the ſame time, by [u] Ephrem the Syrian, in 370, and by [x] the churches of Syria, by [y] Diodorus of Tarſus, in 378, by [z] Hierax, a learned Egyptian, about the year 302, by [a] Serapion, biſhop of Thmuis, in Egypt, about 347, by [b] Titus, biſhop of Boſtra, in Arabia, about 362, by [c] Theodore biſhop of Mopſueſtia, in Cilicia, about the year 394, by [d] Chryſoſtom, at the year 398, by [e] Severian, biſhop of Gabala, in Syria, 401, by [f] Victor, of Antioch, about 401, by [g] Palladius, author of a life of Chryſoſtom, about 408, by [h] Iſidore of Peluſium, about 412, [i] by Cyril, biſhop of Alexandria, in 412, by [k] Theodoret, at 423, by [l] Eutherius, biſhop of Tyana, in Cappadocia, in 431, by [m] Socrates, the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian, about 440, by [n] Euthalius, in Egypt, about 458, and, probably, by [o] Dionyſius, falſly called the Areopagite; by [p] the author of the Quæſtiones et Reſponſiones, commonly aſcribed to Juſtin Martyr, but rather written in the fifth century. It is in [q] the Alexandrian manuſcript, about the year 500, and [r] in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, about 806, is received as Paul's

[g] p. 283, 285. [h] p. 290, 291. [i] p. 295. [k] p. 300—302. [l] p. 309. [m] p. 314, 315. [n] p. 351. [o] p. 400. [p] p. 408. [q] p. 413. [s] p. 417. [t] p. 422, 423. [u] p. 430. [x] p. 439. [y] p. 492. [z] Vol. III. p. 402. [a] p. 386. [b] p. 388, 389, 506. [c] Vol. IV. p. 509. [d] Vol. V. p. 126, 135. [e] p. 160. [f] p. 174. [g] p. 183. [h] p. 187. [i] p. 190. [k] p. 191, 193. [l] p. 209. [m] p. 339. [n] p. 244. [o] p. 246, 247. [p] Vol. II. p. 118. [q] Vol. V. p. 254. [r] p. 258.

by

by [s] Coſmas of Alexandria, about 535, by [t] Leontius, of Conſtantinople, about 610, by [u] John Damaſcen in 730, by [x] Photius, about 858, by [y] Œcumenius, about the year 950, and by [z] Theophylact in 1070. I ſhall not go any lower.

I ſhall now rehearſe ſuch authors, as lived in that part of the Roman empire, where the Latin was the vulgar tongue.

Here in the firſt place offers Clement in his epiſtle to the Corinthians, written about the year 96, or as ſome others ſay, about the year 70. For though he wrote in Greek, we rank him among Latin authors, becauſe he was biſhop of Rome. In his epiſtle [a] are divers paſſages, generally ſuppoſed to contain alluſions, or references to the epiſtle to the Hebrews. Irenæus, biſhop of Lyons, about 178, as we are aſſured by Euſebius, alleged [b] ſome paſſages out of this epiſtle, in a work now loſt. Nevertheleſs, it does not appear, that he received it as St. Paul's. By Tertullian, preſbyter of Carthage, about the year 200, this [c] epiſtle is aſcribed to Barnabas. Caius, about 212, ſuppoſed to have been preſbyter in the church of Rome, reckoning [d] up the epiſtles of St. Paul, mentioned thirteen only, omitting that to the Hebrews. Here I place Hippolytus, who flouriſhed about 220. But it is not certainly known where he was biſhop, whether at Porto in Italy, or at ſome place in the eaſt. We have ſeen evidences, that [e] he did not receive the epiſtle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's. And perhaps, that may afford an argument, that though he wrote in Greek, he lived where the Latin tongue prevailed. This epiſtle is [f] not quoted by Cyprian, biſhop of Carthage, about 248, and afterwards. Nor does it appear to have been received by [g] Novatus, otherwiſe called Novatian preſbyter of Rome, about 251. Nevertheleſs it was in after times received [h] by his followers. It may be thought by ſome, that this epiſtle is referred to by [i] Arnobius, about 306, and [k] Lactantius about the ſame time. It is plainly quoted by [l] another Arnobius in the fifth century. It was received as Paul's by [m] Hilary, of Poictiers, about 354, and [n] by Lucifer, biſhop

[s] p. 267. [t] p. 312. [u] p. 316. [x] p. 319. [y] p. 323. [z] p. 326.

[a] Thoſe paſſages are alleged, with remarks, vol. II. p. 39—43. and ſee p. 46.

[b] Ibid. p. 164—166. and 170.

[c] p. 269—273.

[d] p. 375—377.

[e] p. 401, 412.

[f] See vol. III. p. 168—171. & 182.

[g] p. 242—244.

[h] p. 243, 247, 248.

[i] Vol. IV. p. 22.

[k] p. 77, 78.

[l] p. 23.

[m] p. 305.

[n] p. 373.

of

of Cagliari, in Sardinia, about the ſame time, and by [o] his followers. It was alſo received as Paul's by [p] C. M. Victorinus. Whether [q] it was received by Optatus, of Milevi, in Africa, about 370, is doubtful. It was received as Paul's by [r] Ambroſe, biſhop of Milan, about 374, by [s] the Priſcillianiſts, about 378. About the year 380, was publiſhed a commentary upon thirteen epiſtles of Paul only, [t] aſcribed to Hilary, deacon of Rome. It was received as Paul's by [u] Philaſter, biſhop of Breſcia in Italy, about 380. But he takes notice that it was not then received by all. His ſucceſſor Gaudentius, about 387, quotes this [x] epiſtle as Paul's. It is alſo readily received as Paul's by [y] Jerom, about 392. And he ſays, it was generally received by the Greeks, and the Chriſtians in the eaſt, but not by all the Latins. It was received as Paul's by [z] Rufinus in 397. It is alſo in [a] the catalogue of the third council of Carthage in 397. It is frequently quoted by [b] Auguſtin as St. Paul's. In one place, [c] he ſays, 'It is of doubtful authority with 'ſome. But he was inclined to follow the opinion of the 'churches in the eaſt, who received it among the canonical 'ſcriptures.' It was received as Paul's by [d] Chromatius, biſhop of Aquileia, in Italy, about 401, by [e] Innocent, biſhop of Rome, about 402, by [f] Paulinus, biſhop of Nola, in Italy, about 403. Pelagius [g] about 405, wrote a commentary upon thirteen epiſtles of St. Paul, omitting that to the Hebrews. Nevertheleſs it was received by [h] his followers. It was received by [i] Caſſian, about 424, by [k] Proſper of Aquitain, about 434, and by [l] the authors of the works aſcribed to him: by [m] Eucherius, biſhop of Lyons, in 434, by [n] Sedulius, about 818, by [o] Leo, biſhop of Rome, in 440, by [q] Salvian, preſbyter of Marſeilles, about 440, by Gelaſius, biſhop of Rome, about 496, by [s] Facundus, an African biſhop, about 540, by [t] Junilius, an African biſhop, about 556, by [u] Caſſiodorius in 556, by [x] the author of the imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, about 560, by [y] Gregory, biſhop of Rome, about 590, by [z] Iſidore, of Seville,

[o] p. 374, 375. [p] p. 379. [q] p. 445, 446. [r] p. 451. [s] p. 481, 482. [t] p. 495. [u] p. 500, 501. [x] p. 502. [y] vol. V. p. 32, 46. 49. [z] p. 76. [a] p. 79. [b] p. 86, 97—100. [c] p. 99. [d] p. 169. [e] p. 175. [f] p. 177. [g] p. 178. [h] p. 179. [i] p. 205. [k] p. 212. [l] p. 213, 214. [m] p. 227. [n] p. 231, 232. [o] p. 235. [q] p. 238. [r] p. 249. [s] p. 273. [t] p. 278. [u] p. 281—283. [x] p. 291. [y] p. 298. [z] p. 305, 306.

about

about 596, and by [a] Bede, about 701, or the beginning of the eighth century.

It may be now needful to make a few remarks.

It is evident that this epiſtle was generally received in ancient times, by thoſe Chriſtians, who uſed the Greek language, and lived in the eaſtern part of the Roman empire. I forbear to inſiſt here on the ſeeming references in Ignatius and Polycarp. But Clement of Alexandria, before the end of the ſecond century, received this epiſtle as Paul's, and quotes it as ſuch frequently, without any doubt or heſitation. And had a tradition from ſome before him, concerning the reaſon why the apoſtle did not prefix his name to this, as he did to the other epiſtles.

Concerning the Latin writers it is obvious to remark, that this epiſtle is not expreſsly quoted, as Paul's, by any of them in the firſt three centuries. However, it was known to Irenæus, and Tertullian, as we have ſeen, and poſſibly to others alſo. It is generally ſuppoſed, that there are divers alluſions and references to this epiſtle, in the epiſtle of Clement of Rome, written to the Corinthians. However, I formerly mentioned [b] two learned men, who did not think that a clear point. I have ſince met with another of the ſame mind, whoſe words I place * below. And I muſt likewiſe refer to a conſideration, formerly [c] propoſed: that the little notice taken of this epiſtle by Latin writers in the ſecond and third centuries: and Euſebius [d] and Jerom [e] aſſuring us, that by many of the Romans in their time, this epiſtle was not received: ſeem to weaken the ſuppoſition, that Clement had often alluded to this epiſtle. For if the church of Rome, in his time, had owned it for an epiſtle of Paul; it is not eaſy to conceive, how any Latin Chriſtians afterwards ſhould have rejected it, or doubted of its authority.

However, it is manifeſt, that it was received as an epiſtle

[a] p. 313. [b] See vol. II. p. 42.

* Sed quis dubitaret, quin ex epiſtola ad Hebræos multa habeat, cum Euſebius illud diſerte annotet ——? Nec tamen illud tam exploratum eſt. Phraſium et ſententiarum æqualitas, ex qua illud unice derivandum eſt (nam nuſquam a Clemente citatur) non eſt adeo perfecta et frequens, non adeo ſingularis, ut ex Ep. ad Hebræos eas repetitas eſſe, inde evincatur. Herman. Venem. Diſſ. ii. de Tit. ep. ad Epheſ. num. viii. p. 343.

[c] See vol. II. p. 46. [d] Vid. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 3. p. 72. B. C. and in this work, vol. IV. p. 229.

[e] See vol. V. p. 49, 50.

of

of St. Paul by many Latin writers in the fourth, fifth, and following centuries.

The reaſons of doubting about the genuineneſs of this epiſtle, probably, were the want of a name at the beginning, and the difference of argument, or ſubject matter, and of ſtyle, from the commonly received epiſtles of the apoſtle, as is intimated by [f] Jerom. Whether they are ſufficient reaſons for rejecting this epiſtle, will be conſidered in the courſe of our argument.

2. There is nothing in the epiſtle itſelf, that renders it impoſſible or unlikely to be his.

For the epiſtle appears to have been written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem: as was of old obſerved by [g] Chryſoſtom, and [h] Theodoret, and has been argued alſo by many moderns.[i] That the temple was ſtill ſtanding, and ſacrifices there offered, may be inferred from ch. viii. 4. *For if he were on earth, he ſhould not be a prieſt: ſeeing there are prieſts, that offer according to the law:* and from ch. xiii. 10. *We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which ſerve the tabernacle.* Moreover, if [k] the temple had been deſtroyed, and the worſhip there aboliſhed; the writer would not have failed to take ſome notice of it, in ſupport of his argument, and for abating the too great attachment of many to the rites of the Moſaic inſtitution. To this purpoſe ſpeaks Spanheim in a paſſage which I have tranſcribed below. And in like manner another learned commentator, to [l] whom I refer. It is alſo probable, [m] that thoſe words ch. iii. 13. *While it is called to day*, refer to the patience which God yet continued to exerciſe toward the Jewiſh nation. He ſeems to have had in view the approaching de-

[f] p. 46. [g] Vid. Chryſoſt. Pr. in ep. ad Heb. T. XII. p. 4. C. D.

[h] Theod. in Heb. xiii. 9, 10.

[i] Quærentibus, quo tempore, et unde ſcripta ſit epiſtola ad Hebræos, nihil eſt quod reſpondeamus, niſi ſcriptam fuiſſe, cum Judæi adhuc gloriarentur templo Jeroſolymitano, et ſacerdotio Moſaico: de quibus ubique loquitur ſcriptor, ut etiamnum ſtantibus. Cleric. Hiſt Ec. An. 69. p. 461. [k] Quia nata hæc epiſtola, ſtante templo et Levitico ſacerdotio —— Heb. viii. 4. Neque alias neceſſe fuit declamare in ſacrificiorum uſum, et praxin ſacerdotii, penitus eo templi et urbis et reipublicæ everſione ſublato. Neque maxime omnium prægnans argumentum Judæis confundendis, et coërcendis pſeudo apoſtolis, ab ipſa jactura cultûs, et Hieroſolymitanæ ſedis reſtitutionis ſpe nulla amplius affulgente prætermiſiſſet. Spanhem. ubi ſupra. P. II. cap. vi. p. 3. T. I. p. 229.

[l] See Beauſobre's preface to the epiſtle to the Hebrews, num. iii.

[m] The ſame.

ſolation

ſolation of Jeruſalem, which would put an end to that *to day*, and finiſh the time which God gave to the Jews, as a nation, to *hear his voice*. And Lightfoot[n] argues from ch. xii. 4. *Ye have not yet reſiſted unto blood:* that the epiſtle was written before the war in Judea was begun.

Indeed thoſe words have been the gound of an objection againſt this epiſtle having been ſent to the believing Jews in Judea, becauſe there had been already ſeveral martyrdoms in that country. That difficulty I would now remove. And I have received from a learned friend the following obſervation, which may be of uſe. 'It ſeems to me,' ſays he, 'that [o] the apoſtle here, as well as in the preceding 'context, alludes to the Grecian games or exerciſes: and 'he ſignifies, that they, to whom he writes, had not been 'called out to the moſt dangerous combats; and had not 'run the immediate hazard of their lives. Which, I ſuppoſe, might be ſaid of them, as a body, or church.' And I ſhall transfer hither Mr. Beauſobre's note upon this place. 'There had been martyrs in Judea, as Stephen, and the 'two James's. But for the moſt part the Jews did not put 'the Chriſtians to death, for want of power. They were 'impriſoned and ſcourged. See Acts v. 40. and here ch. 'xiii. 3. And they endured reproaches, and the loſs of 'their ſubſtance, ch. x. 32—34. Theſe were the ſufferings, 'which they had met with. The apoſtle therefore here 'indirectly reproves the Hebrews, that though God treated 'them with more indulgence than he had done his people 'in former times, and even than his own ſon, they never'theleſs wavered in their profeſſion of the goſpel. See 'ver. 12.'

3. There are divers exhortations in this epiſtle, much reſembling ſome in the acknowledged epiſtles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. xii. 3.——*Leſt* [p] *ye be wearied, and faint in your mind.* Gal. vi. 9. *And* [q] *let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due ſeaſon we ſhall reap, if we faint not.* And ſee 2 Theſſ. iii. 13. and Eph. iii. 13.

2.) Heb. xii. 14. *Follow* [r] *peace with all men, and holineſs, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord.* An exhortation very

[n] Harm. of the N. T. vol. I. p. 339.

[o] —— προς την αμαρτιαν ανταγωνιζομενοι.

[p] —— ινα μη καμητε, ταις ψυχαις εκλυομενοι.

[q] Το δε καλον ποιουντες μη εκκακωμεν· Καιρῳ γαρ ιδιῳ θερισομεν, μη εκλυομενοι.

[r] Ειρηνην διωκετε μετα παντων, και τον αγιασμον.

ſuitable

suitable to Paul, and to the Jewish believers in Judea: admonishing them not to impose the rituals of the law upon others, that is, the gentile believers, and to maintain friendship with them, though they did not embrace the law. It has also a resemblance with Rom. xii. 18. But the words of the original are different.

3.) Heb. xiii. 1. *Let brotherly love continue:* and what follows to the end of ver. 3. Then at ver. 4. *Marriage is honourable. But fornicators and adulterers God will judge.* Here is an agreement with Eph. v. 2, 3. *And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us.——But fornication, and all uncleanness, and covetousness, let it not be once named among you.*——Ver. 4. *For this ye know, that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous man,——has any inheritance in the kingdom of God.*

4.) Ch. xiii. 16. *But* [s] *to do good, and to communicate, forget not. For with such sacrifices God is well pleased.* That exhortation is very suitable to Paul's doctrine, and has an agreement with what he says elsewhere: as Philip. iv. 18.—— *An odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing to God.* Moreover, as is observed [t] by Grotius upon this text, the word communicate, or communion, is found in a like sense in the Acts, and in other epistles of St. Paul. See Acts ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ch. ix. 13.

4. In the next place I observe some instances of agreement in the style, or phrases, of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. ii. 4. *God* [u] *also bearing them witness with signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.*

Signs and wonders, together, seldom occur in other books of the New Testament. But they are found several times in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. The phrase is in Matt. xxiv. 24. and Mark xiii. 22. and once likewise in St. John's gospel, ch. iv. 48. But it is several times in the Acts, ch. ii. 19. iv. 30. v. 12. vi. 8. viii. 13. xiv. 3. xv. 12. The most remarkable are these, where there are three different words. Acts ii. 22.——*A man approved of God among you by* [x] *miracles, and wonders, and signs*, Rom. xv. 19.——*Through* [y]

[s] Της δε ευποιιας και κοινωνιας μη επιλανθανεσθε.

[t] Κοινωνιας vox refertur ad pecunias, et ea, quæ pecuniis comparantur. Vide Act ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ix. 13. Grot. in. Heb. xiii. 16.

[u] Συνεπιμαρτυρουντος τε θεε σημειοις και τερασι, και ποικιλαις δυναμεσι, και πνευματος αγιε μερισμοις.

[x] — — δυναμεσι, και τερασι, και σημειοις.

[y] —— εν δυναμει σημειων και τερατων, εν δυναμει πνευματος θεε.

migbty

mighty ſigns and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God. 2 Cor. xii. 12.——[z] *In ſigns, and wonders, and mighty deeds.* 2 Theſſ. ii. 9. [a] *With all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders.*

2.) Ch. ii. 14.——*That through death he might deſtroy him that had the power of death.* The word καταργεω, or καταργεομαι, is, I think, no where uſed in the New Teſtament, except in Luke xiii. 7. and St. Paul's epiſtles, where it is ſeveral times: and is ſometimes uſed in a ſenſe reſembling this place, particularly 2 Tim. i. 10. *Who has aboliſhed death:* καταργησαντος μεν θανατον. And 1 Cor. xv. 26. Compare Dr. Doddridge's Family Expoſitor, vol. IV. upon 1 Cor. xv. 24.

3.) Ch. iii. 1.——*Holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling:* Philip. iii. 14.——*The prize of the high calling of God in Chriſt Jeſus.* 2 Tim. i. 9.——*Who has called us with an holy calling.*

4.) Ch. v. 12—*And are become ſuch as have need of milk, and not of ſtrong meat.* 1 Cor. iii. 2. *I have fed you with milk, and not with meat.* However, in the original, there is no great agreement in the words: except that in both places *milk* is uſed for the firſt rudiments of the chriſtian doctrine.

5.) Ch. viii. 1.—*Who is ſet on the right hand of the throne of the majeſty on high.* Eph. i. 21.—*And ſet him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.*

6.) Ch. viii. 6. ix. 15. and xii. 24. Jeſus Chriſt is ſtyled *mediator.* So likewiſe in Gal. iii, 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5. and in no other books of the New Teſtament.

7.) Ch. viii. 5. *Who ſerve unto the example, and ſhadow of heavenly things.*—και σκια—των επεραιων. x. 1. *For the law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things.* Σκιαν εχων—των μελλοντων αγαθων, και αυτην την εικονα των πραγματων. Col. ii. 17. *Which are a ſhadow of things to come. But the body is of Chriſt.* A εστι σκια των μελλοντων· το δε σωμα τε χριστε.

8.) Ch. x. 33. *Whilſt ye were made a gazing-ſtock,* or ſpectacle, *both by reproaches and afflictions.* ονειδισμοις τε και θλιψεσι θεατριζομενοι. 1 Cor. iv. 9. *For we are made a ſpectacle unto the world* ——οτι θεατρον εγενηθημεν τω κοσμω.

9.) St. Paul, in [b] his acknowledged epiſtles, often alludes to the exerciſes and games, which were then very reputable and frequent in Greece, and other parts of the Roman empire. There are divers ſuch alluſions in this epiſtle, which have

[z] —— εν σημειοις, και τερασι, και δυναμεσι [a] —— εν πασῃ δυναμει, και σημειοις, και τερασι ψευδους. [b] See 1 Cor. ix. 24—26. 1 Tim. vi. 12,

ſuitable to Paul, and to the Jewiſh believers in Judea; admoniſhing them not to impoſe the rituals of the law upon others, that is, the gentile believers, and to maintain friendſhip with them, though they did not embrace the law. It has alſo a reſemblance with Rom. xii. 18. But the words of the original are different.

3.) Heb. xiii. 1. *Let brotherly love continue:* and what follows to the end of ver. 3. Then at ver. 4. *Marriage is honourable. But fornicators and adulterers God will judge.* Here is an agreement with Eph. v. 2, 3. *And walk in love, as Chriſt alſo has loved us.——But fornication, and all uncleanneſs, and covetouſneſs, let it not be once named among you.——*Ver. 4. *For this ye know, that no fornicator, nor unclean perſon, nor covetous man,——has any inheritance in the kingdom of God.*

4.) Ch. xiii. 16. *But* [s] *to do good, and to communicate, forget not. For with ſuch ſacrifices God is well pleaſed.* That exhortation is very ſuitable to Paul's doctrine, and has an agreement with what he ſays elſewhere: as Philip. iv. 18.—— *An odour of a ſweet ſmell, a ſacrifice, acceptable, well pleaſing to God.* Moreover, as is obſerved [t] by Grotius upon this text, the word communicate, or communion, is found in a like ſenſe in the Acts, and in other epiſtles of St. Paul. See Acts ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ch. ix. 13.

4. In the next place I obſerve ſome inſtances of agreement in the ſtyle, or phraſes, of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epiſtles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. ii. 4. *God* [u] *alſo bearing them witneſs with ſigns, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Signs and wonders, together, ſeldom occur in other books of the New Teſtament. But they are found ſeveral times in the Acts, and St. Paul's epiſtles. The phraſe is in Matt. xxiv. 24. and Mark xiii. 22. and once likewiſe in St. John's goſpel, ch. iv. 48. But it is ſeveral times in the Acts, ch. ii. 19. iv. 30. v. 12. vi. 8. viii. 13. xiv. 3. xv. 12. The moſt remarkable are theſe, where there are three different words. Acts ii. 22.——*A man approved of God among you by* [x] *miracles, and wonders, and ſigns*, Rom. xv. 19.——*Through* [y]

[s] Της δε ευποιιας και κοινωνιας μη επιλανθανεσθε.

[t] Κοινωνιας vox refertur ad pecunias, et ea, quæ pecuniis comparantur. Vide Act ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ix. 13. Gret. in. Heb. xiii. 16.

[u] Συνεπιμαρτυρουντος τε θεε σημειοις τε και τερασι, και ποικιλαις δυναμεσι, και πνευματος αγιε μεριſμοις.

[x] —— δυναμεσι, και τερασι, και σημειοις. [y] —— εν δυναμει σημειων και τερατων, εν δυναμει πνευματος θεε.

mighty

mighty ſigns and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God. 2 Cor. xii. 12.——[z] *In ſigns, and wonders, and mighty deeds.* 2 Theſſ. ii. 9. [a] *With all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders.*

2.) Ch. ii. 14.——*That through death he might deſtroy him that had the power of death.* The word καταργεω, or καταργεομαι, is, I think, no where uſed in the New Teſtament, except in Luke xiii. 7. and St. Paul's epiſtles, where it is ſeveral times: and is ſometimes uſed in a ſenſe reſembling this place, particularly 2 Tim. i. 10. *Who has aboliſhed death:* καταργησαντος μεν θανατον. And 1 Cor. xv. 26. Compare Dr. Doddridge's Family Epoſitor, vol. IV. upon 1 Cor. xv. 24.

3.) Ch. iii. 1.——*Holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling:* Philip. iii. 14.——*The prize of the high calling of God in Chriſt Jeſus.* 2 Tim. i. 9.——*Who has called us with an holy calling.*

4.) Ch. v. 12—*And are become ſuch as have need of milk, and not of ſtrong meat.* 1 Cor. iii. 2. *I have fed you with milk, and not with meat.* However, in the original, there is no great agreement in the words: except that in both places *milk* is uſed for the firſt rudiments of the chriſtian doctrine.

5.) Ch. viii. 1.—*Who is ſet on the right hand of the throne of the majeſty on high.* Eph. i. 21.—*And ſet him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.*

6.) Ch. viii. 6. ix. 15. and xii. 24. Jeſus Chriſt is ſtyled *mediator.* So likewiſe in Gal. iii, 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5. and in no other books of the New Teſtament.

7.) Ch. viii. 5. *Who ſerve unto the example, and ſhadow of heavenly things.*—και σκια—των επερανιων. x. 1. *For the law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things.* Σκιαν εχων—των μελλοντων αγαθων, και αυτην την εικονα των πραγματων. Col. ii. 17. *Which are a ſhadow of things to come. But the body is of Chriſt.* Α εστι σκια των μελλοντων· το δε σωμα τυ χριστυ.

8.) Ch. x. 33. *Whilſt ye were made a gazing-ſtock,* or ſpectacle, *both by reproaches and afflictions.* ονειδισμοις τε και θλιψεσι θεατριζομενοι. 1 Cor. iv. 9. *For we are made a ſpectacle unto the world* ——οτι θεατρον εγενηθημεν τω κοσμω.

9.) St. Paul, in [b] his acknowledged epiſtles, often alludes to the exerciſes and games, which were then very reputable and frequent in Greece, and other parts of the Roman empire. There are divers ſuch alluſions in this epiſtle, which have

[z] —— εν σημειοις, και τερασι, και δυναμεσι [a] —— εν πασῃ δυναμει, και σημειοις, και τερασι ψευδυς. [b] See 1 Cor. ix. 24—26. 1 Tim. vi. 12.

have also great elegance. So ch. vi. 18. *Who have fled for refuge to* [c] *lay hold of the hope set before us*, or the reward of eternal life, proposed to animate and encourage us. And ch. xii. 1. *Wherefore seeing we also* [d] *are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let* [e] *us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us, and* [f] *let us run with patience, the race that is set before us.* Ver. 2. *Looking unto Jesus, who* [g] *for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross.* And ver. 3. *Lest* [h] *ye be wearied, and faint in your minds.* And ver. 12. *Wherefore* [i] *lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees.*

All these texts seem to contain allusions to the celebrated exercises and games of those times. And under each of

vi. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 5. and ch. iv. 7, 8. [c] Κρατησαι της προκειμενης ελπιδος: *ad obtinendam spem propositam*, sc. vitam æternam, Elegantissima metaphora est vocis προκειμενης, e veterum certaminum ratione ducta. Proprie enim προκεισθαι dicuntur τα αθλα, sc. præmia certaminis, quæ publice proponuntur in propatulo, ut eorum adspectus, certaque eorum adipiscendorum spes certaturos, alacriores redderet ad certamen ineundum, victoriamque reportandam: ut interpretabamur supra ad 2 Tim. iv. 8. το αποκεισθαι, quod eandem significationem obtinet. J. Tob. Krebsii Observat. in N. T. e Josepho. p. 377.

Ego vero puto φευγειν accipi pro συντονως τρεχειν, et sumptam translationem a gymnicis ludis: quo spectant etiam vocabula κρατησαι, καταπετασματος, et προδρομος. Bez. in loc. [d] See Mr. Hallett upon the place. note *(u)*.

[e] Ογκον αποθεμενοι παντα· *deponentes omne pondus.* Tota hæc oratio translatitia est: quasi nobis in stadio non sine magnis difficultatibus currendum: qua translatione sæpe utitur Paulus. In primis igitur monet, ut ογκον abjiciamus, quo vocabulo crassa omnis et tarda moles significatur. Bez. in loc.

A stadio sumta similitudo: Ibi qui cursuri sunt, omnia quæ oneri esse possunt deponunt, &c. Grot. in loc. And see Hallett, as before, note *(w)*. [f] Τρεχωμεν τον προκειμενον ημιν τον αγωνα. Loquendi ratio est agonistica, et petita, a cursoribus, qui stadium absolvunt. De voce προκειμαι satis multa asserebamus supra Cap. vi. 18. —— Sensus autem Apostoli est: *Curramus in stadio, nobis proposito ad currendum:* voce αγων pro loco, sc. stadio sumta. Krebs. ubi supra. p. 390.

[g] Ος αντι της προκειμενης χαρας. κ. λ. Vid. Krebs. ib. p. 390.

[h] Ινα μη καμητε, ταις ψυχαις υμων εκλυομενοι· —— Hæc duo verba a palæstra et ab athletis desumpta sunt, qui proprie dicuntur καμνειν, et ψυχαις εκλυεσθαι, cum corporis viribus debilitati et fracti, omnique spe vincendi abjectâ, victas manus dant adversario. —— Neque dubium est, quin Apostolus eo respexerit. Id. ib. [i] Διο τας παρειμενας χειρας και τα παραλελυμενα γονατα ανορθωσατε. Quemadmodum Paulus sæpissime delectatur loquendi formulis ex re palæstrica petitis; ita dubium non est, quin hic quoque respexisse eo videatur. Athletis enim et luctatoribus tribuuntur παρειμεναι χειρες et παραλελυμενα γονατα, cum luctando ita defatigati, viribusque fracti sunt, ut neque manus neque pedes officio suo fungi possint, ipsique adeo victos se esse fateri cogantur. Id. ib. p. 392.

them

them I have referred to, or tranſcribed the notes of ſome learned critics and commentators, tending to illuſtrate them. And to theſe may be added, if I miſtake not, the place before [k] taken notice of, ch. xii. 4. *Ye have not yet reſiſted unto blood, ſtriving [l] againſt ſin.*

10.) Ch. xiii. 9. *Be not carried about with divers and ſtrange doctrines.* Διδαχαις ποικιλαις και ξεναις μη περιφερεσθε. Eph. iv. 14. *That we henceforth be no more children, toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine*——κλυδωνιζομενοι, και περιφερομενοι παντι ανεμῳ της διδασκαλιας.

11.) Ch. xiii. 10. *We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat.* 1 Cor. ix. 13. *And they that wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar.* And ch. x. 18. *Are not they which eat of the ſacrifices, partakers of the altar.*

12.) Ch. xiii. 20, 21. *Now the God of peace*——*make you perfect.* Which is a title of the Deity, no where found in the New Teſtament, but in St. Paul's epiſtles. And in them it is ſeveral times, and near the concluſion, as here. So Rom. xv. 33. *Now the God of peace be with you all.* See likewiſe ch. xvi. 20. and Philip. iv. 9. And 1 Theſſ. v. 23. And *the very God of peace ſanctify you wholly.* And 2 Cor. xiii. 11. *And the God of love and peace ſhall be with you.*

5. The concluſion of this epiſtle has a remarkable agreement with the concluſions of St. Paul's epiſtles in ſeveral reſpects.

1.) He here deſires the Chriſtians, to whom he is writing, to pray for him. ch. xiii. 18. *Pray for us.* So Rom. xv. 30. Eph. vi. 18, 19. Col. iv. 3. 1 Theſſ. v. 25. 2 Theſſ. iii. 1.

2.) It is added in the ſame ver. 18. *For we truſt, we have a good conſcience, in all things willing to live honeſtly.* Which may well come from Paul, ſome of the Jewiſh believers not being well affected to him, or being even offended with him. So ſays [m] Theodoret upon this place, and Chryſoſtom [n] to the like purpoſe, very largely. To which might be added, ver. 22. *And I beſeech you, brethren, to ſuffer the word of exhortation.* It is alſo obſervable, that St. Paul makes a like profeſſion of his ſincerity, in pleading againſt the Jews, before Felix, Acts xxiv. 16.

[k] See here, p. 397.

[l] προς την αμαρτιαν ανταγωνιζομενοι.

[m] Διαβεβληντο αυτοις, ως τ αναντια τῳ νομῳ κηρυττων. Διδασκει τοινυν αυτους, ως ουκ αλλα τε χαριν τουτο ποιει, αλλα τῳ θειῳ λογῳ πειθομενος. Δια τουτο και την συνειδησιν εις μαρτυριαν εκαλεσε. Theod. in Hebr. xiii. 18. T. III. p. 461.

[n] In Heb. xiii. hom. 34. tom. XII. p. 313, 314.

3.) Having deſired the prayers of theſe Chriſtians for himſelf, he prays for them, ch. xiii. 20, 21. *Now the God of peace——make you perfect——through Jeſus Chriſt: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.* So Rom. xv. 30—32. having aſked their prayers for him, he adds ver 33. *Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.* Compare Eph. vi. 19—23. and 1 Theſſ. v. 23. 2 Theſſ. iii. 16.

4.) Ch. xiii. 24. *Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the ſaints. They of Italy ſalute you.* The like ſalutations are in divers of St. Paul's epiſtles, Rom. xvi. 1 Cor. xvi. 19—21. 2 Cor. xiii. 13. Philip. iv. 21, 22. Not to refer to any more.

5.) The valedictory benediction at the end is that, which Paul had made the token of the genuineneſs of his epiſtles, 2 Theſſ. iii. 18. So here, ch. xiii. 25. *Grace* ◦ *be with you all. Amen.* Indeed, ſometimes it is *the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you.* But at other times it is more contracted. So Col. iv. 18. *Grace be with you.* 1 Tim. vi. 21. *Grace be with thee.* See likewiſe Eph. vi. 24. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Tit. iii. 15. The ſame obſervation is in [p] Theodoret.

6. The circumſtances of the epiſtle lead us to the apoſtle Paul.

1.) Ch. xiii. 24. *They of Italy ſalute you.* The writer therefore was then in Italy, whither we know Paul was ſent a priſoner, and where he reſided two years, Acts xxviii. where alſo he wrote ſeveral epiſtles, ſtill remaining.

2.) Ver. 19. He deſires them *the rather to pray for him, that he might be reſtored to them the ſooner.* Paul had been brought from Judea to Rome. And he was willing to go thither again, where he had been ſeveral times. And though the original words are not the ſame, there is an agreement between this and Philem. ver. 22. *I truſt, that through your prayers I ſhall be given to you.* This particular is one of the arguments of Euthalius, that [q] this epiſtle is Paul's, and written to the Jews of Paleſtine.

◦ Et hoc ad exemplum Pauli. T. III. p. 462.

Eph. vi. 24. Col. iv. 18 1 Tim. vi. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Tit. iii. 15. Qui alibi explicat, quæ ſit illa gratia, nempe Chriſti. Grot. in. Heb. xiii. 25.

[p] Το συντομες ακροτελευτον τεθεικε, την της χαριτος μετουσιαν. Theod. in loc.

[q] Μαρτυρειται δε και εν τοις εξης η επιστολη υπαρχουσα παυλου, τω γραφειν, οτι και τοις δεσμοις μου συνεπαθησατε, και εκ του λεγειν, περισσοτερον ευχεσθε, ινα ταχιον αποκατασταθω υμιν. Euthal. ap. Zacagn. p. 670.

3.) Ver.

3.) Ver. 23. *Know ye, that our brother Timothy is ſet at liberty. With whom, if he come ſhortly, I will ſee you.* Timothy was with Paul, during his impriſonment at Rome: as is allowed by all. For he is expreſsly mentioned at the beginning of the epiſtles to the Philippians, Coloſſians, Philemon, written when he was in bonds. He is mentioned again, Philip. ii. 19. When the apoſtle writes to Timothy, he calls him *his ſon*, or *dearly beloved ſon.* 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. But when he mentions him to others, he calls him *brother.* 2 Cor. i. 1. Col. i. 1. 1 Theſſ. iii. 2. In like manner Titus. Comp. Titus i. 4. and 2 Cor. ii. 13.

This mention of Timothy has led many, not only moderns, but ancients likewiſe, to think of Paul as writer of the epiſtle, particularly [r] Euthalius. And undoubtedly, many others have been confirmed in that ſuppoſition by this circumſtance.

The original word, απολελυμενον, is ambiguous, being capable of two ſenſes: one of which is that of our tranſlation, *ſet at liberty*, that is, from impriſonment: the other is diſmiſſed, *ſent abroad on an errand.* In this laſt ſenſe it was underſtood by Euthalius. Who, in the place juſt cited, ſays, 'That 'ſcarcely any one can be thought of, beſide Paul, who would 'ſend Timothy abroad upon any ſervice of the goſpel.' And indeed this paſſage doth put us in mind of what Paul ſays to the Philippians, ch. ii. 19. *But I truſt in the Lord Jeſus, to ſend Timothy ſhortly unto you, that I alſo may be of good comfort when I know your ſtate. Him therefore I hope to ſend preſently, ſo ſoon as I ſhall ſee how it will go with me. But I truſt in the Lord, that I alſo myſelf ſhall come ſhortly*, ver. 23, 24. Which induced Beauſobre to ſay in the preface to this epiſtle: 'The 'ſacred [s] author concludes with aſking the prayers of the He- 'brews, ch. xiii. 19. *That he may be reſtored to them.* Theſe 'words intimate, that he was ſtill priſoner, but that he hoped 'to be ſet at liberty. Therefore he adds in the 23. ver. that 'he intended to come and ſee them with Timothy, as ſoon as 'he ſhould be returned. If this explication be right, this 'epiſtle was written at Rome ſome time after the epiſtle to the 'Philippians, and ſince the departure of Timothy for Ma- 'cedonia.'

Thus we are brought to the time of this epiſtle. Never-

[r] Και εις τε λεγειν, γινωσκετε τον αδελφον ημων τιμοθεον απολελυμενον—— ουδεις γαρ αν, οιμαι, απελυσεν εις διακονιαν τιμοθεου, ει μη παυλος. κ. λ. Euthal. ib. p. 671.

[s] Preface ſur l'epitre aux Hebreux. n. 37. p. 429.

theleſs before I proceed to ſpeak diſtinctly to that, I would conclude the argument concerning the writer of it.

All theſe conſiderations juſt mentioned, added to the teſtimony of many ancient writers, make out an argument of great weight (though not deciſive and demonſtrative) that the apoſtle Paul is the writer of this epiſtle.

It ſhould be obſerved, I have hitherto declined the uſe of two arguments often inſiſted upon in diſcourſing of this point.

One of which is the teſtimony of St. Peter: 2 epſt. ch. iii. 15, 16. This I have omitted, becauſe I am not ſatisfied that he and the author of this epiſtle write to the ſame perſons. Nor does it appear certain to me, that St. Peter there takes any particular notice of this [t] epiſtle as one of Paul's. However as many learned men look upon that paſſage of St. Peter, as a full teſtimony to Paul's being the writer of this epiſtle; I ſhall refer to ſeveral, or tranſcribe below, a part at leaſt of what they ſay: particularly [u] Mill, [x] Spanheim, and [y] Baſnage.

The other argument omitted by me is that taken from Heb. x. 34. *For ye had compaſſion of me in my bonds.* On this inſiſt [z] Spanheim, [a] Mill, and [b] Baſnage, to prove that this epiſtle was written by Paul. But Mr. James Peirce tranſlates the words thus: *For ye ſympathized with thoſe who were in bonds.* And in his notes ſays: 'Were it certain, that the common

[t] Says Mr. Hallet. Introduction, p. 21. 'Some learned men have 'attempted to prove this point from 'what St. Peter ſays, 2 Pet. iii. '15, 16. If it could be proved, 'that he ſpeaks of the epiſtle to 'the Hebrews, the teſtimony of this 'apoſtle would fully determine the 'diſpute. But as I do not think, 'it can be certainly proved, that he 'ſpeaks of this epiſtle, without 'proving that St. Paul was the 'author of it, I cannot argue from 'this paſſage. Thoſe on the other 'ſide go upon the ſuppoſition, that 'St. Peter's epiſtles were written 'to the Hebrews, or Jews. But 'it ſeems to me abundantly more 'natural to ſuppoſe, that they were 'written to gentile Chriſtians, if 'we conſider many paſſages of the 'epiſtles themſelves.' [u] Et quidem epiſtolam hanc eam ipſam fuiſſe, quam ad Hebræos Chriſtianos miſerat Apoſtolus noſter, diſertis verbis D. Petri conſtat. Ep. 2. cap. iii. 15, &c. Mill. Proleg. num. 86—91. [x] Vid. Spanhem. Diſſ. de Auct. ep. ad Hebr. Part. I. cap. ii——v. [y] Hebræis Paulum ſcripſiſſe, planum eſt ex poſteriore Petri: *Paulus pro ſibi data ſapientia ſcripſit vobis.* Hebræos enim adibat ſcripto Petrus circumciſionis apoſtolus. Quænam autem Pauli ad Hebræos ſcripta epiſtola, ſi noſtra non eſt?——Ipſa igitur eſt, quæ omnium in manibus verſatur atque oculis. *Baſn. ann. 61. num. iv.* [z] Prima eſto circumſtantia *vinctorum* illa mentio. Capite x. ver. 34.——Conſtat enim, ſoli Paulo, et fere ſemper, veniſſe hoc in uſu. Et quas omnes ex Italia tranſmiſit epiſtolas.

'common is the true reading of the place, there would be 'little room left to doubt of the epiſtle's being written by St. 'Paul. But the Alexandrian, and other manuſcripts, of the 'beſt note, read here δεσμοις inſtead of δεσμοις μου. And the ſame 'is confirmed by ancient verſions.' And that this is the truer reading, may be ſeen in Bengelius, Wetſtein, and Mill himſelf: though in his argument concerning the author of the epiſtle, he has been pleaſed to argue from the common reading. If Paul here referred to his bonds, I ſhould think he intended his impriſonment in Judea, as Mill thought, not at Rome, as Baſnage does, in the place juſt cited. I make no doubt but that the Hebrew believers in Judea afforded St. Paul relief and comfort, whilſt he lay priſoner at Cæſarea. But as I do not here diſcern any plain reference to that, I do not form any argument from this text, in behalf of the writer of the epiſtle.

I ſay no more by way of argument. But there are objections, which ought to be conſidered.

1. Obj. Heb. ii. 3. *How ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo great ſalvation, which at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?*

Hence it has been argued, that the writer of this epiſtle placeth himſelf with thoſe who had received the doctrine of the goſpel from Chriſt's apoſtle's. But Paul had it from Chriſt himſelf, as he ſays at large in the firſt chapter of the epiſtle to the Galatians. This has been thought by [c] Grotius and Le Clerc,[d] a good reaſon why Paul ſhould not be eſteemed the writer of this epiſtle.

To

epiſtolas, vinculorum ſuorum mentione quaſi diſtinxit. Spanh. ib. P. II. cap. 4. [a] Auctorem habet hæc epiſtola, ſi qua uſquam alia, D. Paulum. Alloquitur Auctor Hebræos iſtos, velut ipſius in carcere memores, ejuſque vinculis συμπαθησαντας. Iſta Apoſtolo noſtro congruere, nemo non videt. Hieroſolyma ipſe duos ante annos eleemoſynas eccleſiarum detulerat, ubi ab univerſa illic eccleſia benigne exceptus erat, toto tempore, quo Cæſareæ manſit incarceratus. Mill. Prol. num. 85. [b] A manu catenata epiſtolam in Italia exaratam fuiſſe, cernimus et videmus: *vinculis meis mecum affecti fuiſtis.* Barnabam vero aut Lucam compedibus in Italia fuiſſe detentos, veterum in monimentis ne minimâ quidem literâ invenimus. Baſnag. Ann. 61. n. iv.

[c] Præterea Paulo hanc epiſtolam abjudicat, quod hujus ſcriptor ſe iis annumeret, qui non a Chriſto, ſed ab ejus diſcipulis, notitiam, evangelii acceperit. cap. ii. 3. Cum contra Paulus auctoritatem ſibi addat inde, quod hanc notitiam a Chriſto ipſo acceperit. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Hebr. [d] Videtur et ſcriptor epiſtolæ ad Hebræos cap. ii. 3. &c. eorum numero cenſeri velle,

To which I answer, that it is not uncommon for Paul to join himself with those to whom he is writing, and to say *us*, where he might say *you*: especially, when he says any thing that is humbling, and that might be thought disagreeable. So Col. i. 12, 13. *Giving thanks to the Father, who——has delivered us from the power of darkness.*——This I take to be a plain instance. To which might be added, according to the judgment of some commentators, Eph. ii. 3. and Tit. iii. 3. The note of Grotius upon this last cited text may be observed. And now I transcribe below [c] the answer of Mr. Wetstein to this objection: which is in the main agreeable to what I have just said.

I would also observe, that there is another instance in this epistle, much resembling the text, upon which the present objection is founded. Heb. xii. 1.——*Wherefore——let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us.*——And this way of writing is suitable to Paul's style and method in his acknowledged epistles.

Secondly, I would farther add, if it might not be esteemed too prolix: that in divers other places we find Paul, when he asserts the resurrection of Jesus Christ, insisting also upon the testimony of the other apostles, and likewise of other disciples. Thus, preaching at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 30, 31. *But God raised him from the dead. And he was seen many days of them, which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.* And also 1 Cor. xv. at the beginning: which I shall recite largely, as full to the point. *Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel, which I preached unto you, which also ye have received.*——*By which*

---

veile, qui evangelium acceperant ab iis, a quibus auditus erat ipse Christus.——Quod in Paulum non quadrat, qui evangelium ab ipso Jesu Christo et Deo accepisse se, non falso gloriatur. Gal. i. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 69. p. 459.

[c] Hebr. ii. 3. Paulus se iis annumerat, qui notitiam evangelii a discipulis Christi acceperunt: cum tamen ad Galatas non semel testetur, glorieturque, se non ab hominibus, sed ab ipso Christo fuisse institutum, Gal. i. 1, 12, 17. ch. ii. 6. Ratio discriminis ex modo dictis manifesta est. In epistola ad Galatas id agit, ut auctoritatem suam adstruat: hic autem, ubi de supplicio desertoribus impendente loquitur, ut minus ingrata esset comminatio atque admonitio, seipsum illis annumerat comm. 1. Δει ημας προσεχειν τοις ακουσθεισιν, μη ποτε παρρυωμεν——πως ημεις εκφευξομεθα. ——Postquam igitur ita cœpisset, consequens erat, ut in eadem figura pergeret, scriberetque τηλικης σωτηριας ——εις ημας εβεβαιωθη. Ita Eph. ii. 3. Col. i. 12, 13. Tit. iii. 3. ubi gentium peccata, et pœnam imminentem describit, et seipsum illis annumerat. J. J. Wetstein. N. T. tom. II. p. 384.

also

alſo ye are ſaved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you. ——For I delivered unto you firſt of all, how that Chriſt died for our ſins, according to the ſcriptures: and that he was buried, and that he roſe again the third day, according to the ſcriptures: and that he was ſeen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that he was ſeen of James, then of all the apoſtles. And laſt of all he was ſeen of me.

And this context, perhaps, will juſtify me in proceeding ſomewhat farther. When St. Paul ſays, 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember, that Jeſus Chriſt——was raiſed from the dead, according to my goſpel:* he intends, as I apprehend, to lead Timothy to recollect the goſpel, that had been preached by him in ſuch and ſuch circumſtances, confirmed by miracles wrought by him, and agreeable to the prophecies of the ancient ſcriptures, and the teſtimony of the other apoſtles, and diſciples of Chriſt. As he alſo ſays, at ver. 2. of the ſame chapter, *The things that thou haſt heard of me among many witneſſes:* literally, *by many witneſſes:* that is, confirmed by many witneſſes. And he may be ſuppoſed to intend not only [f] the prophets, which is Grotius's interpretation, but likewiſe the teſtimony of all the apoſtles of Chriſt, and of many others, to which he had appealed in his preaching.

Upon the whole, it ſeems to me, that the expreſſion of this text is highly becoming the apoſtle Paul, eſpecially, ſuppoſing him to be here writing to the believers of Jeruſalem and Judea. And indeed, as before ſhown, the beginning of this ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the Hebrews affords, in my opinion, an argument of no ſmall force, that they are the Chriſtians to whom it is ſent.

2. Obj. Another objection againſt this epiſtle being St. Paul's is, that it is ſuppoſed to have in it an elegance ſuperior to that of his other writings. This has been judged by Grotius, and Le Clerc, who were formerly [g] quoted, ſufficient to ſhow, that it was not written by Paul.

In order to judge the better of this, it may be of uſe to recollect what we have already ſeen in divers ancient writers, relating to this point.

Euſebius has a paſſage of Clement of Alexandria, from his inſtitutions, at large cited by us [h] formerly: where Clement ſays, 'That [i] the epiſtle to the Hebrews is Paul's, and that it 'was

[f] Multis adductis teſtibus prophetis, qui hæc prædixerant. Hebr. xii. 1. Grot. in 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[g] See before, p. 13.

[h] vol. II. p. 211.

[i] Και την προς εβραιες επιστολην παυλε μεν ειναι φησι, γεγραφθαι δε εβραιοις εβραικη φωνη· λεκαν

'was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and 'that Luke having carefully tranſlated it, publiſhed it for the 'uſe of the Greeks. Which is the reaſon of that conformity 'of ſtyle, which is found in this epiſtle, and the Acts of the 'apoſtles.'

The opinion of Origen in his homilies upon this epiſtle as cited by Euſebius, and by us [k] from him, is, 'That the ſtyle 'of the epiſtle to the Hebrews has not the apoſtle's rudeneſs 'of ſpeech——but as to the texture of it, is elegant Greek, 'as every one will allow, who is able to judge of the differ- 'ences of ſtyle.' Again, he ſays, 'The ſentiments of the 'epiſtle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged 'writings of the apoſtle. This will be aſſented to by every 'one, who reads the writings of the apoſtle with attention.' Afterwards, he adds, 'If I was to ſpeak my opinion, I ſhould 'ſay, that the ſentiments are the apoſtle's, but the language 'and compoſition another's, who committed to writing the 'apoſtle's ſenſe, and as it were reduced into commentaries the 'things ſpoken by his maſter.' And what follows.

Euſebius [l] himſelf ſpeaking of Clement's epiſtle to the Corinthians, ſays, 'Paul having written to the Hebrews in their 'own language, ſome think, that the evangeliſt Luke, others, 'that this very Clement, tranſlated it into Greek. Which laſt is 'the moſt likely, there being a great reſemblance between the 'ſtyle of the epiſtle of Clement, and the epiſtle to the Hebrews. 'Nor are the ſentiments of thoſe two writings very different.' This paſſage has been already twice quoted by us: once in the chapter of Clement [m] biſhop of Rome, and again in that [n] of Euſebius.

Philaſter, biſhop of Breſcia, about 380, as formerly quoted, ſays, 'There [o] are ſome, who do not allow the epiſtle to the 'Hebrews to be Paul's: but ſay, it is either an epiſtle of the 'apoſtle Barnabas, or of Clement biſhop of Rome. But ſome 'ſay, it is an epiſtle of Luke the evangeliſt.——Moreover, 'ſome reject it, as more eloquent than the apoſtle's other 'writings.'

Jerom, about 392, in his article of St. Paul in the book of Illuſtrious Men, as [p] before cited alſo, ſays, 'The epiſtle, called 'to the Hebrews, is not thought to be his, becauſe of the

λεκται δε φιλοτιμως αυτην μεθερμηνευσαντα, ειδεναι τοις ελλησιν. κ. λ. ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 6. c. 14. in.

[k] Vol. II. p. 467. from Euſeb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 25.

[l] H. E. l. 3. cap. 38.

[m] Vol. II. p. 26.

[n] Vol. IV. p. 250.

[o] p. 500.

[p] See vol. V. p. 46.

'difference

'difference of the argument and ſtyle: but either Barnabas's, 'as Tertullian thought; or the evangeliſt Luke's, according 'to ſome others; or Clement's, biſhop of Rome: who, as 'ſome think, being much with him, clothed and adorned 'Paul's ſenſe in his own language.——Moreover he wrote as 'a Hebrew to Hebrews in pure Hebrew, it being his own 'language. Whence it came to paſs, that being tranſlated it 'has more elegance in the Greek, than his other epiſtles.'

I need not allege here any more teſtimonies relating to this matter. We ſufficiently perceive by what has been ſaid, that many ancient Chriſtians ſuppoſed the Greek of this epiſtle to have a ſuperior elegance to the received epiſtles of St. Paul. And to ſome of them the Greek was their native language. And others, as Jerom, though Latins, may be ſuppoſed to have been good judges in this matter.

Some learned men of late times, as Grotius, and Le Clerc, have thought this to be an inſuperable objection. Of this opinion likewiſe was [q] Jacob Tollius: who in his notes upon Longinus, of the ſublime, has celebrated the ſublimity of this epiſtle, and particularly the elegance of the beginning of it. Which alone he thinks ſufficient to ſhow, that it is not Paul's. Others allow the fine contexture of the ſtyle of this epiſtle; but do not ſee that conſequence. Theſe are obliged to acount for it; which they do ſeveral ways.

Mr. Wetſtein, who allows, that the epiſtle is St. Paul's, and that it was written in Greek, thinks, that [r] Paul having now lived two years at Rome, may have improved his Greek ſtyle. But in anſwer to that it may be ſaid, that we have ſeveral epiſtles of Paul, written near the end of his impriſonment at Rome, in which we perceive his uſual ſtyle.

Again, Mr. Wetſtein adds, 'That [s] this is a learned epiſtle, 'and

[q] Ejuſmodi σηριγμους, και αναπαυσεις ſtatim in initio eloquentiſſimæ, et neſcio annon omnem gentilium ſcriptorum ſublimitatem ſuperantis, certe adæquantis epiſtolæ ad Hebræos reperias: quam vel hoc uno Pauli non eſſe probaverim. Sed ſunt αναπαυσεις illæ non deorſum ruentis orationis, verum contra ea in cœlum aſcendentis σηριγμοι. Ita vero incipit: Πολυμερως, και πολυτροπως, παλαι ο θεος λαλησας τοις πατρασιν. κ. λ. Ubi tres conſequenter ſunt poſiti Pæones quarti cum ſyllaba poſt ſingulas remanente, velut ad ſubſiſtendum, dum ita in cœlum ad Deum velut gradibus ſcriptor adſcendit. J. Tollius ad Longin. de Sublim. § 39. not 22. [r] Potuit Paulus aliter ſcribere, cum eſſet in Græcia, aliter poſtea, cum in Italiam tranſlatus ex uſu frequentiori linguæ Græcæ, et Hebraiſmos vitare, et facilius ſcribere didiciſſet. Wetſt. N. T. tom. II. p. 385. [s] Potuit hanc epiſtolam, quæ erudita eſt,

longiori

'and may have been compoſed with more care and exactneſs, than letters written to friends, or to churches, whoſe urgent 'neceſſities obliged him to write in haſte.' But neither will this, I believe, be ſufficient to account for the difference of ſtyle in this, and the epiſtles received as Paul's. For no care and attention will on a ſudden enable a man to alter his uſual ſtyle, in a remarkable manner.

It remains therefore, as ſeems to me, that if the epiſtle be Paul's, and was originally written in Greek, as we ſuppoſe, the apoſtle muſt have had ſome aſſiſtance in compoſing it. So that we are led to the judgment of Origen, which appears to be as ingenious, and probable as any. 'The ſentiments are 'the apoſtle's, but the language and compoſition of ſome one 'elſe: who committed to writing the apoſtle's ſenſe, and as 'it were reduced into commentaries the things ſpoken by his 'maſter.' According to this account, the epiſtle is St. Paul's, as to the thoughts and matter, but the words are another's. Jerom, as may be remembered, ſaid, 'He wrote as a Hebrew 'to Hebrews in pure Hebrew, it being his own language. 'Whence it came to paſs, that being tranſlated, it has more 'elegance in the Greek, than his other epiſtles.' My conjecture, which is not very different, if I may be allowed to mention it, is, that St. Paul dictated the epiſtle in Hebrew, and another, who was a great maſter of the Greek language, immediately wrote down the apoſtle's ſentiments in his own elegant Greek. But who this aſſiſtant of the apoſtle was, is altogether unknown.

The ancients, beſide Paul, have mentioned Barnabas, Luke, and Clement, as writers, or tranſlators of this epiſtle. But I do not know, that there is any remarkable agreement between the ſtyle of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and the ſtyle of the epiſtle commonly aſcribed to Barnabas. The [t] ſtyle of Clement, in his epiſtle to the Corinthians, is verboſe and prolix. St. Luke [u] may have ſome words, which are in the epiſtle to the Hebrews. But that does not make out the ſame ſtyle. This epiſtle, as Origen ſaid, 'as to the texture of the ſtyle, is elegant Greek. But that kind of texture appears not in Luke, ſo far as I can perceive. There may be more art and labour

longiori meditatione elaboraſſe, cum alias ad familiares amicos, vel ad eccleſias, ubi neceſſitas urgebat, feſtinantius effudiſſet. Ibid.

[t] Clement eſt diffus, —— &c. Beauſ. Pref. ſur l'epiſtre aux Hebreux. num. vii.

[u] Lucam autem hujus epiſtolæ ſcriptorem oſtendunt etiam vocabula et loquendi genera quædam Lucæ velut propria. Grot. Præf. in ep. ad Hebr.

in

in the writings of Luke, than in thoſe of the other evangeliſts: but not much more elegance, that I can diſcern. This epiſtle to the Hebrews [x] is bright and elegant from the beginning to the end. And ſurpaſſeth as much the ſtyle of St. Luke, as it does the ſtyle of St. Paul in his acknowledged epiſtles. In ſhort, this is an admirable epiſtle, but ſingular in ſentiments and language: ſomewhat different in both reſpects from all the other writings in the New Teſtament. And whoſe is the language, as ſeems to me, is altogether unknown: whether that of Zenas, or Apollos, or ſome other of the apoſtle Paul's aſſiſtants, and fellow-labourers.

3. Obj. There ſtill remains one objection more againſt this epiſtle being written by St. Paul. Which is the want of his name. For to all the thirteen epiſtles, received as his, he prefixeth his name, and generally calleth himſelf apoſtle.

This objection has been obvious in all ages. And the omiſſion has been differently accounted for by the ancients, who received this epiſtle as a genuine writing of St. Paul.

Clement of Alexandria, in his inſtitutions, as cited by us [y] formerly from Euſebius, ſpeaks to this purpoſe, 'The epiſtle 'to the Hebrews, he ſays, is Paul's. But he did not make 'uſe of that inſcription, *Paul the apoſtle.* Of which he aſſigns 'this reaſon. Writing to the Hebrews, who had conceived a 'prejudice againſt him, and were ſuſpicious of him, he wiſely 'declined ſetting his name at the beginning, leſt he ſhould 'offend them. He alſo mentions this tradition: foraſmuch as 'the Lord was ſent as the apoſtle of Almighty God to the 'Hebrews, Paul out of modeſty does not ſtyle himſelf the 'apoſtle of the Hebrews: both out of reſpect to the Lord, 'and that being preacher and apoſtle of the gentiles, he over 'and above wrote to the Hebrews.'

Jerom alſo ſpeaks to this purpoſe, 'That [z] Paul might 'decline putting his name in the inſcription, on account of the 'Hebrews being offended with him.' So in the article of St. Paul, in his book of Illuſtrious Men. In his commentary upon the beginning of the epiſtle to the Galatians, he aſſigns another reaſon, 'That [a] Paul declined to ſtyle himſelf apoſtle 'at

[x] Tout le monde roconnoit de l'eloquence et de l'elevation dans l'epiſtre aux Hebreux. Beauſ. ibid.

[y] Vol. II. p. 211.

[z] Vel certe quia Paulus ſcribebat ad Hebræos, et propter invidiam ſui apud eos nominis titulum in principio ſalutationis amputaverat. De V. I. cap. v.

[a] Et in epiſtola ad Hebræos propterea Paulum ſolita conſuetudine nec nomen ſuum, nec Apoſtoli vocabulum præpoſuiſſe

'at the beginning of the epistle to the Hebrews, because he 'should afterwards call Christ *the high priest, and apostle of our* '*profession*,' See ch. iii. 1.

Theodoret says, that Paul was especially the apostle of the gentiles. For which he allegeth, Gal. ii. 9. and Rom. xi. 13. 'Therefore [b] writing to the Hebrews, who were not entrusted 'to his care, he barely delivered the doctrine of the gospel, 'without assuming any character of authority. For they were 'the charge of the other apostles.'

I need not quote any others; which would be only a repetition of the same, or like reasons.

All these reasons may not be reckoned equally good. And, perhaps, none of them are sufficient, and adequate to the purpose. But though we should not be able to assign a good reason, why Paul omitted his name; the epistle, nevertheless, may be his. For [c] there may have been a good reason for it, though we are not able to find it out. It is the work of a masterly hand. Who for some reason omitted his name. Paul might have a reason for such silence, as well as another.

Lightfoot [d] says, 'Paul's not affixing his name to this, as he 'had done to his other epistles, does no more deny it to be his, 'than the first epistle of John is denied to be John's upon that 'account.'

Tillemont says, 'Possibly [e] Paul considered it as a book, 'rather than a letter: since he makes an excuse for its brevity, 'ch. xiii. 22. For indeed it is short for a book, but long for 'a letter.' The same thought is in [f] Estius. This may in-

duce

posuisse, quia de Christo erat dicturus: *Habentes ergo Principem Sacerdotum, et Apostolum confessionis, Jesum:* nec fuisse congruum, ut ubi Christus Apostolus dicendus erat, ibi etiam Paulus Apostolus poneretur. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 225. in.

[b] Ἑβραίοις δε γραφων, ων ουκ επεχειρισθη την επιμελειαν, γυμνην των αξιωματων εικοτως την διδασκαλιαν προσηνεγκεν· υπο γαρ την των αλλων αποστολων προμηθειαν ετελουν. Theod. in Hebr. T. III. p. 392.

[c] Verum est, Paulum omnibus aliis epistolis, si hanc excipias, et nomen suum præposuisse, et titulos addidisse, quibus sibi autoritatem conciliaret. Nec tamen inde consequitur, hanc, de qua agimus, Pauli non esse. Aut enim dicendum erit, nullius esse, quia nomen nullum præfixum est: aut si alius quis contra morem receptum nomen suum reticere potuit, idem æquo jure etiam Paulo licuit. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 384. med.

[d] See his works. vol. I. p. 339.

[e] S. Paul. art. 46. Mem. T. I.

[f] Sed post hæc omnia, an vera ratio omissæ salutationis est, quod hæc epistola scripta est per modum libri, non per modum epistolæ? Unde in fine dicit: *Etenim perpaucis scripsi vobis.* Quod de epistola non

erat

duce us to recollect an obſervation of Chryſoſtom to the like purpoſe, formerly [g] taken notice of.

It is, I think, obſervable, that there is not at the beginning of this epiſtle any ſalutation. As there is no name of the writer, ſo neither is there any deſcription of the people, to whom it is ſent. It appears from the concluſion, that it was ſent to ſome people in a certain place. And, undoubtedly, they to whom it was ſent, and by whom it was received, knew very well, from whom it came. Nevertheleſs there might be reaſons for omitting an inſcription, and a ſalutation at the beginning. This might ariſe from the circumſtances of things. There might be danger of offence in ſending at that time a long letter to Jews in Judea. And this omiſſion might be in part owing to a regard for the bearer, who too is not named. The only perſon named throughout the epiſtle is Timothy. Nor was he at that time preſent with the writer.

Indeed I imagine, that the two great objections againſt this being a genuine epiſtle of the apoſtle: the elegance of the ſtyle, and the want of a name and inſcription, are both owing to ſome particular circumſtances of the writer, and the people to whom it was ſent. The people, to whom it was ſent, are plainly Jews in Judea; and the writer, very probably, is Paul. Whoſe circumſtances at the breaking up of his confinement at Rome, and his ſetting out upon a new journey, might be attended with ſome peculiar embarraſſments; which obliged him to act differently from his uſual method.

IV. Thus we are brought to the fourth and laſt part of our inquiry concerning this epiſtle, the time and place of writing it. Mill was of opinion, that [h] this epiſtle was written by Paul in the year 63, in ſome part of Italy, ſoon after he had been releaſed from his impriſonment at Rome. Mr. Wetſtein [i] appears to have been of the ſame opinion. Tillemont [k] likewiſe placeth this epiſtle in the year 63, immediately after the apoſtle's being ſet at liberty. Who, as he ſays, was ſtill at Rome, or at leaſt in Italy. Baſnage [l] ſpeaks of this epiſtle at the year 61, and ſuppoſeth it to be written during the apoſtle's impriſonment. For he afterwards ſpeaks of the epiſtle to the Epheſians, and ſays, it [m] was the laſt letter, which the apoſtle

[g] See vol. V. p. 130.

[h] Interea, mox ut e carcere evaſit Apoſtolus, receſſit in ulteriorem aliquam Italiæ partem, ibique ſcripſit epiſtolam ad Hebræos. Proleg. num. 83.

[i] Wetſt. N. T. tom. II. p. 387. in.

[k] S. Paul. art. 46.

[l] Ann. 61. num. ii—vi.

[m] Epiſtolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apoſtolus, ea quæ ad Epheſios, ultima eſſe videtur. Ibid. num. vii.

[h] Mill. Prol. num. 893. Fit. de Auct. Ep. ad Hebr. p. 893. [i] Wetſt. N. T. tom. II. p. 387. in. [k] S. Paul. art. 46. [l] Ann. 61. num. ii—vi. [m] Epiſtolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apoſtolus, ea quæ ad Epheſios, ultima eſſe videtur. Ibid. num. vii.

wrote

wrote during the time of his bonds. Lenfant and Beauſobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epiſtles, obſerve, 'that 'n in the ſubſcription at the end of the epiſtle it is ſaid to have 'been written from Italy. The only ground of which, as they 'add, is what is ſaid, ch. xiii. 24. *They of Italy ſalute you.* 'This has made ſome think, that the apoſtle wrote to the 'Hebrews, after he had been ſet at liberty, and when he was 'got into that part of Italy, which borders upon Sicily, and 'in ancient times was called Italy. Nevertheleſs there is reaſon 'to doubt of this. When he requeſts the prayers of the 'Hebrews, that *he might be reſtored to them the ſooner*, he 'intimates, that he was not yet ſet at liberty.' Accordingly, they place this epiſtle in the year 62.

There is not any great difference in any of theſe opinions concerning the time, or place of this epiſtle: all ſuppoſing, that it was written by the apoſtle, either at Rome, or in Italy, near the end of his impriſonment at Rome, or ſoon after it was over, before he removed to any other country.

I cannot perceive, why it may not be allowed to have been written at Rome. St. Paul's firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians was written at Epheſus. Nevertheleſs he ſays, ch. xvi. 19. *The churches of Aſia ſalute you.* So now he might ſend ſalutations from the Chriſtians of Italy, not excluding, but including thoſe at Rome, together with the reſt throughout that country.

The argument of Lenfant and Beauſobre, that Paul was not yet ſet at liberty, becauſe he requeſted the prayers of the *Hebrews, that he might be reſtored to them the ſooner*, appears not to me of any weight. Though Paul was no longer a priſoner, he might requeſt the prayers of thoſe to whom he was writing, that he might have a proſperous journey to them, whom he was deſirous to viſit: and that all impediments of his intended journey might be removed. And many ſuch there might be, though he was no longer under confinement. Paul was not a priſoner when he wrote the epiſtle to the Romans. Yet he was very fervent in his prayers to God, that he might have a proſperous journey, and come to them, ch. i. 10.

For determining the time of this epiſtle, it may be obſerved, that when the apoſtle wrote the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon, he had hopes of deliverance. At the writing of all thoſe epiſtles Timothy was preſent with him. But now he was abſent, as plainly appears from ch. xiii. 23.

[n] Pref gen. ſur les epiſtres de S. Paul. num. lii.

This

This leads us to think that this epiſtle was written after them. And it is not unlikely, that the apoſtle had now obtained that liberty, which he expected when they were written.

Moreover in the epiſtle to the Philippians he ſpeaks of ſending Timothy to them, ch. ii. 19—23. *But I truſt in the Lord Jeſus, to ſend Timothy ſhortly unto you, that I alſo may be of good comfort, when I know your ſtate.* Timothy therefore, if ſent, was to come back to the apoſtle. *Him therefore I hope to ſend preſently, ſo ſoon as I ſhall ſee how it will go with me.* It is probable that Timothy did go to the Philippians ſoon after writing the above-mentioned epiſtles, the apoſtle having gained good aſſurance of being quite releaſed from his confinement. And this epiſtle to the Hebrews was written during the time of that abſence. For it is ſaid, Heb. xiii. 23. *Know ye that our brother Timothy is ſet at liberty. With whom, if he come ſhortly, I will ſee you.*——*Know ye that our brother Timothy is ſet at liberty*: or *has been ſent abroad.* The word [o] is capable of that meaning. And it is a better and more likely meaning, becauſe it ſuits the coherence. And I ſuppoſe, that Timothy did ſoon come to the apoſtle, and that they both ſailed to Judea, and after that went to Epheſus; where Timothy was left to reſide with his peculiar charge.

Thus this epiſtle was written at Rome, or in Italy, ſoon after that Paul had been releaſed from his confinement at Rome, in the beginning of the year 63.

And I ſuppoſe it to be the laſt written of all St. Paul's epiſtles, which have come down to us, or that we have any knowledge of.

Who was the bearer of it, is not known. At the end of the epiſtle, in ſome manuſcripts, is a ſubſcription to this purpoſe: 'that it was carried from Italy by Timothy.' But that ſubſcription is eſteemed of no authority by all learned men in general, Beza in particular. I put below [p] a part of what he ſays. It is inconſiſtent with what is ſaid of Timothy, ch. xiii. 23. Timothy was to accompany the writer. The epiſtle was ſent before.

[o] Et quidem paullo poſt miſſas hasce [*ad Philippenſes*] literas, libertatem adeptus, Timotheum in Macedoniam miſit, uti liquet ex Hebr. xiii. 23.——Neque enim verbis iſtis ſignificatum vult Apoſtolus, Timotheum tum temporis, ſecum una vinculis liberatum fuiſſe, ſed a ſe ob certa negotia fuiſſe dimiſſum. Mill. Proleg. num. 68.

[p] Puto igitur hanc ſubſcriptionem non ſatis conſiderate adſcriptam fuiſſe a quopiam, qui occaſionem ex eo arripuerit, quod Timothei et Italorum mentio facta fuerat. Nam etiam et in Claromontano codice, et in Syra interpretatione non exſtat. Bez. ad cap. xiii. in fin.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

That the Epistle, inscribed to the Ephesians, was written to them.

The epistle to the Ephesians is one of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul. There never was any doubt among Christians, who was the writer. But there has been, especially of late, a dispute concerning the persons to whom it was sent: some thinking that the common inscription is false, and that this is either a general epistle, or that it was sent to the Laodiceans. Of this opinion is [a] Mill, in his Prolegomena to the New Testament, who has had many followers. Some of whom must be here mentioned by me. Mr. James Peirce, [b] who likewise speaks of Mr. Whiston, as of the same opinion. The [c] author of a Latin letter, or dissertation in the third volume of Mr. La Roche's Literary Journal, published in the year 1731. That letter is anonymous. But the writer is Artemonius, otherwise Samuel Crellius, author of Initium Evangelii S. Joannis Apostoli restitutum. This I was assured of by Mr. La Roche, the editor. W. Wall in his Critical Notes upon the New Testament. Dr. Benson [d]. The author of a letter at the end of the second volume of Dr. Benson's History of the first planting the Christian Religion. Which learned author has also since published a postscript to that letter, which is at the end of the third volume of the same work of Dr. Benson. The unknown author of an edition of the New Testament, in Greek and English, in two volumes octavo, published at London in 1729. Campegius Vitringa, the son, professor of divinity in the university of Franequer, wrote a dissertation on the same side of the question. And not having therein finished his design, his successor, Mr. Venema, added another dissertation, both together making more than one hundred and thirty pages in [e] quarto. Lastly, Mr. J. J. Wet-

[a] Quidni igitur scripta fuerit ad Laodicenses? Proleg. num. 74. vid. ib. num. 71—79. et num. 237.

[b] See an Advertisement at the end of his paraphrase upon the Ep. to the Philippians, p. 114. &c.

[c] See La Roche's Literary Journal for April, May, and June, 1731. vol. III. p. 165—183. Et Conf. Artemonii Initium Evangel. S. Joan. restitutum. p. 212. edit. Londini. 1726.

[d] See Dr. Benson's History of the first planting the Christian Religion, vol. II. p. 270—276. first ed. p. 290—297. 2d. ed.

[e] Dissertat. de genuino titulo epistolæ D. Pauli, quæ vulgo inscribitur ad Ephesios. Ap. Campeg. Vitring. Fil. Diss. Sacr. Franequeræ. 1731. p. 247—379.

stein

ſtein in his notes upon the beginning of this epiſtle. Who alſo has put a mark under the text, ſhowing Laodicea to be, in his opinion, the right reading, inſtead of Epheſus. I here mention no more. But perhaps ſome others may be taken notice of hereafter.

The common reading however has been defended by [f] ſeveral. I mention two authors of great note. One is Le Clerc [g] in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, whoſe words I have placed below. He had ſeen Mill's argument, and ſlighted it. He thought that few would be moved by it. However, he briefly conſiders, and anſwers the principal objections, taken from Eph. i. 15. iii. 2 and 4. As for any other arguments, he ſays, they are of too little moment to be oppoſed to the general conſent of Chriſtian writers.

[f] Vid. J. C. Wolf. Curæ in N. T. tom. IV. p. 1—13. I may be allowed likewiſe to take notice of a Commentary upon the epiſtle to the Epheſians, publiſhed in the Dutch language, by Peter Dinant, a learned miniſter at Rotterdam, in the year 1721. Of which an honourable account is given in the Bibliotheca Bremenſis, where we are aſſured. Ampla operi præmiſit Prolegomena, in quibus primo loco Apoſtolum Paulum vere epiſtolæ ad Epheſios ſcriptorem eſſe demonſtrat. ——Agit deinde de Epheſo, ejuſque, cum Apoſtolus hanc epiſtolam conſcriberet, ſtatu: de Dianæ cultu.——Hinc refutat Grotium, qui Marcionem ſecutus non ad Epheſios, ſed Laodicenſes ſcriptam hanc epiſtolam credidit. Sententia quoque Uſſerii, qui non ad ſolos Epheſios, ſed plures eccleſias deſtinatam, adeoque pro encyclica habendam putat, examinatur, ac rejicitur. Bibliotheca. Hiſt. Phil. Theolog. Claſſis quintæ Faſc. tertius. p. 533, 534. Bremæ 1721.

[g] Poſtea ſcripſit epiſtolam ad Epheſios, quam viri quidam docti [Joan. Millius, in Prolegom. ad N. T. cujus conjectura paucis, credo probabitur:] ſuſpicantur ad Laodicenos datam, ſed ſine ullo ſat firmo argumento. Volunt quidem in hac epiſtola quædam eſſe, quæ Epheſiis non conveniunt, ut cum cap. i. 15. Paulus ſe *audiſſe fidem et caritatem* Epheſiorum ait, quas ipſe per ſe norat, non ex auditu. Sed nihil vetat, quin Romæ audiverit, Epheſios conſtanter eas virtutes coluiſſe, ex quo ipſe eos viderat, eoque in hiſce verbis reſpexerit. Similiter, et quæ habet cap. iii. 2. *Si tamen audiſtis diſpenſationem gratiæ Dei, quæ data eſt mihi in vobis*, in Epheſios optime quadrant, ſi ita intelligantur, ut ſi, Græce ειγε, non ſit dubitantis, ſed adfirmantis, et ſignificet *quandoquidem*, ut cap. iv. 21. et alibi. Ejuſdem cap. iii. 4. ait Paulus poſſe eos, ad quos ſcribit, *legentes intelligere prudentiam ejus in myſterio Chriſti*: quam non tam lectione eorum, quæ in hac epiſtola anteceſſerunt, quam ex præſentis ſermonibus intellexerant Epheſii. Sed nihil nos cogit eo confugere. Nam revera poterat hoc intelligi, vel ex iis quæ ſuperioribus capitibus leguntur. Alia argumenta, leviora multo, et omnium Chriſtianorum conſenſui oppoſita, non adtingam. Quare an ad Epheſios ſcripta ſit hæc epiſtola, nihil eſt cur dubitemus. Cleric. H. E. Ann. 62. num. viii.

So that, ſays he, there is no reaſon, why we ſhould doubt, whether this epiſtle was written to the Epheſians.

The other writer is Whitby, in his preface to this epiſtle. A part of which I cheerfully tranſcribe here. 'That this 'epiſtle to the Epheſians was indeed written by St. Paul, 'and directed to them, and not to any other church, we 'cannot doubt, if we believe either the epiſtle, or Paul 'himſelf. For, firſt, it begins thus, *Paul an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt to the ſaints which are at Epheſus.* And in this reading 'all the verſions, and all the manuſcripts agree. Secondly, 'in the cloſe of the epiſtle he ſpeaks thus to them, *That you 'may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother, 'and faithful miniſter in the Lord, ſhall make known unto you all 'things; whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe.*—— 'Ch. vi. 21, 22. And in the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, 'he ſays, *Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus*, 2 Tim. iv. 12. 'Moreover, thirdly, all antiquity agrees, that this epiſtle 'was written by Paul to the Epheſians.' And what follows.

Thoſe arguments appear to me a ſufficient defence of the preſent reading. Nevertheleſs the other opinion, contrary to Le Clerc's expectation, has of late much prevailed: as appears from the number of the patrons of it above named. And as the arguments of thoſe two learned men, whoſe writings are well known, have not been judged ſatisfactory; there can be little reaſon to expect, that any thing ſaid by me ſhould be of much weight. And indeed, it has ſometimes happened, that certain opinions have had a run, and it has been in vain to oppoſe them: though afterwards they have fallen of themſelves, being unſupported by any good evidence.

However, as a fair occaſion offers, I ſhall enlarge upon the arguments juſt mentioned, in favour of the preſent reading in our Bibles. After which I will particularly conſider the objections brought againſt it.

1. The preſent reading at the beginning of this epiſtle, *to the ſaints which are at Epheſus. and to the faithful in Chriſt Jeſus*, is the reading of all Greek manuſcripts, and of all ancient verſions, the Latin, Syriac, Perſic, Arabic, Ethiopic, and all others. It is altogether inconceivable, how there ſhould have been ſuch a general concurrence in this reading, if it had not been the original inſcription of the epiſtle.

2. It

2. It may be argued from the epiſtle itſelf, that it was written to the Epheſians.

Says the apoſtle here, ch. ii. 19—22. *Now therefore ye are fellow-citizens with the ſaints, and of the houſehold of God. And are built upon the foundation of the apoſtles, and prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner ſtone. In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. In whom you alſo are builded together for an habitation of God through the ſpirit.* It has been obſerved that [h] St. Paul frequently accommodates his ſtyle to the perſons to whom he is writing. In the firſt epiſtle to Timothy, ſent to him at Epheſus, he uſeth architect ſtyle. So particularly, ch. ii. 15. In like manner here the apoſtle may be well ſuppoſed to allude to the magnificent temple of Diana, on account of which the people of Epheſus much valued themſelves, as appears from Acts xix. 27, 28, 34, 35.

I might, perhaps, refer likewiſe to ch. iii. 18. but forbear, it being an obſcure text.

And that the epiſtle was ſent, not to ſtrangers, but to chriſtians, with whom the apoſtle was well acquainted, I ſuppoſe to be certain from internal characters. But the ſhowing that is deferred till by and by.

3. That this epiſtle was ſent to the church at Epheſus, we are aſſured by the teſtimony of all catholic Chriſtians in all paſt ages.

This we can now ſay with confidence, having examined the principal chriſtian writers from the firſt ages to the beginning of the twelfth century. In all which ſpace of time there appears not one, who had any doubt about it.

The teſtimony of ſome of theſe is eſpecially remarkable, on account of their early age, or their learning, or ſome other conſiderations.

One of them, remarkable for his early age, is Ignatius, who was biſhop of Antioch in the latter part of the firſt, and the beginning of the ſecond century, and ſuffered martyrdom at Rome in the year 107, or, as ſome think, in 116. In a letter of his to the Epheſians, written at Smyrna, as he was going from Antioch to Rome, he ſays, 'Ye [i] are the companions 'in the myſteries of the goſpel of Paul, the ſanctified, the

[h] See Dr. Benſon upon 1 Tim. iii. 15.

[i] Παυλῳ συμμυσαι τε αγιασμενῳ, τε μεμαρτυρημενῳ, αξιομακαριςῳ —— ος εν πασῃ επιςολῃ μνημονευει υμων εν χριςῳ ιησῳ. Ignat. ep. ad Eph. cap. xii.

'martyr, [or highly commended] deſervedly moſt happy, 'at whoſe feet may I be found, when I ſhall have attained 'unto God, who throughout all his epiſtle makes mention 'of you in Chriſt Jeſus.'

He plainly means the epiſtle of Paul to the Epheſians, in which the apoſtle commends thoſe Chriſtians, and never blames them.

So I wrote in the firſt edition in 1734, when I collected the paſſages of Ignatius, bearing teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament. Afterwards, in 1735, was publiſhed the letter above-mentioned at the end of the firſt edition of Dr. Benſon's Hiſtory of the firſt planting the chriſtian religion. Which occaſioned my adding a note upon that quotation from Ignatius, at p. 154—156, of the ſecond edition of the firſt volume of this work in 1748.

'The learned writer of that letter, inſtead of μνημονευει υμων 'would read μνημονευω υμων: meaning, that Ignatius himſelf 'mentioned the Epheſians in every epiſtle. In anſwer to 'which I ſaid, that conjecture appears to be without foun-'dation: foraſmuch as in all the editions of Ignatius's 'epiſtles the verb is in the third perſon: not only in the 'Greek of the ſmaller epiſtles, which I tranſlate, but alſo in 'the old Latin verſion of the ſame ſmall epiſtles. Qui in 'omni epiſtola memoriam facit veſtri in Jeſu Chriſto. So 'likewiſe in the Greek interpolated epiſtles, and in the 'Latin verſion of the ſame. There is therefore no various 'reading. And a new one ought not to be admitted, unleſs 'the ſenſe ſhould require it. Which it does not appear to 'do here. For Ignatius is extolling the Epheſians. And 'one part of their glory is, that the apoſtle throughout his 'epiſtle to them had treated them in an honourable manner.'

So I wrote in the note juſt referred to. And though that learned writer has been ſince pleaſed to publiſh a poſtſcript to his letter, he has not produced any manuſcript, or verſion of this epiſtle of Ignatius, where the verb is found in the firſt perſon.

However, in order to ſupport his propoſed reading he excepts to our interpretating the word μνημονευω, of an honourable mention. In anſwer to which I did in the ſame note produce proof of the word's being uſed ſometimes for an honourable, or affectionate mention or remembrance. And the noun μνημοσυνον, is evidently thrice uſed in the New Teſtament for an honourable memorial, Matt. xxvi. 13. Mark xiv. 9.

xiv. 9. Acts x. 4. Of theſe examples I have been reminded by a learned friend.

That learned author excepts likewiſe to our interpretation of εν παση επιστολη, *throughout all his epiſtle*, and would tranſlate, *who make mention of you in every epiſtle:* that is, as he underſtands it, Ignatius tells the Epheſians, to whom he is writing, that he made mention of them in every one of his epiſtles. In anſwer to which I ſaid in the above-mentioned note, that Pearſon had well defended the interpretation, for which we contend. And I alleged a part of the note of Cotelerius upon this paſſage of Ignatius. But by ſome means Valeſius is printed there, inſtead of Cotelerius. I now tranſcribe that note of Cotelerius at length. Fruſtra ſunt, et Andabatarum more digladiantur viri literati, non videntes, εν παση επιστολη eſſe *in tota epiſtola*, ad Epheſios nimirum ſcripta, quâ illos laudat valde, ac ſemper commendat, ut fuit ab Hieronymo obſervatum. And I ſhall place here two inſtances of the uſe of the word πας, which appear to me altogether ſimilar, and therefore to the purpoſe. One is taken from the fifth chapter of Ignatius's epiſtle to the Epheſians, where he ſays, 'If the prayer of one or two be of 'ſuch force, how much more that of the biſhop, and the 'whole church.' και πασης εκκλησιας. The other is in St. Paul's epiſtle to the Epheſians, ch. ii. 21. *In whom all the building*, or the whole building, *fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple to God.* Εν ω πασα οικοδομη κ. λ.

Indeed, Ignatius has mentioned the Epheſians in every one of his epiſtles, except that to Polycarp. But it is very unlikely, that this ſhould be his meaning here. He is extolling the Epheſians, as companions of Paul in the myſteries of the goſpel, and the like. To ſay to them preſently afterwards, and in the ſame period, that *he made mention of them in every one of his epiſtles*, would have an appearance of much vanity: with which, I think, Ignatius was never charged. And at the ſame time it would be very flat and inſipid. Moreover, it is obſervable, that this is not one of the laſt epiſtles, which Ignatius wrote. But, according to the order, in which they are mentioned * by Euſebius, it is the very firſt of his ſeven epiſtles.

There is therefore no reaſon, why we ſhould heſitate to admit the ſenſe, in which this place has been generally underſtood by learned men.

* Vid. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3 cap. 36. and this work. vol. II. p. 67.

We alſo find this ſenſe in ſome ancient writers. Jerom obſerves, that [l] when the apoſtle wrote to the Corinthians, he had occaſion to blame them for fornication, for ſtrifes and contentions: but there is no fault found by him in the Epheſians. To the like purpoſe Primaſius in [m] the preface to his Commentary upon St. Paul's epiſtles, and [n] of his argument of the epiſtle to the Epheſians in particular.

So that either thoſe ancient writers underſtood Ignatius, as we do. Or elſe they were led by the epiſtle itſelf to form the ſame idea of it, that we ſuppoſe him to have had.

What Ignatius means by the apoſtle's mentioning, or being mindful of the Epheſians throughout all his epiſtle to them, is happily explained by biſhop Pearſon; whoſe words [o] I ſhall tranſcribe below, as his work is not in every body's hands. Indeed this is a proper character of this epiſtle, as may be eaſily perceived. Nor did any of the ancients for that reaſon heſitate to allow, that it was ſent to the church at Epheſus.

I hope, that I have now juſtified the preſent reading, and common interpretation of this paſſage of Ignatius.

The learned writer, with whom I have been arguing, concludes

[l] Corinthii, in quibus audiebatur fornicatio qualis nec inter gentes, lacte paſcuntur, quia necdum poterant ſolidum cibum capere. Epheſii autem, in quibus nullum crimen arguitur, ab ipſo Domino cœleſti veſcuntur pane, et ſacramentum quod a ſeculis abſconditum fuerat agnoſcunt. Ep. ad Marcell. T. II. p. 628. ed. Martian —— animadvertat magnam inter Corinthios et Epheſios eſſe diſtantiam. Illis quaſi parvulis atque lactentibus ſcribitur: in quibus erant diſſenſiones, et ſchiſmata, et audiebatur fornicatio qualis ne inter gentes quidem.—— Epheſii vero, apud quos fecit triennium, et omnia eis Chriſti aperuit ſacramenta, aliter erudiuntur, &c. In ep. ad Eph. cap. v. T. IV. P. i. p. 389, 390.

[m] Epheſii ſane nulla reprehenſione, ſed multa ſunt laude digni, quia fidem apoſtolicam ſervaverunt. Primaſ. Præf. ad Comm. in S. Pauli Ep. ap. Bib. P. P. T. X. p. 144. H.

[n] Epheſii ſunt Aſiani. Hi accepto verbo veritatis perſtiterunt in fide. Hos conlaudat Apoſtolus, ſcribens eis Roma a carcere, Argum. ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 217. A.

[o] —— quæ ſcripſit S. Ignatius, S. Paulum *in tota epiſtola, memoriam eorum facere in Jeſu Chriſto.* Hæc a martyre non otioſe aut frigide, ſed vere, imo ſignanter et vigilanter dicta ſunt. Tota enim epiſtola ad Epheſios, ſcripta, ipſos Epheſios, eorumque honorem et curam maxime ſpectat, et ſumme honorificam eorum memoriam ad poſteros tranſmittit. In aliis epiſtolis Apoſtolus eos ad quos ſcribit, ſæpe acriter objurgat —— aut parce laudat. Hic omnibus modis perpetuo ſe Epheſiis applicat, illoſque tanquam egregios Chriſtianos tractat, evangelio ſalutis firmiter credentes, et Spiritu promiſſionis obſignatos, concives ſanctorum, et domeſticos Dei. Pro iis ſæpe ardenter orat, ipſos hortatur, obteſtatur, laudat, utrumque ſexum ſedulo inſtruit, ſuum erga eos ſingularem affectum ubique prodit. Pearſon. Vind. Ignat. Part. 2. cap. x. ſub init.

concludes his poſtſcript in this manner. 'Should what has 'been offered, not prove ſatisfactory, the difficulty will ſtill 'remain, how to reconcile the preſent reading in Ignatius, 'with Dr. Mill's reaſons againſt St. Paul's epiſtle being 'written to the Epheſians.——The moſt plauſible ſolution 'of which ſeems to be that in Mr. Locke.——' And what there follows to the end.

I think we ſhould cheerfully accept of Mr. Locke's, or any other reaſonable ſolution of the difficulty, if there be any. This, ſo far as I am able to judge, is better than to attempt the alteration of a paſſage in an ancient author, without the authority of any manuſcript: when there is nothing in the coherence, that neceſſarily requires it. And much better, than to alter a text of an epiſtle of the New Teſtament, contrary to the authority of all manuſcripts, and the concurring teſtimony of all ancient chriſtian writers.

Beſide that paſſage, there are in Ignatius's epiſtle to the Epheſians, many alluſions and references to St. Paul's epiſtle to the Epheſians. Which ſhows, that he belived that epiſtle to have been written to the church at Epheſus. Thoſe alluſions (though not all of them) were taken notice of by us long [p] ago. And Dr. Jortin having obſerved, that [q] Ignatius in his twelfth chapter takes notice of St. Paul's epiſtle to the Epheſians, and his martyrdom, adds, 'And 'as he was writing to the ſame church, he often alludes to 'the apoſtle's letter to them.'

But there is one word in the twelfth chapter of Ignatius's epiſtle to the Epheſians, of which I have not yet taken ſufficient notice. I mean the word *συμμυσαι*. *Ye are*, ſays he, *the companions of Paul in the myſteries of the goſpel*: or, *ye are partakers of the myſteries of the goſpel with Paul.* This is ſaid out of a regard to St. Paul's epiſtle to the Epheſians. And it fully ſhows, that Ignatius thought that epiſtle to have been ſent to the church, to which himſelf was then writing. For that is their diſtinguiſhing character: at leaſt it is a character, which is more eſpecially the character of the Chriſtians, to whom that letter is written.

I formerly [r] gave an account of Palladius, author of a Dialogue of the Life of Chryſoſtom, about the year 408. In that work Palladius has an argument, in which he obſerves, 'that Paul had called the Cretans liars. Tit. i. 12.

[p] See vol. II. p. 76—78.
[q] See the firſt volume of his remarks upon Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, p. 56.
[r] Vol. V. p. 183.

'the Galatians stupid, Gal. iii. 1. and the Corinthians proud, 'i Cor. v. 2. On the other hand [s] he calls the Romans faith-'ful, the Ephesians μωσαι, initiated, to whom also he writes in 'a sublime manner, and the Thessalonians lovers of the bro-'therhood.'

When Palladius says, that St. Paul called the Romans faithful, it cannot be doubted, that he refers to Rom i. 8. And when he says that the Thessalonians were called *lovers of the brotherhood*, he must intend 1 Thess. iv. 9. 10. When he speaks of the Ephesians as *initiated*, it may not be so easy to determine the text, particularly intended by him. But probably, it is Eph. i. 9, or that joined with others, such as ch. iii. 3, 4—6, and 9. and v. 32. ch. vi. 19. For in this epistle the word *mystery* occurs frequently.

However, hereby we are assured, that this was, especially, the character of the Christians at Ephesus. And we plainly perceive, that Ignatius supposed, that epistle to have been written to them.

Nor will my readers, possibly, blame me for prolixity, if I here allege a passage of Jerom; where he says, 'That 'still 'there are in the churches remainders of the same virtues, 'or vices, for which they were remarkable of old. The 'Romans are still faithful and devout, the Corinthians proud, 'the Galatians stupid, the Thessalonians lovers of the bro-'therhood.' In that place Jerom says nothing particularly of the Ephesians. But in his Commentary upon the epistle to them he often observes, that [u] no epistle of St. Paul was fuller

[s] ——η αναπαλιν πιστις ρωμαιους αποκαλων, και μυστας εφεσιους, οις, και υψηλοτερον επιστελλει, και φιλαδελφους θεσσαλονικεις, μονοις περιεγραψεν τας επαινους; ου παντας. Pallad. ap. Chrys. T. XIII. p. 71. E.

[t] Usque hodie eadem vel virtutum vestigia permanent, vel errorum. Romanorum laudatur fides. Ubi alibi tanto studio et frequentia ad ecclesias, et ad martyrum sepulchra concurritur? —— Non quod aliam habent Romani fidem, nisi hanc quam omnes Christi ecclesiæ: sed quod devotio in eis major sit, et simplicitas ad credendum.—— Corinthios quoque notat, quod indifferenter vescantur in templis, et inflati sapientia seculari, resurrectionem carnis negant.——Macedones in charitate laudantur, et hospitalitate, ac susceptione fratrum. Unde ad eos scribitur. *De charitate autem fraternitatis, non necesse habemus scribere vobis. Ipsi enim vos a Deo didicistis, ut diligatis invicem. Etenim facitis illud in omnes fratres in universa Macedonia.* In ep. ad Gal. Pr. 2. T. IV. p. 255.

[u] Satis abundeque ostendi, quod beatus Apostolus ad nullam ecclesiarum tam mystice scripserit, et abscondita seculis revelaverit sacramenta. Pr. 3. in ep. ad Eph. T. IV. p. 375.

Non

fuller of myſteries: which occaſioned obſcurity, and rendered it very difficult to be explained. And in a place already cited, he ſays of the Epheſians, that they had [x] received the myſtery hid from ages: that is, they were initiated, or were partakers of the myſteries of the goſpel with Paul. And to the like purpoſe in ſeveral paſſages, juſt tranſcribed at the bottom of the page.

By all which, I think, it muſt appear very evident, that Ignatius ſuppoſed St. Paul's epiſtle to the Epheſians to have been really written to them. And his judgment is deciſive: for he could not be miſtaken. So ſays the writer of the letter above-mentioned; whoſe words are theſe: 'I have 'been the longer,' ſays he, 'upon theſe paſſages of Ignatius, 'by reaſon of the weight his authority might juſtly claim 'in this caſe, was it certain, that he had ſpoken of this 'epiſtle of Paul, as written by him to the Epheſians. For 'if this epiſtle was written in the ninth year of Nero, and 'that of Ignatius in the tenth of Trajan, as biſhop Pearſon 'placeth them, the diſtance of Time will be but forty-five 'years. So that Ignatius being then far advanced in age, 'could not well be ignorant of the truth of this matter. 'And beſides, Oneſimus was biſhop of Epheſus at the time 'Ignatius wrote his epiſtle to that church, is mentioned in 'it, and had lately made Ignatius a viſit. So that had 'there been any doubt concerning this affair, he could eaſily 'have ſet him right.'

It might have been added, that [y] Ignatius, at the time of his writing his epiſtle to the Epeſians, had with him Burrhus, a deacon of the church at Epheſus, and Crocus, Euphus, and Fronto, all members of the church at Epheſus, who were then with him at Smyrna. Who likewiſe, as may be ſuppoſed, afterwards carried his letter to Epheſus.

Non vobis moleſtum ſit, ſi diu in obſcurioribus immoremur. Cauſſati enim in principio ſumus, inter omnes Pauli epiſtolas, hanc vel maxime, et verbis et ſenſibus involutam. Comm. in ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 369.

Decenter quoque Epheſiis, qui ad ſcientiæ ſummam conſcenderant, ſcribitur, quod ſint lux in Domino. In cap. v. p. 383.

Epheſii vero, apud quos fecit triennium, et omnia eis Chriſti aperuit ſacramenta, aliter eruditi untur. Ib. p. 390.

Hæc idcirco univerſa replicuimus, ut oſtenderemus, quare Apoſtolus in hac vel potiſſimum epiſtola obſcuros ſenſus, et ignota ſeculis ſacramenta congeſſerit. Pr. i. in ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 322.

[x] Epheſii —— ſacramentum quod a ſeculis abſconditum fuerat agnoſcunt. Vid. ſupr. p. 422. not. *(l)*.

[y] Vid. ep. ad Eph. cap. ii.

If

If therefore by what has been said it appears evident, that Ignatius has spoken of this epistle of Paul, as written to the Ephesians (as I think he does) we have made out what must be reckoned of great weight in this matter.

However, it is not Ignatius's testimony only that is decisive. There are many other ancient writers, whose testimony also is satisfactory and decisive.

For by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, writers of the second and third centuries, this epistle is expressly quoted as written by Paul to the Ephesians. They so quote this epistle, without hesitation, as freely and plainly as they do the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, the Corinthians, or any other of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

It is quoted in the like manner by all writers in general of every age, Latins, Greeks and Syrians. I would particularly observe, that it is so quoted by Jerom, who also wrote a commentary upon this epistle, and had seen many ancient manuscripts and editions of the New Testament: who never expresseth any doubt, whether this epistle was written to the Ephesians, nor takes notice of any various reading in the inscription of it. For which I refer to his chapter, in the tenth volume of this work. This epistle is quoted in the like manner by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, and all the writers of every age, and of different and remote countries.

We may also observe here, that in the fifth century there were some Christians who had a notion, that this epistle was written to the Ephesians before the apostle had seen them. It is likely that this notion was founded upon Eph. i. 15. Nevertheless, they still thought the epistle to have been written to the Ephesians; which is a proof, that they knew nothing to the contrary, and had never heard of any various reading in the inscription of this epistle. Among these is Euthalius, who [z] in his prologue to St. Paul's epistles considers the two epistles to the Romans and Ephesians as epistles written to Christians, whom the apostle knew by report only. This is remarkable. It shows, that he had no various reading in this place. If he had, he would

[z] Πεμπτη η προς εφεσιους κειται, πιστους ανθρωπους, και παραμενοντας, ως εν τη προγραφη το μυστηριον εκτιθεται, παραπλησιως, τη προς ρωμαιους· αμφοτεροις δε εξ ακοης γνωριμοις. Euthal. ap. Zacagn. p. 524.

would have taken notice of it. Euthalius was a learned man. He put out an accurate edition of the catholic epiſtles, and of St. Paul's epiſtles, with a general prologue to them. And [a] he had conſulted, beſide others, the manuſcripts in the library at Cæſarea in Paleſtine. Nevertheleſs he had not met with any various reading.

And in the argument of the epiſtle to the Epheſians, now placed in the edition of Euthalius, it is ſaid, that [b] the epiſtle to the Epheſians was ſent by Paul from Rome to them, when he had not yet ſeen them, and had only heard of them. I do not aſcribe this argument to Euthalius. The reaſons were aſſigned [c] formerly. Euthalius wrote a prologue to St. Paul's epiſtles. But it does not appear that he wrote arguments to each of his epiſtles ſeverally. The ſame thing is alſo ſaid of the epiſtle to the Epheſians in the Synopſis [d] of Scripture aſcribed to Athanaſius. Theſe I reckon one and the ſame, but different from Euthalius.

And I may here take notice of a ſmall inaccuracy in Mr. Wetſtein, who [e] in his notes upon the beginning of the epiſtle to the Epheſians, quotes both the prologue to St. Paul's epiſtles, and the argument of the epiſtle to the Epheſians in particular, as Euthalius's: though in his Prolegomena, in his account of what Euthalius had done, he had obſerved, and rightly, that [f] thoſe arguments were not compoſed by Euthalius, but by another.

I therefore here ſuppoſe two, that is, Euthalius, and another, who wrote the arguments of St. Paul's epiſtles ſeverally; who may be the ſame that compoſed the ſynopſis aſcribed to Athanaſius.

However, beſide theſe there may have been about this time ſome others of the ſame opinion. For Theodoret in his preface to the epiſtle to the Epheſians obſerves, there [g] were ſome, who ſaid, that Paul wrote to the Epheſians, before he had ſeen them. But he ſhows it to be a falſe and abſurd

[a] See vol. V. p. 241, and vol. III. p. 347.

[b] Ταυτην επιστελλει απο ρωμης, ωπω μεν εωρακως αυτους, ακουσας δε περι αυτων. Arg. ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 633.

[c] See vol. V. p. 242, 243.

[d] Ταυτην επιστελλει απο ρωμης, ωπω μεν αυτους εωρακως, ακουσας δε περι αυτων. Ap. Athan. T. II. p. 194. ed. Bened.

[e] Vid. N. T. vol. II. p. 238.

[f] Vid. ejuſd. Prolegom. vol. I. p. 75.

[g] ——τον δε θειοτατον Παυλον μηδεπω τους εφεσιους τε θεαμενον, την δε επιστολην προς αυτους γεγραφεναι. Theod. T. III. p. 290.

opinion,

opinion, and concludes, ſaying: 'It [h] is manifeſt therefore, 'that the apoſtle had preached the goſpel to them, before 'he wrote to them.'

This affords a good argument, that there was not in the fifth century, nor before, any notice, or apprehenſion of a various reading in the inſcription of this epiſtle. For if there had, none would have admitted ſo abſurd a ſuppoſition, that Paul wrote from Rome an epiſtle to the Epheſians, before he had ſeen them.

Another thing deſerving notice here is, that before the end of the fourth century there was forged an epiſtle to the Laodiceans, aſcribed to Paul. For [i] it is expreſsly mentioned by Jerom in his book of Illuſtrious Men, written about 392. Which muſt induce us to think, that the epiſtle to the Epheſians was never called the epiſtle to the Laodiceans.' For then there could have been no pretence for forging another with that title, to verify a falſe interpretation of Col. iv. 16.

I ſhould now proceed to another argument. But I muſt look back, to ſecure this, taken from the teſtimony of ancient chriſtian writers. For it has been argued from a paſſage of St. Baſil, in his books againſt Eunomius, that he had ſeen ſome ancient manuſcripts of this epiſtle, in which theſe words, *at Epheſus*, were wanting. That paſſage, as cited formerly, is thus: 'And Paul writing to the Epheſians, as truly united to him *who is*, through knowledge, 'called them in a peculiar ſenſe *ſuch who are*, ſaying, *to 'the ſaints who are, and* [or even] *the faithful in Chriſt Jeſus.* 'For ſo thoſe before us have tranſmitted it, and we have 'found it in ancient copies.' This point having been already examined by us largely, I refer to what was then ſaid.[k] It was then argued by us, that St. Baſil does not here intimate, that the word, or words, *at Epheſus*, were wanting in any copies ſeen by him. And I would now obſerve farther, that our account of this paſſage is confirmed by the works of other authors, both before and after Baſil. There had lived many learned chriſtian writers before his time. There were many learned Chriſtians cotemporary with him: as his own brother, Gregory Nyſſen, Gregory Nazian-

[h] Δεδεικται αρα σαφως, ως προκηρυξας αυτοις το ευαγγελιον οτως γεγραψε την επιστολην. Ib. p. 292.

[i] Legunt quidam et ad Laodicenſes. Sed ab omnibus exploditur. De V. I. Cap. v.

[k] See vol. IV. p. 401—404.

zen,

zen, Amphilochius, and others: and alſo ſoon after him, as Theodoret, and Euthalius: not now to mention Jerom, or other learned Latin authors. None of whom have ſaid that the words, *at Epheſus*, were wanting in any copies, which they had ſeen. The various reading therefore, intended by Baſil, muſt have been ſomewhat leſs, a ſmall matter, not any thing like εν εφεσω, *at Epheſus*. For ſo remarkable a reading could not have been paſſed by in ſilence, unobſerved by all others. And every one may ſee, that in this very place, as well as elſewhere, Baſil cites this epiſtle, as written by Paul to the Epheſians. And they are the Chriſtians, of whom Paul had ſaid, that through knowledge they were united to him *who is*.

In the place to which I referred juſt now, I gave an account of a Diſſertation of Lenfant, vindicating the common reading; which was approved by Wolfius, and others. However, Mr. Kuſter was not ſatisfied. And in the preface to his edition of Mill's new Teſtament, he ſays, 'That[1] the argument, or interpretation of Baſil, depends upon a ſuppoſition, that the words, *at Epheſus*, were wanting in the inſcription of this epiſtle. Otherwiſe the Chriſtians, to whom that epiſtle is ſent, could not have been reckoned more eſpecially united to him *who is*, or called *ſuch who are*, rather than the Romans, or Philippians, or any other Chriſtians to whom Paul wrote.'

To which I anſwer: that is ſaying all, and the only thing, that can be ſaid, in behalf of the ſuppoſition, that the words, *at Epheſus*, were wanting in ſome copies, which Baſil had ſeen. But though this may ſeem ſpecious and plauſible, it is not concluſive. We have perceived from Palladius, and Jerom lately alleged, that there were ſome, who appropriated certain characters to divers churches. The Romans were eſpecially called faithful, the Epheſians initiated, and knowing, and the Theſſalonians lovers of the brotherhood.

But it cannot be thence concluded, that other Chriſtians were not entitled to the ſame characters: or that the ſame things might not be alſo ſaid of them. As may appear to any one, who does but look into St. Paul's epiſtles: in which the faith of other churches is ſpoken of, beſide that

[1] Nec magis ιδιαζοντως Apoſtolus Epheſios, ex ſenſu Baſilii, vocaverit ειτας quam Romanos, Philippenſes, etc. ad quos ſcribens eadem plane loquendi formula utitur. Kuſter.

of

of the Romans. And others, beſide the Theſſalonians, are ſuppoſed to have been lovers of the ſaints, or the brotherhood. Says the apoſtle, 1 Theſſ. i. 3. *Remembering without ceaſing your work of faith, and labour of love.* 2 Theſſ. i. 4. *So that we ourſelves glory in you, in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your perſecutions.* 2 Cor. viii. 7. *As ye abound in every thing in faith.*——Eph. i. 1. *To the ſaints which are at Epheſus, and to the faithful in Chriſt Jeſus.* Ver. 15. *Wherefore——after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jeſus, and love unto all the ſaints.* Col. i. 2. *To the ſaints and faithful brethren in Chriſt, which are at Coloſſe.* Philem. ver. 5. *Hearing of thy love and faith, which thou haſt toward the Lord Jeſus, and toward all ſaints.* And others, beſide the Epheſians, were partakers of the myſteries of the goſpel with the apoſtle. See Rom. xi. 25. 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7. Col. i. 25—27. ii. 2. iv. 3.

That is the very obſervation of Palladius in the place above cited: that when the apoſtle blames ſome for certain vices, and commends others for certain virtues, he by no means intends to intimate, that thoſe vices, or thoſe virtues, were peculiar to the perſons blamed, or commended by him.

The Romans were called by ſome in ancient times in an eſpecial manner faithful, the Epheſians initiated, and the Theſſalonians, or Macedonians, lovers of the brotherhood. But they were not ſo excluſive of others. For all the churches or Chriſtians, to whom Paul wrote, were faithful, and initiated, or partakers with him in the myſteries of the goſpel, and lovers of the ſaints, or brotherhood: though they might be reaſonably exhorted to abound therein more and more. As are the Theſſalonians themſelves, 1 epiſt. ch. iv. 10. See alſo ch. iii. 12. And indeed, if ſuch properties did not belong to them, they could not have been Chriſtians. Nevertheleſs, when theſe ſeveral characters had been applied to ſome, particularly, it is likely, that few would ſcruple to follow the ſame way of ſpeaking, if there was occaſion.

So in the preſent caſe, that obſervation in Baſil having been applied to the Epheſians by ſome men of no great judgment, it was left there, and not applied to any others. Indeed it is an impertinent obſervation, as Jerom [m] calls it. And, as it ſeems, was made uſe of by a few only. But it

[m] See vol. IV. p. 402, 403. note *(p)*.

might

might have been as properly ſaid of other Chriſtians, as of the Epheſians.

One thing more I add here. They who are for leaving out the words, *at Epheſus*, muſt read the place in this manner, *to ſuch as are ſaints, and faithful in Chriſt Jeſus*. Then this ſhould be a general epiſtle, not directed to any one place, but to good Chriſtians every where. But that it is not a general epiſtle, is manifeſt from Eph. vi. 21, 22. without inſiſting now on any other places. *But that ye may alſo know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus a beloved brother, and faithful miniſter in the Lord, ſhall make known unto you all things; whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.* This plainly ſhows, that the epiſtle had not a general inſcription, *to ſaints and faithful men*, but was inſcribed to the ſaints of ſome place. And who ſhould they be, but the ſaints and faithful at Epheſus: to whom it is inſcribed in all Greek manuſcripts, and in all verſions, and in all catalogues of the books of the New Teſtament, whether compoſed by councils or others?

4. Once more. St. Paul himſelf ſays, 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I ſent to Epheſus*, very probably referring to this epiſtle, as [n] was ſhown ſome while ago. This is what Whitby intends at the beginning of his preface to this epiſtle before tranſcribed. 'That this epiſtle to the Epheſians was indeed written by St. Paul, and directed to them, 'and not to any other church, we cannot doubt, if we 'believe either the epiſtle, or St. Paul himſelf.' By the teſtimony of the epiſtle he means the inſcription at the beginning, where is *at Epheſus*, in all manuſcripts and verſions. By the teſtimony of St. Paul himſelf he means what is ſaid, 2 Tim. iv. 12. quoted above.

Having finiſhed the argument in favour of the genuineneſs of the common inſcription of this epiſtle, which to me appears ſufficient and ſatisfactory: I now propoſe to conſider objections, which have been raiſed by Mill, and others.

1. Obj. 'It is ſaid, that there are in this epiſtle divers 'expreſſions, not ſuited to the Chriſtians at Epheſus, where 'Paul had been twice, and ſpent there almoſt three years. 'See Acts xviii. 19—21. xix. and xx. 1. and 17—38.'

[n] See before, p. 334, 335.

Says

Says Mr. Peirce in the place before referred to, representing Mill's argument, 'He has proved it highly improbable, that the epistle was at first written to the Ephesians. 'St. Paul had resided among them, and *kept back nothing* '*that was profitable unto them.*——How then could he write 'to them, as though he had never seen, or been among 'them, but only had heard of them? Eph. i. 5. *Wherefore I* '*also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love to* '*all the saints.* Again, is it likely, he would refer those, to 'whom he had *declared all the counsel of God*, so long together, 'to a bare report of himself? Eph. iii. 2. *If ye have heard* '*of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to* '*you-ward.* Or would he suppose, that they who had heard 'him preach a thousand times would need to *understand his* '*knowledge in the mystery of Christ*, from what he said in a 'few verses, or even the whole of that short epistle? Eph. 'iii. 4.'

To the like purpose another learned author, whom likewise I shall transcribe here, that this objection may appear in all its strength, 'He [o] intimateth, that he had only heard 'of their faith in Christ, and of their love to all Christians, 'ch. i. 15.——Again, he not only mentioneth his *hearing of* '*their faith in Christ*, but ch. iii. 1, 2. he speaks, as if he 'was dubious, whether they had heard of the extraordinary 'revelations, which he had received from heaven.——And 'verses 3, 4. he intimateth, that, if they had never heard of 'these things before, they might understand them from the 'brief hints, which he had given them in this epistle. Is this 'like St. Paul's style to the churches of his own planting?—— 'Or could a few lines, or even a larger epistle than this, have 'given them so clear a knowledge of St. Paul's illumination, 'as their hearing him a thousand times? For had he not 'been among them for the space of three years, warning 'every one of them night and day with tears?'

But this difficulty, if I mistake not, will disappear upon farther consideration, and a fuller examination of the matter.

First. It appears from the epistle itself, that the Christians, to whom it is sent, were not unknown to Paul, nor they to him; but they were well acquainted with each other.

[o] Dr. Benson's history of the first planting the christian religion, vol. II. p. 272. first edit. p. 292. second edit.

That

That the apoſtle was acquainted with theſe Chriſtians, muſt, I think, be evident to all, who read without prejudice the firſt fourteen verſes of the firſt chapter of this epiſtle. I inſiſt only upon ver. 13. *In whom ye alſo truſted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the goſpel of your ſalvation: in whom alſo after that ye believed, ye were ſealed with the holy ſpirit of promiſe.* How could the apoſtle write thus to any, but to ſuch, whoſe converſion to Chriſtianity he was well acquainted with, and that upon their believing they had received gifts of the ſpirit? How could any man write thus to people, whom he had but lately heard of?

There are alſo many other paſſages of this epiſtle, which ſhow the apoſtle's knowledge of the ſtate of theſe Chriſtians, both before, and after their converſion. Some of which I muſt ſelect here.

Ch. ii. 1, 2. *And you hath he quickened, who were dead in treſpaſſes and ſins: wherein in time paſt ye walked according to the courſe of this world.*——and throughout that chapter to the end.

Then at ch. iii. 13. *Wherefore I deſire, that ye faint not at my tribulation for you, which is your glory.* That muſt be ſaid to Chriſtians, of whoſe tender affection for him he was very ſenſible: recollecting, it is likely, what had happened at Miletus, as related Acts xx. 36—38. And indeed it is throughout an affectionate, as well as inſtructive and uſeful epiſtle.

Ch. iv. 20. *But ye have not ſo learned Chriſt.* Ver. 21. *If ſo be*, or * foraſmuch as *ye have heard him, and have been taught the truth as it is in Jeſus.* This the apoſtle knew very well.

I cannot forbear to recite this place more largely, from ver 20 to 24. *But ye have not ſo learned Chriſt, foraſmuch as ye have heard him, and have been inſtructed in him, as the truth is in Jeſus, to* ** *put off, with reſpect to the former converſation, the old man, which is corrupt according to deceitful luſts, and to be renewed in the ſpirit of your mind, and to put on the new man,*

* *Si tamen illud audiſtis:*] *Si tamen*, Græce, *ſiquidem*. Non enim dubitantis hoc dicit Apoſtolus, ſed magis rem *confirmans*, uti poſt Chryſoſtomum annotat Theophylactus. Nam et alias interdum vim confirmandi habet conjunctio, ſi, ut ſecundæ ad Theſſalon. primo verſ. 6. Eſt. ad Eph. iv. 21. ** See Dr. Doddridge upon the place, whoſe verſion, in the main, I have here adopted.

which is created according to God in righteouſneſs and true holineſs. Certainly theſe are St. Paul's own converts and diſciples. The caſe of theſe people reſembles that of the Galatians. Ch. iii. 1. *Before whoſe eyes Jeſus Chriſt had been evidently ſet forth crucified among them.* But to theſe Chriſtians, at Epheſus, the apoſtle expreſſeth himſelf with more mildneſs, as was fit, than to the Galatians.

Then ver. 30. *And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were ſealed unto the day of redemption:* or with which ye were ſealed in the day of redemption. Theſe gentile Chriſtians had received the ſpirit. And from whom, I pray, if not from St. Paul? And that they had a variety of ſpiritual gifts, is manifeſt from ch. v. 18—20.

Ch. v. 8. *For ye were ſometime darkneſs: but now are ye light in the Lord. Walk as children of the light.* Which ſhows, that the apoſtle knew the ſtate of theſe Chriſtians before and after their converſion.

And that St. Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him, appears to me very evident from ch. vi. 21, 22.

Secondly, at ch. i. 15, are words, upon which an objection has been formed, as we have ſeen. *Wherefore I alſo, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jeſus, and love unto all the ſaints:* that is, according to Mr. Locke's paraphraſe: 'Wherefore I alſo here in my confinement having heard of 'the continuance of your faith in Chriſt Jeſus, and your 'love to all the ſaints.' And in his preface to this epiſtle Mr. Locke has theſe expreſſions. 'Wherefore when he 'heard that the Epheſians ſtood firm in the faith, whereby 'he means their confidence of their title to the privileges 'and benefits of the goſpel, without ſubmiſſion to the law, 'he thanks God for them.'

Whitby's paraphraſe of this verſe is to this purpoſe. 'Wherefore I alſo having heard of your ſteadfaſt faith in the 'Lord Jeſus, and your encreaſing love to all the ſaints: that 'is, that the faith and love wrought in you continues ſtead-'faſt, and aboundeth.'

To the like purpoſe alſo [p] Grotius whoſe words I have placed below.

Theodoret's note upon ver. 15. and 16. is to this purpoſe: 'Hence ſome have ſuppoſed, that the apoſtle wrote this

[p] Loquitur autem Paulus de profectu evangelii apud Epheſios, ex quo ipſe ab illis diſceſſerat. Grot. in Eph. i. 14.

epiſtle

'epiſtle to the Epheſians, when he had not yet ſeen them. But 'they ſhould conſider, that writing to the Corinthians con-'cerning whom he had received ſome diſagreeable information, 'he ſays, *It has been related to me of you, my brethren, by them 'which are of the houſehold of Chloe, that there are contentions 'among you*, 1 Cor. i. 11. As therefore when he had received 'information of ſome things diſagreeable, he wrote with grief 'of mind: ſo when he had received an account of things 'agreeable concerning theſe Epheſians, he beſtows commen-'dation. He praiſeth them, both for their piety and for their 'liberality to the ſaints; whereupon he alſo gives thanks to 'God, the author of all good things.'

So that this text was no difficulty at all with Theodoret. However, it may be expedient, that I ſhould enlarge ſome-what farther.

I obſerve, then, that St. Paul writes in the ſame manner to Philemon, his own convert, whoſe faith therefore he certainly knew. Philem. ver. 4, 5. *I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers: hearing of thy love, and faith, which thou haſt toward the Lord Jeſus, and toward all ſaints.* That Philemon had been converted to the faith of the goſpel by Paul, I ſuppoſe to be evident from ver. 19. *Albeit I do not ſay unto thee, how thou oweſt to me thy ownſelf beſides.* So that text [s] has been generally underſtood: and how it can be interpreted otherwiſe, I do not conceive.

Whitby's paraphraſe is: '*Albeit I do not ſay unto thee, how 'thou oweſt to me*, by whom thou waſt converted, *even thy 'ownſelf*, or the well-being of thy ſoul *beſides*.'

Beauſobre and Lenfant in their preface to the epiſtle to Philemon expreſs themſelves in this manner. 'Philemon 'was a conſiderable perſon at Coloſſe, a city of Phrygia. St. 'Paul had converted him, either at Epheſus, or ſome other 'city of Aſia, when he preached the goſpel in that country; 'or elſe at Coloſſe itſelf, in one of the journies which he had 'made in Phrygia.'

There are ſome other things to be obſerved here concerning this perſon. For in the firſt verſe of that epiſtle Paul calls Philemon beloved, and his fellow-labourer; which, if I am not miſtaken, indicate perſonal acquaintance, and imply their having laboured together in the ſervice of the goſpel at Coloſſe,

[s] Cæterum, ſi ad jus meum re-deam, propter ſermonem Chriſti, quem tibi evangelizavi, et Chriſtianus effectus es, teipſum mihi debes. Hieron. in ep. ad Philem. T. IV. p. 452.

or Ephesus, or in some other place. And yet St. Paul writing to Philemon, speaks of his *having heard of his faith and love.*

Still farther, it appears to me highly probable, that Onesimus, in whose behalf this epistle was written, knew Paul, before he saw him at Rome. He either had seen Paul at his master's house at Colosse, or else at Ephesus, when attending upon his master there. Paul was a prisoner at Rome, and could not go abroad. *He dwelt in his own hired house, with a soldier that kept him,* Acts xxviii. 16. and 30. It is likely, therefore, that Onesimus came first to Paul. Being in straits, and knowing Paul's benevolent temper, and what civilities he had received from his master, Philemon, he might hope for some relief from him. Or, possibly, hearing, that Paul was at Rome, and recollecting the discourses, which he had heard him make, when attending on Philemon, he was touched with remorse for the faults, which he had been guilty of, and came to Paul for farther instruction in the things of religion, and for advice and comfort. He might also encourage himself with hopes of Paul's interceding in his behalf, and obtaining a reconciliation with his master.

Says Beausobre in his preface to the epistle to Philemon: 'It can hardly be doubted, that the repentance of his fault 'obliged Onesimus to come to Paul, whom he knew to be his 'master's friend. For otherwise, he might have remained 'unknown at Rome.'

Philemon then was well known to Paul. Nevertheless, at the beginning of his epistle to him, he thanks God, *having heard of his love and faith.* The meaning is, he had received information of the continuance of his faith, and of its bearing good fruit. If Paul could write thus to Philemon, his convert, friend, and fellow-labourer, he might write in a like manner to other Christians, to whom he was no stranger.

So likewise to the Colossians ch. i. 3, 4. *We give thanks to God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you: since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love, which ye have to all the saints:* that is, having heard of the continuance of your faith, and of the good fruits of it. This he had been assured of by Epaphras, who had come to the apostle at Rome. It is not to be supposed, that Paul now first heard of the faith of the Colossians, or the Laodiceans. I think, that the Colossians were Paul's own converts, and that the church there had been planted by him. But supposing that to be uncertain, I imagine, it cannot be questioned, that

the

the church there had been planted a good while ago by ſome of the apoſtle's aſſiſtants, and fellow-labourers. Conſequently, the apoſtle did not now firſt know, and hear of the faith and love of the Chriſtians at Coloſſe. He muſt have known it before he came to Rome, and before he was apprehended at Jeruſalem. But he had lately received good tidings concerning their ſteadineſs and perſeverance from ſome, who had come from them to him at Rome.

St. Paul, ſince his coming to Rome, had received from Tychicus an account of the ſtate of things at Epheſus, which upon the whole was very pleaſing. He had received from Epaphras a like account of the ſtate of things at Coloſſe, and particularly a good account of the conduct of Philemon. For all which he praiſeth God in his epiſtles to them. Indeed it could not but be matter of much joy to the apoſtle, to hear of the continued faith of Chriſtians in ſeveral places, notwithſtanding the many difficulties attending the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and notwithſtanding the diſcouragement, which his own long captivity might have occaſioned in the minds of many.

In theſe three epiſtles, to the Epheſians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon, are the ſame expreſſions, near the beginning, *having heard of your faith and love.* And they are all to be underſtood in a like manner. If theſe words were to be underſtood in the epiſtle to the Epheſians of *now firſt hearing:* it might be as well argued, that the epiſtle could not be written to the Laodiceans. For, as before intimated, it may be reckoned certain, that before Paul came to Rome he knew of the faith of the church at Laodicea.

Thirdly, in the next place I conſider that part of the objection, which is raiſed from Eph. iii. 2, 3, 4. *If ye have heard of the diſpenſation of the grace of God, which is given me to youward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the myſtery, as I wrote before in a few words: whereby ye may underſtand my knowledge in the myſtery of Chriſt.*

To which part of the objection I anſwer, that *if ye have heard of the diſpenſation*, may be rendered, *ſince*, or *foraſmuch as ye have heard*, and what follows. So Theophylact, approved by Whitby upon the place.

I obſerve farther. Theſe things are as properly ſaid to the Epheſians, as to any other Chriſtians in that country, or thereabout. They were all acquainted, and much alike acquainted with them. If ſuch expreſſions might be uſed in

an epistle to the Colossians, or the Laodiceans, they might be used also in an epistle to the Ephesians. No gentile Christians, whether converted immediately by Paul himself, or by some of his assistants or fellow-labourers, could be ignorant of it. Nor could Paul doubt whether they knew it. Nevertheless he might judge it proper to hint these things, the more to confirm the instructions, and exhortations which he sent them, and to secure their steadiness in the faith and profession of the pure gospel of Christ, as they had been taught. And does he not speak more largely, and more distinctly of this matter, in his epistle to the Galatians, whom none ever denied to be the apostle's converts? Gal. i. 11—20. *But I certify you, brethren,* γνωριζω δε υμιν, *that the gospel, which was preached of me, is not after men.*——*For ye have heard of my conversation in time past*——*But it pleased God*——*to reveal his son in me*——*Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.* These things the Galatians were not ignorant of. But in his epistle he reminds them of them, and in a very solemn manner.

The writers, from whom this objection was taken, speak of the Ephesians having heard the apostle 'preach a thou-'sand times,' and ask: 'Could the apostle suppose, that 'they who had heard him preach a thousand times, could 'need to understand his knowledge of the mystery of Christ, 'from what he said in a few verses, or even from the whole 'of this short epistle?' But those expressions appear to me very strong, and even unjustifiable: though they are warranted by [r] Mill, whom those learned men follow.

He and they seem to conceive of the Christians at Ephesus, as a small society, consisting perhaps of two or three hundred people. And they speak, as if they supposed that church to have been formed and planted before the apostle came thither, or very soon after his arrival: and that they had all heard him preach once at least every day of the three years that he resided in that city. How else could they think, that the Christians at Ephesus had heard Paul preach a thousand times? He says indeed to their elders at Miletus, Acts xx. 31. that *for the space of three years he had not ceased to warn every one night and day with tears.* Certainly, the apostle was very diligent in making converts, and in confirming the believers

[r] Quomodo convenit hoc civibus Ephesinis, qui sexcenties prædicantem audierant Apostolum? Mill. Prol. num. 72.

there.

there. But converſions were made gradually, not all at once, as is evident from the account, which we have of Paul's preaching at Epheſus, in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts; where alſo St. Luke obſerves, at ver. 10. *that all they which dwelt in Aſia, heard the word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks.* This may lead us to think that Paul had many converts in ſeveral parts of Aſia. Some of theſe may have ſeen, and heard the apoſtle at Epheſus once only, or however not often. To all theſe the epiſtle to the Epheſians was ſent. The inſcription *to the ſaints and faithful at Epheſus*, the chief city, would comprehend all the believers in the country. And ſome converts may have been made ſince the apoſtle was there. However, though it ſhould be allowed, that moſt of theſe Chriſtians had heard the apoſtle often, the reading of this epiſtle might be of great uſe to them. For it is an excellent epiſtle, as all muſt allow, and not inferior to the moſt admired of St. Paul's writings.

I have now conſidered the firſt, and, as I ſuppoſe, the principal objection.

2. Obj. It is ſaid, 'that in all St. Paul's epiſtles, written 'to particular churches, there is ſome peculiar caſe mentioned, 'reſpecting each church, that ſeems to be one reaſon at leaſt 'for writing to them: which is alſo obſerved in his epiſtle to 'the Coloſſians, whom he there cautions againſt the worſhip 'of angels.'

I anſwer. That is a juſt obſervation. And the ſame may be found in Jerom's preface to his Commentary upon this epiſtle to the Epheſians: where he ſays, as [s] the bleſſed John in the Revelation, writing to the ſeven churches, either reproves the faults, or commends the virtues of each: ſo likewiſe, he ſays, does the apoſtle Paul in his epiſtles. And he ſuppoſeth this epiſtle to have been written to the Chriſtians at Epheſus, and to be ſuited to their caſe.

But we are not to expect, that even an apoſtle ſhould cenſure, and find fault where there is little or no occaſion for it. It becomes him to own the good temper and conduct of any

[s] Neceſſe eſt enim, ut juxta diverſitates locorum, et temporum, et hominum, quibus ſcriptæ ſunt, diverſas et cauſſas, et argumenta, et origines habeant. Et quomodo beatus Joannes in Apocalypſi ſua ad ſeptem ſcribens eccleſias, in unaquaque earum ſpecialia vel vitia reprehendit, vel virtutes probat: ita et ſanctus Apoſtolus Paulus per ſingulas eccleſias vulneribus medetur illatis, nec ad inſtar imperiti Medici uno collyrio omnium oculos vult curare. Pr. i. in ep. ad Eph. T. IV. p. 320.

church that deserves it. And what church could be so likely to deserve mild treatment, as the church at Ephesus, which had had so much of the apostle's presence, and of his favourite disciple Timothy, upon whom he has bestowed so great commendations? 1 Cor. iv. 17. xvi. 10. Philip. ii. 19—22. and who undoubtedly would be faithful and diligent, where he was sent occasionally only, or where he was stationed for a while. This was the case here. I suppose that Timothy was left at Ephesus, when Paul went up to Jerusalem. There he continued till after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and after the writing of this epistle to the Ephesians, of which we are now speaking. Moreover, as is well known, when Paul was going up to Jerusalem, he delivered, at Miletus, a most pathetic charge to the elders of that church, and to Timothy with them, as I suppose. See Acts xx. 17—38. particularly 28—31. which certainly must have excited all to faithfulness and zeal in the performance of their duty. Indeed he says, *I know, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.* There would arise men, that would endeavour to devour, and lay waste the church of Ephesus. Nevertheless, I think these earnest warnings of the apostle must have been of great use to defeat the designs of such evil men: so that they should not be able to do much mischief there, at least for some while.

And says the apostle ver. 31. *Watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one of you night and day with tears.* This the apostle does again very suitably in this epistle, in divers places, which cannot be overlooked, nor passed by us here. So Eph. iv. 1. *I therefore the prisoner of the Lord beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the vocation, wherewith ye are called,*——ver. 17. *This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other gentiles,* and what follows. So also ch. v. 1.——And vi. 12—17. These warnings have, probably, a respect to temptations, which the Ephesians might meet with from their heathen and idolatrous neighbours, and from deceitful and artful men among Christians. To such things as these Jerom supposed Paul to have an eye in this [t] epistle.

And

[t] Scribebat ad Ephesios Dianam colentes. —— Scribebat autem ad metropolim Asiæ civitatem, in qua ita idololatria —— et artium magicarum præstigiæ viguerant. —— Hæc idcirco universa replicavimus, ut ostenderemus, quare Apostolus in hac vel potissimum epistola obscuros

And theſe written warnings, as well as others, ſeem to have had a good effect. The church of Epheſus appears to have behaved commendably for a good while. This may be collected from Rev. ii. 1—6. And Ignatius at the beginning of his epiſtle to them ſays ch. vi. 'And indeed Oneſimus 'himſelf does greatly commend your good order in God: that 'you all live according to truth, and that no hereſy dwells 'among you.' And ch. ix. 'I have heard of ſome, who have 'paſſed by you, having perverſe doctrine: whom you did not 'ſuffer to ſow among you.' And to the like purpoſe in other places of that epiſtle.

3. Obj. It is ſaid, 'that Timothy's name is not mentioned 'in the introduction to this epiſtle: though it is found in the 'beginning of the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, and that to 'Philemon. Hence it is argued, that Timothy was unknown 'to all, or moſt of the church, to whom this epiſtle was 'written. Conſequently it was not ſent to the church of 'Epheſus, where Timothy was well known.'

In anſwer to which I would ſay, firſt, that I can ſee no reaſon, why St. Paul ſhould ſcruple to put Timothy's name at the beginning of an epiſtle, written to Chriſtians, with whom Timothy was not perſonally acquainted. Secondly. There can be no reaſon to doubt, that Timothy was as well known to the Chriſtians at Laodicea, as at Coloſſe. Thirdly. Therefore there muſt have been ſome other reaſon for omitting the name of Timothy at the beginning of this epiſtle. Fourthly, that reaſon preſently offers, and probably was this, that at writing this epiſtle Timothy was not with the apoſtle at Rome. I think, Timothy was now at Epheſus. How then could his name be placed at the beginning of an epiſtle written to the Epheſians from Rome?

4. Obj. 'At Philippi the church was ſettled with fixed 'officers, before the apoſtle wrote. And therefore he directs 'his epiſtle not only to the Chriſtians in general there, but to 'the biſhops and deacons. But there is no ſuch thing here: 'though the church of Epheſus had evidently ſuch officers, 'before the writing of this epiſtle.' See Acts xx. 17.

To which I anſwer, that there muſt have been fixed officers in many churches, beſide that at Philippi. Says St. Luke in

ſcuros ſenſus, et ignota ſeculis ſacramenta congeſſerit: et de ſanctarum contrariarumque virtutum docuerit poteſtate: qui ſint dæmones, quid valeant. —— De quibus ait: *Non eſt nobis pugna adverſum carnem et ſanguinem, ſed adverſum principitatus et poteſtates.* —— Hieron. ubi ſupr. p. 322.

his

his account of the peregrination of Paul and Barnabas in ſeveral places, Acts xiv. 21—23. *they returned again to Lyſtra, and Iconium, and Antioch,* (in Piſidia) *confirming the ſouls of the diſciples.——And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with faſting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had believed.* Says Beza upon this text: 'In [u] every 'church they ordained elders, that is, paſtors and deacons, 'and other officers.' From what is ſaid here Luke leads us to conclude, what was done elſewhere. It was not needful to mention ſuch things every where. But very probably there were church-officers fixed in all the churches in no long time after they were planted, and particularly in Greece and Macedonia. From St. Paul's epiſtle we know, that there were biſhops and deacons at Philippi, though not mentioned by St. Luke in his hiſtory of the apoſtle's preaching there. Acts xvi. 12—40. Beza concludes from 1 Theſſ. v. 27, that [b] there were fixed officers in the church at Theſſalonica. And it is very manifeſt from ver. 12 and 13 of that chapter: *And we beſeech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you: and to eſteem them very highly in love, for their works' ſake.* St. Paul ſays to Titus, ch. i. 5. *For this cauſe left I thee in Crete, that thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed thee.* Whenever Paul was in Crete, it is reaſonable to think, that he made there but a ſhort ſtay. Nevertheleſs before he left that iſland, he had given orders to Titus, to ordain *elders in every city.* And not long after coming thence he wrote to him an epiſtle, with particular directions for that purpoſe. Before Paul left Epheſus, it is likely, that he had ordained ſeveral elders in that city, and in the diſtrict of Aſia. And yet he afterwards wrote to Timothy, giving him directions concerning the qualifications of ſuch perſons, that he might make a farther ſupply, where it was wanting. Which muſt induce us to think, that the apoſtle was not willing, that any churches ſhould be deſtitute of fit guides and inſtructors for any long time after they had been planted.

[u] *Per ſingulas eccleſias,* κατ εκκλησιαν. Sic antea dixit Lucas κατ οικον, pro *domatim: Preſbyteros,* id eſt, Paſtores et Diaconos, et alios eccleſiæ gubernationi præfectos. Hic enim, ut alibi ſæpe, generaliter accipitur Preſbyteri nomen. Bez. in Act. xiv. 23.

[b] Vos ὑμας. Hinc apparet, mitti ſolitas fuiſſe apoſtolicas epiſtolas preſbyterio, ad quod hæc abjuratio et præcedentes duo verſiculi proprie pertineant: quoniam alioqui abſurda eſſet hæc petitio, ſi ad totum eccleſiæ cœtum referretur. Bez. in 1 Th. v. 27.

planted. St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians, is inscribed *to the churches of Galatia*, without any mention of bishops or deacons. And yet there must have been there men of that character.

St. Peter writes to the Christians in Galatia, and other neighbouring parts, and sends an admonition to such. 1 Pet. v. 1, 2. *The elders which are among you I exhort.——Feed the flock of God, which is among you.* And from the epistle itself it may be concluded with certainty, that there were fixed officers in the churches of Galatia, though they are not mentioned in the inscription. For so St. Paul directs, ch. vi. 6. *Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.* There is no notice taken of any elders in the inscriptions of either of St. Paul's epistles to the Corinthians. And yet there must have been such officers in that church. Clement of Rome, in the first century, in his epistle to the Corinthians, speaking of the apostles, says, ch. xlii. 'They 'went abroad, publishing the good tidings, that the kingdom 'of God was at hand. And preaching in countries and cities, 'they [c] appointed their first-fruits, having first proved them by 'the spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should 'believe.' And afterwards, in ch. xliv. 'Wherefore we can-'not think that they may be justly cast out of their ministry, 'who [d] were either appointed by them [the apostles] or were 'afterwards chosen by other eminent men with the consent of 'the whole church.'——So writes Clement. And thus he bears witness to two things. First, that this was the general method of the apostles. And, secondly, he assures us, particularly, that this had been done in the church of Corinth. About which, I suppose, he could not be mistaken. There must therefore have been fixed officers in the churches of Thessalonica, Corinth, and Galatia: though St. Paul has taken no particular notice of them in the inscriptions of his epistles. It cannot then be any just exception against this epistle having been sent to the Ephesians, because their bishops or elders are not named. For it was a common thing with the apostle, to inscribe his epistles to the churches, or saints, of such a place, without any particular notice of their officers, though there were men of that character among them. I have mentioned above St. Paul's epistles to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. To them might be added the epistle to the Colossians.

[c] —— καθιςασαν τας απαρχας αυτων, δοκιμασαντες τῳ πνευματι, εις επισκοπους και διακονους των μελλοντων πιςευειν.

[d] Τους ουν καταςαθεντας υπ' εκεινων. κ. λ.

For

For that alſo is inſcribed *to the ſaints, and faithful brethren in Chriſt, which are at Coloſſe.* And yet there muſt have been elders in that church: one is mentioned, whoſe name is Archippus. However, it is in this manner only. Col. iv. 17. *And ſay to Archippus, take heed to the miniſtry, which thou haſt received of the Lord, that thou fulfil it.* Nor does the apoſtle ſend his ſalutations to the church in Laodicea by him in particular, but by the ſaints to whom the epiſtle is inſcribed. See ch. iv. 15. Once more, Timothy, as is generally allowed, was at Epheſus when St. Paul wrote to him thoſe two epiſtles, which we have. When the firſt was written, there muſt have been ſome elders in that church, and yet more at the time of writing the ſecond. It cannot be conteſted by any. Nevertheleſs no ſalutations are ſent to the elders of Epheſus, in either of thoſe epiſtles.

5. Obj. 'If this epiſtle was ſent to the Epheſians, it may be 'thought very ſtrange, that St. Paul ſhould not ſalute any of 'his friends there, where he had many friends and acquaint-'ance.'

But I cannot perceive this to be of much weight. There is no epiſtle of St. Paul that has ſo many ſalutations in it, as that to the Romans, whom he had never ſeen. There are no ſalutations of particular perſons at the end of the firſt epiſtle to Timothy, who was then at Epheſus. I ſuppoſe Timothy to have been in the ſame city likewiſe, when Paul wrote his ſecond epiſtle to him. Nevertheleſs there are in it no particular ſalutations, except thoſe in ch. iv. 19. *Salute Priſca and Aquila, and the houſehold of Oneſiphorus.* Tychicus went with this epiſtle to the Epheſians. And what is ſaid ch. vi. 21—23. would be inſtead of many particular ſalutations, and fully anſwer the end. For Tychicus is there required to *make known unto them all things, and to comfort their hearts.* I might add, that no particular perſons are ſaluted by name in either of the epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, nor in the epiſtle to the Galatians, nor in that to Titus, excepting only Titus himſelf, to whom the epiſtle is ſent.

6. Obj. Mr. Wetſtein ſays, 'that[c] the epiſtle to the Ephe-'ſians is written to gentiles, whereas the church at Epheſus 'conſiſted chiefly of Jews.'

I anſwer:

[c] Imprimis vero obſervandum, cum eccleſia Ephefina ex Judæis potiſſimum collecta fuerit. Act. xviii. 19, 21, 24, 25. xix. 9, 10, 17. xx. 21. Apoc. ii. 2, 7. eam, ad quam hæc epiſtola ſcripta eſt, non ex

I anſwer: That the epiſtle, called to the Epheſians, is written to gentiles, or to ſuch chiefly, is allowed, and is very manifeſt. And it ſeems to me very evident, from the hiſtory, which we have of St. Paul's preaching at Epheſus, in the book of the Acts, that the apoſtle's chief harveſt there was from among the gentiles. For a while indeed he taught in the ſynagogue. But the behaviour of the Jews obliged him to withdraw. Whereupon he preached in another place. And I ſhould conclude from what is in Acts xix. 17—40. that the apoſtle had many more converts there among Gentiles, than Jews.

7. Obj. 'It is argued from Col. iv. 16. that this epiſtle was 'ſent to the Laodiceans. For St. Paul ſays there: *and when this 'epiſtle is read among you*, or has been réad among you, *cauſe, 'that it be read alſo in the church of the Laodiceans: and that ye 'likewiſe read the epiſtle from Laodicea.* Hereby, as is argued, 'muſt be intended the epiſtle called to the Epheſians, but really 'ſent to the Laodiceans. For, ſays Mill, [f] 'and likewiſe others 'after him, this epiſtle called to the Epheſians, and the epiſtle 'to the Coloſſians, were both ſent by the ſame meſſenger, and 'at the ſame time.'

To which I anſwer, that if the epiſtle, called to the Epheſians, be the epiſtle intended by the apoſtle, and ſent at the ſame time with that to the Coloſſians; it is manifeſt, that it was not ſent to the Laodiceans. This may be concluded from what is ſaid to the Coloſſians, ch. iv. 15. *Salute the brethren, which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his houſe.* This plainly ſhows, that there was not now any epiſtle ſent to the Laodiceans. If there had, there would have been no occaſion for the apoſtle to ſend this order to the Coloſſians. For it is impoſſible to write a letter to any perſons, or ſocieties, without ſaluting them, or doing ſomewhat that is equivalent. And it is manifeſt, that in the epiſtle inſcribed to the Epheſians, the Chriſtians, to whom it is ſent, are ſaluted. Particularly ch. i. 1, 2. and ch. vi. 21, 22, 23. This has appeared evident to learned men of the firſt rank, and different communions. So [g] Baronius, and Tillemont. This laſt ſays, 'that

ex Judæis, ſed ex Gentilibus fuiſſe congregatam. Wetſt. N. T. tom. II. p. 239.

[f] 'Quidni igitur ſcripta fuerit ad Laodicenſes?——Sane per eundem tempus miſſa erat hæc epiſtola, per quem delata erat epiſtola ad Coloſſenſes, Tychicum ſcilicet, nec non eodem tempore. Mill. Prol. num. 74.

[g] Sane nullam eidem tabellario ad Laodicenſes fuiſſe a Paulo datam epiſtolam,

'that [h] since St. Paul orders the Colossians to salute those of 'Laodicea in his name; it is a certain sign, that he did not 'write to them at that time.' Du Pin says: 'If [i] St. Paul had 'written at the same time to the Laodiceans, he would not 'have charged the Colossians to salute them in his name.' And James Basnage: 'St. [k] Paul did not then write to the 'Laodiceans, since he salutes them in his letter to the church 'of Colosse.' The acute and honest Mr. Peirce, though much inclined to Mill's opinion concerning this epistle, saw this difficulty, and owned it. 'But I have one objection,' says he, 'which I cannot so easily get over. And were it not for that, 'I might fully agree with him. My objection is, that it seems 'highly improbable, that St. Paul should send his salutations to 'the Laodiceans, in the epistle, which he wrote to the Colos-'sians, in case he had sent that epistle to the Laodiceans by 'the same messenger.'

I am not unwilling to allow, that the epistle spoken of in the latter part of verse 16. of ch. iv. to the Colossians, is our epistle to the Ephesians: *and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea:* that is, the epistle that is to come to you from Laodicea. So the place is rendered in the French Testament of Lenfant and Beausobre: *and* [l] *cause likewise to be read among you that which the Laodiceans will send to you.* And their note is this, '*that* [m] *from Laodicea:* that is to say, '*that which will come to you from Laodicea.* For the original 'has that sense.'

If the epistle to the Ephesians was sent away by the apostle at the same time with those to the Colossians, and to Philemon: I should think, that Tychicus went first to Ephesus,

epistolam, satis constat: dum in ea, quam tum scripsit ad Colossenses, salutari mandat eos, qui Laodiceæ essent fideles, sic dicens: *Salutate fratres, qui sunt Laodiceæ.*——Libentius igitur Chrysostomo ac Theodoreto inhæremus, quam cæteris, ut nulla a Paulo scripta fuerit epistola ad Laodicenses. Baron. ann. 60. num. xiii.

[h] Et puisque S. Paul ordonne aux Colossiens de saluer de sa part ceux de Laodicée, c'est un marque indubitable, qu'il ne leur écrivit point alors. S. Paul. note 69. Mem. Ec. tom. I.

[i] En effet, si saint Paul, eût écrit en mesme temps aux Laodicéens, il n'eut pas chargé les Colossiens de les saluer de sa part. Diss. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

[k] S. Paul n'écrivoit pas alors aux Laodicéens, puisqu'il leur fait une salutation dans la lettre á l'eglise de Colosse. Basn. Hist. de l'Eglise. l. 8. ch. 3. n. iii.

[l] Et faites lire de même parmis vous celle que les Laodicéens vous envoyeront.

[m] Gr. *celle de Laodicée*, c'est à dire, *celle qui vous viendra de Laodicée.* Car l'original a ce sens là.

and

and there left the epiſtle to the Epheſians, with an order, that it ſhould be forwarded to Laodicea, and ſo to Coloſſe. Tychicus having left that letter at Epheſus, went forward with Oneſimus to Coloſſe: where they delivered the epiſtles to Philemon, and the Coloſſians. And then I ſuppoſe, that Tychicus's commiſſion was at an end. He had no order to go to Laodicea. The apoſtle's ſalutations to the brethren at Laodicea were to be taken care of by the Coloſſians.

But I rather think, as before ſhown, that the epiſtle to the Epheſians was written very ſoon after the apoſtle's arrival at Rome, and then carried to Epheſus by Tychicus. And when Tychicus went now in the ſecond year of the apoſtle's impriſonment, with theſe epiſtles to the Coloſſians, and Philemon; he came aſhore at Epheſus, and there left expreſs orders, that the epiſtle, formerly ſent to them, ſhould be ſoon forwarded by them to Laodicea, and ſo to Coloſſe. Having ſo done, he went, as before ſaid, with Oneſimus to Coloſſe: where they joined in delivering the letters to Philemon, and the church at Coloſſe. And now the commiſſion of Tychicus was at an end.

8. Obj. Once more, it is obſerved by learned men, 'that Marcion ſaid, this epiſtle was written to the Laodice-'ans, or called this the epiſtle to the Laodiceans.'

To which I anſwer, firſt. Humphry Hody denied, that [n] Marcion reckoned the epiſtle called to the Epheſians to have been written to the Laodiceans. And indeed this point ſeems to lie in great obſcurity. Nor is it ſaid by any one beſide Tertullian, that I know of.

Secondly. Suppoſe Marcion to have affirmed this, what does it avail? Grotius ſays, in his preface to this epiſtle,

[n] Decem tantum epiſtolas Pauli, cum particulis quibuſdam ex epiſtola ad Laod——recepit Marcion hæreticus, quas librum Apoſtolicum inſcripſit. De cæteris ſcripturarum libris nullum agnovit, præter Evangelium Lucæ, illudque mutilatum. Epiſtolas etiam, quas recepit Paulinas, mutilavit vitiavitque.——Simonius in Hiſt. Crit. N. T. cap. 15. contendit, Marcionem, nullam epiſt. ad Laod. recepiſſe, ſed epiſtolam ad Epheſios, falſo inſcripſiſſe ad Laodicenos. Sed in hoc Epiphanius falli non potuit, qui in Apoſtolico Marcionis recenſet epiſtolam ad Epheſios loco 7mo. et illam ad Laodicenos loco xi mo. προς λαοδικεις ια. Ideo vero dicit Tertullianus contra Marc. l. 5. cap. xi. *Epiſtolam quam nos ad Epheſios præſcriptam habemus*, a Marcione *ad Laodicenos inſcriptam fuiſſe*, quoniam locus, qui ex Epiſtola ad Laodicenos a Marcione adductus eſt, in epiſtola ad Epheſios exſtabat. Quod etiam obſervat Epiphanius. Hod. de Bibl. text. origin. p. 664.

'Marcion

'Marcion [o] called this the epiſtle to the Laodiceans. Nor 'was there any reaſon, why he ſhould falſify in this matter.' And to the like purpoſe others. To which I anſwer: Catholic writers of the ſame time, and ſince, call this the epiſtle to the Epheſians. Nor is there any reaſon, why they ſhould falſify. Yea the ſame is ſaid, not only by all catholics, but likewiſe by all heretics in general. Let Marcion's credit be ever ſo good, this is a ſufficient anſwer. For what intereſt had the catholics to falſify here? If Marcion ſaid, this epiſtle was ſent to the Laodiceans, he muſt have been miſtaken. We are aſſured, that what he ſaid is falſe, from the unanimous teſtimony of numerous men, who had no intereſt to deceive, and could not be deceived.

But Marcion's credit is very little in ſuch an affair as this. The ſame writer, who ſpeaks of Marcion's [p] calling this the epiſtle to the Laodiceans, I mean Tertullian, does alſo let us know, that [q] Marcion rejected the epiſtles of Paul to Timothy, and Titus. And chargeth [r] him with altering the text of ſcripture, openly employing a knife, not a ſtile. And ſpeaks particularly of his leaving out texts [s] in the epiſtle to the Romans. Will any ſay, that Marcion had good reaſon for ſo doing? or that all this was owing to his ſuperior care and judgment above other Chriſtians? For my own part, I think not. And if he ſaid, that this epiſtle was written to the Laodiceans, not to the Epheſians, he was miſtaken at leaſt. He had not, and could not have any good reaſon for it.

Mill [t] and other learned men after him, in defending their opinion concerning this epiſtle, magnify the care and ex-

[o] Marcion hanc epiſtolam vocat ad Laodicenſes, ex fide, ut credibile eſt, eccleſiæ Laodicenſis. Nam cur in ea re mentiretur, nihil erat cauſſæ. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Eph.

[p] Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 5. cap. xi.

[q] Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, de eccleſiaſtico ſtatu compoſitas, recuſaverit. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. ult. p. 615.

[r] Marcion enim exerta et palam machæra, non ſtilo uſus eſt: quoniam ad materiam ſuam cædem ſcripturarum confecit. Id. de Præſc. Hær. cap. 38.

[s] Quantas autem foveas in iſta vel maxime epiſtola Marcion fecerit, auferendo quæ voluit, de noſtri inſtrumenti integritate patebit. Adv. Marc. l. 5. cap. 13.

[t] Sed omnino verſimile eſt, Marcionem, qui Sinope aliquamdiu agebat, haud procul a Laodicea, ſive ex popularium ſuorum traditione, ſeu etiam auctoritate exemplarium quorundam, hanc epiſtolam tanquam ad Laodicenſes ſcriptam citaſſe. Mill. Prol. num. 78.

actneſs

actneſs of Marcion. 'He flouriſhed, they ſay, in the be-'ginning of the ſecond century, and lived at Sinope, in 'Paphlagonia, which was in Aſia Minor, as well as Lao-'dicea. And he affirmed, that the epiſtle called to the 'Epheſians was actually an epiſtle to the Laodiceans. Moſt 'probably, he had heard ſo from ſuch as knew the fact, 'and could inform him: or rather, had ſeen ſome of the 'manuſcripts, which gave it that title.'

But all this is ſaid without any ground. Such ſuppoſitions are eaſily made. But there is no proof of the truth of them. If there be any credit to be given to what the ancients ſay of Marcion, he muſt have been a very rāſh, and arbitrary, and careleſs critic: provided he at all deſerve the name of a critic. And if he thought this epiſtle to have been written to the Laodiceans; it is likely, that he took up that opinion without much inquiry, or examination, and without ſufficient reaſon, and perhaps without aſſigning any.

Jerom,[u] ſpeaking of Marcion and Baſilides, who, as he ſays, were not friendly to the Old Teſtament, and altered the goſpels and epiſtles of the New Teſtament, and rejected both the epiſtles to Timothy, and the epiſtle to Titus, and that to the Hebrews, he adds: 'And if they aſſigned any reaſons, why 'they did not reckon theſe epiſtles to be the apoſtle's, we 'ſhould endeavour to make an anſwer, and perhaps might ſay, 'what would be ſufficient to ſatisfy the reader. But now ſince 'with heretical authority they pronounce, and ſay, this epiſtle 'is Paul's, and that not: they may be fitly anſwered on the 'ſide of truth, in the ſame manner that they aſſert falſehood.'

And Tertullian having ſpoken of Marcion's admitting the

[u] Licet non ſint digni fide, qui eidem primam iritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquor et Baſilidem, et omnes hæreticos, qui vetus laniant teſtamentum: tamen eos aliqua ex parte ferremus, ſi ſaltem in novo continerent manus ſuas, et non auderent Chriſti——vel Evangeliſtas violare, vel Apoſtolos. Nunc vero cum Evangelia ejus Chriſti diſſipaverint, et Apoſtolorum epiſtolas non Apoſtolorum Chriſti fecerunt eſſe, ſed proprias, miror, quomodo ſibi Chriſtianorum nomen audeant vindicare. Ut enim de cæteris ſcriptis taceam, de quibus quicquid contrarium ſuo dogmati viderant, eraſerunt, nonnullas integras repudiandas crediderunt: ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebræos, et ad Titum, quam nunc conamur exponere. Et ſi quidem redderent cauſſas, cur eas Apoſtoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid reſpondere, et forſitan ſatisfacere lectori. Nunc vero quum hæretica auctoritate pronuncient, et dicant: Illa epiſtola Pauli eſt, hæc non eſt; ea auctoritate refelli ſe pro veritate intelligant, qua ipſi non erubeſcunt falſa ſimulare. Hieron. Pr. in ep. ad Tit. T. IV. p. 407.

genuineneſs of the epiſtle to Philemon, adds, 'Nevertheleſs 'x I wonder, that when he receives an epiſtle to one man, he 'ſhould reject two to Timothy, and one to Titus, which 'treat of the government of the church. He had a mind, I 'ſuppoſe, to alter alſo the number of the epiſtles:' that is, as he had done of the goſpels: which paſſage, as the reader may remember, was quoted by us [y] formerly.

It hence appears, that Tertullian knew not, why Marcion rejected the epiſtles to Timothy, and Titus. He knew, that Marcion rejected thoſe three epiſtles. But he was not aware of his having aſſigned any reaſons for ſo doing: which ſhows, I think, that Marcion acted arbitrarily in ſuch things as theſe.

Indeed Tertullian ſpeaking of Marcion's attempting, or deſigning to alter the inſcription of the epiſtle to the Epheſians uſeth this expreſſion: 'as if he had made more than common inquiries about it.' But I ſuppoſe Tertullian to ſpeak by way of Irony, and ſarcaſtically: not allowing Marcion uncommon diligence and exactneſs, but intimating, that a man, who acted thus, ſhould be very careful to be rightly informed.

All this I have ſaid in the way of a general anſwer to the argument taken from the ſuppoſed opinion of Marcion. I will now more particularly inquire what Marcion ſaid and did, and what might be the ground and reaſon of his opinion and conduct. And I think there are but two writers, from whom we can receive any information, Tertullian and Epiphanius.

The firſt is Tertullian. 'I [a] paſs by another epiſtle,' ſays he, 'which we have inſcribed to the Epheſians, but heretics 'to the Laodiceans.'

Afterwards: 'According [b] to the true teſtimony of the 'church, we ſuppoſe that epiſtle to have been ſent to the 'Epheſians. But Marcion once had a mind to alter the title, 'as if he had made a very diligent inquiry into that matter.

[x] Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, de eccleſiaſtico ſtatu compoſitas, recuſaverit. Adfectavit, opinor, etiam numerum epiſtolarum interpolare. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. ult. p. 615. D.

[y] See vol. II. p. 265. See alſo here, p. 448. not. *(q)*.

[z] See below, note *(b)*.

[a] Prætereo hic, et de alia epiſtola, quam nos ad Epheſios præſcriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. xi.

[b] Eccleſiæ quidem veritate epiſtolam iſtam ad Epheſios habemus emiſſam, non ad Laodicenos. Sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare geſtiit, quaſi et in illo diligentiſſimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulo intereſt, cum ad omnes Apoſtolus ſcripſerit, dum ad ſingulos. Ib. cap. xvii. p. 607.

'But

'But the title is of no importance, ſince the apoſtle wrote to 'all, when he wrote to ſome.'

I hope I have rightly tranſlated the word *geſtiit*. I think it meaneth, *had a mind to*, or *was inclined*, or ſhowed an inclination ſo to do.

By theſe paſſages of Tertullian we are aſſured, firſt, that this epiſtle, which was in the hands of catholic Chriſtians, was, in all its copies, inſcribed to the Epheſians. And Tertullian was perſuaded, that it was the true teſtimony, or tradition of the church from the beginning.

Secondly, in the firſt of theſe paſſages Tertullian ſays, that heretics called this the epiſtle to the Laodiceans: by heretics meaning, as I ſuppoſe, Marcion and his followers.

Thirdly, Tertullian ſays, that once, or upon ſome occaſion, Marcion had a mind to alter the title of this epiſtle.

Here it may be queſtioned, whether by *title* be meant what we call a running title, affixed to the epiſtle, or the inſcription, which makes a part of the epiſtle, and is inſerted at the beginning of it. I rather think, this laſt to be intended. But take it either way, Tertullian ſuppoſed, that Marcion had in his copies the ſame title, or inſcription with the catholics, that is, to the Epheſians, or at Epheſus. Nor does Tertullian ſay, that Marcion ever inſerted the inſcription, to the Laodiceans, in any of his copies. It ſeems to me, that he did not.

Conſequently, what Tertullian ſays, is, that Marcion, and his followers, ſometimes at leaſt, called this the epiſtle to the Laodiceans, and perhaps quoted it by that title. But he had not in his copies any title, or inſcription, different from that of the catholics. Marcion gave out, that the epiſtle, called by the catholics to the Epheſians, was written to the Laodiceans. He affirmed this to be right, and that the catholics were in the wrong in calling it an epiſtle to the Epheſians. For he was perſuaded, it was written to the Laodiceans.

I think, this is the moſt that is ſaid by Tertullian, or that can be collected from him. Yea, it ſeems to me, that I have in a ſtrong manner repreſented the whole of what is ſaid by him.

I now proceed to Epiphanius, who ſays, 'that 'Marcion

'Εχει δε και επιστολας παρ' αυτω τη αγια αποστολω δεκα, αις μοναις κεχρηται. —— Αι δε επιστολαι αι παρ' αυτω λεγομεναι εισι πρωτη μεν προς γαλατας —— εβδομη προς εφεσιους, ογδοη προς κολασσεις. —— Εχει δε και προς λαοδικειας λεγομενης μερη. Epiph. H. 42. num. ix. p. 310.

 'received

'received only ten epistles of Paul. They are these. The 'first is that to the Galatians, the second is the first to the 'Corinthians, the third is the second to the Corinthians, the 'fourth that to the Romans, the fifth is the first to the Thessa- 'lonians, the sixth the second to the Thessalonians, the se- 'venth is that to the Ephesians, the eighth to the Colossians, 'the ninth to Philemon, the tenth to the Philippians. He 'has also some parts of an epistle to the Laodiceans.' So 'Epiphanius.

It is well known, that Marcion had an evangelicon, and an apostolicon, or a gospel and an apostle. In the former, as is generally said, he had St. Luke's gospel only. But concerning the truth of that account I make no inquiries now. Our concern at present is with St. Paul's epistles only. And Epiphanius here expressly says, that Marcion received ten, and placed them in the order in which they are rehearsed above. He likewise says, that Marcion had some parts of an epistle to the Laodiceans. And he quotes, as from him, those words, which are in Eph. iv. 5, 6. after this manner: *One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Christ, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* Having so done, he says: 'Nor [d] did the unhappy 'Marcion think fit to take that passage from the epistle to 'the Ephesians, but from the epistle to the Laodiceans, 'which is not the apostle's.'

This account of Epiphanius led H. Hody to say, that Marcion received eleven epistles of St. Paul. James Basnage was of the same opinion. He says: 'It [e] has been 'conjectured by some, that Marcion confounded the epistle 'to the Laodiceans with that to the Ephesians.——But that 'conjecture cannot be maintained. For he distinguished 'two epistles of St. Paul, one to the Ephesians, and another 'to the Laodiceans. And Epiphanius reproacheth him, 'because he rather chose to take his passage from the epistle

[d] Οὐ γαρ εδοξε τῳ ελεεινοτατῳ μαρκιωνι απο της προς εφεσιους ταυτην την μαρτυριαν λεγειν, αλλα της προς λαοδικεας, της μη ουσης εν τῳ αποστολῳ. II. 42. p. 375. in.

[e] Marcion l'a citée. Il en tiroit même quelque preuve pour son heresie. On a conjecturé, qu'il la confondoit avec celle des Ephesiens. —— Mais cette conjecture ne peut se soutenir, parceque Marcion distinguoit deux lettres de S. Paul, l'une aux Ephesiens, l'autre aux Laodicéens. Et. S. Epiphane lui fait une espece de reproche, de ce qu'il a mieux aimé tirer son passage de l'epistre aux Laodicéens, qui n'étoit point de S. Paul, que de celle aux Ephesiens, dans laquelle on trouvoit les mesmes paroles. J. Basn. Hist. de l'Egl. l. 3. ch. 3. num. iii.

'to

'to the Laodiceans, which was not Paul's, than from the 'epiſtle to the Epheſians, where are the ſame words.'

And indeed, I apprehend, that if we had Epiphanius only, many might be of the ſame opinion. But comparing him and Tertullian, and examining carefully the whole article of Epiphanius, I think, it muſt appear more probable, that Marcion did ſometimes quote the epiſtle to the Epheſians, as if it had been ſent to the Laodiceans. Nor can I perceive any good reaſon to think, that any letter, to the Laodiceans was forged ſo early, as the time of Marcion.

And now I would obſerve, that Epiphanius ſeems to have been well acquainted with Marcion's apoſtolicon. For he had read his writings, and compoſed a treatiſe againſt him, called Scholion, or Scholia, which he inſerted, ſomewhat altered, in his article of the Marcionites, in his large work, called the Panarium, which we have.

Having obſerved this, I ſay, that from Epiphanius it appears, that in Marcion's apoſtolicon the epiſtle to the Epheſians was entitled, and inſcribed to them, as it was in the copies of the catholics. And all the difference between the catholics and him, upon this head, was, that he ſometimes quoted this epiſtle, as written to the Laodiceans. Epiphanius, who had ſeen Marcion's apoſtolicon, found therein ten epiſtles, all inſcribed, as in the catholic copies. One of which, and the ſeventh in order, was that to the Epheſians. However, in one place of Marcion's works, and [s] but one, he had ſeen a paſſage of the epiſtle to the Epheſians quoted, as from an epiſtle to the Laodiceans.

Some ſuch thing, as this, induced Tertullian, a man of a violent temper, to ſay: 'I paſs by another epiſtle, which we 'have inſcribed to the Epheſians, but heretics to the 'Laodiceans.' However, from Tertullian, as before ſhown, it appears, that in Marcion's copies of this epiſtle it had the ſame title, as in the catholic copies, and that he never altered the inſcription. And thus Tertullian and Epiphanius agree. For from this laſt likewiſe we plainly perceive, that in Marcion's apoſtolicon was the epiſtle to the Epheſians: but not exactly in the ſame order, as with the catholics.

[r] Ελευσομαι δε εις τα υπ' αυτε γεγραμμενα. κ. λ. H. 42. cap. ix. p. 309. C.

[s] Præter hanc tamen ad Epheſios epiſtolam, putat Epiphanius, recepta etiam eſſe a Marcione epiſtolæ ad Laodicenſes fragmenta. Εχει δε και της προς λαοδικεας μερη, inquit. E quibus tamen unicum illud a ſe productum reperit. Jac. Uſſer. Diſſ. de Ep. ad Laod.

And thus, if I miſtake not, Marcion himſelf, confirms the common reading at the beginning of this epiſtle. And this recompence we have of our diligent inquiſition into this affair. So it often happens. Oppoſition made to truth is the means of eſtabliſhing it.

This opinion of the caſe may be farther juſtified by two conſiderations, which perhaps deſerve to be mentioned. One is, that there is no notice taken of this affair by any other writers, beſide Tertullian and Epiphanius. Jerom, and many others, who often ſpeak of Marcion, and his principles, ſay nothing of it. It is therefore very probable, that his inſcription of the epiſtle to the Epheſians was the ſame, as in the catholic copies. If not, his alteration here, as well as in other places, would have been obſerved. The other is, that all thoſe, called heretics, ſo far as we know, had this epiſtle inſcribed to the Epheſians. The Manichees agreed with Marcion in divers of his peculiarities. Nevertheleſs, in their copies this epiſtle was inſcribed to the Epheſians. This has appeared from the quotations of it in the writings of Fauſtus, and Secundinus, formerly [h] taken notice of.

But though the inſcription of this epiſtle was the ſame in Marcion's, as in the catholic copies; he ſometimes quoted it, as an epiſtle to the Laodiceans, and was of opinion, that it was written to them. We are therefore now to inquire into the ground and reaſon of this opinion.

Pamelius [i] in his notes upon Tertullian, as cited by archbiſhop Uſher, (for I have not his edition at hand:) conjectured, that the words of Col. iv. 16. were the occaſion of this opinion of Marcion. So likewiſe ſays [k] Eſtius.

It is very probable, that thoſe words [l] gave occaſion to the forging an epiſtle to the Laodiceans. Theodoret, not far from the beginning of the fifth century, as formerly [m] cited

[h] See vol. III. p. 506, 509, 538.

[i] Jacobus Pamelius, Annot. 259. in lib. 5. Tertulliani adv. Marcionem. *Fortaſſis*, inquit, *occaſionem dedit Marcioni hujus tituli huic epiſtolæ imponendi, quod legiſſet*, Col. iv. *Salutate fratres*, &c. Uſſer. Diſſ. de Ep. ad Laod.

[k] Sciendum præterea eſt, Marcionem, antiquum hæreticum, occaſione præſentis loci, epiſtolæ ad Epheſios ſcriptæ titulum mutaſſe, inſcribendo eam ad Laodicenos, tanquam ea non ad illos, ſed ad hos ſcripta eſſet, &c. Eſt. ad Col. iv. 16.

[l] *Et tam, quæ Laodicenſium eſt, vos legatis.*] Horum verborum occaſione abuſus quiſpiam concinnavit, atque evulgavit epiſtolam quandam velut a Paulo ſcriptam ad Laodicenſes. Eſt. in Col. iv. 16.

[m] See vol. V. p. 194.

by

by us, says in his commentary upon that text: 'Some have 'hence imagined, that the apostle had also written to the 'Laodiceans, and they have forged such an epistle. Never-'theless the apostle does not say, *the epistle to the Laodiceans,* '*but from Laodicea.*'

That is the unvaried reading of this text in all the copies of the New Testament, and in all ancient Greek *⁎ writers. And I have suspected, that the epistle to the Laodiceans was forged by a Latin: and that the Latin version of that text gave occasion to it. Fabricius [n] in the introduction to his account of the epistle to the Laodiceans speaks to the same purpose.

In like manner I have for a good while been of opinion, that the Latin version of this text was the occasion of the mistaken notion of Marcion.

When I formerly gave an account of a Latin Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, written about 380. I took notice, that [o] the translation of Col. iv. 16. followed by that author, was, *that ye read the epistle of the Laodiceans.* Et vos ut eam, quæ est Laodicensium, legatis. The same translation is in the Commentary of Pelagius. Et ea, quæ Laodicensium est, vobis legatur. Which affords good proof, that this was the translation, which was in the Latin version, then in use.

I also observed in the same place, that this expression is ambiguous. It may import an epistle, written by the Laodiceans: or an epistle, which was their property, as having been written to them. I have since found the same

*⁎ As some proof of this, I allege the note of Theophylact upon this verse. 'Which is the epistle 'from Laodicea? It is the first to 'Timothy. For that was written 'from Laodicea. However some 'say, it is an epistle, which the 'Laodiceans had sent to Paul. 'But what good the reading such 'an epistle could do them, I do not 'know.' Τις δε ην η εκ λαοδικειας; η προς τιμοθεον πρωτη. Αυτη γαρ εκ λαοδικειας εγραφη. Τινες δε φασιν, ςτι ην οι λαοδικεις παυλῳ επεςειλαν. Αλλ' εκ οιδα τι αν εκεινης εδει αυτοις προς βελτιωσιν. Theoph. in loc. tom. II. p. 676.

[n] Quamquam hunc Pauli locum neutiquam puto testimonium perhibere commentitiæ ad Laodicenses epistolæ, tamen quia ex illo, sive Latina potius ejus versione ambigua ansam cepit quisquis illam supposuit, non fuit a me omittendus. Lectionis nulla est in codicibus Græcis differentia. Omnes enim, quantum scio, habent την εκ λαοδικειας. Ita et Syrus, et Arabs, et interpretes Græci, Chrysostomus, Theodoritus, Theophylactus, Œcumenius. Neque Latinus aliter legisse videtur, etsi vertit: *Eam, quæ Laodicensium est.* Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. tom. II. p. 853.

[o] See vol. IV. p. 498.

obſervation in [p] Eſtius. So Secundinus, the Manichee, in his letter to Auguſtine, by the epiſtle of the Epheſians plainly means the epiſtle to the Epheſians. For his words are theſe: 'Againſt [q] whom the apoſtle in the epiſtle of the 'Epheſians, ſays, *he wreſtled.* For he ſays: *we wreſtle not* '*againſt fleſh and blood, but againſt principalities, and powers.*' Eph. vi. 12.

It is not unlikely, that a good number of the Latins, by *the epiſtle of the Laodiceans*, in Col. iv. 16. underſtood an epiſtle written to the Laodiceans. And Marcion alſo, having before him the Latin verſion, and underſtanding the words in that ſenſe, concluded, that St. Paul had written an epiſtle to the Laodiceans. At length he was brought to think, that the epiſtle, intended by St. Paul, was the epiſtle inſcribed to the Epheſians. Accordingly, he ſometimes quoted it with that title. This will be the more readily admitted, when it is conſidered, that Marcion made uſe of the Latin verſion of St. Paul's epiſtles. So ſay both [r] Mill, and [s] Wetſtein.

And now, I ſuppoſe, it may appear, what regard is due to the authority of Marcion in this matter.

Thus I have at large ſtated, and conſidered all the material objections againſt the common reading at the beginning of this epiſtle, the epiſtle to the Epheſians. And the ſolutions that have been offered, ſeem to me ſatisfactory. And from the univerſal agreement of all copies in that reading, and the unanimous teſtimony of all Chriſtian writers for the firſt twelve centuries, it appears, that there is no more reaſon to doubt of the genuineneſs of the inſcription of the epiſtle to the Epheſians, than of any other of the acknowledged epiſtles of St. Paul.

[p] Fefellit tamen hos omnes ambiguitas verborum hujus loci, prout Latine leguntur Quod enim dicitur, *eam quæ Laodicenſium eſt*, intelligi poteſt, vel ad quos, vel a quibus epiſtola ſcripta ſit aut miſſa. Et quidem priori modo Latini fere intellexerunt. Sed hanc ambiguitatem diſſolvit Græca lectio, quæ ſic habet: *Et eam quæ ex Laodicea eſt, ut et vos legatis. Eſt ad loc.*

[q] Contra quos ſe Apoſtolus in Epheſiorum epiſtola certamen ſubiſſe fatetur. Dicit enim, ſe non contra carnem et ſanguinem habere certamen, ſed adverſus principes et poteſtates. Secundin. ep. ad Aug. § i. Ap. Aug. T. VIII.

[r] Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 378. et 606. [s] Ac principio, quod a nemine adhuc animadverſum puto, (niſi a J. Millio Prol. 378. ſuboluiſſe putemus) comperimus, Marcionis codices N. T. non ex Græcis exemplaribus, ſed ex verſione Latina veteri ſive Italica conflatos fuiſſe, &c. Wetſten. Prolegom. p. 79.

This

This diſquiſition has been of greater length, than might have been wiſhed. But if any things have been ſet in a truer light, than uſual, it will be acceptable to ſome.

CHAP. XIV.

That the Churches of Coloſſe and Laodicea were planted by the apoſtle Paul.

It has been of late a prevailing opinion, that the Chriſtians at Coloſſe, and Laodicea, were not converted by St. Paul. But to me it ſeems, that there is no good ground for it.

Says Theodoret in his argument of the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, prefixed to his commentary, 'Some [a] are of 'opinion, that when the divine apoſtle wrote this epiſtle, 'he had not ſeen the Coloſſians. And they endeavour to 'ſupport their opinion by theſe words, *For I would that ye 'ſhould know, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at 'Laodicea, and for as many as have not ſeen my face in the fleſh,* 'ch. ii. 1. But they ſhould conſider, that the meaning of 'the words is this, *I have not only a concern for you, but I have 'alſo great concern for thoſe that have not ſeen me.* And if he be 'not ſo underſtood, he expreſſes no concern for thoſe, who 'had ſeen him, and had been taught by him. Moreover 'the bleſſed Luke ſays in the Acts, *And after he had ſpent 'ſome time there, he departed, and went over all the country of 'Galatia, and Phrygia, in order,* ch. xviii. 23. Coloſſe is a 'city of Phrygia. And Laodicea, the metropolis of the 'country, is not far from it. How was it poſſible for him 'to be in Phrygia, and not carry the goſpel to thoſe places? And in another place the bleſſed Luke ſays, *Now when they 'had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and 'were forbidden of the Holy Ghoſt to preach the word in Aſia,'* ch. xvi. 6.

So ſays that very learned writer in the fifth century. And thoſe obſervations have led me to divers conſiderations, inducing me to think, that the churches of Coloſſe and Laodicea had been planted by Paul, and that the Chriſtians there were his converts.

[a] Theod. tom. III. p. 342, 343.

1. The

1. The apoſtle was twice in Phrygia, in which were Coloſſe, Laodicea and Hierapolis. Says St. Luke in the places already cited by Theodoret, Acts xvi. 6. *Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghoſt to preach the word in Aſia.* And ch. xviii. 23. *And after he had ſpent ſome time there* [at *Antioch*] *he departed, and went over all the countries of Galatia and Phrygia in order, ſtrengthening the brethren.* To which St. Luke refers again, ch. xix. 1. *Paul having paſſed through the upper coaſts, came to Epheſus.* St. Luke does not mention any cities by name. But there is no reaſon to ſay, that he was not at Coloſſe. It is much more reaſonable to think, that in one, or rather, in both thoſe journies, Paul was at Coloſſe, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, chief cities of Phrygia. For, as Theodoret ſays, how was it poſſible, that he ſhould be in that country, yea and go *through it*, and *all over it*, and not be in the chief places of it? St. Luke has not particularly named any places in Galatia, in which Paul was. But he muſt have been in ſeveral towns and cities in that country, where he planted divers churches. Gal. i. 1, 2. So was he, in like manner, in ſeveral cities of Phrygia: where alſo, in all probability, he planted divers churches.

This argument alone appears to me concluſive. The accounts, which St. Luke has given of St. Paul's journies in Phrygia, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that he preached the goſpel there, and made converts, and planted churches in the chief cities.

2. Ch. i. 6. *Which bringeth forth fruit, as it does alſo in you, ſince the day ye heard it, and knew the grace of God in truth.* Of this St. Paul was aſſured. Which renders it probable, that he was their father, or firſt teacher. He ſpeaks to the like purpoſe ſeveral times. Ch. ii. 6, 7. See likewiſe ch. i. 23. St. Paul knew, that they had been rightly taught the goſpel. Nothing more remained, but that they ſhould perſevere in the faith, which they had received, and act according to it.

3. Epaphras was not their firſt inſtructor in the doctrine of the goſpel. This may be concluded from ch. i. 7. the words following thoſe quoted above from ver. 6. *As* [b] *ye have alſo learned of Epaphras, our dear fellow-ſervant, who is for you a faithful miniſter of Chriſt.* The Coloſſians had been taught

[b] Καθως και εμαθετε απο επαφρα.

by

by Epaphras. But he was not their firſt inſtructor. However, he had faithfully taught them, agreeably to the inſtructions, which they had received.

Theodoret[c] upon ch. i. 7, 8. well obſerves, 'that the 'apoſtle beſtows many commendations upon Epaphras, call-'ing him *beloved*, and *fellow-ſervant*, and a *faithful miniſter* '*of Chriſt*, that the Coloſſians might have the greater regard 'for him.' If Epaphras had firſt taught the Coloſſians the Chriſtian doctrine, I think, the apoſtle, when recommending him to ther eſteem and regard, would have added, *by whom ye believed*, or *by whom ye were brought to the fellowſhip of the goſpel*, or ſomewhat elſe, to the like purpoſe. That would have been a great addition to what is ſaid at ver. 7. before cited, and to what is ſaid of him, ch. iv. 12, 13. *Epaphras, who is one of you, a ſervant of Chriſt, ſaluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may ſtand perfect and complete in all the will of God. For I bear him record, that he has a great zeal for you, and for them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis.*

Epaphras, who is one of you. Would the apoſtle have uſed ſuch an expreſſion concerning Epaphras, if the church of Coloſſe had been founded by him? Impoſſible. He ſays as much of Oneſimus, who was but juſt converted, and was now firſt going to appear among them as a Chriſtian. His words at ver. 9. of the ſame chapter are, *Oneſimus, a faithful, and beloved brother, who is one of you.*

I imagine, that St. Paul does the more enlarge at ver. 12, 13. upon the affectionate concern, which Epaphras had for theſe Chriſtians, being apprehenſive of ſome prejudices taken up againſt him, that might obſtruct his uſefulneſs among them. For he had brought the apoſtle an account of the ſtate of this church. Which, though it was true and faithful, was not in all reſpects agreeable: as is concluded by commentators from what St. Paul writes in the ſecond chapter of this epiſtle.

4. St. Paul does in effect, or even expreſsly ſay, that himſelf had diſpenſed the goſpel to theſe Coloſſians, ch. i. 21—25. I ſhall recite here a large part of that context, ver. 23—25. *If ye continue in the faith, grounded and ſettled, and be not moved away from the hope of the goſpel, which ye have heard——whereof I Paul am made a miniſter. Who now*

[c] Ubi ſupra. p. 344.

rejoice

rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his body's sake, which is the church. Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you, to fulfil, or fully to preach, *the word of God.* And what follows to ver. 29.

St. Paul therefore had been the *minister of God* to these Colossians, as well as to other gentiles. Nor would they have been excluded, but included among other gentiles, to whom he had preached the word, if commentators had not been misled by a false interpretation of those words in ch. iv. 1, 2. of which we have already seen Theodoret's account, and shall say more presently. Those words having been misinterpreted, a wrong turn has been given to these likewise.

5. Chrysostom in his preface to the epistle to the Romans speaks to this purpose, 'I [d] see the apostle writing to the 'Romans and the Colossians, upon the same things indeed, 'but not in the same manner. To them he writes with 'much mildness, as when he says.——Rom. xiv. 1, 2. 'To the Colossians he does not so speak of the same things, 'but with greater freedom. *If therefore*, says he, *ye be dead 'with Christ from the rudiments of the world*——and what 'follows, ch. ii. 20—23.' Does not this observation lead us to think, that the Colossians were the apostle's own converts, to whom a different address from that used toward others might be very proper? And there are other passages of this epistle, beside that alleged by Chrysostom, which might be taken notice of, as confirming the same observation.

6. Ch. ii. 6, 7. *As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: grounded, and built up in him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.* Certainly these exhortations of the apostle are the more proper, and forcible, supposing the Colossians to have been first taught and instructed by him. Nor had he any occasion to be more particular. They knew, who had taught them. But I think that in this, or some other of the places, where he reminds the Colossians of what they had heard, and had been taught, if those instructions had

[d] Ὅταν γαρ ιδω ῥωμαιοις και κολοσσαευσιν υπερ αυτων μεν επιστελλοντα, ουχ' ομοιως δε υπερ των αυτων, αλλ' εκεινοις μεν μετα πολλης της συγκαταβασεως.——Κολοσσαευσι δε ουχ' ουτω περι των αυτων αλλα μετα πλειονος παρρησιας. κ. λ. Proœm. in ep. ad Rom. T. IX. p. 427.

been

been received from another, different from himſelf, that would have appeared in the expreſſions made uſe of by him. In ſhort, if they were converted by the apoſtle, there could not, poſſibly, ariſe in his mind a doubt, whether they remembered, who had been their firſt teacher, and who were his fellow-labourers, who had accompanied him in his journies, when he was in their country. And therefore there was no need to remind them of himſelf more expreſsly, than he has done. The thing is ſuppoſed all along.

7. The preſence of Epaphras with Paul at Rome is an argument, that the Coloſſians had perſonal acquaintance with the apoſtle. Indeed Grotius upon ch. i. 7. ſays, 'that 'Epaphras is the ſame as Epaphroditus, mentioned in the 'epiſtle to the Philippians.' But Beauſobre well obſerves upon the ſame place: 'This may be the ſame name with 'Epaphroditus, Philip. ii. 25. But it is not probable, that 'it is the ſame perſon. St. Paul had ſent Epaphroditus to 'Philippi. But Epaphras was ſtill at Rome. And there is 'reaſon to think, that he was a priſoner there. See Philem. 'ver. 23.' If Epaphras was ſent to Rome by the Coloſſians to inquire after Paul's welfare, as may be concluded from ch. iv. 7, 8. that token of reſpect for the apoſtle is a good argument of perſonal acquaintance. And it is allowed, that Epaphras had brought St. Paul a particular account of the ſtate of affairs in this church. Which is another argument, that they were his converts.

8. Ch. i. 8. *Who alſo declared unto us your love in the ſpirit:* that is, ſays [e] Grotius, 'how you love us on account of the Holy Spirit given to you.' Or, as Peirce, 'Who alſo 'declared unto me the love you bear to me upon a ſpiritual 'account.' Or, as Whitby, 'Your ſpiritual and affection-'ate love to me, wrought in you by the ſpirit, whoſe fruit 'is love.' All thus underſtanding it of their love of the apoſtle, and rightly, as ſeems to me. Nothing elſe can be meant by it. For before, at ver. 4. he had ſpoken of *their love to all the ſaints.* This I take to be another good proof of perſonal acquaintance. And the place is agreeable to what he writes to the Theſſalonians, allowed by all to be the apoſtle's converts. 1 Theſſ. iii. 6. *But now when Timothy came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your*

[e] Quomodo nos diligatis propter Spiritum Sanctum vobis datum. Grot. in loc.

faith

faith and charity: [that is the same with Col. i. 4. *Since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of your love to all the saints:*] *and that ye have good remembrance of us always.*

9. Ch. iii. 16. *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching, and admonishing one another, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.* This shows, that the Colossians were endowed with spiritual gifts. And from whom could they receive them, but from St. Paul? Apostles[f] only are allowed to have had the power and privilege of conveying spiritual gifts to other Christians. This text therefore has been a difficulty with such as have supposed, that Paul never was at Colosse. But now that difficulty is removed.

10. Ch. ii. 1, 2. *For I would, that ye knew, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh: that their hearts might be comforted.* This quick change of persons upon the mention of such as had not seen the apostle's face, seems to imply, that the Colossians, to whom he is writing, had seen him. For if the Colossians had been among those who had not seen him, he would have expressed himself in this manner. *I would that ye knew, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh, that your hearts might be comforted.* But upon the mention of such as had not seen him, he says: *that their hearts might be comforted.* And having finished his testimony of concern for such *as had not seen his face*, he returns to the Colossians, to whom he was writing, and says, ver. 4. *And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.*

Theodoret, beside what he had said in the preface to this epistle, which has been already transcribed, speaks again to this purpose in his paraphrase of ch. ii. 1, 2. 'I would 'have you be persuaded of my great concern for you, and 'for the Laodiceans: and not only for you and the Laodiceans, 'but likewise for all who have not seen me. And[g] that this 'is his meaning, appears from what follows: *that their hearts*

[f] 'Though several of the Christians had spiritual gifts, and miraculous powers, none but apostles could confer upon others such 'gifts and powers.' Dr. Benson upon the Acts. vol. I. p. 157. first edit. p. 162. second edit. In like manner other commentators. And see Acts, ch. viii. 5—25.

[g] Ὅτι δὲ ταυτα κατα ταυτην αυτῳ την διανοιαν ειρηται, και τα επαγομενα δηλοι· ινα παρακληθωσιν αι καρδιαι αυτων. Ουκ ειπεν υμων, αλλ' αυτων, τουτεστι, των μηδεπω τεθεαμενων. Theod. ib. p. 350, 351.

'*may*

'*may be comforted.* He does not ſay *your*, but *their*: that is, 'of ſuch as had not ſeen him.'

11. Ch. ii. 5. *For though I be abſent in the fleſh, yet am I with you in the ſpirit, joying, and beholding your order, and the ſteadfaſtneſs of your faith in Chriſt.* It is here implied, if I am not miſtaken, that the apoſtle had been with them, and had been preſent in the aſſembly of the believers at Coloſſe.

12. What is ſaid ch. iv. 7—9. *All my ſtate ſhall Tychicus declare unto you*, and the reſt, beſt ſuits the ſuppoſition of perſonal acquaintance, as before hinted. Indeed, I think it to be full proof, that Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him.

13. The ſalutations in ver. 10, 11, 14. from Ariſtarchus, Mark, Luke, Demas, ſuppoſe the Coloſſians to have been well acquainted with St. Paul's fellow-travellers, and fellow-labourers. And Timothy's name is in the ſalutation at the beginning of the epiſtle. Conſequently, the Coloſſians were not unknown to the apoſtle, nor unacquainted with him. And the like ſalutations are alſo in the epiſtle to Philemon, an inhabitant of Coloſſe.

14. Ch. iv. 15. *Salute the brethren, which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his houſe.* Ver. 17. *And ſay to Archippus: take heed to the miniſtry, which thou haſt received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.* This ſhows, that Paul was well acquainted with the ſtate of the churches in Coloſſe and Laodicea. And it affords an argument that he had been in that country, and particularly at Laodicea. He ſalutes the brethren there, and Nymphas by name, and the church in his houſe. 'It [h] is probable, ſays Theodoret, that he was one of 'the faithful in Laodicea, who had made his houſe a church, 'adorning it with piety.' As for Archippus, the ſame Theodoret ſays, 'That [i] ſome had ſuppoſed him to have been mi-'niſter at Laodicea: but,' ſays he, 'the epiſtle to Philemon 'ſhows, that he dwelled at Coloſſe, where Philemon was.' See Philem. ver. 2.

15. Ch. iv. 3, 4. *Withal, praying alſo for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to ſpeak the myſtery of Chriſt, for which I am in bonds: that I may make it manifeſt, as I ought to*

[h] Ibid. p. 363. [i] Τινες εφασαν, τουτον λαοδικειας γεγενησθαι διδασκαλον.

[k] Ibid.

ſpeak.

ſpeak. And ver. 18. *Remember my bonds.* Such demands may be made of ſtrangers. But they are moſt properly made of friends and acquaintance.

In a word, the whole tenour of this epiſtle ſhows, that the apoſtle is not writing to ſtrangers, but to acquaintance, diſciples, and converts.

16. Finally, an argument may be taken from the epiſtle to Philemon, an inhabitant of Coloſſe, ſent at the ſame time with this to the Coloſſians.

From ver. 19th of the epiſtle to Philemon, I ſuppoſe it to be evident, that he had been converted to Chriſtianity by St. Paul. Indeed this might be done at ſome other place. But it may as well have been done at home.

And St. Paul's acquaintance with Philemon, and the Chriſtians at Coloſſe, may be inferred from ſeveral things in that epiſtle. At ver. 2. he ſalutes Apphia by name, probably wife of Philemon: and Archippus, probably, paſtor at Coloſſe, at leaſt an elder in that church: who, as before obſerved, is alſo mentioned, Col. iv. 17. Once more, at ver. 22. St. Paul deſires Philemon, *to prepare him a lodging.* Whence I conclude, that Paul had been at Coloſſe before.

We might argue alſo from the characters of Philemon and Archippus, in the firſt two verſes of the ſame epiſtle. The former the apoſtle calls his *fellow-labourer*, and the other his *fellow-ſoldier.* Which expreſſions imply perſonal acquaintance, and that they had laboured with him in the ſervice of the goſpel in ſome place. And what place can be ſo likely as Coloſſe? There are many, of whom St. Paul ſpeaks in his epiſtles, as his *fellow-labourers*, or *fellow-helpers*, or *fellow-ſoldiers:* concerning whom it may be made to appear, that he and they had laboured together in ſome one place. And why then ſhould theſe two be exceptions? Yea, it may be reckoned not improbable, that Archippus had been ordained by St. Paul himſelf an elder at Coloſſe. Whether Philemon likewiſe was an elder there, I do not ſay: though he may have been ſo.

From all theſe conſiderations it appears to me very probable, that the church of Coloſſe had been planted by the apoſtle Paul, and that the Chriſtians there were his friends, diſciples, and converts. And if the Chriſtians at Coloſſe were his converts, it may be argued, that ſo likewiſe were the Chriſtians at Laodicea, and Hierapolis. None of which places were far aſunder.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

OF THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

I. *The Antiquity, and the Reaſon of that Denomination.* II. *Called alſo canonical.* III. *Concerning their Reception in ſeveral Ages.* IV. *Their Order.*

I. THERE are ſeven epiſtles, which we call catholic. The antiquity of this denomination may be made manifeſt from a few quotations. Euſebius having given an account of the death of James, called the Juſt, and our Lord's brother, concludes: 'Thus [a] far concerning this James, who is ſaid to be the author of the firſt of the epiſtles called catholic.' In another place he ſays, 'That [b] in his Inſtitutions Clement 'of Alexandria had given ſhort explications of all the cano-'nical ſcriptures, not omitting thoſe which are contradicted. 'I mean the epiſtle of Jude, and the other catholic epiſtles.' They were ſo called therefore in the time of Euſebius, and, probably, before. Of which likewiſe we have good proof. For St. John's firſt epiſtle is ſeveral times called a Catholic epiſtle by Origen [c] in his remaining Greek works, as well as in others. It is likewiſe [d] ſo called ſeveral times by Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria. Athanaſius, Epiphanius, and later Greek writers received ſeven epiſtles, which they called catholic. I only obſerve here farther, that they are ſo called likewiſe by [e] Jerom.

They are called catholic, or univerſal, or general, becauſe they are not written to the believers of ſome one city, or country, or to particular perſons, as St. Paul's epiſtles are, but

[a] Τσιαυτα και τα κατα τον ιακωβον, ὁ ἡ πρωτη των ονομαζομενων καθολικων επιστολων ειναι λεγεται. H. E. l. 2. c. 23. p. 66. D. [b] ——μη δε τας αντιλεγομενας παρελθων· την ιουδα λεγω, και τας λοιπας καθολικας επιστολας. Ib. l. 6. cap. 14. in. [c] See of this work, vol. II. p. 481.

——ὁ το ευαγγελιον το κατα ιωαννην επιγεγραμμενον, και ἡ επιστολη ἡ καθολικη. Ap. Euſeb. l. 7. cap. 25. p. 273. D. Vid. ib. p. 274. B. And in this work, vol. III. p. 105, 106. [e] Petrus——ſcripſit duas epiſtolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur. De V. I. cap. i.

Jacobus——unam tantum ſcripſit epiſtolam, quæ de ſeptem catholicis eſt. Ib. cap. 2.

Judas, frater Domini, parvam, quæ de ſeptem catholicis eſt, epiſtolam reliquit. Ib. cap. 4.

to Chriſtians in general, or to Chriſtians of ſeveral [f] countries. This is the caſe of five, or the greater part of them, with which the two others are joined. Moreover, when the firſt epiſtle of Peter, and the firſt of St. John, were called catholic by the moſt early chriſtian writers, the two ſmaller of St. John were unknown, or not generally received.

II. Theſe epiſtles are ſeveral times called canonical by [g] Caſſiodorius, about the middle of the ſixth century, and [h] by the writer of the prologue to theſe epiſtles, aſcribed to Jerom, though not his. The reaſon of which appellation is not certainly known. Nor is it eaſy to perceive the propriety of it. Du Pin ſays: 'Some [i] Latins have called theſe epiſtles cano-'nical, either confounding the name with catholic, or elſe to 'denote, that they alſo are a part of the canon of the books of 'the New Teſtament.'

III. Of theſe epiſtles two only, the firſt of St. Peter, and the firſt of St. John, were univerſally received in the time [k] of Euſebius. However, the reſt were then well known. In proof of which I ſhall allege one paſſage only from him. 'Here,' ſays he, 'it will be proper to enumerate in a ſummary way the 'books of the New Teſtament, which have been already men-'tioned. And in the firſt place are to be ranked the four ſa-'cred goſpels. Then the book of the Acts of the apoſtles. 'After that are to be reckoned the epiſtles of Paul. In the 'next place, that called the firſt epiſtle of John, and the firſt 'of Peter. After theſe is to be placed, if it be thought 'fit, the Revelation of John.——And among the contradicted, 'but yet well known to the moſt [or approved by many] are 'that called the epiſtle of James, and that of Jude, and the 'ſecond of Peter, and the ſecond and third of John.'

[f] Or, as Leontius expreſſeth it, 'They are called catholic, becauſe 'they are not written to one na-'tion, as Paul's epiſtles, but in ge-'neral to all.' See vol. V. p. 311.

[g] Octavus codex canonicas epiſtolas continet Apoſtolorum —— ſed cum de reliquis canonicis epiſtolis magna nos cogitatio fatigaret, ſubito nobis codex Didymi Græco ſtilo conſcriptus in expoſitionem ſeptem canonicarum epiſtolarum Domino largiente conceſſus eſt. De Inſtit. Div. Lit. cap. 8.

Vid. et Caſſiodorii Complexiones canonicarum epiſtolarum ſeptem.

[h] Prologus ſeptem Epiſtolarum Canonicarum. Ap. Hieron. tom. I. p. 1667.

[i] Diſſ. Prelim. I. 2. ch. 2. § ix.

[k] Vid. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 3. cap. 24. et cap. 25.

[l] —— αις εξης την φερομενην ιακωβου προτεραν, και ομοιως την πετρου κυριαν επιστολην —— των δε αντιλεγομενων φερομενων δ' ουν ομως τοις πολλοις η λεγομενη ιακωβου φερεται, και η ιουδα· ητε πετρου δευτερα επιστολη, και η ονομαζομενη δευτερα και τριτη ιωαννου. Ibid. c. 25. in. See alſo in this Work, vol. IV. p. 227.

And

And in the preceding volumes of this work we have obſerved all the ſeven to have been received by Athanaſius, Epiphanius, Jerom, Auguſtine, and many other writers. But the Syrian churches received [m] three only of theſe epiſtles. Nor does it appear, that more were received by [n] Chryſoſtom or [o] Theodoret. And Amphilochius, in his iambic poem, ſays, 'Of [p] the catholic epiſtles ſome receive ſeven, others three only.' However, as we proceed, we ſhall particularly conſider the claims of the diſputed epiſtles, under the names of thoſe to whom they are aſcribed.

IV. Before I conclude this introduction, I would take notice of the order of theſe epiſtles, becauſe there is ſome variety in ancient authors. In the paſſage, cited from Euſebius at the beginning of this chapter, he ſays, that the epiſtle of James was the firſt of thoſe called catholic. In the paſſage, ſince taken from him, where he mentions theſe epiſtles according to the degree of authority, which they had obtained, he firſt ſpeaks of the firſt epiſtle of John, and the firſt of Peter. Nevertheleſs when he comes to thoſe that were contradicted, the epiſtle of James is firſt named. This is the order in the feſtal epiſtle of Athanaſius: 'Seven [q] epiſtles of the apoſtles,' ſays he, 'called catholic: of James one, of Peter two, of John 'three, and after them, of Jude one.' Which is our preſent order. The ſame order is obſerved in the catalogue of Cyril, of Jeruſalem, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerom's letter to Paulinus, Euthalius, Gelaſius, biſhop of Rome, the Alexandrian manuſcript, the Stichometry of Nicephorus, patriarch of Conſtantinople, Leontius, J. Damaſcenus. The ſame order is in Bede's prologue to theſe epiſtles, largely tranſcribed by us [r] in its proper place: where he aſſigns reaſons of this order, and particularly, why the epiſtle of James was placed firſt. In other authors is a different order. By Rufinus [s] they are rehearſed in this manner: 'Two epiſtles of the apoſtle Peter, one of James, the brother 'of the Lord, and apoſtle, one of Jude, three of John: the 'Revelation of John.' One may be apt to think, that St. John's three epiſtles are here mentioned laſt, that they might not be ſeparated from the book of the Revelation. In the canon of the third council of Carthage, they ſtand in this order:

[m] See vol. IV. p. 439—441. and vol. V. p. 161 and 267—269.
[n] Vol. V. p. 127, 136—138.
[o] Vol. V. p. 195, 196.
[p] —— καθολικαι επιστολαι τινες μεν επτα φασιν, οι δε τρεις μονας. Amphil. p. 132. ver. 310, 311. And ſee vol. IV. p. 413, 414.
[q] Ib. p. 283.
[r] See vol. V. p. 313, 314.
[s] Ib. p. 76.

'Two [t] epistles of the apostle Peter, three of the apostle John, one of the apostle Jude, one of the apostle James.' In Augustine's work of the Christian Doctrine: 'Two [u] epistles of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James.' In the catalogue of pope Innocent: 'Three [x] epistles of John, two epistles of Peter, an epistle of Jude, an epistle of James.' In the commentary of Cassiodorius [y] upon these epistles they are in this order: 'Two epistles of Peter, three of John, of Jude one, of James one.'

CHAP XVI.

ST. JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER.

I. *His History from the N. T. whereby he appears to have been an apostle.* II. *His History from ancient Authors. A Passage from Eusebius concerning him, with Remarks, showing him to be the same, as James the Son of Alpheus.* III. *A Passage of Eusebius, containing two Quotations from Clement of Alexandria, mentioning his Appointment to be Bishop, or residing Apostle at Jerusalem, and the Manner of his Death.* IV. *A Passage of Origen, speaking of our Lord's Brethren, and the Death of James.* V. *A Chapter of Eusebius, containing Accounts of his Death from Hegesippus, and Josephus, with Remarks.* VI. *The Time of his Death.* VII. *How he was related to our Lord, and in what Respect he was his Brother.* VIII. *That he was an Apostle, and the Son of Alpheus.* IX. *Why called the Less.* X. *Surnamed the Just, and other Marks of Respect shown him.* XI. *A Review of what has been said.*

I. THERE is frequent mention of James in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. If he was an apostle, he must be James, the son of Alpheus, always distinctly named in the catalogues of the apostles [a] in the first three gospels, and in the first chapter of the Acts. For [b] there was but one other apostle of this name, James the brother of John, and son of Zebedee. However, the proofs of his being James the son of Alpheus are deferred for the present. I begin with writing the history of James, mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles.

St. Paul, reckoning up the several appearances of our Lord to the disciples after his resurrection, says, 1 Cor. xv. 5—8.

---

[t] p. 79. [u] p. 86. [x] p. 175. [y] p. 283.

[a] Matt. x. 3. Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13.

[b] Nulli dubium est, duos fuisse Apostolos Jacobi vocabulo nuncupatos: Jacobum Zebedæi, et Jacobum Alphæi. Hieron. adv. Helvid. T. IV. p. 137. fin.

That

that he was ſeen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that he was ſeen of above five hundred brethren at once: meaning, I ſuppoſe, at the place in Galilee, where he had appointed to meet the diſciples. *After that he was ſeen of James, then of all the apoſtles:* meaning, it is likely, when they were witneſſes of his aſcenſion. *And laſt of all he was ſeen of me alſo.*

By James muſt be here intended the ſame that is mentioned by St. Paul elſewhere. Moreover James, the ſon of Zebedee, had been dead a good while before writing this epiſtle to the Corinthians, in the year of Chriſt 56. It is likely, that St. Paul ſpeaks of him, who was ſtill living. And he here ſpeaks of a particular appearance of Chriſt to him.

We learn from Jerom, that in the goſpel according to the Hebrews there was an account of a particular appearance of our Lord to James, the Lord's brother, who, according to his computation, governed the church of Jeruſalem thirty years. It is to this purpoſe. '*Very*[c] *ſoon after the Lord was* '*riſen, he went to James, and ſhowed himſelf to him For James* '*had ſolemnly ſworn, that he would eat no bread from the time* '*that he had drunk the cup of the Lord, till he ſhould ſee him riſen* '*from among them that ſleep.* It is added a little after: *Bring,* 'ſaith the Lord, *a table and bread.* And lower: *He took bread,* '*and bleſſed, and brake it, and then gave it to James the Juſt,* '*and ſaid to him: my brother, eat thy bread For the ſon of man* '*is riſen from among them that ſleep.*'

I think this ſtory may be ſufficient to ſhow, that James, called the Juſt, and the Lord's brother, was in high eſteem with the Jewiſh believers, who uſed the goſpel above-mentioned. But ſome of the circumſtances of this account muſt needs be fabulous. Nor is there any reaſon to think that James, or any of the apoſtles, had a certain expectation of the Lord's riſing from the dead: nevertheleſs I ſhall mention a thought, to be conſidered by candid readers. Poſſibly this account is founded upon the hiſtory recorded in Luke xxiv.

[c] Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur ſecundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque ſermonem tranſlatum eſt, —— poſt reſurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem, cum dediſſet ſindonem ſervo Sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum, et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus, ſe non comeſturum panem ab illa hora, quâ biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum reſurgentem *a dormientibus.* Rurſuſque poſt paululum. *Afferte,* ait Dominus, *menſam et panem.* Statimque additur. *Tulit panem, et benedixit, ac fregit, et poſt dedit Jacobo Juſto, et dixit ei: Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia reſurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.* De V. I. cap. 2.

13—35. of the two disciples, to whom the Lord appeared on the day of his resurrection, *to whom he was known in breaking of bread.* One thing more may be concluded from this passage. They who used this gospel, thought James, the Lord's brother, to have been an apostle. For here is a reference to his partaking in the eucharist, appointed by our Lord: where none were present beside the twelve.

However, as I have proposed a conjecture concerning the history in Luke xxiv. it ought to be observed, that the two disciples, there mentioned, were not apostles. For at ver. 35. it is said, that when they were returned to Jerusalem, *they found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them.*

Upon that text of St. Paul Dr. Doddridge [d] mentions a conjecture, which had been communicated to him: that James had not seen our Lord after his resurrection, until the time there mentioned by St. Paul. 'That by sickness, or some other 'accident, James had been detained from meeting his brethren, 'both on the day of our Lord's resurrection, and that day 'sevennight, and likewise at the time, when Christ appeared to 'the five hundred. And that he might in this respect be 'upon the level with them, our Lord appeared to him alone, 'after all the appearances mentioned before.' But I take that conjecture to be without ground, as well as very improbable. St. Paul's words do not imply, that our Lord had not been seen by James before, but that this was a particular appearance to him alone, as [e] Augustine has observed. Who likewise adds very judiciously: 'Nor did Christ now first show himself to all the apostles.' Which agrees with Lightfoot's [f] interpretation of that text.

[d] See the Family-Expositor, vol. IV. p. 380.

[e] *Postea*, inquit, *apparuit Jacobo.* Non tunc autem primum accipere debemus visum esse Jacobo, sed aliqua propria manifestatione singulariter. *Deinde Apostolis omnibus:* nec illis tunc primum, sed jam ut familiarius conversaretur cum eis usque ad diem adscensionis suæ. Aug. de Consens. Evang. l. 3. cap. 25. num. 85. tom. III. P. 2.

[f] 'After the appearing to above 'five hundred brethren at once, 'which we suppose, and not without ground, to have been that 'last mentioned, the apostle relateth, that *he was seen of James,* '1 Cor. xv. 7. *and then of all the apostles.* Which does plainly rank 'this appearance to James between 'that to the five hundred brethren 'on the mountain in Galilee, and 'his coming to all the apostles, 'when they were come again to 'Jerusalem. Which James this was, 'Paul is silent of, as all the evangelists are of any such particular 'appearance. It is most likely, he 'means *James the less,* of whom he 'speaks often elsewhere.' Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 273.

I have

I have one thing more to add. It ſeems to me, that James, here ſpoken of, was an apoſtle. And it will afford a good argument, that James, ſometimes called by ancient chriſtian writers biſhop of Jeruſalem, was an apoſtle.

Gal. i. 18, 19. *Then after three years I went up to Jeruſalem, to ſee Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apoſtles ſaw I none, ſave James the Lord's brother.*

This text ſeems deciſive in favour of the apoſtleſhip of James. St. Luke ſpeaks of the ſame thing in this manner, Acts ix. 27. *Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apoſtles.* Comparing theſe two texts together, I conclude, that James now reſided at Jeruſalem, and acted there as preſident of that church. And I imagine, that Barnabas firſt brought Paul to James, and James brought him to Peter. Thus Paul had communion with all the apoſtles, though he ſaw and converſed with none of them, beſide James and Peter.

When St. Peter had been delivered out of priſon, in the reign of Herod Agrippa, about the time of paſſover, in the year 44, *he came to the houſe of Mary, where many were gathered together, praying. And when he had declared unto them, how the Lord had brought him out of priſon, he ſaid: go ſhow theſe things to James, and to the brethren.* Acts xii. 12—17. This alſo gives ground to think, that James now preſided in the church of Jeruſalem.

Before, Acts xi. 29, 30, it is ſaid: *then the diſciples at Antioch, 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.* Hence, ſome have concluded, that James was not now at Jeruſalem. But there is no reaſon for that ſuppoſition. For it would imply alſo, that none of the apoſtles were at Jeruſalem: whereas, probably, they were all there, or near it. We have proof from the next chapter, already cited, that James the ſon of Zebedee and Peter were there. For the former was beheaded, and Peter impriſoned at Jeruſalem by Herod Agrippa about this time. And when Peter had been brought out of priſon, he deſired his friends to inform James of it, as we have juſt ſeen. Therefore he certainly was then at Jeruſalem.

There are two ways of underſtanding that expreſſion. By elders may be meant elders in general, not excluding the apoſtles. So in the place of Paul, before cited: *after that he was ſeen of above five hundred brethren at once.* Where the apoſtles are not excluded, but included in the word brethren. For it

is reaſonable to think, that divers, yea moſt, if not all of the apoſtles, were preſent at that time. So here the apoſtles may be included in the general denomination of elders. Or by elders may be meant ſuch as are called elders by way of diſtinction from apoſtles, as in Acts xv. 4. 22. xxi. 18. who might be perſons, more eſpecially entruſted with the receiving, and the diſtributing ſuch contributions. Neither of theſe ſenſes oblige us to think, that James was not now at Jeruſalem.

When the controverſy about the manner of receiving the gentiles was brought before *the apoſtles and elders*, aſſembled in council at Jeruſalem; *after there had been much diſputing*, Peter ſpoke, and then Barnabas, and Paul. After all which, James ſpeaks laſt, ſums up the argument, and propoſeth the terms, upon which the Gentiles ſhould be received. To which the whole aſſembly agreed. And they ſent letters to the Gentiles in ſeveral places accordingly. Acts xv. 1—29. It is manifeſt, I think, that James preſided in this council. And it may be thence reckoned probable, that he was an apoſtle, as well as preſident of the church of Jeruſalem.

Chryſoſtom, in a homily upon the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, ſays: 'James [g] was biſhop of Jeruſalem, and therefore ſpoke laſt.' In the ſame place he juſtly applauds the propriety of his diſcourſe in the council.

St. Paul, in the ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the Galatians, giving an account of ſome things which happened, when he was that time at Jeruſalem, but are not mentioned in the book of the Acts, ſpeaks of James, Cephas, and John, as pillars: *who alſo gave to him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowſhip.* Thoſe expreſſions ſtrongly imply, that James was an apoſtle, and preſiding apoſtle in the church of Jeruſalem.

Jerom, in his book againſt Helvidius, allows, that [h] the texts, which I have already cited from the epiſtle to the Galatians, ſhow James, the Lord's brother, to have been an apoſtle.

Afterwards, in the ſame chapter, giving an account of what happened at Antioch: ver. 11, 12. he ſays, that *when Peter was come thither, he did eat with the gentiles, before that certain came from James: but when they were come, he withdrew, and ſeparated himſelf, fearing them of the circumciſion.* This, I

[g] Επισκοπος ην της εν ιεροσολυμοις εκκλησιας ουτος· δια υτερος λεγει. In Act. Ap. hom. 33. p. 253. T. IX.

[h] ——et frater Domini Apoſtolus ſit, Paulo dicente: *Deinde poſt triennium veni Jeruſalem, videre Petrum.* Gal. i. 18, 19. Et in eadem epiſtola: *Et cognitâ gratiâ, quæ data eſt mihi*——cap. ii. 9. Adv. Helvid. p. 138. in.

think,

think, implies, that James reſided at Jeruſalem, and preſided in that church, and that he was greatly reſpected by the Jewiſh believers there. Once more, Acts xxi. 17, 18. When Paul went up to Jeruſalem, about pentecoſt, in the year 58, the day after our arrival, ſays St. Luke, *Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were preſent*; and what follows. Here is another proof, that James reſided at Jeruſalem, and ſuperintended in that church. (A)

In what has been now alleged we have perceived evidences of James being related to our Lord, foraſmuch as he is called his brother, and that he was much at Jeruſalem, and preſided in that church, and that, probably, he was an apoſtle in the higheſt ſenſe of that word. We have alſo ſeen reaſon to think, that he was much reſpected by the Jewiſh believers. And, though we do not allow ourſelves to enlarge upon every thing, ſaid of him in the hiſtory of the council of Jeruſalem, and his reception of Paul, when he went up to Jeruſalem, and was impriſoned: yet I ſuppoſe, that every one may have diſcerned marks of an excellent character, and of his admirably uniting zeal and diſcretion, a love of truth and condeſcenſion to weak brethren. His epiſtle confirms that character. I think likewiſe, that the preſervation of his life, in ſuch a ſtation as his, to the time when he is mentioned laſt by St. Luke (which we ſuppoſe to have been about the time of pentecoſt, in the year of Chriſt 58) may induce us to believe, that he was careful to be inoffenſive in his behaviour toward the unbelieving part of the Jewiſh nation, and that he was had in reverence by many of them.

II. I ſhould now proceed to write the hiſtory of this perſon from ancient authors. But that is a difficult taſk, as I have found, after trying more than once, and at diſtant ſpaces of time. I ſhall therefore take divers paſſages of Euſebius, and others, and make ſuch reflections as offer, for finding out as much truth as we can.

Euſebius has a chapter [i] 'concerning our Saviour's diſciples.' Where he ſpeaks of all theſe following, as ſaid to be of the number of the ſeventy: Barnabas, Soſthenes, who joins with Paul in writing the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, Cephas,

(A) Dr. Whitby, in his preface to the epiſtle of St. James, has argued in a like manner that I have done, that he was an apoſtle in the ſtrict acceptation of the word. And to the ſame purpoſe alſo Cave at the beginning of his Life of St. James the Leſs, in Engliſh.

[i] Περι των μαθητων τε σωτηρος ημων. H. E. l. i. cap. 12. p. 30.

phas, whom Paul resisted at Antioch, of the same name with the apostle Peter, but different from him, Matthias, chosen in the room of Judas, and he who was put up with Matthias, and James, to whom Christ showed himself after his resurrection, as related by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7. 'He [k] likewise,' says Eusebius, 'was one of those called our Saviour's disciples, and 'one of his brethren.'

Upon this it is easy to observe, that beside the loose and inaccurate manner in which this chapter is written by our historian, here are, probably, several mistakes. Some things will be readily assented to, as not unlikely; that Matthias, and the other disciple put up with him, were of the seventy. But, omitting some other things, there is no good reason to say, that Cephas was different from Peter, or that Sosthenes was one of the seventy. If those things are wrong, there is the less reason to rely upon that account which places James, the Lord's brother, in the number only of his disciples, or of the seventy.

However, we here seem to discern the opinion of our Ecclesiastical Historian, that James, the Lord's brother, so often mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, was not one of Christ's apostles. And there we have also his interpretation of these words. 1 Cor. xv. 7. *then he was seen of all the apostles.* By [l] which he understands others, beside the twelve. And to the like purpose [m] Origen. And it was formerly shown at large in the chapter of Eusebius, that [n] he did not esteem this James an apostle in the highest acceptation of the word. It may be observed likewise, in the large account formerly given of Jerom's opinion concerning this James, that [o] he seems not to be quite free from hesitation. Sometimes he speaks of him as one of the twelve apostles, and sometimes not so. We have also seen reason to think, that [p] Cyril of Jerusalem did not reckon James, called bishop of Jerusalem, to have been one of the twelve apostles. Gregory Nyssen [q] likewise distinguishes James, the son of Alpheus, one of the twelve apostles, from James the Less, who was not of that

[k] Ἔπειτα δ' ὠφθαι αυτον ιακωβῳ φησιν· εις δε και ουτος των φερομενων τε σωτηρος· μαθητων, αλλα μην και αδελφων ην. Ib. p. 31. B.

[l] Εἰθ' ὡς παρα τουτοις κατα μιμησιν των δωδεκα πλειονων οσων υπαρξαντων αποστολων —— προσιθησι λεγων· επειτα ὠφθη τοις αποστολοις πασι. Ib. p. 31.

[m] See vol. II. p. 538. [n] Vol. IV. p. 252, 253. [o] Vol. V. p. 51—53. [p] Vol. IV. p. 302.

[q] De Christi Res. Or. 2. tom. III. p. 413. B. C.

number,

number. The ſame opinion appears in [r] the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions.

Tillemont ſays: 'The [s] Greek Chriſtians of our time 'diſtinguiſhed James the ſon of Alpheus, one of the twelve 'apoſtles, and James the Lord's brother, and biſhop of Je- 'ruſalem, as two different perſons: ſo making us entirely 'ignorant of the hiſtory of James, the ſon of Alpheus, and 'excluding the Lord's brother from the number of apoſtles. 'But the opinion of the Latins, who believe, that they are one 'and the ſame perſon, and the apoſtle, appears more conform- 'able to the ſcripture, and is ſupported by the authority of St. 'Paul in particlar, who gives to James the Lord's brother the 'title of apoſtle in the ſame manner that he gives it to Peter.' Gal. i. 19.

III. Euſebius has [t] another chapter, entitled, 'Of things conſtituted by the apoſtles after our Saviour's aſcenſion.' Which is to this purpoſe. 'The firſt is the choice of Matthias, 'one of Chriſt's diſciples, into the apoſtleſhip, in the room of 'Judas. Then the appointment of the ſeven deacons, one of 'whom was Stephen, who ſoon after his being ordained was 'ſtoned by thoſe who had killed the Lord, and was the firſt 'martyr for Chriſt. Then James, called the Lord's brother, 'becauſe he was the ſon of Joſeph——to whom the virgin 'Mary was eſpouſed. This James, called by the ancients the 'Juſt, on account of his eminent virtue, is ſaid to have been 'appointed the firſt biſhop of Jeruſalem. And Clement, in 'the ſixth book of his Inſtitutions, writes after this manner: 'That after our Lord's aſcenſion, Peter, and James, and John, 'though they had been favoured by the Lord above the reſt, 'did not contend for honour, but choſe James the Juſt to be 'biſhop of Jeruſalem. And in the ſeventh book of the ſame 'work he ſays, that after his reſurrection the Lord gave to 'James the Juſt and John and Peter the gift of knowledge. 'And they gave it to the other apoſtles. And the other 'apoſtles gave it to the ſeventy, one of whom was Barnabas. 'For there were two named James: one the Juſt, who was 'thrown down from the battlement of the temple, and killed 'by a fuller's ſtaff. The other is he, who was beheaded. Of 'him that was called the Juſt, Paul alſo makes mention, ſaying: 'other of the apoſtles ſaw I none, ſave James, the Lord's 'brother.'

[r] See vol. IV. p. 351. [s] S. Jacque le Mineur. Art. i. tom. I.
[t] H. E. l. 2. cap. i.

Upon

Upon what has been thus tranſcribed a few remarks may be properly made. In the former part of it Euſebius ſeems to declare it as his own opinion, that James, called the Lord's brother, was the ſon of Joſeph, that is, by a former wife.

For clearing up this paſſage, I would farther obſerve: I ſuppoſe, the whole of this quotation to be taken from Clement. Some may indeed at firſt be apt to think, that the ſecond paſſage of Clement concludes with the word Barnabas. But I rather think, that all which follows in this quotation is Clement's, and nothing of Euſebius. One reaſon of my thinking ſo is, that in the twenty-third chapter of the ſame book, where our Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian gives an account of the death of James from Hegeſippus, who relates, that James was thrown down from the temple, and killed by a fuller's ſtaff, he twice ſays, that is, at [u] the entering upon that account, and [x] at finiſhing it, that this was agreeable to what had been before alleged from Clement. The other reaſon is, that Euſebius ſeems not to have been ſo clear, that there were no more than two of this name, as is implied in this paſſage, particularly in the concluſion of it.

Upon theſe two paſſages cited by Euſebius from Clement, one from the ſixth, the other from the ſeventh book of his Inſtitutions we are led to obſerve, firſt, thar James, called the Juſt, is here ſuppoſed to be an apoſtle. Nor did Clement know of any more of the name James, in the New Teſtament, beſide James the ſon of Zebedee, and him called James the Juſt. Secondly, I obſerve, that James, called the Juſt, is ſuppoſed to have been appointed biſhop of Jeruſalem, by three apoſtles eſpecially, Peter, and the two ſons of Zebedee, and not by our Lord. And the order and coherence of things in this chapter of Euſebius ſeems to imply, that this was done ſoon after the martyrdom of Stephen.

Which appears to me agreeable to the hiſtory in the Acts, and the paſſages alleged thence at the beginning of this chapter. Peter always ſpeaks firſt, as preſident among the apoſtles, until after the choice of the ſeven deacons. Every thing ſaid of St. James after that implies his preſiding in the church of Jeruſalem. And when St. Paul mentions the three chiefs, who were pillars, Gal. ii. 9. with whom he conferred at Jeruſalem, he names James firſt. The reaſon of his doing ſo,

[u] Τον δε της τε ιακωβε τελευτης τροπον ηδη μεν προτερον αι παρατεθεισαι τε κλημεντος φωναι δεδηλωκασιν, απο τε πτερυγιε βεβλησθαι, ξυλω τε την προς θανατον πεπληχθαι αυτον ιστορηκοτος. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 63. C.

[x] Ταυτα δια πλατυς συνωδα τω κλημεντι και ο ηγησιππος. Ibid. p. 65. C.

I take

I take to be, that James then preſided in the church of Jeruſalem.

Tillemont [y] thinks, 'That Chriſt himſelf may have appointed James to be biſhop in that church: but the apoſtles deferred the declaring it ſolemnly, till the time of the perſecution, which broke out after the death of St. Stephen. Then they thought of providing more particularly for the church of Jeruſalem, whence, perhaps, they feared they ſhould be conſtrained to remove. This obliged them to appoint a proper paſtor, who ſhould be obliged to ſtay there till his death, and ſhould charge himſelf with every thing neceſſary for their welfare.'

To me it appears evident, that [z] the apoſtles did not now leave Jeruſalem, nor till a good while afterwards. But they were obliged to live privately. And the circumſtances of things made it prudent to appoint one of their number, who ſhould preſide in that church, and act in their name. Though they could not all appear in public, it was fit there ſhould be one at leaſt, to whom the faithful might apply at any time, in caſe of need. This choice, or appointment, is aſcribed by Clement to three of the apoſtles. But it might be done with the conſent and approbation of all.

As this epiſcopate, or ſuperintendence of James has been thus mentioned, I ſhall here obſerve what notice is taken of it by other ancient chriſtian writers.

Euſebius, in one place, ſays, that [a] James was appointed biſhop of Jeruſalem by the apoſtles: in another by [b] Chriſt and the apoſtles. So likewiſe in the [c] Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. Jerom in his Catologue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, ſays, 'that [d] James ſurnamed the Juſt, was ordained biſhop of Jeruſalem by the apoſtles, ſoon after the Lord's paſſion.' In his Commentary upon the epiſtle to the Galatians he ſpeaks, as [e] if the

[y] St. Jacque le Mineur. Art. iv. mem. tom. I

[z] See Acts. viii. 1.

[a] ——ω προς των αποστολων ο της επισκοπης της εν ιεροσολυμοις εγκεχειρισο θρονος. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. in. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 1. in. p. 38. B.

[b] Τον γαρ ιακωβον θρονον τε πρωτε της ιεροσολυμων εκκλησιας την επισκοπην προς τε σωτηρος και των αποστολων υποδεξαμενε. κ. λ. l. 7. c. 19. [c] Conſtit. l. 8. cap. 35. [d] Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Juſtus——poſt paſſionem Domini ſtatim ab Apoſtolis Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopus ordinatus. De V. I. cap. 2. [e] Nunc hoc ſufficiat, ut propter egregios mores, et incomparabilem fidem, ſapientiamque non mediam, frater dictus ſit Domini: et quod primus ei eccleſiæ præfuerit, quæ prima in Chriſtum

the Lord himſelf had given him this high truſt: meaning, perhaps, no more, than that Chriſt gave it him by the apoſtles: or that they in ſo doing had acted by divine inſpiration. Epiphanius [f] aſcribes this appointment to our Saviour himſelf, as do [g] Chryſoſtom, and [h] Œcumenius, and [i] Photius. The Latin author of a Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epiſtles, ſays, James [k] was appointed biſhop of Jeruſalem by the apoſtles. Nicephorus's account is, that [l] he was ſo appointed by our Saviour, or, as ſome ſaid, by the apoſtles alſo. I ſhall cite no more writers relating to this point, but proceed.

IV. I would now take a paſſage of Origen from the tenth tome of his commentaries upon St. Matthew, where he diſcourſeth upon Matt. xiii. 55, 56. *Is not this the carpenter's ſon? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joſes, and Simon, and Judas? And his ſiſters, are they not all with us?* 'They [m] thought, ſays Origen, that he was the ſon 'of Joſeph and Mary. 'The brethren of Jeſus, ſome ſay upon 'the ground of tradition, particularly what is ſaid in the goſ-'pel according to Peter, or the book of James, were the ſons 'of Joſeph by a former wife, who cohabited with him before 'Mary. They who ſay this, are deſirous to maintain the honour 'of Mary's virginity to the laſt: [or her perpetual virginity:] 'that the body choſen to fulfil what is ſaid: *the Holy Ghoſt ſhall 'come upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow 'thee*, Luke i. 55. might not know man after that. And I 'think it very reaſonable, that as Jeſus was the firſt-fruits of 'virginity among men, Mary ſhould be the ſame among women. 'For it would be very improper to give that honour to any, 'beſide her. This James is he, whom Paul mentions in his 'epiſtle to the Galatians, ſaying: *Other of the apoſtles ſaw I 'none, ſave James, the Lord's brother.* This James was in ſo 'great repute with the people for his virtue, that Joſephus, who 'wrote twenty books of the Jewiſh Antiquities, deſirous to 'aſſign the reaſon of their ſuffering ſuch things, ſo that even 'the temple was deſtroyed, ſays, that thoſe things were owing

Chriſtum credens ex Judæis fuerat congregata. Dicuntur quidem et cæteri Apoſtoli fratres Domini. Sed præcipue hic frater dicitur, cui filios matris ſuæ ad Patrem vadens Dominus commendaverat. In ep. ad Gal. cap. ii. 19.

[f] Hær. 78. num. vii. [g] Chr. in ep. 1. ad Cor. hom. 38. p. 355. tom. X. [h] Œc. ad Act. xv. 13. T. I. p. 122. [i] Phot. Ep. 117.

[k] Jacobum vidit Hieroſolymæ, quia illic erat conſtitutus ab Apoſtolis Epiſcopus. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. 19. [l] Niceph. l. 2. cap. 38.

[m] Origen. in Matt. T. X. p. 462, 463. T. III. Bened. p. 223. tom. I. Huet.

'to

'to the [n] anger of God for what they did to James the brother
'of Jeſus, called Chriſt. And it is wonderful, that he who did
'not believe our Jeſus to be the Chriſt, ſhould bear ſuch a
'teſtimony to James. He alſo ſays, that the people thought
'they ſuffered thoſe things upon account of James. Jude
'wrote an epiſtle, of few lines indeed, but filled with the
'powerful words of the heavenly grace, who ſays at the
'beginning: *Jude, a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and brother of James.*
'Of Joſes and Simon we know nothing.'

Origen, in [o] his books againſt Celſus, quotes Joſephus again, as ſpeaking of James to the like purpoſe. But there are not now any ſuch paſſages in Joſephus: though they are quoted as from him, by [p] Euſebius alſo. But he does not ſay, whether from his Jewiſh War, or from his Antiquities, or in what book of either, as he ſometimes does, when he quotes Joſephus. Jerom has twice quoted Joſephus for theſe things: firſt in his [q] article of St. James, and then in that [r] of Joſephus himſelf: but not much more expreſsly than Euſebius.

Upon the long paſſage of Origen, juſt tranſcribed, I would obſerve as follows.

It is ſtrange, that Origen ſhould take ſuch particular notice of the epiſtle of St. Jude, and ſay nothing of the epiſtle of James, whoſe hiſtory he was writing, when it was not unknown to him. It may be ſuſpected, that a paragraph has been loſt, and dropt out of the Commentary in this place. It is alſo ſtrange, that he ſhould ſay, he knew nothing of Simon: when it is probable, that he likewiſe was one of Chriſt's apoſtles, called *Simon the Canaanite* by Matthew, ch. x. 4. and Mark iii. 18. *Simon Zelotes* by Luke vi. 15. and Acts i. 13.

From what Origen ſays of the death of James it may be concluded, that in his time Chriſtians were perſuaded, that

[n] —— ειρηκεναι, κατα μηνιν θεϋ ταυτα αυτοις απηντηκεναι, δια τα εις ιακωβον τον αδελφον ιησϋ τϋ λεγομενϋ χριϛϋ, υπ' αυτων τετολμημενα. Και το θαυμαστον εϛιν, οτι τον ιησϋν ημων ϗ καταδεξαμενος ειναι χριϛον, ϗδε ηττον ιακωβϋ δικαιοσυνην εμαρτυρησε τοσαυτην. Λεγει δε, οτι και ο λαος ταυτα ενομιζε δια τον ιακωβον πεπονθεναι —— Περι δε ιωσηπϋ, και σιμωνος ϗδεν ιϛορησαμεν. Ib. p. 463. Bened. p. 223. Huet.

[o] Contra Celſ. l. i. p. 35. et l. 2. p. 69. Cantab. l. i. cap. 48. et l. 2. cap. 13. Bened. [p] H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 65. C. D.

[q] Tradit idem Joſephus, tantæ eum ſanctitatis fuiſſe, et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditum ſit, ſubverſam eſſe Hieroſolymam. Hier. De Vir. Ill. cap. 2.

[r] Hic confitetur —— et propter interfectionem Jacobi Apoſtoli dirutam Hieroſolymam. Ib. cap. 13.

James

James had died a martyr for Christ, and had been killed by the Jews, notwithstanding his eminent virtue. Though the passages, to which Origen refers, are not now in Josephus, and though it should be supposed, that there was some inaccuracy in Origen's quotations of him, or references to him; I think it must be allowed, that Christians had in his time a tradition concerning the death of James, and that it happened in circumstances very dishonourable to those who were the authors of it: insomuch that many were disposed to think, it was one of those things, for which God was much offended with the Jewish people. Moreover we have already observed a brief account of the death, or martyrdom of James in Clement, older than Origen, though in part cotemporary with him.

All farther notice of that passage of Origen is deferred, till we come to consider, how James was related to our Lord.

V. As the death of James has been mentioned, I shall now immediately take the accounts of it, which are in Eusebius. And I will transcribe a large part of the twenty-third chapter of the second book of his Ecclesiastical History.

'But when Paul had appealed to Cæsar, and Festus had 'sent him to Rome, the Jews being disappointed in their 'design against him, turned their rage against James the 'Lord's brother, to whom the apostles had assigned the 'episcopal chair of Jerusalem. And in this manner they 'proceeded against him. Having laid hold of him, they 'required him in the presence of all the people to renounce 'his faith in Christ. But he with freedom and boldness be-'yond expectation, before all the multitude, declared our 'Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God. 'They not enduring the testimony of a man, who was in 'high esteem for his piety, laid hold of the opportunity, 'when the country was without a governor to put him to 'death. For Festus having died about that time in Judea, 'the province had in it no procurator. The manner of the 'death of James was shown before in the words of Clement, 'who said, that he was thrown off from the battlement of 'the temple, and then beat to death with a club. But no 'one has so accurately related this transaction, as Hegesip-'pus, a man in the first succession of the apostles, in the 'fifth book of his Commentaries, whose words are to this 'purpose:

'purpoſe: "James,[s] the brother of our Lord, undertook to-
'gether with the apoſtles the government of the church.
'He has been called the Juſt by all from the time of our
'Saviour to ours. For many have been named James. But
'he was holy from his mother's womb. He drank neither
'wine, nor ſtrong drink, nor did he eat any animal food.
'There never came razor upon his head. He neither
'anointed himſelf with oil, nor did he uſe a bath. To him
'alone was it lawful to enter the holy place. He wore no
'woollen, but only linen garments. He entered into the
'temple alone, where he prayed upon his knees. Inſomuch
'that his knees were become like the knees of a camel, by
'means of his being continually upon them, worſhipping
'God, and praying for the forgiveneſs of the people.

'Upon account of his virtue he was called the Juſt, and
'Oblias, that is, the defence of the people, and righteouſ-
'neſs. Some therefore of the ſeven ſects, which there were
'among the Jews, of whom I ſpake in the former part of
'theſe commentaries, aſked him, (B) which is the gate of
'Jeſus: or, what is the gate of ſalvation. And he ſaid,
'Jeſus is the Saviour, or the way of ſalvation. Some of
'them therefore believed, that Jeſus is the Chriſt.——And
'many of the chief men alſo believing, there was a diſturb-

[s] Διαδεχεται δε την εκκλησιαν μετα των αποστολων ο αδελφος τε κυριε ιακωβος. κ. λ. p. 603. C. D.

(B) —— επυνθανοντο αυτε, τις η θυρα τε ιησε; και ελεγε τετον ειναι τον σωτηρα. Le Clerc, in his obſervations upon this paſſage of Hegeſippus, ſays, he does not underſtand thoſe words, *what is the gate of Jeſus.* And, perhaps, the place has been corrupted. Τις η θυρα τε ιησε; quod quid ſibi velit, non intelligo. Sed forte locus eſt corruptus. H. E. p. 416. Ann. lxii. Mr. Moſheim thinks, with great probability, that the queſtion put to James was, 'What is the gate, 'or way of ſalvation? Tell us, how 'we may obtain eternal life.' James anſwered, 'The gate of ſalvation 'is our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.' Vitium vero ejus non in vocabulo θυρα, ſed potius in nomine ιησε quæri debere cenſeo. Judæi, quod manifeſtum eſt, ſciſcitantur ſententiam Jacobi de via ſeu de oſtio ſalutis, id eſt, de vera ratione ad ſalutem æternam perveniendi. Nullus ergo dubito, quin patrio ſermone, quo utebantur, vocabulum Jeſchuah adhibuerint, atque ex Jacobo quæſiverint: dic, rogamus, nobis quodnam tibi videatur eſſe ſalutis oſtium.—— Græcus quæſtionis hujus interpres vero, aut ſermonis non nimis gnarus, aut minus attentus, nomen proprium Servatoris noſtri, Jeſus, cernere ſe putabat, et perperam idcirco, quum σωτηρια ponendum ipſi fuiſſet: Τις η θυρα της σωτηριας; vocabulum ιησε ſcribebat: Τις η θυρα ιησε; Ita ſi Judæorum quæſtio intelligatur, nihil fieri aptius poteſt reſponſione Jacobi: *Oſtium ſalutis eſt Servator noſter, Jeſus Chriſtus.* Moſhem. De Reb. Chriſtianor. ante Conſtantin. Sec. prim. num. 23. p. 95.

'ance among the Jews, and among the scribes and pharisees, who said, there was danger, lest all the people should think Jesus to be the Christ. Coming therefore to James, they said, we beseech thee to restrain the error of the people. We entreat thee to persuade all that come hither at the time of passover to think rightly concerning Jesus. For all the people, and all of us put confidence in thee. ——Stand therefore upon the battlement of the temple, that being placed on high, thou mayest be conspicuous, and thy words may be easily heard by all the people. For because of the passover, all the tribes be come hither, and many gentiles. Therefore the scribes and pharisees, before named, placed James upon the battlement of the temple, and cried out to him, and said, O Justus, whom we ought all to believe, since the people are in an error, following Jesus who was crucified, tell us (c) what is the gate of Jesus. And he answered with a loud voice, why do you ask me concerning the son of man: he even sitteth in the heaven, at the right hand of the great power, and will come in the clouds of heaven. And many were fully satisfied, and well pleased with the testimony of James, saying, hosanna to the son of David. But the same scribes and pharisees said to one another, we have done wrong in procuring such a testimony to Jesus. Let us go up, and throw him down, that the people may be terrified from giving credit to him.——And they went up presently, and cast him down, and said, let us stone James the Just. And they began to stone him, because he was not killed with the fall. But he turning himself kneeled, saying, I entreat thee, O Lord God the Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do. As they were stoning him, one said, give over. What do ye? The just man prays for you. And one of them, a fuller, took a pole, which was used to beat cloths with, and struck him on the head. Thus his martyrdom was completed. And they buried him in that place, and his monument still remains near the temple. This James was a true witness to Jews and Gentiles, that Jesus is the Christ. And soon after Judea was invaded by Vespasian, and the people were carried

(c) See before, note (B).

ι Και λαβων τις απ' αυτων εις των γναφεων το ξυλον εν ω απεπιεζε τα ιματια, πεγκε κατα της κεφαλης τε δικαιε. Ib. p. 65. B.

'captive.'

'captive.' "So writes Hegesippus at large, agreeably to 'Clement. For certain, James was an excellent man, and 'much esteemed by many for his virtue: insomuch that the 'most thoughtful men among the Jews were of opinion, 'that his death was the cause of the siege of Jerusalem, 'which followed soon after his martyrdom: and that it 'was owing to nothing else, but the wickedness committed 'against him. And [u] Josephus says the same in these words:" 'These things befel the Jews in vindication of James the 'Just, who was brother of Jesus, called the Christ. For 'the Jews killed him, who was a most righteous man.' "The same historian, in the twentieth book of his anti-'quities, relates his death in this manner." 'The emperor 'being informed of the death of Festus, sent Albinus to be 'prefect in Judea. But the younger Ananus, who, as we 'said before, was made high priest, was haughty in his 'behaviour, and very enterprizing. And moreover he was 'of the sect of the sadducees, who, as we have also observed 'before, are above all other Jews severe 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. 'But the most moderate men of the city, who also were 'reckoned most skilful in the laws, were offended at this 'proceeding. They therefore sent privately to the king '[Agrippa the younger] entreating him to send orders to 'Ananus, no more to attempt any such things. And some 'went away to meet Albinus, who was coming from 'Alexandria, and put him in mind, that Ananus had no 'right to call a council without his leave. Albinus approv-'ing 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.' "These are the things which are related of 'James, whose is the first of the epistles called catholic."

[u] Ὁ γȣν ιωσηπος ȣκ απωκνησε και τȣτ' εγγραφως επιμαρτυρεσθαι, δι' ων φησι λεξεων· Ταυτα δε συμβεβηκεν ιȣδαιοις, κατ' εκδικησιν ιακωβȣ τȣ δικαιȣ, ος ην αδελφος ιησȣ τȣ λεγομενȣ χριςȣ· επειδηπερ δικαιοτατον αυτον οντα οι ιȣδαιοι απεκτειναν. Ib. p. 65. D.

 Thus

Thus I have given a literal verſion of almoſt the whole of this chapter, being deſirous, that my readers ſhould ſee the accounts, which ancient writers have given of James: though they are not altogether ſo credible, nor ſo entertaining, as might have been wiſhed. Nor do they any where lie in better order than here. And therefore I have choſen this chapter. The ſame things are tranſcribed by Jerom from Euſebius in his chapter of James the Juſt, in his catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers: but very inaccurately, blending together Hegeſippus, and Clement, and Joſephus: ſo that, without comparing Euſebius, it could not be known what belongs to one, and what to the other. For which, I think, he deſerves to be cenſured. Nor could I paſs it by without notice, as an uſe may be made of it. For it may induce us to ſuſpect, that to ſuch careleſſneſs and inaccuracy of quotation we owe thoſe paſſages of Joſephus, in which he is ſaid to have aſſigned the death of James, as the ſole cauſe of the ruin of the Jewiſh people.

And now I proceed to make ſome remarks upon the chapter of Euſebius, and the paſſages therein quoted by him.

1. In the firſt place, it appears from Euſebius's introduction, at the beginning of the chapter, that he ſuppoſed the martyrdom of St. James to have happened at a time, when there was no Roman governor in Judea, after the death of Feſtus, and before the arrival of Albinus in the province. What reaſon he had for this, we do not certainly know. We do not obſerve any notice of that circumſtance in what he has tranſcribed from Hegeſippus. It is indeed expreſsly ſaid in the paſſage of Joſephus. But if that paſſage be the only foundation for the opinion, its authority may be queſtioned. For divers learned men have ſuſpected the genuineneſs of that part of the paſſage, which ſpeaks of the death of James. As will be ſhown more particularly by and by.

2. Upon the firſt quotation, which is from Hegeſippus, it is eaſy for any one to obſerve, that [x] there are in it many things very unlikely: as [y] that James ſhould live in the manner

[x] Ex Jacobus Juſtus, eccleſiæ Hieroſolymitanæ antiſtes, quem miſere trucidarunt. Quod ipſe Joſephus paucis, copioſius Hegeſippus apud Euſebium memoriæ prodidit: quamquam in narratione hujus multa ſunt, quibus nemo, niſi rerum veterum, et Chriſtianarum et Judaicarum, prorſus ignarus, fidem habeat. Moſhem. De Reb. Chriſtian. ante Conſtantin. Sec. i. § xxiii. p. 93.

[y] *Hic ab altero*

manner here repreſented, and particularly, that he ſhould eat no animal food: that he had a right to enter into the holy place when he pleaſed, whether thereby be underſtood the holy of holies, or only the temple: that the ſcribes and phariſees ſhould place him on a pinnacle, or battlement of the temple, to deliver his opinion to the people concerning Jeſus: that they ſhould throw him down thence, and kill him in the temple, or any of the courts of it: that they ſhould bury him near the place, in which he is here ſaid to have been killed: when the Jews, and all other people in thoſe times, uſually buried their dead without the walls of their cities: and, finally, that he ſhould have a monument, or pillar over him, near the place where he was buried, which remained to the time of Hegeſippus, after the war was over, and the city of Jeruſalem, and the temple had been overthrown. Concerning which laſt particular, Jerom in the catalogue above-mentioned, ſays, 'He [z] was buried 'near the temple, where he had been thrown down. He 'had a conſpicuous monument, till the ſiege of Titus, and 'that ſince by Adrian. Some of our people have thought, 'that he was buried on mount Olivet. But that is a miſ-'taken opinion.' So that even in Judea there were different opinions concerning the place, where James was buried. Nevertheleſs I preſume, all were perſuaded, that he had ſuffered martyrdom from the Jews at Jeruſalem. There was no different ſentiment about that.

However, this difference of opinion concerning the place where St. James was buried, deſerves our notice. For it may lead us to ſuſpect ſome miſtake in the account of Hegeſippus. Poſſibly, St James was buried in mount Olivet:

utero matris ſanctus fuit: nazireatûs, nempe, voto Deo conſecratus, ut ſequentia oſtendunt. Nec fieri hoc potuiſſe negârim. *Nec vinum unquam bibit, nec ſiceram.* Ita debuit, ſi Naziræus fuit. *Ab animantium carnibus abſtinuit.* Hoc vero Pythagoricum et ſuperſtitioſum fuit inſtitutum, de quo nihil in Moſaica Lege, et cujus reum fuiſſe Jacobum, etiam poſtquam Chriſtianus factus eſt, vix credibile ſit. *Comam nunquam tetondit.* Recte, atque ordine. Sic enim Lex jubet. Num. vi. 3—5. *Neque ungi, neque lavare balneo corpus unquam ſolitus.* Non tantum præter, ſed et contra Legem hoc fuit, quâ multæ ablutiones Judæis impoſitæ. Nec certe ſordes quæſitæ quidquam ad ſanctitatem faciunt. Cleric. Hiſt. Ec. Ann. lxii. not. (2). p. 415.

[z] ——et juxta templum, ubi et præcipitatus fuerat, ſepultus eſt. Titulum uſque ad obſidionem Titi, et ultimam Hadriani notiſſimum habuit. Quidam e noſtris in monte Oliveti eum putaverunt conditum, ſed falſa eorum opinio eſt. De V. I. cap. 2.

though there was a pillar erected near the place, where he was killed. I think this may be of uſe to remove ſome difficulties in the account of Hegeſippus. The pillar, which he ſaw, might be erected after the ſiege of Jeruſalem, by ſome, who remembred the place where St. James had been killed. And ſome from that monument might conclude, he had been buried there, though really he was not.

I have made ſome remarks upon the paſſage of Hegeſippus. A fuller critique may be ſeen in other [a] writers: partly aggravating the improbabilities of this account, partly ſoftening them, and ſtriving to remove difficulties. Accordingly Petavius ſays, 'that [b] though there are in it ſeveral things very unlikely, yet the whole hiſtory ought not therefore to be rejected.' To whom I am not unwilling to accede. But as I have not room to enlarge upon particulars, for ſhowing the reaſonableneſs of that judgment; I muſt be content with recommending a careful and impartial attention to the obſervations of the writers to whom I have referred. However, I may by and by have an opportunity to mention a few thoughts, beſide what I have already ſaid, for removing difficulties, and anſwering objections.

3. Euſebius ſays, 'that many thoughtful men among the Jews were of opinion, that the death of James was the cauſe of the ſiege of Jeruſalem, and that it was owing to nothing elſe but the wickedneſs committed againſt him, and that Joſephus ſays the ſame.'

Origen ſpeaks to the like purpoſe, as we have ſeen: but not quite ſo ſtrongly. The ſame is ſaid by Jerom more than once. I mean [c] in his book of Illuſtrious Men, and [d] alſo elſewhere. But neither he, nor Euſebius expreſsly ſay, in what place of Joſephus. Which may make us think, that they borrowed this from Origen. Nor does Origen inform

[a] Vid. Joſeph. Scaliger. Animadverſ. in Euſeb. Chron. p. 193, 194. J. Cleric. Hiſt. Ec. A. D. lxii. Petav. Animadverſ. ad Epiphan. Hær. lxxviii. Valeſ. Annot. in Euſeb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. et Tillemont S. Jacque le Mineur. Mem. Ec. tom. I. Baſnag. Ann. 33. num. 184. &c. [b] Nec diffiteor nonnulla vel ab Hegeſippo prodita, vel ab aliis inſerta, quæ parum probabilia videantur. Sed totam ipſam Hiſtoriam nego propterea damnandam eſſe. Petav. Animadv. ad Epiph. H. 78. n. iii. p. 332.

[c] Tradit enim Joſephus, tantæ eum ſanctitatis fuiſſe et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditum ſit, ſubverſam Hieroſolymam. De V. I. cap. 2. Vid. et cap. 13. [d] Tranſeamus ad Jacobum, qui frater Domini dicebatur, tantæ ſanctitatis, tantæque juſtitiæ, et perpetuæ virginitatis, ut

form us, in what work of Joſephus thoſe things were ſaid, though he has mentioned them ſeveral times. Which may diſpoſe us to think, that they were no where expreſsly in Joſephus.

4. Euſebius proceeds, and ſays, that in the twentieth book of his Antiquities Joſephus had related the death of James in a paſſage, which he there tranſcribes. Which paſſage is ſtill in the works of Joſephus. And what is there ſaid, may be very true, for the moſt part: 'that [e] Ananus the younger, being high-prieſt, and a man of an haughty and enterprizing temper, when there was no Roman governor in Judea, convened a council, and had ſome ſtoned to death, as tranſgreſſors of the laws: and that many of the moſt diſcreet and moderate men among the Jews were offended at this proceeding: foraſmuch as whilſt Judea was in the ſtate of a province, the high-prieſt had no right to call the council together, without leave, and they feared, that this action would be reſented by the emperor.' All this, I ſay, is very likely. Nevertheleſs thoſe words, *James, the brother of him who is called Chriſt*, have been ſuſpected to be an interpolation. And, probably, [f] are ſo. Suppoſing [g] thoſe words to be an interpolation, we can gather no more from that paſſage, than that Ananus did illegally condemn ſeveral perſons to death, as tranſgreſſors of the Jewiſh laws. But who they were, or whether any of them were Chriſtians, or not, cannot be determined with certainty.

5. Euſebius ſuppoſeth, that this paſſage of Joſephus confirms the account given by Hegeſippus: whereas [h] it appears,

ut Joſephus quoque hiſtoricus Judæorum propter hujus necem Jeroſolymam ſubverſam referat. Hic primus Epiſcopus ex Judæis Jeroſolymæ credentis eccleſiæ. Adv. Jovin. l. 1. T. IV. P. 2. p. 182. in.

[e] Facile quidem crediderim Jeroſolymitanos proceres graviter tuliſſe, quod ſynedrium ſuâ auctoritate inſtituiſſet, cum dudum jus gladii a Romanis Judæis eſſet ereptum: quod iterum inconſulto Cæſare ab Anano uſurpatum timebant, ne genti ſuæ gravi fortaſſe pœna luendum eſſet. Sed quæ de *Jacobo, Jeſu, qui Chriſtus dicebatur, fratre*, habentur, merum adſumentum male feriati Chriſtiani eſſe videntur. Qua de re alibi diximus. Cleric. ubi ſupr. § ii. p. 415. Conf. ejuſd. Ars Crit. part III. ſect. i. cap. 14. num xi.

[f] See vol. I. p. 80, 81. See here likewiſe, note *(e)*.

[g] See Dr. Benſon's Hiſtory of St. James, ſect. ii. p. 12. the ſecond edition.

[h] Quid magis contrarium eſſe poteſt, quam hæc Joſephi, et illa Hegeſippi narratio? Nam Joſephus quidem damnatum eſſe ſcribit in *publico* Judæorum concilio: Hegeſippus vero, per ſeditionem ac tumultum populi occiſum. Et Hegeſippus quidem fuſte fullonis necatum in

pears, on the other hand, very difficult to reconcile them, I do not perceive Hegeſippus to ſay any thing of Ananus, the high-prieſt. Nor has he expreſsly mentioned the ſadducees, of which ſect Ananus was. Nor does Hegeſippus ſay a word of the council of the Jews. And as the puniſhment of ſtoning, when ordered by magiſtrates, was generally inflicted on men out of the city; it is probable, that they who were put to death by the procurement of Ananus, ſuffered without Jeruſalem. But according to Hegeſippus, James died at the temple or near it, and was buried not far off from the place, where he expired.

6. Since what is ſaid of James in the paſſage of Joſephus, is juſtly ſuſpected to be an interpolation, it ought not to be regarded. Learned men of late times find [i] it very difficult to determine, how James died. But that difficulty, as ſeems to me, is much encreaſed by paying too much regard to a paſſage, the genuineneſs of which is far from being certain. Joſephus, indeed, is an older author than Hegeſippus, and he is an hiſtorian of good credit. But we ſhould be firſt aſſured, that the account is his. If a paſſage, or part of a paſſage, has been inſerted in his works, and there is good reaſon to think it not his; it ſhould be diſregarded, and ſtand for nothing.

If we once ſet aſide that paſſage, we may ſoon come to a determination concerning the manner of James's death. That James had ſuffered martyrdom at Jeruſalem, was the general perſuaſion of Chriſtians in the time of Euſebius, and before, as we plainly perceive. Two ancient chriſtian writers of the ſecond century aſſure us, that his death was completed by the blow of a fuller's pole, with which they are wont to beat wet clothes. And Hegeſippus, in particular, and at large, relates that his death was effected in a tumultuous manner. The tumult began at the temple; where the ſcribes and phariſees, and other Jews, entered into diſcourſe with James. He ſtand-

media urbe. Joſephus autem lapidatum occubuiſſe narrat. Fiebat autem lapidatio extra portas civitatis, ut notum eſt. Valeſ. Annot. ad Euſeb. l. 2. cap 23. p. 41.

Secundo, qui fidem habent narrationi Hegeſippi, eos oportet, aut Joſephum falſi arguere, aut ſuſpectum habere hunc locum, quo res publice Jeroſolymæ geſta, adeoque notiſſima, aliter narratur: ut mirari ſubeat, ab Euſebio Joſephi et Hegeſippi verba allata, eodem capite, nec eum tentaſſe ea in concordiam redigere, aut alterutrius narrationis fidem in dubium non revocaſſe. Cleric. Ars Crit. P. III. ſect. i. n. xii.

[i] Poteſt tamen fieri, ut Jacobus hoc tempore mortuus ſit. Sed genus mortis ignotum. Cleric. H. E. Ann. lxii. num. iii. in.

ing

ing upon ſome eminence, which Hegeſippus calls πτερυγιον, and we now generally render a battlement, or pinnacle, openly declared, and argued, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, or the expected Meſſiah, and that his doctrine contained full inſtruction how men may be ſaved, and obtain eternal life. At which ſome leading men among the Jews were much offended. They then laid hold of him, and perhaps dragged him out of the temple. Some of the people threw ſtones at him. And though he earneſtly prayed to God in the behalf of thoſe who abuſed him, they perſiſted in their abuſes, till one ſtruck him with a long pole, which put an end to his life.

St. John has recorded two inſtances of the Jews taking up ſtones to throw at our Lord, when he was teaching in the temple. ch. viii. 59, and ch. x. 31. The firſt is in theſe words: *Then took they up ſtones to caſt at him. But Jeſus hid himſelf, and went out of the temple, going through the midſt of them, and ſo paſſed by. They took up ſtones to caſt at him.* And if our Lord had not ſaved himſelf by a miraculous exertion of power, they would have then killed him. Divine providence not interpoſing in a like manner, when a like attempt was made upon James, he fell a ſacrifice to the rage of the unbelieving part of the Jewiſh people at Jeruſalem.

Nor ought it to be thought exceeding ſtrange, or abſolutely unaccountable, that ſome ſcribes and phariſees, or other Jews, ſhould gather about James at the temple, and aſk his opinion concerning Jeſus, though they knew it very well already: or that they ſhould come to him with pretences of great reſpect, and aſſurances of paying a regard to his judgment. For many like things are recorded in the goſpels: which every one is able to recollect. I ſhall therefore take particular notice only of that ſecond inſtance, mentioned by St. John, of their taking up ſtones to throw at our Lord. John x. 22—31. *And it was at Jeruſalem, the feaſt of the dedication*——And *Jeſus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and ſaid unto him: How long doſt thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witneſs of me.*——*Then the Jews took up ſtones again to ſtone him.* They came to Jeſus, and deſired an anſwer to a queſtion, that had been anſwered before. But they pretend now to deſire, it ſhould be anſwered in the plaineſt and fulleſt manner. Nevertheleſs they could not hear the anſwer with patience.

I ſaid

I ſaid juſt now, that two ancient writers of the ſecond century, Clement and Hegeſippus, aſſure us, that the death of James had been completed by a fuller's pole, after he had been thrown off from the temple. I ſuppoſe this muſt have been the opinion alſo of Euſebius, who has taken notice of theſe things, and of other ancient Chriſtians. It is the account which [k] Jerom gives of the death of James, in his article, in the book of Illuſtrious Men, and likewiſe [l] elſewhere. The ſame is ſaid by [n] Epiphanius.

Let this ſuffice for the circumſtances and the manner of the death of James.

VI. The time of the death of James may be determined without much difficulty. He was alive, when Paul came to Jeruſalem at the Pentecoſt in the year of Chriſt 58. And it is likely, that he was dead, when St. Paul wrote the epiſtle to the Hebrews, at the beginning of the year 63. Theodoret [n] upon Hebr. xiii. 7. ſuppoſeth the apoſtle there to refer to the martyrdoms of Stephen, James, the brother of John, and James the Juſt. According to Hegeſippus the death of James happened about the time of paſſover, which might be that of the year 62. And if Feſtus was then dead, and Albinus not arrived, the province was without a governor. Such a ſeaſon left the Jews at liberty to gratify their licentious, and turbulent diſpoſition. And they were very likely to embrace it. We may therefore very reaſonably place this event at that juncture.

And it is now the general opinion of learned men, that James died about that time. Pearſon, [o] who ſeems to admit the genuineneſs of the whole paſſage of Joſephus, placeth the death of James in the year 62. Him Mill [p] follows. Le Clerc, who diſputes the genuineneſs of thoſe words, that relate to James, allows, that [q] he might die about that time. This alſo is agreeable to Tillemont's [r] computation. And I refer to [s] Valeſius.

[k] Qui cum præcipitatus de pinna templi, confractis cruribus, adhuc ſemivivus —— fullonis fuſte, quo uda veſtimenta extorqueri ſolent, in cerebro percuſſus interiit. De V. I. cap. 2. [l] Hic autem Jacobus Epiſcopus Jeroſolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Juſtus: Qui et ipſe poſtea de templo a Judæis præcipitatus, ſucceſſorem habuit Simonem, &c. Comm. in ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 237.

[m] Hær. 78. num. xiv. p. 1046.

[n] Theod. tom. III. p. 459.

[o] Ann. Paulin. p. 19. A. Chr. lxii.

[p] Prolegom. num. 56.

[q] H. E. An. 62. num. iii.

[r] S. Jacque le Mineur. art. vii. in.

[s] Valeſ. Annot. ad Eubſeb. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 41.

VII. It

VII. It ſtill remains, that we conſider, on what account he was called the Lord's brother, and whether he be the ſame as James the ſon of Alpheus.

James, as we have ſeen, is called by St. Paul *the Lord's brother*. Gal. i. 19. All Chriſtian writers in general ſpeak of him in the like manner. The queſtion is, in what ſenſe he was ſo.

That James was not the ſon of Mary, or our Lord's brother by nature, has been well argued by Chriſtians in former times, both [t] Latins, and [u] Greeks, from our Lord's words upon the croſs, recorded John xix. 26, 27. where he recommends the care of his mother to John: requiring her to conſider him, as her ſon, and him to take care of her, as his mother.

And indeed it has been the opinion of all Chriſtians in general, that Mary was always a virgin, and that ſhe never had any children by Joſeph. We muſt therefore inquire, in what reſpect this James was our Lord's brother, and ſome others his brothers, or ſiſters.

Euſebius, in a chapter quoted ſome while ago, the firſt of the ſecond book of his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, without heſitation ſays, 'that [x] James was ſaid to be the Lord's 'brother, becauſe he alſo was called the ſon of Joſeph. And 'Joſeph was reckoned his father, becauſe the virgin Mary 'was eſpouſed to him.'

Origen [y] in a paſſage alſo cited [z] above, ſays, that the brethren of Jeſus were the ſons of Joſeph by a former wife, who had cohabited with him before Mary. And he men-

[t] Verum homines praviſſimi hinc præſumunt opinionis ſuæ auctoritatem, quod plures Dominum noſtrum fratres habuiſſe ſi traditum. Qui ſi Mariæ filii fuiſſent, et non potius Joſephi ex priore canjugio ſuſcepti, nunquam in tempore paſſionis Joanni Apoſtolo tranſcripta eſſet in matrem, Domino ad utrumque dicente, Mulier ecce filius tuus, et Joanni, Ecce mater tua: niſi quod deſolatæ ſolatium caritatem filii in diſcipulo relinquebat. Hilar. Pict. Comm. in Matt. cap. i. p. 612. Ed. Bened.

[u] Ει ησαν δε τεκνα τη μαρια, και ει υπηρχεν αυτη ανηρ, τινι λογῳ παρεδιδε την μαριαν τῳ ιωαννη, και τον ιωαννην τη μαρια; Epih. Hær. 78. num. x. p. 1042. C.

Ει γαρ εγνω αυτην, και εν ταξει γυναικος ειχε, πως ὡς απροσατευτον αυτην, και υδενα εχησαν, τῳ μαθητη παρατιθεται, και κελευει αυτω εις τα ιδια αυτην λαβειν; Chryſoſt. in Matt. hom. 5. T. VII. p. 77.

[x] Τοτε δη και ιακωβον, τον τε κυριε λεγομενον αδελφον, οτι δη και ουτος ιωσηφ ωνομασο πως· τε δε χριςε πατηρ ο ιωσηφ, ω μνηςευθεισα η παρθενος. κ. λ. L. 2. c. 1. p. 38. B.

[y] In Matt. T. X. p. 462, 463. T. III. Bened. P. 223. tom. I. Huet.

[z] See before, p. 478.

tions

tions it as ſupported by an ancient tradition. This was the opinion [a] of Epiphanius, and of many [b] ancient writers, both Greeks and Latins.

Jerom, in his article of this perſon, in his catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers, ſays: 'James [c] who is called the Lord's 'brother, ſurnamed the Juſt, was, as ſome think, the ſon 'of Joſeph by another wife, but, as ſeems to me, the ſon 'of Mary, ſiſter to our Lord's mother, mentioned by John, 'in his goſpel, John xix. 25.' And in his book againſt Helvidius he delivers it as his opinion, that [d] thoſe called our Lord's brethren in the goſpels, were ſo named, as they were couſins, or relations. He ſpeaks to the like purpoſe alſo [e] in his commentary upon Matth. xii. 49, 50.

This opinion was at length embraced by Auguſtine. In his expoſition of the epiſtle to the Galatians, written about the year 394, he ſpeaks dubiouſly, ſaying, 'that [f] James 'was the Lord's brother, as he was the ſon of Joſeph by a 'former wife, or elſe as he was related to his mother Mary.' But in works, written afterwards, he continually ſays, that [g] our Lord's brethren were relations of his mother Mary.

The

[a] Epiph. Hær. 29. n. iii. et iv. Hær. 51. num. x. Hær. 78. num. viii. et ix. Ancorat. num. lx. p. 62.

[b] Greg. Nyſſen. de Chriſti Reſur. Or. 2. tom. III. p. 412, 413. Chryſoſt. in Matt. hom. 5. tom. VII. p. 77. C. Theophyl. in Gal. i. 19. p. 448. Niceph. Call. l. 2. cap. 3. in. Hilar. Pictav. Comm. in Matt. cap. i. p. 612. ed. Bened. Ambroſ. de Inſtit. Virg. cap. vi. T. II. p. 260. Bened. Ambroſiaſtri Comment. in Gal. i. 19. ap. Ambroſ. in App. T. II. p. 213.

[c] Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Juſtus, ut nonnulli exiſtimant, Joſeph ex alia uxore, ut mihi videtur, Mariæ ſororis matris Domini,, cujus Joannes in libro ſuo meminit, filius. De V. I. cap. 2.

[d] Reſtat igitur, ut juxta ſuperiorem expoſitionem fratres eos intelligas appellatos, cognatione, non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non naturâ: quomodo Lot Abrahæ, quomodo Jacob Laban eſt appellatus frater, &c. Adv. Helvid. T. IV. P. 2. p. 140.

[e] Quidam fratres Domini de aliâ uxore Joſeph filios ſuſpicantur, ſequentes deliramenta apocryphorum, et quandam Meſcham vel Eſcham mulierculam confingentes. Nos autem, ſicut in libro, quem contra Helvidium ſcripſimus, continetur, non filios Joſeph, ſed conſobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos, intelligimus, materteræ Domini: quæ eſſe dicitur mater Jacobi minoris, et Joſeph, et Judæ: quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem conſobrinos dici, omnis ſcriptura demonſtrat. In Matt. cap. xii. T. IV. p. 53.

[f] Jacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joſeph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus debet intelligi. Aug. Expoſ. ep. ad Gal. cap. i. et ii. num. viii. tom. III. P. 2.

[g] Fratres ejus ſic accipite, ſicut noſtis. Non enim novum eſt quod auditis. Conſanguinei virginis Mariæ fratres Domini dicebantur. Scriptura

The former, as appears from the authors juſt cited, was the more ancient opinion. Nor does Jerom allege any before him who held the opinion mentioned as his own. Indeed he ſeems to have been the firſt, who ſaid, that our Lord's brethren were the ſons of Mary, his mother's ſiſter, and therefore only couſins or relations. But when he advanced this notion, he [h] was inclined to think Joſeph alſo a virgin. As has been well obſerved by [i] G. J. Voſſius.

However Jerom's opinion has prevailed very much of late. I ſuppoſe, it may be that [k] of the Romaniſts in general. It was alſo the opinion of [l] Lightfoot. It is likewiſe embraced by [m] Witſius, and [n] Lampe, and [o] many other proteſtants. But Valeſius, among the Romaniſts, in his annotations upon the above cited chapter of Euſebius, ſays, he [p] thinks, that James was the ſon of Joſeph by a former wife. The ſame opinion has been aſſerted by ſeveral among the

Scriptura tamen hujuſmodi cognationes fratres appellat. Nam Abraham et Lot fratres ſunt dicti, cum eſſet Abraham patruus Lot: et Laban et Jacob fratres ſunt dicti, cum eſſet Laban avunculus Jacob, &c. In Joan. Tract. 28. num. iii. tom. III. P. 2. Vid. ibid. in Matt. Qu. xvii. et in Joan. Tr. x.

Et Loth frater Abrahæ dicitur, cum patruus ejus eſſet Abraham. Ex quâ vocabuli conſuetudine etiam fratres Domini vocantur in Evangelio, non utique quos Maria virgo peperierat, ſed ejus conſanguinitate omnes propinqui Contr. Fauſt l. 22. cap. 35. T. VIII.

[h] Tu dicis, Mariam virginem non permanſiſſe. Ego mihi plus vindico, etiam ipſum Joſeph virginem fuiſſe per Mariam, ut ex virginitatis conjugio virgo filius naſceretur. Adv. Helvid. tom. IV. p. 142. in.

[i] Et ſane, qui Joſephum putaret non habuiſſe uxorem, antequam B. Mariam duceret, ante B. Hieronymum arbitror fuiſſe neminem: utcumque poſterioribus temporibus, in virginitate extollenda immodicis, avide multi eam fuerint ſententiam amplexi. Voſſ. de Gen. Chriſti. cap. vi. [k] Vid. Baron. in Apparatu num. lxi. &c. Eſt. ad Gal. cap. i. 19. et alibi. Tillem. S. Jacque le Mineur. Art. i. et ii.

[l] See Lightfoot's Works, vol. I. p. 270, 541, 660. [m] At quamvis Euſebius, Epiphanius, Gregorius Nyſſenus, plurimique veterum, in eandem conceſſerint ſententiam, non videtur mihi ea probabilibus niti argumentis. Rectius Hieronymo accedemus, arbitranti eos qui Domini fratres dicuntur, fuiſſe ejus conſobrinos, loquendi genere, etiam Græcis et Romanis noto. Witſ. Comm. in ep. Jud. § 4. p. 454.

[n] Erat hic frater Jacobi minoris. ——Quare fuit conſobrinus Chriſti ſecundum carnem, natus ex Maria, uxore Cleophæ, ſeu Alphæi, quæ ſoror erat Mariæ Matris Domini. Lampe in Evang. Joan. cap. xiv. 22. T. III. p. 167. [o] Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. 5. n. xi. T. III. p. 165. And ſee Lenfant et Beauſobre ſur Gal. i. 19. et la preface ſur l'epiſtre de S. Jacques. Dr. Benſon in his preface to the epiſtle of St. James, ſect. ii. Doddridge in his preface to the ſame epiſtle.

[p] Ait igitur Euſebius, Jacobum, qui in Evangelio et epiſtola Pauli frater Domini dicitur, filium fuiſſe Joſephi

the protestants, [q] G. J. Vossius, and [r] Basnage, and [s] Cave, in his Lives of the Apostles written in English. Nor does it appear, that he had abandoned his first judgment, when he wrote his Historia Literaria.

I likewise have for a long time been much inclined to the same opinion; and have composed an argument upon the question. But I have laid it aside, supposing it to be rather too prolix, and too intricate, to be inserted in this place. And after all, perhaps some might think, that the argument does not afford a complete solution of all difficulties and objections. I therefore enter not at present into any dispute about it, but leave every one to judge as he sees good.

VIII. Whether James was the son of Joseph by a former wife, or the son of Mary, wife of Cleophas, sister to Mary, our Lord's mother, or otherwise nearly related to her, he was an

Josephi ex aliá conjuge, quam Josephus ante Mariam sibi sociaverat. Cum Eusebio consentit Epiphanius —— Gregorius Nyssenus —— sed Hieronymus in libro de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis Jacobum hunc idcirco fratrem Domini appellatum esse existimat, quod filius esset Mariæ, sororis fratris Domini. —— Multa quidem de hoc argumento disseruit Baronius in Annalibus. Mihi tamen verior videtur opinio eorum, qui Jacobum, et reliquos Domini fratres, Josephi ex priore matrimonio filios esse dicunt. Hæc enim sententia magis convenit verbis Evangelii. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 1.

Fuit enim Jacobus filius Josephi, ac proinde oriundus ex stirpe David. Id. in Annot. ad l. 2. cap. 23. p. 40.

[q] Voss. de Gen J. C. cap. vi.

[r] Basnag. ann. ante Christ. 6. num. xxviii. et xxix.

[s] 'He 'was the son (as we may probably 'conjecture) of Joseph, afterwards 'husband to the blessed virgin, and 'his first wife. Hence reputed our 'Lord's brother, in the same sense, 'that he was reputed the son of 'Joseph. —— Jerom, and some o'thers, will have Christ's brethren 'so called, because sons of Mary, 'cousin-german, or, according to 'the custom of the Hebrew language, sister to the virgin Mary. 'But Eusebius, Epiphanius, and 'the far greater part of the ancients '(from whom, especially in matters 'of fact, we are not rashly to depart) make them the children of 'Joseph by a former wife. And 'this seems most genuine and natural, the evangelists seeming very 'express and accurate in the account 'which they give of them. *Is not 'this the carpenter's son? Is not his 'mother called Mary? and his brethren, 'James, and Joses, and Simon, and 'Jude?* —— Matt. xiii. 55, 56. By 'which it is plain, that the Jews 'understood these persons not to be 'Christ's kinsmen only, but his 'brothers, the same carpenter's 'sons, having the same relation to 'him that Christ himself had: 'though they indeed had more. 'Christ being but his reputed, they 'his natural sons.' And what follows. The Life of James the Less, num 2.

[t] S. Jacobus apostolus —— minor dictus, cognomento Justus, frater Domini, Josephi utpote ex priori conjuge, seu ut Hieronymo placet, Mariæ sororis matris Domini filius. Hist. Lit. tom. I. p. 14.

apostle.

apoſtle. I think, it was clearly proved at the beginning of this chapter from the New Teſtament, that James, called *the Lord's brother*, was an apoſtle in the higheſt acceptation of the word. Conſequently, he muſt be James the ſon of Alpheus, or Cleophas. For thoſe names ſeem to be one differently written.

But how he was ſo is made out differently. They who ſay that thoſe called our Lord's brethren were ſons of Cleophas, huſband of Mary, related to our Lord's mother, ſeem to have here no difficulty. But they who ſuppoſe our Lord's brethren to have been ſons of Joſeph by a former wife, are ſomewhat embarraſſed. However, I juſt obſerve, that the account, given by [u] Epiphanius, is this. Cleophas and Joſeph were brothers. The former died without iſſue, and Joſeph raiſed up ſeed to his brother. Accordingly, James being the firſt-born of Joſeph, was called the ſon of Cleophas. In like manner ſpeaks [x] Theophilact. But, as before ſaid, I do not now form any debate about this.

That James, called our Lord's brother, is the ſame as he, who in the catalogues of the apoſtles is called the *ſon of Alpheus*, or *Cleophas*, is allowed by Epiphanius, Chryſoſtom, and Theophilact. Epiphanius ſays, that [y] James, by nature the ſon of Joſeph, who was called the Lord's brother, and was an apoſtle, was appointed the firſt biſhop of Jeruſalem. Chryſoſtom in his comment upon Gal. i. 19. ſays, 'that '[z] Paul calls James the Lord's brother, giving him that 'honourable appellation, when he might have ſaid *the ſon of* '*Cleophas*, as he is called in the goſpels.' Theophilact likewiſe ſays, 'that [a] Paul calls him the Lord's brother, by the 'way of an honourable diſtinction when he might have 'called him the ſon of Cleophas. Nor was he the Lord's

[u] Vid. Epiph. Hær. 29. n. iii. iv. H. 51. n. x. H. 78. num. vii. viii. ix. et Ancorat. num. lx.

[x] Πως δε ην τε κλοπα; Ακεε· Κλοπας και ιωσηφ αδελφοι. Τε κλοπα απαιδος τελευτησαντος, ο ιωσηφ εξανεςησεν αυτω σπερμα, και ετεκε τετον, και τες αλλες αυτε αδελφες. κ. λ. Theoph. in Gal. i. 19.

[y] —— καταταθεντος ευθυς ιακωβ τε αδελφε κυριε καλεμενε και αποςολε επισκοπε πρωτε υιε ιωσηφ φυσει οντος. κ. λ. Hær. 29. n. iii.

[z] Ει γαρ σημαινει ον ελεγεν ηθελεν, ενην και εξ ετερε γνωρισματος τετο ποιησαι δηλον, και ειπειν τον τε κλωπα, οπερ και ευαγγελιςης ελεγεν. Chr. in Gal. cap. i. T. X. p. 678. E.

[a] Ειδε δε και ιακωβον. Μετα τιμης δε και τετε μεμνηται, τον αδελφον τε κυριε ειπων, ετω και βασκανιας απηλλακτο· καιτοι ει ηθελετο σημαναι, ειπεν αν, τον τε κλοπα· ειδε γαρ κατα σαρκα αδελφος ην τε κυριε, αλλ' ενομιζετο. Theoph. in Gal. i. 19.

'brother

'brother according to the fleſh, but only thought to be ſo.' I mention no more ancient writers.

And that James, called the ſon of Alpheus in the catalogues of the apoſtles, was one of thoſe, who are called *the Lord's brethren*, I think, may be ſhown from the goſpels, by comparing ſeveral texts together.

In all the catalogues of the twelve apoſtles of Chriſt the four laſt mentioned are theſe. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whoſe ſurname was Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iſcariot, who alſo betrayed him*, Matt. x. 3, 4. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iſcariot, which alſo betrayed him*, Mark iii. 18, 19. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iſcariot, which was alſo the traitor*, Luke vi. 15, 16. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James*, Acts i. 13.

Let us now compare the texts in the goſpels, where our Lord's brethren are named, Matt. xiii. 55. *Is not this the carpenter's ſon? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joſes, and Simon, and Judas?* And Mark vi. 3. *Is not this the carpenter, the ſon of Mary, the brother of James, and of Joſes, and of Judah, and Simon?*

All theſe, except Joſes, ſeem to have been apoſtles. For muſt not the three apoſtles, laſt mentioned before Judas Iſcariot, in the firſt catalogues, and the three laſt mentioned, in the Acts, be three of the four called in the goſpels our Lord's brethren?

And I ſhould chooſe to tranſlate the texts of St. Luke, where the apoſtles are named, ſomewhat differently from what is generally done, in this manner. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas, brethren of James:* declaring, that both Simon, and Judas, were brethren of James, the ſon of Alpheus, before named. A word muſt be ſupplied. And the coherence leads me to think, brethren more proper than brother.

By all which we are led to conclude, that James, ſeveral times mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epiſtles, is the ſame, who in the catalogues of the apoſtles is called *James the ſon of Alpheus*. For James, mentioned by St. Paul is called *the Lord's brother*, and plainly appears to be an apoſtle. Conſequently, he is *James, the ſon of Alpheus*, mentioned in all the catalogues of the apoſtles of Chriſt.

Wall, in his notes upon John vii. at the beginning, ſays, 'Theſe

'These brethren and kinsfolk of our Lord, as they were 'but mean persons, so also they were some of the back-'wardest to believe in him.——They that are most usually 'called his brethren were James, and Joses, and Simon, and 'Judas.——Two of these, James and Judas, some learned 'men think to have been two of the apostles. And there 'were two apostles of those names that were brethren. But 'this place, if they be of those that are meant in it, is a 'strong argument against that opinion. For these brethren 'did hardly yet believe in him; but the apostles did. This 'was but half a year before he suffered.'

Upon which I would observe: when St. John says, ch. vii. 5. *For neither did his brethren believe in him:* he does not intend to say that they had not faith in him. Grotius's comment appears to me very right. 'The [b] meaning is 'not, that they did not believe at all: but that they did not 'believe as they should.'

Learned men are certainly in the right, when they say, that some of our Lord's brethren were apostles. And it seems to me, that all those, who in the gospels are called our Lord's brethren, had early and always an affection and esteem for him. This may be perceived from several places in the gospels, as Matt. xii. 46. Mark iii. 31. Luke viii. 19. See also John ii. 12. And in time they all believed in him, and that rightly as the Messiah. St. Luke, in the history of things after our Lord's ascension, Acts i. 13, 14. having mentioned the names of the apostles, adds, *These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.* And St. Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 5. speaks of *brethren of the Lord*, not apostles, who laboured in spreading the gospel in the world.

They, of whom St. John speaks, had worldly views and expectations. They were desirous, that Jesus, if he were indeed the Messiah, should go to Jerusalem, and set up his kingdom in a glorious manner. Even after this, several who certainly were apostles, betrayed great ignorance, or weak faith, or wrong apprehensions, by their discourses, and questions put to our Saviour. Of Thomas see John xiv. 5. Of Philip, see ver. 8—11. and of Judas, ver. 22, 23.

Those brethren of our Lord proposed, that he should hasten to Jerusalem, to the feast of tabernacles, nigh at

[b] Non omnino, non ut oportebat. Grot. in loc.

hand.——*Jesus said to them, my time is not yet come. But your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you. But me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil. Go ye up unto this feast. I go not up yet unto this feast: for my time is not yet full come*, ch. vii. 6, 7, 8. It is manifest, that he taxeth their carnality and worldly-mindedness. As if he had said: 'It is [c] not proper for me to go up to this feast, as yet, 'nor till after it is begun. But you may go up at any time, 'since you have done little or nothing to make the Jews 'unfriendly to you, as I have done: who by the strictness of 'my doctrine, and the freedom of my reproofs, have provoked 'many to a great degree.'

It follows in ver. 9, 10. *When he had said these things unto them, he abode still in Galilee. But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.* These words may afford, in the opinion of some, another objection to the supposition, that these brethren of our Lord were apostles. But to me the objection appears not of much moment. Some of these brethren might nevertheless be among the apostles, and go up to the feast before him. For our Lord seems not to have been attended by all his apostles in that journey. So much is implied in the manner, in which it was performed. *He went not openly, but as it were in private:* in a more private manner than he had usually done, and attended by a small number of his apostles only, several of them having gone up to Jerusalem before him, upon occasion of the approaching solemnity.

Chrysostom seems not to have doubted, that some of the brethren of our Lord, here spoken of, were apostles, or at least among his disciples. For discoursing on John vii. 3, 4, 5. he says: 'Observe [d] with me the power of Christ. Of them who 'uttered these words, one was the first bishop of Jerusalem, even 'the blessed James, of whom Paul says: *Other of the apostles 'saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.* And Judas also is 'said to have been a wonderful man.' So says Chrysostom, who did not receive the epistle of St. Jude, so far as we can perceive, though he did that of St. James.

IX. This James is called by St. Mark, *the less*, ch. xv. 40. *There were also women looking on afar off. Among whom was Mary*

[c] Compare Mr. James Macknight's Harmony of the Gospels, vol. II. p. 5.

[d] Συ δε μοι σκοπει τυ χριστυ την δυναμιν. Απο γαρ τυτων των ταυτα λεγοντων τα ρηματα, ο πρωτος των ιεροσολυμων επισκοπος γεγονεν, ο μακαριος ιακωβος. —— Λεγεται δε και ο ιυδας θαυμαστος τε γεγονεναι. In Jo. hom. 48. T. VIII. p. 284. D.

Magdalene,

Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Leſs, and Joſes, and Salome. That hereby is meant James, the Lord's brother, and the ſon of Alpheus, is generally ſuppoſed, and I think reaſonably. He can be no other, becauſe Joſes is preſently afterwards mentioned, as his brother, agreeably to other places of the evangeliſts, where our Lord's brethren are named, Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. But interpreters are not agreed, why he was ſo called.

It has been thought, that [e] herein is a reference to James the ſon of Zebedee, and brother of John, who had been beheaded by Herod in the year of Chriſt 44. And Lightfoot ſays, 'that 'James, or Jacob, is commonly called James the great, in 'diſtinction from James the ſon of Alpheus, who is called the 'leſs, not for any dignity, or ſuperiority of apoſtleſhip that he 'had above the other, but either becauſe this James was the 'elder, or becauſe of the ſingular privacy, that Chriſt admitted 'him to with himſelf, as he alſo did Peter and John.'

Here are ſeveral reaſons of this denomination, but though Lightfoot ſays, James the ſon of Zebedee was commonly called James the great, there is no inſtance of it in the New Teſtament.

It may be obſerved, that the leſs, in the original, is not a comparative, but a poſitive, the little, τε μικρε. And ſo Beza has tranſlated. Maria Jacobi parvi et Joſe mater. However in the Latin vulgate it is Jacobi minoris. And it is evident, that [g] Jerom ſo underſtood the word.

Gregory Nyſſen [h] thought, he was called the leſs, as not being one of the twelve apoſtles. Which reaſon I cannot admit, becauſe I am perſuaded he was an apoſtle, if he was the Lord's brother. Nor do I perceive in the New Teſtament more than two of this name.

Some ſay, he was ſo called, becauſe he was the younger of the two apoſtles of this name. But of this there is no proof, nor probability. For James, the ſon of Alpheus, muſt have

[e] Puto ita dictum inter Apoſtolos ad diſcrimen Jacobi Zebedaidæ. Grot. ad Marc. xv. 40. [f] The third part of the Harmony of the four Evangeliſts, vol. I. p. 634.

[g] Si non eſt Apoſtolus, ſed neſcio quis Jacobus, quomodo eſt frater Domini putandus? Et quomodo tertius ad diſtinctionem majoris appellabitur minor? quum major et minor non inter tres, ſed inter duos ſoleant præbere diſtantiam. Adv. Helvid. p. 138. in.

[h] Ὁ δε μαρκος ιακωβε τε μικρε και ιωση μητερα αυτην ειπεν, επειπερ ην αλλος ιακωβος ο τε αλφαιε, δια τετο μεγας, οτι τοις αποστολοις τοις δωδεκα συναριθμητο· ο γαρ μικρος εκ ην αυτοις εναριθμιος. Greg. Nyſſ. De Chriſt. Reſ. Or. 2. T. III. p. 413.

been his father's firſt-born, and may have been as old, or older than James the ſon of Zebedee.

Some have conjectured, that [i] he might be ſo called on account of his ſtature. Which conjecture is favoured by the literal ſenſe of the word in the poſitive degree, James the little. And ſome may be apt to think, that this was one reaſon, why the Jews at the temple, according to Hegeſippus, placed him on an eminence, that he might be heard by all the people, when aſſembled in great numbers. So Zaccheus, being little of ſtature, and there being a great croud, climbed up into a ſycamore tree, to ſee Jeſus, as he paſſed by, Luke xix. Perhaps, this is as likely a conjecture as any.

Nevertheleſs I ſhall mention one more. He might be ſo called, on account of his inferiority, in compariſon of the other James. It is manifeſt, that during the time of our Lord's abode on this earth, Peter, and James and John, the two ſons of Zebedee, were the moſt eminent and conſiderable of the diſciples. They were the moſt favoured, and were admitted by our Lord to ſome ſpecial meaſure of confidence and freedom. And it is obſervable, that in all the catalogues of the apoſtles James the ſon of Alpheus, and Simon the Canaanite, or Zelotes, and Judas, are the laſt mentioned, except Judas Iſcariot. Poſſibly theſe three, whom I ſuppoſe to have been our Lord's brethren, were the lateſt called to be apoſtles, and for a while were defective in faith, and underſtanding, or not ſo conſiderable, and eminent, as ſome of the other apoſtles, particularly James the ſon of Zebedee. The queſtion put to our Lord by Judas, one of them, recorded in John xiv. 22. ſeems a remarkable inſtance of the ſlowneſs of his underſtanding in the things of religion, under all the advantages, which he had enjoyed.

James therefore might be called *the leſs*, by way of diſtinction from another of the ſame name, who had been called to be an apoſtle before him, and was more eminent. And yet the appellation carried not in it any reflection. This coincides with ſome things ſaid by Lightfoot above.

However, it is mentioned only as a conjecture, to be conſidered by thoſe, who are diſpoſed to do it. For I am not able to ſay with aſſurance, what was the ground and reaſon of this appellation.

[i] Potuit etiam Jacobus parvus appellari ad corporis molem ratione habitâ: quomodo apud Romanos ob corporis affectiones Pauli, Magni, Longi, Craſſi, Claudii, Pulchri nuncupabantur. Baſnag. ann. ante Dom. 6. num. xxxi.

X. We

X. We have ſeen divers proofs of the reſpect ſhown to this perſon, which any one is able to recollect, and therefore they need not to be repeated. However, I ſhall here take notice of a few ſuch things.

1. He is never called Juſtus, or the Juſt in the New Teſtament. But he ſeems to have been ſo called by many, even in his life-time, as well as afterwards. Euſebius ſays, that [k] he was called the Juſt by the ancients on account of the eminence of his virtue. He is ſeveral times ſo called in the paſſages of Clement of Alexandria, quoted from Euſebius [l] ſome while ago. Hegeſippus ſays, he [m] had been called the Juſt by all from our Saviour's time to his own: and afterwards, that [n] on account of his eminent virtue he was called the Juſt, and Oblias. He likewiſe ſays, that [o] the Jews at the temple called him the Juſt, as may be ſeen in the account of his death, tranſcribed above. Jerom [p] in the beginning of his article of this perſon ſays, 'that James the Lord's brother was ſurnamed the Juſt.'

2. In his commentary upon the epiſtle to the Galatians, at ch. i. 19. he ſays, 'that [q] James, there ſpoken of, was in ſuch 'eſteem for his ſanctity, that it was no uncommon thing for 'people to croud about him, and ſtrive to touch the hem of his 'garment.'

3. Euſebius ſays, that [r] the epiſcopal chair, in which James was uſed to ſit, was preſerved to his time, and was had in veneration by the church at Jeruſalem.

XI. I have not been able to write the hiſtory of this perſon ſo regularly, as that of ſome others. For which reaſon it may not be amiſs to take a ſummary view of what we have ſeen.

James, ſometimes called the Leſs, the ſon of Alpheus, and called the Lord's brother, either as being the ſon of Joſeph by

[k] Τετον δη ον αυτον ιακωβον, ον και δικαιον επικλην οι παλαι δι αρετης εκαλουν προτερηματα.——Euſ. H. E. l. 2. c. 1. p. 38. B.

[l] p. 475, 476.

[m] Ὁ ονομασθεις υπο παντων δικαιος απο των τε κυριε χρονων μεχρι και ημων. Ap. Euſeb. l. 2. c. 23. p. 63. D.

[n] Δια γετοι την υπερβολην της δικαιοσυνης αυτε εκαλειτο δικαιος και ωβλιας. Ib. p. 64. A.

[o] ——και εκραξαν αυτω, και ειπον· Δικαιε, ω παντες πειθεσθαι οφειλομεν. Ib. D. Vid. et p. 65. A. et B.

[p] Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Juſtus. De V. I. cap. 2.

[q] Hic autem Jacobus epiſcopus Jeroſolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Juſtus: vir tantæ ſanctitatis et rumoris in populo, ut ſimbriam veſtimenti ejus certatim cuperent attingere. In Gal. T. IV. p. 237. in.

[r] Τον γαρ ιακωβε θρονον τε πρωτε της ιεροσολυμων εκκλησιας——εις δευρο πεφυλαγμενον οι τηδε κατα διαδοχην περιεποντες αδελφοι. κ. λ. H. E. l. 7. c. 19.

a former wife, or a relation of his mother Mary, was one of Chriſt's apoſtles. We have no account of the time, when he was called to the apoſtleſhip. Nor is there any thing ſaid of him particularly in the hiſtory of our Saviour, which is in the goſpels. But from the Acts, and St. Paul's epiſtles, we can perceive, that after our Lord's aſcenſion he was of note among the apoſtles. Soon after St. Stephen's death in the year 36, or thereabout, he ſeems to have been appointed preſident, or ſuperintendent in the church of Jeruſalem, where, and in Judea, he reſided the remaining part of his life. Accordingly, he preſided in the council of Jeruſalem, held there in the year 49, or 50. He was in great repute among the Jewiſh people, both believers and unbelievers, and was ſurnamed the Juſt. Notwithſtanding which he ſuffered martyrdom in a tumult at the temple: and, probably, in the former part of the year 62. He wrote one epiſtle, not long before his death, of which we ſhall ſpeak preſently.

CHAP. XVII.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

I. *The Evidences of its Genuineneſs.* II. *When written.* III. *To whom.*

HAVING now done all I am able for clearing up the hiſtory of this perſon, I come to conſider the epiſtle aſcribed to him.

Here I would obſerve the evidences of its genuineneſs, and authority, the time when, and the people to whom it was written.

I. And for the firſt point. This epiſtle ſeems to be alluded, or referred to, by Clement biſhop of Rome, vol. II. p. 43, 44. and by Hermas, p. 58—60. It is not expreſsly quoted by Irenæus. Nor are there in him any indiſputed references to it, vol. II. p. 166—169. Nor do we perceive it to be quoted by Clement of Alexandria, vol. II. p. 225—229. nor by Tertullian, p. 273, 274. This epiſtle is quoted once or twice by Origen, but, as of doubtful authority, or not received by all, p. 478, 479. We do not obſerve any notice to be taken of this epiſtle by Cyprian, vol. III. p. 171. It ſeems to be referred to by Commodian, a Latin writer about the year 270, p. 260. It is probable, that it was received by the Manichees, and Paulicians,

ans, p. 507, 547, 548. It ſeems to be referred to by Lactantius, vol. IV. p. 79.

From a paſſage of Euſebius, cited in the [a] preceding chapter, it appears, that in his time, the beginning of the fourth century, all the ſeven epiſtles called catholic, were well known, and received by many. And he expreſsly ſays, that the epiſtle of James was the firſt of them. And to the like purpoſe again in another paſſage to be here taken notice of by us. Having given a particular account of the death of James, called the Juſt, and the brother of the Lord, and biſhop of Jeruſalem, he concludes the chapter in this manner. 'Thus 'far,' [b] ſays he, 'concerning James, who is ſaid to be the 'writer of the firſt of the epiſtles called catholic. But it 'ought to be obſerved, that it is ſpurious [meaning, that it 'was a contradicted book of ſcripture, or at the utmoſt, that 'it was doubted of, or rejected by many:] foraſmuch as there 'are not many of the ancient writers, who have quoted it; 'as neither that called Jude's, another of the ſeven epiſtles 'called catholic. However we know, that theſe alſo are 'commonly uſed [or publicly read] in moſt churches, together 'with the reſt.'

This paſſage is very ſatisfactory. For it aſſures us, who was the writer of this epiſtle: namely, James, before ſpoken of, called the Lord's brother, ſurnamed the Juſt, who generally reſided at Jeruſalem. It alſo aſſures us, that though it had been doubted of by ſome, it was then generally received, and publicly read in the aſſemblies of Chriſtians. They who have leiſure, and are curious, may ſee what was farther obſerved by us formerly, relating to the opinion of Euſebius himſelf concerning this epiſtle, and the writer of it, vol. IV. p. 251—253.

I only add here, that this epiſtle of St. James is one of the three catholic epiſtles received by the Syrian Chriſtians, and by Chryſoſtom and Theodoret. And that after the time of Euſebius, this and the other ſix catholic epiſtles, were received by all Greeks and Latins in general: and are in the catalogues of canonical ſcripture compoſed by councils, and

[a] See before, p. 466, 467.

[b] Ταυτα και τα κατα τον ιακωβον, ε η πρωτη των ονομαζομενων καθολικων ειναι λεγεται. Ιστεον δε ως νοθευεται. Ου πολλοι γαρ των παλαιων αυτης εμνημονευσαν, ως ουδε της λεγομενης ιουδα, μιας και αυτης ουσης των επτα λεγομενων καθολικων. Ομως δε ισμεν και ταυτας μετα των λοιπων εν πλειοσαις δεδημοσιευμενας εκκλησιαις. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 66. Comp. vol. IV. p. 235.

learned authors: as was shown in a foregoing chapter. However, there might be still some few, who doubted of its authority, especially in the east, as was observed vol. V. p. 278.

This epistle was received by Jerom, as was distinctly and largely shown in his article, vol. V. p. 51—53. Who in one place says, 'The [c] apostles, James, Peter, John, Jude, wrote seven epistles, of few words, but full of sense.' It may nevertheless be worth the while to recollect here particularly what he says of it in his book of Illustrious Men, transcribed there at p. 125. 'James, the Lord's brother,——wrote but one 'epistle, which is among the seven catholic epistles. Which 'too [d] is said to have been published by another in his name. 'But gradually, in process of time it has gained authority. 'This is he of whom Paul writes in his epistle to the Gala- 'tians. And he is often mentioned in the Acts of the 'apostles.'

'Which likewise,' says Jerom, 'is said to have been published by another in his name:' that is, even that one epistle is said by some to be spurious, and not really written by James, though it bears his name. But I do not believe there is reason to think, that was ever said by any. And I am persuaded, that what Jerom says here is owing to a mistake of his, not rightly understanding Eusebius: who, as may be remembered, says, 'This James is said to be the author of the 'first of the epistles called catholic. But [e] it ought to be ob- 'served, that it is spurious.' By which Jerom understood Eusebius to say, that this epistle was falsely ascribed to James, and was not his: whereas Eusebius means no more than that it was a contradicted book, not received by all as of authority: or at the utmost, that it was doubted of, or rejected by many. This I suppose to have been clearly shown before. See vol. IV. p. 234—239. and also p. 253. (A)

The reason why this epistle was not received by all, I suppose to have been, that it was not certainly known that James, the writer of it, was an apostle. We have observed several ancient writers, who did not allow him to have that high character. There were two apostles of this name: James the son of Zebedee, and James the son of Alpheus. That the

[c] Vol. V. p. 32.

[d] Quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur.

[e] ἰσεον δε ως νοθευεται μεν. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 66. C.

(A) I likewise refer to Dr. Leonard Twells's Examination of the late new text and version of the N. T. Part. 2. ch. 2. p. 82. Who speaks to the like purpose.

writer

writer of this epiſtle was not James the ſon of Zebedee, muſt have been evident. Nor was it certain that he was the ſon of Alpheus. Another reaſon of doubting of his apoſtleſhip may have been, that he was often called biſhop of Jeruſalem, and ſaid by ſome to have been appointed to that office by the apoſtles. This alſo may have contributed to the doubt, whether he was one of the twelve apoſtles of Chriſt.

Other reaſons have been aſſigned in late ages, why ſome might heſitate about receiving this epiſtle as a part of canonical ſcripture. But thoſe reaſons are not to be found in the moſt early antiquity: whereas we can plainly perceive, that not a few learned Chriſtians of the firſt ages were not ſatisfied, the writer was an apoſtle; which muſt have occaſioned a demur concerning the high authority of the epiſtle.

If this James was not one of the twelve apoſtles, he was nevertheleſs a perſon of great diſtinction, as he was the Lord's brother, and reſided many years at Jeruſalem after our Lord's aſcenſion, as preſident, or ſuperintendent of the church there, and of the Jewiſh believers in Judea in general. Accordingly, Euſebius, who did not think this James to be one of the twelve apoſtles, in his commentary upon Iſaiah, reckons fourteen apoſtles, meaning Paul, and this James, though not equal to him. See vol. IV. p. 252, 253. And Jerom likewiſe, in one place, formerly taken notice of, reckons this James, brother of the Lord, an additional apoſtle with Paul, beſide the twelve, vol. V. p. 52.

But I think it manifeſt, that James, the Lord's brother, who reſided at Jeruſalem, ſeveral times mentioned in the Acts of the apoſtles, and in St. Paul's epiſtles, was an apoſtle, one of the twelve, and conſequently the ſame with him who is called the ſon of Alpheus. And as this epiſtle has been all along aſcribed to James, the Lord's brother, ſurnamed the Juſt, I receive it as a part of ſacred ſcripture, and think it ought to be ſo received.

II. Concerning the time of this epiſtle, there cannot be very different apprehenſions.

Mill [f] ſays it was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſa-

[f] De tempore, quo ſcripta eſt, certum eſt in primis exaratam fuiſſe ante excidium Hieroſolymitanum. De hoc enim, ut et generali Judæorum calamitate, veluti jam imminente, loquitur. cap. v. 1. Jam vero Jacobus ſtatim poſt Feſti mortem martyrium obiit, teſte Joſepho, anno æræ vulgaris, ex rationibus Pearſonianis, quas libenter ſequor, lxii, adeoque uno vel altero ante mortem, ſcriptam cenſuerim hanc epiſtolam circa annum lx. Prol. num. 56.

lem,

lem, and a year or two before his own death, about the year 60: which is alſo the opinion of [g] Fabricius.

But that appears to me rather too ſoon. If St. James ſuffered martyrdom in the year 62, I ſhould be inclined to think, this epiſtle was written in the beginning of that year, or in 61, and but a ſhort time before his death.

Euſebius ſays, 'When [h] Paul had appealed to Cæſar, and 'had been ſent to Rome by Feſtus, the Jews, who had aimed 'at his death, being diſappointed in that deſign, turned their 'rage againſt James, the Lord's brother, who had been ap-'pointed by the apoſtles biſhop of Jeruſalem.' In like manner Tillemont adopting that thought, ſays, 'St. Paul [i] having 'been ſent to Rome near the end of the year 60, by Feſtus, 'governor of Judea, the Jews finding themſelves not able to 'accompliſh their deſign againſt him, turned their rage againſt 'James. Nevertheleſs they did not ſhow it till eighteen months 'after, when Feſtus being dead, and Albinus, who ſucceeded 'him, not being yet arrived, the province was without a 'governor.'

That the Jews were much vexed, when Paul was ſent to Rome, and had thus eſcaped out of their hands, is very reaſonably ſuppoſed. But that their vexation upon that account was the occaſion of the death of James, is mere conjecture. Nor does any thing like it appear in the accounts of his death, which Euſebius has tranſcribed from Hegeſippus, and Joſephus.

If I likewiſe may be allowed to mention a conjecture, (which is at leaſt as probable, as that juſt taken notice of) I ſhould ſay, I am apt to think, that the death of James was partly occaſioned by the offence taken at his epiſtle: in which are not only ſharp reprehenſions of the unbelieving Jews for the crimes committed by them, but alſo affecting repreſentations of the dreadful calamities coming upon them. ch. iv. 1, 8. v. 1—6.

III. I am now to conſider, to whom this epiſtle was ſent.

Beza ſays, it [k] was ſent to the believing Jews, diſperſed all over the world. Cave [l] ſeems to ſay, to believing Jews chiefly. And [m] to the like purpoſe Fabricius. Grotius [n] ſays, to all

[g] Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. n. ix. tom. III. p. 165. [h] H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. in. [i] S. Jacque le Mineur. Art. vii. Mem. tom. I.

[k] —— fidelibus omnibus Judæis, cujuſcunque tribus ſint, per orbem terrarum diſperſis. Bez. ad cap. i. 1.

[l] Scripſit, paulo, ut videtur, ante mortem, epiſtolam catholicam Judæis ἐν διασπορᾷ, Chriſtianam præcipue doctrinam profeſſis. Cav. H. L. in Jacobo. [m] Ad Judæos maxime Chriſtianiſmum amplexos, qui uſquequaque diſperſi degebant. Ubi ſupr. p. 160.

[n] Id eſt, gente Iſraelitica qui erant extra Judæam. Gr. ad loc.

the

the people of Iſrael living out of Judea. Wall's account of this epiſtle is this: 'It * was written to ſuch Jews (being now 'Chriſtians) as were diſperſed abroad out of Judea.——This 'epiſtle conſiſts of general exhortations to piety, patience, and 'other moral virtues. It has twice or thrice mentioned our 'Saviour: but has nothing of his miracles, or teachings, or 'death, or reſurrection, or our redemption by him: of which 'Paul's, and Peter's, and John's epiſtles are full.'

To me it ſeems, that this epiſtle was written to all Jews deſcendants of Jacob, of every denomination, throughout the world, in Judea, and out of it. For ſuch is the inſcription: *James, a ſervant of God, and of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to the twelve tribes, which are ſcattered abroad, greeting.* No expreſſion can be more general, than *the twelve tribes.* There is not any limitation, reſtraining it to Chriſtians, or believers in Jeſus. Nor does he wiſh them grace or peace from Jeſus Chriſt. It is only a general ſalutation, or greeting. Indeed he does not diſſemble his own character. He calls himſelf *a ſervant of God, and of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* He takes upon himſelf the character of a Chriſtian, and, perhaps, of an apoſtle. But he does not ſo characterize thoſe, to whom he writes. Nor is there any chriſtian benediction at the end of the epiſtle.

Nor can I ſee, why *the twelve tribes ſcattered abroad* ſhould not comprehend thoſe of them in Judea, which were the peculiar charge of the writer. And divers things in the epiſtle ſeem to belong to them eſpecially. He means therefore the people of the twelve tribes every where in Judea, and out of it.

A large part of the epiſtle is ſuitable to Chriſtians. But there are divers paragraphs, that muſt be underſtood, to be addreſſed to unbelieving Jews, particularly, ch. v. 1—6. as is generally allowed. I think likewiſe, that the firſt ten verſes of ch. iv. are addreſſed to unbelieving Jews. Where it is ſaid, *Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your luſts, that war in your members? Ye luſt, and have not. Ye kill, and deſire to have, and cannot obtain. Ye fight, and war.* Theſe things could not be ſaid to Chriſtians. They muſt relate to thoſe diſturbances, which, ſome while before the Roman war broke out, were every where among the unbelieving Jews.

I am of opinion, that this way of writing was choſen to abate the offence, which the reproofs, and exhortations, and

* Crit. Notes upon the N. T. p. 144.

warnings

warnings of the epistle were likely to occasion. St. James writes in a general way. Let all apply to themselves those things, which belong to them. Wall's note upon ch. v. 6. is to this effect, 'This is spoken, not to the Christians, but to 'some rich heathens, or infidel Jews, that oppressed and mur-'dered them. No Christians of those times had any wars, or 'fightings, such as ch. iv. 1. or killing, as here: viz. not in 'the time of James, bishop of Jerusalem.'

And says Whitby upon ch. iv. 1. '*Whence come wars?* 'This epistle seems to have been written about the eighth of 'Nero, and the sixty-second of Christ, the year before the death 'of James: before which time the Jews had great wars and 'fightings, not only with their neighbours [see note upon 'Matt. xxiv. 6.] but even among themselves, in every city 'and family, saith Josephus: not only in Judea, but in 'Alexandria, and Syria, and many other places.' A very proper note upon the text, as seems to me. And what he says upon the following verses of that chapter, and upon ch. v. 1—6. and in his preface to the epistle sect. v. and vi. deserves also attentive regard. Where indeed he expressly says, 'Since 'James writes to the whole twelve tribes, I doubt not but 'those of Palestine must be included.'

Mr. Pyle [p] has spoken clearly to the like purpose in the preface to his paraphrase of this epistle.

I shall now transcribe a part of venerable Bede's note upon the beginning of this epistle. From the words, *scattered abroad*, he is led to think of what is said, Acts viii. 1. that upon occasion of the persecution against the church at Jerusalem after the death of Stephen, *they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea, and Samaria, except the apostles*, and says, 'that [q] James writes this epistle to those who were 'scattered

[p] These circumstances gave occasion to this apostle, the residentiary of the circumcision in Judea, to endite this epistle, partly to the infidel, and partly to the believing Jews. —— It was directed to the Jews and Jewish converts of the dispersion. Yet, as that to the Hebrews was intended for the general benefit of all the scattered tribes, though directed to the natives of the holy land: so, no doubt, this had an equal respect to them, over whom James immediately presided, in the special character of their bishop. Pyle's Paraphrase, vol. II. p. 290, 291.

[q] Legimus, occiso a Judæis B. Stephano, quia facta est in illa die persecutio magna, in ecclesiâ, quæ est Hierosolymis, et omnes dispersi sunt per regionis Judææ et Samariæ, præter apostolos. His ergo dispersis, qui persecutionem passi sunt propter justitiam, mittit epistolam. Nec solum his, verum etiam

'scattered abroad, and suffered persecution for the sake of 'righteousness: nor to them only, but also to those, who 'though they had believed in Christ, were not careful to be 'perfect in good works, as what follows in the epistle plainly 'shows: and likewise to such as continued unbelieving, and 'to the utmost of their power persecuted those who believed.' Which appears to me very right.

CHAP XVIII.

ST. PETER.

I. *His History to the Time of our Saviour's Ascension.* II. *To the Council of Jerusalem, in the year* 49. III. *He goes to Antioch, where he is reproved by St. Paul for Dissimulation.* IV. *His travels, and the Time of his coming to Rome.* V. *The Time of his Death.* VI. *Several Things, hitherto omitted, or but lightly touched upon.* 1. *His episcopate at Antioch.* 2. *His having been five and twenty Years Bishop of Rome.* 3. *His Children.* 4. *His Wife's Martyrdom.* 5. *His absconding at Rome.* 6. *The Manner of his Crucifixion.* VII. *That he was at Rome, and suffered Martyrdom there.*

I. 'THE land of Palestine, says [a] Cave, at and before the 'coming of our blessed Saviour, was distinguished into three 'several provinces, Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. This last 'was divided into the Upper and the Lower. In the Upper, 'called also Galilee of the gentiles, within the division, belong-'ing to the tribe of Naphtali, stood Bethsaida, formerly an 'obscure and inconsiderable village, till lately re-edified, [b] and 'enlarged by Philip the tetrarch, and in honour of Julia 'daughter of Augustus called by him Julias. It was situated 'upon the banks of the sea of Galilee, called also the sea 'of Tiberias, and the lake of Gennesareth, which [c] was about 'forty furlongs in breadth, and a hundred in length, and had 'a wilderness on the other side, called the desert of Bethsaida, 'whither our Saviour used often to retire.'

At this place was born [d] Simon, surnamed Cephas, or Petros, Petrus, Peter, signifying a stone or rock. He was a fisherman

am illis, qui percepta fide Christi nondum operibus perfecti esse curabant, sicut sequentia epistolæ plane testantur: necnon et eis, qui etiam fidei exortes durabant, quin et ipsam in credentibus, quantum valuëre, persequi ac perturbare studebant. Bed. Expos. super Jacob. Epist. [a] Life of St. Peter. sect. i. [b] Joseph. Antiq. l. 18. cap. 3. al. 2. in. [c] Id. de B. J. l. 3. cap. 10. al. 18. [d] John i. 44.

upon

upon the forementioned lake or sea: as was also, in all probability, his father Jonas, Jonah, or John. He had a brother, named Andrew. Which was the oldest of the two is not certain. For concerning this there were different opinions among the ancients. Epiphanius [e] supposed Andrew to be the elder. But according to Chrysostom, [f] Peter was the first-born. So likewise [g] Bede, and [h] Cassian, who even makes Peter's age the ground of his precedence among the apostles. And Jerom himself has expressed himself in the like manner, saying, 'that [i] the keys were given to all the apostles alike, 'and the church was built upon all of them equally. But for 'preventing dissension, precedency was given to one. John 'might have been the person. But he was too young. And 'Peter was preferred upon account of his age.'

St. John [k] has informed us of the first acquaintance of Simon Peter with Jesus: to whom he was introduced by his brother Andrew. *He findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him: we have found the Messiah. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said: thou art Simon, the son of Jonas. Thou shalt be called Cephas.*

Undoubtedly, they had been from the beginning among those, who are said to have *looked for the kingdom of God, and waited for redemption in Israel.* Andrew had received Jesus as the Messiah. And his brother Simon readily concurred in the same belief and profession. They had heard John, and, as may be supposed, had been baptized by him, as all Jews in general were. Being from his testimony, and by personal conversation with Jesus, convinced, that he was the Messiah, it is likely, that henceforward they often came to him, and heard him, and saw some of the miracles done by him. We may take it for granted, that they were present at the miracle at Cana in

[e] H. 51. num. xvii. [f] Hom. in Matt. 58. al. 59. T. VII. p. 586. D. [g] In Evang. Joann. cap. i. [h] Interroganti ergo Domino Jesu Christo, quem cum crederent —— respondit primus Apostolorum Petrus, unus utique pro omnibus. Idem enim unius habuit responsio, quod habeat [f. habebat] omnium fides. Sed primum debuit respondere, ut idem esset ordo responsionis, qui erat honoris, et ipse antecederet confessione, qui antecedebat ætate. Cassian. de Incarn. l. 3. cap. 12. ap. Bib. P. P. tom. VII. [i] At dicis, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia: licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant: et ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Joannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat: ne adhuc adolescens, ac pene puer, progressæ ætatis hominibus præferretur. Adv. Jovin. l. i. T. IV. p. 168. [k] Ch. i. 35—42.

Galilee

Galilee: it being expreſsly ſaid, that *Jeſus and his diſciples were invited to the marriage ſolemnity* in that place, John ii. 1, 2. It is alſo ſaid ver. 11. *This beginning of miracles did Jeſus in Cana of Galilee, and manifeſted forth his glory. And his diſciples believed on him:* that is, were confirmed in the perſuaſion, that he was the Meſſiah.

The call of Andrew and Peter to a ſtated attendance on Jeſus is recorded by [l] three evangeliſts. Their father, Jonas, ſeems to have been dead. For there is no mention of him, as there is of Zebedee, when his two ſons were called. It is only ſaid of Andrew and Peter, that when Jeſus called them, *they left their nets, and followed him.* At that time Jeſus made them a magnificent promiſe. *Follow me*, ſaid he, *and I will make you fiſhers of men.* 'In time you will be qualified by me to gain 'men, and to recover them, in great numbers, from ignorance 'and error, folly and vice, and form them to juſt ſentiments in 'religion, and the practice of virtue.'

From this time they uſually attended on our Lord. And [m] when he completed the number of his apoſtles, they were put among them.

Having before written the hiſtory of St. John at large, I need not be ſo particular in that of Peter, becauſe theſe two apoſtles were much together. However, I intend to take notice of the moſt remarkable things in his life, eſpecially after our Saviour's aſcenſion.

Simon Peter was married when called by our Lord to attend upon him. And upon occaſion of that alliance, as it ſeems, had removed from Bethſaida to Capernaum, where was his wife's family. Upon [n] her mother our Saviour in a very gracious manner wrought a great miracle of healing.

And I ſuppoſe, that when our Lord *left Nazareth, and came and dwelled at Capernaum* (as mentioned Matt. iv. 13.) he made Peter's houſe [o] the place of his uſual abode, when he was in thoſe parts. I think we have a proof it in the hiſtory juſt taken notice of. When Jeſus came out of the ſynagogue at Capernaum, *he entered into Simon's houſe*, Luke iv. 38. Comp. Mark i. 29. which is well paraphraſed by Dr. Clarke: 'Now 'when Jeſus came out of the ſynagogue, he went home to 'Peter's houſe.' And there it was that the people reſorted

[l] Matt iv. 18—20. Mark i. 29—31. Luke iv. 38, 39.
[m] Luke v. 1—9.
[n] Matt. x. 1—4. Mark iii. 13—19. Luke vi. 12—16.
[o] Matt. viii. 14, 15. Mark i. 29—31. Luke iv. 38, 39.
[o] It is called *Peter's houſe*, Matt. viii. 14. *Simon's houſe*, Luke iv. 38. *the houſe of Simon and Andrew*, Mark i. 29.

unto

unto him in the evening, Luke iv. 40. Matt. viii. 16. Mark i. 32—34.

Another proof of this we have in a history, which is in St. Matthew only, ch. xvii. 24—27. of our Lord's paying at Capernaum the tribute-money for the use of the temple, and his directing Peter, when he had found a piece of money, in the manner there prescribed, to pay it for both of them. The text is to this purpose. *And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received the tribute-money, came to Peter, and said: doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him.*——The beginning of that account at ver. 24. is thus paraphrased by Dr. Clarke. 'Now when they were come home to Capernaum, where Jesus 'used to dwell, the officers, appointed to gather the yearly 'offering for the service of the temple, came to Peter.'

After the miracle of the five loaves, and two fishes, *straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him to the other side, whilst he sent the multitudes away.* In their passage they met with a contrary wind. *In the fourth watch of the night,* near morning, *Jesus came toward them, walking on the sea.* And there not being yet light enough, to know who he was, they were affrighted, thinking it had been an apparition, and cried out for fear. Jesus then spake to them, and they knew him. After which follows a particular concerning Peter, related by St. Matthew only. *Peter* [p] *answered him, and said: Lord if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus. But when he saw the sea boisterous, he was afraid: and beginning to sink, he cried, saying: Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him.——And when he was come into the ship, the wind ceased.* Peter at first presumed too much upon the strength of his faith, and was forward to show his zeal. However, this must in the end have been of use to confirm his faith. He had here great and sensible experience of the knowledge, as well as the power of Jesus. As soon as his faith failed, our Lord suffered him to sink. And upon his calling for help, Jesus immediately stretched out his hand, and saved him.

The next day our Lord preached in the synagogue at Capernaum, as related by St. John, ch. vi. 24—65. where many, who expected from the Messiah a worldly kingdom, were offended at his discourse. And it is said, ver. 66—69. *From that*

[p] Matt. xiv. 28—31.

time

time many of his diſciples, who had hitherto followed him, and profeſſed faith in him, *went back, and walked no more with him. Then ſaid Jeſus unto the twelve: will ye alſo go away? Then Simon Peter anſwered him: Lord, to whom ſhould we go? Thou haſt the words of eternal life. And we know, and are ſure, that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God.*

Some time after this, when our Lord had an opportunity of private converſation with the diſciples, he inquired of them, what men ſaid of him, and then, whom they thought him to be? *Simon Peter anſwered, and ſaid, thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God,* Matt. xvi. 13—16. So far likewiſe in Mark viii. 27—29. and Luke ix. 18—20. Then follows in Matthew, ver. 17—19. *And Jeſus anſwered, and ſaid unto him, bleſſed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona. For fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.* That is, 'It is not a partial affection for me, thy maſter, nor 'a fond and inconſiderate regard to the judgments of others, 'for whom thou haſt a reſpect, that has induced thee to think 'thus of me. But it is a juſt perſuaſion, formed in thy mind 'by obſerving the great works, which thou haſt ſeen me 'do by the power of God, in the confirmation of my miſſion 'and doctrine.' *And I ſay unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon 'this rock will I build my church.——And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* By which many interpreters ſuppoſe, that (A) our Lord promiſed to Peter, that he ſhould have the honour of beginning to preach the goſpel, after his reſurrection, to Jews and Gentiles, and of receiving them into the church. If ſo, that is perſonal. Nevertheleſs, what follows: *And whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven. And whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven.* This, I ſay, muſt have been the privilege of all the apoſtles. For the like things are expreſsly ſaid to

(A) Dr. Clarke is very ſingular in his paraphraſe of that text. Matt. xvi. 18. 'You ſhall be the firſt 'preacher of my true religion to 'the gentile world.' And ver. 19. 'You ſhall firſt open the kingdom 'of the Meſſiah, and make the 'firſt publication of the goſpel to 'the gentiles.' Upon both verſes alſo referring to Acts x. When I firſt obſerved this, I was ſurpriſed. Nor could I ſee the ground of it. But now I gueſs, that he confined this perſonal privilege to Peter's firſt preaching to gentiles at the houſe of Cornelius, becauſe Peter was then alone, and none of the apoſtles were there with him: whereas, after the pouring out of the Holy Ghoſt, all the apoſtles were preſent with him, as it is ſaid, Acts ii. 14. *But Peter, ſtanding up with the eleven, lift up his voice.*——

them, Luke xxii. 29, 30. John xx. 21—23. Moreover, all the apoſtles concurred with Peter in the firſt preaching both to Jews and Gentiles. As he was preſident in the college of the apoſtles, it was very fit, and a thing of courſe, that he ſhould be primarily concerned in the firſt opening of things. The confeſſion, now particularly before us, was made by him. But it was in anſwer to a queſtion, that had been put to all. And he ſpoke the ſenſe of all the apoſtles, and in their name. I ſuppoſe this to be as true in this inſtance, as in the other, before taken notice of, which is in John vi. 68, 69.

In the account which St. John has given of our Saviour's waſhing the diſciples' feet, Peter's modeſty and fervour are conſpicuous, John xiii. 1—10.

When [q] the Jewiſh officers were about to apprehend our Lord, *Peter having a ſword, drew it, and ſmote a ſervant of the high prieſt, and cut off his right ear.* Our Lord having checked Peter, touched the ſervant's ear, and healed him. So great is Jeſus every where!

They that laid hold of Jeſus, led him away to the houſe of Caiaphas. The reſt of the diſciples now forſook their Maſter, and fled. *But Peter followed him afar off unto the high prieſt's palace, and went in, and ſat with the ſervants to ſee the end.* Here Peter thrice diſowned his Lord, peremptorily denying, that he was one of his diſciples, or had any knowledge of him, as related by [r] all the evangeliſts. For which he ſoon after humbled himſelf, and wept bitterly.

We do not perceive that Peter followed our Lord any farther, or that he at all attended the crucifixion. It is likely, that he was under too much concern of mind, to appear in public, and that he choſe retirement, as moſt ſuitable to his preſent temper and circumſtances.

On [s] the firſt day of the week, early in the morning, when Mary Magdalene, and other women came to the ſepulchre, bringing the ſweet ſpices, which they had prepared, *they ſaw an angel, who ſaid unto them, be not affrighted. Ye ſeek Jeſus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is riſen.* ——*Go quickly, and tell his diſciples that he is riſen from the dead:* as in Matthew. *Tell his diſciples, and Peter,* as in Mark. *And behold he goes before you into Galilee.* That was

[q] John xviii. 10, 11. Matt xxvi. 51—54. Mark xiv. 46, 47. Luke xxii. 50, 51.

[r] Matt. xxvi. 57—71. Mark xiv. 53—72. Luke xxii. 54—62. John xviii. 15—27.

[s] Matt. xxviii. Mark xvi. Luke xxiv. John xx.

a moſt

a moſt gracious diſpoſal of Providence, to ſupport the diſciples, Peter in particular, under their great affliction.

Our Lord firſt ſhowed himſelf to Mary Magdalene, and afterwards to ſome other women. On the ſame day likewiſe on which he aroſe from the dead, he ſhowed himſelf to Peter, though the circumſtances of this appearance are no where related. However it is evident from Luke xxiv. 33, 34. For when the two diſciples, who had been at *Emmaus, returned to Jeruſalem, they found the eleven gathered together, and thoſe that were with them, ſaying, the Lord is riſen indeed, and has appeared unto Simon.* That muſt be the ſame appearance, which is mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 5. *and that he was ſeen of Cephas, then of the twelve.* And it has been obſerved, that as Mary Magdalene was the firſt woman, ſo[1] Peter was the firſt man to whom Jeſus ſhowed himſelf after he was riſen from the dead.

In the twenty-firſt chapter of St. John's goſpel are ſome appearances of our Lord to his diſciples, in which Peter is greatly intereſted, to which the attentive reader is referred. Our Lord there graciouſly affords Peter an opportunity of making a three-fold profeſſion of love for him: which he accepts, and renews to him the apoſtolical commiſſion, and, as it were, re-inſtates him in his high and important office: requiring him, as the beſt teſtimony of love for his Lord, to feed his ſheep with fidelity and tenderneſs. And notwithſtanding his late unſteadineſs, our Lord encourageth this diſciple to hope, that in his future conduct he would ſet an example of reſolution and fortitude under great difficulties, and at length glorify God by his death, in the ſervice to which he had been appointed.

As we have now proceeded in the hiſtory of this apoſtle to the time of our Lord's aſcenſion, it may be worth the while to look back, and obſerve thoſe things in the goſpels, which imply his peculiar diſtinction, or at leaſt are honourable to him.

By Mark, ch. v. 37. and Luke viii. 51. we are aſſured, that Peter was one of the three diſciples whom our Lord admitted to be preſent at the raiſing of Jairus's daughter. That particular is not mentioned by Matthew, ch. ix. 18—26. From all the firſt three evangeliſts we know, that

[1] —— *αλλ' εν ανδρασι τουτῳ πρωτῳ τω μαλιστα αυτον ποθουντι ιδειν.* Chryſ. in 1 Cor. hom. 38. tom. X.

Peter was one of the three whom our Lord took up with him into the mountain, where he was glorioufly tranſformed, Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 28. He was alſo one of the three whom our Lord took with him apart from the other diſciples, when he retired to prayer, a little before his laſt ſufferings. As we know from Matt. xxvi. 37. Mark xiv. 33. But that particular is omitted by Luke, ch. xxii. 39—46.

And if it might not be reckoned too minute and particular, I would obſerve ſome things of this kind mentioned by one evangeliſt only.

There are ſeveral ſuch things deſerving notice in St. Matthew. 1. In the catalogue of the apoſtles Matthew only [u] calls Peter *chief*, or *the firſt*, ch. x. 2. He only has the account of Peter's deſiring to come to Chriſt upon the water; and what follows, ch. xiv. 28—31. 3. He alone has recorded what our Lord ſaid to Peter, when he gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, ch. xvi. 16—19. 4. He only relates our Lord's paying the tribute-money for Peter, ch. xvii. 24—27. 5. He likewiſe ſays that after Peter had denied Chriſt, *he wept bitterly*, ch. xxvi. 75.

In St. Mark are chiefly two things to be obſerved, as honourable to Peter. The firſt is, that he was one of the four apoſtles to whom our Lord addreſſed himſelf, when he foretold the deſtruction of the temple, and the calamities attending it, Mark xiii. 3. The other is, that in the meſſage, ſent by the angel to the diſciples after our Lord's reſurrection, Peter is particularly named, ch. xvi. 7.

In St. Luke are theſe things remarkable. Firſt, that when our Lord warned Peter of his danger, he alſo aſſured him, *he had prayed for him that his faith might not fail*, Luke xxii. 31, 32. Secondly, we perceive from St. Luke, that our Lord appeared to Peter in particular on the day of his reſurrection, though the circumſtances of that appearance are not recorded, ch. xxiv. 33, 34.

In St. John's goſpel are divers things honourable to Peter. 1. The profeſſion of faith in Chriſt, related John vi. 67—69. 2. Peter's remarkable humility, expreſſed in an unwillingneſs that Jeſus ſhould waſh his feet, with our Lord's particular diſcourſe to him, ch. xiii. 6—10. 3. Peter's zeal in cutting off the ear of the high prieſt's ſervant is related by

[u] Πρωτος σιμων ο λεγομενος πετρος.

other

other evangeliſts. But St. John only mentions Peter by name, ch. xviii. 10. 4. It is, I think, honourable to Peter, that when he and John went together to the ſepulchre, John, only ſtooping down, looked in; but Peter went in, and ſearched the ſepulchre. After which John alſo went in ch. xx. 4—8. 5. St. John only mentions Peter's faith and zeal in *caſting himſelf into the ſea*, to go to Chriſt, ch. xxi. 7. 6. Our Lord's diſcourſe with Peter concerning his love to him, and his particular repeated charge to *feed his ſheep*, ver. 15—17. 7. Our Lord's predicting to Peter his martyrdom, and the manner of it, ver. 18, 19.

It is obſervable, that Matthew and John, the two apoſtles, have mentioned more of theſe prerogatives of Peter, than the other two evangeliſts. We may hence conclude, that the apoſtles, when illuminated by the ſpirit with the knowledge of the true nature of Chriſt's kingdom, were quite free from envy, and that Peter was not aſſuming and arrogant among his brethren.

It may be here obſerved likewiſe, that as our ſacred hiſtorians were not envious, ſo neither were they fond and partial. The ſeveral advantages and virtues of Peter are recorded by ſome only. But his fault in denying Chriſt, when under proſecution, is related by all.

II. In a ſhort time after our Lord's aſcenſion, Peter, as preſident in the college of the apoſtles, propoſed, that in the room of Judas another ſhould be choſen out of the men that had accompanied them during the time that Jeſus had been with them. And when two ſuch had been nominated, and they had by prayer appealed to God, *who knows the hearts of all men, the lot fell upon Matthias. And he was numbered with the eleven apoſtles*, Acts i. 15—26.

I have here, and elſewhere, ſpoken of Peter, as preſiding among the apoſtles, or having a primacy of order. For it appears in what has been juſt mentioned, and in other things related afterwards. And it is obſervable, that in all the catalogues of the twelve apoſtles Peter is named firſt, though there is ſome variety in the order of the names of the other apoſtles. I might add, that[x] where ever the three diſciples, Peter, James, and John, are mentioned together, Peter is always put firſt, though there is a variety

[x] See Mark v. 37. and Luke viii. Luke ix. 28. Matt. xxvi. 37. Mark 51. Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. xiv. 33.

in the order of the names of thoſe two brothers, James and John, ſons of Zebedee. He is alſo firſt placed, where [y] four are named, Andrew being added to them. And likewiſe where [z] only he and John are mentioned. There is an exception in Gal. ii. 9. where the order is James, Cephas, and John. The reaſon of which I take to be, that [a] James, there mentioned, then preſided in the church of Jeruſalem, where Paul then was. I place below [b] the thoughts of Baſnage concerning this point, who ſpeaks to the like purpoſe: without denying the equal dignity of the apoſtles, or aſcribing to Peter any juriſdiction over them. For which there is not any the leaſt foundation either in the Goſpels, or the Acts.

On the day of pentecoſt next enſuing, the promiſed gift of the Holy Ghoſt came down upon the apoſtles and their company. And upon this occaſion *Peter, ſtanding up with the eleven*, preached to a great number of people aſſembled about the apoſtles, and aſſerted the reſurrection of Jeſus, and with ſuch force, that about three thouſand were converted, and baptized, Acts ii. 14—47.

Afterwards Peter and John healed a poor man at the temple, who had been lame from his birth, a well known perſon, forty years of age. And many being gathered about them, Peter made an affecting diſcourſe, whereby many

[y] See Mark xiii. 3.

[z] Luke xxii. 8. Acts iii. 1. iv. 13, 19. viii. 14. [a] See before, p. 473. [b] Ordinis primatum quod attinet, illum a Petro abjudicari non poſſe cenſemus, ſi qua fides evangelio. Neque ulla ratio aſſignari poteſt, cur Apoſtolorum in indiculo a tribus Evangeliſtis exhibito, Petrus ſemper ordinem ducat. Quippe ſolâ neceſſitate numerandi non ſcribitur Matthæo *primus Petrus*: (ſic enim ſequens ſecundus dici debuiſſet:) ſed quia in divino hoc collegio præſidem agebat. Eo quidem munere functum fuiſſe, ubique Scriptura teſtatur. Aliorum ſane Apoſtolorum ordinem mutavit Lucas in Actis, primum tamen Petro locum ſervavit: Petrus, Jacobus, Joannes. Quid, nonne præſidis functio fuit, ſurgere in medio diſcipulorum, eoſque monere, ut in proditoris Judæ locum alium ſufficerent Apoſtolum? Si ordinis cauſſâ non præerat Apoſtolis, cur Petrus ſurgens cum undecim Judæos miraculum linguarum ſtupentes alloquitur. ——Cur etiam dum Joannis erat in comitatu Petrus, et claudum ſanandum alloquitur, et Senatum Hieroſolymitanum compellat, et Simoni Mago minitatur? Rationis eſt quidem et conſuetudinis, ut legatorum primus orationem habeat, quomodo Paulus, qui Barnabam eminebat, præibat in loquendo. Ut ad pauca redeamus, is Petro collatus honor eſt, ut primus et in Judæis, et in Gentibus, Eccleſiæ fundamenta jaceret. Qui longe maximus honos principem Apoſtolorum decuit, nec a præſidis munere divelli poteſt. Annon nobiliores Apoſtolatus functiones honoratiori competebant? Baſnag. ann. 31. num. lxxv.

were

were awakened, and convinced. And in a ſhort time after this, the number of believers at *Jeruſalem was* (B) *about five thouſand*, ch. iii. and iv. 4. But the Jewiſh prieſts and rulers were much offended. And whilſt Peter and John were ſpeaking to the people, their officers came, and laid hold on them. And it being then evening, they put them in priſon till the next day. On the morrow therefore they were brought before the council. Having been examined, they were at length diſmiſſed, with a charge not to preach any more in the name of Jeſus, and were ſeverely threatened if they did, ch. iv. 1—22.

The number of believers being much increaſed, and many being in low circumſtances, *ſome who were poſſeſſed of houſes, or lands, ſold them, and brought the prices of the things that were ſold, and laid them at the apoſtles' feet. And diſtribution was made to every man according as he had need.* But a certain man, named Ananias, and Sapphira, his wife, when they had ſold a poſſeſſion, brought a part of the price, keeping back the reſt, though they declared it to be the whole price. For this they were reproved by Peter, and were charged with having lied to God himſelf, who acted by the apoſtles. At his reproof Ananias and Sapphira were both ſtruck dead by the immediate hand of God in a ſmall ſpace of time, one after the other, ch. iv. 31—— v. 1—11. We have here, as ſeems to me, a proof, that Peter now preſided in the aſſembly of the apoſtles, and the whole church of Jeruſalem.

And, after this, *by the hands of the apoſtles were many ſigns and wonders wrought among the people——inſomuch that they brought forth the ſick in the ſtreets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the leaſt the ſhadow of Peter paſſing by might overſhadow ſome of them. There came alſo a multitude out of the cities round about Jeruſalem, bringing ſick folks, and them that were vexed with unclean ſpirits. And they were healed every one*, ch. v. 12—16.

I put this in the hiſtory of St. Peter, as he has a ſhare in it. But I do not think, that all the miracles here ſpoken of were wrought by his hands, or by his ſhadow paſſing by.

(B) How that five thouſand in Acts iv. 4. ought to be underſtood, was ſhown vol. V. p. 239, 240. I ſhall now add here the words of Seueur. Ainſi croiſſoit l'Egliſe Chretienne parmi les Juifs. Et elle ſe montoit bien alors à cinq mille perſonnes. A. C. 35. Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe, et de l'Empire, vol. I. p. 133.

It ſeems, that many of theſe miracles were wrought by other apoſtles, as hinted, or expreſsly ſaid, at the beginning of the citation, in ver. 12. In a word, there were now miracles wrought at Jeruſalem in great numbers by all and every one of the apoſtles. This may be alſo farther argued hence, that hereupon all the apoſtles were taken up, as is ſaid ver. 17, 18. *Then the high-prieſt roſe up, and all they that were with him, and were filled with indignation. And they laid their hands on the apoſtles, and put them in the common priſon.* The event may be ſeen in what follows, ch. v. 17—42. However, I am willing to allow, that there were no miracles wrought by the ſhadow of any of the apoſtles, except Peter's. This [c] ſeems to be moſt agreeable to St. Luke's expreſſions.

Upon the death of Stephen *there aroſe a great perſecution againſt the church that was at Jeruſalem*: inſomuch that all the believers in general *were ſcattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apoſtles. Then Philip*, one of the ſeven, *went down to Samaria, and preached Chriſt to them.* And many of the people there believed. *Now when the apoſtles, which were at Jeruſalem, heard, that Samaria had received the word of God, they ſent unto them Peter and John*, that they might confer upon them the gift of the Holy Ghoſt. Which they did by prayer, and laying on of their hands. Here Peter reproved Simon of Samaria, as he is called: who himſelf was a believer for a while, but had given proofs of inſincerity. Theſe two apoſtles then returned to Jeruſalem, and in their way thither *preached the goſpel in many villages of the Samaritans*, ch. viii. 1—25.

St. Paul, who informs us of his return to Jeruſalem, three years after his converſion, has aſſured us, that he then ſaw Peter and James, and no other of the apoſtles, Gal. i. 18, 19. And St. Luke having given the hiſtory of St. Paul's oppoſition to the diſciples, and of his converſion, and return from Damaſcus to Jeruſalem, ſays, that *Barnabas brought him to the apoſtles*, Acts ix. 1—30. Theſe two

[c] Omnibus accurate perpenſis, illorum opinionis magis ſumus, qui ſoli Petro, id auctoritatis conceſſum fuiſſe putant, ut ipſius umbrâ ægroti a morbis ſuis recrearentur. Neque id obſcure Lucas indicat. Præmiſſis enim Apoſtolorum prodigiis, ſubinde hoc addit. *In plateas efferebant ægrotos et ponebant in lectis, ut venientis Petri vel umbra inumbraret aliquem eorum.* Cur non dixit, *ut prætereuntium Apoſtolorum vel umbra* ſi facultatem ejuſmodi a Chriſto nacta fuit? &c. Baſnag. Ann. 34. n. xviii.

accounts

accounts are eaſily reconciled. Paul ſaw only Peter and James. But they received him in the name, and with the approbation of all the apoſtles, and thus he had communion with them.

It follows in St. Luke's hiſtory, Acts ix. 31. *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.* This reſt, as was formerly ſhown, commenced in the year 40, and probably continued a year or more. This ſeaſon, as we may well ſuppoſe, was improved by all the apoſtles, and by Peter, in particular. Of whom it is ſaid, that he paſſed through all parts of the country, *and came down alſo to the ſaints that dwelt at Lydda.* Here, in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, he healed Æneas, who had the palſy, and had kept his bed eight years. Whilſt he was in that place, a chriſtian woman, named Tabitha, died at Joppa, which was not far off. The diſciples therefore ſent to Peter, deſiring him without delay to come to them. Which he did, and there reſtored her to life. *And he tarried many days at Joppa, with one Simon, a tanner*, ch. ix. 32—43.

Whilſt Peter was there, Cornelius of *Cæſarea by the ſea-ſide* (the city where the Roman governor had his reſidence) a centurion, a worſhipper of God, but not of the houſe of Iſrael, nor a Jewiſh proſelyte, had a viſion; wherein he was directed by an angel, to ſend to Joppa for Simon, whoſe ſurname was Peter; from whom he would receive farther information in the things of religion. When the viſion was over, he called two of his ſervants, and a pious ſoldier, and ſent them to Joppa. The day after, as they drew near the city, Peter went up to the top of the houſe to pray, about the ſixth hour of the day or noon. There he fell into a trance or ecſtacy, and had a viſion. A veſſel deſcended, wherein were all ſorts of living creatures, wild and tame, clean and unclean. *And there came a voice to him, ſaying, kill and eat. But Peter ſaid, not ſo, Lord. For I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice ſpake unto him again the ſecond time, what God hath cleanſed, that call not thou common.——While Peter thought on the viſion, the ſpirit ſaid unto him, behold, three men ſeek thee. Ariſe therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have ſent them.——On the morrow Peter went away with them, and certain brethren from Joppa*, ſix in number, *accompanied him.*

The

The next day they arrived at Cæſarea, and entered into the houſe of Cornelius, where were alſo many others, his relations, and intimate friends, whom Cornelius had invited to come thither. *Peter ſaid unto them, ye know, how that it is an unlawful thing for a Jew, to keep company, or to come unto one of another nation. But God has ſhown me, that I ſhould not call any man common or unclean.*—— Whilſt Peter was preaching, and ſpeaking to them the things concerning Jeſus Chriſt, and before he had finiſhed, *the Holy Ghoſt fell on all of them that heard the word. And they of the circumciſion, which believed, were aſtoniſhed, as many as came with Peter, becauſe that on the gentiles alſo was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghoſt. For they heard them ſpeak with tongues, and magnify God.——Peter therefore commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days,* ch. x.

Thus the door of faith, or the kingdom of heaven, or of the Meſſiah, was opened to gentiles, and they were received into the church of God. And, if I may ſay it, God now cleanſed all gentiles, and ſhowed with full evidence and divine atteſtations, that all men, of every nation, who became worſhippers of God, and believed in Jeſus, were accepted of him, as his people, and the members of his church, and in the way of ſalvation, without circumciſion, or taking upon them the obſervation of the rituals of the law of Moſes.

While Peter tarried at Cæſarea, *the apoſtles and brethren that were in Judea, heard that the gentiles alſo had received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jeruſalem, they that were of the circumciſion contended with him, ſaying: Thou wenteſt in to men uncircumciſed, and didſt eat with them.* But Peter gave them an account of the tranſaction from the beginning, and all were ſatisfied. *When they heard thoſe things, they held their peace, and glorified God, ſaying: Then hath God alſo to the gentiles granted repentance unto life.*

An opinion has obtained among Chriſtians in late ages, that Cornelius was a proſelyte of the gate. Which opinion is founded upon a ſuppoſition, that there were among the Jews two ſorts of proſelytes: ſome called proſelytes of the covenant, or of righteouſneſs, who were circumciſed: and others, called proſelytes of the gate: who, though they were not circumciſed, obſerved ſome things, not obligatory in themſelves, as is ſuppoſed, in order to facilitate commerce between

between the Jews and them. What thoſe things were, or are ſuppoſed to be, I do not now inquire.

However, for clearing up this matter I would obſerve, that there was but one ſort of proſelytes among the Jews: and that Cornelius was not a proſelyte, but a gentile.

Firſt. There was but one ſort of proſelytes among the Jews. They were circumciſed. So they became Jews by religion, and were admitted to eat the paſſover, and to partake of all religious privileges, as the Jews by deſcent did. They were called *ſtrangers, or proſelytes within the gates*, and *ſojourners*, as they were allowed to dwell, or ſojourn among the people of Iſrael. And they were ſo called, becauſe they could not poſſeſs land. For according to the law of Moſes, all the land of Canaan was to be given to the twelve tribes of Iſrael, the deſcendants of the patriarch Jacob. Which enables us to diſcern the propriety of the expreſſion, juſt mentioned.

What has been now ſaid, may be illuſtrated by ſome texts: which, though well known, ſhall be alleged here.

Exod. xii. 48. *And when a ſtranger ſhall ſojourn with thee, and will keep the paſſover to the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed. And then let him come near, and keep it. And he ſhall be as one born in the land.* 49. *One law ſhall be to him that is home-born, and to the ſtranger that ſojourneth among you.*

Lev. xvii. 8. *Whatſoever man there be of the houſe of Iſrael, or of the ſtrangers, which ſojourn among you, that offereth a burnt-offering, or ſacrifice*——ver. 13.——*children of Iſrael, neither any ſtranger, that ſojourneth among you.* The ſame again, ver. 15. *One of your own country, or a ſtranger.*

Numb. ix. 14. *And if a ſtranger ſhall ſojourn among you, and will keep the paſſover to the Lord*——*ye ſhall have one ordinance, both for the ſtranger, and for him that was born in the land.*

Numb. xv. 15. *One ordinance ſhall be both for you of the congregation, and alſo for the ſtranger that ſojourneth with you*——*as ye are, ſo ſhall the ſtranger be before the Lord.* 16. *One law, and one manner ſhall be for you, and for the ſtranger, that ſojourneth among you.*

In all theſe places by *ſtranger*, and *ſtranger that ſojourneth among you*, I ſuppoſe to be meant men circumciſed, according to the law of Moſes.

Perhaps, it may be here aſked. Could none then, dwell among the Iſraelites in the land of Canaan, but proſelytes, or circumciſed men? To which I anſwer. It ſeems to me, that

no

no other had the privilege of a ſettled abode, or reſidence there, that is, to ſojourn in the land. However, I think, there muſt have been an exception for travellers, paſſing through the country, even though they were idolaters, and for ſome, whoſe traffic was needful, and therefore allowed of. As Patrick ſays upon Deut. xiv. 21. 'There were ſome 'called Nocherim, which we here tranſlate *aliens*: who were 'mere gentiles, and not ſuffered to have an habitation among 'them, but only to come and go in their traffic with them.'

And, if I miſtake not, an argument of the apoſtle may be hence illuſtrated, Eph. ii. 13. *But now, in Chriſt Jeſus, ye, who ſome time were far off, are made nigh*, very nigh, even to a coaleſcence, *by the blood of Chriſt.* Ver. 19. *Now therefore ye are no more ſtrangers, and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the ſaints, and of the houſehold of God.* The apoſtle alludes to the ſtate of things in the Jewiſh commonwealth. *Now therefore*, ſays he, *ye are no more ſtrangers, and foreigners.* Thoſe are not terms of diſtance, as they ſeem to be in our tranſlation, and as ſome have ſuppoſed, but of nearneſs. They are expreſſive of all the favour and privilege, which could be vouchſafed to any, not of the natural ſeed of Iſrael, before the manifeſtation of the goſpel. 'Now [d] *therefore ye are no longer gueſts.* 'Such you might be, and be well, and civilly entertained (c) 'for a while, though you were aliens, and ſojourners, as the 'Jewiſh proſelytes were, who might live in the country, but 'had few privileges, they not being allowed to poſſeſs land, 'nor to have any ſhare in the government of it; *but ye are* '*fellow-citizens with the ſaints*: you have equal rights of 'citizenſhip with the people, and natives of the country; '*and are God's domeſtics.* You are brought into the court and 'family of the king of the country, and are admitted to his 'preſence, and to attend upon his perſon.' The whole of this is much the ſame with what is ſaid 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10. and Rev. i. 6. I place below a Latin verſion [e] of this text, which appears to me to be right.

Proſelyte is a word of Greek original, equivalent to

[d] Ἄρα ουν ουκετι εστε ξενοι, και παροικοι, αλλα συμπολιται των αγιων, και οικειοι τυ θευ.

(c) The Greek word ξενος, like the Latin word, *hoſpes*, ſignifies both a *hoſt*, and a *gueſt*, an entertainer, and him that is entertained, et qui domo ſuſcipit, et qui ſuſcipitur. In Rom. xvi. 23. it is uſed in the former, here in the latter ſenſe.

[e] Nempe igitur non amplius eſtis hoſpites, et inquilini, ſed concives ſanctorum, ac domeſtici Dei.

ſtranger,

ſtranger, long ſince become a technical word, denoting a convert to the Jewiſh religion, or a Jew by religion.

In the fourth commandment they are called *thy ſtranger within thy gates*, Exod xx. 10. and Deut. v. 14.

According to the Jewiſh way of reckoning, agreeably to the law of Moſes, there were three ſorts of men in the world: Iſraelites, called alſo home-born, or natives; ſtrangers within their gates, and aliens. So Deut. xiv. 21. *Ye ſhall not eat any thing that dieth of itſelf. Thou ſhalt give it to the ſtranger that is in thy gates, that he may eat it: or thou mayeſt ſell it to an alien.* Or, otherwiſe, there were two ſorts of men, circumciſed and uncircumciſed, Jews and Gentiles, or Heathens.

A proſelyte, as before ſaid, is a man circumciſed according to the law of Moſes, or a Jew by religion. This is the ſenſe of the word in all the texts of the New Teſtament, where it is uſed. Matt. xxiii. 15. *Ye compaſs ſea and land to make one proſelyte.* Acts ii. 10. *Jews and proſelytes.* Acts vi. 5. *Nicolas, a proſelyte of Antioch.* Ch. xiii. 43. *Religious proſelytes.* There never was any doubt about preaching to theſe, and receiving them into the church. Such were among St. Peter's hearers of his firſt ſermon. And one ſuch perſon at leaſt was among the ſeven deacons in the church of Jeruſalem.

In this ſenſe the word is always underſtood by ancient chriſtian writers. Says Bede in his expoſition of the ſecond chapter of the Acts: 'They [f] called thoſe proſelytes, that is, 'ſtrangers, who being of gentile original, had embraced 'circumciſion, and judaiſm.' To the like purpoſe [g] another Latin writer, of the ninth century, in his commentary upon St. Matthew's goſpel. So likewiſe [h] Theodoret, and [i] Euthy-

[f] *Judæi quoque et proſelyti.*] Proſelytos, id eſt, advenas, nuncupabant eos, qui de Gentibus originem ducentes, circumciſionem et judaiſmum eligere malebant. Non ſolum ergo, inquiunt, [f. inquit,] qui naturâ ſuâ Judæi ex diverſo orbe convenerant: verum et ii, qui de præputio nati, eorum adhæſere ritui. Bed. Expoſ. in Act. Ap. cap. ii.

[g] Proſelytus dicebatur Græce advena: quia de alia gente ad legem ipſorum convertebatur, ut fuit Jethro, et Achior. Et multa millia virorum fuerunt, qui de Gentibus circumciſi fuerunt, et Deum cœli crediderunt. Chriſtian. Druthmar. Grammatic. Exp. in Matth. ap. Bib. PP. tom. XV. p. 156. A.

[h] Οἱ ἐξ ἐθνων προσελήλυθοτες, και κατα τας σας νομους πολιτευεσθαι, την ἀδικον παρ' αυτων σφαγην ὑπομενουσι· προσηλυτες γαρ τουτους ωνομασε. Theod. in Pſ. xciii. al. xciv. ver. 6. tom. I. p. 775. Conf. Suid. V. Προσηλυτος.

[i] Proſelytum vero Judæi appellabant, qui ex Gentili effectus fuiſſet Judæus. Euthym. in Pſ. xciii. p. 396. ap. Bib. PP. T. XIX.

mius.

mius. Nor do I believe, that the notion of two ſorts of Jewiſh proſelytes can be found in any chriſtian writer before the fourteenth century or later.

Cornelius is not called a proſelyte in the New Teſtament. It is ſaid of him, that [k] he was *a devout man, and one that feared God with all his houſe:* that is, he was a truly good man. What is there ſaid of him is only his perſonal character. Here is not any thing, denoting a religious denomination, as ſome have thought. And it is plain, that notwithſtanding his piety, he was an alien. Peter would not have converſed with him, if he had not been directed by an expreſs command. The reaſon is, that there is no appointment in the law of Moſes for receiving any men into covenant with God, or to communion with his people, but by circumciſion: which implied an obligation to obey all the laws of the Moſaic inſtitution.

Let us now go over, and obſerve the moſt remarkable particulars of this hiſtory.

Cornelius, and his friends, are called gentiles, ch. x. 45. ch. xi. 1, and 18. ch. xv. 7. that is, *gojim*, a Hebrew word, very frequent in the Old Teſtament, and rendered by us *nations*, or *heathen* or *heathens*. And in our verſion of the New Teſtament likewiſe is ſeveral times put *heathen* inſtead of *the nations*, or *the gentiles*, 2 Cor. xi. 26. Gal. ii. 9. ch. iii. 8.

In the next place we take notice of the veſſel let down from heaven, and ſet before Peter. There were in it *all manner of four-footed beaſts of the earth, and wild beaſts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air:* ſome of them altogether abominable, and exceeding filthy in the eye of Jews. Hereby are repreſented the people, who had ſent for Peter, though pious, becauſe they were uncircumciſed. But it is likely, that herein are alſo included, and repreſented gentiles of all ſorts, men of every nation, all men uncircumciſed in general, whether worſhippers of God, or not. ver. 13—16. *And there came a voice to him, ſaying: ariſe, Peter, kill, and eat. But Peter ſaid: not ſo, Lord, for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice ſpake unto him again the ſecond time: what God has cleanſed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the veſſel was received up again into heaven.*——

[k] Ευσεβης και φοβουμενος τον θεον, συν παντι τῳ οικῳ αυτου.

What.

What God has cleanſed, that call not thou common: denoting, that thoſe people, which were moſt impure in Jewiſh eſteem, were now cleanſed, or to be cleanſed, and to be received as pure and holy.

Omitting ſome other things, in the next place we obſerve Peter's addreſs at the houſe of Cornelius, ver. 28. *Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to* (D) *keep company, or to come to a man of another nation.* The people therefore, to whom Peter had been ſent, and among whom he now was, were ſuch, as no Jew might converſe with, according to the law of Moſes, and their eſtabliſhed cuſtom. *A man of another nation*: αλλοφυλω: an alien or foreigner. Jerom obſerves, that [1] though the Greek word ſignifies in general a man of another nation; the ſeventy tranſlators of the Old Teſtament conſtantly made uſe of it, to denote the philiſtines, or heathen people of the land of Paleſtine. That obſervation is repeated by him. And I have tranſcribed below ſeveral of his paſſages. This character, an alien, or a man of another nation, ſatisfies us, that the people, to whom Peter was now ſent by divine order, had not been before received into the Jewiſh church, or admitted to communion with them, but were aliens from their commonwealth.

(D) 'Κολλασθαι η προσερχεσθαι αλλοφυλω. By which words is not to be underſtood, as if a Jew might have no dealing at all with a gentile, and traffic with them: for it was next to impoſſible to do otherwiſe, they living, very many of them, in heathen cities. And gentiles came continually, in the way of trade, to Jeruſalem, Neh. xiii. 16. What was unlawful, was converſing with gentiles in near and cloſe ſociety, as the word κολλασθαι ſignifies, and that eſpecially in theſe two things, *not to eat with them*, and *not to go into their houſes*. And this is that, for which they of the circumciſion excepted at Peter upon his return. *Thou wenteſt in to men uncircumciſed, and didſt eat with them*, ch. xi. 3.' So Lightfoot in his commentary upon the Acts of the apoſtles, vol I. p. 844. Where follow other things, relating to this ſubject, very worthy of obſervation.

[1] Pro Philiſthiim ſemper lxx. alienigenas interpretati ſunt, nomen commune pro proprio: quæ eſt hodie gens Palæſtinorum, quaſi Philiſtinorum. Hieron: in Iſ. cap. ii. 6. tom. III. p. 24.

Philiſtæos autem, ut ſæpe diximus, Palæſtinos ſignificat, quos alienigenas vulgata ſcribit editio: quum hic non unius gentis, ſed omnium cæterarum gentium vocabulum ſit. Id in Iſ. xiv. 29. p. 116.

Videamus autem, quid Philiſthiim, et urbes ejus peccaverint, quos ſeptuaginta ſemper alienigenas tranſtulerunt. Ubiquumque enim in veteri teſtamento αλλοφυλες, id eſt, *alienigenas*, legimus, non commune nomen omnium externarum gentium ſed proprie Philiſthiim, qui nunc Palæſtini vocantur, accipiendi ſunt. Id. in Amos. cap. i. ib. p. 1376.

It

It follows in the ſame addreſs of Peter: *But God has ſhowed me, that I ſhould not call any man common or unclean.* Thoſe expreſſions are as general and comprehenſive as any that can be uſed; plainly including all mankind, who now were cleanſed, or to be cleanſed and purified by faith, and received into the church of God without circumciſion.

Cornelius having declared the occaſion of ſending for him, *Peter opened his mouth, and ſaid, of a truth I perceive that God is no reſpecter of perſons: but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteouſneſs, is accepted with him.* Theſe expreſſions are as general and comprehenſive as the former, including men of all nations, without exception.

The concluſion of St. Peter's diſcourſe at the houſe of Cornelius, is this, *To him give all the prophets witneſs, that through his name, whoſoever believeth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins:* Which, ſo far as I am able to perceive, is preaching the goſpel as clearly as ever it was preached by Paul himſelf.

While Peter yet ſpake theſe words, the Holy Ghoſt fell on all them that heard the word. Or, as St. Peter himſelf expreſſeth it, rehearſing the matter at Jeruſalem, ch. xi. 15. *As I began to ſpeak, the Holy Ghoſt fell on all them, as on us at the beginning*; whereupon Peter ordered them to be baptized, and ſo received into the church. And, as he ſays in the defence of himſelf, *Foraſmuch then, as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; what was I that I could withſtand God?*

That very extraordinary manifeſtation, the coming down of the Holy Ghoſt immediately from heaven upon theſe perſons, leads us to think, that the tranſaction at the houſe of Cornelius was a very important thing, and no leſs than cleanſing the whole gentile world: or encouraging the preaching of the goſpel to them, and receiving them to communion, without the rites of the law. And from this time forward it was ſo preached to them, as appears from the hiſtory in the Acts.

I ſuppoſe, that what I have now ſaid is agreeable to the ſenſe of all Chriſtians in ancient times; who call Cornelius [m] the firſt-fruits of the gentiles, and [n] the beginning of the gentiles,

[m] Ex quibus eſſe arbitror etiam Cornelium illum, qui Cæſarienſis eccleſiæ cum iis cum quibus Spiritum Sanctum meruit accipere, primitiæ merito dicitur. Et non ſolum hujus eccleſiæ, ſed fortaſſis et omnium

gentiles. And ſay, that [o] in him all gentiles were cleanſed and ſanctified, and that [p] the living creatures of all kinds, which were in the veſſel let down to Peter, and held by four corners, repreſented all gentiles throughout the world.

Many learned men of late times make a great difference between preaching the goſpel to what they call *devout gentiles*, or *proſelytes of the gate*, and *idolatrous gentiles*. But I do not perceive, that Chriſtians in ancient times had any notion of this. Nor is there any foundation for it in the New Teſtament. But all men, uncircumciſed, whether worſhippers of God, or idolatrous, are called gentiles. That Cornelius, and his family, and friends, are called gentiles, though pious, has been lately ſeen. And in almoſt innumerable places of St. Paul's epiſtles the ſame word is uſed of ſuch as then were, or had been idolaters.

Nor can I conceive, how there ſhould be an objection againſt preaching to idolatrous gentiles, in order to convert them from idolatry. It is well known, that the Jewiſh people were very diligent in making proſelytes to their religion. Our Lord himſelf has taken notice of it, Matt. xxiii. 15. The obſtructions given to Paul were not owing to his converting men from idolatry, but to his manner of receiving them. If he had taught, and required them to be circumciſed, and keep the law, all had been well. For certain, I

omnium gentium primitiæ Cornelius appellandus eſt. Primus enim credidit ex gentibus, et primus Sancto Spiritu repletus eſt. Et ideo recte primitiæ gentium appellabitur. Origen. in Num. hom. xi. p. 306. T. II. Bened. [n] Ὁρας πόθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ γίνεται τῶν ἐθνῶν. Chryſ. in Act. Ap. hom. 22. T. IX. p. 180.

[o] Sub Apoſtolis vero, cum ii, qui in Chriſtum ex circumciſione crediderant, eos qui gentiles erant, dicebanturque præputium, juſtificationem gratiæ arbitrarentur participes eſſe non poſſe, docet B. Apoſtolus Petrus, quam indiſcretus apud Deum uterque ſit populus, ſi in unitatem fidei denuo convenerint. *Cum autem*, inquit, *cœpiſſem loqui*, &c De Vocatione Gentium. Lib. II. cap. 18.

[p] Etenim Eccleſia necdum erat in gentibus. In Judæa crediderunt ex Judæis, et putabant——ſolos ſe pertinere ad Chriſtum. Miſſi ſunt Apoſtoli ad gentes, prædicatum eſt Cornelio.——Diſcus ille, qui habebat omnia animalia, ſignificabat omnes gentes. Ideo autem quatuor lineis pendebat, quia quatuor ſunt partes orbis, unde futuri populi erant. Auguſt. Enarr. in Pſ. xcvi. num. 13. tom. IV.

Siquidem cum Sanctus Petrus per viſionem omne genus animalium, de baptizando Cornelio, ac perinde de omnibus gentibus doceretur, atque ille immundum et indiſcretum cibum Judaica obſervantia recuſaret, trina ad eum vox facta ſit, dicens: Quæ Deus mundavit, tu ne commune dixeris. Proſper. ep. ad Rufin. cap. vi. ap. Aug. T. X. in Append. Ed. Bened.

think, there could have been no offence taken by any believers from among the Jews, however bigotted. *And I, brethren*, ſays the apoſtle to the Galatians, *if I yet preach circumciſion, why do I yet ſuffer perſecution? Then is the offence of the croſs ceaſed*, Gal. v. 11.

Theſe thoughts, which are now propoſed to public conſideration, are not new. A thorough examination of this point was occaſioned by the Miſcellanea Sacra, which was publiſhed in 1725. And in a few years I came to a full determination. Nor have I concealed my ſentiments. They have been communicated to ſeveral. And by ſome they have been approved.

Nor do I make any queſtion, but that others likewiſe are of the ſame opinion. I ſhall therefore here tranſcribe a paragraph of a letter from my honoured friend, Mr. Joſeph Hallett, of Exeter, received from him in the year 1735. 'It is certain 'fact,' ſays he, 'that the ſcripture never mentions the difference between preaching to devout Gentiles, and idolatrous 'Gentiles, which ſome do. The original inſtruction was: 'Go, *diſciple all nations*, Matt. xxviii. 19. *Preach the goſpel to 'every creature*, Mark xvi. 15. The order in which the apoſtles 'were to preach the goſpel, was in *Jeruſalem, in all Judea, in 'Samaria, and to the uttermoſt parts of the earth*, Acts i. 8. 'In theſe, and all other places, one and the ſame character 'comprehends all Gentiles. When St. Peter ſtuck at preaching the goſpel to Cornelius, the plain reaſon was, becauſe he 'was uncircumciſed. See Acts xi. 3. Neither he at firſt, nor 'they that afterwards quarrelled with him, would have any 'more heſitated to preach to idolaters, than to Cornelius. 'Only in that caſe, they muſt have begun with proving the 'unity of God; which they had no need to do in the caſe of 'Cornelius, ſince he already believed it.'

And as I have this opportunity, I ſhall now communicate to the public ſome other thoughts of Mr. Hallett, relating to the ſame ſubject, which I received from him at the ſame time. 'That the decree in Acts xv. relates to the idolatrous 'gentiles in particular, is manifeſt. Indeed it is demonſtrable from ver. 19. where St. James ſpeaks of thoſe, '*who from among the gentiles are turned to God.* Their being '*turned to God* here is the ſame, as their becoming Chriſtians. 'They were not turned to God before. And therefore they 'were (not devout, but) idolatrous gentiles. They were 'plainly of the ſame ſort with the Theſſalonians, who *turned 'to God from idols*, 1 Theſſ. i. 9. who are acknowledged

'to

'to be idolatrous gentiles. The ſame character then will 'prove, that the others were ſo too. The ſame thing is 'demonſtrable from ver. 17. For the expreſſion, *all the* '*gentiles*, can never be reſtrained to a few proſelytes of the 'gate. Farther, the letter of the church of Jeruſalem was 'directed and ſent to the believing gentiles in Antioch, &c. 'ver. 23. to decide a diſpute, which was raiſed there. But 'the diſpute there was about idolatrous gentiles in par-'ticular, ver. 2, 3, 5. Conſequently, the letter muſt be 'interpreted to ſpeak of the ſame perſons. Nay the church 'at Antioch was compoſed of ſuch as had been idolatrous 'gentiles. And therefore the letter muſt relate to that ſort 'of men. And when Paul went through Syria, Cilicia, 'Derbe, Lyſtra, &c. (where, it is allowed, there were 'converts from among the idolatrous gentiles) *he delivered* '*the decrees to them*, i. e. the ſaid idolatrous gentiles, to *keep*, 'ch. xvi. 1, 4.' So Mr. Hallett.

Dr. Doddridge, in the third volume of his Family Expoſitor, which is upon the Acts of the apoſtles, has many acute and judicious obſervations, relating to this ſubject. And I am well ſatisfied, that he intended to write a diſſertation concerning Jewiſh proſelytes. Which is alſo acknowledged by [q] the learned editor of his poſthumous volumes: though no ſuch thing has been found among his papers. And in his general introduction to the firſt epiſtle of St. Peter, Dr. Doddridge freely declares, 'that there is no 'ſufficient ground to ſuppoſe, that there ever were any 'ſuch perſons, as proſelytes of the gate.' And he thinks, 'that what he has ſuggeſted in his notes upon the Acts may 'convince an attentive reader.' And indeed I am of the ſame opinion concerning what he has ſaid in thoſe notes. For which reaſon I do not ſo much regret the loſs of the diſſertation, as otherwiſe I ſhould.

Says Sueur, ſpeaking of St. Peter's viſion of the ſheet: 'God [r] thereby ſhowed unto his ſervant, that thenceforward 'he would have all the people of the world, without excep-'tion, called to partake in his gracious covenant in his ſon

[q] See the note at the bottom of p. 218. of the ſixth volume of the Family Expoſitor.

[r] 'Et puiſque Dieu rompoit cette ſeparation, il montroit à ſon ſerviteur, que de là en avant il vouloit appeller indifferement tous les peuples de la monde à ſon alliance de grace en ſon fils Jeſus Chriſt, et à ſa ſalutaire connoiſſance. J. Sueur Hiſt. de l'Egliſe, &c. A. C. 41. tom. I. p. 165.

'Jeſus Chriſt, and to the knowledge of ſalvation by him.' That it was ſo underſtood by the primitive Chriſtians, we have lately ſeen. And that this whole tranſaction was ſo underſtood by the apoſtles, and by the evangeliſts, their fellow-labourers, is manifeſt from the ſequel of the hiſtory in the book of the Acts.

For removing difficulties, and fully clearing up this point, it may be needful to conſider that text. Gal. ii. 1, 2. *Then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jeruſalem, with Barnabas, and took Titus with me alſo. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that goſpel, which I preach among the gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, leſt by any means I ſhould run, or had run in vain.*

Some* who contend for the ſuppoſition of two ſorts of proſelytes among the Jews, and think, that the goſpel was preached ſeveral years to ſuch as they call *proſelytes of the gate*, before it was preached to idolatrous gentiles, and underſtand the decree of the council of Jeruſalem to bind thoſe proſelytes only, ſay, that the converſion of idolatrous gentiles was unknown to the church at Jeruſalem, when that decree was made, and explain the above cited words after this manner: 'That ** Paul communicated what he had preached to the 'gentiles, only to James, and Peter, and John, the three 'renowned apoſtles of the circumciſion, and that under the 'ſeal of the greateſt ſecrecy.'

But that cannot be St. Paul's meaning. For moſt, if not all the converts at Antioch, muſt have been idolaters. But, ſuppoſing for the preſent, that they had been devout gentiles; it is univerſally allowed, that before the controverſy aroſe at Antioch about circumciſing the gentiles that believed, the goſpel had been preached for a good while by Paul and Barnabas to idolatrous gentiles in Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Piſidia, Iconium, Lyſtra, Derbe, and other places: of which a particular account is given Acts xiii. xiv. And preſently after, St. Luke, relating the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jeruſalem, ſays, ch. xv. 3, 4. *And being brought on their way by the church* [of Antioch] *they paſſed through Phenice, and Samaria, declaring the converſion of the gentiles* [or heathens:] *and they cauſed great joy to all the brethren. And*

* See Miſcellanea Sacra in the Preface, and Eſſay iv. and Dr. Benſon's Hiſtory of the firſt planting the Chriſtian Religion. vol. II. chap. iii. ſect. i. ii. &c.

** Miſcell. Sacr. Eſſ. iv. p. 50. Dr. Benſon, as before, vol. II. p. 52. ſecond edit.

when

when they were come to Jeruſalem, they were received by the church, and by the apoſtles, and elders; and they declared all things, that God had done with them. In which muſt have been included their preaching not only at Antioch in Syria, but alſo in all the other countries and cities mentioned juſt before. Of this they gave an account to the church of Jeruſalem in general, and particularly to the apoſtles and elders.

And Acts xv. 12. in the council. *Then all the multitude kept ſilence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles God had wrought among the gentiles by them.*

And ver. 25, 26. the apoſtles and elders in their epiſtle, ſpeaking of Barnabas and Paul, ſay, *they were men that had hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Intending, as may be reaſonably ſuppoſed, the dangers, and ſufferings, which they had met with, when preaching the goſpel to idolaters at Antioch in Piſidia, Iconium, and Lyſtra, of which St. Luke has given an account Acts xiii. near the end, and ch. xiv. to which St. Paul alſo refers. 2 Tim. iii. 11. Theſe things Paul and Barnabas, or the brethren that went up with them from Antioch, had related to the church at Jeruſalem, and to the apoſtles and elders. For we hence plainly perceive, that theſe things were well known there.

That is St. Luke's hiſtory. Let us now obſerve St. Paul's own words in this text. *Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jeruſalem.——And I went up by revelation, and communicated to them that goſpel, which I preach among the gentiles:* meaning, as ſeems to me, the church, or the believing brethren there. So ſay all the beſt interpreters in general. Dr. Hammond's paraphraſe is in theſe words: 'And by 'God's appointment, either firſt ſignified, or afterwards 'confirmed to me by viſion (ſuch as Paul had about ſeveral 'matters) I went up at this time to Jeruſalem, and gave the 'church there an account of my preaching, and the ſucceſs 'of it among the gentiles. This I thought fit to do, and yet 'firſt to do it to thoſe that were the principal men among 'them.' So Hammond. To the like purpoſe Eſtius, †* whom

† *Et contuli cum illis evangelium, quod prædico in Gentibus.* Auguſtinus legit: *Et expoſui illis.* Sed intellige, more conferentis. Id enim vult, etiam Hieronomo teſte, quod in Græco eſt, ανεθεμην αυτοις. Nam ſenſus eſt: Communicavi cum illis qui Jeroſolymis erant, de evangelio, quod prædico inter Gentes, deque tota ratione doctrinæ meæ

whom I transcribe below. Le Clerc's French version is to this purpose. ‘ *And* †‡ *I explained* in public *to the saints the* ‘ *gospel which I preach among the gentiles: the which I also did in* ‘ *particular to them who were in reputation.*’ And Beausobre's: *I* †* *went thither by revelation, and I conferred with the faithful about the gospel, which I preach among the gentiles. I conferred about it also in particular with those who were most esteemed among them.* *,*

It follows in the same verse: *Lest by any means I should run, or had run in vain.* That is: ‘ This I thought fit to do, in ‘ order to secure the success of my ministry: for remov. ‘ ing obstacles in the way of my preaching for the future, ‘ and that the minds of converts already made might not ‘ be unsettled. With those views I conferred with the ‘ believers at Jerusalem in public, and also in private with ‘ those who were most esteemed.’

Ver. 3. *But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.* The apostle's taking such particular notice of Titus in a letter to Christians converted from idolatry, and calling him a Greek, led us to think, that he was originally idolatrous.

Ver. 4. *And that because of false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.* ver. 5. *To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour: that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.*

quam tradidi, et etiam nunc trado Gentibus, quarum sum Apostolus. Non itaque discendi studio, quod supra negavit, evangelium suum nunc demum cum Ecclesia Jerosolymitana confert. &c. Est. ad Gal. ii. 2. †‡ J'y allai —— et j'expliquai *en public* aux saints l'evangile, que j'annonce parmi les Gentils: ce que je fis aussi en particulier à ceux qui étoient le plus en reputation. Le Clerc.

†* Or j'y allai par revelation, et je conferai *avec les fidelles* touchant l'evangile, que je prêche parmi les Gentils. J'en conferai en particulier avec les plus celebres entre eux. Beauf. *,* The interpretation given by me of St. Paul's phrase κατ' ἰδιαν, as equivalent to *separately, particularly*, may be much confirmed by a passage of Libanius, which I here transcribe. Ἐγω δὲ σοι μετα της ολης πολεως οιδα χαριν. Οιδε γαρ με και αυτον εν τοις παρ' εκεινοις ειναι γραμμασι· και παλιν ἰδια ταυτον ποιω. Liban. [ad Maximum.] Ep. 1157. p. 553. ed. Wolf. To which may be added another from Josephus. Επει δ' ωφεσχημαι την αιτιολογιαν απαντων ἰδια συγγραψαμενος παραδωσειν, εις τοτε και την περι αυτης ερμηνειαν αναβαλλομαι. Antiq. l. i. cap. i. § 1.

Accordingly, the Latin Vulgate is thus: *Seorsum autem iis, qui videbantur aliquid esse.* —— And, in the margin of some of our Bibles, for *privately* is put *severally*: which I think to be the true meaning.

Where

Where St. Paul ſeems to refer to the riſe of the diſpute at Antioch, which is thus related by St. Luke. Acts xv. 1. *And certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and ſaid: unleſs ye be circumciſed after the manner of Moſes, ye cannot be ſaved.* Theſe, as the apoſtle here ſays, had intruded themſelves into the church of Antioch, that they might bring them into ſubjection to all the burdenſome obſervances of the law of Moſes. Upon that account, and for defeating their deſign, he went up to Jeruſalem, and there acted, as juſt ſhown.

This text, and the explication now given of it, may receive illuſtration from the account, which St. Luke gives of Paul's coming to Jeruſalem afterwards, where he firſt converſes with the brethren, and then has a conference with James and the elders. The reſult of which is ſoon made known to all. Acts xxi. 17. *And when we were come to Jeruſalem, the brethren received us gladly.* ver. 18. *And the day following Paul went in with us unto James. And all the elders were preſent.* ver. 19. *And when he had ſaluted them, he declared to them * particularly what things God had wrought among the gentiles by his miniſtry.* Certainly St. Paul here intends heathens and idolaters. ver. 20. *And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and ſaid to him* ——ver. 25. *As touching the gentiles which believe, we have written, and concluded, that they obſerve no ſuch thing.*——The connection leads us to ſuppoſe, that they ſpeak of all gentiles whatever, idolatrous, as well as others.

Upon the whole the apoſtle aſſures the Chriſtians, his converts, in Galatia, that his going to Jeruſalem, his declaring there to all, the goſpel which he preached among the gentiles, and his conferring in private with the apoſtles, particularly, with thoſe who were reckoned the chief of them, were all done with a view to their benefit, *that the truth of the goſpel might continue with them*, and other gentiles. And the event, as related by St. Luke, and as repreſented by the apoſtle himſelf in this epiſtle, was entirely to his ſatisfaction.

St. Paul in this epiſtle moſt earneſtly exhorts the Galatians, *to ſtand faſt in the liberty, with which Chriſt has made us free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of bondage*, ch. v. 1. and he ſeverely cenſures inſtability in the genuine faith of

* —— εξηγειτο καθ' εν εκαστον ων εποιησεν ο θεος εν τοις εθνεσι δια της διακονιας αυτου.

the goſpel. It would be, as ſeems to me, very ſtrange, to ſuppoſe him to ſay, that when he was at Jeruſalem, a few years only before writing this epiſtle, he had ſtudiouſly concealed the doctrine, which he preached among the gentiles, from all but ſome few apoſtles. His ſo doing, whether through fear, or from prudential conſiderations, or any reaſons whatever, muſt have been a great diſcouragement to thoſe, to whom he is writing. How could it be expected, that they ſhould openly aſſert before all the world the true evangelical liberty, if himſelf had been upon the reſerve upon a late and important occaſion?

St. Paul's having a private conference with ſome of the apoſtles, is no proof, that he had any ſecrets, with-held from the knowledge of others. But it might be a proper piece of reſpect, to diſcourſe with thoſe who were in great eſteem, about what was to be communicated to all.

If St. Paul had deſired to conceal his preaching to idolatrous gentiles, he could not have done it. His preaching at Antioch, and his and Barnabas's peregrination in divers other countries, related in Acts xiii. xiv. were well known to all the Chriſtians at Antioch. And when Paul and Barnabas went thence to Jeruſalem about the queſtion that had been ſtarted there; it is very likely, that ſome went to Jeruſalem upon the ſame occaſion, who were on the impoſing ſide of the queſtion. If Paul had endeavoured to conceal any thing of an offenſive nature, they would not have failed to divulge it.

We now proceed in the hiſtory.

Peter having by divine appointment and direction performed that important ſervice at the houſe of Cornelius in Cæſarea, and having received gentiles into communion by baptiſm, without circumciſion according to the law of Moſes: and his conduct having been approved by the apoſtles, and brethren at Jeruſalem: *they who had been ſcattered abroad upon the perſecution that aroſe about Stephen*, and had hitherto preached the word to none but Jews only, having heard of this tranſaction, when they came to Antioch, *ſpake unto the Greeks* there, *preaching the Lord Jeſus. And the hand of the Lord was with them. And a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord. Then tidings of theſe things came unto the ears of the church which was at Jeruſalem. And they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch.* He afterwards brought Paul thither. And from that time forward the goſpel

pel was freely preached to Gentiles, as well as Jews, and with great ſucceſs. Acts xi. 19—26.

Soon after the converſion of Cornelius, it is likely that *the reſt of the churches*, before-mentioned was abated, till it was quite interrupted. However, Peter, and the other apoſtles, ſtill continued in Judea. And according to the utmoſt of their power, as the circumſtances of things allowed, employed themſelves in confirming the believers, and making additions to their number.

Toward the end of his reign Herod Agrippa became an open perſecutor of the believers; *and 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.*] *And when he had apprehended him, he put him in priſon, and delivered him to four quaternions of ſoldiers, to keep him:* that is, ſixteen in all, four of which were by turns to watch him: *intending after Eaſter to bring him forth to the people.* Acts x. 1—4.

The converſion of Cornelius happened, as I ſuppoſe, in the year 41 of our Saviour's nativity, according to the vulgar computation. And the Eaſter, or paſſover, here mentioned, was, probably, the paſſover of the year 44.

Peter therefore was kept in priſon. But prayer was made without ceaſing of the church unto God for him. ver. 5. And he was delivered out of priſon in a miraculous manner, as related ver. 6—11. The Divine Being did not allow, that a period ſhould be yet put to the life of that apoſtle. One thing very obſervable in this hiſtory is the compoſure of Peter's mind in a great extremity, and in the near apprehenſion of death. For it is ſaid ver. 6. *And when Herod would have brought him forth, the ſame night Peter was ſleeping between two ſoldiers, bound with two chains.* In that poſture the angel found him, who at that inſtant was ſent to aſſiſt his eſcape.

Having informed ſome of his intimate friends, aſſembled at the houſe of Mary, in Jeruſalem, of his wonderful deliverance out of priſon, *he departed and went to another place.* ver. 17. Meaning either another houſe in Jeruſalem, or elſe ſome city, or village, not far from it. Where, probably, he lived privately, till the death of Herod Agrippa, which happened before the end of that year.

Some have thought, that Peter now went to Antioch, or Rome. But there is no good evidence of either of thoſe opinions. Says Mr. Lenfant upon the place: 'If St. Peter 'had

'had gone to ſome celebrated city, for inſtance, Antioch, 'according to ſome, or Rome, according to others, no 'doubt St. Luke would have mentioned it, and ſome of the 'brethren would have accompanied him, according to 'cuſtom. From the manner in which St. Luke expreſſeth 'himſelf, nothing is more natural, than to ſuppoſe, that St. 'Peter, that he might not expoſe to danger the faithful at 'the houſe where he firſt called, and where many were aſ-'ſembled, retired to ſome other place in Jeruſalem.'

In the year 49, or 50, was aſſembled the council of Jeruſalem, concerning the queſtion, *whether it was needful to circumciſe the gentiles, who believed, and to command them to keep the law.* At this aſſembly Peter was preſent, and in the debate clearly declared his opinion, that *the yoke of the law ſhould not be laid upon the neck of the diſciples* from among the gentiles. As a cogent argument for his opinion, he reminded the aſſembly, how by divine appointment he had preached the word of the goſpel to gentiles at Cæſarea, and that God, *who knoweth the hearts of all men*, had ſhown his acceptance of them by giving to them the Holy Ghoſt, though uncircumciſed. By which it had been made manifeſt, that they might be ſaved by faith in Jeſus Chriſt, without the rituals of the law.

Whilſt Paul was this time at Jeruſalem, James, Peter, and John, *gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowſhip*, that they might proceed in preaching to the gentiles: whilſt they, and the other apoſtles, ſtill continued in Judea to preach to thoſe of the circumciſion, Gal. ii. 6—10.

III. Some ſhort time afterwards, as it ſeems, Peter was at Antioch, as we learn from St. Paul, Gal. ii. 11—16. I place this journey of Peter to Antioch, after the council of Jeruſalem, according to the general opinion. But Baſnage argues, that [s] it was before it. If it was not till after it (as I rather think) it could not be long. For Barnabas was now at Antioch. Whereas in a ſhort time after their return thither from Jeruſalem, he and Paul parted. Here Peter at firſt

[s] Illud nobis veriſimilius, Concilii Hieroſolymitani celebrationi anteceſſiſſe Petrinam hanc in Syriæ metropoli commorationem. Argumento eſt diſceptatio Pauli cum Petro, cujus diſſimulationem obruiſſet auctoritate Synodi, ſi jam coacta fuiſſet. Quin immo nulla Petro, et timendi Judæos, et eorum gratiâ ſeſe ſeparandi a Gentibus cauſſa fuit, ſi tum temporis promulgata fuiſſet Concilii Hieroſolymitani Epiſtola: quo veluti clypeo, ad omnes telorum Judaicorum ictus tutus erat. Baſnag. Ann. 46. num. xxv.

converſed

converſed freely with the gentile converts. But when there came thither from Judea ſome Jewiſh believers, zealous for the law, *he ſeparated himſelf, fearing them of the circumciſion.* Herein Peter acted contrary to his own judgment, and declared opinion, through fear of the diſpleaſure of others. St. Paul therefore repreſents his conduct, as diſſimulation, or hypocriſy. What he now did, in compliance with the zealots for the law, was a thing of very bad tendency. St. Paul therefore juſtly *withſtood him*, and ſo ſhowed him to be blameable, that Peter acquieſced. Hereby, as Paul expreſſeth it, *he* (E) *compelled the gentiles to judaize*, or become Jews. For his ſeparating from them, as unfit for converſe and communion with the apoſtles of Chriſt, and the believers from among the Jews, implied, that they were not acceptable in the ſight of God, nor in the way of ſalvation: and that in order to be ſaved, it was needful for them to be circumciſed, and keep the law.

It was, as I ſuppoſe, ſoon after the council, and the year 50, in which Peter came to Antioch. And I imagine, that he now firſt of all went abroad out of Judea, into gentile countries. It is very likely, that he was deſirous to ſee the chriſtian people at Antioch. But hitherto he had been little uſed to converſe with gentiles. And when ſome zealous Jewiſh believers came to Antioch from Jeruſalem, he was alarmed: recollecting, it is likely, how ſome at Jeruſalem had contended with him after he was come from Cæſarea, becauſe he had been with men uncircumciſed, and *did eat with them*, Acts xi. 23. and very well knowing, from long and frequent experience, the prevailing temper of the people of his country. But it is reaſonable to think, that Peter

(E) *He compelled the gentiles to judaize*, or become Jews.] Our tranſlation is, *Why compelleſt thou the gentiles to live as do the Jews?* But it is far from being exact. Τι τα εθνη αναγκαζεις ιουδαιζειν; to judaize is to become a Jew, or proſelyte to the Jewiſh religion. Eſther viii. 17. *And many of the people of the land became Jews.* Or, as in the ſeventy——*were circumciſed, and judaized.* Και πολλοι των εθνων περιετεμνοντο, και ιουδαιζον. The Greek word is uſed in the ſame ſenſe by Joſephus. De B. J. l. 2. cap. 18 n. 2. Απεσκευασθαι γαρ τους ιουδαιους δοκουντες εκαστοι, τους ιουδαιζοντας ειχον εν υποψια. To chriſtianize, arianize, ſabellianize, is to become a Chriſtian, an Arian, a Sabellian. And to judaize is to become a Jew. Which, if I may be allowed to ſay it, ſhows the impropriety of the uſe of the word, Judaizer, now very common among learned moderns, as denoting a man, who is for impoſing Judaiſm upon others.

never

never more ſhowed the like unſteadineſs, but was firm ever afterwards.

This is the laſt time, that Peter is expreſsly mentioned in the New Teſtament, excepting his own epiſtles, and 1 Cor. i. 12. and ch. iii. 22. From which texts Pearſon concludes, that [t] St. Peter had been at Corinth, before St. Paul wrote his firſt epiſtle to the church there. But others think, that [u] there were ſome at Corinth, who had heard Peter preach in Judea: and ſome, who had ſeen Chriſt in perſon. They who ſaid, *I am of Cephas, or of Chriſt*, muſt be ſuppoſed to have been Jews, either by deſcent, or religion.

I do not think, theſe words can prove that Peter had been at Corinth, before Paul wrote this epiſtle. At ch. iii. 6. St. Paul ſays: *I have planted. Apollos watered.* He makes no mention of Peter's labours among the Corinthians. Peter may have been at Corinth afterwards, in his way to Rome. But I do not ſee any proof from this epiſtle of his having been there.

IV. We have no where any very diſtinct account of this apoſtle's travels. He might return to Judea, and ſtay there a good while after having been at Antioch, at the time ſpoken of by St. Paul in the epiſtle to the Galatians. However, I formerly quoted Epiphanius, ſaying, that [x] Peter was often in the countries of Pontus, and Bithynia. And by Euſebius we are aſſured, that Origen in the third tome of his expoſition of the book of Geneſis, writes to this pur-

[t] At certiſſimum eſt, Petrum non minus quam Paulum Corinthi fuiſſe, et quidem antequam S. Paulus primam epiſtolam dedit ad Corinthios. Ita enim Apoſtolus loquitur. 1 Cor. i. 12. Unde colligitur, non minus Cepham, et Apollo, quam Paulum Corinthi fuiſſe. Pearſ. Op. Poſt. Diſſ. i. cap. vii. p. 37.

[u] Alii ergo Corinthi ab Apollo inſtituti poſt Pauli abitum, alii ab ipſo Paulo, alii qui ex Judæa venerant a Petro, ſub illis nominibus, alia atque alia dogmata tradebant. ——*Ego autem Chriſti.* Venerant enim ex Judæa quidam, qui ipſum Chriſtum docentem audierant. Grot. ad 1 Cor. i. 12. Vid. et Witſ. de Vita Pauli. ſect. 7. num. xx. Meletem. p. 104, 105.

Sunt viri docti qui exiſtimant, Petrum Apoſtolum hoc anno Corinthum veniſſe, dum in ea urbe etiamnum eſſet Apollos. —— Sed propenſio in Petrum eſſe potuit, licet Corinthum pedem non intuliſſet. Nihil enim vetat fuiſſe Chriſtianos Corinthi, qui cum Petrum in Judæa aut alibi audiviſſent, magiſtrum eum ſuum dictitarent, et Paulo præferrent. Itaque iter hoc Petri nimis levi conjecturâ nititur. Cleric. H. E. ann. 55. num. v.

[x] Vol. IV. p. 316.

poſe:

poſe: 'Peter [y] is ſuppoſed to have preached to the Jews of 'the diſperſion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, 'and Aſia. Who at length coming to Rome, was crucified 'with his head downwards, himſelf having deſired it might 'be in that manner.'

For the time of Peter's coming to Rome, no ancient writer is now more regarded by learned moderns than Lactantius, or whoever is the author of the book of the Deaths of Perſecutors; who ſays, that [z] Peter came thither in the time of Nero. Inſomuch that [a] Pagi aſſents to this account; and has ſhown it to be altogether improbable that [b] St. Peter came thither in the time of Claudius. He likewiſe obſerves [c] ſome difficulties, which they are liable to, who ſuppoſe that he firſt came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and afterwards in the reign of Nero. But though Peter did not come to Rome before the reign of Nero, which began in the year of Chriſt 54, we cannot ſay exactly the time when he came thither, as is alſo [d] acknowledged by the ſame excellent chronologer.

However, it appears to me very probable, that St. Peter did not come to Rome before the year of Chriſt 63, or 64, nor till after St. Paul's departure thence, at the end of his two years' impriſonment in that city.

The books of the New Teſtament afford a very plauſible, and probable, if not a certain argument for it. After our Lord's aſcenſion we find Peter, with the reſt of the apoſtles, at Jeruſalem. He and John were ſent by the apoſtles from Jeruſalem to Samaria, whence they returned to Jeruſalem. When Paul came to Jeruſalem, three years after his converſion, he found Peter there. Upon occaſion of the tranquillity of the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria,

[y] Πετρος δε εν ρωντω——κεκηρυκεναι τοις εν διασπορα ιουδαιοις εοικεν. Ὁς και επι τελει εν ρωμη γενομενος, ανεσκολοπισθη κατα κεφαλης, ετως αυτος αξιωσας παθειν. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. i.

[z] ——et per annos xxv. uſque ad principium Neroniani imperii per omnes provincias et civitates Eccleſiæ fundamenta miſerunt. Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit, et editis quibuſdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipſius Dei, data ſibi ab eo poteſtate, faciebat, convertit multos ad juſtitiam, Deoque templum fidele ac ſtabile collocavit. Quâ re ad Neronem delatâ——et primus omnium perſecutus Dei ſervos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Perſec. cap. 2.

[a] Critic. in Baron. ann. 43. num. iii. [b] Ibid. num. ii.

[c] Ibid. num. iii.

[d] ——cum verus ejus adventûs annus nos lateat. Id. ann. 54. num. ii.

near

near the end of the reign of Caligula, Peter left Jeruſalem, and viſited the churches in the ſeveral parts of that country, particularly at Lydda and Joppa, where he tarried many days. Thence he went to Cæſarea by the ſea ſide, where he preached to Cornelius, and his company. Thence he returned to Jeruſalem: and ſome time afterwards he was impriſoned there by Herod Agrippa. This brings down the hiſtory of our apoſtle to the year 44. A few years after this he was preſent at the council of Jeruſalem. Nor is there any evidence that he came thither barely for that occaſion. It is more probable, that he had not yet been out of Judea. Soon after that council he was at Antioch, where he was reproved by St. Paul.

The books of the New Teſtament afford no light for determining where Peter was for ſeveral years after that. But to me it appears not unlikely, that he returned in a ſhort time to Judea from Antioch: and that he ſtayed in Judea a good while before he went thence any more. And it ſeems to me, that when he left Judea, he went again to Antioch the chief city of Syria. Thence he might go into other parts of the continent, particularly Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia, which are expreſsly mentioned at the beginning of his firſt epiſtle. In thoſe countries he might ſtay a good while. It is very likely that he did ſo; and that he was well acquainted with the Chriſtians there, to whom he afterwards wrote two epiſtles.

When he left thoſe parts, I think, he went to Rome: but not till after Paul had been in that city, and was gone from it. Several of St. Paul's epiſtles furniſh out a cogent argument of Peter's abſence from Rome for a conſiderable ſpace of time. St. Paul, in the laſt chapter of his epiſtle to the Romans, written, as we ſuppoſe, in the beginning of the year 58, ſalutes many by name, without mentioning Peter. And the whole tenour of the epiſtle makes it reaſonable to think, that the Chriſtians there had not yet had the benefit of that apoſtle's preſence, and inſtructions. During his two years' confinement at Rome, which ended, as we ſuppoſe, in the ſpring of the year 63, St. Paul wrote four, or five epiſtles; thoſe to the Epheſians, the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and Philemon: in none of which is any mention of Peter. Nor is any thing ſaid, or hinted, whence it can be concluded, that he had ever been there.

I think

I think therefore, that Peter did not come to Rome before the year 63, or perhaps 64. And, as I ſuppoſe, he obtained the crown of martyrdom in the year 64, or 65. Conſequently, St. Peter could not reſide very long at Rome, before his death.

It is very remarkable, that [e] Nicephorus, at the beginning of the ninth century, in his Chronography, computes St. Peter's epiſcopate at Rome to have been of two years' duration only. For that paſſage I am indebted to [f] Baſnage, whoſe argument upon it I have placed below. Nicephorus, therefore (and probably others likewiſe) muſt have ſuppoſed, that Peter did not come to Rome, till near the end of his life.

As the foregoing is the moſt likely account of St. Peter's travels, which I have been able to form; I do not ſee any reaſon to believe, that he ever was in Chaldea. Coſmas, of Alexandria, who thought, that by [g] Babylon at the end of St. Peter's firſt epiſtle is meant Babylon in Perſia, muſt have ſuppoſed, that this apoſtle was in that country. And learned men [h] who underſtand Babylon in the ſame ſenſe, take it for granted, that St. Peter travelled into that part of the world. But I do not perceive them to ſupport their opinion by teſtimonies of ancient writers; which ſurely would have been of advantage to it.

And there are ſome paſſages of ancient authors, where it would be reaſonable to expect an account of ſuch a journey, if there had been in thoſe times any knowledge of it, or well atteſted tradition about it.

Origen, in the paſſage cited by Euſebius, and already quoted by us likewiſe from him, ſays: 'Peter is ſaid to have 'preached to the Jews of the diſperſion in Pontus, Galatia,

[e] Οι εν ρωμη επισκοπευσαντες απο χριστ8, και των αποστολων, α Πετρος αποστολος ετη b. Ap. Scalig. Theſ. Temp. p. 308. [f] Lactantius Euſebio paullo antiquior Petrum non Claudio quidem, ſed Nerone imperante Romam veniſſe tradit. Neque Lactantio propria chronologia hæc eſt.——In Nicephori enim Chronographia legimus: *Qui Romæ epiſcopatum geſſerunt a Chriſto et Apoſtolis. Petrus apoſtolus annis duobus.* Quibus conſequens eſt, Petrum biennium circiter ante mortem iter in urbem direxiſſe. Secus diuturniorem ei epiſcopatum vindicaſſet Nicephorus. Baſn. ann. 42. num. x.

[g] See vol. V. p. 269.

[h] ——Verum ego priorem ſententiam tanquam longe veriſimiliorem amplector, tum quod in Babylone Parthicâ magna eſſet Judæorum frequentia, qui αιχμαλοταρχην ſuum habuerunt: tum quod Petro Antiochiâ diſcedenti facilior ac commodior eſſet in hæc loca tranſitus, in quibus eum diu prædicaſſe, nemo, opinor, facile negabit. Cav. H. L. in Petro. p. 6. Et Conf. Baſnag. Ann. 57. num. iii. et ann. 46. num. xxv.

'Bithynia,

'Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Aſia.[l] Who at length coming to 'Rome was crucified.'

Euſebius, in his Chronical Canon, as publiſhed by Scaliger, ſays, in the Greek, 'that [k] Peter having founded the 'church in Antioch, went away to Rome, preaching the 'goſpel.'

Jerom, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, in like manner ſays: 'that [l] Peter having been at Antioch, and preached 'to the Jews of the diſperſion in Pontus, and the neigh-'bouring countries, went to Rome.' In another place Jerom ſays: 'that [m] Chriſt was with the apoſtles in all the 'places whither they went. He was with Thomas in India, 'with Peter at Rome, with Paul in Illyricum, with Titus 'in Crete, with Andrew in Achaia.' Why does he not alſo ſay, that Chriſt was with Peter in Babylon?

Ephrem the Syrian ſays, 'that [n] Peter preached at Rome, 'John at Epheſus, Matthew in Paleſtine, and Thomas in 'the Indies.'

Gregory Nazianzen [o] ſpeaks of Paul, as having for his province all the gentiles in general, Peter Judea, Luke Achaia, Andrew Epirus, John Epheſus, Thomas the Indies, and Mark Italy.'

Why do none of theſe writers take in Babylon, or Perſia, or Chaldea, as the apoſtle Peter's province?

Once more. Says Chryſoſtom: 'This [p] is one preroga-'tive of our city, (Antioch) that we had at the beginning 'the chief of the apoſtles for our maſter. For it was fit, 'that the place, which was firſt honoured with the name of 'Chriſtians, ſhould have the chief of the apoſtles for its 'paſtor. But though we had him for a maſter awhile, 'we did not detain him, but reſigned him to the royal city, 'Rome. Or rather, we have him ſtill. For though we have

[l] Vid. Euſ. H. E. l. 3. cap. i.

[k] Πετρος ὁ κορυφαιος την εν αντιοχεια πρωτην θεμελιωσας εκκλησιαν εις ρωμην απεισε κηρυττων το ευαγγελιον. Chr. Can. p. 204. [l] Simon Petrus, —— princeps Apoſtolorum, poſt epiſcopatum Antiochenſis eccleſiæ, et prædicationem diſperſionis eorum, qui de circumciſione crediderant, in Ponto —— ſecundo Claudii Imperatoris anno, ad expugnandum Simonem Magum, Romam pergit. De V. I. cap. i.

[m] Tom. IV. P. I. p. 167. ad Marcell. ep. 148. [n] See vol. IV. p. 437. [o] Orat. 25. p. 438. A.

[p] Εν γαρ και τουτο πλεονεκτημα της ημετερας πολεως, το των αποστολων κορυφαιον λαβειν εν αρχη διδασκαλον. —— Αλλα —— ουκ εις τελος κατεχομεν, αλλα παρεχωρησαμεν τη βασιλιδι ρωμη. κ.λ. In Princip. Act. Ap. hom. 2. T. III. p. 70.

'not

'not his body, we have his faith." I might refer to other places of Chryſoſtom, where he ſpeaks of Peter's having been at Rome. But why does he not alſo mention Babylon?

I therefore rely upon the account before given of St. Peter's travels, as moſt likely. And in particular I obſerve, that we have not in ancient chriſtian writers any good aſſurance of his having ever been in Perſia, or Parthia. A learned writer of our time, who contends that he was there, and that his firſt epiſtle was written at the Aſſyrian Babylon, acknowledgeth, that [q] from that epiſtle of St. Peter alone we have not any aſſurance of his having been at Babylon.

V. In the hiſtory of St. Paul I have already ſhown it to be probable, that he and Peter ſuffered martyrdom at Rome in 64, or 65.

Cave [r] likewiſe, in his Life of St. Peter, written in Engliſh, in 1676, placeth the death of this apoſtle in 64, or 65. Nor was his mind much altered when he publiſhed his Hiſtoria Literaria in 1688. For there alſo he ſuppoſeth that St. Peter [s] died a martyr at Rome, in the year of Chriſt 64,

[q] Supereſt aliquid, quod ex hoc Petri loco diſcamus. Primum igitur cognoſcimus hic, quod aliunde non conſtat, Babylone etiam fuiſſe Petrum, magnamque ibi meſſuiſſe Chriſto meſſem. Heumann. Nova Sylloge Diſſ. Part. II. p. 113.

[r] 'The date of his death is 'differently aſſigned by the ancients. —— That which ſeems to 'me moſt probable, is, that it was 'in the tenth of Nero, or the year '65. Which I thus compute. 'Nero's burning of Rome is placed 'by Tacitus under the conſulſhip 'of C. Lucanus, and M. Licinius, 'about the month of July, that is, 'A. ch. lxiv. This act procured 'him the hatred and clamours of 'the people. Which having in 'vain endeavoured ſeveral ways to 'remove and pacify, he at laſt re'ſolved upon this project, to de'rive the odium upon the Chriſtians. 'Whom therefore, both to appeaſe 'the Gods, and pleaſe the people, 'he condemned as guilty of the 'fact, and cauſed to be executed 'with all manner of acute and 'exquiſite tortures. This perſe'cution began, as we may ſup'poſe, about the end of that, or 'the beginning of the following 'year. And under this perſecution, 'I doubt not, it was, St. Peter 'ſuffered, and changed earth for 'heaven.' Cave's Life of St. Peter, ſect. xi.

[s] Tandem ſub Nerone, forſan circa annum 63, Romam venit, fideles, quos ibi reperit, in ordinem redegit, eccleſiam conſtituit, auxit, et mox ſanguine ſuo locupletavit. —— Obiit igitur ſanctus Petrus anno Chriſti 64, Neronis 10, ſub initium perſecutionis Neronianæ, ut in opere vernaculo, *De Vitis Apoſtolorum*, latius diſſeruimus. Etenim cum Nero ob grande illud ſcelus, Romanæ Urbis incendium, in odium omnium veniſſet, abolendo rumori, inquit Tacitus, crimen conjecit in Chriſtianos, eoſque hâc de cauſſâ quæſitiſſimis pœnis affecit. Quin hâc occaſione rapti ſint ad martyrium Apoſtoli, nemo, cui ſanum ſinciput, dubitare poteſt. Hiſt. Lit. de Petro. p. 5.

at the beginning of Nero's perſecution: and indeed expreſſeth himſelf with a great deal of aſſurance and poſitiveneſs.

Jerom concludes his article of St. Peter, ſaying, 'He 'was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the triumphal 'way, and is in veneration all over the world.' We likewiſe formerly [t] ſaw a paſſage of Caius, about the year 212, where he ſpeaks of the tombs of the two apoſtles, Peter and Paul, at Rome. And Chryſoſtom, in a paſſage lately cited, ſuppoſes St. Peter to have been buried in that city.

VI. I ſhall now take notice of a few things hitherto entirely omitted, or but ſlightly touched upon. His epiſcopate at Antioch, his having been five and twenty years biſhop of Rome, his children, his wife's martyrdom, ſaid to have abſconded at Rome, the manner of his crucifixion.

1. We have ſeen ſeveral authors, who ſpeak of Peter's having been at Antioch. Chryſoſtom ſeems to have ſuppoſed, that [x] he was there a good while. This may be alſo implied in the paſſage of Jerom before cited [y] from his book of Illuſtrious Men, where he ſpeaks of Peter's epiſcopate of Antioch. And in his commentary upon the epiſtle to the Galatians, he ſays, that [z] Peter was at firſt biſhop of Antioch, and afterwards biſhop of Rome. Euſebius ſpeaking of Ignatius, and his epiſtles, calls [a] him the ſecond biſhop of Antioch after Peter. Jerom [b] calls Ignatius the third biſhop of Antioch after Peter. They both ſuppoſe Euodius, of whom [c] Euſebius ſpeaks elſewhere, to have been the firſt biſhop of Antioch, or the firſt after Peter.

What real foundation there is for all this, is hard to ſay; whether it be built entirely upon what St. Paul writes, Gal. ii. 11—16. or whether there was ſome other ground for it.

But, as before ſaid in the account above given of St. Peter's travels, I think, that St. Peter did not ſtay long at Antioch, the firſt time he was there, which is mentioned by St. Paul, but returned to Judea, and after ſome time leaving that country, he went to Antioch again. Where he might ſtay a while,

[t] See vol. V. p. 53, 54.
[u] Vol. II. p. 374.
[x] See before, p. 544.
[y] See before, p. 544. note *(l)*
[z] Denique primum Epiſcopum Antiochenæ eccleſiæ Petrum fuiſſe accepimus, et Romam exinde tranſlatum, quod Lucas penitus omiſit. Hieron. in ep. ad Gal. cap. ii. 11—13. T. IV. P. I. p. 244.
[a] —— της κατ' αντιοχειαν πετρε διαδοχης δευτερος την επισκοπην κεκληρωκως. H. E. l. 3. cap. 36. p. 106. D.
[b] Ignatius Antiochenæ eccleſiæ tertius poſt Petrum Apoſtolum Epiſcopus. De V. I. cap. 16.
[c] H. E. l. 3. cap. 22.

and

and then go and preach in the countries mentioned at the beginning of his firſt epiſtle, and then go to Rome.

2. It has been ſaid, that Peter was biſhop of Rome five and twenty years. This is ſaid by Jerom in [d] his book of Illuſtrious Men, and [e] in his Chronicle, or his Latin edition of Euſebius' Greek Chronicle, or Chronical Canon, as it is ſometimes called: where [f] he added divers things, not ſaid by Euſebius himſelf.

But this is inconſiſtent with the hiſtory in the Acts. Nor is it any where expreſsly ſaid by Euſebius: though, perhaps, it might be argued from ſome things ſaid by him. How the origin of this notion is accounted for by [h] Pagi, and [i] Baluze,

[d] Poſt epiſcopatum Antiochenſis eccleſiæ, et prædicationem diſperſionis eorum, qui de circumciſione crediderant in Ponto—— Romam pergit: ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram ſacerdotalem tenuit, uſque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id eſt, decimum quartum. De V. I. cap. i. [e] Petrus Apoſtolus, quum primus Antiochenam eccleſiam fundaſſet, Romam mittitur, ubi evangelium prædicans xxv. annis ejuſdem urbis Epiſcopus perſeverat. Chron. p. 160.

[f] —— *Ibid. xxv. annis ejuſdem urbis epiſcopus perſeverat.*] Adjecta ſunt ab Hieronymo, et ab eodem repetuntur in Catalogo Scriptor. Ecc. Græca enim non habent. Ab Aſſumtione Domini, ad id tempus, quo Petrus conjectus fuit in vincula ab Herode Agrippa.——Petrus ſemper fuit in Palæſtina, aut Syria. Herodes obiit quarto anno Claudii. Quomodo igitur anno ſecundo Claudii profectus eſt Romam? Quomodo viginti quinque annos Romæ perſeveravit? Scaliger. Animadv. p. 189. [h] Præſtat hic Lactantii citati verba in medium afferre. *Apoſtoli per annos xxv. uſque ad principium Neroniani Imperii per omnes provincias et civitates Eccleſiæ fundamenta miſerunt. Cumque Jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit.*—— Ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apoſtolorum ex æquo pertinent, orta videtur opinio de xxv. annis, qui vulgo tribuuntur S. Petro in ſede Romanâ. Pagi. ann. 43. num. iii.

[i] Fortaſſis ergo ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apoſtolorum æque pertinent, orta eſt opinio de viginti quinque annis, quos quidam veteres, et innumerabile recentiorum agmen, ſancto Petro apoſtolo tribuunt in ſede Romana. Sane licet fruſtra et ſupervacaneè a nonnullis negari putem adventum ejus ad urbem Romam, qui clariſſimis veterum teſtimoniis comprobatus eſt, de tempore tamen multum ambigo; cum videam tot tantaſque difficultates habere eorum ſententiam, qui illum Romam veniſſe volunt Claudio imperante, ut coacti ſint duplicare profectionem ejus in urbem, et duplex item ejus cum Simone Mago certamen comminiſci, primo quidem temporibus Claudii, dein principatu Neronis. Quæ res quam abſurde ſit, cum id a nullo veterum proditum ſit memoriæ literarum, pervident iſtarum rerum periti.—— Itaque ſi fas eſſet recedere a vulgari, et in animis hominum inſita opinione, ei Lactantianam lubentur præferrem; id eſt, Petrum quidem Romæ prædicaſſe evangelium facile concederem, non ſub Tiberio Claudio, ut vulgo putant, ſed ſub Nerone Claudio, &c. Steph. Baluz. annot. ad libr. de M. P. cap. 2.

both Romaniſts, may be ſeen in their own words, which I tranſcribe below. I refer likewiſe to [k] Baſnage, and Dodwell. [l] In all whom are good obſervations relating to this point.

3. Clement of Alexandria [m] reckons Peter among thoſe apoſtles, who had children. According to him Philip was another. Epiphanius ſays, that [n] Peter came to Chriſt after he was married, and had children. Jerom, in his firſt book againſt Jovinian, takes notice, that [o] in the Circuits, probably meaning the Recognitions, mention was made both of Peter's wife and daughter. But, ſays he, that is not a canonical book. And ſtill we have a paſſage in the Recognitions, where St. Peter's wife is mentioned: but, as [p] Coteletius obſerves, what was ſaid of Peter's daughter is wanting. Poſſibly theſe things may illuſtrate the words of Peter, recorded Matt. xix. 27. *Behold, we have forſaken all, and followed thee. What ſhall we have therefore?* And indeed Origen, in his Commentary upon St. Matthew, ſays: 'It [q] ſeems, that Peter did not leave 'nets only, but alſo a houſe, and a wife, whoſe mother the 'Lord healed of a fever, and, as may be ſuppoſed, children, 'and poſſibly likewiſe ſome ſmall eſtate.'

4. Farther, Clement of Alexandria, [r] cited alſo by [s] Euſebius, informs us: 'It was ſaid, that the bleſſed Peter ſeeing his wife led forth to death, rejoiced for the grace of God vouchſafed to him: and calling to her by name, exhorted and

[k] Ann. 42. n. x. xi. [l] Diſſ. Singularis. cap. iii. n. 1. p. 13.

[m] ——η και αποστολες αποδοκιμαζεσι; Πετρος μεν γαρ και φιλιππος επαιδοποησαντο. Clem. Strom. l. 3. p. 448. D. et ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 30. [n] Μετα γαρ το γημαι, και τεκνα κεκτησθαι, και πενθερας εχειν, συνετυχε τω σωτηρι, εξ ιουδαιων ορμωμενος. Hær. 30. num. xxii. p. 147. B.

[o] Poſſumus autem et de Petro dicere, quod habuerit ſocrum eo tempore quo credidit, et uxorem non habuerit: quamquam legatur in Περιοδοις et uxor ejus et filia. Sed nunc nobis de canone omne certamen eſt. Contr. Jovin. l. 1. T. IV. P. II p. 168. in.

[p] *Die autem poſterâ ſedens cum uxore Petri.*] Teſtatur Hieronymus contra Jovinianum ſcribens, legi in Periodis et uxorem Petri et filiam. Ea igitur Circuituum pars, in quâ de Petri filiâ (Petronillam illam vocant) ſermo erat, nunc deſideratur. Uxorem autem memorant præterea Clem. A. Str. 7. ubi et martyrium illius refert verbis, quæ citantur ab Euſebio. iii. 30. Origines ad Matt. xix. 27. Epiphanius H 30. n. 22. Hieronymus ep. 34. Coteler. ad Recognit. l. 7. cap. 25.

[q] Origen. in Matt. tom. XV. p. 682. T. III. Bened. [r] Φασι γε, τον μακαριον πετρον θεασαμενον την αυτου γυναικα αγομενην επι θανατον, χαιρειν τε της κλησεως χαριν —— επιφωνησαι δε αυτη μαλα προτρεπτικως και παρακλητικως εξ ονοματος προσειποντα· Μεμνησο ω αυτη του κυριου. Str. 7. p. 736. B.

[s] H. E. l. 3. cap. 30.

comforted

comforted her, saying: *Remember the Lord.* If time and place had been mentioned, it would have added to the credibility of the story. However she might be at Rome, as we know Peter was. And if so, she might suffer about the same time with him. For Nero's persecution took in people of both sexes, and of all conditions, as we know from the accounts given by Tacitus. And we learn from St. Paul, that Peter was attended by his wife in his travels. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

5. It is also said, 'that' St. Peter being imprisoned at Rome, or being in some imminent danger of suffering, the brethren there entreated him to consult his safety by flight, and to reserve himself for farther service and usefulness. At length he was persuaded, and went out in the dark night. But when he came to the gate, he saw Christ entering into the city. Whereupon he said: *Lord, whither art thou going?* Christ answered: *I am come hither to be crucified again.* By which Peter apprehended himself to be reproved, and perceived, that Jesus spake of his death, and that now he was to be crucified in his servant. Accordingly Peter turned back, and gave satisfaction to the brethren. And being soon after taken up, he was crucified.'

This story is in Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in the fourth century. Tillemont [u] has endeavoured to find some grounds for it, or references to it, in more ancient authors. But they are very obscure and doubtful. Basnage [x] has some remarks upon it, which may be read by such as have leisure.

6. St. Peter's death, and the manner of it, we saw just now in a passage cited from [y] Origen, and likewise, that when he was to be crucified, he desired it might be in that way. So likewise Jerom, 'that' [z] he was crucified by order of Nero,

[t] Idem Petrus postea, victo Simone, cum præcepta Dei populo seminaret, excitavit animos Gentilium: quibus eum quærentibus, Christianæ animæ deprecatæ sunt, ut paullisper cederet. Et quamvis esset cupidus passionis, tamen contemplatione populi precantis inflexus est. Rogabatur enim, ut ad instituendum et confirmandum populum se reservaret. Quid multa? Nocte muros egredi cœpit. Sed videns sibi in via Christum occurrere, urbem ingredi, ait: Domine quo vadis? Respondit Christus: Venio iterum crucifigi.——Intel exit ergo Petrus, quod iterum Christus crucifigendus esset in servulo. Itaque sponte remeavit. Interrogantibus Christianis responsum reddidit, statimque correptus, per crucem suam honoravit Dominum Jesum. Ambr. Serm. contr. Aux. T. II. p. 867. A. B. ed Bened.

[u] S. Pierre. art. 35. et note 39. Mem. tom. I. [x] Ann. 65. num. xi. [y] See p. 541.

[z] A quo et affixus cruci, martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso, et in sublime pedibus elevatis: asserens, se indignum, qui sic crucifigeretur, ut Dominus suus. De V. I. cap. i.

'and ſo crowned with martyrdom, his head downward, and his 'feet lifted up, ſaying, he was unworthy to be crucified as his 'maſter was.' To the like purpoſe [a] Prudentius. Chryſoſtom alſo ſeveral times ſpeaks [b] of Peter's being crucified with his head downwards.

And it is unqueſtioned, that [c] among the Romans ſome were ſo crucified, to add to their pain and ignominy. Nevertheleſs ſome ancient writers, who ſpeak of Peter's martyrdom by crucifixion, do [d] not take notice of that circumſtance. Which has induced [e] Baſnage to diſpute the truth of it. Allowing, that [f] Peter was crucified in that manner, he thinks it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, it was at his own requeſt. And it muſt be acknowledged that his reaſoning is plauſible.

It ſeems to me, that Peter might be crucified in that manner, and that it might be owing to the ſpite and malice of thoſe, who put him to death. The ſaying, that it was at his own deſire, may have been at firſt only the oratorical flight of ſome man of more wit than judgment. But the thought was pleaſing, and therefore has been followed by many.

[a] Primum Petrum rapuit ſententia, legibus Neronis,
Pendere juſſum præminente ligno.
Ille tamen veritus celſæ decus æmulando mortis
Ambire tanti gloriam magiſtri:
Exigit, ut pedibus merſum caput imprimant ſupinis,
Quo ſpectet imum ſtipitem cerebro. Περι στεφ. cap. 12.

[b] ——ατε δη και πλειους λαβων δυναμιν και μειζον το θαρσος υπερ αυτε αποθανειν, και τω σαυρω κατα κεφαλης προσομιλησαι. κ. λ. Chr. in Pr. Act. hom. 4. T. III. p. 93. E.

Παυλος δε και πετρος εχι ος μεν αποτμηθεις, ος δε απ' εναντιας τω δεσποτη τε σαυρε την τιμωριαν δεξαμενος, ατω μετεση της παρασης ζωης; In. Gen. hom. 66. tom. IV. p. 630. A.

Ο χριστος εσαυρωθη· ατος εμελλεν αποκεφαλιζεσθαι· ο πετρος κατωθεν ανεσκολοπισθη. In 2 Tim. hom. 5. T. XI. p. 687. D.

[c] Vid. Baſnag. ann. 65. num. xiv. [d] Ubi Petrus paſſioni dominicæ adæquatur. Tertull. Pr. cap. 36. p. 245. Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, quum cruci adſtringitur. Id. Scorp. cap. 15. p. 633. ——Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Perſec. cap. 2. [e] Ubi ſupra. num. xiv. [f] Conceſſo, ut plures teſtantur, ſublimibus Petrum veſtigiis affixum cruci, quin ex Prætoris mandato irrogatum hoc ſupplicii, quo pereunti adderetur dolor et ludibrium, non credere non poſſumus.——Præpoſtera ſane et vana ea videtur eſſe modeſtia, quam aſcribunt Petro.——Neque priſcorum aliquem martyrum, qui in crucem acti fuerunt ſimilis unquam inceſſit humilitas.——Præterea certo certius eſt, atrocius eorum fuiſſe ſupplicium, qui inverſo, quam qui recto capite figebantur cruci.——Martyris autem eſt, imperatam ſibi mortem perferre fortiter, non vero poſcere, ut intendantur a carnifice tormenta. Id. ib. num. xv.

VII.

VII. Some learned men have denied that Peter ever was at Rome, as [g] Scaliger, [h] Salmaſius, [i] Frederick Spanheim, and ſome others. Mr. Bower is much of the ſame mind. His words are: 'From [k] what has been hitherto ſaid every im-'partial judge muſt conclude, that it is at beſt very much to 'be doubted, whether St. Peter ever was at Rome.' Nevertheleſs there have been many learned men among the proteſtants, as well as Romaniſts, whoſe impartiality was never queſtioned, who have believed, and argued very well, that Peter was at Rome, and ſuffered martyrdom there. I refer to ſome: [l] Cave, [m] Pearſon, [n] Le Clerc, [o] Baſnage, [p] Barratier.

I ſhall therefore remind my readers of ſome teſtimonies of ancient writers, relating to this matter, making alſo a few remarks upon them. And then let every one judge.

I begin with Clement of Rome, who wrote an epiſtle to the Corinthians, before the year of Chriſt 70, as ſome think, or about the year 96, as others ſuppoſe. In that epiſtle are theſe expreſſions. 'But [q] not to inſiſt any longer,' ſays he, 'upon examples of former times, let us come to thoſe wor-'thies that are *neareſt to us, and* take the brave examples of 'our own age. Through zeal and envy they who were the 'moſt righteous pillars of the church [r] have been perſecuted 'even to a cruel death. Let [s] us ſet before our eyes the excel-'lent apoſtles. Peter through unrighteous zeal underwent not 'one or two, but many labours, till at laſt being martyred he 'went to the place of glory that was due to him. Through

[g] Quum igitur Petrus ad περιτομὴν miſſus eſſet, videtur in διασπορὰ Aſiana periiſſe, ſi conjecturæ locus eſt. Nam de ejus Romam adventu, ſede 25. annorum, et ſupremo capitis ſupplicio, ibidem, nemo qui paullo humanior fuerit, credere poſſet. Joſ. Scal. annot. ad Joh. xviii. 31. [h] De Petro vero a Nerone ſublato non conſtat. Si non poteſt probari Romæ illam fuiſſe unquam, quomodo ibi crucifixus? Putem ego cum Salmaſio Babylone martyrium paſſum eſſe, ſi quid divinare in re incerta licet. Gallus ad Lact. Inſtit. l. 4. cap. 21. Vid. et de Salmaſii ſententiâ Pearſon. De Succeſſ. prim. Rom. Epiſcop. Diſſ. i. cap. viii.

[i] Diſſ. de ficta profectione Petri Ap. in urbem Romam. Opp tom. II. p. 331, &c. [k] Hiſtory of the Popes, vol. I. p. 5.

[l] Hiſt. Lit. in Petro. [m] De Succeſſione primorum Romæ Epiſcoporum. Diſſ. i. cap. vii. et viii. [n] Hiſt. Ecc. ann. 67. n. i. et ann. 68. n. 1, 2. [o] Ann. 64. num. ix. x. xi. [p] De Succeſſione Epiſc. Roman. cap. i.

[q] Clem. ep. ad Cor. cap. v. vi.

[r] —— εδιωχθησαν και εως θανατου δεινα.

[s] Λαβωμεν προ οφθαλμων ημων τους αγαθους αποστολους. Πετρος δια ζηλον αδικον —— και ουτω μαρτυρησας επορευθη εις τον οφειλομενον τοπον της δοξης.

'zeal [t] Paul obtained the reward of patience. Seven times he 'was in bonds, he was whipped, he was stoned. He preached 'both in the east and in the west. And having taught the 'whole world righteousness, and [u] coming to the borders of 'the west,' and suffering martyrdom under the governors, 'so he departed out of the world, and went to the most holy 'place, being a most eminent pattern of patience.

'To [x] these men, who lived a divine life, was joined a great 'multitude of choice ones, who having undergone through 'zeal many reproaches and torments, became an excellent 'example among us.'

From these passages I think it may be justly concluded, that Peter and Paul were martyrs at Rome in the time of Nero's persecution. For they suffered among the Romans, where Clement was bishop, and in whose name he was writing to the Corinthians. They were martyrs, when many others were an example, or pattern, of a like patience among them. To *these apostles*, says Clement, *was joined a great multitude of choice ones*, or elect, that is, Christians. This is a manifest description of Nero's persecution at Rome, when a multitude of Christians there were put to death under grievous reproaches, and exquisite torments, as we are assured by Tacitus. These were joined to the excellent apostles, Peter and Paul, before-mentioned. Therefore Peter and Paul had suffered at that place, and at that time: and, as it seems, according to this account, at the beginning of that persecution. Which may be reckoned not at all improbable.

When Clement says, that *Paul suffered martyrdom under the governors*, he may be understood to mean *by order of the magistrate*. It cannot be hence inferred, that Peter and Paul did not die by Nero's order, or in virtue of his edict against the Christians. It should be considered, that Clement is not an historian. He is writing an epistle, containing divers exhortations. It was not needful for him to be more particular. He does not name the city, in which either Peter or Paul died, nor the death which they underwent. But he intimates, that they suffered a cruel death, together with

[t] Διὰ ζῆλον ὁ παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἐπέτυχεν. [u] Καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑποδείγματος.

[x] Τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν βίοις πολιτευσαμένοις συνήθροισθη πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν, οἵτινες πολλαῖς αἰκίαις καὶ βασάνοις διὰ ζῆλον παθόντες ὑπόδειγμα κάλλιστον ἐγένοντο ἐν ἡμῖν.

many

many choice ones among them. Which muſt mean Rome. And he plainly repreſents theſe apoſtles as martyrs, who had ſuffered through envy and unrighteous zeal. The place and the manner of their death were well known to the Chriſtians at Corinth, to whom Clement was writing.

If we conſider, where Clement was, he may be reaſonably excuſed from naming the emperor, or being otherwiſe more particular. This epiſtle was written ſoon after ſome troubles, which the Chriſtians at Rome had met with, as appears plainly from the beginning of it: meaning, it is likely, either the perſecution of Nero, or of Domitian, the next perſecutor of the Chriſtians. It is not at all ſtrange, that at ſuch a time Clement ſhould think himſelf obliged to circumſpection in the manner of his expreſſions.

Indeed the primitive Chriſtians were always very careful, not to ſpeak diſreſpectfully of heathen princes, or other magiſtrates, how much ſoever they ſuffered from them. The epiſtle begins in this manner. *The calamities and afflictions, brethren, which have befallen us, have ſomewhat retarded our anſwer to your inquiries.* Thoſe afflictions intend, as before ſaid, the perſecution of Nero or Domitian. And if ſo, certainly there is much mildneſs in the expreſſions. But a very different ſtyle is uſed preſently after in ſpeaking of the diſſenſion, which there was among the Chriſtians at Corinth. It is called *a wicked and ungodly ſedition, unbecoming the elect of God, fomented by a few raſh and ſelf-willed men.*

Biſhop Pearſon has argued from this place, that [y] Peter and Paul did not die by order of Nero himſelf, but by order of the prefects of the city, when Nero was abſent, and, particularly, on Feb. 22. in the year of Chriſt 68, and the laſt year of Nero. And he ſays, that [z] the Greek word, which I have rendered governors or magiſtrates, never denotes the emperor, but only the prefects of the city, or of the provinces.

[y] S. Paulus (cum Petro) ultimo Neronis anno martyrium fecit. Factum autem id eſt ſub Præfectis in urbe, ut teſtatur Clemens Romanus, abſente ſcilicet Nerone, Februarii die 22. Ann. Paulin. p. [illegible] A. D. 68. [z] Quod ſi Romanus diſerte non expreſſerit, Nero certe multo minus delineavit. Non eſt enim Paulum επι των ηγουμενων. — Neque enim ηγουμενοι Imperatores dicti ſunt: ſed qui ſub Imperatore, in provinciis præſertim, Præſidum loca ſub variis nominibus obtinebant. — Neque hæc vox tantum in provinciis ſolennis fuit, ſed etiam Romæ. — Tales erant Romæ, ultimo Neronis anno, duo Præfecti Prætorio, Tigellinus et Sabinus, et cum ſumma poteſtate Helius. De Succeſſion. prim. Romæ Epiſcop. Diſſ. i. cap. 8. § ix.

But

But Pearſon was very unhappy in that obſervation. For Nero was at Rome in the beginning of the year 68. Pagi [a] and Baſnage [b] have ſhown, that whereas Nero was abſent from Rome almoſt two years, the greateſt part of 66, and 67, he arrived at Rome from Greece in December 67.

And the word, which I have rendered 'governors,' is often uſed, not only for prefects, but alſo for kings and emperors, or other ſupreme magiſtrates. Of [c] which I place ſeveral inſtances in the margin.

However, both the noun and the verb are general words, and are uſed concerning governors ſupreme and ſubordinate. As is apparent from that well known text. Luke iii. 1. *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæſar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea.* As the words are well rendered in our verſion. But, literally, they might be tranſlated in this manner. *Now in the fifteenth year of the government of Tiberius Cæſar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea.*

As for the words being in the plural number: it is no uncommon thing to prefer that to the ſingular, when we are obliged to be cautious, and intend, as I ſuppoſe Clement did, to ſpeak in a general way. In ſhort, Clement ſhows, that Peter and Paul had died by martyrdom, and not in a tumult of the people, but by order of the magiſtrate, meaning the emperor, though he is not named.

So that I muſt take the liberty to ſay, that Pearſon's obſervation, that Peter and Paul were put to death, not by Nero, but by the prefects of Rome, or ſome other great officer, in

[a] Ann. 67. num. ii. [b] Ann. 66. num. vi. et 67. n. v.

[c] 1 Kings xv. 13. it is ſaid of Aſa, *And alſo Maachah his mother he removed from being queen.* In the lxx. it is thus: Και την ανα την μητερα εαυτε μετεστησε τε μη ειναι ηγεμενην. 2 Chron. vii. 18. When God appeared to Solomon, he ſaid, *Then will I eſtabliſh the throne of thy kingdom. There ſhall not fail thee a man to be ruler in Iſrael.* Ουκ εξαρθησεται σοι ηγεμενες ανηρ εν ισραηλ. 2 Chr. ix. 26. *And he reigned over all the kings from the river.* Και ην ηγεμενος παντων των βασιλεων απο τε ποταμε. When St. Matth. ch. ii. 6. quotes the words of the prophet Micah: *Out of thee ſhall come a governor,* ηγεμενος, *that ſhall rule my people Iſrael:* he does not mean a governor of inferior rank, but the Meſſiah himſelf. I ſhall add only a like inſtance or two from Joſephus, and from a Greek claſſic, though many might be mentioned —— μεχρι ετε; δωδεκατε την νερωνος ηγεμονιας. Joſeph. Ant. l. 20. cap. x. ſect. ult. n. 2. —— δωδεκατω μεν ετει της νερωνος ηγεμονιας De B. I. l. 2. cap. 14. n. 4. —— τον πρεσβυτερον αυτων αποδειξαι ρωμαιων ηγεμονα. Dion. Hal. l. 4. cap. 4. p. 202. ed. Hudſon.

[d] Εν ετει δε πεντεκαιδεκατω της ηγεμονιας τιβεριε καισαρος, ηγεμονευοντος ποντιε πιλατε της ιεδαιας.

the

the abſence of the emperor, appears to be of no value. And it is deſtitute of all authority from hiſtory. For we ſhall ſee as we proceed, that the death of theſe two apoſtles is continually aſcribed to Nero by all who ſpeak diſtinctly about it.

One thing more I muſt take notice of. From theſe paſſages of Clement it has been argued, that Peter never was at Rome, in 'this manner. 'Clemens Romanus (who was perſonally 'acquainted with the apoſtles, and knew very well where they 'travelled) writes a letter from Rome to Corinth, and menti-'ons St. Paul's travelling very far to ſpread the goſpel: but 'in the ſame ſection, though he mentions St. Peter's ſufferings 'and martyrdom, yet he ſays nothing of his travelling much, 'nor one word of his ever having been at Rome.'

Upon which I beg leave to obſerve, firſt. It ſeems to me, that Clement ſays, Peter and Paul ſuffered martyrdom at Rome: for ſpeaking of the 'great multitude of the elect, who 'had been an excellent example of patience among them,' meaning the Romans, he ſays, 'they 'were joined to' or with 'the good apoſtles,' before mentioned. Therefore the apoſtles had ſuffered in the ſame place. Certainly Clement, who wrote this, did not think, that Peter died at Babylon in Meſopotamia, and Paul at Rome in Italy. Secondly. The reaſon why Clement ſo particularly mentions St. Paul's travels, probably, was, becauſe the extent of his preaching was very remarkable. And it is likely, that Clement refers to Rom. xv. 19. Thirdly, His omitting to ſpeak of Peter's travels is not a denial of his having travelled a great deal. Nor does it imply, that he had not been at Rome. St. Paul muſt have been twice in the weſt, and at Rome, if he ſuffered martyrdom there. But Clement does not ſay ſo, though he knew it very well. As did the Corinthians likewiſe. But when we ſpeak or write of things well known (as theſe things were at that time) there is no need to be very particular. It was ſufficient, if Clement mentioned ſuch things, as would render his exhortations effectual.

I ſhall now tranſcribe below [g] ſome like obſervations of Pearſon, in his Confutation of Salmaſius. Upon

[e] See Dr. Benſon's Preface to St. Peter's firſt epiſtle, ſect iii. p. 157. ſecond edit. [f] τουτοις —— συνηφθη πολυ πληθος εκλεκτων.

[g] Denique manifeſtum eſt, nihil hic a Clemente de Urbe vel de Imperatore diſcite et expreſſim dictum eſſe, quia a Romanis ad Corinthios ſcripſit, qui hæc omnia, non minus quam ipſe, noverunt. Imo Clemens mentionem loci non fecit, non quia ipſe ignorabat, ſed quia illi cognoverunt. Nam ſi ignoraſſet quo in loco, qua in regione, aut qua in orbis parte, mortuus eſt Petrus, quomodo aſſerere potuit,

cum

Upon the whole, I cannot but think, that theſe paſſages of Clement bear a teſtimony to the martyrdoms both of Peter and Paul, and that at Rome, which cannot be evaded.

Ignatius, about 108, writing to the Romans, ſays, 'I [k] do 'not command you, as Peter and Paul. They were apoſtles, 'I am a condemned perſon.' Ignatius muſt have ſuppoſed, that the Chriſtians at Rome had been inſtructed by Peter, as well as by Paul. The obſervations of [i] Pearſon, and [l] Barratier, upon this place, which I put below, appear very juſt.

The preaching of Peter, or of Peter and Paul, quoted by ſeveral ancient writers (as has been ſhown in this work) though not as a book of authority, compoſed [l] about the middle of the ſecond century or ſooner, makes mention of Peter's being at Rome, in this manner, as cited by Lactantius. 'After [m] his reſurrection Chriſt opened to his diſciples all 'things that ſhould come to paſs, which things Peter and 'Paul preached at Rome.' And what follows. There [n] is another large quotation of this book in the author of Rebaptizing, written about 256, where it is ſuppoſed, that Peter and Paul were together at Rome.

Dionyſius, biſhop of Corinth, about 170, in a letter to the

eum martyrio coronatum fuiſſe? ——Proculdubio hæc loci omiſſio non ex ignorantiâ cujuſpiam, aut ſcriptoris alterius, ſed ex certiſſimâ omnium, ad quos ſpectabat hæc epiſtola, tum Romanorum, tum Corinthiorum, aliorumque fidelium cognitione et exploratâ ſcientiâ, quæ ulteriorem expoſitionem minime requirebat. Ac tandem argumentum hoc negativum ex Clemente productum, non eorum ſed noſtrûm eſt. Clemens optime novit, et ubi, et quomodo paſſus eſt S. Petrus. Idem etiam bene noverunt tum Romani, tum Corinthii. Aliter eos eâ de re certiores feciſſet Clemens. Pearſon. de Succeſſ. prim. Romæ Epiſc. Diſſ. i. cap. 8. ſect. ix.

[h] Οὐχ' ὡς πέτρος καὶ παῦλος διατασσομαι ὑμιν. Ἐκεινοι ἀποστολοι, ἐγω κατακριτος. Ad Rom. cap. 4.

[i] Quid enim ex his verbis ad Romanos ſcriptis apertius, quam ſanctiſſimum Martyrem in eâ ſententiâ fuiſſe, quod Petrus, non minus quam Paulus, Romæ evangelium prædicavit, et paſſus ſit? Pearſon. ib. cap. 7. n. ii.

[k] Ignatius,——Romanis ſcribens, negat ſe ipſis, tanquam Petrum et Paulum, præcipere velle. Cur Petrum et Paulum unà nominat, niſi quod uterque Romæ fuerit? Cur Petrum, ſi cum Romanis nullum nexum habuerit? Si enim Romæ non fuerit, cum Romanis non ſcripſerit, nil magis cum iis commune habebat, vel iis præceperat, quam Jacobus, vel Judas, vel Joannes. Manifeſtum eſt, Ignatium Romanum Petri iter noviſſe. Barrat. ubi ſupr. num. iii. p. 5.

[l] See vol. II. p. 239. note (F).

[m] Sed et futura aperuit illis omnia, quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt. Et ea prædicatio in memoriam ſcripta permanſit. Lactant. Inſt. l. 4. cap. 21. p. 422.

[n] See vol. III. p. 197.

church

church of Rome, inſcribed to Soter their biſhop, as cited by Euſebius, takes notice, 'that [o] Peter and Paul going to 'Italy, taught there, and ſuffered martyrdom about the ſame 'time.'

Irenæus about 178, ſpeaks of the church of Rome, '[p] as 'founded and eſtabliſhed by the two great apoſtles Peter and 'Paul.' In another place, he ſays, 'that [q] Matthew wrote 'his goſpel, whilſt Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, 'and eſtabliſhing the church there.' Irenæus, who was as likely to know as moſt, had no doubt about theſe things. And ſome of his arguments with heretics, are partly built upon them: well knowing, that they could not be conteſted, and that they were generally allowed.

According to Clement of Alexandria, who flouriſhed about the year 194. St. Mark's goſpel [r] was written at the deſire of St. Peter's hearers at Rome.

Tertullian, about the year 200, and after, often ſpeaks [s] of Peter being at Rome, and teaching there, and ſuffering martyrdom there, together with Paul, or about the ſame time.

Caius, about 212, obſerves, that [t] in his time were to be ſeen at Rome the tombs of the apoſtles, Peter and Paul, who had eſtabliſhed that church.

[o] Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς ἰταλίαν ὁμοῦ ἐλθόντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν. Ap. Euſeb. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 68. The ſame paſſage is largely quoted vol. II. p. 135.

[p] Sed quoniam valde longum eſt in hoc tali volumine omnium eccleſiarum enumerare ſucceſſiones; maximæ, et antiquiſſimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a glorioſiſſimis Apoſtolis, Petro et Paulo, Romæ formatæ et conſtitutæ eccleſiæ, eam quam habet ab Apoſtolis traditionem, et annuntiatam omnibus fidem, &c. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 3.

Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 1. et ap. Euſeb. l. 5. cap. 8.

[q] Vid. Euſeb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 15. et lib. VI. cap. 14. and of this work vol. II. p. 210.

[s] Si autem proximæ adjaces, habes Romam.—— Quam felix eccleſia, cui totam doctrinam Apoſtoli cum ſanguine ſuo profuderunt! Ubi Petrus paſſioni Dominicæ adæquatur: ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur. De Præſcr. Hær. cap. 36. p. 245.

Nec quicquam refert inter eos, quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit. De Baptiſm. cap. 4. p. 257.

Videamus quod lac a Paulo Corinthii hauſerint.—— Quid etiam Romani de proximo ſonent, quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus ſanguine quoque ſuo ſignatum reliquerunt. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 5. p. 505. B.

Orientem fidem Romæ primus Nero cruentavit. Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, quum cruci adſtringitur. Tunc Paulus civitatis Romanæ conſequitur nativitatem, quum illic martyrii renaſcitur generoſitate. Scorpiac. cap. 15. p. 633. B.

[t] —— εὑρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἱδρυσαμένων ἐκκλησίαν. Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 68. in. And ſee in this work, vol. II. p. 374.

Origen

Origen, about 230, as cited by Euſebius, ſays, that [u] Peter having preached in Pontus, Galatia, and other places, at length came to Rome, where he was crucified.

Cyprian [x] at Carthage, about 248, and afterwards, always ſuppoſeth the church of Rome to have been eſtabliſhed by Peter. So [y] likewiſe does Firmilian, in Cappadocia, in his letter, written in 258.

Lactantius [z] about 306, in his Inſtitutions, aſcribes the death of Peter and Paul to Nero at Rome.

The ſame Lactantius, or whoever is the author of the book of the Deaths of Perſecutors, is very clear, that [a] in the reign of Nero, Peter came to Rome, and that by his order Peter was crucified, and Paul alſo put to death.

Euſebius, both in his Demonſtration, and in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, bears witneſs to the ſame things. Not now to inſiſt on his Chronicle. In the former, [b] he ſays, 'that Peter was 'crucified at Rome with his head downward, and Paul 'beheaded. In his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, ſpeaking of Nero, 'as [c] the firſt perſecutor of the Chriſtians,' he ſays, 'that he 'put to death the apoſtles, at which time Paul was beheaded 'at Rome, and Peter crucified, as hiſtory relates. And the 'account,' he ſays, 'is confirmed by the monuments ſtill ſeen 'in the cemeteries of that city, with their names inſcribed upon

[u] Ap. Euſeb. l. 3. cap. i.

[x] Factus eſt autem Cornelius epiſcopus de Dei et Chriſti ejus judicio —— cum nemo ante ſe factus eſſet, cum Fabiani locus, id eſt, cum locus Petri, et gradus cathedræ ſacerdotalis vacaret. Cyprian. ad Antonian. ep. 55. p. 104.

Poſt iſta adhuc inſuper pſeudo-epiſcopo ſibi ab hæreticis conſtituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram, atque eccleſiam principalem —— a ſchiſmaticis et profanis literas ferre —— Cyprian Cornelio. ep. 59. p. 135. Oxon. 1682.

[y] Atque ego in hac parte juſte indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifeſtam Stephani ſtultitiam, quod qui ſic de epiſcopatus ſui loco gloriatur, et ſe ſucceſſionem Petri tenere contendit —— multas alias petras inducat. Stephanus, qui per ſucceſſionem cathedram Petri habere ſe prædicat, nullo adverſus hæreticos zelo excitatur. Firmilian. ep. Cyprian. 75. p. 225.

[z] Itaque poſt illorum obitum, cum eos Nero interemiſſet, Judæorum nomen et gentem Veſpaſianus exſtinxit, fecitque omnia quæ illi futura prædixerant. Inſtitut. l. 4. cap. 21. p. 423.

[a] Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit. —— et convertit multos ad juſtitiam. —— Quæ re ad Neronem delatâ —— et primus omnium perſecutus Dei ſervos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Perſec. cap. 2.

[b] Και πετρος δε επι ρωμης κατα κεφαλης σταυρεται παυλος δε αποτεμνεται. Dem. Ev. l. 3. p. 116. C.

[c] Ταυτη γαρ ουτος θεομαχος εν τοις μαλιστα πρωτος αναχηρυχθεις, επι τας κατα των αποστολων επηρθη σφαγας. Παυλος μεν ουν επ' αυτης ρωμης την κεφαλην αποτμηθηναι, και πετρος ωσαυτως ανασκολοπισθηναι κατ' αυτον ιστορειται. κ. λ. H. E. l. 2. c. 25. p. 67. Vid. et. l. 2. cap. 22. fin. p. 62. D.

'them.

'them.' And what follows. In another chapter of the ſame work, he ſays: 'that [d] Linus was the firſt biſhop of Rome after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter.' It is needleſs to refer to any more of the many places of this learned biſhop of Cæſarea, where he appears to have been fully perſuaded, that theſe two apoſtles accompliſhed their martyrdom at Rome.

Athanaſius [e] ſuppoſes both Peter and Paul to have ſuffered martyrdom in that city.

Ephrem the Syrian, about 370, ſays, that [f] Peter taught at Rome.

Epiphanius, as may be remembered, ſays, 'that [g] Matthew 'wrote firſt, and Mark ſoon after, being a companion of Peter 'at Rome.' In another place [h] he ſpeaks of Peter and Paul, as the firſt apoſtles and biſhops of Rome. After whom, he ſays, were Linus, Cletus, Clement.

Jerom's opinion is well known from his article of St. Peter, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, where he ſays, 'that [i] Peter was crucified at Rome in the fourteenth year of Nero's reign:' and from [k] his chapter of St. Mark, 'whom he calls the diſ-'ciple and interpreter of Peter, and ſays, that at the deſire of 'the brethren at Rome he wrote a ſhort goſpel, according to 'what he had heard from Peter.' Not now to refer to any other places.

We lately ſaw, how [l] Chryſoſtom ſays, that Peter having been at Antioch, afterwards went to Rome. In another place he ſays, that [m] after Peter and Paul, Ignatius alſo ſuffered martyrdom at Rome. And he thinks it a wiſe diſpoſal of Providence, that ſo many ſhould bear the moſt ſignal teſtimony to truth in a place, which was then the chief ſeat of impiety and ſuperſtition.

According to Sulpicius Severus, who wrote about the year 401, Paul [n] and Peter ſuffered martyrdom at Rome in Nero's perſecution. Prudentius,

[d] Τῆς δὲ ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίας μετὰ τὴν τούτου [Παύλου] καὶ Πέτρου μαρτυρίαν, πρῶτος κληροῦται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν λίνος. H. E. l. 3. cap. 2. [e] Πέτρος δὲ ὁ διὰ τὸν ζῆλον τῆς ἰουδαίων κηρυττομένης, καὶ παυτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ χαλασθεὶς, καὶ φυγὼν, ἀφικνεῖται εἰς ῥώμην ὅθεν ὑμᾶς μαρτυρῆσαι, καὶ ἀποδέχεσθαι τὴν ἀποδημίαν. Apol. de fugâ ſuâ, p. 331. [f] See in this work, vol. IV. p. [g] et opp. ſyr. tom. I. p. 553. [h] See vol. IV. p. 314. from Hær. 51. num. vi. [h] Ἐν ῥωμῃ γὰρ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι πέτρος καὶ παῦλος οἱ ἀποστολοι καὶ ἐπισκοποι, εἶτα λίνος. κ. λ. Hær. 27. num. vi. [i] See vol. V. p. 53. [k] The ſame, p. 38. [l] See before, p. 544. [m] Οἱ δὲ τὴν ῥωμὴν οἰκοῦντες, ἀφ' ὅτε πολλὴ τότε ἀσεβείας ὕλη ἐκεῖ, πλείονος ἐχρῄζετο βοηθείας. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πέτρος καὶ παῦλος, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνους οὗτος ἐκεῖ πάντες ἐβυβησαν. Ch. hom. in S. Ig. Mart. T. II. p. 599. A. [n] Tum Paulus ac Petrus

Prudentius, about 405, has ſeveral times celebrated the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul at Rome. One place was tranſcribed from him not long [o] ago.

To him I ſubjoin P. Oroſius [p] about 416.

And Theodoret, about 423, well obſerves, that [q] though Nero put to death two of the principal chriſtian lawgivers, Peter and Paul, he could not aboliſh their laws.

I omit Auguſtine, and many others, who ſpeak to the like purpoſe. But I would add, for ſhowing how general this tradition is, that Abdias Babylonius, as he is called in his Apoſtolical hiſtory, ſuppoſes Peter [r] to have been at Rome, and to have ſuffered martyrdom there.

Nor can any of my readers forbear to recollect the general, and almoſt unanimous teſtimony of ancient writers concerning St. Mark: that he was a diſciple of St. Peter, that his goſpel is the ſubſtance of St. Peter's preaching, and that it was written at Rome.

It is not needful to make many remarks upon this tradition. But it is eaſy to obſerve, that it is the general, uncontradicted, diſintereſted teſtimony of ancient writers, in the ſeveral parts of the world, Greeks, Latins, Syrians. As our Lord's prediction concerning the death of Peter is recorded in one of the four goſpels, it is very likely, that [s] Chriſtians would obſerve the accompliſhment of it. Which muſt have been in ſome place. And about this place there is no difference among chriſtian writers of ancient times. Never any other place was named, beſide Rome. Nor [t] did any other city ever glory in the martyrdom of Peter. There were in the ſecond and third centuries

Petrus capitis damnati. Quorum uni cervix gladio deſecta, Petrus in crucem ſublatus eſt. Sul. Sev. Hiſt. Sacra. l. 2. cap. 29 al. 41.

[o] See before, p. 550. [p] Nam primus Romæ Chriſtianos ſuppliciis et mortibus adfecit, ac per omnes provincias pari perſecutione excruciari imperavit. Ipſumque nomen extirpare conatus, beatiſſimos Chriſti apoſtolos, Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit. Oroſ. Hiſt. l. 7. cap. 7. [q] See of this work, vol. V. p. 201. from Theod. Serm. 9. De Legibus, tom. IV. p. 611. D.

[r] Apoſtol. Hiſt. de Petro. § xvi. &c. Ap. Fabr. tom. II.

[s] Non infirmanda eſſe eâ de re antiquitatis teſtimonia, multa monent. 1. Convenientiſſimum ſane fuit ſciri locum, ubi Petro mors oblata eſt, ad illuſtrandum Chriſti de ſervi ſui martyrio oraculum. —— Locus autem in ignoratione jacet, ſi in Romana civitate Petrus cruci ſuffixus non fuit. Baſnag. ann. 64. n. x. [t] Gloria decorique maximo eccleſiis fuit, quod et doctrinâ et ſanguine Apoſtolorum conderentur. Hinc exclamabat olim Tertullianus: *Felix eccleſia, cui totam doctrinam Apoſtoli cum ſanguine ſuo profuderunt.* Qui fit ergo, ut nulla præter Romanam eccleſiam

centuries diſputes between the biſhop of Rome and other biſhops and churches about the time of keeping Eaſter, and about the baptiſm of heretics. Yet [u] none denied the biſhop of Rome to have what they called the chair of Peter.

It is not for our honour, nor our intereſt, either as chriſtians, or proteſtants, to deny the truth of events, aſcertained by early and well atteſted tradition. If any make an ill uſe of ſuch facts, we are not accountable for it. We [x] are not from a dread of ſuch abuſes, to overthrow the credit of all hiſtory: the conſequence of which would be fatal.

Fables and fictions have been mixed with the accounts of Peter's being at Rome. But they are not in the moſt early writers. They have been added ſince. And it is well known, that fictions have been joined with hiſtories of the moſt certain and important facts.

The two traditions, concerning Peter's being at Rome and Paul's preaching in Spain, ought not to be compared together. They are not at all alike. The latter is not atteſted by ſo many, nor ſo early writers, as the other: and is, probably, a mere conjecture, without any foundation, but the words of Rom. xv. 28. which are no proof at all.

This argument may be cenſured by ſome as prolix, and even needleſs. But as ſome of our own times, as well as formerly, have denied, or diſputed this point; I have thought it expedient, to let my readers ſee the evidences of what appears to myſelf, as well as to many other proteſtants, very certain: that St. Peter was at Rome, and ſuffered martyrdom *there*.

in morte Petri exultârit et triumphârit? Id. ib. [u] Cum graviſſimos in adverſarios inciderint olim Epiſcopi Romani, Cyprianos, Firmilianos, alioſque bene multos, nonne eorum aliquis eam perſtrinxiſſet: et gloriationem, quâ Romana ſe efferebat eccleſia, utpote quæ nunquam præſentiâ Petri, ſanguineque floruerit, etſi ad ravim uſque utroque ornamento ſuperbiret? Id ib. [x] Neque ulla unquam traditio fuit, quæ majore teſtium numero cingatur: ut de Petri in urbem adventu dubitari non poſſit, quin omnia hiſtoriæ fundamenta convellantur. Baſn. ann. 64. n. ix. Tantus hac in re omnium conſenſus fuit, ut ſane miraculo debuerit eſſe, quoſdam noſtris ſeculis ortos, factum adeo manifeſtum negare præſumſiſſe. Barrat. de Succeſſ. Ep. Rom. cap. i. num. i.

Verum hi omnium veterum patrum teſtimonio refelluntur. —— Quæ, malum, impudentia eſt, id quidem quod nemo veterum dixit, temere affirmare: Petrum ſcilicet ſedem fixiſſe Babylone: id vero quod veteres omnes eccleſiaſtici ſcriptores diſertiſſime prodiderunt, adventum videlicet Petri Apoſtoli in urbem Romam pertinaciter negare. Atqui nihil in tota hiſtoria eccleſiaſtica illuſtrius, nihil certius, atque teſtatius, quam adventus Petri Apoſtoli in urbem Romam. Valeſ. Annot. ad Euſeb. l. 2. c. 15.

CHAP. XIX.

THE TWO EPISTLES OF ST. PETER.

I. *Their Genuineneſs ſhown from Teſtimony, and internal Characters.* II. *The People, to whom they were ſent.* III. *The Place where.* IV. *The Time when they were written.* V. *Remarks upon* 1 *Pet. v.* 13.

HAVING written the hiſtory of the apoſtle Peter, I now proceed to his epiſtles. Concerning which three or four things are to be conſidered by us: their genuineneſs, the perſons to whom they were ſent, the place where, and the time when they were written.

I. The firſt epiſtle was all along received by catholic Chriſtians, as authentic, and genuine. This we learn from [a] Euſebius. Who likewiſe ſays: 'Of [b] the controverted 'books of the New Teſtament, but yet well known, and 'approved by many, are that called the epiſtle of James, 'and that of Jude, and the ſecond of Peter, and the ſecond 'and third of John.' And in another place: 'One [c] epiſtle 'of Peter, called the firſt, is univerſally received. This 'the preſbyters of ancient times have quoted in their wri-'tings, as undoubtedly genuine. But that called his ſecond, 'we have been informed, [by tradition] has not been re-'ceived as a part of the New Teſtament. Nevertheleſs 'appearing to many to be uſeful, it has been carefully 'ſtudied with the other ſcriptures.' By which, I think, we may be aſſured, that a great regard was ſhown to this epiſtle by many Chriſtians in the time of our learned Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian.

Jerom ſays: 'Peter [d] wrote two epiſtles, called catholic: 'the ſecond of which is denied by many to be his, becauſe 'of the difference of the ſtyle from the former.'

And Origen before them, in his Commentaries upon the goſpel of St. Matthew, as cited by [e] Euſebius, ſays: 'Peter 'on whom the church is built, has left one epiſtle, [uni-'verſally] acknowledged. Let it be granted, that he alſo 'wrote a ſecond. For it is doubted of.'

[a] See vol. IV. p. 227—229, 254.
[b] p. 227. [c] p. 228.
[d] Vol. V. p. 53.
[e] H. E. l. 6 cap. 25. p. 227. A.
[f] See vol. II. p. 466.

What

What thoſe learned writers of the third and fourth centuries ſay of theſe two epiſtles, we have found agreeable to the teſtimony of more ancient writers, whom we have conſulted. For the firſt epiſtle ſeems to be referred to by [e] Clement of Rome. It is plainly referred to by [h] Polycarp ſeveral times. It is alſo referred to by the [i] martyrs at Lyons. It was received by [k] Theophilus, biſhop of Antioch. It was quoted [l] by Papias. It is quoted in the remaining writings of [m] Irenæus, [n] Clement of Alexandria, and [o] Tertullian. Conſequently, it was all along received. But we do not perceive the ſecond epiſtle to be quoted by [p] Papias, nor [q] by Irenæus, nor [r] Tertullian, nor [s] Cyprian.

However, both theſe epiſtles were generally received in the fourth, and following centuries, by all Chriſtians, except the Syrians. For they were received by Athanaſius, Cyril of Jeruſalem, the conncil of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Jerom, Rufin, Auguſtine, and others. As may be ſeen in the alphabetical table, in St. Peter, at the end of the eleventh volume, to which the reader is referred.

Such are the teſtimonies of ancient writers concerning theſe two epiſtles. If we conſult the epiſtles themſelves, and endeavour to form a judgment by internal evidence; I ſuppoſe, it will appear very probable, that both are of the ſame author. And it may ſeem ſomewhat ſtrange, that any of the ancients heſitated about it, who had the two epiſtles before them. For with regard to ſome of the moſt ancient writers, it may be ſuppoſed, that the ſecond epiſtle had not been ſeen by them, it not having come to their hands together with the firſt.

The firſt epiſtle being allowed to be St. Peter's, we can argue in favour of the other alſo after this manner. It bears in the inſcription the name of the ſame apoſtle. For ſo it begins: *Simon Peter, a ſervant, and an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt.* And in ch. i. 14. are theſe words: *Knowing, that ſhortly I muſt put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jeſus Chriſt has ſhewed me.* The writer of this epiſtle may have had a particular revelation concerning the time of his death, not long before writing this. But it is probable, that here is a reference to our Lord's predictions concerning St. Peter's

[e] p. 44, 46.
[f] 97—99. See alſo p. 87.
[g] p. 152. [k] p. 194 and 200.
[l] 113, 115. [m] p. 167.
[n] p. 226. [o] p. 273.
[p] p. 113. [q] p. 167, 170.
[r] p. 275, 277. [s] Vol. III. p. 172.

death, and the manner of it, which are recorded in John xxi. 18, 19.

From ch. i. 16, 17, 18. it appears, that the writer was one of the diſciples, who were with Jeſus in the mount, when he was transfigured in a glorious manner. This certainly leads us to Peter, who was there, and whoſe name the epiſtle bears in the inſcription.

Ch. iii. 1. *This ſecond epiſtle, beloved, I now write unto you: in both which I ſtir up your pure minds by way of remembrance:* plainly referring to the former epiſtle, which has been always acknowledged for Peter's. Theſe words are expreſs. But it might have been argued with ſome degree of probability from ch. i. 12—15. that he had before written to the ſame perſons.

Once more, ch. iii. 15, 16. he calls Paul brother, and otherwiſe ſo ſpeaks of him, and his epiſtles, as muſt needs be reckoned moſt ſuitable to an apoſtle.

The writer therefore is the apoſtle Peter, whoſe name the epiſtle bears in the inſcription.

So that we are here led to that obſervation, which Wall placed at the head of his notes upon this ſecond epiſtle. 'It is,' ſays [t] he, 'a good proof of the cautiouſneſs of the 'ancient Chriſtians in receiving any book for canonical, that 'they not only rejected all thoſe pieces forged by heretics. 'under the names of apoſtles:——but alſo, if any good book 'affirmed by ſome men, or by ſome churches, to have been 'written, and ſent by ſome apoſtle, were offered to them, 'they would not, till fully ſatisfied of the fact, receive it 'into their canon.' He adds: 'There is more hazard in 'denying this to be Peter's, than there is in denying ſome 'other books to be of that author, to whom they are by 'tradition aſcribed. For they, if they be not of that apoſtle, 'to whom they are imputed, yet may be of ſome other 'apoſtle, or apoſtolical man. But this author is either the 'apoſtle, or elſe by ſetting his name, and by other circum-'ſtances, he does deſignedly perſonate him; which no man 'of piety and truth would do.' And then he concludes: 'This epiſtle being written by him but a little before his 'death, ch. i. 14. and perhaps no more than one copy ſent; 'it might be a good while, before a number of copies, well 'atteſted, came abroad to the generality of the Chriſtian 'churches.'

[t] Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 358, 359.

What

What has been juſt ſaid is ſufficient to confute the opinion advanced by Grotius, that [u] this ſecond epiſtle was written by Simeon, biſhop of Jeruſalem after James, the Lord's brother. Indeed that opinion cannot be admitted. It is deſtitute of all authority from antiquity, and is inconſiſtent with the whole tenour of the epiſtle itſelf, or at leaſt with many things in it. As has been well obſerved by [x] Vitringa, and has been now ſhown by us.

Jerom, in his article of St. Peter, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, as already ſeen, ſays: 'Peter [y] wrote two epiſtles, called catholic: the ſecond of which was by many 'denied to be his, becauſe of its differing in ſtyle from the 'former.' Of [z] this he ſpeaks likewiſe in his epiſtle to Hedibia. Baſnage [a] ſays, he is not able to diſcern ſuch difference of ſtyle in the two epiſtles. However, Dr. Sherlock, now biſhop of London, has largely treated of this point in his Diſſertation concerning the authority of the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter. Who obſerves, p. 203. 'that 'the firſt and third of the three chapters, into which this 'epiſtle is now divided, agree in ſtyle with the firſt epiſtle. 'The only difference is in the ſecond chapter, the ſtyle of 'which is no more like to that of the other two, than it is 'to that of the firſt epiſtle. The occaſion of this difference 'ſeems to be this, that in the ſecond chapter there is a de-'ſcription of the falſe prophets and teachers, who infeſted

[u] Scriptorem autem hujus epiſtolæ arbitror eſſe Simeonem, Epiſcopum poſt Jacobi mortem Hieroſolymis, ejuſdemque Jacobi, cujus epiſtolam habemus, ſucceſſorem et imitatorem, &c. Grot. in 2. ep. S. Petri. [x] Verum quacumque etiam ſpecie ſe commendet conjectatio hæc Grotiana, hactenus animum inducere non potui, ut eam probem. Epiſtola Petri poſterior talis eſt, ut ſcripta cenſeri nequeat ab impoſtore. Eſt enim gravis, et ſancto viro digniſſima. Quod ſi ita eſt, certiſſime Petro erit vindicanda, quia præter præfationem, non temere rejiciendam, alia per hanc epiſtolam ſparſa ſunt, quæ perſonam Petri nobis digito quaſi demonſtrant, ut cap. i. 18. iii. 15. Vitring. obſervat. Sacr. l. 4. cap. 9. num. xlii. [y] Scripſit duas epiſtolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur: quarum ſecunda a pleriſque ejus eſſe negatur, propter ſtyli cum priore diſſonantiam. De V. I. cap. i. [z] Habebat ergo Titum interpretem, ſicut et beatus Petrus Marcum: cujus Evangelium Petro narrante, et illo ſcribente, compoſitum eſt. Denique et duæ epiſtolæ, quæ feruntur Petri, ſtylo inter ſe et charactere diſcrepant, ſtructuráque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro neceſſitate rerum diverſis eum uſum interpretibus. Ad Hedib. Qu. xi. T. IV. P. I. p. 183. al. ep. 150.

[a] Nos ſtyli diſcrimen deprehendere non poſſumus. Neque continet aliquid, quod Apoſtolo ſit indignum. Baſnag. A. 63. num. iii.

'the church, and perverted the doctrines of the goſpel. 'Some ancient Jewiſh writer had left behind him a deſcrip- 'tion of the falſe prophets of his own, or perhaps earlier 'times. Which deſcription is applied both by St. Peter 'and St. Jude to the falſe teachers of their own times.' It is added by his Lordſhip, p. 204. 'St. Jerom ſuppoſed, 'and others have followed his opinion, that St. Peter made 'uſe of different interpreters, to expreſs his ſenſe in his two 'epiſtles. But had that been the caſe, the difference of 'ſtyle would have appeared in the whole, and not in one 'part of it only: which is the preſent caſe. And I ſee 'no reaſon to think, that St. Peter did not write both his 'epiſtles himſelf.'

This is the account, which his lordſhip gives of the difference of the ſtyle. Which all will allow to be ingenious, whether they admit it to be right, or not. For ſome may think, that [b] all this difference of ſtyle ariſes from the ſubject treated of in the ſecond chapter.

I conclude therefore, that the two epiſtles, generally aſcribed to the apoſtle Peter, are indeed his.

Mr. Ottervald, of Neufchatel, ſpeaking of the firſt of theſe epiſtles, ſays: 'It contains very weighty inſtructions, and 'is one of the fineſt books of the New Teſtament.' Of the ſecond he ſays: 'It is a moſt excellent epiſtle, as well as the foregoing, and is written with great ſtrength and majeſty.'

Certainly, theſe epiſtles, and the diſcourſes of Peter recorded in the Acts, together with the effects of them, are monuments of a divine inſpiration, and of the fulfilment of the promiſe, which Chriſt made to him, when he ſaw him, and his brother Andrew employed in their trade, and caſting a net into the ſea: *Follow me*, ſaid he, *and I will make you fiſhers of men*, Matt. iv. 19.

II. Concerning the perſons, to whom theſe epiſtles were ſent, there have been different opinions among both ancients and moderns.

Euſebius [c] ſpeaking of St. Peter's firſt epiſtle, as univerſally acknowledged, ſays: 'It is inſcribed by him to the 'Hebrews, *ſcattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, 'Aſia, and Bithynia.*' They who are deſirous to know Jerom's opinion, may conſider what is tranſcribed from him

[b] Concerning this ſee more hereafter in the remarks upon St. Jude's epiſtle, chap. xxi. near the end.

[c] See vol. IV. p. 230.

vol.

vol. V. p. 53, 54. For he does not ſeem to me to have any ſettled judgment about the perſons, to whom Peter wrote. Didymus, of Alexandria, ſuppoſed, [d] St. Peter's firſt epiſtle to have been ſent to Jews ſcattered abroad in ſeveral countries. To the ſame purpoſe Œcumenius, not only in his argument of the epiſtle, referred to by me [e] formerly, but alſo in his commentary [f] upon the beginning of the epiſtle.

Among the moderns not a few are of the ſame opinion, as Beza and Grotius in their notes upon the firſt verſe of the firſt epiſtle, and Mill [g] in his Prolegomena. Cave ſays, St. Peter's [h] two epiſtles were written chiefly to Jewiſh Chriſtians. Tillemont, ſpeaking of the firſt epiſtle, ſays, it [i] is addreſſed particularly to the converted Jews, in thoſe countries, but it ſpeaks alſo to the gentiles, who had embraced the faith.

But though ſome of the ancients, as juſt ſeen, ſay, that St. Peter wrote to the believers of the circumciſion, we have in the courſe of this work obſerved divers others, who ſay, he wrote to gentiles: as [k] the author of the calling of the gentiles, by ſome ſuppoſed to be Proſper of Aquitain: the [l] author of the Divine Promiſes and Predictions: [m] Junilius. Caſſiodorius in one place [n] ſpeaks of Peter's writing to the gentiles, in another [o] to believing Jews. Auguſtine has twice ſaid, that [p] Peter wrote to gentiles. In like manner another author [q] in a ſermon joined with his works, who may be ſuppoſed to have been his diſciple. Gregory the firſt biſhop of Rome, expreſſeth himſelf, as if he thought, that St. Peter's epiſtles were ſent to all Chriſtians in general, both Jews and Gentiles, in the countries mentioned at the beginning of the firſt epiſtle. Bede, in his prologue to the ſeven catholic epiſtles, largely cited by us formerly, ſays, that (*r*) St. Peter's epiſtles were ſent to ſuch as had been proſelyted from gentiliſm to judaiſm, and after that were converted to the chriſtian religion. He ſpeaks again to the like purpoſe at the beginning of his Expoſition of St. Peter's

[d] See p. 423. [e] Vol. V. p. 324.

[f] Ὃς ἐν περιτομῇ οὗτος ἐπιστέλλει, ὁ μακάριος ἰακώβος· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἀφορισθεὶς τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν σκηνὴν κατοικοῦσιν Ἰουδαίοις ὑποβήσεται ταῦτα. Οὗτος δὲ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως τοῖς κλησει πᾶσι γράφει. κ. λ. Tom. I. II. p. 482. C. D.

[g] Num. 60. [h] Reliquit poſt ſe duas, Judæis Chriſtianis ſuperſcriptas. H. L. T. I. p. 5.

[i] Il l'addreſſe particulierement aux Juifs convertis dans toutes ces provinces, quoiqu'elle parle auſſi aux Gentils qui avoient embraſſé la foy. S. Pierre art. 53. Mem. T. I.

[k] Vol. V. p. 213. [l] p. 214.

[m] p. 278. [n] p. 282.

[o] p. 284. [p] p. 101. [q] The ſame. [r] p. 300. (*r*) p. 314.

firſt epiſtle. But the Greek word, rendered by us *ſtrangers*, is not equivalent to proſelytes: as was obſerved long ago by [s] Œcumenius upon the place, and ſince by [t] Baſnage.

Mr. Wetſtein argues from divers texts, that [u] the firſt epiſtle was ſent to gentiles. Mr. Hallett in his learned Introduction to the epiſtle to the Hebrews obſerves: 'Some,' ſays he, 'go upon the ſuppoſition, that St. Peter's epiſtles 'were written to Jews. But it ſeems to me abundantly 'more natural to ſuppoſe, that they were written to gentile 'Chriſtians, if we conſider many paſſages of the epiſtles 'themſelves.' Where [x] he proceeds to allege many paſſages, and, in my opinion, very pertinently. Some of which will be alſo alleged by me by and by.

Dr. Sykes [y] has lately declared himſelf in favour of the ſame ſentiment, and argued well for it.

Mr. Baſnage ſuppoſed, that [z] St. Peter's epiſtles were written to Jews and Gentiles, chiefly the former.

[s] Σημαινει δε το ονομα ου ταυτον τω προσηλυτω. κ. λ. Œcum. vol. II. p. 483. D.

[t] Fallitur egregie Beda. —— A qua ſe ſententia revocaſſet, ſi vocem a Petro adhibitam, επιδημος, attendiſſet, quâ religionis proſelytus nunquam deſignatur. Baſn. An. 57. n. iv.

[u] Ad eos, qui ex Gentibus electi ſunt, ut Chriſto et veritati obedirent. Cap. i. 8, 18, 21, 22. ii. 10. iv. 3. Wetſten. N. T. tom. II. p. 681.

[x] See his introduction, p. 23—25.

[y] 'This epiſtle of St. Peter,' ſays he, 'was written to the ſtran-'gers ſcattered through ſeveral 'parts of the Leſſer Aſia. And 'it is plain, that he meant by them 'gentiles converted in thoſe parts 'of the world to Chriſt. He does 'not mean Jews, but ſuch as were '*elect, according to the foreknowledge 'of God the Father.* Such, *of whoſe 'ſalvation the prophets inquired, who 'propheſied of the grace that ſhould 'come unto them*, ch. i. ver. 10. 'ſuch, *for whom Chriſt was mani-'feſted in theſe laſt times*, ver. 20. 'ſuch as were λαος εις περιποιησιν, '*an acquired people, who had not 'obtained mercy:* ch. ii. 9, 10. *as 'ſheep going aſtray, but now returned*, 'ver. 25. as men, *who in the time 'paſt of their life had wrought the 'will of the gentiles*, iv. 3. Theſe 'are marks ſufficient to deſcribe 'the people, to whom St. Peter 'wrote. —— The gentiles were *now 'begotten in Chriſt to a lively hope.* 'They were become now what the 'Jews formerly were, *a choſen gene-'ration, a royal prieſthood, an holy 'nation, a peculiar people*, &c.' The Scripture doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jeſus Chriſt, ch. iii. ſect. 252. p. 62, 63. ſee likewiſe ch. v. num. 832. p. 306, 307.

[z] Ut noſtra fert opinio, ad utroſque ſcripta eſt, præcipue tamen ad Judæos, qui ſub apoſtolatum Petri ceciderant. Ad gentes quoque epiſtolam ſcriptam fuiſſe, ex his explorate percipitur: *Qui quondam cratis non populus, nunc eſtis populus Dei.* 1 ep. ii. 10. Quæ Ethnicorum præcipue ſunt. —— Præterea Ethnicorum idolatria his perſtringitur: *Inceſſimus in nefariis idolorum cultibus*, iv. 3. Baſn. ann. 57. num. iv.

To

To me it ſeems, that St. Peter's epiſtles were ſent to all Chriſtians in general, Jews and Gentiles, living in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia: the greateſt part of whom muſt have been converted by Paul, and had been before involved in ignorance, and ſin, as all people in general were, till the manifeſtation of the goſpel of Chriſt.

That St. Peter wrote to all Chriſtians in thoſe countries, is apparent from the valedictory bleſſing, or wiſh, at the end of the epiſtle, 1 ep. v. 14. *Peace be with you all that are in Chriſt Jeſus.* Lewis Capellus, who thought, that St. Peter's firſt epiſtle was written to Jewiſh believers, allows, that [a] the ſecond epiſtle was written to all Chriſtians in general, and particularly to gentiles, induced thereto by the comprehenſiveneſs of the addreſs at the beginning of that epiſtle: *to them that have obtained like precious faith with us.* He ſhould have concluded as much of the firſt epiſtle likewiſe. For they were both ſent to the ſame people, as is evident from St. Peter's own words, 2 ep. iii. 1.

Moreover, the inſcription of the firſt epiſtle ſeems to be as general, as that of the ſecond. Let us obſerve it diſtinctly.

To the elect, εκλεκτοις. Says Wall upon the place: 'He 'uſeth the word εκλεκτοι, *choice ones*, juſt as St. Paul does the 'word αγιοι, *ſaints*, for the word *Chriſtians*. And as St. Paul 'directs almoſt all his epiſtles *to the ſaints*, that is, the '*Chriſtians*, of ſuch a place; ſo St. Peter here, *to the elect*, or '*choice ones*, that is *Chriſtians*, ſojourning in the diſperſions of 'Pontus, Galatia, and Bithynia.'

Strangers, παρεπιδημοις. Good men, though at home, are ſtrangers, eſpecially, if they meet with oppoſition, trouble, and affliction, as thoſe Chriſtians did, to whom St. Peter is here writing. For he ſpeaks of their *trials, and temptations*, ch. i. ver. 6, 7. and exhorts them, ch. ii. 11. *as ſojourners, and ſtrangers*, ως παροικους και παρεπιδημους, *to abſtain from fleſhly luſts.*

[a] Ad poſteriorem autem B. Petri epiſtolam. —— Nec fuit ea ſcripta, quemadmodum prior, ſolis Judæis τοις εν διασπορας, ſed omnibus in univerſum fidelibus, tum ex Judæis, tum ex Gentibus, ad Chriſtum converſis. Quod liquet tum ex ver. 1. cap. i. τοις ισοτιμον ημιν λαχουσι πιστιν. (quod de Gentibus proprie dicitur) tum ex eo quod cap. iii. 15, 16. dicit Paulum ad eos ſcripſiſſe in omnibus ſuis epiſtolis. Atqui pleræque omnes Pauli epiſtolæ ſcriptæ ſunt ad Gentes ad fidem Chriſti converſas. Capell. Hiſt. Apoſt. p. 44.

Says

Says Œcumenius upon ch. i. ver. 1, 2. 'He calls [b] them '*ſtrangers*, either on account of their diſperſion, or becauſe 'that all who live religiouſly, are called *ſtrangers* on this 'earth, as David alſo ſays: *I am a ſojourner with thee, and a* '*ſtranger, as all my fathers were*,' Pſ. xxxix. 12.

Scattered throughout Pontus —— or, '*of* [c] *the diſperſion of Pontus, Galatia:* —— ſo he calls them, not becauſe they had been driven out from their native country, but becauſe he writes to the Chriſtians of divers countries, who alſo were but a few, or a ſmall number, in every place where they dwelled.

This may ſuffice for ſhowing, that theſe two epiſtles were ſent to all Chriſtians in general, living in the countries, mentioned at the beginning of the firſt epiſtle.

I ſhall now ſhow, that theſe Chriſtians were for the moſt part of gentile ſtock and original.

1 Pet. i. 14. *As obedient children, not faſhioning yourſelves, according to the former luſts in your ignorance.* This might be very pertinently ſaid to men, converted from gentiliſm to Chriſtianity. But no ſuch thing is ever ſaid by the apoſtles, concerning the Jewiſh people, who had been favoured with Divine revelation, and had the knowledge of the true God. And ver. 20, and 21. he ſays, that *through Chriſt they did now believe in God.* Therefore they were not worſhippers of God, till they were acquainted with the Chriſtian revelation. In like manner ch. ii. 9. St. Peter ſpeaks of thoſe to whom he writes, as *having been called out of darkneſs into God's marvellous light.* Moreover, they once were not God's people. ver. 10. *Which in time paſt were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.* Words reſembling thoſe of St. Paul, Rom. ix. 24, 25. where he is unqueſtionably ſpeaking of gentile converts.

There are alſo other expreſſions, which plainly ſhow, that theſe perſons had been gentiles, and had lived in the ſins of gentiliſm. ch. i. 18. *Foraſmuch as ye know, that ye were redeemed from your vain converſation, received by tradition from your fathers.* And ch. iv. 3. *For the time paſt of our life may ſuffice us, to have wrought the will of the gentiles: when we*

[b] Ἐκλεκτοις παρεπιδημοις.] Το παρεπιδημοις, ητοι διὰ την διασπορὰν ειπεν, ἢ και οτι παντες οι κατα θεον ζωντες παρεπιδημοι λεγονται της γης, ως και δαβὶδ φησιν. κ λ. Œcum. T. II p 483.

[c] Ἐκλεκτοις παρεπιδημοις διασπορας ποντ8. ——

walked

walked in laſciviouſneſs, luſts, exceſs of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries. St. Peter does not charge himſelf with ſuch things. But they to whom he writes had been guilty in thoſe reſpects. And by way of condeſcenſion, and for avoiding offence, and for rendering his argument more effectual, he joins himſelf with them.

Once more, when St. Peter repreſents the dignity of thoſe to whom he writes, upon account of their Chriſtian vocation, ch. ii. 9. as *a choſen generation, a peculiar people, a royal prieſthood:* certainly, the expreſſions are moſt pertinent, and emphatical, if underſtood of ſuch as had been brought from gentiliſm to the faith of the goſpel, as indeed they plainly were. For he there ſays, *they were to ſhow forth the praiſes of him, who had called them out of darkneſs into his marvellous light.*

To all which might be added, what was hinted before, that the perſons, to whom Peter writes, were, for the moſt part, the apoſtle Paul's converts. This muſt be reckoned probable from the accounts, which we have in the Acts of St. Paul's travels and preaching. Whence we know, that he had been in Galatia, and the other countries, mentioned by St. Peter at the beginning of his firſt epiſtle. Moreover he obſerves 2 ep. iii. 15. that *his beloved brother Paul had written unto them.* We may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that he thereby intends St. Paul's epiſtles to the Galatians, the Epheſians, and Coloſſians, all in thoſe countries, and for the moſt part gentile believers. Nor do I ſee reaſon to dobut, but that Peter had before now ſeen, and read St. Paul's two epiſtles to Timothy. And if we ſhould add them, as here intended alſo, it would be no prejudice to our argument. For thoſe epiſtles likewiſe were deſigned for the uſe and benefit of the churches in thoſe parts.

To me theſe conſiderations appear unanſwerable. I ſhall therefore take notice of but one objection only, which is grounded upon ch. ii. 12. *Having your converſation honeſt among the gentiles: that whereas they ſpeak againſt you as evildoers, they may by your good works, which they ſhall behold, glorify God in the day of viſitation.*

Upon the firſt clauſe in that verſe Beza ſays, that [d] this place alone is ſufficient to ſhow, that this epiſtle was

[d] *Inter Gentes, εν τοις εθνεσιν.*] Vel hic locus tribubus illis diſperſis proprie fuiſſe inſcriptam hanc epiſtolam convincit. Bez. in loc.

ſent

ſent to Jews. But, I think not. From St. Paul may be alleged a text of the like ſort. 1 Cor. x. 32. *Give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles,* [και ελλησι] *nor to the church of God.* It might be as well argued from that text, that the Corinthians were by deſcent neither Jews nor Greeks, as from this, that the perſons to whom St. Peter wrote, were not originally Gentiles. In the text of St. Paul, juſt alleged, by Jews and Gentiles, or Greeks, are intended ſuch as were unbelievers. So it is likewiſe in the text of St. Peter, which we are conſidering: as is apparent from the latter part of the verſe, above tranſcribed at large. St. Peter had a right to diſtinguiſh thoſe, to whom he writes, from the gentile people among whom they lived: as he had at the beginning of his epiſtle called them *elect*, or *choice ones*, and *ſtrangers*, and they likewiſe went by the name of Chriſtians, as we perceive from ch. iv. 16.

St. Peter's two epiſtles, then, were ſent to all Chriſtians in general, living in thoſe countries: the greateſt part of whom had been converted from gentiliſm, or heatheniſm.

III. Our next inquiry is, concerning the place, where theſe epiſtles were written.

At the end of the firſt epiſtle St. Peter ſays: *The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, ſaluteth you.* Which text, underſtood literally, has been thought by ſome to denote Babylon in Aſſyria, or Babylon in Egypt. By others it is interpreted figuratively, and ſuppoſed to denote Jeruſalem, or Rome. So that there are four opinions concerning the place where this epiſtle is dated. All which muſt be conſidered by us.

1. Pearſon by Babylon ſuppoſes to be meant [e] a town, or city, of that name in Egypt. But it ſeems to me, that [f] little can be ſaid for this opinion. Babylon in Egypt is an obſcure place. It was a frontier town, or ſtrong caſtle, with

[e] Explodatur figurata, admittatur literalis expoſitio. Non opus erit, ut in Aſſyriam nos conferamus, ſi nudo urbis nomine ſtandum eſſe arbitremur. Alia enim erat urbs Babylonis nomine inſignita, eaque Judææ multo vicinior, a Babyloniis poſt dira Prophetarum vaticinia, Ptolomæorum permiſſu condita et habitata. Pearſon. de Succ. Rom. Epiſc. Diſſ. i. num. vii. &c.

[f] Duas enim vetus terrarum orbis habuit Babylones, alteram clariſſimam illam Chaldæorum regiam, alteram caſtellum quoddam Ægypti a Babyloniis conditum. Poſteriorem hic nominari, nemo crediturus fuiſſe videtur, niſi fama fuiſſet vulgata, prioris Babylonis ætate nihil ſuperfuiſſe, certe nullos prorſus ei fuiſſe incolas. Heumann. Nova Sylloge Diſſertat. P. II. p. 106.

a garriſon,

a garriſon, as it is deſcribed by [g] Strabo: in whoſe time, the reign of Tiberius, was quartered there one of the three Roman legions, appointed to keep the Egyptian people in order. In ſuch a place, as may be ſuppoſed, there [h] were but few Jews, and not many inhabitants of any ſort, beſide ſoldiers. This opinion likewiſe is altogether without the authority of ancient Chriſtians. If St. Peter had written an epiſtle in Egypt, in all probability, it [i] would have been dated at Alexandria. But there is not in early antiquity any intimation, that [k] the apoſtle Peter was at all at Alexandria, or in any part of Egypt. If St. Peter had been at Babylon in Egypt, and had founded a church there, it would have been a church of great renown among Chriſtians: whereas [l] there is not for the firſt four centuries any notice taken of a church, or biſhop in that place.

Le Clerc, who [m] follows Pearſon, ſays, in his notes upon 1 Pet. v. 13. 'Thereby [n] is to be underſtood, not Babylon, 'which

[g] Ἀναπλευσαντι δ' εστι βαβυλων φρουριον ——— νυνι δ' εστι στρατοπεδον εις των τριων ταγματων των φρουρουντων την αιγυπτον. Strab. l. 17. p. 807. al. p. 1160.

[h] Abundaſſe Judæis Ægyptiacam Babylonem, vix probabile videtur, propter et conſtitutum in ea civitate Romanorum præſidium, cum ſignis et aquilis ſuis, quæ Judæis odio erant, et vicinitatem Alexandriæ, in qua libentius degebant. Baſnag. Ann. 46. num. xxvii.

[i] Si Petrus in Ægyptiaca Babylone verſatus eſt, cui probabile fiet, non petiviſſe Alexandriam, civitatem totius orbis ſecundum Romam nobiliſſimam, magnoque Judæorum numero frequentem: cum Alexandriæ in vicinia exſtaret Babylon, et moris eſſet Apoſtolorum, aliqua in regione veſtigium ponentium, Metropoles adire ut majus theatrum haberet evangelii prædicatio, quæ inde veluti ex fonte manabat urbibus provincialibus irrigandis. Id. ibid. [k] Quod vero in Ægypto aliquam verſatus fuerit, ne leviſſima quidem antiquitatis umbra obtendi poteſt. Cav. de Petro H. L. p. 6.

Quis vero Veterum dixit, Petrum ſe Alexandriam contuliſſe? Hoccine diſſimulaſſent tot eruditi ſcriptores, quos Alexandrina peperit eccleſia? Baſnag, ib.

[l] Liquet omnes eccleſias apoſtolicas magnæ exiſtimationis fuiſſe Veteribus. Hinc illud Tertullianum: *Percurre eccleſias Apoſtolicas, apud quas ipſæ adhuc cathedræ Apoſtolorum ſuis locis præſident.* Proindeque eccleſia, quæ Memphitica Babylone fuit, apoſtolicis eſſet inferenda, et multo honore cumulata fuiſſet, utpote a Petro fundata. Jam vero tam obſcura fuit Babylonica illa eccleſia, ut labentibus quadringentis amplius annis, in antiquitatis monumentis nullo veſtigio reperiatur: nullâ fuit Epiſcoporum ſucceſſione, nullâ Martyrum paſſione nobilis. Quod de eccleſiâ apoſtolicâ, et in Imperio Romano conſtitutâ, vix cogitatione fingi poteſt. Baſn. ubi ſupra.

[m] Vid. ejus H. E. anno. 61. num. vii. et Annot. ad Hammondi Præmonitionem in 1 Petri epiſtolam.

[n] Il faut entendre non la Babylone, qui étoit à l'orient de l'Euphrate,

'which lay on the eaſt ſide of the Euphrates, and where 'Peter never was, but a city in Egypt, ſo called, and lying 'not far from the place where now is Cairo.' But what proof is there of Peter's ever having been in Egypt, more than of his having been in Aſſyria?

2. Lewis Capellus conjectured, that [o] by Babylon is to be underſtood Jeruſalem. But it is a mere conjecture, quite deſtitute of foundation in antiquity. And therefore, in my opinion, no more to be received, than the preceding interpretation.

3. Divers other learned men think, that by Babylon is meant Babylon in Aſſyria. So [p] Beza, [q] Lightfoot, [r] Baſnage. Cave, who ſuppoſeth, [s] the firſt epiſtle of St. Peter to have been written at Babylon in Aſſyria, thinks, that [t] his ſecond epiſtle was written at Rome.

They who reject this opinion, ſay, that [u] the Aſſyrian Babylon was at that time almoſt deſerted. On the contrary, they who embrace it, ſay, there [x] were multitudes of Jews in that country. Which may be true. For there were many Jews in moſt countries. But it would have been more to the purpoſe, to produce ſome evidence from antiquity, that Peter was in that country. The primitive Chriſtians had in their hands St. Peter's firſt epiſtle. And it was univerſally received, as his. And it is dated at Ba-

phrate, et ou S. Pierre n'a jamais été: mais une ville d'Egypte, qui ſe nommoit ainſi, et qui n'étoit pas loin de lieu ou eſt-bâti le Caire. Le Clerc. ſur 1 ep. de S. Pierre. v. 13 [o] Ego potius conjicerem Jeroſolymæ fuiſſe ſcriptam, et Jeroſolymam a Petro fuiſſe dictam figurate Babylonem: quod tum temporis Jeruſalem non eſſet amplius urbs, ſed ſpiritualis quædam Babylon, in quâ eccleſia Dei captiva quaſi tenebatur, et gravi ſervitute premebatur, quatenus pridem a Judæis perſecutionem pati cœperat. Capp. Hiſt Ap. p. 42.

[p] Babylona proprie accipio pro celebri illa Aſſyriæ urbe, in quâ tum eſſet Petrus, circumciſionis Apoſtolus Bez in 1 Pet. v. 13.

[q] See his ſermon upon 1 Pet. v. 13. vol. II. p. 1141—1147. and many other places in his works.

[r] Baſn. ann. 46. num. xxvii.

[s] Verum ego priorem ſententiam tanquam longe veriſimiliorem amplector, tum quod in Babylone Parthica magna eſſet Judæorum frequentia. &c. Cav. in Petro. H. L. p. 6. [t] Epiſtola ſecunda Romæ, ut videtur, paullo ante mortem ſcripta. Id ibid. [u] An urbem illam S. Petrus adire maxime concupivit, quam Prophetarum vaticinio, et juſto Dei judicio percuſſam eſſe novit? Pearſon ubi ſupr. § iv. Paullatim igitur defecit Babylon, a Regibus primo, deinde a populo deſerta Ib num. v.

[x] In Aſſyria, ubi Babylon, immenſa fuit Judæorum multitudo, quos ſub Petrinum cecidiſſe apoſtolatum, certum, exploratumque eſt: ut nuſquam gentium provinciani adminiſtrare ſuam felicius potuerit. Baſnag ann. 46. num. xxvii.

bylon.

bylon. And yet eccleſiaſtical hiſtory affords no accounts, that this apoſtle was in Aſſyria or Chaldea. Is not this a proof, that [y] there was not any very ancient tradition, that he was in that country? We juſt now obſerved paſſages of Origen, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerom, Chryſoſtom, relating to St. Peter's travels. But none have mentioned Babylon, as a place, where he travelled, and preached the goſpel.

Says Mr. Beauſobre: 'As [z] Peter was the apoſtle of the 'Jews ſcattered abroad among the Gentiles, St. James 'having ſtayed in Judea, he went to Babylon, where a great 'number of the Iſraelites had remained.' But may I not take the liberty to aſk a queſtion, and ſay, who aſſigned to theſe apoſtles thoſe ſeveral provinces, with ſuch limitations? St. James ſtayed in Judea. It is allowed. We are certain of it from the hiſtory in the Acts. Nevertheleſs he did not confine his regards to the Jews in the land of Iſrael. For he wrote an epiſtle, addreſſed *to the twelve tribes ſcattered abroad.* And if Peter alſo was an apoſtle, chiefly, of the circumciſion; it was not of thoſe only, who were in gentile countries, but of thoſe likewiſe, who were in Judea; where, as I apprehend, he ſpent the greateſt part of his life, even after our Saviour's aſcenſion.

Mr. Beauſobre ſays, 'Peter went to Babylon, where a great number of Iſraelites had remained.' That is, he imagined, that he did ſo. And it was fit for him ſo to do. As Baſnage, in a paſſage [a] cited not long ago, ſays: 'There 'was a multitude of Jews in Aſſyria, where was Babylon. 'Nor could he any where more ſucceſsfully execute his

[y] Sunt qui in dicta Petri epiſtola Babylonis nomine non Romam, ſed Babylonem ipſam, quæ caput fuit imperii, deſignari contendunt. Quam ſententiam omnium veterum patrum conſenſio refelluntur. Certe qui Petrum Babylone ſedisſe volunt, fatendum nobis oportet ſucceſſionem illius primum, qui Babylonis eccleſiæ præfuit Petrum adminiſtrarunt. Quod, malum, impudentia eſt, quod nemo veterum dixerit affirmare: Petrum ſeiliſſe Babylone: id vero omnes ſcriptores diſſidio prodiderunt, pertinaciter negare! Valeſ. Annot. in Euſeb. l. 2. cap. 15. p. 33.

Negant enim, Petrum Romæ fuiſſe: quod teſtatur antiquitas. Affirmant autem Babylone fuiſſe, vel in Ægypto, vel in Chaldæa. Quod nulla prodit hiſtoria. Eſt in 1 Pet. v. 13.

[z] Comme il étoit l'Apotrê des Juifs diſperſez parmi les Payens, S. Jacques étant demeuré en Judée, il alla à Babylone, et dans les provinces voiſines, ou il étoit reſté un bon nombre d'Iſraelites. Hiſt. de Manich. l. 2. ch. 3. T. I. p. 181.

[a] See note (x).

'apoſtolical

'apoſtolical commiſſion.' And becauſe we imagine, that Peter might very fitly preach the goſpel in Aſſyria, we conclude, that he went thither. But ſuch reaſonings, if calmly conſidered, are of no weight. It would be much better to allege ſome ancient teſtimonies, in behalf of St. Peter's journey into Aſſyria, or Parthia.

Mr. Wetſtein thinks, that St. Peter's firſt epiſtle was written in the country of Babylon, in Meſopotamia. As there is ſomewhat new in his argument, I place below [b] a large part of it. In particular, he ſays, that when a perſon writes to the people of ſeveral cities, or countries, it is natural to begin with that which is neareſt to him. So does Paul, Col. iv. 3. and St. John in Patmos, Rev. i. and ii. The like order, ſays he, is alſo accurately obſerved by St. Peter, if he wrote from Meſopotamia, not if we ſuppoſe him to have written from Italy, or Egypt.

But ſuch obſervations, though ingenious and plauſible, are not demonſtrative and deciſive, even when they are juſt and right. Which cannot be ſaid of this. For ſuppoſing St. Peter to have been in Meſopotamia, the country, neareſt to him, would be Cappadocia, as lying more eaſtward, and more ſouthward, than the two firſt named. Certainly Pontus and Galatia were farther off from Meſopotamia than Cappadocia. The truth is: St. Peter begins at the north, and ſo goes round. And that way of beginning does as well ſuit Rome, as Babylon, ſo far as I can ſee.

Beſide all this, there offers an argument, which appears to me deciſive. If the Aſſyrian Babylon was not now ſubject to the Romans, but to [c] the Parthians: which I ſuppoſe to be

[b] Cur Babylon in Italia potius, aut Ægypto, quam in Meſopotamia, ſit quærenda, cauſſam non video. Veteres quidem Romam intelligunt. —— Quod recentiores obſervant, Babylonem proprie dictam, quo tempore Petrus hæc ſcribebat, habitatam non fuiſſe, verum eſt. At (præterquam quod et Stephano Byzantino et Lucano conſtat, etiam Seleuciam eo tempore nomine Babylonis fuiſſe appellatam) poſſumus Babylonem interpretari non urbem, ſed totam regionem. —— Huic obſervationi addo aliam, quæ licet mihi nunc primum in mentem venerit, ſuum tamen apud me pondus habet. Nimirum ubi de pluribus vel provinciis vel urbibus loquimur, vel ubi ad plures ſcribimus, ordini naturæ convenientius et ſimplicius videtur, ut incipiamus non ab ea, quæ loquentibus vel ſcribentibus eſt remotiſſima, ſed proxima. Hunc ordinem ſervavit Paulus Col. iv. 13. et Joannes ex Patmo. Apoc. i. et ii. Hunc ordinem accuratæ ſervavit etiam Petrus, ſi ſcripſit ex Meſopotamia, minime autem, ſi vel ex Ægypto, vel ex Italia, eum ſcripſiſſe exiſtimemus. Wetſten. in 2 Pet. v. 13. T. II. p. 697, 698.

[c] Vid. Strab. l. 16. p. 1081. in al. p. 745.

allowed

allowed by all: it cannot be the place, intended by St. Peter. For the people, to whom he writes, were ſubject to the Romans. And at the time of writing this epiſtle he muſt have been within the territories of the ſame empire, 1 epiſt. ii. 13, 14. *Submit yourſelves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's ſake: whether it be to the king*, or rather emperor, as formerly [d] ſhown, *as ſupreme: or unto governors ſent* (from Rome) *by him, for the puniſhment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well.* Again, ver. 17. *Honour the king:* or rather, the emperor. If St. Peter had not now been within the Roman territories, he would have been led to expreſs himſelf in a different manner, when he enforced obedience to the Roman emperor.

This argument appears to me very obvious. And yet I do not know, that it has ever been thought of by any before. Which makes me almoſt ſuſpect the validity of it: though I cannot diſcern where the defect lies.

St. Peter requires ſubjection to governors, ſent by the emperor: undoubtedly, meaning from Rome. I ſuppoſe, that way of ſpeaking might be properly uſed in any part of the empire. But it might have a ſpecial propriety, if the writer was then at Rome: where indeed, in all probability, Peter then was.

4. So that we are now come to the fourth opinion concerning the date of this epiſtle. Which is, that by Babylon St. Peter figuratively means Rome. This is the opinion of [e] Grotius, and [f] Whitby, and [g] Valeſius, and all the learned writers of the Roman communion in general.

[d] See vol. I. p. 85.

[e] De Babylone diſſident veteres et novi interpretes. Veteres Romam interpretantur, ubi Petrum fuiſſe nemo verus Chriſtianus dubitabit. Novi Babylonem in Chaldæa. Ego veteribus aſſentior. Nam quod Romam Babylonem vocavit, non in hoc tantum ſerviit, ut ſi deprehenderetur epiſtola, non poſſet inde ſciri, quibus in locis viveret. Verum etiam. —— Congruentias plurimas inter Babylonem et Romam vide Oroſii ii. 2, 3, 4. Grot. ad 1 Pet. v. 13.

[f] See him upon 1 Pet. v. 13.

[g] Romam Petrus figurate Babylonem vocavit, vel ob magnitudinem et potentiam, vel propter impietatem. —— Poteſt etiam alia ratio hujus cognominis afferri, quod ſcilicet ut Babylonii Judæos in ſervitutem redegerant, ſic Romani tunc Judæos ditioni ſuæ ſubjeciſſent. Sunt qui in dicta Petri epiſtola Babylonis nomine non Romam, ſed Babylonem ipſam, quæ caput fuit Aſſyriorum, deſignari contendunt. Verum hi omnium veterum patrum teſtimonio refelluntur. Valeſ. Annot. ad Euſeb. H. E. l. 2. c. 15. p. 33.

Theſe have, confeſſedly, in their favour, the teſtimony of antiquity: which is no ſmall advantage.

Euſebius having given an account of St. Mark's goſpel, and of its having been written at the requeſt of St. Peter's hearers at Rome, adds: 'and [h] it is ſaid, that Peter mentions this Mark in his firſt epiſtle, which, they ſay, he wrote at Rome: and that himſelf calls that city Babylon figuratively in thoſe words: *The church that is at Babylon ſalutes you, as does Mark my ſon.*'

This interpretation ſome ſuppoſe Euſebius to aſcribe to Papias. But [i] Spanheim denies it. And perhaps it is not certain. Whether Papias ſaid ſo, or not, it was the prevailing opinion in the time of Euſebius.

Jerom in his book of Illuſtrious Men, in his article of St. Mark, tranſcribes the juſt cited paſſage of Euſebius, but expreſſeth himſelf more poſitively. 'Peter [k] makes mention of this Mark in his firſt epiſtle, figuratively denoting Rome by the name of Babylon. *The church which is at Babylon, elected together with you, ſaluteth you, as does Mark my ſon.*'

Bede, [l] by Babylon underſtood Rome, as did [m] Œcumenius. However, it may be here properly recollected, that formerly we ſaw an author, Coſmas of Alexandria, in the ſixth century, who hereby ſeems to have underſtood Babylon in Aſſyria.

This opinion concerning the place of writing this epiſtle is much confirmed by the general tradition of the ancients, that St. Mark's goſpel was written at Rome, at the requeſt of Peter's hearers, and that Mark here mentioned is the evangeliſt. Nor is this contradicted by Coſmas, but con-

[h] Τω δε μαρκω μνημονευειν τον πετρον εν τη προτερα επιστολη, ην και συνταξαι φασιν εκ' αυτης ρωμης· σημαινειν τε τετ' αυτον την πολιν τροπικωτερον βαβυλωνα, προσειπουντα δια τετων· Ασπαζεται υμας η εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, και μαρκος ο υιος μου. Euſ. H. E. l. 2. c. 15.

[i] Atqui primus omnium Euſebius narrationi de Marco hæc ſubjungit: *Eſſe, qui dicerent Romam figurate Babylonem appellari.*——Nec tamen Papiæ ipſi adſcribi eam interpretationem, quicquid vulgo ſentiant, Valeſio ipſo verba hæc a prioribus ſejungente, ſupra demonſtratum eſt. Vid. P. III. num. xii. Spanhem. Diſſ. de ficta Profect. Petri ad Rom. Part. iv. num. ii. tom. II. p. 375.

[k] Meminit hujus Marci et Petrus in epiſtola prima, ſub nomine Babylonis figuraliter Roman ſignificans: ſalutat vos quæ in Babylone eſt coëlecta, et Marcus filius meus. De V. I. cap. viii.

[l] Babylonem typice Romam dicit, videlicet propter confuſionem multiplicis idololatriæ, &c. Bed. expoſ. 1 Pet. v. 13.

[m] Βαβυλωνα δε την ρωμην δια το περιφανες καλει, ο και βαβυλων πολλω χρονω εσχηκε. Œcum. in loc. tom. II. p. 526. A

[n] See vol. V. p. 269 and 272.

firmed

firmed by him. For he expreſsly ſays, 'that [o] Mark, the 'ſecond evangeliſt, wrote his goſpel at Rome by the direction 'of Peter.'

They [p] who reject this interpretation, affect to ſlight Papias: whereas there is no good reaſon for it. If he ſaid ſo, certainly his teſtimony would be of ſome value. But we do not clearly perceive, that this was in Papias. However, it is ſaid by Euſebius. It was then a common opinion. Nor did he know of a better.

Others inſinuate likewiſe, that [q] the reaſon why Jerom was willing to confound Rome with Babylon, was, that he was out of humour with the people of Rome; which ſeems to me to be groundleſs. Jerom only tranſcribes what he had found in Euſebius. They who reject the accounts of thoſe two learned ancients ſhould by all means produce ſome evidence that Peter was in Meſopotamia. We have good aſſurance that St. Mark's goſpel was written at Rome, and that Peter preached and ſuffered martyrdom there. His two epiſtles therefore, probably, were written in the ſame city, a ſhort time before the period of his life.

Mill varies. In his note upon the place he is for Babylon in Egypt. But in his Prolegomena [r] he is for Rome, and argues well enough for that opinion. I ſuppoſe that to be his final determination.

It may be beſt for me now to conclude this argument with a part of Whitby's note upon 1 Pet. v. 13. which is very agreeable alſo to the note of Eſtius upon the ſame text. 'That Babylon is figuratively here put for Rome, is an

[o] p. 266, and in this vol. p. 89.

[p] Quod ſi, ut Rufinus interpretatur, teſte Papia nititur, infirmo ſane tibicine fultum eſt. Nec temere ad tropum in nominibus urbium aut regionum eſt recurrendum, niſi ubi propria vocis ſignificatio locum habere non poteſt. Wetſten. N. T. tom. II. p. 697.

[q] C'eſt une imagination de Papias, que les anciens ont adopté avec trop de facilité, et que S. Jerom auroit rejettée avec mepris, ſi dans la mauvaiſe humeur ou il étoit contre Rome, il n'eût été bien aiſe de la confondre avec Babylone. Beauſ. Hiſt. Manich. l. 2. ch. 3. T. I. p. 181.

[r] Romæ eam ſcriptam fuiſſe, notant ex traditione Veterum Euſebius, Hieronymus in Catalogo, et alii permulti. Hanc enim Babylonis nomine deſignatam voluit Petrus, ceu communi tum temporis apud Judæos ſuos appellatione: quæ quidem et in hunc uſque diem apud Eos obtinet. Abarbinel, aliique recentiores Judæi, commentantes in prophetias de Babylone, ad Romam iſtas referunt: quod ſicut a Babyloniis olim in ſervitutem redacti fuerint, ita poſtea jam a Romanis, &c. Proleg. num. 59, 60.

'opinion ſo early delivered by Papias, and which afterwards 'ſo generally prevailed (as we learn from Euſebius, Jerom, 'and Œcumenius) that I ſubſcribe to the note at the end of 'this epiſtle, εγραφη απο ρωμης, *it was written from Rome* ſtyled 'alſo *Babylon* by the author of the Revelations, ch. xvii. and 'xviii. For the apoſtle, at the time of writing it, muſt be 'at Rome, figuratively, or at ſome city, properly called 'Babylon. Now as it is uncertain, whether St. Peter ever 'was at Babylon in Chaldea, or in Egypt, and improbable, 'that he made any conſiderable ſtay there: ſo it is very im-'probable he ſhould do it when near his end. At Rome 'and Antioch, where he confeſſedly reſided, church hiſtory 'is copious in giving an account of his ſucceſſors in thoſe 'Sees. But who can ſhow any thing of this nature, with 'reference to either of thoſe Babylons? &c. &c."

IV. The only thing remaining to be obſerved by us is the time of writing theſe two epiſtles. Which I think to be the year 63, or 64, or at the lateſt 65. I ſuppoſe, Paul to have left Rome in the ſpring of the year 63. St. Peter was not then come thither. If he had been there, he would have been mentioned by St. Paul in ſome of his epiſtles, written near the end of his impriſonment at Rome. However, not very long after St. Paul was gone, St. Peter might come thither. Here, I ſuppoſe, he preached for a while freely, and with great ſucceſs. And it appears to me probable, that both theſe epiſtles were written at Rome, not long before the apoſtle's death.

That he was old, and near his end, when he wrote the ſecond epiſtle, is apparent from ch. i. 14. And that the firſt epiſtle to the ſame Chriſtians had not been written long before, may be argued from the apology, which he makes for writing this ſecond epiſtle to them: ch. i. ver. 13—15. *Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of theſe things, though ye know them, and be eſtabliſhed in the preſent truth. Yea I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to ſtir you up by way of remembrance. Knowing, that ſhortly I muſt put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jeſus Chriſt has ſhowed me. Moreover, I will endeavour, that you may be able after my deceaſe to have theſe things always in remembrance.*

It is not unlikely, that ſoon after the apoſtle had ſent away Silvanus with the firſt epiſtle, ſome came from thoſe countries to Rome, where was a frequent and general reſort from

from all parts, bringing him informations concerning the ſtate of religion among them: which induced him to write a ſecond time for the eſtabliſhment of the Chriſtians, among whom he had laboured. And he might well hope, that his laſt words, and dying teſtimony to the doctrine, which he had received from Chriſt, and had taught for many years with unſhaken ſteadfaſtneſs, would be of great weight with them.

V. I have now gone through the four inquiries, propoſed at the beginning of this article. I ſhall here add only a few remarks upon 1 Pet. v. 13. *The* [s] *church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, ſaluteth you. And ſo does Mark, my ſon.*

The word *church* is not in the original, but is inſerted in the tranſlation. The ſame word is ſupplied in [t] Œcumenius, and [u] in the Latin, and other ancient verſions, with the approbation of [x] Grotius, and many others. But Mill [y] in his notes upon this text, where he underſtands the word Babylon literally, of a city of that name in Egypt, argues, that thereby is intended St. Peter's wife, or ſome honourable chriſtian woman, of the city of Babylon, where he then was. Which conjecture is countenanced by [z] Wall.

Dr. Heumann

[s] Ασπαζεται υμας η εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, και μαρκος ο υιος μου.

[t] Ασπαζεται υμας η εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη εκκλησια. [u] Εκκλησια præfigunt Lin. [in margine. manu recentiori:] Œcumen. Vulg. Syr. Arab. Æthiop. ex interpretamento. Mill. in loc. [x] Ad vocem συνεκλεκτη, et Syrus, et Arabs, et Latinus, addunt nomen eccleſiæ, recte. Nam et ad eccleſiam ſcribit, et hæc, et illa, pariter Deo electa, id eſt, a mundo ſegregata. Grot. in loc. [y] Nempe pro indubitato ſumitur, eccleſiam Babyloniorum hic intelligi. Atqui vero, ſi de eccleſia hic ſermo, quum nulla ejus mentio facta ſit in præcedentibus, aperte dixiſſet Petrus συνεκλεκτα τη βαβυλωνι. —— Mihi quidem verisimilis ſuſpicio eſt, per την εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτην, intelligi hic Petri uxorem, fidei ſimul ſuſceptæ, vitæ, laborum, ſociam: quæ Babylone Ægyptiacâ tunc, cum hæc ſcriberentur, egerit. —— Si dicas, illud η εν βαβυλωνι denotare potius feminam aliquam, quæ fixam ſedem habuerit in Babylone, nihil equidem repugno. Eſto η εν βαβυλωνι ſive uxor Petri, ſive etiam opulenta quædam ac illuſtri loco nata femina apud Babylonios, quæ Apoſtolum hoſpitio exceperit: certe nihil hoc loco de eccleſia Babyloniorum. *Mill. in loc.*

[z] 'The word *church* is not in the 'Greek, but put in by the tranſla-'tors, as underſtood in the Greek. '——Dr. Mill thinks it to mean 'Peter's wife, who being now at 'Babylon with her huſband, did 'ſalute thoſe Chriſtians, to whom 'the epiſtle was written. And 'then the reading of the words 'will be: *She who his your fellow-*

Dr. Heumann proceeds farther. Firſt, he ſays, that [a] by *Mark my ſon*, we are to underſtand Peter's own ſon, which he had by his wife. And [b] then by *elected together with you*, is to be underſtood, an excellent Jewiſh woman of Babylon in Aſſyria, whom, with many others, Peter had there converted to the chriſtian faith, and afterwards married: his firſt wife, mentioned Luke iv. 38. by whom he had Mark, being dead.

But it appears to me very unlikely, that St. Peter ſhould ſend ſalutations to the Chriſtians of ſeveral countries from a woman, not named by him. Beza ſays well, that [c] St. Peter omits the noun, *church*, as is often done with regard to words of common uſe. What was the ſenſe of Chriſtians in former times, appears from Œcumenius, and the verſions taken notice of above. The ſame ſenſe appears in [d] the Complexions of Caſſiodorius, and [e] the Expoſition of Bede.

With regard to St. Mark, Œcumenius ſays, 'that [f] Peter 'calls him *his ſon* according to the ſpirit, not according to 'the fleſh. Him he permitted to write the goſpel. But 'ſome, as he adds, have preſumed to call Mark ſon of Peter 'according to the fleſh, arguing from Luke's hiſtory, in the 'Acts of the apoſtles: where Peter, having been delivered 'out of priſon by an angel, is ſaid to have *come to the houſe of* '*Mary, the mother of John, whoſe ſurname was Mark*, as [g] if 'he had then gone to his own houſe, and his lawful wife.'

'*Chriſtian at Babylon, ſaluteth you.*' Wall, p. 357. [a] Similem errarunt errorem, qui quem *filium ſuum* hic loci nominavit Petrus, eum non naturalem ejus fuiſſe filium, ſed ſpiritualem arbitrati ſunt. —— Maneat nunc, Petrum de filio ſibi ex conjuge nato loqui: quem facile ex hoc ipſo loco cognoſcimus fuiſſe ſocium paternorum itinerum, et ſimul συνεργον εν χριστω Heum. ubi ſupr. p. 110. [b] Relinquitur igitur, ut ſtatuamus, loqui Apoſtolum de uxore ſua, Babylone nata, ac tum, cum ibi verſaretur Petrus, una cum aliis utriuſque ſexus Judæis in eccleſiam Chriſti traducta. Hoc enim ſibi volunt hæc verba: η εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη. —— Quis nunc non videat, Petrum hanc νεοφυτον, ſingulari haud dubie pietate et prudentia conſpicuam, duxiſſe in matrimonium, comitemque poſtea habuiſſe ſacrorum itinerum? Ex quo ſequitur, priorem uxorem, cujus Lucæ iv. 38. mentio, e quâ ſuſceperat Marcum, fuiſſe exſtinctam. Heum. ibid. p. 112, 113.

[c] Eccleſiæ nomen omittit, ut in vocabulis communi uſu tritis fieri ſolet. Bez. [d] Salutationes quoque eccleſiæ, quam de Babylonia, id eſt, de ſeculi iſtius confuſione, dicit electam, et Marci filii ſui pia inſtitutione tranſmittens. Caſſiod. in loc. [e] Expoſ. in 1 Petr. cap. v.

[f] Μαρκον δε υιον κατα πνευμα καλει, αλλ' ε κατα σαρκα. Œcum. T. II. p. 526. A.

[g] —— ως εις την εαυτε οικιαν επανελθοντα, και την νομιμην συζυγον. Ib. B.

That

That is a wrong deduction from the words of Acts xii. 12. But we hence perceive, that thoſe people ſuppoſed Mark, the evangeliſt, to have been the ſame as John, ſurnamed Mark.

And I would alſo farther obſerve here, by the way, 'that Œcumenius [h] computes Silvanus, by whom St. Peter ſent this epiſtle, and who is mentioned chap. v. 12. to be the ſame, who is ſeveral times mentioned by St. Paul in his epiſtles, particularly 1 Theſſ. i. 1. 2 Theſſ. ii. 1.' Who likewiſe, very probably, is the ſame as Silas, often mentioned in the Acts.

Œcumenius there calls Silvanus *a moſt faithful man, zealous for the progreſs of the goſpel.* Indeed all muſt be ſenſible, that he was an excellent man, who from generous principles attended the apoſtles of Chriſt in the journies undertaken by them, in the ſervice of the goſpel. His deputation from the apoſtles and elders, and church of Jeruſalem, with their letter to the Chriſtians at Antioch, is very honourable to him. Acts xv. 27, 32. His ſtay there, and Paul's chooſing him for his companion in his travels, when he and Barnabas ſeparated, farther aſſure us of his juſt ſentiments concerning the freedom of the gentiles from the yoke of the law, and of his zeal for promoting true religion.

CHAP. XX

THE THREE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN.

I. *Their genuineneſs ſhown from Teſtimony, and internal Characters.* II. *The Time of writing the firſt of theſe Epiſtles.* III. *The People to whom it was ſent.* IV. *Obſervations upon the ſecond Epiſtle.* V. *Upon the third.* VI. *The Time when they were written.*

I. I HAVE already written the hiſtory of St. John, one of Chriſt's twelve apoſtles, and an evangeliſt. I have alſo obſerved what is needful concerning the goſpel written by him. We are now to conſider his epiſtles.

[h] Πιστος υπερβαλλοντως ο σιλουανος εστις, και περι το κηρυγμα ευθυμως αγωνιζομενος, ειγε και παυλος αυτε μαρτυρει, και συνεργον αυτον μετα τιμοθεε εν ταις επιστολαις παραλαμβανει. Παυλος λεγων και σιλουανος και τιμοθεος. Œcum. ib. p. 525. D.

The regard ſhown to them by the ancients, may be ſoon perceived by recollecting briefly what has been largely alleged by us from them in the ſeveral volumes of this work.

St. John's firſt epiſtle is referred to by Polycarp, vol. II. p. 99, is quoted by Papias, p. 109, 113, 115, and is referred to by the martyrs of Lyons, p. 152. His firſt and ſecond epiſtles are quoted by Irenæus, p. 167, 168. They were alſo received by Clement of Alexandria, p. 211, 226, 227. And, ſays Origen, 'John, beſide the Goſpel and Revelation, has 'left us an epiſtle of a few lines. Grant alſo a ſecond and a 'third. For all do not allow theſe to be genuine,' p. 467. Dionyſius, of Alexandria, receives John's firſt epiſtle, which he calls his catholic Epiſtle, η επιστολη η καθολικη. He likewiſe mentions the other two, as aſcribed to him, vol. III. p. 106. The firſt epiſtle was received by Cyprian, and probably, the other two likewiſe, p. 173—175. The ſecond epiſtle is quoted by Alexander, biſhop of Alexandria, vol. IV. p. 104, 105. Euſebius ſays, 'Beſide his goſpel 'his firſt epiſtle is univerſally acknowledged by thoſe of the 'preſent time, and by the ancients: but the other two 'are contradicted:' that is, doubted of by ſome, p. 227. See alſo p. 254, 255. All the three epiſtles were received by Athanaſius, p. 283, by Cyril of Jeruſalem, p. 300, by the council of Laodicea, p. 309, by Epiphanius, p. 313, 316. All three were received by Jerom, vol. V. p. 32. but the two laſt were doubted of by ſome in his time, p. 41. All three were received by Rufinus, p. 76, by the third council of Carthage, p. 79, by Auguſtine, p. 86, 101, 102, and by all thoſe authors, who received the ſame canon of the New Teſtament that we do. They are in the Alexandrian manuſcript, p. 254. All three are alſo in the catalogues of Gregory Nazianzen, vol. IV. p. 408, and of Amphilochius, p. 413, 414. But this laſt obſerves, that ſome received one of them only. And indeed it is acknowledged, that but one epiſtle of St. John is received by the Syrian churches, p. 430, 431, 439. Nor were any more received by Chryſoſtom, vol. V. p. 127, 136, 137. Venerable Bede, near the beginning of the eighth century, in his Expoſition of the ſecond epiſtle, ſays, 'Some [a] have thought this and 'the

[a] Quidam putant, hanc et ſequentem epiſtolam non eſſe Joannis Apoſtoli, ſed cujuſdam preſbyteri Joannis, cujus ſepulchrum uſque hodie monſtratur in Epheſo. Cujus etiam Papias, auditor Apoſtolorum, et in Hierapoli Epiſcopus, in opuſculis ſuis ſæpe meminit. Sed

'the following epiſtle not to have been written by John 'the apoſtle, but by another, a preſbyter of the ſame name, 'whoſe ſepulchre is ſtill ſhown at Epheſus, whom alſo Pa- 'pias, mentions in his writings. But now it is the general 'conſent of the church, that John the apoſtle wrote alſo 'theſe two epiſtles: foraſmuch as there is a great agreement 'of doctrine and ſtyle between theſe and his firſt epiſtle, 'and there is alſo a like zeal againſt heretics.' They who are deſirous to ſee more quotations of ancient writers, may conſult the table of principal matters in the eleventh volume, in St. John, Catholic Epiſtles, and Authors, who had the ſame canon of the N. T. with that which is now generally received: which article may be found under Canon of the ſcriptures of the N. T.

All the three epiſtles are now generally received as St. John's in theſe parts of the world. And with good reaſon, as ſeems to me. Said Origen: 'he has alſo left an epiſtle of a very few lines. Grant alſo a ſecond, and a third.' That is very right. One epiſtle was received by all, as certainly genuine. And it is not worth the while to contend about the other two, when they are ſo very ſhort, and reſemble the firſt in ſentiment, phraſe, and manner of writing, as is well obſerved by [b] Mill. And of the ſecond epiſtle, which conſiſts of only thirteen of our verſes, eight may be found in the firſt, either in ſenſe or expreſſion. The title of elder at the beginning of theſe two epiſtles, affords no juſt exception. It [c] is a very honourable character, well

Sed nunc generalis Eccleſiæ conſenſus habet, quod has quoque epiſtolas Joannes Apoſtolus ſcripſerit, quia revera multam verborum et fidei ſimilitudinem cum prima ejus epiſtola oſtendunt, et ſimili zelo deteſtantur hæreticos. Bed. Exp. in 2 ep. Joan.

[b] Epiſtolas autem iſtas habere auctorem Joannem——ex eo plane conſtat, quod in iſtis omnibus eadem paſſim ſint νοηματα, idem genus et character dictionis. Secundæ, certe ολιγοστιχω, (neque enim continet ultra tredecim verſus ex hodiernis noſtris) octo quidem verſiculorum cum ſenſus, tum ipſæ voces, exſtant in epiſtola prima.—— Epiſtola autem tertia, ejuſdem omnino coloris ac characteris cum ſecunda, per omnia ſapit Joannem Apoſtolum. Mill. Proleg. num. 153.

[c] Quod aliqui Joanni cuidam alteri, Preſbytero vulgo dicto, adſcriptas velint has duas epiſtolas, ii neutiquam vident, quam fortiter contra ipſos militet illud ο πρεσβυτερος κατ' εξοχην: quique privato homini, vel etiam Epiſcopo, haudquaquam conveniat.——Imo vero Apoſtolo noſtro peculiariter adaptatum et accommodatum erat: utpote qui jam pluſquam nonagenarius fuerit, omnibuſque provinciæ Aſiaticæ eccleſiis præſederit. Mill. Ibid. num. 153, 154. Vid. et Lampe Prolegom. in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num. viii.

becoming

becoming John as an apoſtle, and now in years, reſiding in Aſia, as ſuperintendent of all the churches in that country. And St. Peter ſpeaks of himſelf in the ſame character, in his epiſtle univerſally acknowledged, ch. v. 1.

Dr. Heumann ſuppoſeth, that [d] here is a reference to St. John's great age, at the time of his writing theſe two epiſtles. And he thinks, that St. John was then as well known by that title, as by his name. The elder therefore is as much, as if he had ſaid, the aged apoſtle. And he refers to Wolfius, and others, who had before ſaid the ſame, or what is to the like purpoſe.

The want of a name at the beginning is no objection. It is rather an argument, that they are his: that being agreeable to St. John, who prefixes not his name to that epiſtle, which is unqueſtionably his.

And ſay Beauſobre and Lenfant in their preface to the ſecond and third epiſtles: 'It is certain, that the writer of 'the third epiſtle ſpeaks with an authority, which the biſhop 'of a particular church could not pretend to, and could not 'ſuit John the elder, even ſuppoſing him to have been 'biſhop of the church of Epheſus, as the pretended apoſ-'tolical conſtitutions,' ſay he, 'was appointed by John the 'apoſtle. For if Diotrephes was biſhop of one of the churches 'of Aſia, as is reckoned, the biſhop of Epheſus had no 'right to ſay to him, as the writer of this epiſtle does, ver. '10. *If I come, I will remember his deeds which he does.* That 'language, and the viſits made to the churches, denote 'a man, who had a more general juriſdiction, than that of 'a biſhop, and can only ſuit St. John the apoſtle.'

II. That may ſuffice for ſhowing the genuineneſs of the three epiſtles. Let us now make ſome remarks upon each of them, beginning with the firſt. Concerning which there are two inquiries, that may be proper: the time when, and the perſons to whom it was written.

[d] Deinde articulo ὁ docet Joannes, nomen hoc ſibi eum nemine commune eſſe, adeoque viſo τῷ πρεσβυτερῳ titulo ſtatim ſcriptorem harum literarum agnoviſſe.——Nihil proinde reſtat, quam ut ſtatuamus, a Joanne iſto titulo indicari ætatem ſuam provectiſſimam, moriſque tum fuiſſe, eum appellitari honoris ac reverentiæ cauſſa *Senem*, ſive *Seniorem*, vel etiam *Senem Apoſtolum*.—— Græca proinde hæc, Ὁ Πρεσβυτερος Γαιῳ, melius reddi Latine non poſſunt, quam hoc modo: Grandævus Apoſtolus ſalutem dicit Caio.—— Heuman. Comm. in Joan. Ep. iii. ap. Nov. Syllog. Diſſ. P. i. p. 279, 280.

Grotius

Grotius thought this [c] epiſtle to have been written in Patmos, before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. Hammond and Whitby likewiſe were of opinion, that it was written before that great calamity befel the Jewiſh nation. Dr. Benſon [f] is inclined to place it in the year of our Lord 68, of Nero 14, that is, after the Jewiſh war was broke out, and not long before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. Mill, [g] and Le Clerc, [h] who follows him, place this epiſtle in the year 91, or 92. Baſnage [i] ſpeaks of this epiſtle at the year 98, and Baronius [k] at the year 99. Beauſobre and Lenfant in their preface to this epiſtle expreſs themſelves after this manner: 'Although we cannot ſay any thing certain concerning the time, when St. John wrote this epiſtle: we may be ſatisfied, that it was near the end of the firſt century, when the apoſtle was far advanced in age.' Du Pin [l] ſays, it is not known, when it was written, but moſt probably, near the end of the apoſtle's life. Mr. Whiſton [m] thought, this, and the other two epiſtles of St. John, to have been written not long after each other, about the year of Chriſt, 82, or 83. Mr. Lampe [n] ſuppoſeth this firſt epiſtle to have been written after the Jewiſh war, before St. John's exile in Patmos, and, probably, ſome good while before it. Conſequently, he and Mr. Whiſton do not differ greatly about the time of this epiſtle.

I muſt likewiſe ſay, though the exact time is not known, I am of opinion, it was not written, till after the Jewiſh war was over. My reaſon is, that the arguments alleged, for proving it to have been written ſooner, are not ſatisfactory. And in examining them, perhaps, ſome things may occur, affording hints of a later date.

One argument is taken from ch. ii. 18. *it is the laſt time*, or hour: meaning, as [o] ſome interpreters think, the laſt

[c] Puto autem ſcriptam, ut alibi dixi, ex Patmo hanc epiſtolam, non multo ante excidium Hieroſolymitanum. Grot. Pr. in 1 ep. Joan.

[f] Preface to St. John's firſt Epiſtle, § iv. [g] Proleg. num. 148—150. [h] H. E. an 91. num. i. [i] Ann. 98. num. iv.

[k] Ann. 99. num. vii—x.

[l] Diſſ. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. § xi.

[m] Commentary upon St. John's three Catholic Epiſtles, p. 14.

[n] Acquieſcimus igitur hactenus in judicio clariſſimi Enſii de Canone N. T. p. 270. Scriptæ tamen creduntur Joannis epiſtolæ ante exilium in Patmum inſulam. Neque eſt ratio, ob quam non ſtatueremus, eas diu ante illud tempus fuiſſe conſcriptas. Lampe Prol. cap 7. num. iv. note *(h)*.

[o] *Ultima hora:* id eſt, ultimum tempus, ubi ad Judæos ſermo eſt, ſignificat tempus, proximum excidio urbis, ac templi, et reipublicæ Judæorum. Grot. annot. in 1 ep. Jo. ii, 18.

hour

hour of the Jewish state and constitution. Nevertheless, there [p] are learned men, who do not assent to that interpretation. Grotius himself owns, that [q] the phrase is sometimes used concerning the world, or mankind in general, as well as the Jews. And Mr. Lampe, who supposeth the phrase to relate to the divine judgment upon the Jewish people, says, it [r] might be used not only at the time when it was inflicting, but also after it was accomplished. Which he supposes to be meant by those expressions, ch. ii. 8. *the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth:* [though [s] Wolfius thinks no such thing there intended.] And therefore, he says, he [t] does not acquiesce in the reasons alleged by Grotius and Hammond, to prove, that this epistle was written before that event.

Let me add here also a part of Wall's note upon ch. ii. 18. which to me appears not amiss. 'The saying of St. John, '*it is the last time*, is spoken as a great many such sayings of 'St. Paul, and the other apostles, had been, according to 'the general charge, given by Christ to the apostles, and to 'all other Christians, to live in a continual expectation of 'the judgment. They that interpret it otherwise, of the 'destruction of Jerusalem, as Grotius, and Hammond, are 'forced to suppose this epistle to have been written just be-'fore that destruction, about the year 69.——Nor are St. 'John's words here like those of any one, that was fore-'telling that event: but rather of one that was speaking of 'the present state of the christian religion.'

[p] Vid. Wolff. Prolegom. in 1 ep. Joann. p. 243, 244. Conf. eund. ad 1 ep. cap. ii. ver. 18.

[q] Nomen *horæ extremæ* modo totum humanum genus respicit, modo populum Judaicum, ex quo erant Apostoli, et non pauci Christianorum. Grot. in loca quædam N. T. de Antichristo: speciatim in 1 ep. Jo. cap. ii. Opp. tom. III.

[r] Alii maturius, aut brevi ante, aut saltem circa excidium Hierosolymitanum scriptum esse existimant, qui nobis maxime ad verisimilitudinem accedere videntur. Probabile enim est, per εσχατην ωραν intelligi tempus judicii divini in Judæos. cap. ii. 18. ejusque consummationem spectare verba cap. ii. 8. Lampe Prol. l. 1. c. 7. n. iv. p. 106.

[s] ——sed non video, quomodo imminens illud judicium argumentum esse possit, quo Apostolus ad inculcandum et urgendum amorem mutuum uti voluerit. Tenebræ omnino inferunt pristinam et Judæorum et Gentilium conditionem, per quam non solum erroribus, sed et vitiis ita erant immersi, ut υἱοι σκοτους appellari potuerint. Wolf. Curæ in 1 Jo. ii. 8.

[t] Grotius et Hammondus ante excidium Hierosolymitanum scriptam esse suspicantur. Quod tamen loca adducta non evincunt. Licet enim excidium illud in actum datum esset, dici tamen etiamnum poterat, quod hora illa ultima venerit. Id. ib. note *(h)*.

Again,

Again, it is argued, that [u] the apoſtle might refer to the calamities of the Jewiſh people in thoſe words, chap. ii. 17. *The world paſſeth away, and the luſt thereof.* But thoſe are only general expreſſions, repreſenting the uncertainty of all earthly things. And therefore afford not any argument, that the apoſtle had therein a regard to affairs in Judea. For, if he had, his expreſſions would have been more diſtinct and particular.

Thirdly, an argument is alſo brought from ch. ii. 13. *I write unto you, fathers, becauſe ye have known him that is from the beginning.* Whereby St. John has been ſuppoſed by ſome to intend ſome aged Chriſtians, who had ſeen Jeſus Chriſt upon earth. Which is more likely to have been the caſe of ſome in the year 68, about thirty-five years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, than many years afterwards. To which I anſwer, that [x] by *him that is from the beginning*, probably is intended God the Father, not Jeſus Chriſt. It is equivalent to what is afterwards ſaid of others, in the ſame verſe. *I write unto you, little children, becauſe ye have known the Father.* But it would not ſound ſo well, to ſay: *I have written unto you, fathers, becauſe ye have known the Father.* See alſo ver. 14.

Fourthly, it is [y] argued to the like purpoſe from ch. ii. 7. *I write no new commandment to you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning.* But thereby may be meant no more than the commandment, which ye had from the beginning of your being Chriſtians: or from the time when you were firſt converted to the chriſtian religion, whenever it was. And, as [z] Wolfius obſerves, none of thoſe to whom St. John wrote, in any part of his life, were very far diſtant in point of time, from the firſt preaching of the goſpel.

[u] Unde etiam per *mundum tranſeuntem cum ſuis cupiditatibus* ad idem excidium Reipublicæ Judaicæ reſpicere Evangeliſta potuit. Lampe ib. p. 106.

[x] *Noſtis Deum, qui Senex Dierum.* Dan. vii. 9, 13, 22. Dat cuique ordini quæ ipſi conveniunt. A prima ætate noviſtis Deum, hujus mundi opificem. Is autem is eſt, qui Chriſtum miſit, eumque pro ſe audiri voluit. Grot. ad ver. 13.

[y] Accedit, quod ad fratres ſcribat, qui præceptum a principio audiverant. cap. ii. 7. Per quod intelligi debet principium prædicationis evangelicæ. A quo igitur non nimium removeri debent illi, quos Apoſtolus alloquitur. Lampe ubi ſupra. p. 106.

[z] Quod ad alteram rationem attinet, nullus eorum, qui Joannis ætate ad Chriſti cognitionem adducti ſunt, ab originibus evangelii nimium removebitur, ſive illi ante, ſive poſt excidium Hieroſolymitanum eo pervenerint. Omnes enim ſub originibus ejus eam adepti cenſeri debent, quippe quibus Joannes, ut αυτοπτης earum, teſtis et præco, adfuerit. Wolf. ubi. ſupr. p. 244.

Since

Since therefore there are no expreſſions in the epiſtle, declaring the time of it, or clearly referring to the calamities attending the downfall of the Jewiſh ſtate; it appears to me probable, that it was not written till a good while after that event, about the year of Chriſt 80, or later.

III. We are next to conſider to whom this epiſtle was ſent.

And here I obſerve: as the writer does not at the beginning prefix his name, nor any where elſe mention it in the epiſtle: ſo neither does he deſcribe or characterize the perſons to whom he writes by the name of their city, or country, or any ſuch thing.

The firſt expreſſion of addreſs is that in ch. ii. 1. *My little children, theſe things write I unto you, that ye ſin not.* And the epiſtle concludes with theſe words: *Little children, keep yourſelves from idols.* And he ſeveral times calls the Chriſtians, to whom he writes, *little children*, as ch. ii. 12, 18. iii. 7, 18, iv. 4. v. 21. Our Lord ſpoke to the diſciples in a like manner, John xiii. 33. and xxi. 5. It is a tender and affectionate appellation, denoting paternal authority, love and concern. As an apoſtle, it might be uſed by St. John in any part of life. Nevertheleſs it ſeems to imply, together with apoſtolical authority, advanced age.

Some have thought, that this epiſtle was written to Parthians, or Jewiſh believers in that country. We have ſeen ſeveral ancient Latin authors, who ſpeak of it, as inſcribed to Parthians. So [a] Auguſtine, [b] Caſſiodorius, and [c] Bede. I have already ſpoken of this, and have referred to divers learned moderns [d] whoſe opinions deſerve to be taken notice of. I ſhall now add Mr. Whiſton's thoughts relating to this point, taken from his Commentary upon St. John's epiſtles, publiſhed in 1719. 'None of theſe three epiſtles 'of St. John,' ſays he, p. 5, 6, 'were written to the Parthians, 'as ſome later Latin writers have ſuppoſed: but rather to 'the Chriſtians or churches of Aſia, near Epheſus.' 'This 'he argues from the perfect ſilence of all true antiquity, as to 'St. John's ever preaching in Parthia: and from the account which we have in Euſebius from Origen, that Parthia 'was St. Thomas's province, and Aſia St. John's: as alſo from 'the account in the Recognitions ix. 29. that Thomas really

[a] Vol. V. p. 101. [b] p. 282. [c] p. 314. [d] p. 101.

'preached

'preached the goſpel in Parthia, without a ſyllable of St. 'John thereto relating. All which,' ſays he,' makes it plain 'that this pretended direction of any of St. John's epiſtles to 'the Parthians ſtands upon no good authority at all. And it 'is not improbable, that the occaſion of this error was barely 'a falſe reading in ſome ancient manuſcript, where προς παρθους 'was read for προς παρθενες: *to the Parthians*, for *to the virgins*: 'which latter inſcription might eaſily be applied to the firſt 'epiſtle. For as it is chiefly addreſſed to young Chriſtians, 'yet uncorrupted, both as to fleſhly and ſpiritual fornication, 'ſuch as in St. John's Revelations are called παρθενοι *virgins*: ſo 'was the ſecond epiſtle anciently affirmed by ſome to be writ-'ten *to the virgins*: as we learn from Clement of Alexandria, 'in Caſſiodorius:' that is, from Clement's Adumbrations upon the catholic Epiſtles, tranſlated by order [e] of Caſſiodorius. For there [f] the ſecond epiſtle of St. John is ſaid to be written to virgins.

And before, at p. 4, of the ſame Commentary, Mr. Whiſton obſerves, 'St. John ſays nothing in his firſt epiſtle, by 'which we can directly gather, to whom it was ſent: though 'it ſeems moſt probably to belong to his own Aſiatic churches.'

As I have quoted Clement, I muſt not omit the obſervation of Lenfant and Beauſobre: 'Clement [g] ſays, that the ſecond 'epiſtle of John was directed to virgins, undoubtedly intend-'ing by the means of this lady. But there is nothing in the 'epiſtle, which ſuits virgins, more than other Chriſtians.'

Mr. Lampe ſays, 'This [h] firſt epiſtle is written to believers, 'as is abundantly manifeſt from the whole ſcope of the epiſtle. 'We alſo,' ſays he, 'eaſily admit, that Jewiſh believers are 'eſpecially regarded. Nevertheleſs we think, that St. John 'directed it to all believers of his time in general: foraſmuch 'as there appears not in it any expreſſion of limitation.'

Du Pin ſays, 'Though [i] there is no inſcription, it appears 'from the beginning of the ſecond chapter, that it is addreſſed

[e] See vol. II. p. 227, 228.

[f] Secunda Joannis epiſtola, quæ ad virgines ſcripta eſt, ſimpliciſſima eſt. Scripta vero eſt ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine. Adumbr. in ep. 2 Joan.

[g] As before, p. 584.

[h] Ad fideles cum ſcripſiſſe, abunde patet ex ſcopo epiſtolæ, cap. i. 4, totoque ejus argumento. Facile etiam admittimus, ſpeciatim fideles ex Hebræis innui. Univerſis tamen credentibus ſui temporis Joannem hanc epiſtolam deſtinaſſe putamus, quia nulla reſtrictionis occurrit mentio. Lamp. ibid. num. iii. 105.

[i] Diſſerta. ſur la Bible. t. 2. ch. 2. § xi.

'to

'to many Christians. And there is no proof, that it is sent to 'Jews, rather than to Gentiles.'

On the other hand, Dr. Benson [m] thinks, 'that the apostle 'wrote this epistle to the Jewish Christians in Judea and 'Galilee.'

But the former opinion appears to me more probable. For 1. It is always called a catholic epistle. So it was called by Dionysius of Alexandria, as before seen, as well as by later writers. 2. It really appears to be so. For there are not in it any expressions of limitation. 3. There could be very little occasion for that admonition to believers in Judea, in the year 68, after the war was broke out, which is in ch. ii. 15. *Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world.* That admonition is rather suited to people, who were supposed to be in easy circumstances, and are in danger of being ensnared by the allurements of prosperity. 4. Nor has the concluding exhortation of the epistle, *keep yourselves from idols,* any special suitableness to believers in Judea: but is much more likely to be directed to Christians living in other parts of the world.

Œcumenius in his comment upon the last verse of this epistle says, it [n] was written to the whole church in general. And in the proëm to his commentary upon the second epistle he [o] calls the first a catholic epistle, And he says, 'that [p] epistle is 'not written to a certain person, nor to the churches of one or 'more places, as the blessed Peter's to the Jews in their dispersion, nor as James's before him, to the twelve tribes of the 'Jewish people. But he writes to all the faithful in general, 'whether assembled together or not. For which reason there is 'no inscription to that epistle, as there is to the other two.'

To me therefore it seems, that this epistle was designed for the churches in Asia under St. John's inspection, and for all other Christians, into whose hands it should come. Or in other words, it was designed for all Christians in general, especially those under the apostle's inspection, and nearest to him:

[m] See his preface to St. John's first epistle. sect. iv.

[n] ——φαμεν ȣν, ως επειδαν εκκλησιᾳ ολῃ ταυτα εγραφεν. κ. λ. Œcum. T. II. p. 602. B.

[o] Ib. p. 605. B.

[p] ——Ὁυ γαρ προς ωρισμενον εγραψε προσωπον, ουδε προς εκκλησιαν τοπων τινων, ωσπερ εποιησεν ο μακαριος πετρος αφωρισμενως προς τȣς εν τῃ διασπορα επισημαινομενος ιȣδαιοις γραφειν· και προ τȣτȣ ο θειος ιακωβος ταις δωδεκα φυλαις —— αλλα πασι πιστοις κοινον ποιȣμενος τον λογον εκκλησιαζȣσι και μη εκκλησιαζȣσι, τον της προγραφης παρελιπε λογον. Id. p. 606. B. 607. A.

without

without excepting the believers in Judea, or in any other country whatever.

Nor am I aware of any thing in the epiſtle, that ſhould lead us to think, Jewiſh believers in particular to be intended, except what is in ch. ii. 2. where by *our*, ſome have underſtood Jewiſh Chriſtians, and by *the whole world*, Gentiles. But the coherence does not require that interpretation. In the preceding verſe is firſt mentioned that general addreſs, *my little children*, which occurs ſeveral times afterwards. He there ſays: *Theſe things write I unto you, that ye ſin not.* Having delivered that earneſt exhortation, for avoiding all offenſive harſhneſs, he ſoon afterwards joins himſelf with thoſe, to whom he writes, adding: *And if any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous. And he is the propitiation for our ſins, and not for ours only,* 'that is, mine and yours, to 'whom I am now writing, who already believe in Jeſus, and 'have done ſo for a good while: *but alſo for the ſins of the whole 'world:* that is, of all men, of every nation and people, rank 'and condition, in every part and age of the world, who ſhall 'believe and repent.' Here is nothing to limit what the apoſtle ſays to Jewiſh Chriſtians. And that this apoſtle does frequently join himſelf with thoſe, to whom he writes, with a like view to that above-mentioned, muſt be evident to all, who read this epiſtle with attention. See ch. i. 6—10. ii. 3. iii. 14, 18—22.

However for the ſake of ſuch as are really inquiſitive, I ſhall here ſubjoin the note of Œcumenius upon thoſe words: *not for ours only, but alſo for the ſins of the whole world.* 'This [q] 'he ſaid, either becauſe he wrote to Jews, and intended to 'ſhow, that the benefit of repentance was not reſtrained to 'them, but extended to Gentiles alſo: or elſe, that the promiſe 'was not made to the men of that time only, but likewiſe to 'all in future times.'

IV. St. John's ſecond epiſtle is thus inſcribed: *The elder to the elect lady, and her children.* Which has been differently underſtood by ancient and moderns: whoſe opinions may be ſeen in [r] Wolfius, and in Dr. Benſon's preface to the ſecond and third epiſtles of St. John, and briefly in Beza, whom [s] I tranſcribe below. Some

[q] Τουτο δε ειπεν, ητοι οτι προς ιουδαιους ην ὁ λογος, και ινα μη μονοις εκεινοις περιληπτα της μετανοιας, αλλα και προς τα εθνη εξαπλωση ταυτην· η οτι μη τοις κατ' εκεινο καιρον η επαγγελια μονον, αλλα και τοις μετεπειτα πασι. Œcum. in 1 ep. Joan. p. 565.

[r] Wolf. Prolegom. in ep. Joann. ii. p. 320—326. [s] *Electæ Domi-*

Some have hereby understood the Christian church in general. So [t] Jerom. But that, as Beza well observes in the place just transcribed, is a way of speaking, of which no like instance can be found. And it is inconsistent with what is said in the conclusion of the epistle, where the writer speaks of coming to see her, and sends her the salutations of the children of her elect sister.

Cassiodorius here [u] understood a particular church.

Mr. Whiston [x] says: 'St. John's second epistle was not written to a particular lady, but to a particular church: and, 'not improbably, to the church of Philadelphia.' Which last I take to be said without any good foundation.

Œcumenius, in his comment upon the last verse of this epistle, says: 'Hence [y] some argue, that the epistle was sent 'not to a woman, but to a church. About which,' he says, 'he does not choose to dispute.' But in his introduction, or comment upon the beginning of the epistle, he says, 'St. [z] John 'did not scruple to write to a faithful woman: forasmuch as '*in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.*' And before, he speaks [a] of this epistle being written to a particular woman.

In

næ. Nonnulli *Electæ* nomen proprium esse volunt. Quod non probo. Dicendum enim esset κυρια εκλεκτη, *Dominæ Electæ.* Alii hoc nomine volunt Ecclesiam Christianam in genere significari. Quibus repugnat primum, quod hoc dicendi genus sit prorsus inusitatum. Deinde, quod in extremis duobus versibus diserte pollicetur, se ad eam et filios ipsius venturum, additque filiorum sororis salutem, quam et ipsam *electam* vocat. Puto igitur inscriptam esse epistolam præstanti alicui feminæ, quarum nonnullæ ecclesias suis opibus passim sustentabant: et *electam* illam vocari, id est, *eximiam,* addita Dominæ appellatione —— sicut Lucas Theophilum, et Paulus Festum κρατιστον, id est, *potentissimum,* vel *præstantissimum,* compellant. Neque enim ab ejusmodi honestis titulis Christiana Religio abhorret, quatenus quidem justum ac fas est. Perinde est igitur, acsi scriptum esset: Eximiæ ac præstanti dignitate Dominæ. Atenim cur nomen proprium non addidit? Nempe satis inter se noti ac familiares erant. Quamobrem etiam ne nomen quidem suum exprimendum putavit. Bez. in Joann. ep. secund.

[t] Legimus in Carminum libro. —— *Una est columba mea.* —— Ad quam scribit idem Joannes epistolam: *Senior electæ dominæ, et filiis ejus* —— Ad Ageruch. ep. 91. al. 11. T. IV. p. 745.

[u] Joannes senior, quoniam ætate provectus, electæ dominæ scribit ecclesiæ, filiisque ejus, quos sacro fonte genuerat. Cassiod. in ep. Jo. ii.

[x] As before, p. 469.

[y] Δια δε τω προσθηναι, ασπαζεται σε τα τεκνα της αδελφης σω της εκλεκτης, βουλονται τινες βεβαιειν, ως ω προς γυναικα η επιστολη, αλλα προς εκκλησιαν περι ω ουδεν τω βουλομενω διενεχθειν. Œc. T. II. p. 612.

[z] Προς δε γυναικα γραφων πιστην εστιν υπεστειλατο, οτι εν χριστω ιησυ ουκ αρσεν και θηλυ οιδε. Ib. p. 606. C.

[a] —— καιτοι και πρεσβυτερον εαυτον εν ταυταις γραφει. και προς γυναικα, κ.τ.

In the Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria, as we now have them in Latin, this [b] epiſtle is ſaid to be written to a Babylonian woman, or virgin, named Electa.

And of late many learned men, whoſe [c] arguments I place below, chooſe to read this inſcription thus: *To the lady Electa, or Eclecta.* But in my opinion the concluſion affords an objection. For it is not very likely, that two ſiſters ſhould both have one and the ſame name. So it may be ſometimes; but very ſeldom, as I imagine. This was a difficulty with [d] Wolfius, and [e] Tillemont.

Dr. Heumann ſuppoſeth, that [f] this woman's name was Kuria, or Kyria, and renders the inſcription after this manner: *To the elect Kyria.* Which opinion is embraced by [g] Dr. Benſon. But [h] Wolfius is not quite ſatisfied with it.

Tillemont has obſerved, that [i] in the Synopſis of Athanaſius κυρια

λα. ετερον γαιον, ενα και αυτον, ωσπερ και την γυναικα μιαν. Id. p. 605. B.

[b] Secunda Joannis epiſtola, quæ ad virgines ſcripta eſt, ſimpliciſſima eſt. Scripta vero eſt ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine. Significat autem electionem eccleſiæ ſanctæ. Clem. A. ed. Potter, p. 1011. [c] Epiſtola ſecunda ſcripta eſt ad quandam Babyloniam, Electam nomine, ut legas in Adumbrationibus ad hanc epiſtolam, quæ feruntur ſub nomine Clementis Alexandrini. Nomen enim proprium feminæ eſſe Electam, recte obſervarunt viri doctiſſimi, perinde ut εκλεκτος viri nomen eſt apud Herodianum. Eandem Joannes κυριαν vocat, quemadmodum Latini feminas honeſtas vocabant dominas, ſive dominas. Et Nazianzenus ep. iv. Κυρια τη μητρι. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. 5. tom. III. p. 343.

Εκλεκτη quoque litera majuſcula ſcribitur apud Wechelium, et in editione R. Stephani, quam ſecutus eſt Millius, quamvis ipſe eo nomine Cyriacam feminam indicari exiſtimet. Wolf. in 2 ep. Jo. p. 323. [d] Electus cubicularius fuit Imp. [illegible] modi genere Ægyptius, &c. [illegible] n. ad Joan. ep. 2. p. 729. [e] Electam proprii nominis vocabulo vix habuerim, per comma 13. ubi matronæ hujus ſoror itidem εκλεκτη appellatur. Quod ut illius ætatis moribus non reſpondet, ita ſoror illa εκλεκτη, tanquam Chriſtiana commode vocari poterat. Wolf. ib. p. 325. [e] Et on trouve de la difficulté à croire qu' εκλεκτη en ſoit un, [nom propre] parceque S. Jean. ver. 13. le donne auſſi, à la ſœur de cette dame, n'eſtant pas ordinaire que deux ſœurs aient le meſme nom: et parceq' il auroit dû eſtre devant κυρια plutoſt qu' aprés. S. Jean. l' Evangeliſte. note xiv. Mem. T. I.

[f] Heuman. Pœc. T. II. p. 421—427. et T. III. p. 14 &c.

[g] See his preface to the ſecond and third epiſtles of St. John, ſect. iv. [h] Poſterius hoc argumentum me etiam adducit, ut nec Cyriæ nomen proprium hic agnoſcam. Ita enim Apoſtolus ſcripturus erat: Κυρια τη εκλεκτη, quemadmodum ver. 1. epiſtolæ tertiæ: Γαιω τω αγαπητω. Simili ſcribendi ratione utitur Paulus. Rom. xvi. 5. Ασπασεσθε επαινετον τον αγαπητον μου. Vid. etiam ib. ver. 8. et 12. et. 13. Wolf. ib. p. 325.

[i] Neanmoins Saint Athanaſe met

κυρια ſeems to be taken for a proper name. But that is not clear. The expreſſion is ambiguous, and may be as well rendered: 'the [k] elder writes to a lady, and her children,' as to Kyria, and her children. So [l] likewiſe thought Wolfius.

Before I proceed, I muſt detain the reader, whilſt I obſerve, that the article of the Synopſis, quoted by Tillemont, is exactly the ſame with the hypotheſis, or argument, prefixed to St. John's ſecond epiſtle in [m] the ſecond tome of Œcumenius. However, I do not ſuppoſe it to be really Œcumenius's. I allow it to be a part of the Synopſis, generally thought to have been compoſed by Athanaſius, biſhop of Alexandria in the fifth century, as [p] formerly ſhown.

Œcumenius himſelf ſeems to me to have ſuppoſed, this epiſtle to have been ſent [q] to a Chriſtian woman, whoſe name is not known. However in one place, in his prologue, he has theſe expreſſions: 'He [r] calls her *elect*, either from her 'name, or on account of the excellence of her virtue.'

Finally, then, others underſtand this inſcription agreeably to our own tranſlation: *The elder to the elect lady, and her children.* This [s] has hitherto been the common opinion, and is favoured by [t] Beza, [u] Mill, [x] Wall, [y] Wolfius, [z] Le Clerc and others. And Tillemont in the place before referred to, ſays: 'The ſecond epiſtle of St. John is inſcribed to εκλεκτη 'κυριᾳ. St. Jerom tranſlates the word κυριᾳ by Dominæ, lady. 'And it is difficult to tranſlate otherwiſe in the fifth verſe, 'where St. John repeats the ſame word.'

γραφει κυρια, και τοις τεκνοις αυτης. par ou il paroiſt avoir pris le mot de κυρια pour un nom propre. Mem. Ec. T. I. S. Jean l'Evangeliſte. note xiv.

[k] Ταυτην ως πρεσβυτερος γραφει κυρια και τοις τεκνοις αυτης. Athan. Synopſ. S. S. T. II. p. 190. ed. Bened.

[l] Mihi quidem id ex phraſi iſta non admodum liquet. Wolf. ib. p. 323.

[m] Œcum. T. II. p. 603.

[p] Vol. IV. p. 289, 290.

[q] Δυο δε τη εκλεκτη ταυτη επιμαρτυρει. κ. λ. Œcum. tom. II. p. 606. D.

[r] Εκλεκτην δε η απο τ ονοματος, η απο της περι την αρετην φιλοτιμιας, καλει. Id. p. 606. B.

[s] Alii utramque vocem pro appellativa habent, matronæque nomen ſimili ſilentio tectum conſent, quo ſuum Joannes ipſe texit. Hæc communior fere eſt ſententia. Wolf. ib. p. 324.

[t] See before note (s) p. 593.

[u] Prolegom. num. 151.

[x] Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 378.

[y] Ubi ſupra. p. 326.

[z] Quoique ce mot puiſſe être un nom propre——il eſt aſſez vraiſemblable, que c'eſt ici un nom appellatif, qui ſignifie, que c'etoit une Dame Chrêtienne, a qui S. Jean. écrivoit, et qui étoit connue a ceux qui lui devoient rendre cette lettre, &c. Le Clerc Remarques ſur la 2 ep. de S. Jean.

It

It is not eaſy for me to decide in ſuch a variety of opinions, each one of which is ſupported by great patrons. The arguments for a proper name, either of Eclecta, or Kyria, are plauſible, and ſpecious. But it is an object of ſome moment, that this notion was little, if at all known to the ancients. If it had, they would not have ſuppoſed, that St. John here writes to the church of Chriſt in general, or to ſome Chriſtian church in particular. The Latin Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria, as they are called, are not very material. The paſſage of the Synopſis, quoted by Tillemont, is ambiguous. Œcumenius has juſt mentioned the opinion, that Eclecta might be the name of the perſon to whom St. John wrote. But he does not ſeem to adhere to it, as has been obſerved by Eſtius.[a] Nor is there any notice taken of this interpretation by Jerom, or Caſſiodorius, or Bede, authors, in which it would be very likely to be found, if it had been known in ancient times. And why it ſhould not have been known, if there is any foundation for it, would not be eaſily ſhown. That Jerom did not take κυρια to be a proper name, appears not only from the Latin verſion of this epiſtle, but likewiſe from his book of the Interpretation of Hebrew names: where, as formerly [b] obſerved, there are no proper names collected out of the ſecond epiſtle of St. John, though there are out of his other two epiſtles, and indeed from all the ſeven catholic epiſtles, excepting only this one of St. John's ſecond epiſtle.

V. The third epiſtle of St. John is thus inſcribed: *The elder to the beloved Gaius.* There [c] ſeem to be two of this name

- *Electæ.* Non liquet, an hoc ſit nomen proprium mulieris, ad quam ſcribitur epiſtola, an commune. Id quod potius exiſtimandum videtur: quoniam in fine epiſtolæ etiam ſoror ejus vocatur *electa*. Non ſolent autem in eadem familia duæ proles eſſe cognomines. Poſſe ſumi tanquam commune, Œcumenius ſua expoſitione oſtendit, et recte. Videtur fuiſſe mulier nobilis ſive genere, ſive opibus. —— Alioqui poterat vocare filiam. —— Sed moris eſt apud bene moratas gentes, infirmiorem ſexum titulis et aliis decentibus modis honorare. Eſt. in Joann. ep. ii. ver. 1.

[a] See vol. V. p. 33. [c] Gaius quidam inter comites ejus nominatur in tumultu Epheſino Act. xix. 29. qui Derbæus videtur dici Act xx. 4. Habebat etiam Corinthi hoſpitem Gaium. Rom. xvi. 23. quem ipſe baptizaverat. 1 Cor. i. 14. An hi ſint iidem inter ſe aut cum Gaio Joannis, quis diſpiciet? Beda, Pſeudo-Dexter, Lyranus, aliique, affirmant. —— Id quoque novum procreare dubium poteſt, quod Gaius Paulinus Corinthi ſedem ac domicilium habuerit, noſter vero proculdubio in Aſia habitaverit, brevi ab Apoſtolo viſitandus, de cujus extra Aſiam poſt exceſſum Neronis itineribus tota antiquitas ſilet. Lampe Proleg. in Joan. l. 1. cap. 7. num. xii.

mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epiſtles. In the diſturbance at Epheſus, it is ſaid: *Having caught Gaius and Ariſtarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they ruſhed with one accord into the theatre.* Acts xix. 29. And among the ſame apoſtle's fellow-travellers, who accompanied him in his journey toward Jeruſalem, is mentioned *Gaius of Derbe.* xx. 4. There is another Gaius, who appears to have been an inhabitant of Corinth. 1 Cor. i. 14. Rom. xvi. 23. I ſee no reaſon to think, that Gaius, or Caius, to whom St. John writes, was one of them. He ſeems to have been an eminent Chriſtian, who lived in ſome city of Aſia, not far from Epheſus, where St. John chiefly reſided, after his leaving Judea. For at ver. 14. the apoſtle ſpeaks of *ſhortly coming to him.* Which he could not well do, if Caius lived at Corinth, or any other remote place. Grotius thought him to be a good Chriſtian, who [d] lived in one of the churches, or cities mentioned in the Revelation.

Mr. Whiſton [e] ſuppoſes, Caius to have been biſhop of Pergamos. Mill [f] was inclined to be of the ſame opinion. But this is ſaid only upon the ground of the pretended Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, which in this caſe are of no authority at all.

Dr. Heumann [g] in his Commentary upon this epiſtle of St. John has ſome curious and uncommon obſervations. He does not chooſe to trouble himſelf with inquiring, who Caius was: the knowledge of which, he thinks, would be of no great uſe. It is ſufficient, that we know him to have been a good Chriſtian. Nevertheleſs he appears to ſlight the opinion juſt mentioned that [h] he was biſhop of Pergamos. And he argues likewiſe, that [i] he is different from thoſe of the ſame name, mentioned in the Acts, or St. Paul's epiſtles. And indeed it cannot be thought ſtrange, that in the times of the apoſtles, there were ſeveral Chriſtians of this name: which ſeems to have been as common a name among the Greeks and Romans, as any name whatever.

[d] Vixit hic Caius in aliqua eccleſiarum, quarum mentio in Apocalypſi. Grot. in 3 ep. Joan. ver. 1.

[e] Commentary upon St. John's Epiſtles, p. 14, 15, 86. [f] Alteram vero illam ad Gaium, eccleſiæ Pergamenſis Epiſcopum, ab ipſo Joanne (ſi quid Apoſtolicarum Conſtitutionum auctori credimus) ordinatum. Mill. Prol. num. 152.

[g] Commentarius in Joan. Ap. epiſtolam tertiam. Ap. Nov. Syllog. Diſſertation. P. I. p. 276—328. [g] Ibid. p. 277.

[h] Millius, Conſtitutionibus Apoſtolicis credulus, Caium hunc eccleſiæ Pergamenæ Epiſcopum ſcribit in Prolegomenis ſuis ad N. T. Eandem amplexum eſſe ſententiam Guil. Whiſtonum in ſuo in hanc epiſtolam commentario, quis mirabitur? Ib. p. 277. in notis.

[i] p. 277, 278.

Dr.

Dr. Heumann ſays, that [k] Diotrephes, mentioned by St. John ver. 9. and ſaid, to *love to have the pre-eminence*, was not a heathen magiſtrate, nor a heretic, nor a biſhop, but a deacon in the church, to which he belonged. Upon which I obſerve: it was eaſy to ſhow, that Diotrephes was not an heathen magiſtrate.

Dr. Heumann ſeems likewiſe to have proved, that [l] Diotrephes was not a heretic. For, as he argues, if Diotrephes had been a corrupter of the true chriſtian doctrine, it would have been the duty of the apoſtle, to caution Chriſtians againſt familiar converſe with him: in like manner as he does in the tenth and eleventh verſes of his ſecond epiſtle. Moreover, in that caſe, the apoſtle would have ſignified his errors, and would have directed men to beware of the leaven of Diotrephes. But this he has not done. He only reproves his pride, want of hoſpitality, and a perverſe contempt, not of the apoſtle's doctrine, but of his direction for receiving ſtrangers. He alſo quotes [m] Calovius, as ſpeaking to the like purpoſe.

And the late Mr. Moſheim, who, as I ſuppoſe, had not ſeen Dr. Heumann's Diſſertation, and gives a very different account of this epiſtle in ſeveral reſpects, allows, that [n] Diotrephes was not a heretic. So likewiſe argued Mr. Lampe [o] before either of them.

But

[k] Ibid. p. 306, 307. [l] Nunc, ille Diotrephes quis fuerit, inveſtigandum venit. Eraſmus *novæ hereſis auctorem* vocat in Paraphraſi. Ac ita jam olim ſenſit Beda——Verum recte Buddeus hanc ſententiam reſpuit. Quod ſi enim corruptor doctrinæ apoſtolicæ fuiſſet Diotrephes, Apoſtoli fuiſſet avocare Chriſtianos a familiari cum ipſo conſuetudine: id quod fecit hæreticis in ſecundæ ſuæ epiſtolæ verſu decimo et undecimo. Fuiſſet item apoſtoli, notare ipſius errores, et, ut a fermento Diotrephis caveatur, præcipere. Jam vero id non facit, ſed ſuperbiam duntaxat ejus notat, et inhoſpitalitatem, et protervam non doctrinæ Joannis, ſed præcepti ejus de liberalitate in pios exules exercenda, contentionem. Ib. p. 302, 303.

[m] Etiam Calovius ad h. l. hac de cauſſa negat, Diotrephen fuiſſe hæreticum. *Si hæreticus fuiſſet*, inquit, *gravius ſine dubio acturus adverſus eum, et Caium, alioſque, de ſeductione ipſius cavenda moniturus fuiſſet Joannes.* Quod argumentum accepit a Cornelio a Lapide, cujus pene omnes ſunt annotationes, quas ad hanc Joannis epiſtolam exhibet Calovius. Heuman. ib. p. 303 note *(z)*.

[n] Nullam igitur Diotrephes religionis dogmatibus injuriam inferebat, ſed iniquius tantum erat, et ultra modum rigidus dignitatis ſuæ cuſtos. Moſhem. de Reb. Chriſtianor. p. 176, 177.

[o] De cauſſa rixæ et contentionis inter Diotrephen et Joannem in diverſa abeunt interpretes. Bartholomæus Petri: *Credibile eſt*, inquit, *fuiſſe quempiam ex illis Judæis titulo tenus Chriſtianis, qui Chriſti fidem ita ſuſcipiendam putabant, ut ſimul ſervaretur lex ceremonialis Moſis.*——Sed optime

But I cannot ſay, that Dr. Heumann has proved, Diotrephes not to have been a biſhop. For I think, that every thing ſaid of him in this epiſtle implies his being preſident, or chief director of things in the church, to which Caius belonged. However, we will conſider his arguments.

In the firſt place he ſays, the [p] principal reaſon, why learned men have thought Diotrephes to be a biſhop, is becauſe they have underſtood thoſe words at ver. 10. *and caſteth them out of the church*, of excommunication. But thoſe words, he ſays, are capable of another ſenſe. They ſeem rather to mean, that by ill treatment he forced thoſe ſtrangers to leave the church, to which they had applied for relief, and to go elſewhere.

But granting, this interpretation to be right; Diotrephes might nevertheleſs be a biſhop. For that ill treatment might be owing to an abuſe of his epiſcopal power and authority.

Again, ſays Dr. Heumann, the [q] fault of Diotrephes lay in ſeeking pre-eminence; which ſhows, he was not a biſhop: for then he would have had pre-eminence. Nor does a man ſeek what he has already.

But I cannot perceive that obſervation to be very material. For a biſhop may ſhow improper love of power and pre-eminence by arbitrary proceedings in the ſociety, over which he preſides, and by an arrogant behaviour toward neighbouring biſhops or ſuperintendents, his equals, and, perhaps, in ſome reſpects, his ſuperiors.

Finally, not to take notice of any other arguments of this kind, Dr. Heumann thinks, that [r] Diotrephes was deacon, and had

optime obſervat Calovius, ſi Joannes id innuiſſet, quod tum ſine dubio acturus adverſus eundem, et Caium alioſque de ſeductione ipſius cavenda moniturus eſſet. Nullius ſane dogmatis, ſed factorum tantum perverſorum Diotrephes incuſatur. Lamp. Prol. l. 1. cap. 7. § xiv.

[p] Alii igitur Diotrephen fuiſſe illius eccleſiæ epiſcopum crediderunt, hoc potiſſimum uſi argumento, quod excommunicaſſe ſcribatur pios exules. Verum infra docebimus, *ejicere ex eccleſia*, hic non eſſe excommunicare, atque adeo aſſingi Diotrephi excommunicationem judicio præcipiti. Ib. 303.

[q] Ac vel verbum φιλοπρωτευων demonſtrat nobis, eum haud fuiſſe Epiſcopum enim eſt ο πρωτευων in eccleſia. Atqui quod quis jam habet, non expetit. Ib. p. 303, 304.

[r] Jam cum clariſſime cognoſcamus, nec hæreticum, nec epiſcopum, nec preſbyterum, nec ethnicum ſcilicet reipublicæ rectorem, fuiſſe Diotrephen, via ſatis aperta eſt ad perſonam ejus inveniendam. Statim enim mentem noſtram hæc ſubit quæſtio: An forte fuit illius eccleſiæ diaconus, hoc eſt, bonorum eccleſiaſticorum adminiſtrator? Hoc enim officium certis hominibus jam initio Chriſtianæ Eccleſiæ demandatum fuiſſe, ex Act. vi. notum eſt. Ac ſane facilis nunc et perſpicuus nobis

had the charge of the ſtock or treaſure of the church to which he belonged, and therefore he was not biſhop.

But neither do I ſee the force of this argument. For Diotrephes might have the diſpoſal of the church-ſtock, and yet be biſhop. For in ancient times it was a part of the biſhop's office and care, to ſee, that the revenues of the church were managed and diſpoſed to the beſt advantage. This appears from [s] Juſtin Martyr, and [t] Cyprian. They who deſire to ſee more proofs, may conſult [u] Bingham. Since then we allow Diotrephes to have had a right to concern himſelf in the diſpoſal of the church-ſtock, it need not affect Dr. Heumann's main argument, whether he was biſhop, or deacon.

To me, then, it ſeems, that Diotrephes was biſhop in this church, and that Caius was a man in a private ſtation, of good ſubſtance, and a liberal diſpoſition. St. John ſays ver. 9. *I wrote unto the church:* or rather [x] I would have written unto the church, and at the ſame time to Diotrephes: *but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence, receiveth us not.* For that reaſon St. John ſent this letter to Caius.

Let us now conſider, what was the caſe, to which St. John refers in this epiſtle, and what was the fault of Diotrephes. Concerning this there have been various ſentiments of learned

nobis videtur totus hic locus noſter. Præerat ſcilicet ærario eccleſiaſtico Diotrephes. Erat ejus pauperibus inde erogare pecunias. Advenas autem fratres ideo non ſublevabat, quod vix eccleſiæ illius pauperibus alendis ſatis videretur ſuppetere. Id cauſatus alio diſcedere, aliorum auxilium implorare jubebat: imo dum nihil ipſis ſuppeditabat, cogebat hoc ipſo eos εκ της εκκλησιας, ex illa eccleſia, excedere, atque ita erat εκβαλλων αυτους εκ της εκκλησιας. Erant, qui exulibus his ex ærario dari aliquid volebant. Verum non audiebat hos providus ſcilicet œconomus, ſed ſuam ſequi ſententiam cupiebat cæteros Chriſtianos omnes. Atque ita erat φιλοπρωτευων (ſive ut Petrus loquitur, κατακυριευων) αυτων. Quid? Tam prudens et juſtus ſibi videbatur œconomus, ut ne Joannis quidem Apoſtoli præcepto morem gereret, ratus ſcilicet, eum, ſi hic eſſet, ærariique rationes haberet cognitas, aliter ſenſurum. Bonum doctorem eſſe Joannem, non negabat: bonum eum eſſe œconomum, prudentemque in politicis rebus conſiliatorem, id vero negabat. Imo eo temeritatis provehebat, ut ludicra maledicta effutiret in virum ſanctiſſimum. et fortaſſe *ſenem* appellaret, cætera quidem ſumme venerabilem, ſed hoc certe in genere *delirum*. Ib. p. 306, 307.

[s] Οι ευπορουντες δε και βουλομενοι, κατα προαιρεσιν εκαστος την εαυτου, ο βουλεται διδωσι· και το συλλεγομενον παρα τω προεστωτι αποτιθεται, και αυτος επικουρει ορφανοις τε και χηραις —— και τοις παρεπιδημοις ασι ξενοις. κ. λ. Apol. 2. p. 99. A. Par. 1636.

[t] —— et ſtipendia ejus Epiſcopo diſpenſante perciperent. Cypr. ep. 41. al. 38. [u] Antiquities of the Chriſt. Church. B. I. ch. iv. ſect. 6.

[x] Scripſiſſem forſitan eccleſiæ. Vulgat. Vid. et Cleric. H. E. A. D. 92. num. ii. Vid. et Grot. in loc.

men

men. Grotius ſuppoſed [y] theſe ſtrangers here ſpoken of to be believing Jews, whom Diotrephes, a gentile, would not receive, becauſe they were Jews, or becauſe they were for joining the rites of the law with Chriſtianity. To the like purpoſe [z] Le Clerc, and [a] Beauſobre. This opinion is much diſliked by [b] Dr. Heumann. Mr. Moſheim [c] likewiſe argues againſt it, as an opinion, quite deſtitute of foundation in antiquity.

Others think, that Diotrephes was a Jew, and zealous for the law, and that he would not receive theſe ſtrangers, converts from among the gentiles, becauſe they did not take upon them the obſervation of the rites and ceremonies of the law of Moſes. This opinion is mentioned by [d] Lampe. But he argues well againſt it.

And indeed both theſe opinions were confuted before, when we ſhowed, that Diotrephes was not a heretic, or that there is no reaſon to think him ſo.

It has been of late a common opinion among learned men, that [e] St. John here ſpeaks of ſome, particularly Jews, who had

[y] Is vero ex illo erat hominum genere, qui Judæos, quànquam Chriſtum profeſſos, ſi legis ritus obſervabant (quod in Judæa Chriſtiani faciebant ad hæc uſque tempora, ut Sulpicius nos docet) ad ſuos cœtus non admittebant. Grot. in ep. 3. ver. 9.

[z] Nolebat autem Chriſtianos circumciſos ab incircumciſis ſeu Gentilibus, in eccleſiam admitti. Cleric. ib. [a] Son nom eſt Grec. Ce qui fait juger, qu'il étoit Payen d'origine, et c'eſt peut-être pour cela qu'il ne vouloit pas qu'on reçût Chrêtiens d'entre les Juifs, fort mepriſez par les Gentils. Pref. ſur. ii. et iii. ep. de S. Jean. p. 585. Voyez auſſi la remarque ſur. l'ep. iii. ver. 9. [b] Heuman. ubi ſup. p. 303. note *(a)*.

[c] Eam (cauſſam) viri docti quærunt in conditione eorum, quos beneficiis et amore eccleſiæ excludebat. Diotrephen nempe ſuſpicantur origine fuiſſe Ethnicum, illos vero quos recipere nolebat Judæos. Ex quo efficiunt, inſitum Ethnicorum animis contemptum Judæorum tantum apud eum potuiſſe, ut ſanctiſſimum amoris præceptum violaret. In hac conjectura, ut verum fatear, nihil eſt, quo moveri queat aliquis conſideratus et rerum Chriſtianarum non imperitus. Nam, ut omittam, omnibus eam præſidiis deſtitutam eſſe, ſi nomen Diotrephis excipias, quod Græcum eſt —— ut taceam, nuſquam aliquid memoriæ proditum extare, unde pateat, tam immani Judæorum odio et deſpicientiâ Chriſtianos ex Græcis flagraſſe, ut in fratribus eos habere nollent, et omni amoris fructu ſpoliarent. &c. Moſhem. De Reb. Chriſtian. ante Conſt. M. p. 175.

[d] See before, p. 599. note *(o)*.

[e] Tertiam epiſtolam ſcripſit Gaio cuidam. —— Hominis liberalitatem laudat, qui præcones quoſdam evangelicos, e Judæa gente, qui a Gentilibus nihil accipere voluerant, opibus ſuis adjuviſſet. Cleric. ubi ſupr.

Diotrephen duplici nomine S. Joannes

had gone out into the world, to propagate the Christian religion. Who had acted upon a generous and disinterested principle, refusing to take any thing from those, among whom they laboured, and whom they had converted to the Christian faith. And they think, that St. John commends Caius for encouraging such teachers, and blames Diotrephes for not receiving and helping them. But that opinion appears to me without foundation. For I see nothing that should lead us to think preachers here spoken of, but only strangers in want.

Ver. 5. *Beloved*, says St. John to Caius, *thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers:* 'that is, 'to the members of the church, to which he belonged, and 'to strangers, who came to the city, where he dwelt: whom 'he had received civilly, and courteously, and relieved gene-'rously, if they were in want.'

Ver. 6. *Which have borne witness of thy charity before the church.* 'Some such persons, or some members of that church, 'had been at the place, where St. John resided. And before 'the church they declared his good temper and liberality.' *Whom if thou bring forward on their journey, after a godly sort, thou shalt do well.* 'And it will be very commendable in you, 'if after this any other such persons should come to your city, 'you shall act in a like manner to them also, receiving them 'kindly, and forwarding them in their way. This will be 'very becoming your Christian profession.'

Ver. 7. *Because that for his name's sake they went forth taking nothing of the gentiles.*

We learn from Bede, that [f] there were in ancient times two interpretations of these words: 'For the name of Christ they 'went forth to preach the gospel. Or, for the faith of Christ, 'and the profession of his name they had left their native 'country, or had been expelled from it.' This [g] is the sense,

Joannes objurgat: primum ideo, quod imperium sibi arrogaret in ecclesia —— deinde propterea quod durum se ac inhumanum fratribus bene de religione Christiana promeritis exhiberet. Egressi erant quidam ex cœtu, cujus membrum Diotrephes erat, ad propagandum inter vicinas gentes religionem Christianam, &c. Moshem. ib. p. 175.

[f] Duabus autem ex caussis pro nomine Domini sunt profecti, aut ad prædicandum videlicet nomen ejus proprie sponte venientes, aut propter nominis sancti fidem et confessionem a civibus seu contribubibus suis patriâ expulsi. Bed. in 3. Joann. Ep.

[g] Nam exules illi Christiani e patria sua cum egressi sunt, nihil quicquam suorum bonorum acceperunt ab hostibus suis Ethnicis, sed coacti sunt abire sine ullo vitæ subsidio. Heuman. ubi supr. p. 327.

for

for which Dr. Heumann contends, and therefore often calls theſe ſtrangers exiles.

He ſuppoſeth theſe ſtrangers to have been gentile converts, who had forſaken their native country, or had been driven out of it, deſtitute of all things.

However this place may be underſtood partly otherwiſe: 'That we, who are Chriſtians, ought to help theſe ſtrangers 'in their difficulty, eſpecially becauſe they have not ſought 'for relief among unbelieving gentiles: though ſome even of 'them might have been diſpoſed to give them aſſiſtance.'

Grotius [h] explains the place in that manner. The ſame ſenſe is likewiſe in Eſtius. Whoſe [i] note upon this text I ſhall now tranſcribe at large, it being well ſuited to illuſtrate this epiſtle.

Ver. 8. *We therefore ought to receive ſuch, that we might be fellow-helpers to the truth.* 'It ſhould be an allowed maxim, 'that we are to ſhow kindneſs to ſuch: otherwiſe, we do not 'act the part of Chriſtians, who ought to encourage thoſe who 'have a zeal for truth.'

Ver. 9. *I wrote to the church.* Or, *I ſhould have written to the church*, and therein to Diotrephes. *But Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.* 'I know, he would not pay a regard to my directions.'

[h] Μηδεν λαμβανοντες απο των εθνων. ——In manuſcripto απο των εθνικων. ——Potuerant in iſta calamitate adjuvari miſericordiâ των εξω, *extraneorum*. Sed maluerunt omnia Chriſtianis debere. Grot. ad ver. 7. *Nos ergo.* Nos Chriſtiani ubique locorum οφειλομεν απολαμβανειν. —— Manuſcriptus, υπολαμβανειν τοιυτυς: id vero eſt, opitulari. Id. ad ver. 8.

[i] Quod ait Apoſtolus, *iſtos profectos pro nomine Jeſu Chriſti*, poteſt bifariam exponi, ait Beda videlicet, aut ut prædicaturi evangelium ejus ſponte ſint profecti ad Gentiles convertendos, aut ut propter fidem et confeſſionem nominis Chriſti per Contribules ſuos patriâ fuerint expulſi. Similiter, quod ſequitur, *nihil accipientes a gentibus*, ambiguum eſt, an de gentibus ad fidem Chriſti jam converſis accipiendum ſit, an de nondum converſis. Et uterque ſenſus ſua nititur probabilitate. Illo modo ſenſus eſt, quod hi quamvis annuntiaſſent, et deinceps forent annuntiaturi gentibus evangelium ſeu fidem Chriſti, eſſentque jam complures gentilium eorum prædicatione converſi nihil tamen ab iis exigere, vel accipere voluerint neceſſariæ ſuſtentationis, hac ſcilicet de cauſſa ne quod offendiculum darent evangelio Chriſti. ——De gentibus autem non converſis ſi ſermo ſit, tunc ſignificatur, quod iſti peregrini, quamvis egerent, quâcumque tantum ex cauſſâ, nihil tamen ab hujuſmodi gentilibus accipere, nedum petere, voluerint: ne ii ſcandalizarentur, et longius a Chriſtiana religione averterentur. Dixiſſent enim: Ecce nulla eſt charitas inter Chriſtianos ——Utraque expoſitio bene probabilis eſt. Nec ſatis liquet, utra ſit præferenda. *Eſt. in 3. Joan. ver. 7.*

Ver.

Ver. 10. *Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds, which he does.* That is, 'I [k] will remind him of his actions, 'and reprove and admoniſh him, in order to his amendment 'of which I do not deſpair.' *Prating againſt us with malicious words.* He proceeded ſo far, as to ſpeak of the apoſtle in a petulant manner. Perhaps, he ſaid, that though St. John did well in giving out general rules for the practice of piety; yet he had no right to intermeddle in particular caſes, concerning which every one ſhould judge for himſelf. *And not content therewith, neither doth he himſelf receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and caſteth them out of the church.* 'Nor is that all. For he not only refuſes to receive and enter-'tain theſe brethren, but he alſo diſcourages thoſe who would 'relieve and entertain them. And thus he obligeth theſe 'ſtrangers to leave your church, and go elſewhere.'

By theſe laſt words moſt interpreters underſtand St. John to ſay, that Diotrephes excommunicated, or caſt out of the church, *the brethren*, members of it, who were for receiving theſe ſtrangers. But Dr. Heumann ſays, that [l] by the perſons, whom Diotrephes caſt out of the church, muſt be underſtood

[k] Certe nihil aliud ſibi vult Apoſtolus, quam ſe more ſuo molliſſimum, placidiſſimumque in modum admoniturum eſſe Diotrephen peccati ſui, rectamque eum revocaturum in viam. Heum. ib. p. 309.

[l] Univerſi videlicet, qui hanc tractarunt epiſtolam, ſibi perſuaſerunt, deſcribi his verbis illud pœnæ eccleſiaſticæ genus, quod excommunicatio vocari ſolet. Facile quidem poterat hic error agnoſci. Nam primo, Caium, id, quod fieri nolebat Diotrephes, facientem, ab ipſo non fuiſſe excommunicatum, in propatulo eſt.——Sed age, rem totam intueamur propius. Initio igitur conſiderandum, quoſnam eccleſiâ ejecerit Diotrephes. Ab omnibus, ſi Beauſobrium excipimus, hoc refertur ad propinquius, τους βελομενους, hoc eſt, eos, qui volebant exules hoſpitio excipere. Cum vero jam graves attulimus cauſſas, cur res credi poſſit hos excommunicatione ejeciſſe eccleſiâ, ſequitur, ut ſtatuamus, hæc verba, εκ της εκκλησιας εκβαλλει, pertinere ad remotius, ad fratres exules. His ſcilicet, dum nec ipſe ex ærario aliquid impertiebat, et aliis, quoque, ut nihil ipſis darent, ſuadebat ac perſuadebat, hoc ipſo migrare eos cogebat alio, atque ita *e ſua expellebat eccleſia*. Non erat igitur noſtro loco neceſſe excommunicationem tribuere Diotrephi. Sed ſatis evidens eſt, id eum effeciſſe, quod omiſſam priorum exulum receptionem neceſſario conſequebatur, ut videlicet exirent eccleſiâ, aliamque peterent, opum pariter et miſericordiæ abundantiorem.——Appareret hinc etiam facile, cum volentes exulum miſereri κωλυειν hic dicitur Diotrephes, non credi eum debere id vetuiſſe pro imperio, ſed allatis duntaxat cauſſis, cur fieri id non oportebat, multos ab hoc pietatis officio revocaſſe.——Atque hoc ipſum nos admonet, verbo, εκβαλλειν, non neceſſario ſignificari, omnes illos exules revera abire coactos, ſed id etiam recte uſurpari de conatu Diotrephis id efficiendi. Heuman. ibid. p. 310—313.

theſe

theſe ſtrangers, not the members of the church. For, as plainly appears, Caius was not excommunicated, though he had done what was oppoſed by Diotrephes. Nor need it be ſuppoſed, that all the ſtrangers here ſpoken of, were obliged to leave that place, or ſociety. Diotrephes, it is true, diſcouraged their reception, and ſome might remove elſewhere. Others of them, however, might continue their abode there, encouraged by Caius, and ſome other pious members of this church, who did not ſubmit to the reaſons, or the orders of Diotrephes.

In this interpretation it is ſuppoſed, that *caſting out of the church* refers not to the perſons laſt mentioned, who would receive theſe ſtrangers, but to *the ſtrangers*, whom Diotrephes would not have to be received. And Beauſobre ſays, the [n] place may be ſo underſtood. Dr. Heumann blames him for not ſaying, that [n] it ought to be ſo underſtood.

There have been various conjectures of learned men concerning the reaſons of Diotrephes's conduct, which I do not chooſe to take notice of now. Dr. Heumann ſuppoſeth, that Diotrephes had the diſpoſal of the revenues of the church. There came to the place ſtrangers, who needed relief. But Diotrephes oppoſed the diſtribution of any of the common ſtock, and alſo diſcouraged ſuch as were willing to aſſiſt them with their own. For all which, as may be ſuppoſed, he aſſigned ſome reaſons. This appears to me to have been the whole of the affair.

But whether theſe ſtrangers were Jews, or Gentiles, I cannot ſay. There might be ſome of both. Grotius [o] and Lampe [p] think they were Jews, who had been driven out of Paleſtine, or had been reduced to want by the general and grievous calamity of that country, and had come into Aſia with hopes of relief, and for the ſake of a ſettlement. Heumann, as before ſeen, ſays they were Gentiles. For certain, they were Chriſtians.

[m] *Les chaſſe de l' egliſe.* Cela ſe peut rapporter ou aux freres, ou á ceux qui les reçoient, ou aux uns et aux autres. Sur. ver. 10.

[n] Hic enim in Gallica ſua N. T. verſione animadvertit, hæc verba etiam ad remotius referri poſſe, hoc eſt, ad fratres exules. Debebat vero indulgere meditationi, nec id relinquere dubium et incertum. Heum. ib. p. 311. note *(p)*.

[o] Τους τε ονομαζοντας αυτα εξω βαλλει· id eſt, a Judæa, ejecti ſunt per Judæos incredulos ob Chriſtum. Grot. ad ver. 7. [p] Unde colligimus, peregrinos hos, quorum cauſſam Joannes tam impenſe egit, fuiſſe Judæos ex Palæſtina cum eo profugos, qui pro ſe aliiſque per totalem regionis illius devaſtationem ad ſummam egeſtatem redactis, opem eccleſiarum Aſiæ florentium implorabant. Lamp. Proleg. l. 1. c. 7. num. xvi.

And

And St. John, I think, says, that we ought to receive such, whether they be of Jewish or Gentile stock, *that we may be fellow-helpers to the truth:* 'that we also may serve the interests of truth, for the sake of which these persons have suffered the loss of all things.'

Ver. 11. *Beloved, follow not that which is evil, but that which is good.* Here the apostle exhorts Caius to persist in his good conduct, and to be upon his guard, not to be influenced by any bad examples.

In the 12th verse he recommends to him Demetrius, by whom, as may be supposed, this letter was carried.

In the 13th and 14th verses he sends salutations, and speaks again of coming to the place where Caius dwelled, and of *speaking with him face to face.* Which I suppose he did.

And I please myself with the supposition, that his journey was not in vain. I imagine, that Diotrephes submitted, and acquiesced in the advices and admonitions of the apostle. Of this I have no certain assurance. However I may add: that neither does any one else know the contrary.

VI. Concerning the time of writing these two epistles, nothing can be said with certainty. Mill [q] placeth them about the same time with the first, in 91, or 92. Whiston [r] likewise supposeth, that they were all three written about the year 82, or 83. I imagine, that St. John was somewhat advanced in age, and that he had resided a good while in Asia; before he wrote any of these epistles. Consequently, I am disposed to think, that these two were not written sooner than the first. And as it was before [s] argued, that the first epistle was written about the year 80, these two may be reckoned to have been written between the years 80, and 90.

CHAP XXI.

ST. JUDE, AND HIS EPISTLE.

I. *His History.* II. *Testimonies to the Genuineness of the Epistle.* III. *To whom it was sent.* IV. *The Time when it was written.*

I. The writer describes himself in this manner at the beginning of the epistle. ch. i. ver. 1. *Jude* [a] *the servant of Jesus*

[q] Proleg. num. 151. [r] As before, p. 587. [s] See above, p. 590.
[a] Ιȣδας, ιησȣ χριστȣ δȣλος, αδελφος δε ιακωβȣ.

Christ

Chriſt and brother of James. Thoſe two characters lead us to think, that he was one of thoſe called the Lord's brethren, and that he was an apoſtle. Our Lord's brethren, as enumerated in Matt. xiii. 55. are *James, and Joſes, and Simon, and Judas.* In Mark vi. 3. *James, and Joſes, and Judas, and Simon.* And in the catalogues of the apoſtles are theſe. Matt. x. 3. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whoſe ſurname was Thaddeus. Simon the Canaanite.* Mark iii. 18. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite.* Luke vi. 15, 16. *James the Son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.* Acts i. 13. *James the ſon of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.*

Thus he appears to have been ſometimes called Judas, at other times Thaddeus, or Lebbeus. As I do not inquire into the meaning and origin of theſe names, I refer to [b] others. I only obſerve, that it was no uncommon thing among the Jews, for a man to have different names, as Simon, ſometimes called Simeon, at other times Peter, or Cephas. And Thomas was alſo called Didymus.

Jude, ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt. He does not thereby deny himſelf to be an apoſtle. St. Paul does not always take upon himſelf that character at the beginning of his epiſtles. It is wanting in his two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, in the epiſtles to the Philippians, and to Philemon. The epiſtle to the Philippians begins in this manner. *Paul and Timothy, ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt, to all the ſaints in Chriſt Jeſus, which are at Philippi.*

It follows. *And brother of James:* meaning James, ſometimes called the Lord's brother, and ſon of Alpheus, one of the twelve apoſtles. And he does fitly ſo ſtyle himſelf, as that James was the eldeſt brother, and was of note among the apoſtles, after our Saviour's aſcenſion, and in great repute among the Jewiſh believers. As appears from Acts xii. 17. xv. xxi. 18—25. and Gal. i. 19. ii. 9.

We have no account of Jude's vocation to the apoſtleſhip. Nor is there any thing ſaid of him particularly in the goſpels, except what is related in John xiv. 21, 22, 23. in the account, which that evangeliſt has given of our Lord's moſt excellent and affectionate diſcourſes with the diſciples a ſhort time

[b] See Lightfoot's Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. Matthew, vol. II. p. 176. Witſii Comm. in ep. Judæ. num. ii. Cave's Life of St. Jude, in Engliſh. Dr. Benſon's Preface to this epiſtle, ſect. i.

before

before his laſt ſufferings. *He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. And he that loveth me, ſhall be loved of my Father. And I will love him, and will manifeſt myſelf to him. Judas ſaith unto him, not Iſcariot: Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifeſt thyſelf to us, and not unto the world! Jeſus anſwered, and ſaid unto him: if a man love me, he will keep my words. And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*

This diſciple ſtill had the common prejudice concerning the kingdom of the Meſſiah. And he aſks our Saviour with ſurpriſe, how he could ſpeak of manifeſting himſelf to a few only, when he was about to ſet up an univerſal monarchy in great power and ſplendour? Our Lord tells him (what he might have known before) that his kingdom, as Meſſiah, was ſpiritual, a kingdom of truth and righteouſneſs: and that the bleſſings and privileges of it were peculiar to good men, who obeyed the precepts of true religion, which had been taught by him. Such would be accepted, and approved by himſelf, and by his heavenly Father, in whoſe name he had ſpoken. This they would all know, when he ſhould come again among them, after his reſurrection, and when the gift of the Spirit ſhould be beſtowed upon them, and others his followers.

As there is little ſaid of Jude in the hiſtory of our Saviour before his reſurrection, ſo St. Luke in the Acts has inſerted nothing particularly concerning him after it. However it is unqueſtionable, that he partook of the plentiful effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt at the pentecoſt next after our Lord's aſcenſion: and that he joined with the other apoſtles in bearing an open teſtimony to our Lord's reſurrection at Jeruſalem: and that he had a ſhare with them in the reproaches and other ſufferings, which they endured upon that account.

It may be alſo reaſonably ſuppoſed, that for a while he preached the goſpel in ſeveral parts of the land of Iſrael, and wrought miracles in the name of Chriſt. But what they were, we cannot ſay, becauſe they are not recorded by St. Luke, nor any other credible hiſtorian near the time.

As his life ſeems to have been prolonged, it may be alſo reckoned very likely, that he afterwards left Judea, and went abroad, preaching the goſpel to Jews and Gentiles in other countries. But we have no account of his travels, that can be relied on. Some have ſaid, that he preached in Arabia, Syria, Meſopotamia, and Perſia: and that he ſuffered martyrdom in

this last mentioned country. But of these things there remains not any credible history,

Indeed, it may be questioned, whether St. Jude was a martyr. It was formerly observed by [c] us, that Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, reckons [d] among apostles, who had not died by matyrdom, Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi. And it was then said, that by Levi, Heracleon, probably, meant Lebbeus, that is, Judas. Which is allowed by [e] Dodwell, and some other learned writers, to whom we then referred. Nor does Jerom, in his article of St. Jude, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, say any thing of his having died a martyr.

Jerom, in his commentary upon the tenth chapter of St. Matthew, where is the catalogue of the apostles, says, 'that 'the apostle Thaddeus, called by the evangelist Luke, *Jude the* '*brother of James*, was sent to Edessa to Agbarus king of Os-'röene.' But Eusebius, in his account of that affair, says, 'that [g] Thomas, one of the twelve, sent to Edessa Thaddeus, 'one of Christ's seventy disciples, to preach the gospel in those 'countries.' And in the preceding [h] chapter, where he speaks of Christ's seventy disciples, he reckons Thaddeus, who went to Edessa, one of them. Whence it came to pass, that Jerom called him an apostle, and reckoned him one of the twelve, is [i] not easy to say. But I imagine, that what he says in his commentary upon St. Matthew, is an inaccuracy, owing to his writing in haste. This conjecture receives confirmation hence, that in the article of St. Jude, in the catalogue above-mentioned, he says nothing of that journey.

Before I proceed any farther, I must take notice of [k] a Dissertation of the learned Theodore Hasæus: in which he argues, that Judas, called Lebbeus, and Thaddeus, is the

[c] See before, p. 44. note (B).

[d] Ου γαρ παντες οι σωζομενοι ωμολογησαν την δια της φωνης ομολογιαν, και εξηλθεν· εξ ων ματθαιος, φιλιππος, θωμας, λευις, και αλλοι πολλοι. Heracl. ap. Clem. A. Str. l. 4. p. 502.

[e] Diss. Iren. i. num. xxiv.

[f] Thaddæum Apostolum, ecclesiastica tradit historia missum Edessan ad Abgarum regem Osrœnæ, qui ab Evangelista Luca, Judas Jacobi dicitur. In Matt. T. IV. p. 35. in.

[g] H. E. l. i. cap. 13. p. 32.

[h] Cap. 12. p. 31. A.

[i] Vid. Vales. Annot. in loc. p. 21.

[k] Theodori Hasæi de Levi a Christo ad Apostolatum vocato: ad loca Marci ii. 14. seq. Luc. v. 27. seq. Disquisitio. Quâ eum non, ut vulgo putatur, Matthæum, sed Judam Thaddæum esse ostenditur. Ap. Biblioth. Brem. Cl. v. Fascic. iii. num. vi. p. 475, &c. Bremæ, 1721.

same

ſame as Levi, of whoſe call St. Mark, ch. ii. 13—17. and St. Luke, ch. v. 27—32. give an account.

He ſuppoſeth, that St. Matthew, ch. ix. 9—13. gives an account of his own call to be an apoſtle, and that St. Mark and St. Luke give an account of the call of another publican, named Levi, or Lebbeus, or Judas.

Upon which I obſerve:

1. That is a very forced interpretation. The whole hiſtory, and all the circumſtances of it, ſhow, that one and the ſame perſon is ſpoken of by all the three evangeliſts. And the coherence renders it indubitable. The ſame things precede and follow in thoſe ſeveral evangeliſts: as may be perceived by any one, who compares them.

2. So far as we can find, it has been the opinion of the moſt ancient and learned chriſtian writers, that Matthew and Levi are two names of one and the ſame man. So thought [l] Euſebius. So likewiſe [m] Jerom in ſeveral places of his works: which ſhows, it was his ſettled opinion, and that he never heſitated about it. The [n] compiler of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions ſays the ſame expreſsly. Victor of Antioch in his commentary upon St. Mark, ſays, that [o] Mark and Luke, when they give an account of his call at the receipt of cuſtom, deſignedly uſe a name, by which he was not ſo well known, as that of Matthew. Jerom ſpeaks to the like purpoſe in a paſſage, already †‡ tranſcribed. It is very likely, that Victor had ſeen that obſervation in more ancient writers: and poſſibly in Origen, in [p] whoſe preface to his commentary upon the epiſtle to the Romans,

[l] Vid. Dem. Ev. l. 3. cap. v. p. 119, &c. cited in this work, vol. IV. p. 222, &c. [m] Primus omnium Matthæus eſt Publicanus cognomento Levi, qui Evangelium in Judæa Hebræo ſermone edidit. Hieron. Prol. in Matt. T. IV. in citat ſupra vol. V. p. 35.

Cæteri Evangeliſtæ propter verecundiam et honorem Matthæi noluerant eum nomine appellare vulgato, ſed dixerunt Levi. Duplici quippe vocabulo fuit. Id. in Matt. cap. x. tom. IV. P. I. p. 30

Matthæus, qui et Levi, ex Publicano Apoſtolus. De V. I. cap. 3.

[n] Περι δε αναγνωσων εγω ματθαιος, ο και λευις, ο ποτε τελωνης, διατασσομαι. Conſt. Ap. l. 8. c. 22.

[o] Eſt autem Levi hic idem omnino cum Evangeliſta Matthæo. Et quidem Marcus et Lucas nomen, quod illi familiare erat, primæva appellatione obnubunt, &c. Victor in S. Marc. ap. Bib. PP. Lugd. T. IV. p. 375. B. Citat. vol. V. hujus operis p. 172.

†‡ See note *(m)* [p] Prima nobis quæſtio de nomine ipſius Pauli videtur exſurgere, cur is qui Saulus dictus eſt in Actibus Apoſtolorum, nunc Paulus dicatur. —— Invenimus igitur in ſcripturis aliquantos binis, alios etiam ternis uſos eſſe nominibus. —— Sed nec Evangelia quidem hunc renuunt morem,

Romans, as we now have it in Latin only, is ſomewhat equivalent. However, he plainly ſays, that Matthew and Levi are only two names of one and the ſame man.

3. Haſæus argues, that [q] Levi is never ſaid in the goſpels to have been alſo called Matthew, nor is Matthew ſaid to be otherwiſe called Levi.

To which I anſwer, there was no neceſſity that we ſhould be told this. It is allowed, that Thaddeus, and Lebbeus, and Judas, are names of one and the ſame apoſtle. And [r] it was alſo ſo underſtood by ancient Chriſtians: ſome of whom I have quoted below. Nevertheleſs St. Luke has never told us, that Judas was ſurnamed Thaddeus, or Lebbeus. Nor has St. Matthew, or St. Mark ſaid, that Thaddeus, or Lebbeus, was alſo called Judas.

Theſe obſervations, as ſeems to me, are ſufficient to confirm the common opinion. However I will add a thought or two of leſs moment.

4. St. Matthew, in the catalogue of the apoſtles, placeth himſelf in this manner, ch. x. 3. *and Matthew the publican:* και ματθαιος ο τελωνης. May it not be hence argued with probability, that he was the only publican among the apoſtles, and that there was no other?

5. If we were to form a conjecture concerning the employment, that was followed by Jude, before he was an apoſtle, it would be that of an huſbandman. In the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions the apoſtles are made to ſay: 'Some of us are fiſhermen, others tent-makers, others huſbandmen.' Undoubtedly ſeveral of the apoſtles were fiſhermen. But by the latter part of the ſentence no more may be meant, than that there was among them one tent-maker, even Paul, and one huſbandman, intending, perhaps, St. Jude. For Hegeſippus, as quoted by Euſe-

morem. Nam et Matthæus ipſe refert de ſe, quod cum tranſiret Jeſus, invenit quendam ſedentem ad telonium nomine Matthæum. Lucas vero de eodem dicit: quia cum tranſiret Jeſus, quendam vidit publicanum nomine Levi, &c. Origen. in ep. ad Rom. tom. II. p. 458. Baſil.

[q] Nam obſervabam, Matthæum nunquam dici Levin, vel Levin viciſſim appellari Matthæum, &c. Haſ. ubi ſupra. p. 477.

[r] Thaddæum Apoſtolum —— qui ab Evangeliſta Luca Judas Jacobi dicitur: et alibi appellatur Lebbeus, quod interpretatur corculus. Credendumque eſt eum fuiſſe trinomium: ſicut Simon, Petrus, et filii Zebedæi, Boanerges, ex firmitate et magnitudine fidei nominati ſunt. Hieron. in Matt. x. T. IV. p. 35. in.

Ην γαρ ετερος ιουδας ο λεββαιος, ο και επικληθεις θαδδαιος, ον ιακωβ φησιν ειναι ο λουκας, λεγων ιουδας ιακωβ. Chryſ. in Matt. hom. 32. al. 33. tom. VII. p. 369.

Vid. et Heſychii Quæſtiones. Diff. xiv. ap. Coteler. Monum. Gr. tom. III. p. 11.

[s] Vid. Cav. H. L. in S. Judæ.

bius,

bius, writes, 'that [t] when Domitian made inquiries after the 'poſterity of David, ſome grandſons of Jude, called the Lord's 'brother, were brought before him. Being aſked concerning 'their poſſeſſions, and ſubſtance, they aſſured him, that they had 'only ſo many acres of land, out of the improvement of which 'they both paid him tribute, and maintained themſelves with 'their own hard labour. The truth of what they ſaid was con-'firmed by the calouſneſs of their hands. Being aſked con-'cerning Chriſt, and his kingdom, of what kind it was, and 'when it would appear; they anſwered, that it was not worldly 'and earthly, but heavenly and angelical: that it would be ma-'nifeſted at the end of the world: when coming in great glory 'he would judge the living and the dead, and render to every 'man according to his works. The men being mean, and their 'principles harmleſs, they were diſmiſſed.'

Hence ſome may argue, that St. Jude himſelf had been an huſbandman. And from this account, if it may be relied upon, we learn, that this apoſtle was married, and had children.

That may ſuffice for the hiſtory of St. Jude.

II. In the next place I am to obſerve the evidences of the genuineneſs, and canonical authority of the epiſtle aſcribed to him.

Somewhat relating to this point has been already ſaid in the fifteenth chapter, concerning the Catholic epiſtles in general. To which chapter therefore the reader is referred, though I may here tranſcribe ſome things from it, for ſhowing the authority of this epiſtle in particular.

It ſhould be remembered, that Euſebius having enumerated the books of ſcripture, univerſally received from the beginning, and among them the firſt epiſtle of Peter, and the firſt epiſtle of John, he adds: 'And [u] among the contradicted, but 'yet well known to the moſt (or approved by many) are that 'called the epiſtle of James, and that of Jude, and the ſecond 'of Peter, and the ſecond, and third of John.' So that in his time this epiſtle was well known, and received by many, though not by all.

This epiſtle is no where expreſsly cited by Irenæus, who wrote about the year of Chriſt 178. Whether he has at all referred to it, was conſidered formerly. And the reader is referred to what was then [x] ſaid.

[t] ετι δε περιησαν οι απο γενους του κυριακου υιωνοι ιουδα, του κατα σαρκα λεγομενου αυτου αδελφου, ους ενηλατορευσαν, ως εκ γενους οντας δαβιδ. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. xx.

[u] See before, p. 466.

[x] See vol. II. p. 169, 170.

Clement of Alexandria flouriſhed about the year 194. Euſebius giving an account of his works, ſays 'that [y] in his Inſti-'tutions, Clement had given explications of all the canonical 'ſcriptures, not omitting thoſe which are contradicted. I 'mean the epiſtle of Jude, and the other catholic epiſtles.'

That work, entitled Inſtitutions, is loſt. But we have in Latin a ſmall treatiſe or fragment, called Adumbrations, ſuppoſed to be tranſlated from the Inſtitutions. Here are notes upon the epiſtle of Jude: in which is an obſervation concerning the modeſty of the writer: 'that [z] Jude who wrote a catho-'lic epiſtle, did not ſtyle himſelf at the beginning of it, 'brother of the Lord, though he was related to him, but *Jude,* '*the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and brother of James.*'

Which obſervation ſerves to ſhow, whom Clement took to be the writer of this epiſtle. He ſuppoſed him to be one of them, who are called the Lord's brethren. Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. and an apoſtle. See Luke vi. 16. In that Adumbration follow brief remarks upon almoſt every verſe of the epiſtle, except the laſt, or twenty-fifth verſe.

It might be obſerved likewiſe, that in that place Clement declares his opinion concerning thoſe called the Lord's brethren, that they were children of Joſeph.

This epiſtle is alſo quoted expreſsly by Clement in two of his works, which remain entire, the Pedagogue or Inſtructor, and the Stromata, or Miſcellanies.

In the Pedagogue he ſpeaks to this purpoſe: *I will* [a] *that ye ſhould know,* ſays Jude, *that God having once ſaved the people out of Egypt, afterwards deſtroyed them that believed not. And the angels, which kept not their firſt eſtate, but left their own habitation, he* [b] *has reſerved in everlaſting chains under darkneſs, unto the judgment of the great day.* And afterwards, he emphatically deſcribes the characters of thoſe who are judged. *Woe unto them, for they have walked in the way of Cain, and ran greedily in the error of Balaam for reward, and periſhed in the gainſaying of Core.*——Jude, ver. 5, 6, and 11.

[y] —— μη δε τας αντιλεγομενας παρελθων· την ιυδα λεγω και τας λοιπας καθολικας επιστολας. H. E. l. 6. cap. 14. in. [z] Judas, qui catholicam ſcripſit epiſtolam, frater filiorum Joſeph, extans valde religioſus, quum ſciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, ſe ipſum fratrem ejus eſſe. Sed quid dixit? *Jacobus ſervus Jeſu Chriſti,* utpote Domini, *frater autem Jacobi.* Adumbrat. in epiſt. Judæ. p. 1007. ed. Oxon.

[a] Pæd. l. 3. p. 239.

[b] —— δεσμοις αιδιοις υπο ζοφον αγριων [al. αγιων.] αγγελων τετηρηκεν.

In

In his Stromata Clement writes to this purpoſe: 'Of [c] theſe, 'and the like heretics, I think, Jude ſpoke prophetically in 'his epiſtle: *Likewiſe alſo theſe dreamers*, and what follows to, '*And their mouth ſpeaketh great ſwelling words:*' that is, from ver. 8, to ver. 16. And that manner of quoting ſhows, that the epiſtle was in the hands of many people, or of all Chriſtians in general, to be conſulted by them.

I have been thus prolix in rehearſing theſe paſſages of Clement. For they appear to me a ſufficient proof of the antiquity, and genuineneſs of this epiſtle: or that it was written by Jude, one of Chriſt's twelve apoſtles. However I would alſo refer thoſe of my readers, who are willing to look back, to Clement's teſtimony to this, and to the other catholic epiſtles, as formerly obſerved in [d] his chapter.

In Tertullian, about the year 200, is but one quotation of this epiſtle. But it is very expreſs. 'Hence [e] it is, ſays he, that Enoch is quoted by the apoſtle Jude.' Intending the 14th verſe of the epiſtle, and making no doubt, that the writer was an apoſtle.

In Origen, about the year 230, are divers plain quotations of St. Jude's epiſtle.

In his Commentaries upon St. Matthew, which we ſtill have in Greek, having taken notice of the words of Matth. xiii. 55, 56.——beſide other remarks, he ſays, 'that [f] James 'is the ſame, whom Paul mentions in the epiſtle to the Gala-'tians, as having been ſeen by him.' Gal. i. 19. He alſo obſerves a paſſage, ſaid to be in the Antiquities of Joſephus, relating to the ſame James. Then he adds: 'And [g] Jude 'wrote an epiſtle, of few lines indeed, but full of the power-'ful words of the heavenly grace, who at the beginning ſays: '*Jude the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and brother of James.*' Theſe paſſages are of uſe to ſhow us, whom Origen took to be the writer of this epiſtle.

[c] Επι τετων, οιμαι, και των ομοιων αιρεσεων προφητικως ιουδαν εν τη επιστολη ειρηκεναι· Ὁμοιως μεντοι και ουτοι ενυπνιαζομενοι· ο γαρ υπαρ τη αληθεια επιβαλλεσιν· εως, και το στομα αυτων λαλει υπερογκα. Strom. l. 3. p. 431. A. B.

[d] See vol. II. p. 227—230.

[e] Eo accidit, quod Enoch apud Judam Apoſtolum teſtimonium perhibet. De Cultu Fem. l. 1. cap. 3. p. 172. A.

[f] Ιακωβος δε εστιν ουτος, ον λεγει παυλος ειδειν εν τη προς γαλατας επιστολη, ειπων· κ. λ. Comment. in Matt. p. 223. C. Heut. p. 463. B. T. 3. Bened.

[g] Και ιουδας εγραψεν επιστολην, ολιγοστιχον μεν, πεπληρωμενην δε των της ουρανιου χαριτος ερρωμενων λογων, οστις εν τω προοιμιω ειρηκεν· Ιουδας ιησου χριστου δουλος, αδελφος δε ιακωβου. Ibid. p. 223. D. al. p. 463. D.

Again, in the ſame Commentaries. 'And [h] in the epiſtle 'of Jude: *To them that are beloved* [or ſanctified] *in God the 'Father, and preſerved in Jeſus Chriſt, and called.*'

Once more, in the ſame Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew's goſpel, having quoted 1 Pet. i. 12. he ſays: 'But '[i] if any one receives alſo the epiſtle of Jude, let him conſider 'what will follow from what is there ſaid: *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.*'

This epiſtle is alſo quoted in thoſe works of Origen, which we now have only in a Latin tranſlation. But forbearing to take farther notice of them here, I refer to the account formerly given at large of Origen's teſtimony to the ſcriptures, in [k] the third volume of this work.

Upon the whole we perceive, that there were ſome in his time, who doubted of, or denied the authority of this epiſtle. But himſelf, as ſeems to me, admitted the genuineneſs and authority of it. For he quotes it expreſsly, without heſitation, as written by Jude, one of the Lord's brethren, and brother of James, conſequently apoſtle. And he ſays, that is was *full of the powerful words of the heavenly grace.*

I have not obſerved any notice taken of this epiſtle [l] in the writings of Cyprian, biſhop of Carthage, about the year 248, and afterwards.

It is quoted by the anonymous author againſt the Novatian heretic, who wrote about the year 255. But he does not name St. Jude. His words are: 'As [m] it is written: *Behold 'he cometh with ten thouſands of his angels, to execute judgment 'upon all,* and what follows,' that is, the 14th and 15th verſes of the epiſtle.

Euſebius flouriſhed about the year 315. I have already tranſcribed from him a [n] paſſage concerning the catholic epiſtles, and among them concerning St. Jude's, which ought to be recollected here. There is another taken from him,

[h] Και εν τη ιουδα επιστολη, τοις εν θεω πατρι ηγαπημενοις και ιησυ χριστω τετηρημενοις και κλητοις. Ib. p. 332. A. al. 607. C.

[i] Ει δε και την ιουδα προσοιτο τις επιστολην, ορατω τι επεται τω λογω δια το. Αγγελους τε μη τηρησαντας. κ. λ. Ib. p. 488. E. al. p. 814. C.

[k] Ch. xxxviii. vol. II. p. 482, 483.

[l] See vol. III. p. 175.

[m] Sicut ſcriptum eſt: Ecce venit cum multis millibus nunciorum ſuorum, facere judicium de omnibus, &c. Ap. Cyprian. in App. p. 20. Vid. et hujus operis vol. III. p. 191.

[n] See p. 465. of this volume.

at

at [o] the beginning of this article. And I ſhall here put down again a third paſſage tranſcribed above in the chapter of [p] the epiſtle of St. James. Where having given an account of the martyrdom of St. James, he ſays: 'Thus [q] far concerning 'James, who is ſaid to be the writer of the firſt of the epiſtles, 'called catholic. But it ought to be obſerved, that it is ſpu-'rious [that is contradicted] foraſmuch as there are not many 'of the ancients, who have made mention of it: as neither of 'that called Jude's, which likewiſe is one of the epiſtles called 'catholic. However we know, that [r] theſe alſo are commonly 'uſed [or publicly read] in moſt churches together with the 'reſt.'

That paſſage needs no comment. This epiſtle was generally received in the time of Euſebius, though not by all.

Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, about 354, has [s] quoted almoſt the whole of this epiſtle. He quotes it expreſsly, as written [t] by the excellent apoſtle Jude, brother of the apoſtle James.

I need not particularly mention more authors. For after the time of Euſebius, ſeven catholic epiſtles were generally received by all Chriſtians, Greeks and Latins. St. Jude's epiſtle therefore, as well as the reſt, was received by Athanaſius, Cyril of Jeruſalem, Epiphanius, Didymus of Alexandria, Jerom, Rufinus, the third council of Carthage, Auguſtine, Iſidore of Peluſium, Cyril of Alexandria and others, whoſe names may be ſeen in the alphabetical table in the eleventh volume, under the article of ſeven catholic epiſtles. But [u] it was not received by the Syrians.

And it may not be amiſs to obſerve here, that we have found this epiſtle oftener quoted by writers, who lived before the time of Euſebius, than the epiſtle of St. James.

Of the authors above named there are two, of whom I would take ſome farther notice.

Epiphanius, about 368, in his hereſy of the Gnoſtics, expreſsly [x] cites [u] the catholic epiſtle of the apoſtle Jude, bro-

[o] p. 613.
[p] p. 503.
[q] H. E. l. 2. c. 23. p. 66. C.
[r] Ὁμως δε ισμεν και ταυτας μετα των λοιπων εν πλειςαις δεδημοσιευμενας εκκλησιαις. Ibid.
[s] See vol. IV. p. 373.
[t] Cum exhortetur Judas, gloriosus Apoſtolus, frater Jacobi Apoſtoli, &c. Ap. Bib. PP. T. IV. p. 227. C—E.
[u] See vol. IV. p. 439, 441. vol. V. p. 268, 269.
[x] Ως και περι τετων οιμαι εκινηθη το αγιον πνευμα εν τω αποςολω ιυδα, λεγων δε εν τη υπ' αυτε γραφειση καθολικη επιςολη. Ιυδας δε εςιν ουτος, ο αδελφος ιακωβε και κυριε λεγομενος. H. 26. n. xi. p. 92. D.

'ther

'ther of James, and of the Lord, written by inſpiration.' This epiſtle is received by Jerom, as written by the apoſtle Jude, as may be recollected by thoſe, who have read his chapter in the tenth volume of this work. Where, [x] in his letter to Paulinus, he ſays: 'The apoſtles James, Peter, John, 'Jude, write ſeven epiſtles, of few words, but full of ſenſe.'

And in the chapter of St. Jude, in his catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical writers, he ſays: 'Jude [y] brother of James, left a ſhort 'epiſtle, which is one of the ſeven called catholic. But [z] be-'cauſe of a quotation from a book of Enoch, which is apo-'cryphal, it is rejected by many. However at length it has 'obtained authority, and is reckoned among the ſacred ſcrip-'tures.'

There is ſome inaccuracy in Jerom's manner of expreſſion. For a book to be at the ſame time rejected by the moſt, or many, and to be reckoned among the ſacred ſcriptures, are inconſiſtent. But it might have been properly ſaid: 'that 'whereas it had been rejected by many, becauſe of a quotation 'from an apocryphal book; it had at length obtained autho-'rity, and was reckoned among the ſacred ſcriptures.'

Many learned men [a] have carefully conſidered this difficulty. But as the ancients overcame it, and at length admitted the authority of this epiſtle, perhaps it might have been paſſed over, as a thing of no great conſequence. Indeed, if there is a credible teſtimony to any book, or epiſtle, that it was written by an apoſtle, ſuch a paſſage need not cauſe much heſitation. Origen has an obſervation in one of his Latin tracts. 'St. 'Paul [b] ſays: as Jannes and Jambres withſtood Moſes. This 'is not found in the public ſcriptures, but in a ſecret book; 'entitled Jannes and Jambres. For which reaſon ſome have 'been ſo daring, as to argue againſt that epiſtle of Timothy, 'though in vain.' For certain ſuch an objection could be of little weight againſt ſo well atteſted a writing, as St. Paul's

[x] Vol. V. p. 32.

[y] p. 54. [z] Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus eſt, in eâ aſſumitur teſtimonium, a pleriſque rejicitur. Tamen auctoritatem vetuſtate jam et uſu meruit, et inter ſanctas ſcripturas computatur. De V. I. cap. iv.

[a] Beauſobre and Lenfant in their Preface to the epiſtle of St. Jude. Dr. Benſon in his Preface to this epiſtle, ſect. i. and many others.

[b] Item quod ait, *ſicut Jannes et Mambres reſtiterunt Moſi*, non invenitur in publicis ſcripturis, ſed in libro ſecreto, qui ſuprascribitur Jamnes et Mambres. Unde auſi ſunt quidam epiſtolam ad Timotheum repellere, quaſi habentem in ſe textum alicujus ſecreti. Sed non potuerunt. In Matt. Tract. 35. p. 193. tom. II. Baſil. Et in hoc opere vol. II. p. 513.

ſecond

ſecond epiſtle to Timothy. Nor ought it to weigh much in this caſe.

I might conclude here. But for the ſake of ſome, ſhall add the two following obſervations.

1. It is not certain, that St. Jude cites any book. He only ſays, that [c] *Enoch propheſied, ſaying, the Lord cometh with ten thouſands of his ſaints.* Which [d] might be words of a prophecy, preſerved by tradition, and inſerted occaſionally in divers writings. Nor is there good evidence, that in St. Jude's time there was extant any book entitled Enoch, or Enoch's Prophecies, though there was ſuch a book in the hands of Chriſtians in the ſecond and third centuries. Moreover St. Jude might aſcribe to Enoch what it is reaſonable to believe was the import of his prophecy.

I tranſcribe here an obſervation, which I have met with: 'St. Jude [c] in his epiſtle, from the circumſtances of the men 'and the manners of the people to whom Enoch preached, 'gathered what might be the ſum of Enoch's preaching, in 'this ſort. '*Behold the Lord cometh.*' How? As at the 'giving of the law, *with thouſands of his angels, to give judgment 'againſt all men, and to rebuke all the ungodly among them of all 'their wicked deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all 'their cruel ſpeakings, which wicked ſinners have ſpoken againſt 'him.* Upon which words the Greeks, not knowing the 'courſe of the Hebrews in their feigned ſpeeches, imagined, 'that Enoch left a book of his preaching behind him.'

[c] Verum quicquid et vetuſtis patribus et recentioribus quibuſdam videatur, non poteſt ullo mihi pacto probari, Judam Apoſtolum ex libro ſcripto temporibus ejus extante, tritaque prophetia ſuum illud vaticinium deprompſiſſe. Nam primo id Judas non teſtatur. Qui ſimpliciter habet: προεφητευσε. Prophetiam ſcriptis ab eo conſignatam eſſe non dicit. J. H. Heidegger. Hiſt. Patr Exercita. x. de Prophetia Enochi. § v. tom. I. p. 271.'

At neque dicit Judas Henochum ita ſcripſiſſe: neque in libro, qui Henochi dicitur, prophetiæ hujus vel vola vel veſtigium reperitur. Imo credibile eſt, Judæ ætate ſuppoſitium hunc librum ne quidem in rerum natura fuiſſe, ſed a putido et portentoſo neſcio quo Cabbaliſta Græcanico, vel ab hæretico, et ſciolo aliquo Chriſtum profeſſo, ſub Henochi nomine procuſum eſſe. Witſius in ep. Jud. num. xli. p. 502.

[d] Alii denique veriſimilius arbitrantur, habuiſſe Judam ex nota et confeſſa eo tempore traditione: quam veram eſſe Spiritu magiſtro cognovit, dignamque judicavit, quam ſua hac epiſtola conſecraret æternitati. Cui ſententiæ ego quoque hactenus acquieſco. Witſ. ubi ſupr. num. xli. p. 503.

[c] The General Review of the Holy Scriptures, p. 39. by Thomas Hayne, London, 1640. folio.

Grotius

Grotius [f] has ſomewhat to the like purpoſe.

And J. H. Heidegger [g] approved of this manner of interpretation. He ſuppoſes St. Jude to refer to the words of Moſes. Gen. v. 22 and 24. *And Enoch walked with God.* Cocceius, alſo, as cited [h] by Witſius, argued not very differently, though Witſius did not fully approve of it.

I ſhall add a thought or two confirming that method of interpretation. St. Peter 2 ep. ii. 5, calls Noah, *a preacher of righteouſneſs:* referring, I ſuppoſe, to the hiſtory in Geneſis, though it is not expreſsly ſaid there. And at ver. 7, 8. he ſays of Lot, that *he was vexed with the filthy converſation of the wicked: and that dwelling among them, in ſeeing and hearing, he vexed his righteous ſoul from day to day, with their unlawful deeds.* Theſe things are not expreſsly ſaid in the book of Geneſis. Nevertheleſs I make no queſtion, but the apoſtle refers to what is there ſaid, and deduceth theſe things thence, and not from an apocryphal, or any other writing whatever.

[f] Solebant Rabbini et angelis, et magnis hominibus, tribuere ea verba, quæ veriſimiliter dicere potuerunt. Tale illud quod de Enocho habebimus, et illud quod Heb. xii. 21. et Actor. vii. 26, &c. Grot. ad S. Jud. ver. 9.

Solebant, ut modo dixi, Rabbini et angelis, et viris magnis tribuere ea dicta, quæ dixiſſe poterant. Id. ad ver. 14.

Quod tunc Enoch aut dixit, aut dicere potuit, imminente diluvio, idem Judas ad ingentem illam internecionem, quæ Judæis contumacibus imminebat, referre commode potuit. Id. ib. ad ver. 15.

[g] Diſtinguendum accurate eſt inter fundamentum prophetiæ, et ejus formulam. Fundamentum quod attinet, eſt illud totam εγγραφον. —— Alterum eſt, quod ſcriptum reperitur, *Enochum cum Deo ambulaſſe.* Ex eo Judæ proclive fuit conficere Enochum non pro ſe tantum quæſiviſſe Deum, ſed etiam alios propoſito terrore ultimi judicii ab impietate et injuſtitia deterruiſſe: neque potuiſſe cum Deo ambulare, vel pii viri officio defungi, niſi judicium Domini venturi cum myriadibus angelorum hominibus ſuæ ætatis annunciaret. Cum igitur non potuerit non loqui de judicio Domini ſuperventuro impiis, et ii, de quibus S. Judas loquitur, ſint ultimi temporis, conficit, Enochum diu ante diluvium de iis prophetaſſe. —— Porro quod formulam attinet prophetiæ, cujus fundamentum ita in Scripturis oſtendimus, illam ex iis verbis contexuit Judas, in quorum virtute eam latere per συνεσιν πνευματικην *intelligentiam ſpiritualem*, probe ſcivit. Heid. ubi ſupra. num. x. p. 277.

[h] Celeberrimus Coccejus conjectat Judam ex hiſtoria Moſaica collegiſſe. *Nam*, inquit, *prophetaſſe Henochum, ſatis conſtat ex ſacris literis. Ambulavit enim cum Deo. Ergo cum Deo fecit, defectoribus ſe oppoſuit, verbis ſine dubio in Spiritu Sancto dictis, et opere. —— Porro Judas talia Henochum prophetaſſe teſtatur, quæ optime et pathetice ei attribuuntur in proſopopœia.* Quæ quidem non male mihi animadverſa videntur. Attamen non validum ſatis firmamentum continere, cui Judæ allegatio commode inædificetur. Nam Judas formulam prophetiæ Henocho adſcribit, quæ ex Moſe diſci non poteſt. Witſ. ib. num. xli. p. 502. et 503.

There

There is no neceſſity therefore to ſuppoſe, that St. Jude quoted a book called Enoch, or *Enoch's prophecies.*

2. Allowing St. Jude to quote ſuch a book, he gives it no authority. It was no canonical book of the Jews. That is certain. Conſequently, if there was ſuch a book among them, it was apocryphal. But though it was ſo, there might be in it ſome right things. Theſe St. Jude might take, without approving the whole of it. To this purpoſe [i] Jerom has argued largely, and very well, in his commentary upon the epiſtle to Titus, upon occaſion of St. Paul's quotation of Epimenides. Tit. i. 12. And Cave ſays, 'It [k] is no more ſtrange, that St. 'Jude ſhould quote an apocryphal book, than that St. Paul 'ſhould put down Jannes and Jambres for the two magicians 'of Pharaoh that oppoſed Moſes. Which he muſt either de-'rive from tradition, or fetch from ſome uncanonical author 'of thoſe times, there being no mention of their names in 'Moſes' relation of that matter.'

As I have ſaid ſo much about this text, I am induced to take notice of ſome other like things in this epiſtle.

Says St. Jude, ver. 8, and 9. *Likewiſe alſo theſe filthy dreamers defile the fleſh, deſpiſe dominion, and ſpeak evil of dignities. Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, he diſputed about the body of Moſes, dared not* [*choſe* †† *not*] *to bring againſt him a railing accuſation, but ſaid: the Lord rebuke thee.*

Origen, in the third century, ſuppoſed, that [l] St. Jude might refer to a book, called the Aſſumption, or Aſcenſion of Moſes, though it was not a book of authority. But indeed, there is no good reaſon to think, that there was any ſuch book extant in the time of St. Jude. It is more probable, that it was forged afterwards. Some therefore have imagined, that St. Jude took this paſſage from ſome more valuable Hebrew author, of whom however we have no knowledge.

[i] Qui autem totum librum debere ſequi eum qui libri parte uſus ſit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enochi, de quo Apoſtolus Judas in epiſtola ſua teſtimonium poſuit, inter Eccleſiæ ſcripturas recipere, et multa alia, quæ Apoſtolus Paulus de reconditis eſt loquutus. Poſſumus enim hoc argumento dicere: quia apud Athenienſes ignotum Deum colere ſe dixit, quem illi in ara annotaverant, debere Paulum et cætera, quæ in arâ ſcripta fuerant, ſequi. et ea quæ Athenienſes facie-bant facere, quia cum Athenienſibus in culturâ ignoti Dei ex parte conſenſerat. Hieron. in Tit. T. IV. p. 421. [k] Life of St. Jude, in Engliſh, p. 205.

†† Michael autem οὐκ ἐτολμησε, non *ſuſtinuit*, non induxit animum, impingere illi notam maledicti, id eſt, ultionem maledicendo ſumere. Non quod timuerit diabolum, ſed quod ex decoro omnia agere voluerit. Witſ. Comm. in Ep. Judæ ver. 9. p. 480. [l] See vol. II. p. 483. a citation from Origen's books of Principles.

But

But to me it is apparent, that St. Jude refers to the viſion in Zech. iii. 1—3. *And he ſhowed me Joſhua the high-prieſt, ſtanding before the angel of the Lord,* and *Satan ſtanding at his right hand to reſiſt him. And the Lord* [that is, *the angel of the Lord,* before mentioned] *ſaid unto Satan: The Lord rebuke thee.* And what follows. The text of St. Jude is parallel with 2 Pet. ii. 11. *Whereas angels, which are greater in power, bring not railing accuſation before the Lord.* Here alſo is a plain reference to the viſion in Zechariah. The thing itſelf, and that circumſtance, *before the Lord,* anſwering to the expreſſion in Zechariah, *ſtanding before the Lord,* or *before the angel of the Lord,* put it, as ſeems to me, beyond queſtion.

Campegius Vitringa [m] has ſome curious obſervations upon this text of St. Jude. Inſtead of *the body of Moſes,* he would read *the body of Joſhua.* That is ingenious. Nevertheleſs the common reading may be right, and may be explained very agreeably to the paſſage of Zechariah. For, according to an interpretation of that viſion, formerly [n] taken from Ephrem the Syrian, Joſhua, the high-prieſt, there denotes the Jewiſh people. Whom St. Jude might call *the body of Moſes,* as Chriſtians are called *the body of Chriſt* by St. Paul. 1 Cor. xii. 20, 25, 27. Eph. i. 23, and iv. 12, 16. Col. i. 18. The ſame interpretation was propoſed ſome while ago, and well ſupported in a Diſſertation of a learned writer, who was not acquainted with Ephrem. ††

[m] Probabile nobis videtur, Judam ſcripſiſſe περι τε ιησε σωματος, et hodiernam lectionem eſſe a manu imperitioris bibliographi, qui cum nihil in Scripturis memorabile legiſſet de *corpore Joſuæ,* ſed contra ex Hiſtoria Sacra intellexiſſet, quid circa *corpus Moſis* ſingulare accediſſet, nec interea de loco Zachariæ cogitaret, Joſuæ nomen in illud Moſis commutavit. Sed quam certum eſt, Judam his verbis reſpexiſſe locum illum Zachariæ, tam quoque certum eſt, non ſcripſiſſe, Michaëlem diſputaſſe cum Diabolo de *corpore Moſis.*——Imo ex eadem ratione liquidiſſime patet, Judam, quæ hic habet *de corpore Moſis,* non deſumpſiſſe ex apocrypho aliquo Judaici ingenii, in quo hanc fabulam offendiſſet. Reſpexit Judas, ut jam dixi, ad locum Zachariæ, et inde recte evicit, Satanæ, potentiſſimi angeli, ab ipſo principe angelorum Michaële in judicio in ipſum proferendo magnam habitam eſſe rationem: ac proin multo minus *poteſtates* et *glorias,* hoc eſt, potentiſſimos principes, licet malos, nobiſque adverſos, a nobis eſſe vilipendendos. Campeg. Vitring. Obſerv. Sacr. l. 4. cap. ix. n. 35. p. 1003, 1004.

[n] See vol. IV. p. 435.

†† See Bib. Raiſonnée. tom. XXXI. P. II. art. i. p. 243—269.

Once

Once more. St. Jude ſays, 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.* To which there is a parallel place in 2 Pet. ii. 4. The learned writer, above quoted, obſerves, that [o] neither here have theſe apoſtles a reference to any Jewiſh apocryphal book: but to ſome text of ſacred ſcripture, or of the Old Teſtamenr. But he then deferred ſhowing the place. Nor do I know, that theſe texts ever came in his way afterwards. I wiſh they had. For I alſo am much inclined to believe, that in all theſe places the apoſtles referred to paſſages of the Old Teſtament.

This may aſſiſt us in forming a judgment concerning the opinion [p] of the biſhop of London, that St. Jude in his epiſtle, and St. Peter in the ſecond chapter of his ſecond epiſtle, copied, or imitated ſome Hebrew writer, who had left behind him a deſcription of the falſe prophets of his own, or former times. Which indeed is ingenious, and plauſible. Nevertheleſs I think, ſuch conjectures ought not to be preſently received as certain. St. Peter, and St. Jude, and all the Chriſtians in general of their time, had before them the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament. Many of the caſes referred to by theſe apoſtles are evidently found there, ſuch as Cain, Korah, Balaam, the people of Sodom. And why ſhould not the other inſtances be taken thence likewiſe? If they are, I preſume, the argument would be more forcible with all, than otherwiſe it would have been. Nor does the reſemblance of ſtyle in St. Peter and Jude afford a concluſive argument, that they both borrowed from ſome one Jewiſh author. The ſimilitude of the ſubject might produce a reſemblance of ſtyle. The deſign of St. Peter and St. Jude was to condemn ſome looſe and erroneous Chriſtians, and to caution others againſt them. When ſpeaking of the ſame ſort of perſons, their ſtyle, and figures of ſpeech, would have a great agreement. And certainly I think, that the apoſtles needed not any other aſſiſtance in confuting and expoſing corrupt Chriſtians, than their own inſpiration, and an acquaintance with the ancient ſcriptures of the Jewiſh church.

III. We are now to conſider to whom this epiſtle was ſent.

[o] Quid Petrus et Judas per alterum illud exemplum *angelorum*, qui *peccaverunt, principio et domicilio ſuo derelicto*, intenderint, et ad quam partem Hiſtoriæ Sacræ reſpexerint, (ad Hiſtoriam enim Sacram reſpexiſſe certum eſt) nunc prætermitto, alia forſitan occaſione commodiore indicandum. Id. ib. num. 35.

[p] See his Diſſertation concerning the authority of the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter. And here in this volume, p. 565.

Witſius

Witſius ſays, it [q] was written to all Chriſtians every where, but eſpecially to Chriſtians converted from Judaiſm: foraſmuch as St. Jude refers to Jewiſh writings and traditions. Moreover he wrote to the ſame Chriſtians, to whom Peter wrote, who were ſuch as had been Jews. To the like purpoſe [r] Eſtius.

Hammond [s] ſays, the epiſtle was written to the Jews ſcattered abroad, who believed the chriſtian religion, to ſecure them againſt the errors of the gnoſtics.

Dr. Benſon [t] thinks, that St. Jude wrote to Jewiſh Chriſtians, as his brother James had done, and moſt probably, to the Jews of the weſtern diſperſion.

Let us now obſerve the inſcription of the epiſtle in the writer's own words. *Jude, the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and brother of James, to them that are ſanctified by God the Father, and preſerved in Jeſus Chriſt, and called* ver. 1. And ver. 3. *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common ſalvation: it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye ſhould earneſtly contend for the faith, which was once delivered unto the ſaints.*

Theſe expreſſions, as ſeems to me, lead us to think, that the epiſtle was deſigned for the uſe of all in general, who had embraced the chriſtian religion. And if St. Jude writes to the ſame people, to whom St. Peter wrote, that is a farther argument for this ſuppoſition. For, that St. Peter wrote to all Chriſtians in general, in the countries named at the beginning of his firſt epiſtle, was ſhown [u] formerly.

IV. We now come to the laſt point, the time of writing this epiſtle. Here I ſhall obſerve the opinions of ſeveral.

[q] Epiſtola hæc Chriſtianis quidem univerſim, et potiſſimum Hebræis ſcripta eſt.——Ii quibus ſcripta eſt epiſtola, illis deſignantur epithetis, quæ ſine Gentium diſtinctione Chriſtianis omnibus competunt: quamvis credibile ſit, potiſſimum eos ſpectari, qui ex Iſraelitis in Chriſto crediderant. Iis enim ſæpiuſcule argumentis utitur, quæ ex Judæorum libris, vel etiam traditionibus, deſumpta ſunt. Videnturque prorſus iidem eſſe cum illis, quos Petrus poſteriore ſua epiſtola compellat. Witſ. Comment. in ep. Jud. § viii. p. 460.

[r] Porro veriſimile eſt, ad eoſdem ſcriptam eſſe, ad quos ſcripſit B. Petrus, id eſt, ad eos præcipue, qui ex circumciſione crediderant. —— Id ipſum indicant illa verba verſus 5. *Commonere autem vos volo, ſcientes ſemel omnia.* Nam id aptiſſime Judæis dicitur, a prima ætate imbutis cognitione hiſtoriæ ſacræ. Eſt. Argum. in Ep. Jud.

[s] Videtur autem, ſicut epiſtolæ Jacobi et Petri, ſcripta fuiſſe ad Judæos diſperſionis, Chriſtianam Religionem amplexos, ut confirmarentur contra pravas doctrinas Gnoſticorum, qui tunc temporis exorti ſunt. Hammond. Admonit. in ep. Judæ. Ex verſione Clerici.

[t] Preface to this ep. ſect. ii. p. 446. See alſo his paraphraſe of ver. 1.

[u] See before, p. 568, &c.

Dr.

Dr. Benſon's opinion is, 'that [x] this epiſtle was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, a few weeks, or months, after the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter: foraſmuch as the ſtate of things, as repreſented in both theſe epiſtles, is very much the ſame.'

Mill's conjecture is, that [y] this epiſtle was written about the year of Chriſt 90. But as he ſays, there are no clear evidences of the exact time when it was written.

Dodwell, [z] whom Cave [a] follows, argues, that this epiſtle was written ſoon after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, in the year 71, or 72. But the reaſonings of thoſe learned men are far from being concluſive.

Lenfant and Beauſobre were of opinion, that [b] this epiſtle may be placed with great probability between the year 70, and the year 75.

Witſius thinks it [c] was written in this apoſtle's old age, and in the laſt age of the apoſtles of Chriſt, and when few, or perhaps none of them, were living, beſides St. John.

To the like purpoſe [d] Eſtius.

Œcumenius in his note upon ver. 17, 18, of this epiſtle. *Remember the words, which were ſpoken before of the apoſtles of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: that they told you, there ſhould be mockers in the laſt time.*—'Meaning,' ſays he, 'by [e] Peter in his ſecond epiſtle, and by Paul in almoſt all his epiſtles. Hence it is evident, that he wrote late, after the deceaſe of the apoſtles.'

If St. Jude referred here to St. Peter's ſecond epiſtle, it muſt be allowed, that he had ſeen it, and wrote after St. Peter: which indeed is the opinion of many. So Œcumenius appears to have thought. So alſo ſays [f] Eſtius. Dr Benſon, expreſſeth

[x] Preface to the epiſtle of St. Jude. ſect. iii. p. 448. [y] Fortaſſe quidem circa annum vulgaris æræ &c. Verum de ipſo præciſo tempore nihil habemus explorate. Prolog. num. 147. [z] Diſſ. Iren. i. num. xiv. [a] H. L. in S. Juda. [b] On ne ſe trompera pas en plaçant cette epiſtre entre les années 70. et 75. de l' ere Chrêtienne. Pref. ſur l' epiſtre de S. Jude. [c] Tempus ſcriptæ hujus epiſtolæ, uti ad poſtremam Apoſtolorum ætatem referendum eſt, quod colligitur ex ver. 17. ita ad extremam quoque Judæ ſenectutem pertinet, &c. Witſ. in Jud. num. ix.

[d] Cæterum Apoſtolis fuit poſterior, non omnibus, ſed pleriſque jam ante vitâ defunctis: ut Petro, et Paulo, et Jacobo. Nam Joannes adhuc ſupererat. Eſt. ad Jud. ver. 17.

[e] ——υπο των αποστολων· των υπο πετρε εν τη δευτερα επιστολη, και υπο παυλε εν παση σχεδον επιστολη. Εκ τετε δε δηλον, οτι εσχατον μετα το παρελθειν τες αποστολες, εγραφε ταυτα. Œcum. T. II. p. 633. D.

[f] Convenit argumentum hujus epiſtolæ cum iis, quæ B. Petrus ſcribit in ſecunda epiſtola, præſertim

expreſſeth himſelf after this manner: 'that [g] it ſeems highly 'probable, that St. Jude had ſeen and read the ſecond epiſtle 'of St. Peter. For there are found in St. Jude ſeveral ſimilar 'paſſages, not only to thoſe in the ſecond chapter of the ſecond of St. Peter, but alſo in the other parts of that epiſtle.

Nevertheleſs I muſt ſtill ſay, this appears to me doubtful. For it ſeems very unlikely, that St. Jude ſhould write ſo ſimilar an epiſtle, if he had ſeen St. Peter's. In that caſe St. Jude would not have thought it needful for him to write at all. If he had formed a deſign of writing, and had met with an epiſtle of one of the apoſtles, very ſuitable to his own thoughts and intentions, I think, he would have forborne to write.

Indeed the great agreement in ſubject and deſign between theſe two epiſtles affords a ſtrong argument, that they were written about the ſame time. As therefore I have placed the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter in the year 64, I am induced to place this epiſtle of St. Jude in the ſame year, or ſoon after, in 65, or 66. For there was exactly the ſame ſtate of things in the chriſtian church, or in ſome part of it, when both theſe epiſtles were written.

I do not inſiſt upon the expreſſion, *in the laſt time*, which is in ver. 18. Some would underſtand thereby the laſt period of the Jewiſh ſtate and conſtitution, immediately preceding the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. But I cannot interpret the phraſe, *the laſt time*, in Jude, or *the laſt days*, in St. Peter iii. 3. in ſo limited a ſenſe. I think, that thereby muſt be meant the days of the Meſſiah, or the late ages of the world.

However, undoubtedly, that exhortation, ver. 17 and 18. *But, beloved, remember ye the words, which were ſpoken before by the apoſtles of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt: that they told you, there ſhould be mockers in the laſt time:* do imply, as Witſius and Eſtius obſerve, that it was then the laſt age of the apoſtles: when ſeveral of them had left the world, and few of them were ſtill ſurviving. Which well ſuits the date, before mentioned, the year 64, or 65, or 66.

When St. Jude adviſeth the Chriſtians to recollect, *and be mindful of the words of the apoſtles of Chriſt*, he may intend

capite 2. et initio tertii. Nam quæ hic ſcribuntur, adeo cum illis ſimilia ſunt, et hujus author S. Judas eam non ſolum legiſſe videatur, verum etiam, partim contrahendo, partim extendendo, partim iiſdem vocibus et ſententiis utendo, imitatus fuiſſet. Eſt. argum. Vid. eund. ad ver. epiſtolæ 17.

[g] Preface to St. Jude, ſect. iii.

their

their preaching, which theſe Chriſtians had heard, or the writings of apoſtles, which they had read, and had in their hands. Such diſcourſes of St. Paul may be ſeen recorded in Acts xx. 29, 30. And he writes to the like purpoſe 1 Tim. iv. 1—5. and 2 Tim. iii. and iv. They who ſuppoſe, that St. Jude had ſeen and read the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter, muſt think, that he refers alſo to 2 Pet. ch. iii. 1—5.

There are ſome other expreſſions in this epiſtle, which may deſerve to be here taken notice of by us. Ver. 3. *It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that you ſhould earneſtly contend for the faith once delivered to the ſaints.* and ver. 5. *I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this.* Theſe expreſſions ſeem to imply, that now ſome conſiderable time had paſſed, ſince the whole ſcheme of the chriſtian doctrine had been publiſhed to the world, and ſince the perſons, to whom the apoſtle is writing, were firſt inſtructed in it.

Upon the whole, as before ſaid, this epiſtle might be written in the year of Chriſt 64, or 65, or 66.

CHAP. XXII.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

I. *Its Genuineneſs ſhown from Teſtimony.* II. *From internal Characters.* III. *Its Time.*

I. We are now come to the laſt book of the New Teſtament, the Revelation: about which there have been different ſentiments among Chriſtians, many receiving it as the writing of John, the apoſtle and evangeliſt, others aſcribing it to John a preſbyter, others to Cerinthus, and ſome rejecting it, without knowing to whom it ſhould be aſcribed.

I ſhall therefore here rehearſe the teſtimony of ancient Chriſtians, as it ariſeth in ſeveral ages.

It is probable, that Hermas had read the book of the Revelation, and imitated it. He has many things reſembling it, vol. II. p. 61—64. It is referred to by the martyrs at Lyons, p. 152. There is reaſon to think, it was received by Papias, p. 108—114. Juſtin Martyr, about the year 140,

was acquainted with this book, and received it, as written by the apoſtle John. For in his dialogue with Trypho he expreſsly ſays: 'And a man from among us, by name John, 'one of the apoſtles of Chriſt, in the revelation made to him, 'has propheſied, that the believers in our Chriſt ſhall live a 'thouſand years in Jeruſalem, and after that ſhall be the ge-'neral, and, in a word, the eternal reſurrection and judgment 'of all together,' p. 126. To this very paſſage we ſuppoſe Euſebius to refer in his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, when giving an account of Juſtin's works, he obſerves to this purpoſe: 'he 'alſo mentions the Revelation of John, expreſsly calling it 'the apoſtle's.' See the ſame page, note *(a)*. Among the works of Melito, biſhop of Sardis, one of the ſeven churches of Aſia, about the year 177, Euſebius mentions one, entitled, 'Of the Revelation of John,' p. 147. It is very probable, that Melito aſcribed this book to the apoſtle of that name, and eſteemed it a book of canonical authority. Irenæus, biſhop of Lyons in Gaul, about 178, who in his younger days was acquainted with Polycarp, often quotes this book, 'as the Revelation of John, the diſciple of the Lord,' p. 169. And in one place he ſays: 'It was ſeen not long ago, but almoſt in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian.' Ibid. And ſee p. 155.

Theophilus was biſhop of Antioch about 181. Euſebius ſpeaking of a work of his againſt the hereſy of Hermogenes, ſays, 'he therein made uſe of teſtimonies, or quoted paſſages, from John's Apocalypſe,' vol. II. p. 190. The book of the Revelation is ſeveral times quoted by Clement of Alexandria, who flouriſhed about 194, and once in this manner: 'Such an 'one, though here on earth he is not honoured with the firſt 'ſeat, ſhall ſit upon the four and twenty thrones judging the 'people, as John ſays in the Revelation,' p. 229. Tertullian, about the year 200, often quotes the Revelation, and ſuppoſeth it to have been written by St. John, the ſame who wrote the firſt epiſtle of John, univerſally received, p. 276, 277. Again; 'the apoſtle John in the Apocalypſe deſcribes *a ſharp two-edged 'ſword coming out of the mouth of God*,' p. 277. He alſo ſays, 'We have churches, that are diſciples of John. For though 'Marcion rejects the Revelation, the ſucceſſion of biſhops, 'traced to the original, will aſſure us, that John is the au-'thor:' ibid. by John, undoubtedly, meaning the apoſtle.

From Euſebius we learn, that Apollonius, who wrote againſt the Montaniſts about the year 211, quoted the Revelation,

lation, p. 371. By Caius, about the year 212, it was aſcribed to Cerinthus, p. 378, 379. It was received by Hippolytus, about the year 220, p. 412, and by Origen about 230, p. 466—468. It is often quoted by him. He ſeems not to have had any doubt about its genuineneſs. In his commentary upon St. John's goſpel, he ſpeaks of it in this manner: 'Therefore John, the ſon of Zebedee, ſays in the Revelation, p. 483. See alſo p. 483, 484, and 543.

Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria, about the year 247, or ſomewhat later, wrote a book againſt the Millenarians, in which he allows the Revelation to be written by John, a holy and divinely inſpired man. But he ſays, 'he cannot eaſily 'grant him to be the apoſtle, the ſon of Zebedee, whoſe is the 'goſpel according to John, and the catholic epiſtle,' vol. III. p. 105. He rather thinks it may be the work of John, an elder, who alſo lived at Epheſus, in Aſia, as well as the apoſtle, p. 107. See likewiſe p. 128, 129, 131. Moreover, it appears from a conference, which Dionyſius had with ſome Millenarians, that the Revelation was about the year 240, and before, received by Nepos, an Egyptian biſhop, and by many others in that country, p. 68, 103, 104, and that it was in great reputation, p. 128, 129. It was received by Cyprian, biſhop of Carthage, about 248, and by the church of Rome in his time, p. 175, 176, and by divers Latin authors, whoſe hiſtory is written in the third volume of this work. As may be ſeen in the alphabetical Table of principal matters, in the article of the Revelation.

The Revelation was received by Novatus, and his followers, p. 245, 246, and by divers other authors, whoſe hiſtory is written in that volume.

It is alſo probable, that it was received by the Manichees, p. 507.

It was received by Lactantius, vol. IV. p. 80, and by the Donatiſts, p. 102, by the latter Arnobius, about 460, p. 24, and by the Arians, p. 117.

In the time of Euſebius, in the former part of the fourth century, it was not received by all. And therefore it is reckoned by him among contradicted books, vol. IV. p. 227. Nevertheleſs it was generally received, p. 234 and 255. Euſebius himſelf ſeems to have heſitated about it. For he ſays, 'It is likely, that the Revelation was ſeen by John the elder, if not by John the apoſtle,' p. 256. It may be reckoned probable, that the critical argument of Dionyſius, of

Alexandria, was of great weight with him, and others of that time. See p. 257, 258. The Revelation was received by Athanaſius, p. 283—286, and by Epiphanius, p. 313—316. But we alſo learn from him, that it was not received by all in his time, p. 316, 317. It is not in the catalogue of Cyril of Jeruſalem, about 348, and ſeems, not to have been received by him, p. 300—302. It is alſo wanting in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, about 363, p. 309. Nevertheleſs I do not think, it can be thence concluded, that this book was rejected by the biſhops of that council. Their deſign ſeems to have been to mention by name thoſe books only, which ſhould be publicly read. And they might be of opinion, that upon account of its obſcurity, it ſhould not be publicly read, though it was of ſacred authority. And ſome may be of opinion, that this obſervation ſhould likewiſe be applied to Cyril's catalogue juſt taken notice of.

The Revelation is not in Gregory Nazianzen's catalogue, vol. IV. p. 408. Nevertheleſs it ſeems to have been received by him, p. 409. It is in the catalogue of Amphilochius. But he ſays, it was not received by all, p. 414. It is alſo omitted in Ebedjeſu's catalogue of the books of ſcripture, received by the Syrians, p. 439, 440; nor is it in the ancient Syriac verſion, p. 441.

It was received by Jerom, vol. V. p. 32, 33, 41, 44. But he ſays, it was rejected by the Greek Chriſtians, p. 50. It was received by Rufin, p. 76, by the third council of Carthage in 397, p. 79, and by Auguſtine, p. 86, 104. But it was not received by all in his time, p. 102. It is never quoted by Chryſoſtom, and, probably, was not received by him, p. 137. It is in the catalogue of Dionyſius, called the Areopagite, about 490, p. 247. It is in the Alexandrian manuſcript, p. 254—256. It was received by Sulpicius Severus, about 401, p. 164, and by J. Damaſcenus, p. 316, and by Œcumenius, p. 325, and by many other authors, whoſe hiſtory is written in the fifth volume. Andrew, biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century, p. 250, and Arethas, biſhop of the ſame place in the ſixth century, wrote commentaries upon it, p. 274. But it was not received by Severian, biſhop of Gabala, p. 161; nor, as it ſeems, by Theodoret, p. 195, 196.

Upon the whole it appears, that this book has been generally received in all ages: though ſome have doubted of it, or rejected it, particularly, the Syrians, and ſome other Chriſtians

Chriſtians in the eaſt. However, for more particulars, ſee St. John, and the Revelation, in the alphabetical table, which is in the eleventh volume of this work.

It may not be improper for me here to remind my readers of the ſentiments of divers learned moderns, concerning this book, which were put together in vol. III. p. 126, 131, after having largely repreſented the criticiſms of Caius, and Dionyſius of Alexandria, in the third century upon the ſtyle of this book, and of the other writings aſcribed to St. John. Where alſo is propoſed this obſervation, p. 131: 'It may 'be queſtioned, whether their exceptions, founded in the 'difference of ſtyle, and ſuch like things, or any other 'criticiſms whatever, can be ſufficient to create a doubt 'concerning the author of this book: which was owned for 'a writing of John, the apoſtle and evangeliſt, before the 'times of Dionyſius and Caius, and, ſo far as we know, 'before the moſt early of thoſe, who diſputed its genuine-'neſs.'

II. Having thus repreſented the external evidence of the genuineneſs of the book of the Revelation, or of its being written by St. John, I ſhould proceed to conſider the internal evidence. But I need not enlarge here, becauſe the objections taken from the ſtyle, and ſome other particulars, were ſtated, and conſidered, in the third volume, in the article of Dionyſius, above-named, biſhop of Alexandria.

I now intend therefore only to take notice of a few things, of principal note, which learned men inſiſt upon, as arguments, that the Revelation has the ſame author with the goſpel, and epiſtles, that go under the name of the apoſtle and evangeliſt John.

1. Ch. i. ver. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him, to ſhow unto his ſervants things, which muſt ſhortly come to paſs. And he ſent, and ſignified it by his angel, unto his ſervant John.*

Hence it is argued, that [a] John ſtyles himſelf the *ſervant of Chriſt*, in a ſenſe not common to all believers, but peculiar to thoſe, who are eſpecially employed by him. So Paul, and

[a] —— ſed eſſe ſe *inter notabiles Chriſti Jeſu miniſtros*, quos ad Eccleſiam ſuam docendam, regendam, et curandam adhibebat.—— Hoc ſenſu Moſes, David, Jeſaias, et Prophetæ omnes ſub œconomia vetere, et Paulus, et alii Apoſtoli ſub œconomia nova vocantur ſervi Dei. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. 1.

other apostles, call themselves *servants of God, and of Christ.* Particularly Rom. i. 1. *Paul a servant of Jesus Christ.* James i. 1. *James a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ.* 2 Pet. i. 1. *Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ.* Jude v. 1. *Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ.* So Moses is called *the servant of God.* Numb. xii. 7. and Heb.. iii. 2. And in like manner divers of the prophets. And in this very book, ch. x. 7. is the expression: *as he has declared unto his servants the prophets.*

This observation may be of some weight for showing, that the writer is an apostle. But it is not decisive. And in the same verse, whence this argument is taken, the phrase is used in its general sense. *Which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants.*

2. Ver. 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw.*

Some suppose, the writer herein to refer to the written gospel of St. John, and to say, that he had already *borne testimony concerning the word of God, and Jesus Christ.* But, as formerly [b] observed, these words may be understood of this very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer says here very properly, at the beginning, and by way of preface, that he had performed his office in this book, having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, which he had received from Jesus Christ.

For certain, if these words did clearly refer to a written gospel, they would be decisive. But [c] they are allowed to be ambiguous, and other senses have been given of them. By some they have been understood to contain a declaration, that the writer had already borne witness to Jesus Christ before magistrates. Moreover, I think, that if St. John had intended to manifest himself in this introduction, he would

[b] See vol. III. p. 118.

[c] Ver. 2. *Qui testatus est sermonem Dei, et testimonium J. C. et quæ vidit.*] Duplici modo hæc accipi possunt, vel Joannem confessionem veritatis solennem coram tribunali Præfecti Asiæ Romani edidisse, ob quam ipse missus fuerit in exilium: vel ipsum Evangelio a se edito solenne de Christo, ejusque dictis et gestis edidisse testimonium. Priore sensu vox μαρτυρειν scriptoribus Græcis posterioris temporis receptissima est, et manifeste etiam sumitur a Paulo, 1 Tim. vi. 13——Veni igitur ultro in illam sententiam, quæ hæc Joannis verba refert ad Evangelium non prædicatum tantum a Joanne solenniter, sed et scriptis confirmatum.——Quæ si sane sit hujus loci interpretatio, certò simul testabitur de illius auctore, Joanne Apostolo, ac proinde de libri hujus divinitate, et summa auctoritate. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2.

have

have more plainly characterized himſelf in ſeveral parts of this book, than he has done.

This obſervation therefore appears to me to be of ſmall moment for determining, who the writer is.

3. Farther, it is argued, in favour of the genuineneſs of this book, 'that there are in it many inſtances of conformity, both of ſentiment and expreſſion, between the Revelation and the unconteſted writings of St. John.'

Divers ſuch coincidences, or inſtances of agreement, were taken notice of formerly, and remarks were made upon them, vol. III. p. 121—125. That which is at p. 124, appears to me, as ſtriking, as any. I ſhall therefore enlarge upon it here. Our Saviour ſays to his diſciples John xvi. 33. *Be of good cheer. I have overcome the world.* Chriſtian firmneſs under trials is ſeveral times repreſented by *overcoming*, or *overcoming the world*, or *overcoming the wicked one*, in St. John's firſt epiſtle, ch. ii. 13, 14. iv. 4. v. 4, 5. And it is language peculiar to St. John, being in no other books of the New Teſtament. And our Lord ſays Rev. iii. 21. *To him that overcometh will I grant to ſit with me in my throne, even as I alſo overcame, and am ſet down with my Father in his throne.* Compare ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26. iii. 5, 12, 21. and xxi. 7.

III. Concerning the time of writing this book, I need not now ſay much, having before ſhown, in [d] the hiſtory of St. John, that it is the general teſtimony of ancient authors, that St. John was baniſhed into [e] Patmos, in the time of Domitian, in the latter part of his reign, and reſtored by his ſucceſſor Nerva. But the book could not be publiſhed, till after St. John's releaſe, and return to Epheſus in Aſia.

As Domitian died in 96, and his perſecution did not commence, till near the end of his reign, the Revelation ſeems to be fitly dated in the year 95, or 96.

Mill [f] placeth the Revelation in the year of Chriſt 96, and the laſt year of the emperor Domitian. At firſt, he ſuppoſed, that

[d] See before, p. 174—186.

[e] Eodem ordine ſeptem iſtæ Aſiæ civitates enumerantur, quo ex Patmo inſulâ adiri debebant. Wetſten. in Apoc. i. 11. tom. II. p. 750.

[f] Paucis poſt conſcriptas has literas annis, exorta eſt Chriſtianorum perſecutio ſub Domitiano. ——In inſulâ vero Patmo, in quam relegatus erat Joannes, Domitiani ultimo, ſeu anno æræ vulgaris xcvi. ——facta eſt ipſi Revelatio: quam univerſam poſtea expreſſo Chriſti mandato ſcriptis conſignavit. Scriptamque Domini ejuſdem juſſu miſit ad ſeptem eccleſias Aſiæ. Unde manifeſtum

that the Revelation was written in Patmos. But afterwards he [g] altered his mind, and thought, it was not written until after his return to Epheſus from Patmos. He builds upon the words of Rev. i. 9. If ſo, I apprehend, it might not be publiſhed before the year 97, or, at the ſooneſt, near the end of the year 96.

Baſnage [h] placeth the Revelation in the year of Chriſt 96.

Le Clerc [i] likewiſe, who readily admits the genuineneſs of this book, ſpeaks of it at the ſame year.

Mr. Lowman * ſuppoſes, St. John to have had his viſions in the iſle of Patmos in the year 95.

But Mr. Wetſtein [k] favours the opinion of thoſe, who have argued, that the Revelation was written before the Jewiſh war. He moreover ſays, that [l] if the Revelation was written before that war, it is likely, that the events of that

manifeſtum eſt, viſionem non modo Joanni factam fuiſſe, ſed etiam ab eo literis traditam in inſula Patmo. —— Scriptam fuiſſe ex prædictis conſtat anno vulgaris æræ xcvi. ſeu Domitiani xvi. et quidem ad finem ejuſdem imperii, inquit Irenæus, ſeu tempore æſtivo æræ vulg. xcvi. Proleg. num. 157.

[g] Subjiciemus hic verba Millii, quæ in emendandis poſuerat: *Hic ſententiam*, inquit, *mutavimus. Conſtat enim ex ipſis Joannis verbis Apoc. i. 9. eum poſt reditum ad Epheſum hunc librum ſcripſiſſe.* Kuſter. in notis num. 157. Proleg. p. 19.

[h] Vid. ann. 96. num. xii.

[i] At nemo de auctoritate ejus dubitârat ante Caium, Romanum Preſbyterum, qui circa finem ii. ſeculi vixit. Cum Cataphryges eo libro abuterentur —— fœtum hunc eſſe Apoſtoli negare, atque a Cerintho, præſcripto ejus nomine, editum dicere maluit. At Juſtinus, et Irenæus, eo antiquiores, et qui cum Joannis diſcipulis verſati erant, Apoſtolo hoc opus tribuerunt. Similiter, cum medio ſeculo iii. Nepos in Ægypto Epiſcopus, Chiliaſtarum deliria eodem libro tueretur, Dionyſius Alexandrinus eadem de cauſſa Joanni eum abjudicavit. Sed aliter ſenſerant, quicumque Apocalypſeos antea mentionem fecerant, excepto Caio, quos ſequuti etiam poſteri omnes ad unum. —— Multo fide dignior Irenæus, qui paſſim hunc librum, quaſi Joannis Apoſtoli, ad teſtimonium vocat, et diſerte, lib. v. c. 30. *Neque enim ante multum tempus viſa eſt, ſed ferme noſtra ætate, ſub finem imperii Domitiani.* Quæ ejus verba Græca habet Euſebius. l. 5. c. 8. J. Cleric. H. E. An. 96. num. v.

* See the ſcheme and order of the prophecies in the book of the Revelation, which is prefixed to his paraphraſe.

[k] Nos quidem, omnibus expenſis, cum iis facimus, qui ſtatuunt, Apocalypſin ante bellum Judaicum fuiſſe ſcriptum. Wetſt. N. T. tom. II. p. 746. m.

[l] Quæſtio eſt non levis momenti, cum vera Apocalypſeos interpretatio maximam partem inde pendeat. Si enim ſcripta eſt ante bellum Judaicum, et bella civilia in Italia; nullo modo probabile eſt, tantam rerum converſionem omnino præteriri atque negligi potuiſſe. Sin autem poſt illos motus compoſitos ſcripta eſt, probabilior erit eorum ſententia, qui eventus in Apocalypſi prædictos in ſeculorum ſequentium hiſtoria quærendos exiſtimant. Id. ib.

time

time ſhould be foretold in it. To which I anſwer, that [m] though ſome interpreters have applied ſome things in this book to thoſe times, I cannot ſay, whether they have done it rightly, or not, becauſe I do not underſtand the Revelation. But to me it ſeems, that though this book was written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, there was no neceſſity, that it ſhould be foretold here: becauſe our bleſſed Lord had in his own preaching at divers times ſpoken very plainly, and intelligibly, concerning the calamities coming upon the Jewiſh people in general, and the city and temple of Jeruſalem, in particular. And his plain predictions, and ſymbolical prefigurations of thoſe events, were recorded by no leſs than three hiſtorians and evangeliſts, before the war in Judea broke out.

Grotius, who, as [n] formerly ſeen, placeth this book in the reign of Claudius, was of opinion, that [o] the viſions of this book were ſeen at ſeveral times, and afterwards joined together in one book: in like manner, as the viſions and prophecies of ſome of the prophets of the Old Teſtament.

Concerning this opinion it is not proper for me to diſpute: though there appears not any foundation for it in the book itſelf, as [p] Vitringa has obſerved. But that the book of the Revelation,

[m] Lightfootus in genere cenſet, Apocalypſin hanc editam eſſe ante noviſſimum Hieroſolymorum excidium. Et certe ſi Joannes hanc Revelationem vere a Chriſto Jeſu accepiſſet ſub Claudio, magna cum ſpecie negari non poſſet doctiſſimis his viris, quædam *ſigillorum viſa* ad fata judaiſmi non adeo incommode applicari poſſe. Sed obſtant graves rationes, quæ nos in hanc ſententiam ire vetant. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2. p. 7. Vid. et in cap. vi. ver. 1, 2. p. 101—105.

[n] See before, p. 176.

[o] *Et mitte ſeptem eccleſiis.* Nempe hujus viſi deſcriptionem. Neque ad cætera hujus libri pertinet. Diverſa viſa diverſis temporibus Joanni obtigëre, ut et Prophetis aliis. Grot. ad Apoc. cap i. 11.

Poſt abſolutum Viſum, monita ſalutaria continens, ad ſeptem epiſcopos et eccleſias.—Sequuntur Viſa alia, quæ diverſis temporibus Apoſtolo obtigëre, et poſtea in unum volumen redacta ſunt: quod et in prophetiis aliis evenit, ſæpe etiam non annotato temporis diſcrimine, ſed dato intelligi ex iis quæ loco quoque continentur. Pertinent autem hæc Viſa ad res Judæorum uſque ad finem capitis undecimi: deinde ad res Romanorum, uſque ad finem capitis viceſſimi: deinde ad ſtatum florentiſſimum Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ ad finem uſque, &c. Ejuſdem Annot. ad cap. iv. init. Vid. et ejus Commentatio ad loca quæd. N. T. &c. citat. in hujus Supplementi volumine primo, p. 176.

[p] Et vero Grotius et Hammondus ipſi cauſam ſuam produnt, ubi poſteriorem Apocalypſeos partem ſub Veſpaſiano Epheſi ſcriptam concedunt. Quis enim illos docuit, Viſa Joannis in Apocalypſi hoc modo diſtinguere, et diverſa illis et tam longe diſſita aſſignare tam tempora quam loca? Nullum indicium, nulla ſignificatio illius rei in ipſa

Revelation, in its preſent form, ſent as an epiſtle to the ſeven churches of Aſia, ch. i. ver. 4. was not compoſed, and publiſhed before the reign of Domitian, appears to me very probable from the general, and almoſt univerſally concurring teſtimony of the ancients, and from ſome things in the book itſelf.

Now therefore I ſhall tranſcribe [q] a part of Lenfant's and Beauſobre's preface to the Revelation, at the ſame time referring to Vitringa [r] in the margin, who has many like thoughts.

Having

ipſa Apocalypſi exſtat. Contra dicitur Joannes, quæ vidit, *vidiſſe in inſula Patmo.* Vitr. ib. p. 11, 12.

[q] Preface ſur l' Apoc. de S. Jean. p. 613, 614.

[r] Primo dubium non eſt, quin ſi teſtimoniis Veterum res conficienda ſit: communis antiquæ Eccleſiæ traditio, firmata auctoritate Irenæi, hic multum præponderet teſtimonio Epiphanii. Irenæus enim temporibus Joannis Apoſtoli propior fuit, tanquam qui eodem adhuc ſeculo cum Joanne vixerit, et traditionem nobis retulit ſuo ætate communem, et omnibus notiſſimam.

Sed quod plus etiam momenti cauſſæ noſtræ addit: non nititur noſtra hæc ſententia de tempore ſcriptæ Apocalypſis ſola traditione Veterum. Poteſt illa ex ipſo hoc libro, etiam abſque ulla traditione veteris Eccleſiæ demonſtrari. Quare *ſecundo* obſervari velim, ex ipſa Apocalypſi evidentiſſimas adduci poſſe probationes, ex quibus evincatur, hunc librum non utique ſub Claudio, ſed omnino poſt Claudii et Neronis tempora, quin imo ſub Domitiano demum in lucem editum eſſe.——Quo tempore ſcripta eſt Apocalypſis, eccleſiæ jam per Aſiam inferiorem in celeberrimis locis non tantum erant fundatæ et conſtabilitæ, ſed jamdudum fundatæ et ſtabilitæ fuiſſe ſupponuntur. Redarguuntur enim pleræque a Domino gravium vitiorum et criminum, quæ tractu longioris temporis eccleſias illas obrepſerant. Epheſina jam *reliquerat primam ſuam charitatem.* Sardicenſis dicebatur, *nomine vivere, ſed vere mortua eſſe.* Laodicenam *magnus occupaverat tepor*, eratque *ærumnoſa et miſerabilis.* Hæc vero quam belle conveniunt temporibus Claudii! Ex eccleſiis enim ſeptem, quæ hic memorantur, in Actibus Apoſtolorum, aliarum mentio non eſt, quum Epheſinæ et Laodicenæ. Epheſina autem a Paulo Apoſtolo demum fundata eſt, ſecundum Annales Ceſtrienſis, anno Claudii Imperatoris extremo.——Liquet ex iiſdem epiſtolis Joannis, illo tempore, quo edita eſt Apocalypſis, Gnoſticorum hæreſes, quæ dicuntur, in florentiſſimis Aſiæ eccleſiis altas jam egiſſe radices. Ad illas enim carnalium hominum doctrinas ſub myſticis nominibus Bileamitarum et Nicolaitarum in variis locis alluditur. Illam hæreſim prævidebat Petrus in Eccleſia brevi exorituram, quando epiſtolam ſuam ſcribebat poſteriorem, non longe ante Hieroſolymorum excidium. Judas, qui epiſtolam ſuam edidit, ut probabilis ratio ſuadet, poſt Hieroſolymorum illud excidium, hoc ſemen in prima vidit herba. Sed quo tempore ſcripta eſt Apocalypſis non nata tantum, ſed confirmata erat hæc hæreſis, et præcipuas Aſiæ eccleſias inquinaverat. Quare ſi Judas Apoſtolus epiſtolam ſuam ſcripſit ſub Veſpaſiano: quis neget, Apocalypſin editam eſſe ſub Domitiano? In ipſis illis Epiſtolis paſſim ſupponuntur afflictiones graviores, quas Eccleſia Chriſti religionis ſuæ

Having quoted Irenæus, Origen, Euſebius, and divers other ancients, placing St. John's baniſhment in Patmos in the latter part of the reign of Domitian, and ſaying, that he there ſaw the Revelation, they ſay: 'To theſe unconteſtible witneſſes 'it is needleſs to add a long liſt of others, of all ages, and 'of the ſame ſentiment: to whom the authority of Epipha-'nius is by no means comparable.' And then they go on: 'We muſt add to ſo conſtant a tradition other reaſons, which 'farther ſhow, that the Revelation was not written, till after 'Claudius, and Nero. It appears from the book itſelf, that 'there had been already churches for a conſiderable ſpace of 'time in Aſia: foraſmuch as St. John in the name of Chriſt 'reproves faults, that happen not but after a while. The 'church of Epheſus *had left her firſt love.* That of Sardis *had* 'a name to live, but was dead. The church of Laodicea was 'fallen into lukewarmneſs and indifference. But the church 'of Epheſus, for inſtance, was not founded by St. Paul, be-

ſuæ cauſſa jam ſuſtinebat, et ſuſtinuerat: et inter illas ſupplicium capitale, quo confeſſores veritatis afficiebantur. Sic Dominus ad Angelum eccleſiæ Epheſinæ: *Novi laborem tuum*, και την υπομονην σε, et *tolerantiam* in afflictionibus. Ad Angelum Smyrnenſis: *Novi opera tua*, et την θλιψιν, *afflictionem, et paupertatem.* Ad Angelum Pergamenæ: *Nec abnegaſti fidem meam, ne quidem in diebus, quibus Antipas, teſtis meus fidelis,* απεκταν θη, *occiſus eſt.* Supponunt hæc manifeſte, tempore editæ Apocalypſis Gentiles jam cœpiſſe in Chriſtianos ſævire, et ipſam etiam mortem pœnæ loco illis quandoque ſolennibus judiciis irrogaſſe. Id vero hactenus non liquet factum eſſe imperante Claudio. Nero, poſtquam humanitatem exuiſſet, ſanguinem Chriſtianum primus bibit: Romæ tamen, magis quam in provinciis. Poſt Neronem Domitianus, ultimis imperii ſui, idem tentavit. Ad quas poſtremas Domitiani perſecutiones in his locis haud dubie alluditur. Neronis enim illam perſecutionem in provinciis Romani Imperii æque ac Romæ arſiſſe, nec liquet, nec probabile eſt. Ad Domitiani itaque perſecutionem hic manifeſte alluditur. Quod argumento eſt, Apocalypſin hanc ſub ipſo editam eſſe. Ejuſdem hujus Domitianæi temporis manifeſtum habemus characterem in Joanne. Dicit enim exerte, *ſe accepiſſe hanc revelationem a Domino Jeſu, cum ob confeſſionem veritatis evangelicæ ageret in inſula Patmo.* Vocatque ſe Chriſtianorum, illo tempore *afflictorum, ſocium in afflictione, regno, et patiente exſpectatione Jeſu Chriſti.* Fuit igitur Joannes *in exilio*, cauſſâ veritatis relegatus in inſulam Patmon. Id vero quo modo acciderit ſub Claudio? Illum enim in Chriſtianos in provinciis aut exilio aut cæde ſæviſſe, nullibi legitur. —— Domitiani igitur hic, et nullius alius Imperatoris character eſt. Nero enim Chriſtianis capitali ſupplicio Romæ affecit: ſed Domitianus plures exilio, paucos morte punivit, ut certi teſtes ſunt Dio et Euſebius, et pluribus proſecutus eſt Dodwellus. Diſſ. xi. De Pauc. Mart. § xvii. Quid ceſſamus itaque tam evidentibus probationibus convicti fidem adhibere traditioni Veterum apud Irenæum? Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2 p. 9—11.

'ſore

'fore the laſt years of Claudius. When in 61, or 62, St. 'Paul wrote to them from Rome, inſtead of reproving their 'want of love, he commends their love and faith, ch. i. 15. '2. It appears from the Revelation, that the Nicolaitans made 'a ſect, when this book was written, ſince they are expreſsly 'named: whereas they were only foretold, and deſcribed in 'general terms by St. Peter in his ſecond epiſtle, written after 'the year ſixty, and in St. Jude's about the time of the de-'ſtruction of Jeruſalem by Veſpaſian. 3. It is evident from 'divers places of the Revelation, that there had been an 'open perſecution in the provinces. St. John himſelf had 'been baniſhed into Patmos for the teſtimony of Jeſus.' The 'church of Epheſus, or its biſhop, is commended for their '*labour and patience*, which ſeems to imply perſecution. This 'is ſtill more manifeſt in the words directed to the church of 'Smyrna, ch. ii. 9. *I know thy works, and tribulation.* For 'the original word always denotes perſecution, in the ſcrip-'tures of the New Teſtament: as it is alſo explained in the 'following verſe. In the thirteenth verſe of the ſame chap-'ter is mention made of a martyr, named Antipas, put to 'death at Pergamus. Though ancient eccleſiaſtical hiſtory 'gives us no information concerning this Antipas, it is ne-'vertheleſs certain, that according to all the rules of lan-'guage, what is here ſaid, ought to be underſtood literally.— 'All that has been now obſerved concerning the perſecution, 'of which mention is made in the firſt chapters of the Reve-'lation, cannot relate to the time of Claudius, who did not 'perſecute the Chriſtians, nor to the time of Nero, whoſe 'perſecution did not reach the provinces. And therefore it 'muſt relate to Domitian, according to eccleſiaſtical tra-'dition.'

The viſions therefore here recorded, and the publication of them in this book, muſt be aſſigned, ſo far as I can ſee, to the years of Chriſt 95, and 96, or 97.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *Their Order in ancient Authors.* II. *General Obſervations upon their Order.* III. *The Order of the ſeveral Parts of the N. T.* 1. *The Goſpels.* 2. *The Acts.* 3. *St. Paul's Epiſtles in general.* 4. *Their Order ſeverally.* 5. *Of placing them in the Order of Time.* 6. *The Order of the Catholic Epiſtles.* 7. *The Revelation.*

I. In ſhowing the order of the books of the New Teſtament, I begin with a paſſage of Euſebius, in a chapter, which is entitled 'Concerning the [a] divine ſcriptures, which are univerſally received, and thoſe which are not ſuch.' 'But,' ſays he, 'it will 'be proper to enumerate here in a ſummary way the [b] books 'of the New Teſtament, which have been already mentioned. 'And in the firſt place are to be ranked the ſacred four goſ-'pels. Then the book of the Acts of the apoſtles. After that 'are to be reckoned the epiſtles of Paul. In the next place, 'that called the firſt epiſtle of John, and the [firſt] epiſtle of 'Peter, are to be eſteemed authentic. After theſe is to be 'placed, if it be thought fit, the Revelation of John, about 'which we ſhall obſerve the different opinions at a proper ſea-'ſon. Of the controverted, but yet well known [or approved 'by the moſt, or many] are that called the epiſtle of James, 'and that of Jude, and the ſecond of Peter, and the ſecond and 'third of John: whether they are written by the evangeliſt, or 'by another of that name.'

This paſſage, as my readers may well remember, was tranſcribed by us [c] formerly. And here the order is very obſervable: the four goſpels, the Acts, St. Paul's epiſtles, the two catholic epiſtles of St. John, and St. Peter, which were univerſally received, and then the books that were controverted, that is, not received by all, though by many.

The ſame order ſeems to have been followed by that ancient writer Irenæus. For in the third book of his works againſt heretics, where he is confuting the Valentinians, he [d] in ſeveral chapters argues from the goſpels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Then in the twelfth chapter of that book, he largely

[a] Περι των ομολογουμενων θειων γραφων, και των μη τοιουτων. H. E. l. 3. cap. 25.

[b] ——της καινης διαθηκης γραφας.

[c] Vol. IV. p. 227.

[d] Iren. l. 3. cap. ix. x. xi.

quotes

quotes the book of the Acts. After which he considers the authority of the apostle Paul, and quotes both him, and Peter.

In the festal epistle of Athanasius, the books of the New Testament are enumerated in this order. 'The [e] four gospels, 'the Acts of the apostles, the seven catholic epistles, the fourteen 'epistles of the apostle Paul, and the Revelation.' They stand exactly in the same order, in [f] the Synopsis ascribed to him, though not composed till more than a hundred years after his time. The same is the order [g] of our Alexandrian manuscript. So likewise in [h] Cyril of Jerusalem: 'the four gospels, the Acts 'of the apostles, seven catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles 'of the apostle Paul.' He omits the Revelation. The same is the order of [i] the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, omitting also the Revelation. So likewise in the [k] catalogue of John Damascenus: 'the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, 'the catholic epistles, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and 'the Revelation.' The same is the order of [l] Leontius. And in the Syrian catalogues as given by [m] Ebedjesu: 'the four 'gospels, the Acts, three catholic epistles, and the fourteen 'epistles of Paul.'

Rufinus's order is 'the [n] gospels, the Acts, Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.' The same order is in [o] the catalogue of the third council of Carthage. In Gregory Nazianzen [p] also 'the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of Paul, the catholic epistles.' The Revelation is wanting. The same order is in the catalogue of [q] Amphilochius, with the Revelation at the end, mentioned as doubtful. In the Stichometry [r] also of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, about the year 806, 'the four gospels, the Acts, Paul's fourteen epistles, and the seven catholic epistles.'

That is the order of Eusebius, and, probably, of Irenæus likewise, as before shown, consequently, the most ancient. It is also the order, which is now generally received. And to me it appears to be the best.

In Epiphanius [s] the books of the New Testament are enumerated in this order: 'the four sacred gospels, the fourteen 'epistles of the apostle Paul, the Acts of the apostles, the seven 'catholic epistles, and the Revelation.'

[e] See vol. IV. p. 283. [f] p. 291. [g] Vol. V. p. 254. [h] Vol. IV. p. 300. [i] p. 329. [k] Vol. V. p. 316. [l] p. 311. [m] Vol. IV. p. 439, 440. [n] Vol. V. p. 76. [o] p. 79. [p] Vol. IV. p. 408. [q] p. 413, 414. [r] Vol. V. p. 258. [s] Hær. 76. p. 941. cited vol. IV. p. 313.

I imagine,

I imagine, that this must have been the order of Euthalius. For [t] he is supposed to have first published an edition of Paul's epistles, and afterwards an edition of the Acts, and the catholic epistles, about the year 490. In his prologue to the Acts of the apostles, addressed to Athanasius, then bishop of Alexandria, he says: 'having [u] formerly divided the epistles of Paul 'into sections, I have now done the like in the book of the Acts, 'and the seven catholic epistles.' Hence I am led to argue, that this was his order: Paul's epistles, the Acts, and the catholic epistles.

Jerom's order, in his letter to Paulinus, is [x] 'the four gos-'pels, St. Paul's epistles, the Acts, the catholic epistles, and the 'Revelation.' Which is very agreeable to the order of Epiphanius, and also of Euthalius, if I understand him aright. But in Jerom's work of the interpretation of Hebrew names the order is thus: 'the [y] gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the seven 'catholic epistles, the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the Reve-'lation.' In the letter to Læta the order is, 'the [z] gospels, the Acts, and the epistles of the apostles.'

Augustine varies. In his work of the christian doctrine, the scriptures of the New Testament are rehearsed in this manner: 'The [a] four books of the gospels, fourteen epistles of the apo-'stle Paul, the seven catholic epistles, the Acts of the apostles 'in one book, and the Revelation of John in one book.' In another work: 'the [b] gospels, the epistles of apostles [meaning 'Paul's epistles, and the catholic epistles] the Acts of the apo-'stles, and the Revelation of John.' In one of his works he quotes texts from the books of the New Testament in this order: first [c] from the gospels, next from several of the catholic epistles, then from almost all the epistles of Paul, after that from the Revelation, and lastly from the Acts of the apostles.

In the catalogue of Innocent the first, bishop of Rome, this order is observable: 'the [d] four gospels, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, seven catholic epistles, the Acts, and the Revelation.' Isidore of Seville, in his several works, has three or four catalogues of the books of the New Testament. In [e] all of them

[t] See vol. V. p. 241.

[u] Ἐναγκος τοινυν, ως εφην, την παυλε βιβλον ανεγνωκως, αυτικα δητα, και τηδε την των αποστολικων πραξεων, αμα τη των καθολικων επιστολων επδομαδι, πονεσας, αρτιως σοι πεπομφα. Euthal. ap. Zacagn. Monum. Vet. p. 405.

[x] Cited, vol V. p. 31, 32.

[y] p. 33. [z] p. 65. [a] p. 85, 86. [b] p. 103. [c] p. 105. [d] p. 175. [e] p. 308.

we ſee this order: 'firſt, the goſpels, then the epiſtles of the 'apoſtle Paul, then the catholic epiſtles, after them the Acts, 'and then the Revelation.' There were according to him, two parts or diviſions of the New Teſtament, one called the goſpels or the evangeliſts, the other the apoſtles or the epiſtles. And in this laſt part the book of the Acts was placed. The ſame is the order in the complexions or ſhort commentaries of Caſſiodorius: they [f] are upon St. Paul's epiſtles, the catholic epiſtles, the Acts of the apoſtles, and the Revelation.

The three writers, alleged in this laſt paragraph agree very much with Auguſtine in the two paſſages firſt cited from him in the preceding paragraph.

Chryſoſtom's order, in the Synopſis aſcribed to him, as formerly obſerved, is very ſingular: 'the [g] fourteen epiſtles of the 'apoſtle Paul, the four goſpels, the book of the Acts, and three 'catholic epiſtles.'

The catalogue of Gelaſius alſo is particular for the place of the Revelation. For he enumerates the books in this order: 'the [h] four goſpels, the Acts, St. Paul's fourteen epiſtles, the Revelation, and the catholic epiſtles.'

I ſuppoſe, I ought not to omit the order of the books in the 85th apoſtolical canon, as it is called, which is this. 'The [i] four 'goſpels, Paul's fourteen epiſtles, ſeven catholic epiſtles, two 'epiſtles of Clement, the Conſtitutions, the Acts of the 'apoſtles.'

I ſhall tranſcribe nothing more of this kind. They who are deſirous to ſee more examples, may conſult the alphabetical table at the end of the eleventh volume, in that article, *The New Teſtament*. Here is enough to be a foundation for ſuch remarks, as are proper to be made, relating to this point.

II. It is obvious to remark upon what we have now ſeen, that in the ſeveral ages of Chriſtianity, and in ſeveral parts of the world, there has been ſome variety in the diſpoſition of the books of the New Teſtament, in two particulars eſpecially. For in ſome catalogues St. Paul's epiſtles precede the catholic epiſtles, in others they follow them. And the book of the Acts is ſometimes placed next after the goſpels, in other catalogues it follows all the epiſtles.

Dr. Mill, who, in his Prolegomena, has an article concerning the order of the books of the New Teſtament, with regard to the firſt particular, the placing in divers catalogues the catholic

[f] p. 283. [g] p. 126, 127. [h] p. 248, 249. [i] Vol. IV. p. 354.

epiſtles

epiſtles before St. Paul's, ſays, 'that [k] poſſibly the Chriſtians 'of thoſe times ſuppoſed them to deſerve precedence, becauſe 'they were not directed to one church, or perſon only, as St. 'Paul's are, but to Chriſtians in general, and many churches 'ſcattered over the world. Some might alſo think the catholic 'epiſtles entitled to precedence, becauſe they were written by 'thoſe, who were apoſtles before Paul, and had accompanied 'our Lord in his perſonal miniſtry here on earth.'

Mill likewiſe argues, that this was the moſt ancient order, becauſe it is that of the Alexandrian, and ſome other ancient manuſcripts. But I do not think that to be full proof. For Euſebius is older, and his order is the ſame as ours. The ſame order is in the catalogues of Rufin, the council of Carthage, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, and divers others, very probably older than any manuſcripts now in being. And in many other writers likewiſe of great antiquity, St. Paul's epiſtles precede the catholic epiſtles. Whereby I am induced to think, this muſt have been the moſt ancient order.

The reaſon, why the book of the Acts was ſometimes placed after all the epiſtles, ſome may think, was, becauſe it was not ſo generally received as the goſpels, the thirteen epiſtles of Paul, and ſome of the catholic epiſtles. Mr. Wetſtein [l] hints at that reaſon. But I rather think, that by ſome it was judged proper, that the epiſtles of apoſtles ſhould immediately follow the goſpels, containing the hiſtory of our Lord himſelf: and that the hiſtory of the apoſtles, and of their preaching, written by an apoſtolical man, ſhould not precede, but rather follow their writings. For by Euſebius, as we have ſeen, the book of the Acts of the apoſtles is reckoned among ſcriptures univerſally acknowledged by catholic Chriſtians. It is ſo conſidered likewiſe by [m] Origen. And indeed, that this has been all along

[k] In epiſtolarum quidem diſpoſitione variatum eſt. In antiquiſſimis quos habemus manuſcriptis, etiam Alexandrino noſtro Paulinis præmiſſæ ſunt Catholicæ: eo quod hæ Judæis per orbem quaquaverſum diſperſis, adeoque pluribus eccleſiis inſcriptæ ſint: illæ vero ſingulis ſive eccleſiis, ſive etiam hominibus. Ne dicam, quod in iſthâc diſpoſitione rationem forſan habuerint dignitatis Apoſtolorum, a quibus ſcriptæ ſunt: ut nempe Apoſtoli Judæorum, iique jam ab initio electi a Domino, ac cum eo per omne miniſterii ipſius tempus verſati, præponerentur Paulo, ApoſtoloGentium, ac cui noviſſime omnium Chriſtus viſus erat. Poſtea autem Paulinæ poſitæ ſunt ante Catholicas. Mill. Proleg. num. 236.

[l] Apud orthodoxos vero hic Actuum liber non videtur eodem loco fuiſſe habitus, quo reliqui N. T. libri. Wetſten. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

[m] Vol. II. p. 471.

an universally acknowledged sacred book of the New Testament, appears from our collections from every age of Christianity from the beginning. See *Acts of the apostles* in the alphabetical table of matters at the end of the eleventh volume.

Mr. Wetstein [n] argues from the 85th Apostolical Canon, where the Acts of the apostles are mentioned last. To which I answer, first, that the age, when those canons were composed, is uncertain. And secondly, that order may have been there chosen out of a regard to the common rules of modesty. For it is thus: 'the [o] gospels, Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, 'two epistles of Clement, the Constitutions, and [p] the Acts of 'us the apostles.' When a man took upon himself the character of the apostles, and expressed himself in that manner, it was natural enough to reckon the book, which contained the history of their own actions, last of all. Surely, it is trifling, to form an argument from that position in this canon. And Mr. Wetstein might have observed, that in many catalogues, undoubtedly ancient, the Acts immediately follow the gospels: and that, not only in those catalogues, where St. Paul's epistles have the precedence before the catholic epistles, but in divers others likewise, where the catholic epistles precede.

III. Having made these general observations, I now propose to consider distinctly the order of these several parts of the New Testament: the gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.

1. The order of the four gospels has generally been this, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. This is their order in [q] Irenæus, [r] Origen, [s] Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, and in his ten Canons, as represented in his letter to Carpian, [t] Athanasius, [u] the council of Laodicea, [x] Epiphanius, [y] the 85th apostolical canon, [z] Gregory Nazianzen, [a] Amphilochius, [b] the Syrian catalogue, [c] Jerom, [d] Rufin, [e] Augustine, [f] the Alexandrian manuscript, [g] the Stichometry of Nicephorus, [h] Cosmas of Alexandria, [i] Junilius, an African bishop, [k] Isidore of Seville, [l] Leontius, of Constantinople. And in like man-

[n] In Can. Ap. 85. ordo librorum iste reperitur: iv. Evangelia, Epistolæ Pauli xiv. Petri, Joannis, Jacobi, Judæ, Clementis duæ, Constitutiones, Acta. Wetst. ubi supr. p. 455. [o] See vol. IV. p. 354.

[p] Και πραξεις ημων των αποστολων.

[q] Vol. II. p. 158. [r] p. 466, 470. [s] Vol. IV. p. 225. [t] p. 283, 291. [u] p. 309. [x] p. 314. [y] p. 354. [z] p. 408. [a] p. 413. [b] p. 439. [c] Vol. V. p. 32, 33, 35, 36. [d] p. 76. [e] p. 85. [f] p. 254. [g] p. 258. [h] p. 265, 266. [i] p. 277. [k] Ib. 307. [l] p. 311.

ner

ner in all authors and catalogues in general, diſtinctly taken notice of in the ſeveral volumes of this work.

Nevertheleſs in conſidering the teſtimony of Tertullian, we thought we ſaw reaſon to apprehend, that [m] in his time, in the African churches at leaſt, the goſpels were diſpoſed according to the quality of the writers: in the firſt place thoſe two, which were written by apoſtles, then the other two, written by apoſtolical men. This was inferred from ſome expreſſions in his [n] works. But perhaps the argument is not concluſive. However the four goſpels are in the ſame order in [o] ſome Latin manuſcripts, ſtill in being, and alſo in [p] the Cambridge manuſcript, which is Greek and Latin: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But by Mr. Wetſtein, we are aſſured, that [q] it is the only Greek manuſcript, in which the evangeliſts are ſo diſpoſed. For certain the other order muſt have generally prevailed.

2. Concerning the Acts the queſtion is, in which part of the New Teſtament it was generally placed by the ancients: whether in the evangelicon, or the apoſtolicon. And undoubtedly, by thoſe who mention it after St. Paul's epiſtles, or after all the epiſtles of the apoſtles, it was placed in the latter part. But, as we have ſeen, it is often mentioned by ancient writers next after the four goſpels. Was it then reckoned a part of the evangelicon, or of the apoſtolicon? From ſome paſſages of Tertullian it was formerly argued by us, that [r] the book of the Acts was placed in the ſecond part of the New Teſtament, and at the beginning of it. I would now add, that I think the ſame may be argued from Irenæus, who [s] having alleged paſſages from the four goſpels, proceeds to the Acts, and conſiders what he allegeth thence as the doctrine, particularly, of the apoſtles. And Mill ſuppoſeth, that [t] in the moſt ancient times the Acts were placed with the epiſtles,

[m] See vol. II. p. 282.

[n] Denique nobis fidem ex Apoſtolis Joannes et Matthæus inſinuant: ex apoſtolicis Lucas et Marcus inſtaurant, iiſdem regulis exorſi. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 2. p. 503. A. Vid. et ibid. cap. 5. p. 505. C. D.

[o] Vid. Joſeph Blanchini Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinæ Verſionis Antiquæ. [p] Vid. Mill. Prolegom. num. 1269.

[q] Vidit tamen, niſi admodum fallor, hunc ipſum Codicem Cantabrigienſem, qui unus et ſolus omnium Codicum Græce Scriptorum hunc ordinem ſervat. Wetſten. Prolegom. p. 28.

[r] Vol. II. p. 281, 282.

[s] Vid. Iren. contr. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. fin. et cap. xii. in.

[t] Primo loco poſita ſunt Acta Apoſtolorum. —— Subſecutæ ſunt Epiſtolæ indubitato Apoſtolicæ, quas conjugare undique liceret. Proleg. num. 195.

but before them, as the first book of that part. However, it is observable, that the Cambridge manuscript has the Acts of the apostles, though it has not the epistles. But then Mill says, that [u] volume once had the epistles, as well as the gospels. And therefore, probably, the book of the Acts stood at the head of that part, which contained the epistles. And for certain, I think it best that the historical books of the New Testament should appear together. Accordingly, as we have seen, the Acts do in many ancient catalogues immediately follow the gospels. And I wish, that Mr. Wetstein had followed that order, which now prevails, and that he had not placed the Acts of the apostles, as he has done, at the head of the catholic epistles, and after the epistles of St. Paul.

3. In the catalogues lately alleged, we have seen St. Paul's epistles sometimes preceding the catholic epistles, at other times following them. Here the order, as seems to me, is of little consequence. But I rather prefer our present order, which places St. Paul's epistles first: because, excepting only the epistle to the Hebrews, all of them have been all along universally acknowledged: whereas among the seven catholic epistles there are but two, which have not been at some times contradicted books. Moreover St. Paul's epistles immediately follow the historical books in Eusebius. Whence I am willing to infer, that it is the most ancient order.

4. I must say something about the order of St. Paul's epistles severally. Our order is that of his thirteen epistles, which have been universally acknowledged, and then the epistle to the Hebrews, about which there had been doubts in the minds of many for a good while.

Among the ancients there is some variety. To the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, Hebrews, Timothy, Titus, Philemon. So [x] in the festal epistle of Athanasius, and [y] in the Synopsis ascribed to him, and [z] in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, and [a] in the Alexandrian manuscript. In others

[u] Marci Evangelio suffixa est eti- am notula, significans, post illud proxime poni librum Actuum. Verum hæc est scribæ recentioris. Sequens enim folium, quod prima facie duodecim postremos versus epistolæ tertiæ D. Joannis exhibet, alterâ primam partem capitis primi Actorum, clare indicat Exemplar hoc jam olim, præter Evangelia et Acta, complexum fuisse Catholicas saltem Epistolas. Mill. Proleg. num. 1270.

[x] See vol. IV. p. 283.

[y] p. 291. [z] p. 309.

[a] Vol. V. p. 254.

may

may be found our preſent order, as [b] in the iambic poem of Amphilochius, the [c] Syrian catalogue in Ebedjeſu, [d] Jerom in his article of St. Paul, [e] Auguſtine in his work of the chriſtian doctrine, [f] Œcumenius, and many others.

Epiphanius, obſerving how Marcion had diſturbed the order of St. Paul's epiſtles, ſays, that [g] in ſome editions of the New Teſtament, the epiſtle to the Hebrews was the fourteenth, in others the tenth, being placed before the two epiſtles to Timothy, and the epiſtles to Titus, and Philemon: and that [h] in all good copies the epiſtle to the Romans was the firſt, not that to the Galatians, as Marcion had diſpoſed them.

Theodoret [i] and Cryſoſtom [k] have particularly taken notice, that the epiſtle to the Romans was placed firſt, though it was not the firſt in the order of time.

Concerning the reaſon of that diſpoſition of the epiſtle to the Romans, Theodoret obſerves, 'that it [l] had been placed firſt, 'as containing the moſt full and exact repreſentation of the 'chriſtian doctrine in all its branches. But ſome ſay, it had 'been ſo placed out of reſpect to the city, to which it had been 'ſent, as preſiding over the whole world.'

I have ſometimes thought, that firſt obſervation might be applied to all St. Paul's epiſtles, as the ground and reaſon of their ſituation, For the firſt five epiſtles, that to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, and the epiſtles to the Galatians, and the Epheſians, are the largeſt of St. Paul's epiſtles. And all that follow are ſhorter, excepting the epiſtle to the Hebrews, which has been placed after thoſe ſent to churches, or laſt of all, after thoſe likewiſe, which were ſent to particular perſons, becauſe its genuineneſs was not univerſally allowed of.

But the other, the dignity of the cities and people, to whom the epiſtles were ſent, has been more generally ſuppoſed to be the ground and reaſon of the order, in which they are placed. How this is repreſented by Mill, may appear in his own words, which [m] I place below.

I alſo

[b] Vol. IV. p. 413. [c] p. 439, 440.
[d] Vol. V. p. 46. [e] p. 85, 86.
[f] p. 323. [g] Hær. 42. p. 373. C.
[h] Παντα δε τα αντιγραφα τα σωα και αληθη την προς ρωμαιους εχουσι πρωτην, ουχ' ως συ μαρκιων την προς γαλατας ταξας πρωτην. H. 42. p. 373. D.
[i] Vol. V. p. 193, 194.
[k] p. 134.
[l] Προτεταχασι δε την προς ρωμαιους, ως παντοδαπην εχουσαν διδασκαλιαν, και την των δογματων ακριβειαν δια πλειονων διδασκουσαν. Τινες δε φασιν, οτι και την πολιν τιμωντες. κ. λ. Theod. Pr. in Ep. S. P. T. III. p. 6.
[m] In iis vero diſponendis (excepta una ad Hebræos, de qua mox,) ſpectata eſt omnino dignitas eccleſiarum et hominum, quibus miſſæ ſunt. Epiſtola

I alſo ſhall ſhow this, as well as I can. Epiſtles to churches are placed firſt. Afterwards thoſe to particular perſons. The epiſtles to churches are placed very much according to the rank of the cities, or places, to which they were ſent. The epiſtle to the Romans is placed firſt, becauſe Rome was the chief city of the Roman empire. The two epiſtles to the Corinthians come next, becauſe Corinth was a large, and polite, and renowned city. Galatia was a country, in which were ſeveral churches, and therefore the epiſtle to them might be placed before others, written to one church only. Nevertheleſs the epiſtles to the Romans and the Corinthians have been preferred, as is ſuppoſed, upon account of the great eminence of thoſe two cities. The epiſtle to the Epheſians follows next, becauſe Epheſus was the chief city of Aſia, ſtrictly ſo called. Afterwards follow the epiſtles to the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and the Theſſalonians. But how to account for this order, according to the method we here obſerve, I do not well know. Coloſſe indeed might be reckoned a city of inferior rank, and Philippi was a Roman colony. But Theſſalonica was the chief city of Macedonia, in which Philippi ſtood. And if the epiſtles were diſpoſed according to the dignity of places, it is not eaſy to conceive, why the two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians were placed after thoſe to the Philippians, and the Coloſſians. So that in this method, as ſeems to me, the order of the epiſtles is made out in but a lame and imperfect manner. And there may be reaſon to apprehend, that the brevity of the two epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, eſpecially of the ſecond, procured them this ſituation: though they are the firſt written epiſtles of our apoſtle, and indeed the firſt written of all the ſacred ſcriptures of the New Teſtament.

Among the epiſtles to particular perſons, thoſe to Timothy have the precedence, as he was a favourite diſciple of St. Paul, and thoſe epiſtles are the largeſt and fulleſt. The epiſtle to Titus comes next, as he was an evangeliſt. And that to Philemon is laſt, as he was ſuppoſed by many to be only a private Chriſtian. Undoubtedly Titus was a perſon of greater eminence, and in a higher ſtation than Philemon. Moreover, by

Epiſtola ad eccleſias Galatiæ, quæ erat integra provincia, merito præcedebat illas, quæ ad unam datæ erant civitatem, Laodiceam, Philippos, Coloſſenſes, Theſſalonicam. His tamen præponere viſum eſt epiſtolas ad Romanos et Corinthios, ob eminentem harum urbium dignitatem, qua provinciam iſtam ſuperare videbantur. Epiſtolas integris eccleſiis inſcriptas ſequuntur, quæ ad ſingulos homines datæ ſunt. Proleg. num. 237.

many

many the deſign of that epiſtle was thought to be of no great importance.

The epiſtle to the Hebrews is fitly enough placed after the reſt, becauſe for a while it was doubted of, as before ſaid. I likewiſe think it to be the laſt written of all St. Paul's epiſtles.

5. Some learned men, who have examined the chronology of St. Paul's epiſtles, have propoſed, that they ſhould be placed in our bibles, according to the order of time. Dr. Wall, at the end of the preface to his critical notes upon the New Teſtament, has an argument to this purpoſe.

But firſt, it will be difficult to alter the order which has been ſo long eſtabliſhed in all editions of the original Greek, and in all verſions. Secondly, The order of their times has not been yet ſettled. Many, I ſuppoſe, are of opinion, that Dr. Wall's order is not right. Muſt the order be altered again and again, to ſuit every one's fancy? That would create a very troubleſome and diſagreeable confuſion.

I think, that the knowledge of the order in which St. Paul's epiſtles were written, muſt be very entertaining and uſeful: and I have done what is in my power to find it out. But I am far from deſiring that they ſhould be placed, and bound up together, according to my calculations. Before an attempt of that kind is made, the order of time ſhould be ſettled, and determined to the general ſatisfaction of all learned and inquiſitive men. And judicious Chriſtians, who have ſtudied the chronological order of the writings of the New Teſtament, may have an advantage by it, though the books are continued in their preſent order.

6. I ſay nothing here concerning the order of the ſeven catholic epiſtles, becauſe I have ſpoken to it ſufficiently in a preceding [n] chapter.

7. Finally, the book of the Revelation is now placed the laſt of all, and has been generally ſo placed in former times, and very fitly, as [o] Mill ſays in his obſervations upon the order of the books of the New Teſtament, 'it being prophetical

[n] See p. 467, 468.

[o] Agmen vero Novi Fœderis librorum claudit Apocalypſis. Quæ cum circa diverſum plane a reliquis verſetur argumentum, atque minus apte inter Evangelia et Epiſtolas media fuiſſet interpoſita, commodiſſime in fine omnium collocata fuit: quoniam tanquam liber propheticus futura reſpicit adhuc implenda: ac denique inſignem illam habet in calce clauſulam de non addendo quidpiam iſti prophetiæ, vel ab ea detrahendo: quâ etiam ad omnes N. T. libros accommodatâ, canonem univerſum veluti obſignare, convenientiſſimum videbatur. Mill. Proleg. num. 239.

of

'of things to be hereafter fulfilled, and therefore of a different 'kind from the reſt: and having alſo near the end that remark-'able clauſe, ch. xxii. 18, 19. containing a caution againſt 'adding to, or taking from it: which may be applied to all 'the books of ſcripture.' To which might be added, that there are not wanting divers reaſons to think it is the laſt written of all the books of the New Teſtament.

CHAP. XXIV.

That the Books of the New Teſtament, conſiſting of a Collection of ſacred Writings, in two Parts, one called Goſpel, or Goſpels, or Evangelicon, the other Epiſtles, or Apoſtle, or Apoſtles, or Apoſtolicon, were early known, read, and made uſe of by Chriſtians.

THAT the goſpels, the Acts, and the epiſtles of the New Teſtament, or divers of thoſe epiſtles, were ſoon well known, much read, and collected together, may be argued from internal marks and characters, and from teſtimony.

I. Internal marks and characters are ſuch as theſe.

1. It is obvious from the nature of the thing. Who compoſes and publiſhes any works, without deſiring to have them peruſed? It is very likely therefore, that the authors of the books of the New Teſtament, who were at the pains of writing hiſtories, or epiſtles, would take care, that they ſhould be known. The ſame zeal that prompted any man to write, would induce him to provide for the publication. The importance of the ſubject would juſtify a concern to ſpread the work. All muſt allow, that there never were, and that there cannot be, any writings, containing more important facts and principles. To ſuppoſe, that any of theſe writers were indifferent about the ſucceſs and acceptance of what they had compoſed, is very abſurd and unreaſonable.

2. All the writings, of which the New Teſtament conſiſts, were addreſſed to ſome, who would ſet a great value on them, and would willingly recommend them to others. All the epiſtles, and the Revelation, as is manifeſt, are ſent to chriſtian ſocieties, or particular perſons. St. Luke's goſpel, and the Acts, were ſent to the moſt excellent, or moſt noble Theophilus. St. John intended his goſpel for ſome, whom he had in his eye. As appears from ch. xx. 30, 31. and from ch. xxi. 24, 25.

24, 25. And it is very likely, that St. Matthew, and St. Mark alſo wrote for ſome, who would gladly receive, and highly value their books, and get them copied for the uſe and ſatisfaction of others.

3. In ſeveral of the books of the New Teſtament directions are given, which would tend to make them well known. St. Paul at the end of his firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, one of his firſt written epiſtles, enjoins, *that it ſhould be read to all the holy brethren,* 1 Theſſ. v. 27. The ſame method, undoubtedly, was obſerved with regard to the ſecond epiſtle, ſent to the ſame Theſſalonians, and written not long after. Probably, the ſame practice obtained in all the chriſtian churches, to which St. Paul afterwards ſent any epiſtle. And the chriſtian people of other churches, beſide thoſe who had letters ſent to them, would be deſirous to ſee the epiſtles of their great apoſtle, by whom they had been converted, and would therefore get them tranſcribed for their own uſe. At the end of the epiſtle to the Coloſſians, ch. iv. 16. he directs: *And when this epiſtle is read among you, cauſe that it be read in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye read the epiſtle from Laodicea*: meaning, probably, the epiſtle to the Epheſians, which was to come round to Coloſſe from Epheſus, by the way of Laodicea. The apoſtle therefore was willing, and even deſirous, that his epiſtles ſhould be read by others, beſide thoſe to whom they were ſent, for the ſake of general edification. And can it be queſtioned, whether other gentile churches in theſe parts, all which were of his own planting, would not thankfully embrace the encouragement hereby given them to look into his epiſtles, and to get them tranſcribed, and read in their aſſemblies alſo?

4. St. Peter writes to this purpoſe in his ſecond epiſtle, which we may ſuppoſe to have been written in the year 64. *And account, that the long-ſuffering of the Lord is ſalvation, even as our beloved brother Paul alſo, according to the wiſdom given to him, has written unto you. As alſo in all his epiſtles, ſpeaking of theſe things, in which there are ſome things hard to be underſtood. Which they that are unlearned and unſtable wreſt, as they do the other ſcriptures, unto their own deſtruction.* 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

Here are ſeveral things to be obſerved. Firſt, Peter ſpeaks of epiſtles of Paul ſent to the ſame Chriſtians, to whom himſelf was writing. Secondly, he ſpeaks of other epiſtles of Paul: as alſo in all his epiſtles. Thirdly, Peter therefore had a knowledge

ledge of ſeveral epiſtles of Paul, ſent to the Chriſtians of thoſe countries, and likewiſe of divers others, which he intends in the phraſe, *all his epiſtles.* Fourthly, the Chriſtians, to whom Peter writes, were well acquainted with the epiſtles, which Paul had written to them, and with the reſt of his epiſtles, or divers of them. Fifthly, it is ſuppoſed, and implied, that all, or at leaſt many of Paul's epiſtles, were well known, and much read. For Peter ſpeaks of ſome, whom he calls, unlearned, and unſtable, who wreſted Paul's epiſtles, or ſome things in them, to their own deſtruction. And very probably there were other readers of the ſame epiſtles, who improved them to their edification, and ſalvation.

It ſeems to me, that what Peter ſays here, affords reaſon to think, that at the time of writing this epiſtle, Paul's epiſtles (moſt, or all of them) were well known among Chriſtians, and that Peter had good evidence of it.

When Peter ſays, *as our beloved brother Paul has written unto you:* ſome learned men, Mill [a] in particular, have ſuppoſed, that thereby Peter intended the epiſtle to the Hebrews. But I think without reaſon, as Mr. Hallett [b] has largely ſhown. St. Peter's epiſtles are addreſſed to *the ſtrangers ſcattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia.* It is not unlikely therefore, that St. Peter intends Paul's epiſtles to the Galatians, and the Epheſians, and the Coloſſians, all ſituated in thoſe countries: and likewiſe the two epiſtles to Timothy, who reſided much at Epheſus, and muſt have received the epiſtles written to him, when in that city, and the epiſtle to Philemon, who was of Coloſſe. And in the expreſſion, *all his epiſtles*, ſome others muſt be intended, and included: ſuch as the epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, the Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, Titus: ſo many, however, as the apoſtle Peter was then acquainted with. Mill has obſerved paſſages in [c] the firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, and in [d] the epiſtle to the Romans, and in [e] that to the Philippians: in which are *ſome of thoſe things hard to be underſtood,* to which St. Peter may be ſuppoſed to have an eye.

Theſe marks and characters there are in the books of the New Teſtament, which may induce us to believe, that they were ſoon diſperſed among Chriſtians, and well known to them.

[a] Prolegom. num. 86.
[b] See his introduction to the epiſtle to the Hebrews, p. 21. &c.
[c] Proleg. num. 5.
[d] Ib. num. 28.
[e] Ib. num. 70.

II. This

II. This is alſo manifeſt from teſtimony.

1. The accounts, which we find in the ancients, concerning the occaſions of the ſeveral goſpels, lead us to think, that they were ſoon ſpread abroad after they were written. Matthew is ſaid to have written his goſpel at the requeſt of the believers in Judea: and Mark his, at the deſire of the Chriſtians at Rome, for the aſſiſtance of their memories. When therefore thoſe goſpels had been written, divers copies would be ſoon taken, that the ends, for which they had been written, might be anſwered. The ſeveral defective and imperfect accounts, which had been publiſhed of our Lord's words and works, induced St. Luke to write. And when his fuller and exacter account was publiſhed, it muſt have been attended to, and would be tranſcribed, and communicated to many. Before St. John wrote, he had ſeen the other three goſpels. And the Chriſtians in Aſia, where he reſided, were acquainted with them. Therefore they were well known, and joined together. And when his goſpel was written, undoubtedly it was added to them, and they were all joined together in one volume, for general uſe.

That the firſt three goſpels were well known in the world, before St. John wrote, is ſuppoſed by Euſebius of Cæſarea, who was well acquainted with the writings of Chriſtians before his time. Theſe are the words of that eminent man. Having ſpoken of St. Matthew's goſpel, he goes on: 'And [r] when 'Mark and Luke had publiſhed the goſpels according to them, 'it is ſaid, that John, who all this while had preached by 'word of mouth, was induced to write for this reaſon. The 'three firſt written goſpels being now delivered to all men, 'and to John himſelf, it is ſaid, that he approved them.' And what follows. Before this laſt evangeliſt wrote, the *other three goſpels had been delivered unto all men, and to John.* He therefore had ſeen them before, and they were in the hands of many people.

What has been now ſaid of the goſpels, is applicable, in a great meaſure, to the Acts, and the epiſtles of the New Teſtament: as may be perceived by all, without my enlarging any farther.

2. Ignatius, who was honoured with the crown of martyrdom about the year 107, does, in his epiſtles, uſe expreſſions, denoting [s] two codes, or collections, one of goſpels, the other

[r] See vol. IV. p. 225.

[s] See vol. II. p. 81, 82, 85, and vol. V. p. 355, 356, 358.

of

of epiſtles of apoſtles. Such volumes there were then, and may have been ſome good while before.

I ſhall here remind my readers of a few other like inſtances. In the epiſtle to Diognetus, certainly very ancient, and by ſome aſcribed to Juſtin Martyr, are theſe expreſſions: 'The 'fear of the Lord [h] is celebrated, and the grace of the prophets 'is known, the faith of the goſpel is eſtabliſhed, and the tradi-'tion of the apoſtles is kept.' By theſe laſt expreſſions denoting, as is reaſonable to think, a volume of the goſpels, and another of epiſtles of apoſtles. Irenæus ſpeaks of the evangelic and apoſtolic writings in a paſſage, which will be alleged preſently. Tertullian ſpeaks [i] of 'the ſayings of the prophets, the goſpels, and the apoſtles.' And in another place ſays: 'This [k] I perceive both in the goſpels, and the apoſtles.' I go no lower, my intention at preſent being only to allege a few writers of the earlieſt times.

3. As before ſhown [l] from Euſebius, they who in the reign of Trajan, about the year 112, travelled abroad to teach the chriſtian religion in remote countries, 'took with them the ſcriptures of the divine goſpels.' Nor can there be any reaſon to doubt, that our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian here ſpeaks of the four goſpels, ſo well known in his own time.

4. By Juſtin Martyr, about the year 140, in his account of the chriſtian worſhip, which is in his apology to the emperor and ſenate of Rome, the whole world was aſſured, that [m] the goſpels, which he calls Memoirs of the apoſtles, and their companions, were publicly read in the aſſemblies of Chriſtians every Lord's day.

Certainly, the goſpels were then well known, and had been ſo for ſome while before.

5. Tatian, who flouriſhed ſome time before and after the year 170, compoſed a harmony of the four goſpels. We [n] have full aſſurance of it. Is not this ſufficient evidence, that the goſpels were then, and had been for a good while, generally known, and in common uſe? And does it not alſo afford reaſon to believe, that it was then, and had been for ſome while, an eſtabliſhed, or generally received opinion among

[h] See vol. II. p. 133.

[i] Compendiis paucorum verborum, quot attinguntur edicta Prophetarum, Evangeliorum, Apoſtolorum? De Oratione cap. 9. p. 125. C. quoted vol. II. p. 280.

[k] p. 281.

[l] See vol. II. p. 105, and vol. V. p. 358.

[m] See vol. II. p. 121, 122, and vol. V. p. 359.

[n] See vol. II. p. 137, 158, 414. and vol. V. p. 360.

Chriſtians,

Chriſtians, that there were four, and no more than four authentic memoirs or hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt?

6. I forbear to allege any thing from Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, or Tertullian, for ſhowing the notoriety of the books of the New Teſtament in early times, becauſe I now inſiſt only upon writers of the higheſt antiquity. But I ſhall take notice of ſome things, which we have in the accounts of the hereſies of the ſecond century.

However, that this argument may not be too prolix, I entirely paſs by Baſilides.

7. Valentinus is placed by Cave [o] as flouriſhing about the year 120. By Baſnage [p] he is placed at the year 124. By Mill [q] between 123, and 127. And by Irenæus we are aſſured, 'that [r] the Valentinians endeavoured to ſupport their 'opinions from texts of the evangelic and apoſtolic ſcrip-'tures,' or of the goſpels and apoſtles, that is, both parts of the New Teſtament: 'and that [s] they argued eſpecially from the goſpel according to John.'

And Tertullian allows, that [t] Valentinus uſed the books of the New Teſtament entire, without altering them, as Marcion did.

Mr. Wetſtein ſays, the [u] Valentinians rejected the Acts of the apoſtles. And he thinks this appears from Irenæus. But to me it appears manifeſt from Irenæus, that they received the Acts. For in his confutation of them, in his third book againſt hereſies, he [x] argues againſt them largely, firſt from the goſpels, then from the book of the Acts, and laſtly from the epiſtles of apoſtles. And Maſſuet, the learned Benedictine editor of Irenæus, allows, that [y] according to that

[o] Hiſt. Lit. p. 50. [p] Ann. 124. num. vii. [q] Proleg. num. 265. [r] Και ου μονον εκ των ευαγγελικων, και των αποστολικων πειρωνται τας αποδειξεις ποιεισθαι. Iren. l. i. c. 3. n. 6. p. 17.

[s] Hi autem qui a Valentino ſunt, eo quod eſt ſecundum Joannem pleniſſime utentes, ad oſtenſionem conjugationum ſuarum, ex ipſo detegentur, nihil recte dicentes. Id. l. 3. cap. xi. n. 7. p. 190.

[t] Alius manu ſcripturas, alius ſenſus expoſitione intervertit. Neque enim ſi Valentinus integro inſtrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exerte et palam machæra, non ſtilo uſus eſt: quoniam ad materiam ſuam cædem ſcripturarum confecit. Valentinus autem pepercit: quoniam non ad materiam ſcripturas, ſed materiam ad ſcripturas, excogitavit. De Præſc. Hær. cap. 38. p. 246. [u] Acta Apoſtolorum rejecerunt Valentiniani. Quod conſtat ex Irenæo. Hær. iii. 2. Wetſten. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

[x] Vid. Iren. contr. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. xii. [y] At ipſi Valentino

that ancient writer, the Valentinians did not reject any books of the New Teſtament.

Irenæus, as we have juſt ſeen, ſays, that the Valentinians endeavoured to ſupport their opinions by the evangelic and apoſtolic ſcriptures. The Acts were included in this ſecond volume of the New Teſtament, according to the method of the ancient Chriſtians.

8. Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, is ſuppoſed by [z] Grabe to have been contemporary with his maſter, Valentinus, and to have appeared about the year 123. However, he might continue a good while after that. Baſnage [a] ſpeaks of him at the year 125. And Cave [b] placeth him at 126. They who are ſo pleaſed, may recollect what was ſaid of his age [c] formerly.

Heracleon ſeems to have written commentaries upon ſeveral parts of the New Teſtament. Clement of Alexandria having quoted the words of Matt. x. 32. or Luke xii. 8. and of Luke xii. 11, 12. ſays: 'Heracleon [d] explaining this place has theſe very words;' which I need not tranſcribe at preſent, though it be a valuable paſſage. There is in Clement [e] another ſhort paſſage of Heracleon's commentary upon St. Luke.

Origen, in his commentary upon St. John's goſpel, often quotes Heracleon. The paſſages of Heracleon's commentary upon that goſpel, with Origen's remarks, are collected by [f] Grabe. And from him they have been placed by Maſſuet in his appendix to Irenæus. The paſſages of Heracleon, quoted by Origen, are above forty-in number, and ſome of them long.

Heracleon's commentaries upon the goſpels of St. Luke, and St. John, are an early proof of the reſpect ſhown to the

tino nihil ſimile uſquam adſcribit Irenæus. Imo tum loco mox citato, tum lib. I. cap. viii. et ix. et alibi paſſim, ſatis ſignificat, Valentinianos ſibi coævos ſic canonem ſcripturarum novo Evangelio auxiſſe, ut nihil quidquam, nullum librum integrum, nullam ejuſdem partem, (quod Marcioni non ſemel exprobat) ab eo abjeciſſent: ſed *vel parabolas Dominicas, vel dictiones Prophcticas, aut ſermones Apoſtolicas*, ad hypotheſim ſuam aptare conatos, calumniam intuliſſe Scripturis. Maſſuet. Diſſ. i. num. ix. p. xvii.

[z] Spicil. T. I. p. 62. T. II. p. 69. et 80. [a] Ann. 125. num. iii. [b] H. L. p. 53. [c] Vol. II. p. 239, 240, note (F.)

[d] Τουτον εξηγουμενος τον τοπον ηρακλεων. ——κατα λεξιν φησιν. ——Strom. l. 4. p. 502. A——D.

[e] Vid. Eclog. Proph. ap. Cl. Al. p. 804. D. et Grabe Spic. T. II. p. 85. [f] Spic. T. II. p. 85—117.

books

books of the New Teſtament. And it may be reaſonable to think, that others beſide Heracleon, both catholics and heretics, publiſhed about the ſame time commentaries upon ſome of the books of the New Teſtament.

Origen [g] has at once given us Heracleon's obſervations upon Matt. viii. 12. and Iſ. i. 2.

Heracleon likewiſe received St. Paul, and his writings. For [h] he quotes, as his, the beginning of the twelfth chapter of the epiſtle to the Romans. Moreover Origen [i] has given us Heracleon's interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.

I might add here ſome other things. But this is ſufficient to ſhow, that in the very early days of Chriſtianity, the books of the New Teſtament were well known, much uſed, and greatly reſpected.

9. Marcion about [k] the year 138, placed by ſome [l] ſooner, in 127, or 130, had, and probably, in imitation of other Chriſtians, a [m] goſpel, and an apoſtle, or an evangelicon, and apoſtolicon.

In the former, as is generally ſaid, was [n] St. Luke's goſpel only, and that curtailed. But Mr. Lampe ſays, that [o] Marcion

[g] Origen. Comm. in Joan. T. II. p. 256. C. Huet. [h] —— καθ' ο και ο αποστολος διδασκει, λεγων, λογικην λατρειαν την τοιαυτην θεοσεβειαν. Ap. Orig. ib. p. 217. E. et Grabe Spic. p. 101. [i] Ap. Orig. ib. p. 255. D. et Grabe. p. 110.

[k] Vid. Pagi Ann. 144. n. iii. et Aſſeman. Bib. Or. T. I. p. 389. note (4.) [l] Vid. Cav. H. L. p. 54. &c. S. Baſnag. ann. 131. iii. —— v. 133. iv. Mill. Prol. num. 306, 307. [m] Adamant. Απο ποιων γραφων δειξαι ταυτα επαγγελλη; Marc. Απο τε Ευαγγελιε κα. τε Αποστολε. Dial. contr. Marcion. Sect. 2. p. 54. Baſil. 1674. p. 821. D. T. I. Bened. Vid. et Epiph. H. 42. n. ix.

[n] Et ſuper hæc, id quod eſt ſecundum Lucam Evangelium circumcidens. Iren. l. 1. cap. 27. 2. al. cap. 29.

Nam ex iis Commentatoribus, quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegiſſe, quem cæderet. Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 4. cap. 2. p. 503. Vid. et Epiph. Hær. 42. n. ix.

[o] Verum hinc quoque plus elicitur, quam voluit Marcion. Non enim aſſerere Marcion auſus eſt, Evangelia, quæ extra Lucam habemus, eſſe conficta et falſo Evangeliſtis ſuppoſita. Nemo Patrum antiquiorum hujus criminis Marcionem accuſavit. *Id tantum voluit*, Lucæ Evangelium, ductu Pauli conſcriptum, reliquis Evangeliis præferendum eſſe. —— Clariſſima hæc eſſe puto. Et quod prætenſionem interpolationis attinet, hujus inſigne ſtatim cap. 7. [lib. 4. contr. Marc.] exemplum affertur: *Cæterum et loco et illuminationis opere ſecundum prædicationem occurrentibus Chriſto, jam cum Prophetam incipimus agnoſcere, oſtendentem in primo ingreſſu veniſſe ſe, non ut Legem et Prophetas diſſolveret, ſed ut potens adimpleret. Hoc enim Marcion, ut additum eraſit.* Cum enim hæc verba Matthæi v. 17. inveniantur, hinc inferimus, Marcionem Evangelium Matthæi non ſimpliciter

cion did not reject the other goſpels, though he preferred St. Luke's. This he infers from a paſſage in Tertullian, which ſeems to ſhow, that Marcion did not reject St. Matthew's goſpel.

I ſhall add another from Iſidore of Peluſium, where he ſays: 'Take [p] the goſpel [or the evangelicon] of Marcion, 'and you will preſently ſee at the very beginning, a proof of 'their impudence. For they have left out our Lord's ge- 'nealogy from David and Abraham. And if you proceed 'a little farther, you will ſee another inſtance of their wick- 'edneſs, in altering our Lord's words. *I came not*, ſays he, '*to deſtroy the law or the prophets.* But they have made it 'thus: *Think ye, that I came to fulfil the law, or the prophets? 'I am come to deſtroy, not to fulfil.*' Matt. v. 17.

It might be alſo argued from the dialogue againſt the Marcionites, that they uſed St. Matthew's goſpel. But I forbear to allege any places in particular.

So that it may be reckoned probable, that Marcion did not reject any of the four goſpels. But undoubtedly he made alterations in them, agreeable to his own particular opinion, under a pretence, that [q] they had been corrupted by ſome before his time.

Perhaps [r] Marcion filled up St. Luke's goſpel out of the reſt, taking from them ſuch things as ſuited his purpoſe. Tertullian ſays, that [s] his goſpel, or evangelicon, had no title.

ſimpliciter negaſſe, ſed quæcunque erroribus ejus non patrocinabantur, pro lubitu eraſiſſe. Atque ita procul dubio etiam cum reliquis Evangeliſtis egit. Lampe Proleg. ad Joan. Evang. l. 2. cap. 1. n. iv. p. 136, 137.

[p] Ει προϊσχεται ο της μαρκιωνος συνηγορος βλασφημιας, το παρ' εκεινοις ονομαζομενον ευαγγελιον λαβων αναγνωθι, και ευρησεις ευθυς εν προοιμιω την ατοπιαν. Αυτην γαρ την καταγωσαν επι χριστον απο δαβιδ και αβρααμ γενεαλογιαν απετεμεν. Και μικρον υστερον προιων αλλην οψει κακονοιαν. Αμειψαντες γαρ την τε κυριε φωνην, Ουκ ηλθον, λεγοντος, καταλυσαι, τον νομον, η τες προφητας, εποιησαν· Δοκειτε, οτι ηλθον πληρωσαι τον νομον, η τες προφητας; Ηλθον καταλυσαι, αλλ' ε πληρωσαι. Iſid. Pel. l. i. ep. 371.

[q] Vid. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 4. [r] Occurrit primo loco Marcion et Marcionitæ, qui corruperunt libros N. T. reſectis omnibus iis, quæ Judaicæ religioni favere putabant, et contracto toto N. T. in duos codices, quorum priorem vocabant Evangelium, ex Lucâ maximam partem conflatum, et ſubinde ex reliquis Evangeliſtis integratum. Wetſt. Proleg. N. T. tom. I. p. 79. [s] Contra Marcion Evangelio, ſcilicet ſuo, nullum aſcribit auctorem: quaſi non licuerit illi titulum quoque adfingere, cui nefas non fuit ipſum corpus evertere. Et poſſem hic jam gradum figere, non agnoſcendum contendens

title. That may have been the reaſon of it. And we can hence conclude, that in very ancient times, among the catholics, the four goſpels were entitled, and inſcribed, with the names of the ſeveral evangeliſts. Which [t] has been denied, or doubted of by ſome.

Marcion had alſo an apoſtolicon. In this were ten epiſtles only of St. Paul, and thoſe diminiſhed, at leaſt ſome of them. Their order according to him, as we are informed by [u] Epiphanius, was this: the epiſtle to the Galatians, the firſt and ſecond to the Corinthians, to the Romans, the firſt and ſecond to the Theſſalonians, to the Epheſians, the Coloſſians, Philemon, the Philippians.

He received not any other epiſtles of St. Paul. It is ſuppoſed likewiſe, that he rejected the catholic epiſtles, and the Revelation. Whether he received the Acts of the apoſtles, I cannot ſay certainly: though [x] ſome learned men think, he did not receive them. But then it ſhould be obſerved by us, that [y] the Marcionite apoſtolicon was reckoned very defective by the catholic Chriſtians.

And it may be inferred from the accounts, which we have in the beſt writers of the moſt early ages, that Marcion was the moſt arbitrary, and moſt licentious of all the ancient heretics, in his judgment concerning the ſcriptures that ſhould be received, and in his manner of treating ſuch as were received by him. So that his opinion can be no prejudice to the genuineneſs, or the notoriety of any of thoſe books of the New Teſtament, which were received by the catholics, and indeed by moſt heretics likewiſe. I ſhall place below [z] a remarkable paſſage of Irenæus, where he ſays: ‘ Marcion and his followers curtail the ſcriptures with great ‘ aſſurance,

dens opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam conſtantiam præferat, nullam fidem repromittat de plenitudine tituli, et profeſſione debita auctoris. Contr. Marc. l. 4. cap. 2. [t] Vid. Mill. Prol. num. 347. [u] Hær. 42. num. ix. et alibi.

[x] Acta Apoſtolorum rejecerunt Marcionitæ. —— Tertullianus adv. Marcionem liv. v. cap. 2. *Si ex hoc congruunt Paulo Apoſtolorum Acta, cur ea reſpuatis, jam apparet.* Wetſt. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

[y] Προενεγκε το αποστολικον σου, ει και τα μαλιστα περικεκομμενον εστι. Dialog. adv. Marcion. ſect. i. p. 8. Baſil. p. 806. T. I. Bened.

[z] Unde et Marcion, et qui ab eo ſunt, ad intercidendas converſi ſunt Scripturas, quaſdam quidem in totum non cognoſcentes, ſecundum Lucam autem Evangelium, et Epiſtolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc ſola legitima eſſe dicunt, quæ ipſi minoraverunt. —— Reliqui vero omnes falſo ſcientiæ nomine inflati Scrip-

'aſſurance, rejecting ſome entirely, and diminiſhing the 'goſpel according to Luke, and the epiſtles of Paul, affirm-'ing thoſe parts of them alone to be genuine, which they 'have preſerved.——All others, who are puffed up with 'the ſcience falſely ſo called, receive the ſcriptures, whilſt 'they pervert them by wrong interpretations.'

In another place he ſays, 'that [a] Marcion alone had openly dared to curtail the ſcriptures.' And my readers can eaſily recollect, how [b] ſeverely Tertullian cenſures Marcion [c] for altering the text of the ſcriptures, openly employing a knife, as he ſays, not a ſtyle, to render them agreeable to his erroneous opinions.

However, I think, here is full proof, that the books of the New Teſtament were well known in Marcion's time, and before him: and that they were collected together in two parts or volumes, an evangelicon and apoſtolicon. He and other Chriſtians had a goſpel and an apoſtle. But theirs were fuller than his.

10. We might, perhaps, not unprofitably recollect here thoſe [d] paſſages of Euſebius of Cæſarea, where he ſpeaks of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament: ſome of which were univerſally received, others were contradicted: divers of which laſt, nevertheleſs, were received by many. The univerſally received by the ſounder part of Chriſtians were the four goſpels, the Acts of the apoſtles, thirteen epiſtles of Paul, one of Peter, one of John. It may be reckoned not unlikely, that all theſe had been from ancient time inſerted by moſt Chriſtians in their two volumes of the goſpel and apoſtle. And, probably, divers of the other books, called controverted, or contradicted, were joined with the reſt in the volumes of a good number of Chriſtians.

III. There are ſome obſervations of Mr. Henry Dodwell concerning the late forming of the canon of the New Teſtament, which cannot be eaſily overlooked, and ſeem to require ſome notice in this place.

turas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt. Iren. adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. xii. n. 12. p. 198. b. Maſſuet.

[a] Sed huic quidem, quoniam et ſolus manifeſte auſus eſt circumcidere Scripturas, &c. Iren. l. i. cap. 27. n. 4. p. 106. al. cap. 29. Vid. ib. num. 2. [b] See vol. II. p. 278. [c] Marcion enim exerte palam machæra, non ſtilo uſus eſt: quoniam ad materiam ſuam cædem Scripturarum confecit. De Præſcr. Hær. cap. 38. p. 246. C.

[d] See vol. IV. p. 224—231.

1. He

1. He ſays, 'that [e] the canon of the ſacred books was not 'determined, nor what number of them ſhould be of autho-'rity in points of faith, before the time of the emperor Tra-'jan, who began his reign in the year of Chriſt 98.'

Anſw. If hereby be meant all the books of our preſent canon, this may be true. But then it is a trifling propoſition. For ſome of them were not written, or have been ſuppoſed by many not to have been written, till near the end of the firſt century. How then could they be ſooner made a part of ſacred ſcripture? or how could they be placed in the number of books, eſteemed to be the rule of faith? But the firſt three goſpels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and poſſibly the fourth likewiſe, St. John's, and many of the epiſtles of the New Teſtament, were well known before the reign of Trajan, even as ſoon as they were written. And wherever they were known, and by whomſoever they were received, they were reckoned a part of the rule of faith.

2. The ſame learned man ſays likewiſe: the [f] canonical 'ſcriptures of the New Teſtament lay hid in the cabinets of 'particular churches, and private perſons, till the reign of 'Trajan, and perhaps till the reign of Adrian.'

But I preſume, we have juſt now ſufficiently ſhown the falſhood of this, and that the goſpels, and other books of the New Teſtament, were written and publiſhed with a deſign to be read, and made uſe of, and that they were ſoon divulged abroad, and not purpoſely hid by any.

3. Farther, ſays Mr. Dodwell: 'The [g] epiſtles of Paul 'were well known ſoon after they were written. His many 'travels, and the mark of his hand at the end of them, 'occaſioned this.'

[e] Atqui certe ante illam epocham, quam dixi, Trajani, nondum conſtitutus eſt librorum ſacrorum canon, nec receptus aliquis in eccleſia catholica librorum certus numerus, quos deinde adhibere oportuerit in ſacris fidei cauſſis dijudicandis, nec rejecti hæreticorum pſeudepigraphi, monitive fideles, ut ab eorum uſu deinde caverent. Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. i. num. 39. in. p. 67.

[f] Latitabant enim uſque ad recentiora illa ſeu Trajani, ſeu etiam fortaſſe Hadriani tempora, in privatarum eccleſiarum, ſeu etiam hominum ſcriniis, ſcripta illa canonica, ne ad eccleſiæ catholicæ notitiam pervenirent. Ibid. num. 38, p. 66.

[g] Sequuntur Epiſtolæ Paulinæ, quas a prima uſque ſcriptione celeberrimas fecere ipſius Apoſtoli tam crebræ peregrinationes, et nota ejus in omni epiſtola manus.—Proinde meminit eorum et Petrus, meminit S. Clemens, meminit Ignatius, et Polycarpus. Ibid. num. 41, p. 73.

We readily acknowledge it. It is very true. We think alſo, that the goſpels, the Acts, and other books of the New Teſtament, were well known ſoon after they were written: and that in a ſhort ſpace of time many copies were taken of them, and thus they were divulged abroad. The firſt three goſpels were well known to St. John, and to many others, before he wrote his goſpel. Which muſt have been written before the end of the firſt century, and, probably, a good while before the end of it.

4. The ſame learned writer, ſpeaking of the apoſtolical fathers, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, ſays, they [h] ſeveral times quote apocryphal books. And he ſo expreſſeth himſelf, as if he intended to affirm this of all of them.

To which I muſt anſwer, that ſo far as I am able to perceive, after a careful examination, there are not any quotations of apocryphal books in any of the apoſtolical fathers. They who are deſirous of farther ſatisfaction therein, are referred to their ſeveral chapters in the ſecond volume of this work, and to [i] ſome additional obſervations in the Recapitulation of the ſecond part of the Credibility, which is in the fifth volume.

5. Once more. The ſame learned writer ſays, 'that [k] 'before the reign of Trajan the pſeudepigraphal books of 'heretics had not been rejected. Nor had the faithful 'been cautioned, not to make uſe of them.'

Which appears to me an obſervation of little or no importance. If thoſe pſeudepigraphal books were not in being before the reign of Trajan, how ſhould they be rejected before that time? That they were not ſooner in being, has been [l] ſufficiently ſhown. They are the productions of heretics, who aroſe in the ſecond century: who aſſerted two principles, had a diſadvantageous opinion of marriage, and denied the real humanity of our Saviour. In that ſecond century many pſeudepigraphal goſpels, Acts, travels, or circuits of apoſtles were compoſed. Which were afterwards made uſe of by the Manichees, the Priſcillianiſts, and ſome others.

[h] Habemus hodieque horum temporum ſcriptores eccleſiaſticos luculentiſſimos, Clementem Romanum, Barnabam, Hermam, Ignatium, Polycarpum.—Sed et apocrypha adhibent iidem aliquoties, quæ certum eſt in hodiernis non haberi Evangeliis. Ibid. n. 39, p. 67.

[i] See vol. V. p. 358, 412, &c.

[k] See before, p. 661, note [c].

[l] Vol. V. p. 415, 416.

But

But thoſe pſeudepigraphal books of heretics never were joined with the genuine writings of the apoſtles and evangeliſts. They were always diſtinguiſhed from them, and were eſteemed by all catholic Chriſtians in general to be of little value, and no authority. As appears from our collections out of ancient authors, and particularly from the accounts given of thoſe books by [m] the learned biſhop of Cæſarea, at the beginning of the fourth century.

CHAP. XXV.

The Queſtion conſidered, whether any ſacred Books of the New Teſtament have been loſt.

THERE is a queſtion, which has been propoſed by ſome learned men: whether any ſacred books of the New Teſtament, or any epiſtles of apoſtles and evangeliſts, written by Divine inſpiration, have been loſt? And ſome have taken the affirmative, particularly, [a] Mr. John Ens, and [b] Mr. C. M. Pfaff, in a work, publiſhed by him in the early part of his life. Herman Witſius likewiſe [c] has argued on the ſame ſide in ſeveral of his works.

I. Here, in the firſt place, I obſerve, that ſome ſuppoſitions have been made, and propoſitions laid down by learned men, which may form a prejudice in favour of the affirma-

[m] See vol. IV. p. 228, 229, and vol. V. p. 412, 413.—160.

[a] Et certe, pace et incolumi amicitia diſſentientium id dictum ſit, affirmativa nobis eligi debere videtur ſententia, et concedi, quod multi divini libri perierint. Joh. Ens Bibliotheca Sacra, cap. 4. § iv. p. 19. Amſt. 1710.

Itaque hoc miſſo, inſpiciamus et rite perpendamus, quid probationi inſerviat, ad evincendum, quod Apoſtoli plura exararint ſcripta vere θεοπνευστα et divina, quam nunc extant. Id. ib. § vi. p. 22.

[b] Chr. Matth. Pfaffii Diſſertatio Critica de genuinis Librorum N. T. Lectionibus, p. 46—48. Amſt. 1709.

[c] Coccejus aſſeveranter dicit, Judam præter hanc epiſtolam non ſcripſiſſe, neque neceſſe habuiſſe ſcribere, neque a Spiritu Sancto impulſum fuiſſe ut ſcriberet. Id mihi non videtur certum, imo nec probabile. Apoſtoli enim quum univerſalis Eccleſiæ doctores et directores eſſent, et corpore ubique præſentes eſſe non poſſent, et frequenter ſine dubio ab eccleſiis conſulerenter, neceſſe habuerunt frequenter ſcribere.——Non autem magis opus fuit omnes Apoſtolorum epiſtolas ſuperſtites manere, quam omnes ſermones Chriſti. Sufficiunt quos habemus, ad perfectum canonem. Witſ. Comment. in Ep. S. Jud. § xii. p. 463. Vid. Id. De Vita Pauli Apoſtoli. ſect. 7. n. xi. ſect. 8. n. xxi. et. ſect. 12. n. xvi.

tive ſide of the queſtion, but afford no proof. Such things ſhould not be advanced by fair diſputants.

As firſt, that [d] the apoſtles of Chriſt were ever ready to ſerve all the exigencies of the church; which is very true. And yet it does not follow, that any epiſtles, or other writings, were compoſed by them for the general uſe of Chriſtians, beſide thoſe which we have. And, ſecondly, that [e] it is unlikely, that all the apoſtles of Chriſt ſhould have written no more letters, than now remain: as it is alſo, that [f] Paul ſhould have written no more than fourteen epiſtles. Theſe, and ſuch like obſervations, though adopted by [g] Witſius, as well as ſome others, I chooſe to diſmiſs without a particular diſcuſſion, as they contain not any real argument.

A man, who thinks of our Lord's great character, and the unparalleled excellence of his diſcourſes, and the great number of his miraculous works, and that he had twelve apoſtles, and ſeventy other diſciples, employed by him, all zealous for the honour of their Maſter, and the good of his people, might be diſpoſed to ſay: certainly, there were many goſpels, or authentic hiſtories of his life, written before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. And yet, if there is any credit to be given to eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, when John was deſired to write his goſpel, about the time of that event, or after it; there were brought to him no more than three goſpels, to be confirmed by him, or to have ſome additions made to them. One of which only had been written by an

[d] Prima obſervatio eſt, quod alacres et paratiſſimi fuerint Apoſtoli ad omnia conferenda, quæ uſui et utilitati Eccleſiæ inſervire poterant. Ens ubi ſupra. § xx. p. 35.

[e] Porro attendamus, ſecundo, quod quatuordecim habeamus epiſtolas a ſolo Paulo conſcriptas, et judicet unuſquiſque, an ſibi probabile videatur, Bartholomæum, Thomam, Jacobum Alphæi, Andream, Philippum, et Simonem Zelotem, quorum nulla habemus ſcripta, ne unicam quidem ad Eccleſiæ ædificationem epiſtolam ſcripſiſſe, atque, Jacobum et Judam unicam tantum, Petrum duas, et Joannem tres exaraſſe: quum Paulus toties ſcripſerit. Ens ib. § xxiii. p. 38.

[f] Immo nec illud veritatis ſpeciem habet, ipſum Paulum non plures quam quatuordecim epiſtolas ſcripſiſſe. Quod tertio obſervari velim. Id. § xxv. p. 41.

[g] Nullus equidem dubito, quin Apoſtoli omnes pro ſingulari ſuâ diligentiâ frequentiſſimas literas ad eccleſias curæ ſuæ commiſſas dederint: quibus præſentes ſemper adeſſe non licebat, et quibus multa tamen identidem habebant inculcanda. Witſ. De Vita Pauli. ſect. 7. num. xi. p. 98.

Laudanda profecto Dei benignitas eſt, quod ex tot Paulinis epiſtolis, quæ perierunt, hanc tamen [*ad Philem.*] mole exiguam, et de re domeſtica agentem, ſuperare voluerit. Id. ib. ſect. 12. num. xvi.

apoſtle,

apoſtle, even Matthew's. And it is the concurrent teſtimony of all chriſtian antiquity, that there were but four goſpels, written by apoſtles, and apoſtolical men. And yet we have no reaſon to ſay, that the true intereſt of mankind has not been duly conſulted.

II. I obſerve, ſecondly: it is generally allowed by learned men, and by [h] Mr. Ens, and [i] Witſius, that the epiſtles to the Theſſalonians are among the firſt of St. Paul's epiſtles, that remain, or were written by him. And I think, that the concluſion of the firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians ſuggeſts a very probable argument, that it is the firſt epiſtle, which was written by him with divine and apoſtolical authority for the edification of Chriſtians. The words intended by me, are thoſe of 1 Theſſ. v. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this epiſtle be read unto all the holy brethren.* This, as [k] was formerly obſerved, I take to be the firſt inſtance of enjoining the reading of a chriſtian writing in their religious aſſemblies, as a part of their worſhip. Chriſtian people had before now, very probably, read in that manner the books of the Old Teſtament. St. Paul, who knew the fulneſs of the apoſtolical inſpiration, aſſerts his authority, and requires, that the ſame reſpect ſhould be now ſhown to his epiſtle, and that it ſhould be publicly read among them for their general edification. If any ſuch thing had been done before, there would not have been occaſion for ſo much earneſtneſs, as is expreſſed in this direction. This epiſtle is ſuppoſed to have been written in the year 52, conſequently, not till near twenty years after our Lord's aſcenſion. If this be the firſt epiſtle of Paul, written with apoſtolical authority; there were no ſacred writings of his of a more ancient date to be loſt. And his other remaining epiſtles are as many, as could be reaſonably expected.

III. There are many conſiderations, tending to ſatisfy us, that no ſacred writings of the apoſtles of Chriſt are loſt.

1. The four goſpels, which we have, were written [l] for the ſake of thoſe, who certainly would receive them with reſpect, keep them with care, and recommend them to others. And if any other ſuch authentic hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt had been

[h] Ens ubi ſupra. § xxviii. p. 45.

[i] At nobis de Paulinis Epiſtolis nunc eſt agendum: quarum quæ ſuperſunt primas eſſe conſtat utramque ad Theſſalonicenſes, Corinthi, ut initio dixi, ſcriptas. Ubi ſupra ſect. 7. num. xii. p. 99.

[k] See before, p. 304.

[l] See vol. IV. p. 240.

written

written by apoſtles, or apoſtolical men, they would have been received, and preſerved in the like manner, and would not have been loſt.

2. We can perceive, from the teſtimony of divers ancient chriſtian writers, that [m] the book of the Acts, which we ſtill have, was the only authentic hiſtory of the preaching of the apoſtles after our Lord's aſcenſion, which they had in their hands, or had heard of. Conſequently, there was no other ſuch hiſtory to be loſt.

3. The epiſtles of Paul, James, Peter, John, Jude, were ſent to churches, people, or particular perſons, who would ſhow them great regard, when received, and would carefully preſerve them, and readily communicate them to others, that they might take copies of them, and make uſe of them, for their eſtabliſhment in religion and virtue. If thoſe apoſtles had written other epiſtles, and if other apoſtles had ſent epiſtles to churches planted by them, or to particular perſons, their diſciples, or chriſtian friends, the caſe would have been much the ſame. Thoſe epiſtles would have been eſteemed, preſerved, and frequently copied, and could not eaſily have been loſt.

4. Moreover, the apoſtles, and evangeliſts, who drew up any writings for the inſtruction, or confirmation of chriſtian people, muſt have been careful of them. The ſame principle of zeal for the doctrine taught by them, and for the welfare of chriſtian people, which induced them, amidſt their many labours, fatigues, and difficulties, to compoſe any writings, would lead them to take due care, that they ſhould anſwer the ends for which they were compoſed. Proofs of ſuch care we evidently diſcern in divers of the epiſtles of apoſtles, which we have. A like care, probably, was taken of the reſt, and would be taken of epiſtles written by any other apoſtles. They would be ſent by fit meſſengers, and be faithfully delivered. And they might be accompanied with ſome proper directions, ſuch as we find in ſeveral of St. Paul's epiſtles: as that in the firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, requiring it to be read to all the brethren: and that in the epiſtle to the Coloſſians iv. 16. that it ſhould be read firſt among themſelves, and then ſent to the church of the Laodiceans: and

[m] See particularly vol. II. p. 162, 262; vol. V. p. 96, 97, 131, 132, 311, 312.

that

that they likewiſe ſhould read the epiſtle, that would be brought to them from Laodicea.

All which conſiderations muſt induce us to think, that no ſacred writings of apoſtles, compoſed for the inſtruction and edification of chriſtian people, their friends, and converts, could be eaſily loſt.

IV. There are no ſufficient reaſons to believe, that any ſacred writings of the New Teſtament have been loſt. Let us however ſee what they are. For divers difficulties have been thought of.

1. St. Paul ſays [n] 2 Theſſ. ii. 1, 2. *Now we beſeech you, brethren,——that ye be not ſoon ſhaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by ſpirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Chriſt is at hand.*

Theſe words, as I apprehend, afford not any proof, that St. Paul wrote more epiſtles to the Theſſalonians, than thoſe which we have. For a perſon, who had never written one letter before, might uſe ſuch expreſſions, if he had any ground to ſuſpect, that ſome men were diſpoſed to forge letters in his name.

2. 2 Theſſ. iii. 17. [o] *The ſalutation of Paul with my own hand, which is the token in every epiſtle: ſo I write.*

But I think, he might ſay this though it were the very firſt epiſtle written by him: provided he thought, that he ſhould have occaſion to write more, and had reaſon to ſuſpect, that there were ſome men, who might be diſpoſed to falſify his name. Nor does it follow, that he afterwards wrote any more epiſtles to the Theſſalonians. However, he could not be certain, that he ſhould not have occaſion to write to them again. And he might judge it to be very likely, that he ſhould write more letters, either to them, or

[n] Atqui hujus rei nullum fuiſſet periculum, nulla monendi neceſſitas, niſi varias acceperunt Theſſalonicenſes epiſtolas a Paulo miſſas. Qui enim unam ac alteram ſolummodo ad eccleſias ſcribebat epiſtolas, illius nomen falſæ epiſtolæ ad eccleſias datæ non facile mentiri poterat. J. Ens ubi ſupr. § xxix. p. 46.

[o] Illud idem iterum agnoſcit Apoſtolus ſtatim allegato cap. iii. 17. dato ſigno epiſtolis ſuis peculiari, quo nullæ epiſtolæ a ſe miſſæ carent.——Se dicit γραφειν, *ſcribere.* Quod paucis admodum epiſtolis vix congruum videtur: præſertim quando dicit, ſe ετω γραφειν, ut ſalutatio propria manu ſit ſignum εν παση επιστολη, *in quacumque epiſtola* ——Quid erat periculi, quod datis epiſtolis committeretur fallacia, ſi nullas præter, et poſt haſce duas ad illos daret epiſtolas? Id. ib. § xxx. p. 46, 47.

to

to others. This declaration, then, was a proper mark, which might be of uſe to the Theſſalonians, and to others, and a ſecurity againſt all impoſitions of that kind.

3. 2 Cor. x. 9, 10, 11. *That I may not ſeem, as if I would terrify you by letters. For his letters, ſay they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily preſence is weak, and his ſpeech contemptible. Let ſuch an one think this, that ſuch as we are in word by letters, when we are abſent, ſuch will we be alſo in deed, when we are preſent.*

Hence it is argued, that [p] the apoſtle had before now written more than one, even ſeveral letters, to the Corinthians.

To which I anſwer. It is very common to ſpeak of one epiſtle in the plural number, as all know. And St. Paul might well write, as he here does, though he had as yet ſent but one letter to thoſe, to whom he is writing. And from ſo long a letter, as is the firſt to the Corinthians, men might form a good judgment concerning his manner of writing letters, though they had ſeen no other.

4. 1 Cor. v. 9. *I wrote unto you in an epiſtle, not to company with fornicators.*

Hence it is argued, that [q] St. Paul had written an epiſtle to the Corinthians, before he wrote the firſt of thoſe two, which we have. Conſequently, here is proof of the loſs of a ſacred writing, which would have been canonical, if extant.

And it muſt be acknowledged, that ſeveral [r] learned men have concluded as much from this text. Others however ſee not here any ſuch proof. And on this ſide have argued [s] Whitby, and [t] others. And I think, it is of no ſmall weight, that ſeveral ancient writers underſtood the apoſtle to ſay: *I have written to*

[p] Cum duobus illis ex epiſt. ad Theſſalonicenſes locis conferam Pauli dictum ad Corinthios. 2. x. 9, 10, 11. —— Quibus verbis Apoſtolus ſtatuit, quod non unam epiſtolam, ſed plures ad Corinthios ſcripſerit. Id. ibid. § xxxiii. p. 49.

[q] Inter illas eſt epiſtola quædam —— ad Corinthios ſcripta ante illam, quæ nobis prima eſt, de qua Apoſtolus: Ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *ſcripſi vobis in epiſtola.* 1 Cor. v. 9. Ens. ib. § xxxiii. p. 51.

[r] Ex quibus verbis hoc concludo, ante hanc ad Corinthios epiſtolam aliam exſtitiſſe, ubi Paulus a converſatione cum fornicatoribus eos dehortatus fuerit. C. M. Pfaff. ubi ſupr. p. 46.

Hinc autem apparet, aliam ante hanc a Paulo ſcriptam fuiſſe epiſtolam ad Corinthios, quæ poſt interciderit. Eſtius in loc. Vid. et Grot. in loc. H. Witſ. de Vit. Paul. Ap. ſect. 8. n. xxi. Mill. Prolegom. n. 8.

[s] See him upon the place.

[t] Wolf. curæ in loc. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 918. &c.

you

you in this epiſtle. So [u] Theodoret, [x] Theophylact, and [y] Photius in Œcumenius. They ſuppoſe, that the apoſtle here refers to ſomewhat before ſaid by him in the ſame epiſtle, and in this very chapter, ver. 2, or 6, 7.

And that hereby is meant this epiſtle, ſeems to me very evident. That interpretation ſuits the words. And there are divers other places, where the ſame phraſe is, and muſt be ſo rendered, Rom. xvi. 22. *I Tertius, who wrote this epiſtle,* Ο γραψας την επιστολην. 1 Theſſ. v. 27. I charge you by the Lord, that this epiſtle *be read unto all the holy brethren.* αναγνωσθηναι την επιστολην πασι τοις αγιοις. And 1 Theſſ. iv. 6. *That no man go beyond, and defraud his brother in any matter:* or *in this matter.* μη υπερβαινειν και πλεονεκτειν εν τω πραγματι τον αδελφον αυτυ (A).

Fabricius ſays, the [z] words, *I have written unto you,* may be underſtood as equivalent to, *I do write.* And it may be remembered, that [a] ſome while ago I quoted an ancient writer, who gives this interpretation. [c] *I* [b] *have written unto you,* that is, I write.' And intending, I think, ſomewhat to be afterwards ſaid by the apoſtle in this epiſtle: which appears to me to be right. Many like inſtances might be alleged. I ſhall put in the margin ſome paſſages [c] from A. Gellius,

[u] Ουκ εν αλλη, αλλ' εν ταυτη. Προ βραχεων γαρ εφη· Ουκ οιδατε, οτι μικρα ζυμη ολον το φυραμα ζυμοι; Theod. in loc.

[x] Εν ποια επιστολη; Εν αυτη ταυτη. Επειδη γαρ ειπεν ανωτερω, οτι εκκαθαρατε την παλαιαν ζυμην, τον πορνευκοτα, ως δεδηλωται, αινιττομενος, δι υ εδηλυτο το μη συναμιγνυσθαι πορνοις· ισως υπενοησαν αν οτι παντων των πορνων, και των παρ' ελλησι χωριζεσθαι δει. Ερμηνευει τοινυν περι ποιων παρηγγειλε. Theoph. in loc.

[y] Πυ εγραψεν; Εν οις λεγει, και ουχι μαλλον επενθησατε. κ. λ. —— Και παλιν εκκαθαρατε την παλαιαν ζυμην. κ. λ. —— Τοις πορνοις τυ κοσμυ τυτυ.] Ινα μη νομισωσιν, οφειλειν και τοις των ελληνων πορνοις μη συναμιγνυσθαι, οπερ ην αδυνατον τοις πολιν οικυσι, διορθυται αυτο. Apud. Œcum. in loc.

(A) I might refer to many other texts of ſcripture, and to paſſages of other writers, Matt. xxvii. 8. εως της σημερον. xxviii. 15. —— μεχρι της σημερον. —— Apoc. i. 3. και οι ακουοντες τυς λογυς της προφητειας, Id eſt, ταυτης προφητειας, quomodo accepit Latinus. Grot. in loc. So Liban. ep. 1174, p. 558. Ἐμελλε μεν και μη δοντος μυ την επιστολην. κ. λ. Etiamſi ego has literas non ſcripſiſſem. —— Ep. 1177. p. 559. Και μην κακεινο δηλον, οτι μειζονος απολαυσει της παρα συ προνοιας, μετα την επιστολην. poſt traditas has literas.

[z] Poſſunt etiam verba, εγραψα υμιν, reddi, *ſcribo vobis.* &c. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 154.

[a] *See* vol. V. p. 232. See there likewiſe, p. 180. [b] *Scripſi vobis.*] Pro ſcribo. Vel ideo præteritum dicit, quia cum legeretur, tempus ſcribendi præteritum eſſet. Sedul. Comm. in loc. Ap. PP. Lugd. T. VI. p. 540. C. [c] Verba Varronis ſubjeci. A. Gell. Noct. Att. l. 2. cap. 20.

Propterea verba Atteii Capitonis

ex

Gellius, where it is ſaid: 'I have ſubjoined the words of Varro:' that is, I ſhall ſubjoin them. In another place. 'I have tranſcribed the words of Plutarch.' And in like manner often: when the words of an author had not yet been tranſcribed, but were to be tranſcribed ſoon after.

In John iv. 38. Our Lord ſays to the diſciples: *I ſent you to reap that whereon ye have beſtowed no labour.* Nevertheleſs the diſciples had not yet been ſent forth by him. But knowing what he deſigned to do, and alſo knowing beforehand what would be the circumſtances of their miſſion, he ſays to them: 'When I ſhall ſend you to preach the goſpel, you will find the caſe to be as I now repreſent it.'

In like manner St. Paul having in his mind the whole plan of the epiſtle, which he was writing, and conſidering ſome directions, which he ſhould give in the remaining part of the epiſtle, ſays: *I have written unto you.* If it be aſked, where are thoſe directions? I anſwer: I think, they are in the tenth chapter of this epiſtle, where the apoſtle cautions againſt idolatry, and dangerous temptations to it, and againſt doing what might be underſtood to be religious communion with idols, and idolaters. Theſe things I apprehend, the apoſtle then had in his mind.

What he ſays therefore here in ch. v. 9, 10, 11. is to this purpoſe: 'I ſhall in this epiſtle deliver ſome cautions againſt a 'dangerous and offenſive intimacy with idolaters. But when 'I do ſo, it is not my intention, to prohibit all civil commerce 'with gentile people, *who are fornicators, or covetous, or extor-* 'tioners, *or idolaters.* For at that rate you could not live in 'the world. But here I am ſpeaking of ſuch as are profeſſed 'Chriſtians. *And I have now written unto you,* that is, I now 'charge you, and require it of you: *If any man, called a brother,* 'a profeſſed Chriſtian, *be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater,* '*or an extortioner, with ſuch an one, no not to eat:* that is, not to 'have any converſation with him.' Compare 2 Theſſ. iii. 14, 15.

That appears to me the moſt probable account of this text. But if any heſitate about the reference to a place, that follows

ex quinto Librorum, quos de Pontificio Jure compoſuit, ſcripſi. Ib. l. 4. cap. 6.

Verba ipſa Plutarchi, quoniam res inopinata eſt, ſubſcripſi. Ib. cap. 12.

Ex quo libro plura verba adſcripſimus, ut ſimul ibidem quid ipſe inter res geſtas et annales eſſe dixerit, oſtenderemus. Ib. l. 5. cap. 18.

Ipſa autem verba Chryſippi, quantum valui memoriâ adſcripſi —— In libro enim περὶ προνοίας quarto dicit. —— Ib. l. 6. cap. 2.

in

in the remaining part of the epiſtle; I ſtill hope, I may inſiſt upon it, that εν τη επιστολη, which we have rendered in an epiſtle, does, and muſt ſignify, in this epiſtle.

5. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. *And account, that the long-ſuffering of our Lord is ſalvation: even as our beloved brother Paul alſo, according to the wiſdom given unto him, has written unto you.*

Hence it is argued, that [d] St Paul wrote ſeveral letters to the diſperſed Jews, which are now loſt. I anſwer, that this argument depends upon the ſuppoſition, that the epiſtles of St. Peter were ſent to believing Jews: which is far from being certain. It is more probable, as was [e] formerly ſhown, that St. Peter's epiſtles were ſent to believing gentiles in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Aſia, and Bithynia, or to all Chriſtians in general in thoſe countries. To which Chriſtians Paul had indeed ſent ſeveral letters. To them were ſent his epiſtle to the Galatians, the Epheſians, the Coloſſians. To which might be added, his two epiſtles to Timothy, then reſiding at Epheſus, the chief city of Aſia. To theſe, and other epiſtles of the apoſtle Paul, St. Peter might refer. Nor can I ſee any reaſon at all to doubt, whether the epiſtles of Paul, intended by St. Peter, are not ſtill in being.

6. 3 John ver. 9. *I wrote unto the church.* Hence [f] ſome have argued, that St. John wrote an epiſtle to the church, where Diotrephes affected to have pre-eminence, which is now loſt.

Indeed this text has exerciſed the thoughts of many critics, as may be ſeen in *Wolfii Curæ*. However the words may be tranſlated thus: *I had written*, or *I would have written to the church*. This verſion has been approved by [g] ſome. And to me it appears very right. If this interpretation be admitted, there is no reaſon to conclude, that [h] any writing of St. John has been loſt.

[d] S. Petrus 2. ep. iii. 15. 16. plures literas ad diſperſos Hebræos allegat, quæ jam dudum periere. Neque enim, uti Millius putavit f. x. col. 2. heic citatur epiſtola ad Hebræos, quæ exſtat, &c. Pfaff. ubi ſupra. p. 47. Conf. Ens ubi ſupra. § xxxvi. xxxvii. p. 53. 54.

[e] See before. p. 569. &c.

[f] Eodem modo et literæ S. Joannis, ad Eccleſiam, in quâ Diotrephes ο φιλοπρωτευων erat, ſcriptæ, et 3. Joh. ver. 9. memoratæ, periêre. Pfaff. ib. p. 47.

[g] See Whitby upon the place, and Dr. Benſon. And ſee before, p. 601, note [x].

[h] 'Some would, 'from hence, gather, that St. John 'wrote an epiſtle, which is now loſt. 'But the primitive Chriſtians were 'not ſo careleſs about preſerving 'the apoſtolic writings. There is 'not the leaſt hint among the an-'cients, that there ever was ſuch an 'epiſtle. And the apoſtle's words, 'in this place, are fairly capable of 'another interpretation.'—— Dr. Benſon upon the place. p. 703.

7. It

7. It is argued, that [i] Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, expreſſeth himſelf, as if he thought, St. Paul had written to them more epiſtles than one.

To which it is eaſy to anſwer, that though the word be in the plural number, one epiſtle only might be meant. Secondly, it is not improbable, that Polycarp intended the epiſtle to the Philippians, and alſo the two epiſtles of Paul to the Theſſalonians, who were in the ſame province of Macedonia, as was ſhown [k] formerly. Indeed this objection is ſo obviated by what was ſaid, when we largely conſidered the teſtimony of Polycarp to the New Teſtament, that I think nothing more needs to be added here.

V. In treating this ſubject Mr. Ens could not help thinking of thoſe paſſages of Origen, and Euſebius, where they ſpeak of the apoſtles not being ſolicitous to write many volumes. Which paſſages were taken notice of by us [l] long ago. He endeavours to evade the proper concluſion to be thence drawn. But he owns, that [m] the ancients had no knowledge of thoſe writings of the apoſtles, which he and ſome others have imagined to be loſt. And he thinks it almoſt miraculous, or however a very wonderful diſpenſation of Providence, that they ſhould ſo ſoon periſh, as to be unknown to the ancients, as well as to us.

But does not that ſhow, that this whole argument is frivolous and inſignificant? For plauſible ſpeculations cannot be valid againſt fact and evidence. If the primitive Chriſtians knew not of any apoſtolical writings, beſide thoſe, which have been tranſmitted to us; it is very probable, there were none.

[i] Memorat quoque Polycarpus in literis ad Philippenſes, S. Paulum non unam ſed plures ad eos επιστολας abſentem ſcripſiſſe. Pfaff. ib. p. 47. Conf. Ens p. 51—56.

[k] See vol. II. p. 91, 92. [l] See vol. II. p. 466, 467, and vol. IV. p. 225, 226. [m] Fateor ingenue, vix concipi poteſt, unde tam cito tanta fuerit inter veteres ignorantia de eo, quod Apoſtoli multo plura ſcripſerint, quam quidem illorum, et noſtras pervenit ad manus. Fateor, vix concipi poteſt, ubi tam profunde latere potuerint ſcripta illa apoſtolica, ut omnium fugerint oculos. At divina hic mihi admiranda ac adoranda videtur providentia, quæ ad tempus data ſcripta, dum aliorum quæ permanerent in vitæ canonem perpetuum nondum eſſet in eccleſiis copia, deinde protinus e medio tolli voluerit. Ens ibid. § li. p. 68.

THE END OF THE SIXTH VOLUME.