

7162
6

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

FOUR GOSPELS;

TENDING CHIEFLY,

To ascertain the Times of their Publication ;

AND

To illustrate the Form and Manner of their
Composition.

By the Rev. Dr. HENRY OWEN,
Rector of St. OLAVE in *Hart-street*,
and Fellow of the *Royal Society*.

Ζητῶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὑφ' ἧς ἔδειξ πῶποτε ἐβλάβη.
M. ANTONIN. lib. vi. § 21.

L O N D O N :

Printed for T. PAYNE, next the *Mews-Gate*, *Castle-Street*, *St. Martin's*. M DCC LXIV.

“CUM rerum a CHRISTO gestarum
“ nulla superfit historia fide digna,
“ præter eas quæ a sanctissimis viris, qui
“ Evangelistæ dicuntur, conscriptæ sunt;
“ maximi est momenti certo scire a *quibus*,
“ & *quo consilio* scriptæ sint, tum etiam *quo*
“ *tempore* in lucem sint editæ; ne fides,
“ quam iis habemus, temeraria credulitas
“ existimari queat, aut levibus objectiun-
“ culis posse labefactari.”

CLERICI Harm. Evangel. Dissert. tertia.

P R E F A C E.

COULD we truly discover at what time, for whose use, and on what occasion, the Gospels were respectively written, we should doubtless be able, not only to understand them more perfectly, but also to read them with more profit, than we have the happiness at present to pretend to. For such a Discovery, as it would throw light on the difficult passages, and help us to reconcile the seeming contradictions, which obstruct our progress in these sacred studies; so would it impart an additional lustre, force, and propriety to the several arguments, which the Scripture offers for the confirmation and improvement of our Faith.

BUT if this Discovery, once attained, would prove of such infinite use and consequence, then surely an *Essay* which is made

towards it may hope to meet with a candid reception, though it should not succeed in every respect.

THE following disquisitions, if they can plead no other merit, may yet at least lay claim to this—that they were formed with a good design, and conducted with the utmost impartiality. For the Author, having no hypothesis to serve, nor any other end in view but the investigation of truth, suffered himself to be carried along as the tide of evidence bore him.

In the course of his enquiry, he followed chiefly the light of Scripture; and where that failed, betook himself to the primitive Writers for farther instruction. But as these Writers differ widely in their accounts, he has only so far adopted their opinions, as they appear conformable to the sacred history, and consistent with each other—and even the testimonies alledged are generally to be looked upon as no more than collateral proofs of what had been deduced before from the internal structure of the Gospels.

P R E F A C E, v

THIS is the method in which he thought proper to conduct his enquiry. The result of it he now humbly submits to the judgment of the learned; who, as they are alone able to pronounce on its merits, will be the most ready to pardon its defects.

THE Author may appear perhaps singular in his opinions; but he desires no indulgence to any singularities that are wrong. If he differs in some points from those who have written before him, it is not, he presumes, altogether without reason.

If he has affixed to some of the Gospels, and particularly to St. MATTHEW'S, an earlier date than others have done, it was because the peculiarities of this Gospel, in conjunction with the circumstances of the *Jewish* Church, evidently point to such a period.

If he has displaced the common order of the Gospels, it was because he found
4 that

that order incompatible with their internal character, and contrary to the sentiment of primitive antiquity.

IF he asserts, that the later Evangelists perused and transcribed the Writings of the former, it is upon no other account, but that he was forced to do it by the evidence of fact. And if he seems thereby to have deprived Religion of an argument which it did not want, he has the satisfaction to think, that he has supplied it with another, by that very means, of which it really stood in need.

IF the plan here exhibited be just in the main—if it be right even with respect to the Persons for whose use the Gospels were more immediately written—then there is a new field of Criticism opened, where the learned may usefully employ their abilities, in comparing the several Gospels together, and raising observations from that *comparative View*. Some few specimens of this sort, the Reader will find inserted
in

in the Notes. More could not conveniently be added, though they sprung up thick in the Author's way. This superstructure he leaves to others and to future time: his present concern is for the goodness of the foundation, which he intreats the public to examine with care; and to judge of with candour and impartiality. Whatever is defective in it, he heartily wishes to see supplied; and whatever is exceptionable, corrected. The whole aim of his researches is the acquisition of Truth, to which he is ready to sacrifice any of the fore-mentioned opinions, whenever they are proved to be false.

The Reader is desired to correct the following

E R R A T A.

Page 8. Note (t) l. 4. for *about* r. *before*

13. l. 1. insert *the* before *many*

l. 4. for *o na* r. *on a*

34. Col. 2. l. 12, for $\text{\textcircled{S}}$ r. $\text{\textcircled{r}}$

85. l. 17. before *that* insert ~~—~~

87. Note (d) l. 2. dele *and*

95. l. 19. for 1. r. *First,*

96. l. 1. dele 2.

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

FOUR GOSPELS.

S E C T. I.

IF we think fit to enquire — “by whom
 “the Gospels were originally com-
 “posed” — we shall find them ascribed by
 all the ecclesiastical writers of antiquity to
 the four persons, whose names they bear.
 In this article the several authors perfectly
 agree; and therefore may be depended up-
 on with safety. But if we enquire further—
 “at what particular time or year, either of
 “these Gospels was penned or published”—
 the accounts they have left us on this head
 are evidently too vague, confused, and dis-
 cordant, to lead us to any solid or certain
 determination. Discordant, however, as

these accounts are, it may not be improper to collect them together, and present them to the Reader's view. And

I. WITH regard to St. MATTHEW, EUSEBIUS intimates [a], and THEOPHYLACT affirms [b], that he wrote his Gospel about *eight* years after our Saviour's ascension; that is, about the year of our Lord XLI.

OTHERS [c] date the publication of it about *seven* years later, viz. A. D. XLVIII. OF XLIX.

AND IRENÆUS [d] brings it still lower *fourteen* years, namely, to the year LXII. For so late it must be, before the Apostles, St. PETER and St. PAUL, preached the

[a] Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 24.

[b] Ματθαῖος — ἔγραψε τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον — μετὰ ὀκτὼ ἔτη τῆς τῆ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως. MATTHÆUS scripsit Evangelium post octo annos assumpti in caelos CHRISTI. Præf. Com. in MATTH.

[c] NICEPHOR. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 45. Chron. Alexand. Cav. Hist. Lit. in MATTHÆO.

[d] MATTHÆUS — Scripturam edidit Evangelii, cum PETRUS & PAULUS Romæ evangelizarent, & fundarent ecclesiam. *Contra Hæres.* lib. iii. c. 1. & EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 8.

Gospel together (if indeed they ever *did* preach the Gospel together) at *Rome* [*e*].

II. WITH regard to St. MARK, THE same Author relates [*f*], that he committed his Gospel to writing some time after the *departure* of the fore-mentioned Apostles: which, if he means their departure from *Rome*, might be about the year LXIV; but if he means their departure out of this world, i. e. their decease, then it could not be earlier than the close of the year LXVIII.

[*e*] St. PAUL arrived at *Rome* in the year LXI, and continued *two* years a prisoner there. It is a question whether we are to refer the publication of St. MATTHEW's Gospel to the *beginning*; or the *end* of this period. MILL inclines to the *first*, and supposes it to be published in LXI (*Proleg.* N. 61—64). We have taken the medium, LXII. But Dr. LARDNER thinks, that IRENÆUS speaks of the *second* time that St. PAUL was at Rome; and thence concludes that St. MATTHEW writ his Gospel in the year LXIV. *Supplement to Credibility*, vol. I. chap. 5.

[*f*] Post horum excessum, (Græcè ἑξοδος) MARCUS discipulus & interpres PETRI, & ipse quæ a PETRO annunciata erant, per scripta nobis tradidit. IREN. ubi supra. Vide etiam ATHANAS. ad fin. Synops. S. Script. et HERONYM. Catal. Script. Eccl. voce MARC.

BUT THEOPHYLACT [g] and EUTHYMIUS [h] both assert, that the Gospel of St. MARK was written about *ten* years after our Lord's ascension, namely, in the year XLIII; — which is agreeable to the date affixed to the end of it in some *Greek* manuscripts [i].

III. WITH respect to St. LUKE, IRENÆUS informs us [k], that he digested into writing what St. PAUL had preached among the *Gentiles*; intimating thereby, that it was after that Apostle had dispatched a *considerable* part of his ministry:—nay, he had dispatched indeed the far *greater* part of it, before St. LUKE engaged in this work, if our author's account be true. For, considering he ranks him *after* St. MARK,

[g] Τὸ κτ̄ Μάρκου Εὐαγγέλιον μετὰ δέκα ἔτη τῆς τῷ Χριστῷ ἀνα-
 λήψεως συνεγράφη ἐν Ῥώμῃ. *Evangelium sec. MARCUM post decem
 annos assumpti Christi Romæ conscriptum est.* Præf. Com. in
 MARC.

[h] See his testimony produced at large in LARDNER's *Supplement* &c. vol. I. chap. vii. p. 179.

[i] Vide MILL. & WETSTEN. ad finem MARCI.

[k] LUCAS autem sectator PAULI, quod ab illo prædicabatur Evangelium, in libro condidit. *Contra Hæres.* ubi supra.

it is evident he thought him to be a *later* writer; and consequently, that his Gospel could not be published sooner than the year LXV—when the Apostle of the *Gentiles* had well nigh finished his course.

BUT THEOPHYLACT says expressly [l], that St. LUKE wrote his Gospel within *fifteen* years after the ascension of CHRIST; that is, about the year of our Lord XLVIII; which is the time specified in some *Greek* manuscripts [m].

IV. WITH respect to St. JOHN, THEOPHYLACT assures us [n], that he penned his Gospel *thirty-two* years after

[l] Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον μετὰ πάσης ἀκριθείας, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ προοίμιον αὐτῆ ἰμφαίνει, μετὰ πεντεκαίδεκα δὲ ἔτη τῆς τῆ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως συγγράψατο. *Evangelium cum omni diligentia conscripsit, id quod Ἔ proœmium ejus declarat, post assumptum in cœlos CHRISTUM anno quinto decimo.* Argument. in *Evangel. sec. LUCAM.* EUTHYMIUS affirms the same. LARDNER'S *Supplement* &c. vol. I. chap. viii. p. 225.

[m] Vid. MILL. & WETSTEN. ad fin. LUC.

[n] Ὁ (Εὐαγγέλιον) συνέγραψεν, ἐν Πάτμῳ τῆ νήσῳ Ἰκέρου Ἀγριλῶν, μετὰ τριάκοντα δύο ἔτη τῆς τῆ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως. *Quod (sc. Evangelium) Ἔ exul in Patmo insula conscripsit post triginta duos annos assumpti in cœlos CHRISTI.* Præf. Com. in JOAN.

our Lord's ascension; viz. in the year LXV.

NICEPHORUS says [o] that he wrote it *four* years later; namely, in the year LXIX.

BUT others affirm [p] that he composed it in his *old* age, and near the conclusion of the first century; that is, about the year of our Lord XCVIII.

FROM these accounts, delivered down to us by the ancient Fathers, the only inference we can draw with certainty is, — that, of all the Evangelists, St. MATTHEW, in their opinion [q], wrote first; St. MARK, next; then St. LUKE; and last of all St. JOHN: though perhaps the Gospels themselves, carefully examined,

[o] ἰωάννης, ἀργότερον ἀγγέλω χρώμασιν τῷ κηρύγματι, μετὰ ἧς καὶ τ' ἔτη εἰς ἑξήκον ἀπόδος Χριστῷ, ὑσταίον πάντων λόγων καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ γράφειν ἔλθειν. JOANNES autem, qui prius sine scripto verbum depraedicasset, post triginta sex a CHRISTI ascensione annos, postremus omnium creditur ad scribendum descendisse. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 45.

[p] IREN. contra Hæres. lib. iii. c. 1. & 3. EPIPHAN. Hær. ii. § 12. HIERONYM. Cat. Script. Eccl. voce JOAN. MILL. Prolegom. n. 131. ed. KUSTER.

[q] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 25.

may afford us reason to doubt the exactness of this order.

WITH regard to the *Times*, in which the Gospels are said to have been published, and which differ so widely from each other, it may be sufficient to observe at present, that the *circumstances* of things, and the *necessities* of the Church, seem to plead in favour of the *earliest*, rather than of the *latest* dates. For we can hardly suppose, that the Church should be left, for so many years as these dates imply, without any authentic account in writing of facts so highly important not only to its edification, but also to its very being [r]. And if we may depend on the testimony of EUSEBIUS, we find in reality it was not. For he expressly assures us [s], on the credit of antiquity, that St. JOHN, at the request of the faithful, perused and ratified the three first Gospels; and afterwards added his own, as a proper Supplement to them. Whence it is evident, that those Gospels must not only

[r] Vide CLERICI *Dissertationem tertiam* Harmon. Evangel. subjunctam.

[s] Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 24.

have been published, but also received and acknowledged by the world, long before the *close* of the *first* century [s].

S E C T. II.

ALL that has been hitherto advanced, we have taken on the authority of the ancient Fathers; and they, 'tis to be feared, took it upon trust. The oldest of them collected the reports of their own times, and set them down for certain truths; and these who followed, adopted their accounts, with implicit reverence. Thus, traditions of every sort, true or false, passed on from hand to hand without examination, until it was almost too late to examine them to any purpose.

THERE being, then, but little dependance to be laid on these *external* proofs, let

[s] This is further confirmed by the frequent *allusions* to these Gospels, and the many *quotations* from them, which are to be found in the *apostolical* Fathers, BARNABAS, CLEMENT, and HERMAS; who are all supposed to have written about the end of the first century. See LARDNER'S *Credibility* &c. vol. II. Book i. ch. 1—4.

us now see whether any thing can be inferred from the *internal* construction of the Gospels themselves, either *for* or *against* the preceding articles.

WHEN the *first* Evangelist had penned his Gospel, it is natural to conclude that it was soon published and dispersed abroad among the various assemblies of Christians; who would be eager to obtain a *true* and *genuine* account of the words and actions of the Founder of their Religion, that is, of those things, in which they had been instructed; and upon which their faith was founded.

Hence then we may further conclude, that the *second* Evangelist was perfectly acquainted with the writings of the *first*: and that the *third*, when he wrote, perused the Gospels of the other *two*; which he might apply, in part, to his own use, making what additions he thought proper. This we offer at present only by way of supposition: hereafter it may appear to have been real fact.

BUT to clear our way to the proof of this fact, it will be necessary to determine,
among

among other things, which of these sacred Historians is in reality to be accounted the *first*; which the *second*; and which the *third*: for much depends upon this question.

WHEN the Apostles, after their Master's decease, began to open and discharge their commission; it is well known, that, apprehending the *Gentiles* to have no concern in the *Christian Covenant*, they preached the Gospel to the *Jews* only [u]. Under this mistaken apprehension, they continued at least for the space of *seven* years; and consequently, during *that* time, confined their labours altogether to the limits of the *Holy Land* [x]. Nay, they confined them in general to a much narrower compass. For

[u] Acts xi. 19.

[x] Dr. CAVE (*Liv. of the Ap. art. St. PET. § 11. p. 44.*) concludes from a passage in CLEMENS ALEX. *Strom. lib. vi.* that the Apostles preached to none but the *Jews* in and about *Judea*, for *twelve* years after our Saviour's ascension — and that in consequence of his special command. The passage referred to is this — Ἐξὼ μὲν εἰς τις δεκάτη τῆς Ἰερουζαλὴ μείλιτοῦσαι, κ. τ. λ. *If any Jew shall repent, and believe the Gospel, he shall be pardoned; but after twelve years go ye into all the world, that none may pretend they have not heard.* vid. GRAB. *Spicileg. Patr. sec. i. p. 67.* APOLLONIUS relates a tradition to the same purpose. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 18.*

they

they seem to be all this while intirely taken up in forming and settling the Church at *Jerusalem* [y]; which, considering the weight of opposing difficulties, required indeed the constant exertion of their joint labours.

FROM thence they went out occasionally, one or more as it was thought requisite, to *confirm* the Churches that were planted by *others* in various parts of the country. For the Churches established at a distance from *Jerusalem*, in the several districts of the *Holy Land* and the countries adjoining, were originally founded, not by the *Apostles*, but by those inspired Christian *Converts*, who were dispersed abroad on account of the persecution carried on by SAUL [z] under the direction of the *Sanhedrim*. These men laid the foundation; directed therein by supernatural influence, and aided by ex-

[y] It was of infinite consequence, that a Christian Church should be established at *Jerusalem*, the place where Christianity was first preached; otherwise the Gospel would have been immediately rejected in *more distant* places, as a mere forgery — unable to maintain its ground among those persons, who were best qualified to judge of its merits.

[z] Acts viii. 4 — 13. 40.

traordinary

traordinary powers. But whatever their powers and abilities were, yet the doctrines they preached seem still to have wanted the concurring aid of *apostolical* testimony to advance them into *Gospel-Truths*. Such a testimony therefore they obtained. For two of the Apostles are expressly said to have *borne witness* to the truth of what had been preached in the region of *Samaria* [a]: nor is there any room to doubt, but that others of them did the same in other places.

BUT nevertheless, all that the Apostles either preached or confirmed, in these short excursions, could only be the general Heads of Christianity; and not that perfect System of Religion, which their Master had delivered to them. Such compleat instruction they could not impart in so short a time: and if they had, how liable would it have been, as it depended upon memory, to be soon forgotten! To guard therefore against

[a] Acts viii. 14, &c. "Now when the Apostles, which were at *Jerusalem*, heard that *Samaria* had received the word of God, they sent unto them PETER and JOHN" &c.—"And they, when they had *testified* and preached the Word of the LORD, returned to *Jerusalem*, and preached the Gospel in many villages of the *Samaritans*." † 25.

many inconveniences which inevitably attend *oral Tradition*, and to fix *these Churches* on a stable footing, it was evidently necessary, that some one or other of the Apostles should deliver to them a *written* narrative of their Master's life and doctrine; which might remain with them as an infallible *standard* of what they were to believe and practise.

As the *Jewish-Converts* in *Judea* stood in need of such an account, so we find that they were accordingly supplied with it. For it is the unanimous opinion of antiquity, “that St. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel
“for the service of the *Jews* in *Palestine* [b];
“with a view to confirm those who be-
“lieved, and to convert, if possible, those
“who believed not.” The structure and genius of his Gospel countenance and cor-

[b] Ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κτλ ἢ ποτὲ τελώϊω, ὕστερον δὲ Ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμῶν πιστεύουσι. κ. τ. λ. *Primum scilicet Evangelium scriptum esse a MATTHÆO, prius quidem Publicano, postea vero Apostolo JESU CHRISTI, qui illud, Hebraïco sermone conscriptum, Judæis ad fidem conversis publicavit.* ORIGEN. apud EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 25. Vide etiam HIERONYMI Com. in MATTH. Procem. & THEOPHYLACT. Procem. Com. in MATTH.

roborate

roborate this opinion: For he begins with the genealogy of CHRIST from ABRAHAM [c]—refers often to *Jewish* customs—relates the most of our Saviour's discourses against *Jewish* errors and superstitions [d]—quotes the greatest number of passages from the *Jewish* Scriptures — answers the most considerable *Jewish* objections — and frequently makes use of the terms and phrases of *Jewish* Theology.

[c] St. MATTHEW, in conformity with the *Jewish* custom, records the genealogy of CHRIST according to his *legal* descent; and brings it down from ABRAHAM; through DAVID, to shew his title to the kingdom of *Israel*. Vid. CHRYSOST. Hom. I. in MATTH.

[d] Ch. xxiii. 1 — 33. Here St. MATTHEW speaks to the *Jews* personally, and reproves their superstitions, as our Saviour did, with a view to *correct* them. And St. LUKE, who had to do with *foreign Jews*, follows the same method, xi. 42—52. But St. MARK, xii. 38—40. viii. 15. vii. 5—7. speaks only of the *Jews*, and their various superstitions; and seems to do it with a view to *distinguish* them from the *Christians*, who were commonly, tho' unjustly, looked upon as a sect of the *Jews*, and comprehended under that denomination in the *imperial* edicts. By shewing in this manner that the *Christians* condemned all *Jewish* superstitions and factious tenets, St. MARK might hope to procure for them a more favourable treatment from the *Roman* state.

THESE

THESE marks of its being primarily intended for the benefit of the *Jews* [e], stand, as it were, on the surface of his Gospel; and are obvious to every Reader, that is tolerably acquainted with the original. But, if we look a little deeper, we shall find that it abounds with *other* characters, strongly expressive of the same design. To introduce you to the knowledge of these characters, it will be necessary to observe, THAT, IN PENNING THEIR GOSPELS, THE SACRED HISTORIANS HAD A CONSTANT REGARD [f], AS WELL TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PERSONS, FOR WHOSE USE THEY WROTE; AS TO THE SEVERAL PARTICULARS OF CHRIST'S LIFE, WHICH THEY WERE THEN WRIT-

[e] Among other instructions delivered by our Saviour to his Apostles, St. MATTHEW records the following—"Go not into the way of the *Gentiles*, and into any city of the *Samaritans* enter ye not." ch. x. 5. Whether *this* be any proof or intimation that he wrote his Gospel for the sake of the *Jews*, and before the conversion of the *Gentiles*, let others determine. No such words however are to be found either in St. MARK'S or St. LUKE'S Gospel.

[f] Vide WETSTEN. de Interpret. Nov. Test. Regul. 7. tom. ii. p. 878—882.

ING [g]. It was THIS that regulated the conduct of their narration—that frequently determined them in their choice of materials—and, when they had chosen, induced them either to contract or enlarge, as they judged expedient. In short, it was THIS that *modified* their Histories, and gave them their different *colourings*.

Now, if the Gospels were thus modelled, as I apprehend they were, to the state; temper, and disposition of the times; in which they were written; then are we furnished with certain CRITERIA, by which we may judge of their respective dates: For those times, whose transactions accord with the turn of the discourses related in the *Gospel-Histories*, are, in all probability, the *very times* when the GOSPELS were written.

IF we bring St. MATTHEW'S to this test, and examine it by the foregoing prin-

[g] If the Evangelists had regarded only the particulars of CHRIST'S Life, they would doubtless have mentioned as many as they could of his Discourses and Miracles. But, notwithstanding they had such a variety of materials to make a choice from; yet the three first of them chiefly insist on the very same articles.

ciple,

ciple, it will manifestly appear to have been penned at a time, when the Church was labouring under a heavy persecution. For it contains many obvious references to such a state; and many dexterous applications both to the injurious, and to the injured, party.

As to the injured and persecuted *Christians*, the Evangelist informs them — that their afflictions were no more than they had been taught to expect, and had promised to bear when they embraced the Gospel [*b*] — that, however unreasonable their sufferings might be, considered as the effects of the malice of their enemies, they were yet useful and profitable to themselves, considered as trials of their faith and fidelity [*i*] — that, though they were grievous to be borne at present, yet they operated powerfully to their future joy [*k*] — that a pusillanimous desertion of the Faith would be so far from bettering their state and condition, that it would infallibly expose them to greater calamities, and cut them off from

[*b*] Ch. x, 21, 22. 34—36. ch. xvi. 24.

[*i*] Ch. v. 11. ch. xxiv. 9—13.

[*k*] Ch. v. 4. 10—12.

the hopes of Heaven [l] — that they were not, however, forbidden to use the lawful means of preservation; but even enjoined to put them in practice, whenever they could do it with innocence [m] — that the due observance of the Christian precepts was an excellent method to appease the wrath and fury of their enemies, and what therefore they were obliged, in point of prudence as well as duty, carefully to mind and attend to [n] — that, if it should be their fate to suffer martyrdom at last for their Religion, it was infinitely better to continue faithful to their important trust, than by any base compliance to incur *his* displeasure, in whose hands are the issues not only of *this* life, but also of *that* which is *to come* [o].

ON the other hand again, to calm the passions of the enraged *Jews*, and win them over to the profession of the Gospel, he labours to soften and abate their prejudices,

[l] Ch. x. 28, 32, 33, 39.

[m] Ch. x. 16, 17, 23.

[n] Ch. v. 30. vii. 12, 24—27. ch. v. 13—20.

[o] Ch. xvi. 25—27. ch. x. 28.

and

and to engage them in the practice of meekness and charity [*p*]. To this end, he lays before them the dignity and amiableness of a compassionate, benevolent disposition [*q*];—the natural good consequences that are annexed to it here; and the distinguished regard, which the Almighty himself will pay to it hereafter [*r*]. Then he reminds them of the repeated punishments, which GOD had inflicted on their fore-fathers for their cruel and barbarous treatment of his Prophets, and assures them that a still more accumulated vengeance was reserved for themselves, if they obstinately persisted in the ways of cruelty [*s*]: For GOD, though patient and long-suffering, was sure at last to vindicate his elect, and to punish their oppressors, unless they repented, believed, and reformed, with the dreadful rigour of a general destruction [*t*].

[*p*] Ch. ix. 13:

[*q*] Ch. v. 43—48. ch. xviii. 23—35. and is particularly illustrated in all our Saviour's Miracles.

[*r*] Ch. v. 5, 7, 9. ch. x. 40—42. ch. xviii. 23—35. ch. v. 21—26. ch. xxv. 31—46.

[*s*] Ch. xxiii. 27—39. ch. x. 14, 15.

[*t*] Ch. xxiv. 2, &c.

THESE and such like arguments St. MATTHEW has inserted in the body of his Gospel, by way of comfort to the afflicted Christians, and as a warning to those who oppressed and injured them. But these arguments evidently refer to a state of distress and persecution: And therefore the Church must be supposed to labour under such a state when the Evangelist advanced and urged them. Now the greatest persecution ever raised against the Church, while it consisted only of *Jewish* Converts, was that, which was first begun by the *Sanhedrim*, and afterwards continued and conducted by SAUL with implacable rage and fury [*u*]. During these severities, which lasted in the whole about *six* [*x*] years, the members of the Christian Church stood in need of all the support, comfort,

[*u*] EUSEBIUS calls it “the first and most grievous persecution.” Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 1. and so does St. LUKE, Acts viii. 1.

[*x*] Namely till the third of CALIGULA, A.D. xxxix. or xl. when the *Jews* were too much alarmed about their *own* affairs to give any further disturbance to the *Christians*. See LARDNER’S *Credibil.* vol. I. B. I. C. ii. § 12. “Then had the “Churches rest,” &c. Acts ix. 31.

and

and assistance, that could possibly be administered to them. But what comfort could they possibly receive, in their distressed situation, comparable to that, which resulted from the example of their suffering Master, and the promises he had made to his faithful followers? This example therefore, and these promises, St. MATTHEW seasonably laid before them, for their imitation and encouragement. For NOW—towards the close of this dangerous period—it is most likely that he wrote his Gospel; and delivered it to them, as the anchor of their hope, to keep them steadfast in this violent tempest.

THIS opinion is not only conformable to the circumstances of the time, and the tenor of the Gospel, but is also supported by ancient testimony. For COSMAS of *Alexandria*, who wrote in the beginning of the *sixth* century, informs us [y], that a persecution being raised on the death of STEPHEN, which obliged St. MATTHEW to depart from *Judea*, the Believers entreat-

[y] COSMÆ Topographia Christiana, lib. v. p. 245. Ap. B. MONTFAUC. Nov. Collect. PP. tom. ii. Paris, 1706.

ed him to leave with them a *written* instruction for the regulation of their lives;—with which request he complied, and composed his Gospel.

THE Author of the *Imperfect Work* on St. MATTHEW, formerly supposed to be St. CHRYSOSTOM, seems to intimate the same thing [z].

FROM hence it appears to have been a *common* notion, that St. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel before the end of that first persecution, which raged in *Palestine* after the death of the Martyr STEPHEN. He must therefore have written early. And if he wrote so early as the year xxxviii, the *second* of CALIGULA, and the *fifth* from our Saviour's ascension, then it is easy to see why he did not continue his History beyond that memorable event. Nor is it less evident, why he affixed no marks or dates to any of the transactions he has recorded. They were then recent, and too well known to stand in need of such specification.

[z] Vide Eruditi Commentar. in Evang. MATTHÆI, in certo Authore, *Prælegum*, inter Opera CHRYSOST. ed. Commelin.

S E C T. III.

WHEN the partition-wall was broken down, and the *Gentiles* had admittance into the Christian Church; as they were anxious to share in the privileges of the Gospel, so were they eager to learn the several particulars of the MESSIAH'S life, through whom those privileges were conveyed to them. But, having no opportunity of knowing CHRIST personally, all they could learn of him and his actions, must necessarily be derived from the scattered informations of others. And though we should suppose, that they pursued their enquiries with care and diligence; yet they would be able at last, after all their pains, to gain but a slight and imperfect account of the things which had been transacted by him. To *Christians* however, that is, to *themselves* now in their *converted* state, the knowledge of these things was of the utmost importance. But then, how was such knowledge to be obtained? Histories, compiled from *broken* accounts and *imper-*

fect Traditions, were not to be trusted to. One History indeed, I mean St. MATTHEW's [a], they might with safety depend upon as far as it went. But that History, being confessedly written for the sake of the *Jews*, and consequently adapted to their peculiar circumstances, must necessarily be defective in several particulars, which nearly concerned the *Gentiles*. And therefore it seems to be highly expedient, that some inspired *apostolical* person, sufficiently acquainted with all the transactions of our Saviour's life, should deliver such a *regular* and *authentic* account of them, as might satisfy the enquiries, and supply the wants of these *Heathen* Converts.

ACCORDINGLY we are informed, that St. LUKE, a person in all respects qualified for the work, wrote his Gospel with this design; and delivered it to the *Gentile*

[a]It should seem by what EUSEBIUS says (Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 10.) that authentic Copies of St. MATTHEW's Gospel were carried by the Apostles into the several countries, where they went to preach at their general dispersion about the year

Christians [*b*], that they might both see and be convinced of the truth of those things, in which they had been instructed by their Teachers [*c*].

WRITING therefore to the Gentiles, who were far remote from the scene of action, and consequently ignorant of Jewish affairs, it was incumbent upon him, in order to accomplish what he had in view, to trace the subject quite up to its source, and to proceed through the whole of our Saviour's ministry in a circumstantial and methodical order.

HENCE it is—that he begins his History with the birth of JOHN the Baptist [*d*], as introductory to that of CHRIST — that, in the course of it, he mentions several particulars [*e*] omitted by St. MATTHEW — and that he is so careful in specifying times and places [*f*], together with other cir-

[*b*] Τρίτον Εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστιν τὸ κτ' Λυκαῶν, τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ἐπαινεῖται, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθνῶν πεποιηκότα. *Tertium Evangelium est illud secundum LUCAM, a PAULO laudatum, & in gratiam Gentilium conscriptum.* ORIGEN. Com. in MATTH. tom. i. p. 203. ed. HUET.

[*c*] LUKE i. 3, 4.

[*d*] Ch. i. 5, &c.

[*e*] Ch. ii. 1—6, &c.

[*f*] Ch. iii. 1. 23, &c.

cumstances of facts that were highly conducive to the information of strangers; tho' they needed not to be recited to the *Jews*, who could easily supply them from their own knowledge. Hence also it is that he sets before them the genealogy of CHRIST according to his natural descent [g] — and carries it up as high as ADAM, in order to shew that he was that Seed of the Woman, who was promised for the Redemption of the *whole* World [b]. And by the like references to the state of the *Gentiles*, it is easy to account for his other peculiarities [i].

[g] Ch. iii. 23 — 38.

[b] These circumstances, which an ingenious *Harmonist* thinks inexplicable on any other supposition than that of St. LUKE's being the *First* Writer, appear now, I presume, very consistent with the notion of his being the *Second* — and writing for the instruction of the *Gentiles*.

[i] Tho' St. LUKE wrote his Gospel for the use of the *Gentile* Churches, yet we are to observe that those Churches had many members of *Jewish* extraction; and therefore, in accounting for his *manner* of writing, we must attend to the state of those *believing Jews*, as well as to that of the *Gentile* Converts. It is for *their* sake — i. e. for the sake of the *Jews* — that he has produced so many *Prophecies* from the Old Testament; and repeated so many *Arguments* that had been urged before in similar cases by St. MATTHEW.

With regard to the general construction of his Gospel, it seems to be formed very nearly on the same plan with that of St. MATTHEW; as, indeed, the reason of things required it should. For if the state and condition of the *Gentile* Converts was similar to that of the *Jewish*, (and it is well known that the former suffered the same things from their own countrymen, as the latter did from the *Jews* [k]) then it was necessary that St. LUKE should adjust the points of his History, as his Brother-Evangelist had done before, to the circumstances of the persons to whom he wrote; and so modify his general instructions as to make them applicable to those particular times. And we find, in fact, that he has so done. For he abounds in applications suitable to their condition; and directs his arguments with great propriety both to the support of the persecuted Christians [l], and to the conversion of their obstinate and malicious Adversaries [m]—

[k] 1 Thess. ii. 14.

[l] Ch. vi. 20—23. xii. 4—12. 31, &c. xviii. 28—30.

[m] Ch. vi. 24—26. x. 12. xiii. 1—5. xix. 41—44.

of whom the *Jews* residing in the several countries were still the chief [n].

BUT as the rage and envy of the *Jews* sprang now from another cause than that which had moved their indignation before, (for now they persecuted the *Gentiles* because they laid claim to the privileges of the Gospel [o]) so it was necessary, that the Evangelist should attend to this particular point, and prove their claim to be just and valid.

AGREEABLY thereunto he reminds the *Jews* — that, though they were formerly his chosen nation, and consequently entitled to his peculiar favours; yet GOD had

[n] And hence it is that the scope and turn of St. LUKE's arguments are in many places so very similar to those of St. MATTHEW. Both Evangelists had similar designs. For if it was St. MATTHEW's intention, among other things, to convert, if possible, the unbelieving *Jews* who lived in *Palatine*; or to abate at least the fury and malice they bore to their *Brethren* who had embraced the Gospel: So it was one part of St. LUKE's intention to convert, if possible, the unbelieving *Jews* who resided in *distant Countries*; or to abate at least the rage and violence, which they exercised towards the *Gentiles*, and *those* of their *own Persuasion*, who had *believed*. There being then such an affinity in their designs, no wonder there is such *similarity* in their *method* and *argument*.

[o] Acts xvii. 5, 13.

often

often directed his Prophets to confer those blessings on *Strangers* and *Heathens*, of which, by their ingratitude, the *Jews* had rendered themselves unworthy [*p*] — that this was the case with regard to the Gospel, which, being ungratefully rejected by *them*, was therefore preached to the more obedient *Gentiles* [*q*] — that the hatred and violence which they expressed on that account was both unreasonable and inhuman [*r*] — that GOD, when he came to vindicate his Elect, would severely punish them for the injurious attempts they made on his people, and the aggravated provocations they had offered to himself [*s*] — and therefore that it behoved them to look to the consequences, and strive to avert, by faith and penitence, the grievous judgments that were coming upon them [*t*].

BUT so prejudiced were the *Jews* against the *Gentiles*, and so averse to their admission into the Christian Church, that they

[*p*] Ch. iv. 25—27.

[*q*] Ch. xx. 9—16.

[*r*] Ch. xv. 11—32. see DODDRIDGE on the place.

[*s*] Ch. xviii. 7, 8.

[*t*] Chap. xiii. 1—5. xxi. 5, &c.

endeavoured to degrade the character of those who asserted their claim, and questioned the authority by which it was supported [u]. They affirmed, that our Saviour chose no more than *Twelve* Apostles, to whom he committed the care of his Religion—that they who undertook to preach to the *Gentiles* were consequently but Deputies and inferior Ministers; the truth of whose doctrines entirely depended on the conformity they bore to what the others taught — and therefore, that this grand, fundamental doctrine of St. PAUL and his Associates must needs be false, since it wanted the seal of apostolical authority.

To obviate these objections, St. LUKE informs them, that the Lord appointed *Seventy* others [x], besides the *Twelve*, who were particularly called *Apostles*, to convey the knowledge of his Religion to the world; and not only so, but invested them with the same authority—charged them with the same instructions—and endowed them with

[u] Acts xiii. 45 — 53. “Am I not an Apostle?” says St. PAUL (1 Cor. ix. 1.) to those who questioned it; see also Gal. i. and ii. and the Commentators thereon.

[x] x. 1—16.

like power of working miracles in proof of their mission, as he had done to their brethren before: And consequently that the Apostles were not the sole commissioned Preachers of the Gospel, tho' they were indeed the first and principal.

AND as to the DOCTRINE itself, it was so far, he assures them, from wanting the support and evidence they supposed, that it stood on the highest and best-grounded authority. For CHRIST had plainly foretold them [*y*] that his Church would be filled with the complying *Gentiles*, while themselves, who rejected his Gospel, should judicially be rejected by him, and left to perish in their sins and impenitence: — and that all this was evident, not only from the account which himself now offered to the world, but also from the Gospel of St. MATTHEW [*z*], who was known

[*y*] Ch. xiii. 28—30. ch. xiv. 16—24.

[*z*] MATTH. xxi. 43. ch. xii. 18, 21. ch. xxiv. 14. It is a great instance of the wisdom of Providence, that St. MATTHEW, who wrote so very early, should give such strong intimations of the calling of the *Gentiles*; otherwise it might have been thought a crafty scheme, invented by the Apostles, in revenge for the ill success they met with among the Jews.

to be an Apostle, as well as an Evangelist: and whose Gospel he had strongly recommended to them — not by name indeed, but by a better, and more common method — that of quoting and copying his words [a].

IF this assertion should be thought to stand in need of proof, as in the opinion of many I suppose it will, the following Collations may serve to confirm it, at the same time that they illustrate the observations by which it was introduced.

E X A M P L E I.

MATTH. iii. 3.

Φωνὴ βοᾶν[τ]ῆς ἐν τῇ
ἐρήμῳ· Ἐτοιμάσα[τ]ε τὴν
ὁδὸν Κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν
ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ποιῆτε τὰς
ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ.

LUKE iii. 4—6.

Φωνὴ βοᾶν[τ]ῆς ἐν τῇ
ἐρήμῳ· Ἐτοιμάσα[τ]ε τὴν
ὁδὸν Κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν
ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ποιῆτε τὰς
ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ.

κ. τ. λ.

[a] The Evangelists often refer to passages in the *Old Testament* without naming the books in which they are to be found. And in like manner, several passages in the *Gospels* are recommended with a high degree of respect by the *Apostolical Fathers*, without the names of the Evangelists.

IN

IN this instance, it is natural to expect that both the Evangelists should perfectly agree, since the whole is a quotation from the Prophet ISAIAH [b]: But as this quotation differs a little from the *Greek Version* whence it was taken, it is not improbable, that St. LUKE, in transcribing it, made the same alteration that he observed St. MATTHEW had done before — and then took in the remainder of the Prophecy to shew its accomplishment in the admission of the *Gentiles* into the Church of CHRIST. For it plainly appeared at the time he wrote, that “all flesh was to see the Salvation of *GOD*,” and to partake of its inestimable blessings.

BUT whatever objections may be made to this Example, the following, doubtless, comes full to the point.

E X A M P L E II.

MATTHEW. iii. 7—10.

LUKE iii. 7—9.

Γενήματα ἔχιδνῶν, τίς
ὤψεδείξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν
διὰ τὴν μελλέσης ὀργῆς;

Γενήματα ἔχιδνῶν, τίς
ὤψεδείξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν
διὰ τὴν μελλέσης ὀργῆς;

[b] Ch. xl. 3.

D

Ποιή-

MATTHEW.

Ποιήσατε ἔν καρπὸν
ἀξίον τῆ μετάνοίας.

Καὶ μὴ δόξητε λέγειν
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχο-
μεν τὸ Ἀβραάμ. λέγω
γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι διὼα ὁ
Θεὸς οὐκ ἔστι λίθων τέτων
ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβρα-
άμ.

Ἦδη ἢ καὶ ἡ ἀξίγη
πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶ δένδρον
κεῖται· πᾶν ἔν δένδρον
μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλόν,
ὀκκόπηε), καὶ εἰς πυρ-
βάλλε).

AND again,

VER. 11, 12.

Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑ-
μᾶς ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνο-
υσαν [c]. ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μετᾶ
ἐρχόμενος, ἰσχυρότερός

LUKE.

Ποιήσατε ἔν καρπὸς
ἀξίους τῆ μετάνοίας·

Καὶ μὴ ἄρξηθε λέγειν
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχο-
μεν τὸ Ἀβραάμ. λέγω
γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι διὼα ὁ
Θεὸς οὐκ ἔστι λίθων τέτων
ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβρα-
άμ.

Ἦδη ἢ καὶ ἡ ἀξίγη
πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶ δένδρον
κεῖται· πᾶν ἔν δένδρον
μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλόν,
ὀκκόπηε), καὶ εἰς πυρ-
βάλλε).

VER. 16, 17.

Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω
ὑμᾶς.

ἔρχε) ἢ ὁ ἰσχυρό-
τερός με, ἔκ εἰμι ἰκα-

[c] St. MATTHEW inserts εἰς μετάνουσαν to remind the Jews of the necessity of *Repentance*: the Gentiles *acknowledged* it, which accounts for the omission in the other Gospel.

MATTHEW:

LUKE.

μὲ ἐσὶν, ἃ ἔκ εἰμι ἰκα-
νὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βα-
σάσαι· Αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βα-
πτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
καὶ πυρὶ.

Οὐ τὸ πρῶτον ἐν τῇ
χειρὶ αὐτῆ, καὶ Διακαθα-
ρεῖ τὰ ἄλωνα αὐτῆ, καὶ
ζυγᾶξει τὸ σῖτον αὐτῆ εἰς
τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἄ-
χυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ
ἀσβέσῳ.

νὸς λύσαι τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν
ὑποδημάτων αὐτῆ [d].
Αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν
πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ.

Οὐ τὸ πρῶτον ἐν τῇ
χειρὶ αὐτῆ, καὶ Διακαθα-
ρεῖ τὰ ἄλωνα αὐτῆ, καὶ
ζυγᾶξει τὸ σῖτον εἰς τὴν
ἀποθήκην αὐτῆ, τὸ δὲ ἄ-
χυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ
ἀσβέσῳ.

ST. LUKE, in describing our Saviour's Temptations (iv. 1—17) had certainly his eye on St. MATTHEW's account of the same transaction (iv. 1—11). For he follows it in general very close; tho' he found himself obliged to make some particular alterations in the order [e] and phraseology of it.

THE

[d] The variation here is owing to the different forms in which the Proverb was expressed among different nations. This may be applied to other articles.

[e] St. MATTHEW recites the Temptations according to the order in which they were employed: And in this order,

THE same may be said of the Cure of the Leper, v. 12, &c. and various other articles, as appears by comparing the following passages,

in St. LUKE,		with St. MATTH.	
Ch. v.	12—14.	Ch. viii.	2—4.
	20—25.	ix.	2—7.
	27—38.		9—17.
vi.	1—5.	xii.	1—8.
	27, 28, 32.	v.	44, 46.*
	41, 42.	vii.	3—5.
vii.	6—9.	viii.	8—10.*
	32—35.	xi.	16—19.
viii.	5—10.	xiii.	3—13.
ix.	16, 17.	xiv.	19—21.
	18—20,	xvi.	13—16.
	22—27.		21, 24—26, 28.
	40, 41.	xvii.	16, 17.

considering the natural temper of the *Jews*, they appear to rise progressively in strength one above another. On *different people* they might operate with *different powers*: And therefore St. LUKE, to preserve the *climax* with regard to the *Gentiles*, might judge it necessary to make the transposition we find he has. Vid. WETSTEN, in loc.

* The places marked with asterisks, if read according to some of the best Mss, come nearer the parallel texts than they are at present in the common printed copies. See MILL and WETSTEIN.

LUKE.

MATTHEW.

ix.	47, 48.	xviii.	2, 5.
xi.	9—13.	vii.	7—11.
	15—23.	xii.	24—30.
	24—26.		43—45.
	29—32.		39—42.
	34, 35.	vi.	22, 23.
xviii.	15—30.	xix.	13—29.
	31—33.	xx.	17—19.
xix.	29—38.	xxi.	1—9.
xx.	1—8.		23—27.
	9—19.		33—45.
	21—38.	xxii.	16—32.
xxi.	30—33.	xxiv.	32—35.

&c. &c. where the marks of their being transcribed, the one from the other, are often apparent to the slightest inspection, and render it the more amazing, that the learned DODWELL should presume to advance (*Diff. I. in IREN. § 39.*) that “the
 “later Evangelists had no knowledge of
 “what the former ones had written be-
 “fore them.”

BUT to convince the Reader of this truth, without the trouble of collating the Gospels, I shall lay before him two more

Examples, not inserted in the preceding series.

E X A M P L E III.

ΜΑΤΤ. vi. 25—33.

Διὰ τῆτο λέγω ὑμῖν,
Μὴ μερμυᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ
ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε ἢ τί
πίνητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι
ὑμῶν, τί ἐνδύσθηθε·

ἐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον
ἐστὶ τῆ τροφῆς, ἢ τὸ σῶ-
μα τῆ ἐνδύματι;

Ἐμβλέψατε [f] εἰς
τὰ πετεινὰ τῆ ἔραν, ὅτι
ἐσπεύρουσιν, ἐδὲ θερίζου-
σιν, ἐδὲ συβάγουσιν εἰς
ἀποθήκας, ἢ ὁ Πατήρ

LUKE xii. 22—31.

Διὰ τῆτο ὑμῖν λέγω,
Μὴ μερμυᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ
ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε μηδὲ
τῷ σώματι, τί ἐνδύση-
θε.

Ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἐστὶ
τῆ τροφῆς, ἢ τὸ σῶμα τῆ
ἐνδύματι.

Κατανοήσατε τὰς κό-
ρακας, ὅτι
ἐσπεύρουσιν, ἐδὲ θερίζου-
σιν, οἷς οὐκ ἐστὶ ταμεῖον,
ἐδὲ ἀποθήκη, ἢ ὁ Θεός

[f] Our Saviour, in his parabolical Discourses, often al-
luded to things present; and therefore St. MATTHEW, writing
to the Jews, retains his mode of expression, and says — Εμ-
βλέψατε — “Behold, or look on, the birds of the air.” But
the Gentiles were to make the reflexion for themselves; and
hence St. LUKE, with great propriety, substitutes the word —
Κατανοήσατε — “Consider” — in its stead.

MATTHEW.

LUKE.

ὑμῶν ὁ ἐργάτης [g]
 τρέφει αὐτά· ἔχ ὑμεῖς
 μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐ-
 τῶν;

τρέφει αὐτά· πῶσω
 μᾶλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε
 τῷ περὶ αὐτῶν;

Τίς ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν με-
 ριμνῶν δυνάτῃ προαει-
 ναι ἐπὶ τῇ ἡλικίαν αὐτῶν
 πῆχυν ἓνα;

Τίς ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν με-
 ριμνῶν δυνάτῃ προαει-
 ναι ἐπὶ τῇ ἡλικίαν αὐτῶν
 πῆχυν ἓνα;

Καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματίν
 τί μεριμνᾶτε;

Εἰ ἔν ἕτε ἐλάχιστον
 δυνάσθε, τί περὶ τῶν λα-
 πῶν μεριμνᾶτε;

Καὶ ἀμάθειε τὰ κρίνα
 τῆς ἀγροῦ, πῶς αὐξάνει·
 ἔκ κρομμύδα, ἔδὲ νήθει· λέγω
 ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἔσθῃ Σολομῶν
 ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῶν
 περιεβάλλειο, ὡς ἐν τέττων.

Καὶ ἀνοήσατε τὰ κρί-
 να, πῶς αὐξάνει· ἔκ κρο-
 μμύδα, ἔδὲ νήθει· λέγω ἡ-
 μῖν, ἔσθῃ Σολομῶν ἐν
 πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῶν πε-
 ριεβάλλειο, ὡς ἐν τέττων.

Εἰ ἡ τῆς χορῆς τῆς ἀγροῦ,
 σήμερον ἔνθα, καὶ αὔριον
 εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμε-
 νον, ὁ Θεὸς ἔτις ἀμφι-

Εἰ ἡ τῆς χορῆς ἐν τῷ
 ἀγρῷ σήμερον ἔνθα, καὶ
 αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλ-
 λόμενον, ὁ Θεὸς ἔτις

[g] Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐργάτης. St. LUKE expresses by Θεός, for a reason too obvious to be mentioned: However, the same reason will explain many other phraseological differences of the like nature.

MATTHEW.

LUKE.

ένυσιν, ἔ πολλῶ μάλ-
λον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι;

Μὴ ἔν μεριμνήσητε,
λέγουσιν, Τί φάγωμεν,
ἢ τί πίωμεν, ἢ τί πε-
ρβαλώμεθα;

Πάντα γὰ ταῦτα τὰ
ἔθνη ἰσχυροῦσιν· οἶδε γὰ ὁ
Πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἔρῶν· ὅτι
ζητεῖτε τῶν πάντων
τῶν.

Ζητεῖτε ἡ πρώτον τὴν
βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν
δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ [b],
καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προσε-
θήσονται ὑμῖν.

ἀμφίενυσιν, πόσῳ μάλ-
λον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι;

Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε
τί φάγητε, ἢ τί πίητε, καὶ
μὴ μελεωρίζεσθε.

Ταῦτα γὰ πάντα τὰ
ἔθνη ἔκ κόσμου ἰσχυροῦσιν
ὑμῶν ἡ ὁ Πατήρ οἶδεν ὅτι
ζητεῖτε τῶν.

Πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βα-
σιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῦ-
τα πάντα προσεθήσονται
ὑμῖν.

[b] Καὶ πλὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ — “And his righteousness.”
To the Jews, who believed that the profession of Religion
without the practice of a holy life would intitle them to salva-
tion, this was indeed a necessary piece of additional caution.
But the Gentiles had not so learned CHRIST.

EXAMPLE

EXAMPLE IV.

MATTHEW xi.

3—11.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορεύθητε ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννη ἃ ἀκέετε ἢ βλέπετε.

Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν ἢ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται ἢ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται ἢ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.

Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὁ εἰ μὴ σκανδαλισθῆ ἐν ἐμοί.

Τούτων δὲ παραδομένων, ἦρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου· Τί ἐξηλήθε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον;

LUKE vii. 20,

22—28.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορεύθητε ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννη ἃ εἶδετε ἢ ἠκούσατε.

Ὅτι τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.

Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὁ εἰ μὴ σκανδαλισθῆ ἐν ἐμοί.

Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάννου, ἦρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου· Τί ἐξεληλύθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον;

Ἄλλὰ

MATTHEW.

Ἄλλα τί ἐξήλθει
 ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μα-
 λακαῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσ-
 μένον; ἰδὲ, οἱ τὰ μα-
 λακὰ φορῶντες ἐν ταῖς
 οἰκῆσι τῶν βασιλέων εἰσίν.

Ἄλλα τί ἐξήλθει
 ἰδεῖν; προφήτῳ; ναὶ,
 λέγω ὑμῖν, ἢ περὶ ἄλλοτε-
 ρον προφήτην.

Οὗτος γάρ ἐστι περὶ
 τοῦ γεγραπτοῦ· ἰδὲ, ἐγὼ
 ἀποστέλλω τὸ ἄγγελόν μου
 πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς
 κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου
 ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Ἄλλω λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι
 ἐγγύστε ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ γυναι-
 κῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ
 Βαπτιστῆ· ὁ
 μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασι-
 λείᾳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, μείζων
 αὐτὸς ἐστίν.

LUKE.

Ἄλλα τί ἐξεληλύθατε
 ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλα-
 καῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμέ-
 νον; ἰδὲ, οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῶ
 ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρ-
 χοντες, ἐν ταῖς βασιλείοις
 εἰσίν.

Ἄλλα τί ἐξεληλύθατε
 ἰδεῖν; προφήτῳ; ναὶ,
 λέγω ὑμῖν, ἢ περὶ ἄλλοτε-
 ρον προφήτην.

Οὗτος ἐστὶ περὶ τοῦ
 γεγραπτοῦ· ἰδὲ, ἐγὼ ἀπο-
 στέλλω τὸ ἄγγελόν μου
 πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς
 κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου
 ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Λέγω ὑμῖν, μείζων
 ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ γυναικῶν προ-
 φήτης Ἰωάννης τοῦ Βα-
 πτίστα· οἱ
 μικρότεροι ἐν τῇ βασι-
 λείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μείζων
 αὐτὸς ἐστίν.

THE use I would make of these Collations at present, is only to shew, that St. LUKE, quoting thus largely from St. MATTHEW, must necessarily have written after him. But how long he wrote after him, i. e. after the year XXXVIII, remains to be deduced from other considerations.

Now it is evident, in the first place, from his addressing it, as he does, to the *believing Gentiles*, that St. LUKE wrote his Gospel something later than the year XL, when St. PETER preached to CORNELIUS [i]. For until *that* time the *Gentiles* were universally supposed to have no title to the Christian Covenant; and therefore could not properly be the object of such an address. And after they were admitted into the Church by *some*, yet, considering their claim was opposed by *others*, it is hardly to be imagined, this Evangelist would engage so far in their favour, as to draw up *immediately* such a work for their use, before the controversy was finally determined. This then, if it had any weight with him, must cause him to suspend his

[i] Acts x.

intention of writing, till after the celebrated Council at *Jerusalem*, which was held in the year XLIX.

BUT be this, or any thing else the reason, it is manifest, however, from his *Preface*, that he never set about the work till some considerable time after the CALL and CONVERSION of the *Gentiles*. For MANY, he assures us (and those, it should seem, *Heathen Converts*) had written before him on the same subject [k]. And if we reflect how much time it would take them up — to acquire information — to collect their materials — to compose their Histories — and to disperse them abroad; — we shall be forced to acknowledge, that St. LUKE, who succeeded them, could scarce begin to write his Gospel before the year specified above.

[k] The Life of CHRIST was so amazingly wonderful, that the *Heathens* could not but be sensibly affected with the accounts they heard of it from the first Preachers of the Gospel. These accounts therefore they would naturally commit to writing. Hence the origin of those Histories to which St. LUKE refers. Histories well known, it should seem, to THEOPHILUS; but Histories nevertheless which he is cautioned not to depend upon — because they were inaccurate, if not fabulous. EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. iij. c. 24.

BESIDES,

BESIDES, from the time that the *Gentiles* were admitted into the Church, he was so constantly employed in the work of the Ministry, that hitherto he seems to have had but little or no leisure for such an undertaking: And therefore we must look out for a season of repose, which might afford him a convenient opportunity of performing it.

Now if we attend St. PAUL in his travels, (and St. LUKE was his inseparable companion [l]) we shall find him, soon after this time, that is, about the end of the year LII, passing through *Greece*, or the Region of *Achaia*; and then settling at *Corinth*, where he continued a year and six months [m]. In this time of relaxation from journeyings and fatigue, he wrote his *First* and *Second* Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, and also that to the *Galatians*. And while the Apostle was engaged in these works, it is not improbable, but St. LUKE was busied in writing his Gospel. The opportunity was favourable; and his concern

[l] IREN. lib. iii. c. 14.

[m] Acts xviii. 11.

for the Church would naturally prompt him to lay hold of it.

THIS may be reasonably supposed: But we are not obliged to rest this point on a mere supposition. It stands confirmed by no meaner testimony than that of St. JEROM; who affirms, doubtless on the authority of the Ancients, that “St. LUKE
“ wrote his Volume of the Gospel in the
“ Regions of *Achaia* and *Bœotia* [n]” ; — plainly referring to *this* journey of St. PAUL through that part of *Greece*. And if it was written at this time, under the care and inspection of St. PAUL, and delivered to the *Corinthians* with his approbation, it was not without peculiar propriety (especially in writing to *them*) that he afterwards styles St. LUKE, its Author, “ the Brother,

[n] LUCAS, —cujus laus in Evangelio, qui & ipse discipulus Apostoli PAULI, in *Achaie Bœotique* partibus volumen condidit, quædam altius repetens. *Proœm. in Comment. super MATTHEUM*. GREGOR. NAZIAN. seems to intimate the same, tom. I. Orat. xxv. p. 438. ed. Paris. 1630. Vide GROTII Proleg. in Luc. Evangel. and CAVE'S Lives of the Apostles, p. 181. Art. St. LUKE, § 4. LARDNER'S *Supplement &c.* vol. I. Chap. viii. p. 268, &c.

“ whose

“ whose praise is in the Gospel,” 2 *Cor.* viii. 18. [o].

AND as he was *now* concerned to recommend the *Author*, so had he taken occasion *before* to recommend his *Gospel* to them; or rather to awaken them to an attentive perusal of it. For, finding it necessary to reprove the *Corinthians* with regard to their behaviour at the Lord's Supper, he labours to convince them of the heinousness of their conduct, by shewing its unsuitableness to the nature and end of that solemn institution. But when he comes to explain the institution itself, tho' he acquired the knowledge of it by immediate Revelation; yet, it is very remarkable, that he expresses himself in the words of St. LUKE:

LUKE xxii. 19, 20. 1 COR. xi. 23 — 25.

Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον,	Ἔλαβεν ἄρτον, καὶ
ὠχαριστήσας ἐκλάσε,	ὠχαριστήσας ἐκλάσε, καὶ
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λέ-	εἶπε· Λάβετε, φάγετε*·
γων· Τὸ ἐστὶ τὸ ζῶ-	Τὸ μὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ζῶμα,

[o] See the Commentators on the place.

* Similar to St. MATT. xxvi. 26.

LUKE.

I COR.

μά μᾶ, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
 διδόμενον· τῆτο ποιεῖτε
 εἰς τὸ ἐμὲ ἀνάμνησιν.

Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ πω-
 τήριον, μὲ τὸ δειπνήσαι,
 λέγων· Τῆτο τὸ ποτήριον,
 ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ
 αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
 ἐκχυρόμενον.

τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμε-
 νον [ρ]. τῆτο ποιεῖτε εἰς
 τὸ ἐμὲ ἀνάμνησιν.

Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ πω-
 τήριον, μὲ τὸ δειπνήσαι,
 λέγων· Τῆτο τὸ ποτήριον,
 ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν
 τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τῆτο ποι-
 εῖτε. κ. τ. λ.

intending, it should seem, by this quōta-
 tion, to make them sensible, that, though
 they might plead the frailty of their me-
 mory in excuse of their forgetfulness of
 what *himself* had delivered on this subject
 by word of mouth; they were, neverthe-
 less, extremely culpable in not attending
 to the information of the *Gospel* they had
 then in their hands; which, if duly re-
 garded, would have effectually restrained
 them from such infamous proceedings.

[ρ] St. LUKE, referring to CHRIST'S *real* body, then to be
 offered up, says διδόμενον; St. PAUL, referring to his *sacramen-
 tal* body, or the *bread*, uses the word κλώμενον: And both with
 singular propriety.

IF this be allowed, and St. PAUL had actually an eye to St. LUKE, in the passage here cited, we have then a pretty clear proof that his Gospel was written before the *First* Epistle to the *Corinthians* — that is, before the year LVII; and thence conclude, that we cannot be far distant from the truth in fixing the date of its first publication to the year LIII, the thirteenth of CLAUDIUS:

S E C T. IV.

AS the Gospel met with so much opposition; it became the duty of the first Evangelists, in order to facilitate its way in the world, to accommodate their accounts to the temper of the times, and remove the impediments that obstructed its progress. In consequence of this, they were unavoidably led, in the course of their narration, not only to confirm the truth of the doctrine they meant to establish, — but also to confute the cavils, — correct the opinions, — and reform the practices, of those who opposed it. Hence their Histories be-

E came

came, in the detail, more complex and various than we have reason to think they would otherwise have been; — containing references to customs and tenets, which, but for the particular disposition of the times, would in all probability have had no place in them.

BUT when the Christian Religion had gained ground, and the controversies that disturbed it were tolerably settled, it is in no wise unnatural to suppose, that some of its most faithful and serious Professors might wish to see the Gospel exhibited in a more simple form: and, without any particular consideration to *Jew* or *Gentile*, delivered in a manner suitable to the condition of the world at large.

AGREEABLY to this supposition, we are told, that the Christian Converts at *Rome* requested St. MARK, with great earnestness, to write *such* a History for their use and instruction [q]. I say *such* a History.

[q] Τοσούτο δ' ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς ἡ ἀκρατῶν τῷ Πίττει ἀλαοίαις εὐσεβείαις φείγθω, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἰκαιῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοῇ, μὴ δὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τῷ θείῳ κηρύγματι διδασκαλία. Παρακλήσισι δὲ σαιτοίαις Μάρκου, ἔ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλυθον ὄντα Πίττει λιπαρῆσαι, ὡς αὐτὸ καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδουθί-

ry. For the Gospel he wrote at their request is evidently a simple and compendious narrative [r], divested of almost all peculiarities, and accommodated to general use. In compiling this narrative, he had but little more to do, it seems, than to abridge the Gospels which lay before him—varying some expressions, and inserting some additions, as occasion required. That St. MARK followed this plan, no one can doubt, who compares his Gospel with those of the two former Evangelists. He

σης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας, μὴ προτερόν τε ἀρεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸ ἄιδεα, καὶ ταύτην αἰτίας ἠρώδαι τῆς τῆ λεγομένη καὶ Μάρκου Εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. *Tantus autem pietatis fulgor emicuit in mentibus eorum, qui (Romæ) PETRUM audierant, ut parum haberent semel audisse, nec contenti essent cœlestis verbi doctrinam vivâ voce, nullis traditam scriptis, accepisse; sed MARCUM, PETRI comitem, cujus jam extat Evangelium, multis precibus orarent, ut doctrinæ illius, quam auditu acceperant, scriptum aliquem commentarium apud se relinqueret. Nec prius destiterunt, quam hominem expugnassent; quomodo causa fuerunt cur scriberetur Evangelium, quod MARCI dicitur. CLEM. ALEX. apud EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 15.*

[r] MARCUS discipulus & interpretes PETRI, juxta quod PETRUM referentem audierat, rogatus Romæ a fratribus breve scripsit Evangelium. HIERONYM. Catal. Script. Eccles. voce MARC. Propter hoc & compendiosam & præcurrentem annunciationem fecit. IREN. lib. iii. c. xi.

copies largely from both : and takes either the one or the other almost perpetually for his guide. The order indeed is his own, and is very close and well connected. In his account of facts he is also clear, exact, and critical ; and the more so perhaps, as he wrote it for the perusal of a learned and critical people. For he seems to proceed with great caution, and to be solicitous that his Gospel should stand clear of all objections. But to consider it more particularly.

THE *Exordium* is somewhat singular. For whilst the former Evangelists describe our Saviour as “the Son of MAN,” St. MARK stiles him in express terms “the
 “ Son of GOD [s] :—A title the most likely, as being the most august, to engage the attention and obedience of the *Romans*, those Lords of the Earth, to the Religion that was promulged by him. In describing this Religion, St. MARK has brought together so many of our Saviour’s Discourses and Miracles, as might serve to exhibit a general view of his character ; and shew the world, at the same time, what kind of

[s] Ch. i. 1.

principles they were concerned to embrace, and what course of life they were bound to lead, who professed themselves his Followers and Disciples. This fully answered the end of his design. But as the things he records to this purpose are chiefly taken from the other Evangelists, so it is to be observed that they are often expressed in their very words; which confirms the account we have before given of him. How much he is indebted to St. MATTHEW, will appear in some measure from the following Collations:

E X A M P L E I.

MARK IV. 1 — 9. MATTHEW. xiii. 1 — 9.

Ἦρξατο διδάσκειν πα-
ρα τῆ θάλασσαν· ἢ συν-
ήχθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος
πολύς, ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐμ-
βάνα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καθ-
ῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ· ἢ
πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν
θάλασσαν ἵπτι τῆ γῆς ἦν.

Καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς
ἐν ᾠραβολαῖς πολλά,
ἢ ἔλεγεν,

Ἐκάθητο πα-
ρα τῆ θάλασσαν· ἢ συν-
ήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι
πολλοὶ, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ
πλοῖον ἐμβάνα καθῆσθαι·
ἢ
πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἵπτι τῆ αἰ-
γιαλὸν εἰσήκει.

Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς
πολλά ἐν ᾠραβολαῖς,
λέγων, Ἰδοὺ,

MARK.

MATTHEW.

Ἰδὲ, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπεί-
ρων ἄσπεῖραι·

Καὶ ἐγγύθει ἐν τῷ
σπείρειν, ὃ [t] μὲν ἔπεσε
ὡραὶ τὸ ὄρον, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ
πείρινα ἄσπεῖραι [u] καὶ
κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

Ἄλλο δὲ ἔπεσεν ὅτι
τὰ περὶ ὄρον, ὅτι ὄρον
εἶχε γὰρ πολλὴν, καὶ
ὄθεν ἐξάνειλε, ἀλλὰ
τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·

ἡλίξ δὲ ἀναείλαντο,
ὄκαυμαλίωθη, καὶ, ἀλλὰ τὸ
μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, ἐξηράνθη.

Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς
τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέβη-
σαν αἱ ἀκάνθαι, καὶ ζω-
πέπνιζαν αὐτὸ, καὶ καρπὸν
ὄρον ἔδωκε·

Ἰδὲ, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπεί-
ρων ἄσπεῖρειν·

Καὶ ἐν τῷ
σπείρειν αὐτὸν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε
ὡραὶ τὸ ὄρον, ἔλθε τὰ
πείρινα καὶ
κατέφαγεν αὐτά.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ὅτι
τὰ περὶ ὄρον, ὅτι ὄρον
εἶχε γὰρ πολλὴν, καὶ
ὄθεν ἐξάνειλε, ἀλλὰ
τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·

ἡλίξ δὲ ἀναείλαντο,
ὄκαυμαλίωθη, καὶ, ἀλλὰ τὸ
μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, ἐξηράνθη.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ὅτι
τὰς ἀκάνθας· ἔλθε ἀνέβη-
σαν αἱ ἀκάνθαι, καὶ ἀπέ-
πνιζαν αὐτά.

[t] St. MARK, tho' he copies the words of St. MATTHEW, yet puts them in the singular number in conformity to St. LUKE viii. 4, &c.

[u] Τὸ ἄσπεῖραι is wanting in some of the best MSS. vid. MILL. & WETSTEN. in loc. which renders the two Evangelists still more conformable to each other.

MARK.

Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς
τὸ γλῶττι καλίω. καὶ
ἔδιδε καρπὸν ἀναβαίνον-
τα καὶ αὐξανούσια, καὶ ἔφε-
ρην, ἐν τριάκοντα, καὶ ἐν
ἑξήκοντα, Ἐν ἑκατόν[α].

Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὁ
ἔχων ὠτα ἀκέειν, ἀκεί-
ετω.

MATTHEW.

Ἄλλα ἡ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ
τὸ γλῶττι καλίω. καὶ
ἔδιδε καρπὸν,

ὁ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὁ ἡ
ἑξήκοντα, ὁ ἡ τριάκοντα.

Ὁ
ἔχων ὠτα ἀκέειν, ἀκεί-
ετω.

AND so again in the explanation of this Parable, ver. 15—20, he had evidently his eye all along on St. MATTHEW, ver. 19—23, till he comes to the conclusion, ver. 21, 22, 25; where he makes a transition to the Gospel of St. LUKE, ch. viii. 16—18.

EXAMPLE II.

MARK xiv. 26—46.

MATTHEW xxvi.

30—50.

Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἔξ-
ἤλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρθρον τῶν ἑ-
λαιῶν.

Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἔξ-
ἤλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρθρον τῶν ἑ-
λαιῶν.

[α] St. MARK here inverts the words of St. MATTHEW, in order to form the *climax*; which is one instance, among many others, of the great regard he had to his language.

MARK.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοῖ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· ὅτι γέγραπται, Πατάξω τὸ ποιμνία, ἢ διασκορπισθήσε) τὰ πρόβατα [γ].

Ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Καὶ εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἐγώ.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὲν λέγω σοι, ὅτι σήμερον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, πρὶν ἢ δὶς [z] ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

MATTHEW.

Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοῖ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· γέγραπ) γ) Πατάξω τὸ ποιμνία, ἢ διασκορπισθήσε) τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνης.

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Εἰ ἅ πάντες σκανδαλισθῶσιν) ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ ἂν οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθῶμαι.

Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὲν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ, πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

Ὁ δὲ

[γ] Some Mss. add τῆς ποιμνης in this place, as it is in St. MATTHEW. vide MILL. & WETSTEN.

[z] As the Jews, in the enumeration of the times of the night, took notice only of *one* cock-crowing, which comprehended

MARK.

Ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν εἶπε
 μάλλον, Ἐάν με δεῖ
 ζῆναποθανεῖν σοι, ἔ μή
 σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. Ὡσ-
 αὐτως ἰησοῦς καὶ πάντες ἔλε-
 γον.

Καὶ ἔρχοντο εἰς χω-
 ρίον, ἔ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθηση-
 μανή. καὶ
 λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,
 Καθίσατε ἔδε, ἔως προσ-
 δέξωμαι.

Καὶ πάλιν λαμβάνει τὸν
 Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ
 Ἰωάννην μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ

MATTHEW.

λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πέτρος,
 Καὶν δεῖ με σὺν σοὶ
 ἀποθανεῖν, ἔ μή σε ἀπ-
 αρνήσομαι. Ὁμοίως ἰη-
 σοῦς καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ
 εἶπον.

Τότε ἔρχεται μετ' αὐ-
 τῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς χωρίον
 λεγόμενον Γεθησημανεὶ καὶ
 λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς, Καθ-
 ίσατε αὐτῶν, ἔως ἔ ἀπελ-
 θῶν προσδέξωμαι ἔκει.

Καὶ πάλιν λαβὼν τὸν
 Πέτρον, καὶ τὰς δύο υἱοὺς
 Ζεβεδαίου,

hended the third watch; so St. MATTHEW, to give them a clear information that PETER would deny his Master *thrice* before *Three* in the morning, needed only to say, that he would do it “before the cock crew.” But the ROMANS, reckoning by a *double* crowing of the cock — the first of which was about *Midnight*, and the second at *Three* — stood in need of a more particular designation: And therefore St. MARK, to denote the same hour to *them*, was obliged to say — “before the cock crow *twice*.” — JUVENAL uses exactly the same phrase, to specify the same hour:

“Quod tamen ad cāntum galli facit ipse SECUNDI,

“Proximus ante diem caupo sciet.” —

Sat. ix. 107.

MARK.

ἡρξάτο ὀκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περιλυπτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε.

Καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν, ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τῆ γῆς, ἵνα προσήυχθῆτο, ἵνα, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἢ ὥρα·

Καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἄβραῶ ὁ Πατήρ, πάντα διωκιάσοι· παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τῆτο· ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σύ.

Καὶ ἔρχετο καὶ κρίσκει αὐτὰς καθύδουνας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σίμων, καθύδεις; σὺ ἰχθύσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορήσαι;

Γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλ-

MATTHEW.

ἡρξάτο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν.

Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περιλυπτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε ἵνα γρηγορεῖτε μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν, ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν, προσεύχόμενος.

Καὶ λέγων, Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρέλθῃ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τῆτο· πλὴν ἕως ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ.

Καὶ ἔρχετο πρὸς τὰς μαθητάς, ἵνα κρίσκει αὐτὰς καθύδουνας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Οὕτως σὺ ἰχθύσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορήσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ;

Γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλ-

θῆτε

MARK.

θῆε εἰς πειρασμὸν. τὸ
 μὴ πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἢ
 ᾧ σὰρξ ἀδελφής.

Καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν
 προσηύξατο, ἢ αὐτὸν λό-
 γον εἰπών.

Καὶ ὑποστρέψας εὐ-
 ρεν αὐτὰς πάλιν καθύ-
 δοντας· ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὀφ-
 θαλμοὶ αὐτῶν κἀβαθα-
 ρυνόμενοι, κ. τ. λ.

St. MARK omits our Sa-
 viour's *third Prayer*, as being
 the same with the *former*; and
 only mentions his *third Return*.

Καὶ ἔρχεῖ τὸ τρίτον,
 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθύ-
 δετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀνα-
 παύεσθε [a];
 ἀπέχει, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα·
 ἰδοὺ, ᾧ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
 ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας
 τοῦ ἀμαρτωλῶν.

MATTHEW.

θῆε εἰς πειρασμὸν. τὸ
 μὴ πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἢ
 ᾧ σὰρξ ἀδελφής.

Πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου ἀπ-
 ελθὼν προσηύξατο, λέ-
 γων, Πάτερ μου, κ. τ. λ.

Καὶ ἔλθων δὲ ἴσκει
 αὐτὰς πάλιν καθύδου-
 τας· ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ
 ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβαρημένοι.

Καὶ ἀφίς αὐτὰς, ἀπ-
 ελθὼν πάλιν, προσηύξα-
 το ἐκ τρίτου, ἢ αὐτὸν
 λόγον εἰπών.

Τότε ἔρχεῖ πρὸς τὰς
 μαθητὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει
 αὐτοῖς, Καθύδετε τὸ λοι-
 πὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε [a];
 ἰδοὺ, ἦγγικεν ἡ ὥρα· ἔστι
 υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδί-
 δοταί εἰς χεῖρας ἀμαρτω-
 λῶν.

[a] So I venture to point the sentence — and to read inter-
 rogatively — “Do you *still* sleep, and take your rest?” This
 makes the sense perfect, and consistent with what follows.

MARK.

Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμην·
 ἰδὲ ὁ παραδιδὸς με ἤγ-
 γικε.

Καὶ ὥσθως, ἔτι αὐτὰ
 λαλῶντες, παραγίνετο
 Ἰάδας, εἰς ἃν τὴ δώδεκα,
 καὶ μετ' αὐτῶ ὄχλος πο-
 λὺς μετ' μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύ-
 λων, ὡς τὴ δὲ χειρῶν
 καὶ τὴ γραμματίων ἔτι
 πρεσβυτέρων.

Δεδώκει ἡ ὁ παραδι-
 δὸς αὐτὸν σύσημον αὐ-
 τοῖς, λέγων, Ὅν ἂν
 φιλήσω, αὐτὸς ἐστὶ κρα-
 τήσατε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀπα-
 γάγετε ἀσφαλῶς.

Καὶ ἐλθὼν, ὥσθως
 προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει,
 Ῥαββί, ραββί· καὶ κατε-
 φίλησεν αὐτόν.

Οἱ ἡ ἐπέβαλον ἐπὶ
 αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν,
 καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

MATTHEW.

Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμην·
 ἰδὲ ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδὸς
 με.

Καὶ ἔτι αὐτῶ λαλῶν-
 τες, ἰδὲ, Ἰάδας εἰς τὴ
 δώδεκα ἦλθε,
 καὶ μετ' αὐτῶ ὄχλος πο-
 λὺς μετ' μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύ-
 λων, ἀπὸ τὴ δὲ χειρῶν καὶ
 πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ.

Ὁ ἡ παραδι-
 δὸς αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς
 σημεῖον, λέγων, Ὅν ἂν
 φιλήσω, αὐτὸς ἐστὶ κρα-
 τήσατε αὐτόν.

Καὶ ὥσθως
 προσελθὼν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, εἶπε,
 Χαῖρε, ραββί· καὶ κατεφί-
 λησεν αὐτόν.

Τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέ-
 βάλλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν
 Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐκράτησαν
 αὐτόν.

AND

AND so on through the course of this Chapter.

FOR more instances of the same kind, the Reader is referred to the following Table :

MARK.		MATTHEW.	
Ch.	i. 3—8. 16—20. 40—44.	Ch.	iii. 1—6, 11. iv. 18—22. viii. 2—4.
	ii. 14—17. 23—28.		ix. 9—12. xii. 1—8.
	vi. 1—5. 35—51.		xiii. 54—58. xiv. 15—27, 32.
	vii. 1—23, &c.		xv. 1—20, &c. 32—39.
	viii. 1—10. 27—29. —39.		xvi. 13—16. 20—28.
	ix. 1—12.		xvii. 1—12.
	x. 1—16. 32—34—45.		xix. 1—15. xx. 17—19—28.
	xi. 27—33.		xxi. 23—27.
	xii. 13—27.		xxii. 16—32.
	xiii. 1—9. 14—32.		xxiv. 1—9. 15—36. xiv. 1

MARK.

MATTHEW.

Ch.	xiv.	1—25.	xxvi.	4—29.
	xv.	1—20.	xxvii.	1, 2, 11, 31.
		—47.		—61.
	xvi.	1—8.	xxviii.	1—8.

HENCE then it appears, that St. MARK perused the Gospel of St. MATTHEW, and had it before him when he wrote his own. This, indeed, is a point generally acknowledged; but we are now to prove—what will not perhaps be so easily granted—that he copied likewise from St. LUKE. To this end we shall, as before, compare a few of the parallel places, and leave the Reader to judge for himself.

EXAMPLE I.

MARK i. 21—28.

LUKE iv. 31—37.

Καὶ εἰσπορεύσας εἰς
Καπερναῖμ

ἢ δ' ἰθὺς

Καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Κα-
περναῖμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλι-
λαίας [b], ἢ ἦν διδά-

[b] As the cities in the *Holy Land* were pretty well known by the *Romans*, St. MARK says only *Capernaum*: But the *Greeks*, having little or no connexion with *that* country, required a more particular information; and therefore St. LUKE adds — πόλις τῆς Γαλιλαίας — “a city of Galilee.”

MARK.

τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς Συναγωγὴν, ἐδίδασκε.

Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτῶ·——

Καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρῃ, ἢ ἀνεκραξέ,

λέγων, "Εα, τί ἡμῖν ἢ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος Θεός.

Καὶ ἐπέιμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Φιμώθητι, ἢ ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτῶ.

Καὶ παρατίξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον — ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῶ.

Καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν πάντες, ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸς, λέγοντας, Τί ἐσι τῶτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἢ καινὴ αὕτη, ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς

LUKE.

σκῶν αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν.

Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτῶ·——

Καὶ ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίον ἀκαθάρῃ, ἢ ἀνεκραξέ——

λέγων, "Εα, τί ἡμῖν ἢ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος Θεός.

Καὶ ἐπέιμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Φιμώθητι, ἢ ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτῶ.

Καὶ ρίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον, ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῶ——

Καὶ ἐγγίβο θάμβο ἐπὶ πάντας, ἢ Συναλάλυν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, λέγοντες, Τίς ὁ λόγος τῶ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἰπιτάσει τοῖς πνεύμασι

MARK.

LUKE.

πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρ-
τοις ὑπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπα-
κούσων αὐτῷ;

Ἐξῆλθε ἣ ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐ-
τῆς ἀθὺς εἰς ὅλην τὴν
περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

ἀκαθάρτοις τῶν δυνάμεσι, καὶ
ἐξέρχον;) ;

Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ἡ χὺς
ἐκ αὐτῆς εἰς πᾶν ἅπαν τὸ
πὸν τῆς περιχώρου.

EXAMPLE II.

MARK II. 5—12:

Ἰδὼν ἣ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν
πίστιν αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ
παραλυτικῷ· Τέκνον,
ἀφέωνται σοι αἱ ἁμαρ-
τίαι σου.

Ἦσαν δὲ τινὲς τῶν γραμ-
ματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι,
καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν τῇ
καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν·

Τί ἔτι ἔτι ἔτι λαλεῖ
βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται
ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ
εἰς ὁ Θεός;

Καὶ ἀθέως ὑπὸ πνεύματι
ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι

LUKE V. 20—26:

Καὶ ἰδὼν ἣ
πίστιν αὐτῶν, λέγει αὐτῷ·
Ἄνθρωπε, ἀφέωνται σοι
αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου.

Καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογί-
ζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες·

Τίς ἐστιν ἔτι ὅς λα-
λεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς
δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας,
εἰ μὴ μόνον ὁ Θεός;

Ἐπιγνὼν ἣ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
τὰς διαλογισμὰς αὐτῶν,
αὐτῶν,

MARK.

LUKE.

αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἔτι αὐτοὶ δια-
 λογιζόν) ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, εἶπεν
 αὐτοῖς· Τί ταῦτα δια-
 λογίζεσθε ἐν τῇ καρδίαις
 ὑμῶν;

Τί ἐστὶν ἀνοήτωτερον
 εἰπεῖν τῷ παρρησιαστικῷ·
 Ἀφέναι σοὶ αἱ ἁμαρ-
 τίαί· ἢ εἰπεῖν· Ἑγεραι,
 καὶ ἄρρον σοὶ τὸ κράββατον
 καὶ πορεύεαι;

Ἴνα ᾗ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξου-
 σίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώ-
 που ἀφέναι ὅπτι τῆ γῆς
 ἁμαρτίας, (λέγει τῷ
 παρρησιαστικῷ,)

Σοὶ λέγω, Ἑγεραι, καὶ
 ἄρρον τὸν κράββατόν [c]
 σοὶ, καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸ οἶκόν
 σοὶ.

Καὶ ἠγέρθη ἀθέως,
 καὶ ἄρας τὸ κράββατον,

παρρησιαστικῷ εἶπε πρὸς
 αὐτὸν· Τί διαλογίζεσθε
 ἐν τῇ καρδίαις ὑμῶν;

Τί ἐστὶν ἀνοήτωτερον
 εἰπεῖν·

Ἀφέναι σοὶ αἱ ἁμαρ-
 τίαί σοι· ἢ εἰπεῖν· Ἑγερ-
 ραι,
 καὶ πορεύεαι;

Ἴνα ᾗ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξου-
 σίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώ-
 που ὅπτι τῆ γῆς ἀφέναι
 ἁμαρτίας, (εἶπε τῷ παρρη-
 σιαστικῷ,)

Σοὶ λέγω, Ἑγεραι, καὶ
 ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιον [c] σοὶ,
 πορεύεαι εἰς τὸ οἶκόν σοι.

Καὶ παρρησιαστικῷ ἀνα-
 ράσας ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν,

[c] St. MARK changes the κλινίδιον of LUKE into κράββατον, as being a word more familiar to the Romans. vid. CICERO, de Divinat. ii. 63. SENECA, Epist. xviii. CATULL. x. 22, MARTIAL. xii. 32.

MARK.

LUKE.

ἔξῃλθεν ἐναντίον πάντων
 ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι
 πάντας, καὶ δοξάζειν τὸ
 Θεόν.

ἄρας ἐφ' ᾧ κατέκειτο ἀπὸ
 ἦλθεν — καὶ ἑκστασις
 ἔλαβεν ἀπαντίας, καὶ ἐδό-
 ξαζον τὸ Θεόν.

EXAMPLE III.

MARK II. 19—32.

LUKE V. 34—38.

Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ
 Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ δυνάαν) οἱ υἱοὶ
 τῶ νυμφῶν), ἐν ᾧ ὁ
 ὁ νυμφίος) μετ' αὐτῶν
 ἐσσι, νηστεύειν; —

Ἐλθόν) ἡμέραι,
 ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν
 ὁ νυμφίος), καὶ τότε νη-
 στεύουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις τῆ
 ἡμέραις.

Καὶ εἶδεις
 ἐπίβλημα ῥάκας ἀγνά-
 φος ἐπιρράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμα-
 τίῳ παλαιῷ· εἰ ἢ μὴ,
 αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς
 τὸ καινὸν τῶ παλαιῷ, καὶ
 χεῖρον οἰσμα γίνε).

Ὁ ἢ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτῶς·
 Μὴ δυνάατε τὰς υἱὰς τῶ
 νυμφῶν), ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμ-
 φίος) μετ' αὐτῶν ἐσσι,
 ποιῆσαι νηστεύειν;

Ἐλθόν) ἡμέραι,
 καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐ-
 τῶν ὁ νυμφίος) τότε νη-
 στεύουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις τῆ
 ἡμέραις.

[Οὐδεὶς ἢ ἐπιβάλλει
 ἐπίβλημα ῥάκας ἀγνάφου
 ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· αἶρει
 γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς ἀπὸ
 τῶ ἱματίου, καὶ χεῖρον
 οἰσμα γίνε). MATTH.
 IX. 16.]

MARK.

LUKE.

Καὶ ἔδει βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὰς παλαιάς· εἰ ἢ μὴ, ῥήσεται ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τὰς ἀσκὰς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ διαπολεῦνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὰς καινὰς βλητέον.

Καὶ ἔδει βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὰς παλαιάς· εἰ ἢ μήγε, ῥήξει ὁ νέος οἶνος τὰς ἀσκὰς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ διαπολεῦνται· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὰς καινὰς βλητέον.

EXAMPLE IV.

MARK X. 13—31.

LUKE XVIII. 15—30.

Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἅψῃ αὐτῶν· οἱ ἢ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν.

Προσέφερον ἢ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψῃ· Ἰδόντες ἢ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπιτίμησαν αὐτοῖς.

Ἰδὼν ἢ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγανάκησεν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά· ἅτινά τριτόνων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Ὁ ἢ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτά, εἶπεν· Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά· ἅτινά τριτόνων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅς ἐάν τις μὴ δεξῆται τὴν βασι-

Ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅς ἐάν τις μὴ δεξῆται τὴν βασι-

MARK.

λείαν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς παι-
δίον, ἔ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς
αὐτόν. —

Καὶ — προσδραμῶν
εἰς — ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν·
Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθε, τί
ποιήσω ἵνα ζωῶ αἰώ-
νιον κληρονομήσω;

Ὁ ᾧ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;
ἔδεις ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς,
ὁ Θεός.

Τὰς ἐπιτολάς οἶδας·
Μὴ μοιχώσης· Μὴ φο-
νώσης· Μὴ κλέψης· Μὴ
ψευδομαρτυρήσης· Μὴ
ἀποσερήσης· Τίμα τὸ
πατέρα σου καὶ τὸ μητέρα.

Ὁ ᾧ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶ-
πεν αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε,
ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξά-
μιεν ὅκ νεότητός μου.

Ὁ ᾧ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας
αὐτῷ, ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν,

LUKE.

λείαν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς παι-
δίον, ἔ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς
αὐτόν.

Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέ τις
αὐτὸν ἄρχων, λέγων·
Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθε, τί
ποιήσας ζωῶ αἰώνιον
κληρονομήσω;

Εἶπε ᾧ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;
ἔδεις ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς,
ὁ Θεός.

Τὰς ἐπιτολάς οἶδας·
Μὴ μοιχώσης· Μὴ φο-
νώσης· Μὴ κλέψης· Μὴ
ψευδομαρτυρήσης·
Τίμα τὸ
πατέρα σου καὶ τὸ μητέρα
σου.

Ὁ ᾧ
εἶπε·
ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξά-
μιεν ὅκ νεότητός μου.

Ἀκίσσας ᾧ ταῦτα ὁ
Ἰησοῦς,

καὶ

MARK.

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐν σοὶ ὑπερεῖ ὑπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ δὸς τοῖς πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ· καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολουθήσει μοι· —

Ὁ δὲ, συγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ, ἀπῆλθε λυπέμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.

Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτῶ· Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ κτήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται; —

Εὐκρωπώτερόν ἐστι κάμηλον διὰ τὴν τρυμαλιᾶς τὴν ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλῆσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Οἱ δὲ περιωσῶς ἐξεπλήσαντο, λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς· Καί τις δύναται σωθῆναι;

LUKE.

εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐτι ἐν σοὶ λείπει πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ διάδοθι πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ· καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολουθήσει μοι.

Ὁ δὲ, ἀκῶσας ταῦτα — [ἀπῆλθε λυπέμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά. ΜΑΤΤ. xix. 22.]

Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς περιλυπὸν γρόμενον, εἶπε· Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ κτήματα ἔχοντες εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Εὐκρωπώτερον γὰρ ἐστι κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλῆσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Εἶπον δὲ οἱ ἀκῶσαντες·

Καί τις δύναται σωθῆναι;

MARK.

Ἐμβλέψας δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγει· Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ πάντα δυνατὰ ἐσὶν ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Καὶ ἠρξάμενος ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολοθήσαμέν σοι.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ ἀδελφάς, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ μητέρα, ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀρχάς, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ ἢ ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας,

εἰ μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατόνταπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ—καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι, ἕχθαιοί καὶ οἱ ἕχθαιοι, πρῶτοι.

LUKE.

[Ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τούτο ἀδύνατον ἐστὶν, ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ πάντα δυνατὰ ἐσὶν. ΜΑΤΤΗ. XIX. 26.]

Εἶπε ἰὼ ὁ Πέτρος, Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολοθήσαμέν σοι.

Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ γονεῖς, ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα, ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ,

ὃς εἰ μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατόνταπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

[Πολλοὶ ἰὼ ἔσονται πρῶτοι, ἕχθαιοί καὶ ἕχθαιοι, πρῶτοι. ΜΑΤΤΗ. XIX. 30.]

THESE instances are certainly too many to be thought accidental, and much too close and uniform to be accounted for upon any other principle, than that of the one's transcribing from the other [d]. Nor are these the only instances: The following Table will exhibit more; tho' not all of them perhaps equally striking:

St. MARK.		St. LUKE.	
Ch.	i. 7, 8.	Ch.	iii. 16
	ii. 23—28.		vi. 1—5.
	iii. 1—5.		6—10.

[d] They who argue from the Apostles' first discourses being *historical*, that the facts related by them were delivered in the *same*, or nearly the *same words* to their different hearers — and that those hearers took them down in writing — which writings were handed about among believers, and became the source of these *similarities*, plainly argue against the evidence of Scripture, (Compare *Acts* ii. 22—39. with *Acts* iii. 12—26. x. 34—43. and *Acts* xiii. 16—41. with *Acts* xvii. 22—31. xxvi. 2—29.) and at the same time place the Gospels of St. MARK and St. LUKE upon a very precarious footing. I doubt not but many discourses were taken down when they were first preached, as these Gentlemen suppose. Nor is it improbable, that the Gospel according to the XII *Apostles*, or, as it is otherwise called, according to the *Hebrews*, was composed, in part at least, from such narrations. But the genuine Gospels stand upon *another*, and much *better*, foundation.

MARK.		LUKE.	
Ch.	iv. 21--23, 25.	Ch.	viii. 16--18.
	v. 1--19.		26--39.
	vi. 7--11.		ix. 1--5.
	viii. 27--31.		18--22.
	34--38. ix. 1.		23--27.
	ix. 37--40.		48, 50.
	xii. 1--12.		xx. 9--19.
	38--40.		45--47.
	xiv. 13--16.		xxii. 8--13.

BUT here it may be asked — If either of them must be supposed to have copied from the other — “ Why might not St. LUKE “ have made these transcripts from the “ Gospel of St. MARK, rather than St. “ MARK from the Gospel of St. LUKE ? ”

IN answer to this, it may be observed,
 I. THAT St. LUKE has been always considered as an original Writer; which is by no means the case of St. MARK. For he is plainly an Epitomist; and delivers no facts throughout his whole Gospel (a single Miracle only excepted [e]), but what are recorded

[e] Viz. the cure of the *blind* man at *Bethsaida*, ch. viii. 22--26. For the cure of the *deaf* and *dumb* man, vii. 22--26.

recorded by one or other of the two former Evangelists. He is often indeed very circumstantial in his narration; and adds many things for the sake of the Romans [*f*], to enable them the better to understand his accounts. And when you have allowed him this, you will find little, or nothing more, that can properly be called his own.

is comprehended in St. MATTHEW's general account, ch. xv. 29, 30. And the Parable of the *Seed*, iv. 26—29. seems to be taken from MATT. xiii. 24, &c. but varied a little in the circumstances.

[*f*] As a *Roman* might not know, how wild and uninhabited the *Deserts of Arabia* were, in which CHRIST was tempted, he adds, ch. i. 13. “and was with the wild beasts.” In ch. vii. 2. he explains the meaning of the word — *defiled* or *common* — as it is used among the Jews; and in ψ 3, 4, gives an account of the Jewish customs. And ch. xv. 21, having mentioned SIMON the *Cyrenian*, as the person they compelled to bear the cross, he adds—that he was “the father of ALEXANDER and RUFUS” — because both these persons resided at Rome, and were known to the Roman Christians. See *Rom.* xvi. 13. And perhaps the young man, mentioned ch. xiv. 51, 52, was a *Roman*; whose curiosity might lead him to know the cause of the tumult; and, being a stranger, might be the sooner suspected, and therefore apprehended. He had perhaps often told the story at *Rome*; and the Evangelist thought proper to confirm it. In this light it makes a good argument.

BESIDES,

BESIDES, it is apparent,

2. THAT St. MARK makes quick and frequent transitions from one Evangelist to the other; and blends their *accounts*, I mean their *words*, in such a manner as is utterly inexplicable upon any other footing, than by supposing he had both these Gospels before him. Of this the Reader will find a specimen purposely inserted in EXAMPLE III. p. 66, 67. and again in EXAMPLE IV. p. 67—70. And if he stands in need of further confirmation, he may compare St. MARK, ch. xii. 13—27. with MATTH. xxii. 16—32. and LUKE xx. 20—38; where he will find, if I am not mistaken, as ample a proof of such a commixture of phrases and sentences, as can well be desired.

IT is, moreover, worthy of our notice,

3. THAT St. LUKE agrees much oftener with St. MATTHEW, than he does with St. MARK, in places common to *both*; yea, and in places too, where the former is very *concise*, and the latter very *diffuse*, in his narration; which, considering the copiousness and exuberance of St. LUKE's style, could

could hardly have been the case, had he not written before St. MARK [g], and left to him only the province of enlarging on what he had delivered.

ADD to this,

[g] But this, it will perhaps be objected, is to contradict the accounts of the ancient Fathers, who all assert that St. LUKE wrote later than St. MARK; and the place he holds in the manuscript copies of the New Testament is a proof that their assertion is well founded. But the Ancients are not so unanimous in this point, as some are willing to believe. For CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, a writer of the *second* century, reciting a tradition relative to the order and disposition of the Gospels, which he had received from Presbyters of more ancient times, says, “that the Gospels which contain the *Genealogies* were *first* written.” — *πρωγενεαφθαι ελεγεν τ̄ εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας* — Apud EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 14. So that, according to the *most ancient* account, St. LUKE wrote, as I have here supposed, before St. MARK. And with respect to the place he is observed to hold in manuscript copies, little or nothing can be inferred from thence. For by *that* rule we should conclude the ACTS to be written later than the Gospel of St. JOHN. Not that the *common* order of the Gospels is always observed in Mss. vid. WETSTEN. Proleg. n. 90. p. 56. & ad fin. MATTH. But though we allow that it generally is, yet 'tis greatly to be suspected, that the Gospel of St. MARK got at first the precedence of St. LUKE's, just in the same way, and for the same reason, that St. PAUL's Epistle to the *Romans* came to be placed before the others that were prior to it in point of time—that is, from a regard to the persons to whom it was written. vide THEOPHYLACT. Argum. Epist. ad Rom.

4. The conclusion that arises from the date of his Gospel. For tho' the date of it be somewhat uncertain, yet, upon every supposition, it comes down lower than St. LUKE's, and affords us thereby sufficient reason for attributing all the fore-mentioned similarities to St. MARK's inspection of that prior Gospel. In support of this deduction, we have nothing to do but to fix the date: And the date may be settled by the following observations.

THAT the Christian Religion had made a considerable progress in the world before St. MARK wrote his Gospel, is evident from his own words. For then, he tells us, the Apostles "had gone forth, and "preached every where[b]"—i. e. throughout the whole *Roman* Empire, and even among the barbarous nations. A circumstance that must needs extend the date of its publication far beyond the time that THEOPHYLACT mentions, or the *Greek* subscriptions place it at.

THAT this Gospel was written at *Rome*, for the use of the Christians there, many

[b] Ch. xvi. 20.

of the Ancients positively assert [*i*]: And there are several *internal* characters to be found in it, which plainly countenance and confirm their assertion.—So far the current of Tradition runs in one channel; but here it divides, and carries us different ways.

IF we credit the accounts of CLEMENS and PAPIAS, and suppose this Gospel to have been composed at the request of the *Roman* Converts, as an abstract of what St. PETER had preached among them [*k*]; then we shall be forced to conclude it was written about the year LVI — a little later than the reputed time of that Apostle's arrival at *Rome* [*l*].

BUT since it is almost demonstrably evident, that St. PETER had not been at *Rome*

[*i*] See notes [*q*] [*r*] above, p. 50, 51. and ATHANASII Synopf. S. Script. p. 155. HIERONYM. Com. in MARC. Proem.

[*k*] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 15. lib. iii. c. 39. & lib. vi. c. 14.

[*l*] LACTANTIUS, in his book *De Mortibus Persecut.* cap. ii. brings him to *Rome* in the beginning of NERO's reign, about the year LV; and is certainly much nearer the truth than EUSEBIUS, who (Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 14.) represents him preaching there in the reign of CLAUDIUS.

in the year LVIII [m]; we must necessarily drop this part of the story, and attend only to the motions of St. MARK:

Now it appears from undoubted authority, that he always accompanied some or other of the Apostles in their journies. The Ancients agree in making him the familiar Companion of St. PETER; who, in I PET. v. 13. speaks of a MARK, and calls him “his Son”. This MARK they supposed to be the Evangelist, and the same person with him who is mentioned by that name

[m] It is observable; says Dr. WHITBY, Pref. to the Epist. to the *Romans*, that among all the salutations which St. PAUL sends to those of *Rome*, he hath not one directed to St. PETER; nor doth he give us any hint that St. PETER then had ever been at *Rome*, or planted any Church there; which, as it makes it highly probable he had not then been there at all, so doth it make it certain that St. PAUL knew not of his being there when this Epistle was indited—in the year of our Lord LVIII. And again, in his note on these words—“I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at *Rome* also, ch. i. 15.—he adds, “It seems highly probable, that St. PETER was not yet come to *Rome*, much less had settled his *See* there; for if so, why should St. PAUL be so desirous, so often purposing, to come to them, that he might impart some spiritual gift to them; to the end they might be established, y 11. unless St. PETER was either insufficient for, or very negligent in, that work.” See also CAVE’s Life of St. PETER, § xi. p. 42.

in the twelfth of the ACTS :—from whence we may easily account for the intimacy and connexion he maintained with St. PETER [n].

BUT he sometimes likewise accompanied St. PAUL ; and particularly in his first travels among the *Gentiles* [o]. Afterwards indeed he separated from him ; but we find him again with St. PAUL in *Rome* at the time of his first imprisonment. For in his Epistle to PHILEMON, directed from thence in the year LXIII, he reckons him, ver. 24, among his Fellow-Labourers. When, and upon what account, he came there, we know not ; but it appears from

[n] VICTOR. Præf. in MARC. in Caten. Patr.

[o] “ BARNABAS and SAUL—took with them JOHN, whose surname was MARK,” *Acts* xii. 25. GROTIUS, in his Proleg. ad MARCI Evangel. supposes that the MARK here mentioned was a different person from MARK the Evangelist ; but the reasons he urges are, I think, of so little force, that we may still safely conclude with WETSTEIN — “ Nihil vetat, quo minus simpliciter cum VICTORE & THEOPHYLACTO hunc eundem MARCUM intelligamus, quoties illius nomen in Actis & Epistolis reperimus.” Proleg. in MARC. Evang. See LARDNER’S *Supplement* &c. vol. I. c. vii. p. 155—160. LIGHTFOOT’S *Works*, vol. I. p. 336. fol. MICHAELIS’S *Introd. Lect.* § xci. p. 226.

Coloss. iv. 10. that he departed soon after :— and probably never returned. For in the year LXVI, towards the close of his last confinement, we find the Apostle expressing his earnest desire to see him, as one that was useful to him and his Ministry [p].

IF St. MARK then wrote his Gospel, as the Ancients unanimously affirm, at *Rome*; the foregoing limitations will unavoidably constrain us to date its publication about the end of the year LXII, or the beginning of LXIII, the ninth of the Emperor NERO [q]. A time when the Church stood in need of every religious consolation, to support itself under the afflictive weight of a dreadfully cruel persecution [r].

IF this be admitted, it will be easy to account for his transcribing so much, as

[p] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

[q] St. JEROME indeed reports, *Proem. in MARC.* that he died the year before, viz. the eighth of NERO. But herein he is little to be credited, since it is evident from IRENÆUS, lib. iii. c. 1. that he far outlived that period. See CAVE's *Lives of the Ap.* p. 176. MARK, § 4.

[r] About this time began the first general persecution; when the Christians at *Rome* were treated by the Emperor with all the instances of scorn and-cruelty. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 25. C. CORN. TACIT. *Annal.* lib. xv.

we suppose him to have done, from the Gospel of St. LUKE. For he could not fail of being well acquainted with that Gospel; since the Author of it then lived at *Rome*, and laboured with him in the service of Christianity [s]. And probably one great reason of St. PAUL's wishing afterwards to see him, as a person useful to the *Roman* Church [t], might arise from the consideration of the special influence, which he experienced St. MARK had gained over them, by the favour he had done them, in penning this Gospel for their service and use.

WHAT has been said is sufficient, we hope, to illustrate the design, and ascertain the dates, of these three Gospels. But in clearing these points we have opened the way to several conclusions of no mean importance: two of which we shall now proceed to draw out to their full extent.

FROM the Collations here made, it plainly appears,

[s] Philem. ver. 24.

[t] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

I. THAT the Evangelists not only perused, but also transcribed, each others Writings; and consequently, that the argument commonly urged in support of the credibility of the Gospel-History, and founded on the contrary opinion, is at last founded on a common mistake. For thus they reason [u]. “The sacred Historians
 “agree in their accounts, and yet knew
 “nothing of each others Writings; they did
 “not therefore write in concert, and forge
 “these accounts, but were severally guided
 “by the real existence of the facts related.” True indeed it is, that they neither forged their accounts, nor wrote in concert; for they wrote at different times, in different places, and with different views: yet, so far is it from being true, that the later Evangelists never consulted what the former had written before them, that the very reverse has, I presume, been already demonstrated. They perused, recommended, and copied each other. And happy

[u] Præf. NICETÆ ad Symb. Evang. in Caten. Patr. Græc. in Matth. vide etiam HAMMOND. & CLERICI Præf. ad Annotationes, &c.

it is, as will hereafter appear, for the cause of Christianity, that they really did so.

BUT how, then, came they not to avoid the many contradictions observable among them? These are only *seeming* contradictions; and vanish most of them, on a close comparison of the several passages: and were we sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances of the facts; the views of the Relators; the turns of their expressions, and the method they used in their computations; the rest would doubtless immediately disappear; and the several Gospels would perfectly correspond with each other.

FROM the same Collations, we may likewise infer,

2. THAT St. MATTHEW's Gospel, if not originally written in *Greek*, was yet very early translated into that Language; and that the present Version, if we must needs have it to be a Version, is of equal authority with the *Greek* Text of the other Gospels; that is, of authority truly divine. St. MARK and St. LUKE adopted it as such: and what weight can the surmises

of some credulous Fathers carry in opposition to their infallible judgment ?

BUT it is now time to go on with our design, and examine the contents of the remaining Gospel, viz. that of St. JOHN.

S E C T. V.

NO sooner was the Christian Church established, but its doctrines were obscured, debased, and corrupted by errors and heresies of various kinds.—The first Heretics, who set up their own opinions against the truths delivered to them, assumed the general Name of *Gnostics*, i. e. “knowing Men”; and made extraordinary pretensions to superior light and knowledge [x]. This false science appeared early in the days of the Apostles; and is probably that of which St. PAUL speaks, when he warns TIMOTHY to “avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of SCIENCE

[x] Adversantur Traditioni, dicentes se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, sinceram invenisse veritatem. IREN. cont. Hæres. Lib. iii. c. 2.

“falsely

“falsely so called; which some professing,
“have erred concerning the Faith [y].”

OF all the heretical notions founded on Philosophy and *vain* Learning, none made a quicker progress in the world, or were more injurious to the truths of the Gospel, than those originally embraced by the *Nicolaitans*, and afterwards propagated by EBION and CERINTHUS. These notions, therefore, the Governors of the Church were obliged in duty to refute and extirpate. They prevailed most in *Asia* [z]. And accordingly we find, that the *Asian* Bishops desired St. JOHN, who had been the beloved Disciple of CHRIST, and as it were his bosom-friend, to draw up a confutation of them [a], that, in compliance with their request, he wrote his Gospel, in which he endeavoured to extirpate the errors that had been propagated

[y] 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21. [z] EPIPHAN. Hæres. 28. [a] JOANNES—scripsit Evāgelium, rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis, adversus CERINTHUM aliosque Hæreticos, et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma confurgens, qui asserunt CHRISTUM ante MARIAM non fuisse—HIERONYM. Cat. Script. Eccl. in voce JOANNES. Vide etiam ejusdem autoris Comment. in MATTH. Proem.

by CERINTHUS, and long before his time by the *Nicolaitans*, a sect of those who are falsely called *Gnostics* [b].

WE are therefore to consider his Gospel, not merely as an historical narrative, but also as a *polemic* tract, designed to confute the errors of CERINTHUS, and other Heretics of the same stamp [c]. The me-

[b] Hanc fidem annuncians JOANNES Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annunciationem auferre eum, qui a CERINTHO infeminatus erat hominibus, Errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ, qui sunt vulso ejus quæ falso cognominatur scientiæ, &c. IREN. Lib. iii. c. 11.

[c] MR. LAMPE (Prolegom. in JOAN.) DR. LARDNER (Suppl. to *Cred.* Vol. I.) and several others strenuously contend, that it could never be the intention of the Evangelist to confute these Heretics, because they did not appear in the world, till some time *after* the publication of this Gospel. But it is evident from IRENÆUS (Lib. iii. c. 3.) that CERINTHUS was cotemporary with St. JOHN—and from EPIPHANIUS (Hær. 28.) that he began *very early* to sow tares in the Church. The *Nicolaitans* are mentioned Rev. ii. 6. and 15. Nor is there any room to doubt but the *Gnostics* corrupted the Christian Faith, almost as *soon* as St. PAUL established it. 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21. And as this was the case, it certainly became the concern of the Evangelist, so to order the œconomy of his Gospel, as to render it an antidote to the fatal poison of these prevailing Heresies. And since it is universally allowed, that they *may all* be confuted by it, does it not plainly follow, that it was purposely written with a view to confute them?

thod he employed for this purpose was, to set forth at large the Discourses of CHRIST which disproved their notions, and to recount the Miracles which confirmed those Discourses. And how conclusive this method of argumentation was, appears from the conduct of his opponents; who had no other way of eluding its force, than by totally rejecting his Gospel [*d*].

IN order therefore to understand the scheme and disposition of this Gospel, we must first examine the tenets of CERINTHUS, in opposition to which we suppose it to have been purposely written.

Now the opinions attributed to CERINTHUS are chiefly these,

[*d*] The *Ebionites*, *Cerinthians*, and other Heretics of the like cast, received only the Gospel of St. MATTHEW, and that not in its purity, as appears from the following testimonies. *Ebionæi eo solo, quod est secundum MATTHÆUM, Evangelio utuntur. IREN. Lib. i. c. 26. et Lib. iii. c. 11. In Evangelio (scil. MATTH.) quo utuntur Nazaræi et Ebionitæ. HIERON. Com. MATTH. c. xii. com. 13. Per Nazarenos intelligendi sunt Hæretici, isto nomine sese appellantes, de quibus Epiphanius Hær. 29. agit, qui ut in dogmatibus cum Ebionitis conspirârunt, ita et uno Evangelio usi sunt. GRAB. spicileg. Patr. secul. i. p. 15.*

HE believed,

1. THAT the most high GOD was entirely unknown before the appearance of CHRIST; and dwelt in a remote Heaven, called Πάρωμα with the chief Spirits or *Æons* [e].

2. THAT this supreme GOD first generated an only-begotten Son, ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ, who again begat the Word, ΛΟΓΟΣ, which was inferior to the First-born [f].

3. THAT CHRIST was a still lower *Æon*, tho' far superior to some others [g].

4. THAT there were two high *Æons*, distinct from CHRIST; one called ΖΩΗ or the Life, and the other ΦΩΣ or the Light [h].

5. THAT from the *Æons* again proceeded inferior orders of Spirits; and particu-

[e] IREN. adversus Hæreses, Lib. i. Cap. 1. in princip. et passim alibi. For what is said there of the *Valentinians* is equally true of the *Cerinthians*, who maintained the same principles before them.

[f] Incitum quidem esse Monogonen, Logon autem verum filium Unigeniti. IREN. Lib. iii. cap. 11.

[g] Alterum vero de superioribus CHRISTUM. IREN. ubi supra.

[h] See GROT. Proœm. Com. in JOAN. and MICHAELIS Lect. on the New Testament. § ci. p. 248. Eng. Ed.

larly one DEMIURGUS, who created this visible World out of eternal matter [i].

6. THAT this DEMIURGUS was ignorant of the supreme GOD, and much lower than the *Æons* which were wholly invisible [k].

7. THAT he was however the peculiar GOD and Protector of the *Israelites*, and sent MOSES to them, whose laws and injunctions were to be of constant and perpetual obligation [l].

[i] DEMIURGUS perficiebat fabricationem conditionis, i. e. creationis. IREN. Lib. iii. cap. 11.

[k] CERINTHUS in Asia, non a primo DEO factum esse mundum, docuit, sed a virtute quadam valde separata, et distante ab ea principalitate quæ est super universa, et ignorante eum qui est super omnia DEUM. IREN. Lib. i. cap. 25. & alibi. A virtute aliqua valde deorsum subjecta, et abscessa ab eorum communicatione, quæ sunt invisibilia et inominabilia. Lib. iii. cap. 11.

[l] Ex DEO per varias emanationes esse angelos (vel angelum DEMIURGUM opificem) qui hunc condiderint mundum; è quorum numero angelorum fuerit quoque DEUS, ille Judæorum, qui veterem instituit œconomiam. VITRINGA apud BUDDÆUM, Eccl. Apost. Cap. v. § 3. De Cerinthianis equidem talia traduntur, ex quibus colligas, haud procul eos a pseudapostolorum disciplina abfuisse, quod scilicet necessitatem legis Mosaicæ statuerint, plurimæque Instituta Mosaica retinuerint. BUDDÆI Eccl. Ap. Cap. iii. § 1. MOSHEM. Instit. Hist. Christian. Antiq. sect. i. p. ii. cap. v. § 16.

8. THAT

8. THAT JESUS was a mere Man, the real SON of JOSEPH and MARY [m].

9. THAT the *Æon*, CHRIST, descended upon him in the form of a Dove when he was baptized; revealed to him the unknown Father, and impowered him to work Miracles [n].

10. THAT the *Æon*, *Light*, entered into JOHN the Baptist, in the same manner as CHRIST entered into JESUS; and therefore that JOHN was, in some respects, to be preferred to our Saviour [o].

[m] JESUM autem subjecit (CERINTHUS,) non ex virgine natum; (impossibile enim hoc ei visum est) fuisse autem eum JOSEPH et MARIÆ filium, similiter ac reliqui omnes homines, et plus potuisse justitiâ, et prudentiâ, et sapientiâ ab omnibus. IREN. Lib. i. cap. 25.

[n] Post baptismum descendisse in eum, ab ea Principalitate quæ est super omnia, CHRISTUM, figura columbæ, et tunc annuñciassè incognitum Patrem, et virtutes perfecisse. IREN. ubi supra.

[o] Erant et qui JOANNIS Baptistæ sectatores quam JESU dici mallent, says GROTIUS in JOAN. He adds indeed *ad sabterfugiendam crucem*—“in order to avoid the shame of the “cross;” which might be the case with some: and yet others, especially those who adopted the maxims and practices of the *Essenes*, might do it from an opinion of the Baptist’s superior Sanctity. vid. IREN. L. iii. c. 2.

11. THAT

11. THAT when JESUS had propagated the knowledge of GOD, and came to suffer, CHRIST left him, and fled into the *Plerōma*, or upper-most Heaven. And consequently that JESUS only suffered, whilst CHRIST, being a spiritual *Æon*, remained impassible [*p*].

12. THAT JESUS CHRIST should reign on Earth for the space of a thousand years; and that his Disciples should live in carnal delights, and all kinds of sensual enjoyments [*q*].

[*p*] In fine autem revolasse iterum CHRISTUM de JESU, et JESUM passum esse, et resurrexisse: CHRISTUM autem impassibilem perseverasse, existentem spiritalem. IREN. Lib. i. c. 25. et lib. iii. c. 11. p. 217. Ed. Grab.

[*q*] Ἄλλα καὶ Κήρηθος λέγων, μὴ πλὴν ἀνάσασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δαλεύειν. καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀριθμὸν χιλιοῦστας ἐν γάμῳ ἑορτῆς δέλων πλανᾶν λέγει γίνεσθαι. Sed et CERINTHUS—affirmans post resurrectionem regnum CHRISTI in terris futurum, ac rursus homines Hierosolymis degentes cupiditatibus et voluptati corporis obnoxios fore—additque hostis ille divinarum scripturarum mille annorum spatium in nuptialibus festis transactum iri quo facilius imperitos homines decipiat. EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 28. AUGUSTIN. de Hæres. c. viii.

SOME

SOME of the *Cerinthian* sect denied also the Resurrection of the Dead;—and many of them maintained, that JESUS CHRIST was not yet risen [r].

IF we enter the Gospel with these articles, we shall soon perceive how conducive they are to the explanation of it. Not only particular passages will derive from them great light; but the whole will appear to be a compleat work—regular, clear, and conclusive.

IT may properly be divided into THREE parts.

THE *First* comprehends the DOCTRINES to be maintained; which are contrary to those of *Cerintbus*, i. 1—18.

THE *Second* contains the *Proofs* of these Doctrines, delivered in an historical manner, i. 19—xx. 29.

THE *Third* is a *Conclusion* or *Appendix*, giving some account of the Person of the Writer, and of the view he had in penning this Gospel, xx. 30. to the end.

[r] DUPIN'S Hist. of the Church, Vol. II. Eng. Ed. 12mo. p. 41.—CAVE'S Lives of the Apost. p. 124. St. JOHN, § i.

THE DOCTRINES laid down in the first Part, as contra-positions to the tenets of CERINTHUS, may be reduced to the following heads; where the Evangelist asserts

1. THAT CHRIST is the *Logos* or Word of GOD.

2. THAT the *Logos* and *Monogenes* are not distinct beings, but one and the same person, i. 14.

3. THAT CHRIST or the *Logos* is not an inferior *Æon*, but GOD, i. 1.

4. THAT he perfectly knew the supreme GOD, being always with him in the *Plerōma*, i. 18.

5. THAT he is not to be distinguished from the DEMIURGUS; for he is the Creator of the whole World, i. 3, 10.

6. THAT *Life* and *Light* are not particular and separate Spirits, but the same with the *Logos* and CHRIST, i. 4, 7—9. 17. And therefore that CHRIST, the *Logos*, *Life*, *Light*, the *only-begotten*, are not distinct *Æons*, but one and the same divine person [s].

[s] Unus et idem ostenditur Logos et Monogenes, et Zōe et Phos, et soter et CHRISTUS filius Dei, et hic idem incarnatus pro nobis. IREN. Lib. i. c. i. § 20.

7. THAT

7. THAT no particular *Æon* entered into JOHN the Baptist by the name of *Light*, to communicate to him a superior Knowledge of the divine Will, i. 8 ; but that he was a mere man, and, tho' inspired, much inferior to JESUS, being only the Fore-runner of him, i. 6, 8, 15.

8. THAT the supreme GOD was not entirely unknown before the time of CHRIST ; for men had received such lights on this head, under the various dispensations thro' which they passed, that it was their own fault, if they remained ignorant, i. 9, 10.

9. THAT the *Jews* were not the peculiar people of an inferior GOD, such as the DEMIURGUS ; but of CHRIST himself, the only-begotten Son of GOD, i. 11.

10 THAT in the fulness of time the Son of GOD took upon him human nature, and became Man, i. 14.

11. THAT he abolished the Law of MOSES, which was only the shadow of good things to come, and in its stead introduced the substance, or the very things signified by it, i. 17.

AND

AND lastly,

12. THAT the *Jew* has no more right in this divine person, and the privileges conferred thro' him, than the *Gentile* [t] : for whoever believes in him, becomes thereby a Child of God, and is entitled by that adoption to a glorious inheritance, i. 12, 13.

THESE propositions being settled, the Evangelist proceeds to the proofs of them; which he delivers in the way of History, as being all expressed or plainly implied in the Discourses and Transactions of our Saviour. Let us therefore pursue the thread of the History, in order to discover what proofs arise from the several transactions and speeches of CHRIST, recorded by this Evangelist. And,

1. JOHN the Baptist himself confesses to the *Jewish* Priests, that he is much *inferior* to JESUS—refers his own Disciples to him, who acknowledge him to be the MESSIAH, and are confirmed in this Faith by a Miracle, i. 19—ii. 11.

[t] ORIGEN. Philocal. c. i. p. 17. Ed. SPENCER.

2. AFTER this JESUS conducts himself at *Jerusalem*, as the Lord of the Temple, ii. 12—25.—reveals himself to NICODEMUS, as the only-begotten Son of GOD—shews the design of his coming into the world—and the necessity of believing in him, iii. 1—21.

THEN follows an additional Testimony of JOHN the Baptist to the superiority of CHRIST, and the excellency of his ordinances, iii. 22—36.

JESUS visits the *Samaritans*—declares himself to be the CHRIST—and foretells the abolition of the *Levitical* Worship, iv. 1—42.

Then, by a second Miracle, he demonstrates his divine mission in his own country, where it was most disputed, iv. 43—54.

As a farther proof of the future abrogation of the *Ceremonial* Law, JESUS works a Miracle on the *Sabbath*, and vindicates his conduct—declares himself to be the Son of GOD, and exhibits various evidences of his mission, v. 1—47.

THEN,

THEN, to shew that he was the End of the Law, he substitutes himself in the room of the *Legal* Sacrifices; and commands the people, who were used to feast on some of those Sacrifices, to *eat* his *Flesh* and drink his *Blood*. And to convince them that he was truly the Bread of Life, he miraculously feeds above five thousand of them with five barley loaves, vi. 1—71.

THE People being disposed by this Miracle to make him a King, JESUS disclaims all temporal views—urges farther the Proofs of his divine mission,—and promises the assistance of the Holy Spirit to all true Believers, vii. 1—53.

HE declares himself to be the Light of the World—reproves the *Jews* for rejecting him—promises Immortality to his Followers—and speaks of his own existence as prior to that of *Abraham*, viii. 12—59.

IN proof of his being the Light of the world, he restores a blind man to sight—and warns the Jews of that judicial *Darkness*, under which they were soon to be sealed up, for perverting so basely those

means of knowledge that were graciously offered to them, ix. 1—41.

AFTER this he represents himself as the Door of the Sheepfold; and tells the *Pharisees*, who called themselves the Shepherds of the people, that they “who entered not by the door into the Sheepfold, “but climbed up some other way,” whatever character they might assume, were in reality no better than thieves and robbers. A reflexion which the Christians of those days could hardly avoid applying to CERINTHUS and other *Heresiarchs*. Then follows a description of a good Shepherd and an Hireling, which may be looked upon as a kind of test, whereby to judge of the different conduct of the Apostles and Heretics, &c. x. 1—42.

JESUS performs a signal Miracle in the presence of a large number of people; which was attended with this peculiar circumstance,—that it was wrought after an express invocation of GOD, that he would apply it to the confirmation of what our Saviour had taught, xi. 1—44. Observe particularly ver. 41, 42.

THEN

THEN follows a brief account of the different effects which this Miracle produced on the minds of the Jews:—so different, that though it *won* upon many of the *People*, it *exasperated* most of the *Priests*; xi. 45—57. xii. 1—11.

CHRIST rides in triumph to *Jerusalem*; and is proclaimed King of Israel. The *Greeks*, who may be considered as the first-fruits of the *Gentiles*, apply to him, and are admitted. He addresses them in terms suitable to the occasion—and his Doctrine is confirmed by a Voice from Heaven, xii. 12—36.

SOME intimation being now given, that the *Gentiles* were to be admitted into the Christian Church, JESUS institutes the Law of Hospitality [*u*], and delivers to
 H 2 his

[*u*] Washing the Feet was commonly, in the *Eastern* countries, the first kindness shewn to a Traveller, who was to be hospitably received: Gen. xviii. 4. xix. 2. xliii. 24. whence it came to be used for hospitality in general, 1 Tim. v. 10. When our Saviour therefore washed the feet of his Disciples, and taught them to condescend in like manner to their inferiors, it amounted to the same thing, as if he had instituted and established the law of hospitality among all his future Followers.

his Disciples a *new* Commandment; that they should love one another as Brethren, without distinction, and as Members of the same Church, xiii. 1—35.

THEN he informs them, in a long Discourse, that a perpetual and intimate union with him, their Head, is indispensably necessary to salvation;—and that, after his departure, he would send down the Holy Spirit, who should guide them into all truth, and enable them to fulfil his commandments, xiv. 1—15. xvi. 33.

AFTER this, JESUS recommends his Disciples, &c. to the Father, in a pathetic and memorable Prayer; and at the same time testifies, that none of his Apostles was lost, but JUDAS ISCARIOT, xvii. 1—26. As this Prayer was favourably heard, and the Apostles were afterwards endowed with extraordinary powers, it afforded an argu-

ers. Now as Strangers are the Objects of this Law, and not Persons who live in the same Community, it was indeed, in the strictest sense, a NEW Commandment to *them*, who thought it their Duty “to avoid those of another nation;” Acts x. 28. See MICHAELIS’s Introd. Lect. § ciii. p. 254; to whom I am indebted for this, and many other observations on the present subject.

ment

ment, against CERINTHUS, of the divine Authority of the Doctrines they taught.

THEN follows a particular account of our Saviour's Passion, adapted to prove that he did not die as a mere Man, xviii. 1. xix. 42.

AND also of his Resurrection, in opposition to those, who denied that he was risen, xx. 1—29.

THE *first* part of the *Appendix* contains a declaration of the end which the Evangelist had in view, when he penned this account: namely, that his Readers might be convinced thereby, that "JESUS is "the CHRIST, the Son of God*";—and consequently that the notions and tenets of CERINTHUS were altogether false and heretical.

THE *second* part relates to himself, and seems to have been added as a confutation of the opinion, which some entertained, that St. JOHN was not to die. An opinion that might have weakened his authority, had he suffered it to pass unrefuted.

* Ch. xx. 31.

[x] Ch. xxi. 23.

THE only thing that remains is to settle the Date of this Gospel, which, according to the unanimous suffrage of the Ancients, was written the last of all the Four :—tho' at what time cannot be determined from *their* strangely various and contradictory Accounts. Let us therefore consult the Gospel itself, and see what information may be collected from thence.

Now the Gospel contains one or two particulars, which plainly intimate that it was not written till after the Death of St. PETER. For had he been then living, St. JOHN would have undoubtedly suppressed his name, as the other Evangelists had done, in the account of his assault on the High-Priest's servant, for fear of exposing him to the resentment of the *Jews*. But he inserts it at full length—“SIMON PETER
“ drew a sword”, &c. [y] : And this insertion of it is a presumptive proof that he was now dead.

BUT there is no necessity that we should rest this point here. The same thing may

[y] Ch. xviii. 10, 26.

be inferred from the following Passage. “When thou wast young,” says our Saviour to PETER, “thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not,” “This,” St. JOHN remarks, “our Saviour spake, signifying by what death”—viz. Crucifixion—“he should glorify GOD [z].” An interpretation he would have hardly affixed to such ambiguous words, had it not been already ascertained by the completion of the Prophecy.

IF these Arguments be of any weight, then it follows,

THAT St. JOHN did not write his Gospel before the year *sixty-eight*: for in that year, we are told, St. PETER was martyred at *Rome* [a];—and therefore,

[z] Ch. xxi. 18, 19. Compare this with Ch. xii. 33. and xviii. 32.

[a] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. ii. c. 25, LACTANT. de Mort. Persecut. c. 2.

THAT THEOPHYLACT dates this Gospel a little too early, when he affirms it to have been written in *sixty-five*.

THOSE Writers, who, on the other hand, bring down the date of it far below the Destruction of *Jerusalem* [b], seem to place it much too late. For the Evangelist himself speaks of that city as still subsisting (ΕΣΤΙ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΟΙΣ) ch. v. 2, [c] at the time he wrote. But *Jerusalem*, we know, was taken and destroyed in the Year LXX: and by that circumstance, in conjunction with the foregoing remarks, we are necessarily confined to the Year of our Lord LXIX, the very year specified by NICEPHORUS, as the most likely time for the publication of this Gospel.

If it be supposed, that the true reading in this Place, is either Ε57, according to the *Complutensian* Edition;—or Ην, according to the *Syriac* Version, and some of the Fathers;—or else, that the Evangelist

[b] IREN. Lib. iii. c. 1. EPIPHAN. Hæres. LI. CHRYSOST. Serm. de S. JOAN. Apost. Tom. vi. Ed. Lut. Paris. an. 1624. MILL. Prolegom. No. 181. p. 604.

[c] See WHITHY on the Place. BASNAG. An. xcvi. No. 12. LAMP. Proleg. in JOAN. Lib. ii. c. ii. No. 11.

made use of the *present* instead of the *præter* tense [*d*], in order the better to enliven the scene, and engage the attention of his Reader;—then, indeed, for any thing that appears to the contrary in the Text, we may bring the date as low as we please. But this would be, in one case, presumptuously to despise the authority of the best and most ancient Manuscripts; and, in the other, to alter without reason the plain sense and meaning of the Historian. We must therefore adhere to the foregoing conclusion, and join with those Fathers, who ascribe to this Gospel the *earlier* date.

THIS date, deduced from internal marks, we may now fix upon with the greater confidence, as it appears to be confirmed by a happy accession of external proofs. If the two Epistles of St. CLEMENT, published by WETSTEIN at the end of his New Testament, be genuine, (and he has produced very strong Arguments [*e*] to prove

[*d*] JONES on the Canon of the New Testament, Vol. iii. p. 141.

[*e*] *Prolegom.* ad duas Epistolas Sti CLEMENTIS *Romani*, p. 5—9.

them

them such) then it is evident from the express quotations [*f*] contained in them, that St. JOHN penned his Gospel, not only before the Death of that apostolical Bishop, but even before his Abdication. For these Epistles bear the nature of *Episcopal* charges, and are particularly addressed to the *Teachers* of Religion; which manifestly implies, that St. CLEMENT presided over the see of *Rome* at the time he wrote them. But he quitted that see, according to the computation of the most approved Chronologers, about the Year LXXXIII. From whence it follows, that the Gospel, so often quoted by him, must necessarily have been extant before that time.

WE have now seen at what times, and with what views, the Gospels were written: And if we attend a little to the views and intentions the Writers had, we may easily and rationally account for their Number.

St. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel for the use of the Churches in *Palestine*, then

[*f*] Ep. i. § 6, 8, 13. Ep. ii. § 15.

composed

composed of *Jewish* Converts; and adapted it to the condition of the times, and the nature of their circumstances.

WHEN the *Gentiles* were admitted into the Christian Church, St. LUKE, as the exigences of their state required, strengthened their faith by another Gospel, accommodated to their special use.

AND when the invidious distinction between *Jews* and *Gentiles* had well nigh ceased, St. MARK, wisely rejecting the many peculiarities of these two Gospels, compacted a third out of their most important Contents, for the benefit and instruction of Christians at large.

AND afterwards, when the Church was infested by Hereticks, St. JOHN undertook to confute their errors from the Life and Conversation of CHRIST: which produced the last of these Gospels; and afforded the Author an excellent opportunity of relating several remarkable things which had been before omitted by his Predecessors. These, in all probability, were the reasons which induced the Evangelists to write—

And

And hence it is that we have FOUR Gospels: all of them composed, as EUSEBIUS observes [g], on *special* and *urgent* occasions.

Now, these Gospels are by no means to be looked upon as so many detached pieces, composed by persons totally ignorant of each other's Intention; but rather as one complete, entire system of Divinity, supported by the strongest proofs that the subject is capable of, and defended against all the objections which either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, or even its more dangerous *heretical* Professors, could make to the truth and certainty of it. If we read them in the order they are here placed, we shall find them improving one upon another, and yet all conspiring to the same end—to a perfect representation of revealed Religion. Each of the Authors consulted the Writings of his Predecessors; and either by addition of facts—explanation of terms—or confirmation of doctrine, contributed something to the common stock, and the

[g] Οὗς ἐξ ἐπιτάξεως ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἰλθεῖν κατέχει λόγος. *Quas quidem necessitate quadam ad scribendum impulsus fuisse perhibent.*
Hist. Eccl. l. iii. c. 24.

general instruction of Christians [b]. They likewise quoted each others words, and thereby recommended each others Histories. A circumstance of great advantage, whatever some may think of it, to the service of the Christian cause. For by this means they became not only mutual Vouchers for the truth of these *genuine* Gospels, but at the same time joint-opposers of all those *spurious* ones, that were impiously obtruded on the world.

It is well known, that the first Converts to Christianity, desirous of preserving the remembrance of the things transacted by our Saviour, collected together all the reports they could hear concerning him, and digested them into Histories, which they called GOSPELS. Among these there were two of principal Note—the one stiled “the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*”—and the other “according to the *Egyptians*” [i]. Both these Gospels ap-

[b] Vide CHRYSOST. Hom. prim. in MATTH. sub initio.

[i] THEOPHYLACT. Præf. Com. in LUC. MILL. Prolegom. No. 38. ORIGEN. in Præm. LUCÆ. HIERONYM. Com. in MATTH. Præm.

pear, by the fragments still extant [k], to have been full fraught with ridiculous stories—imperfect relations—and false doctrines; and yet pretended to the most sacred authority, as being compiled from accounts, delivered by those “who were “Eye-Witnesses and Ministers of the “Word [l]”. Accordingly, they were held in the highest veneration among these People to whom they are ascribed [m]: and Heretics of various denominations soon began to appeal to them; as they did indeed to other monuments of the like kind, which favoured their pernicious Doctrines [n].

IN this state of things, when so many Gospels appeared in the World, all claiming an equal authority, how were the *true* ones to be distinguished from the *false*? Will you say that the absurdities contained in some of them, were alone sufficient to

[k] GRAB. Spicileg. Patr. Tom. I. Sect. 1. p. 25---31. et p. 35---37.

[l] LUKE i. 2. ΤΗΕΟΡΗΥΛ. in locum.

[m] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 25. Lib. ii. c. 17. MILL. Prolegom. No. 38---52.

[n] MILL. Prolegom. No. 53.

overthrow their credit? with *judicious* men indeed they might. But what if the generality took things upon trust, and seldom or never exercised their judgment? and yet if this was not the case, it is hard to conceive, how several articles could gain belief, which, nevertheless, passed current among the primitive Christians.

SINCE then there was but little likelihood that they should distinguish and determine rightly for themselves, it was incumbent on the Evangelists to do it for them: and they did it indeed effectually. For they apprized the world, that there were many *spurious* Gospels abroad: But, as they deemed them worthy of no regard, so they wisely took no farther notice of them. The *true* ones however they carefully directed their Disciples to, and recommended them to their perusal in a peculiar manner. St. LUKE, by his quotations, refered his Readers to the Gospel of St. MATTHEW. St. MARK, by the same method, referred again both to St. MATTHEW's and St. LUKE's. These
three

three Gospels were approved by St. JOHN [o], and appointed to be read in the Churches. And afterwards, when he wrote his own, it was ushered into the world with the knowledge, approbation, and perhaps testimony [p] of all the *Asiatic* Bishops.

THUS the true Gospels were not only distinguished from the false, but the prior ones continually received additional light, strength, and confirmation from those that followed;—till at length the whole Evangelical History was finally closed, and the Evangelical Canon established upon the firmest ground, by the most venerable authority [q]. For it is evident that St. JOHN actually closed the History of CHRIST, when he added his own to the Three other Gospels. And lest Christians should be deceived by vain pretences to more

[o] Τῶν προαναγεγραφέντων τριῶν (Εὐαγγελίων) εἰς πάντας ἤδη καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν (Ἰωάννην) διαδιδόμενον, ἀποδέξασθαι μὲν φασὶν, ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρήσασθαι. *Praelatis jam in omnium ipsiusque adeo JOANNI notitiam supradictis tribus Evangeliiis, approbavisse ea JOANNES et veritatem scriptorum suo testimonio confirmasse dicitur.* EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 24.

[p] Vid. GROT. Annot. ad Joan. xxi. 24. et xx. 30.

[q] Vide MILLII Prolegom. Numb. 193, 194.

perfect accounts than what are here to be met with, he' wisely guarded them from receiving any other Gospels, even tho' they should chance to contain some *real* Facts, not mentioned by him, or his brother Evangelists. "There are many other things, " says he, 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 would be written " [r]:" that is, there would be no end of writing. But tho' " there are many other " Things that JESUS did in the presence of " his Disciples, which are not written " in this Book" of the four Evangelists, which is here compleated; yet these things that are now written are sufficient to answer the Purpose intended—viz. " that " you might see reason to believe that JESUS is the CHRIST, the Son of GOD, " and that, believing, you might have " Life thro' his Name [s]"

THEREFORE look no farther.

[r] Ch. xxi. 25.

[s] Ch. xx. 30, 31.

THIS Rule the *Apostolical* Fathers religiously observed. For they always refer to the *genuine* Gospels, and never, that I know of, to *apocryphal* or *spurious* ones.

F I N I S.

A SCHEME of the Times, Places, and Occasions of writing the GOSPELS, according to the foregoing Account.

GOSPELS.	PLACE,	A. D.
St. MATTHEW'S,	<i>Jerusalem,</i>	ab ^t . XXXVIII.
For the use of the <i>Jewish</i> Converts.		
St. LUKE'S,	<i>Corinth,</i>	about LIII.
For the use of the <i>Gentile</i> Converts.		
St. MARK'S,	<i>Rome,</i>	about LXIII.
For the use of <i>Christians</i> at large.		
St. JOHN'S,	<i>Ephesus,</i>	about LXIX.
To confute the <i>Cerinthian</i> and other Here- sies.		