HORÆ PAULINÆ;

OR

THE TRUTH

OF THE

SCRIPTURE HISTORY OF ST. PAUL,

EVINCED BY A COMPARISON

OF THE

EPISTLES WHICH BEAR HIS NAME

WITH

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES,

AND WITH ONE ANOTHER.

BY WILLIAM PALEY, D. D.

ARCHDEACON OF CARLISLE.

FIRST AMERICAN FROM THE FOURTH LONDON EDITION.

CAMBRIDGE,

PRINTED AND SOLD BY WILLIAM HILLIARD; SOLD ALSO BY THE BOOKSELLERS IN BOSTON, AND BY THOMAS AND WHIPPLE, NEWBURYPORT.

1806.

THE

TRUTH

OF THE

SCRIPTURE HISTORY OF ST. PAUL

EVINCED.

CHAP. I.

EXPOSITION OF THE ARGUMENT.

THE volume of Christian Scriptures contains thirteen letters purporting to be written by St. Paul; it contains also a book, which, amongst other things, professes to deliver the history, or rather memoirs of the history of this same person. By assuming the genuineness of the letters, we may prove the substantial truth of the history; or, by assuming the truth of the history, we may argue strongly in support of the genuineness of the letters. But I assume neither one nor the other. The reader is at liberty to suppose these writings to have been lately discovered in the library of Escurial, and to come to our hands destitute of any extrinsic or collateral evidence whatever; and the argument I I am about to offer is calculated to show that a comparison of the different writings would, even under these circumstances, afford good reason to believe the persons and transactions to have been real, the letters authentic, and the narration in the main to be true.

Agreement or conformity between letters bearing the name of an ancient author, and a received history of that

author's life, does not necessarily establish the credit of either; because,

1. The history may, like Middleton's Life of Cicero, or Jortin's Life of Erasmus, have been wholly, or in part compiled from the letters; in which case it is manifest that the history adds nothing to the evidence already afforded by the letters; or,

2. The letters may have been fabricated out of the history; a species of imposture which is certainly practicable; and which, without any accession of proof or authority, would necessarily produce the appearance of consistency and agreement; or,

3. The history and letters may have been founded upon some authority common to both; as upon reports and traditions which prevailed in the age in which they were composed, or upon some ancient record now lost, which both writers consulted; in which case also, the letters without being genuine, may exhibit marks of conformity with the history; and the history, without being true, may agree with the letters.

Agreement therefore, or conformity, is only to be relied upon so far as we can exclude these several suppositions. Now the point to be noticed is, that, in the three cases above enumerated, conformity must be the effect of *design*. Where the history is compiled from the letters, which is the first case, the design and composition of the work are in general so confessed, or made so evident by comparison, as to leave us in no danger of confounding the production with original history, or of mistaking it for and independent authority. The agreement, it is probable, will be close and uniform, and will easily be perceived to result from the intention of the author, and from the plan and conduct of his work. Where the letters are fabricated from the history, which is the second case, it is always for the purose of imposing a forgery upon the public; and in order to give color and probability to the fraud, names, places, and circumstances, found in

the history, may be studiously introduced into the letters, as well as a general consistency be endeavoured to be maintained. But here it is manifest, that whatever congruity appears, is the consequence of meditation, artifice, and design. The third case is that wherein the history and the letters, without any direct privity or communication with each other, derive their materials from the same source; and, by reason of their common original, furnish instances of accordance and correspondency. This is a situation in which we must allow it to be possible for ancient writings to be placed; and it is a situation in which it is more difficult to distinguish spurious from genuine writings, than in either of the cases described in the preceeding suppositions; inasmuch as the congruities observable are so far accidental, as that they are not produced by the immediate transplanting of names and circumstances out of one writing into the other. But although, with respect to each other, the agreement in these writings be mediate and secondary, yet it is not properly or absolutely undesigned; because, with respect to the common original from which the information of the writers proceeds, it is studied and factitious. The case of which we treat must, as to the letters, be a case of forgery; and when the writer, who is personating another, sits down to his composition, whether he have the history with which we now compare the letters, or some other record, before him; or whether he have only loose tradition and reports to go by, he must adapt his imposture, as well as he can, to what he finds in these accounts; and his adaptations will be the result of counsel, scheme, and industry; art must be employed; and vestiges will appear of management and design. Add to this, that, in most of the following examples, the circumstances in which the coincidence is remarked are of too particular and domestic a nature to have floated down upon the stream of general tradition.

Of the three cases which we have stated, the difference

between the first and the two others is, that in the first the design may be fair and honest, in the others it must be accompanied with the consciousness of fraud; but in all there is design. In examining, therefore, the agreement between ancient writings, the character of truth and originality is undesignedness; and this test applies to every supposition; for, whether we suppose the history to be true, but the letters spurious; or the letters to be genuine; but the history false; or, lastly, falsehood to belong to both; the history to be a fable, and the letters fictitious; the same inference will result, that either there will be no agreement between them, or the agreement will be the effect of design. Nor will it elude the principle of this rule, to suppose the same person to have been the author of all the letters, or even the author both of the letters and the history; for no less design is necessary to produce coincidents between different parts of a man's own writings, especially when they are made to take the different forms of a history and of original letters, than to adjust them to the circumstances found in any other writing.

With respect to those writings of the New Testament which are to be the subject of our present consideration, I think that, as to the authenticity of the epistles, this argument, where it is sufficiently sustained by instances, is nearly conclusive; for I cannot assign a supposition of forgery, in which coincidencies of the kind we enquire after are likely to appear. As to the history, it extends to these points; it proves the general reality of the circumstances; it proves the historian's knowledge of these circumstances. In the present instance it confirms his pretensions of having been a contemporary, and in the latter part of his history a companion of St. Paul. In a word, it establishes the substantial truth of the narration; and *substantial* truth is that which, in every historical enquiry, ought to be the first thing sought after and ascertained; it must be the groundwork of every other observation.

The reader then will please to remember this word *undesignedness*, as denoting that upon which the construction and validity of our argument chiefly depend.

As to the proofs of undesignedness, I shall in this place say little; for I had rather the reader's persuasion should arise from the instances themselves, and the separate remarks with which they may be accompanied, than from any previous formulary or description of argument. In a great plurality of examples, I trust he will be perfectly convinced that no design or contrivance whatever has been exercised; and if some of the coincidences alledged appear to be minute, circuitous, or oblique, let him reflect that this very indirectness and subtility is that which gives force and propriety to the example. Broad, obvious, and explicit agreements prove little; because it may be suggested, that the insertion of such is the ordinary expedient of every forgery; and though they may occur, and probably will occur, in genuine writings, yet it cannot be proved that they are peculiar to these. Thus what St. Paul declares in chap. xi. of 1 Cor. concerning the institution of the eucharist, "For I have received "of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, "that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was "betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, "he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which "is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me," though it be in close and verbal conformity with the account of the same transaction preserved by St. Luke, is yet a conformity of which no use can be made in our argument; for if it should be objected that this was a mere recital from the Gospel, borrowed by the author of the epistle, for the purpose of setting off his composition by an appearance of agreement with the received account of the Lord's supper, I should not know how to repel the insinuation. In like manner, the description which St. Paul gives of himself in his epistle to the Philippians (iii 5.)— "Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the

"tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as "touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal perse- "cuting the church; touching the righteousness, which "is in the law, blameless"—is made up of particulars so plainly delivered concerning him, in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Galatians, that I cannot deny but that it would be easy for an impostor, who was fabricating a letter in the name of St. Paul, to collect these articles into one view. This therefore is a conformity, which we do not adduce. But when I read, in the Acts of the Apostles, that "when "Paul came to Derbe and Lystra, behold a certain disci- "ple was there, named Timotheus, the son of a certain "woman *which was a Jewess*;" and when in an epistle addressed to Timothy, I find him reminded of his "hav- "ing known the Holy Scriptures *from a child*," which implies that he must, on one side or both, have been brought up by Jewish parents; I conceive that I remark a coincidence which shows, by its very *obliquity*, that scheme was not employed in its formation. In like manner, if a coincidence depend upon a comparison of dates, or rather of circumstances from which the dates are gathered, the more intricate that comparison shall be; the more numerous the intermediate steps through which the conclusion is deduced; in a word, the more *circuitous* the investigation is, the better, because the agreement which finally results is thereby further removed from the suspicion of contrivance, affectation, or design. And it should be remembered, concerning these coincidences, that it is one thing to be minute, and another to be precarious; one thing to be unobserved, and another to be obscure; one thing to be circuitous or oblique, and another to be forced, dubious, or fanciful. And this distinction ought always to be retained in our thoughts.

The very particularity of St. Paul's epistles; the perpetual recurrence of names of persons and places; the frequent allusions to the incidents of his private life, and

the circumstances of his condition and history; and the connection and parallelism of these with the same circumstances in the Acts of the Apostles, so as to enable us, for the most part, to confront them one with another; as well as the relation which subsists between the circumstances, as mentioned or referred to in the different epistles; afford no inconsiderable proof of the genuineness of the writings, and the reality of the transactions. For as no advertency is sufficient to guard against slips and contradictions, when circumstances are multiplied, and when they are liable to be detected by cotemporary accounts equally circumstantial, an impostor, I should expect, would either have avoided particulars entirely, contenting himself with doctrinal discussions, moral precepts, and general reflexions*; or if, for the sake of imitating St. Paul's style, he should have thought it necessary to intersperse his composition with names and circumstances, he would have placed them out of the reach of comparison with the history. And I am confirmed in this opinion by an inspection of two attempts to counterfeit St. Paul's epistles, which have come down to us; and the only attempts, of which we have any knowledge that are at all deserving of regard. One of these is an epistle to the Laodiceans, extant in Latin, and preserved by Fabricius in his collection of apocryphal scriptures. The other purports

* This however must not be misunderstood. A person writing to his friends, and upon a subject in which the transactions of his own life were concerned, would probably be led in the course of his letter, especially if it was a long one, to refer to passages found in his history. A person addressing an epistle to the public at large, or under the form of an epistle delivering a discourse upon some speculative argument, would not, it is probable, meet with an occasion of alluding to the circumstances of his life at all; he might, or he might not; the chance on either side is nearly equal. This is the situation of the catholic epistle. Although therefore the presence of these allusions and agreements be a valuable accession to the arguments by which the authenticity of a letter is maintained, yet the want of them certainly forms no positive objection.

to be an epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, in answer to an epistle from the Corinthians to him. This was translated by Scroderus from a copy in the Armenian language which had been sent to W. Whiston, and was afterwards, from a more perfect copy procured at Aleppo, published by his sons, as an appendix to their edition of Moses Chorenensis. No Greek copy exists of either; they are not only not supported by ancient testimony, but they are negatived and excluded; as they have never found admission into any catalouge of apostolical writings, acknowledged by, or known to, the early ages of Christianity. In the first of these I found, as I expected, a total *evitation* of circumstances. It is simply a collection of sentences from the canonical epistles, strung together with very little skill. The second, which is a more versute and specious forgery, is introduced with a list of names of persons who wrote to St. Paul from Corinth; and is preceded by an account sufficiently particular of the manner in which the epistle was sent from Corinth to St. Paul, and the answer returned. But they are names which no one ever heard of; and the account it is impossible to combine with any thing found in the Acts, or in the other epistles. It is not necessary for me to point out the internal mark of spuriousness and imposture which these compositions betray; but it was necessary to observe, that they do not afford those coincidences which we propose as proofs of authenticity in the epistles which we defend.

Having explained the general scheme and formation of the argument, I may be permitted to subjoin a brief account of the manner of conducting it.

I have disposed the several instances of agreement under separate numbers; as well to mark more sensibly the divisions of the subject, as for another purpose, viz. that the reader may thereby be reminded that the instances are independent of one another. I have advanced nothing which I did not think probable; but the degree of probability, by which different instances are supported,

is undoubtedly very different. If the reader, therefore, meets with a number which contains an instance that appears to him unsatisfactory, or founded in mistake, he will dismiss that number from the argument, but without prejudice to any other. He will have occasion also to observe, that the coincidences discoverable in some epistles are much fewer and weaker than what are supplied by others. But he will add to his observation this important circumstance, that whatever ascertains the original of one epistle, in some measure establishes the authority of the rest. For, whether these epistles be genuine or spurious, every thing about them indicates that they come from the same hand. The diction, which it is extremely difficult to imitate, preserves its resemblance and peculiarity throughout all the epistles. Numerous expressions and singularities of style, found in no other part of the New Testament, are repeated in different epistles; and occur, in their respective places, without the smallest appearance of force or art. An involved argumentation, frequent obscurities, especially in the order and transition of thought, piety, vehemence, affection, bursts of rapture, and of unparallelled sublimity, are properties, all or most of them, discernible in every letter of the collection. But although these epistles bear strong marks of proceeding from the same hand, I think it is still more certain that they were originally separate publications. They form no continued story; they compose no regular correspondence; they comprise not the transactions of any particular period; they carry on no connection of argument; they depend not upon one another; except in one or two instances, they refer not to one another. I will further undertake to say, that no study or care has been employed to produce or preserve an appearance of consistency amongst them. All which observations show that they were not intended by the person, whoever he was, that wrote them, to come forth or be

read together; that they appeared at first separately, and have been collected since.

The proper purpose of the following work is, to bring together, from the Acts of the Apostles, and from the different epistles, such passages as furnish examples of undesigned coincidence; but I have so far enlarged upon this plan, as to take into it some circumstances found in the epistles, which contributed strength to the conclusion, though not strictly objects of comparison.

It appeared also a part of the same plan, to examine the difficulties which presented themselves in the course of our enquiry.

I do not know that the subject has been proposed or considered in this view before. Ludovicus Capellus, Bishop Pearson, Dr. Benson, and Dr. Lardner, have each given a continued history of St. Paul's life, made up from the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles joined together. But this, it is manifest, is a different undertaking, from the present, and directed to a different purpose.

If what here is offered shall add one thread to that complication of probabilities by which the Christian history is attested, the reader's attention will be repaid by the supreme importance of the subject; and my design will be fully answered.

CHAP. II.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

No. I.

THE first passage I shall produce from the epistle, and upon which a good deal of observation will be founded, is the following:

"But now I go unto Jerusalem, to minister unto the "saints; for it hath pleased them of Macedonia and A-"chaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints "which are at Jerusalem." Rom. xv. 25, 6.

In this quotation three distinct circumstances are stated; a contribution in Macedonia for the relief of the Christians of Jerusalem, a contribution in Achaia for the same purpose, and an intended journey of St. Paul to Jerusalem. These circumstances are stated as taking place at the same time, and that to be the time when the epistle was written. Now let us enquire whether we can find these circumstances elsewhere; and whether, if we do find them, they meet together in respect of date. Turn to the Acts of the Apostles, chap. xx. ver. 2, 3, and you read the following account; "When he had gone over "those parts (viz. Macedonia,) and had given them much "exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three "months; and when the Jews laid wait for him, *as he* "*was about to sail into Syria*, he purposed to return through Macedonia." From this passage, compared with the account of St. Paul's travels given before, and, from the sequel of the chapter it appears, that upon St. Paul's *second* visit to the peninsula of Greece, his intention was, when he should leave the country, to proceed from Achaia directly by sea to Syria; but that, to avoid the Jews, who were lying in wait to intercept him in his route, he so far changed his purpose as to go back

through Macedonia, embark at Phillippi, and pursue his voyage from thence towards Jerusalem. Here therefore is a journey to Jerusalem; but not a syllable of any contribution. And as St. Paul had taken several journeys to Jerusalem before, and one also immediately after his *first* visit into the peninsula of Greece (Acts xviii. 21.), it cannot from hence be collected in which of these visits the epistle was written, or with certainty, that it was written in either. The silence of the historian, who professes to have been with St. Paul at the time (c. xx, v. 6.), concerning any contribution, might lead us to look out for some different journey, or might induce us perhaps to question the consistency of the two records, did not a very accidental reference, in another part of the same history, afford us sufficient ground to believe that this silence was omission. When St. Paul made his reply before Felix, to the accusations of Tertullus, he alledged, as was natural, that neither the errand which brought him to Jerusalem, nor his conduct whilst he remained there, merited the calumnies with which the Jews had aspersed him. "Now after many years (i. e. of absence) "*I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings*; whereupon "certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the temple, "neither with multitude nor with tumult, who ought "to have been here before thee, and object, if they had "ought against me." Acts xxiv. 17—19. This mention of alms and offerings certainly brings the narrative in the Acts nearer to an accordancy with the epistle; yet no one, I am persuaded, will suspect that this clause was put into St. Paul's defence, either to supply the omission in the preceding narrative, or with any view to such accordancy.

After all, nothing is yet said or hinted concernig the *place* of the contribution; nothing concerning Macedonia and Achaia. Turn therefore to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xvi. 1—4, and you have St. Paul delivering the following directions; "Concerning the collection

" for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches
" of Galatia, even so do ye; upon the first day of the week
" let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath pros-
" pered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And
" when I come, whomsoever you shall approve by your let-
" ters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jeru-
" salem; and if it be meet that I go also, they shall go
" with me." In this passage we find a contribution carrying on at Corinth, the capital of Achaia, for the Christians of Jerusalem; we find also a hint given of the possibility of St. Paul going up to Jerusalem himself, after he had paid his visit into Achaia; but this is spoken of rather as a possibility than as any settled intention; for his first thought was, " Whomsoever you shall approve
" by your letters, them will I *send* to bring your liberality
" to Jerusalem;" and, in the sixth verse he adds, " That
" ye may bring me on my journey *whithersoever* I go."
This epistle purports to be written after St. Paul had been at Corinth; for it refers throughout to what he had done and said amongst them whilst he was there. The expression therefore, " When I come," must relate to a *second* visit; against which visit the contribution spoken of was desired to be in readiness.

But though the contribution in Achaia be expressly mentioned, nothing is here said concerning any contribution in Macedonia. Turn therefore, in the third place to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. viii. ver. 1—4, and you will discover the particular which remains to be sought for. " Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of
" the grace of God bestowed on the *Churches of Macedo-*
" *nia*; how that, in a great trial of affliction, the abun-
" dance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded un-
" to the riches of their liberality; for to their power, I
" bear record, yea and beyond their power, they were wil-
" ling of themselves; praying us, with much entreaty,
" that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fel-
" lowship of the ministering to the saints." To which

add chap. ix. ver. 2. "I know the forwardness of your "mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, "that Achaia was ready a year ago." In this epistle we find St. Paul advanced as far as Macedonia, upon that *second* visit to Corinth, which he promised in his former epistle; we find also, in the passages now quoted from it, that a contribution was going on in Macedonia at the same time with, or soon however following, the contribution which was made in Achaia; but for whom the contribution was made does not appear in this epistle at all; that information must be supplied from the first epistle.

Here therefore, at length, but fetched from three different writings, we have obtained the several circumstances we enquired after, and which the Epistle to the Romans brings together, viz. a contribution in Achaia for the christians of Jerusalem; a contribution in Macedonia for the same; and an approaching journey of St. Paul to Jerusalem. We have these circumstances, each by some hint in the passage in which it is mentioned, or by the date of the writing in which the passage occurs, fixed to a particular time; and we have that time turning out, upon examination, to be in all the *same;* namely, toward the close of St. Paul's second visit to the peninsula of Greece. This is an instance of conformity beyond the possibility, I will venture to say, of random writing to produce. I also assert, that it is in the highest degree improbable that it should have been the effect of contrivance and design. The imputation of *design* amounts to this, that the forger of the Epistle to the Romans inserted in it the passage upon which our observations are founded, for the purpose of giving color to his forgery by the appearance of conformity with other writings which were then extant. I reply, in the first place, that, if he did this to countenance his forgery, he did it for the purpose of an argument which would not strike one reader in ten thousand. Coincidences so circuitous as this answer not the ends of forgery; are seldom, I believe, attempted by it. In the second place I

observe, that he must have had the Acts of the Apostles, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians, before him at the time. In the Acts of the Apostles, (I mean that part of the Acts which relates to this period) he would have found the journey to Jerusalem; but nothing about the contribution. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he would have found a contribution going on in Achaia for the Christians of Jerusalem, and a distant hint of the possibility of the journey; but nothing concerning a contribution in Macedonia. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians he would have found a contribution in Macedonia accompanying that in Achaia; but no intimation for whom either was intended, and not a word about the journey. It was only by a close and attentive collation of the three writings, that he could have picked out the circumstances which he has united in his epistle; and by a still more nice examination, that he could have determined them to belong to the same period. In the third place I remark, what diminishes very much the suspicion of fraud, how aptly and connectedly the mention of the circumstances in question, viz. the journey to Jerusalem, and of the occasion of that journey, arises from the context. "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to "you; for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought "on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat "filled with your company. *But now I go unto Jerusalem, "to minister unto the saints; for it hath pleased them of Mace-"donia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor "saints which are at Jerusalem.* It hath pleased them verily, and their debtors they are; for if the Gentiles have "been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty "is also to minister unto them in carnal things. When "therefore I have performed this, and have sealed them "to this fruit, I will come by you into Spain." Is the passage in *Italics* like a passage foisted in for an extraneous purpose? Does it not arise from what goes before, by a junction as easy as any example of writing upon real busi-

ness can furnish? Could any thing be more natural than that St. Paul, in writing to the Romans, should speak of the time when he hoped to visit them; should mention the business which then detained him; and that he purposed to set forward upon his journey to them, when that business was completed?

No. II.

By means of the quotation which formed the subject of the preceding number, we collect, that the Epistle to the Romans was written at the conclusion of St. Paul's second visit to the peninsula of Greece; but this we collect, not from the epistle itself, nor from any thing *declared* concerning the time and place in any part of the epistle; but from a comparison of circumstances referred to in the epistle, with the order of events recorded in the Acts, and with references to the same circumstances, though for quite different purposes, in the two Epistles to the Corinthians. Now would the author of a forgery, who sought to gain credit to a spurious letter by congruities, depending upon the time and place in which the letter was supposed to be written, have left that time and place to be made out, in a manner so obscure and indirect as this is? If therefore coincidences of circumstances can be pointed out in this epistle, depending upon its date, or the place where it was written, whilst that date and place are only ascertained by other circumstances, such coincidences may fairly be stated as *undesigned*. Under this head I adduce

Chap. xvi. 21—23. "Timotheus, my workfellow, and "Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsman, salute "you. I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in "the Lord. Gaius, mine host, and of the whole church, "saluteth you; and Quartus, a brother." With this passage I compare Acts xx. 4. "And there accompanied "him into Asia, Sopater of Berea; and, of the Thessa-"lonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Der-"be, and Timotheus; and, of Asia, Tychius, and Tro-

"phimus." The Epistle to the Romans, we have seen, was written just before St. Paul's departure from Greece, after his second visit to that peninsula; the persons mentioned in the quotation from the Acts are those who accompanied him in that very departure. Of seven whose names are joined in the salutation of the church of Rome, three, viz, Sosipater, Gaius, and Timothy, are proved, by this passage in the Acts, to have been with St. Paul at the time. And this is perhaps as much coincidence as could be expected from reality, though less, I am apt to think, than would have been produced by design. Four are mentioned in the Acts who are not joined in the salutation; and it is in the nature of the case probable that there should be many attending St. Paul in Greece who knew nothing of the converts at Rome, nor were known by them. In like manner several are joined in the salutation who are not mentioned in the passage referred to in the Acts. This also was to be expected. The occasion of mentioning them in the Acts was their proceeding with St. Paul upon his journey. But we may be sure that there were many eminent Christians with St. Paul in Greece, besides those who accompanied him into Asia.*

* Of these Jason is one, whose presence upon this occasion is very naturally accounted for. Jason was an inhabitant of Thessalonica in Macedonia, and entertained St. Paul in his house upon his first visit to that country. Acts xvii. 7. St. Paul, upon this his second visit, passed through Macedonia on his way to Greece, and, from the situation of Thessalonica, most likely through that city. It appears, from various instances in the Acts, to have been the practice of many converts to attend St. Paul from place to place. It is therefore highly probable, I mean that it is highly consistent with the account in the history, that Jason, according to that account a zealous disciple, the inhabitant of a city at no great distance from Greece, and through which, as it should seem, St. Paul had lately passed, should have accompanied St. Paul into Greece, and have been with him there at this time. Lucius is another name in the epistle. A very slight alteration would convert Λουκιος into Λουκας. Lucius into Luke, which would produce an additional coincidence; for, if Luke was the the author of the

But if any one shall still contend that a forger of the epistle, with the Acts of the Apostles before him, and having settled his scheme of writing a letter as from St. Paul upon his second visit into Greece, would easily think of the expedient of putting in the names of those persons who appeared to be with St. Paul at the time, as an obvious recommendation of the imposture; I then repeat my observations; first, that he would have made the catalogue more complete; and secondly, that with this contrivance in his thoughts, it was certainly his business, in order to avail himself of the artifice, to have stated in the body of the epistle that St. Paul was in Greece when he wrote it, and that he was there upon his second visit. Neither of which he has done, either directly, or even so as to be discoverable by any circumstance found in the narrative delivered in the Acts.

Under the same head, viz. of coincidences depending upon date, I cite from the epistle the following salutation; "Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus, "who have for my life laid down their own necks; unto "whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches "of the Gentiles." Chap. xvi. 3. It appears from the Acts of the Apostles, that Priscilla and Aquila had originally been inhabitants of Rome; for we read, Acts xviii. 2, that "Paul found a certain Jew, named Aquila, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because that "Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from *Rome*." They were connected therefore with the place to which the salutations are sent. That is one coincidence; another is the following: St. Paul became acquainted with these persons at Corinth during his first visit into Greece. They accompanied him upon his return into Asia; were settled for some time at Ephesus, Acts xviii. 19—26,

history, he was with St. Paul at this time; inasmuch as describing the voyage which took place soon after the writing of this epistle, the historian uses the first person—"We sailed away from Philippi. Acts xx. 6.

and appear to have been with St. Paul when he wrote from that place his First Epistle to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Not long after the writing of which epistle St. Paul went from Ephesus into Macedonia, and, "after he had gone over those parts," proceeded from thence upon his second visit into Greece; during which visit, or rather at the conclusion of it, the Epistle to the Romans, as hath been shown, was written. We have therefore the time of St. Paul's residence at Ephesus after he had written to the Corinthians, the time taken up by his progress through Macedonia (which is indefinite, and was probably considerable), and his three months' abode in Greece; we have the sum of these three periods allowed for Aquila and Priscilla going back to Rome, so as to be there when the epistle before us was written. Now what this quotation leads us to observe is, the danger of scattering names and circumstances in writings like the present, how implicated they often are with dates and places, and that nothing but truth can preserve consistency. Had the notes of time in the Epistle to the Romans fixed writing of it to any date prior to St. Paul's first residence at Corinth, the salutation of Aquila and Priscilla would have contradicted the history, because it would have been prior to his acquaintance with these persons. If the notes of time had fixed it to any period during *that* residence at Corinth, during his journey to Jerusalem when he first returned out of Greece, during his stay at Antioch, wither he went down from Jerusalem, or during his second progress through Lesser Asia upon which he proceeded from Antioch, an equal contradiction would have been incurred; because from Acts xviii. 2—18, 19—26, it appears, that during all this time Aquila and Priscilla were either along with St. Paul, or were abiding at Ephesus. Lastly, had the notes of time in this epistle, which we have seen to be perfectly incidental, compared with the notes of time in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which are equally incidental, fixed this epistle to

be either contemporary with that, or prior to it, a similar contradiction would have ensued; because, first, when the Epistle to the Corinthians was written, Aquila and Priscilla were along with St. Paul, as they joined in the salutation of that church, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; and because, secondly, the history does not allow us to suppose, that between the time of their becoming acquainted with St. Paul, and the time of St. Paul's writing to the Corinthians, Aquila and Priscilla could have gone to Rome, so as to have been saluted in an epistle to that city; and then come back to St. Paul at Ephesus, so as to be joined with him in saluting the church of Corinth. As it is, all things are consistent. The Epistle to the Romans is posterior even to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians; because it speaks of a contribution in Achaia being completed, which the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, chap viii, is only soliciting. It is sufficiently therefore posterior to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, to allow time in the interval for Aquila and Priscilla's return from Ephesus to Rome.

Before we dismiss these two persons, we may take notice of the terms of commendation in which St. Paul describes them, and of the agreement of that encomium with the history. "My helpers in Christ Jesus, who have for "my life laid down their necks; unto whom not only I "give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles." In the eighteenth chapter of the Acts, we are informed that Aquila and Priscilla were Jews; that St. Paul first met with them at Corinth; that for some time he abode in the same house with them; that St. Paul's contention at Corinth was with the unbelieving Jews, who at first "opposed and blasphemed, and afterwards with one ac- "cord raised an insurrection against him;" that Aquila and Priscilla adhered, we may conclude, to St. Paul throughout this whole contest; for, when he left the city, they went with him, Acts viii. 18. Under these circumstances, it is highly probable that they should be involved in the dangers and persecutions which St. Paul underwent

from the Jews, being themselves Jews; and, by adhering to St. Paul in this dispute, deserters, as they would be accounted, of the Jewish cause. Further, as they, though Jews, were assisting to St. Paul in preaching to the Gentiles at Corinth, they had taken a decided part in the great controversy of that day, the admission of the Gentiles to a parity of religious situation with the Jews. For this conduct alone, if there was no other reason, they may seem to have been intitled to "thanks from the churches "of the Gentiles." They were Jews taking part with the Gentiles. Yet is all this so indirectly intimated, or rather so much of it left to inference in the account given in the Acts, that I do not think it probable that a forger either could or would have drawn his representation from thence; and still less probable do I think it, that, without having seen the Acts, he could, by mere accident, and without truth for his guide, have delivered a representation so conformable to the circumstances there recorded.

The two congruities last adduced depended upon the time, the two following regard the place, of the epistle.

1. Chap. xvi. 23. "Erastus, the chamberlain of the "city, saluteth you"—of what city? We have seen, that is, we have inferred from circumstances found in the epistle compared with circumstances found in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, that our epistle was written during St. Paul's second visit to the peninsula of Greece. Again, as St. Paul, in his epistle to the church of Corinth, 1 Cor. xvi. 3, speaks of a collection going on in that city, and of his desire that it might be ready against he came thither; and as in this epistle he speaks of that collection being ready, it follows that the epistle was written either whilst he was at Corinth, or after he had been there. Thirdly, since St. Paul speaks in this epistle of his journey to Jerusalem, as about instantly to take place; and as we learn, Acts xx. 3, that his design and attempt was to sail upon that journey immediately from Greece properly so called,

i. e. as distinguished from Macedonia; it is probable that he was in this country when he wrote the epistle, in which he speaks of himself as upon the eve of setting out. If in Greece, he was most likely at Corinth; for the two Epistles to the Corinthians shew that the principal end of his coming into Greece was to visit that city, where he had founded a church. Certainly we know no place in Greece in which his presence was so probable; at least, the placing of him at Corinth satisfies every circumstance. Now that Erastus was an inhabitant of Corinth, or had some connection with Corinth is rendered a fair subject of presumption, by that which is accidentally said of him in the Second Epistle to Timothy, chap. iii. 20. "Erastus a-"bode at *Corinth*." St. Paul complains of his solitude, and is telling Timothy what was become of his companions. "Erastus abode at Corinth; but Trophimus have I "left at Miletum, sick." Erastus was one of those who had attended St. Paul in his travels, Acts xix. 22; and when those travels had, upon some occasion, brought our apostle and his train to Corinth, Erastus staid there, for no reason so probable as that it was his home. I allow that this coincidence is not so precise as some others, yet I think it too clear to be produced by accident; for of the many places which this same epistle has assigned to different persons, and the innumerable others which it might have mentioned, how came it to fix upon Corinth for Erastus? And, as far as it is a coincidence, it is certainly undesigned on the part of the author of the Epistle to the Romans; because he has not told us of what city Erastus was the chamberlain; or, which is the same thing from what city the epistle was written, the setting forth of which was absolutely necessary to the display of the coincidence, if any such display had been thought of; nor could the author of the Epistle to Timothy leave Erastus at Corinth, from any thing he might have read in the Epistle to the Romans, because Corinth is no where in that epistle mentioned either by his name or description.

2. Chap. xvi. 1—3. "I commend unto you Phœbe, "our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at "Cenchrea, that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh "saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she "hath need of you; for she hath been a succourer of many "and of myself also." Cenchrea adjoined to Corinth; St. Paul therefore, at the time of writing the letter, was in the neighbourhood of the woman whom he thus recommends. But, further, that St. Paul had before this been at Cenchrea itself, appears from the eighteenth chapter of the Acts; and appears by a circumstance as incidental, and as unlike design, as any that can be imagined. "Paul "after this tarried there (viz. at Corinth) yet a good while "and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence "into Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila, having "shorn his head *in Cenchrea*, for he had a vow." xviii. 18. The shaving of the head denoted the expiration of the Nazaritic vow. The historian therefore, by the mention of this circumstance, virtually tells us that St. Paul's vow was expired before he set forward upon his voyage, having deferred probably his departure until he should be released from the restrictions under which his vow laid him. Shall we say that the author of the Acts of the Apostles feigned this anecdote of St. Paul, at Cenchrea, because he had read in the Epistle to the Romans that "Phœbe, a servant of the church of Cenchrea, had been "a succourer of many, and of him also?" or shall we say that the author of the Epistle to the Romans, out of his own imagination, created Phœbe "*a servant of the church at Cenchrea*," because he read in the Acts of the Apostles that Paul had "shorn his head" in that place?

No. III.

Chap. i. 13. "Now I would not have you ignorant, "that *oftentimes I purposed to come unto* you, but was let hitherto, that I might have some fruit among you also, "even as among other Gentiles." Again, xv. 23, 24;

"But now having no more place in these parts, and hav-
"ing a great desire these many years (πολλα, oftentimes)
"to come unto you, whensoever I take my journey into
"Spain I will come to you; for I trust to see you in my
"journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by
"you; but now I go up unto Jerusalem, to minister to the
"saints. When therefore I have performed this, and have
"sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain."

With these passages compare Acts xix. 21. "After
"these things were ended (viz. at Ephesus), Paul purpos-
"ed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedo-
"nia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem; saying, after I
"have been there, I must also see Rome."

Let it be observed that our epistle purports to have been written at the conclusion of St. Paul's second journey into Greece; that the quotation from the Acts contains words said to have been spoken by St. Paul at Ephesus, some time before he set forwards upon that journey. Now I contend that it is impossible that two independent fictions should have attributed to St. Paul the same purpose, especially a purpose so specific and particular as this, which was not merely a general design of visiting Rome, but a design of visiting Rome after he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, and after he had performed a voyage from the countries to Jerusalem. The conformity between the history and the epistle is perfect. In the first quotation from the epistle, we find that a design of visiting Rome had long dwelt in the apostle's mind; in the quotation from the Acts we find that design expressed a considerable time before the epistle was written. In the history we find that the plan which St. Paul had formed, was to pass through Macedonia and Achaia; after that to go to Jerusalem; and, when he had finished his visit there, to sail for Rome. When the epistle was written, he had executed so much of his plan, as to have passed through Macedonia and Achaia; and was preparing to pursue the remainder of it, by speedily setting out towards

Jerusalem; and in this point of his travels he tells his friends at Rome, that, when he had completed the business which carried him to Jerusalem, he would come to them. Secondly, I say that the very inspection of the passages will satisfy us that they were not made up from one another.

"Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will "come to you; for I trust to see you in my journey, and "to be brought on my way thitherward by you; but now "I go up to Jerusalem, to minister to the saints. When, "therefore, I have performed this, and have sealed to "them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain." This from the epistle.

"Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed "through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem; "saying, after I have been there, I must also see Rome." This from the Acts.

If the passage in the epistle was taken from that in the Acts, why was *Spain* put in? If the passage in the Acts was taken from that in the epistle, why was *Spain* left out? If the two passages were unknown to each other, nothing can account for their conformity but truth. Whether we suppose the history and the epistle to be alike fictious, or the history to be true but the letter spurious, or the letter to be genuine but the history a fable, the meeting with this circumstance in both, if neither borrowed it from the other, is upon all these suppositions, equally inexplicable.

No. IV.

The following quotation I offer for the purpose of pointing out a geographical coincidence, of so much importance, that Dr. Lardner considered it as confirmation of the whole history of St. Paul's travels.

Chap. xv. 19. "So that from Jerusalem, and round "about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel "of Christ."

I do not think that these words necessarily import that St. Paul had penetrated into Illyricum, or preached the gospel in that province; but rather that he had come to the confines of Illyricum (μεχρι τ Ιλλυρικ) and that these confines were the external boundary of his travels. St. Paul considers Jerusalem as the centre, and is here viewing the circumference to which his travels had extended. The form of expression in the original conveys this idea; απο Ιερουσαλημ και κυκλω μεχρι τ Ιλλυρικ. Illyricum was the part of this circle which he mentions in an Epistle to the Romans, because it lay in a direction from Jerusalem towards that city, and pointed out to the Roman readers the nearest place to them, to which his travels from Jerusalem had brought him. The name of Illyricum no where occurs in the Acts of the Apostles; no suspicion, therefore, can be conceived that the mention of it was borrowed from thence. Yet I think it appears, from these same Acts, that St. Paul, before the time when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, had reached the confines of Illyricum; or, however, that he might have done so, in perfect consistency with the account there delivered. Illyricum adjoins upon Macedonia; measuring from Jerusalem towards Rome, it lies close behind it. If, therefore, St. Paul traversed the whole country of Macedonia, the route would necessarily bring him to the confines of Illyricum, and these confines would be described as the extremity of his journey. Now the account of St. Paul's second visit to the peninsula of Greece, is contained in these words: "He departed for to go into Macedonia; *and* "*when he had gone over these parts*, and had given them "much exhortation, he came into Greece." Acts xx. 2. This account allows, or rather leads us to suppose that St. Paul, in going over Macedonia (διελθων τα μερη εκεινα), had passed so far to the west as to come into those parts of the country which were contiguous to Illyricum, if he did not enter into Illyricum itself. The history, therefore, and the epistle so far agree, and the agreement is much strength-

ened by a coincidence of *time*. At the time the epistle was written, St. Paul might say, in conformity with the history, that he had "come into Illyricum;" much before that time he could not have said so; for, upon his former journey to Macedonia, his route is laid down from the time of his landing at Philippi to his sailing from Corinth. We trace him from Philippi to Amphipolis and Apollonia; from thence to Thessalonica; from Thessalonica to Berea; from Berea to Athens; and from Athens to Corinth; which track confines him to the eastern side of the peninsula, and therefore keeps him all the while at a considerable distance from Illyricum. Upon his second visit to Macedonia, the history, we have seen, leaves him at liberty. It must have been, therefore, upon that second visit, if at all, that he approached Illyricum; and this visit, we know, almost immediately preceded the writing of the epistle. It was natural that the apostle should refer to a journey which was fresh in his thoughts.

No. V.

Chap. xv. 30. "Now I beseech you, brethren, for "the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spir- "it, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to "God for me, that I may be delivered from them that do "not believe in Judea." With this compare Acts xx. 22, 23.

"And now behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jeru- "salem, not knowing the things that shall befal me there, "save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city saying "that bonds and afflictions abide me."

Let it be remarked that it is the same journey to Jerusalem which is spoken of in these two passages; that the epistle was written immediately before St. Paul set forwards upon this journey from Achaia; that the words in the Acts were uttered by him when he had proceeded in that journey as far as Miletus, in Lesser Asia. This be-

ing remembered, I observe that the two passages, without any resemblance between them that could induce us to suspect that they were borrowed from one another, represent the state of St. Paul's mind, with respect to the event of the journey, in terms of substantial agreement. They both express his sense of danger in the approaching visit to Jerusalem; they both express the doubt which dwelt upon his thoughts concerning what might there befal him. When, in his epistle, he entreats the Roman Christians, "for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the "Spirit, to strive together with him in their prayers to "God for him, that he might be delivered from them "which do not believe in Judea," he sufficiently confesses his fears. In the Acts of the Apostles we see in him the same apprehensions, and the same uncertainty: "I go "bound in the spirit to Jerusalem, *not knowing* the things "that shall befal me there." The only difference is, that in the history his thoughts are more inclined to despondency than in the epistle. In the epistles, he retains his hope "that he should come unto them with joy by the will of "God;" in the history, his mind yields to the reflection, "that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city that bonds "and afflictions awaited him." Now that his fears should be greater, and his hopes less, in this stage of his journey than when he wrote his epistle, that is, when he first set out upon it, is no other alteration than might well be expected; since those prophetic intimations to which he refers, when he says, "the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every "city," had probably been received by him in the course of his journey, and were probably similar to what we know he received in the remaining part of it at Tyre, xxi. 4; and afterwards from Agabus at Cæsarea, xxi. 11.

No. VI.

There is another strong remark arising from the same passage in the epistle; to make which understood, it will

be necessary to state the passage over again, and somewhat more at length.

"I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's "sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me, that I may "be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea; "that I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, "and may with you be refreshed."

I desire the reader to call to mind *that* part of St. Paul's history which took place after his arrival at Jerusalem, and which employs the seven last chapters of the Acts; and I build upon it this observation, that supposing the Epistle to the Romans to have been a forgery, and the author of the forgery to have had the Acts of the Apostles before him, and to have there seen that St. Paul, in fact, "was "*not* delivered from the unbelieving Jews," but on the contrary, that he was taken into custody at Jerusalem, and brought to Rome a prisoner; it is next to impossible that he should have made St. Paul express expectations so contrary to what he saw had been the event; and utter prayers, with apparent hopes of success, which he must have known were frustrated in the issue.

This single consideration convinces me, that no concert or confederacy whatever subsisted between the Epistle and the Acts of the Apostles; and that whatever coincidencies have been or can be pointed out between them, are unsophisticated, and are the result of truth and reality.

It also convinces me that the epistle was written not only in St. Paul's lifetime, but before he arrived at Jerusalem; for the important events relating to him which took place after his arrival at that city, must have been known to the Christian community soon after they happened; they form the most public part of his history. But had they been known to the author of the epistle, in other words, had they then taken place, the passage which we have quoted from the epistle would not have been found there.

No. VII.

I now proceed to state the conformity which exists between the argument of this epistle and the history of its reputed author. It is enough for this purpose to observe, that the object of the epistle, that is, of the argumentative part of it, was to place the Gentile convert upon a parity of situation with the Jewish, in respect of his religious condition, and his rank in the divine favour. The epistle supports this point by a variety of arguments; such as, that no man of either description was justified by the works of the law, for this plain reason, that no man had preformed them; that it became therefore necessary to appoint another medium or condition of justification, in which new medium the Jewish peculiarity was merged and lost; that Abraham's own justification was anterior to the law, and independent of it; that the Jewish converts were to consider the law as now dead, and themselves as married to another; that what the law in truth could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God had done by sending his Son; that God had rejected the unbelieving Jews, and had substituted in their place a society of believers in Christ, collected indifferently from Jews and Gentiles. Soon after the writing of this epistle, St. Paul, agreeably to the intention intimated in the epistle itself, took his journey to Jerusalem. The day after he arrived there, he was introduced to the church. What passed at this interview is thus related, Acts xxi. 19: "When he had saluted "them, he declared particularly what things God had "wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry; and, when "they heard it, they glorified the Lord; and said unto "him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews "there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the "law; and they *are informed of thee*, that thou teachest all "the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Mo-"ses, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their chil-"dren, neither to walk after the customs." St. Paul dis-

claimed the charge; but there must have been something to have led to it. Now it is only to suppose that St. Paul openly professed the principles which the epistle contains; that, in the course of his ministry, he had uttered the sentiments which he is here made to write; and the matter is accounted for. Concerning the accusation which public rumour had brought against him to Jerusalem, I will not say that it was just; but I will say, that, if he was the author of the epistle before us, and if his preaching was consistent with his writing, it was extremely natural; for though it be not a necessary, surely it is an easy inference, that if the Gentile convert, who did not observe the law of Moses, held as advantageous a situation in his religious interests as the Jewish convert who did, there could be no strong reason for observing that law at all. The remonstrance therefore of the church of Jerusalem, and the report which occasioned it, were founded in no very violent misconstruction of the apostle's doctrine. His reception at Jerusalem was exactly what I should have expected the author of this epistle to have met with. I am entitled therefore to argue that a separate narrative of effects experienced by St. Paul, similar to what a person might be expected to experience, who held the doctrines advanced in this epistle, forms a proof that he did hold these doctrines; and that the epistle bearing his name, in which such doctrines are laid down, actually proceeded from him.

No. VIII.

This number is supplemental to the former. I propose to point out in it two particulars in the conduct of the argument, perfectly adapted to the historical circumstances under which the epistle was written; which yet are free from all appearance of contrivance, and which it would not, I think, have entered into the mind of a sophist to contrive.

1. The Epistle to the Galatians relates to the same general question as the Epistle to the Romans. St. Paul had

founded the church of Galatia; at Rome he had never been. Observe now a difference in his manner of treating of the same subject, corresponding with this difference in his situation. In the Epistle to the Galatians he puts the point in a great measure upon *authority*: "I marvel that "ye are so soon removed from him that called you into "the grace of Christ, unto another gospel." Gal. i. 6. "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preach-"ed of me is not after man; for I neither received it of "man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Je-"sus Christ." Ch. i. 11, 12. "I am afraid lest I have "bestowed upon you labor in vain." iv. 11, 12. "I de-"sire to be present with you now, for I stand in doubt of "you." iv. 20. "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that, "if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." v. 2. "This persuasion cometh not of him that called "you." v. 8. This is the style in which he accosts the Galatians. In the epistle to the converts of Rome, where his authority was not established, nor his person known, he puts the same point entirely upon *argument*. The perusal of the epistle will prove this to the satisfaction of every reader; and, as the observation relates to the whole contents of the epistle, I forbear adducing seperate extracts. I repeat therefore that we have pointed out a distinction in the two epistles, suited to the relation in which the author stood to his different correspondents.

Another adaption, and somewhat of the same kind, is the following.

2. The Jews we know were very numerous at Rome, and probably formed a principal part amongst the new converts; so much so, that the Christians seem to have been known at Rome rather as a denomination of Jews, than as any thing else. In an epistle consequently to the Roman believers, the point to be endeavoured after by St. Paul was, to reconcile the *Jewish* converts to the opinion, that the Gentiles were admitted by God to a parity of religious situation with themselves, and that without their being bound by the law of Moses. The

Gentile converts would probably accede to this opinion very readily. In this epistle, therefore, though directed to the Roman church in general, it is in truth a Jew writings to Jews. Accordingly you will take notice, that as often as his argument leads him to say any thing derogatory from the Jewish institution, he constantly follows it by a softening clause. Having (ii. 28, 29.) pronounced, not much perhaps to the satisfaction of the native Jews, "that he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither "that circumcision which is outward in the flesh:" he adds immediately, "What advantage then hath the Jew, "or what profit is there in circumcision? *Much every* "*way*." Having in the third chap. ver. 28, brought his argument to this formal conclusion, "that a man is justi-"fied by faith without the deeds of the law," he presently subjoins, ver. 31, "Do we then make void the law "through faith? God forbid! *Yea we establish the law.*" In the seventh chapter, when in the sixth verse he had advanced the bold assertion, that "now we are delivered "from the law, that being dead wherein we were held;" in the very next verse he comes in with this healing question, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid! "Nay, I had not known sin but by the law." Having in the following words insinuated, or rather more than insinuated the inefficacy of the Jewish law, viii. 3, "for what the "law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, "and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh;" after a digression indeed, but that sort of digression which he could never resist, a rapturous contemplation of his Christian hope, and which occupies the latter part of this chapter; we find him in the next, as if sensible that he had said something which would give offence, returning to his Jewish brethren in terms of the warmest affection and respect. "I say the truth in Christ Jesus; I lie not; my con-"science also bearing witness, in the Holy Ghost, that I "have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart;

" for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, " *for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are* " *Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory,* " *and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the ser-* " *vice of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers; and* " *of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.*" When, in the thirty first and thirty second verses of this ninth chapter, he represented to the Jews the error of even the best of their nation, by telling them that " Israel, " which followed after the law of righteousness, had not " attained to the law of righteousness, because they " sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of " the law, for they stumbled at that stumbling stone," he takes care to annex to this declaration these conciliating expressions; " Brethren, *my heart's desire and prayer to* " *God for Israel* is, that they might be saved; for I bear " them record that they *have a zeal of God*, but not ac- " cording to knowledge." Lastly, having, ch. x. 20, 21, by the application of a passage in Isaiah insinuated the most ungrateful of all propositions to a Jewish ear, the rejection of the Jewish nation, as God's peculiar people; he hastens, as it were, to qualify the intelligence of their fall by this interesting expostulation; " I say, then, hath " God cast away his people (i. e. wholly and entirely)? " *God forbid!* for I also am an Israelite, of the seed of A- " braham, of the tribe of Benjamin. *God hath not cast* " *away his people which he foreknew;*" and follows this thought, throughout the whole of the eleventh chapter, in a series of reflections calculated to soothe the Jewish converts, as well as to procur efrom their Gentile brethren respect to the Jewish institution. Now all this is perfectly natural. In a real St. Paul writing to real converts, it is what anxiety to bring them over to his persuasion would naturally produce; but there is an earnestness and a personality, if I may so call it, in the manner, which a cold forgery, I apprehend, would neither have conceived nor supported.

CHAP. III.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

No. I.

BEFORE we proceed to compare this epistle with the history, or with any other epistle, we will employ one number in stating certain remarks applicable to our argument, which arises from a perusal of the epistle itself.

By an expression in the first verse of the seventh chapter, "now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me," it appears, that this letter to the Corinthians was written by St. Paul in answer to one which he had received from them; and that the seventh, and some of the following chapters, are taken up in resolving certain doubts, and regulating certain points of order, concerning which the Corinthians had in their letter consulted him. This alone is a circumstance considerably in favor of the authenticity of the epistle; for it must have been a farfetched contrivance in a forgery, first to have feigned the receipt of a letter from the church of Corinth, which letter does not appear; and then to have drawn up a fictitious answer to it, relative to a great variety of doubts and enquiries, purely economical and domestic; and which, though likely enough to have occurred to an infant society, in a situation and under an institution so novel as that of a Christian church then was, it must have very much exercised the author's invention, and could have answered no imaginable purpose of forgery, to introduce the mention of it at all. Particulars of the kind we refer to, are such as the following; the rule of duty and prudence relative to entering into marriage, as applicable to virgins, to widows; the case of husbands married to unconverted wives, of wives having unconverted husbands; that case where the unconverted party choos-

es to separate, where he chooses to continue the union; the effect which their conversion produced upon their prior state, of circumcision, of slavery; the eating of things offered to idols, as it was in itself, as others were affected by it; the joining in idolatrous sacrifices; the decorum to be observed in their religious assemblies, the order of speaking, the silence of women, the covering or uncovering of the head, as it became men, as it became women. These subjects, with their several subdivisions, are so particular, minute, and numerous, that, though they be exactly agreeable to the circumstances of the persons to whom the letter was written, nothing, I believe, but the existence and reality of those circumstances, could have suggested to the writer's thoughts.

But this is not the only nor the principal observation upon the correspondence between the church of Corinth and their apostle, which I wish to point out. It appears I think, in this correspondence, that, although the Corinthians had written to St. Paul, requesting his answer and his directions in the several points above enumerated, yet that they had not said one syllable about the enormities and disorders which had crept in among them, and in the blame of which they all shared; but that St. Paul's information concerning the irregularities then prevailing at Corinth, had come round to him from other quarters. The quarrels and disputes excited by their contentious adherence to their different teachers, and by their placing of them in competition with one another, were not mentioned in their *letter*, but communicated to St. Paul by more private intelligence. "It hath been declared unto me, my brethren, *by "them which are of the house of Chloe*, that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you "saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, "and I of Christ." (i. 11, 12). The incestuous marriage "of a man with his father's wife," which St. Paul reprehends with so much severity in the fifth chapter of our epistle, and which was not the crime of an individual on-

ly, but a crime in which the whole church, by tolerating and conniving at it, had rendered themselves partakers, did not come to St. Paul's knowledge by the *letter*, but by a rumour which had reached his ears; "*It is report-*
"*ed commonly* that there is fornication among you, and
"such fornication as is not so much as named among the
"Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife; and
"ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned that he
"that hath done this deed might be taken away from
"among you." (v. 1, 2). Their going to law before the judicature of the country, rather than arbitrate and adjust their disputes among themselves, which St. Paul animadverts upon with his usual plainness, was not intimated to him in the *letter*, because he tells them his opinion of this conduct, before he comes to the contents of the letter. Their litigiousness is censured by St. Paul in the sixth chapter of his epistle, and it is only at the beginning of the seventh chapter that he proceeds upon the articles which he found in their letter; and he proceeds upon them with this preface: "Now concerning the things
"whereof ye wrote unto me," (vii. 1.); which introduction he would not have used, if he had been already discussing any of the subjects concerning which they had written. Their irregularities in celebrating the Lord's supper, and the utter perversion of the institution which ensued, were not in the *letter*, as is evident from the terms in which St. Paul mentions the notice he had received of it; "Now
"in this that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that ye
"came together not for the better, but for the worse; for
"first of all, when ye come together in the church, *I*
"*hear* that there be divisions among you, and *I partly be-*
"*lieve it.*" Now that the Corinthians should in their own letter, exhibit the fair side of their conduct to the apostle, and conceal from him the faults of their behaviour, was extremely natural, and extremely probable; but it was a distinction which would not I think, have easily occurred to the author of a forgery; and much less likely is it, that

it should have entered into his thoughts to make the distinction *appear* in the way in which it does appear, viz. not by the original letter, not by any express observation upon it in the answer, but distantly by marks perceivable in the manner, or in the order, in which St. Paul takes notice of their faults.

No. II.

Our epistle purports to have been written after St. Paul had already been at Corinth: "I, brethren, "*when I came unto you*, came not with excellency of "speech or of wisdom," (ii. 1.); and in many other places to the same effect. It purports also to have been written upon the eve of another visit to that church: "I will "come to you shortly, if the Lord will," (iv. 19.); and again, "I will come to you when I shall pass through "Macedonia." (xvi. 5.) Now the history relates that St. Paul did in fact visit Corinth *twice*; once as recorded at length in the eighteenth, and a second time as mentioned briefly in the twentieth chapter of the Acts. The same history also informs us, Acts xv. 1, that it was from Ephesus St. Paul proceeded upon his second journey into Greece. Therefore, as the epistle purports to have been written a short time preceding that journey; and as St. Paul, the history tells us, had resided more than two years at Ephesus before he set out upon it, it follows that it must have been from Ephesus, to be consistent with the history, that the epistle was written; and every note of *place* in the epistle agrees with this supposition. "If after the man-"ner of men, I have fought with beasts at *Ephesus*, what "advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" (xv. 32.) I allow that the apostle might say this, whereever he was; but it was more natural and more to the purpose to say it if he was at Ephesus at the time, and in the midst of those conflicts to which the expression relates. "The churches "of Asia salute you." (xvi. 19.) Asia, throughout the

Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul, does not mean the whole of Asia Minor or Anatolia, nor even the whole of the proconsulor Asia, but a district in the anterior part of that country, called Lydian Asia, divided from the rest, much as Portugal is from Spain, and of which district *Ephesus* was the capital. "Aquila and "Priscilla salute you." (xvi. 19.) Aquila and Priscilla were at *Ephesus* during the period within which this epistle was written. (Acts xviii. 18, 26.)—"I will tarry at "*Ephesus* until Pentecost." (xvi. 8.) This, I apprehend is in terms almost asserting that he was at Ephesus at the time of writing the epistle. "A great and effectual door "is opened unto me." (xvi. 9.) How well this declaration corresponded with the state of things at Ephesus, and the progress of the gospel in these parts, we learn from the reflection with which the historian concludes the account of certain transactions which passed there; "So "mightily grew the word of God and prevailed," (Acts xix. 20.); as well as from the complaint of Demetrius, "that not only at Ephesus, but also throughout all Asia, "this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much peo-"ple." (xix. 26. "And there are many adversaries," says the epistle, (xvi. 9.) Look into the history of this period. "When divers were hardened and believed not, "but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he de-"parted from them, and seperated the disciples." The conformity therefore upon this head of comparison, is circumstantial and perfect. If any one think that this is a conformity so obvious, that any forger of tolerable caution and sagacity, would have taken care to preserve it, I must desire such a one to read the epistle for himself; and, when he has done so, to declare whether he has discovered one mark of art or design; whether the notes of *time* and *place* appear to him to be inserted with any reference to each other, with any view of their being compared with each other, or for the purpose of establishing a visible agreement with the history, in respect of them.

No. III.

Chap. iv. 17—19. "For this cause I have sent unto you "Timotheus, who is my beloved son and faithful in the "Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my "ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every "church. Now some are puffed up, as though I would "not come unto you; but I will come unto you shortly, "if the Lord will."

With this I compare Acts xix. 21, 22; "After these "things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit, when he "had passed through Macedonia and *Achaia*, to go to Je- "rusalem; saying, after I have been there I must also "see Rome: *so* he sent unto Macedonia two of them "that ministered unto him, *Timotheus* and Erastus."

Though it be not said, it appears I think with sufficient certainty, I mean from the history, independently of the epistle, that Timothy was sent upon this occasion into *Achaia*, of which Corinth was the capital city, as well as into Macedonia; for the sending of Timothy and Erastus is, in the passage where it is mentioned, plainly connected with St. Paul's own journey; *he sent them before him.* As he therefore purposed to go into *Achaia* himself, it is highly probable that they were to go thither also. Nevertheless, they are said only to have been sent into Macedonia, because Macedonia was in truth the country to which they went immediately from Ephesus; being directed, as we suppose, to proceed afterwards from thence into Achaia. If this be so, the narrative agrees with the epistle; and the agreement is attended with very little appearance of design. One thing at least concerning it is certain; that if this passage of St. Paul's history had been taken from his letter, it would have sent Timothy to Corinth by name, or expressly however into Achaia.

But there is another circumstance in these two passages much less obvious, in which an agreement holds with-

out any room for suspicion that it was produced by design. We have observed that the sending of Timothy into the peninsula of Greece was connected in the narrative with St. Paul's own journey thither; it is stated as the effect of the same resolution. Paul purposed to go into Macedonia; "so he sent two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus." Now in the Epistle also you remark that, when the apostle mentions his having sent Timothy unto them, in the very next sentence he speaks of his own visit; "for this cause have I sent unto "you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, &c. Now "some are puffed up, as though I would not come to "you; but I will come to you shortly, if God will." Timothy's journey we see is mentioned in the history, and in the epistle, in close connection with St. Paul's own. Here is the same order of thought and intention; yet conveyed under such diversity of circumstance and expression, and the mention of them in the epistle so allied to the occasion which introduces it, viz. the insinuation of his adversaries that he would come to Corinth no more, that I am persuaded no attentive reader will believe, that these passages were written in concert with one another, or will doubt but that the agreement is unsought and uncontrived.

But, in the Acts, Erastus accompanied Timothy in this journey, of whom no mention is made in the epistle. From what has been said in our observations, upon the Epistle to the Romans, it appears probable that Erastus was a Corinthian. If so, though he accompanied Timothy to Corinth, he was only returning home, and Timothy was the messenger charged with St. Paul's orders. At any rate, this discrepancy shews that the passages were not taken from one another.

No. IV.

Chap. xvi. 10, 11. "Now if Timotheus come, see "that he may be with you without fear; for he worketh

"the work of the Lord, as I also do; let no man there-
"fore despise him, but conduct him forth in peace, that
"he may come unto me, for I look for him with the
"brethren."

From the passage considered in the preceding number, it appears that Timothy was sent to Corinth, either with the epistle, or before it; "for this cause have I sent unto "you Timotheus." From the passage now quoted, we infer that Timothy was not sent *with* the epistle; for had he been the bearer of the letter, or accompanied it, would St. Paul in that letter have said, "*if* Timothy come?" Nor is the sequel consistent with the supposition of his carrying the letter; for if Timothy was with the Apostle when he wrote the letter, could he say, as he does, "I look for him with the brethren?" I conclude therefore that Timothy had left St. Paul to proceed upon his journey before the letter was written. Further, the passage before us seems to imply, that Timothy was not expected by St. Paul to arrive at Corinth, till after they had received the letter. He gives them directions in the letter how to treat him when he should arrive: "if he come," act towards him so and so. Lastly, the whole form of expression is most naturally applicable to the supposition of Timothy's coming to Corinth, not directly from St. Paul, but from some other quarter; and that his instructions had been when he should reach Corinth, to return. Now, how stands this matter in the history? Turn to the nineteenth chapter and twenty first verse of the Acts, and you will find that Timothy did not, when sent from Ephesus, where he left St. Paul, and where the present epistle was written, proceed by a straight course to Corinth, but that he went round through Macedonia. This clears up every thing; for, although Timothy was sent forth upon his journey before the letter was written, yet, he might not reach Corinth till after the letter arrived there; and he would come to Corinth, when he did come, not directly

from St. Paul, at Ephesus, but from some part of Macedonia. Here therefore is a circumstantial and critical agreement, and unquestionably without design; for neither of the two passages in the epistle mentions Timothy's journey into Macedonia at all, though nothing but a circuit of that kind can explain and reconcile the expressions which the writer uses.

No. V.

Chap. i. 12. "Now this I say, that every one of you "saith I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, "and I of Christ."

Also iii. 6. "I have planted, Apollos watered, but "God gave the increase."

This expression, "I have planted, Apollos watered," imports two things; first, that Paul had been at Corinth before Apollos; secondly, that Apollos had been at Corinth after Paul, but before the writing of this epistle. This implied account of the several events, and of the order in which they took place, corresponds exactly with the history. St. Paul after his first visit into Greece, returned from Corinth into Syria by the way of Ephesus; and, dropping his companions Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus, he proceeded forwards to Jerusalem; from Jerusalsm he descended to Antioch; and from thence made a progress through some of the upper or northern provinces of the Lesser Asia, Acts xviii. 19. 23; during which progress, and consequently in the interval between St. Paul's first and second visit to Corinth, and consequently also before the writing of this epistle, which was at Ephesus two years at least after the apostle's return from his progress, we hear of Apollos, and we hear of him at Corinth. Whilst St. Paul was engaged, as hath been said, in Phrygia and Galatia, Apollos come down to Ephesus; and being, in St. Paul's absence, instructed by Aquila and Priscilla, and having obtained letters of recommenda-

tion from the church at Ephesus, he passed over to Achaia; and when he was there, we read that he "helped them "much which had believed through grace, for he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly." Acts xviii. 27, 28. To have brought Apollos into Achaia, of which Corinth was the capital city, as well as the principal Christian church; and to have shewn that he preached the gospel in that country, would have been sufficient for our purpose. But the history happens also to mention Corinth by name, as the place in which Apollos after his arrival in Achaia, fixed his residence; for, proceeding with the account of St. Paul's travels, it tells us that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came down to Ephesus, xix. 1. What is said therefore of Apollos, in the epistle, coincides exactly, and especially in the point of chronology, with what is delivered concerning him in the history. The only question now is, whether the allusions were made with a regard to this coincidence. Now the occasions and purposes for which the name of Apollos is introduced in the Acts and in the Epistles, are so independent and so remote, that it is impossible to discover the smallest reference from one to the other. Apollos is mentioned in the Acts, in immediate connection with the history of Aquila and Priscilla, and for the very singular circumstance of his "knowing "only the baptism of John." In the epistle, where none of these circumstances are taken notice of, his name first occurs, for the purpose of reproving the contentious spirit of the Corinthians; and it occurs only in conjunction with that of some others. "Every one of you saith, I "am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I "of Christ." The second passage in which Apollos appears, "I have planted, Apollos watered," fixes, as we have observed, the order of time amongst three distinct events; but it fixes this, I will venture to pronounce, without the writer perceiving that he was doing any such thing. The sentence fixes this order in exact conformity

dence there nothing more particular is recorded than that "he was with the apostles, coming in and going out; "that he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and "disputed against the Grecians who went about to "kill him." From Jerusalem, the history sends him to his native city of Tarsus.* It seems probable, from the order and disposition of the history, that St. Paul's stay at Tarsus was of some continuance; for we hear nothing of him, until, after a long apparent interval, and much interjacent narrative, Barnabas, desirous of Paul's assistance upon the enlargement of the Christian mission, "went to Tarsus for to seek him.†" We cannot doubt but that the new apostle had been busied in his ministry; yet of what he did, or what he suffered, during this period, which may include three or four years, the history professes not to deliver any information. As Tarsus was situated upon the seacoast, and as, though Tarsus was his home, yet it is probable he visited from thence many other places, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel, it is not unlikely, that in the course of three or four years, he might undertake many short voyages to neighbouring countries, in the navigating of which we may be allowed to suppose that some of those disasters and shipwrecks befel him, to which he refers in the quotation before us, "thrice "I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in "the deep." This last clause I am inclined to interpret of his being obliged to take to an open boat, upon the loss of the ship, and his continuing out at sea in that dangerous situation, a night and a day. St. Paul is here recounting his sufferings, not relating miracles. From Tarsus, Barnabas brought Paul to Antioch, and there he remained a year; but of the transactions of that year no other description is given than what is contained in the four last verses of the eleventh chapter. After a more solemn dedication to the ministry, Barnabas and Paul pro-

* Acts, chap. ix. 30.
† Chap. xi. 25.

ceeded from Antioch to Cilicia, and from thence they sailed to Cyprus, of which voyage no particulars are mentioned. Upon their return from Cyprus, they made a progress together through the Lesser Asia; and though two remarkable speeches be preserved, and a few incidents in the course of their travels circumstantially related, yet it is the account of this progress, upon the whole, given professedly with conciseness; for instance, at Iconium it is said that they abode a long time;* yet of this long abode, except concerning the manner in which they were driven away, no memoir is inserted in the history. The whole is wrapped up in one short summary, "they spake boldly in the Lord, which gave testimo-"ny unto the world of his grace, and granted signs and "wonders to bo done by their hands." Having completed their progress, the two apostles returned to Antioch, "and there they abode long time with the disciples." Here we have another large portion of time passed over in silence. To this succeeded a journey to Jerusalem, upon a dispute which then much agitated the Christian church, concerning the obligation of the law of Moses. When the object of that journey was completed, Paul proposed to Barnabas to go again and visit their brethren in every city where they had not preached the word of the Lord. The execution of this plan carried our apostle through Syria, Cilicia, and many provinces of the Lesser Asia; yet is the account of the whole journey dispatched, in four verses of the sixteenth chapter.

If the Acts of the Apostles had undertaken to exhibit regular annals of St. Paul's ministry, or even any continued account of his life, from his conversion at Damascus to his imprisonment at Rome, I should have thought the omission of the circumstances referred to in our epistle, a matter of reasonable objection. But when it appears, from the history itself, that large portions of St. Paul's life were either passed over in silence, or only slightly

* Chap. xvi. 3.

touched upon, and that nothing more than certain detached incidents and discourses are related; when we observe also, that the author of the history did not join our apostle's society till a few years before the writing of the epistle, at least that there is no proof in the history that he did so; in comparing the history with the epistle, we shall not be surprised by the discovery of omissions; we shall ascribe it to truth that there is no contradiction.

No. X.

Cap. iii. 1. "Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you?"

"As some others." Turn to Acts xviii. 27, and you will find that, a short time before the writing of this epistle, Apollos had gone to Corinth with letters of commendation from the Ephesian Christians; "and when Apollos was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote, "exhorting the disciples to receive him." Here the words of the epistle bear the appearance of alluding to some specific instance, and the history supplies that instance; it supplies at least an instance as opposite as possible to the terms which the apostle uses, and to the date and direction of the epistle, in which they are found. The letter which Apollos carried from Ephesus, was precisely the letter of commendation which St. Paul meant? and it was to Achaia, of which Corinth was the capital, and indeed to Corinth itself (Acts, chap. xix. 1.), that Apollos carried it; and it was about two years before the writing of this epistle. If St. Paul's words be rather thought to refer to some general usage which then obtained among Christian churches, the case of Apollos exemplifies that usage; and affords that species of confirmation to the epistle, which arises from seeing the manners of the age, in which it purports to be written, faithfully preserved.

No. XI.

Chap. xiii. 1: "This is the third time I am coming to "you;" τριτον τουτο ερχομαι.

Do not these words import that the writer had been at Corinth twice before? Yet, if they import this, they overset every congruity we have been endeavouring to establish. The Acts of the Apostles record only two journeys of St. Paul to Corinth. We have all along supposed, what every mark of time except this expression indicates, that the epistle was written between the first and second of these journeys. If St. Paul had been already twice at Corinth, this supposition must be given up; and every argument or observation which depend upon it, falls to the ground. Again, the Acts of the Apostles not only record no more than two journeys of St. Paul to Corinth, but do not allow us to suppose that more than two such journeys could be made or intended by him within the period which the history comprises; for, from his first journey into Greece to his first imprisonment at Rome, with which the history concludes, the apostle's time is accounted for. If therefore the epistle was written after the second journey to Corinth, and upon the view and expectation of a third, it must have been written after his first imprisonment at Rome, i. e. after the time to which the history extends. When I first read over this epistle with the particular view of comparing it with the history, which I chose to do without consulting any commentary whatever, I own that I felt myself confounded by this text. It appeared to contradict the opinion, which I had been led by a great variety of circumstances to form, concerning the date and occasion of the epistle. At length however it occurred to my thoughts to inquire, whether the passage did necessarily imply that St. Paul had been at Corinth twice; or whether, when he says "this is the "third time I am coming to you," he might mean only

that this was the third time that he was ready, that he was prepared, that he intended to set out upon his journey to Corinth. I recollected that he had once before this purposed to visit Corinth, and had been disappointed in his purpose; which disappointment forms the subject of much apology and protestation, in the first and second chapters of the epistle. Now, if the journey in which he had been disappointed was reckoned by him one of the times in which "he was coming to them," then the present would be the third time, i. e. of his being ready and prepared to come; although he had been actually at Corinth only *once* before. This conjecture being taken up, a further examination of the passage and the epistle, produced proofs which placed it beyond doubt. This is the third time I am coming to you; in the verse following these words he adds, "I told you before, and foretel you, "as if I were present *the second time*; and being absent, "now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and "to all other, that if I come again I will not spare." In this verse, the apostle is declaring beforehand what he would do in his intended visit; his expression therefore, "as if I "were present the second time," relates to that visit. But, if his future visit would only make him present among them a second time, it follows that he had been already there but once. Again, in the fifteenth verse of the first chapter, he tells them, "In this confidence, I was minded "to come unto you before, that ye might have a *second* "benefit." Why a second, and not a third benefit? why δευτεραν, and not τριτην χαριν, if the τριτον ερχομαι, in the fifteenth chapter, meant a *third* visit? for, though the visit in the first chapter be that visit in which he was disappointed, yet, as it is evident from the epistle that he had never been at Corinth, from the disappointment to the time of writing the epistle, it follows, that if it was only a second visit in which he was disappointed then, it could only be a second visit which he purposed now. But the text which I think is decisive of the question, if any question re-

main upon the subject, is the fourteenth verse of the twelfth "chapter; Behold the third time I am ready to come to you." ἰδὲ τριτον ετοιμως εχω ελθειν. It is very clear that the τριτον ετοιμως εχω ελθειν of the twelfth chapter and the τριτον τουτο ερχομαι of the thirteenth chapter, are equivalent expressions, were intended to convey the same meaning, and to relate to the same journey. The comparison of these phrases gives us St. Paul's own explanation of his own words; and it is that very explanation which we are contending for, viz. that τριτον τουτο ερχομαι does not mean that he was coming a third time, but that this was the third time he was in readiness to come; τριτον ετοιμως εχω. I do not apprehend, that after this it can be necessary to call to our aid the reading of the Alexandrian manuscript, which gives ετοιμως εχω ελθειν in the thirteenth chapter as well as in the twelfth; or of the Syriac and Coptic versions, which follow that reading; because I allow that this reading, besides not being sufficiently supported by ancient copies, is probably paraphrastical, and has been inserted for the purpose of expressing more unequivocally the sense, which the shorter expression τριτον τουτο ερχομαι was supposed to carry. Upon the whole, the matter is sufficiently certain; nor do I propose it as a new interpretation of the text which contains the difficulty, for the same was given by Grotius long ago; but I thought it the clearest way of explaining the subject, to describe the manner in which the difficulty, the solution, and the proofs of that solution, successively presented themselves to my inquiries. Now, in historical researches, a reconciled inconsistency becomes a positive argument. First, because an impostor generally guards against the appearances of inconsistency; and secondly because when apparent inconsistencies are found, it is seldom that any thing but truth renders them capable of reconciliation. The existence of the difficulty proves the want or absence of that caution, which usually accompanies the consciousness of fraud; and the solution proves, that it

is not the collusion of fortuitous proposition which we have to to deal with, but the thread of truth winds through the whole, which preserves every circumstance in its place.

No. XII.

Chap. x. 14—16. "We are come as far as to you al-"so, in preaching the Gospel of Christ; not boasting of "things without our measure, that is, of other men's la-"bours; but having hope, when your faith is increased, "that we shall be enlarged by you, according to our rule, "abundantly to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond "you."

This quotation affords an indirect, and therefore unsuspicious, but at the same time a distinct and indubitable recognition of the truth and exactness of the history. I consider it to be implied by the words of the quotation, that Corinth was the extremity of St. Paul's travels *hitherto*. He expresses to the Corinthians his hope, that in some future visit he might "preach the Gospel to the regions "beyond them;" which imports that he had not hitherto proceeded "beyond them," but that Corinth was as yet the farthest point or boundary of his travels. Now, how is St. Paul's first journey into Europe, which was the only one he had taken before the writing of the epistle, traced out in the history? Sailing from Asia, he landed at Philippi; from Philippi, traversing the eastern coast of the peninsula, he passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica; from thence through Berea to Athens, and from Athens to Corinth, *where he stopped;* and from whence, after a residence of a year and a half, he sailed back into Syria. So that Corinth was the last place which he visited in the peninsula; was the place from which he returned into Asia; and was, as such, the boundary and limit of his progress. He could not have said the same thing, viz. "I hope hereafter to visit the "regions beyond you," in an epistle to the Philippians, or in an epistle to the Thessalonians, inasmuch as he

must be deemed to have already visited the regions beyond *them*, having proceeded from those cities to other parts of Greece. But from Corinth he returned home; every part therefore, beyond that city, might properly be said, as it is said in the passage before us, to be unvisited. Yet is this propriety, the spontaneous effect of truth, and produced without meditation or design.

CHAP. V.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

No. I.

THE argument of this epistle in some measure proves its antiquity. It will hardly be doubted, but that it was written whilst the dispute concerning the circumcision of Gentile converts was fresh in men's minds; for, even supposing it to have been a forgery, the only credible motive that can be assigned for the forgery, was to bring the name and authority of the apostle into this controversy. No design could be so insipid, or so unlikely to enter into the thoughts of any man, as to produce an epistle written earnestly and pointedly upon one side of a controversy, when the controversy itself was dead, and the question no longer interesting to any description of readers whatever. Now the controversy concerning the circumcision of the Gentile Christians was of such a nature, that, if it arose at all, it must have arisen in the beginning of Christianity. As Judea was the scene of the Christian history; as the author and preachers of Christianity were Jews; as the religion itself acknowledged and was founded upon the Jewish religion, in contradistinction to every other religion then professed amongst mankind; it was not to be wondered at, that some of its teachers should carry it out in the world rather as a sect and modification of Judaism, than as a separate original revelation; or that they should invite their proselytes to those observances, in which they lived themselves. This was likely to happen; but if it did not happen *at first*; if, whilst the religion was in the hands of Jewish teachers, no such claim was advanced, no such condition was attempted to be imposed, it is not probable that the doctrine would be started, much less that it should prevail in any future period. I likewise think, that those pretensions of Judaism were

much more likely to be insisted upon, whilst the Jews continued a nation, than after their fall and dispersion; whilst Jerusalem and the temple stood, than after the destruction brought upon them by the Roman arms, the fatal cessation of the sacrifice and the priesthood, the humiliating loss of their country, and, with it, of the great rites and symbols of their institution. It should seem therefore, from the nature of the subject, and the situation of the parties, that this controversy was carried on in the interval between the preaching of Christianity to the Gentiles, and the invasion of Titus; and that our present epistle, which was undoubtedly intended to bear a part in this controversy, must be referred to the same period.

But, again, the epistle supposes that certain designing adherents of the Jewish law had crept into the churches of Galatia; and had been endeavouring, and but too successfully, to persuade the Galatic converts, that they had been taught the new religion imperfectly and at second hand; that the founder of their church himself possessed only an inferior and deputed commission, the seat of truth and authority being in the apostles and elders of Jerusalem; moreover, that whatever he might profess amongst them, he had himself at other times, and in other places, given way to the doctrine of circumcision. The epistle is unintelligible without supposing all this. Referring therefore to this, as to what had actually passed, we find St. Paul treating so unjust an attempt to undermine his credit, and to introduce amongst his converts a doctrine which he had uniformly reprobated, in terms of great asperity and indignation. And in order to refute the suspicions which had been raised concerning the fidelity of his teaching, as well as to assert the independency and divine original of his mission, we find him appealing to the history of his conversion, to his conduct under it, to the manner in which he had conferred with the apostles when he met with them at Jerusalem; alledging, that so far was his doctrine from being derived from them, or they from exercising any superiori-

ty over him, that they had simply assented to what he had already preached amongst the Gentiles, and which preaching was communicated not by them to him, but by himself to them; that he had maintained the liberty of the Gentile church, by opposing, upon one occasion, an apostle to the face, when the timidity of his behaviour seemed to endanger it; that from the first, that all along, that to that hour he had constantly resisted the claims of Judaism; and that the persecutions which he daily underwent, at the hands or by the instigation of the Jews, and of which he bore in his person the marks and scars, might have been avoided by him, if he had consented to employ his labors in bringing, through the medium of Christianity, converts over to the Jewish institution, for then "would the offence of the cross have ceased." Now an impostor who had forged the epistle for the purpose of producing St. Paul's authority in the dispute, which, as hath been observed, is the only credible motive that can be assigned for the forgery, might have made the apostle deliver his opinion upon the subject, in strong and decisive terms, or might have put his name to a train of reasoning and argumentation upon that side of the question, which the imposture was intended to recommend. I can allow the possibility of such a scheme as that. But for a writer, with this purpose in view, to feign a series of transactions supposed to have passed amongst the Christians of Galatia, and then to counterfeit expressions of anger and resentment excited by these transactions; to make the apostle travel back into his own history, and into a recital of various passages of his life, some indeed directly, but others obliquely, and others even obscurely bearing upon the point in question; in a word, to substitute narrative for argument, expostulation and complaint for dogmatic positions and controversial reasoning, in a writing properly controversial, and of which the aim and design was to support one side of a much agitated question, is a method so intricate, and so unlike the methods pursued by

all other impostors, as to require very flagrant proofs of imposition to induce us to believe it to be one.

No. II.

In this number I shall endeavour to prove,

1. That the Epistle to the Galatians, and the Acts of the Apostles, were written without any communication with each other.

2. That the epistle, though written without any communication with the history, by recital, implication, or reference, bears testimony to many of the facts contained in it.

I. The epistle and the Acts of the Apostles were written without any communication with each other.

To judge of this point, we must examine those passages in each, which describe the same transaction; for if the author of either writing derived his information from the account which he had seen in the other, when he came to speak of the same transaction, he would follow that account. The history of St. Paul, at Damascus, as read in the Acts, and as referred to by the epistle, forms an instance of this sort. According to the Acts, Paul (after his conversion) was certain days with the "disciples which "were at Damascus. And straightway he preached "Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God. "But all that heard him were amazed, and said, is not "this he which destroyed them which called on this name "in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent, that he "might bring them bound unto the chief priests? But "Saul increased the more in strength, confounding the "Jews which were at Damascus, proving that this is very "Christ. And after that many days were fulfilled, the "Jews took counsel to kill him. But their laying wait "was known of Saul; and they watched the gates day "and night to kill him. Then the disciples took him by "night and let him down by the wall in a basket. And

"when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join "himself to the disciples." Acts, chap. ix. 19—26.

According to the epistle, "when it pleased God, who "separated me from my mother's womb, and called me "by his grace, to reveal his own son in me, that I might "preach him among the heathen, immediately I confer- "red not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jeru- "salem to them which were apostles before me; but I "went into Arabia, returned again to Damascus; then, "after three years, I went up to Jerusalem."

Beside the difference observable in the terms and general complexion of these two accounts, "the journey into "Arabia," mentioned in the epistle, and omitted in the history, affords full proof that there existed no correspondence between these writers. If the narrative in the Acts had been made up from the epistle, it is impossible that this journey should have been passed over in silence; if the Epistle had been composed out of what the author had read of St. Paul's history in the Acts, it is unaccountable that it should have been inserted.*

The journey to Jerusalem related in the second chapter of the Epistle ("then, fourteen years after, I went up "again to Jerusalem,") supplies another example of the same kind. Either this was the journey described in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, when Paul and Barnabas were sent from Antioch to Jerusalem, to consult the apostles and elders upon the question of the Gentile converts; or it was some journey of which the history does not take notice. If the first opinion be followed, the discrepancy

* *N. B.* The Acts of the Apostles simply imform us that St. Paul left Damascus in order to go to Jerusalem, "after many days were "fulfilled." If any one doubt whether the words "many days" could be intended to express a period which included a term of three years, he will find a complete instance of the same phrase used with the same latitude in the first book of Kings, ch. xi. 38, 39. "And "Shimei dwelt at Jerusalem *many days*:" and it came to pass, at the end of *three years*, "that two of the servants of Shimei ran away."

in the two accounts is so considerable, that it is not without difficulty they can be adapted to the same transaction; so that, upon this supposition, there is no place for suspecting that the writers were guided or assisted by each other. If the latter opinion be preferred, we have then a journey to Jerusalem, and a conference with the principal members of the church there, circumstantially related in the epistle, and entirely omitted in the Acts; and we are at liberty to repeat the observation, which we before made, that the omission of so material a fact in the history is inexplicable, if the historian had read the epistle; and that the insertion of it in the epistle, if the writer derived his information from the history, is not less so.

St Peter's visit to Antioch, during which the dispute arose between him and St. Paul, is not mentioned in the Acts.

If we connect with these instances, the general observation, that no scrutiny can discover the smallest trace of transcription or imitation either in things or words, we shall be fully satisfied in this part of our case; namely, that the two records, be the facts contained in them true or false, come to our hands from independent sources.

Secondly, I say that the epistle, thus proved to have been written without any communication with the history, bears testimony to a great variety of particulars contained in the history.

1. St. Paul in the early part of his life had addicted himself to the study of the Jewish religion, and was distinguished by his zeal for the institution, and for the traditions which had been incorporated with it. Upon this part of his character the history makes St. Paul speak thus; "I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tar-"sus, a city of Cilicia, yet brought up in this city, at the "feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect "manner of the law of the fathers; and was zealous to-"wards God, as ye all are this day." Acts, chap. xxii. 3.

The epistle is as follows; "I profited in the Jews re-
"ligion above many my equals in mine own nation, be-
"ing more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fa-
"thers." Chap. i. 14.

2. St. Paul, before his conversion, had been a fierce persecutor of the new sect. "As for Saul, he made hav-
"oc of the church; entering into every house, and, hal-
"ing men and women, committed them to prison." Acts, chap. viii. 3.

This is the history of St. Paul, as delivered in the Acts; in the recital of his own history in the epistle, "Ye have
"heard," says he, "of my conversation in times past in
"the Jews religion, how that beyond measure I persecut-
"ed the church of God." Chap. i. 13.

3. St. Paul was miraculously converted on his way to Damascus. "And as he journeyed he came near to Da-
"mascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a
"light from heaven; and he fell to the earth, and heard
"a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest
"thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the
"Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest; it is
"hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trem-
"bling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have
"me to do?" Acts. chap. ix. 3—6. With these compare the epistle, chap. i. 15—17. "When it pleased
"God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and
"called me by his grace to reveal his son in me, that I
"might preach him among the heathen; immediately I
"conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to
"Jerusalem, to them that were apostles before me; but
"I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damas-
"cus."

In this quotation from the epistle, I desire it to be remarked how incidently it appears, that the affair passed at *Damascus*. In what may be called the direct part of the account, no mention is made of the place of his conversion at all; a casual expression at the end, and an expression

with the history; but it is itself introduced solely for the sake of the reflection which follows; "Neither is he that "planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God "that giveth the increase."

No. VI.

Chap. iv. 11, 12. "Even unto this present hour "we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buf- "feted, and have no certain dwelling place; and labour, "working with our own hands."

We are expressly told, in the history, that at Corinth St. Paul laboured with his own hands: "He found Aquila "and Priscilla; and, because he was of the same craft, "he abode with them and wrought; for by their occupa- "tion they went tentmakers." But, in the text before us he is made to say, that "he laboured *even unto the present* "*hour*," that is, to the time of writing the epistle at Ephesus. Now, in the narration of St. Paul's transaction at Ephesus, delivered in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts, nothing is said of his working with his own hands; but in the twentieth chapter we read, that upon his return from Greece, he sent for the elders of the church of Ephesus, to meet him at Miletus; and in the discourse which he there addressed to them, amidst some other reflections, which he calls to their remembrance, we find the following; "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or "apparel; yea, you yourselves also know, that these "hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them "that were with me." The reader will not forget to remark, that though St. Paul be now at Miletus, it is to the elders of the church of Ephesus he is speaking, when he says, "Ye yourselves know that these hands have "ministered to my necessities;" and that the whole discourse relates to his conduct, during his last preceding residence at Ephesus. That manual labour therefore, which he had exercised at Corinth, he continued at Ephe-

sus; and not only so, but continued it during that particular residence at Ephesus, near the conclusion of which this epistle was written; so that he might with the strictest truth, say, at the time of writing the epistle, "Even "*unto this present hour* we labour, working with our own "hands." The correspondency is sufficient then, as to the undesignedness of it. It is manifest to my judgment, that if the history, in this article, had been taken from the epistle, this circumstance, if it appeared at all, would have appeared in its *place*, that is, in the direct account of St. Paul's transactions at Ephesus. The correspondency would not have been affected, as it is, by a kind of reflected stroke, that is, by a reference in a subsequent speech, to what in the narrative was omitted. Nor is it likely, on the other hand, that a circumstance which is not extant in the history of St. Paul at Ephesus, should have been made the subject of a fictitious allusion, in an epistle purporting to be written by him from that place; not to mention that the allusion itself, especially as to time, is too oblique and general to answer any purpose of forgery whatever.

No. VII.

Chap. ix. 20. "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew "that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the "law, as under the law."

We have the disposition here described, exemplified in two instances which the history records; one, Acts xvi. 3. "Him (Timothy) would Paul have to go forth with "him, and took and circumcised him, *because of the Jews* "*in those quarters*; for they knew all that his father was "a Greek." This was before the writing of the epistle. The other, Acts xxi. 23, 26, and after the writing of the epistle; "Do this that we say to thee; we have "four men that have a vow on them; them take, and "purify thyself with them, that they may shave their

"heads; and all may know that those things, whereof "they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but "that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the "law. Then Paul took the men, and the next day, *pu-* "*rifying himself with them, entered into the temple.*" Nor does this concurrence between the character and the instances look like the result of contrivance. St. Paul, in the epistle, describes, or is made to describe, his own accommodating conduct towards Jews and towards Gentiles, towards the weak and over scrupulous, towards men indeed of every variety of character; to "them that are "without law as without law, being not without law to "God, but under the law to Christ, that I might gain "them that are without law; to the weak became I as "weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all "things to all men, that I might gain some." This is the sequel of the text which stands at the head of the present number. Taking therefore the whole passage together, the apostle's condescension to the Jews is mentioned only as a part of his general disposition towards all. It is not probable that this character should have been made up from the instances in the Acts, which relate solely to his dealings with the Jews. It is not probable that a sophist should take his hint from those instances, and then extend it so much beyond them; and it is still more incredible that the two instances in the Acts, circumstantially related and interwoven with the history, should have been fabricated in order to suit the character which St. Paul gives of himself in the epistle.

No. VIII.

Chap. i. 14—17. "I thank God that I baptized none "of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that "I baptized in my own name; and I baptized also the "household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I "baptized any other; for Christ sent me not to baptize, "but to preach the gospel."

It may be expected, that those whom the apostle baptized with his own hands, were converts distinguished from the rest by some circumstance, either of eminence, or of connection with him. Accordingly, of the three names here mentioned, Crispus, we find, from Acts xviii. 8, was a "chief ruler of the Jewish synagogue at Co-"rinth, who believed in the Lord, with all his house." Gaius, it appears from Romans xvi. 23, was St. Paul's host at Corinth, and the host, he tells us, "of the whole "church." The household of Stephanas, we read in the sixteenth chapter of this epistle, "were the first fruits of "Achaia." Here therefore is the propriety we expected; and it is a proof of reality not to be contemned; for their names appearing in the several places in which they occur, with a mark of distinction belonging to each, could hardly be the effect of chance, without any truth to direct it; and, on the other hand to suppose that they were picked out from these passages, and brought together in the text before us, in order to display a conformity of names, is both improbable in itself, and is rendered more so, by the purpose for which they are introduced. They come in to assist St. Paul's exculpation of himself, against the possible charge, of having assumed the character of the founder of a separate religion, and with no other visible, or, as I think, imaginable design.*

* Chap. i. 1. "Paul called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, through "the will of God, and Sosthenes, our brother, unto the church of "God, which is at Corinth." The only account we have of any person who bore the name of Sosthenes, is found in the eighteenth chapter of the Acts. When the Jews at Corinth had brought Paul before Gallio, and Gallio had dismissed their complaint as unworthy of his interference, and had driven them from the judgment seat; "then all the Greeks," says the historian, "took Sosthenes, the "chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment "seat." The Sosthenes here spoken of was a Corinthian; and if he was a Christian, and with St. Paul when he wrote this epistle, was likely enough to be joined with him in the salutation of the Corinthian church. But here occurs a difficulty. If Sosthenes was a Chris-

No. IX.

Chap. xvi. 10, 11. "Now, if Timotheus come, let no "man despise him." Why *despise* him? This charge is not given concerning any other messenger whom St. Paul sent; and, in the different epistles, many such messengers are mentioned. Turn to 1 Timothy, chap. iv. 12, and you will find that Timothy was a *young man*; younger probably than those who were usually employed in the Christian mission; and that St. Paul, apprehending lest he should, on that account, be exposed to contempt, urges

tian at the time of this uproar, why should the *Greeks* beat him! The assault upon the Christians was made by the *Jews*. It was the *Jews* who had brought Paul before the magistrate. If it had been the Jews also who had beaten Sosthenes, I should not have doubted but that he had been a favourer of St. Paul, and the same person who is joined with him in the epistle. Let us see therefore whether there be not some error in our present text. The Alexandrian manuscript gives παντες alone, without οι Ελληνες, and is followed in this reading by the Coptic version, by the Arabic version, published by Erpenius, by the Vulgate, and by Bede's Latin version. Three Greek manuscripts again, as well as Chrisostom, give οι Ιουδαιοι in the place of οι Ελληνες. A great plurality of manuscripts authorise the reading which is retained in our copies. In this variety it appears to me extremely probable that the historian originally wrote παντες alone, and that οι Ελληνες, and οι Ιουδαιοι have been respectively added as explanatory of what the word παντες was supposed to mean. The sentence, without the addition of either name, would run very perspicuously thus, "Και απηλασεν αυτους απο του βηματος· "επιλαβομενοι δε παντες Σωσθενην τον αρχισυναγωγον, ετυπτον "εμπροσθεν του βηματος· and he drove them away from the judg- "ment seat; and they all," viz. the crowd of Jews whom the Judge had bid begone, "took Sosthenes, and beat him before the judgment "seat." It is certain that, as the whole body of the people were Greeks, the application of *all* to them is unusual and hard. If I was describing an insurrection at Paris, I might say *all* the Jews, *all* the Protestants, or *all* the English acted so and so; but I should scarcely say *all* the French, when the whole mass of the community were of that description. As what is here offered is founded upon a various reading, and that in opposition to the greater part of the manuscripts that are extant, I have not given it a place in the text.

upon him the caution which is there inserted, "Let no man "despise the youth."

No. X.

Chap. xvi. 1. "Now concerning the collection for the "saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, "even so do ye."

The churches of Galatia and Phrygia were the last churches which St. Paul had visited before the writing of this epistle. He was now at Ephesus, and he came thither immediately from visiting these churches. "He went "over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia, in order, "strengthening all the disciples. And it came to pass "that Paul having passed through the upper coasts," (viz. the abovenamed countries, called the upper coast, as being the northern part of Asia Minor), "came to Ephesus." Acts xviii. 23; xix. 1. These therefore, probably, were the last churches at which he had left directions for their public conduct during his absence. Although two years intervened between his journey to Ephesus, and his writing this epistle, yet it does not appear that during that time he visited any other church. That he had not been silent when he was in Galatia, upon this subject of contribution for the poor, is further made out from a hint which he lets fall in his epistle to that church. "Only they (viz. the "other apostles) would that we should remember the "poor, the same also which I was forward to do."

No. XI.

Chap. iv. 18. "Now, some are puffed up, as though "I would not come unto you."

Why should they suppose that he would not come? Turn to the first chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and you will find that he had already *disappointed* them. "I was minded to come unto you before, that "you might have a second benefit; and to pass by you

"into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia "unto you, and of you to be brought on my way toward "Judea. When I, therefore, was thus minded, did I use "lightness? Or the things that I purpose, do I purpose ac- "cording to the flesh, that with me there should be yea, "yea, and nay, nay? But, as God is true, our word to- "ward you was not yea and nay." It appears from this quotation, that he had not only intended, but that he had promised them a visit before; for, otherwise, why should he apologize for the change of his purpose, or express so much anxiety lest this change should be imputed to any culpable fickleness in his temper; and lest he should thereby seem to them, as one whose word was not, in any sort, to be depended upon? Besides which, the terms made use of, plainly refer to a promise; "Our *word toward you* "was not yea and nay." St. Paul therefore had signified an intention which he had not been able to execute; and this seeming breach of his word, and the delay of his visit, had, with some who were evil affected towards him, given rise to a suggestion that he would come no more to Corinth.

No. XII.

Chap. v. 7, 8. "For even Christ, our passover is sac- "rificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast, not with "the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malace and "wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity "and truth."

Dr. Benson tells us, that from this passage, compared with chapter xvi. 8, it has been conjectured that this epistle was written about the time of the Jewish passover; and to me the conjecture appears to have been very well founded. The passage to which Dr. Benson refers us is this; "I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost." With this passage he ought to have joined another in the same context; "And it may be that I will abide, yea, and win-

" ter with you ;" for, from the two passages laid together, it follows that the epistle was written before Pentecost, yet after winter ; which necessarily determines the date to the part of the year, within which the passover falls. It was written before Pentecost, because he says, " I will " tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost." It was written after winter, because he tells them, " It may be that I may " abide, yea, and winter with you." The winter which the apostle purposed to pass at Corinth, was undoubtedly the winter next ensuing to the date of the epistle ; yet it was a winter subsequent to the ensuing Pentecost, because he did not intend to set forwards upon his journey till after the feast. The words, " let us keep the feast, not with old leav- " en, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but " with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," look very like words suggested by the season ; at least they have, upon that supposition, a force and significancy which do not belong to them upon any other ; and it is not a little remarkable, that the hints casually dropped in the epistle, concerning particular parts of the year, should coincide with this supposition.

CHAP. IV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

No. I.

I WILL not say that it is impossible, having seen the First Epistle to the Corinthians, to construct a second with ostensible allusions to the first; or that it is impossible that both should be fabricated, so as to carry on an order and continuation of story, by successive references to the same events. But I say, that this, in either case, must be the effect of craft and design. Whereas, whoever examines the allusions to the former epistle which he finds in this, whilst he will acknowledge them to be such as would rise spontaneously to the hand of the writer, from the very subject of the correspondence, and the situation of the corresponding parties, supposing these to be real, will see no particle of reason to suspect, either that the clauses containing these allusions were *insertions* for the purpose, or that the several transactions of the Corinthian church were feigned, in order to form a train of narrative, or to support the appearance of connection between the two epistles.

1. In the First Epistle, St. Paul announces his intention of passing through Macedonia, in his way to Corinth; "I will come to you when I shall pass through Macedo-"nia." In the Second Epistle, we find him arrived in Macedonia, and about to pursue his journey to Corinth. But observe the manner in which this is made to appear; "I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast "of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a "year ago, and your zeal had provoked very many; yet "have I sent the brethren, lest our bosting of you should "be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be "ready, lest haply, if they of Macedonia come with me "and find you unprepared, we (that we say not you) be

"ashamed in this same confident boasting." (Chap. ix. 2, 3, 4.) St. Paul's being in Macedonia at the time of writing the epistle, is in this passage, inferred only from his saying, that he had boasted to the Macedonians of the alacrity of his Achaian converts; and the fear which he expresses, lest, if any of the Macedonian Christians should come with him unto Achaia, they should find his boasting unwarranted by the event. The business of the contribution is the sole cause of mentioning Macedonia at all. Will it be insinuated that this passage was framed merely to state that St. Paul was now in Macedonia; and, by that statement, to produce an apparent agreement with the purpose of visiting Macedonia, notified in the First Epistle? Or will it be thought probable, that, if a sophist had meant to place St. Paul in Macedonia, for the sake of giving countenance to his forgery, he would have done it in so oblique a manner as through the medium of the contribution? The same thing may be observed of another text in the epistle, in which the name of Macedonia occurs; "Furthermore, when I came to Troas to preach the gospel, and "a door was opened unto me of the Lord, I had no rest "in my spirit, because I found not Titus, my brother; "but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into "Macedonia." I mean, that it may be observed of this passage also, that there is a reason for mentioning Macedonia, entirely distinct from the purpose of showing St. Paul to be *there*. Indeed, if the passage before us show that point at all, it shows it so obscurely, that Grotius, though he did not doubt that Paul was now in Macedonia, refers this text to a different journey. Is this the hand of a forger, meditating to establish a false conformity? The text, however, in which it is most strongly implied that St. Paul wrote the present epistle from Macedonia, is found in the fourth, fifth, and sixth verses of the seventh chapter; "I "am filled with comfort, I am exceeding joyful in all our "tribulation; for, when we were come into Macedonia,

"our flesh had no rest; without were fightings, within "were fears; nevertheless, God that comforteth those that "are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus." Yet even here, I think, no one will contend, that St. Paul's coming to Macedonia, or being in Macedonia, was the principal thing intended to be told; or that the telling of it, indeed, was any part of the intention with which the text was written; or that the mention even of the name of Macedonia was not purely incidental, in the description of those tumultuous sorrows with which the writer's mind had been lately agitated, and from which he was relieved by the coming of Titus. The five first verses of the eighth chapter, which commend the liberality of the Macedonian churches, do not, in my opinion, by themselves, prove St. Paul to have been in Macedonia at the time of writing the epistle.

2. In the First Epistle, St. Paul denounces a severe censure against an incestuous marriage, which had taken place amongst the Corinthian converts, with the connivance, not to say, with the approbation, of the church; and enjoins the church to purge itself of this scandal, by expelling the offender from its society. "It is reported commonly, that there is "fornication among you, and such fornication, as is not so "much as named amongst the Gentiles, that one should "have his father's wife; and ye are puffed up, and have not "rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might "be taken away from among you; for I, verily, as absent "in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as "though I were present, concerning him that hath so "done this deed; in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, "when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the "power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one "unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spir-"it may be saved in the day of the Lord." (Chap. v. 1—5.) In the Second Epistle, we find this sentence executed, and the offender to be so affected with the punishment, that St. Paul now intercedes for his restoration.

"Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was "inflicted of many; so that, contrawise, ye ought rather "to forgive him and comfort him, lest perhaps such a "one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow; "wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love "towards him." (2 Cor. chap. ii. 7, 8.) Is this whole business feigned for the sake of carrying on a continuation of story through the two epistles? The church also, no less than the offender, was brought by St. Paul's reproof to a deep sense of the impropriety of their conduct. Their penitence, and their respect to his authority, were, as might be expected, exceedingly grateful to St. Paul. "We "were comforted not by Titus's coming only, but by the "consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, when "he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fer- "vent mind towards me, so that I rejoiced the more; "for though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not re- "pent, though I did repent; for I perceive that the same "epistle made you sorry, though it were but for a season. "Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry but that ye "sorrowed to repentance; for ye were made sorry after "a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us "in nothing." (Chap. vii. 7—9.) That this passage is to be referred to the incestuous marriage, is proved by the twelfth verse of the same chapter. "Though I wrote "unto you, I did it not for his cause that had done the "wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong; but that "our care for you in the sight of God, might appear un- "to you." There were, it is true, various topics of blame noticed in the First Epistle; but there was none, except this of the incestuous marriage, which could be called a transaction between private parties, or of which it could be said that one particular person had "done the wrong," and another particular person "had suffered it." Could all this be without foundation? or could it be put into the second epistle, merely to furnish an obscure sequel

to what had been said about an incestuous marriage in the first?

3. In the sixteenth chapter of the First Epistle, a collection for the saints is recommended to be set forwards at Corinth. "Now, concerning the collection for the saints, "as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do "ye." (Chap. xvi. 1.) In the ninth chapter of the Second Epistle, such a collection is spoken of, as in readiness to be received. "As touching the ministering to "the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you, for I "know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast "of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a "year ago, and your zeal hath provoked very many." (Chap. ix. 1, 2,) This is such a continuation of the transaction as might be expected; or possibly it will be said, as might easily be counterfeited; but there is a circumstance of nicety in the agreement between the two epistles, which, I am convinced, the author of a forgery would not have hit upon, or which, if he had hit upon it, he would have set forth with more clearness. The Second Epistle speaks of the Corinthians as having begun this eleemosynary business a year before. "This is expedient for you, "who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be "forward a year ago." (Chap. viii. 10.) "I boast "of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a "year ago." (Chap. ix. 2.) From these texts it is evident, that something had been done in the business a year before. It appears, however, from other texts in the epistle, that the contribution was not yet collected or paid; for brethren were sent from to Corinth, "to make up "their bounty." (Chap. ix. 5.) They are urged to "perform the doing of it." (Chap. viii. 11.) "And "every man was exhorted to give as he purposed in his "heart." (Chap. ix 7.) The contribution, therefore, as represented in our present epistle, was in readiness, yet not received from the contributors; was begun, was forward long before, yet not hitherto collected. Now this

representation agrees with one, and only with one supposition, namely, that every man had laid by in store, had already provided the fund, from which he was afterwards to contribute—the very case which the First Epistle authorizes us to supppse to have existed; for in that epistle St. Paul had charged the Corinthians, "upon "the first day of the week, every one of them lay by in "store as God had prospered him."* (1 Cor. chap. xvi. 2.)

* The following observations will satisfy us concerning the purity of our apostle's conduct in the suspicious business of a pecuniary contribution.

1. He disclaims the having received any inspired authority for the directions which he is giving. "I speak not by the commandment, "but by occasion of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sin- "cerity of your love." (2 Cor. chap. viii. 8.) Who, that had a sinister purposes to answer by the recommending of subscriptions, would thus distinguish, and thus lower the credit of his own recommendation?

2. Although he asserts the general right of Christian ministers to a maintenance from their ministry, yet he protests against the making use of this right in his own person. "Even so hath the Lord ordain- "ed, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel; but "I have used none of these things, neither have I written these things "that it should be so done unto me; for it were better for me to die, "than that any man should make my glorying, i. e. my professions "of disinterestedness, void." (1 Cor. chap. ix. 14, 15.)

3. He repeatedly purposes that there should be associates with himself in the management of the public bounty; not colleagues of his own appointment; but persons elected for that purpose by the contributors themselves. "And when I come, whomsoever ye shall ap- "prove by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality un- "to Jerusalem; and if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with "me." (1 Cor. chap. xvi. 3, 4.) And in the Second Epistle, what is here proposed, we find actually done, and done for the very purpose of guarding his character against any imputation that might be brought upon it, in the discharge of a pecuniary trust. "And we have sent "with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all "the churches; and not that only, but who was also chosen of the "churches to travel with us with this grace (gift) which is adminis- "tered to us to the glory of the same Lord, and the declaration of

No. II.

In comparing the Second Epistle to the Corinthians with the Acts of the Apostles, we are soon brought to observe, not only that there exists no vestige either of the epistle having been taken from the history, or the history from the epistle; but also that there appears in the contents of the epistle positive evidence, that neither was borrowed from the other. Titus, who bears a conspicuous part in the epistle, is not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles at all. St. Paul's sufferings, enumerated, chap. xi. 24, "of the Jews five times received I forty stripes "save one; thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I "stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a "day I have been in the deep." cannot be made out from his history, as delivered in the Acts, nor would this account have been given by a writer, who either drew his knowledge of St. Paul from that history, or who was careful to preserve a conformity with it. The account in the epistle, of St Paul's escape from Damascus, though agreeing in the main fact with the account of the same transaction in the Acts, is related with such difference of circumstance, as renders it utterly improbable that one should be derived from the other. The two accounts, placed by the side of each other stand as follow;

2. Cor. chap. xi. 32, 33.
"In Damascus, the gov-
"ernor under Aretas the
"king, kept the city of the
"Damascenes with a gar-
"rison, desirous to appre-
"hend *me*; and through a
"window in a basket was I
"let down by the wall, and
"escaped his hands."

Acts, chap. ix. 23—25.
"And after many days
"were fulfilled, the Jews
"took counsel to kill him;
"but their laying in wait
"was known of Saul, and
"they watched the gates
"day and night to kill him;
"then the disciples took
"him by night, and let him
"down by the wall in a bas-
"ket."

"your ready mind; avoiding this, that no man should blame us in
"this abundance which is administered by us; providing for things
"honest, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of

Now if we be satisfied in general concerning these two ancient writings, that the one was not known to the writer of the other, or not consulted by him; then the accordances, which may be pointed out between them, will admit of no solution so probable, as the attributing of them to truth and reality, as their common foundation.

No. III.

The opening of this epistle exhibits a connection with the history, which alone would satisfy my mind, that the epistle was written by St. Paul, and by St. Paul in the situation in which the history places him. Let it be remembered, that in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts, St. Paul is represented as driven away from Ephesus, or as leaving however Ephesus, in consequence of an uproar in that city, excited by some interested adversaries of the new religion. The account of the tumult is as follows. "When they heard these sayings," viz. Demetrius's complaint of the danger to be apprehended from St. Paul's ministry to the established worship of the Ephesian goddess, "they were full of wrath, and cried out, "saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians, and the whole "city was filled with confusion; and having caught "Gaius and Aristarchus, Paul's companions in travel, they "rushed with one accord into the theatre; and when "Paul would have entered in unto the people, the disci-"ples suffered him not; and certain of the chief of Asia, "which were his friends, sent unto him, desiring that he "would not adventure himself into the theatre. Some, "therefore, cried one thing, and some another; for the "assembly was confused, and the more part knew not "wherefore they were come together. And they drew "Alexander out of the multitude, the Jews putting him

"men;" i. e. "not resting in the consciousness of our own integrity, "but, in such a subject, careful also to approve our integrity to the "public judgment." (2 Cor. chap. viii. 18—21.)

"forward; and Alexander beckoned with his hand, and "would have made his defence unto the people; but, "when they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice, "about the space of two hours, cried out, Great is Diana "of the Ephesians. And after the uproar was ceased, "Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, "and departed for to go into Macedonia." When he was arrived in Macedonia he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians which is now before us; and he begins his epistle in this wise, "Blessed be God, even the "father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of mercies "and the God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all "our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them "which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith "we ourselves are comforted of God. For, as the suf-"ferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also "aboundeth by Christ; and whether we be afflicted, it "is for your consolation and salvation, which is effectual in "the enduring of the same sufferings, which we also suf-"fer; or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation "and salvation; and our hope of you is steadfast, know-"ing that, as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall "ye be also of the consolation. For we would not, "brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble *which came* "*to us in Asia*, that we were pressed out of measure, a-"bove strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life; "but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we "should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raises "the dead, who delivered us from so great a death, and "doth deliver; in whom we trust that he will yet deliver "us." Nothing could be more expressive of the circumstances in which the history describes St. Paul to have been, at the time when the epistle purports to be written; or rather, nothing could be more expressive of the sensations arising from these circumstances, than this passage.

It is the calm recollection of a mind emerged from the confusion of instant danger. It is that devotion and so-

lemnity of thought, which follows a recent deliverance. There is just enough of particularity in the passage, to show, that it is to be referred to the tumult at Ephesus; "We would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia." And there is nothing more; no mention of Demetrius, of the seizure of St. Paul's friends, of the interference of the town clerk, of the occasion or nature of the danger which St. Paul had escaped, or even of the city where it happened; in a word, no recital from which a suspicion could be conceived, either that the author of the epistle had made use of the narrative in the Acts; or on the other hand, that he had sketched the outline, which the narrative in the Acts only filled up. That the forger of an epistle, under the name of St. Paul, should borrow circumstances from a history of St. Paul then extant; or, that the author of a history of St. Paul should gather materials from letters bearing St. Paul's name, may be credited; but I cannot believe that any forger whatever should fall upon an expedient so refined, as to exhibit sentiments adapted to a situation, and to leave his readers to seek out that situation from the history; still less, that the author of a history should go about to frame facts and circumstances, fitted to supply the sentiments which he found in the letter. It may be said, perhaps, that it does not appear from the history, that any danger threatened St. Paul's life in the uproar at Ephesus, so imminent as that, from which in the epistle he represents himself to have been delivered. This matter it is true, is not stated by the historian in form; but the personal danger of the apostle, we cannot doubt must have been extreme, when the "whole city was filled with "confusion;" when the populace had "seized his com- "panions; when in the distraction of his mind, he insisted upon "coming forth amongst them;" when the Christians who were about him "would not suffer him;" when "his friends, certain of the chief of Asia, sent to him "desiring that he would not adventure himself in the tu-

"mult;" when, lastly, he was obliged to quit immediately the place and the country, "and, when the tumult "was ceased, to depart into Macedonia." All which particulars are found in the narration, and justify St. Paul's own account, "that he was pressed out of measure, above "strength, insomuch that he dispaired even of life, that "he had the sentence of death in himself;" i. e. that he looked upon himself as a man condemned to die.

No. IV.

It has already been remarked, that St. Paul's original intention was to have visited Corinth in his way to Macedonia. "I was minded to come unto you before, and to "pass by you into Macedonia." 2 Cor. chap. i. 15, 16. It has also been remarked that he changed this intention, and ultimately resolved upon going through Macedonia *first*. Now upon this head there exists a circumstance of correspondency between our epistle and the history, which is not very obvious to the reader's observation; but which, when observed, will be found, I think, close and exact. Which circumstance is this; that though the change of St. Paul's intention be expressly mentioned only in the second epistle, yet it appears, both from the history and from this second epistle, that the change had taken place before the writing of the first epistle; that it appears however from neither, otherwise than by an inference, unnoticed perhaps by almost every one who does not sit down professedly to the examination.

First, then, how does this point appear from the history? In the nineteenth chapter of the Acts and the twenty first verse, we are told, that "Paul purposed in the "spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and "Achaia, to go to Jerusalem. So he sent into Macedo-"nia two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus "and Erastus; but he himself stayed in Asia for a sea-"son." A short time after this, and evidently in pursuance of the same intention, we find (chap. xx. 1. 2.) that

" Paul departed from Ephesus for to go into Macedonia; " and that, when he had gone over those parts, he came " into Greece." The resolution therefore of passing first through Macedonia, and from thence into Greece, was formed by St. Paul previously to the sending away of Timothy. The order in which the two countries are mentioned, shows the direction of his intended route, " when " he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia." Timothy and Erastus, who were to precede him in his progress, were sent by him from Ephesus into Macedonia. He himself a short time afterwards, and, as hath been observed, evidently in continuation and pursuance of the same design, " departed for to go into Macedonia." If he had ever therefore entertained a different plan of his journey, which is not hinted in the history, he must have changed that plan before this time. But, from the 17th verse of the fourth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we discover, that Timothy had been sent away from Ephesus before that epistle was written. " For " this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus who is my " beloved son." The change therefore of St. Paul's resolution, which was prior to the sending away Timothy, was necessarily prior to the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Thus stands the order of dates, as collected from the history, compared with the First Epistle. Now let us enquire, secondly, how this matter is represented in the epistle before us. In the sixteenth verse of the first chapter of this epistle, St. Paul speaks of the intention which he had once entertained of visiting Achaia, in his way to Macedonia. " In this confidence I was minded to come " unto you before, that ye might have a second benefit; " and to pass by you into Macedonia." After protesting in the seventeenth verse, against any evil construction that might be put upon his laying aside of this intention, in the twenty third verse he discloses the cause of it; " Moreover " I call God for a record upon my soul, that, to spare

" you, I came not as yet unto Corinth." And then he proceeds as follows; " But I determined this with my-
" self, that I would not come again to you in heaviness;
" for if I make you sorry, who is he then that maketh me
" glad, but the same which is made sorry by me? *And I*
" *wrote this same unto you*, lest when I came I should have
" sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice; having
" confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all;
" for, out of much affliction and anguish of heart, *I wrote*
" *unto you with many tears;* not that ye should be grieved,
" but that ye might know the love which I have more
" abundantly unto you; but if any have caused grief, he
" hath not grieved me but in part, that I may not over-
" charge you all. Sufficient to such a man is this punish-
" ment, which was inflicted of many." In this quotation, let the reader first direct his attention to the clause marked by Italics, " and I wrote this same unto you;" and let him consider, whether from the context, and from the structure of the whole passage, it be not evident that this writing was after St. Paul had " determined with himself, that " he would not come again to them in heaviness?" whether, indeed, it was not in consequence of this determination, or at least with this determination upon his mind? And, in the next place, let him consider, whether the sentence, " I determined this with myself, that I would not come " again to you in heaviness," do not plainly refer to that postponing of his visit, to which he had aluded in the verse but one before, when he said " I call God for a record " upon my soul, that, to spare you, I came not as yet " unto Corinth;" and whether this be not the visit of which he speaks in the sixteenth verse, wherein he informs the Corinthians, " that he had been minded to pass by them " into Macedonia;" but that, for reasons which argued no levity or fickleness in his disposition, he had been compelled to change his purpose. If this be so, then it follows that the writing here mentioned was posterior to the change of his intention. The only question,

therefore, that remains, will be, whether this writing relate to the letter which we now have under the title of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, or to some other letter not extant? And upon this question I think Mr. Locke's observation decisive; namely, that the second clause marked in the quotation by Italics, "I wrote unto you with many "tears," and the first clause so marked, "I wrote this "same unto you," belong to one writing, whatever that was; and that the second clause goes on to advert to a circumstance which is found in our present First Epistle to the Corinthians; namely, the case and punishment of the incestuous person. Upon the whole, then, we see, that it is capable of being inferred from St. Paul's own words, in the long extract which we have quoted, that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written after St. Paul had determined to postpone his journey to Corinth; in other words, that the change of his purpose, with respect to the course of his journey, though expressly mentioned only in the Second Epistle, had taken place before the writing of the First; the point which we made out to be implied in the history, by the order of the events there recorded, and the allusions to those events in the First Epistle. Now this is a species of congruity of all others the most to be relied upon. It is not an agreement between two accounts of the same transaction, or between different statements of the same fact, for the fact is not stated; nothing that can be called an account is given; but it is the junction of two conclusions, deduced from independent sources, and deducible only by investigation and comparison.

This point, viz. the change of the route, being prior to the writing of the first epistle, also falls in with, and accounts for, the manner in which he speaks in that epistle of his journey. His first intention had been, as he here declares, to "pass by them into Macedonia;" that intention having been previously given up, he writes, in his First Epistle, "that he would not see them now by the

"way," i. e. as he must have done upon his first plan; "but that he trusted to tarry awhile with them, and pos- "sibly to abide, yea, and winter with them." 1 Cor. chap. xvi. 5, 6. It also accounts for a singularity in the text referred to, which must strike every reader; "I will "come to you when I pass through Macedonia; for I "do pass through Macedonia. The supplemental sentence, "for I do pass through Macedonia," imports that there had been some previous communication upon the subject of the journey; and also that there had been some vacillation and indecisiveness in the apostle's plan; both which we now perceive to have been the case. The sentence is as much as to say, "This is what I at last re- "solve upon." The expression, "ὅταν Μακεδονίαν διέλθω," is ambiguous; it may denote either "when I pass, or when "I shall have passed, through Macedonia;" the considerations offered above fix it to the latter sense. Lastly, the point we have endeavoured to make out, confirms, or rather, indeed, is necessary to the support of a conjecture which forms the subject of a number in our observations upon the First Epistle that the insinuation of certain of the church of Corinth, that he would come no more amongst them, was founded in some previous disappointment of their expectations.

No. V.

But if St. Paul had changed his purpose before the writing of the First Epistle, why did he defer explaining himself to the Corinthians, concerning the reason of that change, until he wrote the Second? This is a very fair question; and we are able, I think, to return to it a satisfactory answer. The real cause, and the cause at length assigned by St. Paul for postponing his visit to Corinth, and not travelling by the route which he had at first designed, was the disorderly state of the Corinthian church at the time, and the painful severities which he should have found himself obliged to exercise, if he had come amongst them during the existence of these irregularities.

He was willing therefore to try, before he came in person, what a letter of authoritative objurgation would do amongst them, and to leave time for the operation of the experiment. That was his scheme in writing the First Epistle. But it was not for him to acquaint them with the scheme. After the epistle had produced its effect (and to the utmost extent, as it should seem, of the apostle's hopes); when he had wrought in them a deep sense of their fault, and an almost passionate solicitude to restore themselves to the approbation of their teacher; when Titus (chap. vii. 6, 7, 11.) had brought him intelligence "of their earnest desire, their mourning, their "fervent mind towards him, of their sorrow and their "penitence; what carefulness, what clearing of them-"selves, what indignation, what fear, what vehement de-"sire, what zeal, what revenge," his letter, and the general concern occasioned by it, had excited amongst them; he then opens himself fully upon the subject. The affectionate mind of the apostle is touched by this return of zeal and duty. He tells them that he did not visit them at the time proposed, lest their meeting should have been attended with mutual grief; and with grief to him embittered by the reflection, that he was giving pain to those, from whom alone he could receive comfort. "I deter-"mined this with myself, that I would not come again "to you in heaviness; for if I make you sorry, who is "he that maketh me glad but the same which is made "sorry by me?" (chap ii. 1, 2.) that he had written his former epistle to warn them beforehand of their fault "lest when he came he should have sorrow of them of "whom he ought to rejoice;" (chap. ii. 3.) that he had the farther view, though perhaps unperceived by them, of making an experiment of their fidelity, "to know the "proof of them, whether they were obedient in all things," (chap. ii. 9.). This full discovery of his motive came very naturally from the apostle, after he had seen the success of his measures, but would not have been a sea-

sonable communication before. The whole composes a train of sentiment and of conduct resulting from real circumstance, and as remote as possible from fiction or imposture.

No. VI.

Chap. xi. 9. "When I was present with you and "wanted, I was chargeable to no man; for that which "was lacking to me, the brethren which came from Ma-"cedonia supplied." The principle fact set forth in this passage, the arrival at Corinth or brethren from Macedonia during St. Paul's first residence in that city, is explicitly recorded, Acts, chap, xviii. 1, 5. "After these "things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Co-"rinth. And when Silas and Timotheus were come "from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified "to the Jews that Jesus was Christ."

No. VII.

The above quotation from the Acts proves that Silas and Timotheus were assisting to St. Paul in preaching the gospel at Corinth. With which correspond the words of the epistle (chap. i. 19.) "For the son of God, Je-"sus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even "by me, and Sylvanus, and Timotheus, was not yea and "nay, but in him was yea." I do admit that the correspondency, considered by itself, is too direct and obvious; and that an impostor with the history before him might, and probably would, produce agreements of the same kind. But let it be remembered, that this reference is found in a writing, which from many discrepancies, and especially from those noted No. II. we may conclude, was not composed by any one who had consulted, and who pursued the history. Some observation also arises upon the variation of the name. We read Silas in the Acts,

Silvanus in the epistle. The similitude of these two names, if they were the names of different persons, is greater than could easily have proceeded from accident; I mean that it is not probable, that two persons placed in situations so much alike, should bear names so nearly resembling each other.* On the other hand, the difference of the name in the two passages negatives the supposition of the passages, or the account contained in them, being transcribed either from the other.

No. VIII.

Chap. ii. 12, 13. "When I came to Troas to preach "Christ's gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the "Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not "Titus my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went "from thence into Macedonia."

To establish a conformity between this passage and the history, nothing more is necessary to be presumed, than that St. Paul proceeded from Ephesus to Macedonia, upon the same course by which he came back from Macedonia to Ephesus, or rather to Miletus in the neighbourhood of Ephesus; in other words, that in his journey to the peninsula of Greece, he went and returned the same way. St. Paul is now in Macedonia, where he had lately arrived from Ephesus. Our quotation imports that in his journey he had stopped at Troas. Of this, the history says nothing, leaving us only the short account, "that "Paul departed from Ephesus, for to go into Macedonia." But the history says, that in his *return* from Macedonia to Ephesus, "Paul sailed from Philippi to *Troas*; and that, when the disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread, Paul preached unto them all night; that from Troas he went by land to Assos; from Assos, taking ship and coasting along the front of Asia Minor,

* That they were the same person is further confirmed by 1 Thess. chap. i. 1, compared with Acts. chap. xvii. 10.

he came by Mitylene to Miletus." Which account proves first, that Troas lay in the way by which St. Paul passed between Ephesus and Macedonia; secondly, that he had disciples there. In one journey between these two places, the epistle, and in another journey between the same places, the history makes him stop at this city. Of the first journey he is made to say, "that a door was in that city opened "unto him of the Lord;" in the second we find disciples there collected around him, and the apostle exercising his ministry, with, what was even in him, more than ordinary zeal and labour. The epistle therefore is in this instance confirmed, if not by the terms, at least by the probability of the history; a species of confirmation by no means to be despised, because, as far as it reaches, it is evidently uncontrived.

Grotius, I know, refers the arrival at Troas, to which the epistle alludes, to a different period, but I think very improbably; for nothing appears to me more certain, than that the meeting with Titus, which St. Paul expected at Troas, was the same meeting which took place in Macedonia, viz. upon Titus's coming out of Greece. In the quotation before us, he tells the Corinthians, "When I "came to Troas, I had no rest in my spirit, because I "found not Titus, my brother; but, taking my leave of "them, I went from thence into Macedonia." Then in the seventh chapter he writes, "When we were come in- "to Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troub- "led on every side; without were fightings, within were "fears; nevertheless, God, that comforteth them that "are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus." These two passages plainly relate to the same journey of Titus, in meeting with whom St. Paul had been disappointed at Troas, and rejoiced in Macedonia. And amongst other reasons which fix the former passage to the coming of Titus out of Greece, is the consideration, that it was nothing to the Corinthians that St. Paul did not meet with Titus at Troas, were it not that he was to

bring intelligence from Corinth. The mention of the disappointment in this place, upon any other supposition, is irrelative.

No. IX.

Chap. xi. 24, 25. "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a day I have been in the deep."

These particulars cannot be extracted out of the Acts of the Apostles; which proves, as hath been already observed, that the epistle was not framed from the history; yet they are consistent with it, which, considering how numerically circumstantial the account is, is more than could happen to arbitrary and independent fictions. When I say that these particulars are *consistent* with the history, I mean, first, that there is no article in the enumeration which is contradicted by the history; secondly, that the history, though silent with respect to many of the facts here enumerated, has left space for the existence of these facts, consistent with the fidelity of its own narration.

First, no contradiction is discoverable between the epistle and the history. When St. Paul says, *thrice* was I beaten with rods, although the history records only *one* beating with rods, viz. at Philippi, Acts xvi. 22. yet is there no contradiction. It is only the omission in one book of what is related in another. But had the history contained accounts of *four* beatings with rods, at the time of writing this epistle, in which St. Paul says that he had only suffered three, there would have been a contradiction properly so called. The same observation applies generally to the other parts of the enumeration, concerning which the history is silent; but there is one clause in the quotation particularly deserving of remark; because, when confronted with the history, it furnishes the nearest approach

to a contradiction, without a contradiction being actually incurred, of any I remember to have met with. "Once," saith "St. Paul, was I stoned." Does the history relate that St. Paul, prior to the writing of this epistle, had been stoned more than once? The history mentions distinctly one occasion upon which St. Paul was stoned, viz. at Lystra in Lycaonia. "Then came thither certain Jews from Antioch "and Iconium, who persuaded the people; and, having "stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had "been dead." (Chap. xiv. 19.) And it mentions also another occasion in which "an assault was made both of the "Gentiles, and also of the Jews with their rulers, to use them "despitefully, and to stone them; but they were aware of "it," the history proceeds to tell us, "and fled into Lys-"tra and Derbe." This happened at Iconium, prior to the date of the epistle. Now had the assault been completed; had the history related that a stone was thrown, as it relates that preparations were made both by Jews and Gentiles to stone Paul and his companions; or even had the account of this transaction stopped, without going on to inform us that Paul and his companions were "aware of their danger and fled," a contradiction between the history and the epistle would have ensued. Truth is necessarily consistent; but it is scarcely possible that independent accounts, not having truth to guide them, should thus advance to the very brink of contradiction without falling into it.

Secondly, I say, that if the Acts of the Apostles be silent concerning many of the instances enumerated in the epistle, this silence may be accounted for, from the plan and fabric of the history. The date of the epistle synchronises with the beginning of the twentieth chapter of the Acts. The part, therefore, of the history, which precedes the twentieth chapter, is the only part in which can be found any notice of the persecutions to which St. Paul refers. Now it does not appear that the author of the history was with St. Paul until his depar-

ture from Troas, on his way to Macedonia, as related chap xvi. 10; or rather indeed the contrary appears. It is in this point of the history that the language changes. In the seventh and eighth verses of this chapter the third person is used. "After *they* were come to Mysia, *they* "assayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them "not; and *they* passing by Mysia come to Troas;" and the third person is in like manner constantly used throughout the foregoing part of the history. In the tenth verse of this chapter, the first person comes in. "After Paul "had seen the vision, immediately *we* endeavoured to go "into Macedonia; assuredly gathering that the Lord "had called *us* to preach the gospel unto them." Now, from this time to the writing of this epistle, the history occupies four chapters; yet it is in these, if any, that a regular or continued account of the apostle's life is to be expected; for how succinctly his history is delivered in the preceding part of the book, that is to say, from the time of his conversion to the time when the historian joined him at Troas, except the particulars of his conversion itself which are related circumstantially, may be understood from the following observations.

The history of a period of sixteen years is comprised in less than three chapters; and of these, a material part is taken up with discourses. After his conversion, he continued in the neighbourhood of Damascus, according to the history, for a certain considerable, though indefinite length of time, according to his own words (Gal. i. 18.) for three years; of which no other account is given than this short one, that "straightway he preached Christ in the "synagogues, that he is the Son of God; that all that heard "him were amazed, and said, is not this he that destroyed "them which called on his name in Jerusalem? that he "increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews "which dwelt at Damascus; and that, after many days "were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him." From Damascus he proceeded to Jerusalem; and of his resi-

brought in for a different purpose, alone fixes it to have been at Damascus. "I returned again to Damascus." Nothing can be more like simplicity and undesignedness than this is. It also draws the agreement between the two quotations somewhat closer, to observe that they both state St. Paul to have preached the gospel immediately upon his call. "And straightway he preached Christ in "the synagogues, that he is the son of God." Acts, ch. ix. 20. "When it pleased God to reveal his son in me, "that I might preach him among the heathen, immedi- "ately I conferred not with flesh and blood." Gal. chap. i. 15.

4. The course of the apostle's travels after his conversion was this. He went from Damascus to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem into Syria and Cilicia. "At Damascus the disciples took "him by night and let him down by the wall "in a basket; and when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he as- "sayed to join himself to the disciples." Acts chap. ix. 25. Afterwards, "when the brethren knew the conspiracy "formed against him at Jerusalem, they brought him "down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus, a city "in Cilicia." Chap. ix. 30. In the epistle St. Paul gives the following brief account of his proceedings within the same period, "After three years I went to Jerusalem to "see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days; afterwards "I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia." The history had told that Paul passed from Cæsarea to Tarsus. If he took this journey by land, it would carry him through Syria into Cilicia; and he would come, after his visit at Jerusalem, "into the regions of Syria and Cilicia," in the very order in which he mentions them in the epistle. This supposition of his going from Cæsarea to Tarsus *by land*, clears up also another point. It accounts for what St. Paul says in the same place concerning the churches of Judea; "Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria "and Cilicia, and was unknown by face unto the church- "es of Judea, which were in Christ; but they had heard

"only that he which persecuted us in times past, now "preacheth the faith, which once he destroyed; and they "glorified God in me." Upon which passage I observe, first, that what is here said of the churches of Judea, is spoken in connection with his journey into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. Secondly, that the passage itself has little significancy, and that the *connection* is inexplicable, unless St. Paul went through Judea* (though probably by a hasty journey) at the time he came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. Suppose him to have passed by land from Cæsarea to Tarsus, all this, as hath been observed, would be precisely true.

5. Barnabas was with St. Paul at Antioch. "Then "departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul; and "when he had found him, he brought him unto Anti- "och. And it came to pass that a whole year they assem- "bled themselves with the church." Acts, chap. xi. 25, 26. Again and upon another occasion, "they (Paul and Bar- "nabas) sailed to Antioch; and there they continued a "long time with the disciples." Chap. xiv. 26.

Now what says the epistle? "When Peter was come "to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was "to be blamed; and the other Jews dissembled likewise "with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried "away with their dissimulation." Chap. ii. 11. 13.

6. The stated residence of the apostles was at Jerusalem. "At that time there was a great persecution against "the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all "scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and "Samaria, except the apostles." Acts, chap. ii. 1. "They (the Christians at Antioch) determined that Paul "and Barnabas should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apos-

* Dr. Doddridge thought that the Cæsarea here mentioned was not the celebrated city of that name upon the Mediterranean Sea, but Cæsarea Phillippi, near the borders of Syria, which lies in a much more direct line from Jerusalem to Tarsus than the other. The objection to this, Dr. Benson remarks, is, that Cæsarea, without any addition, usually denotes Cæsarea Palestinæ.

"tles and elders, about this question." Acts, chap. xv. 2. With these accounts agrees the declaration in the epistle; "Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me," chap. i. 17; for this declaration implies, or rather assumes it to be known, that Jerusalem was the place where the apostles were to be met with.

7. There were at Jerusalem two apostles, or at the least two eminent members of the church, of the name of James. This is directly inferred from the Acts of the Apostles, which in the second verse of the twelfth chapter relates the death of James, the brother of John; and yet in the fifteenth chapter, and in a subsequent part of the history, records a speech delivered by James in the assembly of the apostles and elders. It is also strongly implied by the form of expression used in the epistle. "Other apos-"tles saw I none, save James, the *Lord's brother*;" i. e. to distinguish him from James the brother of John.

To us who have been long conversant in the Christian history, as contained in the Acts of the Apostles, these points are obvious and familiar; nor do we readily apprehend any greater difficulty in making them appear in a letter purporting to have been written by St. Paul, than there is in introducing them into a modern sermon. But to judge correctly of the argument before us, we must discharge this knowledge from our thoughts. We must propose to ourselves the situation of an author who sat down to the writing of the epistle without having seen the history; and then the concurrences we have deduced will be deemed of importance. They will at least be taken for separate confirmations of the several facts, and not only of those particular facts, but of the general truth of the history.

For, what is the rule with respect to corroborative testimony which prevails in courts of justice, and which prevails only because experience has proved that it is an useful guide to truth? A principal witness in a cause delivers his account; his narrative, in certain parts of it, is con-

firmed by witnesses who are called afterwards. The credit derived from their testimony belongs not only to the particular circumstances in which the auxiliary witnesses agree with the principal witness, but in some measure to the whole of his evidence; because it is improbable that accident or fiction should draw a line which touched upon truth in so many points.

In like manner, if two records be produced, manifestly independent, that is, manifestly written without any participation of intelligence, an agreement between them, even in few and slight circumstances (especially if, from the different nature and design of the writings, few points only of agreement, and those incidental, could be expected to occur,) would add a sensible weight to the authority of both, in every part of their contents.

The same rule is applicable to history, with at least as much reason as any other species of evidence.

No. III.

But although the references to various particulars in the epistle, compared with the direct account of the same particulars in the history, afford a considerable proof of the truth not only of these particulars but of the narrative which contains them; yet they do not shew, it will be said, that the epistle was written by St. Paul; for admitting (what seems to have been proved) that the writer, whoever he was, had no recourse to the Acts of the Apostles, yet many of the facts referred to, such as St. Paul's miraculous conversion, his change from a virulent persecutor to an indefatigable preacher, his labors amongst the Gentiles, and his zeal for the liberties of the Gentile church, were so notorious as to occur readily to the mind of any Christian, who should choose to personate his character, and counterfeit his name; it was only to write what every body knew. Now I think that this supposition, viz. that the epistle was composed upon general information, and the general publicity of the facts alluded to, and that

the author did no more than weave into his work what the common fame of the Christian church had reported to his ears, is repelled by the particularity of the recitals and references. This particularity is observable in the following instances; in perusing which, I desire the reader to reflect, whether they exhibit the language of a man who had nothing but general reputation to proceed upon, or of a man actually speaking of himself and of his own history, and consequently of things concerning which he possesed a clear, intimate, and circumstantial knowledge.

1. The history, in giving an account of St. Paul after his conversion, relates, "that, after many days," effecting, by the assistance of the disciples his escape from Damascus, "he proceeded to Jerusalem." Acts, chap. ix. 25. The epistle, speaking of the same period, makes St. Paul say that "he went into Arabia," that he returned again to Damascus, that after three years he went up to Jerusalem. Chap. i. 17, 18.

2. The history relates, that, when Saul was come from Damascus, "he was with the disciples coming in and go-"ing out." Acts, chap. ix. 28. The epistle, describing the same journey, tells us "that he went up to Jerusalem "to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days." Chap. i. 18.

3. The history relates, that, when Paul was come to Jerusalem, "Barnabas took him and brought him to the "apostles." Acts, chap. ix. 27. The epistle, "that he "saw Peter; but other of the apostles saw he none, save "James, the Lord's brother." Chap. i. 19.

Now this is as it should be. The historian delivers his account in general terms, as of facts to which he was not present. The person who is the subject of that account, when he comes to speak of these facts himself, particularizes time, names, and circumstances.

4. The like notation of places, persons, and dates, is met with in the account of St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem, given in the second chapter of the epistle. It was fourteen

years after his conversion; it was in company with Barnabas and Titus; it was then that he met with James, Cephas, and John; it was then also that it was agreed amongst them, that they should go to the circumcision, and he unto the Gentiles.

5. The dispute with Peter, which occupies the sequel of the second chapter, is marked with the same particularity. It was at Antioch; it was after certain came from James; it was whilst Barnabas was there, who was carried away by their dissimulation. These examples negative the insinuation, that the epistle presents nothing but indefinite allusions to public facts.

No. IV.

Chap. iv. 11—16. "I am afraid of you, lest I have "bestowed upon you labor in vain. Brethren, I beseech "you, be as I am, for I am as ye are. Ye have not in- "jured me at all. Ye know how, through infirmity of "the flesh, I preached the gospel unto you at the first; "and *my temptation, which was in the flesh*, ye despised not, "nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even "as Christ Jesus. Where is then the blessedness you "spake of? for I bear you record, that, if it had been "possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and "have given them unto me. Am I therefore become "your enemy, because I tell you the truth?"

With this passage compare 2 Cor. chap. xii. 1—9. "It "is not expedient for me, doubtless, to glory; I will come "to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man "in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body "I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell; "God knoweth); such an one was caught up to the third "heaven; and I knew such a man (whether in the body "or out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth), how "that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeaka-

" ble words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. " Of such a one will I glory, yet of myself will I not glo- " ry, but in mine infirmities; for, though I would desire to " glory, I shall not be a fool; for I will say the truth. " But now I forbear, lest any man should think of me " above that which he seeth me to be, or that he heareth " of me. And lest I should be exalted above measure, " through the abundance of the revelations, there was giv- " en to me *a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buf-* " *fet me*, lest I should be exalted above measure. For " this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might de- " part from me. And he said unto me, my grace is suf- " ficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weak- " ness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my " infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon " me."

There can be no doubt but that " the temptation which " was in the flesh," mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, and " the thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Sa- " tan to buffet him," mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians, were intended to denote the same thing. Either therefore it was, what we pretend it to have been, the same person in both, alluding, as the occasion led him, to some bodily infirmity under which he labored; that is, we are reading the real letters of a real apostle; or, it was that a sophist, who had seen the circumstance in one epistle, contrived, for the sake of correspondency, to bring it into another; or, lastly, it was a circumstance in St. Paul's personal condition, supposed to be well known to those into whose hands the epistle was likely to fall; and, for that reason, introduced into a writing designed to bear his name. I have extracted the quotations at length, in order to enable the reader to judge accurately of the manner in which the mention of this particular comes in, in each; because that judgment, I think, will acquit the authors of the epistle of the charge of having studiously inserted it, either with a view of producing an apparent

agreement between them, or for any other purpose whatever.

The context, by which the circumstance before us is introduced, is in the two places totally different, and without any mark of imitation; yet in both places does the circumstance rise aptly and naturally out of the context, and that context from the train of thought carried on in the epistle.

The Epistle to the Galatians, from the beginning to the end, runs in a strain of angry complaint of their defection from the apostle, and from the principles which he had taught them. It was very natural to contrast with this conduct, the zeal with which they had once received him; and it was not less so to mention, as a proof of their former disposition towards him, the indulgence which, whilst he was amongst them, they had shewn to his infirmity. "My temptation which was in the flesh ye despised not, "nor rejected, but received me as an angel of God, even "as Christ Jesus. Where is then the blessedness you "spake of, i. e. the benedictions which you bestowed up-"on me? for I bear you record, that if it had been possi-"ble, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have "given them to me."

In the two epistles to the Corinthians, especially in the second, we have the apostle contending with certain teachers in Corinth, who had formed a party in that church against him. To vindicate his personal authority, as well as the dignity and credit of his ministry amongst them, he takes occasion (but not without apologizing repeatedly for the folly, that is, the indecorum of pronouncing his panegyric)* to meet his adversaries in their boastings;

* "Would to God you would bear with me a little in my folly, and "indeed bear with me!" Chap. xi. 1.

"That which I speak, I speak it not after the Lord, but as it were "foolishly, in this confidence of boasting." Chap. xi. 17.

"I am become a fool in glorying, ye have compelled me." Chap. xii. 11.

"Wherein soever any is bold (I speak foolishly) I am "bold also. Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Is- "raelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? "so am I. Are they the ministers of Christ (I speak as a "fool) I am more; in labors more abundant, in stripes "above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft." Being led to the subject, he goes on, as was natural, to recount his trials and dangers, his incessant cares and labors in the Christian mission. From the proofs which he had given of his zeal and activity in the service of Christ, he passes (and that with the same view of establishing his claim to be considered as "not a whit behind the very "chiefest of the apostles)" to the visions and revelations which from time to time had been vouchsafed to him. And then, by a close and easy connection, comes in the mention of his infirmity. Lest I should be exalted, says he, "above measure, through the abundance of revela- "tions, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the "messenger of Satan to buffet me."

Thus then, in both epistles, the notice of his infirmity is suited to the place in which it is found. In the Epistle to the Corinthians, the train of thought draws up to the circumstance by a regular approximation. In the epistle it is suggested by the subject and occasion of the epistle itself. Which observation we offer as an argument to prove that it is not, in either epistle, a circumstance industriously brought forward for the sake of procuring credit to an imposture.

A reader will be taught to perceive the force of this argument, who shall attempt to introduce a *given* circumstance into the body of a writing. To do this without abruptness, or without betraying marks of design in the transition, requires, he will find, more art than he expected to be necessary, certainly more than any one can believe to have been exercised in the composition of these epistles.

No. V.

Chap. iv 29. "But as then he that was born after the "flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even "so is it now."

Chap. v. 11. "And I, brethren, if I yet preach cir- "cumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the "offence of the cross ceased."

Chap. vi. 17. "From henceforth, let no man trouble "me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Je- "sus."

From these several texts, it is apparent that the persecutions which our apostle had undergone, were from the hands or by the instigation of the Jews? that it was not for preaching Christianity in opposition to heathenism, but it was for preaching it as distinct from Judaism, that he had brought upon himself the sufferings which had attended his ministry. And this representation perfectly coincides with that which results from the detail of St. Paul's history, as delivered in the Acts. At Antioch, in Pisidia, the "word of the Lord was published throughout all the "region; but the *Jews stirred up* the devout and honor- "able women and the chief men of the city, and raised "persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled "them out of their coasts." (Acts, chap. xiii. 50). Not long after, at Iconium, "a great multitude of the Jews "and also of the Geeeks believed; but the *unbelieving Jews* "stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affect- "ed against the brethren." (Chap. xiv. 1, 2.) "At "Lystra there came certain Jews from Antioch and Ico- "nium, who persuaded the people; and having stoned "Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been "dead." (Chap. xiv. 19.) The same enmity, and from the same quarter, our apostle experienced in Greece. "At Thessalonica, some of them (the Jews) believed, "and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout

"a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few;
"but *the Jews which believed not*, moved with envy, took
"unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and
"gathered a company, and set all the city in an uproar,
"and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring
"them out to the people." (Acts, chap. xvii. 4, 5.)
Their persecutors follow them to Berea; "when the *Jews*
"of Thessalonica had knowledge that the word of God
"was preached of St. Paul at Berea, they came thither
"also and stirred up the people." (Chap. xvii. 13.)
And lastly at Corinth, when Gallio was deputy of Achaia,
"*the Jews* made insurrection with one accord against Paul
"and brought him to the judgment seat." I think it does
not appear that our apostle was ever set upon by the Gentiles, unless they were first stirred up by the Jews, except
in two instances, in both which the persons who began
the assault were immediately interested in his expulsion
from the place. Once this happened at Philippi, after
the cure of the Pythoness. "When the masters saw the
"hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas,
"and drew them into the market place unto the rulers."
(Chap. xvi. 19.) And a second time at Ephesus, at the
instance of Demetrius a silversmith which made silver
shrines for Diana, "who called together workmen of like
"occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft
"we have our wealth; moreover, ye see and hear that not
"only at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this
"Paul hath persuaded away much people, saying,
"that they be no gods which are made with hands;
"so that not only this our craft is in danger to be
"set at nought, but also that the temple of the great
"goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence
"should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world wor-
"shippeth."

No. VI.

I observe an agreement in a somewhat peculiar rule of Christian conduct, as laid down in this epistle, and as exemplified in the Second Epitle to the Corinthians. It is not the repetition of the same general precept, which would have been a coincidence of little value; but it is the general precept in one place, and the application of that precept to an actual occurrence in the other. In the sixth chapter and first verse of this epistle, our apostle gives the following direction. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken "in a fault, ye, which are spiritual restore such a one in "the spirit of meekness." In 2 Cor. chap. ii. 6—8, he writes thus. "Sufficient to such a man" (the incestuous person mentioned in the First Epistle) "is this punish-"ment, which was inflicted of many; so that, contrariwise, "ye ought rather to forgive him and comfort him, less "perhaps such a once should be swallowed up with over "much sorrow; wherefore I beseech you that ye would "confirm your love towards him." I have little doubt but that it was the same mind which dictated these two passages.

No. VII.

Our epistle goes farther than any of St. Paul's epistles; for it avows in direct terms the suppression of the Jewish law, as an instrument of salvation, even to the Jews themselves. Not only were the Gentiles exempt from its authority, but even the Jews were no longer either to place any dependency upon it, or consider themselves as subject to it on a religious account. "Before faith came, we were "kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should "afterwards be revealed; wherefore the law was our "schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might "be justified by faith; but, after that faith is come, *we are* "*no longer under a schoolmaster.*" (Chap. iii. 23—25.)

This was undoubtedly spoken of Jews and to Jews. In like manner, chap. iv. 1—5. "Now I say that the heir, "as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a ser- "vant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and "governors until the time appointed of the father; "even so we, when we were children, were in bondage "under the elements of the world, but, when the fulness "of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a "women, made under the law, to *redeem them that were un-* "*der the law*, that we might receive the adoption of sons." These passages are nothing short of a declaration, that the obligation of the Jewish law, considered as a religious dispensation, the effects of which were to take place in another life, had ceased, with respect even to the Jews themselves. What then should be the conduct of a Jew (for such St. Paul was) who preached this doctrine? To be consistent with himself, either he would no longer comply, in his own person, with the directions of the law; or, if he did comply, it would be for some other reason than any confidence which he placed in its efficacy, as a religious institution. Now so it happens, that whenever St. Paul's compliance with the Jewish law is mentioned in the history, it is mentioned in connection with circumstances which point out the motive from which it proceeded; and this motive appears to have been always exoteric, namely, a love of order and tranquility, or an unwillingness to give unnecessary offence. Thus, Acts, chap. xvi. 3. "Him (Tim- "othy) would Paul have to go forth with him, and took "and circumcised him, *because of the Jews which were in* "*those quarters.*" Again, Acts, chap. xxi. 26, "when Paul consented to exhibit an example of public compliance with a Jewish rite, by purifying himself in the temple, it is plainly intimated that he did this to satisfy many thousands of Jews who believed, and who were all zealous of the law." So far the instances related in one book, correspond with the doctrine delivered in another.

No. VIII.

Chap. i. 18. "Then, after three years, I went up to "Jerusalem to se Peter, and abode with him fifteen "days."

The shortness of St. Paul's stay at Jerusalem, is what I desire the reader to remark. The direct account of the same journey in the Acts, chap. ix. 28, determines nothing concerning the time of his continuance there. "And "he was with them (the apostles) coming in, and going "out, at Jerusalem; and he spake boldly in the name of "the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians; but "they went about to slay him; which when the brethren "knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea." Or rather this account, taken by itself, would lead a reader to suppose that St. Paul's abode at Jerusalem had been no longer than fifteen days. But turn to the twenty second chapter of the Acts, and you will find a reference to this visit to Jerusalem, which plainly indicates that Paul's continuance in that city had been of short duration. "And it "came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem "even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance, "and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, get thee "quickly out of Jerusalem, for they will not receive "thy testimony concerning me." Here we have the general terms of one text so explained by a distant text in the same book, as to bring an indeterminate expression into a close conformity with a specification delivered in another book; a species of consistency not, I think, usually found in fabulous relations.

No. IX.

Chap. vi. 11. "Ye see how large a letter I have writ-"ten unto you with mine own hand."

These words imply that he did not always write with

his own hand; which is consonant to what we find intimated in some other of the epistles. The Epistle to the Romans was written by Tertius. "I, Tertius, who wrote this "epistle, salute you in the Lord." (Chap. xvi. 22.) The First Epistle to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Colossians and the Second to the Thessalonians, have all, near the conclusion, this clause. "The salutation of me, Paul, "with mine own hand;" which must be understood, and is universally understood to import, that the rest of the epistle was written by another hand. I do not think it improbable that an impostor, who had remarked this subscription in some other epistle, should invent the same in a forgery; but that is not done here. The author of this epistle does not imitate the manner of giving St. Paul's signature; he only bids the Galatians observe how large a letter he had written to them with his own hand. He does not say this was different from his ordinary usage; that is left to implication. Now to suppose that this was an artifice to procure credit to an imposture, is to suppose that the author of the forgery, because he knew that others of St. Paul's were *not* written by himself, therefore made the apostle say that this was; which seems an odd turn to give to the circumstance, and to be given for a purpose which would more naturally and more directly have been answered, by subjoining the salutation or signature in the form in which it is found in other epistles.*

* The words πηλικοις γραμμασιν may probably be meant to describe the character in which he wrote, and not the length of the letter. But this will not alter the truth of our observation. I think however, that as St. Paul by the mention of his own hand designed to express to the Galatians the great concern which he felt for them, the words, whatever they signify, belong to the whole of the epistle; and not, as Grotius, after St. Jerom, interprets it, to the few verses which follow.

No. X.

An exact conformity appears in the maner in which a certain apostle or eminent Christian, whose name was James, is spoken of in the Epistle and in the history. Both writings refer to a situation of his at Jerusalem, somewhat different from that of the other apostles; a kind of eminence or presidency in the church there, or at least a more fixed and stationary residence. Chap, ii. 12. "When Peter was at "Antioch, before that certain came from James, he did "eat with the Gentiles." This text plainly attributes a kind of preeminency to James; and, as we hear of him twice in the same epistle dwelling at Jerusalem, chap. i. 19, and ii. 9, we must apply it to the situation which he held in that church. In the Acts of the Apostles divers intimations occur, conveying the same idea of James's situation. When Peter was miraculously delivered from prison, and had surprised his friends by his appearance among them, after declaring unto them how the Lord had brought him out of prison. "Go shew," says he, "these "things unto James, and to the brethren." (Acts, chap. xii. 17.) Here James is minifestly spoken of in terms of distinction. He appears again with like distinction in the twenty first chapter and the seventeenth and eighteenth verses. "And when we (Paul and his company) were "come to Jerusalem, the day following, Paul went in "with us unto James, and all the elders were present." In the debate which took place upon the business of the Gentile converts, in the council at Jerusalem, this same person seems to have taken the lead. It was he who closed the debate, and proposed the resolution in which the council ultimately concurred; "Wherefore my sentence "is, that we trouble not them which from among the "Gentiles are turned to God."

Upon the whole, that there exists a conformity in the expressions used concerning *James*, throughout the histo-

ry, and in the epistle, is unquestionable. But admitting this conformity, and admitting also the undesignedness of it, what does it prove? It proves that the circumstance itself is founded in truth; that is, that James was a real person, who held a situation of eminence in a real society of Christians at Jerusalem. It confirms also those parts of the narrative which are connected with this circumstance. Suppose, for instance, the truth of the account of Peter's escape from prison was to be tried upon the testimony of a witness who, among other things, made Peter, after his deliverance, say, "Go show these "things to James and to the brethren;" would it not be material, in such a trial, to make out by other independent proofs, or by a comparison of proofs, drawn from independent sources, that there was actually at that time, living at Jerusalem, such a person as James; that this person held such a situation in the society amongst whom these things were transacted, as to render the words which Peter is said to have used concerning him, proper and natural for him to have used? If this would be impertinent in the discussson of oral testimony, it is still more so in appreciating the credit of remote history.

It must not be dissembled, that the comparison of our epistle with the history presents some difficulties, or, to say the least, some questions, of considerable magnitude. It may be doubted, in the first place, to what journey the words which open the second chapter of the epistle, "then "fourteen years afterwards, I went unto Jerusalem," relate. That which best corresponds with the date, and that to which most interpreters apply the passage, is the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, when they went thither from Antioch, upon the business of the Gentile converts; and which journey produced the famous council and decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. To me this opinion appears to be encumbered with strong objections. In the epistle Paul tells us that "he went up "by revelation.." (Chap. ii. 2.) In the Acts, we read

that he was sent by the church of Antioch. "After no "small dissension and disputation, they determined that "Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should "go up to the apostles and elders about this question." (Acts, chap. xv. 2.) This is not very reconcileable. In the epistle St. Paul writes that, when he came to Jerusalem, "he communicated that Gospel which he preached "among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were "of reputation." (Chap. ii. 2.) If by "that Gospel" he meant the immunity of the Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message. But a yet greater difficulty remains, viz. that in the account which the epistle gives of what passed upon this visit at Jerusalem, no notice is taken of the deliberation and decree which are recorded in the Acts, and which, according to that history, formed the business, for the sake of which the journey was undertaken. The mention of the council and of its determination, whilst the apostle was relating his proceedings at Jerusalem, could hardly have been avoided, if in truth the narrative belong to the same journey. To me it appears more probable that Paul and Barnabas had taken some journey to Jerusalem, the mention of which is omitted in the Acts. Prior to the apostolic decree, we read that "Paul and Barnabas abode "at Antioch a long time with the disciples," (Acts, chap. xiv. 28.) Is it unlikely that, during this long abode, they might go up to Jerusalem and return to Antioch? Or would the omission of such a journey be unsuitable to the general brevity with which these memoirs are written, especially of those parts of St. Paul's history which took place before the historian joined his society?

But, again, the first account we find in the Acts of the Apostles of St. Paul's visiting Galatia, is in the sixteenth chapter, and the sixth verse. "Now when they had gone "[illegible]ugh Phrygia and the region of Galatia, they assay-

"ed to go into Bithynia." The progress here recorded was subsequent to the apostolic decree; therefore that decree must have been extant when our epistle was written. Now, as the professed design of the epistle was to establish the exemption of the Gentile converts from the law of Moses, and as the decree pronounced and confirmed that exemption, it may seem extraordinary that no notice whatever is taken of that determination, nor any appeal made to its authority. Much however of the weight of this objection, which applies also to some other of St. Paul's epistles, is removed by the following reflections.

1. It was not St. Paul's manner, nor agreeable to it, to resort or defer much to the authority of the other apotsles, especially whilst he was insisting, as he does strenuously throughout this epistle insist, upon his own original inspiration. He who could speak of the very chiefest of the apostles in such terms as the following, "of those who "seemed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were it ma-"keth no matter to me, God accepteth no man's person), "for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference ad-"ded nothing to me," he, I say, was not likely to support himself by their decision.

2. The epistle argues the point upon principle; and it is not perhaps more to be wondered at, that in such an argument St. Paul should not cite the apostolic decree, than it would be that, in a discourse designed to prove the moral and religious duty of observing the sabbath, the writer should not quote the thirteenth canon.

3. The decree did not go the length of the position maintained in the epistle; the decree only declares that the apostles and elders at Jerusalem did not impose the observance of the Mosaic law upon the Gentile converts, as a condition of their being admitted into the Christian church. Our epistle argues that the Mosaic institution itself was at an end, as to all effects upon a future state, even with respect to the Jews themselves.

4. They, whose error St. Paul combated, were not persons who submitted to the Jewish law, because it was imposed by the authority, or because it was made part of the law of the Christian church; but they were persons who, having already become Christians, afterwards voluntarily took upon themselves the observance of the Mosaic code, under a notion of attaining thereby to a greater perfection. This, I think, is precisely the opinion which St. Paul opposes in this epistle. Many of his expressions apply exactly to it. "Are ye so foolish? having begun "in the spirit, are ye now made perfect in the flesh?" (Chap. iii. 3.) "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the "law, do ye not hear the law?" (Chap. iv. 21.) "How "turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, where- "unto ye desire again to be in bondage?" (Chap. iv. 9.) It cannot be thought extraordinary that St. Paul should resist this opinion with earnestness; for it both changed the character of the Christian dispensation, and derogated expressly from the completeness of that redemption which Jesus Christ had wrought for them that believed in him. But it was to no purpose to alledge to such persons the decision at Jerusalem, for that only showed that they were not bound to these observances by any law of the Christian church; they did not pretend to be so bound. Nevertheless they imagined that there was an efficacy in these observances, a merit, a recommendation to favor, and a ground of acceptance with God for those who complied with them. This was a situation of thought to which the tenor of the decree did not apply. Accordingly St. Paul's address to the Galatians, which is throughout adapted to this situation, runs in a strain widely different from the language of the decree. "Christ is become "of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified "by the law;" (chap. v. 4.) i. e. whosoever places his dependence upon any merit he may apprehend there to be in legal observances. The decree had said nothing like this; therefore it would have been useless to have produc-

ed the decree in an argument of which this was the burthen. In like manner as in contending with an anchorite, who should insist upon the superior holiness of a recluse, ascetic life, and the value of such mortifications in the sight of God, it would be to no purpose to prove that the laws of the church did not require these vows, or even to prove that the laws of the church expressly left every Christian to his liberty. This would avail little towards abating his estimation of their merit, or towards settling the point in controversy.*

* Mr. Locke's solution of this difficulty is by no means satisfactory. "St. Paul," he says, "did not remind the Galatians of the "apostolic decree, because they already had it." In the first place, it does not appear with certainty that they had it; in the second place, if they had it, this was rather a reason, than otherwise, for referring them to it. The passage in the Acts, from which Mr. Locke concludes that the Galatic churches were in possession of the decree, is the fourth verse of the sixteenth chapter. "And as they" (Paul and Timothy) "went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees "for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which "were at Jerusalem." In my opinion, this delivery of the decree was confined to the churches to which St. Paul came, in pursuance of the plan upon which he set out, "of visiting the brethren in every city "where he had preached the word of the Lord;" the history of which progress, and of all that pertained to it, is closed in the fifth verse, when the history informs us that, "so were the churches estab-"lished in the faith, and increased in number daily." Then the history proceeds upon a new section of the narrative, by telling us, that "when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, "they assayed to go into Bithynia." The decree itself is directed to "the brethren which are of the Gentiles at Antioch, Syria, and Cili-"cia;" that is, to churches already founded, and in which this question had been stirred. And I think the observation of the noble author of the Miscellanea Sacra is not only ingenious, but highly probable, viz. that there is, in this place, a dislocation of the text, and that the fourth and fifth verses of the sixteenth chapter ought to follow the last verse of the fifteenth, so as to make the entire passage run thus. "And they went through Syria and Cilicia," (to the Christians of which countries the decree was addressed), "confirming the "churches; and as they went through the cities they delivered them

Another difficulty arises from the account of Peter's conduct towards the Gentile converts at Antioch, as given in the epistle, in the latter part of the second chapter; which conduct, it is said, is consistent neither with the revelation communicated to him, upon the conversion of Cornelius, nor with the part he took in the debate at Jerusalem. But, in order to understand either the difficulty or the solution, it will be necessary to state and explain the passage itself. "When Peter was come to An-
"tioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to
"be blamed; for, before that certain came from James,
"he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come,
"he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which
"were of the circumcision; and the other Jews dissembled
"likewise with him, insomuch that Barnabas also was car-
"ried away with their dissimulation; but when I saw
"they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the
"Gospel, I said unto Peter, before them all, If thou, be-
"ing a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not
"as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live

"the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and el-
"ders which were at Jerusalem; and so were the churches established
"in the faith, and increased in number daily." And then the sixteenth chapter takes up a new and unbroken paragraph. "Then came he to
"Derbe and Lystra, &c." When St. Paul came, as he did into Galatia, to preach the gospel, for the first time, in a new place, it is not probable that he would make mention of the decree, or rather letter, of the church of Jerusalem, which presupposed Christianity to be known, and which related to certain doubts that had arisen in some established Christian communities.

The second reason which Mr. Locke assigns for the omission of the decree, viz. "that St. Paul's sole object in the epistle was to ac-
"quit himself of the imputation that had been charged upon him of
"actually preaching circumcision," does not appear to me to be strictly true. It was not the sole object. The epistle is written in general opposition to the Judaizing inclinations which he found to prevail amongst his converts. The avowal of his own doctrine, and of his steadfast adherence to that doctrine, formed a necessary part of the design of his letter, but was not the whole of it.

"as do the Jews." Now the question that produced the dispute, to which these words relate, was not whether the Gentiles were capable of being admitted into the Christian covenant; that had been fully settled; nor was it whether it should be accounted essential to the profession of Christianity that they should conform themselves to the law of Moses; that was the question at Jerusalem; but it was, whether, upon the Gentiles becoming Christians, the Jews might thenceforth eat and drink with them, as with their own brethren. Upon this point St. Peter betrayed some inconstancy; and so he might, agreeably enough to his history. He might consider the vision at Joppa as a direction for the occasion, rather than as universally abolishing the distinction between Jew and Gentile; I do not mean with respect to final acceptance with God, but as to the manner of their living together in society; at least he might not have comprehended this point with such clearness and certainty, as to stand out upon it against the fear of bringing upon himself the censure and complaint of his brethren in the church of Jerusalem, who still adhered to their ancient prejudices. For Peter, it is said, compelled the Gentiles Ἰουδαΐζειν, "compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" How did he do that? The only way, in which Peter appears to have compelled the Gentiles to comply with the Jewish institution, was by withdrawing himself from their society. By which he may be understood to have made this declaration. "We do not deny your right to be considered as Christians; we do not deny your title in the promise of the Gospel, even without compliance with our law; but if you would have us Jews live with you, as we do with one another, that is, if you would in all respects be treated by us as Jews, you must live as such yourselves." This, I think, was the compulsion which St. Peter's conduct imposed upon the Gentiles, and for which St. Paul reproved him.

As to the part which the historian ascribes to St. Peter,

in the debate at Jerusalem, beside that it was a different question which was there agitated from that which produced the dispute at Antioch, there is nothing to hinder us from supposing that the dispute at Antioch, was prior to the consultation at Jerusalem; or that Peter, in consequence of this rebuke, might have afterwards maintained firmer sentiments.

CHAP. VI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

No. I.

THIS epistle, and the Epistle to the Colossians, appear to have been transmitted to their respective churches by the same messenger. "But that ye also may know "my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother "and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to "you all things; whom I have sent unto you for the same "purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he "might comfort your hearts." Ephes. chap. vi. 21, 22. This text, if it do not expressly declare, clearly I think intimates, that the letter was sent by Tychicus. The words made use of in the Epistle to the Colossians are very similar to these, and afford the same implication that Tychicus, in conjunction with Onesimus, was the bearer of the letter to that church. "All my state shall Tychicus declare "unto you, who is a beloved brother, and a faithful min- "ister, and fellow servant in the Lord, whom I have sent "unto you for the same purpose, that he might know "your estate, and comfort your hearts; with Onesimus, "a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you; they "shall make known unto you all things which are done "here." Colos. chap. iv. 7—9. Both Epistles represent the writer as under imprisonment for the gospel; and both treat of the same general subject. The Epistle therefore to the Ephesians, and the Epistle to the Colossians, import to be two letters written by the same person, at or nearly at, the same time, and upon the same subject, and to have been sent by the same messenger. Now, every thing in the sentiments, order and diction of the two writings corresponds with what might be expected from this circumstance of identity or cognation in their original.

The leading doctrine of both Epistles, is the union of Jews and Gentiles under the Christian dispensation; and that doctrine in both is established by the same arguments, or, more properly speaking, illustrated by the same similitudes* "one vine," "one body," "one "new man," "one temple," are in both Epistles the figures, under which the society of believers in Christ, and their common relation to him as such, is represented.† The ancient, and as had been thought, the indelible distinction between Jew and Gentile, in both Epistles is declared to be "now abolished by his cross." Beside this consent in the general tenor of the two Epistles, and in the run also and warmth of thought, with which they are composed, we may naturally expect, in letters produced under the circumstances, in which these appear to have been written, a closer resemblance of style and diction, than between other letters of the same person, but of distant dates, or between letters adapted to different occasions. In particular we may look for many of the same expressions, and sometimes for whole sentences being alike; since such expressions and sentences would be repeated in the second letter (whichever that was) as yet fresh in the

* St. Paul, I am apt to believe, has been sometimes accused of inconclusive reasoning, by our mistaking that for reasoning which was only intended for illustration. He is not to be read as a man, whose own persuasion of the truth of what he taught always or solely depended upon the views under which he represents it in his writings. Taking for granted the certainty of his doctrine, as resting upon the revelation that had been imparted to him, he exhibits it frequently to the conception of his readers under images and allegories, in which if an analogy may be perceived, or even sometimes a poetic resemblance be found, it is all perhaps that is required.

† Compare { Ephes. i. 22, iv. 15, ii. 15, } with { Colos. i. 18. ii. 19. iii. 10, 11. }

Also { Ephes. ii. 14, 15, ii. 16, ii. 20, } with { Colos. ii. 14. i. 18—21. iii. 7. }

author's mind from the writing of the first. This repetition occurs in the following examples.*

Ephes. ch. i. 7. "In whom we have redemption "through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."†

Colos. ch. i. 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."‡

Beside the sameness of the words, it is further remarkable that the sentence is, in both places, preceded by the same introductory idea. In the Epistle to the Ephesians it is the "*beloved*" (ηγαπημενῳ); in that to the Colossians it is "*his dear Son*," (υιου της αγαπης αυτου.) "in whom we "have redemption." The sentence appears to have been suggested to the mind of the writer by the idea which had accompanied it before.

Ephes. ch. i. 10. "All things both which are in heav-"en and which are in earth, even in him."§

Colos. ch. i. 20. "All things by him, whether they "be things in earth, or things in heaven."‖

This quotation is the more observable, because the connecting of things in earth with things in heaven is a very singular sentiment, and found no where else but in these two Epistles. The words also are introduced and followed by a train of thought nearly alike. They are introduced by describing the union, which Christ had effected, and they are followed by telling the Gentile churches that they were incorporated into it.

* When *verbal* comparisons are relied upon, it becomes necessary to state the original; but that the English reader may be interrupted as little as may be, I shall in general do this in the note.

† Ephes. ch. i. 7. Εν ᾧ εχομεν την απολυτρωσιν δια του αιματος αυτου, την αφεσιν των παραπτωματων.

‡ Colos. ch. i. 14. Εν ᾧ εχομεν την απολυτρωσιν δια του αιματος αυτου, την αφεσιν των αμαρτιων. However, it must be observed, that in this latter text many copies have not δια του αιματος αυτου.

§ Ephes. ch. i. 10. Τα τε εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι της γης, εν αυτῳ.

‖ Colos. ch. i. 20. Δι αυτου, ειτε τα επι της γης, ειτε τα εν τοις ουρανοις.

Ephes. ch. iii. 2. "The dispensation of the grace of God, "which is given me to you ward."*

Colos. ch. i. 25. "The dispensation of God, which "is given to me for you."†

Of these sentences it may likewise be observed, that the accompanying ideas are similar. In both places they are immediately preceded by the mention of his present sufferings; in both places they are immediately followed by the mention of the mystery which was the great subject of his preaching.

Ephes. ch. v. 19. "In psalms and hymns and spiri- "tual songs, singing and making melody in your heart "to the Lord."‡

Colos. ch. iii. 16. "In psalms and hymns and spiri- "tual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the "Lord."§

Ephes. ch. vi. 22. "Whom I have sent unto you for "the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and "that he might comfort your hearts."‖

Colos. ch. iv. 8. "Whom I have sent unto you for "the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and "comfort your hearts."¶

In these examples, we do not perceive a cento of phrases gathered from one composition, and strung together in the other; but the occasional occurrence of the same

* Ephes, ch. iii. 2. Την οικονομιαν της χαριτος του Θεου της δοθεισης μοι εις ὑμας.

† Colos, ch. i. 25. Την οικονομιαν του Θεου, την δοθεισης μοι εις ὑμας.

‡ Ephes .ch. v. 19. Ψαλμοις και ὑμνοις, και ωδαις πνευματικαις, ᾀδοντες και ψαλλοντες εν τη καρδια ὑμων τω Κυριω.

§ Colos. ch. iii 16. Ψαλμοις και ὑμνοις και ωδαις πνευματικαις, εν χαριτι ᾀδοντες εν τη καρδια ὑμων τω Κυριω.

‖ Ephes. ch. vi. 22. Ὁν επεμψα προς ὑμας εις αυτο τουτο, ινα γνωτε τα περι ἡμων, και παρακαλεση τας καρδιας ὑμων.

¶ Colos. ch. iv. 8. Ὁν επεμψα προς ὑμας εις αυτο τουτο, ινα γνῳ τα περι ὑμων, και παρακαλεση τας καρδιας ὑμων.

expression to a mind a second time revolving the same ideas.

2. Whoever writes two letters, or two discourses, nearly upon the same subject, and at no great distance of time, but without any express recollection of what he had written before, will find himself repeating some sentences in the very order of the words, in which he had already used them; but he will more frequently find himself employing some principal terms, with the other inadvertently changed, or with the other disturbed by the intermixture of other words and phrases expressive of ideas rising up at the time; or in many instances repeating not single words, nor yet whole sentences, but parts and fragments of sentences. Of all these varieties the examination of our two Epistles will furnish plain examples; and I should rely upon this class of instances more than upon the last; because, although an impostor might transcribe into a forgery entire sentences and phrases, yet the dislocation of words, the partial recollection of phrases and sentences, the intermixture of new terms and new ideas with terms and ideas before used, which will appear in the examples that follow, and which are the natural properties of writings produced under the circumstances in which these Epistles are represented to have been composed, would not, I think, have occurred to the invention of a forger; nor, if they had occurred, would they have been so easily executed. This studied variation was a refinement in forgery which I believe did not exist; or, if we can suppose it to have been practised in the instances adduced below, why, it may be asked, was not the same art exercised upon those which we have collected in the preceding class?

Ephes. ch. i. 19. ch. ii. 5. "Towards us who believe "according to the working of his mighty power, which he "wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead "(and set him at his own right hand, in the heavenly "places, far above all principality, and power, and might, "and dominion, and every name that is named, not only "in this world, but in that which is to come. And hath "put all things under his feet; and gave him to be the

" head over all things, to the church, which is his body, the " fulness of all things, that filleth all in all); and you hath " he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins, " (wherein in time past ye walked according to the course " of this world, according to the prince of the power of " the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of " disobedience; among whom also we had all our con- " versation, in times past, in the lusts of our flesh ful- " filling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, " and were by nature the children of wrath, even as " others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his " great love wherewith he loved us), even when we " were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with " Christ."*

Colos. ch. ii. 12, 13. " Through the faith of the ope- " ration of God, who hath raised him from the dead, " and you being dead, in your sins and the uncircumcision " of the flesh, hath he quickened together with him."†

Out of the long quotation from the Ephesians, take away the parentheses, and you have left a sentence almost in terms the same as the short quotation from the Colossians. The resemblance is more visible in the original than in our translation; for what is rendered in one place " the " working," and in another the " operation," is the same Greek term ενεργεια; in one place it is, τους πιστευοντας κατα την ενεργειαν; in the other, δια της πιστεως της ενεργειας. Here

* Ephes. ch. i. 19, 20; ii. 1. 5. Τους πιστευοντας κατα την ενεργειαν του κρατους της ισχυος αυτου, ην ενηργησεν εν τω Χριστω, εγειρας αυτον εκ νεκρων· και εκαθισεν εν δεξια αυτου εν τοις επουρανιοις; και υμας οντας νεκρους τοις παραπτωμασι και ταις αμαρτιαις; και οντας ημας νεκρους τοις παραπτωμασι, συνεζωοποιησε τω Χριστω.

† Colos. ch. ii. 12, 13. Δια της πιστεως της ενεργειας του Θεου του εγειραντος αυτον εκ των νεκρων. Και υμας νεκρους οντας εν τοις παραπτωμασι και τη ακροβυστια της σαρκος υμων, συνεζωοποιησε συν αυτω.

therefore we have the same sentiment, and nearly in the same words; but, in the Ephesians, twice broken or interrupted by incidental thoughts, which St. Paul, as his manner was, enlarges upon by the way,* and then returns to the thread of his discourse. It is interrupted the first time by a view which breaks in upon his mind of the exaltation of Christ; and the second time by a description of heathen depravity. I have only to remark that Griesbach, in his very accurate edition, gives the parentheses very nearly in the same manner, in which they are here placed; and that without any respect to the comparison, which we are proposing.

Ephes. ch. iv. 2—4. "With all lowliness and meek-
" ness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love;
" endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit, in the bond
" of peace, there is one body and one spirit, even as ye
" are called in one hope of your calling."†

Colos. ch. iii. 12—15. "Put on therefore, as the elect
" of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness,
" humbleness, of mind, meekness, longsuffering, forbear-
" ing one another and forgiving one another; if any man
" have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you,
" so also do ye: and, above all these things, put on char-
" ity, which is the bond of perfectness; and let the peace
" of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are cal-
" led in one body."‡

* Vide Locke, in loc.

† Ephes. ch. iv. 2—4. Μετα πασης ταπεινοφροσυνης και πραοτητος, μετα μακροθυμιας, ανεχομενοι αλληλων εν αγαπη· σπουδαζοντες τηρειν την ενοτητα του πνευματος εν τω συνδεσμω της ειρηνης. Εν σωμα και εν πνευμα, καθως και εκληθητε εν μια ελπιδι της κλησεως ὑμων.

‡ Colos. ch. iii. 12—15. Ενδυσασθε ουν ως εκλεκτοι του Θεου αγιοι και ηγαπημενοι, σπλαγχνα οικτιρμων, χρηστοτητα, ταπεινοφροσυνην, πραοτητα, μακροθυμιαν ανεχομενοι αλληλων, και χαριζομενοι ἑαυτοις, εαν τις προς τινα εχη μομφην· καθως και ὁ Χριστος

In these two quotations the words ταπεινοφροσυνη, πραοτης, μακροθυμια, ανεχομενοι αλληλων, occur in exactly the same order; αγαπη is also found in both, but in a different connection; συνδεσμος της ειρηνης answers to συνδεσμος της τελειοτητος; εκληθητε εν ενι σωματι to εν σωμα καθως και εκληθητε εν μια ελπιδι; yet is this similitude found in the midst of sentences otherwise very different.

Ephes. ch. iv. 16. "From whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body."*

Col. ch. ii. 19. "From which all the body, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."†

In these quotations are read εξ ου παν το σωμα συμβιβαζομενον in both places, επιχορηγουμενον answering to επιχορηγιας; δια των αφων to δια πασης αφης; αυξει την αυξησιν to ποιειται την αυξησιν; and yet the sentences are considerably diversified in other parts.

Ephes. ch. iv. 32. "And be kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you."‡

εχαρισατο ὑμιν, ουτω και ὑμεις επι πασι δε τουτοις την αγαπην, ητις εστι συνδεσμος της τελειοτητος· και ἡ ειρηνη του Θεου βραβευετω εν ταις καρδιαις ὑμων, εις ἡν και εκληθητε εν ενι σωματι.

* Ephes. ch. iv. 16, Εξ ου παν το σωμα συναρμολογουμενον και συμβιβαζομενον δια πασης αφης της επιχορηγιας, κατ' ενεργειαν εν μετρῳ ενος εκαστου μερους την αυξησιν του σωματος ποιειται.

† Colos. ch. ii. 19. Εξ ου παν το σωμα δια των αφων και συνδεσμων επιχορηγουμενον και συμβιβαζομενον, αυξει την αυξησιν του Θεου.

‡ Ephes. ch. iv. 32. Γινεσθε δε εις αλληλους χρηστοι, ευσπλαγχνοι, χαριζομενοι εαυτοις, καθως και ὁ Θεος εν Χριστῳ εχαρισατο ὑμιν.

Colos. ch. iii. 13. "Forbearing one another and for-
"giving one another; if any man have a quarrel against
"any, even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye."*

Here we have "forgiving one another, even as God, "for Christ's sake (ἐν Χριστῷ), hath forgiven you," in the first quotation, substantially repeated in the second. But in the second the sentence is broken by the interposition of a new clause, "if any man have a quarrel against "any;" and the latter part is a little varied; instead of "God in Christ," it is "Christ hath forgiven you."

Ephes. ch. iv. 22—24. "That ye put off concerning
"the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt
"according to the deceitful lust and be renewed in the
"spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man,
"which, after God, is created in righteousness and true
"holiness."†

Colos. ch. iii. 9, 10. "Seeing that ye have put off
"the old man with his deeds and have put on the new
"man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of
"him that created him."‡

In these quotations, "putting off the old man, and put-
"ting on the new," appears in both. The idea is fur-
ther explained by calling it a renewal; in the one, "re-
"newed in the spirit of your mind;" in the other "re-
"newed in knowledge." In both, the new man is said to

* Colos, ch. iii. 13. *Ανεχομενοι αλληλων, και χαριζομενοι ἑαυτοις, εαν τις προς τινα εχῃ μομφην· καθως και ὁ Χριστος εχαρισατο ὑμιν, ουτω και ὑμεις.*

† Ephes. ch. iv. 22—24. *Αποθεσθαι ὑμας κατα την προτεραν αναστροφην, τον παλαιον ανθρωπον τον φθειρομενον κατα τας επιθυμιας της απατης· ανανεουσθαι δε τῳ πνευματι του νοος ὑμων, και ενδυσασθαι τον καινον ανθρωπον, τον κατα Θεον κτισθεντα εν δικαιοσυνῃ και ὁσιοτητι της αληθειας.*

‡ Colos ch. iii. 9, 10. *Απεκδυσαμενοι τον παλαιον ανθρωπον συν ταις πραξεσιν αυτου· και ενδυσαμενοι τον νεον, τον ανακαινουμενον εις επιγνωσιν κατ' εικονα του κτισαντος αυτον.*

be formed according to the same model; in the one he is, "after God created in righteousness and true holiness;" in the other, "he is renewed after the image of him that "created him." In a word, it is the same person writing upon a kindred subject, with the terms and ideas which he had before employed still floating in his memory."*

Ephes. chap. v. 6—8. "*Because of these things cometh* "*the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience;* be not "ye therefore partakers with them; for ye were some- "times darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk therefore as children of light."†

Colos ch. iii. 6—8. "*For which things sake the wrath* "*of God cometh on the children of disobedience;* in which ye "also walked some time, when ye lived in them; but now "you also put off all these."‡

These verses afford a specimen of that *partial* resemblance which is only to be met with when no imitation is designed, when no studied recollection is employed, but the mind, exercised upon the same subject, is left to the spontaneous return of such terms and phrases, as having been used before, may happen to present themselves again. The sentiment of both passages is throughout alike; half of that sentiment, the denunciation of God's

* In these comparisons, we often perceive the reason, why the writer, though expressing the same idea, uses a different term; namely, because the term before used is employed in the sentence under a different form. Thus, in the quotation under our eye, the new man is *καινος ανθρωπος*, in the Ephesians, and *τον νεον* in the Colossians; and then it is because *τον καινον* is used in the next word *ανακαινουμενον*.

† Ephes. ch. v. 6—8. *Δια ταυτα γαρ ερχεται η οργη του Θεου επι τους υιους της απειθειας. Μη ουν γινεσθε συμμετοχοι αυτων. Ητε γαρ ποτε σκοτος, νυν δε φως εν Κυριω· ως τεκνα φωτος περιπατειτε.*

‡ Colos. ch. iii. 6—8. *Δι ἁ ερχεται η οργη του Θεου επι τους υιους της απειθειας· εν οις και υμεις περιεπατησατε ποτε, οτε ἐζητε εν αυτοις. Νυνι δε αποθεσθε και υμεις τα παντα.*

wrath, is expressed in identical words; the other half viz. the admonition to quit their former conversation, in words entirely different.

Ephes. ch. v. 15, 16. "See then that ye walk circumspectly; not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time."*

Colos. ch. iv. 5. "Walk in wisdom towards, them that are without, redeeming the time."†

This is another example of that mixture which we remarked of sameness and variety in the language of one writer. "Redeeming the time," (ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τον καιρον) is a literal repetition. "Walk not as fools, but as wise" (περιπατειτε μη ὡς ασοφοι αλλ' ὡς σοφοι) answers exactly in sense, and nearly in terms, to "walk in wisdom" (εν σοφια περιπατειτε). Περιπατειτε ακριβως is a very different phrase, but is intended to convey precisely the same idea as περιπατειτε προς τους εξω: ακριβως is not well rendered "circumspectly." It means what in modern speech we should call "correctly;" and when we advise a person to behave "correctly," our advice is always given with a reference to "the opinion of others." προς τους εξω. "Walk correctly, redeeming the time," i.e. suiting yourselves to the difficulty and ticklishness of the times in which we live, "because the days are evil."

Ephes. ch. vi. 19, 20. "And (praying) for me that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds, that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak."‡

* Ephes. ch. v. 15, 16. Βλεπετε ουν πως ακριβως περιπατειτε· μη ὡς ασοφοι, αλλ' ὡς σοφοι, ἐξαγοραζομενοι τον καιρον.

† Colos. ch. iv. 5. Εν σοφια περιπατειτε προς τους εξω, τον καιρον ἐξαγοραζομενοι.

‡ Ephes. ch. vi. 19, 20. Και ὑπερ εμου, ἱνα μοι δοθειη λογος εν ανοιξει του στοματος μου εν παρρησια, γνωρισαι το μυστηριον του ευαγγελιου, ὑπερ ου πρεσβευω εν ἁλυσει, ἱνα εν αυτῳ παρρησιασωμαι, ὡς δει με λαλησαι.

Colos. ch. iv. 3, 4. "Withal praying also for us, that "God would open unto us a door of utterance to speak "the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds, "that I may make it manifest as I ought to speak."*

In these quotations, the phrase "as I ought to speak" (ὡς δει με λαλησαι), the words "utterance" (λογος), "mys- "tery" (μυστηριον) "open" (ανοιξη and εν ανοιξει) are the same. "To make known the mystery of the Gospel," (γνωρισαι το μυστηριον), answers to "make it manifest" (ἱνα φανερωσω αυτο); "for which I am an ambassador in bonds" (υπερ ὁυ πρεσβευω εν ἁλυσει), to "for which I am also in "bonds," (δι' ὁ και δεδεμαι).

Ephes. ch. v. 22. "*Wives submit yourselves to your own* "*husbands, as unto the Lord,* for the husband is the head "of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church, "and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore, as the "church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their "own husbands in every thing. *Husbands, love your* "*wives,* even as Christ also loved the church, and gave "himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with "the washing of water by the word; that he might pre- "sent it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or "wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and "without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their "own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself; "for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth "and cherisheth, it, even as the Lord the church; for we "are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his moth- "er, and be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be "one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak con- "cerning Christ and the Church. Nevertheless, let eve- "ry one of you in particular, so love his wife even as him-

* Colos. ch. iv. 3, 4, Προσευχομενοι ἁμα και περι ἡμων, ἱνα ὁ Θεος ανοιξη ἡμιν θυραν του λογου, λαλησαι το μυστηριον του Χριστου δι' ὁ και δεδεμαι ἱνα φανερωσω αυτο, ὡς δει με λαλησαι.

"self; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.
"*Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.*
"Honor thy father and thy mother (which is the first
"commandment with promise), that it may be well with
"thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. *And ye*
"*fathers, provoke not your children to wrath,* but bring them
"up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. *Ser-*
"*vants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to*
"*the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart,*
"*as unto Christ; not with eye service, as men pleasers, but*
"*as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the*
"*heart, with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not*
"*to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth,*
"*the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or*
"*free.* And, ye masters, do the same things unto them,
"forbearing threatening; *knowing that your master also is*
"*in heaven,* neither is there respect of persons with him."*

† Colos. ch. iii. 18. "Wives, submit yourselves unto

* Ephes. ch. v. 22. Αἱ γυναικες, τοις ἰδιοις ανδρασιν ὑποτασσεσθε, ὡς τῳ Κυριῳ.

† Colos. ch. iii, 18. Αἱ γυναικες, ὑποτασσεσθε τοις ἰδιοις ανδρασιν, ὡς ανηκεν ἐν Κυριῳ.

Ephes. Οἱ ανδρες ἀγαπατε τας γυναικας ἑαυτων.

Colos. Οἱ ανδρες, ἀγαπατε τας γυναικας.

Ephes. Τα τεκνα, ὑπακουετε τοις γονευσιν ὑμων ἐν Κυριῳ· τουτο γαρ ἐστι δικαιον.

Colos. Τα τεκνα. ὑπακουετε τοις γονευσι κατα παντα· τουτο γαρ ἐστιν ευαρεστον τῳ Κυριῳ.

Ephes. Και οἱ πατερες μη παροργιζετε τα τεκνα ὑμων.

Colos. Οἱ πατερες μη *ερεθιζετε τα τεκνα ὑμων.

Ephes. Οἱ δουλοι, ὑπακουετε τοις κυριοις κατα σαρκα μετα φοβου και τρομου, ἐν ἁπλοτητι της καρδιας ὑμων, ὡς τῳ Χριστῳ· μη κατ' οφθαλμοδουλειαν ὡς ανθρωπαρεσκοι, αλλ' ὡς δουλοι του Χριστου, ποιουντες το θελημα του Θεου ἐκ ψυχης· μετ' ευνοιας δουλευοντες ὡς τῳ Κυριῳ, και ουκ ανθρωποις· ειδοτες ὁτι ὁ ἐαν τι ἑκαστος ποιηση ἀγαθον, τουτο κομιειται παρα του Κυριου, ειτε δουλος, ειτε ελευθερος.

* παροργιζετε, lectio non spernenda. GRIESBACH.

" your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands,
" love your wives and be not bitter against them. Chil-
" dren obey your parents in all things, for this is well
" pleasing unto the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your
" children to anger, lest they be discouraged. Servants,
" obey in all things your masters according to the flesh;
" not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness
" of heart, fearing God; and whatever ye do, do it heart-
" ily, as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that
" of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheri-
" tance, for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth
" wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done;
" and their is no respect of persons. Masters, give unto
" your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that
" ye also have a master in heaven."

The passages marked by Italics in the quotation from the Ephesians, bear a strict resemblance, not only in signification but in terms, to the quotation from the Colossians. Both the words and the order of the words are in many clauses a duplicate of one another. In the Epistle to the Colossians, these passages are laid together; in that to the Ephesians, they are divided by intermediate matter; especially by a long digressive allusion to the mysterious union between Christ and his church; which possessing, as Mr. Locke hath well observed, the mind of the apostle, from being an incidental thought, grows up into the principal subject. The affinity between these two passages in signification, in terms, and in the order of the words, is closer than can be pointed out between any parts of any two epistles in the volume.

Colos, *Οἱ δουλοι, ὑπακουετε κατα παντα τοις κατα σαρκα κυριοις, μη εν οφθαλμοδουλειαις, ὡς ανθρωπαρεσκοι, αλλ' εν ἁπλοτητι καρδιας, φοβουμενοι τον Θεον· και παν ὁ, τι αν ποιητε, εκ ψυχης εργαζεσθε, ὡς τω Κυριω, και ουκ ανθρωποις ειδοτες ὁτι απο Κυριου απολημψεσθε την ανταποδοσιν της κληρονομιας· τω γαρ Κυριω Χριστω δουλευετε,*

If the reader would see how the same subject is treated by a different hand, and how distinguishable it is from the production of the same pen, let him turn to the second and third chapters of the First Epistle of St. Peter. The duties of servants, of wives, and of husbands, are enlarged upon in that epistle, as they are in the Epistle to the Ephesians; but the subjects both occur in a different order, and the train of sentiment subjoined to each is totally unlike.

3. In two letters issuing from the same person, nearly at the same time, and upon the same general occasion, we may expect to trace the influence of association in the order in which the topics follow one another. Certain ideas universally or usually suggest others. Here the order is what we call natural, and from such an order nothing can be concluded. But when the order is arbitrary, yet alike, the concurrence indicates the effect of that principle, by which ideas which have been once joined, commonly revisit the thoughts together. The epistles under consideration furnish the two following remarkable instances of this species of agreement.

Ephes. ch. iv. 24. "And that ye put on the new man "which after God is created in righteousness and true ho- "liness; wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man "truth with his neighbour, for we are members one of "another."*

Colos. ch. iii. 9. "Lie not one to another; seeing "that ye have put off the old man, with his deeds; and "have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowl- "edge."†

* Ephes. ch. iv. 24, 25. Και ενδυσασθαι τον καινον ανθρωπον, τον κατα Θεον κτισθεντα εν δικαιοσυνη και οσιοτητι της αληθειας· διο αποθεμενοι το ψευδος, λαλειτε αληθειαν εκαστος μετα του πλησιον αυτου· οτι εσμεν αλληλων μελη.

† Colos. ch. iii. 9. Μη ψευδεσθε εις αλληλους, απεκδυσαμενοι τον παλαιον ανθρωπον, συν ταις πραξεσιν αυτου, και ενδυσαμενοι τον νεον, τον ανακαινουμενον εις επιγνωσιν.

The vice of "lying," or a correction of that vice, does not seem to bear any nearer relation to the "putting on "the new man," than a reformation in any other article of morals. Yet these two ideas, we see stand in both epistles in immediate connection.

Eph. ch. v. 20, 21. "Giving thanks always for all things "unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Je- "sus Christ; submitting yourselves one to another in the "fear of God. Wives, submit yourselves unto your own "husbands, as unto the Lord." *

Colos. ch. iii. 17. "Whatsoever ye do, in word or "deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving "thanks to God and the father by him. Wives, submit "yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the "Lord." †

In both these passages, submission follows giving of thanks, without any similitude in the ideas which should account for the transition.

It is not necessary to pursue the comparison between the two epistles further. The argument which results from it stands thus. No two other epistles contain a circumstance which indicates that they were written at the same, or nearly at the same time. No two other epistles exhibit so many marks of correspondency and resemblance. If the original which we ascribe to these two epistles be the true one, that is, if they were both really written by St. Paul, and both sent to their respective destination by the same messenger, the similitude is, in all points, what should be expected to take place. If they

* Ephes. ch. v. 20—22. Εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων, ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ. Αἱ γυναῖκες, τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτάσσεσθε, ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ.

† Colos. ch. iii. 17. Καὶ πᾶν ὅ, τι ἂν ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ, ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ δι' αὐτοῦ. Αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν Κυρίῳ.

were forgeries, then the mention of Tychicus in both epistles, and in a manner which shews that he either carried or accompanied both epistles, was inserted for the purpose of accounting for their similitude; or else the structure of the epistles was designedly adapted to that circumstance; or, lastly, the conformity between the contents of the forgeries, and what is thus indirectly intimated concerning their date, was only a happy accident. Not one of these three suppositions will gain credit with a reader who peruses the epistles with attention, and who reviews the several examples we have pointed out, and the observations with which they were accompanied.

No. II.

There is such a thing as a peculiar word or phrase cleaving, as it were, to the memory of a writer or speaker, and presenting itself to his utterance at every turn. When we observe this, we call it a *cant* word, or a *cant* phrase. It is a natural effect of habit; and would appear more frequently than it does, had not the rules of good writing taught the ear to be offended with the iteration of the same sound, and often times caused us to reject, on that account, the word which offered itself first to our recollection. With a writer who, like St. Paul, either knew not these rules, or disregarded them, such words will not be avoided. The truth is, an example of this kind runs through several of his epistles, and in the epistle before us *abounds*; and that is in the word *riches* (πλουτος,) used metaphorically as an argumentative of the idea to which it happens to be subjoined. Thus, "the *riches* of his glory," "his *riches* in glory," "*riches* of the glory of his inheritance," "*riches* of the glory of his mistery," Rom. ch. xi. 23, Ephes. ch. iii. 16, Ephes. ch. i. 18, Colos. ch. i. 27; "*riches* of his grace," twice in the Ephesians, ch. i. 7, and ch. ii. 7; "*riches* of the full assurance of understanding," Colos. ch. ii. 2; "*riches*

of his goodness," Rom. ch. ii. 4; "*riches* of the wisdom of God," Rom. ch. xi. 33; "*riches* of Christ," Ephes. ch. iii. 8. In a like sense the adjective. Rom. ch. x. 12, "*rich* unto all that call upon him;" Ephes. ch. ii. 4, "*rich* in mercy;" 1 Tim. ch. vi. 18, "*rich* in good works." Also the adverb, Colos ch. iii. 16, "let the word of Christ dwell in you *richly*." This figurative use of the word, though so familiar to St. Paul, does not occur in any part of the New Testament, except once in the epistle of St. James, ch. ii. 5. "Hath not God cho-"sen the *poor* of this world, *rich* in faith?" where it is manifestly suggested by the antithesis. I propose the frequent, yet seemingly unaffected use of this phrase in the epistle before us, as one internal mark of its genuineness.

No. III.

There is another singularity in St. Paul's style, which, wherever it is found, may be deemed a badge of authenticity; because, if it were noticed, it would not, I think, be imitated, inasmuch as it almost always produces embarrassments and interruption in the reasoning. This singularity is a species of digression which may probably, I think, be denominated *going off at a word*. It is turning aside from the subject upon the occurrence of some particular word, forsaking the train of thought then in hand, and entering upon a parenthetic sentence in which that word is the prevailing term. I shall lay before the reader some examples of this, collected from the other epistles, and then propose two examples of it which are found in the Epistle to the Ephesians. 2 Cor. ch. ii. 14, at the word *savor*. "Now thanks be unto God, which "always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh "manifest the *savor* of his knowledge by us in every place; "for we are unto God a sweet *savor* of Christ, in them "that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one we "are the *savor* of death unto death, and to the other the

"*savor* of life unto life; and who is sufficient of these "things? For we are not as many which corrupt the word "of God, but as of sincerity, but as of God; in the sight "of God speak we in Christ." Again, 2 Cor. ch. iii. 1, at the word *epistle*. "Need we, as some others, *epistles* of "commendation to you? or of commendation from you? "ye are our *epistle*, written in our hearts, known and read "of all men; forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to "be the *epistle* of Christ, ministered by us, written not "with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not "in tables of stone, but in the fleshly tables of the "heart." The position of the words in the original, shews more strongly than in the translation that it was the occurrence of the word επιστολη which gave birth to the sentence that follows. 2 Cor. chap. iii. 1. Ει μη χρηζομεν, ως τινες, συστατικων επιστολων προς υμας, η εξ υμων συστατικων; η επιστολη ημων υμεις εστε, εγγεγραμμενη εν ταις καρδιαις ημων, γινωσκομενη και αναγινωσκομενη υπο παντων ανθρωπων, φανερουμενοι οτι εστε επιστολη Χριστου διακονηθεισα υφ' ημων εγγεγραμμενη ου μελανι, αλλα πνευματι Θεου ζωντος· ουκ εν πλαξι λιθιναις, αλλ' εν πλαξι καρδιας σαρκιναις.

Again, 2 Cor. ch. iii. 12, &c. at the word *vail*. "Seeing "ing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness "of speech; and not as Moses, which put a *vail* over his "face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look "to the end of that which is abolished. But their minds "were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same *vail* "untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, "which *vail* is done away in Christ; but even unto this "day, when Moses is read, the *vail* is upon their heart; "nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the *vail* "shall be taken away (now the Lord is that spirit; and "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty). But "we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glo-"ry of the Lord, are changed into the same image from "glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord. There-

"fore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received "mercy, we faint not."

Who sees not that this whole allegory of the *vail* arises entirely out of the occurrence of the word, in telling us that "Moses put a *vail* over his face," and that it drew the apostle away from the proper subject of his discourse, the dignity of the office in which he was engaged; which subject he fetches up again almost in the words with which he had left it; "therefore seeing we have this ministry, as "we have received mercy, we faint not." The sentence which he had before been going on with, and in which he had been interrupted by the *vail*, was, "seeing then that "we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech."

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, the reader will remark two instances in which the same habit of composition obtains; he will recognize the same pen. One he will find, chap. iv. 8—11, at the word *ascended*. "Wherefore "he saith, when he *ascended* up on high, he led captivity "captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he *ascend-* "*ed*, what is it but that he also descended first unto the "lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same "also that *ascended* up far above all heavens, that he "might fill all things.) And he gave some apostles," &c.

The other appears, chap. v. 12—15, at the word *light*. "For it is a shame even to speak of those things which "are done of them in secret; but all things that are re- "proved, are made manifest by the *light*; (for whatsoev- "er doth make manifest, is *light*; wherefore he saith, a- "wake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and "Christ shall give thee *light*;) see then that ye walk cir- "cumspectly."

No. IV.

Although it does not appear to have ever been disputed that the epistle before us was written by St. Paul, yet it

is well known that a doubt has long been entertained concerning the persons to whom it was addressed. The question is founded partly in some ambiguity in the external evidence. Marcion, a heretic of the second century as quoted by Tertullian, a father in the beginning of the third, calls it the Epistle to the Laodiceans. From what we know of Marcion, his judgment is little to be relied upon; nor is it perfectly clear that Marcion was rightly understood by Tertullian. If, however, Marcion be brought to prove that some copies in his time gave εἰς Λαοδικειαν in the superscription, his testimony if it be truly interpreted, is not diminished by his heresy; for, as Grotius observes, "*cur meâ re mentiretur nihil erat causæ.*" The name ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, in the first verse, upon which word singly depends the proof, that the epistle was written to the Ephesians, is not read in all the manuscripts now extant. I admit, however, that the external evidence preponderates with a manifest excess on the side of the received reading. The objection therefore principally arises from the contents of the epistle itself; which, in many respects, militate with the supposition that it was written to the church of Ephesus. According to the history, St. Paul had passed two whole years at Ephesus, Acts, chap. xix. 10. And in this point, viz. of St. Paul having preached for a considerable length of time at Ephesus, the history is confirmed by the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and by the two Epistles to Timothy. "I will tarry at *Ephesus* until Pentecost." 1 Cor. ch. xvi. ver. 8. "We would not have you ignorant of our "trouble which came to us in *Asia*." 2 Cor. ch. i. 8. "As I besought thee to abide still at *Ephesus*, when I went "into Macedonia." 1 Tim. ch. i. 3. "And in how "many things he ministered to me at *Ephesus* thou know-"est well." 2 Tim. ch. i. 18. I adduce these testimonies, because, had it been a competition of credit between the history and the epistle, I should have thought myself bound to have preferred the epistle. Now, every epistle

which St. Paul wrote to churches, which he himself had founded, or which he had visited, abounds with references, and appeals to what had passed during the time that he was present amongst them; whereas there is not a text in the Epistle to the Ephesians, from which we can collect that he had ever been at Ephesus at all. The two Epistles to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Galatians, the Epistle to the Philippians, and the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, are of this class; and they are full of allusions to the apostle's history, his reception, and his conduct, whilst amongst them; the total want of which, in the epistle before us, is very difficult to account for, if it was in truth written to the church of Ephesus, in which city he had resided for so long a time. This is the first and strongest objection. But further, the Epistle to the Colossians was addressed to a church, in which St. Paul had never been. This we infer from the first verse of the second chapter. "For I would that ye knew what "great conflict I have for you and for them at Laodicea, "and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh." There could be no propriety in thus joining the Colossians and Laodiceans with those "who had not seen his face "in the flesh," if they did not also belong to the same description.* Now, his address to the Colossians, whom he had not visited, is precisely the same as his address to the Christians, to whom he wrote in the epistle, which we are now considering. "We give thanks to God and the "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for "you, *since we heard of your faith* in Christ Jesus, and of "the love which ye have to all the saints." Col. ch. i. 3. Thus he speaks to the Colossians, in the epistle before us, as follows. "Wherefore I also, *after I heard of your faith* "in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease "not to give thanks for you in my prayers," chap. i. 15. The terms of this address are observable. The words

* Dr. Lardner contends against the validity of this conclusion; but, I think without success. LARDNER, vol. xiv. p. 475. edit. 1757.

"having *heard* of your faith and love," are the very words we see, which he uses towards strangers; and it is not probable that he should employ the same in accosting a church in which he had long exercised his ministry, and whose "faith and love," he must have personally known.* The Epistle to the Romans was written before St. Paul had been at Rome; and his address to them runs in the same strain with that just now quoted; "I thank my "God, through Jesus Christ, for you all, that your faith "is *spoken* of throughout the whole world." Rom. chap. i. 8. Let us now see what was the form in which our apostle was accustomed to introduce his epistles, when he wrote to those with whom he was already acquainted. To the Corinthians it was this. "I thank my God al-"ways on your behalf, for the grace of God which is giv-"en you by Christ Jesus." 1 Cor. ch. i. 4. To the Philippians. I thank my God upon every remembrance "of you." Phil. ch. i. 3. To the Thessalonians. "We "give thanks to God always for you all, making mention "of you in our prayers, remembering without ceasing "your work of faith, and labor of love." 1 Thess. chap. i. 3. To Timothy. "I thank God, whom I serve from "my forefathers with pure conscience, that without ceas-"ing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night "and day." 2 Tim. chap. i. 4. In these quotations, it is usually his *remembrance*, and never his *hearing* of them, which he makes the subject of his thankfulness to God.

As great difficulties stand in the way of supposing the

* Mr. Locke endeavours to avoid this difficulty, by explaining "*their faith*, of which St. Paul had heard," to mean the steadfastness of their persuasion that they were called into the kingdom of God, without subjection to the Mosaic institution. But this interpretation seems to me extremely *hard*; for, in the manner in which faith is here joined with love, in the expression, "your faith and love," it could not be meant to denote any particular tenet which distinguished one set of Christians from others; forasmuch as the expression describes the general virtues of the Christian profession. Vide Locke, in loc.

epistle before us to have been written to the church of Ephesus, so I think it probable that it is actually the Epistle to the Laodiceans, referred to in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians. The text which contains that reference is this. "When this epistle is read among "you, cause that it be read also in the church of the La- "odiceans, and that ye likewise read the epistle from La- "odicea, chap. iv. 16. The "epistle *from* Laodicea" was an epistle sent by St. Paul to that church, and by them transmitted to Colosse. The two churches were mutually to communicate the epistles they had received. This is the way in which the direction is explained by the greater part of commentators, and is the most probable sense that can be given to it. It is also probable that the epistle alluded to was an epistle which had been received by the church of Laodicea *lately*. It appears then, with a considerable degree of evidence, that there existed an epistle of St. Paul's nearly of the same date with the Epistle to the Colossians, and an epistle directed to a church (for such the church of Laodicea was) in which St. Paul had never been. What has been observed concerning the epistle before us, shews that it answers perfectly to that character.

Nor does the mistake seem very difficult to account for. Whoever inspects the map of Asia Minor will see, that a person proceeding from Rome to Laodicea would probably land at Ephesus, as the nearest frequented seaport in that direction. Might not Tychicus then, in passing through Ephesus, communicate to the Christians of that place the letter, with which he was charged? And might not copies of that letter be multiplied and preserved at Ephesus? Might not some of the copies drop the words of designation ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείᾳ,* which it was of no conse-

* And it is remarkable that there seem to have been some ancient copies without the words of designation, either the words *in Ephesus*, or the words *in Laodicea*. St. Basil, a writer of the fourth century, speaking of the present epistle, has this very singular passage. "And

quence to an Ephesian to retain? Might not copies of the letter come out into the Christian church at large from Ephesus; and might not this give occasion to a belief that the letter was written to that church? And, lastly, might not this belief produce the error, which we suppose to have crept into the inscription?

No. V.

As our epistle purports to have been written during St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, which lies beyond the period, to which the Acts of the Apostles brings up his history; and as we have seen and acknowledged that the epistle contains no reference to any transactions at Ephesus during the apostle's residence in that city, we cannot expect that it should supply many marks of agreement with the narrative. One coincidence however occurs, and a coincidence of that minute and less obvious kind, which, as hath been repeatedly observed, is of all others the most to be relied upon.

Chap. vi. 19, 20, we read, "praying for me, that I "may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mys- "tery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in "bonds." "*In bonds*," ἐν ἁλύσει, in a *chain*. In the twenty eighth chapter of the Acts we are informed, that Paul, after his arrival at Rome, was suffered to dwell by

"writing to the Ephesians, as truly united to him who is through "knowledge, he (Paul) calleth them in a peculiar sense *such who are*, "saying, *to the saints who are and* (or *even*) *the faithful in Christ Jesus*; "for so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in "ancient copies." Dr. Mill interprets (and, notwithstanding some objections that have been made to him in my opinion rightly interprets) these words of Basil, as declaring that this father had seen certain copies of the Epistle in which the words "in Ephesus" were wanting. And the passage, I think, must be considered as Basil's fanciful way of explaining what was really a corrupt and defective reading; for I do not believe it possible that the author of the Epistle could have originally written ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν, without any name of place to follow it.

himself with a soldier, that kept him. Dr. Lardner has shown that this mode of custody was in use amongst the Romans, and that whenever it was adopted the prisoner was bound to the soldier by a single chain; in reference to which St. Paul, in the twentieth verse of this chapter, tells the Jews, whom he had assembled, "For this cause "therefore have I called for you to see you, and to speak "with you, because that for the hope of Israel I am bound "*with this chain*," τῇ ἁλύσει ταύτῃ περίκειμαι. It is in exact conformity therefore with the truth of St. Paul's situation at the time, that he declares of himself in the epistle περίκειται τῇ ἁλύσει. And the exactness is the more remarkable, as ἁλύσις (a chain) is no where used in the singular number to express any other kind of custody. When the prisoner's hands or feet were bound together, the word was δεσμὰ (bonds), as in the twenty sixth chapter of the Acts, where Paul replies to Agrippa, "I would to "God that not only thou, but also all that hear me this "day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, ex- "cept *these bonds*," παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων. When the prisoner was confined between two soldiers, as in the case of Peter, Acts, chap. xii. 6, two chains were employed; and it is said, upon his miraculous deliverance, that the "chains" (ἁλύσεις, in the plural) "fell from his hands." Δεσμὸς the noun, and δέω the verb, being general terms, were applicable to this in common with any other species of personal coertion; but ἁλύσις, in the singular number, to none but this.

If it can be suspected that the writer of the present epistle, who in no other particular appears to have availed himself of the information concerning St. Paul delivered in the Acts, had, in this verse, borrowed the word, which he read in that book, and had adapted his expression to what he found there recorded of St. Paul's treatment at Rome; in short, that the coincidence here noted was effected by craft and design; I think it a strong reply to remark, that, in the parallel passage of the Epistle to the

Colossians, the same allusion is not preserved; the words there are, "praying also for us, that God would open un- "to us a door of utterance to speak the mystery of Christ, "for which *I am also in bonds*," δι' ὁ καὶ δέδεμαι. After what has been shown in a preceding number, there can be little doubt but that these two epistles were written by the same person. If the writer therefore sought for, and fraudulently inserted, the correspondency into one epistle, why did he not do it in the other? A real prisoner might use either general words which comprehended this amongst many other modes of custody; or might use appropriate words which specified this, and distinguished it from any other mode. It would be accidental which form of expression he fell upon. But an impostor, who had the art in one place, to employ the appropriate term for the purpose of fraud, would have used it in both places.

CHAP. VII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

No. I.

WHEN a transaction is referred to in such a manner, as that the reference is easily and immediately understood by those who are beforehand, or from other quarters, acquainted with the fact, but is obscure, or imperfect, or requires investigation, or a comparison of different parts, in order to be made clear to other readers, the transaction so referred to is probably real; because, had it been fictitious, the writer would have set forth his story more fully and plainly, not merely as conscious of the fiction, but as conscious that his readers could have no other knowledge of the subject of his allusion than from the information of which he put them in possession.

The account of Epaphroditus, in the Epistle to the Philippians, of his journey to Rome, and of the business which brought him thither, is the article to which I mean to apply this observation. There are three passages in the epistle which relate to this subject. The first, chap. i. 7. "Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, "because I have you in my heart, inasmuch as both in "my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the "gospel, ye all are *συγκοινωνοι μου της χαριτος*, joint con- "tributors to the gift which I have received."* Nothing more is said in this place. In the latter part of the

* Pearce, I believe, was the first commentator who gave this sense to the expression; and I believe also, that his exposition is now generally assented to. He interprets in the same sense the phrase in the fifth verse, which our translation renders, "your fellowship in the "gospel;" but which in the original is not *κοινωνια του ευαγγελιου*, or, *κοινωνια εν τω ευαγγελιω*; but *κοινωνια εις το ευαγγελιον*.

second chapter, and at the distance of half the epistle from the last quotation, the subject appears again. "Yet I "supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my "brother and companion in labor, and fellow soldier, but "your messenger, and *he that ministered to my wants;* "for he longed after you all, and was fell of heavi- "ness, because that ye had heard that he had been "sick; for indeed he was sick nigh unto death; but "God had mercy on him, and not on him only, but on "me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow. I sent "him therefore the more carefully, that when ye see him "again ye may rejoice, and that I may be the less sor- "rowful. Receive him therefore in the Lord with all "gladness; and hold such in reputation; because for the "work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding "his life *to supply your lack of service toward me.*" Chap. ii. 25—30. The matter is here dropped, and no further mention made of it till it is taken up near the conclusion of the epistle as follows. "But I rejoiced in the Lord "greatly, that now at the last your care of me hath "flourished again; wherein ye were also careful, but ye "lacked opportunity; not that I speak in respect of want; "for I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith "to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I "know how to abound; every where and in all things I "am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to "abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through "Christ which strengtheneth me. Notwithstanding ye "have well done that ye did communicate with my afflic- "tion. Now ye, Philippians, know also that in the be- "ginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedo- "nia, no church communicated with me as concerning "giving and receiving, but ye only; for even in Thessa- "lonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity; not "because I desire a gift; but I desire fruit that may "abound to your account. But I have all, and abound; "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things

"which were sent from you." Chap. iv. 10—18. To the Philippian reader, who knew that contributions were wont to be made in that church for the apostle's subsistence and relief, that the supply which they were accustomed to send to him had been delayed by the want of opportunity, that Epaphroditus had undertaken the charge of conveying their liberality to the hands of the apostle, that he had acquitted himself of this commission at the peril of his life, by hastening to Rome under the oppression of a grevious sickness; to a reader who knew all this beforehand, every line in the above quotation would be plain and clear. But how is it with a stranger? The knowledge of these several particulars is necessary to the perception and explanation of the references; yet that knowledge must be gathered from a comparison of passages lying at a great distance from one another. Texts must be interpreted by texts long subsequent to them, which necessarily produces embarrassment and suspense. The passage quoted from the beginning of the epistle contains an acknowledgment, on the part of the apostle, of the liberality which the Philippians had exercised towards him; but the allusion is so general and indeterminate, that, had nothing more been said in the sequel of the epistle, it would hardly have been applied to this occasion at all. In the second quotation, Epaphroditus is declared to have "minis-"tered to the apostle's wants," and "to have supplied "their lack of service towards him;" but *how*, that is, at whose expence, or from what fund he "ministered," or what was the "lack of service" which he supplied, are left very much unexplained, till we arrive at the third quotation, where we find Epaphroditus, "ministered to "St. Paul's wants," only by conveying to his hands the contributions of the Philippians; "I am full, having re-"ceived of Epaphroditus the things which were sent "from you;" and that "the lack of service which he "supplied" was a delay or interruption of their accustomed bounty, occasioned by the want of opportunity; "I

"rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at the last your "care of me hath flourished again; wherein ye were al- "so careful, but ye lacked opportunity." The affair at length comes out clear; but it comes out by peacemeal. The clearness is the result of the reciprocal illustration of divided texts. Should any one choose therefore to insinuate, that this whole story of Epaphroditus, of his journey, his errand, his sickness, even his existence, might, for what we know, have no other foundation than in the invention of the forger of the epistle; I answer, that a forger would have set forth his story connectedly, and also more fully and more perspicuously. If the epistle be authentic, and the transaction real, then every thing which is said concerning Epaphroditus and his commission, would be clear to those into whose hands the epistle was expected to come. Considering the Philippians as his readers, a person might naturally write upon the subject, as the author of the epistle has written; but there is no supposition of forgery with which it will suit.

No. II.

The history of Epaphroditus supplies another observation; "Indeed he was sick, nigh unto death; but God "had mercy on him, and not on him only, but on me "also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow." In this passage, no intimation is given that Epaphroditus's recovery was miraculous. It is plainly, I think, spoken of as a natural event. This instance, together with one in the Second Epistle to Timothy, ("Trophimus have I left at "Miletum sick,") affords a proof that the power of performing cures, and, by parity of reason, of working other miracles, was a power which only visited the apostles occasionally, and did not at all depend upon their own will. Paul undoubtedly would have healed Epaphroditus if he could. Nor, if the power of working cures had awaited his disposal, would he have left his fellow travel-

ler at Miletum sick. This, I think, is a fair observation upon the instances adduced; but it is not the observation I am concerned to make. It is more for the purpose of my argument to remark, that forgery, upon such an occasion, would not have spared a miracle; much less would it have introduced St. Paul professing the utmost anxiety for the safety of his friend, yet acknowledging himself unable to help him; which he does almost expressly, in the case of Trophimus, for he "left him sick;" and virtually in the passage before us, in which he felicitates himself upon the recovery of Epaphroditus, in terms which almost exclude the supposition of any supernatural means being employed to effect it. This is a reserve which nothing but truth would have imposed.

No. III.

Chap. iv. 15, 16. "Now ye, Philippians, know also "that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed "from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as "concerning giving and receiving, but ye only; for even "in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessi- "ty."

It will be necessary to state the Greek of this passage, because our translation does not, I think, give the sense of it accurately.

Οιδατε δε και υμεις, Φιλιππησιοι, ότι εν αρχη του ευαγγελιου, ότε εξηλθον απο Μακεδονιας, ουδεμια μοι εκκλησια εκοινωνησεν εις λογον δοσεως και λημψεως, ει μη υμεις μονοι· ότι και εν Θεσσαλονικη και απαξ και δις εις την χρειαν μοι επεμψατε.

The reader will please to direct his attention to the corresponding particles *ότι* and *ότι και*, which connect the words *εν αρχη του ευαγγελιου, ότε εξηλθον απο Μακεδονιας*, with the words *εν Θεσσαλονικη*, and denote, as I interpret the passage, two distinct donations, or rather donations at two distinct periods, one at Thessalonica, *απαξ και δις*, the other *after* his departure from Macedonia, *ότι εξηλθον απο*

Μακεδονιας.* I would render the passage, so as to mark these different periods, thus. "Now ye Philippians, know also, that "in the beginning of the gospel, when I was departed "from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as "concerning giving and receiving, but ye only: and that "also in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my "necessity." Now with this exposition of the passage compare 2 Cor. ch. xi. 8, 9. "I robbed other churches, "taking wages of them to do you service; and when I "was present with you and wanted, I was chargeable to "no man; for that which was lacking to me the brethren "which came from Macedonia supplied."

It appears from St. Paul's history, as related in the Acts of the Apostle, that upon leaving Macedonia he passed, after a very short stay at Athens, into Achaia. It appears, secondly, from the quotation out of the Epistle to the Corinthians, that in Achaia he accepted no pecuniary assistance from the converts of that country; but that he drew a supply for his wants from the Macedonian Christians. Agreeably whereunto it appears, in the third place, from the text which is the subject of the present number, that the brethren in Philippi, a city of Macedonia, had followed him with their munificence, ὁτι ἐξηλθον απο Μακεδονιας, when he was departed from Macedonia, that is, when he was *come into Achaia.*

The passage under consideration affords another circumstance of agreement deserving of our notice. The gift alluded to in the Epistle to the Philippians is stated to

* Luke, ch. ii. 15. Και εγενετο, ὡς απηλθον απ' αυτων εις τον ουρανον οἱ αγγελοι, "as the angels were gone away," i. e. *after* their departure, οἱ ποιμενες, ειπον προς αλληλους. Matth. ch. xii. 43, Ὁταν δε το ακαθαρτον πνευμα εξελθη απο του ανθρωπου, "when the "unclean spirit is gone." i. e. *after* his departure, διερχεται. John, ch. xiii. 30, Ὁτε εξηλθε (Ιουδας) "when he was gone," i. e. *after* his departure, λεγει Ιησους. Acts, ch. x. 7, ὡς δε απηλθεν ὁ αγγελος ὁ λαλων τω Κορνηλιω, "and when the angel which spake unto him "was departed," i. e. *after* his departure, φωνησας δυο των οικετων, &c.

have been made "in the beginning of the gospel." This phrase is most naturally explained to signify the first preaching of the gospel in these parts; viz. on that side of the Ægean sea. The succours referred to in the Epistle to the Corinthians, as received from Macedonia, are stated to have been received by him upon his first visit to the peninsula of Greece. The dates therefore assigned to the donation in the two epistles agree; yet is the date in one ascertained very incidentally, namely, by the considerations which fix the date of the epistle itself; and in the other, by an expression ("the beginning of the gos-"pel") much too general to have been used, if the text had been penned with any view to the correspondency we are remarking.

Further, the phrase, "in the *beginning* of the gospel," raises an idea in the reader's mind that the gospel had been preached there more than once. The writer would hardly have called the visit to which he refers the "beginning "of the gospel," if he had not also visited them in some other stage of it. The fact corresponds with this idea. If we consult the sixteenth and twentieth chapters of the Acts, we shall find, that St. Paul, before his imprisonment at Rome, during which this epistle purports to have been written, had ben *twice* in Macedonia, and each time at Philippi.

No. IV.

That Timothy had been long with St. Paul at Philippi is a fact which seems to be implied in this epistle twice. First, he joins in the salutation with which the epistle opens, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, "to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi." Secondly, and more directly, the point is inferred from what is said concerning him, chap. ii. 19: "But I trust "in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus shortly unto you, "that I also may be of good comfort when I know your

"state; for I have no man like minded, who will natur-
"ally care for your state; for all seek their own, not the
"things which are Jesus Christ's; but *ye know the proof of*
"*him*, that as a son with the father, he hath served with
"me in the gospel." Had Timothy's presence with St. Paul at Philippi, when he preached the gospel there, been expressly remarked in the Acts of the Apostles, this quotation might be thought to contain a contrived adaptation to the history; although, even in that case, the averment, or rather the allusion in the epistle, is too oblique to afford much room for such suspicion. But the truth is, that in the history of St. Paul's transactions at Philippi, which occupies the greatest part of the sixteenth chapter of the Acts, no mention is made of Timothy at all. What appears concerning Timothy in the history, so far as relates to the present subject, is this; "When Paul
"came to Derbe and Lystra, behold a certain disciple
"was there named Timotheus, whom Paul would have
"to go forth with him." The narrative then proceeds with the account of St. Paul's progress through various provinces of the Lesser Asia, till it brings him down to Troas. At Troas he was warned in a vision to pass over into Macedonia. In obedience to which he crossed the Ægean sea to Samothracia, the next day to Neapolis, and from thence to Philippi. His preaching, miracles, and persecutions at Philippi follow next; after which Paul and his company, when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollinia, came to Thessalonica, and from Thessalonica to Berea. From Berea the brethren sent away Paul; "but Silas and *Timotheus* abode there
"still." The itinerary, of which the above is an abstract, is undoubtedly sufficient to support an inference that Timothy was along with St. Paul at Philippi. We find them setting out together upon this progress from Derbe, in Lycaonia; we find them together near the conclusion of it, at Berea, in Macedonia. It is highly probable, therefore, that they came together to Philippi,

through which their route between these two places lay. If this be thought probable, it is sufficient. For what I wish to be observed is, that in comparing, upon this subject, the epistle with the history, we do not find a recital in one place of what is related in another; but that we find, what is much more to be relied upon, an oblique allusion to an implied fact.

No. V.

Our epistle purports to have been written near the conclusion of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, and after a residence in that city of considerable duration. These circumstances are made out by different intimations, and the intimations upon the subject preserve among themselves a just consistency, and a consistency certainly unmeditated. First, the apostle had already been a prisoner at Rome so long, as that the reputation of his bonds, and of his constancy under them had contributed to advance the success of the gospel. "But I would ye should understand, brethren, that "the things which happened unto me have fallen out "rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my "bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all "other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord "waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to "speak the word without fear." Secondly, the account given of Epaphroditus imports, that St. Paul, when he wrote the epistle, had been in Rome a considerable time; "He longed after you all, and was full of heaviness, be-"cause that ye had heard that he had been sick." Epaphroditus was with St. Paul at Rome. He had been sick. The Philippians had heard of his sickness, and he again had received an account how much they had been affected by the intelligence. The passing and repassing of these advices must necessarily have occupied a large portion of time, and must have all taken place during St. Paul's residence at Rome. Thirdly, after a residence at

Rome thus proved to have been of considerable duration, he now regards the decision of his fate as nigh at hand. He contemplates either alternative, that of his deliverance, ch. ii. 23. "Him therefore (Timothy) I hope to send "*presently*, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me; "but I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come "shortly;" that of his condemnation, ver. 17, "Yea, and "if I be offered * upon the sacrifice and service of your "faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." This consistency is material, if the consideration of it be confined to the epistle. It is further material, as it agrees with respect to the duration of St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, with the account delivered in the Acts, which, having brought the apostle to Rome, closes the history by telling us, "that he dwelt there *two whole years* in his own hired "house."

No. VI.

Chap. i. 23. "For I am in a strait betwixt two, hav-"ing a desire to depart, and be with Christ; which is far "better."

With this compare 2 Cor. chap. v. 8. "We are con-"fident and willing rather to be absent from the body, "and to be present with the Lord."

The sameness of sentiment in these two quotations is obvious. I rely however not so much upon that, as upon the similitude in the train of thought which in each epistle leads up to this sentiment, and upon the suitableness of that train of thought to the circumstances under which the epistles purport to have been written. This, I conceive, bespeaks the production of the same mind, and of a mind operating upon real circumstances. The sentiment is in both places preceded by the contemplation of imminent personal danger. To the Philippians he writes

* Αλλ' ει και σπενδομαι επι τη θυσια της πιστεως υμων, if my blood be poured out as a libation upon the sacrifice of your faith.

in the twentieth verse of this chapter, "According to "my earnest expectation and my hope, that in nothing I "shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, "*so now also*, Christ shall be magnified in my body, "whether it be by life or death." To the Corinthians, "Troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, "but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast "down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the "body the dying of the Lord Jesus." This train of reflection is continued to the place from whence the words which we compare are taken. The two epistles, though written at different times, from different places, and to different churches, were both written under circumstances which would naturally recal to the author's mind the precarious condition of his life, and the perils which constantly awaited him. When the Epistle to the Philippians was written, the author was a prisoner at home, expecting his trial. When the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written, he had lately escaped a danger in which he had given himself over for lost. The epistle opens with a recollection of this subject, and the impression accompanied the writer's thoughts throughout.

I know that nothing is easier than to transplant into a forged epistle a sentiment or expression which is found in a true one; or supposing both epistles to be forged by the same hand, to insert the same sentiment or expression in both. But the difficulty is to introduce it in just and close connection with a train of thought going before, and with a train of thought apparently generated by the circumstances under which the epistle is written. In two epistles purporting to be written on different occasions, and in different periods of the author's history, this propriety would not easily be managed.

No. VII.

Chap. i. 29. 30; ii. 1, 2. "For unto you is given in "the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but al- "so to suffer for his sake, having the same conflict which

"ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me. If there be, "therefore, any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of "love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and "mercies: fulfil ye my joy; that ye be like minded, "having the same love, being of one accord, of one "mind."

With this compare Acts xvi. 22: "And the multitude "(at Philippi) rose up against them (Paul and Silas); "and the magistrates rent off their clothes, and com-"manded to beat them; and when they had laid many "stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging "the jailer to keep them safely; who, having received "such a charge, thrust them into the inner prison, and "made their feet fast in the stocks."

The passage in the epistle is very remarkable. I know not an example in any writing of a juster pathos, or which more truly represents the workings of a warm and affectionate mind, than what is exhibited in the quotation before us.* The apostle reminds his Philippians of their being joined with himself in the endurance of persecution for the sake of Christ. He conjures them by the ties of their common profession and their common sufferings, to "fulfil his joy;" to complete, by the unity of their faith, and by their mutual love, that joy with which the instances he had received of their zeal and attachment had inspired his breast. Now if this was the real effusion of St. Paul's mind, of which it bears the strongest internal character, then we have in the words "the "same conflict which ye saw in me," an authentic confirmation of so much of the apostle's history in the Acts, as relates to his transactions at Philippi; and through that of the intelligence and general fidelity of the historian.

* The original is very spirited Ει τις εν παρακλησις εν Χριστω, ει τι παραμυθιον αγαπης, ει τις κοινωνια πνευματος, ει τινα σπλαγχνα και οικτιρμοι, πληρωσατε μου την χαραν.

CHAP. VIII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

No. I.

THERE is a circumstance of conformity between St. Paul's history and his letters, especially those which were written during his first imprisonment at Rome, and more especially the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, which, being too close to be accounted for from accident, yet too indirect and latent to be imputed to design, cannot easily be resolved into any other original than truth. Which circumstance is this, that St. Paul in these epistles attributes his imprisonment not to his preaching of Christianity, but to his asserting the right of the Gentiles to be admitted into it without conforming themselves to the Jewish law. This was the doctrine to which he considered himself as a martyr. Thus, in the epistle before us, chap. i. 24. (I Paul) "who "now rejoice in my sufferings for you"—"*for you*," i. e. for those whom he had never seen; for a few verses afterwards he adds, "I would that ye knew what great con- "flict I have for you, and for them in Laodicea, "and for as many as have not seen my face in "the flesh." His suffering therefore for *them* was, in their general capacity of Gentile Christians, agreeably to what he explicitly declares in his Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 1. "For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner "of Jesus Christ, *for you Gentiles*." Again in the epistle now under consideration, iv. 3. "Withal praying also "for us, that God would open unto us a door of utter- "ance to speak the *mystery* of Christ, for which I am also "in bonds." What that "mystery of Christ" was, the Epistle to the Ephesians distinctly informs us; "whereby

" when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the
" *mystery of Christ*, which, in other ages, was not made
" known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto
" his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit *that the Gen-*
" *tiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partak-*
" *ers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.*" This, therefore was the *confession* for which he declares himself to be in bonds. Now let us enquire how the occasion of St. Paul's imprisonment is represented in the history. The apostle had not long returned to Jerusalem from his second visit into Greece, when an uproar was excited in that city by the clamour of certain Asiatic Jews, who, " having seen
" Paul in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid
" hands on him." The charge advanced against him was, that " he taught all men every where against the
" people and the law, and this place; and further brought
" Greeks also into the temple, and polluted that holy
" place." The former part of the charge seems to point at the doctrine, which he maintained, of the admission of the Gentiles, under the new dispensation, to an indiscriminate participation of God's favour with the Jews. But what follows makes the matter clear. When, by the interference of the chief captain, Paul had been rescued out of the hands of the populace, and was permitted to address the multitude who had followed him to the stairs of the castle, he delivered a brief account of his birth, of the early course of his life, of his miraculous conversion; and is proceeding in his narative, until he comes to describe a vision which was presented to him, as he was praying in the temple; and which bid him depart out of Jerusalem, " for I will send thee far hence
" *unto the Gentiles.*" Acts xxii. 21. " They gave him au-
" dience," says the historian, " *unto this word*; and then
" lift up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow
" from the earth!" Nothing can show more strongly than this account does, what was the offence which drew down upon St. Paul the vengeance of his countrymen.

His mission, to the Gentiles, and his open avowel of that mission, was the intolerable part of the apostle's crime. But although the real motive of the prosecution appears to have been the apostle's conduct towards the Gentiles; yet, when his accusers came before a Roman magistrate, a charge was to be framed of a more legal form. The profanation of the temple was the article they chose to rely upon. This, therefore, became the immediate subject of Tertullus's oration before Felix, and of Paul's defence. But that he all along considered his ministry amongst the Gentiles as the actual source of the enmity that had been exercised against him, and in particular as the cause of the insurrection in which his person had been seized, is apparent from the conclusion of his discourse before Agrippa. "I have appeared unto thee," says he, describing what passed upon his journey to Damascus, "for this pur-
"pose, to make thee a minister and a witness, both of
"these things which thou hast seen, and of those things
"in the which I will appear unto thee, delivering thee
"from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom now
"I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from
"darkness to light, and from the power of satan unto God,
"that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance
"among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.
"Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto
"the heavenly vision; but shewed first unto them of Da-
"mascus, and of Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts
"of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should re-
"pent and turn to God, and do works meet for repent-
"ance. *For these causes* the Jews caught me in the tem-
"ple, and went about to kill me." The seizing, therefore, of St. Paul's person, from which he was never discharged till his final liberation at Rome; and of which, therefore, his imprisonment at Rome was the continuation and effect, was not in consequence of any general persecution set on foot against Christianity; nor did it befal him simply, as professing or teaching Christ's religion, which

James and the elders at Jerusalem did as well as he (and yet for any thing that appears remained at that time unmolested); but it was distinctly and specifically brought upon him by his activity in preaching to the Gentiles, and by his boldly placing them upon a level with the once favoured and still self flattered posterity of Abraham. How well St. Paul's letters, purporting to be written during this imprisonment, agree with this account of its cause and origin, we have already seen.

No. II.

Chap. iv. 10. "Aristarchus my fellow prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas, touching whom ye received commandments. If he come unto you, receive him, and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision."

We find Aristarcus as a companion of our apostle in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts and twenty ninth verse, "And the whole city of Ephesus was filled with confusion; and having caught Gaius and *Aristarchus*, men of Macedonia, *Paul's companions in travel*, they rushed with one accord into the theatre." And we find him upon his journey with St. Paul at Rome, in the twenty seventh chapter, and the second verse. "And when it was determined that we should sail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners unto one named Julius, a centurion of Augustus's band; and, entering into a ship of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to sail by the coast of Asia; one *Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us.*" But might not the author of the epistle have consulted the history; and, observing that the historian had brought Aristarchus along with Paul to Rome, might he not for that reason, and without any other foundation, have put down his name amongst the salutations of an epistle, purporting to be written by the apostle from that place? I allow so much of possibility to this objection, that I should not have pro-

posed this in the number of coincidences clearly undesigned, had Aristarchus stood alone. The observetion that strikes me in reading the passage is, that together with Aristarchus, whose journey to Rome we trace in the history, are joined Marcus and Justus, of whose coming to Rome the history says nothing. Aristarchus alone appears in the history, and Aristarchus alone would have appeared in the epistle, if the author had regulated himself by that conformity. Or if you take it the other way; if you suppose the history to have been made out of the epistle, why the journey of Aristarcus to Rome should be recorded, and not that of Marcus and Justus, if the groundwork of the narrative was the appearance of Aristarchus's name in the epistle, seems to be unaccountable.

"Marcus, *sistsr's son* to Barnabas." Does not this hint account for Barnabas's adherence to Mark in the contest that arose with our apostle concerning him? "And some "days after Paul said unto Barnabas, let us go again and "visit our brethren in every city where we have preached "the word of the Lord, and see how they do; and *Bar-* "*nabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was* "*Mark;* but Paul thought not good to take him with "them, who departed from Pamphylia, and went not with "them to the work; and the contention was so sharp be- "tween them, that they departed asunder one from the "other; and so Barnabas took Mark and sailed unto Cy- "prus." The history which records the dispute has not preserved the circumstance of Mark's relationship to Barnabas. It is no where noticed but in the text before us. As far, therefore, as it applies, the application is certainly undesigned.

"*Sister's* son to Barnabas." This women, the mother of Mark, and the sister of Barnabas, was, as might be expected, a person of some eminence amongst the Christians of Jerusalem. It so happens that we hear of her in the history. "When Peter was delivered from prison he

" came to the house of *Mary the mother of John, whose sur-*
" *name was Mark*, where many were gathered together
" praying." Acts xii. 12. There is somewhat of coincidence in this; somewhat bespeaking real transactions amongst real persons.

No. III.

The following coincidence, though it bear the appearance of great nicety and refinement, ought not, perhaps, to be deemed imaginary. In the salutations with which this, like most of St. Paul's epistles, concludes, we have " Aristarchus and Marcus, and Jesus, which is called Jus-
" tus, *who are of the circumcision*," iv. 10, 11. Then follow also, " Epaphras, Luke the beloved physician, and " Demas." Now as this description, " who are of the " circumcision," is added after the three first names, it is inferred, not without great appearance of probability, that the rest, amongst whom is Luke, were not of the circumcision. Now can we discover any expression in the Acts of the apostles, which ascertains whether the author of the book was a Jew or not? If we can discover that he was not a Jew, we fix a circumstance in his character, which coincides with what is here, indirectly indeed, but not very uncertainly, intimated concereing Luke; and we so far confirm both the testimony of the primitive church, that the Acts of the Apostles was written by St. Luke, and the general reality of the persons and circumstances brought together in this epistle. The text in the Acts, which has been construed to shew that the writer was not a Jew, is the nineteenth verse of the first chapter, where, in describing the field which had been purchased with the reward of Judas' iniquity, it is said, " that it was known unto all the " dwellers at Jerusalem " insomuch as that field is called " in *their* proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, the " field of blood." These words are by most commentators taken to be the words and observation of the historian, and not a part of St. Peter's speech, in the midst of which

they are found. If this be admitted, then it is argued that the expression, "in *their* proper tongue," would not have been used by a Jew, but is suitable to the pen of a Gentile writing concerning Jews.* The reader will judge of the probability of this conclusion, and we urge the coincidence no further than that probability extends. The coincidence, if it be one, is so remote from all possibility of design, that nothing need be added to satisfy the reader upon that part of the argument.

No. IV.

Chap. iv. 9. "With Onesimus, a faithful and beloved "brother, *who is one of you.*"

Observe how it may be made out that Onesimus was a Colossian. Turn to the Epistle to Philemon, and you will find that Onesimus was the servant or slave of Philemon. The question therefore will be to what city Philemon belonged. In the epistle addressed to him this is not declared. It appears only that he was of the same place, whatever that place was, with an eminent Christian named Archippus. "Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and "Timothy our brother, unto Philemon our dearly be-"loved and fellow laborer; and to our beloved Ap-"phia, and *Archippus* our fellow soldier, and to the "church in the house." Now turn back to the Epistle to the Colossians, and you will find Archippus saluted by name amongst the Christians of that church. "Say to "Archippus, take heed to the ministry which thou hast "received in the Lord that thou fulfil it," (iv. 17). The necessary result is, that Onesimus also was of the same city, agreeably to what is said of him, "he is one of you." And this result is the effect, either of truth which produces consistency without the writer's thought or care, or of a contexture of forgeries confirming and falling in with one onother by a species of fortuity of which I know no

* Vide Benson's Dissertation, vol. i. p. 318, of his works, ed. 1756.

example. The supposition of design, I think, is excluded, not only because the purpose to which the design must have been directed, viz. the verification of the passage in our epistle, in which it is said concerning Onesimus, "he "is one of you," is a purpose which would be lost upon ninety nine readers out of a hundred; but because the means made use of are too circuitous to have been the subject of affectation and contrivance. Would a forger, who had this purpose in view, have left his readers to hunt it out, by going forward and backward from one epistle to another, in order to connect Onesimus with Philemon, Philemon with Archippus, and Archippus with Colosse? all-which he must do before he arrives at his discovery, that it was truly said of Onesimus, "he is one of you."

CHAP. IX.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

No. I.

IT is known to every reader of Scripture, that the First Epistle to the Thessalonians speaks of the coming of Christ in terms which indicate an expectation of his speedy appearance. "For this we say unto you by the "word of the Lord, that *we* which are alive and remain "unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them "which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend "from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archan-"gel, and with the trump of God and the dead in Christ "shall rise first; then *we which are alive and remain*, shall "be caught up together with them in the clouds—But ye "brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should over-"take you as a thief," (chap. iv. 15 16, 17. chap. v. 4.)

Whatever other construction these texts may *bear*, the idea they leave upon the mind of an ordinary reader, is that of the author of the epistle looking for the day of judgment to take place in his own time, or near to it. Now the use which I make of this circumstance, is to deduce from it a proof that the epistle itself was not the production of a subsequent age. Would an impostor have given this expectation to St. Paul, after experience had proved it to be erroneous? or would he have put into the apostle's mouth, or, which is the same thing, into writings purporting to come from his hand, expressions, if not necessarily conveying, at least easily interpreted to convey, an opinion which was then known to be founded in mistake? I state this as an argument to shew that the epistle was contempo-

rary with St. Paul, which is little less than to shew that it actually proceeded from his pen. For I question whether any ancient forgeries were executed in the lifetime of the person whose name they bear; nor was the primitive situation of the church likely to give birth to such on attempt.

No. II.

Our epistle concludes with a direction, that it should be publickly read in the church to which it was addresssed. "I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read un- "to all the holy brethren." The existence of this clause in the body of the epistle is an evidence of its authenticity; because to produce a letter purporting to have been publicly read in the church of Thessalonica when no such letter in truth had been read or heard of in that church, would be to produce an imposture destructive of itself. At least it seems unlikely that the author of an imposture would voluntarily, and even officiously, afford a handle to so plain an objection. Either the epistle was publicly read in the church of Thessalonica during St. Paul's lifetime, or it was not. If it was, no publication could be more authentic, no species of notoriety more unquestionable, no method of preserving the integrity of the copy more secure. If it was not, the clause we produce would remain a standing condemnation of the forgery, and one would suppose, an invincible impediment to its success.

If we connect this article with the preceding, we shall perceive that they combine into one strong proof of the genuineness of the epistle. The preceding article carries up the date of the epistle to the time of St. Paul; the present article fixes the publication of it to the church of Thessalonica. Either therefore the church of Thessalonica was imposed upon by a false epistle, which in St. Paul's lifetime they received and read publicly as his, carrying on a communication with him all the while, and the epistle referring to the continuance of that communication; or

other Christian churches in the same lifetime of the apostle, received an epistle purporting to have been publicly read in the church of Thessalonica, which nevertheless had not been heard of in that church; or lastly, the conclusion remains, that the epistle now in our hands is genuine.

No. III.

Between our epistle and the history the accordancy in many points is circumstantial and complete. The history relates, that after Paul and Silas had been beaten with many stripes at Philippi, shut up in the inner prison, and their feet made fast in the stocks, as soon as they were discharged from their confinement they departed from thence, and, when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apolonia, came to Thessalonica, where Paul opened and alleged that Jesus was the Christ, Acts xvi. 23, &c. The epistle written in the name of Paul and Sylvanus (Silas), and of Timotheus, who also appears to have been along with them at Philippi, (vide Phil. No. iv.) speaks to the church of Thessalonica thus. "Even after that we "had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as "ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak "unto you the gospel of God with much contention," (ii. 21).

The history relates, that after they had been some time at Thessalonica, "the Jews who believed not set all the "city in an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason where "Paul and Silas were, and sought to bring them out to "the people." Acts xvii. 5. The epistle declares, "when "we were with you, we told you before that we should "suffer tribulation; even *as it came to pass, and ye know,*" (iii. 4.)

The history brings Paul and Silas and Timothy together at Corinth, soon after the preaching of the gospel at Thessalonica. "And when Silas and Timotheus were "come from Macedonia (to Corinth), Paul was pressed in

"spirit." Acts xviii. 5. The epistle is written in the name of these three persons, who consequently must have been together at the time, and speaks throughout of their ministy at Thessalonica as a recent transaction. "We "brethren, *being taken from you for a short time*, in presence "not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see "your face, with great desire." (ii. 17).

The harmony is indubitable; but the points of history in which it consists, are so expressly set forth in the narrative, and so directly referred to in the epistle, that it becomes necessary for us to shew, that the facts in one writing were not copied from the other. Now amidst some minute discrepancies, which will be noticed below, there is one circumstance which mixes itself with all the allusions in the epistle, but does not appear in the history any where; and that is of a visit which St. Paul had intended to pay to the Thessalonians during the time of his residing at Corinth. Wherefore we would "have come unto you (even I Paul) once and again, but "Satan hindered us." (ii. 1.) "Night and day praying "exceedingly that we might see your face, and might per-"fect that which is lacking in your faith. Now God him-"self and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct "our way unto you," (iii. 10, 11). Concerning a design which was not executed, although the person himself who was conscious of his own purpose, should make mention in his letters, nothing is more probable than that his historian should be silent, if not ignorant. The author of the epistle could not however have learnt this circumstance from the history, for it is not there to be met with; nor, if the historian had drawn his materials from the epistle, is it likely that he would have passed over a circumstance, which is amongst the most obvious and prominent of the facts to be collected from that source of information.

No. IV.

Chap. iii. 1—7. "Wherefore when we could no long-
"er forbear, we thought it good *to be left at Athens alone*,
"and sent Timotheus, our brother and minister of God, to
"establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith;
"but now when Timotheus came from you unto us, and
"brought us good tidings of your faith and charity, we
"were comforted over you in all our affliction and dis-
"tress by your faith."

The history relates, that when Paul came out of Macedonia to Athens, Silas and Timothy staid behind at Berea. "The brethren sent away Paul to go as it were to "the sea; but Silas and Timotheus abode there still; and "they that conducted Paul brought him to Athens." Acts, ch. xvii. 14, 15. The history further relates, that after Paul had tarried some time at Athens, and had proceeded from thence to Corinth, whilst he was exercising his ministry in that city, Silas and Timothy came to him from Macedonia, Acts, chap. xviii. 5. But to reconcile the history with the clause in the epistle which makes St. Paul say, "I thought it good to be left at Athens alone, and "to send Timothy unto you," it is necessary to suppose that Timothy had come up with St. Paul at Athens; a circumstance which the history does not mention. I remark therefore, that, although the history do not expressly notice this arrival, yet it contains intimations which render it extremely probable that the fact took place. First, as soon as Paul had reached Athens, he sent a message back to Silas and Timothy "for to come to him with all speed." Acts, chap. xvii. 15. Secondly, his stay at Athens was on purpose that they might join him there. "Now whilst "Paul *waited for them at Athens*, his spirit was stirred in "him." Acts, chap. xvii. 16. Thirdly, his departure from Athens does not appear to have been in any sort hastened or abrupt. It is said, "after these things," viz.

his disputation with the Jews, his conferences with the philosophers, his discourse at Areopagus, and the gaining of some converts, "he departed from Athens and came "to Corinth." It is not hinted that he quitted Athens before the time that he had intended to leave it; it is not suggested that he was driven from thence, as he was from many cities, by tumults or persecutions, or because his life was no longer safe. Observe then the particulars which the history *does* notice; that Paul had ordered Timothy to follow him without delay; that he waited at Athens on purpose that Timothy might come up with him; that he staid there as long as his own choice led him to continue. Laying these circumstances which the history does disclose together, it is highly probable that Timothy came to the apostle at Athens, a fact which the epistle, we have seen, virtually asserts when it makes Paul send Timothy back from Athens to Thessalonica. The *sending back of Timothy into Macedonia* accounts also for his not not coming to Corinth till after Paul had been fixed in that city for some considerable time. Paul had found out Aquila and Priscilla, abode with them and wrought, being of the same craft; and reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath day, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks, Acts, chap. xviii. 1—5. All this passed at Corinth before Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Acts, chap. xviii. 5. If this was the first time of their coming up with him after their separation at Berea, there is nothing to account for a delay so contrary to what appears from the history itself to have been St. Paul's plan and expectation. This is a conformity of a peculiar species. The epistle discloses a fact which is not preserved in the history; but which makes what is said in the history more significant, probable, and consistent. The history bears marks of an omission; the epistle by reference furnishes a circumstance which supplies that omission.

No. V.

Chap. ii. 14. "For ye, brethren, became followers of "the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus; "for ye also have suffered like things *of your own country-* "*men*, even as they have of the Jews."

To a reader of the Acts of the Apostles, it might seem at first sight, that the persecutions which the preachers and converts of Christianity underwent, were suffered at the hand of their old adversaries the Jews. But, if we attend carefully to the accounts there delivered, we shall observe that, though the opposition made to the gospel usually *originated* from the enmity of the Jews, yet in almost all places the Jews went about to accomplish their purpose, by stirring up the Gentile inhabitants against their converted countrymen. Out of Judea they had not power to do much mischief in any other way. This was the case at Thessalonica in particular. "The Jews which believ- "ed not, moved with envy, set all the city in an uproar." Acts, ch. xvii. 5. It was the same a short time afterwards at Berea. "When the Jews of Thessalonica had "knowledge that the word of God was preached of Paul "at Berea, they came thither also, and stirred up the peo- "ple." Acts, ch. xvii. 13. And before this our apostle had met with a like species of persecution, in his progress through the Lesser Asia; "in every city the unbelieving "Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil "affected against the brethren." Acts, ch. xiv. 2. The epistle therefore represents the case accurately as the history states it. It was the Jews always who set on foot the persecutions against the apostles and their followers. He speaks truly therefore of them when he says in this epistle, "they both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, "and have *persecuted us*; forbidding us to speak unto the "Gentiles. (ii. 15, 16). But out of Judea it was at the hands of the Gentiles, it was "of their own countrymen,"

that the injuries they underwent were immediately sustained. "Ye have suffered like things of your own countrymen, "even as they have of the Jews."

No. VI.

The apparent discrepancies between our epistle and the history, though of magnitude sufficient to repel the imputation of confederacy or transcription (in which view they form a part of our argument), are neither numerous, nor very difficult to reconcile.

One of these may be observed in the ninth and tenth verses of the second chapter. "For ye remember, breth-"ren, our labor and travel; for laboring night and day "because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we "preached unto you the gospel of God. Ye are witnes-"ses, and God also, how holily, and justly, and unblame-"ably we behaved ourselves among you that believe." A person who reads this passage is naturally led by it to suppose, that the writer had dwelt at Thessalonica for some considerable time; yet of St. Paul's ministry in that city, the history gives no other account than the following; "that he came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue "of the Jews; that, as his manner was, he went in unto "them, and *three sabbath days* reasoned with them out of "the Scriptures; that some of them believed and consort-"ed with Paul and Silas." The history then proceeds to tell us, that the Jews which believed not set the city in an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, where Paul and his companions lodged; that the consequence of this outrage was, that "the brethren immediately sent away "Paul and Silas by night unto Berea." Acts, ch. xvii. 1—10. From the mention of his preaching three sabbath days in the Jewish synagogue, and from the want of any further specification of his ministry, it has usually been taken for granted that Paul did not continue at Thessalonica more than three weeks. This, however, is inferred without necessity. It appears to have been St. Paul's practice,

in almost every place that he came to, upon his first arrival to repair to the synagogue. He thought himself bound to propose the gospel to the Jews *first*, agreeably to what he declared at Antioch in Pisidia; "it was necessary "that the word of God should first have been spoken to "you." Acts, ch. xiii. 46. If the Jews rejected his ministry, he quitted the synagogue, and betook himself to a Gentile audience. At Corinth, upon his first coming thither, he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath; "but "when the Jews opposed themselves, and blasphemed, "he departed thence," expressly telling them, "from "henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles; and he remain-"ed in that city a year and six months." Acts, ch. xviii. 6—11. At Ephesus, in like manner, for the space of three months he went into the synagogue; but "when di-"vers were hardened and believed not, but spake evil of "that way, he departed from them and separated the dis-"ciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus; "and this continued by the space of two years." Acts, ch. xix. 9, 10. Upon inspecting the history, I see nothing in it which negatives the supposition, that St. Paul pursued the same plan at Thessalonica which he adopted in other places; and that, though he resorted to the synagogue only three sabbath days, yet he remained in the city and in the exercise of his ministry amongst the Gentile citizens, much longer; and until the success of his preaching had provoked the Jews to excite the tumult and insurrection by which he was driven away.

Another seeming discrepancy is found in the ninth verse of the first chapter of the epistle. For they themselves show of us "what manner of entering in we had unto you, "and how *ye turned to God from idols* to serve the living "and true God." This text contains an assertion, that, by means of St. Paul's ministry at Thessalonica, many idolatrous Gentiles had been brought over to Christianity. Yet the history, in describing the effects of that ministry, only says, that "some of the Jews believed, and of the de-

"vout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women "not a few." (ch. xvii. 4.) The devout Greeks were those who already worshipped the one true God; and therefore could not be said, by embracing Christianity, "to be turned to God from idols."

This is the difficulty. The answer may be assisted by the following observations. The Alexandrian and Cambridge manuscripts read (for των σεβομενων ελληνων πολυ πληθος) των σεβομενων και ελληνων πολυ πληθος. In which reading they are also confirmed by the Vulgate Latin. And this reading is, in my opinion, strongly supported by the considerations, first, that οι σεβομενοι alone, i. e. without ελληνες, is used in this sense in this same chapter—Paul being come to Athens διελεγετο εν τη συναγωγη τοις Ιουδαιοις και τοις σεβομενοις; secondly, that σεβομενοι and ελληνες no where come together. The expression is redundant. The οι σεβομενοι must be ελληνες. Thirdly, that the και is much more likely to have been left out incuriâ manûs than to have been put in. Or, after all, if we be not allowed to change the present reading, which is undoubtedly retained by a great plurality of copies, may not the passage in the history be considered as describing only the effects of St. Paul's discourses during the three sabbath days in which he preached in the synagogue? and may it not be true, as we have remarked above, that his application to the Gentiles at large, and his success amongst them, was posterior to this?

CHAP. X.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

No. I.

IT may seem odd to allege obscurity itself as an argument, or to draw a proof in favor of a writing, from that which is usually considered as the principal defect in its composition. The present epistle, however, furnishes a passage, hitherto unexplained, and probably inexplicable by us, the existence of which, under the darkness and difficulties that attend it, can only be accounted for upon the supposition of the epistle being genuine; and upon that supposition is accounted for with great ease. The passage which I allude to is in the second chapter. "That day "shall not come, except there come a falling away first, "and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is cal- "led God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sit- "teth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is "God. Remember ye not that WHEN I WAS YET WITH "YOU I TOLD YOU THESE THINGS? *And now ye know* "*what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time;* for "the mystery of iniquity doth already work, *only he that* "*now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way;* and "then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall "consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy "with the brightness of his coming." It were superfluous to prove, because it is in vain to deny, that this passage is involved in great obscurity, more especially the clauses distinguished by Italics. Now the observation I have to offer is founded upon this, that the passage expressly refers to a conversation which the author had previously holden with the Thessalonians upon the same subject.

" Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you *I told* " *you these things? And now ye know* what withholdeth." If such conversation actually passed; if, whilst he was yet with them, " he *told* them those things," then it follows that the epistle is authentic. And of the reality of this conversation it appears to be a proof, that what it said in the epistle might be understood by those who had been present to such conversation, and yet be incapable of being explained by any other. No man writes unintelligibly on purpose. But it may easily happen, that a part of a letter which relates to a subject, upon which the parties had conversed together before, which refers to what had been before *said*, which is in truth a portion or continuation of a former discourse, may be utterly without meaning to a stranger, who should pick up the letter upon the road, and yet be perfectly clear to the person to who m it is directed, and with whom the previous communication had passed. And if, in a letter which thus accidentally fell into my hands, I found a passage expressly referring to a former conversation, and difficult to be explained without knowing that conversation, I should consider this very difficulty as a proof that the conversation had actually passed, and consequently that the letter contained the real correspondence of real persons.

No. II.

Chap. iii. 8. " Neither did we eat any man's bread " for nought, but wrought with labor night and day, that " we might not be chargeable to any of you; not because " we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample " unto you to follow."

In a letter, purporting to have been written to another of the Macedonic churches, we find the following declaration.

" Now ye, Philippians, know also that in the begin- " ning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, *no*

"*church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiv-*
"*ing, but ye only.*"

The conformity between these two passages is strong and plain. They confine the transaction to the same period. The epistle to the Philippians refers to what passed "in the beginning of the gospel," that is to say, during the first preaching of the gospel on that side of the Ægean sea. The epistle to the Thessalonians speaks of the apostle's conduct in that city upon "his first entrance in unto them," which the history informs us was in the course of his first visit to the peninsula of Greece.

As St. Paul tells the Philippians, "that no church com-
"municated with him, as concerning giving and receiv-
"ing, but they only," he could not consistently with the truth of this declaration, have received any thing from the neighbouring church of Thessalonica. What thus appears by general implication in an epistle to another church, when he writes to the Thessalonians themselves, is noticed expressly and particularly; "neither did we eat any man's
"bread for nought, but wrought night and day, that we
"might not be chargeable to any of you."

The texts here cited further also exhibit a mark of conformity with what St. Paul is made to say of himself in the Acts of the Apostles. The apostle not only reminds the Thessalonians that he had not been chargeable to any of them, but he states likewise the motive which dictated this reserve; "not because we have not power, but to
"make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us."
(ch. iii. 9.) This conduct and, what is much more precise, the end which he had in view by it, was the very same as that which the history attributes to St. Paul in a discourse, which it represents him to have addressed to the elders of the church of Ephesus. "Yea, ye yourselves
"also know that these hands have ministered unto my ne-
"cessities, and to them that were with me. I have *show-*
"*ed* you all things, how *that so labouring ye ought to support*
"*the weak.*" Acts, ch. xx. 34. The sentiment in the

epistle and in the speech is in both parts of it so much alike, and yet the words which convey it show so little of imitation or even of resemblance, that the agreement cannot well be explained without supposing the speech and the letter to have really proceeded from the same person.

No. III.

Our reader remembers the passage in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, in which St. Paul spoke of the coming of Christ. "This we say unto you by the word of "the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the "coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are "asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, "and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which "are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with "them in the clouds, and so shall we be ever with the "Lord. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that "day should overtake you as a thief." 1 Thess. iv. 15—17, and ch. v. 4. It should seem that the Thessalonians, or some however amongst them, had from this passage conceived an opinion (and that not very unnaturally) that the coming of Christ was to take place instantly, ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν;* and that this persuasion had produced, as it well might, much agitation in the church. The apostle therefore now writes, amongst other purposes, to quiet this alarm, and to rectify the misconstruction that had been put upon his words. "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our "gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken "in mind, or be troubled neither by spirit, nor by word, *nor* "*by letter as from us*, as that the day of Christ is at hand." If the allusion which we contend for be admitted, namely, if it be admitted, that the passage in the second epistle re-

* Ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν, nemque hoc anno, says Grotius, ἐνέστηκεν hic dicitur de re præsenti, ut Rom. viii. 38. 1 Cor. iii. 22. Gal. i. 4. Heb. ix. 9.

lates to the passage in the first, it amounts to a considerable proof of the genuineness of both epistles. I have no conception, because I know no example, of such a device in a forgery, as first to frame an ambiguous passage in a letter, then to represent the persons to whom the letter is addressed as mistaking the meaning of the passage, and lastly, to write a second letter in order to correct this mistake.

I have said that this argument arises out of the text, *if* the allusion be admitted; for I am not ignorant that many expositors understand the passage in the second epistle as referring to some forged letters, which had been produced in St. Paul's name, and in which the apostle had been made to say that the coming of Christ was then at hand. In defence, however, of the explanation which we propose, the reader is desired to observe,

1. The strong fact, that there exists a passage in the first epistle, to which that in the second is capable of being referred, i. e. which accounts for the error the writer is solicitous to remove. Had no other epistle than the second been extant, and had it under these circumstances come to be considered, whether the text before us related to a forged epistle or to some misconstruction of a true one, many conjectures and many probabilities might have been admitted in the inquiry, which can have little weight when an epistle is produced, containing the very sort of passage we were seeking, that is, a passage liable to the misinterpretation which the apostle protests against.

2. That the clause which introduces the passage in the second epistle bears a particular affinity to what is found in the passage cited from the first epistle. The clause is this. "We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our "Lord Jesus Christ, and *by our gathering together unto him.*" Now in the first epistle the description of the coming of Christ is accompanied with the mention of this very circumstance of his saints "being collected round him." "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a

"shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump "of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we "which are alive and remain shall be caught up togeth- "er with them in the clouds, *to meet the Lord* in the air." 1 Thess. chap. iv. 16, 17. This I suppose to be the "gath- "ering together unto him" intended in the second epistle; and that the author, when he used these words, retained in his thoughts what he had written on the subject before.

3. The second epistle is written in the joint name of Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus, and it cautions the Thessalonians against being misled "by letter as from us (ὡς δι' ἡμων). Do not these words 'δι' ἡμων,' appropriate the reference to some writing which bore the name of these three teachers? Now this circumstance, which is a very close one, belongs to the epistle at present in our hands; for the epistle which we call the First Epistle to the Thessalonians contains these names in its superscription.

4. The words in the original, as far as they are material to be stated, are these; εις το μη ταχεως σαλευθηναι υμας απο τυ νοος, μητε θροεισθαι, μητε δια πνευματος, μητε δια λογυ, μητε δι' επιστολης, ὡς δι' ἡμων, ὡς ὁτι ενεστηκεν ἡ ἡμερα τυ Χριστυ. Under the weight of the preceding observations may not the words μητε δια λογυ, μητε δι' επιστολης, ὡς δι' ἡμων, be construed to signify *quasi nos quid tale aut dixerimus aut scripserimus*,* intimating that their words had been mistaken, and that they had in truth said or written no such thing.

* Should a contrary interpretation be preferred, I do not think that it implies the conclusion that a false epistle had then been published in the apostle's name. It will completely satisfy the allusion in the text to allow, that some one or other at Thessalonica had pretended to have been told by St. Paul and his companions, or to have seen a letter from them, in which they had said, that the day of Christ was at hand. In like manner as Acts xv. 1, 24. it is recorded that some had pretended to have received instructions from the church at Jerusalem, which had not been received "to whom they gave no such com- "mandment." And thus Dr. Benson interpreted the passage μητε θροεισθαι, μητε δια πνευματος, μητε δια λογυ, μητε δι' επιστολης, ὡς δι' ἡμων "nor be dismayed by any revelation, or discourse, or epis- "tle, which any one shall pretend to have heard or received from us."

CHAP. XI.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

FROM the third verse of the first chapter, "as "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went in- "to Macedonia," it is evident that this Epistle was written soon after St. Paul had gone to Macedonia from Ephesus. Dr. Benson fixes its date to the time of St. Paul's journey, recorded in the beginning of the twentieth chapter of the Acts. "And after the uproar (excited by De- "metrius at Ephesus) was ceased, Paul called unto him "the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to "go into Macedonia." And in this opinion Dr. Benson is followed by Michaelis, as he was preceded by the greater part of the commentators who have considered the question. There is, however, one objection to the hypothesis, which these learned men appear to me to have overlooked; and it is no other than this, that the superscription of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians seems to prove, that at the time St. Paul is supposed by them to have written this Epistle to Timothy, Timothy in truth was with St. Paul in Macedonia. Paul, as it is related in the Acts, left Ephesus "for to go into Macedonia." When he had got into Macedonia he wrote his second Epistle to the Corinthians. Concerning this point there exists little variety of opinion. It is plainly indicated by the contents of the epistle. It is also strongly implied that the epistle was written *soon* after the apostle's arrival in Macedonia; for he begins his letter by a train of reflection, referring to his persecutions in Asia as to recent transactions, as to dangers from which he had lately been delivered. But in the salutation with which the epistle opens *Timothy is joined with St. Paul*, and consequently could not at that time be "left behind at Ephesus." And as to the only solu-

tion of the difficulty which can be thought of, viz. that Timothy, though he was left behind at Ephesus upon St. Paul's departure from Asia, yet might follow him so soon after, as to come up with the apostle in Macedonia, before he wrote his epistle to the Corinthians; that supposition is inconsistent with the terms and tenor of the epistle throughout. For the writer speaks uniformly of his intention to return to Timothy at Ephesus, and not of his expecting Timothy to come to him in Macedonia. "These things write I unto thee *hoping to come unto thee* "*shortly*; but if I tarry long that thou mayest know how "thou oughtest to behave thyself," (chap. iii. 14, 15). "*Till I come* give attendence to reading, to exhortation, to "doctrine," (chap. iv. 13).

Since, therefore, the leaving of Timothy behind at Ephesus, when Paul went into Macedonia, suits not with any journey into Macedonia recorded in the Acts, I concur with Bishop Pearson in placing the date of this epistle, and the journey referred to in it, at a period subsequent to St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, and consequently subsequent to the era, up to which the Acts of the Apostles brings his history. The only difficulty which attends our opinion is, that St. Paul must, according to us, have come to Ephesus after his liberation at Rome, contrary as it should seem to what he foretold to the Ephesian elders, "that they should see his face no more." And it is to save the infallibility of this prediction, and for no other reason of weight, that an earlier date is assigned to this epistle. The prediction itself however, when considered in connection with the circumstances under which it was delivered, does not seem to demand so much anxiety. The words in question are found in the twenty fifth verse of the twentieth chapter of the Acts. And now behold, "I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preach-"ing the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." In the twenty second and the twenty third verses of the

same chapter, i. e. two verses before, the apostle makes this declaration. "And now behold, I go bound in the "spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that "shall befal me there; save that the Holy Ghost witness-"eth in every city, saying, that bonds and afflictions a-"bide me." This "witnessing of the Holy Ghost" was undoubtedly prophetic and supernatural. But it went no further than to foretel that bonds and afflictions awaited him. And I can very well conceive, that this might be all which was communicated to the apostle by extraordinary revelation, and that the rest was the conclusion of his own mind, the desponding inference which he drew from strong and repeated intimations of approaching danger. And the expression "I know," which St. Paul here uses, does not perhaps, when applied to future events affecting himself, convey an assertion so positive and absolute as we may at first sight apprehend. In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians and the twenty fifth verse, "I know" says he, "that I shall a-"bide and continue with you all for your joy and further-"ance of faith." Notwithstanding this strong declaration, in the second chapter and twenty third verse of this same epistle, and speaking also of the very same event, he is content to use a language of some doubt and uncertainty. "Him therefore I hope to send presently, "so soon *as I shall see how it will go with me*; but *I trust* "in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly." And a few verses preceding these, he not only seems to doubt of his safety, but almost to despair; to contemplate the possibility at least of his condemnation and martyrdom. "Yea and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and "service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all."

No. I.

But can we shew that St. Paul visited Ephesus after his liberation at Rome? or rather, can we collect any

hints from his other letters which make it probable that he did? If we can, then we have a coincidence. If we cannot, we have only an unauthorized supposition, to which the exigency of the case compels us to resort. Now, for this purpose, let us examine the Epistle to the Philippians and the Epistle to Philemon. These two epistles purport to be written whilst St. Paul was yet a prisoner at Rome. To the Philippians he writes as follows. "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly." To Philemon, who was a Colossian, he gives this direction. "But withal, prepare me also a lodging, "for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given "unto you." An inspection of the map will show us that Colosse was a city of the Lesser Asia, lying eastward, and at no great distance from Ephesus. Philippi was on the other, i. e. the western side of the Ægean sea. If the apostle executed his purpose; if, in pursuance of the intention expressed in his letter to Philemon, he came to Colosse soon after he was set at liberty at Rome, it is very improbable that he would omit to visit Ephesus, which lay so near to it, and where he had spent three years of his ministry. As he was also under a promise to the church of Philippi to see them "shortly;" if he passed from Colosse to Philippi, or from Philippi to Colosse, he could hardly avoid taking Ephesus in his way.

No. II.

Chap. v. 9. "Let not a widow be taken into the "number under threescore years old."

This accords with the account delivered in the sixth chapter of the Acts. "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, *'because "their widows were neglected in the daily ministration.'*" It appears that from the first formation of the Christian church, provision was made out of the public funds of the

society for the indigent *widows* who belonged to it. The history, we have seen, distinctly records the existence of such an institution at Jerusalem, a few years after our Lord's ascension; and is led to the mention of it very incidentally, viz. by a dispute, of which it was the occasion, and which produced important consequences to the christian community. The epistle, without being suspected of borrowing from the history, refers, briefly indeed, but decisively, to a similar establishment, subsisting some years afterwards at Ephesus. This agreement indicates that both writings were founded upon real circumstances.

But in this article, the material thing to be noticed is the mode of expression. "Let not a widow be taken into the number." No previous account or explanation is given, to which these words, "into the number," can refer; but the direction comes concisely and unpreparedly. "Let not a widow be taken into the number." Now this is the way in which a man writes, who is conscious that he is writing to persons already acquainted with the subject of his letter; and who, he knows, will readily apprehend and apply what he says by virtue of their being so acquainted; but it is not the way in which a man writes upon any other occasion; and least of all, in which a man would draw up a feigned letter, or introduce a suppositious fact.*

* It is not altogether unconnected with our general purpose to remark, in the passage before us, the selection and reserve which St. Paul recommends to the governors of the church of Ephesus, in the bestowing relief upon the poor, because it refutes a calumny which has been insinuated, that the liberality of the first Christians was an artifice to catch converts: or one of the temptations, however, by which the idle and mendicant were drawn into this society. "Let not a widow be "taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the "wife of one man, well reported of for her good works; if she have "brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed "the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work; but the younger widows refuse." (v. 9, 10, 11). And, in another place, "If any man or woman that be-

No. III.

Chap. iii. 2, 3. "A bishop must be blameless, the "husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, "given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no "striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, but patient, not a "brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own "house."

"*No striker.*" That is the article which I single out from the collection as evincing the antiquity at least, if not the genuineness, of the epistle, because it is an article which no man would have made the subject of caution who lived in an advanced era of the church. It agreed with the infancy of the society, and with no other state of it. After the government of the church had acquired the dignified form which it soon and naturally assumed, this injunction could have no place. Would a person who lived under a hierarchy, such as the Christian hierarchy became when it had settled into a regular establishment, have thought it necessary to prescribe concerning the qualification of a bishop, "that he should be no strik-"er?" And this injunction would be equally alien from the imagination of the writer; whether he wrote in his own character, or personated that of an apostle.

"lieveth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the church "be charged, that it may relieve them that are widows indeed." And to the same effect, or rather more to our present purpose, the apostle writes in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. "Even "when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would "not work, neither let him eat," i. e. at the public expense. "For "we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, "*working not at all*, but are busy bodies; now them that are such, we "command and exhort, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness "they work, and eat their own bread." Could a designing or dissolute poor take advantage of bounty regulated with so much caution, or could the mind which dictated those sober and prudent directions be influenced in his recommendations of public charity by any other than the properest motives of beneficence?

No. IV.

Chap. v. 23. "Drink no longer water, but use a little "wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities."

Imagine an impostor sitting down to forge an epistle in the name of St. Paul. Is it credible that it should come into his head to give such a direction as this; so remote from every thing of doctrine or discipline, every thing of public concern to the religion or the church, or to any sect, order, or party in it, and from every purpose with which such an epistle could be written? It seems to me that nothing but reality, that is, the real valetudinary situation of a real person, could have suggested a thought of so domestic a nature.

But if the peculiarity of the advice be observable, the place in which it stands is more so. The context is this; "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of "other men's sins; keep thyself pure; drink no longer "water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and "thine often infirmities; some men's sins are open before "hand, going before to judgment; and some men they "follow after." The direction to Timothy about his diet stands between two sentences, as wide from the subject as possible. The train of thought seems to be broken to let it in. Now when does this happen? It happens when a man writes as he remembers; when he puts down an article that occurs the moment it occurs, lest he should afterwards forget it. Of this the passage before us bears strongly the appearance. In actual letters, in the negligence of a real correspondence, examples of this kind frequently take place; seldom I believe in any other production. For the moment a man regards what he writes as a *composition*, which the author of a forgery would, of all others, be the first to do, notions of order, in the arrangement and succession of his thoughts, present themselves to his judgment, and guide his pen.

No. V.

Chap. i. 15, 16. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. Howbeit, for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe in him to life everlasting."

What was the mercy which St. Paul here commemorates, and what was the crime of which he accuses himself, is apparent from the verses immediately preceding. "I thank Christ Jesus, our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry, *who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor and injurious;* but I obtained *mercy*, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief," (ch. i. 12, 13.) The whole quotation plainly refers to St. Paul's original enmity to the Christian name, the interposition of providence in his conversion, and his subsequent designation to the ministry of the gospel; and by this reference affirms indeed the substance of the apostle's history delivered in the Acts. But what in the passage strikes my mind most powerfully, is the observation that is raised out of the fact. "For this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting." It is a just and solemn reflection, springing from the circumstances of the author's conversion, or rather from the impression which that great event had left upon his memory. It will be said perhaps, that an impostor acquainted with St. Paul's history, may have put such a sentiment into his mouth; or, what is the same thing, into a letter drawn up in his name. But, where, we may ask, is such an impostor to be found? The piety, the truth, the benevolence of the thought

ought to protect it from this imputation. For though we should allow that one of the great masters of the ancient tragedy could have given to his scene a sentiment as virtuous and as elevated as this is, and, at the same time as appropriate, and as well suited to the particular situation of the person who delivers it; yet whoever is conversant in these enquiries will acknowledge, that to do this in a fictitious production is beyond the reach of the understandings which have been employed upon any *fabrications* that have come down to us under Christian names.

CHAP. XII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

No. I.

IT was the uniform tradition of the primitive church, that St. Paul visited Rome twice, and twice there suffered imprisonment; and that he was put to death at Rome at the conclusion of his second imprisonment. This opinion concerning St. Paul's *two* journeys to Rome is confirmed by a great variety of hints and allusions in the epistle before us, compared with what fell from the apostle's pen in other letters purporting to have been written from Rome. That our present epistle was written whilst St. Paul was a *prisoner*, is distinctly intimated by the eighth verse of the first chapter. "Be not thou there-"fore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of "me his prisoner." And whilst he was a prisoner *at Rome*, by the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of the same chapter. "The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; "or he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my "chain; but when he was in Rome he sought me out "very diligently, and found me." Since it appears from the former quotation that St. Paul wrote this epistle in confinement, it will hardly admit of doubt that the word *chain*, in the latter quotation refers to that confinement; the chain by which he was *then* bound, the custody in which he was then kept. And if the word chain designate the author's confinement at the time of writing the epistle, the next words determine it to have been written from Rome. "He was not ashamed of my chain; "but when he was in Rome he sought me out very dili-"gently." Now that it *was* not written during the apostle's

first imprisonment at Rome, or during the same imprisonment in which the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Colossians, the Philippians, and Philemon, were written, may be gathered, with considerable evidence, from a comparison of these several epistles with the present.

I. In the former epistles the author confidently looked forward to his liberation from confinement, and his speedy departure from Rome. He tells the Philippians (ch. ii. 24.) "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly." Philemon he bids to prepare for him a lodging; "for I trust," says he, "that through your prayers, I "shall be given unto you," (ver. 22.) In the epistle before us he holds a language extremely different. "I am "now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is "at hand. I have fought a good fight; I have finished my "course; I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid "up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the "righteous Judge, shall give me at that day" (ch. iv. 6—8.)

II. When the former epistles were written from Rome, Timothy was with St. Paul; and is joined with him in writing to the Colossians, the Philippians, and to Philemon. The present epistle implies that he was absent.

III. In the former epistles Demas was with St. Paul at Rome. "Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, "greet you." In the epistle now before us; "Demas "hath forsaken him, having loved this present world, and "is gone to Thessalonica."

IV. In the former epistle, Mark was with St. Paul, and joins in saluting the Colossians. In the present epistle, Timothy is ordered to "bring him with him, for he is "profitable to me for the ministry," (ch. iv. 11.)

The case of Timothy and of Mark might be very well accounted for, by supposing the present epistle to have been written *before* the others; so that Timothy, who is here exhorted "to come shortly unto him," (chap. iv. 9,) might have arrived, and that Mark, "whom he was to

"bring with him," (chap. iv. 11,) might have also reached Rome in sufficient time to have been with St. Paul when the four epistles were written; but then such a supposition is inconsistent with what is said of Demas, by which the posteriority of this to the other epistles is strongly indicated; for in the other epistles Demas was with St. Paul, in the present he hath "forsaken him, and is "gone to Thessalonica." The opposition also of sentiment, with respect to the event of the persecution, is hardly reconcileable to the same imprisonment.

The two following considerations, which were first suggested upon this question by Ludovicus Capellus, are still more conclusive.

1. In the twentieth verse of the fourth chapter, St. Paul informs Timothy, "that Erastus abode at Corinth," Εραστος εμεινε εν Κορινθῳ. The form of expression implies, that Erastus had staid behind at Corinth, when St. Paul left it. But this could not be meant of any journey from Corinth which St. Paul took prior to his first imprisonment at Rome; for when Paul departed from Corinth, as related in the twentieth chapter of the Acts, Timothy was with him; and this was the last time the apostle left Corinth before his coming to Rome; because he left it to proceed on his way to Jerusalem, soon after his arrival, at which place he was taken into custody, and continued in that custody till he was carried to Cæsar's tribunal. There could be no need therefore to inform Timothy that "Erastus staid behind at Corinth" upon this occasion, because, if the fact was so, it must have been known to Timothy who was present, as well as to St. Paul.

2. In the same verse our epistle also states the following article. "Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick." When St. Paul passed through Miletum on his way to Jerusalem, as related Acts xx. Trophimus was not left behind, but accompanied him to that city. He was indeed the occasion of the uproar at Jerusalem, in consequence of which St. Paul was apprehended; for "they

"had seen," says the historian, "before with him in the "city, Trophimus, an Ephesian, whom they supposed that "Paul had brought into the temple." This was evidently the last time of Paul's being at Miletus before his first imprisonment; for, as hath been said, after his apprehension at Jerusalem, he remained in custody till he was sent to Rome.

In these two articles we have a journey referred to, which must have taken place subsequent to the conclusion of St. Luke's history, and of course after St. Paul's liberation from his first imprisonment. The epistle therefore which contains this reference, since it appears from other parts of it to have been written while St. Paul was a prisoner at Rome, proves that he had returned to that city again and undergone there a second imprisonment.

I do not produce these particulars for the sake of the support which they lend to the testimony of the fathers concerning St. Paul's *second* imprisonment, but to remark their consistency and agreement with one another. They are all resolvable into one supposition; and although the supposition itself be in some sort only negative, viz. that the epistle was not written during St. Paul's first residence at Rome, but in some future imprisonment in that city; yet is the consistency not less worthy of observation; for the epistle touches upon names and circumstances connected with the date and with the history of the first imprisonment, and mentioned in letters written during that imprisonment, and so touches upon them, as to leave what is said of one consistent with what is said of others, and consistent also with what is said of them in different epistles. Had one of these circumstances been so described as to have fixed the date of the epistle to the first imprisonment, it would have involved the rest in contradiction. And when the number and particularity of the articles which have been brought together under his head are considered; and when it is considered also, that the comparisons we have formed amongst them, were in all prob-

ability neither provided for, nor thought of, by the writer of the epistle, it will be deemed something very like the effect of truth, that no invincible repugnancy is perceived between them.

No. II.

In the Acts of the Apostles, in the sixteenth chapter, and at the first verse, we are told that Paul "came to "Derbe and Lystra, and behold a certain disciple was "there named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman "which was a Jewess, and believed; but his father was a "Greek." In the epistle before us, in the first chapter and at the fifth verse, St. Paul writes to Timothy thus; "Greatly desiring to see thee, being mindful of thy tears "that I may be filled with joy, when I call to remem-"brance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt "first in thy grandmother Lois, *and thy mother Eunice*; and "I am persuaded that in the also." Here we have a fair unforced example of coincidence. In the history Timothy was the "son of a Jewess *that* believed;" in the epistle St. Paul applauds "the *faith* which dwelt in his mother Eu-"nice." In the history it is said of of the mother, "that "she was a Jewess, and believed;" of the father, "that "he was a Greek." Now when it is said of the mother *alone* "that she believed," the father being nevertheless mentioned in the same sentence, we are led to suppose of the father that he did not belive, i. e. either that he was dead, or that he remained unconverted. Agreeably hereunto, whilst praise is bestowed in the epistle upon one parent, and upon her sincerity in the faith, no notice is taken of the other. The mention of the grandmother is the addition of a circumstance not found in the history; but it is a circumstance which, as well as the names of the parties, might naturally be expected to be known to the apostle, though overlooked by his historian.

No. III.

Chap. iii. 15. "And that from a child thou hast known "the Holy Scriptures which are able to make the wise "unto salvation."

This verse discloses a circumstance which agrees exactly with what is intimated in the quotation from the Acts, adduced in the last number. In that quotation it is recorded of Timothy's mother, "that she was a Jewess." This description is virtually, though, I am satisfied, undesignedly, recognized in the epistle, when Timothy is reminded in it, "that from a child he had known the Holy "Scriptures." "The Holy Scriptures" undoubtedly meant the scriptures of the Old Testament. The expression bears that sense in every place in which it occurs. Those of the New had not acquired the name, not to mention, that in Timothy's childhood, probably none of them existed. In what manner then could Timothy have known "from a child," the Jewish scriptures had he not been born, on one side or on both, of Jewish parentage? Perhaps he was not less likely to be carefully instructed in them, for that his mother alone professed that religion.

No. IV.

Chap. ii. 22. "Flee also *youthful* lusts, but follow "righteousness, faith, charity, peace with them that call "on the Lord out of a pure heart."

"*Flee also youthful lusts.*" The suitableness of this precept to the age of the person to whom it is addressed, is gathered from 1 Tim. chap, iv. 12. "Let no man des-"pise thy youth." Nor do I deem the less of this coincidence, because the propriety resides in a single epithet; or because this one precept is joined with, and followed by a train of others, not more applicable to Timothy than

to any ordinary convert. It is in these transient and cursory allusions that the argument is best founded. When a writer dwells and rests upon a point in which some coincidence is discerned, it may be doubted whether he himself had not fabricated the conformity, and was endeavoring to display and set it off. But when the reference is contained in a single word, unobserved perhaps by most readers, the writer passing on to other subjects, as unconscious that he had hit upon a correspondency, or unsolicitous whether it were remarked or not, we may be pretty well assured that no fraud was exercised, no imposition intended.

No. V.

Chap. iii. 10, 11. "But thou hast fully known my "doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, long suffering, "charity, patience, persecutions, afflictions, which came "unto me *at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra*; what perse- "cutions I endured; but out of them all the Lord deliv- "ered me."

The Antioch here mentioned was not Antioch the capital of Syria, where Paul and Barnabas resided "a "long time;" but Antioch in Pisidia, to which place Paul and Barnabas came in their first apostolic progress, and where Paul delivered a memorable discourse, which is preserved in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts. At this Antioch the history relates, that "the Jews stirred "up the devout and honorable women, and the chief men "of the city, *and raised persecution against Paul and Bar-* "*nabas*, and expelled them out of their coasts. But they "shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came "unto *Iconium* . . . . And it came to pass in Iconium, "that they went both together into the synagogue of the "Jews, and so spake that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed; but the unbe- "lieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their "minds evil affected against the brethren. Long time

"therefore abode they speaking boldly in the Lord, which "gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and grant- "ed signs and wonders to be done by their hands. But "the multitude of the city was divided; and part held "with the Jews, and part with the apostles. And when "there was an assault made both of the Gentiles and also "of the Jews, with their rulers, *to use them despitefully and* "*to stone* them, they were aware of it, and fled unto *Lys-* "*tra* and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and unto the region, "that lieth round about, and there they preached the "gospel . . . . And there came thither certain Jews "from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the people, "and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, sup- "posing he had been dead. Howbeit, as the disciples stood "round about him, he rose up and came into the city; "and the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe; "and when they had preached the gospel in that city, "and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, "and to Iconium, and to Antioch." This account comprises the period to which the allusion in the epistle is to be referred. We have so far therefore a conformity beween the history and the epistle, that St. Paul is asserted in the history to have suffered persecutions in the three cities, his persecutions at which are appealed to in the epistle; and not only so, but to have suffered these persecutions both in immediate succession, and in the order in which the cities are mentioned in the epistle. The conformity also extends to another circumstance. In the apostolic history Lystra and Derbe are commonly mentioned together; in the quotation from the epistle Lystra is mentioned, and not Derbe. And the distinction will appear on this occasion to be accurate; for St. Paul is here enumerating his persecutions; and although he underwent grievous persecutions in each of the three cities through which he passed to Derbe, at Derbe itself he met with none; "The next day he depart- ed," says the historian, "to Derbe; and when they had "preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many

"they returned again to Lystra." The epistle, therefore, in the names of the cities, in the order in which they are enumerated, and in the place at which the enumeration stops, corresponds exactly with the history.

But a second question remains, namely, how these persecutions were "known" to Timothy, or why the apostle should recal these in particular to his remembrance, rather than many other persecutions with which his ministry had been attended. When some time, probably three years, afterwards (*vide* Pearson's Annales Paulinas,) St. Paul made a second journey through the same country, "in or-"der to go again and visit the brethren in every city where "he had preached the word of the Lord:" we read, Acts, chap. xvi. 1. that "when he came to Derbe and Lystra, "behold a certain disciple was there named Timotheus." One or other therefore of these cities was the place of Timothy's abode. We read moreover that he was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium; so that he must have been well acquainted with these places. Also again, when Paul came to Derbe and Lystra, Timothy was already a disciple. "Behold a cer-"tain disciple was there named Timotheus." He must therefore have been converted before. But since it is expressly stated in the epistle, that Timothy was converted by St. Paul himself, that he was "his own son in the "faith," it follows, that he must have been converted by him upon his former journey into those parts; which was the very time when the apostle underwent the persecutions referred to in the epistle. Upon the whole, then, persecutions at the several cities named in the epistle are expressly recorded in the Acts: and Timothy's knowledge of this part of St. Paul's history, which knowledge is appealed to in the epistle, is fairly deduced from the place of his abode, and the time of his conversion. It may further be observed, that it is probable from this account, that St. Paul was in the midst of these persecutions when Timothy became known to him. No wonder then that the apostle,

though in a letter written long afterwards, should remind his favourite convert of those scenes of affliction and distress under which they first met.

Although this coincidence, as to the names of the cities, be more specific and direct than many which we have pointed out, yet I apprehend there is no just reason for thinking it to be artificial; for had the writer of the epistle sought a coincidence with the history upon this head, and searched the Acts of the Apostles for the purpose, I conceive he would have sent us at once to Philippi and Thessalonica, where Paul suffered persecution, and where from what is stated, it may easily be gathered that Timothy accompanied him, rather than have appealed to persecutions as known to Timothy, in the account of which persecutions Timothy's presence is not mentioned; it not being till after one entire chapter, and in the history of a journey three years future to this, that Timothy's name occurs in the Acts of the Apostles for the first time.

CHAP. XIII.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

No. I.

A VERY characteristic circumstance in this Epistle, is the quotation from Epimenides, chap. i. 12. "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, "the Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies."

Κρητες αει ψευσται, κακα θηρια, γαστερες αργαι.

I call this quotation characteristic, because no writer in the New Testament, except St. Paul, appealed to heathen testimony; and because St. Paul repeatedly did so. In his celebrated speech at Athens, preserved in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts, he tells his audience, that "in "God we live, and move, and have our being; as certain "also of your own poets have said, for we are also his off-"spring."

—τε γαρ και γενος εσμεν.

The reader will perceive much similarity of manner in these two passages. The reference in the speech is to a heathen poet; it is the same in the epistle. In the speech the apostle urges his hearers with the authority of a poet *of their own*; in the epistle he avails himself of the same advantage. Yet there is a variation, which shows that the hint of inserting a quotation in the epistle was not, as it may be suspected, borrowed from seeing the like practice attributed to St. Paul in the history; and it is this, that in the epistle the author cited is called a *prophet*, "one "of themselves, even a *prophet* of their own." Whatever might be the reason for calling Epimenides a prophet; whether the names of poet and prophet were occasionally

convertible; whether Epimenides in particular had obtained that title, as Grotius seems to have proved; or whether the appellation was given to him, in this instance, as having delivered a description of the Cretan character, which the future state of morals among them verified; whatever was the reason (and any of these reasons will account for the variation, supposing St. Paul to have been the author), one point is plain, namely, if the epistle had been forged, and the author had inserted a quotation in it merely from having seen an example of the same kind in a speech ascribed to St Paul, he would so far have imitated his original, as to have introduced his quotation in the same manner, that is, he would have given to Epimenides the title which he saw there given to Aratus. The other side of the alternative is, that the history took the hint from the epistle. But that the author of the Acts of the Apostles had not the epistle to Titus before him, at least that he did not use it as one of the documents or materials of his narrative is rendered nearly certain by the observation, that the name of Titus does not once occur in his book.

It is well known, and was remarked by St. Jerome, that the apophthegm in the fifteenth chapter of the Corinthians, "evil communications corrupt good manners," is an Iambic of Menander's.

Φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαι.

Here we have another unaffected instance of the same turn and habit of composition. Probably there are some hitherto unnoticed; and more, which the loss of the original authors render impossible to be now ascertained.

No. II.

There exists a visible affinity between the Epistle to Titus and the First Epistle to Timothy. Both letters were addressed to persons left by the writer to preside in their respective churches during his absence. Both letters were

principally occupied in describing the qualifications to be sought for, in those whom they should appoint to offices in the church; and the ingredients of this description are in both letters nearly the same. Timothy and Titus are likewise cautioned against the same prevailing corruptions, and, in particular, against the same misdirection of their cares and studies. This affinity obtains, not only in the subject of the letters, which, from the similarity of situation in the persons to whom they were addressed, might be expected to be somewhat alike, but extends, in a great variety of instances, to the phrases and expressions. The writer accosts his two friends with the same salutation, and passes on to the business of his letter by the same transition.

"Unto Timothy, *my own son in the faith*, grace, mercy, "and peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our "Lord; *as I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I* "*went into Macedonia*," &c. 1 Tim. chap, i. 2, 3.

"To Titus, *mine own son after the common faith*, grace, "mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord "Jesus Christ our Saviour; *for this cause left I thee in* "*Crete*." Tit. chap. i. 4, 5.

If Timothy was "not to *give heed to fables* and endless "*genealogies*, which minister *questions*," 1 Tim. chap. i. 4. Titus also was to "avoid foolish *questions*, and *genealogies*, and contentions," (chap. iii. 9); "and was to rebuke "them sharply, *not giving heed to Jewish fables*," (chap. i. 14.) If Timothy was to be a pattern (τυπος.) 1 Tim. chap iv. 12; so was Titus, (chap. ii. 7.) If Timothy was to "let no man despise his youth," 1 Tim. chap. iv. 12. Titus also was to "let no man despise him," (chap. ii. 15.) This verbal consent is also observable in some very peculiar expressions, which have no relation to the particular character of Timothy or Titus.

The phrase, "it is a faithful saying," (πιστος ὁ λογος,) made use of to preface some sentence upon which the writer lays a more than ordinary stress, occurs three

times in the First Epistle to Timothy, once in the Second, and once in the epistle before us, and in no other part of St. Paul's writings; and it is remarkable that these three epistles were probably all written towards the conclusion of his life; and that they are the only epistles which were written after his first imprisonment at Rome.

The same observation belongs to another singularity of expression, and that is in the epithet, "*sound*," (ὑγιαινων,) as applied to words or doctrine. It is thus used, twice in the First Epistle to Timothy, twice in the Second, and three times in the Epistle to Titus, beside two cognate expressions, ὑγιαινοντας τῃ πιστει and λογον ὑγιη, and it is is found, in the same sense, in no other part of the New Testament.

The phrase "God our Saviour" stands in nearly the same predicament. It is repeated three times in the First Epistle to Timothy, as many in the Epistle to Titus, and in no other book of the New Testament occurs at all, except once in the Epistle of Jude.

Similar terms intermixed indeed with others, are employed, in the two Epistles, in enumerating the qualifications required in those who should be advanced to stations of authority in the church.

"A bishop must be blameless, *the husband of one wife*, "vigilant, *sober*, of good behaviour, *given to hospitality*, apt "to teach, *not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy* "*lucre*; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous, one that "ruleth well his own house, having his children in sub-"jection with all gravity."* 1 Tim. chap. iii. 2—4.

"If any be *blameless*, *the husband of one wife*, having "faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly; for a "bishop must be blameless as the steward of God, not

* "Δει ουν τον επισκοπον ανεπιλημπτον ειναι, μιας γυναικος ανδρα, νηφαλιον, σωφρονα, κοσμιον, φιλοξενον, διδακτικον, μη παροινον, μη πληκτην, μη αισχροκερδη· αλλ' επιεικη, αμαχον, αφιλαργυρον; τε ιδιε οικε καλως προϊσταμενον, τεκνα εχοντα εν ὑποταγη μετα πασης σεμνοτητος."

" selfwilled, not soon angry, *not given to wine, no striker, not* " *given to filthy lucre, but a lover of hospitality,* a lover of good " men, sober, just, holy, temperate."† Titus, ch. i. 6—8.

The most natural account which can be given of these resemblances is to suppose that the two epistles were written nearly at the same time, and whilst the same ideas and phrases dwelt in the writer's mind. Let us enquire therefore, whether the notes of time, extant in the two epistles, in any manner favor this supposition.

We have seen that it was necessary to refer the First Epistle to Timothy to a date subsequent to St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, because there was no journey into Macedonia prior to that event, which accorded with the circumstance of leaving " Timothy behind at Ephesus." The journey of St. Paul from Crete, alluded to in the epistle before us, and in which Titus " was left in Crete to " set in order the things that were wanting," must, in like manner, be carried to the period which intervened between his first and second imprisonment. For the history, which reaches, we know, to the time of St. Paul's first imprisonment, contains no account of his going to Crete, except upon his voyage as a prisoner to Rome; and that this could not be the occasion referred to in our epistle is evident from hence, that when St. Paul wrote this epistle, he appears to have been at liberty; whereas after that voyage, he continued for two years at least in confinement. Again, it is agreed that St. Paul wrote his First Epistle to Timothy from Macedonia. " As I be- " sought the to abide still at Ephesus, when I went (or " came) into Macedonia." And that he was in these parts, i. e. in this peninsula, when he wrote the Epistle to Titus,

† " Ει τις εστιν ανεγκλητος, μιας γυναικος ανηρ, τεκνα εχων πιστα, μη εν κατηγοριᾳ ασωτιας, η ανυποτακτα. Δει γαρ τον επισκοπον ανεγκλητον ειναι, ὡς Θεου οικονομον, μη αυθαδη, μη οργιλον, μη παροινον, μη πληκτην, μη αισχροκερδη· αλλα φιλοξενον, φιλαγαθον, σωφρονα, δικαιον, ὁσιον, εγκρατη."

is rendered probable by his directing Titus to come to him to Nicopolis. "When I shall send Artemas "unto thee or Tychicus, be diligent (make haste) to "come unto me to Nicopolis; for I have determined there "to winter." The most noted city of that name was in Epirus, near to Actium. And I think the form of speaking, as well as the nature of the case, renders it probable, that the writer was at Nicopolis, or in the neighbourhood thereof, when he dictated this direction to Titus.

Upon the whole, if we may be allowed to suppose that St. Paul, after his liberation at Rome, sailed into Asia, taking Crete in his way; that from Asia, and from Ephesus, the capital of that country, he proceeded into Macedonia, and crossing the peninsula inhis progress, came into the neighbourhood of Nicopolis; we have a route which falls in with every thing. It executes the intention expressed by the apostle of visiting Colosse and Philippi as soon as he should be set at liberty at Rome. It allows him to leave "Titus at Crete," and "Timothy at Ephe-"sus, as he went into Macedonia;" and to write to both not long after from the peninsula of Greece, and probably the neighbourhood of Nicopolis; thus bringing together the dates of these two letters, and thereby accounting for that affinity between them, both in subject and language, which our remarks have pointed out. I confess that the journey which we have thus traced out for St. Paul, is, in a great measure, hypothetic; but it should be observed, that it is a species of consistency, which seldom belongs to falsehood, to admit of an hypothesis, which includes a great number of independent circumstances without contradiction.

CHAP. XIV.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

No. I.

THE singular correspondency between this epistle and that to the Colossians has been remarked already. An assertion in the Epistle to the Colossians, viz, that "Onesimus was one of them," is verified by the Epistle to Philemon; and is verified, not by any mention of Colosse, any the most distant intimation concerning the place of Philemon's abode, but singly by stating Onesimus to be Philemon's servant, and by joining in the salutaion Philemon with Archippus; for this Archippus, when we go back to the Epistle to the Colossians, appears to have been an inhabitant of that city, and as it should seem, to have held an office of authority in that church. The case stands thus. Take the Epistle to the Colossians alone, and no circumstance is discoverable which makes out the assertion, that Onesimus was "one of them." Take the Epistle to Philemon alone, and nothing at all appears concerning the place to which Philemon or his servant Onesimus belonged. For any thing that is said in the epistle, Philemon might have been a Thessalonian, a Philippian, or an Ephesian, as well as a Colossian. Put the two epistles together and the matter is clear. The reader perceives a *junction* of circumstances, which ascertains the conclusion at once. Now, all that is necessary to be added in this place is, that this correspondency evinces the genuineness of one epistle, as well as of the other. It is like comparing the two parts of a cloven tally. Coincidence proves the authenticity of both.

No. II.

And this coincidence is perfect; not only in the main article of showing, by implication, Onesimus to be a Colossian, but in many dependant circumstances.

1. "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus; whom *I* "*have sent* again," (ver. 10—12). It appears from the Epistle to the Colossians, that, in truth, Onesimus was sent at that time to Colosse. "All my state shall Tychicus "declare, whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, "*with Onesimus*, a faithful and beloved brother." Colos. chap. iv. 7—9.

2. "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, *whom I have* "*begotten in my bonds*," (ver. 10). It appears from the preceding quotation, that Onesimus was with St. Paul when he wrote the epistle to the Colossians; and that he wrote that epistle *in imprisonment* is evident from this declaration in the fourth chapter and third verse; "Praying "also for us, that God would open unto us a door of ut- "terance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am "also *in bonds*."

3. St. Paul bids Philemon prepare for him a lodging. "For I trust," says he, "that, through your prayers, I "shall be given unto you." This agrees with the expectation of speedy deliverance, which he expressed in another epistle written during the same imprisonment. "Him," (Timothy) "I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall "see how it will go with me; *but I trust in the Lord that* "*I also myself shall come shortly*." Phil. chap. ii. 23, 24.

4. As the letter to Philemon, and that to the Colossians, were written at the the same time, and sent by the same messenger, the one to a particular inhabitant, the other to the church of Colosse, it may be expected that the same, or nearly the same, persons would be about St. Paul, and join with him, as was the practice, in the salutations of the epistle. Accordingly we find the names of Aristarchus,

Marcus, Epaphras, Luke, and Demas, in both epistles. Timothy, who is joined with St. Paul in the superscription of the Epistle to the Colossians, is joined with him in this. Tychicus did not salute Philemon, because he accompanied the epistle to Colosse, and would undoubtedly there see him. Yet the reader of the Epistle to Philemon will remark one considerable diversity in the catalogue of saluting friends, and which shows that the catalogue was not copied from that to the Colossians. In the Epistle to the Colossians, Aristarchus is called by St. Paul his fellow prisoner, Colos. chap. iv. 10. in the Epistle to Philemon, Aristarchus is mentioned without any addition, and the title of fellow peisoner is given to Epaphras.*

And let it also be observed, that notwithstanding the close and circumstantial agreement between the two epistles, this is not the case of an opening left in a genuine writing, which an impostor is induced to fill up; nor of a reference to some writing not extant, which sets a sophist at work to supply the loss, in like manner as, because St. Paul was supposed, Colos. chap. iv. 16, to allude to an epistle written by him to the Laodiceans, some person has from thence taken the hint of uttering a forgery under that title. The present, I say, is not that case; for Philemon's name is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians; Onesimus' servile condition is no where hinted at, any more than his crime, his flight, or the place or time of his conversion. The story therefore of the epistle if it be a fiction, is a fiction to which the author could not have been guided, by any thing he had read in St. Paul's genuine writings,

* Dr. Benson observes, and perhaps truly, that the appellation of fellow prisoner, as applied by St. Paul to Epaphras, did not imply that they were imprisoned together *at the time*; any more than your calling a person your fellow traveller, imports that you are then upon your travels. If he had, upon any former occasion, travelled with you, you might afterwards speak of him under that title. It is just so with the term fellow prisoner.

No. III.

Ver. 4, 5. "I thank my God, making mention of "thee always in my prayers; hearing of thy love and "faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and to-"ward all saints."

"*Hearing of thy love and faith.*" This is the form of speech which St. Paul was wont to use towards those churches which he had not seen, or then visited; see Rom. chap. i. 8; Ephes. chap. i. 15; Col. chap. i. 3, 4. Toward those churches and persons, with whom he was previously acquainted, he employed a different phrase; as, "I thank my God always on your behalf," 1 Cor. chap. i. 4; 2 Thess. chap i. 3; or, "upon every *remembrance* of "you," Phil. chap. i. 3; 1 Thess. chap. i. 2, 3; 2 Tim. chap. i. 3; and never speaks of *hearing of them.* Yet, I think, it must be concluded, from the nineteenth verse of this epistle, that Philemon had been converted by St. Paul himself; "Albeit, I do not say to thee, how *thou* "*owest unto me* even thine ownself besides." Here then is a peculiarity. Let us enquire whether the epistle supplies any circumstance which will account for it. We have seen that it may be made out, not from the epistle itself, but from a comparison of the epistle with that to the Colossians, that Philemon was an inhabitant of Colosse; and it further appears, from the Epistle to the Colossians, that St. Paul had never been in that city; "I would "that ye knew what great conflict I have for you and for "them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen "my face in the flesh. Colos. chap. ii. 1. Although, therefore, St. Paul had formerly met with Philemon at some other place, and had been the immediate instrument of his conversion, yet Philemon's faith and conduct afterwards, inasmuch as he lived in a city which St. Paul had never visited, could only be known to him by fame and reputation.

The tenderness and delicacy of this epistle have been long admired. "Though I might be much bold in "Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient, yet for "love's sake I rather beseech thee, being such a one as "Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ. "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have be-"gotten in my bonds." There is something certainly very melting and persuasive in this, and every part of the epistle. Yet, in my opinion, the character of St. Paul prevails in it throughout. The warm, affectionate, authoritative teacher is interceding with an absent friend for a beloved convert. He urges his suit with an earnestness, befitting perhaps not so much the occasion, as the ardor and sensibility of his own mind. Here also, as every where, he shows himself conscious of the weight and dignity of his mission; nor does he suffer Philemon for a moment to forget it. "I *might* be much bold in Christ to "enjoin thee that which is convenient." He is careful also to recall, though obliquely, to Philemon's memory, the sacred obligation under which he had laid him, by bringing to him the knowledge of Jesus Christ; "I do not say "to thee, how thou owest to me even thine own self be-"sides." Without laying aside, therefore, the apostolic character, our author softens the imperative style of his address, by mixing with it every sentiment and consideration that could move the heart of his correspondent. Aged and in prison, he is content to supplicate and entreat. Onesimus was rendered dear to him by his conversion and his services; the child of his affliction, and "minis-"tering unto him in the bonds of the gospel." This ought to recommend him, whatever had been his fault, to Philemon's forgiveness. "Receive him as myself, as my "own bowels." Every thing however, should be voluntary. St. Paul was determined that Philemon's compli-

ance should flow from his own bounty. "Without thy "mind would I do nothing, that thy benefit should not "be as it were of necessity, but wilingly;" trusting nevertheless to his gratitude and attachment for the performance of all that he requested, and for more. "Having "confidence in thy obedience, I wrote unto thee, knowing "that thou wilt also do more than I say."

St. Paul's discourses at Miletus; his speech before Agrippa? his Epistle to the Romans, as hath been remarked (No. VIII); that to the Galatians, chap. iv. 11—20; to the Philippians, chap. i. 29—ch. ii. 2; the Second to the Corinthians, chap. vi, 1—13; and indeed some part or other of almost exery epistle exhibits examples of a similar application to the feelings and affections of the persons whom he addresses. And it is observable, that these pathetic effusions, drawn for the most part from his own sufferings and situations, usually precede a command, soften a rebuke, or mitigate the harshness of some disagreeable truth.

CHAP. XV.

THE SUBSCRIPTIONS OF THE EPISTLES.

SIX of these *subscriptions* are false or improbable; that is, they are either absolutely contradicted by the contents of the epistle, or are difficult to be reconciled with them.

I. The subscription of the First Epistle to the Corinthians states that it was written from Philippi, notwithstanding that, in the sixteenth chapter and the eighth verse of the epistle, St. Paul informs the Corinthians, that he will "tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost;" and notwithstanding that he begins the salutations in the epistle, by telling them "the churches of Asia salute you;" a pretty evident indication that he himself was in Asia at this time.

II. The Epistle to the Galatians is by the subscription dated from Rome; yet, in the epistle itself, St. Paul expresses his surprise "that they were *so soon* removing from "him that called them;" whereas his journey to Rome was ten years posterior to the conversion of the Galatians. And what, I think, is more conclusive, the author, though speaking of himself in this more than any other epistle, does not once mention his bonds, or call himself a prisoner; which he had not failed to do in every one of the four epistles written from that city, and during that imprisonment.

III. The First Epistle to the Thessalonians was written, the subscription tells us, from Athens; yet the epistle refers expressly to the coming of Timotheus from Thessalonica (chap. iii. 6); and the history informs us, Acts xviii. 5, that Timothy came out of Macedonia to St. Paul at *Corinth*.

IV. The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is dated,

and without any discoverable reason, from Athens also. If it be truly the *second*; if it refer as it appears to do, (ch. ii. 2,) to the first, and the first was written from Corinth, the place must be erroneously assigned, for the history does not allow us to suppose that St. Paul after he had reached Corinth, went back to Athens.

V. The First Epistle to Timothy the subscription asserts to have been sent from Laodicea; yet, when St. Paul writes, "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, πορευο-μενος εις Μακεδονιαν (when I set out for Macedonia,)" the reader is naturally led to conclude, that he wrote the letter upon his arrival in that country.

VI. The Epistle to Titus is dated from Nicopolis in Macedonia, whilst no city of that name is known to have existed in that province.

The use, and the only use, which I make of these observations, is to show, how easily errors and contradictions steal in where the writer is not guided by original knowledge. There are only eleven distinct assignments of date to St. Paul's Epistles (for the four written from Rome may be considered as plainly contemporary); and of these, six seem to be erroneous. I do not attribute any authority to these subscriptions. I believe them to have been conjectures founded sometimes upon loose traditions, but more generally upon a consideration of some particular text, without sufficiently comparing it with other parts of the epistle, with different epistles, or with the history. Suppose then that the subscriptions had come down to us as authentic parts of the epistles, there would have been more contrarieties and difficulties arising out of these final verses, than from all the rest of the volume. Yet, if the epistles had been forged, the whole must have been made up of the same elements as those of which the subscriptions are composed, viz. tradition, conjecture, and inference; and it would have remained to be accounted for, how, whilst so many errors were crowded in the conclud-

ing clauses of the letters, so much consistency should be preserved in other parts.

The same reflection arises from observing the oversights and mistakes which learned men have committed, when arguing upon allusions which relate to time and place, or when endeavoring to digest scattered circumstances into a continued story. It is indeed the same case; for these subscriptions must be regarded as ancient scholia, and as nothing more. Of this liability to error I can present the reader with a notable instance; and which I bring forward for no other purpose than that to which I apply the erroneous subscriptions. Ludovicus Capellus, in that part of his Historia Apostolica Illustrata, which is entitled *De Ordine*, Epist. Paul. writing upon the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, triumphs unmercifully over the want of sagacity in Baronius, who, it seems, makes St. Paul write his Epistle to Titus from Macedonia upon his second visit into that province; whereas it appears from the history, that Titus, instead of being in Crete, where the epistle places him, was at that time sent by the apostle from Macedonia to Corinth. "Animadvertere est," says Capellus, "magnam hominis illius ἀβλεψίαν, qui vult Titum "a Paulo in Cretam abductum, illicque relictum, cum in- "de Nicopolim navigaret, quem tamen agnoscit a Paulo "ex Macedoniâ missum esse Corinthum." This probably will be thought a detection of inconsistency in Baronius. But what is the most remarkable, is, that in the same chapter in which he thus indulges his contempt of Baronius's judgment, Capellus himself falls into an error of the same kind, and more gross and palable than that which he reproves. For he begins the chapter by stating the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the First Epistle to Timothy to be nearly cotemporary; to have been both written during the apostle's second visit into Macedonia; and that a doubt subsisted concerning the immediate priority of their dates; "Posterior ad eosdem Co- "rinthios Epistola, ea Prior ad Timotheum certant de

" prioritate et sub judice lis est; utraque autem scripta " est paulo postquam Paulus Epheso discessisset, adeoque " dum Macedoniam peragraret, sed utra tempore præce- " dat, non liquet." Now, in the first place, it is highly improbable that the two epistles should have been written either nearly together, or during the same journey through Macedonia; for in the Epistle to the Corinthians, Timothy appears to have been *with* St. Paul; in the epistle addressed to him, to have been left behind at Ephesus, and not only left behind, but directed to continue there, till St. Paul should return to that city. In the second place it is inconceivable, that a question should be proposed concerning the priority of date of the two epistles; for, when St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, opens his address to him by saying, " as I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus " when I went into Macedonia," no reader can doubt but that he here refers to the *last* interview which had passed between them; that he had not seen him since; whereas, if the epistle be posterior to that to the Corinthians, yet written upon the same visit into Macedonia, this could not be true; for as Timothy was along with St. Paul when he wrote to the Corinthians, he must, upon this supposition, have passed over to St. Paul in Macedonia after he had been left by him at Ephesus and must have returned to Ephesus again before the epistle was written. What misled Ludovicus Capellus was simply this, that he had entirely overlooked Timothy's name in the superscription of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Which oversight appears not only in the quotation which we have given, but from his telling us, as he does, hat Timothy came from Ephesus to St. Paul at *Corinth*, whereas the superscription proves that Timothy was already with St. Paul when he wrote to the Corinthians frm Macedonia.

CHAP. XVI.

THE CONCLUSION.

IN the outset of this enquiry, the reader was directed to consider the Acts of the Apostles and the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul as certain ancient manuscripts, lately discovered in the closet of some celebrated library. We have adhered to this view of the subject. External evidence of every kind has been removed out of sight; and our endeavors have been employed to collect the indications of truth and authenticity, which appeared to exist in the writings themselves, and to result from a comparison of their different parts. It is not however necessary to continue this supposition longer. The testimony which other remains of cotemporary, or the monuments of adjoining ages afford to the reception, notoriety, and public estimation of a book, form no doubt the first proof of its genuineness. And in no books whatever is this proof more complete, than in those at present under our consideration. The enquiries of learned men, and, above all of the excellent Lardner, who never overstates a point of evidence, and whose fidelity in citing his authorities has in no one instance beeen impeached, have established concerning these writings, the following propositions.

I. That in the age immediately posterior to that in which St. Paul lived, his letters were publicly read and acknowledged.

Some of them are quoted or alluded to by almost every Christian writer that followed, by Clement of Rome, by Hermas, by Ignatius, by Polycarp, disciples or cotemporaries of the apostles; by Justin Martyr, by the churches of Gaul, by Irenæus, by Athenagoras, by Theophilus, by Clement of Alexandria, by Hermias, by Tertullian, who occupied the succeeding age. Now when we find a book

quoted or referred to by an ancient author, we are entitled to conclude, that it was read and received in the age and country in which that author lived. And this conclusion does not, in any degree, rest upon the judgment or character of the author making such reference. Proceeding by this rule, we have, concerning the First Epistle to the Corinthians in particular, within forty years after the epistle was written, evidence, not only of its being extant at Corinth, but of its being known and read at Rome. Clement, bishop of that city, writing to the church of Corinth, uses these words. "Take into your hands the E-"pistle of the blessed Paul the apostle. What did he at "first write unto you in the beginning of the gospel? Verily "he did by the Spirit admonish you concerning himself "and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then you "did form parties."*

This was written at a time when probably some must have been living at Corinth, who remembered St. Paul's ministry there and the receipt of the epistle. The testimony is still more valuable, as it shows that the epistles were preserved in the churches to which they were sent, and that they were spread and propagated from them to the rest of the Christian community. Agreeably to which natural mode and order of their publication, Tertullian, a century afterwards, for proof of the integrity and genuineness of the apostolic writings, bids "any one, who is "willing to exercise his curiosity profitably in the busi-"ness of their salvation, to visit the apostolical churches, "in which their very authentic letters are recited, ipsæ au-"thenticæ literæ eorum recitantur." Then he goes on; "Is Achaia near you? You have Corinth. If you are "not far from Macedonia, you have Thessalonica. If "you can go to Asia, you have Ephesus; but if you are "near to Italy, you have Rome."† I adduce this passage to show, that the distinct churches or Christian So-

* See Lardner, vol. xii. p. 22.

† Lardner, vol. ii. p. 598.

cieties, to which St. Paul's Epistles were sent, subsisted for some ages afterwards; that his several epistles were all along respectively read in those churches; that Christians at large received them from those churches, and appealed to those churches for their originality and authenticity.

Arguing in like manner from citations and allusions, we have, within the space of a hundred and fifty years from the time that the first of St. Paul's Epistles was written, proofs of almost all of them being read, in Palestine, Syria, the countries of Asia Minor, in Egypt, in that part of Africa which used the Latin tongue, in Greece, Italy, and Gaul.* I do not mean simply to assert, that, within the space of a hundred and fifty years, St. Paul's Epistles were read in those countries, for I believe that they were, read and circulated from the beginning; but that proofs of their being so read occur within that period. And when it is considered how few of the primitive Christians wrote, and of what was written how much is lost, we are to account it extraordinary, or rather as a sure proof of the extensiveness of the reputation of these writings, and of the general respect in which they were held, that so many testimonies, and of such antiquity, are still extant. "In the remaining works of Irenæus, Clement "of Alexandria, and Tertullian, there are perhaps more "and larger quotations of the small volume of the New "Testament, than of all the works of Cicero, in the writings "of all characters for several ages."† We must add, that the Epistles of Paul come in for their full share of this observation; and that all the thirteen epistles, except that to Philemon, which is not quoted by Irenæus or Clement, and which probably escaped notice merely by its brevity, are severally cited, and expressly recognized as St. Paul's by each of theseChristian writers. TheEbionites, an early, though inconsiderable Christian sect, rejected St. Paul and his epistles;‡ that is, they rejected these epistles, not be-

* See Lardner's Recapitulation, vol. xii. p. 53.
† See Lardner's Recapitulation, vol. xii. p. 53
‡ Lardner, vol. ii. p. 803.

cause they were not, but because they were St. Paul's; and because, adhering to the obligation of the Jewish law, they chose to dispute his doctrine and authority. Their suffrage as to the genuineness of the epistles does not contradict that of other Christians. Marcion, an heretical writer in the former part of the second century, is said by Tertullian to have rejected three of the epistles which we now receive, viz. the two Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. It appears to me not improbable, that Marcion might make some such distinction as this, that no apostolic epistle was to be admitted which was not read or attested by the church to which it was sent; for it is remarkable that, together with these epistles to private persons, he rejected also the catholic epistles. Now the catholic epistles and the epistle to private pesons agree in the circumstance of wanting this particular species of attestation. Marcion, it seems, acknowledged the Epistle to Philemon, and is upbraided for his inconsistency in doing so by Tertullian, who asks* "why, when he received a "letter written to a single person, he should refuse two "to Timothy and one to Titus composed upon the affairs "of the church?" This passage so far favors our account of Marcion's objection, as it shows that the objection was supposed by Tertullian to have been founded in something, which belonged to the nature of a private letter.

Nothing of the works of Marcion remains. Probably he was, after all, a rash, arbitrary, licentious critic (if he deserved indeed the name of critic), and who offered no reason for his determination. What St. Jerome says of him intimates this, and is beside founded in good sense; speaking of him and Basilides, "If they had assigned any "reasons," says he, "why they did not reckon these epis- "tles," viz. the first and second to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, "to be the apostle's, we would have endeav- "ored to have answered them, and perhaps might have

* Lardner, vol. xiv. p. 455.

"satisfied the reader; but when they take upon them, "by their own authority, to pronounce one epistle to be "Paul's, and another not, they can only be replied to in "the same manner."!* Let it be remembered, however, that Marcion received ten of these epistles. His authority therefore, even if his credit had been better than it is, forms a very small exception to the uniformity of the evidence. Of Basilides we know still less than we do of Marcion. The same observation however belongs to him, viz. that his objection, as far as appears from this passage of St. Jerome, was confined to the three private epistles. Yet this is the only opinion which can be said to disturb the consent of the two first centuries of the Chistian era; for as to Tatian, who is reported by Jerome alone to have rejected some of St. Paul's Epistles, the extravagant or rather delirious notions into which he fell, take away weight and credit from his judgment. If, indeed, Jerome's account of this circumstance be correct; for it appears from much older writers than Jerome, that Tatian owned and used many of these epistles.†

II. They, who in those ages disputed about so many other points, agreed in acknowledging the Scriptures now before us. Contending sects appealed to them in their controversies with equal and unreserved submission. When they were urged by one side, however they might be interpreted or misinterpreted by the other, their authority was not questioned. "Reliqui omnes," says Irenæus, speaking of Marcion, "falso scientiæ nomine inflati, scrip-"turas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero conver-"tunt."*

III. When the genuineness of some other writings which were in circulation, and even of a few which are now received into the canon, was contested, these were never called into dispute. Whatever was the objection, or whether, in truth, there ever was any real objection to the au-

* Lardner, vol. xiv. p. 458.

† Lardner, vol. i. p. 313.

* Iren. advers. Hær. quoted by Lardner, vol. xv. p. 425.

thenticity of the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, the Epistle of James, or that of Jude, or to the book of the Revelations of St. John, the doubts that appear to have been entertained concerning them, exceedingly strengthen the force of the testimony as to those writings, about which there was no doubt; because it shows, that the matter was a subject, amongst the early Christians, of examination and discussion; and that, where there was any room to doubt, they did doubt.

What Eusebius hath left upon the subject is directly to the purpose of this observation. Eusebius, it is well known, divided the ecclesiastical writings which were extant in his time into three classes; the "ἀναντιῤῥητα, uncontradicted," as he calls them in one chapter or "scriptures universally acknowledged," as he calls them in another; the "controverted, yet well known and approved by many;" and "the spurious." What were the shades of difference in the books of the second, or in those of the third class; or what it was precisely that he meant by the term *spurious*, it is not necessary in this place to enquire. It is sufficient for us to find, that the thirteen epistles of St. Paul are placed by him in the first class without any sort of hesitation or doubt.

It is further also to be collected, from the chapter in which this distinction is laid down, that the method made use of by Eusebius, and by the Christians of his time, viz. the close of the third century, in judging concerning the sacred authority of any books, was to enquire after and consider the testimony of those who lived near the age of the apostles.†

IV. That no ancient writing, which is attested as these epistles are, hath had its authenticity disproved, or is in fact questioned. The controversies which have been moved concerning suspected writings, as the epistles, for instance, of Phalaris, or the eighteen epistles of Cicero, begin by showing that this attestation is wanting. That

† Lardner, vol. viii. p. 106.

being proved, the question is thrown back upon internal marks of spuriousness or authenticity; and in these the dispute is occupied. In which disputes it is to be observed, that the contested writings are commonly attacked by arguments drawn from some opposition to which they betray to "authentic history," to "true epistles," to "the "real sentiments or circumstances of the author whom "they personate;"* which authentic history, which true epistles, which real sentiments themselves, are no other than ancient documents, whose early existence and reception can be proved, in the manner in which the writings before us are traced up to the age of their reputed author, or to ages near to his. A modern who sits down to compose the history of some ancient period, has no stronger evidence to appeal to for the most confident assertion, or the most undisputed fact, that he delivers, than writings, whose genuineness is proved by the same medium through which we evince the authenticity of ours. Nor, whilst he can have recourse to such authorities as these, does he apprehend any uncertainty in his accounts, from the suspicion of spuriousness or imposture in his materials.

V. It cannot be shown that any forgeries, properly so called,† that is, writings published under the name of the person who did not compose them, made their appearance in the first century of the Christian era, in which century these epistles undoubtedly existed. I shall set down under this proposition the guarded words of Lardner himself. "There are no quotations of any books of "them (spurious and apocryphal books) in the apostoli- "cal fathers, by whom I mean Barnabas, Clement of "Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, whose writ- "ings reach from the year of our Lord 70 to the year

* See the tracts written in the controversy between Tunstal and Middleton upon certain suspected epistles ascribed to Cicero.

† I believe that there is a great deal of truth in Dr. Lardner's observations, that comparatively few of those books, which we call apocryphal, were strictly and originally forgeries. See Lardner, vol. xii. p. 167.

" 108. *I say this confidently, because I think it has been* " *proved.*"*

Nor when they did appear where they much used by the primitive Christians. " Irenæus quotes not any " of these books. He mentions some of them, but he " never quotes them. The same may be said of Tertul- " lian; he has mentiond a book called 'Acts of Paul " and Thecla;' but it is only to condemn it. Clement of " Alexandria and Origen have mentioned and quoted sev- " eral such books, but never as authority, and sometimes " with express marks of dislike. Eusebius quotes no such " books in any of his works. He has mentioned them in- " deed, but how? Not by way of approbation, but to " show that they were of little or no value; and that they " never were received by the sounder part of Christians." Now, if with this, which is advanced after the most minute and diligent examination, we compare what the same cautious writer had before said of our received scriptures, " that in the works of three only of the above mentioned " fathers, there are more and larger quotations of the " small volume of the New Testament, than of all the " works of Cicero in the writers of all characters for seve- " ral ages;" and if, with the marks of obscurity or condemnation, which accompanied the mention of the several apocryphal Christian writings, when they happened to be mentioned at all, we contrast what Dr. Lardner's work completely and in detail makes out concerning the writings which we defend, and what, having so made out, he thought himself authorized in his conclusion to assert, that these books were not only received from the beginning, but received with the greatest respect; have been publicly and solemnly read in the assemblies of Christians throughout the world, in every age from that time to this; early translated into the languages of divers countries and people; commentaries written to explain and illustrate them;

* Lardner, vol. xii. p. 158.

quoted by way of proof in all arguments of a religious nature; recommended to the perusal of unbelievers, as containing the authentic account of the Christian doctrine; when we attend, I say, to this representation, we perceive in it, not only full proof of the early notoriety of these books, but a clear and sensible line of discrimination, which separates these from the pretensions of any others.

The Epistles of St. Paul stand particularly free of any doubt or confusion that might arise from this source. Until the conclusion of the fourth century, no intimation appears of any attempt whatever being made to counterfeit these writings; and then it appears only of a single and obscure instance. Jerome, who flourished in the year 392, has this expression. "Legunt quidam et ad Laodicen-"ses; sed ad omnibus exploditur;" there is also an Epistle to the Laodiceans, but it is rejected by every body.* Theodoret, who wrote in the year 423, speaks of this epistle in the same terms.† Beside these, I know not whether any ancient writer mentions it. It was certainly unnoticed during the three first centuries of the Church; and when it came afterwards to be mentioned, it was mentioned only to show, that, though such a writing did exist, it obtained no credit. It is probable that the forgery to which Jerome alludes, is the epistle which we now have under that title. If so, as hath been already observed, it is nothing more than a collection of sentences from the genuine Epistles; and was perhaps, at first, rather the exercise of some idle pen, than any serious attempt to impose a forgery upon the public. Of an Epistle to the Corinthians under St. Paul's name, which was brought into Europe in the present century, antiquity is entirely silent. It was unheard of for sixteen centuries; and at this day, though it be extant, and was first found in the Armenian language, it is not, by the Christians of that country, received into their scriptures. I hope, after this, that there is

* Lardner, vol. x. p. 103.
† Lardner, vol. xi. p. 88.

no reader who will think there is any competition of credit, or of external proof, between these and the received Epistles; or rather, who will not acknowledge the evidence of authenticity to be confirmed by the want of success which attended imposture.

When we take into our hands the letters which the suffrage and consent of antiquity hath thus transmitted to us, the first thing that strikes our attention is the air of reality and business, as well as of seriousness and conviction, which pervades the whole. Let the sceptic read them. If he be not sensible of these qualities in them, the argument can have no weight with him. If he be; if he perceive in almost every page the language of a mind actuated by real occasions, and operating upon real circumstances, I would wish it to be observed, that the proof which arises from this perception is not to be deemed occult or imaginary, because it is incapable of being drawn out in words, or of being conveyed to the apprehension of the reader in any other way, than by sending him to the books themselves.

And here, in its proper place, comes in the argument which it has been the office of these pages to unfold. St. Paul's Epistles are connected with the history by their particularity, and by the numerous circumstances, which are found in them. When we descend to an examination and comparison of these circumstances, we not only observe the history and the epistles to be independent documents unknown to, or at least unconsulted by each other, but we find the substance, and oftentimes very minute articles, of the history, recognized in the epistles, by allusions and references, which can neither be imputed to *design*, nor, without a foundation in truth, be accounted for by accident, by hints and expressions, and single words dropping as it were fortuitously from the pen of the writer, or drawn forth, each by some occasion proper to the place in which it occurs, but widely removed from any view to consistency or agreement. These, we know, are

effects which reality naturally produces, but which, without reality at the bottom, can hardly be conceived to exist.

When therefore, with a body of external evidence, which is relied upon, and which experience proves may safely be relied upon, in appreciating the credit of ancient writings, we combine characters of genuineness and originality which are not found, and which, in the nature and order of things, cannot be expected to be found in spurious compositions; whatever difficulties we may meet with in other topics of the Christian evidence, we can have little in yielding our assent to the following conclusions; that there was such a person as St. Paul; that he lived in the age which we ascribe to him; that he went about preaching the religion of which Jesus Christ was the founder; and that the letters which we now read were actually written by him upon the subject, and in the course of his ministry.

And if it be true that we are in possession of the very letters which St. Paul wrote, let us consider what confirmation they afford to the Christian history. In my opinion they substantiate the whole transaction. The great object of modern research is to come at the epistolary correspondence of the times. Amidst the obscurities, the silence, or the contradictions of history, if a letter can be found, we regard it as the discovery of a landmark; as that by which we can correct, adjust, or supply the imperfections and uncertainties of other accounts. One cause of the superior credit which is attributed to letters is this, that the facts which they disclose generally come out *incidentally*, and therefore without design to mislead the public by false or exaggerated accounts. This reason may be applied to St. Paul's Epistles with as much justice as to any letters whatever. Nothing could be further from the intention of the writer than to record any part of his history. That his history was *in fact* made public by these letters, and has by the same means been transmitted to future ages, is

a secondary and uthoughtof effect. The sincerity therefore of the apostle's declarations cannot reasonably be disputed; at least we are sure that it was not vitiated by any desire of setting himself off to the public at large. But these letters form a part of the muniments of Christianity, as much to be valued for their contents, as for their originality. A more inestimable treasure the care of antiquity could not have sent down to us. Beside the proof they afford of the general reality of St. Paul's history, of the knowledge which the author of the Acts of the Apostles had obtained of that history, and the consequent probability that he was, what he professes himself to have been, a companion of the apostle's; beside the support they lend to these important inferences, they meet specifically some of the principal objections upon which the adversaries of Christianity have thought proper to rely. In particular they show,

I. That Christianity was not a story set on foot amidst the confusions which attended and immediately preceded the destruction of Jerusalem; when many extravagant reports were circulated, when men's minds were broken by terror and distress, when amidst the tumults that surrounded them enquiry was impracticable. These letters show incontestably that the religion had fixed and established itself before this state of things took place.

II. Whereas it hath been insinuated, that our gospels may have been made up of reports and stories, which were current at the time, we may observe that, with respect to the Epistles, this is impossible. A man cannot write the history of his own life from reports; nor, what is the same thing, be led by reports to refer to passages and transactions in which he states himself to have been immediately present and active. I do not allow that this insinuation is applied to the historical part of the New Testament with any colour of justice or probability; but I say, that to the Epistles it is not applicable at all.

III. These letters prove that the converts to Christian-

ity were not drawn from the barbarous, the mean, or the ignorant set of men, which the representations of infidelity would sometimes make them. We learn from letters the character not only of the writer, but, in some measure of the persons to whom they are written. To suppose that these letters were addressed to a rude tribe, incapable of thought or reflection, is just as reasonable as to suppose Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding to have been written for the instruction of savages. Whatever may be thought of these letters in other respects, either of diction or argument, they are certainly removed as far as possible from the habits and comprehension of a barbarous people.

IV. St. Paul's history, I mean so much of it as may be collected from his letters, is so *implicated* with that of the other apostles, and with the substance indeed of the Christian history itself, that I apprehend it will be found impossible to admit St. Paul's story (I do not speak of the miraculous part of it) to be true, and yet to reject the rest as fabulous. For instance, can any one believe that there was such a man as Paul, a preacher of Christianity in the age which we assign to him, and *not* believe that there were also at the same time such men as Peter and James, and other apostles, who had been companions of Christ during his life, and who after his death published and avowed the same things concerning him which Paul taught? Judea, and especially Jerusalem, was the scene of Christ's ministry. The witnesses of his miracles lived there. St. Paul by his own account, as well as that of his historian, appears to have frequently visited that city; to have carried on a communication with the church there; to have associated with the rulers and elders of that church, who were some of them apostles; to have acted, as occasions offered, in correspondence, and sometimes in conjunction with them. Can it, after this, be doubted, but that the religion and the general facts relating to it, which St. Paul appears by his letters to have delivered to

the several churches which he establised at a distance were at the same time taught and published at Jerusalem itself, the place where the business was transacted; and taught and published by those who had attended the founder of the institution in his miraculous, or pretendedly miraculous ministry?

It is observable, for so it appears both in the Epistles and from the Acts of the Apostles, that Jerusalem, and the society of believers in that city, long continued the centre from which the missionaries of the religion issued with which all other churches maintained a correspondence and connection, to which they referred their doubts, and to whose relief, in times of public distress, they remitted their charitable assistance. This observation I think material, because it proves that this was not the case of giving our accounts in one country of what is transacted in another, without affording the hearers an opportunity of knowing whether the things related were credited by any, or even published, in the place where they are reported to have passed.

V. St. Paul's letters furnish evidence (and what better evidence than a man's own letters can be desired?) of the soundness and sobriety of his judgment. His caution in distinguishing between the occasional suggestions of inspiration, and the ordinary exercise of his natural understanding, is without example in the history of human enthusiasm. His morality is every where calm, pure, and rational; adapted to the condition, the activity, and the business of social life, and of its various relations; free from the over scrupulousness and austerities of superstition, and from, what was more perhaps to be apprehended, the abstractions of quietism, and the soarings and extravagancies of fanaticism. His judgment concerning a hesitating conscience; his opinion of the moral indifferency of many actions, yet of the prudence and even the duty of compliance, where noncompliance would produce evil effects on the minds of persons who observed it, is as cor-

rect and just as the most liberal and enlightened moralist could form at this day. The accuracy of modern ethics has found nothing to amend in these determinations.

What lord Lyttelton has remarked of the preference ascribed by St. Paul to inward rectitude of principle above every other religious accomplishment is very material to our present purpose. "In his First Epistle the to Corin-" thians, chap. xiii. 1—3, St Paul has these words; " *Though I speak with the tongue of men and of angels, and* " *have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tink-* " *ling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and* " *understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have* " *all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not* " *charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods* " *to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and* " *have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.* Is this the lan-" guage of enthusiasm? Did ever enthusiast prefer that u-" niversal benevolence which comprehendeth all moral vir-" tues, and which, as appeareth by the following verses, is " meant by charity here; did ever enthusiast, I say, prefer " that benevolence" (which we may add is attainable by every man) " to faith and to miracles, to those religious " opinions which he had embraced, and to those super-" natural graces and gifts which he imagined he had ac-" quired; nay even to the merit of martyrdom? Is it not " the genius of enthusiasm to set moral virtues infinitely " below the merit of faith; and of all moral virtues to " value that least which is most particularly enforced by " St. Paul, a spirit of candor, moderation, and peace? " Certainly neither the temper nor the opinions of a man " subject to fanatic delusions are to be found in this pas-" sage." Lord Lyttelton's Considerations on the Conversion, &c.

I see no reason therefore to question the integrity of his understanding. To call him a visionary, because he appealed to visions, or an enthusiast, because he pretended to inspiration, is to take the whole question for

granted. It is to take for granted that no such visions or inspirations existed; at least it is to assume, contrary to his own assertions, that he had no other proofs than these to offer of his mission, or of the truth of his relations.

One thing I allow, that his letters every where discover great zeal and earnestness in the cause in which he was engaged; that is to say, he was convinced of the truth of what he taught; he was deeply impressed, but not more so than the occasion merited, with a sense of its importance. This produces a corresponding animation and solicitude in the exercise of his ministry. But would not these considerations, supposing them to be well founded, have holden the same place, and produced the same effect, in a mind the strongest and most sedate?

VI. These letters are decisive as to the sufferings of the author; also as to the distressed state of the Christian church, and the dangers which attend the preaching of the gospel.

"Whereof I Paul am made a minister, who now re-
"joice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is
"behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his
"body's sake, which is the church." Col. ch. i. 24.

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of
"all men the most miserable," Cor. ch. xv. 19.

"Why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by
"your rejoicing, which I have in Christ Jesus, I die dai-
"ly. If after the manner of men, I have fought with
"beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead
"rise not?" 1 Cor. ch. xv. 30, &c.

"If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs
"with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we
"may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the
"sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be com-
"pared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."
Rom. ch. viii. 17, 18.

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall

"tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or na-
"kedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, for thy
"sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as
"sheep for the slaughter." Rom. ch. viii. 35, 36.

"Rejoicing in hope, *patient in tribulation*, continuing in-
"stant in prayer," Rom. ch. xii. 12.

"Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of
"the Lord; yet I give my judgment as one that hath ob-
"tained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I suppose
"therefore that this is good *for the present distress*; I say
"that it is good for a man so to be." 1 Cor. ch. vii. 25,
"26.

"For unto you it is given, in the behalf of Christ, not
"only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake,
"having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now
"hear to be in me." Phil. ch. i. 29, 30.

"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of
"our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified
"unto me, and I unto the world."

"From henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear
"in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Gal. ch.
"vi. 14, 17.

"Ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having
"received the word in much affliction, with joy of the
"Holy Ghost." 1 Thess. ch. i. 6.

"We ourselves glory in you in the churches of God
"for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and
"tribulations that ye endure." 2 Thess. ch. i. 4.

We may seem to have accumulated texts unnecessarily; but beside that the point, which they are brought to prove, is of great importance, there is this also to be remarked in every one of the passages cited, that the allusion is drawn from the writer by the argument or the occasion; that the notice which is taken of his sufferings, and of the suffering condition of Christianity, is perfectly incidental, and is dictated by no design of stating the facts themselves. Indeed they are not stated at all; they may rath-

er be said to be assumed. This is a distinction upon which we have relied a good deal in former parts of this treatise; and where the writer's information cannot be doubted, it always, in my opinion, adds greatly to the value and credit of the testimony.

If any reader require from the apostle more direct and explicit assertions of the same thing, he will receive full satisfaction in the following quotations.

"Are they ministers of Christ; (I speak as a fool) I "am more; in labors more abundant, in stripes above "measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of "the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; "thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned; "thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and day I have "been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of wa- "ters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own coun- "trymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, "in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils "among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, "in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings of- "ten, in cold and nakedness." 2 Cor. ch. xi. 23—28.

Can it be necessary to add more! "I think that God "hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed "to death; for we are made a spectacle unto the world, "and to angels, and to men. Even unto this present "hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and "are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place, and "labor, working with our own hands; being reviled, "we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defam- "ed, we entreat; we are made as the filth of the earth, "and are the offscouring of all things unto this day." 1 Cor. ch. iv. 9—13. I subjoin this passage to the former, because it extends to the other apostles of Christianity much of that which St. Paul declared concerning himself.

In the following quotations, the reference to the author's sufferings is accompanied with a specification of time

and place, and with an appeal for the truth of what he declares to the knowledge of the persons whom he addresses. "Even after that we had suffered before, and "were shamefully entreated, *as ye know, at Philippi*, we "were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of "God with much contention." 1 Thess. ch. ii. 2.

"But *thou hast fully known* my doctrine, manner of "life, purpose, faith, longsuffering, persecutions, afflic-"tions, which came to me *at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra*; "what persecutions I endured; but out of them all the "Lord delivered me." 2 Tim. ch. iii, 10, 11.

I apprehended that to this point, as far as the testimony of St. Paul is credited, the evidence from his letters is complete and full. It appears under every form in which it could appear, by occasional allusions and by direct assertions, by general declarations, and by specific examples.

VII. St. Paul in these letters asserts, in positive and unequivocal terms, his performance of miracles strictly and properly so called.

"He therefore that ministereth to you the spirit "and worketh miracles (ενεργων δυναμεις) among you, doth "he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of "faith?" Gal. ch. iii. 5.

"For I will not dare to speak of those things which "Christ hath not wrought be me,* to make the Gentiles "obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and "wonders (εν δυναμει σημειων και τερατων), by the power of "the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem and round "about unto Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel "of Christ." Rom, ch. xv. 18, 19.

"Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among "you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds," (εν σημειοις και τερασι και δυναμεσι†). 2 Cor. ch. xii. 12.

* i. e. "I will speak of nothing but what Christ hath wrought by "me;" or, as Grotius interprets it, "Christ hath wrought so great "things by me, that I will not dare to say what he hath not wrought.

† To those may be added the following indirect allusions, which,

These words, signs, wonders, and mighty deeds (σημεια, και τερατα, και δυναμεις), are the specific appropriate terms throughout the New Testament, employed when public sensible miracles are intended to be expressed. This will appear by consulting, amongst other places, the texts referred to in the note;* and it cannot be shown that they are ever employed to express any thing else.

Secondly, these words not only denote miracles as opposed to natural effects, but they depote visible, and what may be called external miracles, as distinguished,

First, from *inspiration*. If St. Paul had meant to refer only to secret illuminations of his understanding, or secret influences upon his will or affections, he could not, with truth, have represented them as "signs and wonders "*wrought* by him," of "signs and wonders and mighty "deeds wrought *amongst* them."

Secondly, from *visions*. These would not, by any means, satisfy the force of the terms, "signs, wonders, "and mighty deeds;" still less could they be said to be

though if they had stood alone, i.e. without plainer texts in the same writings, they might have been accounted dubious; yet when considered in conjunction with the passages already cited, can hardly receive any other interpretation than that which we give them.

"My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of "men's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power; "that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but of the "power of God." 1 Cor. chap. ii. 4, 5.

"The gospel, whereof I was made a minister, according to the "gift of the grace of God given unto me, by the effectual working of "his power." Eph. ch. iii. 7.

"For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the "circumcision, the same was mighty in me towards the Gentiles." Gal. ch. ii. 8.

"For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in pow-"er, and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance." 1 Thess. ch. i. 5.

* Mark, xvi. 20. Luke, xxiii. 8. John, ii. 11. 23; iii. 2; iv. 48. 54; xi. 49. Acts, ii. 22; iv. 30; v. 12; vi. 8; vii. 16; xiv. 3; xv. 12. Heb. ii. 4.

"*wrought* by him," or "wrought *amongst* them;" nor are these terms and expressions any where applied to visions. When our author alludes to the supernatural communications which he had received, either by vision or otherwise, he uses expressions suited to the nature of the subject, but very different from the words which we have quoted. He calls them revelations, but never signs, wonders, or mighty deeds. "I will come," says he, "to "visions and *revelations* of the Lord;" and then proceeds to describe a particular instance, and afterwards adds, "lest I should be exalted above measure through the "abundance of the revelations, there was given me a thorn "in the flesh."

Upon the whole, the matter admits of no softening qualification, or ambiguity whatever. If St. Paul did not work actual, sensible, public miracles, he has knowingly, in these letters, borne his testimony to a falsehood. I need not add, that, in two also of the quotations, he has advanced his assertion in the face of those persons amongst whom he declares the miracles to have been wrought.

Let it be remembered that the Acts of the Apostles describe various particular miracles wrought by St. Paul, which in their nature answer to the terms and expressions which we have seen to be used by St. Paul himself.

Here then we have a man of liberal attainments, and in other peints of sound judgment who had addicted his life to the service of the gospel. We see him, in the prosecution of his purpose, travelling from country to country, enduring every species of hardship, encountering every extremity of danger, assaulted by the populace, punished by the magistrates, scourged, beat, stoned, left for dead; expecting, wherever he came, a renewal of the same treatment, and the same dangers, yet, when driven from one city, preaching in the next; spending his whole time in the employment, sacrificing to it his pleasures, his

ease, his safety; persisting in this course to old age, unaltered by the experience of perverseness, ingratitude, prejudice, desertion; unsubdued by anxiety, want, labor, persecutions; unwearied by long confinement, undismayed by the prospect of death. Such was St. Paul. We have his letters in our hands; we have also a history purporting to be written by one of his fellow travellers, and appearing, by a comparison with these letters, certainly to have been written by some person well acquainted with the transactions of his life. From the letters, as well as from the history, we gather not only the account which we have stated of *him*, but that he was one out of many who acted and suffered in the same manner; and that, of those who did so, several had been the companions of Christ's ministry, the ocular witnesses, or pretending to be such, of his miracles, and of his resurrection. We moreover find this same person referring in his letters to his supernatural conversion, the particulars and accompanying circumstances of which are related in the history, and which accompanying circumstances, if all or any of them be true, render it impossible to have been a delusion. We also find him positively, and in appropriated terms, asserting, that he himself worked miracles, strictly and properly so called, in support of the mission which he executed; the history, meanwhile, recording various passages of his ministry, which come up to the extent of this assertion. The question is, wether falsehood was ever attested by evidence like this. Falsehoods, we know, have found their way into reports, into tradition, into books; but is an example to be met with, of a man voluntarily undertaking a life of want and pain, of incessant fatigue, of continual peril; submitting to the loss of his home and country, to stripes and stoning, to tedious imprisonment, and the constant expectation of a violent death, for the sake of carrying about a story of what was false, and of what, if false, he must have known to be so?

FINIS.