

THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;
JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;
HISTORY OF HERETICS;
AND HIS SERMONS. AND TRACTS:

WITH

GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

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

VOLUME VI.

LONDON:

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

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

C O N T E N T S

OF THE

S I X T H V O L U M E.

A HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

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

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

A P L A N
OF THE
T I M E S A N D P L A C E S

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

GOSPELS, &c.	PLACES.	A. D.
St. Matthew's.	Judea, or near it.	about 64
St. Mark's.	Rome.	----- 64
St. Luke's.	Greece.	about 63 or 64
St. John's.	Ephesus.	about 68
The Acts of the Apostles.	Greece.	about 63 or 64
EPISTLES.		
To the Romans.	Corinth.	about February 58
1 Corinthians.	Ephesus.	beginning of 56
2 Corinthians.	Macedonia.	about October 57
Galatians.	Corinth or Ephesus.	{ near the end of 52 or the beginning of 53
Ephesians.	Rome.	about April 61
Philippians.	Rome,	before the end of 62
Colossians.	Rome.	before the end of 62
1 Thessalonians.	Corinth.	52
2 Thessalonians.	Corinth.	52
1 Timothy.	Macedonia.	56
2 Timothy.	Rome.	about May 61
Titus.	Macedonia, or near it.	before the end of 56
Philemon.	Rome.	before the end of 62
Hebrews.	Rome, or Italy.	in the spring of 63
Epistle of St. James.	Judea.	61, or beginning of 62
Two epistles of St. Peter.	Rome.	64
St. John's first epistle.	Ephesus.	about 80
His second and third epistles.	Ephesus.	between 80 and 90
Epistle of St. Jude.	Unknown.	64 or 65
The Revelation of St. John.	Patmos, or Ephesus.	95 or 96

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

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

E R R A T A.

Page. line.

- 25 10 *insert*ⁱ *after* Wherefore
 77 8 from bottom, *for* V. Testimonies, *read* IV. Testimonies
 86 15 *insert*ⁿ *after* transcribed
 90 5, 6 *dele* the inverted commas
 101 19 *read* to St.
 131 11 *dele* the comma at the end of the line
 238 5 from bottom, *read* Theophilus
 141 4 ——— supposititious
 223 2 *for*, any of, *read* any one of
 231 23 ——— loaves
 290 2 ——— Paul
 450 15 *insert*^z *after* as
 586 22 *read* constitutions say, he was

IN THE NOTES.

- | <i>Page.</i> | | <i>read</i> |
|--------------|--|---------------------|
| 140 | note l ——— | p. 135, 136 |
| 152 | col. 1. l. 2 <i>for</i> mer, ——— | rem |
| 153 | col. 2. l. 3 ——— | αὐτῶ αὐτῆ |
| 184 | col. 2. l. 4 ——— | p. 173 |
| 215 | col. 2. l. 14 ——— | Exercita |
| 216 | col. 2. from bottom ——— | p. 213 |
| 235 | col. 2. l. 3. from bottom . | Moshem. |
| 250 | note x ——— | p. 236 |
| 252 | col. 2. l. 5. <i>for</i> lo — | lum |
| 315 | note i <i>after</i> vol. ——— | I. |
| 352 | bottom ——— | f As before, p. 322 |
| 481 | note x l. 1. <i>for</i> Ex ——— | Et |
| 508 | col. 2. l. 9. <i>for</i> regionis — | regiones |
| 574 | col. 2. l. 3. from bottom, <i>for</i> pro-
vinciani ——— | provinciam |
| 615 | col. 1. l. 4 <i>for</i> υπαξ ——— | υπαξ |

A

S U P P L E M E N T

TO THE SECOND PART OF THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;

CONTAINING A HISTORY OF THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS,

WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:

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

WITH REMARKS AND OBSERVATIONS

UPON EVERY BOOK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

Useful for all who desire to understand the CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

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

VOL. VI.

B

A
H I S T O R Y
O F T H E
A P O S T L E S A N D E V A N G E L I S T S,
W R I T E R S O F T H E N E W T E S T A M E N T.

C H A P. I.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^a Vol. V. p. 141.

^b Ibid. p. 65.

^c Ibid. p. 104.

^d Ἄλλα δεῖ παῖα καιρον επιτηθειον ηγειςθαι προς την των πνευματικων λογων διαλεξιν. . . Δυνησομεθα και επι οικιας διατριβουτες, και μετα την εσιασιν, και προ της εσιασης μετα χειρας λαβουτες τα δεῖα βιβλια την εξ αυτων καρπεσθαι ωφελειαν. In i. Gen. hom. x. T. IV. p. 81. C. Bened.

^e De origine nominis Bibliorum: Heum. Pœcile. Tom. I. p. 412—415.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^g Ib. p. 414.

^h Le mot signifie non seulement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^l Κανονα εκαλεσε την προκειμενην διδασκαλιαν, ως ευθυτηη κοσμημενην, και μητε ελλειπον τι, μητε περιτιον εχυσαν. Theod. in loc.

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

^l See vol. II. p. 235.

^m Κανων δε εκκλησιαστικος η συνωδια και η συμφωνια νομων τε και προφητων τη κατα την τε κυρια παρθεσιαν παραδιδομενη διαθηκη. Cl. Strom. l. 6. p. 676. C.

ⁿ Vol. II. p. 466.

^o . . . τον εκκλησιαστικον φυλατιων κανονα. Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 25. p. 226. B.

to which passages therefore the reader may easily have recourse.

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

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

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

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

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

The third council of Carthage, about 397, ordains,

^p Vol. IV. p. 283, 284.

^q Ib. p. 290—292.

^q The same, p. 308.

^r See vol. V. p. 76, 77.

^s Hæc sunt, quæ patres intra canonem concluderunt, & ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt. . . . Sciendum tamen est, quod alii libri sunt, qui non sunt canonici, sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt. . . . Quæ omnia

legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Cæteras vero scripturas apocryphas nominarunt, quas in ecclesiis legi noluerunt. Rufin. citat. ubi supra, p. 185. note g.

^r Vol. V. p. 17.

^u . . . p. 18.

^x p. 22.

^y p. 35, 36.

‘ that ^z nothing beside the canonical scriptures be read in
 ‘ the church under the name of Divine Scriptures.’

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

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

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

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

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

^z . . . p. 79. ^a p. 84.

^b Totus autem canon scrip-
 turarum . . . his libris continetur.
 Ib. note r. ibid.

^c . . . p. 103.

^d See p. 103—109.

^e Vol. V. Recapitulation of chap.
 cxviii.

^f ‘Ορτις, εις οσην ατοπιαν επιπλεσιν
 οι μη βελεμενοι τω της θειας γραφης
 κατακολεθειν κανονι κ. λ. In Gen.

cap. 33. hom, 58. T. IV. p.
 566. B.

^g Vid. hom. 33. in Act, Ap. sub
 fin.

ⁱ Οτι δε ταυτα κτως εχει, τον κανονα
 της αληθειας, τας θειας φημι γραφας,
 κατοπλευσωμεν. Ibid. ep. 114. l. 4.

^k See vol. V. p. 311.

^l Ταυτα ειτι τα κανονιζομενα βιβλια
 εν τη εκκλησια, και παλαια και νεα.
 Citat. ibid. p. 380. note e.

and

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

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

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

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

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

ⁿ Ἐτι δε και μαθειν την των παλαιων βιβλιων εβραηθης ακριβειαν. κ. λ. Ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 27. p. 148. D.

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

^p Ibid. p. 148. D.

^q See vol. IV. p. 271.

^r The same, p. 299.

passage already³ cited he calls the gospels, or the New Testament in general, the evangelic instrument. And says: 'How⁴ large chasms Marcion has made in the epistle to the Romans, by leaving out what he pleases, may appear from our entire instrument:' or our unaltered copies of the New Testament, particularly of that epistle. Speaking of the shepherd of Hermas, he says, it⁵ was not reckoned a part of the divine instrument: thereby meaning, as it seems, the New Testament: which passage was quoted by us⁶ formerly. He calls⁷ the law and the prophets the Jewish instruments: that is, writings or scriptures. He speaks of the antiquity⁸ of the Jewish instruments or scriptures. He⁹ seems in one place to use the word instrument, as equivalent to scriptures, containing the doctrine of revelation, or the revealed will of God.

VI. Digest is another word used by Tertullian in speaking of the scriptures. 'Luke's¹⁰ digest, he says, is often ascribed to Paul.' He calls¹¹ the gospels, or the whole New Testament, 'our digest,' in allusion, as it seems, to some collection of the Roman laws digested into order. Those two passages were cited in the chapter of Tertullian. I now transcribe the latter below¹² more at large, it having also the word instrument, as equivalent to the New Testa-

³ See vol. II. p. 256.

⁴ *Quantas autem foveas in ista vel maxime epistola [ad Romanos] Marcion fecerit, auferendo quæ voluit, de nostri Instrumenti integritate patebit. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. 13. p. 601.*

⁵ *Sed cederem tibi, si scriptura Pastoris—divino instrumento meruisset incidi. . . De Pudicit. cap. 10. p. 727. A.*

⁶ See vol. II. p. 284.

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

⁸ *Primam instrumentis istis auctoritatem summa antiquitas vindicat. Apol. cap. 19. p. 19. B.*

Sed quoniam edidimus, anti-

quissimis Judæorum instrumentis sectam istam esse suffultam. Apol. cap. 21. in. p. 20.

⁹ *Sed quo plenius et impressius tam ipsum, quam dispositiones ejus et voluntates adiremus, instrumentum adjecit literaturæ, si quis velit de Deo inquirere. Apol. cap. 18. p. 18. C.*

¹⁰ See vol. II. p. 258.

¹¹ The same, p. 280.

¹² *Si vero Apostoli quidem integrum evangelium contulerunt, de sola convictus inæqualitate reprehensi, Pseudapostoli autem veritatem eorum interpolârunt, et inde sunt nostra digesta: quod erit germanum illud Apostolorum instrumentum, quod adulteros passum est? Adver. Marc. l. 4. cap. 3. p. 504. B.*

ment. He likewise calls the Jewish scriptures ‘ Sacred Digests.’ He seems to use the word digest ^f elsewhere, as equivalent to writing, or work in general.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^ε Ἐὐαγγέλιον δὲ τὸ κηρυγμα προσηγορευθεν, ὡς πολλῶν αγαθῶν υπισχυμενον χορηγιαν. Ἐυαγγελιζεται γαρ τας τε θεα καλαλλαγας, την τε διαβολα, καλαλυσιν, των αμαρτηματων την αφεσιν, τε θανατα την παυλαν, των νεκρων την ανασασιν, την ζωην την αιωνιον, την βασιλειαν των θρανων. In ep. ad Rom. T. III. p. 10. B.

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

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

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

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

^a That is Dr. Clarke's paraphrase. But I am sensible, it will not be allowed by all. Œcumenius says, that by gospel Mark does not intend his own writing, but Christ's preaching. *Μαρκος, αρχη, φησι, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἔτι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφήν καλεῖ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς χριστοῦ κήρυγμα.* Œcum. in Act. Ap. He proceeds to say, that the faithful afterwards called the writings of the evangelists gospels, as truly containing the gospel, that is, the doctrine of Christ. See vol. V. p. 324.

^b Matt. iii. 1, 2. *In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying: repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.* Compare Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 1, 2. And says St. Luke iii. 18. *And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.* *Πολλὰ μὲν ἔτι καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν, εὐαγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν.* Which may be literally rendered thus: *And exhorting many other like things, he evangelized [or preached the gospel to] the people.*

C H A P. II.

General Observations upon the Canon of the New Testament.

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

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

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

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

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

^b Vol. V. p. 49.

^c The same, p. 138.

^d p. 195, 196

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

^f Facillima refutatu est postrema hæc opinio, ideo quod Paulinæ epistolæ inter se sint germanæ, pari charactere ac dicendi modo: hæc

vero manifeste ab iis discrepet, selectiores habens voces Græcas, leniusque fluens, non autem fracta brevibus incisus, ac salebrosa. . . . Grot. Proœm. in ep. ad Hebr.

^g Hist. Ec. Ann. 69. p. 455—461.

^h Prolegom. in ep. ad Hebr.

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

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

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

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

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

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

^k Jam olim veterum multi credidère, non esse apostoli Petri, argumento tum dictionis ab epistola priore multum diversæ, quod agnoscunt Eusebius & Hieronymus, tum quod multæ olim ecclesiæ hanc non receperint. . . . Scriptorem autem hujus epistolæ arbitror esse Simeonem sive Simonem, episcopum post Jacobi mortem Hierosolymis, ejusdemque Jacobi, cujus epistolam habemus, successorem & imitatore. . . . Unde etiam constat, vixisse hunc post excidium

Hierosolymitanum ad Trajani tempora, & tunc pro nomine Christi crucifixum. Annot. in Ep. Petri secund.

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

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

there

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

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

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

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

^o ' If any one has a mind to sort
' the several books of the New
' Testament, he may in the first
' place set the Apostolical Consti-
' tutions with its extract, or Doc-
' trine of the apostles, as derived
' from the body, or college of the
' apostles met in councils. In the
' next place he may put the four

' gospels, with their appendix, the
' Acts of the apostles. The Apo-
' calypse of John also cannot be
' reckoned at all inferior to them,
' though it be quite of another
' nature from them. In the third
' rank may stand the epistles of the
' apostles, Paul, Peter and John.
' In the fourth rank may stand the
' epistles of the brethren of our
' Lord, James and Jude. In the
' fifth and last rank may stand the
' epistles and writings of the com-
' panions and attendants of the
' apostles, Barnabas, Clement, Her-
' mas, Ignatius, Polycarp. All
' which, with the addition perhaps
' of apocryphal Esdras, and of the
' Apocalypse of Peter, and the Acts
' of Paul where now extant, I look
' upon, though in different de-
' grees, as the sacred books of the
' New Testament.' Ibid. p. 72,
73.

of

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

III. A short canon of scripture is most eligible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

^p Dr. Jortin's Remarks on Eccle-
siastical History, vol. I. p. 229.

^q See vol. V. p. 117.

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

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

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

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

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

V. Nevertheless

^r Vol. IV. p. 224—231.

^a We learn from Paul Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, that one of the doctrinal articles concerning sacred scripture, extracted, or pretended to be extracted out of Luther's works, was this: 'That no books should be reckoned a part of the Old Testament, beside those received by the Jews: and that out of the New Testament should be excluded the

' epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle
' of James, the second of Peter,
' the second and third of John, the
' epistle of Jude, and the Reve-
' lation.' And there were some
bishops in that council, ' who
' would have had the books of the
' New Testament divided into
' two classes: in one of which
' should be put those books only,
' which had been always received
' without contradiction: and in the
' other

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

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

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

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

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

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

‘ other those which had been rejected by some, or about which at least there had been doubts.’ And Dr. Courayer, in his notes, seems to favour this proposal. See his

French translation of the History of the Council of Trent. Liv. 2. ch. 43. tom. 1. p. 235. and ch. 47. p. 240. and note i.

^s See ch. i. vol. II. p. 12—14.

nevertheless,

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

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

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

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

2. Barnabas was not an apostle.

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

^t p. 232, 233.

^u p. 497, 498.

^x p. 465, &c.

^y Vol. IV. p. 227, 258.

^z p. 227, 228.

^a p. 283, 284.

^b p. 300.

^c p. 309.

^d p. 313.

^e p. 408.

^f p. 413, 414.

^g Vol. V. p. 32.

^h p. 76.

ⁱ p. 79.

^k p. 85, 86.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To which I answer, first, Both being now together, and meeting with the like treatment, might be called apostles; though only one of them was, properly, so. Secondly, it is not unlikely, that Barnabas and Paul are here styled by St. Luke apostles, in regard to what had been done at Antioch, as related by him, ch. xii. 1—4. when by an express order from heaven, they were sent forth from the church at Antioch, upon a special commission, in which they were still employed. That designation, however solemn, did not make either of them apostles of Christ in the highest sense. It was not the apostolical, which is a general commission. But it was a particular commission, as appears from that whole history, and from what is said at the conclusion of the journey, which they had taken, Acts xiv. 26. *And thence they sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work, which they had fulfilled.* Nevertheless, they are not unfitly called apostles upon account of it. So 2 Cor. viii. 13. *Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner, and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be enquired of, they¹ are the messengers of the churches, literally, apostles of the churches, and the glory of Christ.* If those brethren, which had been appointed by the churches to go to Jerusalem, with the contributions, which had been made for the relief of the poor saints in Judea, might be called apostles; there can be no doubt, but Paul and Barnabas might be called apostles in regard to the work, to which they had been solemnly appointed by the church at Antioch.

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

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

¹ ἀποστολῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

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

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

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

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

By Tertullian, as cited by usⁿ formerly, Barnabas is plainly reckoned no more, than a companion of apostles.

Eusebius, in a chapter concerning those who were disciples of Christ, says: 'The names of our Saviour's apostles are well known from the gospels: but there is nowhere extant a catalogue of the seventy disciples. However, it is said, that Barnabas was one of them, who is expressly mentioned in the acts, and in Paul's epistle to the Galatians.' That learned writer therefore did not know, that Barnabas was an apostle. In^o another place of the same work, his Ecclesiastical History, he quotes a passage from the seventh book of Clement's Institutions or Hypotyposes, where Barnabas is styled one of the seventy. In his Commentary upon Isaiah^r Eusebius computes fourteen apos-

^m Vol. II. p. 232.

ⁿ p. 270.

^o Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam Magistrorum. Exstat enim & Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos.

Tertull. de Pudicit. cap. 20 p. 741.

^p . . . Τῶν δὲ ἐβδομηκοντὰ μαθητῶν κατὰλογῶ μὲν εἶς ἕδαμη φερεῖται λέγεται γέ μιν εἰς αὐτῶν βαρναβᾶς, κ. λ. H. E. l. 1. cap. xii.

^q L. II. cap. i. p. 38 D.

^r Comm. in Es. p. 422.

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

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

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

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

^s See vol. IV. p. 252, 253.

^t See vol. V. p. 58.

^u Ibid.

^x Ibid. p. 198—201.

^y p. 148, 149.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^z See apostles in the alphabetical Table of principal matters.

^a See vol. II. p. 234.

^b Vol. V. p. 42.

^c Decimus nobis character apostolicæ *υπεροχης* est potestas scribendi ad ecclesias plures, vel ad omnes, *τοις καθολοις πιστοις*, hujusmodi epistolas, quæ in canonem referri mererentur, id est, quæ forent canonica, universalis et perpetuæ in Ecclesia auctoritatis. *Diss. prima de Apostol.*

Duod. num. xi. Opp. T. II. p. 310.

^d Ego autem non tanquam doctor, sed unus ex vobis, demonstrabo pauca, per quæ in plurimis latiores sitis. *Barn. ep. cap. i.*

^e Adhuc & hoc rogo vos, tanquam unus ex vobis. *Ib. cap. 4.*

^f 'Οιδεν ο την εμφυτον δωρεαν της διδαχης αυτη θεμειθ εν ημιν εδεις γνησιωτερον εμαθεν απ εμας λογον. 'Αλλα οιδα, οτι αξιοι εσε υμεις. *Cap. 9.*

I shall

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

‘ Thus ^ε as much as in me lies, I have written to you with great plainness. And I hope, that according to my ability, I have omitted nothing conducive to your salvation in the present circumstance.’

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

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

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

C H A P III.

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

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

^ε Ἐφ' ὅσον ἦν ἐν δυνάτει καὶ ἀπλο-
τητι δηλωσαὶ ὑμῖν ἐλπίζει μὴ ἡ ψυχή
τῆ ἐπιθυμίας μὴ μὴ παραλελοιπέναι με-
τι τῶν ἀνηκούσων ὑμῖν εἰς σωτηρίαν,
ἐπέρωτων. Cap. 17.

^h Ἐρωτῶ ὑμᾶς, χάριν αἰτεμενῶ.
κ. λ. Cap. 21.

ⁱ Διὸ μάλλον ἐσιπτάδασα γραψαί, ἀφ'
ὧν ἰδυνήθη, εἰς τὸ εὐφραναί ὑμᾶς. Ibid.

ministry;

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

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

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

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

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

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

And

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

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

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

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

^a See Eusebius vol. IV. p. 217, 218.

^b Vol. IV. p. 231.

^c Vol. V. p. 84—85.

^d 270, 271.

^{dd} p. 282, 283.

^e Vol. V. p. 84, 85.

^f p. 280—282.

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

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

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

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

^s Vol. ii. p. 221.

^h p. 466.

ⁱ Vol. IV. p. 228, &c.

^k 283.

^l p. 299, 300.

^m Vol. V. p. 76, 77.

ⁿ p. 84, 85.

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

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

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

o Vol. II. p. 247.

p Vol. IV. p. 228.

q Vol. IV. p. 308, 309.

r Vol. V. p. 78, 79.

s Nusquam quidem legimus, Col-
 legiam Apostolicam, aut cœtum

ullum Rectorum Ecclesiarum Chris-
 tianarum coactum esse, qui pro auc-
 toritate definierint hunc numerum
 Evangeliorum esse admittendum,
 non majorem, nec minorem. Sed
 nec opus fuit, cum omnibus con-
 staret,

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

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

stare, ex testimonio et consensu
 æqualium, quatuor hæc Evangelia
 eorum vere fuisse, quorum nomina
 præferunt: cumque nihil in iis
 legatur quod scriptoribus dignum
 non sit, vel revelationi Veteris Tes-
 tamenti, rectæ rationi, vel mini-
 mum adversetur: aut quod inferius
 ævum, recentiorumque manus ullo
 modo resipiat. Non opus fuit syno-
 do Grammaticorum, qui, pro impe-
 rio, pronunciarent ea scripta, verbi
 causa, Ciceronis et Virgilio, quæ
 eorum esse non dubitamus, re verâ
 tantorum ingeniorum fœtus fuisse,
 et posteritati ea in re consulerent.
 Omnium consensus, non quæsitus,
 non rogatus, sed sponte significatus,
 prout occasio tulit, resque ipsæ om-

nibus, qui postea vixere, dubitati-
 onem omnem anteverterunt. . . . Sic
 et Evangeliorum auctoritas merito
 constituta est, et invaluit, perpetuo
 consensu, sine ullo Rectorum Eccle-
 siæ decreto.

Idem dixerimus de Epistolis Apo-
 stolicis, quæ nullius ecclesiastici con-
 ventus judicio, sed constanti om-
 nium christianorum testimonio, re-
 busque ipsis, quas complectuntur,
 auctoritatem omnem suam debent.
 Cleric. H. E. ann. 100. num. iii.
 iv. Vid. et ann. 29. num. xcii.

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

^u New and full Method, part L
 ch. v. vi. vii.

^x See vol. III. p. 523—526.

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

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

C H A P. IV.

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

S E C T. I.

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

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

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

^y p. 525, 526.

^a Φασι δὲ, ὡς ἀρα τε κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελισ μνημονεύειν ὁ παῦλος εἰώθειν,

ὁππῶκα ὡς περὶ ἰδὴ τίνος εὐαγγελισ γράφων εἶπε, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μῆ. Euf. H. E. l. 3. c. 4. p. 73. D.

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

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

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

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

^c Και τριτον το κατα λυκαν, το υπο παυλα επαινεμενον ευαγγελιον. Ap. Euf. l. 6. cap. 25 p. 226. C.

^d See vol. II. p. 466.

^e See vol. V. p. 39.

^f p. 35.

^g De quo [Luca] et in alio loco:

Misi, inquit, cum illo fratrem, cujus laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias... &c. In Philem. T. IV. P. I. p. 454.

^h Και τις εστος εστιν ο αδελφος; τινες μεν του λυκαν. Και φασι, δια την ιστοριαν ηνπερ εγραψε. Τινες δε του βαρναβαν. Και γαρ το αγραφον κηρυγμα ευαγγελιον καλει. In 2 epist. ad Corinth. hom. 18. tom. X.

ⁱ In loc. p. 389.

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

^l Œcum. in loc. Tom. I. p. 663.

' of

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

Let us now observe the interpretations of some judicious
 moderns.

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

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

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

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

^m Mihi non displicet sententia
 illorum, qui hic Lucam designari
 putant: ita tamen ut per evangeli-
 um non intelligatur liber, qui tunc
 editus nondum erat, sed ipsum mu-
 nus evangelistæ, quod Lucas Pauli
 vice multis in locis fideliter obierat,
 sive ipsa evangelii prædicatio, ut
 infra x. 14. *ev in pro dia per.* Grot.
 ad 2 Cor. viii. 18.

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

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

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

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

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

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

° Vid. Est. in 2 Cor. viii. 18. et Beaufobr. in ver. 18. et 23.

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

^q Iterum serio et graviter admonet, ut acceptam fidei doctrinam conservet, ne locum relinquat ulli

peregrino dogmati. Nomine depositi metaphorice significatur doctrina successoribus credita, ac per manus tradita. Est. in loc.

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

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

S E C T. II.

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

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

^s See vol. II. p. 158.

^t Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. Nec enim fas est dicere, quoniam ante prædicaverunt, quam perfectam haberent agnitionem, sicut quidam audent dicere, glori-

antes, emendatores se esse Apostolorum. Postea enim quam surrexit Dominus noster a mortuis, & induti sunt supervenientis Spiritus Sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti sunt, & habuerant perfectam agnitionem, exierunt in fines terræ, ea quæ a Deo nobis bona sunt evangelizantes, & cœlestem pacem hominibus annunciantes: qui quidem & omnes pariter & singuli eorum habentes evangelium Dei. Iren. Adv. Haer. l. 3. cap. 1.

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

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

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

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

^u Vol. iv. p. 225.

^x See vol. II. p. 466.

^{*} Vol. IV. p. 239—245.

^y Ib. p. 511, 512.

['] earth,

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

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

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

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

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

^z See vol. II. p. 111, 112, 210— 218. Vol. IV. p. 314. Vol. V. p. 171, 172. ^b Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew’s gospel, p. 54. chap. vi.

^a Vol. V. p. 38.

S E C T. III.

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

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

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

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

^c Quinetiam, si ex Veterum nonnullorum testimoniis antea adductis, de re judicemus, affirmabimus, Matthæum, Marcum, et Lucam, ante ultima Neronis tempora, quibus occisi sunt Petrus et Paulus, Evangelia scripsisse. Quod non levi argumento confirmari potest, ducto ex Matt. cap. xxiv. Marc. xiii. Luc. xxi. ubi narratur Jerosolymæ excidii prædictio, quasi rei etiamnum futuræ, eo tempore, quo Evangelia ab iis scribebantur. Si enim eam prædicationem post eventum scripsissent Evangelistæ memorati, verbulo saltem monuissent, prædictionem fuisse eventu confir-

matam. Quod tantum abest ut faciant, ut Matthæus et Marcus hac admonitione, ο αναγιγνωσκων νοειτω, qui legit, intelligat, quam subjiciunt præfagiis Jerosolymitanæ cladis, admonere videantur Christianos in Judæa viventes, ut diligenter futura illa præfagia attendant, quo possint vitæ suæ consulere. Vide Matt. xxiv. 15. Marc. xiii. 14. et ad ea loca interpretes. Cleric Diff. iii. de quatuor Evangeliiis. num. vii. p. 541.

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

expressed

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

Moreover, though these predictions must have been recorded, before they were accomplished; I think, the fulfilment was then near at hand, and not far off. This seems to be implied in that expression: *Let him that readeth, understand.* And indeed it must have been difficult and hazardous to publish such things in writing. How offensive these sayings must have been to the Jewish people, and perhaps to some others likewise, is easy to conceive from the nature of the things spoken of; and it may be confirmed by divers instances. When our Lord had spoken the parable of the vineyard, let out to husbandmen, recorded in Luke xx. 9—13. it is added by the evangelist, ver. 19, 20. *And the chief priests, and the scribes, the same hour sought to lay hands on him, but they feared the people; for they perceived, that he had spoken this parable against them. And they watched him, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor.* And among the odious charges brought against our Saviour by false witnesses, this was one, *that he said: I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days,* Matt. xxvi. 61. With this he was reproached

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

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

S E C T IV.

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

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

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

^c Hence we see near to what time this history of the Acts was written: viz. either in the year 62, or not long after: it being altogether probable, that St. Luke

would not defer writing long after his departure from St. Paul. Which seems to have been now, when the apostle was set at liberty from his confinement at Rome. . . .

^c That

and ^r Estius, ^s Mill, ^{*} Dodwell, and ^h Basnage; though the thing appears to me very obvious: and if so, we have gained very nearly the date of one of the four gospels.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^k See vol. V. p. 39.

and

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

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

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

Of those many he says, they 'had taken in hand,' undertaken, or attempted. St. Luke would not have spoken thus of Matthew, or Mark. Indeed, we may suppose, that¹ those narrations, to which St. Luke refers, were not false and fabulous, nor heretical: but they were defective.

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

Nevertheless the ancient Christians, to several of whom the Greek language was natural, understood the word differently. And their judgments must be of value in this case. Origen's observations upon St. Luke's introduction may be seen, vol. II. p. 503, 504. where he says, 'St. Luke's expression, *taken in hand*, implies a tacit accusation of those, who, without the gift of the Holy Ghost, took upon them to write gospels. For Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John, did not take in hand to write: but being full of the Holy Ghost, wrote gospels.' In which words, and afterwards, continually, he distinguisheth the four evangelists from the

¹ Quod istos ait Lucas, non satis commode præstitisse: minime tamen, opinor, fabulosas, immo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem Ecclesiæ, sub Nicodemi, . . . Thomæ, Ægyptiorum nominibus impudentissime obtrusas. Nec tamen hic recte colligunt, Lucam post Matthæum et Marcum hanc suam

historiam edidisse. Bez. in Luc. cap. i. ver. 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ⁿ See vol. IV. p. 449.

^o . . . δῆλων ὡς ἀρα πολλῶν καὶ ἀλλῶν προπετεστέρον ἐπιτηδεύματων διηγησιν ποιησάσθαι ὧν αὐτὸς πεπληροφόρητο λόγων, κ. λ. Euseb. l. 3. c. 24. p. 96. C.

^p Vol. IV. p. 226, 227.

^q . . . φασκῶν, ἐπειδὴ πῶρ πολλοὶ ἐπεχειρήσαν· ἵνα τινὰς ἐπιχειρήσας δεῖξῃ· φημι δὲ τὰς περὶ κηρινθῶν, καὶ μηρινθῶν, καὶ τὰς ἀλλῆς. H. 51. num. vii. p. 428.

^r Ce mot Grec, ἐπεχειρήσαν, est certainement très équivoque, et peut fort bien signifier *des tentatives malheureuses, des efforts qui ont mal réussi.*

St. Epiphane ne l'a pas entendu autrement. Origène de même, dans sa préface sur S. Luc. et après lui la plupart des Interprètes Grecs. Quand il s'agit de la signification des termes Grecs, et que les auteurs Grecs, qui les expliquent, n'ont aucun intérêt à leur donner des sens forcés, ces derniers semblent dignes de créance. Beauf. Remarques sur Luc. ch. i. p. 100.

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

Consequently,

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

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

C H A P. V.

ST. MATTHEW, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST.

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

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

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

^b This evangelist, in his account of his being called by Christ, names himself Matthew, ch. ix. 9. But St. Mark and St. Luke in their accounts of it call him Levi. Mark ii. 14. Luke v. 27 & 29. This has induced Grotius to argue, that Matthew and Levi are different persons: though he cannot deny,

that the circumstances of the history lead us to think, one and the same person to be intended. *Video omnes hodie ita existimare, hunc eundem esse, quem Marcus & Lucas Levi nominant. Et sane congruunt circumstantiæ.* Grot. ad Matt. ix. 9. It is observable, that Heracleon, the Valentinian, as cited by Clement of A. Str. l. 4. p. 102. reckons among apostles, who had not suffered martyrdom, Matthew, Philip, Thomas and Levi.

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Doddridge, Family Expositor, sect. 44 vol. I. p. 280. says roundly, 'that Matthew, otherwise called Levi, was the son of Al-

pheus, and the brother of James. Compare Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13.' But I do not think, those texts can afford sufficient proof, that Matthew, and James the son of Alpheus, had the same father, and were brothers. If that had been the case, their relation to each other would have been hinted, or plainly declared in the gospels.

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

d 'His office seems more particularly to have consisted in gathering the customs of commodities, that came by the sea of Galilee, and the tribute, which passengers were to pay, that went by water.' Cave's Lives of the Apostles, p. 177.

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

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

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

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

of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 129—137. and by Dr. Doddridge, Family Expositor, vol. I. sect. LXXI. note a who says, 'It is certain, the feast was after the day of his calling, perhaps some months after:

' when he had made up his accounts, and regularly passed his business into other hands: which, to be sure, from a principle of justice, as well as prudence, he would take care to do.'

other,

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

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

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

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

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

^a Ματθαιῶν μεν ην ο αποστολῶν σπερματων, και ανροδρουων, και λαχανων,

ανευ κρεων μετελαμβάνεν. Clem. Pæd. l. 2. p. 148. D.

^b Ἦνικα οἱ αποστολοι κληρω την εις τα εθνη πορειαν εποιηνηο, θωμας μεν την παρθων αποστολην υπεδεχετο· ματθαιῶν δε αιθιοπιαν. κ. λ. Socr. H. E. l. 1. c. 19.

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

Thus

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

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

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

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

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

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

^e Vol. V. p. 37.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ⁿ See of this work, vol. II. p. 159.

^l Ὁ μὲν δὲ ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς ἑβραίοις τῶν αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφῆν ἐξηνεύκεν εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ πῆτρος, καὶ τὸ παῦλος ἐν ῥῆμῳ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιουσῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. κ. λ. Adv. Hær. l. 3.

cap. i. Et ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 8.

And in this work, vol. II. p. 158.

^k p. 159.

^l p. 466.

^m p. 486.

ⁿ Vol. IV. p. 225, 263.

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

Cyril of Jerufalem says, ‘ that ^q Matthew wrote in Hebrew.’

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

Gregory Nazianzen, in his catalogue, says, ‘ that ^t Matthew wrote for the Hebrews.’

And Ebedjesu, ‘ that ^u Matthew, the first evangelist, published his gospel in Palestine, written in Hebrew.’

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

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

^o p. 283. ^p p. 293.

^q p. 301. ^r p. 314.

^s Εὐθύς δὲ μετὰ τὸν ματθαίου ἀπολαύσας
γενομένου ο μαρκος τῷ ἀγίῳ πετρῷ ἐν ῥώμῃ.
Citat. ib. p. 305.

^t Vol. IV. p. 408.

^u p. 439.

^x p. 511.

^y Vol. V. p. 35.

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

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

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

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

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

^z p. 37.

^a p. 128.

^b *Ibid.*

^c Vol. V. p. 265.

^d p. 290.

^e See vol. IV. p. 263.

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

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

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

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

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

^f Vol. V. p. 326, 327.

^g p. 333.

^h p. 335, 336.

ⁱ See vol. IV. p. 263.

^k p. 262—264.

^l L. 5. cap. 8. p. 172. C.

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

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

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

^m De tempore, quando scripserit, cui potius fidem habeamus, quam S. Irenæo, temporibus illis proximo, qui tradit eum edidisse Evangelium, τὰ πετρε καὶ τὰ παυλᾶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐναγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιωντῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. 5. T. 3. p. 126.

ⁿ Prolegom. num. 61.

^o A. 64. n. xii.

^p Examen Concil Trid. p. 16.

^q Tamen Irenæus l. 3. c. i. expresse dicit, ex auctoritate Papiæ, nullus dubito, qui παραδοσιν hanc a Johanne Presbytero, Apostolorum familiari, acceperat, Matthæum Evangelium suum edidisse, cum Pe-

trus et Paulus evangelizarent Romæ, et fundarent ecclesiam. Proleg. num. 61.

^r Vid. Diss. de iv. Evang. sub init.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^u Scripsisse Evangelium suum viii. a Christi resurrectione anno vulgo dicitur. Quod tamen ad annum a Christi assumptione 15 referunt auctor Chr. A. et Nicephorus. Et sane cum ante annum a passione Christi 12. Apostolis Judææ finibus egredi non licuit, vix ante ann. 15. chr. 48. finita synodo Hieroso-

lymitana, ad suam quisque sortem abierunt, adeo ut paulo ante Matthæus Evangelium suum condidisse videtur. H. L. in Matthæo, p. 13.

^x Baron. Ann. 41. num. ix, xvi.

^y Grot. Pr. ad Matth.

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

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

. ' that

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

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

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

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

^c See vol. IV. p. 262—264.

^d Magno consensu perhibent Patres, Matthæum in gratiam credentium ex Judæis in Palæstina Evangelium suum exscripsisse, et quidem, ut multi addunt, Hierosolymis, octavo post ascensionem Christi anno, qui Claudii Imperatoris primus fuit. Cur illorum testimonium in dubium vocetur, causam non video: quin ista hypothesis admissa, plurima non infeliciter existimo explicari posse, quorum aliter ratio vix invenitur. Hinc

enim intelligimus, cur Matthæus primum in ordine Evangelistarum occupet locum, quia nimirum primus omnium scripsit: cur item tam multas de Judæorum superstitionibus referat disputationes, quibus apud alias nationes, vel templo jam everso, vel paulo post evertendo, locus vix fuisset. Wetst. N. T. Tom. I. p. 223.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

that

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

§ See vol. IV. p. 240—245.

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

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

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

^h Vol. ii. p. 110.

ⁱ p. 541—543.

^k Vol. IV. p. 266—268.

^l Diff. iii. De iv. Evangeliiis.

^m Neque tam facile assentimur sententiæ eorundem Patrum statuentium, Matthæum scripsisse Hebraice, hoc est, Syriace, sive Chaldaicè, quâ linguâ tunc temporis Judæi in Palæstina utebantur. . . . Estimamus enim Patres hic jam non testimonium dicere, sed conjecturam suam in medium proferre, non admittendam, si aut idoneis rationibus non sit fulta, aut verisimilibus argumentis refutari possit.

Quod enim putant necesse fuisse ut Hebræis scribens Hebraice scriberet, verum non est: cum constet eo tempore linguam Græcam per totum Imperium Romanum, et in Judæa præsertim, in usu fuisse. . . . Videntur ergo vetustissimi Patres, et inter eos Papias, homo simplex et credulus, re non explorata, inanis Nazaræorum jactantiæ fidem habuisse. . . . Nullum sane in nostro Matthæo reperitur indicium, unde colligi possit, ex alia in aliam linguam fuisse conversam. Plurima vero aliud suadent. Wetsten. N. T. tom. I. p. 224.

' Greek

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

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

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

Says ^{*} Dr. Jortin: ‘In the time of Christ and his apostles the Greek was really the universal language: the New Testament is a proof of it, if proof were wanting. And this is one reason amongst many others, why St. Matthew probably wrote his gospel in Greek. See Wetstein’s N. T. p. 224. St. Matthew, ch. v. 47, 48. says: “Οἱ τελῶναι στο περισιν. Ἔσεθε ἂν ὑμεῖς τελεῖοι . . . that is, be not *τελῶναι*, but *τελεῖν*. Videtur autem Matthæus vocem *τελεῖοι* hic adhibuisse, ut *τελῶναις* opponeret. Wetstein. Add to this, that *τελῶναις* and *τελεῖος* are both derived from the same word, *τελος*. So again, ch. vi. 16. we find an antithesis in the words, *ἀφανίζωσι τὰ πρόσωπα, ὡς φανώσι*. Eleganter dicitur: *Tegunt faciem, ut appareant, &c.* Wetstein.

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

I shall now propose some observations relating to this point.

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

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

[‡] Ann. 54. n. xiii.

^{*} See his Discourses concerning the Christian Religion, p. 176. note (o) the third edition.

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

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

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

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

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

^p Vol. II. p. 541—543.

^q Vol. IV. p. 266—268.

^r Vol. V. p. 70.

^s Vol. II. p. 110.

^t Vol. V. p. 37.

^u Vol. IV. p. 293

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

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

* Quis in Græcum transfuderit, incertum est. Papias de hoc nihil ab Aristione aut Joanne presbytero accepit, aut tradidit. Auctor Synopsos S. Scripturæ Jacobo fratri Domini diserte adscribit hanc versionem. Theophylactus, ex fama dantavat, Joanni Evangelistæ. Ego ad priorem illam sententiam, seu magis verisimilem, accedo. Satis enim probabile est, Evangelium in Hebræorum usum linguâ ipsorum patriâ primum exaratum, ab ipsorum Episcopo primario Jacobo, Episcopo Hierosolymitano, in sermone Græcum, per provincias, in quas dispersi erant ex gente illa summi, Judæis pariter ac aliis in

usu familiari, translatum fuisse, &c. Proleg. num. 66.

^y Μετεφρασε δε τετο ιωαννης απο της εβραϊδος γλωττης εις την ελληνιδα, ως λεγεται. Theoph. Pr. in Matt. p. 2. D.

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

^a See vol. II. p. 144.

^b In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone translulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque

Hebrews was reckoned the true and authentic gospel of Matthew.

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

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

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

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

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

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

This

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

C H A P. VI.

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

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

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

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

^e Ann. 60. num. 31.

^f Δια τετο φησιν ο πετρος, ειρηκειναι τω κυριον τοις αποστολοις. 'Εαν μεν εν τις βελησθι τε ισραηλ μετανοησαι [forte μετανοησας] δια τε ονοματος μη πιστευειν ι; τε θεον, αφεθησονται αυτω αμαρτιαι.

Μετα δωδεκα ετη εξελθετε εις κοσμον, μη τις ειπη. 'Ουκ ηκησαμεν. Clem. Str. l. 6. p. 636. Conf. Cav. H. L. T. I. . . 5. et Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 67.

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

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

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

Origen says in general, ‘That ^e when the Jews did not receive the word, the apostles went to the gentiles.’

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

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

^b H. E. l. 5. cap. 18. p. 136.

^c Vol. II. p. 371.

^d Hist Lit. T. I. p. 5. et 13.

^e . . . μη παραδεξαμενων ιουδαιων τον λογον, απεληλυθεσαν εις τα εθνη.

In Matth. T. I. p. 225. E. Huet.

^f Πολυ γαρ το διαστημα, και εκ εδει της αποστολης της χωρισθηναι εκειθεν, ινα μη νομισθωσιν ειηαι φυγαδες, και της

αυτων πεφευγεναι. τοτε αναγκαιως χριζονται, οτε λοιπον ανιατα εχειν εδοκει τα κατ’ αυτες. In Act. hom. 25. tom. IX. p. 202, 203.

^g Μετεπειτα ελθων εις ιεροσολυμα μετα βαρναβα, και ευρων πετρον και της λοιπης αποστολης αιμα ιακωβω τω αδελφω τε κυριω, γραφουσιν επισολην οι απωστολοι εις αντιοχειαν της συριας, βεμελιαντες

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

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

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

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

το αυτων εκκλησιαν, και διακονησι την αυτων οι αποστολοι τοτε γραφουσιν, προ
 ειρηλην εις αντιοχειαν αυτος παυλος και της διασπορας αυτων. Chr. Pasch.
 εχρησασ, ως δηλωση αι πραξεις. Εκ p. 233. B. C.
 τετα εσηκνυται, οτι και τας καθολικας

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Theodoret has a like argument: Ἐξ ὧν ραδιον κατιδεν. ως αποστολος ιωαννης. Theodr. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. Tom. III. p. 290.

ἐπειτα καταλελοιπει την ιερουσαλημ ο θεις

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alterum, quod ex dicto Pauli ad Galatas colligimus, illud est, Joannem etiam post discessum Pauli cum duobus collegis per aliquod temporis intervallum Hierosolymis, et in Judæa substitisse. Gentium enim conversione Paulo et Barnabæ cemandata, ipsi inter Judæos se operam porro locaturos declarant.

Quæ etiam causa est, cur Joannis et sociorum in Actis Apostolicis vix mentio occurrat, quia postquam primordia Ecclesiæ Christianæ inter Judæos memorata erant, nihil amplius videbatur addendum, nisi ut narretur, quomodo primitiæ Gentium essent introductæ. Lamp. Proleg. in Jo. l. 1. cap. 3. § vii.

frequently

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

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

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

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

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

¹ Contra persuasum habeo, hoc longo admodum tempore fuisse emblemata supponere, Ecclesiam jam sictam . . . Ne jam dicam, non constare

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

C H A P. VII.

S T. M A R K, E V A N G E L I S T.

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

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

constare ex historia Ecclesiæ, quoniam illi sint Martyres, quorum sanguis, præter eum Stephani, et utriusque Jacobi, de quorum altero ex Luca, altero ex Josepho liquet et Hegesippo, a Judæis fusus fuerit. Iudæi enim, excepto brevi intervallo regni Agrippæ, rerum suarum non erant domini: et licet in Christianos pessime affecti fuerint, a prætoribus tamen Romanis prohibeban-

tur, pro lubitu in innocuos Jesu Christi discipulos sævire. Quæ enim junior Ananus tentavit in Jacobum fratrem Domini, et τινὰς ἑτεροὺς, quosdam alios, Christianæ professionis homines, ut constat ex Josepho, Festo mortuo, et Albino adhuc in itinere agente, peracta sunt. Campeg. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. vi. ver. 12. § xxx. p. 303.

the

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

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

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

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

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

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

^b Cum enim illum epistolâ secundâ ad Timotheum — Romam accersiverat Paulus — Id. ib.

^c Gr. Pr. in Marc.

^d Diff. Prelim. l. 2. ch. ii. § iv.

^e Mem. Ec. Tom. II.

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

^g Lightfoot is making observations upon the first epistle of St. Peter. 'He sends this epistle, says he, by Silvanus, Paul's old attendant, but now with Peter. . . . His naming of Mark with him calls our thoughts back to what has been mentioned of Mark heretofore:

his being with Paul at Rome, and his coming from him into the east. To suppose two Marks, one with Peter, and another with Paul, is to breed confusion where there needeth not. . . . It is easily seen how John Mark came into familiarity with Paul and Peter. And other Mark we can find none in the New Testament, unless of our own invention. . . . He it was that wrote the gospel. Lightfoot Harm. of the N. T. vol. I. p. 336.

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

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

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

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

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

I answer:

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

^k Il y a plus d'apparence, qu'il a reçu l'évangile de S. Pierre, qui l'appelle fils, peut-être parcequ'il l'avoit engendré en J. C. Diff. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § iv.

^l Joannes quoque ille Mariæ filius, Barnabæ consanguineus, . . .

Marcus vocabatur: quem multi hunc nostrum scriptorem putant. Quibus quo minus assentiar, moveor veterum auctoritate, qui hunc scriptorem Joannem nunquam, Marcum semper vocant. . . . Grot. Pr. in Marc.

^m L'Évangéliste n'est appelé nulle part du nom de Jean, qui étoit le nom propre de celui-ci. Du Pin. ubi supra.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Il étoit disciple de S. Pierre, et

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

And

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^o Tradunt autem hunc, natione Israelitica, et sacerdotali ortum prosapia, ac post passionem ac resurrectionem Domini Salvatoris, ad prædicationem Apostolorum evangelica fide a sacramentis imbutum, atque ex eorum fuisse numero, de

quibus scribit Lucas, quia multa etiam turba sacerdotum obediebat fidei. Bed. Prol. in Marc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Τῆτον δὲ μαρκον πρῶτον φασιν ἐπι-
της αἰγυπτῶν σείλαμενον, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
οὗ καὶ συνεγράψατο κηρυξάι, ἐκκλησίας
τὴν πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἀλεξάνδρειας συστή-
σασθαι. κ. λ. H. E. l. 2. cap. 16.

... πρῶτος μετὰ μαρκον τὸν ἀπο-
στόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστῆν, τῆς ἐν ἀλεξάν-
δρεια παροικίας ἀνιάνου τὴν λειτουργίαν
παρέχεται ἀνὴρ θεοφιλῆς ὧν καὶ τὰ
πάντα θαυμασιός. Ib. cap. 24.

... καὶ γραφῆς ἀποστέλλεται ὑπο-
τῆ ἀγίου πέτρῳ εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰγυπτίων
χώραν. H. 51. num. vi.

^u Vol. V. p. 38.

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

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

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

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

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

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

^y An. 64. § i. ii.

^z Alexandrie primus Episcopus factus Martyrium ibi subit: quo vero anno, mihi hætenus incompertum. II. L. p. 24.

^a Tandem vero in Ægyptum concessisse, atque Alexandria lingue suo doctrinam Christi conser-

masse, historia ecclesiastica testatur. J. J. Wetsten N. T. tom. I. p. 551.

^b Ann. 66. num. xix. xx

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

^d Vol. II. p. 109.

^e Vol. II. p. 158.

^f p. 159.

‘had been preached by Peter.’ In another place ‘he calls Mark ‘the interpreter and follower of Peter.’

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

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

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

^s p. 159. ^s p. 210. ^h p. 211, 212. ⁱ p. 111, 112, 212—220.

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

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

Says Origen, about 230. ‘The ^m second gospel is that according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter dictated it to him: who therefore calls him his son in his catholic epistle.’ See 1 Peter v. 13.

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

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

The author of the Dialogue against the Marcionites, about 330, says, that ‘Mark was one of Christ’s seventy disciples.’

^k p. 256—260.

^l p. 258.

^m p. 466.

ⁿ Vol. IV. p. 223, 224.

^o p. 224.

^p p. 223.

^q p. 248.

^r p. 283.

^s p. 293.

^t p. 295.

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

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

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

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

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

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

^u p. 314.

^x Ibid.

^y Dissentit Papias apud Eusebium. . . . Quod autem asserunt nonnulli, Marcum non vidisse Dominum, viderit necne non affirmo. Videre quidem potuisse, temporum ipsa ratio persuadet. Neque vero damnanda est Epiphanii sententia,

dum illum e LXXII discipulorum numero fuisse tradat, etsi contrarium alii patres tradant. Petav. ad loc. Animadv. p. 88.

^z Vol. IV. p. 351.

^a p. 408.

^b p. 439.

^c Vol. V. p. 38.

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

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

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

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

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

^c p. 35.

^d p. 38.

^e p. 93.

^f *Ibid.*

^g p. 95, 96.

^h p. 128.

ⁱ *Ibid.*

^k p. 129.

^l p. 171.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^m p. 266.

ⁿ p. 306.

^o p. 309.

^p p. 324.

^q p. 327.

^r p. 333.

^s p. 335, 336.

^t Et tempore Neronis Cæsaris scripsit Petrus, Apostolorum princeps, Evangelium Marci, dictante Marco, lingua Romana, in urbe Romæ: sed attribuit illud Marco. Eutych.

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

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

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

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

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

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

S. Basnage has some observations upon this point, which deserve to be taken notice of. ‘ Epiphanius * and the

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

^u Vid. Selden in Eutych. Origin. not. 28. p. 152.

* Marcum de LXX discipulis unum fuisse, credidit Epiphanius. . . . Nobis tamen non arridet ea sententia cum incredibile sit, Petrum Marco filii nomen addidisse, si de septuaginta discipulis unus fuisset, quos Christus ipse legaverat, quique ab omni fere parte æquales erant Apostolis. Papias quoque vetustus ille auctor LXX

discipulis Marcum eximit. . . . Ex Tertulliano quoque scimus, Marcum interpretis officio functum fuisse, quod infra LXX dignitatem fuit. . . . Neque LXX discipulis eum apposuit Origenes, cujus non minimi ponderis est testimonium. . . . Nobis tamen est admodum probabile, Marcum unum fuisse quingentorum fratrum, qui Christum a morte revocatum contemplati sunt: cuique, ut testi oculato, commissa est scribendi Evangelii provincia. Basn. Ann. 66. num. xvii.

‘ author

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

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

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

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

fofdom indeed fpeaks of its being written in Egypt; but he is almoft fingular. That it was written at Rome, or in Italy, is faid not only by Epiphanius, Jerom, Gregory Nazianzen, Victor, and divers others; but the Egyptian writers likewise all along fay the fame thing: that it was written by Mark at Rome, in the company of the apoftle Peter. So fay Clement of Alexandria, Athanafius, the fupposed author of the Synopfis of fcripture, Cosmas, and Eutychius, all of Alexandria. Ebedjefu likewise, in his catalogue of Syrian writings, fays, that Mark wrote at Rome. And the Latin author of the commentary upon St. Mark's gofpel, quoted fome while ago, fays, that it was written in Italy.

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

VI. Thefe are obfervations which the above cited testimonies feem naturally to afford. But before we proceed any farther, it will be fit for us to take notice of the fentiments of learned moderns concerning the time of St. Mark's writing his gofpel.

Cave fupposes St. Mark to have published his gofpel at Rome, in the year of Chrift 65. His argument for it I place ^z below.

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

^z Rogatus Romæ a fratribus, fcripfit Evangelium, a Petro approbatum, idque Græco fermone Romanis fatis familiari. Factum id circa ann. 65, Petro et Paulo jam morte fublatis. Cum enim illum epiftola fecunda ad Timotheum non longe ante martyrdom fcripta, Romam accerliverat Paulus, probabile eft, Marcum vel eodem, vel faltem fequenti anno illuc veniffe, ibique Evangelium vel primum condidiffe, vel prius conditum in publicum edidiffe. Certe Irenæus, l. 3. cap. i. et apud Eufebium, l. 5. c. viii. S. Mar-

cum μείζ την τριτων εξοδον Evangelium fuum confcripfiſſe diferte tradit. Cav. H. L. T. I. p. 24.

^a Mr. Jones' words are thefe: ' Thefe, with fome other reafons, ' make it evident to me, that St. ' Peter was not at Rome, till the ' year of Chrift 63 or 64, and ' confequently, that the gofpel of ' St. Mark was not written before ' this time, but between that and ' the martyrdom of this apoftle and ' St. Paul, in the year of Chrift 67 ' or 68.' New and full Method, vol. III. p. 88.

J. A.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^b Post Pauli ac Petri exilium, seu discessum ab urbe Roma. . . . *Markus discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse Petri annuntiata erant, per Paulum tradidit.* Inquit Irenæus. . . . Scripsit igitur Marcus Evangelium, juxta Irenæum, paulo post horum duorum Apostolorum

discessum a Roma, qui accidisse videtur anno æræ vulgaris lxxiii. Mill. Proleg. num. 101.

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

^e Vid. ann. 65. num. ix.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Postremo, in ipsis Evangeliiis ex quibus ea sero esse conscripta quaedam exsistere videntur criteria, colligi potest. Phrasis μέχρι της σήμερον,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

αὐτοῦ, usque ad hunc diem. Matt. xxviii. 15. justum spatium inter Christi resurrectionem et Evangelium exaratum postulare videtur. Ita quæ Marcus cap. xvi. 18. de serpentibus a Christi discipulis sine damno tollendis habet, ad Paulum, Romam tendentem, et quod ei in iti-

nere in insula Mileto contigit, respicere videntur. Herman. Venerma Diff. secund. de titulo ep. ad Ephes. cap. v. num. iv.

ⁱ Vol. IV. p. 223.

^k Vol. V. p. 329.

^l Ibid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

^a See New and full Method, part extraordinary, related by Matthew only, ch. xiv. 28—31. I do not

^b There is a like thing, and more know, why Mr. Jones omitted it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ⁿ See vol. II. p. 258.

' say,

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

I now proceed to another observation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* See here, p. 175.

† See vol. V. p. 130.

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

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

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

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

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

12.) Ch. iv. 26. *And he said: so is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast his seed into the ground, 27. and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how* 28. *For the earth bringeth forth fruit of itself, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.* 29. *But when the fruit is ripe, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come.* This parable is peculiar to St. Mark. See Whitby upon the place, and likewise ⁹ Grotius.

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

⁹ Hæc parabola, aliis omiſſa, cum suam hic explicationem non habeat, explicari debet ex simili compara-

tione, quæ est apud Matt. xiii. 24. Grot. ad Marc. iv. 26.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

† See vol. V. p. 173.

† Notes and Discourses, vol II.

‡ Demonstration of the Messiah, p. 114—125.
part II. ch. ii. p. 38, 39.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Non de Apostolorum grege . . . accurrens, ut conspiceret, quid ageretur. Grot. ad Marc. xi. 51.

repta militum excitatus, et subito

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

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

C H A P. VIII.

ST. LUKE, EVANGELIST.

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

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

^a From some words in the Cambridge manuscript Bp. Pearson has argued, that Luke was in Paul's company from the year 43. Dein peragrat [Paulus] Phrygiam et Galatiam, et per Mysiam venit Troadem, ubi se illi comitem adjunxisse indicat Lucas xvi 10. Qui antea etiam Antiochiæ cum Paulo fuit, et jam eum Troade affectus est: ut colligere licet ex Act. xi. 28. ubi Codex Cantabr. habet, συνεστραμμενων δε ημων. Ab anno igitur 43.

per octennium discipulus fuerat Antiochiæ. Annal. Paulin. p. 10. But it is not safe to rely upon one manuscript only, different from all others, and of no great authority. As Mr. Tillemont took notice of this observation of Pearson, I transcribe his thoughts about it. Selon le manuscrit de Cambridge S. Luc dit qu'il estoit avec S. Paul à Antioche, des l' an 43. ce que Pearson a receu. Mais il ne seroit pas seur de s'ier à un manuscrit different

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

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

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

différent de tous les autres. Et quand cela se pourroit en quelques occasions, ce ne seroit pas à l'égard du manuscrit de Cambridge, qui est plein d'additions et alterations contraires au véritable texte de S. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2. S. Luc. note iii. Some may argue from these words, that Luke was a Gentile, converted by Paul at Antioch. And others might argue, that he is the same as Lucius, mentioned Acts xiii. 1. But I should think it best for neither side to form an argument from this reading. Mr. Wetstein has referred us to a place of St. Augustine, where this text is quoted very agreeably to the Cambridge manuscript. In illis autem diebus descendunt ab Hierosolymis Propheta Antiochiam. Congregatis autem illis, surgens unus ex illis, nomine

Agabus. &c. De Serm. Dom. 1. 2. c. 17. But it is observable, that Irenæus l. 3. c. 14. init. a more ancient writer, enumerating St. Luke's journeys in St. Paul's company, begins at Troas. Acts xvi. 8—10. I presume, it must be best to rely upon him, and the general consent of all manuscripts, except one, in the common reading.

^b Nevertheless it is supposed by many, that Luke continued with Paul. Irenæus calls him Paul's inseparable companion, after his coming to be with the Apostle at Troas. Adv. H. 1. 3. c. 14. So likewise Cave. Cujus perinde sectator erat, et omnis peregrinationis comes. H. L. T. i. p. 25. See also Tillem. St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2.

embraced

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

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

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

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

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

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

Irenæus,

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

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

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

^a Vol. II. p. 158.

^b p. 161, 162.

^c p. 162.

^d p. 161.

^e Sic Apostoli simpliciter nemini invidentes quæ didicerant ipsi a Domino hæc omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas nemini invidens,

ea quæ ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testatur dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et ministri fuerunt verbi. Adv. H. l. 3. cap. 14. n. 2.

^f Vol. II. p. 211.

^g p. 261.

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

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

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

^b p. 258.

ⁱ p. 261.

^k p. 466.

^l Sed et Lucium quidam perhibent esse Lucam Evangelistam, qui Evangelium scripsit, pro eo quod soleant

nomina interdum secundum patriam declinationem, interdum Græcam Romanamque proferri. In Rom. T. 2. p. 632. Basil. 1571.

^m Vol. V. p. 232.

ⁿ Vol. IV. p. 230.

‘ from

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

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

The author of the Dialogue against the Marcionites, says, ‘that’ Mark and Luke were disciples of Christ, and of the number of the seventy.’

Epiphanius⁹ speaks to the like purpose.

Gregory Nazianzen says, ‘that’ Luke wrote for the Greeks, or in Achaia.

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

In the catalogue of Ebedjesu is said, ‘that’ Luke taught and wrote at Alexandria, in the Greek language.’

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

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

⁹ p. 227.

... Τοῦ ασφαλεῖ λόγον ὡν αὐτὸς ἰκα-
 νησθεὶς ἀρετῶν κατελιγῆται, ἐκ τῆς αἰμα-
 τῆς ἰατρικῆς, τε καὶ διατριβῆς, καὶ
 τῆς ἐπισημοῦς ἀποστόλων οὐμίας ὠφελη-
 ῶν. ἕνα τε ἰσὺς παρέδωκεν εὐαγγέλιον.
 H. E. l. 3. c. 24. p. 96. c.

⁹ Vol. IV. p. 293.

^r p. 295.

^s p. 314.

^t p. 408.

^u p. 416.

^x p. 439.

^y p. 498.

^z Vol. V. p. 38, 39.

‘which

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

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

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

Augustine says, ‘ that ^c two of the evangelists, Matthew
 ‘ and John, were apostles . . . Mark and Luke disciples of
 ‘ apostles.’

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

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

Paulinus ^m celebrates Luke, as having been first a physi-
 cian of the body, then of the soul.

Here I would refer to the author of *Quæstiones et Re-*
sponses, probably written in the fifth century, who

^a p. 35.

^b p. 40.

^c p. 93.

^d p. 126.

^e p. 127, 128, and see 131.

^f p. 130.

^g Ουτος εστιν ο ευαγγελιστης. In Col.
 hom. 12. T. XI. p. 412.

^h See vol. V. p. 193. note (a.)

ⁱ In 2 Tim. T. III. p. 505.

^m Vol. V. p. 177.

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

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

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

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

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

ⁿ See vol. II. p. 119.

^o Vol. V. p. 243.

^p p. 306.

^q p. 307.

^r p. 326, 327.

^s p. 327.

^t p. 328.

^u p. 329.

^x p. 333, 334.

‘ afterwards

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

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

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

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

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

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

^y p. 335, 336.

^z Etiam tempore hujus Imperatoris scripsit Lucas Evangelium suum Græce, ad virum nobilem ex sapientibus Romanis, cui nomen Theophilus, ad quem item scripsit Acta seu Discipulorum historiam. Erat autem Lucas Evangelista comes Pauli

Apostoli, quocumque per aliquod tempus mansit. Unde est, quod Paulus Apostolus in quadam epistola sua dicit. Lucas Medicus vos salutat. Eutych. Annal. p. 335, 336.

^a . . . ακρως δε την ζωγραφην τεχνην εξεπισαμενος. Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. T. I. p. 210.

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

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

^b Saint Luc. Mem. Ec. T. II.

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

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

^e See his Lives of the Popes, vol. III. p. 205, 206.

^f Nostro autem nomen quidem Romanum fuisse arbitror, sed aliquanto longius. . . . Quare et Lucas, si quid video, contractum est ex Romano nomine, quod suspicor fuisse Lucillum. Nam ea gens tum Roma florebat. . . . Erat noster hic Syrus, ut veteres consentiunt, et medicinam fecit. . . . Syria autem multis Romanis servos exhibebat. Et medicina, ut ex Plinio atque aliis

discimus, munus erat servile. Manumissi autem nomen patroni induebant, ut Comædiarum scriptor, Afer cum esset, dictus est a patrono Terentio Terentius. . . . Ita hic a Lucillio Lucillius, et contracte Λυκας. Credibile est, cum Romæ medicinam factitasset aliquamdiu, acceptâ libertate, rediisse in patriam, &c. Grot. Pr. in S. Lucam.

^g Exercuisse medicinam Paulus ad Colossenses testatur, Eusebius autem et Hieronymus addunt fuisse natione Syrum Antiochenum. . . . Interpretes porro conjectura probabili, tum ex nomine, tum ex arte quam profitebatur, colligunt, fuisse servum manumissum. Observant enim primo, nomen ejus in compendium fuisse redactum, ut pro Lucillio vel Lucano vocaretur Lucas. . . . Observant secundo, servos et præcipue Syros medicinam factitasse. . . . Quod vero quidam existimant, eum Romæ serviisse, et a domino, qui ipsum manumiserit, nomine Lucam appellatum fuisse, non satis certum videtur. Nam præter familiam Lucilliam, quæ Romana fuit, etiam Græcis illud nomen fuit impositum, ut ex Anthologia constat. Wetst. Pr. ad Luc. T. I. p. 643.

were skilful in the art of medicine, and practised it in the families of their Roman masters. But does it follow, that because Luke was a physician, that he was also a slave? This therefore being entirely destitute of foundation in antiquity must be esteemed the fiction of some learned critic, who was much delighted with his own ingenious speculations:

3. The account given of this evangelist by Eusebius, and Jerom after him, that he was a Syrian, and native of Antioch, may be justly suspected. We do not find it in Irenæus, nor Clement of Alexandria, nor Tertullian, nor Origen, nor in any other writer before Eusebius. Probably, therefore, it is not founded in any general, or well attested tradition: but was the invention of some conjectural critic, who having first imagined, out of his own head, that Luke was originally a gentile, at length determined, that he was converted by Paul at Antioch. But all this was taken up without any good ground, or sufficient authority: and Luke may have been a believer, before either Paul or Barnabas went to Antioch. The same account is in Jerom: but he only follows Eusebius. He does not seem to have had any information about it from any others: which is an argument, that there was not any early tradition to this purpose.

This story, I say, is in Eusebius, and Jerom, and some others after them, but not in all succeeding writers. Some of the ancients, as Epiphanius, and others, supposed Luke to have been one of Christ's seventy disciples; which is inconsistent with his being a native of Antioch. If any did not see this inconsistency, and allowed both, it must have been owing to want of due attention and consideration. And the supposition, made by some, that Luke was one of the seventy, shows, that there was no prevailing, and well attested tradition, that he was a native of Antioch. For if there had been any such tradition, it is not easy to conceive, how any should have held the opinion, that he was one of the seventy.

It was formerly observed, that ^h Chrysoftom no where says in his remaining works, that Luke was of Antioch. Indeed, we ⁱ have lost one of his homilies upon the title and beginning of the Acts of the apostles. Nevertheless it seems, that in some of his many homilies, still remaining upon that book, or elsewhere, we should have seen this particular, if it had

^h Vol. V. p. 133.

ⁱ p. 131.

been known to him. He takes notice, that ^k there might be seen in his time the house, in which Paul dwelled at Antioch. And he often speaks of the prerogatives of that city, in his homilies preached there. Methinks this also should have been mentioned as one: that Luke, whom (as is well known) he often celebrates, was a native of that city. If this had been then known, or generally believed, it is reasonable to expect, that it should have been frequently mentioned by Chrystom, a native and presbyter of Antioch, who shined there as a preacher twelve years. This has disposed me to think, that in his time there was not at Antioch any prevailing tradition to this purpose.

Cave says, it ^l is likely, that Luke was converted by Paul at Antioch. Mill ^m says the same, rather more positively: which may now be the opinion of many. I have guessed, that it might be the opinion of the person, who first gave rise to the account, that Luke was a Syrian, of Antioch, mentioned in Eusebius. But I do not remember, that this is expressly said by any of the ancient writers, out of whom I have made so large collections in the preceding volumes; and the thing is altogether unlikely. If Luke had been a gentile, converted by Paul, he would have been always uncircumcised, and unfit to accompany Paul, as he did. For the apostle would not have allowed the Greeks, or gentiles, of Antioch, or any other place, to receive that rite. Nor are there in the Acts, or Paul's epistles, any hints that Luke was his convert. Whereas, if he had been so, there ^c would have appeared some tokens of it in the affectionate expressions of Paul toward him on the one hand, or in the respectful and grateful expressions of Luke toward Paul on the other hand.

^k p. 150.

^l . . . a D Paulo, dum Antiochiæ ageret, (uti verisimile est) conversus. Hist. Lit. T. I. p. 25.

^m Scriptor operi huic suscipiendo, si quis unquam, summe idoneus: utpote qui ab ipso tempore conversionis, quæ contigit circa annum a vulgariis XII. Ipsum enim secutus istis, qui magno numero Antiochiæ conversi sunt, [Act. xi. 26] omnino adnumerârim. Prol. n. 112

^c This thought occurred to Dr. Wadby, who in his preface to St.

Luke's gospel speaks to this purpose: 'We are told, that Luke was converted by Paul at Thebes. Answer. But this we have only from Nicephorus. And it is the less credible, not only because it comes to us so late: but also because it appears not from any credible author, that St. Paul ever was there. It is more probable from the silence of St. Luke, and St. Paul, who never calleth him his son, that he was a Christian, or a believer, long before.'

4. It has been reckoned doubtful by divers learned men, whether the evangelist Luke was a physician.

This particular is different from the foregoing. Nor has it any connection with it. Luke may have been of Antioch, and not a physician. He may have been a physician, and not of Antioch. The question is, whether Luke, the beloved physician, mentioned by St. Paul, Col. iv: 14. be the evangelist. Divers of the ancients, as we have seen, have supposed him there intended. Chrysoftom's expressions are these: 'Thisⁿ is the evangelist: but he does not diminish him by naming him so late; he extols him, as he does Epaphras. It is likely, that there were others called by that name.' This last particular, perhaps, may deserve to be taken notice of. He affirms, that this is the evangelist; but he supposeth, that there were others of the same name.

That distinguishing character, beloved physician, not given to the apostle's companion, and fellow-labourer, in any other epistle, has induced divers learned and inquisitive moderns, to doubt; whether one and the same person is intended. Among these are^o Calvin, ^p Sam. Basnage, ^q Dr. Heumann, whose observations and arguments I transcribe below. On the other hand ^r Estius, and ^s Mr. Jones, strongly argue, that the

ⁿ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΤΗΣ . . . ΕΙΚΟΣ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΟΣ ΚΑΛΩΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΩ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ ΤΑΥΤΩ. Chry. in Col. iv. hom. 12. T. XI. p. 412.

^o Non assentior iis, qui Lucam Evangelistam intelligunt. Nam et notiozem fuisse judico, quam ut opus fuerit tali indicatione, et splendidiore elogio fuisset insignitus. Certe coadjutorem suum, aut fidum saltem comitem, et certaminum participem vocasset. Potius conjicio, hunc abfuisse, et alteram medici epitheto ab illo discerni. Quamquam non contendo, ut de re certa, sed tamen conjecturas affero. Calvin. in Col. iv. 14.

^p Sunt tamen in Scripturâ Lucam Evangelistam a Luca Medico distinguendi causa, &c. Basnag. Ann. 60. n. xxxiii.

^q Lucam Evangelistam fuisse Medicum, Hieronymus aliique probari posse credunt ex Col. iv. 14. Sed ex hoc ipso loco confirmari posse

puto contrarium. Si enim illa loco Paulus innuisset comitem suum omnibus notum, Lucam Evangelistam, simpliciter vocasset Lucam, uti fecit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. At ut significaret, se de alio Luca loqui, discriminis causa addit ο ιατρης. C. A. Heuman. Ep. Misc. T. II. p. 518.

^r Sunt qui in dubium revocent, num de Luca Evangelista loquatur Apostolus. Hunc enim dicunt notiozem fuisse, quam ut artis nomine eum designaret. Ac saltem, inquiunt, eum coadjutorem suum, aut fidelem comitem vocasset. Verum, ut vetus et communis, ita probatissima sententia est. . . . Lucam Evangelistam, Medicum fuisse, et eum ipsum, cujus hic mentio est: (neque enim alium Lucam Paulo familiarem ulla prodit historia) Quod vero tacuit hoc loco adjutorem, id diserte expressit ad Philemonem scribens, *Demas et Lucas adjutores mei.*

Non

the same Luke is here intended, who is mentioned by St. Paul in some other epistles, even our evangelist.

Upon the whole it must be acknowledged, that this distinguishing character, *beloved physician*, has occasioned a difficulty. Nevertheless, I would hope, that it is not insuperable. It is allowed, that in all other places of St. Paul's epistles by Luke is intended the evangelist. We know from the book of the Acts, that Luke, the writer of it, went with Paul to Rome, and stayed with him to the end of his captivity there; nor is there any reason to surmise, that at the time of writing this epistle he might be absent from the apostle upon some special occasion: for he joins in the salutations in the epistle to Philemon of Colosse, sent at the same time with this epistle to the Colossians, where also he is styled a *fellow-labourer*. Philem. ver. 24. So that I cannot but think it probable, that Luke the evangelist was by profession a physician.

5. St. Luke was a Jew by birth, at least by religion.

None of the writers, out of whom we have made collections, call him a Gentile. Some, in Jerom's time; whose names we do not know, said, Luke had been a Jewish proselyte, that is, had been converted from Gentilism to Judaism, and afterwards became a Christian: but none, that I remember, expressly say that he was converted from Gentilism to Christianity; unless we should make an exception for Nicephorus Callisti, who in one place says so. But he is too late, and of too little credit to be much regarded: especially if he be singular. All our writers, who speak of Luke as a companion and disciple of apostles, must have supposed him to be a Jew: and some have said that he was one of the seventy, as we have seen.

That Luke was a Jew by birth, or at least by religion, may be argued from his being a constant companion of Paul in many places, particularly at Jerusalem. If Luke had been an uncircumcised gentile, some exceptions would have been made to him. Nevertheless nothing of that kind appears either in St. Paul's epistles or in the Acts. Another thing

Non enim putavit Apostolus rem
hanc notam ubique inculcandam es-
se. Ubi illud observandum est,
Apostolum assidue Lucam cum De-
ma nominare, tam hoc loco, et ad
Philemonem, quam etiam in secun-

da ad Tim. ep: cap. iv. Quis ergo
dixerit, alium atque alium esse
Lucam cum eodem Dema nomina-
tum? Com. in Col. iv. 14.

* See Mr. Jones's New and Full
Method, vol. III. p. 103, 104.

leading to this supposition is his following the Jewish computations of times: such as the passover, pentecost, the fast. Of all which instances may be seen in Acts xii. 3. xx. 6 and 16. xxvii. 9.

Here it will be objected, that *Luke the physician*, mentioned Col. iv. 14. must have been a gentile, because at ver. 10, 11. the apostle had mentioned *all those of the circumcision, who were his fellow-workers, and had been a comfort to him.* To which I answer. It is not certain, that Luke, the evangelist, is the *beloved physician*, there spoken of: we just now saw the reasons of doubting about it. But there is another solution. St. Paul^u needs not to be understood to speak absolutely: there might be several exceptions to that proposition. Timothy was one, who joins with the apostle in sending the epistle: but he and Luke were so well known to all, as faithful to the apostle, that they needed not to be there mentioned. And Luke and Demas follow afterwards, somewhat lower, nearer the end of the epistle, very properly, ver. 14, *Luke the beloved physician, and Demas greet you.* And I should be unwilling from this text, and the coherence, to conclude, that Demas was a gentile. Says the apostle: Philem. ver. 24. *There salute thee Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers.* The two first named were certainly Jews: I suppose, the other two were so likewise. Salutations from believers, of the Jewish people, would be very acceptable and encouraging to gentile converts.

St. Luke says, Acts i. 19, *insomuch as that field was called in their proper tongue Aceldama:* whence some may argue, that he was not a Jew. But it might be observed, that none of the evangelists, when they speak of the Jews, say any thing, to denote they were of that people. Says St. Matthew ch. xxviii. 15. *And this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.* Mark vii. 3. *For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands, eat not.* John i. 19. *The Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem,* ch. v. 1. *After this there was a feast of the Jews.* See also ch. xix. 40—42. And does not St. Paul say 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15. *Ye became followers*

[†] Quis vero cum veri specie aliqua Lucam Evangelistam unum ex Judæis fuisse neget? Lucam qui in designandis temporibus Judæorum diligenter adhibet, Pentecostem scilicet, Jejunium, tertiam noctis vigiliam. Quæ omnia ex Judaico

more petuntur. Basnag. An. 60. n. xxxiii.

^u Adde, quod ille sermo, hi soli, non est ita rigide accipiendus, ut absolute excludat omnes alios, sed benigno sensu: hi sere soli sunt ad-jutores. Est. ad iv. Col. 11.

of the churches of God in Judea. For ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they of the Jews: who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets. It might be not amiss to observe also Acts xxviii. 17—91. And I might refer to other places.

That this evangelist was a Jew, is the opinion of many learned and judicious moderns; particularly Mr. S. Basnage, whom I have cited at note (r) and J. A. Fabricius, who likewise is clearly of the same opinion. Indeed I think it ought not to be questioned.

6. Luke the evangelist was probably an early Jewish believer, soon after Christ's ascension, if not a hearer of Christ, and one of the seventy disciples.

Our most ancient writers, as we have seen, speak of Luke as a disciple of the apostles. Some have reckoned him one of the seventy, others have thought him to be Lucius, mentioned by St. Paul in the epistle to the Romans, and others have supposed that he was one of the two disciples that met Jesus in the way to Emmaus.

The large accounts which Luke has given in the book of the Acts of several below the rank of apostles, has made me think, that he was one of the same rank, and possibly one of them. There are three instances of this kind. The first is Stephen, one of the seven deacons, who, as we learn, *was full of faith and power, and did great wonders and miracles among the people*: against whom there arose a strong opposition, so that he was the very first martyr for Christ and his doctrine, and of whom St. Luke has recorded a long discourse before the Jewish council, ch. vii. The second is Philip, another of the seven, of whom St. Luke writes, that he first preached Christ to the Samaritans. ch. viii. 5—8. *so that the people with one accord gave heed to those things which Philip spake, heaving and seeing the miracles which he did*; and what follows. The same Philip afterwards, having first explained the scriptures to him, and brought him to sincere faith in Jesus as the Christ, baptized the chamberlain and treasurer of the queen of Ethiopia, a Jewish proselyte, and a man of great distinction. ver. 26—40. The third instance of this kind is

* Lucas, sive Lucius, . . . incertum, num idem cum Luca Medico Gal. iv. 14. quin Judæus fuerit, atque quam Christo nomen daret, ne cuius quidem, præcipue si verum est

quod legas in Origenis sive Adamantii cujusdam dialogis, adversus Marcionitas, et Epiphaniæ LI. II. eum fuisse e numero LXX. discipulorum. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. v. T. III. p. 132.

that of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, *who travelled as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only.* Who soon after their coming to *Antioch, spake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus.* And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord, ch. xi. 19—21. These were the men who first preached to Gentiles out of Judea: as Peter was the first who preached to gentiles at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea, ch. x. and not long before them. We have, as it seems, the names of three of those men. Ch. xiii. 1. *Simeon, called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen.* The second person here named may be our evangelist.

A like argument may be formed in favour of St. Luke's having been one of Christ's seventy disciples, in that he, and he only of all the evangelists, has inserted in his gospel an account of the commission which Christ gave unto them. ch. x. 1—20. And indeed some learned men of later times, as well as formerly, have been of opinion that Luke was one of the seventy. Among these is our Dr. Whitby, who ^b reckoned both Mark and Luke to have been of that number. J. A. Fabricius ^c was inclined to be of the same opinion. And in favour of it refers to the passages of Adamantius and Epiphanius, before taken notice of by us. This likewise was the sentiment of ^d Mr. Basnage.

Dr. C. A. Heumann has lately published a dissertation concerning Christ's seventy disciples, containing many curious observations: and he supposeth that * these several following were of that number. Matthias, chosen in the room of the traitor, Joseph, called Barsabas, surnamed Justus, and probably the seven deacons, or however some of them, and the four teachers and prophets of Antioch, Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, whom he thinks to be our Luke the evangelist, and Manaen. Acts. xiii. 1. His argument is to this purpose. We have not in the gospels the

^b See his Preface to St. Luke's gospel.

^c . . . præcipue, si verum est, quod legas in Origenis seu Adamantii cujusdam Dialogis adversus Marcionitas, et Epiphaniæ H. LI. n. xi. Neque adeo repugnat et Lucam et Marcum ex illis fuisse, licet Veteres miro consensu, ut Marcum Petri, ita Lucam tradunt Pauli fuisse inter-

pretem et sectatorem. Haud dubie enim Apostolorum etiam præ LXX. illis magna prærogativa erat, &c. Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. v. T. III. p. 133.

^d Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

* Dissertatio de Septuaginta Christi Legatis. ap. Nov. Syllog. Dissertat. part. I. p. 120—154.

names of those disciples; nor did Christ form a college or company of them, as he did of the twelve, because it was a temporary office, which subsisted for a short time only. They were but once sent forth; and when they were returned their commission was at an end. Nevertheless they hereby became qualified for public service: and it may be reckoned very probable, that if an opportunity was afforded, they would be very willing, after Christ's ascension, to exert themselves in his cause. And it is very likely that some of these seventy were chosen, and employed by the apostles as men who had been already exercised in the service of the gospel, and were thereby fitted for farther usefulness.

So that learned writer. And it must be acknowledged, that this is a specious argument: but it is rather founded in an ingenious speculation, than in the authority of testimony; which, in this case, would be more valuable.

Indeed Epiphanius, beside the places ^e formerly alleged, where he says, Mark and Luke were of the seventy, has another, where ^f he mentions a great many, who were said to be of that number: as the seven deacons, all whom he mentions by name, and also Matthias, Mark, Luke, Justus, Barnabas, Apelles, Rufus, Niger. And therefore, we cannot deny, that in the time of Epiphanius there were some, who entertained an opinion, that all these were of Christ's seventy disciples. Nevertheless we do not find it in Irenæus, or Clement of Alexandria, or Origen, or any others of the highest antiquity, and best credit: nor in Eusebius, or Jerom, that I remember, who were acquainted with the writings of those ancient authors, and many others, which are not come to us. Eusebius has a chapter concerning the disciples of our Saviour: he says, the names of Christ's twelve apostles were well known; but ^g there was no where any catalogue of the seventy. However, he mentions Barnabas, Matthias, and the disciple put up with him, and one or two more, who were said to be of the seventy: but he takes not here any notice of Mark, or Luke, or of any of the seven deacons.

Matthias and Barsabas certainly were such men, as are described Acts i. 21, 22. and they may have been of the seventy: but we cannot be certain, because we have not been

^e Mar. li. num. vi. xi.

^f H. 20. num. iv.

^g Ταυ τε εξεδομηκοντα μαθητων κατα-

λογος μεν υδεις υδαμη φερεται. H. E.
l. i. c. 12.

assured of it by any accounts, that demand full assent. Some of the seven deacons may have been of the seventy, as Stephen and Philip; but we do not know, that they were. It is very probable, that all those deacons were not of the seventy, particularly, Nicolas, a proselyte, of Antioch. If Luke, the evangelist, be the same as Lucius, of Cyrene, there ariseth a strong objection against his having been one of the seventy. Simeon, called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned, Acts xiii. 1. and *the men of Cyprus and Cyrene*, (of whom those two just mentioned, were a part) were early believers, after Christ's ascension, and they may have heard and seen the Lord in person: but they cannot be well supposed to have been of the seventy. Christ's twelve apostles were of Galilee: it is likely, that the seventy also were of the same country, or near it, Christ sent them forth from him, to go over the land of Israel, and to return to him in a short time, where he should be: and his usual residence was in Galilee. It does not appear to me at all probable, that our Lord put into that commission any men, who were born, and usually resided abroad, in other countries, out of the land of Israel.

Hitherto, then, we have not any full proof, that our evangelist was one of the seventy. Let us proceed.

St. Luke ch. xxiv. 13—34. relates how two disciples met Jesus after his resurrection, as they were going to Emmaus. And he says, that the name of one of them was Cleopas. Theophylact in his comment upon this place, as ^h formerly shown, observes: 'Some ⁱ say, that one of these two was Luke himself: but that the evangelist concealed his own name.' Nicephorus Callisti ^k in one place, makes no doubt, that Luke was the other disciple not named. It is likely, that he had met with it in more ancient writers. Sam. Basnage ^l readily declares himself of the same opinion. Indeed, I think, it has

^h Vol. V. p. 328.

ⁱ Τινες τον ενα τετων των δυο αυτου τον λουκαν ειπαι φασι διο και απεκρυψε το εαυτε ονομα ο ευαγγελισης. Theoph. in Luc. cap. xxiv. p. 539.

^k Τοις περι λουκαν και κλεσσαν την εδον παρισσι γνωριζεται, προς εσπεραν εις δειπνον αυτο-ς συγκατακληθεις. Niceph. l. i. c. 34. p. 117.

^l Nulla sane magis idonea ratio observatur animo, cur Cleopæ, non

alterius, Lucas meminerit: quomodo Joannes, ubi de se mentionem agit, nomen dissimulat suum. Si de grege Apostolorum fuissent, aut virorum multa laude in Evangelio celebratorum, uti Nathanaël, quod Hieriphanio visum, iterum atque iterum dicemus, tam ejus quam Cleopæ nomen fœnerasset. Ann. 55. num. CL.

a great appearance of probability. It is much more likely, than the tradition, or interpretation in Epiphanius that ^m it was Nathanael. The same Basnage says, that if Nathanael had been the other, St. Luke would have named him.

St. Mark, ch. xvi. 12, 13. has a like account, but briefer, of two, to whom Christ appeared as *they were walking into the country*. He does not name either of them. Grotius ⁿ allows that Mark's and Luke's histories are of the same persons. Both the evangelists speak of these as two of them. They were not of the twelve, but yet they were of their company, such as had been with Jesus; as is allowed by ^o Grotius, and ^p Beza. Nevertheless they say that ^q Luke is not the other. He is excluded, as they say, by the tenour of his introductions both to his gospel, and the Acts. Their reasonings will be considered presently.

However, supposing Luke to be the person here intended, I do not think that he is thereby shown to be one of the seventy. Cleopas and the other were disciples of Christ and eye-witnesses: but it does therefore follow that they were of the number of the seventy.

We proceed. Among the salutations in the epistle to the Romans are these, ch. xvi. 20. *Timothy my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater my kinsmen, salute you*. All these were Jewish believers, and the three last mentioned, as it seems, were the apostle's relations. That by Lucius some supposed the evangelist Luke to be intended, we have been informed by so ancient a writer as Origen. And it is very likely that St. Luke's name was written differently: Lucas, Lucius, and Lucanus. There is the more reason to think

^o See vol. IV. p. 319.

^p Quare immerito Euthymius hic aliam putat historiam indicari, quam eam, quæ a Luca copiose describitur. Grot. ad Marc. xvi. 12.

^q . . . ἄλλοι ἐν αὐτῶν.] τῶν μετὰ ἰησοῦ γεννηθῶν, ut supra dixit, ver. 10. Nam hoc nomine etiam alii extra xii. censentur, præcipue qui de numero erant illorum septuaginta. Grot. ad Marc. xvi. 11.

^r Ex his, εἰς αὐτῶν, nempe discipulis, non autem ex Apostolis. Aliorum enim præter Apostolos mentio facta fuit precedente versu 9. Bez. ad Luc. xxiv. 13.

^q Alterum fuisse hunc nostrum Lucam, quidam ex veteribus arbitrantur, quorum opinio refellitur ex præfatione Actis Apostolorum præposita. Bez. ad Luc. xxiv. 18.

Duo ex illis, nempe eorum, quos modo λαίπων, *cæterorum* nomine designarat, e sectatoribus Christi. Probabiliter sentiunt Veteres, fuisse hos de numero LXX. . . . Nomen alterius infra exprimit Lucas, Cleopam vocans. Alterum ipsum Lucam multi putârunt, quos satis ipse refellit in Evangelii anteloquio, ab oculatis testibus se separans. Grot. ad Luc. xxiv. 13.

that

that the evangelist is here intended, because he must have been with the apostle at the time of writing the epistle to the Romans. Says Mr. Tillemont, 'Many' believe that St. Luke 'is he whom St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans calls Lucius, making his name a little more Latin. And it is the more likely, inasmuch as the Acts assure us, that St. Luke was then with St. Paul. If that be so, he was related to this apostle.' Grotius, who supposed our evangelist to have been of Antioch, taking notice of the above mentioned observation of Origen, says, that 'Lucius in Rom. xvi. is the same as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned Acts xiii. 1.

Fabricius 'esteemed it somewhat probable that Lucius is the evangelist.

Dr. Heumann supposes ^u this Lucius to be St. Luke, and the same as Lucius of Cyrene, whom ^x he computes to be one of the seventy disciples, as before seen.

Mr. Basnage likewise argues very strongly, that ^y Lucius is our evangelist.

^r Mem. Ec. tom. II. S. Luc.

^s Docet nos Origenes, in annotationibus epistolæ ad Romanos, fuisse qui crederent Lucium eum, qui in eadem epistola nominatur. xvi. 21. esse hunc ipsum Lucam, et Lucium dici flexione Romana, Lucam Græca. Ego Lucium illum, cujus ibi meminit Paulus, puto non alium esse a Cyrenensi, quem noster hic nominat Actor. xiii. 1. Grot. Præf. ad Evang. S. Luc.

^t Fuerunt enim jam olim, qui teste Origene Lucam eundem putarent cum Lucio, quem Paulus inter *συνυπερις* suos refert Rom. xvi. 21. Neque verisimilitudine destituitur hæc sententia. Fab. Bib. Gr. ubi supra. p. 132.

^u Lucas non est verum, id est, pure expressum nomen Evangelistæ, sed vel Lucanus, (quem in modum et ex Silvanus factum est Silas) vel Lucius. Ac perversissimum est, Evangelistam nostrum esse Lucium illum Cyrenæum, cujus fit mentio Act. xiii. 1. Quem nec diversum esse credo ab illo Lucio, quem Paulus Rom. xvi. 21. vocat cognatum suum, simulque testatur, cum in suo comi-

tatu fuisse. Heuman: Ep. Misc. T. II. p. 519.

^x Jure igitur credimus, et hoc quatuor [Act. xiii. 1.] fuisse e septuaginta illorum discipulorum numero. Jam inter hos si Lucius non est alius quam Lucas Evangelista, merito et Lucam nostrum recensemus inter septuaginta illos discipulos. Diff. de LXX. Christi Legat. § 20. p. 149.

^y Lucam Evangelistam Paulo consanguineum fuisse verisimilitudinis multum habet. Lucium sane, cujus nomine Romanos salutat Apostolus, ex ipsius cognatis unus erat. Sunt vero non pertenuis conjecturæ, quibus adducamur ad existimandum unum eundemque virum cum Luca Lucium esse. Quæ antiqua sane sententia fuit, cujus meminit Origenes in Rom. xvi. . . . Silam quidem Paulus ipse Silvanum vocat. Aderat etiam Paulo comes Lucas, cum missa est ad Romanos epistola, quem in salutato præterisse, prorsus sit incredibile: quod tamen factum fuisset, si Lucius est a Luca diversus. Basn. ann. 60. n. xxxiii.

Indeed

Indeed this opinion cannot be well said to be destitute of probability: since there is a good deal of reason to think that Luke was in the apostle's company when he wrote the epistle to the Romans. And if Lucius be not he, no mention is made of him; which is very unlikely.

If this be our evangelist, we hence learn that he was a Jew, and related to the apostle. And if this be Lucius of Cyrene, we know his character, and, in part, his history, from Acts xi. 19—21. and xiii. 1—4. He was an early Jewish believer after Christ's ascension, and together with others was very serviceable in early preaching the gospel to Jews and Gentiles out of Judea. And, once more, if the other; who accompanied Cleopas in the way to Emmaus, be Luke the evangelist, he was a disciple and eye-witness of Jesus Christ: but I do not say one of the seventy.

Now we come to consider the objection of Beza, Grotius, and divers others: who have supposed, that St. Luke, in the introduction to his gospel excludes himself from the number of eye-witnesses. But though this has been a difficulty with many, there have been of late divers learned men, remarkable for inquisitiveness and good judgment, who are not much moved by it. One of them is Dr. Whitby, in his preface to St. Luke's gospel, already taken notice of by us. Another is ^a Fabricius, a third ^a Bafnage, the fourth Heumann: who in his forecited Dissertation observes, that ^b St. Luke's introduction imports no more, than that he was not an eye-witness from the beginning, nor an apostle. But he may have been for some while a follower of Christ, very consistently with what he there writes: and, probably, he was so. But he

^a Neque obstat porro, quod Lucas affirmat, se ea scribere, quæ accepit ab illis, qui fuissent ἀρχιεπισκοποι. Nam non de omnibus ἐπισκοποι hoc poterat, quod Act. i. 21. et seq. ad Apostolum requiritur. Bib. Gr. T. III. p. 133.

Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

Repugnare quidem videri possit in Lucas cap. i. 2. scribens, se accepit ab illis ἀ τοῖς ἀρχιεπισκοποις. Verum non se negat fuisset ἀποστολος, qui negat, se αυτοπτερον ἀποστολος fuisse. Concedimus itaque non ab initio statim, uti Apostoles,

quos υπηρετας τῶν λόγων appellat, interfuisse rebus a Christo gestis Lucam. Sed aliquo jam tempore functo suo munere Messiae se applicuisse Lucam, et postea semper in ejus comitatu fuisse, quo minus credamus, hoc ipsius testimonium minime impedit. Accedit, quod modestiæ erat, Apostolorum potius, quam suum ipsius testimonium commendare, jubereque lectores, si forte sibi credituri sint ægrius, fidem habere Apostolis, testibus nulli obnoxiiis exceptioni Heum. Diss. ib. num. xx.

very fitly puts the credit and authority of his history upon the testimony of the apostles.

I shall likewise transcribe below a passage of Petavius ^c from his animadversions upon Epiphanius, though it be somewhat long. I do it the rather, because he is an older author than any of those hitherto cited in behalf of this interpretation. He is considering what Epiphanius says of Luke's being one of Christ's seventy disciples. The sum of what he advanceth is to this purpose: 'He dares not affirm, that Luke was a disciple of Christ, because many of the fathers have thought otherwise. But he says, there is nothing in St. Luke's introduction to induce us to think, he was not a disciple of Christ, or that he had not seen a large part of the things related by him: but rather the contrary. And he was willing to show, that Epiphanius is not contradicted by St. Luke himself.'

7. St. Luke was for a good while a constant companion of St. Paul. But he was also acquainted with other apostles.

Tertullian and Chrysoftom, as we have seen, call St. Paul Luke's master. But they need not be understood to intend that Luke learned nothing from other apostles. So Irenæus said: 'Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel that had been preached by Paul.' But in another place he says, 'That * Luke was a fellow-labourer of the

^c Quod Lucas & discipulorum numero fuerit, asserit et Dorotheus in Synopsi . . . Sed contra sentiunt plerique, et id ex ipsis Lucæ verbis colligunt, cum ait: Ἐδοξε καμοι . . . Sed tantum abest, ut hæc discipulum Christi fuisse, ac non pleraque, cum ab eo gererentur, oculis usurpasse negent, ut contrarium potius hinc cluci possit. Verbum enim παρακολυθειν nonnunquam ad eam notitiam refertur, quæ oculis ipsis, ac propria intelligentia comparatur, non aliorum sermonibus. Ut cum Demosthenes ἐν τῷ περιπαράπρεσβειας, de Æschine, cujus in legatione comes fuerat, sic loquitur: Καὶ οὗτος πειρηματὰ εἶδεν, καὶ παρακολυθηκώς ἀπασὶ κατηγόρων. Sic igitur Lucas ἀνωθεν παρακολυθημεναι πᾶσιν ἀκριβώς dicitur, hoc est, comperta, explorataque, ac spectata etiam, habuisse. Ac videri potest, et nonnulla hæc antithesis

esse, ut cum superiore versu dixerit: Quemadmodum multi res a Christo gestas scribere aggressi sunt, καὶ παραδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, statim subjiciat: Ἐδοξε καμοι παρακολυθηκώς, hoc est, qui non, ut illi ἐκ παραδόσεως, sed ex propria id scientia compererim. Cæterum tametsi ad eum sensum accommodari Lucæ verba nihil prohibet, non idcirco tamen Christi discipulum fuisse certo pronunciare ausim: cum huic adversari sententiæ longe plures Patres intelligam. Sed ista commemoravi, ut ne Lucæ ipsi de se testanti refragari quisquam Epiphanium arbitretur. Petav. Animadv. in Epiphanius. Hæc. LI. num. xi. p. 89, 90.

* Quoniam non solum prosequutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit Apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli. Iren. l. 3: c. 14. n. 1. p. 201. b.

apostles,

apostles, especially of Paul. And in another place he calls Luke** 'a follower and disciple of the apostles. And Eusebius said: 'Luke was for the most part a companion of Paul, but had also more than a slight acquaintance with the other apostles.' And Jerom says: 'It was supposed, that Luke did not learn his gospel from the apostle Paul only, who had not conversed with the Lord in the flesh, but also from other apostles. Which also he acknowledgeth at the beginning of his volume, saying, *Even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses of the word.*'

That must be right, I think, because it is agreeable to the writer's own words in the introduction to his work. I always consider Paul as an eye-witness: but he was not an eye-witness from the beginning; nor a minister of the word from the beginning. He must have had a distinct knowledge of all things concerning the Lord Jesus. Christianity, as has been often and justly said, is founded in facts. In order to preach it, Paul must have had a knowledge of Christ's life, preaching, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension. As he was not instructed by other apostles in the doctrine preached by him, he must have had it from revelation. And I suppose that a man, who, like Luke, often heard Paul preach, might have composed a gospel or history of Jesus Christ from Paul's sermon's, preached in divers places, and to men of all characters: and the ancients seem to have supposed that Luke had thereby great assistances for composing his gospel; which I do not deny. Nevertheless it seems fairly to be concluded from his own introduction, that he had consulted others also.

It might not be amiss, if I had room for such observations, to compare St. Luke's gospel and the historical parts of St. Paul's epistles, and also of his discourses recorded by Luke himself in the book of the Acts. It is reasonable to think, that wherever any disciples of Jesus preached the christian religion, they gave an account of the things concerning Christ. Wherever the apostles, or others, preached, in order to induce faith in Jesus and his doctrine, their first discourses must have been historical. The reason of the thing leads us to this; and we are assured of it from their discourses, of which we have an account. We perceive this in the discourses of St. Peter at Jerusalem. Acts ii. 22—36. ch. iii. 12—16. ch. iv. 10.

** Lucas autem sectator et discipulus Apostolorum. Ibid. cap. x. [al. xi.] in p. 189.

and at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea, ch. x. 34—43. from Paul's discourses in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia. Ch. xiii. 23—38. at Athens, ch. xvii. 31. at Corinth, ch. xix. 8. before the governor Festus, and king Agrippa, ch. xxvi. and at Rome: though then many years had passed, since the ascension of Christ, and since his religion had begun to be preached, and propagated in the world. St. Luke's general account of Paul there is thus: *And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ,* ch. xxviii. 30, 31. 'That is, says ^d Grotius, his 'miracles, doctrine, death, resurrection, and the mission of 'the spirit: by which things men were assured, that the heavenly kingdom was set up.' And this may have been the occasion of the frequent use of those expressions, *preaching Christ, and preaching Jesus Christ,* as equivalent to preaching the christian religion, or the doctrine of the gospel.

I must own, that in the survey of St. Luke's gospel, and St. Paul's discourses and epistles, I have not discerned any such special agreement, as to be induced to think that one of them had copied the other.

St. Paul says, at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 23. *Of this man's seed has God raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus.* And 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember, that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel.* These things are agreeable to St. Luke's gospel: but they are also in St. Matthew's; and must have been taught by all the apostles, and all preachers of the gospel.

Acts xx. 35. *And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, it is more blessed to give than to receive.* That saying of our Lord is not recorded by St. Luke in his gospel, nor by any other of the evangelists.

1 Cor. xv. 5—7. *And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once . . . After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles.* St. Luke's account of our Saviour's appearances after his resurrection are in ch. xxiv. and Acts i. 1—12. And if they are observed, I suppose that no remarkable agreement between Paul and Luke will be discerned, but rather the con-

^d Miracula ejus, et præcepta, et mortem, et resurrectionem, et missionem Spiritus Sancti. Per quæ certis- sicbant homines de regno illo celesti. Gr. ad Act. xxviii. 31.

rary. The five hundred brethren, mentioned by St. Paul probably saw Jesus in Galilee: where, as in Matt. xxvi. 32. xxviii. 7. and Mark xvi. 7. he appointed to meet the disciples: but of this there is nothing in St. Luke. And all our Saviour's appearances to the disciples, mentioned by him, were at Jerusalem, or in its neighbourhood. Nor does Luke give any hint of that particular appearance to James mentioned by St. Paul: not now to add any thing farther.

However, I shall transcribe below ^c some observations of Mr. Wetstein, relating to this matter.

8. It may be reckoned probable, that St. Luke died a natural death: forasmuch as none of the most ancient writers, such as Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerom, say any thing of his martyrdom. Gregory Nazianzen, in ^d one of his orations, seems to put Luke among martyrs. Nevertheless, as is well observed by ^e Tillemont, Elias Cretensis, in the eighth century, famous for his commentaries upon Gregory, supposeth it certain, that ^f Luke did not die a martyr any more than John, the apostle and evangelist: but that after having suffered much in the cause of Christ, and the gospel, he returned in peace to the God of peace. Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, about 387, observes, that ^g in his time it was generally said, that Luke and Andrew finished their course at Patræ in Achaia. He does not say, in the way of martyrdom. I do not perceive Paulinus, about the year 403, to ^h celebrate Luke, as a martyr, but rather Nazarius, mentioned in the next verse. If martyr belongs to Luke, it may

^c Si Lucas vel Pauli hortatu, vel peculiari Spiritus Sancti afflatu ad scribendum impulsus fuisset, rem memoratu tam dignam . . . silentio neutiquam transiisset. Quod vero quidam existimant, ex locis 2 Tim. ii. 8. et 1 Cor. xv. 4. collatis cum Luc. xxiv. 7, 34. probari, Lucæ, quod dicitur, Evangelium ad Paulum potius auctorem esse referendum, nobis parum sit verisimile. Wetsten. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 3. tom. I. p. 647.

^d Orat. 3. p. 76.

^e St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. II.

^f Quippe ne longe abeam, Joannes . . . et item Lucas haudquaquam

interempti fuere, verum cum per multas propter Christum et ejus evangelium calamitates pertulissent, in pace ad eum qui pacis Deus est, reversi sunt. El. Cr. Annot. p. 322, 323.

^g Andreas et Lucas apud Patras, Achaia civitatem, consummati referuntur. Gaud. Serm. 17. ap. Bib. PP. tom. V. p. 969. C.

^h Hic pater Andreas, et magno nomine Lucas, Martyr et illustris sanguine Nazarius.

Paulin. Ep. 32. p. 210. Conf. Annot. p. 75. Paris, 1685.

be understood in a general sense, as equivalent to confessor, or a great sufferer for the gospel.

9. Cave says, that ^l Luke lived a single life, and died in the 84th year of his age, about the year of Christ 70, but of what death, is uncertain. And it is true, that Nicephorus, in the fourteenth century, says, that ^m Luke died in the 80th year of his age. And in some editions of Jerom's book of illustrious men there is a passage, near the end of the article of St. Luke, importing, that he lived 84 years in celibacy. But Martiany, the learned Benedictine editor of Jerom's works, says, that ⁿ passage is not in any manuscripts: nor does he know whence that silly fiction was borrowed. Fabricius confirms that account.

IV. There is no great difficulty in settling the time of St. Luke's writing his gospel. The Acts of the apostles were published in 63, or 64, and not long after his gospel, as is generally allowed. Accordingly Dr. Mill ^p supposes those books to have been two parts of one and the same volume, and to have been published in the year of Christ 64. This argument was represented at length ^q formerly. The reader is referred to it, that I may not enlarge upon it in this place.

V. However, I cannot forbear to observe some marks of time in the gospel itself.

1. The occasion of writing it, as St. Luke assures us in the introduction, was, that many had already published narrations of these things. But it cannot be reasonably thought, that many should have written histories of Jesus Christ presently after his ascension, nor indeed till many years after it.

^l Vitam egit cœlibem, ac mortuus est anno ætatis 84. circa annum (ut nonnulli volunt) 70. Quo vero mortis genere incertum est. Hist. Lit. p. 25.

^m Ὁγδοηκόντα ἔτων γενομένου, ὡς φασι. Niceph. l. 2. c. 43.

ⁿ Falso additur in hoc loco: *Vixit octoginta et quatuor annos, uxorem non habens.* Nullum exstat vestigium horum verborum in manuscriptis codicibus. Neque novi, unde putida hæc commenta fluxerint. Martian.

^o Sed illa Erasmus, Martinus Lipsius, et Suffridus Petri, in exemplaribus suis mss. non invenerunt. Fabr. in loc. ap. Bib. Eccles.

^p Voluminibus hujus D. Lucæ partem posteriorem, seu λόγον δεύτερον quod attinet, librum dico actuum Apostolorum, haud dubium est, quin is scriptus fuerit statim post λόγον πρώτον, sive Evangelium. Proleg. num. 121.

^q See in this volume, ch. iv. sect. iv. p. 40—44.

2. There are several things in the gospel, from which it may be fairly argued, that it was not written, till after Peter and Paul, and perhaps other apostles likewise, had preached to gentiles, and received them into the church, without their embracing the peculiarities of the law of Moses.

3. In ch. ii. 10. the angel says to the shepherds near Bethlchem: *I bring you good tidings of great joy to all people.* At ver. 30—32. Simeon says, at the presentation of Jesus in the temple: *Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people: a light to lighten the gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.* In ch. iii. 8. says, John the baptist: *God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.* And I might here refer to ch. i. 78, 79. I suppose, that when St. Luke recorded these things he understood them: which he could not do, till after the gospel had been freely and fully published among gentiles.

4. That St. Luke understood the spirituality of the doctrine of the gospel, may be concluded from the account, which he has given of our Lord's discourse, recorded ch. vi. 20—49. I might for this refer to ch. i. 74, 75. and other places.

5. Ch. vii. 9. When our Lord had heard the centurion's profession of faith, *he marvelled at him, and said: I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel.* In Matt. viii. 11, 12. is a farther enlargement. The like to which may be seen in Luke xiii. 28—30.

6. In ch. xiii. 6—9. is the parable of *the fig-tree, spared one year more*: representing the ruin of the Jewish church and people as near, if they did not speedily repent.

7. In ch. xi. 48—51. are predictions of the calamities coming upon the Jewish people. In ch. xiii. 34, 35. are our Lord's lamentations over the city of Jerufalem, in the view of the calamities coming upon it. See likewise ch. xvii. 22—37. ch. xix. 11—27. ch. xx. 9—18. ch. xxi. 5—11. and ver. 20—35. As St. Luke enlargeth so much in his accounts of these predictions, it may be argued, that the accomplishment was not far off when he wrote.

8. In ch. xiv. 16—24. is the parable of *a great supper*; when they who were first invited, refused to come; whereupon the invitations were enlarged, and made more general. And in the end he who made the supper declares, that *they who were first bidden, should not taste of it*: representing the

call of the gentiles, and the general rejection of the Jews for their unbelief.

9. In ch. xiii. 18—21. are the parables of the *grain of mustard-seed* and *leaven*, representing the wonderful progress of the gospel; of which, probably, St. Luke had been witness, when he recorded them.

10. Ch. xxiv. 46, 47. . . . *And he said unto them . . . that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* When St. Luke wrote this, it is very likely, that he well understood the commission of the apostles, as reaching to men of all denominations, throughout the whole world.

11. But I need not enlarge farther on these internal characters of time, the other argument being sufficient and satisfactory.

VI. I must say something concerning the place where St. Luke's gospel was written.

Jerom, as before ' quoted, in the prologue to his commentary upon St. Matthew, says, that ^s Luke, the third evangelist, published his gospel in the countries of Achaia and Bœotia. In his book of illustrious men he says, that Acts were written at Rome. Gregory Nazianzen says, that ^u Luke wrote for the Greeks, or in Achaia. And speaking of the provinces of divers of the apostles and evangelists, he ^x assigns Judea to Peter, the gentiles to Paul, Achaia to Luke, Epirus to Andrew, Ephesus or Asia to John, India to Thomas, Italy to Mark: in which country, undoubtedly, many of the ancients believed this last mentioned evangelist to have written his gospel. Chrysoftom does not say, where Luke wrote: but only that ^y he wrote for all in general.

We are told by ^z Philostorgius, that in the reign of the emperor Constantius St. Luke's reliques were translated from Achaia to Constantinople. It must therefore have been the general persuasion in those times, that St. Luke had died, and had been buried in Achaia. Nicephorus

^r Vol. V. p. 35.

^s In Achaia Bœotiaque partibus volumen condidit, p. 34.

^t p. 39.

^u Vol. IV. p. 408.

^x Ἐγὼ πετρῆ ἢ ἰουδαία, τὴν παύλῳ

κοινωνῶν πρὸς τὰ εὐρη, λαοὶ πρὸς ἀλλὰ
... μικρῶν πρὸς ἰταλίαν; Gregor. Or.
25. p. 438. A.

^y Vol. V. p. 128.

^z Vol. IV. p. 133.

says, that ^a when Paul left Rome, Luke returned to Greece, where he preached the gospel, and converted many: where also he suffered martyrdom, and was buried. Soon afterwards he says, that ^b in the reign of Constantius, Luke's body was translated from Thebes to Constantinople. The connection leads us by Thebes, to understand Thebes in Greece.

Grotius says, he thinks, that ^c about the time that Paul left Rome, Luke also went thence into Achaia, and there wrote his books, which we have, as Jerom likewise says. Cave thought, that ^d both St. Luke's books were written at Rome, and before Paul's captivity there was at an end.

But by Mill, Grabe, and Wetstein, it is said, that Luke published his gospel at Alexandria, in Egypt. Let us observe their proofs.

First of all ^e Mill and ^f Wetstein quote Œcumenius, as saying, that Luke preached at Thebes in Egypt. Nevertheless I do not find it in Œcumenius. And I suppose, that Simeon Metaphrastes, a writer of no great credit, in the tenth century, in his life of St. Luke, is their authority: for he is the writer quoted by ^g Grabe, though he does it cautiously. Nor does Metaphrastes say, that St. Luke published his gospel in Egypt: he supposeth it to have been written before he went thither. For he says, that ^h when Luke preached there, he sometimes argued from the Old Testament, and sometimes from the gospel, which he had written.

^a Συδιαγων δ' εν ρωμη τω παυλω, επηκει τη ελλαδι αυθις. κ. λ. Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. p. 210.

^b Ibid. C.

^c Puto autem Româ iisse Lucam in Achaïam, atque ibi ab eo conscriptos quos habemus libros. Quod et Hieronymus prodidit. Grot. Præf. in Evang. Luc.

^d Utrumque anno Christi 59. S. Paulo nondum ex carcere dimisso, scripsisse videtur. In Luca II. L. p. 25.

^e Certe post discessum a Româ Libyam petiisse nostrum hunc Evangelium, ac apud Thebanos verbum predicasse, testatur Œcumenius comment. in Lucam. Mill. Prol. n. 111.

^f . . . vel secundum Hieronymum . . . in Achaïæ Bœotiaëque finibus, qui tamen Thebas Ægyptias, ubi teste Œcumenio Lucas prædicavit, pro Bœotiis accepisse videtur. Wetst. N. T. tom. I. p. 643.

^g Taceo recentiores, veluti Simeonem Metaphrasten, qui in Vita S. Lucæ Græce et Latine edita ad calcem commentariorum Œcumenii. p. 857. D. ita scribit: totam Libyam percurrens in Ægyptum pervenit, &c. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 33.

^h Και νυν μεν απο της παλαιας παραγων γραφης, νυν δε αφ ηπερ ετος ανεταξατο ευαγγελιη διερμηνευων αυτοις τα περι χριστου. — Sim. Metaphr. de Vit. S. Lucæ, p. 858. B.

It may be reckoned probable therefore, that this journey of St. Luke into Egypt is a mere fiction, a thing without ground ascribed to him by some, after he had left Paul, and after he had written his gospel.

Nevertheless those learned men ⁱ have been pleased to argue from this passage of Metaphrastes, that Jerom mistook Thebes in Bœotia for Thebes in Egypt: which appears to me to be altogether arbitrary. I should rather think, that some later writer mistook the place, and instead of Thebes in Bœotia, thought of Thebes in Egypt, a very famous city, and better known to himself than the other.

It may be of use to take here more at large the passage of Nicephorus, in part quoted just now. ‘ Luke ^k says he, ‘ was born at Antioch, which is in Syria, by profession a ‘ physician, and also well skilled in painting. He came to ‘ Paul at Thebes with its seven gates: where renouncing the ‘ error of his ancestors he embraced the christian doctrine, ‘ and of a physician for the body, became a physician for the ‘ soul. He likewise wrote a gospel, as Paul dictated it to ‘ him, and also the Acts of the apostles. Whilst Paul was ‘ at Rome [or, when Paul had been at Rome,] he returned ‘ into Greece.’ This, I think, must confirm our supposition, that somebody mistook Thebes in Egypt for Thebes in Bœotia. It is plain, that Nicephorus means Thebes of Greece. And he seems to have supposed, in this place, that Luke was converted about the time that he came to be with Paul in Macedonia and Greece. See Acts xvi. 10. He says, Luke returned into Greece. Therefore the Thebes before-mentioned must have been in that country: nor was Paul ever at Thebes in Egypt. Luke therefore could not meet him, and be converted by him there. He calls it

ⁱ Neque aliunde in aliam sententiam ductum arbitror Hieronymum, qui in Achaia Bœotiaque finibus hoc Evangelium conditum ait, quam quod seu lecto, seu ex traditione alicubi accepto, Lucam apud Thebanos prædicasse, ac conscripsisse Evangelium, incolas istos fuisse existimarit Thebarum Bœotiarum, non autem Thebarum urbis Ægypti superioris. Mill. Prol. n. 115. Vid. et Wetsten. citat. supra note (f)

^k Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. p. 210. A. B.

^d All must be sensible that this story of Nicephorus is very strange. For in one place he without hesitation speaks of St. Luke, as the companion of Cleophas, mentioned Luke xxiv. 18. lib. I. cap. 34. p. 117. A. And he several times speaks of Mark and Luke, as two of Christ's seventy disciples. Lib. II. cap. 43. in et cap. 45. p. 213. B. και εκ τῶν οἰκιστῶν οἱ δυο ετερες, μαρκον και λυκαν.

Thebes with its seven gates: so ¹ Thebes in Bœotia was sometimes called.

Secondly. Another argument, that St. Luke's gospel was written at Alexandria, is, that ^m it is so said in the Syriac version.

But those titles are of no great weight. Before the three catholic epistles, received by the Syrians, is a title or inscription, importing, that ⁿ they were written by the apostles, James, Peter, and John, witnesses of our Saviour's transfiguration, taking James to be the son of Zebedee: whereas the epistle of James could not be written till long after his death, who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa, as related Acts xii. 1, 2. And St. Paul's second epistle to Timothy ^o is said by the same Syrians, to have been written at Rome, and sent by Luke: which is manifestly contrary to the epistle itself. See 2 Tim. iv. 11, 12.

St. Luke's gospel is also said in the Persian version, ^p to have been written at Alexandria. But then it is allowed, that this version was made from the Syriac, not from the Greek.

Thirdly, it is also urged, that there are *epigraphai* or inscriptions in some manuscripts, at the end of this gospel, where it is said, that it was written in the great city of Alexandria.

But it is well known, that those inscriptions at the end of the books of the New Testament are of little value, divers of them containing manifest mistakes: and they are in late manuscripts only, or however, such as are not of the highest antiquity.

Fourthly. Grabe ^q likewise insists upon a passage in the Apostolical Constitutions, where the apostles are brought in, relating

¹ Vid. Cellar. Geogr. Antiq. lib. II. cap. 13.

^m Ita quippe sonat titulus ejus in versione Syriaca, ante mille annos edita: Evangelium Lucæ Evangelizavit Græce in Alexandria magna. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 33. Conf. Mill. Prol. n. 114.

ⁿ Sanctorum Apostolorum, Jacobi, Petri, Joannis, transfigurationis Cyrilli spectatorum, epistolæ singulæ.

^o Ad Timotheum vero secunda Romæ scripta, fuit missa per eundem Lucam Medicum et Evangelistam. Ebedjesu Catal. ap. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. III. p. 12.

^p Et in versione Persica, quam tamen non ex Græco, sed Syriaco textu translata existimat admodum R. Waltonus: Evangelium Lucæ, quod lingua Græca Ægyptiaca in Alexandria scripsit. Grabe ubi. supr. p. 33.

^q Atque hoc non parum confirmatur

relating what bishops had been appointed by them in their own time. And it is said, that in Alexandria, Anianus, the first bishop, was ordained by the evangelist Mark, and Abilius by Luke, also evangelist. And Mill in like manner quotes the constitutions, after Grabe, though almost ashamed so to do.

But it should be considered, that the author of that work is anonymous, and unknown, and his time not certain. He says what he pleaseth: and has been convicted of falshood in such accounts as these, as well as in others. It has very much the appearance of fiction, that the first bishop of Alexandria should be ordained by Mark, and the second by Luke: and possibly it is a fiction of the writer himself; for I do not recollect, that this is said any where else. Epiphanius, as well as more ancient writers, must have been totally unacquainted with this ordination, and with St. Luke's journies in Egypt: for he says, that this evangelist preached the gospel in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy, and Macedonia, but especially in Gaul.

Du Pin having taken notice of what is said relating to this matter in the inscriptions, which are in some manuscripts, the titles in the Syriac and Perfic versions, Metaphraustes, and the Constitutions, concludes: 'All these monuments deserve no credit. We ought to adhere to what is said by Jerom, as most probable: that this gospel was composed in Achaia, or Bœœtia.'

Upon the whole, there appears not any good reason to say, that St. Luke wrote his gospel at Alexandria, or that he preached at all in Egypt. It is more probable, that when he left Paul, he went into Greece, and there composed, or finished, and published his gospel, and the Acts of the apostles.

VII. I would now offer something by way of character of this evangelist: but I shall do it briefly, and cautiously; and

firmatur ex eo quod, lib. vii. Const. Apost. Clement. cap. 46 Lucas dicatur Alexandriæ fuisse, ibique Episcopum Avilium ordinasse. *Urbis Alexandrinorum Anianus primus a Marco Evangelista ordinatus est, secundus vero Avilius a Luca, et ipso Evangelista.* Grabe ibid.

^r Et si Constitutionum Apostolicarum seu auctori seu confarcinatori

fides, in ecclesia Alexandria, a Marco primum fundata. . . . Avilium Aniani primi Episcopi successorem, ordinaverit. Mill. Prol. n. 141.

^s See in this work vol. IV. p. 333. 334.

^t Haer. L. I. num. xi. p. 433.

^u Disserta. sur la Bible. liv. 2. ch. 2. § v. p. 39.

if I mention doubtful things doubtfully, I may hope to escape censure. It is probable, that he is Lucius, mentioned Rom. xvi. 21. If so, he was related to St. Paul the apostle. And it is not unlikely, that that Lucius is the same as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned by name. Acts xiii. 1. and in general with others. ch. xi. 20. It appears to me very probable, that St. Luke was a Jew by birth, and an early Jewish believer. This must be reckoned to be a kind of requisite qualification for writing a history of Christ and the early preaching of his apostles to advantage; which, certainly, St. Luke has performed. I do not perceive sufficient reason to believe, that Luke was one of Christ's seventy disciples. But he may have been one of the two, whom our Lord met in the way to Emmaus, on the day of his resurrection, as related Luke xxiv. 13—35. He is expressly styled by the apostle *his fellow-labourer*, Philem. ver. 24. If he be the person intended, Col. iv. 14. (which seems very probable) he was, or had been, by profession a physician. And he was greatly valued by the apostle, who calls him beloved: which must be reckoned much to his honour. For nothing could be so likely to recommend any man to St. Paul's esteem, as faithfulness to the interests of pure religion. It is undoubted, that he accompanied Paul, when he first went into Macedonia, Acts xvi. 8—40. And though we are not fully assured, that he continued to be with him, constantly afterwards: we know, that he went with the apostle from Greece through Macedonia, and Asia, to Jerusalem, and thence to Rome, where he stayed with him the whole two years of his imprisonment in that city. This alone makes out the space of above five years. And it is an attendance well becoming Lucius of Cyrene: to which no man could be more readily disposed, than one of the first preachers of the gospel to the gentiles. We do not exactly know, when St. Luke formed the design of writing his two books: but, probably, they are the labour of several years. During St. Paul's imprisonment in Judea, which lasted more than two years, and was a time of inaction for the apostle, St. Luke had an opportunity for completing his collections, and filling up his plan. For in that time unquestionably Luke conversed with many early Jewish believers, and eye-witnesses of the Lord, and some of the apostles, who were still at Jerusalem. And I make no doubt, but that before that season he had conversed with
several

several of the apostles, and other eye-witnesses of our Lord's person and works. Nor can any hesitate to allow the truth of what is said by some of the ancients, that Luke, who for the most part was a companion of Paul, had likewise more than a slight acquaintance with the rest of the apostles. Whilst he was with Paul at Rome, it is likely, that he had some leisure for composing, and writing. When St. Paul left Rome, I imagine, that Luke accompanied him no longer: but went into Greece, where he finished, and published, one after the other, his two books. Which he inscribed to Theophilus, an honourable friend, and a good Christian in that country. Here Luke died, and, perhaps somewhat in years. Nor need it to be reckoned an improbable supposition, that he was older than the apostle.

VIII. I shall conclude this chapter with some observations upon St. Luke's gospel, and the Acts of the apostles. But those upon his gospel will chiefly relate to the introduction: though some were mentioned formerly.

I. St. Luke's two books, his gospel and the Acts, are inscribed to Theophilus: whereby some understand any good Christian in general, others a particular person.

Epiphanius ^x speaks as if he was in doubt, whether thereby should be understood a particular person, or a lover of God in general. Salvian ^y seems to have supposed it to be only a feigned name.

Augustin ^z and Chrysostom, ^a and many others, have thereby understood a real person. Theophylact expresseth himself after this manner: 'Theophilus ^b to whom Luke wrote, was a man of senatorian rank, and possibly a governor: forasmuch as he calls him most excellent, the same title, which Paul useth in his addresses to Felix and Festus.' Œcumenius says, 'that Theophilus was a pre-

^x 'Εἶτ' ἔν τινι θεοφιλω τότε γραφῶν τῆτο ελεγεν, ἡ παντι ανθρωπω θεου αγαπωντι. Epiph. Haer. LI. n. vii. p. 429. A.

^y Positus itaque in hoc ambiguae opinionis incerto, optimum fere credidit, ut beati Evangelistae sacratissimum sequeretur exemplum: qui in utroque divini operis exordio Theophili nomen inscribens, cum ad hominem scripsisse videatur, ad amorem Dei scripsit: hoc scilicet

dignissimum esse judicans, ut ad ipsum affectum Dei scripta dirigeret, a quo ad scribendum impulsus esset. Salvian. ad Salon. ep. 9. p. 215.

^z De Consens. Evan. l. 4. c. 8. T. III.

^a Chrys. in Act. Hom. i. T. IX. p. 3, 4.

^b See vol. V. p. 327, 328.

^c 'Ηγεμων ην αυτος ο θεοφιλης, &c. Comm. in Act. T. II. p. 2. C. sect

fect or governor.' However, we have no particular account in the ancients, who he was, or of what country.

Cave ^a supposed Theophilus to have been a nobleman of Antioch. And in his Lives of the Apostles and Evangelists ^e written in English, he refers to the recognitions: where is mentioned a rich man of Antioch of this name. But I do not esteem that to be any proof, that St. Luke's Theophilus was of Antioch. That fabulous writer is not speaking of Paul, nor of Luke, but of Peter: who, as he says, in ^f seven days converted ten thousand people at Antioch. And Theophilus, the greatest man in the city, turned his house into a church. Moreover, supposing him to intend St. Luke's Theophilus, his authority is of no value. A writer at the end of the second century does not speak of his own knowledge. And if St. Luke published his books in Greece, which to me seems probable, I should be inclined to think, that Theophilus, to whom they are addressed, was a man of the same country.

2. It may be of more importance to inquire, whom St. Luke means by the many, who before him had attempted to write histories of Jesus Christ. Epiphanius says, that ^g St. Luke intended Cerinthus, Merinthus, and others. How Origen ^h expressed himself concerning this, in his preface to St. Luke's gospel: and how Jerom ⁱ in his preface to St. Matthew, may be seen by those, who are pleased to look back. They say, that many attempted to write gospels, as Basilides, Apelles, and others. And they mention divers gospels, not received by the church: such as the gospel of Thomas, and Matthias, the gospel of the Egyptians, and of the twelve. But it is not necessary to be supposed by us, that they thought, that all, if any of those gospels were written before St. Luke's, or that he spoke of them; for Basilides and Apelles could not write gospels before the

Utrumque opus inscripsit Theophilo optimati (ut credere fas est) Antiocheno. Hist. Lit. in Luca.

^e p. 224.

^f Et ne multis immorer, intra septem dies, plus quam decem milia hominum credentes Deo baptizati sunt, et sanctificatione consecrati: ita ut omni aviditatis desiderio Theophilus, qui erat cunctis potentibus in civitate sublimior, domus

sue ingentem basilicam, ecclesie nomine consecravit. Recogn. l. x. cap. 71.

^g . . . φασκων επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν· ινα τινας μεν επιχειρητας δειξη, φημι δε τας περι κηρινθον, και μηρινθον, και τας αλλας. H. LI. n. vii. in.

^h See vol. II. p. 503, 504.

ⁱ See Vol. V. p. 57, 58.

second century: and they might suppose, that several, if not all the others, mentioned by them, were written after St. Luke's. The meaning of what these ancient writers say, is, that the church receives four gospels only. There were many others. But to them may be applied the words of St. Luke: they only took in hand, or attempted. They did not perform, as Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John did. And they might express themselves in that manner concerning gospels written after St. Luke's, as well as before it.

However, Theophylact, as was formerly ^k observed, in the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke, expresseth himself, as if he thought, the evangelist referred to the gospels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve.

3. We will now observe the judgments of some learned moderns. Grabe ^l allows, that St. Luke did not refer to the gospels of Basilides, or Thomas, or some others, mentioned by Origen: for they were not published, till after St. Luke's death. But he thinks, that St. Luke might refer to the gospels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve, and some others not known.

That St. Luke might refer to the gospel according to the Egyptians, he thinks for the following reasons, which I shall consider.

The first is, that ^k St. Luke's gospel was written in Egypt. To which I answer: that is said without ground, as has been lately ^l shown.

Grabe's second argument is, that ^m Clement of Rome, or some other, in the fragment of the second epistle ascribed

to

^k Vol. V. p. 327.

^l Reliqua quippe ab Origene et Ambrosio nominata falsa Evangelia, veluti Basilidis, aliudque Manichæorum, Apostolo Thomæ perperam adscriptum, procul omni dubio post S. Lucæ obitum prodire: adeo ut ea in primis Evangelii verbis, in quorum explicatione Origenes et Ambrosius ista afferunt, respicere hæc potuerit. Contra vero hæc est absimile, ista secundum Hebræos et Ægyptios ante fuisse scripta, atque ad ea, una cum aliis pluribus jam ignotis, Lucam intendisse digitum,

dum præfatus est, &c. Gr. Spic. T. I. p. 31, 32.

^k Evangelium, de quo agitur, ab Ægyptiis editum fuisse ante Lucæ Evangelium, huncque istud inter alia, si non præcipue, respicisse, dum in præfatio plures historias evangelicas memorat, ad quas emendandas, et defectus eorum supplendos, suam literis consignasse se innuit, probabile redditur ex eo, quod Lucas Evangelium scripsisse dicatur Alexandria in Ægypto. Id. ib. p. 33. in.

^l See before, p. 273—277.

^m Accedit, quod jam Clementis Romanus,

to him, has quoted the gospel according to the Egyptians. Which argument, as one would think, might have been spared: since Grabe himself allows that a second epistle to be suppositious, and not to have been composed till about the middle of the third century. If that be the true date of the epistle, it is too late a thing to warrant the supposition, that St. Luke referred to the gospel according to the Egyptians.

I shall take no farther notice of Grabe. But I imagine that the gospel, according to the Egyptians, was not composed before the second century. Clement of Alexandria is the first known catholic author that has cited it; and in his time it was very obscure and little known. This was shown formerly.

Dr. Mill does not much differ from Grabe. He thinks, that ^p of the many narrations, to which St. Luke refers, the two principal were the gospels according to the Hebrews, and according to the Egyptians.

The general account which Mill gives of those memoirs or narrations, seems to be very just and reasonable; and I intend to transcribe him here largely, 'About the year

58,

Romanus, vel quisquis est auctor ep. 2. ad Corinthios, certe antiquissimus, isto Evangelio usus esse ex fragmento mox recitando, colligatur. Ibid. p. 34.

ⁿ Caterum quæras, quando epistola illa Clementi supposita fuerat, respondeo, id seculo iii. et quidem medio, factum esse. Ib. p. 269. in.

^v See vol. II. p. 235, 236.

^r Ex dictis autem hisce historiolicis . . . duæ præ cæteris celebrata erant, quæ et ipsa Evangelia appellabantur, secundum Hebræos alteram, alteram secundum Ægyptios. Proleg. n. 38. vid. et n. 39—41. et n. 112. &c.

^s Sub hoc quidem tempus, annum dico LVIII. seu etiam aliquanto ante, contextæ fuere a fidelibus quibusdam prius *πρωινησαις* evangelicis, seu historiolicæ de rebus Christi. Præter hoc ex Evangelio D. Lucæ proæmio: . . . Exinde coligimus, in primis equidem, *πολλας* hosce,

qui historias conficiebant, alios profusus fuisse ab Evangelistis nostris, Matthæo et Marco. Erat enim Matthæus unus ex *αυτοπταις*, ideoque nec ab istorum traditionibus pendebat, sicut hi quos memorat Lucas. Ne dicam, quod duos duntaxat nemo *πολλας* dixerit. Deinde vero notandum, eos narrationes suas instituisse *περι των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματος*, hoc est, ut ego lubens interpretor, *de rebus apud primos fidei professores*, quorum numero seipsum accenset Lucas, a Christo impletis sive gestis. Denique liquet ex verbis modo citatis, traductas fuisse naratiunculas istas seu proxime, seu mediate saltem, ab Apostolis ipsis, eorumque in opere evangelico adiutoribus. Manifestum est igitur, fuisse e primis Christianis nonnullos, qui ante Lucam, [addo etiam Matthæum et Marcum] res Christi, (seu Evangelia) ex apostolicis traditionibus undecunque ac-

ceptas,

‘ 58, or somewhat sooner,’ says Mill, ‘ were composed by
 ‘ some of the faithful evangelical narrations, or short histo-
 ‘ ries of Christ. This appears from St. Luke’s introduc-
 ‘ tion to his gospel. From which we learn, in the first place,
 ‘ that they were not our evangelists, Matthew and Mark;
 ‘ for Matthew was an eye-witness; nor can two be called
 ‘ many. In the next place it is to be observed, that these
 ‘ narrations consisted of things most surely believed among
 ‘ us, that is, as I understand it, of the things fulfilled and
 ‘ done by Christ among the first professors of the faith; of
 ‘ which number Luke reckons himself. Lastly, from the
 ‘ words of that introduction it appears, that those narrations
 ‘ were received either from the apostles themselves, or from
 ‘ their assistants in the work of the gospel. It is therefore
 ‘ manifest, that there were some of the first Christians, who
 ‘ before Luke (and also, as we may suppose, before Mat-
 ‘ thew and Mark) wrote histories of the things done by
 ‘ Christ, and received from apostolical traditions: and that
 ‘ not with a bad or heretical design, as many insinuate, who
 ‘ comment upon this introduction of St. Luke, but with
 ‘ the same design as our evangelists; that Christians might
 ‘ have at least some account in writing of the Lord’s actions.
 ‘ Nevertheless it may be also inferred from what St. Luke
 ‘ here says, that their histories were inaccurate and imper-
 ‘ fect, there were in them some things not certain, or well
 ‘ attested, and possibly here and there some mistakes. For
 ‘ which cause it seemed good to him, who had attained to
 ‘ full information, to write a complete and copious history
 ‘ of the things done by Christ.’

If this account be right, some consequences may be de-
 duced, which will be of use to us.

ceptas, conscripserant: idque non
 studio aliquo maligno, seu hære-
 tico, quod insinuant fere qui in hoc
 Lucæ præmium commentati sunt:
 sed eodem plane fine, quo Evan-
 gelistæ nostri: ut haberet scilicet
 Ecclesia rerum a Domino nostro
 gestarum qualem notitiam. Cæte-
 rum cum in iis quæ sequuntur
 apud Lucam, singula Christianæ rei
 historiam spectantia accurate se af-
 secutum esse dicat Evangelista...
 haud obscure quidem hinc colligi

videtur, τῶν πολλῶν istorum διηγήσεις
 minus accuratas fuisse, minusque
 perfectas: ita quidem, ut in his,
 quæ tradiderant, aliqua hinc inde
 occurrerint parum certa, ne dicam
 a vero aberrantia. Unde omnino
 visum sit ipsi plenariam historię hu-
 jusce cognitionem consecuto, inte-
 grum jam et luculentum rerum a
 Christo gestarum Commentarium
 scribere. Mill. Prolog. num. 35—
 37.

And

And indeed it seems to me to be very right. There were several histories of Christ, to which St. Luke here refers. They were composed with a good view, like to that of our evangelists. But they were defective and inaccurate. If there were any mistakes, I would imagine that they were not numerous, nor in things of the greatest importance. Nor were the writers sufficiently qualified for the work which they had undertaken. This, I think, to be intimated by St. Luke, though modestly, and without censoriousness, in what he says of himself, *that he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first*: which, probably, could not be said of the composers of the narrations, to which he refers. They were men who had an honest zeal; but they had written too hastily before they had obtained full information: for which reason their histories could not answer the end aimed at.

These things being allowed to be right, several consequences may be deduced by us.

In the first place, and in particular we hence learn, that the gospel, according to the twelve, or according to the Hebrews, was not one of those narrations, or memoirs, to which St. Luke refers. For these were very short histories [*historiœ* as Mill calls them:] that was a full gospel, or large history of Jesus Christ. Many, in Jerom's time, supposed it to be the authentic gospel of St. Matthew: which, certainly, is not a short and imperfect memoir. From the notice taken of that gospel by several ancient writers, especially by Jerom, it appears to me very probable (and I should think must appear very probable to others likewise) that the gospel according to the twelve, or according to the Hebrews, either was St. Matthew's original Hebrew gospel, with additions; or his original Greek gospel, translated into Hebrew, with additions. But this last seems to me most likely, as has been often said already upon divers occasions.

Secondly. Another thing to be deduced from Mill's account, if right, is, that the gospel according to the Egyp-

I am not singular in supposing, that the gospel according to the Egyptians is not intended by St. Luke. Beza says the same strongly. And, as I imagine, he justly asserts it not to have been written, till after St. Luke's gospel. Quod istos ad Lucas, non satis commode præ-

stitisse: minime tamen opinor, fabulosas, imo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem Ecclesiæ sub Nicodemi, Nazaræorum, Thomæ, Ægyptiorum, nominibus impudentissime obtrusas. Bez. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 1.

tians was not one of the narrations, to which St. Luke refers. For that gospel was not composed upon the same principles with those of our evangelists. It was an heretical gospel, as appears from the fragments of it, collected by Grabe, and probably it was composed in the second century, by some encratites, enemies of marriage.

Thirdly. I add one thing more, whether it be a consequence from what has been already said, or not: that nothing remains of the narrations, to which St. Luke refers, not so much as any fragments, they not being quoted in any christian writings now extant.

3. I shall now transcribe a part of Dr. Doddridge's remarks upon St. Luke's introduction. 'This must refer to some histories of the life of Christ, now lost. For Matthew and Mark, the only evangelists that can be supposed to have written before Luke, could not with any propriety be called many. And of these two, Matthew at least wrote from personal knowledge, not from the testimony of others. I conclude, that the books referred to are lost: as I am well satisfied that none of the apocryphal gospels, now extant, published, particularly by Fabricius and Jones, can pretend to equal antiquity, with this of St. Luke. . . . And St. Luke seems to allow these histories, whatever they were, to have been honestly written, according to information received from capable judges.'

4. Mr. Beaufobre, speaking of these memoirs, says 'The life of our Saviour was so beautiful, his character so sublime and divine, his doctrine so excellent, and the miracles by which he confirmed it, were so shining and so numerous, that it was impossible but many should undertake to write memoirs of them. This produced many histories of our Saviour, some more, others less exact. It is great pity that they are lost: for we might have consulted them, and could have judged for ourselves concerning the character of the writers, and their compositions. St. Luke, who speaks of narrations, or gospels that had preceded his own, intimates indeed, that they were defective, but he does not condemn them as fabulous, or bad.'

5. That is right. Those memoirs were not bad, nor fabulous: but they were imperfect, as I apprehend, to a great

^r Vid. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 31—37.

^s See his Family Expositor, vol. I. p. 1.

^t Hist. de Manich. tom. I. p. 449.

degree; nor do I lament the loss of them. I can pay so much deference to the judgment of christian antiquity, especially the earliest of all, as to believe, that those many narrations to which St. Luke refers, did not deserve to be preserved, or to be much taken notice of, after the publication of the gospels of our first three evangelists. I imagine, that when once these came abroad, the former appeared to the faithful so low, and mean, and defective, that they could not bear to see, or read them.

IX. I shall now make some observations upon the other work of our evangelist.

1. The book of the Acts was written, according to ^u Mill, in the year 64. And from what has been argued by us in several places, that must appear to be as likely a time as any. It could not be written till after St. Paul's confinement at Rome was come to a period; I suppose it to have ended in the former part of the year of Christ 63. And I think it probable, that St. Luke finished this book the same, or the next year, either at Rome, or in Greece.

2. It cannot be disagreeable to recollect here some of the observations of ancient writers upon this book, the only book of the kind which we have, containing a history of the preaching of Christ's apostles after his resurrection.

3. Tertullian ^x often speaks of the importance of this book, as showing Christ's fulfilment of the promise of the Holy Ghost to his disciples.

4. 'The ^y Acts of the apostles,' says Jerom in his letter to Paulinus concerning the study of the scriptures, 'seems to promise a bare history, and an account of the early infancy of the church: but if we consider, that the writer is Luke the physician, we shall at the same time discern, that every word is suited to heal the maladies of the soul.'

5. Says Augustin: 'Luke ^z after having written a gospel, containing a history of Christ's words and works to the time of his resurrection and ascension, wrote such an ac-

^u Prolegom. num. 121.

^x See vol. II. p. 261.

^y Actus Apostolorum nudam quidem sonare videntur historiam, et nascentis Ecclesie infantiam texere. Sed si noverimus, scriptorem eorum Lucam esse Medicum, cujus

laus est in evangelio, animadvertemus pariter, omnia verba illius animæ languentis esse medicinam. Ad Paulin. ep. 50. al. 103. T. IV. P. II. p. 574.

^z See vol. V. p. 96, 97.

‘count of the Acts of the apostles, as he judged to be
 ‘sufficient for the edification of believers. And it is the
 ‘only history of the apostles, which has been received by the
 ‘church: all others having been rejected, as not to be
 ‘relied upon.’

6. I beg leave to refer my readers to the passages of Chrysoftom, already ^a transcribed, relating to this book: and to the whole of his first homily upon it. I add now only one passage more out of the same homily. ‘The ^b gospels,’ says he, ‘are the history of the things which Christ
 ‘did and spake. The Acts the history of the things, which
 ‘another Paraclet spake and did.’

7. It is not needful for me to make a distinct enumeration of the things contained in this book. Every one who has perused it with care, cannot but know, that it contains an account of the choice of Matthias to be apostle in the room of the traitor, of the wonderful and plentiful pouring out of the gift of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, and other disciples of Jesus at Jerusalem, at the Pentecost next succeeding his crucifixion, and of the testimony borne by the apostles to his resurrection and ascension in their discourses, and by many miracles, and various sufferings: their preaching first at Jerusalem, and in Judea, and afterwards by themselves, or their assistants, in Samaria: and then to Gentiles in Judea, and afterwards out of it, as well as to Jews: and of the conversion of Paul, and his preaching, miracles, labours, sufferings, in many cities and countries, parts of the Roman empire, and the polite world, and at length in Rome itself.

8. If we were to indulge ourselves in making remarks upon this useful and excellent performance, nothing, perhaps, would be more observable than its brevity and conciseness: by which means many things must have been omitted, which happened during the period of that history. For it is very true, which Chrysoftom said, that ^c Luke leaves us thirsting for more.

9. Says Le Clerc: ‘Luke’s ^d apostolical history relates the
 ‘beginnings of the preaching of the gospel among Jews and
 ‘Gentiles,

^a Ibid. p. 131—133.

^b Τα μεν εν ευαγγελια ων ο χριστος
 εποιησεν και ειπεν ιστορια τις εστιν αι δε
 πραξεις, ων ο ετερος παρακλητος ειπε

και εποιησε. In Act. Hom. i. tom.
 IX. p. 9. B.

^c Vol. V. p. 132.

^d Hic vero definit Lucæ Historia
 Apostolica,

‘Gentiles, chiefly by the ministry of Peter and Paul: for of the other apostles he is almost entirely silent. . . . I wish,’ says he, ‘that some other apostolical man, of like judgment and integrity, had written the history of the other apostles, and had undertaken to supply what was wanting in Luke’s history, and that this work had come down to us.’ But, however desirable it may now appear to us, we cannot perceive from ecclesiastical history, that ever such a work was published.

10. Estius imagined, ‘that Luke, possibly, intended to write a third book, to supply, particularly, the omissions of the two years, which St. Paul spent at Rome.’ But I verily believe, there is no ground at all for that conjectural supposition.

11. Again: Le Clerc, above-mentioned, thinks, ‘that Luke breaks off the history of St. Peter, of whom he had said so much before, very abruptly, in those words, Acts xii. 17. *And he departed, and went to another place.*’ Nevertheless St. Luke afterwards drops St. Barnabas in a like manner. ch. xv. 39. And in the end he will take his leave of the apostle Paul himself without much more ceremony.

12. Those omissions are no reflection upon the writer, nor any disparagement to his history. The proper deduction to be made by us is this: we hereby perceive, that it was not the design of St. Luke, to aggrandize Peter, or Paul, or any of the apostles, nor to write their lives: but to record the evidences of our Saviour’s resurrection, and to write a history of the first preaching and planting the christian religion in the world. This design he has admirably executed: and having filled up his plan, he concluded.

Apostolica, quâ initia prædicationis evangelicæ apud Judæos, Ethnicosque, et ministerio quidem Petri et Pauli potissimum scribere adgressus est. De cæteris Apostolis autem ubique apud eum est silentium. . . . Utinam vero, vir quispiam apostolicus, pari judicio et fide, cæterorum res gestas literis mandasset, quæ narrationi Lucæ defunt supplere voluisset, idque opus ad nos pervenisset! Cler. H. E. An. 61. n. iv.

Pauli a Luca sunt omiſſa. . . . Ac fortasse Lucas meditabatur tertium librum, in quo repeteret acta illius biennii. . . . sicut Act. i. quædam exposuit tacita ultimo capite Evangelii. Est. ad Act. Ap. xxviii. 30.

† Mirum est, Lucam, postquam liberationem Petri e carcere narravit cap. xii. 17. eumque *in alium locum*, hoc est, extra Ierosolymam, ivisse dixit, ne verbum quidem de eo habere, de quo tam multa alia dixerat. Id. ibid.

† Sed proculdubio multa actorum

L 2

13. However,

13. However, undoubtedly, many things are omitted by St. Luke: some of which we may learn from St. Paul's epistles. I shall observe some omissions.

14. St. Luke has not in the course of his history, mentioned the writing of any of St. Paul's epistles. It is probable, that he was at Corinth, when the apostle wrote thence his large epistle to the Romans. Nevertheless he takes not any notice of it, nor of the epistles written by St. Paul at Rome, when he certainly was with him, nor indeed of any other. By comparing the epistles themselves, and St. Luke's history of the apostle in the Acts, we are enabled to trace the time and place of divers of those epistles: but they are no where particularly mentioned by the historian.

15. In Acts ix. 19—26. St. Luke, after the account of St. Paul's conversion, speaks of his being at Damascus, and his preaching there, and of the opposition, which he there met with from the Jews, and his escape thence, and then going to Jerusalem. But St. Paul Gal. i. 17, 18. informs us, that after his conversion he went into Arabia, and then returned to Damascus: and that three years passed between his conversion and his going to Jerusalem. This is an instructive instance: for the omission is certain, and undoubted. I am of opinion, that St. Luke did not omit the journey into Arabia, because he did not know of it: but designedly, and because he did not judge it necessary to be mentioned. Jerom^s has taken particular notice of the omission of that journey into Arabia.

16. Like omissions are in St. Luke's gospel. I shall take notice of two.

1.) Having given the history of our Lord's presentation at the temple, he says, ch. ii. 39. *And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth.* Nevertheless, I think the holy family did not now go directly from Jerusalem to Nazareth, but to Bethlehem. There, as I suppose, our Lord received the homage of the magians. And afterwards, to avoid the persecution of Herod, they removed thence to

§ Lucam vero idcirco de Arabia præterisse, quia forsitan nihil dignum apostolatu in Arabia perpetravit: et ea potius compendiosa narratione dixisse: quæ digna Christi evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc

segnitiæ Apostoli deputandum, si frustra in Arabia fuerit: sed quod aliqua dispensatio et Dei præceptum fuerit, ut taceret. Hier. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 235.

Egypt,

Egypt, and then returned to Nazareth. All which is recorded Matt. ii. 1—13.

The visit of the Magians must have been after the presentation at the temple. If it had been before, and if they had presented *their gifts, gold, and frankincense, and myrrh*: mentioned Matt. ii. 11. Mary would not have made the lesser offering for her purification, mentioned Luke ii. 23, 24. Nor could the child Jesus have been safely brought to Jerusalem, or such notice have been taken of him at the temple, as St. Luke particularly relates, ch. ii. 25—38, if *Herod, and all Jerusalem*, had been just before alarmed by the inquiries of the Magians: *Where is he that is born king of the Jews?* Matt. ii. 1, 2. Omitting therefore all those things, St. Luke says, as above observed, and afterwards they returned to Nazareth, the place of their usual abode: which is agreeable to Matt. ii. 22, 23.

2.) Another thing observable is, that all our Saviour's appearances to his disciples, after his resurrection, recorded by St. Luke, ch. xxiv. were at Jerusalem, or near it. He takes not any notice of our Saviour's meeting the disciples in Galilee, so particularly mentioned Matt. xxviii. 7. and Mark xvi. 7. St. John also, ch. xxi. 1—23. speaks of our Saviour's showing himself to the disciples at *the sea of Tiberias*. And St. Paul assures us, that our Lord was seen of *above five hundred brethren at once*, 1 Cor. xv. 6; which, probably, was in the same country. And though at the beginning of his book of the Acts, St. Luke resumes the account of our Saviour's showing himself to the disciples after his resurrection; there is nothing more about Galilee, than in the former relation. Inasmuch that, if we had St. Luke's histories only, we might have been apt to conclude, that all the appearances of our Saviour to his disciples were at Jerusalem, or near it, and no where else.

17. St. Paul's epistles inform us of many things omitted by St. Luke. But we should have known many more, if we had had a parallel historian. A comparison of St. Luke's history of our Saviour with that of the other evangelists may assure of this.

18. In the eleventh chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul mentions divers visions and revelations, with which he had been favoured: but St. Luke has not taken notice of any of them. St. Paul in his speech to the people at Jerusalem, recorded by St. Luke Acts xxii. 17. mentions a trance, which he had in the temple. But St. Luke has no

where told us the exact time of it; nor has he otherwise mentioned it.

19. I do not think that these things were omitted by St. Luke, because St. Paul concealed them from him; or because by some other means he was unacquainted with the time and place of them: but it was a regard to brevity that induced him to pass them over. They were not necessary to be inserted in his history: without them he has recorded sufficient attestations of Paul's apostolical authority, and of the truth and divine original of the doctrine taught by him.

20. Says St. Paul, unwillingly, and constrained by the disadvantageous insinuations and charges of self-interested and designing men. 2 Cor. xi. 23. *Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool:) I am more. In labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft.*

In prisons more frequent. Therefore before writing this epistle, in the year 57, Paul had been imprisoned several times: though St. Luke has mentioned before this time one imprisonment only, which was at Philippi. Acts xvi. 23—40. Upon which Estius ^h observes, that Paul did and suffered many things not mentioned in the Acts. And Rom. xvi. 7. *Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners . . . who also were in Christ before me.* Paul was not a prisoner when he wrote the epistle to the Romans, in the beginning of the year 58. But ⁱ he had been in prison before with those two early Christians, his relations: but where, or when, we cannot exactly say.

21. Ver. 24. *Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one.* Nevertheless St. Luke has not mentioned one of those times. Estius conjectures that ^k Luke omitted these, and many other things, because he was not with the apostle

^h De Paulo autem incarcerato ante hanc epistolam, in Actis Apostolorum non legimus quidem, nisi cap. xvi. ubi a Philippensibus in carcerem missus legitur. Sed permulta Paulus et fecit et passus est, quæ in Actis non scribuntur. Est. ad 2 Cor. xi. 23.

ⁱ Porro concaptivos intellige, quod aliquando communia cum Paulo vincula pro Christo passi fuissent. Ubi tamen, aut quando factum sit, ignoratur. Est. ad Rom. xvi. 7.

^k Sed cur Lucas in Actis ne unius quidem flagellationis ex quinque meminit? Ideo videlicet, quod de Paulo pene ea sola, quibus ipse præsens fuit, sigillatim recenset: alia vero vel silentio pertranseat, vel summatim ac breviter referat. . . . Qua in re notanda humilitas Pauli, qui suas tot et tam graves pro Christo passiones Lucæ comiti suo non aperuerit, ne hic quidem recitaturus, nisi coëgisset eum amor salutis Corinthiorum. Id. ib. ad ver. 24.

when they happened, and Paul out of modesty forbore to tell him of them. I rather think that Luke was fully acquainted with Paul's history: but he aimed at brevity, and judged the things mentioned by him to be sufficient.

22. Ver. 25. *Thrice was I beaten with rods*: meaning, I suppose, by Roman magistrates. But St. Luke has mentioned one instance only of this; which was at Philippi, when Paul and Silas both underwent this hard usage. Acts xvi. 19—40. Of this ¹ likewise Estius has taken notice in his Commentary.

Once was I stoned: undoubtedly meaning at Lystra in Lycaonia, as related by St. Luke Acts xiv. 19, 20.

Thrice I have suffered shipwreck. St. Luke has recorded but one instance, which was not until after this time, in the apostle's voyage from Judea to Rome: Acts xxvii. which therefore must have been the fourth.

A night and a day have I been in the deep. At one of those times I escaped with the utmost difficulty, by getting on a plank, and floating in the sea a night and a day, or a whole day of four and twenty hours.

23. Ver. 26. *In journeyings often, in perils of waters, or rather rivers*. Which ^m are sometimes very dangerous. But St. Luke has not recorded any dangers of the apostle upon rivers, either in crossing them, or sailing upon them.

24. Says Tillemont in his life of St. Paul: 'The ⁿ greatest part of interpreters think, that St. Paul made no voyages, but those, which are taken notice of in the Acts. . . . Nevertheless we must necessarily acknowledge, that beside what St. Luke informs us of the sufferings of St. Paul, this apostle was five times scourged by the Jews, twice beaten with rods, and thrice shipwrecked. All this happened before he wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians; that is, in the time of which St. Luke has written the history. Nevertheless St. Luke says nothing of all this. It is certain therefore, that either he has omitted the circumstances of the most remarkable events which he relates, or that St. Paul made several voyages, of which he has taken no notice.'

¹ *Ten virgis cæsus sum*: a Gentili-
ba. Lat. enim Romanis consue-
tum, virgis cædere nocentes. . . .
Locus tantum semel meminit
contumeliæ Paulo illatæ: sci-
bet Act. xvi. ubi scribit eum una
cum Sila virgis cæsum a Philippensi-
bus. Est. in loc.

^m *Periculis fluminum*: quæ inter-
dam non minus periculosa sunt
navigantibus, quam mare. Est. in
loc.

ⁿ Mem. Ec. T. i. St. Paul, note
xviii.

25. The reason of St. Luke's silence here I take to be the same that has been already assigned of his silence upon other occasions: it was not necessary, that these things should be related. To have written an account of all the apostle's journies and dangers, would have rendered the work more voluminous and prolix than was judged proper. When St. Luke set about composing and publishing this book, he had all the materials before him, and his plan was formed. Agreeably to which, he determined to write at large the history of St. Paul's voyage from Judea to Rome, in which are many remarkable incidents, and to omit some other of the apostle's journies and voyages: though divers of them likewise were attended with affecting circumstances.

26. The chapter, from which I have just now transcribed several things, concludes in this manner. Ver. 31—33. *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knows that I lie not. In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king, kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me. And through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands.*

I have often reflected with great satisfaction on St. Luke's not omitting this dangerous attempt upon the apostle's liberty and life: with which himself was so much affected, and which he has here mentioned with such solemnity. The history of it may be seen in Acts ix. 23—25.

I now proceed to some other things.

27. St. Paul assures us Gal. ii. 1—3. that when he went up to Jerusalem upon occasion of the debate concerning the manner of receiving gentile converts, he took Titus with him: which is not said by St. Luke Acts xv. though he gives a particular account of Paul's going from Antioch to Jerusalem upon that occasion. Nor indeed has St. Luke once mentioned Titus in his history: though St. Paul wrote an epistle to him, and has mentioned him several times in his epistles sent to others.

28. Gal. ii. 11—21. St. Paul speaks of Peter's being at Antioch, before he and Barnabas had separated: but St. Luke says nothing of it. Jerom, in his Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, says: 'We are not to wonder, that Luke has taken no notice of this. For by the usual privilege

^o Nec mirum esse, si Lucas hanc mer tuerit, quum et alia multa, quae Paulus sustinuisse se replicat, historiographi licentiâ prætermiserit. In Gal. cap. ii. T. IV. p. 244.

‘of historians he has omitted many things performed by Paul, and which we know from himself.’

29. Rom. xvi. 3, 4. St. Paul applauds an action of great generosity in Aquila and Priscilla: but St. Luke has not informed us of the place, or occasion of it. Doubtless he did not omit it, for want of respect to those excellent Christians, whom he has mentioned more than once. ch. xviii. 18, and 26. But that particular did not come within the compass of his design.

30. Many things, not expressly mentioned by St. Luke, may be argued, and concluded to have been done, from those which he has recorded.

1.) In Acts iv. 23—30. is recorded a prayer of the apostles, in which they request, that they may be enabled to work miracles for farther confirming the doctrine taught by them. And unquestionably their prayer was heard, and their request granted, and they did work many miracles in the name of Christ, more than are related by St. Luke.

2.) Acts v. 12. *And by the hand of the apostles were many signs and wonders done among the people:* and what follows. Whence it may be concluded, that ^r many miracles were wrought, not only by Peter and John, but also by the other apostles also, beside those which are particularly recorded. See also ch. ii. 43.

3.) Says Mr. Biscoe: ‘Many ^r and great miracles are related in the history of the Acts to be wrought by St. Paul and his fellow-labourers in their preaching the gospel to the gentiles. And agreeably hereto St. Paul says, 2 Cor. xii, 12. *Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought amongst you in all patience, in signs and wonders, and mighty deeds.* And to the Romans, ch. xv. 18, 19. . . . I make no doubt, says that learned writer, but the apostles wrought miracles in every city, where they came with a view to preach the gospel, and make converts. St. Luke is so very succinct in his history of the Acts, that he often omits them. He gives an account of only a miracle or two wrought at Philippi in his

^r Oecumenius. says, that Luke omitted many miracles wrought by the Apostles for avoiding ostentation.

Πολλων δε θαυματων επιτελεσμενων υπο των αποστολων, ως και ανωτερω εμνησθη ο ταυτα γραφων λεκτας, [cap. ii. 43.] εστις εκεινων ονομασι μνημονευει, αλλ’

εκεινο γραφει μονον αφ’ ε παντες εκινηθησαν. . . . η και οτι ε κερπηε χαριν η συγγραφη αυτη εσπεδασθη. Oecum. in Act. Cap. iii. tom. i. p. 25. A. B.

^r The History of the Acts confirmed. ch. xi. § 8. p. 407, 408.

‘ whole

‘ whole relation of St. Paul’s journey from Antioch to the
 ‘ west, when he converted a great part of Macedonia and
 ‘ Achaia: though it is evident from St. Paul’s own epistle,
 ‘ already quoted, that he at that time did many signs and
 ‘ wonders at Corinth. And that he did the same at Thessalo-
 ‘ nica is not obscurely intimated in his first epistle to the
 ‘ Thessalonians, ch. i. 5. We read nothing in the Acts of
 ‘ the apostles of what St. Paul did in Galatia the first time,
 ‘ more than that he went through it. Acts xvi. 6. And all
 ‘ that is added the second time he was there is, that *he went*
 ‘ *over all the country of Galatia, strengthening all the disciples,*
 ‘ ch. xviii. 23, Which indeed is an intimation, that the first
 ‘ time he was there he preached the gospel among them, and
 ‘ made converts. But from his epistle to the Galatian
 ‘ churches it is fully evident that he wrought miracles among
 ‘ them, and conferred on them gifts of the Holy Spirit. For
 ‘ he asks them: *He that ministreth to you the spirit, and work-*
 ‘ *eth miracles among you, doth he it by the works of the law, or*
 ‘ *by the hearing of faith?* Gal. iii. 5. That he means himself,
 ‘ is manifest from the whole tenor of the epistle. See ch. i. 6.
 ‘ ch. iv. 11, 13, 14, 19.’

There follow other like observations, which I may not transcribe.

4.) Mr. Biscoe, as above, makes no doubt but the apostles wrought miracles in every city, where they came, with a view to preach the gospel, and make converts. I am of opinion, that this may be truly supposed of Paul particularly, and that it may be concluded from what St. Luke has written. For, according to him, Paul wrought miracles in Cyprus. Acts xiii. 11. at Lystra. xiv. 10. at Philippi. xvi. 16—18. See also 25, 26. and very many at Ephesus. xix. 11—17. And at Troas he raised Eutychus to life. xx. 9—12. In his voyage from Judea to Rome he wrought many miracles. xxviii. 3—6. and 7—10. From these miracles, recorded by St. Luke, it may be well argued, that St. Paul wrought miracles in all, or most other places, where he went and made any stay, preaching the gospel. In particular, it may be argued, that Paul wrought miracles at Athens and at Rome. What they were we cannot say, because they have not been recorded by St. Luke, nor by any other credible writer. But that miracles were performed by the apostle in those cities, appears to me very probable.

5.) St.

5.) St. Luke has not given any account of St. Paul's appearing before the emperor Nero at Rome, when he was sent thither by Festus. Nevertheless, that Paul was brought before Nero soon after his arrival at Rome, is highly probable. And though St. Luke has not expressly said so, it may be concluded from what he has said. For he has again and again sufficiently intimated that Paul was certainly to appear before the emperor, to whom he had appealed. See Acts xxv. 10, 11, 12, 21, xxvi. 32. xxvii. 24. xxviii. 19. The apostle therefore was brought before Nero, and pleaded before him. But St. Luke forbore to give a distinct account of it, because he had already given a particular account of Paul's pleadings before Felix, and Festus, and Agrippa: and from them may be concluded what was the tenor of his apology before the emperor himself.

6.) St. Paul, in his epistle to the Christians at Rome, says, ch. i. 11. *I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established.* And ch. xv. 29. *I am sure, that when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.* And unquestionably, the event was agreeable to these wishes and expectations.

7.) St. Luke has not particularly recorded those things in his history: but from what he has said they may be inferred. Says our historian. Acts xxviii. 13—16. *And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were desired to tarry with them seven days. And so we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the three taverns. Whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage. And when we came to Rome, the Centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard. But Paul was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him. And ver. 30. Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house.*

8.) From the things here said it may be fairly concluded, that during the apostle's stay at Rome, there was a very delightful communication of civil and religious offices between him and the believers there, according to the abilities, and the exigences of each. Before he left Rome, the Philippians seem to have sent him a supply by Epaphroditus. Philip. iv. 10—18. But it may be well supposed, that the price of his

* Mirum, quod Lucas hic nullam Quam factam fuisse primo anno, faciat mentionem primæ defensionis Pauli, de qua ipse 2 Tim. iv. Est. ad Act. xxviii. 30. quo Romam venit, non dubitandum.

lodging, and the expences of his maintenance, were provided for, chiefly, by the Christians, whom he found at Rome, when he came thither, and by the converts, which he made afterwards. The soldiers likewise, who by turns attended upon him, would expect to be considered, if they carried it civilly toward their prisoner. All which, we may suppose, was taken care of by the good Christians at Rome: who, as St. Luke assures us, went out to meet him, and conducted him into the city.

C H A P. IX.

ST. JOHN, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST.

- I. *His History from the N. T.* II. *His Age.* III. *When he left Judea, to go to Ephesus.* IV. *His History from ecclesiastical Writers.* V. *The Time, when he was banished into Patmos.* VI. *How long he was there.* VII. *Testimonies of ancient Writers to his Gospel.* VIII. *Opinions of learned Moderns concerning the Time, when this Gospel was written.* IX. *An Argument, to prove, that it was written before the Destruction of Jerusalem.* X. *Objections considered.* XI. *Observations upon this Gospel.*

I. JOHN was the son of Zebedee, a fisherman upon the sea of Galilee, probably ^a of the town of Bethsaida, and ^b Salome. John was the younger brother: for James is always ^c mentioned first, except in Luke ix. 28. and John is generally reckoned the youngest of all Christ's disciples.

Though Zebedee was by trade a fisherman, he needs not be reckoned poor: for, as St. Mark has particularly observed, he was not only master of a boat, and nets, but had *hired servants*, ch. i. 20. Moreover, we may recollect what Peter said to Christ, who also had been a fisherman upon the same sea: *We have left all, and followed thee*, Matt. xix. 27. They

^a Zebedæum gente Galilæum fuisse ex loco commorationis circa lacum Gennesareth suspicamur. Incertius autem, Bethsãidensem pronunciarè, ut plerique faciunt: cum id nitatur tantum testimonio Evangelii, sociis Andræ ac Petro hoc oppidum adsignantis. Neque tamen argumenta ad manus sunt, qui-

bus vulgatam hanc opinionem impugnemus. Lampe Prolegom. in Johan.

^b Compare Matt. xxvii. 56, with Mark xv. 40, and xvi. 1.

^c So Matt. iv. 21. ch. x. 2. Mark i. 19. ch. iii. 17. ch. x. 35. Luke v. 10. Acts i. 13.

left their employments, by which they gained a subsistence: and for the present there was self-denial in their attendance upon Jesus.

It is not unlikely, that Zebedee died not long after these two brothers were called to be apostles. However, the circumstances of the family may be collected from what is said of their mother, who is mentioned Matt. xxvii. 55. and Mark xv. 40. among *those women, who followed Jesus out of Galilee, and ministred unto him.* That ministry is described Luke viii. 3. To which might be added, that she is mentioned among those women that bought sweet spices to embalm the body of Jesus, Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiii. 55. And our Lord, having recommended his mother to this disciple, it is said, that *he took her to his own home,* John xix. 27.

If Salome was related to our Lord in the manner supposed by Theophylact, or some other way, with which we are not distinctly acquainted; that may have been, in part, the ground and reason of several things mentioned in the gospels: as the petition of these two brothers, disciples, for the first two places in Christ's kingdom: John's being the beloved disciple, and friend of Jesus, and being admitted to some freedoms denied to the rest: and, possibly, performing some offices about his person: and, finally, our Lord's committing to him the care of his mother, so long as she should survive him.

In Acts iv. 13. It is said of Peter and John, that they were ignorant, and unlearned men. Which, indeed, is nothing else, but that they were neither ^f doctors, nor magistrates, but men of private stations, who had not been educated in the schools of the Rabbies: or, as Dr. Doddridge has happily translated this text, illiterate men, and in private stations of

^e See vol. V. p. 328.

^e Opus scilicet erat ipsi aliquo, quem interdum ad matrem mitteret, quod non ita raro factum esse, facile intelligitur,) quo uteretur ad ligandos sibi pedes, ad induendos sibi et exuendos calceos. [vid. Matt. iii. 11. Marc. i. 8. Luc. iii. 16. Joan. i. 27.] qui sibi præsto esset ad præparanda cubilia, qui in cubiculo sibi recubaret dormienti, qui alia sibi præpararet minuta officiola domestica,

qui propterea perpetuus sibi esset pedisequus, nec nisi jussus ab ipso recederet. Heuman. Diss. Syll. tom. II p. 338.

^f *Ἀγραμματοί, sine literis:* id est, non versati in doctrinis thaludicis, quales illiterati Hebræis. Nam scripturas sacras Apostoli et legérant, et memoria tenebant. *Καὶ ἰδοὺταί.* Idiotæ sunt Hebræis, qui neque Magistratus sunt, neque Legisperiti. Grot. in loc.

life. So Œcumenius says, that s St. John in sending a letter to Gaius had Paul for an example, who wrote to Timothy, and Titus, and to Philemon, an idiot: that is, a man of a private station: whereas Timothy and Titus had a public character in the church, as they were evangelists.

There can be no doubt, that Zebedee's sons, as the children of all pious Jews at that time, were well acquainted with the scriptures of the Old Testament. They had read them, and had heard them read and explained in the synagogues. They had also been accustomed to go to Jerusalem at the feasts, and had discoursed with many upon the things of religion. They now were in expectation of the appearing of the Messiah, foretold in the law and the prophets: but, undoubtedly, were in the common prejudice of the nation, that it would be, in part at least, a worldly kingdom. And it is very likely, that they had heard John preach: though they did not attend statedly upon him as his disciples: for all the people of Judea, in general, went to John's baptism.

Says St. John, i. 35, 36. *Again, the next day after, John stood, and two of his disciples. And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith: behold the lamb of God...* From ver. 40. we learn, that one of these two, which heard John speak, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. And ^h some have supposed, that our evangelist, who writes this, was the other: which I do not look upon as certain, though I do not deny it.

Whether the other was John, or not, it ought to be reckoned unquestioned, that before he was called to be an apostle, he had seen and heard the Lord Jesus, and had been witness of some miracles wrought by him. It appears to me very probable, that ⁱ he was one of the disciples, who were present at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, where water was made wine. John ii. 1—11.

The call of James and John, to attend upon Jesus statedly, is related Matt. iv. 21, 22. Mark i. 19, 20. Luke v. 1—10.

St. Mark putting down the names of the twelve apostles, when he mentions James and John, says, that our Lord sur-

^s Προς δε γαιον ενα γραφων εχει παυλον τιτω γραφοντα και τιμοθεω, και προς φιλημονα δε ιδιωτην. Œcum I. 11. p. 606. C.

^h Duorum alter ver. 41. nominatur. Alter videtur ipse Evangelista noster fuisse, uti visum in vita ejus.

Lib. I. cap. 2. Lampe in Joh. cap. i. ver. 35, 36.

ⁱ However, Basnage disputes this. Neque probabile admodum, Joannem his interfuisse nuptiis. Quod si concederetur, &c. Basn. Ann. 30. num. xxxviii.

named

named them *Boanerges*, which is, *sons of thunder*, ch. iii. 17. By which it seems unreasonable to suppose that our Lord intended to reproach them with some fault in their natural temper, as if they were fierce and furious: though ^k a learned writer has intimated so much. That ^l name must have been very honourable, prophetically representing the resolution and courage with which they would openly and boldly declare the great truths of the gospel, when fully acquainted with them. How John answered this character, we know from what is said of him in the book of the Acts, and from his own writings, and from things recorded of him in ecclesiastical history. How well James, the other brother, answered that character, may be concluded from his being beheaded by Herod Agrippa at Jerusalem, not many years after our Lord's ascension. Which, we cannot doubt, was owing to an open and steadfast testimony to the resurrection of Jesus, and to other services for the church: whereby he had greatly signa- lized himself in the short period of his life after our Lord's ascension. Possibly ^m he had, with a freedom, not a little offensive, spoken of the calamities coming upon the Jewish people, if they did not repent, and believe in Jesus as the Christ: as also John the Baptist had declared in his preach- ing, Matt. iii. 7—12. Luke iii. 17. and Stephen in his, Acts, vi. 13, 14. James ⁿ was the first martyr for Christ among the apostles;

^k ' However it was, our Lord, I doubt not, herein had respect to the furious and resolute disposition of those two brothers, who seem to have been of a more fierce and fiery temper than the rest of the Apostles.' Cave's Life of St. James the Great. num. 5. p. 142.

^l Vid. Fr. Lamp. Prolegom. l. i. cap. 2. num. vii—xv.

^m Accedit altera ratio, quæ eos adhuc proprius spectabat, nempe quod in scopo ministerii sui præ cæteris Apostolis Baptistæ similes futuri. Nempe sicut Baptista in ea totus erat, ut per tonitru præconii sui judicium jam tum Judæis imminens indicaret et averteret; ita et ministerium fratrum horum potissimum ad Judæos spectaturum erat. Jacobus quidem ea fini post adscensi-

onem Domini nunquam, quod sci- mus, ab Hierosolyma discessit, donec pro fide martyrium subiret. Hoc vero ei evenisse, quam maxime probabile est, quia invidiosa præ cæteris ejus concio fuit, periculum instans incredulorum ex Judæis omni data occasione ingeminans, &c. Lamp. ib. l. i. cap. 2. num. xv.

ⁿ It has long been the general opinion of the people of Spain, that this James, the son of Zebedee, planted the gospel in that country. Gaspar Sanctius, a learned Spanish jesuit, wrote a treatise in defence of it, beside what he says in his Commentary upon the Acts of the apostles. But it is inconsistent with the history in the Acts: none of the Apostles left Judea so soon; nor is this opinion founded on the testimony

apostles; and bids fair for obtaining his petition, in a higher sense, than it was at first intended: of *sitting on the right hand or the left hand of Christ in his kingdom.* And the other brother surviving all the other apostles, bore the longest testimony to the truth of the gospel.

This account of that name is agreeable to ⁿ what Grotius says in his Annotations. But Dr. Heumann ^o has another thought. He observes, that Simon, to whom Jesus gave the name of Peter, is often so called: but we do not read that the two sons of Zebedee were any where else spoken of by the name Boanerges, either by themselves or others. He thinks that the words should be thus rendered: 'And he had surnamed them Boanerges:' that is, upon a particular occasion he so called them. That occasion ^a he supposes to be the history related Luke ix. 52—56. That is an ingenious conjecture. But if this name had been given them in the way of reproof and censure, as Christ once called Peter Satan, Matt. xvi. 23. Mark viii. 33. one would scarcely expect to see it here. The place, as seems to me, leads us to think the name honourable, as well as Peter. Which has been the general opinion of all times.

testimony of any ancient writers, of good credit; and it is now generally given up, even by Popish writers. Vid. Baron. A. D. 41. num. i. Tillemont S. Jaques Le Majeur, et note vi. Mem. Ec. tom. I. I transcribe here the Judgment of Estius. Deinde, quando occisus est, vixdum cœperat evangelium gentibus prædicari, ut ex præcedentibus et sequentibus patet. Nec dum Apostoli dispersi erant in remotas gentes: sed ejus rei commodum tempus expectabant. Denique nullus scriptor antiquus certæ fidei refert, Jacobum Hispanias vidisse. Est. in Act. Ap. Cap. xii. ver. 2.—Vid et Basnag. Ann. 44. num. iv. v. et Dictionarie de Moreri. S. Jaques le Majeur.

ⁿ Omnino mihi videtur Christus, in hujus nominis impositione respexisse ad Aggæi vaticinium. cap. ii. 7. . . . Quod de evangelii prædicatione exponit Scriptor ad Hebræos. xii. 26. Ad hanc ergo maximam rerum mutationem significat Chris-

tus, Zebedæi filios eximios sibi ministros fore. Et certe distinctam illis excellentiam quandam inter ipsos Apostolos vel hoc ostendit, quod cum Petro seorsim a cæteris multarum rerum testes sunt assumti. Adde jam quod Jacobus primus Apostolorum omnium sanguine suo Christi doctrinam obsignavit; et quod Johannes omnibus Apostolis superstes diutissime testimonium perhibuit veritati. Grot. ad Marc. iii. 17.

^o Nova Sylloge Differt. part. I. p. 254—259.

^a Legimus, et adversus Petrum indigne se gerentem, in hæc verba erupisse Christum: Apage, Satana. Jam uti Satanus non factum est ordinarium Petri cognomen, sic nec Zebedæi fratres nisi semel nominati sunt Boanerges. Nec proinde laudis hoc nomen est, (quæ quidem inveterata est opinio,) sed nomen vitii. Non est, inquam, appellatio honorifica, sed invectiva. lb. p. 259.

In Suicer's Thesaurus, at the word *Βροντη* may be seen the observations of many ancient writers upon this name. I take Theophylact's only; who says, that ^r when Christ called these two disciples sons of thunder, he intimated that they would be great preachers, and eminent divines.

From the time they were called by Christ, they stately attended upon him. They heard his discourses, and saw his miracles.

They were two of the twelve, whom ^s Christ sent forth upon a commission, to preach in the Land of Israel; which was of great use to them: thereby ^t they learned to trust in God, and were prepared for the greater difficulties of their apostleship afterwards.

John addressed himself to Christ, saying, *Master we saw one casting out dæmons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he felloweth not with us. . . .* So in Luke ix. 49, 50. And more at large in Mark ix. 38—41. But it was a thing, in which several were concerned. For John says: *We saw one casting out dæmons, in thy name; and we forbade him.* The history, as recorded by the evangelists, led me to think so: and Mr. Lampe ^u was of the same mind. Moreover, it might be done some while before.

Our Lord was going from Galilee, to Jerusalem before the feast of tabernacles, as some think, or before the feast of the dedication, as ^x Dr. Doddridge argues. And, as he was to pass through the country of Samaria, he sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. But they did not receive him, because his face was, as though he would go unto Jerusalem. When his disciples, James and John, saw this, they said: *Lord, wilt thou, that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did.* But he turned, and rebuked them, and said: *ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. . . .* And they went to another village, Luke ix. 51—56. Some have been of opinion, that the messengers sent by our Lord, to prepare entertainment for him, were these two disciples. If so, this proposal might be suspected to proceed as much

^r Τῆς δὲ βροντῆς ὀνομαζεῖ τῆς τῆς
Μετὰ τὴν ἐξ ἐμεγαλοκηρυκῆς καὶ θεολο-
γίας. In Marc. tom. I. p. 205. C.

^s See Matt. x. 6. Mark vi. 7.
Luke ix. 1.

^t See Luke xxii. 35.

^u Ubi supr. l. i. cap. 2. num. 18.

^x Family Expositor, vol. II. p. 183.

from resentment of an injurious treatment of themselves, as of their master. But to me that is not certain: I rather think, that those messengers were different persons. So ^y likewise argues Mr. Lampe.

The two brothers, James and John, were ambitious of high posts of honour and dignity in Christ's kingdom: which, with others, they esteemed to be of a worldly nature. The petition was presented by their mother, but at their instigation. And they seem to have been present at the same time: for our Lord's answer is directed to them, Matt. xx. 20—23. Mark x. 35—40.

The two brothers, James and John, and Peter, were the only disciples that were admitted to be present with our Lord at the raising of the daughter of Jairus, Mark v. 37. Luke viii. 51. The same three disciples were taken up by Christ into the mount, when he was transformed in a glorious manner, and Moses and Elias appeared talking with him, Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 28. The same three were admitted to be present at our Lord's devotions in the garden, when he retired from the rest. But they all failed to watch with their Lord, as he had desired, Matt. xxvi. 36—45. Mark xiv. 32—42.

Says St. Mark xiii. 1, 2. *And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings are here. And Jesus answering, said unto him, seest thou these great buildings! There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.* Compare Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. It follows in Mark xiii. 3, 4. *And as he sate on the mount of olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, asked him privately: tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign, when all these things shall be fulfilled?* Whereby we perceive, that to those four disciples, especially, our Lord addressed himself, when he delivered the predictions concerning the great desolation coming upon the Jewish people, recorded in that chapter, and in Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi.

^y Cui tamen in eo non accedimus, quod filios Zebedæi ipsos illos legatos putat fuisse, quos Jesus in vicum Samaritanorum hospitium rogaturos miserat. Unde ob illatam sibi injuriam videntur exacerbati esse, sed textus legatos illos a filiis

Zebedæi satis clare distinguit. Accedit, quod Jesus ad illos *τραπέζης* conversus fuerit. Quod indicat, illos, cum Domino consilium proponerent, non fuisse Domino obvios, sed pone eum sequentes. Lampe Poleg. l. 1. cap. 2. n. xix. not. (b).

This

This apostle and Peter were the two disciples whom Jesus sent to prepare for eating his last passover. Luke xxii. 8. Compare Matt. xxvi. 17—19. Mark xiv. 13—16.

Our Lord sitting at supper with his disciples said, *one of you will betray me.* Peter beckoned to John, who leaned on the bosom of Jesus, *that he would ask, who it should be of whom he spake:* which he did. And our Lord gave him a sign, by which he might know, whom he intended, John xiii. 21—26. This is an instance of the freedom which John might take, as the beloved disciple and friend of Jesus.

When our Lord was apprehended by the Jewish officers, we are informed by St. Mark xiv. 51, 52. *And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body: and the young men laid hold of him. And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them.* Some have thought that this young man was John. Cave ^a gives a good deal of countenance to that supposition. Others ^b have thought him to be James, the Lord's brother. But Grotius, and justly, wonders, that ^c any should have been of opinion that he was one of the apostles.

That Peter followed our Lord at a distance, and was admitted into the hall of the Jewish high priest, we are assured from all the gospels. It has been supposed by many, that John showed the like testimony of affection and respect for his Lord; for he says, ch. xviii. 15. *And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple. That disciple was known to the high priest, and spake to her that kept the door, and brought in Peter.*

Nevertheless it may be questioned, whether John hereby intends himself. Chryostom ^c supposeth him to be meant, and that St. John concealeth his name out of humility and

^a 'Indeed upon our Lord's first apprehension, he fled after the other apostles: it not being without some probabilities of reason, that the ancients conceive him to have been that *young man*, that followed after Christ, *having a linen cloth cast about his naked body:* whom when the officers laid hold upon, he left the linen cloth, and fled naked away.' Cave's Life of St. John, num. ii. p. 151.

^b See Whitby upon Mark xiv. 51.

^b Non de Apostolorum grege. Quod miror, veteribus in mentem venire potuisse. Nec e domo, in quam Christus in urbe diverterat, sed ex villa aliqua horto proxima, strepitu militum excitatus, et subito accurrens, ut conspiceret, quid agerent. Grot. ad Marc. xiv. 51.

^c Τις εστιν ο αλλος μαθητης; 'Ο ταυτα γραψας. κ. λ. Chr. in Joan. hom. 83. al. 82. T. VIII. p. 491.

modesty. To the like purpose also ^d Theophylact. Nor had ^e Jerom any doubt here. But Augustine ^f was cautious in saying who it was; though he thought it might be John.

Let us now observe the sentiments of moderns. Whitby upon the place says: 'He seems not to be John: for he being a Galilean as well as Peter, they might equally have suspected him upon that account.' However, to this it might be answered, that John being known to the high priest, he was safe. But then another difficulty will arise; for it may be said, how came John to be so well known to the high priest and his family, as to be able to direct the servant to admit a stranger, as Peter was, and at that time of night?

Grotius likewise thought that ^g this other disciple could not be John, or any one of the twelve; but rather some believer, an inhabitant of Jerusalem, and, possibly, the person at whose house our Lord had eaten the paschal supper.

Lampe ^h hesitates: and at length allegeth the sentiment of a learned writer, who conjectured that this other disciple

was

^d Τις ην ο αλλος μαθητης; 'Αυτος ουτος ο ταυτα γραφας αποκρυπτει εαυτον δια ταπεινοφροσυνην. κ. λ. Theoph. in Joh. xviii. p. 309.

^e Unde et Jesus Joannem Evangelistam amabat plurimum. Qui propter generis nobilitatem erat notus Pontifici, et Judæorum insidias non timebat: in tantum ut Petrum introduceret in atrium, et staret solus Apostolorum ante crucem, matremque Salvatoris in sua reciperet. Ad Princip. virg. ep. 96. al. 16. T. IV. p. 780.

^f Quisnam iste sit discipulus, non temere affirmandum est, quia taceatur. Solet autem se idem Joannes ita significare, et addere, quem diligebat Jesus. Fortassis ergo hic ipse est. Quisquis tamen sit, sequentia videamus. In Joann. Evang. Tr. 113. T. III. P. 2.

^g Et sane non est probabile, aut ipsum Joannem hic intelligi (cur enim Galileus cum esset, minus interrogaretur ab adstantibus, quam Petrus?) aut aliquem ex Duodecim,

sed alium quendam Hierosolymitanum, non æque manifestum fautorem Jesu: quales multi erant in urbe, ut supra didicimus, xii. 42. Valde mihi se probat conjectura existimantium, hunc esse eum, in cuius domo Christus cœnaverat, ob id quod legitur, Matt. xxvi. 18. Grot. ad Joh. xviii. 15.

^h Scripseram hæc, cum J. Casp. Merhenii Observat. Crit. in Pass. J. C. . consulens, novam ab eo hypothesein proponi deprehenderem, . . . quæ notatu non indigna est. Ipsum siquidem Judam proditorem pro hoc discipulo habet, quem Joannes nominatè post turpissimum proditoris crimen indignum censuit. . . . Id autem quod potissimum in rem spectare videtur, neque a nostra sententia, quam de consilio Judæ in prodendo servatore fovemus, ablu- dit, ita habet: *Judam post commissarum scelus pudore suffusum pedetentim cœ- litem fuisse secutum, atque in Petrum ita incidisse, cui scelus suum excusare, quæ negare potuit, se ea mente Christo cœ-*

lar:

was Judas the traitor. For Judas, he thinks, was soon touched with remorse for what he had done; and he might follow Jesus to the high priest's, hoping, that by some means he might escape out of the hands of those to whom he had betrayed him. Judas being there himself, might be very willing to let in Peter. Whether this conjecture be specious or not, I cannot say: but it does not seem to me very likely, that St. John should characterize Judas by the title of *another disciple*, after he had betrayed his Lord and Master.

After all I am not able to determine this point. At first reading this place of St. John, we are naturally enough led to think, that by *the other disciple* should be meant himself. But upon farther consideration there arise difficulties that may induce us to hesitate.

Whether he followed Jesus to the hall of Caiaphas, or not, we are assured that he attended the crucifixion, and seems to have been the only one of the twelve that did so. John xix. 25—27. *Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother. . . . When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, woman, behold thy son. Then saith he to the disciple, behold thy mother. And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.* There might be several reasons for that determination: as John's being a relation, the sweetness of his temper, and his having somewhat of his own. He had been the beloved disciple or friend of Jesus; and therefore was the most proper to be thus trusted: and doubtless this designation was perfectly agreeable to our Lord's mother.

John saw his Lord expire on the cross; and still farther: *One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that saw it bare witness; and his record is true,* ch. xix. 34, 35. And undoubtedly he also stayed afterwards, and saw the body of Jesus laid in the sepulchre, and the stone placed at the mouth of it; as related

*ut Christum proderet, sed
et per totam manibus et subindicaret.
Vnde de eo vix dubitamus, Ju-
deni penitentiam sceleris jam tum
tunc tunc, atque conscientie sti-
mulo propter agitatum facile po-
tente eo consilio Iesum captum te-*

*qui, ut resciret, annon aliquâ rati-
one, pro solito, Iesus manus capto-
rum evasurus esset. Liberam jam
lecteri optionem relinquimus. Lam-
pe in Evaug. Joann. cap. xviii. tom.
III. p. 523. note (f)*

by himself ch. xix. 38—42. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 53—60. Mark xv. 45.—47. Luke xxiii. 50—56.

Early in the morning, on which our Lord rose from the dead, Mary Magdalene and other women, came to the sepulchre, and saw it was open, the stone having been taken away. Mary Magdalene knowing where she could find the two apostles, Peter and John, went back to the city, and told them that *they had taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre: and, says she, we know not where they have laid him. So they ran both together to the sepulchre.* And by what they saw there, they were led to the persuasion that Jesus was risen from the dead; as related John xx. 1—10.

John was present with the other disciples when Jesus showed himself to them in the evening of the day on which he arose, and likewise eight days after, ch. xx. 19—29.

He has also particularly related the history of our Lord's showing himself to several disciples at the sea of Tiberias; when they had an extraordinary draught of fishes, in number one hundred and fifty three. There were present at that time *Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples,* ch. xxi. 1—23. Beside other things which I omit, our Lord having had discourse with Peter, and having foretold his martyrdom: Peter put to him a question concerning John, saying, *Lord, what shall this man do? Jesus, saith unto him: if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him: he shall not die: but if I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* Thus checking, as I apprehend, Peter's curiosity. However, it has been supposed by judicious commentators, that here is an intimation that John should not die before the destruction of Jerusalem. Nor is there any doubt but he survived that event, which few or none of the other apostles did. Though our Lord's words may be understood to contain only an obscure intimation, that whereas Peter's days would be shortened by martyrdom, this disciple should be preserved till he died in the ordinary course of nature.

ⁱ Ita obscure significat, Johannem, non, ut Petrum morte violenta moriturum, sed tali, quâ, sine hominum vi solveretur, ubi Chris-

tus tempus idoneum judicasset. Quod et contigit, ut Veterum plures consentiunt. Grot. ad Joan. xxi. 22.

From all which we perceive, that * St. John was present at most of the things related by him in his gospel : and that he was an eye and ear-witness of our Lord's labours, journeyings, discourses, miracles, his low abasement even to an ignominious death, and his being alive again, and then ascending to heaven.

Having ¹ been present with the rest of the apostles at the Lord's ascension, he ^m returned with them from mount Olivet to Jerusalem, and continued with them, joining with them in their devotions, and in the choice of another, to supply the place of Judas : and ⁿ partook in the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles and their company on the day of Pentecost next ensuing.

Peter and John, who often accompanied each other, healed the lame man at the temple, and upon that occasion preached to the people who assembled about them. For which they were brought before the Jewish council, and after some debates, were dismissed, with orders not to preach any more in the name of Jesus, Acts iii. and iv. 1—22.

Some while after this, the number of believers still increasing in Jerusalem, John and the rest of the apostles were apprehended, and put in the common prison. But they were the same night delivered by an angel, who commanded them to *go and speak in the temple to the people*; which they did *early in the morning*: whereupon they were again taken up and brought before the council, who consulted

* Ex ipsa historia evangelica Joannis probabile fit, omnibus eventibus, itineribus, miraculis, conciliis servatoris nostri ipsum interfuisse . . . cum probabile fit, illum fuisse inter discipulos duos Joannis Baptistæ, a quibus collectionis discipulorum initium Jesus fecit, uti L. i. cap. 2. §. ii. ostendimus, inde colligimus, Evangelistam nostrum scilicet ab initio rebus, quæ scribit, inter fuisse et hanc esse veram rationem, cur non altius filium historie sue inciperet. Hæc omnibus quoties sequentibus narrationibus nulla est, in qua absentem Evangelistam statim statuoamus fuisse, nisi forte excipere velis illa, quæ in palatio Annae et Caiaphæ acciderunt. Cap. viii. 13—17. De quibus tamen res dubia, quia definiti accurate ne-

quit, annon discipulus, qui Petrum in Palatium Caiaphæ introduxerit, ipse Evangelista nosse fuerit. Sed licet ille præsens non perceperit, a Petro tamen, socio intimo, statim proculdubio audivit. Et forte per ejus relationem excitatus est, ut ad Prætorium Pilati summo mane advolaret, atque ita cum reliquis mulieribus Jesum ad crucem sequeretur. . . . Hæc quo patet, quantâ cum emphasi præ cæteris apostolis et evangelistis dicere potuit: Quæ audivimus, quæ vidimus. 1 Jo. i. 1, 2. Lamp. Proleg. l. 2. cap. 4. num. vi.

¹ Mark xvi. 19 Luke xxiv. 50—53. Acts i. 1—12.

^m Acts i. 12—26.

ⁿ Acts ii. 1—13.

how they might put them to death. But by the advice of Gamaliel that design was laid aside. *And when they had beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go. Whereupon the apostles departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing. . . . And daily in the temple, and from house to house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.*

Afterward, there being a violent persecution at Jerusalem, many were scattered abroad. Philip, one of the seven, went down to Samaria, and preached to them, and wrought many miracles, insomuch that great numbers believed. When the apostles, who were at Jerusalem, heard of this, they sent unto them Peter and John, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Having performed that service, they returned to Jerusalem: and in their way preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans, Acts viii. 5—25.

From what St. Paul says in the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians we perceive, that John was present at the council of Jerusalem: of which an account is given Acts xv. Which council was held in the year 49, or 50, or thereabout. And it may be reckoned probable, that till that time John had staid in the land of Israel, and had not been abroad in any gentile countries.

I would add, that though no miracles are related to be done by St. John beside those which have been here taken notice of; I reckon it very probable, that many miracles, beside those particularly mentioned by the historian, were wrought by him and other apostles during their stay in Judæa. This may be inferred from general expressions of St. Luke in several places. *And many signs and wonders were done by the apostles, Acts ii. 43. And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, ch. iv. 33. And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people, ch. v. 12. Comp. iv. 29, 30.*

From the book of the Revelation, ch. i. 9. we learn, that St. John was for a while in the island called Patmos, where he was favoured with visions and revelations.

Thus far we have endeavoured to collect the history of this apostle from the New Testament.

II. From ecclesiastical history we learn, that St. John lived to a great age, and that in the latter part of his life he resided

resided in Asia, particularly at Ephesus, the chief city of that country.

Concerning his abode in Asia we have divers testimonies of good credit. Irenæus in ° two places of his work against heresies, both ° cited by Eusebius, says, that John the apostle lived in Asia till the time of Trajan, [who succeeded Nerva in the year of Christ 98.] Eusebius ° understands Clement of Alexandria to speak to the like purpose. Origen also says, that ° John having lived long in Asia, died at Ephesus. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, about 196, is an unexceptionable witness, that ° John was buried in that city. Jerom ° in his book of Illustrious Men, and in ° his books against Jovinian, says, ° that the apostle John lived in Asia, ° to the time of Trajan; and dying at a great age, in the ° sixty-eighth year after our Lord's passion, was buried near ° the city of Ephesus.' Supposing our Lord to have been crucified in the year 32, of the vulgar æra, which ° seems to have been Jerom's opinion, sixty-eight years will reach to the year 100, or the third of Trajan: at which year of that emperor the death of St. John is placed by Jerom in his ° Chronicle.

What was John's age, when called by Christ, we are not informed. Baronius ° thought he might then be about 22 years of age. Having been with Christ three years, he was about 25 years of age when our Lord was crucified. Tillemont ° supposes St. John to have been about 25 or 26 years of age when called to be an apostle. Lampe ° thinks, that he was about the same age with our Saviour. For my part, I cannot persuade myself, that any of Christ's apostles, when called to attend upon him, that they might be his witnesses to the world, were much under the age of thirty. If it hence follows, that John was a hundred years of age, or thereabout when he died, it is not at all incredible, nor unlikely.

° Iren. adv. Hær. l. 2. cap. 22.

* p. 165. ex ed. Scalig.

° v. p. 148. ed Mass. et l. 3. cap.

° Ann. 101. num. ix.

° p. 1-8.

° S. Jean. l' Evangeliste. art. x. et note xv. Mem. tom. I.

° Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in.

° Quare nihil impedit, quo minus ejusdem ferme ætatis cum servatore nostro fuerit. Prolegom. in Jo. l. i. cap. 2. num. i. note (a)

° Vid. Euseb. Ibid.

° Ap. Euseb. l. 3. cap. 1.

° Ap. Euseb. l. v. cap. 24. in.

° Vol. V. p. 41, 42.

° Vid. Basnag. Ann. 101. num. ii.

III. As it is an allowed point, that John dwelt in Asia in the latter part of his life; we may be reasonably desirous to know, when he settled in that country: and for determining this, the books of the New Testament may afford good hints. For ^b in all St. Luke's history of the preaching and travels of Paul, particularly in Asia, no mention is made of John: which may induce us to think, that he was not there at that time. Nor are there any salutations sent to John in any of St. Paul's epistles written at Rome: several of which were sent to Ephesus, or other places, not very remote from it: as the epistle to the Ephesians, the second epistle to Timothy, probably, at Ephesus, the epistle to the Colossians, and the epistle to Philemon, at Colosse.

I will now observe the opinions of some learned moderns. Baronius thought, that ^c this apostle did not come to reside in Asia, until after the death of St. Peter, and St. Paul. Du Pin says: 'we ^d do not exactly know, when he came into Asia: perhaps it was about the year 70.' Tillemont was of opinion, that ^e St. John did not come to reside in Asia, till about the year 66. But he supposeth, that upon some occasion, he had before that been in that country, without making a stay there: which last, as I apprehend, is said without any good authority. Mr. Lampe was of opinion, that ^f John did not leave Judea, till after the death of James, called the Less, and but a short time only before the destruction of Jerusalem.

To me it seems not unlikely, that St. John came into Asia about the time that the war broke out in Judea, in the year 66, or a short time before, when, probably, St. Peter and Paul had been before crowned with martyrdom.

As St. John stayed a good while in Palestine, it may be reasonably concluded, that the virgin Mary did not go with

^b 'In the division of provinces, which the apostles made among themselves, Asia fell to his share, though he did not presently enter into his charge. Otherwise, we must have heard of him in the account, which St. Luke gives of St. Paul's several journies into, and residence in those parts.' Cave's Life of St. John, § iv.

^c A. d. 97. num. ii.

^d Du Pin Diff. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § vi.

^e St. Jean art. iv.

^f Post ejus (Jacobi Minoris) excessum neminem ex τῶν δωδεκα grege et constantius et diutius Hierosolymis subtitisse nostro Apostolo: ita ut vix exiguo ante exordium intervallo, inde se avelli pateretur. Proleg. l. i. cap. 2. n. xv. p. 29.

him to Ephesus, as ^s Baronius and some others have thought, but died before he went thither: which was the opinion of ^b Cave, and ¹ Basnage.

IV. St. John having had a long life, many things have been said of him, some true, others false. Most of them have been already taken notice of in several chapters of this work: it may not be improper to recollect them here, with some remarks.

1. Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists, and flourished about the year 211, says, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, 'That ^k by the divine power John raised up a dead man to life at Ephesus.' Which miracle is also taken notice of by ¹ Sozomen, and ^m Nicephorus, and may have been really done. But if we had had a more circumstantial history of it, and if it had been mentioned by some other early writers, beside Apollonius, it would have been more credible.

2. There was a book forged with the title of the Travels of Paul and Thecla by a presbyter, who was deposed for so doing, as related by Tertullian. Jerom says that he was a presbyter in Asia, and that he was convicted before St. John of being the author of it, and for that reason was deposed. Of this matter we have already spoken distinctly, and therefore refer to what was then said.ⁿ

3. It is also related of our apostle, that going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving that Cerinthus, or, as others say, Ebion was already in the bath, he came out again hastily, and would not make use of the bath. The probability of which account was examined formerly.^o

4. It is said, that by order of the emperor Domitian, St. John was cast into a caldron of boiling oil at Rome, and came out again, without being hurt. The ^p truth of which story likewise has been considered by us.

5. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus in the latter part of the second century, says, that John was Christ's high priest,

^s A. d. 44. n. xxix.

^t Probable therefore it is, that he dwelt in his own house at Jerusalem, at least till the death of the blessed Virgin.' Cave's Life of St. John, § iv.

¹ Vid. Basnag. An. 46. num. lxxviii.

^k See vol. II. p. 371.

¹ Soz. l. 7. cap. 27. p. 750.

^m Niceph. l. 4. cap. 25.

ⁿ See vol. II. p. 285, 286, 311, 312.

^o See vol. II. p. 86, 87. note (b) and vol. V. p. 44.

^p See vol. II. p. 268, 269. note (e) and vol. V. p. 44.

wearing on his forehead a golden plate: which account⁹ has been considered, and the judgments of divers learned men upon it alleged.

6. Eusebius has a story, from a work of Clement of Alexandria, of a young man in a city of Asia, not far from Ephesus, who after having been instructed in the christian religion took to evil courses, and became profligate: but nevertheless was afterwards brought to repentance by our apostle. This account is inserted at large by Eusebius^r in his Ecclesiastical History. It has been repeated in like manner by Simeon Metaphrastes in his life of St. John. Chrysoptom^s has referred to it. It is also briefly told in the^t Paschal Chronicle. I have already taken some notice of this^u story. S. Basnage^x thinks it to be a fable, or feigned apologue, composed to convey useful instruction. Mr. Lampe^y is favourable to this history. And, perhaps, it may be true, abating some circumstances; which are not seldom added to such accounts, to render them the more entertaining.

7. Jerom has given an account of St. John's method of preaching, when he was of a great age, and was not able to make a long discourse. This^z was taken notice of by us in a proper place: nor is the truth of it, though related by Jerom only, disputed, either by^a Lampe, or^b Le Clerc.

8. It is generally supposed, that^c John is one of those apostles, who lived a single life: it is said by^d Tertullian,

⁹ See vol. V. p. 43, 44.

^r L. 3. cap. 23.

^s Ad Theodor. Laps. T. I. p. 31. ed. Bened.

^t Chr. Pasch. p. 251. D.

^u See vol. V. p. 44.

^x Apologo quam historię videtur esse propior. . . . Ac sane nescimus, si vera historia est, cur Clemens *μυθε*, fabulę, nomen ipsi primum imposuerit. Fabula fuit ratione rei significantis, veritasque respectu rei significatę, quę mentibus proponeretur, nempe eximii pastoris officium, ac vis pœnitentię. Non insolens erat antiquis, uti apologis ejusmodi ad informandos mores. . . . Si cui tamen placet de Joanne Clementis narrationem veram histori-

am esse, quia sic Veteribus visum, de hac re quidem contendere nolumus. Basn. ann. 97. num. x.

^y Prolegom. l. i. cap. v. num. iii—ix.

^z Vol. V. p. 42.

^a Licet enim Hieronymus solus hujus narrationis auctor sit, nihil tamen occurrit, quod non cum more Joannis, ut cum ratione Ecclesię ejus temporis apprime convenit. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. v. n. xi.

^b H. E. ann. 99. num. i.

^c Vid. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. i. num. xiii.

^d Joannes Christi spado. De Monog. cap. 17. p. 688.

and Jerom; which last affirms, that ecclesiastical history assures us of it; and he makes it the ground of all the peculiar privileges of this apostle.

9. Another thing, said of John, is, that he was banished into Patmos, an island of the Mediterranean sea, not far from the coast of Asia. And, if he is the writer of the book of the Revelation, which we do not now dispute, the thing is unquestioned. But I have deferred the consideration of this particular, till now, because learned moderns are not agreed about the time of it.

V. I shall therefore first put down the accounts of ancient authors, and then observe the opinions of learned men of later times.

Irenæus says of the Revelation, 'that it was seen no long time ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian.' And though Irenæus does not say, that St. John was then in Patmos, yet since he supposeth him to be the person, who had the revelation, he must have believed him to be then in Patmos, as the book itself says, ch. i. 9.

Clement, of Alexandria, in his book, entitled, Who is the rich man that may be saved, as cited by Eusebius, speaks of 'John's returning from Patmos to Ephesus, after the death of the tyrant:' by whom, it is probable, he means Domitian.

Tertullian, in his apology, speaks of Domitian, as having banished some Christians, and afterwards giving them leave to return home: probably intending St. John, and

Talem fuisse eunuchum, quem Jesus amavit plurimum, Evangelicam Joannem, ecclesiasticæ tradit laboris: qui recubuit super pedes Jesu: qui, Petro tardius ambulante, elatus virginitatis alis excurrit ad Dominum: qui in secula divine se nativitatibus immergit. Causus est dicere: in principio erat Verbum, &c. In II. cap. LVI. tom. III. p. 410.

Joannes vero noster, quasi aquila, a septima volat, et ad ipsum Patmos pervenit, dicens: in principio erat Verbum, &c. Exposuit Virginitatem, quod nuptiæ scire non poterat. Et ut brevi sermone multum comprehendam, doceamque, cu-

jus privilegii sit Joannes, imo in Joanne virginitas: a Domino virgine, mater virgo virgini discipulo commendatur. Adv. Jovin. l. i. T. IV. P. II. p. 169. Vid. et ad Princip. virg. ep. 96. al. 16. ib. p. 780. f.

^f See vol. II. p. 169.

^g Επειδή γὰρ τὸ τυραννικὸν τελευτήσας, ἀπὸ τῆς πατρίδος τῆς Ἰησοῦ μετήλθεν εἰς τὴν ἐφεσον. κ. λ. Ap. Euseb. H. E. i. 3. c. 23. p. 92.

^h Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate. Sed quæ et homo facile ceptum repressit, restituitis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. 5.

some others. In another work he says, 'that ⁱ John having been sent for to Rome, was cast into a vessel of boiling oil, and then banished into an island:' in the time of Domitian, as is most probable.

Origen, explaining Matt. xx. 23. says: 'James ^k the brother of John, was killed with a sword by Herod. And a Roman emperor, as tradition teaches, banished John into the island Patmos for the testimony, which he bore to the word of truth. And John himself bears witness to his banishment, omitting the name of the emperor, by whom he was banished, saying in the Revelation: *I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle of Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.* And it seems, that the Revelation was seen in that island.'

Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw about 290, again and again says, that ^m John was banished by Domitian, and in his reign saw the Revelation.

Eusebius, giving an account of Domitian's persecution, says: 'In ⁿ this persecution, as it is said, John, the apostle and evangelist, being still living, was banished into the island Patmos for the testimony of the word of God.'

Epiphanius, as formerly ^p shown, says: 'John prophesied in the isle of Patmos, in the reign of Claudius.' And in another place, then only referred to, he says: 'John wrote his gospel in his old age, when he was more than ninety years old, after his return from Patmos, which ^q was in the time of Claudius Cæsar.'

Jerom, in his book of illustrious men, as ^r formerly cited, says: 'Domitian in the fourteenth year of his reign raising the second persecution after Nero, John was banished into the island Patmos, where he wrote the Revelation.' And in another work, also cited ^s formerly, he says again: 'John was a prophet, as he saw the Revelation in the island Pat-

ⁱ . . . habes Romam, . . . ubi Apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. De Pr. Hier. cap. 36. p. 245.

^k Comm. in Matt. T. I. p. 417. Huet.

^l Και εοικε την αποκαλυψιν εν τη νησω τεθεωρηκεναι. Ibid. C.

^m See vol. III. p. 301.

ⁿ H. E. l. 3. cap. 18.

^p Vol. IV. p. 316.

^q . . . την επι κλαυδιε γενομενην καισαρος. Hier. 51. num. xii.

^r See vol. V. p. 41.

^s p. 42.

‘mos, where he was banished by Domitian.’ And I shall now transcribe below ‘ in his own words, without translating them, his comment upon Matt. xx. 23. where he speaks of St. John’s having been banished into Patmos: but does not name the emperor, by whom he was banished.

Sulpicius Severus says, ‘ that “ John, the apostle and evangelist, was banished by Domitian into the island Patmos: where he had visions, and where he wrote the book of the Revelation.’

Arethas in his commentary upon the Revelation, supposed to be written in the sixth century, says, upon the authority of Eusebius, that * John was banished into Patmos by Domitian.

Isidore, of Seville, near the end of the sixth century, says, ‘ Domitian ’ railed a persecution against the Christians. In ‘ his time the apostle John having been banished into the ‘ island Patmos saw the Revelation.’

We may now make a remark or two.

1. All these testimonies are of use, whether they name the island where John was banished, or the emperor by whom he was banished, or not. They all agree that St. John was sent thither by way of punishment, or restraint, for bearing witness to the truth: which confutes the opinion of Lightfoot, ‘ that ² John travelling in the ministry of the ‘ gospel, up and down, from Asia westward, comes into ‘ the isle Patmos, in the Icarian sea, an island about thirty ‘ miles compass: and there on the Lord’s day he has these ‘ visions, and an angel interprets to him all he saw.’

2. All these writers, who mention the time of the Revelation, and of the banishment, say, it was in the time of Domitian, and that he was the emperor, by whom St. John

Quæritur, quomodo calicem martyrii filii Zebedæi, Jacobus videlicet et Joannes, biberint: quom scriptura narret Jacobum tantum apostolum ab Herode capite truncatum: Joannes autem propria morte vitam finierit. Sed si legamus ecclesiasticas historias, in quibus ferunt, quod et ipse propter martirium in missis in ferventis olei cum, et inde ad suscipiendam coronam Christi athleta processerit, et tunc relegatus in Patmon intum sit, videbimus, martyrio ani-

mum non defuisse, et bibisse Joannem calicem confessionis. Comm. in Matt. tom. IV. P. I. p. 92.

^u See vol. V. p. 164.

* Ἐξοριστὸν δὲ αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἐν πατμῶ τῆ νήσῳ ὑπὸ δομετιανῆ, εὐσεβίου ὁ παμφίλῳ ἐν τῷ χρονικῷ αὐτῆ βιβλίῳ παρατίθεται. Andr. in Apoc. ap. Œcum. tom. II. p. 654. D.

^y Vol. V. p. 309.

^z Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 341.

was

was banished: except Epiphanius, who says it was in the time of Claudius. As he is singular, it should seem that he cannot be of any great weight against so many others.

Nevertheless, as some learned men, particularly Grotius, have paid great regard to Epiphanius in this point, it is fit we should consider what they say.

Says Grotius in a tract, entitled, *A Comment upon divers Texts of the New Testament, relating to Antichrist: particularly upon the tenth verse of the seventeenth chapter of the Revelation: 'John' began to be illuminated with 'divine visions in the island Patmos, in the time of Claudius; which was the opinion of the most ancient Christians. See Epiphanius in the heresy of the Alogians. 'Claudius, as we learn from Acts xviii. 2. commanded all 'Jews to depart from Rome. Under the name of Jews, 'Christians also were comprehended, as has been observed 'by many learned men. And it cannot be doubted, but 'many governors of the Roman provinces followed that example. So therefore John was driven from Ephesus.'*

That argument was long ago examined by ^b David Blondel, who says, 1. It is not true, that the most ancient writers said that St. John was sent into Patmos by Claudius. It is Epiphanius only who says so: he is altogether singular. There are no ancients, either before or after him, who have said this. 2. As Epiphanius is singular, he ought not to be regarded. 3. There was no persecution of the Christians in the reign of Claudius. There is no proof from any ancient monuments, that Christians, as such, suffered banishment under that emperor. It is allowed that ^c Nero

^a Cœpit autem Joannes in Patmo esse, et Dei visis illuminari Claudii temporibus, quæ vetustissimorum Christianorum est sententia, non Domitiani, ut volunt alii. Vide Epiphanium in Hæresi Alogorum. Claudius Judæos, sub quorum nomine tunc et Christiani censebantur, ut multis viris doctis observatum est, Roma pepulerat, Act. xviii. 2. Quod exemplum non dubium est, quin imitati sint multi Præsides Romanarum provinciarum. Ita Epheso expulsus Joannes. Grot. Commentatio ad loca quædam N. T. quæ de Antichristo agunt, aut agere putantur. Opp. tom. III.

^b Des Sibylles l. 2. ch. iii. p. 145—148. à Charenten. 1649.

^c Consulite commentarios vestros. Illic reperietis, primum Neronem in hanc sectam, cum maxime Romæ orientem, Cæsariano gladio ferocisse. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis nostræ etiam gloriamur. Tertull. Ap. cap. vi.

Nerone imperante. . . . Qui dignus exstitit, qui persecutionem in Christianos primus inciperet. Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sacr. l. 2. cap. 39.

Nam primus Romæ Christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit. P. Oros. l. 7. cap. 7. Vid. et Euseb. H. C. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 67.

was the first Roman emperor who persecuted the Christians. 4. The edict of Claudius only banished the Jews from Rome. It did not affect the Jews in the provinces, as appears from the New Testament itself, particularly Act xviii. and xix. It is manifest from the history in the Acts, that in the reign of Claudius, in other parts of the empire out of Rome, the Jews enjoyed as full liberty as they did before. Paul and Silas, Aquila and Priscilla, dwelt quietly at Corinth; where the men of their nation had their synagogue, and assembled in it according to custom without molestation. 5. Nor could the governors of provinces banish either Jews or Christians out of their governments, without order from the emperor: and that they had no such order, is apparent. Neither Jews nor Christians were molested by them at Ephesus, as may be perceived from the history in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. That they were not molested by them at Corinth, appears from the preceding chapter. 6. St. John could not be banished from Ephesus by Claudius, or the governors under him: for he was not in that city during the reign of that emperor, nor in the former part of the reign of Nero, as has been shown. He did not come thither till near the end of the reign of the last mentioned emperor: therefore he could not be sooner banished from Ephesus.

These observations, if I am not mistaken, are sufficient to confute the opinion of Grotius.

Sir Isaac Newton was of opinion, that ^b St. John was banished into Patmos, and that the Revelation was seen in the reign of Nero, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

¹ Sir Isaac Newton's opinion is much the same with that of John Hentenius of Mechlin, confuted by David Blondel in the same work, and in the next chapter to that, in which he confuted Grotius. Hentenius and Newton argue much alike. It may be suspected, that Newton incautiously borrowed some of his weak arguments. Says Blondel: 'Jean Hentenius en sa preface sur le Commentaire d'Arethas . . . a le discours, qui suit: *Il me semble, qu' Jean . . . a esté relegué par Neron a Patmos au mesme temps que celui là qui étoit dans Rome. . . . Pierre et Paul.*

Tertullicien, voisin des temps des mesmes Apostres, assure cela mesme en deux lieux. Eusebe aussi traite la mesme chose au livre de la Demonstration Evangelique, combien qu'en ses Chroniques, et en l' Histoire Ecclesiastique il dit que cela est arrivé sous Domitien: ce que aussi Saint Hierome et plusieurs autres suivent. Mais à ces livres cy, comme escrits és années precedentes, si grande autorité n' est pas attribuée, qu' à celui de la Demonstration Evangelique, veu qu'il a esté depuis, et plus correctement élaboré. Blondel des Sibylles. l. 2. ch. iv. p. 148, 149.

‘Eusebius,’ says he, ‘in his Chronicle, and Ecclesiastical History follows Irenæus: (who said the Apocalypse was written in the time of Domitian :) but afterwards in his Evangelical Demonstration he conjoins the banishment of John into Patmos, with the deaths of Peter and Paul.’

To which I answer, first, that the Ecclesiastical History was not written before the Evangelical Demonstration, but after it: for the Demonstration is referred to at the end of the second chapter of the first book of the Ecclesiastical History. Secondly, Eusebius in his Demonstration is not different from himself in his Ecclesiastical History. In his Demonstration, having spoken of the imprisonment of all the apostles at Jerusalem, and of their being beaten, and of the stoning of Stephen, the beheading of James the son of Zebedee, and the imprisonment of Peter, he adds: ‘James the Lord’s brother, was stoned, Peter was crucified at Rome with his head downward, and Paul was beheaded, and John banished into an island.’ But he does not say, that all these things happened in the time of one and the same emperor. It is plain, that it is not his design to mention exactly the time of the sufferings of all these persons. Nothing hinders our supposing, that the apostles Peter and Paul were put to death by order of Nero, and John banished by Domitian, many years afterwards, agreeably to what himself writes in his Chronicle and History.

It follows in Sir Isaac Newton. ‘And so do Tertullian, and Pseudo-Prochorus, as well as the first author, whoever he was, of that very ancient fable, that St. John was put by Nero into a vessel of hot oil.’

I place below ^h the words of Tertullian, to which Sir Isaac refers. And I answer: it is true, that Tertullian speaks of the death of Peter and Paul, and of John’s being cast into boiling oil, and then banished, all together: but he does not say, that all happened in the same reign. St. John’s

^d Newton’s Observations upon the Apocalypse of St. John, chap. i. p. 236.

^e See in this work, vol. IV. p. 206. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. p. 8, 9. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 5. cap. iv. tom. VI. p. 57—59.

^f . . . και πετρος δε επι ρωμης κατα κεφαλης σαυραται παυλος τε αποτεμνεται, ιωαννης τε νησω παραδιδεται. Dem. Ev. l. 3. p. 116.

^g As before, p. 236.

^h *Ista quam felix ecclesia, ubi Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquatur: ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur: ubi Apostolus Joannes, postquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur.* De Præscr. cap. 36. p. 245.

banishment is the last thing mentioned by him: and, probably, it happened not, till after the death of Peter and Paul. It is likely, that Tertullian supposed it to have been done by the order of Domitian; for in another place he speaks of the persecution of that emperor, as consisting chiefly in banishments.

‘... and Pseudo-Prochorus.’ What place of Prochorus, who pretended to be one of the seven deacons, and is called by Baronius * himself a great liar, Sir Isaac Newton refers to, I do not know. But in his history of St. John he is entirely against him. For he particularly relates the sufferings, which St. John underwent in the second persecution of the Christians, which was raised by Domitian. That emperor sent orders to the proconsul at Ephesus, to apprehend the apostle. When the proconsul had got St. John in his power, he informed Domitian of it; who then commanded the proconsul to bring him to Rome. When ^m he was come, the emperor would not see him, but ordered him to be cast into a vessel of scalding oil, and he came out unhurt. Then Domitian commanded the proconsul to have St. John back again to Ephesus. Some time ⁿ after that, by order of the same Domitian, John, and others at Ephesus, were banished into Patmos. Domitian ^o being dead, they returned to Ephesus with the leave of his successor, who did not persecute the Christians. So Pseudo-Prochorus.

Since the great Newton has been pleased to refer to such a writer, I shall take notice of another of the like sort; I mean Abdias, who assumed the character of the first bishop of Babylon. What he says, is to this purpose: that ^p John, who survived

ⁱ Tentaverat et Domitianus . . . sed quâ et homo, facile coeptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. 5.

^k — in multis mendacissimus hic auctor fuisse convincitur. An. 92. num. i.

^l Secundam vero persecutionem Domitianus excitârat, cujus temporibus Joannes Ephesi morabatur. Imperator autem Domitianus epistolam misit Ephesum ad Proconsulem civitatis. . . Proch. de Vit. Joan. cap. 8. Ap. Bib. Patr. Ludg. T. II.

^m Audiens autem Domitianus de

adventu ejus, noluit impius Cæsar videre faciem Apostoli. Et jussit, ut Proconsul duceret ad Portam Latinam, et in ferventis olei dolium illum vivum dimitti, &c. Ibid. cap. 10.

ⁿ Ibid. cap. 14.

^o Mortuo autem Domitiano, qui nos transmiserat, in exilium, successor ejus non prohibebat Christianos. Et cum audisset de bonitate et sanctimonia Joannis, quodque fuisset injuste a prædecessore suo exilio relegatus, per literas nos revocavit ab exilio. Ib. cap. 45.

^p Est igitur et hoc ipsum amoris Salvatoris

survived the other apostles, lived to the time of Domitian, preaching the word to the people in Asia. When Domitian's edict for persecuting the Christians was brought to Ephesus, and John refused to deny Christ, or to give over preaching, the proconsul ordered that he should be drowned in a vessel of boiling oil: but John presently leaped out unhurt. The proconsul would then have set him at liberty, if he had not feared to transgress the emperor's edict. He therefore banished John into Patmos, where he saw and wrote the Revelation. After the death of Domitian, his edicts having been abrogated by the senate, they who had been banished, returned to their homes: and John came to Ephesus, where he had a dwelling, and many friends.

Then follows an account of St. John's visiting the churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. Where is inserted also the story, formerly taken notice of, concerning the young man, as related by Eusebius from Clement of Alexandria: and as happening, not after the death of Nero, but of Domitian.

Newton proceeds: 'as well as the first author, whoever he was, of that very ancient fable, that John was put by Nero into a vessel of hot oil, and coming out unhurt, was banished by him into Patmos. Though this story be no more than a fiction, yet it was founded on a tradition of the first churches, that John was banished into Patmos in the days of Nero.'

Who was the first author of that fable, I do not know. But it does not appear, that Tertullian, the first writer who has mentioned it, thought it to be in the time of Nero. He might mean, and probably did mean, Domitian, the same who banished John into an island: as did also the two writers just taken notice of, Prochorus and Abdias, to whom we were

led

Salvatoris in beatum Joannem indicium non vulgare, quod vitâ reliquos omnes superaverit, et, ut dictum est, ad Domitiani Imperatoris ætatem usque in Asia verbum salutis populis adnunciarit. . . . Cui Proconsul loci cum edictum Imperatoris, ut Christum negaret, et a prædicatione cessaret, legisset, Apostolus intrepide respondit. . . . Ad cujus responsionem motus Proconsul jussit eum velut rebellem in dolio ferventis olei demergi. Qui statim ut

conjectus in æneo est, veluti athleta unctus, non adustus, de vase exiit. Ad quod miraculum Proconsul stupefactus, voluit eum libertati sue reddere. Et fecisset, nisi timuisset edictum Cæsaris. Mitio rem igitur pœnam cogitans, in exilium eum relegavit, in insulam, quæ dicitur Patmos. In qua et Apocalypsin, quæ ex nomine ejus legitur, et vidit, et scripsit. Post mortem autem Domitiani, quia omnia ejus decreta Senatus infringi jussit, inter cæte-

ros,

led by Sir Isaac. Jerom, who^s in his books against Jovinian, mentions this story, as from Tertullian, according to some copies, says, it was done at Rome, according to others, in the time of Nero. However in the same place, as well as elsewhere, Jerom expressly says, that John was banished into Patmos by Domitian. And^r in the other place, where he mentions the casting St. John into boiling oil, he says: 'and presently afterwards he was banished into the island Patmos.' Therefore that other trial, which St. John met with, was in the same reign, that is, Domitian's. And indeed Jerom always supposes St. John's banishment to have been in that reign: as he particularly relates in the ninth chapter of his book of illustrious men. Let me add, that if the story of St. John's being put into a vessel of scalding oil be a fable, and a fiction, it must be hazardous to build an argument upon it.

It follows in Newton: 'Epiphanius represents the gospel of John as written in the time of Domitian, and the Apocalypse even before that of Nero.' I have already said enough of Epiphanius in considering the opinion of Grotius. However, as one would think, Sir Isaac Newton had little reason to mention Epiphanius, when he does not follow him. He says, that St. John was banished into Patmos in the time of Claudius: Sir Isaac, not till near the end of the reign of Nero.

'Arethas,' says^s Sir Isaac, 'in the beginning of his commentary quotes the opinion of Irenæus from Eusebius, but does not follow it. For he afterwards affirms, that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and that former commentators had expounded the sixth seal of that destruction.'

To which I answer. Arethas does indeed say, that some interpreters had explained things under the sixth seal, as relating

is, qui ab eo relegati fuerant, et ad propria remeabant, etiam sanctus Johannes prophetum rediit, ubi et exilium, et multos amicos habebat. Abd. Hist. Apostol. cap. v. p. 148. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 556.

enim in Patmos insula, relegatus a Domitiano principe fuit, Apocalypsin. . . Refert Tertullianus, quod Romæ, [sub Nerone] missus in ferventis

olei dolium purior et vegetior exierit, quam intravit. Adv. Jovin. l. i. tom. 4. p. 169. Sed si legamus ecclesiasticas historias, in quibus fertur, quod et ipse propter martyrium sit missus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad suscipiendam coronam Christi athleta processerit, statimque relegatus in Patmos insulam sit, &c. Comm. in Matt. xx. 23. tom. 4. P. i. p. 92. As before, p. 236. ¹ Τὸς δὲ ταῦτα

lating to the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian: but they were some only, not the most. Yea, he presently afterwards says, that the most interpreted it otherwise. Nor does he say, that any of those commentators were of opinion, that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Arethas seems to have been of opinion, that things, which had come to pass long before, might be represented in the Revelation. Therefore immediately before that passage, explaining Rev. vi. 12, 13. he says: ‘What^u is the opening of the sixth seal? It is the cross and death of the Lord, followed by his resurrection, desirable to all faithful and understanding men. *And lo, there was a great earthquake.* Manifestly denoting, says he, the signs that happened during the crucifixion, the shaking of the earth, the darkness of the sun, the turning the moon into blood. For when it was full moon, being the fourteenth day, how was it possible, that the sun should be eclipsed by its interposition?’

However, I must not conceal what he says afterwards, in another chapter of his * Commentary. He is explaining Rev. vii. 4—8. ‘These, says he, who instructs the evangelist, will not partake in the calamities inflicted by the Romans. For the destruction caused by the Romans had not fallen upon the Jews, when the evangelist received these instructions. Nor was he at Jerusalem, but in Ionia, where is Ephesus: for he stayed at Jerusalem no more than fourteen years.— And after the death of our Lord’s mother, he left Judea, and went to Ephesus, as y tradition says: where also, as is said, he had the revelation of future things.’ But how can we rely upon a writer of the sixth century for these particulars; that John did not stay at Jerusalem more than fourteen years: that he left Judea upon the death of our Lord’s mother, and then went to Ephesus: when we can evidently perceive from the history in the Acts, that in the fourteenth year after our Lord’s ascension, there were no christian converts at Ephesus: and that the church at Ephesus was not founded by St. Paul, till several years afterwards? What avails it, to refer to such passages as these? Which when looked into, and examined,

εις την υπο βεσπασιανη γινομενην πολιορκιαν εξελαβον παντα τα ειρημενα τροπολογησαντες. ‘Οι δε πλειστοι των ερμηνευτων. κ. λ. Areth. cap. 18. p. 709. A. ^u Τις δε η λυσις της εκτης σφραγιδος; ‘Ο σαυρος τε κυρις και θανα-

τος, οισηκολεθησεν η ευκταια πασι πιστευσι και αισθητοις ανασασις. κ. λ. Cap. 18. p. 708. C. D. * Cap. xix. p. 713, 714. γ . . . αλλα προς εφεσον μετασθηναι αυτον λογος. καθ’ ην, εειρηται. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 714. in.

contain

contain no certain assurances of any thing. And Sir Isaac Newton himself says: 'It ² seems to me, that Peter and John stayed with their churches in Judea and Syria: till the Romans made war upon their nation, that is, till the twelfth year of Nero.' or A. D. 66.

We proceed with this great man's arguments, who adds: 'With ^a the opinion of the first commentators agrees the tradition of the churches of Syria, preserved to this day in the title of the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, which title is this: *The revelation, which was made to John the evangelist by God in the island Patmos, into which he was banished by Nero Caesar.*' But how comes it to pass, that the tradition of the churches of Syria is alleged here, when the apocalypse was not generally received by them? Moreover in the titles of the books of the New Testament received by them, there are manifest errors. Nor ^b can we say, when the Syriac version of the apocalypse was made: nor ^c is it impossible, that the authors of that title might mean Domitian by Nero. It is not a greater error, than that of supposing the epistle of James to have been written by James the son of Zebedee.

Again, says the celebrated Newton: 'The ^d same is confirmed by a story told by Eusebius out of Clemens Alexandrinus, and other ancient authors, concerning a youth, whom St. John some time after his return from Patmos committed to the care of the bishop of a certain city. This is a story of many years, and requires, that John should have returned from Patmos rather at the death of Nero, than at that of Domitian.'

But, first, if this be only a feigned story, or apologue, as some have thought, contrived to convey moral instruction; circum-

^a As before, p. 243.

^b p. 236, 237.

^c Ad Neronis imperium hoc exilium Syrus refert. Verum incerta est quam maxime hujus versionis ætas, nulloque gaudet socio. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. 4. § vii.

Quapropter nihil in hisce est, quod Syrum ab erroris culpa liberare possit: quemadmodum nec supra erat, quod Epiphanium in nomine Claudii tueretur. Illud tantummodo adnotatum volo Syriacam Apocalypseos versionem haud æqualem cæterorum librorum interpre-

tationi videri, uti nec primi codices in Europam adlati appositam habuerunt, quam demum Ludovicus de Dieu MDCXXVII. in lucem primum produxit, &c. Ch. Cellarius de septem ecclesiis Asiæ num. xvii. p. 428.

^d Sed forsitan aliquis, honoris interpretis Syri sollicitus et cupidus, posset in illius gratiam asserere, illum non Neronem, sed Domitianum, alterum Neronem, seu portionem Neronis, ut vocatur Tertulliano, &c. Le Moyne. Var. Sacr. tom. II. p. 1019.

^e As above, p. 237.

stances ought not to be strained, nor the truth of history be founded upon it. Secondly, we must take the story, as it is related by Clement, and other ancient authors. Clement placeth it after the death of the tyrant, by whom John had been banished: and Eusebius^e supposeth him to mean Domitian. Thirdly, if St. John lived in Asia two, or three, or four years after his return from Patmos, that is time enough for the events of this story.

Sir Isaac adds in the same place: ‘And John in his old age was so infirm, as to be carried to church, dying above ninety years old: and therefore could not be then supposed able to ride after the thief.’

Nevertheless in the original account, which we have of this affair, St. John is expressly called^f an old man: Sir Isaac therefore has no right to make him young; for that would be making a new story. If a man allows himself so to do, and argues upon it; the necessary consequence is, that he deceives himself and others.

Upon the whole, I see not much weight in any of these arguments of Sir Isaac Newton; and must adhere to the common opinion, that St. John was banished into Patmos, in the reign of Domitian, and by virtue of his edicts for persecuting the Christians, in the latter part of his reign. Says Mr. Lampe: ‘All antiquity is agreed, that St. John’s banishment was by order of Domitian.’

VI. We should now inquire, when St. John was released, or how long his banishment lasted.

According to Tertullian, Domitian’s persecution^h was very short, and the emperor himself, before he died, recalled those whom he had banished. Hegeſippus likewise says, thatⁱ Domitian by an edict put an end to the persecution which he had ordered.

Eusebius says, ‘that^k after the death of Domitian, John returned from his banishment.’ And before, in another chap-
ter

^e H. E. l. 3. cap. 23.

^f . . . επιλαθόμενος της ηλικίας αυτης . . . τι με φευγεις . . . του γυμνιον, του γεροντα; προσελθοντα δε του γεροντα περιελαβεν. κ. λ. Clem. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. p. 93. ^g Tota antiquitas in eo abunde consentit, quod Domitianus exilii Joannis auctor fuerit. Lamp. Proleg. l. i.

cap. 4. § viii. ^h cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. v. vid. Supr. p. 355. note (b).

ⁱ . . . καταπανσαι δε δια προσταγματος του κατα της εκκλησιας διαγμω. Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B.

^k . . . απο της κατα την ιησυν μετα
τις

ter of the same book, he said more largely: 'After Domitian had reigned fifteen years, Nerva succeeded him, and the Roman Senate decreed, that the honourable titles bestowed upon Domitian should be abrogated, and moreover, that they who had been banished by him might return to their homes, and repossess their goods, of which they had been unjustly deprived. This we learn from such as have written the history of those times. Then therefore, as our ancestors say, the apostle John returned from his banishment, and again took up his abode at Ephesus.'

Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men, says: 'When Domitian had been killed, and his edicts had been repealed by the Senate, because of their excessive cruelty, John returned to Ephesus in the time of the emperor Nerva.'

I place below a passage of the martyrdom of Timothy in Photius, and another of Suidas, saying, that after Domitian's death, when Nerva was emperor, St. John returned from his banishment.

This is also agreeable to the general accounts in Dion Cassius, and the author of the Deaths of Persecutors.

Indeed, Hegesippus and Tertullian, as before observed, intimate, that the persecution of Domitian ended before his death. But it is very remarkable, that Eusebius having quoted both of them, gives a different account, as we saw just now. And, as learned men have observed, it is a great prejudice to their authority in this point, that Eusebius does not follow them, but presently afterwards differs from them.

It seems probable therefore, that St. John, and other exiles, did not return from their banishment, until after the death of Domitian: which is the opinion of Basnage, and likewise of Cellarius.

Domitian

ἡ δὲ δευτέρα τελευτὴν ἐπαυελθὼν φυγῆς.
Euf. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in.

¹ H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B. C.

² See vol. V. p. 41.

³ Νερῶν δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κρατῆς τὸ
ἀπὸ τῶν ἀιανδρῶν, ὁ θεολόγος ἰωάν-
νης τῆς ὑπεροχῆς φυγῆς ἀφῆκε κατα-
γεῖται πρὸς Ἐφεσον, ἧς καὶ προτέρου ἀπο-
στασίας πεφογαδέυτο. Ap. Phot.
Cod. 254. p. 1404.

⁴ Vid. Suid. voce Νερῶν.

⁵ Καὶ ὁ ἱερὸς τῆς τε κρινόμενης ἐπὶ

ἀσέβεια ἀφῆκε, καὶ τῆς φευγοντῆς κατη-
γαγε. κ. λ. Dio. l. 62. in. p. 769.

⁶ De M. P. cap. 3. ⁷ H. E.

l. 3. cap. 20. ⁸ Utrum Domi-
tiani decretum revocarit, difficilis
questio est. Sic enim antiquorum
nonnullis visum. Hegesippus . . .
Hegesippo assentitur et Tertullia-
nus . . . Contra vero nobilis histori-
cus Dio, qui rerum Romanarum
Hegesippo peritior erat, et Tertul-
liano, disertissime testatur, Nervæ
indulgentia

Domitian^u is computed to have died Sept. 18. A. D. 96. after having reigned fifteen years, and some days. Nerva^x died the 27th day of Jan. 98, after having reigned one year four months, and nine days. Therefore Trajan began his reign Jan. 27. A. D. 98.

If the persecution of Domitian began in the fourteenth year of his reign, and St. John was sent to Patmos that year, and restored in the beginning of the reign of Nerva, his^y exile could not last more than two years, perhaps not much above a year.

If St. John's life reached to the third year of the reign of Trajan, which is the opinion of Cave^z and many others, he lived three years after his return from Patmos: if it reached to the fourth year of Trajan, as^a Basnage thought, he must have lived four years after his return.

Or, in other words: if St. John returned about the end of the year 96, or the beginning of 97, and did not die till the year 101, he lived four years in Asia, after his return from Patmos. If he died in the year 100, he lived three years after his return.

VII. Having now said of St. John all that is needful by way of history, we come to his writings, of which there are five generally ascribed to him: a gospel, three epistles, and the Revelation: two of which, the gospel, and the first epistle, are universally received as genuine.

Now I speak of the gospel only. And here in the first place I shall recite the accounts of the ancients, but chiefly such, as

indulgentia revocatos fuisse Christianos: *Nerva autem eos qui damnati erant impietatis absolvit, exulesque restituit.* Neque alia mens Lactantio de Mort. Perf. cap. 3. Basnag. ann. 96. num. iv.

^t Cellar. de Septem. ecclesiis Asiæ. cap. xvii.—xx.

^u Basnag. ann. 96. n. xiii.

^x Basn. A. D. 98. i. Pagi. ann. 98. ii.

^y In alterum tantum annum ad summum duravit, quando Nerva succedens Domitiano exules revocavit, et cum eis Joannem, uti ex vetustiorum fide refert Eusebius, l. 3. H. E. cap. 20. . . . Quæ quidem eo majorem fidem merentur, quia ipse Dio, seu ex eo Xiphili- nus, revocationem exulum Christianorum Nervæ tribuit. Lampe

Prol. l. 1. cap. 4. § ix. Vid. et Cellar. ubi supra cap. xvii.

^z Interfecto Domitiano Ephesum rediit ann. Chr. 97. in qua, ut et in regionibus circumvicinis, reliquum vitæ transegit, et . . . anno Chr. 100. Trajani 3. juxta Eusebium et Hieronymum, anno uno aut altero centenario major . . . in Domino placide obdormivit. Cav. H. L. T. I. p. 16.

^a Cæterum cum ex antiqua traditione haustum videatur, Joannem senio confectum, 68, post passionem anno mortuum esse, quæ in 33 æræ nostræ incidit, probabilis est conjectura, Joannem anno labente finem hujus lucis invenisse. Basn. A. 101. n. ii.

concern the time when it was written; omitting many other testimonies, as not necessary to be mentioned now, though very valuable in themselves: after which we will observe the judgments of learned moderns concerning the same point; I mean, the time when it was written.

Irenæus having spoken of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, adds: 'Afterwards ^b John the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, likewise published a gospel, whilst he dwelled at Ephesus in Asia.'

In another place he says: 'John ^c the disciple of the Lord declaring this faith, and by the publication of the gospel designing to root out the error, which had been sown among men by Cerinthus, and long before by those who are called Nicolaitans——thus began in the doctrine, which is according to the gospel: *In the beginning was the Word.*'

In another place of the same ancient writer are these expressions: 'As ^d John the disciple of the Lord assures us, saying: *But these are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* [ch. xx. 30.] Foreseeing these blasphemous notions that divide the Lord, so far as it is in their power.'

In the preceding passage Irenæus speaks, as if St. John's gospel was written after the rise of Cerinthus, and other heresies: but here he seems to say, that it was written before them, and foreseeing them. In like manner afterwards, in the same chapter, he says of Paul: as ^e he says: *It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen, who is at the right hand of God.* Rom. viii. 34. And again, *Knowing that Christ being raised from*

^b See vol. II. p. 158.

^c Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho infeminatus erat hominibus errorem, et inulto prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ, qui sunt vulsio ejus, quæ falso cognominatur scientia. . . . Sic inchoavit in ea quæ est secundum evangelium doctrina. In principio erat verbum, &c. Adv. Hær. 1. 3. cap. xi. p. 188. Bened.

^d — quemadmodum Joannes Domini discipulus confirmat, dicens, *Hæc autem scripta sunt, ut credatis, quoniam Jesus est Filius Dei,*

et ut credentes vitam æternam habeatis in nomine ejus: providens has blasphemias regulas, quæ dividant Dominum quantum ex ipsis attinet, ex altera et altera substantia dicentes eum factum. Adv. Hær. 1. 3. cap. 16. n. 5. p. 206.

^e — quemadmodum ipse ait: *Simul autem Christus mortuus est, immo et resurrexit——Et iterum: Scientes quoniam Christus resurgens a mortuis, jam non moritur.* Prævidens enim et ipse per Spiritum subdivisiones malorum magistrorum, et omnem ipsorum occasionem dissensionis volens abscindere, ait quæ prædicta sunt. Ibid. n. 9. p. 207.

‘ *the dead, dies no more*, ch. vi. 9. For he also foreseeing by the spirit, the divisions of evil teachers, and being desirous to cut off from them all occasion of dissension, says what has been just quoted.’

Clement, of Alexandria, speaking of the order of the gospels, according to what he had received from presbyters of more ancient times, says: ‘ Last of all John observing, that in other gospels those things were related, which concern the humanity of Christ, and being persuaded by his friends, and also moved by the spirit of God, he wrote a spiritual gospel.’ Here it is supposed, not only, that St. John wrote the last of the four, but likewise, that he had seen the gospels of the other three evangelists.

Origen² speaks of all the four gospels in our present order, that is, Matthew’s first, and John’s last.

A long passage of Eusebius concerning St. John’s gospel may be seen vol. IV. p. 224—227. It cannot be omitted here. ‘ But it shall be abridged. ‘ And that it has been justly placed by the ancients the fourth in order, and after the other three, may be made evident.—For Matthew delivered his gospel to the Hebrews.—And when Mark and Luke also had published the gospels according to them, it is said, that John who all this while had preached by word of mouth, was at length induced to write for this reason. The three first written gospels being now delivered to all men, and to John himself, it is said, that he approved them, and confirmed the truth of their narration by his own testimony, saying: There was only wanting a written account of the things done by Christ, in the former part, and near the beginning of his preaching—And, certainly, that observation is true—’.

Epiphanius^h speaks of St. John’s gospel, as the last of the four. He also says, that St. John wrote it, after he had long declined so doing through humility, when he was ninety years of age, and when he had lived in Asia many years, after his return thither from Patmos, in the time of the emperor Claudius. He moreover says in several places, that this gospel was occasioned by the errors of the Ebionites, the Cerinthians, and other heretics.

According toⁱ the Syrian churches, St. John wrote his gospel at Ephesus.

^f See vol. II. p. 212.

² p. 466.

^h See vol. IV. p. 314, 315.

ⁱ p. 439.

My readers are again referred to the noble passage ^k of Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, concerning the four gospels, and to the remarks upon it.

Jerom, in his book of *Illustrious Men*, says: ‘John ^l the apostle wrote a gospel at the desire of the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus, and other heretics, and especially the doctrine of the Ebionites, then springing up, who say, that Christ did not exist before his birth of Mary: for which reason he was obliged to declare his divine nativity. Another reason of his writing is also mentioned; which is, that after having read the volumes of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, he expressed his approbation of their history as true: but observed, that they had recorded an account of but one year of our Lord’s ministry, even the last, after the imprisonment of John, in which also he suffered. Omitting therefore [very much] that year, the history of which had been written by the other three, he related the Acts of the preceding time, before John was shut up in prison; as may appear to those, who read the four evangelists: which may be of use to account for the seeming difference between John and the rest.’

According to ^m Augustine, St. John is the last of the four evangelists.

Chrysofom ⁿ assigning the reasons of St. John’s writing his gospel, supposeth that he did not write till after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Paulinus says: ‘It ^o had been handed down by tradition, that John survived all the other apostles, and wrote the last of the four evangelists, and so as to confirm their most certain history.’ And he observes, ‘that ^p in the beginning of St. John’s gospel all heretics are confuted, particularly, Arius, Sabellius, Marcion and the Manichees.’

Cosmas of Alexandria, says, ‘that ^q when John dwelt at Ephesus, there were delivered to him by the faithful, the writings of the other three evangelists. Receiving them he said, that what they had written was well written: but some things were omitted by them, which were needful to be related. And being desired by the faithful, he also published his writing, as a kind of supplement to the rest, containing such things as these: the wedding at Cana; the history of Nicodemus; the woman of Samaria; the nobleman, [or

^k p. 511—513.

ⁿ p. 127, 130.

^o p. 176.

Vol. V. p. 40, 41.

^m p. 93.

^p p. 177.

^q p. 266.

^r courtier,

‘ courtier, John iv. 46—54.] the man blind from his birth; Lazarus; the indignation of Judas, at the woman that anointed the Lord with ointment; the Greeks that came to Jesus; his washing the disciples’ feet; and suitable instructions upon several occasions, and the promise of the Comforter; and concerning the Deity of Christ, expressly and clearly at the beginning, and premising that, as the foundation of his work: all which things had been omitted by the rest.’

Isidore of Seville, says, that ^r John wrote the last in Asia.

Theophylact computed, that ^s St. John wrote about two and thirty years after Christ’s ascension.

Euthymius, that ^t it was not written until many years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Nicephorus Callisti says, that ^u John wrote last of all, about six and thirty years after the Lord’s ascension to heaven.

VIII. Having seen these testimonies of the ancients to St. John’s gospel, and the time of it, I would now observe the judgments of learned moderns.

According to ^x Mill’s computation St. John wrote his gospel at Ephesus, in the year of Christ 97, about one year before his death.

Fabricius ^y speaks to the like purpose.

Le Clerc ^z likewise placeth the writing of this gospel in the year 97.

Mr. Jones argues, that ^a it was written about the year 98, and not before 97.

The late Mr. Wetstein thought, that ^b this gospel might be written about the year 32, after our Lord’s ascension: and dislikes the supposition, that it was written by St. John in decrepit old age.

^r Vol. V. p. 306.

^s p. 328.

^t p. 334.

^u p. 335.

^x Et quidem Ephesum ab exilio reversus Joannes uno ante mortem anno scripsit Evangelium. Mil. Prol. num. 181.

^y Evangelium Græce edidit Ephesi, omnium postremus, jam nonagenario major, cum e Patmo reversus esset post Domitiani necem, quæ anno 96. contigit. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. T. III. p. 139.

^z Hist. E. An. 97. num. i.

^a New and Full Method, vol. III.

p. 139.

^b Hinc etiam consequitur, Evangelium Joannis non ab eo decrepito, et fere centenario, et post mortem Clementis, sed diu antea fuisse editum, adeoque inscriptionem Codicum Græcorum, qui illud Evangelium anno tricesimo secundo post ascensionem Christi, scriptum fuisse testantur, ad verum proprius accedere: præcipue cum ratio nulla sit, cur Joannes scriptionem in tam longum tempus differre debuerit. West. Proleg. ad duas Clement. Ep. sub. fin.

Basnage^c was inclined to think, that this gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. His reasons will be alleged, and considered by and by.

Mr. Lampe was of opinion, that^d this gospel was written in the latter part of the reign of Nero, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

IX. I shall now propose an argument concerning the date of this gospel.

There are two considerations, principally, which lead me to think, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, or about the time of that event: these I shall first mention, and then take notice of divers others, observable in learned moderns.

1. It is likely, that St. John wrote in a short time after the other evangelists. Their gospels were soon brought to him: and if he thought fit to confirm them, or to write any thing by way of supplement, he would do it in a short time. The first three gospels, very probably, were written and published before the end of the year 64, or in 65, at the farthest. If they were brought to St. John in 65, or 66, he would not defer more, or not much more, than a year, or two, to publish his history of Jesus, and make the account complete.

I do not presume to say exactly the year in which this gospel was written: but I think it might be written and published in the year 68.

This argument offered itself to Mr. Whiston's thoughts, and is thus expressed by him: 'That^e occasion of John's writing his gospel, mentioned by the ancients, viz. the bringing the other three gospels to him, and his observing their deficiency, as to the acts of Christ before the Baptist's imprisonment, does much better agree with this time, just after the publication of those gospels, than with that above thirty years later, to which its writing is now ordinarily ascribed.'

And is it not a strange supposition, that all the other three gospels should have been written by the year 60, or thereabout, and St. John's not till the year 97, or 98, that is, more than thirty years after the others? When likewise he must have been of a very great age, and scarcely fit for such a work as this.

^c Ann. 97. num. xii. ^d Putem
ego non contemnendas esse ratio-
nes, quæ ante excidium Hierosoly-
mitanum Evangelium nostrum sub
extremis forte Neronis temporibus

conscriptum esse persuadent. Pro-
leg. l. 2 cap. 2. num. ix.

^e Essay on the Apostolical Con-
stitutions, p. 38, 39.

2. The second consideration is the suitability of St. John's gospel to the circumstances of things before the overthrow of the Jews, or about that time.

Mr. Lampe has observed, that 'the great design of St. John in writing his gospel seems to have been, to show, how inexcusable the Jews were in not receiving Jesus as the Christ, and to vindicate the providence of God in the calamities already befallen, or now coming upon them. If that appear to be the design of St. John in writing his gospel, it will very much strengthen the supposition, that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem was completed.

St. John says, ch. xx. 31. *These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* That is, 'This history has been written, that they who believe, may be confirmed in their faith, and that all others, who yet believe not, may believe in Jesus, as the Christ, the Son of God, and obtain that life, which he promiseth to those who believe in him, and obey him.'

That is the design of all the evangelists; and their histories are a sufficient ground and reason of this belief. But St. John's gospel contains an ample confirmation of all that they have said, with valuable additions, and more plain and frequent assurances, that Jesus is not only a prophet, and messenger of God, but the Christ, the Son of God, or that great prophet, that should come into the world: whereby all are rendered inexcusable in rejecting him, and especially the Jews, among whom he preached, and wrought many miracles, and whom he often called to receive him as the Christ. This runs through

† Totam porro œconomiam hujus Evangelii ita esse digestam, ut ad convincendos ac ἀναπολογητὰς reddendos Judæos spectaret, capite sequenti ostendemus. Prolegom. in Joan. l. 2. cap. 3. § ii.

Imminens etiam Judææ perniciēs occasionem maxime opportunam conscribendo libro dabat, in quo Joannis animus erat hujus ipsius judicii imminentis æquitatem defendere, et tentare, an Judæi ex hoc Reipublicæ naufragio magno agmine in Asiam enatantes, ad recipiendum unicum mundi Salvato-

rem hoc medio permoveri possint. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. § xv. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 3. num. iii. not. (b).

‡ Priora duodecim capita evidētissime ea commemorant, quæ severum et tremendum illud Dei in Judæos judicium defendunt. Talia enim facta et dicta continuo ordine proponunt, quæ non in obscuro angulo, sed coram tota gente Judaica edita sunt, nullamque exceptionem patiuntur. — Atque hæc est ratio, cur Joannes secundum festa Judæorum historiam evangelicam digerat. Inde enim innotescit, Jesum ea diligenter

through St. John's gospel from the beginning to the end, or near the end of the twelfth chapter.

Even in the introduction, he says, ch. i. 7. *John came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe.* Ver. 8. *He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light.* Ver. 9. *That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* 'That is, he was designed to be an universal blessing: and he has done all that was fit to be done, to enlighten all men in the knowledge of God, and true religion.' Ver. 14. *And we beheld his glory, we his disciples, and all who impartially attended, beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father: that is, the glory peculiar to the promised Messiah.* Again, at ver. 18. he styles him *the only begotten son.* Here St. John may be supposed to declare his present faith, or to make a profession of the faith, which he had at the time of his writing. Having so done, he proceeds in the history. Ver. 19, 20. *And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, who art thou.* He answered, that he was not the Christ, but his harbinger, or fore-runner, the person spoken of by Isaiah. And he declares the transcendent greatness of him, who was about to appear, and was already among them. Ver. 21—28. Then at ver. 29. *The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith: behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.* Undoubtedly, by that character meaning the Messiah, and understood by all so to mean. See also ver. 30, 31, 32, 33. Then at ver. 34. *And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God: or the Christ.* And ver. 35, 36. *Again, the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples. And looking upon Jesus, as he walked, he saith: behold the Lamb of God.* He tells every body, that Jesus is the Christ, though not always in the same terms. And, to finish our account of John the Baptist. In ch. iii. 25—36. is the last testimony borne by him to Jesus: and it is very strong and full. He declares, he was not himself the Christ, *but was sent before him.* To him, says he, *God giveth not the spirit by measure.* The

ligenter frequentasse, atque in iis publice coram toto populo Judaico se satis superque manifestasse. Illud enim Evangelistæ nostro plane primæ est, ut ea potissimum narret, quæ a Domino nostro Hierosolymis, quem in ipso templo gesta atque

dicta sunt: paucis tantum interjectis, quæ eum etiam Judæam, Samariam, Galilæam, radiis gloriæ suæ cœlestis abunde illustrasse, atque ita nullam partem regionis Judæorum vacuam reliquisse, probant. Lamp. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 4. num. xxxiii. xxxiv.

Father loveth the Son, and hath put all things into his hands.— He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Having gone through the Baptist's testimony, as here recorded, we look back to ch. i. 4—42. where Andrew finds his brother Simon, and says to him: *We have found the Messiah.* Then ver. 45—51. *Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith to him: we have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth.* Nathanael likewise is convinced, and says: *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel.* So writes St. John, showing, that the pious, and well disposed among the Jews, readily received Jesus as the Christ. And thereby showing likewise the great unreasonableness, and extreme perverseness of those who did not believe in him after all the proofs, which he set before them in the course of his most powerful ministry. As the evangelist most justly says, near the conclusion of this part of his gospel. Ch. xii. 37. *But though he had done so many miracles among them, yet they believed not on him.* And see what follows there.

Ch. ii. 11. After the account of the miracle at Cana. *This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory: that is, the glory of the Messiah; and his disciples believed on him: or were confirmed in their belief, that he was the Christ.*

Soon after this, Jesus went up to Jerusalem at the passover, and cleansed the temple, saying: *Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise,* ch. ii. 13—17. By the work itself, and by his words, manifesting himself to be the Messiah. I omit other things in the remaining part of that chapter, which an attentive reader will take notice of.

Then, ch. iii. 1—21. is the history of Nicodemus, who, whilst Jesus was this time at Jerusalem, made him a private visit. He immediately professeth faith in him, as a prophet. But our Lord tells him plainly, that he was the Messiah, and demands a suitable regard from him. He likewise sets before Nicodemus the nature of his design, for preventing, or for removing all worldly expectations from him. He likewise intimates the call of the Gentiles, and the judgments coming upon the Jewish people, if they should persist in unbelief. *For, says he, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.—*

God sent not his Son, the Messiah, into the world, to condemn the world: but that through him the world, Gentiles as well as Jews, might be saved. And what there follows.

Jesus going through Samaria from Jerusalem, in his way to Galilee, meets with a woman of that country. Ch. iv. 19. *The woman saith unto him: Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.*—And ver. 25, 26. *The woman saith unto him: I know that the Messiah cometh, or is soon to appear.*—*Jesus saith unto her: I that speak unto thee am he.*—The woman left him, and went into the city, and saith unto the men: *come, see a man that has told me all things that ever I did. Is not this the Christ?* Afterwards ver. 42. *Many of that place said unto the woman: now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know, that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.* Here is another instance of our Lord's freely declaring himself to be the Christ, and of his accepting a profession of faith in himself, as such. And the ready faith of these Samaritans aggravates the continued unbelief of the Jews, on whom more culture had been bestowed.

Ch. v. i. *After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.* By many this is thought to be the passover. By others it is reckoned some other feast between the last mentioned, and the next passover of our Lord's ministry. However that may be, at this season our Lord healed the lame man at the pool of Bethesda, on the sabbath day, and bid him carry his bed, and go home. *Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day.* But Jesus answered them: *my Father worketh hitherto. And I work,* ver. 16, 17. The Jews charge him with blasphemy. Our Lord vindicates himself, and claims the character of the Messiah in high terms: and assures them, *that all judgment had been committed unto the Son,* meaning himself, the Messiah: *that all men might honour the Son, even as they honour the Father,* ver. 21—23. And, for proof, he refers to their scriptures, the testimony of John, and the works, which he had wrought among them, in the Father's name, ver. 24—47.

Ch. vi. 1—3. We perceive, our Lord to be in Galilee, whither he had gone from Judea. Then at ver. 4. *And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh.* After which follows the miracle of the five loaves and two fishes, for feeding five thousand. *Then, those men, when they had seen the miracle,*

which Jesus did, said, this is of a truth that prophet which should come into the world: or the expected Messiah. Their notion of the kingdom, belonging to that character, being worldly and carnal, and they looking for worldly advantages, would have come, and taken him by force, to make him a king: so that our Lord found it needful to depart into a mountain himself alone. The disciples in the mean time took shipping, and he came to them walking upon the sea. When they had received him, immediately the ship was at the land, whither they were going, ver. 14—21. The people having been disappointed, came to him as soon as they could at Capernaum; where our Lord takes an opportunity to reprove their carnal temper, and instructs them in the design of the Messiah, and the nature of his kingdom. And still taking upon himself that character, and requiring faith in him as such, he says: *I am the bread of life.*—*And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life.*—*I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread that I will give him is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*—*Many therefore of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. But Peter, in the name of the twelve, and possibly, in the name also of some others, followers of Jesus, said: To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are sure, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,* ver. 22—69.

Ch. vii. 1, 2. *After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him. Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand.*—ver. 14. *Now about the midst of the feast, Jesus went up into the temple, and taught.* ver. 25, 26. *Then said some of them of Jerusalem.*—*Do the rulers know indeed, that this is the very Christ?* ver. 31. *And many of the people believed on him, and said: When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these, which this man has done?* ver. 37, 38. *In the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood, and cried: if any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink.*—He speaks of himself in the character of the Messiah, and calls on all men to come to him, as such, and receive the great blessings, which he is able to bestow. And at ver. 40, 41. *Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said: this is the prophet. Others said: this is the Christ.*

Ch. viii. 12—23. Our Lord is still at Jerusalem. And at ver. 12. *Then spake Jesus unto them, saying: I am the light* of

of the world: claiming the character of the Messiah, and declaring also the advantages of believing in him, and the sad consequence of not receiving him. ver. 21. *Then said Jesus again unto them; I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins.* ver. 24. *I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins.* For, if ye believe not, that I am he, the Messiah, ye shall die in your sins: that is, ye will bring upon yourselves heavy judgments and calamities. Ver. 47. *He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.*—ver. 56. *your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day.*—Does not our Lord in all this propose himself to them, as the Messiah, require their faith in him, as such, and plainly intimate the calamities, that would befall them, if they should continue to reject him?

Nor is there any inconsistency in what is here observed, and the accounts of the other evangelists. After Peter had made a profession of his faith, it is said, Matt. xvi. 20. *Then charged he his disciples, that they should tell no man that he was the Christ.* And compare Mark viii. 30. and Luke ix. 21. Nevertheless, he was not unwilling to be thought of in that character. When Simon Peter had said by way of answer to the question that had been put to the disciples, *thou art the Christ, the son of the living God:* our Lord was greatly pleased, and pronounced him blessed upon that account: and he was desirous, that all should receive him as the Messiah. It was the design of his own, and his fore-runner's preaching, as recorded in all the evangelists, the first three, as well as St. John. They called upon all men to *repent, for the kingdom of heaven, or of God, by the Messiah, is at hand.* So Mark i. 14, 15. And himself says, Matt. xii. 28. *If I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you.* And Luke xvii. 21. *Behold the kingdom of God is among you, or in the midst of you, not within you, as we render it: but he tells them that the kingdom of the Messiah was already begun to be set up among them.* When our Lord was baptized, *there came a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* Or, this is the Messiah: as recorded by all the first three evangelists: Matt. iii. 17. Mark i. 11. Luke iii. 22. And in them our Lord accepts applications to him, and confessions of faith in him, in the character of *the Son of David, and the Son of God,* both which are the same as the Messiah. Of the former there are many instances:

instances: of the latter I mention one. Matt. xiv. 33. *Then they that were in the ship, came, and worshipped him, saying: thou art the Son of God.* And when he entered into Jerusalem, he accepted the acclamations of the multitude, which cried, *Hosanna to the Son of David: blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord,* Matt. xxi. 1—16. Mark xi. 1—11. Luke xix. 28—40. He sometimes laments the small success of his preaching, and that so few received him. But acquiesceth in the event. As in Luke vii. 31—35. Matt. xi. 16—26. Luke x. 21—24. And he even expresseth a surprise, that the pharisees and others, did not discern the signs of the time. Matt. xvi. 1—4. Mark viii. 11—13. Luke xii. 54—57. And every one may easily perceive the reason, why he did not allow the disciples, or some others, to say publicly, that he was the Messiah. For considering that the Jewish people in general, and the disciples themselves, expected a worldly kingdom, and worldly advantages from the Messiah; there needed some discretion, lest men should have been led to make tumults and disturbances, which might have been offensive to the magistrate. But when our Lord spoke of himself, as the Messiah, he always inculcated the true design of his coming, and gave assurances of spiritual and heavenly blessings, and such only.

Our Lord still continues at Jerusalem. Ch. ix. 1—41. is the history of the man blind from his birth, whom our Lord healed, anointing his eyes with clay, moistened with his spittle. *And it was the sabbath day, when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes.* The man being brought before the pharisees, and examined by them, said, that he who had opened his eyes was a prophet. *And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out. And when he had found him, he said unto him: dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered, and said: who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? Jesus said unto him: thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he said: Lord, I believe, and he worshipped him.* All this needs no comment. Afterwards at ver. 39—41. are intimations given to the pharisees of the sad consequences of rejecting him. And indeed in this history the bad temper of the Jewish rulers is very manifest.

Ch. x. Our Lord speaks of himself as *the true shepherd*, or the Messiah. Ver. 11. *I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.* Ver. 16. *And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold.* Ver. 22—24. *And it was at Jerusa-*
lem

tem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter. And Jesus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him: how long dost thou make us to doubt! If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witness of me. A very proper answer, certainly. And what follows to ver. 38. deserves to be consulted.

Ch. x. 39—42. Therefore they sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hand. And went away beyond Jordan, unto the place where John at first baptized: and there he abode. And many resorted unto him, and said: John did no miracles: but all things, that John spake of this man, were true. And many believed on him there.

I suppose this retreat of our Lord to a place beyond Jordan, to be the same that is mentioned Matt. xix. 1. and Mark x. 1. upon which some remarks were made ^h many years ago. What passed during that interval in that country, is recorded Matt. xix. to xx. 16. and Mark x. 1—31. Nor was St. Luke unacquainted with this retreat. For he has inserted in his gospel at ch. xviii. 15—30. some of the same discourses, which are in the other two evangelists, whilst our Lord was there: I say, I suppose, that St. John and the other evangelists speak of one and the same recess. But St. John seems to mention more particularly the occasion of it, in the verses just recited.

In this place and interval, our Lord lived somewhat more privately than he had done before. He received all who came to him, either for instruction, or to be healed by him. But he did not go about the cities and villages of Judea, preaching publicly, as he had done for some while before.

I always supposed, that our Lord's living thus, in that place, at no great distance from Jerusalem, had in it a kind design. He intended thereby to afford to the Jewish people, especially, their priests and rulers at Jerusalem, an opportunity to consider, and calmly reflect upon all the wonderful things that had happened among them in the space of a few years, the preaching and baptism of John, and all the things said and done by himself in the course of his ministry; particularly, the miracles which he had wrought among them, the claims, which he had made of being the promised

^h See the Vindication of our Saviour's three Miracles of raising the dead, vol. XI. p. 1—77.

Messiah, whom all ought to receive, and the intimations that had been given of impending ruin and misery.

Here our Lord waited, willing to rest the proof of his mission upon the testimonies, that had been given to it. And if the rulers of the Jewish people had now come, and solemnly owned him in the character, he bore, and with which God had clothed him, how joyfully would they have been received! But they were not so disposed. Great multitudes of the people came to him there, and *he healed them.* The *pharisees also came unto him*: but it was *tempting him.* Matth. xix. 1, 2, 3. Mark x. 1, 2.

But beside what is recorded by the other evangelists, St. John assures us, that in this interval our Lord came to Bethany about fifteen furlongs, or two miles, from Jerusalem, and there raised Lazarus to life. ch. xi. 1—44. *Then many of the Jews, which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him*: that is, that he was the Christ. *But some of them went their way to the pharisees, and told them, what things Jesus had done.* ver. 45, 46. *Then gathered they a council.*—*Then from that day forth, they took counsel together, for to put him to death.* ver. 47—53. This shows, that they were inflexible, and not to be gained by any considerations. It follows in ver. 54. *Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews*: but went thence into a country near the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples. Which * I suppose, was not far from the place, from which our Lord came last. And from this city, called Ephraim, our Lord came to Bethany again, by the way of Jericho, a short time before the next passover, as related by the other evangelists. We proceed.

Say St. John ch. xi. 55—57. *And the Jews' passover was nigh at hand.*—*Now both the chief priests and the pharisees had given a commandment, that if any knew where he was, he should show it, that they might take him.* That is a proof of a determined purpose to accomplish their evil designs against Jesus.

The whole following xiith chapter of this gospel deserves attentive regard. I must transcribe a part, though it adds to the length of these extracts. *Then Jesus, six days before the passover, came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, who had been dead, whom he raised from the dead,* ch. xii. 1. *Much people of the*

* Vid. Reland. Palæst. l. i. cap. 56. tom. I. p. 377. et Lenfant sur S. Jean. ch. xi. ver. 54.

Jews therefore knew, that he was there. And they came, not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead. But the chief priests consulted, that they might put Lazarus also to death: because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus. ver. 9—11. And here is an account of some Greeks, or Gentiles, who were desirous to see Jesus. ver. 20—22. Whose readiness, accompanied with humility, may be reasonably understood to cast a reflection upon the pride and obstinacy of those, who were unmoved by the most powerful arguments, and the most gracious invitations. The remainder of that chapter, from ver. 35 to 50, is a most proper conclusion of this part of the gospel, in which are these things very observable. Then Jesus said unto them: Yet a little while the light is with you; walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you——While ye have the light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.——But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the saying of Esaias might be fulfilled.——Jesus cried, and said: he that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me, should not abide in darkness.——I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should speak. And I know, that his commandment is life everlasting. Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

Then in the xiii, xiv, xv, xvi and xviih chapters our Lord instructs and comforts, prays with and for his disciples: showing tokens of the tenderest affection, and the most faithful concern for those, who had paid a due regard to the evidences of his mission, and adhered to him under difficulties and discouragements. So begins the next, that is, the thirteenth chapter: Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew, that his hour was come, that he should depart out of the world unto the Father: having loved his own, which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.

And indeed it was very natural for the evangelist, who had largely shown the unreasonableness, and the aggravated

¹ Sicut vero hæcenus severitatem Domini in Judæos defendit Evangelista, ita in sequentibus a capite xiii. ad finem usque fidelitatem Christi prædicatam, quam discipulis suis adiecit, ex ultimis verbis adserit.

Hæc intentio haud obscure addiscitur ex nova, quæ alteri hujus Evangelii parti præfigitur, præfatiuncula. cap. xiii. 1. — Lamp. Prol. l. 2. c. 4. num. xxxvi.

guilt of the Jews, who did not believe in Jesus, but rejected him, to give also a particular account of our Lord's kind acceptance of those who believed in him, and persevered in their faith. So that the design of showing, how inexcusable the Jewish people were, in rejecting Jesus, and of vindicating Divine Providence in the calamities brought upon them, is what produced the whole order and economy of this gospel.

The two following chapters, the xviiith and xixth contain the account of our Lord's prosecution, condemnation, death, and interment. In the two last chapters the xxth and the xxith are the accounts of our Lord's resurrection, and the evidences of it, with many tokens of kind regard for his disciples, who had followed him in the time of his abode on this earth, and were now to be his witnesses in the world, and to preach, under many difficulties, the same doctrine which he had taught.

There is another thing, which may induce us to think, that one great design of St. John in writing his gospel was to show the unreasonableness, and the great guilt of the Jews, in rejecting Jesus: that in his gospel are inserted more instances of their attempts upon our Lord's life, than in the other gospels. Some such things there are in them. Accounts of the pharisees consulting, how they might destroy Jesus, may be seen in Matt. xii. 14. Mark iii. 6. Luke vi. 11. beside their last attempt: when they were permitted to accomplish their evil design. But there are more such instances in St. John's, than in any of the other gospels. As John vii. 1. *After these things Jesus walked in Galilee. For he would not walk in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him.* However, he came up to Jerusalem at the next feast of tabernacles, ver. 2. And their designs were renewed. Ch. vii. 25. *Then said some of them at Jerusalem: is not this he, whom they seek to kill?—Ver. 31, 32. And many of the people believed on him, and said: when the Christ cometh, will he do more miracles, than these, which this man has done? The pharisees heard, that they murmured such things concerning him: and the pharisees and chief priest sent officers to take him.* But the officers, overcome by the excellence of his discourses, could not persuade themselves to apprehend him: for which they were reproached by the council in a most outrageous manner; but Nicodemus strove to allay their resentment. ver. 45—52. And ch. viii. 20. *These words spake Jesus, in the treasury, as he taught*

taught: in the temple: and no man laid hands on him, because his time was not yet come. Ver. 37. I know, that ye are Abraham's seed: but ye seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth, which I have heard of God. This did not Abraham. Ver. 59. Then took they up stones to cast at him.—And ch. x. 39. 40. Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand. And went away beyond Jordan. And when our Lord proposed to go to Bethany, upon occasion of the sickness and death of Lazarus, the disciples go unwillingly, and would have dissuaded him from that journey, being apprehensive of the imminent danger therein both to him and themselves. ch. xi. 7—16. See likewise ver. 45—57. All these are things quite omitted by the other evangelists. As is also what is said, ch. xii. 10, 11. And in their last persecution of Jesus before Pilate there are some very aggravating particulars mentioned by St. John, which the other evangelists have not taken notice of. See ch. xviii. 29—32. ch. xix. 1—15.

Our blessed Lord, preparing his disciples for afflictions, reconciling their minds to them, and encouraging them to endure them patiently, says, ch. xv. 21—24. *All these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. If I had not come, and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no excuse for their sin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father also. If I had not done among them the works, which no other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen, and hated both me and my Father.* That is a strong, but just and true representation of the heinousness of the guilt of the Jewish people. For which reason I could not forbear to allege it here, though it should be thought out of place.

And now having, as I suppose, shown this design of the evangelist, let me mention an observation, or two, by way of corollary.

First. We see the reason of St. John's recording the miracle of raising Lazarus, omitted by the other evangelists. There was no necessity, that they should mention it: for without it they have recorded sufficient evidences of our Lord's mission and character. Nor was it possible, without an improper prolixity to record all our Saviour's discourses and miracles, as St. John himself has observed. Moreover the first three evangelists have chiefly insisted upon the most public part of our Lord's ministry: for which reason this miracle did not come so directly in their way. But St. John could

could not omit it. His design necessarily led him to relate this great miracle, done so near Jerusalem, and with all its circumstances. For it manifestly shows the perverse and incorrigible temper of the Jewish priests and rulers.

Secondly. None ought any more to make a question, whether our Lord twice cleansed the temple, or once only. It was cleansed by him at the time of his last passover, as related by the first three evangelists. But it was very proper for St. John to record that done at the first passover of our Lord's ministry: it affording an alarming evidence of his being the expected Messiah, which should have been taken notice of by the Jewish rulers at Jerusalem. It was an early and open claim of the character of the Messiah. And their neglecting that, and so many other claims and evidences of the same great truth afterwards, manifests the obstinacy of their unbelief: which was fitly shown by this evangelist.

I now proceed to some other arguments.

3. One argument, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, is taken from ch. v. 2. *Now there is at Jerusalem, by the sheep-market, or sheep-gate, a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches.*

On this passage insist both * Basnage and † Lampe. St. John does not say, as they observe, there was, but there is. And though the pool might remain, it could not be said after the ruin of the city, that the five porches still subsisted.

Mr. Whiston argues in this manner. ' St. John's ^m speaking of the pool of Bethesda in the present tense, better agrees to the time here assigned, A. D. 63, before the

* Porro quod tam sero scriptum Joannis Evangelium tradamus, id ex sententia potius veterum, quam ex rei veritate fecimus. Ex ipso quippe Evangelio nascitur argumentum ad existimandum, lucem prius aspexisse, quam Hierosolyma everteretur. *Est, inquit, Hierosolymis ad portam ovium piscina.* Stetisse ergo videtur urbs sancta, Joanne ea verba scribente. Secus, non præsens, est, est, sed præteritum adhibuisset. Basn. An. 97. n. xii. † Habetur igitur hic non tantum mentio *portæ ovium*, tanquam tunc adhuc existan-

tis, cum scriberet Evangelista, sed etiam ædificii ex quinque porticibus constantis, quales structuræ post dirutam a Romanis Hierosolymam illic frustra essent quæsitæ. Licet enim piscinam superesse velint itineraria, portæ tamen ac muri solo æquata erant. Inde igitur colligimus, stetisse urbem sanctam, Joanne ea verba scribente. Secus non præsens est, sed præteritum adhibuisset. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. num. xi. ^m Essay on the Constitutions, ch. i. p. 38.

‘ destruction

‘destruction of Jerusalem, when that pool and porch were
‘certainly in being, than to the time afterwards, when pro-
‘bably both were destroyed.’

Dr. Whitby likewise was somewhat affected by this text, and says: ‘If *there is* be the true reading, as the consent
‘of almost all the Greek copies argues, it seems to intimate,
‘that Jerusalem and this pool were standing, when St. John
‘wrote his gospel: and therefore, that it was written, as
‘Theophylact, and others say, before the destruction of
‘Jerusalem, and not, as the more ancient fathers thought,
‘long after.’

But Mr. Jones, beside other things, says, ‘that’ in all
‘probability the pool was not filled up, but was still in the
‘same state, after the destruction of Jerusalem, as before.’
To which, however, it might be answered, that supposing
the pool not to have been filled up, it would not be rea-
sonable to think, that the porches and the gate still sub-
sisted, after the destruction of the city. But then Mr. Jones
adds: ‘Supposing the pool was destroyed, and St. John to
‘have known it, there is no impropriety in using the verb
‘*is*: nothing being’ more common among writers, than to
‘use verbs in the present tense, to denote the preterperfect.’

Having represented this argument, as it has appeared
to divers learned men, I leave every one to judge of it.

4. In ch. xxi. 18, 19. Christ foretels, that Peter would
die by martyrdom. Then it is added: *This spake he, signi-
fying, by what death he should glorify God.* Some may hence
argue, that Peter was not yet dead when this was written:
or that St. John did not then know of it. But others may
be of opinion, that though Peter had suffered martyrdom
a good while before, and St. John knew it very well; yet
he was not obliged to take notice of it, but might write as
he does.

New and Full Method, vol. III.
p. 141.

Post Petri martyrium editum esse
Jannis Evangelium consensus est
Patrum omnium. Fit tamen in ea re
scandalus. Petro Christus mortem di-
vine portendit. cap. xxi. 18. —
Que si scripta sunt, jam misso ad
mortem Petro, injici de ea re mentio
debebat, ut et completi oraculi
cognitio caperetur, et martyri Chris-

ti laus sua concederetur. Basnag.
Exercit. p. 384. P Locus ex

Joh. xxi. 18. non magni in hac
caussa momenti est. Nullam enim
video necessitatem, cur mortem Pe-
tri commemoraret, si vel actu noti-
tiam ejus habuisset, quia sic per se
satis veritas prædictionis Jesu inno-
tuisset, &c. Lamp. ib. l. 2. c. 2. §
xiii.

Indeed,

Indeed, I am of opinion, that St. John could not take notice of Peter's death. It was not a thing within his province. As an Evangelist, he wrote the history of our Saviour, not of his Apostles.

5. A like argument may be taken from the following verses, 20, 21, 22. *Peter seeing John, saith to Jesus: Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him: if I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad, that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him, he shall not die: but if I will, that he tarry, till I come, what is that to thee?* If by Christ's coming be here intended the overthrow of Jerusalem, as many think, it may be supposed reasonable by some to expect, that St. John should have taken some notice of it here, if he wrote after that event. Nevertheless, I humbly apprehend, that this is not an argument of much weight. I do not think, that as an evangelist he was obliged to give an account of the fulfilment of Christ's prediction, though he had been a witness of it.

6. *This is the disciple, that testifieth these things, and wrote these things. And we know, that his testimony is true.* By these last words Mr. Lampe⁹ supposed, to be meant some Jews, then living in Asia, who were eye-witnesses of our Lord, and his ministry: which might well be, if St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem: but would not be reckoned likely, if it was written not before the year of the vulgar epoch 97, or 98. They who confirm the testimony of another, ought to have the same certain knowledge of the thing testified, as he who speaks, or writes. But after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is not reasonable to think, there were many to bear witness to things done forty or fifty years before. These Jews, eye-witnesses of our Lord, Mr. Lampe supposeth to have been believers of that nation, who accompanied John into Asia, when he left Judea.

I have thought it proper, not to omit this argument of that learned writer: but it depends upon his interpretation of this verse; which is not certain. For some have supposed, that it is the church of Ephesus, which here speaks: and others think it to be^s St. John himself. The change
of

⁹ Ibid. l. 2 cap. 2. num. ix.

^r *Et scimus*] Loquitur ecclesia Ephesina. *Scimus*, aiunt, *fide dignum*, ex vitæ scilicet puritate, et

miraculis ab eo editis. Grot. in loc.

^s 'The evangelist had said before ch. xix. 35. *He knoweth, that he saith true.* Here in this place he changeth
' the

of number and person, of *we* for *I*, is no valid objection. So 1 John i. 1—5. *That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes.*—3 epist. 12. *Yea, and we also bear record, and ye know that our record is true.* And St. Paul 1 Thess. ii. 18. *Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us.* Chrysostom¹ and Theophylact² understood St. John to speak here of himself, as an eye-witness, who had been present at almost every thing related by him in his history.

7. It is said: ‘The three epistles of St. John do ever suppose, the gospel of St. John to have been written long before, and to be well known by those, to whom he wrote. And they are written with a constant view and regard to the contents of the same gospel.’ That is an argument of Mr. Whiston, which, with what he adds by way of confirmation, is referred to the reader’s consideration.

8. Some have argued for an early date of this gospel, or at least, that it was written before the Revelation, which was seen in Patmos, because³ it is said at the beginning of that book, ch. i. 1, 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things which he saw.* They suppose, that therein St. John refers to his gospel, and what he had written in it. But to me the most reasonable account of those words appears to be that which⁴ was given formerly: that they are most properly understood of that very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer there says, very pertinently, in his introduction, that in that book he had discharged the office

¹ the person, saying: *We know, that his testimony is true.* Lightfoot upon John xxi. 24. vol. II. p. 627. See likewise Whithy, Lenfant, and Doddridge upon the place.

και περι εμαυτη λεγω, οτι αληθευω. Theophyl. in Jo. tom. I. p. 847.

² See his Commentary upon St. John’s three Catholic Epistles, p. 8. &c.

³ Και οίδα, φησιν, οτι αληθη εστιν α λεγει. — Και πασι δε παρην, και οδε εμαρτυρησεν απολιμπανετο, και την μητερα εκχαριβη. Chryf. hom. 88. al. 87. T. VIII. p. 588. C. D. E. ⁴ Και οίδα, φησιν, οτι αληθη λεγει, τετεστι. εμαρτυρησεν εγραφα, α εγραφα, ατε πασι παρων, και τοις εργοις, και τοις λεγοις, και τοις παθεσι, και τοις μετα τη παρασπι. Αγαπητος γαρ ημην, και οχι απολιμπανομην, ωσε παρρησιαζομαι,

⁵ Ipsum porro audiamus Evangelistam idem non obscure, uti nobis videtur, subindicantem, quando Apoc. i. 2. se ita circumscribit: ας εμαρτυρησε του λογον τε θεου. — Et versu 9 — Plurimi optimi interpretes in eo consentiunt, quod in his verbis ad Evangelium respiciatur, licet in modo demonstrandi differant, &c. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. § viii. ⁶ See vol. III. p. 118, 119.

assigned him: having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jesus Christ, and all the visions which he had seen.

9. Once more it is argued from inscriptions, at the end of this gospel, in divers manuscripts, that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem: it being there said, that this gospel was written in the time of Nero, at thirty years, or about two and thirty years after our Saviour's ascension. Upon these insisted ^a Mr. Wetstein in a passage quoted from him some while ago. Upon them likewise insists ^b Mr. Lampe.

For my own part I lay not any stress at all upon these inscriptions, at the end of Greek or Arabic, or other manuscripts of the New Testament, written in the ninth or tenth century, or later. They ^c are of no authority: for there is no proof that this account was derived from the testimony or tradition of ancient authors. The early date of the gospels was popular. Some having without reason determined the time of writing the other gospels at eight, or ten, or fifteen years after our Lord's ascension, pitched upon the year 30, or 32, for the time of St. John's gospel: but it was done upon no other ground and foundation, but mere fancy and conjecture.

X. It is upon the two first mentioned arguments that I chiefly rely. However, there are objections, which deserve to be considered.

I. Obj. Chrysostom was of opinion, that St. John did not write, till after the destruction of Jerusalem. For in a homily upon Matt. xxiv. he says, ' John ^a writes not of any ' of these things, lest it should be thought, that he took an ' advantage from the event. For he was living a good ' while after the destruction of Jerusalem. But the other

^a See before p. 190.

^b *Accedit multarum glossarum et versionum in id consensus, quod sub Nerone Evangelium sit exaratum. Licet enim authoritates hæ sequioris ævi sint, ob earum tamen frequentiam et harmoniam valde est credibile, quod in antiquiori traditione fundatæ sint—*Id tamen observavi discrimen, ut quædam numero rotundo XXX post Christi adscensionem, aliæ XXXII nomi-

nent. Lampe *ibid.* l. 2. cap. 2. num. xii. Vid. et num. xiv.

^c *Neque ordo, qui nunc receptus est epistolarum, sequitur ordinem temporis, neque antiqua sunt illa, quæ sub finem sunt addita, ad significandum, unde et per quos missæ sunt.—*et illæ in fine annotatiunculæ, seræ sunt, ex conjectura, aut tenui fama. Grot. *Comm.* in loca quædam N. T. sub in. tom. III. p. 457. ^d See vol. V. p. 130.

^e evangelists,

‘evangelists, who died before the destruction of Jerusalem, and saw none of those things, record these predictions.’

To which I answer, that St. John’s omitting our Saviour’s predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, which are recorded by the other evangelists, is no proof that he did not write until after they were fulfilled. For if he wrote at the time supposed by us, when that event was near; it is very likely, that he would omit these predictions: especially, having observed, that they were sufficiently recorded already. And we plainly see, that it is not St. John’s method to repeat what had been recorded before. However, he has inserted in his gospel divers expressions, containing warnings and intimations of the miseries coming upon the Jewish people, if they did not receive the Lord Jesus as the Messiah. John the Baptist may be supposed to intend this in words, recorded John iii. 36. Our Lord intimates it in his discourse with Nicodemus, ch. iii. 18, 19. and upon divers other occasions, already taken notice of by us in this gospel, ch. viii. 12, 21, 24. ch. ix. 39—41. ch. xii. 35, 36.

2. Obj. Mr. Whiston in ^e his Short View of the Harmony of the Evangelists, says, ‘that St. John useth the Roman or Julian beginning of the day in his gospel, the same that we use at present, and reckons the hours from midnight and noon. He refers to John i. 39. xix. 14. and xx. 19. Which he reckons an argument, that St. John wrote his gospel long after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the period of the Jewish polity at Ephesus, a place remote from Judea, and under the Roman government.’

To which I answer, 1. It does not appear to me, that St. John computes the hours of the day after the Roman, but rather after the Jewish manner. 2. Supposing St. John to have used the Roman method of computation, it does not follow, that he wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the period of the Jewish polity. We allow, that St. John’s gospel was written at Ephesus, at a distance from Judea. And, if he thought fit, he might use the Roman way of reckoning, especially, when the period of the Jewish commonwealth was near, though not quite accomplished.

Thus I have endeavoured to solve this objection. What was Mr. Whiston’s own solution, I do not know: but I

^e p. 115, 116.

suppose, that he afterwards overcame this difficulty. For in his later writings he maintains a very different sentiment concerning the date of St. John's gospel, pleading, that it was written about the year of Christ 63, a good while before the destruction of Jerusalem. So he argues in his Essay upon the Apostolical Constitutions, published in 1711, and in his Commentary upon St. John's Epistles, published in 1719. His Harmony of the four Evangelists was printed at Cambridge in the year 1702.

3. Obj. It is farther objected, that many ancient writers speak of a late date of St. John's gospel, and that he wrote with a design to confute divers heretics: who cannot be supposed to have appeared, till after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish people.

To which I answer, that this may have been owing to a mistaken apprehension. Many heretics, they saw, might be confuted by St. John's gospel. Therefore they concluded, that he did not write, till after they had appeared in the world: whilst the truth might be no more than this, that such and such heretics might be confuted out of his gospel: though they had not appeared in the world till long after. Paulinus says, 'that in the beginning of St. John's gospel
' all heretics are confuted, particularly, Arius, Sabellius,
' Photinus, Marcion, and the Manichees.' And in Mr. Wetstein's preface to St. John's gospel, written not long ago, in our time, are these expressions. Having before quoted Irenæus, he adds, 'Which if they be compared
' with those things, which Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo,
' Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, have said
' of angels, and æons: among whom were Charis *grace*,
' Alethea *truth*, Monogenes *only begotten*, Logos *word*, Zoe
' *life*: it must be manifest, that John so opposed his doctrine
' to them, as to use the forms of expression received by
' them.' Surely, this is very incautious and inaccurate. Must it not be so, to say, that St. John opposed those heretics, most of which are heretics of the second century?

† Vol. V. p. 177.

‡ Quæ si comparentur cum iis, quæ Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus, et Marcion de angelis et æonibus, inter quos erant Charis, Alethea, Monogenes, Logos, Zoe,

item de Christo, non vere, sed *δοκίμοι* passo, tradiderunt: satis manifestum erit, Joannem doctrinam suam illis ita opponere, ut loquendi formulis apud illos receptis utatur. Wetst. Test. Gr. tom. I. p. 832.

If St. John's gospel be genuine, it must have been written before the end of the first century. Yea, Mr. Wetstein says, it was written at about two and thirty years after Christ's ascension. How then could St. John oppose them, or write against them, but in the way of prophecy or prevention? But to say, he opposed his doctrine to them, or wrote against them, does not seem very proper. And if the ancient writers speak not more accurately than this learned modern; an argument taken from them, upon this head, cannot be of much weight.

It is the testimony of Irenæus, which ought principally to be regarded by us, upon account of his antiquity, and his having been acquainted with Polycarp in the early part of his life. He says, as before transcribed, 'that by the publication of his gospel John designed to root out the error that had been sown among men by Cerinthus. But it is observable, that in another place, also transcribed above, he says: 'John foreseeing those blasphemous notions that divide the Lord, so far as it is in their power,' wrote his gospel. For this passage I am indebted to Mr. Whiston, who argues, that St. John's gospel was written about the year 63, and before this apostle's three epistles. 'Nor,' says^b he, 'shall I need to support this observation from any other argument, than that from Irenæus, who supposeth this gospel, and St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, ancients, and these epistles later, than the rise of the heresy of Cerinthus:' referring to the passage of Irenæus, before taken notice of by us.

If then we put together the several passages of Irenæus, he does not contradict the supposition of an early date of St. John's gospel: or, that it was written before the rise of those heresies, which may be confuted by it.

It may be judged presumptuous to oppose the prevailing opinion of learned men, who have supposed that some heretics were particularly struck at in the beginning of this gospel. Nevertheless Mr. Lampe,^c whom I have often quoted, has presumed

^b Commentary upon St. John's epistles, p. 8.

^c Nos ut salva, quam viris magnis, — debemus, existimatione, libere animi sensa proferamus, an Evangelio suo Joannes controversam tractare, hæreticosque in Ecclesia sui ævi ullos refutare volue-

rit, dubitamus admodum. Neque enim id titulus generalis Evangelii libro præfixus admittit, neque id commode per librum ad methodum historiæ compositum fieri potuit, neque illius rei vel vola vel vestigium ullum apparet: quod tamen et scriptoribus elencticis in

presumed to oppose this opinion, and has largely argued, that St. John did not write against Cerinthus, or other heretics in his gospel. And though another learned German * has since written against Mr. Lampe, I cannot say that he has confuted him.

I shall therefore take the liberty to mention some thoughts relating to this matter, which offer themselves to my mind.

First: To me it seems below an evangelist to write against heretics in the history of his Lord and Master. Nor do any of the evangelists enter into a particular account of things after our Lord's ascension. St. John proceeds no farther than his resurrection, and the evidences of it, without particularly mentioning his ascension: nor has St. Matthew proceeded any farther. However, undoubtedly, it is implied in what they write, that our Lord was raised up to an endless life, and to universal power in heaven and on earth. -St. Mark, ch. xvi. 19. and St. Luke xxiv. 50, 51. relate our Saviour's ascension to heaven.

This has oftentimes appeared to me exceeding remarkable, that none of the evangelists should in their gospels give an account of the preaching of the apostles after our Lord's ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. Take the earliest date of the gospels that can be thought of, or assigned by any; all must allow, that before any of them were written, many miracles had been performed by the apostles, and many converts must have been made from among Jews, if not also from among Gentiles; and many promises of our Lord must have been accomplished: and we can perceive from their gospels, that they had a knowledge of such things; nevertheless there is no particular account of them in any of the gospels. St. Mark is the only evangelist that has said any thing in his gospel of the ministry of the apostles; and he enters not into any detail: his whole account is in a few words only, the last verse of his gospel.

Considering this method of all the evangelists in their histories of our Lord and Saviour, it appears to me probable, that though St. John had not written his gospel before the

more constanti positum est, et e re admodum erat, ut eo certius tela ferirent, et eo evidentius argumentorum patefceret robur. Lampe Prolegom. in Joann. l. 2. cap. iii. num. xiii. Vid. ib. num. xiv. xv. xvi. et seq.

* G. L. Cæderus de scopo Evangelii S. Jo. Ap. certissime Hæres. Cerinthi et Ebionis oppositi. Adversus V. C. Fr. Ad. Lampe. Lipsiæ 1732.

year

year 96, or 97, as some have supposed; he would not have taken notice of heretics, or vouchsafed to argue with them. St. John did not write the history of the apostles, as is evident: how then could he take notice of heretics.

Secondly: Another thing of no small moment is this. I see nothing of this kind in the rest of St. John's gospel. Why¹ then should we imagine that there is any such thing in the introduction? If St. John's gospel is not written against heretics, why should the beginning of it be so? What St. John says in the introduction, appears to me agreeable to the main design of his gospel, as it has been before largely represented. He therein shows, that Jesus came and acted by the authority of God, the creator of the world, the God, and supreme law-giver of the Jewish people. The^m eternal word, reason, wisdom, power of God, which is God himself, by which the world had been made, by which he dwelled among the Jews in the tabernacle, and the temple, ⁿ dwelled and resided in Jesus in the fullest manner: so^o that we his disciples, and others who believed in him, saw, and clearly discerned him to be the promised Messiah, the great prophet that should come into the world.

¹ Ex quibus clare, ut putamus, patet, in prologo compendium contineri rerum, quas Evangelista toto Evangelio demonstrare volebat, nempe Jesum non tantum esse Filium Dei et redemptorem mundi, [ver. 1—4] sed etiam qua talem ita plene in mundo demonstratum esse, ut ab una parte Judaei plane redditi fuerint *αναπολογητοι*, [ver. 4—11.] ab altera autem fideles suscipiens fidei firmamentum acceperint, ver. 12—18. Lamp. Prolog. l. 2 cap. 4. num. xxv.

¹¹ Queris veram hujus nominis interpretationem, de qua variae exstant eruditorum virorum sententiae? Non vindico mihi ejus rei arbitrium: tantum, quod hic sentio, modeste, salva dissentientium existimatione et amicicia, profero. Verensum esse hoc nomen Ratio, vel Sapientia Dei: etli receptam phrasin Sermonis Dei, in versione retinendam censuerim. — Constat cuique, prologum Evangelii legendi, alludere Joannem in toto illo

prologo — ad caput octavum Proverbiorum Salomonis, — ut proinde talem eligere oporteat interpretationem, quae affinis sit voci Sapientiae, Vitring. in Apoc. cap. xix. ver. 13. p. 1109.

¹¹ Ut celebratissimo loco legitur: *Και ο λογος σαρχε εγενετο*. Quod recte redditur: Et Verbum, sive sermo, homo factus est, sive humanam naturam induit. Et *εξ εργαων νομη & δικαιωθησεται πασα σαρχε*: i. e. homo quisquam. Rom. iii. 20. ut Ps. cxliv. 22. al. cxlv. 21. *και ευλογειτω πασα σαρχε το ονομα αυτου*. Pearson. Prolegom. ad version. lxx. Cantab. p. 13. ^o 'We saw his glory, as what became the only begotten Son of God. He did not glitter in any worldly pomp and grandeur, according to what the Jewish nation fondly dreamed their Messiah would do: but he was decked with the glory of holiness, grace, truth, and the power of miracles.' Lightfoot's Exercitationes upon St. John, vol. II. p. 521.

The apostles in their addresses to the Jewish people never fail to give assurances, that Jesus Christ had acted by the authority of the one true God, the God of their ancestors. So Acts ii. 22. *Ye men of Israel. hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles—which God did by him in the midst of you.* And ch. iii. 13. *The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers has glorified his Son Jesus.*—See also ver. 22—26. ch. v. 30. *The God of our Fathers has raised up Jesus.*—The epistle to the Hebrews begins in this manner: *God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.*

Indeed, this is necessary for the satisfaction of all men, both Jews and Gentiles: for there is no other God but one, even the God of the patriarchs and prophets: nor can any true revelation come from any but him.

In all the gospels our Lord ascribes all his miracles, and all his authority, to the one God, *his Father who is in heaven,* Matt. xii. 28. *If I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you,* Luke xi. 20. *If I by the finger of God cast out demons. no doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you,* Matt. xi. 27. *All things are delivered unto me by my Father.*—Comp. Luke x. 22. Matt. xv. 13. *Every plant, which my heavenly Father has not planted, shall be rooted up,* Matt. xvi. 27. *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father.*—Comp. Mark viii. 38. And the like in many other places.

But in none of the gospels does our Lord so frequently and expressly ascribe all his authority to God the Father, as in St. John's gospel: thereby plainly showing the guilt of those who did not receive him. John v. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do.*—Ver. 30. *I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me.* Ver. 36, 37. *But I have greater witness than that of John. For the works, which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.*—Ver. 43. *I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not.*—And at ver. 45—47. our Lord appeals to Moses and his writings, which were allowed to be of divine original, as bearing testimony to him. Then ch. vi. 27.—*him hath God the Father sealed.* Ch. vii. 16. *I am not alone. But I, and the Father, that sent me.* Ch. x. 36. *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world: thou blasphemest: because*

because I said, I am the Son of God? And, to add no more, ch. xi. 41, 42. When he wrought that great miracle of raising Lazarus from the dead, Jesus lift up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee, that thou hast heard me: and I knew that thou bearest me always; but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.

Agreeable to all this is the introduction, where, beside other, are these expressions: *He came to his own. And his own received him not.*—*The word was made flesh, and dwelled among us*—*And we saw his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.*—*The law was given by Moses; but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him.* So ends the introduction. And it is what St. John has largely and fully shown in his gospel.

But it will be asked: whence came it to pass, that St. John made use of that term, *the Word*?

I answer: I am of opinion, that it was not out of regard to Philo, or any Platonic writers. But I suppose, this way of speaking to have been very common with the Jewish people, and, perhaps, more especially with those of them, who were most zealous for the law, and most exempt from foreign, and philosophical speculations. Who by *the Word*, or *the Word of God*, understood, not a spirit separate from God, and inferior to him, but God himself, as St. John¹ does.

Numb.

¹ Plerique observant, similem locutionem frequenter occurrere in Paraphrasibus Chaldaicis, quæ veterum Hebraeorum catechesin, et antiquas loquendi formulas, exhibent. Quoties de Deo nobiscum conversante sermo est, toties vero Targumistæ, pro Deo, vel Jehova, substituerunt verbum Jehovæ. Pro exemplo hæc paucula ex innumeris sunt. Gen. xxi. 20. Deus fuit cum illo. Onkelos. Verbum Domini fuit illi auxilio. Ib. comm. 22. Deus est tecum. Onkelos. Verbum Domini enim tibi subsidio. Deut. xxi. 1. Ne timeto ab eis. Nam Deus tuus tecum est. Onkelos. — eo quod Jehova Deus tuus, Verbum ejus auxilio tibi est, quod eduxit te ex terra Ægypti. Num. xii. 20. Eo quod reprobasti Jeho-

vam. Onkelos. Eo quod fastidistis Verbum Domini, ejus Shechinah Divina Majestas habitat in vobis. Exod. xvi. 8. Non contra nos murmurationes vestræ, sed contra Jehovam. Onkelos.—sed contra Verbum Jevæ. Infinita sunt similia. Unde colligitur, receptum eo tempore Hebræis fuisse, ut Deum, quatenus cum populo suo agit, Verbum vocaverint: cui ea attribuerunt, quæ Dei sunt. Wits. Miscell. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 88. 89. Exorcita. iii. περι τε λεγυ. § ii.

² Omnia igitur talia conscribere volens discipulus Domini, et regulam veritatis constituere in Ecclesia quia est unus Deus Omnipotens, qui per Verbum suum omnia fecit, et visibilia, et invisibilia: significans quoque, quoniam per Verbum,

Numb. xxiii. 8. *How shall I curse, whom God has not cursed? or, how shall I defy, whom the Lord has not defied?* Upon which verse Patrick says, ‘In the Jerusalem Targum this verse is thus paraphrased: *How shall I curse the house of Israel, when the Word of the Lord has blessed them? Or, how shall I diminish the family of Israel, when the word of the Lord has multiplied them?*’

It is well known, that in the Chaldee paraphrases, it is very common to put *Mimra* Jehovah, the word of the Lord, for Jehovah, or God. When those paraphrases were made, is not certain; whether before, or after the time of our Saviour: but their great antiquity is generally allowed. And it is very probable, that this way of speaking was common, and much used before. ‘It is likely, says a learned friend, that *Mimra* Jehovah was used before the paraphrases were committed to writing, because it would be an unreasonable thing to use a phrase, which the common people did not understand: for it is supposed, that the paraphrases were chiefly made for them.’

Let me add, that the use of this phrase, *the Word of God*, or *the Word of the Lord*, as equivalent to God himself, seems to be founded in the original language of the Old Testament. In behalf of which I would allege the following texts. Gen. i. 1. *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.* Ver. 3. *God said: let there be light. And there was light.* Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.* And Ps. cv. 19. *Until the time that this word came: the Word of the Lord tried him.*

When St. John says, ch. i. 1, 2, 3. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.* He seems to allude to what Solomon says of wisdom in the book of Proverbs, particularly, the eighth chapter. And how

Verbum, per quod Deus perfecit conditionem, in hoc et salutem his qui in conditione sunt, præstitit hominibus: sic inchoavit in ea, quæ est secundum Evangelium, doctrina: In principio erat Verbum. Iren. l. 3. cap. xi. in Massuet.

Et Cerinthus autem quidam in Asia, non a primo Deo factum esse mundum docuit, sed a Virtute quadam valde separata, et distante ab

ea Principalitate, quæ est super omnia. Id. l. 1. cap. xxv. al. 26 in.

Deus autem totus existens mens, et totus existens logos, quod cogitat, hoc et loquitur: et quod loquitur, id et cogitat. Cogitatio enim ejus logos, et logos mens, et omnia concludens mens, ipse et Pater. Id. l. 2. cap. xxviii. n. 5. p. 57.

See the passage of Vitringa quoted just now, at note (m) p. 434. wisdom

wisdom ought to be understood as spoken of by Solomon, was shown formerly, if I may be allowed to say so, in a discourse upon Prov. viii. 17. Moreover the beginning of St. John's gospel should be compared with the beginning of his first epistle, particularly, ch. i. 1, 2.

According to the account now given, what St. John says at the beginning, is a very proper introduction to his gospel: where he largely shows the guilt of those, who rejected the manifestation of the wisdom, the word, the will of God, in the person of Jesus.

Upon the whole, I see no reason to think, that, in the introduction to his gospel, St. John opposed any Christian heresies, or had any regard to them.

Consequently, the foregoing argument, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, or about the time of that event remains entire.

XI. I shall now mention some observations upon this gospel.

1. There is no need to show here, particularly, from the gospel itself, as we did of the former evangelists, that St. John did not write his gospel, till after converts had been made from among gentiles: because it is allowed by all, that St. John did not write, till after the other evangelists, about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or afterwards: before which time the apostles must have left Judea, to go abroad, and preach to gentiles. Nevertheless one signal passage may be here taken notice of, which is not far from the beginning of this gospel. Ch. i. 11, 12, 13. *He came to his own, and his own received him not: but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* That is, 'he came to the Jews, and first appeared, and taught among them, and they generally rejected him. But upon all who believed in him, whether Jews or Gentiles, of whatever country, or nation, or people they were, he bestowed the privilege of being the people of God, and all the blessings appertaining to them.'

2. Eusebius says, 'The other three evangelists have recorded the actions of our Saviour for one year only, after the imprisonment of John the Baptist.' Jerom speaks to the like purpose in his book of Illustrious Men, just now transcribed. But it should have been said, 'one year, and some-

† See vol. X. p. 173, 174.

‡ See vol. III. p. 76.

§ See vol. IV. p. 226.

¶ See before, p. 189.

what more:’ meaning the time and actions of our Lord’s most public ministry. For it seems to me, that the ancients supposed our Lord’s ministry to have lasted, in the whole, somewhat more than two years; as was shown vol. II. p. 423, 424. Eusebius indeed computed * our Lord’s ministry to have consisted of three years and a half, and supposed St. John’s gospel to have in it four passovers. He seems to have been the first Christian, who advanced that opinion: and he is now generally followed by harmonizers of the gospels, and by ecclesiastical historians. Sir Isaac Newton † however computes five passovers in our Saviour’s ministry; as does likewise Dr. Edward Wells in his *Historical Geography of the New Testament*. And others may be of the same opinion, or make more. But none of these opinions appear to me, to have any foundation in the gospels. The opinion of Eusebius, and those who follow him, is much more probable, than theirs who yet farther enlarge the number of the passovers of our Saviour’s ministry. The first passover in St. John is that mentioned by him ch. ii. 13. At ch. v. 1. it is said: *After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.* They who follow Eusebius, and make four passovers in our Lord’s ministry, reckon this feast to be a passover. But they who compute his ministry to have lasted only two years, and somewhat more, suppose this to be some other feast, possibly, the feast of tabernacles, next succeeding the passover, mentioned ch. ii. 13. At ch. vi. 4. *And the passover, a feast of the Jews was nigh:* this, according to different computations, is either the second, or the third passover in our Lord’s ministry. The third, or, according to others, the fourth, is that mentioned by all the evangelists, at which our Lord suffered. It is mentioned by St. John, ch. xi. 55. and xii. 1.

3. St. John has omitted the greatest part of those things, which are recorded by the other evangelists: which much confirms the testimony of ancient writers, that the first three gospels were written, and published among the faithful before St. John wrote; that they were brought to him, and that he affirmed the truth of their relations, but said, that some discourses and miracles of our Saviour were omitted by them, which might be usefully recorded.

Indeed, there is little or nothing in his gospel, which is not new and additional, except the account of our Saviour’s pro-

* See vol. IV. p. 264.

† Observations upon Daniel, p. 156, 157.

secution, death and resurrection, where all four coincide in many particulars: though even here also St. John has divers things peculiar to himself. In St. John's gospel is no account of our Saviour's nativity, nor of his baptism by John; though, undoubtedly, it is there supposed, and referred to. He takes no notice of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderness, nor of the call, or names of the twelve apostles, nor of their mission in our Saviour's life time, nor of our Lord's parables, or other discourses of his, recorded by them, nor of our Saviour's journies, of which they give an account, nor any of those predictions relating to the desolations of Jerusalem, which are in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Nor has he any miracles recorded by them, excepting only, that one of the multiplication of small provision for feeding five thousand, with the extraordinary circumstances of the return to Capernaum from the country, where that miracle had been wrought, ch. vi. 4—21. And it is likely, that this miracle was recorded by him, for the sake of the discourses, to which it gave occasion, and which follow there, ver. 22—71.

However, it should be observed, that he has one thing recorded by all the evangelists, Peter's striking a servant of the high priest, and cutting off his ear. Ch. xviii. 10. *Then Simon Peter having a sword, drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus.* Which, as St. Luke informs us, Jesus touched, and healed. ch. xxii. 51. Peter's action is mentioned by all the three evangelists, Matt. xxvi. 51. Mark xiv. 47. Luke xxii. 50. But St. John alone mentions Peter by name, and the name of the servant. I thought proper to take notice of this, though St. John does not particularly mention the miracle of healing.

St. John likewise, ch. ii. 14—22. gives an account of our Lord's cleansing the temple at his first passover, when he went to Jerusalem. All the other evangelists have a like account of our Lord's cleansing the temple at his last passover, Matt. xxi. 12, 13. Mark xi. 15, 16. Luke xix. 45, 46. But I suppose them to be quite different actions, and that our blessed Lord twice cleansed the temple, as already shown.

4. Though the first three evangelists have not particularly recorded our Saviour's several journies to Jerusalem, as St. John has done, but have only given a particular account of his preaching there at his last passover, they were not unacquainted with them.

This

This may be concluded from divers things in their histories. To those, who came to apprehend him, our Lord said: *I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.* Matt. xxvi. 55. And compare Mark xiv. 49. Luke xxii. 53. And among the accusations brought against him by the Jewish Rulers before Pilate, they say: *He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee to this place,* Luke xxiii. 5. Peter preaching at Jerusalem, soon after our Lord's ascension, says: *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs: which God did by him in the midst of you, as yourselves also know,* Acts ii. 22. And at the house of Cornelius, in Cæsarea: *That word, you know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee,* Acts x. 37.—*And we are witnesses of all things, which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and at Jerusalem,* ver. 39. And it appears from their histories, that our Lord's fame had early reached Jerusalem. Many attended him in Galilee from thence, and from other parts. Says St. Matthew: *And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan,* ch. iv. 25. Comp. Mark iii. 7, 8. Again: *And the scribes, which came from Jerusalem, said: He has Belzeub.*—Mark iii. 22—30. Compare Matt. ix. 34. Luke xi. 14—26. *Then came to Jesus scribes and pharisees, which were of Jerusalem,* Matt. xv. 1. Compare Mark vii. 1. And says St. Luke, ch. v. 17. *And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were pharisees, and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judea, and Jerusalem; and the power of the Lord was present to heal them.* And in every one of the evangelists we may meet with scribes and pharisees, opposing our Lord, watching his words and actions, cavilling with him, and reflecting upon him, and his disciples.

Moreover in St. Luke, ch. ix. 51—56. is an account of a remarkable incident, when our Lord was going from Galilee through Samaria to Jerusalem, at one of their feasts: supposed by ^z some to be the feast of tabernacles, by others ^a the feast of dedication, preceding his last passover. See likewise Luke xiii. 22. and xvii. 11.

However, after all, I do not think it was needful, that our Lord should go often to Jerusalem, or that all his journeys

^z Vid. Cleric. Harmon. p. 234. *mily Expositor.* Sect. 127. Vol. II. 235. ^a See Dr. Doddridge's *Fa-* p. 183.

thither, and discourses there, should be recorded. It was indeed highly expedient, that his ministry should be public: so it might be, without going often to Jerusalem. John the Baptist was a man of great reputation, though he never went up to Jerusalem during the time of his showing himself unto Israel, that we know of, Luke i. 80. And it is manifest from the first three Evangelists, as well as from St. John, that our Lord's ministry was very public, and well known in all parts of Judea, and the regions round about, and to men of all ranks therein. In them we find our Lord to have been notified before-hand by John the Baptist. He sent out once his twelve apostles, and then seventy other disciples, *two by two, to go before him, and prepare men for him, in every city and place where he should come.* In them we find him teaching in synagogues, in cities, and villages, and desert places, crowded by throngs, attended by multitudes of people, and miraculously feeding at one time five thousand, at another four thousand men, beside women and children.

It was fit, that our Lord's ministry should be very public; it is manifest, from all the four evangelists, that it was so; which cannot but be the ground of great satisfaction to us.

5. The genuineness of the twenty-first or last chapter of St. John's gospel ought not to be contested.

Grotius indeed was of opinion, that ^b St. John concluded his gospel with the words, which are at the end of the twentieth chapter: and that what is in the twenty-first chapter was added after St. John's death by the church of Ephesus.

Against that opinion the general, or ^c even universal consent of manuscripts and versions is a great objection. For it is very probable, that this gospel was published before St. John's death. And if there had been an edition without this chapter,

^b Omnino arbitror, quæ hic sequantur conclusionem essetotius operis, et ibi finiisse Joannem librum, quem edidit. At sicut caput ultimum Pentateuchi, et caput ultimum Josuæ post Mosis. et Josuæ mortem additum est a Synedrio Hebræorum: ita et caput quod sequitur post mortem Joannis additum ab Ecclesia Ephesina, hoc maxime sine, ut ostenderetur impletum quod de longavitate ac non violenta morte Joannis Dominus prædixerat, &c. Grot. ad Joh. xx. 30.

^c Cæterum in tanto codicum. et versionum consensu, eoque prorsus universali, cogitari non debebat, caput hoc ab Ecclesia demum Ephesina accessisse. Quis enim negare tuto potest, Evangelium Joannis ante ipsius obitum, adeoque ante additum hoc, quod creditur, supplementum accessisse? Et quis crediderit, vel sic omnes codices in exhibendo isto capite tam constanter consentire potuisse? Wolf. in Joh. cap. xxi. in.

it is very likely, that it would have been wanting in some copies. To which may be added, that we do not find, that any of the ancient christian writers ever made a question, whether this chapter was composed by St. John, or by another. Finally, ^d the style is St. John's. In chapter xix. 35. *And he that saw it bare record; and his record is true: and he knoweth, that he says true.* Here xxi. 24. *This is the disciple, which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know, that his testimony is true.* Compare likewise ver. 7. and 20. The last words of the chapter, at ver. 25. are these: *And there are also many other things, which Jesus did: the which if they should be written every one, I suppose, that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.* Which clause evidently is from the same person, who wrote ver. 30, and 31, of ch. xx. Here the evangelist seems to check himself, and to determine not to proceed any farther. For if he should attempt to commit to writing every thing which Jesus had said and done, he should never come to an end.

^e Says Dr. Whitby upon ch. xx. 31. 'Some think, that St. John here ended his gospel, and that the following chapter was written by some other hands. But these words give no ground for that imagination: since other apostles, after they seem to have concluded their epistles, add some new matter: as may be seen in the conclusions of the epistles to the Romans, and to the Hebrews.' See Rom. ch. xv. and xvi. Heb. xiii. 21—25. I would likewise refer to Mr. Lensant's note upon ch. xxi. 24. who also asserts the genuineness of this last chapter.

^d Rejicimus hic sententiam eorum, qui ab alia manu, quam ipsius Joannis Evangelistæ hoc caput esse adjectum putant. Nam ita clare stilum redolet Apostoli, ut si aliquis alius id adjecisset, non sine impostura istud facere potuisset. Neque enim se Joannem vocat, sed more suo discipulum, quem Jesus amabat. ver. 7. 20. Tum hæc addit: Hic est discipulus ille, qui de his testatur, et hæc scripsit. ver. 24. Quæ defendi non possunt a mendacio, si quisquam alius præter Apostolum hoc caput adjecisset. Adde, quod diligentissimi circa tales circumstantias Patres, Eusebius, Hieronymus, atque alii, non ita plene silentio id involvissent, &c. Fr. Lamp. in Jo. Evang. cap. xxi. tom. III. p. 720, 721. Vid. et Mill. Proleg. num. 249, 250.

C H A P. X.

The Question considered, whether any of the first three Evangelists had seen the Gospels of the others, before he wrote.

HERE I shall in the first place mention the different sentiments of learned moderns concerning this point. And then I intend to consider the merits of the question.

Calvin ^a in the preface to his Harmony of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, declares it to be his opinion, that St. Mark was so far from having abridged St. Matthew's gospel, that he thinks he had never seen it: which he also supposes to have been St. Luke's case.

This likewise must have been the opinion of Basnage. For he supposeth ^b St. Luke's to have been the first written of all the gospels. Consequently this evangelist could not borrow either from St. Matthew, or St. Mark.

Mr. Whiston in ^c his Harmony of the four Evangelists called St. Mark the epitomizer of St. Matthew. Mr. Jones, in his Vindication of St. Matthew's gospel, well, and largely argued against that opinion.

Mr. Dodwell declared his opinion upon this subject after this manner: 'That ^d none of the first three evangelists had seen 'the others' gospels. Otherwise there could not have been in

^a Mihi certe magis probabile est, et ex re ipsa conjicere licet, nunquam librum Matthæi fuisse ab eo inspectum, cum ipse suum scriberet: tantum abest, ut in compendium ex professo redigere voluerit. Idem et de Luca judicium facio. Calvin. argum. in Evangel. &c.

^b Basn. Ann. 60. num. xxxi.

^c P. 102.

^d Sic latuerant in illis terrarum angulis, in quibus scripta fuerant. Evangelia, ut ne quidem resciverint recentiores Evangelistæ, quid scripsissent de iisdem rebus antiquiores. Aliter foret ne tot essent *εναντιοφάνη*, quæ fere a prima usque canonis constitutione eruditorum hominum ingenia exercuerint. Certe S. Lucas si genealogiam illam Domini in Matthæo vidisset, non aliam ipsæ, nihilque fere habentem com-

mune, produxisset, ne quidem minima consilii tam diversi edita ratione. S. Matthæus, qui solus e nostris Luca erat antiquior ipse erat *αυτοπτης* — S. Joannis Luca longo erat intervallo in scriptione junior. Junior etiam S. Marcus, si quidem S. Lucas eo scripsit anno Evangelium, quo Acta terminavit Apostolorum. Quod ego sane puto verisimillimum. Sunt enim Acta *δευτερος* ejusdem operis *λογος*, cujus *πρωτον λογον* ipse suum agnoscit Evangelium. Act. i. 1. — Ita quo anno scriptum est a S. Luca Evangelium secundus fluxerit Apostolo Paulo annus captivitatis Romanæ. Eo enim usque Actorum historia perducta est. S. autem Marcus, seu post obitum Petri, seu non multo ante, scripsisse videtur. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. num. xxxix.

^e them

‘ them so many seeming contradictions, which have exercised
 ‘ the thoughts of inquisitive men almost ever since the form-
 ‘ ing of the canon of the New Testament. Certainly, if St.
 ‘ Luke had seen the genealogy of our Lord, which is in St.
 ‘ Matthew, he would not have published another so very dif-
 ‘ ferent, without assigning any reason for it.—St. Matthew is
 ‘ the only one of our evangelists, who wrote before St. Luke.
 ‘ —St. John did not write till long after St. Luke. Nor did
 ‘ Mark write till after St. Luke, if he wrote his gospel in the
 ‘ same year that he finished the Acts of the apostles; which
 ‘ seems to me very probable: for the Acts are the second book
 ‘ of the same work, as is evident from what himself says Acts i.
 ‘ 1. St. Luke’s gospel therefore was written in the second year
 ‘ of the apostle Paul’s imprisonment at Rome; for so far the
 ‘ history of the Acts reaches. But St. Mark seems not to have
 ‘ written until after the death of St. Peter, or not long before
 ‘ it.’ This then is the order of the four evangelists, accord-
 ing to Mr. Dodwell; Matthew the first, Luke the second,
 Mark the third, and John the fourth.

How Mr. Le Clerc argued on the same side, was seen formerly.

On the other hand, Grotius says, it is manifest from comparing their gospels, that Mark made use of Matthew.

Mill has spoken largely to this point in his Prolegomena. He says, it was not the design of St. Mark, to make an abridgment of St. Matthew’s gospel, as some have supposed. For he does not always follow St. Matthew’s order, as an abridger would have done: and he is oftentimes more prolix in his histories of the same thing than St. Matthew, and has inserted many additional things, and some of great moment for illustrating the evangelical history.—Nay^h so

^e See vol. V. p. 95, 96.

^f Usus esse Marcum Matthæi Evangelio apertum facit collatio. Grot. ad Marc. cap. i. ver. 1.

^g Ipsam Evangelii structuram quod attinet, neutiquam Marco institutum fuit, quod nonnullis videtur, Evangelium Matthæi in epitomen redigere. Præterquam enim quod servatum a Matthæo ordinem non ubique sequatur, quod sane epitomatoris foret, in ejusdem rei narratione Matthæo haud raro prolixior est, ac plurima passim inserta

habet, eaque subinde magni ad elucidandam historiam momenti. Proleg. num. 103.

^h Imo certe adeo nihil Marco erat in animo de abbreviando Matthæi Evangelio, ut haud desint magni nominis auctores, qui existimant, a Marco ne quidem visum fuisse Evangelium Matthæi.... Cæterum contrarium evincit, Evangelium imprimis Matthæi et Marci quod attinet, istorum phraseos, ipsique contextus similitudo. Ibid. n. 107.

‘ far was Mark from intending to abbreviate St. Matthew’s
 ‘ gospel, that there have been men of great fame, as Calvin,
 ‘ and our Dodwell, who were of opinion, that St. Mark and
 ‘ Luke had never seen Matthew’s gospel. However, Gro-
 ‘ tius was of a different opinion. And indeed the great resem-
 ‘ blance of the style and composition of these two Evangelists
 ‘ manifests the truth of it.’

Of St. Luke Mill says: ‘ Nothing † is more evident, than
 ‘ that he made use of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. For
 ‘ he has borrowed from them many phrases and expressions,
 ‘ and even whole paragraphs word for word.’

But there is not sufficient foundation for such strong asser-
 tions, in the account which Mill himself gives of the time of
 writing the first three gospels: for, according to him, St.
 Matthew’s gospel was published in ^k the year 61, St.
 Mark’s ^l in 63, St. Luke’s ^m in 64; which is but one
 year later. Nor has Mill made it out, that St. Mark’s
 was published so soon as the year 63. For he owns, that it
 was not written till after Peter’s and Paul’s departure from
 Rome; which could not be, till after the year 63. How
 then could St. Luke make so much use of St. Mark’s gospel,
 as is pretended?

I allege but one author more, relating to this point. Mr.
 Wetstein says, that ⁿ Mark made use of Matthew: and of
 St. Luke he says, ‘ that ^o he transcribed many things from
 Matthew, and yet more from Mark.’

But may I not say, that before Mr. Wetstein asserted such
 things, he should have given at least some tolerable account
 of the times, when the evangelists wrote, and that St. Mark
 was prior in time to Luke? Which I do not perceive him
 to have done. St. Matthew’s gospel, indeed, he supposes
 to have been written ^p in the eighth year after our Lord’s
 ascension. But of St. Luke he observes, that ^q ecclesiastical
 writers say, he published his gospel at about fifteen, or as

ⁱ Certe vulgatum fuisse illud post
 editionem Evangeliorum Matthæi et
 Marci, ex collatione trium horum
 inter se luce clarius apparet. Nihil
 scilicet evidentius, quam D. Lucam
 Evangeliorum Matthæi et Marci ip-
 sa ^r $\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, phrases et locutiones, imo
 vero totas pericopas, in suum non-
 nunquam $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$ traduxisse. Ib.

num. 116.

^k Proleg. num. 61.

^l Ibid. num. 101. ^m Ibid. num.
 112.

ⁿ De Marco ap. T. Gr.
 T. I. p. 552.

^o Lucam multa
 ex Matthæo, ex Marco plura de-
 scripsisse, ex collatione patet. De
 Luca ibid. p. 643.

^p Ibid. p. 223.

^q Ibid. p. 643.

others about two and twenty years after our Saviour's ascension. His account of St. Mark is, 'that' he was with 'Peter at Babylon. Thence he came to Rome, and was 'with St. Paul during his captivity there, Col. iv. 10. 'Philem. 23. Then he went to Colosse. Afterwards at 'the desire of the apostle he came to him thence to Rome, '2 Tim. iv. 11. Where he is said to have written his gospel, abridging St. Matthew, and adding some things, 'which he had heard from Peter.' A very fine character of our evangelist, truly! But according to this account of St. Mark's travels, and of the place, where his gospel was written, it could not be published before the year 64, or 65. How then could St. Luke make use of it, if he wrote so soon as fifteen or two and twenty years after Christ's ascension?

I proceed now to speak more distinctly to the merits of the question.

1. It does not appear, that any of the learned ancient christian writers had a suspicion, that any of the first three evangelists had seen the other histories, before they wrote. They say indeed, 'that when the three first written gospels 'had been delivered to all men, they were also brought 'to St. John, and that he confirmed the truth of their narration: but said, there were some things omitted by them, 'which might be profitably related:' or, 'that he wrote 'last, supplying some things, which had been omitted by 'the former evangelists.' After this manner speak Eusebius of Cæsarea, Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Jerom. Not now to mention any others. Augustine indeed about the end of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth, supposeth^y the first three evangelists not to have been totally ignorant of each other's labours, and considers Mark's gospel as an abridgment of St. Matthew's. But, as^z formerly observed, so far as I know, he is the first, in which that opinion is found: nor does it appear, that he was followed by succeeding writers.

^r Postea videtur Petro adhæsisse, et cum eo Babylone fuisse. 1 Pet. v. 13. Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum invisit. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 23. Inde ad Colossenses abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. ubi Evan-

gelium conscripsisse, et Mattheum quidem in compendium redegisse, nonnulla vero, quæ a Petro audiverat, adjecisse dicitur. Ibid. p. 551. ^s See vol. IV. p. 225, 226. ^c p. 315. ^u p. 512. ^x Vol. V. p. 41. ^y p. 93. ^z p. 96.

2. It is not suitable to the character of any of the evangelists, that they should abridge, or transcribe another historian.

St. Matthew was an apostle, and eye-witness: consequently, he was able to write of his own knowledge. Or, if there were any parts of our Lord's ministry, at which he was not present, he might obtain information from his fellow-apostles, or other eye-witnesses. And as for other things, which happened before the apostles were called to follow him, concerning his nativity, infancy, and youth; as Augustine ^a says, these the apostles might know from Christ himself, or from his parents, or his friends and acquaintance, who were to be depended upon.

St. Mark, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples, was an early Jewish believer, acquainted with all the apostles, Peter in particular, and with many other eye-witnesses: consequently, well qualified to write a gospel. Mill ^b himself has been so good, as to acknowledge this.

St. Luke, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples, nor an eye-witness, was a disciple, and companion of apostles, especially of Paul, as is universally allowed: and he must therefore have been well qualified to write a gospel. Moreover, as ^c has been shown, it is manifest from his introduction, that he knew not of any authentic history of Jesus Christ, that had been yet written. And he expressly says of himself, *that he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first*, and he professeth *to write of them to Theophilus in order*. After all this to say, that he transcribed many things from one historian, and yet more from another, so far as I am able to judge, is no less than a contradiction of the evangelist himself.

^a p. 93. ^b Marcus ille, quisquis fuerit, ad Evangelium conscribendum abunde instructus accedebat. Si enim filius fuit Mariæ, civis istius Hierosolymitanæ—ei sane jam a tempore conversionis tam frequens intercesserat, ac plane familiare cum ipsius Apostolis commercium, ut vix aliqua ætatis suæ pars ipsorum consortio vacaret: ita ut quotidie ab illis petere liceret de dictis ac factis Domini παραδόντας, quas conferret

in commentarium. Sane, quisquis fuerit hic Marcus, apud Veteres plane convenit, fuisse cum D. Petri comitem et interpretem: ipsumque comitatum fuisse Romam usque—adeo ut ex Apostoli κηρυσσόμενοις acceperit necesse sit plenissimam et exactissimam historię totius evangelicę cognitionem. Mill. Proleg. n. 102.

^c See before, p. 42—44.

3. The nature and design of the first three gospels manifestly show, that the evangelists had not seen any authentic written history of Jesus Christ.

This is one of the observations of Le Clerc relating to this point: ‘ We ^a can scarcely doubt, whether St. John had
‘ seen the other three gospels. For as he is said to have
‘ lived to a great age, so it appears from his gospel itself,
‘ that he took care not to repeat things related by them,
‘ except a few only, and those necessary things. But I do
‘ not see how it can be reckoned certain that Mark knew
‘ of Matthew’s having written a gospel before him: or that
‘ Luke knew, that they two had written gospels before him.
‘ If Mark had seen the work of Matthew, it is likely that
‘ he would have remained satisfied with it, as being the
‘ work of an apostle of Christ, that is, an eye-witness, which
‘ he was not.’ And what there follows.

I must enlarge upon this observation. I forbear to insist now on the genealogies, which are in St. Matthew and St. Luke only. But I say, that the writings of all and each one of these three evangelists contain an entire gospel, or a complete history of the ministry of Jesus Christ: or, to borrow St. Luke’s expressions, Acts i. 1, 2. a history of *all that Jesus both did and taught, until the day, in the which he was taken up to heaven.* For in all and every one of them is the history of our Lord’s fore-runner, his baptism, preaching, and death, and of our Lord’s being baptized by him: when, by a voice from heaven, he was proclaimed to be the Messiah. Then follows our Lord’s temptation in the wilderness. After which is an account of our Lord’s preaching, and his beginning to gather disciples, the choice of the twelve apostles, and their names: and our Lord’s going over the land of Israel, preaching the doctrine of the kingdom, attended by his twelve apostles, in synagogues, and in cities and villages, working all kinds of healing and saving miracles, upon all sorts of persons, in all places, in the presence of multitudes, and before scribes and pharisees, as well as others: A particular mission of his apostles, in the land of Israel. Our Lord’s transfiguration on the mount, when there appeared Moses and Elias talking with him, and there came a voice from heaven, saying: *This is my beloved Son. Hear him.* His going up to Jerusalem, and making a public entrance into the city, then cleansing the temple, where

^a See vol. V. p. 96.

he often taught the people, and preached the gospel, and openly asserted his authority and character: keeping the passover with his disciples, and instituting a memorial of himself: his last sufferings, and death, with the behaviour of Judas, the traitor, Peter, and the rest of the disciples: his burial, resurrection, with the evidences of it, and the general commission to his apostles, to preach the gospel in all the world, and to all sorts of persons therein.

Here are all the integrals of a gospel. And they are properly filled up. And all these things are in all and every one of the first three evangelists: which shows, that they did not know of each other's writings. For it cannot be thought, that they should be disposed to say the same things over and over, or to repeat what had been well said already. St. John, who had seen the other three gospels, has little in common with them: almost every thing in his gospel is new and additional. So it would have been with every other writer in the like circumstances.

And if St. Matthew's gospel had been written at about eight, or fifteen, or twenty years after our Lord's ascension, and had become generally known among the faithful, (as it certainly would, soon after it was written:) it is not improbable, that we should have had but two gospels, his and St. John's. Or if there had been several, they would all, except the first, have been in the manner of supplements, like St. John's, not entire gospels, like those of the first three evangelists.

This consideration appears to me of great moment, for showing that our first three evangelists are all independent witnesses. Indeed it seems to me to be quite satisfactory, and decisive.

4. There are in these three gospels, as was observed just now by Mr. Dodwell, many seeming contradictions: which have exercised the skill of thoughtful men to reconcile them. This is another argument, that these evangelists did not write by concert, or after having seen each others gospels.

5. In some histories, which are in all these three evangelists, there are small varieties and differences, which plainly show the same thing. I shall allege two or three instances only.

1.) In Matth. viii. 28---34. Mark v. 1---20. Luke viii. 26---40. is the account of the cure of the dæmoniac, or dæmoniacs, in the country of the Gadarenes. It is plainly

the same history, as appears from many agreeing circumstances: nevertheless there are several differences. St. Matthew speaks of two men, St. Mark and St. Luke of one only. In Mark alone it is said, that the man was always night and day in the mountains, crying, and cutting himself with stones. And he alone mentions the number of the swine that were drowned. He likewise says, that the man besought our Lord much, that he would not send them away out of the country. St. Luke says: the dæmons besought him, that he would not command them to go out into the deep, or abyss. Surely these evangelists did not abridge, or transcribe each others writings.

2.) In Matt. xvii. 1 — 13. Mark ix. 1 --- 13. Luke ix. 28 — 36. are the accounts of our Lord's transfiguration on the mount. Where St. Matthew says: *his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light.* St. Mark: *And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them.* St. Luke: *And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glittering.* It is plain, I think, that none had seen what the other had written. In the description of the splendor of our Lord's person, and garments, each one follows his own fancy. In St. Matthew and St. Mark are comparisons; but they are different. In St. Luke there is no comparison at all.

3.) The third instance shall be what follows next in all the three evangelists, after our Lord was come down from the mount. Matt. xvii. 14 — 21. Mark ix. 14 — 29. Luke ix. 37 — 42. In this history of the healing the young man, who had the epilepsy, where St. Mark is more particular and prolix, than the other evangelists, there are many differences: I take notice of a very few only. In St. Matthew the father of the child says: Lord, have mercy on my son, for he is lunatic, and sore vexed: and the healing him is thus related. *And Jesus rebuked the demon, and he departed out of him. And the child was cured from that very hour.* In St. Mark the father of the child says to our Lord: *Master, I have brought unto thee my son, who has a dumb spirit.* And when our Lord healed him, *he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him: Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him.* And what follows. In St. Luke the father says: *Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son, for he is my only child.*

Certainly,

Certainly, he who observes these things, must be sensible, that these historians did not borrow from each other: there are many other like instances: to mention them all would be endless.

I shall add a consideration or two more, which must be allowed to be of some weight in this question.

6. There are some things in St. Matthew's gospel, very remarkable, of which no notice is taken either by St. Mark, or St. Luke.

I intend, particularly, the visit of the Magians, with the causes of it, and its circumstances, and then the consequences of it, our Saviour's flight into Egypt, and the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, and near it. Matt. ii. The dream of Pilate's wife. ch. xxvii. 19. the affair of the Roman guard at the sepulchre. ch. xxviii. 11—15. *an earthquake, rending of rocks, and the resurrection of many saints, who came out of their graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.* ch. xxvii. 51—53.

These are as extraordinary things, as any in the gospels: and if St. Mark, or St. Luke, had written with a view of abridging, or confirming St. Matthew's history, some, or all of these things, would have been taken notice of by them. It is also very observable that St. Luke has no account of the miracle of feeding *four thousand with seven loaves and a few little fishes*, which is in Matt. xv. 32—39. Mark viii. 1—9.

And what has been just now said of St. Matthew, particularly, may be also applied to St. Luke, supposing his to have been the first written gospel: for in him also are many remarkable things, not to be found in the other gospels. And if St. Matthew or St. Mark had written with a view of abridging or confirming St. Luke's history, those things would not have been passed over by them without any notice.

7. All the first three evangelists have many things peculiar to themselves: which shows, that they did not borrow from each other, and that they were all well acquainted with the things, of which they undertook to write a history.

Many such things are in Matthew, as is well known to all: I therefore need not enlarge on them; and a few of them were just now taken notice of.

St. Mark likewise has many things peculiar to himself, not mentioned by any other evangelist: a catalogue of them was made by us^e formerly, though far from being complete.

^e See before, p. 99—104.

The same is true of St. Luke. As much was observed by Irenæus, who says, 'there are many, and those necessary parts of the gospel, which we know from Luke only.' His brief enumeration of those things was transcribed by us into this work † long ago. Let me also rehearse them here somewhat differently. His general introduction, the birth of John the Baptist, and many extraordinary things, attending it. The Roman census made in Judea, by Cyrenius, or before that made by Cyrenius, which brought Joseph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem; the mean circumstances of our Lord's nativity; the notification of it to shepherds by an angel; his circumcision; Mary's purification at the temple; the prophecies of Simeon and Anna there; our Lord's going up to Jerusalem at the age of twelve years. ch. ii. The names of the emperor and other princes, in whose time John the Baptist and our Lord began to preach, and our Lord's age at that time; a genealogy different from Matthew, ch. iii. In St. Luke are also divers miracles, not recorded elsewhere. A numerous draught of fishes, ch. v. 4—9. The cures of Mary Magdalene, Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Sufanna, ch. viii. 2, 3; giving speech to a dumb man. ch. xi. 14; a woman healed in a synagogue of an infirmity, under which she had laboured eighteen years. ch. xiii. 10—17; the man cured of a dropsy on a sabbath day, in the house of a pharisee, ch. xiv. 1—4. Ten lepers cured at once, ch. xvii. 12—19. the ear of Malchus healed, ch. xxii. 50, 51; the son of a widow of Naim raised to life, in the sight of multitudes, when he was carried out to burial, ch. vii. 11—17; a miracle of resurrection, related by no other evangelist. In him alone is the mission of the seventy disciples, ch. x. 1—20. Divers beautiful parables spoken by our Lord, which are not to be found elsewhere: the parable of the good Samaritan, ch. x. 25 — 37; the parable of the lost piece of silver, and the prodigal son, ch. xv. 8—32; of the unjust steward, xvi. 1—12; the rich man and Lazarus, ver. 19—31; the importunate widow, xviii. 1—8. the pharisee and publican, that went up to the temple to pray, ver. 9—14. To St. Luke also are peculiar our Lord's entertainment at the house of a pharisee, where came in a woman that was a sinner; ch. vii. 36—50; his entertainment at the house of Martha, ch. x. 38—42; the history of

† Vol. II. p. 159—161.

Zaccheus, ch. xix. 1—10; our Lord's agony in the garden, ch. xxii. 43, 44; the penitent thief on the cross, ch. xxiii. 39—43; and a particular account of the two disciples going to Emmaus, ch. xxiv. 13—35.

All these, and many other things, which I omit, are peculiar to St. Luke. And did he transcribe many things from St. Matthew, and yet more from St. Mark?

Mill's argument, taken from the similitude of style and composition, to prove, that these evangelists had seen each other's writings, appears to be insufficient. And himself allows, that ^s two authors writing upon the same subject in the Greek language may easily agree very much in expression.

I have insisted the more upon this point, because I think, that to say the evangelists abridged and transcribed each other, without giving any hint of their so doing, is a great disparagement to them: and it likewise diminisheth the value and importance of their testimony. Said Mr. Le Clerc, before quoted, 'They ^h seem to think more justly, who say, that the first three evangelists were unacquainted with each other's design. In that way greater weight accrues to their testimony. When witnesses agree, who have first laid their heads together, they are suspected. But witnesses, who testify the same thing separately, without knowing what others have said, are justly credited.'

This is not a new opinion, lately thought of: nor has it been taken up by me, out of opposition to any. I have all my days read, and admired the first three evangelists, as independent, and harmonious witnesses. And I know not how to forbear ranking the other opinion among those bold, as well as groundless assertions, in which critics too often indulge themselves, without considering the consequences.

^s Verum quidem est, eum esse lingue hujus, quæ Evangelistis in usu erat, Hellenisticæ genium, eam indolem, ut in unum ferme eundemque dicendi characterem, quoties de una eademque materia agitur, sese efformet: ita ut diversi in hoc

genere scriptores, unum idemque aliquod argumentum particulare tractantes, stylo ac sermonis tenore haud ab simili usuri essent, &c. Prol. num. 108.

^h See Vol. V. p. 95.

C H A P. XI.

S T. P A U L.

I. *His History before his Conversion, and his general Character.* II. *The Time of his Conversion.* III. *Observations upon his Conversion, and the Circumstances of things at that time in Judea.* IV. *His age at the Time of his Conversion.* V. *When he was made an Apostle.* VI. *The History of his Travels, and Preaching: particularly, from the Time of his Conversion and Apostleship, to his coming from Damascus to Jerusalem, the first time, after his Conversion.* VII. *From his coming first to Jerusalem to his being brought to Antioch by Barnabas.* VIII. *To his coming up to Jerusalem with the Contributions of the Christians at Antioch.* IX. *To his coming to the Council at Jerusalem about the year 49.* X. *To his coming to Jerusalem with Contributions of divers Gentile Churches, in the year 58, when he was apprehended, and imprisoned.* XI. *To the End of his imprisonment at Rome.* XII. *To the time of his death.*

I. SAUL, called also PAUL, by which name he was generally called, after his preaching in gentile countries, and, particularly, ^a among Greeks and Romans, a descendant of the patriarch Abraham, one of God's ancient chosen people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, was ^b a native of Tarsus, then the chief city of Cilicia. He was also by birth a ^c citizen of Rome. How he became entitled to that privilege, has been distinctly shown ^d in another place. His father ^e was a pharisee, and himself was of the same sect. He had a sister, whose son was a Christian, and a

^a Acts xiii. 9. *Then Saul, who also is called Paul*] Σαυλος δε ο και Παυλος. Id est, qui ex quo cum Romanis conversari cœpit, hoc nomine, a suo non abludente, cœpit a Romanis appellari. Sic qui Jesus Judæis, Græcis Jason: Hillel, Pollio:—apud Romanos Silas, Silvanus, ut notavit Hieronymus. Grot. in Act. xiii. 9.

Hoc primum loco cœpit Apostolus a Lucâ Paulus dici, quem ubique antea Saulum vocavit. Nec deinceps alio, quam Pauli nomine usquam vocabit.—Alii igitur apostolum jam inde ab initio binominem fuisse putant, ut ex altero homine Judæus, ex

altero Romanus civis esse intelligeretur. Alii cum religione nomen cum mutasse putant, cum ex Phariseo fieret Christianus.—Sunt demum qui a Sergio Paulo Proconsule ad Christum converso hoc cognomen adeptum esse putent.—Ac facile mihi quidem persuadeo, primum a Proconsulis Romani familiâ ita vocari cœpisse. Bez. Annot. in Act. xiii. 9. See likewise Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, vol. III. p. 198. note (k) or upon Acts xiii. 9.

^b Acts xxi. 39. xxii. 3. ^c Acts xvi. 37, 38. xxii. 25—29. xxiii. 27.

^d See vol. I. p. 229. ^e Acts xxiii. 6. xxvi. 5. Philip. iii. 5.

discreet

discreet person, who ^f was of great service to his uncle Paul, when a prisoner at Jerusalem. His conduct cannot be thought of without admiration and gratitude. Some others of his relations are mentioned by him in his epistle to the Romans, who also were believers in Jesus, and several of them had been so before himself: which may be reckoned a proof of the virtue and piety of this family. Their names are Andronicus, and Junia, whom he calls *his kinsmen*. *συγγενεις μου*. Rom. xvi. 7. By ^g which he must mean something more than their being his countrymen. He speaks in the like manner of Herodian, ver. 11. and also of Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, ver. 21. It may be reckoned very probable, that (A) he was educated in Greek literature in his early life at Tarsus. It is certain, that ^h he was for a while under the instructions of Gamaliel, at Jerusalem, a celebrated Jewish Rabbi, and that ⁱ he made great proficiency in the study of the law, and the traditions, much esteemed by that people. He seems to have been ^k a person of great natural abilities, of quick apprehension, strong passions, and firm resolution, and thereby qualified for signal service, as a teacher of such principles, as he should embrace, whatever they were. He appears likewise to have been always unblameable in his life, and strictly faithful to the dictates of his conscience, according to the knowledge,

^f Acts xviii. 16—22. ^g *Cognatos suos, id est ejusdem secum generis vocat, ut multi exponunt, quia Judæi erant, quemadmodum supra ix. 3. de Judæis in universum dixit, qui sunt cognati mei secundum carnem: et sic eum loqui, ut Judæorum qui Romæ erant gratiam sibi conciliet. Verum quia multi Romæ erant Judæi Christiani, et proinde hac generali ratione Paulo cognati: idcirco putant alii, cognatos hic dici magis proprie, ut qui fuerint Paulo contribules, id est, de tribu Benjamin: aut forte etiam proprio sanguinis vinculo conjuncti. Est in Rom. xvi. 7.*

(A) This may be argued from the place of his nativity, Tarsus, which was celebrated for polite literature, and from St. Paul's quotations of several Greek poets. Acts xvii. 28. 1 Cor. xv. 33. Tit. i. 12. Dr. Bentley begins his third sermon at Boyle's Lecture, which is the second

upon Acts xvii. 27, 28. in this manner, 'I have said enough in my last, to show the fitness and pertinence of the apostle's discourse — and that he did not talk at random, but was thoroughly acquainted with the several humours and opinions of his auditors. And, as Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, so it is manifest from this chapter alone, if nothing else had been now extant, that St. Paul was a great master in all the learning of the Greeks' ^h Acts xxii. 3.

ⁱ Acts xvii. 3. xxvi. 5. Gal. i. 14. ^k — iectâ Pharisæum, excellenti magnoque ingenio præditum, literarum Judaicarum imprimis peritum, nec Græcarum expertem. J. L. Massem. de Reb. Christian. ante Constantin. sect. 1. n. xv. p. 80.

which

which he had. Of this all must be persuaded, who observe his¹ appeals to the Jews, upon this head, when they were greatly offended with him: and from^m the undissembled satisfaction, which he expresseth upon a serious recollection of his former and later conduct. For some while, after the first appearance of Christianity in the world, he was a bitter enemy, and furious opposer of all who made profession of it. Nevertheless he persisted not long in that course: but was in a very extraordinary manner converted to that faith himself: and ever after he was a steady friend, and zealous advocate for it, and very successful in defending and propagating it, diligently improving the gifts and qualifications extraordinarily vouchsafed him for that purpose. These things are recorded in those writings, which are in the highest esteem, and reckoned sacred among Christians, and indeed are well known to all the world.

II. I am desirous to do my best to settle the time of St. Paul's conversion. If we can do that with some good degree of probability, we shall attain to a near knowledge of the time of St. Stephen's martyrdom: concerning both which events there have been very different opinions in former and later ages. Valesius, in his Annotations upon Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, mentions divers opinions of ancient writersⁿ about the time of St. Stephen's death. As the passage may be acceptable to some, I have placed it below.

Among moderns, Cave thought that^o Stephen was stoned, and Paul converted in the year of our Lord's ascension, the year 33, or the beginning of the year following. Pearson supposeth that^p Stephen was stoned in 34, and Paul converted

¹ Acts xxiii. 1. xxvi. 4, 5.

^m Philip. iii. 6. 1 Tim. i. 13.

² Tim. i. 3.

ⁿ Quo anno Stephanus martyrii coronam adeptus sit, non convenit inter omnes. Alii eodem anno, quo passus est Christus, lapidatum illum volunt. Ita diserte scribitur in Excerptis Chronologicis, quæ cum Eusebii Chronico edidit Scaliger. pag. 68. Et hæc videtur fuisse Eusebii sententia, ut ex hoc loco apparet. — Alii vero triennio post Christi mortem martyrium Stephani retulerunt. — Ita scribit in Chronico

Georgius Syncellus. Multi etiam ulterius processerunt, et Stephanum anno ab ordinatione sua septimo passum esse scripserunt. Inter quos est Evodius apud Nicephorum, et Hippolytus Thebanus, et auctor Chronici Alexandrini, qui anno Claudii primo martyrium Stephani adsignat. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. l. 2. cap. i. ^o — ad fidem Christi conversus, discipulus sit et Apostolus A. C. 33. exeunte, vel saltem ineunte proximo. Hist. Lit. T. I. in S. Paulo. ^p Annal. Paulin. p. 1—4.

in 35, near the end of the year. Having been three years in Arabia, and at Damascus, he came to Jerusalem, near the end of 38; in which year, or the beginning of the following, he went to Tarsus; where, and in Syria, he was four years, that is, 39, 40, 41, 42. Which appears to me a long space of time. In 43, he came to Antioch. And having spent a year there, he came to Jerusalem in 44. So Pearson.

Frederic Spanheim, who also has bestowed great pains in examining this point, placeth the conversion of Paul in the year 40, the last of Caius Caligula: and was inclined to defer it to the first of Claudius, the year 41. Him Witfius follows. And J. A. Fabricius declares his assent to the same opinion.

Lenfant and Beaufobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles, place his conversion in the year 36, and his first coming to Jerusalem after it in 39; which opinion I believe to be nearer the truth than any of the foregoing.

There is an event mentioned in the Acts, about which we may receive light from external history. I mean, *the rest of the churches throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria*, Acts ix. 31.

In the former part of this work it was shown to be very probable, that this rest of the churches of Christ was owing to the state of things in Judea, when Petronius, president of Syria, published the orders which he had received from Caius, to erect his statue in the temple of Jerusalem, in the year of Christ 39, or 40. Which account was afterwards followed by Dr. Benson in his ^u History of the first planting the christian religion. Dr. Doddridge ^x likewise declared his approbation of it.

When I formerly argued, that this rest of the churches was occasioned by the above-mentioned order of the emperor Caius; I did not know that any one had assigned that as the occasion of it. But since, I have perceived, that ^y S. Basnage

^q — in anno conversionis Pauli, quam non anteriorem esse Caii ultimo, audacter pronunciamus. De Conversion. Paulin. Epocha. num. six. Opp. T. II. p. 321.

^r De Vita Pauli. Sect. ii. n. 22. ^s Tan-
^t ap Miletum. Leyd. p. 34. ^u Tan-
tum noto in presentia, me sequi eo-
rum rationes, qui Paulum conver-

sam esse existimant anno quarto sive ultimo Caii. ann. 40. et capite truncatum A. C. 68. Neronis xiv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. III. p. 151. (f).

^v See vol. I. § xii. p. 86—100. especially near the end of that section. ^w See of that work B. I. ch. 9. sect. iii. at the end. ^x Family Expositor, vol. III. p. 147. ^y Mira hæc,

Basnage had thought of it, and spoke to it very well. I was led to my observations by reading Philo, and Josephus: from whom I formed the argument, and overlooked the just mentioned ecclesiastical historian.

I supposed, that ^a Petronius published his order in the year 39, or 40. Basnage ^a and Tillemont ^b say, in the year 40. By whom I am not unwilling to be determined.

It is allowed, that Petronius was sent governor into Syria by Caius in the third year of his reign, A. D. 39. And it is supposed by them, that ^c Petronius came into the province about autumn in the year 39. And Josephus says, 'that ^c Caius, greatly incensed against the Jews for not paying ^c him the same respect that others did, sent Petronius ^c governor into Syria, commanding him to set up his statue ^c in the temple: and if the Jews opposed it, to march into ^c the country with a numerous army, and effect it by force.'

Whenever Petronius published that order, whether in the year 39, or 40, I think it was the occasion of the tranquillity of the churches of Christ, spoken of by St. Luke. And I persuade myself, that most people will readily be of the same opinion.

We will now take a paragraph or two in the Acts, ch. ix. 26—31. *And when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples.——And he was with them, coming in, and going out, at Jerusalem. And he spoke boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians. But they went about to slay him. Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. Then had*

hæc, et præter omnium expectationem exorta rerum vicissitudo fuit. Cui non minimum contulit infelix Judæorum status, quibus a Caligulâ vexatis, timentibusque templi violationem Petronio mandatam, Christi discipulorum persecutioni vacare non licuit. Cum enim constituendæ ecclesiarum paci sæpenu-mero Dei sapientiâ occasionibus utatur, atque humanis auxiliis; probabilis utique affertur conjectura, eo sopitum fuisse Judæorum furorem, quia propriis pressi miseriis ab inferenda Ecclesiæ calamitate prohibebantur.——Nec inopinatæ tranquillitatis aptior ulla ratio reddi potest. Ann. 40. num. xvi.

^a See the place referred to above at note (t). ^a Ubi supra num. v.

^b Ruine des Juifs. art. xviii. xix. Hist. des Emp. tom. I. ^c Sed ex Josephi historia constat, illum in provinciam anno tertio Caii advenisse, circa autumnum. Noris. Cenot. Pisan. Diss. 2. p. 371. Conf. Usser. Ann. 39. ^d Γαίος δὲ ἐν δειπνῶ φερῶν, εἰς τὸσον δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων περιφθαίμωνων, πρεσβευτὴν ἐπὶ Συρίας ἐπέμπει Πέτρονιον——κελευὼν χειρὶ πολλῆ ἐσβαλλόντι εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, εἰ μὲν ἐκστῆς δεχόνται, ἴσαν αὐτὸν ἀνδριαντὰ ἐν τῷ ἰαυτῆ θεῶ· εἰ δ' ἀγνωμωσύῃ χρώντο, πολέμῳ κρητήσαντα τῆτο ποιεῖν. Antiq. l. 18. cap. ix. n. 2. al. cap. xi.

the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified.

This rest, we may suppose, was not complete, or made extensive and universal, till the year 40 perhaps, not till near the middle of it. But when did Paul come to Jerusalem? Before this rest? or, not till after it was commenced? Basnage^c thinks, that Paul came to Jerusalem in the year 40. Let us however make a few remarks.

The peace, of which we are speaking, seems not to have commenced, nor the persecution to have ceased, when Paul arrived at Jerusalem from Damascus. For when *he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed with the Grecians, they went about to slay him*: as we have seen in the paragraph just transcribed. And the brethren found it needful to conduct him with care to Cæsarea, and send him thence to Tarsus. Moreover, Peter was at Jerusalem, when Paul arrived there, and *he abode with him fifteen days*, Gal. i. 18. But when the peace of the churches was established, Peter left Jerusalem, and visited the saints in the several parts of Judea: as we learn from the history immediately following, Acts ix. 31—43. Once more, it appears from the above cited paragraph, and the course of St. Luke's narration, that this rest of the churches in Judea did not begin, until after Paul had been sent thence. And if it had commenced sooner, in all probability he would have been induced to stay longer there among the Jews, for whose conversion he was ardently concerned. St. Luke's words are, as above: *Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified.*

I apprehend it to be probable, then, that Paul came to Jerusalem, at this season, near the end of the year 39, or in the beginning of the year 40. We now proceed.

St. Paul says, Gal. i. 15—18. that *when it pleased God by his grace to reveal his Son in him, — he went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.* For the time of Paul's conversion therefore we must look back *three years*. And if those three years are to be understood complete, and he came to Jerusalem in the year 40, he was converted not long after the

^c Ann. 40. num. xv.

beginning of the year 37, where it is placed by ^f Basnage. If he came to Jerusalem before the end of the year 39, he might be converted near the end of the year 36.

Let me add. Paul says, *after* ^g *three years I went up to Jerusalem*: which may be well understood to mean somewhat more than three years. And then, though Paul should be supposed not to have returned to Jerusalem till the beginning of the year 40, he may have been converted before the end of the year 36.

Shall we now look somewhat farther back, and inquire how long this might be after the death of Stephen? Lewis Capellus ^h and Fr. Spanheim ⁱ supposed that two years passed between the death of Stephen and Paul's conversion. And for certain there was some good space of time between Stephen's martyrdom, and Paul's journey to Damascus. This appears from St. Luke's history, who says, Acts vii. 58. *And they cast Stephen out of the city, and stoned him. And the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul.*—It follows in ch. viii. 1—4. *And Saul was consenting unto his death. At that time there was a great persecution against the church, which was at Jerusalem. And they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles.*—As for Saul he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison. After which, at ver. 5—40. is an account of the preaching of those who were scattered abroad, particularly, of Philip's going to the city Samaria, and preaching there with great success, and of the apostles, who were at Jerusalem, hearing of this, and sending to Samaria Peter and John: and then, how Philip taught and baptized the chamberlain of Candace, queen of Ethiopia. After which Philip preached in all the cities from Azotus, till he came to Cæsarea by the sea side. Still Saul was a persecutor. For it follows, ch. ix. 1, 2. *And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest: and desired of him letters to Damascus,*

^f Ann. 37. n. 48.

^g — μετα ετη τρια. ^h Porro interim — Saulus, qui Stephani morti consenserat, cum per biennium Ecclesiam Dei Jerosolymis vastasset.—Lud. Capel. Hist. Apost. p. 7. ⁱ Ex dictis constare arbitramur — rursus anni minimum

unius decursum, si non verius biennii (quale et Lud. Cappellus post Danæum nostrum, aliosque, statuit) a cæde hujus ad Sauli profectioem Damascenam supponendum esse. Spanh. Diff. de convers. Paulin. Epoch. n. xx.

to the synagogues; that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. To all which might be added, that Paul's ill treatment of the disciples at Jerusalem was well known at Damascus, before he arrived there, as appears from Acts ix. 13.

Nevertheless I do not think, that there is sufficient reason to protract this space so long as two years: but would hope, it might be reduced within the compass of a year, and perhaps to little more than half a year. So thought Basnage. Who ^k therefore placeth the martyrdom of Stephen and the baptism of Paul in one and the same year.

I am the more inclined to think, that Paul's course of opposition against the believers did not exceed the space of a year, at the utmost: because it seems to have been confined to the city of Jerusalem, until he undertook to go to Damascus, and did not reach into the cities of Judea and Samaria. This will lead us to place the martyrdom of Stephen in the year 36, and not far from the beginning of it, or else near the end of the year 35.

Indeed that is a very likely season, and much confirmed by the state of things in Judea about this time, as distinctly represented by us long ago in the first part of this work, when we treated of affairs and persons, occasionally mentioned in the books of the New Testament. It was then shown, that ^l Pontius Pilate was removed from his government in Judea, before the passover of the year 36, probably, five or six months before that passover, in September or October, A. D. 35, about a year and half before the death of Tiberius. It was also shown, that ^m after the removal of Pilate, no governor, or procurator, with the right of the sword, or the power of life and death, was sent into Judea, neither in the remaining part of the reign of Tiberius, nor in the reign of Caius. Which ⁿ afforded the Jews an opportunity to be licentious, and to do many things, which otherwise they could not have done, and to be extremely troublesome to the disciples of Jesus.

Thus then Paul was converted in 37, or possibly, before the end of the year 36. And Stephen was stoned in the beginning of the same year, or, at the soonest, near the end of the year 35.

^k A. D. 37. num. 48.

^l See vol. I. p. 374.

^m Ibid. p. 86—89.

ⁿ p. 95.

III. Having distinctly considered these things, and produced such probable evidence, as offers, I beg leave, to mention several observations.

1. The persecution, which began at the death of Stephen, continued four years.

The disciples of Jesus, as appears from the first chapters of the book of the Acts, were much harrassed by the Jewish council from the beginning. But now, after Stephen was stoned, a more open and violent persecution came on which †‡ lasted a good while. I am not able to assign a more likely time for the commencement of it, than the beginning of the year 36, or the latter part of the year 35, about which time Pilate was removed after his government had been for some good while very feeble among the Jews. The same persecution reached into the year of our Lord 40, the fourth and last year of the reign of Caius; when Petronius published the orders which he had received, to set up the emperor's statue in the temple at Jerusalem: which threw the Jewish people, throughout all that country, into a general consternation, and fully employed them about their own affairs.

It seems to me therefore, from this calculation, that the persecution lasted, at least, four years. To which might be added, that it must have begun about a year before Paul's conversion, after which he was three years in Arabia. And when he returned to Jerusalem, the persecution was not at an end: nor did the peace of the churches come on, till after he had been sent away from Judea to Tarsus.

2. Notwithstanding the violence, and the length of this persecution, the church of Christ was not diminished, but increased during that period.

This may be argued from the description of the peace which succeeded it. Acts ix. 31, 32. *Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified.—And it came to pass, as Peter passed through all quarters, he came to the saints which dwelt in Lydda.* Now

†‡ Here I transcribe a passage from Lightfoot's Commentary upon the Acts, ch. ix. 27. of his works, vol. I. p. 815. 'And thus,' says he, 'that persecution that began about Stephen, had lasted till this very same time of Paul's coming to Jerusalem. For, so it is apparent, both by the fear and suspi-

'cioufness of the disciples at Jerusalem, as also by the clause of the text, ver. 31. *Then had the churches rest.* The length of this persecution, by the computation of the times, as they have been cast up before, seemeth to have been about three years and a half

therefore there were churches in Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria. And I make no question, but most, or all of them were planted during those troublesome times. For before that period we read not of any churches out of Jerusalem. And St. Paul speaking of some things after his conversion, and his return to Jerusalem, says, Gal. i. 22. *He was unknown by face to the churches of Judea, which were in Christ.*

This increase of converts in those countries might be owing to several things: the patience and fortitude of the disciples: their discretion in avoiding needless offence, and in declining dangers; their zeal and intrepidity in asserting the resurrection of Jesus, and other articles of the doctrine of the gospel: the miraculous powers, with which they were endowed, and their exerting them on all fit occasions.

It might be also, in part, owing to the circumstances of things. For a while, as it seems, this persecution was confined to Jerusalem, and did not extend to other parts of Judea. So says St. Luke, Acts viii. 1. *At that time was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem.* Paul's injuries were confined there, till he went to Damascus. He speaks not of any thing done by him against the disciples of Jesus any where else. Acts xxvi. 10, 11. *Which thing I also did in Jerusalem—and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damascus.*

The persecution became more extensive afterwards. As may be gathered from those words of St. Luke, just cited: *then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria,* Wherein it is implied, that the believers in those countries had been disturbed: though, perhaps, the persecution was not there so violent, as in Jerusalem and near it.

But so long as Paul continued in his course of opposition, the persecution either was confined to Jerusalem, or was not very violent in many other parts, if in any. This may be evidently concluded from Acts viii. 1. *And they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea, and Samaria, except the apostles.* Many of the disciples, therefore, who left Jerusalem, found shelter in Judea, and Samaria. This was soon after the death of Stephen, and before Paul went to Damascus. Yea it is added, ver. 4, 5. *Therefore they that were scattered abroad, went every where, preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them.* And what follows to ver. 40. clearly showing the truth of what we are now arguing.

Moreover, it should be remembered, that the Jewish council had not the power of life and death. The death of Stephen therefore was irregular and tumultuous. That no others suffered in a like manner during this period, I would not say; considering the great conciseness of St. Luke's history, and what St. Paul says Acts xxvi. 10. *And when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them.* But if any, beside Stephen, were put to death, I apprehend, not many, and those of lower rank only, none of a station in the church, equal to that of Stephen. The Roman officers in Judea did not join in any part of this persecution. They had no orders so to do. And if the Jewish council had assumed authority to put men to death, it would have been complained of, and they would soon have been checked.

If the Jewish council had had the power of life and death for these four years, it would indeed have gone very hard with the christian interest, throughout the whole country of Judea: the number of believers would have been much lessened: nor could any new converts have been made. Such a persecution the church was not able to endure in its very infancy.

In like manner, a four years' persecution by Herod Agrippa would have extirpated it. All the believers in general must have perished, throughout the whole extent of his dominions, without safety to any but those who escaped into other countries. When therefore that proud and bigoted prince (whom we allow to have had supreme power throughout all the land of Israel) began to persecute the church, and had slain James, and imprisoned Peter; Providence interposed, and miraculously delivered Peter out of prison. And that prince, not observing the hand of God therein, nor being intimidated thereby: as appears from his ordering the innocent guards to be immediately executed: and growing still more and more proud and arrogant, he fell under the hand of God himself. Of whose death, soon after, St. Luke has left an affecting history, ch. xii. 19—23, confirmed also by ° Josephus.

3. The first notice which we have of Paul, is in the account of Stephen's martyrdom. And it seems likely, that he had not long before made his appearance in the world.

And, if we consider Paul's situation and circumstances, we shall discern the proper vindication of his moral character. It may be reckoned probable, that he had not seen Jesus in the time of his abode on this earth. Possibly, he did not come

° See vol. I. p. 21—25.

to Judea from Tarsus, till after the period of our Lord's ministry. It may be likewise supposed, that he had not a personal acquaintance with any of Christ's apostles, nor had seen any miracles done by them, before he became a persecutor. And after that, he would not admit of instruction from the followers of Jesus. However, it is not improbable, that he saw the splendour of Stephen's countenance before the Jewish council, Acts vi. 15. as well as was witness of the wonderful patience and meekness of his death. ch. vii. 55—59. But then, as may be well supposed, he was not only prejudiced, but enraged. See ver. 54, 57. and ch. xxvi. 11.

How long he had been in Judea, and under the tuition of Gamaliel, cannot be certainly said. But it is well known, that students, whilst under the government of tutors, are strictly guarded, and much restrained. None less acquainted with what is done in the world, than they. Among the ancients, especially, students of the law and philosophy, were required to pay a strict regard to their masters' instructions, and their's only. It may be supposed, then, that Paul, so long as he was with Gamaliel, knew little of the public affairs of Judea, though he was in that country. Coming from the schools, animated with an earnest zeal for the law of Moses, and all its peculiarities, and for the traditions of the elders: and finding a number of men, called followers of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they spake of as the Messiah, and raised from the dead, and greater than Moses himself: he was filled with indignation, and thought, he was obliged to oppose them to the utmost: which he did, till Jesus met him, and reclaimed him. It is not unlikely, that he conceived of them, as the deluded followers of an impostor, like others that appeared in Judea about that time, and therefore deserving of no regard from any wise men.

Paul says, among other humbling considerations, that he was *injurious*, 1 Tim. i. 13. And he has mentioned several instances of it. Acts xxvi. 10. But even then, as we may well suppose, he would not have injured any man in his person, or property, from worldly considerations. In what he did against the followers of Jesus he was not actuated by envy, malice, covetousness, or any worldly view. It was a false zeal for God and religion, by which he was induced to be a persecutor: which in some persons, and in some circumstances, is consistent with integrity. It is very likely to have been so in Paul, a young man, little acquainted with the world, and

just come fresh from the study of the law, and the Rabbinical interpretations of it. Chysoftom makes this difference between Paul and the Jews. He ^p had a sincere zeal for religion, according to his knowledge at that time. They had no concern for the welfare of Jerusalem, and aimed at nothing but their own honour.

All this has been said for showing, that Paul was sincere in what he had done, and that he did not act contrary to conviction. But †† he cannot be justified. He should have examined. He should have taken care to be well informed. If, when he first came abroad in the world, and met with those who professed faith in Jesus, as the Messiah, he had inquired into the grounds of their persuasion: if he had attentively observed, whether they wrought any miracles, like those of Moses, and the ancient prophets, recorded in the Old Testament: if he had attended to the prophecies concerning the Messiah, which they alleged, for showing, that the character of Jesus was answerable to them, and that they were fulfilled in him; he might have received satisfaction, and might have been prevented from acting that part against Jesus, and his disciples, which he afterwards bewailed.

But prejudices are very strong in some. They were so in this young man. Persuaded of the divine original of the law, and of the importance of the traditions of the elders, in which he had been lately instructed, and which he had received, and held, as a most valuable branch of science, he had a sovereign contempt for this new sect, and was of opinion, that nothing could be said by them, which deserved consideration.

Such were his prejudices, that they were not to be overcome in an ordinary way. Without something more than common to awaken his attention, he was in danger to have proceeded much farther in the wrong course, which he was in.

But though Paul was greatly prejudiced, he was not obstinate. The Lord Jesus saw this. He knew Paul to be tractable, and open to conviction. Otherwise, he would not have met him in the way to Damascus, as he did: nor would he have called to him: *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* But he well knew, that those words, together with the glory

^p Ουτος μεν εν ουτως επορει, ουχ ως ιηδελιοι μη γενοιτο. Οτι γαρ ζηλω επορει, δηλον εκ τας εις τας εξω πολεις απιεναι: ειπεινοι δε ουτε καν των ιερουσαλιμεις εφροντισαν: αλλ' ενος εγεινοντο μοις τε

τιμις απολαυειν. In Act. Ap. hom. 19. Γ. IX. p. 155. D.

†† See Dr. Doddridge upon 1 Tim. i. 13. note (b) Family Expositor, vol. V. p. 443.

of the appearance surrounding him, would change his heart, and melt him down to ready obedience.

Openness to conviction is a most necessary disposition in such weak, ignorant, fallible, sinful creatures as we are. Without it there can be no alteration for the better: no change of error for truth, or vice for virtue. Of the conceited and obstinate there is no hope. But they who are attentive to reason and argument, and are willing to be determined by evidence, may do great things. Of ignorant they may become knowing. Instead of being erroneous, they may have just sentiments. And they will proceed from one measure of knowledge and virtue to another, till they attain to great perfection in both.

This was Paul's disposition. It is very manifest in him. With what enmity against the disciples of Jesus he set out for Damascus, and how soon he was changed, the history shows. *And as he journeyed, he came near to Damascus. And suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? Acts ix. 3—6.* Whereupon he trembles, and acquiesces. All his rage is subdued, and he becomes a disciple of Jesus.

Upon occasion of an abuse, which he received from the high priest, before whom he stood, he expressed himself with rather too much warmth and resentment. But having been admonished of it by those who stood by, he answers with great mildness: *I wist not, I did not consider, brethren, that it was the high priest. For it is written: thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people. Acts xxiii. 1—5.*

He was once offended with John Mark, because he declined a service, which he thought reasonable to be performed. Acts xiii. 13. xv. 38. But he was afterwards reconciled to him, and desired his company: persuaded, that he would be *profitable to him for the ministry.* 2 Tim. iv. 11.

So much did this temper prevail in him, and so reasonable and beneficial did it appear to him, that he thought, no men could be destitute of it, and that all men must be willing to hearken, and to yield to evidence. This we perceive from what he says, Acts xxii. 17—21. *When I was come again to Jerusalem, I was in a trance, and saw him saying unto me: make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said: Lord, they know, that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee.*

thee.—*And he said unto me: depart. For I will send thee far hence unto the gentiles.* He imagined, that an account of his conversion, who once was so opposite, and the reasons of it, if fairly laid before them, must persuade them. But Jesus, who knew the hearts of all men, saw, that the people of Judea were so hardened, that nothing would work upon them. Instead therefore of labouring unprofitably among them, the Lord renewed his orders to Paul, without delay, to proceed in the work of preaching to gentiles, as he had already begun to do.

4. It was very gracious in the Lord Jesus, to call to Paul at the time he did, and not to suffer him to continue any longer in his career of rash, and inconsiderate, and injurious zeal, without control. As yet he was tender, and tractable. Afterwards he might have been hardened: or, upon conviction, he might have sunk into despair.

5. We have reason to think, that there was an over-ruling Providence in disposing the person and concerns of Paul about this time, as well as in the other parts of his life.

He reflects with gratitude, that *God had separated him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace,* Gal. i. 15. There was great wisdom, as well as goodness, in the season of his call, as just shown.

It was likewise a very happy and favourable circumstance, that he did not return into Judea presently after his conversion: forasmuch as the violent persecution, which began about the time of Stephen's death, had continued at least three years after Paul left Judea to go to Damascus.

It was also well for him, that he was out of Judea, during the three or four years' reign of Herod Agrippa, when he was king of all Israel. It was, indeed, owing to a violent onset of the Grecians, as they are called, that the disciples were induced to convey him to Cæsarea, and send him forth to Tarsus. Acts ix. 29, 30. But it was over-ruled for his good. By this means he was out of Judea, during the reign of that proud and cruel prince: which appears to have been a troublesome time to the followers of Jesus in that country, till near the end it broke out into the greatest violence. As we learn from the history in the twelfth chapter of the Acts.

IV. What was Paul's age at the time of his conversion, is not certain. Witsius supposeth, that ^a he was born near the end

^a At in neutram variationem incidit pueritia Pauli, quem natum esse oportet circa mortem Herodis. Quod ita conficitur. Ipse se *senex* fuisse

end of Herod's reign, about the same time with our Saviour. It is observable, that in the epistle to Philemon, ver. 9, written about the year of the vulgar æra 62, he calls himself Paul the aged. Which, I think, must lead us to suppose, that he was then sixty years of age, or not much less.

In the account of the martyrdom of Stephen he is called a young man. Acts vii. 58. But it is well known, that among the ancients the word youth is used with latitude. Some things said of him about that time may induce us to think him arrived to years of maturity, or discretion. For he seems to have been one of the principal agents in the persecution of the believers after the death of Stephen: and to have been entrusted by the Jewish rulers in carrying it on. As he says to king Agrippa. Acts xxvi. 10. *Which thing I also did in Jerusalem. And many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests.* And it is well known, being again and again related, that he had a commission from the high priest, when he went to Damascus. And it is also mentioned afterwards in the farther account of himself to Agrippa, ver. 12. *Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests.*—And there were several others with him at the same time, who may be supposed to have been officers under him. All which shows the regard that was paid to him.

Mr. Biscoe thinks, that before his conversion Paul had been ordained elder, or rabbi, or doctor. And he supposeth, that this may enable us to account for Paul's being never excommunicated by the Jews. 'It may seem strange to some,' says he, 'that St. Paul was not excommunicated by the Jews, after he turned Christian. For St. John tells us, ch. ix. 22. *The Jews had agreed, that if any man did confess, that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.* St. Paul, notwithstanding, entered boldly into their synagogues, wherever he came, and preached that Jesus was the Christ. He was often scourged by them, 2 Cor. xi. 24. But we nowhere read of his being excommunicated. The Talmud explains this to us: forasmuch as thence it is abundantly evi-

fuisse docet, quando evangelii causa vincens Romæ detinebatur a Nerone. Philem. comm. 9. Neque tamen admodum senex eo tempore fuit, quum *ἡλικίας* dicatur in martyrio Stephani. Unde necesse est,

ejusdem propemodum cum Christo ætatis fuisse. De Vita Pauli. sect. i. n. iii. See Acts ix 1, 2, 14. xxii. 8. The History of the Acts confirmed, p. 269, 270.

dent,

‘dent, that they were very backward to excommunicate the
‘disciples of the wise, the doctors, and teachers of the law.’

Whether that be certain or not, I think it may be inferred from what was before said, that at the time of his conversion, Paul was of an age when men are able to judge of the evidence of things, and to form a reasonable determination concerning their future conduct.

V. It may be now fit for us, before we proceed any farther, to consider when Paul became an apostle.

It has generally been the opinion of learned men, that Paul was called to the apostleship at the time that he was converted, or very soon after. So says ‘Spanheim, and “Witfius, who follows him. So likewise say divers others, who also have carefully considered this point, particularly ‘Cave, ‘Pearson, ‘Bafnage. To whom I must add my late much valued friend ‘Mr. Hallet. Who, in his discourse on ordination, had occasion to consider Acts xiii. 2, 3. as well as some other texts.

That Paul was now made an apostle, and fully instructed for preaching the gospel, is evident from the account of his
conversion

‘Id vero ante omnia in disquisitionis hujus limine supponimus: idem omnino esse tempus vocationis Paulinæ ad apostolatam, quod fuit ad Christum, annum adeo eundem utriusque ac mensem. Spanh. ubi supra. § iv. p. 314. ‘Quo tempore ad Christianismum, eodem ad Apostolatam vocatus est Paulus. Actor. ix. 15. xxiii. 15. xxvi 17. &c. Witf. de Vit. Pauli. sect. ii. num. xxi. ‘See before, note

(o) p. 6. ‘Tiberii 22. A. D. 36. Saulus in Arabia moratur, ubi per Revelationem accepit plenam a Deo notitiam evangelii, ad quod prædicandum immediate vocatus est.

— A. D. 37. Saulus ex Arabia redit Damascum, satis in officio per revelationem instructus. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 2. ‘His

peractis, Paulus relicta Damasco, in vicina loca aliquantisper secessit, ut ab ipso Christo ἀπεσῶς institueretur, quod et ipse tradit, Gal. i. 15—17. In eo igitur recessu non ab hominibus edoctus est, sed ab ipso Christo

per revelationem didicit evangelium, et creatus est Apostolus, &c. Bafnag. Ann. 37. num. lxii.

‘From this view of the history of St. Paul’s life after his conversion to Christianity, it is plain, that many years (thought to have been ten) had passed, during which he had been a preacher, and an apostle, before the time mentioned Acts xiii. At the beginning of those ten years, just after his conversion, Christ made him a minister and an apostle, and particularly gave him a commission to preach to the gentiles, when he appeared to him from heaven, and said, as in Acts xxvi. 16, 17, 18. — When therefore, ten years after this, the prophets at Antioch separated Paul for the work to which he was called, by prayer, and fasting, and imposition of hands, it is evident they did not give him any authority. He had received the full apostolical authority, and that, as the

‘apostle

conversion given by the evangelist ^b Luke, and from all the accounts, which he gives of himself in his discourses in Judea, to the Jewish people, and ^d to Festus, and Agrippa, and from his epistle to the Galatians, and from the manner of his speaking of himself at the beginning of divers of his epistles.

What he says of himself to the Galatians, in particular, implies his having had a full knowledge of the gospel-revelation, and his being invested in the apostolical character, before the time of his first coming to Jerusalem, after his conversion. Gal. i. 11, 12. *But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel, which was preached of me, is not after men. For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ—* ver. 15, 18. *But when it pleased God, (who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace) to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem, to them which were apostles before me. But I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.*

Paul must have been an apostle, and qualified to preach the gospel, before he came to Jerusalem, and saw Peter: or what he says here cannot be reckoned material, and to the purpose, about which he is speaking.

Undoubtedly, for some good while Paul preached to Jews only. And when he began to preach to gentiles also, he may have had some farther revelations from Christ. But it does not follow, that he was not an apostle before that. Peter, and the rest, had been apostles several years, before they were required, or qualified to preach to gentiles.

Paul seldom speaks of his being an apostle, or *called to be an apostle*, as he often does at the beginning of his epistles, but he seems to refer to, and intend his early call, when he was converted, and put into the ministry. Rom. i. 1. *Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, separated unto the gospel of God.* 1 Cor. i. 1. *Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God.* See also 2 Cor. i. 1. but especially Gal. i. 1. *Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.* See likewise 1 Tim. i. 12. ch. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11.

^a apostle of the gentiles too, long and Discourses, vol. II. p. 321, 322.
^b before this, immediately from ^b Acts ix. 15—22. ^c Ch. xxii.
^d Christ himself.' Hallett's Notes 6—16. ^d Ch. xxvi. 13—24.

One requisite qualification of an apostle appears to have been, that he should see Christ in person, and that after his resurrection. This was manifestly one privilege of the first twelve apostles, and of Matthias, chosen in the room of Judas, Acts i. 21, 22. Accordingly, we find, that Paul also, claiming the character of an apostle, speaks of his having seen Christ, and as of a well known, and uncontested thing. 1 Cor. ix. 1. *Have I not seen Jesus Christ, our Lord?* And largely in the xv. chapter of the same epistle, rehearsing divers appearances of our Lord, after his resurrection, to the apostles, and others, he says, ver. 8, 9. *And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.*

It is plain, then, that Paul had seen Christ, and after he was risen from the dead, as the other apostles had done. But where did he see him? It is generally said, and, I think, rightly, in the way to Damascus. Then, as seems to me, Christ personally appeared to him. It is evident from St. Luke's account of Paul's conversion. Acts ix. 3—6. *And as he journeyed, he came near to Damascus, and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth,*

° Vide Wits. de Vita Pauli. sect. ii. num. v. vi. vii. et Basnagius ann. 37. num. lviii.

Qu. 2. Qualis erat hæc apparitio? *Resp.* Indubie corporalis: quia se, ut cæteros, testem oculatum adducit. Qu. 3. Quando, et ubi Christum vidit? *Resp.* Dum iret Damascus. Act. ix. Obj. At Paulus tunc excæcatus erat. *Resp.* Prius tamen Dominum vidit, cujus maxima claritate peritrici sunt ejus oculi, ut sit solem intuentibus. Poli Synops. ad 1 Cor. xv. 8.

Jam quod ad hanc apparitionem Dominicam Paulo factam attinet, quæ sine dubio post ascensionem Domini contigit, illud etiam indubitate tenendum est, talem fuisse quâ Christus semet ipsum corporaliter atque oculis corporeis videntum Paulo ostenderet: ad quem modum et aliis omnibus supra memoratis visus est. Nam nisi talis visio fuisset etiam hæc de quâ nunc

Paulus loquitur, quomodo se perinde ut cæteros testem adduceret oculatum ad probandam veritatem resurrectionis Christi? — Nam Paulo illo tempore suæ conversionis, quum iret Damascus, non tantum audivisse Dominum loquentem, sed etiam vidisse, ex subsequenti narratione clarum est. Dicit enim ad eum Ananias ix. 17. *Dominus misit me, Jesus qui apparuit, Græce εἶπας, qui visus est, tibi in via.* Et cap. xxii. 14. *Deus præordinavit te, ut videres justum, et audires vocem ex ore ejus.* Rursum cap. ix. 27. Barnabas de eo narrat Apostolis, quomodo in via vidisset Dominum, et quia locutus est ei. Sed et Dominus ad Saulum prostratum, ipso referente, cap. xxvi. 16. *Ad hoc enim apparui, εἶπόν, visus sum tibi, ut constituerem te ministrum et testem eorum, quæ vidisti.* Et quæ sequuntur. Est. in 1 Cor. xv. 8.

and heard a voice, saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said: who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest.—And he trembling, and astonished, said: Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him: arise, and go into the city. And it shall be told thee, what thou must do. When Ananias, by special order, entered into the house, where Paul was, and put his hands upon him, he said: ver. 17. Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared to thee in the way, as thou camest, *καὶ ἐπέστειλέν σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. hath sent me.* Compare ch. xxii. 14. And ch. ix. 27. Barnabas brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them, how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken unto him. Paul likewise in his own accounts of his conversion uses words expressive of a personal appearance to him. So Acts xxii. 6—8. in his speech to the people of Jerusalem, where truth and exactness were very requisite. *And it came to pass, that as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly, there shone from heaven a light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me. And I answered, who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me: I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest.* So likewise Acts xxvi. 12—19. very strong and expressive, indeed. To which the reader is referred.

If Paul did not see Jesus in person at the time of his conversion, when did he so see him? Some may say, at the time mentioned, Acts xxii. 17—21.—*And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even when I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance, and saw him saying unto me: make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me.*

Some think, that ^f Paul had this trance when he first came to Jerusalem, at the end of three years after his conversion. Others rather think, that ^g it happened, when he and Barnabas came to Jerusalem from Antioch, with the contributions of the Christians there for the support of the believers in Judea, in the time of the dearth in the reign of Claudius, and in the year

^f Ver. 17. *Retourné à Jerusalem.* Ne pas d'abord. Voyez. Gal. i. 17. mais après son voyage en Arabie et son séjour à Damas. Ibid. ch. 18. L'enfant sur Actes. xxii. 17. See likewise Dr. Doddridge at the same place, in his Family

Expositor, vol. III. p. 355. sect. L.

^g Et tum, opinor, Saulus raptus est in tertium cœlum, post quod tempus anno xiv. scripsit secundam ad Corinthios epistolam. cap. xii. 2. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. A. D. 44. p. 6.

of Christ 44. Of which an account is given Acts xi. 27—30. ch. xii. 25. Others ^b hesitate.

But I cannot persuade myself, that this is what Paul intended, when he said to the Corinthians: *am I not an apostle? —Have I not seen Jesus Christ, our Lord?* nor when he says afterwards in the same epistle: *And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.* For ⁱ there, as I apprehend, he must mean seeing Jesus Christ in person, waking, and with eyes open. Which is quite different from what happens in a dream, vision, trance, ecstasy.

The ^k same answer will suffice for the season of his being taken up into paradise, and into the third heaven. For such things are visionary. Nor did Paul himself certainly know, whether it was *in the body, or out of the body*, 2 Cor. xii. 1—3. that is, whether he was then personally transported into paradise, or whether the representation was made in his mind without any local removal. And the things, which he then

^b Witsius, De Vita Pauli. sect. 3. num. xi. is in doubt, at which of those times Paul had this trance or vision.

ⁱ Saulo Damascum proficiscenti Jesum factum conspicuum, nulli dubitamus.—Nobis aperte favent Ananiæ verba: Act. ix. 17. Illud ipsum testatur Barnabas eo capite, ver. 27. sed et ipse Paulus talia voce refert. Act. xxii. 24.—Comparatum ita erat, ut nemo apostolatus officio fungi posset, qui corporeis Christum oculis non aspexisset. Itaque in eâ collatâ sibi gratiâ exultat Paulus, atque triumphat. *Nonne Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum vidi?* Quandonam porro vidit, si non vidit, dum Damascum proficisceretur? Non sane in ea visione, cujus meminit. Act. xxii. 17—21. Fuit enim extasis, quæ non sufficiebat apostolatus. Neque ad raptum ad tertium usque cælum referri potest ea manifestatio, quæ Apostolo necessaria: sive quia dubitat Paulus, utrum corpore fuerit, an spiritu: sive etiam quia multos ante annos manus obiit Apostoli, quam mirandus ipsi raptus contigerit. &c. Basnag. A. D. 37. n. lvii. vid. et n. lviii. ^k Quod vero multi

præter visionem, quæ in via Damascena contigit, etiam mentionem huc ingerunt illius visionis, quam Paulus sibi Hierosolymam reverso, et in templo oranti, narrat oblatam fuisse. Act. xxii. 17. tanquam illud respiciat hoc loco: satis illud refellitur, ex eo quod, ipso Paulo teste, extatica fuerit illa visio: sive, ut Interpres noster vertit, *in superementis* facta. Jam autem ostendimus visionem corporalem hic intelligi debere. Sed neque ad raptum in tertium cælum, atque in paradysum, de qua scribit. 2 Cor. xii.—referenda est hæc visio.—Non tamen ibi scribit, se Dominum vidisse. Et ut vidisset, nescire tamen se dicit, utrum in corpore, an extra corpus ipsi raptus ille et visio contigerit: et ut in corpore contigerit, quod est probabilius, extaticam tamen fuisse, mente videlicet a sensibus corporeis abstracta, convenit inter Theologos. Nec, si per sensum oculorum facta fuisset ea visio, Paulus id nescire potuisset. Hic vero certum perhibet testimonium, se corporaliter, ut alios Apostolos, Christum vidisse. Estius ad 1 Cor. xv. 8.

law and heard, were not to be revealed. He seldom speaks of such matters. When he does, it is not without an apology. For, as it seems, they were, chiefly, for his own encouragement under the many and great difficulties which he met with. This rapture into the third heaven and paradise had been concealed by him above fourteen years, and not mentioned at all, till now in this his second epistle to the Corinthians: as has been observed both by ¹ ancients, and ^m moderns. But the seeing Christ, for qualifying him to be an apostle, had been often, and openly mentioned by him.

But it may be objected, that long after his conversion Paul is numbered among prophets. Acts xiii. 1. *Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers: as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen——and Saul.*

To which I answer, 1. If Paul should be allowed to be here ranked among prophets, it will not follow, that he was not more than a prophet, even an apostle. St. Peter styles himself an elder, though, undoubtedly, he was also an apostle. 1 Pet. v. 1. Mr. Le Clerc has a fine observation relating to this matter in his Ecclesiastical History: that ⁿ though Paul is mentioned last, he was superior to the rest in point of gifts. But, says he, the first Christians were not solicitous about titles and pre-eminence.

2. It is not clear, that Paul is here reckoned among prophets. He seems rather to be distinguished from them. For, very probably, it is not without some reason that Paul is not put first, nor next to Barnabas, but last of all. The meaning appears to be this. ‘Now there were in the church at Antioch certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and also Saul, whose character and station in the church is well known from the preceding history of him in this book.’ Whereby indeed he evidently appears to be an apostle.

¹ Δια τετο και τον χρονον εθηκε των δεκατεσσαρων ετων· εδε γαρ απλως αυτη μεμικται, αλλα δεικνυς, οτι εκ αν ο το- ρετοι καρτερησας χρονον, ιυν αν εξειπεν, ει μη πολλη ην αιαγκη. Chrysost. in 2 Cor. hom. 26 Γ. X. p. 681. D.

^m See Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, vol. IV. p. 522.

ⁿ Ceterum, si ex Spiritus Sancti donis, sublimibusque revelationibus, Prophetarum, Doctorumque, qui

memorantur, ordo conceptus esset, sine dubio, primum omnium Saulum collocari oportuisset. Sed iis temporibus nondum de prima sede, dignitateque contentiones erant inter Christianos: et qui meritis in rem Christianam omnium erant primi, ii se, ex Domini præcepto, quasi minimos gerebant, nec ultimos appellari refugiebant. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 45. num. i.

3. I add one thing more, that I may fully clear up this point. The designation, mentioned ch. xiii. 2, 3. could not be to the apostleship. For *Paul was not an apostle of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father*, Gal. i. 1. Moreover, it is here expressly said, that this ordination, or appointment, at Antioch, was to a particular work or service. *As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work, whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.* And it might be said, that here is no consecration to an office, but rather a benediction for the particular work upon which they were now sent.

As Mr. Hallett says, in the place before quoted, ‘They were not now separated for the work of the ministry in general, but were separated from the other teachers at Antioch, to go abroad and propagate the gospel in other countries. When they went out upon this important work, nothing could be more agreeable, than for the church at Antioch to pray God to give Barnabas and Paul good success: which accordingly they did. They now recommended them to the grace, or favour of God, as St. Luke says concerning this solemn transaction, ch. xiv. 26. And after this again, when Paul was sent abroad another time to preach the gospel where he had preached it before, he was in the same manner recommended to the grace of God, as it is written ch. xv. 40. *Paul chose Silas, and departed, being recommended by the brethren to the grace, or favour of God.* Since therefore both times, when Paul went out from Antioch, to preach the gospel to the same people, the evangelist says, in the same words, that he was recommended to the grace of God; we cannot suppose that he was any more first made an apostle of the gentiles at the former, than at the latter time of his being recommended.’

Upon the whole, it appears to me highly probable, from all the accounts which we have of Paul’s wonderful conversion, in Acts ix. xxii. and xxvi. that he received his apostolical commission from the mouth of Christ in person, when he called to him from heaven, and spoke to him in the way to Damascus. And especially does this appear from Acts xxvi. 15—20. where

° Porro, vere ut dicamus, nil ordinationis est in Antiochensium Prophetarum χειροθεσια. — Eam ergo Paulus Barnabasque manuum

susceperunt impositionem, quæ benedictionis est, non consecrationis. S. Basnag. Ann. 45. num. iii. p Vol. II. p. 323.

Paul expressly relates his commission, and the time of it, and declares, as seems to me, that all which had been hitherto done by him, in preaching the gospel to the very time when he was imprisoned, had been done in virtue of that commission. *And he said. I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest. But arise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared to thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister, and a witness, both of those things which thou hast seen and of those things in which I will appear unto thee: delivering thee from the people, and from the gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, ΕΙΣ ὧΣ ὤψῳ σε ἀποστέλλω, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light.—Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: but showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea. and then to the gentiles; that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.*

This also exactly suits the manner, in which the other apostles were appointed. They were apostles from the time that Jesus Christ called them to attend upon him. See Matt. iv. 18—22. Luke vi. 13. And he often discoursed to them concerning their commission in its full extent, and the difficulties they would meet with in the discharge of it: giving them also various directions, relating to their conduct, when they should come abroad in the world. See Matt. x. throughout, and xvi. 18, 19 and many like places in the other gospels. And before he left them, he expressly said: *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations,* Matt. xxviii. 19. But they did not at first understand the full extent of their commission, nor presently execute it. At the first they preached to Jews only. And it was several years after Christ's ascension before they preached to gentiles. So Paul was from the beginning called, and appointed to be an apostle: and by degrees he was qualified for it as his commission opened. And in time he was called out by Divine Providence to the full execution of it. But all along he was an apostle, and acted, and taught as such: first preaching to Jews at Damascus, and Jerusalem, and Judea, and other parts, and then to gentiles. So he plainly says to Agrippa in the place recited just now.

VI. Having thus settled the time of Paul's conversion and apostleship according to the best of my ability, I now intend to give an account of his travels in the service of the gospel. This I do for the sake of showing the date of his writings. And it would be shorter, and more agreeable on divers accounts, to take in his epistles as we go along. But there being

debates about the time of several of them, I think it will be preferable to write his history, without interruption, as briefly as we can, and then observe the order of his epistles.

Paul, having been baptized by Ananias at Damascus, stayed a short time with the disciples there, and then went into Arabia: where, it is very likely, he might meet with some believers. For Arabians are expressly mentioned Acts ii. 11. among the Jews and proselytes, who heard the apostle Peter's first sermon at Jerusalem after the descent of the Holy Ghost. At which time many were converted to a faith in Jesus Christ. Acts ii. 41.

Whilst Paul was in Arabia, it is reasonable to think, that he was fully instructed, by special †† revelation, in the doctrine preached by Jesus Christ, when here on earth, and all the things said and done by him, and his sufferings, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension, the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies in Jesus, the Christ, the son of David, and the son of Abraham, and received also the Holy Ghost, in a measure equal to that of other apostles. Whereby he was qualified to preach the gospel, and to testify the resurrection of Jesus, and to prove him to be the Christ, without receiving either instruction or gifts from other apostles.

Having been some time in Arabia, he returned to Damascus. *And straightway he preached in the synagogues, that Jesus is the Christ, or the Son of God.* This he did with such strength and cogency of argument, as to *confound the Jews, which dwelt at Damascus.* They being greatly provoked, and forming a design upon his life, the disciples found means to provide for his escape. Whereupon he went to Jerusalem, Acts ix. 20—25.

Some think that Paul preached at Damascus, soon after he had been baptized by Ananias, and that he also preached in Arabia, and that he had preached three years, before he came to Jerusalem, after his conversion. Pearson*, supposeth that Paul, whilst in Arabia, received by revelation, a full knowledge of the gospel. And says, that when

†† Concerning the manner of the revelations now vouchsafed to Paul, may be seen Lightfoot in his Comm. upon Acts ix. 1 in the first volume of his works, p. 791.

¶ Il veut montrer, qu'il avoit prêché l'évangile trois ans avant que d'avoir vu aucun Apôtre, &c. Beauf. sur Galat. i. 18.

*. Saulus in Arabiâ moratur, ubi per revelationem accepit plenam a Deo notitiam evangelii, ad quod prædicandum immediate vocatus est.

Saulus ex Arabiâ redit Damascum, satis in officio per revelationem instructus. Annal. Paulin. A. D. 36. 37. p. 2.

he returned from Arabia to Damascus, he preached there. But I do not perceive him to say, that Paul preached in Arabia, or at Damascus, presently after his conversion.

To me it seems, that Paul did not preach at Damascus presently after he had been baptized, but first went into Arabia, and then returned to Damascus. And being now qualified by divine revelation, and by diligent reading the scriptures of the Old Testament, during his recess in Arabia, and being fully determined, after a competent time of humiliation for past conduct, and serious meditation, in which he had well weighed the difficulties of the work he was entering upon, he began to preach Christ in the synagogues of Damascus. I am confirmed in this opinion by the interpretation of an author, whose words I place below. Nor does St. Paul, that I remember, any where say that he preached in Arabia. He makes a large, and, seemingly, very particular enumeration of places and people, to whom he had preached, in his discourse before Agrippa, without taking any notice of Arabia. Acts xxvi. 20. *I sowed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God.*

Jerom observing, that St. Luke had said nothing of Paul's being in Arabia, is inclined to think that he did not discharge any part of his apostolical office in that country.

St. Paul being restored to his sight by Ananias, stayed not long at Damascus, but retired forthwith into Arabia, as he himself tells us, Gal. i. 16, 17. Whereas it is said Acts ix. 19, 20. *And when he had received meat, he was strengthened. Then was Saul certain days with the disciples at Damascus, and straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues.* Here the word, *straightway*, does not relate to Saul's first coming to Damascus, but to his return thither, after he had been in Arabia. For Acts ix. 19, 20. are to be rendered and paraphrased thus: *And when he had received meat, he was strengthened.* Presently after which, according to Gal. i. 16. he went into Arabia, and having been there instructed in the gospel by

the revelation of Jesus Christ, according to Gal. i. 12 he returned again to Damascus. *Then, or now, was Paul certain days with the disciples at Damascus, and straightway, namely, after his return out of Arabia, he preached Christ in the synagogues.* Dr. Edw. Wells's Historical Geography of N. T. part. II. p. 20, 21.

Lucam vero idcirco de Arabia præterisse, quia forsitan nihil dignum apostolatu in Arabia perpetrarat: et ea potius compendiosa narratione dixisse, quæ digna Christi evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc segnitæ Apostoli deputandum, si frustra in Arabiâ fuerit: sed quod aliqua dispensatio et Dei præceptum fuerit, ut taceret. Hieron. in Gal. i. 17. T. IV. P. I. p. 235.

But then, if Paul was silent there, he thinks it was not owing to the apostle's backwardness to speak: but the divine wisdom appointed that it should be so.

Theophylact observes, that the design of the Jews at Damascus to destroy Paul, was not formed presently after his conversion to the faith: but after his return thither from Arabia, at the end of three years, just before his going to Jerusalem.

Indeed, it is very likely, that if Paul had preached at Damascus, soon after his first arrival there, he would have met with a most violent onset. And as nothing of that kind is particularly taken notice of, it may be concluded, that he did not then publicly preach in any synagogues: nor was it fit, or becoming, that he should. It was highly proper, that some time should be allotted for retirement, after such a course, as he had been in, before he began to preach and teach publicly in the name of Jesus.

Though St. Luke has not mentioned the journey into Arabia, nor the time of Paul's absence from Damascus, he knew it very well, and has hinted it, saying, *And after many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to slay him,* Acts ix. 23.

Mr. Beaufobre says, that " Paul's journey into Arabia should be placed between ver. 22 and 23, of the ninth chapter of the Acts. I should rather place it between ver. 19 and 20, of that chapter.

This period of three years, or three years and somewhat more, from Paul's conversion to his coming to Jerusalem, reaches, according to our computation, from near the end of the year 36, to near the end of 39, or the beginning of the year 40, or from the beginning of the year 37, to the former part of the year 40.

I cannot allow myself to speak positively, where there is not the evidence of certainty. I do not know in what month Paul was converted, or came to Jerusalem. Of such things as these it is sufficient to say, that they happened in such a year, or thereabout.

VII. Paul having been full three years at Damascus, and in its neighbourhood, and in Arabia, he came to Jerusalem. Gal. i. 18. *And when he was come thither, he assayed to join him-*

¹ ——— οτι η επιβροχη εν δαμασκω ουκ ευθως μετα το πιστευσαι γεγοιεν: αλλα μετα το αρελθειν αυτου απο αραβιας μετα ετη τρια. Και ουτως γεγοιεν η προς τα ιεροσολυμα ανοδος. Theoph. in Act. Ap. τ' 94.
² Comment. sur Gal. i. 17. *scilicet*

self to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple, Acts ix. 26.

This may seem strange to some. But now we discern the reason of it from the account that has been lately given of the continuance of the persecution in Judea after the death of Stephen, and also of Paul's retired way of life, for some while, in Arabia. Paul had but lately begun to preach openly in the name of Jesus, in the synagogues of Damascus. And †† the believers in Judea being much harrassed by the persecution which they met with at home, had not received any intelligence about what had passed at Damascus, and in the way thither. Nor were the Jewish rulers forward to publish the loss of so active a servant as Paul had been.

Acts ix. 27—30. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them, how he had seen the Lord in the way, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus.

There have been different conjectures concerning the reasons, why Barnabas, in particular, brought Paul to the apostles. Some have imagined that * he and Barnabas had studied together under Gamaliel: or * at least, that they had been acquainted formerly. But I see no ground for such a supposition in the history. If that had been the case, there would have been some intimation of it; which there is not. I therefore rather think, that it was entirely owing to the circumstances of things. When Paul came to Jeru-

†† Says Lightfoot in his Commentary upon Acts ix. 26. vol. I. p. 814. 'Some cannot conceive, how it should be possible, that he should have been a convert three years, and yet his conversion and present qualities should be unknown to the church at Jerusalem. But these two or three considerations may help the scruple. 1. The distance between Damascus and Jerusalem. 2. The persecution that continued still upon the church of Judea, which would keep the disciples of Damascus from going thither. And, 3. The just fear that might possess the disciples at Jerusalem, in the very time of persecution. For though it was said before, that the church of

Jerusalem, and of Judea, enjoyed a great deal of rest and tranquillity after the conversion of Paul, their great persecutor, in comparison of what they had done before, yet was not the persecution of the church utterly extinct to the very time of Paul's coming up to Jerusalem, but continued still. And therefore it is the less wonder, if the disciples there be the more fearful and cautious.'

* On pretend, qu'il avoit étudié avec Saul sous Gamaliel. L'enfant sur Actes. ix. 27. See also Pool's English Annotations upon the place.

* Forte Barnabas Saulum ante conversionem noverat, credebaturque ei ut minime mendaci. Grot. ad loc.

Jerusalem, it was a time of persecution, as before observed, and the apostles lived privately. Paul endeavoured to join himself to the disciples, and be acquainted with them. But they were all shy of him. And possibly they were desirous that he should be approved by some of the apostles, before they took notice of him. However, he met with Barnabas, and gave him an account of his conversion, and of every thing that had happened to him, since he went from Jerusalem. And Barnabas gave credit to his account. Nor is it impossible, but that some believers might come from Damascus, and confirm the truth of it. Whereupon Barnabas was willing to introduce him to the apostles. Unquestionably, they placed full confidence in Barnabas, and he might know where they were. However, it is evident he had access to James. To him he brought Paul: and James brought him to Peter: so Paul had communion with all the apostles. After which he was readily received by the disciples, or believers in general. *And he was with them, coming in and going out at Jerusalem. And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed with the Grecians, or Greeks: meaning proselytes to the Jewish religion, in whom we see the true spirit of the Jewish proselytes about this time, as declared by our Saviour himself, Matt. xxiii. 15. But they went about to slay him. Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus.*

By Cæsarea I should be apt to understand *Cæsarea by the sea side*, mentioned before, ch. viii. 40. But some learned men, particularly * Witsius, and † Dr. Doddridge, hereby suppose to be intended Cæsarea Philippi: If we could be assured of that interpretation, perhaps it might lead us to the meaning of that expression of Paul in his speech to Agrippa, cited not long ago: *throughout all the coasts of Judea.* And indeed it may be reckoned probable, that therein Paul refers to what was now done by him. For we cannot think of any more likely season for it, considering how short a stay he

* — Hierosolymam reliquit, et a fratribus Cæsaream deductus est, non maritimam illam, quæ et Turris Stratonis dicitur, de qua supra cap. viii. 40. sed Cæsaream Philippi, quæ sita erat circa montem Libanum, ad confluentem Jor et Dan, unde Jordanes originem ducit, quæ olim Lachis, deinde Dan appellata fuit, de

qua Jud. xviii. Cujus pomerium quum Rex Agrippa protulisset, mutato nomine in honorem Neronis vocavit Neroniada. Joseph. Antiq. 20. viii. Wits. de Vita Pauli sect. 3. n. ii. † See the Family Expositor, vol. III. p. 146. upon Acts ix. 30.

generally made in Judea, whenever he came thither after his conversion. It is very probable, that as he travelled with the disciples, who accompanied him, he was not silent. Though he made no long stay in any one place, he would embrace every opportunity that offered, to speak of the doctrine, which now lay with so much weight on his mind.

The brethren, as St. Luke says, brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. And St. Paul himself says, Gal. i. 21. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. Tarsus was now the chief city of Cilicia, and Paul's native place: where he had not been, since he first came up to Jerusalem, to study the law under Gamaliel. Possibly, Paul now found some of his relations, and likewise some others, who were disciples of Jesus before him. See Rom. xvi. 7. 11. Possibly also, while he travelled now in these countries of Cilicia and Syria, he met with some of those dangers and difficulties, which are entirely omitted by St. Luke, but are mentioned, or hinted by the apostle in his epistles, especially the eleventh chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians.

In those countries Paul was the remainder of the year 40, and all 41, and likewise all 42, or the greatest part of it, till about the beginning of the year 43, preaching, undoubtedly, in the name of Jesus to native Jews, and to profelytes of the Jewish religion.

Afterwards he went to Antioch, and began to preach to gentiles, as we shall see presently.

The churches having peace, and being no longer disturbed by a violent persecution, Peter visited the disciples in the several parts of Judea. Acts ix. 32—43. Before he returned to Jerusalem, whilst he was in the city of Joppa, where he tarried many days, he received an order from heaven to go to Cæsarea. And in ch. x. and xi. 1—18. St. Luke gives a distinct account of St. Peter's going to the house of Cornelius at Cæsarea, and there preaching to gentiles, and of the defence, which he made of his conduct to the apostles and brethren at Jerusalem, and their acquiescence therein, upon which I do not now enlarge.

Afterwards, at ver. 19, 20. St. Luke says, *Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only. And some of them were men of*

Cyprus and Cyrene: who when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus.

These men had preached the gospel to Jews, and the profelytes to Judaism, in Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch. But some time after their arrival at Antioch, hearing of Peter's having opened the door of the kingdom of heaven to gentiles at the house of Cornelius, they began to preach also to the Greeks at Antioch; that is, the †† people of the country: who might, possibly, some few of them, be pious men like Cornelius, who even before his conversion was a worshipper of the true God, the God of Israel: but the greatest part of them must have been heathen idolaters, as all the people of the earth, except the Jews, generally were, till the coming of Christ, and the preaching of his gospel² among them.

Ver. 21. *And the hand of the Lord was with them.* God graciously accompanied their ministry with miraculous works, which he enabled them to perform in the name of Jesus. Whereby they who saw them were awakened and convinced. And those evangelists likewise were greatly encouraged, being thereby fully satisfied, that what they did was approved by God himself. *And a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.*

Ver. 22—26. *Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church, which was at Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch. Who when he came, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted*

†† — *that is, the people of the country.* Acts xix. 10. — *so that all they which dwelt in Asia, heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.* and ver. 17. *And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus.* It is common with all authors about that time, to call the people, who inhabited the cities of Asia, and Syria, Greeks. ‘Οι δε μετ αυτων — παντα τοις επ αντιοχειας ιουδαιοις απεδουσαν, — και συνεχωρησαν αυτοις εξ ιουδ της πολεως τοις ελλησι μετεχειν. Jos de B. J. l. 7 cap 3. n. 3. p. 1299. Hudson. Iter igitur ita per Asiam feci. — Nullo iudicio, nulla contumelia, auctoritate et cohortatione perfecit, ut et Græci, et

cives Romani, qui frumentum compresserant, magnum numerum populis pollicerentur. Cic. ad Att. l. 5. ep. 21. et passim.

² Ut ut sit, Gentiles hic intelligi, res ipsa clamat. Atque hoc primum exemplum est evangelii publice Gentibus prædicati. Nam alterum illud Cornelii non nisi domesticam fuit. Quum vero Dei favorem in sancto hoc opere insigniter experirentur fideles illi Cyprii ac Cyrenenses, multusque Græcorum numerus fide ipsis habita converteretur ad Christum, non potuit tantæ rei fama Hierosolymitanæ ecclesiæ proceres diu latere. Wisl. de Vita Paul. sect. 3. n. iii.

them all, that with purpose of heart, they should cleave unto the Lord.—Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul. And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch.

VIII. If Peter preached to Cornelius, in the year 41, and about the middle of that year, as is probable; it would be near the end of the year 42, or the beginning of the year 43, when Paul was brought by Barnabas to Antioch.

During this time of Paul's being at Antioch, in the year of Christ 43, he might have the rapture, mentioned by him 2 Cor. xii. It seems to me to have happened soon after he came to Antioch, when he first began to preach to gentiles, who hitherto had preached to Jews only.

Ver. 26. *And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people; and the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.*

This whole year, I think, must be part of the years 43, and 44, according to the vulgar computation. It may have reached some way into the year 44. Indeed, I apprehend, the whole year, mentioned by Luke, to have expired not long before the time that Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem, with the contributions made at Antioch, for the relief of the believers in Judea, in the approaching famine. For that is what St. Luke immediately proceeds to relate in ver. 27—30. that is, to the end of the chapter. And in this year, 44, I suppose the believers in Jesus to have obtained this denomination.

And the disciples were called Christians. Which some think to have been done by a divine admonition. And they translate after this manner: *And^b the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch.*

Witlius^c does not discern any particular emphasis in the word, and readily admits the interpretation of Grotius, that the

^a See Dr. Benson's History of the first planting the Christian religion, vol. I. ch. i. sect. vi. p. 241. first ed. p. 248 second ed. ^b That is Dr. Doddridge's translation. Family Expositor, vol III. p. 178.

^c Quod nomen Latinâ non Græcâ formâ a Christo deflexum, a Romanis Antiochiæ degentibus impostam illis fuisse, conjectat in Annalibus suis Usserius. Nec desunt, qui emphasin quærant in voce χρη-

ματισαι, quâ Lucas utitur. Scilicet talem volunt nominationem eo vocabulo designari, quæ publico edicto, et jussu Republicæ fit.—Non in-video sane observationes istas doctissimis auctoribus suis: modo mihi dubitare liceat, an tam solidæ quam subtiles sint. Simplicior videtur annotatio Grotii: χρηματισειν, pro nominari, est vox melioris Græcitatatis, quam et Polybius non semel usurpat: et Paulus. Rom. vii. 3.

the Greek word, according to its usual meaning in the best Greek writers, and in the New Testament itself, signifies named, or called. And he inclines to the conjectures of Abp. Usher, that this appellation was given to the believers by the Romans then at Antioch.

Suicer in his *Thesaurus* explains ^d the original word, and understands this text, exactly as Grotius did.

Dr. Heumann has ^e a *Dissertation* concerning the origin of the name of Christians. Wherein ^f he largely shows it to be very probable, that this name had not its rise from the Jews. Nor did the disciples of Jesus take it to themselves. But, probably, they were first so called by heathens, particularly the Romans: as Abp. Usher had argued, the name not having a Greek, but a Latin termination.

This will overthrow the observation of Chrysostom, formerly ^g mentioned, 'That St. Paul gave us this name.' And indeed Dr. Heumann shows, that both ^h St. Luke, and

αγα ουν ζωντες τε ανδρος μοιχαλις χρηματισει. Ubi hæc jactata vocis emphasis? Witsl. ubi supr. sect. 3. num. iv.

^d χρηματιζω significat nominor, vocor, appellor. Ita sumitur Act. xi. 26. — *Factum est autem, ut primum Antiochiæ discipuli nominarentur vel appellarentur Christiani.* χρηματισαι hic est ονομασθηναι, προσαγορευθηναι, λεχθηναι, κληθηναι. Suicer.

^e De ortu nominis Christianorum. *Diss.* xi. ap Primit. Gotting. p. 130—147. ^f Satis nunc cognovimus, Christianorum appellationis auctores fuisse non ipsos Christi cultores, sed Ethnicos. — Illud præterea hinc discimus, Latinum potius esse nomen Christianorum, quam Græcum. Ac proinde facile subscribimus sententiæ Usserii, in *Annalibus* suis pronunciantis: *Nomen Christianorum Latina non Græca forma a Christo deslexum, a Romanis Antiochiæ tum agentibus impositum illis fuisse videtur.* Nec Rex Agrippa Act. xxvi. 23. appellatione Christianorum utens, cum esset in domo Festi, Romani præsidis, alio credi potest nomine usus esse, quam quod usurpabant Romani. Ac certe in

universa Laertii *Historia Philosophorum Græcorum*, ne una quidem secta occurrit, cujus nomen terminationem *anus* nactum sit: neque e. g. Platoniani dicuntur Platonis affeclæ, uti Ciceronianos dixissent Latini et Catonianos, sed Platonici. — Illud adjicio, etiam Herodianis hoc nomen imposuisse non Græcos aut Judæos, sed Romanos. Heum. *ib.* num. ix. p. 140. ^g See vol. V. p. 145, 146. ^h Nec

vero solum non probari potest, primum usos esse Christianorum appellatione Christi discipulos: verum etiam gravibus id negari potest argumentis. — Primum enim Lucam sequentibus in capitibus hujus sui libri uti oportuisset hac appellatione, si Christiani Antiocheni hoc nomen ipsi sibi imposuissent. Jam vero id ne semel quidem ab eo factum est, sed, uti antea Christianæ religionis professores modo μαθητας vocavit. cap. i. 15. vi. 1, 2, 7. ix. 1, 10, 19, 25, 26, 36 modo αγγελοι. ix. 30. x. 23. xi. 1, 12. semel etiam τις πισευσαντας. iv. 32. ac semel τις αγιος. ix. 32. sic post mentionem de ortu nominis Christianorum eos semel appellavit τις πεπιστευκτας.

and St. Paul seem to have declined the use of it: possibly, lest our Saviour should have been esteemed an ordinary leader of a sect, like the philosophers at that time much celebrated among the Greeks and Romans.

However, it was not long, before it obtained, and was very acceptable to the followers of Jesus. It is used by St. Peter 1 iv. 16. And some ^k have thought it to be the *worthy name*, intended by St. James, ch. ii. 7. And it is certain, that afterwards it was much, and justly valued by those, who bore it. In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, giving an account of their late sufferings, it is styled ^l an honourable, and glorious, and reviving appellation.

xxi. 25. cæteris in locis aut *μαθητας*.
xi 29. xiii. 52. xiv. 20, 28. xvi.
1. xviii. 23, 27. xix. 1, 9. xx. 1,
7, 30. xxi. 4, 16. aut *αδελφες* xi. 29.
xii 17. xv. 1, 3, 22, 23, 32, 33, 40.
xvi. 2, 40. xvii. 6, 10, 14. xviii.
18. xxi. 7, 17. xxviii. 14, 15.
Ubi supr. num. vi. p. 137.

^l Deinde, si eo tempore, quo Paulus Antiochiæ docuit, Christi discipuli hoc nomen sua sponte adiecerint, dubitari non potest, quin is Apostolus usurpaturus hanc appellationem fuisset suis in epistolis. Semper autem alio is utitur nomine. In exordiis solet eos *της αγιης* vocare. Natus quoque opportunam occasionem eos appellandi *της χριστιανης*. c. gr. Rom. viii. 9. Gal. v. 24. tamen dicere maluit *της της χριστ.* Imo cum Agrippa Act. xxvi. 28. ad ipsum hanc vocem edidisset: *Prete adest, ut et ego fiam χριστιανος* quæsi refugiens appellationem hanc, non ita respondet: *Vellem fias Christianus*, sed hæc verbis: *Vellem fias πικρος, qualis ego sum*. Notabilis et iste locus Gal. i. 22. — At non ait ibi Paulus: *ταις εκκλησιαις χριστιαναις*, sed *ταις εν χριστω*. Eodem modo. 1 Tim. v. 16. ubi dicere poterat, *της Christianas vel christiana mulier*, sed locutus est: *ε, τις πισος η πισα*. Imo si ecclesia ipsa auctor fuisset hæc appellationis, an eam tam facile abstinere potuisset Paulum

credi potest? Memini, etiam, Isidorum Pelusiotam olim hanc proposuisse quaestionem. lib. IV. ep. 61. Cur nusquam Paulus nomen usurparit *χριστιανος*: nihil autem ad eam respondisse. Nos vero videmur nobis iustissima responsione defuncti esse. Ibid. num. vii. p. 138.

Nomine illo Christianorum nec Paulum usquam nec Lucam usum esse, cum supra observaverimus, nunc disceptemus, age, cur hic Apostolus, una cum Ministro suo socioque sacri itineris id fecerit: cur item non ita multo post in civitatem Christianam recepta fuerit ea appellatio. Abstulisse scilicet eam hanc ob causam videtur Paulus, ne Christus hæc pacto in ordinem redigeretur doctorum sapientiæ *των ψιλανθρωπων*, cum sit *θεανθρωπος*. &c. Ib. num. xi. p. 142.

Ad ultimum non dubitabant ipsimet Christiani pervulgato uti hoc nomine. — Cujus rei etsi unum duntaxat exemplum in N. T. codice, in prioris videlicet Petri epistolæ capite quarto, unum tamen illud exemplum est instar sexcentorum. Ib. num. xii. p. 142, 143.

^k Vid. Grot. et Wolf. Cuius in loc. ^l — *την παντιμον, και ενδοξον, και ζωοποιον προσηγοριαν*. Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 5. cap. i. p. 160. D. Vid. et p. 158. A.

It may be hence concluded, that the believers at Antioch were now numerous. Otherwise, heathen people had not taken so much notice of them. And indeed St. Luke had before said, that when the men of Cyprus and Cyrene were come to Antioch and spoke to the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus, the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord, ver. 20, 21. and that upon the coming of Barnabas, and his preaching there, much people was added unto the Lord, ver. 24. It is reasonable to suppose, that after Paul came thither, farther additions were made, at which time they received this new name.

It follows Acts xi. 27—30. *And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them, named Agabus, and signified in the spirit, that there should be great dearth throughout all the world [or all the land meaning Judea.] Which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren, who dwelt in Judea. Which also they did. And sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.*

Then follows in the twelfth chapter an account of the persecution, and death of Herod Agrippa: in the last verse of which chapter it is said: *And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry. And they took with them John whose surname was Mark.*

Of this famine we spoke ^m formerly. And as Agrippa died in 44, and Barnabas and Paul seem not to have performed this service, nor to have returned to Antioch, until after his death; it was argued, that this commission of the church of Antioch was not finished by them till near the end of that year.

At this time of Paul's being at Jerusalem, in the year 44, I suppose, he had the trance mentioned by him in his speech to the Jewish people, Acts xxii. 17—21. For it was in that city, and in the temple, as he expressly says: *And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I was praying in the temple, I was in a trance.—And he said unto me: depart For I will send thee far hence unto the gentiles.* And we shall presently see, that soon after this, Paul and Barnabas left Antioch, and made a farther progress in preaching the gospel to gentile people.

^m See vol. I. p. 240—246.

I suppose this period to be about two years, from the time of Paul's coming first to Antioch, and beginning to preach there to gentiles, to his return thither again, after he had been at Jerusalem upon the commission above-mentioned: that is, from near the end of the year 42, or from the beginning of the year 43, to the end of the year 44.

IX. I now intend to take in the history of Paul and Barnabas from that time to their coming again to Jerusalem, and returning thence to Antioch.

Says St. Luke, Acts xiii. 1—3. *Now there were in the church that is at Antioch certain prophets, and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and Saul. And as they ministered unto the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said: separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.*

Pearson suppoeth, thatⁿ at this time, which, according to his computation, was the year 44, Paul had the rapture mentioned by him 2 Cor. xii. 1—4. But first, I suppose it to have been now the year 45, where also this mission is placed by^o Basnage. Secondly, that rapture must have happened before the year 44. The second epistle to the Corinthians was written, according^p to Pearson, in the year 57. St. Paul's expression, speaking of this rapture, is above fourteen years ago. Which †† will carry us back to the fifteenth year, consequently, to the year of Christ 43, for the soonest. At which time I suppose Paul was come to Antioch, and was beginning to preach the gospel there to gentiles, together with Barnabas. Basnage^q placeth this rapture in the year 41.

^o Dum ibi Prophetæ et Doctores ministrarent Domino, Saulus et Barnabas segregati ab illis sunt in opus ad quod assumfit eos Spiritus Sanctus. Acts xiii.

Et tunc, opinor, Saulus raptus est in tertium cælum, post quod tempore anno xiv. scripsit secundam ad Corinthios, epistolam. xii. 2. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 6. ad ann. Christi p. 71. vulg. 44.

^p Ann. 45. num. iii. iv. &c.

^q Annot. Paulin. p. 15

††^o That rapture, or trance, was somewhat above fourteen years before he wrote his second epistle to Corinth. 2 Cor. xii. 2. Now in that he saith, it was *πρὸ ετών*, before, or above fourteen years ago, he speaketh not of an indefinite time, — but that it was a little above that space, though it were somewhat above exact fourteen years, &c. Lightfoot vol. 1. p. 792. ^q Vid. Ann. 41. num. xxi. xxii.

Acts xiii. 4. *So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia, and thence sailed to Cyprus.*

Antioch upon the Orontes was the capital city of Syria. Seleucia was a city lying about twelve miles lower upon the same river, a port upon the mediterranean sea, a few miles above the mouth of the Orontes. There Paul and Barnabas took shipping, and sailed to Cyprus, which lay westward. They went ashore at Salamis, a city at the east end of the island. Where finding Jewish synagogues, *they preached the word of the Lord to them.* After which they went through the island to Paphos, at the west end, where was the seat of the proconsul. His name was Sergius Paulus; who sent for Barnabas, and Saul, desiring to hear the word of God. He being a man well disposed, and seeing the miracle wrought by Saul upon Elymas the forcerer, whom he smote with blindness for a season, believed, or embraced the doctrine of the gospel, taught by Saul and Barnabas. And hence-forward St. Luke writes the apostle's name Paul, whom he had hitherto called Saul.

It may be thought, that the chief reason of their going now to Cyprus, was, that it was the native country of Barnabas, as we know from Acts iv. 36. But beside that, I imagine, there was another reason, and more influencing. For we perceive, that some of them who left Jerusalem upon account of the persecution, that followed the death of Stephen, were men of Cyprus, and had been there preaching to Jews only, as well as at Antioch. And it might be reckoned very proper, when the gospel was to be preached to gentiles, as well as to Jews, that these special messengers should go directly to a country, where an address had been already made to Jews: and where some of them, as may be reasonably supposed, had been converted to the faith of the gospel.

Leaving Paphos, they came back to the continent, and landed at Perga in Pamphylia. Where Mark, who hitherto had accompanied them, left them, and returned to Jerusalem.

From Perga they went to Antioch, the chief city of Pisidia, lying north of Pamphylia. St. Luke has given a large account of Paul's discourse in the Jewish synagogue there, and the success of it. Acts xiii. 14—52. From Antioch they went to Iconium, the chief city of Lycaonia. Where they also taught in the Jewish synagogue: *so that a great*

great multitude both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks believed. Many miracles likewise were wrought by their hands, during their stay in that city, xiv. 1—4. But at length a design being formed, both by Jews and Gentiles, and their rulers, to stone them to death, and they receiving intelligence of it, when it was almost ripe for execution, went thence: and preached the gospel at *Lystra, and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and in the region round about*, ver. 6, 7. meaning, perhaps, *Maurea*, sometimes reckoned a part of Lycaonia. At *Lystra*, Paul healed a man lame from his birth. Which raised great admiration in the people. And, if not restrained, they would have offered a sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas. Nevertheless by artifices of unbelieving Jews, who came thither from Antioch and Iconium, the minds of the people were soon changed, and they stoned Paul, and dragged him out of the city, supposing he had been dead. Howbeit, as the disciples, who had not left him, stood round about him, he rose up, and came into the city. And the next day he departed with Barnabas to *Derbe*. Where having preached the gospel, and taught many, they returned again to *Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch*, confirming the disciples there, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and letting them know, that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had ordained them elders in every city, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed. From Antioch they went to Pamphylia. And when they had preached the word in *Perga*, where they had been before, but probably made no stay, they went down to *Attalia*, a maritime city of the same country. Thence they sailed to *Antioch*, whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work which they had fulfilled. And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the gentiles. And there they abode long time with the disciples, ver. 18—28.

For this journey Pearson † allots three years, that is, 45, 46, 47, and somewhat more. For he placeth their setting out, and going to *Salamis* in the year 44. Tillemont ‡ thinks this journey might be performed in two years, that is, according to his computation, part of the year 44, all 45, and part of 46. From which time to the council at

Annal. Paulin. p. 67.

† S. Paul. Art. xii—xv.

Jerusalem, next mentioned by St. Luke, might be, as he thinks, about five years. In which space of time, he supposeth Paul to have gone into Illyricum, and also to have preached *throughout all Judea*: as mentioned Acts xxvi. 20. and likewise in Cilicia.

I likewise am of opinion, that this Journey of Paul and Barnabas in the several countries just mentioned, might be performed in two years. I think they could not set out from Antioch before the beginning of the year 45: and, probably returned in the former part of the year 47: but if any are rather for three years, and think this journey was not completed before the beginning of the year 48, I should not reckon it worth while to dispute about it.

But I do not see any reason to believe, that they undertook any more Journies, before they went up to the council at Jerusalem. They might judge it very proper to make a long stay at Antioch, where was the first gentile church: as the other apostles made a long stay at Jerusalem, and in Judea. However, this church of Antioch, I suppose, with Witfius, to have consisted partly of Jews, and partly of Gentiles. Nor do I think that Paul and Barnabas would, as yet, extend their ministry farther than they had done, without an express divine appointment. What they had already done, was a great deal; and must have exceeded the most raised expectations, till they had seen the event. Their stay at Antioch must have been very useful, probably expedient. It was proper to secure what they had gained. And they might there receive applications from the several countries in which they had been, and impart counsel and encouragement. If they had soon gone hence again, some might have arrived, that should unsettle the minds of new converts. We plainly perceive, that from Judea came several to see this new colony at Antioch. Some might come with good views, to encourage and confirm the believers there: or to satisfy themselves concerning the truth of what they had heard with great pleasure. But others might come with a design to instil narrow principles, and disturb their minds with different sentiments from those, which had been taught them by Paul and Barnabas. St. Luke, notwithstanding the conciseness of his history, has

^t Erat enim urbs Gentilis, et ecclesia ibidem collecta omnium prima, quæ partim Judæis, partim converſis Gentilibus conſtabat. Uti ſupr. ſect. iii. num. v.

informed us of two visits made here from Judea: the first, in the year 43, or 44, when *there came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch*, ch. xi. 27. Afterwards *there came men from Judea, who taught the brethren, that unless they were circumcised, they could not be saved*, xv. 1. Of which more presently.

If Paul and Barnabas went any where, we might think of Cilicia: the rather, because we can perceive, that soon after this there were gentile believers there: though, when Paul first preached in that country, we suppose him to have applied to Jews only. And it is well observed by Tillemont upon the case now before us: 'it is certain, that Christianity had been established among the gentiles in Cilicia, before the council of Jerusalem.' Acts xv. 23. Nevertheless, I should rather think, that Paul and Barnabas did not now leave Antioch, after their return thither, before they went up to Jerusalem. For some of Cilicia might learn the doctrine of the gospel by coming to Antioch. Or some of the prophets and evangelists of Antioch, may have gone to Cilicia, with the approbation, and by the direction of Paul and Barnabas.

In this way of arguing I am encouraged by those words of St. Luke, just cited: *And there they abode long time with the disciples.* We now proceed.

Acts xv. 1—5. *And certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren: except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined, that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apostles and elders, about this question — And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders. And they declared all things, that God had done with them. But, (they said) there (B) had risen*

As before, Art. xv.

(L) Many have mistaken those words, as if they were St. Luke's, who observed, that there were at Jerusalem some of the sect of the pharisees, who insisted upon imposing the law upon the gentiles. So thought Dr. Doddridge, Family Expositor, vol. III. p. 233. So likewise Tillemont, whose words are these: Ils furent bien reçus à Jerusalem. Mais ils y trouverent

VOL. VI.

les mesmes troubles, qui agitoient l'église d'Antioche, et dont ils venoient chercher le remede. Car quelques Chretiens, qui avoient été Pharisiens, vouloient qu'on obligast les Gentils à la circumcission, et à l'observation de la loi. S. Paul. art. xvi. Grotius himself seems to have understood these words in the same manner. Sicut Antiochiæ quidam e judæis facti Christiani, ita et Hierosolymis quidam

T

risen up certain of the sect of the pharisees, which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law. Thus they delivered their message, and proposed the question, which they were desirous to have determined.

And the apostles and elders came together to consider of this matter. Having in that assembly, after many debates, formed some resolutions, they sent them in a letter to the brethren, which are of the gentiles, in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, ver. 6—31.

Those determinations were intended for all believers in general from among the gentiles, containing, as it were, the terms, upon which all gentiles were to be admitted into the church of Christ. But the epistle was directed, particularly to the gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, because among them the controversy had arisen, and they were the persons, who had sent a solemn deputation to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, to have their opinion upon it.

This journey to Jerusalem, related by St. Luke Acts xv. I suppose to be the same with that mentioned by St. Paul himself, of which he gives an account to the Galatians, ch. ii. 1—10. Indeed, he mentions some circumstances, wanting in Luke. But, as I apprehend, they are not such as need induce us to think two different journies to be spoken of.

From Paul therefore we shall endeavour to find out the time of it. *Then fourteen years after,* says he, *I went up again to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation.* In the preceding chapter of the

dam duriores illam defendebant sententiam. Grot. in ver. 5. Whereas, upon due consideration, I think, all must be sensible, that they are not the words of the historian, but of the messengers of the church of Antioch, representing to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem the case, or state of the question, about which they were sent, and which they desired to have now fully resolved, and determined. This is the interpretation, which Beza preferred. Hunc locum video omnes perinde interpretari, ac si essent verba Lucæ, quasi cum suam expeditionem narrarent Paulus ac Barnabas,

insurrexerint, qui circumcisionem urgerent. Quod mihi non sit admodum probabile. Sed potius illes, exposita sua expeditione, subiecisse controversiam illam Antiochiæ excitatam, cujus causa ipsi Hierosolymam venerant. Puto igitur, esse illorum verba, non Lucæ. Bez. in loc. Lenfant follows Beza. And Whitby, if I do not mistake him, gives the same interpretation. And Dr. Doddridge, upon my telling him how I understood the place, readily acquiesced, as I well remember. For he was always open to conviction, therein giving a good example to all inquirers after truth.

epistle

epistle to the Galatians, Paul had related his conversion in the way to Damascus, and then his *going up to Jerusalem, after three years, to see Peter, and abiding with him fifteen days*, ch. i. 18. Where are we to date the beginning of those fourteen years? at his conversion? or at his coming to Jerusalem, to see Peter? Pearson is clearly of opinion, that ^x the computation must be made from the time of his conversion. So likewise say ^y Estius, and ^z Basnage.

Says St. Paul, Gal. i. 18. *Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter.* Those three years cannot be computed from his return to Damascus, out of Arabia, though it be the thing mentioned immediately before in ver. 17. But must be reckoned from his conversion. In like manner must be understood those words in ch. ii. 1. *then fourteen years after I went up to Jerusalem.* We must take the same date or epoch for the *three years*, and for the *fourteen years*. They both begin from the same time, that is, St. Paul's conversion.

The council deputed with their epistle two chosen men of their own number, Judas and Silas, to go to Antioch, together with Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 22, 23. After they had tarried there awhile, Judas returned to Jerusalem, but Silas abode there still, ver 32—34.

This council at Jerusalem, according to ^a Pearson, and, I suppose, many others, was held in the year of Christ 49 Basnage, supposing Paul to have been converted in 37, placeth ^b this council in the year 50.

As I cannot say exactly, when Paul was converted, whether in 36, or 37, I am led to hesitate about the time of the council. But if he was converted before the end of the year 36, the council, as I apprehend, may be computed to have been held in the year 49. St. Paul says, Gal. i. 18. *then after three years I went up to Jerusalem.* *επειτα μετα ετη τρια.* Which, I think, implies full *three years*, or somewhat more, as before observed. But the expression in Gal. ii. 1. is different. We translate:

^a Anno xiv. a conversione S. Pauli congregatum. Hunc enim adventum suum narrat Apostolus Gal. 1, 2. et tempus ipsum determinate exprimit. — Quod autem Apostolus ad epocham conversionis se referat annos, quos ibi narrat, manifestum est ex scopo capitis i. et ii. — Deinde, post annos quatuordecim rursus ascendit Hierosolymam. Idem horum verborum scopus, ea-

dem annorum epocha. Vox enim *επειτα*, deinde non conjungit hæc verba cum illis de triennio, quasi a fine illius triennii initium sumerent. Aliud enim *επειτα* inter hæc et illa intercedit. Annal. Paulin. p. 89.

^y Est. in Gal. ii. 1, 2.

^z Ann. 50. num. iii.

^a Annal. Paulin. p. 8, 9, 10.

^b Ann. 50. num. xxi, xxii.

Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem. Ἐπειτα δια δεκατεσσαρων ετων παλιν ανεβην εις ιεροσολυμα. Which, I think, may be thus rendered: *Then in about fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem.* The *three years*, above-mentioned, are complete: but the *fourteen years* need not be so understood. And, probably, were not complete. If therefore Paul be supposed to have been converted in the year 36, this council might be held, accordingly, in 49.

This period, from Paul's setting out with Barnabas from Antioch, to go to Cyprus, in the beginning of the year 45, to their coming up to the council at Jerusalem, and returning thence to Antioch, near the end of the year 49, or the beginning of 50, is the space of about five years.

X. The next period will reach from this time to St. Paul's coming again to Jerusalem, when he was apprehended, and imprisoned.

Soon after the return of Barnabas and Paul to Antioch, Peter, as it seems, came thither, as related by St. Paul, Gal. ii. 11—21. Nevertheless that occasioned not their making any long stay at Antioch. For, says St. Luke, Acts xv. 36. *And some days after, that is, I think, after their being come back to Antioch, or after Judas had gone away to Jerusalem, and the controversy, which had been troublesome for some while before, was fully composed, Paul said unto Barnabas: let us go again, and visit our brethren, in every city, where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. By which we perceive, that Mark, who before had left Paul and Barnabas, and gone to Jerusalem, was now come again into this country, and was willing to have again accompanied them. Possibly, he came hither with Peter. But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp, that they departed asunder one from the other. So Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus. Paul chose Silas, and departed—and went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches.* Acts xv. 33—41.

I am inclined to think, that it was in the beginning of the year 50, that St. Paul now set out from Antioch. Pearson likewise, and ^a Basnage, place it in the same year.

Witsius thinks, that ^c at this time Paul went from Cilicia

^a Ann. Paul. p. 10.

^d Ann. 50. num. xlvi.

^c Ex Cilicia vi-

to Crete: and that not being able to stay long there himself, he left Titus, that he might set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain elders in every city, ch. i. 5. Pearson^s placeth Paul's Journey into Crete in the latter part of the apostle's life, in 63, or 64, after the deliverance from his imprisonment at Rome. But Witfius says, it is not likely, that the preaching of the gospel in Crete should have been deferred so long: when all Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, Cyprus, Syria, had been already instructed in the doctrine of the gospel. And he observes, that not long after Paul was come from Cilicia, he took Timothy into his attendance, to supply, as he thinks, the want of Titus, lately left in Crete.

Though I cannot say, that Paul now went from Cilicia to Crete, I readily own myself to be of opinion, that the apostle's journey into Crete was performed, and his letter to Titus written, before his imprisonment at Rome. But of this more hereafter.

Having gone through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches, Paul came to Derbe, and Lystra: where they had been before. Here they found Timothy, who, as may be supposed, had been converted, when Paul and Barnabas were there together. Timothy having a good character, from the brethren at Lystra and Iconium, Paul would have him to go forth with him, Acts xvi. 1—3.

Afterwards they came into Phrygia. And it may be reckoned very probable, that now Paul preached in the chief cities of that country, Hierapolis, Laodicea, and Colosse. He also went into Galatia, and there founded many churches. But they were forbidden to preach in Asia, properly so called. St. Luke's words are ver. 6, 7. *Now when they had gone through Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the spirit suffered them not.*

deus Paulus in Cretam navigasse, et prædicato ibi evangelio, quoniam cito properabat, Titum reliquisse, utque e desertis corrigeret, atque oppidana presbyteros constitueret. Quæ Lucæ omnia, ex epistola ad Titum supplenda esse, et huic tempori optime convenire, opinatur L. Capellus. At Pearsonus ad postrema Pauli tempora refert, eaque ejus itinera, quæ solutionem ex vinculis Romanis consecuta sunt — Ca-

PELLI tamen rationes potiores hinc mihi videntur. Non enim verisimile est, ad illud usque tempus ignoratum fuisse Christum in Creta, quum tota Achaia — personarent evangelii præconio. — Deinde Derben et Lystram venit. Ibi in Timotheum incidit, fidissimum sibi abhinc omnium itinerum suorum futurum comitem, &c. De Vita Pauli sect. v. num. i. f Ann. Paulin. p. 21.

Then it follows, ver. 8—10. *And they passing by Mysia, came to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night: there stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying: come over into Macedonia, and help us. And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us to preach the gospel unto them.*

By which manner of speaking we perceive, that Luke was now in Paul's company. It is likely, that he met them at Troas. Which seems to have been the name of a country, and of a city, the chief of the country, situated upon the sea coast.

Ver. 11, 12. *Therefore loosing from Troas, we came with a straight course to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis: and thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony. And we were in that city abiding certain days.*

Samothracia was an island, over against Thrace, bordering upon Macedonia. Neapolis was a town upon the sea coast, on the Thracian side of the Strymonic bay, which separated Macedonia and Thrace. Here, I suppose, they landed, but made no stay. Thence they went by land to Philippi. Here they stayed some while, and several remarkable occurrences in that city are related by St. Luke. Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, in Asia, attended to the things that were spoken of Paul, and was baptized, both she and her household. She seems to have been a merchant, of no small dealings, and probably had with her many servants, and other attendants. Here likewise Paul healed the young maiden, said to be *possessed with a spirit of divination*. After which Paul and Silas were apprehended, beaten, and imprisoned. But they were soon set at liberty. Whereupon they left that city, ver. 13—40.

From thence they passed through Amphipolis, and Apollonia, and came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews, Acts xvii. 1.

Amphipolis and Apollonia were cities of Macedonia. And Thessalonica was the chief city of that country. Here being a Jewish synagogue, Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the scriptures. — *And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas.* Whilſt he was here, believed also, of the devout Greeks, that is, of the people of the country, who were well disposed,
a great

a great multitude, and of the chief women of the city not a few. But the unbelieving Jews made a great disturbance, ver. 2—9.

The brethren therefore immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea, where many of the Jews, and many of the men, and honourable women of the place believed. But some Jews came from Thessalonica, and stirred up the people there also, ver. 10—13.

The brethren therefore immediately sent away Paul, and conducted him to Athens, with Luke, it is likely, the writer of this history. But Silas and Timothy abode still at Berea. St. Luke then gives an account of the apostle's preaching at Athens. The event was, that some mocked. Howbeit some adhered to Paul, and believed. Among which was Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them.

Acts xviii. 1, 2. After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth: and found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome.

The council of Jerusalem, as before said, was held in the year 49, or 50. And it was supposed by us, that Paul might set out from Antioch in the year 50, before it was far advanced. If so, he might come now to Corinth, before the end of the year 51. For as Basnage computes, the apostle's journeyings, after leaving Antioch till his coming to Corinth, need not take up more than a year and a half. I put below his brief enumeration of all the places, which have been lately taken notice of by us. But he did not think of the journey into

Redux a synodo Paulus, post dies aliquot moræ Antiochenæ, mox in Syriam et Ciliciam proficiscitur. Quibus peragratis, continuo in Piniadum, Lycaoniam, Phrygiam penetravit, haud longâ usquam morâ, ut verbo διεξῆλθω ostenditur. Hinc solvens Troade, per Samothraciam delatus est Macedoniam, ubi dies non multos exegit. Mox per Amphipolim, et Apolloniam, Thessalonicam, Macedoniae metropolim, pervenit, ubi per sabbata tria discessit. Motâ seditione, Beream noctu petiit: qua salutatâ, eâ dis-

cessit propter adventum Judæorum — et Athenas pervenit: quâ post aliquantulam temporis moram relicta, Corinthum anno 51, ingressus est. Nostram non minimum adjuvat chronologiam adventus Aquilæ in hanc urbem Româ nuper edicto Claudiano pulsæ: quod probabilissimâ sane conjecturâ anno Claudii xi. promulgatum esse colligitur. Ut a synodo ad peregrinationem usque Corinthum sesquiannus circiter elapsus sit. Basn. ann. 50 num. xxii. Vid. et ann. 51. n. lxxviii. lxxix.

Crete, mentioned by Witfius. Nor do I suppose it to have been then performed. This computation suits Paul's finding Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth. For he thinks, that edict of Claudius to have been published in the eleventh year of his reign, which began on Jan. 24th in the year 51.

At Corinth Paul tarried a year and six months, ch. xviii. 11. that is, as I suppose, the remainder of the year 51, and all 52, and part of 53.—*And then he took leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, and with him Priscilla, and Aquila, having shorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow. And he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but he entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. When they desired him to tarry longer time with them, he consented not: but bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast at Jerusalem: meaning, as I apprehend, the feast of pentecost in the year 53. But I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus. And when he had landed at Cæsarea, and gone up, and saluted the church, namely, at Jerusalem, he went down to Antioch. And after he had spent some time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, that is, visiting the churches, formerly planted by him in those countries, strengthening all the disciples, ver. 18—23.*

In this space of time, after Paul had left Ephesus, there came thither Apollos, born at Alexandria: who received from Aquila and Priscilla farther instructions concerning the christian religion, beyond what he knew before, and then went away to Corinth, ver. 24—28.

Ch. xix. 1. *And it came to pass, that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, meaning the country of Galatia and Phrygia, before-mentioned, came to Ephesus: that is, as I apprehend, before the end of the year 53, possibly, in October, or November.*

I hope, I have allowed time enough for all the journies hitherto mentioned: and that I have not brought Paul to Ephesus too soon.

Ver 8—10. Says St. Luke: *And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing, and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciple, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in*
Asia,

Asia, strictly ^h so called, the country of which Ephesus was the metropolis, *heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.* St. Paul, afterwards, Acts xx. 31. in his discourse to the elders of Ephesus, at Miletus, says, he had been with them the space of three years. Which may be a round number. Three months, at least, he had disputed in the Jewish synagogue, and two years in the school of Tyrannus, and, possibly, somewhat more, making, in the whole, a good deal above two, which St. Paul might call three years.

I think, that Paul might come to Ephesus, before the end of the year 53, in October, or November, as before said. There he continued the remainder of that year, and the whole of the years 54, and 55, till the year 56, about pentecost. However, let us observe the history.

From ver. 11. to 41. the end of the forecited sixth chapter of the Acts is St. Luke's account of the special miracles wrought by Paul at Ephesus, and divers remarkable events, and then of a tumult raised by Demetrius, a silversmith, and *other workmen of like occupation.*

Then Acts xx. 1.—6. *And after the uproar had ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece: and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia Sopater of Berea and of the Thessalomans Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy, and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus. These going before tarried for us at Troas. And we sailed away from Philippi, after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days.*

There is not, perhaps, any part of St. Paul's travels attended with more difficulties, than this period, of his leaving Ephesus, and setting out upon his voyage to Jerusalem, with the collections made in the churches of Greece and Macedonia, and

^h Atque hinc diversæ notiones vocis *Asia* oriuntur, ut latissima tertiam orbis terrarum Continentem sonet, Europæ ab ortu oppositam: latior magnam peninsulam inter Ponticum et Mediterraneum mare: loca *Asiam* cis Taurum, vel intra eum montem. Deinde stricte est provincia proconsularis: strictius

media pars illius provinciæ, circa Ephesum et Lydiam propriam: strictissime, Homerica notione, parvus tractus ad Caystrum fluvium. Sacris scriptoribus significatio illa placuit, quam strictiorem modo diximus, uti ex iis, quæ varie adhuc dicta sunt, elucet. Cellar. Diff. de sept. eccles. *Asiæ* § ix.

some

some other places. St. Luke is very distinct and particular in the account of the journey from Troas to Jerusalem. But from Ephesus to Troas he has mentioned but one city only, which is Philippi. Otherwise, as we have seen in the passage just transcribed, he speaks only of the countries of Macedonia, and Greece.

We will therefore endeavour to settle the time, when Paul left Ephesus, and then consider, how long he might be in Macedonia, or other places, before he went to Troas.

After having related Paul's preaching at Ephesus for a good while, and the success of it, St. Luke says in the forecited sixth. 21, 22, 23. *After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying: after I have been there, I must see Rome. So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered to him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for a season. At the same time there arose no small stir about that way:* meaning the tumult caused by Demetrius, as before mentioned.

Lightfoot has a happy thought upon this place. 'Paul's thoughts, says he, of going to Rome argue the death of Claudius, who had banished all the Jews from thence; Acts xviii. 2. and that by the coming in of Nero, a new emperor, that decree was extinct, and freedom of access to Rome opened to them again. For it can be little conceived, that Paul should think of going thither, when he could neither find any of his nation there, nor himself come thither without certain hazard of his life: as the case would have been, if Claudius and his decree were yet alive. It is therefore agreeable to all reason, that the death of Claudius, and the succession of Nero, were now divulged. And Paul thereupon knowing, that it was now lawful again for a Jew to go to Rome, intendeth to take a farewell journey and visit to Macedonia, Achaia, and Jerusalem, and then to go and preach there.'

Claudius died Oct. 13, in the year 54. It might be the beginning of 55, before the tidings of the death of Claudius and the accession of Nero reached Ephesus. Upon which, or soon after, the thought of going to Rome entered Paul's mind. But he intended first to go to Macedonia, and Greece, and Jerusalem.

ⁱ Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 299.

So, says, St. Luke, *he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministred unto him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for a season.*

By which we are led to think, that those messengers were sent into Macedonia in the year 55. After they were gone, came to Paul at Ephesus, from Corinth, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, 1 Cor. xvi. 17. By them he sends his first epistle to the Corinthians, written, as I suppose, in the beginning of the year 56. And it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11. that Timothy, who, as before seen, had been sent into Macedonia, was also to go to Corinth. For there the apostle says: *now if Timothy come, see that he may be with you without fear. For he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do. Let no man therefore despise him: but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me. For I look for him with the brethren.* Paul therefore was in expectation of Timothy's coming to him at Ephesus. Which I suppose he did, before Paul removed thence. Paul says, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9. *But I will tarry at Ephesus, until pentecost. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me. And there are many adversaries.* The pentecost, there mentioned, I suppose to be that of the year 56.

Some time therefore in the year 56, before pentecost, or about that season, Paul left Ephesus to go into Macedonia. So says St. Luke in his account of Paul's removal from Ephesus. He first mentions Macedonia, and then Greece, Acts xx. 1, 2. And from what Paul says, 2 Cor. ii. 12. it is argued, that* he did not sail away directly from Ephesus to Macedonia: but travelled by land to Troas, and then went over to Macedonia by sea. If so, he went now into Macedonia by the same way that he had done, when he was first there, Acts xvi. 11, 12.

But how long was Paul now in Macedonia and Achaia? or what space of time was there between his leaving Ephesus, and Troas, and his return to Troas, in his way to Jerusalem? If it was a year only, or somewhat less, the passover mentioned, Acts xx. 6. and the pentecost, mentioned ver. 16. were in the

* Sed quid interea Paulus, postquam Epheso profectus est, ut iret in Macedoniam? Per Minorem Asiam iter faciens, venit Troadem nobilissimam civitatem, quæ adjacet Helleponto: ubi quærens Timotheum, cum non invenisset, transmissio

fretò abiit in Macedoniam, 2 Cor. ii. Baron. ann. 57. num. clxxxv.

Paul ne s'embarqua pas à Ephese, mais il vint à Troade dans le dessein d'y prescher l'evangile. Tillem. S. Paul. art. 31.

year 57. But if Paul's journey from Ephesus, round about by Troas, Macedonia, and Achaia, and Macedonia again, to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem, took up two years, or thereabout, then the pentecost mentioned Acts xx. 16. was in the year of Christ 58. And, if I mistake not, there are several considerations, leading us to think, that these journeyings took up more, than the space of a year.

It need not to be doubted, that Timothy returned from Corinth to Paul, before the apostle removed from Ephesus. And that Paul left him there, will be manifest from that, which is called the first epistle to Timothy. *As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some, that they teach no other doctrine,* 1 Tim. i. 3. Paul therefore left Timothy at Ephesus, for weighty reasons: and some time after his coming into Macedonia, wrote him a letter, for his direction and assistance in the arduous work lying before him. But Timothy was with Paul, at writing the second epistle to the Corinthians. For it begins thus: *Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ—and Timothy our brother unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the saints in all Achaia.* That letter was sent from Macedonia, a little before Paul went to Corinth. But some good while must have passed between Paul's leaving Timothy at Ephesus, and writing to him, and this second epistle to the Corinthians. Paul, it is very probable, did not send for Timothy to come to him from Ephesus presently after he had left him there. I might add, that there must have been some emergent occasions, that induced Paul to call Timothy to him from Ephesus, where his presence was of great importance. What those occasions were Luke has not at all hinted. But they may be supposed. However, I do not now stay to hint what they were.

Paul in his second epistle to the Corinthians, ch. i and xiii. 1. apologizeth for his deferring so long to come to them. But there could have been no occasion for such apologies, if he had come to them in the same year that he wrote his first epistle.

Paul says, 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6. *Now I will come unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia—And it may be, that I will abide, yea, and winter with you.* But Paul did not abide, and winter with them, according to this proposal, as here intimated. If he had, there could have been no ground for such apologies, as are in the second epistle. Nevertheless the apostle did spend *three months* with them, not very long before a passover.

passover. Which must have been partly in some winter. As they could not be in the year 56, when the first epistle to them was written, they must have been in the year after, that is about the end of the year 57, and the beginning of the year 58. See again Acts xx. 1—6.

St. Paul says, 2 Cor. ix. 2. *For I know the forwardness of your mind For which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago And your zeal has provoked very many.* Which plainly shows, that it was now above a year since writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, which was sent from Ephesus. For there he says, ch. xvi. 1, 2. *Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given directions to the churches of Galatia, so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him: that there be no gatherings when I come.* These directions were then sent to the Corinthians. They therefore were not ready then. They could not be ready till some while after. And yet, at the time of writing the second epistle to them from Macedonia, they had been *ready above a year.*

This shows, that Paul was above a year in Macedonia, or near it. Moreover after sending away this second letter, Paul went to Corinth, and stayed there *three months*, and afterwards went thence through Macedonia to Troas.

Consequently there was the space of two years, or almost two years, between Paul's leaving Ephesus and coming to Troas, in his way to Jerusalem.

As Paul did not winter at Corinth in the year 56, we are led to think of Nicopolis, mentioned Titus iii. 12.

Before I proceed, I must take some farther notice of the words of 2 Cor. i. 15, 16. *And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before, or first, that you might have a second benefit: and to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia to you, and of you to be brought on my way toward Judea* Hence it may be concluded, that in the beginning of the year 56, before Paul left Ephesus, he once had hopes of getting to Judea in the year following, that is, in the year 57, probably at passover, or pentecost, and that he had been prevented. He then intended to go from Ephesus to Corinth, thence to Macedonia, and to return from Macedonia to Corinth, that by the Christians there he might be brought on his way to Judea. But by some means he had been carried into a different course. He had not yet been in Judea: nor was he yet come to Corinth, though he had been in Macedonia. And, probably,

probably, he did not get into Judea before the pentecost in 58. These words therefore must induce us to think, that there was a longer space of time between Paul's leaving Ephesus, and coming to Corinth and Jerusalem, than has been generally supposed of late.

Baronius says, that ^l during this period Paul was in Crete, as well as in Macedonia and Achaia, as does ^m Lightfoot; who also supposeth ⁿ Paul to have been now in Illyricum.

Dr. Benson ^o thinks, that Paul might say as he does, Rom. xv. 19. that he had preached the gospel from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum, 'upon account of his being, and that
' more than once, in Macedonia, which bordered upon Illyri-
' cum, the Scardian mountains, and the river Drilo, being the
' boundaries between them.' And after the like manner Witsius, who thinks that ^p Paul did not intend to say, that he had preached in Illyricum, for he only makes it the boundary of his labours. However, he says, that Apollonia was a city of Illyricum.

Wall upon Acts xx. 2. ^q says, 'St. Paul did many great
' things in that nine months time. [So he computes.] It
' must have been during that space, I think, that he made an
' excursion into Illyricum, and preached the gospel there.'

Mr. Biscoe delivers his thoughts in this manner: 'In the
' same epistle he says: *From Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum,*
' *I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.* Which is a general
' confirmation of the whole history of his travels in the book
' of the Acts. For in that history he is said to have gone

^l Ann. 57. num. ccix. ^m Lightfoot, Harm. of the N. T. vol. I. p. 309. ⁿ Ibid. p. 307. ^o Upon the Acts, vol. II. p. 174. first edit. p. 194. the second edit.

^p Deinde iter fecerunt per Amphipolim urbem Philippis vicinam, et Apolloniam quæ est Corinthiorum et Corcyræorum colonia, civitas Illyriæ. Sic enim Stephanus.— Verum id nostræ nunc potissimum considerationis est, quod Apollonia urbs Illyrica sit. Pertinet hoc ad illustrationem illius quod Paulus Romanis scripsit. xv. 19.— Multorum iste locus ingenia fatigavit, non invenientium, quo tempore Paulus evangelium, in Illyrico,

quod supponunt, prædicavit.— Sed quid laboramus in cassum? Primo enim Illyricum non comprehendit Paulus suis itineribus, quasi id quoque evangelium prædicando peragraverit; sed Illyricum statuit itinerum suorum terminum. Venit enim ad limites Illyrici, quando venit Apolloniam. Optime Grotius ad Rom. xv. 19. Macedonia, quam peragravit Paulus, Dalmatiam attingit, quæ pars Illyrici, et ipsum mare Illyricum. In eo tractu est Apollonia, nominata Act. xvii. 1. Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. v. num. xi. ^q Wall's Notes upon the N. T. p. 205.

^r Upon the Acts, p. 424, 425.

' through

‘ through Syria, Cilicia, and most, if not all the countries in
 ‘ Peninsular Asia, to have gone over into Europe, and to pass
 ‘ through Macedonia into Greece. Now Berea, the last city,
 ‘ in which St. Paul is said to have preached in Macedonia,
 ‘ could not be far from Delfaretia, which was part of the
 ‘ ancient Illyricum. At the same time I must own, it does
 ‘ not seem at all improbable to me, that St. Paul might in one
 ‘ of his journies through Macedonia (for St. Luke relates his
 ‘ passing through Macedonia three times) make an excursion
 ‘ into some of the nearer parts of Illyricum, and plant the
 ‘ gospel among them, though not taken notice of in the
 ‘ history of the ^s Acts. It is certain however, that during St.
 ‘ Paul’s life the gospel was preached even in the remoter parts
 ‘ of Illyricum, and not improbably by the apostle himself,
 ‘ after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome. For
 ‘ in his second epistle to Timothy, written when he was a
 ‘ second time prisoner in that great city, he informs him, that
 ‘ he had sent Titus into Dalmatia.’

If I were to alter the latter part of that paragraph, agree-
 ably to my apprehensions, it would stand thus: ‘ It is certain,
 ‘ that during St. Paul’s life the gospel was preached even in
 ‘ the remoter parts of Illyricum, and more than probable by
 ‘ the apostle himself, and that before his imprisonment at
 ‘ Rome, when he was sent thither from Judea by Festus. For
 ‘ in his second epistle to Timothy, written during that his
 ‘ imprisonment at Rome, he informs him, that he had sent
 ‘ Titus into Dalmatia.’

The second epistle to Timothy having been written at that
 time, if any argument can be fetched from it, it must prove,
 that Paul had been in Illyricum, before he went to Jerusalem,
 and probably, at the time, which we are now speaking of.

It appears to me very probable, that at this time Paul was
 in Illyricum, and Crete. But I cannot digest the order of his
 journies, since St. Luke has not related them. St. Luke says
 nothing of Paul’s going to Troas. He only says, that Paul
 went from Ephesus to Macedonia, and then came into Greece.

‘ All that St. Luke says of his
 ‘ second journey is this: *And when*
 ‘ *he had gone over these parts, and had*
 ‘ *given them much exhortation, he came*
 ‘ *into Greece, Acts xx. 2.* All that
 ‘ is said of the third journey is, that
 ‘ whereas he intended to have sailed
 ‘ from Greece into Syria, knowing

‘ that the Jews laid wait for him,
 ‘ he changed his mind, and passed
 ‘ through Macedonia, ver. 3—6.
 ‘ At either of these times he might
 ‘ make an excursion into Illyricum,
 ‘ but most probably in his second
 ‘ journey.’ That is a note of Mr.
 Biscoe at p. 425.

Though

Though Paul was preparing for his journey to Jerusalem, with contributions of gentile churches, he was not in a hurry. Nor were those collections his only concern. Notwithstanding the tumult at Ephesus, he took leave of his friends there with a good deal of deliberation. St. Luke's words are, Acts xx. 1. *And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia.* Nor does St. Luke represent the apostle in great haste in that country. For he says, ver. 2. *And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece.*

It is now a common opinion, that St. Paul did not go directly to Macedonia from Ephesus, but went by land to Troas, and there crossed over to Macedonia. It is evident, that before he wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians, from Macedonia, he had been at Troas. For 2 Cor. ii. 12. he says, *he came to Troas, to preach Christ's gospel, and that a door was opened to him of the Lord.* There is no absurdity in supposing that St. Luke, who says nothing of Paul's having been then at Troas, and omitted the apostle's journey into Arabia, and indeed many other things, has omitted an account of his going to Crete and Illyricum. Wall, and others, who compute no more than nine months between Paul's leaving Ephesus, and coming to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem, may find a difficulty in admitting what we contend for. But I think I have shown it to be a space of almost two years, or about a year and three quarters. This alone will render it probable, that somewhat was done by Paul, beside what is mentioned by St. Luke in Acts xx. 1—6.

St. Paul's words, in the epistle to the Romans, written at Corinth, in this period, are very remarkable: *so that from Jerusalem, and round about, unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.*—*For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming unto you. But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you,* ch. xv. 19, 22, 23. He seems now, as it were, at ease, knowing what he had done, and considering, that there was nothing more left to be done by him in those parts. And why should not Illyricum be understood in the same manner

‘ He did not go directly from
‘ Ephesus to Macedonia, that is,
‘ he did not take shipping at Ephe-
‘ sus (that was not safe): but e-
‘ scaped by land to Troas, as he

‘ says 2 Cor. ii. 12. and from
‘ thence took ship to Macedonia.’
Wall's Critical Notes upon the N.
T. p. 205.

epistle

as Jerusalem? He had been at Jerusalem: and consequently, I think, in Illyricum likewise. And I should apprehend, that now was the time when Paul could first say so much as he here does.

Jerom had no doubt, but that Paul was in Illyricum. 'Christ, says he, was with Peter at Rome, with Paul in Illyricum with Titus in Crete.' That opinion, it is likely, was built upon this text in the epistle to the Romans. Consequently, it is to be supposed, that Paul had been in Illyricum, before writing that epistle. Nor can any season be thought of more likely, than this period, between his leaving Ephesus, and coming to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem.

I suppose Theodoret to be of the same mind with us, and to confirm what we are now saying, in his comment upon Rom. xv. 19. 'He * shows, to how many people he had preached: so that *from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.* As if he had said, I have not cultivated the nations in a straight line only; but going round about I have planted the doctrine of the gospel in the eastern countries, and also in Pontus, and likewise in Asia and Thrace. That is what he intends by *round about.*'

And Euthalius, in his prologue to St. Paul's fourteen epistles, reckons †† Illyricum among the countries where Paul had preached, and says, that he converted a large part of it to the faith of Christ.

It may be not improper for us to give here some attention to the history of Aquila and Priscilla. They were with Paul at Ephesus, when he wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, in the spring of the year 56. For he sends their salutations in these words: *The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house,* 1 Cor. xvi. 19. The Jews having been banished from

* Erat igitur uno eodemque tempore et cum Apostolis quadraginta diebus — cum Thoma in India, cum Paulo in Illyrico, cum Tito in Creta, cum Andrea in Achaia. Ad Marcell. T. IV. P. I. p. 167. Bened.

† Διδασκει δε και ποσοις εκηρυξεν εθνη — ου γαρ τα κατα την ευθειαν ου παρακειμενα εθνη εγεωργησα μονα, ελλα και κυκλω περκων, τατε εωα, και

τα ποντικα μερη, και προς τετοις τα κατα ασιαν, και την θρακην, της διδασκαλιας επληρωσα. Τατο γαρ δηλοι το κυκλω. Theod. in loc. T. III. p. 111, 112.

†† — πολλας μεν πολεις, πολλας δε χωρας περιενοσησεν, μικρω δε το ιλλυρικον απαν των της εις χριστον ευσεβειας δογματων ανεπληστε. Euthal. ap. Zac. p. 520.

Rome by an edict of Claudius, they came to Corinth, a short time before Paul, Acts xviii. 1—3. When Paul went from Corinth to Ephesus, and Jerusalem, they went with him as far as Ephesus, and tarried there, ver. 18, 19. When Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, at the end of his second peregrination in Macedonia and Achaia, in the spring of the year 58 (as we suppose) they were at Rome. For Paul sends his salutations to them, Rom. xvi. 3. Afterwards they returned to Ephesus. For Paul sends his salutations to them in his second epistle to Timothy, then at Ephesus, 2 Tim. iv. 19. which epistle I think to have been written in the summer of the year 61, soon after Paul's coming a prisoner to Rome. And it has been supposed, that they continued at Ephesus the remainder of their life: which to me seems not improbable. It is likely, that soon after Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia, which he did in April or May 56, they also went from Ephesus to Rome. They might return thither, with a view to settle some secular affairs, they having before left Rome in a hurry, in compliance with the edict of Claudius. Or they returned to Rome with a design to continue there. For they seem to have had their family with them. Says St. Paul, in the place before referred to, Rom. xvi. 3—5. *Salute Priscilla and Aquila, — and the church in their house.* Mr. Biscoe^y explaining these words, *the church in their house*, says, 'they had, it is probable, a considerable number of servants to carry on their trade. These, doubtless, were taught by them the christian faith: by which means they had a church in their house, wherever they settled.' And speaking of their being at Corinth, he says, 'they^z came from Rome, and settled at Corinth: in whose house at Corinth St. Paul took up his lodging, and wrought with them at their trade of tent making.'

What I would observe is this; that there is nothing in the history of these two excellent Christians, Paul's helpers, inconsistent with the account which we have just given of this peregrination of Paul: which is to this purpose. Paul removed from Ephesus in the spring of the year 56, and went into Macedonia. But which way he went, I cannot tell, whether by the way of Troas, or some other course. He also was in Crete, and Illyricum about this time. Having spent the winter of 56 at Nicopolis, either in Thrace or Epirus, he came into Macedonia: where he stayed some while. And near

^y Upon the Acts, p. 433.

^z The same, p. 432.

the end of the year 57, in November, or December, he came into Achaia, and particularly to Corinth, where he stayed three months. Hence Paul intended to have sailed to Syria. But understanding *that the Jews laid wait for him*, he returned again to Macedonia. *And sailed away from Philippi, after the days of unleavened bread, and came to his friends at Troas in five days*, Acts xx. 3—6. That passover, which Paul kept at Philippi, we suppose to have been in the year 58. At Troas Paul stayed seven days.

It is not needful for us to pursue distinctly Paul's Journey thence to Jerusalem, it being very clearly laid down by St. Luke, in the remaining part of ch. xx. and the beginning of xxi. I observe a few things only, ch. xx. 13. *And we went before by ship to Assos [from Troas] there intending to take in Paul. For so he had appointed, minding himself to go afoot.* By which, I apprehend, we need not suppose that Paul walked all that way: the original word, as seems to me, importing no more than that Paul chose to go so far by land; whilst the rest of the company went by water. † ‡

Ch. xx. 16. *For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia. For he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of pentecost.* As I suppose he was, though it is not particularly mentioned by St. Luke. So says ^a Lightfoot: 'St. Paul cometh to Jerusalem at the feast of pentecost, when the city was now full of a confluence to that festival.' Whereby we may be able to apprehend the greatness of the multitude of the people, as intimated by St. Luke xxi. 27—36. and the extremity of the apostle's danger, and the terrifying circumstances of it.

We have now gone through a period of about eight years, from Paul's leaving Antioch, not far from the beginning of the year 50, to his coming to Jerusalem at the pentecost in 58.

XI. I shall next observe the apostle's history from this time to his deliverance from his imprisonment at Rome.

Paul was about two years in Judea. He came to Jerusalem, as just said, at the feast of pentecost in the year 58. And he was sent away to Rome near the end of the year 60. St. Luke's account of what happened to Paul in that space of time is in

† ‡ Μεταμεληθηναι δ' αυτος εν παντι περυσσαι την δε τριτην, οτι μιαν ημεραν
 τρις μεταμελειας: μιαν μεν επι αδιαβετος εμεινεν. Plutarch. Vit. M.
 τρις μεταμελειας λογον απορητον. Caion. Maj.
 αλλα δε πλευσας, οπη δυνατον ην ^a As before, vol. I. p. 319.

ch. xxi. 17.—ch. xxvi. 1—32. For when he had been a few days at Jerusalem, he was seized by a rude and enraged multitude, who would have killed him, if he had not been rescued out of their hands by Lyfias, a tribune, and the chief officer at Jerusalem, under the Roman governor; who secured him in the castle of Antonia, binding him with two chains to two soldiers. But before Paul was carried into the castle, he made a speech to the people, as he stood upon the stairs going up into it. But the people not being at all mollified, and still showing great rage, the chief captain ordered that Paul should be brought into the castle. The next day he loosed Paul from his bonds, and brought him before the Jewish council. But a great dissension arising in the council between the members of it, the captain was obliged *to take him by force from them, and bring him into the castle.* The day after the captain being informed of a conspiracy to assassinate Paul, he prudently sent him from Jerusalem, under a strong guard, to Cæsarea by the sea side, where the governor Felix resided. After two years imprisonment Porcius Festus came in the room of Felix, who, to gratify the Jews, left Paul bound. In a short time Festus brought his prisoner's cause to a hearing at Cæsarea. And the Jews still prosecuting him with great earnestness, Paul appealed to Cæsar. *Then Festus, when he had conferred with his council, answered, hast thou appealed to Cæsar? Unto Cæsar thou shalt go.* A while after which Paul, and other prisoners in that country, were delivered to Julius, a centurion, to be conducted by sea to Italy.

Whilst Paul was in Judea, he made a speech to the people at Jerusalem, already taken notice of, when he freely declared his principles and conduct. He was also brought by Lyfias before the whole Sanhedrim, or Jewish council. He pleaded before Felix in answer to the accusations of Tertullus, and the Jews who employed him. He preached before Felix and his wife Drusilla, and was several times in the presence of Felix. And before he was sent away to Rome, Festus gave him an opportunity to appear, and plead before himself, and king Agrippa, and Bernice, and the tribunes, and principal men of Cæsarea: when Paul gave that august assembly an account of his doctrine, and of himself from his conversion to that time. And it is manifest, that Paul's discourse was well received. And both he and his doctrine were acquitted from all the charges and accusations of the Jews. For when the company had
 withdrawn,

withdrawn, they said among themselves, where certainly they could speak with freedom: *This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds.*

Indeed, it must be owned, that Paul was civilly treated by all the Roman officers in Judea, Lysias, Felix, Festus, Julius. They all behaved as magistrates ought to do. They gave their prisoner and his accusers a fair hearing, that they might know the truth of the case. Felix was a bad man. Nevertheless, *he commanded a Centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister, or to come to him, ch. xxiv. 23.* And he left Paul bound, when he should have released him. But it was only out of compliance to the Jews, of whom he was afraid. And if there was any other defect of justice toward Paul, in the behaviour of the Roman officers; it may be fitly imputed to the powerful influence of the Jews, the people of the country: to whom governors, sent in from abroad, would be obliged to show a great regard from political considerations.

In ch. xxvii. and xxviii. 1—16. is an account of Paul's voyage to Rome, which St. Luke has related very distinctly. As it was near winter, when they set out; they met with bad weather, and were wrecked on the island Melita, now called Malta, lying south of Sicily. There they stayed *three months. xxxviii. 11.* and then sailed for Italy in a ship of Alexandria. They landed at Puteoli, and so went for Rome. Paul and the other prisoners were delivered by the centurion to the captain of the guard. How the other prisoners were disposed of, is not particularly related. *But Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him, ver. 16.* And as Paul had appealed to the emperor, I suppose, that he was soon brought before him, and that the method of his confinement was ordered by the emperor himself. Of which I may say more hereafter, when we come to the second epistle to Timothy.

Says ^b Lightfoot: His accusers, that were come from Judea to lay in their charge against him (for we can hardly suppose otherwise, but that some such were come) would be urgent to get their business dispatched, that they might be returning to their own home again. And so would bring him to trial as soon as they could.—As he ap-

^b As before, p. 322.

‘pealed to Nero himself, so Nero himself heard his cause.
‘Philip. i. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 16.’

So Lightfoot. And it appears to me very strange, that any should think, Paul’s cause was not heard at all at Rome, during his two years stay there. And yet it has been the opinion of several learned men, particularly of James Capellus, and ^d Dr. Doddridge, whose words I have placed below. And Fr. Spanheim speaks to the like purpose. But his sentiments are rejected by his friend ^e Witfius, as no better than trifling.

Paul came to Rome in the spring of the year, as all will readily think. Some learned men place his arrival there in ^f February, others ^g in April. Here Paul *dwelled two whole years in his own hired house.* Therefore he was released from his confinement in the spring, two years after.

I suppose, Paul to have come to Jerusalem at the pentecost of the year 58, to Rome in the spring of the year 61, and to have been released in the former part of the year 63. This period therefore is about the space of five years.

XII. We are now to write the history of our apostle from this time to his death. But in this period we have no assistance from St. Luke, very little from the other books of the New Testament, nor very much from ancient authors, which can be depended upon as certain.

Whither Paul went, after he had obtained his liberty, has been debated. Some think, that ^h he went from Rome to

^e Redit Romam causam acturus, quod in prima Romæ mansionē non comparuissent accusatores. Jac. Cap. Compendios. in Apostol. Histor. Chronolog. Tab.

^d ‘After this Paul continued ^e two whole years at Rome in his ^e own hired house, before he was ^e heard by Cæsar, or his deputy, ^e upon his appeal.’ Upon Acts xxviii. 30. Family Expositor, vol. III. p. 434.

^e Celeberrimus Spanhemius noster ad Historiæ Christianæ seculum i. — hæc habet: *Dimissus nempe fuerat Paulus, ea lege, ut in Asiâ coram accusatoribus suis sisteretur, aut Romæ rursus sisteret, quam ante nulli in ipsam Romam missi a Judæis essent. Ea occasione adiit Corinthum.* — Sed apparen-

tibus Hierosolymâ Judæis, Romam redire coactus est, anno, ut videtur, sequente: ubi conjectus in vincula, ibidemque ultima Pauli certamina, &c.

— Quæ quam debili nitenter fundamento, non puto mihi esse ostendendum. Wits. de Vit. Pauli. sect. xii. num. xl. ^f Ita Paulus, postquam per tres menses Melitæ hiemasset, per Syracusas, Rhegium, et Puteolos, Romam venit mense Febr. Neron. vii. Pearson. Ann. Paul. p. 18. A. D. lxi.

Ita tandem Paulus, post tot casus, post tot rerum discrimina, Romam venit, anno vii. Neronis, mense Februario. Wits. ib. sect. xii. n. i.

See likewise Tillemont. S. Paul. art. 42. ^g Basnag. ann. 62. num. x. ^h Adveniente Timotheo,

theo,

to Spain. Others see not sufficient reason for that supposition. Among these are ¹ Lenfant and Beaufobre, ^k Basnage, and ^l Cellarius, and †* Du Pin.

That Paul went into Spain, has been argued from an expression of Clement in his epistle to the Corinthians, who there says of Paul, ‘that ^m having taught the whole world righteousness, and having come to the borders of the west, and having suffered martyrdom, he went to the holy place.’ Which some have rendered *the utmost bounds of the west*, and argue, that ⁿ hereby is meant Spain. I rather think, that Clement only meant Italy, or Rome, where Clement was, and where Paul suffered. From a note of Le Clerc upon the place we learn, that ^o Bp. Fell so understood Clement. The word *coming* also leads to this sense. If Clement had thought of Spain, or Britain, or any other places beyond that, in which himself was, he would not have said *και ελθων*, and *having come*, but *πορευσαμενος*, or some other equivalent word, and *having gone to the bounds of the west*. Lenfant and Beaufobre in their general preface to St. Paul’s epistles say,

theo, ex Italia profectus est in Hispaniam, quo iturum se dixerat in epistolâ ad Romanos. Pearson. ib. p. 20.

ⁱ Quelques anciens peres ont dit, que saint Paul ayant été mis en liberté, alla faire le voyage d’Espagne, dont il avoit formé le dessein cinq ou six ans auparavant. Rom. xv. 24. Mais outre que ces temoignages sont du quatrième ou du cinquième siecle, il semble que ces peres n’ont parlé de ce voyage, que sur ce que S. Paul en a dit dans l’épître aux Romains. C’est au moins tout ce que S. Jerome allegue. — Aussi les epîtres, que S. Paul écrivit durant sa captivité, temoignent, qu’il ne pensoit qu’à retourner en Grèce et en Asie, des qu’il seroit delivré. Pouvoit il avoir dans l’esprit un voyage en Espagne, lorsqu’il mandoit à Philemon, *de lui preparer un logement*? Laissant donc une tradition, au moins fort incertaine, &c. Lenf. et Beaut. Pref. generale sur les epîtres de S. Paul. § liv. p. 33.

^l Ann. 46. num. xlvi—1.

¹ Eruditis placet, et admodum est probabile, Paulum prima captivitate, quam Lucas scripsit, liberatum in Græciam et Asiam revertisse, adeoque bis Romæ fuisse: in Hispaniam autem penetrasse, credibile non est. Chr. Cellar. de Itineribus S. Pauli Apostoli. § xxviii.

†* Il arriva à Rome au commencement de l’an 61. Il en sortit au bout de deux ans. Plusieurs ont crû, qu’il avoit alors fait le voiage d’Espagne. Mais nous avons fait voir ailleurs, que cela est fort incertain. Il est plus vraisemblable, qu’il revint dans l’Asie, et dans la Grèce. Du Pin. Diss. Prel. 1. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

^m δικαιοσυνην διδάξας ολον τον κοσμον, και επι το τερμα της δυσσεως ελθων, και μαρτυρησας επι των ηγεμονων. — κ. λ. Clem. cap. v. ⁿ Et certe eam regionem vidit, quam Clementis Romanus ejus itinera commemorans appellat το τερμα της δυσσεως. Pearson. ibid. ^o Romæ, hoc est in Hesperia, sive Italia. Fell.

the bounds of the west ^p signify nothing but the west. It is an expression, they say, borrowed from the scriptures, in which the borders of a country denote the country itself. In like manner by those words Clement intended Italy.

However, another ground of this opinion is what St. Paul himself says, Rom. xv. 24. *Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you. For I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company.* But Paul's measures had been broken by his imprisonment at Rome, and the consequences of it. And it was now at least five years, since writing the epistle to the Romans. It is more likely, that ^q when Paul left Rome, he went into the east, and Greece. For in his letters, written near the end of his confinement there, he expresseth hopes of so doing. Philip. ii. 23, 24. speaking of Timothy, he says: *Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see, how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly.* Compare i. 20—25.—And he says to Philemon, an inhabitant of Colosse, ver. 22. *But withal prepare me a lodging: for I trust, that through your prayers, I shall be given unto you.* And in the epistle to the Hebrews, probably, written by Paul to the Jews of Judea, and Jerusalem, he says, ch. xiii. 18, 19. *Pray for us.—And I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.* And lower, ver. 23. *Know ye, that our brother Timothy is set at liberty. With whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.* Moreover, it is not impossible, but that Paul may have taken care of Spain by sending thither some of his fellow-labourers, whilst he was prisoner at Rome.

As I suppose the epistle to the Hebrews to have been written after that to Philemon, I am apt to think, that Paul came from Rome to Jerusalem, as soon, and as directly as he could. But he made there a short stay only. From Judea I think it likely that he went to Ephesus, and there left Timothy: whom about two years before he had sent for

^p Num. liv. p. 33. ^q Nos tamen præcipue movent petita ex Scripturis argumenta, quibus aperte liquet, Paulum egressum Romanorum carcere, in Orientem se contulisse. Documento sane magno, mutatum esse jubente Deo Pauli consilium, quo in Hispaniæ tractum ex civitate Romana proficisci statu-

erat.—Illud etiam nobis est vero proximum, peregrinationem Pauli Hispanicam ex verbis Pauli fabricatam.—Unde collegerunt, quod decreverat, illud executioni esse mandatum. Quæ tamen non est apta argumentandi ratio, &c. Basng. Ann. 46. num. xlix.

to come to him from Ephesus to Rome. From Ephesus Paul might go to Laodicea and Colosse. And, possibly, he returned to Rome by Troas, Philippi, and Corinth.

Some have hesitated to allow, that Paul ever came again into this country, because he says, Acts xx. 25. *And now, behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.* But Lewis Capellus^r has well removed that difficulty. I therefore have placed below a part of his observations. And says Wall^s upon the place: *Εγω οἶδα, I know, when spoken of things future, does not (as it is used by St. Paul) always signify a certain knowledge, or a prophetic certainty: but often means only thus much: I take it for granted: I am fully persuaded: I foresee it highly probable: I have no other expectation. And the like.* See also what there follows.

They who think, that Paul did come again into this country, but nevertheless was not at Ephesus, seem not to attend to St. Paul's expressions, who does not say to the elders of Ephesus: *I know that you will see me no more.* But his words are these: *And now, behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.* The apostle then thought, that he should never more come into those parts. Consequently, he might, as well come to Ephesus, as to Colosse: which he probably did, and certainly hoped, and intended to do. See Philem. ver. 22.

Beside Capellus, and Wall, already alleged, I might refer to others, who hesitate not at all to allow, that Paul came again into this country, particularly Le Clerc, and Lenfant and Beaufobre, upon Acts xx. 25. and^r Pearson. Not now to mention any more.

^r Sed responderi potest, Paulum non semel ex humana conjectura, atque ex humano spiritu, consilio, et proposito, multa ejusmodi cogitasse, putasse, proposuisse, ac dixisse. Quæ tamen postea, Deo ita disponente, aliter ceciderunt. — Itaque mirum videri non debet, si cum Spiritus Paulum oppidatim moneret vincula et afflictiones graves manere eum Jerosolymis, sentiretque se Spiritu ligatum, ut eo nihilominus proficisceretur, nesciens quænam essent illic sibi even-

tura, desperaverit de reditu suo ad eos, quos post se relinquebat, licet Deo ita disponente—res aliquot post annis ceciderit aliter, quam ipse tum credebat. Non est itaque tam validum adversus nos argumentum illud, ut eo subvertatur sententia nostra de Pauli reditu in Orientem, post soluta Romana ejus vincula. Lud. Capel. Hist. Apost. Illustrat. p. 34—36. ^s Notes upon the N. T. p. 255.

^r Paulus venit Miletum, &c. Ann. Paulin. p. 24. A. D. lxvi.

I said

I said just now, that, probably, Paul went to Jerusalem, as soon as he could, after he was set at liberty. And say Lenfant and Beaufobre in their " general preface to St. Paul's epistles: ' We have seen, that the apostle was accustomed to go from time to time to Jerusalem, and to take the opportunity of solemn festivals. So long as the temple subsisted, the Jewish Christians did not neglect the ordinances of the law. St. Paul himself did not neglect them, that he might give no offence to the Jews.' I readily assent to what they say about the apostle's going to Jerusalem. I could almost think, that Paul was desirous to go thither, to praise God in his temple for the favourable circumstances of his imprisonment at Rome, and for his deliverance from it. Paul's case at Rome very much resembled what had happened to him at Corinth. After (c) which, we find, he had a vow, and went from Corinth to Ephesus, and hastened to Jerusalem, Acts xviii. 9—22. In like manner, I imagine, that now Paul went to Jerusalem, as soon as he could. But he made no long stay there. It had not been his custom so to do, since his conversion.

Having been at Jerusalem, I suppose, as before said, that he visited divers churches, which had been planted by him, and then returned to Rome. St. Paul, though a prisoner, had lived very comfortably at Rome. And he had there had great success in his services for the gospel. It seems to me, that he now considered that city, as the most proper place for him to reside in the remaining part of his life. It was the most conspicuous place in all the world, and the place of the greatest resort from all Parts. There he hoped to be more useful, than in any other place.

But things do not always fall out exactly according to human expectations. For, as I suppose, the apostle had not been long returned to Rome, before he was called out to resign his life for the name of Christ.

In the year of Christ 64, as we learn from * Suetonius,

" p. 34. (c) A particular account of that journey from Corinth to Jerusalem may be seen in the first volume of this work, p. 208—212.

* Nam quasi offensus deformitate veterum adificiorum, et angustiis flexurisque vicorum, incendit, ur-

bem. — Per sex dies septemque noctes eâ clade servitum est. — Hoc incendium e turri Maccenatiana prospectans, lætusque flammæ, ut aiebat, pulchritudine, ad 220 Illi in illo suo scenico habitu decantavit. Sueton. Neron. cap. 38.

and ^γ Tacitus, heathen historians, as well as from others, was a dreadful fire at Rome, which continued six or seven days. It was thought by many people, that the city had been set on fire by the emperor's orders. But soon after the Christians were most cruelly treated by him, as if they had been the authors of the conflagration. So says Tacitus. The fire is said to have begun on ^z the 19th of July. And the persecution of the Christians began, as is supposed by some, in ^a November following, by others ^b in August. Which to me seems not so likely.

It is the opinion of ^c Pagi, and ^d Basnage, that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in the year of †† Christ 65. They argue in this manner. Orosius ^e having given an account of Nero's persecution of the Christians, and of the death of the two apostles in it, adds, that it was followed by a pestilence in the city, and other disasters. And Tacitus ^f speak-
ing

^γ Sed non ope humana, non largitionibus Principis, aut Deum placamentis, decedebant infamia, quin iustum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis pœnis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. — Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde iudicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti, &c. Tacit. Ann. 15. cap. 44.

^z Fuere qui annotant, iv. Calendas Sextiles principium incendii hujus ortum, quo et Senones captam urbem inflammaverant. Tacit. Annal. 15. cap. 41.

—cujus initium in medium mensem Novembrem A. 64. cadit. Moïsem. de Reb. Christian. sec. i. cap. 34.

^b Vid. Toinard. ad lib. de Mort. Persecut. cap. ii.

^c Vid. Pagi ann. 64, 65, 67.

^d Inchoatam superiore anno persecutionem currente continuavit Neronis furor, qui Petri Paulique sanguine resperfus est. Basn. an. 65. n. ix.

†† That also was the opinion of Du Pin, not now to mention any others. Quoiqu'il en soit, il est certain, qu' étant revenu

à Rome avec saint Pierre, il y eût la tête tranchée dans le temps de la persecution de Neron, et probablement la 65. année de Jesus Christ, comme nous l'avons fait voir en un autre endroit. Du Pin. Diff. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

^e Nam primus Romæ Christianos suppliciis et mortibus adfecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciarî imperavit: ipsumque nomen extirpare conatus, beatissimos Apostolos, Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit. Mox acervatim miseram civitatem abortæ undique clades. Nam subsequente autumnò tanta urbi pestilentia incubuit, ut triginta millia funerum in rationem Libitinæ venirent. Oros. l. 7. c. 7.

^f Tacitus lib. XVI. cap. 13. loquens de iis quæ Nerva et Vestino Coss. gesta, sic narrationem suam concludit: *Tot facinoribus fædum annum etiam Dii tempestatibus, et morbis, insignivere. Vastata Campania turbine ventorum, qui villas, arbusa, fruges passim disjecit, pertulitque violentiam ad vicina urbi. In qua omne mortalium genus vis pestilentie depopulabatur, nullâ cæli intemperie, quæ occurreret oculis.* Petrus itaque et Paulus eo anno morti traditi, quo urbem pestilentia

ing of affairs, when Nerva and Vestinus were consuls, which was the year of Christ 65, mentions a pestilence in the city, violent storms in some parts of Italy, and other calamities. So Pagi. And Basnage ^g argues in the like manner from that passage of Orosius.

The last mentioned learned chronologer likewise observes, that ^h Sulpicius Severus having given an account of the fire at Rome, and Nero's persecution of the Christians, and of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul therein, adds: 'Whilst these things were doing at Rome, the Jews being uneasy under the oppressions of their governor Gessius Florus, begin to rebel.' Upon which Basnage observes: the ⁱ Jewish war began in May 66. Therefore the martyrdoms of the apostles happened in the year before, that is, 65. To which, perhaps, might be added, that ^k Suetonius, having spoken of the fire, the pestilence, and those calamities, which are mentioned by Tacitus, and Orosius, takes notice, that at the same time Syria was difficultly kept from breaking out into a rebellion: intending, probably, the uneasiness of the Jewish people in 65, and 66.

Basnage observes also, that ^l Epiphanius placeth the

pestilentia affixit. Quare, cum teste Tacito, anno Christi sexagesimo quinto pestis Romæ grassata fuerit, Principum Apostolorum martyrium perperam a Baronio ad præsentem annum dilatatum. Pagi Ann. 67. n. iii. ^g Jam vero sæva hæc lues in Nervæ et Vestini consulatum incidit. Basn. ann. 65. n. ix.

^h Interea abundante jam Christianorum multitudine, accidit, ut Roma incendio conflagraret, Nerone apud Antium constituto. Sed opinio omnium invidiam incendii in Principem retorquebat, credebaturque Imperator gloriam innovandæ urbis quæsisse. Neque ulla re Nero efficiebat, quin ab eo jussu incendium putaretur. Igitur vertit invidiam in Christianos, actæque in innoxios crudelissimæ quæstiones. — Hoc initio in Christianos sæviri cœptum. Post etiam datis legibus, religio vetabatur: palamque

edictis propositis, Christianum esse non licebat. Tum Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati: quorum uni cervix gladio defecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est. Sulp. Sev. l. 2. c. 41.

Dum hæc Romæ geruntur, Judæi, præsidis sui Gessii Flori injurias non ferentes, rebellare cœperunt. ib. cap. 42.

ⁱ Bellum autem Judaicum incipit anni sequentis mense Maio. Proindeque Apostolorum martyrium in præsens tempus conferendum. Basn. an. 65. n. ix.

^k Accesserunt tantis ex Principemalis, probisque quædam et fortuita: pestilentia unius autumnus, quo triginta funerum millia in rationem Libitinæ venerant: Clades Britannica, — ægreque Syria retenta. Sueton. Neron. cap. 39.

^l — μετα την τε αγια πετρο και παυλο τελευτην την επι τω δωδεκατω ετι νερωος γενομενην. Hær. 27. num. vi. death

death of Peter and Paul in the twelfth year of Nero: part^m of which, as he says, fell in the year 65.

I am the more inclined to this date, because we do not find in the epistles of the New Testament any notice taken of the persecution of the Christians at Rome, or of the devastations in Judea, after the commencement of the war. If Peter and Paul had been in any of the provinces, and had survived the terrible persecution at Rome in 64, and 65, we should have had some epistle, or epistles of theirs, concerning it, to the Romans, or to the Christians of some other place.

I do not presume to assign positively the year of the martyrdom of these two apostles. I have mentioned the specious and probable arguments of two very eminent chronologers, in favour of the year 65. Nor do I think the apostles survived that year. But I cannot say, whether their martyrdoms happened in the year 64, or 65. Pagi says, thatⁿ Peter and Paul were taken up and imprisoned in 64, and put to death in the year 65. But I know nothing of the imprisonment of the apostles at this time. There may be in late and fabulous authors large and particular accounts of their imprisonment, just before their martyrdoms. But there is little or no notice taken of it by the most ancient writers. If Peter and Paul were come to Rome before the city was set on fire, and before the persecution of the Christians began (which is not improbable) they might be taken up, and soon put to death, before the end of the year 64.

C H A P. XII.

S T. P A U L ' S E P I S T L E S.

- I. *The Introduction.* II. *The two Epistles to the Thessalonians.* III. *The Epistle to the Galatians.* IV. *The first Epistle to the Corinthians.* V. *The first Epistle to Timothy.* VI. *The Epistle to Titus.* VII. *The second Epistle to the Corinthians.* VIII. *The Epistle to the Romans.*

ⁿ Pars autem anni Neroniani duodecimi ad præsentem spectat, utpote Octobris tertio et decimo incipientis. Basn. an. 65. n. ix.

Præterquam quod, cum persecutio adversus Christianos anno

lxiv. decreta fuerit, ac insequentibus continuata, non dubium, quin priori anno Petrus et Paulus in carcerem conjecti sint, ac posteriori necati. Ann. 67. num. iii.

IX. *The*

IX. *The Epistle to the Ephesians.* X. *The second Epistle to Timothy.*
 XI. *The Epistle to the Philippians.* XII. *The Epistle to the Colossians.*
 XIII. *The Epistle to Philemon.* XIV. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*

h.

§ I. *The INTRODUCTION.*

I SHALL NOW endeavour to settle the time of St. Paul's epistles, of which Origen said: 'If ^a any man reads them with attention, I am persuaded, he will admire the writer's abilities in expressing great things in vulgar language: or, if he does not admire them, himself will appear ridiculous.'

It cannot but afford satisfaction, to know the order of time, in which they were written. It will not only be attended with pleasure, but will also contribute to the right understanding of them. For wrong dates have been the occasion of many mistakes. Baronius observes, that some have imagined the shipwreck at Melita, related in Acts xxvii. to be one of the three, mentioned by St. Paul 2 Cor. xi. 25. not considering, that the second epistle to the Corinthians had been written several years before. I have put the passage ^b in the margin, as quoted by Lewis Capellus. The author of the commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, in the fourth century, made ^c the same mistake, and

^a See vol. II. p. 472.

^b Quantum juvet, quamque sit utile, certo tenere tempus, quo Pauli epistolæ ab eo fuerunt scriptæ, recte observavit Baronius ad A. C. 58. § xlii. Sed hic, inquit ille, et illud necessario monendum putamus lectorem, nonnullis accidisse, ut temporum ignoratione in maximos errores incidant, putantes nimirum naufragium apud Melitam passum, quod Lucas narrat Act. xxvii. unum e tribus fuisse a Paulo enumeratis 2 Cor. xi. non advertentes, secundam istam epistolam ad Corinthios longe ante illud naufragium esse scriptam. Quamobrem scrupulosa, quæ videtur, in historia temporum indagatio quantum conferat ad veram atque germanam Divinæ Scripturæ interpretationem, quisque facile judicabit. — Hæc rectissime Baronius. Ita-

que hac in parte operam nostram ejusmodi indagazione post alios collocavimus. Lud. Cap. Append. ad Hist. Apost. p. 63. ^c *Neque et die in profundo maris sui.]* Hoc factum est, quando missus est Romam, cum appellasset Casarem. Tunc desperatione vitæ in alto, id est, in profundo maris fuit, mortem ante oculos habens. — *Periculis in mari.* Jam superius dixit: *Ter naufragium feci, nocte et die in profundo maris sui.* Quod aliud periculum fuit in mari. Sed hoc est periculum, quando in mari, hoc est, in navi, milites cogitaverant, omnes custodias occidere, ne quis enatans effugeret. Quod periculum centurio prohibuit inferri, ne Paulus occideretur, ut eum vivum Romam produceret. In 2 ep. ad. Cor. xi. 25, 26. p. 202. ap. Ambros. in App. tom. II.

several

several others of a like kind, in explaining the paragraph of 2 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

Of St. Paul's fourteen epistles, thirteen have been generally received by catholic Christians in all times. I therefore need not now allege the testimonies of ancient christian writers, which may be seen in the preceding volumes of this work. But as the epistle to the Hebrews has been sometimes doubted of, I shall observe the evidences of its genuineness. With regard to the others, I shall do little more than show the time when they were written. And I would take it for granted, that they who are disposed to examine the arguments in this chapter, have first read the history of St. Paul, in the preceding chapter: which will be of great use, and prevent the trouble of numerous references.

§ II. *The two* EPISTLES *to the* THESSALONIANS.

The first and second epistles to the Thessalonians are now generally allowed by learned interpreters and chronologers to be the two first written epistles of St. Paul. The time and place of writing them may be deduced from the epistles themselves, and from the history of St. Paul's travels in the book of the Acts. Some have thought, that ^d the first at least, if not also the second, was written at Athens. But I suppose it to be now generally allowed, that ^e both these epistles were written at Corinth: whereby we are also assured of their time. For it was formerly shown to be probable, that ^f St. Paul came to Corinth before the end of the year 51, and staid there till the beginning of the year 53.

In the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius, the ^g first epistle to the Thessalonians, is said to have been written at Athens, and ^h the second, very absurdly, at Rome.

Theodoret, as ⁱ before quoted, saw these to be the two first written epistles of the apostle. The ^k first he supposed to have been written at Athens, and the second not long after, either at Athens or Corinth. For he does not seem to say distinctly, at which of these two cities the second was

^d Ante Pauli vincula omnium prima scripta est ad Thessalonicenses utraque. Scriptæ autem omnino videntur dux istæ epistolæ Athenis. Lud. Cap. Hist. Ap. p. 145. ^e Pearson, Ann. Paulin. p. 11—13. Mill. Proleg. num. 4. et 6. ^f See before, p. 279, 280. ^g Synopf. S. S. n. 66. ap. Athan. T. II. p. 196. ^h Num. 67. ib. p. 197. ⁱ Vol. V. p. 193. ^k Præf. in. Ep. Pauli. T. III. p. 3.

written. Nevertheless I suppose it may be shown that they were both written at Corinth. St. Paul came from Thessalonica to Berea: which place he left in haste, because of the violence of the Jews, who came thither from Thessalonica, and *stirred up the people*, Acts xvii. 10—13. *And then, immediately*, says St. Luke, *the brethren sent away Paul, to go as it were to the sea. But Silas and Timothy abode there still. And they that conducted Paul, brought him unto Athens. And receiving a commandment unto Silas and Timothy to come to him with all speed, they departed*, ver. 14, 15. Accordingly, as we may suppose, Silas and Timothy did soon come to him. And Paul, having great concern for the Thessalonians, whilst he was at Athens, sent Timothy to them. As he says, 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2. *Wherefore, when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone. And sent Timothy, our brother and minister of God, and our fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and comfort you, concerning your faith.* From Athens Paul went to Corinth, where he stayed a year and six months. There Timothy came back to him from Thessalonica. Comp. Acts xviii. 5. and 1 Thess. iii. 6. And Silas, or Silvanus, and Timothy are joined with the apostle in the inscription of the epistle.

Near the end of this epistle, ch. v. 27. are these remarkable words: *I charge, or adjure, you by the Lord*, *οκειλα υμας τον κυριον*, *that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.* It is likely, that from the beginning all christian assemblies had readings of the scriptures of the Old Testament. Paul, knowing the plenitude of the apostolical commission, now demands the same respect to be paid to his writings, with those of the ancient prophets. This is a direction fit to be inserted in the first epistle written by him. And the manner, in which it is given, suggests an argument that this was his first apostolical epistle.

The second epistle to the Thessalonians appears to have been written soon after the first, and at the same place. And Silvanus and Timothy are joined together with the apostle in the inscription of this epistle, as well as of the former.

These two epistles therefore I suppose to have been written at Corinth, in the year of Christ 52. Which is also the opinion of ¹ Mill, and others. But by whom these epistles were carried to the Thessalonians, we do not perceive.

¹ Prolegom. num. 4—7.

Some objections have been made against the above-mentioned date of these two epistles. But the point is so clear, that I do not think it worth the while to prolong this argument in examining them. They who are curious, may see those objections well answered by Dr. Benson, in the second edition of * his history of the first planting the christian religion.

§ III. *The* EPISTLE *to the* GALATIANS.

THE epistle to the Galatians is inscribed after this manner: *Paul, an apostle, — and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia.* Upon which Jerom observes: 'In ⁿ other epistles Sothenes and Silvanus, and sometimes also Timothy, are mentioned at the beginning: but in this, for adding the greater weight and authority, are put *all the brethren*: who, perhaps too, were believers of the circumcision, and not despised by the Galatians. And the consent of many is of great use to satisfy people. *To the churches of Galatia.* Here also, as he proceeds, it is to be observed, that in this place only, Paul writes in general, not to the church of one city only, but to the churches of a whole province: and that he calls them churches, whom afterwards he reproveth as corrupted with error. Whence we learn, that a church may be understood in a two-fold manner: both of that which has no spot, or wrinkle, and is indeed the body of Christ: and of that which is assembled in the name of Christ, without complete and perfect virtues.'

Tertullian ⁿ seems to have thought this one of St. Paul's first

* Vol. II. p. 119—122.

ⁿ In aliis epistolis Sothenes et Silvanus, interdum et Timotheus, in exordio præponuntur: in hac tantum, quia necessaria erat auctoritas plurimorum, omnium fratrum nomen assumitur. Qui et ipsi forsitan ex circumcissione erant, et a Galatis non contempti ducebantur. Plurimum quippe facit ad populum corrigendum multorum in una re sententia atque consensus. Quod autem ait, *Ecclésiis Galatiæ*, et hoc notandum, quia hic tantum genera-

Vol. VI.

liter non ad unam ecclesiam unius urbis, sed ad totius provinciæ scribat, ecclesias: et *ecclesias* vocet, quas postea errore arguat depravatas. Ex quo noscendum, dupliciter ecclesiam posse dici: et eam, quæ non habet maculam aut rugam, et vere corpus Christi fit: et eam, quæ in Christi nomine absque plenis perfectisque virtutibus congregetur. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 225.

ⁿ — ab illo certe Paulo, qui adhuc in gratia rudis, trepidans denique, ne in vacuum cucurrisset,

first written epistles : as has been observed by Grotius, ° who transcribed the passage, though long, into his preface to the epistle to the Galatians. Fabricius p likewise has taken notice of it.

Theodoret, q the r Synopsis of sacred scripture, ascribed to Athanasius, and s the author of the Argument in Œcumenius, reckon this among the epistles written at Rome, and consequently a late epistle. But I see no ground for that opinion, there not being in the epistle any notice taken of an imprisonment at the time of writing it.

However Lightfoot t was also of the same opinion. He supposeth this to have been the first epistle written by St. Paul after his arrival at Rome. He says it was carried by Crescens, arguing from 2 Tim. iv. 10. Which epistle to Timothy he thinks was written at Rome soon afterwards.

Chrysostom u says, this x epistle was written before that to the Romans. And in like manner y Theophylact, probably, borrowing from him.

Divers learned moderns have thought, that this epistle was written at Ephesus, after Paul's arrival there from his journey, related in Acts xviii. 23. and xix. 1. consequently, after that the apostle had been a second time in Galatia. To

aut curreret, tunc primum cum antecessoribus Apostolis conferebat. Igitur, si ferventer, ut adhuc neophytus, adversus Judæismum aliquid in conversatione reprehendendum existimavit, passivum scilicet convictum, postmodum et ipse usu omnibus omnia futurus, ut omnes lucraretur, Judæis quasi Judæus, et eis qui sub lege, tanquam sub lege: tu illam solius conversationis, placituræ postea accusatori suo, reprehensionem, suspectam vis haberi, etiam de prædicationis erga Deum prævaricatione. Tertull. adv. Marc. l. i. cap. 20. p. 443.

° Tertullianus in primo adversus Marcionem, hanc epistolam inter primas Pauli fuisse existimat. &c. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Gal.

p Scripsisse hanc epistolam adhuc

neophytum, et in gratia rudem, adeoque inter primas non dubitat affirmare Tertullianus. — Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 155.

q Τας μεν δὴ ἀλλας ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης ἀπέστειλε, καὶ ταυτῆ μετὰ πνεύματι τὴν πρὸς γαλατας γραφῆται. Theod. Præf. in ep. Paul. T. III. p. 5. B. r Ap. Athan. T. II. p. 194.

s Arg. ep. ad Gal. ap. Œcum. T. I. p. 713. t Vol. I. p. 523.

u See of this work, vol. V. p. 134. x Δοκεῖ δὲ μοι καὶ ἡ πρὸς γαλατας προτέρα εἶναι τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους.

Chryf. Proem. ep. ad Rom. T. IX. p. 427. D. y Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πρὸς γαλατας προτέρα εἶναι ταυτῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους.

Theoph. Arg. ep. ad Rom.

this purpose = Lewis Capellus, = Witfius, and ^b Wall. This likewise seems to have been the opinion of ^c Pearson. For he placeth this epistle in the year 57, after the first to the Corinthians, and before Paul left Ephesus. But I do not discern his reasons for so doing.

Grotius ^d thought it difficult to assign the time, when this epistle was written: but conjectures, that it was written about the same time with that to the Romans.

Fabricius says, 'the ^e design of the epistle is to dissuade the Galatians from putting their neck under the yoke of the Mosaic law. And,' says he, 'to the like purpose the apostle writes to the Romans. But them he had never seen, and he treats them very respectfully, and enlargeth upon the doctrine of the gospel with greater prolixity. To the Galatians he writes more briefly, and as their master, and not without some severity in his reprehensions. He adds, that he is inclined to their opinion, who suppose this epistle to have been written not long after that to the Romans, and in the way to Jerusalem, in the year of Christ 58.'

Mill being a man of great judgment in these things, and what he says appearing at first sight plausible, I shall tran-

^a Per idem tempus, nempe sub finem biennii Ephesini videtur omnino scripta epistola ad Galatas. &c. Cap. Hist. ap. p. 69.

^b Epistola ad Galatas temporis sui hos characteres habet. Primum, quod non diu post Pauli ab iis discessum scripta esse videatur. Sic enim ipse cap. i. 6. — Affuerat autem iis Paulus paulo antequam proficisceretur Ephesum. Act. xviii. 23. coll. cum cap. xix. 1. Unde probabiliter saltem infertur Ephesi esse datam. Specialius, datam esse sub finem biennii, quod Paulus Ephesi exegit, inde colligit Capellus. — Witf. de Vit. Paul. sect. viii. num. xxxii.

^c About this time, 'A. D. 55, when Paul had been at Ephesus a little while, he is supposed to have written his epistle to the Galatians.' Wall's Notes upon the N. T. p. 164.

^d Scribit primam ad Corinthios epistolam. — Scribit epistolam ad Galatas. Per Demetrium Epheso

pellitur. Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. 57.

^e Tempus, quo scripta est hæc epistola ad Gallogræcos epistola, sicut designate indicare non possum, ita videre mihi videor, non longe abfuisse ab eo tempore, quo ad Romanos scripta est epistola. Gr. Pr. ep. ad Galat.

^f Argumentum epistolæ est, Galatas dehortari, ne jugo Legis Mosaicæ iterum collum animasque supponerent. Idem dissuaserat Romanis, sed ad illos, quos nondum præsens ille docuerat, et scribit minus familiariter, et prolixius iis capita Christianæ fidei exponit. Ad Galatas vero, et brevius omnia, et tanquam doctor ipsorum, ita ut nec a gravi increpatione sibi temperet. — Non possum tamen improbare eorum sententiam, qui non diu post epistolam ad Romanos in itinere Hierosolymam versus A. C. 58. exaratam hanc epistolam arbitrantur. Fabr. ubi supra. p. 155.

scribe it below. He thinks, that ^f this epistle was not written, until after that to the Romans, probably, at Troas, or some other place in Asia, as Paul was going to Jerusalem. And he thinks, that Paul refers to the collections lately made in Macedonia and Greece, Gal. ii. 10. And the apostle writes not only in his own name, but also in the name of all the brethren, mentioned Acts xx. 4. who were with him at Troas, and accompanied him to Jerusalem. Moreover, this epistle was written by the apostle with his own hand, and the more easily, and readily, though in a journey, because he had just before treated the same argument in his epistle to the Romans. This epistle therefore is placed by Mill at the year 58.

Upon all which I beg leave to remark, as follows. First, that those words, *all the brethren which are with me*, need not to be understood of those who were with Paul at Troas, and were setting out with him for Jerusalem. Thereby may be intended the brethren of some other place, where Paul was. Secondly, the apostle Paul was able at any time to represent the doctrine of the gospel to any churches, suitably to their particular case and circumstances: whether he had just before treated of it in an epistle, or not. So that the agreement between the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians is no proof, that they were written very soon one after another. Thirdly, when Paul says, ch. ii. 10. *The same which I also was forward to do*: he cannot intend the collections made in Macedonia and Greece, with which he

^f Paulo post dictatam hanc, quæ Romanis inscripta est, scripsit Paulus epistolam ad Galatas, ut apparet ex cap. ii. 10. ο και εσπευδασα αυτο τετο ποιησαι. His enim verbis aperte indicat Apostolus, epistolam hanc post ministerium seu studium, quod eleemosynis pro ecclesia Hierosolymitana colligendis impendebat, scripsisse se, dum aoristo utitur, εσπευδασα — ποιησαι. In itinere itaque versus Hierosolymam versatus D. Paulus alicubi hanc epistolam exarasse videtur, et quidem Troade fortassis, ubi septem dies moratus est; postquam in Asiam veniens comperisset Galatas ad aliud evangelium ετω ταχως translatos fuisse. Auditâ nempe, jam ut vi-

detur ab appulsu ejus in Asiam, inâ αποστασια, arrepto calamo, propria manu, contra quam factum in aliis epistolis, (excepta forte unâ ad Philemonem) totam istam scripsit epistolam, acrem et objurgatoriam, nomine suo, omniumque, qui cum ipso erant fratrum jam Troade, Sopatri, Aristarchi, Secundi, Gaii, Tychici, Trophimi, Titi, Silæ, aliorum. Scripsit autem eo celerius, et festinantius, quod idem argumentum in hac epistola prosequeretur, quod tractaverat paulo ante in epistola ad Romanos, cujus iere sensus in hanc transfundit. — Scripta est statim, ut dixi, post epistolam ad Romanos, anno æræ vulgaris lviii. Proleg. num. 30, 31.

was going to Jerusalem. If that had been his meaning, he would have expressed himself more particularly, like to what he says to the Romans, ch. xv. 25—27. What he says here, he might have said, when at Ephesus, before he set out for Macedonia, and indeed at any time, and in any place. For he had been always mindful of the poor in Judea. I apprehend, that the apostle's words are to be interpreted in this manner. *The same, which I also had endeavoured to do, or had been careful to perform:* referring to his conduct, even before that proposal of the three apostles at Jerusalem: and intending, probably, in particular, the contributions brought by himself and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, some while before, as related Acts xi. 29. Which contributions, as may be well supposed, had been promoted by our apostle's exhortations. Fourthly, St. Paul says to the Galatians in this epistle. ch. i. 6. *I marvel, that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ, unto another gospel.* Those expressions cannot possibly suit the date assigned by Mill, that is, after the passover of the year 58. Which must have been above four years after even Paul's second journey in the country of Galatia.

Another opinion has been proposed by the ingenious and thoughtful author^s of *Miscellanea Sacra*, and embraced by Dr. Benson: that the epistle to the Galatians was written at Corinth, when the apostle was first there, and made a long stay of a year and six months. Whilst Paul was there, he received tidings of the instability of his converts in Galatia, with which he was much affected. Whereupon he wrote this epistle, and sent it by one of his assistants. At that season he might well say at the beginning of his address to them: *I marvel, that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ.* Nor is there in the epistle any hint of his having been with them more than once. The epistle therefore was written at Corinth, or perhaps at Ephesus: when Paul was first there, in his way to Jerusalem, as mentioned Acts xviii. 19—21.

This opinion is proposed by the above-mentioned author, as his own. And I make no doubt, that it was so, and the fruit of his own inquiries and observations. Nevertheless it is not quite new. Say Lenfant and Beausobre in their general

^s See there the Abstract of the Scripture History of the Apostles, p. 31. and the Postscript to the Preface, p. 56—58.

^h History of the first planting the Christian Religion. B. 3. ch. v. § xi. vol. II. p. 118, 119. first edit. p. 136, 137. second edit.

preface to St. Paul's epistles: 'Weⁱ find not in the epistle
 ' to the Galatians any mark, that can enable us to determine
 ' with certainty, at what time, or in what place, it was written.
 ' It is dated at Rome in some printed copies, and manuscripts.
 ' But there is nothing in the epistle itself, to confirm that
 ' date. Paul does not here make any mention of his bonds,
 ' as he does in all his epistles, written at Rome. He says
 ' indeed ch. vi. 17. that *he bears in his body the marks of the*
 ' *Lord Jesus.* But he had often suffered, before he came to
 ' Rome. There are therefore ^k some learned chronologers,
 ' who place the epistle to the Galatians immediately after the
 ' two epistles to the Thessalonians. They think, it was writ-
 ' ten between the third and fourth journey of Paul to Jeru-
 ' salem, and between his first and second journey into Galatia.
 ' This opinion appears to me very probable. For since the
 ' apostle says, *he wonders, that they were so soon turned unto ano-*
 ' *ther gospel,* this epistle must have been written a short time
 ' after he had preached in Galatia. Nor can we discern in the
 ' epistle any notice of the second journey, which St. Paul made
 ' into this country. For this reason it is thought, that the
 ' epistle to the Galatians was written at Corinth, where the
 ' apostle made a long stay, or else, in some city of Asia, par-
 ' ticularly Ephesus, where he stayed some days in his way to
 ' Jerusalem. Acts xviii. 19—21. Therefore, in all probability,
 ' the epistle to the Galatians was written from Corinth, or
 ' from Ephesus, in the year 52, or 53.'

Nothing could be said more properly. And I think, this date may be farther confirmed by some other considerations. Paul says to the Corinthians, xvi. 1. *Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, so do ye.* Which shows, that at the writing of that epistle to the Corinthians, in 56, he had a good opinion of his converts in Galatia, and that he had no doubt of their respect to his directions. Which, probably, had been sent to them from Ephesus, during his long abode there, by some one or other of his assistants. This good temper of the Galatians may be supposed owing to the letter sent to them some time before, and to his second visit to them, related Acts xviii. 23.

ⁱ § xlii. p. 24—26. ^k Here, any references. Nor have I found
 in the margin, are put the names of the places, where this opinion is
 Usher and L. Capellus, without maintained by them.

And now we shall be better able to account for what appears very remarkable. When Paul left Corinth, after his long stay there, he went to Jerusalem, having a vow. In his way he came to Ephesus. Acts xviii. 19—21. *And when they desired him to tarry longer with them, he consented not. But bade them farewell, saying: I must by all means keep this feast that cometh at Jerusalem. But I will return again unto you, if God will.* When we read this, we might be apt to think, that Paul should hasten back to Ephesus, and return thither presently after he had been at Jerusalem. But instead of so doing, after he had been at Jerusalem, he went down to Antioch. And after he had spent some time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, strengthening the disciples, ver. 22, 23. We now seem to see the reason of this course. At Corinth he heard of the defection of many in Galatia. Whereupon he sent away a sharp letter to them. But considering the nature of the case, he judged it best to take the first opportunity to go to Galatia, and support the instructions of his letter. And both together had a very good effect. Gal. iv. 19, 20. *My little children, of whom I travel in birth again.—I desire to be present with you, and to change my voice. For I stand in doubt of you: or, I am perplexed for you.* Now, then, we see the reason of the apostle's not coming directly from Jerusalem to Ephesus. However, he was not unmindful of his promise, and came thither, after he had been in Galatia.

Upon the whole, the epistle to the Galatians is an early epistle. And, as seems to me most probable, was written at Corinth, near the end of the year 52, or at the very beginning of the year 53, before St. Paul set out to go to Jerusalem by the way of Ephesus. But if any should rather think, that it was written at Ephesus, during the apostle's short stay there, in the way from Corinth to Jerusalem, that will make but very little difference. And still, according to our computation, this epistle was written at the beginning of the year 53.

Ch. vi. 11. *Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand.*

Hereby some understand the apostle to say, that this, with what follows to the end of the epistle, was written with his own hand. So ^m Jerom, and ⁿ Grotius. Others understand
St. Paul

¹ Ἰδὲτε πηλικίαις ὑμῶν γραμμασίω lebant, disseminaverant, alia Paulum facere, alia prædicare.—
ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ τῆς ἑωυῆ χειρὶ.

² Illi qui circumcidi Galatas vo- Hanc opinionem quia non potera
Paulus

St. Paul to speak of the whole epistle. So thought ^o Chry-
 fostom, and ^p Theophylact, and ^q Theodoret, and ^r the au-
 thor of the commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles.
 Which interpretation is approved by ^s Wolfius.

—*How long a letter I have written unto you.* Which some
 interpret after this manner: *in what large letters I have written*
unto you, intending the deformity, or inelegance of the cha-
 racters. Which sense is also found in ^t divers ancient authors.

But it is not approved of either by ^u Beza, or ^x Wolfius.
 They say, that this is as long as any of St. Paul's epistles,
 excepting

Paulus apud omnes præfens ipse sub-
 vertere — seipsum per literas re-
 presentat. Et ne aliqua suppositæ
 epistolæ suspicio nasceretur, ab hoc
 ipso usque ad finem manu sua ipse
 perscripsit, ostendens superiora ab
 alio exarata. Hieron. in ep. ad
 Gal. T. IV. p. 314. ⁿ In ali-

arum epistolarum sine quædam scri-
 bebatur suâ manu. 1 Cor. xvi. 21.
 2 Thess. iii. 17. et Col. iv. 18. cæ-
 tera manu aliena, ut videre est Ro-
 man. xvi. 22. Hic vero Paulus
 suâ manu scripsit omnia quæ se-
 quuntur, ut recte putat Hierony-
 mus. Id autem multum erat in ho-
 mine adeo occupato, et, ut videtur,
 non multum assueto Græce scribere,
Quantis literis, id est, quam multis.
 Solent adjectiva magnitudinis poni
 pro adjectivis ad numerum perti-
 nentibus. Sic Græcum *ποσοι, ταυτι,*
 utroque sensu usurpatum. Grot.
 ad Galat. vi. 11.

^o *Ευταυθα εδεν αλλο αινιττεται, αλλ'*
στι αυτος εγραψε την επισολην απασαν,
ο πολλης γνησιοτητες σημειον ην. κ. λ.
 Chr. in loc. T. X. p. 727. B.

^p In loc. T. II. p. 492.

^q *Πασαν, ως εοικε, την δε την επισο-*
λην αυτος εγραψε. Theod. in loc.

^r Auctoritatem dat epistolæ suæ.
 — Ubi enim holographa manus
 est, falsum dici non potest. In loc.
 ap. Ambros. in App. p. 250.

^s Idem vero [Grotius] quamvis
 præunte Hieronymo, errat, quando
 hæc verba non ad totam hanc epif-
 tolam, sed ad ea tantum, quæ inde

usque ad finem leguntur vult refer-
 ri. Rectius Chrysofostomus. — Ad-
 dit idem causam, cur totam episto-
 lam sua manu exararit, ut nempe
 omnis *γοθειας* suspicio *ιδιογραφα* hoc
 præcideretur iis, qui dicere alioquin
 poterant, nonnulla illi inserta, quæ
 Apostoli sententiæ non responde-
 rent. Wolf. in loc.

^t *Το δε πηλικοις, εμοι δοκει ε το με-*
γεθος, αλλα την αμορφιαν των γραμματι-
εμφαινων λεγειν, μονονεχι λεγων' οτι ε-
τε αριστα γραθειν ειδως, ομως κιαγκατ-
δην δι εμαυτε γραψαι, ωσε των συκισπι-
των εμφοραξει το σομα. Chr. ubi
 supr. p. 727. C.

^u *Το δε πηλικοις γραμμασι, τινες με-*
μεγαλοις, τινες δε φαυλοις ηρηκειται.
Εγω γαρ φησιν, εγραφα την επισολην,
καιτοι μη γραφων εις καλλες. Theod.
 in loc. ^u *Quam longis, πηλικου.*

Ad verbum *quantis.* Vulgata *quali-*
bus. In quo explicando miror cur
 se tantopere torqueant interpretes,
 dum alii — ad sublimitatem sen-
 tentiarum referunt, ut Hilarius,
 alii ad ipsa literarum elementa, quæ
 grandiuscula fuerint, — alii ad
 deformitatem characterum, quæ
 Paulus imperitus fuerit pingenda-
 rum literarum, ut exponit Theo-
 phylactus, Chrysofostomum secutus.
 — Sunt autem sane longiores
 epistolæ Romanis et Corinthiis in-
 scriptæ, sed aliena manu exarata
 &c. Bez. ad loc. ^x *Ecce quant-*
is, i. e. quam multis literis vobis scrip-
si. Ita recte Grotius, addens, ad-

jectiva

excepting the epistle to the Romans, the two epistles to the Corinthians, and that to the Hebrews. I may add another thought: that according to our computation this is the third apostolical epistle, written by St. Paul, and is much longer than either of those to the Thessalonians, which had been written before. However, undoubtedly, the apostle has regard to the quantity of his own hand-writing. The rest of his epistles were written by others, while he dictated, (as is generally done by eminent men, much engaged,) and himself wrote only a few words, or sentences, at the end: whereas this epistle was all in his own hand-writing.

And the original word is elsewhere used for epistle, or letter. Acts xxviii. 21. *We have not received letters out of Judea concerning thee.*

So far therefore as I am able to judge, our English version is very right. *Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand.*

That is ^a Beza's translation. Le Clerc ^a in his French Testament, and ^b Beaufobre translate in the like manner.

In Beaufobre's remarks upon the New Testament, published after his death, is this note upon the text, we are considering: *How large a letter, πηλικοις γραμμασι.* Some, says Theodoret, explain this of the largeness of the letters, others, that the letter was ill written: as if the apostle had said: *I have written to you with my own hand, though I do not write well.* St.

jectiva magnitudinis pro adjectivis, ad numerum pertinentibus, poni solere, quemadmodum et Græcum πηλικος utroque sensu usurpetur. — Longius autem a vero aberrant, qui πηλικος ad designandam characterum, quibus usus sit, magnitudinem, spectare putant, ut πηλικα γραμματα sint literæ majusculæ. — Addit [Le Cene] Apostolum hanc epistolam non potuisse appellare πηλικην respectu longitudinis, cum longiores scripserit alias. Imo vero scripturam non tam multorum verborum, quam quod eam totam suâ manu scripserat, qui alias cæteris pauca quædam subscribere consueverit, longam appellat. Præterea hæc ad Galatas, si tres priores, et unam ad Hebræos exceperis, reliquas omne longitudine excedit. Wolf in

^γ Ημεις ετε γραμματα περι σε εδεξαμεθα απο της ιουδαιας.

^z Videtis quam longis literis vobis scripserim mea manu. Bez.

^a Voyez quelle grande lettre je vous ai écrite de ma main. Le Clerc.

^b Voyez quelle grande lettre je vous ai écrite de ma propre main. B.

^c *Quelle grande lettre.* Quelques uns, dit Theodoret, expliquoient ce mot de la grandeur des lettres, et d'autres de ce que la lettre étoit mal écrite, les caracteres mauvais: *Je vous ai écrit de ma main, quoique s'écrive mal.* St. Jerom dans son Commentarie sur cet endroit, dit d'avoir ouï dire quelque chose d'approchant, à quelqu'un dont il ne paroît pas approuver la pensée. Beauf. Remarques sur le N. T. p. 466.

^c Jerom

‘ Jerom, in his commentary upon this place, says, he had heard
 ‘ somewhat of the like kind from some body. But he does
 ‘ not seem to approve of it.’ I transcribe at length ^d below
 the passage, referred to. But Jerom, having mentioned that
 observation of some learned man of his time, does himself
 seem to trifle, when he adds, ‘ That St. Paul’s letter to the
 ‘ Galatians was great for the sense. And so were all his letters,
 ‘ though short.’ However, this interpretation may be appro-
 ved by some. It is in the note of Beza, above * transcribed.

§ IV. *The FIRST EPISTLE to the CORINTHIANS.*

THE first epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus, as all may perceive. Says the apostle 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9. *But I will tarry at Ephesus, until pentecost. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me. And there are many adversaries.* And ver. 19, he says: *The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord.* Those two good Christians had come with Paul from Corinth to Ephesus, when he was first there, and staid but a short time. As appears from Acts xviii. 18, 19. And there they continued, as we suppose, till after Paul left Ephesus, to go into Macedonia.

This epistle is placed by ^e Pearson in the year 57. Mill thinks ^f it was written before the passover of the year 57.

According to our computation ^g of St. Paul’s times and travels, this epistle was written at Ephesus, in the spring of the

^d *Videte qualibus literis scripsi vobis: non quod grandes literæ fuerint [hoc quippe in Græco sonat ὀνηλικαῖς:] sed quod suæ manus essent eis nota vestigia: ut dum literarum apices recognoscunt, ipsum se putarent videre, qui scripserat. In hoc loco vir apprimè nostris temporibus eruditus, miror quomodo rem ridiculam loquutus sit. Paulus, inquit, Hebræus erat, et Græcas literas nesciebat. Et quia necessitas expetebat, ut manu sua epistolam subscriberet, contra consuetudinem curvos tramites literarum exprimebat: etiam in hoc suæ ad Galatas indicia caritatis ostendens, quod propter illos id quoque quod non poterat, facere conaretur. Grandibus ergo Paulus literis*

*scripsit epistolam, quia sensus erat grandis in literis. — Grandes Paulus literas non solum tunc ad Galatas, sed etiam hodie scribit ad cunctos: et quamvis parvi sint apices, quibus ejus epistolæ conscribuntur, tamen magnæ sunt literæ, quia in literis magnus est sensus. Hieron. Comm. in Gal. T. IV. p. 315. * See note (u) p. 312.*

^e Scribit primam ad Corinthos epistolam, cum Sothene responderet epistolæ Corinthorum. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 15. Anno lvii.

^f Quando igitur? Haud diu sane antequam ex Asia abiret anno aræ vulgaris. lvii. et quidem ante illius anni festum paschale. Proleg. num. 9. ^g See here, p. 284.

year 56. Which ^h was also the opinion of the French commentators before named, Lenfant and Beaufobre. Some have argued from ch. v. 7. *For Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us*, that it was now the time of the Jewish passover, or that it was just over. But to me it seems, that the apostle might make use of that expression, and build an argument, or exhortation, upon it in any part of the year. And when a year was begun, he might speak of staying where he was, till some distant feast. And supposing the epistle to have been written early in the spring, he might think of continuing at Ephesus, till pentecost. This letter was carried to Corinth by Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaichus, mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18. who had come to the apostle from the Corinthians, and are supposed to have brought a letter with them. See 1 Cor. vii. 1. It was after writing this epistle, that the tumult happened, which was caused by Demetrius. For as Lightfoot ⁱ says: 'Between ver. "22 and 23 of this sixth chapter of the Acts falleth in the time of St. Paul's writing the first epistle to the Corinthians.' Consequently, this epistle was sent away, before the tumult raised by Demetrius, and other silversmiths, related by St. Luke Acts xix. 23—41. nevertheless, after Paul had fought with beasts at Ephesus, as he says, 1 Cor. xv. 32. When that tumult of Demetrius was appeased, Paul seems to have been at rest. And though he did not judge it prudent to stay any longer there, he took leave of his friends with deliberation. *And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia,* Acts xx. 1.

The first epistle to the Corinthians, therefore, according to our account, was written at Ephesus, in the beginning, or the spring, of the year 56.

§ V. *The* FIRST EPISTLE *to* TIMOTHY.

THE first epistle to Timothy was written, according to ^k Pearson, ^l Whitby, ^m Basnage, ⁿ Cave, ^o Fabricius, ^p Mill, and others, in the year of Christ 64, or 65, some while after St. Paul's

^h La i. Epître aux Corinthiens fut écrite d'Ephese au printemps de l'année 56. Pref. Gen. sur les ep. de S. Paul. § 45. p. 27.

ⁱ Vol. p. 299.

^k Pearson

Annal. Paulin. An. 64. p. 22.

^l Wh. in his preface to the epistle.

^m Ann. 62. n. vii.

ⁿ Cav. H.

L. in Paulo.

^o Bib. Gr. l. 4.

cap. v. T. III. p. 157.

^p Proleg.

num. 123.

Paul's release from his confinement at Rome. In ^q Lightfoot this is the epistle written next after the first to the Corinthians. It is the same in ^r Baronius, and ^s Estius. Who say, that this epistle was written in Macedonia, when Paul was there the second-time. In this date agree in the main ^t Dr. Benson, and ^u Dr. Doddridge. This also was the opinion of Hammond, as may be seen in his preface to this epistle. Witsius, after having considered the reasons of Lightfoot and Pearson in behalf of their several opinions, hesitates ^x and cannot say, exactly, when this epistle was written: though he does not judge it needful to defer it so long, as Pearson did, that is, till after St. Paul's deliverance from his imprisonment at Rome. Lewis Capellus was in doubt, which was first written, whether ^y the second epistle to the Corinthians, or the first epistle to Timothy. However, he thinks, that both were written not long after St. Paul had left Ephesus, to go into Macedonia. Consequently his opinion was not very different from that of Lightfoot, Baronius, and Estius, before recited.

According to Theodoret, in his general preface to St. Paul's epistles, the first four are the two epistles to the Thessalonians, and the first and second to the Corinthians. ^v The ^z fifth, says ^v he, is the first epistle to Timothy. For after the introduction ^v he says: *As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some, that they receive*

num. 123. ^q See Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 307. ^r An 57. num. 187. ^s Scripta est autem hæc epistola, posteaquam Paulus, Epheso relicta, sicut habetur initio xx. cap. Actorum, profectus est in Macedoniam. Id quod ipsius epistolæ verba statim initio declarant. Unde cum Cardinale Baronio colligimus, in Macedonia scriptam esse. Est. arg. 1 ep. ad Timoth. p. 758.

^t History &c. B. 3. ch. vii. sect. v. p. 167. &c. first edit. p. 184. &c. sec. edit. See also his preface to the first ep. to Tim. sect. iii.

^u See Family Expositor, vol. III. p. 305. note (e) p. 319. note (b) p. 332. note (r).

^x Non tamen æque constat, scip- tionem epistolæ differendam esse ad solutionem Pauli a Romanis vinculis. Neque enim omnia Pauli itinera descripsit Lucas, sed notabilia quædam. — Pronunciemus

itaque, de tempore, quo scripta est prior Pauli ad Timotheum epistola, non liquere. Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. 9. num. v. ^y Posterior ad eisdem Corinthios epistola, et prior ad Timotheum, certant de proprietate, et sub iudice lis est. Utrique autem scripta est paullo postquam Paulus Epheso discessisset, adeoque dum Macedoniam peragraret. Sed utra tempore præcedat, non liquet. Lud. Cap. Hist. Ap. p. 72.

^z Περὶ τὴν ἡγεμίαν τῶν πρὸς τιμῶν τὴν προτέραν. Μετὰ γὰρ δὲ το πρῶτον εἶπω φησὶ· Καθὼς παρεκαλεῖσθαι ἐπὶ προσμείναι ἐν ἐφεσῶ, πορευόμενος εἰς μακεδονίαν. — Διὸν τοίνυν, ὡς καὶ τὸ δευτέρου ἀπὸ τῆς ἐφεσῶ παρεγγεῖται εἰς μακεδονίαν ὁ μακάριος παῦλος, τότε τὸ πάντα ἀριστὸν τιμοθεὸν ἐκεῖ καταλείπει, εἰς ἐπιμελείαν τῶν δεξιμένων το σατράν κηρυγμα. Præf. in ep. Paul. T. III. p. 3, 4.

'no other doctrine, 1 Tim. i. 3. It is manifest therefore, that when Paul went the second time into Macedonia, he left the most excellent Timothy at Ephesus, to take care of those who had received the salutary doctrine.'

I shall now endeavour to show at length the grounds of this opinion.

St. Luke expressly says, Acts xx. 1. *And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia.* And St. Paul says, in the place just cited, 1 Tim. i. 3. *As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia.* And St. Luke informs us, ch. xix. 21, 22. *After these things were ended, Paul purposed in spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia to go to Jerusalem.—So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for some season.* Then follows an account of the tumult at Ephesus. Some while after those messengers, Timothy and Erastus, were gone to Macedonia, and Greece, Paul, as it seems, wrote, and sent away his first letter to the Corinthians. From which letter we plainly perceive, that Timothy was in those parts. For so it is said in 1 Cor. iv. 17. *For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy.* And ch. xvi. 10, 11. *Now, if Timothy come, see that he may be with you without fear.—Let no man therefore despise him, but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me. For I look for him with the brethren.* Whence it appears, that at concluding that letter Paul was in expectation of Timothy's return to Ephesus. And very probably he did return before Paul went thence. Moreover St. Luke said just now, that after Timothy and Erastus had been sent into Macedonia, *Paul himself stayed in Asia for a season.*

St. Paul, in the place above cited, says, 1 Tim. i. 3. that he *besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia.* Does not that term, beseeching, or entreating Timothy, imply some difficulty in the service required of him? And do we not see, what apprehensions Timothy might be under upon being left at Ephesus, where Paul had met with much opposition, and some very lately? 'A soft word,' says Beza upon the place, 'to be used by one of much superior authority.' But if we consider the dangers of our sup-

Παρατρέξα. sum precatus, vel blanditus. Blando vocabulo utitur, quens quibusvis, in maxima etiam auctoritate constitutis. Bez. in loc. regule modestie exemplum relin.

posed time, we may see the reason of Paul's speaking in that manner to Timothy.

Again. 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15. *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know, how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God.* Words, which mightily suit the present time. St. Paul went into Macedonia, with a design to forward the collections for the poor saints in Judea, and then to go to Jerusalem. And it may be well supposed, that he had then hopes of calling in at Ephesus, in his way to Judea, and there seeing Timothy. However, he could not yet say the time. Which also is plainly agreeable to the apostle's circumstances at this season. For we perceive from what St. Luke writes in the Acts, and from the second epistle to the Corinthians, written some while afterwards in Macedonia, that Paul was not then able long before hand to fix resolutions about the time of journies to be undertaken by him.

Farther, the time assigned by Pearson, and those who agree with him, must be wrong. It appears from Acts xx. 17.— that when Paul was going to Jerusalem in the former part of the year 58, there were elders at Ephesus, and probably, in the neighbouring cities of Asia. But when Paul wrote this epistle, there seems to have been a want of such officers at Ephesus, or thereabout. For a main design of it appears to be, to instruct Timothy in the proper qualifications of such men, and to admonish him to use great care and caution in the choice of them.

Once more, I am of opinion, that the second epistle to Timothy was written, soon after Paul had been brought to Rome a prisoner from Judea. Therefore, if this epistle be prior to it, it must have been written, before Paul went to Jerusalem, with the contributions of the Christians of Greece, and Macedonia, and other places.

There is, however, a difficulty attending our supposition. For Timothy is joined with Paul in the inscription at the beginning of the second epistle to the Corinthians, generally allowed to have been written in Macedonia. And in Acts xx. 4. Timothy is mentioned among those, who accompanied Paul into Asia, when he was going to Jerusalem with the above-mentioned contributions. All which may induce some to think, that either Timothy did not return to Paul, before he left Ephesus: or that Paul took Timothy with him, when he went into Macedonia.

To which I answer: we have showed it to be very probable, that Timothy returned to Ephesus before Paul left it. The apostle therefore might send Timothy this letter from Macedonia, and afterwards send for him, to come thither to him, having some special occasion for his assistance. And though this was not entirely agreeable to the apostle, he might be the rather disposed to it, hoping, that as he went to Jerusalem, he should have an opportunity to leave Timothy at Ephesus. Which, as I apprehend, he did, when he came to Miletus.

Farther, this difficulty is very much abated by the account formerly given of this period of our apostle's history. For it was then shown, that there was a space of almost two years between St. Paul's going from Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia, and his coming to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem. Timothy therefore may have resided at Ephesus above a year, and yet be with the apostle at the writing of the second epistle to the Corinthians, which was not sent to them till near the end of the year 57.

Dr. Benson^b supposeth this epistle to have been written at Troas, soon after the apostle was come from Ephesus. And indeed, many learned men think, that Paul now went into Macedonia by the way of Troas. This has been collected from 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. But that appears to me a difficult text. And it may be disputed, whether Paul there refers to his journey from Ephesus. For it is difficult to conceive, how the apostle could have reason to expect Titus at Troas at that season: considering, that his removal from Ephesus had been sudden, or however, somewhat sooner than he had intended. How then was it possible for him to have made an appointment for Titus to meet him at Troas punctually at the time of his arrival there.

But allowing Paul to have gone from Ephesus to Macedonia by the way of Troas, it will not follow, that this epistle was written there. It may be concluded from 1 Tim. i. 3. that the apostle was now in Macedonia, or had been there, since he left Ephesus. Accordingly, Lightfoot, Baronius, and Estius, before named, suppose this epistle to have been written in Macedonia. Says^c Lightfoot: 'It is apparent from 1 Tim. i. 3. that this epistle was written after Paul's setting out from Ephesus for Macedonia.—Now it cannot be conceived

^b See his preface to the first epistle to Timothy, sect. iii.

^c Harmony of N. T. vol. I. p. 307.

‘ to have been written, when he was going toward Macedonia,
 ‘ For then he was but newly parted from Timothy. And it is
 ‘ not likely, that he would so write to him, when he was but
 ‘ newly come from him. — Therefore it cannot but be con-
 ‘ cluded, that this epistle was written whilst he was in Mace-
 ‘ donia, or the parts thereabout, at this time that we are
 ‘ upon.’ To which I readily assent.

I shall add only, what is also already hinted by Lightfoot, that it is very improbable, that the apostle should use those expressions. 1 Tim. iii. 14. *hoping to come and see thee shortly,* before he had been in Macedonia. St. Paul was much more likely to say this, when he had been some months absent from Ephesus, than when he had been come away but a few days only.

I should now say more particularly, when this epistle was written. And I think, it must have been written in the year 56. In the beginning of that year, according to our account, Paul wrote the first epistle to the Corinthians. Before pentecost in that year he left Ephesus. And before the end of that year, I suppose, he might write this epistle to Timothy. The place is not absolutely certain. Before writing this epistle the apostle had been in Macedonia, since he left Ephesus. But whether he was now in that country, cannot, I apprehend, be fully determined by those expressions, 1 Tim. i. 3. However, this may be reckoned very likely, that the apostle was either in Macedonia, or near it. Lewis Capellus, as before observed, was in doubt, which was first written, this epistle, or the second to the Corinthians. About that I have no doubt. We shall soon see clear proof, that the second epistle to the Corinthians was written not long before the end of the year 57. This first epistle to Timothy was written in the year 56, and probably, some good while before the end of it.

§ VI. *The* EPISTLE *to* TITUS.

SAYS Theodoret immediately after what was transcribed from him above concerning the first epistle to Timothy:
 ‘ After that, ^d as I think, was written the epistle to Titus.
 ‘ For being still in those parts, he desired Titus to come to

^d Μετα ταυτην υπολαβανω την περιω αρτεμειν. — Την δε ικετην προς τιτον γεγραφθαι εν εκεινοις γαρ ετι θρακιην μεν πολιν ειπαι φασι, τη δε μεδιαγων τοις μερεσι, καταλαβειν αυτου κεδονια πελαζειν. Theod. T. III. παρεγγυησε. Λεγει δε βτως' εταν p. 4. C.

him, saying: *When I shall send unto thee Artemas, or Tychicus, be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis. For I have determined to winter there,* Tit. iii. 12. They say, that Nicopolis is a city of Thrace, nigh unto Macedonia.' So writes Theodoret in his general preface to St. Paul's epistles. And in his note upon Tit. iii. 12. he says, 'Nicopolis' is a city of Thrace, nigh unto Macedonia. It is manifest therefore, that he wrote this epistle when he was in Macedonia and Achaia.'

Following the opinion of this learned ancient, which I think to be very right, the epistle to Titus was written in the year 56, and Paul spent the winter of that year at Nicopolis.

If it be asked, when was Paul in Crete? I answer, in general: a short time, before he wrote this epistle, as may appear from those words: *For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed thee,* ch. i. 5. More particularly, I suppose, that Paul had been in Crete in this year 56, since he came from Ephesus, to go into Macedonia. About this time, I think, he was in Crete, and Illyricum, as well as in Macedonia. But as I do not indulge myself in making conjectures, I do not attempt to describe the order of the apostle's voyages. It was before shown to be probable, that between Paul's leaving Ephesus in the spring of the year 56, and his coming to Troas, after the passover, in the year 58, in his way to Jerusalem, there was the space of about two years. In that time Paul might do, and probably did more than is particularly related by St. Luke. Few learned men, considering the conciseness of St. Luke's manner of writing, can make any difficulty to allow, that he has not related all the apostle's journies. It is observable, that Titus was the person, who was sent by Paul into Dalmatia, when he was come to Rome. As appears from 2 Tim. iv. 10. Which may be reckoned an argument, that he had been there before.

About this time the epistle to Titus was written, according to the opinion of divers learned men, to whom I refer: as "

^a Της θρακης εστιν η νικοπολις, τη δε μακεδονια πελαζει. Δηλον τοιουτ' ως νατ εκεινον τον καιρον, καθ' ου εν τη μακεδονια και αχαα διετριβεν, εγραψε τη επιστολην. Ibid. p. 515. A.

^c See before, p. 284—286.

^e Neque enim omnia Pauli itinera descripsit Lucas, sed notabiliora quaedam. Wits. de Vita Pauli. Sect. 9. num. v.

^h Baron. Ann. 57. num. ccix.

Baronius, ⁱ Capellus, ^k Hammond, and ^l Lightfoot. Estius ⁿ could not determine the time of this epistle exactly: but he thought, it was written before the apostle's imprisonment at Jerusalem, and Rome.

Cavé in his ⁿ *Historia Literaria* placeth this epistle in the year 63. But, when he wrote the lives of the apostles, he supposed it to have been written soon after the first epistle to the Corinthians.

Mill ^p placeth this epistle in the year 64. Pearson ^q in 65, Paul having, as he supposes, been in Crete, and left Titus there the year before, that is, in 64. And many others may be of the same opinion.

But this appears to me too late a date. All that is said of Paul's going into Spain, and Crete, and some other places, after being released from his imprisonment at Rome, is mere conjecture, without any good authority, either from the books of the New Testament, or very early antiquity. It is not likely, that Paul, who in his epistle to Philemon calls himself *aged*, should after that undertake new work. It is more probable, that he went to such places, where he had been before, and where he had disciples already: as he intimates in his epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, Philemon, the Hebrews. Nor is it at all likely, that the Cretans should have been so long without being instructed in the doctrine of the gospel, as Pearson supposeth.

I have already shown the most probable date of the first epistle to Timothy. It is likely, that the epistle to Titus was written about the same time. For the state of things in both appears to be very similar. In both are instructions concerning the qualifications of elders, or bishops, and deacons. So

ⁱ Lud. Capell. *Hist. Ap.* p. 16. et 66. Vid. et Jacob. Cap. *Compend. in apost. hist. Chronol. Tab.*

^k *Præf. in ep. ad Tit.* ^l Lightfoot's Works, vol. I. p. 309, 310.

^m Quando scripta sit hæc epistola, non liquet, nec facile ex Actis Apost. colligi potest, quod in iis non legatur Paulus Cretam ingressus fuisse. Verisimile est, ante captivitatem Apostoli, quia vinculorum hic nulla mentio. Imo, cum dicit cap. iii *ibi enim statui hyemare*, plane significat, non esse vinctum. Est. *Argum. ep. ad Tit.*

ⁿ *Epistola ad Titum* — data anno 63. e medio aliquo loco inter Macedoniam et Nicopolim Illic enim hyemare decreverat. H. L. in Paulo. ^o See there the Life of St. Paul, sect. iv. num. ix.

^p *Proleg. num. 122.* ^q *Ann. Paulin. p. 20—22.*

^r Non verisimile est, ad illud usque tempus ignoratum fuisse Christum in Creta: quum tota Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, Cyprus, Syria, personarent evangelii præconio. Wits. *de Vita Pauli. loc. v. num. i.*

1 Tim. iii. and Tit. i. Nor is it reasonable to think that Paul should have occasion, so late as the Year 64, or 65, to send to his assistants and fellow-labourers such particular directions concerning that matter, as are in these two epistles. It is probable, that instructions of that kind had been given sooner. Moreover, the like errors are guarded against in both these epistles. 1 Tim. i. 4. *Neither give heed to fables, and endless genealogies.*—Ch. iv. 7. *But refuse profane and old wives' fables.*—Ch. vi. 20. *Avoiding profane and vain babblings.*—Tit. iii. 9. *But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law. For they are unprofitable and vain.* See also ch. i. 10—14. In both are like directions for paying a proper regard to civil magistrates. 1 Tim. ii. 1—6. and Tit. iii. 1—3. There are also like directions concerning relative duties, particularly those of masters and servants, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2. Tit. ii. 9, 10. Timothy and Titus are in a like manner exhorted, to take heed to themselves, and their doctrine, and to be examples of virtue. 1 Tim. i. 18, 19. iv. 6, 16. Tit. ii. 1—8. I might add, that near the conclusion of each epistle the practice of good works is in a very similar manner enjoined upon the converts to Christianity.

It appears from many texts of the second epistle to the Corinthians, written in Macedonia, that about this time Paul had the assistance of Titus in those parts. And Tychicus, mentioned Tit. iii. 12. was likewise with Paul at this time: for he was one of the company that went with him into Asia, Acts xx. 4. And therefore, probably, not he, but Artemas, had been sent into Crete, to relieve Titus. Moreover, Apollos was at Ephesus, a little before Paul left that city, to go into Macedonia. That is manifest from 1 Cor. xvi. 12. And it may be reckoned very probable, that he did not stay long at Ephesus after Paul: but either went with him into Macedonia, or came into those parts soon afterwards. So that Paul might now have occasion to recommend him to Titus, in Crete, together with Zenas, Tit. iii. 13.

There are not in this epistle any tokens of Paul's great age, or of his being near the period of his ministry. He is plainly at liberty at the time of writing this epistle. Nor are there any intimations of his having as yet endured any long imprisonment.

This letter may be the shorter, because, probably, Paul had lately written at length upon the same subject to Timothy. Moreover, Titus was older, and might have more experience. Chrysoſtom judged ^s the brevity of this epistle to be an argument of the ability of Titus. 'He did not need a long exhortation. A few hints were sufficient.'

St. Paul ſays, Tit. iii. 12. *When I ſhall ſend Artemas unto thee, or Tycheus, be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis. For I have determined there to winter.* Thereby Theodoret underſtood Nicopolis in Thrace, as ſeen above. So likewiſe Chryſoſtom.^t But Jerom^u ſuppoſed the apoſtle to mean Nicopolis in Epirus. Neither of theſe interpretations is any prejudice to our argument. In which-ſoever of thoſe countries Nicopolis was ſituated, the apoſtle was as likely to be there at the time ſuppoſed by us, as at any other.

At Nicopolis the apoſtle wintered, in the year 56, according to my computation. Conſequentially, this letter was written ſome time before, in the ſame year 56. When the winter was over, Paul came into Macedonia, where he had been before, ſince he came from Ephesus. From Macedonia he came into Greece.

§ VII. *The SECOND EPISTLE to the CORINTHIANS.*

WHILST the apoſtle was in Macedonia, at this time, he wrote the ſecond epistle to the Corinthians, A. D. 57.

Concerning this there can be no doubt, if we attend to the epistle itſelf. From which it plainly appears, that the apoſtle was then in Macedonia, and was going to Greece, particularly to Corinth. So 2 Cor. ix. 1—5. *For as touching the miniſtring to the ſaints, it is ſuperfluous for me to write unto You. For I know the forwardneſs of your mind, for which I boaſt of you to them of Macedonia: that Achaia was ready a year ago — Yet have I ſent the brethren — leſt haply, if they of Ma-*

^s — βραχειαν δε ποιει την επιſολην, εικοτας. Και τετο δε της αρετης τε τιτε τεκμηριον ην, το μη δεισθαι λογων πολλων, αλλα' ωσπερ τινος υπομνησεως. In. Tit. hom. i. tom. XI. p. 730. B.

^t 'Η δ' νικοπολις της θρακιης εστι. Chryſ. in Tit. hom. 6. ib. p. 766. B. ^u Scribit igitur Apoſtolus, ο Paula et Euftochium, de Nico-

poli, quæ in Aethiaco littore sit, nunc possessionis vestrae pars maxima est. &c. Hieron. Pr. 12 ep. ad Tit. T. IV. P. I. p. 407.

Nicopolis ipsa est, quæ ob victoriam Augusti, quod ibi Antonia et Cleopatram superavit, nomen accepit. Id in Tit. cap. iii. v. 7. 439. ^x Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. lvii.

cedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not you) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your bounty. — See also ch. viii. and ch. xiii. 1. This is the third time I am coming to you.

According to Pearson^x this epistle was written in Macedonia, in the year 57, according to ^y Mill, near the end of that year. I likewise think that it was written in the year 57, probably, in September, or October. For the apostle, plainly, was soon to go to Corinth, where he might arrive, as I apprehend, in November.

I suppose it was now above a year since writing the first epistle to the Corinthians. The reasons of that supposition were mentioned ^z formerly. And need not to be repeated here.

Timothy was with Paul at writing this epistle: for his name is in the inscription. It is likely, that ^a he had come from Ephesus to the apostle in Macedonia, either upon occasion of some affairs of that church, or at the desire of the apostle, who needed his assistance. As before said.

§ VIII. The EPISTLE to the ROMANS.

THE epistle to the Romans is dated by ^b Pearson in the year 57, by ^c Mill in the year 58. According to our computation of Paul's journies there can be no reason to hesitate about either the time, or the place of this epistle. It was written at Corinth in the beginning of the year 58, before Paul set out on his journey to Jerusalem.

As St. Luke's few words in Acts xx. 1, 2, 3. afford great light, and are a sure guide, I recite them here. *And after*

^x Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. lvii.

— sub finem, ut videtur, anni
vulgaris lvii. Proleg. num. 21.

^z See before, p. 284, 285.

^a Lateor, cum Paulus esset in Macedonia, una cum illo fuisse Timotheum. 2 Cor. i. 1. et postquam hævemem transgisset in Epiro. Tit. iii. 12. ac per tres menses commoratus in Grecia. Act. xx. 2, 3. reversusque esset in Macedoniam, illi adfuisse Timotheum. Act. xx. 4. ac recta cum illo ivisse Troadem. Quæ omnia contingere

potuerunt, postquam Paulus reliquisset Timotheum Ephesi: ex qua urbe tamen iverit ad Paulum, sive propter negotia Ephesinæ ecclesiæ. de quibus Paulum consuli ab eo oporteret, vel ut pareret Paulo, quem, ut videmus, et postea invisit, longiore itinere. Romam usque. 2 Tim. iv. 9. Hammond. Præf. in 1 ep. Timoth. ex versione Clerici.

^b Annal. Paulin. p. 15.

^c Proleg. num. 26.

the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed [from Ephesus] for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and given them much exhortation, he came into Greece. And there abode three months. In the space of these three months was written the epistle to the Romans.

According to Theodoret the epistle to the Romans ^a is the seventh in order of time, having been written by the apostle after the two epistles to the Thessalonians, and to the Corinthians, the first to Timothy, and the epistle to Titus. He adds: 'That ^c the epistle to the Romans was written ^c from Corinth, is manifest from the conclusion. For there ^c the apostle recommends Phœbe, calling her *deaconness of the church in Cenchrea*, which was a borough of the Corinthians, ^c Rom. xvi. 1. Besides, he says: *Gaius, my host, and of the whole church, saluteth you*, ver. 23. By *host* he means the ^c person, who entertained him. And that Gaius was a ^c Corinthian, we learn from the first epistle to the Corinthians. For thus he writes to them: *I thank God, that I baptized none of you, but Crispus, and Gaius*, 1 Cor. i. 14. ^c The epistle to the Romans therefore is the last of the ^c epistles written from Asia, and Macedonia, and Achaia: ^c and is the seventh in order, as has been shown. The rest ^c were sent from Rome.' So Theodoret. Who might have added, as a proof, that this epistle was written at Corinth, what follows in ver 23. *Erastus, the chamberlain of the city, saluteth you.* For by *the city* I suppose to be meant Corinth. But whether this Erastus be the same, who is mentioned by St. Luke Acts xix. 22. as one of St. Paul's assistants, I cannot say certainly.

The time of writing this epistle is farther manifest hence. It was written after that Paul had completed his collections in Macedonia, and Achaia, and when he was setting out for Jerusalem. For so he writes, ch. xv. 25, 26. *But now I go unto Jerusalem, to minister unto the saints. For it has pleased them of Macedonia, and Achaia, to make a certain contribution for the poor saints, which are at Jerusalem,——ver. 30, 31. Now I beseech you, brethren,——that ye strive together with me in prayers to God for me: that I may be delivered from them that do*

^a Ἐβδομὴν τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπε-
τείλει· μετὰ γὰρ ὅτι ταύτας ἀπάσας ταύ-

τὴν αὐτὸς γεγραφεῖναι διδάσκει. κ. λ.
Theod. T. III. p. 4. C.

^c Ibid. p. 5.

not believe in Judea, and that my service, which I have for Jerusalem, may be accepted of the saints.

Consequently, it is probable, that it was now near the end of the *three months*, that the apostle stayed in Greece. Whence he returned to Macedonia, and after the days of unleavened bread, sailed from Philippi, to Troas, upon the continent of Asia, Acts xx. 3—6. And then went to Jerusalem, where he arrived about the time of pentecost in the year 58.

If St. Paul came to Corinth in November 57, the epistle to the Romans might be sent thence in the month of February, in the year 58.

§ IX. The EPISTLE to the EPHESIANS.

CONCERNING St. Paul's epistles, written during his imprisonment at Rome, particularly, the epistle to the Ephesians.

Soon after writing the epistle to the Romans, as was before hinted, Paul set out from Corinth, on his journey to Jerusalem. In a short time after his arrival there, he was apprehended. And he was kept a prisoner in that country, till he was sent to Rome.

During his stay in Judea, we know not of his corresponding with any churches, or particular persons, by writing. But at Rome, though a prisoner, he wrote divers letters. Grotius says, that ^f though all St. Paul's epistles are excellent, he most admires those written by him, when a prisoner at Rome. And of the epistle to the Ephesians he says, it ^s surpasseth all human eloquence.

It is generally supposed, that St. Paul wrote there four epistles: to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. Jerom has twice ^b spoken of these four epistles, as written at Rome. Theodoret having spoken of the epistle to the Romans, as the seventh in order, and

^f Omnes epistolæ Pauli egregiæ sunt: sed omnium in primis, quæ Romæ ex vinculis missæ sunt. Gr. Pr. in ep. ad Col. ^s — rerum sublimitatem adæquans verbis sublimioribus, quam ulla unquam habuit lingua humana. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. ^b Quod Romæ in vincula coniectus, hanc epistolam scripsit eo tempore, quo ad Phile-

monem, et ad Colossenses, et ad Philippenses, in alio loco scriptas esse monstravimus. Hieron. in Eph. cap. iii. T. IV. p. 347.

Scribit igitur ad Philemonem Romæ vinctus in carcere, quo tempore mihi videntur ad Philippenses, Colossenses, et Ephesios epistolæ esse dictatæ. In Philem. ib. p. 445, in.

the last of those that were sent from Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia, says: 'The rest were sent from Rome: the first of which I take to be that, written to the Galatians.' Lightfoot * likewise supposed the epistle to the Galatians to have been written at Rome, and the first of those that were written there. That is a wrong computation, as must appear from what has been already said. But beside the four above-mentioned, the second epistle to Timothy might be written at this season. The epistle to the Hebrews likewise, if it be Paul's, was, probably, written about this time, either during the apostle's imprisonment, or soon after it, before he left Rome, and Italy.

St. Paul's imprisonment, from the time of his being apprehended at Jerusalem, to his coming to Rome, was the space of almost, or quite three years. For a short time he was confined in the castle of Antonia at Jerusalem. Thence he was sent to Cæsarea by the sea-side, the seat of the Roman governor, who at that time was Felix. Where he was kept in Herod's judgment hall, Acts xxiii. 35. And though afterwards there was an order for enlarging the first strictness of his custody, *and that his acquaintance should be permitted to come to him, and minister to him,* ch. xxiv. 23. I suppose, he was still confined in the above-mentioned prison. And, perhaps, this new order imported little more, than leave for his friends to bring him needful refreshments, and take care of his health. It does not appear, that during the space of two years, and several months, whilst he was in Judea, he wrote any letters, or received any, as before intimated. Says † Wall: 'Those two years of imprisonment under Felix seem to have been the most unactive part of St. Paul's life. There is no account of any preachings, or disputations, or of any epistles written in this space.' Indeed, considering the violent opposition made by the Jews throughout the whole space of the apostle's being in that country: I apprehend, there was no attempt made by Paul, or his friends, to procure him intelligence from the christian churches abroad: and that the Roman governor could not allow of any such thing. He would rather have set Paul at liberty, and let him go quite away. But when

ⁱ Τα; γαρ δι' αλλας απο τις ρωμης επεστειλε και πρωτην μεν ηγαμαι την προς γαλατας γραφηναι. T. III. p. 5.

^k Lightf. vol. I. p. 323.

^l Notes upon the N. T. p. 267, 268.

Paul was brought to Rome, though he was under a guard, he was *suffered to dwell by himself, in his own hired house*, Acts xxviii. 16—30. where he was two years. Having such liberty, he wisely improved it, not only by discoursing with all those who came to him, but also by writing several epistles.

Of all these epistles the first written seems to me to be that to the Ephesians. I think, it was drawn up by the apostle, as soon as conveniently could be, after his friends at Rome had taken a lodging for him, and he was settled in it. A. D. 61.

The epistle is inscribed *to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus*. But I apprehend, that the apostle thought of the Christians throughout Asia, properly so called; whether living at Ephesus, the chief city of the country, or not. To the like purpose ^m Hammond: and also Mr. Pyle, who paraphraseth the first verse of the epistle in this manner: 'Paul, called to be an apostle, sendeth this epistle to the church of Ephesus, and to all the Christians of the lesser Asia, those faithful Christians, that firmly rely upon the christian religion for salvation, without the observation of the Mosaical ceremonies.' We are led to this supposition by what St. Paul says near the conclusion of his first epistle to the Corinthians, written at Ephesus: *the churches of Asia salute you*, 1 Cor. ch. xvi. 19. And that epistle to the Corinthians is addressed *to the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, both theirs, and ours*. And the second epistle to the Corinthians is addressed *to the church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the saints, which are in all Achaia*.

After the salutation of these Christians, at the beginning of the epistle, he praiseth God for the gospel-dispensation, now made known to all men, agreeably to the gracious purpose, long since formed in the divine counsels. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the*

^m Ephesum fuisse primam Metropolim Lydiæ, vel proconsularis Asiæ, ostendimus in notis ad Coloss. 11. 16. Itaque epistola hæc, Ephesius inscripta, non est putanda ad

eos solos pertinere, verum etiam ad alias urbes provinciæ, imo et totius Asiæ. Hammond. Præf. in ep. ad Eph.

world, ver. 3, 4, to the 12. He then reminds them of their first faith in the gospel, and the circumstances of it. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise. Which is the earnest of our inheritance——ver. 13, 14. After which he lets them know, that in his confinement, since he came to Rome, he had heard of the continuance of their faith, and of their love for all Christians in general: which had filled him with transports of joy and satisfaction. Wherefore I also having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers: that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom: or that they might be more and more illuminated, and established in the principles of true religion, ver. 15, 16. and to ver. 23.

The account that had been brought him of the Christians at Ephesus by Tychicus, as may be supposed, having been very agreeable, the apostle does not censure them for any great irregularities in conduct as he does the Corinthians, nor for any remarkable deviations from the simplicity of the gospel, or instability therein, as he does the Galatians. But he treats them with mildness. However, he sends them a pathetic exhortation to persevere in a conversation, becoming their profession and their privileges, and to guard against the temptations which they might meet with either from heathen idolaters, or corrupt and self-interested Christians.

At the end, he tells them, that he had sent Tychicus, who would give them information concerning his affairs, and comfort them, ch. vi. 21, 22. And then adds: *Peace be to the brethren, and love, with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, ver. 23. Peace be to the brethren,* that is, the brethren with you at Ephesus, to whom the epistle is directed. So 1 Thess. v. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren:* meaning the brethren, or Christians at Thessalonica. So to the Philippians, ch. iv. 21. *Salute every saint in Christ Jesus,* meaning, undoubtedly, the Christians at Philippi. And then at ver. 22. *All the saints salute you:* meaning all the Christians in general at Rome. It was not needful to say, of this place. The meaning is obvious.

The concluding words of this epistle are these at ver. 23. *Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity:* which, I think, may be understood and paraphrased after this manner. 'And grace be with all those, who, like you, love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.'

That is a brief and general account of the epistle itself. I must add somewhat in behalf of the early date of it, which is here assigned by me.

There might be many considerations, inducing the apostle to write to the Ephesians, soon after his arrival at Rome. Ephesus was a place of great importance, being the chief city of Asia, where was a great resort of merchants, and all other people. Here the apostle chose to settle that eminent disciple of his, Timothy. Here also St. John took up his residence, after he had left Judea. It was the place where Paul had been longer than in any other city, except Antioch. Here also he had wrought many and special miracles, and had great success in his preaching. Acts xix. Moreover, he had intended them a visit. 1 Tim iii. 14. But had been prevented. When he went to Jerusalem, it is likely, that it was earnestly desired, and confidently expected by the Christians at Ephesus. Such expectations are sufficiently intimated by St. Luke, Acts xx. 15—17. *The next day we came to Miletus. For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hastened, if possible, to be at Jerusalem the day of pentecost. And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church.* Where having made a pathetic discourse, all present were much affected, and gave testimonies of a fervent and high esteem. These things must have made impressions upon the apostle, and have been well remembered by him: and may have induced him to think of writing first to this church upon his coming to Rome, and having liberty of correspondence.

There might be likewise some other reasons for this determination. The epistle is carried by Tychicus, who was of Asia, and, probably, an Ephesian. Mr. Biscoe^a thought, that Tychicus accompanied the apostle in his voyage to Rome. But for that I see no ground. I rather think, that like divers others of his fellow-labourers, Tychicus had come to Rome of his own accord, to meet Paul, and to attend upon him: or had been sent by the

^a Upon the Acts, p. 435.

Ephesians, to pay their respects to him, and inquire into the state of his affairs. It seems to me, that Tychicus was one of the first, who came to the apostle, and very soon after his arrival at Rome. Yea, possibly, Tychicus was got thither before him, as some other of the apostle's friends likewise might be. However, Tychicus being now at Rome, he was a very fit person to go with a letter from the apostle to Ephesus.

If we duly attend to the apostle's situation, after having been above two years in a close confinement at Cæsarea, we may be able to discern the reason of several things. Particularly, we may perceive, why this is a kind of general epistle, not much concerning itself with the affairs and circumstances of any church: but delivering, first, the doctrine of the gospel, and then the duties of it, with a fulness, scarcely equalled in any other of the apostolical epistles. As Theodoret said: 'The former part of the epistle contains the doctrine of the gospel, the latter part a moral admonition.' Or as a learned modern says: 'Being somewhat in the manner of an institute.' The apostle might well judge it best to write thus in his first letter, written after a long silence: and in this manner, to remind his friends and converts in Asia of the principles of the gospel, and their obligations, as Christians.

We are likewise hence led to discern the great beauty and propriety of the several places of this epistle, where the apostle speaks of his bonds, ch. iii. 1. *I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you gentiles.* That for their cause, he was now in bonds, appears from the history of his imprisonment, as related by St. Luke in the Acts, and particularly, from what is said ch. xxii. 21, 22. and the following verses. There is an especial suitableness in that expression of the apostle, in a letter written soon after his arrival at Rome, and especially, if it be the first letter written by him after his being apprehended, as I think it is. And having enlarged somewhat farther upon his having been appointed an apostle by Christ, for forwarding the gospel among gentiles, he goes on, and endeavours to comfort these Christians, and all gentile converts in general, with regard to the afflictive dispensation, which he was under, and which might appear very strange to many, ver. 13. *Wherefore I*

* See vol. V. p. 194.

desire, that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. Again: iv. 1 *I therefore the prisoner of the Lord beseech you.* And ch. vi. 20. he calls himself *an ambassador in bonds.* How suitable is this to the apostle's circumstances, if we consider him now lately arrived in the city of Rome, the capital of the Roman empire, and the seat of the emperor.

I cannot forbear transcribing that passage, ch. vi. 18—20. *Praying for all saints,——and for me, that utterance may be given to me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel. For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.* Wherein I do not think, the apostle so much desires these Christians to pray for his enlargement, as that he might discharge his commission aright: and speak with the freedom and boldness of an ambassador from a great prince: though he was chained as a prisoner, and had not the outward pomp and state, usual with men of that high character. This was very proper at the time of his arrival at Rome, where he was likely to continue some while.

There is a like passage in Col. iv. 3, 4. which, I think, ought not to be understood very differently.

It is also an argument, that this epistle was written by the apostle soon after his coming to Rome: that here are no expressions, denoting hopes of enlargement, as there are in the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon: written, as we suppose, not long before his deliverance. Nor does he here take any notice of successes obtained at Rome, or give any intimations of converts made by him there, as he does Philip. i. 12, 13, 14. iv. 22. He seems indeed to have pleased himself with a prospect of recommending the gospel in his present situation, ch. iii. 7—10. like to what he says 2 Tim. iv. 17. an epistle written about the same time. But he does not intimate any advantages obtained as yet. Nor does he at the end of this epistle send such salutations, as at the end of the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. All which must lead us to think, that the circumstances of the apostle at writing this epistle were different from his circumstances at writing those epistles: when his captivity, as is allowed, was near its period.

Says St. Paul 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.* It is likely, that the apostle there refers to the epistle,

epistle, of which we are now speaking. He had just sent, or was sending away Tychicus to Ephesus with this epistle. I think, I shall presently show, that the second epistle to Timothy was written in the first year of the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, and not very long after his arrival there. Consequently this epistle, being there referred to, must have been sent about the same time.

That the epistle to the Ephesians is here referred to, has been the opinion of many. So thought ^p Tillemont. Who supposing, that the second to Timothy was written in a second imprisonment of the apostle at Rome, placeth the writing of this to the Ephesians in the year 65. Whitby in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians, observes, 'In his close of this epistle St. Paul speaks thus to them, ch. vi. 21, 22. *That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.*—*Tychicus shall make known unto you all things.*—And in the second epistle to Timothy he saith, *Tychicus have I sent unto Ephesus,* 2 Tim. iv. 12.' So Whitby. But forgetting, as it seems, what he had said in some other places. However, this shows, how natural and easy it is, to think the epistle to the Ephesians intended in that place of the second to Timothy. And it is what most would think, if not biassed by some prejudice.

Theodoret, in his general preface to St. Paul's epistles, says, 'The apostle sent to the Ephesians and the Colossians at the same time, and sent them by the same messenger,' meaning Tychicus. But in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians, having quoted Eph. vi. 21, 22. he goes on: 'And that he sent Tychicus from Rome, he shows in his second epistle to Timothy, saying, do thy diligence to come to me shortly.—And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus,' 2 Tim. iv. 10—12. So Theodoret, without considering the consequence. For he supposed the second to Timothy to have been written but a short time before the apostle's martyrdom. But if the epistle to the Ephesians was written when the apostle was first at Rome (as Theodoret allows) and if he refers to it in his second epistle to Timothy; it will follow, that this was written soon after

^p Saint Paul. Art. 49. et Note 58. Mem. Ec. tom. I.

^q Και μεν τοι και εφεσιοις και κολοσσαευσι κατα του αυτου εγραψε χρονον, εν των επιτολων διακοινη αμφοτερων χρη-

σαμενος. Theod. T. III. p. 5.

^r Του δε μακαριου τυχιου απο της ρωμης απεστειλε και τριτο εν τη προς τιμοθεον δευτερα διδασκει. κ. λ. Ib. p. 292. A.

that

that to the Ephesians, and when the apostle was first at Rome.

However, there are difficulties attending this opinion, which must be considered.

First, it is said, that the epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians were sent by the same messenger. Comp. Eph. vi. 21, 22. Col. iv. 7, 8. The epistle to the Colossians was sent away from Rome, when the apostle had hopes of enlargement. Consequently, the epistle to the Ephesians was written about the same time.

I answer, that this is no proof. For Tychicus might be sent twice into the same country, in the time of the apostle's two years imprisonment. Tychicus might be sent to Ephesus, with this letter to the Ephesians, soon after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and come back to him, and be able to take another journey into those parts a year after, when the apostle was about to be set at liberty.

Secondly, it is said, that there is a great agreement between the epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians. This last, as is allowed, was written in the second year of the apostle's confinement, and when it was near its end. Consequently, the epistle to the Ephesians was written about the same time.

To which I answer: undoubtedly, there is an agreement between these epistles in several things, taken notice of by Grotius, and others. But it does not therefore follow, that they were sent away together. For, as has been observed by Lightfoot, it is likely, that the apostle kept copies of his letters. If so, it might be easy for him to write after the same manner at different times, to people not very remote from each other, and whose circumstances were much alike. Indeed, without keeping copies of his letters, I believe it would be no difficult matter for St. Paul to repeat the christian principles, and exhortations to christian virtues, at several

^s Proxima huic et argumento, et verbis etiam, est illa ad Colossenses, eodem, ni fallor, scripta tempore. Grot. Præf. in ep. ad Eph. vid. et ejusd. Pr. in ep. ad Coloss.

^t It may be the parchments, ² Tim. iv. 13. were the originals of those epistles that he had already written. For that he sent

transcripts, and reserved the originals, may be collected from these passages. *I Tertius, who wrote out this epistle*, Rom. xvi. 22. See also 1 Cor. xvi. 21. Col. iv. 18. 2 Thess. iii. 17 For all the epistle beside was written with another hand.' Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 316.

times,

times, in like expressions, if the circumstances of men required it.

And there are several things in the epistles themselves, which afford good reason for thinking, that they were not written, and sent away at the same time: and that the epistle to the Colossians was written some while after that to the Ephesians. From what is said in the second chapter of the epistle to the Colossians, concerning the worshipping of angels, and other matters, it may be concluded, that the apostle had received from those parts some intelligence, which he had not, when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians. For there those matters are not at all touched upon.

And though there is a resemblance between these two epistles, they are very different. For the epistle to the Ephesians, is a good deal longer than that to the Colossians, though the fore-mentioned article in the second chapter to the Colossians is entirely wanting: and in those places where there is an agreement, there are differences.

Nor is there in the epistle to the Ephesians any notice taken of Timothy, or Epaphras, or Mark, so expressly mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians. Which must be reckoned a very strong, and even a demonstrative argument, that these two epistles were not written, and sent away at the same time.

In this date of the epistle to the Ephesians I have ^u followed Lightfoot: from whom I have had great assistances in settling the time of St. Paul's epistles. I have likewise had, in this instance, assistances from ^x Baronius, ^y Estius, ^z Hammond, and ^a Witsius.

Baronius ^b and Lightfoot first speak of the second epistle to Timothy: though they do not deny the epistle to the Ephesians to have been written before it. But as we are now inquiring into the order of time, I have judged it best to adhere to that strictly. A few weeks, yea a few days, might make a great alteration in the apostle's circumstances at this time. And some of his friends and assistants might be daily coming to Rome from the provinces, and getting access to him in

^u As before, p. 325. ^x Annal. 59. num. xv. Vid. et num. xx.

^y Præf. in ep. ad Eph. ^z Præf. in ep. ad Ephes. ^a Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. xii. num. vi. et ix.

^b Hæc cum ita sint, nos tamen primum egimus de ipsa ad Timo-

theum scripta epistola, eo quod multa in ea de rebus suis Romæ gestis ipse significet, ex quibus intexeretur historia: quarum nulla est mentio in epistola ad Ephesios. Baron. Ann. 59. num. xv.

his apartment. By comparing these two epistles I am led to think, that when the apostle wrote the second epistle to Timothy, he had been longer at Rome, and was better acquainted with the world about him, than when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians.

Basnage is singular in his sentiment concerning the time of this epistle. 'That it was written at Rome, when Paul was prisoner there,' he says, 'is manifest. But he thinks it to have been the last epistle which was sent thence by the apostle. He argues well enough, that it was not sent with the epistle to the Colossians. And he supposeth, that Tychicus was sent twice into these countries by the apostle from Rome.' He should therefore have concluded, that this letter to the Ephesians, was carried by Tychicus, not after those other epistles, but before them.

Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.* I suppose the apostle here to refer to the epistle to the Ephesians, which was carried from Rome to Ephesus by Tychicus. But still, perhaps, it may be questioned, whether those two epistles, that to the Ephesians, and the second to Timothy were sent away together. Baronius^d says, they were. He says, the apostle puts the preterit for the present. So Eph. vi. 21, 22.—*That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.—Tychicus—shall make known unto you all things, whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose.* And unquestionably, that way of speaking is not uncommon. Instances are obvious. So Philem. ver. 12. *Whom I have sent again.* Which may be rendered: *whom I am sending again to you,*

^c Epistolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apostolus, ea quæ ad Ephesios ultima esse videtur. Ludovico enim Capello non assentimur, qui eodem tempore ad Colossenses et ad Ephesios, epistolam scriptam esse statuit. — Agebat Romæ Epaphras, dum Paulus scribit Colossensibus. Col. i. 8. Urbe autem aberat, cum ad Ephellos misit epistolam, in qua ne verbo quidem meminit Epaphræ. Quinetiam non ut ad Colossenses sic et ad Ephesios nomine suo et Timothei scribit. Præterea per Tychicum missa est epistola. Eph. vi. 21. Quæ de alia profus Ty-

chici profectioe intelligenda sunt, quam cujus meminit ad Colossenses iv. 12. Alioquin Timothei ac Epaphræ mentionem quoque injecisset. Ann. 61. num. vii.

^d Verum eidem Tabellario, nempe Tychico, dedit etiam tunc Paulus epistolam ad Ephesios. Licet in ea ad Timotheum dicat: *Tychicum misi Ephesum*: tamen præteritum tempus pro præsentis usurpasse videtur, sicut cum ad Ephesios de eodem scribens ait: *Ut autem et vos sciatis, quæ circa me sunt—nota faciet Tychicus—quem misi ad vos ad hoc ipsum.* — Bar. ann. 59. num. xv.

times, in like expressions, if the circumstances of men required it.

And there are several things in the epistles themselves, which afford good reason for thinking, that they were not written, and sent away at the same time: and that the epistle to the Colossians was written some while after that to the Ephesians. From what is said in the second chapter of the epistle to the Colossians, concerning the worshipping of angels, and other matters, it may be concluded, that the apostle had received from those parts some intelligence, which he had not, when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians. For there those matters are not at all touched upon.

And though there is a resemblance between these two epistles, they are very different. For the epistle to the Ephesians, is a good deal longer than that to the Colossians, though the fore-mentioned article in the second chapter to the Colossians is entirely wanting: and in those places where there is an agreement, there are differences.

Nor is there in the epistle to the Ephesians any notice taken of Timothy, or Epaphras, or Mark, so expressly mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians. Which must be reckoned a very strong, and even a demonstrative argument, that these two epistles were not written, and sent away at the same time.

In this date of the epistle to the Ephesians I have ^u followed Lightfoot: from whom I have had great assistances in settling the time of St. Paul's epistles. I have likewise had, in this instance, assistances from ^x Baronius, ^y Estius, ^z Hammond, and ^a Witfius.

Baronius ^b and Lightfoot first speak of the second epistle to Timothy: though they do not deny the epistle to the Ephesians to have been written before it. But as we are now inquiring into the order of time, I have judged it best to adhere to that strictly. A few weeks, yea a few days, might make a great alteration in the apostle's circumstances at this time. And some of his friends and assistants might be daily coming to Rome from the provinces, and getting access to him in

^u As before, p. 325. ^x Annal. 59. num. xv. Vid. et num. xx.

^y Præf. in ep. ad Eph. ^z Præf. in ep. ad Ephes. ^a Witf. de Vit. Paul. sect. xii. num. vi. et ix.

^b Hæc cum ita sint, nos tamen primum egimus de ipsa ad Timo-

them scripta epistola, eo quod multa in ea de rebus suis Romæ gestis ipse significet, ex quibus intexeretur historia: quarum nulla est mentio in epistola ad Ephesios. Baron. Ann. 59. num. xv.

his apartment. By comparing these two epistles I am led to think, that when the apostle wrote the second epistle to Timothy, he had been longer at Rome, and was better acquainted with the world about him, than when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians.

Basnage is singular in his sentiment concerning the time of this epistle. 'That it was written at Rome, when Paul was prisoner there,' he says, 'is manifest. But he thinks it to have been the last epistle which was sent thence by the apostle. He argues well enough, that it was not sent with the epistle to the Colossians. And he supposeth, that Tychicus was sent twice into these countries by the apostle from Rome.' He should therefore have concluded, that this letter to the Ephesians, was carried by Tychicus, not after those other epistles, but before them.

Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.* I suppose the apostle here to refer to the epistle to the Ephesians, which was carried from Rome to Ephesus by Tychicus. But still, perhaps, it may be questioned, whether those two epistles, that to the Ephesians, and the second to Timothy were sent away together. Baronius^d says, they were. He says, the apostle puts the preterit for the present. So Eph. vi. 21, 22.—*That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.—Tychicus—shall make known unto you all things, whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose.* And unquestionably, that way of speaking is not uncommon. Instances are obvious. So Philem, ver. 12. *Whom I have sent again.* Which may be rendered: *whom I am sending again to you.*

^c Epistolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apostolus, ea quæ ad Ephesios ultima esse videtur. Ludovico enim Capello non assentimur, qui eodem tempore ad Colossenses et ad Ephesios, epistolam scriptam esse statuit. — Agebat Romæ Epaphras, dum Paulus scribit Colossensibus. Col. i. 8. Urbe autem aberat, cum ad Ephesios misit epistolam, in qua ne verbulo quidem meminit Epaphræ. Quinetiam non ut ad Colossenses sic et ad Ephesios nomine suo et Timothei scribit. Præterea per Tychicum missa est epistola. Eph. vi. 21. Quæ de alia prorsus Ty-

chici professione intelligenda sunt, quam cujus meminit ad Colossenses iv. 12. Alioquin Timothei ac Epaphræ mentionem quoque injecisset. Ann. 61. num. vii.

^d Verum eidem Tabellario, nempe Tychico, dedit etiam tunc Paulus epistolam ad Ephesios. Licet in ea ad Timotheum dicat: *Tychicum misi Ephesum*: tamen præteritum tempus pro præsentis usurpasse videtur, sicut cum ad Ephesios de eodem scribens ait: *Ut autem et vos sciatis, quæ circa me sunt—nota faciet Tychicus—quem misi ad vos ad hoc ipsum.* — Bar. ann. 59. num. xv.

See also ver. 19—21. and Philip. ii. 28. So here in 2 Tim. iv. 12. The words may be rendered: *And Tychicus I am sending to Ephesus.* Nevertheless, as that interpretation, in this place, is not certain, I would not be positive. The epistle to the Ephesians, I think, was carried from Rome by Tychicus, either at the same time with the second to Timothy, or a short time only before it.

And according to my calculation, the epistle to the Ephesians was written at Rome, soon after the apostle's arrival there, in 61, and before the summer of that year. It was the first epistle written by the apostle in that city. And it was sent away a short time before the second epistle to Timothy, of which I shall speak next, or together with it.

§ X. *The second* EPISTLE to TIMOTHY.

WE come now to the second epistle to Timothy, which we suppose to have been sent away together with that to the Ephesians, or soon after it, A. D. 61.

Many learned men speak of a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome, and suppose, that this second epistle to Timothy was then written, in 67, or 68. But I do not know, that we have any good account of a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome. He suffered martyrdom there, as some think, in 64, or 65, or as others, in 67, or 68. But that he might do, without a previous imprisonment of any duration. For he might be apprehended on a sudden, and be put to death presently. Which may be reckoned as likely, as not.

Before I proceed to the proofs, that this second epistle to Timothy was written during Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when he was sent thither from Judea by Festus, I would premise, that I suppose, with most learned moderns, that Timothy was now at Ephesus.

It has been thought, that Timothy was not there, because it is said, ch. iv. 12. *Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.* But that argument is of no force. There was no need to say: I have sent Tychicus to you. There are many similar, or parallel ways of speaking in St Paul's epistles. 1 Cor. xv. 32. He speaks of his having *fought with beasts at Ephesus*: where he certainly was at that time, as appears from xvi. 8. And 2 Tim. i. 17. he says: *When Onesiphorus was at Rome, he sought me out very diligently.* He does not say, when he was here.

Lightfoot

Lightfoot * observes, that from the epistle itself it may be concluded, that Timothy was at Ephesus. For 1. He directs him to salute the household of Onesiphorus, ch. iv. 19. who was an Ephesian, ch. i. 16—18. 2. He directs Timothy to take Troas in his way to him, ch. iv. 13. which was the way that Paul had gone from Ephesus, 2 Cor. ii. 12. and to Ephesus again, Acts xx. 5. 3. He warns him of Alexander, ch. iv. 14. who was an Ephesian. 1 Tim. i. 20. Acts xix. 33. So Lightfoot. To which, I think, may be added, 4. Paul's salutation of Priscilla and Aquila, ch. iv. 19. who, probably, were now returned to Ephesus, and settled there, where they had been formerly. Acts xviii. 18, 19—26. and 1 Cor. xvi. 19. For certainly they were not now at Rome, where Paul himself was: though they were there, when he wrote the epistle to the Romans, ch. xvi. 3, 4.

Here it may be asked: when did Timothy come to Ephesus? And how long had he been there? I answer, that by a very easy and probable conjecture, it may be concluded, that he was left there, when Paul was going up to Jerusalem, with the collections, which he had made among the gentile Christians, for the poor saints in Judea. For Timothy is expressly mentioned by St. Luke among the apostle's company in that journey. Acts xx. 3, 4, 5. *And as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia, Sopater of Berea—and Timothy, and of Asia, Tychicus, and Trophimus.* Timothy therefore was in Paul's company, and went with him as far as Asia, in which Ephesus stood. And so far, I suppose, all above-mentioned accompanied Paul, but not into Syria. I apprehend, that Timothy and Tychicus stayed in Asia. For we have not any intimations from St. Luke, or St. Paul, or any way, that these two were with the apostle at Jerusalem.

Every one is here able to recollect, that when Paul went into Macedonia in the year 56, about the time of pentecost, he left Timothy at Ephesus, 1 Tim. i. 3. But for some reasons, which may be well supposed to have been good and sufficient, he came from thence to Paul in Macedonia. For he is joined with Paul in the salutation, at the beginning of the second epistle to the Corinthians. And, as has been just seen, he attended Paul, when he left Macedonia, to proceed to Jerusalem. But no man can doubt, that Paul would be willing

* Vol. I. p. 324.

to replace Timothy at Ephesus, where his presence was of great importance, if an opportunity should offer. Such an opportunity there now was. And, very probably, it was embraced. And Paul parted with him at Miletus, where he had sent for the elders of the church of Ephesus to meet him.

Tillemont says: 'It^f is not said, what became of Timothy, during the two years that St. Paul was prisoner in Judea.' I think, I may presume to say, he was all that time at Ephesus, and parts adjacent in Asia. Du Pin was of the same opinion, whose words I transcribe & below.

Tillemont adds presently afterwards: 'It is however certain, that Timothy was at Rome, when the apostle wrote to Philemon, the Philippians, and the Colossians: forasmuch as he is named jointly with him in the titles of those three epistles.' How Timothy came to be then at Rome, we shall see presently.

Paul therefore parted with Timothy at Miletus, as just said. And I think, that when the elders of Ephesus where come to Miletus, Timothy joined himself with them, and stood at the head of them: and consequently was one of those, of whom it is said: *And they all wept sore, and fell on Paul's neck, and kissed him: sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him to the ship,* Acts xx. 37, 38.

Of this Paul takes notice in the most affectionate manner, 2 Tim. i. 4. *Greatly desirous to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy.* Doubtless Paul was much affected by the tears of all the rest, but especially Timothy's: and was now *greatly desirous to see him*, who had been so deeply struck with the thoughts of never seeing his face any more.

Timothy, then, was at Ephesus, when this epistle was sent to him. And he had been there from the time that Paul left Miletus, to go to Jerusalem, and during his imprisonment in Judea.

^f S. Timothée Mem. T. II.

^g On pourroit dire néanmoins, et je ne m'eloignerois de ce sentiment, que S. Paul le laissa à Ephese, quand s'étant arrêté à Milet, il envoya querir les prêtres de l'église d'Ephese. Act. xx ver. 17. Car nous lisons, que comme S. Paul partoit pour aller en Asie par Macédoine, Timothée fut un de ceux

qui l'accompagnerent en Asie. ch. xx. 4. Et nous ne trouvons plus Timothée à sa compagnie, ni à Jerusalem, ni pendant sa prison de Cesarée. Si cela est, Timothée aura été établi par S. Paul pour gouverner les églises d'Asie en 58. Du Pin Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

The observation, that Paul here refers to the tears; shed by his friends at his parting with them at Miletus, appears to me very obvious: though it has been hitherto entirely overlooked, so far as I know. And it will directly lead us to the true date of this epistle. It is a most proper beginning of a letter sent by Paul to Timothy at Ephesus, soon after his arrival at Rome from Palestine, at the time we suppose: but it is very unlikely to be taken notice of in an epistle written several years afterwards, and after there had been an interview: as there certainly was, when Paul was at Rome.

I shall now observe divers particulars, confirming the supposition, that St. Paul's second epistle to Timothy was written, during the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, and near the beginning of it.

1. The circumstances of the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus, and at the time of writing this epistle, are exactly the same.

Says St. Luke, Acts xxviii. 16. *Paul was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him. And ver 30. Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him.*

Here are two remarkable particulars. First, that Paul *dwelt by himself, with a soldier that kept him*: that is, after the manner of the Romans, by an iron chain, of convenient length, he was fastened to a soldier, who had one end of the chain upon his left hand, and Paul the other end upon his right hand, as was largely shown ^h formerly. To this St. Paul refers in this his second epistle to Timothy i. 16. speaking of Onesiphorus: *He oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain.* So exactly, Acts xxviii. 20. *Because for the hope of Israel, I am bound with this chain.*

Secondly. The other remarkable particular is, that when at Rome, *Paul dwelt in his own hired house, and received all who came in unto him.* Such also was his case at writing this epistle, as appears abundantly from ch. iv. 10. and other places. He had with him Demas, Crescens, Titus. The first was gone to Thessalonica, without his approbation: the others were gone, whither he had sent them, as it seems. And Luke was still with him. And at ver. 21. he sends salutations to Timothy from divers persons, and from the church at Rome in general, saying: *Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens,*

^h See vol. I. p. 230—235.

and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren. Which shows, that people had free access to the apostle, when he wrote this epistle.

1. Obj. However, it has been objected, that ⁱ when Onesiphorus came to Rome, Paul was close shut up, and Onesiphorus had much difficulty in finding him. Which is different from the imprisonment, of which St. Luke has given an account.

To which I answer, that Onesiphorus had no uncommon difficulty in his access to Paul, whose words are, 2 Tim. i. 16, 17. *The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus. For he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain. But when he was at Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and came unto me:* that is, I think: ‘Onesiphorus has been often with me, and refreshed me, with presents, and with his conversation, without being at all ashamed of me, though I had a chain upon me.’ Which shows, that Onesiphorus might come to visit the apostle, when he pleased: and might give him as much relief, as he saw good. ‘Yea, says the apostle, as soon as he came to Rome, he made inquiries after me, and came to see me without delay.’

Here appear not any tokens of Paul’s being under a very strict confinement. But here are evidences of his being in such a condition, as that represented by St. Luke, when he had been brought from Judea to Rome. Onesiphorus seems to have come to Rome, soon after the apostle’s arrival there. In order to find him out, and know where he was, it was needful to make some inquiries. How else should any man find a stranger in a great city? Whether he was quite at liberty, or in one of the prisons of it, some inquiries would be needful. And when Onesiphorus had found the place, where Paul was, he came to it without any difficulty.

Witsius ^k speaks exactly to the like purpose. And supposeth, that after some inquiries (such as are needful, when a

ⁱ In secundis vinculis alia statim rerum facies fuit. Tunc enim Onesiphorus, inquit, cum Romam venisset, solícite me quæsit, et invenit. i. 17. An opus erat, ut Onesiphorus σπευδαιότερον, et cum tanto studio ac solícitudine quæreret Paulum, et ex tam sedula inquisitione inveniret, si Apostolus aut in eadem domo, aut cum eadem libertate, et

non in arcta et abdita custodia prædicasset? Pearson. De Success. primor. Rom. Episcop. Diff. i. cap. 9. n. viii.

^k Quando Onesiphorus Paulum Romæ quæsitum venit, non videtur invenisse in carcerem conjectum, arctaque custodia detentum, sed militi suo alligatum, in diversolo. Sic enim Paulus: Καὶ τὴν αλυσὶν μὲ

man comes to a large city, and wants to see a stranger newly arrived) Onesiphorus found Paul with the soldier, in his own hired house.

The case I take to be this. Onesiphorus came to Rome upon his own secular business. He knew very well, that Paul had been carried thither, as a prisoner. But what was become of him, he did not know: whether he had been set at liberty, or was still a prisoner, or had been put to death. Upon coming to Rome therefore, not long after Paul had been brought thither, he made anxious inquiries after him. And hearing where Paul was, he readily came to him, notwithstanding his disgraceful circumstances, being chained to a soldier. And so long as he stayed in Rome, he made the apostle frequent visits, and afforded him such refreshment, as was in his power.

2. Obj. But it is urged, that St. Paul says, 2 Tim. ii. 9. *Wherein I suffer, as an evil doer, even unto bonds.*

To which I answer, that the word, here rendered bonds, is the same that is used in other epistles, written during the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus. Col. iv. 18. *Remember my bonds.* Μνημονεύετε με τῶν δεσμῶν. The same word is used at least four times in the epistle to the Philippians, ch. i. 7, 13, 14, 16. and in Philem. ver. 10. and 13. Hebr. x. 34. And to the Ephesians he says, ch. iii. 1. *I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ.* ὁ δεσμιός. And ch. iv. 1. *The prisoner of the Lord.* Not to mention any other places. When Paul was so bound, he had reason to say, *he suffered as an evil-doer, or malefactor, even unto bonds.* He was not a malefactor, or notorious offender, nor a criminal: but was innocent in the view of the Roman laws, as well as in point of reason, justice, and equity. But he suffered, *as an evil-doer.* Had he not reason to say so, when he was sent bound from Judea to Rome? Had he not been prosecuted, as a malefactor? Did not the Jewish multitude, who first laid hold of him, intend to kill him? Acts xxi. 31—36. xxiii. 27. xxiv. 6. Did not the multitude, who heard him with patience for a

οὐκ ἐπισημασθῆναι. — Et sane quamvis vincula Pauli nota fuerint in toto Prætorio, non tamen inde consequitur, Pauli domum ita notam omnibus fuisse, ut homini peregre advenienti, in urbe quæ orbis compendium erat, ad captivi Judæi domum inveniendam diligenti in-

quisitione non fuerit opus. Præsertim si attendamus, facta hæc esse initio vinculorum Pauli, antequam cum celebritatis gradum esset nactus. Wits. ubi supra. sect. 12. num. vi.

¹ Ἐν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ μέχρι δεσμῶν, ὡς κακουργός.

while, at length say: *Away with such a fellow. For it is not fit, that he should live?* ch. xxii. 22. Does not Festus say to king Agrippa, and the large assembly at Cæsarea? *Ye see this man, about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jerusalem, and also here, crying, that he ought not to live any longer,* ch. xxv. 24. So that he was prosecuted as a malefactor all the while that he was in Judea. Nor does it appear, that there was any likelihood of his escape, but by appealing to the emperor. And was he not after all sent bound to Rome, with many obnoxious persons under the command of a centurion? Certainly, I think, these things afforded sufficient ground for Paul to say what he does in this place to Timothy.

But to insinuate from these expressions, that Paul was now in some close confinement, his friends debarred access to him, and himself forbid the use of pen, ink, and paper, I humbly conceive, is altogether without foundation. It is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the epistle, and with the apostle's writing, or editing, and sending such a letter as this to Timothy. Wherein too he desires Timothy to come unto him.

St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus, was occasioned by his zeal for the liberty of the gentiles, as is manifest from Acts xxii. 21, 22. Of which he also takes notice, Eph. iii. 1. saying: *I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for you gentiles.* His imprisonment at Rome, at the time of writing this epistle, was owing to the same thing. For he says here, ch. i. 11, 12. *Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the gentiles. For the which cause I also suffer these things.* This is very observable. And indeed the twelve verses at the beginning of this epistle are a most proper introduction to an epistle, sent to Timothy by Paul, at the time, for which we argue.

Thus the circumstances of Paul's confinement at the time of writing this epistle, compared with the circumstances of that confinement at Rome, of which St. Luke has given a general account, and in which it is allowed, that St. Paul wrote epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, show it to be one and the same imprisonment, and that this epistle also was written about the same time with them.

2. St. Luke was with the apostle at Rome, when he wrote this epistle, 2 Tim. iv. 11. And we know from the Acts, that he went with Paul from Judea to Rome, when he was sent thither by Festus. He is likewise mentioned in the epistles to the
the

the Colossians, and Philemon, written during this imprisonment. But it would be presumption to say, that St. Luke was with the apostle at Rome, in another imprisonment, three, or four, or five years after this: especially, when we see, that his history of St. Paul in the book of the Acts concludes with the account of his two years imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus.

3. Since the apostle's coming to Rome, he had had with him, beside Luke, who accompanied him, Demas, Crescens, Titus, Tychicus, four of his assistants and fellow-labourers. Which might be likely enough to be expected, when Paul was sent from Judea to Rome. But it cannot be said to have been likely at any other season. But at this it was. For Paul's imprisonment in Judea had lasted above two years. And it must have been known to all gentile Christians throughout the world, and observed by them with astonishment, and grief. And his last appearance before Festus, and others at Cæsarea, was a very remarkable thing, and must have soon come to the knowledge of all Christians in Syria, Asia, Greece, and Italy. At that assembly it was determined, that Paul should go to Rome. He took shipping at Cæsarea with others. He had a long and dangerous voyage. And after such an imprisonment in Judea, as that related by St. Luke, with all its circumstances, it may be reckoned highly probable, that some good number of the apostle's affectionate friends, especially his fellow-labourers, if not too much engaged, should form a design, and do their utmost, to meet him at Rome. It seems to me very likely, that some such persons should with this view get to Rome, before Paul himself. Accordingly, we have seen four such persons mentioned by Paul in this epistle. It is a striking circumstance, and exceedingly favours our argument for the time of this epistle.

4. Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 20. *Erastus abode at Corinth*: which is agreeable to the account of St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem, as related by St. Luke. For Acts xix. 22. Erastus is expressly mentioned as *one of those who ministered to Paul*, whom he sent from Ephesus to Macedonia. Nor is Erastus among those who went with Paul from Macedonia, Acts xx. 4. It is therefore very likely that he stayed at Corinth, and did not go with the apostle to Jerusalem. This Timothy knew

[*Erastus remansit Corinthi.*] Fuen-
rat in Macedoniam missus a Paulo.
Acts xix. 22. Deinde Corinthum

redierat, ibique manserat, nec vene-
rat Romam. Grot. in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

very well. Nevertheless, it ^a is very properly mentioned together with other particulars, showing Timothy the reasonableness of his coming to him, and the need which the apostle had of his presence.

We should here recollect what was formerly said of the apostle's situation at Rome, after a long and close confinement in Judea. And then we shall easily account for Paul's mentioning to Timothy divers things which had happened some good while before. In a word, Paul may take the same notice of several things, which had happened before parting with Timothy at Miletus, in the same manner that he would have mentioned them, supposing him to have stayed but a few weeks at Jerusalem, and then sailed from Cæsarea to Rome, and soon after his arrival at Rome, had written to Timothy to come to him. For all the time of the apostle's close confinement in Judea had been sunk and annihilated in his computation.

5. In the same verse. *Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick.* Another particular, leading to that date of this epistle, for which we argue.

We know from Acts xxi. 29. that Trophimus was with Paul at Jerusalem. It may be reckoned probable, that he set out with Paul from Cæsarea to go to Rome. St. Luke indeed, Acts xxvii. 2. mentions not expressly any companions of Paul in his voyage, beside himself and Aristarchus. Nevertheless Trophimus likewise may have embarked with him. The reason of not mentioning him may be, that he did not complete the voyage, having fallen sick, and therefore had been left at Miletus. This Timothy might know very well. Nevertheless it is fitly taken notice of by Paul, in a letter written soon after finishing the voyage, and when writing to Timothy to come to him.

But when was Trophimus left at Miletus? Beza ^o was inclined to read here *Μελιτη*, *Melita*, *Malta*, instead of *Μιλητω*, *Miletus*: which conjecture is approved by ^p Grotius. But if Miletus should be reckoned the true reading, Beza supposeth

^a Quod Erastum Corinthi mansisse scribit, non tanquam rem novam incognitamque Timotheo renunciat: refert tamen, uti attinentem ad scopum suum, &c. Wits. de Vit. Pauli sect. xii. n. vi.

^o Nempe in illa tarda navigatione cum præterveheretur littus Asiæ, sicuti narratur. Act. xxvii. 7.

Quamquam potius conjicio legendum *εν μελιτη*, in Melita. Quod vocabulum facile fuit in *μιλητω* depravare. Bez. in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

^p Omnino assentior doctissimo Bezæ legenti *εν μελιτη*. — In itinere Hierosolymis Paulus Meliten attigit, non Miletum. Grot. in loc.

that Trophimus might be set on shore in the time of that slow sailing, mentioned Acts xxvii. 7. Lightfoot^a concludes from what is in Acts xxvii. 2. that Paul had a good opportunity to leave Trophimus at Miletus.

This will be farther confirmed, if we admit the interpretation given by Wall, without any view to the use, which we are about to make of it. 'Acts xxvii. 2. *Meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia.* ΜΕΛΛΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΠΛΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΑΣΙΑΝ ΤΟΠΗΣ. The ship meant to call at some places in Asia. This is a different phrase from that, ch. xx. 16. παραπλευσαι Ἐφεσον. *to sail by Ephesus*, that is, to leave it, to pass by it, without calling. It is, then, a very easy and natural supposition, that Paul might have an opportunity of setting Trophimus on shore at Miletus.

6. St. Paul desires Timothy to come to him shortly, ch. iv. 9. And unquestionably he did so. We find his name in the salutations at the beginning of the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, Philemon, written during this imprisonment, and near its period. Witsius^r observes, that in the Acts there is no account of Timothy's accompanying Paul to Rome. Timothy therefore not being there at the beginning of the apostle's captivity in that city, he might have occasion to send a letter to him, at the time supposed by us. This

9 ' But when was he left? Not
' when Paul went toward Jerusalem,
' and sent for the elders of Ephesus
' to Miletus. Acts xx. For Tro-
' phimus went, and was with Paul
' at Jerusalem. xxi. 29. But it
' was, when Paul returned from
' Jerusalem, as has been said,
' though it be not particularly men-
' tioned, that he touched there.
' — Luke says plainly, that at
' Paul's coming away from Judea
' in his voyage to Rome, it was
' their resolution *to sail by the coasts*
' *of Asia.* Acts xxvii. 2. Which
' would have been a fairer ground
' to have concluded upon, that
' Paul was at Miletus in this voy-
' age, since that was a part of those
' Asian coasts, than to change
' Miletus into Melita, upon no
' ground at all. And certainly the
' very scope of the apostle in that
' passage will not admit of that
' change. For he is not telling

' Timothy of Erastus' abode at
' Corinth, or of Trophimus's sick-
' stay at Miletus, as things un-
' known to him, but as things very
' well known, yet mentioned to
' him, as making to the apostle's
' purpose.' Lightfoot's Harmony
of the N. T. vol. I. p. 324.

' Pro certo habent, Timotheum
initio priorum Pauli vinculorum
Romæ non fuisse. Etenim in Acti-
bus Apostolicis nihil ultra de Timo-
theo dicitur, quam quod Paulum
Hierosolymam proficiscentem in
Asiam fuerit comitatus, cap. xx. 4.
Exinde nulla Timothei mentio: de
itinere Hierosolymitano, nedum de
navigatione Romana, εἰς ῤῶμην. Quia
vero res ipsius adeo Pauli rebus in-
nexæ fuere, ipseque tam eximiam
sustinuit personam, vix videtur præ-
teriri potuisse in tanta rerum quæ
Paulo acciderunt varietate, &c.
De Vit. Pauli. sect. 12. num. v.

particular

particular is well enforced by Witsius at the beginning of his argument upon the date of this epistle.

7. Ver. 11. St. Paul says, *Take Mark, and bring him with thee.* And doubtless Timothy did bring Mark to Rome. For he is mentioned with others, Col. iv. 10. and Philem. ver. 24. and comprehended in those general expressions, Philip. iv. 21.

Grotius in ^s his notes upon 2 Tim. iv. 9, 11. says the same of Timothy, Luke, and Mark, that I have done. It is strange, that he did not discern the consequence, which is so obvious: that this second epistle to Timothy must have been written before the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. But that he discerned this consequence, does not appear clearly from his preface to this epistle. Whether he did, or not, he admits our interpretations. And the consequence is unavoidable. It follows also from what he says upon ver. 20. of Trophimus having been left at Melita, in Paul's voyage from Judea to Rome, as before observed, and from some other things said by him in his annotations on this epistle. Which may be taken notice of hereafter.

8. Ver. 13. *The cloak, that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, especially the parchments.*

As St. Paul went to Jerusalem by the way of Troas, we are hereby led to the time of this imprisonment: especially when we consider, that Timothy accompanied the apostle in that Journey as far as Asia. And Paul here seems to write to Timothy, as knowing Carpus, and that these things had been left with him.

If it be objected, that Paul had at that time several friends with him, who might be willing to take care of those things: we ^u readily answer: it is true. Nor need it be supposed, that

^s Σπεύδασον ελθειν προς με ταχως
nempe Romam. Et hoc fecit Timotheus, ut apparet. Coloss. i. 1. Philem. i. Hebr. xiii. Philip. ii. 19. Grot. in 2 Tim. iv. 9. vid. et in ver. 11.

Ληκας εστι μονος μετ' εμε. Nam post iter illud, quod sine Aetorum descripsit, mansit in Italiâ cum Paulo. Col. iv. 14. Philem. ver. 24.

Μαρκον αναλαβων αγαγε μετα σεαυτη.
— Et hoc desiderium Pauli impletum est. Vide Philem. 24. Coloss. iv. 10. Id. in ver. 11.

^t Quia jubet sibi adferri penulam, quam Troade apud Carpum reliquerat, et libros. — Ineptum autem est vel cogitare Paulum hæc Troade reliquisse, quum tot secum haberet comites, et collectas Hierosolymam perferendas, et navem ubique conductorum. Ap. Wits. ibid. sect. 12. num. iv.

^u Respondetur: non magis ineptum esse cogitare, Paulum penulam suam cum libris quibusdam et membranis Troade reliquisse in illo itinere,

that in any other journey Paul was without a sufficient number of friends, to perform for him any needful service of that kind. There might be other reasons for leaving those things behind him.

We need not inquire, what were those reasons, nor what were those things. However I shall observe here what Light-foot says of the word, rendered *cloak*, in his account of St. Paul's journey from Troas to Jerusalem: 'when * he goes now from thence, it is most likely, was the time when he left his cloak and parchments with Carpus, 2 Tim. iv. 13. His *cloak*. For he was now going among his own nation in Judea, and there he was to wear his Jewish habit. And he left his Roman garb here, till he should come into those Roman quarters again.'

9. The progress of the gospel at the time of writing this epistle, and the other epistles, confessedly written in the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither from Judea, appears to be the same, or very much alike.

To the Philippians he writes, ch. i. 12, 13. *I would, ye should understand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me, have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel: so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places.* See also ver. 14—18. In this second epistle to Timothy, he says, ch. ii. 9.—that *though he suffered unto bonds, the word of God was not bound.* And see ch. iv. 16. 17. And at ver. 11. he desires, that Mark would come to him: *for, says he, he is profitable to me for the ministry:* supposing, that he should have employment for him, wherein he might promote the interest of the gospel. Paul could speak more distinctly of his successes, and of the oppositions which he met with at Rome, in the epistles written a short time before his enlargement. But even now he appears to have had in prospect those things, which were afterwards accomplished.

10. At ch. iii. 11. he reminds Timothy of *the persecutions, and afflictions which he had endured at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra,* all well known to Timothy. Which is very proper and reasonable, at our supposed time of writing this epistle: more

nere, quod Lucas meminit, quam in alio, quod supponitur, quocumque. Si enim id consulto factum sit, ratio consilii æque nobis in obliquo manet: quippe nullibi tradita. Si per oblivionem aliquam, u. negligentiam eius qui Paulo

ministrabat: quo plures erant, majorisque momenti sarcinæ, eo facilius esse videtur unius alicujus, et vilioris, forsan, neglectus, &c. Wits. ib. sect. 12. num. vi. * As before, p. 298.

reasonable,

reasonable, than it would have been several years afterwards.

Some, perhaps, may think it reasonable to expect more notice taken of the apostle's imprisonment in Judea, and at Rome. But we suppose, that to be the very imprisonment, which he was now under, and of which he often speaks in this epistle, saying, that he *suffered trouble; even unto bonds: that he endured all things for the elects' sake; that Onesiphorus was not ashamed of his chain: that he had made an apology, when all men forsook him.* But if this letter had been written several years after his imprisonment in Judea, and at Rome; it would have been reasonable to expect some references to it, as a thing past, in his exhortations to Timothy, in speaking of persecutions and afflictions formerly endured by him.

11. Ch. ii. 22. *Flee also youthful lusts.* An exhortation to Timothy more suitable now, than several years afterwards. Indeed, this whole epistle is an admonition to Timothy, as a Christian, and a minister, better suiting the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither from Judea, than any later time.

12. Ch. iv. 16, 17. *At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me. — Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the gentiles might hear. And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.*

These words afford a strong argument, that this epistle was written, when Paul was sent bound from Judea to Rome. For it is much more reasonable to think, that Paul would speak of such an apology in an epistle written soon after it was made, than in an epistle written five or six years afterwards. That Paul speaks of an apology made at the time supposed by us, is very probable. And this text was so understood by several ancient writers, Eusebius, Jerom, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The words of Euse-

Υ ——— ΤΟΤΕ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΝ, ΑΥΘΙΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΤΕ ΚΗΡΥΓΜΑΤΟΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑΝ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΧΕΙ ΣΕΙΛΑΣΘΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΝ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΝ ΔΕ ΕΠΙΘΑΝΤΑ ΤΗ ΑΥΤΗ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ ΤΩ ΚΑΤ' ΑΥΤΟΝ ΤΕΛΕΙΩΘΗΝΑΙ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΩ: ΕΝ Ω ΔΕΣΜΟΙΣ ΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΑΛΗΝ ΣΥΝΤΑΤΤΕΙ, ΟΜΕ ΣΗΜΑΝΩΝ ΤΗΝ ΤΕ ΠΡΩΤΕΡΑΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΗΝ ΑΠΟΛΟ-

ΓΙΑΝ, ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΡΑΠΟΔΑΣ ΤΕΛΕΙΩΣΙΝ. ——— ΕΠΙΘΟΣ ΓΕΤΟΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕΝ ΑΡΧΑΣ ΗΠΙΩΤΕΡΟΝ ΤΩ ΝΕΡΩΝΟΣ ΔΙΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΕ, ΡΑΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩ ΔΟΥΓΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΕ ΠΑΥΛΟ ΚΑΤΑΔΕΧΘΗΝΑΙ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑΝ ΠΡΟΕΛΘΟΥΝΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΕΙΣ ΑΒΕΜΙΤΗΣ ΤΟΛΜΑΣ, ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΛΛΩΝ, ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ ΕΥΧΕΙΡΙΣΘΗΝΑΙ. Η. Ε. Ι. ΙΙ. cap. 22. p. 62. Α. εΙ Δ.

buis

bius I transcribe below in his own language. Jerom's words were transcribed by us² formerly, and are fit to be repeated here. They represent the same sentiment with that in Eusebius: from whom, probably, and from some other ancients, he learned it. 'It² should be observed, says he, 'that at the time of his first apology, Nero's government 'not being yet quite degenerated, nor disgraced with the 'horrible wickedness, which historians speak of, Paul was 'set at liberty, that he might preach the gospel in the 'western parts of the world: as himself writes in the second 'epistle to Timothy, dictated by him in his bonds, at the 'time he suffered.' And what follows.

And Chrysoftom in a homily upon the fourth chapter of this epistle: 'How,' says he, 'shall we understand this first 'apology? He was at first brought before the emperor, 'and escaped. But when he had converted his cup-bearer, 'then he was beheaded.'

Theodoret is very express in his comment. 'When 'upon his appeal, he was sent to Rome by Festus, having 'apologized for himself, he was dismissed as innocent, and 'went into Spain, and other nations.—By the first apo- 'logy therefore he meaneth that which was then made. 'And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. So he calls 'Nero, as being emperor, and a cruel man.'

Indeed this defence, or apology, cannot relate to any other time. For he says: *But the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me: that by me the preaching might be fully known, and all the gentiles might hear.* This could ~~not~~ be said at any supposed second imprisonment, when the apostle was near his end. But must relate to the prospect of success, which he had soon after he was brought from Judea to Rome. At that time these expressions were exceedingly proper, and

² See vol. V. p. 45, 46.

^a Sciendum autem, in prima satisfactione, necdum Neronis imperio roborato, nec in tanta erumpente scelera, quanta de eo narrant historiae, Paulum a Nerone dimissum, ut evangelium Christi in Occidentis quoque partibus praedicaret. Sicut ipse in secunda epistola ad Timotheum, eo tempore quo et passus est, de vinculis dictans epistolam, &c. De V. I. cap. 5.

Παλαιά δε πρώτην απολογία λέγει;

Παρεση ήδη τῷ νερωϊ, και διεφυγεν. Επειδη δε τον οινωχουον αυτη κατηχησε, τότε αυτου απετεμεν. In 2 ep. ad Tim. cap. iv. hom. 10. T. XI. p. 722. B.

^c Ηνικα τη εφεσει χρησαμενος εις την ρωμην υπο τε φησιν παρεπεμθη, απολογησαμενος ως αθως εφειση. — Πρωτην τοιον απολογιαν την εν εκεινη τη εκδημια γεγενημενην εκαλεσε. κ. λ. In 2 ep. Tim. iv. 16. tom. III. p. 506.

his expectations were fully answered. As may be collected from Philip. i. 12—20. and ch. iv. 22. Witsius has some observations upon this place, which^d deserve to be transcribed. So do likewise the observations of another learned writer,^e they being well suited to illustrate this text.

For farther clearing up this point, I must stay somewhat longer here. I cannot but think it very evident, that Paul was now brought before the emperor, and that he here refers to it. Lightfoot supposeth, 'that^f in those words, *at my first answer*, Paul does not so much refer to what, or how^g many answers he was called to: but intimates, that even at^h the first pinch and appearance of danger, all that shouldⁱ have been his assistants started from him.' And that may be the meaning. Nevertheless it is not impossible, that Paul might make two apologies, one soon after the other, at the first of which all forsook him: whereas, at the second, there were some, who appeared with him, and spoke in his behalf. But however that may be, I am of opinion, that Paul was brought before Nero himself, and that he here

^d Puto hæc ad ea quæ Romæ tunc gesta sunt referenda esse. Ibi enim constitutus tunc fuit Paulus, ut in summo totius mundi loco, unde evangelii ab ipso prædicati sonus, non tanquam buccinæ, sed tanquam tonitru, quaquaversum audiretur. — Porro ea, quæ Romæ, quæ in Prætorio, quæ ad tribunal Cæsaris dicebantur, vel agebantur, in tanta confluentium multitudine, celerifama, per omnes totius propemodum orbis gentes vulgata fuere. Quibus non parum ponderis ex eo accessit, quod captivus iste, tam mirabilium rerum annunciator, a popularibus quidem suis accusatus, sed a Cæsare absolutus, vel certe non damnatus esset. Wits. de Vit. Paul. § 12. num. xxxii.

^e Idem jam a Paulo indicatum, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. *In prima mea defensione nemo mihi adfuit, sed omnes, nimirum Christiani, Romæ tum Pauli aggregati, me deseruerunt. — Dominus autem mihi adfuit, et confortavit me, ut per me promulgatio evangelii compleretur, et omnes gentes illud audi-*

*rent: Etenim liberatus fui ex ore leonis, quocum jamjam mihi erat depugnandum. — Paulus docet, sese, adjuvante Deo, ab intentata sibi cum leone depugnatione fuisse ereptum: sese causam suam ita dixisse, ut liber et inviolatus fuerit dimissus e Prætorio: Deum hoc pacto promulgationem evangelii promovisse, et in celebritatem deduxisse, ac ad securitatem. Securitas adnuntiationis sita est in voce *πληροφορίας*, quæ a nave, plenis velis ac liberrime invehente, est desumpta. Eum igitur finem liberationis suæ Numen Supreme voluerat esse proprium, ut Paulus in posterum eo liberius doctrinam evangelii evulgaret. Roma erat locus celeberrimus. Quidquid ibi gerebatur, id putabatur agi in luce orbis terrarum. Causa itaque Pauli inde innotuit ac increbuit passim, ac quicumque de ea aliquid audiebant, avidi fuerunt redditi doctrinæ quoque ipsius, quam docebat, audiendæ et cognoscendæ. J. Ch. Harenberg. Otia Ganderhem. Observ. S. § iii.*

speaks of it. Several & moderns have perceived this. But though this opinion had never had the patronage of any great names, I apprehend, it might be deduced with certainty from St. Luke's history in the Acts. He is very concise in what he says of Paul after his arrival at Rome. Nor has he said, that Paul was brought before Nero. But it may be argued, and concluded from what he has said,

When Paul was first brought before Festus at Cæsarea, after he had been left bound by Felix, at the end of two years imprisonment, and Festus proposed, that he should go up to Jerusalem, and be there judged before him: Paul said, I stand at Cæsar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged, Acts xxv. 9, 10. Then Festus, when he had conferred with his council, answered, hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar shalt thou go, ver. 12. Therefore that was now determined. When Festus first spoke to king Agrippa about Paul's affair, he said to him, But when Paul had appealed to be reserved to the bearing, or judgment, of Augustus, I commended him to be kept, till I might send him to Cæsar, ver. 21. And when Festus actually brought Paul before Agrippa, and the rest, he said, He himself having appealed unto Augustus, I have determined to send him, ver. 25. After Paul had pleaded before Festus, and Agrippa, and that great company at Cæsarea, it is said, ch. xxvi. 31, 32. And the king rose up, and Bernice, and they that sat with them. And when they had gone aside, they talked between themselves, saying, this man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds. Then said Agrippa unto Festus: this man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar. After his appeal therefore the sending Paul to Rome was unavoidable. If Agrippa and the rest of that great company did not dare to dismiss him, though they thought him innocent, but judged it needful, that he should go to Rome, it may be reckoned probable, that he was actually brought before the emperor. And Festus wrote a letter concerning Paul to the emperor himself, as may be concluded from

& I shall cite an author or two here, though they may not agree with me about the time of Paul's appearance before the emperor.

'Acts xxvii. 24. Thou must be brought before Cæsar. By this, and by what Paul says, 2 Tim. iv. 17. it seems, that he had a personal hearing before Nero himself.'

Wall's Crit. notes upon the N. T. p. 271.

Nous ne saurions douter au moins que S. Paul n'ait comparu devant Neron peu de temps avant sa mort, comme on le voit par sa seconde epistre à Timothée. Tillem. S. Paul. note 40. Mem. T. I. p. 531. Paris.

ch. xxv. 26, 27. And while Paul was in the voyage to Rome, he had a vision. *An angel stood by him, saying: fear not, Paul, thou must be brought before Cæsar,* ch. xxvii. 23, 24. Certainly, therefore, he was brought before him. And that is what he intends, when he speaks of his apology. Which is also confirmed by what follows: *And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.* Whereby must be meant Nero himself.

And now we may be able to understand those expressions: *No man stood with me: but all men forsook me.* St. Luke's history of Paul's arrival at Rome will give great light to those words. Acts xxviii. 13—15. *And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were desired to tarry with them seven days: and so we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the three taverns: whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage.* The affectionate and respectful visit of so many Christians from Rome was very refreshing and comfortable to him, after all the fatigues of his voyage, and in the disgraceful circumstances of his appearance. But when he was presented to the emperor, *no man stood by him: but all men forsook him.* And these are the men, whom he intends: these, and other Christians then at Rome. None of them had courage to appear in his favour, and plead in his behalf, as they might have done. But all drew back, and left him alone. *Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me.*

Let me now represent the progress of this affair, as it appears to me, after having consulted ^h Lightfoot, and others.

^h ' Julius, the Centurion, that
' had brought Paul, and the rest of
' the prisoners from Judea, had been
' his friend and favourer from his
' first setting out, and so continued,
' till his settling at Rome. — His
' accusers, that were come from
' Judea, to lay in the charge against
' him, [for we can hardly suppose,
' but that some were come:] would
' be urgent to get their business
' despatched, that they might be
' returning to their own homes
' again; and so would bring him to
' his trial, as soon as they could.
' And that his trial was early this
' year, appears by his own words in

' the second epistle to Timothy,
' where he speaketh of his answer,
' and requireth Timothy to come
' to him before winter, 2 Tim.
' iv. 16, 21.

' As he appealed to Nero him-
' self, so Nero himself heard his
' cause, Philip i. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 16.
' And here it was possible for Paul
' and Seneca to see each other. At
' which time all that had owned
' him before, withdrew themselves
' for fear, and dared not to stand by
' him, or appear with him in his
' danger.' Lightfoot, as before,
p. 322.

When

When the prisoners from Judea were brought to Rome, they were all delivered to the captain of the guard, or prefect of the prætorium. At the same time Julius the centurion, to whose charge they had been committed, and who had all along *courteously entreated Paul*, [Acts xxvii. 3.] spoke honourably of him to the prefect, or delivered in a written memorial of his voyage, and the several prisoners, whom he had brought with him, inserting, particularly, some things in favour of this prisoner, and also put into his hands the governor's letter to the emperor, concerning Paul. The tenor of which, as may be concluded from the letter of Lyfias to Felix, ch. xxiii. 25—30. and from other things afterwards recorded in the Acts, omitting the usual forms, not needful to be mentioned here, was to this purpose:

‘ My Lord, when I came into this province, committed to
‘ my charge by thy favour, I found a prisoner, named Paul,
‘ left bound by my predecessor Felix, after he had been two
‘ years in custody. In a short time grievous complaints
‘ were made against him by the chief men of the nation,
‘ desiring me to pass sentence of condemnation upon him.
‘ Whereupon I appointed them a hearing. And being sat
‘ on the judgment-seat, I commanded the man to be brought
‘ forth. But when the accusers stood up, they alleged no
‘ proofs of any thing that could render him criminal in the
‘ eye of our laws. They had only certain questions against
‘ him of their own religion, and concerning one Jesus, who
‘ had died, and whom Paul affirmed to be alive. At this
‘ time the man expressed a desire to be heard at thy tri-
‘ bunal. And having conferred with my council, and con-
‘ sidering, that he is a citizen of Rome, his appeal was
‘ allowed to be valid. Whereupon I resolved to send him
‘ unto thee, as soon as I could. In the mean time, king
‘ Agrippa and Bernice came to the place of my residence.
‘ Who being Jews by nation and religion, and willing to
‘ hear the man, I set him before them, that I might be the
‘ better informed concerning him myself. In their pre-
‘ sence, and before me, and many others, Roman officers,
‘ and principal men of this city, he without reserve declared
‘ his doctrine, and his concern to promote it, and indeed
‘ his whole life from the beginning. After which, when
‘ the assembly, (as honourable as can be expected to be seen
‘ in any of the provinces) were gone aside, they talked
‘ between themselves. And they were all agreed, saying;

‘ this man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds : and
 ‘ he might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed
 ‘ to Augustus. To thee therefore I now send him. And
 ‘ to thy cognizance his cause is referred.’

When Burrhus, the prefect of the prætorium, brought Paul before the emperor, and delivered the governor’s letter; it is not improbable, that he might add some hints in favour of the prisoner, from the character given of him by Julius, either by word, or in his memorial. At this audience must have been present, beside †‡ Burrhus, divers other courtiers, of the greatest eminence and distinction, and perhaps Seneca. It may be likewise supposed, that some Jews delegated by the council at Jerusalem, appeared, to plead against Paul. If there were none, it must have been understood to be a disrespect to the emperor; and a great prejudice to the cause of the accusers. If there were any such here, it would show the reasonableness of Paul’s expectation, that some of the Christians at Rome should have attended likewise.

At this time (unless there was another audience soon after) the emperor pronounced sentence upon Paul, and signed the order of his confinement: such as is related by St. Luke, Acts xxviii. 16, 30, 31. And though Paul was not acquitted, nor set at liberty, it may be esteemed a favourable decision.

It was after this audience of the emperor, and this sentence, that Paul sent for the Jews at Rome to come to him. But when he laid before them his case, and spoke of the proceedings against him in Judea, and of his appeal to Cæsar; they were very humble, and even low spirited, and did not choose to enter into discourse upon the matter.

Paul says, Acts xxviii. 19. *But when the Jews spake against it, I was constrained to appeal to Cæsar: not that I had ought to accuse my nation of.* These last words may be understood by some, as if he had said, ‘ Not that I have any cause of complaint against my nation.’ Which would be great complaisance indeed, after he had received so much hard usage from the Jews. But the words may be thus rendered: ‘ Not that I have a design to accuse my nation of any thing.’ And in

†‡ Burrhus is computed to have died in the year of Christ 62, and Seneca in the year 65. Vid. Basn. Ann. 62. num. i. et Ann. 65. num. iv.

that manner they are rendered by ⁱ Le Clerc, and ^k Lenfant, in their French translations. And it is agreeable to ⁱ Beza's annotation upon the place, who is another good judge. This sense is very becoming Paul, and was very suitable to his circumstance and situation at that time. It was very proper to pacify the Jews at Rome, who might have been apprehensive of Paul's making use of his interest in the emperor's court against them, after he had been so ill used in Judea. But all he aimed at was the vindication of his own innocence, that he might with greater liberty preach the gospel.

Here we see the ground of the difference between Paul's imprisonment in Judea, and at Rome. The difference is manifest. Whilst in Judea, it does not appear that he had any communication with other churches out of it. He is wholly engaged in his own defence, and does but just secure his life against the violence of the unbelieving Jews, and their council. But when he came to Rome, and his apology was over, he was permitted to live by himself, in his own hired house. There he receives intelligence by messengers of the churches, who come to him from divers parts. He makes converts, and writes letters, and has fellow-labourers, whom he sends abroad, as he pleaseth. We now see the ground of this. As ^m Jerom says, 'the apostle being sent to prison by the emperor, he becomes acquainted with the emperor's family, and makes the persecutor's house a church.' Referring to Philip. iv. 22. When Paul was in Judea, he was the governor's prisoner, whose good will was restrained by the influence of the people of the country. Now he is the emperor's prisoner, who allows what liberty he pleaseth. And when granted, none dare to control, or abridge it in any measure. Hence all the advantages of this imprisonment, and the happy conclusion of it. Having so much liberty, and being able to receive all who came to him, he makes many converts and

ⁱ Mais les Juifs s'y opposant, j'ai été contraint d'en appeller à Cesar: sans que j'aye néanmoins dessein d'accuser ma nation, en quoi que se soit. Cl. ^k — sans que j'aye dessein néanmoins d'accuser ma nation, en quoi que ce soit. Lenf.

ⁱ Est autem hoc additum a Paulo, ne putarent Judæi ipsum constituisse

criminari gentem suam apud Cæsarem: cum hoc unum potius ageret, ut nullo hostium incommodo causam Christi et innocentiam suam tueretur. Bez. ^m A Cæsare missus in carcerem, notior familiæ ejus factus, persecutoris domum Christi fecit ecclesiam. In ep. ad Philem. T. IV. p. 445. in.

many friends, some in the emperor's own family, and near his person. Says the apostle in this very epistle, ch. iv. 16, 17. *At my first answer no man stood with me.—Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and all the gentiles might hear.* It is a case much resembling that of our apostle before at Corinth, Acts xviii. 9—11. *Then spake the Lord unto Paul in the night, by a vision: be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace. For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them. And though he was brought before Gallio the governor, and accused; he was acquitted, and continued there yet a good while. In like manner here, the Lord stood by Paul, strengthened him, and delivered him. And he afterwards dwelt two whole years at Rome, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus, no man forbidding him.* Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

Some may say, that during this space several of the apostle's friends and fellow-labourers were apprehended and imprisoned: which seems inconsistent with the supposition of his being committed by the emperor, with an order for allowing him all the liberty which he enjoyed. For Aristarchus is spoken of as his fellow-prisoner, Col. iv. 10. and Epaphras, Philem. ver. 23. And Timothy is said to have been set at liberty, Heb. xiii. 23. Who therefore must have been confined.

To which I answer, that these imprisonments of some of Paul's friends and fellow-labourers do not at all weaken our supposition, but confirm it: forasmuch as Paul's liberty was not abridged, but continued the same all along, until he was quite enlarged: which affords reason to think that the method of his confinement was appointed and ordered by an authority above control. And it is easy to conceive, how it came to pass that some of Paul's friends were imprisoned: when it is considered that he must have had many enemies, and some of his friends acted imprudently, and there were others, who from envy and ill-will were prompted to behave irregularly, with a view of bringing him and his best friends into danger, by exposing them to general resentment, and especially the resentment of men in power. As we learn from Philip. i. 15—17. And yet it does not appear that any of Paul's fellow-labourers endured a long imprisonment.

imprisonment. It is not unlikely, that they were taken up, and imprisoned by some inferior officers, to gratify the fury of the common people, who did not dare to keep them long in custody, nothing material appearing against them. As Jeromⁿ observes, such frequent, short imprisonments and speedy releases were common at the first rise of the christian religion, before Nero became an open persecutor, and before the publication of such edicts, as affected the lives of the followers of Jesus.

All these considerations cannot but be of great weight, to determine the time of this epistle. However, there are some difficulties that ought to be taken notice of.

1. Obj. *For I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand,* 2 Tim. iv. 6.

These expressions led ^o Eusebius of Cæsarea, and ^p Jerom, who followed him, and ^q Chrysoftom, though he did not follow either, to say that this was the last epistle of St. Paul, written only a small space of time before his martyrdom. And many learned moderns have been of the same opinion, as is well known.

But let us attend to Lightfoot. ‘There is one passage,’ says he, ‘in this epistle, which has caused some to doubt about the time of its writing. That is what he says ch. iv. 6. *I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand.* Which would make one think, that he was now ready to be martyred, and taken away. And it has made some believe, this was the last epistle that ever he wrote. But when we compare his own words again, ver. 17, 18. and Philip. i. 25. and Philem. ver. 22. it maketh, past controversy, that he speaketh not of his sudden martyrdom, but that he is to be understood in some other sense. — And indeed the resolution of the difficulty

ⁿ Quod autem crebro Paulus in carcere fuerit, et de vinculis liberatus sit, ipse in alio loco dicit: *in carceribus frequenter*: de quibus nonnunquam Domini auxilio, crebro ipsis persecutoribus nihil dignum in eo morte invenientibus dimittebatur. Necdum enim super nomine Christiano senatus consulta præceperant: necdum Christianum sanguinem Neronis gladius dedicarat. Sed pro novitate prædicationis, sive a Judæis invidentibus, sive ab his

qui sua videbant idola destrui, ad furorem populis concitatis, missi in carcerem, rursus impetu et furore deposito, laxabantur — id agente Domino, ut in toto orbe nova prædicatio disseminaretur. In Philem. ver. 22. T. IV. p. 453.

^o H. E. l. 2. cap. 22.

^p Quoted vol. V. p. 45, 46; from De V. l. cap. v.

^q Quoted likewise before, vol. V. p. 135.

^r Vol. I. p. 324.

‘ lies open and conspicuous in the very text itself. Paul
 ‘ looked upon Timothy, as the prime and choice man that
 ‘ was to succeed him in the work of the gospel, when he
 ‘ himself should be dead and gone: as being a young man,
 ‘ not only of singular qualifications for that work, but of
 ‘ whom there had been special prophecies to such a purpose.
 ‘ 1 Tim. i. 18. He exhorts him therefore in this place, to
 ‘ improve all his pains and parts to the utmost *to do the work*
 ‘ *of an evangelist, to make full proof of his ministry,* ch. iv. 5. for
 ‘ that himself could not last long, being now grown old,
 ‘ and worn out with travail, and beside all that, in bonds
 ‘ at present, and so in continual danger. Therefore must
 ‘ Timothy be fitting himself daily to take his work, when
 ‘ he is gone.’

So Lightfoot, and, as seems to me, very properly. To the like purpose Estius upon the same text. Whom I transcribe below.

I likewise place below: a part of Baronius's solution of the same difficulty, which appears to me very sufficient.

That Paul had now no certain and prophetic view of suffering martyrdom immediately, is apparent from several things in this epistle: particularly from his desiring Timothy to come to him, and to bring Mark with him, as *pro-*

3 Quare quæ hic ab Apostolo dicuntur non ita sunt accipienda, quasi plane sentiat sese jam jam rapiendum ad martyrium: præsertim cum alia quædam ejusdem epistolæ repugnent huic intellectui. — Sed tantum significant, ipsum, etsi de tempore mortis et passionis incertum, tamen per carceres et tribunalia parari ad victimam. — Quocirca non apparet hæc a Paulo dicta fuisse per revelationem aliquam de instante martyrio sibi factam. — Illud etiam considerandum est, Paulum loqui, ut jam senem, et laboribus confectum, qui proinde non multum vitæ tempus sibi reliquum arbitretur. Ac quoniam non dubitat, se martyrio finiendum, idcirco, et de eo tanquam brevi futuro loquitur: *Ego enim, inquit, jam delibor.* — Sensus et connexio est: Idcirco, cum tam serâ obtestatione te discipulum meum officii tui admonseo,

quod jam senex sim, et incertus quamdiu futurus superstes. Jam enim tanquam victima Christo destinata, per hos carceres, et gravissimos quos patior adversariorum impetus immolari incipio. Est. ad 2 Tim. iv. 6. — eo enim sensu hæc putant accipienda esse verba, quasi proxime esset Paulus martyrio coronandus, sicque ab eo spiritu prophético esse pronunciata. — Sed dicant velim: Nonne idem ipse Paulus in eadem testatur epistola, sibi Dominum apparuisse, dum in summo illo discrimine versaretur, hortatumque esse, ac fore prædixisse, ut per ipsum in omnes Gentes prædicatio impleretur? Quomodo igitur hæc sibi cohærent, ut instans Pauli consummatio esset, idemque ipse sic a periculo liberandus, in omnes Gentes prædicationem evangelii propagaturus esset? Et reliqua. Ann. 59. n. xiii. xiv.

fitable

fitable to him for the ministry. He supposed therefore, that he should have an opportunity to employ him in the service of the gospel. He likewise must have hoped to receive, and use the things left at Troas, which he desired Timothy to bring to him.

Obj. 2. St. Paul says, ch. iv. 18. *And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom.* By which many have supposed, that the apostle does not express any hope of being now delivered from death, or the present danger, or any other temporal evil, but from sin, and from all unworthy conduct of his own. So say ^u Le Clerc and ^x Whitby. *Paul had been delivered out of the mouth of the lion.* But he did not now expect any such deliverance. He only hoped to be preserved from sin, and to be brought to God's heavenly kingdom.

But I do not think, that to be St. Paul's meaning. It is inconsistent with what he had just said: that *the Lord had stood by him, and strengthened him, that by him the preaching might be fully known, and that all the gentiles might hear.* Which could not be done presently. But must require some time. To me it clearly appears, that the apostle's words express faith in God, and hope of the divine protection in future difficulties and dangers: or, that God would still deliver him, and uphold him in his service, against all the designs of evil men. And when he had done the work, still remaining for him to do, and fulfilled his testimony to the gospel, he should be *brought safe to God's heavenly kingdom.* Accordingly, he was preserved for some good while after this, enjoying, so far as we know, as much freedom in preaching the gospel, as ever he did, till a period was put to his life by martyrdom. As before observed, what the apostle says here at ch. iv. 16—18. much resembles what is said Acts xviii. 9—17. And the apostle's circumstances at Corinth and Rome were much alike.

3. Obj. Once more, it may be said, the state of things shows, this epistle to have been written many years after the

^u Non de la mort, mais des mauvaises actions, qu'il auroit fallu que S. Paul fit pour l'éviter. Clerc.

^x Dr. Whitby's note upon ver. 18. is, 'If he will deliver him', as Chrysostom says, why does he say, 'I am offered?' Observe therefore his words. He says not, he will

again deliver me out of the power of the lion: but only, that he will preserve me from every evil work, and to his heavenly kingdom. The place of Chrysostom, which I suppose to be here referred to, may be seen: on 2 ad Tim. cap. iv. hom. x. tom. XI. p. 722. Ed. Bened.

first epistle to Timothy, and when Paul was near his death. For he says here, ch. i. 15. *This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me. Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.* Which implies, that great corruptions now prevailed in Asia, particularly in the church of Ephesus.

To which I answer: that if the Asiatics, here spoken of, were now at Rome, or had been lately there; we are not hereby led to think disadvantageously of the Christians at Ephesus, and in Asia, in general. That such are the persons here intended, has been the opinion of many, and is very probable. It was formerly observed, that ^v Chrysostom hereby understood such as were at Rome. Estius, upon the place, says, this ^z was the general opinion of the Greek writers. And indeed it is in ^a Œcumenius, who expressly says, that they which are in Asia is the same, as they which are of Asia. To the like purpose Theophylact: ^b *They in Asia are such of Asia as were then at Rome.* Dr. Hammond's paraphrase is to this purpose, *'Thou hast heard, I believe, that in my affliction, I have been deserted by all the Asiatic Christians at Rome, excepting only Onesiphorus.'* So that this interpretation is confirmed by the connection, it following immediately afterwards, *The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus. For he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain. But when he was at Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me.* Rightly does Hammond say, that Timothy had heard of this. It was likely, that before this letter came to Timothy's hands, he might have heard in general, how the Christians at Rome, particularly those of Asia, had carried it toward his great master, now in bonds. But it seems by the apostle's way of speaking, that he thought he gave Timothy some farther information, especially, when he added, *Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.* Beaufobre was for the late date of this epistle. Nevertheless he supposeth ^d the apostle to speak

^v Vol. V. p. 145. ^a Porro secundum Græcorum expositionem, non est sermo de iis, qui Paulo hæc scribente in Asia erant, sed qui ex Asia Romam venerant. Est. in loc.

^z *Οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀσίᾳ τρεῖς οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀσίᾳ* Œcum. in loc. T. II. p. 261.

^b Κατεβύον αὐτὸν οἱ πάντες, ἐν τῇ

ἀσίᾳ, τρεῖς οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀσίᾳ ἐνδεύοντες τῇ ρωμῇ. Theoph. T. II. p. 806.

^c Audivisti, ut opinor, ab Asiaticis Christianis, qui erant Romæ, excepto solo Onesiphoro, me desertum fuisse, in mea calamitate. Hammond. in loc. ex versione Cleric.

^d Il y a de l'apparence, que quelques

speaks of some Asiatics, who had been with him at Rome, but were returned to their own country. Mr. Mosheim speaks largely to this place. He understands hereby some Asiatics, who had left Paul, and were gone home. He thinks, they were guilty of unkindness, and are chargeable with inconstancy: but he does not suppose, that they forsook the apostle's doctrine, or endeavoured to make innovations.

There is no ground therefore to suppose, that Paul here speaks of a general corruption, and defection of the Christians in Asia.

I know not of any other objections, that deserve consideration. From what has been argued therefore I conclude, that this epistle to Timothy was written at Rome, when Paul was sent thither by Festus in the year 61.

For determining the time of the year we may receive assistance, not only from those who are for this early date, but from those likewise, who are for a later date of this epistle.

From Paul's desiring Timothy to come to him, before winter, Tillemont^f concludes, that this epistle was written near the middle of the year. Witfius thinks, it^g was written in the beginning of the summer. So likewise^h Baronius.

It

ques Asiaticques, qui avoient suivi S. Paul à Rome, l'avoient abandonné, et s'en étoient retournés dans leur pays. Beauf. upon the place.

^e Discesserant hi sine dubio, et in patriam reverterant, quod, Paulo Romæ in vincula coniecto, vitæ suæ metuebant, desperabantque, fore aliquando, ut is libertati restitutus itinera, quæ meditabatur, persequeretur. In hoc vitii est aliquid: fratrem enim, et multo magis Dei legatum, cui præsidio et solatio esse possis, in vitæ discrimine positum, relinquere, animi levis est, et christianæ disciplinæ immemoris. Verum nihil habet hæc inconstantia, ex quo intelligi possit, ideo hos homines domum rediisse, ut quæ ex Paulo perceperant, dogmata oppugnant, novasque res inter Christianos molirentur. Mosheim. De Reb. christian. ante Constantin. Sec. i. num. lx. in notis.

^f Il y prie S. Timothée de le venir trouver avant l'hiver, Ainsi ce ne pouvoit pas être plutard que vers le milieu de l'année. S. Paul art. 49. Mem. tom. I.

^g Observant, justisse hac epistola Paulum, ut festinato ad se accederet, et, si fieri posset, ante hiemem, assumto secum Marco. Venit autem Paulus Romam, mense, ut creditur, Februario. Pone, scriptam hanc epistolam esse ineunte æstate, potuit Timotheus cum Marco ante hiemem Romæ esse: ubi fuit, quando illæ scribebantur epistolæ, quibus præfixum illius nomen est: quemadmodum et Marcus ibi fuit, quo tempore scribebatur illa ad Colossenses, et ad Philemonem. Quidquamne probabilius est, quam omnia ista ex mandato Pauli esse facta? Ubi supra. sect. 12. num. v.

^h Sed et cum illud admonet, ut ante hiemem se Romam transferat: certe,

It seems very probable, that Paul came to Rome, about the end of February, or soon after, before April, or at the utmost in the beginning of it. But before the writing of this letter several things had passed. His apology before the emperor was over. Onesiphorus had made the apostle divers visits. Several of the apostle's assistants or fellow-labourers had been with him, since his arrival, and had taken directions from him. Demas was gone to Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. The epistle to the Ephesians likewise, I suppose to have been written before, and, if it had not been sent away, it lay ready, at least, to be carried by Tychicus, together with this to Timothy. If therefore Paul came to Rome in March, this letter might be sent away in May, or the beginning of June. The direction, ch. iv. 21. *Do thy diligence to come before winter*, might proceed from tenderness for Timothy, the apostle himself having lately felt the inconveniences of a winter-voyage; and may also lead us to think, there would be need of Timothy's making despatch, after the receipt of this letter, lest he should be overtaken by bad weather.

In dating this epistle at the time I have done, I have followed ⁱ Lightfoot, ^k Baronius, ^l Estius, ^m Hammond, ⁿ Witfius. Who have all well asserted this date. Witfius, the last mentioned, has an argument upon the point, which he has all along conducted with great candour, and concluded ^o with much modesty: though to me he seems to have removed every difficulty in a very satisfactory manner. And he speaks of Salmero, as being of the same opinion. And besides, in the course of the argument cites from Cocceius, and Solomon Van Till, (with whose writings

certe, si quis exacte consideret tempus, et locum ipsum, Timotheumque agentem in Asia, ut ejusmodi reddi posset epistola, et ipse Troadem ad sumendam penulam proficisceretur, ac Romam ante hiemem se conferret: plane inveniet, hoc ipso anno, ineunte ætate hanc ad Timotheum scriptam epistolam. Baron. ann. 59. num. x.

ⁱ Harmony of the N. T. in his Works, vol. I. p. 324.

^k Annal. 59. num. x.

^l Praef. in 2 ad Timoth.

^m Praef. in 2 ep. ad Timoth.

ⁿ De Vita et Rebus Pauli Apost. sect. xii. apud Meletem. Leyd. p. 182, &c.

^o Mea si desideretur επικρισις fateor equidem aliquamdiu me in rationum conflictu animi ancipitem hæsisse, quæ quibus anteponendæ sint. Omnibus tamen perpensis, non dissimulo, eo me magis propendere, ut scriptionem hujus epistolæ ad priora Pauli apud Romam vincula referendam esse arbitrer. Ib. sect. 12. num. viii.

I am

I am but little acquainted) divers observations, confirming the same opinion. Cave likewise was of this opinion, when he wrote the Lives of the Apostles, and the first volume of the Lives of the primitive Fathers, in English: expressing himself very clearly, and properly, both in ^p the life of Paul, and ^q the life of Timothy. But when he wrote his *Historia Literaria*, he speaks in the article of St. Paul, as if he had quite changed his mind: though in the article of St. Peter, as it still stands in the new edition at Oxford, he speaks exactly as he had done before.

If he altered his mind, I suppose it must have been in compliance with Pearson, who of late has been followed in this particular by many; who, if they had carefully read the above named authors, might easily have discerned the superiority of their arguments.

To him likewise I suppose, it must be chiefly ascribed, that by the apostle's first answer, or apology, many of late have understood an apology made in a second imprisonment at Rome. Which, as ^u before shown, is contrary to the

^p ' It is not improbable, but that
' about this time St. Paul wrote his
' second epistle to Timothy. I
' know, that Eusebius, and the an-
' cients, and most moderns after
' them, will have it written a little
' before his martyrdom, induced
' thereto by that passage in it, that
' he was *then ready to be offered, and*
' *the time of his departure was at hand.*
' But, surely, it is most reasonable
' to think, that it was written at
' his first being at Rome, and that
' at his first coming there, presently
' after his trial before Nero. In it
' he appoints Timothy shortly to
' come to him, who accordingly
' came, and his name is joined
' together with the apostle's, in the
' front of several epistles, to the
' Philippians, Colossians, and Phile-
' mon.' Cave's Life of St. Paul,
sect. 7. num. v. p. 103, 104.

^q Life of Timothy, num. vii.

^r Epistolam secundam ad Timotheum scriptam esse Romæ, in prima Pauli captivitate contendit cl. Hammondus. Sed errat omnino vir eruditissimus. Quisquis enim

totius epistolæ contextum, omnesque hujus temporis circumstantias serio perpenderit, quin scripta sit anno 64, paulo ante Apostoli martyrium, dubitare nequit. De S. Paulo. Hist. Lit. tom. I. p. 12.

^s Durante biennali captivitate Paulus inde scripsit quatuor vel quinque epistolas, ad Colossenses, Ephesios, Philippenses, et Philemonem, in quibus nullæ notæ, nulla indicia, unde vel divinando quis assequi posset, Romæ Petrum tunc fuisse. — In posteriori ad Timotheum, quam hoc etiam tempore scriptam esse, maxime est probabile. — Carcere Romano liberatus, dum adhuc in Italia hæreret, scripsit epistolam ad Hebræos. De Petro. H. L. p. 9. ^t Paulus Romæ [A. D. lxxvii.] e carcere in discrimen vitæ vocatur ab altero Nerone, et apologiam habet, sive *defensionem suam, vel sui*, quod in prioribus vinculis factum non est: ubi habuit tantum *defensionem et confirmationem evangelii*, adversus Judæos scilicet. Annal. Paulin. p. 24. ^u See before, p. 350—354.

general

general opinion of ancient christian writers: and indeed appears to me a * very unlikely meaning. And to him I suppose it to be entirely owing, that † Paul's lion, whom ‡ all Christians in general had hitherto understood to be the emperor Nero, has on a sudden dwindled into † Elius, or Helius, the emperor's freed-man and favourite.

Upon the whole, it appears to me very probable, that this second epistle to Timothy was written at Rome, when Paul was sent thither by Festus. And I cannot but think, that this ought to be an allowed, and determined point. Accordingly, I now proceed to mention some observations in the way of corollaries.

1. This second epistle to Timothy affords not any argument, that Peter was not at Rome, when Paul came thither a second time, and suffered martyrdom.

Upon these words, ch. iv. 16. *At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me.* Beza says: 'Where † was Peter † then if he was at Rome? Did he desert Paul in the time
' of

* Eusebe, S. Jerome, S. Chrysostome en quelques endroits, et Theodoret, ont entendu cette premiere defense de son premier voyage. S. Chrysostome s'en éloigne en d'autres endroits, et l'entend d'une premiere comparition de S. Paul devant Neron dans son dernier voyage. Mais l'autre sentiment est plus autorisé, et fondé sur le sens le plus naturel du texte. &c. Du Pin. Diff. Prelim. P. II. l. 2 ch. ii. § viii. p. 53. † In qua defensione tantum erat, et Pauli, et suorum periculum, ut omnes sui eum desererent, et nemo illi adesset, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. Sed ereptus est ex ore Leonis, nempe Helii Cæsareani. Ann. Paulin. ibid. ‡ I refer to the collections of Grotius upon 2 Tim. iv. 17. whereby it appears to have been common to give such denominations to bad princes, not to their officers. And I shall transcribe here a curious passage, to which he only refers, showing, that Nero, for his bad temper, was early called a lion. Adde hæc Scholiastis, in Juvenalis Sat. v. Seneca

sub Claudio, quasi conscius adulteriorum Juliae, Germanici filiae, in Corsicam relegatus, post triennium, revocatus est. Qui etsi magno desiderio Athenas intenderet, ab Agrippina tamen, erudiendo Neroni, in palatium adductus, sævum immanemque natum et sensit cito, et mitigavit, inter familiares solitus dicere: non fore sævo illi leoni, quin, gustato semel hominis sanguine, ingenita redeat sævitia. Lipsius in notis ad Tacit. Ann. l. 12. cap. 9.

† Nobis sane non probatur conjectura doctissimi Pearson, qui communis sententiæ pertæsus, Helium Cæsareanum designatum fuisse existimat in Annalibus Paulinis. Neronis potius et furor et dignitas, aptâ eâ metaphorâ significatur; quomodo defuncto Tiberio Marcius Agrippæ libertus dixit domino suo Mortuus est Leo. Balsag. ann. 64. n. vi.

‡ Ubi tum Petrus, si Romæ erat? Num enim quæso Paulum deseruisset? Sed quod in genere dicitur, etsi non temere sic loquitur Paulus, ita tamen accipiendus est, ut aliqui excipi

‘of his difficulty?’ But the good man adds: ‘That Paul’s general expressions need not to be understood absolutely, without any exception.’ That is very charitable and benevolent. But indeed, if Peter had then been at Rome, he could not have afforded any assistance to his brother apostle. Nor would Paul have expected it of him. For Peter was himself an obnoxious person. Paul refers only to such, as by their station were likely to be of some use to him, if they had appeared with him, and had exerted themselves in his behalf.

But though Peter’s not appearing upon that occasion affords not any argument, that he was not then at Rome: the entire silence concerning him throughout this epistle affords good reason to think, he was not then at Rome. For ch. iv. 2. Paul sends salutations from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia. If Peter had been then at Rome, he would have been mentioned likewise. We do justly argue from St. Paul’s omitting Peter among his salutations sent to divers of the Roman Christians, ch. xvi. that Peter was not then in that city. It is also rightly argued from the silence concerning Peter in the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, that Peter was not at Rome, when they were written. To which ought to be added this second epistle to Timothy, as farther confirming the same thing, if written about the same time. But then, if it was written in the year 61, as I suppose, it will not afford any argument against Peter’s being at Rome in 64, or 65, and then suffering martyrdom there. About which there ought not to be any doubt. That Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome, is said by the same writers, that speak of the martyrdom of Paul there. The martyrdoms of both the apostles have a like degree of credibility. For neither is Paul’s martyrdom at Rome founded upon the testimony of any sacred book of the New Testament. If

excipi potuerint, sed perpauci. Bez. in loc. ^c Loquitur de iis qui prodesse poterant, et qui gratiã valebant apud aulicos, — Potest et ita exponi: *Omnes*, id est, pene omnes. Est. in loc.

^d Denique si mentitur traditio de loco Petri martyrii atque sepulchro, quo nobis indicio liquebit

Paulum Romæ interfectum fuisse atque conditum? Unum nobis est argumentum fama constans, in quo etiam fundamento collocatur quæ per animos invasit, de Petri in urbem et adventu et morte, immota explorataque Veterum sententia. Basnag. ann. 64. num 'x.

this

this second epistle to Timothy was written at the time here argued for, we have no proof from scripture, that Paul was a second time at Rome. Nevertheless, he must have been there a second time, if he suffered martyrdom there, as ecclesiastical history says. Consequently, the martyrdom of Paul at Rome has no other, nor better evidence, than the martyrdom of Peter in the same city.

2. We cannot conclude from this second epistle to Timothy, that St. Luke was qualified to write the history of the apostle Paul, for the space of several years lower than he has done in the book of the Acts.

Whitby says upon ver. 11. of the fourth chapter of this epistle: ‘Hence it appears, that Luke must be alive in the 12th or 13th year of Nero, when this epistle was ended.’ St. Luke might be then alive. But this epistle, if written in the 7th or 8th of Nero, affords not any proof, that Luke lived to the 12th or 13th of Nero, or that he was then with Paul. And it may be reckoned probable, that St. Luke did not accompany the apostle after his release from his imprisonment at Rome.

Again, says Wall upon Acts xxviii. 30, 31. ‘St. Luke wrote this book about the year 63.—It is a wonder, that he did not add the history of the rest of his life, whither he went, when he was set free, and what he did in the five years afterwards. One might have guessed, that Luke died about this time. But it was not so. He was with Paul a little before Paul died; as appears from 2 Tim. iv. 11.’ But, that St. Luke was alive, and with Paul in the year 67, or 68, cannot be inferred from this epistle, if it was written in the year 61.

3. We are now able to vindicate the character of Demas. Says Wall upon 2 Tim. iv. 10. ‘At the former imprisonment, five years ago, Demas was one of Paul’s fellow-labourers. As we learn from Philem. ver. 24.’ But that remark will appear preposterous, if the second epistle to Timothy was written before that to Philemon, as I think it was.

Upon our order of the epistles the case will stand thus. Some time after Paul’s coming from Judea to Rome, upon the appearance of some unexpected difficulties, Demas, who had come to Rome to meet Paul, was discouraged. He did not apostatize from the christian religion. But
out

out of too great regard for his own safety, he absented himself from the apostle, and went where Paul had rather he should not have gone. This is what St. Paul intends, when writing to Timothy; he here says: *Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica*, ch. iv. 10. But it was not very long before he returned. Accordingly, Paul makes honourable mention of him, Col. iv. 14, and Philem. 24. epistles, written near the end of his confinement at Rome.

How disagreeable to think, that a fellow-labourer of Paul, who had attended him in his bonds, near the end of a two years' imprisonment at Rome, should afterwards forsake him! According to our account his fault, whatever it might be, was first, and his repentance last: and so sincere and complete, that Paul readily accepted of it, and joins him with his best friends in the salutations sent to Colosse, and Philemon. And, perhaps, Demas had been very useful at Thessalonica, though the apostle did not send him thither.

Grotius upon 2 Tim. iv. 10. says: 'we conclude from Philem. ver. 24. and Col. iv. 14. that Demas repented of his fault.' But that is inconsistent with the late date of the second epistle to Timothy. For if those texts prove Demas's repentance, the second to Timothy must have been written before those two epistles: as Beza perceived, when he allowed the repentance of Demas.

4. Cave's argument for the time of St. Mark's writing his gospel, built upon the supposition, that this second epistle to Timothy, in which that evangelist is mentioned, was written just before St. Paul's martyrdom, is of no value.

5. This second epistle to Timothy affords not any argument against the supposition, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul in the year 63, about the time of his being released from his confinement at Rome.

Le

* Vide hic etiam bonos interdum metu aut malis exemplis mutari. Quare qui stat, videat ne cadat. Sed et culpæ hujus pœnituisse Demam colligimus ex loco Philem. 24. et Coloss. iv. 14. Grot. ad 2 Tim. iv.

† Videtur ille postea resipiscens ad Paulum revertisse, cum fiat ejus mentio in epistola ad Philemonem, quam probabile est post hanc scrip-

Vol. VI.

B b

tam fuisse, cum in ea fiat mentio Timothei ipsius in inscriptione, atque etiam Marci, quasi jam cum Paulo versantis. Bez. ad 2 Tim. iv. 10. ‡ Factum id circa annum 65.

Petro et Paulo jam morte sublatis. Cum enim illum epistola secunda ad Timotheum non longe ante martyrium scripta Romam accersiverat Paulus: probabile est, Marcum vel eodem,

Le Clerc in his French edition of the New Testament, in his notes upon Heb. xiii. 23. says: ‘Nothing ^h of that kind happened to Timothy, during the life of St. Paul, if it had, he would not have failed to take notice of it in his second epistle to him, written a very short time before his death. And he would have thence taken occasion to say something to Timothy, by way of commendation and encouragement, or otherwise. If then Timothy was not imprisoned, during Paul’s life; the mention of these his bonds, and his release, proves this epistle to the Hebrews not to have been written, till after Paul’s death.’ Le Clerc speaks also to the like purpose in his ⁱ Ecclesiastical History. And some before Le Clerc must have been affected with this difficulty. As may be concluded from Beza’s notes upon Heb. xiii. 23.

To which I answer, first, that the original word, rendered by us, *set at liberty*, may signify ^k *sent abroad on an errand*. But upon that I do not now insist, and therefore say, secondly, the epistle to the Hebrews is now generally supposed to have been written by Paul in the year 63, soon after his release from his imprisonment at Rome. And we know, from the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon that Timothy was with Paul at that time, when his imprisonment was near the period. It is not at all improbable, that Timothy might be imprisoned, and soon set at liberty again: as divers of Paul’s fellow-labourers were. But it is unreasonable to expect, that any notice should be taken of these things, in either of the epistles to Timothy: one of which was written before Paul’s first imprisonment, as it is called: and the other soon after the beginning of it.

eodem, vel saltem sequenti anno illuc venisse, ibique Evangelium vel primum condidisse, vel prius conditum edidisse. H. L. T. I. p. 24. in Marco. ^h Il n’étoit rien arrivé de semblable à Timothé, pendant la vie de S. Paul, qui lui écrivit sa 2 epître tres peu de tems avant que de mourir, et qui n’auroit pas manqué d’en parler en quelque occasion. &c. Notes sur Heb. xiii. 23.

ⁱ Mentio fit Timothei in vincula conjecti et dimissi. cap. xiii. 23.

Quod non contigerat ante posteriorem ad Timotheum, ubi nulla ejus rei, uti nec in priore, vel minima mentio. Quam tamen Paulus non prætermisisset, si quid simile contigisset, cum ad laudem Timothei, et constantiam in eo augendam, multum faceret. Itaque in vincula, post conscriptas demum ad eum epistolas, aut etiam post mortem Pauli, conjectus fuerit. H. E. A. D. 69. p. 459. ^k Vid. Mill. Prolegom. num. 68, 69.

6. There can be no ground from this epistle to conclude a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome. For it was written in the time of his imprisonment in that city, when he had been sent thither from Judea by Festus.

7. There may be many other things said upon a supposition, that this epistle was written in a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome, in the year 67, or thereabout. All which must now fall to the ground.

It is often said, that error is endless. And it is certain, that one error is productive of another. This in particular is so. It has occasioned forced and wrong interpretations of divers texts of this epistle, and many false and groundless suppositions, contrary to the truth of history. I shall take notice of but one more, beside those, which have been already mentioned. Tillemont in his history of St. Paul's affairs, in the year 65, some while after he had been set at liberty from his captivity at Rome, says: 'It was, perhaps, at this time, that he suffered at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium, and Lystra, the afflictions, which he mentions in general, in his second epistle to Timothy, ch. iii. 11.' Which to me appears very absurd, and I had almost said, ridiculous.

I shall now mention one observation more, of a different kind.

8. We have no reason upon the whole, to regret St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome.

When we read the opinion of that great company, which had heard Paul's pleading at Cæsarea. Acts xxvi. 31. *This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds:* and what Agrippa said to Festus, in the next verse. *This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Cæsar:* we may be disposed to wish, that appeal had not been made, thinking, that in that case he might now have been set at liberty. But if we consider things maturely, we shall perceive it to have been necessary. It was, indeed, prudently made, being the only probable means of his escape from the continued persecutions of the enraged Jews.

But beside that, there are very many advantages attending it: which ought to reconcile us to it, and induce us to acknowledge the over-ruling providence of God in it. Without that appeal Paul would not have been mentioned to Agrippa. Nor should we have had that excellent apology

¹ St. Paul. art. 47. Mem. Ec. T. I.

for himself, and his doctrine, which he made before Agrippa, and Festus. We should not have had the fine history of the apostle's voyage to Rome, in which are so many affecting incidents. And though he came to Rome as a prisoner, he had there a great deal of liberty. *Nor was the word of God bound.* As he was able to say in this epistle, written soon after his settlement at Rome. 2 Tim. ii. 9. And in his epistle to the Philippians, ch. i. 12—14. written afterwards, are these remarkable words, *But I would, ye should understand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me, have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel. So that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places. And many of the brethren waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear.* Says St. Luke, *Two whole years Paul dwelt in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him. Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him,* Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

Jerom thinks, it ^m was a handsome dwelling, in which was a spacious room, where Paul could receive a good deal of company, and display his apostolical gifts to advantage. So he beforehand wrote to Philemon, *to prepare him a lodging,* ver. 22. Not that he should want many things for his own accommodation. But he wished to have a dwelling in a frequented part of the city of Colosse, and large enough to admit conveniently all who were desirous to be informed concerning his doctrine.

Paul had a great desire to go to Rome, and testify there the gospel of Christ. He thought, it is likely, that he should there have a good opportunity to propose it to Jews and

^m *Simul autem et præpara mihi hospitium.* Non puto tam divitem fuisse apostolum, et tantis sarcinis onustum, ut præparato egeret hospitium, et non una contentus cellula, breves corporis sui spatium ædes amplissimas existimaret.—Si autem hoc non dispensatorie, sed vere quis existimet imperatum, apostolo magis quam Paulo hospitium præparandum est. Venturus ad novam civitatem, prædicaturus crucifixum, et inaudita dogmata delaturus, sciebat ad se plurimos concursuros: et necesse erat, primum, ut domus

in celebri esset urbis loco, ad quam facile conveniretur. Deinde ut ab omni importunitate vacua, ut ampla, quæ plurimos caperet auditorium: ne proxima spectaculorum locis, ne turpi vicinia detestabilis: posset, ut in plano potius sita esset, quam in cœnaculo. Quam ob causam cum existimo etiam Romæ in conducto mansisse biennio. Nec parva, ut reor, erat mansio, ad quam Judæorum turbæ quotidie confluebant. Hieron. in Philem. ver. 22. T. IV. p. 453.

Gentiles,

Gentiles, of inquisitive tempers, and distinguished characters. Rom. i. 9, 10.—*Without ceasing making mention of you always in my prayers: making request (if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God) to come unto you.* And ver. 14, 16. *I am debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation,——to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.* See likewise ch. xv. 28—32. Well, Paul's desire was fulfilled. He was brought to Rome: and although not in the way, and in the circumstances which himself would have chosen: yet I suppose, that in the end he had good reason to be well satisfied. Indeed, I think, that the time of his abode at Rome, must have been, upon the whole, as comfortable, and honourable, and useful, as any period of the like duration, since his conversion to the faith of Christ. He was bound, and was guarded by a soldier. But it needs not to be supposed, that the chain was always upon his hand. And notwithstanding the disgraceful circumstance of his bonds, and the disadvantage of his outward appearance in some respects: such were the dignity and importance of his behaviour, such the superiority of his discourse above that of all other men, and such the works, which God enabled him to perform, as could not but secure him the regard of all serious and discerning men. And ⁿ success in his work would alleviate all his sufferings. For which reason we also ought to rejoice in them, and on account of the testimony thereby given to the truth and innocence of the christian doctrine.

In the introduction to the first part of this work, where our concern was with facts occasionally mentioned in the books of the New Testament, I said; ‘Here is withal an account of proceedings and sentences of courts of judicature, in cities of the first rank, and most general resort: and of some discourses made before persons, next under the Roman emperor, of the highest rank and distinction:’ referring to the history in Acts xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxvi. But now I should choose to say: ‘And of some discourses made before persons of the highest

Simul autem admirandum de
 magnanimitate apostoli, et in Chris-
 tiana mente ferventis. Tenetur in
 carcere. vinculis stringitur, squalore
 corporis, carorum separatione, pœ-
 nalibus tenebris coarctatur: et non
 sentit injuriam, non dolore crucia-
 tur, nihil novit aliud, nisi de Christi
 evangelio cogitare. Hieron. in Phi-
 lem. tom. IV. p. 450. m.

rank and distinction, not excepting the Roman emperor himself.' For from what has been just now argued, it appears to be very probable, that Paul, when brought to Rome, pleaded once, if not twice, before Nero. And though those pleadings may have been very short; yet from thence, and from the treatment, which Paul had presently afterwards in the imperial city, ariseth a very forcible argument for the innocence of the christian doctrine, and its teachers.

Every one perceives, that St. Paul's pleadings upon the occasions before referred to, in the presence of the Jewish council at Jerusalem, and before Felix, and Festus, and Agrippa, at Cæsarea, do us great honour. Particularly, in this last mentioned apology, the doctrine, which Paul preached, as received from heaven, was reported to those great personages, and the honourable company attending them. He lays before them the history of his life, from his youth up, before he was a Christian, and afterwards. He plainly declares his doctrine, and the zeal, with which he had spread and propagated it every where, among Jews and Gentiles, and his unwearied diligence in the cause, in which he was engaged. And in the end all acknowledge, that he did nothing contrary to the peace of society: and that he might have been set at liberty. But having appealed to the emperor, it was now requisite, that the cause should be referred to his tribunal, and be finally determined there.

Here therefore is another testimony to the innocence of Paul, and his doctrine. Festus, the governor of Judea, certainly wrote a letter to the emperor, giving an account of Paul. Of this all may be satisfied, who observe what is said. Acts xxv. 24—27. So Lysias, the tribune, and commanding officer at Jerusalem, when he sent Paul to Felix at Cæsarea, wrote a letter, containing an account of the prisoner, and the proceedings against him hitherto, ch. xxiii. 25—30. In like manner now acted Festus. Nor can it be imagined, that any governor should presume to falsify, prevaricate, or disguise, in such a letter. It might be very respectful to the emperor, and favourable to the prisoner. But there could be nothing but truth. And there must have been all the truth, that was needful to give a just notion of the cause. And yet Paul is not condemned, but obtains an order for such a custody, as leaves him at liberty to *dwell by himself, in his own hired house,* and to receive all who came to him, and to discourse to them of his doctrine. Here he was two years: during which time
he

he had no molestation. And at length he was released. He was all that time in one place. And the place of his abode was well known. He might have been called for at any time. But there were no complaints made against him, or none such, as could induce those in power to change the order first given.

When Paul lay bound in the castle of Antonia at Jerusalem, after he had been brought before the Jewish council, and his life was in imminent danger; *the night following, the Lord stood by him, and said, be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome, Acts xxiii. 11.* Which word of our Lord was fully accomplished: as we are assured in the history, which St. Luke has given of the apostle's going to Rome, and dwelling in that city two whole years, and in the epistles, written by himself, during that period. Which by the Divine goodness are still preserved to us.

According to the preceding argument, the second epistle to Timothy was sent away from Rome, about the summer of the year 61, probably, in May, or June.

§ XI. *The* EPISTLE *to the* PHILIPPIANS.

THERE still remain three epistles of St. Paul to be considered by us, which are generally allowed to have been written during the time of his imprisonment at Rome: the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. And I shall speak of them in the order, in which they have been just named.

The epistle to the Philippians was written in the second year of the apostle's imprisonment. Timothy, who had come to him from Ephesus, according to his desire, 2 Tim. iv. 9—21. is joined with the apostle in the inscription at the beginning of the epistle. It seems to have been written not long before the end of his two years imprisonment. For he had some hopes of a release, ch. i. 24, 25. *Nevertheless to abide in the flesh, is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know, that I shall abide, and continue with you all, for your furtherance, and joy of faith.* Yea he expresseth hopes of making the Philippians a visit, ver. 26. *That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again.* And ch. ii. 19. *But I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy shortly unto you—* and ver. 23, 24. *Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see, how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly.* But though he had hopes of

obtaining his liberty, he was not yet certain of it. As appears from those words just cited, *so soon as I shall see, how it will go with me:* and from what he says, ch. ii. 17. *Yea, if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.* See also ch. i. ver. 20. In the mean time, he sends back to them Epaphroditus, who had come to Rome, with a kind present from the Christians at Philippi, and who had been dangerously sick, but was now recovered. And it is likely, that by him this epistle was carried. So it follows in ver. 25—30. of the second chapter. *Yet I supposed it necessary, to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, but your messenger, and he that ministred to my wants.—I have sent him therefore the more carefully: that when ye see him again, ye may rejoice.* Of their kind regard to him he speaks again, ch. iv. 10—19. In the end of the epistle he sends salutations to the Philippians from *the brethren that were with him,* and from *all the saints, chiefly those of Cæsar's household.* Who may be supposed to be the apostle's converts, and the persons, who chiefly contributed to his being set at liberty, and had already given him hopes of it, and may likewise have been friendly to him in other respects. And at the beginning of this epistle, ch. i. 13. speaking of the progress of the gospel, he says: *So that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places.*

The salutations in this epistle are singular, being different from those at the end of the other epistles, written about the same time. First it is said, *The brethren which are with me greet you:* intending, as I apprehend, Mark, and others, the apostle's fellow-labourers, mentioned by name near the end of the epistles to the Colossians, and Philemon, but not so mentioned here. Then it is added, *All the saints salute you:* meaning all the Christians at Rome in general, *chiefly, they that are of Cæsar's household.* The kind present from the Philippians, it is likely, had recommended them to the notice of all at Rome. That testimony of respect for the apostle was highly pleasing, and very edifying to the Christians in that city. It seems to have been a handsome sum. And it may be reckoned probable, that the collections made for the apostle at Rome, and the contributions brought in from abroad, were all put into one bank, and lodged in the hands of some person or persons of good credit and substance. Possibly, there was now a superfluity. For St. Paul says to these Philippians, *I have all, and abound. I am full.* If there was any thing superfluous,

fluous, beyond what was requisite for his maintenance at Rome, it would be of use for defraying the expences of the journies, which he had in view. And this may be one reason, why this epistle is inscribed *to all the saints, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons*. For there must have been such officers in many of the churches, to which the apostle sent letters, though they are not mentioned. But the bishops and deacons at Philippi had encouraged the contributions made for the apostle, and had assisted in conveying them to him. And therefore they could not be omitted.

St. Paul came to Rome, as I suppose, in the spring of the year 61. *There he dwelled two whole years in his own hired house*, Acts xxviii. 30. Consequently, his captivity ended in the spring of the year 63.

Hereby I am led to think, that this epistle to the Philippians was written in the year 62. It was carried by Epaphroditus. Some time after he was gone, I suppose, (as ° does Mill likewise) that St. Paul sent Timothy to Philippi, agreeably to his design, mentioned ch. ii. 19—23. And when he wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in the spring of the year 63, he was in expectation of Timothy's return to him. Heb. xiii. 23. According to this computation, the epistle to the Philippians was written, and sent away, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

§ XII. *The* EPISTLE *to the* COLOSSIANS.

THE epistles to the Colossians, and Philemon, were sent away together. Chrysofom as ^p formerly observed, thought, that the epistle to Philemon was first written. That he concluded from Col. iv. 7—9. However, I shall first speak of the epistle to the Colossians, according to the order in which the epistles lie in our volume of the New Testament.

The epistle to the Colossians was carried by Tychicus and Onesimus, as we perceive from ch. iv. 7—9. *All my estate shall Tychicus declare unto you. — Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and comfort your hearts: with Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who*

° De visendis enim Philippensibus, ubi primum e carcere evaserit, omnino cogitat. — Et quidem paulo post missas hasce literas li-

bertatem adeptus, Timotheum in Macedoniam misit, uti liquet ex Hebr. xiii. 23. &c. Mill. Prol. num. 68. ^p See vol. V. p. 134.

is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things (which are done) here.

These two letters, as before said, were sent away at the same time. But it is likely, that the letter to Philemon was first delivered. For till Onesimus had been received by his master, he could not be a fit person, to join in delivering a letter to the church of Colosse.

Timothy joins with the apostle at the beginning in the salutation *to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse.* Near the end of the epistle are salutations from Aristarchus, said by the apostle to be his *fellow prisoner*, from Mark, *Jesus called Justus, Epaphras, Luke the beloved physician, and Demas.*

It might have been expected, that this letter should be carried by Epaphras, who had come to the apostle at Rome from Colosse, ch. i. 7, 8. But he was now the apostle's *fellow-prisoner*, as is said, Philem. ver. 23. However he and Aristarchus may have been set at liberty about the same time with St. Paul. Such things were frequent in the early days of the gospel, and before Nero became a persecutor, according to an observation of Jerom in his commentary upon the epistle to Philemon, ver. 22. cited by us ⁹ not long ago.

As Timothy joins with the apostle in the salutation at the beginning of this epistle, he was still at Rome, and not yet sent away to Philippi. I therefore conclude, that this epistle was written about the same time with that to the Philippians, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

§ XIII. *The* EPISTLE *to* PHILEMON.

PHILEMON was a citizen of Colosse, in Phrygia. Paul writes this epistle to him in behalf of Onesimus, a slave, who had robbed his master, and run away. Him Paul had converted to the christian faith at Rome, during his bonds, which are several times mentioned in this epistle.

Timothy is joined with Paul in the salutations at the beginning of the epistle. At ver. 23, and 24, the apostle

⁹ See before, p. 359.

^r Totum autem, pro quo rogat, illud est: Onesimus, servus Philemonis, fugam furto cumulans, quædam rei domesticæ compilarat. Hic pergens in Italiam, ne a proximo fa-

cilius posset apprehendi, pecuniam domini per luxuriam prodegerat, &c. Hieron. in Philem. T. IV. p. 449. Vid. et Theodoretî argum. in ep. ad Philem. T. III. p. 516.

sends salutations from Epaphras, then his *fellow-prisoner*: from Mark, whom Timothy had brought with him to Rome, according to Paul's desire. 2 Tim. iv. 11. from Luke and Aristarchus, who had accompanied the apostle in his voyage from Judea to Rome, and had continued with him ever since: and from Demas, who had departed from the apostle for a while, but was now returned. Compare 2 Tim. iv. 10.

From ver. 19. it is argued by Jerom, as well as by some learned commentators of late times, that the whole of this epistle was sent in the apostle's own hand writing.

St. Paul had now good hopes of obtaining his liberty. For he says, at ver. 22. *But withal prepare me also a lodging. For I trust, that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.* Nevertheless, as Timothy joins with the apostle in the salutations at the beginning of the epistle, I think, it was not yet fully determined. For Paul says to the Philippians, ii. 23. *that he hoped to send him to them presently, so soon as he should see, how it would go with him.* As Timothy was still at Rome, and not sent away to Philippi; it may be argued, that the apostle did not yet certainly know the success of the attempts made use of by his friends to procure his liberty. I therefore conclude, that this epistle was written about the same time with that to the Philippians, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

These three epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon, are also placed by Mill^t in the year 62.

I will now add a few observations concerning the epistle to Philemon.

Philemon's station is not certainly known. Grotius thought, he dwelt at Ephesus, and was one of the elders of that church. Beausobre in his notes upon the first verse of this epistle speaks of Philemon, as * one of the pastors of the church of Colosse.

To me it appears evident, that Philemon was an inhabitant of Colosse. For his servant, Onesimus, is recommended by

^s Quod dicit, tale est. Quod Onesimus furto rapuit, ego me spondeo redditurum. Cujus sponsionis epistola hæc et manus testis est propria. Quam non solito more dictavi, sed mea manu ipse conscripsi. Hier. ib. p. 452.

^t Vid. Prolegom. num. 68—70. et 80—82. ^u Philemoni dilecto.] videtur habitasse Ephesi, ubi One-

simus postea episcopatu functus est, ut et Ignatii literæ, et alii scriptores tradunt.—*Et adjutori meo.*] id est uni Presbyterorum illorum, qui Ephesi plures erant. Act. xx. 17. Grot. in Philem. ver. 1. ^x Il paroît par là, que Philemon étoit un des Pasteurs de l'église de Colosse. Beaus.

St. Paul to the church in that city, and said to be *one of them*, ch. iv. 9. And the Christians at Colosse are required by the apostle to *say to Archippus, take heed to the ministry, which thou hast received*, ver. 17. Which Archippus is saluted in the epistle to Philemon, ver. 2.

Theodoret expressly says, that ^y Philemon was a citizen of Colosse, and that the house in which he dwelt, was still remaining there. Theophylact ^z calls him a Phrygian. Jerom likewise says, he ^a was of Colosse. But he bestows so many words to make it out, that we may be led to think, there were some in his time who disputed it.

Philemon, therefore, was a Colossian. But whether he was an elder there, or only a private christian, in good circumstances, is not so certain. The inscription is,——*unto Philemon, our dearly beloved, and fellow-labourer*. Which last expression is ambiguous. It may imply, that Philemon was an elder in the church of Colosse. Or no more may be intended thereby, than in general, that Philemon was some way useful, in helping forward the gospel. In the Apostolical Constitutions ^b Philemon is said to have been ordained bishop of Colosse by the apostles. But their testimony is of very little weight. I do not perceive Jerom to say expressly, that ^c Philemon was bishop, or elder at Colosse. Perhaps he was not positive about it in his own mind. The author of the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, by some reckoned to be Hilary, deacon of Rome, says, that ^d Philemon had no ecclesiastical

^y Πολυν δὲ εἶχε τὰς κολοσσαίους. Καὶ ἡ οἰκία δὲ αὐτῆς μέχρι τῆς παρόντος μεμνημένη. Theod. arg. ep. ad Philem. T. III. p. 516.

^z Theoph. ep. ad Philem. T. II. p. 861. ^a Si autem Philemon, ad quem hæc epistola scribitur, Onesimi dominus est——et ad Colossenses refertur, quod ex iis sit, ratio nos ipsa et ordo deducit, quod et Philemon Colossensis sit, et eo tempore communem ad omnem ecclesiam Onesimus epistolam tulerit, quo privatas et sui commendatrices ad dominum literas sumferat. Est et aliud indicium, quod in hac eadem epistola et Archippus nominatur: cur hic cum Philemone scribitur: *Dicite, inquit Archippo: Vi-*

de ministerium, quod accepisti a Domino, ut illud impleas.——Ex quo putato, aut Episcopum fuisse Colossensis ecclesiae, cui admonetur studiose et diligenter præesse, ut evangelii prædicatorem. Aut si ita non est, illud mihi impræsentiarum sufficit, quod et Philemon, et Archippus, et Onesimus ipse, qui literas perfererat, fuerint Colossenses, &c. Comm. in Philem. T. IV. p. 445.

^b Const. Ap. l. 7. cap. 46.

^c Scribunt igitur Paulus et Timotheus Philemoni carissimo et cooperatori: qui ideo carissimus dictus est, quod in eodem Christi opere versetur. In ep. ad Philem. p. 446.

^d Philemon nulla erat ecclesiasticæ ordinationis præditus dignitate, sed

ecclesiastical dignity, but was one of the laity. And Œcumenius, in his prologue to the second epistle of St. John, formerly ^c cited, appears also to have thought Philemon to be a man in private station.

Perhaps some have been the rather unwilling to allow, that Philemon was a bishop, or elder, because he had a wife, whose name was Apphia, and because he was a man of substance, who had one slave at least, if not more. Nevertheless we have just observed two learned men, of very good judgment, Grotius and Beaufobre, who were not much swayed by those considerations. One of whom thought Philemon to have been an elder in the church of Ephesus: the other, one of the pastors of the church of Colosse. To them I can now add ^e Dr. Doddridge.

However, as the thing is of no great importance, so I must acknowledge, that it is not very easy to be decided. St. Paul's expression, *fellow-labourer*, as before observed, is ambiguous. His manner of address, which is very earnest, farther induces me to hesitate. If Philemon had been an elder, he must have known his duty. And could not have needed so pressing an exhortation to receive a penitent, and him one of his family.

Onesimus, unquestionably, was received by the church of Colosse, as a good Christian, upon the apostle's recommendation. It is as reasonable to think, that Philemon was reconciled to him: and, probably, gave him his freedom. In the Apostolical Constitutions ^g he is said to have been bishop of Berea in Macedonia. When Ignatius wrote his epistle to the Ephesians, about the year 107, their bishop's name was Onesimus. And Grotius ^h thought him to be the same, for whom Paul interceded with Philemon. But that ⁱ is not certain.

§ XIV. *The* EPISTLE *to the* HEBREWS.

I SHALL inquire, 1. To whom it was written. 2. In what language. 3. By whom. 4. The time and place of writing it.

1. In the first place let us consider, to whom this epistle was written, A. D. 63.

Sir Isaac Newton thought, ^k that this epistle was written ^l to

sed vir laudabilis, unus ex plebe, &c. Proleg. in ep. ad Philem.

^c See before p. 158.

^e See his preface to Philemon. p. 585. and his Paraphrase of the first

verse. p. 589. of the Family-Expositor. vol. V. ^g Lib. VII. cap. 46.

^h See before, note (n) p. 379.

ⁱ Vid. Basnag. Ann. 60. num. xxvii..

^k ^l The epistle to the Hebrews,

‘ to Jewish believers, who left Jerusalem about the time that the
 ‘ war broke out, and went into Asia.’ According to this
 account, the epistle could not be written, till some while after
 the breaking out of the war in Judea, in the year 66. But it
 will be difficult to show, that Paul, whom Sir Isaac allows to
 be the writer, lived so long. Not now to mention any
 thing else.

Dr. Wall was inclined to the same opinion, or somewhat
 not very different. ‘ I ’ agree, says he, that the epistle was
 ‘ written to Hebrews, that is, to the Hebrew Christians of
 ‘ some place. But for the place or country, I think, they were
 ‘ rather the Hebrew Christians of Asia (Ephesus, Miletus,
 ‘ and thereabout) Macedonia, Greece, &c. where St. Paul
 ‘ had spent most of his time, than that they were those of
 ‘ Jerusalem, &c.’

The late Mr. Wetstein conjectured, that ^m the epistle was
 written by Paul to the Jewish believers at Rome, soon after he
 had been released from his confinement in that city. Which
 conjecture, I believe, will be followed by very few. And as it
 has no ancient authority, and is destitute of all appearance of
 probability; I suppose, it need not be confuted.

Lightfoot thought, ‘ That ⁿ this epistle was sent by Paul
 ‘ to the believing Jews of Judea, a people, says he, that had
 ‘ been much engaged to him, for his care of their poor, get-
 ‘ ting collections for them all along in his travels.’ He adds:
 ‘ It is not to be doubted indeed, that he intendeth the dis-
 ‘ course and matter of this epistle to the Jews throughout their
 ‘ dispersion.—Yet does he endorse it, and send it chiefly to
 ‘ the Hebrews, or the Jews of Judea, the principal part of the
 ‘ circumcision, as the properest centre, to which to direct it,
 ‘ and from whence it might be best diffused in time to the
 ‘ whole circumference of the dispersion.’

‘ Hebrews, since it mentions Timo-
 ‘ thy, as related to the Hebrews,
 ‘ must be written to them, after
 ‘ their flight into Asia where Ti-
 ‘ mothy was bishop, and by con-
 ‘ sequence after the war was be-
 ‘ gun.’ Newton’s Observations
 upon the Apoc. of St. John. ch. i.
 p. 244.

^l Critical Notes upon the N. T.
 p. 317, 318. ^m Si conjecturæ
 locus est, existimavimus potius ad

Judæos qui Romæ degebant, et
 Christo nomen dederant, scriptam
 fuisse: quo admissio, facile intelli-
 gitur, qui factum, tum ut Paulus,
 qui Romæ quidem, sed non Italiâ,
 excedere jussus erat, brevi se redi-
 turum speraret, tum ut Itali Ro-
 manos salutarent. Wetsten. N. T.
 tom. II. p. 386, 387.

ⁿ Harmony of the N. T. vol. I.
 p. 340.

Whitby,

Whitby, in his preface to the epistle to the Hebrews, is of the same opinion, and argues much after the same manner with Lightfoot.

So likewise ^o Mill, ^p Pearson, ^q Lewis Capellus, and Beza in his preface to this epistle, and the editors of the French N. T. at Berlin, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles, and in their preface to this epistle in particular. Of this Mr. Hallet had no doubt, who in his Synopsis of the epistle, says: 'This epistle was particularly designed for the Hebrew Christians, that dwelt in one certain place, and was sent thither, as appears from the apostle's saying, ch. xiii. 19, 23. *I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.—I will see you.* And what particular place can this be supposed to be, but Judea? There the Christians were continually persecuted by the unbelieving Jews, as we read in the Acts of the apostles, and as St. Paul takes notice 1 Thess. ii. 14. Hebr. x. 32—36. ch. xii 4, 5. By these persecutions the Hebrew Christians were tempted to apostatise from Christianity, and to think, there was strength in the arguments urged by the persecutors in favour of Judaism. The apostle therefore sets himself to guard against both these dangers.' And what follows.

This appears to me to be the most probable opinion.

For 1. It is the opinion of the ancient christian writers, who received this epistle.

It may be taken for granted, that this was the opinion of Clement^r of Alexandria, and ^s Jerom, and ^t Euthalius, who supposed this epistle to have been first written in Hebrew, and afterwards translated into Greek. It may be allowed to have been also the opinion of many others, who quote this epistle, as written to Hebrews, when they say nothing to the contrary. Nor do I recollect any ancients, who say it was written to Jews living out of Judea.

^o Per Hebræos autem istos potissimum fideles Hierosolymitanos intelligit, apud quos ante duos annos versatus fuerat. Hinc illud, *κατακαταστρωμιον*. cap. xiii. 19. Mill Proleg num. 83. ^p Annal. Paulin. p. 20, 21. ^q Ex quibus conicere licet, hanc epistolam a Paulo sub finem priorum vincu-

lorum Româ scriptum fuisse ad Hierosolymitanos Judæos, qui in Christum crediderant. L. Capel. Hist. Ap. p. 80

^r Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 14.

^s Scripserat ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraice, id est, suo eloquio disertissime. De V. I. cap. v. ^t Argum. ep. ad Hebr. ap. zac. p. 670.

Chrysoſtom

Chrysoſtom ſays, that ^u the epiſtle was ſent to the believing Jews of Paleſtine. And ſuppoſeth, that the apoſtle afterwards made them a viſit. Theodoret ^x in his preface to the epiſtle, allows it to be ſent to the ſame Jews. And Theophylact ^y in his argument of the epiſtle expreſſly ſays, as Chryſoſtom, that it was ſent to the Jews of Paleſtine. So that this ^b was the general opinion of the ancients.

2. There are in the epiſtle many things eſpecially ſuitable to the believers in Judea. Which muſt lead us to think, it was written to them. I ſhall ſelect divers ſuch paſſages.

1.) Hebr. i. 2.—*Has in theſe laſt days ſpoken unto us by his Son.*

2.) Ch. iv. 2. *For unto us was the goſpel preached, as well as to them.*

3.) Ch. ii. 1—4. *Therefore we ought to give the more earneſt heed to the things that we have heard—how then ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo great ſalvation, which at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God alſo bearing them witneſs with ſigns and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Does not that exhortation, and the reaſon, with which it is ſupported, peculiarly ſuit the believers of Judea, where Chriſt himſelf firſt taught, and then his diſciples after him, confirming their teſtimony with very numerous and conſpicuous miracles?

4.) The people, to whom this epiſtle is ſent, were well acquainted with our Saviour's ſufferings, as they of Judea muſt have been. This appears in ch. i. 3. ii. 9, 18. v. 7, 8. ix. 14, 28. x. 11. xii. 2, 3. xiii. 12.

5.) Ch. v. 12. *For when ye ought to be teachers of others, and what follows, is moſt properly underſtood of Chriſtians in Jeruſalem, and Judea, to whom the goſpel was firſt preached.*

6.) What is ſaid, ch. vi. 4—6. and x. 26—29. is moſt properly applicable to apoſtates in Judea.

7.) Ch. x. 32—34. *But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions*

^u Πη δὲ ἴσιν ἐπιτελλεῖ; Ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν ἱεροσολυμοῖς καὶ παλαιστίνῃ — Δύο μὲν ἔτι ἐποίησεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ δεδεμένος· εἶτα ἐφείθη, εἶτα εἰς τὰς σπανίας ἦλθεν· εἶτα εἰς Ἰουδαίαν ἔβη, ὅτε καὶ Ἰουδαίους εἶδε. Καὶ τότε πάλιν ἦλθεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὅτε καὶ ὑπο νεύωνος ἀνηρέθη. Pr. in ep. ad Hebr.

T. XII. p. 2.

^x Vid. Theodoret argum. ep. ad Hebr.

^y Τοῖς ἐν παλαιστίνῃ δὲ καὶ ἱεροσολυμοῖς ἐπιτελλεῖ. Theophyl. arg. ep. ad Hebr. p. 872. ^b Voyez la pref. de Beaufobre sur l'epître aux Hebr. num. xxxviii.

tions——to the end of ver. 34. This leads us to the church of Jerusalem, which had suffered much, long before the writing of this epistle, even very soon after they had received the knowledge of the truth. Comp. Acts viii. i. ix. 1, 2. xi. 19. and 1 Theff. ii. 14. Grotiusⁱ supposeth as much.

8.) Those exhortations ch. xiii. 13, 14. must have been very suitable to the case of the Jews of Jerusalem, at the supposed time of writing this epistle, a few years before the war in that country broke out.

9.) The regard shown in this epistle to the rulers of the church, or churches, to which it is sent, is very remarkable. They are mentioned twice or thrice: first in ch. xiii. 7. *Remember your rulers, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith imitate, considering the end of their conversation.* These were dead, as^k Grotius observes. And Theodoret's note is to this purpose: 'He^l intends the saints that were dead, Stephen the proto-martyr, James the brother of John, and James called the Just. And there were many others, who were taken off by the Jewish rage. Consider these,' says he, 'and observing their example, imitate their faith.' Then again, at ver 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves. For they watch for your souls.*——And once more, ver. 24. *Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints.* Upon which Theodoret says: 'This^m way of speaking intimates, that their rulers did not need such instruction. For which reason he did not write to them, but to their disciples.' That is a fine observation. And Whitby upon that verse, says: 'Hence it seems evident, that this epistle was not sent to the bishops or rulers of the church, but to the whole church, or the laity.' And it may deserve to be considered, whether this repeated notice of the rulers among them does not afford ground to believe, that some of the apostles were still in Judea? Whether there be sufficient reason to believe that, or not, I think these notices very proper and suitable to the state of the Jewish believers in Judea. For I am persuaded, that not only James, and all

ⁱ Post Stephani mortem vehementer vexati fuere illi in Judæa Christiani, ut videre est Act. xi. 19. 1 Theff. ii. 14. Grot. ad Heb. x. 34.

^k Loquitur autem de iis, qui jam obierant, ut ostendant sequentia. Qui vobis locuti sunt verbum Dei: nempe in diversis oppidis: forte etiam diversis temporibus, cum

mortuis alii successerint. Id. ad Hebr. xiii. 7.

^l In ep. ad Hebr. cap. xiii. tom. III. p. 459. D.

^m Αιγιττεται ο λογος, ως οι προσατευοντες αυτων τοιαυτης διδασκαλιας εκ εχησαν· ου δη χαριν εκ εκεινοισ εψεσειλεγ, αλλα τοις μηδηταις. Ibid. p. 462. D.

the other apostles, had exactly the same doctrine with Paul: but that all the elders likewise, and all the understanding men among the Jewish believers, embraced the same doctrine. They were, as I apprehend, the multitude only, *πληθεις*, plebs, or the men of lower rank among them, who were attached to the peculiarities of the Mosaic law, and the customs of their ancestors. This may be argued from what James and the elders at Jerusalem say to Paul. Acts xxi. 20—22. *Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are that believe. And they are all zealous of the law.—What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together.—*It is hence evident, that the zeal for the law, which prevailed in the minds of many, was not approved by James, or the elders. That being the case, these recommendations of a regard for their rulers, whether apostles, or elders, were very proper in an epistle sent to the believers in Judea.

For these reasons I think, that this epistle was sent to the Jewish believers at Jerusalem, and in Judea.

But there are objections, which must be considered.

1. Obj. Ch. vi. 10. *God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love,—in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.* Upon which Dr. Wallⁿ remarks: ‘Here again we are put upon thinking, to what church, or what Christians, this is said. For as to those of Jerusalem, we read much in Paul’s former letters, of their poverty, and of their being ministered to by the gentile Christians of Galatia, Macedonia, Corinth: and in the Acts, by the Antiochians: but no where of their ministering to other saints. If it is of them that St. Paul speaks this, it must be meant of their ministering to their own poor. For that they were famous at first, when their rich men sold their lands, and brought the money to the apostles, and they had all things in common, and none lacked. But in the time since that, they were very poor, and were relieved by other churches.’ The late Mr. Wetstein, whose words I place below, argued much after the same manner with Dr. Wall. This objection, perhaps, might be strengthened from Heb.

ⁿ Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 306.

^o Secundo, non possunt intelligi, qui Hierosolymis degebant. Hi enim pauperiores erant, et opus habebant, ut eorum inopia ab aliis ecclesiis sublevaretur. — lis vero,

ad quos hæc epistola scripta est, commendatur beneficentia. xiii. 16. vi. 10. Erant ergo tales, non qui stipem accipere, sed qui dare debebant, solebantque. Wetst. ubi supr. p. 368. fin.

xiii. 2.

xiii. 2. *Be not forgetful to entertain strangers.* And from ver. 16. *To do good, and to communicate, forget not.*

Ans. But the poverty of the Jews in Judea, and the contributions of the gentile churches for their relief, are no reasons, why such admonitions as these should not be sent to them. They are properly directed to all Christians, that they may be induced to exert themselves to the utmost. The gentile churches, among whom St. Paul made collections for the saints in Judea, were not rich. As he says, 1 Cor. i. 26. *For ye know your calling, brethren—not many mighty, not many noble, are called.*—And of the churches in Macedonia, he says, 2 Cor. viii. 2.—*How that in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy, and their deep poverty, had abounded unto the riches of their liberality.* In like manner there might be instances of liberality to the distressed, among the believers in Judea. There is a very fine example recorded, Acts ix. 36—39. Nor was there ever any city or country in the world, to whom that exhortation, *be not forgetful to entertain strangers, or be not unmindful of hospitality,* τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθανεσθε, could be more properly given, than Jerusalem and Judea. For the people there must have been much accustomed to it at their festivals, when there was a great resort thither from all countries. And the writer of an epistle to the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea would naturally think of such an admonition: being desirous, that they should not fall short of others in that respect. And we may here not unfitly recollect the history of St. Paul's going to Jerusalem, and how he, and his fellow-travellers, were entertained at Cæsarea, in the house of Philip the evangelist, and at Jerusalem, in the house of Mnason, an old disciple. As related Acts xxi. 8—16.

2. Obj. Upon ch. xiii. 18, 19. the same^p Dr. Wall says, 'One would think, that Paul should have prayed and purposed to go any whither, rather than to Jerusalem, where he had been so used: and where he fell into that five years imprisonment, from which he was but just now delivered.' To the like purpose also^q Mr. Wetstein.

But there is not any improbability, that Paul might now desire to see his countrymen in Judea; if he might go thither with safety, as I think he might. Almost three years had now passed, since he left Judea. And his trial, or

^p As before, p. 316.

^q Ubi supra. p. 386.

apology, had been over two years. And he was now set at liberty by the emperor himself. No man, not very presumptuous, would admit a thought of disturbing him. However, I suppose, that the apostle would behave discreetly: so as to give no needless provocation to any, and that he would stay but a short time in Judea, and then go to Ephesus. There have been men of good sense, who have supposed, that Paul went to Jerusalem about this time, particularly Chrysostom^r among the ancients, and divers moderns, one of whom is Pearson.

3. Obj. ^r St. Peter's epistles were written to the Hebrew Christians, scattered in Asia, and Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia. St. Paul must have written an epistle to those Hebrew Christians, to whom St. Peter writes his two epistles. For St. Peter, 2 epist. iii. 15. cites to them what *Paul had written unto them*. No epistle of Paul was written to Hebrews particularly, but this. So that these must be the Hebrews of the above named countries.

To which I answer, that St. Peter's epistles were not sent to Jews, but to Gentiles, or to all Christians in general, in the places above-mentioned, as will be clearly shown hereafter. When St. Peter says, *as Paul has written unto you*, he may intend Paul's epistle to the Galatians, and some other epistles written to gentiles. If he refers at all to this epistle to the Hebrews, it is comprehended under that expression, ver. 16. *as also in all his epistles*.

4. Obj. This epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been written in Greek. But if it had been sent to the Jewish believers in Judea, it would have been written in Hebrew.

To which I answer, that allowing the epistle to have been written in Greek, it might be sent to the believers in Judea. If St. Paul wrote to the Jewish believers in Palestine, he intended the epistle for general use, for all Christians, whether of Jewish or Gentile original. Many^y of the Jews in Judea understood

^r See before, p. 384. ^s Lud. Capell. Hist. Apost. p. 39. Lefant et Beaufobre Pref. generale sur les epitres de St. Paul. num. lv.

^t Paulus e Creta cum Timotheo in Judæam navigat. Heb. xiii. 23. Annal. Paulin. p. 21. A. Chr. 64.

^u Wall, as before, p. 318, 319.

^x Videtur respicere Petrus ad Rom. ii. 4. ubi de Dei longanimitate

similia habet his quæ docet hic Petrus: dicereque ad Asiaticos scriptam epistolam, quæ ad Romanos data, eo quod epistolæ Pauli, quamquam ad singulas ecclesias, et homines singulos, missæ, omnium Christianorum illius ævi communes jure haberentur. Cleric. H. E. A. 69. p. 459.

^y Ils n'ont point eu d'autre raison

understood Greek. Few of the Jews out of Judea understood Hebrew. The Greek language was almost universal, and therefore generally used. All St. Paul's epistles are in Greek, even that to the Romans. And are not both St. Peter's epistles in Greek? and St. John's, and St. Jude's? Yea, did not St. James likewise write in Greek, who is supposed to have resided at Jerusalem, from the time of our Lord's ascension, to the time of his own death? His epistle is inscribed *to the twelve tribes, scattered abroad*. But I presume, that they of the twelve tribes, who dwelt in Judea, are not excluded by him, but intended. Nor could he be unwilling, that his epistle should be read and understood by those, who were his special charge. The epistle written by Barnabas, a Levite, or ascribed to him, was written in Greek. Not now to mention any other Jewish writers, who have used the Greek language.

II. Thus we are unawares brought to the inquiry, in what language this epistle was written. For there have been doubts about it among both ancients and moderns. So that we are obliged to take some particular notice of this point. But I should have deferred the consideration of it, till we had observed the writer of the epistle, if the just mentioned objection had not brought this inquiry in our way in this place.

And it may be recollected, that I formerly alleged divers learned and judicious moderns, who have been of opinion, that Greek, and not Hebrew, was the original language of this epistle. To them I now add several others: ^a James Capellus, ^b S. Basnage, ^c Mill in his prolegomena to the New Testament, and ^d the late Mr. Wetstein, and also Spanheim

son de croire, que S. Paul avoit écrit en Hebreu, que celle qu'il écrivoit à des Hebreux. Or cette raison, toute vraisemblable qu'elle paroît, n'est point convaincante, parcequ'il est certain, que la langue Grecque étoit entenduë dans la Judée, quoiqu'elle ne fût pas la langue vulgaire. Tous les auteurs du nouveau Testament ont écrit en Grec, bien qu'ils écrivissent pour tous les fideles, soit Hebreux, soit Gentils. Beauf. Pref. sur l'epitre aux Hebreux. num. xv.

^a See vol. IV. p. 268, 269.

^b Jacob. Capell. observat. in ep.

ad Hebr. § ii. et iii. ^b Ann. 61. num. vi.

^c Et sane magis adhuc inutilis est eorum sententia, qui hanc epistolam Paulo quidem Hebraice scriptam volunt ab alio autem aliquo traductam fuisse in sermonem Græcum. Nihil enim clarius atque evidentius, quam eam lingua Græca primitus conceptam fuisse, &c. Prolegom. num. 95—98.

^d Ad hæc observamus, i. epistolam ad Hebræos, quæ nunc Græce exstat, non est interpretis, sed ipsius auctoris. Qui putant ad Hebræos non aliter quam Hebraice scribi debuisse, manifesto falluntur.

Spanheim^c in his Dissertation concerning the author of this epistle, which well deserves to be consulted. One argument for this, both of ^f Spanheim, and ^b Wetstein, is taken from the Greek paronomasias in the epistle, or the frequent concurrence of Greek words of like sound. Which seems to be an argument, not easy to be answered.

Some ancient Christian writers were of opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written in the Hebrew language, and ^h translated into Greek by Luke, or Clement of Rome. Jerom ⁱ in particular, seems to have supposed, that this epistle was written in Hebrew. And Origen also is sometimes reckoned among those, who were of this opinion. But I think, I have shown it to be probable, that ^k he thought it was written in Greek. It seems likewise, that they must have been of the same opinion, who considered the elegance of the Greek language of this epistle as an objection against its having been written by St. Paul. For if the Greek epistle had been supposed to be a translation, the superior elegance of the style of this epistle above that of the other epistles of Paul could have afforded no objection against his being the author of it.

Indeed the ancients, as Beaufobre said ^l formerly, had no other reason to believe, that St. Paul wrote in Hebrew, but that he wrote to the Hebrews. So likewise says ^m Capellus.

Omnes enim novi fœderis libri, etiam Matthæi, ut ad ipsum vidimus, lingua Græca scripti sunt. Hanc linguam plerique Judæi norant. Wetstein. T. Gr. T. II. p. 385.

^c Spanh. De Auctore epist. ad Hebr. Part. III. cap. ii. tom. II. p. 245—252.

^f Nono, decretorium fere argumentum est a Græcorum idiotismis, hac in epistola passim conspicuis. Pauca hæc de multis. Auctor cap. v. versu 8. elegantem adhibet *παρωνομασιαν*. Scil. *Ἐμαθεν αφ' ων επαθε*, qualem Hebraismus non ferebat. Græci contra mire sibi in talibus placent, &c. Spanh. ubi supr. n. xii, p. 249.

^g Porro manifestæ reperiuntur paronomasie, et *αμοιδοτελευτα*, quæ si in aliam linguam convertantur, pereunt. Hebr. v. 8.— et ver. 14. *καλστε και κακη*. vii. 3.

απατωρ, αμητωρ. xi. 37. *επισθησαν, επειρασθησαν*. ix. 10. *βρωμασι και πομασι*. xiii. 14. *μειψαν και μελλισαν*. Talia auctor potius sectatur quam interpres. Wetst. ib. p. 385.

^h See vol. II. p. 26, 211, 219. and vol. IV. 249—251. ⁱ vol. V. p. 46.

^k See vol. II. p. 477. and vol. IV. p. 268. ^l vol. IV. p. 269.

See likewise here p. 388. note (y).

^m Qui volunt hanc epistolam Hebraice scriptam, hos decepit titulus. Cum enim ad Hebræos scribebatur, Hebraice quoque scribi debuisset sunt opinati. Sed meminisse debuerant, etiam Hierosolymis magnum fuisse linguæ Græcæ usum. Cis Hierosolymam paucissimi Judæi aliter quam Græce loquebantur. Jacob. Capel. Observat. in Nov. Testam. p. 109.

The title deceived them. And because it was written to Hebrews, they concluded it was written in Hebrew. For none of the ancients appear to have seen a copy of this epistle in that language.

III. I now proceed to the third inquiry, who is the writer of this epistle. And many things offer in favour of the apostle Paul.

1. It is ascribed to him by many of the ancients.

Here I think myself obliged briefly to recollect the testimonies of ancient authors, which have been produced at large in the preceding volumes. And I shall rank them under two heads: first the testimonies of writers who used the Greek tongue, then the testimonies of those who lived in that part of the Roman empire, where the Latin was the vulgar language.

There are some passages ⁿ in the epistles of Ignatius, about the year 107, which may be thought by some to contain allusions to the epistle to the Hebrews. This epistle seems to be referred to by ^o Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, in his epistle, written to the Philippians in the year 108, and ^p in the relation of his martyrdom, written about the middle of the second century. This epistle is often quoted as Paul's by ^r Clement of Alexandria, about the year 194. It is received, and quoted as Paul's by ^s Origen, about 230. It was also received as the apostle's by ^t Dionysius bishop of Alexandria in 247. It is plainly referred to by ^u Theognostus, of Alexandria, about 282. It appears to have been received by ^x Methodius, about 292, by ^y Pamphilus, about 294, and by ^z Archelaus, bishop in Mesopotamia, at the beginning of the fourth century, by ^a the Manichees in the fourth, and ^b by the Paulicians, in the seventh century. It was received, and ascribed to Paul by ^c Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in the year 313, and by ^d the Arians in the fourth century. Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, about 315, says, 'There ^e are fourteen epistles of Paul, manifest and well known: but yet there are some, who reject that to the Hebrews, alleging in behalf of their opinion, that it was not received by the church of Rome, as a writing of Paul.' It is often quoted by Eusebius ^f himself, as Paul's, and

ⁿ See vol. II. p. 79, 80. ^o p. 316, 317. ^y p. 344. ^z p. 374.
^p p. 101. ^r p. 211, 224. ^s p. 506. ^t p. 547. ^u Vol. 97.
^v p. 467, 472, 473. ^w p. 101, IV. p. 104. ^x p. 117, 118.
102, and 132. ^y p. 277. ^z p. ^a p. 229, 233. ^b p. 250, 251.
C C 4 sacred

sacred scripture. This epistle was received by ϵ Athanasius, without any hesitation. In his enumeration of St. Paul's fourteen epistles, this is placed next after the two to the Thessalonians, and before the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. The same order is observed h in the Synopsis of scripture ascribed to him. This epistle is received as Paul's by i Adamantius, author of a dialogue against the Marcionites in 330, and by k Cyril of Jerusalem, in 348, by l the council of Laodicea, in 363. Where St. Paul's epistles are enumerated in the same order, as in Athanasius, just taken notice of. This epistle is also received as Paul's by m Epiphanius, about 368, by n the Apostolical Constitutions, about the end of the fourth century, by o Basil, about 370, by p Gregory Nazianzen, in 370, by Amphilochius q also. But he says, it was not received by all, as Paul's. It was received by r Gregory Nyssen, about 371, by s Didymus of Alexandria, about the same time, by u Ephrem the Syrian, in 370, and by x the churches of Syria, by y Diodorus of Tarsus, in 378, by z Hierax, a learned Egyptian, about the year 302, by a Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, in Egypt, about 347, by b Titus, bishop of Bosra, in Arabia, about 362, by c Theodore bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, about the year 394, by d Chrysostom, at the year 398, by e Severian, bishop of Gabala, in Syria, 401, by f Victor, of Antioch, about 401, by g Palladius, author of a life of Chrysostom, about 408, by h Isidore of Pelusium, about 412, i by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, in 412, by k Theodoret, at 423, by l Eutherius, bishop of Tyana, in Cappadocia, in 431, by m Socrates, the Ecclesiastical Historian, about 440, by n Euthalius, in Egypt, about 458, and, probably, by o Dionysius, falsely called the Arcopagite; by p the author of the *Quæstiones et Responsiones*, commonly ascribed to Justin Martyr, but rather written in the fifth century. It is in q the Alexandrian manuscript, about the year 500, and r in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, about 806, is received as Paul's

ϵ p. 283, 285. h p. 290, 291. IV. p. 509. d Vol. V. p. 126, 135.
 i p. 295. k p. 300—302. l p. 309. e p. 160. f p. 174. g p. 183. h p.
 m p. 314, 315. n p. 351. o p. 400. 187. i p. 190. k p. 191, 193. l p.
 p p. 408. q p. 413. s p. 417. t p. 209. m p. 339. n p. 244. o p.
 422, 423. u p. 430. x p. 439. 246, 247. p Vol. II. p. 118.
 y p. 492. z Vol. III. p. 402. a p. q Vol. V. p. 254. r p. 258.
 386. b p. 388, 389, 506. c Vol.

by ^s Cosmas of Alexandria, about 535, by ^c Leontius, of Constantinople, about 610, by ^u John Damascen in 730, by ^x Photius, about 858, by ^y Œcumenius, about the year 950, and by ^z Theophylact in 1070. I shall not go any lower.

I shall now rehearse such authors, as lived in that part of the Roman empire, where the Latin was the vulgar tongue.

Here in the first place offers Clement in his epistle to the Corinthians, written about the year 96, or as some others say, about the year 70. For though he wrote in Greek, we rank him among Latin authors, because he was bishop of Rome. In his epistle ^a are divers passages, generally supposed to contain allusions, or references to the epistle to the Hebrews. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, about 178, as we are assured by Eusebius, alleged ^b some passages out of this epistle, in a work now lost. Nevertheless, it does not appear, that he received it as St. Paul's. By Tertullian, presbyter of Carthage, about the year 200, this ^c epistle is ascribed to Barnabas. Caius, about 212, supposed to have been presbyter in the church of Rome, reckoning ^d up the epistles of St. Paul, mentioned thirteen only, omitting that to the Hebrews. Here I place Hippolytus, who flourished about 220. But it is not certainly known where he was bishop, whether at Porto in Italy, or at some place in the east. We have seen evidences, that ^e he did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's. And perhaps, that may afford an argument, that though he wrote in Greek, he lived where the Latin tongue prevailed. This epistle is ^f not quoted by Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about 248, and afterwards. Nor does it appear to have been received by ^g Novatus, otherwise called Novatian presbyter of Rome, about 251. Nevertheless it was in after times received ^h by his followers. It may be thought by some, that this epistle is referred to by ⁱ Arnobius, about 306, and ^k Lactantius about the same time. It is plainly quoted by ^l another Arnobius in the fifth century. It was received as Paul's by ^m Hilary, of Poitiers, about 354, and ⁿ by Lucifer, bishop

^s p. 267. ^t p. 312. ^u p. 316.

^x p. 319. ^y p. 323. ^z p. 326.

^a Those passages are alleged, with remarks, vol. II. p. 39—43. and see p. 46. and 170.

^b Ibid. p. 164—166.

^c p. 269—273.

^d p. 375—377.

^e See vol. III. p. 168—171. & 182.

^f p. 242—244.

^g p. 242—244.

^h p. 243, 247, 248.

ⁱ Vol. IV. p. 22.

^j p. 23.

^k p. 77, 78.

^l p. 23.

^m p. 305.

ⁿ p. 373.

of Cagliari, in Sardinia, about the same time, and by ^o his followers. It was also received as Paul's by ^p C. M. Victorinus. Whether ^q it was received by Optatus, of Milevi, in Africa, about 370, is doubtful. It was received as Paul's by ^r Ambrose, bishop of Milan, about 374, by ^s the Priscillianists, about 378. About the year 380, was published a commentary upon thirteen epistles of Paul only, ^t ascribed to Hilary, deacon of Rome. It was received as Paul's by ^u Philaster, bishop of Brescia in Italy, about 380. But he takes notice that it was not then received by all. His successor Gaudentius, about 387, quotes this ^x epistle as Paul's. It is also readily received as Paul's by ^y Jerom, about 392. And he says, it was generally received by the Greeks, and the Christians in the east, but not by all the Latins. It was received as Paul's by ^z Rufinus in 397. It is also in ^a the catalogue of the third council of Carthage in 397. It is frequently quoted by ^b Augustin as St. Paul's. In one place, ^c he says, 'It is of doubtful authority with some. But he was inclined to follow the opinion of the churches in the east, who received it among the canonical scriptures.' It was received as Paul's by ^d Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, in Italy, about 401, by ^e Innocent, bishop of Rome, about 402, by ^f Paulinus, bishop of Nola, in Italy, about 403. Pelagius ^g about 405, wrote a commentary upon thirteen epistles of St. Paul, omitting that to the Hebrews. Nevertheless it was received by ^h his followers. It was received by ⁱ Cassian, about 424, by ^k Prosper of Aquitain, about 434, and by ^l the authors of the works ascribed to him: by ^m Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, in 434, by ⁿ Sedulius, about 818, by ^o Leo, bishop of Rome, in 440, by ^q Salvian, presbyter of Marseilles, about 440, by Gelasius, bishop of Rome, about 496, by ^s Facundus, an African bishop, about 540, by ^t Junilius, an African bishop, about 556, by ^u Cassiodorus in 556, by ^x the author of the imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, about 560, by ^y Gregory, bishop of Rome, about 590, by ^z Isidore, of Seville,

^o p. 374, 375.	^p p. 379.	^f p. 178.	^h p. 179.	ⁱ p. 205.
^q p. 445, 446.	^r p. 451.	^k p. 212.	^l p. 213, 214.	
^s p. 481, 482.	^t p. 495.	^m p. 227.	ⁿ p. 231, 232.	
500, 501.	^x p. 502.	^o p. 235.	^q p. 238.	^r p. 249.
^p p. 32, 46, 49.	^z p. 76.	^s p. 273.	^t p. 278.	^u p.
^b p. 86, 97—100.	^c p. 99.	281—283.	^x p. 291.	^y p. 298.
^e p. 169.	^e p. 175.	^f p. 177.	^z p. 305, 306.	

about

about 596, and by ^a Bede, about 701, or the beginning of the eighth century.

It may be now needful to make a few remarks.

It is evident that this epistle was generally received in ancient times, by those Christians, who used the Greek language, and lived in the eastern part of the Roman empire. I forbear to insist here on the seeming references in Ignatius and Polycarp. But Clement of Alexandria, before the end of the second century, received this epistle as Paul's, and quotes it as such frequently, without any doubt or hesitation. And had a tradition from some before him, concerning the reason why the apostle did not prefix his name to this, as he did to the other epistles.

Concerning the Latin writers it is obvious to remark, that this epistle is not expressly quoted, as Paul's, by any of them in the first three centuries. However, it was known to Irenæus, and Tertullian, as we have seen, and possibly to others also. It is generally supposed, that there are divers allusions and references to this epistle, in the epistle of Clement of Rome, written to the Corinthians. However, I formerly mentioned ^b two learned men, who did not think that a clear point. I have since met with another of the same mind, whose words I place ^{*} below. And I must likewise refer to a consideration, formerly ^c proposed: that the little notice taken of this epistle by Latin writers in the second and third centuries: and Eusebius ^d and Jerom ^e assuring us, that by many of the Romans in their time, this epistle was not received: seem to weaken the supposition, that Clement had often alluded to this epistle. For if the church of Rome, in his time, had owned it for an epistle of Paul; it is not easy to conceive, how any Latin Christians afterwards should have rejected it, or doubted of its authority.

However, it is manifest, that it was received as an epistle

^a p. 313. ^b See vol. II. p. 42.

^{*} Sed quis dubitaret, quin ex epistola ad Hebræos multa habeat, cum Eusebius illud diserte annotet —? Nec tamen illud tam exploratum est. Phrasium et sententiarum æqualitas, ex qua illud unice derivandum est (nam nusquam a Clemente citatur) non est adeo

perfecta et frequens, non adeo singularis, ut ex Ep. ad Hebræos eas repetitas esse, inde evincatur. Herman. Venem. Diss. ii. de Tit. ep. ad Ephes. num. viii. p. 343.

^c See vol. II. p. 46. ^d Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 3. p. 72. B. C. and in this work, vol. IV. p. 229.

^e See vol. V. p. 49, 50.

of St. Paul by many Latin writers in the fourth, fifth, and following centuries.

The reasons of doubting about the genuineness of this epistle, probably, were the want of a name at the beginning, and the difference of argument, or subject matter, and of style, from the commonly received epistles of the apostle, as is intimated by ^f Jerom. Whether they are sufficient reasons for rejecting this epistle, will be considered in the course of our argument.

2. There is nothing in the epistle itself, that renders it impossible or unlikely to be his.

For the epistle appears to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem: as was of old observed by ^g Chrysofom, and ^h Theodoret, and has been argued also by many moderns.ⁱ That the temple was still standing, and sacrifices there offered, may be inferred from ch. viii. 4. *For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest: seeing there are priests, that offer according to the law:* and from ch. xiii. 10. *We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle.* Moreover, if ^k the temple had been destroyed, and the worship there abolished; the writer would not have failed to take some notice of it, in support of his argument, and for abating the too great attachment of many to the rites of the Mosaic institution. To this purpose speaks Spanheim in a passage which I have transcribed below. And in like manner another learned commentator, to ^l whom I refer. It is also probable, ^m that those words ch. iii. 13. *While it is called to day,* refer to the patience which God yet continued to exercise toward the Jewish nation. He seems to have had in view the approaching de-

^f p. 46. ^g Vid. Chrysof. Pr. in ep. ad Heb. T. XII. p. 4. C. D.

^h Theod. in Heb. xiii. 9, 10.

ⁱ Quarentibus, quo tempore, et unde scripta sit epistola ad Hebræos, nihil est quod respondeamus, nisi scriptam fuisse, cum Judæi adhuc gloriarentur templo Jerosolymitano, et sacerdotio Mosaico: de quibus ubique loquitur scriptor, ut etiamnum stantibus. Cleric. Hist. Ec. An. 69. p. 461. ^k Quia nata hæc epistola, stante templo et Levitico sacerdotio—Heb. viii. 4. Neque alias necesse fuit de-

clamare in sacrificiorum usum, et praxin sacerdotii, penitus eo templi et urbis et reipublicæ everfione sublato. Neque maxime omnium prægnans argumentum Judæis confundendis, et coërcendis pseudoapostolis, ab ipsa jactura cultûs, et Hierosolymitanæ sedis restitutionis spe nulla amplius affulgente prætermisisset. Spanhem. ubi supra. P. II. cap. vi. p. 3. T. I. p. 229.

^l See Beaufobre's preface to the epistle to the Hebrews, num. iii.

^m The same.

solation of Jerusalem, which would put an end to that *to day*, and finish the time which God gave to the Jews, as a nation; to *bear his voice*. And Lightfootⁿ argues from ch. xii. 4. *Ye have not yet resisted unto blood*: that the epistle was written before the war in Judea was begun.

Indeed those words have been the gound of an objection against this epistle having been sent to the believing Jews in Judea, because there had been already several martyrdoms in that country. That difficulty I would now remove. And I have received from a learned friend the following observation, which may be of use. 'It seems to me,' says he, 'that ° the apostle here, as well as in the preceding context, alludes to the Grecian games or exercises: and he signifies, that they, to whom he writes, had not been called out to the most dangerous combats; and had not run the immediate hazard of their lives. Which, I suppose, might be said of them, as a body, or church.' And I shall transfer hither Mr. Beaufobre's note upon this place. 'There had been martyrs in Judea, as Stephen, and the two James's. But for the most part the Jews did not put the Christians to death, for want of power. They were imprisoned and scourged. See Acts v. 40. and here ch. xiii. 3. And they endured reproaches, and the loss of their substance, ch. x. 32—34. These were the sufferings, which they had met with. The apostle therefore here indirectly reproves the Hebrews, that though God treated them with more indulgence than he had done his people in former times, and even than his own son, they nevertheless wavered in their profession of the gospel. See ver. 12.'

3. There are divers exhortations in this epistle, much resembling some in the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. xii. 3.—*Lest^p ye be wearied, and faint in your mind*. Gal. vi. 9. *And^q let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not*. And see 2 Thess. iii. 13. and Eph. iii. 13.

2.) Heb. xii. 14. *Follow^r peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord*. An exhortation very

^p Harm. of the N. T. vol. I. p. 339.

^q — προς την αμαρτιαν ανταγωνιζομενοι.

^r — — — — — να μη παρητε, ταις ψυχαις

εκλυσμενοι.

^q Το δε καλον ποιουντες μη εκκαωμεν. Καιρω γαρ ιδιω θερισομεν, μη εκλυσμενοι.

^r Ειρηνην διωκετε μετα παντων, και του αγιασμου.

suitable to Paul, and to the Jewish believers in Judea: admonishing them not to impose the rituals of the law upon others, that is, the gentile believers, and to maintain friendship with them, though they did not embrace the law. It has also a resemblance with Rom. xii. 18. But the words of the original are different.

3.) Heb. xiii. 1. *Let brotherly love continue:* and what follows to the end of ver. 3. Then at ver. 4. *Marriage is honourable. But fornicators and adulterers God will judge.* Here is an agreement with Eph. v. 2, 3. *And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us.*—*But fornication, and all uncleanness, and covetousness, let it not be once named among you.*—Ver. 4. *For this ye know, that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous man,——has any inheritance in the kingdom of God.*

4.) Ch. xiii. 16. *But^s to do good, and to communicate, forget not. For with such sacrifices God is well pleased.* That exhortation is very suitable to Paul's doctrine, and has an agreement with what he says elsewhere: as Philip. iv. 18.—*An odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing to God.* Moreover, as is observed^t by Grotius upon this text, the word communicate, or communion, is found in a like sense in the Acts, and in other epistles of St. Paul. See Acts ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ch. ix. 13.

4. In the next place I observe some instances of agreement in the style, or phrases, of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. ii. 4. *God^u also bearing them witness with signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.*

Signs and wonders, together, seldom occur in other books of the New Testament. But they are found several times in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. The phrase is in Matt. xxiv. 24. and Mark xiii. 22. and once likewise in St. John's gospel, ch. iv. 48. But it is several times in the Acts, ch. ii. 19. iv. 30. v. 12. vi. 8. viii. 13. xiv. 3. xv. 12. The most remarkable are these, where there are three different words. Acts ii. 22.—*A man approved of God among you by^x miracles, and wonders, and signs,* Rom. xv. 19.—*Through^y*

^s Τῆς δὲ εὐπρέπειας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιθρῆνασθε. ^t Κοινωνίας vox refertur ad pecunias, et ea, quæ pecuniis comparantur. Vide Act ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ix. 13. Grot. in. Heb. xiii. 16.

^u Συνεπιμαρτυρητός τε θεῶν σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι, καὶ πνευματικαῖς δυνάμεσι, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς.

^x — δυνάμεσι, καὶ τέρασι, καὶ σημείοις. ^y — ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος θεοῦ.

mightly

mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God.

2 Cor. xii. 12. — ² In signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

2 Theff. ii. 9. ² With all power, and signs, and lying wonders.

2.) Ch. ii. 14. — *That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death.* The word καταργεω, or καταργεομαι, is, I think, no where used in the New Testament, except in Luke xiii. 7. and St. Paul's epistles, where it is several times: and is sometimes used in a sense resembling this place, particularly 2 Tim. i. 10. *Who has abolished death:* καταργησαντος μεν θανατον. And 1 Cor. xv. 26. Compare Dr. Doddridge's Family Epositor, vol. IV. upon 1 Cor. xv. 24.

3.) Ch. iii. 1. — *Holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling:* Philip. iii. 14. — *The prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.* 2 Tim. i. 9. — *Who has called us with an holy calling.*

4.) Ch. v. 12 — *And are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.* 1 Cor. iii. 2. *I have fed you with milk, and not with meat.* However, in the original, there is no great agreement in the words: except that in both places *milk* is used for the first rudiments of the christian doctrine.

5.) Ch. viii. 1. — *Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty on high.* Eph. i. 21. — *And set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.*

6.) Ch. viii. 6. ix. 15. and xii. 24. Jesus Christ is styled *mediator.* So likewise in Gal. iii. 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5. and in no other books of the New Testament.

7.) Ch. viii. 5. *Who serve unto the example, and shadow of heavenly things.* — και σκια — των επιφανων. x. 1. *For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things.* Σκια εχων — των μελλοντων αγαθων, εκ αυτην την εικονα των πραγματος. Col. ii. 17. *Which are a shadow of things to come. But the body is of Christ.* Α εσι σκια των μελλοντων το δε σωμα τϋ χριστου.

8.) Ch. x. 33. *Whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, or spectacle, both by reproaches and afflictions.* ονειδισμοις τε και θλιψεσι θεατριζομενοι. 1 Cor. iv. 9. *For we are made a spectacle unto the world* — εστι θεατρον εγενθημεν τω κοσμω.

9.) St. Paul, in ^b his acknowledged epistles, often alludes to the exercises and games, which were then very reputable and frequent in Greece, and other parts of the Roman empire. There are divers such allusions in this epistle, which have

^a — εν σημειοις, και τερασι, και και σημειοις, και τερασι ψευδους.

βλαμει ^a — εν παση δυναμει,

^b See 1 Cor. ix. 24—26. 1 Tim.

vi. 12,

suitable to Paul, and to the Jewish believers in Judea: admonishing them not to impose the rituals of the law upon others, that is, the gentile believers, and to maintain friendship with them, though they did not embrace the law. It has also a resemblance with Rom. xii. 18. But the words of the original are different.

3.) Heb. xiii. 1. *Let brotherly love continue:* and what follows to the end of ver. 3. Then at ver. 4. *Marriage is honourable. But fornicators and adulterers God will judge.* Here is an agreement with Eph. v. 2, 3. *And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us.*—*But fornication, and all uncleanness, and covetousness, let it not be once named among you.*—Ver. 4. *For this ye know, that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous man,*—*has any inheritance in the kingdom of God.*

4.) Ch. xiii. 16. *But^s to do good, and to communicate, forget not. For with such sacrifices God is well pleased.* That exhortation is very suitable to Paul's doctrine, and has an agreement with what he says elsewhere: as Philip. iv. 18.—*An odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing to God.* Moreover, as is observed¹ by Grotius upon this text, the word communicate, or communion, is found in a like sense in the Acts, and in other epistles of St. Paul. See Acts ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ch. ix. 13.

4. In the next place I observe some instances of agreement in the style, or phrases, of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. ii. 4. *God^u also bearing them witness with signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.*

Signs and wonders, together, seldom occur in other books of the New Testament. But they are found several times in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. The phrase is in Matt. xxiv. 24. and Mark xiii. 22. and once likewise in St. John's gospel, ch. iv. 48. But it is several times in the Acts, ch. ii. 19. iv. 30. v. 12. vi. 8. viii. 13. xiv. 3. xv. 12. The most remarkable are these, where there are three different words. Acts ii. 22.—*A man approved of God among you by^x miracles, and wonders, and signs,* Rom. xv. 19.—*Through^y*

^s Της δε ευποιας και κοινωνιας μη επιθανθησθε. ¹ Κοινωνιας vox refertur ad pecunias, et ea, quae pecuniis comparantur. Vide Act ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ix. 13. Grot. in. Heb. xiii. 16.

^u Συνεπιμαρτυρευοντος τε βεε σημειοις τε και τερασι, και ποικιλαις δυναμει, και πνευματος αγιου μερισμοις.

^x — δυναμει, και τερασι, και σημειοις. ^y — εν δυναμει σημειων και τερατων, εν δυναμει πνευματος βεε.

mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God.

2 Cor. xii. 12. —² In signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

2 Thess. ii. 9. ² With all power, and signs, and lying wonders.

2.) Ch. ii. 14. — That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death. The word καταργεω, or καταργεομαι, is, I think, no where used in the New Testament, except in Luke xiii. 7. and St. Paul's epistles, where it is several times: and is sometimes used in a sense resembling this place, particularly 2 Tim. i. 10. Who has abolished death: καταργησαντος μεν θανατον. And 1 Cor. xv. 26. Compare Dr. Doddridge's Family Epositor, vol. IV. upon 1 Cor. xv. 24.

3.) Ch. iii. 1. — Holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling: Philip. iii. 14. — The prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. 2 Tim. i. 9. — Who has called us with an holy calling.

4.) Ch. v. 12. — And are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. 1 Cor. iii. 2. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat. However, in the original, there is no great agreement in the words: except that in both places milk is used for the first rudiments of the christian doctrine.

5.) Ch. viii. 1. — Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty on high. Eph. i. 21. — And set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.

6.) Ch. viii. 6. ix. 15. and xii. 24. Jesus Christ is styled mediator. So likewise in Gal. iii. 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5. and in no other books of the New Testament.

7.) Ch. viii. 5. Who serve unto the example, and shadow of heavenly things. — και σκια — των επεραντων. x. 1. For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things. Σκιαν εχων — των μελλοντων αγαθων, εκ αυτην την εικονα των πραγματος. Col. ii. 17. Which are a shadow of things to come. But the body is of Christ. Α εσι σκια των μελλοντων το δε σωμα τε χριστου.

8.) Ch. x. 33. Whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, or spectacle, both by reproaches and afflictions. ουειδισμοις τε και θλιψεσι θεατριζομεναι. 1 Cor. iv. 9. For we are made a spectacle unto the world — ετι θεατρον εγεννηθημεν τω κοσμω.

9.) St. Paul, in ^b his acknowledged epistles, often alludes to the exercises and games, which were then very reputable and frequent in Greece, and other parts of the Roman empire. There are divers such allusions in this epistle, which have

^a — εν σημειοις, και τερασι, και και σημειοις, και τερασι ψευδεις.

ειραμεναι ^b — εν παση δυναμει, ^b See 1 Cor. ix. 24—26. 1 Tim. vi. 12.

have also great elegance: So ch. vi. 18. *Who have fled for refuge to^c lay hold of the hope set before us, or the reward of eternal life, proposed to animate and encourage us.* And ch. xii. 1. *Wherefore seeing we also^d are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let^e us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us, and^f let us run with patience, the race that is set before us.* Ver. 2. *Looking unto Jesus, who^g for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross.* And ver. 3. *Lest^h ye be wearied, and faint in your minds.* And ver. 12. *Whereforeⁱ lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees.*

All these texts seem to contain allusions to the celebrated exercises and games of those times. And under each of

vi. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 5. and ch. iv. 7, 8.

^c Κρατησαι της προκειμενης ελπιδος: *ad obtinendam spem propositam, sc. vitam æternam, Elegantissima metaphora est vocis προκειμενης, e veterum certaminum ratione ducta. Proprie enim προκεισθαι dicuntur τα αθλα, sc. præmia certaminis, quæ publice proponuntur in propatulo, ut eorum adspectus, certaue eorum adipiscendorum spes certaturos, alacriores redderet ad certamen ineundum, victoriamque reportandam: ut interpretabamur supra ad 2 Tim. iv. 8. το αποκεισθαι, quod eandem significationem obtinet.* J. Tob. Krebsii Observat. in N. T. e Josepho. p. 377.

Ego vero puto φευγειν accipi pro συντονως τρεχειν, et sumptam translationem a gymnasticis ludis: quo spectant etiam vocabula κρατησαι, καταπετασματος, et προδρομα. Bez. in loc. ^d See Mr. Hallett upon the place. note (u).

^e Ογκον αποθεμενοι παντα: *deponentes omne pondus.* Tota hæc oratio translata est: quasi nobis in stadio non sine magnis difficultatibus currendum: quæ translatione sæpe utitur Paulus. In primis igitur monet, ut ογκον abjiciamus, quo vocabulo crassa omnis et tarda moles significatur. Bez. in loc.

A stadio sumpta similitudo: Ibi qui cursuri sunt, omnia quæ oneri esse possunt deponunt, &c. Grot.

in loc. And see Hallett, as before, note (αυ).

^f Τρεχωμεν τον προκειμενον ημιν τον αγωνα. Loquendi ratio est agonistica, et petita, a cursoribus, qui stadium absolvunt. De voce προκειμαι satis multa afferebamus supra Cap. vi: 18. — Sensus autem Apostoli est: *Curramus in stadio, nobis proposito ad currendum: voce αγων pro loco, sc. stadio sumpta.* Krebs. ubi supra. p. 390.

^g Ος αντι της προκειμενης χαρας. κ. λ. Vid. Krebs. ib. p. 390.

^h Ινα μη καμντε, ταις ψυχαις υμων εκλυομενοι. — Hæc duo verba a palæstra et ab athleticis desumpta sunt, qui proprie dicuntur καμνειν, et ψυχαις ειλυεσθαι, cum corporis viribus debilitati et fracti, omnique spe vincendi abjectâ, victas manus dant adversario. — Neque dubium est, quin Apostolus eo respexerit. Id. ib. ⁱ Διο ταις παρειμενας χειρας και τα παραλελυμενα γονατα ανορθωσατε. Quemadmodum Paulus sæpiissime delectatur loquendi formulis ex re palæstrica petitis; ita dubium non est, quin hic quoque respexisse eo videatur. Athleticis enim et luctatoribus tribuuntur παρειμεναι χειρες et παραλελυμενα γονατα, cum luctando ita defatigati, viribusque fracti sunt, ut neque manus neque pedes officio suo fungi possint, ipsique a deo victos se esse fateri cogantur. Id. ib. p. 392.

them

them I have referred to, or transcribed the notes of some learned critics and commentators, tending to illustrate them. And to these may be added, if I mistake not, the place before ^k taken notice of, ch. xii. 4. *Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving ^l against sin.*

10.) Ch. xiii. 9. *Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines.* Διδαχαις ποικιλαις και ξεναις μη περιφερεσθε. Eph. iv. 14. *That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine*—κλυδωνιζομενοι, και περιφερομενοι παντι ανεμω της διδασκαλιας.

11.) Ch. xiii. 10. *We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat.* 1 Cor. ix. 13. *And they that wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar.* And ch. x. 18. *Are not they which eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar.*

12.) Ch. xiii. 20, 21. *Now the God of peace*—*make you perfect.* Which is a title of the Deity, no where found in the New Testament, but in St. Paul's epistles. And in them it is several times, and near the conclusion, as here. So Rom. xv. 33. *Now the God of peace be with you all.* See likewise ch. xvi. 20. and Philip. iv. 9. And 1 Theff. v. 23. *And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly.* And 2 Cor. xiii. 11. *And the God of love and peace shall be with you.*

5. The conclusion of this epistle has a remarkable agreement with the conclusions of St. Paul's epistles in several respects.

1.) He here desires the Christians, to whom he is writing, to pray for him. ch. xiii. 18. *Pray for us.* So Rom. xv. 30. Eph. vi. 18, 19. Col. iv. 3. 1 Theff. v. 25. 2 Theff. iii. 1.

2.) It is added in the same ver. 18. *For we trust, we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly.* Which may well come from Paul, some of the Jewish believers not being well affected to him, or being even offended with him. So says ^m Theodoret upon this place, and Chrysostom ⁿ to the like purpose, very largely. To which might be added, ver. 22. *And I beseech you, brethren, to suffer the word of exhortation.* It is also observable, that St. Paul makes a like profession of his sincerity, in pleading against the Jews, before Felix, Acts xxiv. 16.

^k See here, p. 397. ^l προς αλλα τω θειω λογω πειθομενος. Δια την αμαρτιαν ανταγωνιζομενοι. τωτο και την συνειδησιν εις μαρτυριαν

^m Διαβεβλητο αυτοις, ως τ αναντια εκαλεσε. Theod. in Hebr. xiii. 18. τω ανεμω κηρυττων. Διδασκει τοιγουν αυ- T. III. p. 461. ⁿ In Heb. xiii. 18, ως εκ αλλα τε χαριν τωτο ποιει, hom. 34. tom. XII. p. 313, 314.

3.) Having desired the prayers of these Christians for himself, he prays for them, ch. xiii. 20, 21. *Now the God of peace—make you perfect—through Jesus Christ: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.* So Rom. xv. 30—32. having asked their prayers for him, he adds ver 33. *Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.* Compare Eph. vi. 19—23. and 1 Thess. v. 23. 2 Thess. iii. 16.

4.) Ch. xiii. 24. *Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.* The like salutations are in divers of St. Paul's epistles, Rom. xvi. 1 Cor. xvi. 19—21. 2 Cor. xiii. 13. Philip. iv. 21, 22. Not to refer to any more.

5.) The valedictory benediction at the end is that, which Paul had made the token of the genuineness of his epistles, 2 Thess. iii. 18. So here, ch. xiii. 25. *Grace be with you all. Amen.* Indeed, sometimes it is *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.* But at other times it is more contracted. So Col. iv. 18. *Grace be with you.* 1 Tim. vi. 21. *Grace be with thee.* See likewise Eph. vi. 24. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Tit. iii. 15. The same observation is in ^p Theodoret.

6. The circumstances of the epistle lead us to the apostle Paul.

1.) Ch. xiii. 24. *They of Italy salute you.* The writer therefore was then in Italy, whither we know Paul was sent a prisoner, and where he resided two years, Acts xxviii. where also he wrote several epistles, still remaining.

2.) Ver. 19. He desires them *the rather to pray for him, that he might be restored to them the sooner.* Paul had been brought from Judea to Rome. And he was willing to go thither again, where he had been several times. And though the original words are not the same, there is an agreement between this and Philem. ver. 22. *I trust, that through your prayers I shall be given to you.* This particular is one of the arguments of Euthalius, that ^q this epistle is Paul's, and written to the Jews of Palestine.

o Et hoc ad exemplum Pauli. Eph. vi. 24. Col. iv. 18 1 Tim. vi. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Tit. iii. 15. Qui alibi explicat, quæ sit illa gratia, nempe Christi. Grot. in. Heb. xiii. 25.

p Το συγγραφες ακροτελευτον τεθεικε, την της χαριτος μετασταν. Theod. in loc.

T. III. p. 462.

q Μαρτυρειται δε και εν τοις εξης τ' επισολη υπαρχουσα παυλς, τω γραφειν, οτι και τοις δεσμοις με συνεπαθησατε, και εκ τα λεγειν, περισσοτερον ευχεσθε, ινα ταχιον αποκατασταθ' υμιν. Euthal. ap. Zacagn. p. 670.

3.) Ver.

3.) Ver. 23. *Know ye, that our brother Timothy is set at liberty. With whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.* Timothy was with Paul, during his imprisonment at Rome: as is allowed by all. For he is expressly mentioned at the beginning of the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, written when he was in bonds. He is mentioned again, Philip. ii. 19. When the apostle writes to Timothy, he calls him *his son, or dearly beloved son.* 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. But when he mentions him to others, he calls him *brother.* 2 Cor. i. 1. Col. i. 1. 1 Thess. iii. 2. In like manner Titus. Comp. Titus i. 4. and 2 Cor. ii. 13.

This mention of Timothy has led many, not only moderns, but ancients likewise, to think of Paul as writer of the epistle, particularly Euthalius. And undoubtedly, many others have been confirmed in that supposition by this circumstance.

The original word, *απολελυμενον*, is ambiguous, being capable of two senses: one of which is that of our translation, *set at liberty*, that is, from imprisonment: the other is dismissed, *sent abroad on an errand.* In this last sense it was understood by Euthalius. Who, in the place just cited, says, 'That scarcely any one can be thought of, beside Paul, who would send Timothy abroad upon any service of the gospel.' And indeed this passage doth put us in mind of what Paul says to the Philippians, ch. ii. 19. *But I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort when I know your state. Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly,* ver. 23, 24. Which induced Beausobre to say in the preface to this epistle: 'The sacred author concludes with asking the prayers of the Hebrews, ch. xiii. 19. *That he may be restored to them.* These words intimate, that he was still prisoner, but that he hoped to be set at liberty. Therefore he adds in the 23. ver. that he intended to come and see them with Timothy, as soon as he should be returned. If this explication be right, this epistle was written at Rome some time after the epistle to the Philippians, and since the departure of Timothy for Macedonia.'

Thus we are brought to the time of this epistle. Never-

† Και ει τε λεγειν, γνωσκετε τον αδελφον ημων τιμοθεον απολελυμενον— ουδεις γαρ αν, σιμαι, απελευσεν εις δια-

κονιαν τιμοθεον, ει μη παυλος. κ. λ. Euthal. ib. p. 671.

‡ Preface sur l'epitre aux Hebreux. n. 37. p. 429.

theless before I proceed to speak distinctly to that, I would conclude the argument concerning the writer of it.

All these considerations just mentioned, added to the testimony of many ancient writers, make out an argument of great weight (though not decisive and demonstrative) that the apostle Paul is the writer of this epistle.

It should be observed, I have hitherto declined the use of two arguments often insisted upon in discoursing of this point.

One of which is the testimony of St. Peter: 2 epst. ch. iii. 15, 16. This I have omitted, because I am not satisfied that he and the author of this epistle write to the same persons. Nor does it appear certain to me, that St. Peter there takes any particular notice of this epistle as one of Paul's. However as many learned men look upon that passage of St. Peter, as a full testimony to Paul's being the writer of this epistle; I shall refer to several, or transcribe below, a part at least of what they say: particularly ^u Mill, ^x Spanheim, and ^y Basnage.

The other argument omitted by me is that taken from Heb. x. 34. *For ye had compassion of me in my bonds.* On this insist ^z Spanheim, ^a Mill, and ^b Basnage, to prove that this epistle was written by Paul. But Mr. James Peirce translates the words thus: *For ye sympathized with those who were in bonds.* And in his notes says: 'Were it certain, that the common

^c Says Mr. Hallet. Introduction, p. 21. 'Some learned men have attempted to prove this point from what St. Peter says, 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. If it could be proved, that he speaks of the epistle to the Hebrews, the testimony of this apostle would fully determine the dispute. But as I do not think, it can be certainly proved, that he speaks of this epistle, without proving that St. Paul was the author of it, I cannot argue from this passage. Those on the other side go upon the supposition, that St. Peter's epistles were written to the Hebrews, or Jews. But it seems to me abundantly more natural to suppose, that they were written to gentile Christians, if we consider many passages of the epistles themselves.' ^u Et qui-

dem epistolam hanc eam ipsam fuisse, quam ad Hebræos Christianos miserat Apostolus noster, disertis verbis D. Petri constat. Ep. 2. cap. iii. 15, &c. Mill. Proleg. num. 86—91. ^x Vid. Spanhem.

Diff. de Auct. ep. ad Hebr. Part. I. cap. ii—v. ^y Hebræis Paulum scripsisse, planum est ex posteriore Petri: *Paulus pro sibi data sapientia scripsit vobis.* Hebræos enim adibat scripto Petrus circumcisionis apostolus. Quænam autem Pauli ad Hebræos scripta epistola, si nostra non est?—Ipsa igitur est, quæ omnium in manibus versatur atque oculis. Basn. ann. 61. num. iv.

^z Prima esto circumstantia vinculorum illa mentio. Capite x. ver. 34.—Constat enim, soli Paulo, et fere semper, venisse hoc in usu. Et quas omnes ex Italia transmisit epistolas.

common is the true reading of the place, there would be little room left to doubt of the epistle's being written by St. Paul. But the Alexandrian, and other manuscripts, of the best note, read here δεσμοις instead of δεσμοις μου. And the same is confirmed by ancient versions.' And that this is the truer reading, may be seen in Bengelius, Wetstein, and Mill himself: though in his argument concerning the author of the epistle, he has been pleased to argue from the common reading. If Paul here referred to his bonds, I should think he intended his imprisonment in Judea, as Mill thought, not at Rome, as Basnage does, in the place just cited. I make no doubt but that the Hebrew believers in Judea afforded St. Paul relief and comfort, whilst he lay prisoner at Cæsarea. But as I do not here discern any plain reference to that, I do not form any argument from this text, in behalf of the writer of the epistle.

I say no more by way of argument. But there are objections, which ought to be considered.

1. Obj. Heb. ii. 3. *How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?*

Hence it has been argued, that the writer of this epistle placeth himself with those who had received the doctrine of the gospel from Christ's apostle's. But Paul had it from Christ himself, as he says at large in the first chapter of the epistle to the Galatians. This has been thought by Grotius and Le Clerc,^d a good reason why Paul should not be esteemed the writer of this epistle.

To

epistolas, vinculorum suorum mentione quasi distinxit. Spanh. ib. P. II. cap. 4. ^a Auctorem habet hæc epistola, si qua usquam alia, D. Paulum. Alloquitur Auctor Hebræos istos, velut ipsius in carcere memores, ejusque vinculis συμπάθησαντας. Ista Apostolo nostro congruere, nemo non videt. Hierosolyma ipse duos ante annos elemosynas ecclesiarum detulerat, ubi ab universa illic ecclesia benigne exceptus erat, toto tempore, quo Cæsareæ mansit incarceratus. Mill. Prol. num. 85. ^b A manu cætenata epistolam in Italia exaratam fuisse, cernimus et videmus: vin-

culis meis mecum affecti fuistis. Barnabam vero aut Lucam compedi- bus in Italia fuisse detentos, veterum in monumentis ne minimâ quidem literâ invenimus. Basnag. Ann. 61. n. iv.

^c Præterea Paulo hanc epistolam abjudicat, quod hujus scriptor se iis annumeret, qui non a Christo, sed ab ejus discipulis, notitiâ, evangelii acceperit. cap. ii. 3. Cui contra Paulus auctoritatem sibi addat inde, quod hanc notitiam a Christo ipso acceperit. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Hebr. ^d Videtur et scriptor epistolæ ad Hebræos cap. ii. 3. &c. eorum numero censeri velle,

To which I answer, that it is not uncommon for Paul to join himself with those to whom he is writing, and to say *us*, where he might say *you*: especially, when he says any thing that is humbling, and that might be thought disagreeable. So Col. i. 12, 13. *Giving thanks to the Father, who—has delivered us from the power of darkness.*—This I take to be a plain instance. To which might be added, according to the judgment of some commentators, Eph. ii. 3. and Tit. iii. 3. The note of Grotius upon this last cited text may be observed. And now I transcribe below ° the answer of Mr. Wetstein to this objection: which is in the main agreeable to what I have just said.

I would also observe, that there is another instance in this epistle, much resembling the text, upon which the present objection is founded. Heb. xii. 1.—*Wherefore—let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us.*—And this way of writing is suitable to Paul's style and method in his acknowledged epistles.

Secondly, I would farther add, if it might not be esteemed too prolix: that in divers other places we find Paul, when he asserts the resurrection of Jesus Christ, insisting also upon the testimony of the other apostles, and likewise of other disciples. Thus, preaching at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 30, 31. *But God raised him from the dead. And he was seen many days of them, which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.* And also 1 Cor. xv. at the beginning: which I shall recite largely, as full to the point. *Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel, which I preached unto you, which also ye have received.*—By which

veille, qui evangelium acceperant ab iis, a quibus auditus erat ipse Christus.—Quod in Paulum non quadrat, qui evangelium ab ipso Jesu Christo et Deo accepisse se, non falso gloriatur. Gal. i. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 69. p. 459.

° Hebr. ii. 3. Paulus se iis annumerat, qui notitiam evangelii a discipulis Christi acceperunt: cum tamen ad Galatas non semel testetur, gloriaturque, se non ab hominibus, sed ab ipso Christo fuisse institutum, Gal. i. 1, 12, 17. ch. ii. 6. Ratio discriminis ex modo dictis manifesta est. In epistola ad Galatas id agit, ut auctoritatem

suam adstruat: hic autem, ubi de supplicio desertoribus impendente loquitur, ut minus ingrata esset comminatio atque admonitio, seipsum illis annumerat comm. 1. Διημας προσεχειν τοις ακησθεισιν, μη ποτε παρρωμεν—πως ημεις εκφουξομεθα.—Postquam igitur ita coepisset, consequens erat, ut in eadem figura pergeret, scriberetque ητις σωτηρια—εις ημας εβιβαιωθη. Ita Eph. ii. 3. Col. i. 12, 13. Tit. iii. 3. ubi gentium peccata, et poenam imminentem describit, et seipsum illis annumerat. J. J. Wetstein. N. T. tom. II. p. 384.

also

also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you. — For I delivered unto you first of all, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures: and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me.

And this context, perhaps, will justify me in proceeding somewhat farther. When St. Paul says, 2 Tim. ii. 8. Remember, that Jesus Christ—was raised from the dead, according to my gospel: he intends, as I apprehend, to lead Timothy to recollect the gospel, that had been preached by him in such and such circumstances, confirmed by miracles wrought by him, and agreeable to the prophecies of the ancient scriptures, and the testimony of the other apostles, and disciples of Christ. As he also says, at ver. 2. of the same chapter, *The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses: literally, by many witnesses: that is, confirmed by many witnesses.* And he may be supposed to intend not only the prophets, which is Grotius's interpretation, but likewise the testimony of all the apostles of Christ, and of many others, to which he had appealed in his preaching.

Upon the whole, it seems to me, that the expression of this text is highly becoming the apostle Paul, especially, supposing him to be here writing to the believers of Jerusalem and Judea. And indeed, as before shown, the beginning of this second chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews affords, in my opinion, an argument of no small force, that they are the Christians to whom it is sent.

2. Obj. Another objection against this epistle being St. Paul's is, that it is supposed to have in it an elegance superior to that of his other writings. This has been judged by Grotius, and Le Clerc, who were formerly^b quoted, sufficient to show, that it was not written by Paul.

In order to judge the better of this, it may be of use to recollect what we have already seen in divers ancient writers, relating to this point.

Eusebius has a passage of Clement of Alexandria, from his institutions, at large cited by us^h formerly: where Clement says, 'Thatⁱ the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's, and that it
' was

^f Multis adductis testibus prophetis, qui hæc prædixerant. Hebr. xi. 1. Grot. in 2 Tim. ii. 2.

^g See before, p. 13.

^h vol. II. p. 211.

ⁱ Και την προς εβραιους επισολην παυλε μεν ειναι φησι, γηγραφθαι δε εβραιοις εβραιη φωνη ληκαν

‘ was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and
 ‘ that Luke having carefully translated it, published it for the
 ‘ use of the Greeks. Which is the reason of that conformity
 ‘ of style, which is found in this epistle, and the Acts of the
 ‘ apostles.’

The opinion of Origen in his homilies upon this epistle as cited by Eusebius, and by us ^k from him, is, ‘ That the style
 ‘ of the epistle to the Hebrews has not the apostle’s rudeness
 ‘ of speech——but as to the texture of it, is elegant Greek,
 ‘ as every one will allow, who is able to judge of the differ-
 ‘ ences of style.’ Again, he says, ‘ The sentiments of the
 ‘ epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged
 ‘ writings of the apostle. This will be assented to by every
 ‘ one, who reads the writings of the apostle with attention.’
 Afterwards, he adds, ‘ If I was to speak my opinion, I should
 ‘ say, that the sentiments are the apostle’s, but the language
 ‘ and composition another’s, who committed to writing the
 ‘ apostle’s sense, and as it were reduced into commentaries the
 ‘ things spoken by his master.’ And what follows.

Eusebius ^l himself speaking of Clement’s epistle to the Corin-
 thians, says, ‘ Paul having written to the Hebrews in their
 ‘ own language, some think, that the evangelist Luke, others,
 ‘ that this very Clement, translated it into Greek. Which last is
 ‘ the most likely, there being a great resemblance between the
 ‘ style of the epistle of Clement, and the epistle to the Hebrews.
 ‘ Nor are the sentiments of those two writings very different.’
 This passage has been already twice quoted by us: once in the
 chapter of Clement ^m bishop of Rome, and again in that ⁿ of
 Eusebius.

Philaster, bishop of Brescia, about 380, as formerly quoted,
 says, ‘ There ^o are some, who do not allow the epistle to the
 ‘ Hebrews to be Paul’s: but say, it is either an epistle of the
 ‘ apostle Barnabas; or of Clement bishop of Rome. But some
 ‘ say, it is an epistle of Luke the evangelist.——Moreover,
 ‘ some reject it, as more eloquent than the apostle’s other
 ‘ writings.’

Jerom, about 392, in his article of St. Paul in the book of
 Illustrious Men, as ^p before cited also, says, ‘ The epistle, called
 ‘ to the Hebrews, is not thought to be his, because of the

λαβαν δε φιλοτιμως αυτην μεθερμηνευσα-
 ρατα, εκδεναι τοις ελλησιν. κ. λ. αρ.
 Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 14. in.

^k Vol. II. p. 467. from Euseb.

H. E. l. 6. cap. 25.

3. cap. 38.

ⁿ Vol. IV. p. 250.

^p See vol. V. p. 46.

^l H. E. l.

^m Vol. II. p. 26.

^o p. 500.

‘ difference

‘ difference of the argument and style: but either Barnabas’s, as Tertullian thought; or the evangelist Luke’s, according to some others; or Clement’s, bishop of Rome: who, as some think, being much with him, clothed and adorned Paul’s sense in his own language.—Moreover he wrote as a Hebrew to Hebrews in pure Hebrew, it being his own language. Whence it came to pass, that being translated it has more elegance in the Greek, than his other epistles.’

I need not allege here any more testimonies relating to this matter. We sufficiently perceive by what has been said, that many ancient Christians supposed the Greek of this epistle to have a superior elegance to the received epistles of St. Paul. And to some of them the Greek was their native language. And others, as Jerom, though Latins, may be supposed to have been good judges in this matter.

Some learned men of late times, as Grotius, and Le Clerc, have thought this to be an insuperable objection. Of this opinion likewise was ^a Jacob Tollius: who in his notes upon Longinus, of the sublime, has celebrated the sublimity of this epistle, and particularly the elegance of the beginning of it. Which alone he thinks sufficient to show, that it is not Paul’s. Others allow the fine contexture of the style of this epistle; but do not see that consequence. These are obliged to account for it; which they do several ways.

Mr. Wetstein, who allows, that the epistle is St. Paul’s, and that it was written in Greek, thinks, that ^r Paul having now lived two years at Rome, may have improved his Greek style. But in answer to that it may be said, that we have several epistles of Paul, written near the end of his imprisonment at Rome, in which we perceive his usual style.

Again, Mr. Wetstein adds, ‘ That ^s this is a learned epistle, and

^a Ejusmodi *σηριγμεις, και αναπαυσεις* statim in initio eloquentissimæ, et nescio annon omnem gentilium scriptorum sublimitatem superantis, certe adæquantis epistolæ ad Hebræos reperias: quam vel hoc uno Pauli non esse probaverim. Sed sunt *αναπαυσεις* illæ non deorsum ruentis orationis, verum contra ea in cœlum ascendentis *σηριγμοι*. Ita vero incipit: Πολυμερως, και πολυτροπως, παλαι ο θεος λαλησας τοις πατρασιν. &c. Ubi tres consequenter sunt

positi Pæones quarti cum syllaba post singulas remanente, velut ad subsistendum, dum ita in cœlum ad Deum velut gradibus scriptor ascendit. J. Tollius ad Longin. de Sublim. § 39. not 22. ^r Potuit Paulus aliter scribere, cum esset in Græcia, aliter postea, cum in Italiam translatus ex usu frequentiori linguæ Græcæ, et Hebraïsmos vitare, et facilius scribere didicisset. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 385. ^s Potuit hanc epistolam, quæ erudita est,

longiori

‘ and may have been composed with more care and exactness, than letters written to friends, or to churches, whose urgent necessities obliged him to write in haste.’ But neither will this, I believe, be sufficient to account for the difference of style in this, and the epistles received as Paul’s. For no care and attention will on a sudden enable a man to alter his usual style, in a remarkable manner.

It remains therefore, as seems to me, that if the epistle be Paul’s, and was originally written in Greek, as we suppose, the apostle must have had some assistance in composing it. So that we are led to the judgment of Origen, which appears to be as ingenious, and probable as any. ‘ The sentiments are the apostle’s, but the language and composition of some one else: who committed to writing the apostle’s sense, and as it were reduced into commentaries the things spoken by his master.’ According to this account, the epistle is St. Paul’s, as to the thoughts and matter, but the words are another’s. Jerom, as may be remembered, said, ‘ He wrote as a Hebrew to Hebrews in pure Hebrew, it being his own language. Whence it came to pass, that being translated, it has more elegance in the Greek, than his other epistles.’ My conjecture, which is not very different, if I may be allowed to mention it, is, that St. Paul dictated the epistle in Hebrew, and another, who was a great master of the Greek language, immediately wrote down the apostle’s sentiments in his own elegant Greek. But who this assistant of the apostle was, is altogether unknown.

The ancients, beside Paul, have mentioned Barnabas, Luke, and Clement, as writers, or translators of this epistle. But I do not know, that there is any remarkable agreement between the style of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the style of the epistle commonly ascribed to Barnabas. The style of Clement, in his epistle to the Corinthians, is verbose and prolix. St. Luke^u may have some words, which are in the epistle to the Hebrews. But that does not make out the same style. This epistle, as Origen said, ‘ as to the texture of the style, is elegant Greek. But that kind of texture appears not in Luke, so far as I can perceive. There may be more art and labour

longiori meditatione elaborasse, cum alias ad familiares amicos, vel ad ecclesias, ubi necessitas urgebat, festinantius effudisset. Ibid.

^t Clement est diffus, — &c. Beauf. Pref. sur l’epître aux He-

breux. num. vii.

^u Lucam autem hujus epistolæ scriptorem ostendunt etiam vocabula et loquendi genera quædam Lucæ velut propria. Grot. Præf. in ep. ad Hebr.

in

in the writings of Luke, than in those of the other evangelists: but not much more elegance, that I can discern. This epistle to the Hebrews * is bright and elegant from the beginning to the end. And surpasseth as much the style of St. Luke, as it does the style of St. Paul in his acknowledged epistles. In short, this is an admirable epistle, but singular in sentiments and language: somewhat different in both respects from all the other writings in the New Testament. And whose is the language, as seems to me, is altogether unknown: whether that of Zenas, or Apollos, or some other of the apostle Paul's assistants, and fellow-labourers.

3. Obj. There still remains one objection more against this epistle being written by St. Paul. Which is the want of his name. For to all the thirteen epistles, received as his, he prefixeth his name, and generally calleth himself apostle.

This objection has been obvious in all ages. And the omission has been differently accounted for by the ancients, who received this epistle as a genuine writing of St. Paul.

Clement of Alexandria, in his institutions, as cited by us † formerly from Eusebius, speaks to this purpose, 'The epistle to the Hebrews, he says, is Paul's. But he did not make use of that inscription, *Paul the apostle*. Of which he assigns this reason. Writing to the Hebrews, who had conceived a prejudice against him, and were suspicious of him, he wisely declined setting his name at the beginning, lest he should offend them. He also mentions this tradition: forasmuch as the Lord was sent as the apostle of Almighty God to the Hebrews, Paul out of modesty does not style himself the apostle of the Hebrews: both out of respect to the Lord, and that being preacher and apostle of the gentiles, he over and above wrote to the Hebrews.'

Jerom also speaks to this purpose, 'That † Paul might decline putting his name in the inscription, on account of the Hebrews being offended with him.' So in the article of St. Paul, in his book of Illustrious Men. In his commentary upon the beginning of the epistle to the Galatians, he assigns another reason, 'That † Paul declined to style himself apostle

' at

* Tout le monde reconnoit de l'éloquence et de l'élevation dans l'épître aux Hebreux. Beauf. ibid. Vol. II. p. 211.

† Vel certe quia Paulus scribebat ad Hebræos, et propter invidiam

sui apud eos nominis titulum in principio salutationis amputaverat. De V. I. cap. v.

‡ Et in epistola ad Hebræos propterea Paulum solita consuetudine nec nomen suum, nec Apostoli vocabulum præposuisse

‘ at the beginning of the epistle to the Hebrews, because he
 ‘ should afterwards call Christ *the high priest, and apostle of our*
 ‘ *profession,*’ See ch. iii. 1.

Theodoret says, that Paul was especially the apostle of the gentiles. For which he allegeth, Gal. ii. 9. and Rom. xi. 13. ‘ Therefore ^b writing to the Hebrews, who were not entrusted to his care, he barely delivered the doctrine of the gospel, without assuming any character of authority. For they were the charge of the other apostles.’

I need not quote any others; which would be only a repetition of the same, or like reasons.

All these reasons may not be reckoned equally good. And, perhaps, none of them are sufficient, and adequate to the purpose. But though we should not be able to assign a good reason, why Paul omitted his name; the epistle, nevertheless, may be his. For ^c there may have been a good reason for it, though we are not able to find it out. It is the work of a masterly hand. Who for some reason omitted his name. Paul might have a reason for such silence, as well as another.

Lightfoot ^d says, ‘ Paul’s not affixing his name to this, as he had done to his other epistles, does no more deny it to be his, than the first epistle of John is denied to be John’s upon that account.’

Tillemont says, ‘ Possibly ^e Paul considered it as a book, rather than a letter: since he makes an excuse for its brevity, ch. xiii. 22. For indeed it is short for a book, but long for a letter.’ The same thought is in ^f Estius. This may induce

posuisse, quia de Christo erat dicturus: *Habentes ergo Principem Sacerdotum, et Apostolum confessionis, Jesum: nec fuisse congruum, ut ubi Christus Apostolus dicendus erat, ibi etiam Paulus Apostolus poneretur.* In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 225. in.

^b Ἐβραίοις δὲ γραφῶν, ὡν ἐκ ἐπιχειρησθῆ τὴν ἐπιμελείαν, γυμνῆν τῶν ἀξιώματων εἰσοτάς τὴν διδασκαλίαν προσηνεύκεν ὑπο γὰρ τὴν τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀποστόλων προμήθειαν ἐτέλεον. Theod. in Hebr. T. III. p. 392. ^c Verum est, Paulum omnibus aliis epistolis, si hanc excipias, et nomen suum præposuisse, et titulos addidisse, quibus

sibi auctoritatem conciliaret. Nec tamen inde consequitur, hanc, de qua agimus, Pauli non esse. Aut enim dicendum erit, nullius esse, quia nomen nullum præfixum est: aut si alius quis contra morem receptum nomen suum reticere potuit, idem æquo jure etiam Paulo licuit. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 384. med.

^d See his works. vol. I. p. 339.

^e S. Paul. art. 46. Mem. T. I.

^f Sed post hæc omnia, an vera ratio omissæ salutationis est, quod hæc epistola scripta est per modum libri, non per modum epistolæ? Unde in fine dicit: *Etenim per paulis scripsi vobis.* Quod de epistola non

erat

duce us to recollect an observation of Chrysoftom to the like purpose, formerly ^s taken notice of.

It is, I think, observable, that there is not at the beginning of this epistle any salutation. As there is no name of the writer, so neither is there any description of the people, to whom it is sent. It appears from the conclusion, that it was sent to some people in a certain place. And, undoubtedly, they to whom it was sent, and by whom it was received, knew very well, from whom it came. Nevertheless there might be reasons for omitting an inscription, and a salutation at the beginning. This might arise from the circumstances of things. There might be danger of offence in sending at that time a long letter to Jews in Judea. And this omission might be in part owing to a regard for the bearer, who too is not named. The only person named throughout the epistle is Timothy. Nor was he at that time present with the writer.

Indeed I imagine, that the two great objections against this being a genuine epistle of the apostle: the elegance of the style, and the want of a name and inscription, are both owing to some particular circumstances of the writer, and the people to whom it was sent. The people, to whom it was sent, are plainly Jews in Judea; and the writer, very probably, is Paul. Whose circumstances at the breaking up of his confinement at Rome, and his setting out upon a new journey, might be attended with some peculiar embarrassments; which obliged him to act differently from his usual method.

IV. Thus we are brought to the fourth and last part of our inquiry concerning this epistle, the time and place of writing it. Mill was of opinion, that ^h this epistle was written by Paul in the year 63, in some part of Italy, soon after he had been released from his imprisonment at Rome. Mr. Wetstein ⁱ appears to have been of the same opinion. Tillemont ^k likewise placeth this epistle in the year 63, immediately after the apostle's being set at liberty. Who, as he says, was still at Rome, or at least in Italy. Basnage ^l speaks of this epistle at the year 61, and supposeth it to be written during the apostle's imprisonment. For he afterwards speaks of the epistle to the Ephesians, and says, it ^m was the last letter, which the apostle

erat dicturus, cum sit epistola prolixæ. Est. de Auct. Ep. ad Hebr. p. 893.

^s See vol. V. p. 130.

^h Interca, mox ut e carcere evasit Apostolus, recessit in ulteriorem aliquam Italiæ partem, ibique scripsit epistolam ad Hebræos. Proleg.

num. 83.

II. p. 387. in.

ⁱ Ann. 61. num. ii—vi.

^m Epistolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit Apostolus, ea quæ ad Ephesios, ultima esse videtur. Ibid. num. vii.

ⁱ Wetst. N. T. tom.

^k S. Paul. art. 46.

wrote during the time of his bonds. Lenfant and Beaufobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles, observe, ' that
 ' ⁿ in the subscription at the end of the epistle it is said to have
 ' been written from Italy. The only ground of which, as they
 ' add, is what is said, ch. xiii. 24. *They of Italy salute you.*
 ' This has made some think, that the apostle wrote to the
 ' Hebrews, after he had been set at liberty, and when he was
 ' got into that part of Italy, which borders upon Sicily, and
 ' in ancient times was called Italy. Nevertheless there is reason
 ' to doubt of this. When he requests the prayers of the
 ' Hebrews, that *he might be restored to them the sooner*, he
 ' intimates, that he was not yet set at liberty.' Accordingly,
 they place this epistle in the year 62.

There is not any great difference in any of these opinions concerning the time, or place of this epistle: all supposing, that it was written by the apostle, either at Rome, or in Italy, near the end of his imprisonment at Rome, or soon after it was over, before he removed to any other country.

I cannot perceive, why it may not be allowed to have been written at Rome. St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus. Nevertheless he says, ch. xvi. 19. *The churches of Asia salute you.* So now he might send salutations from the Christians of Italy, not excluding, but including those at Rome, together with the rest throughout that country.

The argument of Lenfant and Beaufobre, that Paul was not yet set at liberty, because he requested the prayers of the *Hebrews, that he might be restored to them the sooner*, appears not to me of any weight. Though Paul was no longer a prisoner, he might request the prayers of those to whom he was writing, that he might have a prosperous journey to them, whom he was desirous to visit: and that all impediments of his intended journey might be removed. And many such there might be, though he was no longer under confinement. Paul was not a prisoner when he wrote the epistle to the Romans. Yet he was very fervent in his prayers to God, that he might have a prosperous journey, and come to them, ch. i. 10.

For determining the time of this epistle, it may be observed; that when the apostle wrote the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon, he had hopes of deliverance. At the writing of all those epistles Timothy was present with him. But now he was absent, as plainly appears from ch. xiii. 23.

ⁿ Pref. gen. sur les epîtres de S. Paul. num. lii.

This leads us to think that this epistle was written after them. And it is not unlikely, that the apostle had now obtained that liberty, which he expected when they were written.

Moreover in the epistle to the Philippians he speaks of sending Timothy to them, ch. ii. 19—23. *But I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. Timothy therefore, if sent, was to come back to the apostle. Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me.* It is probable that Timothy did go to the Philippians soon after writing the above-mentioned epistles, the apostle having gained good assurance of being quite released from his confinement. And this epistle to the Hebrews was written during the time of that absence. For it is said, Heb. xiii. 23. *Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty. With whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.*—*Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty: or has been sent abroad.* The word^o is capable of that meaning. And it is a better and more likely meaning, because it suits the coherence. And I suppose, that Timothy did soon come to the apostle, and that they both sailed to Judea, and after that went to Ephesus; where Timothy was left to reside with his peculiar charge.

Thus this epistle was written at Rome, or in Italy, soon after that Paul had been released from his confinement at Rome, in the beginning of the year 63.

And I suppose it to be the last written of all St. Paul's epistles, which have come down to us, or that we have any knowledge of.

Who was the bearer of it, is not known. At the end of the epistle, in some manuscripts, is a subscription to this purpose: 'that it was carried from Italy by Timothy.' But that subscription is esteemed of no authority by all learned men in general, Beza in particular. I put below^e a part of what he says. It is inconsistent with what is said of Timothy, ch. xiii. 23. Timothy was to accompany the writer. The epistle was sent before.

^o *Et quidem paullo post missas hæc [ad Philippenses] literas, libertatem adeptus, Timotheum in Macedoniam misit, uti liquet ex Hebr. xiii. 23. — Neque enim verbis istis significatum vult Apostolus, Timotheum tum temporis, secum una vinculis liberatum fuisse, sed a se ob certa negotia fuisse*

dimissum. Mill. Proleg. num. 68.

^e *Puto igitur hanc subscriptionem non satis considerate adscriptam fuisse a quopiam, qui occasionem ex eo arripuerit, quod Timothei et Italicorum mentio facta fuerat. Nam etiam et in Claromontano codice, et in Syra interpretatione non exstat. Bez. ad cap. xiii. in fin.*

C H A P. XIII.

That the Epistle, inscribed to the Ephesians, was written to them.

THE epistle to the Ephesians is one of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul. There never was any doubt among Christians, who was the writer. But there has been, especially of late, a dispute concerning the persons to whom it was sent: some thinking that the common inscription is false, and that this is either a general epistle, or that it was sent to the Laodiceans. Of this opinion is ^a Mill, in his *Prolegomena* to the New Testament, who has had many followers. Some of whom must be here mentioned by me. Mr. James Peirce, ^b who likewise speaks of Mr. Whiston, as of the same opinion. The ^c author of a Latin letter, or dissertation in the third volume of Mr. La Roche's *Literary Journal*, published in the year 1731. That letter is anonymous. But the writer is Artemonius, otherwise Samuel Crellius, author of *Initium Evangelii S. Joannis Apostoli restitutum*. This I was assured of by Mr. La Roche, the editor. W. Wall in his *Critical Notes upon the New Testament*. Dr. Benson ^d. The author of a letter at the end of the second volume of Dr. Benson's *History of the first planting the Christian Religion*. Which learned author has also since published a postscript to that letter, which is at the end of the third volume of the same work of Dr. Benson. The unknown author of an edition of the New Testament, in Greek and English, in two volumes octavo, published at London in 1729. Campegius Vitringa, the son, professor of divinity in the university of Franeker, wrote a dissertation on the same side of the question. And not having therein finished his design, his successor, Mr. Venema, added another dissertation, both together making more than one hundred and thirty pages in ^e quarto. Lastly, Mr. J. J. Wet-

^a Quidni igitur scripta fuerit ad Laodicenses? *Proleg.* num. 74. vid. *ib.* num. 71—79. et num. 237.

^b See an Advertisement at the end of his paraphrase upon the Ep. to the Philippians, p. 114. &c.

^c See La Roche's *Literary Journal* for April, May, and June, 1731. vol. III. p. 165—183. Et *Conf. Artemonii Initium Evangel. S.*

Joan. restitutum. p. 212. edit. Londini. 1726.

^d See Dr. Benson's *History of the first planting the Christian Religion*, vol. II. p. 270—276. first ed. p. 290—297. 2d. ed.

^e *Dissertat. de genuino titulo epistolæ D. Pauli, quæ vulgo inscribitur ad Ephesios.* Ap. Campegi. Vitring. Fil. *Diff. Sacr. Franekeræ.* 1731. p. 247—379.

stein in his notes upon the beginning of this epistle. Who also has put a mark under the text, showing Laodicea to be, in his opinion, the right reading, instead of Ephesus. I here mention no more. But perhaps some others may be taken notice of hereafter.

The common reading however has been defended by several. I mention two authors of great note. One is Le Clerc in his Ecclesiastical History, whose words I have placed below. He had seen Mill's argument, and slighted it. He thought that few would be moved by it. However, he briefly considers, and answers the principal objections, taken from Eph. i. 15. iii. 2 and 4. As for any other arguments, he says, they are of too little moment to be opposed to the general consent of Christian writers.

[Vid. J. C. Wolf. Curæ in N. T. tom. IV. p. 1—13. I may be allowed likewise to take notice of a Commentary upon the epistle to the Ephesians, published in the Dutch language, by Peter Dinant, a learned minister at Rotterdam, in the year 1721. Of which an honourable account is given in the Bibliotheca Bremensis, where we are assured. Ampla operi præmisit Prolegomena, in quibus primo loco Apostolum Paulum vere epistolæ ad Ephesios scriptorem esse demonstrat. — Agit deinde de Epheso, ejusque, cum Apostolus hanc epistolam conscriberet, statu: de Dianæ cultu. — Hinc refutat Grotium, qui Marcionem secutus non ad Ephesios, sed Laodicenses scriptam hanc epistolam credidit. Sententia quoque Usserii, qui non ad solos Ephesios, sed plures ecclesias destinatam, adeoque pro encyclica habendam putat, examinatur, ac rejicitur. Bibliotheca. Hist. Phil. Theolog. Classis quintæ Fasc. tertius. p. 533, 534. Bremæ 1721. & Postea scripsit epistolam ad Ephesios, quam viri quidam docti [Joan. Millius, in Prolegom. ad N. T. cujus conjectura paucis, credo probabitur:] suspicantur ad Laodicenos datam, sed sine ullo sat firmo argumento.

Volunt quidem in hac epistola quædam esse, quæ Ephesios non conveniunt, ut cum cap. i. 15. Paulus se *audisse fidem et caritatem Ephesiorum* ait, quas ipse per se norat, non ex auditu. Sed nihil vetat, quin Romæ audiverit, Ephesios constanter eas virtutes coluisse, ex quo ipse eos viderat, eoque in hisce verbis respexerit. Similiter, et quæ habet cap. iii. 2. *Si tamen audistis dispensationem gratiæ Dei, quæ data est mihi in vobis*, in Ephesios optime quadrant, si ita intelligantur, ut si, Græce εἶπε, non sit dubitantis, sed adfirmantis, et significet *quandoquidem*, ut cap. iv. 21. et alibi. Ejusdem cap. iii. 4. ait Paulus posse eos, ad quos scribit, *legentes intelligere prudentiam ejus in mysterio Christi*: quam non tam lectione eorum, quæ in hac epistola antecesserunt, quam ex præsentis sermonibus intellexerant Ephesii. Sed nihil nos cogit eo confugere. Nam revera poterat hoc intelligi, vel ex iis quæ superioribus capitibus leguntur. Alia argumenta, leviora multo, et omnium Christianorum consensui opposita, non adtingam. Quare an ad Ephesios scripta sit hæc epistola, nihil est cur dubitemus. Cleric. H. E. Ann. 62. num. viii.

So that, says he, there is no reason, why we should doubt, whether this epistle was written to the Ephesians.

The other writer is Whitby, in his preface to this epistle. A part of which I cheerfully transcribe here. ‘ That this
‘ epistle to the Ephesians was indeed written by St. Paul,
‘ and directed to them, and not to any other church, we
‘ cannot doubt, if we believe either the epistle, or Paul
‘ himself. For, first, it begins thus, *Paul an apostle of Jesus
Christ to the saints which are at Ephesus.* And in this reading
‘ all the versions, and all the manuscripts agree. Secondly,
‘ in the close of the epistle he speaks thus to them, *That you
‘ may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother,
‘ and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known unto you all
‘ things; whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose.—*
‘ Ch. vi. 21, 22. And in the second epistle to Timothy,
‘ he says, *Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus,* 2 Tim. iv. 12.
‘ Moreover, thirdly, all antiquity agrees, that this epistle
‘ was written by Paul to the Ephesians.’ And what follows.

Those arguments appear to me a sufficient defence of the present reading. Nevertheless the other opinion, contrary to Le Clerc’s expectation, has of late much prevailed: as appears from the number of the patrons of it above named. And as the arguments of those two learned men, whose writings are well known, have not been judged satisfactory; there can be little reason to expect, that any thing said by me should be of much weight. And indeed, it has sometimes happened, that certain opinions have had a run, and it has been in vain to oppose them: though afterwards they have fallen of themselves, being unsupported by any good evidence.

However, as a fair occasion offers, I shall enlarge upon the arguments just mentioned, in favour of the present reading in our Bibles. After which I will particularly consider the objections brought against it.

1. The present reading at the beginning of this epistle, *to the saints which are at Ephesus. and to the faithful in Christ Jesus,* is the reading of all Greek manuscripts, and of all ancient versions, the Latin, Syriac, Persian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and all others. It is altogether inconceivable, how there should have been such a general concurrence in this reading, if it had not been the original inscription of the epistle.

2. It may be argued from the epistle itself, that it was written to the Ephesians:

Says the apostle here, ch. ii. 19—22. *Now therefore ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. And are built upon the foundation of the apostles, and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. In whom you also are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit.* It has been observed that ^h St. Paul frequently accommodates his style to the persons to whom he is writing. In the first epistle to Timothy, sent to him at Ephesus, he useth architect style. So particularly, ch. ii. 15. In like manner here the apostle may be well supposed to allude to the magnificent temple of Diana, on account of which the people of Ephesus much valued themselves, as appears from Acts xix. 27, 28, 34, 35.

I might, perhaps, refer likewise to ch. iii. 18. but forbear, it being an obscure text.

And that the epistle was sent, not to strangers, but to christians, with whom the apostle was well acquainted, I suppose to be certain from internal characters. But the showing that is deferred till by and by.

3. That this epistle was sent to the church at Ephesus, we are assured by the testimony of all catholic Christians in all past ages.

This we can now say with confidence, having examined the principal christian writers from the first ages to the beginning of the twelfth century. In all which space of time there appears not one, who had any doubt about it.

The testimony of some of these is especially remarkable, on account of their early age, or their learning, or some other considerations.

One of them, remarkable for his early age, is Ignatius, who was bishop of Antioch in the latter part of the first, and the beginning of the second century, and suffered martyrdom at Rome in the year 107, or, as some think, in 116. In a letter of his to the Ephesians, written at Smyrna, as he was going from Antioch to Rome, he says, ‘Ye are the companions in the mysteries of the gospel of Paul, the sanctified, the

^h See Dr. Benson upon 1 Tim. iii. 15. *μεμαρτυρημεν, αξιομακαριστος εν παση επισολη μνημονευει υμων εν χριστω*

ⁱ *Παυλος συμμυσται τε αγιασμεν, τε ισοχ.* Ignat. ep. ad Eph. cap. xii.

‘ martyr, [or highly commended] deservedly most happy,
 ‘ at whose feet may I be found, when I shall have attained
 ‘ unto God, who throughout all his epistle makes mention
 ‘ of you in Christ Jesus.’

He plainly means the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, in which the apostle commends those Christians, and never blames them.

So I wrote in the first edition in 1734, when I collected the passages of Ignatius, bearing testimony to the books of the New Testament. Afterwards, in 1735, was published the letter above-mentioned at the end of the first edition of Dr. Benson’s History of the first planting the christian religion. Which occasioned my adding a note upon that quotation from Ignatius, at p. 154—156, of the second edition of the first volume of this work in 1748.

‘ The learned writer of that letter, instead of *μνημονεύει υμῶν*
 ‘ would read *μνημονεύω υμῶν*: meaning, that Ignatius himself
 ‘ mentioned the Ephesians in every epistle. In answer to
 ‘ which I said, that conjecture appears to be without foun-
 ‘ dation: forasmuch as in all the editions of Ignatius’s
 ‘ epistles the verb is in the third person: not only in the
 ‘ Greek of the smaller epistles, which I translate, but also in
 ‘ the old Latin version of the same small epistles. *Qui in*
 ‘ *omni epistola memoriam facit vestri in Jesu Christo.* So
 ‘ likewise in the Greek interpolated epistles, and in the
 ‘ Latin version of the same. There is therefore no various
 ‘ reading. And a new one ought not to be admitted, unless
 ‘ the sense should require it. Which it does not appear to
 ‘ do here. For Ignatius is extolling the Ephesians. And
 ‘ one part of their glory is, that the apostle throughout his
 ‘ epistle to them had treated them in an honourable manner.’

So I wrote in the note just referred to. And though that learned writer has been since pleased to publish a postscript to his letter, he has not produced any manuscript, or version of this epistle of Ignatius, where the verb is found in the first person.

However, in order to support his proposed reading he excepts to our interpreting the word *μνημονεύω*, of an honourable mention. In answer to which I did in the same note produce proof of the word’s being used sometimes for an honourable, or affectionate mention or remembrance. And the noun *μνημόσυνον*, is evidently thrice used in the New Testament for an honourable memorial, Matt. xxvi. 13. Mark

xiv. 9. Acts x. 4. Of these examples I have been reminded by a learned friend.

That learned author excepts likewise to our interpretation of *εν παση επισολη*, *throughout all his epistle*, and would translate, *who make mention of you in every epistle*: that is, as he understands it, Ignatius tells the Ephesians, to whom he is writing, that he made mention of them in every one of his epistles. In answer to which I said in the above-mentioned note, that Pearson had well defended the interpretation, for which we contend. And I alleged a part of the note of Cotelerius upon this passage of Ignatius. But by some means Valesius is printed there, instead of Cotelerius. I now transcribe that note of Cotelerius at length. *Frustra sunt, et Andabatarum more digladiantur viri literati, non videntes, εν παση επισολη esse in tota epistola, ad Ephesios nimirum scripta, quâ illos laudat valde, ac semper commendat, ut fuit ab Hieronymo observatum.* And I shall place here two instances of the use of the word *πας*, which appear to me altogether similar, and therefore to the purpose. One is taken from the fifth chapter of Ignatius's epistle to the Ephesians, where he says, 'If the prayer of one or two be of such force, how much more that of the bishop, and the whole church.' *και πασης εκκλησιας.* The other is in St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, ch. ii. 21. *In whom all the building, or the whole building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple to God.* *εν ω πασα οικοδομη κ. λ.*

Indeed, Ignatius has mentioned the Ephesians in every one of his epistles, except that to Polycarp. But it is very unlikely, that this should be his meaning here. He is extolling the Ephesians, as companions of Paul in the mysteries of the gospel, and the like. To say to them presently afterwards, and in the same period, that *he made mention of them in every one of his epistles*, would have an appearance of much vanity: with which, I think, Ignatius was never charged. And at the same time it would be very flat and insipid. Moreover, it is observable, that this is not one of the last epistles, which Ignatius wrote. But, according to the order, in which they are mentioned * by Eusebius, it is the very first of his seven epistles.

There is therefore no reason, why we should hesitate to admit the sense, in which this place has been generally understood by learned men.

* Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3 cap. 36. and this work. vol. II. p. 67.

We also find this sense in some ancient writers. Jerom observes, that ^l when the apostle wrote to the Corinthians, he had occasion to blame them for fornication, for strifes and contentions: but there is no fault found by him in the Ephesians. To the like purpose Primasius in ^m the preface to his Commentary upon St. Paul's epistles, and ⁿ of his argument of the epistle to the Ephesians in particular.

So that either those ancient writers understood Ignatius, as we do. Or else they were led by the epistle itself to form the same idea of it, that we suppose him to have had.

What Ignatius means by the apostle's mentioning, or being mindful of the Ephesians throughout all his epistle to them, is happily explained by bishop Pearson; whose words ^o I shall transcribe below, as his work is not in every body's hands. Indeed this is a proper character of this epistle, as may be easily perceived. Nor did any of the ancients for that reason hesitate to allow, that it was sent to the church at Ephesus.

I hope, that I have now justified the present reading, and common interpretation of this passage of Ignatius.

The learned writer, with whom I have been arguing,

^l Corinthii, in quibus audiebatur fornicatio qualis nec inter gentes, lacte pascuntur, quia necdum poterant solidum cibum capere. Ephesii autem, in quibus nullum crimen arguitur, ab ipso Domino cœlesti vescuntur pane, et sacramentum quod a seculis absconditum fuerat agnoscunt. Ep. ad Marcell. T. II. p. 628. ed. Martian—animadvertat magnam inter Corinthios et Ephesios esse distantiam. Illis quasi parvulis atque lactentibus scribitur: in quibus erant dissensiones, et schismata, et audiebatur fornicatio qualis ne inter gentes quidem.—Ephesii vero, apud quos fecit triennium, et omnia eis Christi aperuit sacramenta, aliter erudiuntur, &c. In ep. ad Eph. cap. v. T. IV. P. i. p. 389, 390.

^m Ephesii sane nulla reprehensione, sed multa sunt laude digni, quia fidem apostolicam servaverunt. Primas. Præf. ad Comm. in S. Pauli Ep. ap. Bib. P. P. T. X. p. 144. H.

ⁿ Ephesii sunt Asiani. Hi accepto verbo veritatis perstiterunt

in fide. Hos conlaudat Apostolus, scribens eis Roma a carcere, Argum. ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 217. A.

^o —quæ scripsit S. Ignatius, S. Paulum in tota epistola, memoriam eorum facere in Jesu Christo. Hæc a martyre non otiose aut frigide, sed vere, imo signanter et vigilanter dicta sunt. Tota enim epistola ad Ephesios, scripta, ipsos Ephesios, eorumque honorem et curam maxime spectat, et summe honorificam eorum memoriam ad posteros transmittit. In aliis epistolis Apostolus eos ad quos scribit, sæpe acriter objurgat—aut parce laudat. Hic omnibus modis perpetuo se Ephesii applicat, illosque tanquam egregios Christianos tractat, evangelio salutis firmiter credentes, et Spiritu promissionis ob-signatos, concives sanctorum, et domesticos Dei. Pro iis sæpe arden-ter orat, ipsos hortatur, obtestatur, laudat, utrumque sexum sedulo instruit, suum erga eos singularem affectum ubique prodit. Pearson. Vind. Ignat. Part. 2. cap. x. sub init.

concludes

concludes his postscript in this manner. ‘Should what has been offered, not prove satisfactory, the difficulty will still remain, how to reconcile the present reading in Ignatius, with Dr. Mill’s reasons against St. Paul’s epistle being written to the Ephesians.—The most plausible solution of which seems to be that in Mr. Locke.—’ And what there follows to the end.

I think we should cheerfully accept of Mr. Locke’s, or any other reasonable solution of the difficulty, if there be any. This, so far as I am able to judge, is better than to attempt the alteration of a passage in an ancient author, without the authority of any manuscript: when there is nothing in the coherence, that necessarily requires it. And much better, than to alter a text of an epistle of the New Testament, contrary to the authority of all manuscripts, and the concurring testimony of all ancient christian writers.

Beside that passage, there are in Ignatius’s epistle to the Ephesians, many allusions and references to St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians. Which shows, that he believed that epistle to have been written to the church at Ephesus. Those allusions (though not all of them) were taken notice of by us long ^p ago. And Dr. Jortin having observed, that Ignatius in his twelfth chapter takes notice of St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians, and his martyrdom, adds, ‘And as he was writing to the same church, he often alludes to the apostle’s letter to them.’

But there is one word in the twelfth chapter of Ignatius’s epistle to the Ephesians, of which I have not yet taken sufficient notice. I mean the word *συμμεταί*. *Ye are, says he, the companions of Paul in the mysteries of the gospel: or, ye are partakers of the mysteries of the gospel with Paul.* This is said out of a regard to St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians. And it fully shows, that Ignatius thought that epistle to have been sent to the church, to which himself was then writing. For that is their distinguishing character: at least it is a character, which is more especially the character of the Christians, to whom that letter is written.

I formerly gave an account of Palladius, author of a Dialogue of the Life of Chryostom, about the year 408. In that work Palladius has an argument, in which he observes, ‘that Paul had called the Cretans liars. Tit. i. 12.

See vol. II. p. 76—78.

See the first volume of his re-

marks upon Ecclesiastical History, p. 56.

Vol. V. p. 183.

‘ the Galatians stupid, Gal. iii. 1. and the Corinthians proud, ‘ 1 Cor. v. 2. On the other hand ‘ he calls the Romans faith- ‘ ful, the Ephesians *μυσται*, initiated, to whom also he writes in ‘ a sublime manner, and the Thessalonians lovers of the bro- ‘ therhood.’

When Palladius says, that St. Paul called the Romans faithful, it cannot be doubted, that he refers to Rom i. 8. And when he says that the Thessalonians were called *lovers of the brotherhood*, he must intend 1 Thess. iv. 9. 10. When he speaks of the Ephesians as *initiated*, it may not be so easy to determine the text, particularly intended by him. But probably, it is Eph. i. 9, or that joined with others, such as ch. iii. 3, 4—6, and 9. and v. 32. ch. vi. 19. For in this epistle the word *mystery* occurs frequently.

However, hereby we are assured, that this was, especially, the character of the Christians at Ephesus. And we plainly perceive, that Ignatius supposed, that epistle to have been written to them.

Nor will my readers, possibly, blame me for prolixity, if I here allege a passage of Jerom; where he says, ‘ That ‘ still ‘ there are in the churches remainders of the same virtues, ‘ or vices, for which they were remarkable of old. The ‘ Romans are still faithful and devout, the Corinthians proud, ‘ the Galatians stupid, the Thessalonians lovers of the bro- ‘ therhood.’ In that place Jerom says nothing particularly of the Ephesians. But in his Commentary upon the epistle to them he often observes, that “ no epistle of St. Paul was fuller

ἢ — ἡ ἀναπαλιῶν πίστες, φιλαίως ἀποκαλιῶν, καὶ μυσταὶ ἐφεσίου, οἷς, καὶ ὑψηλ. τεροῦ ἐπιφελῆι, καὶ φιλαδελφῆς θεσσαλονικεῖς, μόνῃς περιεγραφεῖν τῆς ἐπαινεῖς; ἢ πάντες. Pallad. ap. Chryl. T. XIII. p. 71. E.

‘ Usque hodie eadem vel virtu- tum vestigia permanent, vel erro- rum. Romanorum laudatur fides. Ubi alibi tanto studio et frequentia ad ecclesias, et ad martyrum sepul- chra concurritur? — Non quod aliam habent Romani fidem, nisi hanc quam omnes Christi ecclesie: sed quod devotio in eis major sit, et simplicitas ad credendum. — Corinthios quoque notat, quod in-

differenter vescantur in templis, et inflati sapientia seculari, resurrectionem carnis negant. — Macedones in charitate laudantur, et hospitalitate, ac susceptione fratrum. Unde ad eos scribitur. *De charitate autem fraternitatis, non necesse habemus scribere vobis. Ipsi enim vos a Deo didicistis, ut diligatis invicem. Etenim facitis illud in omnes fratres in universa Macedonia.* In ep. ad Gal. Pr. 2. T. IV. p. 255.

‘ Satis abundeque ostendi, quod beatus Apostolus ad nullam ecclesiarum tam mystice scripserit, et abscondita seculis revelaverit sacramenta. Pr. 3. in ep. ad Eph. T. IV. p. 375.

Non

fuller of mysteries: which occasioned obscurity, and rendered it very difficult to be explained. And in a place already cited, he says of the Ephesians, that they had^x received the mystery hid from ages: that is, they were initiated, or were partakers of the mysteries of the gospel with Paul. And to the like purpose in several passages, just transcribed at the bottom of the page.

By all which, I think, it must appear very evident, that Ignatius supposed St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians to have been really written to them. And his judgment is decisive: for he could not be mistaken. So says the writer of the letter above-mentioned; whose words are these: 'I have been the longer,' says he, 'upon these passages of Ignatius, by reason of the weight his authority might justly claim in this case, was it certain, that he had spoken of this epistle of Paul, as written by him to the Ephesians. For if this epistle was written in the ninth year of Nero, and that of Ignatius in the tenth of Trajan, as bishop Pearson placeth them, the distance of Time will be but forty-five years. So that Ignatius being then far advanced in age, could not well be ignorant of the truth of this matter. And besides, Onesimus was bishop of Ephesus at the time Ignatius wrote his epistle to that church, is mentioned in it, and had lately made Ignatius a visit. So that had there been any doubt concerning this affair, he could easily have set him right.'

It might have been added, that ^y Ignatius, at the time of his writing his epistle to the Ephesians, had with him Burrhus, a deacon of the church at Ephesus, and Crocus, Euphus, and Fronto, all members of the church at Ephesus, who were then with him at Smyrna. Who likewise, as may be supposed, afterwards carried his letter to Ephesus.

Non vobis molestum fit, si diu in obscurioribus immoremur. Causati enim in principio sumus, inter omnes Pauli epistolas, hanc vel maxime, et verbis et sensibus involutam. Comm. in ep. ad Eph. Ib. p. 359.

Decenter quoque Ephesii, qui ad scientiæ summam conscenderant, scribitur, quod sint lux in Domino. In cap. v. p. 383.

Ephesii vero, apud quos fecit triennium, et omnia eis Christi

aperuit sacramenta, aliter eruduntur. Ib. p. 390.

Hæc idcirco universa replicuimus, ut ostenderemus, quare Apostolus in hac vel potissimum epistola obscuros sensus, et ignota seculis sacramenta congesserit. Pr. i. in ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 322:

^x Ephesii—sacramentum quod a seculis absconditum fuerat agnoscunt. Vid. supr. p. 422. not. (1).

^y Vid. ep. ad Eph. cap. ii.

If

If therefore by what has been said it appears evident, that Ignatius has spoken of this epistle of Paul, as written to the Ephesians (as I think he does) we have made out what must be reckoned of great weight in this matter.

However, it is not Ignatius's testimony only that is decisive. There are many other ancient writers, whose testimony also is satisfactory and decisive.

For by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, writers of the second and third centuries, this epistle is expressly quoted as written by Paul to the Ephesians. They so quote this epistle, without hesitation, as freely and plainly as they do the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, the Corinthians, or any other of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

It is quoted in the like manner by all writers in general of every age, Latins, Greeks and Syrians. I would particularly observe, that it is so quoted by Jerom, who also wrote a commentary upon this epistle, and had seen many ancient manuscripts and editions of the New Testament: who never expresseth any doubt, whether this epistle was written to the Ephesians, nor takes notice of any various reading in the inscription of it. For which I refer to his chapter, in the tenth volume of this work. This epistle is quoted in the like manner by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, and all the writers of every age, and of different and remote countries.

We may also observe here, that in the fifth century there were some Christians who had a notion, that this epistle was written to the Ephesians before the apostle had seen them. It is likely that this notion was founded upon Eph. i. 15. Nevertheless, they still thought the epistle to have been written to the Ephesians; which is a proof, that they knew nothing to the contrary, and had never heard of any various reading in the inscription of this epistle. Among these is Euthalius, who² in his prologue to St. Paul's epistles considers the two epistles to the Romans and Ephesians as epistles written to Christians, whom the apostle knew by report only. This is remarkable. It shows, that he had no various reading in this place. If he had, he

² Περὶ τῆς ἡ πρὸς ἐφεσίους κεῖται, παραπλησίως, τῆ πρὸς ῥωμαίους ἀμφιπύκνως ἀνθρώπων, καὶ παραμένοντάς, ἢς τερτοῖς δὲ ἐκ ἀκοῆς γινώσκουσιν. Euthal. ἐν τῇ προορῶφῃ τὸ μυστήριον ἐπιτίθεται, ap. Zacagn. p. 524.

would have taken notice of it. Euthalius was a learned man. He put out an accurate edition of the catholic epistles, and of St. Paul's epistles, with a general prologue to them. And he had consulted, beside others, the manuscripts in the library at Cæsarea in Palestine. Nevertheless he had not met with any various reading.

And in the argument of the epistle to the Ephesians, now placed in the edition of Euthalius, it is said, that ^b the epistle to the Ephesians was sent by Paul from Rome to them, when he had not yet seen them, and had only heard of them. I do not ascribe this argument to Euthalius. The reasons were assigned ^c formerly. Euthalius wrote a prologue to St. Paul's epistles. But it does not appear that he wrote arguments to each of his epistles severally. The same thing is also said of the epistle to the Ephesians in the Synopsis ^d of Scripture ascribed to Athanasius. These I reckon one and the same, but different from Euthalius.

And I may here take notice of a small inaccuracy in Mr. Wetstein, who ^e in his notes upon the beginning of the epistle to the Ephesians, quotes both the prologue to St. Paul's epistles, and the argument of the epistle to the Ephesians in particular, as Euthalius's: though in his Prolegomena, in his account of what Euthalius had done, he had observed, and rightly, that ^f those arguments were not composed by Euthalius, but by another.

I therefore here suppose two, that is, Euthalius, and another, who wrote the arguments of St. Paul's epistles severally; who may be the same that composed the synopsis ascribed to Athanasius.

However, beside these there may have been about this time some others of the same opinion. For Theodoret in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians observes, there ^g were some, who said, that Paul wrote to the Ephesians, before he had seen them. But he shows it to be a false and absurd

^a See vol. V. p. 241, and vol. III. p. 347.

^b ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΛΛΕΙ ΑΠΟ ΡΩΜΗΣ, ΕΠΩ ΜΕΝ ΕΩΡΑΚΩΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ, ΑΚΗΣΑΣ ΔΕ ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ. Arg. ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 633.

^c See vol. V. p. 242, 243.

^d ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΛΛΕΙ ΑΠΟ ΡΩΜΗΣ, ΕΠΩ ΜΕΝ ΑΥΤΗΣ ΕΩΡΑΚΩΣ, ΑΚΗΣΑΣ ΔΕ ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ.

Ap. Athan. T. II. p. 194. ed. Bened.

^e Vid. N. T. vol. II. p. 238.

^f Vid. ejusd. Prolegom. vol. I. p. 75.

^g — τον δε θειοτατον Παυλον μηδεπω της εφεσις τε θεαμενον, την δε επισολην προς αυτες γεγραφεναι. Theod. T. III. p. 290.

opinion,

opinion, and concludes, saying: 'It^h is manifest therefore, that the apostle had preached the gospel to them, before he wrote to them.'

This affords a good argument, that there was not in the fifth century, nor before, any notice, or apprehension of a various reading in the inscription of this epistle. For if there had, none would have admitted so absurd a supposition, that Paul wrote from Rome an epistle to the Ephesians, before he had seen them.

Another thing deserving notice here is, that before the end of the fourth century there was forged an epistle to the Laodiceans, ascribed to Paul. Forⁱ it is expressly mentioned by Jerom in his book of Illustrious Men, written about 392. Which must induce us to think, that the epistle to the Ephesians was never called the epistle to the Laodiceans. For then there could have been no pretence for forging another with that title, to verify a false interpretation of Col. iv. 16.

I should now proceed to another argument. But I must look back, to secure this, taken from the testimony of ancient christian writers. For it has been argued from a passage of St. Basil, in his books against Eunomius, that he had seen some ancient manuscripts of this epistle, in which these words, *at Ephesus*, were wanting. That passage, as cited formerly, is thus: 'And Paul writing to the Ephesians, as truly united to him *who is*, through knowledge, called them in a peculiar sense *such who are*, saying, *to the saints who are, and [or even] the faithful in Christ Jesus.* For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in ancient copies.' This point having been already examined by us largely, I refer to what was then said.^k It was then argued by us, that St. Basil does not here intimate, that the word, or words, *at Ephesus*, were wanting in any copies seen by him. And I would now observe farther, that our account of this passage is confirmed by the works of other authors, both before and after Basil. There had lived many learned christian writers before his time. There were many learned Christians cotemporary with him: as his own brother, Gregory Nyssen, Gregory Nazian-

^h Δεδεικται αρα σαφας, ως προκηρυξας αυτοις το ευαγγελιον οτως γεγραψε την επισολην. Ib. p. 292.

ⁱ Legunt quidam et ad Laodi-

censes. Sed ab omnibus exploditur. De V. I. Cap. v.

^k See vol. IV. p. 401—404.

zen, Amphilochius, and others: and also soon after him, as Theodoret, and Euthalius: not now to mention Jerom, or other learned Latin authors. None of whom have said that the words, *at Ephesus*, were wanting in any copies, which they had seen. The various reading therefore, intended by Basil, must have been somewhat less, a small matter, not any thing like *εἰς ἐφεσὺν*, *at Ephesus*. For so remarkable a reading could not have been passed by in silence, unobserved by all others. And every one may see, that in this very place, as well as elsewhere, Basil cites this epistle, as written by Paul to the Ephesians. And they are the Christians, of whom Paul had said, that through knowledge they were united to him *who is*.

In the place to which I referred just now, I gave an account of a Dissertation of Lenfant, vindicating the common reading; which was approved by Wolfius, and others. However, Mr. Kuster was not satisfied. And in the preface to his edition of Mill's new Testament, he says, 'That the argument, or interpretation of Basil, depends upon a supposition, that the words, *at Ephesus*, were wanting in the inscription of this epistle. Otherwise the Christians, to whom that epistle is sent, could not have been reckoned more especially united to him *who is*, or called *such who are*, rather than the Romans, or Philippians, or any other Christians to whom Paul wrote.'

To which I answer: that is saying all, and the only thing, that can be said, in behalf of the supposition, that the words, *at Ephesus*, were wanting in some copies, which Basil had seen. But though this may seem specious and plausible, it is not conclusive. We have perceived from Palladius, and Jerom lately alleged, that there were some, who appropriated certain characters to divers churches. The Romans were especially called faithful, the Ephesians initiated, and knowing, and the Thessalonians lovers of the brotherhood.

But it cannot be thence concluded, that other Christians were not entitled to the same characters: or that the same things might not be also said of them. As may appear to any one, who does but look into St. Paul's epistles: in which the faith of other churches is spoken of, beside that

¹ Nec magis *ἰδιαζοντάς*; Apostolus etc. ad quos scribens eadem plane Ephesios, ex sensu Basilii, vocaverit loquendi formula utitur. Kuster. *τάς*; quam Romanos, Philippenses,

of the Romans. And others, beside the Thessalonians, are supposed to have been lovers of the saints, or the brotherhood. Says the apostle, 1 Thess. i. 3. *Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love.* 2 Thess. i. 4. *So that we ourselves glory in you, in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your persecutions.* 2 Cor. viii. 7. *As ye abound in every thing in faith.*—Eph. i. 1. *To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.* Ver. 15. *Wherefore—after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints.* Col. i. 2. *To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse.* Philem. ver. 5. *Hearing of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.* And others, beside the Ephesians, were partakers of the mysteries of the gospel with the apostle. See Rom. xi. 25. 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7. Col. i. 25—27. ii. 2. iv. 3.

That is the very observation of Palladius in the place above cited: that when the apostle blames some for certain vices, and commends others for certain virtues, he by no means intends to intimate, that those vices, or those virtues, were peculiar to the persons blamed, or commended by him.

The Romans were called by some in ancient times in an especial manner faithful, the Ephesians initiated, and the Thessalonians, or Macedonians, lovers of the brotherhood. But they were not so exclusive of others. For all the churches or Christians, to whom Paul wrote, were faithful, and initiated, or partakers with him in the mysteries of the gospel, and lovers of the saints, or brotherhood: though they might be reasonably exhorted to abound therein more and more. As are the Thessalonians themselves, 1 epist. ch. iv. 10. See also ch. iii. 12. And indeed, if such properties did not belong to them, they could not have been Christians. Nevertheless, when these several characters had been applied to some, particularly, it is likely, that few would scruple to follow the same way of speaking, if there was occasion.

So in the present case, that observation in Basil having been applied to the Ephesians by some men of no great judgment, it was left there, and not applied to any others. Indeed it is an impertinent observation, as Jerom^m calls it. And, as it seems, was made use of by a few only. But it

^m See vol. IV. p. 402, 403. note (P).

might have been as properly said of other Christians, as of the Ephesians.

One thing more I add here. They who are for leaving out the words, *at Ephesus*, must read the place in this manner, *to such as are saints, and faithful in Christ Jesus*. Then this should be a general epistle, not directed to any one place, but to good Christians every where. But that it is not a general epistle, is manifest from Eph. vi. 21, 22. without insisting now on any other places. *But that ye may also know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known unto you all things; whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.* This plainly shows, that the epistle had not a general inscription, *to saints and faithful men*, but was inscribed to the saints of some place. And who should they be, but the saints and faithful at Ephesus: to whom it is inscribed in all Greek manuscripts, and in all versions, and in all catalogues of the books of the New Testament, whether composed by councils or others?

4. Once more. St. Paul himself says, 2 Tim. iv. 12. *And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus*, very probably referring to this epistle, asⁿ was shown some while ago. This is what Whitby intends at the beginning of his preface to this epistle before transcribed. ‘That this epistle to the Ephesians was indeed written by St. Paul, and directed to them, and not to any other church, we cannot doubt, if we believe either the epistle, or St. Paul himself.’ By the testimony of the epistle he means the inscription at the beginning, where is *at Ephesus*, in all manuscripts and versions. By the testimony of St. Paul himself he means what is said, 2 Tim. iv. 12. quoted above.

Having finished the argument in favour of the genuineness of the common inscription of this epistle, which to me appears sufficient and satisfactory: I now propose to consider objections, which have been raised by Mill, and others.

1. Obj. ‘It is said, that there are in this epistle divers expressions, not suited to the Christians at Ephesus, where Paul had been twice, and spent there almost three years. See Acts xviii. 19—21. xix. and xx. 1. and 17—38.’

ⁿ See before, p. 334, 335.

Says Mr. Peirce in the place before referred to, representing Mill's argument, 'He has proved it highly improbable, that the epistle was at first written to the Ephesians. St. Paul had resided among them, and *kept back nothing that was profitable unto them.*—How then could he write to them, as though he had never seen, or been among them, but only had heard of them? Eph. i. 5. *Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love to all the saints.* Again, is it likely, he would refer those, to whom he had *declared all the counsel of God*, so long together, to a bare report of himself? Eph. iii. 2. *If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward.* Or would he suppose, that they who had heard him preach a thousand times would need to *understand his knowledge in the mystery of Christ*, from what he said in a few verses, or even the whole of that short epistle? Eph. iii. 4.'

To the like purpose another learned author, whom likewise I shall transcribe here, that this objection may appear in all its strength, 'He intimateth, that he had only heard of their faith in Christ, and of their love to all Christians, ch. i. 15.—Again, he not only mentioneth his *hearing of their faith in Christ*, but ch. iii. 1, 2. he speaks, as if he was dubious, whether they had heard of the extraordinary revelations, which he had received from heaven.—And verses 3, 4. he intimateth, that, if they had never heard of these things before, they might understand them from the brief hints, which he had given them in this epistle. Is this like St. Paul's style to the churches of his own planting?—Or could a few lines, or even a larger epistle than this, have given them so clear a knowledge of St. Paul's illumination, as their hearing him a thousand times? For had he not been among them for the space of three years, warning every one of them night and day with tears?'

But this difficulty, if I mistake not, will disappear upon farther consideration, and a fuller examination of the matter.

First. It appears from the epistle itself, that the Christians, to whom it is sent, were not unknown to Paul, nor they to him; but they were well acquainted with each other.

° Dr. Benson's history of the first planting the christian religion, vol. II. p. 272. first edit. p. 292. second edit.

That the apostle was acquainted with these Christians, must, I think, be evident to all, who read without prejudice the first fourteen verses of the first chapter of this epistle. I insist only upon ver. 13. *In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the holy spirit of promise.* How could the apostle write thus to any, but to such, whose conversion to Christianity he was well acquainted with, and that upon their believing they had received gifts of the spirit? How could any man write thus to people, whom he had but lately heard of?

There are also many other passages of this epistle, which show the apostle's knowledge of the state of these Christians, both before, and after their conversion. Some of which I must select here.

Ch. ii. 1, 2. *And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world.*—and throughout that chapter to the end.

Then at ch. iii. 13. *Wherefore I desire, that ye faint not at my tribulation for you, which is your glory.* That must be said to Christians, of whose tender affection for him he was very sensible: recollecting, it is likely, what had happened at Miletus, as related Acts xx. 36—38. And indeed it is throughout an affectionate, as well as instructive and useful epistle.

Ch. iv. 20. *But ye have not so learned Christ.* Ver. 21. *If so be, or * forasmuch as ye have heard him, and have been taught the truth as it is in Jesus.* This the apostle knew very well.

I cannot forbear to recite this place more largely, from ver. 20 to 24. *But ye have not so learned Christ, forasmuch as ye have heard him, and have been instructed in him, as the truth is in Jesus, to * put off, with respect to the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts, and to be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and to put on the new man,*

* *Si tamen illud audistis:] Si tamen, Grace, siquidem. Non enim dubitans hoc dicit Apostolus, sed magis eam confirmans, uti post Chrysostomum annotat Theophylactus. Nam et alias interdum vim confirmandi*

*habet conjunctio, si, ut secundæ ad Thessalon. primo vers. 6. Est. ad Eph. iv. 21. * See Dr. Doddridge upon the place, whose version, in the main, I have here adopted.*

which is created according to God in righteousness and true holiness. Certainly these are St. Paul's own converts and disciples. The case of these people resembles that of the Galatians. Ch. iii. 1. *Before whose eyes Jesus Christ had been evidently set forth crucified among them.* But to these Christians, at Ephesus, the apostle expresseth himself with more mildness, as was fit, than to the Galatians.

Then ver. 30. *And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption: or with which ye were sealed in the day of redemption.* These gentile Christians had received the spirit. And from whom, I pray, if not from St. Paul? And that they had a variety of spiritual gifts, is manifest from ch. v. 18—20.

Ch. v. 8. *For ye were sometime darkness: but now are ye light in the Lord. Walk as children of the light.* Which shows, that the apostle knew the state of these Christians before and after their conversion.

And that St. Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him, appears to me very evident from ch. vi. 21, 22.

Secondly, at ch. i. 15, are words, upon which an objection has been formed, as we have seen. *Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints:* that is, according to Mr. Locke's paraphrase: 'Wherefore I also here in my confinement having heard of the continuance of your faith in Christ Jesus, and your love to all the saints.' And in his preface to this epistle Mr. Locke has these expressions. 'Wherefore when he heard that the Ephesians stood firm in the faith, whereby he means their confidence of their title to the privileges and benefits of the gospel, without submission to the law, he thanks God for them.'

Whitby's paraphrase of this verse is to this purpose. 'Wherefore I also having heard of your steadfast faith in the Lord Jesus, and your encreasing love to all the saints: that is, that the faith and love wrought in you continues steadfast, and aboundeth.'

To the like purpose also^p Grotius whose words I have placed below.

Theodoret's note upon ver. 15. and 16. is to this purpose: 'Hence some have supposed, that the apostle wrote this

^p Loquitur autem Paulus de profectu evangelii apud Ephesios, ex quo ipse ab illis discesserat. Grot. in Eph. i. 14.

‘ epistle to the Ephesians, when he had not yet seen them. But
 ‘ they should consider, that writing to the Corinthians con-
 ‘ cerning whom he had received some disagreeable information,
 ‘ he says, *It has been related to me of you, my brethren, by them*
 ‘ *which are of the household of Chloe, that there are contentions*
 ‘ *among you,* 1 Cor. i. 11. As therefore when he had received
 ‘ information of some things disagreeable, he wrote with grief
 ‘ of mind: so when he had received an account of things
 ‘ agreeable concerning these Ephesians, he bestows commen-
 ‘ dation. He praiseth them, both for their piety and for their
 ‘ liberality to the saints; whereupon he also gives thanks to
 ‘ God, the author of all good things.’

So that this text was no difficulty at all with Theodoret. However, it may be expedient, that I should enlarge somewhat farther.

I observe, then, that St. Paul writes in the same manner to Philemon, his own convert, whose faith therefore he certainly knew. Philem. ver. 4, 5. *I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers: bearing of thy love, and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.* That Philemon had been converted to the faith of the gospel by Paul, I suppose to be evident from ver. 19. *Albeit I do not say unto thee, how thou owest to me thy ownself besides.* So that text has been generally understood: and how it can be interpreted otherwise, I do not conceive.

Whitby’s paraphrase is: ‘ *Albeit I do not say unto thee, how thou owest to me, by whom thou wast converted, even thy ownself, or the well-being of thy soul besides.*’

Beaufobre and Lenfant in their preface to the epistle to Philemon express themselves in this manner. ‘ Philemon was a considerable person at Colosse, a city of Phrygia. St. Paul had converted him, either at Ephesus, or some other city of Asia, when he preached the gospel in that country; or else at Colosse itself, in one of the journies which he had made in Phrygia.’

There are some other things to be observed here concerning this person. For in the first verse of that epistle Paul calls Philemon beloved, and his fellow-labourer; which, if I am not mistaken, indicate personal acquaintance, and imply their having laboured together in the service of the gospel at Colosse,

‘ Ceterum, si ad jus meum re- tianus effectus es, teipsum mihi
 ‘ dam, propter sermonem Christi, debes. Hieron. in. ep. ad Philem.
 ‘ quem tibi evangelizavi, et Chris- T. IV. p. 452. ,

or Ephesus, or in some other place. And yet St. Paul writing to Philemon, speaks of his *having heard of his faith and love.*

Still farther, it appears to me highly probable, that Onesimus, in whose behalf this epistle was written, knew Paul, before he saw him at Rome. He either had seen Paul at his master's house at Colosse, or else at Ephesus, when attending upon his master there. Paul was a prisoner at Rome, and could not go abroad. *He dwelt in his own hired house, with a soldier that kept him,* Acts xxviii. 16. and 30. It is likely, therefore, that Onesimus came first to Paul. Being in straits, and knowing Paul's benevolent temper, and what civilities he had received from his master, Philemon, he might hope for some relief from him. Or, possibly, hearing, that Paul was at Rome, and recollecting the discourses, which he had heard him make, when attending on Philemon, he was touched with remorse for the faults, which he had been guilty of, and came to Paul for farther instruction in the things of religion, and for advice and comfort. He might also encourage himself with hopes of Paul's interceding in his behalf, and obtaining a reconciliation with his master.

Says Beaufobre in his preface to the epistle to Philemon: 'It can hardly be doubted, that the repentance of his fault obliged Onesimus to come to Paul, whom he knew to be his master's friend. For otherwise, he might have remained unknown at Rome.'

Philemon then was well known to Paul. Nevertheless, at the beginning of his epistle to him, he thanks God, *having heard of his love and faith.* The meaning is, he had received information of the continuance of his faith, and of its bearing good fruit. If Paul could write thus to Philemon, his convert, friend, and fellow-labourer, he might write in a like manner to other Christians, to whom he was no stranger.

So likewise to the Colossians ch. i. 3, 4. *We give thanks to God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you: since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love, which ye have to all the saints:* that is, having heard of the continuance of your faith, and of the good fruits of it. This he had been assured of by Epaphras, who had come to the apostle at Rome. It is not to be supposed, that Paul now first heard of the faith of the Colossians, or the Laodiceans. I think, that the Colossians were Paul's own converts, and that the church there had been planted by him. But supposing that to be uncertain, I imagine, it cannot be questioned, that

the

the church there had been planted a good while ago by some of the apostle's assistants, and fellow-labourers. Consequently, the apostle did not now first know, and hear of the faith and love of the Christians at Colosse. He must have known it before he came to Rome, and before he was apprehended at Jerusalem. But he had lately received good tidings concerning their steadiness and perseverance from some, who had come from them to him at Rome.

St. Paul, since his coming to Rome, had received from Tychicus an account of the state of things at Ephesus, which upon the whole was very pleasing. He had received from Epaphras a like account of the state of things at Colosse, and particularly a good account of the conduct of Philemon. For all which he praiseth God in his epistles to them. Indeed it could not but be matter of much joy to the apostle, to hear of the continued faith of Christians in several places, notwithstanding the many difficulties attending the profession of Christianity, and notwithstanding the discouragement, which his own long captivity might have occasioned in the minds of many.

In these three epistles, to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon, are the same expressions, near the beginning, *having heard of your faith and love*. And they are all to be understood in a like manner. If these words were to be understood in the epistle to the Ephesians of *now first hearing*: it might be as well argued, that the epistle could not be written to the Laodiceans. For, as before intimated, it may be reckoned certain, that before Paul came to Rome he knew of the faith of the church at Laodicea.

Thirdly, in the next place I consider that part of the objection, which is raised from Eph. iii. 2, 3, 4. *If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote before in a few words: whereby ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ.*

To which part of the objection I answer, that *if ye have heard of the dispensation*, may be rendered, *since, or forasmuch as ye have heard*, and what follows. So Theophylact, approved by Whitby upon the place.

I observe farther. These things are as properly said to the Ephesians, as to any other Christians in that country, or thereabout. They were all acquainted, and much alike acquainted with them. If such expressions might be used in

an epistle to the Colossians, or the Laodiceans, they might be used also in an epistle to the Ephesians. No gentile Christians, whether converted immediately by Paul himself, or by some of his assistants or fellow-labourers, could be ignorant of it. Nor could Paul doubt whether they knew it. Nevertheless he might judge it proper to hint these things, the more to confirm the instructions, and exhortations which he sent them, and to secure their steadiness in the faith and profession of the pure gospel of Christ, as they had been taught. And does he not speak more largely, and more distinctly of this matter, in his epistle to the Galatians, whom none ever denied to be the apostle's converts? Gal. i. 11—20. *But I certify you, brethren, γνωρίζω δε υμῶν, that the gospel, which was preached of me, is not after men.—For ye have heard of my conversation in time past—But it pleased God—to reveal his son in me—Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.* These things the Galatians were not ignorant of. But in his epistle he reminds them of them, and in a very solemn manner.

The writers, from whom this objection was taken, speak of the Ephesians having heard the apostle 'preach a thousand times,' and ask: 'Could the apostle suppose, that they who had heard him preach a thousand times, could need to understand his knowledge of the mystery of Christ, from what he said in a few verses, or even from the whole of this short epistle?' But those expressions appear to me very strong, and even unjustifiable: though they are warranted by Mill, whom those learned men follow.

He and they seem to conceive of the Christians at Ephesus, as a small society, consisting perhaps of two or three hundred people. And they speak, as if they supposed that church to have been formed and planted before the apostle came thither, or very soon after his arrival: and that they had all heard him preach once at least every day of the three years that he resided in that city. How else could they think, that the Christians at Ephesus had heard Paul preach a thousand times? He says indeed to their elders at Miletus, Acts xx. 31. *that for the space of three years he had not ceased to warn every one night and day with tears.* Certainly, the apostle was very diligent in making converts, and in confirming the believers

^r Quomodo convenit hoc civibus eantem audierant Apostolum? Mill. Ephesinis, qui sexcenties prædi- Prol. num. 72.

there. But conversions were made gradually, not all at once, as is evident from the account, which we have of Paul's preaching at Ephesus, in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts; where also St. Luke observes, at ver. 10. *that all they which dwelt in Asia, heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.* This may lead us to think that Paul had many converts in several parts of Asia. Some of these may have seen, and heard the apostle at Ephesus once only, or however not often. To all these the epistle to the Ephesians was sent. The inscription *to the saints and faithful at Ephesus*, the chief city, would comprehend all the believers in the country. And some converts may have been made since the apostle was there. However, though it should be allowed, that most of these Christians had heard the apostle often, the reading of this epistle might be of great use to them. For it is an excellent epistle, as all must allow, and not inferior to the most admired of St. Paul's writings.

I have now considered the first, and, as I suppose, the principal objection.

2. Obj. It is said, 'that in all St. Paul's epistles, written to particular churches, there is some peculiar case mentioned, respecting each church, that seems to be one reason at least for writing to them: which is also observed in his epistle to the Colossians, whom he there cautions against the worship of angels.'

I answer. That is a just observation. And the same may be found in Jerom's preface to his Commentary upon this epistle to the Ephesians: where he says, as 'the blessed John in the Revelation, writing to the seven churches, either re-proves the faults, or commends the virtues of each: so likewise, he says, does the apostle Paul in his epistles. And he supposeth this epistle to have been written to the Christians at Ephesus, and to be suited to their case.

But we are not to expect, that even an apostle should censure, and find fault where there is little or no occasion for it. It becomes him to own the good temper and conduct of any

Necessè est enim, ut juxta diversitates locorum, et temporum, et hominum, quibus scriptæ sunt, diversas et causas, et argumenta, et origines habeant. Et quomodo beatus Joannes in Apocalypsi sua ad septem scribens ecclesias, in unamque earum specialia vel vitia

reprehendit, vel virtutes probat: ita et sanctus Apostolus Paulus per singulas ecclesias vulneribus medetur illatis, nec ad instar imperiti Medici uno collyrio omnium oculos vult curare. Pr. i. in ep. ad Eph. T. IV. p. 320.

church that deserves it. And what church could be so likely to deserve mild treatment, as the church at Ephesus, which had had so much of the apostle's presence, and of his favourite disciple Timothy, upon whom he has bestowed so great commendations? 1 Cor. iv. 17. xvi. 10. Philip. ii. 19—22. and who undoubtedly would be faithful and diligent, where he was sent occasionally only, or where he was stationed for a while. This was the case here. I suppose that Timothy was left at Ephesus, when Paul went up to Jerusalem. There he continued till after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and after the writing of this epistle to the Ephesians, of which we are now speaking. Moreover, as is well known, when Paul was going up to Jerusalem, he delivered, at Miletus, a most pathetic charge to the elders of that church, and to Timothy with them, as I suppose. See Acts xx. 17—38. particularly 28—31. which certainly must have excited all to faithfulness and zeal in the performance of their duty. Indeed he says, *I know, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.* There would arise men, that would endeavour to devour, and lay waste the church of Ephesus. Nevertheless, I think these earnest warnings of the apostle must have been of great use to defeat the designs of such evil men: so that they should not be able to do much mischief there, at least for some while.

And says the apostle ver. 31. *Watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one of you night and day with tears.* This the apostle does again very suitably in this epistle, in divers places, which cannot be overlooked, nor passed by us here. So Eph. iv. 1. *I therefore the prisoner of the Lord beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the vocation, wherewith ye are called,*—ver. 17. *This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other gentiles,* and what follows. So also ch. v. 1.—And vi. 12—17. These warnings have, probably, a respect to temptations, which the Ephesians might meet with from their heathen and idolatrous neighbours, and from deceitful and artful men among Christians. To such things as these Jerom supposed Paul to have an eye in this † epistle.

And

† Scribebat ad Ephesios Dianam colentes. — Scribebat autem ad metropolim Asiæ civitatem, in qua ita idololatria — et artium magi-

caram præstigiæ viguerant. — Hæc idcirco universa replicavimus, ut ostenderemus, quare Apostolus in hac vel potissimum epistola obscuros

And these written warnings, as well as others, seem to have had a good effect. The church of Ephesus appears to have behaved commendably for a good while. This may be collected from Rev. ii. 1—6. And Ignatius at the beginning of his epistle to them says ch. vi. ‘And indeed Onesimus
‘himself does greatly commend your good order in God: that
‘you all live according to truth, and that no heresy dwells
‘among you.’ And ch. ix. ‘I have heard of some, who have
‘passed by you, having perverse doctrine: whom you did not
‘suffer to sow among you.’ And to the like purpose in other places of that epistle.

3. Obj. It is said, ‘that Timothy’s name is not mentioned
‘in the introduction to this epistle: though it is found in the
‘beginning of the epistle to the Colossians, and that to
‘Philemon. Hence it is argued, that Timothy was unknown
‘to all, or most of the church, to whom this epistle was
‘written. Consequently it was not sent to the church of
‘Ephesus, where Timothy was well known.’

In answer to which I would say, first, that I can see no reason, why St. Paul should scruple to put Timothy’s name at the beginning of an epistle, written to Christians, with whom Timothy was not personally acquainted. Secondly. There can be no reason to doubt, that Timothy was as well known to the Christians at Laodicea, as at Colosse. Thirdly. Therefore there must have been some other reason for omitting the name of Timothy at the beginning of this epistle. Fourthly, that reason presently offers, and probably was this, that at writing this epistle Timothy was not with the apostle at Rome. I think, Timothy was now at Ephesus. How then could his name be placed at the beginning of an epistle written to the Ephesians from Rome?

4. Obj. ‘At Philippi the church was settled with fixed
‘officers, before the apostle wrote. And therefore he directs
‘his epistle not only to the Christians in general there, but to
‘the bishops and deacons. But there is no such thing here:
‘though the church of Ephesus had evidently such officers,
‘before the writing of this epistle.’ See Acts xx. 17.

To which I answer, that there must have been fixed officers in many churches, beside that at Philippi. Says St. Luke in

securos sensus, et ignota seculis sacramenta congesserit: et de sanctarum contrariarumque virtutum docuerit potestate: qui sint dæmones, quid valeant. — De quibus ait: *Non est*

nobis pugna adversum carnem et sanguinem, sed adversum principatus et potestates. — Hieron. ubi supr. p. 322.

his

his account of the perègrination of Paul and Barnabas in several places, Acts xiv. 21—23. *they returned again to Lystra, and Iconium, and Antioch, (in Pisidia) confirming the souls of the disciples.—And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had believed.* Says Beza upon this text: ‘In ^u every church they ordained elders, that is, pastors and deacons, and other officers.’ From what is said here Luke leads us to conclude, what was done elsewhere. It was not needful to mention such things every where. But very probably there were church-officers fixed in all the churches in no long time after they were planted, and particularly in Greece and Macedonia. From St. Paul’s epistle we know, that there were bishops and deacons at Philippi, though not mentioned by St. Luke in his history of the apostle’s preaching there. Acts xvi. 12—40. Beza concludes from 1 Thess. v. 27, that ^b there were fixed officers in the church at Thessalonica. And it is very manifest from ver. 12 and 13 of that chapter: *And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you: and to esteem them very highly in love, for their works’ sake.* St. Paul says to Titus, ch. i. 5. *For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed thee.* Whenever Paul was in Crete, it is reasonable to think, that he made there but a short stay. Nevertheless before he left that island, he had given orders to Titus, to ordain *elders in every city.* And not long after coming thence he wrote to him an epistle, with particular directions for that purpose. Before Paul left Ephesus, it is likely, that he had ordained several elders in that city, and in the district of Asia. And yet he afterwards wrote to Timothy, giving him directions concerning the qualifications of such persons, that he might make a farther supply, where it was wanting. Which must induce us to think, that the apostle was not willing, that any churches should be destitute of fit guides and instructors for any long time after they had been

^u *Per singulas ecclesias, κατ ἐκκλησιαν.* Sic antea dixit Lucas κατ οἶκον, pro domatim: Presbyteros, id est, Pastores et Diaconos, et alios ecclesiæ gubernationi præfectos. Hic enim, ut alibi sæpe, generaliter accipitur Presbyteri nomen. Bez. in Act. xiv. 23.

^b *Ὑεσ υμᾶς.* Hinc

apparet, mitti solitas fuisse apostolicas epistolas presbyterio, ad quod hæc abjuratio et præcedentes duo versiculi proprie pertineant: quoniam alioqui absurda esset hæc petitio, si ad totum ecclesiæ cœtum referretur. Bez. in 1 Th. v. 27.

planted.

planted. St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians, is inscribed *to the churches of Galatia*, without any mention of bishops or deacons. And yet there must have been there men of that character.

St. Peter writes to the Christians in Galatia, and other neighbouring parts, and sends an admonition to such. 1 Pet. v. 1, 2. *The elders which are among you I exhort.—Feed the flock of God, which is among you.* And from the epistle itself it may be concluded with certainty, that there were fixed officers in the churches of Galatia, though they are not mentioned in the inscription. For so St. Paul directs, ch. vi. 6. *Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.* There is no notice taken of any elders in the inscriptions of either of St. Paul's epistles to the Corinthians. And yet there must have been such officers in that church. Clement of Rome, in the first century, in his epistle to the Corinthians, speaking of the apostles, says, ch. xlii. 'They went abroad, publishing the good tidings, that the kingdom of God was at hand. And preaching in countries and cities, they appointed their first-fruits, having first proved them by the spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe.' And afterwards, in ch. xliv. 'Wherefore we cannot think that they may be justly cast out of their ministry, who were either appointed by them [the apostles] or were afterwards chosen by other eminent men with the consent of the whole church.'—So writes Clement. And thus he bears witness to two things. First, that this was the general method of the apostles. And, secondly, he assures us, particularly, that this had been done in the church of Corinth. About which, I suppose, he could not be mistaken. There must therefore have been fixed officers in the churches of Thessalonica, Corinth, and Galatia: though St. Paul has taken no particular notice of them in the inscriptions of his epistles. It cannot then be any just exception against this epistle having been sent to the Ephesians, because their bishops or elders are not named. For it was a common thing with the apostle, to inscribe his epistles to the churches, or saints, of such a place, without any particular notice of their officers, though there were men of that character among them. I have mentioned above St. Paul's epistles to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. To them might be added the epistle to the Colossians.

^c — καθίσταναν τας απαρχας πιστευειν. ^d Τες ουν καταστ
 αυται, δοκιμασαντες τω πνευματι, εις αθεντας υπ' εκεινων. κ. λ.
 επισκοπος και διακονος των μελλουντων

For that also is inscribed *to the saints, and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse.* And yet there must have been elders in that church: one is mentioned, whose name is Archippus. However, it is in this manner only. Col. iv. 17. *And say to Archippus, take heed to the ministry, which thou hast received of the Lord, that thou fulfil it.* Nor does the apostle send his salutations to the church in Laodicea by him in particular, but by the saints to whom the epistle is inscribed. See ch. iv. 15. Once more, Timothy, as is generally allowed, was at Ephesus when St. Paul wrote to him those two epistles, which we have. When the first was written, there must have been some elders in that church, and yet more at the time of writing the second. It cannot be contested by any. Nevertheless no salutations are sent to the elders of Ephesus, in either of those epistles.

5. Obj. ‘If this epistle was sent to the Ephesians, it may be thought very strange, that St. Paul should not salute any of his friends there, where he had many friends and acquaintance.’

But I cannot perceive this to be of much weight. There is no epistle of St. Paul that has so many salutations in it, as that to the Romans, whom he had never seen. There are no salutations of particular persons at the end of the first epistle to Timothy, who was then at Ephesus. I suppose Timothy to have been in the same city likewise, when Paul wrote his second epistle to him. Nevertheless there are in it no particular salutations, except those in ch. iv. 19. *Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus.* Tychicus went with this epistle to the Ephesians. And what is said ch. vi. 21—23. would be instead of many particular salutations, and fully answer the end. For Tychicus is there required to *make known unto them all things, and to comfort their hearts.* I might add, that no particular persons are saluted by name in either of the epistles to the Thessalonians, nor in the epistle to the Galatians, nor in that to Titus, excepting only Titus himself, to whom the epistle is sent.

6. Obj. Mr. Wetstein says, ‘that the epistle to the Ephesians is written to gentiles, whereas the church at Ephesus consisted chiefly of Jews.’

I answer:

‘Imprimis vero observandum, cum ecclesia Ephesina ex Judæis potissimum collecta fuerit. Act. xviii. 19, 21, 24, 25. xix. 9, 10, 17. xx. 21. Apoc. ii. 2, 7. eam, ad quam hæc epistola scripta est, non ex

I answer: That the epistle, called to the Ephesians, is written to gentiles, or to such chiefly, is allowed, and is very manifest. And it seems to me very evident, from the history, which we have of St. Paul's preaching at Ephesus, in the book of the Acts, that the apostle's chief harvest there was from among the gentiles. For a while indeed he taught in the synagogue. But the behaviour of the Jews obliged him to withdraw. Whereupon he preached in another place. And I should conclude from what is in Acts xix. 17—40. that the apostle had many more converts there among Gentiles, than Jews.

7. Obj. 'It is argued from Col. iv. 16. that this epistle was sent to the Laodiceans. For St. Paul says there: *and when this epistle is read among you, or has been read among you, cause, that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans: and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.* Hereby, as is argued, must be intended the epistle called to the Ephesians, but really sent to the Laodiceans. For, says Mill, 'and likewise others after him, this epistle called to the Ephesians, and the epistle to the Colossians, were both sent by the same messenger, and at the same time.'

To which I answer, that if the epistle, called to the Ephesians, be the epistle intended by the apostle, and sent at the same time with that to the Colossians; it is manifest, that it was not sent to the Laodiceans. This may be concluded from what is said to the Colossians, ch. iv. 15. *Salute the brethren, which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house.* This plainly shows, that there was not now any epistle sent to the Laodiceans. If there had, there would have been no occasion for the apostle to send this order to the Colossians. For it is impossible to write a letter to any persons, or societies, without saluting them, or doing somewhat that is equivalent. And it is manifest, that in the epistle inscribed to the Ephesians, the Christians, to whom it is sent, are saluted. Particularly ch. i. 1, 2. and ch. vi. 21, 22, 23. This has appeared evident to learned men of the first rank, and different communions. So § Baronius, and Tillemont. This last says,

'that

ex Judæis, sed ex Gentilibus fuisse congregatam. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 239.

Quidni igitur scripta fuerit ad Laodicenses? — Sane per eundem unicum missa erat hæc epistola,

per quem delata erat epistola ad Colossenses, Tychicum scilicet, nec non eodem tempore. Mill. Prol. num. 74.

§ Sane nullam eidem tabellario ad Laodicenses fuisse a Paulo datam epistolam,

‘ that ^b since St. Paul orders the Colossians to salute those of
 ‘ Laodicea in his name; it is a certain sign, that he did not
 ‘ write to them at that time.’ Du Pin says: ‘ If ⁱ St. Paul had
 ‘ written at the same time to the Laodiceans, he would not
 ‘ have charged the Colossians to salute them in his name.’
 And James Basnage: ‘ St. ^k Paul did not then write to the
 ‘ Laodiceans, since he salutes them in his letter to the church
 ‘ of Colosse.’ The acute and honest Mr. Peirce, though much
 inclined to Mill’s opinion concerning this epistle, saw this
 difficulty, and owned it. ‘ But I have one objection,’ says he,
 ‘ which I cannot so easily get over. And were it not for that,
 ‘ I might fully agree with him. My objection is, that it seems
 ‘ highly improbable, that St. Paul should send his salutations to
 ‘ the Laodiceans, in the epistle, which he wrote to the Colos-
 ‘ sians, in case he had sent that epistle to the Laodiceans by
 ‘ the same messenger.’

I am not unwilling to allow, that the epistle spoken of in
 the latter part of verse 16. of ch. iv. to the Colossians, is our
 epistle to the Ephesians: *and that ye likewise read the epistle
 from Laodicea*: that is, the epistle that is to come to you
 from Laodicea. So the place is rendered in the French
 Testament of Lenfant and Beaufobre: *and ^l cause likewise to
 be read among you that which the Laodiceans will send to you.*
 And their note is this, ‘ that ^m from Laodicea: that is to say,
 ‘ that which will come to you from Laodicea. For the original
 ‘ has that sense.’

If the epistle to the Ephesians was sent away by the apostle
 at the same time with those to the Colossians, and to Phile-
 mon: I should think, that Tychicus went first to Ephesus,

epistolam, satis constat: dum in ea,
 quam tum scripsit ad Colossenses,
 salutari mandat eos, qui Laodiceæ
 essent fideles, sic dicens: *Salutate
 fratres, qui sunt Laodiceæ.*—Liben-
 tius igitur Chrysostomo ac Theo-
 doreto inhæremus, quam cæteris,
 ut nulla a Paulo scripta fuerit epis-
 tola ad Laodicenses. Baron. ann.
 60. num. xiii. ^b Et puisque
 S. Paul ordonne aux Colossiens de
 saluer de sa part ceux de Laodicée,
 c’est un marque indubitable, qu’il
 ne leur écrivit point alors. S. Paul.
 note 69. Mem. Ec. tom. I.

ⁱ En effet, si saint Paul, eût

écrit en mesme temps aux Laodi-
 céens, il n’eût pas chargé les Co-
 lossiens de les saluer de sa part.
 Diss. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. § viii.

^k S. Paul n’écrivoit pas alors
 aux Laodicéens, puisqu’il leur fait
 une salutation dans la lettre à l’église
 de Colosse. Basn. Hist. de l’Eglise.
 l. 8. ch. 3. n. iii.

^l Et faites lire de même parmi
 vous celle que les Laodicéens vous
 enverront. ^m Gr. celle de
 Laodicée, c’est à dire, celle qui vous
 viendra de Laodicée. Car l’original
 a ce sens là.

and

and there left the epistle to the Ephesians, with an order, that it should be forwarded to Laodicea, and so to Colosse. Tychicus having left that letter at Ephesus, went forward with Onesimus to Colosse: where they delivered the epistles to Philemon, and the Colossians. And then I suppose, that Tychicus's commission was at an end. He had no order to go to Laodicea. The apostle's salutations to the brethren at Laodicea were to be taken care of by the Colossians.

But I rather think, as before shown, that the epistle to the Ephesians was written very soon after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and then carried to Ephesus by Tychicus. And when Tychicus went now in the second year of the apostle's imprisonment, with these epistles to the Colossians, and Philemon; he came ashore at Ephesus, and there left express orders, that the epistle, formerly sent to them, should be soon forwarded by them to Laodicea, and so to Colosse. Having so done, he went, as before said, with Onesimus to Colosse: where they joined in delivering the letters to Philemon, and the church at Colosse. And now the commission of Tychicus was at an end.

8. Obj. Once more, it is observed by learned men, 'that Marcion said, this epistle was written to the Laodiceans, or called this the epistle to the Laodiceans.'

To which I answer, first. Humphry Hody denied, that Marcion reckoned the epistle called to the Ephesians to have been written to the Laodiceans. And indeed this point seems to lie in great obscurity. Nor is it said by any one beside Tertullian, that I know of.

Secondly. Suppose Marcion to have affirmed this, what does it avail? Grotius says, in his preface to this epistle,

Decem tantum epistolas Pauli, cum particulis quibusdam ex epistola ad Laod—recepit Marcion hereticus, quas librum Apostolicum inscripsit. De cæteris scripturarum libris nullum agnovit, præter Evangelium Lucæ. illudque mutilatum. Epistolas etiam, quas recepit Paulinas, mutilavit vitiavitque.—Simonius in Hist. Crit. N. T. cap. 15. contendit, Marcionem, nullam epist. ad Laod. recepisse, sed epistolam ad Ephesios, falso inscripsisse ad Laodiceanos. Sed in hoc Epi-

phanus falli non potuit, qui in Apostolico Marcionis recenset epistolam ad Ephesios loco 7 mo. et illam ad Laodiceanos loco ximo. *προς λαοδικεις ια.* Ideo vero dicit Tertullianus contra Marc. l. 5. cap. xi. *Epistolam quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, a Marcione ad Laodiceanos inscriptam fuisse, quoniam locus, qui ex Epistola ad Laodiceanos a Marcione adductus est, in epistola ad Ephesios exstabat. Quod etiam observat Epiphanius. Hod. de Bibl. text. origin. p. 664.*

‘ Marcion

‘ Marcion ° called this the epistle to the Laodiceans. Nor
 ‘ was there any reason, why he should falsify in this matter.
 And to the like purpose others. To which I answer: Catho-
 lic writers of the same time, and since, call this the epistle
 to the Ephesians. Nor is there any reason, why they should
 falsify. Yea the same is said, not only by all catholics, but
 likewise by all heretics in general. Let Marcion’s credit
 be ever so good, this is a sufficient answer. For what in-
 terest had the catholics to falsify here? If Marcion said,
 this epistle was sent to the Laodiceans, he must have been
 mistaken. We are assured, that what he said is false, from
 the unanimous testimony of numerous men, who had no
 interest to deceive, and could not be deceived.

But Marcion’s credit is very little in such an affair as this.
 The same writer, who speaks of Marcion’s ^p calling this the
 epistle to the Laodiceans, I mean Tertullian, does also let
 us know, that ^q Marcion rejected the epistles of Paul to
 Timothy, and Titus. And chargeth ^r him with altering
 the text of scripture, openly employing a knife, not a stile.
 And speaks particularly of his leaving out texts ^s in the
 epistle to the Romans. Will any say, that Marcion had
 good reason for so doing? or that all this was owing to his
 superior care and judgment above other Christians? For
 my own part, I think not. And if he said, that this epistle
 was written to the Laodiceans, not to the Ephesians, he
 was mistaken at least. He had not, and could not have
 any good reason for it.

Mill ^t and other learned men after him, in defending their
 opinion concerning this epistle, magnify the care and ex-

° Marcion hanc epistolam vocat
 ad Laodicenses, ex fide, ut credi-
 bile est, ecclesie Laodicensis. Nam
 cur in ea re mentiretur, nihil erat
 causæ. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Eph.

^p Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 5. cap.
 xi. ^q Miror tamen, quum ad
 unum hominem literas factas rece-
 perit, quid ad Timotheum duas,
 et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico
 statu compositas, recusaverit. Adv.
 Marcion. l. 5. cap. ult. p. 615.

^r Marcion enim exerta et palam
 machæra, non stilo usus est: quo-
 niam ad materiam suam eædem

scripturarum confecit. Id. de Præsc.
 Hær. cap. 38.

^s Quantas au-
 tem foveas in ista vel maxime epis-
 tola Marcion fecerit, auferendo quæ
 voluit, de nostri instrumenti inte-
 gritate patebit. Adv. Marc. l. 5.
 cap. 13.

^t Sed omnino verisimile est, Mar-
 cionem, qui Sinope aliquamdiu
 agebat, haud procul a Laodicea,
 sive ex popularium suorum tradi-
 tione, seu etiam auctoritate exem-
 plarium quorundam, hanc episto-
 lam tanquam ad Laodicenses scrip-
 tam citasse. Mill. Prol. num. 78.

actness

actness of Marcion. 'He flourished, they say, in the beginning of the second century, and lived at Sinope, in Paphlagonia, which was in Asia Minor, as well as Laodicea. And he affirmed, that the epistle called to the Ephesians was actually an epistle to the Laodiceans. Most probably, he had heard so from such as knew the fact, and could inform him: or rather, had seen some of the manuscripts, which gave it that title.'

But all this is said without any ground. Such suppositions are easily made. But there is no proof of the truth of them. If there be any credit to be given to what the ancients say of Marcion, he must have been a very rash, and arbitrary, and careless critic: provided he at all deserve the name of a critic. And if he thought this epistle to have been written to the Laodiceans; it is likely, that he took up that opinion without much inquiry, or examination, and without sufficient reason, and perhaps without assigning any.

Jerom, speaking of Marcion and Basilides, who, as he says, were not friendly to the Old Testament, and altered the gospels and epistles of the New Testament, and rejected both the epistles to Timothy, and the epistle to Titus, and that to the Hebrews, he adds: 'And if they assigned any reasons, why they did not reckon these epistles to be the apostle's, we should endeavour to make an answer, and perhaps might say, what would be sufficient to satisfy the reader. But now since with heretical authority they pronounce, and say, this epistle is Paul's, and that not: they may be fitly answered on the side of truth, in the same manner that they assert falsehood.'

And Tertullian having spoken of Marcion's admitting the

Licet non sint digni fide, qui nem primam irritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquor et Basilidem, et omnes hæreticos, qui vetus laniant testamentum: tamen eos aliqua ex parte ferremus, si saltem in novo continerent manus suas, et non auderent Christi—vel Evangelistas violare, vel Apostolos. Nunc vero cum Evangelia ejus Christi dissipaverint, et Apostolorum epistolas non Apostolorum Christi fecerunt esse, sed proprias, miror, quomodo sibi Christianorum nomen audeant vindicare. Ut enim de cæteris epistolis taceam, de quibus quic-

quid contrarium suo dogmati viderant, eraserunt, nonnullas integras repudiandas crediderunt: ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebræos, et ad Titum, quam nunc conamur exponere. Et si quidem redderent causas, cur eas Apostoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid respondere, et forsitan satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero quum hæretica auctoritate pronunciant, et dicant: Illa epistola Pauli est, hæc non est; ea auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescunt falsa simulare. Hieron. Pr. in ep. ad Tit. T. IV. p. 407.

genuineness of the epistle to Philemon, adds, ' Nevertheless
' * I wonder, that when he receives an epistle to one man, he
' should reject two to Timothy, and one to Titus, which
' treat of the government of the church. He had a mind, I
' suppose, to alter also the number of the epistles : ' that is, as
he had done of the gospels : which passage, as the reader may
remember, was quoted by us ' formerly.

It hence appears, that Tertullian knew not, why Marcion
rejected the epistles to Timothy, and Titus. He knew, that
Marcion rejected those three epistles. But he was not aware
of his having assigned any reasons for so doing : which shows,
I think, that Marcion acted arbitrarily in such things as these.

Indeed Tertullian speaking of Marcion's attempting, or
designing to alter the inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians
useth this expression : ' as if he had made more than common
inquiries about it.' But I suppose Tertullian to speak by way
of Irony, and sarcastically : not allowing Marcion uncommon
diligence and exactness, but intimating, that a man, who
acted thus, should be very careful to be rightly informed.

All this I have said in the way of a general answer to the
argument taken from the supposed opinion of Marcion. I
will now more particularly inquire what Marcion said and did,
and what might be the ground and reason of his opinion and
conduct. And I think there are but two writers, from whom
we can receive any information, Tertullian and Epiphanius.

The first is Tertullian. ' I ' pass by another epistle,' says
he, ' which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but heretics
' to the Laodiceans.'

Afterwards : ' According ' to the true testimony of the
' church, we suppose that epistle to have been sent to the
' Ephesians. But Marcion once had a mind to alter the title,
' as if he had made a very diligent inquiry into that matter.

* Miror tamen, quom ad unum
hominem literas factas receperit,
quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam
ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu
compositas, recusaverit. Adfecta-
vit, opinor, etiam numerum epis-
tolarum interpolare. Adv. Mar-
cion. l. 5. cap. ult. p. 615. D.

' See vol. II. p. 265. See also
here, p. 448. not. (g).

' See below, note (b).

' Prætereo hic, et de alia epistola,

quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam
habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodi-
cenos. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l.
5. cap. xi.

' Ecclesiæ quidem
veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios
habemus emissam, non ad Laodi-
cenos. Sed Marcion ei titulum
aliquando interpolare gessit, quæ
et in illo diligentissimus explorator.
Nihil autem de titulo interest, cum
ad omnes Apostolus scripserit, dum
ad singulos. Ib. cap. xvii. p. 607.

' But

‘But the title is of no importance, since the apostle wrote to all, when he wrote to some.’

I hope I have rightly translated the word *gestiit*. I think it meaneth, *had a mind to*, or *was inclined*, or showed an inclination so to do.

By these passages of Tertullian we are assured, first, that this epistle, which was in the hands of catholic Christians, was, in all its copies, inscribed to the Ephesians. And Tertullian was persuaded, that it was the true testimony, or tradition of the church from the beginning.

Secondly, in the first of these passages Tertullian says, that heretics called this the epistle to the Laodiceans: by heretics meaning, as I suppose, Marcion and his followers.

Thirdly, Tertullian says, that once, or upon some occasion, Marcion had a mind to alter the title of this epistle.

Here it may be questioned, whether by *title* be meant what we call a running title, affixed to the epistle, or the inscription, which makes a part of the epistle, and is inserted at the beginning of it. I rather think, this last to be intended. But take it either way, Tertullian supposed, that Marcion had in his copies the same title, or inscription with the catholics, that is, to the Ephesians, or at Ephesus. Nor does Tertullian say, that Marcion ever inserted the inscription, to the Laodiceans, in any of his copies. It seems to me, that he did not.

Consequently, what Tertullian says, is, that Marcion, and his followers, sometimes at least, called this the epistle to the Laodiceans, and perhaps quoted it by that title. But he had not in his copies any title, or inscription, different from that of the catholics. Marcion gave out, that the epistle, called by the catholics to the Ephesians, was written to the Laodiceans. He affirmed this to be right, and that the catholics were in the wrong in calling it an epistle to the Ephesians. For he was persuaded, it was written to the Laodiceans.

I think, this is the most that is said by Tertullian, or that can be collected from him. Yea, it seems to me, that I have in a strong manner represented the whole of what is said by him.

I now proceed to Epiphanius, who says, ‘that Marcion

‘Ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὰς παρ’ αὐτῷ — ἐβδόμενῃ πρὸς ἐφεσίους, ὕδρον πρὸς τῷ αὐτῷ ἀποστολῆ δέκα, αἷς μοναῖς κερκεύεται. — Ἄι δὲ ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ λεγόμεναι εἰσι πρώτη μὲν πρὸς γαλατάς, — ἐβδόμενῃ πρὸς ἐφεσίους, ὕδρον πρὸς λαοδικείας λεγόμενης μερῆ. Epiph. H. 42. num. ix. p. 310.

‘ received only ten epistles of Paul. They are these. The
 ‘ first is that to the Galatians, the second is the first to the
 ‘ Corinthians, the third is the second to the Corinthians, the
 ‘ fourth that to the Romans, the fifth is the first to the Thessa-
 ‘ lonians, the sixth the second to the Thessalonians, the se-
 ‘ venth is that to the Ephesians, the eighth to the Colossians,
 ‘ the ninth to Philemon, the tenth to the Philippians. He
 ‘ has also some parts of an epistle to the Laodiceans.’ So
 ‘ Epiphanius.

It is well known, that Marcion had an evangelicon, and an apostolicon, or a gospel and an apostle. In the former, as is generally said, he had St. Luke’s gospel only. But concerning the truth of that account I make no inquiries now. Our concern at present is with St. Paul’s epistles only. And Epiphanius here expressly says, that Marcion received ten, and placed them in the order in which they are rehearsed above. He likewise says, that Marcion had some parts of an epistle to the Laodiceans. And he quotes, as from him, those words, which are in Eph. iv. 5, 6. after this manner: *One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Christ, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* Having so done, he says: ‘ Nor ^d did the unhappy
 ‘ Marcion think fit to take that passage from the epistle to
 ‘ the Ephesians, but from the epistle to the Laodiceans,
 ‘ which is not the apostle’s.’

This account of Epiphanius led H. Hody to say, that Marcion received eleven epistles of St. Paul. James Bafnage was of the same opinion. He says: ‘ It ^e has been
 ‘ conjectured by some, that Marcion confounded the epistle
 ‘ to the Laodiceans with that to the Ephesians. — But that
 ‘ conjecture cannot be maintained. For he distinguished
 ‘ two epistles of St. Paul, one to the Ephesians, and another
 ‘ to the Laodiceans. And Epiphanius reproacheth him,
 ‘ because he rather chose to take his passage from the epistle

^d Οὐ γὰρ εἶδε τῷ εὐεινότατῳ μαρ-
 κίωνι ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς ἐφεσίους ταύτην τῆν
 μαρτυρίαν λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τῆς πρὸς λαοδι-
 κείας, τῆς μὴ ὄσης ἐν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ. II.
 42. p. 375. in.

^e Marcion l’a citée. Il en tiroit
 même quelque preuve pour son
 hérésie. On a conjecturé, qu’il la
 confondoit avec celle des Ephésiens.
 — Mais cette conjecture ne peut
 se soutenir, parceque Marcion dis-

tinguoit deux lettres de S. Paul,
 l’une aux Ephésiens, l’autre aux
 Laodicéens. Et S. Epiphane. lui
 fait une espèce de reproche, de ce
 qu’il a mieux aimé tirer son passage
 de l’épître aux Laodicéens, qui
 n’étoit point de S. Paul, que de
 celle aux Ephésiens, dans laquelle
 on trouvoit les mêmes paroles.
 J. Basn. Hist. de l’Egl. I. S. ch. 3.
 num. iii.

‘to the Laodiceans, which was not Paul’s, than from the epistle to the Ephesians, where are the same words.’

And indeed, I apprehend, that if we had Epiphanius only, many might be of the same opinion. But comparing him and Tertullian, and examining carefully the whole article of Epiphanius, I think, it must appear more probable, that Marcion did sometimes quote the epistle to the Ephesians, as if it had been sent to the Laodiceans. Nor can I perceive any good reason to think, that any letter, to the Laodiceans was forged so early, as the time of Marcion.

And now I would observe, that Epiphanius seems to have been well acquainted with Marcion’s apostolicon. For he had read his writings, and composed a treatise against him, called Scholion, or Scholia, which he inserted, somewhat altered, in his article of the Marcionites, in his large work, called the Panarium, which we have.

Having observed this, I say, that from Epiphanius it appears, that in Marcion’s apostolicon the epistle to the Ephesians was entitled, and inscribed to them, as it was in the copies of the catholics. And all the difference between the catholics and him, upon this head, was, that he sometimes quoted this epistle, as written to the Laodiceans. Epiphanius, who had seen Marcion’s apostolicon, found therein ten epistles, all inscribed, as in the catholic copies. One of which, and the seventh in order, was that to the Ephesians. However, in one place of Marcion’s works, and ^{but} one, he had seen a passage of the epistle to the Ephesians quoted, as from an epistle to the Laodiceans.

Some such thing, as this, induced Tertullian, a man of a violent temper, to say: ‘I pass by another epistle, which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but heretics to the Laodiceans.’ However, from Tertullian, as before shown, it appears, that in Marcion’s copies of this epistle it had the same title, as in the catholic copies, and that he never altered the inscription. And thus Tertullian and Epiphanius agree. For from this last likewise we plainly perceive, that in Marcion’s apostolicon was the epistle to the Ephesians: but not exactly in the same order, as with the catholics.

Ἐλευσονται δὲ εἰς τὰ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένα. κ. λ. H. 42. cap. ix. p. 109. C.

Præter hanc tamen ad Ephesios epistolam, putat Epiphanius, receptam etiam esse a Marcione epistolæ

ad Laodicenses fragmenta. Ἐχει δὲ καὶ τῆς πρὸς λαοδικεῶς μερῆ, inquit. E quibus tamen unicum illud a se productum reperit. Jac. Uffer. Diss. de Ep. ad Laod.

And thus, if I mistake not, Marcion himself, confirms the common reading at the beginning of this epistle. And this recompence we have of our diligent inquisition into this affair. So it often happens. Opposition made to truth is the means of establishing it.

This opinion of the case may be farther justified by two considerations, which perhaps deserve to be mentioned. One is, that there is no notice taken of this affair by any other writers, beside Tertullian and Epiphanius. Jerom, and many others, who often speak of Marcion, and his principles, say nothing of it. It is therefore very probable, that his inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians was the same, as in the catholic copies. If not, his alteration here, as well as in other places, would have been observed. The other is, that all those, called heretics, so far as we know, had this epistle inscribed to the Ephesians. The Manichees agreed with Marcion in divers of his peculiarities. Nevertheless, in their copies this epistle was inscribed to the Ephesians. This has appeared from the quotations of it in the writings of Faustus, and Secundinus, formerly ^a taken notice of.

But though the inscription of this epistle was the same in Marcion's, as in the catholic copies; he sometimes quoted it, as an epistle to the Laodiceans, and was of opinion, that it was written to them. We are therefore now to inquire into the ground and reason of this opinion.

Pamelius ⁱ in his notes upon Tertullian, as cited by archbishop Usher, (for I have not his edition at hand :) conjectured, that the words of Col. iv. 16. were the occasion of this opinion of Marcion. So likewise says ^k Estius.

It is very probable, that those words ^l gave occasion to the forging an epistle to the Laodiceans. Theodoret, not far from the beginning of the fifth century, as formerly ^m cited

^h See vol. III. p. 506, 509, 538.

ⁱ Jacobus Pamelius, Annot. 259. in lib. 5. Tertulliani adv. Marcionem. *Fortassis, inquit, occasionem dedit Marcioni hujus tituli huic epistolæ imponendi, quod legisset, Col. iv. Salutate fratres, &c.* Usher. Diss. de Ep. ad Laed. ^k Sciendum præterea est, Marcionem, antiquum hæreticum, occasione præsentis loci, epistolæ ad Ephesios scriptæ titu-

lum mutasse, inscribendo eam ad Laodicenos, tanquam ea non ad illos, sed ad hos scripta esset, &c. Est. ad Col. iv. 16. ^l *Et tam, quæ Laodicensium est, vos legatis.]* Horum verborum occasione abusus quispiam concinnavit, atque evulgavit epistolam quædam velut a Paulo scriptam ad Laodicenses. Est. in Col. iv. 16. ^m See vol. V. p. 194.

by us, says in his commentary upon that text: ‘Some have hence imagined, that the apostle had also written to the Laodiceans, and they have forged such an epistle. Nevertheless the apostle does not say, *the epistle to the Laodiceans, but from Laodicea.*’

That is the unvaried reading of this text in all the copies of the New Testament, and in all ancient Greek * * writers. And I have suspected, that the epistle to the Laodiceans was forged by a Latin: and that the Latin version of that text gave occasion to it. Fabricius ⁿ in the introduction to his account of the epistle to the Laodiceans speaks to the same purpose.

In like manner I have for a good while been of opinion, that the Latin version of this text was the occasion of the mistaken notion of Marcion.

When I formerly gave an account of a Latin Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul’s epistles, written about 380. I took notice, that ^o the translation of Col. iv. 16. followed by that author, was, *that ye read the epistle of the Laodiceans.* Et vos ut eam, quæ est Laodicensium, legatis. The same translation is in the Commentary of Pelagius. Et ea, quæ Laodicensium est, vobis legatur. Which affords good proof, that this was the translation, which was in the Latin version, then in use.

I also observed in the same place, that this expression is ambiguous. It may import an epistle, written by the Laodiceans: or an epistle, which was their property, as having been written to them. I have since found the same

* As some proof of this, I allege the note of Theophylact upon this verse. ‘Which is the epistle from Laodicea? It is the first to Timothy. For that was written from Laodicea. However some say, it is an epistle, which the Laodiceans had sent to Paul. But what good the reading such an epistle could do them, I do not know.’ Τίς δὲ ἦν ἡ ἐκ λαοδικείας; ἢ πρὸς τιμῶθεον πρώτη. *Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐκ λαοδικείας ἐγράφη. Τινες δὲ φασιν, εἶτιναι οἱ λαοδικεῖς παυλῷ ἐπέσειλαν. Ἀλλ’ οὐκ οἶδα τί αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνης εἶδει αὐτοῖς πρὸς βελτίωσιν. Theoph. in luc. tom. II. p. 676.

ⁿ Quamquam hunc

Pauli locum neutiquam puto testimonium perhibere commentitiæ ad Laodicenses epistolæ, tamen quia ex illo, sive Latina potius ejus versione ambigua ansam cepit quisquis illam supposuit, non fuit a me omittendus. Lætionis nulla est in codicibus Græcis differentia. Omnes enim, quantum scio, habent τὴν ἐκ λαοδικείας. Ita et Syrus, et Arabs, et interpretes Græci, Chrysostomus, Theodoritus, Theophylactus, Œcumenius. Neque Latinus aliter legisse videtur, cū verit: *Eam, quæ Laodicensium est.* Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. tom. II. p. 853.

^o See vol. IV. p. 498.

observation in ^p Estius. So Secundinus, the Manichee, in his letter to Augustine, by the epistle of the Ephesians plainly means the epistle to the Ephesians. For his words are these: ‘Against^q whom the apostle in the epistle of the Ephesians, says, *he wrestled*. For he says: *we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, and powers.*’ Eph. vi. 12.

It is not unlikely, that a good number of the Latins, by *the epistle of the Laodiceans*, in Col. iv. 16. understood an epistle written to the Laodiceans. And Marcion also, having before him the Latin version, and understanding the words in that sense, concluded, that St. Paul had written an epistle to the Laodiceans. At length he was brought to think, that the epistle, intended by St. Paul, was the epistle inscribed to the Ephesians. Accordingly, he sometimes quoted it with that title. This will be the more readily admitted, when it is considered, that Marcion made use of the Latin version of St. Paul’s epistles. So say both Mill, and Wetstein.

And now, I suppose, it may appear, what regard is due to the authority of Marcion in this matter.

Thus I have at large stated, and considered all the material objections against the common reading at the beginning of this epistle, the epistle to the Ephesians. And the solutions that have been offered, seem to me satisfactory. And from the universal agreement of all copies in that reading, and the unanimous testimony of all Christian writers for the first twelve centuries, it appears, that there is no more reason to doubt of the genuineness of the inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians, than of any other of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

^p Fefellit tamen hos omnes ambiguitas verborum hujus loci, prout Latine leguntur. Quod enim dicitur, *eam quæ Laodicensem est*, intelligi potest, vel ad quos, vel a quibus epistola scripta sit aut missa. Et quidem priori modo Latini fere intellexerunt. Sed hanc ambiguitatem dissolvit Græca lectio, quæ sic habet: *Et eam quæ ex Laodicea est, ut et vos legatis.* Est ad loc.

^q Contra quos se Apostolus in Ephesiorum epistola certamen subisse fatetur. Dicit enim, se non

contra carnem et sanguinem habere certamen, sed adversus principes et potestates. Secundin. ep. ad Aug. § i. Ap. Aug. T. VIII.

^r Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 378. et 606. ^s Ac principio, quod a nemine adhuc animadversum puto, (nisi a J. Millio Proleg. 378. suboluisse putemus) comperimus, Marcionis codices N. T. non ex Græcis exemplaribus, sed ex versione Latina veteri sive Italica constatos fuisse, &c. Wetsten. Prolegom. p. 79.

This

This disquisition has been of greater length, than might have been wished. But if any things have been set in a truer light, than usual, it will be acceptable to some.

C H A P. XIV.

That the Churches of Colosse and Laodicea were planted by the apostle Paul.

It has been of late a prevailing opinion, that the Christians at Colosse, and Laodicea, were not converted by St. Paul. But to me it seems, that there is no good ground for it.

Says Theodoret in his argument of the epistle to the Colossians, prefixed to his commentary, 'Some are of opinion, that when the divine apostle wrote this epistle, he had not seen the Colossians. And they endeavour to support their opinion by these words, *For I would that ye should know, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh,* ch. ii. 1. But they should consider, that the meaning of the words is this, *I have not only a concern for you, but I have also great concern for those that have not seen me.* And if he be not so understood, he expresses no concern for those, who had seen him, and had been taught by him. Moreover the blessed Luke says in the Acts, *And after he had spent some time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order,* ch. xviii. 23. Colosse is a city of Phrygia. And Laodicea, the metropolis of the country, is not far from it. How was it possible for him to be in Phrygia, and not carry the gospel to those places? And in another place the blessed Luke says, *Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia,* ch. xvi. 6.

So says that very learned writer in the fifth century. And those observations have led me to divers considerations, inducing me to think, that the churches of Colosse and Laodicea had been planted by Paul, and that the Christians there were his converts.

^a Theod. tom. III. p. 342, 343.

1. The apostle was twice in Phrygia, in which were Colosse, Laodicea and Hierapolis. Says St. Luke in the places already cited by Theodoret, Acts xvi. 6. *Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia.* And ch. xviii. 23. *And after he had spent some time there [at Antioch] he departed, and went over all the countries of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening the brethren.* To which St. Luke refers again, ch. xix. 1. *Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus.* St. Luke does not mention any cities by name. But there is no reason to say, that he was not at Colosse. It is much more reasonable to think, that in one, or rather, in both those journies, Paul was at Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, chief cities of Phrygia. For, as Theodoret says, how was it possible, that he should be in that country, yea and go *through it, and all over it,* and not be in the chief places of it? St. Luke has not particularly named any places in Galatia, in which Paul was. But he must have been in several towns and cities in that country, where he planted divers churches. Gal. i. 1, 2. So was he, in like manner, in several cities of Phrygia: where also, in all probability, he planted divers churches.

This argument alone appears to me conclusive. The accounts, which St. Luke has given of St. Paul's journies in Phrygia, are sufficient to assure us, that he preached the gospel there, and made converts, and planted churches in the chief cities.

2. Ch. i. 6. *Which bringeth forth fruit, as it does also in you, since the day ye heard it, and knew the grace of God in truth.* Of this St. Paul was assured. Which renders it probable, that he was their father, or first teacher. He speaks to the like purpose several times. Ch. ii. 6, 7. See likewise ch. i. 23. St. Paul knew, that they had been rightly taught the gospel. Nothing more remained, but that they should persevere in the faith, which they had received, and act according to it.

3. Epaphras was not their first instructor in the doctrine of the gospel. This may be concluded from ch. i. 7. the words following those quoted above from ver. 6. *As ye have also learned of Epaphras, our dear fellow-servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ.* The Colossians had been taught

^b Καθὼς καὶ ἐμαθετε ἀπὸ ἐπαφρά.

by Epaphras. But he was not their first instructor. However, he had faithfully taught them, agreeably to the instructions, which they had received.

Theodoret^c upon ch. i. 7, 8. well observes, ‘that the apostle bestows many commendations upon Epaphras, calling him *beloved*, and *fellow-servant*, and a *faithful minister of Christ*, that the Colossians might have the greater regard for him.’ If Epaphras had first taught the Colossians the Christian doctrine, I think, the apostle, when recommending him to their esteem and regard, would have added, *by whom ye believed*, or *by whom ye were brought to the fellowship of the gospel*, or somewhat else, to the like purpose. That would have been a great addition to what is said at ver. 7. before cited, and to what is said of him, ch. iv. 12, 13. *Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God. For I bear him record, that he has a great zeal for you, and for them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis.*

Epaphras, who is one of you. Would the apostle have used such an expression concerning Epaphras, if the church of Colosse had been founded by him? Impossible. He says as much of Onesimus, who was but just converted, and was now first going to appear among them as a Christian. His words at ver. 9. of the same chapter are, *Onesimus, a faithful, and beloved brother, who is one of you.*

I imagine, that St. Paul does the more enlarge at ver. 12, 13. upon the affectionate concern, which Epaphras had for these Christians, being apprehensive of some prejudices taken up against him, that might obstruct his usefulness among them. For he had brought the apostle an account of the state of this church. Which, though it was true and faithful, was not in all respects agreeable: as is concluded by commentators from what St. Paul writes in the second chapter of this epistle.

4. St. Paul does in effect, or even expressly say, that himself had dispensed the gospel to these Colossians, ch. i. 21—25. I shall recite here a large part of that context, ver. 23—25. *If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard——whereof I Paul am made a minister. Who now*

^c Ubi supra. p. 344.

rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his body's sake, which is the church. Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you, to fulfil, or fully to preach, the word of God. And what follows to ver. 29.

St. Paul therefore had been the *minister of God* to these Colossians, as well as to other gentiles. Nor would they have been excluded, but included among other gentiles, to whom he had preached the word, if commentators had not been misled by a false interpretation of those words in ch. iv. 1, 2. of which we have already seen Theodoret's account, and shall say more presently. Those words having been misinterpreted, a wrong turn has been given to these likewise.

5. Chrysoſtom in his preface to the epistle to the Romans speaks to this purpose, 'I see the apostle writing to the Romans and the Colossians, upon the same things indeed, but not in the same manner. To them he writes with much mildness, as when he says.—Rom. xiv. 1, 2. To the Colossians he does not so speak of the same things, but with greater freedom. *If therefore, says he, ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world*—and what follows, ch. ii. 20—23.' Does not this observation lead us to think, that the Colossians were the apostle's own converts, to whom a different address from that used toward others might be very proper? And there are other passages of this epistle, beside that alleged by Chrysoſtom, which might be taken notice of, as confirming the same observation.

6. Ch. ii. 6, 7. *As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: grounded, and built up in him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.* Certainly these exhortations of the apostle are the more proper, and forcible, supposing the Colossians to have been first taught and instructed by him. Nor had he any occasion to be more particular. They knew, who had taught them. But I think that in this, or some other of the places, where he reminds the Colossians of what they had heard, and had been taught, if those instructions had

^d Ὅταν γὰρ ἰδῶ ῤωμαίους καὶ κολοσσαευσίαν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μὲν ἐπιβελόντα, οὐχ' ὁμοίως δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοις μὲν μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς συγκρα-
 τασεως.—Κολοσσαεῦσι δὲ οὐχ' ἔτι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ μετὰ πλείους παρησιας. κ. λ. Proœm. in ep. ad Rom. T. IX. p. 427.

been received from another, different from himself, that would have appeared in the expressions made use of by him. In short, if they were converted by the apostle, there could not, possibly, arise in his mind a doubt, whether they remembered, who had been their first teacher, and who were his fellow-labourers, who had accompanied him in his journies, when he was in their country. And therefore there was no need to remind them of himself more expressly, than he has done. The thing is supposed all along.

7. The presence of Epaphras with Paul at Rome is an argument, that the Colossians had personal acquaintance with the apostle. Indeed Grotius upon ch. i. 7. says, 'that Epaphras is the same as Epaphroditus, mentioned in the epistle to the Philippians.' But Beaufobre well observes upon the same place: 'This may be the same name with Epaphroditus, Philip. ii. 25. But it is not probable, that it is the same person. St. Paul had sent Epaphroditus to Philippi. But Epaphras was still at Rome. And there is reason to think, that he was a prisoner there. See Philem. ver. 23.' If Epaphras was sent to Rome by the Colossians to inquire after Paul's welfare, as may be concluded from ch. iv. 7, 8. that token of respect for the apostle is a good argument of personal acquaintance. And it is allowed, that Epaphras had brought St. Paul a particular account of the state of affairs in this church. Which is another argument, that they were his converts.

8. Ch. i. 8. *Who also declared unto us your love in the spirit:* that is, says Grotius, 'how you love us on account of the Holy Spirit given to you.' Or, as Peirce, 'Who also declared unto me the love you bear to me upon a spiritual account.' Or, as Whitby, 'Your spiritual and affectionate love to me, wrought in you by the spirit, whose fruit is love.' All thus understanding it of their love of the apostle, and rightly, as seems to me. Nothing else can be meant by it. For before, at ver. 4. he had spoken of *their love to all the saints*. This I take to be another good proof of personal acquaintance. And the place is agreeable to what he writes to the Thessalonians, allowed by all to be the apostle's converts. 1 Thess. iii. 6. *But now when Timothy came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your*

Quomodo nos diligatis propter Spiritum Sanctum vobis datum.
Grot. in loc.

faith and charity : [that is the same with Col. i. 4. *Since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of your love to all the saints :*] and that ye have good remembrance of us always.

9. Ch. iii. 16. *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching, and admonishing one another, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.* This shows, that the Colossians were endowed with spiritual gifts. And from whom could they receive them, but from St. Paul? Apostles[†] only are allowed to have had the power and privilege of conveying spiritual gifts to other Christians. This text therefore has been a difficulty with such as have supposed, that Paul never was at Colosse. But now that difficulty is removed.

10. Ch. ii. 1, 2. *For I would, that ye knew, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh: that their hearts might be comforted.* This quick change of persons upon the mention of such as had not seen the apostle's face, seems to imply, that the Colossians, to whom he is writing, had seen him. For if the Colossians had been among those who had not seen him, he would have expressed himself in this manner. *I would that ye knew, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh, that your hearts might be comforted.* But upon the mention of such as had not seen him, he says: *that their hearts might be comforted.* And having finished his testimony of concern for such as had not seen his face, he returns to the Colossians, to whom he was writing, and says, ver. 4. *And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.*

Theodoret, beside what he had said in the preface to this epistle, which has been already transcribed, speaks again to this purpose in his paraphrase of ch. ii. 1, 2. 'I would have you be persuaded of my great concern for you, and for the Laodiceans: and not only for you and the Laodiceans, but likewise for all who have not seen me. And[‡] that this is his meaning, appears from what follows: *that their hearts*

† 'Though several of the Christians had spiritual gifts, and miraculous powers, none but apostles could confer upon others such gifts and powers.' Dr. Benson upon the Acts. vol. I. p. 157. first edit. p. 162. second edit. In like manner other commentators. And

see Acts, ch. viii. 5—25.

‡ 'Ὅτι δε ταυτα κατα ταυτην αυτην την διανοιαν ειρηται, και τα εκαγομενα δηλοι να παρακληθωσιν αι καρδια αυτων. 'Ουκ ειπεν υμων, αλλ' αυτων, τετεσι, των μηδεπω τεθεαμενων. Theod. ib. p. 350, 351.

‘may be comforted. He does not say *your*, but *their*: that is, of such as had not seen him.’

11. Ch. ii. 5. *For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying, and beholding your order, and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ.* It is here implied, if I am not mistaken, that the apostle had been with them, and had been present in the assembly of the believers at Colosse.

12. What is said ch. iv. 7—9. *All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, and the rest, best suits the supposition of personal acquaintance, as before hinted. Indeed, I think it to be full proof, that Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him.*

13. The salutations in ver. 10, 11, 14. from Aristarchus, Mark, Luke, Demas, suppose the Colossians to have been well acquainted with St. Paul’s fellow-travellers, and fellow-labourers. And Timothy’s name is in the salutation at the beginning of the epistle. Consequently, the Colossians were not unknown to the apostle, nor unacquainted with him. And the like salutations are also in the epistle to Philemon, an inhabitant of Colosse.

14. Ch. iv. 15. *Salute the brethren, which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. Ver. 17. And say to Archippus: take heed to the ministry, which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.* This shows, that Paul was well acquainted with the state of the churches in Colosse and Laodicea. And it affords an argument that he had been in that country, and particularly at Laodicea. He salutes the brethren there, and Nymphas by name, and the church in his house. ‘It^b is probable, says Theodoret, that he was one of the faithful in Laodicea, who had made his house a church, ‘adorning it with piety.’ As for Archippus, the same Theodoret says, ‘Thatⁱ some had supposed him to have been minister at Laodicea: but,’ says he, ‘the epistle to Philemon shows, that he dwelled at Colosse, where Philemon was.’ See Philem. ver. 2.

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

^b Ibid. p. 363.

^c Ibid.

ⁱ ΤΙΝΕΣ ΕΦΩΤΑΝ, ΤΕΤΟΥ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΙΑΣ ΓΕΓΕΝΗΣΑΙ ΔΙΔΑΧΚΑΛΟΥ.

Speak.

Speak. And ver. 18. *Remember my bonds.* Such demands may be made of strangers. But they are most properly made of friends and acquaintance.

In a word, the whole tenour of this epistle shows, that the apostle is not writing to strangers, but to acquaintance, disciples, and converts.

16. Finally, an argument may be taken from the epistle to Philemon, an inhabitant of Colosse, sent at the same time with this to the Colossians.

From ver. 19th of the epistle to Philemon, I suppose it to be evident, that he had been converted to Christianity by St. Paul. Indeed this might be done at some other place. But it may as well have been done at home.

And St. Paul's acquaintance with Philemon, and the Christians at Colosse, may be inferred from several things in that epistle. At ver. 2. he salutes Apphia by name, probably wife of Philemon: and Archippus, probably, pastor at Colosse, at least an elder in that church: who, as before observed, is also mentioned, Col. iv. 17. Once more, at ver. 22. St. Paul desires Philemon, *to prepare him a lodging.* Whence I conclude, that Paul had been at Colosse before.

We might argue also from the characters of Philemon and Archippus, in the first two verses of the same epistle. The former the apostle calls his *fellow-labourer*, and the other his *fellow-soldier*. Which expressions imply personal acquaintance, and that they had laboured with him in the service of the gospel in some place. And what place can be so likely as Colosse? There are many, of whom St. Paul speaks in his epistles, as his *fellow-labourers*, or *fellow-helpers*, or *fellow-soldiers*: concerning whom it may be made to appear, that he and they had laboured together in some one place. And why then should these two be exceptions? Yea, it may be reckoned not improbable, that Archippus had been ordained by St. Paul himself an elder at Colosse. Whether Philemon likewise was an elder there, I do not say: though he may have been so.

From all these considerations it appears to me very probable, that the church of Colosse had been planted by the apostle Paul, and that the Christians there were his friends, disciples, and converts. And if the Christians at Colosse were his converts, it may be argued, that so likewise were the Christians at Laodicea, and Hierapolis. None of which places were far asunder.

C H A P. XV.

OF THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

I. *The Antiquity, and the Reason of that Denomination.* II. *Called also canonical.* III. *Concerning their Reception in several Ages.* IV. *Their Order.*

I. THERE are seven epistles, which we call catholic. The antiquity of this denomination may be made manifest from a few quotations. Eusebius having given an account of the death of James, called the Just, and our Lord's brother, concludes: 'Thus ^a far concerning this James, who is said to be the author of the first of the epistles called catholic.' In another place he says, 'That ^b in his Institutions Clement of Alexandria had given short explications of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting those which are contradicted. 'I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles.' They were so called therefore in the time of Eusebius, and, probably, before. Of which likewise we have good proof. For St. John's first epistle is several times called a Catholic epistle by Origen ^c in his remaining Greek works, as well as in others. It is likewise ^d so called several times by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. Athanasius, Epiphanius, and later Greek writers received seven epistles, which they called catholic. I only observe here farther, that they are so called likewise by ^e Jerom.

They are called catholic, or universal, or general, because they are not written to the believers of some one city, or country, or to particular persons, as St. Paul's epistles are, but

^a Τριαντα και τα κατα τον ιακωβον, η η πρωτη των ονομαζομενων καθολικων επισολων ειπαι λεγεται. H. E. l. 2. c. 23. p. 66. D. ^b — μη δε τας αιτλεγομενας παρελθων την ιδδα λεγω, και τας λοιπας καθολικας επισολας. Ib. l. 6. cap. 14. in. ^c See of this work, vol. II. p. 481.

p. 273. D. Vid. ib. p. 274. B. And in this work, vol. III. p. 105, 106. ^e Petrus—scripsit duas epistolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur. De V. l. cap. i.

Jacobus—unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quæ de septem catholicis est. Ib. cap. 2.

Judas, frater Domini, parvam, quæ de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Ib. cap. 4.

—ε το ευαγγελιον το κατα ιωαννην επιγεγραμμενον, και η επισολη η καθολικη. Ap. Euseb. l. 7. cap. 25.

to Christians in general, or to Christians of several countries. This is the case of five, or the greater part of them, with which the two others are joined. Moreover, when the first epistle of Peter, and the first of St. John, were called catholic by the most early christian writers, the two smaller of St. John were unknown, or not generally received.

II. These epistles are several times called canonical by Cassiodorus, about the middle of the sixth century, and by the writer of the prologue to these epistles, ascribed to Jerom, though not his. The reason of which appellation is not certainly known. Nor is it easy to perceive the propriety of it. Du Pin says: 'Some Latins have called these epistles canonical, either confounding the name with catholic, or else to denote, that they also are a part of the canon of the books of the New Testament.'

III. Of these epistles two only, the first of St. Peter, and the first of St. John, were universally received in the time of Eusebius. However, the rest were then well known. In proof of which I shall allege one passage only from him. 'Here,' says he, 'it will be proper to enumerate in a summary way the books of the New Testament, which have been already mentioned. And in the first place are to be ranked the four sacred gospels. Then the book of the Acts of the apostles. After that are to be reckoned the epistles of Paul. In the next place, that called the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter. After these is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the Revelation of John.—And among the contradicted, but yet well known to the most [or approved by many] are that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John.'

^c Or, as Leontius expresseth it, 'They are called catholic, because they are not written to one nation, as Paul's epistles, but in general to all.' See vol. V. p. 311.

^e Octavus codex canonicas epistolas continet Apostolorum — sed cum de reliquis canonicis epistolis magna nos cogitatio fatigaret, subito nobis codex Didymi Græco stilo conscriptus in expositionem septem canonicarum epistolarum Domino largiente concessus est. De Instit. Div. Lit. cap. 8.

Vid. et Cassiodorii Complexiones canonicarum epistolarum septem.

^h Prologus septem Epistolarum Canonicarum. Ap. Hieron. tom. I. p. 1667.

ⁱ Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. § ix.

^k Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 3. cap. 24. et cap. 25.

^l — αἱ ἐξῆς τὴν φερομένην ἰακωβίου προτεραν, καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν πετρῆς κυριότερον ἐπιστολήν — τῶν δὲ ἀντιλεγόμενων ἱερωνίμου δ' ἐν ὁμοίᾳ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ λεγόμενῃ ἰακωβῆ φέρεται, καὶ ἡ ἰεδο' ἢ τε πετρῆ δευτέρα ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη ἰακωβίου. Ibid. c. 25. II. See also in this Work, vol. IV. p. 227.

And in the preceding volumes of this work we have observed all the seven to have been received by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerom, Augustine, and many other writers. But the Syrian churches received ^m three only of these epistles. Nor does it appear, that more were received by ⁿ Chrysoftom or ^o Theodoret. And Amphilochius, in his iambic poem, says, ‘Of ^p the catholic epistles some receive seven, others three only.’ However, as we proceed, we shall particularly consider the claims of the disputed epistles, under the names of those to whom they are ascribed.

IV. Before I conclude this introduction, I would take notice of the order of these epistles, because there is some variety in ancient authors. In the passage, cited from Eusebius at the beginning of this chapter, he says, that the epistle of James was the first of those called catholic. In the passage, since taken from him, where he mentions these epistles according to the degree of authority, which they had obtained, he first speaks of the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter. Nevertheless when he comes to those that were contradicted, the epistle of James is first named. This is the order in the festal epistle of Athanasius: ‘Seven ^q epistles of the apostles,’ says he, ‘called catholic: of James one, of Peter two, of John three, and after them, of Jude one.’ Which is our present order. The same order is observed in the catalogue of Cyril, of Jerusalem, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerom’s letter to Paulinus, Euthalius, Gelasius, bishop of Rome, the Alexandrian manuscript, the Stichometry of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, Leontius, J. Damascenus. The same order is in Bede’s prologue to these epistles, largely transcribed by us ^r in its proper place: where he assigns reasons of this order, and particularly, why the epistle of James was placed first. In other authors is a different order. By Rufinus ^s they are rehearsed in this manner: ‘Two epistles of the apostle Peter, one of James, the brother of the Lord, and apostle, one of Jude, three of John: the Revelation of John.’ One may be apt to think, that St. John’s three epistles are here mentioned last, that they might not be separated from the book of the Revelation. In the canon of the third council of Carthage, they stand in this order:

^m See vol. IV. p. 439—441. and *επτα φασιν, οι δε τρεις μονας.* Amphil. p. 132. ver. 310, 311. And see vol. V. p. 161 and 267—269.

ⁿ Vol. V. p. 127, 136—138. IV. p. 413, 414. ^q Ib. p. 283.

^o Vol. V. p. 195, 196. ^r See vol. V. p. 313, 314.

^p ——— καθολικων επistolων τρεις μιν ^s Ib. p. 76.

‘ Two † epistles of the apostle Peter, three of the apostle John, one of the apostle Jude, one of the apostle James.’ In Augustine’s work of the Christian Doctrine: ‘ Two † epistles of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James.’ In the catalogue of pope Innocent: ‘ Three * epistles of John, two epistles of Peter, an epistle of Jude, an epistle of James.’ In the commentary of Cassiodorus † upon these epistles they are in this order: ‘ Two epistles of Peter, three of John, of Jude one, of James one.’

C H A P X V I.

ST. JAMES, THE LORD’S BROTHER.

- I. *His History from the N. T. whereby he appears to have been an apostle.*
- II. *His History from ancient Authors. A Passage from Eusebius concerning him, with Remarks, showing him to be the same, as James the Son of Alphaeus.*
- III. *A Passage of Eusebius, containing two Quotations from Clement of Alexandria, mentioning his Appointment to be Bishop, or residing Apostle at Jerusalem, and the Manner of his Death.*
- IV. *A Passage of Origen, speaking of our Lord’s Brethren, and the Death of James.*
- V. *A Chapter of Eusebius, containing Accounts of his Death from Hegesippus, and Josephus, with Remarks.*
- VI. *The Time of his Death.*
- VII. *How he was related to our Lord, and in what Respect he was his Brother.*
- VIII. *That he was an Apostle, and the Son of Alphaeus.*
- IX. *Why called the Less.*
- X. *Surnamed the Just, and other Marks of Respect shown him.*
- XI. *A Review of what has been said.*

I. THERE is frequent mention of James in the Acts, and St. Paul’s epistles. If he was an apostle, he must be James, the son of Alphaeus, always distinctly named in the catalogues of the apostles^a in the first three gospels, and in the first chapter of the Acts. For^b there was but one other apostle of this name, James the brother of John, and son of Zebedee. However, the proofs of his being James the son of Alphaeus are deferred for the present. I begin with writing the history of James, mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul’s epistles.

St. Paul, reckoning up the several appearances of our Lord to the disciples after his resurrection, says, 1 Cor. xv. 5—8.

† p. 79. † p. 86. * p. 175. Apostolos Jacobi vocabulo nuncupatos: Jacobum Zebedæi, et Jacobum Alphæi. Hieron. adv. Helvid. T. IV. p. 137. fin.

‡ p. 283.

^a Matt. x. 3. Mark iii. 18.

Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13.

^b Nulli dubium est, duos fuisse

That he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once: meaning, I suppose, at the place in Galilee, where he had appointed to meet the disciples. After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles: meaning, it is likely, when they were witnesses of his ascension. And last of all he was seen of me also.

By James must be here intended the same that is mentioned by St. Paul elsewhere. Moreover James, the son of Zebedee, had been dead a good while before writing this epistle to the Corinthians, in the year of Christ 56. It is likely, that St. Paul speaks of him, who was still living. And he here speaks of a particular appearance of Christ to him.

We learn from Jerom, that in the gospel according to the Hebrews there was an account of a particular appearance of our Lord to James, the Lord's brother, who, according to his computation, governed the church of Jerusalem thirty years. It is to this purpose. *'Very soon after the Lord was risen, he went to James, and showed himself to him. For James had solemnly sworn, that he would eat no bread from the time that he had drunk the cup of the Lord, till he should see him risen from among them that sleep. It is added a little after: Bring, saith the Lord, a table and bread. And lower: He took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and then gave it to James the Just, and said to him: my brother, eat thy bread. For the son of man is risen from among them that sleep.'*

I think this story may be sufficient to show, that James, called the Just, and the Lord's brother, was in high esteem with the Jewish believers, who used the gospel above-mentioned. But some of the circumstances of this account must needs be fabulous. Nor is there any reason to think that James, or any of the apostles, had a certain expectation of the Lord's rising from the dead: nevertheless I shall mention a thought, to be considered by candid readers. Possibly this account is founded upon the history recorded in Luke xxiv.

*Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, — post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem, cum dedisset sindonem servo Sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum, et apparuit ei. Jura-
verat enim Jacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illa hora, quâ*

hiberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus. Rursusque post paululum. Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur. Tulit panem, et benedixit, ac fregit, et post dedit Jacobo Justo, et dixit ei: Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus. De V. I. cap. 2.

13—35. of the two disciples, to whom the Lord appeared on the day of his resurrection, *to whom he was known in breaking of bread.* One thing more may be concluded from this passage. They who used this gospel, thought James, the Lord's brother, to have been an apostle. For here is a reference to his partaking in the eucharist, appointed by our Lord: where none were present beside the twelve.

However, as I have proposed a conjecture concerning the history in Luke xxiv. it ought to be observed, that the two disciples, there mentioned, were not apostles. For at ver. 35. it is said, that when they were returned to Jerusalem, *they found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them.*

Upon that text of St. Paul Dr. Doddridge ^d mentions a conjecture, which had been communicated to him: that James had not seen our Lord after his resurrection, until the time there mentioned by St. Paul. ^e That by sickness, or some other accident, James had been detained from meeting his brethren, ^f both on the day of our Lord's resurrection, and that day ^g sevensnight, and likewise at the time, when Christ appeared to ^h the five hundred. And that he might in this respect be ⁱ upon the level with them, our Lord appeared to him alone, ^j after all the appearances mentioned before.' But I take that conjecture to be without ground, as well as very improbable. St. Paul's words do not imply, that our Lord had not been seen by James before, but that this was a particular appearance to him alone, as ^k Augustine has observed. Who likewise adds very judiciously: ^l 'Nor did Christ now first show himself to all the apostles.' Which agrees with Lightfoot's ^m interpretation of that text.

^d See the Family-Expositor, vol. IV. p. 380.

^e *Postea, inquit, apparuit Jacobo.* Non tunc autem primum accipere debemus visum esse Jacobo, sed aliqua propria manifestatione singulariter. *Deinde Apostolis omnibus:* nec illis tunc primum, sed jam ut familiaris conversaretur cum eis usque ad diem adscensionis suæ. Aug. de Coniens. Evang. l. 3. cap. 25. num. 85. tom. III. P. 2.

^f 'After the appearing to above five hundred brethren at once, which we suppose, and not without ground, to have been that

last mentioned, the apostle relatively, that *he was seen of James,* 1 Cor. xv. 7. and then of all the apostles. Which does plainly rank this appearance to James between that to the five hundred brethren on the mountain in Galilee, and his coming to all the apostles, when they were come again to Jerusalem. Which James this was, Paul is silent of, as all the evangelists are of any such particular appearance. It is most likely, he means *James the less,* of whom he speaks often elsewhere.' Harmony of the N. T. vol. I. p. 273.

I have one thing more to add. It seems to me, that James, here spoken of, was an apostle. And it will afford a good argument, that James, sometimes called by ancient christian writers bishop of Jerusalem, was an apostle.

Gal. i. 18, 19. *Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.*

This text seems decisive in favour of the apostleship of James. St. Luke speaks of the same thing in this manner, Acts ix. 27. *Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles.* Comparing these two texts together, I conclude, that James now resided at Jerusalem, and acted there as president of that church. And I imagine, that Barnabas first brought Paul to James, and James brought him to Peter. Thus Paul had communion with all the apostles, though he saw and conversed with none of them, beside James and Peter.

When St. Peter had been delivered out of prison, in the reign of Herod Agrippa, about the time of passover, in the year 44, *he came to the house of Mary, where many were gathered together, praying. And when he had declared unto them, how the Lord had brought him out of prison, he said: go show these things to James, and to the brethren.* Acts xii. 12—17. This also gives ground to think, that James now presided in the church of Jerusalem.

Before, Acts xi. 29, 30, it is said: *then the disciples at Antioch, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea. Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.* Hence, some have concluded, that James was not now at Jerusalem. But there is no reason for that supposition. For it would imply also, that none of the apostles were at Jerusalem: whereas, probably, they were all there, or near it. We have proof from the next chapter, already cited, that James the son of Zebedee and Peter were there. For the former was beheaded, and Peter imprisoned at Jerusalem by Herod Agrippa about this time. And when Peter had been brought out of prison, he desired his friends to inform James of it, as we have just seen. Therefore he certainly was then at Jerusalem.

There are two ways of understanding that expression. By elders may be meant elders in general, not excluding the apostles. So in the place of Paul, before cited: *after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once.* Where the apostles are not excluded, but included in the word brethren. For it

is reasonable to think, that divers, yea most, if not all of the apostles, were present at that time. So here the apostles may be included in the general denomination of elders. Or by elders may be meant such as are called elders by way of distinction from apostles, as in Acts xv. 4. 22. xxi. 18. who might be persons, more especially entrusted with the receiving, and the distributing such contributions. Neither of these senses oblige us to think, that James was not now at Jerusalem.

When the controversy about the manner of receiving the gentiles was brought before *the apostles and elders*, assembled in council at Jerusalem; *after there had been much disputing*, Peter spoke, and then Barnabas, and Paul. After all which, James speaks last, sums up the argument, and proposeth the terms, upon which the Gentiles should be received. To which the whole assembly agreed. And they sent letters to the Gentiles in several places accordingly. Acts xv. 1—29. It is manifest, I think, that James presided in this council. And it may be thence reckoned probable, that he was an apostle, as well as president of the church of Jerusalem.

Chrysoptom, in a homily upon the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, says: 'James' was bishop of Jerusalem, and therefore spoke last.' In the same place he justly applauds the propriety of his discourse in the council.

St. Paul, in the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, giving an account of some things which happened, when he was that time at Jerusalem, but are not mentioned in the book of the Acts, speaks of James, Cephas, and John, as pillars: *who also gave to him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship*. Those expressions strongly imply, that James was an apostle, and presiding apostle in the church of Jerusalem.

Jerom, in his book against Helvidius, allows, that ^h the texts, which I have already cited from the epistle to the Galatians, show James, the Lord's brother, to have been an apostle.

Afterwards, in the same chapter, giving an account of what happened at Antioch: ver. 11, 12. he says, that *when Peter was come thither, he did eat with the gentiles, before that certain came from James: but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision*. This, I

ε Επισκοπος ην της εν ιεροσολυμοις εκκλησιας ουτος' δια υπερος λεγει. In Act. Ap. hom. 33. p. 253. Γ. IX.

^h —et frater Domini Apostolus sit, Paulo dicente: Deinde post tri-

ennium veni Jerusalem, videre Petrum. Gal. i. 18, 19. Et in eadem epistola: Et cognita gratia, quæ data est mihi—cap. ii. 9. Adv. Helvid. p. 138. in.

think,

think, implies, that James resided at Jerusalem, and presided in that church, and that he was greatly respected by the Jewish believers there. Once more, Acts xxi. 17, 18. When Paul went up to Jerusalem, about pentecost, in the year 58, the day after our arrival, says St. Luke, *Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present*; and what follows. Here is another proof, that James resided at Jerusalem, and superintended in that church. (A)

In what has been now alleged we have perceived evidences of James being related to our Lord, forasmuch as he is called his brother, and that he was much at Jerusalem, and presided in that church, and that, probably, he was an apostle in the highest sense of that word. We have also seen reason to think, that he was much respected by the Jewish believers. And, though we do not allow ourselves to enlarge upon every thing, said of him in the history of the council of Jerusalem, and his reception of Paul, when he went up to Jerusalem, and was imprisoned: yet I suppose, that every one may have discerned marks of an excellent character, and of his admirably uniting zeal and discretion, a love of truth and condescension to weak brethren. His epistle confirms that character. I think likewise, that the preservation of his life, in such a station as his, to the time when he is mentioned last by St. Luke (which we suppose to have been about the time of pentecost, in the year of Christ 58) may induce us to believe, that he was careful to be inoffensive in his behaviour toward the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation, and that he was had in reverence by many of them.

II. I should now proceed to write the history of this person from ancient authors. But that is a difficult task, as I have found, after trying more than once, and at distant spaces of time. I shall therefore take divers passages of Eusebius, and others, and make such reflections as offer, for finding out as much truth as we can.

Eusebius has a chapterⁱ 'concerning our Saviour's disciples.' Where he speaks of all these following, as said to be of the number of the seventy: Barnabas, Sosthenes, who joins with Paul in writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, Ce-

(.) Dr. Whitby, in his preface to the epistle of St. James, has argued in a like manner that I have done, that he was an apostle in the strict acceptation of the word. And

to the same purpose also Cave at the beginning of his Life of St. James the Less, in English.

ⁱ Περὶ τῶν μαθητῶν τῆ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν. H. E. l. i. cap. 12. p. 30.

phas, whom Paul resisted at Antioch, of the same name with the apostle Peter, but different from him, Matthias, chosen in the room of Judas, and he who was put up with Matthias, and James, to whom Christ showed himself after his resurrection, as related by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7. 'He ^k likewise,' says Eusebius, 'was one of those called our Saviour's disciples, and 'one of his brethren.'

Upon this it is easy to observe, that beside the loose and inaccurate manner in which this chapter is written by our historian, here are, probably, several mistakes. Some things will be readily assented to, as not unlikely; that Matthias, and the other disciple put up with him, were of the seventy. But, omitting some other things, there is no good reason to say, that Cephas was different from Peter, or that Sosthenes was one of the seventy. If those things are wrong, there is the less reason to rely upon that account which places James, the Lord's brother, in the number only of his disciples, or of the seventy.

However, we here seem to discern the opinion of our Ecclesiastical Historian, that James, the Lord's brother, so often mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, was not one of Christ's apostles. And there we have also his interpretation of these words. 1 Cor. xv. 7. *then he was seen of all the apostles.* By ^l which he understands others, beside the twelve. And to the like purpose ^m Origen. And it was formerly shown at large in the chapter of Eusebius, that ⁿ he did not esteem this James an apostle in the highest acceptation of the word. It may be observed likewise, in the large account formerly given of Jerom's opinion concerning this James, that ^o he seems not to be quite free from hesitation. Sometimes he speaks of him as one of the twelve apostles, and sometimes not so. We have also seen reason to think, that ^p Cyril of Jerusalem did not reckon James, called bishop of Jerusalem, to have been one of the twelve apostles. Gregory Nyssen ^q likewise distinguishes James, the son of Alpheus, one of the twelve apostles, from James the Less, who was not of that

^k Ἐπειτα δ' ὠφθαι αὐτὸν ἰακώβῳ φησὶν· εἰς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τῶν σωτηρῶν μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἦν. Ib. p. 31. B.

^l Ἐἰθ' ὡς παρὰ τέτταρις κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν δωδεκά πλείων ἑσῶν ὑπαρξάντων

ἀποστόλων———προσέθισσι λέγων· ἐπειτα ὠφθῆ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πασι. Ib. p. 31.

^m See vol. II. p. 538. ⁿ Vol. IV. p. 252, 253. ^o Vol. V.

p. 51—53. ^p Vol. IV. p. 302.

^q De Christi Ref. Or. 2. tom. III. p. 413. B. C.

number. The same opinion appears in ' the Apostolical Constitutions.

Tillemont says: ' The ' Greek Christians of our time
' distinguished James the son, of Alpheus, one of the twelve
' apostles, and James the Lord's brother, and bishop of Je-
' rusalem, as two different persons: so making us entirely
' ignorant of the history of James, the son of Alpheus, and
' excluding the Lord's brother from the number of apostles.
' But the opinion of the Latins, who believe, that they are one
' and the same person, and the apostle, appears more conform-
' able to the scripture; and is supported by the authority of St.
' Paul in particular, who gives to James the Lord's brother the
' title of apostle in the same manner that he gives it to Peter.'
Gal. i. 19.

III. Eusebius has ' another chapter, entitled, ' Of things
constituted by the apostles after our Saviour's ascension.'
Which is to this purpose. ' The first is the choice of Matthias,
' one of Christ's disciples, into the apostleship, in the room of
' Judas. Then the appointment of the seven deacons, one of
' whom was Stephen, who soon after his being ordained was
' stoned by those who had killed the Lord, and was the first
' martyr for Christ. Then James, called the Lord's brother,
' because he was the son of Joseph——to whom the virgin
' Mary was espoused. This James, called by the ancients the
' Just, on account of his eminent virtue, is said to have been
' appointed the first bishop of Jerusalem. And Clement, in
' the sixth book of his Institutions, writes after this manner:
' That after our Lord's ascension, Peter, and James, and John,
' though they had been favoured by the Lord above the rest,
' did not contend for honour, but chose James the Just to be
' bishop of Jerusalem. And in the seventh book of the same
' work he says, that after his resurrection the Lord gave to
' James the Just and John and Peter the gift of knowledge.
' And they gave it to the other apostles. And the other
' apostles gave it to the seventy, one of whom was Barnabas.
' For there were two named James: one the Just, who was
' thrown down from the battlement of the temple, and killed
' by a fuller's staff. The other is he, who was beheaded. Of
' him that was called the Just, Paul also makes mention, saying:
' other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's
' brother.'

^r See vol. IV. p. 351.

^s S. Jacques le Mineur. Art. i. tom. I.

^t H. E. l. 2. cap. i.

Upon what has been thus transcribed a few remarks may be properly made. In the former part of it Eusebius seems to declare it as his own opinion, that James, called the Lord's brother, was the son of Joseph, that is, by a former wife.

For clearing up this passage, I would farther observe: I suppose, the whole of this quotation to be taken from Clement. Some may indeed at first be apt to think, that the second passage of Clement concludes with the word Barnabas. But I rather think, that all which follows in this quotation is Clement's, and nothing of Eusebius. One reason of my thinking so is, that in the twenty-third chapter of the same book, where our Ecclesiastical Historian gives an account of the death of James from Hegesippus, who relates, that James was thrown down from the temple, and killed by a fuller's staff, he twice says, that is, at " the entering upon that account, and * at finishing it, that this was agreeable to what had been before alleged from Clement. The other reason is, that Eusebius seems not to have been so clear, that there were no more than two of this name, as is implied in this passage, particularly in the conclusion of it.

Upon these two passages cited by Eusebius from Clement, one from the sixth, the other from the seventh book of his Institutions we are led to observe, first, that James, called the Just, is here supposed to be an apostle. Nor did Clement know of any more of the name James, in the New Testament, beside James the son of Zebedee, and him called James the Just. Secondly, I observe, that James, called the Just, is supposed to have been appointed bishop of Jerusalem, by three apostles especially, Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, and not by our Lord. And the order and coherence of things in this chapter of Eusebius seems to imply, that this was done soon after the martyrdom of Stephen.

Which appears to me agreeable to the history in the Acts, and the passages alleged thence at the beginning of this chapter. Peter always speaks first, as president among the apostles, until after the choice of the seven deacons. Every thing said of St. James after that implies his presiding in the church of Jerusalem. And when St. Paul mentions the three chiefs, who were pillars, Gal. ii. 9. with whom he conferred at Jerusalem, he names James first. The reason of his doing so,

^u Τον δε της τε ιακωβ τελευτης τροπον ηδη μεν προτερον αι παρατεθεισαι τε κλημεντος φωναι δεδηλωκασιν, απο τε πτερυγισ βεβλησθαι, ξυλω τε την προς

θανατον πεπληχθαι αυτον ιστορηκτος. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 63. C.

* Ταυτα δια πλατης συνωδα τω κλημεντι και ο ηγησιππος. Ibid. p. 65. C.

I take to be, that James then presided in the church of Jerusalem.

Tillemont ^y thinks, 'That Christ himself may have appointed James to be bishop in that church: but the apostles deferred the declaring it solemnly, till the time of the persecution, which broke out after the death of St. Stephen. Then they thought of providing more particularly for the church of Jerusalem, whence, perhaps, they feared they should be constrained to remove. This obliged them to appoint a proper pastor, who should be obliged to stay there till his death, and should charge himself with every thing necessary for their welfare.'

To me it appears evident, that ^z the apostles did not now leave Jerusalem, nor till a good while afterwards. But they were obliged to live privately. And the circumstances of things made it prudent to appoint one of their number, who should preside in that church, and act in their name. Though they could not all appear in public, it was fit there should be one at least, to whom the faithful might apply at any time, in case of need. This choice, or appointment, is ascribed by Clement to three of the apostles. But it might be done with the consent and approbation of all.

As this episcopate, or superintendence of James has been thus mentioned, I shall here observe what notice is taken of it by other ancient christian writers.

Eusebius, in one place, says, that ^a James was appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles: in another by ^b Christ and the apostles. So likewise in the ^c Apostolical Constitutions. Jerom in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, says, 'that ^d James surnamed the Just, was ordained bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles, soon after the Lord's passion.' In his Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians he speaks, as ^e if the

^y St. Jacque le Mineur, Art. iv. mem. tom. I

^z See Acts. viii. 1.

^a — ω προς των αποστολων ο της επισκοπης της εν ιεροσολυμοις εγχεχειριστο θρονος. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. in. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 1. in. p. 38. B.

^b Τον γαρ ιακωβον θρονον τε πρωτε της ιεροσολυμων εκκλησιας την επισκοπην προς τε σωτηρος και των αποστολων υποδεξαμεν. κ. λ. l. 7. c. 19. ^c Conflit.

l. 8. cap. 35.

^d Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus—post passionem Domini statim ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus. De V. I. cap. 2.

^e Nunc hoc sufficiat, ut propter egregios mores, et incomparabilem fidem, sapientiamque non mediam, frater dictus sit Domini: et quod primus ei ecclesie præfuerit, quæ prima in

Christum

the Lord himself had given him this high trust: meaning, perhaps, no more, than that Christ gave it him by the apostles: or that they in so doing had acted by divine inspiration. Epiphanius ^f ascribes this appointment to our Saviour himself, as do ^g Chrysoftom, and ^h Œcumenius, and ⁱ Photius. The Latin author of a Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, says, James ^k was appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles. Nicephorus's account is, that ^l he was so appointed by our Saviour, or, as some said, by the apostles also. I shall cite no more writers relating to this point, but proceed.

IV. I would now take a passage of Origen from the tenth tome of his commentaries upon St. Matthew, where he discourseth upon Matt. xiii. 55, 56. *Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?* ' They ^m thought, says Origen, that he was the son ' of Joseph and Mary. ' The brethren of Jesus, some say upon ' the ground of tradition, particularly what is said in the gos- ' pel according to Peter, or the book of James, were the sons ' of Joseph by a former wife, who cohabited with him before ' Mary. They who say this, are desirous to maintain the honour ' of Mary's virginity to the last: [or her perpetual virginity:] ' that the body chosen to fulfil what is said: *the Holy Ghost shall ' come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow ' thee,* Luke i. 35. might not know man after that. And I ' think it very reasonable, that as Jesus was the first-fruits of ' virginity among men, Mary should be the same among women. ' For it would be very improper to give that honour to any, ' beside her. This James is he, whom Paul mentions in his ' epistle to the Galatians, saying: *Other of the apostles saw I ' none, save James, the Lord's brother.* ' This James was in so ' great repute with the people for his virtue, that Josephus, who ' wrote twenty books of the Jewish Antiquities, desirous to ' assign the reason of their suffering such things, so that even ' the temple was destroyed, says, that those things were owing

Christum credens ex Judæis fuerat congregata. Dicuntur quidem et cæteri Apostoli fratres Domini. Sed præcipue hic frater dicitur, cui filios matris suæ ad Patrem vadens Dominus commendaverat. In ep. ad Gal. cap. ii. 19.

^f Hær. 78. num. vii. ^g Chr. in ep. 1. ad Cor. hom. 38. p. 355.

tom. X. ^h Œc. ad Act. xv. 13. 'T. I. p. 122. ⁱ Phot. Ep. 117.

^k Jacobum vidit Hierosolymæ, quia illic erat constitutus ab Apostolis Episcopus. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. 19. ^l Niceph. l. 2. cap. 38.

^m Origen. in Matt. T. X. p. 462, 463. 'T. III. Bened. p. 223. tom. I. Huet.

to the anger of God for what they did to James the brother of Jesus, called Christ. And it is wonderful, that he who did not believe our Jesus to be the Christ, should bear such a testimony to James. He also says, that the people thought they suffered those things upon account of James. Jude wrote an epistle, of few lines indeed, but filled with the powerful words of the heavenly grace, who says at the beginning: *Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.* Of Joses and Simon we know nothing.

Origen, in his books against Celsus, quotes Josephus again, as speaking of James to the like purpose. But there are not now any such passages in Josephus: though they are quoted as from him, by Eusebius also. But he does not say, whether from his Jewish War, or from his Antiquities, or in what book of either, as he sometimes does, when he quotes Josephus. Jerom has twice quoted Josephus for these things: first in his article of St. James, and then in that of Josephus himself: but not much more expressly than Eusebius.

Upon the long passage of Origen, just transcribed, I would observe as follows.

It is strange, that Origen should take such particular notice of the epistle of St. Jude, and say nothing of the epistle of James, whose history he was writing, when it was not unknown to him. It may be suspected, that a paragraph has been lost, and dropt out of the Commentary in this place. It is also strange, that he should say, he knew nothing of Simon: when it is probable, that he likewise was one of Christ's apostles, called *Simon the Canaanite* by Matthew, ch. x. 4. and Mark iii. 18. *Simon Zelotes* by Luke vi. 15. and Acts i. 13.

From what Origen says of the death of James it may be concluded, that in his time Christians were persuaded, that

^o — εἰρηκεναι, κατὰ μῆνιν θεοῦ ταῦτα αὐτοῖς ἀπηντήκεναι, διὰ τὰ εἰς ἰακώβου τον ἀδελφον ἰησοῦ τῶ λεγομενω χριστω, ὑπ' αὐτων τετολμημενα. Καὶ τὸ θαυμαστον εἰναι, οτι τον ἰησοῦν ημων καταδέξαμενος εἰναι χριστον, εδεν ηττον κακωδωδικοισυνην εμαρτυρησε τοσαυτην. Λεγει δε, οτι και ο λαος ταυτα ενομιζε δια τον ἰακωβου πεποιθεναι. — Περι δε ἰωσηφ, και σιμωνος εδεν ἰσρησαμεν. Ib. p. 463. Bened. p. 223. Huet.

^o Contra Cels. l. i. p. 35. et l. 2. p. 69. Cantab. l. i. cap. 48. et l. 2. cap. 13. Bened. p. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 65. C. D.

^q Tradit idem Josephus, tantum eum sanctitatis fuisse, et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditam sit, subversam esse Hierosolymam. Hier. De Vir. Ill. cap. 2.

^r Hic confitetur. — et propter interfectionem Jacobi Apostoli dirutam Hierosolymam. Ib. cap. 13.

James

James had died a martyr for Christ, and had been killed by the Jews, notwithstanding his eminent virtue. Though the passages; to which Origen refers, are not now in Josephus, and though it should be supposed, that there was some inaccuracy in Origen's quotations of him, or references to him; I think it must be allowed, that Christians had in his time a tradition concerning the death of James, and that it happened in circumstances very dishonourable to those who were the authors of it: infomuch that many were disposed to think, it was one of those things, for which God was much offended with the Jewish people. Moreover we have already observed a brief account of the death, or martyrdom of James in Clement, older than Origen, though in part contemporary with him.

All farther notice of that passage of Origen is deferred, till we come to consider, how James was related to our Lord.

V. As the death of James has been mentioned, I shall now immediately take the accounts of it, which are in Eusebius. And I will transcribe a large part of the twenty-third chapter of the second book of his Ecclesiastical History.

‘ But when Paul had appealed to Cæsar, and Festus had
 ‘ sent him to Rome, the Jews being disappointed in their
 ‘ design against him, turned their rage against James the
 ‘ Lord’s brother, to whom the apostles had assigned the
 ‘ episcopal chair of Jerusalem. And in this manner they
 ‘ proceeded against him. Having laid hold of him, they
 ‘ required him in the presence of all the people to renounce
 ‘ his faith in Christ. But he with freedom and boldness be-
 ‘ yond expectation, before all the multitude, declared our
 ‘ Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.
 ‘ They not enduring the testimony of a man, who was in
 ‘ high esteem for his piety, laid hold of the opportunity,
 ‘ when the country was without a governor to put him to
 ‘ death. For Festus having died about that time in Judea,
 ‘ the province had in it no procurator. The manner of the
 ‘ death of James was shown before in the words of Clement,
 ‘ who said, that he was thrown off from the battlement of
 ‘ the temple, and then beat to death with a club. But no
 ‘ one has so accurately related this transaction, as Hegesip-
 ‘ pus, a man in the first succession of the apostles, in the
 ‘ fifth book of his Commentaries, whose words are to this
 ‘ purpose:

purpose: "James, the brother of our Lord, undertook together with the apostles the government of the church. He has been called the Just by all from the time of our Saviour to ours. For many have been named James. But he was holy from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine, nor strong drink, nor did he eat any animal food. There never came razor upon his head. He neither anointed himself with oil, nor did he use a bath. To him alone was it lawful to enter the holy place. He wore no woollen, but only linen garments. He entered into the temple alone, where he prayed upon his knees. Infomuch that his knees were become like the knees of a camel, by means of his being continually upon them, worshipping God, and praying for the forgiveness of the people.

Upon account of his virtue he was called the Just, and Oblivion, that is, the defence of the people, and righteousness. Some therefore of the seven sects, which there were among the Jews, of whom I spake in the former part of these commentaries, asked him, (B) which is the gate of Jesus: or, what is the gate of salvation. And he said, Jesus is the Saviour, or the way of salvation. Some of them therefore believed, that Jesus is the Christ.—And many of the chief men also believing, there was a disturb-

^s Διαδεχεται δε την εκκλησιαν μετα των αποστολων ο αδελφος τε κυριε ιακωβος. κ. λ. p. 603. C. D.

(B) — επυνθανοντο αυτη, τις η θυρα τε ιησυ; και ελεγε τετον ειναι του σωτηρα. Le Clerc, in his observations upon this passage of Hegeffippus, says, he does not understand those words, *what is the gate of Jesus*. And, perhaps, the place has been corrupted. Τις η θυρα τε ιησυ; quod quid sibi velit, non intelligo. Sed forte locus est corruptus. H. E. p. 416. Ann. lxii. Mr. Mosheim thinks, with great probability, that the question put to James was, 'What is the gate, or way of salvation? Tell us, how we may obtain eternal life.' James answered, 'The gate of salvation is our Saviour Jesus Christ.' Vitium vero ejus non in vocabulo θυρα, sed potius in nomine ιησυ quæri debere censeo. Judæi, quod manifestum

est, sciscitantur sententiam Jacobi de via seu de ostio salutis, id est, de vera ratione ad salutem æternam perveniendi. Nullus ergo dubito, quin patrio sermone, quo utebantur, vocabulum Jeschuah adhibuerint, atque ex Jacobo quæsierint: dic, rogamus, nobis quodnam tibi videatur esse salutis ostium. — Græcus quæstionis hujus interpres vero, aut sermonis non nimis gnarus, aut minus attentus, nomen proprium Servatoris nostri, Jesus, cernere se putabat, et perperam idcirco, quum σωτηρια ponendum ipsi fuisset: Τις η θυρα της σωτηριας; vocabulum ιησυ scribebat: Τις η θυρα ιησυ; Ita si Judæorum quæstio intelligatur, nihil fieri aptius potest responsione Jacobi: *Ostium salutis est Servator noster, Jesus Christus*. Mosheim. De Reb. Christianor. ante Constantin. Sec. prim. num. 23. p. 95.

'ance among the Jews, and among the scribes and phari-
 'sees, who said, there was danger, lest all the people should
 'think Jesus to be the Christ. Coming therefore to James,
 'they said, we beseech thee to restrain the error of the
 'people. We entreat thee to persuade all that come hither
 'at the time of passover to think rightly concerning Jesus.
 'For all the people, and all of us put confidence in thee.
 '— Stand therefore upon the battlement of the temple,
 'that being placed on high, thou mayest be conspicuous,
 'and thy words may be easily heard by all the people. For
 'because of the passover, all the tribes be come hither, and
 'many gentiles. Therefore the scribes and pharisees, before
 'named, placed James upon the battlement of the temple,
 'and cried out to him, and said, O Justus, whom we ought
 'all to believe, since the people are in an error, following
 'Jesus who was crucified, tell us (c) what is the gate of
 'Jesus. And he answered with a loud voice, why do you
 'ask me concerning the son of man: he even sitteth in the
 'heaven, at the right hand of the great power, and will
 'come in the clouds of heaven. And many were fully
 'satisfied, and well pleased with the testimony of James,
 'saying, hosanna to the son of David. But the same scribes
 'and pharisees said to one another, we have done wrong in
 'procuring such a testimony to Jesus. Let us go up, and
 'throw him down, that the people may be terrified from
 'giving credit to him.—And they went up presently, and
 'cast him down, and said, let us stone James the Just. And
 'they began to stone him, because he was not killed with
 'the fall. But he turning himself kneeled, saying, I entreat
 'thee, O Lord God the Father, forgive them: for they
 'know not what they do. As they were stoning him, one
 'said, give over. What do ye? The just man prays for
 'you. And one of them, a fuller, took a pole, which was
 'used to beat cloths with, and struck him on the head.
 'Thus his martyrdom was completed. And they buried
 'him in that place, and his monument still remains near the
 'temple. This James was a true witness to Jews and
 'Gentiles, that Jesus is the Christ. And soon after Judea
 'was invaded by Vespasian, and the people were carried

(c) See before, note (b).

' Και λαβων τις απ' αυτων εις των
 γραφρων το ξυλον εν ω απεπτεζε τα

ιματια, ηνευχε κατα της κεφαλης τε
 δικαις. Ib. p. 65. B.

' captive.'

'captive.' "So writes Hegefippus at large, agreeably to
 'Clement. For certain, James was an excellent man, and
 'much esteemed by many for his virtue: infomuch that the
 'most thoughtful men among the Jews were of opinion,
 'that his death was the cause of the siege of Jerusalem,
 'which followed soon after his martyrdom: and that it
 'was owing to nothing else, but the wickedness committed
 'against him. And " Josephus says the same in these words :"
 'These things befel the Jews in vindication of James the
 'Just, who was brother of Jesus, called the Christ. For
 'the Jews killed him, who was a most righteous man.'
 "The same hiltorian, in the twentieth book of his anti-
 'quities, relates his death in this manner." 'The emperor
 'being informed of the death of Festus, sent Albinus to be
 'prefect in Judea. But the younger Ananus, who, as we
 'said before, was made high priest, was haughty in his
 'behaviour, and very enterprizing. And moreover he was
 'of the sect of the sadducees, who, as we have also observed
 'before, are above all other Jews severe in their judicial
 'sentences. This then being the temper of Ananus, he
 'thinking he had a fit opportunity, because Festus was
 'dead, and Albinus was yet upon the road, calls a council.
 'And bringing before them James, the brother of him who
 'is called Christ, and some others, he accused them as
 'transgressors of the laws, and had them stoned to death.
 'But the most moderate men of the city, who also were
 'reckoned most skilful in the laws, were offended at this
 'proceeding. They therefore sent privately to the king
 '[Agrippa the younger] entreating him to send orders to
 'Ananus, no more to attempt any such things. And some
 'went away to meet Albinus, who was coming from
 'Alexandria, and put him in mind, that Ananus had no
 'right to call a council without his leave. Albinus approv-
 'ing of what they said, wrote a very angry letter to Ananus,
 'threatening to punish him for what he had done. And
 'king Agrippa took away from him the priesthood, after he
 'had enjoyed it three months, and put in Jesus, the son of
 'Damnæus.' "These are the things which are related of
 'James, whose is the first of the epistles called catholic."

'Ο γυν Ιωσηπος εκ απωκησε και ος ην αδελφος ιηου τε λεγομενυ χριστη
 τετ' ευγραφως επιμαρτυρεσθαι, δι' ων επειδηπερ δικαιοτατον αυτον οντα οι
 φρισι λεξεων. Ταυτα δε συμβεβηκεν Ιουδαιοι απεντειναν. lb. p. 65. D.
 Ιουδαιοις, κατ' εκδικησιν Ιακωβου τε δικαιο,

Thus I have given a literal version of almost the whole of this chapter, being desirous, that my readers should see the accounts, which ancient writers have given of James: though they are not altogether so credible, nor so entertaining, as might have been wished. Nor do they any where lie in better order than here. And therefore I have chosen this chapter. The same things are transcribed by Jerom from Eusebius in his chapter of James the Just, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers: but very inaccurately, blending together Hegesippus, and Clement, and Josephus: so that, without comparing Eusebius, it could not be known what belongs to one, and what to the other. For which, I think, he deserves to be censured. Nor could I pass it by without notice, as an use may be made of it. For it may induce us to suspect, that to such carelessness and inaccuracy of quotation we owe those passages of Josephus, in which he is said to have assigned the death of James, as the sole cause of the ruin of the Jewish people.

And now I proceed to make some remarks upon the chapter of Eusebius, and the passages therein quoted by him.

1. In the first place, it appears from Eusebius's introduction, at the beginning of the chapter, that he supposed the martyrdom of St. James to have happened at a time, when there was no Roman governor in Judea, after the death of Festus, and before the arrival of Albinus in the province. What reason he had for this, we do not certainly know. We do not observe any notice of that circumstance in what he has transcribed from Hegesippus. It is indeed expressly said in the passage of Josephus. But if that passage be the only foundation for the opinion, its authority may be questioned. For divers learned men have suspected the genuineness of that part of the passage, which speaks of the death of James. As will be shown more particularly by and by.

2. Upon the first quotation, which is from Hegesippus, it is easy for any one to observe, that ^x there are in it many things very unlikely: as ^y that James should live in the manner

^x Ex Jacobus Justus, ecclesie Hierosolymitanæ antistes, quem misere trucidarunt. Quod ipse Josephus paucis, copiosius Hegesippus apud Eusebium memorie prodidit: quamquam in narratione

hujus multa sunt, quibus nemo, nisi rerum veterum, et Christianarum et Judaicarum, prorsus ignarus, fidem habeat. Moshem. De Reb. Christian. ante Constantin. Sec. i. § xxiii. p. 93.

^y Hic ab utero

manner here represented, and particularly, that he should eat no animal food: that he had a right to enter into the holy place when he pleased, whether thereby be understood the holy of holies, or only the temple: that the scribes and pharisees should place him on a pinnacle, or battlement of the temple, to deliver his opinion to the people concerning Jesus: that they should throw him down thence, and kill him in the temple, or any of the courts of it: that they should bury him near the place, in which he is here said to have been killed: when the Jews, and all other people in those times, usually buried their dead without the walls of their cities: and, finally, that he should have a monument, or pillar over him, near the place where he was buried, which remained to the time of Hegeſippus, after the war was over, and the city of Jeruſalem, and the temple had been overthrown. Concerning which laſt particular, Jerom in the catalogue above-mentioned, ſays, ‘He^z was buried ‘near the temple, where he had been thrown down. He ‘had a conspicuous monument, till the ſiege of Titus, and ‘that ſince by Adrian. Some of our people have thought, ‘that he was buried on mount Olivet. But that is a miſ- ‘taken opinion.’ So that even in Judea there were different opinions concerning the place, where James was buried. Nevertheless I preſume, all were perſuaded, that he had ſuffered martyrdom from the Jews at Jeruſalem. There was no different ſentiment about that.

However, this difference of opinion concerning the place where St. James was buried, deſerves our notice. For it may lead us to ſuſpect ſome miſtake in the account of Hegeſippus. Poſſibly, St James was buried in mount Olivet:

utero matris ſanctus fuit: nazireatus, nempe, voto Deo confecratus, ut ſequentia oſtendunt. Nec fieri hoc potuiſſe negarim. Nec vinum unquam bibit, nec ſiceram. Ita debuit, ſi Nazireus fuit. Ab animantium carnibus abſtinuit. Hoc vero Pythagoricum et ſuperſtitioſum fuit inſtitutum, de quo nihil in Moſaica Lege, et cujus reum fuiſſe Jacobum, etiam poſtquam Chriſtianus factus eſt, vix credibile fit. Comam nunquam tetendit. Recte, atque ordine. Sic enim Lex jubet. Num. vi. 3—5. Neque ungi, neque lavare balneo

corpus unquam ſolitus. Non tantum præter, ſed et contra Legem hoc fuit, quâ multæ ablutiones Judæis impoſitæ. Nec certe ſordes quaſitæ quidquam ad ſanctitatem faciunt. Cleric. Hiſt. Ec. Ann. lxii. not. (2). p. 415.

^z — et juxta templum, ubi et præcipitatus fuerat, ſepultus eſt. Titulum uſque ad obſidionem Titi, et ultimam Hadriani notiffimum habuit. Quidam e noſtris in monte Oliveti cum putaverunt conditum, ſed falſa eorum opinio eſt. De V. l. cap. 2.

though there was a pillar erected near the place, where he was killed. I think this may be of use to remove some difficulties in the account of Hegesippus. The pillar, which he saw, might be erected after the siege of Jerusalem, by some, who remembered the place where St. James had been killed. And some from that monument might conclude, he had been buried there, though really he was not.

I have made some remarks upon the passage of Hegesippus. A fuller critique may be seen in other ^a writers: partly aggravating the improbabilities of this account, partly softening them, and striving to remove difficulties. Accordingly Petavius says, 'that ^b though there are in it several things very unlikely, yet the whole history ought not therefore to be rejected.' To whom I am not unwilling to accede. But as I have not room to enlarge upon particulars, for showing the reasonableness of that judgment; I must be content with recommending a careful and impartial attention to the observations of the writers to whom I have referred. However, I may by and by have an opportunity to mention a few thoughts, beside what I have already said, for removing difficulties, and answering objections.

3. Eusebius says, 'that many thoughtful men among the Jews were of opinion, that the death of James was the cause of the siege of Jerusalem, and that it was owing to nothing else but the wickedness committed against him, and that Josephus says the same.'

Origen speaks to the like purpose, as we have seen: but not quite so strongly. The same is said by Jerom more than once. I mean ^c in his book of Illustrious Men, and ^d also elsewhere. But neither he, nor Eusebius expressly say, in what place of Josephus. Which may make us think, that they borrowed this from Origen. Nor does Origen in-

form

^a Vid. Joseph. Scaliger. Animadvers. in Euseb. Chron. p. 193, 194. J. Cleric. Hist. Ec. A. D. lxii. Petav. Animadvers. ad Epiph. Hær. lxxviii. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. et Tillemont S. Jacque le Mineur. Mem. Ec. tom. I. Basnag. Ann. 33. num. 184. &c.

^b Nec diffiteor nonnulla vel ab Hegesippo prodita, vel ab aliis inserta, quæ parum probabilia videantur. Sed totam

ipsam Historiam nego propterea damnandam esse. Petav. Animadv. ad Epiph. H. 78. n. iii. p. 332.

^c Tradit enim Josephus, tantæ eum sanctitatis fuisse et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditum sit, subversam Hierosolymam. De V. I. cap. 2. Vid. et cap. 13.

^d Transeamus ad Jacobum, qui frater Domini dicebatur, tantæ sanctitatis, tantæque justitiæ, et perpetuæ virginitatis,

ut

form us, in what work of Josephus those things were said, though he has mentioned them several times. Which may dispose us to think, that they were no where expressly in Josephus.

4. Eusebius proceeds, and says, that in the twentieth book of his Antiquities Josephus had related the death of James in a passage, which he there transcribes. Which passage is still in the works of Josephus. And what is there said, may be very true, for the most part: 'that Ananus the younger, being high-priest, and a man of an haughty and enterprizing temper, when there was no Roman governor in Judea, convened a council, and had some stoned to death, as transgressors of the laws: and that many of the most discreet and moderate men among the Jews were offended at this proceeding: forasmuch as whilst Judea was in the state of a province, the high-priest had no right to call the council together, without leave, and they feared, that this action would be resented by the emperor.' All this, I say, is very likely. Nevertheless those words, *James, the brother of him who is called Christ*, have been suspected to be an interpolation. And, probably, are so. Supposing these words to be an interpolation, we can gather no more from that passage, than that Ananus did illegally condemn several persons to death, as transgressors of the Jewish laws. But who they were, or whether any of them were Christians, or not, cannot be determined with certainty.

5. Eusebius supposeth, that this passage of Josephus confirms the account given by Hegesippus: whereas^h it appears,

ut Josephus quoque historicus Judæorum propter hujus necem Jerosolymam subversam referat. Hic primus Episcopus ex Judæis Jerosolymæ credentis ecclesiæ. Adv. Jovin. l. 1. T. IV. P. 2. p. 182. in.

^c Facile quidem crediderim Jerosolymitanos proceres graviter tulisse, quod synedrium suâ auctoritate instituisset, cum dudum jus gladii a Romanis Judæis esset creptum: quod iterum inconsulto Cæsare ab Anano usurpatum timebant, ne genti suæ gravi fortasse pœna luendum esset. Sed quæ de *Jacobo, Jesu, qui Christus dicebatur, fratre*, habentur, merum adamentum male

feriati Christiani esse videntur, Quæ de re alibi diximus. Cleric. ubi supr. § ii. p. 415. Conf. ejusd. Ars Crit. part III. sect. i. cap. 14. num xi.

^f See vol. I. p. 80, 81. See here likewise, note (e). ^g See Dr. Benson's History of St. James, sect. ii. p. 12. the second edition.

^h Quid magis contrarium esse potest, quam hæc Josephi, et illa Hegesippi narratio? Nam Josephus quidem damnatum esse scribit in publico Judæorum concilio: Hegesippus vero, per seditionem ac tumultum populi occisum. Et Hegesippus quidem fuste fullonis necatum in

pears, on the other hand, very difficult to reconcile them, I do not perceive Hegefippus to say any thing of Ananus, the high-priest. Nor has he expressly mentioned the sadducees, of which sect Ananus was. Nor does Hegefippus say a word of the council of the Jews. And as the punishment of stoning, when ordered by magistrates, was generally inflicted on men out of the city; it is probable, that they who were put to death by the procurement of Ananus, suffered without Jerusalem. But according to Hegefippus, James died at the temple or near it, and was buried not far off from the place, where he expired.

6. Since what is said of James in the passage of Josephus, is justly suspected to be an interpolation, it ought not to be regarded. Learned men of late times find it very difficult to determine, how James died. But that difficulty, as seems to me, is much encreased by paying too much regard to a passage, the genuineness of which is far from being certain. Josephus, indeed, is an older author than Hegefippus, and he is an historian of good credit. But we should be first assured, that the account is his. If a passage, or part of a passage, has been inserted in his works, and there is good reason to think it not his; it should be disregarded, and stand for nothing.

If we once set aside that passage, we may soon come to a determination concerning the manner of James's death. That James had suffered martyrdom at Jerusalem, was the general persuasion of Christians in the time of Eusebius, and before, as we plainly perceive. Two ancient christian writers of the second century assure us, that his death was completed by the blow of a fuller's pole, with which they are wont to beat wet clothes. And Hegefippus, in particular, and at large, relates that his death was effected in a tumultuous manner. The tumult began at the temple; where the scribes and pharisees, and other Jews, entered into discourse with James. He stand-

media urbe. Josephus autem lapidatum occubuisse narrat. Fiebat autem lapidatio extra portas civitatis, ut notum est. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 41.

Secundo, qui fidem habent narrationi Hegefippi, eos oportet, aut Josephum falsi arguere, aut suspectum habere hunc locum, quo res publice Jerosolymæ gesta, adeoque notissima, aliter narratur: ut mi-

rari subeat, ab Eusebio Josephi et Hegefippi verba allata, eodem capite, nec eum tentasse ea in concordiam redigere, aut alterutrius narrationis fidem in dubium non revocasse. Cleric. Ars Crit. P. III. sect. i. n. xii. ⁱ Potest tamen fieri, ut Jacobus hoc tempore mortuus sit. Sed genus mortis ignotum. Cleric. H. E. Ann. lxii. num. iii. in.

ing upon some eminence, which Hegeſippus calls *πτερύγιον*, and we now generally render a battlement, or pinnacle, openly declared, and argued, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, or the expected Meſſiah, and that his doctrine contained full inſtruction how men may be ſaved, and obtain eternal life. At which ſome leading men among the Jews were much offended. They then laid hold of him, and perhaps dragged him out of the temple. Some of the people threw ſtones at him. And though he earneſtly prayed to God in the behalf of thoſe who abuſed him, they perſiſted in their abuſes, till one ſtruck him with a long pole, which put an end to his life.

St. John has recorded two inſtances of the Jews taking up ſtones to throw at our Lord, when he was teaching in the temple. ch. viii. 59, and ch. x. 31. The firſt is in theſe words: *Then took they up ſtones to caſt at him. But Jeſus bid himſelf, and went out of the temple, going through the miſt of them, and ſo paſſed by. They took up ſtones to caſt at him.* And if our Lord had not ſaved himſelf by a miraculous exertion of power, they would have then killed him. Divine providence not interpoſing in a like manner, when a like attempt was made upon James, he fell a ſacrifice to the rage of the unbelieving part of the Jewish people at Jeruſalem.

Nor ought it to be thought exceeding ſtrange, or abſolutely unaccountable, that ſome ſcribes and phariſees, or other Jews, ſhould gather about James at the temple, and aſk his opinion concerning Jeſus, though they knew it very well already: or that they ſhould come to him with pretences of great reſpect, and aſſurances of paying a regard to his judgment. For many like things are recorded in the goſpels: which every one is able to recollect. I ſhall therefore take particular notice only of that ſecond inſtance, mentioned by St. John, of their taking up ſtones to throw at our Lord. John x. 22—31. *And it was at Jeruſalem, the feaſt of the dedication—And Jeſus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and ſaid unto him: How long doſt thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly. Jeſus answered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witneſs of me.—Then the Jews took up ſtones again to ſtone him.* They came to Jeſus, and deſired an answer to a queſtion, that had been answered before. But they pretend now to deſire, it ſhould be answered in the plaineſt and fulleſt manner. Nevertheleſs they could not hear the answer with patience.

I ſaid

I said just now, that two ancient writers of the second century, Clement and Hegesippus, assure us, that the death of James had been completed by a fuller's pole, after he had been thrown off from the temple. I suppose this must have been the opinion also of Eusebius, who has taken notice of these things, and of other ancient Christians. It is the account which ^k Jerom gives of the death of James, in his article, in the book of *Illustrious Men*, and likewise ^l elsewhere. The same is said by ^m Epiphanius.

Let this suffice for the circumstances and the manner of the death of James.

VI. The time of the death of James may be determined without much difficulty. He was alive, when Paul came to Jerusalem at the Pentecost in the year of Christ 58. And it is likely, that he was dead, when St. Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, at the beginning of the year 63. Theodoret ⁿ upon Hebr. xiii. 7. supposeth the apostle there to refer to the martyrdoms of Stephen, James, the brother of John, and James the Just. According to Hegesippus the death of James happened about the time of passover, which might be that of the year 62. And if Festus was then dead, and Albinus not arrived, the province was without a governor. Such a season left the Jews at liberty to gratify their licentious, and turbulent disposition. And they were very likely to embrace it. We may therefore very reasonably place this event at that juncture.

And it is now the general opinion of learned men, that James died about that time. Pearson, ^o who seems to admit the genuineness of the whole passage of Josephus, placeth the death of James in the year 62. Him Mill ^p follows. Le Clerc, who disputes the genuineness of those words, that relate to James, allows, that ^q he might die about that time. This also is agreeable to Tillemont's ^r computation. And I refer to ^s Valesius.

^k Qui cum præcipitatus de pinna templi, confractis cruribus, adhuc semivivus — fullonis fuste, quoda vestimenta extorqueri solent, in cerebro percussus interiit. De V. I. cap. 2. ^l Hic autem Jacobus Episcopus Jerosolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Justus: Qui et ipse postea de templo a Judæis præcipitatus, successorem ha-

buit Simonem, &c. Comm. in ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 237.

^m Hær. 78. num. xiv. p. 1046.

ⁿ Theod. tom. III. p. 459.

^o Ann. Paulin. p. 19. A. Chr. lxii. ^p Prolegom. num. 56.

^q H. E. An. 62. num. iii.

^r S. Jacques le Mineur. art. vii. in.

^s Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 41.

VII. It still remains, that we consider, on what account he was called the Lord's brother, and whether he be the same as James the son of Alpheus.

James, as we have seen, is called by St. Paul *the Lord's brother*. Gal. i. 19. All Christian writers in general speak of him in the like manner. The question is, in what sense he was so.

That James was not the son of Mary, or our Lord's brother by nature, has been well argued by Christians in former times, both ^t Latins, and ^u Greeks, from our Lord's words upon the cross, recorded John xix. 26, 27. where he recommends the care of his mother to John: requiring her to consider him, as her son, and him to take care of her, as his mother.

And indeed it has been the opinion of all Christians in general, that Mary was always a virgin, and that she never had any children by Joseph. We must therefore inquire, in what respect this James was our Lord's brother, and some others his brothers, or sisters.

Eusebius, in a chapter quoted some while ago, the first of the second book of his ecclesiastical history, without hesitation says, 'that x James was said to be the Lord's brother, because he also was called the son of Joseph. And Joseph was reckoned his father, because the virgin Mary was espoused to him.'

Origen ^y in a passage also cited z above, says, that the brethren of Jesus were the sons of Joseph by a former wife, who had cohabited with him before Mary. And he men-

^t Verum homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinionis suæ auctoritatem, quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse si traditum. Qui si Mariæ filii fuissent, et non potius Josephi ex priore conjugio suscepti, nunquam in tempore passionis Joanni Apostolo transcripta esset in matrem, Domino ad utrumque dicente, Mulier ecce filius tuus, et Joanni, Ecce mater tua: nisi quod desolatæ solatium caritatem filii in discipulo relinquebat. Hilar. Pict. Comm. in Matt. cap. i. p. 612. Ed. Bened.

^u Ἐἰ ἦσαν δὲ τέκνα τῆς μαρίας, καὶ εἰ ὑπῆρχεν αὐτῇ αὐτῆς, τινὶ λόγῳ παρεδίδεν τὴν μαρίαν τῷ ἰωάννῃ, καὶ τὸν ἰωάννην

τῆς μαρίας; Epih. Hær. 78. num. x. p. 1042. C.

^y Εἰ γὰρ ἐγγὼ αὐτὴν, καὶ ἐν τάξει γυναικὸς εἶχε, πῶς ὡς ἀπρογατευτόν αὐτὴν, καὶ ὕδνα ἐχῆσαν, τῷ μαθητῇ παρατιθεται, καὶ κελεύει αὐτῷ εἰς τὰ ἴδια αὐτὴν λαβεῖν; Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 5. T. VII. p. 77.

^x Τότε δὴ καὶ ἰακώβον, τὸν τῆς κυρίας λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος ἰωσήφ ὠνομαστοῦ πάτερ τῆς δὲ χριστὸς πατήρ οὐ ἰωσήφ, ὡ μνηστευθεῖσα ἡ παρθένος. κ. λ. L. 2. c. 1. p. 38. B.

^y In Matt. T. X. p. 462, 463. T. III. Bened. P. 223. tom. I. Huet.

^z See before, p. 478.

tions

tions it as supported by an ancient tradition. This was the opinion ^a of Epiphanius, and of many ^b ancient writers, both Greeks and Latins.

Jerom, in his article of this person, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, says: 'James ^c who is called the Lord's brother, surnamed the Just, was, as some think, the son of Joseph by another wife, but, as seems to me, the son of Mary, sister to our Lord's mother, mentioned by John, in his gospel, John xix. 25.' And in his book against Helvidius he delivers it as his opinion, that ^d those called our Lord's brethren in the gospels, were so named, as they were cousins, or relations. He speaks to the like purpose also ^e in his commentary upon Matth. xii. 49, 50.

This opinion was at length embraced by Augustine. In his exposition of the epistle to the Galatians, written about the year 394, he speaks dubiously, saying, 'that James was the Lord's brother, as he was the son of Joseph by a former wife, or else as he was related to his mother Mary.' But in works, written afterwards, he continually says, that our Lord's brethren were relations of his mother Mary.

The

^a Epiph. Hær. 29. n. iii. et iv. Hær. 51. num. x. Hær. 78. num. viii. et ix. Ancorat. num. lx. p. 62.

^b Greg. Nyssen. de Christi Resur. Or. 2. tom. III. p. 412, 413. Chrysof. in Matt. hom. 5. tom. VII. p. 77. C. Theophyl. in Gal. i. 19. p. 448. Niceph. Call. l. 2. cap. 3. in Hilar. Piëtav. Comm. in Matt. cap. i. p. 612. ed. Bened. Ambros. de Instit. Virg. cap. vi. T. II. p. 260. Bened. Ambrosiastri Comment. in Gal. i. 19. ap. Ambros. in App. T. II. p. 213. ^c Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia uxore, ut mihi videtur, Mariæ sororis matris Domini, cujus Joannes in libro suo meminit, filius. De V. I. cap. 2.

^d Restat igitur, ut juxta superiorem expositionem fratres eos intelligas appellatos, cognatione, non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non naturâ: quomodo Lot Abrahamæ, quomodo Jacob Laban est appellatus

frater, &c. Adv. Helvid. T. IV. P. 2. p. 140.

^e Quidam fratres Domini de aliâ uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta apocryphorum, et quandam Mescham vel Escham mulierculam contingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro, quem contra Helvidium scripsimus, continetur, non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos, intelligimus, materteræ Domini: quæ esse dicitur mater Jacobi minoris, et Joseph, et Judæ: quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici, omnis scriptura demonstrat. In Matt. cap. xii. T. IV. p. 53. ^f Jacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus debet intelligi. Aug. Expos. ep. ad Gal. cap. i. et ii. num. viii. tom. III. P. 2.

^g Fratres ejus sic accipite, sicut nostis. Non enim novum est quod auditis. Consanguinei virginis Mariæ fratres Domini dicebantur.

Scriptura

The former, as appears from the authors just cited, was the more ancient opinion. Nor does Jerom allege any before him who held the opinion mentioned as his own. Indeed he seems to have been the first, who said, that our Lord's brethren were the sons of Mary, his mother's sister, and therefore only cousins or relations. But when he advanced this notion, he ^h was inclined to think Joseph also a virgin. As has been well observed by ⁱ G. J. Vossius.

However Jerom's opinion has prevailed very much of late. I suppose, it may be that ^k of the Romanists in general. It was also the opinion of ^l Lightfoot. It is likewise embraced by ^m Witsius, and ⁿ Lampe, and ^o many other protestants. But Valesius, among the Romanists, in his annotations upon the above cited chapter of Eusebius, says, he ^p thinks, that James was the son of Joseph by a former wife. The same opinion has been asserted by several among the

Scriptura tamen hujusmodi cognationes fratres appellat. Nam Abraham et Lot fratres sunt dicti, cum esset Abraham patruus Lot: et Laban et Jacob fratres sunt dicti, cum esset Laban avunculus Jacob, &c. In Joan. Tract. 28. num. iii. tom. III. P. 2. Vid. ibid. in Matt. Qu. xvii. et in Joan. Tr. x.

Et Loth frater Abraham dicitur, cum patruus eius esset Abraham. Ex quâ vocabuli consuetudine etiam fratres Domini vocantur in Evangelio, non utique quos Maria virgo pepererat, sed ejus consanguinitate omnes propinqui Contr. Faust l. 22. cap. 35. T. VIII.

^h Tu dicis, Mariam virginem non permanisse. Ego mihi plus vindico, etiam ipsum Joseph virginem fuisse per Mariam, ut ex virginitatis conjugio virgo filius nasceretur. Adv. Helvid. tom. IV. p. 142. in.

ⁱ Et sane, qui Josephum putaret non habuisse uxorem, antequam B. Mariam duceret, ante B. Hieronymum arbitror fuisse neminem: utcumque posterioribus temporibus, in virginitate extollenda immodicis, avide multi eam fuerint sententiam amplexi. Voss. de Gen. Christi. cap. vi. ^k Vid. Baron. in Ap-

paratu num. lxi. &c. Est. ad Gal. cap. i. 19. et alibi. Tillem. S. Jacques le Mineur. Art. i. et ii.

^l See Lightfoot's Works, vol. I. p. 270, 541, 660. ^m At quamvis Eusebius, Epiphanius, Gregorius Nyssenus, plurimique veterum, in eandem concesserint sententiam, non videtur mihi ea probabilibus niti argumentis. Rectius Hieronymo accedemus, arbitranti eos qui Domini fratres dicuntur, fuisse ejus consobrinos, loquendi genere, etiam Græcis et Romanis noto. Wits. Comm. in ep. Jud. § 4. p. 454.

ⁿ Erat hic frater Jacobi minoris. — Quare fuit consobrinus Christi secundum carnem, natus ex Maria, uxore Cleophæ, seu Alphæi, quæ soror erat Mariæ Matris Domini. Lampe in Evang. Joan. cap. xiv. 22. T. III. p. 167. ^o Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. 5. n. xi. T. III. p. 165. And see Lenfant et Beausobre sur Gal. i. 19. et la preface sur l'epître de S. Jacques. Dr. Benson in his preface to the epistle of St. James, sect. ii. Doddridge in his preface to the same epistle.

^p Ait igitur Eusebius, Jacobum, qui in Evangelio et epistola Pauli frater Domini dicitur, filium fuisse Josephi

the protestants, † G. J. Vossius, and † Basnage, and † Cave, in his *Lives of the Apostles* written in English. Nor does it appear, that he had abandoned his first judgment, when † he wrote his *Historia Literaria*.

I likewise have for a long time been much inclined to the same opinion; and have composed an argument upon the question. But I have laid it aside, supposing it to be rather too prolix, and too intricate, to be inserted in this place. And after all, perhaps some might think, that the argument does not afford a complete solution of all difficulties and objections. I therefore enter not at present into any dispute about it, but leave every one to judge as he sees good.

VIII. Whether James was the son of Joseph by a former wife, or the son of Mary, wife of Cleophas, sister to Mary, our Lord's mother, or otherwise nearly related to her, he was an

Josephi ex aliâ conjuge, quam Josephus ante Mariam sibi sociaverat. Cum Eusebio consentit Epiphanius — Gregorius Nyssenus — sed Hieronymus in libro de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis Jacobum hunc idcirco fratrem Domini appellatum esse existimat, quod filius esset Mariæ, sororis fratris Domini. — Multa quidem de hoc argumento differuit Baronius in Annalibus. Mihi tamen verior videtur opinio eorum, qui Jacobum, et reliquos Domini fratres, Josephi ex prioro matrimonio filios esse dicunt. Hæc enim sententia magis convenit verbis Evangelii. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 1.

Fuit enim Jacobus filius Josephi, ac proinde oriundus ex stirpe David. Id. in Annot. ad l. 2. cap. 23. p. 40.

† Voss. de Gen J. C. cap. vi.

† Basnag. ann. ante Christ. 6. num. xxviii. et xxix.

† He was the son (as we may probably conjecture) of Joseph, afterwards husband to the blessed virgin, and his first wife. Hence reputed our Lord's brother, in the same sense, that he was reputed the son of Joseph. — Jerom, and some others, will have Christ's brethren so called, because sons of Mary, cousin-german, or, according to

the custom of the Hebrew language, sister to the virgin Mary. But Eusebius, Epiphanius, and the far greater part of the ancients (from whom, especially in matters of fact, we are not rashly to depart) make them the children of Joseph by a former wife. And this seems most genuine and natural, the evangelists seeming very express and accurate in the account which they give of them. *Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Jude?* — Matt. xiii. 55, 56. By which it is plain, that the Jews understood these persons not to be Christ's kinsmen only, but his brothers, the same carpenter's sons, having the same relation to him that Christ himself had: though they indeed had more. Christ being but his reputed, they his natural sons.' And what follows. *The Life of James the Less, num 2.* † S. Jacobus apostolus — minor dictus, cognomento Justus, frater Domini, Josephi utpote ex prioro conjuge, seu ut Hieronymo placet, Mariæ sororis matris Domini filius. *Hist. Lit. tom. I. p. 14.*

apostle.

apostle. I think, it was clearly proved at the beginning of this chapter from the New Testament, that James, called *the Lord's brother*, was an apostle in the highest acceptation of the word. Consequently, he must be James the son of Alpheus, or Cleophas. For those names seem to be one differently written.

But how he was so is made out differently. They who say that those called our Lord's brethren were sons of Cleophas, husband of Mary, related to our Lord's mother, seem to have here no difficulty. But they who suppose our Lord's brethren to have been sons of Joseph by a former wife, are somewhat embarrassed. However, I just observe, that the account, given by ^u Epiphanius, is this. Cleophas and Joseph were brothers. The former died without issue, and Joseph raised up seed to his brother. Accordingly, James being the first-born of Joseph, was called the son of Cleophas. In like manner speaks ^x Theophilact. But, as before said, I do not now form any debate about this.

That James, called our Lord's brother, is the same as he, who in the catalogues of the apostles is called the *son of Alpheus*, or *Cleophas*, is allowed by Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophilact. Epiphanius says, that ^y James, by nature the son of Joseph, who was called the Lord's brother, and was an apostle, was appointed the first bishop of Jerusalem. Chrysostom in his comment upon Gal. i. 19. says, ^z that 'Paul calls James the Lord's brother, giving him that honourable appellation, when he might have said *the son of Cleophas*, as he is called in the gospels.' Theophilact likewise says, ^a that 'Paul calls him the Lord's brother, by the way of an honourable distinction when he might have called him the son of Cleophas. Nor was he the Lord's

^u Vid. Epiph. Hær. 29. n. iii. iv. H. 51. n. x. H. 78. num. vii. viii. ix. et Ancorat. num. lx.

^x Πως δε ην τε κλοπα; Ακβε' Κλοπας και ιωσηφ αδελφοι. Τε κλοπα απαιδος τελευτησαντος, ο ιωσηφ εξανετησεν αυτω σπερμα, και ετεκε τετον, και τες αλλες αυτε αδελφες. κ. λ. Theoph. in Gal. i. 19.

^y — καταγαθεντος ευθυσ ιακωβ τε αδελφον κυριε καλεμενυ και αποστολη επισκοπος πρωτε υιυ ιωσηφ φυσει οντος. κ. λ. Hær. 29. n. iii.

^z 'Ει γαρ σημασαι ον ελεγεν ηθελεν, ενην και εξ ετερυ γνωρισματος τετο ποιησαι δηλον, και ειπειν τον τε κλωπα, οπερ και ευαγγελισης ελεγεν. Chr. in Gal. cap. i. T. X. p. 678. E.

^a Ειδε δε και ιακωβον. Μετα τιμης δε και τετε μεμνηται, τον αδελφον τε κυριε ειπων, ετω και βασκανιας απηλακτο' καιτοι ει ηβηλετο σημασαι, ειπεν αυ, τον τε κλωπα' εδε γαρ κατα σαρκω αδελφος ην τε κυριε, αλλ' ενομιζετο. Theoph. in Gal. i. 19.

‘brother according to the flesh, but only thought to be so.’ I mention no more ancient writers.

And that James, called the son of Alpheus in the catalogues of the apostles, was one of those, who are called *the Lord’s brethren*, I think, may be shown from the gospels, by comparing several texts together.

In all the catalogues of the twelve apostles of Christ the four last mentioned are these. *James the son of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him, Matt. x. 3, 4. James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him, Mark iii. 18, 19. James the son of Alpheus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which was also the traitor, Luke vi. 15, 16. James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, Acts i. 13.*

Let us now compare the texts in the gospels, where our Lord’s brethren are named, Matt. xiii. 55. *Is not this the carpenter’s son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And Mark vi. 3. Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and of Joses, and of Judah, and Simon?*

All these, except Joses, seem to have been apostles. For must not the three apostles, last mentioned before Judas Iscariot, in the first catalogues, and the three last mentioned, in the Acts, be three of the four called in the gospels our Lord’s brethren?

And I should choose to translate the texts of St. Luke, where the apostles are named, somewhat differently from what is generally done, in this manner. *James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas, brethren of James:* declaring, that both Simon, and Judas, were brethren of James, the son of Alpheus, before named. A word must be supplied. And the coherence leads me to think, brethren more proper than brother.

By all which we are led to conclude, that James, several times mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul’s epistles, is the same, who in the catalogues of the apostles is called *James the son of Alpheus*. For James, mentioned by St. Paul is called *the Lord’s brother*, and plainly appears to be an apostle. Consequently, he is *James, the son of Alpheus*, mentioned in all the catalogues of the apostles of Christ.

Wall, in his notes upon John vii. at the beginning, says,
‘These

‘These brethren and kinsfolk of our Lord, as they were
 ‘but mean persons, so also they were some of the back-
 ‘wardest to believe in him.—They that are moſt uſually
 ‘called his brethren were James, and Joſes, and Simon, and
 ‘Judas.—Two of theſe, James and Judas, ſome learned
 ‘men think to have been two of the apoſtles. And there
 ‘were two apoſtles of thoſe names that were brethren. But
 ‘this place, if they be of thoſe that are meant in it, is a
 ‘ſtrong argument againſt that opinion. For theſe brethren
 ‘did hardly yet believe in him; but the apoſtles did. This
 ‘was but half a year before he ſuffered.’

Upon which I would obſerve: when St. John ſays, ch.
 vii. 5. *For neither did his brethren believe in him*: he does not
 intend to ſay that they had not faith in him. Grotius's
 comment appears to me very right. ‘The ^b meaning is
 ‘not, that they did not believe at all: but that they did not
 ‘believe as they ſhould.’

Learned men are certainly in the right, when they ſay,
 that ſome of our Lord's brethren were apoſtles. And it
 ſeems to me, that all thoſe, who in the gospels are called
 our Lord's brethren, had early and always an affection and
 eſteem for him. This may be perceived from ſeveral places
 in the gospels, as Matt. xii. 46. Mark iii. 31. Luke viii. 19.
 See alſo John ii. 12. And in time they all believed in him,
 and that rightly as the Meſſiah. St. Luke, in the hiſtory
 of things after our Lord's aſcenſion, Acts i. 13, 14. having
 mentioned the names of the apoſtles, adds, *Theſe all continued
 with one accord in prayer and ſupplication, with the women, and
 Mary the mother of Jeſus, and with his brethren.* And St. Paul,
 1 Cor. ix. 5. ſpeaks of *brethren of the Lord*, not apoſtles, who
 laboured in ſpreading the goſpel in the world.

They, of whom St. John ſpeaks, had worldly views and
 expectations. They were deſirous, that Jeſus, if he were
 indeed the Meſſiah, ſhould go to Jeruſalem, and ſet up his
 kingdom in a glorious manner. Even after this, ſeveral
 who certainly were apoſtles, betrayed great ignorance, or
 weak faith, or wrong apprehenſions, by their diſcourſes,
 and queſtions put to our Saviour. Of Thomas ſee John
 xiv. 5. Of Philip, ſee ver. 8—11. and of Judas, ver. 22, 23.

Thoſe brethren of our Lord propoſed, that he ſhould
 haſten to Jeruſalem, to the feaſt of tabernacles, nigh at

^b Non omnino, non ut oportebat. Grot. in loc.

hand. — *Jesus said to them, my time is not yet come. But your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you. But me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil. Go ye up unto this feast. I go not up yet unto this feast: for my time is not yet full come,* ch. vii. 6, 7, 8. It is manifest, that he taxeth their carnality and worldly-mindedness. As if he had said: ‘It is^c not proper for me to go up to this feast, as yet, ‘nor till after it is begun. But you may go up at any time, ‘since you have done little or nothing to make the Jews ‘unfriendly to you, as I have done: who by the strictness of ‘my doctrine, and the freedom of my reproofs, have provoked ‘many to a great degree.’

It follows in ver. 9, 10. *When he had said these things unto them, he abode still in Galilee. But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.* These words may afford, in the opinion of some, another objection to the supposition, that these brethren of our Lord were apostles. But to me the objection appears not of much moment. Some of these brethren might nevertheless be among the apostles, and go up to the feast before him. For our Lord seems not to have been attended by all his apostles in that journey. So much is implied in the manner, in which it was performed. *He went not openly, but as it were in private:* in a more private manner than he had usually done, and attended by a small number of his apostles only, several of them having gone up to Jerusalem before him, upon occasion of the approaching solemnity.

Chrysostom seems not to have doubted, that some of the brethren of our Lord, here spoken of, were apostles, or at least among his disciples. For discoursing on John vii. 3, 4, 5. he says: ‘Observe^d with me the power of Christ. Of them who ‘uttered these words, one was the first bishop of Jerusalem, even ‘the blessed James, of whom Paul says: *Other of the apostles ‘saw I none, save James the Lord’s brother.* And Judas also is ‘said to have been a wonderful man.’ So says Chrysostom, who did not receive the epistle of St. Jude, so far as we can perceive, though he did that of St. James.

IX. This James is called by St. Mark, *the less,* ch. xv. 40. *There were also women looking on afar off. Among whom was Mary*

^c Compare Mr. James Macknight’s *Harmony of the Gospels,* vol. II. p. 5.

^d Σὺ δὲ μοι σκοπεῖς τὰ κρίματα τῆς δουλείας. Ἀπο γὰρ τῶν τῶν ταῦτα λε-

γόντων τὰ κρίματα, ὁ πρῶτος τῶν ἱεροσολυμίων ἐπίσκοπος γεγὼς, ὁ μακαρὶς Ἰακώβος. — Λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰούδας βαυμαστὴς τε γεγὼς. In Jo. hom. 48. T. VIII. p. 284. D.

Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Less, and Joses, and Salome. That hereby is meant James, the Lord's brother, and the son of Alpheus, is generally supposed, and I think reasonably. He can be no other, because Joses is presently afterwards mentioned, as his brother, agreeably to other places of the evangelists, where our Lord's brethren are named, Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. But interpreters are not agreed, why he was so called.

It has been thought, that ^e herein is a reference to James the son of Zebedee, and brother of John, who had been beheaded by Herod in the year of Christ 44. And Lightfoot says, ' that James, or Jacob, is commonly called James the great, in distinction from James the son of Alpheus, who is called the less, not for any dignity, or superiority of apostleship that he had above the other, but either because this James was the elder, or because of the singular privacy, that Christ admitted him to with himself, as he also did Peter and John.'

Here are several reasons of this denomination, but though Lightfoot says, James the son of Zebedee was commonly called James the great, there is no instance of it in the New Testament.

It may be observed, that the less, in the original, is not a comparative, but a positive, the little, *τε μικρον*. And so Beza has translated. *Maria Jacobi parvi et Jose mater*. However in the Latin vulgate it is *Jacobi minoris*. And it is evident, that ^g Jerom so understood the word.

Gregory Nyssen ^h thought, he was called the less, as not being one of the twelve apostles. Which reason I cannot admit, because I am persuaded he was an apostle, if he was the Lord's brother. Nor do I perceive in the New Testament more than two of this name.

Some say, he was so called, because he was the younger of the two apostles of this name. But of this there is no proof, nor probability. For James, the son of Alpheus, must have

^e Puto ita dictum inter Apostolos ad discrimen Jacobi Zebedaidæ. Grot. ad Marc. xv. 40.

^f The third part of the Harmony of the four Evangelists, vol. I. p. 634.

^g Si non est Apostolus, sed nescio quis Jacobus, quomodo est frater Domini putandus? Et quomodo tertius ad distinctionem majoris appellabitur minor? quum major et minor non inter tres, sed inter duos

soleant præbere distantiam. Adv. Helvid. p. 138. in.

^h Ὁ δὲ μαρκος ἰακωβου τε μικρον και ἰωση μητερα αυτην ειπεν, επειπερ ην αλλος ἰακωβος ο τε αλφαιου, δια τριτο μεγας, οτι τοις αποστολοις τοις δωδεκα συναριθμητο· ο γαρ μικρος εκ ην αυτοις εν αριθμω. Greg. Nyss. De Christ. Ref. Or. 2. T. III. p. 413.

been his father's first-born, and may have been as old, or older than James the son of Zebedee.

Some have conjectured, that he might be so called on account of his stature. Which conjecture is favoured by the literal sense of the word in the positive degree, James the little. And some may be apt to think, that this was one reason, why the Jews at the temple, according to Hegesippus, placed him on an eminence, that he might be heard by all the people, when assembled in great numbers. So Zaccheus, being little of stature, and there being a great croud, climbed up into a sycamore tree, to see Jesus, as he passed by, Luke xix. Perhaps, this is as likely a conjecture as any.

Nevertheless I shall mention one more. He might be so called, on account of his inferiority, in comparison of the other James. It is manifest, that during the time of our Lord's abode on this earth, Peter, and James and John, the two sons of Zebedee, were the most eminent and considerable of the disciples. They were the most favoured, and were admitted by our Lord to some special measure of confidence and freedom. And it is observable, that in all the catalogues of the apostles James the son of Alpheus, and Simon the Canaanite, or Zelotes, and Judas, are the last mentioned, except Judas Iscariot. Possibly these three, whom I suppose to have been our Lord's brethren, were the latest called to be apostles, and for a while were defective in faith, and understanding, or not so considerable, and eminent, as some of the other apostles, particularly James the son of Zebedee. The question put to our Lord by Judas, one of them, recorded in John xiv. 22. seems a remarkable instance of the slowness of his understanding in the things of religion, under all the advantages, which he had enjoyed.

James therefore might be called *the less*, by way of distinction from another of the same name, who had been called to be an apostle before him, and was more eminent. And yet the appellation carried not in it any reflection. This coincides with some things said by Lightfoot above.

However, it is mentioned only as a conjecture, to be considered by those, who are disposed to do it. For I am not able to say with assurance, what was the ground and reason of this appellation.

¹ Potuit etiam Jacobus parvus appellari ad corporis molem ratione habitâ: quomodo apud Romanos ob corporis affectiones Pauli, Mag-

ni, Longi, Crassi, Claudii, Pulchri nuncupabantur. Basnag. ann. ante Dom. 6. num. xxxi.

X. We have seen divers proofs of the respect shown to this person, which any one is able to recollect, and therefore they need not to be repeated. However, I shall here take notice of a few such things.

1. He is never called Justus, or the Just in the New Testament. But he seems to have been so called by many, even in his life-time, as well as afterwards. Eusebius says, that ^k he was called the Just by the ancients on account of the eminence of his virtue. He is several times so called in the passages of Clement of Alexandria, quoted from Eusebius ^l some while ago. Hegefippus says, he ^m had been called the Just by all from our Saviour's time to his own: and afterwards, that ⁿ on account of his eminent virtue he was called the Just, and Oblias. He likewise says, that ^o the Jews at the temple called him the Just, as may be seen in the account of his death, transcribed above. Jerom ^p in the beginning of his article of this person says, 'that James the Lord's brother was surnamed the Just.'

2. In his commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, at ch. i. 19. he says, 'that ^q James, there spoken of, was in such esteem for his sanctity, that it was no uncommon thing for people to croud about him, and strive to touch the hem of his garment.'

3. Eusebius says, that ^r the episcopal chair, in which James was used to sit, was preserved to his time, and was had in veneration by the church at Jerusalem.

XI. I have not been able to write the history of this person so regularly, as that of some others. For which reason it may not be amiss to take a summary view of what we have seen.

James, sometimes called the Less, the son of Alpheus, and called the Lord's brother, either as being the son of Joseph by

^k Τετον δὲ ἔν αὐτον ἰακώβου, οὐ καὶ δίκαιον ἐπικλήν οἱ παλαι οἱ ἀρετῆς ἐκαλεῖν προτερήματα. — Euf. H. E. l. 2. c. 1. p. 38. B.

^l p. 475, 476.

^m Ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπο πάντων δίκαιος ἀπο τῶν τε κυρίων χρόνων μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν. Ap. Euseb. l. 2. c. 23. p. 63. D.

ⁿ Δια γέτοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτῆ ἐκαλεῖτο δίκαιος καὶ ὠβλίαν. Ib. p. 64. A.

^o — καὶ ἐκράζαν αὐτῶν, καὶ εἶπον· Δίκαιε, ὡ πάντες πείθεσθαι σφειλομεν. Ib. D. Vid. et p. 65. A. et B.

^p Jacobus, qui

appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus. De V. l. cap. 2.

^q Hic autem Jacobus episcopus Jerosolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Justus: vir tantæ sanctitatis et rumoris in populo, ut simbriam vestimenti ejus certatim cuperent attingere. In Gal. T. IV. p. 237. in.

^r Τον γὰρ ἰακώβου θρόνον τε πρώτῃ τῆς ἱεροσολυμῶν ἐκκλησίας — εἰς δευρὸν πεφυλαγμένον οἱ τῆδε κατὰ διαδοχὴν περιεπόντες ἀδελφοὶ. κ. λ. H. E. l. 7. c. 19.

a former wife, or a relation of his mother Mary, was one of Christ's apostles. We have no account of the time, when he was called to the apostleship. Nor is there any thing said of him particularly in the history of our Saviour, which is in the gospels. But from the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, we can perceive, that after our Lord's ascension he was of note among the apostles. Soon after St. Stephen's death in the year 36, or thereabout, he seems to have been appointed president, or superintendent in the church of Jerusalem, where, and in Judea, he resided the remaining part of his life. Accordingly, he presided in the council of Jerusalem, held there in the year 49, or 50. He was in great repute among the Jewish people, both believers and unbelievers, and was surnamed the Just. Notwithstanding which he suffered martyrdom in a tumult at the temple: and, probably, in the former part of the year 62. He wrote one epistle, not long before his death, of which we shall speak presently.

C H A P. XVII.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

- I. *The Evidences of its Genuineness.* II. *When written.* III. *To whom.*

HAVING now done all I am able for clearing up the history of this person, I come to consider the epistle ascribed to him.

Here I would observe the evidences of its genuineness, and authority, the time when, and the people to whom it was written.

I. And for the first point. This epistle seems to be alluded, or referred to, by Clement bishop of Rome, vol. II. p. 43, 44. and by Hermas, p. 58—60. It is not expressly quoted by Irenæus. Nor are there in him any indisputed references to it, vol. II. p. 166—169. Nor do we perceive it to be quoted by Clement of Alexandria, vol. II. p. 225—229. nor by Tertullian, p. 273, 274. This epistle is quoted once or twice by Origen, but, as of doubtful authority, or not received by all, p. 478, 479. We do not observe any notice to be taken of this epistle by Cyprian, vol. III. p. 171. It seems to be referred to by Commodian, a Latin writer about the year 270, p. 260. It is probable, that it was received by the Manichees, and Paulicians,

ans, p. 507, 547, 548. It seems to be referred to by Lactantius, vol. IV. p. 79.

From a passage of Eusebius, cited in the ^a preceding chapter, it appears, that in his time, the beginning of the fourth century, all the seven epistles called catholic, were well known, and received by many. And he expressly says, that the epistle of James was the first of them. And to the like purpose again in another passage to be here taken notice of by us. Having given a particular account of the death of James, called the Just, and the brother of the Lord, and bishop of Jerusalem, he concludes the chapter in this manner. ‘ Thus far,’ ^b says he, ‘ concerning James, who is said to be the writer of the first of the epistles called catholic. But it ought to be observed, that it is spurious [meaning, that it was a contradicted book of scripture, or at the utmost, that it was doubted of, or rejected by many:] forasmuch as there are not many of the ancient writers, who have quoted it; as neither that called Jude’s, another of the seven epistles called catholic. However we know, that these also are commonly used [or publicly read] in most churches, together with the rest.’

This passage is very satisfactory. For it assures us, who was the writer of this epistle: namely, James, before spoken of, called the Lord’s brother, surnamed the Just, who generally resided at Jerusalem. It also assures us, that though it had been doubted of by some, it was then generally received, and publicly read in the assemblies of Christians. They who have leisure, and are curious, may see what was farther observed by us formerly, relating to the opinion of Eusebius himself concerning this epistle, and the writer of it, vol. IV. p. 251—253.

I only add here, that this epistle of St. James is one of the three catholic epistles received by the Syrian Christians, and by Chryostom and Theodoret. And that after the time of Eusebius, this and the other six catholic epistles, were received by all Greeks and Latins in general: and are in the catalogues of canonical scripture composed by councils, and

^a See before, p. 466, 467.

^b Ταυτα και τα κατα τον ιακωβον, η η πρωτη των ονομαζομενων καθολικων ειναι λεγεται. Ιτερον δε ως νοθευεται. Ου παλλα γην των παλαιων αυτης εμμενευσαν, ως εδε της λεγομενης ιεδα,

μιας και αυτης οσης των επτα λεγομενων καθολικων. Ομως δε ισμεν και ταυτας μετα των λοιπων εν πλεισταις δεδημοσιευμενας εκκλησιαις. H. E. I. 2. cap. 23. p. 66. Comp. vol. IV. p. 235.

learned authors: as was shown in a foregoing chapter. However, there might be still some few, who doubted of its authority, especially in the east, as was observed vol. V. p. 278.

This epistle was received by Jerom, as was distinctly and largely shown in his article, vol. V. p. 51—53. Who in one place says, ‘The apostles, James, Peter, John, Jude, wrote seven epistles, of few words, but full of sense.’ It may nevertheless be worth the while to recollect here particularly what he says of it in his book of *Illustrious Men*, transcribed there at p. 125. ‘James, the Lord’s brother,——wrote but one epistle, which is among the seven catholic epistles. Which too is said to have been published by another in his name. But gradually, in process of time it has gained authority. This is he of whom Paul writes in his epistle to the Galatians. And he is often mentioned in the Acts of the apostles.’

‘Which likewise,’ says Jerom, ‘is said to have been published by another in his name:’ that is, even that one epistle is said by some to be spurious, and not really written by James, though it bears his name. But I do not believe there is reason to think, that was ever said by any. And I am persuaded, that what Jerom says here is owing to a mistake of his, not rightly understanding Eusebius: who, as may be remembered, says, ‘This James is said to be the author of the first of the epistles called catholic. But it ought to be observed, that it is spurious.’ By which Jerom understood Eusebius to say, that this epistle was falsely ascribed to James, and was not his: whereas Eusebius means no more than that it was a contradicted book, not received by all as of authority: or at the utmost, that it was doubted of, or rejected by many. This I suppose to have been clearly shown before. See vol. IV. p. 234—239. and also p. 253. (A)

The reason why this epistle was not received by all, I suppose to have been, that it was not certainly known that James, the writer of it, was an apostle. We have observed several ancient writers, who did not allow him to have that high character. There were two apostles of this name: James the son of Zebedee, and James the son of Alphaeus. That the

° Vol. V. p. 32.

“ Quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur.

“ ἵσθον δε ως ρηθενται μεν. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 66. C.

(A) I likewise refer to Dr. Leonard Twells’s *Examination of the late new text and version of the N. T.* Part. 2. ch. 2. p. 82. Who speaks to the like purpose.

writer of this epistle was not James the son of Zebedee, must have been evident. Nor was it certain that he was the son of Alpheus. Another reason of doubting of his apostleship may have been, that he was often called bishop of Jerusalem, and said by some to have been appointed to that office by the apostles. This also may have contributed to the doubt, whether he was one of the twelve apostles of Christ.

Other reasons have been assigned in late ages, why some might hesitate about receiving this epistle as a part of canonical scripture. But those reasons are not to be found in the most early antiquity: whereas we can plainly perceive, that not a few learned Christians of the first ages were not satisfied, the writer was an apostle; which must have occasioned a demur concerning the high authority of the epistle.

If this James was not one of the twelve apostles, he was nevertheless a person of great distinction, as he was the Lord's brother, and resided many years at Jerusalem after our Lord's ascension, as president, or superintendent of the church there, and of the Jewish believers in Judea in general. Accordingly, Eusebius, who did not think this James to be one of the twelve apostles, in his commentary upon Isaiah, reckons fourteen apostles, meaning Paul, and this James, though not equal to him. See vol. IV. p. 252, 253. And Jerom likewise, in one place, formerly taken notice of, reckons this James, brother of the Lord, an additional apostle with Paul, beside the twelve, vol. V. p. 52.

But I think it manifest, that James, the Lord's brother, who resided at Jerusalem, several times mentioned in the Acts of the apostles, and in St. Paul's epistles, was an apostle, one of the twelve, and consequently the same with him who is called the son of Alpheus. And as this epistle has been all along ascribed to James, the Lord's brother, surnamed the Just, I receive it as a part of sacred scripture, and think it ought to be so received.

II. Concerning the time of this epistle, there cannot be very different apprehensions.

Mill^r says it was written before the destruction of Jerusa-

^r De tempore, quo scripta est, certum est in primis exaratum fuisse ante excidium Hierosolymitanam. De hoc enim, ut et generali Judæorum calamitate, veluti jam imminente, loquitur. cap. v. 1. Jam vero Jacobus statim post Festi

mortem martyrium obiit, teste Josepho, anno aetæ vulgaris, ex rationibus Pearsonianis, quas libenter sequor, lxii, adeoque uno vel altero ante mortem, scriptam censuerim hanc epistolam circa annum lx. Prol. num. 56.

lem, and a year or two before his own death, about the year 60: which is also the opinion of ^s Fabricius.

But that appears to me rather too soon. If St. James suffered martyrdom in the year 62, I should be inclined to think, this epistle was written in the beginning of that year, or in 61, and but a short time before his death.

Eusebius says, 'When ^h Paul had appealed to Cæsar, and
' had been sent to Rome by Festus, the Jews, who had aimed
' at his death, being disappointed in that design, turned their
' rage against James, the Lord's brother, who had been ap-
' pointed by the apostles bishop of Jerusalem.' In like man-
ner Tillemont adopting that thought, says, 'St. Paul ⁱ having
' been sent to Rome near the end of the year 60, by Festus,
' governor of Judea, the Jews finding themselves not able to
' accomplish their design against him, turned their rage against
' James. Nevertheless they did not show it till eighteen months
' after, when Festus being dead, and Albinus, who succeeded
' him, not being yet arrived, the province was without a
' governor.'

That the Jews were much vexed, when Paul was sent to Rome, and had thus escaped out of their hands, is very reasonably supposed. But that their vexation upon that account was the occasion of the death of James, is mere conjecture. Nor does any thing like it appear in the accounts of his death, which Eusebius has transcribed from Hegeſippus, and Josephus.

If I likewise may be allowed to mention a conjecture, (which is at least as probable, as that just taken notice of) I should say, I am apt to think, that the death of James was partly occasioned by the offence taken at his epistle: in which are not only sharp reprehensions of the unbelieving Jews for the crimes committed by them, but also affecting representations of the dreadful calamities coming upon them. ch. iv. 1, 8. v. 1—6.

III. I am now to consider, to whom this epistle was sent.

Beza says, it ^k was sent to the believing Jews, dispersed all over the world. Cave ^l seems to say, to believing Jews chiefly. And ^m to the like purpose Fabricius. Grotius ⁿ says, to all

^s Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. n. ix. tom. III. p. 165.

^h H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. in. ⁱ S. Jacques le Mineur. Art. vii. Mem. tom. I.

^k — fidelibus omnibus Judæis, cujuscunque tribus sint, per orbem terrarum dispersis. Bez. ad cap. i. 1.

^l Scripsit, paulo, ut videtur, ante mortem, epistolam catholicam Ju-

dæis *ev diaspōra*, Christianam præcipue doctrinam professis. Cav. H. L. in Jacobo. ^m Ad Judæos maxime Christianismum amplexos, qui usquequaque dispersi degabant. Ubi supr. p. 160.

ⁿ Id est, gente Israelitica qui erant extra Judæam. Gr. ad loc.

the people of Israel living out of Judea. Wall's account of this epistle is this: 'It was written to such Jews (being now Christians) as were dispersed abroad out of Judea.—This epistle consists of general exhortations to piety, patience, and other moral virtues. It has twice or thrice mentioned our Saviour: but has nothing of his miracles, or teachings, or death, or resurrection, or our redemption by him: of which Paul's, and Peter's, and John's epistles are full.'

To me it seems, that this epistle was written to all Jews descendants of Jacob, of every denomination, throughout the world, in Judea, and out of it. For such is the inscription: *James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes, which are scattered abroad, greeting.* No expression can be more general, than *the twelve tribes*. There is not any limitation, restraining it to Christians, or believers in Jesus. Nor does he wish them grace or peace from Jesus Christ. It is only a general salutation, or greeting. Indeed he does not dissemble his own character. He calls himself *a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ*. He takes upon himself the character of a Christian, and, perhaps, of an apostle. But he does not so characterize those, to whom he writes. Nor is there any christian benediction at the end of the epistle.

Nor can I see, why *the twelve tribes scattered abroad* should not comprehend those of them in Judea, which were the peculiar charge of the writer. And divers things in the epistle seem to belong to them especially. He means therefore the people of the twelve tribes every where in Judea, and out of it.

A large part of the epistle is suitable to Christians. But there are divers paragraphs, that must be understood, to be addressed to unbelieving Jews, particularly, ch. v. 1—6. as is generally allowed. I think likewise, that the first ten verses of ch. iv. are addressed to unbelieving Jews. Where it is said, *Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts, that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not. Ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain. Ye fight, and war.* These things could not be said to Christians. They must relate to those disturbances, which, some while before the Roman war broke out, were every where among the unbelieving Jews.

I am of opinion, that this way of writing was chosen to abate the offence, which the reproofs, and exhortations, and

* Crit. Notes upon the N. T. p. 144.

warnings of the epistle were likely to occasion. St. James writes in a general way. Let all apply to themselves those things, which belong to them. Wall's note upon ch. v. 6. is to this effect, 'This is spoken, not to the Christians, but to some rich heathens, or infidel Jews, that oppressed and murdered them. No Christians of those times had any wars, or fightings, such as ch. iv. 1. or killing, as here: viz. not in the time of James, bishop of Jerusalem.'

And says Whitby upon ch. iv. 1. '*Whence come wars?* This epistle seems to have been written about the eighth of Nero, and the sixty-second of Christ, the year before the death of James: before which time the Jews had great wars and fightings, not only with their neighbours [see note upon Matt. xxiv. 6.] but even among themselves, in every city and family, saith Josephus: not only in Judea, but in Alexandria, and Syria, and many other places.' A very proper note upon the text, as seems to me. And what he says upon the following verses of that chapter, and upon ch. v. 1—6. and in his preface to the epistle sect. v. and vi. deserves also attentive regard. Where indeed he expressly says, 'Since James writes to the whole twelve tribes, I doubt not but those of Palestine must be included.'

Mr. Pyle^p has spoken clearly to the like purpose in the preface to his paraphrase of this epistle.

I shall now transcribe a part of venerable Bede's note upon the beginning of this epistle. From the words, *scattered abroad*, he is led to think of what is said, Acts viii. 1. that upon occasion of the persecution against the church at Jerusalem after the death of Stephen, *they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea, and Samaria, except the apostles*, and says, 'that^q James writes this epistle to those who were scattered

^p These circumstances gave occasion to this apostle, the residentiary of the circumcision in Judea, to endite this epistle, partly to the infidel, and partly to the believing Jews. — It was directed to the Jews and Jewish converts of the dispersion. Yet, as that to the Hebrews was intended for the general benefit of all the scattered tribes, though directed to the natives of the holy land: so, no doubt, this had an equal respect

to them, over whom James immediately presided, in the special character of their bishop. Pyle's Paraphrase, vol. II. p. 290, 291.

^q Legimus, occiso a Judæis B. Stephano, quia facta est in illa die persecutio magna, in ecclesiâ, quæ est Hierosolymis, et omnes dispersi sunt per regionis Judææ et Samariæ, præter apostolos. His ergo dispersis, qui persecutionem passi sunt propter justitiam, mittit epistolam. Nec solum his, verum etiam

‘scattered abroad, and suffered persecution for the sake of
 ‘righteousness: nor to them only, but also to those, who
 ‘though they had believed in Christ, were not careful to be
 ‘perfect in good works, as what follows in the epistle plainly
 ‘shows: and likewise to such as continued unbelieving, and
 ‘to the utmost of their power persecuted those who believed.’
 Which appears to me very right.

C H A P XVIII.

S T. P E T E R.

I. *His History to the Time of our Saviour's Ascension.* II. *To the Council of Jerusalem, in the year 49.* III. *He goes to Antioch, where he is reproved by St. Paul for Dissimulation.* IV. *His travels, and the Time of his coming to Rome.* V. *The Time of his Death.* VI. *Several Things, hitherto omitted, or but lightly touched upon.* 1. *His episcopate at Antioch.* 2. *His having been five and twenty Years Bishop of Rome.* 3. *His Children.* 4. *His Wife's Martyrdom.* 5. *His absconding at Rome.* 6. *The Manner of his Crucifixion.* VII. *That he was at Rome, and suffered Martyrdom there.*

I. ‘THE land of Palestine, says ^a Cave, at and before the
 ‘coming of our blessed Saviour, was distinguished into three
 ‘several provinces, Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. This last
 ‘was divided into the Upper and the Lower. In the Upper,
 ‘called also Galilee of the gentiles, within the division, belong-
 ‘ing to the tribe of Naphtali, stood Bethsaida, formerly an
 ‘obscure and inconsiderable village, till lately re-edified, ^b and
 ‘enlarged by Philip the tetrarch, and in honour of Julia
 ‘daughter of Augustus called by him Julias. It was situated
 ‘upon the banks of the sea of Galilee, called also the sea
 ‘of Tiberias, and the lake of Gennesareth, which ^c was about
 ‘forty furlongs in breadth, and a hundred in length, and had
 ‘a wilderness on the other side, called the desert of Bethsaida,
 ‘whither our Saviour used often to retire.’

At this place was born ^d Simon, surnamed Cephas, or Petros, Petrus, Peter, signifying a stone or rock. He was a fisherman

in illis, qui percepta fide Christi
 modum operibus perfecti esse cura-
 bent, sicut sequentia epistolæ plane
 manifestant: necnon et eis, qui etiam
 dei exortes durabant, quin et ip-
 sam in credentibus, quantum valu-

ere, persequi ac perturbare stude-
 bant. Bed. Expos. super Jacob.
 Epist. ^a Life of St. Peter. sect. i.
^b Joseph. Antiq. l. 13. cap. 3.
 al. 2. in. ^c Id. de B. J. l. 3.
 cap. 10. al. 18. ^d John i. 44.

upon

upon the forementioned lake or sea: as was also, in all probability, his father Jonas, Jonah, or John. He had a brother, named Andrew. Which was the oldest of the two is not certain. For concerning this there were different opinions among the ancients. Epiphanius ^c supposed Andrew to be the elder. But according to Chrysostom, ^f Peter was the first-born. So likewise ^g Bede, and ^h Cassian, who even makes Peter's age the ground of his precedence among the apostles. And Jerom himself has expressed himself in the like manner, saying, 'that ⁱ the keys were given to all the apostles alike, 'and the church was built upon all of them equally. But for 'preventing dissension, precedency was given to one. John 'might have been the person. But he was too young. And 'Peter was preferred upon account of his age.'

St. John ^k has informed us of the first acquaintance of Simon Peter with Jesus: to whom he was introduced by his brother Andrew. *He findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him: we have found the Messiah. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said: thou art Simon, the son of Jonas. Thou shalt be called Cephas.*

Undoubtedly, they had been from the beginning among those, who are said to have *looked for the kingdom of God, and waited for redemption in Israel.* Andrew had received Jesus as the Messiah. And his brother Simon readily concurred in the same belief and profession. They had heard John, and, as may be supposed, had been baptized by him, as all Jews in general were. Being from his testimony, and by personal conversation with Jesus, convinced, that he was the Messiah, it is likely, that henceforward they often came to him, and heard him, and saw some of the miracles done by him. We may take it for granted, that they were present at the miracle at Cana in

^c H. 51. num. xvii. ^f Hom. in Matt. 58. al. 59. T. VII. p. 586. D. ^g In Evang. Joann. cap. i.

^h Interroganti ergo Domino Jesu Christo, quem cum crederent — respondit primus Apostolorum Petrus, unus utique pro omnibus. Idem enim unicus habuit responsio, quod habeat [f. habebat] omnium fides. Sed primum debuit respondere, ut idem esset ordo responsionis, qui erat honoris, et ipse antecederet confessione, qui antecedebat ætate. Cassian. de Incarn. l. 3. cap. 12. ap. Bib. P. P. tom. VII.

ⁱ At dicis, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia: licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant: et ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tolleretur occasio. Sed cur non Joannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat: ne adhuc adolescens, ac pene puer, progressæ ætatis hominibus præferretur. Adv. Jovin. l. i. T. IV. p. 168. ^k Ch. i. 35—42.

Galilee: it being expressly said, that *Jesus and his disciples were invited to the marriage solemnity* in that place, John ii. 1, 2. It is also said ver. 11. *This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory. And his disciples believed on him:* that is, were confirmed in the persuasion, that he was the Messiah.

The call of Andrew and Peter to a stated attendance on Jesus is recorded by ¹ three evangelists. Their father, Jonas, seems to have been dead. For there is no mention of him, as there is of Zebedee, when his two sons were called. It is only said of Andrew and Peter, that when Jesus called them, *they left their nets, and followed him.* At that time Jesus made them a magnificent promise. *Follow me,* said he, *and I will make you fishers of men.* ‘In time you will be qualified by me to gain men, and to recover them, in great numbers, from ignorance and error, folly and vice, and form them to just sentiments in religion, and the practice of virtue.’

From this time they usually attended on our Lord. And ^m when he completed the number of his apostles, they were put among them.

Having before written the history of St. John at large, I need not be so particular in that of Peter, because these two apostles were much together. However, I intend to take notice of the most remarkable things in his life, especially after our Saviour's ascension.

Simon Peter was married when called by our Lord to attend upon him. And upon occasion of that alliance, as it seems, had removed from Bethsaida to Capernaum, where was his wife's family. Upon ⁿ her mother our Saviour in a very gracious manner wrought a great miracle of healing.

And I suppose, that when our Lord *left Nazareth, and came and dwelled at Capernaum* (as mentioned Matt. iv. 13.) he made Peter's house ^o the place of his usual abode, when he was in those parts. I think we have a proof it in the history just taken notice of. When Jesus came out of the synagogue at Capernaum, *he entered into Simon's house,* Luke iv. 38. Comp. Mark i. 29. which is well paraphrased by Dr. Clarke: ‘Now when Jesus came out of the synagogue, he went home to Peter's house.’ And there it was that the people resorted

¹ Matt. iv. 18—20. Mark i. 29—31. Luke iv. 38, 39.
^o It is called *Peter's house*, Matt. 12—13. Luke v. 1—9.
 Matt. x. 1—4. Mark iii. viii. 14. *Simon's house*, Luke iv. 38.
ⁿ Luke vi. 12—16. *the house of Simon and Andrew*, Mark 3—19.
^m Matt. viii. 14, 15. Mark i. i. 29.

unto him in the evening, Luke iv. 40. Matt. viii. 16. Mark i. 32—34.

Another proof of this we have in a history, which is in St. Matthew only, ch. xvii. 24—27. of our Lord's paying at Capernaum the tribute-money for the use of the temple, and his directing Peter, when he had found a piece of money, in the manner there prescribed, to pay it for both of them. The text is to this purpose. *And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received the tribute-money, came to Peter, and said: doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him.*—The beginning of that account at ver. 24. is thus paraphrased by Dr. Clarke. 'Now when they were come home to Capernaum, where Jesus used to dwell, the officers, appointed to gather the yearly offering for the service of the temple, came to Peter.'

After the miracle of the five loaves, and two fishes, straight-way Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him to the other side, whilst he sent the multitudes away. In their passage they met with a contrary wind. In the fourth watch of the night, near morning, Jesus came toward them, walking on the sea. And there not being yet light enough, to know who he was, they were affrighted, thinking it had been an apparition, and cried out for fear. Jesus then spake to them, and they knew him. After which follows a particular concerning Peter, related by St. Matthew only. *Peter answered him, and said: Lord if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus. But when he saw the sea boisterous; he was afraid: and beginning to sink, he cried, saying: Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him.*—And when he was come into the ship, the wind ceased. Peter at first presumed too much upon the strength of his faith, and was forward to show his zeal. However, this must in the end have been of use to confirm his faith. He had here great and sensible experience of the knowledge, as well as the power of Jesus. As soon as his faith failed, our Lord suffered him to sink. And upon his calling for help, Jesus immediately stretched out his hand, and saved him.

The next day our Lord preached in the synagogue at Capernaum, as related by St. John, ch. vi. 24—65. where many, who expected from the Messiah a worldly kingdom, were offended at his discourse. And it is said, ver. 66—69. *From that*

time many of his disciples, who had hitherto followed him, and professed faith in him, went back, and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve: will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him: Lord, to whom should we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we know, and are sure, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Some time after this, when our Lord had an opportunity of private conversation with the disciples, he inquired of them, what men said of him, and then, whom they thought him to be? Simon Peter answered, and said, thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, Matt. xvi. 13—16. So far likewise in Mark viii. 27—29. and Luke ix. 18—20. Then follows in Matthew, ver. 17—19. And Jesus answered, and said unto him, blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona. For flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. That is, 'It is not a partial affection for me, thy master, nor a fond and inconsiderate regard to the judgments of others, for whom thou hast a respect, that has induced thee to think thus of me. But it is a just persuasion, formed in thy mind by observing the great works, which thou hast seen me do by the power of God, in the confirmation of my mission and doctrine.' And I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church.—And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. By which many interpreters suppose, that (A) our Lord promised to Peter, that he should have the honour of beginning to preach the gospel, after his resurrection, to Jews and Gentiles, and of receiving them into the church. If so, that is personal. Nevertheless, what follows: And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. This, I say, must have been the privilege of all the apostles. For the like things are expressly said to

(A) Dr. Clarke is very singular in his paraphrase of that text. Matt. xvi. 18. 'You shall be the first preacher of my true religion to the gentile world.' And ver. 19. 'You shall first open the kingdom of the Messiah, and make the first publication of the gospel to the gentiles.' Upon both verses also referring to Acts x. When I first observed this, I was surprised. Nor could I see the ground of it.

But now I guess, that he confined this personal privilege to Peter's first preaching to gentiles at the house of Cornelius, because Peter was then alone, and none of the apostles were there with him: whereas, after the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, all the apostles were present with him, as it is said, Acts ii. 14. But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lift up his voice.—

them, Luke xxii. 29, 30. John xx. 21—23. Moreover, all the apostles concurred with Peter in the first preaching both to Jews and Gentiles. As he was president in the college of the apostles, it was very fit, and a thing of course, that he should be primarily concerned in the first opening of things. The confession, now particularly before us, was made by him. But it was in answer to a question, that had been put to all. And he spoke the sense of all the apostles, and in their name. I suppose this to be as true in this instance, as in the other, before taken notice of, which is in John vi. 68, 69.

In the account which St. John has given of our Saviour's washing the disciples' feet, Peter's modesty and fervour are conspicuous, John xiii. 1—10.

When ⁹ the Jewish officers were about to apprehend our Lord, *Peter having a sword, drew it, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear.* Our Lord having checked Peter, touched the servant's ear, and healed him. So great is Jesus every where!

They that laid hold of Jesus, led him away to the house of Caiaphas. The rest of the disciples now forsook their Master, and fled. *But Peter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants to see the end.* Here Peter thrice disowned his Lord, peremptorily denying, that he was one of his disciples, or had any knowledge of him, as related by ^r all the evangelists. For which he soon after humbled himself, and wept bitterly.

We do not perceive that Peter followed our Lord any farther, or that he at all attended the crucifixion. It is likely, that he was under too much concern of mind, to appear in public, and that he chose retirement, as most suitable to his present temper and circumstances.

On ^s the first day of the week, early in the morning, when Mary Magdalene, and other women came to the sepulchre, bringing the sweet spices, which they had prepared, *they saw an angel, who said unto them, be not affrighted. Ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen. —Go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead: as in Matthew. Tell his disciples, and Peter, as in Mark. And behold he goes before you into Galilee.* That was

⁹ John xviii. 10, 11. Matt xxvi. 51—54. Mark xiv. 46, 47. Luke xxii. 50, 51. ^r Matt. xxvi. 57—71. Mark xiv. 53—72. Luke xxii. 54—62. John xviii. 15—27. ^s Matt. xxviii. Mark xvi. Luke xxiv. John xx.

a most gracious disposal of Providence, to support the disciples, Peter in particular, under their great affliction.

Our Lord first showed himself to Mary Magdalene, and afterwards to some other women. On the same day likewise on which he arose from the dead, he showed himself to Peter, though the circumstances of this appearance are nowhere related. However it is evident from Luke xxiv. 33, 34. For when the two disciples, who had been at Emmaus, returned to Jerusalem, they found the eleven gathered together, and those that were with them, saying, the Lord is risen indeed, and has appeared unto Simon. That must be the same appearance, which is mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 5. and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. And it has been observed, that as Mary Magdalene was the first woman, so Peter was the first man to whom Jesus showed himself after he was risen from the dead.

In the twenty-first chapter of St. John's gospel are some appearances of our Lord to his disciples, in which Peter is greatly interested, to which the attentive reader is referred. Our Lord there graciously affords Peter an opportunity of making a three-fold profession of love for him: which he accepts, and renews to him the apostolical commission, and, as it were, re-instates him in his high and important office: requiring him, as the best testimony of love for his Lord, to feed his sheep with fidelity and tendernefs. And notwithstanding his late unsteadiness, our Lord encourageth this disciple to hope, that in his future conduct he would set an example of resolution and fortitude under great difficulties, and at length glorify God by his death, in the service to which he had been appointed.

As we have now proceeded in the history of this apostle to the time of our Lord's ascension, it may be worth the while to look back, and observe those things in the gospels, which imply his peculiar distinction, or at least are honourable to him.

By Mark, ch. v. 37. and Luke viii. 51. we are assured, that Peter was one of the three disciples whom our Lord admitted to be present at the raising of Jairus's daughter. That particular is not mentioned by Matthew, ch. ix. 13—26. From all the first three evangelists we know, that

¹ — αλλ' εν ανδρασι τετρω πρωτω τω μαλισα αυτον ποθεντι ιδειν. Chrys. in 1 Cor. hom. 38. tom. X.

Peter was one of the three whom our Lord took up with him into the mountain, where he was gloriously transformed, Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 28. He was also one of the three whom our Lord took with him apart from the other disciples, when he retired to prayer, a little before his last sufferings. As we know from Matt. xxvi. 37. Mark xiv. 33. But that particular is omitted by Luke, ch. xxii. 39—46.

And if it might not be reckoned too minute and particular, I would observe some things of this kind mentioned by one evangelist only.

There are several such things deserving notice in St. Matthew. 1. In the catalogue of the apostles Matthew only ^u calls Peter *chief*, or *the first*, ch. x. 2. He only has the account of Peter's desiring to come to Christ upon the water; and what follows, ch. xiv. 28—31. 3. He alone has recorded what our Lord said to Peter, when he gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, ch. xvi. 16—19. 4. He only relates our Lord's paying the tribute-money for Peter, ch. xvii. 24—27. 5. He likewise says that after Peter had denied Christ, *he wept bitterly*, ch. xxvi. 75.

In St. Mark are chiefly two things to be observed, as honourable to Peter. The first is, that he was one of the four apostles to whom our Lord addressed himself, when he foretold the destruction of the temple, and the calamities attending it, Mark xiii. 3. The other is, that in the message, sent by the angel to the disciples after our Lord's resurrection, Peter is particularly named, ch. xvi. 7.

In St. Luke are these things remarkable. First, that when our Lord warned Peter of his danger, he also assured him, *he had prayed for him that his faith might not fail*, Luke xxii. 31, 32. Secondly, we perceive from St. Luke, that our Lord appeared to Peter in particular on the day of his resurrection, though the circumstances of that appearance are not recorded, ch. xxiv. 33, 34.

In St. John's gospel are divers things honourable to Peter. 1. The profession of faith in Christ, related John vi. 67—69. 2. Peter's remarkable humility, expressed in an unwillingness that Jesus should wash his feet, with our Lord's particular discourse to him, ch. xiii. 6—10. 3. Peter's zeal in cutting off the ear of the high priest's servant is related by

^u Πρωτος σικων ο λεγουμενος πετρος.

other evangelists. But St. John only mentions Peter by name, ch. xviii. 10. 4. It is, I think, honourable to Peter, that when he and John went together to the sepulchre, John, only stooping down, looked in; but Peter went in, and searched the sepulchre. After which John also went in. ch. xx. 4—8. 5. St. John only mentions Peter's faith and zeal in *casting himself into the sea*, to go to Christ, ch. xxi. 7. 6. Our Lord's discourse with Peter concerning his love to him, and his particular repeated charge to *feed his sheep*, ver. 15—17. 7. Our Lord's predicting to Peter his martyrdom, and the manner of it, ver. 18, 19.

It is observable, that Matthew and John, the two apostles, have mentioned more of these prerogatives of Peter, than the other two evangelists. We may hence conclude, that the apostles, when illuminated by the spirit with the knowledge of the true nature of Christ's kingdom, were quite free from envy, and that Peter was not assuming and arrogant among his brethren.

It may be here observed likewise, that as our sacred historians were not envious, so neither were they fond and partial. The several advantages and virtues of Peter are recorded by some only. But his fault in denying Christ, when under prosecution, is related by all.

II. In a short time after our Lord's ascension, Peter, as president in the college of the apostles, proposed, that in the room of Judas another should be chosen out of the men that had accompanied them during the time that Jesus had been with them. And when two such had been nominated, and they had by prayer appealed to God, *who knows the hearts of all men, the lot fell upon Matthias. And he was numbered with the eleven apostles*, Acts i. 15—26.

I have here, and elsewhere, spoken of Peter, as presiding among the apostles, or having a primacy of order. For it appears in what has been just mentioned, and in other things related afterwards. And it is observable, that in all the catalogues of the twelve apostles Peter is named first, though there is some variety in the order of the names of the other apostles. I might add, that* where ever the three disciples, Peter, James, and John, are mentioned together, Peter is always put first, though there is a variety

* See Mark v. 37. and Luke viii. Luke ix. 28. Matt. xxvi. 37. Mark 51. Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. xiv. 33.

in the order of the names of those two brothers, James and John, sons of Zebedee. He is also first placed, where ^y four are named, Andrew being added to them. And likewise where ^z only he and John are mentioned. There is an exception in Gal. ii. 9. where the order is James, Cephas, and John. The reason of which I take to be, that ^a James, there mentioned, then presided in the church of Jerusalem, where Paul then was. I place below ^b the thoughts of Basnage concerning this point, who speaks to the like purpose: without denying the equal dignity of the apostles, or ascribing to Peter any jurisdiction over them. For which there is not any the least foundation either in the Gospels, or the Acts.

On the day of pentecost next ensuing, the promised gift of the Holy Ghost came down upon the apostles and their company. And upon this occasion *Peter, standing up with the eleven*, preached to a great number of people assembled about the apostles, and asserted the resurrection of Jesus, and with such force, that about three thousand were converted, and baptized, Acts ii. 14—47.

Afterwards Peter and John healed a poor man at the temple, who had been lame from his birth, a well known person, forty years of age. And many being gathered about them, Peter made an affecting discourse, whereby many

^y See Mark xiii. 3.

^z Luke xxii. 8. Acts iii. i. iv. 13, 19. viii. 14.

^a See before, p. 473.

^b Ordinis primatum quod attinet, illum a Petro abjudicari non posse censemus, si qua fides evangelio. Neque ulla ratio assignari potest, cur Apostolorum in indiculo a tribus Evangelistis exhibito, Petrus semper ordinem ducat. Quippe solâ necessitate numerandi non scribitur Matthæo *primus Petrus*: (sic enim sequens secundus dici debuisset:) sed quia in divino hoc collegio præsidem agebat. Eo quidem munere functum fuisse, ubique Scriptura testatur. Aliorum sane Apostolorum ordinem mutavit Lucas in Actis, primum tamen Petro locum servavit: Petrus, Jacobus, Joannes. Quid, nonne præsidis functio fuit, surgere in medio discipulorum, eosque monere, ut in pro-

ditoris Judæ locum alium sufficerent Apostolum? Si ordinis causâ non præerat Apostolie, cur Petrus surgens cum undecim Judæos miraculum linguarum stupentes alloquitur. — Cur etiam dum Joannis erat in comitatu Petrus, et claudum sanandum alloquitur, et Senatam Hierosolymitanum compellat, et Simoni Mago minitatur? Rationis est quidem et consuetudinis, ut legatorum primus orationem habeat, quomodo Paulus, qui Barnabam eminebat, præibat in loquendo. Ut ad pauca redeamus, is Petro collatus honor est, ut primus et in Judæis, et in Gentibus, Ecclesiæ fundamenta jaceret. Qui longe maximus honos principem Apostolorum decuit, nec a præsidis munere divelli potest. Annon nobiliores Apostolatus functiones honoratori competebant? Basnag. ann. 31. num. lxxv.

were awakened, and convinced. And in a short time after this, the number of believers at *Jerusalem* was (B) *about five thousand*, ch. iii. and iv. 4. But the Jewish priests and rulers were much offended. And whilst Peter and John were speaking to the people, their officers came, and laid hold on them. And it being then evening, they put them in prison till the next day. On the morrow therefore they were brought before the council. Having been examined, they were at length dismissed, with a charge not to preach any more in the name of Jesus, and were severely threatened if they did, ch. iv. 1—22.

The number of believers being much increased, and many being in low circumstances, *some who were possessed of houses, or lands, sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet. And distribution was made to every man according as he had need.* But a certain man, named Ananias, and Sapphira, his wife, when they had sold a possession, brought a part of the price, keeping back the rest, though they declared it to be the whole price. For this they were reprov'd by Peter, and were charged with having lied to God himself, who acted by the apostles. At his reproof Ananias and Sapphira were both struck dead by the immediate hand of God in a small space of time, one after the other, ch. iv. 31—v. 1—11. We have here, as seems to me, a proof, that Peter now presided in the assembly of the apostles, and the whole church of Jerusalem.

And, after this, by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people—insomuch that they brought forth the sick in the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a multitude out of the cities round about Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them that were vexed with unclean spirits. And they were healed every one, ch. v. 12—16.

I put this in the history of St. Peter, as he has a share in it. But I do not think, that all the miracles here spoken of were wrought by his hands, or by his shadow passing by.

(B) How that five thousand in Acts iv. 4. ought to be understood, was shown vol. V. p. 239, 240. I shall now add here the words of Chretienne parmi les Juifs. Et elle se montoit bien alors à cinq mille personnes. A. C. 35. Histoire de l'Eglise, et de l'Empire, vol. I. p. 133.

It seems, that many of these miracles were wrought by other apostles, as hinted, or expressly said, at the beginning of the citation, in ver. 12. In a word, there were now miracles wrought at Jerusalem in great numbers by all and every one of the apostles. This may be also farther argued hence, that hereupon all the apostles were taken up, as is said ver. 17, 18. *Then the high-priest rose up, and all they that were with him, and were filled with indignation. And they laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison.* The event may be seen in what follows, ch. v. 17—42. However, I am willing to allow, that there were no miracles wrought by the shadow of any of the apostles, except Peter's. This ^c seems to be most agreeable to St. Luke's expressions.

Upon the death of Stephen *there arose a great persecution against the church that was at Jerusalem: insomuch that all the believers in general were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. Then Philip, one of the seven, went down to Samaria, and preached Christ to them. And many of the people there believed. Now when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard, that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, that they might confer upon them the gift of the Holy Ghost. Which they did by prayer, and laying on of their hands. Here Peter reprov'd Simon of Samaria, as he is called: who himself was a believer for a while, but had given proofs of insincerity. These two apostles then returned to Jerusalem, and in their way thither preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans,* ch. viii. 1—25.

St. Paul, who informs us of his return to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, has assured us, that he then saw Peter and James, and no other of the apostles, Gal. i. 18, 19. And St. Luke having given the history of St. Paul's opposition to the disciples, and of his conversion, and return from Damascus to Jerusalem, says, that *Barnabas brought him to the apostles,* Acts ix. 1—30. These two

^c Omnibus accurate perpensis, illorum opinionis magis sumus, qui soli Petro, id auctoritatis concessum fuisse putant, ut ipsius umbrâ ægroti a morbis suis recrearentur. Neque id obscure Lucas indicat. Præmissis enim Apostolorum prodigiis, subinde hoc addit. *In plateas effe-*

rebant ægrotos et ponebant in lectis, ut venientis Petri vel umbra inumbraret aliquem eorum. Cur non dixit, ut prætereuntium Apostolorum vel umbra si facultatem ejusmodi a Christo nacta fuit? &c. Basnag. Ann. 34. n. xviii.

accounts are easily reconciled. Paul saw only Peter and James. But they received him in the name, and with the approbation of all the apostles, and thus he had communion with them.

It follows in St. Luke's history, Acts ix. 31. *Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.* This rest, as was formerly shown, commenced in the year 40, and probably continued a year or more. This season, as we may well suppose, was improved by all the apostles, and by Peter, in particular. Of whom it is said, that he passed through all parts of the country, and came down also to the saints that dwelt at Lydda. Here, in the name of Jesus Christ, he healed Æneas, who had the palsy, and had kept his bed eight years. Whilst he was in that place, a christian woman, named Tabitha, died at Joppa, which was not far off. The disciples therefore sent to Peter, desiring him without delay to come to them. Which he did, and there restored her to life. *And he tarried many days at Joppa, with one Simon, a tanner,* ch. ix. 32—43.

Whilst Peter was there, Cornelius of *Cæsarea by the sea-side* (the city where the Roman governor had his residence) a centurion, a worshipper of God, but not of the house of Israel, nor a Jewish proselyte, had a vision; wherein he was directed by an angel, to send to Joppa for Simon, whose surname was Peter; from whom he would receive farther information in the things of religion. When the vision was over, he called two of his servants, and a pious soldier, and sent them to Joppa. The day after, as they drew near the city, Peter went up to the top of the house to pray, about the sixth hour of the day or noon. There he fell into a trance or ecstasy, and had a vision. A vessel descended, wherein were all sorts of living creatures, wild and tame, clean and unclean. *And there came a voice to him, saying, kill and eat. But Peter said, not so, Lord. For I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, what God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.*—While Peter thought on the vision, the spirit said unto him, *behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them.*—On the morrow Peter went away with them, and certain brethren from Joppa, six in number, accompanied him. The

The next day they arrived at Cæsarea, and entered into the house of Cornelius, where were also many others, his relations, and intimate friends, whom Cornelius had invited to come thither. *Peter said unto them, ye know, how that it is an unlawful thing for a Jew, to keep company, or to come unto one of another nation. But God has shown me, that I should not call any man common or unclean.*—Whilst Peter was preaching, and speaking to them the things concerning Jesus Christ, and before he had finished, *the Holy Ghost fell on all of them that heard the word. And they of the circumcision, which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God.*—Peter therefore commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days, ch. x.

Thus the door of faith, or the kingdom of heaven, or of the Messiah, was opened to gentiles, and they were received into the church of God. And, if I may say it, God now cleansed all gentiles, and showed with full evidence and divine attestations, that all men, of every nation, who became worshippers of God, and believed in Jesus, were accepted of him, as his people, and the members of his church, and in the way of salvation, without circumcision, or taking upon them the observation of the rituals of the law of Moses.

While Peter tarried at Cæsarea, *the apostles and brethren that were in Judæa, heard that the gentiles also had received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying: Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them. But Peter gave them an account of the transaction from the beginning, and all were satisfied. When they heard those things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying: Then hath God also to the gentiles granted repentance unto life.*

An opinion has obtained among Christians in late ages, that Cornelius was a profelyte of the gate. Which opinion is founded upon a supposition, that there were among the Jews two sorts of profelytes: some called profelytes of the covenant, or of righteousness, who were circumcised: and others, called profelytes of the gate: who, though they were not circumcised, observed some things, not obligatory in themselves, as is supposed, in order to facilitate commerce between

between the Jews and them. What those things were, or are supposed to be, I do not now inquire.

However, for clearing up this matter I would observe, that there was but one sort of profelytes among the Jews: and that Cornelius was not a profelyte, but a gentile.

First. There was but one sort of profelytes among the Jews. They were circumcised. So they became Jews by religion, and were admitted to eat the passover, and to partake of all religious privileges, as the Jews by descent did. They were called *strangers, or profelytes within the gates, and sojourners*, as they were allowed to dwell, or sojourn among the people of Israel. And they were so called, because they could not possess land. For according to the law of Moses, all the land of Canaan was to be given to the twelve tribes of Israel, the descendants of the patriarch Jacob. Which enables us to discern the propriety of the expression, just mentioned.

What has been now said, may be illustrated by some texts: which, though well known, shall be alleged here.

Exod. xii. 48. *And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised. And then let him come near, and keep it. And he shall be as one born in the land.* 49. *One law shall be to him that is home-born, and to the stranger that sojourneth among you.*

Lev. xvii. 8. *Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers, which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt-offering, or sacrifice—*ver. 13.—*children of Israel, neither any stranger, that sojourneth among you. The same again, ver. 15. One of your own country, or a stranger.*

Numb. ix. 14. *And if a stranger shall sojourn among you, and will keep the passover to the Lord—ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger, and for him that was born in the land.*

Numb. xv. 15. *One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you—as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord.* 16. *One law, and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger, that sojourneth among you.*

In all these places by *stranger, and stranger that sojourneth among you*, I suppose to be meant men circumcised, according to the law of Moses.

Perhaps, it may be here asked. Could none then, dwell among the Israelites in the land of Canaan, but profelytes, or circumcised men? To which I answer. It seems to me, that

no other had the privilege of a settled abode, or residence there, that is, to sojourn in the land. However, I think, there must have been an exception for travellers, passing through the country, even though they were idolaters, and for some, whose traffic was needful, and therefore allowed of. As Patrick says upon Deut. xiv. 21. ‘There were some called Nocherim, which we here translate *aliens*: who were mere gentiles, and not suffered to have an habitation among them, but only to come and go in their traffic with them.’

And, if I mistake not, an argument of the apostle may be hence illustrated, Eph. ii. 13. *But now, in Christ Jesus, ye, who some time were far off, are made nigh, very nigh, even to a coalescence, by the blood of Christ.* Ver. 19. *Now therefore ye are no more strangers, and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.* The apostle alludes to the state of things in the Jewish commonwealth. *Now therefore, says he, ye are no more strangers, and foreigners.* Those are not terms of distance, as they seem to be in our translation, and as some have supposed, but of nearness. They are expressive of all the favour and privilege, which could be vouchsafed to any, not of the natural seed of Israel, before the manifestation of the gospel. ‘*Now*^d *therefore ye are no longer guests.* Such you might be, and be well, and civilly entertained (c) for a while, though you were aliens, and sojourners, as the Jewish proselytes were, who might live in the country, but had few privileges, they not being allowed to possess land, nor to have any share in the government of it; *but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints*: you have equal rights of citizenship with the people, and natives of the country; *and are God’s domestics.* You are brought into the court and family of the king of the country, and are admitted to his presence, and to attend upon his person.’ The whole of this is much the same with what is said 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10. and Rev. i. 6. I place below a Latin version^e of this text, which appears to me to be right.

Proselyte is a word of Greek original, equivalent to

^d Ἄρα οὐν οὐκ ἐτι ἐγε ξένοι, καὶ παροικοί, ἀλλὰ συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ οἰκεῖοι τῆ θεῶ.

(c) The Greek word ξένος, like the Latin word, *hospes*, signifies both a *host*, and a *guest*, an entertainer, and him that is entertained,

et qui domo suscipit, et qui suscipitur. In Rom. xvi. 23. it is used in the former, here in the latter sense.

^e Nempe igitur non amplius estis hospites, et inquilini, sed concives sanctorum, ac domestici Dei.

stranger,

stranger, long since become a technical word, denoting a convert to the Jewish religion, or a Jew by religion.

In the fourth commandment they are called *thy stranger within thy gates*, Exod xx. 10. and Deut. v. 14.

According to the Jewish way of reckoning, agreeably to the law of Moses, there were three sorts of men in the world: Israelites, called also home-born, or natives; strangers within their gates, and aliens. So Deut. xiv. 21. *Ye shall not eat any thing that dieth of itself. Thou shalt give it to the stranger that is in thy gates, that he may eat it: or thou mayest sell it to an alien.* Or, otherwise, there were two sorts of men, circumcised and uncircumcised, Jews and Gentiles, or Heathens.

A profelyte, as before said, is a man circumcised according to the law of Moses, or a Jew by religion. This is the sense of the word in all the texts of the New Testament, where it is used. Matt. xxiii. 15. *Ye compass sea and land to make one profelyte.* Acts ii. 10. *Jews and profelytes.* Acts vi. 5. *Nicolas, a profelyte of Antioch.* Ch. xiii. 43. *Religious profelytes.* There never was any doubt about preaching to these, and receiving them into the church. Such were among St. Peter's hearers of his first sermon. And one such person at least was among the seven deacons in the church of Jerusalem.

In this sense the word is always understood by ancient christian writers. Says Bede in his exposition of the second chapter of the Acts: 'They called those profelytes, that is, strangers, who being of gentile original, had embraced circumcision, and judaism.' To the like purpose is another Latin writer, of the ninth century, in his commentary upon St. Matthew's gospel. So likewise^b Theodoret, andⁱ Euthy-

^f *Judæi quoque et profelyti.]* Profelytos, id est, advenas, nuncupabant eos, qui de Gentibus originem ducentes, circumcissionem et judaismum eligere malebant. Non solum ergo, inquiunt, [f. inquit,] qui naturâ suâ Judæi ex diverso orbe convenerant: verum et ii, qui de præputio nati, eorum adhæserunt ritui. Bed. Expos. in Act. Ap. cap. ii.

^e Profelytus dicebatur Græce advena: quia de alia gente ad legem ipsorum convertebatur, ut fuit Jehro. et Achior. Et multa millia virorum fuerunt, qui de Gentibus

circumcisi fuerunt, et Deum cæli crediderunt. Christian. Druthmar. Grammatic. Exp. in Matth. ap. Bib. PP. tom. XV. p. 156. A.

^h Ὅτι ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθότες, καὶ κατὰ τὰς σέξ νομῆς, πειθήσαντες πολιτευέσθαι, τὴν ἀδικον παρ' αὐτῶν σφαγὴν ὑπομένουσι προσηλυτοὺς γαρτυτικῶνομασε. Theod. in Ps. xciii. al. xciv. ver. 6. tom. I. p. 775. Conf. Suid. V. Προσηλυτος. ⁱ Profelytum vero Judæi appellabant, qui ex Gentili effectus fuisset Judæus. Euthym. in Ps. xciii. p. 396. ap. Bib. PP. T. XIX.

mius. Nor do I believe, that the notion of two sorts of Jewish profelytes can be found in any christian writer before the fourteenth century or later.

Cornelius is not called a profelyte in the New Testament. It is said of him, that ^k he was *a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house*: that is, he was a truly good man. What is there said of him is only his personal character. Here is not any thing, denoting a religious denomination, as some have thought. And it is plain, that notwithstanding his piety, he was an alien. Peter would not have conversed with him, if he had not been directed by an express command. The reason is, that there is no appointment in the law of Moses for receiving any men into covenant with God, or to communion with his people, but by circumcision: which implied an obligation to obey all the laws of the Mosaic institution.

Let us now go over, and observe the most remarkable particulars of this history.

Cornelius, and his friends, are called gentiles, ch. x. 45. ch. xi. 1, and 18. ch. xv. 7. that is, *gojim*, a Hebrew word, very frequent in the Old Testament, and rendered by us *nations*, or *heathen* or *heathens*. And in our version of the New Testament likewise is several times put *heathen* instead of *the nations*, or *the gentiles*, 2 Cor. xi. 26. Gal. ii. 9. ch. iii. 8.

In the next place we take notice of the vessel let down from heaven, and set before Peter. There were in it *all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air*: some of them altogether abominable, and exceeding filthy in the eye of Jews. Hereby are represented the people, who had sent for Peter, though pious, because they were uncircumcised. But it is likely, that herein are also included, and represented gentiles of all sorts, men of every nation, all men uncircumcised in general, whether worshippers of God, or not. ver. 13—16. *And there came a voice to him, saying: arise, Peter, kill, and eat. But Peter said: not so, Lord, for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time: what God has cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven.*—

^k Εὐσεβῆς καὶ φοβούμενος τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

What God has cleansed, that call not thou common: denoting, that those people, which were most impure in Jewish esteem, were now cleansed, or to be cleansed, and to be received as pure and holy.

Omitting some other things, in the next place we observe Peter's address at the house of Cornelius, ver. 28. *You know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to (D) keep company, or to come to a man of another nation.* The people therefore, to whom Peter had been sent, and among whom he now was, were such, as no Jew might converse with, according to the law of Moses, and their established custom. *A man of another nation:* αλλοφυλω: an alien or foreigner. Jerom observes, that¹ though the Greek word signifies in general a man of another nation; the seventy translators of the Old Testament constantly made use of it, to denote the philistines, or heathen people of the land of Palestine. That observation is repeated by him. And I have transcribed below several of his passages. This character, an alien, or a man of another nation, satisfies us, that the people, to whom Peter was now sent by divine order, had not been before received into the Jewish church, or admitted to communion with them, but were aliens from their commonwealth.

(D) ' Κολλασθαι η προσερχεσθαι αλλοφυλω. By which words is not to be understood, as if a Jew might have no dealing at all with a gentile, and traffic with them: for it was next to impossible to do otherwise, they living, very many of them, in heathen cities. And gentiles came continually, in the way of trade, to Jerusalem, Neh. xiii. 16. What was unlawful, was conversing with gentiles in near and close society, as the word κολλασθαι signifies, and that especially in these two things, *not to eat with them, and not to go into their houses.* And this is that, for which they of the circumcision excepted at Peter upon his return. *Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them,* ch. xi. 3.' So Lightfoot in his commentary upon the Acts of the apostles, vol I. p. 844. Where follow other things, relating to this

subject, very worthy of observation.

¹ Pro Philisthiim semper Ixx. alienigenas interpretati sunt, nomen commune pro proprio: quæ est hodie gens Palæstinorum, quasi Philistinorum. Hieron: in Is. cap. ii. 6. tom. III. p. 24.

Philistæos autem, ut sæpe diximus, Palæstinos significat, quos alienigenas vulgata scribit editio: quum hic non unius gentis, sed omnium cæterarum gentium vocabulum sit. Id in Is. xiv. 29. p. 116.

Videamus autem, quid Philisthiim, et urbes ejus peccaverint, quos septuaginta semper alienigenas transtulerunt. Ubiquumque enim in veteri testamento αλλοφυλες, id est, alienigenas, legimus, non commune nomen omnium externarum gentium sed proprie Philisthiim, qui nunc Palæstini vocantur, accipiendi sunt. Id. in Amos. cap. i. ib. p. 1376.

It follows in the same address of Peter: *But God has showed me, that I should not call any man common or unclean.* Those expressions are as general and comprehensive as any that can be used; plainly including all mankind, who now were cleansed, or to be cleansed and purified by faith, and received into the church of God without circumcision.

Cornelius having declared the occasion of sending for him, *Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.* These expressions are as general and comprehensive as the former, including men of all nations, without exception.

The conclusion of St. Peter's discourse at the house of Cornelius, is this, *To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins:* Which, so far as I am able to perceive, is preaching the gospel as clearly as ever it was preached by Paul himself.

While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word. Or, as St. Peter himself expresseth it, rehearsing the matter at Jerusalem, ch. xi. 15. *As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on all them, as on us at the beginning; whereupon Peter ordered them to be baptized, and so received into the church.* And, as he says in the defence of himself, *Forasmuch then, as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I that I could withstand God?*

That very extraordinary manifestation, the coming down of the Holy Ghost immediately from heaven upon these persons, leads us to think, that the transaction at the house of Cornelius was a very important thing, and no less than cleansing the whole gentile world: or encouraging the preaching of the gospel to them, and receiving them to communion, without the rites of the law. And from this time forward it was so preached to them, as appears from the history in the Acts.

I suppose, that what I have now said is agreeable to the sense of all Christians in ancient times; who call Cornelius ^m the first-fruits of the gentiles, and ⁿ the beginning of the gentiles,

^m Ex quibus esse arbitror etiam Cornelium illum, qui Caesariensis ecclesiae cum iis cum quibus Spiritum Sanctum meruit accipere, primitiae merito dicitur. Et non solum hujus ecclesiae, sed fortassis et omnium

gentiles. And say, that ° in him all gentiles were cleansed and sanctified, and that p the living creatures of all kinds, which were in the vessel let down to Peter, and held by four corners, represented all gentiles throughout the world.

Many learned men of late times make a great difference between preaching the gospel to what they call *devout gentiles*, or *profelytes of the gate*, and *idolatrous gentiles*. But I do not perceive, that Christians in ancient times had any notion of this. Nor is there any foundation for it in the New Testament. But all men, uncircumcised, whether worshippers of God, or idolatrous, are called gentiles. That Cornelius, and his family, and friends, are called gentiles, though pious, has been lately seen. And in almost innumerable places of St. Paul's epistles the same word is used of such as then were, or had been idolaters.

Nor can I conceive, how there should be an objection against preaching to idolatrous gentiles, in order to convert them from idolatry. It is well known, that the Jewish people were very diligent in making profelytes to their religion. Our Lord himself has taken notice of it, Matt. xxiii. 15. The obstructions given to Paul were not owing to his converting men from idolatry, but to his manner of receiving them. If he had taught, and required them to be circumcised, and keep the law, all had been well. For certain, I

omnium gentium primitiæ Cornelius appellandus est. Primus enim credidit ex gentibus, et primus Sancto Spiritu repletus est. Et ideo recte primitiæ gentium appellabitur. Origen. in Num. hom. xi. p. 306. T. II. Bened. ⁿ *Ἄρχη πρῶθεν*

ἡ ἀρχὴ γίνεταί τῶν ἐθνῶν. Chryf. in Act. Ap. hom. 22. T. IX. p. 180.

° Sub Apostolis vero, cum ii, qui in Christum ex circumfisione crediderant, eos qui gentiles erant, dicebanturque præputium, justificationem gratiæ arbitrarentur participes esse non posse, docet B. Apostolus Petrus, quam indiscretus apud Deum uterque sit populus, si in unitatem fidei denuo convenierint. *Cum autem, inquit, cœpissẽm loqui, &c. D. Vocatione Gentium.* Lib. II. cap. 18.

¶ Etenim Ecclesia necdum erat

in gentibus. In Judæa crediderunt ex Judæis, et putabant—solos se pertinere ad Christum. Missi sunt Apostoli ad gentes, prædicatum est Cornelio.—Discus ille, qui habebat omnia animalia, significabat omnes gentes. Ideo autem quatuor lineis pendebat, quia quatuor sunt partes orbis, unde futuri populi erant. August. Enarr. in Pf. xcvi. num. 13. tom. IV.

Siquidem cum Sanctus Petrus per visionem omne genus animalium, de baptizando Cornelio, ac perinde de omnibus gentibus doceretur, atque ille immundum et indiscretum cibum Judaica observantia recusaret, trina ad eum vox facta sit, dicens: Quæ Deus mundavit, tu ne commune dixeris. Prosper. ep. ad Rufin. cap. vi. ap. Aug. T. X. in Append. Ed. Bened.

think, there could have been no offence taken by any believers from among the Jews, however bigotted. *And I, brethren,* says the apostle to the Galatians, *if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the offence of the cross ceased,* Gal. v. 11.

These thoughts, which are now proposed to public consideration, are not new. A thorough examination of this point was occasioned by the *Miscellanea Sacra*, which was published in 1725. And in a few years I came to a full determination. Nor have I concealed my sentiments. They have been communicated to several. And by some they have been approved.

Nor do I make any question, but that others likewise are of the same opinion. I shall therefore here transcribe a paragraph of a letter from my honoured friend, Mr. Joseph Hallett, of Exeter, received from him in the year 1735. ‘It is certain fact,’ says he, ‘that the scripture never mentions the difference between preaching to devout Gentiles, and idolatrous Gentiles, which some do. The original instruction was: *Go, disciple all nations,* Matt. xxviii. 19. *Preach the gospel to every creature,* Mark xvi. 15. The order in which the apostles were to preach the gospel, was in *Jerusalem, in all Judea, in Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth,* Acts i. 8. In these, and all other places, one and the same character comprehends all Gentiles. When St. Peter stuck at preaching the gospel to Cornelius, the plain reason was, because he was uncircumcised. See Acts xi. 3. Neither he at first, nor they that afterwards quarrelled with him, would have any more hesitated to preach to idolaters, than to Cornelius. Only in that case, they must have begun with proving the unity of God; which they had no need to do in the case of Cornelius, since he already believed it.’

And as I have this opportunity, I shall now communicate to the public some other thoughts of Mr. Hallett, relating to the same subject, which I received from him at the same time. ‘That the decree in Acts xv. relates to the idolatrous gentiles in particular, is manifest. Indeed it is demonstrable from ver. 19. where St. James speaks of those, *who from among the gentiles are turned to God.* Their being *turned to God* here is the same, as their becoming Christians. They were not turned to God before. And therefore they were (not devout, but) idolatrous gentiles. They were plainly of the same sort with the Thessalonians, who *turned to God from idols,* 1 Thess. i. 9. who are acknowledged

' to be idolatrous gentiles. The same character then will
 ' prove, that the others were so too. The same thing is
 ' demonstrable from ver. 17. For the expression, *all the*
 ' *gentiles*, can never be restrained to a few profelytes of the
 ' gate. Farther, the letter of the church of Jerusalem was
 ' directed and sent to the believing gentiles in Antioch, &c.
 ' ver. 23. to decide a dispute, which was raised there. But
 ' the dispute there was about idolatrous gentiles in par-
 ' ticular, ver. 2, 3, 5. Consequently, the letter must be
 ' interpreted to speak of the same persons. Nay the church
 ' at Antioch was composed of such as had been idolatrous
 ' gentiles. And therefore the letter must relate to that sort
 ' of men. And when Paul went through Syria, Cilicia,
 ' Derbe, Lystra, &c. (where, it is allowed, there were
 ' converts from among the idolatrous gentiles) *he delivered*
 ' *the decrees to them*, i. e. the said idolatrous gentiles, to *keep*,
 ' ch. xvi. 1, 4.' So Mr. Hallett.

Dr. Doddridge, in the third volume of his Family Ex-
 positor, which is upon the Acts of the apostles, has many
 acute and judicious observations, relating to this subject.
 And I am well satisfied, that he intended to write a differ-
 tation concerning Jewish profelytes. Which is also acknow-
 ledged by ⁹ the learned editor of his posthumous volumes :
 though no such thing has been found among his papers.
 And in his general introduction to the first epistle of St.
 Peter, Dr. Doddridge freely declares, ' that there is no
 ' sufficient ground to suppose, that there ever were any
 ' such persons, as profelytes of the gate.' And he thinks,
 ' that what he has suggested in his notes upon the Acts may
 ' convince an attentive reader.' And indeed I am of the
 same opinion concerning what he has said in those notes.
 For which reason I do not so much regret the loss of
 the dissertation, as otherwise I should.

Says Sueur, speaking of St. Peter's vision of the sheet :
 ' God ' thereby showed unto his servant, that thenceforward
 ' he would have all the people of the world, without excep-
 ' tion, called to partake in his gracious covenant in his son

⁹ See the note at the bottom of
 p. 218. of the sixth volume of the
 Family Expositor.

' Et puisque Dieu rompoit cette
 separation, il monroit à son servi-
 teur, que de là en avant il vouloit

appeller indifferement tous les peu-
 ples de la monde à son alliance de
 grace en son fils Jesus Christ, et à
 sa salutaire connoissance. J. Sueur
 Hist. de l'Eglise, &c. A. C. 41.
 tom. 1. p. 165.

‘ Jesus Christ, and to the knowledge of salvation by him.’ That it was so understood by the primitive Christians, we have lately seen. And that this whole transaction was so understood by the apostles, and by the evangelists, their fellow-labourers, is manifest from the sequel of the history in the book of the Acts.

For removing difficulties, and fully clearing up this point, it may be needful to consider that text. Gal. ii. 1, 2. *Then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel, which I preach among the gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run in vain.*

Some* who contend for the supposition of two sorts of profelytes among the Jews, and think, that the gospel was preached several years to such as they call *profelytes of the gate*, before it was preached to idolatrous gentiles, and understand the decree of the council of Jerusalem to bind those profelytes only, say, that the conversion of idolatrous gentiles was unknown to the church at Jerusalem, when that decree was made, and explain the above cited words after this manner: ‘ That* Paul communicated what he had preached to the gentiles, only to James, and Peter, and John, the three renowned apostles of the circumcision, and that under the seal of the greatest secrecy.’

But that cannot be St. Paul’s meaning. For most, if not all the converts at Antioch, must have been idolaters. But, supposing for the present, that they had been devout gentiles; it is universally allowed, that before the controversy arose at Antioch about circumcising the gentiles that believed, the gospel had been preached for a good while by Paul and Barnabas to idolatrous gentiles in Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and other places: of which a particular account is given Acts xiii. xiv. And presently after, St. Luke, relating the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, says, ch. xv. 3, 4. *And being brought on their way by the church [of Antioch] they passed through Phoenice, and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the gentiles [or heathens:] and they caused great joy to all the brethren. And*

* See *Miscellanea Sacra* in the Preface, and Essay iv. and Dr. Benson’s *History of the first planting the Christian Religion.* vol. II. chap. iii. sect. i. ii. &c.

* *Miscell. Sacr. Ess.* iv. p. 50. Dr. Benson, as before, vol. II. p. 52. second edit.

when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received by the church, and by the apostles, and elders; and they declared all things, that God had done with them. In which must have been included their preaching not only at Antioch in Syria, but also in all the other countries and cities mentioned just before. Of this they gave an account to the church of Jerusalem in general, and particularly to the apostles and elders.

And Acts xv. 12. in the council. *Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles God had wrought among the gentiles by them.*

And ver. 25, 26. the apostles and elders in their epistle, speaking of Barnabas and Paul, say, *they were men that had hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Intending, as may be reasonably supposed, the dangers, and sufferings, which they had met with, when preaching the gospel to idolaters at Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, and Lystra, of which St. Luke has given an account Acts xiii. near the end, and ch. xiv. to which St. Paul also refers. 2 Tim. iii. 11. These things Paul and Barnabas, or the brethren that went up with them from Antioch, had related to the church at Jerusalem, and to the apostles and elders. For we hence plainly perceive, that these things were well known there.

That is St. Luke's history. Let us now observe St. Paul's own words in this text. *Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem.—And I went up by revelation, and communicated to them that gospel, which I preach among the gentiles:* meaning, as seems to me, the church, or the believing brethren there. So say all the best interpreters in general. Dr. Hammond's paraphrase is in these words: 'And by God's appointment, either first signified, or afterwards confirmed to me by vision (such as Paul had about several matters) I went up at this time to Jerusalem, and gave the church there an account of my preaching, and the success of it among the gentiles. This I thought fit to do, and yet first to do it to those that were the principal men among them.' So Hammond. To the like purpose Estius, †* whom

†, *Et contuli cum illis evangelium, quod prædico in Gentibus.* Augustinus legit: *Et exposui illis.* Sed intellige, more conferentis. Id enim vult, etiam Hieronimo teste, quod

in Græco est, *αὐθιξὺν αὐτοῖς.* Nam sensus est: Communicavi cum illis qui Jerosolymis erant, de evangelio, quod prædico inter Gentes, deque tota ratione doctrinæ meæ quam

whom I transcribe below. Le Clerc's French version is to this purpose. 'And †† I explained in public to the saints the gospel which I preach among the gentiles: the which I also did in particular to them who were in reputation.' And Beausobre's: I †* went thither by revelation, and I conferred with the faithful about the gospel, which I preach among the gentiles. I conferred about it also in particular with those who were most esteemed among them. * *

It follows in the same verse: *Lest by any means I should run, or had run in vain.* That is: 'This I thought fit to do, in order to secure the success of my ministry: for removing obstacles in the way of my preaching for the future, and that the minds of converts already made might not be unsettled. With those views I conferred with the believers at Jerusalem in public, and also in private with those who were most esteemed.'

Ver. 3. *But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.* The apostle's taking such particular notice of Titus in a letter to Christians converted from idolatry, and calling him a Greek, led us to think, that he was originally idolatrous.

Ver. 4. *And that because of false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.* ver. 5. *To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour: that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.*

quam tradidi, et etiam nunc trado Gentibus, quarum sum Apostolus. Non itaque discendi studio, quod supra negavit, evangelium suum nunc demum cum Ecclesia Jerosolymitana confert. &c. Est. ad Gal. ii. 2. †† J'y allai — et j'expliquai en public aux saints l'evangile, que j'annonce parmi les Gentils: ce que je fis aussi en particulier à ceux qui étoient le plus en reputation. Le Clerc.

†* Or j'y allai par revelation, et je conferei avec les fidelles touchant l'evangile, que je prêche parmi les Gentils. J'en conferei en particulier avec les plus celebres entre eux. Beauf. * * The interpretation given by me of St. Paul's phrase κατ' ἰδιαν, as equivalent to *separately, particularly,* may be much

confirmed by a passage of Libanius, which I here transcribe. Ἐγὼ εἰ σοι μετὰ τῆς ὅλης πόλεως οἶδα χάρι. Ὅτι γὰρ με καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἐκεῖνοις εἶναι γραμμασι καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ ταῦτον ποίω. Liban. [ad Maximum.] Ep. 1157. p. 553. ed. Wolf. To which may be added another from Josephus. Ἐπει δ' ὑπεσχρηματὴν αἰτιολογίαν ἀπαντῶν ἰδίᾳ συγγράψαμενος παραδώσειν, εἰς τότε καὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτῆς ἐρμηνείαν ἀναβαλεῖμαι. Antiq. l. i. cap. i. § 1.

Accordingly, the Latin Vulgate is thus: *Seorsum autem iis, qui videbantur aliquid esse.* — And, in the margin of some of our Bibles, for *privately* is put *severally*: which I think to be the true meaning.

Where

Where St. Paul seems to refer to the rise of the dispute at Antioch, which is thus related by St. Luke. Acts xv. 1. *And certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and said: unless ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.* These, as the apostle here says, had intruded themselves into the church of Antioch, that they might bring them into subjection to all the burdensome observances of the law of Moses. Upon that account, and for defeating their design, he went up to Jerusalem, and there acted, as just shown.

This text, and the explication now given of it, may receive illustration from the account, which St. Luke gives of Paul's coming to Jerusalem afterwards, where he first converses with the brethren, and then has a conference with James and the elders. The result of which is soon made known to all. Acts xxi. 17. *And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly.* ver. 18. *And the day following Paul went in with us unto James. And all the elders were present.* ver. 19. *And when he had saluted them, he declared to them * particularly what things God had wrought among the gentiles by his ministry.* Certainly St. Paul here intends heathens and idolaters. ver. 20. *And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said to him —* ver. 25. *As touching the gentiles which believe, we have written, and concluded, that they observe no such thing.* — The connection leads us to suppose, that they speak of all gentiles whatever, idolatrous, as well as others.

Upon the whole the apostle assures the Christians, his converts, in Galatia, that his going to Jerusalem, his declaring there to all, the gospel which he preached among the gentiles, and his conferring in private with the apostles, particularly, with those who were reckoned the chief of them, were all done with a view to their benefit, *that the truth of the gospel might continue with them, and other gentiles.* And the event, as related by St. Luke, and as represented by the apostle himself in this epistle, was entirely to his satisfaction.

St. Paul in this epistle most earnestly exhorts the Galatians, *to stand fast in the liberty, with which Christ has made us free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of bondage,* ch. v. 1. and he severely censures instability in the genuine faith of

* — ΕΞΗΓΕΙΤΟ ΚΑΘ' ΕΝ ΕΚΑΣΤΟΥ ΩΝ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΘΝΕΣΙ ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ.

the gospel. It would be, as seems to me, very strange, to suppose him to say, that when he was at Jerusalem, a few years only before writing this epistle, he had studiously concealed the doctrine, which he preached among the gentiles, from all but some few apostles. His so doing, whether through fear, or from prudential considerations, or any reasons whatever, must have been a great discouragement to those, to whom he is writing. How could it be expected, that they should openly assert before all the world the true evangelical liberty, if himself had been upon the reserve upon a late and important occasion?

St. Paul's having a private conference with some of the apostles, is no proof, that he had any secrets, withheld from the knowledge of others. But it might be a proper piece of respect, to discourse with those who were in great esteem, about what was to be communicated to all.

If St. Paul had desired to conceal his preaching to idolatrous gentiles, he could not have done it. His preaching at Antioch, and his and Barnabas's peregrination in divers other countries, related in Acts xiii. xiv. were well known to all the Christians at Antioch. And when Paul and Barnabas went thence to Jerusalem about the question that had been started there; it is very likely, that some went to Jerusalem upon the same occasion, who were on the imposing side of the question. If Paul had endeavoured to conceal any thing of an offensive nature, they would not have failed to divulge it.

We now proceed in the history.

Peter having by divine appointment and direction performed that important service at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea, and having received gentiles into communion by baptism, without circumcision according to the law of Moses: and his conduct having been approved by the apostles, and brethren at Jerusalem: *they who had been scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, and had hitherto preached the word to none but Jews only, having heard of this transaction, when they came to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks there, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them. And a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord. Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church which was at Jerusalem. And they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch. He afterwards brought Paul thither. And from that time forward the gos-*
pel

pel was freely preached to Gentiles, as well as Jews, and with great success. Acts xi. 19—26.

Soon after the conversion of Cornelius, it is likely that *the rest of the churches*, before-mentioned was abated, till it was quite interrupted. However, Peter, and the other apostles, still continued in Judea. And according to the utmost of their power, as the circumstances of things allowed, employed themselves in confirming the believers, and making additions to their number.

Toward the end of his reign Herod Agrippa became an open persecutor of the believers; and killed James the brother of John, with the sword. And because he saw, it pleased the Jews, he proceeded farther, to take Peter also. [Then were the days of unleavened bread.] And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers, to keep him: that is, sixteen in all, four of which were by turns to watch him: intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people. Acts x. 1—4.

The conversion of Cornelius happened, as I suppose, in the year 41 of our Saviour's nativity, according to the vulgar computation. And the Easter, or passover, here mentioned, was, probably, the passover of the year 44.

Peter therefore was kept in prison. But prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him. ver. 5. And he was delivered out of prison in a miraculous manner, as related ver. 6—11. The Divine Being did not allow, that a period should be yet put to the life of that apostle. One thing very observable in this history is the composure of Peter's mind in a great extremity, and in the near apprehension of death. For it is said ver. 6. *And when Herod would have brought him forth, the same night Peter was sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains.* In that posture the angel found him, who at that instant was sent to assist his escape.

Having informed some of his intimate friends, assembled at the house of Mary, in Jerusalem, of his wonderful deliverance out of prison, *he departed and went to another place.* ver. 17. Meaning either another house in Jerusalem, or else some city, or village, not far from it. Where, probably, he lived privately, till the death of Herod Agrippa, which happened before the end of that year.

Some have thought, that Peter now went to Antioch, or Rome. But there is no good evidence of either of those opinions. Says Mr. Lenfant upon the place: 'If St. Peter
' had

‘ had gone to some celebrated city, for instance, Antioch, according to some, or Rome, according to others, no doubt St. Luke would have mentioned it, and some of the brethren would have accompanied him, according to custom. From the manner in which St. Luke expresseth himself, nothing is more natural, than to suppose, that St. Peter, that he might not expose to danger the faithful at the house where he first called, and where many were assembled, retired to some other place in Jerufalem.’

In the year 49, or 50, was assembled the council of Jerufalem, concerning the question, *whether it was needful to circumcise the gentiles, who believed, and to command them to keep the law.* At this assembly Peter was present, and in the debate clearly declared his opinion, that *the yoke of the law should not be laid upon the neck of the disciples* from among the gentiles. As a cogent argument for his opinion, he reminded the assembly, how by divine appointment he had preached the word of the gospel to gentiles at Cæsarea, and that God, *who knoweth the hearts of all men*, had shown his acceptance of them by giving to them the Holy Ghost, though uncircumcised. By which it had been made manifest, that they might be saved by faith in Jesus Christ, without the rituals of the law.

Whilst Paul was this time at Jerufalem, James, Peter, and John, *gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship*, that they might proceed in preaching to the gentiles: whilst they, and the other apostles, still continued in Judea to preach to those of the circumcision, Gal. ii. 6—10.

III. Some short time afterwards, as it seems, Peter was at Antioch, as we learn from St. Paul, Gal. ii. 11—16. I place this journey of Peter to Antioch, after the council of Jerufalem, according to the general opinion. But Basnage argues, that it was before it. If it was not till after it (as I rather think) it could not be long. For Barnabas was now at Antioch. Whereas in a short time after their return thither from Jerufalem, he and Paul parted. Here Peter at first

‘ Illud nobis verisimilius, Concilii Hierosolymitani celebrationi antecessisse Petrinam hanc in Syria metropoli commorationem. Argumento est disceptatio Pauli cum Petro, cujus dissimulationem obruisset auctoritate Synodi, si jam coacta fuisset. Quin immo nulla

Petro, et timendi Judæos, et eorum gratiâ sese separandi a Gentibus causa fuit, si tum temporis promulgata fuisset Concilii Hierosolymitani Epistola: quo veluti clypeo, ad omnes telorum Jûdaicorum ictus tutus erat. Basnag. Ann. 46. num. xxv.

converted

conversed freely with the gentile converts. But when there came thither from Judea some Jewish believers, zealous for the law, *he separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision.* Herein Peter acted contrary to his own judgment, and declared opinion, through fear of the displeasure of others. St. Paul therefore represents his conduct, as dissimulation, or hypocrisy. What he now did, in compliance with the zealots for the law, was a thing of very bad tendency. St. Paul therefore justly *withstood him*, and so showed him to be blameable, that Peter acquiesced. Hereby, as Paul expresseth it, *he (ε) compelled the gentiles to judaize*, or become Jews. For his separating from them, as unfit for converse and communion with the apostles of Christ, and the believers from among the Jews, implied, that they were not acceptable in the sight of God, nor in the way of salvation: and that in order to be saved, it was needful for them to be circumcised, and keep the law.

It was, as I suppose, soon after the council; and the year 50, in which Peter came to Antioch. And I imagine, that he now first of all went abroad out of Judea, into gentile countries. It is very likely, that he was desirous to see the christian people at Antioch. But hitherto he had been little used to converse with gentiles. And when some zealous Jewish believers came to Antioch from Jerusalem, he was alarmed: recollecting, it is likely, how some at Jerusalem had contended with him after he was come from Cæsarea, because he had been with men uncircumcised, and *did eat with them*, Acts xi. 23. and very well knowing, from long and frequent experience, the prevailing temper of the people of his country. But it is reasonable to think, that Peter

(ε) *He compelled the gentiles to judaize, or become Jews.*] Our translation is, *Why compellest thou the gentiles to live as do the Jews?* But it is far from being exact. Τι τα εθνη αναγκαζεις ιουδαιζειν; to judaize is to become a Jew, or proselyte to the Jewish religion. Esther viii. 17. *And many of the people of the land became Jews.* Or, as in the seventy—*were circumcised, and judaized.* Και πολλοι των εθνων περιετεμνοντο, και ιουδαιζον. The Greek word is used in the same

sense by Josephus. De B. J. 1. 2. cap. 18 n. 2. Ἀπεσκευασθαι γαρ τῆς ιουδαικῆς δοκῆντες ἕκαστοι, τῆς ιουδαιζόντας εἶχον ἐν ὑποψίᾳ. To christianize, arianize, sabellianize, is to become a Christian, an Arian, a Sabellian. And to judaize is to become a Jew. Which, if I may be allowed to say it, shows the impropriety of the use of the word, Judaizer, now very common among learned moderns, as denoting a man, who is for imposing Judaism upon others.

never

never more showed the like unsteadiness, but was firm ever afterwards.

This is the last time, that Peter is expressly mentioned in the New Testament, excepting his own epistles, and 1 Cor. i. 12. and ch. iii. 22. From which texts Pearson concludes, that St. Peter had been at Corinth, before St. Paul wrote his first epistle to the church there. But others think, that there were some at Corinth, who had heard Peter preach in Judea: and some, who had seen Christ in person. They who said, *I am of Cephas, or of Christ*, must be supposed to have been Jews, either by descent, or religion.

I do not think, these words can prove that Peter had been at Corinth, before Paul wrote this epistle. At ch. iii. 6. St. Paul says: *I have planted. Apollos watered.* He makes no mention of Peter's labours among the Corinthians. Peter may have been at Corinth afterwards, in his way to Rome. But I do not see any proof from this epistle of his having been there.

IV. We have no where any very distinct account of this apostle's travels. He might return to Judea, and stay there a good while after having been at Antioch, at the time spoken of by St. Paul in the epistle to the Galatians. However, I formerly quoted Epiphanius, saying, that Peter was often in the countries of Pontus, and Bithynia. And by Eusebius we are assured, that Origen in the third tome of his exposition of the book of Genesis, writes to this pur-

† At certissimum est, Petrum non minus quam Paulum Corinthi fuisse, et quidem antequam S. Paulus primam epistolam dedit ad Corinthios. Ita enim Apostolus loquitur. 1 Cor. i. 12. Unde colligitur, non minus Cepham, et Apollo, quam Paulum Corinthi fuisse. Pearf. Op. Post. Diff. i. cap. vii. p. 37.

‡ Alii ergo Corinthi ab Apollo instituti post Pauli abitum, alii ab ipso Paulo, alii qui ex Judæa venerant a Petro, sub illis nominibus, alia atque alia dogmata tradebant. — *Ego autem Christi.* Venerant enim ex Judæa quidam, qui ipsum Christum docentem audierant. Grot.

ad 1 Cor. i. 12. Vid. et Wits. de Vita Pauli. sect. 7. num. xx. Meletem. p. 104, 105.

Sunt viri docti qui existimant, Petrum Apostolum hoc anno Corinthum venisse, dum in ea urbe etiamnum esset Apollos. — Sed pro- pensio in Petrum esse potuit, licet Corinthum pedem non intulisset. Nihil enim vetat fuisse Christianos Corinthi, qui cum Petrum in Judæa aut alibi audivissent, magistrum eum suum dictarent, et Paulo præferrent. Itaque iter hoc Petri nimis levi conjecturâ nititur. Cleric. H. E. ann. 55. num. v.

* Vol. IV. p. 316.

pose: 'Peter y is supposed to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia. Who at length coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downwards, himself having desired it might be in that manner.'

For the time of Peter's coming to Rome, no ancient writer is now more regarded by learned moderns than Lactantius, or whoever is the author of the book of the Deaths of Persecutors; who says, that ^z Peter came thither in the time of Nero. Infomuch that ^a Pagi assents to this account; and has shown it to be altogether improbable that ^b St. Peter came thither in the time of Claudius. He likewise observes ^c some difficulties, which they are liable to, who suppose that he first came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and afterwards in the reign of Nero. But though Peter did not come to Rome before the reign of Nero, which began in the year of Christ 54, we cannot say exactly the time when he came thither, as is also ^d acknowledged by the same excellent chronologer.

However, it appears to me very probable, that St. Peter did not come to Rome before the year of Christ 63, or 64, nor till after St. Paul's departure thence, at the end of his two years' imprisonment in that city.

The books of the New Testament afford a very plausible, and probable, if not a certain argument for it. After our Lord's ascension we find Peter, with the rest of the apostles, at Jerusalem. He and John were sent by the apostles from Jerusalem to Samaria, whence they returned to Jerusalem. When Paul came to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, he found Peter there. Upon occasion of the tranquillity of the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria,

^y Πέτρος δὲ ἐν πόντῳ — κηρυκεῖν αἰ τοὺς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίους εἰκεν. Ὅς καὶ ἐπὶ τελευτῇ ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενομένου, ἀνεσκόλοπισθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, ἕως αὐτοῦ ἀξίως παθεῖν. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. i.

^z — et per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani imperii per omnes provincias et civitates Ecclesiæ fundamenta miserunt. Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit, et editis quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei, data sibi ab eo potestate,

faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, Deoque templum fidele ac stabile collocavit. Quâ re ad Neronem delatâ — et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Persec. cap. 2.

^a Critic. in Baron. ann. 43. num. iii.

^b Ibid. num. ii.

^c Ibid. num. iii.

^d — cum verus ejus adventus annus nos lateat. Id. ann. 54. num. ii.

near

near the end of the reign of Caligula, Peter left Jerusalem, and visited the churches in the several parts of that country, particularly at Lydda and Joppa, where he tarried many days. Thence he went to Cæsarea by the sea side, where he preached to Cornelius, and his company. Thence he returned to Jerusalem: and some time afterwards he was imprisoned there by Herod Agrippa. This brings down the history of our apostle to the year 44. A few years after this he was present at the council of Jerusalem. Nor is there any evidence that he came thither barely for that occasion. It is more probable, that he had not yet been out of Judea. Soon after that council he was at Antioch, where he was reproved by St. Paul.

The books of the New Testament afford no light for determining where Peter was for several years after that. But to me it appears not unlikely, that he returned in a short time to Judea from Antioch: and that he stayed in Judea a good while before he went thence any more. And it seems to me, that when he left Judea, he went again to Antioch the chief city of Syria. Thence he might go into other parts of the continent, particularly Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, which are expressly mentioned at the beginning of his first epistle. In those countries he might stay a good while. It is very likely that he did so; and that he was well acquainted with the Christians there, to whom he afterwards wrote two epistles.

When he left those parts, I think, he went to Rome: but not till after Paul had been in that city, and was gone from it. Several of St. Paul's epistles furnish out a cogent argument of Peter's absence from Rome for a considerable space of time. St. Paul, in the last chapter of his epistle to the Romans, written, as we suppose, in the beginning of the year 58, salutes many by name, without mentioning Peter. And the whole tenour of the epistle makes it reasonable to think, that the Christians there had not yet had the benefit of that apostle's presence, and instructions. During his two years' confinement at Rome, which ended, as we suppose, in the spring of the year 63, St. Paul wrote four, or five epistles; those to the Ephesians, the second epistle to Timothy, to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon: in none of which is any mention of Peter. Nor is any thing said, or hinted, whence it can be concluded, that he had ever been there.

I think

I think therefore, that Peter did not come to Rome before the year 63, or perhaps 64. And, as I suppose, he obtained the crown of martyrdom in the year 64, or 65. Consequently, St. Peter could not reside very long at Rome, before his death.

It is very remarkable, that^c Nicephorus, at the beginning of the ninth century, in his Chronography, computes St. Peter's episcopate at Rome to have been of two years' duration only. For that passage I am indebted to^f Basnage, whose argument upon it I have placed below. Nicephorus, therefore (and probably others likewise) must have supposed, that Peter did not come to Rome, till near the end of his life.

As the foregoing is the most likely account of St. Peter's travels, which I have been able to form; I do not see any reason to believe, that he ever was in Chaldea. Cosmas, of Alexandria, who thought, that by^g Babylon at the end of St. Peter's first epistle is meant Babylon in Persia, must have supposed, that this apostle was in that country. And learned men^h who understand Babylon in the same sense, take it for granted, that St. Peter travelled into that part of the world. But I do not perceive them to support their opinion by testimonies of ancient writers; which surely would have been of advantage to it.

And there are some passages of ancient authors, where it would be reasonable to expect an account of such a journey, if there had been in those times any knowledge of it, or well attested tradition about it.

Origen, in the passage cited by Eusebius, and already quoted by us likewise from him, says: 'Peter is said to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia,

^c 'Οι εν ρωμη επισκοπευσαντες απο χριστου, και των αποστολων, α Πιτρος αποστολος ετη b. Ap. Scalig. Thef. Temp. p. 308. ^f Lactantius Eusebio paullo antiquior Petrum non Claudio quidem, sed Nerone imperante Romam venisse tradit. Neque Lactantio propria chronologia hæc est.—In Nicephori enim Chronographia legimus: *Qui Romæ episcopatum gesserunt a Christo et Apostolis. Petrus apostolus annis duobus. Quibus consequens est, Petrum biennium circiter ante mortem iter in urbem direxisse. Secus diuturniorem ei episcopatum vindicasset*

Nicephorus. Basn. ann. 42. num. x.

^g See vol. V. p. 269.

^h — Verum ego priorem sententiam tanquam longe verisimiliorem amplector, tum quod in Babylone Parthicâ magna esset Judæorum frequentia, qui αιχματοταρχην suam habuerunt: tum quod Petro Antiochiâ discedenti facilior ac commodior esset in hæc loca transitus, in quibus eum diu prædicasse, nemo, opinor, facile negabit. Cav. H. L. in Petro. p. 6. Et Conf. Basnag. Ann. 57. num. iii. et ann. 46. num. xxv.

ⁱ Bithynia,

‘Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia.’ Who at length coming to Rome was crucified.’

Eusebius, in his Chronical Canon, as published by Scaliger, says, in the Greek, ‘that ^k Peter having founded the church in Antioch, went away to Rome, preaching the gospel.’

Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men, in like manner says: ‘that ^l Peter having been at Antioch, and preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, and the neighbouring countries, went to Rome.’ In another place Jerom says: ‘that ^m Christ was with the apostles in all the places whither they went. He was with Thomas in India, with Peter at Rome, with Paul in Illyricum, with Titus in Crete, with Andrew in Achaia.’ Why does he not also say, that Christ was with Peter in Babylon?

Ephrem the Syrian says, ‘that ⁿ Peter preached at Rome, John at Ephesus, Matthew in Palestine, and Thomas in the Indies.’

Gregory Nazianzen speaks of Paul, as having for his province all the gentiles in general, Peter Judea, Luke Achaia, Andrew Epirus, John Ephesus, Thomas the Indies, and Mark Italy.’

Why do none of these writers take in Babylon, or Persia, or Chaldea, as the apostle Peter’s province?

Once more. Says Chrysoftom: ‘This ^p is one prerogative of our city, (Antioch) that we had at the beginning the chief of the apostles for our master. For it was fit, that the place, which was first honoured with the name of Christians, should have the chief of the apostles for its pastor. But though we had him for a master awhile, we did not detain him, but resigned him to the royal city, Rome. Or rather, we have him still. For though we have

^l Vid. Euf. H. E. l. 3. cap. i.

^k Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαιὸς τὴν ἐν ἀντιοχείᾳ πρῶτην θεμελιώσας ἐκκλησίαν εἰς ῥωμὴν ἀπέεισε κηρυττῶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Chr. Can. p. 204.

^l Simon Petrus, — princeps Apostolorum, post episcopatum Antiochenſis eccleſiæ, et prædicationem diſperſionis eorum, qui de circumciſione crediderant, in Ponto — ſecundo Claudii Imperatoris anno, ad expugnandum Simonem Magum, Ro-

man pergit. De V. I. cap. i.

^m Tom. IV. P. I. p. 167. ad Marcell. ep. 148. ⁿ See vol. IV. p. 437. ^o Orat. 25. p. 438. A.

^p Ἐν γὰρ καὶ τὸ πλεονεκτήμα τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως, τὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κορυφαιὸν λαβεῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ διδασκαλῶν. — Ἀλλὰ — οὐκ εἰς τέλος κατέχομεν, ἀλλὰ παρεχώρησαμεν τῇ βασιλείᾳ ῥωμῆ. κ.λ. In Princip. Act. Ap. hom. 2. T. III. p. 70.

‘not his body, we have his faith.’ I might refer to other places of Chrystom, where he speaks of Peter’s having been at Rome. But why does he not also mention Babylon?

I therefore rely upon the account before given of St. Peter’s travels, as most likely. And in particular I observe, that we have not in ancient christian writers any good assurance of his having ever been in Persia, or Parthia. A learned writer of our time, who contends that he was there, and that his first epistle was written at the Assyrian Babylon, acknowledgeth, that ⁹ from that epistle of St. Peter alone we have not any assurance of his having been at Babylon.

V. In the history of St. Paul I have already shown it to be probable, that he and Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome in 64, or 65.

Cave ^r likewise, in his Life of St. Peter, written in English, in 1676, placeth the death of this apostle in 64, or 65. Nor was his mind much altered when he published his *Historia Literaria* in 1688. For there also he supposeth that St. Peter ^s died a martyr at Rome, in the year of Christ 64,

⁹ Superest aliquid, quod ex hoc Petri loco discamus. Primum igitur cognoscimus hic, quod aliunde non constat, Babylone etiam fuisse Petrum, magnamque ibi messuisse Christo messem. Heumann. Nova Sylloge Diss. Part. II. p. 113.

^r The date of his death is differently assigned by the ancients. — That which seems to me most probable, is, that it was in the tenth of Nero, or the year 65. Which I thus compute. Nero’s burning of Rome is placed by Tacitus under the consulship of C. Lucanus, and M. Licinius, about the month of July, that is, A. ch. lxxiv. This act procured him the hatred and clamours of the people. Which having in vain endeavoured several ways to remove and pacify, he at last resolved upon this project, to devote the odium upon the Christians. Whom therefore, both to appease the Gods, and please the people, he condemned as guilty of the fact, and caused to be executed with all manner of acute and

‘exquisite tortures. This persecution began, as we may suppose, about the end of that, or the beginning of the following year. And under this persecution, I doubt not, it was, St. Peter suffered, and changed earth for heaven.’ Cave’s Life of St. Peter, sect. xi.

^r Tandem sub Nerone, forsan circa annum 63, Romam venit, fideles, quos ibi reperit, in ordinem redegit, ecclesiam constituit, auxit, et mox sanguine suo locupletavit. — Obiit igitur sanctus Petrus anno Christi 64, Neronis 10, sub initium persecutionis Neronianæ, ut in opere vernaculo, *De Vitis Apostolorum*, latius disserimus. Etenim cum Nero ob grande illud scelus, Romanæ Urbis incendium, in odium omnium venisset, abolendo rumori, inquit Tacitus, crimen conjecit in Christianos, eosque hâc de causâ quæsitissimis pœnis affecit. Quin hâc occasione rapti sint ad martyrium Apostoli, nemo, cui sanum sinciput, dubitare potest. Hist. Lit. de Petro. p. 5.

at the beginning of Nero's persecution: and indeed expresseth himself with a great deal of assurance and positiveness.

Jerom concludes his article of St. Peter, saying, 'He was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the triumphal way, and is in veneration all over the world.' We likewise formerly^u saw a passage of Caius, about the year 212, where he speaks of the tombs of the two apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome. And Chrysoptom, in a passage lately cited, supposes St. Peter to have been buried in that city.

VI. I shall now take notice of a few things hitherto entirely omitted, or but slightly touched upon. His episcopate at Antioch, his having been five and twenty years bishop of Rome, his children, his wife's martyrdom, said to have absconded at Rome, the manner of his crucifixion.

I. We have seen several authors, who speak of Peter's having been at Antioch. Chrysoptom seems to have supposed, that *x* he was there a good while. This may be also implied in the passage of Jerom before cited *y* from his book of Illustrious Men, where he speaks of Peter's episcopate of Antioch. And in his commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, he says, that *z* Peter was at first bishop of Antioch, and afterwards bishop of Rome. Eusebius speaking of Ignatius, and his epistles, calls *a* him the second bishop of Antioch after Peter. Jerom *b* calls Ignatius the third bishop of Antioch after Peter. They both suppose Euodius, of whom *c* Eusebius speaks elsewhere, to have been the first bishop of Antioch, or the first after Peter.

What real foundation there is for all this, is hard to say; whether it be built entirely upon what St. Paul writes, Gal. ii. 11—16. or whether there was some other ground for it.

But, as before said in the account above given of St. Peter's travels, I think, that St. Peter did not stay long at Antioch, the first time he was there, which is mentioned by St. Paul, but returned to Judea, and after some time leaving that country, he went to Antioch again. Where he might stay a while,

^t See vol. V. p. 53, 54.

^u Vol. II. p. 374.

^x See before, p. 544.

^y See before, p. 544. note (1)

^z Denique primum Episcopum Antiochenæ ecclesiæ Petrum fuisse accepimus, et Romam exinde translatum, quod Lucas penitus omisit. Hieron. in ep. ad Gal. cap. ii.

11—13. T. IV. P. I. p. 244.

^a — τῆς κατ' ἀντιοχείαν πρῶτος διαδοχῆς δευτερός τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληρονομήσας. H. E. l. 3. cap. 36. p. 106. D.

^b Ignatius Antiochenæ ecclesiæ tertius post Petrum Apostolum Episcopus. De V. l. cap. 16.

^c H. E. l. 3. cap. 22.

and then go and preach in the countries mentioned at the beginning of his first epistle, and then go to Rome.

2. It has been said, that Peter was bishop of Rome five and twenty years. This is said by Jerom in ^d his book of Illustrious Men, and ^e in his Chronicle, or his Latin edition of Eusebius' Greek Chronicle, or Chronical Canon, as it is sometimes called: where ^f he added divers things, not said by Eusebius himself.

But this is inconsistent with the history in the Acts. Nor is it any where expressly said by Eusebius: though, perhaps, it might be argued from some things said by him. How the origin of this notion is accounted for by ^h Pagi, and ⁱ Baluze,

^d Post episcopatum Antiochenis ecclesiæ, et prædicationem dispersionis eorum, qui de circumcissione crediderant in Ponto—Romam pergit: ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est, dccimum quartum. De V. I. cap. i.

^e Petrus Apostolus, quum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset, Romam mittitur, ubi evangelium prædicans xxv. annis ejusdem urbis Episcopus perseverat. Chron. p. 160.

^f — *Ibid. xxv. annis ejusdem urbis episcopus perseverat.*] Adjecta sunt ab Hieronymo, et ab eodem repetuntur in Catalogo Scriptor. Ecc. Græca enim non habent. Ab Assumptione Domini, ad id tempus, quo Petrus conjectus fuit in vincula ab Herode Agrippa.—Petrus semper fuit in Palæstina, aut Syria. Herodes obiit quarto anno Claudii. Quomodo igitur anno secundo Claudii profectus est Romam? Quomodo viginti quinque annos Romæ perseveravit? Scaliger. Animadv. p. 189.

^h Præstat hic Lactantii citati verba in medium afferre. *Apostoli per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani Imperii per omnes provincias et civitates Ecclesiæ fundamenta miserunt. Cumque Jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit.*—Ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apostolorum ex æquo pertinent, orta vide-

tur opinio de xxv. annis, qui vulgo tribuuntur S. Petro in sede Romanâ. Pagi. ann. 43. num. iii.

ⁱ Fortassis ergo ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apostolorum æque pertinent, orta est opinio de viginti quinque annis, quos quidam veteres, et innumerabile recentiorum agmen, sancto Petro apostolo tribuunt in sede Romana. Sane licet frustra et supervacaneè a nonnullis negari putem adventum ejus ad urbem Romam, qui clarissimis veterum testimoniis comprobatus est, de tempore tamen multum ambigo; cum videam tot tantasque difficultates habere eorum sententiam, qui illum Romam venisse volunt Claudio imperante, ut coacti sint duplicare profectionem ejus in urbem, et duplex item ejus cum Simone Mago certamen comminisci, primo quidem temporibus Claudii, dein principatu Neronis. Quæ res quam absurde sit, cum id a nullo veterum proditum sit memoriæ literarum, pervident istarum rerum periti.—Itaque si fas esset recedere a vulgari, et in animis hominum insita opinione, ei Lactantianam lubentur præferrem; id est, Petrum quidem Romæ prædicasse evangelium facile concederem, non sub Tiberio Claudio, ut vulgo putant, sed sub Nerone Claudio, &c. Steph. Baluz. annot. ad libr. de M. P. cap. 2.

both Romanists, may be seen in their own words, which I transcribe below. I refer likewise to ^k Basnage, and Dodwell.¹ In all whom are good observations relating to this point.

3. Clement of Alexandria ^m reckons Peter among those apostles, who had children. According to him Philip was another. Epiphanius says, that ⁿ Peter came to Christ after he was married, and had children. Jerom, in his first book against Jovinian, takes notice, that ^o in the Circuits, probably meaning the Recognitions, mention was made both of Peter's wife and daughter. But, says he, that is not a canonical book. And still we have a passage in the Recognitions, where St. Peter's wife is mentioned: but, as ^p Coteletius observes, what was said of Peter's daughter is wanting. Possibly these things may illustrate the words of Peter, recorded Matt. xix. 27. *Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee. What shall we have therefore?* And indeed Origen, in his Commentary upon St. Matthew, says: 'It ^q seems, that Peter did not leave
' nets only, but also a house, and a wife, whose mother the
' Lord healed of a fever, and, as may be supposed, children,
' and possibly likewise some small estate.'

4. Farther, Clement of Alexandria, ^r cited also by Eusebius, informs us: 'It was said, that the blessed Peter seeing his wife led forth to death, rejoiced for the grace of God vouchsafed to him: and calling to her by name, exhorted and

^k Ann. 42. n. x. xi. ¹ Diff. Singularis. cap. iii. n. 1. p. 13.

^m — η και αποστολες αποδοκιμαζετι; Πητρος μεν γαρ και φιλιππος επαιδοποησαντο. Clem. Strom. l. 3. p. 448. D. et ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 30.

ⁿ Μετα γαρ το γημαι, και τεκνα κηκτησθαι, και πειθεραν εχειν, συνετυχε τω σωτηρι, εξ ιουδαιων αρμαμενος. Hier. 30. num. xxii. p. 147. B.

^o Possumus autem et de Petro dicere, quod habuerit socrum eo tempore quo credidit, et uxorem non habuerit: quamquam legatur in Periodis et uxor ejus et filia. Sed nunc nobis de canone omne certamen est. Contr. Jovin. l. 1. T. IV. P. II p. 168. in.

^p *Die autem posierō sedens cum uxore Petri.*] Testatur Hieronymus contra Jovinianum scribens, legi in Perio-

dis et uxorem Petri et filiam. La igitur Circuituum pars, in qua de Petri filiā (Petronillam illam vocant) fermo erat, nunc desideratur. Uxorem autem memorant præterea Clem. A. Str. 7. ubi et martyrium illius refert verbis, quæ citantur ab Eusebio. iii. 30. Origines ad Matt. xix. 27. Epiphanius H. 30. n. 22. Hieronymus ep. 34. Cotelet. ad Recognit. l. 7. cap. 25.

^q Origen. in Matt. tom. XV. p. 682. T. III. Bened. ^r Φασι γει, του μακαριου πητρου θεασαιμενου την αυτη γυναικα αγριμενην την επι θανατον, καθηκει της κλησεως χαριν — επιφανησαι σε ευμαρι προτρεπτικως και παρακλητικως ες αιματος προσειποντα. Μερμησο ω αυτης υμεις. Str. 7. p. 736. B.

^s H. E. l. 3. cap. 30.

comforted her, saying: *Remember the Lord.* If time and place had been mentioned, it would have added to the credibility of the story. However she might be at Rome, as we know Peter was. And if so, she might suffer about the same time with him. For Nero's persecution took in people of both sexes, and of all conditions, as we know from the accounts given by Tacitus. And we learn from St. Paul, that Peter was attended by his wife in his travels. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

5. It is also said, 'that' St. Peter being imprisoned at Rome, or being in some imminent danger of suffering, the brethren there entreated him to consult his safety by flight, and to reserve himself for farther service and usefulness. At length he was persuaded, and went out in the dark night. But when he came to the gate, he saw Christ entering into the city. Whereupon he said: *Lord, whither art thou going?* Christ answered: *I am come hither to be crucified again.* By which Peter apprehended himself to be reprov'd, and perceived, that Jesus spake of his death, and that now he was to be crucified in his servant. Accordingly Peter turned back, and gave satisfaction to the brethren. And being soon after taken up, he was crucified.'

This story is in Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in the fourth century. Tillemont^u has endeavoured to find some grounds for it, or references to it, in more ancient authors. But they are very obscure and doubtful. Bafnage^x has some remarks upon it, which may be read by such as have leisure.

6. St. Peter's death, and the manner of it, we saw just now in a passage cited from y Origen, and likewise, that when he was to be crucified, he desired it might be in that way. So likewise Jerom, 'that'^z he was crucified by order of Nero,

† Item Petrus postea, victo Simone, cum præcepta Dei populo seminaret, excitavit animos Gentilium: quibus eum querentibus, Christianæ animæ deprecatae sunt, ut paulisper cederet. Et quamvis esset cupidus passionis, tamen contemplatione populi precantis inflexus est. Rogabatur enim, ut ad instituendum et consermandum populum se reservaret. Quid multa? Nocte muros egredi cœpit. Sed videns sibi in portâ Christum occurrere, urbemque ingredi, ait: Domine quo vadis? Respondit Christus: Venio iterum crucifigi.—Intel exit ergo Petrus, quod iterum Christus crucifigendus

esset in servulo. Itaque sponte remeavit. Interrogantibus Christianis responsum reddidit, statimque correptus, per crucem suam honoravit Dominum Jesum. Ambr. Serm. contr. Aux. T. II. p. 867. A. B. ed Bened.

^u S. Pierre. art. 35. et note 39. Mem. tom. I. ^x Ann. 65. num. xi. ^y See p. 541.

^z A quo et affixus cruci, martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso, et in sublime pedibus elevatis: asserens, se indignum, qui sic crucifigeretur, ut Dominus suus. De V. I. cap. i.

N n 3

' and

‘ and so crowned with martyrdom, his head downward, and his feet lifted up, saying, he was unworthy to be crucified as his master was.’ To the like purpose ^a Prudentius. Chrysoſtom also ſeveral times ſpeaks ^b of Peter’s being crucified with his head downwards.

And it is unqueſtioned, that ^c among the Romans ſome were ſo crucified, to add to their pain and ignominy. Nevertheless ſome ancient writers, who ſpeak of Peter’s martyrdom by crucifixion, do ^d not take notice of that circumſtance. Which has induced ^e Baſnage to diſpute the truth of it. Allowing, that ^f Peter was crucified in that manner, he thinks it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, it was at his own requeſt. And it muſt be acknowledged that his reaſoning is plauſible.

It ſeems to me, that Peter might be crucified in that manner, and that it might be owing to the ſpite and malice of thoſe, who put him to death. The ſaying, that it was at his own deſire, may have been at firſt only the oratorical flight of ſome man of more wit than judgment. But the thought was pleaſing, and therefore has been followed by many.

^a Primum Petrum rapuit ſententia, legibus Neronis,
Pendere juſſum præminente ligno.

Ille tamen veritus celsæ decus æmulando mortis
Ambire tanti gloriam magiſtri :

Exigit, ut pedibus verſum caput imprimant ſupinis,

Quo ſpectet imum ſtipitem cerêbro. Περὶ Σεφ. cap. 12.

^b — ατε δὴ καὶ πλείους λαβὼν
δυναμὴν καὶ μείζον τοῦ βαρῆος ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς
ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ τῷ σταυρῷ κατὰ κεφαλῆς
προσημιλησάμην. κ. λ. Chr. in Pr. Act.
hom. 4. T. III. p. 93. E.

Παῦλος δὲ καὶ πέτρος ἕξι οὐ μὲν
ἀπεκτιμήθη, οὐ δὲ ἀπ’ ἐναντίας τοῦ
δεσποτῆ τῆς σταυρῆς τὴν τιμωρίαν δεξάμενος,
ἕτω μετῆς τῆς πάρασθης ζωῆς; In. Gen.
hom. 66. tom. IV. p. 630. A.

Ὁ χριστὸς ἐσταυρώθη ἕτος ἐμελλεν
ἀποκεφαλισθῆναι ὁ πέτρος κατὰθεν
ἀνεσκολοπισθῆναι. In 2 Tim. hom. 5.
T. XI. p. 687. D.

^c Vid. Baſnag. ann. 65. num.
xiv. ^d Ubi Petrus paſſioni
dominicæ adæquatur. Tertull. Pr.
cap. 36. p. 245. Tunc Petrus ab
altero cingitur, quum cruci ad-
stringitur. Id. Scorp. cap. 15.
p. 633.

— Petrum cruci adfixit, et
Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Per-
fec. cap. 2.

^e Ubi supra. num.

xiv. ^f Concesso, ut plures
testantur, sublimibus Petrum vesti-
giis affixum cruci, quin ex Prætoris
mandato irrogatum hoc supplicii,
quo pereunti adderetur dolor et
ludibrium, non credere non possu-
mus.—Præpostera sane et vana ea
videtur esse modestia, quam ascri-
bunt Petro.—Neque priscorum
aliquem martyrum, qui in crucem
acti fuerunt similis unquam incessit
humilitas.—Præterea certo cer-
tius est, atrocius eorum fuisse sup-
plicium, qui inverso, quam qui
recto capite figebantur cruci.—
Martyris autem est, imperatam sibi
mortem perferre fortiter, non vero
poscere, ut intendantur a carnifice
tormenta. Id. ib. num. xv.

VII. Some learned men have denied that Peter ever was at Rome, as ^z Scaliger, ^h Salmasius, ⁱ Frederick Spanheim, and some others. Mr. Bower is much of the same mind. His words are: ‘From ^k what has been hitherto said every impartial judge must conclude, that it is at best very much to be doubted, whether St. Peter ever was at Rome.’ Nevertheless there have been many learned men among the protestants, as well as Romanists, whose impartiality was never questioned, who have believed, and argued very well, that Peter was at Rome, and suffered martyrdom there. I refer to some: ^l Cave, ^m Pearson, ⁿ Le Clerc, ^o Basnage, ^p Barratier.

I shall therefore remind my readers of some testimonies of ancient writers, relating to this matter, making also a few remarks upon them. And then let every one judge.

I begin with Clement of Rome, who wrote an epistle to the Corinthians, before the year of Christ 70, as some think, or about the year 96, as others suppose. In that epistle are these expressions. ‘But ^q not to insist any longer,’ says he, ‘upon examples of former times, let us come to those worthies that are nearest to us, and take the brave examples of our own age. Through zeal and envy they who were the most righteous pillars of the church ^r have been persecuted even to a cruel death. Let ^s us set before our eyes the excellent apostles. Peter through unrighteous zeal underwent not one or two, but many labours, till at last being martyred he went to the place of glory that was due to him. Through

^z Quum igitur Petrus ad περιτομῶν missus esset, videtur in διασπορά Afrana periisse, si conjecturæ locus est. Nam de ejus Romam adventu, sedē 25. annorum, et supremo capitis supplicio, ibidem, nemo qui paullo humanior fuerit, credere posset. Jos. Scal. annot. ad Joh. xviii. 31. ^h De Petro vero a Nerone sublato non constat. Si non potest probari Romæ illam fuisse unquam, quomodo ibi crucifixus? Putem ego cum Salmasio Babylone martirium passam esse, si quid divinare in re incerta licet. Galenus ad Lact. Instit. l. 4. cap. 21. Vid. et de Salmasii sententiâ Pearson. De Success. prim. Rom. Episcop. Diff. i. cap. viii.

ⁱ Diss. de ficta professione Petri Ap. in urbem Romam. Opp tom. II. p. 331, &c. ^k History of the Popes, vol. I. p. 5.

^l Hist. Lit. in Petro. ^m De Successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum. Diff. i. cap. vii. et viii.

ⁿ Hist. Ecc. ann. 67. n. i. et ann. 68. n. 1, 2. ^o Ann. 64. num. ix. x. xi.

^p De Successione Episc. Roman. cap. i.

^q Clem. ep. ad Cor. cap. v. vi.

^r — εδιωχθησαν και εως θανατου δειν.

^s Λαβωμεν προ οφθαλμων ημων της αγαλης αποστολης. Πητρος δια ζηλον αδικων — και ετω μαρτυρησας επορευθη εις τον οφειλομενον τοπον της δοξης.

‘ zeal ‘ Paul obtained the reward of patience. Seven times he
 ‘ was in bonds, he was whipped, he was stoned. He preached
 ‘ both in the east and in the west. And having taught the
 ‘ whole world righteousness, and “ coming to the borders of
 ‘ the west,’ and suffering martyrdom under the governors,
 ‘ so he departed out of the world, and went to the most holy
 ‘ place, being a most eminent pattern of patience.

‘ To * these men, who lived a divine life, was joined a great
 ‘ multitude of choice ones, who having undergone through
 ‘ zeal many reproaches and torments, became an excellent
 ‘ example among us.’

From these passages I think it may be justly concluded, that Peter and Paul were martyrs at Rome in the time of Nero’s persecution. For they suffered among the Romans, where Clement was bishop, and in whose name he was writing to the Corinthians. They were martyrs, when many others were an example, or pattern, of a like patience among them. *To these apostles, says Clement, was joined a great multitude of choice ones, or elect, that is, Christians.* This is a manifest description of Nero’s persecution at Rome, when a multitude of Christians there were put to death under grievous reproaches, and exquisite torments, as we are assured by Tacitus. These were joined to the excellent apostles, Peter and Paul, before-mentioned. Therefore Peter and Paul had suffered at that place, and at that time: and, as it seems, according to this account, at the beginning of that persecution. Which may be reckoned not at all improbable.

When Clement says, that *Paul suffered martyrdom under the governors*, he may be understood to mean *by order of the magistrate*. It cannot be hence inferred, that Peter and Paul did not die by Nero’s order, or in virtue of his edict against the Christians. It should be considered, that Clement is not an historian. He is writing an epistle, containing divers exhortations. It was not needful for him to be more particular. He does not name the city, in which either Peter or Paul died, nor the death which they underwent. But he intimates, that they suffered a cruel death, together with

* Δια ζηλον ο παυλος υπομονης θρα-
 σεον επεσχησεν. “ Και επι το τερμα
 της ουτως ελθων, και μαρτυρησας επι
 των ηγεμενων, κτης α επιλαγη τε κοσμου
 και εις το αγιον πνευμα εστρεψθη, υπομο-
 νης γενόμενος μεγιστος υποδειγματος.

* Τιστοις τοις ανδρασιν βειως πολιτευ-
 σαμενοις συνιθροισθη πολυ πληθος εκλεκ-
 τωι, οτινες πολλαις αικιαις και βασανεις
 δια ζηλον παθοντες υποδειγμα καλλιστον
 εγενοντο εν ημιν.

many choice ones among them. Which must mean Rome. And he plainly represents these apostles as martyrs, who had suffered through envy and unrighteous zeal. The place and the manner of their death were well known to the Christians at Corinth, to whom Clement was writing.

If we consider, where Clement was, he may be reasonably excused from naming the emperor, or being otherwise more particular. This epistle was written soon after some troubles, which the Christians at Rome had met with, as appears plainly from the beginning of it: meaning, it is likely, either the persecution of Nero, or of Domitian, the next persecutor of the Christians. It is not at all strange, that at such a time Clement should think himself obliged to circumspection in the manner of his expressions.

Indeed the primitive Christians were always very careful, not to speak disrespectfully of heathen princes, or other magistrates, how much soever they suffered from them. The epistle begins in this manner. *The calamities and afflictions, brethren, which have befallen us, have somewhat retarded our answer to your inquiries.* Those afflictions intend, as before said, the persecution of Nero or Domitian. And if so, certainly there is much mildness in the expressions. But a very different style is used presently after in speaking of the dissension, which there was among the Christians at Corinth. It is called *a wicked and ungodly sedition, unbecoming the elect of God, fomented by a few rash and self-willed men.*

Bishop Pearson has argued from this place, that γ Peter and Paul did not die by order of Nero himself, but by order of the prefects of the city, when Nero was absent, and, particularly, on Feb. 22. in the year of Christ 68, and the last year of Nero. And he says, that α the Greek word, which I have rendered governors or magistrates, never denotes the emperor, but only the prefects of the city, or of the provinces.

γ S. Paulus (cum Petro) ultimo Neronis anno martyrium fecit. factum autem id est sub Præfectis in urbe, ut testatur Clemens Romanus, absente scilicet Nerone, Februarii die 22. Ann. Paulin. p. 25. A. D. 68. α Quod si Romanis dilerte non expresserit, Nero certe multo minus delineavit. β γ δ ϵ ζ η θ ι κ λ μ ν ξ \omicron π ρ σ τ υ ϕ χ ψ ω . — Neque enim η θ ι κ λ μ ν ξ \omicron π ρ σ τ υ ϕ χ ψ ω Impera-

tores dicti sunt: sed qui sub Imperatore, in provinciis præsertim, Præsidum loca sub variis nominibus obtinebant. — Neque hæc vox tantum in provinciis solennis fuit, sed etiam Romæ. — Tales erant Romæ, ultimo Neronis anno, duo Præfecti Prætorio, Tigellinus et Sabinus, et cum summa potestate Helius. De Succession. prim. Romæ Episcop. Diff. i. cap. 8. § ix.

But

But Pearson was very unhappy in that observation. For Nero was at Rome in the beginning of the year 68. Pagi^a and Basnage^b have shown, that whereas Nero was absent from Rome almost two years, the greatest part of 66, and 67, he arrived at Rome from Greece in December 67.

And the word, which I have rendered 'governors,' is often used, not only for prefects, but also for kings and emperors, or other supreme magistrates. Of^c which I place several instances in the margin.

However, both the noun and the verb are general words, and are used concerning governors supreme and subordinate. As is apparent from that well known text. Luke iii. 1. *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea.* As the words are well rendered in our version. But, literally, they might be translated in this manner. *Now in the fifteenth year of the government of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea.*

As for the words being in the plural number: it is no uncommon thing to prefer that to the singular, when we are obliged to be cautious, and intend, as I suppose Clement did, to speak in a general way. In short, Clement shows, that Peter and Paul had died by martyrdom, and not in a tumult of the people, but by order of the magistrate, meaning the emperor, though he is not named.

So that I must take the liberty to say, that Pearson's observation, that Peter and Paul were put to death, not by Nero, but by the prefects of Rome, or some other great officer, in

^a Ann. 67. num. ii. 66. num. vi. et 67. n. v.

^c 1 Kings xv. 13. it is said of Asa, *And also Maachab his mother he removed from being queen.* In the lxx. it is thus: *Και την ανα την μητερα εαυτε μετεστησε τε μη ειναι ηγεμενην.* 2 Chron. vii. 18. When God appeared to Solomon, he said, *Then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom. There shall not fail thee a man to be ruler in Israel.* *’Ουκ εξαρθησεται σοι ηγεμενος ανηρ εν ισραηλ.* 2 Chr. ix. 26. *And he reigned over all the kings from the river.* *Και ην ηγεμενος παντων των βασιλεων απο τε ποταμου.* When St. Matth. ch. ii. 6. quotes the words of the prophet Micah:

^b Ann. *Out of thee shall come a governor, ηγεμενος, that shall rule my people Israel: he does not mean a governor of inferior rank, but the Messiah himself. I shall add only a like instance or two from Josephus, and from a Greek classic, though many might be mentioned—* *μεχρι ετης δωδεκατε την νερωνος ηγεμονιας.* Joseph. Ant. l. 20. cap. x. sect. ult. n. 2. — *δωδεκατω μεν ετει της νερωνος ηγεμονιας* De B. I. l. 2. cap. 14. n. 4. — *των πρεσβυτερον αυτων αποδειξει ρωμαιων ηγεμονα.* Dion. Hal. l. 4. cap. 4. p. 202. ed. Hudson.

^d *’Εν ετει δε πεντεκαιδεκατω της ηγεμονιας τιβεριου καισαρος, ηγεμονευοις ποστις πιλατου της ιουδαιας.*

the absence of the emperor, appears to be of no value. And it is destitute of all authority from history. For we shall see as we proceed, that the death of these two apostles is continually ascribed to Nero by all who speak distinctly about it.

One thing more I must take notice of. From these passages of Clement it has been argued, that Peter never was at Rome, in this manner. 'Clemens Romanus (who was personally acquainted with the apostles, and knew very well where they travelled) writes a letter from Rome to Corinth, and mentions St. Paul's travelling very far to spread the gospel: but in the same section, though he mentions St. Peter's sufferings and martyrdom, yet he says nothing of his travelling much, nor one word of his ever having been at Rome.'

Upon which I beg leave to observe, first. It seems to me, that Clement says, Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome: for speaking of the 'great multitude of the elect, who had been an excellent example of patience among them,' meaning the Romans, he says, 'they were joined to' or with 'the good apostles,' before mentioned. Therefore the apostles had suffered in the same place. Certainly Clement, who wrote this, did not think, that Peter died at Babylon in Mesopotamia, and Paul at Rome in Italy. Secondly. The reason why Clement so particularly mentions St. Paul's travels, probably, was, because the extent of his preaching was very remarkable. And it is likely, that Clement refers to Rom. xv. 19. Thirdly, His omitting to speak of Peter's travels is not a denial of his having travelled a great deal. Nor does it imply, that he had not been at Rome. St. Paul must have been twice in the west, and at Rome, if he suffered martyrdom there. But Clement does not say so, though he knew it very well. As did the Corinthians likewise. But when we speak or write of things well known (as these things were at that time) there is no need to be very particular. It was sufficient, if Clement mentioned such things, as would render his exhortations effectual.

I shall now transcribe below ^s some like observations of Pearson, in his Confutation of Salmasius. Upon

* See Dr. Benson's Preface to St. Peter's first epistle, sect iii. p. 157. second edit. τριτοις — συνή-
κουσα πολυ πληθος εκλεκτων.

† Denique manifestum est, nihil hic a Clemente de Urbe vel de Imperatore discrete et expressim dictum esse, quia a Romanis ad Corinthios

scripsit, qui hæc omnia, non minus quam ipse, noverunt. Imo Clemens mentionem loci non fecit, non quia ipse ignorabat, sed quia illi cognoverunt. Nam si ignorasset quo in loco, qua in regione, aut qua in orbis parte, mortuus est Petrus, quomodo asserere potuit,

cum

Upon the whole, I cannot but think, that these passages of Clement bear a testimony to the martyrdoms both of Peter and Paul, and that at Rome, which cannot be evaded.

Ignatius, about 108, writing to the Romans, says, 'I do not command you, as Peter and Paul. They were apostles, I am a condemned person.' Ignatius must have supposed, that the Christians at Rome had been instructed by Peter, as well as by Paul. The observations of ⁱ Pearson, and ^k Barratier, upon this place, which I put below, appear very just.

The preaching of Peter, or of Peter and Paul, quoted by several ancient writers (as has been shown in this work) though not as a book of authority, composed ^l about the middle of the second century or sooner, makes mention of Peter's being at Rome, in this manner, as cited by Lactantius. 'After ^m his resurrection Christ opened to his disciples all things that should come to pass, which things Peter and Paul preached at Rome.' And what follows. There ⁿ is another large quotation of this book in the author of Rebaptizing, written about 256, where it is supposed, that Peter and Paul were together at Rome.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about 170, in a letter to the

eum martyrio coronatum fuisse?
 —Proculdubio hæc loci omisio non ex ignorantia cujuscumque, aut scriptoris alterius, sed ex certissima omnium, ad quos spectabat hæc epistola, tum Romanorum, tum Corinthiorum, aliorumque fidelium cognitione et explorata scientia, quæ ulteriorem expositionem minime requirebat. Ac tandem argumentum hoc negativum ex Clemente productum, non eorum sed nostrum est. Clemens optime novit, et ubi, et quomodo passus est S. Petrus. Idem etiam bene novērunt tum Romani, tum Corinthii. Aliiter eos eadem de re certiores fecisset Clemens. Pearson. de Success. prim. Romæ Episc. Diss. i. cap. 8. sect. ix. ^h 'Ουχ' ως πετρος και παυλος διατασσομαι υμιν. Εκεινοι αποστολοι, εγω κατακριτος. Ad Rom. cap. 4. ⁱ Quid enim ex his verbis ad Romanos scriptis apertius, quam sanctissimum Martyrem in eadem

sententia fuisse, quod Petrus, non minus quam Paulus, Romæ evangelium prædicavit, et passus sit? Pearson. ib. cap. 7. n. ii.

^k Ignatius, — Romanis scribens, negat se ipsis, tanquam Petrum et Paulum, præcipere velle. Cur Petrum et Paulum unâ nominat, nisi quod uterque Romæ fuerit? Cur Petrum, si cum Romanis nullum nexum habuerit? Si enim Romæ non fuerit, cum Romanis non scripserit, nil magis cum iis commune habebat, vel iis præceperat, quam Jacobus, vel Judas, vel Joannes. Manifestum est, Ignatium Romanum Petri iter novisse. Barrat. ubi supr. num. iii. p. 5. ^l See vol. II. p. 239. note (F). ^m Sed et futura aperuit illis omnia, quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt. Et ea prædicatio in memoriam scripta permansit. Lactant. Inst. l. 4. cap. 21. p. 422.

ⁿ See vol. III. p. 197.

church of Rome, inscribed to Soter their bishop, as cited by Eusebius, takes notice, 'that ° Peter and Paul going to Italy, taught there, and suffered martyrdom about the same time.'

Irenæus about 178, speaks of the church of Rome, 'p as founded and established by the two great apostles Peter and Paul.' In another place, he says, 'that ° Matthew wrote his gospel, whilst Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and establishing the church there.' Irenæus, who was as likely to know as most, had no doubt about these things. And some of his arguments with heretics, are partly built upon them: well knowing, that they could not be contested, and that they were generally allowed.

According to Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about the year 194. St. Mark's gospel was written at the desire of St. Peter's hearers at Rome.

Tertullian, about the year 200, and after, often speaks of Peter being at Rome, and teaching there, and suffering martyrdom there, together with Paul, or about the same time.

Caius, about 212, observes, that in his time were to be seen at Rome the tombs of the apostles, Peter and Paul, who had established that church.

° Ομοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς ἰταλίαν ὁμοσε
ἀλάξαντες; μαρτυρήσαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν
καρπὸν. Ap. Euseb. l. 2. cap. 25.
p. 68. The same passage is largely
quoted vol. II. p. 135.

p Sed
quoniam valde longum est in hoc
tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum
enumerare successiones; maximæ,
et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cog-
nita. a gloriosissimis Apollolis, Pe-
tro et Paulo, Romæ formatæ et con-
stitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet
ab Apollolis traditionem, et an-
nuntiatam omnibus fidem, &c.
Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 3.

Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 1. et ap.
Euseb. l. 5. cap. 8.

Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 15.
et lib. VI. cap. 14. and of this work
vol. II. p. 210.

Si autem
hæc adices, habes Romanam.—
Quæ in felix ecclesiâ, cui totam
Christianam Apostoli cum sanguine
profuderunt! Ubi Petrus pas-
chæ Dominicæ adæquatur: ubi
Joannis exitu coronatur.

De Præfer. Hær. cap. 36. p. 245.

Nec quicquam refert inter eos,
quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos
Petrus in Tiberi tinxit. De Bap-
tism. cap. 4. p. 257.

Videamus quod lac a Paulo Co-
rinthii hauserint.— Quid etiam
Romani de proximo sonent, quibus
evangelium et Petrus et Paulus san-
guine quoque suo signatum relique-
runt. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 5.
p. 505. B.

Orientem fidem Romæ primus
Nero cruentavit. Tunc Petrus ab
altero cingitur, quum cruci ad-
stringitur. Tunc Paulus civitatis
Romanæ consequitur nativitatem,
quum illic martyrii renascitur ge-
nerositate. Scorpiac. cap. 15. p.
633. B.

— εὐρησεῖς τὰ τρωαῖα τῶν ταυ-
τῆν ἰδρυσαμένων ἐκκλησιῶν. Ap. Euseb.
H. E. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 68. in. And
see in this work, vol. II. p. 374.

Origen

Origen, about 230, as cited by Eusebius, says, that ^u Peter having preached in Pontus, Galatia, and other places, at length came to Rome, where he was crucified.

Cyprian ^x at Carthage, about 248, and afterwards, always supposeth the church of Rome to have been established by Peter. So ^y likewise does Firmilian, in Cappadocia, in his letter, written in 258.

Lactantius ^z about 306, in his Institutions, ascribes the death of Peter and Paul to Nero at Rome.

The same Lactantius, or whoever is the author of the book of the Deaths of Persecutors, is very clear, that ^a in the reign of Nero, Peter came to Rome, and that by his order Peter was crucified, and Paul also put to death.

Eusebius, both in his Demonstration, and in his Ecclesiastical History, bears witness to the same things. Not now to insist on his Chronicle. In the former, ^b he says, 'that Peter was crucified at Rome with his head downward, and Paul beheaded. In his ecclesiastical history, speaking of Nero, 'as ^c the first persecutor of the Christians,' he says, 'that he put to death the apostles, at which time Paul was beheaded at Rome, and Peter crucified, as history relates. And the account,' he says, 'is confirmed by the monuments still seen in the cemeteries of that city, with their names inscribed upon

^u Ap. Euseb. l. 3. cap. i.

^x Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio — cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri, et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret. Cyprian. ad Antonian. ep. 55. p. 104.

Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram, atque ecclesiam principalem — a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre — Cyprian Cornelio. ep. 59. p. 135. Oxon. 1682. ^y Atque ego in hac parte justè indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit — multas alias petras inducat. Stephanus, qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se prædicat, nullo adversus hæreticos zelo excitatur. Firmilian. ep. Cyprian. 75.

p. 225. ^z Itaque post illorum obitum, cum eos Nero interemisset, Judæorum nomen et gentem Vespasianus exstinxit, fecitque omnia quæ illi futura prædixerant. Institut. l. 4. cap. 21. p. 423.

^a Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit. — et convertit multos ad justitiam. — Quæ re ad Neronem delatâ — et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Persec. cap. 2.

^b Καὶ πेत्रος δὲ ἐπὶ ρωμῆς κατὰ κεφαλῆς σαυρῆται παυλος δὲ ἀποτεμῆται. Dem. Ev. l. 3. p. 116. C.

^c Ταυτὴ γὰρ οὗτος θεσμαχὸς ἐν ταῖς μαλίστα πρῶτος ἀνακηρυχθεὶς, ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιρῆθης σφαγῆς. Παυλος δὲ οὖν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ρωμῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀποτμηθῆναι, καὶ πेत्रος ὡσαύτως ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι κατ' αὐτὸν ἰσχυρῆται. κ. λ. H. E. l. 2. c. 25. p. 67. Vid. et. l. 2. cap. 22. fin. p. 62. D.

^e them.

‘them.’ And what follows. In another chapter of the same work, he says: ‘that^d Linus was the first bishop of Rome after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter.’ It is needless to refer to any more of the many places of this learned bishop of Cæsarea, where he appears to have been fully persuaded, that these two apostles accomplished their martyrdom at Rome.

Athanasius^c supposes both Peter and Paul to have suffered martyrdom in that city.

Ephrem the Syrian, about 370, says, that^f Peter taught at Rome.

Epiphanius, as may be remembered, says, ‘that^e Matthew wrote first, and Mark soon after, being a companion of Peter at Rome.’ In another place^h he speaks of Peter and Paul, as the first apostles and bishops of Rome. After whom, he says, were Linus, Cletus, Clement.

Jerom’s opinion is well known from his article of St. Peter, in his book of Illustrious Men, where he says, ‘thatⁱ Peter was crucified at Rome in the fourteenth year of Nero’s reign:’ and from^k his chapter of St. Mark, ‘whom he calls the disciple and interpreter of Peter, and says, that at the desire of the brethren at Rome he wrote a short gospel, according to what he had heard from Peter.’ Not now to refer to any other places.

We lately saw, how^l Chrysostom says, that Peter having been at Antioch, afterwards went to Rome. In another place he says, that^m after Peter and Paul, Ignatius also suffered martyrdom at Rome. And he thinks it a wise disposal of Providence, that so many should bear the most signal testimony to truth in a place, which was then the chief seat of impiety and superstition.

According to Sulpicius Severus, who wrote about the year 401, Paulⁿ and Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome in Nero’s persecution. Prudentius,

^a Της δε ρωμαιων εκκλησιας μετα την ελπιου και πετρου μαρτυριαν, πρωτος ηγχετα την επισκοπων λινος. Η. Ε. Ι. β. cap. 2. ^b Πετρος δε ο δια τον εδου και ιουδαιων κρυπτομενος, και παυλου ο σαρρατη χαλασθεις, και φυγων, ανεβαινες εις ρωμην θει υμας μαρτυρησαι, κα ανεδραστο την αποδημιαν. Apol. 1. fugā sua, p. 331.

^c See in this work, vol. IV. p. 553.

^d See vol. IV. p. 314. from Hier.

51. num. vi.

^e Εν ρωμη γαρ γεγονασι πρωτοι πετρος και παυλος οι αποστολοι και επισκοποι, ειτα λινος. κ. λ. Hier. 27. num. vi. ^f See vol. V.

p. 53. ^g The same, p. 38.

^h See before, p. 544. ⁱ Οι δε την ρωμην οικηντες, ατε πολλης τοτε ασεβειας υτης εκει, πλειονος εχρηζον βοηθειας. Δια τειτο και πετρος και παυλος, και μετ’ εκεινης ουτος εκει παντες εδυθησαν. Ch. hom. in S. Ig. Mart. T. II. p. 599. A. ^k Tum Paulus ac Petrus

Prudentius, about 405, has several times celebrated the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul at Rome. One place was transcribed from him not long ago.

To him I subjoin P. Orosius ^p about 416.

And Theodoret, about 423, well observes, that ^q though Nero put to death two of the principal christian lawgivers, Peter and Paul, he could not abolish their laws.

I omit Augustine, and many others, who speak to the like purpose. But I would add, for showing how general this tradition is, that Abdias Babylonius, as he is called in his Apostolical history, supposes Peter ^r to have been at Rome, and to have suffered martyrdom there.

Nor can any of my readers forbear to recollect the general, and almost unanimous testimony of ancient writers concerning St. Mark: that he was a disciple of St. Peter, that his gospel is the substance of St. Peter's preaching, and that it was written at Rome.

It is not needful to make many remarks upon this tradition. But it is easy to observe, that it is the general, uncontradicted, disinterested testimony of ancient writers, in the several parts of the world, Greeks, Latins, Syrians. As our Lord's prediction concerning the death of Peter is recorded in one of the four gospels, it is very likely, that ^s Christians would observe the accomplishment of it. Which must have been in some place. And about this place there is no difference among christian writers of ancient times. Never any other place was named, beside Rome. Nor ^t did any other city ever glory in the martyrdom of Peter. There were in the second and third centuries

Petrus capitis damnati. Quorum uni cervix gladio defecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est. Sul. Sev. Hist. Sacra. l. 2. cap. 29 al. 41.

^o See before, p. 550. ^p Nam primus Romæ Christianos suppliciiis et mortibus adfecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione ex-cruciari imperavit. Ipsumque no-men extirpare conatus, beatissimos Christi apostolos, Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit. Oros. Hist. l. 7. cap. 7. ^q See of this work, vol. V. p. 201. from Theod. Ser. m. 9. De Legibus, tom. IV. p. 611. D.

^r Apostol. Hist. de Petro. § xvi. &c. Ap. Fabr. tom. II.

^s Non infirmenda esse eâ de re antiquitatis testimonia, multa mo-nent. 1. Convenientissimum sane fuit sciri locum, ubi Petro mors oblata est, ad illustrandum Christi de servi sui martyrio oraculum. — Locus autem in ignoratione jacet, si in Romana civitate Petrus cruci suffixus non fuit. Basnag. ann. 64. n. x. ^t Gloria dico-rique maximo ecclesiis fuit, quod et doctrinâ et sanguine Apostolorum conderentur. Hinc exclamabat olim Tertullianus: *Felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum san-guine suo profuderunt.* Qui sit ergo, ut nulla præter Romanam ecclesia

centuries disputes between the bishop of Rome and other bishops and churches about the time of keeping Easter, and about the baptism of heretics. Yet none denied the bishop of Rome to have what they called the chair of Peter.

It is not for our honour, nor our interest, either as christians, or protestants, to deny the truth of events, ascertained by early and well attested tradition. If any make an ill use of such facts, we are not accountable for it. We are not from a dread of such abuses, to overthrow the credit of all history: the consequence of which would be fatal.

Fables and fictions have been mixed with the accounts of Peter's being at Rome. But they are not in the most early writers. They have been added since. And it is well known, that fictions have been joined with histories of the most certain and important facts.

The two traditions, concerning Peter's being at Rome and Paul's preaching in Spain, ought not to be compared together. They are not at all alike. The latter is not attested by so many, nor so early writers, as the other: and is, probably, a mere conjecture, without any foundation, but the words of Rom. xv. 28. which are no proof at all.

This argument may be censured by some as prolix, and even needless. But as some of our own times, as well as formerly, have denied, or disputed this point; I have thought it expedient, to let my readers see the evidences of what appears to myself, as well as to many other protestants, very certain: that St. Peter was at Rome, and suffered martyrdom there.

in morte Petri exultârît et triumphârît? Id. ib.

" Cum gravissimos in adversarios inciderint olim Episcopi Romani, Cyprianos, Firmilianos, aliosque bene multos, nonne eorum aliquis eam perstrinxisset: et gloriationem, quâ Romana se efferebat ecclesia, utpote quæ nunquam præsentiam Petri, sanguineque floruerit, etsi ad ravin usque utroque ornamento superbiret? Id. ib.

* Neque ulla unquam traditio fuit, quæ majore testium numero cingatur: ut de Petri in urbem adventu dubitari non possit, quæ omnia historię fundamenta convellantur. Basn. ann. 64. n. ix.

Fantus hac in re omnium confusus fuit, ut sane miraculo debu-

erit esse, quosdam nostris seculis ortos, factum adeo manifestum negare præsumsisse. Barrat. de Success. Ep. Rom. cap. i. num. i.

Verum hi omnium veterum patrum testimonio refellantur. —

Quæ, malum, impudentia est, id quidem quod nemo veterum dixit, temere affirmare: Petrum scilicet sedem sxisse Babylone: id vero quod veteres omnes ecclesiastici scriptores disertissime prodiderunt, adventum videlicet Petri Apostoli in urbem Romam pertinaciter negare. Atqui nihil in tota historia ecclesiastica illustrius, nihil certius, atque testatius, quam adventus Petri Apostoli in urbem Romam. Val. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. c. 15.

C H A P. XIX.

THE TWO EPISTLES OF ST. PETER.

- I. *Their Genuineness shown from Testimony, and internal Characters.* II. *The People, to whom they were sent.* III. *The Place where.* IV. *The Time when they were written.* V. *Remarks upon 1 Pet. v. 13.*

HAVING written the history of the apostle Peter, I now proceed to his epistles. Concerning which three or four things are to be considered by us: their genuineness, the persons to whom they were sent, the place where, and the time when they were written.

I. The first epistle was all along received by catholic Christians, as authentic, and genuine. This we learn from ^a Eusebius. Who likewise says: ‘Of ^b the controverted books of the New Testament, but yet well known, and approved by many, are that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John.’ And in another place: ‘One epistle of Peter, called the first, is universally received. This the presbyters of ancient times have quoted in their writings, as undoubtedly genuine. But that called his second, we have been informed, [by tradition] has not been received as a part of the New Testament. Nevertheless appearing to many to be useful, it has been carefully studied with the other scriptures.’ By which, I think, we may be assured, that a great regard was shown to this epistle by many Christians in the time of our learned Ecclesiastical Historian.

Jerom says: ‘Peter ^c wrote two epistles, called catholic: the second of which is denied by many to be his, because of the difference of the style from the former.’

And Origen before them, in his Commentaries upon the gospel of St. Matthew, as cited by ^e Eusebius, says: ‘Peter on whom the church is built, has left one epistle, [universally] acknowledged. Let it be granted, that he also wrote a second. For it is doubted of.’

^a See vol. IV. p. 227—229, 254.

^b p. 227.

^d Vol. V. p. 53.

^e H. E. l. 6 cap. 25. p. 227. A.

^f See vol. II. p. 466.

What those learned writers of the third and fourth centuries say of these two epistles, we have found agreeable to the testimony of more ancient writers, whom we have consulted. For the first epistle seems to be referred to by ^a Clement of Rome. It is plainly referred to by ^b Polycarp several times. It is also referred to by the ^c martyrs at Lyons. It was received by ^d Theophilus, bishop of Antioch. It was quoted ^e by Papias. It is quoted in the remaining writings of ^f Irenæus, ^g Clement of Alexandria, and ^h Tertullian. Consequently, it was all along received. But we do not perceive the second epistle to be quoted by ⁱ Papias, nor ^j by Irenæus, nor ^k Tertullian, nor ^l Cyprian.

However, both these epistles were generally received in the fourth, and following centuries, by all Christians, except the Syrians. For they were received by Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Jerom, Rufin, Augustine, and others. As may be seen in the alphabetical table, in St. Peter, at the end of the eleventh volume, to which the reader is referred.

Such are the testimonies of ancient writers concerning these two epistles. If we consult the epistles themselves, and endeavour to form a judgment by internal evidence; I suppose, it will appear very probable, that both are of the same author. And it may seem somewhat strange, that any of the ancients hesitated about it, who had the two epistles before them. For with regard to some of the most ancient writers, it may be supposed, that the second epistle had not been seen by them, it not having come to their hands together with the first.

The first epistle being allowed to be St. Peter's, we can argue in favour of the other also after this manner. It bears in the inscription the name of the same apostle. For so it begins: *Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ.* And in ch. i. 14. are these words: *Knowing, that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ has showed me.* The writer of this epistle may have had a particular revelation concerning the time of his death, not long before writing this. But it is probable, that here is a reference to our Lord's predictions concerning St. Peter's

^a p. 44, 46.^b p. 226.^c p. 273.^d p. 97—99. See also p. 87.^e p. 113.^f p. 167, 170.^g p. 152. ^k p. 194 and 200.ⁱ p. 275, 277.^h Vol. III. p. 172.^l p. 113, 115. ^m p. 167.

death, and the manner of it, which are recorded in John xxi, 18, 19.

From ch. i. 16, 17, 18. it appears, that the writer was one of the disciples, who were with Jesus in the mount, when he was transfigured in a glorious manner. This certainly leads us to Peter, who was there, and whose name the epistle bears in the inscription.

Ch. iii. 1. *This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you: in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance:* plainly referring to the former epistle, which has been always acknowledged for Peter's. These words are express. But it might have been argued with some degree of probability from ch. i. 12—15. that he had before written to the same persons.

Once more, ch. iii. 15, 16. he calls Paul brother, and otherwise so speaks of him, and his epistles, as must needs be reckoned most suitable to an apostle.

The writer therefore is the apostle Peter, whose name the epistle bears in the inscription.

So that we are here led to that observation, which Wall placed at the head of his notes upon this second epistle. 'It is,' says he, 'a good proof of the cautiousness of the ancient Christians in receiving any book for canonical, that they not only rejected all those pieces forged by heretics, under the names of apostles:—but also, if any good book affirmed by some men, or by some churches, to have been written, and sent by some apostle, were offered to them, they would not, till fully satisfied of the fact, receive it into their canon.' He adds: 'There is more hazard in denying this to be Peter's, than there is in denying some other books to be of that author, to whom they are by tradition ascribed. For they, if they be not of that apostle, to whom they are imputed, yet may be of some other apostle, or apostolical man. But this author is either the apostle, or else by setting his name, and by other circumstances, he does designedly personate him; which no man of piety and truth would do.' And then he concludes: 'This epistle being written by him but a little before his death, ch. i. 14. and perhaps no more than one copy sent; it might be a good while, before a number of copies, well attested, came abroad to the generality of the Christian churches.'

^c Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 358, 359.

What has been just said is sufficient to confute the opinion advanced by Grotius, that ^u this second epistle was written by Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem after James, the Lord's brother. Indeed that opinion cannot be admitted. It is destitute of all authority from antiquity, and is inconsistent with the whole tenour of the epistle itself, or at least with many things in it. As has been well observed by ^x Vitranga, and has been now shown by us.

Jerom, in his article of St. Peter, in his book of Illustrious Men, as already seen, says: 'Peter ^y wrote two epistles, called catholic: the second of which was by many denied to be his, because of its differing in style from the former.' Of ^z this he speaks likewise in his epistle to Hedibia. Basnage ^a says, he is not able to discern such difference of style in the two epistles. However, Dr. Sherlock, now bishop of London, has largely treated of this point in his Dissertation concerning the authority of the second epistle of St. Peter. Who observes, p. 203. 'that the first and third of the three chapters, into which this epistle is now divided, agree in style with the first epistle. The only difference is in the second chapter, the style of which is no more like to that of the other two, than it is to that of the first epistle. The occasion of this difference seems to be this, that in the second chapter there is a description of the false prophets and teachers, who infested

^u Scriptorem autem hujus epistolæ arbitror esse Simeonem, Episcopum post Jacobi mortem Hierosolymis, ejusdemque Jacobi, cujus epistolam habemus, successorem et imitatore, &c. Grot. in 2. ep. S. Petri.

^x Verum quacumque etiam specie se commendat conjectatio hæc Grotiana, hætenus animum inducere non potui, ut eam probem. Epistola Petri posterior talis est, ut scripta censeriqueat ab impostore. Est enim gravis, et sancto viro dignissima. Quod si ita est, certissime Petro erit vindicanda, quia præter præfationem, non temere rejiciendam, alia per hanc epistolam sparsa sunt, quæ personam Petri nobis digito quasi præsentant, ut cap. i. 18. iii. 15. Vitrang. observat. Sac. l. 4. cap.

9. num. xlii.

^y Scripsit duas epistolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur: quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam. De V. l. cap. i. ^z Habebat ergo Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum: cujus Evangelium Petro narrante, et illo scribente, compositum est. Denique et duæ epistolæ, quæ feruntur Petri, stylo inter se et caractere discrepant, structuræque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus. Ad Hedib. Qu. xi. T. IV. P. l. p. 183. al. cp. 150.

^a Nos styli discrimen deprehendere non possumus. Neque continet aliquid, quod Apostolo sit indignum. Basnag. A. 63. num. iii.

‘ the church, and perverted the doctrines of the gospel,
 ‘ Some ancient Jewish writer had left behind him a descrip-
 ‘ tion of the false prophets of his own, or perhaps ^{earlier}
 ‘ times. Which description is applied both by St. Peter
 ‘ and St. Jude to the false teachers of their own times.’
 It is added by his Lordship, p. 204. ‘ St. Jerom supposed,
 ‘ and others have followed his opinion, that St. Peter made
 ‘ use of different interpreters, to express his sense in his two
 ‘ epistles. But had that been the case, the difference of
 ‘ style would have appeared in the whole, and not in one
 ‘ part of it only: which is the present case. And I see
 ‘ no reason to think, that St. Peter did not write both his
 ‘ epistles himself.’

This is the account, which his lordship gives of the difference of the style. Which all will allow to be ingenious, whether they admit it to be right, or not. For some may think, that ^b all this difference of style arises from the subject treated of in the second chapter.

I conclude therefore, that the two epistles, generally ascribed to the apostle Peter, are indeed his.

Mr. Ottervald, of Neufchatel, speaking of the first of these epistles, says: ‘ It contains very weighty instructions, and
 ‘ is one of the finest books of the New Testament.’ Of the second he says: ‘ It is a most excellent epistle, as well as the foregoing, and is written with great strength and majesty.’

Certainly, these epistles, and the discourses of Peter recorded in the Acts, together with the effects of them, are monuments of a divine inspiration, and of the fulfilment of the promise, which Christ made to him, when he saw him, and his brother Andrew employed in their trade, and casting a net into the sea: *Follow me*, said he, *and I will make you fishers of men*, Matt. iv. 19.

II. Concerning the persons, to whom these epistles were sent, there have been different opinions among both ancients and moderns.

Eusebius ^c speaking of St. Peter’s first epistle, as universally acknowledged, says: ‘ It is inscribed by him to the
 ‘ Hebrews, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia,
 ‘ Asia, and Bithynia.’ They who are desirous to know Jerom’s opinion, may consider what is transcribed from him

^b Concerning this see more here-
 after in the remarks upon St. Jude’s

epistle, chap. xxi. near the end.

^c See vol. IV. p. 239.

vol. V. p. 53, 54. For he does not seem to me to have any settled judgment about the persons, to whom Peter wrote. Didymus, of Alexandria, supposed, ^d St. Peter's first epistle to have been sent to Jews scattered abroad in several countries. To the same purpose Œcumenius, not only in his argument of the epistle, referred to by me ^e formerly, but also in his commentary ^f upon the beginning of the epistle.

Among the moderns not a few are of the same opinion, as Beza and Grotius in their notes upon the first verse of the first epistle, and Mill ^g in his Prolegomena. Cave says, St. Peter's ^h two epistles were written chiefly to Jewish Christians. Tillemont, speaking of the first epistle, says, it ⁱ is addressed particularly to the converted Jews, in those countries, but it speaks also to the gentiles, who had embraced the faith.

But though some of the ancients, as just seen, say, that St. Peter wrote to the believers of the circumcision, we have in the course of this work observed divers others, who say, he wrote to gentiles: as ^k the author of the calling of the gentiles, by some supposed to be Prosper of Aquitain: the ^l author of the Divine Promises and Predictions: ^m Junilius. Cassiodorius in one place ⁿ speaks of Peter's writing to the gentiles, in another ^o to believing Jews. Augustine has twice said, that ^p Peter wrote to gentiles. In like manner another author ^q in a sermon joined with his works, who may be supposed to have been his disciple. Gregory the first bishop of Rome, expresseth himself, as if he thought, that St. Peter's epistles were sent to all Christians in general, both Jews and Gentiles, in the countries mentioned at the beginning of the first epistle. Bede, in his prologue to the seven catholic epistles, largely cited by us formerly, says, that (^r) St. Peter's epistles were sent to such as had been profelyted from gentilism to judaism, and after that were converted to the christian religion. He speaks again to the like purpose at the beginning of his Exposition of St. Peter's

^d See p. 423. ^e Vol. V. p. 324.
^f Τῆς ἐκ περιτομῆς οὗτος ἐπιστολῆς, ἡ δὲ μακαρίου ἰακώβου· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἀπορί-
 σθησὶν καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν ἐπισημειωθεῖσαν κατοι-
 κῶντο Ἰουδαίοις σπεύδῃσι τε ὡσιν. Οὗτος δὲ
 ἄλλοις τοῖς κλημασι πῶντα. κ. λ.
 Opera T. II. p. 482. C. D.
^g Num. 60. ^h Reliquit post se
 epistolas duas, Judæis Christianis
 et Græcisingulis. H. L. T. I. p. 5.

ⁱ Il l'adresse particulièrement
 aux Juifs convertis dans toutes ces
 provinces, quoiqu'elle parle aussi
 aux Gentils qui avoient embrassé
 la foy. S. Pierre art. 53. Mem. T. I.
^k Vol. V. p. 213. ^l p. 214.
^m p. 278. ⁿ p. 282.
^o p. 284. ^p p. 101. ^q The
 same. ^r p. 300. (^s) p. 314.
 O C 4 first

first epistle. But the Greek word, rendered by us *strangers*, is not equivalent to proselytes: as was observed long ago by Æcumenius upon the place, and since by Basnage.

Mr. Wetstein argues from divers texts, that ^u the first epistle was sent to gentiles. Mr. Hallett in his learned Introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews observes: 'Some,' says he, 'go upon the supposition, that St. Peter's epistles were written to Jews. But it seems to me abundantly more natural to suppose, that they were written to gentile Christians, if we consider many passages of the epistles themselves.' Where ^x he proceeds to allege many passages, and, in my opinion, very pertinently. Some of which will be also alleged by me by and by.

Dr. Sykes ^y has lately declared himself in favour of the same sentiment, and argued well for it.

Mr. Basnage supposed, that ^z St. Peter's epistles were written to Jews and Gentiles, chiefly the former.

^u Σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ὄνομα οὐ ταύτου τῷ προσηλυτῷ. κ. λ. Æcum. vol. II. p. 483. D.

^v Fallitur egregie Beda. — A qua se sententia revocasset, si vocem a Petro adhibitam, ἐπιδημιος, attendisset, quâ religionis proselytus nunquam designatur. Basn. An. 57. n. iv. ^u Ad eos, qui ex Gentibus electi sunt, ut Christo et veritati obedirent. Cap. i. 8, 18, 21, 22. ii. 10. iv. 3. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 681.

^x See his introduction, p. 23—25.

^y 'This epistle of St. Peter,' says he, 'was written to the strangers scattered through several parts of the Lesser Asia. And it is plain, that he meant by them gentiles converted in those parts of the world to Christ. He does not mean Jews, but such as were elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father. Such, of whose salvation the prophets inquired, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto them, ch. i. ver. 10. such, for whom Christ was manifested in these last times, ver. 20. such as were λαός, εἰς περιποίησιν, an acquired people, who had not

obtained mercy: ch. ii. 9, 10. as sheep going astray, but now returned, ver. 25. as men, who in the time past of their life had wrought the will of the gentiles, iv. 3. These are marks sufficient to describe the people, to whom St. Peter wrote. — The gentiles were now begotten in Christ to a lively hope. They were become now what the Jews formerly were, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, &c.' The Scripture doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ, ch. iii. sect. 252. p. 62, 63. see likewise ch. v. num. 832. p. 306, 307.

^z Ut nostra fert opinio, ad utroque scripta est, præcipue tamen ad Judæos, qui sub apostolatum Petri ceciderant. Ad gentes quoque epistolam scriptam fuisse, ex his explorete percipitur: Qui quondam cratis non populus, nunc estis populus Dei. 1 ep. ii. 10. Quæ Ethnicorum præcipue sunt. — Præterea Ethnicorum idolatria his perstringitur: Incessimus in nefariis idolorum cultibus, iv. 3. Basn. ann. 57. num. iv.

To me it seems, that St. Peter's epistles were sent to all Christians in general, Jews and Gentiles, living in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia: the greatest part of whom must have been converted by Paul, and had been before involved in ignorance, and sin, as all people in general were, till the manifestation of the gospel of Christ.

That St. Peter wrote to all Christians in those countries, is apparent from the valedictory blessing, or wish, at the end of the epistle, 1 ep. v. 14. *Peace be with you all that are in Christ Jesus.* Lewis Capellus, who thought, that St. Peter's first epistle was written to Jewish believers, allows, that ^a the second epistle was written to all Christians in general, and particularly to gentiles, induced thereto by the comprehensiveness of the address at the beginning of that epistle: *to them that have obtained like precious faith with us.* He should have concluded as much of the first epistle likewise. For they were both sent to the same people, as is evident from St. Peter's own words, 2 ep. iii. 1.

Moreover, the inscription of the first epistle seems to be as general, as that of the second. Let us observe it distinctly.

To the elect, εκλεκτοις. Says Wall upon the place: 'He useth the word εκλεκτοι, *choice ones*, just as St. Paul does the word αγιοι, *saints*, for the word *Christians*. And as St. Paul directs almost all his epistles *to the saints*, that is, the *Christians*, of such a place; so St. Peter here, *to the elect*, or *choice ones*, that is *Christians*, sojourning in the dispersions of Pontus, Galatia, and Bithynia.'

Strangers, παρεπιδημοις. Good men, though at home, are strangers, especially, if they meet with opposition, trouble, and affliction, as those Christians did, to whom St. Peter is here writing. For he speaks of their *trials, and temptations*, ch. i. ver. 6, 7. and exhorts them, ch. ii. 11. *as sojourners, and strangers, ως παροικης και παρεπιδημης, to abstain from fleshly lusts.*

^a Ad posteriorem autem B. Petri epistolam. — Nec fuit ea scripta, quemadmodum prior, solis Judæis τῶν ἐκ διασπορας, sed omnibus in universum fidelibus, tum ex Judæis, tum ex Gentibus, ad Christum conversis. Quod liquet tum ex ver. 1. cap. i. τῶν ἰσχυρισμῶν ἡμῶν λαχῶσι πιστῶν.

(quod de Gentibus proprie dicitur) tum ex eo quod cap. iii. 15, 16. dicit Paulum ad eos scripsisse in omnibus suis epistolis. Atqui præque omnes Pauli epistolæ scriptæ sunt ad Gentes ad fidem Christi conversas. Capell. Hist. Apost. P. 44.

Says Œcumenius upon ch. i. ver. 1, 2. 'He calls ^b them 'strangers, either on account of their dispersion, or because 'that all who live religiously, are called *strangers* on this 'earth, as David also says: *I am a sojourner with thee, and a 'stranger, as all my fathers were,*' Ps. xxxix. 12.

Scattered throughout Pontus — or, 'of 'the dispersion of *Pontus, Galatia:* — so he calls them, not because they had been driven out from their native country, but because he writes to the Christians of divers countries, who also were but a few, or a small number, in every place where they dwelled.

This may suffice for showing, that these two epistles were sent to all Christians in general, living in the countries, mentioned at the beginning of the first epistle.

I shall now show, that these Christians were for the most part of gentile stock and original.

1 Pet. i. 14. *As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves, according to the former lusts in your ignorance.* This might be very pertinently said to men, converted from gentilism to Christianity. But no such thing is ever said by the apostles, concerning the Jewish people, who had been favoured with Divine revelation, and had the knowledge of the true God. And ver. 20, and 21. he says, that *through Christ they did now believe in God.* Therefore they were not worshippers of God, till they were acquainted with the Christian revelation. In like manner ch. ii. 9. St. Peter speaks of those to whom he writes, as *having been called out of darkness into God's marvellous light.* Moreover, they once were not God's people. ver. 10. *Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.* Words resembling those of St. Paul, Rom. ix. 24, 25. where he is unquestionably speaking of gentile converts.

There are also other expressions, which plainly show, that these persons had been gentiles, and had lived in the sins of gentilism. ch. i. 18. *Forasmuch as ye know, that ye were redeemed from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers.* And ch. iv. 3. *For the time past of our life may suffice us, to have wrought the will of the gentiles: when we*

^b Εκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις.] Το παρεπιδήμοις, ἢτοι διὰ τὴν διάσποραν εἶπεν, ἢ καὶ ὅτι πάντες οἱ κατὰ θεοῦ ζῶντες παρεπιδήμοι λέγονται τῆς γῆς, ὡς καὶ δα-

εἶδ' ἔστιν. κ. λ. Œcum. T. II p 483.

^c Εκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διάσπορας ποιεῖτε. —

walked

walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries. St. Peter does not charge himself with such things. But they to whom he writes had been guilty in those respects. And by way of condescension, and for avoiding offence, and for rendering his argument more effectual, he joins himself with them.

Once more, when St. Peter represents the dignity of those to whom he writes, upon account of their Christian vocation, ch. ii. 9. as *a chosen generation, a peculiar people, a royal priesthood*: certainly, the expressions are most pertinent, and emphatical, if understood of such as had been brought from gentilism to the faith of the gospel, as indeed they plainly were. For he there says, *they were to show forth the praises of him, who had called them out of darkness into his marvellous light.*

To all which might be added, what was hinted before, that the persons, to whom Peter writes, were, for the most part, the apostle Paul's converts. This must be reckoned probable from the accounts, which we have in the Acts of St. Paul's travels and preaching. Whence we know, that he had been in Galatia, and the other countries, mentioned by St. Peter at the beginning of his first epistle. Moreover he observes 2 ep. iii. 15. that *his beloved brother Paul had written unto them.* We may reasonably suppose, that he thereby intends St. Paul's epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, and Colossians, all in those countries, and for the most part gentile believers. Nor do I see reason to doubt, but that Peter had before now seen, and read St. Paul's two epistles to Timothy. And if we should add them, as here intended also, it would be no prejudice to our argument. For those epistles likewise were designed for the use and benefit of the churches in those parts.

To me these considerations appear unanswerable. I shall therefore take notice of but one objection only, which is grounded upon ch. ii. 12. *Having your conversation honest among the gentiles: that whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.*

Upon the first clause in that verse Beza says, that ^d this place alone is sufficient to show, that this epistle was

[*Inter Gentes, et totis ecclesiis.*] Vel *his proprie fuisse inscriptam: hanc hic locus tribus illis dispersis epistolam convincit.* Bez. in loc.

sent to Jews. But, I think not. From St. Paul may be alleged a text of the like sort. 1 Cor. x. 32. *Give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, [και ελλησι] nor to the church of God.* It might be as well argued from that text, that the Corinthians were by descent neither Jews nor Greeks, as from this, that the persons to whom St. Peter wrote, were not originally Gentiles. In the text of St. Paul, just alleged, by Jews and Gentiles, or Greeks, are intended such as were unbelievers. So it is likewise in the text of St. Peter, which we are considering: as is apparent from the latter part of the verse, above transcribed at large. St. Peter had a right to distinguish those, to whom he writes, from the gentile people among whom they lived: as he had at the beginning of his epistle called them *elect*, or *choice ones*, and *strangers*, and they likewise went by the name of Christians, as we perceive from ch. iv. 16.

St. Peter's two epistles, then, were sent to all Christians in general, living in those countries: the greatest part of whom had been converted from gentilism, or heathenism.

III. Our next inquiry is, concerning the place, where these epistles were written.

At the end of the first epistle St. Peter says: *The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you.* Which text, understood literally, has been thought by some to denote Babylon in Assyria, or Babylon in Egypt. By others it is interpreted figuratively, and supposed to denote Jerusalem, or Rome. So that there are four opinions concerning the place where this epistle is dated. All which must be considered by us.

I. Pearson by Babylon supposes to be meant ^e a town, or city, of that name in Egypt. But it seems to me, that little can be said for this opinion. Babylon in Egypt is an obscure place. It was a frontier town, or strong castle, with

^e Explodatur figurata, admittatur literalis expositio. Non opus erit, ut in Assyriam nos conferamus, si nudo urbis nomine standum esse arbitremur. Alia enim erat urbs Babylonis nomine insignita, eaque Judææ multo vicinior, a Babyloniis post dira Prophetarum vaticinia, Ptolomæorum permissu condita et habitata. Pearson. de Succ. Rom. Episc. Diss. i. num. vii. &c.

^f Duas enim vetus terrarum orbis habuit Babylones, alteram clarissimam illam Chaldæorum regiam, alteram castellum quoddam Ægypti a Babyloniis conditum. Posteriores hic nominari, nemo crediturus fuisse videtur, nisi fama fuisset vulgata, prioris Babylonis ætate nihil superfuisse, certe nullos prorsus ei fuisse incolas. Heumann. Nova Sylloge Dissertat. P. II. p. 106.

a garrison,

a garrison, as it is described by Strabo : in whose time, the reign of Tiberius, was quartered there one of the three Roman legions, appointed to keep the Egyptian people in order. In such a place, as may be supposed, there were but few Jews, and not many inhabitants of any sort, beside soldiers. This opinion likewise is altogether without the authority of ancient Christians. If St. Peter had written an epistle in Egypt, in all probability, it would have been dated at Alexandria. But there is not in early antiquity any intimation, that the apostle Peter was at all at Alexandria, or in any part of Egypt. If St. Peter had been at Babylon in Egypt, and had founded a church there, it would have been a church of great renown among Christians : whereas there is not for the first four centuries any notice taken of a church, or bishop in that place.

Le Clerc, who follows Pearson, says, in his notes upon 1 Pet. v. 13. ' Thereby is to be understood, not Babylon, which

Ἐναπλευσαντι δ' ἐστὶ βαβυλων φρε-
ραι ἑρμηνον — νυνὶ δ' ἐστὶ στρατοπεδον
ἐν τῶν τριῶν ταγματων των φρερηντων
τη αιγυπτου. Strab. l. 17. p. 807.
cl. p. 1160.

Abundasse Judæis Ægyptiacam Babylonem, vix probabile videtur, propter et constitutum in ea civitate Romanorum præsidium, cum signis et aquilis suis, quæ Judæis odio erant, et vicinitatem Alexandriæ, in qua libentius degebant. Basnag. Ann. 46. num. xxvii.

Si Petrus in Ægyptiaca Babylone versatus est, cui probabile fiet, non petivisse Alexandriam, civitatem totius orbis secundum Romam nobilissimam, magnoque Judæorum numero frequentem : cum Alexandriæ in vicinia exstaret Babylon, et nobis esset Apostolorum, aliqua in regione vestigium ponentium, Metropoles adire ut majus theatrum haberet evangelii prædicatio, quæ inde veluti ex fonte manabat urbibus provincialibus irrigandis. Id. ibi. * Quod vero in Ægypto nunquam versatus fuerit, ne levissima quidem antiquitatis umbra obtendi potest. Cav. de Petro H. L. p. 6.

Quis vero Veterum dixit, Petrum se Alexandriam contulisse? Hoc sine dissimulasset tot eruditi scriptores, quos Alexandrina peperit ecclesia? Basnag, ib.

Liquet omnes ecclesias apostolicas magnæ existimationis fuisse Veteribus. Hinc illud Tertullianum : *Percurre ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsent.* Proindeque ecclesia, quæ Memphitica Babylone fuit, apostolicis esset inferenda, et multo honore cumulata fuisset, utpote a Petro fundata. Jam vero tam obscura fuit Babylonica illa ecclesia, ut labentibus quadringentis amplius annis, in antiquitatis monumentis nullo vestigio reperitur : nullâ fuit Episcoporum successione, nullâ Martyrum passione nobilis. Quod de ecclesiâ apostolicâ, et in Imperio Romano constitutâ, vix cogitatione fingi potest. Basn. ubi supra.

^m Vid. ejus H. E. anno. 61. num. vii. et Annot. ad Hammondi Præmonitionem in 1 Petri epistolam.

ⁿ Il faut entendre non la Babylone, qui étoit à l'orient de l'Euphrate,

‘ which lay on the east side of the Euphrates, and where
 ‘ Peter never was, but a city in Egypt, so called, and lying
 ‘ not far from the place where now is Cairo.’ But what
 proof is there of Peter’s ever having been in Egypt, more
 than of his having been in Assyria?

2. Lewis Capellus conjectured, that ^o by Babylon is to be understood Jerusalem. But it is a mere conjecture, quite destitute of foundation in antiquity. And therefore, in my opinion, no more to be received, than the preceding interpretation.

3. Divers other learned men think, that by Babylon is meant Babylon in Assyria. So ^p Beza, ^q Lightfoot, ^r Basnage. Cave, who supposeth, ^s the first epistle of St. Peter to have been written at Babylon in Assyria, thinks, that his second epistle was written at Rome.

They who reject this opinion, say, that ^u the Assyrian Babylon was at that time almost deserted. On the contrary, they who embrace it, say, there ^x were multitudes of Jews in that country. Which may be true. For there were many Jews in most countries. But it would have been more to the purpose, to produce some evidence from antiquity, that Peter was in that country. The primitive Christians had in their hands St. Peter’s first epistle. And it was universally received, as his. And it is dated at Ba-

phrate, et ou S. Pierre n’a jamais été: mais une ville d’Egypte, qui se nommoit ainsi, et qui n’étoit pas loin de lieu ou est-bâti le Caire. Le Clerc. sur 1 ep. de S. Pierre. v. 13. ^o Ego potius conjicerem Jerosolymæ fuisse scriptam, et Jerosolymam a Petro fuisse dictam figurate Babylonem: quod tum temporis Jerusalem non esset amplius urbs, sed spiritualis quedam Babylon, in quâ ecclesia Dei captiva quasi tenebatur, et gravi servitute premebatur, quatenus pridem a Judæis persecutionem pati cœperat. Capp. Hist. Ap. p. 42.

^p Babylona proprie accipio pro celebri illa Assyriæ urbe, in quâ tum esset Petrus, circumcisionis Apostolus. Bez. in 1 Pet. v. 13.

^q See his sermon upon 1 Pet. v. 13. vol. II. p. 1141—1147. and many other places in his works.

^r Basn. ann. 46. num. xxvii.

^s Verum ego priorem sententiam tanquam longe verisimiliorem amplector, tum quod in Babylone Parthica magna esset Judæorum frequentia. &c. Cav. in Petro. H. L. p. 6. ^t Epistola secunda Romæ, ut videtur, paullo ante mortem scripta. Id. ibid. ^u An urbem illam S. Petrus adire maxime concupivit, quam Prophetarum vaticinio, et justo Dei judicio percussam esse novit? Pearson ubi supr. § iv. Paullatim igitur defecit Babylon, a Regibus primo, deinde a populo deserta. Ib. num. v.

^x In Assyria, ubi Babylon, imensa fuit Judæorum multitudo, quos sub Petrinum cecidisse apostolatam, certum, exploratumque est: ut nusquam gentium provinciani administrare suam feliciter potuerit. Basnag. ann. 46. num. xxvii.

bylon.

bylon. And yet ecclesiastical history affords no accounts, that this apostle was in Assyria or Chaldea. Is not this a proof, that there was not any very ancient tradition, that he was in that country? We just now observed passages of Origen, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerom, Chrysoftom, relating to St. Peter's travels. But none have mentioned Babylon, as a place, where he travelled, and preached the gospel.

Says Mr. Beaufobre: 'As Peter was the apostle of the Jews scattered abroad among the Gentiles, St. James having stayed in Judea, he went to Babylon, where a great number of the Israelites had remained.' But may I not take the liberty to ask a question, and say, who assigned to these apostles those several provinces, with such limitations? St. James stayed in Judea. It is allowed. We are certain of it from the history in the Acts. Nevertheless he did not confine his regards to the Jews in the land of Israel. For he wrote an epistle, addressed *to the twelve tribes scattered abroad*. And if Peter also was an apostle, chiefly, of the circumcision; it was not of those only, who were in gentile countries, but of those likewise, who were in Judea; where, as I apprehend, he spent the greatest part of his life, even after our Saviour's ascension.

Mr. Beaufobre says, 'Peter went to Babylon, where a great number of Israelites had remained.' That is, he imagined, that he did so. And it was fit for him so to do. As Balmage, in a passage cited not long ago, says: 'There was a multitude of Jews in Assyria, where was Babylon. Nor could he any where more successfully execute his

Sunt qui in dicta Petri epistola Babylonis nomine non Romam, sed urbem ipsam, quæ caput fuit imperii, designari contendunt. Sed in omnium veterum patrum testimonio refelluntur. Certe qui Romam Babylone sedisse volunt, non solum nobis oportet successionem Petri, qui Babylonis ecclesiam non Petrum administrarunt. Sed etiam, malum, impudentia est, affirmare quod nemo veterum dixisset: Petrum scilicet Romam fuisse Babylone: id vero veteres omnes scriptores diducunt prodiderunt, pertinaciter

negare! Valés. Annot. in Euseb. l. 2. cap. 15. p. 33.

Negant enim, Petrum Romæ fuisse: quod testatur antiquitas. Affirmant autem Babylone fuisse, vel in Ægypto, vel in Chaldæa. Quod nulla prodit historia. Est in 1 Pet. v. 13.

² Comme il étoit l'Apôtre des Juifs dispersez parmi les Payens, S. Jacques étant demeuré en Judée, il alla à Babylone, et dans les provinces voisines, où il étoit resté un bon nombre d'Israelites. Hist. de Manich. l. 2. ch. 3. T. I. p. 181.

⁴ See note (x).

apostolical

‘apostolical commission.’ And because we imagine, that Peter might very fitly preach the gospel in Assyria, we conclude, that he went thither. But such reasonings, if calmly considered, are of no weight. It would be much better to allege some ancient testimonies, in behalf of St. Peter’s journey into Assyria, or Parthia.

Mr. Wetstein thinks, that St. Peter’s first epistle was written in the country of Babylon, in Mesopotamia. As there is somewhat new in his argument, I place below ^b a large part of it. In particular, he says, that when a person writes to the people of several cities, or countries, it is natural to begin with that which is nearest to him. So does Paul, Col. iv. 3. and St. John in Patmos, Rev. i. and ii. The like order, says he, is also accurately observed by St. Peter, if he wrote from Mesopotamia, not if we suppose him to have written from Italy, or Egypt.

But such observations, though ingenious and plausible, are not demonstrative and decisive, even when they are just and right. Which cannot be said of this. For supposing St. Peter to have been in Mesopotamia, the country, nearest to him, would be Cappadocia, as lying more eastward, and more southward, than the two first named. Certainly Pontus and Galatia were farther off from Mesopotamia than Cappadocia. The truth is: St. Peter begins at the north, and so goes round. And that way of beginning does as well suit Rome, as Babylon, so far as I can see.

Beside all this, there offers an argument, which appears to me decisive. If the Assyrian Babylon was not now subject to the Romans, but to the Parthians: which I suppose to be

^b Cur Babylon in Italia potius, aut Ægypto, quam in Mesopotamia, sit quærenda, causam non video. Veteres quidem Romam intelligunt. — Quod recentiores observant, Babylonem proprie dictam, quo tempore Petrus hæc scribebat, habitatam non fuisse, verum est. At (præterquam quod et Stephano Byzantino et Lucano constat, etiam Seleuciam eo tempore nomine Babylonis fuisse appellatam) possumus Babylonem interpretari non urbem, sed totam regionem. — Hæc observationi addo aliam, quæ licet mihi nunc primum in mentem venerit, suum tamen apud me pondus

habet. Nimirum ubi de pluribus vel provinciis vel urbibus loquimur, vel ubi ad plures scribimus, ordini naturæ convenientius et simplicius videtur, ut incipiamus non ab ea, quæ loquentibus vel scribentibus est remotissima, sed proxima. Hunc ordinem servavit Paulus Col. iv. 13. et Joannes ex Patmo. Apoc. i. et ii. Hunc ordinem accurate servavit etiam Petrus, si scripsit ex Mesopotamia, minime autem, si vel ex Ægypto, vel ex Italia, eum scripsisse existimemus. Wetsten. in 2 Pet. v. 13. T. II. p. 697, 698.

^c Vid. Strab. l. 16. p. 1081. in al. p. 745.

allowed

allowed by all: it cannot be the place, intended by St. Peter. For the people, to whom he writes, were subject to the Romans. And at the time of writing this epistle he must have been within the territories of the same empire, 1 epist. ii. 13, 14. *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, or rather emperor, as formerly^d shown, as supreme: or unto governors sent (from Rome) by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.* Again, ver. 17. *Honour the king: or rather, the emperor.* If St. Peter had not now been within the Roman territories, he would have been led to express himself in a different manner, when he enforced obedience to the Roman emperor.

This argument appears to me very obvious. And yet I do not know, that it has ever been thought of by any before. Which makes me almost suspect the validity of it: though I cannot discern where the defect lies.

St. Peter requires subjection to governors, sent by the emperor: undoubtedly, meaning from Rome. I suppose, that way of speaking might be properly used in any part of the empire. But it might have a special propriety, if the writer was then at Rome: where indeed, in all probability, Peter then was.

4. So that we are now come to the fourth opinion concerning the date of this epistle. Which is, that by Babylon St. Peter figuratively means Rome. This is the opinion of^e Grotius, and^f Whitby, and^g Valesius, and all the learned writers of the Roman communion in general,

^d See vol. I. p. 85.

^e De Babylone dissident veteres et novi interpretes. Veteres Romam interpretantur, ubi Petrum fuisse nemo verus Christianus dubitabit. Novi Babylonem in Chaldaea. Ego veteribus assentior. Nam quod Romam Babylonem vocavit, non in hoc tantum servit, ut si deprehenderetur epistola, non posset inde sciri, quibus in locis viveret. Verum etiam. — Congruentias plurimas inter Babylonem et Romam vide Orosii ii. 2, 3, 4. Grot. ad 1 Pet. v. 13.

^f See him upon 1 Pet. v. 13.

^g Romam Petrus figurate Babylonem vocavit, vel ob magnitudinem et potentiam, vel propter impietatem. — Potest etiam alia ratio hujus cognominis afferri, quod scilicet ut Babylonii Judæos in servitutum redegerant, sic Romani tunc Judæos ditioni suæ subjecissent. Sunt qui in dicta Petri epistola Babylonis nomine non Romam, sed Babylonem ipsam, quæ caput fuit Assyriorum, designari contendunt. Verum hi omnium veterum patrum testimonio refelluntur. Vales. Arnot. ad Euseb. H. E. l. 2. c. 15. p. 33.

These have, confessedly, in their favour, the testimony of antiquity: which is no small advantage.

Eusebius having given an account of St. Mark's gospel, and of its having been written at the request of St. Peter's hearers at Rome, adds: 'and ^h it is said, that Peter mentions this Mark in his first epistle, which, they say, he wrote at Rome: and that himself calls that city Babylon figuratively in those words: *The church that is at Babylon salutes you, as does Mark my son.*'

This interpretation some suppose Eusebius to ascribe to Papias. But ⁱ Spanheim denies it. And perhaps it is not certain. Whether Papias said so, or not, it was the prevailing opinion in the time of Eusebius.

Jerom in his book of *Illustrious Men*, in his article of St. Mark, transcribes the just cited passage of Eusebius, but expresseth himself more positively. 'Peter ^k makes mention of this Mark in his first epistle, figuratively denoting Rome by the name of Babylon. *The church which is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, as does Mark my son.*'

Bede, ^l by Babylon understood Rome, as did ^m Œcumenius. However, it may be here properly recollected, that formerly we saw an author, Cosmas of Alexandria, in the sixth century, who hereby seems to have understood Babylon in Assyria.

This opinion concerning the place of writing this epistle is much confirmed by the general tradition of the ancients, that St. Mark's gospel was written at Rome, at the request of Peter's hearers, and that Mark here mentioned is the evangelist. Nor is this contradicted by Cosmas, but con-

^h Τὸ δὲ μαρκε μνημονεῦειν τὸν πेत्रον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης· σημαίνειν τε τὸ αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα, προσεῖποντα διὰ τῶν Ἀσπαζεται ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλητή, καὶ μαρκὸς ὁ υἱὸς μου. Euf. H. E. l. 2. c. 15.

ⁱ Atqui primus omnium Eusebius narrationi de Marco hæc subjungit: *Esse, qui dicerent Romam figurate Babylonem appellari.*—Nec tamen Papiæ ipsi adscribi eam interpretationem, quicquid vulgo sentiant, Valestio ipso verba hæc a prioribus sejungente, supra demonstratum est. Vid. P. III. num. xii. Spanhem.

Diff. de ficta Profect. Petri ad Rom. Part. iv. num. ii. tom. II. p. 375.

^k Meminit hujus Marci et Petrus in epistola prima, sub nomine Babylonis figuratiter Roman significans: salutet vos quæ in Babylone est coelecta, et Marcus filius meus. De V. I. cap. viii.

^l Babylonem typice Romam dicit, videlicet propter confusionem multiplicis idololatriæ, &c. Bed. expof. 1 Pet. v. 13.

^m Βαβυλῶνα δὲ τὴν Ῥώμην διὰ τὸ περιφανὲς καλεῖ, ὃ καὶ Βαβυλῶν πόλις ἵεροῦ ἐσχῆκε. Œcum. in loc. tom. II. p. 526. A

ⁿ See vol. V. p. 269 and 272.

firméd

firmed by him. For he expressly says, 'that Mark, the second evangelist, wrote his gospel at Rome by the direction of Peter.'

They who reject this interpretation, affect to slight Papias: whereas there is no good reason for it. If he said so, certainly his testimony would be of some value. But we do not clearly perceive, that this was in Papias. However, it is said by Eusebius. It was then a common opinion. Nor did he know of a better.

Others insinuate likewise, that the reason why Jerom was willing to confound Rome with Babylon, was, that he was out of humour with the people of Rome; which seems to me to be groundless. Jerom only transcribes what he had found in Eusebius. They who reject the accounts of those two learned ancients should by all means produce some evidence that Peter was in Mesopotamia. We have good assurance that St. Mark's gospel was written at Rome, and that Peter preached and suffered martyrdom there. His two epistles therefore, probably, were written in the same city, a short time before the period of his life.

Mill varies. In his note upon the place he is for Babylon in Egypt. But in his Prolegomena he is for Rome, and argues well enough for that opinion. I suppose that to be his final determination.

It may be best for me now to conclude this argument with a part of Whitby's note upon 1 Pet. v. 13. which is very agreeable also to the note of Estius upon the same text. 'That Babylon is figuratively here put for Rome, is an

* p. 266, and in this vol. p. 89.

† Quod si, ut Rufinus interpretatur, teste Papias nititur, infirmo sane tibicine fultum est. Nec temere ad tropum in nominibus urbium aut regionum est recurrendum, nisi ubi propria vocis significatio locum habere non potest. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 697.

‡ C'est une imagination de Papias, que les anciens ont adopté avec trop de facilité, et que S. Jerom auroit rejetée avec mépris, si dans la mauvaise humeur ou il étoit contre Rome, il n'eût été bien aise de la confondre avec Babylone.

Beauf. Hist. Manich. l. 2. ch. 3. T. I. p. 181.

§ Romæ eam scriptam fuisse, notant ex traditione Veterum Eusebius, Hieronymus in Catalogo, et alii permulti. Hanc enim Babylonis nomine designatam voluit Petrus, ceu communi tum temporis apud Judæos suos appellatione: quæ quidem et in hunc usque diem apud Eos obtinet. Abarbinel, alique recentiores Judæi, commentantes in prophetias de Babylone, ad Romam istas referunt: quod sicut a Babyloniis olim in servitutum redacti fuerint, ita postea jam a Romanis, &c. Proleg. num. 59, 60.

‘ opinion so early delivered by Papias, and which afterwards
 ‘ so generally prevailed (as we learn from Eusebius, Jerom,
 ‘ and Œcumenius) that I subscribe to the note at the end of
 ‘ this epistle, *εγραφη απο ρωμης*, *it was written from Rome* styled
 ‘ also *Babylon* by the author of the Revelations, ch. xvii. and
 ‘ xviii. For the apostle, at the time of writing it, must be
 ‘ at Rome, figuratively, or at some city, properly called
 ‘ Babylon. Now as it is uncertain, whether St. Peter ever
 ‘ was at Babylon in Chaldea, or in Egypt, and improbable,
 ‘ that he made any considerable stay there: so it is very im-
 ‘ probable he should do it when near his end. At Rome,
 ‘ and Antioch, where he confessedly resided, church history
 ‘ is copious in giving an account of his successors in those
 ‘ Sees. But who can show any thing of this nature, with
 ‘ reference to either of those Babylons? &c. &c.”

IV. The only thing remaining to be observed by us is
 the time of writing these two epistles. Which I think to be
 the year 63, or 64, or at the latest 65. I suppose, Paul to
 have left Rome in the spring of the year 63. St. Peter was
 not then come thither. If he had been there, he would have
 been mentioned by St. Paul in some of his epistles, written
 near the end of his imprisonment at Rome. However, not very
 long after St. Paul was gone, St. Peter might come thither.
 Here, I suppose, he preached for a while freely, and with
 great success. And it appears to me probable, that both
 these epistles were written at Rome, not long before the
 apostle's death.

That he was old, and near his end, when he wrote the
 second epistle, is apparent from ch. i. 14. And that the
 first epistle to the same Christians had not been written long
 before, may be argued from the apology, which he makes
 for writing this second epistle to them: ch. i. ver. 13—15.
*Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance
 of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the
 present truth. Yea I think it meet, as long as I am in this
 tabernacle, to stir you up by way of remembrance. Knowing, that
 shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus
 Christ has showed me. Moreover, I will endeavour, that you
 may be able after my decease to have these things always in
 remembrance.*

It is not unlikely, that soon after the apostle had sent
 away Silvanus with the first epistle, some came from those
 countries to Rome, where was a frequent and general resort
 from

from all parts, bringing him informations concerning the state of religion among them: which induced him to write a second time for the establishment of the Christians, among whom he had laboured. And he might well hope, that his last words, and dying testimony to the doctrine, which he had received from Christ, and had taught for many years with unshaken steadfastness, would be of great weight with them.

V. I have now gone through the four inquiries, proposed at the beginning of this article. I shall here add only a few remarks upon 1 Pet. v. 13. *The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you. And so does Mark, my son.*

The word *church* is not in the original, but is inserted in the translation. The same word is supplied in ¹ Æcumenius, and ² in the Latin, and other ancient versions, with the approbation of ³ Grotius, and many others. But Mill ⁴ in his notes upon this text, where he understands the word Babylon literally, of a city of that name in Egypt, argues, that thereby is intended St. Peter's wife, or some honourable christian woman, of the city of Babylon, where he then was. Which conjecture is countenanced by ⁵ Wall.

Dr. Heumann

¹ Ασπαζεται υμας η εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλητη, και μαρκος ο υιος μη.

² Ασπαζεται υμας η εν βαβυλωνι εκκλησια συνεκλητη. ³ Εκκλησια

praesigunt Lin. [in margine. manu recentiori:] Æcumen. Vulg. Syr. Arab Æthiop. ex interpretamento. Mill. in loc.

⁴ Ad vocem συνεκλητη, et Syrus, et Arabs, et Latinus, addunt nomen ecclesiae, recte. Nam et ad ecclesiam scribit, et hæc, et illa, pariter Deo electa, id est, a mundo segregata. Grot. in loc.

⁵ Nempe pro indubitato sumitur, ecclesiam Babyloniorum hic intelligi. Atqui vero, si de ecclesia hic sermo, quum nulla eius mentio facta sit in præcedentibus, aperte dixisset Petrus εκκλησια εν βαβυλωνι. — Mihi quidem vehementis suspicio est, per την εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλητην, intelligi hic Petri uxorem, fidei simul susceptæ,

vitæ, laborum, sociam: quæ Babylone Ægyptiacâ tunc, cum hæc scriberentur, egerit. — Si dicas, illud η εν βαβυλωνι denotare potius feminam aliquam, quæ fixam sedem habuerit in Babylone, nihil equidem repugno. Esto η εν βαβυλωνι sive uxor Petri, sive etiam opulenta quædam ac illustri loco nata femina apud Babylonios, quæ Apostolum hospitio exceperit: certe nihil hoc loco de ecclesia Babyloniorum. Mill. in loc.

⁶ The word *church* is not in the Greek, but put in by the translators, as understood in the Greek. — Dr. Mill thinks it to mean Peter's wife, who being now at Babylon with her husband, did salute those Christians, to whom the epistle was written. And then the reading of the words will be: *She who his your fellow-*

Christian

Dr. Heumann proceeds farther. First, he says, that *a* by *Mark my son*, we are to understand Peter's own son, which he had by his wife. And *b* then by *electèd together with you*, is to be understood, an excellent Jewish woman of Babylon in Assyria, whom, with many others, Peter had there converted to the christian faith, and afterwards married: his first wife, mentioned Luke iv. 38. by whom he had Mark, being dead.

But it appears to me very unlikely, that St. Peter should send salutations to the Christians of several countries from a woman, not named by him. Beza says well, that *c* St. Peter omits the noun, *church*, as is often done with regard to words of common use. What was the sense of Christians in former times, appears from *Œcumenius*, and the versions taken notice of above. The same sense appears in *d* the Complexions of *Cassiodorius*, and *e* the Exposition of *Bede*.

With regard to St. Mark, *Œcumenius* says, 'that *f* Peter *g* calls him *his son* according to the spirit, not according to *h* the flesh. Him he permitted to write the gospel. But *i* some, as he adds, have presumed to call Mark son of Peter *k* according to the flesh, arguing from Luke's history, in the *l* Acts of the apostles: where Peter, having been delivered *m* out of prison by an angel, is said to have *n* come to the house of *o* Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, as *p* if *q* he had then gone to his own house, and his lawful wife.'

a *Christian at Babylon, saluteth you.*

Wall, p. 357. *a* Similem errarunt errorem, qui quem *filium suum*

hic loci nominavit Petrus, eum non naturalem ejus fuisse filium, sed spiritualem arbitrati sunt. — Ma-

neat nunc, Petrum de filio sibi ex conjuge nato loqui: quem facile ex hoc ipso loco cognoscimus fuisse socium paternorum itinerum, et simul *συνεργον εν χρισω* Heum. ubi supr. p. 110. *b* Relinquitur

igitur, ut statuamus, loqui Apostolum de uxore sua, Babylone nata, ac tum, cum ibi versaretur Petrus, una cum aliis utriusque sexus Judæis in ecclesiam Christi traducta. Hoc enim sibi volunt hæc verba:

η εν βαβυλωνι συνεκλητη. — Quis nunc non videat, Petrum hanc *μεσφυτον*, singulari hæud dubie pie-

tate et prudentia conspicuam, duxisse in matrimonium, comitemque postea habuisse sacrorum itinerum? Ex quo sequitur, priorem uxorem, cujus Lucæ iv. 38. mentio, e qua susceperat Marcum, fuisse extinctam. Heum. ibid. p. 112, 113.

c Ecclesiæ nomen omittit, ut in vocabulis communi usu tritis fieri solet. Bez. *d* Salutationes quoque ecclesiæ, quam de Babylonia, id est, de seculi illius confusione, dicit electam, et Marci filii sui pia institutione transmittens.

e *Expos. in* *1 Petr. cap. v.* *f* *Μαρκον δε υιον κατα πνευμα καλει, αλλ' ε κατα σαρκα.* *Œcum. T. II. p. 526. A.*

g — *ως εις την εαυτη οικιαν εβα- νελθοντα, και την νομιμην συζυγον.* *ib. B.*

h — *ως εις την εαυτη οικιαν εβα- νελθοντα, και την νομιμην συζυγον.* *ib. B.*

That

That is a wrong deduction from the words of Acts xii. 12. But we hence perceive, that those people supposed Mark, the evangelist, to have been the same as John, surnamed Mark.

And I would also farther observe here, by the way, 'that Œcumenius^b computes Silvanus, by whom St. Peter sent this epistle, and who is mentioned chap. v. 12. to be the same, who is several times mentioned by St. Paul in his epistles, particularly 1 Theff. i. 1. 2 Theff. ii. 1.' Who likewise, very probably, is the same as Silas, often mentioned in the Acts.

Œcumenius there calls Silvanus *a most faithful man, zealous for the progress of the gospel*. Indeed all must be sensible, that he was an excellent man, who from generous principles attended the apostles of Christ in the journies undertaken by them, in the service of the gospel. His deputation from the apostles and elders, and church of Jerusalem, with their letter to the Christians at Antioch, is very honourable to him. Acts xv. 27, 32. His stay there, and Paul's choosing him for his companion in his travels, when he and Barnabas separated, farther assure us of his just sentiments concerning the freedom of the gentiles from the yoke of the law, and of his zeal for promoting true religion.

C H A P. XX

THE THREE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN.

- I. *Their genuineness shown from Testimony, and internal Characters.*
 II. *The Time of writing the first of these Epistles.* III. *The People to whom it was sent.* IV. *Observations upon the second Epistle.* V. *Upon the third.* VI. *The Time when they were written.*

I. I HAVE already written the history of St. John, one of Christ's twelve apostles, and an evangelist. I have also observed what is needful concerning the gospel written by him. We are now to consider his epistles.

^b Πιστος υπερβαλλοντως ο σιλουανος τιμοθεος εν ταις επισολαις παραλαμβανει. Παυλος λεγων και σιλουανος και τιμοθεος. Œcum. ib. p. 525. D.
 Πιστος, και περι το κηρυγμα ευθυμως αγωνιζομενος, ειπε και παυλος αυτε κηρυττει, και συνεργον αυτον μετα
 P p 4

The regard shown to them by the ancients, may be soon perceived by recollecting briefly what has been largely alleged by us from them in the several volumes of this work.

St. John's first epistle is referred to by Polycarp, vol. II. p. 99, is quoted by Papias, p. 109, 113, 115, and is referred to by the martyrs of Lyons, p. 152. His first and second epistles are quoted by Irenæus, p. 167, 168. They were also received by Clement of Alexandria, p. 211, 226, 227. And, says Origen, 'John, beside the Gospel and Revelation, has left us an epistle of a few lines. Grant also a second and a third. For all do not allow these to be genuine,' p. 467. Dionysius, of Alexandria, receives John's first epistle, which he calls his catholic Epistle, *ἡ ἑπιστολὴ ἡ καθολικὴ*. He likewise mentions the other two, as ascribed to him, vol. III. p. 106. The first epistle was received by Cyprian, and probably, the other two likewise, p. 173—175. The second epistle is quoted by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, vol. IV. p. 104, 105. Eusebius says, 'Beside his gospel his first epistle is universally acknowledged by those of the present time, and by the ancients: but the other two are contradicted:' that is, doubted of by some, p. 227. See also p. 254, 255. All the three epistles were received by Athanasius, p. 283, by Cyril of Jerusalem, p. 300, by the council of Laodicea, p. 309, by Epiphanius, p. 313, 316. All three were received by Jerom, vol. V. p. 32. but the two last were doubted of by some in his time, p. 41. All three were received by Rufinus, p. 76, by the third council of Carthage, p. 79, by Augustine, p. 86, 101, 102, and by all those authors, who received the same canon of the New Testament that we do. They are in the Alexandrian manuscript, p. 254. All three are also in the catalogues of Gregory Nazianzen, vol. IV. p. 408, and of Amphilochius, p. 413, 414. But this last observes, that some received one of them only. And indeed it is acknowledged, that but one epistle of St. John is received by the Syrian churches, p. 430, 431, 439. Nor were any more received by Chrysostom, vol. V. p. 127, 136, 137. Venerable Bede, near the beginning of the eighth century, in his Exposition of the second epistle, says, 'Some^a have thought this and
' the

^a Quidam putant, hanc et sequentem epistolam non esse Joannis Apostoli, sed cujusdam presbyteri Joannis, cujus sepulchrum usque hodie monstratur in Epheso. Cujus etiam Papias, auditor Apollolorum, et in Hierapoli Episcopus, in opusculis suis sæpe meminit.

‘the following epistle not to have been written by John the apostle, but by another, a presbyter of the same name, whose sepulchre is still shown at Ephesus, whom also Papias, mentions in his writings. But now it is the general consent of the church, that John the apostle wrote also these two epistles: forasmuch as there is a great agreement of doctrine and style between these and his first epistle, and there is also a like zeal against heretics.’ They who are desirous to see more quotations of ancient writers, may consult the table of principal matters in the eleventh volume, in St. John, Catholic Epistles, and Authors, who had the same canon of the N. T. with that which is now generally received: which article may be found under Canon of the scriptures of the N. T.

All the three epistles are now generally received as St. John's in these parts of the world. And with good reason, as seems to me. Said Origen: ‘he has also left an epistle of a very few lines. Grant also a second, and a third.’ That is very right. One epistle was received by all, as certainly genuine. And it is not worth the while to contend about the other two, when they are so very short, and resemble the first in sentiment, phrase, and manner of writing, as is well observed by Mill. And of the second epistle, which consists of only thirteen of our verses, eight may be found in the first, either in sense or expression. The title of elder at the beginning of these two epistles, affords no just exception. It is a very honourable character, well

Sed nunc generalis Ecclesiæ consensus habet, quod has quoque epistolas Joannes Apostolus scripserit, quia revera multam verborum et fidei similitudinem cum prima ejus epistola ostendunt, et simili zelo detestantur hæreticos. Bed. Exp. in 2 ep. Joan.

Epistolas autem istas habere auctorem Joannem—ex eo plane constat, quod in istis omnibus eadem passim sint νοήματα, idem genus et character dictionis. Secunda, certe ολιγοσυχια, (neque enim continet ultra tredecim versus ex mediernis nostris) octo quidem versuolorum cum sensus, tum ipsæ sententiæ, existant in epistola prima.—Epistola autem tertia, ejusdem om-

nino coloris ac characteris cum secunda, per omnia sapit Joannem Apostolum. Mill. Proleg. num. 153.

‘Quod aliqui Joanni cuidam alteri, Presbytero vulgo dicto, adscriptas velint has duas epistolas, ii neutiquam vident, quam fortiter contra ipsos militet illud ο πρεσβυτερος κατ' εξοχην: quique privato homini, vel etiam Episcopo, haudquaquam conveniat.—Imo vero Apostolo nostro peculiariter adaptatum et accommodatum erat: utpote qui jam plusquam nonagenarius fuerit, omnibusque provinciæ Asiaticæ ecclesiis præfederit. Mill. Ibid. num. 153, 154. Vid. et Lampe Prolegom. in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num. viii.

becoming

becoming John as an apostle, and now in years, residing in Asia, as superintendent of all the churches in that country. And St. Peter speaks of himself in the same character, in his epistle universally acknowledged, ch. v. 1.

Dr. Heumann supposeth, that ^d here is a reference to St. John's great age, at the time of his writing these two epistles. And he thinks, that St. John was then as well known by that title, as by his name. The elder therefore is as much, as if he had said, the aged apostle. And he refers to Wolfius, and others, who had before said the same, or what is to the like purpose.

The want of a name at the beginning is no objection. It is rather an argument, that they are his: that being agreeable to St. John, who prefixes not his name to that epistle, which is unquestionably his.

And say Beaufobre and Lenfant in their preface to the second and third epistles: 'It is certain, that the writer of the third epistle speaks with an authority, which the bishop of a particular church could not pretend to, and could not suit John the elder, even supposing him to have been bishop of the church of Ephesus, as the pretended apostolical constitutions,' say he, 'was appointed by John the apostle. For if Diotrephes was bishop of one of the churches of Asia, as is reckoned, the bishop of Ephesus had no right to say to him, as the writer of this epistle does, ver. 10. *If I come, I will remember his deeds which he does.* That language, and the visits made to the churches, denote a man, who had a more general jurisdiction, than that of a bishop, and can only suit St. John the apostle.'

II. That may suffice for showing the genuineness of the three epistles. Let us now make some remarks upon each of them, beginning with the first. Concerning which there are two inquiries, that may be proper: the time when, and the persons to whom it was written.

^d Deinde articulo ô docet Joannes, nomen hoc sibi eum nemine commune esse, adeoque viso τὸ πρεσβύτερος titulo statim scriptorem harum literarum agnovisse.—Nihil proinde restat, quam ut statuamus, a Joanne isto titulo indicari ætatem suam provec̄tissimam, morisque tum fuisse, eum appellitari honoris ac

reverentiæ causa *Senem*, sive *Seniorem*, vel etiam *Senem Apostolum*.—Græca proinde hæc, Ὁ Πρεσβύτερος Καίω, melius reddi Latine non possunt, quam hoc modo: Grandævus Apostolus salutem dicit Caio.—Heuman. Comm. in Joan. Ep. iii. ap. Nov. Syllog. Diff. P. i. p. 279, 280.

Grotius

Grotius thought this ^c epistle to have been written in Patmos, before the destruction of Jerusalem. Hammond and Whitby likewise were of opinion, that it was written before that great calamity befel the Jewish nation. Dr. Benson ^r is inclined to place it in the year of our Lord 68, of Nero 14, that is, after the Jewish war was broke out, and not long before the destruction of Jerusalem. Mill, ^s and Le Clerc, ⁿ who follows him, place this epistle in the year 91, or 92. Basnage ⁱ speaks of this epistle at the year 98, and Baronius ^k at the year 99. Beaufobre and Lenfant in their preface to this epistle express themselves after this manner: 'Although we cannot say any thing certain concerning the time, when St. John wrote this epistle: we may be satisfied, that it was near the end of the first century, when the apostle was far advanced in age.' Du Pin ^l says, it is not known, when it was written, but most probably, near the end of the apostle's life. Mr. Whiston ^m thought, this, and the other two epistles of St. John, to have been written not long after each other, about the year of Christ, 82, or 83. Mr. Lampe ⁿ supposeth this first epistle to have been written after the Jewish war, before St. John's exile in Patmos, and, probably, some good while before it. Consequently, he and Mr. Whiston do not differ greatly about the time of this epistle.

I must likewise say, though the exact time is not known, I am of opinion, it was not written, till after the Jewish war was over. My reason is, that the arguments alleged, for proving it to have been written sooner, are not satisfactory. And in examining them, perhaps, some things may occur, affording hints of a later date.

One argument is taken from ch. ii. 18. *it is the last time, or hour*: meaning, as ^o some interpreters think, the last

^c Puto autem scriptam, ut alibi dixi, ex Patmo hanc epistolam, non multo ante excidium Hierosolymitanum. Grot. Pr. in 1 ep. Joan.

^f Preface to St. John's first Epistle, § iv. 148—150.

^r Ann. 99. num. vii—x.

^s Proleg. num. 148—150.

ⁿ H. E. an 91. num. i.

ⁱ Ann. 98. num. iv.

^k Ann. 99. num. vii—x.

^l Diff. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. § xi.

^m Commentary upon St. John's three Catholic Epistles, p. 14.

ⁿ Acquiescimus igitur hactenus in iudicio clarissimi Ensi de Canone

N. T. p. 270. Scriptæ tamen creduntur Joannis epistolæ ante exilium in Patmum insulam. Neque est ratio, ob quam non statueremus, eas diu ante illud tempus fuisse conscriptas. Lampe Prol. cap 7. num. iv. note (b).

^o *Ultima hora*: id est, ultimum tempus, ubi ad Judæos sermo est, significat tempus, proximum excidio urbis, ac templi, et reipublicæ Judæorum. Grot. annot. in 1 ep. Jo. ii, 18.

hour of the Jewish state and constitution. Nevertheless, there are learned men, who do not assent to that interpretation. Grotius himself owns, that the phrase is sometimes used concerning the world, or mankind in general, as well as the Jews. And Mr. Lampe, who supposeth the phrase to relate to the divine judgment upon the Jewish people, says, it might be used not only at the time when it was inflicting, but also after it was accomplished. Which he supposes to be meant by those expressions, ch. ii. 8. *the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth*: [though Wolfius thinks no such thing there intended.] And therefore, he says, he does not acquiesce in the reasons alleged by Grotius and Hammond, to prove, that this epistle was written before that event.

Let me add here also a part of Wall's note upon ch. ii. 18. which to me appears not amiss. 'The saying of St. John, *it is the last time*, is spoken as a great many such sayings of St. Paul, and the other apostles, had been, according to the general charge, given by Christ to the apostles, and to all other Christians, to live in a continual expectation of the judgment. They that interpret it otherwise, of the destruction of Jerusalem, as Grotius, and Hammond, are forced to suppose this epistle to have been written just before that destruction, about the year 69.—Nor are St. John's words here like those of any one, that was foretelling that event: but rather of one that was speaking of the present state of the christian religion.'

¶ Vid. Wolff. Prolegom. in 1 ep. Joann. p. 243, 244. Conf. eund. ad 1 ep. cap. ii. ver. 18.

¶ Nomen *horæ extremæ* modo totum humanum genus respicit, modo populum Judaicum, ex quo erant Apostoli, et non pauci Christianorum. Grot. in loca quædam N. T. de Antichristo: speciatim in 1 ep. Jo. cap. ii. Opp. tom. III.

¶ Alii maturius, aut brevi ante, aut saltem circa excidium Hierosolymitanum scriptum esse existimant, qui nobis maxime ad verisimilitudinem accedere videntur. Probabile enim est, per *εσχάτην ὥραν* intelligi tempus judicii divini in Judæos. cap. ii. 18. ejusque consummationem spectare verba cap. ii. 8.

Lampe Prol. 1. 1. c. 7. n. iv. p. 106.

¶ — sed non video, quomodo imminens illud judicium argumentum esse possit, quo Apostolus ad inculcandum et urgendum amorem mutuum uti voluerit. Tenebræ omnino inferunt pristinam et Judæorum et Gentilium conditionem, per quam non solum erroribus, sed et vitiis ita erant immersi, ut *σκοτῆς* appellari potuerint. Wolf. Curæ in 1 Jo. ii. 8. ¶ Grotius et Hammondus ante excidium Hierosolymitanum scriptam esse suspicantur. Quod tamen loca adducta non evincunt. Licet enim excidium illud in actum datum esset, dici tamen etiamnum poterat, quod hora illa ultima venerit. Id. ib. note (b).

Again,

Again, it is argued, that " the apostle might refer to the calamities of the Jewish people in those words, chap. ii. 17. *The world passeth away, and the lust thereof.* But those are only general expressions, representing the uncertainty of all earthly things. And therefore afford not any argument, that the apostle had therein a regard to affairs in Judea. For, if he had, his expressions would have been more distinct and particular.

Thirdly, an argument is also brought from ch. ii. 13. *I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning.* Whereby St. John has been supposed by some to intend some aged Christians, who had seen Jesus Christ upon earth. Which is more likely to have been the case of some in the year 68, about thirty-five years after Christ's ascension, than many years afterwards. To which I answer, that * by *him that is from the beginning*, probably is intended God the Father, not Jesus Christ. It is equivalent to what is afterwards said of others, in the same verse. *I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father.* But it would not sound so well, to say: *I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known the Father.* See also ver. 14.

Fourthly, it is ^y argued to the like purpose from ch. ii. 7. *I write no new commandment to you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning.* But thereby may be meant no more than the commandment, which ye had from the beginning of your being Christians: or from the time when you were first converted to the christian religion, whenever it was. And, as ^z Wolfius observes, none of those to whom St. John wrote, in any part of his life, were very far distant in point of time, from the first preaching of the gospel.

* Unde etiam per mundum transeantem cum suis cupiditatibus ad idem excidium Reipublicæ Judaicæ respicere Evangelista potuit. Lampe ib. p. 106.

^y *Nescitis Deum, qui Senex Dierum.* Dan. vii. 9, 13, 22. Dat cuique ordini quæ ipsi conveniunt. A prima ætate novistis Deum, hujus mundi opificem. Is autem is est, qui Christum misit, eumque pro se audiri voluit. Grot. ad ver. 13.

Accedit, quod ad fratres scribat, qui præceptum a principio audierant. cap. ii. 7. Per quod intelligi debet principium prædica-

tionis evangelicæ. A quo igitur non nimiam removeri debent illi, quos Apostolus alloquitur. Lampe ubi supra. p. 106.

^z Quod ad alteram rationem attinet, nullus eorum, qui Joannis ætate ad Christi cognitionem adducti sunt, ab originibus evangelii nimium removebitur, sive illi ante, sive post excidium Hierosolymitanum eo pervenerint. Omnes enim sub originibus ejus eam adepti censerent, quippe quibus Joannes, ut *αυτοπτης* earum, testis et præco, adfuerit. Wolf. ubi. supr. p. 244.

Since

Since therefore there are no expressions in the epistle, declaring the time of it, or clearly referring to the calamities attending the downfall of the Jewish state; it appears to me probable, that it was not written till a good while after that event; about the year of Christ 80, or later.

III. We are next to consider to whom this epistle was sent.

And here I observe: as the writer does not at the beginning prefix his name, nor any where else mention it in the epistle: so neither does he describe or characterize the persons to whom he writes by the name of their city, or country, or any such thing.

The first expression of address is that in ch. ii. 1. *My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not.* And the epistle concludes with these words: *Little children, keep yourselves from idols.* And he several times calls the Christians, to whom he writes, *little children*, as ch. ii. 12, 18. iii. 7, 18, iv. 4. v. 21. Our Lord spoke to the disciples in a like manner, John xiii. 33. and xxi. 5. It is a tender and affectionate appellation, denoting paternal authority, love and concern. As an apostle, it might be used by St. John in any part of life. Nevertheless it seems to imply, together with apostolical authority, advanced age.

Some have thought, that this epistle was written to Parthians, or Jewish believers in that country. We have seen several ancient Latin authors, who speak of it, as inscribed to Parthians. So ^a Augustine, ^b Cassiodorius, and ^c Bede. I have already spoken of this, and have referred to divers learned moderns ^d whose opinions deserve to be taken notice of. I shall now add Mr. Whilton's thoughts relating to this point, taken from his Commentary upon St. John's epistles, published in 1719. 'None of these three epistles of St. John,' says he, p. 5, 6, 'were written to the Parthians, as some later Latin writers have supposed: but rather to the Christians or churches of Asia, near Ephesus.' 'This he argues from the perfect silence of all true antiquity, as to St. John's ever preaching in Parthia: and from the account which we have in Eusebius from Origen, that Parthia was St. Thomas's province, and Asia St. John's: as also from the account in the Recognitions ix. 29. that Thomas really

^a Vol. V. p. 101.

^b p. 282.

^c p. 314.

^d p. 101.

^e preached

‘preached the gospel in Parthia, without a syllable of St. John thereto relating. All which,’ says he, ‘makes it plain that this pretended direction of any of St. John’s epistles to the Parthians stands upon no good authority at all. And it is not improbable, that the occasion of this error was barely a false reading in some ancient manuscript, where *προς παρθους* was read for *προς παρθενας*: to the Parthians, for to the virgins: which latter inscription might easily be applied to the first epistle. For as it is chiefly addressed to young Christians, yet uncorrupted, both as to fleshly and spiritual fornication, such as in St. John’s Revelations are called *παρθενοι virgins*: so was the second epistle anciently affirmed by some to be written to the virgins: as we learn from Clement of Alexandria, in Cassiodorius:’ that is, from Clement’s Adumbrations upon the catholic Epistles, translated by order of Cassiodorius. For there the second epistle of St. John is said to be written to virgins.

And before, at p. 4, of the same Commentary, Mr. Whiston observes, ‘St. John says nothing in his first epistle, by which we can directly gather, to whom it was sent: though it seems most probably to belong to his own Asiatic churches.’

As I have quoted Clement, I must not omit the observation of Lenfant and Beaufobre: ‘Clement^e says, that the second epistle of John was directed to virgins, undoubtedly intending by the means of this lady. But there is nothing in the epistle, which suits virgins, more than other Christians.’

Mr. Lampe says, ‘This^h first epistle is written to believers, as is abundantly manifest from the whole scope of the epistle. We also,’ says he, ‘easily admit, that Jewish believers are especially regarded. Nevertheless we think, that St. John directed it to all believers of his time in general: forasmuch as there appears not in it any expression of limitation.’

Du Pin says, ‘Though^l there is no inscription, it appears from the beginning of the second chapter, that it is addressed

^e See vol. II. p. 227, 228.

^h Secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est. Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine. Adumbr. in ep. 2 Joan.

^l As before, p. 584. ^h Ad fideles cum scripsisse, abunde patet ex scopo epistolæ, cap. i. 4.

totoque ejus argumento. Facile etiam admittimus, speciatim fideles ex Hebræis innui. Universis tamen credentibus sui temporis Joannem hanc epistolam destinasse putamus, quia nulla restrictionis occurrit mentio. Lamp. ibid. num. iii. 105. ^l Disserta. sur la Bible. l. 2. ch. 2. § xi.

‘to many Christians. And there is no proof, that it is sent to Jews, rather than to Gentiles.’

On the other hand, Dr. Benson ^m thinks, ‘that the apostle wrote this epistle to the Jewish Christians in Judea and Galilee.’

But the former opinion appears to me more probable. For
 1. It is always called a catholic epistle. So it was called by Dionysius of Alexandria, as before seen, as well as by later writers. 2. It really appears to be so. For there are not in it any expressions of limitation. 3. There could be very little occasion for that admonition to believers in Judea, in the year 68, after the war was broke out, which is in ch. ii. 15. *Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world.* That admonition is rather suited to people, who were supposed to be in easy circumstances, and are in danger of being ensnared by the allurements of prosperity. 4. Nor has the concluding exhortation of the epistle, *keep yourselves from idols*, any special suitability to believers in Judea: but is much more likely to be directed to Christians living in other parts of the world.

Œcumenius in his comment upon the last verse of this epistle says, it ⁿ was written to the whole church in general. And in the proëm to his commentary upon the second epistle he ^o calls the first a catholic epistle. And he says, ‘that ^p epistle is not written to a certain person, nor to the churches of one or more places, as the blessed Peter’s to the Jews in their dispersion, nor as James’s before him, to the twelve tribes of the Jewish people. But he writes to all the faithful in general, whether assembled together or not. For which reason there is no inscription to that epistle, as there is to the other two.’

To me therefore it seems, that this epistle was designed for the churches in Asia under St. John’s inspection, and for all other Christians, into whose hands it should come. Or in other words, it was designed for all Christians in general, especially those under the apostle’s inspection, and nearest to him:

^m See his preface to St. John’s first epistle. sect. iv.

ⁿ — φάμεν εν, ως επειδαν εκκλησια ολη ταυτα εγραφεν. κ. λ. Œcum. T. II. p. 602. B. ^o Ib. p. 605. B.

^p — ‘Ου γαρ προς ωρισμενον εγραψε προσωπον, ουδε προς εκκλησιαν τοπων τινων, ωσπερ εποιησεν ο μακαριος

πετρος αφωρισμενωσ προς της εν τη διαπορα επισημαινομενος ιουδαιοις γραφειν και προ τϋτϋ ο θειος ιακωβος ταισ δωδεκα φυλαισ — αλλα πασι πιστοις κειν ποιημενος τον λογον εκκλησιαζεσσι και μη εκκλησιαζεσσι, τον της προγραφης παρελιπε λογον. Id. p. 606. B. 607. A.

without excepting the believers in Judea, or in any other country whatever.

Nor am I aware of any thing in the epistle, that should lead us to think, Jewish believers in particular to be intended, except what is in ch. ii. 2. where by *our*, some have understood Jewish Christians, and by *the whole world*, Gentiles. But the coherence does not require that interpretation. In the preceding verse is first mentioned that general address, *my little children*, which occurs several times afterwards. He there says: *These things write I unto you, that ye sin not.* Having delivered that earnest exhortation, for avoiding all offensive harshness, he soon afterwards joins himself with those, to whom he writes, adding: *And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only,* 'that is, mine and yours, to whom I am now writing, who already believe in Jesus, and have done so for a good while: *but also for the sins of the whole world:* that is, of all men, of every nation and people, rank and condition, in every part and age of the world, who shall believe and repent.' Here is nothing to limit what the apostle says to Jewish Christians. And that this apostle does frequently join himself with those, to whom he writes, with a like view to that above-mentioned, must be evident to all, who read this epistle with attention. See ch. i. 6—10. ii. 3. iii. 14, 18—22.

However for the sake of such as are really inquisitive, I shall here subjoin the note of Œcumenius upon those words: *not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.* 'This he said, either because he wrote to Jews, and intended to show, that the benefit of repentance was not restrained to them, but extended to Gentiles also: or else, that the promise was not made to the men of that time only, but likewise to all in future times.'

IV. St. John's second epistle is thus inscribed: *The elder to the elect lady, and her children.* Which has been differently understood by ancient and moderns: whose opinions may be seen in: Wolfius, and in Dr. Benson's preface to the second and third epistles of St. John, and briefly in Beza, whom I transcribe below. Some

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἶπεν, ἵνα οὐκ ἴδωταις
καὶ ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἐκεῖνοι περι-
κλήσονται τῆς μετανοίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὰ
ἄλλα ἔσπλησθαι ταύτην ἡ ὅτι μὴ τοῖς κατ'

ἐκεῖνο καιρὸν ἡ ἐπαγγελία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ
τοῖς μετεπειτα ᾤασιν. Œcum. in 1 ep.
Joan. p. 565.

Wolf. Prolegom. in ep. Joann.
ii. p. 320—326. ^s *Eleaz. Domi-*

Some have hereby understood the Christian church in general. So Jerom. But that, as Beza well observes in the place just transcribed, is a way of speaking, of which no like instance can be found. And it is inconsistent with what is said in the conclusion of the epistle, where the writer speaks of coming to see her, and sends her the salutations of the children of her elect sister.

Cassiodorus here ^u understood a particular church.

Mr. Whiston ^x says: 'St. John's second epistle was not written to a particular lady, but to a particular church: and, 'not improbably, to the church of Philadelphia.' Which last I take to be said without any good foundation.

Œcumenius, in his comment upon the last verse of this epistle, says: 'Hence, ^y some argue, that the epistle was sent 'not to a woman, but to a church. About which,' he says, 'he does not choose to dispute.' But in his introduction, or comment upon the beginning of the epistle, he says, 'St. ^z John 'did not scruple to write to a faithful woman: forasmuch as 'in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.' And before, he speaks ^a of this epistle being written to a particular woman.

In

να. Nonnulli *Electæ* nomen proprium esse volunt. Quod non probō. Dicendum enim esset *κυρια εκλεκτη*, *Dominæ Electæ*. Alii hoc nomine volunt Ecclesiam Christianam in genere significari. Quibus repugnat primum, quod hoc dicendi genus sit prorsus inusitatum. Deinde, quod in extremis duobus versibus dierte pollicetur, se ad eam et filios ipsius venturum, additque filiorum sororis salutem, quam et ipsam *electam* vocat. Puto igitur inscriptam esse epistolam præstanti alicui feminæ, quarum nonnullæ ecclesias suis opibus passim sustentabant: et *electam* illam vocari, id est, *eximiam*, addita Dominæ appellatione — sicut Lucas Theophilum, et Paulus Festum *κρατιστον*, id est, *potentissimum*, vel *præstantissimum*, compellant. Neque enim ab ejusmodi honestis titulis Christiana Religio abhorret, quatenus quidem justum ac fas est. Perinde est igitur, acsi scriptum esset: Eximix ac præstanti dignitate Dominæ. At enim cur nomen proprium non ad-

didit? Nempe satis inter se noti ac familiares erant. Quamobrem etiam ne nomen quidem suum exprimendum putavit. Bez. in Joann. ep. secund.

^z Legimus in Carminum libro. — *Una est columba mea.* — Ad quam scribit idem Joannes epistolam: *Senior electæ dominæ, et filius ejus* — Ad Ageruch. ep. 91. al. 11. T. IV. p. 745.

^u Joannes senior, quoniam ætate provectus, *electæ dominæ* scribit ecclesiæ, filiisque ejus, quos sacro fonte genuerat. Cassiod. in ep. Jo. ii. ^x As before, p. 469.

^y Δια δε τῆ προσθῆναι, ασπασεται σε τα τεκνα της αδελφης σε της εκλεκτης, βελονται τινες βελαιον, ως ε περι γυναικα η επισολη, αλλα προς εκκλησιαν περι ε εδεν τω βελομενω διενεχθειν. Œc. T. II. p. 612.

^z Προς δε γυναικα γραφων πιστην εστι υπεπειλατο, οτι εν χριστω ιησε ουκ αρρει εδε θηλυ οιδε. Ib. p. 606. C.

^a — καλοτι και πρεσβυτερον εαυτον εν ταυταις γραφει. και προς γυναικα, &c.

In the Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria, as we now have them in Latin, this ^b epistle is said to be written to a Babylonian woman, or virgin, named Electa.

And of late many learned men, whose ^c arguments I place below, choose to read this inscription thus: *To the lady Electa, or Eclecta.* But in my opinion the conclusion affords an objection. For it is not very likely, that two sisters should both have one and the same name. So it may be sometimes; but very seldom, as I imagine. This was a difficulty with ^d Wolfius, and ^e Tillemont.

Dr. Heumann supposeth, that ^f this woman's name was Kuria, or Kyria, and renders the inscription after this manner: *To the elect Kyria.* Which opinion is embraced by ^g Dr. Benson. But ^h Wolfius is not quite satisfied with it.

Tillemont has observed, that ⁱ in the Synopsis of Athanasius

κυρια

α. ΕΤΕΡΟΥ ΓΑΙΟΥ, ΕΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ, ΩΣΠΕΡ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ ΜΙΑΝ. Id. p. 605. B.

^c Secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est. Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine. Significat autem electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ. Clem. A. ed. Potter, p. 1011. ^e Epistola secunda scripta est ad quandam Babyloniam, Electam nomine, ut legas in Adumbrationibus ad hanc epistolam, quæ feruntur sub nomine Clementis Alexandrini. Nomen enim proprium feminæ esse Electam, recte observarunt viri doctissimi, perinde ut εκλεκτος viri nomen est apud Herodianum. Eandem Joannes κυριαν vocat, quemadmodum Latini feminas honestas vocabant dominas, sive curianas. Et Nazianzenus ep. iv. Κυρια τη μητρι. Fabr. Bib. Gr. I. 4. c. p. 5. tom. III. p. 343.

^d Εκλεκτη quoque litera majuscula scribitur apud Wechelium, et in editione R. Stephani, quam secutus est Millius, quamvis ipse eo nomine christianam feminam indicari exisset. Wolf. in 2 ep. Jo. p. 323.

^e Electus cubicularius fuit Imp. Commodi genere Ægyptius, &c. Wolf. ad Joan. ep. 2. p. 729.

^f Electam proprii nominis voca-

bulo vi: habuerim, per comma 13. ubi matronæ hujus soror itidem εκλεκτη appellatur. Quod ut illius ætatis moribus non respondet, ita soror illa εκλεκτη, tanquam Christiana commode vocari poterat. Wolf. ib. p. 325.

^e Et on trouve de la difficulté à croire qu' εκλεκτη en soit un, [nom propre] parceque S. Jean. ver. 13. le donne aussi, à la sœur de cette dame, n'estant pas ordinaire que deux sœurs aient le mesme nom: et parceq' il auroit dû estre devant κυρια plutost qu' après. S. Jean. l' Evangeliste. note xiv. Mem. T. I.

^f Heuman. Pœc. T. II. p. 421—427. et T. III. p. 14 &c.

^g See his preface to the second and third epistles of St. John, sect. iv.

^h Posterius hoc argumentum me etiam adducit, ut nec Cyriæ nomen proprium hic agnoscam. Ita enim Apostolus scripturus erat: Κυρια τη εκλεκτη, quemadmodum ver. 1. epistolæ tertiæ: Γαιω τω αγαπητω. Simili scribendi ratione utitur Paulus. Rom. xvi. 5. Ασπασεβε επακειτον τον αγαπητον με. Vid. etiam ib. ver. 8. et 12. et, 13. Wolf. ib. p. 325.

ⁱ Néanmoins saint Athanase met

κυρια seems to be taken for a proper name. But that is not clear. The expression is ambiguous, and may be as well rendered: 'the ^k elder writes to a lady, and her children,' as to Kyria, and her children. So ^l likewise thought Wolfius.

Before I proceed, I must detain the reader, whilst I observe, that the article of the Synopsis, quoted by Tillemont, is exactly the same with the hypothesis, or argument, prefixed to St. John's second epistle in ^m the second tome of Œcumenius. However, I do not suppose it to be really Œcumenius's. I allow it to be a part of the Synopsis, generally thought to have been composed by Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria in the fifth century, as ^p formerly shown.

Œcumenius himself seems to me to have supposed, this epistle to have been sent ^q to a Christian woman, whose name is not known. However in one place, in his prologue, he has these expressions: 'He ^r calls her *elect*, either from her name, or on account of the excellence of her virtue.'

Finally, then, others understand this inscription agreeably to our own translation: *The elder to the elect lady, and her children.* This ^s has hitherto been the common opinion, and is favoured by ^t Beza, ^u Mill, ^x Wall, ^y Wolfius, ^z Le Clerc and others. And Tillemont in the place before referred to, says: 'The second epistle of St. John is inscribed to εκλεκτη κυρια. St. Jerom translates the word κυρια by Dominæ, lady. And it is difficult to translate otherwise in the fifth verse, where St. John repeats the same word.'

γραφει κυρια, και τοις τεκνοις αυτης.
par ou il paroît avoir pris le mot de κυρια pour un nom propre. Mem. Ec. T. I. S. Jean l'Évangéliste. note xiv.

^k Ταυτην ως πρεσβυτερος γραφει κυρια και τοις τεκνοις αυτης. Athan. Synopf. S. S. T. II. p. 190. ed. Bened.

^l Mihi quidem id ex phrasi ista non admodum liquet. Wolf. ib. p. 323. ^m Œcum. T. II. p. 603. ^p Vol. IV. p. 289, 290.

^q Δυο δε τη εκλεκτη ταυτη επιμαρτυρει. κ. λ. Œcum. tom. II. p. 606. D. ^r Εκλεκτην δε η απο τη ονοματος, η απο της περι την αγετην φιλοτιμιας, καλει. Id. p. 606. B.

^s Alii utramque vocem pro appellativa habent, matronæque nomen simili silentio tectum consent, quo suum Joannes ipse textit. Hac communior fere est sententia. Wolf. ib. p. 324.

^t See before note (s) p. 593.

^u Prolegom. num. 151. ^x Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 378. ^y Ubi supra. p. 326.

^z Quoique ce mot puisse être un nom propre—il est assez vraisemblable, que c'est ici un nom appellatif, qui signifie, que c'étoit une Dame Chrétienne, a qui S. Jean. écrivoit, et qui étoit connue a ceux qui lui devoient rendre cette lettre, &c. Le Clerc Remarques sur la 2 ep. de S. Jean.

It is not easy for me to decide in such a variety of opinions, each one of which is supported by great patrons. The arguments for a proper name, either of *Eclecta*, or *Kyria*, are plausible, and specious. But it is an object of some moment, that this notion was little, if at all known to the ancients. If it had, they would not have supposed, that St. John here writes to the church of Christ in general, or to some Christian church in particular. The Latin Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria, as they are called, are not very material. The passage of the Synopsis, quoted by Tillemont, is ambiguous. *Œcumenius* has just mentioned the opinion, that *Eclecta* might be the name of the person to whom St. John wrote. But he does not seem to adhere to it, as has been observed by *Estius*.^a Nor is there any notice taken of this interpretation by *Jerom*, or *Cassiodorius*, or *Bede*, authors, in which it would be very likely to be found, if it had been known in ancient times. And why it should not have been known, if there is any foundation for it, would not be easily shown. That *Jerom* did not take *κυρια* to be a proper name, appears not only from the Latin version of this epistle, but likewise from his book of the Interpretation of Hebrew names: where, as formerly^b observed, there are no proper names collected out of the second epistle of St. John, though there are out of his other two epistles, and indeed from all the seven catholic epistles, excepting only this one of St. John's second epistle.

V. The third epistle of St. John is thus inscribed: *The elder to the beloved Gaius*. There^c seem to be two of this name

^a *Εκλεκτα*. Non liquet, an hoc sit nomen proprium mulieris, ad quam scribitur epistola, an commune. Id quod potius existimandum videtur: quoniam in fine epistolæ etiam soror ejus vocatur *ελεκτα*. Non solent autem in eadem familia dæ proles esse cognomines. Possesumi tanquam commune, *Œcumenius* sua expositione ostendit, et recte. Videtur fuisse mulier nobilis sive genere, sive opibus. — Alioqui poterat vocare filiam. — Sed moris est apud bene moratas gentes, infirmiore sexum titulis et aliis decentibus modis honorare. Est. in Joann. ep. ii. ver. 1.

^b See vol. V. p. 33. ^c *Gaius* quidam inter comites ejus nomi-

natur in tumultu Ephesino Act. xix. 29. qui *Derbæus* videtur dici Act. xx. 4. Habebat etiam Corinthi hospitem *Gaium*. Rom. xvi. 23. quem ipse baptizaverat. 1 Cor. i. 14. An hi sint iidem inter se aut cum *Gaio Joannis*, quis dispiciet? *Beda*, *Pseudo-Dexter*, *Lyranus*, aliique, affirmant. — Id quoque novum procreare dubium potest, quod *Gaius Paulinus* Corinthi sedem ac domicilium habuerit, noster vero proculdubio in Asia habitaverit, brevi ab Apostolo visitandus, de cujus extra Asiam post excessum *Neronis* itineribus tota antiquitas silet. *Lampe Proleg.* in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num. xii.

mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. In the disturbance at Ephesus, it is said: *Having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre.* Acts xix. 29. And among the same apostle's fellow-travellers, who accompanied him in his journey toward Jerusalem, is mentioned *Gaius of Derbe.* xx. 4. There is another Gaius, who appears to have been an inhabitant of Corinth. 1 Cor. i. 14. Rom. xvi. 23. I see no reason to think, that Gaius, or Caius, to whom St. John writes, was one of them. He seems to have been an eminent Christian, who lived in some city of Asia, not far from Ephesus, where St. John chiefly resided, after his leaving Judea. For at ver. 14. the apostle speaks of *shortly coming to him.* Which he could not well do, if Caius lived at Corinth, or any other remote place. Grotius thought him to be a good Christian, who ^d lived in one of the churches, or cities mentioned in the Revelation.

Mr. Whiston ^e supposes, Caius to have been bishop of Pergamos. Mill ^f was inclined to be of the same opinion. But this is said only upon the ground of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, which in this case are of no authority at all.

Dr. Heumann ^g in his Commentary upon this epistle of St. John has some curious and uncommon observations. He ^h does not choose to trouble himself with inquiring, who Caius was: the knowledge of which, he thinks, would be of no great use. It is sufficient, that we know him to have been a good Christian. Nevertheless he appears to slight the opinion just mentioned that ⁱ he was bishop of Pergamos. And he argues likewise, that ^j he is different from those of the same name, mentioned in the Acts, or St. Paul's epistles. And indeed it cannot be thought strange, that in the times of the apostles, there were several Christians of this name: which seems to have been as common a name among the Greeks and Romans, as any name whatever.

^d Vixit hic Caius in aliqua ecclesiarum, quarum mentio in Apocalypsi. Grot. in 3 ep. Joan. ver. 1.

^e Commentary upon St. John's Epistles, p. 14, 15, 86. ^f Alteram vero illam ad Gaium, ecclesie Pergamenis Episcopum, ab ipso Joanne (si quid Apostolicarum Constitutionum auctori credimus) ordinatum. Mill. Prol. num. 152.

^g Commentarius in Joan. Ap. epistolam tertiam. Ap. Nov. Syl-

log. Dissertation, P. I. p. 276—328. ^h Ibid. p. 277.

ⁱ Millius, Constitutionibus Apostolicis credulus, Caium hunc ecclesie Pergamenae Episcopum scribit in Prolegomenis suis ad N. T. Eandem amplexum esse sententiam Guil. Whistonum in suo in hanc epistolam commentario, quis mirabitur? lb. p. 277. in notis.

^j p. 277, 278.

Dr. Heumann says, that ^k Diotrophes, mentioned by St. John ver. 9. and said, to *love to have the pre-eminence*, was not a heathen magistrate, nor a heretic, nor a bishop, but a deacon in the church, to which he belonged. Upon which I observe: it was easy to show, that Diotrophes was not an heathen magistrate.

Dr. Heumann seems likewise to have proved, that ^l Diotrophes was not a heretic. For, as he argues, if Diotrophes had been a corrupter of the true christian doctrine, it would have been the duty of the apostle, to caution Christians against familiar converse with him: in like manner as he does in the tenth and eleventh verses of his second epistle. Moreover, in that case, the apostle would have signified his errors, and would have directed men to beware of the leaven of Diotrophes. But this he has not done. He only reproveth his pride, want of hospitality, and a perverse contempt, not of the apostle's doctrine, but of his direction for receiving strangers. He also quotes ^m Calovius, as speaking to the like purpose.

And the late Mr. Mosheim, who, as I suppose, had not seen Dr. Heumann's Dissertation, and gives a very different account of this epistle in several respects, allows, that ⁿ Diotrophes was not a heretic. So likewise argued Mr. Lampe ^o before either of them.

But

^k Ibid. p. 306, 307. ^l Nunc, ille Diotrophes quis fuerit, investigandum venit. Erasmus *novæ heresis auctorem* vocat in Paraphrasi. Ac ita jam olim sentit Beda—Verum recte Buddeus hanc sententiam respuit. Quod si enim corruptor doctrinæ apostolicæ fuisset Diotrophes, Apostoli fuisset avocare Christianos a familiari cum ipso consuetudine: id quod fecit hæreticis in secundæ suæ epistolæ versu decimo et undecimo. Fuisset item apostoli, notare ipsius errores, et, ut a fermento Diotrophis caveatur, præcipere. Jam vero id non facit, sed superbiam duntaxat ejus notat, et inhospitalitatem, et proteritiam non doctrinæ Joannis, sed præcepti ejus de liberalitate in pios exules exercenda, contentionem. Ibid. p. 302, 303.

^m Etiam Calovius ad h. l. hac de causa negat, Diotrophen fuisse

hæreticum. *Si hæreticus fuisset, inquit, gravius sine dubio acturus adversus eum, et Caium, aliosque, de seductione ipsius cavenda moniturus fuisset Joannes.* Quod argumentum accepit a Cornelio a Lapide, cujus pene omnes sunt annotationes, quas ad hanc Joannis epistolam exhibet Calovius. Heuman. ib. p. 303 note (z).

ⁿ Nullam igitur Diotrophes religionis dogmatibus injuriam inferebat, sed iniquius tantum erat, et ultra modum rigidus dignitatis suæ custos. Mosheim. de Reb. Christianor. p. 176, 177.

^o De causa rixæ et contentionis inter Diotrophen et Joannem in diversa abeunt interpretes. Bartholomæus Petri: *Credibile est, inquit, fuisse quempiam ex illis Judæis titulo tenus Christianis, qui Christi fidem ita suscipiendam putabant, ut simul servaretur lex ceremonialis Moysi.*—Sed

Q 9 +

optime

But I cannot say, that Dr. Heumann has proved, Diotrephes not to have been a bishop. For I think, that every thing said of him in this epistle implies his being president, or chief director of things in the church, to which Caius belonged. However, we will consider his arguments.

In the first place he says, the ^p principal reason, why learned men have thought Diotrephes to be a bishop, is because they have understood those words at ver. 10. *and casteth them out of the church*, of excommunication. But those words, he says, are capable of another sense. They seem rather to mean, that by ill treatment he forced those strangers to leave the church, to which they had applied for relief, and to go elsewhere.

But granting, this interpretation to be right; Diotrephes might nevertheless be a bishop. For that ill treatment might be owing to an abuse of his episcopal power and authority.

Again, says Dr. Heumann, the ^q fault of Diotrephes lay in seeking pre-eminence; which shows, he was not a bishop: for then he would have had pre-eminence. Nor does a man seek what he has already.

But I cannot perceive that observation to be very material. For a bishop may show improper love of power and pre-eminence by arbitrary proceedings in the society, over which he presides, and by an arrogant behaviour toward neighbouring bishops or superintendents, his equals, and, perhaps, in some respects, his superiors.

Finally, not to take notice of any other arguments of this kind, Dr. Heumann thinks, that ^r Diotrephes was deacon, and had

optime observat Calovius, si Joannes id innuisset, quod tum sine dubio acturus adversus eundem, et Caium aliosque de seductione ipsius cavenda moniturus esset. Nullius sane dogmatis, sed factorum tantum perversorum Diotrephes incusatur. Lamp. Prol. l. 1. cap. 7. § xiv.

^p Alii igitur Diotrephen fuisse illius ecclesie episcopum crediderunt, hoc potissimum usi argumento, quod excommunicasse scribatur pios exules. Verum infra docebimus, *ejicere ex ecclesia*, hic non esse excommunicare, atque adeo assigni Diotrephi excommunicationem judicio precipiti. Ib. 303.

^q Ac vel verbum φιλοπρωτευων de-

monstrat nobis, eum haud fuisse Episcopum enim est ο πρωτευων in ecclesia. Atqui quod quis jam habet, non expetit. Ib. p. 303, 304.

^r Jam cum clarissime cognoscamus, nec hæreticum, nec episcopum, nec presbyterum, nec ethnicum scilicet reipublicæ rectorem, fuisse Diotrephen, via satis aperta est ad personam ejus inveniendam. Statim enim mentem nostram hæc subit quaestio: An forte fuit illius ecclesie diaconus, hoc est, bonorum ecclesiasticorum administrator? Hoc enim officium certis hominibus jam initio Christianæ Ecclesie demandatum fuisse, ex Act. vi. notum est. Ac sane facilis nunc et perspicuus nobis

had the charge of the stock or treasure of the church to which he belonged, and therefore he was not bishop.

But neither do I see the force of this argument. For Diotrophes might have the disposal of the church-stock, and yet be bishop. For in ancient times it was a part of the bishop's office and care, to see, that the revenues of the church were managed and disposed to the best advantage. This appears from Justin Martyr, and Cyprian. They who desire to see more proofs, may consult Bingham. Since then we allow Diotrophes to have had a right to concern himself in the disposal of the church-stock, it need not affect Dr. Heumann's main argument, whether he was bishop, or deacon.

To me, then, it seems, that Diotrophes was bishop in this church, and that Caius was a man in a private station, of good substance, and a liberal disposition. St. John says ver. 9. *I wrote unto the church: or rather I would have written unto the church, and at the same time to Diotrophes: but Diotrophes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence, receiveth us not.* For that reason St. John sent this letter to Caius.

Let us now consider, what was the case, to which St. John refers in this epistle, and what was the fault of Diotrophes. Concerning this there have been various sentiments of learned

nobis videtur totus hic locus noster. Præerat scilicet ærario ecclesiastico Diotrophes. Erat ejus pauperibus inde erogare pecunias. Advenas autem fratres ideo non sublevabat, quod vix ecclesiæ illius pauperibus alendis satis videretur suppeterere. Id causatus alio discedere, aliorum auxilium implorare jubebat: imo dum nihil ipsis suppeditabat, cogebat hoc ipso eos εκ της εκκλησιας, ex illa ecclesia, excedere, atque ita erat εκβαλλων αυτης εκ της εκκλησιας. Erant, qui exulibus his ex ærario dari aliquid volebant. Verum non audiebat hos providus scilicet œconomus, sed suam sequi sententiam cupiebat cæteros Christianos omnes. Atque ita erat φιλοπρωτευων (sive ut Petrus loquitur, κατακυριευων) αυτων. Quid? Tam prudens et justus sibi videbatur œconomus, ut ne Joannis quidem Apostoli præcepto morem gereret, ratus scilicet, eum, si hic esset, ærarii que rationes haberet

cognitas, aliter sensurum. Bonum doctorem esse Joannem, non negabat: bonum eum esse œconomum, prudentemque in politicis rebus consiliatorem, id vero negabat. Imo eo temeritatis provehebat, ut ludicra maledicta effutiret in virum sanctissimum. et fortasse *senem* appellaret, cætera quidem summe venerabilem, sed hoc certe in genere *delirum*. Ib. p. 306, 307.

³ Οἱ ευπορευντες δε και βελομενοι, κατα προαιρεσιν εμαςος την εαυτη, ο βελεται διδωσι και το συλλεγομενον παρα τω προεσωτι αποτιθεται, και αυτος επικηρει ορφανοις τε και χηραις — και τοις παρεπιδημοις και ξενοις. κ. λ. Apol. 2. p. 99. A. Par. 1636.

⁴ — et stipendia ejus Episcopo dispensante perciperent. Cypr. ep. 41. al. 38. ^u Antiquities of the Christ. Church. B. I. ch. iv. sect. 6.

^x Scripsissem forsitan ecclesiæ. Vulgat. Vid. et Cleric. H. E. A. D. 92. num. ii. Vid. et Grot. in loc.

men

men. Grotius supposed ^y these strangers, here spoken of to be believing Jews, whom Diotrophes, a gentile, would not receive, because they were Jews, or because they were for joining the rites of the law with Christianity. To the like purpose ^z Le Clerc, and ^a Beaufobre. This opinion is much disliked by ^b Dr. Heumann. Mr. Mosheim ^c likewise argues against it, as an opinion, quite destitute of foundation in antiquity.

Others think, that Diotrophes was a Jew, and zealous for the law, and that he would not receive these strangers, converts from among the gentiles, because they did not take upon them the observation of the rites and ceremonies of the law of Moses. This opinion is mentioned by ^d Lampe. But he argues well against it.

And indeed both these opinions were confuted before, when we showed, that Diotrophes was not a heretic, or that there is no reason to think him so.

It has been of late a common opinion among learned men, that ^e St. John here speaks of some, particularly Jews, who had

^y Is vero ex illo erat hominum genere, qui Judæos, quâquam Christum professos, si legis ritus observabant (quod in Judæa Christiani faciebant ad hæc usque tempora, ut Sulpicius nos docet) ad suos cœtus non admittebant. Grot. in ep. 3. ver. 9.

^z Nolebat autem Christianos circumcisos ab incircumcisis seu Gentilibus, in ecclesiam admitti. Cleric. ib. ^a Son nom est Grec. Ce qui fait juger, qu'il étoit Payen d'origine, et c'est peut-être pour cela qu'il ne vouloit pas qu'on reçût Chrétiens d'entre les Juifs, fort méprisés par les Gentils. Pref. sur. ii. et iii. ep. de S. Jean. p. 585. Voyez aussi la remarque sur. l'ep. iii. ver. 9. ^b Heuman. ubi sup. p. 303. note (a).

^c Eam (causam) viri docti quarunt in conditione eorum, quos beneficiis et amore ecclesiæ excludebat. Diotrophen nempe suspicantur origine fuisse Ethnicum, illos vero quos recipere volebat Judæos. Ex quo efficiunt, initum Ethnico-

rum animis contemptum Judæorum tantum apud eum potuisse, ut sanctissimum amoris præceptum violaret. In hac conjectura, ut verum fatear, nihil est, quo moveri queat aliquis consideratus et rerum Christianarum non imperitus. Nam, ut omittam, omnibus eam prædiis destitutam esse, si nomen Diotrophis excipias, quod Græcum est — ut taceam, nusquam aliquid memoriæ proditum extare, unde pateat, tam immani Judæorum odio et despicientiâ Christianos ex Græcis flagrasse, ut in fratribus eos habere nollent, et omni amoris fructu spoliarent. &c. Moshem. De Reb. Christian. ante Const. M. p. 175.

^d See before, p. 599. note (o).

^e Tertiam epistolam scripsit Gaio cuidam. — Hominis liberalitatem laudat, qui præcones quosdam evangelicos, e Judæa gente, qui a Gentilibus nihil accipere voluerant, opibus suis adjuvisset. Cleric. ubi sup.

Diotrophen duplici nomine S. Joannes

had gone out into the world, to propagate the Christian religion. Who had acted upon a generous and disinterested principle, refusing to take any thing from those, among whom they laboured, and whom they had converted to the Christian faith. And they think, that St. John commends Caius for encouraging such teachers, and blames Diotrephes for not receiving and helping them. But that opinion appears to me without foundation. For I see nothing that should lead us to think preachers here spoken of, but only strangers in want.

Ver. 5. *Beloved*, says St. John to Caius, *thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers*: 'that is, 'to the members of the church, to which he belonged, and 'to strangers, who came to the city, where he dwelt: whom 'he had received civilly, and courteously, and relieved generously, if they were in want.'

Ver. 6. *Which have borne witness of thy charity before the church*. 'Some such persons, or some members of that church, 'had been at the place, where St. John resided. And before 'the church they declared his good temper and liberality.' *Whom if thou bring forward on their journey, after a godly sort, thou shalt do well*. 'And it will be very commendable in you, 'if after this any other such persons should come to your city, 'you shall act in a like manner to them also, receiving them 'kindly, and forwarding them in their way. This will be 'very becoming your Christian profession.'

Ver. 7. *Because that for his name's sake they went forth taking nothing of the gentiles*.

We learn from Bede, that 'there were in ancient times two interpretations of these words: 'For the name of Christ they 'went forth to preach the gospel. Or, for the faith of Christ, 'and the profession of his name they had left their native 'country, or had been expelled from it.' This is the sense,

Joannes objurgat: primum ideo, quod imperium sibi arrogaret in ecclesia — deinde propterea quod eorum se ac inhumanum fratribus sine de religione Christiana promittis exhiberet. Egressi erant quicquam ex cœtu, cujus membrum Diotrephes erat, ad propagandum inter vicinas gentes religionem Christianam, &c. Moshem. ib. p. 175.

Duos autem ex causis pro nomine Domini sunt profecti, aut

ad prædicandum videlicet nomen ejus proprie sponte venientes, aut propter nominis sancti fidem et confessionem a civibus seu contribubus suis patriâ expulsi. Bed. in 3. Joann. Ep.

z Nam exules illi Christiani e patria sua cum egressi sunt, nihil quicquam suorum bonorum acceperunt ab hostibus suis Ethnicis, sed coacti sunt abire sine ullo vitæ subsidio. Heuman. ubi supr. p. 327.

for

for which Dr. Heumann contends, and therefore often calls these strangers exiles.

He supposeth these strangers to have been gentile converts, who had forsaken their native country, or had been driven out of it, destitute of all things.

However this place may be understood partly otherwise: 'That we, who are Christians, ought to help these strangers in their difficulty, especially because they have not sought for relief among unbelieving gentiles: though some even of them might have been disposed to give them assistance.'

Grotius ^h explains the place in that manner. The same sense is likewise in Estius. Whose ⁱ note upon this text I shall now transcribe at large, it being well suited to illustrate this epistle.

Ver. 8. *We therefore ought to receive such, that we might be fellow-helpers to the truth.* 'It should be an allowed maxim, that we are to show kindness to such: otherwise, we do not act the part of Christians, who ought to encourage those who have a zeal for truth.'

Ver. 9. *I wrote to the church.* Or, *I should have written to the church,* and therein to Diotrephes. *But Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.* 'I know, he would not pay a regard to my directions.'

^h Μηδεν λαμβανοντες απο των εθνων.
— In manuscripto απο των εθνικων.
— Potuerant in ista calamitate adjuvari misericordiâ των εξω, *extraneorum.* Sed maluerunt omnia Christianis debere. Grot. ad ver. 7. *Nos ergo.* Nos Christiani ubique locorum οφειλομεν απολαμβανειν. — Manuscriptus, υπολαμβανειν τοις: id vero est, opitulari. Id. ad ver. 8.

ⁱ Quod ait Apostolus, *istos profectos pro nomine Jesu Christi,* potest bifariam exponi, ait Beda videlicet, aut ut prædicaturi evangelium ejus sponte sint profecti ad Gentiles convertendos, aut ut propter fidem et confessionem nominis Christi per Contribuales suos patriâ fuerint expulsi. Similiter, quod sequitur, *nihil accipientes a gentibus,* ambiguum est, an de gentibus ad fidem Christi jam conversis accipiendum sit, an de nondum conversis. Et uterque sensus sua nititur probabilitate. Il-

lo modo sensus est, quod hi quamvis annuntiaissent, et deinceps forent annuntiaturi gentibus evangelium seu fidem Christi, essentque jam complures gentilium eorum prædicatione conversi nihil tamen ab iis exigere, vel accipere voluerint necessariae sustentationis, hac scilicet de causa ne quod offendiculum darent evangelio Christi. — De gentibus autem non conversis si sermo sit, tunc significatur, quod isti peregrini, quamvis egerent, quâcumque tantum ex causâ, nihil tamen ab hujusmodi gentilibus accipere, nedum petere, voluerint: ne ii scandalizarentur, et longius a Christiana religione averterentur. Dixissent enim: Ecce nulla est charitas inter Christianos — Utraque expositio bene probabilis est. Nec satis liquet, utra sit præferenda. *Est. in 3. Jean. ver. 7.*

Ver. 10. *Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds, which he does.* That is, 'I' will remind him of his actions, and reprove and admonish him, in order to his amendment of which I do not despair.' *Prating against us with malicious words.* He proceeded so far, as to speak of the apostle in a petulant manner. Perhaps, he said, that though St. John did well in giving out general rules for the practice of piety; yet he had no right to intermeddle in particular cases, concerning which every one should judge for himself. *And not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church.* Nor is that all. For he not only refuses to receive and entertain these brethren, but he also discourages those who would relieve and entertain them. And thus he obligeth these strangers to leave your church, and go elsewhere.'

By these last words most interpreters understand St. John to say, that Diotrephes excommunicated, or cast out of the church, *the brethren*, members of it, who were for receiving these strangers. But Dr. Heumann says, that by the persons, whom Diotrephes cast out of the church, must be understood

† Certe nihil aliud sibi vult Apostolus, quam se more suo mollissimum, placidissimumque in modum admoniturum esse Diotrephen peccati sui, rectamque eum revocaturum in viam. Heum. ib. p. 309.

† Universi videlicet, qui hanc tractarunt epistolam, sibi persuaserunt, describi his verbis illud pœnæ ecclesiasticæ genus, quod excommunicatio vocari solet. Facile quidem poterat hic error agnosci. Nam primo, Caium, id, quod fieri volebat Diotrephes, facientem, ab ipso non fuisse excommunicatum, in propatulo est.—Sed age, rem totam intueamur propius. Initio igitur considerandum, quosnam ecclesiâ eiecerit Diotrephes. Ab omnibus, si Beausobrium excipimus, hoc refertur ad propinquius, τες βλασφημοι, hoc est, eos, qui volebant exules hospitio excipere. Cum vero jam graves attulimus causas, cur non credi possit hos excommunicatione eiecisse ecclesiâ, sequitur, ut statuamus, hæc verba, εκ της οικουσεως εκβαλλει, pertinere ad re-

motius, ad fratres exules. His scilicet, dum nec ipse ex ærario aliquid impertiebat, et aliis, quoque, ut nihil ipsis darent, suadebat ac persuadebat, hoc ipso migrare eos cogebat alio, atque ita *e sua expellebat ecclesia*. Non erat igitur nostro loco necesse excommunicationem tribuere Diotrephi. Sed satis evidens est, id eum effecisse, quod omissam priorum exulum receptionem necessario consequeretur, ut videlicet exirent ecclesiâ, aliamque peterent, opum pariter et misericordiæ abundantiorum. — Apparet hinc etiam facile, cum volentes exulum misereri κωλυειν hic dicitur Diotrephes, non credi eum debere id vetuisse pro imperio, sed allatis duntaxat causis, cur fieri id non oportebat, multos ab hoc pietatis officio revocasse. — Atque hoc ipsum nos admonet, verbo, εκβαλλειν, non necessario significari, omnes illos exules revera abire coactos, sed id etiam recte usurpari de conatu Diotrephis id efficiendi. Heuman. ibid. p. 310—313.

these

these strangers, not the members of the church. For, as plainly appears, Caius was not excommunicated, though he had done what was opposed by Diotrephes. Nor need it be supposed, that all the strangers here spoken of, were obliged to leave that place, or society. Diotrephes, it is true, discouraged their reception, and some might remove elsewhere. Others of them, however, might continue their abode there, encouraged by Caius, and some other pious members of this church, who did not submit to the reasons, or the orders of Diotrephes.

In this interpretation it is supposed, that *casting out of the church* refers not to the persons last mentioned, who would receive these strangers, but to *the strangers*, whom Diotrephes would not have to be received. And Beausobre says, the ⁿ place may be so understood. Dr. Heumann blames him for not saying, that ⁿ it ought to be so understood.

There have been various conjectures of learned men concerning the reasons of Diotrephes's conduct, which I do not choose to take notice of now. Dr. Heumann supposeth, that Diotrephes had the disposal of the revenues of the church. There came to the place strangers, who needed relief. But Diotrephes opposed the distribution of any of the common stock, and also discouraged such as were willing to assist them with their own. For all which, as may be supposed, he assigned some reasons. This appears to me to have been the whole of the affair.

But whether these strangers were Jews, or Gentiles, I cannot say. There might be some of both. Grotius^o and Lampe^p think they were Jews, who had been driven out of Palestine, or had been reduced to want by the general and grievous calamity of that country, and had come into Asia with hopes of relief, and for the sake of a settlement. Heumann, as before seen, says they were Gentiles. For certain, they were Christians.

^m *Les chassé de l'eglise.* Cela se peut rapporter ou aux freres, ou á ceux qui les recoient, ou aux uns et aux autres. Sur. ver. 10.

ⁿ Hic enim in Gallica sua N. T. versione animadvertit, hæc verba etiam ad remotius referri posse, hoc est, ad fratres exules. Debebat vero indulgere meditationi, nec id relinquere dubium et incertum. Heum. ib. p. 311. note (p).

^o Ὑπερ τῶν ὀργιστῶν αὐτῶν ἐκδιώχθη

id est, a Judæa, ejecti sunt per Judæos incredulos ob Christum. Grot. ad ver. 7.

^p Unde colligimus, peregrinos hos, quorum causam Joannes tam impense egit, fuisse Judæos ex Palæstina cum eo profugos, qui pro se aliisque per totalem regionis illius devastacionem ad summam egestatem redacti, opem ecclesiarum Asiæ florentium implorabant. Lamp. Proleg. l. I. c. 7. num. xvi.

And St. John, I think, says, that we ought to receive such, whether they be of Jewish or Gentile stock, *that we may be fellow-helpers to the truth*: 'that we also may serve the interests of truth, for the sake of which these persons have suffered the loss of all things.'

Ver. 11. *Beloved, follow not that which is evil, but that which is good.* Here the apostle exhorts Caius to persist in his good conduct, and to be upon his guard, not to be influenced by any bad examples.

In the 12th verse he recommends to him Demetrius, by whom, as may be supposed, this letter was carried.

In the 13th and 14th verses he sends salutations, and speaks again of coming to the place where Caius dwelled, and of *speaking with him face to face.* Which I suppose he did.

And I please myself with the supposition, that his journey was not in vain. I imagine, that Diotrophes submitted, and acquiesced in the advices and admonitions of the apostle. Of this I have no certain assurance. However I may add: that neither does any one else know the contrary.

VI. Concerning the time of writing these two epistles, nothing can be said with certainty. Mill⁹ placeth them about the same time with the first, in 91, or 92. Whiston^r likewise supposeth, that they were all three written about the year 82, or 83. I imagine, that St. John was somewhat advanced in age, and that he had resided a good while in Asia; before he wrote any of these epistles. Consequently, I am disposed to think, that these two were not written sooner than the first. And as it was before^s argued, that the first epistle was written about the year 80, these two may be reckoned to have been written between the years 80, and 90.

C H A P X X I.

ST. JUDE, AND HIS EPISTLE.

- I. *His History.* II. *Testimonies to the Genuineness of the Epistle.*
 III. *To whom it was sent.* IV. *The Time when it was written.*

I. THE writer describes himself in this manner at the beginning of the epistle. ch. i. ver. 1. *Jude*^a *the servant of Jesus*

^a Proleg. num. 151.

^r As before, p. 587.

^s See above, p. 590.

^a Ἰούδας, ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δούλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ ἰακώβου.

Christ and brother of James. Those two characters lead us to think, that he was one of those called the Lord's brethren, and that he was an apostle. Our Lord's brethren, as enumerated in Matt. xiii. 55. are *James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas.* In Mark vi. 3. *James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon.* And in the catalogues of the apostles are these. Matt. x. 3. *James the son of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus. Simon the Canaanite.* Mark iii. 18. *James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite.* Luke vi. 15, 16. *James the Son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.* Acts i. 13. *James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.*

Thus he appears to have been sometimes called Judas, at other times Thaddeus, or Lebbeus. As I do not inquire into the meaning and origin of these names, I refer to others. I only observe, that it was no uncommon thing among the Jews, for a man to have different names, as Simon, sometimes called Simeon, at other times Peter, or Cephas. And Thomas was also called Didymus.

Jude, servant of Jesus Christ. He does not thereby deny himself to be an apostle. St. Paul does not always take upon himself that character at the beginning of his epistles. It is wanting in his two epistles to the Thessalonians, in the epistles to the Philippians, and to Philemon. The epistle to the Philippians begins in this manner. *Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi.*

It follows. *And brother of James:* meaning James, sometimes called the Lord's brother, and son of Alpheus, one of the twelve apostles. And he does fitly so style himself, as that James was the eldest brother, and was of note among the apostles, after our Saviour's ascension, and in great repute among the Jewish believers. As appears from Acts xii. 17. xv. xxi. 18—25. and Gal. i. 19. ii. 9.

We have no account of Jude's vocation to the apostleship. Nor is there any thing said of him particularly in the gospels, except what is related in John xiv. 21, 22, 23. in the account, which that evangelist has given of our Lord's most excellent and affectionate discourses with the disciples a short time

^b See Lightfoot's Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. Matthew, vol. II. p. 176. Witsii Comm. in ep. Judæ. num. ii.

Cave's Life of St. Jude, in English. Dr. Benson's Preface to this epistle, sect. i.

before his last sufferings. *He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. And he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father. And I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot: Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not unto the world! Jesus answered, and said unto him: if a man love me, he will keep my words. And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*

This disciple still had the common prejudice concerning the kingdom of the Messiah. And he asks our Saviour with surprise, how he could speak of manifesting himself to a few only, when he was about to set up an universal monarchy in great power and splendour? Our Lord tells him (what he might have known before) that his kingdom, as Messiah, was spiritual, a kingdom of truth and righteousness: and that the blessings and privileges of it were peculiar to good men, who obeyed the precepts of true religion, which had been taught by him. Such would be accepted, and approved by himself, and by his heavenly Father, in whose name he had spoken. This they would all know, when he should come again among them, after his resurrection, and when the gift of the Spirit should be bestowed upon them, and others his followers.

As there is little said of Jude in the history of our Saviour before his resurrection, so St. Luke in the Acts has inserted nothing particularly concerning him after it. However it is unquestionable, that he partook of the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost at the pentecost next after our Lord's ascension: and that he joined with the other apostles in bearing an open testimony to our Lord's resurrection at Jerusalem: and that he had a share with them in the reproaches and other sufferings, which they endured upon that account.

It may be also reasonably supposed, that for a while he preached the gospel in several parts of the land of Israel, and wrought miracles in the name of Christ. But what they were, we cannot say, because they are not recorded by St. Luke, nor any other credible historian near the time.

As his life seems to have been prolonged, it may be also reckoned very likely, that he afterwards left Judea, and went abroad, preaching the gospel to Jews and Gentiles in other countries. But we have no account of his travels, that can be relied on. Some have said, that he preached in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia: and that he suffered martyrdom in

this last mentioned country. But of these things there remains not any credible history,

Indeed, it may be questioned, whether St. Jude was a martyr. It was formerly observed by ^c us, that Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, reckons ^d among apostles, who had not died by martyrdom, Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi. And it was then said, that by Levi, Heracleon, probably, meant Lebbeus, that is, Judas. Which is allowed by ^e Dodwell, and some other learned writers, to whom we then referred. Nor does Jerom, in his article of St. Jude, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, say any thing of his having died a martyr.

Jerom, in his commentary upon the tenth chapter of St. Matthew, where is the catalogue of the apostles, says, ‘ that ^f the apostle Thaddeus, called by the evangelist Luke, *Jude the brother of James*, was sent to Edessa to Agbarus king of Osröene.’ But Eusebius, in his account of that affair, says, ‘ that ^g Thomas, one of the twelve, sent to Edessa Thaddeus, one of Christ’s seventy disciples, to preach the gospel in those countries.’ And in the preceding ^h chapter, where he speaks of Christ’s seventy disciples, he reckons Thaddeus, who went to Edessa, one of them. Whence it came to pass, that Jerom called him an apostle, and reckoned him one of the twelve, is not easy to say. But I imagine, that what he says in his commentary upon St. Matthew, is an inaccuracy, owing to his writing in haste. This conjecture receives confirmation hence, that in the article of St. Jude, in the catalogue above-mentioned, he says nothing of that journey.

Before I proceed any farther, I must take notice of ^k a Dissertation of the learned Theodore Hafæus: in which he argues, that Judas, called Lebbeus, and Thaddeus, is the

^c See before, p. 44. note (B).

^d Ὁυ γαρ παντες οι συζομενοι ωμολογησαν την δια της φωνης ομολογιαν, και εξηλθεν εξ ων ματθαιος, φιλιππος, θωμας, λευις, και αλλοι πολλοι. Heracl. ap. Clem. A. Str. l. 4. p. 502.

^e Diff. Iren. i. num. xxiv.

^f Thaddæum Apostolum, ecclesiastica tradit historia missum Edessan ad Abgarum regem Osrœnæ, qui ab Evangelista Luca, Judas Jacobi dicitur. In Matt. T. IV. p. 35. in.

^g H. E. l. i. cap. 13. p. 32.

^h Cap. 12. p. 31. A.

ⁱ Vid. Vales. Annot. in loc. p. 21.

^k Theodori Hafæi de Levi a Christo ad Apostolaturn vocato: ad loca Marci ii. 14. seq. Luc. v. 27. seq. Disquisitio. Quâ eum non, ut vulgo putatur, Matthæum, sed Judam Thaddæum esse ostenditur. Ap. Biblioth. Brem. Cl. v. Fascic. iii. num. vi. p. 475, &c. Bremæ. 1721.

same as Levi, of whose call St. Mark, ch. ii. 13—17. and St. Luke, ch. v. 27—32. give an account.

He supposeth, that St. Matthew, ch. ix. 9—13. gives an account of his own call to be an apostle, and that St. Mark and St. Luke give an account of the call of another publican, named Levi, or Lebbeus, or Judas.

Upon which I observe :

1. That is a very forced interpretation. The whole history, and all the circumstances of it, show, that one and the same person is spoken of by all the three evangelists. And the coherence renders it indubitable. The same things precede and follow in those several evangelists : as may be perceived by any one, who compares them.

2. So far as we can find, it has been the opinion of the most ancient and learned christian writers, that Matthew and Levi are two names of one and the same man. So thought ^l Eusebius. So likewise ^m Jerom in several places of his works : which shows, it was his settled opinion, and that he never hesitated about it. The ⁿ compiler of the Apostolical Constitutions says the same expressly. Victor of Antioch in his commentary upon St. Mark, says, that ^o Mark and Luke, when they give an account of his call at the receipt of custom, designedly use a name, by which he was not so well known, as that of Matthew. Jerom speaks to the like purpose in a passage, already †† transcribed. It is very likely, that Victor had seen that observation in more ancient writers : and possibly in Origen, in ^p whose preface to his commentary upon the epistle to the Romans,

^l Vid. Dem. Ev. l. 3. cap. v. p. 119, &c. cited in this work, vol. IV. p. 222, &c.

^m Primus omnium Matthæus est Publicanus cognomento Levi, qui Evangelium in Judæa Hebræo sermone edidit. Hieron. Prol. in Matt. T. IV. in citat supra vol. V. p. 35.

Cæteri Evangelistæ propter reverentiam et honorem Matthæi noluerant eum nomine appellare vulgato, sed dixerunt Levi. Duplici quippe vocabulo fuit. Id. in Matt. cap. x. tom. IV. P. I. p. 30

Matthæus, qui et Levi, ex Publicano Apostolus. De V. I. cap. 3.

ⁿ Περὶ δὲ ἀναγνώσεων ἐγὼ ματθαῖος, ὁ καὶ λευῖς. ὁ ποτε τελωνῆς, διατασσόμεναι.

Const. Ap. l. 8. c. 22.

^o Est autem Levi hic idem omnino cum Evangelista Matthæo. Et quidem Marcus et Lucas nomen, quod illi familiare erat, primæva appellatione obnubunt, &c. Victor in S. Marc. ap. Bib. PP. Lugd. T. IV. p. 375. B. Citat. vol. V. hujus operis p. 172.

†† See note (m) ^p Prima nobis quæstio de nomine ipsius Pauli videtur exurgere, cur is qui Saulus dictus est in Actibus Apostolorum, nunc Paulus dicatur. — Invenimus igitur in scripturis aliquantos binis, alios etiam ternis usos esse nominibus. — Sed nec Evangelia quidem hunc renuunt

morem,

Romans, as we now have it in Latin only, is somewhat equivalent. However, he plainly says, that Matthew and Levi are only two names of one and the same man.

3. Hafæus argues, that Levi is never said in the gospels to have been also called Matthew, nor is Matthew said to be otherwise called Levi.

To which I answer, there was no necessity that we should be told this. It is allowed, that Thaddeus, and Lebbeus, and Judas, are names of one and the same apostle. And it was also so understood by ancient Christians: some of whom I have quoted below. Nevertheless St. Luke has never told us, that Judas was surnamed Thaddeus, or Lebbeus. Nor has St. Matthew, or St. Mark said, that Thaddeus, or Lebbeus, was also called Judas.

These observations, as seems to me, are sufficient to confirm the common opinion. However I will add a thought or two of less moment.

4. St. Matthew, in the catalogue of the apostles, placeth himself in this manner, ch. x. 3. *and Matthew the publican:* και ματθαιος ο τελωνης. May it not be hence argued with probability, that he was the only publican among the apostles, and that there was no other?

5. If we were to form a conjecture concerning the employment, that was followed by Jude, before he was an apostle, it would be that of an husbandman. In the Apostolical Constitutions the apostles are made to say: 'Some of us are fishermen, others tent-makers, others husbandmen.' Undoubtedly several of the apostles were fishermen. But by the latter part of the sentence no more may be meant, than that there was among them one tent-maker, even Paul, and one husbandman, intending, perhaps, St. Jude. For Hegesippus, as quoted by Euse-

morem. Nam et Matthæus ipse refert de se, quod cum transiret Jesus, invenit quendam sedentem ad telonium nomine Matthæum. Lucas vero de eodem dicit: quia cum transiret Jesus, quendam vidit publicanum nomine Levi, &c. Origen. in ep. ad Rom. tom. II. p. 458. Basil.

⁹ Nam observabam, Matthæum nunquam dici Levin, vel Levin vicissim appellari Matthæum, &c. Haf. ubi supra. p. 477.

^r Thaddæum Apostolum — qui ab Evangelista Luca Judas Jacobi dicitur: et alibi appellatur Lebbeus,

quod interpretatur corculus. Crendendumque est eum fuisse trinomium: sicut Simon, Petrus, et filii Zebedæi, Boanerges, ex firmitate et magnitudine fidei nominati sunt. Hieron. in Matt. x. T. IV. p. 35. in.

Ην γαρ ετερος ιουδας ο λεββαιος, ο και επικληθεις θαδδαιος, ον ιακωβος φησιν ειναι ο λυκας, λεγων ιουδας ιακωβος. Chryf. in Matt. hom. 32. al. 33. tom. VII. p. 369.

Vid. et Hesychii Quæstiones. Diff. xiv. ap. Cotelæ. Monum. Gr. tom. III. p. 11.

^s Vid. Cav. H. L. in S. Judæ. bius.

bius, writes, ' that ' when Domitian made inquiries after the ' posterity of David, some grandsons of Jude, called the Lord's ' brother, were brought before him. Being asked concerning ' their possessions, and substance, they assured him, that they had ' only so many acres of land, out of the improvement of which ' they both paid him tribute, and maintained themselves with ' their own hard labour. The truth of what they said was con- ' firmed by the callousness of their hands. Being asked con- ' cerning Christ, and his kingdom, of what kind it was, and ' when it would appear; they answered, that it was not worldly ' and earthly, but heavenly and angelical: that it would be ma- ' nifested at the end of the world: when coming in great glory ' he would judge the living and the dead, and render to every ' man according to his works. The men being mean, and their ' principles harmless, they were dismissed.'

Hence some may argue, that St. Jude himself had been an husbandman. And from this account, if it may be relied up- on, we learn, that this apostle was married, and had children.

That may suffice for the history of St. Jude.

II. In the next place I am to observe the evidences of the genuineness, and canonical authority of the epistle ascribed to him.

Somewhat relating to this point has been already said in the fifteenth chapter, concerning the Catholic epistles in general. To which chapter therefore the reader is referred, though I may here transcribe some things from it, for showing the au- thority of this epistle in particular.

It should be remembered, that Eusebius having enumerated the books of scripture, universally received from the begin- ning, and among them the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John, he adds: ' And " among the contradicted, but ' yet well known to the most (or approved by many) are that ' called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second ' of Peter, and the second, and third of John.' So that in his time this epistle was well known, and received by many, though not by all.

This epistle is no where expressly cited by Irenæus, who wrote about the year of Christ 178. Whether he has at all referred to it, was considered formerly. And the reader is referred to what was then ^x said.

ⁱ εστι δε περιησαν οι απο γενος τε κυ-
ριου υιοι ιβδα, τε κατα σαρκα λεγομενε
αυτη αδελφει, ους εδηλατορευσαν, ως εκ

γενος οντας δαβιδ. Euseb. H. E. 1 :
cap. xx. ^u See before, p. 466.

^x See vol. II. p. 169, 170.

Clement of Alexandria flourished about the year 194. Eusebius giving an account of his works, says ' that ^y in his Institutions, Clement had given explications of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting those which are contradicted. I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles.'

That work, entitled Institutions, is lost. But we have in Latin a small treatise or fragment, called Adumbrations, supposed to be translated from the Institutions. Here are notes upon the epistle of Jude: in which is an observation concerning the modesty of the writer: ' that ^z Jude who wrote a catholic epistle, did not style himself at the beginning of it, brother of the Lord, though he was related to him, but *Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.*'

Which observation serves to show, whom Clement took to be the writer of this epistle. He supposed him to be one of them, who are called the Lord's brethren. Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. and an apostle. See Luke vi. 16. In that Adumbration follow brief remarks upon almost every verse of the epistle, except the last, or twenty-fifth verse.

It might be observed likewise, that in that place Clement declares his opinion concerning those called the Lord's brethren, that they were children of Joseph.

This epistle is also quoted expressly by Clement in two of his works, which remain entire, the Pedagogue or Instructor, and the Stromata, or Miscellanies.

In the Pedagogue he speaks to this purpose: *I will^a that ye should know, says Jude, that God having once saved the people out of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that believed not. And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he^b has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.* And afterwards, he emphatically describes the characters of those who are judged. *Woe unto them, for they have walked in the way of Cain, and run greedily in the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.*—Jude, ver. 5, 6, and 11.

^y — μη δε τας αντιλεγόμενας παρελθων την ιαδα λεγω και τας λοιπας καθολικας επισολας. H. E. l. 6. cap. 14. in. ^z Judas, qui catholicam scripsit epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph, extans valde religiosus, quum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, se ipsum fra-

trem ejus esse. Sed quid dixit? *Jacobus servus Jesu Christi, utpote Domini, frater autem Jacobi.* Adumbrat. in epist. Judæ. p. 1007. ed. Oxon.

^a Pæd. l. 3. p. 239.

^b — δεσμοις αιδιοις υπο ζορον αγριων [al. αγιων.] αγγελων τετηρηκεν.

In his Stromata Clement writes to this purpose: ‘Of these, and the like heretics, I think, Jude spoke prophetically in his epistle: *Likewise also these dreamers, and what follows to, And their mouth speaketh great swelling words:*’ that is, from ver. 8, to ver. 16. And that manner of quoting shows, that the epistle was in the hands of many people, or of all Christians in general, to be consulted by them.

I have been thus prolix in rehearsing these passages of Clement. For they appear to me a sufficient proof of the antiquity, and genuineness of this epistle: or that it was written by Jude, one of Christ’s twelve apostles. However I would also refer those of my readers, who are willing to look back, to Clement’s testimony to this, and to the other catholic epistles, as formerly observed in ^d his chapter.

In Tertullian, about the year 200, is but one quotation of this epistle. But it is very express. ‘Hence ^c it is, says he, that Enoch is quoted by the apostle Jude.’ Intending the 14th verse of the epistle, and making no doubt, that the writer was an apostle.

In Origen, about the year 230, are divers plain quotations of St. Jude’s epistle.

In his Commentaries upon St. Matthew, which we still have in Greek, having taken notice of the words of Matth. xiii. 55, 56.—beside other remarks, he says, ‘that ^f James is the same, whom Paul mentions in the epistle to the Galatians, as having been seen by him.’ Gal. i. 19. He also observes a passage, said to be in the Antiquities of Josephus, relating to the same James. Then he adds: ‘And ^e Jude wrote an epistle, of few lines indeed, but full of the powerful words of the heavenly grace, who at the beginning says: *Jude the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.*’ These passages are of use to show us, whom Origen took to be the writer of this epistle.

^c Ἐπι τετων, οἰμαι, και των ομοιων αιρεσεων προφητικως ιδαν εν τη επισολη ειρηκεναι. Ὁμοιως μεντοι και ἄλλοι ενυπνιαζομενοι ο γαρ υπαρ τη αληθεια επιβαλλουσιν εως, και το σωμα αυτων λαλει υπερβολα. Strom. l. 3. p. 431. A. B.

^d See vol. II. p. 227—230.

^e Eo accidit, quod Enoch apud Judam Apostolum testimonium perhibet. De Cultu Fem. l. 1. cap. 2. p. 172. A.

^f Ιακωβος δε εστιν ουτος, ου λεγει παυλος ειδειν εν τη προς γαλατας επισολη, ειπων κ. λ. Comment. in Matt. p. 223. C. Hent. p. 463. B. T. 3. Bened.

^B Και ιδας εγραψεν επισολην, ολιγοσυχον μεν, περιληρωμενην δε των της κρανιε χαριτος ερωμενων λογων, οτις εν τω προοιμιο ειρηκεν. Ιδας ιησους χριστος δευλος, αδελφος δε ιακωβου. Ibid. p. 223. D. al. p. 463. D.

Again, in the same Commentaries. ‘And ^h in the epistle of Jude: *To them that are beloved [or sanctified] in God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.*’

Once more, in the same Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew’s gospel, having quoted 1 Pet. i. 12. he says: ‘But ⁱ if any one receives also the epistle of Jude, let him consider what will follow from what is there said: *And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.*’

This epistle is also quoted in those works of Origen, which we now have only in a Latin translation. But forbearing to take farther notice of them here, I refer to the account formerly given at large of Origen’s testimony to the scriptures, in ^k the third volume of this work.

Upon the whole we perceive, that there were some in his time, who doubted of, or denied the authority of this epistle. But himself, as seems to me, admitted the genuineness and authority of it. For he quotes it expressly, without hesitation, as written by Jude, one of the Lord’s brethren, and brother of James, consequently apostle. And he says, that it was *full of the powerful words of the heavenly grace.*

I have not observed any notice taken of this epistle ^l in the writings of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about the year 248, and afterwards.

It is quoted by the anonymous author against the Novatian heretic, who wrote about the year 255. But he does not name St. Jude. His words are: ‘As ^m it is written: *Behold he cometh with ten thousands of his angels, to execute judgment upon all,* and what follows,’ that is, the 14th and 15th verses of the epistle.

Eusebius flourished about the year 315. I have already transcribed from him a ⁿ passage concerning the catholic epistles, and among them concerning St. Jude’s, which ought to be recollected here. There is another taken from him,

^h Και εν τη ιεδα επισολη, τοις εν θεω πατρι ηγαπημενοις και ιησω χριστω τετηρημενοις και κλητοις. Ib. p. 332. A. al. 607. C.

ⁱ ‘Ει δε και την ιεδα προσοιτο τις επισολην, ορατω τι επεται τω λογω δια το. Αγγελος τε μη τηρησαντας. κ. λ. Ib. p. 488. E. al. p. 814. C.

^k Ch. xxxviii. vol. II. p. 482,

483. ^l See vol. III. p. 175.

^m Sicut scriptum est: Ecce venit cum multis millibus nunciorum suorum, facere iudicium de omnibus, &c. Ap. Cyprian. in App. p. 20. Vid. et hujus operis vol. III. p. 191. ⁿ See p. 465. of this volume.

at the beginning of this article. And I shall here put down again a third passage transcribed above in the chapter of the epistle of St. James. Where having given an account of the martyrdom of St. James, he says: ' Thus far concerning James, who is said to be the writer of the first of the epistles, called catholic. But it ought to be observed, that it is spurious [that is contradicted] forasmuch as there are not many of the ancients, who have made mention of it: as neither of that called Jude's, which likewise is one of the epistles called catholic. However we know, that these also are commonly used [or publicly read] in most churches together with the rest.'

That passage needs no comment. This epistle was generally received in the time of Eusebius, though not by all.

Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, about 354, has quoted almost the whole of this epistle. He quotes it expressly, as written by the excellent apostle Jude, brother of the apostle James.

I need not particularly mention more authors. For after the time of Eusebius, seven catholic epistles were generally received by all Christians, Greeks and Latins. St. Jude's epistle therefore, as well as the rest, was received by Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Didymus of Alexandria, Jerom, Rufinus, the third council of Carthage, Augustine, Isidore of Pelusium, Cyril of Alexandria and others, whose names may be seen in the alphabetical table in the eleventh volume, under the article of seven catholic epistles. But it was not received by the Syrians.

And it may not be amiss to observe here, that we have found this epistle oftener quoted by writers, who lived before the time of Eusebius, than the epistle of St. James.

Of the authors above named there are two, of whom I would take some farther notice.

Epiphanius, about 368, in his heresy of the Gnostics, expressly 'cites' the catholic epistle of the apostle Jude, bro-

¹ p. 613.

² p. 503.

³ H. E. l. 2. c. 23. p. 66. C.

⁴ See vol. IV. p. 439, 441. vol. V. p. 268, 269.

⁵ Ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς. Ibid.

⁶ See vol. IV. p. 373.

⁷ Cum exhortetur Judas, gloriosus Apostolus, frater Jacobi Apostoli, &c. Ap. Bib. PP. T. IV. p. 227. C—E.

⁸ Ὡς καὶ περὶ τετῶν οἰμαι ἐκινήθη τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ Ἰούδᾳ, λέγων δὲ ἐν τῇ ὑπ' αὐτῆ γραφείῃ καθολικῆ ἐπιστολῇ. Ἰούδας δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ κυρίου λεγόμενος. H. 26. n. xi. p. 92. D.

⁹ ther

‘ther of James, and of the Lord, written by inspiration.’ This epistle is received by Jerom, as written by the apostle Jude, as may be recollected by those, who have read his chapter in the tenth volume of this work. Where, ^x in his letter to Paulinus, he says: ‘The apostles James, Peter, John, Jude, write seven epistles, of few words, but full of sense.’

And in the chapter of St. Jude, in his catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, he says: ‘Jude ^y brother of James, left a short epistle, which is one of the seven called catholic. But ^z because of a quotation from a book of Enoch, which is apocryphal, it is rejected by many. However at length it has obtained authority, and is reckoned among the sacred scriptures.’

There is some inaccuracy in Jerom’s manner of expression. For a book to be at the same time rejected by the most, or many, and to be reckoned among the sacred scriptures, are inconsistent. But it might have been properly said: ‘that whereas it had been rejected by many, because of a quotation from an apocryphal book; it had at length obtained authority, and was reckoned among the sacred scriptures.’

Many learned men ^a have carefully considered this difficulty. But as the ancients overcame it, and at length admitted the authority of this epistle, perhaps it might have been passed over, as a thing of no great consequence. Indeed, if there is a credible testimony to any book, or epistle, that it was written by an apostle, such a passage need not cause much hesitation. Origen has an observation in one of his Latin tracts. ‘St. Paul ^b says: as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses. This is not found in the public scriptures, but in a secret book; entitled Jannes and Jambres. For which reason some have been so daring, as to argue against that epistle of Timothy, though in vain.’ For certain such an objection could be of little weight against so well attested a writing, as St. Paul’s

^x Vol. V. p. 32.

^y p. 54. ^z Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in eâ assumitur testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur. Tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, et inter sanctas scripturas computatur. De V. I. cap. iv.

^a Beausobre and Lenfant in their Preface to the epistle of St. Jude. Dr. Benson in his Preface to this epistle, sect. i. and many others.

^b Item quod ait, sicut Jannes et Mambres resistunt Moysi, non invenitur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto, qui superscribitur Jannes et Mambres. Unde auct sunt quidam epistolam ad Timotheum repellere, quasi habentem in se textum alicujus secreti. Sed non potuerunt. In Matt. Tract. 35. p. 193. tom. II. Basil. Et in hoc opere vol. II. p. 513.

second epistle to Timothy. Nor ought it to weigh much in this case.

I might conclude here. But for the sake of some, shall add the two following observations.

1. It is not certain, that St. Jude cites any book. He only says, that *‘Enoch prophesied, saying, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints.’* Which ^d might be words of a prophecy, preserved by tradition, and inserted occasionally in divers writings. Nor is there good evidence, that in St. Jude’s time there was extant any book entitled Enoch, or Enoch’s Prophecies, though there was such a book in the hands of Christians in the second and third centuries. Moreover St. Jude might ascribe to Enoch what it is reasonable to believe was the import of his prophecy.

I transcribe here an observation, which I have met with: *‘St. Jude’* in his epistle, from the circumstances of the men and the manners of the people to whom Enoch preached, gathered what might be the sum of Enoch’s preaching, in this sort. *‘Behold the Lord cometh.’* How? As at the giving of the law, *with thousands of his angels, to give judgment against all men, and to rebuke all the ungodly among them of all their wicked deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their cruel speakings, which wicked sinners have spoken against him.* Upon which words the Greeks, not knowing the course of the Hebrews in their feigned speeches, imagined, that Enoch left a book of his preaching behind him.’

^c Verum quicquid et vetustis patribus et recentioribus quibusdam videatur, non potest ullo mihi pacto probari, Judam Apostolum ex libro scripto temporibus ejus extante, tritaque prophetia suum illud vaticinium deprompsisse. Nam primo id Judas non testatur. Qui simpliciter habet: *προεφητευσεν.* Prophetiam scriptis ab eo consignatam esse non dicit. J. H. Heidegger. Hist. Patr. Exercita. x. de Prophetia Enoch. § v. tom. I. p. 271.

At neque dicit Judas Henochum ita scripsisse: neque in libro, qui Henochi dicitur, prophetiæ hujus vel vola vel vestigium reperitur. Imo credibile est, Judæ ætate suppositum hunc librum ne quidem in

rerum natura fuisse, sed a putido et portentoso nescio quo Cabbalista Græcanico, vel ab hæretico, et sciolo aliquo Christum professo, sub Henochi nomine prosumum esse. Witsius in ep. Jud. num. xli. p. 502.

^d Alii denique verisimiliter arbitrantur, habuisse Judam ex nota et confessa eo tempore traditione: quam veram esse Spiritu magistro cognovit, dignamque judicavit, quam sua hac epistola consecraret æternitati. Cui sententiæ ego quoque hætenus acquiesco. Wits. ubi supr. num. xli. p. 503.

^e The General Review of the Holy Scriptures, p. 39. by Thomas Hayne, London, 1640. folio.

Grotius

Grotius ^f has somewhat to the like purpose.

And J. H. Heidegger ^g approved of this manner of interpretation. He supposes St. Jude to refer to the words of Moses. Gen. v. 22 and 24. *And Enoch walked with God.* Cocceius, also, as cited ^h by Witsius, argued not very differently, though Witsius did not fully approve of it.

I shall add a thought or two confirming that method of interpretation. St. Peter 2 ep. ii. 5, calls Noah, *a preacher of righteousness*: referring, I suppose, to the history in Genesis, though it is not expressly said there. And at ver. 7, 8. he says of Lot, *that he was vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: and that dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, he vexed his righteous soul from day to day, with their unlawful deeds.* These things are not expressly said in the book of Genesis. Nevertheless I make no question, but the apostle refers to what is there said, and deduceth these things thence, and not from an apocryphal, or any other writing whatever.

^f Solebant Rabbini et angelis, et magnis hominibus, tribuere ea verba, quæ verisimiliter dicere potuerunt. Tale illud quod de Enocho habebimus, et illud quod Heb. xii. 21. et Actor. vii. 26, &c. Grot. ad S. Jud. ver. 9.

Solebant, ut modo dixi, Rabbini et angelis, et viris magnis tribuere ea dicta, quæ dixisse poterant. Id. ad ver. 14.

Quod tunc Enoch aut dixit, aut dicere potuit, imminente diluvio, idem Judas ad ingentem illam interuersionem, quæ Judæis contumacibus imminebat, referre commode potuit. Id. ib. ad ver. 15.

^g Distinguendum accurate est inter fundamentum prophetiæ, et ejus formulam. Fundamentum quod attinet, est illud totam *εγγραφον*. — Alterum est, quod scriptum reperitur, *Enochum cum Deo ambulasse*. Ex eo Judæ proclive fuit conficere Enochum non pro se tantum quæsiuisse Deum, sed etiam alios proposito terrore ultimi judicii ab impietate et injustitia deterruisse: neque potuisse cum Deo ambulare, vel pii viri officio defungi, nisi judicium Domini venturi cum myriadibus angelorum hominibus suæ ætatis annuntiaret. Cum igitur

non potuerit non loqui de judicio Domini superventuro impiis, et ii, de quibus S. Judas loquitur, sint ultimi temporis, conficit, Enochum diu ante diluuium de iis prophetasse. — Porro quod formulam attinet prophetiæ, cujus fundamentum ita in Scripturis ostendimus, illam ex iis verbis contexit Judas, in quorum virtute eam latere per *συνεσιν πνευματικῶν intelligentiam spirituales*, probe scivit. Heid. ubi supra. num. x. p. 277.

^h Celeberrimus Coccejus conjectat Judam ex historia Mosaica collegisse. Nam, inquit, *prophetasse Henochum, satis constat ex sacris literis. Ambulavit enim cum Deo. Ergo cum Deo fecit, defectoribus se opposuit, verbis sine dubio in Spiritu Sancto dictis, et opere.* — Porro Judas talia Henochum prophetasse testatur, quæ optime et pathetice ei attribuuntur in *προφopαία*. Quæ quidem non male mihi animadversa videntur. Attamen non validum satis firmamentum continere, cui Judæ allegatio commode inædificetur. Nam Judas formulam prophetiæ Henochi adscribit, quæ ex Mose disci non potest. Wits. ib. num. xli. p. 502. et 503.

There

There is no necessity therefore to suppose, that St. Jude quoted a book called Enoch, or *Enoch's prophecies*.

2. Allowing St. Jude to quote such a book, he gives it no authority. It was no canonical book of the Jews. That is certain. Consequently, if there was such a book among them, it was apocryphal. But though it was so, there might be in it some right things. These St. Jude might take, without approving the whole of it. To this purpose ⁱ Jerom has argued largely, and very well, in his commentary upon the epistle to Titus, upon occasion of St. Paul's quotation of Epimenides. Tit. i. 12. And Cave says, 'It ^k is no more strange, that St. Jude should quote an apocryphal book, than that St. Paul should put down Jannes and Jambres for the two magicians of Pharaoh that opposed Moses. Which he must either derive from tradition, or fetch from some uncanonical author of those times, there being no mention of their names in Moses' relation of that matter.'

As I have said so much about this text, I am induced to take notice of some other like things in this epistle.

Says St. Jude, ver. 8, and 9. *Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, dared not [chose †† not] to bring against him a railing accusation, but said: the Lord rebuke thee.*

Origen, in the third century, supposed, that ^l St. Jude might refer to a book, called the Assumption, or Ascension of Moses, though it was not a book of authority. But indeed, there is no good reason to think, that there was any such book extant in the time of St. Jude. It is more probable, that it was forged afterwards. Some therefore have imagined, that St. Jude took this passage from some more valuable Hebrew author, of whom however we have no knowledge.

ⁱ Qui autem totum librum debere sequi eum qui libri parte usus sit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enoch, de quo Apostolus Judas in epistola sua testimonium posuit, inter Ecclesiæ scripturas recipere, et multa alia, quæ Apostolus Paulus de reconditis est loquutus. Possumus enim hoc argumento dicere: quia apud Athenienses ignotum Deum colere se dixit, quem illi in arâ annotaverant, debere Paulum et cetera, quæ in arâ scripta fuerant, sequi. et ea quæ Athenienses faciebant facere, quia cum Athenienti-

bus in culturâ ignoti Dei ex parte consenserat. Hieron. in Tit. T. IV. p. 421. ^k Life of St. Jude, in English, p. 205.

†† Michael autem *ἢ ἐτολμήσῃ*, non *sustinuit*, non induxit animum, impingere illi notam maledicti, id est, ultionem maledicendo sumere. Non quod timuerit diabolum, sed quod ex decoro omnia agere voluerit. Wits. Comm. in Ep. Judæ ver. 9. p. 480. ^l See vol. II. p. 483. a citation from Origen's books of Principles.

But

But to me it is apparent, that St. Jude refers to the vision in Zech. iii. 1—3. *And he showed me Joshua the high-priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord [that is, the angel of the Lord, before mentioned] said unto Satan: The Lord rebuke thee.* And what follows. The text of St. Jude is parallel with 2 Pet. ii. 11. *Whereas angels, which are greater in power, bring not railing accusation before the Lord.* Here also is a plain reference to the vision in Zechariah. The thing itself, and that circumstance, *before the Lord*, answering to the expression in Zechariah, *standing before the Lord, or before the angel of the Lord*, put it, as seems to me, beyond question.

Campegius Vitringa^m has some curious observations upon this text of St. Jude. Instead of *the body of Moses*, he would read *the body of Joshua*. That is ingenious. Nevertheless the common reading may be right, and may be explained very agreeably to the passage of Zechariah. For, according to an interpretation of that vision, formerlyⁿ taken from Ephrem the Syrian, Joshua, the high-priest, there denotes the Jewish people. Whom St. Jude might call *the body of Moses*, as Christians are called *the body of Christ* by St. Paul. 1 Cor. xii. 20, 25, 27. Eph. i. 23, and iv. 12, 16. Col. i. 18. The same interpretation was proposed some while ago, and well supported in a Dissertation of a learned writer, who was not acquainted with Ephrem. ††

^m Probabile nobis videtur, Judam scripsisse *περι τῆς ἰουδαϊκῆς σαρκός*, et hodiernam lectionem esse a manu imperitioris bibliographi, qui cum nihil in Scripturis memorabile legisset de *corpore Josuæ*, sed contra ex Historia Sacra intellexisset, quid circa *corpus Mosis* singulare accidisset, nec interea de loco Zachariæ cogitaret, Josuæ nomen in illud Mosis commutavit. Sed quam certum est, Judam his verbis respexisse locum illum Zachariæ, tam quoque certum est, non scripsisse, Michaëlem disputasse cum Diabolo de *corpore Mosis*.—Imo ex eadem ratione liquidissime patet, Judam, quæ hic habet de *corpore Mosis*, non

desumpsisse ex apocrypho aliquo Judaici ingenii, in quo hanc fabulam offendisset. Respexit Judas, ut jam dixi, ad locum Zachariæ, et inde recte evicit, Satanæ, potentissimi angeli, ab ipso principe angelorum Michaële in judicio in ipsum proferendo magnam habitam esse rationem: ac proin multo minus *potestates et glorias*, hoc est, potentissimos principes, licet malos, nobisque adversos, a nobis esse vilipendendos. Campeg. Vitring. *Observ. Sacr.* l. 4. cap. ix. n. 35. p. 1003, 1004.

ⁿ See vol. IV. p. 435.

†† See *Bib. Raisonnée.* tom. XXXI. P. II. art. i. p. 243—269.

Once more. St. Jude says, ver. 6. *And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.* To which there is a parallel place in 2 Pet. ii. 4. The learned writer, above quoted, observes, that ° neither here have these apostles a reference to any Jewish apocryphal book: but to some text of sacred scripture, or of the Old Testament. But he then deferred showing the place. Nor do I know, that these texts ever came in his way afterwards. I wish they had. For I also am much inclined to believe, that in all these places the apostles referred to passages of the Old Testament.

This may assist us in forming a judgment concerning the opinion ^p of the bishop of London, that St. Jude in his epistle, and St. Peter in the second chapter of his second epistle, copied, or imitated some Hebrew writer, who had left behind him a description of the false prophets of his own, or former times. Which indeed is ingenious, and plausible. Nevertheless I think, such conjectures ought not to be presently received as certain. St. Peter, and St. Jude, and all the Christians in general of their time, had before them the scriptures of the Old Testament. Many of the cases referred to by these apostles are evidently found there, such as Cain, Korah, Balaam, the people of Sodom. And why should not the other instances be taken thence likewise? If they are, I presume, the argument would be more forcible with all, than otherwise it would have been. Nor does the resemblance of style in St. Peter and Jude afford a conclusive argument, that they both borrowed from some one Jewish author. The similitude of the subject might produce a resemblance of style. The design of St. Peter and St. Jude was to condemn some loose and erroneous Christians, and to caution others against them. When speaking of the same sort of persons, their style, and figures of speech, would have a great agreement. And certainly I think, that the apostles needed not any other assistance in confuting and exposing corrupt Christians, than their own inspiration, and an acquaintance with the ancient scriptures of the Jewish church.

III. We are now to consider to whom this epistle was sent.

° Quid Petrus et Judas per alterum illud exemplum *angelorum*, qui *preceperunt, principio et domicilio suo derelicto*, intenderint, et ad quam partem Historiæ Sacræ respexerint, (ad Historiam enim Sacram respexisse certum est) nunc præter-

mitto, alia forsitan occasione commodiore indicandum. Id. ib. num. 35.

^p See his Dissertation concerning the authority of the second epistle of St. Peter. And here in this volume, p. 565.

Witsius

Witsius says, it ^a was written to all Christians every where, but especially to Christians converted from Judaism: forasmuch as St. Jude refers to Jewish writings and traditions. Moreover he wrote to the same Christians, to whom Peter wrote, who were such as had been Jews. To the like purpose ^r Estius.

Hammond ^s says, the epistle was written to the Jews scattered abroad, who believed the christian religion, to secure them against the errors of the gnostics.

Dr. Benson ^t thinks, that St. Jude wrote to Jewish Christians, as his brother James had done, and most probably, to the Jews of the western dispersion.

Let us now observe the inscription of the epistle in the writer's own words. *Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called* ver. 1. And ver. 3. *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation: it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered unto the saints.*

These expressions, as seems to me, lead us to think, that the epistle was designed for the use of all in general, who had embraced the christian religion. And if St. Jude writes to the same people, to whom St. Peter wrote, that is a farther argument for this supposition. For, that St. Peter wrote to all Christians in general, in the countries named at the beginning of his first epistle, was shown ^u formerly.

IV. We now come to the last point, the time of writing this epistle. Here I shall observe the opinions of several.

^a Epistola hæc Christianis quidem universim, et potissimum Hebræis scripta est. — In quibus scripta est epistola, illis designantur epithetis, quæ sine Gentium distinctione Christianis omnibus competunt: quamvis credibile sit, potissimum eos spectari, qui ex Israelitis in Christo crediderant. Iis enim sæpiusculè argumentis utitur, quæ ex Judæorum libris, vel etiam traditionibus, desumpta sunt. Videnturque prorsus iidem esse cum illis, quos Petrus posteriore sua epistola compellat. Wits. Comment. in ep. Jud. § viii. p. 460.

^r Porro verisimile est, ad eosdem scriptam esse, ad quos scripsit B. Petrus, id est, ad eos præcipue,

qui ex circumcissione crediderant. — Id ipsum indicant illa verba versus 5. *Commonere autem vos volo, scientes semel omnia.* Nam id aptissime Judæis dicitur, a prima ætate imbutis cognitione historiæ sacræ. Est. Argum. in Ep. Jud.

^s Videtur autem, sicut epistolæ Jacobi et Petri, scripta fuisse ad Judæos dispersionis, Christianam Religionem amplexos, ut confirmarentur contra pravæ doctrinæ Gnosticorum, qui tunc temporis exorti sunt. Hammond. Admonit. in ep. Judæ. Ex versione Clerici.

^t Preface to this ep. sect. ii. p. 446. See also his paraphrase of ver. 1. ^u See before, p. 568, &c.

Dr.

Dr. Benson's opinion is, 'that * this epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, a few weeks, or months, after the second epistle of St. Peter: forasmuch as the state of things, as represented in both these epistles, is very much the same.'

Mill's conjecture is, that ^y this epistle was written about the year of Christ 90. But as he says, there are no clear evidences of the exact time when it was written.

Dodwell, ^z whom Cave ^z follows, argues, that this epistle was written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year 71, or 72. But the reasonings of those learned men are far from being conclusive.

Lenfant and Beausobre were of opinion, that ^v this epistle may be placed with great probability between the year 70, and the year 75.

Witfius thinks it ^c was written in this apostle's old age, and in the last age of the apostles of Christ, and when few, or perhaps none of them, were living, besides St. John.

To the like purpose ^d Estius.

Œcumenius in his note upon ver. 17, 18, of this epistle. *Remember the words, which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: that they told you, there should be mockers in the last time.*—'Meaning,' says he, 'by ^e Peter in his second epistle, and by Paul in almost all his epistles. Hence it is evident, that he wrote late, after the decease of the apostles.'

If St. Jude referred here to St. Peter's second epistle, it must be allowed, that he had seen it, and wrote after St. Peter: which indeed is the opinion of many. So Œcumenius appears to have thought. So also says ^f Estius. Dr Benson, expresseth

* Preface to the epistle of St. Jude. sect. iii. p. 448. ^y Fortasse quidem circa annum vulgaris ætæ æc. Verum de ipso præciso tempore nihil habemus explorate. Proleg. num. 147.

^z Diff. Iren. i. num. xiv. ^a H. L. in S. Juda.

^b On ne se trompera pas en plaçant cette epître entre les années 70. et 75. de l'ère Chrétienne. Pref. sur l'epître de S. Jude.

^c Tempus scripturæ hujus epistolæ, uti ad postremam Apostolorum ætatem referendum est, quod colligitur ex ver. 17. ita ad extremam quoque Judæ senectutem

pertinet, &c. Witf. in Jud. num. ix.

^d Cæterum Apostolis fuit posterior, non omnibus, sed plerisque jam ante vitâ defunctis: ut Petro, et Paulo, et Jacobo. Nam Joannes adhuc supererat. Est. ad Jud. ver. 17.

^e ———υπο των αποστολων των υπο πετρου εν τη δευτερα επισολη, και υπο παυλου εν παση σχεδον επισολη. Έκ τευ δε δηλον, οτι εσχατον μετα το παρελθειν της αποστολης, εγραφε ταυτα. Œcum. T. II. p. 633. D.

^f Convenit argumentum hujus epistolæ cum iis, quæ B. Petrus scribit in secunda epistola, præsertim

expresseth himself after this manner: ' that ^s it seems highly
' probable, that St. Jude had seen and read the second epistle
' of St. Peter. For there are found in St. Jude several similar
' passages, not only to those in the second chapter of the second
of St. Peter, but also in the other parts of that epistle.

Nevertheless I must still say, this appears to me doubtful.
For it seems very unlikely, that St. Jude should write so
similar an epistle, if he had seen St. Peter's. In that case St.
Jude would not have thought it needful for him to write at
all. If he had formed a design of writing, and had met with
an epistle of one of the apostles, very suitable to his own
thoughts and intentions, I think, he would have forborne to
write.

Indeed the great agreement in subject and design between
these two epistles affords a strong argument, that they were
written about the same time. As therefore I have placed the
second epistle of St. Peter in the year 64, I am induced to
place this epistle of St. Jude in the same year, or soon after,
in 65, or 66. For there was exactly the same state of things
in the christian church, or in some part of it, when both these
epistles were written.

I do not insist upon the expression, *in the last time*, which
is in ver. 18. Some would understand thereby the last period
of the Jewish state and constitution, immediately preceding
the destruction of Jerusalem. But I cannot interpret the
phrase, *the last time*, in Jude, or *the last days*, in St. Peter iii.
3. in so limited a sense. I think, that thereby must be meant
the days of the Messiah, or the late ages of the world.

However, undoubtedly, that exhortation, ver. 17 and 18.
*But, beloved, remember ye the words, which were spoken before by
the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ: that they told you, there
should be mockers in the last time:* do imply, as Witsius and
Estius observe, that it was then the last age of the apostles:
when several of them had left the world, and few of them
were still surviving. Which well suits the date, before men-
tioned, the year 64, or 65, or 66.

When St. Jude adviseth the Christians to recollect, *and be
mindful of the words of the apostles of Christ*, he may intend

capite 2. et initio tertii. Nam quæ
hic scribuntur, adeo cum illis simi-
lia sunt, et hujus author S. Judas
eam non solum legisse videatur, ve-
rum etiam, partim contrahendo,

partim extendendo, partim iisdem
vocibus et sententiis utendo, imita-
tus fuisset. Est. argum. Vid. eund.
ad ver. epistolæ 17. ^s Preface
to St. Jude, sect. iii.

their

their preaching, which these Christians had heard, or the writings of apostles, which they had read, and had in their hands. Such discourses of St. Paul may be seen recorded in Acts xx. 29, 30. And he writes to the like purpose 1 Tim. iv. 1—5. and 2 Tim. iii. and iv. They who suppose, that St. Jude had seen and read the second epistle of St. Peter, must think, that he refers also to 2 Pet. ch. iii. 1—5.

There are some other expressions in this epistle, which may deserve to be here taken notice of by us. Ver. 3. *It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that you should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.* and ver. 5. *I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this.* These expressions seem to imply, that now some considerable time had passed, since the whole scheme of the christian doctrine had been published to the world, and since the persons, to whom the apostle is writing, were first instructed in it.

Upon the whole, as before said, this epistle might be written in the year of Christ 64, or 65, or 66.

C H A P XXII.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

- I. *Its Genuineness shown from Testimony.* II. *From internal Characters.*
III. *Its Time.*

I. WE are now come to the last book of the New Testament, the Revelation: about which there have been different sentiments among Christians, many receiving it as the writing of John, the apostle and evangelist, others ascribing it to John a presbyter, others to Cerinthus, and some rejecting it, without knowing to whom it should be ascribed.

I shall therefore here rehearse the testimony of ancient Christians, as it ariseth in several ages.

It is probable, that Hermas had read the book of the Revelation, and imitated it. He has many things resembling it, vol. II. p. 61—64. It is referred to by the martyrs at Lyons, p. 152. There is reason to think, it was received by Papias, p. 108—114. Justin Martyr, about the year 140,

was acquainted with this book, and received it, as written by the apostle John. For in his dialogue with Trypho he expressly says: ‘And a man from among us, by name John, one of the apostles of Christ, in the revelation made to him, has prophesied, that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem, and after that shall be the general, and, in a word, the eternal resurrection and judgment of all together,’ p. 126. To this very passage we suppose Eusebius to refer in his ecclesiastical history, when giving an account of Justin’s works, he observes to this purpose: ‘he also mentions the Revelation of John, expressly calling it the apostle’s.’ See the same page, note (a). Among the works of Melito, bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches of Asia, about the year 177, Eusebius mentions one, entitled, ‘Of the Revelation of John,’ p. 147. It is very probable, that Melito ascribed this book to the apostle of that name, and esteemed it a book of canonical authority. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, about 178, who in his younger days was acquainted with Polycarp, often quotes this book, ‘as the Revelation of John, the disciple of the Lord,’ p. 169. And in one place he says: ‘It was seen not long ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian.’ Ibid. And see p. 155.

Theophilus was bishop of Antioch about 181. Eusebius speaking of a work of his against the heresy of Hermogenes, says, ‘he therein made use of testimonies, or quoted passages, from John’s Apocalypse,’ vol. II. p. 190. The book of the Revelation is several times quoted by Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about 194, and once in this manner: ‘Such an one, though here on earth he is not honoured with the first seat, shall sit upon the four and twenty thrones judging the people, as John says in the Revelation,’ p. 229. Tertullian, about the year 200, often quotes the Revelation, and supposeth it to have been written by St. John, the same who wrote the first epistle of John, universally received, p. 276, 277. Again; ‘the apostle John in the Apocalypse describes a sharp two-edged sword coming out of the mouth of God,’ p. 277. He also says, ‘We have churches, that are disciples of John. For though Marcion rejects the Revelation, the succession of bishops, traced to the original, will assure us, that John is the author:’ *ibid.* by John, undoubtedly, meaning the apostle.

From Eusebius we learn, that Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists about the year 211, quoted the Revelation,

lation, p. 371. By Caius, about the year 212, it was ascribed to Cerinthus, p. 378, 379. It was received by Hippolytus, about the year 220, p. 412, and by Origen about 230, p. 466—468. It is often quoted by him. He seems not to have had any doubt about its genuineness. In his commentary upon St. John's gospel, he speaks of it in this manner: 'Therefore John, the son of Zebedee, says in the Revelation, p. 483. See also p. 483, 484, and 543.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, about the year 247, or somewhat later, wrote a book against the Millenarians, in which he allows the Revelation to be written by John, a holy and divinely inspired man. But he says, 'he cannot easily grant him to be the apostle, the son of Zebedee, whose is the gospel according to John, and the catholic epistle,' vol. III. p. 105. He rather thinks it may be the work of John, an elder, who also lived at Ephesus, in Asia, as well as the apostle, p. 107. See likewise p. 128, 129, 131. Moreover, it appears from a conference, which Dionysius had with some Millenarians, that the Revelation was about the year 240, and before, received by Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, and by many others in that country, p. 68, 103, 104, and that it was in great reputation, p. 128, 129. It was received by Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about 248, and by the church of Rome in his time, p. 175, 176, and by divers Latin authors, whose history is written in the third volume of this work. As may be seen in the alphabetical Table of principal matters, in the article of the Revelation.

The Revelation was received by Novatus, and his followers, p. 245, 246, and by divers other authors, whose history is written in that volume.

It is also probable, that it was received by the Manichees, p. 507.

It was received by Lactantius, vol. IV. p. 80, and by the Donatists, p. 102, by the latter Arnobius, about 460, p. 24, and by the Arians, p. 117.

In the time of Eusebius, in the former part of the fourth century, it was not received by all. And therefore it is reckoned by him among contradicted books, vol. IV. p. 227. Nevertheless it was generally received, p. 234 and 255. Eusebius himself seems to have hesitated about it. For he says, 'It is likely, that the Revelation was seen by John the elder, if not by John the apostle,' p. 256. It may be reckoned probable, that the critical argument of Dionysius, of

Alexandria, was of great weight with him, and others of that time. See p. 257, 258. The Revelation was received by Athanasius, p. 283—286, and by Epiphanius, p. 313—316. But we also learn from him, that it was not received by all in his time, p. 316, 317. It is not in the catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem, about 348, and seems, not to have been received by him, p. 300—302. It is also wanting in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, about 363, p. 309. Nevertheless I do not think, it can be thence concluded, that this book was rejected by the bishops of that council. Their design seems to have been to mention by name those books only, which should be publicly read. And they might be of opinion, that upon account of its obscurity, it should not be publicly read, though it was of sacred authority. And some may be of opinion, that this observation should likewise be applied to Cyril's catalogue just taken notice of.

The Revelation is not in Gregory Nazianzen's catalogue, vol. IV. p. 408. Nevertheless it seems to have been received by him, p. 409. It is in the catalogue of Amphilochius. But he says, it was not received by all, p. 414. It is also omitted in Ebedjesu's catalogue of the books of scripture, received by the Syrians, p. 439, 440; nor is it in the ancient Syriac version, p. 441.

It was received by Jerom, vol. V. p. 32, 33, 41, 44. But he says, it was rejected by the Greek Christians, p. 50. It was received by Rufin, p. 76, by the third council of Carthage in 397, p. 79, and by Augustine, p. 86, 104. But it was not received by all in his time, p. 102. It is never quoted by Chrysostom, and, probably, was not received by him, p. 137. It is in the catalogue of Dionysius, called the Arcopagite, about 490, p. 247. It is in the Alexandrian manuscript, p. 254—256. It was received by Sulpicius Severus, about 401, p. 164, and by J. Damascenus, p. 316, and by Œcumenius, p. 325, and by many other authors, whose history is written in the fifth volume. Andrew, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century, p. 250, and Arethas, bishop of the same place in the sixth century, wrote commentaries upon it, p. 274. But it was not received by Severian, bishop of Gabala, p. 161; nor, as it seems, by Theodoret, p. 195, 196.

Upon the whole it appears, that this book has been generally received in all ages: though some have doubted of it, or rejected it, particularly, the Syrians, and some other
Christians

Christians in the east. However, for more particulars, see St. John, and the Revelation, in the alphabetical table, which is in the eleventh volume of this work.

It may not be improper for me here to remind my readers of the sentiments of divers learned moderns, concerning this book, which were put together in vol. III. p. 126, 131, after having largely represented the criticisms of Caius, and Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century upon the style of this book, and of the other writings ascribed to St. John. Where also is proposed this observation, p. 131: 'It may be questioned, whether their exceptions, founded in the difference of style, and such like things, or any other criticisms whatever, can be sufficient to create a doubt concerning the author of this book; which was owned for a writing of John, the apostle and evangelist, before the times of Dionysius and Caius, and, so far as we know, before the most early of those, who disputed its genuineness.'

II. Having thus represented the external evidence of the genuineness of the book of the Revelation, or of its being written by St. John, I should proceed to consider the internal evidence. But I need not enlarge here, because the objections taken from the style, and some other particulars, were stated, and considered, in the third volume, in the article of Dionysius, above-named, bishop of Alexandria.

I now intend therefore only to take notice of a few things, of principal note, which learned men insist upon, as arguments, that the Revelation has the same author with the gospel, and epistles, that go under the name of the apostle and evangelist John.

1. Ch. i. ver. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things, which must shortly come to pass. And he sent, and signified it by his angel, unto his servant John.*

Hence it is argued, that ^a John styles himself the *servant of Christ*, in a sense not common to all believers, but peculiar to those, who are especially employed by him. So Paul, and

^a — sed esse se *inter notabiles Christi Jesu ministros*, quos ad Ecclesiam suam docendam, regendam, et curandam adhibebat.—Hoc sensu Moses, David, Jesaias, et Prophe-
tæ omnes sub œconomia veteri, et Paulus, et alii Apostoli sub œconomia nova vocantur servi Dei. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. 1.

other apostles, call themselves *servants of God, and of Christ*. Particularly Rom. i. 1. *Paul a servant of Jesus Christ*. James i. 1. *James a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ*. 2 Pet. i. 1. *Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ*. Jude v. 1. *Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ*. So Moses is called *the servant of God*. Numb. xii. 7. and Heb. iii. 2. And in like manner divers of the prophets. And in this very book, ch. x. 7. is the expression: *as he has declared unto his servants the prophets*.

This observation may be of some weight for showing, that the writer is an apostle. But it is not decisive. And in the same verse, whence this argument is taken, the phrase is used in its general sense. *Which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants*.

2. Ver. 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw*.

Some suppose, the writer herein to refer to the written gospel of St. John, and to say, that he had already borne testimony concerning the word of God, and Jesus Christ. But, as formerly ^b observed, these words may be understood of this very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer says here very properly, at the beginning, and by way of preface, that he had performed his office in this book, having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, which he had received from Jesus Christ.

For certain, if these words did clearly refer to a written gospel, they would be decisive. But ^c they are allowed to be ambiguous, and other senses have been given of them. By some they have been understood to contain a declaration, that the writer had already borne witness to Jesus Christ before magistrates. Moreover, I think, that if St. John had intended to manifest himself in this introduction, he would

^b See vol. III. p. 118.

^c Ver. 2. *Qui testatus est sermonem Dei, et testimonium J. C. et quæ vidit.*] Duplici modo hæc accipi possunt, vel Joannem confessionem veritatis solennem coram tribunali Præfecti Asiæ Romani edidisse, ob quam ipse missus fuerit in exilium: vel ipsum Evangelio a se edito solenne de Christo, ejusque dictis et gestis edidisse testimonium. Priore sensu vox μαρτυρειν scriptoribus Græcis posterioris temporis recep-

tissima est, et manifeste etiam sumitur a Paulo, 1 Tim. vi. 13—Veni igitur ultro in illam sententiam, quæ hæc Joannis verba refert ad Evangelium non prædicatum tantum a Joanne solenniter, sed et scriptis confirmatum.—Quæ si sane sit hujus loci interpretatio, certò simul testabitur de illius auctore, Joanne Apostolo, ac proinde de libri hujus divinitate, et summa auctoritate. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2.

have more plainly characterized himself in several parts of this book, than he has done.

This observation therefore appears to me to be of small moment for determining, who the writer is.

3. Farther, it is argued, in favour of the genuineness of this book, 'that there are in it many instances of conformity, both of sentiment and expression, between the Revelation and the uncontested writings of St. John.'

Divers such coincidences, or instances of agreement, were taken notice of formerly, and remarks were made upon them, vol. III. p. 121—125. That which is at p. 124, appears to me, as striking, as any. I shall therefore enlarge upon it here. Our Saviour says to his disciples John xvi. 33. *Be of good cheer. I have overcome the world.* Christian firmness under trials is several times represented by *overcoming*, or *overcoming the world*, or *overcoming the wicked one*, in St. John's first epistle, ch. ii. 13, 14. iv. 4. v. 4, 5. And it is language peculiar to St. John, being in no other books of the New Testament. And our Lord says Rev. iii. 21. *To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.* Compare ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26. iii. 5, 12, 21. and xxi. 7.

III. Concerning the time of writing this book, I need not now say much, having before shown, in ^a the history of St. John, that it is the general testimony of ancient authors, that St. John was banished into Patmos, in the time of Domitian, in the latter part of his reign, and restored by his successor Nerva. But the book could not be published, till after St. John's release, and return to Ephesus in Asia.

As Domitian died in 96, and his persecution did not commence, till near the end of his reign, the Revelation seems to be fitly dated in the year 95, or 96.

Mill ^c placeth the Revelation in the year of Christ 96, and the last year of the emperor Domitian. At first, he supposed, that

^d See before, p. 174—186.

^e Eodem ordine septem istæ Asiæ civitates enumerantur, quo ex Patmo insulâ adiri debebant. Wetsten. in Apoc. i. 11. tom. II. p. 750.

^f Paucis post conscriptas has epistolas annis, exorta est Christianorum persecutio sub Domitiano.

---In insulâ vero Patmo, in quam relegatus erat Joannes, Domitiani ultimo, seu anno æræ vulgaris xcvi. —facta est ipsi Revelatio: quam universam postea expresso Christi mandato scriptis consignavit. Scriptamque Domini ejusdem jussu misit ad septem ecclesias Asiæ. Unde manifestum

that the Revelation was written in Patmos. But afterwards he altered his mind, and thought, it was not written until after his return to Ephesus from Patmos. He builds upon the words of Rev. i. 9. If so, I apprehend, it might not be published before the year 97, or, at the soonest, near the end of the year 96.

Basnage^b placeth the Revelation in the year of Christ 96.

Le Clercⁱ likewise, who readily admits the genuineness of this book, speaks of it at the same year.

Mr. Lowman* supposes, St. John to have had his visions in the isle of Patmos in the year 95.

But Mr. Wetstein^k favours the opinion of those, who have argued, that the Revelation was written before the Jewish war. He moreover says, that^l if the Revelation was written before that war, it is likely, that the events of that

manifestum est, visionem non modo Joanni factam fuisse, sed etiam ab eo literis traditam in insula Patmo. — Scriptam fuisse ex prædictis constat anno vulgaris æræ xcvi. seu Domitiani xvi. et quidem ad finem ejusdem imperii, inquit Irenæus, seu tempore æstivo æræ vulg. xcvi. Proleg. num. 157.

^g Subjiciemus hic verba Millii, quæ in emendandis posuerat: *Hic sententiam, inquit, mutavimus. Constat enim ex ipsis Joannis verbis Apoc. i. 9. eum post reditum ad Ephesum hunc librum scripsisse.* Kuster. in notis num. 157. Proleg. p. 19.

^h Vid. ann. 96. num. xii.

ⁱ At nemo de auctoritate ejus dubitârat ante Caium, Romanum Presbyterum, qui circa finem ii. seculi vixit. Cum Cataphryges eo libro abuterentur—fœtum hunc esse Apostoli negare, atque a Cerintho, præscripto ejus nomine, editum dicere maluit. At Justinus, et Irenæus, eo antiquiores, et qui cum Joannis discipulis versati erant, Apostolo hoc opus tribuerunt. Similiter, cum medio seculo iii. Nepos in Ægypto Episcopus, Chiliastrarum deliria eodem libro tueretur, Dionysius Alexandrinus eadem de causâ Joanni eum abjudicavit. Sed aliter senserant, quicumque

Apocalypseos antea mentionem fecerant, excepto Caio, quos sequuti etiam posterius omnes ad unum. — Multo fide dignior Irenæus, qui passim hunc librum, quasi Joannis Apostoli, ad testimonium vocat, et diserte. lib. v. c. 30. *Neque enim ante multum tempus visa est, sed ferme nostra ætate, sub finem imperii Domitiani.* Quæ ejus verba Græca habet Eusebius. l. 5. c. 8. J. Cleric. H. E. An. 96. num. v. * See the

scheme and order of the prophecies in the book of the Revelation, which is prefixed to his paraphrase.

^k Nos quidem, omnibus expensis, cum iis facimus, qui statuunt, Apocalypsin ante bellum Judaicum fuisse scriptum. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 746. m.

^l Quæstio est non levis momenti, cum vera Apocalypseos interpretatio maximam partem inde pendeat. Si enim scripta est ante bellum Judaicum, et bella civilia in Italia; nullo modo probabile est, tantam rerum conversionem omnino præteriri atque negligi potuisse. Sin autem post illos motus composita scripta est, probabilior erit eorum sententia, qui eventus in Apocalypsi prædictos in seculorum sequentium historia quærendos existimant. Id. ib.

time should be foretold in it. To which I answer, that^m though some interpreters have applied some things in this book to those times, I cannot say, whether they have done it rightly, or not, because I do not understand the Revelation. But to me it seems, that though this book was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, there was no necessity, that it should be foretold here: because our blessed Lord had in his own preaching at divers times spoken very plainly, and intelligibly, concerning the calamities coming upon the Jewish people in general, and the city and temple of Jerusalem, in particular. And his plain predictions, and symbolical prefigurations of those events, were recorded by no less than three historians and evangelists, before the war in Judea broke out.

Grotius, who, asⁿ formerly seen, placeth this book in the reign of Claudius, was of opinion, that^o the visions of this book were seen at several times, and afterwards joined together in one book: in like manner, as the visions and prophecies of some of the prophets of the Old Testament.

Concerning this opinion it is not proper for me to dispute: though there appears not any foundation for it in the book itself, as^p Vitringa has observed. But that the book of the
Revelation,

^m Lightfootus in genere censet, Apocalypsin hanc editam esse ante novissimum Hierosolymorum excidium. Et certe si Joannes hanc Revelationem vere a Christo Jesu accepisset sub Claudio, magna cum specie negari non posset doctissimis his viris, quædam *sigillorum visa* ad fata judaismi non adeo incommode applicari posse. Sed obstant graves rationes, quæ nos in hanc sententiam ire vetant. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2. p. 7. Vid. et in cap. vi. ver. 1, 2. p. 101—105.

ⁿ See before, p. 176.

^o *Et mitte septem ecclesiis.* Nempe hujus visi descriptionem. Neque ad cætera hujus libri pertinet. Diversa visa diversis temporibus Joanni obtigere, ut et Prophetis aliis. Grot. ad Apoc. cap. i. 11.

Post absolutum Visum, monita salutaria continens, ad septem episcopos et ecclesias.—Sequuntur Visa alia, quæ diversis temporibus Apostolo obtigere, et postea in unum

volumen redacta sunt: quod et in prophetiis aliis evenit, sæpe etiam non annotato temporis discrimine, sed dato intelligi ex iis quæ loco quoque continentur. Pertinent autem hæc Visa ad res Judæorum usque ad finem capitis undecimi: deinde ad res Romanorum, usque ad finem capitis vicesimi: deinde ad statum florentissimum Ecclesiæ Christianæ ad finem usque, &c. Ejusdem Annot. ad cap. iv. init. Vid. et ejus Commentatio ad loca quæd. N. T. &c. citat. in hujus Supplementi volumine primo, p. 176.

^p Et vero Grotius et Hammondus ipsi causam suam produnt, ubi posteriorem Apocalypseos partem sub Vespasiano Ephesi scriptam concedunt. Quis enim illos docuit, Visa Joannis in Apocalypsi hoc modo distinguere, et diversa illis et tam longe distita assignare tam tempora quam loca? Nullum indicium, nulla significatio illius rei in ipsa

Revelation, in its present form, sent as an epistle to the seven churches of Asia, ch. i. ver. 4. was not composed, and published before the reign of Domitian, appears to me very probable from the general, and almost universally concurring testimony of the ancients, and from some things in the book itself.

Now therefore I shall transcribe ^a a part of Lenfant's and Beaufobre's preface to the Revelation, at the same time referring to Vitringa ^r in the margin, who has many like thoughts.

Having

ipsa Apocalypsi exstat. Contra dicitur Joannes, quæ vidit, *vidisse in insula Patmo.* Vitr. ib. p. 11, 12.

^a Preface sur l' Apoc. de S. Jean. p. 613, 614.

^r Primo dubium non est, quin si testimoniis Veterum res conficienda sit: communis antiquæ Ecclesiæ traditio, firmata auctoritate Irenæi, hic multum præponderet testimonio Epiphani. Irenæus enim temporibus Joannis Apostoli propior fuit, tanquam qui eodem adhuc seculo cum Joanne vixerit, et traditionem nobis retulit suo ætate communem, et omnibus notissimam.

Sed quod plus etiam momenti causæ nostræ addit: non nititur nostra hæc sententia de tempore scriptæ Apocalypsis sola traditione Veterum. Potest illa ex ipso hoc libro, etiam absque ulla traditione veteris Ecclesiæ demonstrari. Quare *secundo* observari velim, ex ipsa Apocalypsi evidentissimas adduci posse probationes, ex quibus evincatur, hunc librum non utique sub Claudio, sed omnino post Claudii et Neronis tempora, quin imo sub Domitiano demum in lucem editum esse. — Quo tempore scripta est Apocalypsis, ecclesiæ jam per Asiam inferiorem in celeberrimis locis non tantum erant fundatæ et constabilitæ, sed jamdudum fundatæ et stabilitæ fuisse supponuntur. Redarguuntur enim pleræque a Domino gravium vitiorum et criminum, quæ tractu longioris temporis ecclesias illas obreperant. Ephesina

jam reliquerat primam suam charitatem. Sardicensis dicebatur, nomine vivere, sed vere mortua esse. Laodicenam magnus occupaverat tepor, eratque ærumnosa et miserabilis. Hæc vero quam belle conveniunt temporibus Claudii! Ex ecclesiis enim septem, quæ hic memorantur, in Actibus Apostolorum, aliarum mentio non est, quum Ephesinæ et Laodicenæ. Ephesina autem a Paulo Apostolo demum fundata est, secundum Annales Cestriensis, anno Claudii Imperatoris extremo. — Liqueat ex iisdem epistolis Joannis, illo tempore, quo edita est Apocalypsis, Gnosticorum hæreses, quæ dicuntur, in florentissimis Asiæ ecclesiis altas jam egisse radices. Ad illas enim carnalium hominum doctrinas sub mysticis nominibus Bileamitarum et Nicolaitarum in variis locis alluditur. Illam hæresim prævidebat Petrus in Ecclesia brevi exorituram, quando epistolam suam scribebat posteriorem, non longe ante Hierosolymorum excidium. Judas, qui epistolam suam edidit, ut probabilis ratio suadet, post Hierosolymorum illud excidium, hoc semen in prima vidit herba. Sed quo tempore scripta est Apocalypsis non nata tantum, sed confirmata erat hæc hæresis, et præcipuas Asiæ ecclesias inquinaverat. Quare si Judas Apostolus epistolam suam scripsit sub Vespasiano: quis neget, Apocalypsin editam esse sub Domitiano? In ipsis illis Epistolis passim supponuntur afflictiones graviores, quas Ecclesia Christi religionis

suæ

Having quoted Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and divers other ancients, placing St. John's banishment in Patmos in the latter part of the reign of Domitian, and saying, that he there saw the Revelation, they say: 'To these uncontestible witnesses it is needless to add a long list of others, of all ages, and of the same sentiment: to whom the authority of Epiphanius is by no means comparable.' And then they go on: 'We must add to so constant a tradition other reasons, which farther show, that the Revelation was not written, till after Claudius, and Nero. It appears from the book itself, that there had been already churches for a considerable space of time in Asia: forasmuch as St. John in the name of Christ reproves faults, that happen not but after a while. The church of Ephesus had left her first love. That of Sardis had a name to live, but was dead. The church of Laodicea was fallen into lukewarmness and indifference. But the church of Ephesus, for instance, was not founded by St. Paul, be-

hæcausâ jam sustinebat, et sustinebat: et inter illas supplicium capitale, quo confessores veritatis afficiebantur. Sic Dominus ad Angelum ecclesiæ Ephesinæ: *Novi laborem tuum, και την υπομονην σου, et tolerantiam in afflictionibus.* Ad Angelum Smyrnenfis: *Novi opera tua, et ταλαιπωριαν, afflictionem, et paupertatem.* Ad Angelum Pergamenæ: *Nec negasti fidem meam, ne quidem in diebus, quibus Antipas, testis meus fidelis, ἀπεκτασθη, occisus est.* Supponunt hæc manifeste, tempore editæ Apocalypsis Gentiles jam cepisse in Christianos sævire, et ipsam etiam mortem pœnæ loco illis quandoque solennibus judiciis irrogasse. Id vero hætenus non liquet factum esse imperante Claudio. Nero, postquam humanitatem exisset, sanguinem Christianum primus bibit: Romæ tamen, magis quam in provinciis. Post Neronem Domitianus, ultimis imperii sui, hæc tentavit. Ad quas postremas Domitiani persecutiones in his locis hæc debite alluditur. Neronis enim illam persecutionem in provinciis Romani Imperii æque ac Romæ aruisse, nec liquet, nec pro-

babile est. Ad Domitiani itaque persecutionem hic manifeste alluditur. Quod argumento est, Apocalypsin hanc sub ipso editam esse. Eiusdem hujus Domitianæ temporis manifestum habemus characterem in Joanne. Dicit enim exerte, *se accepisse hanc revelationem a Domino Jesu, cum ob confessionem veritatis evangelicæ ageret in insula Patmo.* Vocatque se Christianorum, illo tempore afflictorum, socium in afflictione, regno, et patiente expectatione Jesu Christi. Fuit igitur Joannes in exilio, causâ veritatis relegatus in insulam Patmon. Id vero quomodo acciderit sub Claudio? Illum enim in Christianos in provinciis aut exilio aut cæde sævisse, nullibi legitur. — Domitiani igitur hic, et nullius alius Imperatoris character est. Nero enim Christianis capitali supplicio Romæ affecit: sed Domitianus plures exilio, paucos morte punivit, ut certi testes sunt Dio et Eusebius, et pluribus persecutus est Dodwellus. Diss. xi. De Pauc. Mart. § xvii. Quid cessamus itaque tam evidentibus probationibus convicti fidem adhibere traditioni Veterum apud Irenæum? Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2 p. 9—11.

fore

' fore the last years of Claudius. When in 61, or 62, St.
 ' Paul wrote to them from Rome, instead of reproofing their
 ' want of love, he commends their love and faith, ch. i. 15.
 ' 2. It appears from the Revelation, that the Nicolaitans made
 ' a sect, when this book was written, since they are expressly
 ' named: whereas they were only foretold, and described in
 ' general terms by St. Peter in his second epistle, written after
 ' the year sixty, and in St. Jude's about the time of the de-
 ' struction of Jerusalem by Vespasian. 3. It is evident from
 ' divers places of the Revelation, that there had been an
 ' open persecution in the provinces. St. John himself had
 ' been banished into Patmos for the testimony of Jesus.' The
 ' church of Ephesus, or its bishop, is commended for their
 ' *labour and patience*, which seems to imply persecution. This
 ' is still more manifest in the words directed to the church of
 ' Smyrna, ch. ii. 9. *I know thy works, and tribulation.* For
 ' the original word always denotes persecution, in the scrip-
 ' tures of the New Testament: as it is also explained in the
 ' following verse. In the thirteenth verse of the same chap-
 ' ter is mention made of a martyr, named Antipas, put to
 ' death at Pergamus. Though ancient ecclesiastical history
 ' gives us no information concerning this Antipas, it is ne-
 ' vertheless certain, that according to all the rules of lan-
 ' guage, what is here said, ought to be understood literally.—
 ' All that has been now observed concerning the persecution,
 ' of which mention is made in the first chapters of the Reve-
 ' lation, cannot relate to the time of Claudius, who did not
 ' persecute the Christians, nor to the time of Nero, whose
 ' persecution did not reach the provinces. And therefore it
 ' must relate to Domitian, according to ecclesiastical tra-
 ' dition.'

The visions therefore here recorded, and the publication
 of them in this book, must be assigned, so far as I can see, to
 the years of Christ 95, and 96, or 97.

C H A P. XXIII.

THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *Their Order in ancient Authors.* II. *General Observations upon their Order.* III. *The Order of the several Parts of the N. T.* 1. *The Gospels.* 2. *The Acts.* 3. *St. Paul's Epistles in general.* 4. *Their Order severally.* 5. *Of placing them in the Order of Time.* 6. *The Order of the Catholic Epistles.* 7. *The Revelation.*

1. IN showing the order of the books of the New Testament, I begin with a passage of Eusebius, in a chapter, which is entitled 'Concerning the ^a divine scriptures, which are universally received, and those which are not such.' 'But,' says he, 'it will be proper to enumerate here in a summary way the ^b books of the New Testament, which have been already mentioned. And in the first place are to be ranked the sacred four gospels. Then the book of the Acts of the apostles. After that are to be reckoned the epistles of Paul. In the next place, that called the first epistle of John, and the [first] epistle of Peter, are to be esteemed authentic. After these is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the Revelation of John, about which we shall observe the different opinions at a proper season. Of the controverted, but yet well known [or approved by the most, or many] are that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John: whether they are written by the evangelist, or by another of that name.'

This passage, as my readers may well remember, was transcribed by us ^c formerly. And here the order is very observable: the four gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's epistles, the two catholic epistles of St. John, and St. Peter, which were universally received, and then the books that were controverted, that is, not received by all, though by many.

The same order seems to have been followed by that ancient writer Irenæus. For in the third book of his works against heretics, where he is confuting the Valentinians, he ^d in several chapters argues from the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Then in the twelfth chapter of that book, he largely

^a Περὶ τῶν ομολογημένων θείων γραφῶν, καὶ τῶν μὴ τοιαύτων. H. E. l. 3. cap.

25. ^b ——— τῆς καινῆς διακρίσεως γραφῆς.

^c Vol. IV. p. 227.

^d Iren. l. 3. cap. ix. x. xi.

quotes the book of the Acts. After which he considers the authority of the apostle Paul, and quotes both him, and Peter.

In the festal epistle of Athanasius, the books of the New Testament are enumerated in this order. 'The four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the seven catholic epistles, the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and the Revelation.' They stand exactly in the same order, in the Synopsis ascribed to him, though not composed till more than a hundred years after his time. The same is the order of our Alexandrian manuscript. So likewise in Cyril of Jerusalem: 'the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, seven catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul.' He omits the Revelation. The same is the order of the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, omitting also the Revelation. So likewise in the catalogue of John Damascenus: 'the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the catholic epistles, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and the Revelation.' The same is the order of Leontius. And in the Syrian catalogues as given by Ebedjesu: 'the four gospels, the Acts, three catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles of Paul.'

Rufinus's order is 'the gospels, the Acts, Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.' The same order is in the catalogue of the third council of Carthage. In Gregory Nazianzen also 'the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of Paul, the catholic epistles.' The Revelation is wanting. The same order is in the catalogue of Amphilochius, with the Revelation at the end, mentioned as doubtful. In the Stichometry also of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, about the year 806, 'the four gospels, the Acts, Paul's fourteen epistles, and the seven catholic epistles.'

That is the order of Eusebius, and, probably, of Irenæus likewise, as before shown, consequently, the most ancient. It is also the order, which is now generally received. And to me it appears to be the best.

In Epiphanius the books of the New Testament are enumerated in this order: 'the four sacred gospels, the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the Acts of the apostles, the seven catholic epistles, and the Revelation.'

^e See vol. IV. p. 283.
291. ^f Vol. V. p. 254.
IV. p. 300. ^g p. 329.
V. p. 316. ^h p. 311.
IV. p. 439, 440.

ⁱ p. ⁿ Vol. V. p. 76. ^o p. 79.
^h Vol. ^p Vol. IV. p. 408. ^q p. 413.
^k Vol. 414. ^r Vol. V. p. 258.
^m Vol. ^s Hæc. 76. p. 941. cited vol. IV.
p. 313.

I imagine, that this must have been the order of Euthalius. For ' he is supposed to have first published an edition of Paul's epistles, and afterwards an edition of the Acts, and the catholic epistles, about the year 490. In his prologue to the Acts of the apostles, addressed to Athanasius, then bishop of Alexandria, he says: ' having " formerly divided the epistles of Paul ' into sections, I have now done the like in the book of the Acts; ' and the seven catholic epistles.' Hence I am led to argue, that this was his order: Paul's epistles, the Acts, and the catholic epistles.

Jerom's order, in his letter to Paulinus, is * ' the four gospels, St. Paul's epistles, the Acts, the catholic epistles, and the ' Revelation.' Which is very agreeable to: the order of Epiphanius; and also of Euthalius, if I understand him aright. But in Jerom's work of the interpretation of Hebrew names the order is thus: ' the ^y gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the seven ' catholic epistles, the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the Reve- ' lation.' In the letter to Læta the order is, ' the ^z gospels, the Acts, and the epistles of the apostles.'

Augustine varies. In his work of the christian doctrine, the scriptures of the New Testament are rehearsed in this manner: ' The ^a four books of the gospels, fourteen epistles of the apo- ' stle Paul, the seven catholic epistles, the Acts of the apostles ' in one book, and the Revelation of John in one book.' In another work: ' the ^b gospels, the epistles of apostles [meaning ' Paul's epistles, and the catholic epistles] the Acts of the apo- ' stles, and the Revelation of John.' In one of his works he quotes texts from the books of the New Testament in this order: first ' from the gospels, next from several of the catholic epistles, then from almost all the epistles of Paul, after that from the Revelation, and lastly from the Acts of the apostles.

In the catalogue of Innocent the first, bishop of Rome, this order is observable: ' the ^d four gospels, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, seven catholic epistles, the Acts, and the Revelation.' Isidore of Seville, in his several works, has three or four catalogues of the books of the New Testament. In ^e all of them

* See vol. V. p. 241.

† Εναγκος τοιουτο, ως εφην, την παυ-
λου βιβλον ανεγνωκας, αυτικα δητα, και
την των αποστολικων πραξεων, αμα
τη των καθολικων επισολων επδομαδι,
πρεσβας, αρτιως σοι πεπομφα. Euthal.

ap. Zacagn. Monum. Vet. p. 405.

* Cited, vol V. p. 31, 32.

^y p. 33. ^z p. 65. ^a p. 85,

86. ^b p. 103. ^c p. 105.

^d p. 175. ^e p. 308.

we see this order: 'first, the gospels, then the epistles of the apostle Paul, then the catholic epistles, after them the Acts, and then the Revelation.' There were according to him, two parts or divisions of the New Testament, one called the gospels or the evangelists, the other the apostles or the epistles. And in this last part the book of the Acts was placed. The same is the order in the complexions or short commentaries of Cassiodorus: they are upon St. Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, the Acts of the apostles, and the Revelation.

The three writers, alleged in this last paragraph agree very much with Augustine in the two passages first cited from him in the preceding paragraph.

Chrysoptom's order, in the Synopsis ascribed to him, as formerly observed, is very singular: 'the ^s fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the four gospels, the book of the Acts, and three catholic epistles.'

The catalogue of Gelasius also is particular for the place of the Revelation. For he enumerates the books in this order: 'the ^b four gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, the Revelation, and the catholic epistles.'

I suppose, I ought not to omit the order of the books in the 85th apostolical canon, as it is called, which is this. 'The ⁱ four gospels, Paul's fourteen epistles, seven catholic epistles, two epistles of Clement, the Constitutions, the Acts of the apostles.'

I shall transcribe nothing more of this kind. They who are desirous to see more examples, may consult the alphabetical table at the end of the eleventh volume, in that article, *The New Testament*. Here is enough to be a foundation for such remarks, as are proper to be made, relating to this point.

II. It is obvious to remark upon what we have now seen, that in the several ages of Christianity, and in several parts of the world, there has been some variety in the disposition of the books of the New Testament, in two particulars especially. For in some catalogues St. Paul's epistles precede the catholic epistles, in others they follow them. And the book of the Acts is sometimes placed next after the gospels, in other catalogues it follows all the epistles.

Dr. Mill, who, in his *Prolegomena*, has an article concerning the order of the books of the New Testament, with regard to the first particular, the placing in divers catalogues the catholic

^f p. 283.

^s p. 126, 127.

^h p. 248, 249.

ⁱ Vol. IV. p. 354.

epistles

epistles before St. Paul's, says, 'that possibly the Christians of those times supposed them to deserve precedence, because they were not directed to one church, or person only, as St. Paul's are, but to Christians in general, and many churches scattered over the world. Some might also think the catholic epistles entitled to precedence, because they were written by those, who were apostles before Paul, and had accompanied our Lord in his personal ministry here on earth.'

Mill likewise argues, that this was the most ancient order, because it is that of the Alexandrian, and some other ancient manuscripts. But I do not think that to be full proof. For Eusebius is older, and his order is the same as ours. The same order is in the catalogues of Rufin, the council of Carthage, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, and divers others, very probably older than any manuscripts now in being. And in many other writers likewise of great antiquity, St. Paul's epistles precede the catholic epistles. Whereby I am induced to think, this must have been the most ancient order.

The reason, why the book of the Acts was sometimes placed after all the epistles, some may think, was, because it was not so generally received as the gospels, the thirteen epistles of Paul, and some of the catholic epistles. Mr. Wetstein¹ hints at that reason. But I rather think, that by some it was judged proper, that the epistles of apostles should immediately follow the gospels, containing the history of our Lord himself: and that the history of the apostles, and of their preaching, written by an apostolical man, should not precede, but rather follow their writings. For by Eusebius, as we have seen, the book of the Acts of the apostles is reckoned among scriptures universally acknowledged by catholic Christians. It is so considered likewise by^m Origen. And indeed, that this has been all along

¹ In epistolarum quidem dispositione variatum est. In antiquissimis quos habemus manuscriptis, etiam Alexandrino nostro Paulinis præmissæ sunt Catholicæ: eo quod hæc Judæis per orbem quaquaversum dispersis, adeoque pluribus ecclesiis inscriptæ sint: illæ vero singulis sive ecclesiis, sive etiam hominibus. Ne dicam, quod in isthac dispositione rationem forsan habuerint dignitatis Apostolorum, a quibus scriptæ sunt: ut nempe Apostoli Judæorum. ii que jam ab initio electi

a Domino, ac cum eo per omne ministerii ipsius tempus versati, præponerentur Paulo, Apostolo Gentium, ac cui novissime omnium Christus visus erat. Postea autem Paulinæ positæ sunt ante Catholicas. Mill. Proleg. num. 236.

² Apud orthodoxos vero hic Actuum liber non videtur eodem loco fuisse habitus, quo reliqui N. T. libri. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

³ Vol. II. p. 471.

an universally acknowledged sacred book of the New Testament, appears from our collections from every age of Christianity from the beginning. See *Acts of the apostles* in the alphabetical table of matters at the end of the eleventh volume.

Mr. Wetsteinⁿ argues from the 85th Apostolical Canon, where the Acts of the apostles are mentioned last. To which I answer, first, that the age, when those canons were composed, is uncertain. And secondly, that order may have been there chosen out of a regard to the common rules of modesty. For it is thus: 'the gospels, Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, two epistles of Clement, the Constitutions, and^p the Acts of us the apostles.' When a man took upon himself the character of the apostles, and expressed himself in that manner, it was natural enough to reckon the book, which contained the history of their own actions, last of all. Surely, it is trifling, to form an argument from that position in this canon. And Mr. Wetstein might have observed, that in many catalogues, undoubtedly ancient, the Acts immediately follow the gospels: and that, not only in those catalogues, where St. Paul's epistles have the precedence before the catholic epistles, but in divers others likewise, where the catholic epistles precede.

III. Having made these general observations, I now propose to consider distinctly the order of these several parts of the New Testament: the gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.

1. The order of the four gospels has generally been this, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. This is their order in^q Irenæus, ^r Origen, ^s Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, and in his ten Canons, as represented in his letter to Carpian, ^t Athanasius, ^u the council of Laodicea, ^x Epiphanius, ^y the 85th apostolical canon, ^z Gregory Nazianzen, ^a Amphilochius, ^b the Syrian catalogue, ^c Jerom, ^d Rufin, ^e Augustine, ^f the Alexandrian manuscript, ^g the Stichometry of Nicephorus, ^h Cosmas of Alexandria, ⁱ Junilius, an African bishop, ^k Isidore of Seville, ^l Leontius, of Constantinople. And in like man-

ⁿ In Can. Ap. 85. ordo librorum iste reperitur: iv. Evangelia, Epistolæ Pauli xiv. Petri, Joannis, Jacobi, Judæ, Clementis duæ, Constitutiones, Acta. Wetst. ubi supr. p. 455. ^o See vol. IV. p. 354.

^p Καὶ παραξίεις ἡμῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων.

^q Vol. II. p. 158. ^r p. 466, 470.

^s Vol. IV. p. 225. ^t p. 283, 291. ^u p. 309. ^x p. 314.

^y p. 354. ^z p. 408.

^a p. 413. ^b p. 439.

^c Vol. V. p. 32, 33, 35, 36.

^d p. 76. ^e p. 85. ^f p. 254.

^g p. 258. ^h p. 265, 266.

ⁱ p. 277. ^k lb. 307. ^l p. 311.

ner in all authors and catalogues in general, distinctly taken notice of in the several volumes of this work.

Nevertheless in considering the testimony of Tertullian, we thought we saw reason to apprehend, that ^m in his time, in the African churches at least, the gospels were disposed according to the quality of the writers: in the first place those two, which were written by apostles, then the other two, written by apostolical men. This was inferred from some expressions in his ⁿ works. But perhaps the argument is not conclusive. However the four gospels are in the same order in ^o some Latin manuscripts, still in being, and also in ^p the Cambridge manuscript, which is Greek and Latin: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But by Mr. Wetstein, we are assured, that ^q it is the only Greek manuscript, in which the evangelists are so disposed. For certain the other order must have generally prevailed.

2. Concerning the Acts the question is, in which part of the New Testament it was generally placed by the ancients: whether in the evangelicon, or the apostolicon. And undoubtedly, by those who mention it after St. Paul's epistles, or after all the epistles of the apostles, it was placed in the latter part. But, as we have seen, it is often mentioned by ancient writers next after the four gospels. Was it then reckoned a part of the evangelicon, or of the apostolicon? From some passages of Tertullian it was formerly argued by us, that ^r the book of the Acts was placed in the second part of the New Testament, and at the beginning of it. I would now add, that I think the same may be argued from Irenæus, who ^s having alleged passages from the four gospels, proceeds to the Acts, and considers what he allegeth thence as the doctrine, particularly, of the apostles. And Mill supposeth, that ^t in the most ancient times the Acts were placed with the epistles;

^m See vol. II. p. 282.

ⁿ Denique nobis fidem ex Apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant: ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant, iisdem regulis exorfi. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 2. p. 503. A. Vid. et ibid. cap. 5. p. 505. C. D.

^o Vid. Joseph Blanchini Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latine Versionis Antiquæ. ^p Vid. Mill. Prolegom. num. 1269.

^q Vidit tamen, nisi admodum fallor, hunc ipsum Codicem Can-

tabrigiensem, qui unus et solus omnium Codicum Græce Scriptorum hunc ordinem servat. Wetsten. Prolegom. p. 28.

^r Vol. II. p. 281, 282.

^s Vid. Iren. contr. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. fin. et cap. xii. in.

^t Primo loco posita sunt Acta Apostolorum. — Subsecutæ sunt Epistolæ indubitato Apostolicæ, quas cerogate undique liceret. Proleg. num. 195.

but before them, as the first book of that part. However, it is observable, that the Cambridge manuscript has the Acts of the apostles, though it has not the epistles. But then Mill says, that " volume once had the epistles, as well as the gospels. And therefore, probably, the book of the Acts stood at the head of that part, which contained the epistles. And for certain, I think it best that the historical books of the New Testament should appear together. Accordingly, as we have seen, the Acts do in many ancient catalogues immediately follow the gospels. And I wish, that Mr. Wetstein had followed that order, which now prevails, and that he had not placed the Acts of the apostles, as he has done, at the head of the catholic epistles, and after the epistles of St. Paul.

3. In the catalogues lately alleged, we have seen St. Paul's epistles sometimes preceding the catholic epistles, at other times following them. Here the order, as seems to me, is of little consequence. But I rather prefer our present order, which places St. Paul's epistles first: because, excepting only the epistle to the Hebrews, all of them have been all along universally acknowledged: whereas among the seven catholic epistles there are but two, which have not been at some times contradicted books. Moreover St. Paul's epistles immediately follow the historical books in Eusebius. Whence I am willing to infer, that it is the most ancient order.

4. I must say something about the order of St. Paul's epistles severally. Our order is that of his thirteen epistles, which have been universally acknowledged, and then the epistle to the Hebrews, about which there had been doubts in the minds of many for a good while.

Among the ancients there is some variety. To the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, Hebrews, Timothy, Titus, Philemon. So \times in the festal epistle of Athanasius, and γ in the Synopsis ascribed to him, and z in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, and a in the Alexandrian manuscript. In others

" Marci Evangelio suffixa est etiam notula, significans, post illud proxime poni librum Actuum. Verum hæc est scribæ recentioris. Sequens enim folium, quod prima facie duodecim postremos versus epistolæ tertiæ D. Joannis exhibet, alterâ primam partem capituli primi

Actorum, clare indicat Exemplar hoc jam olim, præter Evangelia et Acta, complexum fuisse Catholicas saltem Epistolas. Mill. Proleg. num. 1270.

\times See vol. IV. p. 283.

γ p. 291. z p. 309.

a Vol. V. p. 254.

may be found our present order, as ^b in the iambic poem of Amphilocheus, the ^c Syrian catalogue in Ebedjesu, ^d Jerom in his article of St. Paul, ^e Augustine in his work of the christian doctrine, ^f Œcumenius, and many others.

Epiphanius, observing how Marcion had disturbed the order of St. Paul's epistles, says, that ^g in some editions of the New Testament, the epistle to the Hebrews was the fourteenth, in others the tenth, being placed before the two epistles to Timothy, and the epistles to Titus, and Philemon: and that ^h in all good copies the epistle to the Romans was the first, not that to the Galatians, as Marcion had disposed them.

Theodoret ⁱ and Crysoftom ^k have particularly taken notice, that the epistle to the Romans was placed first, though it was not the first in the order of time.

Concerning the reason of that disposition of the epistle to the Romans, Theodoret observes, 'that it ^l had been placed first, 'as containing the most full and exact representation of the 'christian doctrine in all its branches. But some say, it had 'been so placed out of respect to the city, to which it had been 'sent, as presiding over the whole world.'

I have sometimes thought, that first observation might be applied to all St. Paul's epistles, as the ground and reason of their situation, For the first five epistles, that to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, and the epistles to the Galatians, and the Ephesians, are the largest of St. Paul's epistles. And all that follow are shorter, excepting the epistle to the Hebrews, which has been placed after those sent to churches, or last of all, after those likewise, which were sent to particular persons, because its genuineness was not universally allowed of.

But the other, the dignity of the cities and people, to whom the epistles were sent, has been more generally supposed to be the ground and reason of the order, in which they are placed. How this is represented by Mill, may appear in his own words, which ^m I place below.

I also

^b Vol. IV. p. 413. ^c p. 439, 440.

^d Vol. V. p. 46. ^e p. 85, 86.

^f p. 323. ^g Hæc. 42. p. 373. C.

^h Πάντα δὲ τὰ ἀντιγραφεὰ τὰ σωα
καὶ ἀληθῆ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἔχει πρῶ-
της, οὐχ' ὡς συμαρμίων τὴν πρὸς γαλατας
ἐτάξας πρῶτην. H. 42. p. 373. D.

ⁱ Vol. V. p. 193, 194.

^k p. 134.

^l Πρῶταχασι δὲ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους,

ὡς παντοδαπὴν ἔχουσιν διδασκαλίαν, καὶ
τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ἀκριβείαν διὰ πλείονων
διδασκῆσαν. Τινες δὲ φασιν, ὅτι καὶ τὴν
πολὴν τιμῶντες. κ. λ. Theod. Pr. in
Ep. S. P. T. III. p. 6.

^m In iis vero disponendis (excepta
una ad Hebræos, de qua mox,)
spectata est omnino dignitas ecclesia-
rum et hominum, quibus missæ sunt.

Epistola

I also shall show this, as well as I can. Epistles to churches are placed first. Afterwards those to particular persons. The epistles to churches are placed very much according to the rank of the cities, or places, to which they were sent. The epistle to the Romans is placed first, because Rome was the chief city of the Roman empire. The two epistles to the Corinthians come next, because Corinth was a large, and polite, and renowned city. Galatia was a country, in which were several churches, and therefore the epistle to them might be placed before others, written to one church only. Nevertheless the epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians have been preferred, as is supposed, upon account of the great eminence of those two cities. The epistle to the Ephesians follows next, because Ephesus was the chief city of Asia, strictly so called. Afterwards follow the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians. But how to account for this order, according to the method we here observe, I do not well know. Colosse indeed might be reckoned a city of inferior rank, and Philippi was a Roman colony. But Thessalonica was the chief city of Macedonia, in which Philippi stood. And if the epistles were disposed according to the dignity of places, it is not easy to conceive, why the two epistles to the Thessalonians were placed after those to the Philippians, and the Colossians. So that in this method, as seems to me, the order of the epistles is made out in but a lame and imperfect manner. And there may be reason to apprehend, that the brevity of the two epistles to the Thessalonians, especially of the second, procured them this situation: though they are the first written epistles of our apostle, and indeed the first written of all the sacred scriptures of the New Testament.

Among the epistles to particular persons, those to Timothy have the precedence, as he was a favourite disciple of St. Paul, and those epistles are the largest and fullest. The epistle to Titus comes next, as he was an evangelist. And that to Philemon is last, as he was supposed by many to be only a private Christian. Undoubtedly Titus was a person of greater eminence, and in a higher station than Philemon. Moreover, by

Epistola ad ecclesias Galatiæ, quæ erat integra provincia, merito præcedebat illas, quæ ad unam datæ erant civitatem, Laodiceam, Philippos, Colossenses, Thessalonicam. His tamen præponere visum est epistolas ad Romanos et Corinthios,

ob eminentem harum urbium dignitatem, qua provinciam istam superare videbantur. Epistolas integris ecclesiis inscriptas sequuntur, quæ ad singulos homines datæ sunt. Proleg. num. 237.

many

many the design of that epistle was thought to be of no great importance.

The epistle to the Hebrews is fitly enough placed after the rest, because for a while it was doubted of, as before said. I likewise think it to be the last written of all St. Paul's epistles.

5. Some learned men, who have examined the chronology of St. Paul's epistles, have proposed, that they should be placed in our bibles, according to the order of time. Dr. Wall, at the end of the preface to his critical notes upon the New Testament, has an argument to this purpose.

But first, it will be difficult to alter the order which has been so long established in all editions of the original Greek, and in all versions. Secondly, The order of their times has not been yet settled. Many, I suppose, are of opinion, that Dr. Wall's order is not right. Must the order be altered again and again, to suit every one's fancy? That would create a very troublesome and disagreeable confusion.

I think, that the knowledge of the order in which St. Paul's epistles were written, must be very entertaining and useful: and I have done what is in my power to find it out. But I am far from desiring that they should be placed, and bound up together, according to my calculations. Before an attempt of that kind is made, the order of time should be settled, and determined to the general satisfaction of all learned and inquisitive men. And judicious Christians, who have studied the chronological order of the writings of the New Testament, may have an advantage by it, though the books are continued in their present order.

6. I say nothing here concerning the order of the seven catholic epistles, because I have spoken to it sufficiently in a preceding ⁿ chapter.

7. Finally, the book of the Revelation is now placed the last of all, and has been generally so placed in former times, and very fitly, as ^o Mill says in his observations upon the order of the books of the New Testament, 'it being prophetic

ⁿ See p. 467, 468.

^o Agmen vero Novi Fœderis librorum claudit Apocalypsis. Quæ cum circa diversum plane a reliquis versetur argumentum, atque minus apte inter Evangelia et Epistolas media fuisset interposita, commodissime in fine omnium collocata fuit: quoniam tanquam liber pro-

pheticus futura respicit adhuc implenda: ac denique insignem illam habet in calce clausulam de non addendo quidpiam isti prophetiæ, vel ab ea detrahendo: quâ etiam ad omnes N. T. libros accommodatâ, canonem universum veluti obsignare, convenientissimum videbatur. Mill, Proleg. num. 239.

‘ of things to be hereafter fulfilled, and therefore of a different
 ‘ kind from the rest : and having also near the end that remark-
 ‘ able clause, ch. xxii. 18, 19. containing a caution against
 ‘ adding to, or taking from it: which may be applied to all
 ‘ the books of scripture.’ To which might be added, that
 there are not wanting divers reasons to think it is the last writ-
 ten of all the books of the New Testament.

C H A P. XXIV.

That the Books of the New Testament, consisting of a Collection of sacred Writings, in two Parts, one called Gospel, or Gospels, or Evangelicon, the other Epistles, or Apostle, or Apostles, or Apostolicon, were early known, read, and made use of by Christians.

THAT the gospels, the Acts, and the epistles of the New Testament, or divers of those epistles, were soon well known, much read, and collected together, may be argued from internal marks and characters, and from testimony.

I. Internal marks and characters are such as these.

1. It is obvious from the nature of the thing. Who composes and publishes any works, without desiring to have them perused? It is very likely therefore, that the authors of the books of the New Testament, who were at the pains of writing histories, or epistles, would take care, that they should be known. The same zeal that prompted any man to write, would induce him to provide for the publication. The importance of the subject would justify a concern to spread the work. All must allow, that there never were, and that there cannot be, any writings, containing more important facts and principles. To suppose, that any of these writers were indifferent about the success and acceptance of what they had composed, is very absurd and unreasonable.

2. All the writings, of which the New Testament consists, were addressed to some, who would set a great value on them, and would willingly recommend them to others. All the epistles, and the Revelation, as is manifest, are sent to christian societies, or particular persons. St. Luke's gospel, and the Acts, were sent to the most excellent, or most noble Theophilus. St. John intended his gospel for some, whom he had in his eye. As appears from ch. xx. 30, 31. and from ch. xxi.

24, 25. And it is very likely, that St. Matthew, and St. Mark also wrote for some, who would gladly receive, and highly value their books, and get them copied for the use and satisfaction of others.

3. In several of the books of the New Testament directions are given, which would tend to make them well known. St. Paul at the end of his first epistle to the Thessalonians, one of his first written epistles, enjoins, *that it should be read to all the holy brethren*, 1 Thess. v. 27. The same method, undoubtedly, was observed with regard to the second epistle, sent to the same Thessalonians, and written not long after. Probably, the same practice obtained in all the christian churches, to which St. Paul afterwards sent any epistle. And the christian people of other churches, beside those who had letters sent to them, would be desirous to see the epistles of their great apostle, by whom they had been converted, and would therefore get them transcribed for their own use. At the end of the epistle to the Colossians, ch. iv. 16. he directs: *And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye read the epistle from Laodicea*: meaning, probably, the epistle to the Ephesians, which was to come round to Colosse from Ephesus, by the way of Laodicea. The apostle therefore was willing, and even desirous, that his epistles should be read by others, beside those to whom they were sent, for the sake of general edification. And can it be questioned, whether other gentile churches in these parts, all which were of his own planting, would not thankfully embrace the encouragement hereby given them to look into his epistles, and to get them transcribed, and read in their assemblies also?

4. St. Peter writes to this purpose in his second epistle, which we may suppose to have been written in the year 64. *And account, that the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation, even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, has written unto you. As also in all his epistles, speaking of these things, in which there are some things hard to be understood. Which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.* 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

Here are several things to be observed. First, Peter speaks of epistles of Paul sent to the same Christians, to whom himself was writing. Secondly, he speaks of other epistles of Paul: as also in all his epistles. Thirdly, Peter therefore had a knowledge

ledge

ledge of several epistles of Paul, sent to the Christians of those countries, and likewise of divers others, which he intends in the phrase, *all his epistles*. Fourthly, the Christians, to whom Peter writes, were well acquainted with the epistles, which Paul had written to them, and with the rest of his epistles, or divers of them. Fifthly, it is supposed, and implied, that all, or at least many of Paul's epistles, were well known, and much read. For Peter speaks of some, whom he calls, unlearned, and unstable, who wrested Paul's epistles, or some things in them, to their own destruction. And very probably there were other readers of the same epistles, who improved them to their edification, and salvation.

It seems to me, that what Peter says here, affords reason to think, that at the time of writing this epistle, Paul's epistles (most, or all of them) were well known among Christians, and that Peter had good evidence of it.

When Peter says, *as our beloved brother Paul has written unto you*: some learned men, Mill ^a in particular, have supposed, that thereby Peter intended the epistle to the Hebrews. But I think without reason, as Mr. Hallett ^b has largely shown. St. Peter's epistles are addressed to *the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia*. It is not unlikely therefore, that St. Peter intends Paul's epistles to the Galatians, and the Ephesians, and the Colossians, all situated in those countries: and likewise the two epistles to Timothy, who resided much at Ephesus, and must have received the epistles written to him, when in that city, and the epistle to Philemon, who was of Colosse. And in the expression, *all his epistles*, some others must be intended, and included: such as the epistles to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, Titus: so many, however, as the apostle Peter was then acquainted with. Mill has observed passages in ^c the first epistle to the Thessalonians, and in ^d the epistle to the Romans, and in ^e that to the Philippians: in which are *some of those things hard to be understood*, to which St. Peter may be supposed to have an eye.

These marks and characters there are in the books of the New Testament, which may induce us to believe, that they were soon dispersed among Christians, and well known to them.

^a Prolegom. num. 86.

^b See his introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 21. &c.

^c Proleg. num. 5.

^d Ib. num. 28.

^e Ib. num. 70.

II. This is also manifest from testimony.

1. The accounts, which we find in the ancients, concerning the occasions of the several gospels, lead us to think, that they were soon spread abroad after they were written. Matthew is said to have written his gospel at the request of the believers in Judea: and Mark his, at the desire of the Christians at Rome, for the assistance of their memories. When therefore those gospels had been written, divers copies would be soon taken, that the ends, for which they had been written, might be answered. The several defective and imperfect accounts, which had been published of our Lord's words and works, induced St. Luke to write. And when his fuller and exacter account was published, it must have been attended to, and would be transcribed, and communicated to many. Before St. John wrote, he had seen the other three gospels. And the Christians in Asia, where he resided, were acquainted with them. Therefore they were well known, and joined together. And when his gospel was written, undoubtedly it was added to them, and they were all joined together in one volume, for general use.

That the first three gospels were well known in the world, before St. John wrote, is supposed by Eusebius of Cæsarea, who was well acquainted with the writings of Christians before his time. These are the words of that eminent man. Having spoken of St. Matthew's gospel, he goes on: 'And when Mark and Luke had published the gospels according to them, it is said, that John, who all this while had preached by word of mouth, was induced to write for this reason. The three first written gospels being now delivered to all men, and to John himself, it is said, that he approved them.' And what follows. Before this last evangelist wrote, the *other three gospels had been delivered unto all men, and to John.* He therefore had seen them before, and they were in the hands of many people.

What has been now said of the gospels, is applicable, in a great measure, to the Acts, and the epistles of the New Testament: as may be perceived by all, without my enlarging any farther.

2. Ignatius, who was honoured with the crown of martyrdom about the year 107, does, in his epistles, use expressions, denoting ^s two codes, or collections, one of gospels, the other

^f See vol. IV. p. 225.

^g See vol. II. p. 81, 82, 85, and vol. V. p. 355, 356, 353.

of epistles of apostles. Such volumes there were then, and may have been some good while before.

I shall here remind my readers of a few other like instances. In the epistle to Diognetus, certainly very ancient, and by some ascribed to Justin Martyr, are these expressions: 'The fear of the Lord^h is celebrated, and the grace of the prophets is known, the faith of the gospel is established, and the tradition of the apostles is kept.' By these last expressions denoting, as is reasonable to think, a volume of the gospels, and another of epistles of apostles. Irenæus speaks of the evangelic and apostolic writings in a passage, which will be alleged presently. Tertullian speaksⁱ of 'the sayings of the prophets, the gospels, and the apostles.' And in another place says: 'This^k I perceive both in the gospels, and the apostles.' I go no lower, my intention at present being only to allege a few writers of the earliest times.

3. As before shown^l from Eusebius, they who in the reign of Trajan, about the year 112, travelled abroad to teach the christian religion in remote countries, 'took with them the scriptures of the divine gospels.' Nor can there be any reason to doubt, that our ecclesiastical historian here speaks of the four gospels, so well known in his own time.

4. By Justin Martyr, about the year 140, in his account of the christian worship, which is in his apology to the emperor and senate of Rome, the whole world was assured, that^m the gospels, which he calls Memoirs of the apostles, and their companions, were publicly read in the assemblies of Christians every Lord's day.

Certainly, the gospels were then well known, and had been so for some while before.

5. Tatian, who flourished some time before and after the year 170, composed a harmony of the four gospels. Weⁿ have full assurance of it. Is not this sufficient evidence, that the gospels were then, and had been for a good while, generally known, and in common use? And does it not also afford reason to believe, that it was then, and had been for some while, an established, or generally received opinion among

^h See vol. II. p. 133.

^k p. 281.

^l See vol. II. p.

ⁱ Compendiis paucorum verborum, quot attinguntur edicta Prophetarum, Evangeliorum, Apostolorum? De Oratione cap. 9. p. 125. C. quoted vol. II. p. 280.

105, and vol. V. p. 358.

^m See vol. II. p. 121, 122, and vol. V. p. 359.

ⁿ See vol. II. p. 137, 158, 414. and vol. V. p. 360.

Christians,

Christians, that there were four, and no more than four authentic memoirs or histories of Jesus Christ?

6. I forbear to allege any thing from Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, or Tertullian, for showing the notoriety of the books of the New Testament in early times, because I now insist only upon writers of the highest antiquity. But I shall take notice of some things, which we have in the accounts of the heresies of the second century.

However, that this argument may not be too prolix, I entirely pass by Basilides.

7. Valentinus is placed by Cave ^o as flourishing about the year 120. By Basnage ^p he is placed at the year 124. By Mill ^q between 123, and 127. And by Irenæus we are assured, 'that ^r the Valentinians endeavoured to support their opinions from texts of the evangelic and apostolic scriptures,' or of the gospels and apostles, that is, both parts of the New Testament: 'and that ^s they argued especially from the gospel according to John.'

And Tertullian allows, that ^t Valentinus used the books of the New Testament entire, without altering them, as Marcion did.

Mr. Wetstein says, ^u the Valentinians rejected the Acts of the apostles. And he thinks this appears from Irenæus. But to me it appears manifest from Irenæus, that they received the Acts. For in his confutation of them, in his third book against heresies, he ^x argues against them largely, first from the gospels, then from the book of the Acts, and lastly from the epistles of apostles. And Massuet, the learned Benedictine editor of Irenæus, allows, that ^y according to that

^o Hist. Lit. p. 50. ^p Ann. 124. num. vii. ^q Proleg. num. 265. ^r Καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν περὶ ταῦς ἀποδείξεις ποιῆσθαι. Iren. l. i. c. 3. n. 6. p. 17.

^s Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Joannem plenissime utentes, ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum, ex ipso de-
regentur, nihil recte dicentes. Id. l. 3. cap. xi. n. 7. p. 190.

^t Alius manu scripturas, alius sensus expositione intervertit. Neque enim si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non calli-

diore ingenio, quam Marcion manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exerte et palam machæra, non stilo usus est: quoniam ad materiam suam eadem scripturarum confecit. Valentinus autem pepercit: quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed materiam ad scripturas, excogitavit. De Præsc. Hær. cap. 38. p. 246.

^u Acta Apostolorum rejecerunt Valentiniani. Quod constat ex Irenæo. Hær. iii. 2. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

^x Vid. Iren. contr. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. xii.

^y At ipsi Valentinus

that ancient writer, the Valentinians did not reject any books of the New Testament.

Irenæus, as we have just seen, says, that the Valentinians endeavoured to support their opinions by the evangelic and apostolic scriptures. The Acts were included in this second volume of the New Testament, according to the method of the ancient Christians.

8. Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, is supposed by ^z Grabe to have been contemporary with his master, Valentinus, and to have appeared about the year 123. However, he might continue a good while after that. Basnage ^a speaks of him at the year 125. And Cave ^b placeth him at 126. They who are so pleased, may recollect what was said of his age formerly.

Heracleon seems to have written commentaries upon several parts of the New Testament. Clement of Alexandria having quoted the words of Matt. x. 32. or Luke xii. 8. and of Luke xii. 11, 12. says: 'Heracleon ^d explaining this place has these very words;' which I need not transcribe at present, though it be a valuable passage. There is in Clement another short passage of Heracleon's commentary upon St. Luke.

Origen, in his commentary upon St. John's gospel, often quotes Heracleon. The passages of Heracleon's commentary upon that gospel, with Origen's remarks, are collected by ^e Grabe. And from him they have been placed by Maffuet in his appendix to Irenæus. The passages of Heracleon, quoted by Origen, are above forty-in number, and some of them long.

Heracleon's commentaries upon the gospels of St. Luke, and St. John, are an early proof of the respect shown to the

tino nihil simile usquam adscribit Irenæus. Imo tum loco mox citato, tum lib. I. cap. viii. et ix. et alibi passim, satis significat, Valentinianos sibi cœvos sic canonem scripturarum novo Evangelio auxisse, ut nihil quidquam, nullum librum integrum, nullam ejusdem partem, (quod Marcioni non semel exprobat) ab eo abjecissent: sed *vel parabolas Dominicas, vel didichones Propheticas, aut sermones Apostolicas,* ad hypothese[m] suam aptare conatos,

calumniam intulisse Scripturis. Maffuet. Diff. i. num. ix. p. xvii.

^z Spicil. T. I. p. 62. T. II. p. 69. et 80. ^a Ann. 125. num. iii.

^b H. L. p. 53. ^c Vol. II. p. 239, 240, note (F.)

^d Τετον ἐξηγήμενος τον τοπον ηρακλεων. — κατα λεξιν φησιν. — Σινομ. l. 4. p. 502. A—D.

^e Vid. Eclog. Proph. ap. Cl. Al. p. 804. D. et Grabe Spic. T. II. p. 85. ^f Spic. T. II. p. 85—117.

books of the New Testament. And it may be reasonable to think, that others beside Heracleon, both catholics and heretics, published about the same time commentaries upon some of the books of the New Testament.

Origen ^s has at once given us Heracleon's observations upon Matt. viii. 12. and If. i. 2.

Heracleon likewise received St. Paul, and his writings. For ^h he quotes, as his, the beginning of the twelfth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. Moreover Origen ^l has given us Heracleon's interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.

I might add here some other things. But this is sufficient to show, that in the very early days of Christianity, the books of the New Testament were well known, much used, and greatly respected.

9. Marcion about ^k the year 138, placed by some ^l sooner, in 127, or 130, had, and probably, in imitation of other Christians, a ^m gospel, and an apostle, or an evangelicon, and apostolicon.

In the former, as is generally said, was ⁿ St. Luke's gospel only, and that curtailed. But Mr. Lampe says, that ^o Mar-
cion

^r Origen. Comm. in Joan. T. II. p. 256. C. Huet. ^h — καθ'

ο και ο αποστολος διδασκει, λεγων, λογι-
κην λατρειαν την τοιαυτην θεοσεβειαν.
Ap. Orig. ib. p. 217. E. et Grabe
Spic. p. 101. ⁱ Ap. Orig. ib.
p. 255. D. et Grabe. p. 110.

^k Vid. Pagi Ann. 144. n. iii. et
Asseman. Bib. Or. T. I. p. 389.
note (4.) ^l Vid. Cav. H. L.
p. 54. &c. S. Basnag. ann. 131.
iii. — v. 133. iv. Mill. Prol. num.
306, 307. ^m Adamant.

Απο παλαιων γραφων δειξει ταυτα επαυ-
γελην; Marc. Απο τς Ευαγγελις
κα. τς Αποστολς. Dial. contr. Mar-
cion. Sect. 2. p. 54. Basil. 1674.
p. 821. D. T. I. Bened. Vid. et
Epiph. H. 42. n. ix.

ⁿ Et super hæc, id quod est secun-
dum Lucam Evangelium circum-
cidens. Iren. l. 1. cap. 27. 2.
al. cap. 29.

Nam ex iis Commentatoribus,
quos habemus, Lucam videtur Mar-
cion elegisse, quem cæderet. Ter-

tull. adv. Marc. l. 4. cap. 2. p. 503.
Vid. et Epiph. Hær. 42. n. ix.

^o Verum hinc quoque plus eli-
citur, quam voluit Marcion. Non
enim asserere Marcion ausus est,
Evangelia, quæ extra Lucam habe-
mus, esse conficta et falso Evan-
gelistis supposita. Nemo Patrum
antiquiorum hujus criminis Mar-
cionem accusavit. Id tantum vo-
luit, Lucæ Evangelium, ductu Pauli
conscriptum, reliquis Evangeliiis
præferendum esse. — Clarissima
hæc esse puto. Et quod præten-
sionem interpolationis attinet, hu-
jus insigne statim cap. 7. [lib. 4.
contr. Marc.] exemplum affertur:
*Cæterum et loco et illuminationis opere
secundum prædicationem occurrentibus
Christo, jam cum Prophetam incipimus
agnoscere, ostendentem in primo ingressu
venisse se, non ut Legem et Prophetas
dissolveret, sed ut potens adimpleret.
Hoc enim Marcion, ut additum erasit.
Cum enim hæc verba Matthæi v. 17.
inveniantur, hinc inferimus, Mar-
cionem Evangelium Matthæi non
simpliciter*

cion did not reject the other gospels, though he preferred St. Luke's. This he infers from a passage in Tertullian, which seems to show, that Marcion did not reject St. Matthew's gospel.

I shall add another from Isidore of Pelusium, where he says: 'Take ^p the gospel [or the evangelicon] of Marcion, and you will presently see at the very beginning, a proof of their impudence. For they have left out our Lord's genealogy from David and Abraham. And if you proceed a little farther, you will see another instance of their wickedness, in altering our Lord's words. *I came not, says he, to destroy the law or the prophets.* But they have made it thus: *Think ye, that I came to fulfil the law, or the prophets? I am come to destroy, not to fulfil.*' Matt. v. 17.

It might be also argued from the dialogue against the Marcionites, that they used St. Matthew's gospel. But I forbear to allege any places in particular.

So that it may be reckoned probable, that Marcion did not reject any of the four gospels. But undoubtedly he made alterations in them, agreeable to his own particular opinion, under a pretence, that ^q they had been corrupted by some before his time.

Perhaps ^r Marcion filled up St. Luke's gospel out of the rest, taking from them such things as suited his purpose. Tertullian says, that ^s his gospel, or evangelicon, had no title.

simpliciter negasse, sed quæcunque erroribus ejus non patrocinebantur, pro lubitu erasisse. Atque ita proculdubio etiam cum reliquis Evangelicis egit. Lampe Proleg. ad Joan. Evang. l. 2. cap. 1. n. iv. p. 136, 137.

^p 'Εἰ προῖσχηται ὁ τῆς μαρκιωνος συνηγορος βλασφημίας, τὸ παρ' ἐκείνοις ὀνομαζόμενον εὐαγγέλιον λαβὼν ἀναγνῶθι, καὶ εὐρησεῖς εὐθὺς ἐν προοίμιῳ τὴν ἀτοπίαν. Αὐτὴν γὰρ τὴν καταγέσσαν ἐπὶ χριστὸν ἀπὸ δαβὶδ καὶ ἀβραὰμ γενεαλογίαν ἀπέτεμεν. Καὶ μικρὸν ὑπερὸν προίων ἀλλήν ὀφείκει κακονοίαν. Ἀμειψάντες γὰρ τὴν τε κυρίῃ φωνῆν, 'Οὐκ ἦλθον, λεγόντος, καταλῦσαι, τὸν νόμον, ἢ τὰς προφητάς, ἐποίησαν. Δοκεῖτε, ὅτι ἦλθον πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον, ἢ τὰς προφητάς; 'Ἦλθον

καταλῦσαι, ἀλλ' ἐ πληρῶσαι. Isid. Pel. l. i. ep. 371.

^q Vid. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 4. ^r Occurrit primo loco Marcion et Marcionitæ, qui corruerunt libros N. T. reselectis omnibus iis, quæ Judaicæ religioni favere putabant, et contracto toto N. T. in duos codices, quorum priorem vocabant Evangelium, ex Lucâ maximam partem constatum, et subinde ex reliquis Evangelicis integratum. Wetst. Proleg. N. T. tom. I. p. 79. ^s Contra Marcion Evangelio, scilicet suo, nullum ascribit auctorem: quasi non licuerit illi titulum quoque adhängere, cui nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evertere. Et possem hic jam gradum figere, non agnoscendum contem-

dens

title. That may have been the reason of it. And we can hence conclude, that in very ancient times, among the catholics, the four gospels were entitled, and inscribed, with the names of the several evangelists. Which ^r has been denied, or doubted of by some.

Marcion had also an apostolicon. In this were ten epistles only of St. Paul, and those diminished, at least some of them. Their order according to him, as we are informed by ^u Epiphanius, was this: the epistle to the Galatians, the first and second to the Corinthians, to the Romans, the first and second to the Thessalonians, to the Ephesians, the Colossians, Philemon, the Philippians.

He received not any other epistles of St. Paul. It is supposed likewise, that he rejected the catholic epistles, and the Revelation. Whether he received the Acts of the apostles, I cannot say certainly: though ^x some learned men think, he did not receive them. But then it should be observed by us, that ^y the Marcionite apostolicon was reckoned very defective by the catholic Christians.

And it may be inferred from the accounts, which we have in the best writers of the most early ages, that Marcion was the most arbitrary, and most licentious of all the ancient heretics, in his judgment concerning the scriptures that should be received, and in his manner of treating such as were received by him. So that his opinion can be no prejudice to the genuineness, or the notoriety of any of those books of the New Testament, which were received by the catholics, and indeed by most heretics likewise. I shall place below ^z a remarkable passage of Irenæus, where he says: ‘ Marcion and his followers curtail the scriptures with great
‘ assurance,

dens opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam constantiam præferat, nullam fidem repromittat de plenitudine tituli, et professione debita auctoris. Contr. Marc. l. 4. cap. 2. ^t Vid. Mill. Prol. num. 347. ^u Hær. 42. num. ix. et alibi.

^v Acta Apostolorum rejecerunt Marcionitæ. — Tertullianus adv. Marcionem liv. v. cap. 2. *Si ex hoc congruunt Paulo Apostolorum Acta, cur ea respuat, jam apparet.* Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

^y Προνευγχε το αποστολικον ση, ει και τα μαλιστα περινεκομμενον εστι. Dialog. adv. Marcion. sect. i. p. 8. Basil. p. 806. T. I. Bened.

^z Unde et Marcion, et qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt Scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Evangelium, et Epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc sola legitima esse dicunt, quæ ipsi minora verunt. — Reliqui vero omnes falso scientiæ nomine inflati Scrip-

‘assurance, rejecting some entirely, and diminishing the
 ‘gospel according to Luke, and the epistles of Paul, affirm-
 ‘ing those parts of them alone to be genuine, which they
 ‘have preserved.—All others, who are puffed up with
 ‘the science falsely so called, receive the scriptures, whilst
 ‘they pervert them by wrong interpretations.’

In another place he says, ‘that ^a Marcion alone had
 openly dared to curtail the scriptures.’ And my readers
 can easily recollect, how ^b severely Tertullian censures
 Marcion ^c for altering the text of the scriptures, openly
 employing a knife, as he says, not a style, to render them
 agreeable to his erroneous opinions.

However, I think, here is full proof, that the books of
 the New Testament were well known in Marcion’s time,
 and before him: and that they were collected together in
 two parts or volumes, an evangelicon and apostolicon.
 He and other Christians had a gospel and an apostle. But
 theirs were fuller than his.

10. We might, perhaps, not unprofitably recollect here
 those ^d passages of Eusebius of Cæsarea, where he speaks of
 the scriptures of the New Testament: some of which were
 universally received, others were contradicted: divers of
 which last, nevertheless, were received by many. The
 universally received by the founder part of Christians were
 the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, thirteen epistles
 of Paul, one of Peter, one of John. It may be reckoned
 not unlikely, that all these had been from ancient time
 inserted by most Christians in their two volumes of the
 gospel and apostle. And, probably, divers of the other
 books, called controverted, or contradicted, were joined
 with the rest in the volumes of a good number of Christians.

III. There are some observations of Mr. Henry Dodwell
 concerning the late forming of the canon of the New Testa-
 ment, which cannot be easily overlooked, and seem to
 require some notice in this place.

turas quidem continentur, interpre-
 tationes vero convertunt. Iren. adv.
 Hær. l. 3. cap. xii. n. 12. p. 198.
 b. Massuet.

^a Sed huic quidem, quoniam et
 solus manifeste ausus est circumci-
 dere Scripturas, &c. Iren. l. i.
 cap. 27. n. 4. p. 106. al. cap. 29.

Vid. ib. num. 2. ^b See vol. II.
 p. 278. ^c Marcion enim exerte
 palam machæra, non stilo usus est:
 quoniam ad materiam suam eadem
 Scripturarum confecit. De Præscr.
 Hær. cap. 38. p. 246. C.

^d See vol. IV. p. 224—231.

1. He

1. He says, 'that' the canon of the sacred books was not determined, nor what number of them should be of authority in points of faith, before the time of the emperor Trajan, who began his reign in the year of Christ 98.'

Ans^r. If hereby be meant all the books of our present canon, this may be true. But then it is a trifling proposition. For some of them were not written, or have been supposed by many not to have been written, till near the end of the first century. How then could they be sooner made a part of sacred scripture? or how could they be placed in the number of books, esteemed to be the rule of faith? But the first three gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and possibly the fourth likewise, St. John's, and many of the epistles of the New Testament, were well known before the reign of Trajan, even as soon as they were written. And wherever they were known, and by whomsoever they were received, they were reckoned a part of the rule of faith.

2. The same learned man says likewise: the 'canonical scriptures of the New Testament lay hid in the cabinets of particular churches, and private persons, till the reign of Trajan, and perhaps till the reign of Adrian.'

But I presume, we have just now sufficiently shown the fallshood of this, and that the gospels, and other books of the New Testament, were written and published with a design to be read, and made use of, and that they were soon divulged abroad, and not purposely hid by any.

3. Farther, says Mr. Dodwell: 'The epistles of Paul were well known soon after they were written. His many travels, and the mark of his hand at the end of them, occasioned this.'

^c Atqui certe ante illam epocham, quam dixi, Trajani, nondum constitutus est librorum sacrorum canon, nec receptus aliquis in ecclesia catholica librorum certus numerus, quos deinde adhibere oportuerit in sacris fidei causis dijudicandis, nec rejecti hæreticorum pseudepigraphi, monitive fideles, ut ab eorum usu deinde caverent. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. num. 39. in p. 67.

^f Latitabant enim usque ad recentiora illa seu Trajani, seu etiam

fortasse Hadriani tempora, in privatarum ecclesiarum, seu etiam hominum scriniis, scripta illa canonica, ne ad ecclesiæ catholicæ notitiam pervenirent. Ibid. num. 38, p. 66.

^s Sequuntur Epistolæ Paulinæ, quas a prima usque scriptione celeberrimas fecere ipsius Apostoli tam crebræ peregrinationes, et nota ejus in omni epistola manus.—Proinde meminit eorum et Petrus, meminit S. Clemens, meminit Ignatius, et Polycarpus. Ibid. num. 41, p. 73.

We readily acknowledge it. It is very true. We think also, that the gospels, the Acts, and other books of the New Testament, were well known soon after they were written: and that in a short space of time many copies were taken of them, and thus they were divulged abroad. The first three gospels were well known to St. John, and to many others, before he wrote his gospel. Which must have been written before the end of the first century, and, probably, a good while before the end of it.

4. The same learned writer, speaking of the apostolical fathers, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, says, they ^b several times quote apocryphal books. And he so expresseth himself, as if he intended to affirm this of all of them.

To which I must answer, that so far as I am able to perceive, after a careful examination, there are not any quotations of apocryphal books in any of the apostolical fathers. They who are desirous of farther satisfaction therein, are referred to their several chapters in the second volume of this work, and to ⁱ some additional observations in the Recapitulation of the second part of the Credibility, which is in the fifth volume.

5. Once more. The same learned writer says, ‘that ^k before the reign of Trajan the pseudepigraphal books of heretics had not been rejected. Nor had the faithful been cautioned, not to make use of them.’

Which appears to me an observation of little or no importance. If those pseudepigraphal books were not in being before the reign of Trajan, how should they be rejected before that time? That they were not sooner in being, has been ^l sufficiently shown. They are the productions of heretics, who arose in the second century: who asserted two principles, had a disadvantageous opinion of marriage, and denied the real humanity of our Saviour. In that second century many pseudepigraphal gospels, Acts, travels, or circuits of apostles were composed. Which were afterwards made use of by the Manichees, the Priscillianists, and some others.

^b Habemus hodieque horum temporum scriptores ecclesiasticos luculentissimos, Clementem Romanum, Barnabam, Hermam, Ignatium, Polycarpum.—Sed et apocrypha adhibent iidem aliquoties, quæ certum

est in hodiernis non haberi Evangelis. Ibid. n. 39, p. 67.

ⁱ See vol. V. p. 358, 412, &c.

^k See before, p. 661, note ^c.

^l Vol. V. p. 415, 416.

But

But those pseudepigraphal books of heretics never were joined with the genuine writings of the apostles and evangelists. They were always distinguished from them, and were esteemed by all catholic Christians in general to be of little value, and no authority. As appears from our collections out of ancient authors, and particularly from the accounts given of those books by ^m the learned bishop of Cæsarea, at the beginning of the fourth century.

C H A P. XXV.

The Question considered, whether any sacred Books of the New Testament have been lost.

THERE is a question, which has been proposed by some learned men: whether any sacred books of the New Testament, or any epistles of apostles and evangelists, written by Divine inspiration, have been lost? And some have taken the affirmative, particularly, ^a Mr. John Ens, and ^b Mr. C. M. Pfaff, in a work, published by him in the early part of his life. Herman Witsius likewise ^c has argued on the same side in several of his works.

I. Here, in the first place, I observe, that some suppositions have been made, and propositions laid down by learned men, which may form a prejudice in favour of the affirma-

^m See vol. IV. p. 228, 229, and vol. V. p. 412, 413.—160.

^a Et certe, pace et incolumi amicitia dissentientium id dictum sit, affirmativa nobis eligi debere videtur sententia, et concedi, quod multi divini libri perierint. Joh. Ens Bibliotheca Sacra, cap. 4. § iv. p. 19. Amst. 1710.

Itaque hoc misso, inspiciamus et rite perpendamus, quid probationi inserviat, ad evincendum, quod Apostoli plura exararint scripta vere θεοπνευστα et divina, quam nunc extant. Id. ib. § vi. p. 22.

^b Chr. Matth. Pfaffii Dissertatio Critica de genuinis Librorum N. T. Lectionibus, p. 46—48. Amst. 1709.

^c Coccejus asseveranter dicit, Judam præter hanc epistolam non

scripsisse, neque necesse habuisse scribere, neque a Spiritu Sancto impulsam fuisse ut scriberet. Id mihi non videtur certum, imo nec probabile. Apostoli enim quum universalis Ecclesiæ doctores et directores essent, et corpore ubique praesentes esse non possent, et frequenter sine dubio ab ecclesiis consulenter, necesse habuerunt frequenter scribere.—Non autem magis opus fuit omnes Apostolorum epistolas superstites manere, quam omnes sermones Christi. Sufficiunt quos habemus, ad perfectum canonem. Wits. Comment. in Ep. S. Jud. § xii. p. 463. Vid. Id. De Vita Pauli Apostoli. sect. 7. n. xi. sect. 8. n. xxi. et. sect. 12. n. xvi.

tive side of the question, but afford no proof. Such things should not be advanced by fair disputants.

As first, that^d the apostles of Christ were ever ready to serve all the exigencies of the church; which is very true. And yet it does not follow, that any epistles, or other writings, were composed by them for the general use of Christians, beside those which we have. And, secondly, that^e it is unlikely, that all the apostles of Christ should have written no more letters, than now remain: as it is also, that^f Paul should have written no more than fourteen epistles. These, and such like observations, though adopted by^g Witfius, as well as some others, I choose to dismiss without a particular discussion, as they contain not any real argument.

A man, who thinks of our Lord's great character, and the unparalleled excellence of his discourses, and the great number of his miraculous works, and that he had twelve apostles, and seventy other disciples, employed by him, all zealous for the honour of their Master, and the good of his people, might be disposed to say: certainly, there were many gospels, or authentic histories of his life, written before the destruction of Jerusalem. And yet, if there is any credit to be given to ecclesiastical history, when John was desired to write his gospel, about the time of that event, or after it; there were brought to him no more than three gospels, to be confirmed by him, or to have some additions made to them. One of which only had been written by an

^d Prima observatio est, quod alicres et paratissimi fuerint Apostoli ad omnia conferenda, quæ usui et utilitati Ecclesiæ inservire poterant. Ens ubi supra. § xx. p. 35.

^e Porro attendamus, secundo, quod quatuordecim habemus epistolas a solo Paulo conscriptas, et judicet unusquisque, an sibi probabile videatur, Bartholomæum, Thomam, Jacobum Alphæi, Andream, Philippum, et Simonem Zelotem, quorum nulla habemus scripta, ne unicam quidem ad Ecclesiæ ædificationem epistolam scripsisse, atque, Jacobum et Judam unicam tantum, Petrum duas, et Joannem tres exarasse: quum Paulus toties scripserit. Ens ib. § xxiii. p. 38.

^f Immo nec illud veritatis spe-

ciem habet, ipsum Paulum non plures quam quatuordecim epistolas scripsisse. Quod tertio observari velim. Id. § xxv. p. 41.

^g Nullus equidem dubito, quin Apostoli omnes pro singulari suâ diligentia frequentissimas literas ad ecclesias curæ suæ commissas dederrint: quibus præsentibus semper adesse non licebat, et quibus multa tamen identidem habebant inculcanda. Wits. De Vita Pauli. sect. 7. num. xi. p. 98.

Laudanda profecto Dei benignitas est, quod ex tot Paulinis epistolis, quæ perierunt, hanc tamen [*ad Philem*] mole exiguam, et de re domestica agentem, superare voluerit. Id. ib. sect. 12. num. xvi.

apostle,

apostle, even Matthew's. And it is the concurrent testimony of all christian antiquity, that there were but four gospels, written by apostles, and apostolical men. And yet we have no reason to say, that the true interest of mankind has not been duly consulted.

II. I observe, secondly: it is generally allowed by learned men, and by ^h Mr. Ens, and ^l Witfius, that the epistles to the Thessalonians are among the first of St. Paul's epistles, that remain, or were written by him. And I think, that the conclusion of the first epistle to the Thessalonians suggests a very probable argument, that it is the first epistle, which was written by him with divine and apostolical authority for the edification of Christians. The words intended by me, are those of 1 Thess. v. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.* This, as ^k was formerly observed, I take to be the first instance of enjoining the reading of a christian writing in their religious assemblies, as a part of their worship. Christian people had before now, very probably, read in that manner the books of the Old Testament. St. Paul, who knew the fulness of the apostolical inspiration, asserts his authority, and requires, that the same respect should be now shown to his epistle, and that it should be publicly read among them for their general edification. If any such thing had been done before, there would not have been occasion for so much earnestness, as is expressed in this direction. This epistle is supposed to have been written in the year 52, consequently, not till near twenty years after our Lord's ascension. If this be the first epistle of Paul, written with apostolical authority; there were no sacred writings of his of a more ancient date to be lost. And his other remaining epistles are as many, as could be reasonably expected.

III. There are many considerations, tending to satisfy us, that no sacred writings of the apostles of Christ are lost.

1. The four gospels, which we have, were written ^l for the sake of those, who certainly would receive them with respect, keep them with care, and recommend them to others. And if any other such authentic histories of Jesus Christ had been

^h Ens ubi supra. § xxviii. p. 45.

^l At nobis de Paulinis Epistolis nunc est agendum: quarum quæ supersunt primas esse conlat utramque ad Thessalonicenses, Corinthi,

ut initio dixi, scriptas. Ubi supra sect. 7. num. xii. p. 99.

^k See before, p. 304.

^l See vol. IV. p. 240.

written by apostles, or apostolical men, they would have been received, and preserved in the like manner, and would not have been lost.

2. We can perceive, from the testimony of divers ancient christian writers, that ^m the book of the Acts, which we still have, was the only authentic history of the preaching of the apostles after our Lord's ascension, which they had in their hands, or had heard of. Consequently, there was no other such history to be lost.

3. The epistles of Paul, James, Peter, John, Jude, were sent to churches, people, or particular persons, who would show them great regard, when received, and would carefully preserve them, and readily communicate them to others, that they might take copies of them, and make use of them, for their establishment in religion and virtue. If those apostles had written other epistles, and if other apostles had sent epistles to churches planted by them, or to particular persons, their disciples, or christian friends, the case would have been much the same. Those epistles would have been esteemed, preserved, and frequently copied, and could not easily have been lost.

4. Moreover, the apostles, and evangelists, who drew up any writings for the instruction, or confirmation of christian people, must have been careful of them. The same principle of zeal for the doctrine taught by them, and for the welfare of christian people, which induced them, amidst their many labours, fatigues, and difficulties, to compose any writings, would lead them to take due care, that they should answer the ends for which they were composed. Proofs of such care we evidently discern in divers of the epistles of apostles, which we have. A like care, probably, was taken of the rest, and would be taken of epistles written by any other apostles. They would be sent by fit messengers, and be faithfully delivered. And they might be accompanied with some proper directions, such as we find in several of St. Paul's epistles: as that in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, requiring it to be read to all the brethren: and that in the epistle to the Colossians iv. 16. that it should be read first among themselves, and then sent to the church of the Laodiceans: and

^m See particularly vol. II. p. 162, 262; vol. V. p. 96, 97, 131, 132, 311, 312.

that they likewise should read the epistle, that would be brought to them from Laodicea.

All which considerations must induce us to think, that no sacred writings of apostles, composed for the instruction and edification of christian people, their friends, and converts, could be easily lost.

IV. There are no sufficient reasons to believe, that any sacred writings of the New Testament have been lost. Let us however see what they are. For divers difficulties have been thought of.

1. St. Paul says ⁿ 2 Theff. ii. 1, 2. *Now we beseech you, brethren, — that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.*

These words, as I apprehend, afford not any proof, that St. Paul wrote more epistles to the Thessalonians, than those which we have. For a person, who had never written one letter before, might use such expressions; if he had any ground to suspect, that some men were disposed to forge letters in his name.

2. 2 Theff. iii. 17. ^o *The salutation of Paul with my own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write.*

But I think, he might say this though it were the very first epistle written by him: provided he thought, that he should have occasion to write more, and had reason to suspect, that there were some men, who might be disposed to falsify his name. Nor does it follow, that he afterwards wrote any more epistles to the Thessalonians. However, he could not be certain, that he should not have occasion to write to them again. And he might judge it to be very likely, that he should write more letters, either to them, or

ⁿ Atqui hujus rei nullum fuisset periculum, nulla monendi necessitas, nisi varias acceperunt Thessalonicenses epistolas a Paulo missas. Qui enim unam ac alteram solummodo ad ecclesias scribebat epistolas, illius nomen falsæ epistolæ ad ecclesias datæ non facile mentiri poterat. J. Ens ubi supr. § xxix. p. 46.

^o Illud idem iterum agnoscit Apostolus statim allegato cap. iii. 17. dato signo epistolis suis peculiari,

quo nullæ epistolæ a se missæ carent. — Se dicit *γραφειν*, scribere. Quod paucis admodum epistolis vix congruum videtur: præsertim quando dicit, se *εγω γραφειν*, ut salutatio propria manu sit signum *εν παντη επισολη*, in quacumque epistola — Quid erat periculi, quod datis epistolis committeretur fallacia, si nullas præter, et post hæc duas ad illos daret epistolas? Id. ib. § xxx. p. 46, 47.

to others. This declaration, then, was a proper mark, which might be of use to the Thessalonians, and to others, and a security against all impositions of that kind.

3. 2 Cor. x. 9, 10, 11. *That I may not seem, as if I would terrify you by letters. For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible. Let such an one think this, that such as we are in word by letters, when we are absent, such will we be also in deed, when we are present.*

Hence it is argued, that ^p the apostle had before now written more than one, even several letters, to the Corinthians.

To which I answer. It is very common to speak of one epistle in the plural number, as all know. And St. Paul might well write, as he here does, though he had as yet sent but one letter to those, to whom he is writing. And from so long a letter, as is the first to the Corinthians, men might form a good judgment concerning his manner of writing letters, though they had seen no other.

4. 1 Cor. v. 9. *I wrote unto you in an epistle, not to company with fornicators.*

Hence it is argued, that ^q St. Paul had written an epistle to the Corinthians, before he wrote the first of those two, which we have. Consequently, here is proof of the loss of a sacred writing, which would have been canonical, if extant.

And it must be acknowledged, that several ^r learned men have concluded as much from this text. Others however see not here any such proof. And on this side have argued: Whitby, and ^t others. And I think, it is of no small weight, that several ancient writers understood the apostle to say: *I have written to*

^p Cum duobus illis ex epist. ad Thessalonicenses locis conferam Pauli dictum ad Corinthios. 2. x. 9, 10, 11. — Quibus verbis Apostolus statuit, quod non unam epistolam, sed plures ad Corinthios scripserit. Id. ibid. § xxxiii. p. 49.

^q Inter illas est epistola quædam — ad Corinthios scripta ante illam, quæ nobis prima est, de qua Apostolus: Ἐγραψα υμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *scripsi vobis in epistola.* 1 Cor. v. 9. Ens. ib. § xxxiii. p. 51.

^r Ex quibus verbis hoc concludo,

ante hanc ad Corinthios epistolam aliam existisse, ubi Paulus a conversatione cum fornicatoribus eos dehortatus fuerit. C. M. Pfaff. ubi supr. p. 46.

Hinc autem apparet, aliam ante hanc a Paulo scriptam fuisse epistolam ad Corinthios, quæ post intercederit. Estius in loc. Vid. et Grot. in loc. H. Wits. de Vit. Paul. Ap. sect. S. n. xxi. Mill. Prolegom. n. 8.

^s See him upon the place.

^t Wolf. curæ in loc. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 918. &c.

you in this epistle. So ^u Theodoret, ^x Theophylact, and ^y Photius in Œcumenius. They suppose, that the apostle here refers to somewhat before said by him in the same epistle, and in this very chapter, ver. 2, or 6, 7.

And that hereby is meant this epistle, seems to me very evident. That interpretation suits the words. And there are divers other places, where the same phrase is, and must be so rendered, Rom. xvi. 22. *I Tertius, who wrote this epistle,* Ο γραφας την επισολην. 1 Theff. v. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.* αναγνωσθηναι την επισολην πασι τοις αγιοις. And 1 Theff. iv. 6. *That no man go beyond, and defraud his brother in any matter: or in this matter.* μη υπερβαινειν και πλεονεκτειν εν τω πραγματι τον αδελφον αυτη (A).

Fabricius says, the ^z words, *I have written unto you*, may be understood as equivalent to, *I do write*. And it may be remembered, that ^a some while ago I quoted an ancient writer, who gives this interpretation. ^c *I^b have written unto you, that is, I write.* And intending, I think, somewhat to be afterwards said by the apostle in this epistle: which appears to me to be right. Many like instances might be alleged. I shall put in the margin some passages ^c from A. Gellius,

^u Ουκ εν αλλη, αλλ' εν ταυτη. Προ βραχεων γαρ εφη' Ουκ οιδατε, οτι μικρα ζυμη ολον το φυραμα ζυμοι; Theod. in loc.

^x Εν ποια επισολη; Εν αυτη ταυτη. Επειδη γαρ ειπεν ανωτερω, οτι εκκαθαρατε την παλαιαν ζυμην, του πορνευκστα, ως δεδηλωται, αιγιττομενος, δι ο εδηλωτο το μη συναμιγνυσθαι πορνοις' ισως υπενοησαν αν οτι παντων των πορνων, και των παρ' ελλησι χωριζεσθαι δει. Ερμηνευει τοιουν περι ποιων παρηγγειλε. Theoph. in loc.

^y Πη εγραψεν; Εν οις λεγει, και εχι μαλλον επενθησατε. κ. λ. — Και παλι εκκαθαρατε την παλαιαν ζυμην. κ. λ. — [Τοις πορνοις τε κοσμη τετα.] Ι:α μη νομισωσιν, οφειλειν και τοις των ελληνων πορνοις μη συναμιγνυσθαι, οπερ ην αδυνατον τοις πολιν οικησι, διορθεται αυτο. Apud. Œcum. in loc.

(A) I might refer to many other texts of scripture, and to passages of other writers, Matt. xxvii. 8.

εως της σημερον. xxviii. 15. — με- χει της σημερον. — Αποσ. i. 3. και οι ακροντες της λογις της προφητειας, Id est, ταυτης προφητειας, quomodo accepit Latinus. Grot. in loc. So Liban. ep. 1174, p. 558. Εμελλε μεν και μη δοντος με την επισολην. κ. λ. Etiam si ego has literas non scripsissem. — Ep. 1177. p. 559. Και μην κακεινο δηλον, οτι μειζονος απολαυσει της παρα σε προνοιας, μετα την επισολην. post traditas has literas.

^z Possunt etiam verba, εγραφα υμιν, reddi, scribo vobis. &c. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 154.

^a See vol. V. p. 232. See there likewise, p. 180. ^b Scripsi vobis.] Pro scribo. Vel ideo prateritum dicit, quia cum legeretur, tempus scribendi prateritum esset. Sedul. Comm. in loc. Ap. PP. Lugd. T. VI. p. 540. C. ^c Verba Varronis subjeci. A. Gell. Noct. Att. l. 2. cap. 20.

Propterea verba Atteii Capitonis ex

Gellius, where it is said: 'I have subjoined the words of Varro:' that is, I shall subjoin them. In another place. 'I have transcribed the words of Plutarch.' And in like manner often: when the words of an author had not yet been transcribed, but were to be transcribed soon after.

In John iv. 38. Our Lord says to the disciples: *I sent you to reap that whereon ye have bestowed no labour.* Nevertheless the disciples had not yet been sent forth by him. But knowing what he designed to do, and also knowing beforehand what would be the circumstances of their mission, he says to them: 'When I shall send you to preach the gospel, you will find the case to be as I now represent it.'

In like manner St. Paul having in his mind the whole plan of the epistle, which he was writing, and considering some directions, which he should give in the remaining part of the epistle, says: *I have written unto you.* If it be asked, where are those directions? I answer: I think, they are in the tenth chapter of this epistle, where the apostle cautions against idolatry, and dangerous temptations to it, and against doing what might be understood to be religious communion with idols, and idolaters. These things I apprehend, the apostle then had in his mind.

What he says therefore here in ch. v. 9, 10, 11. is to this purpose: 'I shall in this epistle deliver some cautions against a dangerous and offensive intimacy with idolaters. But when I do so, it is not my intention, to prohibit all civil commerce with gentile people, *who are fornicators, or covetous, or extortioners, or idolaters.* For at that rate you could not live in the world. But here I am speaking of such as are professed Christians. *And I have now written unto you, that is, I now charge you, and require it of you: If any man, called a brother, a professed Christian, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or an extortioner, with such an one, no not to eat: that is, not to have any conversation with him.*' Compare 2 Theff. iii. 14, 15.

That appears to me the most probable account of this text. But if any hesitate about the reference to a place, that follows

ex quinto Librorum, quos de Pontificio Jure composuit, scripsi. Ib. l. 4. cap. 6.

Verba ipsa Plutarchi, quoniam res inopinata est, subscripsi. Ib. cap. 12.

Ex quo libro plura verba adscripsimus, ut simul ibidem quid

ipse inter res gestas et annales esse dixerit, ostenderemus. Ib. l. 5. cap. 18.

Ipsa autem verba Chryssippi, quantum valui memoriâ adscripsi — In libro enim *περι προνομίας* quarto dicit. — Ib. l. 6. cap. 2.

in

in the remaining part of the epistle; I still hope, I may insist upon it, that *εν τη επισολη*, which we have rendered in an epistle, does, and must signify, in this epistle.

5. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. *And account, that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation: even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, has written unto you.*

Hence it is argued, that ^d St Paul wrote several letters to the dispersed Jews, which are now lost. I answer, that this argument depends upon the supposition, that the epistles of St. Peter were sent to believing Jews: which is far from being certain. It is more probable, as was ^e formerly shown, that St. Peter's epistles were sent to believing gentiles in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, or to all Christians in general in those countries. To which Christians Paul had indeed sent several letters. To them were sent his epistle to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians. To which might be added, his two epistles to Timothy, then residing at Ephesus, the chief city of Asia. To these, and other epistles of the apostle Paul, St. Peter might refer. Nor can I see any reason at all to doubt, whether the epistles of Paul, intended by St. Peter, are not still in being.

6. 3 John ver. 9. *I wrote unto the church.* Hence ^f some have argued, that St. John wrote an epistle to the church, where Diotrophes affected to have pre-eminence, which is now lost.

Indeed this text has exercised the thoughts of many critics, as may be seen in *Wolfii Curæ*. However the words may be translated thus: *I had written, or I would have written to the church.* This version has been approved by ^g some. And to me it appears very right. If this interpretation be admitted, there is no reason to conclude, that ^h any writing of St. John has been lost.

^d S. Petrus 2. ep. iii. 15. 16. plures literas ad dispersos Hebræos allegat, quæ jam dudum periire. Neque enim, uti Millius putavit f. x. col. 2. heic citatur epistola ad Hebræos, quæ exstat, &c. Pfaff. ubi supra. p. 47. Conf. Ens ubi supra. § xxxvi. xxxvii. p. 53. 54.

^e See before. p. 569. &c.

^f Eodem modo et literæ S. Joannis, ad Ecclesiam, in quâ Diotrophes ο φιλοπρωτευων erat, scriptæ, et 3. Joh. ver. 9. memoratæ, periire. Pfaff. ib. p. 47.

^g See Whitby upon the place, and Dr. Benson. And see before, p. 601, note x.

^h 'Some would, ' from hence, gather, that St. John ' wrote an epistle, which is now lost. ' But the primitive Christians were ' not so careless about preserving ' the apostolic writings. There is ' not the least hint among the an- ' cients, that there ever was such an ' epistle. And the apostle's words, ' in this place, are fairly capable of ' another interpretation.'— Dr. Benson upon the place. p. 703.

7. It is argued, that ¹ Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, expresseth himself, as if he thought, St. Paul had written to them more epistles than one.

To which it is easy to answer, that though the word be in the plural number, one epistle only might be meant. Secondly, it is not improbable, that Polycarp intended the epistle to the Philippians, and also the two epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, who were in the same province of Macedonia, as was shown ^k formerly. Indeed this objection is so obviated by what was said, when we largely considered the testimony of Polycarp to the New Testament, that I think nothing more needs to be added here.

V. In treating this subject Mr. Ens could not help thinking of those passages of Origen, and Eusebius, where they speak of the apostles not being solicitous to write many volumes. Which passages were taken notice of by us ¹ long ago. He endeavours to evade the proper conclusion to be thence drawn. But he owns, that ^m the ancients had no knowledge of those writings of the apostles, which he and some others have imagined to be lost. And he thinks it almost miraculous, or however a very wonderful dispensation of Providence, that they should so soon perish, as to be unknown to the ancients, as well as to us.

But does not that show, that this whole argument is frivolous and insignificant? For plausible speculations cannot be valid against fact and evidence. If the primitive Christians knew not of any apostolical writings, beside those, which have been transmitted to us; it is very probable, there were none.

ⁱ Memorat quoque Polycarpus in literis ad Philippenses, S. Paulum non unam sed plures ad eos *επιστολας* absentem scripsisse. Pfaff. ib. p. 47. Conf. Ens p. 51—56.

^k See vol. II. p. 91, 92. ¹ See vol. II. p. 466, 467, and vol. IV. p. 225, 226. ^m Fateor ingenue, vix concipi potest, unde tam cito tanta fuerit inter veteres ignorantia de eo, quod Apostoli multo plura scripserint, quam quidem illorum,

et nostras pervenit ad manus. Fateor, vix concipi potest, ubi tam profunde latere potuerint scripta illa apostolica, ut omnium fugerint oculos. At divina hic mihi admiranda ac adoranda videtur providentia, quæ ad tempus data scripta, dum aliorum quæ permanerent in vitæ canonem perpetuum nondum esset in ecclesiis copia, deinde protinus e medio tolli voluerit. Ens ibid. § li. p. 68.