






107-2
17



BX 8915 .L3 1835 v.10
Lardner, Nathaniel, 1684-
1768.
The works of Nathaniel
Lardner





LARDNER'S WORKS.

VOL. X.

THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

WITH A LIFE BY DR. KIPPIS.

IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. X.

LONDON :

WESTLEY & DAVIS, STATIONERS' COURT.

MDCCCXXXV

BUNGAY :
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY J. R. AND C. CHILDS.

CONTENTS OF THE TENTH VOLUME.

TRACTS.

	PAGE
A Vindication of Three of our Blessed Saviour's Miracles, in answer to the Objections of Mr. Woolston - - -	1
A Letter written in the Year 1730, concerning the Question, whether the Logos supplied the place of a Human Soul in the Person of Jesus Christ - - -	73
The First Postscript, containing an explication of those words, the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of God, as used in the Scriptures - - -	117
The Second Postscript, containing Remarks upon the Third Part of the late Bishop of Clogher's Vindication of the Histories of the Old and New Testament - - -	169

A DISSERTATION UPON THE TWO NEW EPISTLES ASCRIBED TO CLEMENT OF ROME.

Sect. 1. Extracts out of these Epistles, for showing the Author's Testimony to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament - - -	186
2. External Evidence against the Genuineness of these Epistles	189
3. Internal Evidence to the same purpose, and their Time -	199
4. The Author Anonymous - - -	209
5. The Importance and Use of these Epistles - -	210
6. Conclusion - - -	211
An Essay on the Mosaic Account of the Creation and Fall of Man	213
A Letter to Jonas Hanway, Esq. in which some reasons are assigned against the name, Magdalen Houses - - -	237
A Letter to the Authors of the Library, &c. containing Observations on 2 Cor. v. 14. - - -	248
Remarks on 1 Cor. xv. 32. - - -	250
An Inquiry into the Truth of the History of the Seven Brothers, said to have suffered Martyrdom in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Macc. vii. - - -	252

	PAGE
A Letter to the Author of Remarks upon the Inquiry into the Truth of the History of the Seven Brothers in the Maccabees -	257
A Letter upon the Personality of the Spirit - - -	262
 REMARKS UPON THE LATE DR. WARD'S DISSERTATIONS UPON SEVERAL PASSAGES OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. 	
Introduction - - - - -	265
Chap. I. The Case of the Dæmoniac who resided among the Tombs on the coast of Gadara. <i>Dissert.</i> xxi. -	ibid.
II Who those Greeks were who desired to see Jesus; and whether they were admitted? John xii. 20, 21. <i>Dissert.</i> xxviii. - - - - -	275
III. How to reconcile St. John's account concerning the time of our Saviour's Crucifixion with that of the other Evangelists. <i>Dissert.</i> xxxii. - - - - -	278
IV. The manner of embalming dead bodies among the Jews, and particularly that of our Saviour. <i>Dissert.</i> xxxv. - - - - -	283
V. Whom are we to understand by the Grecians and He- brews, mentioned, Acts vi. 1. <i>Dissert.</i> xxxvii. -	287
VI. The term Holy Ghost, in the New Testament, denotes both a person and a power. <i>Dissert.</i> xxxviii. -	299
VII. To whom the Apostolic Decree, Acts xv. was directed; and whether it was perpetual. <i>Dissert.</i> xlii. -	300
Sect. 1. An Introduction - - - - -	ibid.
2. The Noachic precepts, with observations upon them -	301
3. To whom the Apostolic Decree was directed, and that there was but one sort of Jewish proselytes - - -	307
4. General Observations, showing the occasion and design of the Apostolic Decree - - - - -	318
5. The several Articles of the Decree explained - - -	321
6. Observations in the manner of corollary. Where is shown the fault of St. Peter, and St. Paul vindicated -	328
Chap. VIII. Whether St. Paul did really blame St. Peter for his con- duct, mentioned, Gal. ii. <i>Dissert.</i> l. - - -	347
IX. What is the meaning of St. Paul's expression, <i>You see how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand.</i> Gal. vi. 11. <i>Dissert.</i> li. - - -	351

CONTENTS.

11

Observations upon Dr. Macknight's Harmony of the Four Gospels, as far as relates to the History of our Saviour's Resurrection ; in a Letter to the Author - - - - - ibid.

INDEXES.

I. Greek Words explained - - - - - 1
II. Various Readings of Texts in the New Testament - - - - - 2
III. Texts of Scriptures explained - - - - - 3
 Texts of Sermons in the Ninth Volume - - - - - 10
IV. Authors, Sects, and Writings, whose History is written, and from which Extracts are made - - - - - 11
V. An Alphabetical Table of Principal Matters - - - - - 24

A VINDICATION

OF THREE OF

OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR'S MIRACLES :

VIZ.

THE RAISING OF JAIRUS'S DAUGHTER, THE WIDOW OF
NAIN'S SON, AND LAZARUS.

IN ANSWER TO THE OBJECTIONS

OF

MR. WOOLSTON'S FIFTH DISCOURSE ON THE MIRACLES OF OUR SAVIOUR.

THE PREFACE.

THE ensuing vindication was drawn up about nine months since. But it was done for my own satisfaction, without any view to a publication at that time. And when the Reverend Dr. Harris's remarks on the case of Lazarus came out, I thought the public and Mr. W. had received in a short compass a full answer to all the material objections of the discourse, with which these papers are concerned.

Nor did I determine to send them to the press, till after I had seen a passage in Mr. W.'s defence of his Discourses, p. 61, where he says: 'Whoever was the author of the foresaid treatise, [The Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus] he humbly and heartily begs of him to publish what in the conclusion of it he has given us some hopes of, the trial of the witnesses of the resurrection of Lazarus, because his Rabbi's objections to it are a novelty and curiosity, which, by way of such a reply to them, he should be glad to see handled.' I also wish the ingenious author of that performance may be at leisure to grant Mr. W.'s request. In the mean time Mr. W. still expressing a particular regard for his Rabbi's objections, I thought it not amiss to send abroad this Vindication, which I had by me.

If Mr. W. by way of such a reply, means a reply drawn up with the wit and spirit of that author, I freely own it much above my capacity, and am not so vain as to attempt it. If by way of such a reply he means a reply without abusive railing terms, or invoking the aid of the civil magistrate, I have done it in that way. I wish Mr. Woolston no harm; I only wish him a sincere conviction and profession of the truth effected and brought about by solid reasons and arguments, without pains or penalties. And in this point I agree exactly with that learned Dominican, De Maussac, who in his Prolegomena to Raymond Martini's *Pugio Fidei*, written against Moors and Jews, says: 'We must with Tertullian openly profess, that the new law does not defend itself by the sword of the magistrate: forasmuch as it has pleased Christ the author of it, that no man should be forced to the embracing of his law by the punishments of this life, or the fear of them, as appears from many places of the New Testament, not only of Paul, but also of John, and Luke, and Matthew. Nor is it, as the same father says at the end of his book to Scapula, a part of religion to force religion, which must be taken up freely, not upon compulsion. Who will lay upon me the necessity of believing what I will not, or of not believing what I will? as Lactantius says. Nothing is so voluntary as religion. In which, if the mind be averse, religion is quite destroyed. Faith is to be wrought by persuasion, not by compulsion. Severity has always done harm, and always will do harm: and our minds, like noble and generous steeds, are best managed with an easy rein; rather by reason than authority, rather by good words than by threats.'^a

When, at the erecting the Royal Society, into which were freely admitted men of different religions and countries, some it is likely, were apprehensive of this free converse of various judgments, Dr. Sprat^b frankly asserts, 'that our doctrine and discipline [those of the church of England]

^a Nam cum Tertulliano palam est profitendum, legem novam non se vindicare ultore gladio: quod Christo ejus auctori placuerit neminem ad receptionem suæ legis cogi hujus vitæ pœnis, vel earum metu, ut patet ex variis Novi Testamenti locis, tum Pauli, tum Joannis, tum Lucae, tum Matthæi: quod non sit religionis, eodem teste ad Scapulam in fine, cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi debet, non vi. Quis mihi imponat necessitatem vel credendi quod nolim, vel quod velim non credendi? ait Lactantius. Nihil tam voluntarium quam religio. In quâ si animus aversus est, jam sublata, jam nulla est. Fides autem suadenda est, non imperanda; nocuit enim, et nocet semper, rigor: et ingenia nostra, ut nobiles et generosi equi, melius facili fræno reguntur, docendo magis quam jubendo, monendo quam minando.

^b History of the Royal Society, p. 63, second edition.

‘ will be so far from receiving damage by it, that it were
‘ the best way to make them universally embraced, if they
‘ were oftener brought to be canvassed amidst all sorts of
‘ dissenters:—That there is no one profession amidst the
‘ several denominations of christians, that can be exposed to
‘ the search and scrutiny of its adversaries, with so much
‘ safety as ours.’

Dr. Bentley, in a sermon at a public commencement at Cambridge, says,^c ‘ It has pleased the Divine Wisdom, never yet to leave christianity wholly at leisure from opposers; but to give its professors that perpetual exercise of their industry and zeal. And who can tell, if without such adversaries to rouse and quicken them, they might not in long tract of time have grown remiss in the duties, and ignorant in the doctrines of religion?’

These learned men have assured us upon the foundation of the scriptures, of the fathers, and reason, that all force on the minds of men in the matters of belief is contrary to religion in general, and to the christian religion in particular; and that severity instead of doing good, has always done harm.

These points might be enlarged upon, but nothing new can be offered. Possibly some good men may still be in some doubt concerning the issue of admitting the principles of religion to be freely and openly canvassed. But I think that such may find satisfaction even upon this head in the passages I have quoted, provided they will be pleased to consider them. However I will add a few observations briefly upon this matter.

It is an old saying, which has been much admired and applauded for its wisdom, that truth is great, and strong above all things. There is certainly some real excellence in Truth above error. Great and important truths are clearer than others, and not likely to be mistaken, but to shine the more for examination. The christian religion in particular, as contained in the New Testament, abounds with evidence.

These are considerations taken from the nature of things. Experience is on the same side. The christian religion triumphed for the first three hundred years over error and superstition, without the aids of civil authority, against the veneration of ancient custom, against ridicule and calumny, false arguments, and many severe persecutions. From small beginnings by its own internal excellence, and the force of that evidence with which God had clothed it, and the industry and zeal of its honest professors, it spread it-

^c Page 3, quarto edition, 1696.

self over the Roman empire, and the neighbouring countries.

The christian church had in the same space of time a triumph within itself over those false and absurd opinions that sprang up under the christian name. 'These heresies,' Eusebius^d says, 'soon disappeared one after another, being continually changing into new forms and shapes. But the catholic and only true church, always the same and constant to itself, spread and increased continually; shining out among Greeks and barbarians by the gravity, simplicity, freedom, modesty, and purity of its manners and principles.' This joint victory over Gentilism, and over heresies, was^e obtained, as he intimates, by the writings and discourses of the patrons of truth at that time. And indeed it could be owing to nothing else but to those methods, supported by holy lives and patient sufferings.

Our own time also affords a convincing instance to all that will open their eyes to observe. The protestant states and kingdoms of Europe, as they enjoy greater liberty than others, proportionably exceed their neighbours in the justness of their sentiments, and the goodness of their lives. Indeed there is among us protestants a great deal of vice and irreligion, which all good men observe with grief and concern, and some very bad and selfish men delight to aggravate and magnify with a view to their own evil designs; but still without vanity, if we be barely just to our circumstances, sure we have some reason to glory over some of our neighbours in this respect. Which advantage can be ascribed to no other cause so much as the liberty we enjoy. For introduce among us the tyranny they are under, and we shall be as ignorant, as superstitious, and corrupt, as they.

If then men should be permitted among us, to go on in delivering their sentiments freely in matters of religion, and to propose their objections against christianity itself; I apprehend, we have no reason to be in pain for the event. On the side of christianity, I expect to see, as hitherto, the greatest share of learning, good sense, true wit, and fairness of disputation: which things, I hope, will be superior to low ridicule, false argument, and misrepresentation.

For ought I can see, in an age so rational as this we live

^d Ἀλλων ἐπ' ἀλλαις ἁρεσεων καινοτομωμενων, ὑπορρεσων αει των προτερων, και εις πολυτροπως και πολυμορφος ιδεας αλλοτε αλλως φθειρομενων. Προσηει δ' εις αυξησιν και μεγαθος, αει κατα τα αυτα και ὡσαντως εχουσα, ἢ της καθολικαι και μονης αληθους εκκλησιας λαμπροτης, κ. λ. H. E. l. 4. c. 7.

^e Ὅμως δ' ἐν κατα τας δηλωμενες αυθις παρηγεν εις μεσον ἢ αληθεια πλειως εαυτης ὑπερμαχης, ἢ δι' αγραφων αυτο μονον ελεγχων, αλλα και δι' εγγραφων αποδειξεων κατα των αθειων ἁρεσεων τρατευομενης. Ibid.

in, the victory over our enemies may be speedily obtained. They will be driven to those manifest absurdities, which they must be ashamed to own; and be silent in dread of universal censure. But suppose the contest should last for some time, we shall all better understand our Bibles: we shall upon a fresh examination better understand the principles and the grounds of our religion. Possibly some errors may be mixed with our faith, which by this means may be separated, and our faith become more pure. Being more confirmed in the truths of our religion, we shall be more perfect in the duties of it. Instead of being unthinking and nominal, we shall become more generally serious and real christians: each one of which advantages will be a large step toward a complete and final victory.

This victory obtained upon the ground of argument and persuasion alone, by writing and discourse, will be honourable to us and our religion; and we shall be able to reflect upon it with pleasure. We shall not only keep that good thing we have received, but shall deliver it down to others with advantage. But a victory secured by mere authority is no less to be dreaded than a defeat. It may appear a benefit for the present, but it really undermines the cause, and strikes at the root of our holy profession. Will any serious and sensible Christian, in the view of a future judgment, undertake to answer for the damage thereby brought to the doctrine of his Saviour, the meek and patient Jesus? as meek in his principles, as in the example he has bequeathed us.

I might now address myself to our adversaries, and tell them, that it is a very desirable thing, that all authors should write as scholars and gentlemen, at least like civilized people: that it is a point long since determined, that in controversial writings, authors should confine themselves to things, that is, the merits of the cause, without annoying persons: that it is grievous to all sorts of men, to have those things which they respect, treated with indecency. I might tell them, that other men's reputation is as sacred as their own. I might remind them, that christians at this time, generally speaking, are in as good temper as they were ever known to be: that some, being of opinion that Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and that it is his pleasure, that men should not be compelled to receive his law by the punishments of this life, or the fear of them, leave men to propose their doubts and objections in their own way: that others have openly declared, that they ought to be invited; and others that they ought to be permitted to pro-

pose their objections, provided it be done in a grave and serious manner. Christians have also lately shown an instance of their moderation towards some books published in opposition to their principles. These are things, which, one would think, should have some effect on ingenuous minds; and draw them off from the design of any rudeness or indecency in their attacks on the sentiments commonly received among christians. I might also remind our adversaries of some examples of an admirable decorum observed by the disciples of Jesus in their arguings with the Jews and Gentiles. But really one has little encouragement from some late performances to enlarge upon these particulars. And perhaps it would be judged ridiculous, to imagine that any men should oppose the gospel with the same spirit, with which it was at first taught and propagated.

Besides, as all men are more concerned for the good conduct of their friends, than of others; so have I been chiefly solicitous on this occasion about the conduct of those who are engaged in the same cause with myself; that it may be such as is best suited to the nature of those sublime principles they profess, and most for the lasting honour and interest of our religion. And though the things here said may be at first disagreeable to some who are, or have been in part of a different sentiment, it is not impossible, but that upon calm and cool reflection they may obtain their approbation.

A passage of Origen out of his Books against Celsus, concerning these three miracles.

I HAVE in the Vindication prolixly shown, that the literal histories of these miracles are rational, consistent and credible: so that we may be safe and easy in understanding them in their literal sense, whatever any fathers or other people may say to the contrary. I shall however here set before the reader a passage of Origen written about A. D. 245, which passage I have chosen, not only as containing a testimony to the real performance of these miracles in their literal sense, and showing, that Origen argued the messiahship of Jesus from miracles; but also as containing an excellent observation concerning the credibility of the evangelists. The reader will likewise perceive that in Celsus's time, who flourished about the middle of the second century, the miracles of Jesus were much talked of, and well known to the heathens: and that the christians in the time of Celsus, or

before, believed the miracles of Jesus, and argued his divine mission from them.

‘ But this,’ says Origen, ‘ is no new thing with Celsus, when he is not able directly to oppose the miracles which Jesus is recorded to have done, to asperse them as juggling tricks. To which I have already often replied according to my ability. And here he^a makes us answer him; that we therefore believe him to be the Son of God, because he healed the lame and the blind. He adds; and, as you say, raised the dead. For certain we do believe him to be the Christ, and the Son of God, because he healed the lame and the blind. And we are confirmed in it, because that in the prophets it is written: “ Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear, and the lame man leap as an hart.” And that he raised the dead, and that this is not a fiction of those that wrote the gospels, is evident hence; that if it had been a fiction of theirs, they would have related many persons to have been raised up, and those who had lain a long time in their graves. But it not being a fiction, there are few of whom this is related: for instance, the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue (of whom I do not^b know why he said, she is not dead, but s’cepeth, expressing somewhat peculiar to her, not common to all dead persons) and the only son of a widow, on whom he had compassion, and raised him up, after he had bid the bearers of the corpse stop; and the third, Lazarus, who had been buried four days.’

^a —Και νυν δε φησιν οιοει ημιας αποκρινασθαι, οτι δια τωτ' ενομισαμεν αυτον ειναι Υιον Θεου, επει χωλως και τυφλως εθεραπευσε. Προσιζησι δε και το, ως ημεις φατε, αυτη νεκρωε. Οτι μιν εν χωλως και τυφλως εθεραπευσε, ειοπερ Χριστον αυτον και Υιον Θεου νομιζομεν' δηλον ημιν εστιν εκ τω και εν προφητειαις γεγραφθαι. Τοτε.—Οτι δε και νεκρους αυτη, και εκ ετι πλασμα των τα ευαγγελια γραψαντων' παρισταται εκ τω, ει μιν πλασμα ην, πολλωε αναγεγραφθαι τωε αναστανταε, και τωε ηδη χρονωε εχονταε πλειοναε εν τοιε μνημειοιε. Επει δ' εκ ετι πλασμα, πανν ευαριθμητωε λελεχθαι, την τε τω αρχισυναγωγω θυγατερα (περι ηε εκ οιδ' οπωε ειπει, εκ απεθανεν, αλλα καθευει' λεγων τι περι αυτηε ο ε πασι τοιε αποθνεσι προσην) και τον μονογενη της χηραε υιον. Εφ' ω σπλαγχμισθεις ανετησεν, ηησαε τωε φερονταε τον νεκρον' και τριτον Λαζαρον τεταρτην ημεραν εν τω μνημειω εχοντα. Cont. Cels. l. 2. p. 87.

^b Origen, it seems, did not then think of the reason of this. I have assigned the plain reason of it, p. 37 See also, p. 44

A VINDICATION, &c.

Mr. W. begins his Fifth Discourse, p. 1, 2, with saying, that he is now to ‘take into examination the three miracles of Jesus’s raising the dead, viz. of Jairus’s daughter, Matt. ix. Mark v. Luke viii. of the widow of Nain’s son, Luke vii. and of Lazarus, John xi.; the literal stories of which, he says, he shall show to consist of absurdities, improbabilities, and incredibilities, in order to the mystical interpretation of them.’

I have read over his examination of these miracles, and am still of opinion, that the histories of them are credible.

I. I will therefore first consider all his objections against these literal stories.

II. I will consider the Jewish Rabbi’s letter inserted in this discourse.

III. I will show, that the histories of these three miracles are well circumstanced, and have in them the marks and tokens of credibility.

CHAP. I.

SECTION I.

ANSWER TO MR. WOOLSTON’S FIRST OBJECTION.

I WILL first consider all Mr. W’s objections to these ‘literal stories.’

Mr. W. says in his preamble, before he comes to propose his objections in form: ‘that these three miracles are not equally great, but differ in degree, is visible enough to every one that but cursorily reads, and compares their stories one with another; the greatest of the three, and indeed the greatest miracle that Jesus is supposed to have wrought, is that of Lazarus’s resurrection; which, in truth, was a most prodigious miracle, if his corpse was putrefied and stank; and if there were no just exceptions to be made to the credibility of the story. Next to that, in magnitude, is Jesus’s raising of the widow’s son, as they were carrying him to his burial. The least of the three is that of his raising Jairus’s daughter, p. 4, 5.’

For my own part, I will not pretend to affirm, that these three miracles are equally great, though the difference is small: but I should think it highly probable, that the being which can give life to a person really dead, though but for a quarter of an hour, or even a minute, is able also to raise to life another that has been dead many days. The length of time in which a person has lain dead from the time he expired does indeed somewhat increase the certainty of his death. But the difficulty of the work of a resurrection from real death is so very great, that length of time from the decease can add but little to it. This alone (if it be true) ruins Mr. W.'s first observation, however plausible it may have appeared to some. And he himself says, p. 3. 'He believes, it will be granted on all hands, that the restoring a person, indisputably dead, to life again, is a stupendous miracle.'

If then it shall be made appear, that the three persons here mentioned were indisputably dead, and raised to life again; or that there are no just exceptions against the credibility of these stories; we have in the gospels three stupendous miracles, which were wrought by Jesus Christ; and we have no occasion to have recourse to any mystical interpretations.

1. 'Observe,' says he, p. 6, 'that the unnatural and preposterous order of time, in which these miracles are related justly brings them under suspicion of fable and forgery. The greatest of the three is indisputably that of Lazarus's resurrection; but since this is only mentioned by St. John, who wrote his gospel after the other evangelists; here is too much room for cavil and question, whether this story be not entirely his invention: again, if Matthew, the first writer, had recorded only the story of Lazarus, whose resurrection was the greatest miracle, and if Luke had added that of the widow of Nain's son; and John, lastly, had remembered us of Jairus's daughter—then all had been well; and no objection had hence lain against the credit of any of these miracles, or against the authority of the evangelists: but this unnatural and preposterous order of time, in which these miracles are recorded (the greatest being postponed to the last) administers just occasion of suspicion of the truth and credibility of all their stories,' p. 9, 16.

On the contrary I maintain, that St. John the last evangelist's recording a miracle omitted by the former, even supposing it to be greater than any related by them, does not administer any just occasion of suspicion of the truth and credibility of all their three stories, or of any one of them.

If there be any force in this argument of Mr. W. it must lie in some one or more of these following suppositions :

1. That some of the three former evangelists have expressly declared, they have related all the miracles, or all the greatest miracles, which Jesus ever wrought, or which they knew of.

2. Or, if they have not expressly declared this, that however they have in their way of writing shown an affectation of mightily increasing the number of our Saviour's miracles, or of setting down all, and especially the greatest which they knew of.

3. Or else, that the latter evangelists have betrayed a fondness in their gospels, to record more in number, or greater in degree, than those who went before them; and thereby give ground for suspicion of forgery and invention.

4. Or lastly, that the omission of a miracle recorded by the last evangelist, if it had been really done, is absolutely unaccountable.

1. ' That some of the three former evangelists have expressly declared, they have related all the miracles, or all the greatest miracles that Jesus ever did, or that they knew of.' This they have none of them said. Nor is it so much as pretended, they have said so. Indeed they have often declared the contrary.

2. Or, ' If they have not expressly declared this; that the former evangelists have however by their way and manner of writing shown an affectation of mightily increasing the number of our Saviour's miracles, or of setting down all, and especially the greatest which they knew of.' This Mr. W. charges them with: ' To aggrandize the fame of their Master, as a worker of miracles,' he says, ' was the design of all the evangelists, especially of the three first,' p. 7. This does not appear from their histories, but quite the contrary. Having related two or three miracles wrought by Jesus, in any place, they content themselves therewith, though they knew of many others. St. Matthew, in his eighth chapter, having set down the miraculous cure of a leper, of the centurion's servant, and of Peter's wife's mother, relates no more miracles particularly, but only says in general: " When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick," Matt. viii. 16. And in divers other places he affirms many to have been healed, and many other mighty works to have been done, beside those he puts down. Mark has taken the same summary method upon many occasions. " And

at even," says he, "when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and that were possessed with devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils," Mark i. 32, 34. St. Luke has followed the same compendious way of writing. Having related a cure, in a synagogue, of a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and of Simon's wife's mother, he adds: "Now when the sun was setting, all they which had any sick with divers diseases, brought them unto him, and he laid his hands on every one of them and healed them. And devils also came out of many, crying out and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God," Luke iv. 40, 41.

As they do not multiply their particular relations of miracles, but omit great numbers which they knew of, so neither do they affect always to take the greatest in degree, or those that seem so. I do not pretend to understand all the various degrees of miracles. But it appears to me a more showy and affecting work to cure a demoniac, than to heal a person with a fever. But yet Matthew, in the chapter just quoted, at the same time that he relates the cure of Simon's wife's mother, omits all particular accounts of those which were that same day delivered from evil spirits, though there were many such instances. There is in all the gospels but one particular account of any person cured by only touching the hem of Christ's garment, namely, the woman with the bloody issue. And yet there were many other such cases. St. Matthew says, that in the land of Gennesaret, they "besought him, that they might only touch the HEM of his garment, and as many as touched were made perfectly whole," Matt. xiv. 35, 36. St. Mark assures us of the same thing. "For he had healed many, insomuch that they pressed upon him for to TOUCH him, as many as had plagues," Mark iii. 10. And in another place he says: "Whithersoever he entered,—they laid their sick in the streets, and besought him that they might touch, if it were but the BORDER of his garment: and as many as touched him were made whole," ch. vi. 56. St. Luke also confirms this account: "And the whole multitude sought to TOUCH him: for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all," Luke vi. 19.

Nay, there is a great deal of reason to think, that the evangelists did know of more persons raised to life by Jesus, than those they have particularly mentioned. St. Luke, having given the history of raising up the young man, says immediately: "And the disciples of John showed him of

all these things. And John calling unto him two of his disciples, sent them to Jesus, saying, Art thou he that should come, or look we for another? Then Jesus answering, said unto them, Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard, how that the blind see, the lame walk,—the DEAD are raised,” Luke vii. 18, 19, 22. In St. Matthew our Lord says the same thing in his answer to John’s inquiry: “The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk—the DEAD are raised up,” Matt. xi. 5. He says, “The dead are raised,” in the plural number. St. Matthew therefore must have known of more than one, though he has given the particular history of the ruler of the synagogue’s daughter only.

Farther, in answer to this assertion, that the design of all the evangelists was to aggrandize the fame of their Master, as a worker of miracles; I would observe, that the gospels, though but short histories, are not filled with accounts of miracles. There are whole chapters together containing nothing but an account of our Saviour’s pure and heavenly doctrine. Other chapters contain nothing but parables, which are also interspersed here and there in other parts of the narration. Other chapters are taken up with the cavils of the Pharisees and others, and our Saviour’s answers to them, with discourses to the disciples, and divers other matters. So that the miracles alone, separate from the discourses and arguings which they occasioned, make but a moderate part of the gospels. Many miracles undoubtedly the evangelists have related. Nor had Jesus proved himself to be the Messiah, if many miracles had not been performed by him. Such things were expected of the Messiah, when he came, by every body. Therefore it was, that, as St. John observes, “Many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did,” John ii. 23. And in another place, “Many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?” ch. vii. 31. Nor is there any ostentation in the working of any of these miracles, or in the manner in which they are related: but they are done for the confirmation of that excellent doctrine which Christ taught, and that all men might know that the Father had sent him, and that the word he taught was not his own but the Father’s. “If I do not the works of my Father,” says he to the Jews, “believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him,” John x. 37, 38. And to the disciples: “The words that I speak unto

you, I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwells in me, he doth the works. Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very work's sake," ch. xiv. 10, 11.

Since then the first three evangelists appear not to have given an account of all the miracles of Jesus which they knew of, nor of all his greatest miracles, nor of all those which he had raised from the dead: since they have not filled up their gospels with accounts of miracles or other wonderful appearances, and have written all without any marks of affectation or ostentation; it can be no prejudice to the credit of another later historian of Jesus, though he relate some few particular miracles not expressly mentioned by the foregoing.

3. 'Or else, that the latter evangelists have in their gospels betrayed a fondness to record more in number, or greater in degree, than those that went before: and thereby give ground for suspicion of forgery and invention.' Here St. John, the last evangelist, in point of number, is perfectly innocent; he not having related half so many miracles, as any one of the former. The offence therefore, if there be any, must be this, that later evangelists relate greater miracles than the foregoing. And this Mr. W. would insinuate to have been the practice of all in general. For he says, p. 11. 'That the first was sparing and modest in his romance; and the second, being sensible of the insufficiency of the former's tale, devises a miracle of a bigger size; which still not proving sufficient to the end proposed, the third writer, rather than his Prophet's honour should sink for want of a resurrection miracle, forges a story of a monstrously huge one.' To this I answer, that a general conclusion ought not to be drawn from a particular instance or two: supposing that the raising of the widow's son of Nain, related by Luke, be greater than that of raising Jairus's daughter, recorded by Matthew; and that the raising of Lazarus recorded by St. John be greater than either of the two former, a suspicion of forgery and invention cannot be fairly admitted, unless an affectation of enlarging miracles appear also upon other occasions. For which reason we will take a view of the conduct, first of all, of the three former evangelists, and then of St. John.

In the first place we will take a view of the conduct of the three former evangelists. Matthew relates a story of Christ's feeding a multitude in a miraculous manner. He says, there were five thousand of them fed with five loaves, and that twelve baskets of fragments were taken up, Matt. xiv. Nei-

ther St. Mark (ch. vi.) or St. Luke (ch. ix.) have related a greater miracle of this kind; but tell the same story with the same circumstances: whereas, if they had been disposed to invent, the two latter evangelists might have easily told a much greater miracle of this sort than Matthew had done. Again, St. Matthew has given an account of raising Jairus's daughter, ch. ix. 18. St. Mark wrote after him, and yet he has not told any greater resurrection story, but only the same, ch. v. 23. Nay, sometimes a later evangelist lessens a miracle that had been told by a former: so far are they from forging huge miracles, rather than their Master's honour should sink for want of them. Thus Matthew tells of two possessed with devils in the country of the Gergesenes, healed by Jesus, ch. viii. 28. But Mark, who wrote after him, mentions but one of those men, ch. v. 1. Matthew also speaks of two blind men restored to sight near Jericho, ch. xx. 29; Mark mentions only Bartimeus, ch. x. 46, and St. Luke says: "There was a certain blind man by the way side begging," &c. ch. xviii. 35.

There is another thing very observable. One and the same evangelist, who has given an account of a very great miracle of a certain kind, does sometimes a good while after relate another miracle of the same sort, but a great deal less than the former.

Thus Matthew first gives a history of "five thousand fed with five loaves and two fishes," and says there were "twelve baskets of fragments," ch. xiv. But when he afterwards speaks of another miracle of this kind, he mentions but "four thousand fed with seven loaves and a few small fishes," and but "seven baskets full of fragments," ch. xv. These miracles are in the like order recorded in St. Mark, ch. vi. viii. Nay, if the raising of the widow of Nain's son be a greater miracle than raising Jairus's daughter, as Mr. W. supposes, then St. Luke has given an account of his resurrection stories also in this method. For the former is in the seventh, and the latter in the eighth chapter of his gospel.

It is utterly unaccountable, that a forger of miracles should fall into such a method. He who forges stories of miracles knows they are false. His reader's mind must be humoured. By a lesser he may be prepared to receive a greater, which, if told first, had perhaps induced him to throw away the whole tale. Besides a forger of miracles certainly designs to entertain his reader, whereas in this way, instead of being entertained, he must be disappointed. And there can be no reason assigned, why the evangelists should have taken this

method, (as I have shown they have done, more than one of them, in several instances,) but that they had a strict regard to truth, and that the things they relate had been indeed so done. It serves to convince us also, that they had no undue desire to aggrandize their Master; that they have not used art in their compositions, or indulged their own fancy or invention; but have followed a certain train of real, though wonderful and surprising actions.

Now we will take a view of the conduct of St. John, the last evangelist. It is St. John in particular, that Mr. W. means when he says: 'The third writer, rather than his Prophet's honour should sink for want of a resurrection miracle, 'forges a story of a monstrously huge one,' p. 11. But this is somewhat strange, that Mr. W. should impute such an action to St. John; since he has himself said, p. 7, That 'to 'aggrandize their Master, as a worker of miracles, was the 'design especially of the three first.' Moreover Mr. W. allows, p. 9, that one resurrection miracle is sufficient. Why then should it be thought, that St. John hath given an account of one raised from the dead, but that he knew it had been really done?

But not to rely on these observations of Mr. W. though so much in our favour: let us observe St. John's conduct on other occasions; one instance, as I said, not being sufficient. It is he who has informed us of the turning water into wine at Cana in Galilee, John ii. 1. I am fully persuaded this was a real miracle. But it appears to me, (and I suppose to others likewise,) one of the least miracles any where ascribed to our Saviour. If St. John forged miracles, why did he put down here so inconsiderable an one? Why did he not tell an huge one? He had full scope here, as much as any where, the former evangelists not having begun so soon in their account of our Saviour's ministry: as is well known to those who are at all acquainted with the harmony of the gospels.

Nor may any say, that the reason of St. John's relating here so small a miracle was, that he judged it not proper to tell a great miracle at first, but to reserve such an one, and particularly the huge miracle of Lazarus's resurrection, for the last. For soon after this he relates a surprising miracle of a great cure wrought on a person at a distance, and that the son of a nobleman. "So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee. And there was a certain nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum. When he heard that Jesus was come out of Judea into Galilee, he went unto him, and besought him, that he would come down and heal his son, for he was

at the POINT OF DEATH. Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way, thy son liveth." And afterwards upon inquiry "when the fever left him, the father knew that it was at the same hour in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth. This is again the second miracle that Jesus did, when he was come out of Judea into Galilee," John iv. 46—54.

Let us view St. John in another place. In the sixth chapter of his gospel he relates a story of Christ's feeding a multitude in a miraculous manner, which is, that he fed "five thousand people with five barley loaves and two small fishes," and that they took up "twelve baskets full of the fragments that remained." This is just the same with what the three other evangelists had told before. But why did not St. John, if he indulged invention, forge here, or somewhere else, a story of a monstrously huge miracle? It had been altogether as easy for him to have told a story of about ten or twelve thousand men, or more, fed with two loaves and one small fish: and to add, that when all had eaten to satisfaction, there were twenty or thirty baskets full of fragments taken up.

There is no reason then to suspect the truth of the history of Lazarus's resurrection, purely because it is a greater miracle than those recorded by the former evangelists. If the miracle recorded by St. John be greater than those recorded by them, it is not owing (for any thing that yet appears) to St. John's invention, but to truth and real matter of fact, and this regard to it, which was equally the concern of them all.

4. The last pretended ground of suspicion of 'fable and 'forgery' to be considered is, 'That the first evangelist's 'omission of a miracle recorded by the last, if the miracle 'had been really done, is absolutely unaccountable.' Let us hear Mr. W. who is here very copious, in his way, saying the same thing over and over in different words; 'What 'could be the reason,' he asks, p. 6, 'that Matthew, Mark, 'and Luke, who all wrote their gospels before John, should 'omit to record this remarkable and most illustrious miracle of Lazarus?—What then was the reason, I ask it again, 'that the three first evangelists neglected to record this renowned miracle of Lazarus?' p. 8.

To which I answer, that we are under no obligation to account for the omission of the former evangelists. It would be no sufficient ground to refuse our assent to St. John's history of the raising of Lazarus, though we could think of no manner of reason at all for its being omitted by the three former.

However a variety of reasons for this omission offer themselves. I have already shown, the evangelists have not affected to increase the number of our Saviour's miracles, but passed by many, and those very great ones, which they knew very well. Mr. W. himself allows, that one miracle of a resurrection is sufficient. He says likewise, p. 3, that 'the restoring a person indisputably dead, to life again, is 'a stupendous miracle.' (I hope to show hereafter, that every person said to have been raised to life by our Saviour had been certainly dead, and that therefore every one of these instances are stupendous miracles.) If then the least of these is a stupendous miracle, why should we cavil with the evangelists for not putting down every one of them, the greatest miracle of all, if indeed there be a difference? Is it not very reasonable to suppose, that an evangelist might content himself with the relation of one person raised from the dead, since one instance is sufficient, and is a stupendous thing?

Another very common occasion of omissions in writers is a regard to brevity. Mr. W. himself could not help thinking of this excuse, 'the studying brevity,' p. 9; but he would not allow it to the first evangelists. Nevertheless, I think, they have the best title to this excuse of any men that ever wrote. The four gospels bound together do not make a large volume: each one singly is a very small book. And yet the evangelists had before them the most copious and engaging subject. Beside the miracles of our Saviour, with circumstances of time and place, the names of the persons, occasions of working them, and divers other extraordinary testimonies given to him from heaven; they have actually inserted in these pieces an account of the wonderful manner of our Saviour's birth, the dangers of his infancy, the miraculous appearances of Divine Providence in his favour, and his removals and journeyings from one place and country to another. They have recorded the substance of his doctrine in plain terms, again and again. They have set down many parables spoken by him, together with their explications. Here is a mission of his twelve apostles and other seventy disciples. They have also given the cavils and questions of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians, and our Lord's answers to them; the observations and reflections of the people; our Lord's public discourses before all, and his more private instructions to his disciples; his predictions of his own sufferings, of the destruction of Jerusalem, and many other events; a long and particular account of our Saviour's prosecution, condemnation, and cru-

cifixion, as also of his resurrection and ascension; not to mention the history of the birth, preaching, baptism, and sufferings of John the Baptist our blessed Lord's forerunner.

He who considers this great number and variety of matters contained in the gospels, (as also the engaging nature of them, by which an historian must be much inclined to dwell upon them, both for his own sake and for the pleasure and entertainment of others,) must needs allow, that the evangelists have ardently desired and most carefully studied brevity, or their works had risen to a great bulk. They have certainly aimed at this all along, in almost every part of their accounts: and I have before shown they have done this in their relations of miracles; since having given a particular history of some few, they mention many others in a summary way only. It is not at all strange then (we have here a very good reason of it) that when an evangelist had given an account of one person raised from the dead, it being a stupendous miracle, he contented himself therewith.

Nor ought the evangelists to be blamed for aiming at brevity. They deserve very high commendations both for the design itself, and for their excellent execution of it. Their intention was to give a history of Jesus, that all men might believe him to be the Christ, and might have life through his name. It was absolutely necessary therefore to put down the doctrine of Christ, and also somewhat under each one of those heads above-mentioned. But though the subject was extremely copious; these books being intended for the use of all, for the learned and unlearned, for the poor, the rich, the busy, for all ranks and orders of men in all times, it was highly needful they should be short. Great books are tedious and distasteful; many books are troublesome. And I am persuaded that the evangelists have much more effectually consulted the benefit of mankind by their short gospels, than by writing, as they might have easily done, many more, or much larger books of the history of Jesus Christ.

I have proved a regard to brevity in general, and particularly in the account of miracles; and have also shown that this design was necessary and reasonable. This study of brevity must certainly have obliged each one of them to observe silence upon some matters, after they had related others; that they might reserve room for some important events, essential parts of their history, still behind; lest they should proceed to a length and prolixity they had resolved

to avoid. It is therefore very easy to suppose in behalf of the three former evangelists, that when they had come to some certain place or period in their history of the ministry of Jesus, they observed they had given a sufficient account of his doctrine and miracles: and since they must reserve room for an account of his last sufferings, and his resurrection; they resolved to pass over in silence what happened between that period and the time of his last journey to Jerusalem, where he suffered.

Such a period as this may be observed in the three former evangelists, by which means they had not an opportunity of relating the resurrection of Lazarus. I will show this particularly of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

St. Matthew says, ch. xix. 1, 2, 3. "And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the coasts of JUDEA BEYOND JORDAN. And great multitudes followed him, and he healed them there. The pharisees also came unto him tempting him," &c. From which verse, to the sixteenth verse of the next chapter follows an account of the question of the pharisees concerning divorce, Jesus's receiving little children, the young man that came to Christ, some discourses between Christ and the disciples about riches, and a parable. Then at ver. 17 of that chapter (the twentieth) are these words: "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem, took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them," &c. From which it is plain, that Jesus was then going towards Jerusalem, a little before his last passover.

St. Mark says, ch. x. i. "And he arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judea by the FARTHER SIDE OF JORDAN," &c. From whence to the 31st verse is an account of the pharisees' question concerning divorce, the little children brought to Christ, the young man that came to him, a discourse between Christ and the disciples about riches. Then at ver. 32, it is said: "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem," &c.

From which it appears, that St. Matthew and St. Mark have given no particular account of any journeyings of Jesus, and have spoken but very little of any thing else concerning him (except some discourses in the place of his retirement) from the time he came into the country beyond Jordan, till they find him in his way to Jerusalem, before his last passover.

The same thing appears to me in St. Luke also. But that I may not be tedious, I will decline showing that, particularly at present. I may the better be excused, because he has

two resurrection miracles, which is one more than is sufficient.

Now the time of our Lord's coming into the country beyond Jordan, may be learnt from St. John. It was soon after the feast of dedication, John x. 22, which was observed in the winter. For he says: "They sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hands, and went again BEYOND JORDAN into the place where John at first baptized: and there abode. And many resorted unto him," ver. 39, 40, 41. From which country (according to St. John's account) Jesus afterwards came up to Bethany, and raised Lazarus; and then "went into a country near the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples," John xi. 54. These removes the other evangelists have omitted for the sake of brevity, or some other reason. Therefore the resurrection of Lazarus could not be well brought into their relation.

There is another reason of their silence about this matter, concurring with their study of brevity. The design of a writer may be collected from his work. From the three first gospels it appears, that the design of the three first evangelists was to give an account of the most public part of our Lord's ministry. They therefore entirely pass over the former part of it, and begin their relation after the imprisonment of John the Baptist. Thus Matthew, ch. iv. 2. "Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee." Mark i. 14. "Now after that John was cast into prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God." And that St. Luke also begins his account of our Lord's ministry, at about the same time, is apparent from his gospel. See ch. iv. 14, &c.

For the same reason that they omitted the former and less public part of his ministry, before the imprisonment of John the Baptist, they have also slightly passed over what happened from our Lord's arrival beyond Jordan, till he is going up to his last passover. For in this interval he 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 time before.

St. John observing what had been the method of the three former evangelists, and that they had given a very sufficient account of that part of Christ's ministry which immediately succeeded the imprisonment of John the Baptist, resolved to supply their omissions. By which means

he was led to give some history of things done by Jesus between his temptation in the wilderness and the imprisonment of John the Baptist; and also of some things that happened between our Lord's going into the country beyond Jordan, and his journey to the last passover at Jerusalem, in which last interval the miracle of Lazarus was performed.

We have here (so far as I am able to judge) a fair account of the occasion of the omission of Lazarus's resurrection by the three former evangelists, and of its relation by St. John.

Once more. Since the miracles of Jesus were so numerous (according to the account of all the three first evangelists) that they could not be all particularly related without an inconvenient and unnecessary prolixity; these evangelists might very reasonably prefer some miracles before others, and in particular the miracle wrought on Jairus's daughter before that on Lazarus. If one of these miracles were to be omitted, I would ask, which of the two it should be? I can readily answer for myself; I should choose to omit that of Lazarus rather than the other. And though all men should not presently decide with me, I believe that most would waver in the choice.

The raising any person to life is an amazing and truly divine work. Jairus was a ruler of a synagogue, of an order of men generally averse to Jesus: Lazarus was a friend. The miracle therefore on Jairus's daughter is more unexceptionable in this respect than that on Lazarus. All the miracles of Jesus, considering his blameless character, and the circumstances with which they are related, are really unexceptionable. But there are degrees in all kinds of things; and one miracle, even of Jesus himself, may be more unexceptionable than another; which is an important thing in a miracle, as well as the greatness of the work itself. In this respect the raising of Jairus's daughter is preferable to that of Lazarus. I pass by the honour that results to Jesus from the earnest entreaties of so considerable a person as Jairus, that he would come and lay his hands on his daughter, who was at the point of death, or even now dead.

Moreover the miracle on Jairus's daughter was performed in the very height of Christ's public ministry, when there were great numbers continually attending on him; enemies undoubtedly and spies, as well as other people. But to Bethany Jesus came privately with his disciples, and unexpectedly, to raise Lazarus. There happened indeed to be there at that time friends of the pharisees (as I suppose

there were every where) who went away and told them what Jesus had done. But his arrival at Bethany was perfectly unexpected to all, and a surprise even to the family of Lazarus. The evidences which there are in the relation, that our Lord's coming to Bethany at that time was unlooked for, show that there was no concert between him and his friends there: but for the same reason the pharisees might not be so well prepared to observe this miracle as some others.

To conclude this point: Mr. W. says, p. 9, ' If Matthew, ' the first writer, had recorded only the story of Lazarus, ' whose resurrection was the greatest miracle; and if Luke ' had added that of the widow of Nain's son; and John lastly ' had remembered us of Jairus's daughter, which the other ' evangelists, not through ignorance or forgetfulness, but stud- ' dying brevity, had omitted, then all had been well.'

Undoubtedly, all had been well then, because there are not in the gospels any tokens of forgery or fiction, but plain marks of a real history of matter of fact, and of the strictest regard to truth. But all things are as well now. And if Lazarus's story had stood in the three first gospels in the room of that of Jairus's daughter, there might have been as much room for exceptions as there is now, as appears from what I have just said about the circumstances of these persons. Nor is there any good objection to be brought against the present order. The three first evangelists have wisely taken that miracle which occurred to them in the course of our Lord's most public ministry, and which is in all respects most unexceptionable.

Upon the whole, the reasons I have here offered of the silence of the three first evangelists about Lazarus's resurrection are such as readily offer themselves to my mind; they arise out of the gospels themselves; and they appear to me to be of no small weight. But they are not intended to the prejudice of any other probable reasons assigned by Grotius, or Dr. Whitby, or any other learned and judicious writers.^a And whether the reasons offered by me or others appear fully satisfactory or not, is not very material: we not being obliged, as I said at first, to assign any reason at all for this omission.

I have endeavoured to put the force of this objection of Mr. W. into the four before-mentioned suppositions, which I have considered. But there are yet several particulars he has mentioned under this head of what he calls the 'unnatural ' and preposterous order of time,' which I suppose we must

^a See Dr. Harris's Reasonableness of believing in Christ, p. 3, 4.

not pass by. He says then, p. 6, ‘ Since this [Lazarus’s resurrection] is only mentioned by St. John, who wrote his gospels about sixty years, according to the best computation, after our Lord’s ascension; here is too much room for cavil and question, whether this story be not entirely his invention.’

No wise and honest man ought to countenance cavil. It is sufficient that there be no just reason for doubt and question, as there is not here. If any man were now to write a history (never heard of before) of some person raised from the dead, about sixty years ago, in a town not far from one of the chief cities of Europe, and should mention time and place, and names of persons concerned, as St. John has done, he would find no credit with any one. Indeed the design is so foolish and extravagant, that no one will attempt it where there is a liberty of enquiry, as there certainly was in St. John’s time, the friends of Christianity being fewer than its opposers. But there is no reason to suppose, St. John first told this story now, sixty years after our Saviour’s ascension. He had undoubtedly told it before an infinite number of times, in conversation, and in public discourses, before many people, when the fact might be inquired into, and easily known to be true or false. Eusebius, who took a great deal of pains to get the best information concerning the authority of all the books of the New Testament, informs us from the ancients. ‘ And when now Mark and Luke [he had spoken of Matthew before] had published their gospels, they say that John, who had hitherto all along preached only by word of mouth, was induced to write,’^b &c.

From which we learn two things; first, that St. John had spent his time in preaching Jesus Christ, from the time of our Lord’s ascension: secondly, that his gospel contains the substance of his preaching. For he wrote what he had hitherto taught only by word of mouth. Consequently he had often told his hearers this story of Lazarus’s resurrection, long before he wrote his gospel.

Soon after our author says, p. 7. ‘ The first writer of the life of a hero, to be sure makes mention of all the grand occurrences of it.—If a third or fourth biographer after him shall presume to add a more illustrious action of the hero’s life, it will be rejected as fable and romance, though for no other reason than this, that the first writer must have

^b Ἡδὴ δὲ Μαρκοῦ καὶ Λουκᾶ τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίων τὴν ἐκδόσιν πεποιημένων, Ἰωαννὴν φάσι, τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἀγραφῆ κεχρημένον κηρυγματι, τέλος καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἔλθειν, τοιασδε χάριν αἰτίας. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 24.

‘ been apprised of it, and would have inserted its story, if ‘ there had been any truth in it.’

How the lives of heroes are written, I do not know, not being read in legends and romances. But omissions are common in the lives of princes and other great men. Suetonius is allowed to be an excellent biographer, and was a very curious and inquisitive person. Yet no one doubts of the truth and credibility of several things omitted by him, concerning those emperors whose lives he has written. The three first evangelists have not related all the grand occurrences of Christ’s life. They expressly say, they have omitted a great number of them. If they had professed to be particular, and to take great care to omit nothing, there had been some ground for this objection : but to make it now, a man must have first lost all modesty.

But it will be said : The objection is not, that the raising of Lazarus is another occurrence, or another grand occurrence omitted by the three former historians ; but that Lazarus’s resurrection is a most prodigious miracle, p. 4 ; ‘ a ‘ huge and superlatively great miracle,’ p. 7 ; ‘ the miracle of ‘ miracles,’ *ibid.* ‘ a monstrously huge one,’ (p. 11.) in comparison of the other ; and especially of the first, ‘ which is ‘ an imperfect and disputable miracle in comparison of the ‘ other two,’ p. 9.

This indeed Mr. W. does say, and he is obliged to say it, however contradictory it may be to what he says at other times. For if the latter miracle related by the last writer be only somewhat greater, more considerable than the former, the argument is of no force. Let us therefore see what the evangelists say. According to St. Matthew, the first writer, Jairus’s daughter was dead before Jesus came to the house, for the musicians were come to make lamentations for her. And according to St. John, Lazarus had been dead four days.^c He mentions no longer time. But according to Mr. W.’s representation of the resurrection of Lazarus, that it was a ‘ superlatively great miracle, a monstrously

^c St. John says, ch. xi. 17. “When Jesus came he found that he had lain in the grave four days already.” But, ver. 39. Martha says to Jesus : “ Lord, by this time he stinketh : for he hath been dead four days.” Therefore the former four days were incomplete, and it was but the fourth day since his burial. Mr. Woolston therefore (to do him justice) is in the right, when he says, p. 30. ‘ If those four days are numbered according to the arithmetic of ‘ Jesus’s three days in his grave, they are reducible to two days and three ‘ nights.’ So it is : part of the day on which he was buried, then two whole days, and part of the day on which he was raised, and three nights. Thus, I suppose, if Lazarus died on the first day of the week, he was buried on the second, and raised on the fifth. He had been dead four days complete, or thereabouts ; buried four days incomplete.

‘ huge one,’ in comparison of the other ; one would be apt to conclude, that Lazarus had been said by St. John to have been dead at least forty or fifty years, whereas he does not say half so many days. The difference as to time between that of the widow of Nain’s son and Lazarus is still less ; for he was not only dead, but carried forth to burial.

I argue therefore against Mr. W. thus : St. John’s miracle exceeds in degree the other two but a small matter, therefore he did not invent and forge it. For if he had had a design of forging a miracle, from a sense of the insufficiency of the former, he would have made it prodigiously or vastly greater than these, which he has not done. The reader will judge, whether this be a confutation of this objection of Mr. W. or not.

I will add farther : The miracle on Lazarus exceeds that on Jairus’s daughter in but one circumstance, which is, that he had lain dead a little longer. In several other respects the miracle on Jairus’s daughter is superior to that on Lazarus ; for Lazarus was a friend, but Jairus was a stranger and a ruler of a synagogue ; and the miracle on his daughter was performed in the most public part of our Lord’s ministry. St. John therefore did not invent the story of Lazarus from a sense of the insufficiency of the former : for if he had invented, he would have related not only a history of a person dead much longer than the other, (as I showed just now,) but the person to be the subject of his miracle would have been a stranger, and a Rabbi, a ruler, or a nobleman, or some other person of figure : and he would have placed it, in all likelihood, in the most public part of Christ’s ministry. What I say here appears to me to be of the highest degree of probability : that if St. John had contrived a miracle, because he judged the former not sufficient, he would not have taken a friend of Jesus for the subject of it ; and he would have related it with several other different circumstances.

One quotation more from our author, before we leave this article. ‘ Supposing John (who was then above a hundred, and in his dotage) had not reported this miracle of Lazarus ; but that Clement, (joining it with his incredible story of the resurrection of a phoenix,) or Ignatius, or Polycarp, or the author of the apostolical constitutions had related it ; would not your christian critics have been at work to expose it ?’ p. 12.

This argument is proposed with great airs of assurance, but I cannot see the force of it. As to Clement’s story of the phoenix, we have nothing to do with it here, that I know

of; it not being a christian miracle, but an old heathen story told by many authors, though with somewhat different circumstances. If Clement, Ignatius, or Polycarp had given the history of a miracle of Jesus, written in a credible manner with proper circumstances, I make no doubt but a due regard would be had to their authority, in proportion to their nearness to the time of Jesus.

As for John's being above a hundred, when he wrote his gospel; it shows us he was thirty years of age or more, when Jesus lived here on earth; and therefore was arrived at years of discretion, and was able to judge of things. That he was in his dotage, there is no proof. His gospel is not the work of a man in his dotage. Let Mr. W. show me any where out of the Bible, so fine, and yet so simple, so natural a narration of a matter of fact, as that of the cure of the man blind from his birth, contained in the ninth chapter of St. John's gospel: let him show me any where else such a prayer, as that recorded in his seventeenth chapter: let him show me such discourses, so affectionate, so moving, so every way excellent, as those in his fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters: I say, let him show me any where else such things as these, not written by any man in his dotage, but in the prime of life, and the full vigour of his wit and understanding.

SECTION II.

ANSWER TO MR. WOOLSTON'S SECOND OBJECTION.

‘I PASS,’ says Mr. W. p. 15, ‘to a second observation. —What became of these three persons after their resurrection? How long did they live afterwards? And of what use and advantage were their restored lives to the church or to mankind? The evangelical and ecclesiastical history is entirely silent as to these questions, which is enough to make us suspect their stories to be merely romantic or parabolical; and there were no such persons raised from the dead, or we must have heard somewhat of their station and conversation in the world afterwards.’

If I may speak my mind freely: this, and all that follows under this observation, is mere idle and impertinent harangue. I have so good an opinion of the generality of mankind, as to suppose them wiser than to be capable of being moved by it, to admit any doubt of the truth of these histories.

We are not concerned to know, what became of those

persons whom Jesus cured or restored to life. A miracle on the body does not mend the dispositions of the mind. Some of those whom our Saviour healed were ungrateful. Of the ten lepers who were all cleansed as they were going to show themselves to the priests, according to our Lord's direction, there was but one "that returned to give glory to God," Luke xvii. 12. Others there were, who published every where the things that God had done for them. Some of these the evangelists have mentioned. But were they or ecclesiastical writers after them obliged to write the lives of all whom Jesus and his apostles healed?

For the truth of these miracles we have the testimony of the evangelists, honest and credible men. Their testimony is confirmed by the event. The gospel of Christ had not had the mighty progress in the hands of the apostles, which it had, if these things had not been true. What they did, who were the subjects of these works, we do not need to know particularly. But the event, or the great progress of the gospel in a short time, renders it highly probable, that many of these persons by modest and humble acknowledgments of the benefits they had received, by satisfying inquisitive persons, and by other means, according to their several stations, helped forward the work of the apostles and others engaged in spreading the doctrine of Christ.

Our author, speaking of Lazarus, who is said by^a Epiphanes, (though without any certainty,) to have lived thirty years after he was raised, asks, p. 16, 'How did he spend his time all that while? Was it to the honour of Jesus, to the service of the church, and propagation of the gospel?'

Why very probably, so long as he lived, he spoke, upon all proper occasions, of this miracle wrought on himself, and of the other miracles performed by Jesus upon others; and exhorted men, suitably to his station and circumstances, to believe on him as the Messiah. But it is most probable, that our Saviour did not give him a special commission, like that of the apostles, to go preach the gospel. I believe our Lord had a greater regard to the decorum of things, or, if you please, to the rules of modesty and prudence. There was nothing better, than for Lazarus to stay at home, to be ready to answer inquirers, who might come to Bethany to know the truth of the fact reported concerning him. Abroad the testimony of others was more worth than his own. And St. John's short account of his

^a Quin et illud inter traditiones reperimus, triginta tum annos natum fuisse Lazarum, cum a morte excitatus est; atque idem ille postea triginta aliis annis vixit. In Hæres. lxvi. sect. 34. Note 15. of Mr. W.'s fifth Disc. p. 16.

resurrection is more valuable than a history of it written by Lazarus himself would have been. ‘And of Jairus’s daughter, and of the widow of Nain’s son, which is astonishing, we read nothing at all,’ p. 17. Not astonishing in the least. Women are seldom admitted to public posts. The apostles did not allow women to speak in the church. It is no wonder, therefore, that Jairus’s daughter has been nowhere mentioned, but on occasion of the miracle wrought upon her. Should her private conversation afterwards have been recorded? I think it was not necessary. And after all, she may have been eminently useful some way or other, though we have heard no more of her. The memory of many great actions has been entirely lost. We have no authentic accounts of the preaching of many of the apostles of Christ. As for the widow of Nain’s son: he may have died soon after, or he may have been a very useful person, or he might not be qualified for public service. We know nothing of these matters, nor was any body obliged to inform us of them.

SECTION III.

ANSWER TO MR. WOOLSTON’S THIRD OBJECTION.

OUR author says, p. 19, ‘By way of objection to the latter of these three miracles, let us consider the condition of the persons raised from the dead.—Where then was his wisdom and prudence to choose these three persons above others to that honour?’ p. 20. I answer, that Jesus did not ordinarily choose the subjects of his miracles, but healed those chiefly who earnestly implored his mercy, or who pressed on him to be healed, or importunately desired it of him by others, when they could not possibly come to him themselves. It was great wisdom and prudence in him not ordinarily to choose persons, or to do a miracle without being first earnestly sought to for it. If he had acted otherwise, it would have been made use of as an exception against the truth and reality of the miracle, and the extent of his power. Indeed the widow of Nain’s son was in some sense chosen; but since he was publicly carried forth to burial, and the meeting of the corpse was perfectly casual, this choice is unexceptionable.

‘Jairus’s daughter was an insignificant girl of twelve years old.—The widow of Nain’s son too was but a youth, and whether older than the girl above is doubtful,’ p. 21.

Never the worse at all, on any account whatever. The

power of raising a girl is as great as that of raising a woman; and a boy of twelve years old, as a man of forty. The suspicion of cheat and fraud is less; the benignity of Jesus is greater, in that he disdained not the meanest objects.

‘But that an insignificant boy and girl (forsooth!) and the obscure Lazarus, are preferred by Jesus to such public and more deserving persons is unaccountable.’ p. 25.

The obscurity of Lazarus is no objection at all, as appears from what has been already said concerning the two others. The more inconsiderable Lazarus was, the benignity of Jesus is the greater. But they were none of them preferred to others. Were there any other dead persons proposed to Jesus to be raised, whom he refused to concern himself with, though he raised these? None at all. If by preferring is meant choosing out of the number of those who died in Judea during our Saviour's ministry, it has been answered already. Jesus could not ordinarily choose an object, without being desired. It might have had an appearance of ostentation, and enemies would have said, of fraud and deceit.

‘Jesus raised the dead, and wrought other miracles say our divines often, not only to manifest his own power and glory, but his love to mankind: for which reason his miracles are useful and beneficial, as well as stupendous and supernatural acts. On this topic our divines are very copious, as if no more useful and wonderful works could be done, than what he did, p. 23. Instead of a boy and a girl, and even of Lazarus who were all of no consequence to the public, either before or since, I should think Jesus ought to have raised an useful magistrate,’ &c. p. 24.

Divines say very truly, that most of our Saviour's miracles were acts of beneficence to those on whom they were performed, and were in this respect suitable to the goodness and excellence of his doctrine, and to the goodness and meekness of disposition, that appeared in all the other parts of his life. But the main design of a miracle is not the profit of him, who is the subject of it, nor of others his friends and relations, who are interested in him. The great use of a miracle is to attest the divine mission of him who works it, and to give authority to the message or doctrine which he brings. And for this purpose the raising a poor day-labourer is as useful, as raising a prince; and opening the eyes of a blind beggar by the way-side, as curing a powerful magistrate, or a wealthy merchant.

It is not the intention of divines to strain the notion of cur

Saviour's beneficence toward all the miserable objects that were in Judea, as if he had been obliged to act to the utmost of his power for the temporal advantage of men at that time. Mr. W. acknowledges as much. 'That Jesus ought to have raised all that died, wherever he came during the time of his ministry, none, I presume, can hold,' p. 20.

That a miracle may be of use to confirm the character of a prophet, and the truth of his doctrine, it is necessary not only that it be done, but that it be known to be done by him, or the divine power concurring with him. Jesus, when at Jerusalem, might have healed a sick person in Galilee, without the person himself, or any other knowing who cured him. But this, though an act of goodness, would not have made known our Saviour's character. Let us give an instance. Jesus might have immediately healed the daughter of Jairus (as he did the centurion's servant, Matt. viii.) upon Jairus's coming to him, and desiring him to come and lay his hands on her. And this would have been perhaps an act of greater goodness to her, than to raise her after she was dead. But then we had not had the proof of his power and divine character, and of the truth of his doctrine, which we now have from the miracle of raising her from the dead. Nay he might have healed her, before her case came to be so desperate as to oblige her father to come to him for help. This would have been a still greater act of goodness to her and her friends, if we measure goodness and beneficence purely with a regard to the temporal ease and advantage of men.

The spiritual interests of men are more considerable than their bodily, temporal interests. The spiritual interests of many are to be preferred to the temporal interests of a few others. Though therefore it might have been many ways more for the temporal advantage of Lazarus and his family, for Jesus to have cured that sickness of which he died, when his sisters first sent to him; yet it was infinitely greater benignity, with regard to the spiritual interests of mankind (of all the sincere and inquisitive, the children of wisdom at that time, and among them, of Lazarus and his sisters, and also of all such persons in future times) not to interpose at first, but to come up to Bethany, and there raise Lazarus from the dead, after he had been buried four days.

I will proceed to one thing more, without observing intermediate steps or gradations. Our blessed Saviour might have healed all the persons he cured during his ministry, and also many others, without their coming to him, or with-

out their so much as thinking of him, and without any one else knowing that those cures were wrought by him: but then neither the men of that age, nor we, had had the proof we now have from his works, of the certainty of a future life, and of the other parts of Christ's doctrine, so admirably suited to raise men from sin to holiness, from earth to heaven, and to turn them from Satan to God: we had also lost that eminent and undeniable proof they now afford us of our Lord's great character: we had not been assured, as we now are, of that unspeakable instance of the love of God, in sending his Son into the world for our salvation.

How far Jesus may have extended his goodness even to the bodies of men, during his abode here on earth, beyond all those miraculous instances of his power for attesting his character, we cannot tell. But it was necessary that the exercise of his goodness in the way of working miracles for the proof of his mission and doctrine should be chiefly confined to those who were disposed to ask help of him; whether they were poor or wealthy, mean and obscure, or learned and honourable: and that the exercise of his goodness should be also regulated in a great measure by the nature of their desires. This way his miraculous works are free from ostentation, and are unexceptionable.

But yet, when he had an opportunity of doing good, without incurring the suspicion of ostentation or concert, he readily manifested his compassion and benignity to the distressed; as he did in particular to the widow of Naim, whose son he raised to life when he was carried out to be interred.

And herein indeed appear wisdom and goodness, that those acts of beneficence performed by him on the bodies of men, and those perhaps chiefly poor and mean persons, such mostly having come to him, though some wealthy and honourable (all however who came to him, none having been refused, and some who never sought to him) have been made to subserve the great design of Almighty God in saving mankind; and give credit to that doctrine, which is of such admirable use and tendency to cure the minds of men of all evil habits and dispositions: to cure, I say, the minds of men, not of one country or age, but of all the world in all time. This is the wisdom of God, and the power of God, and the goodness of God.

'I should think,' says Mr. W. p. 24. 'Jesus ought to have raised an useful magistrate, whose life had been a common blessing; an industrious merchant, whose death was a public loss.'

The design of Christ in coming into the world was not barely to promote the temporal advantage of men, but for an infinitely higher end. For which reason, I should think, he should cure and raise those, whose cure or restoration would most serve this end. These are they only, who might be cured without suspicion of cheat or fraud; which are chiefly such as voluntarily came to him, or whom he casually met with; whether magistrates or subjects, wealthy or poor.

Soon after, he says, p. 25, ‘ Such instances of his power
‘ would have demonstrated him to be a most benign as well
‘ as mighty agent; and none in interest or prejudice could
‘ have opened their mouths against him, especially if the
‘ persons raised from the dead were selected upon the re-
‘ commendation of this or that city.’

Ridiculous! Should Jesus have gone to the magistrates and people of some town or city, and tell them: if they had lately lost any useful magistrate or worthy citizen, whom they wished to have restored again to life, and would be pleased to recommend such person to him, he would raise him up? I think no minister or messenger of God, endowed with the power of working miracles, would be guilty of such meanness. And if no such persons came to Jesus, it was not his fault. However there were some such, and they were not refused, but were as readily gratified as any others. Thus in the case of the centurion, whose servant was “sick and ready to die,” we are assured, “that when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto him the elders of the Jews, and when they came to Jesus, they besought him instantly, saying, that he was worthy for whom he should do this,” Luke vii. 2, 3. And one of the persons raised to life by Jesus was the daughter of a ruler of a synagogue. And if any others had been recommended in a like manner by rulers or elders, there is no reason to doubt but they would have been received.

But certainly it was by no means needful, that the miracles of Jesus, of any kind, should be generally performed on magistrates and wealthy men, or at their recommendation. This method might have served indeed to stop men’s mouths, but not to convince them. There is an observation of Origen in his answer to Celsus, which is much more judicious than any thing said by our author upon this subject. ‘It is not,’ says Origen,^a ‘a number of impostors met

^a Ου γαρ συνελθοντες γοητες, χαριν τινοντες βασιλει τιμη κελευοντι, η ηγίμονι προστασσουντι, πεποιθηκεναι εδοξαν αυτον ειναι θεον, αλλ’ κ. λ. Contr. Cels. l. 3. p. 133. edit. Cantab.

‘ together, who in compliance with the orders of a king or emperor have decreed, that he [Jesus] should be made a God; but the Creator of the world himself,’ &c. It is much more for the honour of Jesus, for the credit of his miracles and religion, and for the satisfaction of men in all times, that his miracles and doctrine obtained belief and esteem without the power and authority of magistrates, by the force of their own internal excellence and evidence.

‘ But now I am speaking,’ says Mr. W. ‘ of the fitness and unfitness of deceased persons, to have this grand miracle wrought on them: it comes into my head to ask, why Jesus raised not John the Baptist to life again? A person of greater merits, and more worthy of the favour of Jesus, and of this miracle, could not be. This is a very reasonable question,’ p. 25. A very silly one, most people will think. John the Baptist had performed his work, and finished his course. If he had been soon raised to life again, the value and merit of his testimony given to Jesus had been much weakened. If it had been related in the history of Jesus, that John the Baptist had been raised again to life by him; Mr. W. might have said, it gave ground for suspicion of collusion between the Principal and forerunner.

SECTION IV.

ANSWER TO MR. WOOLSTON'S FOURTH OBJECTION.

PAGE 26, he says, ‘ That none of these raised persons had been long enough dead to amputate all doubt of Jesus's miraculous power in their resurrection.’ They have been long enough dead to assure us of a miracle, if they are raised, who have been so long dead that their nearest and most affectionate friends bury them, or carry them out to be buried: as have they also, who have on them such evident tokens of their being expired, that their friends hope no longer for help from those, on whose assistance they before depended, so long as there were any signs of life. The former is the case of the widow of Nain's son, and of Lazarus; the latter of Jairus's daughter. When Jairus came to Christ his daughter was expiring, for he says in Matthew, “ My daughter is even now dead;” in Mark, “ lieth at the point of death.” Still he had hopes of help from Jesus, for he says: “ But come and lay thy hand upon her and she shall live.” But before Jesus got to the house she expired, and

all hopes were gone. "And there came (says St. Mark) from the ruler of the synagogue's house, certain which said, Thy daughter is dead, why troublest thou the Master any further?" ch. v. 25. This is good reason to suppose she was really dead. These messengers doubtless were despatched away to Jairus, to acquaint him with the death of his daughter, by those persons that attended her during her sickness, and were convinced of her being expired.

Mr. W. says a good deal more about the time these persons ought to have been dead. Speaking of Jairus's daughter, he says, p. 27, 'Supposing she was really dead, yet for the sake of an indisputable miracle in her resurrection, it must be granted, that she ought to have been much longer, some days, if not weeks, dead and buried.' And of the event at Naim, he says, p. 29, 'All I have to say here, is, that if Jesus had a mind to raise the son of this widow, in testimony of his divine power, he should have suffered him to have been buried two or three weeks first.'

Mr. W.'s first proposition here appears to me very strange, 'That supposing she was really dead, yet for the sake of an indisputable miracle—she ought to have been dead much longer.' If she was really dead (as she certainly was) and was restored again to life, it is with all men of sense and reason an indisputable miracle.

As for the time which Mr. W. requires, that a person must be 'some days, if not weeks, dead and buried; buried two or three weeks first:' this is not needful. If we could not be certainly assured of the death of persons, by evident tokens appearing in their bodies, in less time than Mr. W. prescribes here, we should not be justified in committing to the grave any man in less time. Much less could we endure to bury our dearest friends and relations under two or three weeks or more after they seem to have expired. We cannot justify burying men, but on a well-grounded supposal that they are really dead. We cannot justify the laying out of men's bodies, as we do very soon after visible tokens of death, if those tokens were not sufficient.

And since they buried their deceased friends much sooner in those warm countries, than we do here, this must doubtless have been, because dead bodies became also much sooner offensive there, than in our cold climate. This circumstance strengthens my argument: for how can we imagine that persons should, by burying their deceased friends so early, put them absolutely and entirely beyond any manner of possibility of reviving, unless they might well and safely depend

upon some certain, experienced, and uncontestable proofs and evidences of their being already deprived of any remaining life ?

There may have been mistakes made sometimes, though but very rarely ; and even those accidents have chiefly happened in cases of sudden death. Where any dangerous distemper precedes, the possibility of mistake is very small, and can seldom happen. This was the case, we know, of Jairus's daughter, and of Lazarus : and this confirms us still more in the belief, that their friends were not mistaken in the persuasion of their death ; upon which persuasion the one had been buried, and for the other the public mourners were come to make lamentations. And as for the young man at Nain ; though we do not know how he died, whether suddenly, or of a gradual illness, we may rely upon the fondness of a mother, a widow too, that she would not have carried forth to burial her only son without knowing he was become a dead corpse.

It is so natural, and even unavoidable for men that argue against plain truth, to contradict themselves ; that it is hardly worth while to take any notice of Mr. W.'s self-contradictions. I shall only just observe, that this story of Lazarus's resurrection, which before was represented by him as the miracle of miracles, superlatively great, and monstrously huge, as if nothing greater and more prodigious could be devised or thought of, is here pretended not to be big enough to assure us it was any miracle at all. For he says, p. 31 : ' It is plain that Lazarus was not so long dead and buried, as that there is no room to doubt of the miracle of his resurrection.'

Mr. W. says, p. 28, 29 : ' And where there is a possibility of fraud, it is nonsense, and mere credulity to talk of a real, certain, and stupendous miracle, especially where the juggler and pretended worker of miracles has been detected in some of his other tricks.' Perhaps there are few or no cases where there is an absolute impossibility of fraud. It is sufficient that fraud be improbable, unlikely, and next to impossible. In such a case (which is ours) it is not nonsense and mere credulity, but the highest reason to admit the truth of a relation ; and to assert a real, certain, and great, or if you choose, stupendous miracle. A fraud is as easy to happen in a person who has been dead and buried many weeks, as in one publicly carried out to burial.

Herein however I readily agree with Mr. W. that it is mere credulity to talk of such a thing, where a juggler has

been detected in any other tricks. But where was he, who is said to have raised the widow's son at Nain, detected of any tricks? When Mr. W. has detected such a thing in any one case, I will allow it in this also. But till then, as this story is credibly related, I shall continue to pay a regard to it.

Our author has several other things under this observation; but as they do not properly belong to this, of the length of time these persons are said to have been dead, but rather to his sixth observation, of the circumstances of the narrations, I shall take no notice of them here: I have already spoken to some things here, which might have been let alone till we come to that observation.

SECTION V.

ANSWER TO MR. WOOLSTON'S FIFTH OBJECTION.

5. 'THE consideration that none of these raised persons did or could after their return to their bodies, tell any tales of their separate existence; otherwise the evangelists had not been silent in their main point,' &c. p. 32.

'None of these persons,' Mr. W. says, 'told any tales of their separate existence.' So I suppose with him. As for the two first: how should they? being only, as Mr. W. says, 'an insignificant boy and girl,' of twelve years of age, or thereabouts. Or if they did, the evangelists were wiser than to take any notice of their tales. As for Lazarus, I would suppose he was a wiser man than to indulge a vain inclination of amusing people with idle stories of no use. Besides, I presume he had been a follower of Jesus before he died. And when he had been raised from the grave, it is likely he was yet further confirmed by that wonderful work wrought upon himself in the belief that Jesus was the Messiah: and that instead of pretending to be wise above what Jesus taught, he would exhort men and especially his neighbours, to attend him, and hear him, who had the words of eternal life.

The evangelists have recorded no tales told by any of these three raised persons. I much admire this objection. I am very glad they have not mentioned any such things. Jesus himself, who was from above, who was in the bosom of the Father, has not delivered any profound unintelligible theory of the separate state of existence. The great apostle Paul, who was "an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from

the dead," Gal. i. 1: who had been "caught up into the third heaven," and "into paradise;" who had "abundance of revelations," has not attempted any such thing: but declares that the things he heard were "unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter," 2 Cor. xii. 2—7. He treats with the utmost contempt every thing that has a show of wisdom without real advantage: exhorts his dear son Timothy to refuse "profane and old wives' fables, and exercise himself rather unto godliness," 1 Tim. iv. 7: to "shun profane and vain babblings," 2 Tim. ii. 16: and requires him to "charge [men] before the Lord, that they strive not about words to no profit," v. 14.

Jesus and his apostles have made known the certainty of a resurrection of the just and unjust; a general judgment, wherein men shall be judged in righteousness; when the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal. What they say of the different recompenses of good and bad is great and awful, sufficient to affect the minds of all; but they have not entered into a detail of needless particulars, above the capacity of men in the present state.

Religion is the concern of all. This is the most perfect religion, which is suited to all. This is the christian doctrine, which, as it was preached to the poor, and to every creature under heaven, is wonderfully suited to all capacities.

To the immortal honour then of the evangelists be it said, that when they wrote the history of the preaching and miracles of Jesus, who knew all things, they have not recorded dreams and visions, or abstruse theories of a separate state, for the amusement of mankind, but important, certain truths, taught by Jesus for their edification.

'Was any person, in this age, to be raised to life, that had been any time dead; the first thing that his friends and acquaintance would enquire of him, would be to know where his soul had been, in what company,' &c. p. 32. Not impossible: vulgar minds might show such weakness even now. And the greatest minds, while in an uncertainty about another life, might have acted in this manner. Thus some of the greatest men of antiquity, justly admired by all the world, have actually told dreams, or accounts of departed men, and doubtless with a good intention. But he who has the sun needs not the light of a candle. The evangelists, keeping close to their Master, are vastly superior to the greatest men that were before them.

Our author is pleased to trifle so much, as to put ques-

tions about the place where the souls of these persons had been, between their death and their being raised up again ; and particularly the soul of Lazarus. ‘ But the thought, ‘ that any of Jesus’s friends should go to hell, will not be ‘ borne with. And if Lazarus’s soul had been in paradise, it was hardly a good work in Jesus to recall it,—to the ‘ troubles and miseries of this wicked world,’ p. 34. Suppose Lazarus’s soul to have been asleep, or in paradise, or in heaven itself, it might be a very good work in Jesus to recall it into this world for a time. It was much for the spiritual benefit of many, who might be induced by the great miracle of raising him to life, to believe in Jesus, and receive his doctrine, which, when heartily embraced, is fruitful of the greatest benefits. Nor could the soul of any good man be unwilling to return for a time to the troubles and miseries of this wicked world, how grievous soever, in order to serve the great design of saving his fellow creatures ; for which end Jesus his Saviour descended from the height of glory he had with the Father, took flesh, and underwent the troubles and sorrows of this mortal life. And it might issue in the end to the advantage of Lazarus himself ; as no man can doubt, who believes a future judgment, and that Jesus will preside therein, which is the doctrine of the New Testament.

SECTION VI.

ANSWER TO MR. WOOLSTON’S SIXTH OBJECTION.

6. AND lastly, ‘ Let us consider the intrinsic absurdities ‘ and incredibilities of the several stories of these three miracles, p. 36. As to Jairus’s daughter, and her resurrection from the dead, St. Hilary^a hints that there was no such ‘ person as Jairus ;—and he gives this reason, and a good ‘ reason it is, why he thought so, because it is elsewhere intimated in the gospel that none of the rulers of the synagogues confessedly believed on Jesus,’ John vii. 48, and xii. 42.

St. John’s words in the last quoted text are these : “ Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also many believed on him, but because of the pharisees, they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue.” This text is no ways to our author’s purpose. The rulers here mentioned by St. John probably were members of their great council at Jerusalem, or of the lesser councils in some other

^a In loc. Matt.

cities: but Jairus^b was the ruler of the synagogue. But supposing Jairus to have been one of that same sort of rulers which St. John speaks of, here is no inconsistency. Jairus might believe in Jesus and come to him to heal his daughter, and yet not publicly "confess him to be the Christ."

'But why did Jesus say, this girl was but in a sleep?' p. 36. Mr. W. had before affirmed this: 'Jesus himself says, she was but asleep.' And it is true that our Lord, "when he came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels, he said unto them, Give place, for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth." But by this our Lord did not intend to deny that she was expired, but to assure them in a modest way, that she would be raised up as it were out of sleep. That this is our Saviour's meaning, is most evident from his use of these same expressions in St. John concerning Lazarus. See John xi. 4, &c. Lazarus's sisters sent to Jesus to inform him that their brother was sick. "When Jesus heard that, he said," to his disciples, "this sickness is not unto death," that is, to his final death, to a lasting death. (So the words must be understood, because, according to St. John, Lazarus did actually expire and die of that sickness.) "But for the glory of God." Afterwards St. John says: "These things said he, and after that he saith unto them, our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep. Then said the disciples, Lord, if he sleep he shall do well. Howbeit Jesus spake of his death. Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." Where in formal express terms St. John assures us, that by sleep our Lord meant death. No critical reader will doubt, that this is the meaning of Christ's words, which he spoke of Jairus's daughter. Nor will any lover of virtue endure to be robbed of a singular instance of such charming virtues as humility and modesty. Instead of these modest expressions, "Give place, for the maid is not dead but sleepeth:" had Jesus been a juggler and impostor, as is pretended, or had this history been a forgery, we had had some such silly boasting speech as this: Ay! the young woman is really dead, and your lamentations are well-grounded: but let me only look upon her, and say a few words over her, and depend upon it, you will see her alive again, and as well as ever.

'If he were going to work a miracle in her resuscitation, he should not have called death SLEEP; but if others had been of a contrary opinion, he should first have convinced them of the certainty of her death,' p. 36, 37. That is, Jesus

^b Vid. Grot. in Matt. ix. 18.

should have spent time, and taken pains to convince them of what they were convinced of before, and were so positive in, that when they understood him to say the maid was not expired, but only sleeping in a natural sleep, "they laughed him to scorn."

It follows in our author: 'And why did he charge the parents of the girl not to speak of the miracle?' There might be many reasons for this, and those founded not upon the falsehood or uncertainty of the miracle, but on the certainty and greatness of it. This prohibition then was partly owing to the humility and modesty of Jesus, who, instead of ordering men to proclaim his works, often desired them to be silent about them. It was partly owing to prudence, that he might have opportunity during the short time his ministry was to last, for teaching men the will of God, and for instructing his disciples; that he might avoid the suspicion of setting up for a ruler and governor, or attempting any disturbance; which suspicion might have arisen in men's minds, if the concourse of men to him had been too numerous.

These prohibitions therefore may be understood to be only temporary or for the present. Thus our Saviour forbid his disciples to speak of the transfiguration on the mount, "until the Son of man be risen from the dead," Matt. xvii. 9. It was not long before he was to be taken out of this world: and then they on whom he wrought any miracles might speak freely of them, without giving any occasion to suspect his designing a temporal kingdom, to the prejudice of the civil government then in being.

Besides, though the parents of this maid were to be silent of this miracle, here were many others that might speak of it. All her friends who knew she was dead, were witnesses of her resurrection, when they saw her alive again.

And rather than suspect any bad design in this prohibition, which is so contrary to the whole character of Jesus; I would conceive that he might have some regard to the character of Jairus, as a ruler of the synagogue; and since he was an honest man, who had entertained a faith in Jesus for working so great a miracle, he by his advice of silence dispensed with his speaking publicly of the miracle, which might have been much to his prejudice, and was not at present absolutely necessary. This I am sure is more consonant to the meekness and goodness of Jesus, upon many other occasions, than any suspicion of fraud or imposture.

'And why did he turn the people out of the house before he would raise her?' p. 37. Why, perhaps, partly for

the reasons of silence just mentioned. If many had been actually present at the raising her up, they might have been more excited to spread abroad the miracle, and thereby make too great a concourse; which might have given umbrage, and been a handle to his enemies to charge him with innovations in the state. Another reason is this; that no more might thrust into the room where the young woman lay dead, than those he took with him; that there might be no disturbance in the house; that the persons he took along with him, might have no interruption of any kind; that they might be sedate and composed, and attend only to the work he was about to perform before them; and that they might have a near, clear, distinct, and full view of it; and that they might afterwards (his disciples especially) report it to others, upon the fullest assurance and conviction.

There were the parents of the young woman, and three of our Saviour's disciples, which are witnesses enough of any action; and being with our Lord six in number, might be as many as could have, in the room where she lay, a clear sight without interrupting each other. Five close witnesses, at full ease, are better than forty witnesses in a crowd and confusion. This action then of our blessed Lord in clearing the house of hired musicians and other people, is no exception in the least to this miracle.

There is still a reflection of Mr. W.'s relating to this miracle to be considered, which he places under one of his former observations; which I passed by then, only that it might be considered here in its proper place. 'And it is not,' says he, p. 27, 'impossible, but the passionate screams of the feminine by-standers might fright her into fits, that bore the appearance of death; otherwise, why did Jesus turn these inordinate weepers out of the house, before he could bring her to her senses again?' If Mr. W. by the 'feminine by-standers' means any persons different from "the minstrels and the people making a noise," [Matt. ix. 23.] which Jesus saw when he came into the house; and would insinuate, that these persons by 'passionate screams might fright her into fits;' this is mere fiction, and contrary to the history of this event. This young woman was near expiring when her father left her, and when he came to Jesus he says she was then at the point of death. This supposition of the father must have been owing to the nature of her case, which he had seen before he left her, and not to any passionate screams which he could know nothing of. Besides, who make passionate screams when people are well, and in no danger? And if made when persons are

desperate, would rather be of service than otherwise. These screams then to fright her into fits and an appearance of death, are mere fiction, and an invention of the author against the history.

If by passionate screams Mr. W. intends the lamentations of the minstrels and other people making a noise, whom Jesus found in the house: I should have thought Mr. W. might know very well, that it was not possible they should hurt the young woman; unless they could fright her after she was dead. If her friends had not known she was dead, they would not have suffered these musicians to enter their house, and make lamentations, and put them to charge without any occasion. The music of these minstrels is alone a sufficient proof she was dead. But there had before come some from Jairus's house, which said, "Thy daughter is dead, why troublest thou the master any further?" Mark v. 35.

I think I have now considered all the objections against the history of raising Jairus's daughter.

'As for the story of the widow of Nain's son,' says Mr. W. p. 37, 38, 'excepting what is before observed of the shortness of the time in which he lay dead, and of the unfitness of his person to be raised, I have here no more fault to find in the letter of it.' These objections I have spoken to already. But under one of them Mr. W. placed some objections to the circumstances of this story, which I will now consider. He then says, p. 28: 'And who knows but Jesus, upon some information or other, might suspect this youth to be in a lethargic state, and had a mind to try, if by chafing, &c. he could do what successfully he did, bring him to his senses again: or might not a piece of fraud be concerted between Jesus, a subtle youth, and his mother and others; and all the formalities of a death and burial be contrived, that Jesus, whose fame for a worker of miracles was to be raised, might here have an opportunity to make a show of a grand one. The mourning of the widow, who had her tears at command, and Jesus's casual meeting of the corpse upon the road, looks like contrivance to put the better face upon the matter. God forbid, that I should suspect there was any fraud of this kind here; but of the possibility of it, none can doubt.'

To all this I answer, that the character of Jesus and his doctrine prevents all suspicion of so vile a thing as that of contrivance. His doctrine is as holy and excellent (to say no more) as that which the best men ever taught. He is

in his whole behaviour innocent, meek, and undesigning. It is not possible, that such a person should form or countenance a contrivance to deceive or impose upon men.

If he had entertained a thought of contrivance, yet it was not possible he should succeed therein. How was it possible, 'that a piece of fraud might be here concerted between Jesus, a subtle youth, and his mother, and others; and all the formalities of a death and burial be contrived?' Such a scene could not be acted without a great many persons being in the intrigue (as is apparent from the objection itself) who must have known the fraud. Jesus, who had so many enemies, and those men of power, was the most unlikely of any to succeed herein. Besides, when men form contrivances, they are not of such public, open scenes as this was, but are attended with some circumstances of secrecy. When was there ever such a contrivance as this scene is? so public, so open? Jesus entering into a city, many of his disciples with him, and much other people; a public funeral, in day-time, attended with much people of the city!

Moreover, none could be under any temptations to enter into a contrivance with him. For Jesus was poor, and subsisted on the voluntary contributions of his friends; and therefore could give no bribes. Men must be some way or other tempted to such an action, because they thereby would incur the censure of the civil magistrate, and expose themselves to some very heavy punishment. If you say here, that Jesus did at last suffer death, and therefore he must certainly have been convicted of some such fault as this: I answer, that it appears from the history of his condemnation that he was innocent; that there was no crime proved against him; and that Pilate himself saw clearly, that it was only out of envy and malice that the chief priests and pharisees accused him. But not to insist on this: there were no persons punished, or taken up, as accomplices with Jesus; not his disciples, nor any other persons whatever; which is a demonstration that no imposture was proved upon Jesus, nor suspected concerning him.

As to what is urged in the first place: 'Who knows but Jesus, upon some information or other, might suspect this youth to be in a lethargic state, and had a mind to try, if by chafing, &c. he could not do what successfully he did, bring him to his senses again:' this likewise contains an intimation of a fraud, which, as I said, is absolutely inconsistent with Jesus's character. It also supposes vile and selfish people to be in a combination or correspondence with

him, which is entirely inconsistent with the mean and poor circumstances of our blessed Lord in this world. Lastly, all the circumstances of the relation, the tears of the mother, (who was the most likely of any to know whether her son was in a lethargy or not,) the great number of the people at this funeral; the great company with Jesus, (who, if the meeting of the corpse was not casual, must have known it,) our Lord's coming up to the bier and touching it, without asking beforehand any questions, concur together to induce us to believe that it was a real miracle. To which might be added, that the company present were fully convinced, it was neither a contrivance, nor a cure performed by a successful and fortunate chafing, but a great and awful miracle: For "there came a fear on all, and they glorified God, saying, that a great prophet is risen up amongst us, and that God hath visited his people," Luke vii. 16.

We may now proceed to the story of Lazarus, which the author calls long, and says, 'Is brimful of absurdities. He will single out only three or four of them at present, reserving the rest for another opportunity, when the whole story of this miracle will appear to be such a contexture of folly and fraud in its contrivance, execution and relation, as is not to be equalled in all romantic history,' p. 38. Let us however examine the three or four pretended absurdities. First then, says Mr. W. 'Observe that Jesus is said to have wept and groaned for the death of Lazarus. Patience and resignation unto God upon the death of our dearest friends and relations is what all philosophers have rightly taught; And Jesus, one would think, should have been the most heroical example of these graces. A stoical apathy had better become him than such childish and effeminate grief,' p. 38.

It does not appear from St. John, that Jesus did weep and groan for the death of Lazarus. He says indeed that "Jesus wept: then said the Jews, behold how he loved him." But it does not follow, that in this they judged right, any more than in some other reflections passed on Jesus at other times; which though the evangelists knew to be false, they do not concern themselves to refute them. But supposing, he did out of love for Lazarus weep for his death; there is nothing in this inconsistent with patience and resignation to God.^a Nor is there any thing therein weak and effeminate. The ancients, who by many are thought best to have understood human nature, did not think tears unmanly, or disgraceful to a man of true fortitude; as might be amply

^a See Dr. Harris's Remarks on the Case of Lazarus, p. 75.

shown, if needful. For my own part, I never loved stoical principles or dispositions, and I believe Jesus had as tender sentiments as any man. Supposing then the death of Lazarus, and the affection Jesus had for him to have been the cause of these tears, I see no absurdity in them. But there were other things before Jesus of an affecting kind, which might have drawn forth these tears of compassion. He might at that time be affected with the thought of the many afflictions, to which human nature is liable in this state: or he might be affected with the excess of sorrow, which the sisters of Lazarus and other persons then present seem to have showed on this occasion.

As for the groans of Jesus, they were not owing to the death of Lazarus, but to somewhat else, as is very plain from the account; which is this: "Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw him, she fell down at his feet, saying unto him, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. When Jesus therefore saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled." Here are two just grounds of grief and concern, namely, the excess of sorrow and mourning of Mary and her friends for the loss of Lazarus; and secondly, the tokens which she and the rest gave of want of faith in his power to raise him up after his death. For Mary says to him: "If thou hadst been here, my brother had not died;" which implies her doubting his power to raise him up: which was a great fault in her, considering the proofs he had before given of his power; considering all the appearances from heaven in his favour, and all the other evidences that had been given that he was the Christ. It was also just matter of concern, that the faith of the people with her was so far from answering the proofs he had given of his power.

The occasion of his last groaning was thus: "And some of them said, Could not this man which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died? Jesus therefore again groaning in himself, cometh to the grave." Here also was another sign of want of faith in his power to raise dead Lazarus; which showed, they did not fully believe him to be the Christ, though he had given more than sufficient proof of it.^a It is also highly probable,

^a There are other places also, in which our Lord is said to have been angry or grieved: the cause or occasion of which grief or anger appears plainly to be the same with that here assigned by me of his groaning, Mark iii. 5. "And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts;" See Mark viii. 12.

that our blessed Lord was now touched with the thought of their continued future unbelief, and the miseries it would bring upon them. As they had not admitted a full conviction of his character from the works they had already seen him do, so he foresaw they would not be convinced neither by the great work he was now going to do in raising Lazarus to life, but would after all persist in their obstinate malice and unbelief. And supposing Jesus to have really done those things which are told of him in the gospels, I think no one can deny, but that the hardness of heart which was in that people was matter of just grief to any wise and good man.

‘Secondly, observe,’ says the author, p. 40. ‘that John ‘says, it was with a loud voice, that Jesus called Lazarus ‘forth out of his grave.—Was dead Lazarus deafer than ‘Jairus’s daughter, or the widow’s son?’ &c.

It is necessary, when a miracle is wrought for the proof of the character or divine mission of any person, that it appear to be done by him, and not to be a casual thing. It has been common therefore for all the prophets and extraordinary messengers of God to make use of some external action at the same time that they performed a miracle, though that external action was in itself of no real virtue. When the red sea was to be opened to give a passage for the children of Israel, “God said to Moses: Lift up thy rod, and stretch thine hand over the sea, and divide it,” Exod. xiv. 16. And when they had passed through, “God said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the sea, that the waters may come again upon the Egyptians,” ver. 26. The “stretching the hand” did not divide the sea, but the divine power that accompanied that action. Nevertheless the action was of great use to convince the people, that the dividing or returning of the waters, which immediately followed thereupon, was not a casual, natural event, but that God was with Moses their leader. The same thing may be said of any other external actions made use of by Moses, or other ancient prophets. Jesus in like manner, when he intended a miracle, sometimes laid his hands on the person to be cured; or else said, Be thou clean, be thou healed, or used some such other words; that the people might be assured, that the cure was wrought by him, and might believe that God had sent him. For this reason, when he raised Jairus’s daughter, “he took her by the hand,” and said unto her, “Damsel, arise.” And when he raised the widow’s son at Nain, “he said; Young man, I say unto thee, arise.” And when he raised Lazarus, “he cried with

a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." There is no absurdity in the loudness of the voice. It well became so solemn and awful an event. When he raised Jairus's daughter, there was no occasion for a loud voice; she being raised to life in the chamber where she lay, where there were no more than five persons present. But at Lazarus's grave a loud voice was not at all improper, when there was by a great multitude of people, that all might know Lazarus was raised to life by Jesus. Whether Jesus spoke with a loud voice when he raised the widow of Nain's son is not related, and we are under no obligation to conjecture. I think, Jesus might speak in what voice he pleased upon such great occasions as these. There can be no cavils formed, but what are at first sight unreasonable.

' Thirdly, because that a miracle should be well guarded against all suspicion of fraud, I was thinking to make it an absurdity, that the napkin, before Jesus raised Lazarus, was not taken from his face, that the spectators might behold his mortified looks, and the miraculous change of his countenance from death unto life,' p. 41. This wise objection is repeated again in the Jew's letter. ' But however this was, they [the spectators] could not but take notice of the napkin about his face all the while; which Jesus, to prevent all suspicion of cheat, should have first ordered to be taken off, that his mortified countenance might be viewed before the miraculous change of it to life was wrought,' p. 51, 52.

The napkin over Lazarus's face is one proof that he was supposed by his friends to be dead, when they buried him. Do not all civilized people out of decency cover the face of a corpse with a napkin, or some such other thing, as well as the other parts of it? If any one had been sent into the sepulchre by Jesus, before he commanded Lazarus forth, it might have given ground of suspicion that the person had been ordered in to see whether Lazarus was alive, and capable to come out of himself, and concur with the command pronounced to come forth. Or it might have been pretended, that he went in to daub his face with some juices that might make him look like a mortified corpse. Any meddling with the body beforehand might have caused some suspicion, but now there was none at all. And the napkin is a circumstance I am very glad St. John did not forget. It very much corroborates other proofs of Lazarus's real death.

' Fourthly and lastly, Observe, St. John says, ver. 45. " that many of the Jews, who had seen the things that Jesus

‘ did here, believed on him ; and some of them,” ver. 46, who ‘ “ did not believe, went their ways to the pharisees, and ‘ told them what things Jesus had done” in this pretended ‘ miracle, and how the business was transacted,’ p. 41.

It is true, that some went to the pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done. But it does not follow that they were persons who did not believe. They did not indeed believe Jesus to be the Christ, as many other Jews did hereupon ; but they believed the miracle, and knew it, and went and told the pharisees of it. That these persons told the pharisees of a miracle done by Jesus, is evident from the speeches of the pharisees upon occasion of the report brought them, ver. 47. “ Then gathered the chief priests and the pharisees a council, and said, What do we ? for this man doth many miracles.”

Mr. W. goes on, p. 42, ‘ Whereupon the chief priests ‘ and pharisees were so far incensed as, ver. 53, “ from that ‘ day forth they took counsel together to put him to death ; ‘ and, chap. xii. 10, consulted that they might put Lazarus ‘ also to death. Jesus therefore,” (and his disciples and ‘ Lazarus fled for it, for they) ver. 54, “ walked no more ‘ openly among the Jews, but went thence into a country ‘ near to the wilderness,” (a convenient hiding place,) “ and ‘ there continued with his disciples ;” otherwise in all probability they had been all sacrificed.’

I must take leave to observe, that it is no where said that Lazarus absconded or fled for it : nor is there any account of the pharisees having at this time any design against Lazarus. Afterwards when Jesus came again to Bethany, we find that Lazarus was then at home. And many of the Jews came thither, “ 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 to death ; because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus,” John xii. 9, 10, 11. Lazarus therefore did not abscond, but was at Bethany ; and the miracle wrought on him was so certain, that many for that reason believed on Jesus. And the reason why the pharisees consulted that they might put Lazarus to death, was not because any imposture was detected, but because the miracle was too clear to be denied, and induced great numbers of the Jews, even followers of the pharisees, to go away from them, and believe in Jesus.

But this retirement of Jesus with his disciples into a country near the wilderness is judged so mighty an objection, that it is repeated again in the Jew’s letter. ‘ Why

‘ did Jesus and his disciples, with Lazarus, run away and
 ‘ abscond upon it?—Is there not here a plain sign of guilt
 ‘ and fraud? Men that have God’s cause, truth and power
 ‘ on their side, never want courage and resolution to stand
 ‘ to it,’ p. 44.

The judgments of men are surely very unfair and unequal. When any of the first Christians are observed to have been too forward in exposing themselves, they are represented as a company of mad men, and hot-headed enthusiasts. Jesus now for avoiding a danger is taxed with want of ‘ courage and resolution;’ nay his retirement for only a very short time is termed, ‘ a plain sign of guilt and fraud.’ Thus the desire of serving a present low purpose prevails over all the regards of justice and equity. ‘ So hard is it, (as Socrates^a observed,) though you are free from all fault to escape ‘ unfair judges.’ “ But wisdom is justified of her children.”

It might be sufficient here to remind men of Christ’s returning in a short time to Bethany again, and appearing publicly at Jerusalem, and teaching in the temple. But let us at present observe only this history of his raising Lazarus from the grave. When Jesus heard of the sickness of Lazarus, he was in the country beyond Jordan, John x. 40, and when he proposed to his disciples “ to go into Judea again,” they remembering the attempts of the Jews against him, endeavour all they can to divert him from the journey. “ His disciples say unto him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, and goest thou thither again?” chap. xi. 8. Jesus then argues with them, that they need not apprehend any danger to him as yet. “ These things said he, and after that saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep,” ver. 11. They from thence take occasion to argue again, that then their journey to Bethany was not needful: “ Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well.” After that he tells him that Lazarus was dead, and declares his resolution to go to Bethany: “ nevertheless let us go unto him.” Whereupon Thomas filled with a kind of indignation^b that Jesus should have no more concern for himself nor them, than to expose them all to certain death, but at the same time sensible of his duty to follow him, says to his fellow-disciples; “ Let us also go that we may die with him,” ver. 16.

^a Χαλεπον ἐε και αναμαρτητως τι ποιησαντας μη αγνωμον κριτη περιττευειν. Apud Xenophon, Memor. l. 2.

^b Or perhaps, there was no indignation in his mind, but only a warm affection, which disposed him to go with Jesus, and to call upon the other disciples to do so likewise, whatever the danger was.

So that our blessed Lord, when he was in a place of safety, resolved to come to Bethany near Jerusalem, for the sake of Lazarus: and herein showed great courage and resolution. And what is there, I pray, blamable in his retiring again to some distance from Jerusalem, when he had performed the business for which he came into its neighbourhood?

CHAP. II.

ANSWER TO THE JEWISH RABBI'S LETTER.

WE are now come to the letter of Mr. W.'s Jewish Rabbi, whom Mr. W. calls his friend, and says his letter 'consists of calm and sedate reasoning,' p. 55. I on the other hand can see no reason in it. But the reader shall not need to rely upon my judgment. Therefore I will transcribe some parts of it, and then make some remarks. The argument of the letter is, that the story of Lazarus's being raised is an imposture; or else the Jews could not have been so wicked as to be on that account provoked against Jesus and Lazarus.

'If there had been an indisputable miracle wrought in Lazarus's resurrection, why were the chief priests and pharisees so incensed upon it, as to take counsel to put Jesus and Lazarus to death for it?' p. 43.

The reason is very evident; because that by reason of it "many of the Jews went away," deserted the proud pharisees, "and believed on Jesus," John xii. 10.

'If,' says he, 'historians can parallel this story of the malignity of the Jews towards Jesus and Lazarus upon such a real miracle with thing [things] equally barbarous and inhuman in any other sect and nation; we will acknowledge the truth of it against our own nation: or if such inhumanity, abstractedly considered, be at all agreeable to the conceptions any one can form of human nature, in the most uncivilized and brutish people, we will allow our ancestors in this case, to have been that people.—And he promises to make it out as foolish and wicked an imposture as ever was contrived and transacted in the world—that it is no wonder the people by an unanimous voice, called for the releasement of Barabbas, a robber and murderer, before Jesus,' p. 46, 53, 54.

The demand made of a parallel of the malignity of the

Jews against Jesus, upon such a real miracle, is very idle, because there never was such a public miracle done by any other for so pure a doctrine. But if this Jew or any one else will produce an instance of such a miracle done by any one, who also taught the same spiritual, heavenly doctrine that Jesus did, and nothing else; and who conversed and taught as publicly as Jesus did; and spoke the truth to all without fear or favour: I will show he had an ignominious death, or else wondrous escapes and deliverances by manifest interpositions of Divine Providence.

But though an instance of equal malignity cannot be shown, because there is no other character equal to our Saviour's in innocence of life and greatness of works; yet the Jewish nation will afford an instance, which I am very sorry is so near a parallel. Moses was the greatest prophet, and meekest man, they ever had among them, except Jesus, and they often murmured against him. "And Moses cried unto the Lord, saying, What shall I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me," *Exod. xvii. 4.* When they should have gone to have taken possession of the land of Canaan, "All the children of Israel murmured against Moses and against Aaron. All the congregation bade stone them with stones," *Numb. xiv. 2—10*, that is, Moses and Aaron, Caleb and Joshua, or at least these two, the only persons that stood by Moses, and his brother.

This people were to a man obliged to Moses, who had brought them up out of a state of servitude. Nor had they any just ground of complaint against him, whilst in the wilderness, for God says: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings," *Exod. xix. 4.* The blessings Moses proposed were far more agreeable to carnal minds (such as the Jews and most other men's are) than those promised by Jesus. He engaged to raise them to a state of independency in a land flowing with milk and honey. The time set for this event according to divine promise was now come. And he had performed many great miracles before them, and yet they rebelled continually against God and this his servant. Nor did any of all this congregation, except Caleb and Joshua, believe God, as Moses tells them expressly. *Deut. ix. 23, 24.* They are called by the Psalmist a "stubborn and rebellious generation," *Ps. lxxviii. 8.* "They believed not for all his wondrous works," *ver. 32.* Not that they disbelieved the works themselves: they knew them, but though they saw the works of God, they were not obedient.

"Thou knowest," says Aaron to Moses, "that this people

is set upon mischief," Exod. xxxii. 22. As they were then, so they continued to be; and slew the prophets which God sent to them. They are upon record in their own writings as the most obstinate of all people, Ezek. iii. 5, 6. They are said to have "changed God's judgments into wickedness more than the nations," ch. v. 6. One would think these, and many other such things, were recorded on purpose to prevent such an objection as we have now before us; or to help us to answer it, if any should be so unreasonable as to make it.

Why should it be thought strange that this people, who would have stoned Moses, and who slew many other prophets, should also conspire against Jesus? especially considering that they abounded now as much as ever with all kinds of the worst wickedness, except idolatry; (if we may credit Josephus and other writers of this nation;) and were now disappointed in their fondest expectations of worldly power and splendour. I will transcribe here an answer of Origen to a like objection of Celsus, proposed in the person of a Jew. ' Well then, sirs, how will you (says Origen)^a ' answer such questions as these, if put to you by us? ' Which are in your opinion the greatest miracles? those ' which were wrought in Egypt, and in the wilderness? or ' those which we say were wrought among you by Jesus? ' If in your opinion those are greater than these latter: is ' it not hence apparent, that according to your custom, you ' may despise the less, who disbelieved the greater? since ' you think those ascribed to Jesus less than those former. ' But if those, which are related of Jesus are equal to those ' written by Moses: is it any thing strange, that the same ' people should be equally unbelieving upon both occa- ' sions? For the beginning of the law was by Moses: and in ' that are recorded the transgressions of the unbelievers and ' sinners among you. And the beginning of the second law ' and covenant is allowed to have been given unto us by

^a Το, τι βελεσθε, ω ετοι, προς τας πενσεις ημων αποκρινεσθαι; ποια εννα-
μεις μειζος, οσον επι ημετερα υποληψει ειναι υμιν φαινονται. αι εν Αιγυπτω
και τη ερημω, η α εφαιμεν ημεις πεποιηκεναι τον Ιησυν παρ' υμιν; ει μιν δε
εκειναι μειζος τωτων καθ' υμας εισι πως εκ αυτοθεν δεικνυται, οτι κατα το
ηθος των τοις μειζοσιν απισησαντων εστι και το των ηττωνων καταφρονην;
τατο γαρ υπολαμβανεται περι ων λεγομεν περι Ιησ' ει δε ισαι λεγονται περι
τη Ιησ' ταις αναγεγραμμεναις υπο Μωσσεως, τι ξενον απηνητησε λαω κατ'
αμφοτερας ταις αρχαις των πραγματων απισκνυτι; αρχη μιν γαρ νομοθεσιας, επι
Μωσσεως ην. εν η τα αμαρτηματα των απιστων και των αμαρτανοντων ημων
αναγεγραπται. Αρχη δε νομοθεσιας και διαθηκης δευτερας κατα τον Ιησυν
ημιν γεγονεναι ομολογεται. Και μαρτυρειτε εδ' ων τη Ιησ' απιστειτε, οτι νιοι
εστε εν τη ερημω απισησαντων ταις θειας επιφανειαις. Origen, contr. Cels.
l. 2. p. 206, 207.

‘ Jesus. And by your unbelief in Jesus you make it appear, ‘ that ye are the children of those who did not believe the divine appearances in the wilderness.’

Any man may perceive, that a prophet is the most unpopular of all characters. For he is to “ cry aloud and spare not; to lift up his voice like a trumpet,” Isaiah lviii. 1, and show men of all ranks their transgressions and their sins. “ Moses at first supposed his brethren would have understood, how that God by his hand would deliver them,” Acts vii. 25. But when he endeavoured only to reconcile two of them, and “ said to him that did the wrong, Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow?” what a smart reply did he meet with? “ who made thee a prince and a judge over us? intendest thou to kill me as thou killedst the Egyptian?” Exod. ii. 13, 14. These were his apprehensions then; but when he was forty years old, and knew the world better, and God appeared to him and told him, he would send him to bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt: after divers fine excuses, which are not accepted of, he in a modest way positively refuses to go. “ And he said, O Lord, send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send,” Exod. iv. 13. Nor does he yield, till the anger of the Lord is kindled against him. So hazardous and difficult was this office, that God sometimes promises a prophet as a special favour and a most necessary qualification, together with a commission, boldness of countenance to execute it. “ As an adamant harder than flint,” says God to Ezekiel, “ have I made thy forehead: fear them not, neither be dismayed,” Ezek. iii. 9. And Jeremiah he made a “ defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls against the whole land,” Jerem. i. 18.

It is a very unjust way of judging: such an one suffered, or was hated and opposed; therefore he was a wicked man, or an impostor. If we will pass a judgment on men, we should examine their conduct, as well as the treatment they meet with: otherwise we are in danger of being unjust to the memory of some of the best men that ever were. Solomon says, “ A just man falleth [into trouble] seven times, and riseth up again,” Prov. xxiv. 16. And his father David: “ Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all,” Ps. xxxiv. 19. Many were the afflictions of our blessed Saviour, but he was delivered out of them all, if ever man was; having been soon raised up from the grave, and seated at the right hand of God.

Solomon says again: “ An unjust man is an abomination

to the just: and he that is upright in the way, is abomination to the wicked," Prov. xxix. 27. Which last observation is confirmed by divers heathen writers of good knowledge in human nature: 'That a man can no sooner be an enemy to all vice, and walk in the ways of virtue, but he becomes the object of hatred.'^b Socrates who had been pronounced by the oracle of Apollo the wisest man, and who has since had almost universally the character of the best man among the Greeks,^c was put to death by his countrymen the Athenians, a people more renowned for civility and good humour than the Jews. He was always apprehensive of suffering, and sensible of the danger he incurred by opposing the evil practices of men. He goes so far as to tell the Athenians:^d 'It is impossible for any man to be safe among them, or any where else, who honestly and courageously opposes vice and injustice.' He says also that he had chosen a private life as best suited to answer his design; and that if he had been in the magistracy, and taken the course he had done of instructing and admonishing all people, he had not lived so long. And Cicero^e observed in his time, that philosophy, which proposed to cure the minds of men, was suspected and hated by the most, as a dangerous thing. Some sovereign princes have lost their lives in attempts of reformation. Many indeed are the instances of the unjust judgments of the most. A peaceable prince, who protects the estates, the commerce, the persons and consciences of his subjects, is barely beloved; a conqueror is adored; though he needlessly hazards the lives of his own subjects, and violates toward his neighbours all the laws of nations, and all the laws of honour and humanity.

But I am ashamed to give this argument its full force. I little expected to have ever seen this objection seriously

^b Si quis vitiorum omnium inimicus rectum iter vitæ cœpit insistere, primum propter morum differentiam odium habet. Quis enim potest probare diversa? Petron. Arbiter, laudat. a Grot. ad Matt. x. 22.

Και γαρ και μισηνται, ελεγχοντες αυτων τας αμαθιας. Lucian. Contemplant. V. l. p. 357. edit. Amst.

^c Και τον αριστον των Ελληνων λαβων υποθεσιν [Αριστοφανης] ανδρα τοις τε αλλοις θεοις φιλον, και εη και μαλιστα τω Απολλωνι. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. 2. c. 13.

^d Εν γαρ ιτε, ω Αθηναιοι, ει εγω παλαι επεχειρησα πραττειν τα πολιτικα πραγματα, παλαι αν απολωλειν.—Και μοι μη αχθεσζε λεγοντι τ' αληθη. Ου γαρ εστιν οτις ανθρωπων σωθησεται, ουτε ιμιν ουτε αλλη ουδενι πληξει γνησιως εναντιωμενος, και ειακωλων πολλα αδικα και παρανομα εν τη πολει γιγνεσθαι. Plat. Apolog. Socrat. p. 31. E.

^e Animi autem medicina nec tam desiderata sit,—nec tam multis grata et probata, plumbus etiam suspecta et invisa. Tusc. Q. l. 3. init.

produced against the miracles, or any other branch of the history of the New Testament, and called 'calm and sedate reasoning,' p. 55. An apologist for christianity might have brought it forth and stated it, to adorn his triumph, after a confutation of other more plausible objections; but for any seriously to mention the enmity of the Jews against Jesus, as an objection against him, can be owing to nothing, in my opinion, but strange ignorance or prejudice, or a most contemptuous opinion of all the reason and observation of mankind.

Let us examine another passage in the Jew's letter. 'Such a manifest miracle, let it be wrought for what end and purpose we can possibly imagine, would strike men with awe and reverence, and none could hate and persecute the author of the miracle; lest he who could raise the dead, should exert his power against themselves, and either wound or smite them dead with it. For which reason, the resurrection of Lazarus, on the certain knowledge of our ancestors, was all fraud, or they would have revered and adored the power of him that did it,' p. 48. And more such stuff has this Jew again and again to this same purpose.

I must therefore remind him of some examples in the books of the Old Testament. In 1 Kings xvii. is the history of Elijah's raising the widow's son. In the next chapter he works a great miracle at the altar, and after that obtaineth rain. Nevertheless it is said, chap xix. 1, 2. "And Ahab told Jezebel all that Elijah had done, and withal how he had slain all the prophets with the sword. Then Jezebel sent a messenger to Elijah," and solemnly swears she would destroy him, "saying, So let the gods do to me, and more also, if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to-morrow about this time." Whereupon Elijah absconds, and in a prayer to God he says, "They seek his life to take it away." In the twenty-second chapter is mention of another prophet of the Lord, by name Micajah, of whom Ahab says to Jehosaphat in plain terms; "I hate him."

Ahaziah, another king of Israel, fell "down through a lattice in his upper chamber, and was sick," 2 Kings i. Nevertheless, in this condition, (such stubbornness is there in the heart of man!) he sends officers, one after another, to Elijah, requiring him to come to him. Elisha also, successor of Elijah, raised a person to life and wrought divers other miracles, 2 Kings iv. Notwithstanding this, Jehoram, another king of Israel, says: ch. vi. 31. "God do so and

more also to me, if the head of Elisha the son of Shaphat shall stand on him this day.”

One story more to our purpose out of the Jewish writings, 2 Kings vi. 11—13, but wherein a foreigner is concerned. The king of Syria is at war with Israel. Elisha informs the king of Israel of all his enemies' steps. The king of Syria is amazed, and complains to his servants that they discover his secrets: “Will ye not show me, which of us is for the king of Israel? and one of his servants said, None, my lord, O king; but Elisha the prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber.” This king of Syria believed what his servant said, otherwise he had not concerned himself about Elisha. But it follows there: “And he said, Go and spy where he is, that I may send and fetch him. And it was told him, Behold he is in Dothan. Therefore sent he thither horses and chariots, and a great host, and they came by night and compassed him about.” So that it is plain, miracles do not always fill wicked men with such awe and reverence, but that they can still hate and persecute, and break forth into rage against the authors of them.

This Jew says, p. 49: ‘That it is certain, according to christian commentators, that some of them did not believe the miracle.’ Again he says, p. 51: ‘It is plain from the story in John, that there was a dispute amongst the bystanders at Lazarus's resurrection, whether it was a real miracle or not.’ I presume to say: this is a false account. It is not plain, that there was any dispute among the bystanders, whether it was a real miracle. It is plain those people, who went to the pharisees, told them of a real miracle. And the pharisees, when met in council, say: “What do we? for this man doth many miracles.”

Nor do I know, that any christian commentators say,^f that ‘some of them did not believe the miracle.’ They did not believe in Jesus indeed, but they knew the miracle. “Many of the Jews that came to Mary,” says St. John, “believed on him.” But some of them (which were present, who did not believe in Jesus notwithstanding the miracle) “went their ways to the pharisees.” This is the sense of the place.

^f Grot. ad ver. 46. Impios hos fuisse necesse est; quod genus hominum ne conspectâ quidem mortuorum resurrectione respiscere solet. Luc. xvi. 31. Omnia enim potius, etiam absurdissima, comminiscuntur, quam sua commoda aut hominum gratiam (quam istos venatos apparet) amittant. Et ad ver. 47. ‘Multa signa facit.’ Adeo execrati erant invidiâ animi, ut quod argumentum esse debuerat, quo ipsi crederent, eo in ipsius perniciem incitarentur.

So the Jews in the wilderness did not believe God, but no Jew sure will say, they disputed whether the things done by Moses were miraculous.

‘Perhaps,’ says this Jew, ‘they discovered some fragments of the food, that for four days in the cave, he had subsisted on.’ There is no ground here for a perhaps. How should a man take any food, “who was bound hand and foot with grave-clothes; and whose face was bound about with the” so often mentioned “napkin?”

‘As it is plain,’ (says the Jew again,) ‘from the story in John, that there was a dispute among the by-standers at Lazarus’s resurrection, whether it was a real miracle; so it is the opinion of us Jews, which is of the nature of a tradition, that the chief priests and civil magistrates of Bethany, for the better determination of the dispute, required that Jesus should repeat the miracle upon another person, there lately dead and buried. But Jesus declining this test of his power, the whole multitude questioned the resurrection of Lazarus. And this was one reason of that vehement and universal outcry and demand, at Jesus’s trial, for his crucifixion.’ p. 50, 52.

There is no reason to believe, that this is the opinion of the Jews; but supposing it to be so, it is groundless. And here a present opinion is advanced into a tradition. This tradition is set up against authentic history, written by witnesses and other well-informed persons, who lived near the event. Is that a good cause that needs such a defence? will any man of sense and reason engage, in any other case, in so desperate a cause?

There are innumerable proofs in the evangelists, not only that the raising of Lazarus was a real miracle, but also that the pharisees knew it to be so. Their not putting Lazarus or any other person to death, as an accomplice with Jesus, is demonstration that this and the other miracles of Jesus were known to be real, and not impostures. It is apparent from the trial of Jesus, that the truth of his miracles could not be called in question. If they had, the evangelists, who have recorded so many charges against Jesus, and so many spiteful, scurrilous reproaches on him, would not have omitted this.

CHAP. III.

THAT THESE THREE MIRACLES ARE WELL CIRCUMSTANCED.

I AM now to show, that the histories of these three miracles are well circumstanced, and have in them the marks and tokens of credibility. But I have here very little to say. Scarce any thing can be added to the perspicuity of the evangelists' several relations.

I shall however make two or three general observations, and then go over the particulars of the relation of each miracle.

SECTION I.

THE general observations I would mention are these :

I. There are in these relations proper circumstances of time and place, and the names and characters of persons. Of the miracle on Jairus's daughter, the time and place are sufficiently specified by St. Mark and St. Luke. It was soon after his crossing the sea of Galilee after Jesus had cured the men possessed with devils in the country of the Gergesenes, "And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people gathered unto him, and he was nigh unto the sea. And behold there cometh one of the rulers," &c. Mark v. 21. "And it came to pass that when Jesus was returned, the people gladly received him. And behold there came a man," &c. Luke viii. 40.

The character of the person on whom the miracle was performed is particularly described. She is the daughter of a ruler of a synagogue, whose name was Jairus. Matthew says, ch. ix. 18. "There came a certain ruler." Mark, "Behold, there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name." Luke, "Behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was the ruler of the synagogue." And by Mark she is said to have been of the "age of twelve years."

Of the next miracle, related by Luke only, it is said to have been done the day after the cure of the Centurion's servant at Capernaum. The place is the city of Nain, the person is the only son of a widow there. Luke vii. 11, 12. "And it came to pass the day after, that he went into a city called Nain. Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow."

Of the last miracle related by St. John only, the person on whom it is said to have been done is Lazarus, of the town of Bethany, nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off, brother of Mary and Martha : friend of Jesus and his disciples ; and on occasion of the death of Lazarus, Jesus came up from beyond Jordan to Bethany, and then retired into a city called Ephraim. Moreover it appears to have been done not long before our Saviour's death.

This specifying of time, place, and names or characters of persons, is an argument of a real story and not a fiction : for, if it had been a fiction, it might have been easily discovered.

2. These miracles were done at the usual place of the residence of those persons on whom they were performed ; a much greater security, in this case, against cheat and imposture, than if they had been done on travellers, who were strangers in the places where such things are acted on them.

3. They were all very public miracles, as is apparent from the relation. It may be difficult to say, where there was the greatest concourse ; but I am inclined to think, that the company at Lazarus's resurrection was the fewest ; and also, that the company which attended Jesus to the house of Jairus was the greatest concourse of the three. There were not indeed so many present at speaking the word, when his daughter was restored to life. Nor could the young woman's corpse be brought out of her chamber, and placed before the house, in order to raise her there before all the people, without ostentation : which is entirely unbecoming the character of Jesus ; but all the numerous company then attending our Lord had full evidence of her death, and of her restoration to life, as has been shown in part already, and may further appear presently.

SECTION II.

WE will now go over the particulars of the relation of each miracle, from which it will appear that these persons had been dead, and were raised to life by Jesus.

Jairus, ruler of a synagogue, came to Jesus and " worshipped him ;" or as Mark, and Luke, " fell down at his feet, saying, My daughter is even now dead," or, " at the point of death, but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live."

It is not reasonable to suppose, that a ruler of a synagogue would come to Jesus, and ask him to heal his daugh-

ter in so earnest a manner, and with such signs of high esteem and respect, and that before great numbers of people, unless his daughter's case was desperate, and past all hopes of remedy in an ordinary way. It was dishonourable to pay any respect to Jesus. There were few or none of Jairus's character who publicly owned him for the Christ. His application to him must be very offensive to his brethren; and therefore we may be assured, he had no prospect of help for his daughter any other way but this.

Moreover, the manner in which he comes to Jesus, shows an uncommon concern and earnestness. While Jesus is speaking in public, he comes and falls down at his feet, and "besought him greatly—I pray thee come and lay thy hands on her."

The expressions he uses concerning his daughter, represent her to be in the utmost extremity; so that she must be near expiring when he left her.

Upon his earnest entreaty, "Jesus arose, and followed him, and so did his disciples," Matthew: and much "people followed him and thronged him," Mark: and from St. Luke it appears, that "a multitude thronged and pressed him." From all the three evangelists, who relate this matter, it is plain, that when Jairus came to Jesus, much people was round about him. The request of Jairus, so noted a person, to come and heal his daughter, would also doubtless increase the number of people that were before gathered together about him. It was impossible for Jesus, surrounded by so great a crowd, to go in great haste to Jairus's house.

Moreover all these three evangelists are agreed, that as Jesus was going along, there came behind him a woman who had an infirmity of twelve years' standing, who touched the hem of his garment and was made whole. St. Matthew assures us also, that Jesus had then some discourse with this woman: St. Mark and St. Luke, that Jesus perceiving virtue to have gone out of him, stood still, looked round him, asked who touched him. The disciples then express their wonder that he should ask such a question. The woman tells her case at length before him and all the people; and Jesus bids her go away in peace. This affair took up considerable time; and if Jairus's daughter lay dying when he left her, she may be supposed to be worse by this time, if not quite dead.

And accordingly, we are assured by Mark and Luke, "that while he yet spake" with this woman, there came one or more persons from Jairus's house, saying, "Thy daugh-

ter is dead, why troublest thou the Master any further?" This person came from Jairus's house, and very probably had been despatched away by some of those who attended on the young woman. Would any of his servants or friends come with such a melancholy story to Jairus, that his daughter had died while he was abroad, if they had not known for certain that she was dead?

By all these things we know, that Jairus's daughter died of sickness that made gradual advances; not of a sudden fit, or fright, or any thing like it. She lay dying when Jairus left the house. Some persons come to him, and tell him that she was dead, and dissuade him from troubling the Master any further: whereas, if she had only had something like a fit, it had been most unreasonable to dissuade Jairus from troubling Jesus any further.

Let us go on: when Jesus came into the ruler's house, he saw "the minstrels and the people making a noise," Matthew: "He seeth the tumult and them that wept greatly," Mark: "And all wept and bewailed her," Luke. Here were friends, and public hired musicians, weeping and bewailing the young woman. They knew therefore that she was dead; she had been dead some time, or else these minstrels had not begun their lamentations.

Jesus says; "Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth." Whereupon, say all the three evangelists, "They laughed him to scorn." So sure were these persons that she was dead and not in a sleep; as they understood Jesus to say.

Jesus puts forth out of the house these public mourners, and other strangers. When the disciples and all the people saw these minstrels come out, they had further evidence hereby of the death of the young woman.

Jesus having removed all strangers, that the house might be quiet, enters into the room where the young woman lay, taking with him the parents, "the father and mother of the maiden, and three of his own disciples;" a sufficient number of persons to attest any fact; yet not so many, but that they might all have a clear and distinct view of the thing: the properest persons of any to be admitted; the father and the mother, as best knowing the young woman's case, the most unwilling of any to admit a deceit, and to take another person, a stranger who had not died, instead of their own daughter; three of his own disciples, who were to be witnesses of his works, and who could not have been persuaded to undertake the difficult work of preaching the gospel after their

Master's removal without good proof of his divine mission ; who might also assure the other disciples of this thing from their own sight.

These five persons Jesus took along with him ; and now the three disciples saw the dead corpse of the young woman, whom her parents and friends knew to be dead before.

And " he took her by the hand, and said, Maid, arise. And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway, and walked." Upon Jesus's taking hold of her hand, and bidding her arise, she immediately arose. It was therefore evidently the effect of that power that accompanied his word. She also walked, so that life and strength were at once conveyed. He also " commanded to give her meat." And then all who ministered food to her, and saw her eat, were witnesses of her perfect recovery.

They who were present were convinced it was a miracle. " Her parents were astonished," says St. Mark : " And they were astonished with a great astonishment," says St. Luke, meaning, it is likely, the three disciples as well as the parents. Lastly, St. Matthew says, " The fame hereof went abroad into all that land." So that whether the parents, and the three disciples present, were silent, according to Christ's direction, or not, the thing was known ; many were persuaded of the miracle, and spoke of it. And indeed, the circumstances of her death were so public, that all who saw her alive again, though they were not in the room at the time she was raised, must know the miracle.

The three disciples present at this transaction were afterwards the most forward and courageous of any in declaring Jesus to be the Son of God, in the midst of dangers ; whereas they must have been the most backward of all men in giving him this character, if they had perceived this affair to be any thing but a real miracle.

The next story is that of the widow of Nain's son. " Jesus went into a city called Nain, and many of his disciples went with him," Luke vii. 11 ; that is, of his followers, beside the twelve, and much other people. " Now when he came nigh unto the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out." This meeting of the corpse must have been casual, without any concerted design between Jesus and any people of Nain. For our Lord's life, during the course of his ministry, was very public. This event happened in a very noted part of it. He had but the day before cured the Centurion's servant at Capernaum. At this instant there were many of his disciples and other people

with him. There could not have been any agreement transacted between him and any at Nain so privately but it must have been known.

The dead man carried out was the "only son of his mother, and she was a widow; and much people of the city was with her." As sure as persons do not carry men forth to burial till they are dead, so sure are we that this was a dead corpse. The person was not one who had no friends to take care of him. He was the only son of a widow, therefore her only support, her husband being dead.

"There were much people of the city with her," her neighbours. Could she have concerted a fraud for carrying out her only child, if he had been alive! It is observable, that there were "much people of the city with her," which is no unusual thing at the funeral of a person who leaves behind him so fond a relation as a widow-mother. But had there been any fraud, it is very unlikely that she should have carried out her son with much company of that place. She would have contrived some pretence to excuse their company at this time. Or rather, she would have said nothing of the matter to any one, but carried him out privately to burial as dead, without any previous notice. This "much people of the city" with the mother, ruins all objections that can be raised.

If it be said: it might be the contrivance of the young man, a subtle youth, without the knowledge of his mother: I answer, that is impossible. If he had been abroad in a strange country, he might have contrived such a thing with his comrades; but it is impossible he should transact such a matter in his mother's house without her knowledge. Would a widow let her only son be carried to burial out of her own house, without knowing whether he was dead or not?

"And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not." Jesus, before he had seen the corpse, without asking any questions, knowing the power he had of raising the dead to life, bid her forbear weeping; thereby intimating in a modest way, that she should soon see her son, whose death was the cause of her sorrow, restored to life.

"And he came and touched the bier, (and they that bare him stood still,) and he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise; and he that was dead sat up, and began to speak: and he delivered him to his mother." Presently, upon the voice of Jesus commanding him to arise, he sat up, and began to speak. The tokens of life, strength and vigour,

appeared immediately upon the command of Jesus. His life was manifestly known hereby to be the effect of the power accompanying the word of Jesus.

This was reckoned a miracle by the numerous company present, before whom it was publicly done: and they reported it to others, for it follows: "And there came a fear on all: and they glorified God, saying, That a great Prophet is risen up among us, and that God hath visited his people. And this rumour of him went forth throughout all Judea, and throughout all the region round about."

We will now take a view of the last story of this kind. "Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus of Bethany, the town of Mary and Martha—Therefore his sisters sent unto him, saying, Lord, behold he whom thou lovest is sick." Hereby we learn, that Lazarus did not die suddenly: that he was not taken off by a fit, but by a sickness which made gradual advances. His sisters sent to Jesus, "He whom thou lovest is sick;" supposing that out of his affection for Lazarus, he would come to Bethany; and hoping also that he might possibly get thither before he was dead. That Lazarus was dangerously sick, is evident not only from the substance of the message, but from their sending a messenger so far, and also from their not coming either of them to Christ. It is also hence apparent, that there could be no fraud and contrivance. The matter is not secretly transacted between Lazarus, his sisters, and Jesus, but here is a messenger employed. Moreover, if they had had any thought of such a great design in hand, as making a pretence of raising up Lazarus, though not dead, some one of these sisters would have come herself. Nothing but real sickness could have kept the sisters at home, and from coming to Jesus. The thought of making a pretence of so great a miracle as raising a dead man to life would certainly have obliged one of the nearest relations to come in person to him, who was to have the honour of so mighty a work.

Jesus staid some time in the place where he was, after the receiving a message of Lazarus's sickness. He receives no more messages; a sign there was no longer any need of his coming, and that Lazarus was recovered; or else that he was in such a state, that his friends had no longer hopes of any benefit from Jesus.

But at length Jesus resolves to go into Judea, and sets out with his disciples for Bethany, though it was nigh to Jerusalem, where the Jews had lately sought his life; a sure sign of the consciousness of his innocence and integrity. Had it been thought necessary to concert a pre-

tended miracle between Jesus and these persons : Lazarus might have come to the country beyond Jordan, and a death and a resurrection might have been contrived there. None would have chosen Bethany for the scene of a pretended miracle at this time ; so near the fiercest enemies, so near the great council of the Jews. If a miracle had been contrived at Bethany, it would not have been upon an inhabitant of the place, a well known person, but some stranger purposely arrived there by accident, but who should have no occasion to come thither again. What reward, what sum of money could be sufficient to induce a well known person, inhabitant of Bethany, so near Jerusalem, to enter into a combination with Jesus, to be the person on whom an imposture of this kind should be acted ?

“ Then when Jesus came, he found that he had lain in the grave four days already.—And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary to comfort them concerning their brother. Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him : but Mary sat still in the house.” Hence it is evident, that Lazarus’s death and burial were public things. Moreover these sisters did not go to Jesus : Martha does not go, till she hears Jesus is near the house ; and Mary stays still at home ; all arguments of true sorrow, and that there was no contrivance.

“ Then saith Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.” How natural expressions of sorrow and concern ! Did this person, who spoke these words, know her brother was alive still, and only feigned to be dead ? Impossible. “ But I know, that even now whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee.” More words, that demonstrate they were not in any concerted design of feigning a miracle. After some more discourse between her and Jesus, she went her way, and “ called Mary her sister secretly, saying, The Master is come and calleth for thee.”

“ As soon as she heard that, she arose quickly, and came unto him. Now Jesus was not yet come into the town, but was in that place where Martha met him. The Jews then which were with her, when they saw Mary, that she rose up hastily, and went out, followed her ; saying, She goeth unto the grave, to weep there.” Mary’s grief was real, in the opinion of all these persons, who might, one would think, have known it to be counterfeit, if it had been so.

“ Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw him, she fell down at his feet, saying unto him, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.” She had

no more thought of seeing her brother raised presently by Jesus, than her sister Martha had.

“When Jesus therefore saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled.” Here are in this joint weeping of Mary and her friends the tokens of a deep sorrow, arising from the death of Lazarus, and a despair of ever seeing him again, before the resurrection at the last day. Their grief so far exceeded the bounds it ought to have done, when Jesus, who had already given such demonstrations of his power, was with them, that he “groaned in spirit, and was troubled.”

Ver. 34. “And said, Where have ye laid him? They said unto him, Lord, come and see.” Jesus himself first makes the proposal of going toward the sepulchre by asking the question; “where they had laid him.” There appear no where any intimations that they had hopes of seeing Lazarus alive again.

They go toward the sepulchre, ver. 38. “Jesus—cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it. Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto him, Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he has been dead four days.” Need I here remark, that these are the words of one, who knew her brother was dead? She expresses herein such a want of all hopes of seeing her brother alive again, that Jesus reproves her, and says: “Said I not unto thee, That if thou wouldst believe, thou shouldst see the glory of God?”

Now with what deliberation, and with what solemnity of address to the Father does Jesus proceed to this great work, that the minds of all the company might be attentive, and observe!

Ver. 41—44. “Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lift up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee, that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me. And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go.”

There is no occasion for remarks here: he who was dead came out with burial clothes upon him, with all the tokens of a corpse buried by his friends; so bound, that in a natural course he was not able to move; and he was ordered

to be unloosed by others, not being able to help himself; that all might see the tokens of life, strength and vigour, by the actions of walking.

Is there any reason to doubt after this view of this relation, whether this was a real miracle; and whether they who were present must not be sure it was so, and report it as such, as John has done?

But we will proceed a little farther. All present are represented as persuaded of it. For “many of the Jews, which came to Mary and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him:” that is, believed him to be the Messias. “But some of them,” being wicked, malicious men, “went to the pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done.” And the pharisees considering the greatness of this work, and that such things as these would tend to bring “all men,” great numbers of people, to believe on him, “from that day forth they took counsel together to put him to death,” ver. 53.

That this thing was no imposture, but a real miracle, appears finally from hence; that not long after this, (by which time the pharisees might have enquired into the matter, and got evidence of the imposture, if any could be had,) Jesus comes publicly to Jerusalem, enters into the temple, teaches there boldly from day to day, spends several days at Jerusalem, and in the neighbourhood, at Bethany itself, the place of this action; and lives all this time in the most public, open manner at the near approach of one of the Jewish principal festivals, when there was a general resort thither from all parts. He celebrates moreover this great feast with his disciples in Jerusalem. And supper being over, he goes into a garden, an usual place of retirement, with his disciples: whither the officers of the high priest come to apprehend him, to whom he voluntarily surrenders himself. Whereupon he is examined and tried before the council, and before Pilate, but not one imposture of any kind is proved or charged upon him.

SECTION III.

I MIGHT conclude here, but I am willing to add a few observations on the propriety and beauty of our Lord's action, and of the evangelists' relations.

St. Matthew informs us, that when the ruler came to Jesus, he was discoursing to the people. “While Jesus spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler to him—saying. My daughter is even now dead. but come

and lay thy hand upon her. And Jesus arose and followed him," Matt. ix. 18.

Jesus is always ready, never unwilling or unprepared for the performance of any good work : but immediately hearkens to the call, and proceeds without delay from good and useful discourse to great and useful works.

Not only the disciples, but those also that were hearing him, go along with him : " And much people followed him, and thronged him," Mark v. 24. As he is going, a woman in the crowd, who had a long and grievous infirmity, secretly touches him and is healed. " Jesus, perceiving that virtue had gone out of him," instead of omitting the notice hereof, and hasting along to Jairus's house, lest the case should become too desperate and beyond his reach ; but knowing that all things were in his power, stops, turns him about, and asks, " Who touched me ?"

How sedate is his temper ! He is not exalted with the thought of the honour done him by a ruler of a synagogue, who had earnestly besought him to heal his daughter. He is not in any haste to proceed to his house, lest the opportunity of showing his power in the family of a ruler in Israel should be lost : but stands still, inquires who touched him ; hears the poor woman tell her case, and confirms her cure, by bidding her " go in peace."

Jesus was now going to Jairus's house, whose daughter was by this time dead. And there was no way left for him to help this ruler ; and perform his request, of laying his hand on his daughter, that she might live, without raising her up from the dead. As he is going to this surprising awful action of giving life to the dead, virtue issues forth from him through his garment, and heals a long and obstinate disease. How great is Jesus here ! How transporting the idea the mind forms of him !

When he came " to the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels and " others " making a noise, he said unto them : Give place, for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth," Matt. ix. 28. What modesty ! what humility ! " They laughed him to scorn," supposing him to speak of natural sleep. Yet he corrects not their mistake. Nothing can draw out from him any word that has the appearance of boast or vanity.

I shall by and by give a like instance of modesty in St. John's history of the miracle of Lazarus. He who reads such passages as these in these evangelists, the one originally of so sordid an employment as that of a publican, the other an illiterate fisherman, may be assured, they did not

invent, but that they drew some real character: there not being, I believe, another such example of modesty to be found in any author ancient or modern; how well soever skilled in historical facts, or however renowned for greatness of genius and fruitfulness of fancy. The humble modesty is equal to the miracle. Such things as these do they write, in the coolest terms, the plainest manner. They subjoin not a fulsome, or any other set encomium. They have not added a passionate exclamation, or so much as a hint of special observation. But the attentive reader, when he pauses and reflects, finds his heart glowing with an ardent affection and zeal for him of whom they write. Nor can he help being transported with the thought of the unparalleled, unaffected honesty and simplicity of the evangelists.

“But when the people were put forth, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the maid arose.” How simple! and yet how truly great is this narration of St. Matthew!

I cannot leave this story, till I have observed the wondrous propriety of our Lord's action throughout the whole of this affair; which was so public, so diversified with incidents, and so various in its circumstances. So soon as Jairus comes to him, he goes along with him, in order to perform the useful work he had desired of him. As he is going, a woman is healed by a secret touch of his garment. He asks, “Who touched me?” The disciples tell him, that was a strange question. Still our Lord insists upon it, that somebody had touched him. He then looks round him, but points out no person: is only silent, till the woman comes, and trembling reveals the whole matter. And what a lustre has this delay of Jesus in the way to Jairus's house thrown upon his character! What a discovery has it made of his knowledge and power! When he hears it reported to the father, that the damsel was dead, he bids him “not fear, but believe.” When he comes to the house, he directs all things with the highest propriety, by clearing the house of strangers, that it might be quiet; taking in with him, “into the room where the young woman lay,” the properest persons that could be chosen out of his disciples, and out of the whole multitude that was there.

In the history of raising the young man at Nain it is said: “And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not. And he came and touched the bier, (and they that bare him stood still,) and he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.”

On ordinary occasions Jesus could not work a miracle without being first sought to, lest thereby a suspicion should

have arisen, that he had chosen objects within his power. But here the meeting of the corpse being perfectly casual, he had an opportunity of showing both his power and his goodness, without being sought to. And he wisely and graciously lays hold of it, as soon as it offers. How glorious is Jesus here! Travelling with his disciples he meets a dead man, carried forth to burial. And he on the sudden, without any previous notice of the case, without any prior preparation, raises the dead man to life.

“And he delivered him to his mother.” The highest propriety! He was moved by compassion to perform this work, and he delivers the raised person to her, to whom his life was the greatest comfort. Not to say further, that she would best know, whether it was her son or another, that was restored to her: and that instead of making a show, and calling upon the multitude to admire the action: he barely delivers the young man to his mother, as if he had only performed an ordinary piece of kindness.

In the history of raising Lazarus, there are these things very observable, Jesus had declared to his disciples a design of going to Bethany. Before he sets out from the place where he then was, he says to them: “Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep.” Here we have again a like example of humble modesty, with that I observed before in the account of Jairus’s daughter. These low soft terms does he use concerning death, and raising to life: the one he terms sleep, the other awaking him out of it; as appears from what follows. “Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep he shall do well. Howbeit Jesus spake of his death: but they thought he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep.” Jesus was obliged to let them understand what he meant. “Then said he unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead. And I am glad for your sakes, that I was not there, (to the intent you may believe,) nevertheless let us go.” When Jesus spoke in the low and ambiguous term of sleep, he added: “But I go that I may awake him out of sleep.” But having now said plainly, that Lazarus was dead, he does not say: But I go to raise him to life: only intimates in general, that there would be some new proof given them to confirm their faith; studiously avoiding every thing that had any appearance of boasting. The modesty here is rather greater than in the former case. There Jesus had to do with a mixed multitude of strangers. Here he is talking with his own disciples. Yet he forbears to say beforehand in plain terms, that he should raise Lazarus to life.

Herein also is adorable, the wisdom, the goodness, the condescension of Jesus; that he who could have healed sick Lazarus, or raised him when dead, without opening his lips, or rising from his seat, went from the place of his retirement beyond Jordan into Judea, where they had lately sought his life: because his raising up Lazarus at Bethany, the place where he had died, and was well known, in all those circumstances, and before so many persons as he afterwards did, in person, would be a means of convincing men of the truth of his mission, and of drawing men of that and future ages to the belief of his doctrine, which is so suited to prepare them for eternal life.

There is likewise somewhat very remarkable in the manner of performing this miracle. The great works which our Lord did are in themselves a proof, that he was espoused by God. He accordingly made frequent and public appeals to his works, as certain proofs and evidences, that God was with him. But he did not ordinarily, at the time of doing these works, formally and expressly address himself to God. But now being about to perform in the sight of mortal men so extraordinary and affecting a thing, as the raising up from the grave a man that had been buried four days, he lifts up his eyes to heaven, and adores the Father in an act of praise and thanksgiving; acknowledging the power of doing the works he had already done, and of that he was then going to perform, to have been given him by the Father. "Then took they away the stone from the place, where the dead was laid. And Jesus lift up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." That is, the works I do, declare that thou art with me; but that the people may have the fuller assurance that thou concurrest with me, and that the words I speak are not mine but thine; before I do this great and awful work in their sight, I publicly praise and thank thee. In this way (of an immediate appeal to God) the fullest proof possible was given, that his authority was from the Father, and all objections were answered. See John xiv. 8—11. xvi. 28—30.

Other things might be observed here, but I shall take notice of but one particular more. "And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." Sure the majesty of the voice well became the work. Herein is some resemblance of that loud command, at the sound of which shall be broken all the bars of hell and the

grave, and their doors fly open, and the dead of all orders and of all times shall awake and come forth; some to honour, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. There is a peculiar propriety and decency in this loud and majestic voice, as it had been immediately preceded by an humble and thankful acknowledgment of the Father, who is over all.

A LETTER

WRITTEN IN THE YEAR 1730,

CONCERNING THE QUESTION, WHETHER THE LOGOS SUPPLIED
THE PLACE OF A HUMAN SOUL IN THE PERSON
OF JESUS CHRIST.

TO WHICH ARE NOW ADDED,

TWO POSTSCRIPTS:

THE FIRST CONTAINING AN EXPLICATION OF THOSE WORDS, THE
SPIRIT, THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE SPIRIT OF GOD, AS USED IN
THE SCRIPTURES; THE SECOND, CONTAINING REMARKS
UPON THE THIRD PART OF THE LATE BISHOP OF
CLOGHER'S VINDICATION OF THE HISTORIES
OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

*Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal
life, and they are they which testify of me. John v. 39.*

*Ergo nec Parentum, nec Majorum Error sequendus est :
sed Auctoritas Scripturarum, et Dei docentis Imperium.
Hieron. in Jer. cap. ix. ver. 12—14.*

THE PREFACE.

THOUGH the names in this letter are fictitious, (as they always were, and the same that appear now,) it is a part of a real correspondence. Papinian, who was a man of a mature age, of great eminence, and a diligent reader of the sacred scriptures, has long since accomplished his course in this world. Philaethes is still living. The letter sent to Papinian was never returned, but Philaethes kept a copy of it. Though written almost thirty years ago, it has hitherto lain concealed in the writer's cabinet. Nor has it, till very lately, been shown to more than two persons, one of whom is deceased. Whether this will be reckoned full proof, that the writer is not forward to engage in religious disputes, I cannot say. This however is certain : he would

have great reason to think himself happy, if, with the assistance of others, without noise and disturbance, in the way of free, calm, and peaceable debate, he could clear up a controverted point of religion, to general satisfaction.

If any should ask, why is this letter published now? I would answer in the words of Solomon: "There is a time to keep silence, and a time to speak." But whether the present season has been fitly chosen, the event under the conduct of Divine Providence will best show.

The reader is desired to take notice, that whatever he sees at the bottom of the pages, is additional. There are also some additions in the letter itself, especially near the end, where more texts are explained than were in the original letter.

For better understanding the argument, it may be needful to observe, for the sake of some, that by divers ancient writers we are assured, it was the opinion of Arius and his followers, 'That^a our Saviour took flesh of Mary, but not a 'soul:' 'that^b Christ had flesh only, as a covering for his 'Deity: and that the Word in him was the same as the 'soul in us: and that the Word, or the Deity in Christ, 'was liable to sufferings in the body.'

Mr. Whiston, in his Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Clarke, giving an account of the act in the divinity schools at Cambridge, in the year 1709, when Mr. Clarke, then rector of St. James's, received the doctor's degree, says, at p. 20, 21, 'In the course of this act, where I was present, 'Professor James — digressed from one of the doctor's 'questions, and pressed him hard to condemn one of the 'opinions, which I had just then published in my Sermons 'and Essays. Which book he held in his hand, when he 'was in the chair. I suppose, it might be this: that our 'Saviour had no human soul, but that the Divine Logos or 'Word supplied its place. However, Dr. Clarke, who, I 'believe, had not particularly examined that point, did 'prudently avoid either the approbation or condemnation

^a — σαρκα μονον τον Σωτηρα απο Μαριας ειληφεναι, διαβεβαιωμενοι, και οχι ψυχην. Epiph. de Arianis in Indic. T. I. p. 606.

Αλλα και αρνηνται ψυχην αυτον ανθρωπινην ειληφεναι. Id. H. 69, n. 19, p. 743. A. Conf. n. 48—51.

^b Αρειος δε σαρκα μονην προς αποκρυφην της θεοτητος ομολογει· αντι δε τω εσωθεν εν ημιν ανθρωπω, τωτ' εστι της ψυχης, τον λογον εν τη σαρκι λεγει γεγονεναι, κ. λ. Athan. Contr. Apollin. l. 2, n. 3. p. 942. C.

In eo autem quod Christum sine animâ solam carnem suscepisse arbitrantur, minus noti sunt—sed hoc verum esse, et Epiphanius non tacuit, et ego ex eorum quibusdam scriptis et collocutionibus certissime inveni. August. de Hær. c. 49.

‘ of it. Yet have I reason to believe, he long afterwards
‘ came into it, upon a further examination : though, I think,
‘ he ever avoided, according to his usual caution, to de-
‘ clare publicly that his approbation, even upon the most
‘ pressing applications ; which is one great instance of that
‘ impenetrable secrecy, which Dr. Sykes justly notes to
‘ have been in him, upon many occasions.’

So Mr. Whiston. Who clearly declares his own opinion.
Who likewise supposeth, that the same was for some while
received by Dr. Clarke. But he seems not to have had any
certain evidence of it. For, as he acknowledges, ‘ Dr.
‘ Clarke never publicly declared his approbation of it.’

Nevertheless it may not be disagreeable to see here what
Dr. Clarke himself says in his *Scripture Doctrine of the
Trinity*, part I. ch. iii. numb. 998. p. 197. ‘ Matt. iv. 1.
‘ “ Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness.”
‘ From this, and many other of the following texts, it seems,
‘ that the Logos, the Divine Nature of Christ, did so far
‘ *κενωσαι εαυτον*, diminish itself, as St. Paul expresses it,
‘ Philip. ii. 7, that, during the time of his incarnation, he was
‘ all along under the conduct of the Holy Spirit.’

And Part II. sect. xxviii. p. 301. ‘ The Holy Spirit is
‘ described in the New Testament, as the immediate author
‘ and worker of all miracles, even of those done by our
‘ Lord himself: and as the conductor of Christ in all the
‘ actions of his life, during his state of humiliation here on
‘ earth.’

Before I finish this preface, I must make some citations
from Dr. Robert Clayton, late Lord Bishop of Clogher ;
who in the third part of his *Vindication of the Histories of
the Old and New Testament*, has expressed himself after
this manner. Letter v. p. 80, 81, or p. 443. ‘ “ He who
‘ had glory with the Father, before the world was, emptied
‘ himself,” or divested himself of that glory, in order to re-
‘ deem mankind, and descended from heaven, and “ took
‘ upon him the form of a servant, and was made man.”
‘ That is, he, who was a glorified pre-existent spirit in the
‘ presence of God, submitted to descend from heaven, and
‘ to have himself conveyed by the wonderful power of
‘ Almighty God, into the womb of a virgin. Where being
‘ clothed with flesh, and ripening by degrees to manhood,
‘ he was at length brought forth into the world, in the same
‘ apparent state and condition with other human infants.’

Again Letter vii. p. 132, 133. or 482, 483. ‘ And ac-
‘ cordingly this exalted spirit was by the wonderful power
‘ of God, as before related, conveyed into the womb of the

‘ virgin Mary, and was made man ; that is, was made as
‘ much so, as his mother could make him, without being
‘ impregnated by man. And now being deprived of the
‘ immediate presence of God the Father, and being shut up
‘ in darkness, and the shadow of death, he was after nine
‘ months brought forth into life, in the form of a feeble in-
‘ fant, with all the weakness, and frailties, and infirmities of
‘ human nature about him. And as he grew up into life,
‘ and his reason improved, this only served to make the
‘ terrible change and alteration of his condition, so much the
‘ more perceptible, and the recollection of it so much the
‘ more grievous and insufferable. The dreadfulness of
‘ which state is hardly conceivable to us, because that we
‘ never were sensible of any thing better than our present
‘ existence. But for any being, which had ever enjoyed
‘ the happiness of heaven, and had been in possession of
‘ “glory with the Father,” to be deprived thereof, and to
‘ be sent to dwell here in this world, encompassed within
‘ the narrow limits of this earthly tabernacle, and the heavy
‘ organs, made of flesh and blood, it must, literally speak-
‘ ing, be to such a being, a hell upon earth.’ So says that
celebrated writer.

To the letter are now added two postscripts. Concerning
which nothing needs to be said here. They who look into
them will see what they are.

One thing the author would say. He hopes the whole is
written in the way of reason and argument, with meekness
and candour, without acrimony and abuse : though not
without a just concern for such things as appear to him to
be of importance.

February 12, 1759.

A LETTER

WRITTEN IN THE YEAR 1730,

CONCERNING THE QUESTION, WHETHER THE LOGOS SUPPLIED
THE PLACE OF A HUMAN SOUL IN THE PERSON
OF JESUS CHRIST.

TO PAPINIAN.

You have, it seems, heard of the correspondence between Eugenius and Phileleutherus, and particularly of an incidental question, concerning the Arian hypothesis. You have been informed, likewise, that I am well acquainted with this correspondence. And, as it has excited your curiosity, you demand of me an account of it, and also my own opinion upon the point in debate.

If it were proper for me to deny you any thing, I should entirely excuse myself, and be perfectly silent: being apprehensive that touching upon a subject of so much niceness and difficulty may occasion some trouble to yourself, as well as to me. But you are determined not to accept of any excuses.

I must then, without further preamble, declare to you that I cannot but take the same side of the question with Phileleutherus: though once, for some while, I was much inclined to the other.

However, whilst I was favourable to the supposition, that the Logos was the soul of our Saviour, I was embarrassed with a very considerable difficulty. For the scriptures do plainly represent our blessed Saviour, exalted to power and glory, as a reward of his sufferings here on earth: but I was at a loss to conceive how that high Being, the first and only immediately derived being by whom God made the world,^a should gain any exaltation by receiving after his

^a Dr. Clarke, Scripture Doctrine, &c. P. I. numb. 535. p. 86. ‘The third interpretation is, that the Word is a person deriving from the Father (with whom he existed before the world was) both his being itself, and incomprehensible power and knowledge, and other divine attributes and authority, in a manner not revealed, and which human wisdom ought not to presume to explain.’

Ib. Part. II. p. 242, sect. ii. ‘With this first and supreme cause and Father

resurrection and ascension, a bright resplendent human body, and being made the King and Lord of all good men in this world, and the Judge of mankind, and, if you please to add likewise being made higher than the angels, to whom, according to the same hypothesis, he was vastly superior before.

But to speak my mind freely, I now entirely dislike that scheme, and think it all amazing throughout, and irreconcilable to reason.

However, that we may not take up any prejudices from apprehensions which our own reason might afford, I shall suspend all inquiries of that sort, and will immediately enter upon the consideration of what the scriptures say of the person of our Saviour.

He is called a man in many places of the gospels. And every body took him for a man during his abode on this earth, when he conversed with all sorts of people in the most free and open manner. He frequently styles himself "the Son of man." He is also said to be "the Son of David," and "the Son of Abraham." He is called a man even after his ascension. Acts xvii. 31, "He has appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he has ordained." 1 Tim. ii. 5, "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." And St. Peter to the Jews at Jerusalem, Acts ii. 22, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; 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 ye yourselves also know."

Now if Jesus Christ be a man, he consists of a human soul and body: for what else is a man?

This title and appellation of MAN being so often and so plainly given to our Saviour, must needs lead us to think that he was properly man, unless there are some expressions of another kind that are decisive to the contrary. But we

‘ of all things, there has existed, from the beginning, a second divine Person, which is his Word or Son.’

Page 297, sect. xxvi. ‘ By the operation of the Son, the Father both made and governs the world.’

Page 298, sect. xxvii. ‘ Concerning the Son, there are other things spoken in scripture; and the highest titles are ascribed to him, even such as include all divine powers, excepting absolute independency and supremacy.’

A part of Mr. Peirce's paraphrase upon Col. i. 15, 16, is in these words: ‘ — and since he was the first being that was derived from the Father. And that he must be the first derived from him, is hence evident, that all other beings were derived from God, the primary and supreme cause of all, through his Son, by whom, as their immediate author, all things were created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, &c.

find that he is not only called a man, but is also said to be a man as we are, or like to us. Heb. ii. 17, "Therefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren." Ch. iv. 15, "We have not an high priest, which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." And see the second chapter of that epistle throughout.

Beside these plain expressions, describing our Lord to be a man, and like to us; this point may be argued from a great number and variety of particulars related in the New Testament: for two evangelists have recorded our Lord's nativity. St. Paul says, "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law," Gal. iv. 4. If it were expedient that our Saviour should be born into the world, as we are, and live in infancy, and grow up to manhood, as we do, and be liable to all the bodily wants, weaknesses, and disasters to which we are exposed, must it not have been as needful, or more needful, and as conformable to the Divine Wisdom, that he should be also like unto us in the other part of which we are composed, a human soul, or spirit?^b

Moreover, this supposition does best, if not only, account for our blessed Saviour's temptation, and every part of it. For how was it possible that he should be under any temptation to try the love of God to him, by turning stones into bread! or by casting himself down from a pinnacle of the temple! How could all the glories of this world, and the kingdoms of it, be any temptation to him, who had made all things under the Supreme Being? Had he forgot the

^b ' And when we say, that person was conceived and born, we declare, ' he was made really and truly man, of the same human nature, which is in ' all other men.—For "the Mediator between God and men is the man Christ ' Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5. "That since by man came death, by man also ' [should] come the resurrection of the dead," 1 Cor. xv. 21. As sure, then, ' as the first Adam, and we who are redeemed, are men; so certainly is the ' second Adam, and our Mediator, man. He is therefore frequently called ' "the Son of man," and in that nature he was always promised; first to ' Eve, as her seed, and consequently her son; then to Abraham. And that ' seed is Christ. Gal. iii. 16, and so the son of Abraham, next to David;— ' and consequently of the same nature with David and Abraham. And as ' he was their son, so are we his brethren, as descendants from the same father ' Adam. "And therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren: ' for he laid not hold on the angels, but on the seed of Abraham," Heb. ii. ' 16, 17; and so became not an angel, but a man.

' As then man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul, so doth ' Christ.—And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the ' frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without ' which he could not be man. For "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature;" ' one in respect of his body, the other of his soul, Luke ii. 52.' Pearson upon the Creed, Art. iii. p. 159, 160, the fourth edition, 1676.

glory and power which he once had? If that could be supposed, and that this want of memory of past things still remained, it might be as well supposed, that he had no remembrance of the orders which he had received from God, and of the commission with which God the Father had sent him into the world.

The supposition of Christ being a man, does also best account for his agony in the garden,^c and the dark, yet glorious scene of his sufferings on the cross, and the concluding prayer there: “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

And the making the Logos to be the soul of Christ does really annihilate his example, and enervate all the force which it should have upon us.

But it may be said, that there are some texts, which lead us to think, that Jesus Christ had a human body, but not a human soul: particularly John i. 14. and Hebr. x. 5.

John i. 14, “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.” But it should be observed, that “flesh” in the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, is oftentimes equivalent to “man,” Ps. lvi. 5, “I will not fear what flesh can do unto me.” Ver. 11, “I will not fear what man can do unto me.” And in innumerable other places. And in the New Testament, Matt. xiii. 20. Luke iii. 6. John xvii. 2. Acts ii. 17. 1 Pet. i. 24.

^c Luke xxii. 44. “And being in an agony”—*Και γενομενος εν αγωνια.*] I would put the question, whether it might not be thus translated? “And being under great concern.” I will transcribe here a passage of an ancient writer, representing the anxiety or solicitude of Julius Cæsar and others, when Octavius Cæsar, then a young man, had a dangerous sickness. *Χαλεπως δε διακειμενος, παντες μεν εν φοβη ησαν, αγωνιωντες, ει τι πεισεται τοιαυτη φυσικη, μαλιστα δε παντων ο Καισαρ. Διο πασαν ημεραν η αυτος παρων αυτη ευθυμιαν παρειχεν, η φιλως πεμπων, ιατρους τε αποσταειν ουκ εων. Και ποτε δειπνωντι ηγγειλε τις, ως εκλυτος ειη, και χαλεπως εχοι. Ο δε εκπηδησας ανυποδητος ηκεν ενθα ενουσηλευετο, και των ιατρων εδειτο εμπαθεσατα μεσος ων αγωνιας, και αυτος παρεκαθητο, κ. λ. Nic. Damascen. De Institutione Cæsaris Augusti Ap. Vales. Excerpta. p. 841.*

I have observed, that some learned men seem studiously to have avoided the word AGONY in their translations. In the Latin vulgate is: et factus in agoniâ. But Beza translates: et constitutus in angore. Le Clerc's French version is: et comme il étoit dans une extrême inquiétude—And Lenfant's: et comme il étoit dans un grand combat—Which last I do not think to be right. For the original word is not *αγων*, but *αγωνια*. The Syriac version, as translated into Latin by Tremellius, Trostius, and others, is: cum esset in timore, instanter orabat. I shall add a short passage from V. H. Glogeri *Physiologia Historiæ Passionis J. C. Cap. II. p. 4.* Ideoque non immerito dici potest *αγωνια* (quam in defectu commodioris vocabuli angorem Latine vocemus) promptitudo rem quamquam aggrediundi, sed cum timore et trepidatione.

What St. John says therefore is this: “And the Word was made flesh,” or took upon him the human nature.^d

St. John says, 1 Ep. iv. 2, 3. “Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God.” See likewise 2 Ep. ver. 7.

It is well known, that in the early days of christianity, particularly in Asia, where St. John resided, there arose people, generally called Docetes, who denied the real humanity of Christ, and said, he was man in appearance only.

These St. John opposeth in his epistles, if not in his gospel also. Against them he here asserts, that Jesus had the innocent infirmities of the human nature, and that he really suffered and died. But when he says, that “Jesus Christ came in the flesh,” he does not deny, that he had a human soul, or was man completely. Indeed, it is here implied, that he was man as we are.^e

Heb. x. 5. “Wherefore, when he cometh into the world he saith: Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.”

But it is reasonable to think, that^f a part is here put for

^d ‘He took upon him our human nature, became himself a man, subject to the like frailties with us, and lived and conversed freely amongst men.’ Dr. Clarke’s Paraphrase of St. John i. 14. the fourth edition, 1722.

^e Ecce in quibus verbis suis omnino manifestant negare se, quod ad unitatem personæ Christi etiam humana anima pertineat; sed in Christo carnem et divinitatem tantummodo confiteri. Quandoquidem cum penderet in ligno, illud, ubi ait, ‘Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum,’ divinitatem ipsam volunt eum intelligi commendasse Patri, non humanum spiritum, quod est anima—Et his atque hujusmodi sanctarum scripturarum testimoniis non resistant, fateanturque Christum, non tantum carnem, sed animam quoque humanam Verbo unigenito coaptasse—Aut si eo moventur quod scriptum est, ‘Verbum caro factum est,’ nec illic anima nominata est: intelligant, carnem pro homine positam, a parte totum significante locutionis modo, sicuti est, ‘Ad te omnis caro veniet.’ Item, ‘Ex operibus legis non justificabitur omnis caro.’ Quod apertius alio loco dixit: ‘Ex lege nemo justificabitur.’ Itemque alio: ‘Non justificatur homo ex operibus.’ Sic itaque dictum est, ‘verbum caro factum est;’ ac si diceretur, Verbum homo factum est. Veruntamen isti, cum ejus solam humanam carnem velint intelligi hominem Christum, non enim negabunt hominem, de quo apertissime dicitur, unus mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus—&c. Aug. Contr. sermon. Arian. cap. ix. tom. VIII.

^f ‘A body here is a synecdochical expression of the human nature of Christ. So is flesh taken, when he is said to be made flesh. For the general end of his having this body was, that he might therein and thereby yield obedience, or do the will of God. And the especial end of it was, that he might have what to offer in sacrifice to God. But neither of these can be confined unto his body alone. For it is the soul, the other essential part of the human nature, that is the principle of obedience,’ Dr. J. Owen upon Heb. x. 5. p. 29.

the whole, and that the word, "body," is not to be understood exclusively of the soul. St. Paul writes to the Romans: "I beseech you therefore, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice to God," ch. xii. 1. But no one ought hence to conclude, that the Romans had not souls as well as bodies, or that their souls might be neglected. No. The faculties of the mind, as well as the members of the body, were to be consecrated to God, and employed in his service. At the beginning of the next chapter, St. Paul says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Where the other part of the human nature is put for the whole.

And it is manifest from ch. ii. 17, 18, and other places, that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews believed Christ to be man, or to have the human nature complete like unto us. It would therefore be very unreasonable to understand body in this place exclusively of the soul.

The words of the apostle are a quotation from Ps. xl. prophetically representing the readiness of Christ to do the will of God in this world.

"Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith." Which words are capable of two interpretations. They may relate to our Lord's nativity, when he literally entered into the world. Or they may relate to the entrance upon his ministry. Then it was, that "the Father sanctified him and sent him into the world," John x. 36, and xvii. 18. And then it was that he devoted himself to God entirely. Nor can it be well doubted, that the prayer, which Jesus made, when he was baptized, and received the Spirit, which is mentioned Luke iii. 31, contained a declaration, equivalent to that in this place: "Lo I come to do thy will, O God." Compare John v. 30, and vi. 38.

I will now consider some texts, which have been thought by some to represent to us the pre-existence of the soul of our Saviour, before his conception in the womb of the virgin Mary.

"The form of God," Philip. ii. 6, seems to me to have been enjoyed by our Lord in this world. It^h denotes his knowledge of the hearts of men, his power of healing diseases, and raising the dead, and working other miracles, at all times, whenever he pleased, and all the other evidences

^g See Beausobre upon Heb. x. 5.

^h *Μορφη*, 'forma,' in nostris libris non significat æternum et occultum aliquid, sed id quod in oculos incurrit, qualis erat eximia in Christo potestas sanandi morbos omnes, ejiciendi dæmonas, excitandi mortuos, mutandi rerum naturas; quæ vere divina sunt, ita ut Moses, qui tam magna non fecit, dictus ob id fuerit Deus Pharaonis. Grot. in Philip. ii. 6.

of his divine mission. This sense does wonderfully accord with what our Lord says, John x. 34—36, and in many other places of that gospel. “Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, to whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?” But though he had so great power, “he made himself of no reputation:” he lived in a mean condition, and submitted to the reproaches of enemies, and at last to death itself. Which was plainly a voluntary submission. For being innocent, he needed not to have died, but might have been translated without tasting death.

If this be the meaning of that text, then 2 Cor. viii. 9, is also explained: thatⁱ “though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor.”

John i. 15, “John bare witness of him—He that cometh after me is preferred before me. For he was before me.” And ver. 30, “This is he, of whom I said: After me cometh a man, which is preferred before me. For he was before me.” But I apprehend, that John the Baptist does not here say, that Jesus was before him in time. But he says: ‘He who comes after me, has always been before me, or in my view. For he is my chief, or prince, or principal.’ This suits what he says of the great dignity and transcendent excellence of our Lord’s person and character, at ver. 27. “Whose shoes’ latchet I am not worthy to unloose:” and ver. 23, “I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord:” that is, I am the harbinger, or forerunner of the great Person, who is about to appear among you. I am come before him, to prepare for his reception.

John viii. 58, may be thought a strong text for the pre-existence of our Saviour’s soul. But really he there only represents his dignity as the Messiah, the special favour of God toward him, and the importance of the dispensation by him. It is a way of speaking, resembling that in Rev. xiii. 8, “Whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world,” and explained, 1 Pet. i. 20, “Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world.”^k See also Eph. i. 4. 2 Tim. i.

ⁱ Id est, cum vi polleret omnis generis miracula patrandi, etiam mortuos resuscitandi, personam tamen gessit tam humilem, ut ne domum quidem haberet propriam. Grot. in loc.

^k Fuerat ante Abrahamum Jesus divinâ constitutione: infra xvii. 5. Apoc. xiii. 8. 1 Pet. i. 20. Constat hoc, quia de ipso ipsiusque Ecclesiâ mystice

9. Tit. i. 2. The Jewish people have a saying, that^l the law was before the world was created. In like manner the dispensation by the Messiah was before the dispensation of Abraham, in dignity, nature, and design, though not in time.

The Jews were much offended at the words, recorded in the 56th verse. Nevertheless our Lord does not there say, that he had seen Abraham, or that Abraham had seen him in person. What he says is this: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day. And he saw it, and was glad;" that is, he earnestly desired to see the time, when all the nations of the earth should be blessed, through his promised seed, the Messiah. And "by faith he saw it, and was glad." Compare Heb. xi. 13.^m

Another text proper to be considered here is John xvii. 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." But this, according to the Jewish phraseology, may be very well understood of the glory, always designed for the Christ by the immutable purpose of God. See Grotius upon the place. That our Lord had not, before his nativity, the glory which he here prays for, is apparent from the whole tenor of the gospel, and from clear and manifest expressions in the context. For the glory, which he now prays for, is the reward of his obedience. Ver. 4, "I have finished the work, which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me." And St. Paul says, Philip. ii. 9, "Wherefore God also has highly exalted him," Heb. ii. 9, "for the suffering of death he was crowned with glory and honour," ver. 10, "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." And Heb. xii. 2, "Looking unto Jesus, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame. And is set down on the right hand of the

dictum erat, recente humano genere, futurum, ut semen muliebre contereret caput serpentis. Grot. in Joh. viii. 58. Vid. et Bez. in loc.

^l Sic 'legem fuisse ante mundum,' aiunt Hebræi. Vide Thalmudem de Votis. Grot. ad Joh. xvii. 5.

^m Cæterum, ex Hebræorum idiotismo, dies alicujus nihil aliud declarat, quam spatium quo vixerit aliquis, aut insigne quidpiam, quod ipsi vel facere vel ferre contigit. Quæ res notior est, quam ut testimonio egeat. Dies ergo Domini nihil aliud significat, quam ipsius adventum in carnem. Vidit enim eum cernens Abraham, fidei nimirum oculis, ut declaratur, Hebr. xi. 13.—ac gavisus est,—Respicit autem expresse Christus ad id quod dicitur, Gen. xvii. 17. Abrahamum, acceptâ de nascituro sibi illo semine promissione, sese prostravisse, et risisse. Unde et ipsi Isaaco nomen imposuit Dominus. Bez. ad Joh. viii. 56.

throne of God." And Luke xxiv. 26. Our Saviour says to the disciples, in the way to Emmaus: "Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" And St. Peter, 1 Ep. i. 10, 11, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired—Searching what, or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." And St. Paul, Acts xxvi. 22, 23, "saying no other things than those, which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that the Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead." All harmonious, as we see, that the glory of the Messiah was subsequent to his obedience and sufferings on this earth. See likewise Rom. i. 3, 4.

Nor can I forbear to observe to you, that Augustin, who has largely considered the words of John xvii. 5, and in so doing quotes Eph. i. 4, and Rom. i. 1—4, understands them of Christ's human nature, and explains them in the same manner that I have done. Quasi vero quisquam regulam fidei intuens, Filium Dei negaturus est prædestinatum, qui eum negare hominem non potest. Recte quippe dicitur non prædestinatus secundum id quod est Verbum Dei, Deus apud Deum—Illud autem prædestinandum erat, quod nondum erat, ut suo tempore fieret, quemadmodum ante omnia tempora prædestinatum erat, ut fieret. Quisquis igitur Dei Filium prædestinatum negat, hunc eundem filium hominis negat—secundum hanc ergo prædestinationem etiam clarificatus est antequam mundus esset, ut esset claritas ejus ex resurrectione mortuorum apud Patrem, ad cujus dexteram sedet. Cum ergo videret illius prædestinatæ suæ clarificationis venisse jam tempus, ut et nunc fieret in redditione, quod fuerat in prædestinatione jam factum, oravit, dicens: 'Et nunc clarifica me tu Pater apud te ipsum, claritate, quam habui priusquam mundus esset, apud te:' tanquam diceret, Claritatem quam habui apud te, id est, illam claritatem, quam habui apud te in prædestinatione tua, tempus est, ut apud te habeam etiam vivens in dexterâ tuâ. August. In Joan. Evang. cap. 17. Tr. cv. n. 8. ed. Bened. Tom. III. p. 2.

It has been thought by some,ⁿ that Christ, or the Son, appeared to the patriarchs, and was oftentimes sent upon messages to men by the Supreme Being, before the times of the gospel. But where is the proof of this? It was the

ⁿ That opinion is modestly rejected by Mr. Peirce, in his Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Chap. 1. ver. 2.

opinion of some of the ancient writers of the church, who had a philosophy, that was a mixture of Pythagorism and Platonism. Nevertheless, this supposition, that God had employed the Son in former times, before the gospel, is overthrown by the very first words of the apostle in the epistle to the Hebrews, "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." It is also inconsistent with the apostle's arguments to care and circumspection, steadfastness and perseverance, which follow afterwards. Heb. ii. 1, 2, 3, "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, 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?" See likewise ch. iii. 1, "For this man was counted worthy of more honour than Moses," ver. 6. But Christ, as a Son, "over his own house."

Still it may be said, that nothing but the pre-existence of the soul of Christ can suit those expressions of his being "sent from God," and "coming from God."

To which I answer, that the account here given by me is well suited to all such expressions in their utmost latitude, according to the style of scripture. For we may be all said to be sent by God into the world, without the supposition of a pre-existent soul. Especially are prophets sent from God. But above all Jesus is most properly "the sent of God," as he had the highest and most important commission.

So John i. 6, "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." Nevertheless none suppose, that John the Baptist came directly from heaven: but only, that he was inspired, and had a divine command to appear in the world, and bear witness concerning the Christ, who would come presently after him.

And the commission which our Lord gave to his apostles, is expressed by himself after this manner. John xvii. 18, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world." And xx. 21, "As my Father has sent me, so send I you."

But, as before said, Jesus is "the sent of God," as he had the highest commission. John iii. 34, "He whom God has sent, speaketh the words of God." Chap. iv. 34, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." Chap. v. 38, "Ye have not his word abiding in you. For whom he has

sent, ye believe not." See also ver. 23, 24, 30, 34, 36. And x. 36, "Say ye of him, whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" And in the history of the cure of the blind man, recorded in the ninth chapter of the same gospel, at ver. 7, "And said unto him: Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, which is by interpretation, Sent." Probably here is an allusion to our Lord's character, as "the sent of God." And there may be an intimation intended, that he is the Shiloh, spoken of in Gen. xlix. 10.

There are some other texts needful to be taken notice of here, John xiii. 3, "Jesus knowing that he was come from God, and went to God," *οτι απο Θεου εξηλθε*. xvi. 27, "For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God," *οτι εγω παρι του Θεου εξηλθον*. ver. 28, "I am come forth from the Father, and am come into the world. Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." *'Εξηλθον παρι του πατρος*. This expression is explained in chap. viii. 42. Whence we perceive, that^o thereby is intended our Lord's divine commission. "Jesus said unto them: If God were your Father, ye would love me. For I proceeded forth, and came from God. Neither came I of myself, but he sent me." *'Εγω γαρ εκ του Θεου εξηλθον, και ηκω, κ. λ.*

The reproaches and contradictions which our Lord met with, and the sufferings of his death, are often set before us. But if the Logos, that high and exalted spirit, in the Arian sense, was the soul of Christ: this part of his humiliation, in clothing himself with an human body, would have been frequently represented and described in the clearest and most emphatical expressions.

Here, if I mistake not, is a proper place for setting down those observations upon this scheme, which reason may suggest, and were passed over before.

In the first place, I do not apprehend it possib'e that so glorious and perfect a spirit should undergo such diminution by being united to a human body, as to become thereby unconscious, or to be greatly enfeebled. I think, that if this spirit were to animate, and take upon it the part of a soul in a human body; its power, cogitation, and knowledge would subsist and remain, even in its infant state. In short, the human body would be swallowed up by this great soul. That soul would exert itself in the body, and sustain it with all facility, without rest, food, or any other

^o Voyez cette façon de parler expliquée ci dessus, ch. viii. 42, par la mission. L'enfant upon John xvi. 27.

refreshment, against all pain and uneasiness, and every kind of infirmity. This, I say, would be the case, supposing so great a being to take upon it a human body. If an angel (as is supposed) can move with agility a material vehicle, made dense enough to be sensible to human eyes; what influence would not this powerful Logos have over the grossest human body? But this is not agreeable to fact, as represented in the New Testament: for there Jesus is said to have "increased in wisdom" as he grew up. And he had hunger and thirst, and was wearied with journeying, and had all the sinless infirmities of the human nature, and was subject to death.

But secondly, supposing this humiliation to be possible, I think, it could not be reasonable. It is not reasonable that so great a Being should submit to unconsciousness, or any such like debilitation. Consequently, it cannot be required by God. It is incongruous to all just notions of things, that any other spirit, beside a human soul, should be made subject to the infirmities of human flesh.

I forbear mentioning some things, which appear to me consequences from the Logos (in the Arian sense of that term) being the soul of our blessed Saviour. And, as they are not mentioned, they need not affect you, unless they should occur to your thoughts.

I now proceed to the introduction to St. John's gospel. For I believe, you may be of opinion, that I must not pass it by entirely, notwithstanding its difficulty. I will therefore explain it briefly, or a part of it at least, according to the best of my ability; still willing, however, to receive further light from any one that shall afford it.

"In the beginning was the Word." By "beginning," I think, cannot be intended the beginning of the gospel, but of the creation, or rather always, from eternity, "was the Word. And the Word was with God:" that is, was always with God, though not fully manifested, till these last days of the world.^p "And the Word was God." *Kai Θεος ην ο Λογος.* Which sometimes has been rendered thus: "And God was the Word." But there are learned men, who say, that then the Greek would have been, *Kai ο Θεος ην Λογος*: and, that the article being joined with *Λογος*, therefore that is the antecedent, and our translation is right.

Here I had been wont to submit to what Dr. Clarke says,

^p 1 John i. 2, "For the life was manifested. And we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." 1 Tim. iii. 16, "And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh."

The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, P. I. numb. 535. ‘Of these words there are only three interpretations. The ‘first is, that the Word was that same person, whom he was ‘with. And that is both a contradiction in terms, and also ‘the ancient heresy of Sabellius.’ But now that does not move me. I am of opinion, that God here is the same God that was mentioned before. St. John useth a gradation. First he says, “the Word was” always, before all time. Then he adds: “and was with God:” and lastly, that he “was God” himself. What follows confirms this interpretation, ver. 3, “All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.” Who should this be, but God the Father, the one living and true God, and Author of life, and all being? Are there more creators than one? Would any Jew, or disciple of Jesus, ascribe^a the creation of the world to any but God, or his reason, or understanding, or discretion, his wisdom, his power, his word, his spirit, which is the same as God himself? Ver. 10, “He was in the world, and the world was made by him.” This needs no comment. Ver. 11, “He came to his own, and his own received him not.” I pray whose people were the Jews, but God’s, his, who styled himself Jehovah? He now came, in Jesus, to his own people. But they received him not.

St. John therefore intends the one true God, not any inferior deity.

Shall I show this more particularly from other places of his gospel? It is observable, that St. John, out of the many discourses of Jesus, (a great part of which he has omitted, as appears from ch. xx. 30, 31. ch. xxi. 25.) has selected those, in which our Lord speaks very expressly of the commission, which he had received from the Father, and of his near and intimate union with him.

In all the gospels our Saviour ascribes his miracles to the Father, particularly in Luke xi. 20, and Matt. xii. 28. And the people do the same. “And when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.” Matt. ix. 8.

But in none of the gospels is this done so frequently, and so expressly, as in St. John’s. Chap. v. 9, “The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do:”

^a The creation of the world is always ascribed to the one living and true God, in the Old and New Testament. Gen. i. Exod. xx. 11. Job xxvi. 13. xxxviii. 4. Ps. xxxiii. 6. cxxxvi. 5—10. cxlvi. 5, 6. Is. xlii. 5. xlv. 12. li. 13. Jer. x. 12. li. 15. and elsewhere. Acts iv. 24. xiv. 15. xvii. 24. Rev. iv. 8—11. x. 6. xiv. 7.

and onward to ver. 27, and ver. 30—32, and ver. 36, 37, chap. viii. 18, “The Father that hath sent me, beareth witness of me.” Ver. 28, 29, “When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know, that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself: but that as the Father has taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me, is with me. The Father hath not left me alone. For I do always the things that please him.” Ver. 42, “For I proceeded forth, and came from God. Neither came I of myself, but he sent me.” Ver. 54, “It is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye say, that he is your God.” Ch. x. 35, “The works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.” Ver. 29, 30, “My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all. And no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand. I and my Father are one.”

This appears also in the discourses of others, recorded in this gospel, chap. iii. 2. Nicodemus says, “Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God. For no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.” And ch. ix. 30, “Herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not whence he is. And yet he hath opened my eyes.” Ver. 33, “If this man were not of God, he could do nothing.”

All these texts seem to me sufficient to satisfy us, that by “the Word,” which St. John says, “was in the beginning, and was with God, and was God,” he does not mean a being separate from God, and inferior to him, but God himself, or the wisdom and power of God, which is the same as God, even the Father, who alone is God, nor is there any other.

If by the Word, in the introduction to his gospel, St. John had intended a being separate from God, and inferior to him; it is reasonable to expect, that he should be mentioned again afterwards. But nothing of that kind appears. He speaks indeed of “the Son, and the only begotten Son of God.” But thereby is not meant “the Word,” but the man Jesus, the Messiah, in whom “the Word,” that is, the power and wisdom of God, resided.

I now therefore proceed, ver. 14. “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us:” that is, as before shown, ‘And the Word was made man, or took upon him the human nature.’ “And we beheld his glory the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” That is, ‘And we beheld in Jesus such power and wisdom, that we could not doubt his being the Messiah.’ That St. John intends the Lord Jesus, is evident from what he adds in the 15th verse. “John bare witness of him, and

cried, saying, This is he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me, is preferred before me.”

“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” This is the same, which, in other words, is said in divers texts of the New Testament. Matt. i. 20—23, “And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying: Behold a virgin shall conceive, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which is, God with us.” And John iii. 34, 35, “For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God. For God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.” Col. 1. 19. “For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell.” And ch. ii, “In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.” And ver. 19, “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily.”

“And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.” As before hinted, it was not “the Word,” which St. John and others beheld, but Jesus in whom the Word dwelled. Him they beheld: and his greatness was conspicuous; so that he appeared, and they knew him to be “the only begotten of the Father,” or the Messiah.

“Only begotten Son.” The phrase is again in John iii. 16 and 18. In our Lord’s conference with Nicodemus, “Only begotten,” and “well beloved Son” are equivalent. This last is the phrase in several texts: as Matt. iii. 17, Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22, Matt. xvii. 5, Mark ix. 7, Luke ix. 35. So Prov. iv. 3, “For I was my father’s son, tender, and only beloved in the sight of my mother.” Comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 1.

“The Christ,” or “the Messiah,” and “the Son of God,” are equivalent in the new Testament. Matt. xvi. 16, Peter’s applauded confession of our Lord’s character is in these words: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” So likewise John vi. 69. But in Mark viii. 29, it is: “Thou art the Christ of God.” And Luke ix. 20, “the Christ of God.”

And that in the language of the Jews the titles of Messiah and Son of God are the same, may be seen in Matt. xxvi. 63, and Luke xxii. 66, 70. But now I shall argue it more particularly from St. John’s gospel, ch. i. 34—49. John the Baptist bears testimony to Jesus under several charac-

ters, all equivalent to that of the Messiah. "And I saw," says he, "and bare record, that this is the Son of God. 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." These disciples are convinced: "one of them, which heard John, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him: We have found the Messias. Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him: We have found him, of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Nathanael likewise, after some hesitation, is convinced, and makes a like profession, saying: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel."

All these pious men, acquainted with the scriptures of the Old Testament, upon the ground of John's testimony, and their own conversation with Jesus, under somewhat different appellations, but of one and the same meaning, acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ. See also John ix. 35, 36, and 1 John v. 1, 5.

The Jews, it is likely, had learned this title and character of the Messiah from Ps. ii. 7, 12. And see 2 Sam. vii. 14.

When Jesus was baptized, he was solemnly and publicly declared to be the Messiah. "There came a voice from heaven, saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." After which having been led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, the tempter, when he came to him, said: "If thou be the Son of God," that is, If indeed thou art the Son of God,^r or the Christ, "command that these stones be made bread."

I would now endeavour to show, upon what accounts Jesus is in the scriptures said to be "the Son of God."

Sonship is a term of nearness, dearness, and affection. In general, Jesus is the Son of God, or eminently so, as he is, so far as we know, the person in all the world most dear to God the Father. To be more particular.

1. Jesus is the Son of God, upon account of his miraculous conception and birth.

Luke i. 31–35, "An angel appeared to Mary, and said unto her: Fear not, Mary. For thou hast found favour

^r Il y a simplement dans le Grec, 'si vous êtes Fils de Dieu,' sans article. On ne laisse pas de l'ajouter. Car le miracle, que le diable exige de J. C. montre, qu'il ne s'agit pas de savoir, 'si Jésus est enfant de Dieu,' mais s'il est 'le Fils de Dieu,' par excellence, c. a. d. le Messie. L'enfant sur Matt. iv. 3.

with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." A like history of our Saviour's nativity is in the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

2. Jesus is the Son of God, upon account of the especial commission given him by the Father, and the extraordinary qualifications bestowed upon him in order to his fulfilling it.

John x. 36, "Say ye of him, whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?"

When our Lord was baptized, "the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and rested upon him," Matt. iii. 16. Mark i. 10. Luke iii. 21, 22. And John i. 32—34, "And John bare record, saying: I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God." And ch. iii. 34, says John the Baptist again: "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." Is. xi. 1—3, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his root. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord. And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord." Comp. Isa. xlii. 1—4. chap. lxi. 1—3, and Matt. xii. 17, and Luke iv. 18, 19.

By virtue of this most plentiful and extraordinary communication of the Spirit, "without measure," or "the indwelling of the Father's fulness in him," as the same thing is at other times expressed, or his being "in the bosom of the Father," and acquainted with all his counsels, Jesus knew the whole will of God concerning the salvation of men, and spoke the words of God with full authority, and wrought miracles of all kinds whenever he pleased, and knew the thoughts and characters of men, and things at a distance, and things to come.

3. Jesus is the Son of God, upon account of his resurrection from the dead, on the third day, to die no more.

Rom. i. 3, 4, "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the

flesh: and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." And Heb. i. 6, "When he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith: And let all the angels of God worship him." Which some have understood of our Lord's coming into the world at his nativity. But more generally interpreters have understood it of our Lord's entering into his glory, and taking possession of his kingdom after his resurrection. Which brings me to another thing.

4. Jesus is the Son of God, on account of his exaltation to God's right hand, and being invested with authority and dominion over all flesh, and constituted Judge of the world, by whom God will pass sentence upon all mankind.

John iii. 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." Chap. v. 21, 22, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." Heb. i. 1, 2, "God—has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he has appointed heir" or lord "of all things." Ch. iii. 5, 6, "Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant—But Christ as Son over his own house."

5. Another token of the especial love of the Father for Jesus Christ, as his own Son, is the pouring out of abundance of spiritual gifts, though in different degrees, upon his apostles, and all who believed in him, after his resurrection.

John i. 32—34, "And John bare record, saying: I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove. And it abode upon him. And I knew him not. But he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me: Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining, the same is he, which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God." Comp. Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16.

John vii. 37—39, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood, and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

Acts xi. 15, 16, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then re-

membered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." See Acts i. 5. and ii. 1—36.

Gal. iv. 6, " And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

Eph. iv. 8—11, " When he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men : and he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers."

Upon all these accounts, and not only upon account of his miraculous conception and birth, is Jesus " the Son of God." The texts alleged under each particular sufficiently show that they are all justly mentioned, and that none of them ought to be omitted.

There are some expressions in St. Luke's history of our Lord's nativity of a virgin mother, which show the truth of this observation. They likewise manifestly show, that it is in respect to his humanity, and the dignity conferred upon it, that he has the title of " the Son of God." The expressions, which were partly alleged before, are exceedingly remarkable. " And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary ; for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shall bring forth a son ; and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest. And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever. And of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 33.

Upon all the fore-mentioned accounts, then, and his transcendent greatness, Jesus is " the Son of God." And all these things may be supposed to be comprehended in that expression, Heb. i. 9, " Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The words are a quotation from Ps. xlv. 7, and seem to have been originally intended of Solomon, who by divine choice and designation was preferred before his brethren," 1 Chron. xxviii. 5. But they are also fitly applied to the Messiah ; who has been greatly distinguished, and highly honoured above his brethren : meaning men, of whose nature he partook, Heb. ii. 14—16, or prophets, who had the Spirit in a due, but less measure, bestowed upon them.

All these prerogatives has God the Father, in his unsearchable wisdom, conferred upon Jesus of Nazareth, whom he chose and appointed to be the Messiah : who is also the

“seed of the woman,” that should bruise the head of the serpent, Gen. iii. 15, and “the seed of Abraham,” in and through whom, all the families or nations of the earth were to be blessed,” Gen. xii. 3. xviii. 18. Acts iii. 25. Gal. iii. 8. “The rod out of the stem of Jesse, and the branch that should grow out of his root, to whom the Gentiles would seek,” Is. ix. 1—10. “Who was to restore the preserved of Israel, and was likewise given to be a light to the Gentiles, that he might be for salvation to the ends of the earth,” Is. xlix. 6. or, as old Simeon said, “a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of God’s people Israel,” Luke ii. 32. For it is a certain truth, that the grace, which has been manifested by the appearing of Jesus Christ, was from early ages purposed by the Divine Being, and foretold by his prophets, Rom. i. 1—3. Eph. i. 4. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10. 1 Pet. i. 10—12.

And how agreeable the several articles of this detail are to the scriptures of the Old Testament, must appear from texts already alleged thence. Nevertheless I shall here put together a few other texts, and some of the same more largely than hitherto quoted: not transcribing them now, but referring to them, and entreating you, if you please, to read and consider them at your leisure.

Ps. ii. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12.

Ps. xxii. throughout.

Is. xlii. 1, “Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my servant, in whom my soul delighteth.” Almost the very words of the voice, that came from heaven at our Lord’s baptism and transfiguration. “I have put my Spirit upon him. He shall bring forth judgment unto the Gentiles;” and what follows to the end of ver. 7.

Is. xlix. 1—6. Compare Acts xiii. 47. and xxvi. 23.

We must now be able to perceive the true character of our blessed Saviour, and the great propriety with which the apostles and evangelists speak of him.

John i. 45, “Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write. Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph.” And see ver. 46—50. and Acts ii. 22. “Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and signs, and wonders, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know.” See also ver. 36. ch. iv. 27, “For of a truth, against thy holy child [rather son, or servant] Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were

gathered together." Ch. x. 38, "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power. Who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil. For God was with him." Nor does our dear Redeemer disdain this title in his state of exaltation. For when he called to Saul out of heaven, and "Saul answered,—Who art thou, Lord? he said, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest," Acts xxii. 6—8. Comp. ch. ix. 5. See also ch. iii. 6, and xxvi. 9.

From all that has been said, it appears that Jesus is a man, appointed, anointed, beloved, honoured, and exalted by God above all other beings.^s

^s Some now by "the Son of God" understand an intelligent being, or emanation, begotten by the Father, or proceeding from him, in an ineffable manner, from all eternity, and of the same essence or substance with the Father. Others thereby understand a mighty spirit, or angel, begotten or formed by the will of the Father, in time, before the creation of the world, and of a different substance from the Father; which Son of God, according to them, became incarnate; that is, united himself, either to the human nature, consisting of soul and body, or to a human body, so as to supply the place of a human soul.

But those senses of this phrase, or title, are not to be found in any of the books of the New Testament. 'The Jews had no notion that their Messiah should be any thing more than mere man.' See Whitby upon Rom. ix. 5. Dr. Jortin's Discourses concerning the Christian Religion, p. 17. which indeed is well shown in the passages of ancient authors, alleged by Whitby in the place referred to.

This will lead us to the true meaning of the title, "the Son of God," in the gospels; for there many give our Lord that title, who took him to be a man especially favoured by God. This title is given to our Lord, not only by Peter in his confession, Matt. xvi. 16, and the parallel places, and John vi. 69. but also by John the Baptist, John i. 34, iii. 35, 36. by Nathanael, John i. 49. by Martha, xi. 27. and by others, Matt. xiv. 33, Luke iv. 41. Our blessed Lord likewise often takes it to himself either directly or indirectly. John iii. 17, 18, v. 25, ix. 35—37, x. 36, and xi. 4.

The case seems to be this. In the Jewish style, and the language of scripture, all good men, and all people, who are in a covenant-relation to God, are his sons, and are entitled to many blessings and privileges: but Jesus, as the Messiah, is "the Son of God," by way of eminence and distinction.

Exod. iv. 22, 23, "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born. And I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me." Is. xliii. 6, "Bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth." See likewise Is. xlv. 11, 12, and Jer. xxxi. 9, "For I am a father unto Israel; and Ephraim is my first-born." Ver. 20, "Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child?" Hos. xi. 1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." To which I must add Jer. xxxi. 1, "At the same time, saith the Lord, I will be the God of all the families of Israel. And they shall be my people." Comp. ver. 9 and 33. All which is expressed by St. Paul after this manner. 2 Cor. vi. 18. "And I will be a father unto them; and they shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." See there also ver. 16 and 17.

Accordingly, in the New Testament, the Gentiles, who received Jesus as the Christ, being brought into God's family, and into the number of his peo-

Obj. 1. It may be said : Admitting this notion of our Saviour's person, we shall lose that great instance of humiliation, and condescension, which the Arian scheme sets before us. For according to that, the most exalted spirit, next to God the Father, submits to all the laws of infancy and childhood, and is greatly incommoded by the body during its dwelling on this earth.

To which I answer : I would by no means rob you, or any one else, of any argument that is really suited to engage to humility in particular, or to all virtue in general. But, Papinian, if I am not mistaken, it appears from what was before said, that this instance of humiliation is an imaginary thing. It is impossible that so exalted a spirit should be the soul of a human body. If it is not an absolute contradiction, it is incongruous to the nature of things, and in the highest degree improbable.

And if so great a being were to inhabit a human body, it would entirely swallow it up. That spirit would still retain its own knowledge, and power, and would raise the body above all pains, weaknesses, and wants.

Whatever advantages may be fancied in the Arian scheme, there are much greater inconveniences attending it. For, as before hinted, it deprives us of the force of our Saviour's example. We are common men. But he is supposed to be the most perfect spirit, next to God. How should any temptation, from the things of this world, affect such a being? How should he be tempted, in all respects, as we are? It could not be. It is altogether irrational.

But there are many and great advantages in supposing

ple, are called "the sons of God." John i. 12, "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." Comp. 1 John iii. 1. and see Rom. viii. 14—17, Gal. iv. 4—7, and Heb. ii. 10, and elsewhere.

Matt. xxvii. 54, "Now when the Centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly, this was the Son of God." Comp. Mark xv. 39. And, says St. Luke, ch. xxiii. 47, "Now when the Centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man."

All good men and women, then, are God's sons and daughters. But Jesus, the Messiah, is "the Son of God," by way of eminence and distinction, and has in all things the pre-eminence.

This, as it seems to me, is the way of thinking, to which we are led, by comparing many texts of the Old and New Testament, where the title or denomination of "Son of God" is used.

There is therefore no foundation for the interpretations mentioned at the beginning of this note : which, nevertheless, have been received by many, and have produced intricate schemes and systems, by which the minds of christians have been greatly perplexed, and the world itself sometimes thrown into confusion and disturbance.

Jesus Christ to be a man, consisting of soul and body. His example is then justly set before us in all the strength and beauty, with which it now appears in the gospels and epistles of the New Testament.

It is also upon the ground of this scheme alone, that the expectation of attaining to a glory, like that of Jesus Christ, can be supported. For which, however, there is plain encouragement in the doctrine of the gospel. John xvii. 21—26, Rom. viii. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12, Rev. iii. 21, and elsewhere.

These are the most glorious, the most animating hopes that can be conceived. They excite to faithfulness and zeal beyond expression. We may be made like unto Jesus Christ hereafter, if we will but follow his example, and resemble him now. But how can we admit the thought of being near to him, in the future state, who, beside the merit of his obedience and sufferings here, has, in the Arian hypothesis, the glory of being employed by God in things of a quite different nature, such as creating this visible world, and all the angels, and invisible hosts of heaven?

And is not this one reason of our slothfulness, and other faults? “The truth is not in us: the words of Christ do not abide in us.” We suffer ourselves to be deluded, and perverted from the truth and simplicity of the gospel, by the philosophical schemes of speculative men. And so, almost any man “may take our crown,” Rev. iii. 11.

I believe, Papinian, that you, as well as other serious christians, desire, with the apostle Paul, “to know Christ, and the power of his resurrection,” Philip. iii. 10. But what is there extraordinary in the resurrection of Christ, according to the Arian hypothesis? Is it any thing extraordinary, that the Logos (in the Arian sense of that word) should raise the body, in which he has acted, and suffered for a while? He might be supposed to have an especial regard for that body, and be willing to make it glorious. But I do not see, that such a resurrection can so fully assure us of our own, as if we suppose Christ to be a man like unto us. For then his resurrection is a pattern of ours. Which is the doctrine of the New Testament. 1 Cor. xv. 20—23, and the glorious argument of St. Paul, Eph. i. 17—23. Hereby we are indeed assured of our resurrection. God the Father who gave his own Son for us, and raised him up from the dead, will, most certainly, raise up us also, as it is expressed, 1 Cor. iv. 14, “Knowing that he, who raised up the Lord Jesus, should raise up us also by Jesus, and should present us with you.” And see Philip. iii. 20,

21. In a word, here is the best foundation of unmoveable confidence in God. And the apostle expressly says in the place just referred to, in 1 Cor. xv. 21, "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."

Obj. 2. Again, it may be objected, that this idea of the person of Jesus does not fully suit the strong expressions in the New Testament, concerning the love of God, in giving his Son for us.

But I think it does. For can there be any greater love, than for that person, who is immediately sent by God, who is his ambassador, invested with all his power and authority, who is the object of the Father's especial love, and therefore his own Son, who was "holy, harmless, and undefiled," Heb. vii. 16, to live a mean, despised, reproached life in this world, and then to die a painful and ignominious death for our good, and for the good of mankind in general?

Besides, this is that love of God, which is so much, and so justly magnified, and extolled in the New Testament: that God gave his Son to die for us. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all; how shall he not with him freely give us all things?" And see before, ch. v. 6—8, and 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God, even our Father." Gal. i. 4. See likewise 1 Tim. ii. 6, 1 Pet. i. 18—21, 1 John iii. 16, iv. 9, 10, and many other places.

If Christ had dwelt in pre-existent glory, and had come from heaven, to animate a human body; this also would have been plainly and frequently represented to us.

In the way now mentioned, we go to God directly through Jesus Christ. And the love of the Father is most conspicuous in the supposition, that God sent, and appointed the man Jesus Christ, for our salvation. Herein, I say, the love of God is most conspicuous, much more than in supposing the pre-existence of the Son, the covenant of redemption, and the offer of the Son to come into the world, and many other such like things, derogatory to the honour of the Father; because they diminish our idea of his free, transcendent, and unmerited love and goodness. The gospel account is summed up in these words: "And all things are of God, who has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ. And has given unto us the ministry of reconciliation: to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them: and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation," 2 Cor.

v. 18, 19. See likewise what follows in ver. 20, 21, and Eph. i. 1—10.

Upon the whole, as before said, the true evangelical description of our blessed Saviour's person and character, is that, which we have in St. Peter's words, recorded Acts ii. 22, and 36, and ch. x. 38, and St. Paul's, Acts xvii. 31, and 1 Tim. ii. 5, Col. ii. 3—9, and many other places.

Nor is this a diminishing character. It is the greatest, and the most honourable to him, on whom it is bestowed, and the most satisfying to us, who are called upon to believe in him, to rely upon him, and follow him in the way of obedience prescribed to us.

Says God to the people of Israel of old, "Behold, I send an angel before thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not. For he will not pardon your transgressions. For my name is in him," Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. Upon which place Patrick speaks to this purpose. "For my name is in him." He acts by my authority and power, and sustains my person, who am present where he is. For the name of God is said to be there, where he is present after a singular and extraordinary manner, 1 Kings viii. 16, 1 Chron. vi. 5, 6. Maimonides expounds it, "My word is in him," that is, says he, God's will and pleasure was declared by the angel. In which he seems to follow the Chaldee, who translates it, "for his word is in my name," that is, what he speaks is by my authority.'

Afterwards, when the people had transgressed in making a golden calf, and God was greatly displeased; Moses offered an earnest prayer, that he would himself go with them, and conduct them, Ex. xxxiii. 12, 13. And he received this gracious answer, by which he was encouraged. Ver. 14, 15, "And he said: My presence shall go with thee: and I will give thee rest. And he said: If thy presence go not with us, carry us not hence." ^t

^t 'The question upon this occasion was, Whether God would himself go up with the people, who had highly offended him; or whether he should send an angel before them, to conduct them. God said to Moses: "I will send an angel before thee." And added: "For I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiff-necked people; lest I consume thee in the way," Ex. xxxiii. 1—3. Upon the prayer and intercession of Moses, God is pleased to promise, that his presence should go with him. The promise must be understood necessarily, in opposition to the foregoing threatening, that God would not go up in the midst of them, but that he would send an angel before them.

'The presence of God therefore in this place must be *αυτος ο θεος*,—as the Seventy justly render it: and that in direct opposition to an angel in his name and stead.' Mr. Moses Lowman, in his Tracts, p. 38, 39. see also p. 37.

“ My presence ” that is, I myself, as in the Greek version : *αυτος προπορευσομαι σοι*. In the Hebrew it is, literally, “ my face.” Which is the same as myself. So 2 Sam. xvii. 11, “ and that thou go to battle in thy own person.” In the Hebrew it is : “ that thy face go to the battle.”

That the presence of God was with Jesus the Messiah, our Lord and Saviour, in the most signal and extraordinary manner, we are assured by every book and chapter of the New Testament, and particularly by St John’s gospel, in the introduction, and throughout.

The dignity of Jesus, as Messiah, is very great, far superior to that of angels. We know it from our Lord himself, and from things said by him, whilst dwelling on this earth. Matt. xxiv. 36, “ But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, but my Father only.” Which is thus expressed in Mark xiii. 32, “ But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man, no, not the angels, which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” To which let me add John xiv. 28, “ If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father. For my Father is greater than I.” Which I suppose to be said of our Lord, as man.

Nor am I singular therein. The same is said by Augustine, whom I shall write out for your use. *Non recte cogitas, quem locum in rebus habeat humana natura, quæ condita est ad imaginem Dei. Majores angeli dici possunt homine, quia majores sunt hominis corpore : majores sunt et animo, sed in formâ, quam peccati originalis merito corruptibile aggravat corpus. Naturâ vero humanâ qualem naturam Christus humanæ mentis assumpsit, quæ nullo peccato potuit depravari, Deus solus est major. — Naturâ vero hominis, quæ mente rationali et intellectuali creaturas cæteras antecedit, Deus solus est major : cui utique, injuria facta non est, ubi scriptum est, “ Major est Deus corde nostro,” 1 Joh. iii. 20. Filius ergo Dei susceptum hominem levaturus ad Patrem, quando dicebat, “ Si diligeretis me, gauderetis utique, quia vado ad Patrem, quia Pater major me est,” Joh. xiv. 28. non carni suæ solum, sed etiam menti, quam gerebat, humanæ, Deum Patrem utique præferbat. Aug. Contr. Maximin. Arian, l. 2, cap. xxv. Tom. VIII.*

Dr. Whitby’s paraphrase of Mark xiii. 32, is thus : “ Neither the Son,” who has the Spirit without measure, but “ the Father only.”

What I have been arguing for, was the sentiment of the Nazarene christians. Nor do I think it can be made appear

that any Jews, who were believers, had any other idea of our Saviour: excepting those called Ebionites, or some of them, who were extremely mistaken in supposing that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary.^u

The notion of an inferior Deity, pre-existing, and then incarnate, seems to have been brought into the church by some of the learned converts from heathenism, who had not thoroughly abandoned the principles in which they had been educated. Perhaps, likewise, they hoped by this means to render the doctrine of Christ more palatable to heathen people, especially their philosophers. Moreover

^u Athanasius says, ‘That the Jews at that time being in an error, and ‘thinking that the expected Messiah would be a mere man, of the seed of ‘David—for that reason the blessed apostles in great wisdom first instructed ‘the Jews in the things concerning our Saviour’s humanity.’ *De Sentent. Dionysii*, n. 8. p. 248. C. D.

Chrysostom, at the beginning of his fourth homily upon St. John’s gospel, says: ‘The other evangelists having chiefly insisted upon our Saviour’s humanity, there was danger, lest his eternal generation should have been neglected by some: and men might have been of the same opinion with Paul ‘of Samosata, if John had not written.’ In *Joh. hom.* 4. tom. VIII. p. 27. A. B. Bened.

In his first homily upon the Acts, he expresseth himself again to this purpose: ‘In the discourses of the apostles recorded in this book, little is said ‘about Christ’s divinity. But they discourse chiefly of his humanity, and ‘passion, and resurrection, and ascension; because his resurrection and ascension to heaven were the points necessary to be proved and believed at ‘that time.’ In *Act. Ap. hom.* i. t. IX. p. 3. A.

Augustine in one of his sermons says, ‘Peter and the other apostles have ‘written of our Lord, but it is chiefly concerning his humanity.’ Again, ‘Peter says little of our Lord’s divinity in his epistles,’ but John enlarges upon that subject in his gospel: *Quoniam Petrus scripsit de Domino, scripserunt et alii: sed scriptura eorum magis circa humanitatem Domini est occupata—Sed de divinitate Christi in literis Petri aliquid [al. non aliquid]: in Evangelio autem Joannis multum eminet.* *Serm.* 253. cap. iv. t. V. And in his Confessions he informs us, that for a great while he was of opinion that Jesus was a most wise and excellent man, miraculously born of a virgin, and sent by God, with a high commission, to give us an example of stedfast virtue, amidst the temptations of this world, and to instruct us in the way how we might obtain everlasting salvation. *Ego vero aliud putabam, tantumque sentiebam de Domino Christo meo, quantum de excellentis sapientiæ viro, cui nullus posset æquari: præsertim quia mirabiliter natus ex virgine, ad exemplum contemnendorum temporalium pro adipiscendâ immortalitate, divinâ pro nobis curâ tantam auctoritatem magisterii meruisse videbatur.* *Conf.* l. 7. c. xix. n. 25. *Ego autem aliquanto posterius didicisse me fateor—quomodo catholica veritas a Photini falsitate dirimatur.* *Ibid.* But upon reading the works of some Platonic philosophers, which were put into his hands, he altered his opinion. *Et primo volens ostendere mihi—quod Verbum tuum caro factum est, et habitavit inter homines, procurâsti mihi, per quendam hominem inhumanissimo typho turgidum, quosdam Platoniorum libros ex Græcâ linguâ in Latinam versos: et ibi legi, non quidem his verbis, sed hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus, quod in principio erat Verbum, &c.* *ibid.* cap. ix. n. 13. *vid. et cap. xx. n. 26.*

the christians of the second century, and afterwards, were too averse to all Jews in general, and even to the believers from among that people. The apostle Paul had seen a temper of pride and insolence springing up in the Gentile christians, in his own time: or he would not have delivered that caution, which we find in Rom. xi. 17—24.^v

Thus far I have pursued my own thoughts, without consulting any other writer at all, or very slightly, except in those places where I have expressly said so. But I all along intended, before I finished, to observe a part of what is said by Dr. Clarke in his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*; which I have now done. And I cannot forbear saying, that his interpretations of texts are generally false, arising, as from some other causes, so particularly, from an aversion to Sabellian or Socinian senses: some of which may be absurd, and unnatural. But I must prefer Grotius's interpretations upon the comparison, above Dr. Clarke's. So far as I am able to judge, Grotius explains texts better than the professed Socinians. The reason may be, that he had more learning, and particularly was better acquainted with the Jewish style. But I am apt to think, that their later writers have borrowed from him, and improved by him.

However, this is said very much in the way of conjecture. For I must acknowledge that I have not been greatly conversant with the writers of that denomination. I have never read Crellius *de uno Deo Patre*: though I believe it to be a very good book. There is also, in our own language, a collection of Unitarian Tracts in two or three

^v I take this breach of communion, correspondence, and communication between the Jewish christians that fled from Jerusalem into the east, and the Gentile christians, (which breach continued till the former were totally destroyed, or dissipated,) to have been a great mismanagement, and the greatest misfortune that ever befel the christian church.—St. Paul laboured with all his might, aim, and study, to keep up union, communion, and friendship, between these two bodies of christians. And he did with great difficulty preserve it in some good measure, as long as he lived.—Epiphanius had some knowledge of those of the Jewish christians, which remained to his time, that is, 370, whom the Gentile christians then called Nazarenes. And he styles them heretics; for no other reason, that I can perceive, but that they, together with their christian faith, continued the use of circumcision, and of the Jewish law. Which is a thing, that St. Paul never blamed in a Jewish christian, though in the Gentile christians he did. Dr. William Wall, in the Preface to his *Notes upon the O. T.* p. xi. xii.

That is a melancholy observation. Let us endeavour to repair the damage here bewailed, by diligently studying, and resolutely adhering to, the doctrine of Christ's apostles, as contained in the books of the New Testament; wherein, I verily believe, are delivered all the truths of religion, and in sufficient perspicuity, if we will but attend.

quartos. But I am not acquainted with it. Nor can I remember, that I ever looked into it. I have formed my sentiments upon the scriptures, and by reading such Commentators, chiefly, as are in the best repute. I may add, that the reading of the ancient writers of the church has been of use to confirm me, and to assist me in clearing up difficulties.

I observe then, that many of the texts in Dr. Clarke's P. I. chap. ii. sect. 3, concerning the highest titles given to Christ, instead of proving his opinion, are inconsistent with it, and confirm that for which I argue. Yea, they prove it, and agree with no other: such as "the Father is in me, and I in him: he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me: if ye had known me, ye would have known the Father also: I in the Father, and you in me, and I in you: he that hateth me, hateth my Father also: all things that the Father hath, are mine," &c. &c.

Script. Doct. ch. ii. sect. 3. numb. 616. p. 114, 115, is a quotation from Justin Martyr. 'The Jews,' saith he, 'are justly reprov'd for imagining that the Father of all things spake to Moses, when indeed it was the Son of God, who is called the angel and the messenger of the Father.' Again, afterwards, from the same Justin. 'Yet it was not God the Creator of the universe, which then said to Moses, that he was "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."'

This appears to me very strange, that the Jews should not know who was their God, and delivered the law by Moses. And I cannot help wondering, that any learned men of our times should pay any regard to such observations as these. Is it not better to say, that Justin was mistaken, than that the Jewish people were mistaken in such a thing as this? For Justin was a convert from heathenism, and had been a philosopher, and brought along with him many prejudices, which might hinder his rightly understanding the Old Testament.

That God, who spake to Moses, and brought the people of Israel out of Egypt, is the Creator of the universe, is manifest. Exod. xx. 1, 2, 3, "And God spake all these things, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Ver. 10, 11, "But the seventh day is the sabbath of Jehovah thy God—For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." Is. xl. 27, 28, "Why sayest thou, O Jacob, My way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is pass'd over from my God?"

Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, nor is weary?" See also ch. xlv. 11, 12, and elsewhere.

Neither our Saviour, nor his apostles, had any debate with the Jews upon this head: but plainly suppose, that they were right, as to the object of worship. Therefore our Lord says to the woman of Samaria, John iv. 22, "Ye worship ye know not what. We know what we worship. For salvation is of the Jews." John viii. 54, "It is my Father that honoureth me: of whom ye say, that he is your God." Acts iii. 13, "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, has glorified his Son Jesus." Ver. 30, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree." Are not these texts clear? However, see likewise Matt. xi. 25, John xvii. throughout, and xx. 17, 21, Eph. iii. 14, Heb. i. 1, 2, I John iv. 14.

Mark xii. 21, 29, "One of the scribes came, and asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? Jesus answered him: The first of all the commandments is: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," Deut. vi. 4. To which the scribe assented. And Mark xii. 34, "When Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him: Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." All which supposeth, that the Jews were not mistaken about the object of worship.

Once more. Our Lord's argument with the Sadducees, in behalf of a resurrection, taken from Ex. iii. 6, and recorded Matt. xxii. Mark xii. Luke xx. supposeth "the God of Abraham," &c. to be the one true God, "who is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him.

In short, if Justin Martyr be in the right, it is not sufficient to say, that the Jewish people were mistaken: but we must say, that the Old and New Testament, and the sacred penmen of them, and all who speak therein by inspiration, are mistaken.

Unquestionably, God may make use of the ministry of angels, as well as of men. But it is not the messenger who is God: but he, from whom he comes, and in whose name he speaks.

I may show this by an instance or two. Gen. xxii. 15—18, "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said: By myself I have sworn, saith the Lord, that because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thy only son; in bless-

ing I will bless thee." Here is mentioned an angel. But he is only God's messenger, and God speaks by him. Of this we are fully assured by an argument in the epistle to the Hebrews, Ch. vi. 13, 14, "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying: Surely, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee."

For certain, therefore, this was the oath of God Almighty, the one living and true God, and the Creator of all things. For there was "no greater than he." And that this was the one true God, appears, as from many other texts, so particularly from Ps. cv. where the psalmist gratefully commemorates God's wonderful works, and expressly mentions his mindfulness of "his covenant with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac," ver. 9.

St. Stephen speaks of the Jews having received "the law by the disposition of angels," Acts vii. 54, that is, by their ministration, under God the supreme Lawgiver, who at that time had the attendance of a numerous host of angels, Deut. xxxiii. 1, 2. Comp. Heb. ii. 2. And, says the Psalmist very poetically, Ps. lxxviii. 17, "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of thousands. The Lord is among them, in his holy place, as in Sinai." And see Is. xxxiii. 22.

I must take some other things from the above-mentioned learned writer.

Script. Doct. ch. ii. sect. 3. numb. 576. ' John iii. 13, ' "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came ' down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in hea- ' ven." The meaning is explained, ch. i. 18, "No man ' hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son, which ' is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him." ' Excellently well, in my opinion. That is the whole of Dr. Clarke's note upon that text.

Script. Doct. n. 580. p. 96. John v. 18, "But said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."

Here Dr. Clarke speaks to this purpose. ' Assuming to ' himself the power and authority of God. It is the same ' accusation with that other. Ch. x. 33, "We stone thee— ' for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest ' thyself God." And Mark ii. 7, "Why does this man thus ' speak blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but God only?" ' The Jews, it is evident, did not by these expressions mean ' to charge Jesus with affirming himself to be the supreme, ' self-existent, independent Deity: nay, not so much as with ' taking upon himself to be a Divine Person at all: but

‘ only with assuming to himself the power and authority of ‘ God.’ So far is not amiss in my opinion. What follows there I leave to those who may like it.

Script. Doct. n. 645. p. 124. Col. ii. 9, “ For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily.” The note is this. ‘ Ch. i. 19, “ It pleased the Father, that in him should ‘ all fulness dwell.” And John xiv. 10, “ The Father that ‘ dwelleth in me, he does the works.”’ Excellently well, according to my apprehension.

This will lead me to proceed somewhat further, and to consider some other texts before I conclude.

Rom. i. 3, 4, “ Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.”

Here are two things: first, that “ Jesus was made of the seed of David:” secondly, that he was “ declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead.” Both which may be illustrated by comparing other texts.

How this text is explained by those who favour the Arian hypothesis, of the Logos supplying the place of a human soul in the person of Jesus, may be seen in divers writers.* I shall explain it as I am able, without attempting a particular confutation of any.

First, “ who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.” That phrase, “ according to the flesh,” is in several other texts. Some of which may be observed. Acts ii. 30, “ Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.”—Rom. ix. 3, “ For I could wish, that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh,”—ver. 5, “ Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.” And see 2 Cor. v. 16.

Secondly, it is added: “ And declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.”

There are several texts to be observed here. Acts ii. 32, “ This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Ver. 36, “ therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” Jesus was and had been declared to be the Christ, the Son of God, whilst he was here on earth. But this was more fully manifested by his

* See the Paraphrases of Mr. Locke, and Dr. Taylor.

resurrection, and the consequent effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles and others. See Acts xiii. 33, and Heb. v. 5. And our Lord himself had mentioned this to the Jews, as “the sign,” the most decisive, and demonstrative evidence, that he was indeed the Messiah, as he had said. See Matt. xii. 38—40, xvi. 1—5, Luke xi. 29, 30, John ii. 18, 19, iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32.

Now therefore we may explain, and paraphrase this text after this manner: ‘Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who, with regard to the external circumstances of his nativity into this world, was of the family and lineage of David: from whom God had promised the Messiah should descend: and with regard to the “spirit of holiness,” or the divine energy and influence, by which he had been conceived in the womb, and by which he was sanctified to his high office, and by which he wrought the greatest miracles, he was the Son of God, and was known to be so. But was most fully and solemnly constituted, and declared to be the Son of God, by that wonderful demonstration of the divine power, his resurrection from the dead.’

Nor is it easy to avoid recollecting here, in what terms St. Paul speaks of the power which God exerted in raising Christ from the dead, and exalting him to that dominion, which was the consequence of his resurrection. Eph. i. 19—23.

I shall transcribe below^x a part of Grotius’s annotations upon this text, and refer to others.^y

Eph. iii. 9, “And to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.”

Here it may be observed, in the first place, that those words, “by Jesus Christ,” are by some learned men suspected to be an interpolation.^z

^x Sed sensum difficiliorem efficit curtata locutio, quam evolvere conabimur. Jesus Filius Dei multis modis dicitur; maxime populariter, ideo quod in regnum a Deo evehctus est; quo sensu verba Psalmi ii. de Davide dicta, cum ad regnum pervenit, Christo aptantur. Act. xiii. 33, et ad Heb. i. 5, v. 5. Hæc autem Filii sive regia dignitas Jesu prædestinabatur, et præfigurabatur, jam tum cum mortalem agens vitam magna illa signa et prodigia ederet—Hæc signa edebat Jesus per spiritum illum sanctitatis, id est, vim divinam, per quam ab initio conceptionis sanctificatus fuerat. Luc. i. 35.—Ostenditur ergo Jesus nobilis ex maternâ parte, utpote ex rege terreno ortus, sed nobilior ex paternâ parte, quippe a Deo factus Rex cœlestis post resurrectionem. Heb. v. 9, Act. ii. 30, et xxvi. p. 2, 3. Grot. Annot. ad Rom. i. 4.

^y Vid. Limborch. Comment. in Rom. i. 3, 4, et Eujedini Explicat. V. et N. Test. p. 258—264.

^z Δία τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] Deest in Alexandr. Vulg. Syr.—Et quidem, cum

But, secondly, allowing them to be genuine, it is to be observed, that many learned men are of opinion that St. Paul is here speaking of the new creation. So says Grotius. *Omnia Christus fecit nova. 1 Cor. v. 17, Et divinius hæc creatio, quam prior illa.* And you very well know Mr. Locke's paraphrase, which is this: 'Who frames and 'manages this whole new creation by Jesus Christ.' And he has endeavoured in a long note to support that paraphrase. This likewise is the sense of Calvin. "*Qui omnia creavit per Christum.*"] *Non tam de primâ creatione interpretari licet, quam de instauratione spirituali. Tametsi enim verum est illud, Verbo Dei creata esse omnia, quemadmodum tot locis habetur: circumstantia tamen loci postulat, ut de renovatione intelligamus, quæ continetur in beneficio redemptionis.* Beausobre likewise has a very valuable note upon this text; but being somewhat prolix, I only refer you to it.

2 Cor. iv. 4. Christ is styled "the image of God." *ὁς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ.* Upon which Whithy's note is to this purpose. 'Christ seems here to be styled the image of God, 'not in the sense of Theodoret, as being "God of God," 'but rather, as the text insinuates, with relation to the gospel, and his mediatory office: in which he has given us 'many glorious demonstrations of the power, the wisdom, 'the holiness, purity and justice, the mercy, goodness, and 'philanthropy of God.' Tit. iii. 4. Beza's note upon the place is to the like purpose. *Id est, in quo seipsum perspicue conspiciendum præbet Deus, ut 1 Tim. iii. 16. Neque enim Dei imaginem nunc vocat Paulus Christum alio quam officii ipsius respectu: ut, licet vera, tamen sint ἀπροσδιόνυστα, quæ nonnulli ex veteribus hoc loco περὶ τὰ ὁμοσιε descriuerunt.* So that I need not here appeal to Grotius.

Col. i. 15, "Who is the image of the invisible God." Mr. Peirce's note is in these very words. 'The Father 'alone is represented in the New Testament, as the "invisible God." See John i. 18, v. 37, vi. 46, 1 Tim. i. 17, 'vi. 16, Heb. xi. 27, 1 John iv. 12, 20. Christ is never represented as invisible. It might seem strange, if he 'should, since he actually took upon him flesh, and appeared, and was seen in the world: which are things the 'nature of the Father cannot possibly admit. His being

vix fieri possit, ut exemplaribus antiquissimis exciderint, scribarum seu fraude, sive incuriâ, verba tam insignia, præsertim ante tempora Arii; adjecta hoc loco crediderim, interpretamenti gratiâ, ex illo Apostoli. Col. i. 16. Mill. in loc. Vid. et Bez. in loc.

‘ called “ the image of God ” in this place, and 2 Cor. iv. 4, implies his being visible, and that the perfections of God do most eminently shine forth in him.’

So writes Mr. Peirce. And by Christ seems to mean the Logos, or Christ in his pre-existent state, before he came into this world : which appears to me not a little strange. God, the Father, unquestionably, is invisible. So I think, are the Logos, in the Arian sense of that term, and also angels, and the souls of men, and all beings which we call spirits. None of them are visible to our bodily eyes.

Therefore Christ’s being “ the image of God,” must be understood of his acting in this world. God is invisible in his nature and essence. But he can manifest himself, and make known to us his mind and will, by those whom he sends as his ministers. This appears to me very plain and evident from John xiv. 8—11, “ Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.” What, now, is the answer which our Lord makes to that disciple ? Does he reprehend him, as asking an impossibility ? No. His answer is this : “ Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip ? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. And how sayest thou, show us the Father ! ” See what follows, and ver. 7.

I think that Irenæus says the same that I have just now done. ‘ Beati mundi corde, quoniam ipsi videbunt Deum.’ Sed secundum magnitudinem quidem ejus, et mirabilem gloriam, “ nemo videbit Deum, et vivet.” Ex. xxxiii. 20. Incapabilis enim Pater. Secundum autem dilectionem et humanitatem, et quod omnia possit, etiam hoc concedit iis qui se diligunt, id est, videre Deum. Homo etenim a se non videt Deum. Ille autem volens videtur hominibus, quibus vult, et quando vult, et quemadmodum vult. Potens est enim in omnibus Deus : visus quidem tunc per spiritum prophetiæ, visus autem et per Filium adoptivæ. Videbitur autem et in regno cœlorum paternaliter. Iren. l. 4. cap. 20. al. 37. n. 5. p. 254.^a

So likewise when Christ is called “ the image of God ” in 2 Cor. iv. 4, the place before cited, the meaning is, that he was so in this world. This I think to be exceeding evident from the context, which shall be now recited more at

^a I must transcribe Grotius here. *Qui est imago Dei invisibilis.*] Dei in-
aspecti aspectabilis imago. Ita enim Latini loquuntur. Idem sensus 2 Cor.
iv. 4, et 1 Tim. iii. 16, Heb. i. 3. Adam imago Dei fuit, sed valde tenuis
In Christo perfectissime apparuit, quam Deus esset sapiens, potens, bonus. Sic
in aquâ solem conspicimus. Aliud imago, aliud umbra, qualis in Lege. Heb.
x. 1. Grot. ad Col. i. 15.

large:—"lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them—For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face," or person, "of Jesus Christ."

It follows in the same, Col. i. 15, "Who is the first-born of every creature," or rather, as seems to me, "of the whole creation," *πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως*: that is, he is the chief, the most excellent, of the whole creation. Pelagius says, it is to be understood of Christ in regard to his humanity. He is the first, not in time, but in dignity. So it is said, "Israel is my first-born." *Primogenitus secundum assumpti hominis formam, non tempore, sed honore, juxta illud: "Filius meus primogenitus Israel."* Pelag. in loc. Ap. Hieron. tom. V. p. 1070.

Grotius understands it of the new creation. He refers to 2 Cor. v. 17, Rev. xxi. 5, Heb. ii. 5, to which, perhaps, might have been added Heb. xii. 23, "The church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven." ^b He likewise says, that in the sacred scriptures, "the first-born," sometimes denotes the greatest or highest, and refers to Ps. lxxxix. 27, Jer. xxxi. 9. *Primus in creatione, nova scilicet, de quâ 2 Cor. v. 17. Primogenitum Hebræis dicitur et quod primum, et quod summum est in quoque genere.*

For the explication of what follows, I mean Col. 16—20, I beg leave to refer you to Grotius.

Heb. i. 1, 2, "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by," or in "the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by," or in "his Son," the promised Messiah:—*εν τοις προφηταις —εν υιω*. "Whom he has appointed heir of all things: by whom also he made the worlds." Grotius thinks that the Greek phrase may be rendered, "for whom;" which is very suitable to the coherence, it having been before said, that he was "appointed heir," or lord "of all things." *Videtur δι' ε hic recte accipi posse pro δι' ον, "propter quem."* Ideo autem hæc interpretatio hoc loco maxime mihi se probat, quia ad Hebræos scribens videtur respicere ad dictum vetus Hebræorum, propter Messiam conditum esse mundum. ^c

^b 'By Christ we are all called to be the first-born, that is, to be all hallowed, and to be called God's peculiar, as were the first-born, before the Levites were taken in their stead.' Dr. Sykes upon Heb. xii. 23.

^c Moreover it might be observed, 'That Dr. Sykes says, the word *αιωνας*, which we render worlds, does not signify "the heavens, and the earth, and

Ver. 3, "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." That expresseth the glory of Jesus Christ in this world. He is the refulgence of the Father's glory, which shone upon him, and was seen in him. In him appeared the wisdom, the power, the truth, the holiness, the goodness, the mercifulness of God. It is much the same as "the form of God," Philip. ii. 6. Says Grotius, 'Ὁς ὡν ἀπαύλασμα τῆς ἐοξῆς.—Repercussus divinæ majestatis, qualis est solis in nube, quæ dicitur *παρηλιος*—Majestas divina, cum per se conspici nequeat, cernitur in Christo, sicut sol, quem directe oculi nostri tueri nequeunt, cernitur in aquâ, speculo, nube. Vide 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15, *Καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτῆ*—*Ὑπόστασις* hic non ita sumitur, quomodo Platonici, et post Origenem ex Platonicis christiani, sumpsere,—Ita potentia, justitia, veritas in Deo Christi Patre sunt primario, in Christo vero secundario, sed ita ut nobis in Christo ea evidentè appareant, Joh. xiv. 9.

The same ver. 3, "and upholding all things by the word of his power." This must relate to our Saviour's transactions in this world, because it precedes the mention of his death, which follows next. I have looked into Brenius, who says the same: and I shall transcribe him, as it is likely you have him not with you. Cumque omnia potenti suo jussu in terris ferret. *Φερεῖν* hic, ut interpretes nonnulli recte annotant, potius significat agere, sive moderari, et gubernare, quam portare aut ferre: nisi ferendi aut portandi verbum hoc sensu accipiatur, ut metaphorice designet Christum etiam in terris munus suum administrantem, omnia ad regni cœlestis in terris dispensationem pertinentia, velut humeris suis portâsse, Conf. Is. ix. 6.

To the same purpose likewise Limborch, whom I shall transcribe also in part. Sic videmus Domini Jesu potentia omnia fuisse subjecta, ejusque miracula fuisse universalia in totam naturam; nullamque fuisse creaturam, quin imperium ipsius agnoverit—Quibus omnibus præconii sui divinitatem adstruxit, seque a Deo Patre suo esse missum probavit. Quæ omnia solo jussu efficere, vere divinum est.

'all things that are in them:' but it means, he says, properly, "ages," or "certain periods of time," in which such or such things were done. Such were the patriarchal, that of the law, that of the Messiah, that of the ante-diluvians—These were properly *αιωνες*, ages.' Admit, then, the interpretation of Grotius, *ἐν ᾧ*, to be "for whom." And we have a most apt and beautiful sense, which is this. "For whom also," or "for whose sake also," or in respect to whom, he disposed and ordered the ages, that is, the ante-diluvian, the patriarchal, the legal ages or periods, and all the divine dispensations towards the sons of men.'

Et qui id facit quasi imago Dei est, potentiamque divinam in se residere ostendit.

Hereby then, is represented the power residing in Jesus, whereby he wrought the greatest miracles, whenever he pleased, by an effectual all-commanding word, healing diseases, raising the dead, rebuking stormy winds and waves, and they subsided, multiplying provisions in desert places, causing a fish to bring a stater for the tribute money to be paid to the temple, for himself and the disciple at whose house he was entertained.

It follows in the same verse, "when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Which last words include our Lord's resurrection from the dead, and his ascension to heaven, and there sitting on the right hand of the Father. Upon which the apostle farther enlargeth.

Ver. 4, 5, "Being made so much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?" See 2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. ii. 7, lxxxix. 26, 27.

Ver. 6, "And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."

Mr. Peirce's paraphrase of ver. 6, is thus: 'So far is he from speaking in such a manner of any of the angels, that on the contrary, when he brings again his first-begotten into the world, raising him from the dead, he says, and let all the angels of God be subject to him.' See I Pet. iii. 21, 22—"by the resurrection of Jesus Christ; who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him."

Ver. 7, "And of the angels he saith, who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire."

Ver. 8, "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." Ver. 9, "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

"But unto the Son he saith." I think it should be thus rendered: "but of the Son he saith, [or,] with regard to the Son, he saith." For in the original it is the same phrase, which in the seventh verse we have translated, "of the angels he saith." So here, "With regard to the Son,

he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." The words are in Ps. xlv. 6, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. The sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre." The writer of this epistle to the Hebrews says, 'And with regard to the Son, or the Messiah, God's throne is for ever and ever:' that is, the kingdom of God, erected by the Messiah, is to have no period: and this is expressed in the words of the Psalmist here quoted. Comp. Luke i. 33, 34. So likewise Dan. ii. 44. And "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." And in Rev. xiv. 6, the doctrine to be preached to all nations is called "the everlasting gospel."

Here I recollect a passage in Origen's books against Celsus, who informs us he had met with a Jew, esteemed a very learned man, 'who said that these words, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre:" are addressed to the God of the universe: but the following words, "thou lovest righteousness and hatest iniquity; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows," are addressed to the Messiah.' *Και μεμνημαι γε πανυ θλιψας τον Ιεδαιον, νομιζομενον σοφον, εκ λεξεως ταυτης. Ος προς αυτην απορων, ειπε τα τω εαυτη ιεδωσμω ακολουθα· ειπε προς μεν τον των ολων Θεον ειρησθαι το, ο θρονος σε, ο Θεος, εις τον αιωνα τσ αιωνος, ραβδος ευθυτατος η ραβδος της βασιλειας σε· προς δε τον Χριστον το, ηγαπησας δικαιοσυνην, και εμισησας ανομιαν. Δια τετο εχρισε σε ο Θεος ο Θεος σε, και τα εξης.* *Contra Cels.* l. 1. p. 43. *Cant. Tom. 1. p. 371. Bened.*

Origen did not approve of that interpretation: but to me it appears both very right and very valuable. Nor is it so difficult, but that it might have been discerned by a christian, were it not that we are strangely misled by a great variety of wrong notions which prevail amongst us.

So again, ver. 10, "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Ver. 11, "They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old like a garment," Ver. 12, "And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." Which words are a quotation from Ps. cii. 25, 26, 27, where they are addressed to God: and so they are here. In order to preserve the connection, we are to supply some such words as these at the beginning of the quotation. 'And of the Son, or with regard to the Son, or the Messiah, the scripture saith,' "And thou, Lord,"—that is, upon account of the dispensation by the

Messiah, which is to last for ever, are applicable those words: "And thou, Lord," and what follows.

The apostle, the more effectually to secure the steadfastness of the Jewish believers, observes to them the excellence, the importance, the wide extent, and long duration of the divine dispensation by the Messiah. The dispensation by Moses was limited to one nation, and to a certain period of time. But the dispensation of the Messiah was to be an universal blessing, and to subsist to the end of time. And to the kingdom of God by the Messiah are fitly applicable the texts cited in this place from the Old Testament.

In a word, hereby are shown the dignity and excellence of the evangelical dispensation, in that higher expressions are used concerning it, than can be applied to any other.

I think I have above shown from scripture, that Jesus Christ was a man like unto us, or having a human soul, as well as a human body. Nor have you any reason upon that account to suspect me of heterodoxy. I think myself therein both a catholic and a scriptural christian. It has been the general belief of the church of Christ in all ages. And the glory of the evangelical dispensation depends upon it. In Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, there is a chapter, where it is asserted, that this was the opinion of all the ancients in general, *εμφυχον του ενανθρωπησαντα*, of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Apollinarius of Hierapolis, Serapion Bishop of Antioch, Origen and others. Socrat. l. 3. cap. viii. Conf. Theodoret. H. E. l. 5. cap. ix. et x.

I can easily show it to have been the opinion of some later writers, who have always been in great repute for their right faith.

Epiphanius expresseth himself upon this subject very particularly, and very emphatically. For though our Saviour was not born in the ordinary way of human generation, *απο σπερματος ανδρος ουκ ην*, he says, he was perfect man, and was tempted like unto us, but without sin. *Παντα γαρ τελειως εσχε, τα παντα εχων, σαρκα, και νευρα, και φλεβας, και τα αλλα παντα οσα εστι ψυχην δε αληθινως, και εδοκησει νυν δε και τα παντα οσα εστιν εν τη ανθρωπησει, χωρις αμαρτιας, ως γεγραπται.*—Heb. iv. 15. Hær. 69. n. xxv. p. 750.

To the like purpose Jerom in several places, more than need to be cited here.

Quod autem infert: 'Homo in dolore, et sciens ferre infirmitatem,' sive 'virum dolorum, et scientem infirmitatem,' verum corpus hominis, et veram demonstrat animam. Hieron in Is. cap. liii. tom. III. p. 383.

Quod si opposuerint nobis hi, qui Christum negant hu-

manam habuisse animam, sed in humano corpore Deum fuisse pro animâ, audiant in Christo substantiam animæ demonstrari. Id. in Amos. cap. vi. ib. p. 1427.

Quod autem spiritus accipiatur pro animâ, manifeste significat Salvatoris oratio: ‘Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum.’ Neque enim Jesus aut perversum spiritum, quod cogitare quoque nefas est, aut Spiritum Sanctum, qui ipse Deus est, Patri poterat commendare, et non potius animam suam, de quâ dixerat: ‘Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem.’ Matt. xxvi. 38. Id. in Abac. cap. ii. ib. p. 1618.

I shall not transcribe here any thing from Augustin, but only refer you to one place in him. Contr. sermon. Arian. cap. ix. tom. VIII.^d

I shall proceed no further at this time. I need not tell you, that the Unity of God is an important article of natural religion. And after it has been so strongly asserted in the Jewish revelation, and has been as clearly taught in the New Testament,^e it ought not to be given up by christians.

If, Papinian, you will bestow a few thoughts upon these papers, and send me the result of them, without compliment, and without resentment, you will oblige

PHILALETES.

THE

FIRST POSTSCRIPT,

CONTAINING AN EXPLICATION OF THOSE WORDS, ‘THE SPIRIT, THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND THE SPIRIT OF GOD,’ AS USED IN THE SCRIPTURES.

PHILALETES, when he wrote the foregoing letter, had no occasion to proceed any farther than he did. But now he thinks, that if he could rightly explain those words, the Spirit, and the Holy Spirit, and the like, he should do a real service to religion, and contribute to the understanding of the scriptures.

^d That passage may be seen above, p. 81, note ^d.

^e See Mark xii. 29, Matt. xix. 17, Mark x. 18, John xvii. 3, Rom. xv. 6, xvi. 27, 1 Cor. viii. 6, 2 Cor. xi. 31, Eph. iv. 6, 1 Tm. ii. 5, vi. 15, 16, and elsewhere.

This Postscript will consist of three sections. In the first shall be an argument, showing the several acceptations of the words, the Spirit, and the Holy Spirit. In the second section such texts will be considered, as may be supposed to afford objections. In the third divers other texts will be explained.

SECTION I.

AN ARGUMENT. In showing the several acceptations of these words in scripture, I begin with a passage of Maimonides, generally reckoned as learned and judicious a writer as any of the Jewish Rabbins.

‘The^a word Spirit,’ says he, ‘has several senses. 1. It signifies the air, that is, one of the four elements. “And the spirit of the Lord moved upon the face of the waters,” Gen. i. 2.

2. ‘It signifies wind. “And the east-wind brought the locusts,” Ex. x. 13. Afterwards, ver. 19, “And the Lord turned a mighty strong west-wind, which took away the locusts.” And in like manner very often.

3. ‘It is taken for the vital breath. “He remembered

^a *Ruach* vox est homonyma. Significat enim, primo, Aërem, hoc est, unum ex quatuor elementis: ut “Veruach, et Spiritus Domini incubabat super aquas,” Gen. i. 2. *Deinde*, significat spiritum flantem, i. e. ventum. Ut “Veruach, et spiritus (ventus) orientalis attulit locustas,” Ex. x. 13. Item, “Ruach, spiritus occidentalis,” ib. ver. 19. Et sic sæpissime, *Tertio*, sumitur pro spiritu vitali. Ut “Ruach, spiritus vitæ,” Gen. vi. 17. *Quarto*, sumitur de parte illâ hominis incorruptibili, quæ surperstes remanet post mortem. Ut “Veruach, et spiritus hominis redit ad Deum, qui dedit eum,” Ecc. xii. 7. *Quinto*, significat influentiam divinam, a Deo prophetis instillatam, cujus virtute prophetabant, quemadmodum explicaturi sumus, quando de prophetiâ agemus; cujus ratio quoque in hoc libro pertractanda. “Et separabo,” min ruach, “de spiritu, qui est in te, et ponam in eis,” Numb. xi. 17. “Et fuit, cum quievisset super eos” haruach “spiritus,” ver. 26. Item, Ruach, “spiritus loquutus est in me,” 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. *Sexto*, significat quoque propositum, et voluntatem. Ut Kol rucho, “omnem spiritum suum profert stultus,” Pr. xxix. 11, hoc est, omnem intentionem, voluntatem suam. Sic, Et “exhaurietur” ruach “spiritus Ægypti in medio ejus, et consilium ejus absorbebo,” Is. xix. 3, i. e. dissipabitur propositum ipsius, et gubernatio ipsius abscondetur. Sic, “Quis direxit ruach Domini, et quis vir consilii ejus, ut indicare possit eum,” Is. xl. 13, hoc est, Quis est, qui sciat ordinem voluntatis ejus, aut qui apprehendat et assequatur, quâ ratione hanc rerum universitatem gubernet, et qui eum indicare posset. Vides ergo, quod hæc vox, “ruach,” quando Deo attribuitur, ubique sumatur partim in quintâ, partim in sextâ et ultimâ significatione, quâtenus voluntatem significat. Exponatur in quoque loco pro ratione rerum et circumstantiarum. Rabbi Mosis Maimonidis liber More Nevochim. Part I. cap. xl.

Veritas et quidditas prophetiæ nihil aliud est, quam influentia a Deo Opt. Max. mediante intellectu, agens super facultatem rationalem primo, deinde super facultatem imaginariam influens. Id. More Nevochim. P. II. cap. 36.

‘ that they were but flesh, a wind [a spirit] that passeth away, and cometh not again,” Ps. lxxviii. 39. And, “ all flesh, wherein is the breath of life,” Gen. vi. 17.

4. ‘ It is taken for the incorruptible part of men, which survives after death. “ And the spirit shall return to God who gave it,” Ecc. xii. 7.

5. ‘ It signifies the Divine Influence, inspiring the prophets, by virtue of which they prophesied. “ I will take of the spirit that is in thee, and will put it upon them,” Numb. xi. 17. “ And the spirit rested upon them,” ver. 27. “ The spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue,” 2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

6. ‘ It also signifies design, will, purpose. “ A fool uttereth all his mind,” literally, spirit, Prov. xxix. 11, “ And the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof, and I will destroy the council thereof,” Is. xix. 3. “ Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor has taught him?” Is. xl. 13.

‘ It is evident therefore,’ says he, ‘ that the word *spirit*, when spoken of God, is to be always understood, either in the fifth, or the sixth and last acceptation of the word, according as the coherence and circumstances of things direct.’

This passage of Maimonides, which I have here transcribed at length, has been taken notice of by divers learned christian writers.^b

My design leads me to observe those texts only of the Old and New Testament, where the word spirit is spoken of God, or such other, as may tend to explain those texts.

And, first of all, I think, that in many places the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, or the Holy Ghost, is equivalent to God himself.

The spirit of a man is the same as man. So the Spirit of God must be the same as God himself. 1 Cor. ii. 11, “ What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, that is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, [or no one,] but the Spirit of God.”

1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18, “ I am glad of the coming of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus—For they have refreshed my spirit, and yours:” that is, me and you. Or, as Mr. Locke paraphraseth the place. ‘ For by the account, which they have given me of you, they have quieted my mind, and yours too.’

Gal. vi. 18, “ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with

^b Selden de Synedr. l. 2. c. 4. et iii. iv. S. Basnag. Exercitationes in Baron. p. 45.

your spirit:" that is, with you. 2 Tim. iv. 22, "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit," or with thee.

Ps. cxxxix, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?" that is, from Thee. "Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?" In like manner it is said, with regard to Moses, Ps. evi. 33, "because they provoked his spirit," meaning him.

Is. lxiii. 10, "But they rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit." Which in other texts is expressed in this manner, Num. xix. 11, "And the Lord said unto Moses: How long will this people provoke me!" Ps lxxviii. 56, "Yet they tempted, and provoked the most high God, and kept not his testimonies." Ps. xev, "When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my work."

Soul is a word resembling spirit, and often signifies man, or person. Lev. iv. 2, "If a soul shall sin through ignorance."—Acts ii. 41, "And the same day were added to them three thousand souls." So likewise ch. vii. 14, and in very many other places.

And my soul is the same as I or myself. Gen. xii. 13, "And my soul shall live because of thee," ch. xix. 10, "that my soul may bless thee, before I die." 2 Sam. iv. 9, "As the Lord liveth, who has redeemed my soul out of all adversity." Job x. 1, "My soul is weary of my life." See also ch. vii. 15. Ps. xxxv. 9, "And my soul shall be joyful in the Lord." Is. lxi. 10, "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord: my soul shall be joyful in my God." Matt. xxvi. 38, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death."

The Divine Being himself sometimes adopts this form of speech. Is. i. 14, "Your new moons and your appointed feasts, my soul hateth. They are a trouble unto me. I am weary to bear them." Where, 'my soul' is the same as I, which is in the following clause.

Is. xlii. 1, "My elect, in whom my soul delighteth," or, in whom I delight. Compare Matt. xii. 18. And see Jer. v. 9, ch. vi. 8, and other places.

Secondly, By the Spirit of God, or the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, is often meant the power, or wisdom of God, or his will and command.

Ps. xxxiii. 6, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the host of them by the breath [or spirit] of his mouth." Where the word of the Lord, and the breath of his mouth, are all one. All things came into being, and were disposed by his will, at his word and command.

In like manner, Job xxvi. 13, "By his spirit he has gar-

nished the heavens : his hand has formed the crooked serpent :” that is, the winding constellation in the heavens, which we call the milky-way, or the galaxy. The spirit, or the hand of God, which are both one, has formed all those things.

Micah ii. 7, “ O thou that art named the house of Jacob, is the spirit of the Lord straitened ?” A part of Mr. Lowth’s note upon which words is thus : ‘ Is God’s hand or power ‘ shortened ?’ Comp. Is. lix. 1, “ Behold, the Lord’s hand is not shortened, that it cannot save.”

Zach. iv. 6, “ Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.” Here Mr. Lowth’s note is to this purpose. ‘ Zerubbabel and Joshua, with the Jews ‘ under their conduct, shall finish the temple, and re-estab- ‘ lish the Jewish state, not by force of arms, or of human ‘ power, but by the secret assistance of my providence.’

Luke i. 35, “ And the angel answered, and said unto her : The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee.” The latter words explain the former. And the Holy Ghost is said to be the same as the power of God. Where likewise it follows : “ Therefore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.”

Matt. xii. 28, “ But if I cast out dæmons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you.” Luke xi. 20, “ But if I with the finger of God cast out dæmons, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you.”^c

So that the finger of God, or the Spirit of God, is the same as the power of God, or God himself. As St. Peter says, Acts ii. 22, “ Ye men of Israel, hear these words : 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 ye yourselves also know.”

To which two texts of St. Matthew and St. Luke, just alleged, may be added, as very similar, if not exactly parallel, some others. 2 Cor. iii. 3, “ Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the spirit of the liv-

^c ‘ Again, Matt. xii. 28, “ If I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then ‘ the kingdom of God is come unto you.” Here the spirit of God does not ‘ signify the Holy Ghost, or the third person of the Holy Trinity, but the ‘ power of God ; as appears from the parallel passage in St. Luke xi. 20, where ‘ instead of the spirit of God, we read the finger of God. By this power the ‘ man Christ was enabled to cast out devils. For he speaks of himself here in his ‘ human, not in his divine nature, according to the notion which the pharisees ‘ had of him ; as is plain from his styling himself the Son of man, in the sequel ‘ of his discourse to them.’ Abraham Le Moine’s Treatise on Miracles, p. 50.

ing God: not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." Undoubtedly alluding to what is said of the two tables containing the ten commandments. Exod. xxxi. 18, and Deut. ix. 10, that they were written by the finger of God, or miraculously by God himself. So also Ps. viii. 3, "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained." See Patrick upon Ex. xxxi. 18.

Thirdly, by the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, or the Holy Ghost, is oftentimes meant an extraordinary gift from God of power, wisdom, knowledge and understanding.

Sometimes hereby is intended courage, or wisdom, or some one particular advantage only. At other times hereby is intended a plentiful effusion of a variety of spiritual gifts.

For which reason it will be needful to allege, under this article, many texts both from the Old and the New Testament.

Ex. xxxi. 1—7, "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, See I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah. And I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning work in gold, and in silver, and in brass.—And behold, I have given with him Aholiab,—and in the hearts of all that are wise-hearted, I have put wisdom, that they may make all that I have commanded thee." See also ch. xxxv. 30—35, and xxxiv. 1, 2.

Numb. xi. 16, 17, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather to me seventy men of the elders of the people: and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them." No one understands hereby that God intended to take from Moses a spiritual being, or part of a spiritual being: but that he determined to bestow upon those elders qualifications of wisdom and understanding, resembling those in Moses, by which he was so eminent and distinguished.

Afterwards it is said, ver. 25, 26, "And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders. And it came to pass, that when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease:" meaning for some while. "But there remained two of the men in the camp: and the spirit rested upon them; and they prophesied in the camp."

Deut. xxxiv. 9, "And Joshua was full of the spirit of wisdom: for Moses had laid his hands upon him."

Judges iii. 10, "And the spirit of the Lord came upon him, [Othniel,] and he judged Israel, and went out to war—And his hand prevailed against Chushan-rishathaim."

Judges vi. 34, "But the spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon." Ch. xi. 29, "Then the spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah."

Ch. xiv. 5, 6, "Then went Samson down, and his father and his mother, to Timnath: and behold a young lion roared against him: and the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him: and he rent him as he would have rent a kid: and he had nothing in his hand." See likewise ch. xv. 14.

2 Sam. xxii. 1—3, "Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist of Israel, said, The spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me: he that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God."

2 Chron. xx. 14, 15, "Then upon Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, the son of Benaiah,—a Levite of the sons of Asaph, came the spirit of the Lord, in the midst of the congregation. And he said: Hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem"—Another instance of what Maimonides calls divine influence, whereby a man is enabled to prophesy, or give counsel from God in a difficult circumstance, as that was with the people of Judah.

So Ezek. xi. 4, 5, "Therefore prophesy against them, [prophesy,] O son of man. And the spirit of the Lord fell upon me, and said unto me: Speak, thus saith the Lord"—And St. Peter says, 2 Ep. i. 20, 21, "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation [impulse or suggestion]. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," or by the divine influence. As St. Paul also says, 2 Tim. iii. 16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God."

1 Chron. xii. 18, "Then the spirit came upon Amasai, who was chief of the captains, and he said: Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse. Peace be unto thee, and peace be to thy helpers. For thy God helpeth thee. Then David received them." Patrick's comment is to this purpose: 'The spirit of power, saith the Targum: that is, God powerfully moved him with an heroical boldness and resolution, in the name of them all to protest fidelity to David, in such pathetical words, as convinced him they were friends.'

2 Kings ii. 9, "And it came to pass, when they were gone over, [Jordan,] that Elijah said unto Elisha: Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away from thee. And Elisha said: I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me."

By which some have supposed, that Elisha begged to have as much more of the spirit as Elijah had. But as that would be arrogance, the best commentators rather think, he only desired, that he might be as the eldest, or first-born among his fellow-disciples: even as the first-born in a family had a double portion to that of other children. See thereafter, ver. 15, and Deut. xxi. 17, and Grotius and Patrick upon this text. All must be sensible, that a gift, not a person, is here intended.

Prov. i. 23, "Turn you at my reproof. Behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you. I will make known my words unto you." 'That is, I will teach you, and enable you to understand the rules of virtue and holiness; which if you follow, you will be happy.'

Zech. xii. 10, "And I will pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplications." Which cannot imply a promise of pouring out upon them a transcendent being or spirit: but of giving them the temper, the qualification, the disposition of grace and supplication.

There are also in the Old Testament promises of the spirit relating to the Messiah.

Is. xi. 1—3, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse—And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord. And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord."

Is. lxii. 2, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my elect, in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my spirit upon him. He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles."

And the promises of the spirit, in the times of the Messiah, import also a plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts.

Is. xlv. 3, "And I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thy offspring." Comp. John vii. 38, 39, Acts ii. 17, 18. And see Is. lix. 2, Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 27, xxxvii. 14, xxxix. 29.

Joel ii. 28, 29, "And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh. And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy. Your old men

shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions. And also upon the servants, and the handmaids, in those days will I pour out my spirit." See Acts ii. 17, 18.

In all which texts, as seems very evident, by the spirit, and the spirit of God, and the spirit of the Lord, is meant not a being, or intelligent agent, but a power, a gift, a favour, a blessing.

I proceed to the New Testament, in which likewise many texts are to be taken notice of by us.

Matt. x. 19, 20. "But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak. For it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."

Mark xiii. 11, "But when they shall lead you and deliver you up, take no thought before-hand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate. But whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye. For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."

Luke xii. 11, 12, "And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers; take ye no thought how, or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say. For the Holy Ghost shall teach you, in that same hour, what ye ought to say."

Luke xxi. 14, 15, "Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before, what ye shall answer. For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, [or wise speech,] which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist."

How these and the like promises were afterwards fulfilled, when the apostles of Christ, and other his disciples, were brought before the Jewish or other rulers and governors, we see in their history, recorded in the book of the Acts. Of St. Stephen, in particular, it is said, ch. vi. 9, 10, "Then there arose certain, disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit, by which he spake."

John iii. 34, "For he, whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God. For God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him." Here by the spirit, as I suppose, all understand a gift.

John vii. 37—39, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood, and cried, saying: If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the spirit, which they that believe on him should receive. For the Holy Ghost

was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

Here also, as is very plain, by the spirit, and the Holy Ghost, is meant a gift, or a plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts.

John xx. 19—22, "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week—came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them: Peace be unto you—As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost:" that is, he encouraged them to rely upon him for the fulfilment of the promise he had made, that they should receive from above sufficient qualifications for the discharge of their high office. Which actually came to pass on the day of Pentecost next ensuing.

Acts i. 4, 5, "And being assembled together with them, he commanded them, that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, Which, saith he, ye have heard of me." [Luke xxiv. 49.] "For John truly baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Which cannot be understood of a person. The meaning thereof is: Ye shall be favoured with a plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts. As the event likewise shows. See John i. 33, and Acts xi. 16.

Ver. 8, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."

Acts ii. 1—4, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place: And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance."

When all men wondered at this strange appearance, and some mocked, ver. 14—18, Peter, standing up, says, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel. And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh. And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your old men shall dream dreams. And on my servants and my handmaidens I will pour out my spirit, and they shall prophesy."

Ver. 33, "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth, [or poured out,] this which ye now see and hear."

Ver. 38, "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized—in the name of Jesus Christ: and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Acts iv. 8, "Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel—"

—Ver. 21, "And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost. And they spake the word with boldness. Ver. 33, And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. And great grace was upon all."

Acts vi. 3, "Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." Ver. 5, "And the saying pleased the whole multitude. And they chose Stephen, full of the Holy Ghost, and Philip." Ver. 8, "And Stephen full of faith and power did great wonders and miracles among the people." Ver. 9, "Then there arose certain,—disputing with Stephen." Ver. 10, "And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake."

Acts viii. 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." Ver. 15, "Who when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet he was fallen upon none of them. Only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Ver. 17, "Then laid they their hands on them; and they received the Holy Ghost." Ver. 18, "And when Simon saw, that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money." And what follows.

Acts x. 44, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." Ver. 45, "And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Ver. 46, "For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." Ver. 47, "Then answered Peter: Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"

Acts xi. 16, 17, "Forasmuch then, as God gave them the like gift, as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus; what was I, that I could withstand God?" Ch. xv. 18, "And God, which knows the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, as he did unto us."

I have omitted Acts ix. 17, and x. 38, for the sake of brevity, and as not being necessary to be now insisted

upon. The paragraph in Acts xix. 1—7, will be considered hereafter among the texts that are to be explained.

Rom. v. 5, “And hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us.”

Tit. iii. 5, 6, “According to his merey he has saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us, [has poured out upon us, *ὡς ἐξεχέεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς,*] abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.”

Heb. ii. 4, “God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miraeles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will.”

“And gifts of the Holy Ghost.” It should be rather rendered, And distributions of the Holy Ghost: *καὶ πνευματος ἀριε μερισμοις.* A remarkable expression, plainly declaring that by the Holy Ghost, or the Holy Spirit, was meant those spiritual gifts which came down upon men from heaven immediately, or were communicated in great variety by the laying on of the hands of the apostles.

Heb. vi. 4, “Those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were partakers of the Holy Ghost.” — *Τες ἀπαξ φωτισθεντας, γευσσαμενους τε της δωρεας της επερανις, και μετοχους γενηθεντας πνευματος ἀριε.*

Dr. Whitby’s paraphrase is this: ‘and having tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, sent down from heaven, and conferred on them by the imposition of hands.’

Learned interpreters are not agreed in the meaning of the heavenly gift. To me it seems that by both these expressions, one and the same thing is intended, even the Holy Ghost: and that the writer of this epistle calls it the heavenly gift, in allusion to the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles and their company on the day of Pentecost, as related, Acts ii. 1—13.

But though commentators do not agree in their interpretation of the first particular, I suppose, that by the Holy Ghost they generally understand miraeulous powers and gifts, of which persons here spoken of had partaken. So Whitby, as just cited. So likewise Grotius. Subjicit etiam “participes fuisse Spiritûs Sancti,” id est, dona consecutos prophetiæ, linguarum, sanationum, quæ non contingebant eo tempore nisi justificatis, id est, purgatis. Grot. in loc. Du Saint Esprit.] Des dons miraeuleux. Le Clerc.

1 Pet. i. 12, “Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto

themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel to you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.”

Here I suppose to be a plain reference to the plentiful effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, as related by St. Luke at the beginning of the book of the Acts. It is probable, that many of the christians, to whom St. Peter is here writing, were converted by St. Paul, who was not present with the rest on that memorable day. Nevertheless he had received the Spirit in a very plentiful measure, and immediately from heaven, without the intervention of any of those who were apostles before him. It is also very likely that St. Peter himself, and some others of the twelve, had been in these countries before his writing this epistle. For, not now to mention St. John, who perhaps did not take up his abode at Ephesus, till after the writing this epistle of Peter, I think we have good evidence that^d Philip, one of the twelve apostles, resided for some time, and died at Hierapolis in Phrygia. And it may be reckoned probable, that he was for a while very useful in preaching the gospel in those parts, and that he wrought miracles among the people there.

By the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, I suppose to be meant the inspiration of the apostles, and the miraculous powers and gifts with which they were endowed.

Res illæ magnæ nobis plene explicatæ sunt per apostolos, et eorum adjutores, ‘cælitus donatos spiritu sancto,’ id est, donis majoribus, quam ipsi prophetæ habuere, et de quibus ipsi prophetæ sunt locuti, ut Joel ii. 28. Grot. in loc.

I John iv. 13, “Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit:” *ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν.* And see ch. ii. 20.

In these texts the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, is oftentimes spoken of as a gift. And there is a variety of expressions, such as giving, pouring out, falling upon men, receiving, and being filled with, the Holy Ghost; which import a gift, a power, a privilege and blessing, rather than a person.

To all which may be added, fourthly, that in the epistles of the New Testament there are at the beginning, and elsewhere, wishes of peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, but none from the Spirit distinctly. Nor are there any doxologies, or ascriptions of glory to the Spirit

^d Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 31. l. 5. c. 24. in Hieron. de V. I. cap. 45. Polycrates.

distinctly, though there are several such ascriptions to God and Christ, or to God through Christ.

Rom. i. 7, "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints; grace be to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." So also I Cor. i. 3, 2 Cor. i. 2, Gal. i. 3, Eph. i. 2, and elsewhere. And Eph. vi. 13, "Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

Some of the doxologies are these: Rom. xi. 36, "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen." Ch. xvi. 27, "To God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen." See Eph. iii. 20, 21. Philip. iv. 8, "Now unto God, even our Father, be glory for ever and ever." See I Tim. i. 17. Heb. xiii. 20, 21, "Now the God of peace—make you perfect,—through Jesus Christ: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." I Pet. iv. 11, "That God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ: to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." 2 Pet. iii. 18, "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: to whom be glory both now and ever. Amen." And see Jude, ver. 24, 25. Rev. i. 5, 6, "Unto him that loved us, and redeemed us from our sins by his own blood, and has made us kings and priests unto God, even his Father: to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." See also Rev. iv. 9—11, v. 12, 13, vii. 10.

I quote no other books as of authority, beside the books of scripture commonly received by christians, as of divine original. Nevertheless I may observe by way of illustration, that the wishes of peace and the doxologies in the most early christian writers, are agreeable to those in the epistles of the New Testament, which have been just now alleged.

The epistle of Clement, written in the name of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth, begins in this manner. 'Grace and peace be multiplied unto you from God Almighty through Jesus Christ.'

In this epistle are several doxologies. And they are all ascribed to God, or Christ, or to God through Christ.

The conclusion of the epistle is in these words: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you, and with all every where, who are called by God through him: through whom to him be glory, honour, might, majesty, and everlasting dominion, for ever and ever. Amen.'

The epistle of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, which is sent to the Philippians, is inscribed in this manner: 'Polycarp,

‘ and the presbyters that are with him, to the church of God
 ‘ which is at Philippi. Mercy and peace be multiplied
 ‘ unto you from God Almighty, and from the Lord Jesus
 ‘ Christ our Saviour.’

In the twelfth chapter or section of that epistle are these expressions. ‘ Now the God and Father of our Lord Jesus
 ‘ Christ, and he himself, who is our everlasting High Priest,
 ‘ the Son of God, Jesus Christ, build you up in faith and
 ‘ truth, meekness and patience.’

A catholic author, supposed to have lived about the year of Christ 220, and writing against heretics, says: ‘ There is,
 ‘ indeed, one God, whom we can know no otherwise, but
 ‘ from the holy scriptures. Whatever therefore the divine
 ‘ scriptures declare, that let us embrace: what they teach,
 ‘ let us learn. And as the Father willeth we should be-
 ‘ lieve, so let us believe: as he willeth the Son should be
 ‘ honoured, so let us honour him: as ^e he willeth the Holy
 ‘ Ghost should be given, so let us accept.’

Jerom says, ‘ that ^f Lactantius in his epistles, especially
 ‘ those to Demetrian, denies the personality of the Holy
 ‘ Ghost: referring him, and his operations, as the Jews also
 ‘ erroneously do, to the Father, or the Son.’

And in another place he says, that ^g this was the senti-
 ment of many christians in his own time, who did not un-
 derstand the scriptures.

The bishops in the council of Nice, having declared the doctrine concerning God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, add: ‘ And in the Holy Ghost:’ that is: ‘ And we
 ‘ believe in the Holy Ghost.’

It follows in the same creed, as it is exhibited in the liturgy of the Church of England: ‘ The Lord and Giver
 ‘ of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who
 ‘ with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified,
 ‘ who spake by the prophets.’ But that is not in the creed of the council of Nice, which sat in the year of our Lord 325, but it is taken from the creed of the council of Constantino-

^e ——— και ως θελει πνευμα αγιον δωρεισθαι, λαβωμεν. Hippolyt. contr. Noët. § ix. p. 12. ap. Fabr. T. II.

^f Lactantius, in epistolis suis, et maxime in epistolis ad Demetrianum, Spiritus Sancti negat substantiam, et errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, et sanctificationem utriusque personæ sub nomine ejus demonstrari. Hieron. ad Pamm. et Oc. ep. 41. al. 65. T. IV. p. 345.

^g Hoc ideo: quia multi per imperitiam scripturarum (quod et Firmianus in octavo ad Demetrianum epistolarum libro fecit) asserunt, Spiritum Sanctum sæpe Patrem sæpe Filium nominari. Et cum perspicue in Trinitate credamus, tertiam personam auferentes, non substantiam ejus volunt esse, sed nomen. Id. in Galat. cap. iv. v. 6. T. IV. P. I. p. 268.

ple, which was convened in the year 381. Or, as it is more accurately expressed by Bishop Burnet at the beginning of his exposition of the eighth article of the church of England: ‘ So that the creed, here called the Nicene creed, is ‘ indeed the Constantinopolitan creed, together with the ‘ addition of Filioque, made by the western church.’

I might add a great deal more from the writers of the first three centuries. But this is not a place for enlargement. What has been already said, may be sufficient to render it probable, that the doctrine of the Trinity, which is now commonly received, and which is so much disliked by many, was not formed all at once, but was the work of several ages.

SECTION II.

OBJECTIONS. But it may be objected, that the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, is oftentimes spoken of as a person, and especially in St. John’s gospel.

John xiv. 16, 17, “ And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him. But ye know him. For he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.”

—Ver. 25, 26, “ These things have I spoken unto you, being present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.”

John xvi. 7, “ Nevertheless I tell you the truth. It is expedient for you that I go away. For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. But if I depart, I will send him unto you” —Ver. 12, “ I have yet many things to say unto you. But ye cannot bear them now.” Ver. 13, “ Howbeit, when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth. For he shall not speak of himself. But whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak. And he shall show you things to come.” Ver. 14, “ He shall glorify me. For he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.” Ver. 15, “ All things that the Father hath are mine. Therefore said I, that he shall take of mine : and shall show it unto you.”

In answer to which several things may be said.

1. It is not uncommon, in the language of scripture, to personalize many things, to which we do not ascribe intelligence.

The book of Proverbs, where wisdom is brought in speaking, as a person, is a well-known and remarkable instance. So likewise in the New Testament death reigns, Rom. v. 14, 17, and is an enemy, I Cor. xv. 26, 55—57. And sin is spoken of as a lord and master, and pays wages, and that in opposition to God, the most perfect agent. Rom. vi. 12, “Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.” 14, “For sin shall not have dominion over you.” 17, “Ye were once the servants of sin” — 23, “For the wages of sin is death. But the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

And how many things are done by charity, as described by St. Paul? I Cor. xiii, “It suffereth long, and is kind, thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things,” and the like.

I might quote here many other texts. Judg. xxiv. 26, 27, “And Joshua took a great stone, and set it up there under an oak — And Joshua said unto all the people: Behold, this stone shall be a witness unto us: for it has heard all the words of the Lord, which he spake unto us. It shall therefore be a witness unto you, lest ye deny your God.”

John xii. 48, “He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, has one that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day.”

Let me recite here the words of a pious and learned English writer.^h ‘To conclude this point, the sum of our Saviour’s preaching consists in inculcating this one great and fundamental truth of Christianity: that “we are nothing, and God is all in all.” It is his word that enlightens our minds, his Spirit directs our wills, his providence orders our affairs, his grace guides us here, and his mercy must bring us to heaven hereafter.’

Why is God’s spirit a person more than his providence, or his grace, or mercy? We know, that by these last this writer does not intend persons, though he ascribes to them the guidance of us, or other actions. In the Jewish language, and among the Jewish people, spirit would no more signify a person, than grace or mercy. Nor were they more likely to ascribe distinct personality to the spirit, than we to the grace, or mercy, or providence of God.

2. There is not in the Acts of the Apostles, or in any other book of the New Testament, any account of the appearance and manifestation of a great agent, or person, after our Sa-

^h Directions for profitable reading the Holy Scriptures. By William Lowth, p. 100.

viour's ascension: therefore no such thing was promised or intended by our Saviour, nor expected by the apostles, who could not but know his meaning.

3. In other texts of scripture, and particularly in St. John's gospel, by the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, is meant a gift, or a plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts. I intend John iii. 34, vii. 39, xx. 22, which were alleged not long ago.

4. Our Saviour himself has explained what he meant by "the Comforter."

So it is one of those texts, upon which this objection is founded. John xiv. 26, "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost," or, more literally, the Comforter, the Holy Ghost. *Ὁ δὲ παρακλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.* But by the Holy Ghost, in other places of this gospel, as well as in many other texts of the New Testament, is not meant, as we have plainly seen, a powerful agent, but the Divine Influence, or the effusion of spiritual gifts. This therefore is what our Lord intended by the Comforter. And this sense is confirmed by the book of the Acts, wherein is recorded the fulfilment of our Saviour's promise.

5. Our blessed Lord, in speaking of this matter, has made use of a variety of expressions: by attending to which we may clearly discern his true meaning in what he says of the Comforter.

Matt. xxviii. 20, "And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." In John xiv. 16, lately quoted, he says: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." One and the same thing is intended in both places.

In the texts of St. John's gospel, upon which this objection is built, our Saviour speaks of the teachings of the spirit, whereby the disciples would be enlightened, and led into a clear discernment of his scheme of religion. But in John xvi. 25, are these expressions: "These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs. The time cometh, when I shall no more speak to you in proverbs, [or parables:] but I shall show you plainly of the Father." Here our Lord speaks of those teachings as his own.

In Matt. x. 20, it is said: "For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." To the like purpose in Mark xiii. 11, and Luke xii. 12. But in Luke xxi. 15, our Lord expresseth himself in this manner. "For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay, nor resist."

Mark xvi. 19, 20, "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the

right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them," or the Lord co-operating, *τε Κυρις συνεργησεντος*, and confirming the word with signs following. Here the miracles of the apostles, after his ascension, are ascribed to our Lord himself, or his powerful presence and influence.

Acts ix. 17, 18, "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house: and putting his hands upon him, said: "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes, as it had been scales. And he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized."

Acts ix. 32—34, "And it came to pass, as Peter passed throughout all quarters, he came down also to the saints, which dwelt at Lydda. And there he found a certain man named Eneas, which had kept his bed eight years, and was sick of the palsy. And Peter said unto him: Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole. Arise, and make thy bed. And he arose immediately."

I might refer also to Acts iii. 6, iv. 10—12. But I forbear.

However, I shall add a few other texts from the epistles, which I think are to the present purpose, and may deserve to be considered.

Rom. xii. 3, "For I say, through the grace given to me, to every man that is among you—to think soberly, according as God has dealt to every man the measure of faith."

Ver. 6, "Having then gifts, differing according to the grace that is given to us."

Eph. iii. 6, 7, "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs—and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel: whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me, by the effectual working of his power."

Eph. iv. 7, "But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ."—Ver. 11, 12, "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

1 Pet. iv. 10, 11, "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him

speak as the oracles of God: if any man minister, let him do it, as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ. To whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

And I Cor. xii. 6. St. Paul says: "There are diversities of operations: but it is the same God which worketh all in all." And at ver. 28, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles—."

All which seems to show, that by the spirit is to be understood that special influence, which, in different measures and proportions, God vouchsafes to men through Jesus Christ, for their own comfort and establishment, and for spreading the great truths of religion in the world.

Luke xxiv. 49, "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you. But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."

This power, this divine influence, this effusion of knowledge, and other spiritual gifts, our Lord calls "the Comforter," or the Advocate, *παράκλητος*, as thereby their cause would be pleaded with men, and they would be justified in their preaching boldly in the name of Jesus Christ.

This gift, this divine influence, he calls also "the spirit of truth," because by that wonderful influence on their minds the apostles would be led into the knowledge of all the truths of the gospel, and would be enabled to teach them to others with perspicuity.

And our Lord speaks of the Spirit's "bringing to their remembrance" the things, which he had said, and of his "receiving of his, and showing it unto them:" because by this miraculous influence upon their minds, those prejudices would be removed, which had obstructed their clear discernment of what Christ had said unto them, while he was with them.

There are other texts from which objections may be raised. But they may be as well considered in the next section. And I think, that will be the shortest method.

SECTION III.

TEXTS EXPLAINED. 1. Luke xi. 13, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit unto them that ask him?" Which is parallel with Matt. vii. 11, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children: how much more shall your Father,

which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him?" Whereby we may perceive, that by the Holy Spirit is meant any good thing, conducive to our real happiness. And we are introduced to recollect here what St. James says, i. 5, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not. And it shall be given to him." And see ver. 17.

2. Matt. iv. 1, "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil." Mark i. 12, "And immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness." Luke iv. 1, "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness."

The coherence will lead us into the true meaning of these words. Our blessed Lord had just been baptized, and the Holy Ghost descended from heaven, and abode upon him. At the same time he was solemnly inaugurated, and publicly declared to be the Messiah. There came a voice from heaven, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Now therefore was fulfilled the prophecy in Is. xi. 1, 2, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse—And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might"—By that divine and extraordinary wisdom, our Lord was directed, and influenced, to retire into the wilderness. And having been there tempted of Satan, and having vanquished him, as St. Luke says, ch. iv. 14, 15, "Jesus returned in the power of the spirit into Galilee," fully qualified for the discharge of his high office, both for teaching his excellent doctrine, and for confirming it by miracles, "And there went out a fame of him through all the regions round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all." So our Lord said to his disciples, as recorded Acts i. 8, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." Or, as it is in the margin of some of our Bibles: "Ye shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you."

3. Matt. xii. 31, "Wherefore I say unto you: All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men. But the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." And see ver. 32. Compare also Mark iii. and Luke xii.

Dr. Wall, who upon John xvi. 13. p. 113. asserts the personality of the Spirit, explains this text of St. Matthew after this manner, p. 15. 'A man that sees plainly the effects of a present supernatural power, which, he must be convinced

‘ in conscience, is the finger, or spirit, or immediate miraculous power of God: (which is that, which is here called the Holy Spirit, or Holy Ghost :) and yet will maliciously blaspheme, or speak blasphemous words against it: that it is the devil, or that the devil helps the man that does it: such an one blasphemes God himself, showing himself, or his miraculous power, at that time from heaven.’

‘ In Luke xi. 20. What is here called “the Holy Ghost,” is there called “the finger of God.” And so the Egyptian magicians, when convinced, called it. Ex. viii. 19.’

Afterwards, in the same note, at p. 16, he says: ‘ In Acts ii. 13, there was a miraculous power of God, enabling the apostles to speak with tongues. Some, who did not conceive it to be any spirit, or miraculous power, mocked at it. These were not denounced to be in any unpardonable state.’

Nothing more needs to be said for the explication of that text in St. Matthew, and the parallel places in the other gospels.

4. Matt. xxviii. 19, “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” ‘That is, Go ye therefore into all the world, and teach, or disciple all nations, baptizing them into the profession of faith in, and an obligation to obey the doctrine taught by Christ, with authority from God the Father, and confirmed by the Holy Ghost.’ⁱ

By the Holy Ghost, as I apprehend, we are here to understand the miracles of our Saviour’s ministry, and likewise the miracles wrought by his apostles, and the spiritual gifts bestowed upon the apostles, and other disciples of Jesus, and all believers in general, soon after our Lord’s ascension, and all the miraculous attestations of the truth and divine original of the doctrine taught by Jesus Christ.

It is observable, that the baptismal form, which is in St. Matthew, never appears in those very words, either in the book of the Acts, or in any of the Epistles. But men are required to be “baptized in the name of Christ,” or said to have been “baptized into Christ.” That is, they made a

ⁱ ‘ “Baptizing [them with water,] in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:” that is, receiving them to a profession of the belief of, and an obligation to the practice of that religion, which God the Father has revealed and taught by the Son, and confirmed and established by the Holy Ghost.’ Dr. Clarke’s Paraphrase.

‘The true meaning is, baptizing into the profession of that doctrine, which is the mind and counsel of God the Father, made known to mankind by the Son, and confirmed by the mighty operations of the Holy Ghost.’ Mr. Jo. Burroughs’s two Discourses on positive Institutions, p. 41.

profession of faith in Jesus as the Christ, and acknowledged their obligation to obey him, by being baptized. Acts ii. 38, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." Ch. viii. 16, "Only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." See likewise ver. 35—38. Rom. vi. 3, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" Gal. iii. 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

But though the form which is in St. Matthew, never appears elsewhere, the thing intended thereby is always implied. Nor could any be brought to make a profession of faith in Jesus, as the Christ, but upon the supposition that he had taught in the name and with the authority of God the Father, and had proved his commission by miraculous attestations, which could not be denied nor gainsayed.

5. John xvi. 7, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away. For if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you:" which agrees with what our Lord says, John vii, 37—39, and with the evangelist's own remark; "For the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

The fitness and wisdom of deferring the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost for illuminating the apostles, and removing their prejudices, and enabling them to teach the doctrine of Christ with perspicuity, and to confirm it by wonderful works, must be apparent to all who consider what evidence was thereby afforded to the truth of their testimony concerning the resurrection and ascension of Jesus.

Ver. 8—11, "And when he is come, he will reprove [or convince] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me: of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more: of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."

If we recollect the many texts which have been already alleged, and particularly what our Lord says in John vii. 37—39, just now taken notice of, we shall find no great difficulty in understanding this text.

"And when he is come." It is not to be hence argued, that the Holy Ghost had never come before. But hereby is meant a certain coming, a plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost, foretold by the prophets, and by our Lord.

The Spirit had in former times come upon Moses and the prophets. For, as St. Peter says, 2 Epist. i. 21, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,"

and after a long withdrawing of the Spirit of God, or withholding extraordinary powers and gifts, from the Jewish people, about the time of our Saviour's nativity, we see divers instances of the divine influence and operation in Zechariah, father of John the Baptist, and Elisabeth, and Anna, and Simeon, and then John the Baptist: who undoubtedly taught, and preached, and prophesied by the Holy Ghost, though he did no miracles. The Holy Spirit came down also upon our Lord in a glorious manner, and there were visible tokens of it: whereby John knew him to be the Messiah, the great person, who was to come: and he had "the Spirit without measure," John iii. 34. The Holy Ghost must likewise have been given, during the time of our Lord's abode on this earth, in a certain measure, upon several, particularly the twelve apostles, and the seventy other disciples, in order to qualify them for the discharge of the commission, which our Lord gave them for a time, to go over the cities of Judea, and prepare men for him. And of the seventy it is expressly said, "they returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the dæmons are subject to us through thy name," Luke x. 17.

"By the coming of the Holy Ghost," then, is to be understood, in this place, a general and plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts upon the apostles themselves, and upon other believers in the Lord Jesus, such as that related in the Acts; when the disciples, who had followed the Lord in the time of his ministry, and still continued together, and afterwards many others likewise, were enabled on a sudden to speak in divers languages, which they had never learned, and to perform many great and extraordinary works in the name of Jesus Christ.

Indeed this coming of the Comforter, or the Holy Ghost, comprehends in it all manner of spiritual gifts; not only those just mentioned, but also a clear and distinct knowledge of divine things, even the truths of the doctrine of Christ, and the whole scheme of the gospel-dispensation: and prophesying, or foretelling things to come, as well as working miracles, and also readiness of speech, and a becoming degree of courage and boldness in the midst of dangers, and in the presence of the greatest personages; qualifications, of which the disciples had been hitherto very destitute.

The several particulars, sin, righteousness, and judgment, of which the world would be convinced by the plentiful effusion of the Spirit, here spoken of, need not to be distinctly explained. The sum is, that hereby the progress of

the gospel would be secured. This large and general effusion of spiritual gifts would be a persuasive and satisfactory evidence of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, and that he was the promised Messiah, through whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed. Or, as John the Baptist expresseth it: "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me: Upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God," John i. 33, 34.

And with great force, as well as propriety, do the apostles say to the Jewish council, as recorded, Acts v. 29—32, "Then Peter, and the [other] apostles said: We ought to obey God, rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things. And so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God has given to them that obey him: 'That is, say those judicious commentators, L'Enfant ' and Beausobre,^k the miraculous gifts which Jesus had bestowed upon his apostles, and which they conferred upon ' believers.'

6. Acts i. 2,—“after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles, whom he had chosen.”

Or, as in the Syriac version,^l “after that he had given commandments to the apostles, whom he had chosen by the Holy Spirit:” that is, by special direction from heaven. Which is very agreeable to what St. Luke writes, chap. vi. 12, 13, “And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God:” or, in an oratory of God. “And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples. And of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles.” Indeed a right choice of the apostles of Christ depended upon no less than infinite wisdom. And when another was to be

^k ‘Le S. Esprit.] Ces sont les dons miraculeux, dont J. C. avoit revêtus ses Apôtres, et qu'ils conféroient aux fideles. Act. ii. 33. viii. 15, 17. Note sur les Actes des Apôtres. Chap. v. ver. 32.

^l Act. i. 2. Verba, *δια πνευματος αγιου*, quæ plerique ad *εντεταλαμενος* referunt, construxit Syrus cum *εξελεξατο*: ‘quos [apostolos] elegerat per Spiritum Sanctum.’—Ex mente Syri interpretis hoc dicit Lucas: Christum non ex suâ voluntate apostolos legisse, sed ex nutu Patris, qui per Spiritum Sanctum tanto munere dignos candidatos Filio demonstraverit. J. D. Michaëlis Curæ in Versionem Syriacam Actuum Apostolorum, p. 1.

added to the eleven, after the apostasy and “ death of Judas, they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, and Matthias. And they prayed, and said: Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show, whether of these two thou hast chosen,” Acts i. 23, 24.

7. Acts v. 3, 6, “ Then Peter said: Ananias, why has Satan filled thy heart, to lie unto the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?—Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God—Then Peter said unto her: [Sapphira] How is it that ye have agreed together, to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?”

They tempted the Spirit of the Lord. They acted, as if they had doubted of the divine omniscience, like the Israelites in the wilderness, of whom it is said, Psal. lxxviii. 18, 19, 20, “ And they tempted God in their heart, by asking meat for their lust. They said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?—Can he give bread also? Can he provide flesh for his people!” And as the apostles were plainly under an extraordinary divine influence and direction, when Ananias and Sapphira attempted to impose upon them by a false account, they were justly said to lie to God himself, and not to men only.

Athanasius, speaking of this matter, says: ‘ So^m that he ‘ who lied to the Holy Spirit lied unto God, who dwells in ‘ men by his Spirit. For where the Spirit of God is, there ‘ is God. As it is said: “ Hereby know we, that God ‘ dwelleth in us, because he has given us of his spirit.” ’ — I John iv. 33.

8. Acts viii. 18, 19, “ And when Simon saw, that through laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying: “ Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I shall lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.”

Mr. Le Moine explains this text in his Treatise on Miracles, p. 189, ‘ And when he saw, that through laying on of ‘ their hands, the Holy Ghost, or the power of working mi- ‘ racles, was given, he offered them money, to have the same ‘ power.’

So then the Holy Ghost, which was bestowed upon believers by the apostles, was the power of miracles, or an extraordinary power, by which the believers might perform miraculous works.

9. Acts ix. 31, “ Then had the churches rest throughout

^m Ωτε ὁ ψευσαμενος τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, τῷ Θεῷ ἐψεύσατο τῷ κατοικῶντι ἐν ἀνθρώποις διὰ τῆς πνεύματος αὐτοῦ. Οὐκ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ ὁ Θεός, κ. λ. Athan. De Incarnat. et cont. Arian. n. 13. p. 881. A.

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.

What is here said of the churches does in a great measure coincide with what we find in chap. ii. 42, 43, and 46, 47.

—“And in the comfort of the Holy Ghost.” *Εν τη παρακλησει τῶ ἀγίου πνεύματος.* Which might be rendered the patronage or assistance of the Holy Ghost: agreeable to what our Lord had promised the disciples, as recorded, John xiv. 16.

These words therefore may be now paraphrased in this manner. ‘Then had the churches, in the several countries here mentioned, peace and tranquillity, being freed from the persecution with which they had been disturbed, and were more and more confirmed in the faith. And continuing in the devout worship of God, and in the steady and amiable practice of virtue, and likewise exercising the miraculous gifts and powers, with which they had been favoured, they were greatly increased with the addition of numerous converts.’

Accordingly, there follows in the remaining part of the chapter an account of Peter’s passing throughout divers places, and coming, particularly, to Lydda, where he healed Eneas, who had been long sick of the palsy. “And all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, [recovered,] and turned unto the Lord.” Afterwards Peter went to Joppa, where he raised to life Tabitha, otherwise named Dorcas. “And it was known throughout Joppa; and many believed in the Lord.”

10. Acts xiii. 1—4, “Now there were in the church that is at Antioch certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon that is called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. 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. So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia, and thence they sailed to Cyprus.”

‘That is, whilst those prophets and teachers were engaged with others in the public worship of God, itⁿ was revealed unto some of them, that they should set apart Barnabas and Saul to a certain work, for which God had

ⁿ —*Dixit Spiritus Sanctus.*] Per prophetas. Grot. in loc.

‘ designed them. Which they did with prayer, and fasting, and laying on of their hands. And being sent forth by that special appointment of heaven, they went to Seleucia, and thence they sailed to the island of Cyprus.’

This text, compared with others, may cast light upon them, and be illustrated by them.

Acts xx. 22, 23, “ And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.” That is, God had declared as much by the mouth of christian prophets, in several cities, through which the apostles had already passed. Which is agreeable to what St. Luke says more particularly in the account of what happened at Cæsarea, ch. xxi. 10, 11, “ And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he came unto us, he took Paul’s girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said: Thus saith the Holy Ghost: So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owns this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.”

St. Paul speaks of Timothy’s having been ordained out of a regard to some prophecies concerning him. 1 Tim. i. 18, “ This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before concerning thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare.” And ch. iv. 14, “ Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.”

There were prophets, who, when under inspiration, had said some things to the advantage of Timothy: by which the apostle had been encouraged to bestow upon him eminent gifts, and to instate him in an important and useful office.

This enables us also to understand what is said, Acts xx. 28, ‘ Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers.’ They had been made bishops by some, who were inspired, or who had been directed in their choice by persons speaking with inspiration.

So Barnabas and Saul were sent out from Antioch, according to prophecy, with an important commission. But their designation may have been more express and solemn, than that of the others, just taken notice of by us.

11. Acts xv. 28, “ For it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden, than

these necessary things: that is, ° ‘It has seemed good to us, ‘ who have the spirit of God, or are inspired.’

12. Acts xix. 1—6, “And it came to pass, that whilst Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coast, came to Ephesus. And finding certain disciples, he said unto them: Have ye received the Holy Ghost, since ye believed? And they said unto him: We have not so much as heard, whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them: Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said: Unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul: John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard that, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied. And all the men were about twelve.”

In the preceding chapter, ver. 24, 25, we are informed of “a Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, who came to Ephesus, knowing only the baptism of John.” This likewise was the case of the men here spoken of. They were in Judea when John preached, or when he began to preach, and left it before our Lord appeared publicly. Or else they had been instructed by Apollos, or some other such person, who was not fully acquainted with the doctrine of Christ. And they knew nothing of the preaching of the apostles, and other transactions at Jerusalem, and in Judea, after our Lord’s ascension.

Dr. Wall’s explication of ver. 2. Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 164. is this: ‘We have not so much as heard whether there be any such powers of prophesying, speaking ‘ with tongues, &c. granted to those that believe.’

Which interpretation seems to me to be very right. These men did not know, or had not heard, that there was then any general pouring out of the Holy Ghost, in which they could partake. They might know, that a general effusion of extraordinary gifts had been foretold by the prophets, as the privilege of the days of the Messiah. But they had not heard, or been informed by any, that such a thing was yet vouchsafed to men: so far were they from having received it themselves.

° “Visum est enim Spiritui Sancto, et nobis.”] Id est, nobis per Spiritum Sanctum. *Ev dia devov.* Grot. in loc.

Adeo ut verborum sensus esse videatur: nobis, qui Spiritu Sancto donati sumus, visum est. Limborch in Act. Apost. p. 152. fin.

And I should think, it must appear evident to all, that in this paragraph, the Holy Ghost, wherever mentioned, that is, in Paul's question, in the answer made by these men, and the apostle's following action, denotes a power, a blessing, a privilege, and not a person.

Miraculous gifts being then very common, and generally bestowed upon those who professed faith in Jesus Christ, St. Paul meeting with these men at Ephesus, asks them: "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him: We have not so much as heard that there is any Holy Ghost. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied:" that is, when he had laid his hands upon them, they received miraculous powers, and immediately spake with tongues, and prophesied.

I shall place below, in the margin, the observations of ^r Grotius, and ^q Witsius upon this text, who speak to the same purpose, or not very differently.

13. Rom. xiv. 17, "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

The last clause, which should now be explained by me, has been differently understood. Whitby, in his annotation, says, 'it signifies an inward joy, arising from the consolations of the Holy Ghost.' And Le Clerc, 'The inward satisfaction, which we enjoy, when we live according to the spirit of the gospel.' Mr. Locke, 'Joy in the gifts and benefits of the Holy Ghost under the gospel.'

But Grotius hereby understands ^r 'a care and concern to

^p "Si Spiritum Sanctum accepistis credentes?"] Spiritus Sanctus hic, et in sequentibus, ita ut Johannis vii. 39. sunt dona ista ecclesiæ christianæ reservata; quæ Paulus haud dubium quin pluribus vocibus descriperit.

"Sed neque si Spiritus Sanctus est, audivimus."] Non audivimus dari nunc talia dona. Grot. ad Act. xix. 2.

^q Quos interrogat, 'ecquid Spiritum Sanctum accepissent postquam crederent.' Illi vero negant, audivisse se, 'situe Spiritus Sanctus.' Respondent ex catechesi majorum, quæ edocti erant, a morte Ezræ, Haggæi, Zachariæ, et Malachiæ, Spiritum Sanctum ab Israelitis esse ablatum. Porro, restitutum esse, negant sibi compertum. Palam est, non de personâ Spiritûs Sancti sed de singularibus et visibilibus illius donis utrinque sermonem esse. Wits. De Vitâ Pauli, Sect. viii. p. 107.

^r Cura exhilarandi alios per dona Spiritûs Sancti, non autem eos irritandi, quod modo dixit *λατρεω*. Grot. in loc.

Limborch, in his commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans, largely asserts the same sense. Beansobre likewise, in a few words, finely illustrates the text after this interpretation. I would also refer to Mr. Joseph Morris's Sermons, published in 1743, particularly his sermons upon 1 Thess. v. 16. "Rejoice evermore."

‘ exhilarate others, by the gifts of the spirit.’ And considers it as opposed to the grieving, offending, provoking our brother, spoken of, and cautioned against, at ver. 15.

That this is the apostle’s intention, appears, I think, from the whole argument in this chapter, and in the beginning of the next, and particularly from the nearest context, both before and after. Peace is not inward quiet of mind, but peaceableness, a love and study of peace, and doing all in our power to secure and promote it. Nor does the apostle speak of the joy which we possess ourselves, but of that which we ought to give to others. So likewise Gal. v. 22, “ The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering.” Where joy is joined with other virtues and duties toward our neighbour: and cannot mean the satisfaction which we feel ourselves, but the satisfaction which we procure to others.

St. Paul then here says, ‘ The kingdom of God does not consist in such things as meat and drink, but in the practice of righteousness, in a love and study of peace, and care to please and edify our brother by a mild and condescending behaviour, and discourses suited to his capacity, according to the doctrine of the gospel, confirmed by mighty works, and many miraculous gifts and powers bestowed upon believers in general.’ Therefore he offers that earnest prayer, chap. xv. 5, “ Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded according to Christ Jesus.” That is, according to the will and command of Christ.

14. In the twelfth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians the apostle has a long argument about spiritual gifts, or spiritual persons, as some understand the expression in ver. 1. *Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν.* Here undoubtedly, are some personalizing expressions. As ver. 11, “ But all these worketh that one and the self-same spirit, dividing to every one severally, as he will.” But then there are other expressions, by which he shows that by the Spirit he means a blessing, a gift, a power.

Ver. 7, “ But the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal:” ‘ That is, but the plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts, with which the church of God is now favoured, is designed for general good. And every one is to exercise his own particular gift in the way most conducive to the advantage of his brethren in Christ.’

And ver. 13, “ For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free. And have been all made to drink into one

spirit.” So we translate the words: but I suppose they might be better rendered in this manner.^s “For we have all been baptized with one^t spirit, that we might be one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and we have been all made to drink into one spirit.”

All believers in Jesus Christ, of every nation and people, of every rank and condition, had received the like or self-same spiritual gifts, that they might reckon themselves to be, and behave as one body; being all united together in love and friendship, in communion and worship. Moreover in the same context the apostle says, ver. 6, “And there are diversities of operations: but it is the same God which worketh all in all.” And ver. 28, “And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.”

Many interpreters have supposed, that in the phrase, “and have been all made to drink into one spirit,” the apostle alludes to the eucharistical cup. But I do not perceive any good ground for it. I think the apostle carries on the same allusion. Men were baptized with water. Receiving the spirit in a plentiful effusion is called being baptized with the spirit: and the spirit is compared to water. John vii. 37—39, and see Isa. xlv. 3, Joel ii. 18, and elsewhere. I think the apostle compares the Spirit, or the plentiful effusion of spiritual powers and gifts, such as the church of Christ was then favoured with, to a fountain or river. We have all drank at, and been refreshed out of, the same fountain.

The Syriac version of the last clause of this verse is: ‘And we have all drank in one spirit.’ Et omnes nos unum Spiritum imbibimus. The Latin version may be also observed: Et omnes in uno Spiritu potati sumus.

15. I may take this opportunity, to consider the difficult words of the third verse of this chapter. “Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed, [or anathema:] and that no man can say, that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.” ‘That is, you may be assured, that man is not ‘inspired, whatever pretences he may make, who pronounces ‘Jesus accursed. Nor can any man profess faith in Jesus,

^s Καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτισθημεν—καὶ πάντες εἰς ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτισθημεν.

^t Matt. iii. 11, “I indeed baptize you with water:—but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.” Αὐτοῦς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, καὶ πυρὶ.

‘ as the Christ and Lord of all, under God the Father, and
 ‘ recommend that faith to others, unless he has been him-
 ‘ self made partaker of miraculous powers and gifts, or seen
 ‘ miraculous works performed by others in the name of Je-
 ‘ sus.’ St. John speaks to the like purpose. 1 Epistle
 iv. 1—3.

16. 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, “ Now the Lord is that spirit.
 And where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But
 we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of
 the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to
 glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord.” Or, as others
 choose to render it, by the Lord the spirit. However, in
 both is the same sense.

Dr. Whitby will assist us in explaining these words.
 For in his Annotations upon ver. 7—11, of this chapter, he
 says: ‘ The glory of God, or of the Lord, in the Old Tes-
 ‘ tament, imports a bright light or flame included in a cloud
 ‘ styled the cloud of glory. And because this, whenever it
 ‘ appeared, was a symbol of God’s glorious presence, it is
 ‘ styled by the Jews, Shechinah, the habitation. See Ex.
 ‘ xvi. 7, 10. ch. xl. 34. This glory, saith the author of
 ‘ Cosiri, is the divine light, which God vouchsafeth to his
 ‘ people. By the Shechinah, says Elias, we understand the
 ‘ Holy Spirit. As it is evident they do, in these sayings:
 ‘ The Shechinah will not dwell with sorrowful or melan-
 ‘ choly men. The Shechinah will only dwell with a strong,
 ‘ rich, wise, and humble man. The Shechinah dwells with
 ‘ the meek. And the like.’

We should now observe the nearest context, from ver.
 12, “ Seeing then that we have such hope,” or such confi-
 dence, and well-grounded assurance, we, the apostles of
 Christ, “ use great plainness of speech,” boldly preaching
 the pure gospel of Christ, without recommending to men
 the rituals of the law. Ver. 13, “ And not as Moses, who
 put a vail over his face.”—Ver. 14, “ For until this day re-
 maineth the vail untaken away, in the reading of the Old
 Testament. Which vail is done away in Christ.” Ver. 15,
 “ But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is
 upon their hearts.” Ver. 16, “ Nevertheless, when it shall
 turn unto the Lord, the vail shall be taken away.” Ver.
 17, “ Now the Lord is that spirit, and where the spirit of
 the Lord is, there is liberty.”

Here is throughout an allusion to the history of Moses af-
 ter his receiving from God, the second time, the two tables
 of the law in the mount.

Ex. xxxiv. 29—34, “ And it came to pass, when Moses

came down from Mount Sinai—that Moses wist not, that the skin of his face shone. And when Aaron, and all the children of Israel, saw Moses, behold the skin of his face shone. And they were afraid to come nigh him. And Moses called unto them. And Aaron, and all the rulers of the congregation, returned unto him. And Moses talked with them. Afterwards all the children of Israel came nigh — And till Moses had done speaking unto them, he put a vail on his face. But when Moses went before the Lord, to speak with him, he took the vail off until he came out.”

That is what the apostle alludes to, when he says, ver. 16, 17, “ Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord,” that is, when the Jews shall come to Christ, and believe in him, “ the vail shall be taken away.” For Moses, when he went in, to appear before the Lord, took off the vail. “ Now the Lord is that spirit.” The Lord Jesus is the glory of God : and by coming to him, we are as in the divine presence, and converse without a vail. Which is what is meant by those words : “ And where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”

Then it follows in ver. 18, “ But we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord.” ‘ But it is not now with us, as it was ‘ with the Israelites of old, who only saw the face of Moses through a vail, and received no derivation of his glory upon themselves : the brightness of it, having been intercepted by the vail. No, it is not so with us. For now, ‘ we all, both Jews and Gentiles, who are followers of Jesus, and the people of God, under the gospel dispensation, ‘ “ with open [or unvailed] face, beholding as in a mirror ‘ the glory of the Lord,” seeing a strong and lively impression of the divine glory in the person of Jesus Christ, and ‘ his gospel : and there being a bright, and clear, and strong ‘ refulgence of that glory upon us, “ we are changed into ‘ the same image, from glory to glory, as by the spirit of the ‘ Lord :” we are transformed into the same likeness, which ‘ is continually increasing and improving. And the impression, made upon us, is much the same, as if we were ‘ in the divine presence, and saw the glory of God, with as ‘ near and full a manifestation, as can be admitted in the ‘ present state.’

17. 2 Cor. xiii. 14, “ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.”

The last clause may imply a wish, that those christians

might continue to partake in miraculous gifts and powers. But we have observed, that sometimes by the Spirit, or Holy Spirit, may be understood many good things, conducive to men's real happiness. Compare Matt. vii. 11, with Luke xi. 13. And see Eph. i. 3, Prov. i. 23. In this place therefore we may suppose to be hereby meant a participation of, and communion in, all the blessings of the gospel, and all other needful good things.

18. Eph. ii. 22, "In whom ye also are builded for an habitation of God through the spirit."

Dr. Jeremiah Hunt shall explain the text for us.^u

'I think,' says he, 'there is an expression made use of in respect to all believers in the first age. "Ye are the habitation of God through the spirit." We christians are the habitation of God's Shechinah, the people among whom God dwells. He dwelt as a political king with the Jews, by a sensible symbol of his presence. He dwelt with christian societies (when this doctrine was first planted) by those extraordinary gifts of the spirit. That is spoken of, in such terms, as are made use of, to express God's inhabiting among the people of Israel. He dwelt with the Jews in the tabernacle, and the temple. He dwelt with christians, in the first establishment of this religion, by the extraordinary gifts, which he imparted to the apostles, who were to found his doctrine, and to establish it. Thus far, you see, we are free from enthusiasm.

'I would farther observe, Christ promiseth those who believe in him, and keep his commandments, that he would love them, and that his Father would love them, and that they would come, and make their abode with them. John xiv. 21, 23. These expressions have been used in a wrong sense by enthusiasts. But the phrases are scriptural, and easy to be understood, "I will come, and dwell with you," There is a reference to the Shechinah, the divine glory. By the spiritual gifts, which the Father has given me power to confer, I will induce you to believe in me. You will then become the habitation of my Father. He will have communion or society with you, by those gifts, which he will enable me to impart, and by which that doctrine shall be confirmed and established.'

There are divers other texts, where christians are spoken of as the temple of God through the spirit. And in all of them there is an allusion to the presence of God among the Jewish people, and in the temple at Jerusalem.

^u See his Sermon upon Communion with God: on 1 John i. 6, 7. vol. III. p. 426, 427.

1.) 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, " Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy, which ye are."

2.) 1 Cor. vi. 19, " What, know ye not, that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which ye have of God !"

3.) 2 Cor. vi. 16, " And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols ? For ye are the temple of the living God : as God hath said : I will dwell in them, and walk in them ; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." See Lev. xxvi. 11, 12.

I would observe, that in the second of these three texts the apostle seems to speak of the spirit, as a gift : which, says he, ye have of God. Grotius says, that the Holy Ghost here is the same as the Shechinah. I shall place his note below. ^v

And upon the third, the last cited text, " ye are the temple of the living God," he says : ' Where^w God dwells, ' there is a temple. God dwells in good men by his spirit. ' They therefore are the temple of God. Nor is it without ' reason added " living." For the gods of the heathen were ' dead men.'

19. The commonness of spiritual gifts, and the ends and uses of them appear from many texts.

1.) Eph. i. 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 that Holy Spirit of promise : " or, with that Holy Spirit, which had been promised.

Upon which text Mr. Locke remarks in these words : ' The Holy Ghost was neither promised nor given to the ' heathens, who were apostates from God, and enemies, but ' only to the people of God. And therefore the converted

^v ' Spiritus Sanctus,' hic idem quod Shechinah [' Numen Divinum '] in templo. ' Totus homo ' templum Dei,' supra iii. 16, 17. Sed ' adytum ' est mens hominis : animi cæteræ partes ' basilica templi : ' corpus vero ' porticus,' cum subdialibus. Bene hunc locum explicat Tertullianus libro de Cultu Feminarum altero : ' Cum omnes templum simus Dei, illato in nos et consecrato Spiritu ' Sancto, ejus templi æditua et antistita Pudicitia est, quæ nihil immundum ac ' profanum inferri sinat, ne Deus ille, qui inhabitat, inquinatam sedem offensus ' derelinquat.'

Οὐ ἐχέτε ἀπο Θεοῦ.] Spiritus ille à Deo est multo magis quam splendor ille, qui apparebat interdum inter Cherubinos. Constructio est Græca, quæ relativo pronomini dat casum præcedentem. Grot. in loc.

^w " Vos enim estis templum Dei vivi."] Templum est, ubi Deus habitat. In piis habitat Deus per Spiritum Sanctum. Sunt igitur templum Dei. Idem sensus 1 Cor. iii. 17, et vi. 19. Nec frustra addidit ζωντος, quia dii gentium erant homines mortui. Grot. in loc.

‘ Ephesians having received it, might be assured thereby, that they were now the people of God, and might rest satisfied in this pledge of it.’

2.) Eph. ii. 18, “ For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father.” ‘ For through him we are all encouraged in our access to the Father, and are persuaded of our acceptance with him : the like miraculous gifts, which can come from God only, having been bestowed equally upon Jews and Gentiles.’

3.) Eph. iv. 30, “ And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption :” or rather, wherewith ye were sealed in the day of redemption.

The miraculous gifts and powers bestowed upon the christian church, in its early days, are enumerated in several places. Rom. xii. 6—8, 1 Cor. xii. 1—11, 28—30, xiii. 1, 2, xiv. Eph. iv. 11, 12. And see Eph. v. 18—20, Col. iii. 16, 1 Thess. v. 19—21.

These gifts and powers, bestowed upon the apostles and others, soon after our Lord’s ascension, vindicated them, and justified their preaching in his name, and enabled them to do it with success.

The pouring out of such gifts upon Cornelius, and his company, in an extraordinary manner, immediately from heaven, satisfied the apostles, that Gentiles might be received into the church, as God’s people, upon faith in Jesus Christ, without taking upon them the observation of the rituals of the law of Moses. Acts x. 44—48, xi. 15—18.

And gifts of the spirit were bestowed upon many with the imposition of the hands of the apostles. Which afforded great comfort to them,^x as it satisfied them, that they were received by God, as his people and children. This appears in several texts. Some more of which shall be here alleged.

4.) Rom. i. 11, “ For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end you may be established.” Comp. xv. 29.

5.) Rom. v. 5, “ And hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us.”

6.) Rom. viii. 15—17, “ For ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry : Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God. And if children, then heirs, heirs of God and

^x Sic et dona illa Dei, puta prophetiæ, sanationes, linguæ, ejectiones dæmonum, certos reddebant credentes, de paternâ Dei in se benevolentia. Grot. in Eph. 1. 13.

joint heirs with Christ." See also ver. 23. And compare Gal. iv. 5--7.

7.) 1 Cor. vi. 11, "And such were some of you. But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God." That is, ye have been cleansed, and sanctified by the doctrine of Christ, and have been fully assured of your acceptance with God, by the spiritual gifts conferred upon you.

8.) 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, "Now he which establisheth us with you, in Christ, and has anointed us, is God. Who has also sealed us, and given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts."

9.) 2 Cor. xi. 4, "For if he that cometh to you, preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached: or, if ye receive another Spirit, which ye have not received: or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him."

By "another spirit" the apostle cannot mean another intelligent agent: but must mean greater and more excellent spiritual gifts, than those which had been imparted to the Corinthians by himself.^y Mr. Locke's paraphrase is in these words: "Or, if you have received from him (the intruder) other, or greater gifts of the Spirit, than those you have received from me." See 1 Cor. xii.

10.) Gal. iii. 2, "This only would I learn of you. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" This is paraphrased by Mr. Locke after this manner. "This one thing I desire to know of you. Did you receive the miraculous gifts of the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the gospel preached to you?"

11.) Ver. 5, "He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Here again Mr. Locke's paraphrase is this; "The gifts of the Holy Ghost that have been conferred upon you, have they not been conferred upon you as christians, professing faith in Jesus Christ, and not as observers of the law? And hath not he, who has conveyed these gifts to you, and done miracles among you, done it as a preacher and professor of the gospel?"

By all which texts we see, how common spiritual gifts were in the churches of Christ. St. Paul, in Eph. i. 13. cited just now, useth the expression, "that holy Spirit of

^y Ἡ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβανετε, ο ἅκ ελαβετε. Aut si is vobis potiora dona Spiritus conferre potuit, quam nos per manuum impositionem vobis contulimus. Grot. in loc.

promise." Our Lord's own words are: "and behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you," Luke xxiv. 49. Again, "He commanded them, that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father: which, said he, ye have heard of me," Acts i. 4. And see ch. ii. 33.

Indeed the promise of the spirit was made to all believers in general, and not to apostles only: though to them especially, and in a greater measure than to others. The promise of the spirit is delivered by Jesus himself, by his forerunner, and by the ancient prophets, as the great blessing of the evangelical dispensation, or the privilege of the times of the Messiah.

Says our Lord's forerunner, "I baptize you with water—He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire," Matt. iii. 11. Comp. Acts i. 5, ch. xi. 16. Our Lord says, John vii. 38, 39, "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water"—And, adds the evangelist: "This he spake of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive." And Mark xvi. 17, 18, "These signs shall follow them that believe." In my name shall they cast out dæmons. They shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents. And if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." For the promises of the Old Testament, I need now refer only to Acts ii. 16—18. And St. Peter, directing and comforting those who were much affected with his first discourse after Christ's ascension, "said unto them: Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," ch. ii. 38, 39. Again: "And we are his witnesses of these things. And so also is the Holy Ghost, which God has given to them that obey him," ver. 32.

20. I shall here put together some of those texts, which contain exhortations to such as were partakers of the Holy Ghost, or had been favoured with spiritual gifts.

1.) Eph. iv. 30, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Or, "with which ye were sealed in the day of redemption." This text was quoted before, upon another account.

Here may be a reference to Is. lxiii. 10, By the "Spirit of God," the apostle means those powers and gifts with

which those christians had been sealed; and by which they might be known, both to themselves and others, to be the people of God. See Eph. i. 13, 14. In the preceding and following verses the apostle cautions the Ephesians to avoid every thing by which God might be offended, and provoked to withhold his gracious influences, or to withdraw from them the gifts that had been bestowed upon them. "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth.—Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice."

2.) Eph. v. 18, 19, "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess: but be filled with the Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing, and making melody in your heart to the Lord." 'That is, 'be careful not to be drunk with wine, in which men are 'too liable to exceed. But, when you are disposed to be 'cheerful, gratify and entertain yourselves and others, with 'a free exercise of the spiritual gifts wherewith God has 'blessed you.' Comp. Col. iv. 16.

3.) 1 Thess. v. 19—22, "Quench not the Spirit. Despise not prophesyings. Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance of evil."

'Quench not, nor damp the spiritual gifts, with which you 'have been favoured, either by a neglect of any of them, or 'by an irregular exercise of them, or by the indulgence of 'any sin. And especially, do not despise, but cherish, and 'highly esteem the gift of prophesying, or speaking by in- 'spiration for the instruction and edification of the church. 'And be sure that you take heed to, and examine what is 'proposed to you in your public assemblies. Embrace 'whatever is right and good, and reject every thing that is 'evil.'

The comment of Grotius upon these words, "Quench not the Spirit," is to this purpose.^z By "the Spirit" are meant the gifts of healing, and of tongues, which are fitly compared to fire. And therefore may be said to be "stirred up," as in 2 Tim. i. 6. and on the other hand to be extinguished. They are stirred up by prayer, giving of thanks, and a continued regular practice of piety. And are ex-

^z Το πνευμα μη σβεννυτε.] Spiritus hic sunt dona sanationum et linguarum, quæ sicut in ignis formâ data erant, ita igni recte comparantur, ac proinde dicuntur, et *suscitari*, 2 Tim. i. 6, et contra, *extingui*. *Suscitantur* precibus, gratiarum actione, ac perpetuo studie pietatis: *extinguuntur* per contrariâ. Nam in Novo Testamento, maxime post constitutas ecclesias, Deus illa dona non vult dare aut servare, nisi credentibus, et pie viventibus. Vide Marc. xvi. 17. Grot. in loc.

tinguished by the contrary. For God, under the evangelical dispensation, does not vouchsafe, or at least continue those gifts to any but such as believe, and live piously. See Mark xvi. 17.

And Wolfius says, that^a by “the Spirit,” undoubtedly, are meant gifts of the Spirit, who is sometimes compared to fire, as 2 Tim. i. 6.

The apostle having delivered that direction, “Quench not the Spirit,” relating to spiritual gifts in general, adds a particular caution, “Despise not prophesyings,” because, though it was the most useful and valuable gift of all, some, as it seems, were apt to prefer “speaking with tongues,” as a more showy gift. This may be collected from what he writes, 2 Cor. xiv. And see particularly ver. 39.

“Abstain from all appearance of evil.” Many understand this to be a direction, relating to practice in life, agreeably to our version; that christians should not only abstain from what is really, and manifestly evil, but also from every thing that has but the appearance of being evil. And so Grotius understood this clause.^b But to me it seems, that this last clause is to be understood in connection with the former part, “prove all things:” and that it is intended to direct the right exercise of the judgment. Christians should examine all things proposed to them, embracing what is right, and rejecting every thing that is wrong. So this exhortation was understood by Pelagius.^c And Grotius himself interprets the former expressions, “prove all things, and hold fast that which is good,” in the like manner.^d

4.) 1 Tim. iv. 14, “Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.”

5.) 2 Tim. i. 6, “Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.”

^a Quod ad rem spectat, το πνευμα omnia sunt dona Spiritus Sancti qui cum igne solet comparari, quo sensu Paulus, 2 Tim. i. 6, αναζωπυρειν το χαρισμα Θεου jubet. Wolf. Curæ in 1 Th. v. 19.

^b Απο παντος ειδος πονηριω απεχετε.] Christiani non a rebus malis tantum, sed ab iis, quæ speciem habent mali, abstinere debent. Exemplum vide, 1 Cor. viii. 10. Grot. in 1 Thess. v. 21.

^c Tantum, ut probetis, si legi non sunt contraria, quæ dicuntur: si quid tale fuerit, refutate. Pelag. in 1 Thess. v. 21, 22. Ap. Hieron. Opp. T. V. p. 1082.

^d Παντα δοκιμαζοντες, το καλον κατεχετε. Hoc pertinet ad διακρισεις πνευματων. 1 Cor. xii. xiv. Sic 1 Joh. iv. 1. Δοκιμαζετε τα πνευματα—Ergo παντα, omnia, hic restringendum ex antecedente ad ea quæ dicuntur ab eis, qui se prophetas dicitant. Grot. ad ver. 20.

I take no notice of any other texts of this kind. But it is well known, that the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of the first epistle to the Corinthians contain many directions for regulating the exercise of spiritual gifts, with which that church abounded. It is sufficient for me to refer to them. There are likewise in other epistles of the New Testament divers exhortations to christians in regard to the gifts, with which they were favoured: as Rom. xii. 3—8. 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11.

21. 1 Thess. i. 5, “ For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance” — ver. 6, “ And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost.”

The explication of this text shall be taken from Dr. Benson’s paraphrase on the epistle. ‘ In as much as the gospel, ‘ preached by us, did not come unto you in word only ; but ‘ was accompanied also with a miraculous power, and with ‘ our imparting unto you the Holy Spirit, and with full and ‘ abundant conviction to your minds.’

— ‘ And we can bear witness to your amiable behaviour, ‘ For you became imitators of us, and of the Lord Jesus ‘ Christ: in that you steadily adhered to the truth, amidst ‘ great difficulties and discouragements, after you had re- ‘ ceived the gospel, in much affliction, with the joy, which ‘ ariseth from your having the Holy Spirit.’ The same learned writer, in his note upon the fifth verse, says: ‘ By ‘ power I understand the power of working miracles, ex- ‘ erted by the apostle, or his assistants. And by the Holy ‘ Ghost, or Holy Spirit, I understand the gift of the Spirit, ‘ as imparted to the Thessalonians.’

22. Heb. ix. 14, “ How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?”

Dr. Whitby, in his Annotations upon Heb. v. 5. says, that Christ was by his death consecrated to his priesthood, and dates the commencement of our Lord’s priesthood at his resurrection. This sentiment has been much improved by the late Mr. Thomas Moore in his discourse concerning the priesthood of Christ. I may refer to one place particularly, where he says, ‘ The time, when Jesus was called to, ‘ and invested with, the order of priesthood, was at his re- ‘ surrection from the dead.’ Which he argues from Heb. v. 10, compared with Acts xiii. 33. See him, p. 11—13.

That may be the key to this text. However, there are

some other interpreters, who have well explained it, as we shall see presently, though they have not so distinctly settled the date of Christ's priesthood.

“How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience — ?”

When our Lord offered himself to God, or presented himself before God, he was risen from the dead, and had obtained everlasting life, “to die no more,” as St. Paul says, Rom. vi. 9. 10. And in Ps. cx. 4, the only place in the Old Testament, where Christ's priesthood is spoken of, it is said: “The Lord has sworn, and will not repent: thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.” This the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews often observes, and insists much upon. As Heb. vii. 21, where the text of that Psalm is quoted, see also ver. 11. And at ver. 24, 25, “But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him: seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.” And ver. 15, 16, of the same chapter: “For that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.” And ch. v. 9, “And being made perfect, he became the Author of eternal salvation to them that obey him.” And ver. 12, of this ch. ix. just before the text, which we are now considering, he speaks of Christ's “having obtained eternal redemption for us.” And ver. 15,—“that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.” And in 1 Cor. xv. 45, “The last Adam,” meaning the Lord Jesus, is said to be “a quickening Spirit.”

The meaning of this text therefore seems to be this: ‘That Christ being now “entered into heaven itself,” ch. ix. 24, that is, the true holy of holies, by his own never-dying spirit, or by “the power of an endless life,” ch. vii. 16, he “offered himself to God,” or presented himself before God, having been innocent, and unspotted in his whole life on earth, and being now “made perfect, and higher than the heavens.”’ Ch. v. 9, and vii. 26, 28.

Which is very agreeable to the annotations of Grotius upon this verse.^e

^e Oblatio autem Christi hic intelligitur illa, quæ oblationi legali in adyto factæ respondet. Ea autem est non oblatio in altari crucis facta, sed facta in

There are some others likewise, who have so pertinently criticised upon this text, that I am willing to transcribe their remarks below, for the sake of intelligent readers.^f

23. Heb. x. 28, 29, "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and has counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and has done despite unto the spirit of grace?"

The case here supposed is that of apostasy from the christian faith. The persons intended are such as those spoken of, ch. vi. 4, "Who have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were partakers of the Holy Ghost." And one of the aggravations of their apostasy is, that "they had done despite to the spirit of grace:" or rejected, and cast reproach upon that great evidence of the truth of the christian religion, the miraculous gifts, which God had most graciously bestowed upon

adyto cœlesti. Facta autem ibi est, "per Spiritum æternum," ut ante dixit, vii. 16, "per vim vitæ indissolubilis," quia spiritus ejus jam non erat vivens tantum, ut in vitâ hac terrenâ, sed in æternum corpus sibi adjunctum "vivificans." 1 Cor. xv. 45.—*Δια* hic sume, ut supra, ver. 12. pro præpositione *cum*, quomodo et Hebræum *ב* poni solet. Intelligitur hinc dignitas oblationis, quod eam fecit is, qui jam spiritu et corpore erat immortalis. Sanguini autem purgatio ista tribuitur, quia per sanguinem, id est, mortem Christi, secutâ ejus excitatione et evectione, gignitur in nobis fides. Rom. iii. 25.—Cum dicit *αρωμον*, respicit legem victimarum, Lev. xxii. 20. In victimis legalibus nullum debebat esse corporis vitium: in Christi vitâ nihil fuit vitiosum. Et ideo spiritu illo æterno statim donatus est. Grot. Annot. in Heb. ix. 14.

^f *Ὁς δια πνευματος αιωνιου.*] Qui a mortuis suscitatus, cum spirituali et immortalis corpore (quod antequam in cœleste tabernaculum ingrederetur, accepit) omnis infirmitatis et patibilitatis labe, quæ mortali naturæ inhærent, purgatum semetipsum obtulit Deo, sedens ad dexteram majestatis ejus in cœlis. Brennius in loc.

Christum autem, cujus sanguinem opponit sanguini taurorum et hircorum, describit, quod "per spiritum æternum seipsum Deo immaculatum obtulerit." Christo jam e mortuis suscitato tribuit "spiritum æternum:" quia post resurrectionem anima ejus non amplius est anima vivens, sed spiritus vivificans. 1 Cor. xv. 45, diciturque habere vitam indissolubilem, supra, vii. 16, et in æternum manere, ver. 24. Vivit ergo in omnem æternitatem, ut sit æternus Pontifex. Christus nimirum sanguinem suum, tanquam victima, in cruce effudit, et eum isto sanguine, id est, virtute illius sanguinis, jam e mortuis suscitatus, et spiritus vivificus ac æternus, seipsum in cœlis obtulit Deo, id est, coram Deo pro nobis comparuit.

Dicitur autem hic "se obtulisse immaculatum," non tantum respectu vitæ suæ, quam hic in terris degit, quâtenus sine ullâ peccati labe vixit. 1 Pet. ii. 22, 2 Cor. v. 21, sed et respectu statûs illius cœlestis, quo nunc fruitur, ab omni infirmitate, cui hic in terris in statu humiliationis obnoxius fuit, adeo ut nihil in ipso, ut æternus sit Pontifex, desiderari possit. Vid. cap. vii. 26. Ph. Limborch in Ep. ad Heb. cap. ix. 14.

themselves and others. So^g Grotius. And Limborch expresseth himself to the like purpose.^h

24. 1 John v. 5—10, “Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood. And these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God, which he has testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself. He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record, that God gave of his Son.”

I have quoted this passage according to the Alexandrian, and other ancient manuscripts, and the citations in ancient writers, without regarding any modern printed copies; which, indeed, deserve not any regard.

Some have paraphrased the former part of ver. 6. in this manner. ‘Now that this Jesus Christ was a real man, and ‘died, we have the utmost testimony. For I myself, when ‘he expired on the cross, saw his side pierced with a spear, ‘and blood and water gush out at the wound; which are ‘two determining proofs that he really died.’ Supposing, that here is a reference to what is related in St. John’s gospel, xix. 34, 35.

But that is manifestly a weak and arbitrary interpretation.ⁱ St. John is not here observing the proofs of our Lord’s real humanity, but of his being the Son of God, the Messiah.

To me it seems, that the water, an emblem of purity, [Ezek. xxxvi. 25.] denotes the innocence of our Lord’s life, which was without spot, and exemplary; and the reasonableness, excellency, and perfection of his doctrine, which,

^g Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας: ‘et spiritui gratiæ contumeliam fecerit.’ Spiritum illum, quem summo Dei beneficio acceperat, contumeliâ afficiens: nullius pretii æstimans tantum donum, quo se ipse ait privatum. Grot. in loc.

^h Tertium. ‘Et spiritum gratiæ contumeliâ affecit. Spiritus gratiæ’ est spiritus ille, qui in initio prædicationis evangelii datus fuit credentibus, ad confirmationem divinitatis evangelii: nimirum dona illa extraordinaria spiritus sancti, quæ passim in Actis et epistolis Apostolorum in credentes effusa legimus. Qui vocatur spiritus gratiæ, tum quia ex gratiâ divinâ credentibus datus est; tum quia per illum obsignata fuit divinitas doctrinæ Jesu Christi, in quâ maxima et excellentissima Dei gratia patefacta est. Limb. in Ep. ad Heb. p. 667.

ⁱ And yet it is followed by the late Mr. Wetstein: Probavit se non phantasma, sed verum hominem esse, qui ex spiritu, sanguine, et aquâ seu humore constaret. Joh. xix. 34, 35. J. J. Wetstein in loc. p. 721.

after the strictest examination, and nicest scrutiny, cannot be charged with any error or falsehood. The blood denotes our Lord's willing and patient, though painful and ignominious death, the utmost testimony that can be given of integrity. The Spirit intends our Lord's many miraculous works, wrought by the Spirit, the finger, the power of God, or God himself. This testimony is truth, that is, exceeding true, so that it may be relied upon. For it is unquestionable, and cannot be gainsayed. See John v. 32—37; ch. x. 25; Acts ii. 22.

Here are three witnesses.^k And "they agree in one." They are harmonious, all saying the same thing, and concurring in the same testimony.

The apostle adds, ver. 9, "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater:" referring to the appointment in the law of Moses, that by "the mouth of two or three witnesses any matter might be established," Deut. xvii. 6, and xix. 15. Whatsoever was attested by two or three men, was deemed true and certain. In the point before us there are three most credible witnesses, one of whom is God himself. Refusing this testimony therefore would be the same, as making God a liar, or charging him with giving false evidence, and with a design to deceive, and impose upon his creatures. "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the testimony which God giveth of his Son."

This interpretation is the same as that in Grotius,^l or not very different.

25. Rev. xxii. 17, "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come." 'That is, says^m Grotius, men who are endowed 'with spiritual gifts.'

Mr. Pyle's paraphrase is this: 'The whole body of truly 'good christians, who are the true church and spouse of 'Christ.' And in his notes he says, "The Spirit and the 'bride," or "the spiritual bride," that is, the true church of 'Christ. Thus "grace and truth" is a truth conveying 'the greatest favour. John i. 17. "Glory and virtue, is 'glorious virtue or power. 2 Pet. i. 3. "kingdom and glory,"

^k Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες. κ. λ. I shall here put down a similar expression of the Sophist Ælius Aristides, in the second century. Oration T. I. p. 146. edit. Jebb. al. p. 272. Τρεῖς γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦσαντες παραχρημα Ἀθηναίων εἶναι τὴν νικην, Ἀθηναῖοι, Λακεδαιμόνιοι, Βοιωτοί.

^l Et in epistolâ 1 Joh. v. 8, 'Aqua' est puritas vitæ christianæ, quæ simul cum martyrio, et miraculis, testimonium reddit veritati dogmatis. Grot. Anii. in Joh. iii. 5.

^m Id est, viri prophetici donis clari. Vide supra, ver. 6. Est abstractum pro concreto; spiritus pro habentibus spiritum. Dicunt: Veni. &c. Grot. in loc.

‘ a glorious kingdom. 1 Thess. ii. 12. Had the generality of commentators observed this, they would not have had occasion to interpret this of the “ Holy Spirit of God wishing,” [and] praying for the coming of Christ’s kingdom, in the same manner, and with the same ardency as St. John and the christian church here does. Which to me seems very incongruous.’ So Mr. Pyle, whose interpretation is approved by Mr. Lowman.

Breniusⁿ is not very different. Or, as some^o other interpreters express it, “ The Spirit and the bride;” that is, ‘ the church animated by the Spirit, and ardently longing for the coming of Christ.’

Every one may perceive, that we have been discoursing of miraculous gifts and powers; which now are, and for a long time have been, commonly called extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. These are not saving. They who received such gifts after baptism, and profession of faith in Jesus Christ, were thereby satisfied that the doctrine of Christ was true, and from heaven. And they were assured, that if they acted according to that faith, they might be saved, without observing the peculiarities of the law of Moses. But such gifts alone were not saving, without sincere virtue, and the practice of a good life.

So says St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, “ But covet earnestly the best gifts. Τα χαρισματα τα κρειττονα. And yet show I unto you a more excellent way, Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge: and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.” The same might be said of the necessity of sobriety, and humility, and meekness, or any other virtue, that is there said of charity or love. And perhaps all social virtue is comprehended by the apostle in the one virtue here mentioned by him. For in another place he says: “ Love is the fulfilling of the law,” Rom. xiii. 8—10.

And that all virtues ought to be joined together, and carefully cultivated by those who make a profession of the christian religion, is shown by St. Peter. “ And beside this,” says he, “ giving all diligence, add to your faith

ⁿ Spiritus qui est in Sponsâ, vel Sponsa per spiritum, qui in ipsâ residet, dicit: id est, credentium omnium vota, tum separatim tum conjunctim, hoc idem contendunt. Bren. in loc.

^o C’est à dire, l’Espouse, qui est l’église, animée du S. Esprit, et soupirant ardemment après l’apparition de J. C. L’Enf. et Beaus.

virtue, [or fortitude,] and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness.—For so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” 2 Pet. i. 5—10.

CONCLUSION. I have now finished what I proposed at the beginning of this postscript, having explained, according to my ability, those words, the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of God, as used in the scriptures.

Many of the interpretations, which have been given by me, will be readily assented to by all. If any others should not be approved of at first, I hope no offence needs to be taken. I do not dictate; but with humility and deference recommend these thoughts to the consideration of my brethren in Christ Jesus.

It becomes us all to examine the doctrines, which are proposed to us. We should not be christians and protestants upon the same grounds, that others are Mahometans and papists: barely because such or such opinions are generally received and established in the country where we live.

Our blessed Lord and his apostles have forewarned us, that men would arise, teaching perverse things; that tares would be mingled with the good grain, and error with truth. The event has been accordingly. If there are any notions concerning a Trinity of Divine Persons, which are not right and just: if transubstantiation is not a reasonable and scriptural doctrine: if the worship of angels, and departed saints, and of their images, is not required and commanded, but condemned and forbidden, in the Old and New Testament: it must be allowed, that corruptions have been brought into the christian church. For such things there are among those, who are called christians.

What is to be done in this case? Are they, who discern such corruptions, obliged to acquiesce? Would it be sin, to show, how unreasonable and unscriptural such things are? I do not see how this can be said, provided it be done with meekness and gentleness.

Plato, in his *Timæus*, says, ‘That^p it is very difficult to find out the author and parent of the universe, and when found, it is impossible to declare him to all.’ Cicero, who translated that work of Plato into Latin, renders the last

^p Τον μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τῆδε τῆ παντὸς εὐρεῖν τε ἐργόν, καὶ εὐροντα, εἰς πάντα, ἀδύνατον λέγειν. Platon. *Timæus*. p. 28. T. III. Serran. et ap. Fabr. p. 336.

clause, as if Plato had said : ‘ When⁹ you have found him, ‘ it is unlawful to declare him to the vulgar.’ Perhaps, that was Cicero’s own sentiment. Being a statesman, and politician, as well as a philosopher, he might be more concerned for peace than truth. A multitude of deities being the prevailing belief, he was afraid to oppose the prejudices of the people, who might be offended at the doctrine of the divine unity with its consequences. But so it should not be among christians, who, beside the light of nature, have also the light of revelation.

Says the Psalmist : “ In Judah is God known. His name is great in Israel,” Ps. lxxvi. 1. It was their great privilege, and happiness, that God was known among them, and worshipped, and served by them ; when heathen people were ignorant of the true God, and worshipped senseless idols. That distinction was owing to the revelation, which God had made of himself to Abraham, and his descendants. Which benefit we also now enjoy, together with the clearer and fuller revelation of God and his will, which has been made by our blessed Saviour, the promised Messiah. See John i. 18 ; iv. 23, 24 ; xvii. 25, 26.

Says that most excellent teacher of men in an address to the Father : “ And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,” John xvii. 3.

The right knowledge of God and Christ therefore must be the greatest of blessings, and should be sought after in the first place, and be prized above all things. And wherever the benefit of it is obstructed by wrong notions, it may be the duty of some to give, and of others to receive, instruction ; that God may be glorified, and men may be edified, and saved.

The scriptures are acknowledged to be the fountain of religious knowledge. Accordingly some there have been among us, and in our own times, who have endeavoured to give a clear account of the scripture-doctrine, concerning God and Christ ; men of unquestioned piety, and eminent for natural and acquired abilities. And though their schemes have not been exactly the same, and they have not all had equal success and acceptance, it must be acknowledged, that their writings have been very useful. They have kept up, and cherished a spirit of inquiry and thoughtfulness in things of religion. And they have promoted knowledge, moderation, candour, and equity, among chris-

⁹ ———et cum jam inveneris, indicare in vulgus nefas.

tians. And may such excellent dispositions prevail among us yet more and more.

Saith the venerable Dr. Sherlock, bishop of London, in the fourth volume^r of his Discourses, lately published, p. 321, 322, ‘From these things laid together it is evident, ‘that the apostles were witnesses and teachers of the faith, ‘and had no authority to add any thing to the doctrine of ‘Christ, or to declare new articles of faith.

‘Now if the apostles, commissioned directly by Christ ‘himself, and supported by miraculous gifts of the spirit, ‘had not this power, can any of their successors in the government of the church, without great impiety, pretend to ‘it? Did the bishops and clergy of the ninth and tenth ‘centuries know the articles of the faith better than the ‘apostles did? Or were they more powerfully assisted by ‘the Holy Spirit? No christian can think it, or say it. ‘Whence is it then that the church of Rome has received ‘the power they pretend to, of making new articles of faith, ‘and dooming all to eternal destruction who receive them ‘not? Can any sober, serious christian trust himself to such ‘guides, and not tremble, when he reads the woe denounced ‘by St. Paul: “Though we, or an angel from heaven, ‘preach any other gospel—let him be accursed?” Gal. i. 8.’

Certainly that is a noble declaration, and well deserving the regard of all christians.

His lordship here allows, or even asserts the rights of private judgment. He supposes, that common christians, who have no share in the government of the church, are able to understand the doctrine delivered by the apostles, and the determinations of bishops, and to compare them together, and to discern wherein they differ. And he allows us to reject new articles, not delivered and taught by Christ’s apostles. And strongly represents to us the great hazard of trusting to such assuming guides, as make and impose new articles of faith.

If we may judge of articles, taught by the bishops and clergy of the ninth and tenth centuries; we may for the same reason judge concerning those decreed by the bishops and clergy of the fourth and fifth centuries—For neither were they apostles, but at the utmost no more than successors of the apostles. And if it should appear, that they taught and recommended any articles, which are no part of “the faith, once delivered to the saints” by Christ’s apostles, such articles may be rejected by us.

^r It is the twelfth discourse in that volume. The text is the epistle of St. Jude, ver. 3, latter part.

And since it is allowed, that the bishops and clergy of the ninth and tenth centuries have assumed an authority to decide new articles, to which they had no right; should not this put christians upon their guard, and induce them to examine the doctrine proposed to them, and consider, whether it is the faith once delivered to the saints, or somewhat added to it? For what has been done, or attempted, in some ages, may have been attempted in others.

His lordship blames the church of Rome for making new articles of faith, and dooming all to eternal destruction, who receive them not.

We should be impartial. If any others do the like, are not they blameable also? It is well known, that there is a creed, in great authority with many, beside the church of Rome, containing an abstruse doctrine, very hard to be believed. And it would be a very difficult undertaking to show, that it adds not any thing to the doctrine of Christ, as taught and testified by his faithful apostles. And yet it is there said: ‘This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.’ And, ‘which faith, except every man do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.’ Can this be justified? And does not the bishop’s argument just recited, oblige me to add, though unwillingly, May it not deserve to be considered by every sober and serious christian, who solemnly recites that creed, on whom those anathemas may fall, if God should treat men according to strict justice!

But I forbear enlarging. For I have been desirous, if possible, not to say any thing offensive. Therefore I do not indulge myself in grievous complaints, and severe reprehensions of such things, as by many have been thought to be wrong.

But, if I might be permitted to do it, I would take notice of one thing, because it has a connection with the subject of this postscript.

‘Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost: as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.’

Doubtless this is said by many very frequently, and with great devotion. But can it be said truly? Does not that deserve consideration? Is there any such doxology in the New Testament? If not, how can it be said to have been ‘in the beginning?’ Are not the books of the New Testament the most ancient, and the most authentic christian writings in all the world? It matters not much to inquire when this doxology was first used, or how long it has been

in use, if it be not in the New Testament. And whether it is there, or not, may be known by those, who are pleased to read it with care; as all may, in Protestant countries, where the Bible lies open to be seen and read by all men.

I would therefore, after many others, recommend the diligent study of the scriptures, and the making use of all proper means for gaining the true sense of them. If we had the knowledge of the christian religion, as contained in the scriptures, the advantages would be great and manifold. Jesus would be unspeakably amiable; and the gospel would appear to be a pearl of great price: christians would be no longer wavering and unsettled, but would be firmly established in a faith, that is throughout reasonable and excellent, and well attested to be of divine original. As our Lord says to the woman of Samaria, John iv. 14, "Who-soever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst." He will be fully satisfied. He will desire no other instruction concerning the right way of worshipping and serving God, or obtaining true happiness. "But the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life."

If we would sincerely study, heartily embrace, and openly profess the christian doctrine in its purity, and would diligently recommend it to others, upon the ground of that evidence, with which God hath clothed it, we should gain upon deists and infidels of all sorts. For a religion, reasonable and excellent in all its principles, promulged by a teacher of an unspotted character, with a commission from heaven, confirmed by many mighty works, which could be performed by God only, has an evidence, which cannot be easily withstood and gainsayed. But no authority can recommend falsehood and absurdity to rational beings, who think and consider. Every one therefore, who loves the Lord Jesus in sincerity, must be willing to reform abuses and corruptions, which have been introduced into the christian profession, and are matter of offence to heathens and infidels.

When the religion professed by christians shall be in all things agreeable to the scriptures, the only standard of religious truth; the advantages just mentioned, are very likely: as also divers others, which may be readily apprehended by every one. For then the papal power and tyranny, which for many ages has been a heavy weight upon Christendom, will sink, and fall to the ground: impositions upon conscience, which undermine religion at the very foundation, and prevail at present to a great degree in almost all

christian countries, will be abolished. The consequence of which will be, that true piety and virtue will be more general in all ranks and orders of men. The great diversity of opinions, and fierce contentions among christians, which are now so great an offence and scandal to by-standers, will cease; christians will live in harmony, and will love one another as brethren. And the church of Christ will be the joy and the praise of the whole earth.

As an unbiassed and disinterested love and pursuit of truth are of great importance, and would mightily conduce to the good ends and purposes which are so desirable; I cannot but wish, that we did all of us less mind our own things, the things of our own worldly wealth and credit, our own church and party, and more the things of Jesus Christ. To whom be glory and dominion now and ever. Amen.

THE

SECOND POSTSCRIPT.

CONTAINING REMARKS UPON THE THIRD PART OF THE
LATE BISHOP OF CLOGHER'S VINDICATION OF THE HIS-
TORIES OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.^a

LETT. iv. p. 59, or 425.^b ‘But, my lord, supposing we
‘should allow, that there were more Gods than one con-

^a When I was preparing these remarks in March last, 1758, we received the tidings of the death of the Right Reverend Dr. Robert Clayton, Lord Bishop of Clogher, who departed this life the preceding month; which gave me much concern upon divers accounts. In particular, I was in hopes, that these remarks, such as they are, might be perused by his lordship. I could wish likewise, that Mr. Whiston were still living. But they are both removed out of this world, as I likewise shall be in a short time. And certainly, it behoves us all to improve diligently the season of life whilst it lasts, and to serve God and man according to the ability which God has given us, and the station in which we have been placed, that we may give up an account of our stewardship with joy, and not with grief. Though those eminent and useful men are now no more in this world, their writings remain. It is with these I am concerned. If I have inadvertently misrepresented them, I presume, they have friends who are able to vindicate them. And, if my argument does not appear conclusive, I wish that they, or some others, may show wherein it fails. Jan. 25, 1759.

^b The author, in composing these remarks upon the third part of the bishop's Vindication, made use of that edition which was printed at London in 1758.

cerned in the creation of the world, as manifestly appears that there were, from Gen. i. 26, and ch. iii. 22, where it is said; "Let us make man in our image." And, "behold, the man is become as one of us."

Is then creative power a property communicable to many or several? St. Paul speaks of one Creator only, Rom. i. 25, and blames the heathens, "who worshipped, and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen." What then would be the consequences, if christians should come to believe, that there are more creators than one?

It is hard, that we should be put to prove, what is so very evident, as that there is one God creator. However, I shall here prove it from the Old and New Testament.

Ex. xx. 1, "And God spake all these words, saying— Ver. 3, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." Ver. 10, 11, "But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God—For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is."

Ps. cxxxvi, "O, give thanks to the Lord, to him, who alone doth great wonders, to him that by wisdom made the heavens, to him that stretched out the earth above the waters; to him that made great lights, the sun to rule by day, the moon and stars to rule by night," &c.

Isa. xlii. 5, "Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it: he that giveth breath to the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein."

Isa. xl. 28, "Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, nor is weary?"

Ch. xliv. 24, "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb; I am the Lord, that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." See also ch. xlv. 11, 12; ch. li. 12, 13; Jer. x. 12; ch. li. 15, and elsewhere.

Let us now consider the words of Gen. i. 26, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."

Some christians have said that here is a proof of a trinity of persons in the unity of the Godhead. The learned

But another edition of the whole Vindication, with all the three parts, having been published here on the twenty-third day of this instant January, 1759, just as these sheets were going to the press, he has taken care to add the pages of this new edition to those of the former.

writer, now before us, argues hence for several creators, one supreme, another or several subordinate. But it is easy to answer, that the Jewish people never understood these expressions after that manner; for they always believed one God and Creator, and that God to be one person. And many learned interpreters among christians have said, that^c the style, common with princes, and other great men, who often speak in the plural number, is here ascribed to God. Nor needs the consultation, here represented, be supposed to be between equals. But God may be rather understood to declare his mind to the angels, as his counsellors.

But indeed we need not suppose any discourse, or consultation at all. The meaning is no more than this. ‘All other things being made, God proceeded to the creation of man; or, he now proposed, at the conclusion, to make man.’ And it may be reckoned probable, that Moses introduces God, in this peculiar manner, deliberating and consulting upon the creation of man, to intimate thereby, that he is the chief of the works of God. Or, in other words, according to Patrick, ‘God not only reserved man for the last of his works, but does, as it were, advise, and consult, and deliberate about his production: the better to represent the dignity of man, and that he was made with admirable wisdom and prudence.’

We may be confirmed in the reasonableness of this way of thinking, by observing the style made use of in speaking of all the other parts of the creation, which is to this effect. “God said, Let there be light, and there was light. God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters—And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind.”

There is another like instance, ch. ii. 18, “And the Lord God, [Jehovah, Elohim,] said, It is not good that the man should be alone. I will make him an help meet for him.” The design of the other expressions, as before observed, was to intimate the great dignity and superior excellence of man above the other creatures, whose formation has been already related. In like manner, when God proceeds to the making of the woman, he is represented as consulting, and resolving what to do; that the man might be the more sensible of the goodness of the Creator in providing for him so suitable a help.

Moreover, though in Gen i. 26, the words are: “And

^c ‘Faciamus.’] Mos est Hebræis de Deo, ut de Rege, loqui. Reges res magnas agunt de consilio primorum. 1 Reg. xii. 6, 2 Paral. x. 9. Sic et Deus 1 Reg. xxii. 20. Grot. ad Gen. i. 26.

God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness:" the execution of that purpose, as related in ver. 27, is in these words: "So God created man in his own image: in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." And when the formation of man is mentioned in other places of scripture, no intimation is given that more than one had a hand in his creation. See particularly Matt. xix. 3—6, Mark x. 2—9, where our blessed Lord himself says: "From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." And "what God has joined together, let no man put asunder." For certain therefore man, as well as the other creatures, was made by God himself.

If more than one being had been concerned in the creation of man, or any other parts of the world, we ought to have been acquainted with it, that due respect might be paid to them by us. As scripture is here silent, no man has a right to ascribe that to another which the scripture ascribes to God alone. And wherein, as in Ps. cxlviii. all beings, of every rank, in heaven and on earth, are required to praise God for the wonders of their formation. "Praise ye the Lord: praise him from the heavens; praise him all ye his angels; praise ye him all his hosts; praise ye him sun and moon; praise him all ye stars of light—Let them praise the name of the Lord. For he commanded, and they were created—Kings of the earth, and all people: princes, and all judges of the earth—Let them praise the name of the Lord; for his name alone is excellent; and his glory is above the earth and heaven."

Ecc. xii. 1, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth." In the Hebrew the word is plural, Creators. Nevertheless, not only our own, but all other versions translate, and rightly, Creator.

Και μνησθητι τε κτισαντος σε εν ημεραις νεοτητος σε. Gr.

Memento Creatoris tui in diebus juventutis tuæ. Lat.

Isa. liv. 5, "For thy Maker is thy husband." In the Hebrew, literally, "for thy Makers are thy husbands." Nevertheless the words are always understood as singular. And what follows, shows that one person is only intended; "the Lord of hosts is his name."

Calvin's remark upon Gen. iii. 22, is to this purpose: 'Whereas,' says he, 'many christians from this place draw the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Deity; I fear their argument is not solid.' *Quod autem eliciunt ex hoc loco christiani doctrinam de tribus in Deo personis, vereor ne satis firmum sit argumentum.*

But Patrick says: ‘Those words plainly insinuate a plurality of persons. And all other interpretations seem forced and unnatural.’ And he particularly rejects what Calvin says.

For my part, so far as I am able to judge, if those words implied more Divine Persons than one, or more Creators than one; it would not be worth while to dispute, whether they are equal, or not.

But, as before intimated, I rather think, that here, and in some other like texts, there is a reference to the angelic order of beings, supposed to be more perfect, and more knowing than man. For though Moses gives no particular account of the creation of angels, their existence is supposed in divers parts of this history. And they may be considered as counsellors only, or witnesses and attendants.

And I cannot help being of opinion, that those christians, who endeavour to prove, from the Old Testament, a Trinity of Divine Persons, or more Creators than one, whether co-equal or subordinate, expose themselves to the unbelieving part of the Jewish people, whom they are desirous to gain. For the Divine unity is with them a fundamental article of religion. Remarkable are the words of Lord King, in his *Critical History of the Apostles’ Creed*, upon the first article of it, p. 55, 56. ‘As for the persons, who were condemned by this clause, it will be readily granted, that they were not the Jews, seeing the unity of the Godhead is every where inculcated in the Mosaical law, and the body of that people have been so immoveably fixed and confirmed in the belief thereof, that now, throughout their sixteen hundred years’ captivity and dispersion, they have never quitted or deserted that principle, that God is one; as is evident from their thirteen articles of faith composed by Maimonides, the second whereof is the Unity of the blessed God. Which is there explained to be in such a peculiar and transcendent manner, as that nothing like it can be found. And in their liturgy, according to the use of the Sepharadim, or the Spaniards, which is read in those parts of the world, in their synagogues, in the very first hymn, which is an admiring declaration of the excellences of the Divine Nature, the repeated chorus is this: All creatures, both above and below, testify and witness, all of them as one, that the Lord is one, and his name one.’

And if we would but read the New Testament with care, and then consider what we have read and seen therein; we might know, that one object of worship is there recommended by Christ and his apostles, and that he is the ever-

lasting God, the Creator of the world and all things therein, and the same who was worshipped by the Jewish people, and their ancestors.

Our Lord himself says, that he came in his Father's name, and acted by his authority, even his, who, the Jews said, was their God. And he styles him 'Lord of heaven and earth, and the only true God.' And he referred them to their scriptures, as testifying of him.

The apostles of Christ after his ascension, preaching to the Jews, say: "The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, has glorified his Son Jesus," Acts iii. 13. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus," chap. v. 3. And requesting special assistance from heaven in their work, and under their many difficulties, "they lift up their voice to God, and said: Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is. Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said,"—chap. iv. 24, 25.

Paul, writing to the Jewish believers, says: "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has, in these last days, spoken unto us by his Son," Heb. i. 1, 2. He and Barnabas, teaching Gentiles, say: "We preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein," Acts xiv. 15. And at Athens, says Paul: "God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands," chap. xvii. 29.

I think I have now proved, both from the Old and the New Testament, that there is one God, Creator of man and all things in the world.^d

Accordingly, the first article in the apostle's creed, which ought never to be diminished, or enervated, is this: 'I believe in God the Father, almighty, maker of heaven and earth.'

Lett. vii. p. 128, or 479. 'Now upon examination into the scriptures, it will appear, that this Messiah, or Christ, was the same person with the great archangel Michael, who was the guardian angel of Israel.'

For which the learned author alleges, 1 Cor. x. 4 and 9, and Heb. xi. 26. But as none of those texts appear to be at all to the purpose, for which they are alleged, I need not stay to explain them.

That our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ is not an angel, is

^d More texts to the like purpose may be seen alleged at p. 117, note ^e.

evident from many plain texts of scripture. Heb. i. 4—6. “Being made so much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?—And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith: And let all the angels of God worship him.” See also ver. 7, and ver. 13, 14. Ch. ii. 5, “But unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, of which we now speak.” Ver. 16, “For verily he did not lay hold of angels; but he laid hold of the seed of Abraham.” See likewise the preceding part of that chapter.

And when our blessed Saviour is mentioned with angels, he is distinguished from them. “I charge thee,” says Paul, “before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels,” 1 Tim. v. 21. And St. John, “Grace be unto you, and peace, from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come: and from the seven spirits which are before the throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness,” Rev. i. 4, 5. Not now to mention any other like texts.

These must be sufficient to satisfy us that Jesus Christ is not an angel, or one of the angelical order of beings; or we can be assured of nothing.

However, I must not omit Mal. iii. 1, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me. And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, in whom ye delight.”

Here the Messiah is spoken of as the messenger, or angel of the covenant. Tertullian, referring to this text, or to Isa. ix. 6, says, ‘Christ is an angel by office, but not by nature.’ *Dictus est quidem magni consilii angelus, id est, nuntius; officii non naturæ vocabulo. Magnum enim cogitatum Patris super hominum restitutione annunciaturus seculo erat.* *De Carne Christi. cap. 14. p. 370.*

And St. Paul writes, Heb. iii. 1, “Wherefore, holy brethren,—consider the apostle, and High Priest of our profession, Jesus Christ.” Which is paraphrased by Dr. Sykes in this manner: ‘It is your duty to consider him, as a messenger sent by God, and as the High Priest of our profession.’

Lett. vii. p. 132, or 482, ‘And therefore, “in the fulness of time,” saith the apostle, “God sent forth his beloved Son, to be made of a woman,” that is, to take human nature upon him,’ Gal. iv. 4.

The words of the apostle are these: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." It is not, "to be made," but "made of a woman, made under the law," *γενομενον εκ γυναικος, γενομενον υπο νομον*, al. *νομυ*: *factum ex muliere, factum sub lege*.

And the note of Grotius upon the text should be observed. *Εξαπεστειλεν*—*misit Deus Filium suum, primogenitum, ad quem, absente patre, cura pertinebat. Misit, id est, potestatem ei dedit eximiam—factum ex muliere; non creatum eo modo, quo Adamus creatus erat, sed natum partu muliebri, quo nobis esset similior; factum sub lege, id est, subditum legi, quia scilicet natus erat Judæus.*

Let. v. p. 78, or 441, 'And therefore it manifestly appears from hence, that there is no contradiction, either to reason or revelation, in supposing that three persons of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be three Gods, provided it be not at the same time asserted, that these three Gods are one God, or that the Son and holy Spirit are self-existent, or co-eternal, or co-equal with God the Father.'

But is not that an express contradiction to St. Paul, who says, "We know that there is no other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth (as there are gods many and lords many). But to us (christians) there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus, by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. viii. 4–6.

And Eph. iv. 5, 6, "One Lord,—one God and Father of all." And Philip. ii. 11,—"that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Many other texts might be mentioned, but I forbear.

Let. v. p. 83, 84, or 445, 'To which being "anointed," Acts iv. 27, 28, "or appointed of God, he is therefore called the "Messiah," [or] "Christ," which literally signify "the anointed." And accordingly, at the same time that we are informed of the transgression of our first parents, we are told for our comfort that the seed of the woman shall bruise that serpent's head which had occasioned their fall. Which was accordingly done, when the Messiah, whose spirit was of a superior order to mankind, condescended to take human nature upon himself, by being born of the virgin Mary, and went through that scene of trials and afflictions, to which he was anointed.'

It is not unlikely that some others may speak after the

same manner; but to me it seems very improper; for, as a judicious writer says, ‘That^e name can denote only a person who has received gifts, graces, perfections, and a dignity which he did not possess of himself.’

Chrysostom accordingly says, ‘That Jesus was called ‘Christ from the anointing of the Spirit, which was poured ‘out upon him, as man.’ *Και Χριστος δε απο τη χρισθηναι λεγεται, ο και αυτο τη σαρκος ην^ρ και ποιω, φησιν, ελαιω εχρισθη, ‘Ελαιω μεν εκ εχρισθη, πνευματι δε.* Chr. in ep. ad Rom. hom. i. T. IX. p. 430.

To the like purpose Augustin.^f And, certainly, very agreeably to the scriptures. Therefore it is said: “You know—how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the devil. For God was with him.” Acts x. 38.

And says Mr. Abraham Le Moine, in his Treatise on Miracles, p. 51, ‘As to those other passages, wherein it is ‘said, that “he was full of the Holy Ghost,” Luke iv. 1, ‘that “God gave him not the spirit by measure,” John iii. ‘34, that “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy ‘Ghost, and with power,” Acts x. 38, they visibly relate ‘to our Saviour’s human nature.’

Lett. v. p. 85, or 446, ‘For if the divine essence, or God- ‘head, did not enter into the womb of the virgin; when ‘was it, that that “fulness of the Godhead which dwelt in ‘him bodily,” Col. ii. 9, did enter into him?’

Here I must take the liberty to say, that I do not approve of curious inquiries in things of religion; and that I am afraid to attempt to answer such inquiries particularly, lest I should advance what cannot be clearly made out by the authority of scripture.

However, in general, I answer, in the first place, that the text in Col. ii. 9, does not speak of “a superior order to mankind,” as the author said just now, or, as he expresseth it elsewhere, p. 66, or 430, “a separate spirit from the Father, and inferior to him.” St. Paul’s expression is, “the fulness of the Deity.” And there is but one Deity, or God, even the Father. Thereby therefore must be meant the Father’s fulness. So it is said in Eusebius’s Commentary

^e C’est s’exprimer d’une manière fort suspecte, d’appeler la Nature Divine de notre seigneur du nom de Christ. Ce nom ne peut désigner qu’une personne, qui a reçu des grâces, des dons, des perfections, une dignité, qu’elle ne possédoit pas d’elle même. Beaus. Hist. Man. T. I. p. 115.

^f Vid. Contr. Maximin. Arian. l. 2. cap. xvi. tom. VIII.

upon Psal. xlv. otherwise xlv.^s ‘All the Father’s grace was ‘poured out upon the beloved: for it was the Father that ‘spake in him.’

And upon Ps. lxxi. or lxxii. ver. 1, he says: ‘This righteousness of the Father was given to the king’s son, of the ‘seed of David, according to the flesh; in^h whom, as in a ‘temple, dwelt the word, and wisdom, and righteousness of ‘God.’

And upon Ps. xc. or xcvi. referring to Isa. lxi. 1, and Luke iv. 18, ‘Showing,’ says he, ‘that his was not a bodily ‘anointing, like that of others; butⁱ that he was anointed with ‘the spirit of the Father’s deity, and therefore called Christ.’

Theodoret, who deserves to be consulted also upon Col. i. 9, 10, in his commentary upon Isa. xi. 2, expresseth himself after this manner. ‘“And the Spirit of the Lord shall ‘rest upon him.”^k Every one of the prophets had a particular gift. But in him “dwelt all the fulness of the ‘Godhead bodily.” And as man he had all the gifts of the ‘spirit. And out of his fulness, as the blessed John says, ‘we have all received.’

And, says Pelagius upon Col. i. 19, ‘In others,^l that is, ‘apostles, patriarchs, and prophets, there was some particular gift. But in Christ the whole divinity dwelt bodily ‘or summarily.’

Secondly, I suppose that this fulness of the Deity is the same with what is said of our Saviour in other expressions, in many texts of scripture.

As St. John says at the beginning of his gospel, the word, the wisdom, the power of God dwelt in him, and he was “full of grace and truth.” And, as John the Baptist said: “God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.” And, as St. Peter said just now, “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power.” All speaking agreeably to what is foretold, Isa. xi. 2, 3, “And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the

^s Ἐπει δὲ τὴ ἀγαπητῆ πασα ἡ πατρικὴ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκενώθη χάρις· ἦν γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ λαλῶν ἐν ὕμῳ. In Ps. p. 188. D.

^h Ἐν ᾧ κατοίκησε, ὡσπερ ἐν ναυῷ ὁ τὸ θεὸς λόγος, καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ δικαιοσύνη. In Ps. lxxi. p. 404. B.

ⁱ Τῷ δὲ πνεύματι τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος κεχρισμένον, καὶ διὰ τῆτο Χριστὸν ἀνηγορευμένον. In Ps. xc. p. 634. E.

^k Τῶν μὲν γὰρ προφητῶν ἕκαστος μερικὴν τινα ἐδέξατο χάριν· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ κατοίκησε πᾶν τὸ πληρῶμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς· καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον δὲ πάντα εἶχε τὰ χαρίσματα. κ. λ. In Es. cap. xi. tom. II. p. 52.

^l In aliis, hoc est, apostolis, patriarchis, vel prophetis, gratia fuit ex parte. In Christo autem tota Divinitas habitabat corporaliter, quasi dicas, summaliter Pelag. ap. Hieron. T. V. p. 1070.

spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord," and what follows.

And this method of interpretation is much confirmed by the excellent passages of divers ancient writers just quoted.

Thirdly, I presume not to say when, or how our blessed Saviour was "filled with all the fulness of the Godhead." I observe a few things only.

It was foretold of John the Baptist, that "he should be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb," Luke i. 15. Which may have been true of our Lord likewise. However St. Luke observes in his history, after Joseph had returned to Nazareth in Galilee, ch. ii. 40, "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom. And the grace of God was upon him." Afterwards, giving an account of the journey of Joseph and Mary to Jerusalem at a passover, when Jesus was twelve years of age, he says, "the child Jesus tarried behind them in Jerusalem," and seeking him, "they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions. And all that heard him, were astonished at his understanding and answers," ver. 41—47. It is added afterwards at ver. 52, "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man."

Moreover all the first three evangelists, in their history of our Lord's baptism, say, that "the heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost descended upon him." Matt. iii. 16, "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water. And lo the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the spirit of God descending from heaven, and lighting upon him." See likewise Mark i. 10, 11; Luke iii. 21, 22; and Luke iv. 1, presently after his baptism. "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, was led by the spirit into the wilderness." And again, when the temptation was over, the evangelist says, ver. 14, "And Jesus returned in the power of the spirit into Galilee." And in St. John's gospel, ch. i. ver. 32, 33, "And John bare record, saying; I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove. And it abode upon him." And what follows.

I close up these observations in the words of bishop Pearson, upon the second article of the creed, p. 99, 'So
' our Jesus, the son of David, was first sanctified, and
' anointed with the Holy Ghost at his conception, and there-
' by received a right unto, and was prepared for, all those
' offices which belonged to the Redeemer of the world.
' But when he was to enter upon the actual and full per-

‘formance of all those functions which belonged to him; ‘then does the same spirit, which had sanctified him at his ‘conception, visibly descend upon him at his inauguration.’

And afterwards, at p. 104, summing up what had been before largely said: “I believe in Jesus Christ.” That ‘is, I do assent to this, as a certain truth, that there was a ‘man promised by God, and foretold by the prophets, to ‘be the Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel, and the expectation of the nations. I am fully assured by all those predictions, that the Messiah so promised is already come. I ‘am as certainly persuaded, that the man born in the days ‘of Herod of the virgin Mary, by an angel from heaven ‘called Jesus, is the true Messiah, so long, and so often ‘promised: that, as the Messiah, he was anointed to three ‘special offices belonging to him, as the mediator between ‘God and man; prophet—priest—and king. I believe ‘this unction, by which he became the true Messiah, was ‘not performed by any material oil, but by the spirit of ‘God, which he received as the head, and conveys to his ‘members.’

Lett. vii. p. 135, or 484, ‘And now, my lord, let any one ‘judge whether this temptation of Jesus in the wilderness, ‘looks as if Satan thought the divine spirit, that was intimately united to the humanity of Jesus, was that of the ‘supreme God? And can any one think, that a being, endowed with so much power, [should it not be knowledge?] ‘as Satan manifestly was, did not know whether Jesus was ‘the supreme God or not?’

This is brought in with an air of much triumph. But may I not ask, Did not Satan know that Jesus Christ was his creator, under God the Father? For this learned writer argues, p. 78, 79, or 441, 442, that all things were made by Christ, and consequently Satan himself; however, I choose not to multiply words in exposing this observation, as founded in the author’s wrong scheme.

The truth of the case is this. Jesus had been baptized by John. At which time he was publicly declared to be the expected Messiah. He also received abundant qualifications for discharging the high office into which he was inaugurated. Soon after which Satan attempted to surprise him by divers temptations. “When he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hundred. And when the tempter came to him, he said: If thou be the Son of God, [that is, if indeed thou art the Christ,] command that these stones be made bread.” Afterwards,

“ taking him into the holy city, he setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him; If thou be the Son of God, [that is, if indeed thou art the Messiah,] cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.” And what follows. *Matt. ch. iv.* And are not all these insidious proposals made to our Saviour, as man?

The learned author having taken notice of the transaction in the garden, goes on. *Lett. vii. p. 136, 137, or 485, 486,*
‘ Here then we poor mortals are at a stand, being at a loss
‘ to know, how it is possible for one spirit so to torment
‘ another, as to put Jesus into such an agony as is above
‘ transcribed, from the very apprehensions of what he was
‘ to undergo. If he were to suffer NOTHING BUT WHAT IS
‘ WRITTEN concerning his scoffs, and scourgings, and cru-
‘ cifixion, and, we may add, all the sufferings and tortures
‘ which his human nature could possibly undergo: these
‘ surely could never have moved him in so high a degree;
‘ being only such sufferings as the prophets of old under-
‘ went, not only without dread, but with pleasure in their
‘ countenance. *Heb. xi. 35, 36.*

‘ Whoever therefore can suppose Jesus to have been ter-
‘ rified at these things, which could only affect his human
‘ part, must suppose him to be less than a man. Whereas,
‘ IF WE SUPPOSE SATAN LET LOOSE UPON HIM, by the per-
‘ mission of God, and empowered to attack him in his nobler
‘ part, in his angelic nature, while his divine Spirit, being
‘ encumbered with the load of flesh and blood, and fettered
‘ and confined within the compass of an human tabernacle,
‘ was disabled from exerting its full powers; well might
‘ he dread the conflict on such unequal terms.

‘ AND IF NOTHING IS DESCRIBED TO US IN THE SCRIP-
‘ TURES, BUT HIS SUFFERINGS IN THE FLESH, this we ought
‘ to conclude was done in condescension to our understand-
‘ ings, which are unable to comprehend, or have any notion
‘ of his inward sufferings; and for the same reason it was,
‘ that any outward sufferings were inflicted on him at all.
‘ Which being in their own nature insignificant and trifling,
‘ could not possibly be any trial of his obedience; but were
‘ inflicted on him by God for us, and for our sake. Who
‘ in compassion to our ignorance and infirmities, was pleased
‘ to appoint some of his sufferings to be such, as were within
‘ the reach of our capacities to comprehend.’

Does not all this show the great inconvenience, and vast disadvantage of that opinion, which supposes, that a spirit

of a superior order to the human soul animated our Saviour's body?

I think, that the incongruity of this has been fully shown in the preceding letter; and that if such a thing were practicable, that exalted spirit would swallow up the body, and sustain it above all pains, wants, and infirmities. But it is manifest from the gospels, and every book of the New Testament, that our Saviour had all the innocent infirmities of the human nature. Therefore the before-mentioned doctrine is not true.

This author is not quite a Docete, or does not profess to be so. Nevertheless he does little less than admit the force of the argument just referred to. He calls all the sufferings inflicted on our Saviour by men, and all the sufferings recorded concerning him, 'trifling and insignificant,' and says, 'they could not possibly be any trial of his obedience.'

He thinks, Jesus Christ suffered; but it must have been owing to the buffetings of Satan. Of which, however, there is not, as himself owns, any distinct account given in the scriptures. Is not this to be wise above and beyond what is written? It is manifestly so. But does that become a christian? And they who are wise above, or beyond what is written, will generally contradict what is written.

This seems to be the case here. 'The scourgings, scoffs, crucifixion, and all the outward sufferings inflicted on Jesus, were insignificant and trifling, and could not possibly be any trial of his obedience.' Nevertheless these are things much insisted upon, distinctly related, and frequently repeated in the sacred writings of the New Testament. And the writers of the New Testament, the apostles and evangelists represent them to christians, as very great and affecting, and a trial of the obedience of our great Lord and Master. And his patience under them is set before us as a moving and encouraging example to his followers. And for these sufferings, and his patience, resignation, and meekness under them, he is represented to have been highly rewarded by God the Father, supreme Lord and disposer of all things.

So St. Paul, Heb. xii. 1—3, "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied, and faint in your minds."

So likewise St. Peter, 1 Epist. ii. 21—24, “For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps. Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness. By whose stripes ye were healed.”

See Philip. ii. 1—11, and many other places, and all the gospels, wherein are recorded our Lord’s sufferings, and especially his last.

All these things are thus insisted upon as very considerable, and of great importance to christians. So that it seems very strange, that they should be reckoned by any ‘trifling and insignificant, and no trial of obedience.’

There is, I think, plainly a difference between this great author, and our apostles and evangelists. Whence should this come to pass? Is it not, that he preacheth another Jesus? According to them, Jesus is a man^m like unto us, and suffers such evils as men in this world are liable to, in the steady practice of virtue; and he has set before us a most amiable, most animating, and encouraging example, under a great variety of contradictions and sufferings. For all which he has been highly rewarded by God the Father Almighty, who alone is perfectly wise, and perfectly good.

But according to this author, Jesus is an embodied angel, or archangel, and not capable of being much, if at all, affected by ‘all the sufferings, and tortures, which human nature could possibly undergo. These, surely,’ he says, ‘could never have moved him in so high a degree,’ p. 136, 137, or 486.

Indeed this writer pleads, that if the buffetings of Satan, or such sufferings, as he contends for, are not ‘described to us in the scriptures, but his sufferings in the flesh; this we ought to conclude was done in condescension to our understandings, which are unable to comprehend, or have any notion of his inward sufferings,’ p. 137, or 486.

For certain, all men, who advance a doctrine, without express authority from scripture, will endeavour to find out some reason for the silence of scripture about it. But no good reason can be assigned for the omission, here supposed and granted. ‘His outward sufferings,’ the writer says,

^m So likewise says the prophet, “A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief,” Isa. liii.

‘ were insignificant and trifling, and could not possibly be ‘ any trial of his obedience.’—If they were not, should not some others have been recorded? The not doing it, surely, must be reckoned an inexcusable omission and neglect in the sacred penmen.

However, it is certain, they have recorded such sufferings, as they supposed to be a trial of our Lord’s obedience; and his patience under them, as an example and pattern to us.

Our great author would have us suppose, ‘ Satan let loose ‘ upon our Lord, by the permission of God, and empowered ‘ to attack him in his nobler part, his angelic nature,’ p. 137, or 486. And speaks of ‘ the buffetings of Satan,’ p. 138, or 487,—‘ and the insults of Satan, p. 133, or 483. But why should such things be supposed, when all the writers of the New Testament are silent about them? If any will invent, and describe such sufferings, it must be altogether unscriptural, and could be no better than a philosophical or theological romance.

And may I not ask, what good purposes can be answered by this scheme? For we are neither angels, nor embodied angels, but men, placed here in a state of trial. And our trial arises from the good and evil things of this world, by which our hopes and our fears are much influenced.

To me then the contrivance of our great author appears both unscriptural and unprofitable. Nor can I forbear joining in with the apostle, and saying: “ But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God; because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men,” 1 Cor. i. 23—25.

However, at p. 138, or 487, it is argued after this manner: ‘ And therefore, when he was betrayed, and seized by the ‘ officers that were sent to apprehend him, our Saviour said ‘ unto them: “ This is your hour, and the power of darkness,” Luke xxii. 53. Giving them thereby to understand, ‘ and us through them, that it was not only the hour of ‘ men’s wrath, but “ the hour of the power of darkness,” ‘ that he so much dreaded, when he prayed to God the ‘ Father, to “ save him from that hour.” At which time he ‘ had not only the contradiction of wicked men to strive ‘ with, but knew that this was the time allotted by God for ‘ Satan, the prince of darkness, to exercise and employ his ‘ whole power in afflicting him.’

But really no such conclusion can be drawn from those words; where one and the same thing is expressed in a twofold manner, the more emphatically to represent the greatness of the trouble then coming upon our Saviour. As if he had said, ‘ But this is your hour : and indeed it is ‘ a very dark and afflictive season.’

Dr. Clarke’s paraphrase is in these terms :

‘ But this is the time, wherein the infinite wisdom of God ‘ has appointed me to suffer. And Providence has now ‘ given you power over me, permitting you to execute your ‘ malice and cruelty upon me, that the scripture may be ‘ fulfilled, and the eternal counsels of the divine wisdom for ‘ the salvation of men fully accomplished.’ To the like purpose Grotius upon John. xiv. 30.”

And that this is the meaning of the words, may be argued from our Lord’s manner of expression elsewhere, speaking of the same thing. So in John xvi. 32, 33, “ Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come,—that ye shall leave me alone. And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me. These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.” And therefore when he mentions Satan, it is in the character of “ the prince of this world.” John xiv. 30, “ Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the prince of this world cometh: and “ bath nothing in me:” which is thus paraphrased by Dr. Whitby. “ The prince of this world ‘ cometh” by his ministers, Judas, and the rulers of the ‘ Jews, “ and findeth nothing in me:” he himself having no ‘ power to inflict death upon me, in whom is no sin, and ‘ they finding nothing in me “ worthy of death,” Acts xiii. ‘ 28. Though therefore I am to suffer death, I do not suffer ‘ for any fault that can deserve it, or on account of any ‘ power he or his ministers have over me to inflict it. But ‘ I give up myself to death, in compliance with my Father’s ‘ will, and what follows.’

ⁿ Venit autem per homines sui plenos, quorum vis erat εἰς ἡμᾶς τὸ σκοτεῖν. Grot. in Joh. xiv. 30.

A DISSERTATION

UPON THE TWO EPISTLES ASCRIBED TO CLEMENT OF ROME,

LATELY PUBLISHED BY MR. WETSTEIN.

WITH LARGE EXTRACTS OUT OF THEM, AND AN ARGUMENT SHOWING THEM NOT TO BE GENUINE.

- I. *Extracts out of these epistles, for showing the Author's testimony to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.* II. *External evidence against the genuineness of these epistles.* III. *Internal evidence to the same purpose, and their time.* IV. *The Author anonymous.* V. *The importance and use of these epistles.* VI. *The Conclusion.*

EXTRACTS. 1. My extracts from these two epistles will relate chiefly to the books of scripture quoted therein.

1. In these epistles several books of the Old Testament are quoted; the book of Genesis several times; Exodus; the Judges, and several of the following historical books; the book of the Proverbs, often; the book of Ecclesiastes once; Isaiah once, and also the story of Susanna.

2. Out of the New Testament are taken several passages of Matthew, one^a of Luke, several of John's gospel. The Acts of the Apostles may be supposed^b to be referred to. I cannot tell whether^c there be a reference to Acts xxvi. 25, in some words, which I place below, that others may judge. There are also passages out of the apostle Paul's epistle to the Romans, both the epistles to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the first and second to the Thessalonians, the first and second to Timothy, the epistle to the Hebrews,

^a Domino Jesu Christo ministrarunt mulieres e possessionibus suis. Ep. 2. ii. 15. Vid. Luc. viii. 3.

^b Porro Paulus, et Barnabas, et Timotheus, cum cæteris, quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitæ. Ep. i. c. 6. Conf. Philip. iv. 3.

^c —et loquimur cum illis verba exhortationis et honestatis. Ep. 2. cap. 1.

two or three quotations, which will be taken notice of presently, and many passages out of the epistle of James. But I have not clearly discerned any passages out of the epistle of Paul to Titus, or Philemon; nor out of the epistles of Peter, or John, or Jude, or the book of the Revelation.

3. I say, there are passages out of the several books of scripture before mentioned. But there occurs not the name of any book or writer, either of the Old or the New Testament; except in general, in the gospel, the apostle, meaning Paul, and the like.

4. The passages of the epistle to the Hebrews are these: ‘But,^d brethren, we are persuaded of you, that you will think of these things, which are necessary to your salvation. But we thus speak of them, because,’ and what follows. Where the author must have had an eye to Heb. vi. 9.

5. I suppose likewise, that there may be a reference to Heb. vi. 15–19, as well as to Isaiah lvi. in a passage which^e I transcribe below.

6. Again: ‘For^f he said: “Honour your elders, and when you see their conversations, and their manners, imitate their faith.”’ Which must be allowed to be a reference to, or quotation of, Heb. xiii. 7.

7. The forms of quotation are such as these: ‘For he said,’ in the place just quoted: ‘They^g who are truly virgins, for God’s sake, hear him, who said.’ Where he quotes divers passages from the book of the Proverbs. ‘Such^h virginity the Lord calls foolish, as he says in the gospel.’ See Matt. xxv. ‘Thereforeⁱ he said rightly to that generation.’ ‘And^k of such servants it is said.’ ‘As^l it is written.’ ‘And^m they hear not him, who says.’ Quoting the epistle of James. ‘Andⁿ again he says.’ ‘Have^o you not read of Amnon

^d Confidimus autem de vobis, fratres, vos cogituros ea, quæ necessaria sunt salutis vestræ. Sed ita loquimur de iis, quæ loquimur, propter famam et rumorem malum, &c. Ep. i. c. 10.

^e —sed desiderat spem promissam et præparatam et positam in cœlis Deo, qui promisit ore, et non mentitur; qui major est filiis et filiabus, et dabit virginibus locum celebrem in domo Dei——Ep. i. c. 4.

^f Dixit enim: Seniores vestros honorate; et quando videtis conversationes eorum, et mores eorum, imitamini eorum fidem. Ep. i. c. 7.

^g Qui autem vere sunt virgines propter Deum, audiunt eum qui dixit. Ep. i. c. 2.

^h Dominus enim virginitatem talem stultam vocat, sicut ait in Evangelio. Ep. i. c. 3.

ⁱ Propterea recte dicit generationi tali. Ep. 1. 8.

^k Et dictum est de talibus servis. i. 9.

^l Sicut scriptum est. i. 10.

^m Et non audiunt dicentem. i. 11.

ⁿ Et iterum dicit. i. 11.

^o Nonne legisti de Amnone et Themare, liberis Davidis? ii. c. 11.

and Tamar, children of David?' In the next chapter, 'Have^p you not read of the family of Solomon?' 'They^q did not remember that saying.' 'Behold,^r we find what is written of Moses and Aaron.' 'For so^s the holy scriptures speak in these very words.' 'As^t the apostle said.' See 2 Cor. xi. 12. 'Whom^u the divine apostle rejects.' 'Widows^v whom the divine apostle refuseth.' 'Let us be mindful^w of the word, which says.' See Eccles. vii. 26. 'As^x we have learned from the law, the prophets, and the Lord Jesus Christ.' 'Let^y us inquire and search from the law to the New Testament.'

8. Farther, he seems in several places to refer to a practice then in use of reading the scriptures in private houses, and at visits.

For^z he blames some, whom he calls idle, 'who went about to the houses of brethren, and sisters, virgins, under a pretence of visiting them, or reading the scriptures to them, or exorcising them, or teaching them.' Representing his own and other good people's way of travelling, whose conduct is set forth to be an example, he says: 'When^a we come to a place where there is no man, but all are faithful women and virgins, when we have gathered them all together, and find they live in peace, we speak to them in all purity, and read to them the scriptures.' Afterwards in the next chapter: 'If^b we come to a place, and there be one faithful woman only alone, and nobody else; we do not stay there, nor pray there, nor read the scriptures there, but we flee away as from the face of a serpent, and

^p Nonne legisti de familiâ Salomonis, &c. ii. 12.

^q Non enim

recordati sunt dicti illius, &c. ii. 13.

^r Ecce reperimus quod scriptum

est de Mose et Aarone. ii. 14.

^s Sic enim scripturæ sacræ testantur

ad verbum. ii. 14.

^t Sicut dixit apostolus. i. 12.

^u Quos

aversatur apostolus divinus. i. 10.

^v ———aut cum viduis, quas fugit

divinus apostolus. ii. 14.

^w ———sed simus memores verbi dicentis

de muliere. ii. 10.

^x Sicut didicimus de Lege, et Prophetis, et

Domino Jesu Christo. i. 12.

^y Inquiramus et scrutemur a Lege ad

Novum Testamentum. ii. 7.

^z Alii autem circumeuntes per domos

virginum, fratrum, et sororum, prætextu visitandi eos, aut legendi scripturas, aut exorcizandi eos, aut docendi eos, quia sunt otiosi. i. 10.

^a Si autem contingat, ut nos recipiamus in locum, ubi vir non est, sed omnes sunt mulieres et virgines, cogantque nos pernoctare in illo loco; vocamus omnes illos in unum locum, ad latus dextrum——et quando congregatæ veniunt omnes, et videmus quomodo in pace sunt, loquimur cum illis verba castitatis in timore Dei, et legimus illis scripturas in verocundiâ, &c. ii. 4.

^b Si autem recipiamus nos in locum, et inveniamus ibi unicam mulierem fidelem solam, nec quisquam alius ibi sit nisi illa sola, non stamus ibi, neque oramus ibi, neque legimus ibi scripturas, sed fugimus, sicut coram facie serpentis, et tanquam coram laqueo peccati. ii. 5.

from a dangerous snare.' And in another place, 'We do not sing psalms, nor read the scriptures to Gentiles.'

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. II. Having made these extracts, it will be proper to consider the age and authority of the epistles from whence they are taken. When it was first reported among us, that Mr. Wetstein of Amsterdam had received out of the East a Syriac translation of two new epistles of Clement, bishop of Rome, I said, it was a mistake. It was more probable, that he had received a Syriac translation of the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, and of the other epistle often ascribed to him. And if that was the case, the translation might be very valuable, and of great use, because we have not the epistle to the Corinthians entire, and of the other epistle a fragment only. And undoubtedly those two epistles, if entire, though in a translation only, would have been an acceptable present to the learned world. But I was mistaken in my conjecture. The report first made has been confirmed by the event. The two epistles received by Mr. Wetstein, and published by him, have been hitherto^d unknown. It must therefore be very fit that we examine their title to this high original, before we receive them as genuine. In the first place I will consider the external, then the internal evidence.

In examining these epistles by external evidence we are led to recollect what ancient writers have said of Clement and his works.

1. Says Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, who flourished about the year 178, in his books against heresies: 'When^e the blessed apostles Peter and Paul had founded and established the church, (at Rome,) they delivered the office of the bishopric in it to Linus—to him succeeded Anencletus. Next to whom in the third place after the apostles, Clement obtained the bishopric, who had seen the blessed apostles, and conversed with them—In the time therefore of this Clement, when there was no small dissension among the brethren at Corinth, the church of Rome sent a most excellent letter to the Corinthians, exhorting them to peace among themselves, and reminding them of the doctrine lately received from the apostles, which declares, that there is one God Almighty, Maker of the

^e Propterea non psallimus gentibus, neque legimus illis scripturas, ii. 7.

^d Præcipuum vero, ut tandem ad rem ipsam veniam, manuscripti hujus ornamentum sunt duæ Clementis Romani Epistolæ, hactenus non ineditæ solum, verum nostri temporis eruditis plane incognitæ. Wetst. Proleg. p. v.

^e Iren. Contr. Hær. l. 3. c. 3. p. 176, ed. Massuet. Et. conf. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 15. et 16. et l. 5. c. 6.

‘ heavens and the earth, who brought in the flood, and
 ‘ called Abraham; who brought the people out of Egypt,
 ‘ who spake with Moses, who ordained the law, and sent
 ‘ the prophets.’

This is the only writing of Clement, which is taken notice of by Irenæus. If he had known of any other, why should he not have quoted it, the more effectually to confute and silence the unreasonable men against whom he was arguing?

2. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, flourished about the year 170. Eusebius mentions an epistle of his to Soter, then bishop of Rome, ‘ In^f which letter, says the ecclesiastical historian, he makes mention also of the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, testifying that it had been wont to be read in the church from ancient time, saying, ‘ To-day we have kept the holy Lord’s-day, in which we read your epistle. Which we shall also read frequently for our instruction, as^g well as the former, written to us by Clement.’

This, as it seems to me, affords an irrefragable argument, that there was but one epistle of the church of Rome, written by Clement to the Corinthians.

3. We are also assured by Eusebius, that Hegesippus, who flourished about the year 173, made^h mention of the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.

4. Clement of Rome is several times quoted by his namesake of Alexandria, about the year 194. But he quotes only the epistle ofⁱ Clement, or^k of the Romans, to the Corinthians.

5. Origen, about 230, has some passages out of Clement’s epistle to the Corinthians in^l his books of Principles, and in^m his Commentary upon St. John’s gospel. He elsewhereⁿ quotes a work called, Circuits, ascribed to Clement.

6. We come now to Eusebius of Cesarea, about the year 315, who, having mentioned the order of the succession of the first bishops of Rome to Clement, whom he reckons the third after the apostles, adds: ‘ Of^o this Clement there is

^f Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 3. p. 145. B. C.

προτεραν ἡμιν δια Κλημεντος γραφεισαν. Ibid.

παρεσι μετα τινα περι της Κλημεντος προς Κορινθιος επιτολης αυτω ειρημενα. H. E. l. 4. c. 22. in. Vid. et. l. 3. c. 16.

^g — — ὡς και την
^h Ακρσαι γε τοι
ⁱ Αυτικα ο Κλημης εν τη
 προς Κορινθιος επιτολη κατα λεξιν φησι. Str. l. i. p. 289. A. Paris 1629.

Vid. et Str. 4. p. 516. A. Str. 6. p. 647. A. B.

^k Αλλα κεν τη
 προς Κορινθιος Ρωμαιων επιτολη. Str. l. 5. p. 536. B.

^l De Princip. l. 2. p. 82. et 83. Edit. Bened. T. i.

^m Comm. in Jo. c. i. v. 29. T. 2. p. 143. Huet.

ⁿ Philoc. cap. 23. p. 81. Cant.

^o H. E. l. 3. c. 15. et 16.

‘one epistle acknowledged by all, a great and admirable epistle, which as from the church of Rome, he wrote to the church of the Corinthians, upon occasion of a dissension, which there was then at Corinth. And we know, that this epistle has been formerly, and is still publicly read in many churches.’

In another place^p he speaks of ‘the epistle of Clement acknowledged by all, which he wrote to the Corinthians, in the name of the church of Rome.’ Afterwards, in the same chapter: ‘It ought to be observed, that there is another epistle said to be Clement’s. But this is not so generally received as the former. Nor do we know the ancients to have quoted it. There have been published also not long since other large and prolix writings in his name, containing Dialogues of Peter and Appion, of which there is not the least mention made by the ancients. Nor have they the pure apostolical doctrine.’

So writes Eusebius, who had so good opportunities for acquainting himself with the writings of christians before his time; and, so far as we are able to judge, diligently improved those opportunities.

7. Cyril of Jerusalem, about the year 348, quotes,^q or refers to a passage of Clement, which is in his epistle to the Corinthians.

8. Jerom, in his Catalogue, written in 392, in the article of Clement of Rome, expresseth himself in this manner: ‘He^r wrote in the name of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth a very useful epistle, which also is publicly read in some places—There is likewise a second epistle, which goes under his name, but it is rejected by the ancients. And a prolix disputation of Peter and Appion, which is censured by Eusebius in the third book of his Ecclesiastical History.’

Upon this chapter we are led to make some remarks. 1. There was but one epistle of Clement universally acknowledged; which also was publicly read in some churches. 2. There was another epistle received as Clement’s by some in Jerom’s time. But he says, it was rejected by the ancients, that is, was not quoted by them as Clement’s. 3. Jerom does not expressly say, that this second epistle was

^p L. 3. c. 3. p. 110.

^q Catech. 18. n. viii. p. 288. edit. Bened.

^r Clemens, de quo apostolus ad Philippenses,——scripsit ex personâ Romanæ ecclesiæ ad ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur—Fertur et secunda ejus nomine epistola, quæ a veteribus reprobatur. Et disputatio Petri et Appionis longo sermone conscripta, quam Eusebius in tertio Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ volumine coarguit. De V. I. cap. 15.

supposed by any to have been written to the Corinthians. But, possibly, some of those who received it, reckoned it to have been sent to the same church, to which the former epistle was sent. 4. Jerom was quite ignorant of any other epistles ascribed to Clement. Having mentioned those two epistles, he proceeds to the long disputation, which Eusebius had censured; and doubtless ought to be understood to confirm that censure with his own approbation.

Clement is mentioned in some other works of Jerom; particularly in^s his Commentary upon the prophecy of Isaiah; where he expressly quotes the epistle of Clement bishop of Rome to the Corinthians. And much after the same manner twice^t in his Commentary upon the epistle to the Ephesians. Clement is also mentioned by Jerom in the fifth chapter of the book of Illustrious Men, where is the article of St. Paul, in speaking of the epistle to the Hebrews. He is also mentioned^u elsewhere.

There is yet one passage more of Jerom, of which particular notice must be taken. It is in his first book against Jovinian; who, as Jerom assures us, beside other things, said, ‘that^v virgins have no more merit than widows and married women, unless their works distinguish them in other respects; and likewise, that there is no difference of merit between abstaining from some meats and using them with thanksgiving.’ Our author having quoted Matt. xix. 12, says, ‘To^w such [eunuchs] Clement also, successor of the apostle Peter, of whom the apostle Paul makes mention, Philip. iv. 3, writes epistles, and almost throughout discourseth of the purity of virginity. And in like manner, [or and afterwards] many apostolical men, and martyrs, and others, illustrious for their piety and eloquence, as may be easily seen in their own writings.’

Mr. Wetstein, whose^x words I transcribe below, says that

^s De quo et Clemens, vir apostolicus, qui post Petrum Romanam rexit ecclesiam, mittit ad Corinthios. In Is. cap. 52. T. III. p. 382.

^t De quibus et Clemens in epistolâ suâ scribit. In ep. ad Eph. cap. ii. v. 2. T. IV. P. I. p. 338. Cujus rei et Clemens ad Corinthios testis est. In Eph. cap. iv. v. 1. ib. p. 359.

^u Et si Clemens, aut ille apostolorum discipulus, aut ille Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ, et ipsius magister Origenis, tale aliquid dixerunt. Adv. Rufin. l. 2. p. 406. T. IV. P. 2.

^v Dicit, virgines, viduas, et maritatas, quæ semel in Christo lotæ sunt, si non discrepent cæteris operibus, ejusdem esse meriti——Tertium proponit, inter abstinentiam ciborum, et cum gratiarum actione perceptionem eorum nullam esse distantiam. Adv. Jovin. l. 2. T. IV. p. 146.

^w Ad hos [eunuchos] et Clemens, successor apostoli Petri, cujus Paulus apostolus meminit, scribit epistolas, omnemque pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexuit: et deinceps multi apostolici, et martyres, et illustres tam sanctitate quam eloquentiâ viri, quos ex propriis scriptis nôsse perfacile est. Id. ibid. p. 156. m.

^x ———quarum γυναισότητα et utilitatem nunc indicare atque demonstrare

here Jerom refers to the two epistles published by him. But, 1. Jerom must be understood to mean the two well known epistles of Clement, of which he had spoken in his Catalogue: which are plainly the same, and no other than those spoken of by Eusebius of Cæsarea in his Ecclesiastical History, to which he refers, and indeed transcribes. It is the more reasonable, and even expedient, so to understand him, because the books against Jovinian were written about the same time with the catalogue: from which it appears, that he had then no knowledge of any other epistles of Clement. If he had, he would not have omitted there to take notice of them. And in his other works, as we have seen, he quotes no epistle of Clement, but his well known and universally received epistle to the Corinthians. Here he speaks of two, it having been then not uncommon to ascribe to Clement another epistle, beside that which was universally received by the ancients, as we saw him acknowledge in the Catalogue. 2. Jerom here speaks hyperbolically, a style very frequent with him, as all know, and especially in his books against Jovinian; where he so exalted virginity, and depreciated marriage, as to give general offence, though at that time virginity was in great esteem. In those epistles, says Jerom, ‘Clement discourseth almost throughout of the purity of virginity.’ The meaning of which really is no more, than that there are in his epistles some things favourable to virginity. Jerom may be supposed to refer to some things in ch. 21, 29, 30, 35, 38, 48, and 58, of the epistle to the Corinthians; particularly to such places as these, where Clement says: ‘Let^y our [or your] children partake of the discipline of Christ—Let them know how much a chaste love avails with God, how great and excellent his fear is, saving all who serve him in holiness with

conabor. Proferam primo duo externa testimonia Hieronymi atque Epiphani, quorum ille c. Jovinianum l. i. ‘Hi,’ inquit, ‘sunt eunuchi, quos castravit non necessitas, sed voluntas propter regnum cœlorum. Ad hos et Clemens, successor apostoli Petri, cujus Paulus apostolus meminit,’ Philip. iv. 3, ‘scribit epistolas, omnemque pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contextuit: et deinceps multi apostolici et martyres, et illustres tam sanctitate quam eloquentiâ viri, quos ex propriis scriptis nosse perfacile est.’ Hic vero Hær. xxx. Ebitonitarum n. 15. *Αυτος Κλημης*—Hæc tamen testimonia de nostris epistolis, quæ nemo non videt esse clarissima, et a Petavio et Martinæo, Epiphani et Hieronymi editoribus, et ab omnibus, quotquot illa epistolis Clementis ad Corinthios præfixa legerunt, et scriptoribus ecclesiasticæ historiæ, qui de Clemente egerunt, neglecta, id est, non intellecta, aut perperam de duabus istis ad Corinthios epistolis, in quibus tamen nec Sampsonis, nec prolixus de virginitate sermo reperitur, intellecta fuere. Wetst. Prolegom. p. v.

^y ——τι αγαπη ἀγνη παρα τη θεω δυναται—κ. λ. Ep. ad Corinth cap. 21.

‘ a pure mind. We^z being the portion of the holy one, let us do all things that pertain unto holiness, shunning impure and unchaste embraces.’ Among the blessed and wonderful gifts of God, Clement reckons^a ‘ continence [or chastity] in holiness.’ Again: ‘ Let^b therefore our whole body be saved in Jesus Christ.’ Afterwards, in the same chapter: ‘ Let^c not him that is chaste [or pure] in the flesh, grow proud, knowing that it is from another he received the gift of continence.’ And near the end he prays, ‘ That^d God may give them patience, long-suffering, continence, chastity, and sobriety.’ To these and other things in the epistles to the Corinthians Jerom^e may be supposed to refer. And he may intend a large part of that which is called Clement’s second epistle; in which are recommended chastity, self-denial, and mortification to the delights of this world. Jerom might have a regard to that epistle from chap. 4, to chap 12, that is, the end, so far as we have it. Where are such expressions as these: ‘ keeping^f the flesh chaste.’ ‘ We^g ought therefore to keep our flesh as the temple of God.’ Serving^h God with a pure heart.’ And the like. That such expressions as these may be the foundation of what he says, is manifest from what immediately precedes the passage which we are considering. ‘ Itⁱ is,’ says he, ‘ an act of eminent faith, and eminent virtue, to be a holy temple of God, to “ offer ourselves a whole burnt-offering to the Lord,” Rom. xii. 1. And, according to the same apostle, to be “ holy both in body and spirit,” 1 Cor. vii. 34. These are eunuchs, who in Isaiah call themselves a dry tree—To these eunuchs Clement writes.’—The hyperbolical style appears likewise in what follows: ‘ In like manner many apostolical men, and martyrs, and others illustrious for their piety and eloquence, as may be easily seen in their own writings.’ It is true, that many, beside Clement, have discoursed of chastity, and

^z Ibid. cap. 30.

^a ———εγκρατεια εν ἀγασμω. c. 35.

^b Σωζισθω το ἡμων ὅλον σωμα εν Χριστω Ιησω. c. 38. ^c Ὁ ἀγνος εν τη σαρκι μη αλαζονευεσθω, γινωσκων, ὅτι ἕτερος εστιν ὁ επιχορηγων αυτω την εγκρατειαν. Ibid.

^d ———μακροθυμιαν, εγκρατειαν, αγνειαν, και σωφροσυνην. cap. 58. ^e Et posteriora quidem loca de continentia virginali aperte loquuntur, priora vero licet castitatem in genere, ipsamque conjugalem, concernant, ab Hieronymo tamen in disputationis fervore aliorum trahi potuerunt. Grabe Spic. T. I. p. 263.

^f ———και την σαρκα αγνην τηρησαντες. Ep. 2. cap. 8.

^g Δει εν ἡμας, ὡς ναον θεο, φυλασσειν την σαρκα. cap. 9.

^h Ἡμεις εν εν καθαρη καρδια εδουλευομεν τω θεω. Ib. c. xi.

ⁱ Grandis fidei est, grandisque virtutis, Dei templum esse purissimum, totum se holocaustum offerre Domino, et juxta eundem apostolum, esse sanctum et corpore et spiritu. Hi sunt eunuchi, qui se lignum aridum ob sterilitatem putantes, audiunt per Isaiam, &c.

of purity in soul and body. But who are they, of whom it can be said, without an hyperbole, that they had written books, discoursing almost throughout of the purity of virginity? And where are their writings to be found? Dr. Cave^k understood Jerom exactly after this manner. As did^l Grabe likewise; whose remarks upon this passage of Jerom are so clear and full, and, as seems to me, satisfactory, that I think it great pity Mr. Wetstein did not observe and well consider them. If he had so done, it might have prevented those scornful reflections upon Dr. Cave, and Bishop Beveridge, and the two learned editors of Epiphanius and Jerom, which are at p. v. of the Prolegomena. Godfrey Wendelin, as cited by Mr. Wetstein, Prolegom. p. vi. supposed that Jerom had an eye to the latter part of the second epistle, which is now wanting. And to the like purpose Cotelerius^m in his note at the end of that fragment. And indeed it has seemed to me not improbable, that Jerom reckoned he had an advantage to his cause from the second epistle ascribed to Clement. And therefore here writing against Jovinian, when his mind was heated with his argument, he speaks of two epistles of Clement; though in his catalogue, where he writes as a critic and an historian, he speaks as if he thought one only to be genuine; nor has he quoted any other in his Commentaries. Nevertheless I am of opinion, that we have enough remaining of these two epistles, and particularly of that last mentioned, to justify our interpretation of Jerom; especially with that qualifying expression *almost*: which no man can think to be a mere expletive. 3. I observe farther. If Jerom had intended the two epistles published by Mr. Wetstein, he would have said; To these eunuchs Clement wrote two whole epistles

^k Cæterum haud satis constat, quid sibi velit Hieronymus, cum de epistolis a Clemente ad Corinthios scriptis verba faciens, ‘omnem pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate Clementem contexuisse,’ scribat. Neque enim alias ab hisce quæ nunc extant epistolas ad Corinthios dedisse Clementem credi potest, nec in his utramque faciunt paginam virginitatis laudes. Id potius dicendum videtur, Hieronymum nimio virginitatis studio abreptum, hyperbolicâ dictione usum esse, cumque Clemens pauculas periodos animi corporisque puritati docendæ impendat, totum sermonem virginitatis encomio dicatum esse voluisse. H. L. T. i. p. 20. De Clemente.

^l Hieronymus vero acriter disputans contra errorem Joviniani, eandem conjugii ac virginitatis dignitatem coram Deo statuentis, hyperbolice ait, ‘Clementem omnem pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexuisse.’ Quales hyperbolice locutiones in ipsius scriptis, inque ipso illo contra Jovinianum, haud infrequentes occurrunt. Spic. T. i. p. 264.

^m Verisimile sit ex Epiphanio H. 30. cap. 15. et Hieronymo i. adversus Jovinianum 7. Apostolicum nostrum in iis quæ desiderantur istius epistolæ, de virginitate disseruisse non paucis. Cot. ap. Patr. Ap. p. 188.

in praise of virginity, and teaching how it may be kept pure and incorrupt. And the remaining part of the sentence, relating to other apostolical men, and other eminent writers, would likewise have been different. 4. If Jerom had these two epistles before him, and had supposed them to be written by Clement of Rome, he would not have failed to make great use of them in his books against Jovinian, and in his apology for them. Moreover they would also have been often quoted in his other writings, where he recommends virginity, and gives directions about preserving it.

9. Epiphanius, who flourished about A. D. 368, and afterwards, in his article of the heresy of the Carpocratians, speaking of the first bishops of Rome, quotes Clement thus: ‘Forⁿ he says in one of his epistles.’ The passage there quoted, is in the 54th chapter of the epistle to the Corinthians, which we have. Hereby we perceive that Epiphanius acknowledged more than one epistle of Clement. And we have learned from Jerom, that about that time it was not uncommon to speak of two epistles, as written by Clement.

In another place, the heresy of the Ebionites, says Epiphanius: ‘There are other books used by them, as the Circuits of Peter, written by Clement: [probably meaning ‘the recognitions:’] in which they have made many interpolations. But^o Clement himself confutes them in the circular letters written by him, which are read in the holy churches——He teaches virginity which they reject. He commends Elias, and David, and Samson, and all the prophets, whom they abuse.’

Mr. Wetstein^p thinks, that Epiphanius here intends the epistles published by him. But to me it appears plain, that Epiphanius intends the two epistles spoken of by Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, and by Jerom, in his Catalogue, and which we have had published now above a century by Patrick Young, from whence several other editions have been since made. For the epistles here spoken of by Epiphanius were circular, and read in the churches. So were ours. Indeed Eusebius and Jerom speak of but one only publicly read in christian assemblies. But the other might be so read likewise. There is reason to think, that both were read in some churches. For the eighty-fifth

ⁿ Λεγει γαρ εν μια των επιστολων αυτη. κ. λ. Η. 27. n. 6. p. 107.

^o —— ὡς αὐτοῦ Κλημῆς αὐτῆς κατὰ πάντα ἐλεγεῖ, ἀφ’ ὧν ἐγραψεν ἐπιστολῶν ἐγκυκλιῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγιγνωσκομένων——Αὐτοῦ γὰρ παρθεναίαν ἀιδασκεῖ, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ δεχόνται. Αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐγκωμιάζει Ἡλιαν καὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Σαμψῶν, καὶ πάντας τῆς προφητείας ὡς ἅτοι βδελυτόνται. Η. 30. u. xv. p. 139.

^p See before, note *, p. 192

apostolical canon, as it is called, reckons two epistles of Clement among the books of the New Testament. And our two epistles were at the end of the Alexandrian manuscript, after the books of scripture generally received; which affords an argument, that both these epistles were publicly read in the place where it was written: and it should be taken notice of by us, that here we have two new witnesses to the number of Clement's epistles, as two only. If Jerom could say of our epistles, (as we have seen he might,) that Clement almost throughout discourseth of the purity of virginity, Epiphanius might say, he teacheth it. He also says, that Clement commends Elias, David, Samson, and all the prophets, which is the proper character of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, though not the whole of it, and particularly insisted on by that early writer Irenæus: in which, says he, 'Clement exhorts the Corinthians to peace among themselves, and reminds them of the doctrine lately received from the apostles; which declares, that there is one God Almighty, maker of the heavens and the earth, who called Abraham, who spake to Moses, and sent the prophets.' All which perfectly suits the epistle to the Corinthians, which we still have in our hands, and in the name of Clement, as may appear to any upon consulting ch. 17, 18, 19, 20, 43, and other places. Mr. Wetstein objects, that Samson is not named in the epistle just mentioned, whereas he is in his. But though we do not now find Samson's name in what remains of that epistle, he may have been there. And as we have it not entire, I think it would be presumption to say he was not there named.

10. Photius, patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, has two articles for Clement bishop of Rome. In the first he says, 'That Clement wrote a valuable epistle to the Corinthians, which is so esteemed by many, as to be read publicly. But that which is called the second to the same is rejected as spurious.'

In the other article he speaks^s of two epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, bound together in one book or volume; and he distinctly gives the character of each, with regard to their style and doctrine; but says nothing particularly about the genuineness of either.

11. Nicephorus Callisti, in the fourteenth century, so

^q Κλημεντος επιτολαι δυο.

^r Αυτος και επιτολην αξιολογον προς Κορινθιος γραφει, ητις παρα πολλοις αποδοχης ηξιωθη, ως και δημοσια αναγιγνωσκουσαι. Η δε λεγομενη δευτερα προς αυτας, ως νοθος, αποδοκιμαζεται. Cod. 113. p. 289.

^s Αναγνωσθη βιβλιαριον, εν ω Κλημεντος επιτολαι προς Κορινθιος δυο ανεφεροντο. Cod. 126. p. 305.

agrees with Eusebius of Cæsarea, that I need not take any particular notice of him.

12. Mr. Wetstein^t seems to suppose, that Dionysius Barsalibi, bishop of Amida near the end of the twelfth century, of whom there is an account in Dr. Asseman's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, speaks of another letter of Clement, written against those who rejected marriage. 'Barsalibi,' says^u Asseman, 'beside Ephrem, Chrysostom, and other authors, cites an epistle of Clement against those who rejected marriage.' Upon which I observe, 1. It does not certainly appear what Clement is here spoken of. 2. If Clement of Rome be intended, Barsalibi must mean one of the two epistles spoken of by Eusebius, Jerom, Epiphanius, and Photius, provided he deserves any regard; for there never were any other epistles ascribed to him by learned christians in former times. And it may be reckoned very likely, that Barsalibi cited the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, particularly ch. 1, or 21. So, on account of some things in that epistle Epiphanius might say, that Clement teaches virginity, and Jerom, that almost throughout he discourseth of the purity of virginity. And with regard to some other passages Barsalibi might say, that he wrote against those who rejected marriage. In like manner a learned writer might say, that St. Paul in his epistles recommends virginity; and another, suitably to the argument of which he is treating, may say, he vindicates marriage. And both those authors would be understood to mean the same epistles. Yea they might both cite, or refer to one and the same epistle, for their several ends and purposes, particularly the first epistle to the Corinthians. Not now to instance in any other.

13. Mr. Wetstein says farther, 'That^v probably these two epistles were suppressed, or laid aside, because of the strictness of the rules of piety contained therein.' Which to me appears a false and injurious reflection upon the christians of the early ages. There always were, especially in the first five centuries, pastors, and other eminent men, who approved of, and were themselves able to give right instructions for a good life. Nor can it be denied, that they were sufficiently zealous for virginity. They have preserved

^t Prolegom. p. vii. m.

^u Præter Ephræmum vero, Chrysostomum, — quibus Barsalibæum usum fuisse, supra dixi, auctores hi ab ipso eitantur, videlicet, Dionysius epis. ad Timotheum: Clemens adversus eos qui matrimonium rejiciunt. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. II. p. 158.

^v Tantum vero abest ut mirer, austeram Clementis disciplinam in epistolis istis traditam non placere, ut potius propter hanc ipsam causam eas et dudum sepositas esse, et per tot secula in tenebris latuisse existimem. Proleg. p. vii. fin.

and handed down to us the scriptures of the New Testament, than which no writings whatever have delivered better directions for the practice of strict virtue. And why should any man think, that the primitive christians would designedly suppress any writings of Clement of Rome, who was highly esteemed by all catholics in general, and by some others likewise? Insomuch that their works forged in his name, and ascribed to him, which had not the apostolical doctrine. We are well assured, that his epistle to the Corinthians was read in many churches, and the other likewise in some. If there had been any other epistles of Clement, they would have been esteemed, and often quoted, and not suppressed, or laid aside in obscurity. And how comes Mr. Wetstein now to speak of his epistles as obscure, when before he supposed them to be the same that had been quoted by Jerom in his books against Jovinian, and the same which Epiphanius said were read in the holy churches? Are these things consistent?

14. Upon the whole it appears to me very clear, that there never were more than two epistles of Clement bishop of Rome, received by christians in former times. Those two I suppose to be the same which are at the end of the Alexandrian manuscript, and now are, and for more than a century have been well known to the learned. Suppose a man should say, that he had found two epistles of the apostle Paul, or the apostle Peter, which for many ages past have been unknown, would he deserve to be credited? It is almost as strange and surprising for any man to say the like of Clement of Rome, a man so highly esteemed in all antiquity, and so much taken notice of by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Jerom, Photius, and others. The epistles therefore, which have been published by Mr. Wetstein, are not Clement's. They cannot be his. There is no need to open the packet. Thus much may be certainly known without looking into it.

III. INTERNAL EVIDENCE. However, as we have already taken a view of these epistles, and have made some extracts out of them, we will now examine them more distinctly. And however good and pious they may be, it is likely, there will still offer more reasons for confirming the persuasion that they were not written by Clement.

•1. And in the first place I observe, that the quotations of scripture, and forms of quoting the scriptures, in these epistles, are different from those in the universally acknowledged epistle to the Corinthians; for that is the epistle to

which I shall have an eye; it being, in my opinion,^w the only genuine writing of that apostolical man, Clement of Rome. 1. The author of these epistles useth some phrases and expressions concerning the scriptures not found in Clement, nor in any of the apostolical fathers, that I remember. ‘As we have learned from the law and the prophets, and the Lord Jesus Christ; the law and the New Testament; the divine apostle.’ 2. In these epistles many more^x books of the New Testament are quoted, than in the acknowledged epistle of Clement. 3. This writer’s forms of quotation in the Old Testament are different from those of Clement. What are this writer’s forms may be seen in the extracts at the beginning of this dissertation. In Clement’s epistle to the Corinthians the forms of quotation are such as these. ‘The^y ministers of the grace of God have spoken of repentance by the Holy Spirit. And himself, the Lord of all, has spoken of repentance with an oath.’ See Ezek. xxxiii. ‘And, Let^z us do that which is written. For the Holy Spirit says.’ And in the same chapter or section. ‘For^a the holy word says.’ And in another chapter. ‘For^b himself bespeaketh us by the Holy Spirit.’ ‘Look^c

^w I am not singular in that opinion, which is much confirmed, as any may perceive, by the testimonies of ancient writers largely alleged here in the article of external evidence. H. Grotius declared himself to the like purpose in the year 1634, in his judgment upon these epistles, the year after their publication by P. Young. *Alteram epistolam, cujus fragmentum additum est, quamquam Clementis et ipsa in libris nonnullis nomen prætulit, non esse tamen ei tribuendam, etiam veteres judicârunt. Quorum auctoritati accedit characteris diversitas. H. Gr. ep. 347.* Grabe, who has since carefully examined the early writings of christianity, is clearly of the same opinion, induced thereto chiefly by the letter of Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, and the silence of ancient writers before Eusebius, concerning any second epistle of Clement——pluraque sunt, quæ pene demonstrare mihi videntur, epistolam secundam Clementis ad Corinthios suppositam esse. *Et primo quidem maxime considerandum est testimonium Dionysii, Episcopi Corinthiorum, proxime post Clementem seculo florentis——Spic. p. 265.* Secundum, argumentum contra secundam Clementi adscriptam epistolam suppeditat silentium omnium antiquorum Patrum, apud quos nullam ejus vel citationem invenit Eusebius——*Ibid. p. 267.* And indeed, it seems strange to me, that any learned men should still quote the second epistle as Clement’s.

^x What books of the New Testament are quoted or alluded to by Clement, may be seen in his epistle, and in the large extracts made out of it in the first volume of this work, ch. ii. And at the conclusion of ch. iii. where are extracts out of the fragment of the second epistle ascribed to Clement, it was observed, that therein the gospels are several times quoted more expressly, than in Clement’s epistle to the Corinthians. This was there taken notice of as an internal character, confirming the supposition that it had not the same author with the epistle to the Corinthians, and that it is of a later date.

^y Ep. ad Corinth. c. 8.

^z Ib. cap. 13.

^a *Ibid.*

^b Cap. 22.

^c Cap. 45.

‘ into the holy scriptures, which are the true sayings of the ‘ Holy Spirit.’ Which forms of citation do not occur in the epistles published by Mr. Wetstein. I omit those common forms, in the same epistle to the Corinthians, ‘ It^d is written, and^e the scripture says, and the like.’ 2. Clement’s quotations of texts of scripture, especially of the Old Testament, which are large and numerous, are neat and distinct. But the writer of these two epistles jumbles texts and books together, and quotes in a very confused manner. How Clement quotes may be seen by any, who look into his epistle. Having quoted a passage of scripture, when he proceeds to take another passage out of another book, or out of the same book, he usually says : ‘ And^f in another place,’ or the like. I do not deny, that^g the writer of these epistles does also sometimes make use of like forms of transition. But oftentimes his quotations are exceedingly jumbled and confused. For instance, ‘ Therefore^h he rightly said to such a generation : “ My Spirit shall not always dwell with man, because ‘ they are flesh. Every one therefore in whom is not the ‘ spirit of Christ, he is not his.” As it is written : “ The ‘ spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit ‘ from the Lord troubled him.”’ See Gen. vi. 3. Rom. viii. 9. I Sam. xvi. 14.

2. Mr. Wetstein, as an instance of agreement between the epistle of Clement, and the epistles published by him, says, that there is a doxologyⁱ in the middle of one of them. I suppose, that Mr. W—— may refer to the sixth chapter of his second epistle, at the end of which there is an Amen. But I see not there, nor any where else in these epistles, neither in the middle, nor at the endings of them, one doxology. Which therefore leads me to observe another difference between these epistles, and the generally received epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. For in that epistle, as has been often observed by learned men, there are at least seven or eight doxologies.

3. THE TIME OF THESE EPISTLES. There are several things in these epistles, which will directly lead us to the time and occasion of writing them, and assure us of their late age.

A passage above cited shows, that when these epistles were written, Gentilism was not extinct in the Roman empire. For I allow, that they were not first written in Syriac,

^d Γεγραπται γαρ. cap. iv. et passim.

^e Λεγει γαρ ἡ γραφη. cap. xxxi. et

^f Καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τοπῷ λεγει. cap. viii. Καὶ παλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τοπῷ λεγει. cap. 46. et passim.

^g Ep. i. cap. 11.

^h Ep. i. cap. 8.

ⁱ Stylus, δοξολογια in media epistola. Proleg. p. vi. med.

but in Greek, as Mr. Wetstein well argues. When therefore this author said, as above: ‘we do not read the scriptures to Gentiles;’ I reckon it a proof, that Gentilism still subsisted in the country where he lived. Which indeed I imagine to have been somewhere in the eastern part of the Roman empire.

Farther, these epistles were not written until after some ecclesiastics had begun to have with them what were called subintroduced women; nor till after it had been taken notice of and censured. Upon this subject the late learned Mr. Henry Dodwell^k has a curious dissertation. Bingham^l likewise may be consulted. And some notice has been already taken of it in this work,^m particularly in the history of Paul of Samosata.

There were some unmarried clergymen, who, for the sake of domestic affairs, had women to live with them. Dodwellⁿ says, they were virgins consecrated to God. Bingham says, ‘They were^o commonly some of the virgins belonging to the church, whom they that entertained, pretended only to love as sisters with a chaste love.’ It appears from St. Cyprian, that^p they dwelled together in the same house, and sometimes lodged in the same room, and in the same bed. To the like purpose^q speaks Jerom. Nevertheless they made solemn declarations of their innocence, and gave such assurances of being unpolluted by carnal commerce, as were satisfactory. So says Mr. Dodwell,^r upon the authority of a passage of St. Cyprian; which however still declares the

^k Diss. Cypr. iii. De flagitio mulierum cum clericis concumbentium, &c.

^l Antiquities of the church. B. 6. ch. 2. sect. 13. vol. II. p. 329—332.

^m Vol. ii. chap. xliii. num. viii. ⁿ Ubi supr. n. i. ii. ^o As before, p. 331.

^p Legimus literas tuas, frater carissime,—postulans et desiderans, ut tibi rescriberemus, quid nobis de iis virginibus videatur, quæ cum in statu suo esse, et continentiam firmiter tenere decreverant, detectæ sint postea in eodem lecto pariter mansisse cum masculis; ex quibus unum esse Diaconum dicis; plane easdem quæ se cum viris dormisse confessæ sint, asseverare se integras esse—Primo igitur in loco,—elaborandum est—nec pati virgines cum masculis habitare, non dico simul dormire, sed nec simul vivere. Cyprian. ep. 4. al. 62.

^q Unde in ecclesias Agapetarum pestis introiit! Unde sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum!—Eadem domo, uno cubiculo, sæpe uno tenentur et lectulo, et suspiciosos nos vocant, si aliquid existimamus. Ad. Eustoch. ep. 18. al. 22. T. IV. p. 33.

^r Quid deinde illud—quod cum summo animi nostri gemitu et dolore cognovimus, non deesse qui Dei templa et post confessionem sanctificata et illustrata membra turpi et infami concubitu suo plus maculent, cubilia sua cum feminis promiscua iungentes, quando etsi stuprum conscientie eorum desit, hoc ipso grande crimen est, quod illorum scandalo in aliorum ruinas exempla nascuntur. [Cypr. ep. 6. al. 7. al. 13.] Constat itaque, qui ita cum mulieribus concumberent, carnis tamen integritatem, servasse illibatam. Dodwell ubi supra, n. i.

practice to be unrespectable and offensive. Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, is censured by Athanasius^s for cohabiting with a virgin. And he may be reckoned to be one of those, who gave proof of his freedom from carnal commerce.

We cannot dispute the truth of what St. Cyprian says, that in Africa some of these ecclesiastics and their virgins lay in the same room, and in the same bed. Nevertheless perhaps there were very few instances of this sort. St. Chrysostom has two homilies or orations upon this subject. One is, ‘against those who had with them subintroduced ‘virgins.’ The other, ‘that canonical women ought not to ‘dwell [or cohabit] with men.’ It may be allowed, that he treats those whom he reproves with a good deal of politeness and tenderness. Nevertheless his argument is very cogent. Nor can any imagine, that John Chrysostom would extenuate the guilt of those whom he blamed, or dissemble any part of their fault. And yet I do not perceive, that he had received any intelligence of those last-mentioned aggravating circumstances. He speaks of their dwelling^t under the same roof, of^u their cohabiting together, eating at the same table, sitting together, and discoursing freely and pleasantly in the day-time. But they did not lie together.^v He plainly supposeth, that^w they had different apartments, and that there were others, particularly women-servants, in the house with them. In that way of acting it may be reckoned, that their virtue would not be in any immediate danger. However, undoubtedly, notwithstanding such precautions, some would be suspicious; which was enough to render this practice offensive. And therefore the fathers of the council of Nice ordained in one of their canons, ‘that ‘no bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any of the clergy, should ‘have an introduced woman, unless she be a mother, or sister, ‘or aunt, or however a person liable to no suspicion.’ But I need not enlarge further by way of introduction to my argument.

That this practice is referred to, and censured in these

^s Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Λεοντίος ἐμβαλλόμενος, μετὰ γυναῖκος τινος νεώτερας, λεγομένης Εὐπολίδος, καὶ κωλυόμενος συνοικεῖν αὐτῇ, εἰς αὐτὴν ἑαυτὸν ἀπέκοψεν, ἰν’ ἐπ’ αἰείας ἐχθρῶς διατριβεῖν μετ’ αὐτῆς. Apol. de fugâ suâ. p. 335. E. Vid. et. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. p. 360. B. ^t ————της ὁμοσκημίας ταύτης. Contr. eos. &c. T. I. p. 229. B. ————ὁμοσκημίας ταύτης. Ib. p. 233. B. ————της συνοικησεως ταύτης. Ib. D. ^u ————νεος ————κορη συνοικων παρθενῶν, καὶ συγκαθημενῶν, καὶ συνδειπνῶν καὶ συνδιαλεγόμενος εἰς ἡμέρας τῶν γὰρ ἀλλῶν εἶδεν προσιθῆμι ————Ib. p. 231. B. ————ἀλλ’ ὅτι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐχὼν οἰκίαν, καὶ τραπέζην, καὶ λόγων κοινωνῶν, καὶ μετὰ παρήρησίας πολλῆς. Ib. C. ^v Ubi supra, p. 241. D. E. p. 254. fm. ^w P. 264.

epistles, is manifest from some passages to be now produced. ‘We^x are persuaded, says the writer, that you will mind these things, which are necessary to your salvation. But we speak as we do, because of the evil fame and report concerning imprudent men, who dwell with virgins under a pretence of piety, and put their souls in danger—It is altogether unfit, that they who are christians, and fear God, should act thus.’

Setting forth his own conduct, and that of others, whom he represents as exemplary, he says; ‘We^y do not dwell with virgins, nor have we any concern with them. We do not eat and drink where a virgin is. Nor do we lie [sleep] where a virgin lies. Nor do women wash our feet, or anoint us. We never lie [or sleep] where a virgin is, who is unmarried, and fit for marriage. Though she be alone, and in another place, [or part of the house,] we do not spend the night there.’

In another chapter. ‘We^z that are holy, do not eat and drink with women. Nor do women or virgins minister to us, or wash our feet, or anoint us. Nor do we lie [sleep] where women lie, that we may be in all things without offence.’

Afterwards in another chapter, ‘Even^a after the Lord was risen from the dead, when Mary came running to the

^x —sed ita loquimur de iis quæ loquimur, propter famam et rumorem malum de hominibus impudentibus, qui habitant cum virginibus, prætextu pietatis, et conieciunt animam suam in periculum—Prorsus non decet christianos et timentes Deum ita conversari. Alii autem edunt et bibunt cum virginibus, &c. Ep. i. c. 10. Wetstein.

^y Cum virginibus non habitamus, et inter illas nihil habemus negotii. Et cum virginibus nec edimus nec bibimus. Nec lavant mulieres pedes nostros, nec unguunt nos. Et prorsus ubi dormit virgo, quæ viri non est, aut filia nubilis, non dormimus: etiamsi sit in alio loco sola, non pernoctamus ibi. Ep. 2. c. 1. W.

^z Nos sancti cum mulieribus nec edimus nec bibimus, nec ministrant nobis mulieres vel virgines. Et mulieres non lavant nobis pedes, nec unguunt nos; et non conveniunt nobis mulieres; neque dormimus, ubi dormiunt mulieres, ut simus sine reprehensione, &c. Ep. 2. c. 3. W.

^a Nec hoc solum, sed etiam postquam surrexit Dominus a mortuis, et veniret Maria ad sepulchrum currens, et sedens ad pedes Domini, et adorans eum, et quærens eum apprehendere, ipse dixit ei: “Noli me tangere. Nondum enim adscendi ad patrem meum.” Nonne igitur mirabile est de Domino, quod non permisit Mariæ, mulieri beatæ, ut tangeret pedes ejus; tu autem habitas cum illis, et tibi ministrant mulieres et virgines; et dormis, ubi illæ dormiunt; et lavant tibi pedes, et unguunt te mulieres?—Mulieres autem multæ sanctæ ministrârunt sanctis e possessionibus suis, sicut ministravit Sulamitis Elisæ; sed cum eo non habitavit; et ipse propheta in domo seorsim habitavit—— Domino Jesu Christo ministrârunt mulieres e possessionibus suis; sed cum illo non habitârunt. Etiam apostolis, etiam Paulo reperimus ministrâsse mulieres; sed cum illis non habitârunt. Ep. 2. c. 15. W.

‘ sepulchre, and falling down at his feet, and worshipping
 ‘ him, sought to touch him, he said unto her; “ Touch me
 ‘ not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father,” John xx.
 ‘ 17. Is it not then wonderful, that the Lord permitted not
 ‘ that blessed woman Mary to touch his feet? And you
 ‘ dwell with them, and women and virgins minister to you,
 ‘ and you lie where they lie; and women wash your feet,
 ‘ and anoint you—Many holy women have ministered to the
 ‘ saints out of their substance, as the Shunamite woman
 ‘ ministered to Elisha. But she did not dwell with him;
 ‘ for the prophet dwelt in a house by himself, 2 Kings iv. 8
 ‘ —10. Women ministered to the Lord Jesus Christ out of
 ‘ their substance, Luke viii. 3, but they did not dwell with
 ‘ him. We also find that women ministered to the other
 ‘ apostles, and to Paul; but they did not dwell with them.’

I need not transcribe any more; here is enough, to show the occasion and design of these epistles. However, there is still one thing more to be taken notice of, which will fully determine the point. The people complained of by St. Cyprian, and others, were ecclesiastics and women, who made profession of virginity. So it is here. Both these letters are addressed to virgins. And it is implied, that they were pure in body, or free from carnal pollutions. ‘ Whoever,’ says^b the author, ‘ professeth before the Lord, that he will keep his chastity, ought to be clothed with every virtue; and if he has truly crucified his body for the sake of piety, he deprecates that saying, “ increase and multiply,” and all concupiscence, and all the delights of this world, and shuns all those snares, by which he might be endangered.’

And presently afterwards, in the next chapter, ‘ For^c this cause he separates himself from the desires of the body, and not only deprecates that, “ increase and multiply,” but desires the promised hope, prepared and laid up in heaven, even a better place [or recompense] than that of those who have been holy in the state of marriage.’

^b Quicumque enim profitetur coram domino, se servaturum castitatem, debet cingi omni virtute sanctæ Dei, et si vere in timore crucifixit corpus suum propter pietatem, deprecatur verbum, dicens, ‘ Crescite et multiplicamini,’ et totam mentem et cogitationem, et concupiscentiam mundi hujus, et delicias, et ebrietatem, et omnem amorem ejus, et otium ejus——et exinanitus est ab omni conversatione mundi hujus, et ex laqueis et impedimentis ejus. Ep. i. c. 3. W.

^c Propterea separat se ab omnibus concupiscentiis corporis; et non solum deprecatur illud, ‘ fructificate et multiplicate,’ sed desiderat spem promissam et præparatam et positam in cælis Deo, qui promisit ore, et non mentitur——locum celebrem in domo Dei excellentiorem filiis et filiabus, et excellentiorem illis, qui conjuges fuerunt in sanctitate. Ibid. c. 4.

Nor does this author any where charge those to whom he writes with any acts of uncleanness; but he advises them to^d keep more out of the way of temptation, and^e also to show a greater regard for the opinion of men, and avoid whatever might be an occasion of offence and scandal.

This being the case, we now see the reason of some things, which otherwise would not be easily accounted for. First, we see the reason of the address of these epistles, which at first seems odd and whimsical. They are addressed^f to ‘virgins, and virgins.’ So in the first chapter, and twice in the second, and frequently throughout the epistles. Which Mr. Wetstein, and rightly, as I suppose, renders ‘virgins,’ brethren, and ‘virgins,’ sisters. Chrysostom pronounced two orations for the sake of these people: one ‘against those who had with them subintroduced virgins:’ the other, ‘that canonical women ought not to dwell with ‘men.’ But this writer applies to both together, and calls them virgins. Secondly, we now also see the reason why the^g good conduct of the preachers of the gospel is so much insisted upon in these epistles. They were clergymen who offended in this point, and therefore needed to be admonished to take more care both of their virtue, and their reputation, and not to give offence to other people. Thirdly, that expression, relating to this matter, which we saw just now, ‘men, who dwell with virgins under a pretence of piety,’ appears remarkable, and leads to the following observation. The ecclesiastics, now complained of, were generally, or for the most part, men of religion and virtue. Being desirous to have the attendance and assistance of a woman in their domestic affairs, they pitched upon such as were virgins by profession, whom they judged to be the most unexceptionable of any, and least liable to suspicion. Determined to keep themselves pure, they supposed, that if notwithstanding all their care an evil thought or desire should arise in

^d —et exinanitus est ab omni conversatione mundi hujus, et ex laqueis et retibus et impedimentis ejus. Ep. i. cap. 3. f.

—et conjiciunt animam suam in periculum; et eunt cum illis in semitâ et in deserto soli viam plenam periculis, et plenam offendiculis et laqueis et foveis. Ib. c. 10.

^e —ut sinus sine reprehensione in omnibus, ne quis in nobis offendatur, &c. Ep. 2. c. 3.

—et ne demus occasionem illis, qui volunt, ut teneant occasionem post nos, et loquantur de nobis mala, et ut nemini sinus offendiculo, &c. Ib. cap. 5.

^f Virginibus (‘fratribus’) beatis, qui constituerunt servare virginitatem propter regnum cœlorum, et virginibus (‘sororibus’) sanctis in Deo, salutem. cap. 1. Unicuique virginum (‘fratrum’) et virginum (‘sororum’)——Qui autem vere sunt virgines (‘fratres’) et virgines (‘sorores’) audiunt eum qui dixit——cap. 2. * Vid. ep. i. c. 11, 12. et ep. ii. passim.

them, such persons would not encourage, but check and control it. So 'they dwelled with virgins under a pre-
'tence of piety,' as this writer says. It has often seemed strange to me, that these 'subintroduced women,' mentioned by ancient writers, were continually spoken of as virgins, and devoted to Christ, and the like. We here see the reason, why such were chosen and preferred to others. This observation first came into my mind upon reading these epistles; and it is referred to the consideration of the learned.

The time therefore of these epistles is to be collected from that of this practice. When it was first introduced, and when it ceased, may not be easily decided. It was taken notice of and censured by Cyprian about the middle of the third century. And not long after that time Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and divers of the clergy of that diocese were charged with it. And if Chrysostom's orations upon occasion of it were not composed till after the commencement of his episcopate, as the^h Benedictine editors think, it subsisted to the end of the fourth century. And doubtless there were instances of it in the following century. Chrysostom speaks of itⁱ as a new thing, that had arisen in that age; but the expressions of orators may be understood with latitude. However, it is very probable, that it did not appear in the early days of christianity, nor till after the death of all the apostles, and their disciples, called apostolical men; consequently, not in the time of Clement bishop of Rome. And if the writer of these epistles refers to it, as I think he plainly does, he is not Clement disciple of the apostle Paul.

4. I observe, in the fourth place, that this writer exceeds in his praises of virginity, and in his recommendations of it. Mr. Wetstein is sensible, that^k what he says is not agreeable to the Protestant doctrine. Nevertheless he thinks it is not unreasonable, nor unscriptural. If I am not mistaken, I could easily show, that a great deal said upon this head by the writer of these epistles is destitute of support and countenance from the doctrine of the New Testament. But instead of doing that at present, I would observe, that he differs from Clement, who in the first chapter of his epistle

^h Vide Monitum. T. i. p. 227.

ⁱ ———— *Ἐπι δὲ τῆς γενεᾶς*

ἡμετέρας καὶ τρίτος ἐπενοήθη τρόπος καινός τις καὶ παραδόξος. T. i. p. 228.

A. B. ^k Erunt fortasse, quibus, harum epistolarum scriptor videbitur et matrimonio esse iniquior, cœlibatum vero nimium extollere—Aliterque, fatcor, de cœlibatu et matrimonio sensit Clemens, quam M. Lutherus. At nondum probatum est, illum male sensisse. Wetst. Prolegom. p. vii.

to the Corinthians says: ‘ You were subject to your rulers, giving becoming respect to elders. Young men you taught to be modest. The women you exhorted to do all things unblamably—loving their husbands, as is fit,—and managing the affairs of the house with propriety and modesty.’ And in the 21st chapter: ‘ Let us respect our rulers, and honour the elders; young men let us instruct in the discipline and fear of God; our wives let us direct to that which is good, that they may show forth the agreeable behaviour of chastity—And let our children be bred up in the discipline of Christ.’ So Clement. Whether he was married, or single, I know not. But this apostolical man, to render his exhortations more forcible, joins himself with men in the marriage-state. Nothing of this kind is to be found in the writer of these two epistles. He scorns to touch upon these points. The virtues of the marriage-state are below his regard.

He differs likewise from St. Cyprian, who¹ in treating on this subject, adviseth rather that these virgins should marry, if they are not able to persevere in the purpose of purity.

He differs also from St. Chrysostom, who in the second of his orations before mentioned, says to those virgins: ‘ If^m you desire to have men to cohabit with you, you should not have chosen virginity, but should have married; for it would be better to marry, than to act thus in a state of virginity. God does not condemn marriage, nor do men disparage it. For it is honourable, offending none, injuring none. But virginity, in the company of men, is worse and more offensive to all, than fornication itself.’ Afterwards in the same oration he says, ‘ it wouldⁿ be better for these virgins to marry twice, than to act as they did, and be the occasion of so much scandal.’ I refer^o to some other like places in these homilies of Chrysostom. But nothing of this kind appears in these epistles.

He who should read what this^p writer says in praise of virginity; how glorious, and how arduous it is, the great

¹ Quodsi ex fide se Christo dicaverunt, pudicæ et castæ sine ullâ fabulâ perseverent, et ita fortes et stabiles præmium virginitatis expectent. Si autem perseverare nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant. Certe nullum fratribus et sororibus scandalum faciant. Cypri. ad Pompon. ep. 4. al. 62.

^m Εἰ γὰρ ἀνδρας ἐπιθυμεις εχειν συνοικηοντας, ἢ κ' εἶδε παρθενίαν εἰσεθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπι τοῦ γαμου ελθειν· πολλῶν γὰρ βελτιον γαμειν ἐκεινωσ, ἢ παρθενευειν ετωσ. κ. λ. Ubi supra. p. 253. E. 254. A.

ⁿ Πολλῶν γὰρ βελτιον ἐνι, καὶ δευτερω συνναπτεσθαι γαμῶ, ἢ τοιαυτα ασχημονειν. κ. λ. Ib. p. 265. D.

^o Vid. p. 234. D. 236. D. E.

^p Vid. ep. i. cap. 3—8

examples by which it is encouraged, and what peculiar rewards it is entitled to; must, I apprehend, think it strange, that for preventing ill consequences, and that men might not be led into a snare, he did not reckon himself obliged to add something concerning the lawfulness and purity of marriage, and the expediency of it for most men; which are so often intimated, and expressly asserted in the New Testament, and may be easily discerned by the reason, and observation, and experience of mankind.

It is very likely, that before this practice obtained, the marriage of the clergy lay under some restraints. They who doubt of it, may read the notes of Gothofred upon a law of Honorius and Theodosius the younger, relating to this very matter. I transcribe from him a few lines only^a below. The marriage of the clergy was not forbidden by any canon of the church, or law of the state. But it lay under discouragements, and was restrained by the prevailing opinion of men. Celibacy was more reputable; and many clergymen coveted the honour of it, who found it burdensome. And virginity likewise being much applauded, many women were induced to make a profession of it; who afterwards knew not how to perform their engagements, nor to get rid of them. Gradually the celibacy of the clergy, and virginity of women, grew more and more in vogue. And the high notions which the writer of these epistles has of virginity, without saying any thing in favour of marriage, make me think, that he did not write soon, but rather not till a good while after the rise of the practice of which we have been speaking.

IV. THE AUTHOR ANONYMOUS. Who the author was, cannot be determined. Probably he was a bishop. It was most becoming a man in that high station, to write letters with exhortations to christian people, especially to such as made profession of celibacy and virginity. Moreover it may be argued from the authoritative manner in which the second epistle concludes.

I do by no means charge the writer with imposture; I do not believe he had the least thought of such a thing. It should be observed, that there is not at the beginnings or endings of these epistles any distinguishing inscription.

^a Extraneas, inquam, mulieres vetantur clerici sibi adsciscere. Nempe ex quo cœlibatûs clericalis mos paulatim inolescere cœpit, atque hac etiam ratione clerici probabilem seculo disciplinam agere, seque seculo de cœlibatûs seu continentiae voto commendare instituerunt, clam tamen atque aliâ ratione voluptates suas explere alicubi rerum experimentis visi sunt, *κρυφῆ πορνευοντες*, &c. In Cod. Theod. lib. 16. cap. 2. l. 44.

There is no name of the writer, nor any hint of his character and station. Nor is there any intimation of the city or country where they lived, to whom the epistles are addressed. There is only a title prefixed to these epistles, to this purpose: the^r first, or the second, epistle of the blessed Clement, disciple of the apostle Peter. And at the end is that common phrase—‘Here^s ends the first, or the second, epistle of ‘Clement disciple of Peter.’ These titles, or inscriptions, as I imagine, were placed there by some late editor, who did not know who was the writer of the epistles. It might be done by him ignorantly, or designedly; which of the two, we cannot determine. He might, I say, herein act honestly. Possibly he really supposed them to be the epistles of Clement; though, if he did, he was much mistaken. Or he might do it designedly, with a view to procure the more regard for the epistles, which he was publishing.

As there is nothing in the epistles to distinguish the author, or the people, to whom he wrote, I have suspected, that he was anonymous, and that he designed to be so. When he formed the intention to write upon this subject, he determined to conceal himself. He hoped, that his exhortations might in that way have the greater effect. Having thus fixed his resolution, he wrote in the form of epistles upon the subject, which at that time was much discoursed of, and addressed himself to those who were chiefly concerned, sending them admonitions and directions according to the best of his judgment. However, this is only conjecture. For when these epistles were first published, the writer might be well known, though afterwards his name and character were forgotten.

V. IMPORTANCE OF THESE EPISTLES. From the extracts, placed at the beginning of this Dissertation, we learn, that the epistle to the Hebrews was received by the writer of these epistles. And from the numerous quotations out of the Old and the New Testament, we perceive the great regard which christians had for the sacred scriptures. Of which we have seen many proofs in the collections that have been made from the ancient writers of the church.

We likewise discern, that at the time of writing these epistles virginity was in great esteem.

But if a true account has been now given of the time and occasion of these epistles, we cannot from them learn the date of any of the books of the New Testament. Mr. Wet-

^r Porro epistola prior beati Clementis, discipuli Petri apostoli.

^s Explicit epistola secunda Clementis, discipuli Petri.

stein, supposing, that these epistles were written by Clement of Rome, thinks, that^t from the quotations here made of St. John's gospel, it may be proved, that St. John wrote earlier than many have imagined, or about the thirty-second year after our Lord's ascension. I do not now concern myself about the time of publishing St. John's gospel. But if these epistles were not written before the middle of the third century, no argument for the early age of that gospel can be drawn from the quotations of it by this writer. And though the writer were Clement, Mr. Wetstein's argument would not be conclusive, because the exact time of Clement's episcopate is not certainly known. At least there are different opinions about it; some placing it in the year of Christ 61, and onwards, others in 69, or 70. And others say, he was not bishop before the year 91, or 93. Many years ago, when I made my extracts out of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, written in the name of the church of Rome, it seemed to me most probable, that it^u was written about the year 96. And the late learned Dr. Waterland, whose good judgment in such things is allowed, readily declared^v his acquiescence in the reasons there alleged. These epistles therefore might be Clement's, and yet not written much before the end of the first century. Consequently, the quotations therein made of St. John's gospel will not prove it to have been written before the year of our Lord 70.

VI. CONCLUSION. I have now made a fair examination of these two epistles. I hope I have given no offence to Mr. Wetstein, or his friends. That learned man knows very well, that the pretensions of writings, which bear the names of eminent ancients, ought to be carefully weighed, before they are admitted. And I persuade myself, that, upon farther consideration, Mr. Wetstein will be convinced he has too hastily published these epistles as Clement's bishop of Rome. And I am apt to think, that he and other learned men will discern in them more marks of a later age, than have been taken notice of by me.

When tidings were first brought hither, that Mr. Wetstein had received two new epistles of Clement out of the East, several of my friends and readers signified their desire, that when they should be published, I would observe the

^t Hinc etiam consequitur, Evangelium Joannis non ab eo jam decrepito et fere centenario, et post mortem Clementis, sed diu antea esse editum, adeoque inscriptionem codicum Græcorum, qui illud Evangelium anno 32 post ascensionem Christi—scriptum fuisse testantur, ad verum propius accedere. Proleg. p. ix.

^u See Vol. ii. p. 34.

^v See Dr. Water-

land's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, p. 33. Cambridge, 1737.

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

AN ESSAY

ON THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF THE

CREATION AND FALL OF MAN.

THERE are not a few difficulties in the account which Moses has given of the creation of the world, and of the formation, and temptation, and fall of our first parents. Some by the six days of the creation have understood as many years. Whilst others have thought the creation of the world instantaneous; and that the number of days mentioned by Moses is only intended to assist our conception, who are best able to think of things in order of succession.

No one part of this account is fuller of difficulties than that which relates to man. And some learned Jews, as well as Origen, and others among christians, have supposed the account before us, not to be a history, but an allegory. The present prevailing opinion is, that what relates to man is fact. And it is argued, that, as the true character of Moses is that of an historian, it would be unbecoming his judgment and exactness, to insert an allegory in the midst of historical facts, without giving any intimation of it.

I shall take the account in the literal sense, and shall go over it under these several heads or divisions. 1. The formation of man. 2. The trial upon which he was put in paradise. 3. The temptation he met with. 4. His transgression. 5. The consequences of that, with the sentence passed by God upon the tempter, and upon the transgressors, our first parents.

1. The first thing in order is the creation of man. For with that I begin, not intending to survey the other works of God, before made.

Gen. i. 26, "And God said, Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Ver. 27, "So God

created man in his own image ; in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them.”

This may be reckoned a summary account of the creation of man, which is more largely and particularly related again in the next chapter.

“ And God said : Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness.”

It is common for christians to say, that here is a proof of a Trinity of persons in the unity of the Godhead. To which others answer, that the Jews never understood these expressions after this manner, who always believed one God, and that God to be one person only, except when they fell into gross idolatry, after the manner of their heathen neighbours. And many learned christians are clearly of opinion, that the doctrine of the Trinity was not revealed in the Old Testament.

These interpreters therefore suppose, that the style common to princes and great men, who often speak in the plural number, is here ascribed to God. Nor need the consultation, here represented, be supposed to be between equals. But God may be rather supposed to declare his mind to his angels, as counsellors. Nor will it be an invincible objection, that in this history there is no notice taken of the creation of angels. For there follow expressions, which may be reckoned to imply their existence and their dignity, and that they were not unknown to man.

But indeed we need not to suppose any real discourse or consultation at all. The meaning is no more than this : ‘ All other things being made, God proceeded to the creation of man : or, he purposed now, at the conclusion, to ‘ make man.’ And it may be reckoned probable, that Moses introduces God in this peculiar manner, deliberating and consulting upon the creation of man, to intimate thereby, that he is the chief of the works of God, which are here described. Or, in other words, according to Patrick upon ver. 26. ‘ God not only reserved man for the last of his ‘ works, but does, as it were, advise and consult, or deliberate ‘ about his production ; the better to represent the dignity ‘ of man, and that he was made with admirable wisdom and ‘ prudence.’

It is here also worthy to be observed, that according to the account of Moses, a different method was taken in forming man, from that in which other animals were formed. Ver. 20, “ And God said ; Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life.” And afterwards, ver. 24, “ And God said ; Let the earth bring forth the

living creature after its kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth." They were produced by the Divine power, and command. But God is represented, as making man himself, immediately, to denote his dignity, and superior prerogative above the rest of the creatures.

Still at ver. 26, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." By which two-fold expression, it is likely, one and the same thing is intended. For when the result or execution of this deliberation and purpose is described and related, it is in this manner: ver. 27, "So God created man in his own image: in the image of God created he him."

What is the "image," or likeness of God, intended by Moses, is not clear, because he has not distinctly expressed it; and we may now conjecture things which were not in the mind of the writer. Nevertheless I think the coherence leads us to understand hereby, as somewhat suitable to the mind of Moses, "dominion over the rest of the creatures of this earth," together with that reason and understanding, which is a main part of the superiority of the human nature above brute creatures, and qualifies man to rule over them, and subdue them, and make them subservient to his own use and benefit. So are the words of this twenty-sixth verse: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth on the earth." And the eminence of man is thus described, Job xxxv. 11, "He teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth, and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven."

Ver. 27, "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." What we are first led to observe here, as connected with what was just said, is, that the woman was made after the image of God, as well as the man.

And from inserting, in this summary account of man's creation, on the sixth day, this particular, that "God created man male and female," it may be concluded, that the woman too was made on that day; which, I reckon, is the general opinion of interpreters; though there are some things in the next chapter, containing a more particular account of the formation of man, that might occasion some doubt about it. Patrick, in particular, says, 'God made 'woman the same day he made man; as he did both sexes

‘ of other creatures, and as he made herbs and plants with seeds in them, to propagate their species.’

It is always supposed, that God made man in maturity of body and understanding. And some have been so curious as to inquire at what age : or what was the age he appeared to have. And in conformity to the great length of the lives of the antediluvians, they have supposed, he might have the appearance of a man of fifty or sixty years of age according to that time.

Ver. 28, “ And God blessed them, and God said unto them : Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth.” The Jewish writers are generally disposed to understand that expression, “ be fruitful and multiply,” as implying a precept universally binding. But the coherence rather leads us to understand it of a blessing or power ; the like to which was bestowed upon the brute creatures, at ver. 22, which are not the subjects of a precept.

And here the privilege of dominion over the creatures is again expressed, denoting it to be common to both sexes, and designed to appertain to their posterity. “ Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it. And have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.”

It follows in ver. 29, and 30, “ And God said : Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree, yielding seed. To you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth on the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat. And it was so.” Hence it is argued by many, that meat, or food of animal flesh, was not used before the flood. But that does not seem certain. It may be allowed, that for a good while, flesh was forborne. As animals were made by pairs only, it was not convenient that any should be slain till they were increased. It may be allowed also, that vegetables were very much the diet of those who lived before the flood ; when, probably, all things were in greater vigour and perfection than afterwards. But here is no prohibition of animal food. And it is observable, that Abel and Seth, and all who were of the family of God, were keepers of cattle. And, if they were not allowed to make use of them for food, it would be difficult to show, how keeping cattle, not fit for draught or burden, especially in any large number, could turn to a

good account. If it be said, they might use their milk; I answer, that is more than is clearly expressed in the grant. Moreover, sacrifices of living creatures were in use very early. It is not reasonable to think, they were all whole burnt-offerings. It may be reckoned probable, that they who brought to God sacrifices and offerings of living creatures, did partake of their offerings; which, certainly, was the custom in after times.

The first chapter of Genesis concludes thus: "And God saw every thing that he had made: and behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day." Every thing was now formed according to the will, and purpose, and command, of God. And every part of each day's creation, man in particular, was good, and such as God approved and designed.

Thus we have surveyed the summary account of man's creation, which is in the first chapter of the book of Genesis. At the beginning of the second chapter is introduced an account of the sabbath, and a description of Paradise, which I forbear to insist on; but I would observe what is farther said of the formation of the first pair.

Ch. ii. 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. And man became a living soul." Man is made of the "dust of the ground." But thereby is supposed to be meant moist earth. And whereas it is said, "God breathed into him the breath of life," which is not said of any other animals; it is hence argued, that the soul of man is different from the body, and that it is a more excellent spirit than that of brute creatures.

Ver. 18, "And the Lord God said: It is not good that the man should be alone, I will make him an help meet for him." Here, I apprehend, we are led to the same observation that was mentioned before, upon occasion of those words, which represented God as consulting about the creation of man. The design of those expressions was to intimate the great dignity, and superior excellence of man above brute creatures, whose creation was before related. In like manner, when God proceeds to the making of the woman, he is represented as consulting, and resolving what to do; that the man might be the more sensible of the goodness of the Creator in providing for him so suitable a help.

Ver. 19, "And out of the ground God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam, to see what he would call them. And whatsoever

Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." Ver. 20, "And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." This bringing the living creatures to Adam, and his giving them names, is a proof of his dominion over them.

This representation of things would lead us to suppose, that Eve was not formed on the sixth day, but some time after, because her formation is here related after the living creatures had been shown to Adam. Nevertheless, as before hinted, that argument is not conclusive. Here we have only a more distinct account of what was before related in general. This may be strongly argued from the seventh verse of this chapter before taken notice of, concerning the formation of Adam, who, certainly, was created on the sixth day.

It follows at ver. 21, "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept. And he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof." By this "sleep," as is supposed, all pain was prevented. It is needless to multiply words here, or nicely to weigh objections. It seems most probable, that in the first formation there was somewhat superfluous in Adam. It has been supposed, that he had a superfluous rib on each side, and that God took away one pair, with the muscular parts adhering to them, and out of them made Eve.

Ver. 22, "And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." Ver. 23, "And Adam said: This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."

It has been thought not improbable, that Adam had an ecstasy, during the time of his deep sleep, showing him what was done upon him: which enabled him to speak so properly, when Eve was brought to him.

Ver. 24, "Therefore shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife. And they shall be one flesh."

This is sometimes called Adam's prophecy. For certain, if these are the words of Adam, he must have been inspired. For he could not at this time, in an ordinary way, have distinct ideas of the relations of father and mother. But many good interpreters think, that these should rather be understood as words of Moses, who by divine direction here inserted this law.

Ver. 25, "And they were both naked, the man and his

wife. And they were not ashamed." This, certainly, must have been the case in a state of innocence. And therefore was proper to be mentioned.

And thus concludes the account of the formation of the first pair.

2. The next point in order is the trial, upon which Adam was put in Paradise.

Ch. ii. 9, "And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree, that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food: the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil."

Of what kind, or for what use "the tree of life" was, we cannot certainly say; though the name of it might lead us to think, it would have been of use upon occasion of eating any thing noxious, or for restoring decays, and preserving the vigour of life.

"And the tree of knowledge of good and evil." It is doubted, why this tree was so called: whether it received its denomination from the event; or whether it was at first so called from the design for which it was made and instituted, that it might be a trial of man's virtue.

In the 8, 10—14 verses is the description of Paradise, which I pass over.

Ver. 15, "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it." Not that he was made out of Paradise, and then brought into it. But, when made, he was placed therein, to keep it in good order.

Ver. 16, "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying; Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat." Ver. 17, "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it. For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Adam, as a rational creature, was subject to the law and will of God. He was necessarily bound by all moral laws and rules, and thereby obliged to love, honour, worship his Creator, and to love every creature of the same species or kind with himself, and to be merciful and tender of inferior beings, in subjection to him. But God was pleased to try him also by a positive law. And this would be likewise a trial of his virtue. For there can be no doubt but he was obliged to respect this law and restraint of his bountiful Maker. And if he should disobey this law, it must be owing to some defect or failure of virtue. There cannot be conceived any reason, why he should transgress this command, unless some wrong temper, or evil thought, or irregularity

and exorbitance of desire, (which, certainly, is immoral and sinful,) first arose in him.

“In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” Literally, in the original, “dying thou shalt die.” Which our translators have well expressed, “thou shalt surely die.”

Hereby some expositors have understood death spiritual, natural, and eternal. But I do not see any good reason they have for it. We seem rather to be justified in taking it in the sense of natural death only, or the dissolution of this frame, the separation of soul and body. We are led to this by the words of the sentence pronounced after the transgression: “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

“In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” By which may be meant, that very day thou shalt become mortal, and be liable to pains and diseases, which will issue in death. Or, that very day thou shalt actually die. Which last sense may be as probable as the other.

That is the trial, upon which man was put in Paradise, and in his state of innocence.

3. The next point, the third in order, is the temptation which he met with; the account of which is at the beginning of the third chapter of the book of Genesis. How long it was after the creation of Adam and Eve, before this happened, is not said. But it is likely, that some days had passed. The serpent found Eve alone, and attempted her in the absence of the man. Nor would his insinuations have been received, we may suppose, if he had suggested disobedience to a command, that was but just then given.

Chap. iii. 1, “Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, which God had made.” It is generally allowed, that here was the contrivance and agency of Satan. But Moses speaks only of the outward appearance; and therein, as I apprehend, refers to, or intends the winding, insinuating motion of serpents. “And he said unto the woman; Yea, has God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?” This is somewhat abrupt, and, possibly, some other discourse had preceded. However, it is very artful; not denying what was most true and certain; but insinuating, that it was very strange, if such a prohibition had been delivered to them. And, possibly, Eve concluded, that she was now addressed by some angel, who wished them well.

Ver. 2, “And the woman said unto the serpent; We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden.” Ver. 3, “But

of the fruit of the tree, which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it; neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." By which we perceive that the woman was well apprized of the command, and the strictness of it. And, probably, she was by when it was delivered; though Adam only be particularly mentioned.

Ver. 4, "And the serpent said unto the woman: Ye shall not surely die." Ver. 5, "For God does know, that in the day you eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Which last words may be thought to imply, that Eve was not without an apprehension of other intelligent beings, distinct from God the Creator and man, and of an intermediate order between both.

In this discourse the serpent insinuates a wrong and disadvantageous opinion of the Deity, as envious of the high happiness and dignity which they might attain to. And Eve was much to blame, for admitting suspicions of the benevolence of him that made them.

4. I proceed immediately to our first parents' transgression, the accounts of that and the temptation being closely connected.

Ver. 6, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat." This is indeed strange. But from the serpent's insinuations she had admitted a dishonourable and disrespectful thought of the Deity, and then soon lost a just regard to the command he had given. She views this dangerous and deadly fruit with complacency. She looked upon this prohibited fruit, till she had an appetite to it, conceived of it as good food, and was taken with its beautiful colour, and possessed with a persuasion, that her curiosity would be gratified with an increase of knowledge. And according to the Mosaic account, which is concise, when Adam came up, and Eve presented him with some of the same forbidden fruit, he took it at her hand, and did eat of it. The account, I say, is concise. But it was needless to be more particular, after the clear account before given of the strict prohibition. Which sets Adam's fault in a conspicuous view. Possibly, the woman gave Adam an account of what the serpent had said to her, and represented it to him, with tokens of her approbation. He could have no temptation beyond what had been represented to the

woman, beside the addition of her offer of it. Which, as it seems, was no small inducement to compliance, and to do as she had done, and whatever should be the event, to share as she did.

Ver. 7, “ And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked: and they sewed [or twisted] fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.” Upon reflection, their eyes were opened in a different sense from what the serpent had said, and they were filled with shame, not knowing what to think of themselves, or how to act. But they soon contrived a slight garment as for a covering.

Ver. 8, “ And they heard the voice of the Lord walking in the garden, in the cool of the day.” They perceived a brisk motion of the air coming towards them, with an increasing sound, that was awful to them. Or, in the words of Bishop Patrick: ‘ They heard the sound of the majestic presence, or the glory of the Lord, approaching nearer and nearer to the place where they were.’ “ And Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden.” They who before had converse with God, which was delightful, now retire into the closest, and most shady coverts, to avoid the Divine appearance.

Ver. 9, “ And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him: Where art thou?” God summoned Adam to appear before him, and to attend to what he should say. Ver. 10, “ And he said, I heard thy voice in the midst of the garden. And I was afraid, because I was naked. And I hid myself.” Ver. 11, “ And he said: Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat? Intimating, that doubtless that was the occasion of all this confusion and disorder of mind, and of his shyness of the Divine presence.

Ver. 12, “ And the man said, The woman, whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.” He cannot deny his guilt; but he puts it off, as much as he can, upon the woman. And the more to excuse himself to God, he says, “ the woman, whom thou gavest to be with me ——”

Ver. 13, “ And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.” She too endeavours to cast the blame upon another. And though it was not a full

vindication, (far from it,) yet it was an alleviation of the fault. It would have been much worse if she had eaten of her own accord, without a tempter.

Ver. 14, "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field. Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Ver. 13, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

It is an observation of an ancient christian writer, in Patrick upon ver. 14, 'That though God inflicted punishments upon Adam and Eve, yet he did not curse them, as he did the serpent, they standing fair for a restitution to his favour.' Undoubtedly, it must have been comfortable to Adam and Eve, to see the displeasure of God against the serpent that had seduced them. Nor were they presently cut off, as the threatening, annexed to disobedience, seemed to import. Yea God speaks of the woman's seed. Therefore they were not to die immediately, but were to have a posterity; meaning by her seed men in general, or the Messiah, and good men who should prevail against the tempter and adversary, though they would suffer some injuries through his means; and calling it the "woman's seed," as some expositors think, to mollify Adam, and prevent his displeasure against her, who had led him into wrong conduct.

Ver. 16, "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth thy children;" that is, I will add to thee pain and sorrow of child-bearing, "And thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Thy will shall be subject to thy husband's. So it was before; but now his authority might be more rigorous and severe than otherwise it would have been. The punishment inflicted on Eve is suitable to the condition of her sex.

Ver. 17, "Unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, (where we see what was his chief temptation, and what was the nearest and most immediate inducement to him to transgress;) and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake. In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." Ver. 18, "Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field." Ver. 19, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to

the ground; for out of it wast thou taken. For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

This part of the sentence, "returning to the dust," or dying, must be supposed common to both the man and the woman. And so far the first sentence takes place. They did not die immediately. But an irreversible sentence of death passes upon them, which would take place in a term of years, when God saw fit.

The rest of the sentence or punishment inflicted on Adam, is suitable to the condition of his sex, as the woman's was to hers, whose province, as the apostle excellently describes it, 1 Tim. v. 14, is to "bear children, and guide the house:" whilst the man has the charge of providing for himself and the family by his care, labour, and industry. The punishment therefore laid upon Adam is, that his care, and toil, and labour, should now for the future be increased beyond what it would have been otherwise.

But here arise objections, relating to the execution of the several sentences pronounced upon the serpent, the tempter, and the two transgressors. The sentence upon the serpent was, "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life."

This is thought a difficulty. And it is asked: Did not serpents go upon the belly before? Was not that their ordinary motion always? How else should they be serpents, if they wanted that which is their proper nature? With regard then to this, and the two other sentences of punishment pronounced upon Eve, and upon Adam, I would observe. It seems to me probable, that God foresaw the event; and that though Adam was made innocent and upright, yet he would fall. This being foreseen, there were dispositions made in the original formation of things, which would be suitable to what happened. Therefore the alterations to be made upon the transgression of the first pair, were not very great and extraordinary. That is, there needed not any great alteration in the form of serpents, nor in the woman's make and constitution, nor in the temper of the ground, to accomplish what is mentioned as a punishment upon each.

Serpents there were before the fall, as is manifest. And their winding, insinuating motion is referred to. Nor did God now, after the fall, create any new species of plants, as "thorns and thistles," to exercise Adam's patience. There were already formed plants and herbs, that were not immediately useful for food, and would occasion an increase of

labour and toil. And doubtless there were also lions, and tigers, and other like creatures; all originally made within the compass of the six day's creation, and all good and wisely designed, as a restraint upon man, according as his temper and circumstances should prove; to humble him, and to render him sensible of his weakness in himself, and his dependence upon God; and to make him thankful for all his distinctions, that he might be induced to give the praise of all his prerogatives and pre-eminences to him from whom they came; who had made him to differ, with advantage, from the rest of the living creatures of this earth; but had also shown, in a proper measure, his wisdom and power in them, as well as in him, and indeed, is wise and holy, great and admirable, in all his works.

Nor does it appear that the whole earth, though fitted for great fertility, was made paradisaical. For, according to Moses, paradise was a garden, a spot of ground which God planted, a certain district or territory, designed for the accommodation of man, and the living creatures with him, in a state of innocence. When Adam therefore was turned out of paradise, he would find a difference.

It follows at ver. 20, "And Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living."

When this was done, is not absolutely certain. Moses does not say when. And as he seems not always to keep the order of time, it may be questioned whether this was done very soon after the sentence had been pronounced upon them; or not till after the woman had brought forth, and was the mother of a living child.

Ver. 21, "Unto Adam also, and to his wife, did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them."

It is very likely that this is not mentioned in the order of time. For it precedes the account of expelling Adam and Eve out of Paradise; whereas it cannot be easily supposed that it was done so soon. It must be reckoned probable, that immediately after the transgression of our first parents, and pronouncing sentence upon them, they were driven out of paradise. But coats of skins could not be had till some time after the fall; for as all the brute creatures were made by pairs, some time must have been allowed for their increase, before any could be slain in the way of sacrifice, or otherwise.

Some of the Jewish writers indeed have understood this literally: "that unto Adam and his wife God did make coats of skins and clothed them:" that is, he *created* for them such garments. Then there would be no occasion to

take from any of the beasts; but the more likely meaning is, that by Divine instruction and direction they made to themselves coats of skins: and it may be supposed, that they were but rough and unpolished.

Understand these words, as we generally do, that by Divine instruction, and with the divine approbation, Adam and Eve clothed themselves with the skins of slain beasts, of sheep, or goats, or other living creatures: I should be much inclined to think that Moses inserted this particular, as evidence that God himself approved of clothing the body with proper and sufficient covering, as a ground and foundation of that decency, which is necessary to be observed by so sociable a creature as man, and in his present circumstances. And if the rough skins of beasts were used then, a more agreeable and more ornamental clothing would not be unlawful or sinful hereafter: when farther improvements in arts and sciences should be made by the wit and industry of man: provided it were but suitable to the ability and condition of persons. And, for certain, a great variety of circumstances was very likely to arise in a numerous race of beings.

I say, if this be the meaning of the words, as they are generally understood, I should be much disposed to think, that Moses inserted this particular, to prevent all scruples upon this head: for though a thing be in itself reasonable, and highly expedient; yet there is nothing that so effectually puts objections to silence, as a divine precept or precedent.

However, there is a very learned and diligent expositor of scripture,^a who explains this text in a different manner. He does not deny, that the original word is used for coat or clothing: but yet he thinks the word rendered coats, signifies tents or tabernacles: which would be more needful than clothing in that warm climate near paradise. Nor would the first pair, he thinks, need there so thick and heavy a clothing as that of the skins of beasts. Nevertheless, I do but just mention this sense; for that of our translation is generally approved of both by Jewish and christian interpreters.

Ver. 22, “And the Lord God said; Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.”

Calvin’s remark upon this verse is exactly to this purpose: ‘Whereas,^b says he, many christians from this place

^a Vid. J. Cleric. Comm. in Gen. iii. 7, et 21.

^b Quod autem eliciunt ex hoc loco christiani doctrinam de tribus in Deo personis, vereor ne satis firmum sit argumentum. Comm. in Gen. iii. 22.

‘draw the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Deity, I fear ‘the argument is not solid.’ So that great man. And indeed, though Moses gives no particular account of the creation of angels, yet their existence is supposed in several parts of this history; and what reason could there be for saying, upon this occasion, that man was become like one of the Divine persons? It may therefore be reckoned very likely that here is a reference to the angelical order of beings, supposed to be more perfect and more knowing than man.

Still, ver. 22, “And now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and live for ever.”

The expression is elliptical. Somewhat is to be supplied, and to this effect. ‘Now care must be had, that he take ‘not of the tree of life, and live for ever.’ This seems to imply, what was formerly hinted, that the tree of life was salutary and healing, and might be useful in case of hurts, and injuries, and decays. But man having transgressed in eating of the fruit forbidden him, and having incurred the threatened sentence; (which too had been pronounced upon him;) it was by no means fit he should eat of the tree of life: the fruit of which might have rendered him immortal, or however prolonged his days to a period that was not suited to the circumstances into which he had brought himself by wilful transgression. There is an allusion to this design, or this virtue of the tree of life in Rev. xxii. 2, “And in the midst of the street of it, and on either side the river was there the tree of life——And the leaves of the tree were for healing the nations.”

Ver. 23, 24, “Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man. And he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.”

The design of all which, seems to be to intimate, that the sentence of death, pronounced upon man, was peremptory and irreversible. He was by no means to attain to immortality in this world, but suffer the change of death, or the dissolution of soul and body, and return to the dust, out of which he was taken.

The text speaks expressly of “man” only. But all allow that the “woman” is included, and must be understood. And are we not also to conclude, that the living creatures were all to follow Adam, and leave paradise.

There was no need to mention them. They accompanied him who had dominion over them.

Man is sent forth "to till the ground," in doing which he would have more labour than he would have had in paradise. His employment is described by tilling the ground. For that would be his main work, as his diet, for some while at least, would be chiefly vegetable. At the entrance into Eden, by which Adam was driven out, were placed cherubim or angels, with a bright appearance, more than ordinary, which rendered it awful.

It would be too curious, I apprehend, to inquire what became of that delightful garden, or spot of ground, in which Adam and Eve were first placed by their bountiful Maker. If it subsisted for a while, it may be supposed to have been destroyed by the flood, and possibly before.

I have now surveyed the account of the creation and fall of man. And though I have not made use of the notion of its being allegorical, which usually leaves too much room for fancy, and for a variety of imaginations, many of which, if not all, would be conjectural; yet, possibly, all is not exact history, nor every thing put in the order of time.

One instance of this, I think, we have plainly seen in the latter part of this chapter: where God's making coats for Adam and Eve is mentioned before their expulsion from paradise; whereas it is very probable it was after it.

Another thing seems to be transposed in the Mosaic account. The living creatures are represented to be brought to Adam, to see how he would call them, before Eve was made. But it is not easy to conceive how that should be done on the very sixth day of the creation, when Eve was made. It might be rather done some time after it. But Moses places that transaction as he has done, the more to show the importance of the woman's creation, though it might in time succeed it.

And there might be some other things instanced in, which need not to be literally taken, as here related in the utmost strictness of interpretation.

In this account of Moses we have the origin of things. It is what speculative minds, in all ages, and in almost all parts of the world, have been employed about. God is good; but how to account, then, for evil, is a difficulty which has greatly engaged and perplexed mankind.

In this relation of Moses is set before us the origin of moral and penal evil of sin, and diseases, and death, of the uncommon pains of child-bearing women, and of the great

pains and labour which man takes for the providing the necessaries of life.

And though, as has been owned, the Mosaic account is not free from difficulties, there never was a better given by any. And consider Moses only as a philosopher, or law-giver separate from the character of an inspired writer, his account of the creation, and of the primitive state of man, and his fall, is worthy of respect. And we have reason to be thankful for it.

I shall now mention some observations in the way of corollary.

I. All things were originally as they came out of the hand of God, good, and were made by him in great wisdom.

After the history of the six days' creation, and of man in particular, it is added by Moses, at the end of the first chapter of this book: "And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day." And Solomon, having with great diligence employed his active and capacious mind in surveying the affairs of this world, and having observed many instances of vanity and vexation therein, and particularly the great degeneracy of mankind, says: "This have I found," of this I see reason to be fully satisfied, "that God made man upright: but they have sought out many inventions," *Ecc. vii. 29.*

II. We are here led to observe the dignity of the human nature, which is so set before us, that it might not be overlooked, but might be regarded, and taken notice of by every one.

Gen. i. 26, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Every word shows the dignity of the human nature. God is represented as proceeding to the formation of man with deliberation and consultation. He makes him himself. He does not say: "Let the earth now bring forth man." But, "Let us make man." And still farther: "in our image, after our likeness." His dignity is also signified in what follows: "And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth." This thought, of man's having dominion over all things in this earth, and being lord of all the creatures therein, seldom occurs, as I apprehend, in heathen writings, but it is a great and just notion, and is a privilege, which man still enjoys in great measure.

This notion of the dignity of the human nature leads us to two reflections: first, man, who has been made so excel-

lent, and has dominion over other creatures, should act according to his dignity, as reasonable, and superior to other creatures on this earth, and should scorn every thing that is mean, base, impure, and cruel.

Another thought, which the dignity of the human nature leads us to, is this; that we can thence argue with great probability, if not with absolute certainty, that God will not lose this creature man, or suffer him to be for ever and totally lost. If man perish and be lost, to what purpose was this earth formed? And of what use are all things therein, if man, to whom dominion over them was given, be taken away? and if he live not to take pleasure in, admire, use, and improve, the rich and costly furniture with which this earth is adorned? It is moreover highly probable, that his time on this earth is not the whole period of his existence. So we may argue from the consideration of the superior dignity of the human nature. And we may see hereafter, that the argument is not inconclusive, but rightly framed.

III. All mankind have proceeded from one pair.

Of this we could not be now absolutely sure, without some good authority, or well attested tradition; but it is the account of Moses, the greatest law-giver that ever was, and an inspired prophet of God. The great resemblance of mankind in the several parts of the world might be some ground of this supposition: but it would not be full proof. For many pairs, resembling each other, might have been formed by God, the Creator, at once, in several, and remote countries, that the earth might be soon peopled thereby. But the account of Moses, I suppose, may be relied upon. Nor ought difference of complexion, and some other lesser things, to be reckoned a valid objection; for difference of climates, with the varieties of air, earth, water, and the lesser or greater degrees of the sun's heat, will make sensible alterations and differences in one and the same species. St. Paul observes to the Athenians, that "God had made of one blood, all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth," Acts xvii. 26. And though, as before said, the great resemblance of the human frame and powers in the several parts of the world may not be a demonstrative argument to us, that all came from one pair; yet this account of Moses is much confirmed by the great agreement between the several nations of the earth in bodily frame, and intellectual powers, like desires, and passions, and diseases, and in universal liableness to death.

This leads us to two reflections. One is, the remarkable effect of the Divine blessing, bestowing such fruitfulness,

that by one pair the vast circumference of this earth should be gradually peopled, manured, and improved.

The second is, that all men ought to love one another as brethren, for they are all descended from the same parents, and cannot but have like powers, and weaknesses, and wants. Solomon says, Prov. xxvii. 19, "As in water," or any other mirror, "face answers to face, so the heart of man to man." By considering ourselves we may know others; what they want, how we may relieve and comfort them. And this thought should abate exorbitant pride: for, notwithstanding some differences of outward condition, we have all the same nature, and are brethren.

IV. The Mosaic account teaches the only right order of marriage, that is, of one man, and one woman.

When the pharisees came to our Lord with a question about divorce, they being then accustomed to polygamy, and to frequent and easy divorces, he immediately answers them, and puts them to silence, by referring them to the Mosaic account of the creation of the first pair, and the Divine institution of marriage. Careful observations upon the increase of mankind have shown us, that the number of males and females born into the world is near equal. Consequently, great inconveniences would ensue from a perversion of the right order of marriage. Nevertheless, nothing can be so effectual, to put and keep things in a right course, as Divine authority, like that in the Mosaic account of the creation.

V. Another thing taught in this account of the origin of things, is the lawfulness, purity, and innocence, of the married state.

For God made man male and female, and marriage was instituted in the primitive state of innocence. Chap. i. 27, 28, "And God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them; Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." Not now to recite again the farther account of the formation of the woman in the second chapter. Doubtless this account of Moses has been of great service in all ages, to remove or prevent scruples, and to restrain those, who from mistaken notions, or wrong views, have been disposed to prohibit, or to discourage marriage.

But though all are at liberty to marry, if they please, yet our Saviour,^c as well as St. Paul,^d seems to intimate the commendableness of the single life in some, if they are

^c Matt. xix.

^d 1 Cor. vii.

masters of their own purpose, and if they prefer it, that they may serve God with less distraction, and greater freedom from the cares of this life; if they choose to deny themselves, and to give themselves wholly up to the service of others in spreading the principles of religion, or promoting the interest of civil society, in any cases of emergency; provided also, that they herein act without ostentation, and do not overvalue themselves on this account, nor at all despise others; then there may be some commendableness in the single life. Nevertheless, after all, it may be reckoned probable, that there are not, and cannot be, many instances of the single life with all the above-mentioned qualifications.

VI. The Mosaic account of the origin of things teaches the duty of the sexes to each other in the married state.

This account teaches this, and is designed so to do. The design is so apparent, that it may possibly lead some to question, whether there is not some studied contrivance in the narration. And if all is history, and things were so performed in the order here related, it may be esteemed unquestionable, that things were so done, particularly, that God created the man and the woman in this manner, and in this order, on purpose to convey these instructions. So therefore argues St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 7—9, “For the man is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man.” And in another place, 1 Tim. ii. 12—14, “But I suffer not a woman to teach, or to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.” Here he adds also: “And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.”

Indeed all nations by their own reason and observation have discerned the same, and have allotted to men the cabinet of princes, the senate, and courts of judicature, as well as the command of navies and armies. But there are two ways of teaching one and the same thing. One is by reason, the other is by facts related in a certain order, and clothed with certain circumstances. And this latter method may be least offensive, and as effectual as the other. For comparisons between equals, or nearly so, are odious and disagreeable. Few or none can bear to insist upon majesty of countenance, bulk and strength of body, compass of knowledge, and solidity of judgment, as grounds of superiority and pre-eminence: when too there may be on the other side advantages of a different kind, that will bring the balance

very nigh, if not quite, to an equilibre. The Mosaic narration affords a better, as it is a softer, argument. Ch. ii. 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. And man became a living soul." Afterwards, ver. 18, "And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone. I will make him an help meet for him." Ver. 21, 22, "And he took one of his ribs—And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." All which affords excellent instruction. And if this account teaches yielding of will and desire on the one hand, it does as strongly enforce protection, love, and tenderness on the other; the performance of which, suitably, on each side, it is likely, will secure mutual comfort and happiness.

VII. Man was put upon a fair and equitable trial, and fell from his primitive state of happiness by his own fault.

Ch. ii. 16, 17, "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat. For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

Divines of all denominations, I think, are agreed that Adam had freedom of will, power to choose and to refuse. Good and evil were set before him. Nor was it a difficult thing to avoid the prohibited fruit; and yet he was induced to eat of it.

VIII. If Adam, who was made upright, was overcome by temptation, we ought to be upon our guard.

This is a duty inculcated upon all of us by our excellent Lord and Master. Especially ought we to guard against disadvantageous and dishonourable thoughts of the Deity. By this means, as much as any, the subtle serpent prevailed upon and deceived Eve. Ch. iii. 1, "Yea has God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"—Ver. 5, "For God does know, that in the day ye eat thereof your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." All dishonourable sentiments of God, as unmerciful, illiberal, rigid, and inexorable, except upon terms of strict justice, are as false as those here suggested by the serpent, or rather by Satan; and if hearkened to, will have a bad influence upon us, and lead us astray from him who is the source of our happiness.

IX. The fall of our first parents is not only an argument to watch ourselves, but also to watch over others. Says St. Paul. 2 Cor xi. 2, 3, "I am jealous over you with a

godly jealousy—For I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.”

X. The sentence pronounced by God upon our first parents for their transgression was mild and equitable: or it was a just sentence tempered with mercy.

The whole process of the judgment shows this, as related by Moses. First, Adam is summoned. He could not deny that he had eaten the forbidden fruit; but he has an excuse; not a very good one, yet an excuse it is. “The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.” The woman too had tasted of the forbidden fruit, and had first tasted. She likewise has an excuse and apology; and though not sufficient, yet of some moment. “And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.” Still farther, God begins with pronouncing sentence upon the serpent, which must have been exceeding comfortable to our first parents. And an intimation is given, that the “seed of the woman” should prevail against the serpent; or, that the cause of truth and innocence, religion and virtue, and the true interest and happiness of man, should prevail and take place in the end.

And though afterwards there are distinct and several sentences pronounced upon each, even upon Adam and Eve; and the sentence of death, as common to both: yet they are not immediately destroyed, but have time afforded for repentance.

We cannot forbear therefore to observe the justice and equity of the Divine Being. Man must die, but not immediately. And he would meet with arguments to establish his resolutions for obedience to the will of God, and for performing the duties of his present condition. The angels that fell appear not to have had any mercy shown them: they, it is likely, had no tempter. Herein, then, there is a difference between man and them. God in his great goodness and equity considers this, and treats man accordingly. This, as well as other things, should induce us to acknowledge the goodness of God, and to guard against all those sentiments that impeach it. God is the fountain of goodness. God therefore is the most merciful and most equitable being in the universe.

XI. The Mosaic account may lead us to think, that some magnify the consequences of the fall of our first parents.

The sin of Adam was the introduction of death, and of the miseries of this life. And so far his sin is imputed to his descendants, that they all become liable to the sentence

of natural death. As St. Paul says, Rom. v. 12, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. And so death," a sentence of death, "passed upon all men." This is not to be denied; nor is it any impeachment of the Divine justice or goodness. For God might have made man at first mortal, only supposing a future state: and that all things here, comforts and sorrows, be designed and ordered, as preparatory and disciplinary for another and better state.

But beside this, some assert, that the descendants of Adam derive from him a vitiated and corrupted nature, unable and averse to good, and inclined to evil. But where is this taught, either in this origin of things now before us, or in any other part of scripture? And would not this be, in reality, to make God the author of sin? Is not this imitating guilty Adam, who said: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me, and I did eat." But if men could allege a vitiated nature, it would be a better apology than that of Adam. The bad conduct, and the solicitations of the woman, could be no more at the utmost than a temptation from without. But nature is inborn, and the man himself. If a bad nature be derived to him without his own fault, the evil is past remedy, and quite out of his power. And if bad actions flow from a bad nature, he is scarce accountable for them. They must be put to the account of nature, and the author of it.

Besides, what reason is there to apprehend so great an alteration made in the nature and powers of man by Adam's transgression? Is there an immense difference between Adam and his posterity? Adam was made innocent; but his virtue was not confirmed. How easily were Adam and Eve misled and drawn into transgression? Is it not very strange that, in their circumstances, they should not be satisfied without tasting of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: when the prohibition was so express and strict, and they enjoyed great plenty of other things? The positive law, delivered to Adam, forbidding him to touch the fruit of that one tree, was a proper trial of his virtue. For it cannot be doubted, that he was obliged to respect this law of his Creator; and if he should disobey it, that must be owing to some defect or failure of moral virtue, as before observed.

Let us, then, not be unwilling to consider, whether the consequences of the fall of our first parents be not aggravated by some; and let us be careful not to admit any schemes which are derogatory to God's honour, and which

countenance or justify men in their allowed weaknesses, or wilful transgressions.

XII. Finally, from the Mosaic account of the origin of things, and the explication which has been now given of it, we may be enabled to perceive, that the permission of the fall of our first parents, with the consequences of it, is no reflection upon the wisdom of the Divine government.

For rational creatures must be put upon trial. They cannot be without freedom of will, which may be abused. And as our first parents did not sin without a tempter, or of their own motion, as many of the angels seem to have done, God in his treatment of them has joined mercy with justice. Hence will arise glory to God, and good to men. God by his long-suffering and patience, and the instructions afforded to them, and other methods of his Providence, the result of his unsearchable wisdom and goodness, will bring many of the sons of Adam to repentance, true holiness, eminent virtue, and heavenly glory and happiness, exceeding what could have been enjoyed on this earth, even in Paradise itself.

The virtue of true penitents is sometimes very great. They gain an establishment in the love and fear of God, and a full resolution for all goodness. The steady virtue of men amidst the temptations of this world will exceed the virtue of Adam in Paradise. It is true they are not innocent as he was; but they are upright, and fully resolved, and they overcome strong temptations: and the moment of their virtue, according to equitable construction, (and such is that of the Divine judgment,) may equal, and even surpass the virtue of an angel, who has not so great temptations. I am the more led to this, considering the great recompenses which God in the gospel has proposed to the faithful, the steady and victorions in this state of trial: and if we may attain to such excellence here, and such glory hereafter, we are greatly to blame, and much wanting to ourselves, if we do not "strive against sin," Heb. xii. 4, to the utmost, and resolutely, though humbly, and without ostentation, maintain our integrity amidst all the solicitations of this world.

A LETTER
TO JONAS HANWAY, Esq.

IN WHICH SOME REASONS ARE ASSIGNED, WHY HOUSES FOR THE
RECEPTION OF PENITENT WOMEN, WHO HAVE BEEN DISOR-
DERLY IN THEIR LIVES, OUGHT NOT TO BE CALLED
MAGDALEN HOUSES.

SIR,

YOUR generous concern to promote good designs occasions you this trouble. There is now, and has been for some while, much discourse about erecting a house, or houses, for the reception of penitent women, who have been disorderly in their lives; a design formerly unknown and unheard of among us. It has been proposed by some that they should be called Magdalen houses. And there is already established a house of this kind in Goodman's-fields, which is called a Magdalen house for penitent prostitutes.

As that denomination is disliked by others beside myself, I have taken the liberty to address you upon this subject.

I presume it may be owing to a supposition, that the fine story, recorded in the seventh chapter of St. Luke's gospel, of the gracious reception which our Lord gave to a woman, there called "a sinner," relates to Mary Magdalene. And you, Sir, if I do not misunderstand you, in your Letter to Robert Dingley, Esq. at p. 22, speak of Mary Magdalene as a harlot.^a

And that she is the woman, there spoken of, must have been at some times a prevailing opinion. For the summary of part of that chapter, in our English Bibles, is to this purpose. 'Our Lord showeth by occasion of Mary Magdalene, how he is a friend to sinners, not to maintain them in sins, but to forgive their sins upon faith and repentance.'^b

^a The words, to which I refer, are these: 'What judgment did the Saviour of the world pass on a harlot? What was the case of Mary Magdalene?'

^b The contents, or summaries, prefixed to the chapters in our Bibles, seem to have been annexed to the English translation now in use, which was made in the time of king James the first. For in all editions of that translation, so

Nevertheless I cannot think that Mary Magdalene is there meant.

One reason here offers from the history itself, at ver. 27, where she is said to be “a woman in the city,” in which our Lord then was; which, according to most harmonizers of the gospels, was either Capernaum or Naim; whereas there can be no reason to believe that Mary Magdalene resided at either of those places. Says Mr. James Macknight, *Harm. sect. xliii. p. 134*, ‘*Ἡ μαγδαληνή*, the Magdalene or Magdalite, probably from Magdala, the place of her nativity, a town situated somewhere beside the lake, and mentioned, *Matt. xv. 29.*’

A passage at the beginning of the next chapter of St. Luke’s gospel deserves particular attention; which, therefore, shall be here recited. “And it came to pass afterwards, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching, and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God. And the twelve were with him, and certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits, and infirmities; Mary, called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod’s steward, and Susanna, and many others. Which ministered to him of their substance,” *ch. viii. 1—3.*

This text affords divers reasons for thinking, that Mary Magdalene is not the woman intended in the preceding chapter.

In the first place, it hence appears, that Mary Magdalene was a woman of quality. But it is very uncommon for such to deserve the character given, *ch. vii. 37*, “a woman in the city which was a sinner.” And the pharisee, at whose house our Lord was then entertained, “spake with himself, saying: This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who, and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him. For she is a sinner.”

Mr. Macknight, again, argues to the like purpose, *p. 134*, ‘Mary Magdalene seems rather to have been a woman far as I have observed, they are the same, where there are any contents at all. But it is not to be supposed that they represent the sense of all learned men in general. For in an English Bible in the quarto form, printed in the reign of queen Elizabeth in 1599, by the deputies of Christopher Barker, the summary of that paragraph in Luke vii. is this: ‘The sinful woman washeth Jesus’ feet.’ In Pool’s English Annotations it is this: ‘Eating at Simon’s house, a woman washeth his feet with tears,’ &c. And in Dr. Clarke’s Paraphrase, the same paragraph is briefly expressed in this manner: ‘Jesus shows by the similitude of a forgiven debtor, that repenting sinners often exceed other men in zeal and piety.’ I might refer to others; but these instances are sufficient to show, that not a few learned men have declined naming the woman there spoken of, and that they have not been satisfied she was the same with Mary Magdalene.

‘ of high station and opulent fortune, being mentioned by St. Luke even before Joanna, the wife of so great a man as Herod’s steward. Besides, the other evangelists, when they have occasion to speak of our Lord’s female friends, commonly assign the first place to Mary Magdalene.’ As Matt. xxvii. 56, 61; xxviii. 1; Mark. xv. 40, 47. And see Luke xxiv. 10. But John xix. 25, affords an exception.

Grotius, in his Annotations upon Matt. xxviii. 1, speaks to the like purpose.^c He likewise thinks, it was at her expense, chiefly, that the spices were prepared for embalming the body of Jesus.

To which I would add, that the precedence, just taken notice of, may have been, partly, owing to her age.

Secondly, In the text, which we are now considering, Mary Magdalene is mentioned with other women, “ who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities.” And of her is said, “ out of whom went seven devils.” Which is also observed by another evangelist, Mark. xvi. 9. She therefore was one of those, who are sometimes called demoniacs, and had been possessed, as we generally say, by evil spirits.^d

Accordingly, Dr. Lardner, in his case of the demoniacs, mentioned in the New Testament, has several times taken notice of Mary Magdalene. At p. 104, 105, he says: ‘ What was Mary’s case, appears in general by St. Luke’s account. ch. viii. 1, 2—Here Mary is reckoned among those, whom our Lord had healed of infirmities, and such infirmities, as were ascribed to evil spirits.’

‘ But I do not think, we can with certainty conclude from those words, what was her particular affliction, because the Jews in those times imputed a great variety of distempers to the influence of demons. But though we dare not say positively, what was her case, whether a distempered frame of mind, or epilepsy, or somewhat else; it appears to me very evident, that some natural, not moral distemper, is hereby intended, and that by seven demons is meant many; a certain number being put for an uncertain. It was supposed, as in the case of the man, who called himself legion, that more than one demon, or unclean spi-

^c ‘ Maria Magdalene.] Quam, ut ducem agminis, Matthæus nominat. Et credo ab eâ factos præcipue sumptus. Sane cæteris nobilior fuisse videtur, quia nomen ejus aliis præponi solet. Grot. in Matt. xxviii. 1.

^d Dr. Clarke’s Paraphrase of Luke viii. 2, is thus: ‘ particularly, Mary Magdalene, whom he had miraculously delivered from evil spirits, that had possessed her ’

‘rit, was concerned in inflicting, or aggravating the infirmity, which she had been afflicted with, and which our ‘blessed Lord graciously removed.’

Thirdly, In this text Mary Magdalene is mentioned with divers other honourable women, who attended our Lord in his journies, and ministered to him of their substance.^e

But it may be justly questioned, whether our Lord would have allowed of that, if Mary’s conduct had been unreputable in the former part of her life. For though he received such an one as a penitent, and assured her of the forgiveness of her sins: it would not be easily reconciled with the rules of prudence to admit such a person to a stated attendance.

This argument has affected the minds of many learned men.^f

Nor can it be imagined, that any women of distinction and good credit would admit into their company one who had been under the reproach of a disorderly life. By St. Luke they are here enumerated after this manner. “Mary called Magdalene, Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod’s steward, and Susanna, and many others.” In St. Matthew xxvii. 55, 56, “And many women were there, beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him; among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee’s children.” Compare Mark xv. 40, 47; xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 10; John xix. 25. All these must have been women of an unblemished character. And so far was there from being any exception to Mary Magdalene, that she is several times mentioned as the most honourable, and placed first of all.

Among them, whether she be expressly named or not, was our Lord’s mother. And undoubtedly an exact decorum was observed, according to the Jewish custom.

Nor were they idle.^g As Jerom says, they provided for

^e Of that attendance Grotius speaks in this manner. More Judaïco, ut recte notat Hieronymus, mulieres, viduæ præsertim, solebant magistris necessaria suppeditare. Quod secuti sunt apostoli inter Judæos, Paulus inter Gentes omisit, ne sinisterioris sermonis ansam præberet. Maluit autem Christus admittere hoc beneficium, quam cum apostolorum comitatu gravis esse ignotis, ad quos adventabat. Grot. ad Luc. viii. 1.

^f Sed et de vitâ Magdalenæ ante actâ nihil plane constat, nisi quod abluere a majestate Domini videatur, quod in comitatu suo mulierem ob impunitates suas infamem voluerit circumducere—Neque consulit huic difficultati Nat. Alexander, quoad ansa omni scandalo per illustrem atque inter Judæos notam pœnitentiam præcisa fuerit. Nimis enim efferata erat Judæorum malitia, quam ut capropter a conviciis cessaturi essent. Lampe in Joan. Evang. cap. xix. T. III. p. 608. Vid. et Basnag. Ann. 31. num. xlii.

^g —secute sunt Jesum non otiosæ, sed facientes quæ mandabantur ab

our Lord's accommodation in his food and garments.^b And possibly, Mary Magdalene presided in the direction of the affairs which were under their care.ⁱ

When they accompanied our Lord in any of his journies, they may have followed at a distance, and in a separate band. And, as may be well supposed, they had some female servants of their own.

The woman called "a sinner," was absolutely excluded from having any part in that company. When she came into the room where our Lord was, and gave proofs of repentance, he graciously and openly received her as a penitent. Having delivered the similitude of two forgiven debtors, he addressed the pharisee, at whose house he was, in these words: "Wherefore, I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven," Luke vii. 47. Afterwards, at ver. 48, "And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven." Finally, at ver. 50, "And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee. Go in peace." Nor could any unprejudiced men disallow our Lord's ability to discern her real temper, and to pronounce a right sentence, after he had shown to the pharisee himself, that he knew his inmost thoughts.

In all this our blessed Lord acted agreeably to his great design, which was to bring sinful men to repentance. And he faithfully discharged the important commission that had been given him, which was "to seek and to save that which was lost," Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10.

But it cannot be reasonably supposed, that he would admit such a person into the number of his stated attendants. And I believe, that they who attentively observe our Lord's history, as recorded in the gospels, may perceive his life to have been an example of admirable wisdom and prudence, as well as of the strictest virtue, and the most generous goodness and compassion.

Let us now sum up the evidence, so far as we have gone. Mary of Magdala was a woman of distinction, and very easy in her worldly circumstances. For a while she had laboured under some bodily indisposition, which our Lord miraculously healed. For which benefit she was ever after very thankful. So far as we know, her conduct was always re-
eo, et delectabant eum. Ministrantes enim sequebantur eum. Orig. in Matt. Item. 35. num. 141. p. 929. T. III. ed. Bened.

^b Consuetudinis Judaicæ fuit, nec ducebatur in culpam, more gentis antiquo, ut mulieres de substantiâ suâ victum atque vestitum præceptoribus ministrarent, &c. Hieron. in Matt. xxvii. tom. IV. p. 140. Bened.

ⁱ 'Οὕτω και αυτη αρχηγος των μαθητριων γενομενη. κ. λ. Modest. ap. Phot. Cod. 275, p. 1526.

gular, and free from censure. And we may reasonably believe, that after her acquaintance with our Saviour it was edifying and exemplary. I conceive of her, as a woman of a fine understanding, and known virtue and discretion, with a dignity of behaviour becoming her age, her wisdom, and her high station. By all which she was a credit to him, whom she followed as her Master and benefactor. She showed our Lord great respect in his life, at his death, and after it. And she was one of those, to whom he first showed himself after his resurrection. As appears from Matt. xxviii. 1—10; Mark xvi. 9; and John xx. 1—18.

I am very unwilling to trouble you with the intricacies of criticism. But I fear, my argument will not be reckoned conclusive by all, unless I proceed a little farther, and take notice of some other things. For by some it has been supposed, that Mary, sister of Lazarus, was the same as Mary Magdalene. And by some it has been thought, that Mary, sister of Lazarus, is the same as the woman called “a sinner.”

First, Some have supposed, that Mary, sister of Martha and Lazarus, was the same as Mary Magdalene. This is an assertion of Baronius,^k who was confuted by Isaac Casaubon,^l G. J. Vossius,^m and others. Grotiusⁿ likewise has well argued against that opinion.

Indeed I think it is very manifest, that they are different persons. For, 1. Mary Magdalene was so called from a place situated in Galilee. Lazarus and his sisters were inhabitants of Bethany near Jerusalem in Judea, properly so called. John xi. 1, and elsewhere. 2. Mary Magdalene is frequently named with other women, who attended our Lord in his journies, and came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem at the times of the great feasts, as we have seen. But Lazarus and his sisters resided at Bethany. Nor do we read of any attendance, which either of those sisters gave our Lord, except at the place of their ordinary residence. St. Luke has recorded a visit, which our Lord made there, not improbably, as he was going up to the feast of the dedication, mentioned John x. 22, “And it came to pass,”

^k In primis dicimus, attestazione Joannis Evangelistæ, immo Christi, apertissime constare, unam eandemque personam fuisse Mariam Lazari et Marthæ sororem cum Maria Magdalena. Baron. Ann. 32. num. xix.

^l Exercit. Antibar. xix. num. xi.

^m Longius vero a januâ, quod dicitur, videntur mihi aberâsse, qui arbitrantur, Mariam, a quâ Dominus, priusquam pateretur, inunctus fuit, Mariam fuisse Magdalenam——Hæc enim non eâ notâ ab aliis distinguitur Mariis, quod inunxerit Dominum, sed quod Dominus ex eâ septem ejecerit dæmonia. G. J. Voss. Harm. Ev. l. 1. c. 3. sect. vii.

ⁿ Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 6.

says St. Luke, “ as they went, that he entered into a certain village. And a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister named Mary, which also sat at Jesus’ feet, and heard his word.” And what there follows: Luke x. 38, 39. And St. John, ch. xi. giving an account of the sickness, and death, and resurrection of Lazarus, assures us, that both his sisters were at home at Bethany. Here likewise it was, that Mary anointed our Lord with precious ointment, a short time before his last sufferings, as related, John xii. at the beginning. 3. Mary Magdalene is particularly mentioned with others, whom our Lord had miraculously healed of infirmities; and out of her, as is said, went seven demons. But nothing of this kind is ever said, or hinted, of Mary, sister of Lazarus.

Secondly, Some have supposed, Mary sister of Martha and Lazarus, to be the same with the woman called “ a sinner,” of whom St. Luke speaks in ch. vii.

For St. John writes, ch. xi. 1, 2, “ Now a certain man was sick named Lazarus of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, whose brother Lazarus was sick.”

Here therefore we must again recollect what St. Luke says, ch. vii. 37, 38, “ And behold, a woman in the city which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the pharisee’s house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping. And she began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.”

Hence, then, it may be argued, that St. John has told us the name of the woman that was “ a sinner,” though St. Luke omitted it. She is Mary, sister of Lazarus.

To which I would answer. 1. Mary, sister of Lazarus, was a woman of good character, without any note of infamy. St. Chrysostom, in a homily upon the beginning of the eleventh chapter of St. John’s gospel, says: ‘ Some have put ‘ the question, whether this be the same with her that is ‘ called “ a sinner.” But without reason, he says, for^o this ‘ was a virtuous woman of good credit.’ And in a homily upon Matt. xxvi. 6, &c. he calls the sister of Lazarus, ‘ an^p ‘ admirable woman.’ 2. The anointing, mentioned by St. Luke, was done at Naim or Capernaum, or some other place in Galilee. But Mary, sister of Lazarus, as was before

^o Ἄντη δὲ καὶ σεμνή καὶ σπεῦδατα. In Joan. hom. 62. [al. 61.] T. VIII. p. 368.

^p Ἄλλ’ ἕτερα τις θαυμαστή, ἢ τὴν Λαζάρου ἀδελφῆν. In Matt. hom. 80. [al. 81.] T. VII. p. 765.

shown, dwelt at Bethany. 3. St. John here intends that anointing of our Lord, of which himself has given a particular relation in ch. xii. 1—8. Which therefore we must now observe. “Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, which had been dead. There they made him a supper, and Martha served. But Lazarus was one of them that sat at table. Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair. And the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. Then said one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son, which should betray him; Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?—Then said Jesus: Let her alone; against the day of my burying has she kept this. For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always.”

That this is a different anointing from that mentioned by St. Luke, is manifest from divers particulars. They differ in the circumstances of time and place as just shown. Again, in the former it was Simon the pharisee, who took offence at our Lord’s suffering himself to be touched by a woman that was a sinner. Here it is Judas, one of the disciples, who murmurs at the expense. And our Lord’s vindications are quite different. To which might be added, that the woman, of whom St. Luke writes, stood behind our Lord “weeping, and washing his feet with tears.” But^a St John has not a word of Mary’s shedding any tears, though he has twice said, that “she wiped his feet with her hair.” See ch. xi. 2, and xii. 3.

In Matt xxvi. 6—13, and Mark xiv. 3—9, as is well known, is an account of our Saviour’s being anointed by a certain woman a short time before the passover. Some^r learned interpreters think, that these are different histories, and that our Lord was twice anointed in Bethany, in the space of a few days; once by Mary sister of Lazarus, as related by St. John, and a second time by another woman not named, as related by those two evangelists. Others^s

^a Et quæ secundum Lucam est, plorat, et multum lacrymat, ut pedes Jesu lacrymis lavet. Quæ autem secundum Joannem est Maria, neque peccatrix, neque lacrymans introducitur. Orig. in Matt. hom. 35. num. 77. p. 892. Vid. et Hieron. in Matt. xxvi. 7. T. IV. p. 125.

^r Cleric. Harm. Evang. cap. lii. p. 350, 351. et cap. lix. p. 404, 405. See also Mr. Macknight’s Harm. sect. 109. p. 97, 98. and sect. 124. p. 146.

^s G. J. Voss. Harm. Ev. l. i. cap. 3. sect. 7. Calvin in Joan. Ev. xii. 1. Lampe Comm. in Jo. T. II. p. 822. Byreus de Morte Christi. l. i. cap. 3. num. v. &c. L’Enfant sur Matt. xxvi. 6. et Jean. xii. 2, 3. Doddridge’s

think, that these three evangelists speak of one and the same anointing. Which to me appears very right. But it is not needful, that I should now stay to reconcile those accounts.

I have aimed to show, that Mary Magdalene is not the woman called “ a sinner,” of whom St. Luke writes, ch. vii. And I suppose, that most Protestant divines are of the same opinion. The learned Romanists have been divided. The grounds and reasons of the controversy among them may be seen in several.^t

Nevertheless the learned Benedictine editor of St. Chrysostom’s works has expressed himself very freely concerning this point, in a note upon one of the homilies above cited. ‘ It is a difficult question,’ says he, ‘ whether the ‘ woman that was a sinner, who washed Christ’s feet, be ‘ the same as Mary, sister of Lazarus. But that Mary ‘ Magdalene is different from them, is now denied by very ‘ few.’^u

Tillemont begins his article of Mary Magdalene with these words : ‘ It is an ancient question in the church, and ‘ upon which all are not yet entirely agreed, whether Mary ‘ Magdalene be the same as Mary sister of Lazarus, and the ‘ woman that is said to be a sinner, or whether they are ‘ three different persons. The most illustrious churches of ‘ France, and almost all the learned men of our times, have ‘ declared for the distinction of these three persons. And ‘ it has been proved by reasons, which seem fully to decide ‘ the difficulty, if we will judge without prejudice.’

Du Pin, referring to Luke vii. says : ‘ It^v is commonly ‘ thought, that this woman was Mary Magdalene. Never- ‘ theless the evangelist, who relates this history, does not ‘ name her. All he says is, that she was a woman in that

Family Expositor, vol. II. p. 283. note (a). Hammond upon Luke vii. 37. Vid. et Hieron. in Matt. xxvi. T. IV. p. 125. fin.

^t See in Bayle’s Dictionary J. Fevre, d’Etaples, or Faber Stapulensis, particularly note (e). They who have leisure might also consult Tillemont’s chapter of S. Marie Madeleine, Mem. Tom. II. and the Notes upon it, which are long, and contain a great deal of learning, relating to this subject.

^u Grandis quæstio, utrum peccatrix illa, quæ Christi pedes abluit, eadem ipsa sit, quæ soror Lazari ; quam tractare presentis non est instituti. Mariam autem Magdalenam ab his diversam esse, pauci jam negant. Ap. Chryst. T. VII. p. 765.

^v On croit communément, que cette femme étoit Marie Magdeleine. Cependant l’Evangeliste S. Luc, qui rapporte cette histoire, ne la nomme point. C’ étoit une femme connue dans la ville pour une femme de mauvaise vie. Il n’ y a pas d’ apparence, que ce fût ni Marie Magdeleine, ni Marie Sœur du Lazare, dont nous parlerons, qui étoient des femmes de qualité, et de bonne condition. Du Pin, Histoire de l’ Eglise en Abrégé. Vol. i. p. 451.

‘ city, known for her disorderly life. It is not at all probable, that she was Mary Magdalene, or Mary sister of Lazarus, who were women of quality, and good condition.’

After this long argument, and so many good authorities, I may leave you to consider, whether they have not some good reason for their judgment, who dislike the denomination or inscription, taken notice of at the beginning of this letter. ‘ A Magdalen house for penitent pr—tes.’

It appears to me a great abuse of the name of a truly honourable, and I think truly excellent woman. If Mary’s shame had been manifest, and upon record, she could not have been worse stigmatized: whereas the disadvantageous opinion concerning the former part of her life is founded only in an uncertain, and conjectural deduction. And if the notion, that she was the woman in Luke vii. be no more than a vulgar error, it ought to be abandoned by wise men, and not propagated, and perpetuated.^w

Besides, are there no bad consequences of a moral kind to be apprehended from this mistaken, or at best very doubtful opinion? Some, perhaps many, will be admitted into these houses, who have lived very dissolute lives, and have been very abandoned creatures. And the proofs of the

^w Since writing what is above, and indeed the whole of this Letter, I have met with a book, entitled Thoughts on the Plan for a Magdalen House for Repentant Prostitutes, addressed to the promoters of this charity. Where, at p. 23, is this paragraph. ‘ Give me leave to take notice of the name of your charity. It does not appear to me, that Mary Magdalene was deficient in point of chastity, as is vulgarly understood. I rather imagine she was not. It is certain, she was a lady of distinction, and of a great and noble mind. Her gratitude for the miraculous cure performed upon her was so remarkable, that her story is related with the greatest honour. And she will ever stand fair in the records of fame. Your charity requires a zeal like hers. You are her disciples. And the dedication of your institution to her memory is entirely consistent with the honour due to her character. And in this light no name more proper could be given to it.’ Any one may be sensible, that the justice done to Mary Magdalene in the former part of this paragraph, is very pleasing to me. But I do not perceive, how the title, pleaded for, can be consistent with the honour due to her character. For it carries in it an implication, that she once laboured under the like bad habits with the women placed under the roof of the houses dedicated to her; which houses, with this title, will uphold the popular opinion against the best arguments. And Mary Magdalene, rather than any other, must still be the patroness of penitents, because she is supposed to have been for some while a great sinner. An understanding man, like the author of these thoughts, may now and then declare in conversation, and in writing, that Mary Magdalene was not deficient in point of chastity: but to little or no purpose. These houses, so named, will be new monuments erected, in a protestant country, to the dishonour of a virtuous woman, added to all others of the like kind, which there are already in popish countries; in which, especially some of them, ignorance and superstition prevail to a great degree. And may they never so prevail, and be so general among us!

repentance of some may be very ambiguous. Nevertheless all who get into houses, called Magdalen houses, will reckon themselves Magdalens. If they have been first taught to impute to her their own vices, they will soon learn to ascribe to themselves her virtues, whether with reason or without. At the lowest, they will be encouraged to magnify themselves beyond what might be wished; where humility, as we may think, should be one requisite qualification. And indeed I imagine, it would be best, that these houses should not have the denomination of any saint at all.

It is not my intention to disparage your institution. I hope that many of your patients may be recovered to wisdom and virtue; though I cannot see the reason why they should be called Magdalens.

It may not be proper for me to recommend another inscription; but I apprehend that a variety might be thought of, all of them decent and inoffensive. I shall propose one, which is very plain: 'A charity house for penitent women:' which, I think, sufficiently indicates their fault; and yet is, at the same time, expressive of tenderness, by avoiding a word of offensive sound and meaning, denoting the lowest disgrace that human nature can fall into, and which few modest men and women can think of without pain and uneasiness. Or, if that title is not reckoned distinct and particular enough, with a small alteration, it may be made, 'for penitent harlots.'

Perhaps you will say, that this letter has been brought to you too late; and I could now almost wish you had had it sooner, provided it contains any thing deserving your regard; for these thoughts, or most of them, did early arise in my mind upon the first intelligence concerning this new design; but I declined the labour of putting them together. And I was also in hopes, that the point would be considered by some pious clergyman, or other learned man, apprehensive of consequences, and concerned for the honour of our Saviour, and his friends, as well as desirous to promote the good of his neighbours, and other fellow-creatures of his own time.

Your humble Servant,

October 2, 1758.

A. B.

A LETTER

TO THE AUTHORS OF THE LIBRARY, &c.^a

GENTLEMEN,

I HOPE you will find room in your Magazine for some critical observations upon the Scriptures. I send you the following, which you are at liberty to make such use of as you please.

2 Cor. v. 14, "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." I think it should be rendered, "then should all die."

That this is the sense, appears from the connection in the next verse: I therefore shall briefly paraphrase both the verses.

"For the love of Christ constraineth us, we judging this, that if," or, forasmuch as, "one died for all:" then without all doubt, "all should die," to sin, and the world: "and that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves," seeking only their own gratification, "but" rather should live "to him," to the glory, and according to the will and the commandments of "him, who died for them, and rose again."

This interpretation is much confirmed by divers other texts, which may be reckoned parallel, particularly Rom. vi. 1, 11; xiv. 7, 8; 1 Pet. iv. 2.

Isaiah lxiii. 1—6, "Who is this, that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?"

The proper and primary meaning of this passage of scripture, seems to be to this purpose. The prophet in a vision, or ecstacy, foresees some great deliverance of the Jewish nation from their enemies, particularly the Edomites; and, being fully persuaded of the event, he addresseth the deliverer, as if seeing him coming from the defeat of the enemy. "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?" the capital city of the Edomites: "this, that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?" Approaching toward me, like

^a First published in the LIBRARY, (a periodical Work printed in 1761 and 1762,) for May 1761.

a mighty and glorious conqueror in triumph? "I, that speak in righteousness." It is I, whom you have seen in vision, who speak the truth, and am concerned for true religion: "mighty to save," who labour for the welfare of my people, and expose myself to the greatest dangers for their safety. "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?" Tell me, then, says the prophet, whence this redness of blood upon thine apparel, so that thy garments look like those of one that treadeth in the wine-fat? The deliverer answers: "I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me:" I have performed this difficult work almost alone, few of my own people joining with me, and without the concurring assistance of neighbouring nations, our allies around us. "For I will tread them," or, for I have trodden them, "in my anger: and I will trample," or, I have trampled, "them in my fury; and their blood shall be," or, has been, "sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain," or, have stained, "all my raiment. For the day of vengeance was in my heart, and the day of my redeemed," or, of redeeming my people, "was come. And I looked, and there was none to help." I looked round, and well considered the matter; but none of our neighbours were willing to help us, nor were many of my own people ready to join with me, "and I wondered, that there was none to uphold;" this appeared to me very strange, and even astonishing; nevertheless I was not discouraged: "therefore my own arm brought salvation unto me, and my fury," or, zeal for religion, and for the welfare of my people, "it upheld me," and carried me through all the dangers and difficulties of this arduous service. You see the reason therefore, and you need not wonder at it, that I "am red in my apparel, and that my garments are like him that treadeth in the wine-fat."

That appears to be the most proper and critical, or at least the primary sense of this text; however, by some, it is also applied to Christ, and the church. They say, the reason of mentioning Edom is, that it is usual for the prophets to denote the enemies of the church in general, by the name of some country, or people, which has been remarkable for its hatred of the Jewish nation; and that here the prophet seems to take a hint from some remarkable calamity, that had befallen the Edomites, to describe some more general judgment, that should be inflicted upon the enemies of God's church and people.

Be it so: still this passage of scripture has no relation to

the sufferings of Christ, but to some deliverance of God's people in ancient or later times, out of the hands of their unrighteous enemies and oppressors.

And we may perceive, that these words in ver. 5, "I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered, that there was none to uphold, therefore my own arm brought salvation unto me, and my fury, it upheld me:" do not point to Christ's transactions on this earth. These words may be allusively applied to that great salvation, which is the work of God and Christ alone, but no otherwise; and allusions, even where no more is intended, are dangerous; for texts, often alleged in the way of allusion, and separate from the connection, are apt to gain a sense in our minds, which is not the true meaning of them.

Your readers, if they think fit, may compare this with the same paragraph of the prophet Isaiah, as versified in the Protestant Magazine for April, p. 40.

TO THE INGENIOUS AUTHOR OF THE

REMARKS

UPON 1 COR. xv. 32, IN THE LAST MAGAZINE, p. 315.^a

SIR,

YOU have touched upon a difficult text; permit me also to propose some observations upon it. You think it probable, 'that the scene of danger here referred to, is that mentioned Acts xix. 30, 31.' But I rather think, that the first epistle to the Corinthians was written and sent away, before the tumult caused by Demetrius. St. Luke there informs us, ver. 22, "So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for a season." Then at ver. 23, "And the same time there arose no small stir about that way," &c. Says Lightfoot, vol. I. p. 299, 'Between ver. 22 and 23, of 'this nineteenth chapter of the Acts, falleth in the time of 'St. Paul's writing the first epistle to the Corinthians:' which I take to be very right. You have Dr. Ward with

^a First published in the LIBRARY for October 1761.

you, at p. 200, where he says: 'It is most reasonable, therefore, to understand the expression as metaphorical, and that he refers to the tumult raised by Demetrius.' But turn over the leaf, and look to p. 199, there you may see him saying, 'After the affair of Demetrius, he immediately left the city, and went into Macedonia.' This decides the point. The epistle was written before the tumult, not after it; and therefore cannot refer to it.

I understand the expression, "fighting with beasts," literally; I do not love to depart from the proper meaning of a word, unless there be a necessity for so doing.

Nevertheless I do not suppose that St. Paul ever fought with beasts. St. Luke is entirely silent about it: nor is it mentioned by himself in the catalogue of his dangers and sufferings, 2 Cor. xi. 23—33. 'Moreover,' as Dr. Ward well observes, 'had St. Paul been thus engaged, it is difficult to apprehend how he could have escaped, without a miracle.'

To proceed. I am of opinion that St. Paul refers not here to any particular event, or occurrence of his life; it is only a supposition made, an affecting case put by him, to enforce his arguments in behalf of a resurrection, and a life to come.

Let us observe the context. Ver. 19, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable." Ver. 20, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Ver. 30, "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" Ver. 31, "I protest by our rejoicing, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily." 'I exert myself to the utmost, and am continually exposed to the greatest dangers; all which I acquiesce in, and even am joyful; hoping for a resurrection, and to be for ever with Christ. Without that expectation, all such laborious and hazardous services would be unreasonable, and unprofitable.' Ver. 32, 'If, according to a cruel custom which obtains among men, I had, for the sake of the gospel, been condemned in this city to fight with beasts, and had been miserably torn to pieces, and destroyed by them; would it have been of any advantage to me? None at all. All such fortitude and alacrity in serving the interests of religion, and with a view to promote the general good of men, would have been quite lost, and fruitless. "If the dead rise not," if there be no life after this, we might be disposed to adopt that profane saying, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But, my brethren, far be it that any of us should embrace

‘ such sentiments, or act upon them, ver. 33, “ be not deceived,” &c.’

I allow of your pointing. My version is little different from yours, and agrees also with that of Dr. Gerdes, professor of divinity at Groningen, who has lately published a critical commentary upon this whole chapter. It is thus :
 ‘ Quod si secundum hominem etiam cum bestiis decertassem
 ‘ Ephesi, quid inde ad me lucri? Si mortui non resurgent,
 ‘ edamus et bibamus. Cras enim moriemur.’ A.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH OF THE

HISTORY OF THE SEVEN BROTHERS,

SAID TO HAVE SUFFERED MARTYRDOM IN THE TIME OF
 ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES, 2 Macc. vii^a

I. THE truth of this history depends entirely upon the second book of the Maccabees. Dr. Prideaux has given a large and judicious account of both those books. Conn. year before Christ 166, p. 185, &c. ‘ The first,’ he says, ‘ which is a very accurate and excellent history, and comes ‘ the nearest to the style and manner of the sacred historical ‘ writings of any extant, was written originally in the Chal- ‘ dee language, of the Jerusalem dialect, which was the ‘ language spoken in Judea from the return of the Jews ‘ thither from the Babylonish captivity.’ The second book of the Maccabees, he says, was written by an Egyptian Jew, probably of Alexandria. But he says, ‘ it does by no means ‘ equal the accurateness and excellence of the first.’ And he observes, ‘ that it consists of several pieces compiled to- ‘ gether, by what author is uncertain. It begins with two ‘ epistles sent from the Jews of Jerusalem, to the Jews of ‘ Alexandria and Egypt. Both these epistles seem to be ‘ spurious, wherever the compiler of this book picked ‘ them up.’

After these two epistles, which end at the eighteenth verse of the second chapter, the author proposes to write of things, ‘ as declared by Jason of Cyrene, in five books, which he

^a First published in the LIBRARY for February 1762.

‘ will assay to abridge in one volume.’ ‘ But,’ says Du Pin, ‘ the author of this abridgment does not make an exact ‘ abridgment of Jason. Sometimes he copies, sometimes he ‘ abridges, and oftentimes he passes from one narration to ‘ another, and does not relate facts in their true order.’

II. The sufferings of these seven brothers, and likewise of Eleazar, related in the sixth chapter of this second book of Maccabees, and said to be “ one of the principal scribes, and fourscore years old and ten,” are entirely omitted in the first book of the Maccabees: though the author of it there writes of the Jewish affairs, and their sufferings in the time of Antiochus. It appears to be probable, that he would not have omitted the sufferings of these persons, if he had been acquainted with them. But so far from relating them particularly, he does not give any the least hint of them.

III. There is not any notice taken of this Eleazar, or these seven brethren, or their mother, by Josephus, in any of his authentic writings. He had twice a fair occasion to mention them; first in his *History of the Jewish War*, written not many years after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the first book of which he relates the encroachments of Antiochus Epiphanes; and secondly in his *Antiquities*, written many years afterwards, where he again recounts the sufferings of the Jewish people under the same prince, *Ant. L. xii. cap. v.* But in neither of those works has he said any thing of Eleazar, or these seven brothers; whose story is so remarkable, that it could not have been omitted by him, if it had been matter of fact.

It is true, there is a work, sometimes ascribed to Josephus, entitled, ‘ *Of the Empire of Reason, or a Discourse ‘ of the Maccabees.*’ But, as Cave says, it is denied to be his by many learned men. ‘ *Josephi tamen esse negant ex ‘ eruditiss, quam plurimi.*’ And the late Mr. Whiston, who translated into English all the genuine writings of Josephus, omitted this, and would not join it with the rest. And in an advertisement at the end of his version, he says, ‘ I have ‘ omitted what is in the other editions of Josephus; I mean ‘ the discourse about the Maccabees, that is, about the tor- ‘ ments of the mother, and her seven children, under Anti- ‘ ochus Epiphanes. It is commended by Eusebius, and ‘ Jerom themselves, as an elegant performance, and as the ‘ genuine work of Josephus. It seems to me not to deserve ‘ that character. Nor can it, I think, with the least proba- ‘ bility, be ascribed to Josephus, unless as a declamation ‘ when he was a school-boy.’ And he observes, that the history is taken from the second book of the Maccabees,

‘ which it evidently appears Josephus never made use of in ‘ his other writings.’ So Mr. Whiston. To me it appears to be the work of some christian.

IV. This account is defective in what we generally call internal characters of credibility.

1. The thing is in itself very extraordinary ; that so many persons, of one and the same family, should be all at one and the same time called out to suffer, and be all steady and valiant. It is very improbable, and almost incredible.

2. The whole story has the appearance of a contrived fiction. First there is an account of Eleazar, who suffers at the age of fourscore years and ten, ‘ that he might leave a notable example to such as are young, to die willingly and courageously for the honourable and holy laws.’ Then follow the sufferings and death of these young men, who too are exactly seven, a number much respected among the Jews.

3. The sufferers are not described so particularly as they ought to be, and generally are, in credible relations. The names of the seven brothers are all omitted. Nor is it said, what was their tribe, or family, or what was the usual place of their abode. Nor are we told, who was their father. In some modern accounts the fore-mentioned Eleazar may be said to be their father. But there is no ground for it in this narrative. Nor are we told the name of the mother of these brothers, though she is so often mentioned. Nor is it said how she died. All that is said, is this: “ Last of all after the sons, the mother died.” In the discourse of the Maccabees, ascribed to Josephus, it is said, “ the mother, that no man might touch her body, threw herself upon the pile.” *Και να μη ψαυσειε τε σωματος αυτης εαυτην ερριψε κατα της πυρας*, chap. 17. Upon which the note of Cambesis might be seen. This is one of those passages, which makes me think that work to have been composed by a christian. Josippon, or Josephus Ben Gorion, a Jewish writer of the ninth or tenth century, or later, says, that after she had offered up her prayer to God, her spirit departed from her, and she fell upon the heaps of her son’s dead bodies, and lay upon the earth. But these things are additional to the original account. ‘ Postquam desiit ita orare, et effundere orationem coram Jehova, egressa est anima ejus, dum adhuc loqueretur, et exiit spiritus ejus, et corruit super acervos corporum filiorum ejus et jacuit etiam cum eis projecta super terram,’ p. 115, Oxon. 1706.

4. These seven brothers are here represented to have been examined, tortured, and slain, one after another, in the

presence of the king, or Antiochus. Which is very improbable. For such examinations and executions are generally delegated to officers. And in the first book of the Maccabees, upon which we can depend, we are assured, that Antiochus had officers for this purpose in the several parts of Judea. So 1 Macc. i. 51, "In the self-same manner wrote he to his whole kingdom, and appointed overseers over all the people, commanding the cities of Judah to sacrifice, city by city." And afterwards it is particularly said, 1 Macc. ii. 25, "that Mattathias slew the king's commissioner at Modin, who compelled men to sacrifice."

5. It is not said, or hinted, where these persons suffered. Here is a very extraordinary transaction, seven men, all brothers, the sons of one mother, tried, tortured, put to death, one after another, in the presence of a great king. But where is not said, whether at Jerusalem, or in some other city of Judea. As it is not said where all this happened, we may not unreasonably infer, it never happened, or was done any where.

For these reasons this history appears so much like a fiction, that I do not see how it can be relied upon as true. Many acts of christian martyrs, which had been received for a while, have since been examined by learned men, and rejected, some as spurious, others as very much interpolated: why then should we be afraid to examine a like narrative in a Jewish apocryphal book, of little credit?

Obj. It will be said: does not the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews refer to this history, and thereby assure us of the truth of it? Heb. xi. 35, "And others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection." To which I answer. It is not clear, or certain, that there is a reference to this history in that text. And I shall add a part of what Mr. Hallet says upon this place, in his paraphrase and notes upon the three last chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews. 'All the commentators agree in
' supposing, that the apostle here refers to the history of the
' martyrdom of Eleazar, and the mother, and her seven sons,
' mentioned in the second book of the Maccabees. And I
' was once carried away with the stream; but I am now
' persuaded, that the apostle, in this whole chapter, does not
' refer to any examples that are recommended by any other
' book, beside the holy scripture. Estius goes upon this
' same general principle: and therefore concludes from the
' common application of this passage, that it affords more
' than a probable argument for the sacred authority of the
' second book of the Maccabees. For,' says he, 'all the

‘ examples of the saints mentioned, either expressly, or
 ‘ tacitly, in this chapter, are taken from the sacred scrip-
 ‘ tures, that is, from those books which were in the days of
 ‘ the writer of this epistle esteemed to be sacred by “chris-
 ‘ tians.” Yet still how a man of Estius’s excellent, good
 ‘ sense could have a notion, that the second book of the
 ‘ Maccabees was a part of sacred scripture, when it was
 ‘ confessedly written after the spirit of prophecy ceased in
 ‘ Malachi, and before it was restored in John the Baptist, is
 ‘ not a little surprising.’

‘ But there is no more need to go to the Apocrypha, than
 ‘ to Fox’s Book of Martyrs, for instances of men, “being
 ‘ tortured, not accepting deliverance.” There are confess-
 ‘ edly several instances of this kind in the Old Testament.
 ‘ The apostle, just after, more particularly points at the
 ‘ persons he means, viz. such as “were stoned, sawn asun-
 ‘ der, or slain with the sword,” ver. 37. “These were tor-
 ‘ tured. These did not accept deliverance.” And these
 ‘ refused to accept of deliverance upon sinful terms, for this
 ‘ very end, “that they might obtain a blessed resurrection”
 ‘ to eternal life. These therefore may be the persons here
 ‘ meant.’

I am not fond of singularity: yet I hope I can follow truth alone, with a view of increasing her train, and having more company in time, attracted by the same reasons and arguments, by which I have been swayed myself.

We have just seen how Mr. Hallett argues, and that these persons are not referred to in the epistle to the Hebrews; but I do not say that he denied the fact, since he has not expressly told us.

I once thought that Dr. Prideaux doubted of the truth of this history, because he has not particularly related it; and because he points at the want of a material circumstance, the place of this transaction. But perhaps I was mistaken; however I shall transcribe here what he says: Conn. year before Christ 167, p. 181, ‘ On this occasion happened the
 ‘ martyrdom of Eleazar, and of the mother and her seven
 ‘ sons, which we have described to us by the author of the
 ‘ second book of the Maccabees, and by Josephus; by both
 ‘ of which a full account having been given of this matter,
 ‘ especially the latter, I refer my readers to them. Rufinus,
 ‘ in his Latin paraphrase of this book of Josephus, concern-
 ‘ ing the Maccabees, gives us the names of these seven bro-
 ‘ thers, and of their mother. [Maccabees, Aber, Machir,
 ‘ Judas, Achaz, Aseth, Jacob; and their mother’s name
 ‘ Solomona; but the later Jewish historians call her Anna.]

‘ And he tells us, that as well they as Eleazar were carried
‘ from Judea to Antioch; and that it was there that they
‘ were judged by Antiochus; but without any authority
‘ that we know of for either, except his own invention. The
‘ reason of the thing, as well as the tenor of the history,
‘ which is given us of it by both the authors I have men-
‘ tioned, make it much more likely, that Jerusalem, and
‘ not Antioch, was made the scene of this cruelty: and that,
‘ especially, since it being designed for an example of
‘ terror unto the Jews of Judea, it would have lost its
‘ force, if executed any where else than in that country.’

So says that eminent writer; but, I presume, that no modern, however learned and eminent, can determine the place of an event, which is entirely omitted by all ancient writers. If Rufinus had no authority for placing this transaction at Antioch, except his own invention; Prideaux can have no better authority in behalf of Jerusalem. And if these brothers were tortured, and slain in the presence of Antiochus, Rufinus’s conjecture would be as plausible as any other. But all conjectures of this sort are vain and groundless. And they should be declined, and never be proposed, or mentioned by wise and sedate men. We cannot now add to what ancient authors have delivered. In history there is no room for invention.

I am desirous, gentlemen, if you please, by your means, to recommend these thoughts to the consideration of the public.

A.

A LETTER

TO THE AUTHOR OF THE

REMARKS UPON THE INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH OF
THE HISTORY OF THE SEVEN BROTHERS IN
THE MACCABEES.^a

SIR,

I AM obliged to you for your Remarks, as they will give me an opportunity farther to clear up the point.

You chiefly object to what I have alleged from Mr. Hallett, relating to Heb. xi. 35.

^a First published in the LIBRARY for May 1762.

You say, ‘ There are no instances in the Old Testament of any persons, who, on account of their faith in God, were sawn asunder, or wandered about in sheep-skins, or goat-skins, or were afflicted by other instances of distress or persecution, mentioned in the three verses above mentioned,’ viz. 35, 36, 37.

But I somewhat wonder that you should say so. Is it not the opinion of all interpreters in general, that by the persons “ who wandered about in sheep-skins, and goat-skins,” are intended Elijah and Elisha, and other prophets of the Old Testament? And, says Clement of Rome, a companion of St. Paul, in his epistle to the church of Corinth, ch. xvii. Let us be imitators of those who went about in goat-skins and sheep-skins, preaching the coming of Christ; we mean the prophets, Elijah, and Elisha, and Ezekiel, &c. which passage is largely quoted by Clement of Alexandria in the fourth book of his *Stromata*. And see 1 Kings xix. 13, 19; and 2 Kings ii. 8, 13, 14; in the Greek version, where Elijah’s mantle is called a *melote*.

And Estius and Grotius have referred to persons in the Old Testament, who were instances of all the several sorts of distress and persecution, mentioned in ver. 36 and 37, though they also take notice of other like examples in later times.

Dr. Owen’s observation upon ver. 36, which also may be applied elsewhere, is to this purpose: ‘ It is of no use to fix the particulars here mentioned to certain determinate persons. For seeing the apostle has left that undetermined, so may we do also. Certain it is, that there were in these days believers, who through faith, patiently and victoriously underwent these things.’

You presently after say, ‘ Much less are there any instances of persons in these calamitous circumstances to whom deliverance was offered on sinful conditions, in any of the canonical books of the Old Testament. Nor are there any persons mentioned in the said scriptures, to have expressed their hopes of obtaining a better resurrection, either in these, or any other circumstances.’

Here, Sir, you should have attended to what Mr. Hallett says, as quoted by me in the Inquiry. ‘ But there is no more need to go to the Apocrypha, than to Fox’s Book of Martyrs, for instances of men, being tortured, not accepting deliverance. There are, confessedly, several instances of this kind in the Old Testament. The apostle, just after, particularly points at the persons he means. And these refused to accept deliverance upon sinful terms, for that

‘ very end, that they might obtain a blessed resurrection to ‘ eternal life.’

This appears to me very right. The persons just referred to, and many others, who suffered death in the times of the Old Testament, might have avoided it, if they would have practised sinful compliances; but they refused so to do, in hopes of future recompenses.

Mr. Hallet’s observation, so far as I am able to judge, is agreeable to the style of the apostle in this epistle, and particularly in this chapter: thus at ver. 24, “ By faith Moses, when he came to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter.” Moses did not tell her, nor any one else, that he would no more be called or reckoned her son; but he showed his refusal of that character by his conduct. As St. Stephen says, Acts vii. 23, “ And when he was full forty years old, it came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel.” ‘ Non legitur eam adoptionem Moses verbis respuisse, sed facto satis respuit, quando, relicta aulâ regiâ, ad fratres suos in afflictione egressus est, nec ad aulæ delicias ultra reversus, ut legitur.’ Exod. cap. ii. and Acts vii. Estius.

In like manner, ver. 14, “ For they that say such things, declare plainly, that they seek a country.” Ver. 16, “ But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly.” They declared and manifested this by their conduct, and by some of their words. Nevertheless, they never expressly said, that they sought, or desired, a better, and a heavenly country.

You observe, ‘ that the noun *τυμπανον*, as it stands for an ‘ instrument of torture, occurs not in any part of the canonical Greek scriptures.’ You mean, I think, of the Old Testament. I therefore add, Nor is that word in St. Paul. But the word *τυμπανιζομαι*, used by him Heb. xi. 35, is in I Sam. xxi. 13, a part of canonical Greek scripture.

You add: ‘ Neither is any inflection of the word *τυμπανιζομαι*, signifying torturing in general, to be found any ‘ where, but in this single passage of the epistle to the ‘ Hebrews.’

On the contrary, Gataker, in his laboured Disquisition concerning this noun and verb, expressly says, that the verb is often used in that larger sense. ‘ Sed illud adjicere non abs usu fuerit, το αποτυμπανιζεσθαι, latiori etiam significatu non raro usurpari. Quum enim modus iste tollendi miseros mortales, utpote qui promptus nimis & proclivis esset, frequentius adhiberetur, inde natum est, ut *τυμπανι-*

ζεσθαι και αποτυμπανιζεσθαι dicerentur, qui vi aliquâ e medio tollebantur, sive fuste, sive reste, sive ferro, id fierit.' Misc. cap. 46. p. 912. Vid. et Poli Synops. in loc. p. 1375. M.

I shall allege one place where it is so used. It is in the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons concerning their martyrs and confessors. 'The governor wrote to the emperor for directions concerning some who were in prison. The emperor directed, that they who still confessed Christ should be put to death, [*τες μεν αποτυμπανισθηναι*, ut confidentes gladio cœderentur, Vales.] and that they who renounced the faith should be set at liberty. When therefore the governor had again interrogated them, as many as were found to be Roman citizens, he ordered to be beheaded, the rest were cast to the wild beasts.'

'The apostle,' you say, 'or whoever wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, mentions the matter in very general terms, and with no other circumstances, than what might very naturally and probably happen to some martyrs in the persecution under Antiochus.'

But the history, to which you suppose the apostle to refer, is unnatural, and improbable, and very unlikely to happen under the persecution of Antiochus, or any other persecution whatever, as was before shown in the Inquiry.

You proceed: 'And as no critic seems to doubt but the history was extant, when the epistle to the Hebrews was written, we may be sure, that whatever the writer of that epistle thought, the Hebrews, to whom he wrote, believed an history so honourable to their countrymen.'

But I do not see how we can be sure of that. This history is omitted in the first book of the Maccabees, where it might have been properly inserted, and probably would have been inserted, if it had been true, and generally credited and respected by the Jewish people.

Josephus was contemporary with the apostle, and the Hebrews to whom he wrote. But he did not write till after St. Paul's martyrdom, and after the death of many of the Hebrews to whom he wrote. He has never taken any notice of these martyrs, though he had twice a fair occasion for it. How then can we be sure, that the history of the martyrs, in the second book of Maccabees, was generally believed and respected by the Hebrews?

I do not know when the second book of the Maccabees was published; but Mr. Whiston, who was well acquainted with the writings of Josephus, says, that he never made use

of it. If therefore it was extant in his time, it was very obscure, and in little or no credit. Nor do we at all want it for explaining the epistle to the Hebrews.

Once more, Mr. Hallet, as you observe, affirms, ‘ that they who were tortured not accepting deliverance, ver. 35, ‘ and they who were stoned, sawn asunder, &c. ver. 37, ‘ were the same persons.’ Whereas the text assures us, ver. 36, that they were not the same persons, but others.

But here you seem to me, partly, to mistake both St. Paul, and Mr. Hallet. The others are those next mentioned, who did not suffer death. And they are of four sorts. Some were exposed to “ mockings, some to scourgings,” some to “ bonds,” some to “ imprisonment.” After which such are mentioned as suffered death; of which also, according to our present reading, there are four sorts. “ They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword.” To these, and others, the apostle may refer. For there were many prophets and other good men, who suffered death among the Jewish people, who might have saved their lives by sinful compliances. See Neh. ix. 26; and 1 Kings xviii. xix. There were, particularly, many such patient and victorious sufferers, in the times of the two prophets, Elijah and Elisha, from whom the “ women,” mentioned, ver. 35, “ received their dead raised to life again.” After which therefore the apostle adds, most beautifully, and agreeably to the force and elegance, for which this epistle is so remarkable: “ And others were put to death, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection.”

I have allowed myself to be very minute and particular in my answer to your remarks, considering the uncommonness of the subject; for which reason I hope it will be excused by yourself and others.

Mr. Hallet says, ‘ All the commentators agree in supposing, that the apostle here refers to the histories in the ‘ second book of the Maccabees.’ But perhaps he there allows more than he needed to do. Wolfius expresses himself in this cold and general manner: ‘ There are, who ‘ think that there is here a reference to the seven brothers in ‘ the Maccabees. Ad septem fratres Maccabeos respici, ‘ sunt, qui existiment.’

St. Chrysostom, in a homily upon part of this chapter, says, ‘ he thinks the persons here intended are John and ‘ James; for *αποτυμpanισμος* denotes beheading. They might ‘ have lived longer; but they who had raised up others to ‘ life, chose to die, that they might obtain a better resur-

‘reception.’ In Hebr. Hom. 27. tom. XII. p. 248. I do not think this interpretation to be right; for St. Paul refers to such as lived before the coming of Christ. But we hence discern, that Chrysostom did not then think of the Maccabees, or that the apostle referred to them. Theophylact, following Chrysostom, says, ‘they were beheaded,’ meaning John, and James the son of Zebedee. But others by that word understand being beaten with clubs.

A LETTER

UPON THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT,

WRITTEN IN THE YEAR 1762, TO THE REV. MR. CALEB FLEMING.

SIR,

YOU refer me to John xvi. 13, as a difficult text relating to the Personality of the Spirit. I must refer you to the letter written in 1730, p. 141, 145, and p. 148, 150.—At p. 141, that and other texts are proposed; and in the same place follow explications of those texts sufficient to remove all difficulties.

Christ’s promise of the spirit, and all his expressions made use of about it, as recorded in St. John’s gospel, are explained in the Acts, where is the history of the accomplishment of all these promises. The fulfilment plainly shows, that by the spirit, to be sent, is meant an effusion of spiritual gifts of power, knowledge, and understanding.

Our Lord himself has explained it thus, John vii. 38, “He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.” There is the plentiful effusion of knowledge, &c. It follows, ver. 39, “But this he spake of the spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet [given,] because Jesus was not yet glorified.” Miraculous gifts are the spirit. That is what Christ promised when he spoke of the spirit. So Mark xvi. 17, 18, “And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out demons; they shall speak with tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they

drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." These are the "living waters" promised, John vii. 38, which at ver. 39, are said to be the spirit.

Acts v. 32, is a remarkable text, and is explained in the above letter, p. 150, "And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him:" that is, these are the miraculous gifts which God has bestowed upon us, and upon others, who believe in Jesus, &c. These miraculous gifts, bestowed upon believers, are the promised spirit, of which Christ told, John xv. 26, "He shall testify of me."

John xvi. 12, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." However, be easy, in a short time you shall be so illuminated from above, as to know all those things distinctly.

Ver. 13, "Howbeit, when the spirit of truth is come," or when the divine miraculous powers and gifts, which are to testify to the truth of my mission and doctrine, are poured out upon you, "He will guide you into all truth." You will be enabled to understand every thing relating to the institution which God is setting up by me, &c. So we find, that gradually the apostles were able to speak properly to Jews and Gentiles, as they were instructed in the right manner of receiving the Gentiles, of which they had no notion, whilst Christ was with them, nor till after they were illuminated from above, after his ascension.

It is certain that the Holy Ghost is often mentioned as a gift or power plainly. These texts may enable us to understand others, if we will exercise our reason. Dr. Ward says, p. 159, that the term, the "Holy Ghost," often denotes a power, cannot be questioned; as where the apostles and other christians at that time, are said to be filled with the Holy Ghost.

There are no wishes of peace from the Spirit at the beginning or ending of the apostolical epistles; nor any where ascriptions of glory to the Spirit.

There are also other texts, leading us to think that the apostles knew not of any divine person under the name Spirit. If they had, he would have been mentioned by them. 1 Tim. v. 21, "I charge thee, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels." Rev. i. 4, 5, "Grace from him, which is—and from the seven spirits before the throne, and from Jesus Christ." Our Lord will "come in the glory of the Father, with the holy angels." How could the holy spirit be omitted in all these places. if

Jesus and his apostles knew there was a divine Spirit equal to the Father, or nearly so ?

November 13, 1762.

Shall I add a few more thoughts upon the same subject ?

By the Holy Ghost is plainly meant, in divers places, a power, a gift, an effusion of spiritual gifts. John vii. 39, "For the Holy Ghost was not yet given." So we translate, supplying the sense. But the Greek is, "for the Holy Ghost was not yet:" and so the Latin Vulgate, and Beza, *nondum erat spiritus sanctus*. In Dr. Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. I. p. 420, are some curious observations upon that text. If by the Holy Ghost is to be understood a divine person, St. John would not say, that "he did not exist yet." Read also Acts xix. 1—19. There are twelve Jewish people who know not that there "was any Holy Ghost." The meaning is, they did not know there was an effusion of spiritual gifts, in which they could partake. St. Paul laid his hands upon them, and the "Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Compare Acts x. 45; and xi. 15—17.

Our Lord has told us what he meant by the Comforter, John xiv. 26, "but the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost," meaning the miraculous knowledge and understanding which they should receive by inspiration.

"The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" is blaspheming the miraculous works which Christ did, or professed to do, by the power, or finger, or spirit of God. To ascribe those works to demons, or to Satan himself, was that blasphemy.

John xvi. 14, "He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. This relates to some things of which Christ had spoken, but not fully, and which the disciples did not yet understand; particularly the calling of the Gentiles, and the manner of receiving them. Says Christ, John x. 16, "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring." And he several times said, that many should come from the east and the west—and the children of the kingdom be cast out. These things were explained afterwards to the disciples by divers miraculous manifestations, as we see in the Acts, chap. x. and elsewhere. And gradually, by such means, the disciples were led into "all truth," that is, every thing relating to the gospel institution.

November 22, 1762.

REMARKS

UPON

THE LATE DR. WARD'S DISSERTATIONS

UPON

SEVERAL PASSAGES OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

WHEREIN ARE SHOWN, BESIDE OTHER THINGS, THAT ST. JOHN COMPUTED THE HOURS OF THE DAY AFTER THE JEWISH MANNER; WHO ARE THE GREEKS, JOHN XII. WHO THE GRECIANS, ACTS VI. THE DESIGN OF THE APOSTOLIC DECREE, ACTS XV. THAT THERE WAS BUT ONE SORT OF JEWISH PROSELYTES: WHEREIN LAY THE FAULT OF ST. PETER, AND HOW ST. PAUL MAY BE VINDICATED.

INTRODUCTION.

DR. WARD'S intimate acquaintance with antiquity, and his uncommon skill in all parts of literature, are well known. His sincere piety and respect for the sacred scriptures were as conspicuous. And his Dissertations, though posthumous, have been well received by the public. Nevertheless among many curious criticisms, and just observations, there are some things, which appear to deserve farther consideration. I hope, therefore, that my making remarks upon some places, where I hesitate, will not be reckoned inconsistent with the respect which I long had, and still have for the learned and pious author.

And I may take this opportunity to enlarge upon some articles, beyond what the design of making remarks would require.

CHAP. I.

PAGE 73. Diss. xxi. 'The case of the demoniac, who resided among the tombs on the coast of Gadara.'

As my remarks are to be made in the order of the dissertations, I begin with this. Upon which I have received some observations in a letter from my much esteemed friend, Mr. Thomas Mole, which I shall here transcribe.

‘ I have read the Dissertations of Dr. Ward ; among which
‘ I find one upon the ease of the demoniac, who resided
‘ among the tombs on the coast of Gadara.

‘ This affair of the possessions is an embarrassment, which
‘ one would be glad fairly to get rid of. The interpretation
‘ which represents them as mad, or otherwise grievously
‘ diseased, seems to be the only method effectually to re-
‘ move it. A great deal has been written to show the pro-
‘ bability of this explanation, and principally by yourself.
‘ Our late friend seems to have been very tenacious of the
‘ other sense, and treats them as real possessions. He justly
‘ observes the impropriety of calling devils what in the
‘ evangelists is called demons ; but does not, I think, so
‘ fairly as one would desire, argue in support of their being
‘ possessions.

‘ The man,’ he says, p. 75, ‘ is here described, as wholly
‘ unconvertible, so fierce that no one dared come near him.
‘ This must have been at times only. For it is said, Mark
‘ v. 4, that “ he had been often bound with fetters and chains,
‘ and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the
‘ fetters broken in pieces.” So that it is going farther than
‘ the text allows, to say of him, that none dared to come
‘ near him, during all the time, since he was first seized ;
‘ as he evidently, I think, means. For he adds immediately ;
‘ he had lived a long time in that condition.

‘ When it is added by St. Mark, ver. 4, “ neither could
‘ any man tame him,” it seems to me, that there had been
‘ many trials of cure undertaken, and various methods used
‘ for that purpose, though without success, especially if he
‘ was a man of any note in that^a city. For *εκ πολεως*, “ out

^a “ Especially if he was a man of note in that city.”] That appears to me a curious thought, and a valuable hint ; which may lead us to consider, whether there are not in this history some things which may induce us to suppose, that the demoniac, to whom St. Mark and St. Luke confine their narration, was a man of some substance. And I think there are several such things. In St. Mark v. 19, our Lord says : “ Go home to thy friends.” *Υπαγε εις τον οικον σου προς τους σους*. Literally, ‘ go to thy house to thy own people,’ meaning family, or friends. In Luke viii. 39, “ return to thy own house.” *Υποστρεψε εις τον οικον σου*. Care had been taken of him, and there had been, as is manifest, divers attempts made to cure his disorder, or to relieve and restrain him under it. And when the multitude from the city, and from the country round about came to Jesus, they saw the man sitting, and clothed. Clothing therefore had been brought to him, and probably from his own house, in the adjacent city, and from his family. They knew where he was, though

‘ of the city,” in St. Luke, must, I think, refer to the place
 ‘ of his habitation, while he was sane, rather than when thus
 ‘ disordered, and from which he came, when he met Jesus.
 ‘ And the word, *εαμαζω*, here used, and in St. James iii. 7,
 ‘ of “ taming wild beasts,” and the “ tongues of men,” seems
 ‘ not improperly to express the cure of madness, and perhaps
 ‘ more properly than the dispossession of demons. It might
 ‘ deserve our inquiry, whether it is never so used by the
 ‘ ancients, in treating of maniacal cases.

‘ It appears farther probable to me, that this man had his
 ‘ madness by fits, or at certain seasons, with intervals of
 ‘ sanity between them ; and that when his fits were observed
 ‘ to be coming on, he was bound by his friends, (with whom
 ‘ he might possibly have lived in those intervals,) to prevent
 ‘ his doing harm to himself, or others, and have him more
 ‘ under command. Does not St. Luke say, or mean this?
 ‘ viii. 29, “ For oftentimes, *πολλοις χρονοις*, it had caught
 ‘ him, and he was kept *φυλασσομενος*, bound with chains and
 ‘ fetters. And he brake the bands, and was driven of the
 ‘ devil into the wilderness.” St. Mark says, he had been
 ‘ often bound,” *πολλάκις*. St. Matthew, viii. 28, ascribes to
 ‘ him this exceeding fierceness only, when coming out of
 ‘ the tombs to them.

‘ Hence I would farther observe, that we are under no
 ‘ necessity of allowing what we find asserted, that he had
 ‘ lived a long time in this condition ; and therefore was
 ‘ neither capable, nor had any opportunity of knowing any
 ‘ thing concerning Christ or his character. For though he
 ‘ had been ever so long a time disordered, if there had been
 ‘ any intervals, (and the longer had been the time, it is likely
 ‘ there had been the more :) might he not in some one or
 ‘ other of those intervals, have acquired some knowledge of
 ‘ the character, and even of the person of Christ? And
 ‘ hence, in his fits, especially, when Christ appeared in his

he had escaped from them ; and upon the first intelligence concerning what
 had happened, they recollected the distress he must be in, for want of clothing :
 they therefore immediately sent him apparel. And that they were his own
 garments, which he had been used to wear when composed, or at least such in
 which he could make a decent appearance, may be collected from his request
 to be with Jesus, and accompany him. This circumstance may be one reason
 why St. Mark and St. Luke give an account of this one demoniac only, though
 there were two, as St. Matthew says. Finally, his being a person of good
 condition, in the city where he dwelt, might render him better qualified to
 speak of this great work. Any man, however mean, deserved to be attended
 to, when he spoke of a miracle wrought upon himself, of which divers others
 were witnesses : but a man of substance, and a reputable inhabitant of the
 place, might do it to better advantage.

‘ sight, discourse and behave to him as he did; only allowing for what his disorder made him mingle therewith.

‘ What is farther said, p. 76, concerning the inhabitants of the neighbouring town, that they do not seem to have known more of Christ than this man, is with me alike void of probability. For Christ had been teaching the doctrine of the kingdom, and working miracles, a considerable time, and had taken up his residence at Capernaum; in which, and in the neighbourhood thereof, he lived a good while. It is credible that all this could have been, and St. Matthew, iv. 24, (as is by our late friend observed, p. 78,) had said before, “that his fame went throughout all Syria?” And yet the people of this town, not above perhaps seven or eight miles distant, and to which a boat might pass in a night’s time from Capernaum, had never heard and knew nothing of him? What! spread over all Syria, and never reached a place within a few miles of him? I allow it is a general expression, and must admit of limitation. But I can see no other ground for excepting this place, than the serving an hypothesis.

‘ Nor does the instance adduced, p. 79, from Mark i. 21, &c. prove any thing, as I think, to the purpose for which it is brought. For though that was something earlier in the ministry of Christ than this, and he might be then less known; yet he had been long enough known there for that person to have heard of him. For Mark i. 16, he had begun to preach the gospel of the kingdom of God, saying, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel:” and walking by the sea of Galilee, he had called first Simon and Andrew, and afterwards James and John his brother, ver. 16—20, and, I suppose, had wrought some miracles. It is not impossible, but the person who was cured in the synagogue of Capernaum, being left at his liberty, and allowed to enter there, might have heard of what Christ had done in his way thither; and heard, or heard of, what he had preached after he came thither. And in St. Luke iv. 31—37, it should seem, that this person was cured, not upon Christ’s first coming to Capernaum. Which enlargeth the time, that this man had to come to the knowledge of him.

‘ There is no necessity therefore to suppose, that these persons could have no knowledge of Christ, and that it must not be they, but the devils only in them, who knew him.

‘ The arguing, p. 82, from the mention made of “ casting out devils,” after raising the dead, in the commission given by Christ to his disciples, Matt. x. 8, when he sent them forth, is, I think, of no force; for there may be no necessity of supposing the expression to rise higher than the other, from its being placed after it; as appears from other texts. Luke ix. 1, 2, “ Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick.” And Matt. x. 1, “ And when he had called unto him the twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease. See also Matt. iv. 24. It may likewise be observed, that if the expression of “ casting out devils,” be supposed to refer to real possessions; it is not an expression of greater power, than that of raising the dead. Nor does the fact carry in it a greater degree of evidence and conviction; because there is not equal evidence to be had that a person is really possessed, as there is of a person’s being really dead. And therefore it may be as well placed after the raising the dead, if it be interpreted of persons mad, as if it be understood of persons possessed.

‘ May not the term *σωφρονευτα*, Mark v. 16; Luke viii. 35, “ in his right mind,” by which this person is represented after his cure, as it is used both by sacred and profane writers in opposition to madness, afford some countenance to this interpretation?’

So far my good friend.

One of my arguments against real possessions^b was taken, from the manner in which the persons, said to have “ unclean spirits,” speak of our Lord Jesus Christ.

‘ For such persons did often bear an honourable testimony to our Lord. So Mark i. 24; Luke iv. 41. But it is incredible, that Satan, or any other evil spirits, under his influence and direction, should freely and cheerfully bear witness to our Lord, as the Christ.

‘ Indeed, this appears to me a very forcible argument. I have been sometimes apt to think, that this consideration has been overlooked by learned and pious men, who have so readily admitted real possessions.’

So I said. But Dr. Ward is not at all moved by that consideration. He even thinks the testimony of demons to our Lord, to have been of some value, and of use, especially for encouraging the disciples.

^b See Vol. i. Supplement. Disc. III. 8.

Diss. p. 81, ‘ And as to the case of these demoniacs among
 ‘ the Gergesenes, there seems to have been the greatest pro-
 ‘ priety at that time, not only for his permitting the devils
 ‘ to confess him to be the Son of God, but likewise to wor-
 ‘ ship him. For it does not appear, that any other persons
 ‘ were then present, but Christ himself, and his disciples,
 ‘ except the demoniacs. And this was not long before he
 ‘ sent forth his disciples both to preach, and also “ to heal
 ‘ the sick, — to raise the dead, and cast out devils,” Matt.
 ‘ x. 7, 8. Therefore what could be more proper, or give
 ‘ them higher encouragement to hope for success in their
 ‘ work, than to see the devils thus subject to their master,
 ‘ and paying homage to him ?’

But first, it is not at all likely that our Lord should accept the testimony of demons in private, if he did not receive it in public. How he checked and disallowed the confessions of persons under these disorders, may be seen, Mark i. 23—26; and Luke iv. 33, 35. Dr. W. supposeth that there was great propriety in permitting such confessions, when few were present. But I am not able to discern that propriety.

Secondly, there were others then present with our Lord, beside the disciples, and the demoniacs. For St. Matthew says, viii. 28, “ And when he was come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce.” St. Mark v. 1, 2, “ And they came over unto the other side of the sea—And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit.” Luke viii. 27, “ And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes.”

The place of the present abode of these demoniacs was on the sea-coast. When they saw our Saviour and the disciples come on shore, they immediately came toward them. Nor can there be any doubt made, that the sailors also, in whose ship our Saviour and his disciples had arrived, came ashore with them, or presently after. The appearance of such objects could not but excite their curiosity. Moreover, in the voyage from the other side there had happened a great storm, which our Lord composed by his word. And the men of the ship, as well as the disciples, “ marvelled greatly,” or were exceedingly surprised, “ saying: What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!” Matt. viii. 27. Nor were these men now first acquainted with our Lord. Before this they had heard

him preach, and might have seen some other miracles done by him. Besides, as we are assured by St. Mark, upon our Lord's saying in the evening, "Let us pass over to the other side," he not only set out himself in the ship, where he had been preaching; but "there were also several other little ships," filled, it is likely, with men who had attended on his discourses in the day-time. These knew he was going to "the other side" of the lake; and would be there as soon as he, or before. In short, our Lord was now, as it were, in the height of his ministry. And we know from the evangelists, that before this time, he was followed with uncommon zeal by multitudes wherever he went, even into desert places. As is shown, Mark i. 45; and Luke iv. 42, 43. So that before this man, or these men, worshipped our Lord, or acknowledged him to be the Son of God, many people must have been gathered together.

P. 75. For proving that this unhappy person was not barely distracted, our author says: 'Besides, it is plain that he could not be apprised of his coming at that time, for the ship sailed over from the other side in the night. And so soon as Christ came ashore, and the man saw him at a distance, he ran to him, and worshipped him.'

But there is not sufficient precision in that proposition. Two things are joined together, which ought to be separated. When our Lord, and his disciples, (let me now add,) and other people, landed, he came toward them. And from the respect shown to our Lord by the disciples, and by all the company, he discerned him to be the principal person: but he did not worship our Lord, nor confess him to be the Christ, until after some discourse, as appears from the history.

Matt. viii. 28, 29, already cited. "And when he was come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce—And, behold, they cried out saying: What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God?"

But let us compare the other evangelists. Mark v. 2, "And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit—Ver. 6—8, But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him. And cried with a loud voice, and said: What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? I adjure thee, that thou torment me not. For he had said unto him; Come out of him, thou unclean spirit."

And Luke viii. 27—29, "And when he went forth to

land, there met him out of the city a certain man which had devils long time—When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God Most High. I beseech thee, torment me not. For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man.”

According to all the Evangelists therefore, this demoniac, or these two demoniacs, acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God. But from St. Mark and St. Luke it appears, that this was not done until after our Lord had some discourse with him. From this discourse, and from the general intelligence which he had before received concerning Jesus, in the intervals of his disorder, he was enabled and disposed to speak of him as he did.

St. Mark alone expressly says, that the man of whom he speaks “worshipped” Christ. But the same thing is said by St. Luke in another phrase, “he fell down before him.” And it is implied in what is attested by all the Evangelists, that he acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God. So in the history of the man born blind, whom our Lord had healed. John ix. 35—38, “Jesus heard that they had cast him out. And when he had found him, he said, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered, and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And 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.” So likewise, after our Lord’s ascension. Matt. xxviii. 17, “And when they saw him they worshipped him.”

I have no intention to add any new arguments concerning the case of the demoniacs, mentioned in the New Testament. I rely upon those which were formerly alleged. And let every one judge as he sees best. But I would take this opportunity to propose some observations upon the history of the cure of the two unhappy men in the country of the Gadarenes, which have not been yet mentioned.

In accounting for the loss of the swine several things are said at Supplement to vol. I. Disc. IV. The distraction under which the man called Legion had laboured, was very grievous. He was a hideous form, and his action was very violent. When he had conceived the thought of gratifying the evil spirits, by which he imagined himself to be possessed, with the destruction of the swine, he would without much difficulty drive them off the precipice. If some few of them were put in motion, the whole herd would follow.

I would now say more distinctly, that the loss of the swine

was occasioned by a fright. When our blessed Lord said, "go," as in St. Matthew; or "he gave them leave," or "he suffered them," as in the other Evangelists; I think, that one or both the demoniaes went hastily toward the swine; and by some noise, or action, a few of them were affrighted; which fright was immediately communicated to the rest, whereupon the whole herd went off with great violence; and the way being steep and leading to the lake, they all perished in the water. This is easy to be apprehended. ∞

There are very few who have not been witnesses to something like this in the horse; who takes fright at very slight things, one knows not what sometimes: though at other times from manifest causes. Whenever it happens, he runs away with great violence, to his own perdition and the great hazard and oftentimes to the great detriment of others: and, if there are several together, the whole set, or team, becomes ungovernable. This is certain, and well known to almost every body.

I have also observed in our fields near London, where have been many horses grazing, if one is frightened, all the rest are alarmed. The same is seen in our fields, where are large herds of horned cattle. If one is disturbed by the barking of a dog, or the sport of idle boys, or any other odd occurrence; all the rest, to the utmost bounds of the enclosure, are alarmed and put in motion. The same is likewise well known of flocks of sheep, and flocks of geese, and sparrows. If one of the flock take fright, all the rest hasten away in the same direction. I believe this to be true of all animals that are gregarious: as were these swine; a large herd, feeding by each other. If one or two of them took fright, and tended toward the lake; all the rest, without exception, would go off the same way with the utmost precipitation.

By all the three evangelists we are assured, that after the loss of the swine, and the cure of the demoniaes, the Gadarenes besought our Lord "that he would depart out of their coasts." This I have twice, in the Supplement to vol. I. Disc. I. ascribed to the carnal temper of these people; that being apprehensive of suffering in their worldly inter-

∞ ' On Monday (May 7.) as J— H—, Esq. was coming to town from his house at Carshalton in Surrey, in his post-chaise, the horses took fright, just by Newington church, and ran with such violence against a waggon, passing through the turnpike, that one of the horses was killed on the spot, and the other so much bruised, that he died in an hour afterwards, and the chaise was almost torn to pieces. But happily the gentleman received no hurt, and the driver was but slightly bruised.—The General Evening Post, Thursday, May 10, 1759.

ests, instead of entreating Jesus to stay with them, a while at least, they joined together with much unanimity in beseeching him to depart out of their coasts.

Nor do I now say, that a sensual temper of mind had no influence on them, for producing that request. Nevertheless, perhaps, that alone was not the whole cause. I therefore would add as follows.

It is observable from divers instances in the Old Testament, that special and extraordinary manifestations of the Divine Presence were generally awful and affecting to the men to whom they were made, though the message was gracious. I refer not only to Ex. xx. 19, but also to ch. xxiv. 30, and Judges vi. 22, and xiii. 22. See likewise Ex. xxxiii. 20.

There are likewise instances in the New Testament. How comfortable the tidings! Luke ii. 8—15. Yet it is said of the shepherds, ver. 9, “And they were sore afraid.” And Luke v. 8—10, “When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus’ knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken. And so were also James and John, the sons of Zebedee.—And Jesus said unto Simon: Fear not, henceforth thou shalt catch men.” Upon another occasion, Mark iv. 41, “And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another: What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him!” Compare Luke viii. 25. And on the mount. Matt. xvii. 6, 7, “And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid.” Compare Mark ix. 6, and Luke ix. 34.

Let us now observe what is said of the Gadarenes. Mark v. 15, “And they (meaning the people of the neighbouring town and country) come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion, sitting and clothed, and in his right mind; and they were afraid.” To the like purpose exactly in Luke viii. 35. And at ver. 37, it is said: “Then the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about besought him to depart from them; for they were taken with great fear.”

If Peter desired our Lord “to depart from him, because he was a sinful man:” if he, and the rest, were at other times so astonished that they knew not what to say nor what to think of themselves; though all the great works which they had seen performed by him were healing and beneficial; well might the people of this country be struck with awe at the sight of the man called Legion, “sitting,

and clothed, and in his right mind." For it was a work of Divine Power and a token of the Divine Presence. And, very probably, they thought themselves unqualified for the residence of so great and holy a person among them.

At their request our Lord departed, and took ship, and returned to the place whence he had come; well knowing that many there were in earnest expectation of him.

But though our Lord himself staid no longer with the Gadarenes, he left there the man whom he had cured. "He prayed, that he might be with him. However Jesus suffered him not. But saith unto him; Go home to thy friends, and tell them, how great things the Lord hath done for thee. And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis, how great things Jesus had done for him. And all men did marvel." And it is not an unreasonable, nor an improbable supposition, that some of that country did afterwards come over into Galilee or Judea to see Jesus, that they might receive benefit from his great wisdom, or great power.

CHAP. II.

PAGE 106. Diss. xxviii. 'Who those Greeks were, who desired to see Jesus? And whether they were admitted?' John xii. 20, 21.

Dr. Ward well observes, at p. 107, 'The greater part of Syria was in our Saviour's time called Greece by the Jews. Hence, when he was in the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and a woman besought him to cast the evil spirit out of her daughter, she is called "a Greek, a Syrophenician by nation," Mark vii. 26. And these Greeks who were desirous to see Jesus, were, probably, of the same nation, and known to Philip, who is here said to have been of Bethsaida of Galilee.'

The same observation is in Grotius^a upon this text. And I had occasion some while ago, in considering another text, to say: 'It^b was common with all authors about that time, to call the people, who inhabited the cities of Asia and Syria, Greeks.'

^a Videntur autem hi Gentiles fuisse Syrophœnices. Nam alibi notavimus, Marci vii. 26, 'Ελληνίδα vocari, quæ aliis est Syrophœnista. Et his ob vicinitatem facilius notitia cum Galilæis Bethsædensibus, quod illi forte in partes Tyri et Sidonis excurrerant. Grot. ad Joh. xii. 20.

^b See Vol. v. ch. xi. num. vii. note ^b.

Our author says, p. 107, ‘ They seem to have been proselytes, as they are reckoned among those who came up to Jerusalem to worship at the feasts.’

Which expression is ambiguous. For as many learned men of our time say there were two sorts of proselytes, some called proselytes of the gate, others proselytes of righteousness; Dr. W. may mean the former, as do Whitby and Hammond. I know nothing of that sort of half-proselytes. I think^c there were not any such men in any part of the world in the times of our Saviour and his apostles.

That these men were not proselytes, or men circumcised after the manner of the Jews, appears to me very probable. For all proselytes were entitled to the same religious privileges with native Jews, or the descendants of Abraham and Jacob. Such therefore, as it seems, might have had free access to Christ at the temple. The modesty of these persons may make us think of the Centurion, who, when he entreated our Lord to heal his sick servant, that was dear to him, and our Lord was going toward his house with some elders of the Jews, who also joined in the same request; “ he sent friends unto him, saying,” not only, “ that he was not worthy that Jesus should enter under his roof:” but likewise, “ that neither thought he himself worthy to come unto him,” Luke vii. 1—8. Moreover Philip himself seems to have hesitated about the propriety of the request of these persons. For he also consulted Andrew, before he made the proposal to our Lord. So is the history. “ And there were certain Greeks among them, who came up to worship at the feast. The same came to Philip, who was of Bethsaida in Galilee, and desired him, saying; Sir, we would see Jesus. Philip cometh, and telleth Andrew. And again, Andrew and Philip told Jesus.”

Their request to see Jesus, I imagine, implied a desire to have access to his person, and to have some conversation with him. Which request, I think, was granted. Supposing these men to have been uncircumcised Gentiles, it was a favour and a condescension, according to the Jewish maxims. But the woman, who was of the same country, and is also called a Greek, came near to our Lord, and spoke to him several times, and he to her, and at length very comfortably, and healed her daughter. Matt. xv. 21—28; Mark vii. If our Lord yielded so far to the importunity of that woman, why might he not also grant the request of these Greeks, though Gentiles? It is manifest, that she was no better. For our Lord said to her: “ Let the children first

^c Ib. ch. xviii. num. ii.

be filled. It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it unto the dogs."

The sequel of the history confirms this supposition. In the hearing of these persons, or soon after they were gone, our Lord made use of these expressions. Ver. 23, "And Jesus answered them, saying: The hour is come, that the Son of man shall be glorified," that is, by the faith of the Gentiles, though many of the Jewish people rejected him. And afterwards, as ver. 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The coming of these persons therefore was very acceptable to our Lord. And he thereupon pleaseth himself with the prospect of the speedy and extensive progress of his doctrine. So after the profession made by the forementioned centurion, of faith in our Lord's power to heal his servant at a distance, "He said to them that followed: I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," and what there follows. Matt. viii. 10—12.

That the Greeks here spoken of were Gentiles, was the opinion of the ancient writers of the church, as ^d Epiphanius, ^e Chrysostom, ^f Theophylact, ^g Theodore of Mopsuestia, ^h Jerom, and others; who never were perplexed with the notion of two sorts of proselytes, which has gained so much credit among learned christians of late times.

And we are likewise assured by Josephus, that ⁱ Gentiles, or such as were aliens, were wont to come to Jerusalem, to worship there at the time of the Jewish festivals. Though uncircumcised men might not eat the passover, nor offer sacrifices at the temple, they might pray there. And when our Lord cleansed the temple, and drove the buyers and sellers, with their merchandize, from the outer court, he reminded them that it was "written, that God's house should be called an house of prayer for all people," Isa. lvi. 7; Matt. xxi. 13; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46.

^d Hær. 30. num. xxvii.
tom. VIII.

^e In Joh. hom. 66. [al. 65.] n. 3. p. 390.

^f In loc.

^g Apud Cotelerii Caten. Patr. in Jo.

p. 309.

^h Ad Rufin. T. II. p. 217. al. ep. 131.

ⁱ ΑΛΛ'

ἑδεῖ τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις, ὅσοι, κατὰ ἑρησκείαν παρήσαν. De B. J. l. 6. cap. ix. 3.

CHAP. III.

PAGE 125. Diss. xxxii. ‘How to reconcile St. John’s account concerning the time of our Saviour’s crucifixion with that of the three other evangelists.’

St. John writes, ch. xix. 13, 14, “When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat in the judgment seat.—And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour. And he saith unto the Jews: Behold your King.” St. Mark says, xv. 25, “And it was the third hour, and they crucified him.”

For reconciling these accounts our learned author says, p. 127, 128, ‘And about six in the morning Pilate brought him forth to the Jews, and said: “Behold your King.” This is the time which John refers to, and calls the “sixth hour,” that is, of the civil day. The three following hours were employed in preparing for his crucifixion, and that of the two robbers, and carrying them to the place without the city. At the conclusion of those three hours he was crucified. Which Mark calls the “third hour,” that is, of the natural day. And by the same reckoning must be understood the “sixth hour,” at which the darkness commenced; and also the “ninth hour,” when he expired; as related by all the evangelists, except John; who has used the Roman way of reckoning in some other places also, as ch. i. 39, iv. 6, and xx. 19. And it is not improbable, that he writing so late might choose that way of reckoning the hours of the day, which was customary among the Romans: as the others had followed that which was practised by the Jews.’

To me it seems, that St. John reckons the hours of the day as the other evangelists do, according to the custom of the Jews. Nor do I comprehend, how any historian could write intelligibly of transactions in Judea, without observing the Jewish custom, unless he gives particular notice of it.

In the history of the nobleman of Capernaum, who came to Jesus, “beseeching him to come down and heal his son, it is said, John iv. 51, 52, And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend; and they said unto him, Yesterday, about the seventh hour, the fever left him.” These persons must be supposed to speak according to the ordinary custom of the

country in which they lived. And by the "seventh hour" must be meant about one of the clock afternoon, according to our computation.

And in chap. xi. 9, our Saviour himself says, very agreeably to the Jewish manner, "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" But I do not insist upon this as decisive, because the Romans, and others, might express themselves in like manner, meaning the natural day.

John iv. 5, 6, "Then cometh Jesus unto a city called Sychar:—now Jacob's well was there; Jesus therefore being wearied with his journey sat thus on the well. And it was about the sixth hour," that is, says Whitby, 'about noon.' So it is generally^a understood, and very rightly, as I apprehend.

So says^b Cyril of Alexandria, not very far below the beginning of the fifth century, in his comment upon this text; whom I transcribe in the margin. And in like manner Isaac, surnamed the Great, who flourished about the middle of the same century. Among his works Dr. Asseman reckons five sermons concerning the Samaritan woman. The first of which begins in this manner.^c 'At the sixth hour, when the day was grown hot, our Saviour came to the well.'

I think this must be right. For I do not see how those ancient writers, who lived not very remote from Judea, could be mistaken.

Josephus dwelt at Rome, and wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem. Nevertheless he also computes the hours in the same way. Giving an account of an assembly at Taricheas in Galilee, in a proseucha, or oratory; he says, 'There^d certainly would have been a great disturbance, if the assembly had not been dissolved by the approach of the sixth hour, at which time we are wont to go to dinner on the sabbaths.' And he assures us, 'That^e the priests

^a Vid. supr. cap. i. 39. Causam sitis ostendit, quia et multum itineris fecerat, et jam erat meridies. Grot. in ver. 6.

Quia, inquit, lassus erat de viâ, et instabat meridies, maximus videlicet diei æstus. Bez. in loc.

^b Ευαφορμως επι τη πηγη καταλυοντα δεικνυει τον Ιησεν. 'Ηλιος γαρ ακμαιοτατην απο μεσων ωψιδων τοις επι της γης την ικτινα καταχειροντος, και ακρατοις τα σωματα καταφλεγοντος βολαις, το μεν επι προσω βαδιζειν εκαζημιον. κ. λ. Cyr. H. in Joan. T. IV. p. 179. ^c Primus sic incipit. Horâ sextâ, quum dies incaluisset, venit ad puteum Dominus. Ap. Assen. B. Or. T. i. p. 232. p. 79.

^d Και παντως αν εις τασιν εχωρησαν, ει μη την συνοδον διελυσειν επελθεσα εκτη ωρα, καθ' ην τοις σαββασιν αριστοποιεισθαι νομιμον εστιν ημιν. Jos. Vit. secl. 54. p. 26. ^e ——— καθ' ην ζυγουσι μεν απο εννατης ωρας μεχρι ενδεκατης. De B. J. l. 6. ix. 3.

‘ at the temple were employed in killing paschal lambs
‘ from the ninth hour to the eleventh.’

John i. 35—39, “ 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. And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.—And they said to him; Rabbi, where dwellest thou? He saith unto them: Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day; for it was about the tenth hour.” Or, as it is said in the margin of some of our Bibles, ‘ two hours before night.’ Which explication is very reasonable and obvious. The connexion leads us to think, that the day was declining, when these disciples went to the house where Jesus dwelt. Nor is there any consideration that should induce us to think of our ten in the forenoon. For inquisitive, attentive, and well-disposed men, as these were, might learn a great deal in the space of two hours’ conversation, with so excellent a master as they now applied to.

There still remains one text more to be considered. John xx. 19, “ Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them; Peace be unto you.”

As our author here particularly refers to Dr. Benson, I must observe what he says: ‘ We^t have yet a more evident
‘ proof, that St. John followed the Roman method of reckon-
‘ ing the hours of the day. For speaking of that very day,
‘ on which our blessed Lord rose from the dead, he first
‘ mentions his appearing to Mary Magdalene. And then
‘ intimates, that he appeared to other of his disciples, that
‘ same day. But his words are very remarkable. “ The
‘ same day, when it was evening, being the first day of the
‘ week :” and the disciples had bolted the doors for fear of
‘ the Jews: “ Then came Jesus and stood in the midst of
‘ them,” &c. Now, no Jew would have used that language.
‘ No! When “ the evening was come,” they would have
‘ called it “ the second day of the week.” St. John, there-
‘ fore, in this place, hath, in effect, (though not in express
‘ words) told his attentive readers, that he has followed
‘ the Roman computation of the hours of the day. For,
‘ according to that, it was still the first day of the week,
‘ and the same day on which our Lord arose; notwithstand-

^t See the History of the first Planting the Christian Religion, second edit. App. n. 4. p. 52, 53.

‘ing the sun was set, and the evening come.’ And the ‘Jews would, unquestionably, have reckoned it “the second ‘day of the week.’”’

This whole argument, as every one sees, depends upon the supposition, that this appearance of our Lord to his disciples, was after sun-set, and perhaps late in the night; as Grotius^g and some others have thought. But other learned men are rather of opinion, that^h our Lord showed himself to his disciples by day-light. Nor is it said, that the doors had been shut by the disciples because it was night, but “for fear of the Jews.”

This appearance of our Lord was not made, until after the return of the two that had been at Emmaus. And it will be of great use to us to attend to that history, as it stands in St. Luke's gospel, ch. xxiv. 13—36.

“And behold two of them went that same day to a village, called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all these things, which had happened. Whilst they communed together, and reasoned, Jesus drew near, and went with them. —And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they were going. And he made as though he would have gone farther. But they constrained him, saying: Abide with us. For it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them: [or as he was sitting down to table with them:] he took bread, and blessed it, and brake unto them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight:” that is, he retired, and went away. “And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them.—And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known unto them in breaking of bread.—And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them: Peace be unto you.”

When they entreated Jesus to “abide with them,” they said: It is toward evening, and the day is far spent,” or has already begun to decline, *ὅτι προς ἑσπεραν ἐστι, και κεκλικεν ἡ ἡμερα*. It was past noon, and might be near our three after-

^g Jam multâ nocte. Grot. in Jo. xx. 19.

^h Existente vesperâ, et quidem satis serâ, januis clausis. Quod licet a plerisque consideretur, ut signum proVectæ noctis, nobis tamen minime ita videtur. Circumstantiis enim omnibus rite perpensis, videtur concludendum esse, quod adhuc ante sextam vespertinarum hæc apparitio discipulis contigerit. Lampe, in Joh. loc. T. III. p. 685. Et confer Wolf. in loc.

noon. As they were sitting down to eat, looking more directly at Jesus, than they had yet done, they knew him. Our Lord thereupon retired, and they hastened to the disciples. Emmaus was about a two hours' walk from Jerusalem. They might get thither more than an hour before sun-set. Soon after our Lord came in. He might have been there before them; but he was willing that the disciples, and they that were with them, should be prepared for his appearing among them by the testimony of these two, added to the testimonies of Peter, and the women who had already seen him.

All this may be confirmed by the history of the miracle of the five loaves and five thousand. Matt. xiv. 15, "And when it was evening, his disciples came unto him, saying; This is a desert place, and the time is now past." Mark vi. 35, "And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said: This is a desert place, and now the time is far passed." Says Mr. Macknightⁱ in his instructive and edifying account of this miracle, 'The five thousand men, beside women and children, were all fed with such expedition, that though the thing was not so much as proposed to the disciples, till about three, all was over by five of the clock in the afternoon.'

I have endeavoured to show, that St. John followed the Jewish computation of the hours of the day. I am not now concerned to reconcile him with the other evangelists. Solutions of this difficulty may be found in^k editors and commentators. Some think, that St. John's original number was "the third hour," as in St. Mark; and that his number has been since altered. Others propose different solutions. But so far as I am able to judge, a solution, depending upon the supposition, that St. John followed the Roman computation of the hours of the day, is not likely to be right.

The learned men, with whom I have been arguing, think, that St. John wrote his gospel very late, not before the year of our Lord ninety-seven, a little before his own death. But that is said without ground. It is more probable, that^l St. John wrote his gospel before the destruction of Jerusalem, about the year of Christ sixty-eight; though not till after the other three evangelists, and after having read their gospels, as all the ancients testify. However, if he had

ⁱ See his Harmony of the Gospels. Sect. 60. p. 173. ^k Vid. Mill. et Wetstein. Bengel. in Cris. et Gnomon. ad Jo. xix. 20. Vid. et Grot. et Wolf. et Lampe, in loc. et Bez. ad Marc xv. 29. Basnag. Ann. 33. n. vii.

^l See Vol. vi. ch. ix. sect. 9, 10.

written after the destruction of Jerusalem, it could not but be very proper to observe the Jewish computation in speaking of things done among the Jews, in their own country, and before that event.

CHAP. IV.

PAGE 141. Diss. xxxv. ‘The manner of embalming ‘dead bodies among the Jews, and particularly that of our ‘Saviour.’

Here it is said, p. 149, 150. ‘The other Evangelists indeed take notice, that the women afterwards carried spices ‘to the sepulchre. For, as Joseph and Nicodemus doubtless ‘embalmed the body privately, after it was carried from the ‘cross; the women, as they were not present, might know ‘nothing of it. And considering the shortness of the time, ‘they might imagine, that nothing had been done; and ‘therefore were willing to do what they could themselves.’

This is said by our learned author, for removing a difficulty, arising from what is said by St. John, and the other evangelists. St. John says, ch. xix. 38—40, not only, that “Joseph of Arimathea,” who is also mentioned by^a the other evangelists, “besought Pilate, that he might take the body of Jesus, and that Pilate gave him leave:” but adds, “There came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight:” including, as I imagine, the bandage, as well as the spices. “Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury,” meaning such persons as were of eminence and distinction.

Nevertheless, St. Mark says, xvi. 1, 2, “And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre, at the rising of the sun.” See also Luke xxiii. 55, 56, and chap. xxiv. 1, 2.

As our Lord’s female friends prepared spices, and brought them to the sepulchre; our author concludes that they knew nothing of what had been done by Joseph and Nicodemus.

^a Matt. xxvii. 57—60; Mark xv. 42—46; Luke xxiii. 50—53.

But it is manifest from all the evangelists, that the women who attended our Lord's crucifixion, attended also his interment. St. John himself says, ch. xix. 25, "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." And St. Matthew, ch. xxvii. 55—61, "And many women were there, beholding afar off—Among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children.—Joseph of Arimathea—went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.—And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock; and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed. And there was Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre." And St. Mark expressly says, xv. 47, "And Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses, beheld where he was laid." See likewise ch. xvi. 1—3. From which two evangelists, and also from Luke xxiv. 1, 2, it appears, that the women knew every thing concerning our Saviour's interment, to the placing of the stone at the door of the sepulchre. But they knew nothing of the watch or guard of soldiers, set there afterwards, as related, Matt. xxvii. 52—66. And St. Luke says, ch. xxiii. 52—56, "That Joseph having begged the body of Jesus, took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man was laid—And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how the body was laid." Or, as in Dr. Clarke's paraphrase, 'And the women of Galilee, who had stood at a distance, seeing the crucifixion, followed the body of their Lord, when it was taken away, and observed where Joseph laid it.'

To imagine therefore, that these women knew nothing of what had been done by Joseph and Nicodemus, is to suppose them extremely negligent about an object that engaged all their attention. I am not for obviating, or removing difficulties, by denying any parts of a history that are manifest. Nor do I recollect one commentator who has been of opinion, that these good women were unacquainted with the embalming of our Lord's body, so far as it had been done, before he was laid in the sepulchre.

We may conceive of the case in this manner. When Pilate, at the request of the Jews, had given leave, "that the legs of the two malefactors might be broken," for hastening their death, and "that they might be taken away:"

and when, at the request of Joseph of Arimathea, Pilate had also given leave “for taking away the body of Jesus;” the crucifixion was over, and the crowd would disperse. And the women, who before had stood at some distance, would come nearer. They must have been exceedingly solicitous about the disposal of the body of their beloved Lord, as no preparations had been made for his burial. And the coming of Joseph and Nicodemus, with their attendants, bringing a fine linen cloth, and rollers or bandages, and myrrh and aloes, must have afforded them much satisfaction. When the body was taken down from the cross, they would follow those who carried it away. Nor would they lose sight of the body, or at least of those who took care of it. They were not now agents, but spectators, or standers-by. But they would be as near to those, who were employed in embalming the body, or in swathing it with rollers, as they could be, without interrupting them. And it may be well supposed, that Joseph and Nicodemus, and their attendants, whether their own servants, or perfumers and apothecaries, would be civil to them, and not be at all offended at the respect which they showed to Jesus.

Where the precious body was washed from the blood of the wounds, and embalmed, and wrapped up in the rollers, may not be easy for us to say; whether in a shed, or lodge of the garden, or in the sepulchre itself, or before the door, at the entrance of it. But this last seems to me as likely as any. Wherever it was done, the women were near the place, and saw, or at least knew what was done. “They sat over against the sepulchre, and saw where and how the body was laid:” and that a great stone was rolled at the door of it.

After which they went away; and when the sabbath was over, they bought spices, and came with them to the sepulchre early on the first day of the week. The reason of their so doing is differently assigned by learned commentators.

Grotius^b and Beza^c were of opinion, that our Lord’s body was not anointed or embalmed; that is, Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea did not make use of the spices, but laid them by in the sepulchre, intending to come again to

^b ‘Cum aromatibus.’] Non unxerunt, ob temporis angustias, sed aromata apposuerunt, uncturi primo commodo tempore. Grot. in Jo. xix. 40.

^c Non est tamen pollinctum Christi cadaver, mulieribus alioqui non accessuris post alterum diem ad illud ungendum. Sed tumultuarie fuit, propter instantem, et quasi jam præsentem parasceven, in illo monumento proximo civitati positum, cum aromatibus a Nicodemo allatis, dilatâ in alterum a sepulto diem integrâ funeris pollinctura. Bez. in loc.

complete the embalming. Lampe^d does not approve of that account. Nevertheless he is obliged to own, that^e what was now performed, was done in haste. As Lucas Brugensis is not in many hands, I shall transcribe a part of what he says, for showing what these good women aimed at by their kind^f offices. And I shall refer to Theophylact,^g who speaks to the like purpose.

What these women intended to do, we cannot say particularly. Nor can it be reasonably expected that we should be able to determine; because it cannot be supposed that any now are fully acquainted with the various methods of embalming among the Jews, or the whole process of their embalming. But that there was somewhat wanting, somewhat left to be done by respectful and affectionate friends, may be argued from the shortness of time, and great haste, in which our Lord was embalmed and buried; and likewise from the concurring concern of several women, who may be justly supposed to have been as attentive, and as discreet and understanding, as any of their sex. And it has seemed to me, that our Lord foresaw, that, for want of opportunity, there would happen a defect in that respect, which might otherwise have been shown him at his death.

Of the woman that anointed Jesus at Bethany with precious ointment, he said to those who were uneasy at the expense: Matt. xxvi. 12, "For in that she has poured this ointment upon my body, she did it for my burial," *προς το ενταφιασαι με*. Mark xiv. 8, "She has done what she could. She is come before hand, to anoint my body to the burial," *εις τον ενταφιασμον*. John xii. 7, "Let her alone. Against the day of my burying has she kept this," *εις την ημεραν τε ενταφιασμε με*.

But learned interpreters say, that^h the original word,

^d Leviora sane sunt, quibus persuadere vult, Dominici corporis unctionem quidem susceptam esse, sed non datam exsecutioni. Lampe, in Jo. T. III. p. 644.

^e Prius nullius est momenti, quia raptim et festinanter Jesum esse unctum, facile concedimus. Id. ib.

^f 'Emerunt' a pharmacopolis 'aromata,' vi exsiccandi et fragrantiam addendi prædita—ut 'ungerent' Jesum mortuum—Neque vero ignorabant, corpus Jesu a Nicodemo non parce unctum fuisse, centum inquam libris myrrhæ et aloës, quæ præsentibus adfuerant, cum ungeretur, quanquam forte suis oculis non viderant. Sed habebat consuetudo, ut carissima capita, et quæ plurimi fierent cadavera, non semel tantum ungerentur, sed sæpius, pluribusque continuis diebus, donec exsiccatum et absorpto vi aromatum omni reliquo humore, imo tabefactâ carne aridâ, et quasi aeneâ redditâ, diu servari possent integra, et immunia a putrefactione, &c. Vid. Gen. L. 23. Luc. Brug. in Marc. xvi.

^g Theoph. in Marc. xvi. 1.

^h 'Ad funerandum me:' *προς το ενταφιασαι με*. Vulg. et Erasmus, 'ad me sepeliendum,' male. Nam aliud est *θαπτειν*, quam *ενταφιαζειν*: ut Latinis

made use of by all the evangelists, does not so properly denote burial, as the preparations made for burial, and particularly the costly preparations made for persons of distinction.

The meaning therefore is: “In that she has poured this ointment upon my body, she has done it,” as it were, “for my embalming,” or to embalm me. And this part of our Lord’s apology for that pious woman may be paraphrased in this manner, as indeed it wasⁱ formerly: ‘You may consider this anointing as an embalming of me. And it may so happen, that neither she, nor any others, shall have an opportunity to lay out all the rich spices and ointments upon me, when dead, which they may be disposed to make use of.’

CHAP. V.

PAGE 155. Diss. xxxvii. ‘Whom are we to understand by the Grecians and Hebrews mentioned, Acts vi. 1.’

It will be worth the while to put down here the words of the text at length. “And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration.”

I am of opinion, that by Hebrews are meant native Jews, descendants of Abraham and Israel, and that by Grecians are meant proselytes to the Jewish religion. This I shall endeavour to make out by an induction of particulars, and by numerous quotations from the Old Testament.

Hebrew, or Hebrew. It is a very honourable, and the most ancient, denomination of the Jewish people. Abraham himself is called “a Hebrew,” or “the Hebrew,” Gen. xiv. 13. as is Joseph in Egypt, Gen xxxix. 14, 17. chap. xli. 12. The Hebrews are mentioned more than once in his history. Gen xl. 15. and xliii. 32. In particular, the country insepelire est sepulcro condere: funerare vero pollincire, cadaver sepulcro mandandum, prius curare. &c. Bez. ad Matt. xxvi. 12.

—Habet me jam quasi pro mortuo, atque officium illud solemne modico tantum tempore avertit. Hunc sensum apertissime significat Marcus voce προελαβε. Hic το ενταφιασαι, pollincire, interpretandum est per ελλειψιν voculæ, ὡσει tanquam: ‘fecit quasi ad me pollinciendum.’ Quam voculam prudenter hic, ut et in hac apud Marcum historiâ, addidit Syrus interpres. Et Johanni ἡμερα ενταφιασμε est dies quasi pollincturæ. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 12.

ⁱ See Vol. ix. p. 427.

habited by Jacob and his family, whence Joseph is brought, is called "the land of the Hebrews, Gen. xl. 15. God himself, when he sent Moses to deliver the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage, took upon himself this title and character, "The Lord God of the Hebrews," Ex. iii. 18. Which character is often mentioned in the accounts of Moses's appearances before Pharaoh. Ex. v. 3; vii. 16; ix. 1; x. 3.

I do not now inquire into the origin of this name, though the disquisition might be curious. I had rather, for the sake of brevity, refer to^a others. Whatever was the origin of the name, it was early known, and seems to have been peculiar to Abraham and his descendants, by Isaac and Jacob, when Moses was sent to conduct the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt. And "the Lord God of the Hebrews," and "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," are used as equivalent. Ex. iii. 6, 15, 16, 18; iv. 5.

It was a common denomination of the children of Israel, when they dwelt in Egypt: And "the king of Egypt spake to the Hebrew midwives"—And he said: "When ye do the office of a midwife to the Hebrew women, if it be a son, ye shall kill him—And the midwives said unto Pharaoh—because the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women," Ex. i. 15, 16, 19. When Pharaoh's daughter found Moses, she said: "This is one of the Hebrews' children. Then said his sister unto Pharaoh's daughter; Shall I go, and call thee a nurse of the Hebrew women?" Ex. ii. 6, 7. Afterwards, when Moses was grown, he went out unto his brethren, and espied an Egyptian smiting an Hebrew, one of his brethren—[And] when he went out the second day, behold two men of the Hebrews strove together," ver. 11—13.

Hebrew, or Hebrews, is often used in the first book of Samuel, as equivalent to Israelites, or the people of Israel. 1 Sam. iv. 6, 9; xiii. 3; and elsewhere.

When the mariners in the ship said to Jonah, i. 8, 9, "What is thy occupation? and whence comest thou? What is thy country? and of what people art thou? He said unto them; I am an Hebrew. And I fear the Lord God of heaven, which made the sea and the dry land."

This denomination is seldom found in the later books of the Old Testament. However, it is in Jeremiah, ch. xxxiv.

^a Vid. Bochart. Geo. S. P. i. l. 2. c. 14. Scalig. Not. in Græca Eusebii. p. 410. Voss. de Orig. Idol. l. 3. c. 44. p. 356. Br. Walton, Proleg. iii. Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop. iv. cap. 13. Jo. Cleric. Comm. in Gen. x. 21. xiv. 13. et Disserta. de Ling. Hebr.

The place is remarkable, and will be of use to us in the present inquiry. “This is the word, that came unto Jeremiah from the Lord—That every man should let his manservant, and every man his maid-servant, being a Hebrew or Hebrewess, go free: that none should serve himself of them, to wit, of a Jew his brother—Then they obeyed, and let them go. Afterwards they caused them to return, and brought them into subjection for servants, and for handmaids—Therefore the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah, saying; Thus saith the God of Israel; I made a covenant with your fathers, saying; At the end of seven years, let ye go every man his brother, an Hebrew, which has been sold unto thee —”

Let us therefore observe the laws, which are here referred to. Ex. xxi. 2, “If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve thee; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.” Deut. xv. 12, “If thy brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee.” Lev. xxv. 44—46, “Both thy bondmen, and thy bond-maids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen [or the nations] that are round about thee. Of them shall ye buy bond-men, and bond-maids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they beget in your land; and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them for an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession. They shall be your bond-men for ever. But over your brethren, the children of Israel, you shall not rule one over another with rigour.”

“By strangers sojourning among them,” I understand proselytes, men circumcised after the manner of the Mosaic law. We here therefore see the great difference between the children of Israel, or native Jews, and strangers, or proselytes. And in speaking of this matter, for preventing ambiguity, the words Hebrew or Hebrewess, are used by Jeremiah, as certainly denoting the descendants of Abraham and the other patriarchs.

In the laws, just transcribed from the books of Moses, there are clearly mentioned three sorts of persons: “Hebrews, [or] children of Israel,” that is, native Jews; then “strangers sojourning among them,” or proselytes; lastly, “heathens,” that is, the nations, or Gentiles. The prophet demands liberty after six years’ servitude for the first only, not for any of the others. The law of Moses did not em-

power him to do more. And the command of God, by the prophet, certainly, is agreeable to his own laws, first delivered by the hand of Moses.

I shall just observe, as we go along, that Josephus says of himself, he^b was a Hebrew by birth. And Eusebius says of Moses, that^c he was a great divine, and a Hebrew of Hebrews. He also observes the antiquity of this name, and says, that^d Joseph was a Hebrew of Hebrews, but there were yet no Jews. Which is very true. For the people of Israel were not called Jews, till^e about the time of the Babylonish captivity. After that, a man of any nation, who embraced the religion of the Jews, and was circumcised after the manner of Moses, became a Jew. But he never could be a Hebrew, that denomination being peculiar to the descendants of the ancient patriarchs.

There are three places in the New Testament where this title is found. One is that of the text under consideration. Another is 2 Cor. xi. 22, "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I." The third is Philip. iii. 5, "Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews." He was circumcised the eighth day; which is a proof, he was born of parents, who were themselves Jews, and punctually obeyed the law of Moses. However, this might have been, and he have been no more than the child of a proselyte; He therefore proceeds, and says, he was of "the stock of Israel," or the seed of Jacob; and particularly, "of the tribe of Benjamin," an honoured tribe, upon divers accounts, particularly, as Benjamin was one of the sons of Jacob by Rachel, his wife, as she^f is styled in the catalogue of Jacob's family, which went into Egypt; but especially as this tribe had, in a great measure, preserved itself from idolatry. "An Hebrew of the Hebrews," or rather, "an Hebrew of Hebrews:" meaning, that he was himself a Hebrew, and descended from Hebrews.

As Paul was a Hebrew, though born out of Judea, at Tarsus in Cilicia, where the Greek tongue was used, we are fully assured, that by the Grecians cannot be meant Jews, who used the Greek language.

^b ———γενει Ἑβραϊος. De B. J. l. i. pr. 1.

^c Ὁ τοῦτον μεγας θεολογος Μωσης, Ἑβραϊος ὡν ἐξ Ἑβραίων, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος. κ. λ. Pr. Ev. l. 7. c. 7. p. 305.

^d Πλην ἄλλα καὶ ἔτος Ἑβραϊος, ἐξ Ἑβραίων, εἰ δὲ Ἰσραηλῖος, ὅτι μὴδὲ ἦν πῶ τα Ἰσραηλῖων. Ib. cap. 8. p. 312.

^e Josephus dates the origin of this name after their return from the Babylonish captivity. Ant. l. 11. v. 7.

^f "The sons of Rachel, Jacob's wife: Joseph and Benjamin," Gen. xlv. 19.

From all these texts, therefore, now alleged from the Old and New Testament, it appears, the denomination or character of Hebrew, is the privilege of birth, not of choice, or acquisition, or accidental circumstance. All descendants of Abraham the Hebrew, by Isaac and Jacob, wherever they are born, and whatever language they use, are Hebrews. Nor can any other men be Hebrews, but only they who are descended from Abraham.

This then, is the first consideration, tending to determine who these Grecians were. To whom we now proceed.

Grecians, or Hellenists, as in the original. The word Grecians occurs thrice in our English version of the New Testament; here, and ch. ix. 29, and xi. 20. But it is well known to the learned, that in the second of these places the Alexandrian MS. has *Greeks*; which also is the reading in the third text, not only in the Alexandrian manuscript, but likewise in the Latin Vulgate, and several other versions. Whatever are the readings, it is apparent, that the same persons are not intended in the third and last text, as in the two former.

Various^s have been the sentiments of learned men concerning the Grecians, mentioned here, and in ch. ix. 29. The most prevailing opinions are these two. Some hereby understand Jews, born out of Judea, who spake Greek, and used the Greek version of the Old Testament in their synagogues. The other opinion is, that these Grecians were proselytes, or men of other nations, who had embraced the Jewish religion.

That the former are not here intended, has been, as I apprehend, sufficiently shown already. I therefore go on to support farther the opinion, that these Grecians were proselytes.

Which, I think, may be argued from the neglect they had met with. There arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected, *παρεθεωρεντο*, were overlooked, passed by, omitted,^h in the daily ministrations. There was no regard had to them. There were no allowances or distributions made to them.

This may have been owing to two reasons, because they were few in number, and because they were despised. There may be some reason to think it was chiefly owing to this last.

^s Seven different opinions have been taken notice of by some learned writers. Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. vi. T. III. p. 226. et Lux Evangelii, cap. iv. p. 59, 60. et Wolf. Curæ ad Act. vi. 1. ^h *Παρεθεωρεντο*.] ‘despicerentur,’ id est, negligenterentur, et contemnerentur. Joach. Camer. in loc.

The Jews of this time knew very well how to pay respect to proselytes of distinction, as they did to Helena, queen of the Adiabenes, and her son Izates. But for the most part native Jews, descendants of Abraham and the patriarchs, must have been preferred to proselytes. I cannot conceive any reason why any Jews should have been neglected, barely because they were born out of Judea, and used the Greek language. But proselytes might be overlooked, because they were reckoned much inferior to Israelites. Proselytes wereⁱ admitted to eat the passover, and to communion with Israelites in all religious privileges. But they were far from enjoying equal civil privileges with the children of Israel. This must be apparent from what was before alleged from the thirty-fourth chapter of Jeremiah, and parallel places.

I beg leave to take notice of some other things relating to them from the Old Testament. When the Gibeonites had beguiled Joshua, and the elders, and their deceit was known, "all the congregation murmured against the princes:" however, as they had "made a league with them, to let them live, and the princes of the congregation had sworn to them," they would not falsify their oath. They gave them their lives, but took from them their lands, and made them slaves, or little better. As it is said, Josh. ix. 26, 27, "Joshua delivered them out of the hand of the children of Israel, that they slew them not. And he made them hewers of wood, and drawers of water, for the congregation, and for the altar of the Lord."

And we are told, "that Saul sought to slay them," or endeavoured to extirpate them, in "his zeal to the children of Israel and Judah," 2 Sam. xxi. 2. Which shows, that they were not beloved, and that this zeal of Saul was popular. But it was resented in the time of David.

This sort of men were employed in the laborious works for building the temple. 1 Chr. xxi. 2, "And David commanded to gather together the strangers that were in the land of Israel. And he set masons to hew wrought stones to build the house of God." And 2 Chr. ii. 17, 18, "And Solomon^k numbered all the strangers that were in the land of Israel, after the numbering, wherewith David his father had numbered them. And they were found an hundred and

ⁱ See Ex. xii. 48, 49; Numb. ix. 14; and other places.

^k Καὶ συνήγαγε Σαλομων παντας τας ανδρας τας προσηλυτους, τας εν γη Ισραηλ. κ. λ. LXX.

Numeravit igitur Salomon omnes viros proselytos, qui erant in terrâ Israel. Hieron.

fifty thousand, and three thousand, and six hundred. And he set threescore and ten thousand of them to be bearers of burdens, and fourscore thousand to be hewers in the mountains, and three thousand and six hundred overseers, to set the people to work."

The overseers I suppose to have been Israelites, the rest strangers or proselytes; as they are called in the Greek version of the Seventy, and in St. Jerom's Latin version. Many of these strangers may have been remains of the Gibeonites; but I presume there were others besides.

Nethinims are mentioned, 1 Chr. ix. 2, "Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions, in their cities, were the Israelites, the Priests, the Levites, and the Nethinims." They, and Solomon's servants, are often mentioned in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. In the catalogue of the people that returned from Babylon it is said, Ezr. ii. 58, "All the Nethinims, and the children of Solomon's servants, were three hundred ninety and two." So also Nch. vii. 60, and Ezr. viii. 20, "Also the Nethinims, whom David and the princes had appointed for the service of the Levites, two hundred and twenty."

These Nethinims had been given the Levites, to serve them. Afterwards Solomon appointed more for the like service. These must have been strangers or proselytes. It is not to be thought that David, or Solomon, or any king of Israel, with the elders, had power to give Israelites to the service of the Levites. As some Jews said to our Lord: "We be Abraham's seed, and never were in bondage to any man," John viii. 33. No, they were free-born, and high born, in comparison of other men; though they were little concerned for the freedom of which our Lord was speaking. Says Patriek upon 2 Chr. ix. 2, 'Ezra gives a good account of the Nethinims, ch. viii. 20, where he informs us, they were given by David to the Levites, (which is the original of their name,) as the Levites were given by God to help the priests; and therefore in all places they are mentioned with holy persons.'

I do not know whether these men may be called inferior clergy. They seem rather to have been servants to them. But however mean their original, or low and laborious their employment may have been; the people of Israel were indebted to them for their zeal for the house of God. Many of them readily returned from Babylon to Judea, and performed their part for upholding the worship of God at his temple.

As all the land of Canaan was given to the twelve tribes,

the children of Israel, and many of the regulations in the law of Moses were in their favour; it was foreseen, that strangers, who joined themselves to them, and came to sojourn among them, would lie under some disadvantages. God therefore, who wisely made those appointments of the law of Moses regarding the descendants of Jacob, in his great goodness, made provisions likewise for strangers, that they might not be abused.

The people of Israel, to whom the laws of Moses were delivered, are charged in this manner. Ex. xxii. 20, "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Comp. Lev. xix. 33, 34, and Ex. xxiii. 12, "Six days shalt thou do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thy ox and thy ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger may be refreshed:" see there ver. 9. Lev. xix. 9, 10, "And when ye reap the harvest of your land—thou shalt not gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard. Thou shalt leave them for the poor, and the stranger. I am the Lord your God." See also Lev. xxv. 5, 6, and 38; and Deut. xvi. 13, 14, "Thou shalt observe the feast of tabernacles seven days, after that thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine. And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man servant, and thy maid servant, and the Levite, the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow that are in thy gates." And again, very particularly, Deut. xxvi. 11—13, "And thou shalt rejoice in every good thing, which the Lord thy God hath given unto thee, and unto thy house, thou, and the Levite, and the stranger that is among you. When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thy increase—and hast given it unto the Levite, and the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled. Then thou shalt say before the Lord thy God; I have brought away the hallowed things out of my house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, according to thy commandment." These instances of kindness are strongly enforced, Deut. x. 17—19.

I shall add a text or two, somewhat different, though still to the like purpose. Deut. xii. 12, "And ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God, ye and your sons, and your daughters, and your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and the Levite that is within your gates. Forasmuch as he has no part, nor inheritance with you." And ver. 18,

“Thou must eat them before the Lord thy God, in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates.” See also Deut. x. 9.

By “stranger,” and “stranger within thy gates, and the stranger that sojourneth with thee, [or] in thy land,” I always understand proselytes, men circumcised according to the law of Moses; or, as they are now often called, “proselytes of the covenant, [or] of righteousness.” If the Levites are said “to have no inheritance,” and are styled “Levites within thy gates,” as they are in some texts just cited, though there were allotted to them cities, with their suburbs, out of the inheritance of the other tribes, as is manifest from Numb. xxxv. 1—8, and Josh. xiv. 1—5, all strangers, though circumcised, and admitted to full communion in all religious ordinances, may well be called “sojourners, and the strangers within thy gates.”

Once more. As God in his laws, delivered to the children of Israel, was not unmindful of the stranger; so likewise does David remember them in his devotions. Ps. cxv. 9—13, “O Israel trust thou in the Lord. O house of Israel trust thou in the Lord. Ye that fear the Lord, trust in the Lord. The Lord will bless the house of Israel; he will bless the house of Aaron. He will bless them that fear the Lord, both small and great,” cxviii. 2—4, “Let Israel now say, that his mercy endureth for ever. Let the house of Aaron now say, that his mercy endureth for ever. Let them that fear the Lord say, that his mercy endureth for ever.” Ps. cxxxv. 19, 20, “Bless the Lord, O house of Israel. Bless the Lord, O house of Aaron. Bless the Lord, O house of Levi. Ye that fear the Lord, bless the Lord.”

These men, who fear the Lord, mentioned after all the divisions of the people of Israel, I suppose to have been strangers, or proselytes. Hereby we are led to understand St. Paul’s address in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia. Acts xiii. 16, “Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience.” And ver. 26, “Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent.” Here, by them that feared God, must be meant proselytes. For that none were present, but such as were Jews, either by birth or religion, appears from ver. 42, and what there follows.

Proselytes are mentioned among the hearers of St. Peter’s first sermon, preached at Jerusalem, after our Lord’s ascension. Acts ii. 10. I suppose proselytes to be meant by Grecians here, ch. vi. 1, and ix. 29.

Who they were, we cannot say exactly. But there might be many such men in Judea, and in other countries all over the world, where the Jewish people resided. Some of them may have been descendants of such as had joined themselves to the people of Israel in former times; and others may have been new converts to the Jewish religion.

I have imagined, that proselytes now living in Judea, who were poor, may have been chiefly, or for the most part, servants of the Roman governors, or of their officers; who having come into Judea with their masters, were converted to the Jewish religion; and, when their masters returned home, got leave to stay behind. Having renounced gentilism, they could not expect very agreeable treatment from their friends and relatives at home. And though they had not the prospect of any considerable advantage in Judea, yet they might hope for civilities among those, whose religion they had embraced. Besides, new converts have a great deal of zeal. Some of them might conceive a particular affection for the land of Israel, and the city of Jerusalem, where was the temple.

Beside the servants of Roman officers, who had resided in Judea, probably, there were others, who had served Jews out of Judea; who, having for some reasons left their masters, chose to come, and seek subsistence in Judea, not being willing to serve heathens.

There might be also divers other persons of different stations, who being converted to Judaism, preferred Jerusalem to all other places.

Nicolas, chosen to be one of the seven, a proselyte of Antioch, now at Jerusalem, was, very probably, a man of good substance. And it is observable, that Helena, queen of the Adiabenes, not long after her conversion went to^l Jerusalem. And she must have often visited that city, or resided there very much. For she was there, when her son Izates^m died. And several of the brothers and sons of Izatesⁿ were shut in at the last siege of Jerusalem.

That therefore is my third and last argument, that these Grecians were proselytes; forasmuch as upon their complaints a proselyte was chosen to be one of the seven, to preside in the daily ministrations, even Nicolas of Antioch. The rest, I presume, were Hebrews, that is, Jews by birth, descendants of the patriarchs. Some of whom may have been born in Judea, others of them out of it, but were now at Jerusalem.

It is no sufficient reason to believe that any of the rest

^l Jos. Ant. l. 20. ii. 6.

^m Ib. iii. 3.

ⁿ De B. J. l. 6. vi. 4.

were proselytes, or that all the rest were Jews, who were born in other countries, because their names are Greek. For several of our Saviour's disciples had Greek names, though they were all men of Galilee; as Philip, and Andrew, and Thomas called Didymus, and Simon, called also Cephas, and Peter, by which last name he was generally called, and best known.

That Stephen was a Jew by birth, is highly probable from the whole of his speech before the council, and particularly from the beginning of it. Acts vii. 2, "Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken. The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia."

Philip, the second of the seven, was a person of great eminence, who first preached the gospel in Samaria, and wrought there many miracles. Acts viii. 1—5. Who also converted the chamberlain, and treasurer of Candace queen of the Ethiopians. There cannot be any reason to make a doubt, whether Philip, so eminent an evangelist, of an order next in authority and dignity to Christ's apostles, was of the seed of Israel. It would be altogether absurd to suppose, that one so early employed in such signal services for promoting the gospel, was only a proselyte.

When the eunuch had been baptized, "the spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more. But Philip was found at Azotus; and passing through, he preached in all the cities, till he came to Cæsarea," ver. 39, 40. There he seems to have settled. For there he was, when St. Paul came to Jerusalem in the year fifty-eight, as we learn from Acts xxi. 8—10, "And the next day we came to Cesarea. And we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven, and abode there."

Stephen suffered martyrdom soon after he was chosen. Philip likewise, as we perceive, not long after removed from Jerusalem. Indeed, the seven seem to have been appointed upon occasion of a particular emergency. However, the other five, or some of them, may have stayed at Jerusalem, and may have continued to officiate in the service, to which they had been appointed. And moreover, others may have been chosen in the room of Stephen, who died, and of Philip, who removed.

Dr. Whitby upon Acts vi. 1, objects against our opinion from ch. ix. 29; where it is said, "That Paul disputed against the Grecians; but they went about to slay him." "Which, as he argues, shows they must be Jews by birth, 'and not only strangers of other nations come hither. For

how dared they to kill a Jew among the Jews, without bringing him to their tribunals?’

Which is an argument of no moment. For I presume, that neither had a Jew by birth a right to assassinate a man without any trial. And, generally, such things must have been disliked. But a proselyte might attempt it as well as another. And considering how unpopular a person Paul now was, the killing him might be passed by, and overlooked, or even approved of, by whomsoever it was done. Proselytes were as likely as any men to be bigoted in their sentiments, and to practise violence against those who differed from them. What sort of men most of the proselytes of that time were, may be concluded from what our Lord said to the pharisees without reserve. *Matt. xxiii. 15.* But there were some of a better temper, who believed in Jesus after his resurrection, and joined themselves to his apostles, when the profession of his name must have exposed them to difficulties.

To me it seems, that there is great propriety in St. Luke's style, calling the Jews, who were of the seed of Israel, Hebrews, and proselytes, Hellenists, Grecians, or perhaps Hellenes, Greeks, from their origin. For I have sometimes been much inclined to think that to be the true reading in this text, as well as in the rest. And Dr. Ward says, p. 155, ‘ That the word *Ἑλληνισταί*, Hellenists, is used only by ‘ St. Luke in this book, and is not perhaps to be found in ‘ any other writer so ancient.’ Indeed, I believe, it is not to be found in Josephus. And the uncommonness of the word may cause a suspicion, that it is the invention of some christian; though it is ancient. For, in this text, it is in the Alexandrian manuscript. And the word may be seen in^o Chrysostom.

Any, who are pleased to consider all that was before said, concerning the word Hebrew, are able to judge whether there is not some special propriety in St. Luke's style, according to this interpretation. A Hebrew, denoting a Jew by ancient descent, must be fitly opposed to Grecians, or Greeks, thereby understanding proselytes, who were Jews, by religion only, and not by birth.

The opinion, for which I argue, has been espoused by many learned men, as ^p Beza, ^q Basnage, and ^r Pearson.

^o In Act. *Αἱ. hom.* 14, p. 111. tom. ix.

^p In Act. 1.

^q Ann. 35. p. vii.

^r Hic autem *Ἑλληνισταί* opponuntur *Ἑβραίοις*—Neque enim Hebræi, neque Judæi erant, hoc est, genere: non Hebræi ex Hebræis—Sed Judæi

Which last has asserted it with great strength, and neatness, in a few words. Insomuch, that it may be thought somewhat strange, that this opinion has not been generally received without farther dispute. I have enlarged, being desirous to establish and illustrate it to the best of my power.

CHAP. VI.

PAGE 159. Diss. xxxviii. ‘The term Holy Ghost, in the New Testament, denotes both a person and a power.’

P. 159, ‘That it often denotes a power, cannot be questioned, as where the apostles and other christians at that time, are said to be filled with the Holy Ghost. But that it signifies also a person, seems evident from the following passages among others.’

That Dissertation concludes in this manner, p. 161, ‘We meet with *χαρισμα Θεου*, “the gift of God,” Rom. vi. 23, and *χαρισμα Χριστου*, “the gift of Christ,” 2 Tim. i. 6, according to some copies; though others have it *Θεου*, “the gift of God,” as it is in our version. And agreeably to all analogy *χαρισματα Αγιου Πνευματος* must signify “the gifts of the Holy Spirit,” in a personal sense: since that word is never used otherwise, but of persons in the New Testament, where the donor is mentioned.’

But for this last our author refers not to any text, as he does for the two former; because, I suppose, he found not any such text in the New Testament. Nor do I know of any.

This observation therefore is unsupported by proper authority, and is what one would not have expected in so accurate a writer as Dr. Ward. I think we ought here to recollect, that these Dissertations are posthumous.

But I have no intention to enter into an argument upon this subject. There^a was an anonymous tract published not long ago, where it is treated more distinctly, to which I refer.

tantum religione, id est, proselyti. Hi igitur proselyti, cum, antequam circumciderentur, Ἕλληνες, sive Gentiles fuerint, etsi jam religione facti Judæi, et totius legis impletionem in se suscipientes, tamen a Judæis seu Hebræis, stirpe et genere ab Abrahamo deducto superbientibus, inferiori loco habebantur. Unde neglectus viduarum, et ex eo neglectu murmur, seu *γογγυσμος των Ελληνιστων*. Pearson, Lec. 3. in Act. Apost. num. v.

^a See the First Postscript to a letter written in 1730, p. 116.

CHAP. VII.

PAGE 174. Diss. xlii. ‘To whom the apostolic decree, ‘Acts xv. was directed. And whether it was perpetual.’

As this chapter will be of considerable length, I shall divide it into the following sections.

I. An introduction.

II. The Noachic precepts, with observations upon them.

III. To whom the apostolic decree was directed; and that there was but one sort of Jewish proselytes.

IV. General observations, showing the occasion and design of the apostolic decree.

V. The several articles of the decree explained.

VI. Observations, in the manner of corollaries.

I. INTRODUCTION. Before I make any remarks upon this article, I would observe, that a good while ago, in the chapter of St. Cyprian,^a I carefully considered the various readings of this decree, as it stands in the book of the Acts of the Apostles, ch. xv. 20, 29, and xxi. 25. The result of which was, that the readings in our present copies of it, in the New Testament, are right. It was a long discussion. But I do not repent the labour of it. It has formerly, and does still afford satisfaction.

Says our learned author, p. 174, ‘The decree is directed ‘*τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν*, that is, as seems most probable, to all ‘the heathen converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, who ‘were not proselytes of the gate, before they embraced ‘christianity. For the Jewish proselytes were always ‘obliged to regard the things therein mentioned, as they ‘were all contained in the precepts given to Noah. And ‘therefore we do not find in Acts x. that Peter laid any such ‘injunctions upon Cornelius, and his company.’

Dr. Ward, as seems to me, useth those words, “proselytes of the gate, and Jewish proselytes,” very improperly. But of that more hereafter.

It may be proper to observe here, that the author of *Miscellanea Sacra* has advanced an opinion, not known before, that^b the decree of the council of Jerusalem was directed to such converts to christianity only, as were “proselytes of the gate,” and were, before their conversion to christianity, obliged to observe the several regulations contained in this decree. Which opinion has been embraced by several.

^a Vol. iii. p. 22—35.

^b See *Miscell. Sacra*. Essay iv. However, see also Hammond upon Acts xv. 29.

Dr. Ward does not differ much from them. He thinks that^c such things, as were before required of “proselytes of the gate,” were, in the decree, enjoined upon all converts to christianity, in the countries above mentioned. But, he says, there was no need of giving such injunctions to Cornelius, he having before observed the like things, as a “proselyte of the gate,” living in Judea.

Upon this scheme, I now make no remarks. I put down these things here at present, only by way of explication of our author’s sentiment.

II. THE NOACHIC PRECEPTS. Dr. W. in the words just cited, speaks of the precepts given to Noah. And at p. 177, says, ‘That the several things contained in the apostolic decree, are all included in the Noachic precepts.’

I therefore shall now show, what are called the seven precepts of Noah, or the sons of Noah, taking my account from Ainsworth, where I believe they are rightly represented. Which is more than can be said of some others, who talk much of them.

Says that exact and diligent writer, in his Annotations upon Gen. ix. 4, “But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.” ‘The Hebrew doctors ‘make this the seventh commandment given to the sons of ‘Noah, which all nations were bound to keep, as there had ‘been six from Adam’s time. The first against idolatry, ‘the worship of stars, images, &c. the second against blas- ‘pheming the name of God; the third against shedding of ‘blood; the fourth against unjust carnal copulations, ‘whereof they made six sorts: 1. with a man’s own mother: ‘2. or with a father’s wife: 3. or with his neighbour’s wife: ‘4. or with his sister by the mother’s side: 5. or with man- ‘kind: 6. or with beasts. The fifth precept was against ‘rapine, or robbery. The sixth to have judgment, or ‘punishment for malefactors. And unto Noah was added ‘the seventh, which is here mentioned. Which they under- ‘stand to forbid the eating of any member, or of the flesh ‘of a beast, taken from it alive. Whosoever in the world ‘transgressed any of these seven commandments wilfully, ‘the Jews held, he was to be killed with the sword. But ‘the heathen, who would yield to obey these seven precepts, ‘though they received not circumcision, nor observed the ‘other ordinances given afterwards to Israel, they were ‘suffered to dwell as strangers among the Israelites, and to ‘dwell in their land.’

^c See Hammond, as before referred to.

Upon all which I beg leave to make the several following observations.

First. Fornication is not mentioned among the several kinds of unjust carnal copulation. This omission has been observed by^d Grotius. The reason of it, I do not stay to inquire.

Secondly. Every thing, here mentioned, is of a moral nature, even the seventh precept, as well as the rest. For it condemns cruelty. It is not, to forbear eating blood, but to eat the member, or the flesh of a beast taken from it alive. Which is great cruelty, and even barbarity.

Thirdly. This whole article, as seems to me, is a Jewish way of representing the law of nature, by which all men are obliged. For sons of Adam, and sons of Noah, comprehend the whole world. By the law of nature all are obliged. Jews and christians, who are under a particular law of revelation, are not exempted from this law, and its several obligations: but are as much subject to it as other men.

Fourthly. As this scheme is the scheme of Jewish masters only, it need not to be received without examination. Rabbinical and Thalmudical writers may be of use. But they are not infallible. Indeed, I had rather learn Jewish antiquities from the scriptures, and such other Jewish writers as lived before our Saviour's coming, or were contemporary with Christ and his apostles, than from later Jewish authors.

Fifthly. These precepts deliver a wrong interpretation of Gen. ix. 4, the command given to Noah, relating to food. They represented it to forbid the eating of any member, or of any flesh of a beast taken from it alive; which is a wrong account, as must be apparent to all. The words are: "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." Or, as in Lev. xvii. 14, "Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh. For the life of all flesh is the blood thereof." And see Deut. xii. 23. And this law, as delivered to Noah, was understood by Josephus^e to forbid the eating

^d Inter præcepta Adamo et Noæ data, Judæi non ponunt interdictum scortandi. Grot. in Act. xv. 20.

^e 'Excepto quod carnem cum sanguine non comedetis.'] Hebræi recentiores, et, ut credo, christianorum odio, sentiunt vetari hic esum membri rapti de animali vivo——At certe vetustiores Hebræorum non ita interpretatos satis docet Josephus, qui ait, *χωρίς αμαρτος εν τρω γαρ εσω η ψυχη*. Quem sensum iisdem prope verbis hic expressit Rabbi Sardias, et quidem sequuntur non ignobiles Hebræorum magistri. Gro. ad Gen. ix. 4.

——Ita interpretatur et Josephus, Ant. l. i. cap. 3.

——At posteriores Rabbini inter præcepta Noacho data, quæ ad totum genus humanum pertinere ab iis putantur, hoc recensent, sensumque esse volunt, 'membrum animalis viventis non esse comedendum'——Sed hæc

of blood. Which must induce us to believe, that this is a false and late interpretation; and that this whole scheme of Noachical precepts is a modern thing. Several learned men have argued in the like manner.

Sixthly. If the Jewish doctors say, (as undoubtedly many christian commentators now do,) that any people, who obeyed these seven precepts, though they received not circumcision, might dwell among the Israelites, and sojourn in their land; I presume, they are mistaken.

This I argue, 1. From the sixth of these precepts, to have judgment, or punishment for malefactors. Or, in other words, magistracy, for restraining excesses, inconsistent with the peace of society, and for punishing delinquents. How can any learned christians suppose, that uncircumcised Gentiles were required, or allowed to have magistracy in the land of Israel? nay, it cannot be supposed, that proselytes, or men circumcised after the law of Moses, living in the land of Israel, had magistrates of their own. Whilst the Jewish people were *sui juris*, their own masters, all civil privileges, in their country, were appropriated to the descendants of Jacob. The case was quite different afterwards when they were subject to the Romans, and especially, when they were reduced to the state of a Roman province; as they were after the removal of Archelaus, not many years after our Saviour's nativity.

Indeed, God was the lawgiver and the king of the Jewish people. He governed them after the death of Moses, first by judges, then by kings, of his own appointment; who were to govern the people committed to their charge, according to the laws, which himself had delivered by the hand of Moses.

2. It seems to me to be probable, that, according to the law of Moses, no uncircumcised men could reside, or be stated inhabitants, in the land of Israel. Or, as I expressed it some while ago,^f 'It seems to me, that none but proselytes, or circumcised men, 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 also for some, whose traffic was needful, and therefore allowed. As Patrick says upon Deut. xiv. 21. There were some, called Nocherim, which we translate aliens; who were mere Gentiles, and not suffered

posterioris ævi commenta exigui sunt, ad expositionem horum librorum usûs. Cleric. in Gen. ix. 4.

^f See Vol. vi. p. 217.

‘ to have an habitation among them, but only to come and go in their traffic among them.’

I shall now argue this point more distinctly from divers considerations.

In the first place, I argue it from the law of circumcision, as delivered to Abraham. For, as our Saviour himself said to the Jews of his time, “circumcision is not of Moses, but of the fathers,” John vii. 22. The original law is in Gen. xvii. 11—14, “And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin. And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and thee. And he that is eight days old, shall be circumcised among you. Every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money, must needs be circumcised. And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant; and the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people. He has broken my covenant.” Afterwards, ver. 23, “And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham’s house; and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin, in the self-same day, as God had commanded him.” And see what follows to the end of ver. 27.

That is the law, which God gave to Abraham, and Moses afterwards delivered to the children of Israel, when they were multiplied, and were become a nation.

And the institution of the passover is to this purpose. Ex. xii. 43, 44, “This is the ordinance of the passover. There shall no stranger eat thereof.” In the Heb. ‘Every son of the stranger shall not eat thereof.’ Gr. *πας αλλογενενης*, ‘But every man’s servant that is bought with money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof.’ And ver. 48, “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.”

Such laws must have made circumcision very general in that country.

When the oppression, which the Jewish people had laboured under, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was abated, and Mattathias had come out of his retirement,^g and had got a number of men about him: it is said, 1 Macc. ii. 45, 46, “Then Mattathias, and his friends, went round about, and pulled down the altars. And what children soever they found within the coast of Israel uncircumcised, those

^g See Prideaux, Conn. year before Christ 165. Vol. ii. p. 182.

they circumcised valiantly :” that is, resolutely, strenuously, without scruple, being persuaded, that they had a right so to do.

Hyrcanus having conquered the Idumeans, in^b the year before Christ, one hundred and twenty-nine, asⁱ Josephus says, ‘ He permitted them to remain in the country, if ‘ they consented to be circumcised, and to observe the Jewish laws ; which they engaged to do, rather than leave ‘ their country ; and from that time they became Jews.’

Afterwards, in^k the year before Christ, one hundred and six. ‘ Aristobulus, as we also learn from^l Josephus, having ‘ subdued the Itureans, added a large part of their country ‘ to Judea, and obliged the inhabitants, if they would stay ‘ in that country, to be circumcised, and to live according ‘ to the laws of the Jews.’

I suppose, that this was done, because those countries were reckoned to be part of the land which God had given to the children of Israel.

Seventhly. What has been just said under the foregoing particular, must needs render it probable, that by “ the stranger, the stranger within thy gates, the stranger that sojourneth with thee,” so often mentioned in the law of Moses, and other books of the Old Testament, are meant proselytes, men circumcised after the law of Moses.

Nevertheless, I shall here farther add some other proof, which may be reckoned more particular and positive. The argument which I now aim at is this: The same religious ordinances are given to the children of Israel, and to the strangers sojourning among them, and under the same penalties.

Lev. xvii. 8—10, “ And thou shalt say unto them ; Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt offering, or a sacrifice ; and bringeth it not to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer it unto the Lord, even that man shall be cut off from among his people. And whatever man there shall be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people.” Ver. 13, “ And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which hunteth, and catcheth any beast, or fowl, that may be eaten, he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with

^b Prid. as before, p. 307.

ⁱ Antiq. l. 13. c. ix. sect. 1.

^k Prid. p. 370.

^l Antiq. l. 13. cap. xi. 3.

dust." Ver. 15, 16, "And every soul that eateth that which died of itself, or that which was torn with beasts, whether he be one of your own country, or a stranger, he shall both wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the even. Then shall he be clean. But if he wash not himself, nor bathe his flesh, then he shall bear his iniquity."

I might add other texts. But these appear to be sufficient. These prohibitions are delivered equally to the children of Israel, and to strangers that sojourned with them. And the penalty of transgression is that of being "cut off from his people." Therefore this sojourning stranger was one, who had joined himself to the house of Israel, or the Jewish people, by circumcision. Otherwise he could not have been cut off from them. I do not now quote any more places at length. But I would refer to Numb. xv. 13—16, and 25—31.

Eighthly. If observing the above-mentioned precepts of the sons of Noah qualified men to reside in the land of Israel; I presume it must have been lawful for Jews to converse with them: and that they might do so, without contracting any legal impurity.

Nevertheless, St. Peter was shy of conversing with Cornelius of Cesarea. When he came to his house, he told him and his company, "they knew how it was an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation." Acts x. 28. And when St. Peter was come back to Jerusalem, "they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying; Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them," ch. xi. 2, 3.

Of that centurion it is said, "that he feared God, with all his house, that he gave much alms to the people, and that he prayed to God always." Cornelius therefore was not a transgressor of any of the precepts of the sons of Noah. He was not an idolater, nor a blasphemer, nor unjust and rapacious: nor did he indulge himself in the practice of abominable filthiness. And yet, we see, from authentic evidence, that it was not lawful for a Jew to converse with him. Indeed, he lived at Cæsarea, a part of the land of Israel. But so did many idolaters, at that time, under the Romans. It was not then in the power of the Jews to exclude any men, who were admitted by their masters.

Once more, ninthly, the seven precepts of Noah, or the sons of Noah, can afford no help for explaining the regulations of the council at Jerusalem. For there is no resem-

blance between them. Nor have they any relation to each other. The Noachic precepts are all of the moral kind, as was shown just now: those of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem are, all of them, things indifferent, as will be shown hereafter.

And if the seven precepts of Noah are an invention of modern Jews, as some learned men of the best understanding^m have argued, it is great pity, that so much regard has been shown to them by christians, who profess a zeal for truth, and are desirous to know the right interpretation of the scriptures. Though they are pompously called precepts of Adam and Noah, as if they had been delivered to the first man that lived on this earth, and to him who escaped the deluge, from whom all who have since lived on this earth are descended; they are, in this system and collection, a modern invention, and were unknown to Christ's apostles. We might as well attempt to explain the scriptures by the decrees of the council of Trent, or the synod of Dort, as the apostolic decree by these seven precepts.

III. THAT THERE WAS BUT ONE SORT OF JEWISH PROSELYTES. I have spoken my mind concerning the Noachic precepts. I should now proceed to consider the first question, proposed by our Author at the head of this Dissertation. To whom the apostolic decree was directed.

But this question I have answeredⁿ formerly. It was directed to all Gentile converts whatever. The letter is inscribed, Acts xv. 23, "to the brethren, which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia." To them the Epistle was inscribed, to them it was sent, and to them it was delivered by the messengers, who carried it from Jerusalem. And afterwards. Acts xvi. 1—4, when Paul and Silas left Antioch, "they came to Derbe, and Lystra—And as they went through the cities, they delivered them the

^m I desire the reader to look back to p. 302, note ^e. I add here the judgments of others.

Mihi dubiæ sublestæque fidei videtur quidquid Judæi de his Noachidarum præceptis, eorumque antiquitate et origine tradant——Nam si Adamo in paradiso, vel Noachi filiis, fuerunt mandata; cur de iis in sacris literis, et Josephi scriptis, est silentium? D. Salom. Deyling. Observation. Sacrar. P. secund. &c. Obser. 38. sect. 9. p. 465, &c.

——'peregrinus tuus, qui in portis tuis.'] LXX. Int. ὁ προσηλυτος ὁ παροικων εν σοι. Notum quidem est, quid Rabbini de proselytis sentiant, quidve olim ab Hebræis veteribus ex iis postulatum fuisse existiment. Sed cum multa aut prorsus fingunt, aut ex sui ævi moribus judicent, tutum non est iis omnia credere. Cleric. in Ex. xx. 10.

'And indeed the modern Rabbins are of small authority in all such matters 'of remote antiquity.' Whiston, note ^f, upon Josephus, of the Jewish War, B. VI. ch. v. 3. ⁿ See Vol. vi. ch. xviii.

decrees to keep, that were ordained by the apostles and elders, which were at Jerusalem." And that the decree was designed for all Gentiles, appears from the words of St. James, who proposed it; ver. 19, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God." And long after this, when St. Paul was come again to Jerusalem, the same James, the residing apostle in that city, says to him, ch. xxi. 25, "As touching the Gentiles, which believe, we have written, and concluded."

And from the beginning all christians every where, for a good while, supposed themselves to be bound by them, and did observe them, as we know from many ancient authors still extant. But since the fourth century, they have been little regarded by those christians, who^o used the Latin tongue.

Moreover, I did formerly^p allege a passage of Mr. Hallett, arguing very clearly and strongly to the like purpose.

I did likewise at that time argue, that^q there never were, in ancient times, among the Jews, two sorts of proselytes; and that all those men, who, in the Old Testament, are called proselytes, or strangers, or strangers within thy gates, were men circumcised. I have here added more arguments to the same purpose in the observations upon the Noachic precepts.

I must therefore entreat those learned men, who say the regulations of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem were sent to uncircumcised Gentiles, whom they call proselytes of the gate, to give some better proof that there were such men, than they have yet done. Otherwise, I must still think their scheme chimerical, and without foundation.

They are the more obliged to do this, because upon many other occasions, they bring in those half-proselytes, in their explications of the scriptures.

To call any uncircumcised men Jewish proselytes, as our learned author does here, though such men are never called proselytes in the New Testament; nor, as I think, in the Old; is unwarrantable, and unbecoming men who profess to be inquirers after truth.^r

^o See the chapter of St. Cyprian, before referred to, Vol. iii.

^p See Vol. vi. ch. xviii.

^q The same.

^r Dr. Ward is not alone in this way of speaking. Dr. Hammond's paraphrase of Acts x. 2, in Le Clerc's Latin version, is thus: *Hic Cornelius erat Judaicæ religionis proselytus—licet circumciscus non esset.* I do not see how any men of judgment and candour can approve of this. For a paraprast ought not to add to the original. See by all means Dr. Doddridge's note^b, upon that text.

An uncircumcised proselyte appears to me to be as truly an impropriety and contradiction, as an uncircumcised Jew. For a proselyte is a Jew by religion, though not by birth.

I am arguing with my late learned friend whose Dissertations are before me. But I ought to be understood to argue with all others, who have adopted the same sentiment.

It is not to be expected, that I should repeat here what I said^s formerly. But if I could contribute any thing farther toward clearing up this point, I should willingly add a few more observations.

I then^t said, ‘I did not believe that the notion of two ‘sorts of Jewish proselytes can be found in any christian ‘writer, before the fourteenth century, or later.’

I shall now add, I cannot at present say certainly, which is the most ancient commentator, in whom I have met with it; whether Cardinal Cajetan, or Alphonsus Tostatus, or another. For I cannot now refer to the place. I either made no written extract, or have lost it. But I well remember to have read in some commentator about their times, this observation. Some say, there were two sorts of Jewish proselytes, but it is a mistake. There was but one. That is proof, that the notion of two sorts of proselytes was then embraced by some.

But though I cannot now say where I met with that observation, I have by me divers extracts made from Alphonsus Tostatus, who^u flourished in the fifteenth century, and died in the year 1454. From which extracts it appears, that himself acknowledged but one sort of Jewish proselytes, and that by “strangers within their gates, and sojourners,” he understood men circumcised, who had embraced the Jewish religion.

Upon Exodus, ch. xii. he says, ‘A^v native is he, who was ‘born in the Hebrew religion, having a Hebrew father. A ‘sojourner is one, who comes from Gentilism into the Jewish religion.’

Upon Exodus xx. explaining the fourth commandment, he says, ‘That^w by “strangers within thy gates” are meant

^s See Vol. vi. ch. xviii.

^t The same.

^u See Du Pin, and Morery.

^v Indigena dicitur, qui in

Hebræorum ritu natus est, quia patrem Hebræum habebat. Colonus dicitur, qui ad colendum verum Deum transit, ad ritum Judaicum veniens de Gentilitate. In Ex. cap. xii. Qu. lviii. T. II. p. 160. E. Colon. Agrip. 1613.

^w ‘Advena, qui est intra portas tuas.’] Id est, etiam observabunt diem sabbati advenæ de Gentilitate conversi ad Judaïsmum. Et isti sunt intra portas tuas, id est, intra portas civitatum tuarum. In Ex. xx. Qu. xiv.

‘ converts from Gentilism to Judaism. They also must observe the sabbath. They dwell within thy gates, that is, within the gates of thy cities.’

Upon Matt. xxiii. 15, he says ‘ Proselyte^x denotes a man converted to Judaism. The Jewish people consisted of two parts. Some were Jews by ancient descent, and were called the children of Israel; others were converted from among the nations to Judaism. And these were called by three names, sojourners, strangers, and proselytes. Those two divisions are very common in the books of Moses: “ the children of Israel, and the strangers that sojourn among you :” particularly in the seventeenth chapter of Leviticus; that is, such as were Jews by birth, or such as were converted to Judaism. So also Ezek. xiv. 1, “ Every one of the house of Israel, or of the stranger that sojourneth in Israel, which separateth himself from me, and setteth up his idols in his heart.” It is evident, that by the stranger is meant a proselyte, who had been converted to God. Otherwise he could not be separated from him.’

I have transcribed but a small part of his notes upon Matt. xxiii. 15, which are large, and well deserve to be read by such as have opportunity. So far as I am able to judge, he always speaks agreeably to the true tenour of the Mosaic law, and is altogether unbiassed by modern Rabbinical interpretations.

I cannot say whether Erasmus was acquainted with the notion of two sorts of proselytes, or not. He speaks very judiciously in his comment upon Matt. xxiii. 15. Where he says: ‘ Proselyte^y is a Greek word, equivalent to stranger. For so the Hebrews called those whom they received from other nations into communion with them.’

Philip Melancthon also was a learned man. He was born in 1497, and died in 1560. I think, we may be posi-

* Dicendum est, quod proselytus denotat hominem conversum ad Judaismum. Judæi autem distinguebantur in duo, quia quidam ex origine primâ erant Judæi; et isti vocabantur filii Israël. Alii erant conversi de Gentibus ad Judaismum; et isti vocabantur tribus nominibus. sc. advenæ, peregrini, et proselyti. Et ista duo nomina sunt multum usitata in libris Moysis; sc. homo de filiis Israël et de advenis, qui peregrinantur inter vos. Lev. xvii. id est, sive sit de Judæis ex genere, sive de illis qui conversi fuerunt ad Judaismum. Ezech. xiv. Homo de domo Israël, et de proselytis, quicumque advena fuerit in Israël, si alienatus fuerit a me, et posuerit idola sua in corde suo. Ex quo apparet, quod erat jam conversus ad Deum, qui proselytus est, quia alias non potuit a Deo alienari, &c. In Matt. cap. xxiii. Qu. 87. p. 325.

^y Proselytus Græca vox est, *προσηλυτος*, nobis ‘ advena.’ Sic enim dicebatur Hebræis, quem ex alienâ natione in suæ legis consortium receperant. Erasm.

tive, that he knew nothing of any proselytes, but such as were circumcised, and thereby obliged to observe all the ritual ordinances of the law of Moses. His comment upon Matt. xxiii. 15, is very observable. And I shall transcribe^z it.

‘ Here you may learn, that God had a church at all times, even among the Gentiles. And in the times of the kingdom of Israel and Judah there were three states of men, who were members of the church.

‘ The first state was the seed of Abraham. Those were to be circumcised, and to keep the ceremonies according to the law of Moses.

‘ The second state was that of the proselytes, that is, strangers, who were not of the seed of Abraham, but yet were willing to be a part of that people, and were willing to be circumcised. These, because they were willing to be circumcised, were bound to observe all the other ceremonies. Of this number was Urias.

‘ The third state are such as in the Acts are called religious men, that is, heathens, as Naaman the Syrian, Nabuchodonosor, Cyrus, Cornelius, and many others, who learned the promises concerning the coming of the Messiah, and the doctrine concerning the true God, and concerning good works, agreeably to the decalogue. These were not circumcised, nor did they observe the Mosaic ceremonies.’

So writes Melancthon, and, as I think, according to the sense of all christian writers of the first twelve centuries, and later.

I shall not proceed any lower in the inquiry, when that opinion, which now prevails so much, had its first rise among christians.

But I shall proceed in my argument.

The word, proselyte, occurs four times in the books of the

^z Hic discatis, quod Deus omni tempore sibi colligit ecclesiam, etiam ex gentibus. Ac tempore regni Israël et Juda, erant tres status hominum, qui erant membra ecclesiæ.

Primus status erat semen Abrahæ. Hic oportuit circumcidi, et servare cæremonias juxta legem Mosis.

Secundus status erat proselytorum, id est, advenarum, qui non erant nati ex semine Abrahæ, sed tamen volebant esse pars hujus populi, et volebant circumcidi. Hi, quia volebant circumcidi, debebant etiam servare alias cæremonias, ut Urias.

Tertius status erat, qui in Actis vocantur viri religiosi, id est, Ethnici, ut Nahaman Syrus, Nabocodonosor, Cyrus, Cornelius, et alii multi. Qui discabant promissiones de venturo Messia, et doctrinam de vero Deo, et de bonis operibus, juxta Decalogum. Et tamen nec circumcisi erant, nec servabant cæremonias Mosaicæ. Melancthon, in Matt. T. III. p. 545. Witteb. 1563.

New Testament.^a Matt. xxiii. 15; Acts ii. 10; ch. vi. 5; and ch. xiii. 43. I suppose it to be universally allowed by learned men, that in the first three texts by proselyte is intended a man circumcised after the manner of Moses. Nor do I know, that there is any doubt about the fourth and last text. And the place was so understood by^b ancient christian writers. And among the moderns Grotius is very clear, that^c hereby are intended proselytes, or as he calls them, after the now prevailing custom, and to prevent mistake, proselytes of righteousness.

However, as this text is somewhat particular, I shall consider it distinctly. “Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes, followed Paul and Barnabas, who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God, των σεβομενων προσηλυτων. I know, that by σεβομενοι, in this place, Dr. Ward did not understand a religious distinction or denomination, but a personal character. Œcumenius speaks to the like purpose. He says, ‘These^d persons were so called because they were sincere and fervent in their religion.’ It is used in the same sense by Josephus, when he says that^e Alexandra, widow of Alexander Janneus, was a religious woman, or religious toward God.

Afterwards Œcumenius seems to give another interpretation, saying; ‘Or otherwise^f he calls the proselytes worshippers properly. He addresseth himself to them before, ‘saying, “Men of Israel, and ye that fear God.” [Comp. ver. 16, and 26.] ‘calling the proselytes “men that feared God.” Thus he gives to the former the honour of their ‘birth, calling them “men of Israel.” And though he

^a The note of Lucas Brugensis upon Matt. xxiii. 15, is so neat and pertinent, that I shall put it down here. ‘Proselytum.’] Græca vox est, Latine sonans ‘advenam,’ quem Hebræi efferunt Ger, quâ significant eum, quem ex alienâ natione in suæ legis consortium adduxerint: qui a gentilitate ad judaismum adductus est, non natione Judæus, sed adoptione factus, ac in legis Mosaicæ fœdera acceptus; quasi dicas adventitium ad religionem, quod opponitur Judæo nato. Luc. Brug.

^b ‘Secuti sunt multi Judæorum, et colentium advenarum.’]—Significat eos, qui naturâ gentiles erant, sed religione Judæi, quos Græci proselytos vocant. Bed. in loc. Vid. et Œcum. in loc. p. 115, 116.

^c ‘Colentium advenarum.’] Non Græcorum, sed eorum, qui legi Mosis se subdiderant, advenæ justitiæ. Grot. in Act. xiii. 43.

^d Σεβομενες ενταυθα τε και προΐων της περι το οικειον σεβας θερμης και διαπυρης και ζηλωτας των αλλων μαλλον καλει. Œcum. in Act. Ap. p. 115.

^e —σεβομενη περι το θειον. De B. J. l. 1. v. 2. And see Vol. i.

^f —η σεβομενες ιδως προσηλυτας καλει. Και δημηγορων εμπροσθεν, και λεγων, Ανδρες Ισραηλιται, και οι εν υμιν φοβημενοι τον Θεον, φοβημενες τον Θεον της προσηλυτας εκαλει, της μεν απο τα γενος σεμννων, και Ισραηλιτας εξοριμαζων, της δε ότι μη τωτο ειχεν ειπειν, απο θρησκειας ισαζων. Ib. p. 116.

‘ could not say that of the other, he makes them equal for ‘ their religion.’ The place is somewhat obscure. But I think, he intends to say, that St. Luke, by calling those men worshippers, makes them equal to the Israelites, in point of religion, because the word worshipper does properly denote one who is proselyted to the Jewish religion; whereas fearing God might be ascribed to other men, who were not so united to the Jewish people.

There is one place in Josephus, where this word is used, which appears to be very remarkable. It is in his account of the plundering the temple at Jerusalem, by Crassus, in the year before Christ 54. ‘ Nor ought it to be thought ‘ strange, says^e Josephus, that there should be such riches ‘ in our temple, when all the Jews and worshippers of God ‘ from every part of the world, from Europe and Asia, had ‘ been sending presents thither for several ages.’

By worshippers in this place, I think, must be meant proselytes. And worshippers here is a sort of technical word, like that of proselytes, denoting men that had joined themselves to the Jewish people, and were, by religion, though not by birth, Jews. I do not deny that some men who were not proselytes, but downright heathens and idolaters, did sometimes of their own accord, and freely, send presents to the Jewish temple. But here Josephus says, that all worshippers, as well as Jews, sent presents to the temple. We are thereby led to understand proselytes, who were as much obliged to pay respect to the temple as Jews by descent.

This word is found several times in the Acts, and, as seems to me, in its proper sense. I shall consider all those texts.

Acts xiii. 50, “ But the^h Jews stirred up the devout [rather the worshipping] and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts.”

These might be called, not improperly, proselytes; though never initiated by any particular rite. Later Jews may say, thatⁱ women were initiated by baptism. But there is no ground for it in the law of Moses. I think that women were first so honoured and distinguished under the gospel

^e — παντων των κατα την οικουμενην Ιουδαιων, και σεβομενων του Θεου. Ant. l. 14. vii. 2.

^h Οι δε Ιουδαιοι παρωτρυναν τας σεβομενας γυναικας, και τας ευσημονας, και τες πρωτες της πολεως.

ⁱ The rabbinical accounts of initiating proselytes may be seen in Reland. Antiq. Hebr. P. II. cap. 7. p. 246. and Moses Maimon. Tract. de Proselytis. cap. 1. p. 113, 114, ex. ed. H. Prid. Oxon. 1679.

dispensation. Therefore St. Paul says, that “There is neither male nor female;—for ye are all one in Christ Jesus,” Gal. iii. 28. And we are assured, that when the people of Samaria “believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women,” Acts vii. 12. And Lydia and her household were baptized, Acts xvi. 15.

I pay no regard to what the later Jewish rabbins say of the method of initiating proselytes, by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice; who have made void not only the moral, (with which our Lord often chargeth them, as Matt. xv. 1—9; Mark vii. 1—13; and other places,) but also the ritual part of the law of God. Indeed, they corrupted the Mosaic ritual, by numberless additions before the coming of our Saviour. As appears from the texts of St. Mark just referred to. Nor have they ceased to do the like since.

I think, as before said, that women were first baptized under the evangelical dispensation. I am also of opinion, that our blessed Lord's forerunner first made use of baptism as an initiating ordinance; and therefore he was called the Baptist, *ὁ Βαπτιστής*, Matt. iii. 1; and in many other places. Nor am I singular in this opinion.

Josephus,^k who makes so long a story about circumcising Izates, does not say, that Helena, his mother, was initiated by any external rite: though she likewise embraced the Jewish religion.

The worshipping women, above mentioned, whom ¹Grotius calls proselytes, were unquestionably reckoned to be of the Jewish religion. Josephus, speaking of affairs in the year of Christ sixty-six, says, ‘The^m men of Damascus formed a design to make away with all the Jews of that place. But they concealed their design from their wives, who, excepting a few only, were all devoted to the Jewish religion.’

Acts xvi. 13, 14. At Philippi in Macedonia. “And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made, [or, where an oratory was appointed to be,] and we sat down, and spake unto the women, which resorted thither. And a certain woman, named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us,” *σεβομενη τον Θεον*.

^k Antiq. l. 20. cap. ii.

¹ *Τας σεβομενας γυναικας*, ‘mulieres religioſas.’ Proselytas. Nam erant et proselyti in eâ urbe, ut audivimus supra, ver. 43. Grot. in loc.

^m *Ἀπασας πλην ολιγων ὑπηγγεμενας τη Ἰεδαϊκη θρησκεια*. De B. J. l. 2. xx. 2. And see Vol. i. p. 123.

Acts xvii. 1—4, “ And they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews. And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them. And three sabbath-days [successively] reasoned with them out of the scriptures. And some of them,” that is, of the Jews, who were so by birth, or Israelites, “ believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas ; and of the devout [worshipping] Greeks, a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few,” *των τε σεβομενων Ἑλληνων πολυ πληθος.*

These worshipping Greeks must have been proselytes ; for they frequented the synagogue, and were admitted there without scruple. They were among the ordinary stated attendants on the worship there.

It is true, when at Antioch, in Pisidia, it is said, Acts xiii. 42, 44, “ And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought, that these words might be preached unto them the next sabbath.—And the next sabbath-day came almost the whole city to hear the word of God.”

But this was an extraordinary case. And under “ almost the whole city ” must be comprehended many heathens and idolaters of the place. And from this very context it appears, that none beside Jews and proselytes frequented the synagogue. For it is here said, “ When the Jews were gone out—the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them.” Therefore they were not present at St. Paul’s first discourse. It was owing to some general rumour only, that their curiosity had been raised.

St. Luke, in the place just cited from Acts xvii. at the beginning, does not mention St. Paul’s preaching at Thessalonica to any besides Jews and worshipping Greeks. Nevertheless the apostle, in his first epistle to the Thessalonians, ch. i. 9, writes to them as “ having turned to God from idols, to serve the living God.” St. Paul therefore, whilst at Thessalonica, either between the sabbaths above mentioned or afterwards, must have preached to and converted a considerable number of Gentiles. And there” seems good reason to think, that the apostle and his fellow-labourers stayed longer at Thessalonica than three weeks. For whilst he was there, the Philippian “ sent once and again to his necessity,” Philip. iv. 16. He also reminds the Thessalonians, that whilst he was with them, he and his companions “ laboured night and day, that they might not be chargeable to any of them.”

ⁿ See Dr. Benson’s *History of the First Planting the Christian Religion*, B. 3. ch. v. sect. 5. p. 99.

Acts xvii. 17. At Athens. "Therefore disputed he in the synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met him." *Διεδεχθητο μεν εν εν τη συναγωγη τοις Ιουδαιοις, και τοις σεβομενοις.* It should have been rendered, *with the Jews, and the worshippers*, agreeably to the^o Latin Vulgate, here, and elsewhere, *et colentibus*, not *religiosis*, as in Beza.

These were proselytes; for they frequented the synagogue equally with the Jews; and Paul applied himself equally to them. This, as we learned from the passage of Josephus before quoted, was the proper distinction and denomination of those who by proselytism joined themselves to the people of Israel. They were not of the stock of Israel: but they worshipped with them, in synagogues and at the temple. They paid tribute to the temple, as other Jews did. They might offer sacrifices there, and they kept the passover. In other words, they were in full communion with the people of Israel in religious ordinances. They partook with them in all their religious privileges, and joined with them in all their solemnities. They were therefore very properly called worshippers.

Acts xviii. 1—7, "After these things Paul departed from Athens and came to Corinth.—And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. And when Silas and Timothy were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified to the Jews, that Jesus was the Christ. And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed; he shook his raiment, and said unto them; Your blood be upon your own heads. I am clean. Henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles. And he departed thence, and entered into a certain man's house, named Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue."

"Who worshipped God," *σεβομενος τον Θεον.* Justus was a proselyte. He was one of those Greeks whom Paul persuaded, together with the Jews, in the synagogue. And Justus was convinced by what Paul said, and became a christian. That Paul, whilst in the synagogue, preached to Jews only, that is, to men circumcised, Jews by birth or by religion, is apparent from the history, ver. 4, 5, "And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. And when Silas and Timothy were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in spirit," and testified to the Jews "that Jesus was the Christ:" "That

^o Disputabat igitur in synagogâ cum Judæis, et colentibus, et in foro, per omnes dies, ad eos qui aderant. Vers. Lat.

‘ is, upon the coming of those two his fellow-labourers, he ‘ was encouraged; and also animated with the greatest ardour; and once more, and finally, “ testified to the Jews,” ‘ that Jesus was the expected and promised Messiah.’ “ But when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them; Your blood be upon your own heads. I am clean. Henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.”

Let this suffice for explaining the word *σεβομενος*, *worshipper*.

I now intend to take notice of some other Greek words, which in our translation are rendered *devout*.

Acts x. 1, 2, “ There was a certain man in Cesarea, called Cornelius—a devout man, and one that feared God, with all his house,” *ευσεβης*. It should be rendered *pious*.

Ver. 7, “ And when the angel, which spake unto Cornelius, was departed, he called two of his household servants, and a devout soldier, of them that waited upon him continually,” *στρατιωτην ευσεβη*.

Here again is the same Greek word, which should be translated *pious*. It denotes not any religious distinction or denomination; but is a personal character. Cornelius is never called a proselyte, nor *σεβομενος*, a worshipper. And that he and his family and all the company at his house, were Gentiles, and uncircumcised, is manifest, as from other places, so particularly from ch. xi. 1—3.

I shall observe likewise upon another Greek word rendered by us *devout*, in some places.

Luke ii. 25, “ And behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon. And the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel,” *Και ο ανθρωπος ουτος δικαιος, και ευλαβης*. I should be disposed to render it thus: ‘ And he was a righteous and understanding man.’ Simeon was righteous, or religious, and also knowing and discreet.

Acts ii. 5, “ And there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven,” *ανδρες ευλαβεις*. The same word again, and to be understood in the like manner; denoting, that there were then at Jerusalem Jews from all parts, who were the most eminent men of the nation, and most distinguished for their zeal, their understanding, and their outward circumstances and condition.

Ch. viii. 2, “ And devout men carried Stephen to his burial,” *Συνεκομισαν δε τον Στεφανον ανδρες ευλαβεις*. I should like to translate the word in this place ‘ discreet.’ ‘ And discreet men carried forth Stephen, and made great lamen-

tation for him.' Such men were the best fitted for the kind office here spoken of. Wisdom, or discretion, and circumspection, appear to be included in the verb, as used in Acts xxiii. 10, and Heb. xi. 7. And observe likewise the noun substantive in Heb. v. 7.

IV. THE OCCASION AND DESIGN OF THE DECREE. The other question concerning the apostolic decree, at the head of this Dissertation, is, whether it was perpetual.

I now therefore intend to consider the occasion of it, and then to explain it. Wherein will be contained a sufficient answer to the question proposed above.

I begin with laying down these several following propositions.

1. This epistle, or decree, was designed for the use and direction of all the Gentile converts to christianity at that time. This was shown before; and needs no enlargement here.

2. The several regulations of the council at Jerusalem relate to things in their own nature indifferent.

1.) The point in controversy relates to things in their own nature indifferent. Therefore it is likely, that the determination of the question should be of the like kind. The rise of the controversy, and all the debates upon the occasion, lead us to think, that the regulations of the council should concern things indifferent, ritual, and ceremonial. There never was a question, whether believers from among the Gentiles should obey the moral precepts of righteousness and true holiness. But the dispute was, whether they should be circumcised, and observe the ritual ordinances of the law of Moses, as the Jews did.

They who have any doubt about this, should do well to attend to the history of this council, and particularly the occasion of it, at the beginning of the fifteenth chapter of the book of the Acts, and throughout. However, I shall transcribe below the sentiments of divers learned and judicious commentators,^p who speak to the like purpose. To whom, possibly, some others may be added in the process of this argument.

^p Non censet, monendos pios ex Gentibus de iis, quæ satis didicerant: Deum colendum unum verum, non falsos; ei omnem exhibendam reverentiam; abstinendum a cædibus, a rapinis, injuriis, adulteriis, et incestis jure Gentium cognitis: jus cuique reddendum. Sed de iis monet, quæ disputationem recipere videbantur, et quæ Judæos poterant offendere, et impedire, quo minus pii ex Gentibus cum piis Hebræis in unam ecclesiam coalescerent. Grot. in Act. xv. 20. sub in.

Hæc ille [Tertullianus] a scopo aberrans, cum nulla hic sit nisi rerum suapte naturâ mediarum mentio. Bez. annot. in Act. xv. 20.

2.) The apostles and elders call what they recommend in their epistle, a burden, *βαρος*. Ver. 28, “It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden, than these necessary things.”

Which word may lead us to think, they intend not such things as are in themselves reasonable, and always obligatory.

‘Burden,’ say Beausobre and L’Enfant, in their note upon this place, ‘is the same with “yoke,” mentioned, ver. 10. ‘These expressions show, that the discourse is about ceremonial observances, which are considered as a yoke and ‘burden, in opposition to moral precepts, which ought not ‘to be reckoned burdensome; since the reason and consciences of men teach them, that they are obligatory in ‘themselves.’

Rev. ii. 24, 25,——“I will put upon you no other burden,” *βαρος*, “But that which ye have already, hold fast till I come.” Where, I think, our exalted Lord refers to this decree of the apostles. And he graciously declares, that this burden should not always lie upon his people; but should be taken off from them, when his religion had made greater progress in the world.

Our Lord inviting men to receive his instructions, as the rule of life, in order to their obtaining everlasting salvation, says, Matt. xi. 30, “My yoke is easy, and my burden [*το φορτιον με*] is light.” But he therein intends to say, as I apprehend, that his requirements are not burdensome at all, and that observing them will afford great pleasure and delight.

So St. John says, 1 John v. 3, “And his commandments are not grievous.” They are not grievous, or burdensome, because they are in themselves reasonable, and approve themselves to the judgment and understanding of all men.

As the things recommended in this epistle are so distinctly spoken of, as a burden, it is likely they were not then understood to be in themselves reasonable.

3.) Another character of these regulations of the council is, that they are necessary things. By which I think ought to be understood such things^a as are expedient.

Undoubtedly, moral virtues are of all things the most necessary, according to the general use of the word among us. Both reason and revelation assure us of their absolute necessity. To promote real holiness is the great design of

^a Necessaria autem hic intellige ad pacem ecclesiæ, quæ tum erat, per tolerantiam infirmorum; non autem necessaria per se, et simpliciter, exceptâ scortatione. Piscator, in Act. xv. 28.

all true religion. Nor is any institution so well suited to make men truly and eminently virtuous and holy, as the christian. Nevertheless in the language of the New Testament, moral virtues are not usually called necessary things, nor holiness said to be of necessity. I am not aware of more than one text, in which any moral virtue is recommended under that character. It is Rom. xiii. 5, "Wherefore^r ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." In other places the meaning of the word is expedient, fit, proper, convenient in certain seasons and circumstances. Says St. Paul to the Corinthians: "Therefore^s I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren to go before unto you, to make up beforehand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before," 2 Cor. ix. 5.

To the Philippians: "Yet^t I supposed it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, my brother," ch. ii. 25. And, "nevertheless to abide in the flesh^u is more needful for you," ch. i. 24. In the epistle to the Hebrews: "It^v was therefore necessary that the patterns of the things in the heavens should be purified with these," ch. ix. 23. St. Luke in the Acts: "Then Paul and Barnabas waxed hold, and said, It^w was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken unto you," Acts xiii. 46. In all which places, as seems to me, this expression denotes what is expedient, highly proper and convenient, considering the circumstances of things and persons. And so the phrase is understood here by some^x very judicious commentators.

I would however observe, that the^y original phrase in this place is somewhat particular. And, instead of these necessary things, some^z rather understand such things as it was needful for the apostles to impose. But this, as I appre-

^r Διο αναγκη. κ. λ.

^s Αναγκαιον εν ήγησαμην.

^t Αναγκαιον δε ήγησαμην—— ^u ——αναγκαιοτερον δι' υμιας.

^v Αναγκη εν τα μεν υποδειγματα των εν τοις θρανοις, τετοις καθαριζεσθαι.

^w Ύμιν ην αναγκαιον πρωτον λαληθηναι τον λογον τσ Θεσ.

^x Necessaires.] Il s'agit ici d'une nécessité relative aux circonstances des temps, des personnes, et des lieux, pour dégager les gentils de toute participation à l'idolatrie, et pour marquer aux Juifs autant d'égards qu'il se pouvoient, sans blesser la liberté Chrétienne. L'Enf. et Beaus. sur Actes xv. 28.

^y Πλην των επαναγκης τετων. ^z Non imponeremus hæc, nisi necesse esset ea imponere. Non dicunt: Imponimus hæc necessaria, sed imponimus hæc, quæ necesse est, scilicet, imponere. Comment. Practicus Caspar. Streson. in Act. Ap. p. 568. Amst. 1658.

The Latin Vulgate is 'hæc necessaria.' Beza translates, 'præter necessaria 'ista.' But in his Annotations says, Id est, ad quæ nos adigit præsens necessitas, nempe quod aliter non possint Judæi lucriferi, non quod ista per se ad salutem requirerentur. Bez. in xv. 28.

hend, makes little difference; whether these things were such as the circumstances of things obliged the council to require, or the Gentile christians to observe.

4.) None of the christian converts needed to be informed, that they ought to keep themselves from the practice of such things as are immoral, and in their own nature evil, and unreasonable.

Take things sacrificed to idols for idolatry, blood for homicide, and fornication for uncleanness, or any sins contrary to moral purity: and there was not a Gentile convert to the christian religion, whether converted by Paul, or Barnabas, or any other Jewish preacher of the gospel, but knew his duty in all those respects. Men may need to be exhorted to the practice of what they know to be their duty, and to be dissuaded from things which they know to be evil. But men do not need to be informed of what they know already.

5.) If the apostles, and elders, and brethren, present in this council, had intended to forbid in their epistle things contrary to morality; they would have added divers other things, beside those here mentioned.

They would, in that case, expressly have forbidden lying, perjury, wrath, evil speaking, theft, robbery, adultery, and all uncleanness. I might add, that if it had been the design of this assembly to remind the converts, to whom they write, of their duties and obligations as christians; they would have exhorted them particularly to persevere in the faith of Christ, and would have recommended to them the duty of bearing the cross, or of patience and fortitude under afflictions and persecutions for his name's sake.

6.) All the several particulars of the decree must be understood to be of the like kind.

They ought to be all moral, or all indifferent. At least, it appears to me to have a good deal of probability, that the writers of the epistle would not put together things of a different nature, without denoting their difference, or making a distinction between them. That all these things are not moral, or reasonable in themselves, and in their own nature obligatory upon all men, in all times, is apparent. Therefore none are so.

These several considerations, as seems to me, amount to a convincing and satisfactory proof, that nothing in this decree is of a moral nature.

V. THE DECREE EXPLAINED. Here some may say: How then do you understand them? To which I answer, That I am not obliged to explain any of them. Things necessary,

or expedient, in some places, at certain seasons, and upon account of the circumstances of things and persons, need not to be understood by all in all times, or by those, who are under no obligation to observe them. It may be supposed, that they to whom the epistle was sent understood it. And it is unquestionable, that if any articles were obscure, or ambiguous, they who delivered the epistle were able to explain them. And so long as these regulations were necessary, or expedient, to be kept and observed, it is likely that the right sense and design of them were generally understood. But, as that expedient ceased, or abated, the exact meaning of these regulations might be gradually lost, or not distinctly retained by all.

However, I am not unwilling to show the probable meaning of these several articles, according to the best of my ability.

The whole decree consists of four articles. Which, as they are recited three times, are reckoned up in a different order, and in some small variety of expression.

Acts xv. 20. St. James proposeth them in the council after this manner: "That we write unto them, that they abstain from pollution of idols,^a and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood." At ver. 29, in the epistle itself: "That^b ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication." Afterwards, St. James in his discourse with the apostle Paul at Jerusalem, ch. xxi. 25, "Save^c only, that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication." Which is the same order with that in the epistle, and shall be followed by me.

1. Pollutions of idols, or things offered to idols.

The obvious sense of this regulation is, that Gentile christians should abstain from eating meats which had been offered to idols, by heathen people; I mean, in some circumstances. Several things in St. Paul's epistles confirm this interpretation, and may enable us to discern the design of this prohibition. As 1 Cor. ch. viii. throughout, and x. 14—23.

But this regulation is now obsolete, there being no longer any heathen idols among us. All the idolatry of ancient heathenism, once so general, and so much delighted in by princes and people, is abolished in this part of the world.

^a Ἔσ ἀπεχεσθαι ἀπο τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων. ver. 20.

^b Ἀπεχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων. ver. 29.

^c —εἰ μὴ φυλασσεσθαι

αὐτῆς το, τε εἰδωλοθύτων.

By the progress of the gospel God hath wonderfully accomplished what he long before said he would perform. Zeph. ii. 11, "The Lord will be terrible unto them; for he will furnish all the gods of the earth. And men shall worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen."

2. And from blood.

This I take to be a prohibition to drink or eat the blood of brute animals alone, or mixed with other things, raw, or dressed and prepared.

It may be of use to us to observe here some of those places in the Old Testament, where the eating of blood is prohibited.

Gen. ix. 3, 4, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. But flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."

Lev. xvii. 10—14, "And whatsoever man there is of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will set my face against that man that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood. And I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls. For it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul; therefore I said unto the children of Israel, no soul of you shall eat blood; neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood. And whatsoever man there is of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, who hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust; for it is the life of all flesh. The blood of it is for the life thereof. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh. For the life of all flesh is the blood thereof. Whosoever eateth it, shall be cut off."

That law in Leviticus, and the like elsewhere, are given to the house of Israel, and likewise to the strangers that joined themselves to them: for no others could offer sacrifices; nor could any others be cut off for transgressing these laws, but such as were of that people. The reason here assigned, that the blood was appointed to make atonement upon the altar, can affect none but Jews, and other men circumcised after the manner of Moses.

Eating blood cannot be reckoned an immorality. And, if it is not, this prohibition, in the decree, cannot be bind-

ing upon all men in all times; but only at some seasons, when the circumstances of things render the forbearing it expedient.

All wholesome food is lawful in itself, and under the gospel-dispensation. As St. Paul says, Rom. xiv. 14, 15, "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." And ver. 19, "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." See also what there follows, and I Cor. viii. 11—13.

However, I must add, that blood appears to me very unwholesome. Indeed I esteem it filthy, and highly disagreeable; so that I cannot bear the thought of eating it. If it ever comes to me in food, it is more than I know. And I suppose it is never brought, neither alone nor mixed with other things, to the tables of polite people.

There seem to me to be two reasons for this prohibition, even in the law of Moses. One reason is that above mentioned, that it was to make atonement for them, that is, for offences against the law. The other reason is thus expressed: "It is the life of all flesh. The blood of it is for the life thereof." That is, it is the nourishment of the animal, and not fit for your nourishment. And because it was not fit for food, and was useless and offensive; therefore it was to be poured out upon the earth, or covered with dust, that is, buried in the earth: which order is frequently repeated. So in ver. 13, of the fore-cited seventeenth chapter of Leviticus, and Deut. xii. 16, "Only ye shall not eat the blood. Ye shall pour it upon the earth as water." And again, ver. 24, and ch. xv. 23.

The prohibition of blood was like the prohibition of fat. Lev. iii. 15—17, "And the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them—it shall be taken away. And the priest shall burn them upon the altar. It is the food of the offering made by fire, for a sweet savour. All the fat is the Lord's. It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood." And ch. vii. 25, "For whosoever eateth the fat of the beast, of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, shall be cut off from his people." That is the reason which is expressed, and for which the penalty is so great.

But another reason may be implied, which is, that the fat cleaving to the kidneys of animals is not^d wholesome.

Those ordinances answered two ends and purposes. They kept the Jewish people separate from other nations, and also promoted their bodily health and vigour. And for all their labour and self-denial, they had a present reward.

In the frequent washings and purifications appointed the Jewish people, I suppose their health was consulted; as it was likewise in the directions concerning creatures clean and unclean.

Lev. xi. 3, “Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is cloven-footed, and cheweth the cud, among the beasts, that shall ye eat.” See also Deut. xiv. 4—8. And it must be allowed, that such beasts as have both those properties, are preferable for food to others; as the ox, the sheep, the goat, and the deer of every kind. And though we do eat some animals which have but one of those properties, as the coney, the hare, the swine; we never eat those which have neither of those properties; that is, which neither chew the cud, nor divide the hoof. Nor do we use for food any of the birds, or fowls, forbidden in that long list, Lev. xi. 13—20, and Deut. xiv. 12—20.

In ancient times there were among all people two sorts of creatures, clean and unclean. This distinction obtained and was general before the flood. Noah, therefore, “was commanded to take with him into the ark of every clean beast by sevens, the male and the female; and of the beasts that are not clean, by two, the male and the female,” Gen. vii. 1—3.

This distinction related as much to food as to sacrifice. For the worshipper, as well as the priest, partook of the altar, excepting in the case of whole burnt-offerings. Every living creature therefore, which was clean for sacrifice, was also clean for food.

This article was inserted in the epistle, out of regard to the Jewish believers; that the Gentile converts might not give them offence. As there are now no Jewish believers, to take offence at our eating of blood, we may do as we see good. We may avoid it, if we please, for the sake of health; but are not obliged to forbear it upon a religious account, which would be no better than superstition.

3. And from things strangled, that is, from the flesh of

^d And when they killed any of these, or other clean creatures, for their food at home, still they were to forbear to eat the suet; partly out of reverence to God, whose portion it was at the altar; and partly, because it was heavy, and too strong a food, as Maimonides takes it. Patrick upon Levit. iii. 16.

animals, that have not been fairly killed, so as that the blood might be all drained out of them whilst warm.

Upon this our learned author says, p. 175, ‘ This is omitted by many of the ancient fathers, and therefore by some ‘ esteemed a gloss.’ But that is said rather too hastily, and without ground ; as may appear by what was said^e formerly. This article is as genuine and authentic as the rest. It is in all Greek manuscripts in general, and is quoted by the most ancient writers of the church. But near the end of the fourth century, and afterwards, the Latin christians paid little regard to those regulations. And for that reason the apostolic decree is not always quoted exactly by writers in that language.

This regulation, like the preceding, must be understood to have been inserted, that the Gentile converts might not offend the Jewish believers. We now, are at liberty to act as we see fit. We are under no obligation to forbear things strangled upon a religious account.

4. And from fornication.

I suppose it to have been already shown by general, but unanswerable reasons, that this epistle is not concerned about things of a moral nature : consequently, what we now generally mean by this word is not here intended : that being an immorality, and in itself unreasonable. But the true meaning is not certain : nor ought it to be thought strange, that it is not.

Beza’s interpretation may be seen in his Annotations upon Acts xv. 20. He is clear, that things of a moral nature have no part in these regulations, but only such things as are in themselves indifferent, recommended for peace’ sake, and out of regard to weak brethren. Therefore this word is not here to be understood in its common acceptation. He applies it to some things mentioned by St. Paul in the eighth and tenth chapters of the first epistle to the Corinthians, particularly, “ sitting at meat in an idol’s temple,” 1 Cor. viii. 9.

But I apprehend, that what St. Paul there speaks of must rather relate to the first prohibition in this epistle, “ The pollution of idols, or things offered to idols.”

To me it appears probable, that hereby are forbidden some alliances with heathens ; which, though not absolutely unlawful, had better be avoided by christians, lest they should prove dangerous temptations to apostasy. So the apostle writes, Heb. xii. 16, “ Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold

^e See Vol. iii. p. 23—30.

his birthright.” I suppose, that both these characters are given of Esau. He was not a lewd profligate, or fornicator, in our sense of the word; but he married Canaanitish women, “which were a grief of mind to Isaac and Rebekah,” Gen. xxvi. 34, 35. Which Jacob carefully avoided, ch. xxviii. 6—9. [†]Theodoret mentions the interpretation which I have given of that text. I am indebted to Beausobre^s for the reference.

I am confirmed in this interpretation by observing the earnestness with which St. Paul dissuades christians from marrying with heathens, though such marriages were not unlawful. 1 Cor. vii. 39, “The wife is bound by the law, as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord.” 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15, “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?”

The Jews were forbidden by the law of Moses to marry with idolaters. Deut. vii. 3, 4. And see Malachi ii. 11. Ezra obliged many, who had married such women, to put them away, though they had children by them, ch. ix. and x. Nehemiah severely reproveth such persons, and gives a reason against such marriages, which would be of some weight in the early times of the gospel, ch. xiii. 23—27. Remarkable are the words of Ex. xxxiv. 15, 16, “Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods; and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; and thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and they make thy sons go a whoring after their gods.”

St. Paul has wisely determined the point; that christians should not marry with idolaters, as before seen. Nor should a person converted to christianity dissolve by separation a marriage, contracted whilst he was an idolater, and before his conversion to christianity. But, if the unbelieving relative went off, then the christian would be at liberty. So I understand what he says, 1 Cor. vii. 12—16, “If any brother has a wife, that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell

[†] Μη τις πορνός, η βεβήλος, ως Ησαυ.] Πορνείαν τε Ησαυ την γαστριμαργίαν εκάλεσε—Ουκ αν δε τις άμαρτοι, πορνείαν αυτη καλεσας και τον παρονομον γαμον' αλλεξυλεις γαρ γυναικας ηγαγετο. Theod. in Heb. xii. 16. T. III. p. 456.

^s See him on Heb. xii. 16.

with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which has an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him—But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother, or a sister, is not under bondage in such cases. But God has called us to peace.” That is, if the unbelieving relative depart, the marriage must be dissolved. But the believing relative is not to be the first mover in dissolving the contract of marriage. Such things were done under the law. But a more friendly and peaceable behaviour is required of us. For as he goes on, “What knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or, how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?” that is, by bringing off in time such relatives, respectively, from idolatry to christianity.

The danger of idolatry might still be great; but not so great under the gospel, as under the law. And the gospel of Christ was less burdensome, and more reasonable and inviting, than the law of Moses.

Marriages with idolaters were not to be dissolved; but yet should not be contracted. Though such a marriage would not be unlawful, yet it was a point of prudence, and a matter of expedience, to avoid it. This is what I understand by fornication in this epistle. And as there are not now, and have not been for a good while in this part of the world, any heathen idolaters; this article, like the rest, is become obsolete. And as all the directions, here given, relate to things expedient in the circumstances of those times; it is not to be at all wondered at, that the meaning of several of them is now obscure and doubtful.

VI. OBSERVATIONS, IN THE MANNER OF COROLLARY. I have now shown, that this epistle was designed for the use of all believers from among the Gentiles; that the regulations, contained in it, are not of a moral nature, but relate to such things as are in their own nature indifferent. I have also endeavoured to show the meaning of each particular.

I am in great danger of being esteemed prolix. Nevertheless as the subject is before me, I shall go on to put down some other observations, chiefly in the way of corollaries.

I. This decree is not to be understood as a precept, or commandment, but as delivering advice and counsel concerning some matters of prudence and expedience, considering the circumstances of things and persons at that time.

When Paul and Barnabas had returned to Antioch from

a peregrination in several cities and countries, where they had preached the gospel, “They gathered the church together, and 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,” Acts xiv. 27, 28.

Whilst they were there, “certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and said; 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. When they were come to Jerusalem, they were received by the church, and by the apostles and elders; and they declared all that God had done with them; but there had risen up certain of the sect of the pharisees which believed, who said, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and elders came together to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and spoke”——After that Barnabas and Paul were heard, “who declared what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.” After which James riseth up, and reasons upon the point. And then concludes: “Wherefore my sentence is,” *Διό εγω κρινω*, I judge, I determine, “that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write to them,” *επιστειλαι αυτοις*, that they “abstain from pollutions of idols——Then^h pleased it the apostles,” or it seemed good “to the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch——And they wrote letters by them after this manner——Itⁱ has seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden, than these necessary things——From which, if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well:” ‘You will do what is acceptable, and agreeable, and will be well taken by us and ‘by all the brethren of the circumcision.’ So Cornelius says to St. Peter, ch. x. 33, “Immediately therefore I sent to thee. And thou hast well done, that thou art come.” Philip. iv. 14, “You have well done, that you have communicated with me in my affliction.” 3 John, ver. 6, “Whom, if thou bring forward in their journey, after a godly sort, thou wilt do^k well.”

^h Τότε εδοξε τοις αποστολοις.
και ημιν.

ⁱ Εδοξε γαρ τω αγιω πνευματι,

^k Vid. Grot. in Act. x. 33. et xv. 29.

Afterwards, ch. xvi. 4. It is said of Paul and Barnabas, "that as they went through the cities,¹ they delivered them the decrees to keep, that were ordained," determined, "by the apostles and elders at Jerusalem." The meaning of the Greek word here rendered decrees is equivalent to *placita*, resolutions, decisions, upon a question, and particularly, upon that question, which had been brought from Antioch, to the apostles at Jerusalem.

For certain, if we have given a right interpretation of the words, these regulations are not a part of the gospel of Christ, which is everlasting; but wise decisions and determinations, suited to the circumstances of things, in the christian church at that time.

2. These regulations are the result of that wisdom, with which the apostles of Christ were inspired, for deciding the question, whether Gentile converts should keep the law; and for directing their conduct, in the use of that liberty, which they had a right to, and was now secured to them.

"It has seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us," that is, it has seemed good unto us,^m under the divine influence and direction, "to lay upon you no other burden, than these necessary things:" which we have judged expedient to be observed by you in the present circumstances.

I say these regulations are the result of that wisdom, with which the apostles were inspired upon this occasion. For it does not appear, that any such regulations had obtained before. If they had, some notice would have been taken of it. And the reminding men of it would have tended to reconcile those, to whom these directions were sent to comply with them, and pay a regard to them. Nor can I discern either in Josephus, or in the books of the Old, or the New Testament, any hints or traces of them, before this council at Jerusalem.

I may hereafter enlarge farther upon the wisdom bestowed upon the apostles for conducting the affairs of the christian church. All that I intended to say here, is no more than this: that the four articles in this decree are not taken from any Noachic precepts, nor from any other Jewish traditions: but were now first thought of, and first proposed and recommended, by the apostles, upon occasion of the present emergency.

¹ Παρείδεν αυτοις φυλασσειν τα δογματα τα κεκριμμενα υπο των αποσολων.
 κ. λ. ^m 'Visum est Spiritui Sancto, et nobis.'] Id est, visum est nobis ex extinctu sive suggestione Spiritûs Sancti. εν δια δνω. Piscator in Act. xv. 28.

3. The several regulations of this decree were expedient and useful, (as has been already hintedⁿ several times,) on one or both these accounts. 1. To prevent offence in the believing Jews, and facilitate civil converse, and religious communion between believing Jews and Gentiles. And, 2. To secure the Gentile converts themselves, the more effectually from apostasy, or a return to idolatry, by keeping them out of the way of some dangerous snares and temptations.

That the former was one ground and reason of these regulations, may be reckoned evident from the history in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, and from many things in St. Paul's epistles; where he shows the expediency of forbearing some meats, when there was any hazard of offending a christian brother. As Rom. xiv. and xv. at the beginning, and 1 Cor. chap. viii. and x. 25—33. That the latter was another ground and reason of the counsels here given, may be also argued to be very probable from St. Paul's exhortations to avoid dangerous temptations to idolatry, which are likewise in the same context. See particularly, 1 Cor. x. 1—22, and 2 Cor. vi. 13—18.

4. There was a happy agreement in the council, and the regulations, now determined, were carried with great unanimity; as appears from the history in the fifteenth chapter of the book of the Acts.

St. Luke intimates, that for a while there was much disputing. It is very likely, that they who were for imposing the law upon the Gentiles, and now appeared before the council, laboured to maintain their cause, and carry their point. And, possibly, their arguments at first appeared specious and plausible to some others, who were not engaged with them. But, that the resolutions, finally determined, were carried with a general consent, is manifest. We have the speech of the apostle Peter, who openly declares against imposing a law upon the Gentiles, as necessary to salvation. James afterwards speaks to the like purpose, sums up the arguments that had been alleged, and concludes the debates. The epistle itself is written in clear and strong terms. And the judgment upon the point is delivered with the joint authority of all the members of the council. "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren. And wrote letters by them after this manner. The apostles, and

ⁿ See particularly, p. 320, note *.

elders, and brethren, send greeting unto the brethren, which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia." Then they pass a censure upon those, who had occasioned the disturbance at Antioch, and say; "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certam, which went out from among us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying; Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment." They proceed: "It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore unto you Judas and Silas, who shall tell you the same things by mouth." How affectionate and respectful is all this! "For it has seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us," that is, to us, under divine influence and direction, "to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things—So when they were dismissed, they came to Antioch. And when they had gathered the multitude together, they delivered the epistle. Which when they had read, they rejoiced for the consolation. And Judas and Silas being prophets also themselves, exhorted the brethren, and confirmed them."

Every part of this whole affair shows great unanimity, good temper, and admirable candour and discretion. When the messengers from the church at Antioch came to Jerusalem, and proposed the question; "The apostles and elders came together to consider of the matter." Having carefully weighed it, they all agree in one judgment. And when they send the decree away, they make the most honourable mention of Barnabas and Paul, who had preached the gospel in Syria, and other parts. With them they send Judas and Silas, who were some of the most eminent men of the church of Jerusalem, and also prophets themselves: next in knowledge and understanding, and in spiritual gifts, to apostles. Who, when they came to Antioch, "gathered together the multitude," or the whole church, and delivered to them the epistle: adding also observations of their own, tending to reconcile them to the regulations contained in it. And the christians at Antioch were well satisfied, and rejoiced for the consolation afforded them, and for the regard that had been shown to them, in asserting and securing their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial appointments of the law of Moses.

This harmony continued: as appears from the discourses of James and the elders at Jerusalem, when Paul came

thither again several years afterwards. "As touching the Gentiles which believe," say they, "we have written, and concluded, that they observe no such thing:" which shows, that this was still the judgment of James himself, and of the elders, and of the church at Jerusalem. Some exceptions there might be: but the determinations of the council were what the church at Jerusalem generally agreed to, and heartily approved of. They did not exact of the Gentile believers an entire conformity to the law of Moses, as necessary to salvation.

Paul readily received these regulations, as prudent counsels, or matters of expedience at that time. And the other apostles intended no more by them.

Paul and Barnabas, Judas and Silas, are the persons who by name are charged with the epistle by the council. They carry it to Antioch, and deliver it to the church there. And Judas and Silas, moreover, recommend the observation of the things therein ordained: and doubtless with the approbation of Paul, who was then at Antioch, and continued there some time. When he left Antioch, he chose Silas to accompany him. And St. Luke has assured us, that "as they went through the cities, they delivered to them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily," ch. xvi. 4, 5. And, several years after this, as before observed, when Paul came again to Jerusalem, and the elders there, with James, remind him of the several articles of the epistle, they mention them as things with which Paul was well satisfied. Nor does he show any dislike. His accepting of these decisions is also manifest from his epistles above quoted.

Once more, for showing the general consent with which these determinations were made, it ought to be observed, that all the apostles of Christ, or most of them, were present in the council of Jerusalem. For, as formerly shown^o at large, there is good reason to think, that none of the twelve apostles left Judea to go and teach either Jews or Gentiles in other countries, until after the council. It is likely therefore, that they were all at the council where the controversy was fully determined; which was a great advantage. By that means the manner of receiving Gentiles into the church of God was fixed and settled beyond dispute, and beyond opposition. Or, if any opposition should be made afterwards, it could not be successful, nor very troublesome. And we may be assured, that all the apos-

• See Vol. v. ch. vi.

tles, and their disciples, would be harmonious, and preach the same doctrine to Jews and Gentiles, wheresoever they went.

5. We may hence perceive the wisdom with which the apostles of Christ were furnished, for behaving in cases of difficulty that came before them; so as might be for the peace of the church, the edification of believers of every rank and capacity, and the preservation of the purity of the christian doctrine.

I think the regulations of the council at Jerusalem, as just represented and explained, are a proof of this. The first and principal thing to be regarded by the apostles of Christ was the preservation of the purity of the doctrine which they had received from him. The Gentiles were by no means to be brought into subjection to the law of Moses, as necessary to salvation. It behoved the apostles of Christ to assert their freedom from an obligation to observe the peculiarities of the Mosaic dispensation. This is strongly done by Peter, and the others, in the debates at the council. And the rights of the Gentiles are well secured in the epistle written by them.

Nevertheless some regard was due to the Jewish believers—And the Gentiles were to be directed to avoid such things as might be offensive to their brethren of the circumcision; and likewise to decline such things as might prove dangerous temptations to themselves, and be a means of ensnaring them, and leading them into apostasy.

In a word, one exercise of wise and good men in this world arises from different sentiments, especially in things of religion. We can evidently discern, that there were some differences of opinion, and some controversies among the followers of Jesus Christ, even in the apostolic age. Some thought, that the observation of the law of Moses was necessary for men's salvation, and were for imposing it, as such, upon the believing Gentiles.

Others of the Jewish believers thought, that the law was obligatory upon themselves and their posterity, as a distinct nation and people, to whom that law had been delivered; whilst they hoped to be justified in the sight of God, and to be eternally saved, by faith in Jesus Christ, and sincere obedience to his precepts. These did not expect the Gentiles should come under the law of Moses, as necessary to salvation. Nevertheless they still had scruples about meats and drinks, and about conversing with them, who observed no such distinctions. Others there were, as it seems, among the Jews, who thought that the obligation of the law of

Moses, as to its peculiarities, had ceased. And they judged no wholesome meat to be unclean; which was the opinion of the Gentile believers in general.

Hence there arose an obligation to a different conduct. And these last mentioned, whom we reckon the more knowing, and strong, were to practise prudence, condescension, forbearance, compliance. They were to do what lay in their power, as they had opportunity, to enlarge the minds of men. In the mean time they were "to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves," Rom. xv. 1.

But others, who were rigid, and would impose indifferent things, as necessary to salvation, were to be blamed, and reprov'd, as they are by this council. And every one knows, how they were withstood by the apostle Paul. And all who are attentive in reading the New Testament, may perceive, that the epistle of the council at Jerusalem exactly corresponds with the doctrine of Paul in his epistles, and that the temper of both is one and the same.

Some regard was due to the Jewish nation in general, even to the unbelievers among them, whilst they behaved with decency and civility. For a long time they had been favoured with many religious privileges above other men. As is acknowledged in Rom. ix. 4, 5. And it is the apostle's direction, 1 Cor. x. 32, "Give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God:" by the two former plainly meaning such as were unbelievers. And it is said, Acts xvi. 2, 3, that when Paul determined to have Timothy with him, who was "the son of a woman that was a Jewess, and believed; he took him, and circumcised him, because of the Jews who were in those quarters; for they all knew, that his father was a Greek." I think, those Jews were unbelievers. Paul would not offend them; and he might hope to gain some of them. See 1 Cor. ix. 19, 20.

But they were not the men, who occasioned the council of Jerusalem, or the decisions of it. The men, who came to Antioch, and taught the brethren there, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved," were pharisees who believed, Acts xv. 1. They were men, who went out from the church at Jerusalem, ver. 24. These are now reprov'd. But whilst the freedom of the Gentiles is asserted from a subjection to the law of Moses and its appointments, some things are recommended to them as expedient for the time. Which might facilitate converse and communion with all the Jewish believers, who were tract-

able, and would be also useful for preserving themselves from some temptations to apostasy in those times.

6. We may hence perceive the reason, why those of the Jewish believers, who were for imposing the law upon the Gentiles, are so severely reprov'd, and condemn'd by St. Paul.

They were for imposing the law, and its observances, upon the Gentiles, as necessary to salvation. Which should be always attended by us, when we read St. Paul's epistles, and observe the tartness of his expressions. So says St. Luke very clearly. Ch. xvi. 1, "Certain men which came down from Judea, taught the brethren: Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." See also ver. 5. And are not these men tartly reprov'd by the apostles and elders in their epistle? ver. 24, "Forasmuch as we have heard," say they, "that certain, which went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law."

And justly does St. Paul say of Peter, and the rest, who separated themselves from the Gentile christians at Antioch, that "they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel," Gal. ii. 14. And as justly does he exhort, and argue, Gal. v. 1—4, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free. And be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised," esteeming it necessary to salvation, "he is a debtor to the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law. Ye are fallen from grace." Which now must be all clear. It can need no farther explication.

7. We may now discern, wherein lay the fault of the apostle Peter, and others, who complied too far with the rigid part of the Jewish believers.

The only place of scripture, where this is mentioned, is Gal. ii. 11—16, "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles. But when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews likewise dissembled with him: insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw, that they walked not up-

rightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews; why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law. For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

The fault of Peter lay in this, that his conduct implied the necessity of the Gentiles being circumcised, and keeping the ordinances of the Mosaic law, in order to their being saved, "Why^p compellest thou the Gentiles to judaize?" that is, to^q become Jews, and live according to the law of Moses, and that, in order to salvation. This was the meaning of his behaviour. The Gentiles at Antioch had believed in Jesus Christ, and heartily embraced his doctrine. Nevertheless Peter now behaved toward them, as if they were unworthy of converse, or communion with himself, or other Jewish believers. They were not yet of the church and people of God; but must, if they would be saved, be circumcised, and obey the law of Moses, as the Jewish people did.

This is what Paul blames Peter for. It is apparent from St. Paul's whole argument in this place. It follows next after the words just cited: "We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing, that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." Which plainly shows, that St. Paul is speaking of imposing the law, as necessary to acceptance with God; or, in other words, that he is speaking of justification, and salvation. And St. Peter says the same thing at the council, in almost the same words. Acts xv. 10, 11, "Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers, nor we, were able to bear? For we believe, that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved, even as they."

We see therefore, that Peter was now guilty of dissimulation. He acted contrary to his own judgment. And did what implied the necessity of the Gentiles receiving the law

^p Τι τα εθνη αναγκάζεις ιεραϊζειν;

^q The word is explained at

large in Vol. vi. ch. xii.

of Moses, in order to salvation. Thus he acted, “fearing them of the circumcision.” I transcribe Augustine below,^r who speaks exactly to the same purpose.

Some have been unwilling to think, that the apostle Peter should have exposed himself to this censure after the council of Jerusalem; though the order of St. Paul’s narration, in the chapter just cited, implies as much. But the difference is not great. Peter’s guilt may be aggravated thereby. But whether before, or after that council, he was now guilty of dissimulation. For he did eat, and converse for a while with the Gentiles at Antioch; and afterwards separated himself from them, “fearing them of the circumcision.” And a part of Paul’s argument is to this purpose; “If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles,” that is, sometimes, as he had lately done, and probably at some other times likewise, “and not as do the Jews; why compellest thou the Gentiles to judaize?” Or, as Mr. Locke: ‘If thou, being a Jew, takest the liberty sometimes to live ‘after the manner of the Gentiles, not keeping to those rules ‘which the Jews observe; why doest thou constrain the ‘Gentiles to conform themselves to the rites, and manner of ‘living of the Jews?’

Moreover, we know, that long before the council of Jerusalem, Peter had been at the house of Cornelius at Cesarea, and received him, and his company, though Gentiles, into the church by baptism. And, when he returned to Jerusalem, and there were some “who contended with him, because he had gone to men uncircumcised, and did eat with them;” he having rehearsed the whole matter to them, they were satisfied, “and glorified God, saying; Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life,” Acts x. and xi. 1—8. Of which St. Peter takes particular notice in his speech at the council, Acts xv. 7—9.

This action of Peter therefore was hypocrisy, or dissimulation, as St. Paul justly calls it, a mean compliance, contrary to judgment, through fear of the displeasure of unreasonable men. And this was the fault of all the rest who

^r Quapropter non ideo Petrum emendavit, quod paternas traditiones observaret; quod si facere vellet, nec mendaciter nec incongrue faceret. Quamvis enim jam superflua, tamen solita non nocerent. Sed quoniam Gentes cogebat judaizare; quod nullo modo posset, nisi ea sic ageret, tanquam adhuc etiam post Domini adventum necessaria salutis forent; quod vehementer per apostolatam Pauli veritas dissuasit. Nec apostolus Petrus hoc ignorabat. Sed id faciebat, timens eos qui ex circumcisione erant. Itaque et ipse vere correctus est, et Paulus vera narravit. Augustin. ad Hieron. ap. Hieron. Ep. 67. T. IV. P. II. p. 605.

joined him in that behaviour. “And the other Jews,” says St. Paul, “dissembled with him : insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.”

The apostle Peter, as is manifest, submitted, and acquiesced. And we may reasonably believe, that he never after showed the like unsteadiness, but was firm against the like temptation. The same may be well supposed of Barnabas, and most of the other Jews, who were now faithfully and openly reproved by St. Paul.

8. We may now be able to vindicate the conduct of the apostle Paul in complying, as he did at Jerusalem, with the advice of James, and the elders there. As related Acts xxi. 17—30.

I do not know, that we are bound to justify the conduct of any man, not even of an apostle, in all things. Nay, we cannot but acknowledge, that some of the most eminent of that order failed in some instances. We have just now been observing upon a faulty conduct of Peter. And it is likely, that in the contention between Paul and Barnabas, there was on each side a sharpness not to be justified. Acts xv. 36—41. Paul might be too much offended with Mark, “who departed from them from Pamphylia.” And he might be too much exasperated at Barnabas, who had dissembled with Peter, when he separated himself from those, with whom he had before lived familiarly. But Paul was reconciled to both afterwards, and makes honourable mention of them in his epistles. Paul likewise seems to have been too much moved by the indignity offered him by the high-priest, Ananias, Acts xxiii. 1—5.

But we cannot willingly allow of many instances of misconduct in the apostles. And we may be disposed to vindicate any men, so far as we reasonably can, especially men of eminence and extensive usefulness, whose usual conduct entitles them to esteem and reverence.

And, excepting the instances just mentioned, St. Paul’s conduct, so far as we know, was free from censure. Indeed, I think, that his doctrine and his conduct, as a christian and an apostle, were always uniform, and harmonious ; and that he never practised any compliances, but such as were agreeable to his avowed principles.

However, it is fit that we should particularly consider what we find related in Acts xxi. 17—30.

This relation, as seems to me, is brought in to inform us how, and in what manner, Paul was apprehended ; that we might know the occasion of that imprisonment of the apostle, which was of so long continuance, and was attended

with many incidents of importance. And as the apostle's imprisonment was a necessary part of his history, the occasion of it could not be omitted by a faithful and judicious historian, as St. Luke certainly is.

And there appear so many tokens of candour and good temper, wisdom and discretion, in James and the elders of the church at Jerusalem, that, as one would think, men of ingenuity should be little disposed to surmise, that any thing was now proposed to Paul, or complied with by him, which was at all dishonourable to him, or derogatory to the true principles of religion, or to the interests, either of believing Jews or Gentiles.

But it is not to be expected, that all should be contented with such general observations. We will therefore observe every paragraph of this narration.

Ver. 17, "And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren," meaning the church in general, "received us gladly." The presence of Paul was acceptable to them, and in a friendly and affectionate manner they congratulated him upon his safe arrival among them.

Ver. 18, 19, "And the day following Paul went in with us unto James: and all the elders were present. And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly, what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry."

The original phrase, *καθ' εν εκαστου*, imports the exactness, and particularity of the accounts which Paul gave of his successes in the several cities and countries in which he had been, since he was last at Jerusalem. And here we cannot forbear to observe the frankness and openness, and also the humility of the apostle, in giving so full an account of himself; where he had been, and what he had done, and what tokens of divine approbation had been afforded to him, and to his endeavours. This resembles the account which Paul and Barnabas gave to the church of Antioch, upon their return thither, after they had fulfilled the work to which they had been appointed in an especial manner, Acts xiv. 26, 27, and compare ch. xiii. 1—4. The main difference is, that there "they gathered the church together, and rehearsed all that God had done with them." Here Paul speaks to James and the elders only of the church at Jerusalem.

Ver. 20, "And when they heard it they glorified the Lord." A proof of the truly christian and charitable disposition of the chief men at Jerusalem. They rejoiced and were thankful to God for the progress of the gospel among the Gentile people, as preached to them by Paul.

“ And said unto him ; Thou seest, brother, how many thousand Jews there are, which believe. And they are all zealous of the law :” thinking it still obligatory upon themselves, and their posterity, who are of the Jewish nation. However, they afterwards add, at ver. 25, agreeably to the determination of the council : “ As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written, and concluded, that they observe no such thing :” that is, that they need not, are under no obligation to observe the law, or its customs ; but may be justified without observing them. Consequently, neither did the believing Jews expect to be justified by the law. And their zeal for it consisted only in a desire to keep it, as obligatory upon themselves, to whom it was delivered as a nation and people. They must generally, (for we need not be unwilling to allow of exceptions for some individuals,) have assented to what St. Peter says in the council, chap. xv. 11, “ We believe, that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we [Jews] shall be saved, even as they,” the Gentiles. Which is also agreeable to what St. Paul says to St. Peter himself, and as a thing well known, and allowed by such as believed in Christ, Galatians ii. 15, 16, “ We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing, that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law.”

“ They are all zealous of the law,” in the sense just mentioned. But, possibly, even that was more than was approved of by James, and the elders, or the most knowing and understanding men in the church at Jerusalem.

Ver. 21, “ And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles, to forsake the law, saying, That they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.”

“ That they ought not,” that is, that it was unlawful for them so to do. Which was a calumny upon the apostle. He never said so. He may have said, that they needed not to practise circumcision ; or that they were at liberty to quit the observances of the law. As he is understood by some to say, Rom. vii. 1—6. But, he never said that it was unlawful, or sinful for the Jews to circumcise their children, and keep the law. And though this had been reported among the Jews at Jerusalem, it is evident that James and the elders did not give credit to it. By their manner of speaking they show, that they were persuaded, and knew it to be a falsehood.

Ver. 22—24, “What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together. For they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this, that we say unto thee. We have four men, which have a vow on them. Them take, and purify thyself with them, that they may shave their heads, and all may know that these things, whereof they are informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself walkest orderly, [or regularly,] and keepest the law.”

They recommend something to be done by Paul, as likely to be more satisfying, and convincing, than any verbal declaration could be. And he complies. Which showed, that he did not think it unlawful for a Jew to observe their customs. And that is all.

However, this compliance of the apostle must have been very agreeable to them, by whom the proposal was made. And though by the violence of the people of the city, and of others assembled there upon occasion of the feast, he was prevented from “accomplishing the days of the purification,” and performing all the prescribed rites: there can be no question made, but that his design was well taken by the whole church at Jerusalem. He may have received many civilities from them, whilst he was kept in custody in Judea. And he was better qualified to write to them, at the end of his imprisonment, that excellent epistle, called, to the Hebrews; and they, and other Jewish believers elsewhere, may have been better disposed to receive from him that word of exhortation, which was so well suited to their circumstances.

Though I have now gone over that history, perhaps it will not be disagreeable to some, if I add a word or two more by way of remarks upon it.

1.) St. Paul's complying with the proposal made to him by James, and the elders, did not at all weaken the freedom of the Gentiles from the law of Moses. Nor could it be understood by any so to do. This is manifest from the clear and open declaration here made by them, that “as touching the Gentiles, which believe, it had been concluded, that they observe no such thing.”

2.) What St. Paul did now, was not contrary, but agreeable to his own declarations at other times, and to his conduct upon other occasions, and to the directions, which he gave to others.

First, What St. Paul now did was agreeable to his declarations at other times; and therefore, as we may be assured, was conformable to his settled judgment and per-

suasion, and not an artful or hypocritical compliance, proceeding from fear, or calculated to subserve some private and selfish views.

He was a Jew. The rites prescribed by the law of Moses were in their own nature indifferent. He^s practised them now, as such, not as things necessary to his own, or any other men's salvation. This his conduct therefore is agreeable to his declarations at other times. Thus it follows after the words before quoted from the beginning of the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Galatians; where he so earnestly dissuades them from taking upon them the yoke of the law, as necessary to justification and salvation, "For, [says he, ver. 5, 6,] we, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness through faith. For in Christ Jesus," or according to the tenour of the christian dispensation, "neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith, which worketh by love." And afterwards, in the same epistle, ch. vi. 15, 16, "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be upon them, and upon the whole Israel of God." So he writes in an epistle, where he strongly asserts his own integrity, and earnestly exhorts those, to whom he is writing, "to stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made us free." He might therefore very reasonably practise indifferent things, as lawful, when not insisted upon, as necessary to salvation.

Farther, the compliance, related in the place, which we are considering, was also agreeable to his avowed conduct upon other occasions.

So I Cor. ix. 20—22, "And unto the Jews became I as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law,—that I might gain them that are without law. To

^s 'Factus sum Judæis tanquam Judæus, ut Judæos lucrifacerem,'——compassione misericordiae, non simulatione fallaciæ—Nam utique Judæus erat. Christianus autem factus, non Judæorum sacramenta reliquerat, quæ convenienter ille populus et legitimo tempore quo oportebat, acceperat. Sed ideo susceperat ea celebranda, quum jam Christi esset discipulus, ut doceret non esse perniciosa his qui vellent, sicut a parentibus per legem acceperant, custodire, etiam quum in Christo credidissent; non tamen in eis jam constituerent spem salutis, quoniam per Dominum Jesum salus ipsa quæ ipsis sacramentis significabatur, advenerat. Ideoque gentibus, quod insuetos a fide revocarent onere gravi, et non necessario, nullo modo imponenda esse censebat.—Aug. ad Hieron. ap. Hieron. ep. 67. T. 4. p. 605. And see Remarques de Beausobre sur le N. T. T. I. p. 444, at the end of the second ep. to the Corinthians.

the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."

Here, in the history under consideration, we have an instance of that compliance and condescension, which in the just-cited text from the First to the Corinthians, he openly declares to have been his frequent practice; and which he esteemed to be his duty, in order to gain and save men of every rank and denomination. And what was now done by him, was done by the advice and recommendation of men of great candour, and great wisdom and understanding; friends to Paul who knew him well, favourable to the Gentiles, and guardians of the church at Jerusalem.

"This do, [say they,] that all may know, that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee are nothing:" that is, that all may be satisfied that "thou dost not teach the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses; [nor say,] that it is unlawful for them to circumcise their children, and to walk after the customs; forasmuch as thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law." The meaning is not that he did always and constantly keep the law in all its appointments; but^t that sometimes, or often, upon many occasions, he did not scruple so doing: and that he did not judge it sinful, or contrary to the doctrine of Christ, so to do: for, when Paul said to Peter, Gal. ii. 14, "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews:" the meaning, certainly, is not that Peter always, and in all things, lived after the manner of the Gentiles, but only sometimes. Take the words in that sense, which it seems most reasonable to do: and Paul's argument with the apostle Peter is sufficiently cogent.

And that Paul did sometimes "become to the Jews as a Jew," he says himself in the place just cited from the first epistle to the Corinthians. And some instances of his so acting are particularly recorded by St. Luke, beside that of which we are speaking. So, as before observed, "he took, and circumcised Timothy, the son of a Jewess, because of the Jews in those quarters." For his father being a Greek

^t Ipsum vero Paulum non ad hoc id egisse, quod vel Timotheum circumcedit, vel Cenchreis votum persolvit vel Jerosolymis a Jacobo admonitus, cum eis qui voverant, legitima illa celebrauda suscepit, ut putari, videretur per ea sacramenta etiam christianam salutem dari: sed ne illa quæ prioribus, ut congruebant temporibus, in umbris rerum futurarum Deus fieri jusserat, tanquam idololatriam Gentilium damnare crederetur, &c. Aug. ad Iheron. ep. 76. ib. p. 631, 632.

by nation and religion, all supposed that Timothy was as yet uncircumcised. Acts xvi. 1—3.

And afterwards, ch. xviii. 18—22, at Corinth, “Paul tarried there yet a good while; and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, having shorn his head in Cenchrea. For he had a vow. And he came to Ephesus—When they desired him to tarry longer time there, he consented not; but bid them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem; but I will return unto you again, if God will.”^u

This is an action much resembling that which was proposed to him by James, and the elders at Jerusalem. And, so far as we are able to discern, it was performed by him, of his own accord, freely and voluntarily, without any compulsion, and without the advice and recommendation of any. And, I think, it must be reckoned full proof, that he did, upon some occasions, “walk orderly and keep the law.”

Once more, finally, the complying conduct of Paul at Jerusalem was agreeable to the directions which he gave to others upon the like occasions.

We all know, that in his epistles he oftentimes earnestly exhorts the Gentile christians, the strong among them in particular, not always to assert to the utmost their christian liberty; but to forbear it, when there was danger, lest any weaker brethren should be so offended as to fall. “I know, [says he in his epistle to the Romans, ch. xiv. 14—20.] and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, then walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. Let not then your good be evil spoken of. For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and approved of men. Let us therefore follow the things that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another. For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak. Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.” See likewise what follows at the beginning of the next chapter.

^u Of Paul's vow at Cenchrea there is a particular account in Vol. i. p. 219, &c.

Now therefore, at Jerusalem, Paul only put in practice the rules and directions which he had given unto others. He was a Jew, and he might perform such acts, as were in themselves indifferent, without sin. If he was not under the law of Moses, he was under the law of charity, by which all christians were bound. And, as in respect to that obligation, he had exhorted Gentile believers, not unseasonably to assert their liberty, he was in like manner obliged to condescend himself. Here was such a case. If ever there could be such a case, it must be here, at Jerusalem. And, if he had not complied, as he did, he must have run the hazard of offending a great number of the Jewish believers, his brethren, so as to cause them to fall, and fill their minds with prejudices against the dispensation of the gospel. According to the rules, just seen by us, as given to the Romans, he was obliged to act now as he did. If he had not, he would not have "followed the things that make for peace, and wherewith one may edify another." If he never practised condescension, compliance, yielding to the infirmities of the weak; how could he propose himself as an example to others; as he does, after a long exhortation at the end of the tenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians? not now to refer to other texts: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God; even as I please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit, but the profit of many, that they might be saved."

I hope, I have now vindicated St. Paul. But there still remains one observation more, which may be not improperly mentioned here.

9. From the explication, which has been given of the apostolic decree, and from all that has been now largely observed upon it, we may be able to discern the reason, why the epistle of the council of Jerusalem is never particularly mentioned by Paul, nor James, nor Peter, nor John, nor Jude, in their epistles.

There was no necessity of so doing, partly, because it may be supposed, that all christians in general were already acquainted with it; and partly, because the regulations therein contained are not, strictly speaking, any part of the christian religion, or everlasting gospel, which is to be in force to the end of time; but only prudential rules and directions, suited to the circumstances of the christian church at that time. However, I think, there is a reference to it in Rev. ii. 24.

Another reason why Paul and other apostles do not expressly mention that epistle, or the decree in it, though they recommend like rules, or deliver cautions very suitable to it, (as St. Paul certainly does, and very often,) may be, that, by virtue of their apostolic commission, they were each one of them qualified to deliver prudential rules and directions.

Which observation may be of use for enabling us to understand some expressions of St. Paul, in the seventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and perhaps elsewhere. "To the rest speak I, not the Lord," ver. 12, and, "I have no commandment of the Lord. Yet I give my judgment, [or opinion, *γνωμην*,"] as one that has obtained mercy to be faithful, ver. 25; and, "after my judgment," or according to my opinion, *κατα την εμην γνωμην*. "And I think also, that I have the spirit of God," ver. 40. That is, he knew, and thought it could not be reasonably called in question by any christians, that, beside authority to declare the gospel of Christ, he was also endowed with wisdom and power, to deliver prudential counsels, suited to the state of things. And, when he delivers them, he uses such expressions, as show, they were not properly a part of the christian doctrine, but only directions and counsels, adapted to the exigence of things at that time. "I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the present distress," ver. 26. necessity, or exigence, whilst the profession of the faith is exposed to so many difficulties. "And this I speak for your profit; not that I might cast a snare upon you," ver. 35, that is, 'I speak this with a sincere view to your good; not intending, however, any thing above your ability to perform; of which you must be the best judges, after seriously weighing the case.'

CHAP. VIII.

PAGE 201. Diss. L. 'Whether St. Paul did really blame St. Peter for his conduct, mentioned Gal. ii?'

That St. Peter was culpable, is allowed by our author. Wherein his fault consisted, was shown^a formerly, and again in^b these Remarks.

^a In Vol. vi. ch. xviii. sect. 3.

^b P. 336, &c.

Page 202, ‘The only difficulty seems to be,’ says our learned author, ‘with regard to Peter’s motive for this conduct, which possibly might be this. He had been charged before at Jerusalem, on account of his eating with uncircumcised Gentiles, and vindicated himself to the satisfaction of the assembly, Acts xi. But he had done that in a more private manner, which rendered him less obnoxious to the zealous Jews.’

There is no reason to say, that was done in a more private manner. It was very public, as appears from the history in the tenth and eleventh chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Nothing could be done more publicly among christians at that time. When Peter, by divine direction, went from Joppa to Cornelius at Cesarea, he took with him six brethren, who were witnesses to all that was done at the house of Cornelius. There Peter tarried several days. Before he returned to Jerusalem, “the apostles and brethren that were in Judea,” by whom must be meant the whole church at Jerusalem, or a large part of it, “heard that the Gentiles also had received the word. And when Peter came 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 rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order to them.” His discourse there follows at length. And in the council St. Peter speaks of this transaction openly, and as a thing well known to all. Acts xv. 7, “And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them: Men and brethren, ye know, how that God a good while ago made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.”

There is no reason, therefore, to insinuate, that this was done in a more private manner. But learned men, when engaged in an argument, are too apt to advance some things to serve a present purpose. Which should be carefully avoided by sincere inquirers after truth.

Page 203, ‘Afterwards, when Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem about the dispute raised at Antioch concerning the Gentile converts, and Paul took Titus with him; he would not consent that Titus should be circumcised, though some pretended Jewish converts, who probably crept into the assembly, when that matter was debated, insisted upon it. These seem to have been different persons from the believing pharisees, who are mentioned as being at that assembly. But, as they are said to have

‘ believed, he would not, one would think, have here called ‘ them “ false brethren,” though they joined likewise in ‘ insisting upon the circumcision of Titus.’

By “ the false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage,” Gal. ii. 4, Paul means no others than^c those who began the disturbance at Antioch, of whom it is said, Acts xv. 1—“ Certain men came down from Judea, who taught the brethren, and said ; Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved ;” who at ver. 5, are said to be “ pharisees that believed.”

Nor can I see, why St. Paul should make any scruple to call them “ false brethren,” who are so censured by the apostles and elders, and the whole council at Jerusalem, who say of them : “ Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain men, which went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls—to whom we gave no such commandment.”

Nor does it appear, that there was any dispute about Titus, in particular, either at Antioch, or at Jerusalem. But Paul, to satisfy the Galatians of his inviolable steadiness upon all occasions, inserts this fact in his narration : that he took Titus with him to Jerusalem, and brought him thence again uncircumcised.

P. 203, 204, ‘ But after this, when Paul and Barnabas ‘ returned to Antioch, Peter coming thither, for some time ‘ did eat with the Gentile converts. This conduct of Peter ‘ could not but make much noise, and give offence to the ‘ converted Jews, who were yet zealous for their law. ‘ Which being heard at Jerusalem, might occasion much ‘ uneasiness there among that sort of persons. And this ‘ might occasion James to send some persons to Antioch, to ‘ acquaint Peter with it : who, to avoid the ill consequences, ‘ which he apprehended would follow from thence, might ‘ think proper to alter his conduct, and also to induce Bar- ‘ nabas, and other Jews, to do the like.’

In my opinion, all this is abundantly too conjectural. Many things are here said without ground. Why should Peter's eating with Gentiles at Antioch presently make

^c “ And that, because of false brethren,” who came down to Antioch, ‘ Acts xv. 1, “ unawares brought in,” insinuating themselves into the church ‘ at Antioch. “ Who came in privily to spy out our liberty,” from the ob- ‘ servance of the Jewish law, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might ‘ bring us into bondage ” to it : they pleading for the necessity of circumcising ‘ the Gentiles, and commanding them to keep the law, Acts xv. 5. Whitby ‘ upon Gal. ii. 4. See also Doddridge upon the same place.’

much noise? It was doing no more than might be reasonably expected of him, especially after the decisions of the council at Jerusalem, as Dr. W. allows this to have been, p. 202. Nor is there any reason to believe, that tidings of Peter's eating with Gentiles at Antioch had been brought to Jerusalem. Peter, as it seems, stayed now but a short time only in that city. And the Jews mentioned, Gal. ii. 12, may have come to Antioch upon business, or purely to gratify their curiosity. There is no reason at all to bring in James, and make him either a cause, or an occasion of the alteration of Peter's behaviour. "Before that certain came from James." The meaning of those words is no more than 'when certain men came down from Jerusalem, where James was.' As^d is allowed by the best interpreters.

Peter was culpable, as is evident. And he was justly and openly reprov'd by Paul. And Peter acquiesced. But we will not acquiesce. And rather than not make out an apology for him, we attempt to bring in another apostle to be partner in guilt with him; though the history affords not any ground or reason for so doing.

Without any curious researches, and groundless conjectures, Peter's alteration of conduct is easily accounted for from the well-known zeal of the Jewish people in general, and of too many of the Jewish believers. As formerly^e said: 'I imagine, that he now first of all went abroad out of Judea into Gentile countries. It is probable, that he was desirous to see the christian people at Antioch. But hitherto he had not been much used to converse with Gentiles. And when some zealous Jew 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 Cesarea, because "he had eaten with men uncircumcised," Acts xi. 1—3, and very well knowing, from long and frequent experience, the prevailing temper of the people of his country.'

^d 'Quum venirent quidam a Jacobo.] Id est, ab Hierosolymis, cui ecclesiæ tum præsidebat Jacobus. A Jacobo, id est, ab eo loco ubi erat Jacobus, &c. Grot. ad Gal. ii. 12. A Jacobo.] Id est, Hierosolymis, ubi pedem fixerat Jacobus. Bez. in loc.

^e Vol. vi. chap. xviii. sect. 3.

CHAP. IX.

PAGE 208. Diss. li. ‘ What is the meaning of Paul’s expression, “ You see how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand,” Gal. vi. 11.’

This question has been considered by many interpreters, and other learned men. I likewise have had occasion to speak to^a it. And I think, I have said what is sufficient to show, that our English version is very right.

OBSERVATIONS

UPON DR. MACKNIGHT’S

HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS :

AS FAR AS RELATES TO THE HISTORY OF OUR
SAVIOUR’S RESURRECTION.

IN A LETTER TO THE AUTHOR.

REVEREND SIR,

I INTEND to send you some observations upon your Harmony of the Four Gospels, relating to the history of our Saviour’s resurrection. They will regard these several sections of your work, sect. 149—156. If my thoughts are somewhat different from yours, I do not know that you have any good reason to be offended. You have made a “ New Harmony of the Gospels,” after many others, and very different from them in many respects. Another therefore may have a right after you, and may think himself obliged to represent the sense of the evangelists as it appears to him.

^a See Vol. vi. chap. xii. sect. 3.

My observations will relate to the several following articles. 1. The burial of our Saviour. 2. The request of the chief priests and pharisees, to Pilate the governor, to afford them a guard for the security of the sepulchre. 3. A visit to the sepulchre, which you suppose to have been intended and attempted by the women from Galilee, but not performed by them. 4. The preparing the spices by those women to anoint the body of the Lord Jesus. 5. Their journey to the sepulchre, and the appearances of our Lord to them, and others, after his resurrection.

I. 'Of the burial of our Saviour,' which is related by all the evangelists, but by St. John more particularly than by any of the rest. Matt. xxvii. 57—61; Mark xv. 42—47; Luke xxiii. 50—56; John xix. 38—42.

But here I do not stay, not intending to make any remarks upon this beside what may offer occasionally, in considering the other articles.

II. 'The request of the chief priests and pharisees to Pilate the governor, to afford them a guard for the security of the sepulchre.' Which is related by St. Matthew only, ch. xxvii. 62—66.

His words are these. "Now the next day that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again; command therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead. So the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch. Go your way, and make it as sure as you can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch."

Upon this you say, p. 618, 'Τη δε επαυριον, ἣτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν, "the next day that followed the preparation," that is, after the sun was set. For the Jewish day began then. They took this measure therefore, not "on the morrow," in our sense of the word, but in the evening, after sun-setting, when the Jewish sabbath was begun, and when they understood the body was buried. To have delayed it to sun-rising, would have been preposterous, as the disciples might have stolen the body away during the preceding night.'

This you say, contrary, as I suppose, to all interpreters and commentators whatever. Says Whitby: "Now the 'next day that followed the preparation,' viz. the sabbath-

‘day in the morning.’ And in like manner other interpreters. But the thing is so plain, as scarcely to need any paraphrase or explication, and therefore is seldom found in commentators. But that the meaning of the original word is “the next day,” according to our usual manner of speaking, is manifest from many texts, where it is found. So Acts xxv. 22, 23, “Then Agrippa said unto Festus; I would also hear the man myself. To-morrow, *αυριον*, said he, thou shalt hear him. On the morrow, *τη εν επαυριον*, when Agrippa was come, and Bernice with great pomp, and was entered into the place of hearing, with the chief captains, and principal men of the city, at Festus’s commandment Paul was brought forth.” I presume, that by “to-morrow, [or] on the morrow,” is not meant the dark evening, or night, after sun-setting, but “the next day,” when it was light, the only proper season for such an assembly, and the important design of it.

Acts iv. 5, “And it came to pass, that on the morrow, *εγενετο δε επι την αυριον*, their elders, and rulers, and scribes, —were gathered together.” The context shows, that hereby is not meant the night-season, after sun-setting, but the next day when it would be light. For it is said at ver. 3, “And they laid hands on them, and put them in hold until the next day, *εις την αυριον*. For it was now even-tide.”

Acts x. 23, 24, “Then called he them in, and lodged them. And on the morrow, *τη δε επαυριον*, Peter went away with them, and certain brethren from Joppa accompanied him. And on the morrow, *τη δε επαυριον*, they entered into Cesarea.” I do not see how the word can be here understood of any thing, but the morning of the next day, after the rising of the sun. Nor do I think, that it ever was understood otherwise. See also ver. 9, and chap. xx. 7, xxii. 30, and other like places, which may easily be found by yourself, or any other, that wants farther satisfaction.

It seems to me somewhat strange, that you should misunderstand a phrase, which has in so many places, invariably, the same meaning, and has always been so understood. If the evangelist had intended the time mentioned by you, he would have expressed it, in some one of the phrases, not unusual in the gospels. He would have said: “And when the evening was now come, [or] when the sun was now set,” of which examples may be seen, Matt. xiv. 23; *οψιας δε γενομενης*. John vi. 16; *ως δε οψια εγενετο*. Mark i. 32; *οψιας δε γενομενης, οτε εδν ο ηλιος*. Luke iv. 40; *δυνοντος δε τε ηλιου*.

And why do you affix this unheard-of meaning to the

word in *Matt.* xxvii. 62? Let us attend. ‘To have delayed it to sun-rising would have been preposterous, as the disciples might have stolen the body away during the preceding night.’ But, Sir, such reasonings are of no avail against the clear and express assertion of the evangelist, that the priests and pharisees did not go to Pilate, till the next day, or the morrow after our Saviour’s crucifixion and burial.

And there are obvious reasons for such delay. The day, in which our Lord was crucified, had been a day of full employment and great perplexity to Pilate. And the Jewish priests and pharisees might not judge it convenient to disturb him in the evening of it. Possibly this thought of a guard, to watch the sepulchre, came not into the minds of any of them that evening. Whenever the thought arose in the minds of one, or two, or some few of them, it would require time to propose it to others, and gather them together, to go with the request to Pilate. And the morning of the next day was soon enough. For they could none of them suspect the disciples to be so horribly profane and desperate, as to attempt to remove a dead body on the sabbath! They therefore made provision against the night that followed after the sabbath. Which was all that could be reckoned needful in the opinion of the most suspicious. Indeed, it is not easily supposable, that any of those Jews did really suspect the disciples of a design to steal the body. But they were willing to cast upon them the scandal of such a supposition, the more to bring them under popular resentment. But the contrivance turned out to their own disadvantage.

I seem to myself to have now made good the common interpretation of this text. I have advanced nothing new. On the next day, after the crucifixion of Jesus, and probably in the morning of that day, some of the priests and pharisees went to Pilate, requesting a guard at the sepulchre, and he granted their request.

This paragraph of *St. Matthew* is so plain and easy, that I have found few notes upon it in commentators: scarcely any, excepting to show, that by “the day that followed the day of the preparation,” is to be understood the Jewish sabbath. However *Grotius* has a note, that may be proper to be observed. It is to this purpose: ‘The^a council could

^a Non potuit eo die synedrium haberi. Sed privato consilio sacerdotum principes quidam et senatores aliqui, pharisaicæ factionis, Pilatum conveniunt, tanquam acturi de negotio ad summam rempublicam pertinente. Nec difficulter ab eo impetrarunt rem, in quâ ille nihil situm existimabat. *Gr. in Matt.* xxvii. 62.

‘ not sit on that day. But after a private consultation some
 ‘ of the priests and senators of the sect of the pharisees went
 ‘ to Pilate, as if they had somewhat to say to him of the
 ‘ utmost importance. Nor had they much difficulty to ob-
 ‘ tain what they requested.’

III. I now proceed to the next article of my inquiry,
 concerning ‘ a visit to the sepulchre, which you suppose to
 have been intended, and attempted by some of the women
 from Galilee, but not performed by them.’

This is a visit or journey to the sepulchre, which I do
 not see in other commentators. Nor can I discern it in the
 gospels, after all that you have said in favour of it. A part
 of the title or contents of your 149th section, p. 619, is this:
 ‘ Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, go out
 ‘ to see the sepulchre; but are terrified by an earthquake.’

P. 620, ‘ Matt. xxviii. 1; “ In the end of the sabbath, as
 ‘ it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came
 ‘ Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary to see the sepulchre,”
 ‘ θεωρησαι, to see, if the stone was still at the door, because
 ‘ by that they could know, whether the body was within.
 ‘ For from John xiv. 42, it would appear, that the friends of
 ‘ Jesus intended to carry him somewhere else—The women
 ‘ knowing this, had reason to think, that Joseph would re-
 ‘ move the body, as soon as the sabbath was ended. Ac-
 ‘ cordingly, having bought the spices, they judged it proper
 ‘ to send two of their number, to see if Jesus was still in
 ‘ the sepulchre; and, if he was not, to inquire of the gar-
 ‘ dener where he was laid; that when the spices were pre-
 ‘ pared,—they might go directly to the place, and embalm
 ‘ him.’

All fiction, surely! Nor do I, as before said, find this
 in any commentators, with whom I am acquainted. How-
 ever, let us see what this ingenious author says to sup-
 port it.

P. 620, 621, ‘ This journey to the sepulchre, by the two
 ‘ Marys, is generally supposed to have been undertaken in
 ‘ the morning, according to our sense of the word, that is to
 ‘ say, some time after midnight. But this opinion, though
 ‘ universally received, may be justly called in question. For
 ‘ first of all, what reason can be assigned for the women
 ‘ not going to see the sepulchre, as soon as the Jewish sab-
 ‘ bath was ended, that is, on Saturday, immediately after
 ‘ sun-setting, when they had more than an hour’s twilight
 ‘ to carry them thither?’

To which I answer, that they could not go then, because
 the spices were not yet prepared. For I shall show pre-

sently, that they were not bought, till after the Jewish sabbath was ended.

You go on: 'In the second place, since they delayed it 'at all, why did they go at two or three in the morning, 'rather than at some more seasonable time?' You should not say, at two or three in the morning. For that is not the time intended by the expositors, with whom you are arguing. You should say, 'four or five in the morning.' So the evangelist tells us, the women set out early, "at the dawning of the day," that is, between four and five in the morning, according to our way of computation. They could not go sooner with decency. And, if the body was to be embalmed, it was proper to take the first opportunity, and perform it as soon as could be conveniently done after decease. This, I think, accounts for the women's going to the sepulchre, early in the morning, at the time supposed by all commentators in general. They would have anointed the body sooner, if they had not been prevented by the coming in of the Jewish sabbath. That being over, and the spices prepared, they embrace the earliest season for going to the sepulchre.

Still you say, p. 621, 'The reader will be pleased to take 'notice, that the time here fixed for the women's first visit 'to the sepulchre, is capable of direct proof likewise from 'the words of the text. Matt. xxviii. 1, "In the end of the 'sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the 'week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see 'the sepulchre." According to the Jewish form of the 'day, the sabbath ended, and the first day of the week began at sun-setting, Lev. xxii. 32. If so, Matthew's description of the time, when the women set out for the 'sepulchre, fixeth it expressly to the evening, notwithstanding the word "dawn," in our translation, falsely 'protracts it to some hour after midnight, being very improperly used in this passage. The word in the original 'is *επιφωσκειση*. Which applied to the Jewish day, signifies 'simply, that "the day began," without conveying any idea 'of light at all. Contrary, I own, to its primary meaning, 'which doubtless includes the notion of light, gradually 'increasing in conformity to the commencement of the day 'among the Greeks, who formed the word, so as to denote 'their own idea. But however contrary to the analogy of 'the Greek language, this signification of the word *επιφωσκειση* may seem, it could have no other in the mouth of a 'Jew, whose days all began at sun-setting. Besides, it has 'this meaning without dispute, Luke xxiii. 54, where, in

‘ the history of our Lord’s burial, it is said : “ And that day
 ‘ was the day of the preparation, and the sabbath dawned,”
 ‘ *επεφωσκε*, that is, was about to begin ; or, as it is well ren-
 ‘ dered in our version, “ drew on.” For nobody ever fan-
 ‘ cied, that Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus, laid Jesus
 ‘ in the sepulchre, when the Jewish sabbath “ dawned,” in
 ‘ the sense of its becoming light. But the meaning which
 ‘ this Greek word has in Luke, it may have in Matthew, or
 ‘ rather must have ; as it cannot be imagined that an histo-
 ‘ rian, capable of common accuracy, much less an inspired
 ‘ writer, would say, it dawned toward the first day of the
 ‘ week, nine or ten hours after the first day of the week
 ‘ began.’

I have made this long quotation that I might set your argument in its full light, and that you might not complain that justice had not been done to it. In answer to all which I say ; all know very well, that the Jewish civil day, or *νυχθημερον*, began at the setting of the sun. But that day was divided into two parts, *night and day*, by *day* meaning the natural day, or that part of the civil day which is light. This sense of the word *day* is very common in scripture. Ps. lxxiv. 16, “ The day is thine, the night also is thine.” John xi. 9. 10, “ Jesus answered ; Are there not twelve hours in the day ? If any walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of the world. But if he walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him.” In Matt. xx. 1—16, is the parable of the labourers hired to work in a vineyard “ for a penny a day :” meaning a day of twelve hours, whilst it is light, and a proper season for labour. Luke iv. 42, “ And when it was day, *γενομενης δε ημερας*, he departed, and went into a desert place.” Acts xii. 18, “ Now, as soon as it was day, *γενομενης δε ημερας*, there was no small stir among the soldiers.” Where, “ as soon as it was day,” cannot mean the Jewish civil day, but *day-light*. All which is agreeable to that ancient and original determination of the Deity himself. Gen. i. 5, “ And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night.”

Need I add any more examples ? they are easily had : Luke vi. 13, “ And when it was day, *και οτε εγενετο ημερα* he called unto him his disciples.” Acts xxvii. 29. “ They cast four anchors out of the ship, and wished for the day,” *ηυχοντο ημεραν γενεσθαι*. Ver. 33, “ And while the day was coming on, *αχρι δε ε εμελλεν ημερα γενεσθαι*, Paul besought them all to take meat.” I add no other texts, but that of 2 Peter i. 19, “ Until the day dawn, and the day-star arise

in your hearts," *εως ε ημερα διανγαση, και φωσφορος ανατειλη εν καρδιαις υμων.*

That must be the meaning of the text in Matt. xxviii. 1, "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." With which I suppose to be parallel, Mark xvi. 1, 2, "And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun."

I beg leave to refer you to Grotius. And I intend to transcribe below the observations of^b Keuchenius, which appear to me to be very material.

I allow your interpretation of Luke xxiii. 54, to be right. But there the word, *επεφωσκε*, is used figuratively, and improperly, though elegantly, and significantly enough. I say improperly, for you yourself say, p. 621, 'That according to its primary meaning, doubtless, the word includes 'the notion of light gradually increasing.'

However, after all, you say, that this journey of which you are here speaking, though undertaken, was not performed.

You proceed therefore at p. 622, 623, 'For these reasons I think it probable, that the two Marys attempted to visit the sepulchre, in the end of the Jewish sabbath, or about the setting of the sun, on our Saturday evening. I say, attempted to visit the sepulchre, because it does not appear that they actually went thither. While they were going, there was a great earthquake. This earthquake, I suppose, frightened the women to such a degree, that they immediately turned back. Or their return may have been rendered necessary by a storm, if this earthquake was attended with a storm——The guards, it is true, remained at

^b Matt. xxviii. 1. *Τη επιφωσκηση εις μιαν σαββατων, &c.* Bene monuit vir illustris H. Grotius, phrasim hanc passim de solis luce usurpari. Ad quam sententiam adstruendam non possum non producere insignem locum, qui occurrit Neh. viii. 3. ubi Esras in libro legis fertur legisse a 'luce usque ad medium diei.' Quod LXX. Senes hoc modo vertunt: *Και ανεγνω εν αυτω απο της ωρας τε διαφωτισαι τον ηλιον εως ημισε της ημερας.* Unde liquet, Interpretes hos per 'lucem,' non nisi 'solis lucem' vel 'ortum' intellexisse. Conf. lxx. ad Job xxxi. 16. Et sane non 'diluculum, sed 'solis' potius 'ortum,' hac locutione designari, ex re ipsâ manifestum est. Dicitur enim Esras coram populo legisse, 'a luce.' Quod non tam facile a primâ lucis apparitione, quam a solis ortu factum fuisse, percipi potest. Quapropter arbitror, phrasin hanc idem fere significare, quod apud Marcum cap. xvi. 2. *λιαν πρωϊ, της μας σαββατων ανατειλαντος τε ηλιου.* Pet. Keuchen. in N. T. p. 157.

‘ the sepulchre all the while. But there was a great difference between the tempers of the persons——.’

That these women did not go, you argue in this manner, in the notes, at p. 624, ‘ It is true,’ Matthew says, ‘ that the women “ came to see the sepulchre.” But the word *ἦλθε*, which he makes use of, does not imply that they arrived at the sepulchre. All, who understand the Greek, know that *ἔλθειν* signifies *to go*, as well as *to come*. See Mark vii. 31; Luke ii. 44, in the original.’

Well, let us look into Mark vii. 31. “ And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis.” But how is this to your purpose? Translate *he went*, instead of *he came*; still he actually arrived at the place here spoken of, the “ sea of Galilee.” He did not attempt only, but he went.

Again, Luke ii. 44, “ But they, supposing him to have been in the company, went, *ἦλθον*, a day’s journey.” Allowing that to be the right reading, still Joseph and Mary did actually *go* “ a day’s journey,” and not attempt it only.

So it must be here also. “ At the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came, [or went] Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre.” They did go. Consequently, the journey ‘ attempted, but not performed,’ at the setting of the sun, is a fiction, without any foundation; for St. Matthew speaks of a journey, or visit to the sepulchre, which these women actually made, early in the morning. Which visit shall be observed by and by, as related by the evangelists.

For the present, I stay a while, to make some reflections. For, sir, I cannot forbear to complain of you, and expostulate with you. Is this to do honour to the sacred history? In support of this fictitious journey, ‘ attempted, but not performed,’ you have made many suppositions, without any authority from the evangelists. I shall observe some of them as distinctly as I can, in so perplexed an argument as yours is.

Supp. 1. You say, ‘ From John xix. 42, it would appear that the friends of Jesus intended to carry him somewhere else,’ p. 620.

Supp. 2. You suppose that the women knew this. Your words, in the same page, are: ‘ The women knowing this, had reason to think that Joseph would remove the body as soon as the sabbath was ended.’

Where is your authority for these suppositions? If the friends of Jesus intended to carry him somewhere else, and

the women knew this, that intention would have manifested itself when the women came to the sepulchre, and missed the body; or when John and Peter came thither, and likewise found not the body. If they had before known, that such a removal was intended by any of their own number, or by Joseph, they would not have been in such surprise at not finding the body, as they were. Some of them would presently have said: 'The body indeed is gone. But we need not be very uneasy about it. Undoubtedly Joseph has removed it to some other place, and taken good care of it. Let us therefore go to him and inquire.' But no such speeches as these drop from any of them. When Mary Magdalene had been at the sepulchre, and saw the stone to be taken away, and the body not within: "she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them; They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre. And we know not where they have laid him," John xx. 1, 2. She did not suppose that to have been done by friends, but by strangers, whom she knew nothing of. And Peter, as related by St. Luke, xxiv. 12, "ran to the sepulchre, and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed wondering in himself at that which was come to pass."

Nevertheless this notion of the intention of Joseph, or the disciples, to remove the body elsewhere, has taken such possession of your mind, that in your argument to support the early attempted journey, you impute to the women an apprehension, that the body had been removed even during the sabbath, and before it ended. For you say, p. 621, 'It is much more probable that by appointment of the rest, and in conformity to their own inclinations, the two set out for the sepulchre on Saturday evening, according to our form of the day, perhaps, at about six or seven at night.' And, p. 620, 'Accordingly, having bought the spices, they judged it proper to send two of their number, to see if Jesus was still in the sepulchre, and if not, to inquire of the gardener where he was laid.' And at the top of p. 621, you ask, 'What reason can be assigned for the women's not going to see the sepulchre, as soon as the Jewish sabbath was ended, that is, on Saturday, immediately after sun-setting, when they had more than an hour's twilight to carry them thither?' And at the bottom of p. 622, you suppose this visit was attempted, 'In the end of the Jewish

^c And just before, at the top of p. 620, you say, 'The women went to "see the sepulchre," (*θεωρησαι,*) to see if the stone was still at the door, because by that they could know whether the body was within.'

‘ sabbath, or about the setting of the sun, on our Saturday evening.’

Therefore, before their setting out, which, according to you, was ‘ as soon as the Jewish sabbath was ended, immediately after sun-setting, or about the setting of the sun,’ they had a suspicion that Joseph had already removed the body, and were in great doubt about it; but, if at that time ‘ they had any suspicion or doubt whether the body was still in the sepulchre,’ they must have had a suspicion, that it had been removed by Joseph, before the sabbath was over. But I apprehend, that none could admit in their minds any suspicion, that a pious Jew (as Joseph certainly was) would remove a dead body on the sabbath day.

Supp. 3. p. 623, ‘ While they were going, there was a great earthquake.’ For this you have no authority from the gospels. The women, as you say, set out for the sepulchre at ‘ about six or seven in the evening, immediately after sun-setting.’ But there is no reason to think from St. Matthew, or any other evangelist, that there was an earthquake at Jerusalem at that time. The earthquake, of which you speak, must have happened soon after the women set out, near Jerusalem, and early in the evening, which seems not to be the time of the earthquake mentioned by St. Matthew.

Supp. 4. You say, p. 624, ‘ This earthquake, I suppose, terrified the women to such a degree, that they immediately turned back. Yet the guards remained at the sepulchre all the while.’ Suppositions for which there is no ground; for there is no intimation in the gospels that any of the women followers of Jesus were affrighted by an earthquake; nor that the Roman soldiers stayed near the sepulchre, after the earthquake mentioned by St. Matthew, which is the only earthquake spoken of at all about this season. Nor is it said, that the soldiers were seen by the women, or by the disciples, who came to the sepulchre, early in the morning.

Supp. 5. You say, at p. 625, ‘ That the angel’s appearance was ushered in with a great earthquake and a storm, which lasted several hours.’ I do not see any intimation of this long storm in the gospels. It is a contrivance of yours, to support your fictitious journey, begun and attempted, but not finished, early in the evening, soon after sun-setting. The earthquake mentioned by St. Matthew, was sudden and instantaneous, or, however, of no long dura-

tion, immediately preceding or accompanying the appearance of the^d angel.

Supp. 6. In arguing for this imaginary journey, you suppose, that for a while the weather was cloudy and rainy. Your words at p. 621, are, ‘To conclude, it cannot be said, ‘that this journey was too great to be undertaken in the ‘evening: for the sepulchre was nigh to the city, John xix. ‘20. It may be said indeed, that it was always full moon ‘at the passover: and therefore that the middle of the night ‘was as proper a season for their visit as any. It would ‘not, however, be a proper season, if the weather was either ‘rainy or cloudy then, as it seems actually to have been. ‘This I gather from John xx. 1, where we are told, that in ‘the morning, when Mary Magdalene came to the sepulchre, it was dark.’

But those words “early [or in the morning] when it was yet dark,” *πρωὶ σκοτίας ἐτι ἔσσης* denote no more, than that it was not yet full day-light, or that the sun was not risen, or, according to Dr. Clarke’s paraphrase: ‘Very early, before ‘it was yet day-light.’ To the same purpose are the two Latin versions of Beza and the Vulgate, which here agree exactly. *Maria Magdalene venit mane, cum adhuc tenebræ essent.* Those words do not denote the temperature of the air, but the time of the day.

However of the bad weather at that time, you speak also in some other places, particularly p. 643, ‘The storm, the ‘earthquake, and the vision that accompanied this astonishing event, had driven the soldiers away from the sepulchre. ‘Impelled therefore by their fears and the weather, they ‘would take shelter in the first house they could find. And ‘as they fled away about the time that Jesus arose, they ‘would, probably, sleep till morning. Or, though the ‘terror they were in hindered them from sleeping, they ‘would stay nevertheless, having no inclination to go out ‘in such a stormy night.’

So you are pleased to write. Nevertheless I discern not any intimations in the evangelists what the weather was at that time. And if the evangelists have said nothing about it, we can form no determinations concerning it. And for aught that is said by them during the period of our Lord’s lying in the grave, it may have been all calm and serene, till the time appointed for his rising out of it. When on a

^d ‘*Terræ motus factus est magnus.*] *Motus hic signum fuit secuturæ οπτασις*, satis notum Judaïco populo. Ps. lxxviii. 8, 9; xcix. 1; cxiv. 6, 7. Grot. ad Matt. xxviii. 2.

sudden, there was a forcible concussion of the earth and air, preceding, or accompanying the presence of the angel, who descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulchre. After which also, so far as we know, the air was calm and serene. For the women, and some of the disciples, came early out of the city to the sepulchre, without any difficulties arising from bad weather, so far as we can observe.

The several suppositions above mentioned, appear to me to be made by you altogether without any ground or foundation from the evangelists; and therefore they are unjustifiable, and must be of bad consequence. What history can stand before such treatment? It must be perverted. It will be altered, and made somewhat very different from what it really is. Heedless and inattentive readers (of which there are too many) are amused and entertained, and not carefully consulting the original, they admit such suppositions as parts of the history, though they are not mentioned nor implied in it.

IV. I now proceed to my fourth inquiry, which relates to ‘the preparing the spices by the women from Galilee to ‘anoint the body of Jesus.’

The accounts which we have of this are in two evangelists only. St. Mark having at the end of ch. xv. said: “And Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses, beheld where he was laid,” begins the xvi. chapter in this manner: “And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought [or brought] sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.” St. Luke xxiii. 55, 56, xxiv. 1, “And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how the body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the sabbath-day, according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.”

I understand that narrative in this manner. When the crucifixion was over, and the women here spoken of had seen our Lord laid in the sepulchre, they returned to Jerusalem, to their apartment there, and rested on the sabbath-day, which was now coming on, if not already begun. And when the sabbath was over, in the evening they bought sweet spices, and early in the morning, on the first day of the week, they went to the sepulchre, carrying the spices

with them, in order to anoint the body, according to their intention.

Your way of reconciling these two accounts is this. P. 617, ‘ This is not inconsistent with Mark xvi. 1, where we ‘ are told, that they bought spices after the sabbath was ‘ ended. It seems, the quantity, which according to Luke ‘ had been provided and prepared on the night of the cruci- ‘ fixion, was too small : or the sabbath coming on, they had ‘ not time to procure all the ingredients that were necessary. ‘ For which reason they went the first day of the week, and ‘ bought more.’

I rather think, that all the spices which they wanted were bought at once, and in the evening, after the sabbath was ended, as St. Mark says. Nor need St. Luke to be otherwise understood. You can help us out here. For you say, Prelim. Obser. iii. p. 14, ‘ Matthew and Luke giving the ‘ history of our Lord’s public entry into Jerusalem, connect ‘ the purging the temple therewith, as if both happened in ‘ one day. Nevertheless, from the more particular account ‘ which Mark gives of these affairs, it appears, that on the ‘ day of his public entry, Jesus did not go into the temple ‘ till the evening, when the market, usually kept in the ‘ court of the Gentiles, which he intended to prohibit, was ‘ over, and that he did not reform this abuse till the next ‘ day.’

So it is here. Nor is St. Luke to be understood to say, that they prepared any spices that day. He is to be understood in this manner. ‘ And they returned, and prepared ‘ spices and ointments. Nevertheless they rested the sab- ‘ bath-day, according to the commandment. And deferred ‘ preparing them till that was over.’

In your Chronological Dissertations, p. 88, you say : ‘ Luke also insinuates, that Jesus was crucified on the pre- ‘ paration of the passover. For he tells us, ch. xxiii. 56, ‘ that when the women had viewed our Lord’s sepulchre, ‘ and how his body was laid, “ they returned, and rested ac- ‘ cording to the commandment.” It seems the sabbath began ‘ about the time they were at the sepulchre.’

Which indeed I take to be the truth of the case. By the time the funeral rites were finished, and whilst they were yet at the sepulchre, the day closed, the sun set, and the sabbath came on. After which the women, and the other company there present, might without any scruple of their own, and without offence to others, walk thence to their apartments, or their habitations, at Jerusalem. But after

that, no work could be done until after the sabbath was over.

Nor do I see how it could be otherwise. For our Lord did not expire, as all allow, till the "ninth hour of the day," or our three afternoon. And says St. Matt. xxvii. 57, 58, "when the even was come," that is, three afternoon, "there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple. He went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus; then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered." Compare Mark xv. 42—45, and Luke xxiii. 50—53, and John xix. 38. But we are told by St. Mark, in the place just referred to, that when Joseph presented that request, "Pilate marvelled if he were already dead; and calling for the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. And when he knew it, he gave the body to Joseph." That would take up some time. For the centurion, undoubtedly, was at the place of execution, attending the bodies. Nor could he remove from that place without special order from the governor himself. Whether by "calling for the centurion," be intended, that Pilate commanded him to come to him, that he might himself speak to him; or whether thereby be only meant, that Pilate sent a messenger to the centurion, and received an answer from him by that messenger, I do not determine; either way some time was required to give Pilate satisfaction upon this head.

Nevertheless, I will suppose that much time was not lost by that means; for Joseph and Nicodemus might take it for granted that the body would not be refused, but would be delivered to them at their request; and^e immediately after the Lord Jesus had expired, they might begin to make preparations for his burial. However, the performing the funeral rites, as related by St. John, might fully occupy the space of time that followed, till sun-setting. Nor is it conceivable that the women could get back to Jerusalem before the sabbath was begun, or very near beginning, at the soonest, that is, the time of sun-setting, or our six afternoon.

At p. 620, you speak of the women *pounding* and *mixing* the spices. 'Accordingly, having bought the spices, they 'judged it proper to send two of their number to see if 'Jesus was still in the sepulchre—that when the spices 'were prepared, that is, pounded, mixed, and melted into an 'ointment, they might go directly to the place and embalm 'him.'

^e Apparemment que Joseph fit ses appareils, et assembla les gens dont il avoit besoin pour la sépulture de Jésus Christ, dès qu'il le vit crucifié. Le Clerc sur Marc xv. 42.

I cannot believe that there was any occasion for this. These women were not inhabitants of Jerusalem, but had come up thither with our Lord as attendants upon him at the time of the passover. I see not how they should be furnished with pestles and mortars, and other vessels for pounding, mixing, and melting spices. I rather think they bought spices already mixed into an ointment, prepared and fitted for the use intended by them. In countries where embalming was in use, and where they buried soon after men had expired, and especially in great cities, and near them, such as Jerusalem, there must have been shops, or warehouses of apothecaries, or embalmers, or confectioners, where spices of all sorts, proper for funeral rites, and also bandages and rollers might be had, and upon the shortest notice, for all sorts of persons, according to their several circumstances. We have an instance of this in the burial of our Saviour. His crucifixion and death were unlooked for by his friends. Nevertheless, as soon as he had expired, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus came to the place, “bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. And they took the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, [or bandages,] with spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury”——*ἐδησαν αὐτο θονοις.*

And that the Jews of that time buried soon after decease, we see in the instances of Ananias and Sapphira, Acts v. 1—10. It also appears in the history of Lazarus. John xi. 39, “Jesus said, Take away the stone. Martha, the sister of him who was dead, saith unto him; Lord, by this time he smelleth; for he has been dead four days.” *Τετάρταιος ἡμέρας ἐστίν.* You, Sir, are pleased to say in your Harmony, sect. c. p. 418: ‘When Jesus and his disciples were come ‘nigh to Bethany, they heard from some of the inhabitants ‘that Lazarus was four days buried. Wherefore, as a day ‘or two must have been spent in making preparations for ‘the burial, he could not well be less than five days dead ‘when Jesus arrived.’

Your computation is wrong. Lazarus was buried on the day in which he died. John xi. 17, “Then, when Jesus came, he found that he had lain in the grave four days already.” But those days are not to be reckoned complete. It was the fourth day since he was buried, on which also he had died. You know very well how the sacred writers compute days. Matt. xii. 4, “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” You do not thereby understand three com-

plete days and nights. If Lazarus had been dead more than four days Martha would have said so. For corruption of bodies does not commence merely from the time of burial, but from the time of death. And, says Cyril of Alexandria,^f ‘ Jesus brought Lazarus out of the grave, now dead, ‘ and stinking, on the fourth day after his death.’ So says Cyril, who, as I think, must have understood Greek as well as any modern critics. This is the same computation of the time of Lazarus’s death, which was made long ago in a tract^g which you just now quoted with approbation.

These good women of Galilee, then, as I suppose, bought the spices they wanted, ready prepared, and mixed into an ointment, in the evening, after the sabbath was over. And, when they had so done, as I apprehend, they went to rest, trusting in God, as other good men and women do, that they might be composed, and the better fitted for the intended service of the ensuing day. This is to be understood so far as was consistent with the greatness of their concern for what had lately happened to their much respected Lord and Master.

What these women designed, we cannot say exactly. But I dare say, it was not what you suppose, p. 617, ‘ That they ‘ might embalm their dead Lord by anointing and swathing ‘ him in a proper manner.’ For I think, he was properly swathed, or rolled, before. And any alteration of the rollers, or bandages, would have been inconsistent with that respect, which was due to the body of Jesus. What they aimed at, I say, I do not know. But possibly they intended to rub ointment on the outside of the bandages, to fill up the spaces, or interstices, which there might be, and to add to the fragranciness of the spices, which had been already made use of.

After all, I do not think it was any great matter, which was intended by them. And to me it seems, that you speak too slightly of what had been done by Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus. Your words at p. 617 are these: ‘ The ‘ Galilean women, who had waited on Jesus in his last ‘ moments, and accompanied him to the sepulchre, ob- ‘ serving that his funeral rites were performed in a hurry, ‘ (the body being rolled in nothing but a mixture of myrrh ‘ and aloes, which Nicodemus brought,) agreed among them- ‘ selves to come when the sabbath was passed, and embalm ‘ their dead Lord, by anointing and swathing him in a pro-

^f Τον δυσωδη νεκρον, μετα τεταρτην της τελευτης ημεραν, εκ θηκης εξηγαγεν. Cyril. in Jo. xi. 44. T. IV. p. 689. ^g See Vindication of Three of our Saviour’s Miracles, against Woolston, p. 24, note c.

‘ per manner. Accordingly, when he was laid in the sepulchre, they returned to the city, and bought what other spices were necessary for that purpose : Nicodemus having furnished a mixture only of myrrh and aloes.’

I must take the liberty to say, this manner of speaking is unjustifiable, after the accounts which we have of our Lord's interment by all the evangelists, before referred to, and particularly by St. John, ch. xix. 38—40, “ After this Joseph of Arimathea—took the body of Jesus. And there came also Nicodemus,—and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.” *Ελαβον εν το σωμα τῆ Ιησῆ, και ἐδησαν αὐτο οθονιοις, μετα των αρωματων, καθως εθος εστι τοις Ιουδαιοις ενταφιαζειν.*

The funeral rites were performed with expedition, but not, properly speaking, in a hurry. And when St. John says that the “ body was wound up in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury :” I think he means as they use to bury persons of distinction. For to such only spices and aromatic gums belong. I think that to be implied also in the original word, *ενταφιαζειν*. Nor was Lazarus, the friend of Jesus, buried in that manner. His body was bound or swathed in rollers. But there was no mixture of spices. For he was supposed to smell after he had been dead not more than four days. And whereas you use the expression, ‘ rolled in nothing but a mixture of ‘ myrrh and aloes,’ and again, ‘ a mixture only of myrrh ‘ and aloes :’ I think there can be no reason to doubt that they were such spices, as were most proper for the purpose. So^h says Grotius. And all was done, as may be reasonably supposed, after the best manner, by the hands of an apothecary, or confectioner, or perfumer, skilful in performing funeral rites. There must have been many such in Jerusalem. And those two great and rich men, Joseph and Nicodemus, would procure one of the best and most proper for the service intended by them. Such men as these seem to be meant in Eccles. xxxviii. 4, 7, 8, “ The Lord has created medicines out of the earth—with such does the physician heal men, and take away their pains. Of such does the apothecary make a confection,” or mixture, *μιγμα*, the word used by St. John. “ And of his works there is no end.” See Grotius upon the place. There must have been at Jerusalem several of this profession, Unguentarii, who were

^h ——*μιγμα σμυρνης και αλοης.* Quæ aromata ad hunc usum optima habebantur. Grot. ad Joan. xix. 39.

able to perform funeral rites in a proper manner, in the space of three hours. And Nicodemus and Joseph would, besides, have the attendance of such of their servants as could be of any use upon this occasion. A representation of our Saviour's body, embalmed, and swathed and brought to the door of the sepulchre, may be seen in Chifflet. And I suppose, that the justness of the representation is allowed by antiquarians.

V. I come now to the fifth and last article of my inquiry. and the most important of all: 'the journey of these women
' to the sepulchre, and the appearances of our Lord to them,
' and to others after his resurrection.

Here I cannot forbear saying, that your harmony of this part of the evangelical history is very perplexed and intricate. Your words at p. 634, are these. 'It may seem
' strange, that in the accounts which the evangelists have
' given of our Lord's resurrection, there is not the least men-
' tion made of the disciples meeting one another in the way,
' although they went several times backward and forward,
' in separate companies, between their lodgings in the city
' and the sepulchre. On the contrary, the circumstances of
' the history oblige us to suppose, that they did not meet one
' another. But there is nothing improbable in all this. For,
' as Jerusalem was a great city, the apostles' lodging might
' be at the distance of a mile or two from that extremity of
' it, which was nearest to the sepulchre. And therefore
' from their lodging to the sepulchre there might be several
' different ways through the city, all equally convenient.
' Farther, Calvary, where our Lord was crucified, is said to
' have been "nigh unto the city," John xix. 20. But it
' would be nigh, though it was at the distance of half a
' mile. Suppose it however to have been only a little more
' than a quarter of a mile. In this place, or nigh to it [*εν*
' *τοπω*] was the garden, where our Lord was buried, John
' xix. 41. Yet the garden might be on the side of Calvary,
' which was farthest from Jerusalem. Wherefore, as it was
' a spacious garden, the sepulchre could not well be nearer
' the city than half a mile. It may however have been at
' the distance of a whole mile, consistently enough with the
' description which John has given of its situation. On
' either supposition, there may have been different roads
' from Joseph's villa and garden to the city. Besides, as
' Jerusalem was walled round, the apostles' lodging might
' be so situated, that persons going from thence to Joseph's
' garden, could come out of the city by different gates. To
' conclude, the garden, where the sepulchre was, might

‘ have more doors than one, and several shady walks in it, leading to the sepulchre. On these suppositions, it is easy to imagine, that the disciples and the women, who went to and from the sepulchre, may have missed each other by taking their rout through different streets of the city, or different roads in the field; or they may have been hid from one another by the shady walks of the garden, in which the sepulchre stood.’

So you write. But should you not have been led to suspect a scheme, which needs so many suppositions to support it? If the women and the disciples never met each other, in passing to and from the sepulchre, may it not afford reason to believe, that they did not make so many journeys separately, as you have supposed? How many of those journeys you have found in the evangelists, or ingeniously contrived for them; I should not be able to say distinctly, were it not for a note, which you have placed at the bottom, p. 657, 658, where you say: ‘ if the reader desires a more compendious view of the several journeys to the sepulchre, and of the relation which they bear to one another, he may take it as follows.’ Where you reckon twelve in number, the last of which is this: ‘ 12. In the evening, the disciples arrive from Emmaus, and while they are telling their story, Jesus himself appears.’

There are, undoubtedly, some real, or seeming difficulties in this part of the evangelical history. Which, as seems to me, have been of late increased and multiplied by annotators, and other writers, and not at all diminished by yourself. This being the case, I have found myself to be under a disability to unfold it by my own skill only. I have therefore, upon this occasion, had recourse to a learned and judicious friend: who, I before knew, had some uncommon observations upon this subject. The answer, with which he has favoured me, is to this purpose.

‘ I never could bring my mind to think, that Christ appeared first to Mary Magdalene separately, but that his first appearance was to the watch: who, I think, saw the angel, and the rolling away of the stone, as well as felt the σεισμον μεγαν attending the presence and action of the angel, for fear of whom the keepers did shake and became ωσει νεκροι, “ as dead men.” Some of whom, as the same evangelist says, τινες της κωστωδιας, “ came into the city, and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.” The appearance to Mary Magdalene, I think, was in common to her and to the other women, who went altogether to the sepulchre, and once only, not twice,

‘ as is generally supposed, and saw our Saviour, and were
 ‘ coming back to the city, with the account of what they
 ‘ had seen and heard to the apostles, at the same time, that
 ‘ some of the watch came to relate all that was done, to the
 ‘ chief priests. And they did make their report to the
 ‘ apostles, before the two went from the rest of the company
 ‘ to Emmaus. No notice indeed is mentioned by the two
 ‘ in discourse with Christ of the women’s having related
 ‘ their interview with Jesus, because it should seem none of
 ‘ the company believed a word of what the women said,
 ‘ Mark xvi. 11; Luke xxiv. 11. And none of the evange-
 ‘ lists pretend to give an exact detail of all circumstances.’

This I apprehend to be the truth, or nearly so. And it will be the key to this history. And I now intend to digest the several particulars of it, in their proper order, as well as I can. If I should at all differ from my friend, it will be in such points only as are not very material. And still I must acknowledge myself indebted to him for a clear insight into this history.

But before I enter upon the rehearsal of the several parts of the history, I must premise a few observations.

First of all, I reckon, I have showed, that your supposed journey of some of the women to the sepulchre, designed and begun, but not performed and finished, by them, about six or seven o’clock in the evening of Saturday, presently after the sabbath was over, is fictitious, and without foundation.

Secondly, You speak of a journey to the sepulchre made by some of the company of the apostles, who set out after Peter and John were gone. This you call, at p. 639, a second deputation from the apostles. You speak of it likewise at p. 633, 656, 657. I beg leave to say, that I cannot but consider this as a fiction, without any foundation. And perhaps I may take no farther notice of it hereafter.

Thirdly, You suppose St. Peter to have made a second visit to the sepulchre alone, different from that mentioned, John xx. 3—10. This you argue from Luke xxiv. 12, at p. 646, 647. But I think it to be the same visit which is mentioned by St. John; when “ Peter, and that other disciple,” went together. So this also is understood by Le Clerc, and all other interpreters and commentators in general, so far as I know. Therefore my friend says in his letter to me: ‘ St. Luke, xxiv. 12, mentions only Peter running
 ‘ to the sepulchre; but we do not conclude from thence, that
 ‘ he ran thither twice, once by himself. and at another time

‘along with John.’ However, it is your opinion that two visits are here spoken of. And indeed this is agreeable to the usual method of your harmony; in which you make two stories of one, and account such passages of the gospels to be different, which are really parallel. Whereby, in my opinion, and so far as I am able to judge, you have oftentimes perverted the true order of things related by the evangelists.

I can now proceed to rehearse the several parts of this history, and to digest them in order as well as I can.

Says St. John, xx. 1, “The first day of the week, cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.”

But though Mary Magdalene only be here mentioned, I suppose she was not alone. It is agreeable to what you say also, p. 626, ‘In the morning of the first day of the week, according to our form of the day, all the women went out together very early, carrying the spices which they had prepared to the sepulchre, at which they arrived about the rising of the sun.’ See Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1, 2; Luke xxiv. 10. And at p. 627, you observe, ‘The women said to have made this journey, are in all the evangelists the same——Mary Magdalene therefore, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, are the women who made the visit with the spices early in the morning. John indeed speaks of none of the women who made this visit to the sepulchre, but Mary Magdalene. Yet because he mentions none but her, it does not follow, that there was nobody with her. In the gospels there are many such omissions——Wherefore, since it is the manner of the sacred historians in other instances, John may be supposed to have mentioned Mary Magdalene singly in this part of his history, notwithstanding he knew that others had been with her at the sepulchre, and the rather, because his intention was to relate only what things happened in consequence of her information, and not to speak of the transactions of the rest, which his brethren historians had handled at large.’

You say very well. We therefore proceed in considering St. John’s narrative, which follows, ver. 2, “Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them; They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.”

I do not believe that Mary Magdalene was now alone. All the women might be with her. If some only, the rest

stayed in the garden, expecting her return. For they knew that she went to tell Peter and John what she and the rest had seen, and to invite them to come to the sepulchre, and see how things were there.

It follows, ver. 3—10, “Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together. And the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he, stooping down, saw the linen clothes lying. Yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter, following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie: and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.”

Here you say upon ver. 8, p. 636, “Then went in also that other disciple which came first to the sepulchre. And he saw and believed.” ‘Finding nothing in the sepulchre but the clothes, he believed the body was taken away, as Mary Magdalene had told him. This, as I take it, is all that John means, when he tells us, that Peter and he, after searching the sepulchre, “saw and believed.” Mary Magdalene, it would appear, had told them not only that the body was taken away, but that the cloths were left behind, a circumstance which filled them with wonder. They saw them however with their own eyes, and believed her report—For that they had not the least suspicion of Christ’s resurrection, is evident from the apology, which John himself makes for the stupidity of the disciples in this matter. Ver. 9, “For as yet they knew not the scriptures, that he must rise from the dead”——Nor had she herself the least notion of it, even when Jesus appeared to her, as is plain from what she says, ver. 13 and 15.’ You say very right, in my opinion. And Grotius has spoken to the like purpose in his annotationsⁱ upon these verses.

St. Luke says, ch. xxiv. 12, “Then arose Peter, and ran

ⁱ ‘Et vidit, et credidit,’ ver. 8.] Credidit certo abesse corpus, quod Mariæ referenti non crediderat, et de quo conspectis fasciis dubitaverat. Gr. ad Joh. xx. 8.

Ver. 9, ‘Nondum enim sciebant scripturam.’] Quasi dicat, Corpus illud vitæ redditum nondum credebatur Joannes. Nam et ille et discipuli alii nondum satis perceperant id quod scriptura prædixerat de ejus resurrectione. Sæpe quidem audiverant Dominum id pollicentem. Sed rei magnitudo et ingenii tarditas obstabant, quo minus hoc in animum admitterent. Lucæ xxiv. 12. Gr. ad Jo. xx. 9.

unto the sepulchre, and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which had come to pass." This I take not to be another or a second visit of Peter, or different from that mentioned by St. John, but the same. And as this is the general opinion of interpreters, I need not say any thing to prove it.

St. John goes on, ver. 11—18, " But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping. And as she wept she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them: Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing. And knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him: Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her: Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him; Rabboni, which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her: Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and my God, and your God. Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her."

This I suppose to be what is related by St. Mark xvi. 9, " Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons." And I can suppose that Mary Magdalene was now alone, or only one of the other women with her, and she, perhaps, not one of the most honourable: which, I think, is the opinion of some learned interpreter, though I do not now recollect his^k name.

Our Lord having shown himself to Mary Magdalene, and discoursed with her, as related by St. John, I think, he withdrew to a small distance, out of sight. Mary, then, immediately went to the other women, who were not afar off, and told them that she had " seen the Lord," and that he had spoken unto her. They assented to what she said, and were willing to go down with her presently to the

^k Grotius has in one place intimated, that Mary Magdalene had a maid-servant with her——*nisi dicere malumus, quod credibile est, ancillam Magdalene adfuisse.* Gr. in Matt. xxviii. 9.

apostles, and acquaint them with the glad tidings, that the Lord was risen. Whilst they were going, and not yet got out of the garden, Jesus came to them, and showed himself to them all. Which is what is related by St. Matthew, xxviii. 5—9, “ And the angel answered and said unto the women : Fear ye not. For I know that ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here. For he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples, that he is risen from the dead. And behold, he goes before you into Galilee. There shall ye see him. Lo, I have told you. And they departed quickly from the sepulchre, with fear, and joy, and did run [that is, they were setting out] to bring his disciples word. And as they went, [or were going,] to tell his disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail, [or a good day to you.] And they came, and held him by the feet, and worshipped¹ him.” And now, undoubtedly, Mary Magdalene likewise was admitted to embrace our Lord's feet, if she did it not before. For the words, “ touch me not,” need not to be understood of an absolute prohibition not to touch him at all, but only that she was not to expect to be indulged in a long conversation. And now they were all fully satisfied that it was Jesus himself, who was alive again. He had given them all the evidences which they could desire. They saw him, they heard his voice, they handled him. “ Then [ver. 10.] said Jesus unto them : Be not afraid ; go, tell my brethren, that they go into Galilee ; and there shall they see me.”

Now all the women together had a joint appearance of Jesus, resembling that made to the eleven disciples, in the evening of the same day. And perhaps there was some peculiar fitness in our Lord showing himself first to Mary Magdalene, either alone, or when one more only was with her, and then to the rest all together. So before he showed himself to the eleven, he appeared to the two going to Emmaus, and to Peter, much about the same time ; though we cannot exactly say when or^m where.

This appearance to Mary Magdalene, and the other women with her, may be considered as one and the same appearance. It is so considered by Lightfoot. Harmony of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 269, 270.

¹ ‘ Amplexæ sunt,’ *κρατησαν.*] Vulg. tenuerunt. Sic prehensis videlicet ejus pedibus, quasi eum illic retenturæ, quo spectat Christi responsum. Mihi propterea magis placuit amplectendi, quamprehendendi verbum. Bez. in loc.

^m Postea etiam Jesus se conspiciendum præbuit Petro, quamvis rei circumstantiæ ad posteros transmissæ non sunt. Cleric. Harmon. p. 487.

It follows, that we now consider their message to the apostles. John, as before, ver. 18, says: "Mary Magdalene came, and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had said these things unto her." Matt. xxviii. 9, 10, before transcribed. And Mark xvi. 10, 11, "And she went, and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." St. Luke, xxiv. 9—11, is more particular. "And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with him, who told these things unto the apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not."

Thus is the message, or testimony of the women, related by several evangelists; but the disciples did not believe them.

Nor do I discern in the gospels any more journies of the women, or of the apostles, to the sepulchre, and back again, than these already mentioned. The first journey of the women to the sepulchre, was early in the morning: when they saw that the stone was rolled away from the sepulchre, and missed the body of Jesus. Mary Magdalene, then, with some other of the women, came down to the apostles, and informed them of what they had seen with great surprise. Whereupon Peter and John went to the sepulchre, and then returned to their own home. Mary Magdalene, and the others, who had come down to the apostles, followed Peter and John to the sepulchre. And when those two apostles returned back to Jerusalem, Mary and her companions stayed yet a while near the sepulchre. And whilst they were there attending, Jesus came, and showed himself to them. Whereupon Mary and all the women came down to Jerusalem, and went to the apostles, assuring them that they had seen Jesus: and went no more to the sepulchre. For which indeed there could be no reason, when they were persuaded that Jesus had left it, and was alive again. As Lightfoot says, in the place before referred to, p. 270, 'Here Matthew speaks short. For he mentioneth but one journey of the women to the grave, and back, and saith, that as they came back, Jesus met them. Whereas Mary Magdalene had two journies. As she returned, now the watchmen are come into the city, and bribed to deny that he was risen. And so the chief priests and elders gave money to hire the nation into unbelief.'

The next appearance of our Lord is to the two disciples

going to Emmaus. Of this I understand St. Mark to speak briefly, ch. xvi. 12, 13, "After that, he appeared in another form unto two of them as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue. Neither believed they them. After that," meaning after the appearance of Jesus to the women before related, ver. 9, 10, and after that they had delivered their message and testimony to the eleven.

Of those two disciples St. Luke speaks more particularly and at large, ch. xxiv. 13—35, "And behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all those things which had happened. And it came to pass, that whilst they communed together, and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were held, that they should not know him. And he said unto them: What manner of communications are these, that ye have one to another as ye walk, and are sad? And the one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering, said unto him: Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them: What things? And they said unto him: Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet, mighty in deed and word before God, and all the people; and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel. And beside all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, who were early at the sepulchre. And when they found not his body, they came saying, that they had seen a vision of angels, which said he was risen. And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even as they said. But him they saw not. Then he said unto them: O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. And they drew nigh unto the village whither they went. And he made as if he would have gone farther. And they constrained him, saying, Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in, to tarry with them. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, [or as he was sitting down to table with them,] he took bread, and

blessed it, and brake unto them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him. And he vanished out of their sight; [that is, he retired, and went away.] And they said one to another: Did not our hearts burn within us, whilst he talked with us in the way? and whilst he opened to us the scriptures? And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon. And they told them what things were done in the way, and how he was known unto them in breaking of bread."

Here ariseth a question, whether these two disciples did set out for Emmaus before the disciples knew of Mary Magdalene's having herself seen Jesus. You say, p. 648, 'It seems that these two had left the city before any of the women came with the news of Christ's personal appearance.' And presently afterwards you say, p. 648, 649, 'The smallest attention will show, that Cleophas and his companion do not here speak of Mary Magdalene's second information.' Le Clerc likewise says, 'Thatⁿ these two disciples set out for Emmaus before Jesus had shown himself to Mary Magdalene.' I believe this may be the opinion of many. I also may have said the same myself. But my honoured friend above mentioned thinks otherwise, as we have seen. 'They did,' as he says, 'make their report to the apostles, before the two went from the rest of the company to Emmaus. No notice is mentioned by the two in discourse with Christ of the women's having related their interview with Jesus, because it should seem, none of the company believed a word of what the women said,' Mark xvi. 11; Luke xxiv. 11. 'And none of the evangelists pretend to give an exact detail of all circumstances.'

Let us now go over the particulars of ver. 21—24, "And beside all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, who were early at the sepulchre. And when they found not his body, they came, saying, That they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive." It follows in the same discourse of the two disciples, ver. 24, "And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even as the women had said. But him they saw not." Referring to what St. John writes of

ⁿ Cum vero duo ex discipulis Jesu, mane ejusdem diei, antequam se Mariæ Magdalenaë stitisset Jesus, profecti essent Jerosolymâ Emmaüntem. Cleric. Harm. p. 487.

Peter and John visiting the sepulchre, chap. xx. 3—10; and to what St. Luke writes of Peter, chap. xxiv. 12.

It might be expected that now, after this, these two disciples should also distinctly mention the second report of Mary Magdalene, related by St. John, xx. 11—18, provided that report had been made to the apostles before the two set out for Emmaus. This omission is accounted for by my friend in the manner above mentioned: they take no notice of this, because they paid little regard to it. And does not this appear also in what the eleven say to these two when they came to them, and told them what they had seen? Luke xxiv. 34, "They said to them: The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon." They say nothing of Mary Magdalene, though she certainly had been with them before that time, and made her second report to them, "that she had seen the Lord, and that he had said these things unto her," John xx. 18.

Let me now cite some observations of your own, p. 652, ' As soon as Jesus departed, the two disciples made all the : haste they could to Jerusalem, that they might have the ' pleasure of acquainting them with the agreeable news. ' But they were in some measure prevented: for immedi- ' ately on their arrival, the eleven, with the women, accosted ' them, giving them the news of their Master's resurrection. ' " And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Je- ' rusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them ' that were with them, saying: The Lord is risen indeed, ' and hath appeared unto Simon." The apostles had given ' little credit to the reports of the women, supposing they ' were occasioned more by imagination than reality; but ' when a person of Simon's capacity and gravity declared ' that he had seen the Lord, they began to think that he ' was risen indeed. Their belief therefore was not a little ' confirmed by the arrival of these two disciples, who de- ' clared that the Lord had appeared to them also. Ver. 35, ' " And they told what things were done in the way, and ' how he was known unto them in breaking of bread," that ' is, by his prayer before meat. Mark however represents ' the reception which their report met with somewhat differ- ' ently; ch. xvi. 12, " After that he appeared in another ' form," *εν ετερα μορφη*, i. e. in another dress, the dress of a ' traveller, " unto two of them, as they walked and went ' into the country." Ver. 13, " And they went and told it ' unto the residue; neither believed they them." But there ' is no inconsistency between the evangelists; for though ' the greatest part of the apostles believed that Jesus was

‘risen, as Luke affirms; some who had not given credit
 ‘either to the women or to Simon, continued obstinately to
 ‘disbelieve, in spite of all that these two disciples or the
 ‘rest could say.’

I shall add somewhat farther from your Preliminary Observations, p. 39, where you say, ‘The male disciples being
 ‘the witnesses, upon whose testimony the world was to believe that our Lord arose from the dead, it concerned
 ‘mankind more to be informed of his appearances to them,
 ‘than to be made acquainted with his appearances to the
 ‘women. Luke knew this; and therefore, while he has
 ‘related the appearances to the male disciples, he has omitted
 ‘the appearances to the women altogether. It seems, the
 ‘brevity which he studied did not permit that both should
 ‘be told. In like manner the apostle Paul, summing up
 ‘the evidence of our Lord’s resurrection, takes no notice of
 ‘his appearances to the women, because they were not to
 ‘be the witnesses of this matter to the world, 1 Cor.
 ‘xv. 1—9.’

And here from your observations just mentioned, ariseth another consideration. For you say, that ‘St. Luke has
 ‘omitted Christ’s appearances to the women altogether.’ If that be so, we are not to expect, that these two should take any notice of Mary Magdalene’s second report, though it had been made to the apostles before they set out from Jerusalem. St. Luke’s words are these: ch. xxiv. 1—11,
 “Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they [that is, the women who had come with Jesus from Galilee, ch. xxiii. 55.] came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices, which they had prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments. And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them: Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen. Remember how he spake unto you, when he was yet in Galilee, saying: The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words. And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, who told these things unto the apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and

they believed them not." That is the account which St. Luke has given of the testimony of the women to the resurrection of Jesus. And it is very observable. I make no question, that herein is included Mary Magdalene's second report to the apostles, mentioned by St. John, xx. 18. And it confirms the supposition, before mentioned, that Mary Magdalene was not then alone, but that all the other women were then with her, though they are not mentioned by St. John.

These observations are sufficient to account for the two disciples not mentioning distinctly the report of Mary Magdalene, though they did not set out from Jerusalem until after it had been made to the apostles.

But there are other considerations, which may support the same persuasion. It is confirmed by the order of narration in St. Mark's gospel, ch. xvi. 9, "Now when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons." Ver. 10, "And she went, and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept." This is what St. John says, ch. xx. 18, "Mary Magdalene came, and told the disciples, that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her." It follows in Mark xvi. 11, "And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." Then, at ver. 12, "After^o that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country." This is full proof, that these two did not set out for Emmaus, till after that Mary Magdalene had told the disciples, "she had seen the Lord."

And, I pray, what is the meaning of his appearing to them in another form? You say, in another dress, that of a traveller. Which I think does not give the true meaning of the phrase. Grotius ^psays, 'in another dress, that is, 'different from what had been used by him.' And Dr. Doddridge, to the same purpose: 'in a different habit 'from what he ordinarily wore.' But neither does that, as I apprehend, fully represent the design and meaning of the evangelist's expression. I think, he refers to some appearances of Christ, which had been made before that now made to these two. What can that be, but "the appearance to Mary Magdalene," mentioned by himself, ver. 9, 10? This

^o Μετα δε ταυτα δυσιν εξ αυτων περιπατησιν εφανερωθη εν ετερα μορφη, πορευομενοις εις αγρον. ^p Εν ετερα μορφη, in alia effigie.] Habitu alio, quam quo uti solebat. Ideo παροικον habitantem in proximo, putabant. Grot. in Marc. xvi. 12.

seems to me to be the plain and evident meaning of St. Mark. And it fully shows, that Mary's second report to the apostles had been made, before these two set out from Jerusalem to go to Emmaus.

There is still another argument of great force, which offers to our consideration. These two disciples did not set out till eleven or twelve o'clock, according to our computation. Emmaus was little more than two hours' walk, if at all. They arrived at the village about three in the afternoon, or sooner, Luke xxiv. 29. As they were engaged in discourse, during a great part of the journey; we will suppose, that they made three hours of it. Consequently, they set out at twelve, or not much sooner. But before that, Mary had made her second report to the disciples, that "she had seen the Lord." And these two were with the disciples when that report was made. Mary and the other women went early to the sepulchre. They got to the sepulchre by the rising of the sun. When Mary came first to the apostles, as is related, John xx. 1, 2, it could not be more than six o'clock, or thereabout. After which Peter and John went in great haste to the sepulchre, and Mary with them, or after them, as fast as she could. Peter and John did not stay long at the sepulchre. But having taken a view of the state of things there, "they went away again to their own home," John xx. 10. Soon after these two apostles were gone away, the Lord appeared to Mary Magdalene, and presently after that to all the other women, who had gone up early in the morning with the spices. Then Mary and the rest came down to the apostles, and let them know that they "had seen the Lord," and they delivered to them the message, with which they had been entrusted, together with all the circumstances of his appearing to them. It could not be then more than seven or eight or nine in the forenoon. This is much confirmed by the circumstance observed by my friend from Matt. xxviii. 11, "Now when they [the women] were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done." It may be well supposed, that this part of the watch, or guard, came to the priests as soon as they could have access unto them in a body, when met together. Which may be reckoned between seven and eight, or, at the farthest, between eight and nine in the morning. At that time Mary Magdalene, and the women with her, came down to the disciples, and made their report to them, that "they had seen the Lord."

There can then no longer be any question made, but that

the two disciples were acquainted with that report of Mary Magdalene, and the rest of the women, before they set out for Emmaus.

St. Luke says, ch. xxiv. 33—36, “ And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them. Saying, the Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them: Peace be unto you.”

We should now observe the time, when these two disciples arrived at Jerusalem, and returned to the company of the disciples, whom they had left to go to Emmaus.

When they arrived at that village, and entreated Jesus “ to abide with them, they said: It is toward evening, and the day is far spent,” or has already begun to decline;” *ὅτι προς ἑσπεραν ἐστι, και κεκλικεν ἡμερα*, ver. 29. It was past noon, and might be near our three, afternoon. As they were sitting down to eat, looking more directly at Jesus, than they had yet done, they knew him. Our Lord thereupon retired, and they hastened to Jerusalem. Emmaus was about a two-hours' walk from Jerusalem. They might get thither about five, afternoon, more than an hour before sun-set; and, probably, did so. Soon after, our Lord came in. He might have been there before them. But he was willing that the disciples, and they that were with them, should be prepared for his appearing among them, by the testimony of these two, added to the testimonies of Peter, and the women, who had already seen him.

We proceed in Luke xxiv. 36, “ And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst, and saith: Peace be unto you.” Ver. 37, “ But they were terrified, and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit.” [Which shows, that there were still several, who did not believe him to be risen from the dead.] Ver. 38, “ And he said unto them: Why are ye troubled? And why do thoughts arise in your hearts?” Ver. 39, “ Behold my hands, and my feet, that it is I myself. Handle me, and see. For a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” Ver. 40, “ And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet.” Ver. 41, “ And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered; he said unto them: Have ye here any meat?” Ver. 42, “ And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb.” Ver. 43, “ And he took it, and did eat before them.”

The words, last quoted, "Have ye here any meat," &c. deserve notice. They should be compared with Mark xvi. 14, "Afterwards he appeared to the eleven, as they sat at meat, Ὑστερον, ανακειμενοις αυτοις τοις ενδεκα εφανερωθη. The eleven were yet at table, or were not yet risen up from their places. There is no improbability in this, considering the transactions of the day, and the great concern they had been in for their Lord, and their apprehensions from the Jews. It might well happen, that they had not dined before five, afternoon. Coming in, then, at that time, when their repast was just over, and finished, he might well put that question: "Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb."

Upon this you say, p. 654, 'He tarried so long with them, that they had time to make ready some fish for supper, which he took a share of.' But the other way of accounting for that question, appears to me preferable. "Have ye here any meat?" ΕΧΕΤΕ ΤΙ ΒΡΩΣΙΜΟΝ ΕΥΘΑΔΕ is properly said to persons now risen, or just rising from table. And they gave it him presently. He does not desire them to prepare, or make ready for him. But he asks, if they had any meat at hand, or any thing left. Beza disputes this interpretation of the word.⁹ But he acknowledgeth that it is the rendering both of the Vulgate, and of Erasmus. To me it appears very right. And Beza's objections against it are frivolous and ill grounded.

We proceed, Luke xxiv. 44, "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me." Ver. 45, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." Ver. 46, "And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." Ver. 47, "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Ver. 48, "And ye are witnesses of these things." Ver. 49, "And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you. But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, till ye be endowed with power from on high."

Of this appearance of our Lord to the disciples, St. John writes to this purpose, ch. xx. 19—23, "Then the same day, at evening, being the first day of the week, when the

⁹ 'Postremo vero unâ sedentibus ipsis undecim.' [Recumbentibus ipsis undecim. Vulg.] Id est, cum unâ domi essent. Vulg. et Erasmus de accubitu interpretantur, &c. Bez. ad Marc. xvi. 14.

doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he showed them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you. As my Father hath sent me, so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed upon them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

Thus concluded the first day of the week, the day on which Jesus rose from the dead. Says St. John, "Then, the same day at evening, before the first day of the week—came Jesus, and stood in the midst." The first evening, according to Jewish computation, began at three afternoon, and ended at six afternoon, or sun-setting. Of this use of the word, we have divers examples in the New Testament. In the history of the miracle of the five thousand fed with five loaves, St. Matthew says, ch. xiv. 15, "And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past." It was then about three afternoon. So likewise, Matt. xxvii. 57, "When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was a disciple." Every one knows that Jesus expired at three afternoon. At that time, called here the evening, came Joseph to take care of the body of Jesus. And when St. John in this text says, "the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, came Jesus:" he must be understood to say that Jesus came to the disciples, in that space of time, between three afternoon, and sun-setting, or six afternoon. And from the history of the two disciples who had been at Emmaus, [as related, Luke xxiv.] who had arrived just before Jesus came in, we have argued, that Jesus came in at five afternoon, or possibly somewhat sooner, when there was yet an hour's daylight. And I believe, that upon due consideration, it will be thought to be a strange conceit, which has been admitted by some christian commentators, that Jesus did not now appear to the disciples till after sun-setting, when it was night, and even late in the night: which is, really, to expose this history to the scoffs of infidels. St. John says, "the doors were shut," but he does not say that they were shut because it was dark: but for "fear of the Jews:" which they may have been all that day.^r

^r What is above said, is very similar to some observations of the author of

I have still one observation more to mention ; which is intended farther to confirm the supposition, that the two did not leave the other disciples, nor set out for Emmaus, till after the report made by Mary Magdalene, and the other women with her, “ that they had seen the Lord :” and also to explain more distinctly those words of the two disciples to Jesus. Luke xxiv. 22, 23, “ Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre. And when they found not his body, they came, saying, That they had also seen a vision of angels, which said, that he was alive.”

I think that these words refer to, and include, the second report of Mary Magdalene, and the women with her, which is recorded in John, xx. 18, “ Mary Magdalene, came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her.”

What I would now propose to consideration, is this : neither Mary Magdalene, nor any other of the women, saw any angel when they first went up to the sepulchre. They did not see any angel till some time afterwards, that is, not till after they had been down with the apostles, and returned back to the sepulchre. Nor did John and Peter see any angel when they went up to verify the truth of what the women had said to them. The appearance of the angels was not till after Mary Magdalene was returned to the sepulchre from the apostles : therefore the two disciples, in the words above quoted from Luke, xxiv. 22, 23, refer to the second report or testimony of Mary Magdalene, and the women with her.

Let us observe the history, as it lies in St. John's gospel, xx. 1, 2, “ The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them : They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.” She says not a word of the appearance of angels, or any information received from them. Therefore no such thing had happened.

It follows, ver. 3—10, “ Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together, and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying. Yet went he

the Remarks upon Dr. Ward's Dissertations, p. 286, &c. to whom therefore I refer you : for there the same point is handled more at large.

not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed, [that is, finding nothing in the sepulchre but the clothes, he believed that the body was taken away as Mary Magdalene had said:] For as yet they knew not the scripture: That he must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again to their own home." Therefore neither did these apostles see any angels at the sepulchre, or near it. For no such thing is here mentioned or hinted. It is also confirmed by St. Luke's account of the same visit or journey to the sepulchre, ch. xxiv. 12, "Then arose Peter, and came unto the sepulchre, and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." He seeth not any angels; nor does he receive any information from angels. He only sees, and views the sepulchre, and observes, that the body was gone, and the clothes were left lying by themselves. Nor could he forbear to wonder greatly.

We are next to attend to what follows the quotation before made from John xx. where at ver. 11, 12, "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre, weeping. And as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain."

When the two disciples, John and Peter, returned to their home in Jerusalem, Mary still stayed behind. "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre, weeping." And well she might, considering how ignominiously her Lord had been put to death a few days ago; and now the body was missing and gone; and, as she thought, removed and carried away, but whither, and by whom, she could not tell. In this distress, and now first upon this occasion, there is an appearance of angels.

"But Mary stood without weeping. And as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre; and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." No such beings had been seen before by any of the women, or the disciples, who had looked into the sepulchre, and been in it, and searched it, once and again. "And they say unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them,

Because they have taken away my Lord. And I know not where they have laid him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her: Mary. She turneth herself, and saith: Rabbouni, which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her: Touch me not: for I am not yet ascended to my Father. But go to my brethren, and say unto them: I ascend to my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God. Mary Magdalene came, and told the disciples, that she had seen the Lord, and that he had said these things unto her."

Since therefore there was no appearance of angels to the women, when they first came to the sepulchre, those words, Luke xxiv. 23, "And certain women, when they found not his body, came, saying that they also had seen a vision of angels, which said, that he was alive." These words, I say, must relate to the second report of Mary Magdalene, and the other women, recorded by St. John, in the verse just cited, ch. xx. 18.

I am not aware, that any considerable difficulties can be raised against this account. I think, we may safely follow the order of things related by St. John, who had seen and read the other gospels.

St. Luke, xxiv. 1—11, puts together the whole testimony of the women. But we know from St. John, that their testimony consisted of two reports; brought down to the apostles at different times, and at a considerable distance of time from each other, one made, before John and Peter went to the sepulchre, the second report afterwards, as we have seen.

When St. Luke says, xxiv. 12, "Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre," he does not intend to say, that happened not till after all was done, which is related in the former eleven verses. Our version indeed is, "then arose Peter," seeming to intimate, that he did not go to the sepulchre till after the message delivered by the women to the apostles, by the direction of the angels. But there is nothing of that kind in the original. The words are: *Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἐδράμειν ἐπὶ τὸ σημεῖον*: that is, "And Peter arising, went to the sepulchre." Or, 'moreover, beside the report and testimony of the women, "Peter also arose, and ran unto the sepulchre," &c.'

I shall now make a paraphrase of those words of the two disciples to Jesus in the way to Emmaus. Luke xxiv. 22—24, ‘“Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre. And when they found not his body they came, saying, That they had also seen a vision of angels.” [And they said they also had seen the Lord themselves.]’^s But in a matter of so great importance, and so very unlikely, we all thought it best to pay little regard to their testimony. “And certain of them which were with us, went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said. But him they saw not.” However it must be acknowledged, that beside the women, two of the disciples, and those of the best understanding, and the most eminent among us, have also been at the sepulchre. The occasion of it was this. Some of the women, who were very early at the sepulchre, came down to us in great haste, saying, “They have taken the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him,” John xx. 2. Whereupon two, and those the most eminent of the disciples, went themselves to the sepulchre, and found it even as the women had said, that is, that the body was gone, and nothing left beside the clothes, in which it had been covered. But him they saw not; [as the women have since said, that they have seen him.]

‘Whereupon, our Lord, as if out of patience at their stupidity and inconsideration, “says to them: O fools, and slow of heart, to believe all that the prophets have spoken,”’ &c. ver. 25.

These two do not mention the visit made to the sepulchre by Peter and John, last, because it was not made till after the women had seen “a vision of angels,” but, as the more considerable thing. The women’s testimony they slighted, “Their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not,” Luke xxiv. 11. For these two disciples they had some regard, but not so much as they should. And therefore our Lord says to them: “O fools, and slow of heart,” and what there follows.

^s I think, I have rightly inserted that in my paraphrase of that place. Dr. Doddridge seems to have been aware that so much was implied. Therefore, in his notes upon ver. 23, he says: ‘And what is added in the next verse, with relation to Peter and John, who are the men here spoken of, (“but him they did not see,”) may perhaps imply, that the women pretended also to have seen Jesus himself.’ And in his paraphrase of ver. 24, he says: ‘but him they did not see: though the women apprehended, he had actually appeared to them himself, and declared, that he was risen, and would show himself to his disciples.’

From all which it appears to me evident, that the two disciples did not set out for Emmaus, till after the report made to the apostles by Mary Magdalene, "that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her:" as related, John xx. 18.

This observation I have deferred till now, that I might not disturb and interrupt the preceding argument.

I have now performed all that I intended. For I never proposed to go any farther, than the appearances of our Lord to the disciples, and others, on the day of his resurrection.

Shall I now recollect, and sum up what has been said under this fifth and last article of our inquiry?

Early on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, and other women, who had come up with our Lord to Jerusalem from Galilee, and had often attended upon him, went up to the sepulchre, bringing the spices, which they had prepared. As they were going, they said among themselves, "Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? For it was very great." But, when they came nigh to the sepulchre, they perceived that the stone was rolled away. That obstacle therefore to their performing the intended office of respect, in embalming the body, of which they had been apprehensive, was removed. Which afforded them, for the present, a good deal of satisfaction. But when they had entered in, they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. This filled them with the utmost surprise and concern. Whereupon, with the consent and approbation of all the rest of the women, Mary Magdalene, and some others of them, ran down immediately, in all haste, to the apostles at Jerusalem, telling them, that they had been at the sepulchre, that they found the stone rolled away from the door of it; they therefore entered in, but found not the body of Jesus: "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, [said they,] and we know not where they have laid him." Peter and John therefore ran to the sepulchre, entered into it, and found every thing exactly agreeing to the report of the women. The body of Jesus was gone, but the clothes, with which he had been covered, remained, every part of them, and lying in great order. So that they could not but wonder greatly at what had happened. But as it was not safe or prudent for them to stay there, they soon went away again to their own home. But Mary Magdalene, and the other women, who had come back to the sepulchre from the apostles, stayed behind. And soon after those disciples

were gone away, there appeared to them two angels, and one of them said to them, "Fear not. Ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here. He is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go, quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead. And they departed quickly from the sepulchre, with fear and great joy, and did run to bring the disciples word. As they were going to tell his disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came, and held him by the feet, and worshipped him. Then said Jesus unto them: Be not afraid. Go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee. And there shall they see me. Now when they were going, behold some of the watch came into the city, and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done." So in Matt. xxviii. 5—11, or, as in John xx. 18, "Mary Magdalene came, and told the disciples, that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her." When she, and the rest of the women, now came down to the apostles, it might be about seven or eight, at the latest about eight or nine in the forenoon. Nor did the women, nor any of the disciples, go up to the sepulchre any more after this. These just mentioned, are all the journeys to the sepulchre which are recorded by the evangelists. Some while after the return of these women, and after they had reported their testimony to the apostles, two of their company went to the village, called Emmaus; where Jesus appeared to them also, and was known to them, about three of the clock in the afternoon, or sooner. And about the same time the Lord appeared also to Peter, though we cannot exactly say the place. Jesus having clearly made known himself to the two at Emmaus, as they were sitting down to table, he afterwards withdrew, when it was about three afternoon. "They then rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them. They arrived there about five afternoon, or sooner. Immediately after which "Jesus [also] came, and stood in the midst," and graciously manifested himself to them, giving them full assurance that it was he himself.

According to different computations, Jesus showed himself to his disciples and followers four or five times on the day in which he rose from the dead. First to Mary Magdalene, and the women with her at the sepulchre; next to the two who went to Emmaus, then to Peter, and at length to the eleven at Jerusalem, who were assembled together, about five of the clock in the afternoon. If we compute

the appearance to Mary Magdalene, to be distinct from that to the women, there are five appearances, otherwise, they are four only.

Thus I have digested the history of our Saviour's resurrection, and his first appearances to the disciples. I please myself with the persuasion, that I have done it in a plainer manner, than it has been done of late by some others. These thoughts therefore are now referred to your consideration. And I remain, with true esteem,

Sir,

Your friend and well-wisher,

E. F.

INDEXES

10

THIS AND THE PRECEDING VOLUMES.

N. B. The Numeral Letters denote the Volumes, and the Figures the Pages

INDEX I.

GREEK WORDS EXPLAINED.

Αλλοτριεπισκοπος	-	-	-	Vol. i. p. 208.
Απογραφή	-	-	-	i. 314.
Απογραφομαι	-	-	-	i. 276.
Βασιλευς	-	-	-	i. 89, note ^k .
Δαιμονιον	-	-	-	viii. 537, note *.
Δεισιδαιμονια	-	-	-	i. 202.
Ἑλληνισταί	-	-	-	x. 298.
Ενταφιαζειν	-	-	-	x. 286.
Ευλαβης	-	-	-	x. 317.
Ιεδαϊζειν	-	-	-	{ vi. 232. vii. 433.
Οικαμενη	-	-	-	i. 253, 268.
Παρακλητος	-	-	-	x. 134, 136.
Πρωτος	-	-	-	i. 317—328.
Σεβομενοι	-	-	-	x. 312—317.
Χαριζομαι	-	-	-	i. 73, 74.

INDEX II.

VARIOUS READINGS OF TEXTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

- Matt. i. 18. Vol. ii. p. 184.
 vi. 13. ii. 560. iv. 174, 527, 581. v. 12, 14, 56,
 144.
 33. ii. 556, 557. iv. 141.
 viii. 28 ; Mark v. 1 ; Luke viii. 26. ii. 556. *And see*
Wetstein upon Matt. viii. 28.
 x. 29. ii. 557.
 xiii. 35. iv. 140. vii. 424.
 xix. 19. ii. 554.
 24. ii. 558.
 xxiv. 36. iii. 157.
 xxv. 23. ii. 558.
 xxvii. 9. ii. 544.
- Mark ii. 9. iv. 235.
 vi. 3. ii. 558.
 xvi. 9—20. ii. 451, 454. iv. 297, 336, 473, 523, 585.
 v. 38, 39, 133, 166.
- Luke ii. 2. iv. 140.
 33. iv. 473.
 ix. 50. iv. 329.
 xi. 2, 3, 4. ii. 559.
 xxii. 43, 44. ii. 451, 454. iv. 474. v. 152.
 xxiii. 43. ii. 560. iii. 437.
- John i. 28. ii. 555.
 v. 4. ii. 451, 454.
 6. iv. 246.
 vii. 39. ii. 560.
 viii. 1—11. ii. 452, 454. iii. 437. iv. 246, 336, 474,
 523, 555. v. 7, 163.
 25. iv. 296.
 44. iii. 356, 437.
 xiii. 14, 15. iii. 21.
 xix. 14. v. 7.
- Acts viii. 39. iv. 474. v. 113.
 xiv. 19. v. 113.
 xv. 20, 29. iii. 23—36. iv. 390.
 xx. 28. iv. 159. v. 57, 105.
- Rom. i. 3. iii. 438.
 32. ii. 41. iii. 36. v. 12, 57.
 ix. 4, 5. ii. 175, 280. iii. 111.
 xii. 13. iv. 329. v. 58.

- 1 Cor. vi. 20. Vol. iii. p. 48.
 ix. 6. ii. 288.
 10. ii. 560.
 24. iv. 589.
 xi. 23, 24. iii. 37.
- Eph. i. 1. iv. 280—283.
 iv. 30. iii. 37. iv. 581.
 v. 9. ii. 642.
- 1 Thess. v. 21. ii. 561, 566. v. 123.
- 1 Tim. iii. 16. ii. 566, 567. iv. 384, 592, 593.
- 2 Tim. ii. 2. ii. 437.
 Tit. ii. 13. v. 102.
- Heb. xi. 37. v. 58—61.
- 1 Pet. ii. 23. iii. 44. iv. 589. v. 62.
- 1 John iii. 16. v. 40.
 iv. 3. v. 172.
 v. 7, 8. ii. 295, 567. iii. 46, 68. iv. 289, 336, 474.
 v. 40, 53, 54, 62, 102, 114, 149.
- Jude 1. ii. 512.
 4, 7. iv. 250.
- Rev. i. 5. v. 104.
 xxii. 14. iv. 159.

INDEX III.

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED.

- Gen. i. 2. Vol. v. p. 20.
 26, 27. x. 170, 171, 213 - 215, 229.
 28—30. x. 216.
 ii. throughout, x. 217—220.
 iii. 1—5. x. 220, 221.
 6—19. x. 221—225.
 14. x. 224.
 20, 21. x. 225.
 22. x. 172.
- vi. 1—4. x. 574.
 2. iv. 315.
 xlix. 10. ix. 71.
- Exod. ii. 11, 12. iv. 316.
 xxiii. 20, 21. x. 101.
 xxxiii. 15. ib.
- Deut. xviii. 15—20. iv. 316. ix. 72.
- Judg. xiv. 14. vii. 270.

- 2 Kings ii. 9. Vol. x. p. 124.
 1 Chron. xii. 18. x. 123.
 Psalm xl. 7. x. 82.
 xlv. 7. x. 95.
 li. 8. v. 133.
 lxix. 31. iv. 88.
 Prov. i. 23. x. 124.
 iv. 20—27. ix. 563—565.
 viii. 22, 23. ix. 164.
 Eccles. iv. 13. iii. 166, note ^b.
 xii. 1. x. 172.
 Isa. xxviii. 10. viii. 369.
 lxiii. 1—6. iv. 88. x. 248.
 Ezek. i. 1. iv. 316.
 Mic. vi. 1—7. ix. 136, 137, 138.
 Hag. ii. 9. ix. 74.
 Zech. iii. 1—4. iv. 316, 317.
 vi. 12, 13; xii. 10—14. iv. 317.
 xiii. 1; xiv. 9. iv. 318.
 Mal. iii. 1. x. 175.
 Matt. i. 1. iv. 555.
 iv. 1. x. 137.
 23. ii. 568.
 v. 3. ii. 370. iii. 437. iv. 90.
 4. iii. 437.
 6. ii. 371. iii. 437.
 44. v. 163.
 vi. 1—4. v. 123.
 13. iv. 527.
 viii. 24—26. i. 515.
 28; Mark v. 2. i. 450, &c.
 ix. 1. iv. 557.
 xii. 27. i. 510.
 28. x. 121, note.
 31. x. 137.
 43—45. i. 511.
 47, 48. iii. 378.
 xiii. 3—8; Luke viii. 5, 8. ii. 371.
 35. i. 423.
 xvi. 17—19. vi. 207.
 28. ii. 452.
 xvii. 21; Mark ix. 29. i. 513.
 xx. 1—16. v. 133.
 xxii. 11, 12. ii. 569.
 xxiv. 15, 16. vi. 408.
 xxvi. 39. ix. 320.
 xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26. ii. 454.
 xxvii. 46. ix. 317.
 62—66. x. 352—355.

- Matt. xxviii. 1. Vol. x. p. 358—362.
 17. iv. 169.
 19. vii. 637. x. 138.
 20. iv. 555.
- Mark i. 1. v. 155.
 23—26. i. 516.
 v. 1—19. x. 266, &c.
 39. iv. 584.
 x. 39, 40. iv. 585. v. 163.
 xiii. 32. x. 102.
 xiv. 51, 52. v. 349.
 xv. 25. x. 278—282.
 40. iv. 298.
 xvi. 1. x. 363—369.
 9. i. 460.
 9—20. v. 350.
 12. x. 381.
- Luke i. 1—4. v. 291—293, 370—372, 382—388
 2. v. 21.
 3. v. 160.
 ii. 1. i. 267—273.
 2. i. 306—336. ix. 517.
 25. x. 317.
 34, 35. vii. 63.
 iii. 23. i. 356. iv. 192.
 iv. 18. iv. 91.
 viii. 2. i. 495.
 x. 17, 18. i. 515.
 xi. 13. x. 136.
 xv. 11—32. iv. 277.
 xvi. 25. iv. 555.
 xxii. 43, 44. ii. 453. v. 152.
 44. x. 80, note c.
 xxiii. 43. ix. 316.
 xxiv. 12. x. 388.
 13. iv. 193.
 18. v. 160.
 31. x. 281.
 44. iv. 428, 432.
 49. x. 136.
- John i. 1—5. ii. 662, 663. vii. 627, 629.
 1—12. v. 452—456. x. 88, 89.
 9. iv. 555.
 14. x. 80, 90.
 15. x. 83.
 15, 30. i. 321.
 ii. 14, 15, 18, 19, 20. i. 250.
 20. i. 395, 396.
 iii. 5. ii. 372.

- John iii. 13. Vol. x. p. 107.
 v. 1. iv. 193. v. 163.
 18. x. 107.
 39. v. 35.
 vi. 44. ix. 247.
 54, 55. ii. 453, 570.
 vii. 5. vi. 190.
 6, 7, 8. vi. 191.
 39. x. 263, 264.
 viii. 1—11. i. 43, 44.
 56, 58. x. 83.
 ix. 3. i. 505.
 xi. 47, 48. i. 55, 56.
 49—52. i. 405—407.
 xii. 7. x. 286.
 20, 21. x. 275—277.
 xiii. 3. x. 87.
 14, 15. ii. 570.
 xiv. 16, 17, 26. x. 132—134, 264.
 xv. 1—7. ix. 241, 242.
 18. i. 321.
 xvi. 7—17. x. 132, 139, 140.
 13. x. 262, 263.
 14. x. 264.
 xvii. 5. ix. 589. x. 84.
 xviii. 15. v. 406, 407.
 xix. 1—8, 9, 12. i. 157, 158.
 13, 14. x. 278—282.
 25. v. 161.
 39. x. 283.
 40. x. 368.
 xx. 19. x. 280, 385.
 28. iv. 401.
- Acts i. 2. x. 141.
 ii. 8. iv. 289.
 15. i. 215.
 32. x. 108.
 iv. 4. v. 66. vi. 212.
 13. v. 400
 24—31. i. 515.
 v. 3, 4. x. 142.
 32. x. 141.
 vi. 1. x. 287.
 9. i. 516, 517.
 vii. 54. x. 107.
 viii. 18, 19. x. 142.
 ix. 19—25. v. 495—497.
 26—30. v. 315, 316, 497, 498. vi. 165.
 31. i. 101—103. x. 142, 143.

Acts x. 28. Vol. vi. p. 220, note ^m.

xi. 19, 20. v. 500.

28. i. 253—255.

xii. 17. vi. 230.

xiii. 1—4. x. 143.

xv. 20, 28, 29. ii. 571. iii. 22—35. iv. 174, 390.

x. 144, 145, 300—347.

xvi. 13. i. 115—117.

16—18. i. 497—499, 503. iv. 556.

16—39. i. 189.

xvii. 18. iv. 556.

22, 23. i. 202. iv. 556. vii. 319—328.

34. iv. 100.

xviii. 8, 17. iv. 556.

15. i. 200.

xix. 1—7. ii. 581. x. 145, 264.

xx. 22, 23, 28. x. 144.

xxi. 17—30. x. 339—342.

24. i. 222, 223.

xxiii. 3. v. 123.

xxiv. 14. i. 199. viii. 294.

xxvii. 2. vi. 46.

xxviii. 19. vi. 55.

Romans i. 3, 4. x. 103, 109.

ii. 16; xvi. 25. ii. 571.

v. 12. x. 235.

vii. iv. 592.

viii. 33, 34. iv. 527.

ix. 3. v. 153.

5. ii. 175, 280.

xi. 25, 26. ix. 85, 86.

xiv. 17. x. 146.

xv. 24. v. 58.

xvi. 5. iv. 557.

21. v. 58.

1 Cor. v. 9. iv. 592. v. 58.

v. 9. vi. 357—359.

9, 10, 11. vi. 359.

vi. 11. x. 154.

vii. 12, 25, 40. x. 347.

ix. 5, 6. v. 272.

20—22. x. 343.

27. iv. 556, 589.

xii. 3. x. 143.

7, 13. x. 147.

xv. 7. ii. 571. vi. 165.

24—28. ix. 161.

25. v. 58.

29. iv. 556.

- 1 Cor. xv. 32. Vol. x. p. 250—252.
 50. iii. 371.
 xvi. 2. v. 58.
- 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18. x. 149.
 iv. 4. viii. 506, 507. x. 110, 111.
 v. 14. x. 248.
 viii. 18. iv. 334, 436, 439, 444, 556. v. 282, 283.
 xi. 4. x. 154.
 6. ii. 495. iv. 480.
 xii. 2—4. iii. 199.
 7. iv. 481.
- Gal. i. 19. iv. 592.
 ii. 1, 2. vi. 225.
 4. x. 349.
 7—9. v. 322.
 11—16. x. 336, 337.
 14. vi. 232.
 iv. 4. x. 175.
 9. ix. 491.
 14. iv. 481.
 vi. 11. vi. 12—14. x. 351.
- Eph. i. 13. x. 152.
 15. vi. 129.
 15, 16. v. 17.
 ii. 3. iv. 289, 304. ix. 182.
 13, 19. vi. 217.
 18. x. 153.
 20. iv. 559.
 22. x. 151.
 iii. 9. x. 109.
 iv. 30. x. 153, 155.
 v. 18, 19. x. 156.
 vi. 2, 11, 12. i. 473.
- Phil. ii. 6. vii. 167. ix. 369. x. 82, 113.
 6, 8. ii. 163, 572. iii. 37, 38, 115, 200, 236. ix.
 609, 610.
 9, 10, 11. ix. 611.
 14. iv. 592.
 iii. 5. x. 200.
- Col. i. 15. x. 110—112.
 15, 19. iv. 592.
 ii. 9. ix. 377. x. 103, 177, 178.
 iv. 14. iv. 444, 544. v. 161
 16. iv. 384, 547. v. 18, 156, 161. vi. 141,
 149, 150.
- 1 Thess. i. 5, 6. x. 158.
 iv. 16, 17. iii. 200.
 v. 19—22. x. 156, 157.
 21, 22. ii. 650.

- 2Thess. ii. 1—12. Vol. iii. p. 173.
 4. iv. 556.
 iii. 17. vi. 356.
- 1 Tim. i. 18; iv. 14. x. 144.
 iii. 16. ii. 663.
 vi. 20. v. 284.
- 2 Tim. i. 15. vi. 60.
 16. iv. 557.
 ii. 8. iv. 100. and see on Rom. ii. 16.
 iv. 6. vi. 58.
 10. iv. 100.
 16, 17. vi. 49—51.
 16—18. iv. 451.
 18. vi. 59.
- Tit. iii. 3. ii. 572.
 10, 11. iii. 39, 40.
 13. iv. 385.
- Philem. 2. iv. 557.
- Heb. i. 1—12. x. 112—115.
 6. x. 94.
 8, 9. x. 95, 114.
 10—12. x. 115.
 ii. 4. x. 128.
 11. ix. 615 note *c*.
 vi. 4. x. 128.
 ix. 14. x. 158, 159, and 160, note *t*
 x. 5. x. 81, 82.
 28, 29. x. 160.
 xi. 35—37. x. 255—261.
 xii. 16. x. 326.
 xiii. 23. vi. 68, 99. 111.
- 1 Pet. i. 1, 2. vi. 261.
 12. x. 128, 129.
 ii. 5. ix. 416.
 13, 14. i. 88.
 iii. 3. ix. 36.
 iv. 15. i. 208.
 v. 13. iv. 443, 583. v. 78, 97, 100. v. 272—274.
- 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. vi. 360.
- 1 John v. 5—10. x. 161.
- 3 John 5, 6, 7. vi. 294.
 9. vi. 292, 295, 360.
- Jude 6. vi. 313.
 8, 9. vi. 312, 313.
- Rev. i. 2. ii. 707.
 ii. 24, 25. x. 319.
 vi. 12, 13. v. 78.
 vii. 1, 3. ib.
 xx. 1—3, 7. v. 79.
 xxii. 17. x. 162, 163.

TEXTS OF SERMONS IN THE NINTH VOLUME.

	PAGE
1 Kings xviii. 12	194
Psalms lxxxiv. 11	204
cxix. 59	115
60	123
Proverbs iv. 23	563
viii. 17	163
xxviii. 14	281
Micah vi. 8 (Three Sermons)	136
Matthew x. 16	1
xi. 12	439
xii. 36, 37	261
xix. 13, 14, 15	173
xxvi. 13	425
xxvii. 52, 53	324
xxviii. 12, 13	333
Luke xvii. 22	357
John xiv. 2	92
27	385
xv. 5.	240
xvi. 24	405
xix. 28, 29	290
30	299
xx. 17	366
29	347
Acts xvi. 31 (Two Sermons)	216
Rom. xi. 11 (Three Sermons)	60
xii. 2 (Two Sermons)	21
2 Cor. viii. 9	376
xiii. 14	394
Gal. iii. 13, 14	484
Eph. v. 16	470
Phil. ii. 5—11 (Four Sermons)	576
iv. 5	553
8	252
2 Thess. i. 10	44
1 Tim. iii. 16	460
iv. 8. (Two Sermons)	496
vi. 12	232
2 Tim. i. 5	186
James iii. 2	272
2 Pet. i. 15, 16 (Two Sermons)	514
Rev. iii. 18	450

INDEX IV.

AN

ALPHABETICAL CATALOGUE

OF

AUTHORS, SECTS, AND WRITINGS,

WHOSE HISTORY IS WRITTEN, AND FROM WHICH EXTRACTS
ARE MADE, IN THIS AND THE PRECEDING VOLUMES.

A

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Abgarus, king of Edessa	33	vi.	596
Acacius, Bp. of Cæsarea, in Palestine	340	iii.	583
Acts of Paul and Thecla in the second century		ii.	331
Acts of Pilate	33	vi.	605
Adamantius, author of a dialogue against the Marcionites	330	iv.	166
Adamites or Adamians, an imaginary sect		viii.	424
Addas, or Adimantus, a Manichee; near the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century		iii.	279
Adrian, emperor	117	vii.	92
Aerius	360	iv.	179
Aetius, an Arian	359	iii.	584
Julius Africanus	220	ii.	457
Agapius, a Manichæan writer of the fourth century		iii.	282
Agathias, writer of the history of Justinian	565	viii.	149
Agrippa Castor	132	ii.	309
Alexander, Bp. of Alexandria	313	iii.	566
Alexander, Bp. of Jerusalem	212	ii.	414
Alexander of Lycopolis, in the fourth cen- tury	} . . .	iii.	269
		vii.	574
The Alexandrian Manuscript . . . about	500	v.	80
Alogians, an imaginary sect		viii.	627

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Ambrose, Origen's friend	230	ii.	473
Ambrose, Bp. of Milan	374	iv.	330
Amelius, a Platonic philosopher	263	vii.	372
Ammonius, author of the Harmony of the Gospels	220	ii.	438
Ammonius Saccas, a heathen philosopher at Alexandria, master of Plotinus		vii.	446
Ammonius, a grammarian and priest at Alexandria, master of Socrates the historian	391	viii.	280
Amphilochius, Bp. of Iconium	370	iv.	290
Anatolius, Bp. of Laodicea	270	iii.	140
Anatolius, præfect of Illyricum in the time Constantius, a zealous gentile		viii.	69
Andrew, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia	500	v.	77
Angelics, an obscure sect		ii.	602
Anonymous author of the second epistle ascribed to Clement of Rome, written in the third century		ii.	55
Anonymous author against Artemon	212	ii.	402
Anonymous author of <i>Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos</i> , ascribed to Justin Martyr, written in the fifth century		ii.	128
Anonymous author of the epistle to Diognetus; the second or third century		ii.	140
Anonymous author of a Computation of Easter	243	iii.	71
Anonymous author concerning Discipline	250	iii.	59
Anonymous author in praise of Martyrdom; the third century		iii.	60
Anonymous author against the Novatian Heretic	255	iii.	62
Anonymous author of the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas	203	ii.	584
Anonymous author of Rebaptizing	256	iii.	66
Anonymous author concerning shows	250	iii.	57
Anonymous author of Circumcision; time uncertain		iii.	110
Anonymous writer against the christians	303	vii.	471
Anonymous author against the Marcionites; time uncertain		iv.	166
Anonymous author of the Acts of Saturninus and others; at the beginning of the fourth century		iii.	560

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Anonymous author of a Commentary upon the book of Job: the fourth century		iii.	587
Anonymous author of a treatise in August- tine's works	418	ib.	
Antoninus the Pious, emperor	138	vii.	124
Marcus Antoninus, emperor	161	vi.	132
Apelles, a Marcionite about	160	viii.	538
Claudius Apollinaris, Bp. of Hierapolis, in Phrygia	176	ii.	313
Apollinarius, Bp. of Laodicea in Syria	362	iv.	257
Apollonius, a Roman senator	186	ii.	323
Another Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists	211	ii.	391
Apostolical Constitutions and Canons: time uncertain		iv.	194
Apostolics, an obscure sect		ii.	603
Appion: in the second century		ii.	262
Apthonius, a Manichee, in the fourth century		iii.	283
Apuleius, a Platonic philosopher	164	vii.	198
Arabianus: the second century		ii.	262
Arator	544	v.	105
Archelaus, Bp. in Mesopotamia: the begin- ning of the fourth century		iii.	252
Arethas	540	v.	103
Aristides	126	ii.	308
Aristides the sophist	176	vii.	291
Aristo, of Pella	140	ii.	310
Arius	316	iii.	569
Arnobius	306	iii.	456
Another Arnobius	460	iii.	479
Arrian, who published Epictetus	109	vii.	85
Artemon, an Unitarian in the second century		viii.	570
Asterius Urbanus	232	ii.	410
Asterius, an Arian	330	iii.	587
Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria	326	iv.	152
Athenagoras	178	iii.	193
The Audians	350	iv.	176
Six writers of the Augustan history	306	vii.	468
Augustine, Bp. of Hippo Regius, in Africa	395	} iii.	270
		iv.	488
Aurelian, emperor	270	vii.	385

B.

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Bacchylus	196	ii.	325
Bardesanes	180	ii.	316
St. Barnabas	71	ii.	17
Basil, Bp. of Ancyra in Galatia	336	iii.	589
Basil, Bp. of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia	370	iv.	278
Basilides, a Heretic about	132	viii.	349
Venerable Bede	701	v.	144
Bemarchius, who wrote the history of Con- stantine	350	vii.	580
Beryllus, Bp. of Bostra in Arabia	230	ii.	477
Bruttius Præsens, a heathen historian	136	vii.	102

C.

Caians, or Cainites, an imaginary sect		viii.	560
Caius	212	ii.	394
Candidus: in the second century		ii.	262
Carpocrates, a Heretic in the second century		viii.	391
The third council of Carthage	397	iv.	486
Cassian, a principal defender of Docetism, about	190	ix.	611
J. Cassian	424	v.	27
M. A. Cassiodorius Senator	556	v.	109
Celsus	176	vii.	210
Cerdon, a follower of Heracleon in the second century		viii.	444
Cerinthus, an early Heretic		viii.	404
Chalcidius, a philosopher; time uncertain		vii.	570
Chromatius, Bp. of Aquileia	401	iv.	579
John Chrysostom, Bp. of Constantinople	398	iv.	534
Claudian	396	viii.	77
Clement, Bp. of Rome	96	ii.	29
Clement of Alexandria	194	ii.	220
Clementine Homilies: the second century		ii.	376
Clementine Epitome: fourth or fifth century		ii.	381
A Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's Epistles. And see Hilary, deacon of Rome	380	iv.	381
Commodian	270	iii.	181
Constantine the Great, the first christian emperor	306	iv.	3
Cornelius, Bp. of Rome	251	iii.	74

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Cosmas, of Alexandria	535	v.	92
Cresconius, grammarian among the Donatists	406	iii.	560
Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage, in Africa	248	iii.	3
Cyril, Bp. of Jerusalem	348	iv.	171
Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria	412	v.	13

D.

J. Damascenus	730	v.	146
Damascius	540	viii.	138
Damasus, Bp. of Rome	366	iv.	275
Decius, emperor	249	vii.	356
Dictinius, Priscillianist, Bp. and author	390	iv.	362
Didymus of Alexandria	370	{ iii.	275
		{ iv.	300
Dioclesian's Persecution	303—313	vii.	515
Diodorus, Bp. of Tarsus	378	iv.	376
Dion Cassius	230	vii.	338
Dion Chrysostom, a sophist	98	vii.	298
Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria	247	ii.	643
Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite	490	{ v.	72
		{ vii.	123
Dionysius, Bp. of Corinth	170	ii.	144
Dionysius, Bp. of Rome	259	iii.	127
Donatists	312	iii.	555
See a History of divers of their writers	iii.		560, &c.
Donatus of Carthage	328	iii.	553
Ælius Donatus	356	viii.	278
Dorotheus, Presbyter of Antioch	290	iii.	159
Dorotheus, author of a Synopsis of the life and death of the prophets and apostles, of no great value, probably composed in the sixth century		iii.	160

E.

Ebedjesu	1285	iv.	320
Ebionites		vi.	383
Elcesaites, or Ossens: their time uncertain		viii.	614
Ephrem, the Syrian	370	iv.	304
Epictetus	109	vii.	78
Epiphanius, Bp. in Cyprus	368	iv.	185
Epistle of the church of Smyrna, concern- ing the martyrdom of Polycarp	167	ii.	110

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons	177	ii.	160
Epistle to Diognetus		ii.	140
Eucherius, Bp. of Lyons	434	v.	52
Eunapius	396	viii.	62
Eunomius, Bp. of Cyzicum	360	iii.	590
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea in Palestine	315	iv.	69
Eusebius, Bp. of Laodicea	264	iii.	145
Eusebius, Bp. of Emesa	340	iii.	592
Eusebius, Bp. of Nicomedia	324	iii.	594
Eusebius, Bp. of Vercelli	354	iv.	244
Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch	320	iv.	149
Euthalius, Bp. of Sulca, in Ægypt	458	v.	68
Eutherius, Bp. of Tyana	431	v.	33
Euthymius	1110	v.	164
Eutropius	370	viii.	42
Euzoius, Bp. of Cæsarea in Palestine	366	iii.	595

F.

Facundus, Bp. of Hermiana, in Africa	540	v.	101
Faustinus and Marcellinus, Luciferians	383	iv.	250
Faustus, a Manichæan Bishop	384	iii.	283
Rufus Festus, proconsul of Asia	374	viii.	192
Firmilian, Bp. of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia	233	ii.	578
Fortunatianus, Bp. of Aquileia	340	iv.	236
Fronto, a writer against the christians, master to M. Antoninus		vii.	208

G.

Galen	180	vii.	300
Gallus, emperor	251	vii.	360
Gaudentius, Bp. of Brescia	387	iv.	388
Gaudentius, a Donatist bishop in Numidia	411	iii.	560
Gelasius, Bp. of Rome	496	v.	75
Geminianus or Geminian	232	ii.	588
Gennadius, presbyter of Marseilles	494	v.	74
George, an Arian Bp. of Laodicea	340	iii.	596
Gregory, Bp. of Neocæsarea	243	ii.	608
Gregory, Bp. of Illiberis	355	iv.	252
Gregory Nazianzen	370	iv.	284
Gregory Nyssen	371	iv.	295
Gregory I. Bp. of Rome	590	v.	126

H.

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Hegesippus	173	ii.	152
Heliodorus, author of the Ethiopics		viii.	16
Helladius, a grammarian and priest at Constantinople		viii.	280
Heracleon, Bp. of Chalcedon: time uncertain		iii.	269
Heracleon, a Valentinian, time and country uncertain		viii.	439
Heraclitus	196	ii.	261
Hermas	100	ii.	57
Hermias	200	ii.	263
Hermogenes, a heretic about	180	viii.	579
Hesychius, Bp. in Egypt	296	iii.	209
Hierax, a learned Egyptian	302	iii.	285
Hierocles, who set up Apollonius Tyanaeus as a rival to our Saviour	303	vii.	476
Hierocles of Alexandria, a Platonic philosopher	450	viii.	127
Hilary, Bp. of Poitiers	354	iv.	178
Hilary, deacon of Rome	380	iv.	381
Himerius, a sophist	363	viii.	3
Hippolytus	220	ii.	421

I.

Jamblichus	313	vii.	503
Jehudah, or Judah the holy, composer of the Mishna	180	vi.	506
Jerom	392	iv.	403
Ignatius, Bp. of Antioch	107	ii.	73
The Imperfect Work upon St. Matthew	560	v.	114
Innocent I. Bp. of Rome	402	iv.	586
John, a martyr in Dioclesian's time	310	iii.	222
Josephus	76	vi.	393
Josippon, or Joseph Ben Gorion	930	vi.	531
Irenæus, Bp. of Lyons, in Gaul	178	ii.	165
Isidore, of Pelusium	412	v.	8
Isidore, Bp. of Seville	596	v.	135
Judas	202	ii.	583
Julian, emperor	361	vii.	581
Junilius, Bp. in Africa	550	v.	106
Justin Martyr	140	ii.	125
Juvenal	100	vi.	638
Juvenus	330	iv.	168

L.

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Firminianus Lactantius	306	iii.	481
Diogenes Laertius	210	vii.	318
Lampridius, one of the writers of the Augustan history	306	vii.	468
The Council of Laodicea	363	iv.	182
Latronian of Spain, a Priscillianist	380	iv.	338
Leo. I. Bp. of Rome	440	v.	61
Leontius, of Constantinople	610	v.	141
Leucius, a writer of apocryphal books, in the second century		{ iii.	431
		{ viii.	514
Libanius, a sophist	370	viii.	14
Longinus	264	vii.	376
Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, and martyr	290	iii.	202
Lucian, of Samosata	176	vii.	278
Lucifer, Bp. of Cagliari, in Sardinia	354	iv.	247
Lucius, Bp. of Rome	252	iii.	77
Lucius, Arian Bp. of Alexandria, in the fourth century		iii.	597

M.

Macrobius, Bp. of the Donatists at Rome	370	iii.	562
Macrobius	400	viii.	83
Malchion, presbyter of Antioch	270	iii.	135
Mani and his followers: before the end of the third century		iii.	259
Marc, and the Marcosians; in the second century		viii.	428
Amm. Marcellinus	380	viii.	45
Marcellus, Bp. of Ancyra, in Galatia	320	iv.	146
Marcion, a follower of Cerdon	130	viii.	448
Marinus, successor of Proclus	485	viii.	132
Martial	100	vi.	635
Julius Firmicus Maternus	345	iv.	169
Maximin, an Arian Bp. in Africa	428	iii.	597
Maximin II. emperor, his letter in favour of the christians	312	vii.	539
Maximus: in the second century		ii.	262
Meletius, an Egyptian Bp., and his followers	306	iii.	240
Melito, Bp. of Sardis, in Lydia	177	ii.	157
Methodius, Bp. of Olympus, in Lycia	290	iii.	181
Miltiades, an apologist for the christian religion	180	ii.	201

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
M. Minucius Felix, an apologist for the christian religion	210	ii.	386
Mishna	180	vi.	505
Modestus	176	ii.	313
Montanus, and the Montanists in the second century		viii.	589
Musanus	176	ii.	313

N.

Nareissus, Bp. of Jerusalem	196	ii.	325
Nazarenes in the first century		vi.	384
Nepos, an Egyptian bishop	244	ii.	654
Nice, the council of	325	iv.	55
Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople	806	v.	85
Nicephorus Callisti	1325	v.	167
Noëtus	220	ii.	590
Nonnus	410	v.	7
Novatus, otherwise called Novatian	251	iii.	78
Novatians	251	iii.	95
Numenius, a philosopher, time uncertain		vii.	381

O.

Oecumenius	950	v.	154
Olympiodorus	425	viii.	90
Ophians, or Ophites, supposed to be the same as the Sethians		viii.	565
Optatus, of Milevi, in Africa	370	iv.	327
Oribasius, a philosopher, a friend of Julian		viii.	74
Origen	230	ii.	469
Origenists: an obscure sect		ii.	605
Paul Orosius, a christian writer about the beginning of the fifth century		vii.	55
Ossens. See Elcesaites			

P.

Pacian, Bp. of Barcelona	370	iv.	326
Palladius	408	v.	6
Palmas, Bp. of Amastris, in Pontus	170	ii.	312
Pamphilus	294	iii.	216
Pantænus, catechist at Alexandria	192	ii.	215
Papias, Bp. of Hierapolis, in Phrygia	116	ii.	116

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Parmenian, Donatist Bp. at Carthage	350	iii.	562
Paul, of Samosata, Bp. of Antioch	260	ii.	666
Paulicians, in the seventh century		iii.	446
Paulinus, Bp. of Nola	403	iv.	587
Pausanias	180	vi.	477
Pelagius	405	iv.	590
Peter, Bp. of Alexandria	300	iii.	237
Petilian, Donatist Bp. at Cirtha, in Numidia	411	iii.	562
Philaster, Bp. of Brescia	380	iv.	385
Phileas, Bp. of Thmuis, in Egypt	296	iii.	234
Philip, Bp. of Gortyna, in Crete	170	ii.	312
Philip, emperor	244	vii.	349
Philoromus, of Alexandria	296	iii.	234
Philostorgius, a learned Arian historian	425	iii.	597
Philostratus, his Life of Apollonius Tyanæus	210	vii.	487
Phlegon	138	vii.	105
Phœbadius, Bp. of Agen, in Gaul	359	iv.	253
Photinus	341	iv.	236
Photius, patriarch of Constantinople	858	v.	150
Pierius, presbyter at Alexandria	283	iii.	155
Pinytus, Bp. of Gnosus, in Crete	170	ii.	312
Pliny the elder	77	vi.	625
Pliny the younger, and Trajan	106, 107	vii.	17
Plutarch, concerning the death of Pan	33	vi.	620
Polycarp, Bp. of Smyrna, in Asia	108	ii.	94
Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus	196	ii.	259
Pontius, deacon at Carthage	251	iii.	55
Porphyry	270	vii.	390
Praxagoras, of Athens	350	vii.	579
Praxeas, an Unitarian, about the end of the second century		viii.	602
Priscillian, Bp. of Abila, in Spain, and his followers	378	iv.	337
Proclus, president at the school at Athens	464	viii.	130
Procopius, a christian writer of the history of Justinian	552	viii.	149
Proculus, a Montanist	212	ii.	586
Prodicus a heretic	between 120 and 130	viii.	417
Prosper, of Aquitain	434	v.	36
Works ascribed to Prosper	434	v.	37
Prudentius, of Saragossa, in Spain	405	v.	3

Q.

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Quadratus, apologist for the christian religion in the time of Adrian	126	ii.	307

R.

Recognitions: in the second century		ii.	364
Rheticus, Bp. of Autun, in Gaul	313	iv.	232
Rhodon	190	ii.	324
Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia	397	iv.	482
Rutilias	418	viii.	88

S.

Sabellius	256	ii.	662
Sabinus, an Arian ecclesiastical historian	376	iii.	600
Salvian, presbyter of Marseilles	440	v.	64
Saturninus, a heretic		viii.	347
Scythian, one of Mani's predecessors: in the third century		iii.	317
Secundinus, of Rome, a Manichæan author	406	iii.	289
Cæcilius Sedulius	434	v.	55
Another Sedulius	818	v.	57
Seneca		vi.	637
Serapion, Bp. of Antioch	200	ii.	264
Serapion, Bp. of Thmuis, in Ægypt	347	iii.	270
Servius	412	viii.	278
Sethians about	150	viii.	552
Severian, Bp. of Galbala, in Syria	401	iv.	570
Severus, Alexander	222	vii.	329
Severus, Septimius	202	vii.	308
Severus, Sulpicius	401	iv.	573
Sextus: in the second century		ii.	262
Sibylline Oracles: in the second century		ii.	333
Silvanus, Bp. of Gaza, in Palestine	310	iii.	221
Simplicius	550	viii.	148
Sisinnius, a disciple of Mani about	300	iii.	267
Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian	440	v.	171
Sophronius	390	iv.	391
Soter, Bp. of Rome	164	ii.	311
Sozomen, the ecclesiastical historian	440	v.	172
Spartian, one of the writers of the Augustan history	306	vii.	468

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Stephen, Bp. of Laodicea	280	iii.	146
Suetonius	110	vi.	641
Symmachus	200	ii.	326
Symmachus, præfect of Rome	384	viii.	220
Syrianus	450	viii.	137

T.

Tacitus	100	vi.	626
Talmud	500	vi.	{ 505 516
Tatian	172	ii.	147
Terebinthus, one of Mani's predecessors: in the third century		iii.	317
Tertullian	200	ii.	267
Testaments of the twelve patriarchs: in the second century		ii.	346
Thallus: time not known		vii.	121
Themison, a Montanist	211	ii.	391
Themistius	364	viii.	5
Theodore, Bp. of Heraclea, in Thrace	334	iii.	601
Theodore, Bp. of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia	394	iv.	392
Theodoret	423	v.	{ 14 173
Theodotus, Bp. of Laodicea, in Syria	308	iii.	146
Theodotus, the tanner, an Unitarian	308	viii.	572
Theognostus, of Alexandria	282	iii.	148
Theonas, Bp. of Alexandria	290	iii.	153
Theophilus, Bp. of Antioch	181	ii.	203
Theophilus, Bp. of Cæsarea	196	ii.	325
Theophylact	1070	v.	157
Tiberiau, of Spain, a Priscillianist	390	iv.	338
Tichonius, a Donatist writer	380	iii.	563
Titus, Bp. of Bostra, in Arabia	362	iii.	272
Toldoth Jeschu, written in the 14th or 15th century		vi.	{ 558 note ^a .
Triphyllius, Bp. in Cyprus	340	iv.	234
Tryphon	233	ii.	589

V.

Valens, deacon of Ælia, or Jerusalem, martyr in Dioclesian's persecution	294	iii.	221
Valentinus (the gnostic) in the second cen- tury		ii.	{ 256 note ^v .

	A. D.	VOL.	PAGE
Valerian, and Gallienus, emperors	253	vii.	361
Valesians, an obscure sect		ii.	600
Vegetius	390	viii.	61
Victor, Bp. of Rome	196	ii.	324
Victor of Antioch: a Commentary upon St. Mark's gospel, ascribed to him	401	iv.	581
Victor Tununensis	566	v.	124
Victorinus, Bp. of Pettaw, in Germany	290	iii.	162
C. M. Victorinus Afer	360	iv.	254
Vincentius Lirinensis	434	v.	41
Vitellius, a Donatist	344	iii.	563
Ulphilas, Bp. of the Goths	365	iii.	602
Ulpian	222	vii.	334
Vopiscus, one of the Augustan writers	306	vii.	470

X.

Xiphilinus, a christian, wrote an Epitome of Dion Cassius: in the 11th century		vii.	187
---	--	------	-----

Z.

Zosimus	425	viii.	93
-------------------	-----	-------	----

INDEX V.

AN

ALPHABETICAL TABLE

OF

PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

A

- ABERCIUS MARCELLUS**, to whom Asterius Urbanus inscribed his books against the Montanists, volume ii. page 412
- Abgarus**, king of Edessa, his letter to our Saviour, and our Saviour's rescript, with remarks, vi. 596—605
- Ablabius**, a Novatian bishop, iii. 103
- Abominations standing in the holy place**, explained, vi. 408.
- Abraxas**, this name and the gems called *Abraxæi*, as used by the Basilidians, viii. 352, 370—375. these gems used as charms by the heathens, 375. an examination of Montfauçon's figures, 377—381. from these gems the heathenish custom of using *Abrasadabra* as a charm, 383. arguments from Beausobre that these gems were not used by christians, and that Abraxas was not the god of the Basilidians, 383—387. it was the first of their 365 heavens, or the chief of the 365 angels, 374
- Abulpharagius**, see *Bar-Hebræus*
- Acacius**, Bp. of Cæsarea, iii. 583. wrote the life of his predecessor Eusebius, iv. 72
- Acclamations**, see *Applauses*
- Acesius**, a Novatian bishop at Constantinople, said to have been at the council of Nice, iii. 97. what Constantine said to him, ib. commended, 99
- Achaia**, the extent of that province, i. 34
- Achillas**, presbyter and catechist, afterwards bishop of Alexandria, iii. 156
- Acme**, a Jewess, put to death at Rome, i. 360
- Acosta** (*Uriel*) whipped in the synagogue at Amsterdam, i. 43

Acts of Andrew, and Thomas, and John, and other apostles, ii. 605. iii. 429, 434-5. iv. 97, 106, 132

Acts, or journeying of the apostles, forged by Leucius, viii. 535—538

Acts of the Apostles, why so called, iv. 569. the importance of this book, ii. 174-5, 279-80. v. 143. observations upon it, v. 388—398 ; in what part of the N. T. placed by the ancients, ii. 300-1. vi. 335-6, 346

Referred to by Clement of Rome, ii. 40, 41. by Ignatius, 82. Polycarp, 102. Just. Martyr, 133. the martyrs at Lyons, 162. Polycrates, 261. the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 360-1. the Recognitions, 372-3. and the Acts of Paul and Thecla, 333. quoted, and ascribed to St. Luke by Irenæus, 173. by Clement of Alexandria, 225, 234-5, 237. and by Tertullian, 279. received by the Nazaræan christians, vi. 386. quoted, and ascribed to St. Luke by Origen, ii. 495, 499. an uncontested book, and a book of authority, according to the same, 499, 500. received by Asterius Urbanns, 414. Hippolytus, 426, 436. received and quoted by Dionysius of Alexandria, 647, 695. by Cyprian, iii. 22. Pontius, 56. the author of Re-baptizing, 70. joined with the epistles in Cyprian's time, 51. a remarkable quotation of this book, 73. probably received by Novatus, 113-14. and the Novatians, 121. received by Commodian, 134. Victorinus, 176. Methodius, 194. Pamphilus, 229. Peter, Bp. of Alexandria, 239. received and quoted as a book of authority by Archelaus, Bp. in Mesopotamia, 258. Serapion, Bp. of Thmuis, 271. Titus of Bostra, 274. Didymus of Alexandria, 401. and Theodore of Mopsuestia, iv. 395, 402. both these wrote commentaries upon this book, 302, 395. whether received by the Manichees, iii. 341-2, 399—402. received by some of the Paulicians, 448. referred to by Arnobius, 478. by the other Arnobius, 480. by Lactantius, 535. the author of the book of the Deaths of Persecutors, 548. well known in Africa, 551. received by the Donatists, who in general received the same scriptures with other christians ; this book in particular, which is largely quoted by Petilian and Tichonus, Donatist writers, 564-5. received by the Arians, who likewise received the same books of scripture which other christians did, 581-2. a book universally acknowledged, according to Eusebius of Cæsarea, iv. 96, 118. ascribed by him to St. Luke, 99, 100, 118. who is sometimes said by him to have been of Antioch, and a physician. Quoted by Adamantius, author of a Dialogue against the Marcionites, 167. ascribed to Luke by Athanasius, 157, and Epiphanius, 189. received and appointed to be publicly read, by the *Apostolical Constitutions*, 226. mentioned in the 85th apostolical canon, 230. quoted by Lucifer of Cagliari, 249. Faustinus, 251. Gregory of Illiberis, 253. Victorinus, 256. Gregory Nazianzen, 287. Ephrem, 310. Optatus, 328. ascribed to St. Luke by Amphilocheus, 292.

Gregory Nyssen, 296. Ebedjesu, 321. Ambrose of Milan, 334. received by Jerom, and ascribed by him to St. Luke, 436-7. by Rufinus, 484. Augustine, 505. Chrysostom, 542—544. is in the catalogue of the third council of Carthage, 487. publicly read, well known, and much valued, as a book of great importance, 505-6. 542—544. received and quoted by Severian, Bp. of Gabala, in Syria, 571-2. by Sulpicius Severus, and ascribed by him to St. Luke, 575. received by Chromatius, Bp. of Aquileia, 580-1. Victor of Antioch, 582-3. Innocent I. Bp. of Rome, 586. Paulinus, Bp. of Nola, and ascribed by him to St. Luke, 589. received by Pelagius, 591. Palladius, author of the life of Chrysostom, v. 6. Isidore, of Pelusium, and ascribed by him to St. Luke, 10. as also by Theodoret, 16, 17, and note^s. quoted by Eutherius, Bp. of Tyana in Cappadocia, 33—35. Salvian, 65. Gelasius, Bp. of Rome, 76. Andrew, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 78. is in the Alexandrian MS. 82. in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, 86. and that of Cotelerius, 89. ascribed to St. Luke by Euthalius, 70. who also published an edition of this book, and divided it into chapters and sections, 69. ascribed to St. Luke by Arethas, 104. by Arator, who turned the whole into verse, 105. ascribed to St. Luke by Casiodorus, who wrote a commentary upon it, 113. received as a canonical book by Junilius, an African bishop, 106. ascribed to St. Luke by the author of the *Imperfect work* upon St. Matthew, 121. by Isidore, of Seville, 136. received by Leontius, 142. ascribed to Luke by Damascenus, 147. Nicephorus Callisti, 168. Œcumenius, 155. and Theophylact, 157. which two last mentioned wrote commentaries upon this book. It is in all the catalogues of the books of the New Testament. See *Catalogues*. Received by the Valentinians, vi. 345. always universally acknowledged, iv. 96. vi. 333-4

Rejected by the Marcionites, viii. 500

Acts of Paul, ii. 539. iv. 97, 98, 131

Acts of Paul and Thecla, ii. 304-5, 331-2. how quoted by Faustus the Manichee, iii. 430

Acts of Peter, supposed to be quoted by Clement of Alexandria, ii. 256. See iv. 98, 132. not received by the ancients, 98, 131

Acts of Pontius Pilate, and his letter to Tiberius, vi. 605—619

Acts of the senate of Rome, and of governors of provinces, and other Acts, vi. 608—610

Adam, his fall foreseen, and therefore the sexes made, v. 20.

Adam and Eve the first pair according to the Manichees, iii. 365

Adamantius, author of a Dialogue against the Marcionites, iv. 166-7

Adamians, or Adamites, viii. 424. probably an imaginary sect, 425. objections to this answered, 426-7

Addas, an ancient disciple of Mani, taught Turbo, iii. 267. See *Adimantus* and *Buddas*

- Addison*, his observations upon the fortitude of the christians in early times, vii. 175
- Adimantus*, a Manichæan writer, his history, iii. 279. whether he was the same as Addas, 279—281. his work much esteemed, 281. called Terebinthus and Buddas, 320
- Adrian*, his time, and general character, vii. 92. not reckoned among persecuting emperors, *ib.* his rescript in favour of the christians, 93-4. his letter to Servianus, 98. his moderation commended, 97. whether he intended to erect temples to Jesus Christ, 99—101
- Ædesius*, martyr at Alexandria in Dioclesian's persecution, vii. 480
- Ærians*, iv. 179—181. 195.
- Aetius*, an Arian writer, his history, iii. 584—587. his dispute with Athonius, a Manichee, 283
- Africanus, Julius*, his history, ii. 457. his learning, 461. his testimony to the scriptures, 462. a man of great eminence, 467
- Agapæ*, or *love feasts* among the christians; their design and use, and the time when they were celebrated, vii. 42-3, 280
- Agape*, a Priscillianist woman, iv. 340
- Agapius*, Bp. of Cæsarea, iii. 219
- Agapinus*, a Manichæan author, his history and works, iii. 282
- Agathias*, his history of Justinian and his character, viii. 149-50
- Agathobulus*, a Jewish writer mentioned by Anatolius, iii. 143
- Agelius*, a Novatian bishop of Constantinople, his history and character, iii. 99—102
- Agobardus*, Bp. of Lyons in the ninth century, ii. 329
- Agony*, a remark upon our Lord's *agony* in the garden, x. 80, note ^c
- Agrippa Castor*, a writer against Basilides in the second century, ii. 309
- Agrippa the Great, or the Elder.* See *Herod Agrippa*
- Agrippa the Younger*, son of Herod Agrippa, i. 27, 30. his several preferments, 30, 31. was a Jew, *ib.* had the government of the temple, 31, 84. his speech to dissuade the Jews from the war with the Romans, 82, 284-5. raiseth his palace at Jerusalem, 191-2. intercedes with Claudius in favour of the Jews, 191
- Agrippa (Marcus)* confirms the privileges of the Jews in Ionia, i. 185
- Agrippa, and his son Monbaz*, put to death at Rome by Vespasian, according to Josippon, vi. 537
- Agrippina*, mother of Nero, puts Lollia Paulina to death, i. 20
- Ainsworth's* account of the seven precepts of Noah, x. 301
- Akibas*, a Jewish Rabbi of great note, his history and character, vi. 513, 516
- Alaric*, his history, so far as written by Zosimus, viii. 118—122. See *Rome*
- Albinus*, procurator of Judea, for money releaseth prisoners, i. 82, 176. succeeded Festus, 80, 83, 176

- Alcibiades*, a martyr at Lyons, who led a very austere life, ii. 163-4. vii. 169
- Aldrich*, (*H.*) commended, i. 436
- Alexander*, *Bp. of Alexandria*, his history, iii. 566. his testimony to the scriptures, 567-8
- Alexander*, *Bp. of Jerusalem*, scholar of Clement of Alexandria, ii. 221. colleague of Narcissus, 326. his honourable testimony to the same Clement, 222. his history, 414—418. erected a library at Jerusalem, 419. his character, 419-20. he ordained Origen, 475. and heard him, 476. his sufferings and martyrdom, vii. 311, 357
- Alexander*, *the collier*, his ordination, ii. 615
- Alexander of Lycopolis, in Egypt*, his time and character, iii. 269, 277. vii. 574—576. his testimony to the scriptures, and to the christian doctrine or philosophy, 576—579
- Alexander*, one of the martyrs at Lyons, a Phrygian, and by profession a physician, vii. 165
- Alexander Severus*. See *Severus*
- Alexandra*, widow of Alexander Jannæus, a religious woman, i. 125
- Alexandria*, an ancient christian school there, ii. 216
- Alexandrian MS.* its time and contents, with remarks, v. 80—85
- Alogians*, said by Epiphanius to have rejected all St. John's writings, iv. 190-1. viii. 627. never was such a heresy, 628. Epiphanius's account of them, 629. a groundless supposition that the Unitarians of the second century rejected John's gospel, 630.
- Altar*, the communion table not so called in early times, iv. 212
- The altar to the unknown God* at Athens; the occasion of erecting it, and that the inscription was in the singular number, vii. 319—328
- The altar of victory*, an account of it, viii. 199—203. and see *Senate*
- Alypius*, Augustine's friend, iii. 279. what induced him to be a Manichee, 297
- Ambrose*, Origen's friend, said to have been at first a Marcionite, ii. 422. his history, 473—475
- Ambrose*, *Bp. of Milan*, his time, and character, and works, iv. 330-1. quotes apocryphal books of the Old Testament, 331. sent ambassador to Maximus by Valentinian the younger, 356. proposes terms for reconciling the Priscillianists to the church, 360. his confutation of Symmachus's petition, viii. 212-13
- Ambrosiaster*, quoted, iii. 26. supposed to be Hilary, and author of *A Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles*, iv. 382
- Amelius*, his history, and time, and testimony to St. John's gospel, vii. 372—375
- Ammianus Marcellinus*. See *Marcellinus*
- Amnias, of Philadelphia*, said to have been a prophet of the New Testament, ii. 414

- Ammonianus*, a learned grammarian, viii. 144
- Ammonius*, a christian writer, author of a Harmony of the four gospels, and other works; his history and testimony to the books of the New Testament, ii. 438—442. different from Ammonius Saccas, 439. whether his and Tatian's Harmonies are still extant, 442—447. extracts out of a Harmony ascribed to Tatian, 447—454. and out of a Harmony ascribed to Ammonius, 454—456.
- Ammonius Saccas*, a celebrated heathen philosopher at Alexandria, his history and character, ii. 439-40. different from Ammonius, author of divers christian writings, vii. 446—450
- Ammonius*, a learned heathen, and grammarian at Alexandria, and afterwards at Constantinople, in the fourth century, master of Socrates, v. 171. viii. 230, 234.
- Amphilochius*, Bp. of Iconium, his time and works, iv. 290-1. a catalogue of books ascribed to him, 291. his zeal against Arians, and other heretics, unjustifiable, 293-4
- Ananus the younger*, high-priest, a Sadducee, i. 84, 130. puts St. James and others to death by his council, 83
- Anatolius*, Bp. of Laodicea in Syria, his history and works, iii. 140—143. his testimony to the scriptures, 143-4
- Anatolius*, master of Jamblichus, iii. 143
- Anatolius*, præfect of Illyricum in the time of Constantius, a zealous Gentile, and an author, and much commended by Eunapius and Libanius, viii. 69—72
- Andragathias, a philosopher*; Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom studied under him, iv. 393
- Andrew*, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, his time and commentary upon the Revelation, v. 77—79
- Anencletus*, an early bishop of Rome, ii. 32
- Angelics*, ii. 602
- Angels*, an opinion of many of the ancient christians concerning the occasion of their fall, iii. 133, 190, 520
- Anicetus*, Bp. of Rome, ii. 95
- Annas and Caiaphas*, high-priests, i. 401
- Anonymous* author of the *second epistle* ascribed to Clement of Rome, written probably in the third century, ii. 55, 57
- Anonymous* author of *Quæstiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, ascribed to Justin Martyr, ii. 128
- Anonymous* author of the epistle to Diognetus, ii. 140
- Anonymous* author against Artemon, ii. 402
- Anonymous* author of the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas, ii. 534-5. his testimony to the scriptures, 586
- Anonymous* author concerning Discipline, iii. 59
- Anonymous* author concerning Shows, iii. 57
- Anonymous* author in praise of Martyrdom, iii. 60
- Anonymous* author against the Novatian heretic, iii. 62
- Anonymous* author of Rebaptizing, or of the Baptism of Heretics, iii. 66

- Anonymous* author of a Computation of Easter, iii. 71
- Anonymous* author of a tract concerning the true circumcision, iii. 110, 276
- Anonymous* author of a book in verse against the Marcionites, iii. 169. extracts out of it, 170
- Anonymous* author of the Acts of Saturninus and others, iii. 560
- Anonymous* Arian author of a commentary upon the book of Job, iii. 587
- Anonymous* Arian author of a discourse in Augustine's works, iii. 587
- Anonymous* author of a History of the Manichees, iii. 275
- Anonymous* writer against the christians at the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution, of whom Lactantius gives an account, vii. 471—474
- Anthimus*, Bp. of Nicomedia, his martyrdom, iii. 204, 210
- Anthimus*, Bp. of Tyana in Cappadocia, contemporary with Basil, ii. 625
- Antichrist*, opinions concerning him, iii. 134, 173
- Antioch*, Bishops of that church from the apostles to Theophilus the sixth Bishop, ii. 203. who was succeeded by Maximin, and he by Serapion the eighth, 264. their successors enumerated to the year 260, 589. the great prerogative of that city, that the disciples were first called christians there, iv. 558. the number of christians there in the time of Chrysostom, and of the poor maintained by that church, and the house to be seen where St. Paul dwelt, 561-2. christian assemblies more numerous there than at Constantinople, 562. and see *Councils*
- Antipater*, eldest son of Herod the Great, concerned in the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, i. 358. see likewise, 296. his design to poison his father, 360-1, 365. the time of his last journey to Rome settled, 363—366, his death, 361, 445
- Antipodes*, denied by Lactantius, iii. 519. believed by Mani, 309
- Antonia*, widow of Drusus, her excellent character, i. 246
- Antonia*, the castle at Jerusalem, described, i. 108
- Arrius Antoninus*, proconsul of Asia, how he treated the christians, and the time of his persecution, vii. 58—60
- Antoninus the pious*, his time, and excellent character, vii. 124-5. was favourable to the christians, 125. his edict to the states of Asia, 126-7. the genuineness of it asserted, 128—30. and 196. he wrote also in favour of the christians to the Thessalonians, Athenians, and all the Greeks in general, 127.
- Antoninus*, (*Marcus, the philosopher*,) his time and character, vii. 132—135. his passage concerning the christians in his Meditations, with notes and observations, 135—143. a general account of the persecutions in his reign, and that he was not friendly to the christians, and the reasons of it, 144—150. an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, and others, at Smyrna,

in the year 168, 150—155. the martyrs at Lyons in the year 177, 155—169. remarks upon that history, 169—176. a general account of a remarkable deliverance obtained by him in Germany, in the year 174, 176—196. that deliverance ascribed by some to the prayers of a legion of christians in his army, afterwards called the *Thundering, or Thunderbolt legion*, 177. observations upon that history, 178—193. a summary of the arguments upon that subject, 193—198

Apelles, a follower of Marcion, ii. 296, 324. iv. 330. his gospel, 463. received the New Testament in general, v. 246. his time, viii. 539. his connection with Philumene, *ib.* the story of his incontinence false, 540-1. did not discourage inquiry, 541-2. of his writings, 543. his peculiar principles, 544—547. what scriptures he received, 548—551

Apocalypse of Elijah, iv. 463

Apocryphal, equivalent to spurious, ii. 385

APOCRYPHAL BOOKS, not quoted by the apostolical fathers, ii. 28, 54, 73, 92. nor by Irenæus nor Tertullian, v. 244. forged by Heretics, ii. 156. how quoted by Clement of Alexandria, 250—258. much despised by christians, 545. in some of them a future state clearly mentioned, 548. few or none of them composed before the beginning of the second century, except the gospel according to the Hebrews, v. 247. the Acts of Paul and Thecla must have been composed before the end of the first century, or in the beginning of the second, *ib.* Jewish apocryphal books said to be referred to in the New Testament, ii. 544—549. how they are quoted by Origen, 531-2. by Cyprian, iii. 53—55. christian apocryphal books not quoted as of authority, by Dionysius of Alexandria, ii. 722. not quoted by Cyprian, iii. 52. nor by Novatus, 120, nor by Methodius, 201. used by the Manichees, 425. what they were, 429—431. a definition of such books, 428. forged by Leucius, 432. remarks upon them, 434-5. they confirm the history of the authentic books of the New Testament, 435. v. 245. used by the Priscillianists, iv. 366. rejected by Eusebius of Cæsarea, 132—146. and Athanasius, 156. *Apocryphal books* of the Old Testament, quoted by Ambrose, Bp. of Milan, 331-2. but he rejects christian apocryphal books, 333. no notice taken of such books by Gaudentius, Bp. of Brescia, 388. the controverted, or spurious, or apocryphal books of the N. T. which are taken notice of by Eusebius, 128, 132. apocryphal books of the O. and N. T. mentioned by Jerom, 460—468. much censured and condemned by him, 424, 440, 466—472. some of them composed with a view to explain the New Testament, 466. apocryphal books of the Old and New Testament mentioned with contempt by Augustine, 499. such books seldom quoted by Gregory, Bp. of Rome, v. 127. are of no authority, 138. how quoted in the imperfect work, 119. such books in the early times of christianity, afford no valid argument against the

- genuineness, or the authority of the books of the New Testament now generally received, 244—251. but confirm it, viii. 538
- Apollinaris (Claudius) Bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia*, ii. 313—316
- Apollinarius, Bp. of Laodicea in Syria*, his time and family, iv. 257-8. his Apology for the christian religion against Porphyry, 259-60, 263-4. his commentaries upon the scriptures, and his other works, 258—264. his peculiar opinions, 264—271. his works relating to those opinions, 272-3. his character, 273-4. wrote against Dionysius of Alexandria concerning the Millennium, ii. 703
- Apollonia*, a virgin martyr at Alexandria, before the publication of Decius's edict against the christians, vii. 359
- Apollonius*, a Roman senator, christian, apologist, and martyr, ii. 323. his remarkable martyrdom, vii. 563
- Apollonius*, an ecclesiastical man, who wrote against the Montanists, his history, ii. 391-2. different from Apollonius, senator and martyr, 392. says that Christ commanded his apostles to stay twelve years at Jerusalem after his ascension, 393. received *The Revelation*, *ib.* Tertullian wrote against him, 392
- Apollonius*, a stoic philosopher, in the time of M. Antoninus, ii. 318, 321
- Apollonius*, or *Apollonides*, reckoned among the followers of Artemon, ii. 406
- Apollonius Tyanæus*, set up by Hierocles as a rival with our Saviour, vii. 476—480. remarks upon his life written by Philostratus, 486, &c. his obscurity for a good while, 484—486. his letter to Titus, after the conquest of Judea, vi. 478
- APOLOGIES (early) for the christian religion**: to the emperor Adrian by Quadratus, ii. 307. by Aristides, 308. to Antoninus the pious, Justin Martyr's first apology, 126. to M. Antoninus the philosopher, his second apology, 127. to the same emperor, apologies presented by Melito, bishop of Sardis, 158. by Athenagoras, 194. by Cl. Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, 314. to the princes of this world by Miltiades, 202. In the reign of Commodus, three books to Antolicius, a learned heathen, by Theophilus bishop of Antioch, 203. in the same reign the apology of Apollonius in the senate, 323. in the reign of Severus, Tertullian's celebrated apology to the Roman presidents, 268—271. and his apologetical discourse to Scapula, proconsul of Africa; beside his two books to the nations, and many books of others, written in the first two centuries, or the beginning of the third, against Jews and Gentiles
- Apostles*, sometimes used in a lower sense, as equivalent to apostolical, ii. 247—249. v. 67
- APOSTLES**, had the largest measure of the gifts of the spirit, and therefore had the highest authority in the church, ii. 278. said to be commanded by Christ to stay twelve years at Jeru-

saalem after his ascension, 393. their employments before they followed Jesus, iv. 207. twelve in number, and four evangelists, 571. said to be fourteen apostles, 122. said to have chosen to themselves several provinces of the world, 318-19. staid a good while in Judea after Christ's ascension, v. 286. the time when they left Judea to go and preach the gospel in other countries, 313—325. were all of the Jewish nation, iv. 383. there are no certain accounts of the places where many of them preached after they left Judea, v. 297. they did not all die by martyrdom, iv. 90. v. 294, note ^b. *They* only under the New Testament write doctrinal and preceptive books of authority, ii. 697. iii. 52. iv. 108-9. v. 76, 98, 99, 265, 274-5. the whole world committed to them, iv. 558. not forward to write, 94. the usefulness of their writings, 114-15. their sincerity, 88. four were fishermen, two publicans, Peter chief, and two others also said to be chiefs, 558. were illiterate and mean, 559. most of them born in Galilee, v. 21. the prerogatives of their high office, iv. 558. one of which is, writing epistles to the churches as masters, which should be of authority, iv. 446-7. their just sentiments, and excellent philosophy, 563. St. Mark and St. Luke wrote, when their gospels might be approved by apostles, 505

Apostolical benediction, a sermon, ix. 394

Apostolical Constitutions and Canons. See *Constitutions*

Apostolical fathers, do not quote apocryphal books, ii. 92. general observations upon their testimony to the books of the New Testament, 112—114

Apostolical men, known companions of apostles, (such as Mark and Luke,) may write historical books of authority, ii. 191-2, 249, 255, 276, 697

Apostolicon of Marcion, consisted of ten of the epistles of St. Paul, viii. 500

Apostolics, ii. 603

Appeals, made to Rome from the provinces, i. 248

Apphianus, a martyr at Cæsarea, in Dioclesian's persecution, vii. 480

Appion; author of a treatise upon the six days' work, ii. 262

Applauses and acclamations, in use among the ancients, 668-9

Aphthonius, a learned Manichee, iii. 283

Apuleius, of Madaura in Africa, his time and works, vii. 198-9. his passages concerning the christians, 199—201. miracles ascribed to him by heathen people, 202, 476, 498. the design of his work called, *The Metamorphosis*, or *Golden Ass*, 202—205

Aquila and Priscilla, their history, v. 525-6

Aquila, author of a Greek version of the Old Testament in the time of Adrian, ii. 326

Aram, who meant by that name, iv. 394

Arator, his work entitled *Apostolical history*, in verse, composed out of the book of *The Acts*, v. 105

- Arbogastes*, an account of him, viii. 78
- Arch of Titus at Rome*, vi. 467, 479, 556
- Archelaus*, what part of his father's kingdom came to his share, i. 16, 268, 284. styled *king* in the New Testament, *ethnarch* by Josephus; the consistency of this, 16. was generally hated, 17. banished by Augustus to Vienna in Gaul, 17, 307, 445. the duration of his government, 17, 307, 445
- Archelaus, Bp. in Mesopotamia*, a work ascribed to him, iii. 253. the character of that work, *ib.* ascribed by some to Hegemonius, 254. the time of it, 255. its antiquity, 256. he speaks like an Unitarian, 257. his testimony to the scriptures, 257-8. from that work ancient writers against the Manichees took their accounts, 263. remarks upon it, 264—268
- Aretas*, successor of Obodas, king of Arabia, i. 291
- Arethas*, his commentary upon the Revelation, v. 103
- Aristides*, an Athenian philosopher, and christian apologist, ii. 308-9
- Aristides*, a letter of Africanus to him, concerning the differences in the two genealogies of Matthew and Luke, ii. 457-8, 462—464
- Aristides, (Ælius)* the sophist, his time and works, vii. 291-2. select passages from him, 292-3. passages concerning the christians, and illustrating the books of the New Testament, 294—297. his character, 298
- Aristion*, an elder, near the times of the apostles, ii. 117—119
- Aristo*, of Pella in Palestine, ii. 310
- Aristobulus*, a Jewish writer, mentioned by Anatolius, and said to be one of the seventy translators of the Old Testament, iii. 143
- Arianism*, compared to heathenism, ii. 677. said to be the worst of all Heresies, iv. 153. its time and rise, iii. 570. great increase, 571-2. the occasion of the controversy, 575. countenanced by some Antenicene writers of the church, iv. 482. the Arian scheme of doctrine, ix. 582—587. objections against it, 587—590
- Arians*, persecute the Novatians, iii. 99, 100. many of them disciples of Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, 212-13. divisions among them, 578. their numerous synods and creeds, *ib.* their want of moderation, iii. 579-80. said to be great persecutors, iv. 153. the cruelty of a persecution raised by them, v. 48. not allowed to be christians by Athanasius, iv. 153. their writers, iii. 583—603. free remarks upon their conduct in the time of Constantius, viii. 49, 50
- Arius*, his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia quoted, iii. 212. makes mention of the Manichees, 276. his history, 569—573. his works, 573. his character, 574. his opinions, 576-7. his and his followers' testimony to the scriptures, 581-2. excommunicated by the council of Nice, and banished by Constantine, iv. 59
- Aruobius*, his history, work, and time, iii. 456—462, his cha-

- racter, 462—465. select passages from him, 465—474. his testimony to the scriptures, 474—479. a fine saying of his, iv. 83
- Arnobius*, author of a commentary upon the Psalms, iii. 462, 479, 480
- Arnold (Godfrey)* his history of all Heresies, iii. 334
- Arrian*, who published the *Euchiridion*, and discourses of Epictetus, his time and character, vii. 35—37
- Artemon*, or *Artemas*, and his followers; an anonymous author against them, ii. 403. they received the scriptures, 404—408. viii. 570. charges against them as corrupters of the scriptures, weakened and confuted, ii. 405—408. their sentiment the same as that of Paul of Samosata, 403, 675. Artemas, mentioned by Methodius, iii. 194. the time when he lived, viii. 572. believed Christ was a mere man, born of a virgin, 570
- Ascension of Moses*, an apocryphal book, how mentioned by Origen, ii. 512, 543
- Ascension of Isaiah*, an apocryphal book, how mentioned by Jerom, iv. 463. See *Isaiah*.
- Asclepiades*, Bp. of Antioch after Serapion, ii. 417
- Asclepiodotus*, or Asclepiades, reckoned among the followers of Artemon, ii. 405-6
- Asiarchs*, or chief men of Asia, who they were, i. 173
- Asseman*, (*Jos.*) commended, iv. 306, 320, 325
- Assessment*, the nature of a Roman assessment, i. 273—275. sometimes made in the territories of dependent princes, 286—290. there was an assessment made in Judea, at the time of our Saviour's birth, 270—272, 289—300. objections against that supposition considered, 300—308
- Asterius Urbanus*, author of a work against the Montanists, his history, ii. 410-11. his charity and moderation, 413. his testimony to the books of the New Testament, 412—414
- Asterius*, an Arian author, his history and works, iii. 587—589. Marcellus of Ancyra wrote against him, iv. 146-7
- Asturius*, a Roman senator, and a christian, who buried in an honourable manner the body of Marinus, a martyr, in the time of Gallienus, vii. 371
- Athanasian Creed* considered, ix. 578—580
- Athanasius*, Bp. of Alexandria, his time, iv. 152. select passages from him, 152,-3. his bitterness against the Arians, *ibid.* condemns persecution, viii. 284. his testimony to the scriptures, iv. 154. received all the books of the New Testament which are commonly received now, and no other, 154—160. a bible sent by him to the emperor Constans, 159. the Synopsis of sacred scripture ascribed to him, not his, 161, 166. extracts out of it, for showing the writer's testimony to the scriptures, 162—166. the truth of Athanasius's account of Meletius and his followers, disputed, iii. 240—242. his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, iv. 430. Julian's great enmity to him, vii. 642—644. quoted, x. 103, note ^u, 142

- Athenagoras*, an apologist for the christian religion in the time of M. Antoninus, his history, works, and testimony to the scriptures, ii. 193—200
- Athenians*, their character, i. 202
- Athenodorus*, brother of Gregory, Bishop of Neocæsarea, ii. 620, 628
- Attalus*, native of Pergamus, one of the martyrs at Lyons, ii. 163. vii. 159, 163—166. whether he was favoured with the gifts of the Spirit, 169
- Audians*, followers of Audius, of Mesopotamia, their history and sentiments, iv. 176-7
- Auditors*, among the Manichees, an account of them, iii. 290—294. needed purification after death, 370. their misery, 442
- Augustan Writers*, six in number, an account of them, vii. 468—470
- Augustine, Bp. of Hippo Regius in Africa*, his character of the Sibylline oracles, ii. 335, 344. how long he was with the Manichees, iii. 277. his zeal for Manichæism, 279, 445. by what arguments he was misled, 345, 348. his writings against them, 270. particularly against Faustus, 283. asserted free-will against them, 274, 369. commended, 444. his fine passages, showing the genuineness and authority of the scriptures of the New Testament, 420—424. his charity and moderation toward the Manichees, 444. his time, iv. 489. his character, and compared with Jerom, *ib.* what acquaintance he had with the Greek language, 490-1. his testimony to the scriptures, 492, &c. his judicious observations upon the conduct of St. Peter and St. Paul towards Jews and Gentiles, and towards each other, vii. 431—436. and his good sense acknowledged, 436. See also, x. 338. his excellent observations upon idols and heathen deities, vii. 458, note ^o. select passages from him, iv. 527—533. a passage in him amended, 526. his quotations of the work called *The Philosophy of Oracles*, and remarks upon them, vii. 460—466. his account of the treatment given to heathen people by christian magistrates, viii. 274-5. the occasion of writing his large work, *Of the City of God*, 253. quotations from him, x. 81, note ^e. 85, 103, note ^u. referred to, 117, 177. his account of the Heretics, Adamians, viii. 424. Cerdon, 446. Leucius, 515. the Montanists, 600
- Augustus*, his decree in favour of the Jews in Asia and Cyrene, i. 186. several computations of his reign, 373. the nature of this title of Augustus, 382. his jest upon Herod for killing his sons, 353
- Aurelian*, his treatment of Zenobia and Longinus, vii. 378. his time and character, 385. how the christians were mentioned by him in a letter to the senate of Rome, 385-6. his conduct towards Paul of Samosata, Bp. of Antioch, ii. 671. vii. 387. his persecution of the christians, 387—389
- Authentic Letters*, as used by Tertullian, explained, ii. 284—288
- Autolicus*, a learned heathen of the second century, ii. 203. to

whom Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, sent his *Apology for the christian religion*, vii. 209

B

Babylas, Bp. of Antioch, a martyr under Decius, vii. 357

Bacchanalia, prohibited by the Roman senate, i. 183

Bacchylus, Bp. of Corinth, and writer in the second century, ii. 325

Bagoas, an eunuch in the court of Herod the Great, i. 293. bantered by Josephus, 295

Baldwinus, (*Fr.*) his judicious observations upon Pliny's letter to Trajan concerning the christians, vii. 34, 53. and upon Trajan's rescript, 51, note ^t. his remark upon the temper of Severus toward the christians, vii. 309. his observation concerning Papiusian, 318

Baluze (*Stephen*) quoted, iv. 12, 18

Baptism, had its original from John, iv. 174. women not initiated among the Jews by baptism, x. 313-14. christian baptism, how misrepresented by Julian, vii. 635-6. by Zosimus, viii. 101-2

Barcabbas, and *Barcoph*, or *Parcor*, their prophecies were oriental books, and not forged by Basilides, viii. 390

Bar-Cepha, *Moses*, his time, ii. 460

Barchochebas, a Jewish impostor, who set himself up for the Messiah, in the time of Adrian, vi. 392, 513

Bardesanes, the *Syrian*, his age, and whether the same as the Babylonian, ii. 318-323. his history and works, 316-319. composed 150 Psalms, in imitation of David's Psalter, 319. believed the unity of God, viii. 322

Bar-Hebræus (*Gregory*) called *Abulpharagius*, his time, ii. 416

Barnabas (*St.*) his history, and the character of the epistle ascribed to him, ii. 17-20. mentioned by Jerom, 18. iv. 458, 464-5. to whom that epistle was written, ii. 19. when written, *ib.* not a part of canonical scripture though genuine, iv. 97, 105-108, 128. v. 269-275. how quoted by Clement of Alexandria, ii. 18, 247. by Origen, 18, 528. he was not an apostle, v. 270-275. reckoned by Clement of Alexandria an apostolical man, or an apostle, in the lower sense of the word, ii. 18, 248-9. not reckoned an apostle by Theodoret, v. 22. said by Tertullian to be the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 288

Baronius, his misrepresentation of Pliny, i. 262. thought Cyrenius was twice governor of Syria, 312

Barratier (*J. B.*) his judgment concerning the *Constitutions*, iv. 201. his observations upon some works of Theodoret, v. 15

Barsabas, surnamed *Justus*, Acts i. 23. a miracle wrought upon him, related by Papias, ii. 118

Bar-Salibi (*Dionysius*) Bp. of Amida in Mesopotamia; his time, ii. 460

- Bartholomew (St.)* said to have preached the gospel in India, and to have left there St. Matthew's gospel, ii. 217
- Baruch*, not received as a canonical book by Jerom, iv. 422, 425
- Basil*, Bp. of Ancyra, an Arian, or Semi-Arian, his history and works, iii. 589
- Basil*, Bp. of *Cæsarea, in Cappadocia*, his time and works, iv. 278-9. scriptures received by him, 279. marks of respect for them, 283. a passage of his relating to the inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians considered, 280—283. his honourable testimony to Gregory Thaumaturgus, ii. 621. remarks upon it, 627-8
- Basilides of Alexandria*, next after Saturninus, his character, viii. 365. see the *Contents of his chapter*, viii. his time, and the account of his heresy, ii. 309-10. viii. 349—352. confuted by Agrippa Castor, ii. 309. an examination of several opinions attributed to him, viii. 353-4. his opinion concerning Christ, 356—359. his sentiments according to Beausobre, 360-1. his definition of faith, 370. he believed that the soul only would be saved, 363. he is said to have written a gospel, ii. 310, 533-4. iv. 463. viii. 389. probably this is his 24 books of commentaries, 389. falsely accused of believing the indifference of actions, and of using magic, 363—369. the scriptures received by him, 387—389. his followers are said to have used spurious books, ii. 547. the Basilidians resembled the Valentinians in many respects, viii. 368. these accounts prove that the knowledge of the scriptures was much diffused in the world, 391
- Basnage (S.)* his solution concerning the different names of Herodias's first husband, rejected, i. 410-11. quoted, with a remark concerning him, iii. 242. his remarks upon the prodigies preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, as related by Josephus, vi. 454. his judicious observations upon the accounts of M. Antoninus's deliverance in Germany, vii. 181
- Bassianus*, put to death by Constantine, iv. 40
- Batricides*, his peculiar opinion concerning Simon the just, i. 433
- Bayle*, his remarks upon Phlegon, vii. 115. his observation upon the agreement of pagan and christian persecutions, 474. upon the miracles ascribed to Apuleius, 498. a quotation from his article *Cainites*, viii. 319
- Beausobre, (J. de)* his opinion of the author of the *Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs*, ii. 347. quoted and commended, ii. 590, 596, 663. iii. 191. iv. 57, 140, 250, 325, 380. his vindication of the Manichees from some aspersions cast upon them, iii. 295-6, his observations upon the Manichean notion of the design of Christ's coming, 383-4. his account of the Ebionites, and Nazarene christians, 441, note¹. his history of the Manichees, and his freedom of thinking commended, 438-9, note², 449—453. his sentiment concerning the epistle to the

- Hebrews, iv. 139-40. his characters of Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, 380. quoted, v. 283-4, 387-8. vi. 93, 131. and elsewhere; his observations on the Marcionite notion of Christ's delivering the wicked in hell, but leaving the good, viii. 470-1. quoted, 321, 354, 357, 359-60, 365, 454, 540. x. 82, 110, 177, and in many other places.
- Beansobre and L'Enfant*, quoted, iii. 116, 126. x. 141
- Bede (Venerable)* his time and testimony to the scriptures, v. 144-5
- Bemarchius*, his history of Constantine, which was favourable to him, vii. 580
- Bengelius (J. A.)* quoted, v. 54, 61
- Benson (Dr. G.)* quoted, i. 514-15. ii. 572. iv. 159, note ^d, 169, note ⁱ. v. 475. vi. 6, 20, 181, note ^f, 283, 285-6, 315-16, 360. x. 158. and elsewhere.
- Bentley (Dr. R.)* quoted, iv. 526. v. 125. x. 3. his remarks upon Julian's ridicule of christian baptism, vii. 636. his remarks upon Zosimus, viii. 126
- Bernice*, her descent, i. 27, 32. envied her sister Drusilla, 28. her character, 32. respected by Titus, *ib.* interceded with her brother Agrippa, in behalf of Justus Tiberias, 74. kept a vow at Jerusalem, 219. first married to her uncle Herod, king of Chalcis, afterwards to Polemon, 27, 411, note ⁱ
- Beryllus*, Bp. of Bostra, ii. 421. his history and time, 477-8
- Beza (Theodore)* his solution concerning Cyrenius's enrolment, i. 329. his judgment concerning the *Revelation*, ii. 715. quoted, x. 84, 110, 375, 384
- Bible*, the origin of that word, v. 256
- Biblias*, one of the martyrs at Lyons, vii. 161
- Birth, natural*, how the Manichees speak of it, iii. 363, 367
- Biscoe (R.)* quoted, i. 498. v. 487, 522, 525
- Bishops*, charged with pride by Jerom, iv. 482. their office easy when slightly performed; but difficult if well performed, 533. See also *Christian clergy*.
- Bishops and elders*, at first all one, v. 57
- Blackwall (A.)* quoted, ii. 715—717
- Blandina*, maid-servant, and martyr at Lyons, ii. 163. her grievous sufferings, and wonderful patience under them, vii. 159—165
- Blatius*, a Valentinian, to whom Irenæus wrote a letter, ii. 166.
- Blondel (D.)* his confutation of the opinion of Grotius concerning the time of the *Revelation*, and St. John's banishment in Patmos, v. 417-18. quoted, vi. 481, 499
- Blood* forbidden to be eaten, in Gen. ix. 4. x. 302
- Boanerges*, on what account our Lord gave that surname to St. John, and his brother James, v. 401—404
- Bonosus*, bishop, and follower of Photinus, iv. 244
- Bower (A.)* remarks upon his account of the Manichees, iii.

- 449—455. his history of the popes quoted, 244, note ^e. v. 28, 32, 35
- Brekel* quoted, viii. 345
- Britain*, christians there in the time of Eusebius of Cæsarea, iv. 89. of Chrysostom, 560. of Theodoret, v. 24. and of Gregory, bishop of Rome, 134
- Bruttius Præsens*, his time, and his testimony to Domitian's persecution, vii. 102—104
- Buddas*, a disciple of Mani, said to have taken that name instead of Terebinthus, iii. 261. no bad design therein, iii. 319, the same as *Addas*, 320. the common accounts of him not to be relied upon, 319
- Buddeus (J. Fr.)* quoted, iv. 432
- Burial*, allowed to malefactors in Judea, i. 169-70
- Burnet (Bishop)* an observation of his, concerning persecutors, iv. 50
- Burning the scriptures, and concerning traitors*, in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 549—552
- Burrhus*, captain of the guard to Nero, i. 245

C

- Cæcilian*, Bp. of Carthage, charges against him by the Donatists, iii. 554—556. was present at the council of Nice, iv. 57
- Cæsarea*, in Palestine, its inhabitants, i. 14, 193. a library erected there by Pamphilus, iii. 216-17, 223. it was repaired by *Euzoïus*, Bp. of that city, 223. made use of by Jerom, *ib.* and Eusebius, iv. 84. and Euthalius, v. 68. destroyed before the middle of the seventh century, iii. 226
- Caians, or Cainites*, supposed a part of the Sethians, viii. 562-3. the accounts of them from Epiphanius and Irenæus, incredible, 560—562. no sect ever called themselves by that name, or professed such principles, 564-5
- Caiaphas*, high priest when our Saviour was crucified, i. 149-50. called Joseph by Josephus, 416
- Caius*, adopted son of Augustus, his journey through Judea, i. 302
- Caius, or Gaius*, to whom St. John wrote his third epistle, vi. 288-9
- Caius*, his history and time, ii. 394. said to have been a disciple of Irenæus, 395. did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, 395, 397, 399. did not receive the *Revelation*, 401-2, 699, 700. not certain that he was a presbyter of Rome, 395, 398. the Dialogue with Proculus a Montanist, the only piece rightly ascribed to him, 396, 400. what he writes of the martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, 396. how he reckons St. Paul's epistles, 397—400. the reason why he did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews, considered, 398—400

- Calama, in Numidia*, a disturbance there in the year 408, occasioned by Gentile worship, viii. 245-6
- Caligula*, his attempt to set up his statue at Jerusalem, i. 101. favoured Herod Agrippa, 247
- Calvin, (J.)* quoted, x. 110, 172
- Calumnies upon the Primitive Christians*, what they were, and how they may be accounted for, ii. 337-8. vi. 388—392, 514-15. the notice taken of them by Arnobius, iii. 471. and by Lactantius, 502
- Cambridge manuscript*, character of the, iii. 29. the same with Stephen's second MS. 33
- Camerarius. (Joach.)* his judgment concerning *The Revelation*, ii. 715
- Canon*, several senses of the word, v. 257. that word, and *Canonical*, much used, denoting books of the highest authority, v. 258—260
- Canon of the O. T.* the Jewish canon, received by Melito, ii. 158. by Jerom, iv. 425, 495. by Rufinus, 484, 495. Augustine, 492—498. Chrysostom, 535—537. Theodoret, v. 16. Cosmas of Alexandria, 92-3. Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 126—129. Leontius, 141—143. generally regarded by christians, 87, 90
- Canon of the scriptures of the N. T.* general observations upon it, v. 264—269. how it has been formed, 276—281. not settled by any authority universally acknowledged among christians in the time of Eusebius of Cæsarea, iv. 100-1. nor in the time of Augustine, 494. nor in the time of Cosmas of Alexandria, v. 99. nor in the time of Cassiodorius, 112. nevertheless there was a general agreement among christians upon this head, *ib.* nor were there any books received as sacred by christians in former times, beside those now generally received by us, *ib.* and 87, 90, 99, 139, 143, 169
- Authors, who had the same canon of the New Testament, with that which is generally received in our times*; Athanasius, iv. 154-5. Cyril of Jerusalem, excepting that he has not the Revelation, 172-3. In like manner the council of Laodicea, iv. 182-3. Epiphanius has the same as ours, 186-7. so likewise Basil, 279. Gregory Nazianzen, 287-8. Amphilocheus, 292. Gregory Nyssen, 295-6. Jerom, 435-6. Rufinus, 483-4. the third council of Carthage, 486-7. Augustine, 493—495. Innocent I. bishop of Rome, 586. Isidore of Pelusium, v. 10. Cyril of Alexandria, 13, 14. Cassian, 29. Prosper of Aquitain, 36, 37. Eucherius, Bp. of Lyons, 52, 53. Sedulius, 61. Leo, Bp. of Rome, 62, 63. Salvian, 65. Dionysius, called the Areopagite, 74. Gelasius, Bp. of Rome, 75, 76. Andrew, 78. Facundus, 101-2. Arethas, 104. Cassiodorius, 113. the author of the *Imperfect Work*, 121. Photius, 150. Oecumenius, 154—156. Nicephorus Callisti, 167—169. Theophylact, excepting the Revelation, 161-2

- Canterbury* (*The Archbishop of*) his sermon quoted with respect, viii. 283
- Canticles*, (*The book of*) quoted by Ephrem, iv. 308-9. Pacian, 326. Ambrose of Milan, 331. Commentaries upon it by Rheticius, 232. and by Triphyllus, 234. received by Paulinus, 588. Theodoret, v. 15. Arethas, 103. the author of the *Imperfect Work*, 118. Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 126. is in the catalogue of Dionysius, called the Areopagite, 74. in the Alexandrian MS. 82. See *Solomon*
- Capernaum*, called our Lord's own city, and why, iv. 557
- Capito*, collector of the Roman tribute in Judea, i. 92, note °
- Capitolinus*, (*Jul.*) his account of M. Antoninus's deliverance in Germany, vii. 189
- Captain of the temple*, a Jewish officer, i. 46, 109-10
- Captain of the guard*, at Rome, prisoners sent to him from the provinces, i. 249. sometimes there were two, *ib.*
- Carabas*, a distracted fellow at Alexandria, i. 166
- Caracalla*, a story told of him, when young, by Spartian, vii. 309. had a christian nurse, *ib.* the christians had an advantage by his act of indemnity, 312
- Carpocrates*, an account of him from ancient authors, viii. 391-2. his time, 393. he and his followers believed that the world was made by angels, 394. that Jesus Christ was born of Joseph and Mary, *ib.* accusations against them, 395-6, 398-9. the improbability of these accusations, 400-1. a general view of what they believed, 398. what scriptures they received, 403
- Carter* (*Mrs. Eliz.*) her translation of Epictetus quoted and commended, vii. 83-85, 89, 91
- Carthage*, *The third Council of*, its time, and the scriptures received by the bishops there assembled, iv. 486-488
- Casanbon* (*J.*) a remark of his upon a passage in Ignatius, ii. 91. his observations upon Lampridius quoted and commended, vii. 99
- Casley* (*D.*) his remarks upon a passage in Augustine, iv. 525-6. quoted, v. 80
- Cassian* (*John*) his country, works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 27-30. reckoned an opposer of the Augustinian doctrine, 31. how he treats Nestorius, and others called heretics, 31, 32
- Cassianus* (*Julius*) or Cassian, an heretical writer of the second century, mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, ii. 251. one of the Docetae, who argued from the Old as well as the New Testament, viii. 611-12. his opinions and country, 613
- Cassiodorius*, (*M. A.*) *Senator*, his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 109-113. a Latin translation of the *Adumbrations* of Clement of Alexandria, made by his order, ii. 234, 244
- Castle*, at Jerusalem, see *Antonia*

- CATALOGUES of the books of the Old Testament**; Melito's, ii. 158-9. Jerom's, iv. 419-421. three such catalogues taken notice of by Eusebius, 141. such catalogues of several recited, namely, from the book of Ecclesiasticus, Philo, the New Testament, Josephus, Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, 426-431
- CATALOGUES of the books of the Old and New Testament** in Origen, ii. 493-513. Athanasius, iv. 154-5. in the Synopsis ascribed to him, iv. 162-3. in Cyril of Jerusalem, 172-3. in the canons of the council of Laodicea, 182. in Epiphanius, 185-190. in the 85th canon, called apostolical, 230. in Gregory Nazianzen, 286-7. in Amphilochius, 292-3. in Ebedjesu, 320-322. in Philaster, 385-6. in Jerom, 435-438. Rufinus, 483-485. the third council of Carthage, 486-7. Augustine, 493-4. Chrysostom, 535-537. Innocent, Bp. of Rome, 586. Gelasius, Bp. of Rome, v. 75-6. Dionysius, called the Areopagite, 73, 74. the Alexandrian MS. 81, 82. Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, 86, 87. the Stichometry of Coterius, 89. Cassiodorius, 109-111. Isidore of Seville, 135-138. Leontius, 141-2. J. Damascenus, 146-7
- CATALOGUES of the books of the New Testament**, see several in Origen, ii. 494-497. recited in divers passages of Eusebius of Cæsarea, iv. 94-100. who makes several sorts or classes of books—universally received—generally received—controverted—received by a few: sometimes called by him spurious—lastly, such as were universally rejected by catholic christians, as contrary to the apostolical doctrine, 101-108. the catalogue of Nicephorus Callisti, v. 167-169. *And see the preceding article.*
- Catholic epistles**, received by the Manichees, iii. 404. and the Paulicians, 448. seldom quoted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who lived in the East, iv. 227-8. freely quoted by Cyril of Alexandria, v. 19
- CATHOLIC EPISTLES (SEVEN ;)** the antiquity and reason of that denomination, vi. 159. called also canonical, 160. by whom received in several ages, 160-1. well known and received by many in the time of Eusebius, iv. 97, 104. received by Athanasius, 155, 157. by the author of the Synopsis of sacred scripture, 163. Cyril of Jerusalem, 173. Epiphanius, 187, 189, 190. *Seven* in the catalogues of Gregory Nazianzen, 287. and of Amphilochius, 293. *Three* only received by the Syrians, 321, 323. and by Chrysostom, 537, 547, 549. Severian, bishop of Gabala, 572. Theodoret, v. 19. Cosmas, 93, 95, 96. *Seven* received by Jerom, iv. 436. Rufinus, 484. the third council of Carthage, 487. Augustine, 494, 510. their Order, vi. 161-2. in Jerom, iv. 436. Rufinus, 484. the third council of Carthage, 487. Augustine, 494. *Seven* generally received at Alexandria, and in Egypt, in the fifth century, v. 70. and by many in the

- sixth century, 96, 97. *Seven* received by Innocent, bishop of Rome, iv. 586. Palladius, v. 6, 7. Isidore of Pelusium, 10. Cyril of Alexandria, 13. Euthalius, who put out an edition of them, and divided them into chapters and sections, 68. the author of the *Calling of the Gentiles*, 38. and of the *Divine Promises and Predictions*, 39. Gelasius, Bp. of Rome, 76. Andrew, 78. Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 129—131. Leontius, 142. the author of the *Imperfect Work*, 121. J. Damascenus, 147. Photius, 150. Theophylact, [probably,] 162. Œcumenius, who wrote a *Commentary* upon them, 154. Nicephorus Callisti, 168-9. their time and order, according to Bede, 144-5. a *Commentary* upon them by Didymus, ii. 244. iv. 302. by Cassiodorius, and their order in him, v. 112-13. in the Alexandrian MS. 82. in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, 87. and that from Cotelarius, 89. Five of them doubted of by some in the east, 108
- Celer, the tribune*, beheaded at Jerusalem, i. 198
- Celestinius, Bp. of Rome*, how he persecuted the Novatians, iii. 104-5
- Cellarius, (Ch.)* his *Observations* upon the christianity ascribed to the emperor Philip commended, vii. 351, 355
- Celsus*, a christian writer, whether Bp. of Iconium uncertain, ii. 311
- Celsus the Epicurean*, quoted, i. 139. what he says of a christian dialogue, ii. 310. he called the christians *Sibyllists*, 336. how he reviled the apostles, 528. his time and character, and work against the christians, which work Origen answered in eight books, in which a large part of the work is still preserved, vii. 211-12. his passages representing the Jewish expectation of the Messiah, 212—214. passages containing references to books of the New Testament, 214—224, 266, 271-2. his references to christian facts, chiefly such as are recorded in the books of the New Testament, 224—242, 266—268. passages concerning christian principles, 243—250. concerning the progress of the christian religion, 250—255. how he charges christians with magical practices, 255-6. concerning the worship and assemblies of christians, 256-7. concerning those called Heretics, 258-9. injurious reflections upon the christians, 260—263. remarks upon the work of Celsus, and Origen's answer, ii. 432, 518, 542. vii. 263—265. a recapitulation of the extracts made from the work of Celsus, 265—269. a summary of the work of Celsus by Dr. Doddridge, 270—275. by Dr. J. Leland, 275-6. by Dr. Sherlock, 277. see also 205-6. and the word *Scriptures*, v. in this Index
- Censors*, at Rome, and in the provinces, their office and power, i. 274-5
- Census*; see *Assessment*
- Cerdon*, his time and opinions, viii. 444—446. an admirer of virginity, and is said to have recanted his errors, 446-7. what scriptures were received by him, 447

- Ceres*, her statue at Enna plundered by Verres, i. 181
- Cerinthus*, confuted in St. John's gospel, according to Irenæus, ii. 173. whether St. John met him in a bath at Ephesus, 95. viii. 404-5. Caius is said to have written against him, ii. 396. what Caius said of him, and that he forged a *Revelation*, 400-1. The Revelation ascribed to him, 693. but he was not the author, 700-1. his opinions, 701. doubtful whether he was a Chiliast, 702. did not corrupt the Revelation, 705. an account of him from ancient authors, viii. 404—403. of his time and history, 409. his sentiments, 410—413. zealous for the Mosaic law, 413. his morals vindicated, 414. what scriptures he received, 415—417. did not reject the first or second chapter of St. Matthew, 415
- Cestius Gallus*, governor of Syria; his unsuccessful expedition into Judea, vi. 425—428, 572
- Chain*; the Roman method of chaining prisoners, i. 244. Agrippa presented with a gold chain by Caligula, 247
- Chalcidius*, his time, work, and character, vii. 570—572. his testimony to the appearance of an extraordinary star at the time of our Saviour's nativity, 572
- Chandler (Dr.)* commended, v. 113. his Letter concerning the paragraph in Josephus concerning Christ, with Dr. Lardner's answer, i. p. xciv.—xcvii.
- Chapman, (Dr. J.)* quoted, iii. 462. his argument for the continuance of miraculous powers in the church after the times of the apostles, vii. 297-8. his account of the stipends of the philosophers and sophists in the second century, 298, note c. quoted again, 299, 445, 477
- Chapters*, whether the books of the New Testament were divided into sections in the time of Tertullian, ii. 301. an account of their being so divided afterwards by Euthalius, and another learned christian, v. 68, 69
- Chapters, (the Three)* what they were, iv. 491
- Chrestus*, whether thereby Suetonius understood Christ, i. 260
- CHRIST**, or **MESSIAH**, the ground and reason of that character, x. 176—178. how the word is used by some ancient christian writers, iii. 333. early different opinions concerning his person, 440-1. the time of his ministry, 257. the ends of his death, according to Arnobius, 473. according to Lactantius, 508-9. according to Augustine, iv. 531-2. his priestly office not insisted on by Lactantius, iii. 521. Christ, the Son of man, a sermon, ix. 357. the Son of God, a sermon, 366. his thirst upon the cross, a sermon, 290. his greatness in his last sufferings, a sermon, 299. divine testimonials given him during his last sufferings, a sermon, 324. made a curse for us, a sermon, 484. the power and efficacy of his doctrine, a sermon, 240. little children brought to him, a sermon, 173. his poverty our riches, a sermon, 376. his farewell wish of peace to his disciples, a sermon, 385. praying in his name, a sermon, 405. the

- woman anointing him, a sermon, 425. upon what grounds the Manichees believed in him, iii. 375. they believed him to be God, but not man, 375—380. they denied his nativity, 376-7. and his real death, 380. did not reckon his death a sacrifice for sin, 383-4. That Christ did not write the New Testament, 413. the Manichees had no Letter of Christ, iii. 425. the opinions of other Heretics concerning Christ, viii. 305-6, 360-1, 410—413, 433-4, 470—479, 545—547, 555-6
- Christian*, the origin of that name, iv. 402. the great honour of it, 557
- Christian clergy*, censured by Sulpicius, 576. by Julian Pomerius, v. 40. not called priests and Levites by the first christians, iv. 212, 219-20
- Christian doctrine*, remarks upon some difficulties concerning it, i. p. lxxxii.—lxxxviii.
- CHRISTIAN RELIGION; the nature and design of it, and its happy effects, iii. 463—465, 468, 500—503. iv. 85—87. called the divine philosophy, 87. arguments from it, iii. 465—470. objections against it, 470-1. writers against it, 502, 529. how it prevailed against opposition, ii. 493. its early progress in the East and the West, 654, note c. when planted in Persia, iii. 439. has withstood many difficulties, 442-3. its evidences not weakened by the Manichees, 443. its swift and wonderful progress in the world, and its truth asserted, 469, 479, 510, 548-9. iv. 78, 89, 170, 319, 590, 482, 560—562. v. 9, 21—26, 100. and see *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*. Its great progress in the time of Pliny and Trajan, vii. 72. of Adrian, 95—99. of M. Antoninus, 149, 169. of Celsus, 250—255. of Lucian, 284. of Domitian, attested by Dion Cassius, 345. by Porphyry, 437, 556. and by all authors who wrote against the christians, and by all edicts of persecuting emperors, 557-8. The state of christianity under heathen emperors, 558—570. Some evidences of the christian religion are not weakened, but gain force by length of time, ix. 82, 83
- CHRISTIANS: the origin of that denomination, v. 502-3. their moderation toward men of different sentiments, ii. 492. their patience and fortitude under sufferings, 651-2. their kindness to each other, and to heathens in affliction, 650. iii. 9. their innocence, 503. their fortitude under sufferings, 510. did not persecute, 515. not denominated from their bishops, nor from the apostles, but from Christ, iv. 153, 193. the fortitude of the primitive christians celebrated by Salvian, v. 67. how treated by the unbelieving Jews, vi. 388—392. they left Jerusalem before the siege of that place began, 409, 428-9. well known in the time of Pliny and Trajan, vii. 26. there were no Imperial edicts for persecuting them when Pliny went into his province, 27. they suffered under heathen emperors, as christians, for the name only, without any crimes proved against them, 29, 51, 173. See by all means note ¹, p. 51. their innocence at-

- tested by Pliny and Trajan, 46, 52, 74. their sincere respect for the authority of civil magistrates, 43, 44, 75. were numerous in the time of Pliny and Trajan, 47. their sufferings in times of persecution were very grievous, 171. their fortitude and patience under them, 173. they were steady in the profession of the truth, 73. their steadiness applauded, 50. their principles and worship, 74-5, 243—250, 256-7. their innocence, and eminent virtue, 75, 173, 257. their early and principal adversaries who wrote against them, 205—209. falsely accused of worshipping Serapis, viii. 376-7. vindicated from some charges as if they were too forward in exposing themselves to sufferings, vii. 57-8, 140—142. were sometimes ridiculed by heathen authors, 289. favoured in the time of Caracalla, 309, 312. their heavy sufferings after the publication of the edict of Severus against them, and also before it, 314—318. were numerous in the Roman empire before the conversion of Constantine, 566. their good character in the first three centuries, 569. a testimony to their good manners in Julian, 645. great corruptions of manners among them afterwards, according to Salvian, v. 67
- Chromatius*, Bp. of *Aquileia*, his time and eminence, iv. 580. his works, and testimony to the scriptures, 580-1
- Chronicles*, the usefulness of those books, 435
- Chrysanthius*, high priest of Lydia, in the time of Julian, his moderation, viii. 68. how he acted when sent for by Julian to come to court, 197-8
- Chrysanthus*, Novatian Bp. at Constantinople, iii. 102
- Chrysostom (John)* Bp. of Constantinople; his time, iv. 534. a Synopsis of scripture ascribed to him, 535. his testimony to the New Testament, 538—549. books of the New Testament received by him, 549. marks of respect for the scriptures, 550—555. some texts interpreted, 555—557. his observations concerning our Saviour, the apostles and evangelists, the christian religion, &c. 557—570. he often argued against the Manichees, iii. 276. what he says of Manichæan virgins, 298-9. his remark upon the History of Apollonius Tyanaeus, vii. 503. his differences with the empress, as related by Zosimus, viii. 116—118. quoted, x. 103, note ^v, 177. obscure through oratory, iii. 204
- Churches*, St. Paul writes to seven churches, iii. 41-2. iv. 451. the apostolical churches mentioned in the New Testament, 506
- Churches*; how to be built according to the *Constitutions*, iv. 211. in the primitive times christians had not spacious buildings to meet in, 212. and see ii. 526-7
- Cicero*, heathen people offended at his works, iii. 474. whether Lactantius took pleasure in opposing him, 525. quoted, x. 164
- Citizenship of Rome*, bought with a great sum, i. 237, 241
- Clark's (S.)* Annotations on Phil. ii. 5—9. quoted and commended, ix. 530
- Clarke (Dr. S.)* how he quotes Phlegon, vii. 109. does not quote

- Thallus, 123. quoted, vi. 205-6. ix. 604. x. 75, 77, 81, 105, 107, 138, 185
- Claudian*, his time and works, viii. 77. his testimony to the victory of Theodosius over Eugenius, A. D. 394. 78—83
- Claudius*, restores to the Jews all their privileges, of which they had been deprived by Caligula, i. 187-8. permits the Jews to keep the high priest's vestment, 190. banishes Cumanus, predecessor to Felix, and condemns Celer to be beheaded at Jerusalem, 198. banished the Jews from Rome, 259. a famine in his time, 252—258
- Clayton* (*R.* late Bp. of Clogher) quoted, v. 75, 169, 180, 184
- Clement of Alexandria*, his history, time, character, and works, ii. 220—224. his testimony to the books of the New Testament, 224—249. a difficult passage of his, relating to St. Mark's gospel, explained, 226—232. his *Adumbrations*, 221, 234. how he quotes apocryphal books, 250—258. commended by Alexander, Bp. of Jerusalem, 417. his account of the Heretics, Basilidians, viii. 356, 359, 364. Carpocrates and Epiphanes, 391. Cassian, 612-13. Prodicus, 417
- Clement of Rome*, not of Jewish extraction, v. 183, note ^a. not a martyr, nor related to the Roman emperors, ii. 35. his epistle to the Corinthians, and the time of writing it, 29—34. that epistle read in some churches on the Lord's day, 32, 33. Photius's character of it, 29, note ^b. his only genuine work, 35. the second epistle, ascribed to him, not his, 33—35. not author of the Constitutions, or Recognitions, or other books ascribed to him, 364—368, 376—378. his epistle to the Corinthians is quoted by Irenæus, 186-7. by Clement of Alexandria, 248. by Origen, 528. was one of St. Paul's fellow-labourers, 529. acquainted with apostles, and apostolical men, iii. 170. his epistle, though genuine, not a part of the New Testament, iv. 107, 128-9. though he wrote in Greek, he may be reckoned among Latins, vi. 90. his remarkable testimony to the martyrdoms of the apostles Peter and Paul, and other christians at Rome, 244—248. quoted, x. 130

A DISSERTATION upon the two epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome, lately published by Mr. Wetstein, x. 186—212. not genuine, for they are not mentioned by the ancient writers who acknowledge his epistle to the Corinthians, 189—192. Jerom did not refer to these epistles, 191—196. but to the two former epistles, as Dr. Cave, Grabe, &c. understood him, 195. a passage cited also from Epiphanius may well refer to the former epistles, 196-7. other external arguments of Wetstein's refuted, 198-9. no internal evidences, for scripture is not cited in the manner of Clement, 199—201. they were written long after Clement's time, (though before gentilism was extinct in the Roman empire,) for the custom had commenced for some ecclesiastics to have what were called *subintroduced women*, 202—207. the writer's excessive praises

of virginity do not resemble the scriptures nor Clement, 207-8

The epistle to the Hebrews was received by this writer, and christians had then a great regard for the sacred scriptures, 210

Clement (Flavius) a relation of Domitian, and consul of Rome, put to death by that emperor, ii. 35. vi. 647-8. vii. 342—345

Clementine Homilies, the work of an Ebionite, ii. 376-7, 380. the same as the *Dialogues of Peter and Appion*, 378

Clementine Epitome, an account of that work, 381—383

Clerc (J. Le) quoted, i. 317, 341, 375, 427. ii. 38, 39, 91, 92. v. 280, 471. x. 375, 378. asserts that the apostolical fathers do not quote apocryphal books, ii. 92. other judicious observations of his upon the same fathers, 112-13. his opinion, but without sufficient reason, that Clement of Alexandria did not distinguish apocryphal books from others, 250—252. a mistake of his concerning the number of the books of the New Testament quoted by Irenæus, 182. his observations upon the treatment given to heathens by Constantine, and afterwards, iv. 49. viii. 276. his opinion of the *Constitutions*, iv. 201. his commendation of a work of Jerom, 468. his judgment concerning Augustine, 490-1. his fine observations upon the evangelists, and that St. Mark is not an abridger of St. Matthew, 503-4. his judicious observations upon Pliny's letter concerning the christians, and Trajan's rescript, vii. 28—34, 36, 56-7. upon M. Antoninus's *Meditations*, 138

Cælestis, the goddess, her temple at Carthage demolished, A. D. 399. viii. 243

Colonia (D.) quoted, vi. 622. he acknowledges the superstition of Pliny, vii. 63, 66. his judgment upon Phlegon, 116. upon Dionysius the Areopagite, vii. 124. receives the *Philosophy of oracles* as a work of Porphyry, 445

Colonies, Roman, their nature, i. 79

Colosse, the church there planted by St. Paul, v. 18. vi. 151—158. the epistle to them when and where written, 75

Commentaries upon the four gospels, ii. 205

Commodian, contemporary with Cyprian; his history, and character, and work, iii. 131—133. select passages from him, 133. his testimony to the scriptures, 134-5

Conclusion of the second century, heathen sayings of the christians, vii. 302. anecdotes concerning divers heathen governors, who persecuted the christians, or were favourable to them, 302—305. remarks concerning the number of heathen writers, who have mentioned the christians, 305—307

Conformity to this world forbidden to christians: two discourses, ix. 21

Consideration, the Duty of, a sermon, 115

Constantine, the first christian emperor, receives addresses from the Donatists, iii. 558. appoints a council at Rome, and after-

- wards another at Arles, to hear their cause, *ib.* and decides it himself, *ib.* his parentage, and the time and place of his birth, iv. 3, 4. leaves Galerius, and goes to his father Constantius, 10. succeeds his father, 11. gives his sister Constantia in marriage to Licinius, 13. his death, and the duration of his reign, 14. his conversion to the christian religion, 14, 15. said to have seen a luminous cross in the heavens, 16. several opinions about it, 18. observations upon the account of it, 18—25. gives liberty to the christians, 28. his edicts in their favour, *ib.* grants privileges to the Catholics and their ministers, 29. churches built by him, 31. abolishes the punishment of the cross, 37. his character, 38, 39. remarks upon his reign, 39—52. his testimony to the scriptures, 52—54. convened the council of Nice, 56. his letter to Alexander and Arius commended, 55, 68. said to have inquired after Heretics, iii. 302. his history written by Praxagoras and Bemarchius, both heathen authors, and favourable to him, vii. 579-80. the account of his conversion in Zosimus, and the several blemishes of his reign, and reflections upon him, considered, viii. 97—102. and see 42—45. concerning his building Constantinople, 103—106. his edict for a general toleration rehearsed, 164
- Constantine and Licinius*, their edicts in favour of the christians, vii. 539, 542—545. the conversion of Constantine a great advantage to the christians, 551
- Constantinople*, consecrated by Constantine, iv. 52
- Constantius*, father of Constantine, his family, iv. 7. his character, 8. moderated the persecution in his part of the empire, 9. his marriage with Claudia Theodora, daughter-in-law of Maximian Herculus, and his children by her, 7, 8. his death, 11
- Constitutions and canons (The Apostolical)* Pearson's opinion of them, ii. 431. how quoted by Epiphanius, iv. 194—198. the judgment of moderns concerning them, 198—202. drawn up in the name of the apostles, 202. not quoted by the writers of the first three centuries, 205. their manner of citing the books of the N. T. not suitable to the apostles, 209-10. have in them many things not suited to the times of the apostles, 211—221. things unworthy of the apostles, 222. inconsistencies, 223. expressions betraying a late age, 224. are an imposture, 225. the author's testimony to the scriptures, 226—229. the eighty-fifth apostolical canon not ancient, 230. whether the constitutions are quoted by Irenæus, ii. 190. quoted in the Imperfect Work, v. 122. whether quoted by Damascenus, 148-9
- Consubstantial*, see *Homöusian*.
- Coponius*, the first procurator in Judea, what power he had, and the time of his coming thither, i. 79, 90, 307, 340
- Corinthians, the first epistle to the*, when and where written, vi. 15
- Corinthians, the second epistle to the*, when and where written, vi. 25

- Cornelius of Casarea*, the time of his conversion, vi. 230. that he was not a Jewish proselyte, 216—219
- Cornelius, Bp. of Rome*; his history and works, iii. 74, 75. extracts from a letter of his concerning Novatus, 79. remarks upon it, 81—86
- Cosmas of Alexandria* quoted, iv. 572. his time, and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 92—101
- Cotelerius (J. B.)* a remark of his concerning the epistle of St. Barnabas, as cited by Clement of A. ii. 248-9. his judgment upon the *Recognitions*, 364, 368. upon the *apostolical* constitutions and canons, iv. 198-9, 229
- Council at Jerusalem*, the time of it, v. 511
- Councils*, how little regarded by some men, iv. 63. have no right to decide in matters of faith, 64
- Councils of Antioch*, relating to Paul of Samosata; their times, ii. 670-1. who present at them, 666-7. the most famous councils in the first three centuries, 673. the number of bishops present, 674
- Counsels of prudence*, for the use of young people, a sermon, ix. 1—21
- Creation*, how divided between the Father and the Son, according to some christian writers, iii. 191. the work of God alone, x. 89, 105, 169—175. creation of Adam and Eve, 213—219
- CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY, vols. i. ii. iii. iv. throughout, and vol. v. to p. 251
- Credibility of the Evangelical History*, and the truth of the christian religion, ii. 573. iii. 477, 543. iv. 91, 93. 530-1, 562—564. v. 162-3. internal marks of credibility in the New Testament, two sermons, ix. 515
- Crellius* mentioned, x. 104
- Cresconius*, a learned Donatist, iii. 560
- Crevier (Mr.)* quoted, vi. 440, 456. vii. 332-3, 354. his character of Trajan, 67. his judgment upon a passage of Lampridius, 101. his character of Apuleius, 204
- Crispus*, eldest son of Constantine, put to death by his father, iv. 41—43
- Cross*, malefactors carried their own cross, i. 167
- Cross*, on which Christ suffered, said to be found by Helena, iv. 32
- Cudworth (R.)* his opinion concerning the importance of Apollonius Tyanæus, vii. 484. that Philostratus wrote his life with a design to set him up as a rival with our Saviour, this opinion examined, 489—496. a passage from him concerning the Valentinians, viii. 323
- Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage*, his history and time, iii. 3—15. his opinion of the baptism of Heretics, 8. his character, 13. called Tertullian his master, ii. 269. testimonies to him, iii. 13—15. understood Greek, 18. his works, 15. testimony to the scriptures, 20—22. too much relied upon in the account of Novatus,

94. his confession and martyrdom in the time of Valerian, vii. 366—370
- Cyprianus* (*Ernestus Solomon*) his remark on Jerom, ii. 305
- Cyrenius*, the account of his coming into Syria and Judea after the removal of Archelaus, i. 79, 229, 302, 307. his true name, 310. his character and history, 331. divers solutions of the chief difficulty concerning the enrolment at our Saviour's nativity, 311, &c. that enrolment made by Cyrenius, 329—337. iv. 140. objections against this considered, i. 338—345
- Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria*, how he treated the Novatians, iii. 104. his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 13, 14. his answer to Julian's work against the christians, vii. 601—603
- Cyril of Jerusalem*, his time and works, iv. 171-2. his testimony to the scriptures, 172—176. his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, 430. what he said when there was much discourse, in the time of Julian, about rebuilding the temple, vii. 609

D

Dæmoniac, how Ignatius useth that word, and dæmon, ii. 92

Remarks on Dr. Ward's dissertations concerning the dæmoniac who resided among the tombs, x. 265—275. Mr. Mole's observations on the subject, 265—269. physicians ascribed their disorders to natural causes, ii. 568. Origen's opinion of them, 568-9. Optatus thought that every man is born with an unclean spirit, 569

The CASE of the DÆMONIACS mentioned in the New Testament, in four sermons on Mark v. 19, with an appendix, i. 449—519. by what means the herd was hurried down the precipice, 457, 494-5. for what reasons our Saviour did not suffer the dæmoniac to continue with him, 458-9. the distemper of the men was lunacy, or distraction, 460. the only miracle of the kind particularly recorded, *ib.* the opinion of the moderns concerning the dæmoniacs, 465-6. the general opinion concerning them in the time of our Saviour, 467—477. the word *dæmons* should be used, and not *devils*, for throughout the New Testament there is but one evil spirit called *devil*, 468. meaning of the word dæmons, in ancient writers, and in the New Testament, 469-70. Josephus and many others supposed that they were the souls of wicked men, 470. in which sense the word is used in the Old and New Testament, 471. many believed that Providence permitted the souls of bad men, and fallen angels, to dwell in the region of the air, 472—474. and that these evil spirits were in subjection to Satan, or the devil, as their head or prince, and were instruments of afflictions to men, 474-5. there were dæmoniacs likewise among the heathens about the same time, 476. that those disorders were mere bodily in-

- dispositions appears from several considerations, 480—488. objections to this answered, 490—506. Mary Magdalene's case, 495-6. two passages from Josephus, with remarks, 507—510. Some texts of the New Testament explained, 510—516. that demons, or the souls of dead men, have power over the living, was believed universally among the heathens, and by many orthodox christians, viii. 368, 537, note *
- Daille (J.)* his character of Tertullian, ii. 272. his judgment concerning the *Apostolical Constitutions*, iv. 199. his treatise about them, 205-6. quoted again, 209-10, 215
- Damascenus (J.)* his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, iv. 431. his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 146—150
- Damascius*, his time and works, viii. 138. extracts out of his works, in Photius, 139—143. in Suidas, 144—148
- Damasus* persecuted the Luciferians, iv. 249. his learning and writings, 275—278. how he succeeded in the contention for the bishopric of Rome, 275. viii. 55, 56
- Damis*, friend and companion of Apollonius Tyanæus, vii. 486-7, 501, 509
- Daniel*, esteemed a prophet by Josephus, iv. 426. and by Jerom, though not by the Jews in his time, 422. the additional apocryphal part of his book rejected by Apollinarius and Eusebius, 260-1. and Jerom, 422-3. that part not explained by Theodoret, v. 16
- Deaconesses*, christian, Pliny's account of them, and how they were, by his order, examined by torture, vii. 24, 45, 74
- Deacons*, their office, ii. 13, 14
- Decius*, his time and character, vii. 356-7. accounts of his persecution from several, 357. a persecution at Alexandria before the publication of his edict against the christians, 358. his persecution was general, 359-60
- Decree (Apostolic)* in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, considered, x. 300—347. it was directed to all Gentile converts, 307-8, 318. all the particulars of it in their own nature indifferent, 318—321. therefore not obligatory on all men, at all times, 321. the several articles explained, 322—323. the word rendered *fornication* implies some alliances with heathens, of which Esau was guilty, Heb. xii. 16. 326-7
- Delays* in things of religion unreasonable, a sermon, ix. 123
- Delivering*, the meaning of that word in divers places of the New Testament, i. 52, 73, 74
- Delphinus*, Bp. of Bourdeaux, iv. 342, 344
- Demas*, his character cleared up and vindicated, vi. 66, 67
- Demetrian*, to whom Cyprian's Apology for the christian religion was sent, vii. 209
- Demetrius*, Bp. of Alexandria, appoints Origen master of the catechetical school there, ii. 471. afterwards is offended with him, and ill-treats him, ii. 475

- Dexter (Fl.)* son of Pacian, and friend of Jerom, iv. 326
- Dictinius*, a Priscillianist Bp. and author, iv. 360-1
- Didymus* of Alexandria, his work against the Manichees, iii. 275. commended, *ib.* and quoted elsewhere. His history and character, iv. 300. his testimony to the scriptures, 301—303. published an exposition of the seven catholic epistles, ii. 244. iv. 302
- Digest*, how that word is used concerning the books of scripture, v. 262
- Dioclesian*, an introduction to an account of his persecution, vii. 515-16. the civil state of the empire at that time, 516—519. general accounts of this persecution from several authors, 519-20. the date of it, and the several edicts published against the christians at that time, iv. 8, 9. vii. 520-1. the sufferings of the christians, 523—528. the edict of Galerius in their favour in the year 311, 528—530. how the persecution was still carried on by Maximin in the East, 533—535. how Constantine overcame Maxentius at Rome, A. D. 312. and he and Licinius in the same year published their first edict in favour of the christians, 539. Maximin's letter to Sabinus in favour of the christians in 312, 539—541. the second edict of Constantine and Licinius in favour of the christians, A. D. 313, 541—544. Maximin is overcome by Licinius, and publishes a new edict in favour of the christians, in 313, and dies, 546-7. two inscriptions relating to Dioclesian's persecution, 548-9. observations upon this persecution, and Dioclesian's character, 549—552. an edict against the Manichees, said to be his, iii. 301-2. he resigns the empire, and lives retired, and dies, iv. 9
- Diodorus*, Bp. of Tarsus, his book against the Manichees, iii. 269. a mistake imputed to him, 280. his time and history, iv. 376-7. his commentaries upon the scriptures, and his other works, 377—379. his great merit, 380. said to have embraced the doctrine of Paul of Samosata, 402
- Diogenes*; see *Laertius*.
- Diognetus*, the epistle to him not written by Justin Martyr, ii. 127-8, 141
- Dion Cassius*, his time and work, vii. 338-9. his testimony to the conquest of Judea by Titus, and to the destruction of Jerusalem, vi. 477. vii. 339—342. his testimony to Domitian's persecution, 342—345. and to the progress of the christian religion at that time, 345. and in the time of Commodus, 346-7. and to Nerva's favourable regard to the christians, 345. his account of the shower by which M. Antoninus and his army were saved in Germany, 186—189, 347
- Dion Chrysostom*, his time, and testimony to the christians, vii. 298-9
- Dionysius the Arcopagite*, said to have been the first bishop of Athens, ii. 144. the works falsely ascribed to him, when written, 687. his testimony to the darkness at the time of our Saviour's passion not much valued by learned men, vii. 123-4

- Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite*, the time of his works, and his catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, v. 72—74. see also ii. 687
- Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria*, succeeded Heraclas, ii. 476. his history, 643—648. had revelations, 648-9. said to favour Arianism, 658—661. his writings, 682-3. his argument upon the *Revelation*, 693—697. remarks upon it, 698—718. his own opinion of that book, 718. his testimony to the scriptures summed up, 721. his character, 687
- Dionysius, Bp. of Corinth*, his history, and testimony to the scriptures, ii. 144—147
- Dionysius, Bp. of Rome*, his history and works, iii. 127—130. his kindness to the christians at Cæsarea in Cappadocia under affliction, 128. appealed to in the controversy about Sabellianism, *ib.* several books and epistles addressed to him, 129. his character, 130. his testimony to the scriptures, 130-1
- Dioscurus*, and his brothers, called tall, and other monks in Egypt, how treated by Theophilus, Bp. of Alexandria, iv. 413-14
- Diotrephes*, was not an Heretic; wherein his fault consisted, iv. 289—293
- A *Divination* of heathen people in the time of Valens, viii. 182—199
- Divorces*, practised by the Jews, i. 38, 39. both men and women, 411, note 1
- Docetæ*, their opinion concerning the person of Christ, viii. 306. x. 81, 182. they all deny the resurrection of the body, or the flesh, viii. 520
- Doctrine of the Apostles*, how mentioned by Eusebius, iv. 94, 129-30. by Athanasius, 155. and by the author of *The Synopsis of Sacred Scripture*, 164. not the same as the *Apostolical Constitutions* now extant, 130
- Doddridge (Dr. P.)* quoted, v. 294-5, 316, 387, 404, 475, 499, 529. vi. 224. x. 381, 389. his observations upon the testimony of Josephus, vi. 473-4. his summary of the work of Celsus against the christians, vii. 270—275
- Dodwell (H.)* his opinion of the age of Bardesanes examined, ii. 320—323. quoted, v. 293, 462-3, 467. vi. 350-1
- Domitian*, his inquiries after the posterity of David, ii. 154-5. the cruelties of his reign, and the occasion of his death, vi. 639, 647-8. See *Bruttius Præsens*. Dion's testimony to his persecution, vii. 342—345
- Domitilla (Flavia)* related to Flavius Clemens the consul, banished to the island Pontia, for the sake of christianity, vii. 102, 342—344
- Domnus*, Bp. of Antioch after Paul of Samosata, ii. 670, 676
- Donatists*, a brief history of them, iii. 554—560. their writers, 560—564. their testimony to the scriptures, 564-5

- Donatus*, a confessor, to whom Cæcilius dedicated his book of the Deaths of Persecutors, vii. 530
- Donatus*, Bp. of Carthage, iii. 553
- Donatus*, Bp. of Casæ Nigræ in Numidia, iii. 554, 557
- Donatus*, the famous Latin grammarian, and Jerom's master, iv. 405. when he flourished and taught at Rome, viii. 278
- Doris*, a signal piece of justice done there by Petronius, president of Syria, in the time of Claudius, with remarks upon it, i. 188—190
- Dorotheus*, presbyter at Antioch, iii. 159-60
- Dorotheus*, Dioclesian's chamberlain, and a martyr, iii. 160
- Dorotheus*, supposed author of the *Synopsis* of the lives of the prophets and apostles; remarks upon it, iii. 160—162
- Doxology*, that at the end of the Lord's prayer taken notice of in the dialogue, *Philopatris*, vii. 290
- Doxologies* in the New Testament, and ancient christian writers, x. 130-1, and see 167-8
- Drake (Dr.)* his discourse upon the inscription of the altar to the unknown god, vii. 323
- Drusilla*, third daughter of Herod Agrippa, i. 27. contracted to Epiphanes, married to Azizus, afterwards to Felix, 27, 28, 411, note ¹

E

- Easter*, the different times of keeping it, ii. 259—261, 324—326. when kept by the Audians, iv. 177. the determination of the council of Nice about it, 61. not kept by the Aerians, 179-80. the controversy about the time of it in the second and third centuries, 208
- Ebedjesu*, his time, ii. 460. iv. 320. his catalogue of the books of scripture, which is the same as the canon of the churches of Syria, 320-1. remarks upon it, 322—325
- Ebionites*, their opinion of Christ, ii. 327, 348. in his opinion they were extremely mistaken, x. 103. two sorts of them, vi. 382-3. and see *Nazarenes*. The beginning of their gospel according to Epiphanius, ii. 154. another passage of it from Epiphanius, ii. 138. their gospel said to be corrupted, 154. rejected St. Paul and his writings, 376. Symmachus was of this sect, 327. what gospels they used, 380. the Clementine Homilies, and the Recognitions, composed by an Ebionite, 381
- Ecclesiasticus*, how quoted by Origen, ii. 541. by Cyprian, iii. 54. not received as a canonical book by Jerom, iv. 421-2. nor Rufinus, 484. nor Chrysostom, 536. see also 495. Quoted, as written by Solomon, 588. as written by a wise man, v. 10. Not a book of authority, according to Cosmas, 92. nor according to Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 126
- Edessen Chronicle*, its time, ii. 319

- Egyptian Impostor*, his history, with remarks, i. 434—439
- Egyptians*; see *Gospel according to them*.
- Egyptians*, their character, vii. 98. their rites contemned by the Romans, i. 182. prohibited at Rome, ib.
- Eleesaites*, mentioned by Origen, ii. 478. x. 614. by Epiphanius, under the names of Ossens and Ebionites, viii. 615-16, 620. by Theodoret, 619. by Methodius, 615. iii. 194. the time of their rise uncertain, viii. 614. the name of their founder, 621. the modern opinions of the time they flourished, 622—624. their duration, 624-5. what parts of scripture they received, 625-6. explanation of a prayer of Elxai, 626
- Elect, among the Manichees*, an account of them, iii. 290—293, 370, 387-8
- Eleutherus*, Bp. of Rome, ii. 153, 155
- Elpidius*, a rhetorician, and master of Priscillian, iv. 340—342, 349, 360
- Embalming*, used by the Jews, i. 170-1. the manner of their embalming dead bodies, and particularly that of our Saviour, x. 285-6
- Emperor*, that title given to colleagues in the Roman empire, i. 379
- Encratites*, a sect said to be founded by Tatian, and improved by Severus, ii. 148, 151. see, concerning several such people, 603—605
- Enoch*, his books, how quoted by Origen, ii. 542-3. mentioned by Anatolius, iii. 143. an apocryphal book, supposed to be quoted by St. Jude, iv. 460, 462
- Ens (J.)* quoted, vi. 352, 361
- Epagathus (Vettius)* a martyr at Lyons, vii. 157-8
- Ephesians* commended by St. Paul, ii. 71. iv. 453
- EPHESIANS**, the epistle so entitled, sent to them, according to Ignatius, ii. 78. and Irenæus, 175. and Clement of A. 238. and Tertullian, 281. that it was written to the Ephesians, vi. 112—151. to the Laodiceans, according to Marcion, as is supposed, ii. 281. called the epistle to the Ephesians, by Origen, 500. Cyprian, iii. 37. Victorinus, Bp. of Pettaw, 177. Faustus and Secundinus, Manichees, 403, 407, 438. Athanasius, iv. 155. the Synopsis ascribed to him, 165. the council of Laodicea, 182. C. M. Victorinus, 256. Basil, 282. Amphilo-chius, 292. Gregory Nyssen, 296. Didymus of A. 302. Ebed-jesu, 321, 323. Ambrose, Bp. of Milan, 334. the author of the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, 384. Theodore, of Mopsuestia, 395. Jerom, 453. Rufinus, 485. Augustine, 494, 506. Chrysostom, 547. Pelagius, 592. Palladius, v. 6. Theodoret, 17, 18. Prosper, 37. the author of the Calling of the Gentiles, 38. Enthalius, 71. Facundus, 102. and many other authors in the same volume; when and where written, vi. 27—38. a general character of this epistle, 17, 18. a passage of Basil relating to it considered, iv. 280—283

- Ephrem, the Syrian*, his time and character, iv. 304-5. the editions of his works, and his testimony to the scriptures, 306—315. select passages from him, 315—319. that he wrote Commentaries upon Tatian's Harmony, ii. 444-5. what he says of Bardesanes, and the use which he made of his works, 319
- Epictetus*, his life and time, vii. 78—82. his patience, 83-4. was learned, 84, 85. was not always a slave, nor was always poor, but for a good part of his life was a freeman, and enjoyed a competence, 78, 79, 84. passages in him concerning the christians, with notes and observations, 88—91. much commended by Celsus, 248. the price of his lamp, 79. see a fine maxim, comprehending the general design of his philosophy, 91. his affected silence concerning the christians, *ibid.* and 306
- Epimenides*, his time, and a remarkable story concerning him, taken from Laertius, vii. 320-1
- Epiphanes*, a Carpocratian, son of Carpocrates, viii. 391
- Epiphanius (Bp. of Salamis in Cyprus)* his time and works, and character, iv. 185. his testimony to the scriptures, 186—193. his quotations of a work called *Constitutions*, 194—197. his catalogues of the books of the O. T. 430-1. quoted, x. 116. his account of the Heretics, Adamians, viii. 424. Alogians, 627—629. Apelles, 544—547. Cainites, 560, 563. Carpocratians, 391-2, &c. Cerdon, 445. Cerinthus, 406-7, &c. Elcesaites, 615—619. Heraclion, 440. Leucius, 514-15. Marcionites, 452. Montanists, 596, Ophians, 566. Sethians, 553. Theodotus, 573—576
- Epiphanius*, a heathen sophist at Laodicea, master of Apollinarius, iv. 258
- Epistle of the church of Smyrna*, containing an account of Polycarp's martyrdom, ii. 110-11
- Epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons*, ii. 160—165
- Eppomina*, wife of Sabinus, her excellent character, vi. 441
- Erasmus*, his characters of Jerom and Augustine, iv. 489
- Eryenk and Estenk*, a work of Mani, iii. 310
- Eros, Bp. of Antioch*, ii. 203
- Essenes*, their principles, and why not mentioned by the evangelists, i. 133-4
- Esther*, received as a canonical book by Jerom, iv. 420, 425, 435. by Rufinus, 483. the third council of Carthage, 486. Augustine, 493
- Evangelists*, their candour, i. 348. the time when they wrote, v. 282—294. whether any of the first three evangelists had seen the gospel of the other before he wrote, iv. 503-4. v. 461—471. they knew how and what to write better than Plato, ii. 518. are credible witnesses, 573-4. their several accounts of the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, burial, resurrection, and appearances, reconciled, x. 278—287, 351—392. their symbols according to Jerom, iv. 440. according to Augustine, 502. see also v. 78, 128, 159. two of them apostles, two other disciples

- or companions of apostles, iv. 501, 538. St. Mark and St. Luke wrote at a time when their gospels might be approved by apostles, iv. 505. their order, according to Augustine, the same as ours, 501. and Chrysostom, 541. their order in Cosmas of Alexandria, v. 94. and Theophylact, 158. commended, iv. 583-4, v. 162-3
- Evangelists*, in the reign of Trajan, ii. 115-16. and afterwards, in the time of Commodus, 216
- Eucharist*, the design of it, and the words of the institution explained, ii. 453
- Eucherius*, Bp. of Lyons, his time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 52—54
- Euchrocia*, wife of Elpidius, the rhetorician, iv. 342. put to death with other followers of Priscillian, 346. her death and character from Pacatus, 349, 358
- Eugenius*, set up for emperor by Arbogastes ; his history, and character, viii. 78
- Eunapius*, his time and works, viii. 62. extracts from his history of the Roman emperors, 62, 63. from his lives of the sophists, 63—76. observations on those extracts, 76
- Eunomius*, an Arian, his time and works, and character, iii. 590—592. said to have been shy of disputing with Sisinnius, a Novatian Bishop, 102. opposed the extreme veneration which was then begun to be shown to the reliques of martyrs, v. 216
- Evocatus*, an officer under Domitian, ii. 154
- Euodius*, præfect under the usurper Maximus, and judge in the cause of the Priscillianists, iv. 345, 354
- Euphrates*, a philosopher, who had some differences with Apollonius of Tyana, vii. 488
- Eusebius*, Bp. of *Cæsarea*, his history and time, iv. 69—71. vindicated from a charge brought against him, ii. 660-1. iv. 71. his works, 72—81. a character of his Ecclesiastical History, 80. how he treated Marcellus, 77. remarks upon his works, 80, 81. whether he was an Arian, 82, 83. his character, 84, 85. select passages from him, 85—93. his passages concerning the books of the N. T. received in his own and former times, with remarks, 94—117. books of the N. T. received by him, 117—127. whether he received the epistle to the Hebrews, 119-20. and the Revelation, 125—127. the sum of his testimony, and that he did not make use of christian apocryphal books, 145-6. censured, i. 344-5. ii. 397, 409. too easily imposed upon, when he received the *Philosophy of Oracles*, vii. 458, 466. his subscribing the Nicene creed considered, iv. 66, 83. his passage concerning the Manichees, iii. 259. seldom mentions them, 261. his observations upon the testimony of Josephus, vi. 474-5. the paragraph in Josephus concerning our Saviour first quoted by him, 487, 495. how he quotes Plutarch, 622. his answer to Hierocles against the christians, vii. 477—481. mentions the time of the heresy of the Elcesaites, viii. 614. quoted, x. 177.

- his Commentary upon the Psalms translated into Latin by Eusebius of Vercelli, iv. 245
- Eusebius*, a learned Novatian, iii. 103
- Eusebius*, Bp. of *Emesa*; his time, and works, and character, iii. 592-3
- Eusebius*, Bp. of *Laodicea*, in *Syria*, ii. 651. his history, iii. 145. formerly deacon at Alexandria, and much commended, ii. 651
- Eusebius*, Bp. of *Nicomedia*, his time and character, iii. 594-5
- Eusebius*, Bp. of *Vercelli*, his history, and works, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 244—246
- Eustathius*, Bp. of *Antioch*, his history, and how deposed, iv. 149—151. said to have been a Sabellian, 151
- Eustathius*, an *Arian*, Bp. of *Sebaste*, in *Armenia*, iv. 180
- Eustathius*, Bp. of *Sulca* in *Ægypt*, his time, v. 68. his editions of the Acts, St. Paul's epistles, and the catholic epistles, iii. 229. iv. 165-6. v. 68—72
- Eutherius*, Bp. of *Tyana*, in *Cappadocia*, a friend of Nestorius, v. 33. his argument against following the multitude, 33, 34. against those who discouraged reading the scriptures, 34, 35
- Euthymius*, his time, and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 164—166
- Eutychian*, a Novatian, said to have worked miracles, iii. 101
- Euzoïus*, Bp. of *Cæsarea*, his history, iii. 595-6. his care of the library there, 224
- Execution (An)* made by Herod at Jerusalem, i. 293, 366-7. remarks upon it, 297, 348-9. 367. See likewise 139
- Ezra*, his care in publishing an exact edition of the O. T. which he is said by some to have restored, v. 15

F

- Fabatus*, procurator of Augustus in Arabia and Judea, i. 272-3. called Cæsar's servant, 305
- Faber (Tanaquil)* commended, i. 336. quoted, vi. 481
- Fabian*, Bp. of *Rome*, his history, and martyrdom in the time of Decius, iii. 74, 75. vii. 357
- Fabius*, Bp. of *Antioch*, favoured the Novatians, iii. 96
- Fabricius (J. A.)* his opinion of the time of Athenagoras, ii. 194. his judgment upon the collection of the Sibylline oracles, 334. upon the value and usefulness of the works of Josephus, vi. 502. quoted and commended, vii. 447. his argument for the real character of Ammonius, 448. receives *The Philosophy of Oracles* as written by Porphyry, 444
- Facundus*, an *African Bishop*, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 101-2
- Faith*, the good exercise of, a sermon, ix. 232
- Faith and hope*, defined by Basilides, viii. 369-70
- Famine* in Judea, and the time of it, i. 252—258. remarks upon it, 258-9

- Famine* at the siege of Jerusalem, the distresses of it described, vi. 444—447, 449-50, 541, 543-4
- Fausta*, daughter of Maximian Hercules, married to Constantine, iv. 11. put to death, 40, 43, 44
- Faustinus and Marcellinus*, followers of Lucifer of Cagliari, iv. 250-1
- Faustus*, deacon of Alexandria, died a martyr, when of a great age, in Dioclesian's persecution, ii. 652
- Faustus*, a Manichean Bp. his history, iii. 283—285. was banished into an island, 285, 300. a fine passage of his concerning the worship of God, 384-5. his passages concerning the interpolation of the books of the N. T. 412—416. remarks upon them, 416—420. quoted, 454
- Fearing always*, *The benefit of*, a sermon, ix. 281
- Felicitas*, a martyr, ii. 584
- Felix*, governor of Judea, i. 27, 28, 30. his marriage with Drusilla, 29, 411, note ¹. was guilty of unjust actions, 29. hires Dora to kill Jonathan the high-priest, 29, 147. he hoped to receive money of St. Paul, 29. his good conduct towards the Jews and Greeks at Cæsarea, 194
- Felix*, a Manichee; Augustine's dispute with him, iii. 300. a remarkable passage from him, 344
- Festus (Porcius)* governor of Judea, i. 27. died there, 83. his council, 111
- Festus (Rufus)* proconsul of Asia in the time of Valens, and author of a Breviary of the Roman History, viii. 192
- Fevardentius*, his edition of Irenæus, ii. 99
- Firmilian*, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, his friendship for Origen, ii. 476. his history, 578, his character, 579. his testimony to the scriptures, 580—582. whether he received the second epistle of St. Peter, 582, and iii. 45, 46. his eminence, and his moderation in the affair of Paul of Samosata, ii. 667
- Firmilian*, the Roman president in Palestine; his cruelty to the christians, iii. 222, note ^d.
- Flaccus*, president of Asia, forbids the Jews to send money to Jerusalem, i. 184
- Flaccus*, president of Egypt, subject to the Egyptians, and unjust to the Jews, i. 85, 86, 96
- Flavius Illyricus*, his judgment concerning Eusebius and many other ancient christian writers, iii. 521-2. concerning the Revelation, ii. 721
- Fleming (M. C.)* A letter to, on the Personality of the Spirit, x. 262—264
- Florinus*, a Valentinian, to whom Irenæus wrote a letter, ii. 96
- Fornication*, its signification in the apostolic decree, Acts xv. x. 326—328
- Fortunatianus*, Bishop of Aquileia, his Commentary upon the Gospels, and his character, iv. 236
- Fortunatus*, a Manichean presbyter, Augustine's dispute with

- him, iii. 295-6. he vindicates the manners of his sect, 296. quoted again, 331, 347, 360, 371, 382-3
- Fravitta*, or *Frajntus*, a barbarian, and a gentile, and yet a great general, and faithful to the Romans, viii. 115-16
- Free inquiry* in things of religion recommended, ii. 649-50. iii. 474
- Free will*, asserted by Commodian, iii. 133. whether held by the Manichees, 368-9. how maintained by Augustine and other ancient christians, 274, 368. see also 444. asserted by Arnobius, 474. by Lactantius, 501. by Eusebius, iv. 88. by Gregory Nazianzen, 290. Gregory Nyssen, 299. Ephrem the Syrian, 319. Gaudentius, 389. Chrysostom, 567-8. Victor of Antioch, 586. Isidore of Pelusium, v. 9
- Fronto*, an early writer against the christians, vii. 208
- Fundanus* (*Minucius*) proconsul of Asia, to whom Adrian sent a rescript, favourable to the christians, vii. 94
- Future State* provable by reason, a sermon, ix. 204. see also iii. 504-5

G

- Gagnier* (*J.*) quoted, vi. 532-3, 537, 539, 553, 555
- Gainas*, the *Goth*, an account of him, viii. 114-15
- Galatians* [*The epistle to the*] when and where written, vi. 6—16
- Galen*, his time, vii. 300. his passages concerning Moses, and Christ and his followers, 301
- Galerius* (*Maximian*) his edict in favour of the christians in 311. vii. 529-30
- Galilee*, the native place of most of Christ's apostles, where also he wrought many miracles, v. 21
- Gallienus* revokes Valerian's edict against the christians, vii. 366
- Gallio*, proconsul of Achaia, i. 34. his behaviour towards St. Paul, 173. his character, 175. said by Chrysostom to have been a man of moderation and equity, iv. 556
- Gallus* (*C. T.*) successor of *Decius*, his time, vii. 360. was a persecutor of the christians, ii. 646. vii. 360
- Gamaliel*, the aged, the force of his reasoning in favour of the apostles, i. 309-10. his great eminence, and that he never embraced the christian religion, vi. 511—514
- Gaudentius*, *Bp. of Brescia*, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 388—391
- Gaudentius*, a Donatist bishop, iii. 560-1
- Gelasius*, *Bp. of Rome*, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 75—77
- Gellius* (*A.*) how he quotes Epictetus, vii. 79, 82, 91
- Geminus*, or *Geminianus*, presbyter of Antioch, and author, ii. 588
- Genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke*; both said to be

- Joseph's by the author of the *Questiones et Responsiones*, &c. ii. 129. said to be left out of Tatian's harmony, 149. both in Ammonius's harmony, 454. reconciled by Africanus, 462—464. both referred to by Clement of A. 226, 233, 236. both in the Manichæan and catholic copies, iii. 437. received by Eusebius, iv. 118. that in Matthew referred to by Irenæus, ii. 171, 184. Tertullian, 278-9. Victorinus, iii. 175. Cerinthus, viii. 415. generally received by christians in Porphyry's time, vii. 423
- Generidus*, in high offices, a barbarian, and gentile, yet faithful to the Romans, in the time of Honorius, viii. 123-4
- Gennadius*, presbyter of Marseilles, his words, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 74, 75
- Gentilism*, established by edicts in the time of Julian, vii. 596. the state of Gentilism under christian emperors, viii. 163—290
- George*, a learned Arian, and Bp. of Laodicea, iii. 596
- George*, the Arian Bp. of Alexandria, murdered by the people there; an account of it in Ammianus, viii. 52—54. Julian, upon that occasion, sent a letter of reproof to the Alexandrians, vii. 641. and he desired that George's library should be procured for him, 641-2
- Gerdes (Dr.)* quoted, i. 517. x. 253
- Germanus*, a Bp. who reflected upon Dionysius of A. ii. 684
- Germinius*, an Arian, successor to Photius in the see of Sirmium, iv. 239
- Gibson (Dr.)* Bp. of London, quoted with respect, ii. 701, 710
- Glabrio*, put to death by Domitian, doubtful whether he was a christian, vii. 343
- Gobar (Ste.)* his character of Hegesippus, ii. 152-3, 156-7. says that Hippolytus and Irenæus did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, 177
- Godliness*, the great mystery of, a sermon, ix. 460
- Gospel*, meaning of the word, v. 262—264. that the *gospel of Christ* is the same as his preaching, or doctrine, iii. 436. the gospel was preached all over the Roman empire before the destruction of Jerusalem, vi. 409
- Gospels* referred to, by Clement of Rome, ii. 37—39
- GOSPELS (FOUR)** the time of writing them, especially the first three, iv. 399, v. 281—294. received by Justin M. ii. 129—132. the author of *Questiones et R.* 128-9. Tatian, 148-9. Irenæus, 169—173. Theophilus, Bp. of Antioch, 214-15. the author of a *Harmony* of the gospels ascribed to him, 204. Clement of Alexandria, 236-7. Tertullian, 273—279. called by him our Digesta, 299. four gospels likewise according to Origen, 494. Dionysius of Alexandria, 689-90, 721. Cyprian, iii. 20. the author of the Computation of Easter, 72, 73. the author of the poem against the Marcionites, 171. Victorinus, Bp. of Pettaw, 175-6. Methodius, 194. Peter, Bp. of Alexandria, 239. they seem to be acknowledged by Archelaus, 257-8. Serapion, Bp. of Thmuis in Egypt, 271. Titus of Bostra, 274.

Hierax, 288. received by the Manichees, 397-8, 406. and the Paulicians, 447-449. Eusebius of Cæsarea, and universally acknowledged, iv. 96, 97. and see 79. four gospels according to Athanasius, 155. and the Synopsis, 163. Adamantius, 167. Juvencus, 169. Julius Firmicus, 171. Cyril of Jerusalem, 173-4. the council of Laodicea, 182. Epiphanius, 188-9. the Apostolical Constitutions, 226. Basil, 279. Gregory Nazianzen, 287. Amphilochius, 292. Gregory Nyssen, 298. Ephrem the Syrian, 310. Ebedjesu, or the Syrian christians, 321. Ambrose, Bp. of Milan, 333. Philaster, 387. Gaudentius, 388. Theodore of Mopsuestia, 398. Jerom, 435-440. Rufinus, 484. the third council of Carthage, 487. Augustine, 493, 499, 504-5. Chrysostom, 537-539. Severian, 571-2. Victor of Antioch, 582. Innocent, Bp. of Rome, 586. Isidore, of Pelusium, v. 10. Theodoret, 16. Sedulius, 56. Gelasius, Bp. of Rome, 76. Andrew, 78. in the Alexandrian MS. 82. in a Stichometry from Cotelarius, 89. another Stichometry, 91. Cosmas, of A. 93, 94. Junilius, 106. the *Imperfect Work*, 119-121. Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 128. Isidore of Seville, 136, 138. Leontius, 142. Damascenus, 147. Oecumenius, 155. Theophylact, 157-8. Euthymius, 165-6. Nicephorus Callisti, 167-8

A Commentary upon the four gospels by Fortunatianus, iv. 236. upon Matthew and John by Didymus, 302. upon Luke by Ambrose of Milan, 334. upon Matthew, Luke, and John, by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 395. upon Matthew, by Jerom, 470. upon Mark, by Victor of Antioch, 581. upon the four gospels, by Theophylact, v. 157. Euthymius, and the time when written; 164-166. whether Theophilus of Antioch wrote a commentary upon Matthew's or the other gospels, ii. 204-5

The Order in which the four gospels were written; according to Clement of Alexandria, Matthew, Luke, Mark, John, i. 232-3. in which they were placed, as it seems, in Tertullian's time; first, the two written by apostles, and then the other two written by apostolical men, 301. the order of placing them according to Origen, and Eusebius; first Matthew, next Mark, then Luke, lastly John, 494. iv. 95, 96. so also, according to Jerom, 436-7. Augustine, 502. Chrysostom, 541. Cosmas, v. 94. Theophylact, 158. and others. Called commentaries, or memoirs, that is, short histories, ii. 131-2, 277. a code, or collection of them in the time of Ignatius, 89, 90. in the time of Trajan, 115-16. of Irenæus, 183

GOSPELS, the most excellent part of scripture, iv. 499. divers observations of Augustine upon them, 499-503. not certain in what place each gospel was written, 538-9. the time when they were written, according to Theophylact, 158-160. Euthymius, 165. Nicephorus Callisti, 168. their late date supposed by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 398-400. many advantages of their late date, that is, of their not being written till about 20 or 30 years after our Lord's ascension, 109-114. the

- characters of the several gospels, 571-2. the story that they were corrected in the time of the emperor Anastasius, as having been written by illiterate evangelists, considered, v. 124-5. the benefit of several gospels, and their wonderful harmony, 162-3. the evangelists did not call their histories *gospels*; the faithful afterwards called them gospels, 155-6. nor did the evangelists prefix their names to their books, and the reason of it, iv. 541
- Gospels Small*, worn by superstitious people, iv. 481, 554. v. 12. some cast lots upon them, iv. 529
- Gospels* according to the Egyptians, Basilides, Thomas, and Matthias, rejected by Origen, ii. 533-4
- Gospels* according to the Twelve, Basilides, Thomas, Matthias, rejected by Ambrose of Milan, iv. 330
- Gospels* according to the Egyptians, Thomas, Matthias, Bartholomew, the twelve apostles, Basilides, Apelles, and others not named, rejected by Jerom, iv. 463
- Gospel according to the Egyptians*; the obscurity of it, and how quoted by Clement of Alexandria, and rejected by him, ii. 236, 250-1. supposed to be quoted in the fragment of what is called the second epistle of Clement of Rome, 56. I think not written before the third century, v. 247. much neglected, ii. 535
- Gospel according to the Hebrews*; or, *of the Nazarenes*; whether quoted by Ignatius, ii. 91, 92. composed out of St. Matthew's and the other authentic gospels, with additions of some other things, received by oral tradition, 93. compare 381. not confirmed by Papias, 119. supposed to be quoted by Hegesippus, 124. how quoted by Clement of Alexandria, 250. by Origen, 535. see likewise the chapter of Ensebins, iv. 97, 106, 129. translated by Jerom, 457. see also 441. v. 91. and *Ebionites*. A character of it, vi. 386, note ⁱ. St. Luke does not refer to the gospels according to the Egyptians and Hebrews, in the introduction to his gospel, v. 383—388
- Gospel of James*, or *Protevangelion*, composed by Leucius, viii. 526-7
- Gospel of Matthias*, iv. 97, 106, 131. how the *Traditions* of Matthias are quoted by Clement of Alexandria, may be seen, ii. 256-7. viii. 534
- Gospel of the Nativity of Mary*, supposed to be written by Leucius, viii. 524—526
- Gospel according to Peter*, confuted by Serapion, Bp. of Antioch, and the obscurity of it, ii. 264—266. viii. 533. supposed by some moderns to have been composed by Leucius, ii. 266. viii. 533. the Gospel according to Peter, or the book of James, mentioned by Origen, ii. 537. and see iv. 97, 106, 131, 459
- Gospel according to Thomas*, said to have been forged by the Manichees, iii. 429. but without reason, being of an earlier date, 435. see iv. 97, 106, 131
- Gospels,—of James*, (or *Protevangelion*,) of the Infancy, of

- Matthias, of the Nativity of Mary, of Nicodemus, of Peter ; see viii. 524—535
- Gospel (The)* the true way of Salvation, two sermons, ix. 216
- Goths* converted by Audiis, iv. 177
- Governors* of the temple, i. 31
- Governors* of provinces, their different behaviour toward the christians, vii. 302—305
- Grabe (J. E.)* his argument upon the fragment of the second epistle ascribed to Clement of Rome, ii. 35. an observation of his upon a passage of Justin Martyr, 139. upon a passage of Irenæus, omitting St. James, 181. commended, 333, 368. his judgment upon the doctrine of the apostles, and the Constitutions, iv. 130, 196, note ^k. 200. his account of the Alexandrian MS. v. 80
- Gratianus (Serenius)* proconsul of Asia, his letter to Adrian in favour of the christians, vii. 93, 94
- Gratian*, his edict against Heretics, iv. 342. the same repealed, 351. whether he refused the title of Pontifex Maximus, viii. 111-12. when he ordered the Altar of Victory to be removed out of the senate house, 200
- Greeks*, or Grecians, in Acts ix. 29, who they were, v. 499. and those mentioned Acts xi. 20. 500-1. the Greeks in John xii. 20, 21, who they were, x. 275—277. the Grecians and Hebrews in Acts vi. 1. 287
- Gregory, Bp. of Illiberis*, his works, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 252-3. was a Luciferian, 252
- Gregory Nazianzen*, his works and time, iv. 285-6. his testimony to the scriptures, 286—289. his judgment concerning synods of bishops, 290. did not understand the principles of moderation, 289
- Gregory of Neocæsarea*, called *Thaumaturgus*, comes to Origen, ii. 476. his history, 608—619. testimonies to him, 619—628. his time, 629—633. was not at the second council of Antioch, 632. his works, 633—637. a creed ascribed to him, not his, 633—637. his character, 637—639. his testimony to the scriptures, 640—642
- Gregory Nyssen*, his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 295—297. select passages from him, 297—299
- Gregory I. Bp. of Rome*, his reason why the Manichees rejected marriage, iv. 371. his time, v. 126. books of the Old Testament quoted by him, 126-7. books of the New Testament quoted by him, 128—131. his respect for the scriptures, 131. select passages, 132—134
- Grotius (Hugo)* his judgment concerning *The Revelation*, ii. 721. his remarks upon Trajan's persecution of the christians, vii. 60. did not quote Thallus as a witness of the darkness at the time of our Saviour's passion, 123. his observations upon Porphyry's objections against the book of Daniel, 405-6, 413,

417-18. in the notes ; quoted, x. 82—84, 109, 111—113, 128, 143, 145-6, 152, 153-4, 156-7, 159—161, 176, 185. commended, 104

H

Hagiographa, that division of the sacred books of the Old Testament, largely considered, iv. 426—433

Hallet, (*Jos.*) quoted, ii. 50, 502, 506, 560. iii. 40, 41, 115. iv. 328. v. 487-8. vi. 100, 224, 260. x. 255-6. his observations upon the christian *Agapæ*, or love feasts, vii. 42, 43. upon the doxology in the *Philopatris*, 290. upon the altar to the unknown God, 327-8

Harmonius, son of *Bardesanes*, his character, ii. 319

Harris, (*Dr.*) his funeral sermon, ix. 44. his life and character, 55—59

Hasæus (*Th.*) quoted, vi. 301

Hayne (*T.*) quoted, vi. 310

Heart:—On keeping the Heart, a sermon, ix. 563

Heathen people, imposed upon by their priests, iii. 133. their temples shut up by Constantine, iv. 34. some of them demolished in his time, *ib.* their idolatrous worship forbidden, 35. remarks upon his laws against them, 48—50. on account of the doctrine of the Trinity, some of them thought that the christians worshipped a plurality of gods, 152

Hebed-Jesu ; see *Ebedjesu*.

Hebrew:—*The* EPISTLE *to the* HEBREWS ; *To whom* it was written, vi. 78—86. to believing Jews in Palestine, under persecution, iv. 547. v. 95, 137

In *what language* it was written, vi. 86—88. said by some of the ancients to have been translated into Greek, by Clement of Rome or St. Luke, ii. 32, 33. v. 95. by Luke, according to Clement of Alexandria, ii. 225, 234. Origen supposed it to have been written in Greek, 506. which is probable, iv. 138-9. said to be translated into Greek by Luke or Clement, 119-20. probably written in Greek, and the judgments of divers learned moderns in favour of that opinion, 138-9

By whom it was written, vi. 88—109. ascribed to Paul by Clement of Alexandria, ii. 225, 234, 239. to Barnabas by Tertullian, 288. by some to Barnabas, to Clement, or Luke, 495. v. 136

The time and place of writing it, vi. 109—112

Received, by Dionysius of Alexandria, ii. 690. by some of the Novatians, iii. 121. Theognostus, 152. the author of a poem against the Marcionites, 171. Methodius, 195. Peter of Alexandria, 239. Archelaus, 258. Serapion of Thmuis, 271. Titus of Bostra, 274. Hierax, 288. the Manichees, 403. and the Paulicians, 448. whether referred to by Arnobius, 479. referred to by Laetantius, 539. received by the other Arnobius,

480. Alexander, Bp. of Alexandria, 567. the Arians, 581-2. Hilary of Poitiers, iv. 179. Lucifer of Cagliari, 250. Faustinus and Marcellinus, 251. C. M. Victorinus, 256. Basil, 279. Gregory Nazianzen, 287. Amphilocheus, 293. Gregory Nyssen, 296. Didymus, 303. Ephrem, 310. Ebedjesu, 322. Ambrose, 334. Philaster, 387. Gaudentius, 388. Theodore of Mopsuestia, 395. Jerom, 436-7, 451. Rufinus, 484. third council of Carthage, 487. Chrysostom, 547. Severian, Bp. of Gabala, 571. Chromatius, Bp. of Aquileia, 581. Victor, of Antioch, 586. Paulinus, 589. the followers of Pelagius, 591. Palladius, v. 6. Isidore of Pelusium, 10. Cyril, of Alexandria, 13. Theodoret, 17. Cassian, 29. Prosper, 36. the author of the Calling of the Gentiles, 38. and of the divine Promises and Predictions, 39. Salvian, 65. Cosmas, 95. the author of the Imperfect Work, 121. Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 129. is in the Alexandrian MS. 82. received by Isidore of Seville, 137

Not received as Paul's by Caius, Irenæus, or Hippolytus, ii. 395—397, 425. not quoted by Cyprian, iii. 40—43. rejected by some of the Romans in the time of Eusebius and Jerom, ii. 397—399. and by some in the East, 467, 500-1. doubted of by several, 503—506. not received by Novatus, iii. 115—117. not received by the church of Rome in the time of Eusebius, iv. 98, 102-3. not received by all, 454—456, 488, 508

Whether quoted or alluded to by Clement of Rome, ii. 46—50. known to and quoted by Irenæus, 167. but not certain that it was received by him as Paul's, 178. quoted in the *Questiones et R.* 129. seems to be referred to by Polycarp, 106. the grounds of Caius's rejecting it considered, 398—400. Origen's judgment upon it, 495. how quoted by him, 501-2. observations upon his judgment, 502—507. whether the catholics rejected this epistle because it was perverted by the Novatians, iii. 116-17. probably it was received by Pamphilus, 226. doubtful whether it was received by Victorinus of Pettaw, 177-8. Eusebius's opinion of it, ii. 32. whether quoted by Optatus, iv. 328. whether received by the author of the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's Epistles, 383. doubts about this epistle, and the reason of them, 386-7. how quoted by Augustine, 507—509. whether received by Pelagius, 591. doubted of by some of the Latins, because of the difference of the style, 451. see St. Paul's epistles.

Hegemonius, said to be author of a work ascribed to Archelaus, iii. 254, 269

Hegesippus, a Hebrew christian, his history and works, and testimony to the books of the New Testament, ii. 152—157. his character, 152-3

Heidegger (J. H.) quoted, vi. 310

Helcesaites, see *Elcesaites*.

Helena, mother of Constantine, her mean original, iv. 4. whether wife of Constantius Chlorus, 5. respect shown her by Constan-

- tine, 6. her death, *ib.* churches said to be built by her, 32. whether she found our Saviour's real cross, *ib.*
- Helene, queen of the Adiabenes*, converted to Judaism, i. 120. relieves the Jews in a famine, 257
- Heliodorus*, author of the *Ethiopics*, viii. 16
- Hell-torments*, whether the Manichees believed them to be eternal, iii. 372-3. their eternity believed by Lactantius, 506
- Helladius*, a learned heathen and grammarian at Alexandria in the fourth century, afterwards at Constantinople, viii. 230, 234
- Hellenism*, the meaning of that word, vii. 644, note ^c
- Helvidius*, his opinion about the Lord's brethren. iii. 174
- Heraclas*, catechist and Bp. of Alexandria; famous for learning, ii. 457. mentioned again, 471, 472, 476
- Heracleas*, Bp. of Chalcedon, his work against the Manichees, iii. 254, 263-9
- Heracleon*, a Valentinian, his time and country, ii. 256. vi. 346. viii. 439. books of the New Testament received by him, vi. 346-7. quoted the preaching of Peter, ii. 256. it is probable that he received both the Old and New Testament, viii. 443. wrote commentaries on several parts of scripture, 441-2. remarks on those commentaries, 442-3. they give testimony to the genuineness of the introduction to John's gospel, 444
- Heraclitus*, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, ii. 261-2
- Hercules*, his image and temple destroyed by the christians, at Suffecta, in Africa, in the year 399, viii. 244
- Heresy*, defined, iii. 438. viii. 293—299. a heretic, one separated from the church, and who acknowledges himself a christian, 297. the unhappiness of heresy, iii. 298. advantage from it, 443. viii. 338. the causes of heresy, 299—301. many mistakes in the writers on this subject, 301—303. of the number of heresies, 303—305. heresies in the two first centuries principally two, those of the Docetæ who held two gods or first principles, and of the Ebionites who believed that our Saviour was a mere man, 305-6. the seeds sown in the days of the apostles, 344
- HISTORY** (The) of the **HERETICS** of the two first centuries after Christ, viii. 291, &c.
- HERETICS**, said to have corrupted the scriptures, ii. 146. who of them did so, 544. several heretics mentioned by Methodius, iii. 194. severally censured by Photius, 275. how treated by Constantine, iv. 35. remarks upon his treatment of them, 47. heretics have been often treated with harshness, viii. 307-8. and greatly calumniated, 309. unjustly accused of magic, 309-10. and lewdness, 311. christians in general as well as heretics had thus been accused, 312. the accusations unjust, 311—320. the ancient heretics believed the unity of God, 320—323. several heretics mentioned in the *Constitutions*, iv. 206. how to be treated according to Martin, Bp. of Tours, 345, 364. sometimes discovered by their modest garb and be-

- haviour, without inquiring into their faith, 351. the ancient heresiarchs generally men of letters, and borrowed their notions from the philosophers, viii. 333—335. and moderate to those who differed from them, 342. they did not admit the pernicious consequences charged upon their doctrines, 342-3. their writings lost, iv. 274. how censured by Cassian, v. 31, 32. by Vincentius Lirinensis, 42. and the author of the *Imperfect Work*, 115—118. they received the same scriptures with the Catholics, and quoted them very much, 48—50, 67. and made great use of them, viii. 324—329. they respected the apostles, 331-2. used also apocryphal books, 329—332. said to err innocently, at least sincerely, v. 67. a fine passage of Sozomen, concerning them, iii. 98, 99. order of the most early heretics, viii. 349
- Hermas*, his Pastor, or Shepherd, despised by some, approved by others, and his time, ii. 57, 58. placed in the time of Pope Pius by the author of a poem against the Marcionites, iii. 170, how quoted by Irenæus, ii. 186-7. Clement of Alexandria, 249. Tertullian, 303-4. Origen, 530—532. not a canonical book, though genuine, iv. 97, 98, 108, 129. not received as of authority, by Athanasius, 155, 158. by Prosper, v. 37
- Hermias*, an early author, who wrote against Gentilism, ii. 263
- Hermogenes*, a heretic, confuted by Theophilus, Bp. of Antioch, ii. 203-4. the account of him from ancient authors, viii. 580-1. of his time and country, 579-80. his opinion concerning the eternity of matter, 582-3. he asserted one God, 583-4. some other of his opinions, 584-5. set up no separate communion, 586. received both the Old and New Testament, 586—588. no account of his writings, 588
- Herod the Great*, an Idumean, i. 14. and yet a Jew, 14, 193. how he obtained the kingdom of Judea, 15, 284. the manner of his death, 45, 444-5. was always a dependant, tributary prince, 284—286. reduced to a more strict subjection to the Romans, 290. several of his cruel actions rehearsed, 346-7. Augustus's jest upon him for killing his sons, 353. who of his children survived him, 411-12. several opinions concerning the time of his death, 443—448
- Herod Agrippa*, his several preferments till he became king of all Judea, i. 22, 23. a zealous Jew, 23. his remarkable death, 24—27. his children, 27, 28. his letter to Caligula to dissuade him from erecting his statue at Jerusalem, 90, 113. how ridiculed at Alexandria, 166-7. imprisoned by order of Tiberius, 246. complains to Petronius of an injury done the Jews in Syria, 247. presents a gold chain at Jerusalem, 247. orders Nazarites to be shaved, 222
- Herod Antipas*, tetrarch of Galilee, in the time of John the Baptist, and our Saviour, i. 18. his marriage with Herodias, 18, 19. see also 408. banished by Caligula into Gaul, 21. was at Jerusalem at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, 152

- Herod, king of Chalcis*, married his niece Bernice, i. 27. see also 411, note ¹. had the government of the temple, 31, note ¹
- Herod*, son of Herod the Great, by Mariamme the high priest's daughter, his history, and that he was otherwise called Philip, and was the first husband of Herodias, i. 409-10
- Herodians*, who they were, i. 131—133
- Herodias*, married Herod the tetrarch, i. 18, 19. her character, 20, 21. her daughter demands John Baptist's head, 20. who was her first husband, 408—410
- Herwaert (John Geo.)* his interpretation of Luke ii. 2. i. 316
- Hesychius, Bp. in Egypt*, his edition of the Old and New Testament, iii. 206—209. mentioned again, 238
- Heuman (C. A.)* his opinion concerning the bishopric and martyrdom of Hippolytus, ii. 427-8. his edition of Lactantius commended, iii. 488-9, 499. his opinion concerning the Manichæism of Lactantius considered, 516. his remarks upon a passage of Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus, iv. 449. quoted, iii. 483, 523. iv. 81, 474. v. 8, 365, 370, 403, 502. vi. 273, 277, 286, 289-90. his remarks upon Pliny's letter concerning the christians examined, vii. 32. quoted and commended, 467
- Hierax*, a learned christian of Egypt, reckoned a Manichee, iii. 285. but without reason, 285—288. his eminence, 286—288. his testimony to the scriptures, 288-9
- Hierocles*, who wrote against the christians at the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution, vii. 207. an account of his work from Lactantius, 474—477. from Eusebius, 477—480. he did not deny the truth of our Saviour's miracles, but set up Apollonius Tyanæus against him: he was well acquainted with the books of the Old and New Testament, and bears witness to their antiquity and genuineness, and mentions by name St. Peter and St. Paul, 475—484. see also 555-6. guilty of great cruelties when he was præfect at Alexandria, 480. different from Hierocles a philosopher at Alexandria, in the fifth century, 481
- Hierocles of Alexandria*, his time, history, and works, with remarks, viii. 127—130
- High priests*, did rend their clothes upon extraordinary occasions, i. 153-4. mentioned in the plural number, 154. their sacred vestment, by whom kept at several times, 190-1. see also *Vitellius*; their succession preserved by Josephus, 404-5
- Hilary, deacon of Rome*, his history, character, and principles, iv. 381-2. whether author of a Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, 382
- Hilary of Poitiers*, his works and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 178-9
- Hillel and Shammai*, their different opinions, i. 132
- Himerius*, sophist and professor of rhetoric at Athens, under whom Basil and Gregory Nazianzen studied, viii. 3—5
- Hippolytus (Bp. of Porto)*, probably author of *The Treatise of the Universe*, ascribed to Caius and others, ii. 409. his history

- and works, 421—425. what sort of a bishop he was, and whether he was a martyr, 426—428. wrote against the Valentinians, Marcionites, Nicolaitans, Noetians, and all heretics, 421—425. against the Noëtians, 590, 598—600. did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, 425-6, 436. opinions of moderns concerning his remaining works, 429—431. his testimony to the scriptures, 433—437. though he wrote in Greek he may be reckoned among Latins, vi. 90. quoted, x. 131, note ^e
- HISTORY** of the APOSTLES and EVANGELISTS, writers of the New Testament, v. 255—vi. 361
- Hody's (H.)* opinion concerning the Hagiographa, iv. 426, 433. quoted, v. 139, 146. vi. 142, 147
- Hogg's (Mr.)* note concerning the Ophians, viii. 569
- HOLY SPIRIT**, meaning of it in the Scriptures, ix. 400—403, x. 117, &c. 299. A Letter upon the Personality of the Spirit, 262—264. see also the word *Spirit*
- Homousian*, different sentiments concerning that word, iii. 139-40
- Homousians*, called heretics, v. 116-17. they persecuted the Arians, and others, 116
- Honoratus*, *Augustine's friend*, once a heathen, afterwards a Manichee, iii. 279, 296
- Hormista of Orsius*, viii. 253
- Hours of the day*, computed in the gospel of John, as in the other gospels, in the Jewish manner, v. 449, x. 278—283
- Huber (Z.)* commended, i. 104
- Huet (P. D.)* quoted, ii. 241. his opinion concerning the design of Philostratus in writing the life of Apollonius of Tyana, vii. 493-4, 511
- Hunt (Dr.)* quoted, x. 151. his funeral sermon, ix. 92. his life and character, 103—114
- Hymns to the gods*, were sometimes in prose, sometimes in verse, vii. 40, 41
- Hymns*, used in the church, afterwards laid aside, ii. 682
- Hypatia*, her great merit, and the manner of her death, viii. 145—148
- Hypythians*, said by Origen to use spurious writings, ii. 547
- Hyrcanus*, high-priest and prince of Judea, i. 13. put to death by Herod, i. 347

I

- Jackson (J.)* his opinion of the time of a work of Novatian, and of Sabellianism, examined, iii. 105—109. an answer to his remarks on the fifth volume of the former edition of this work, 243—251
- Jamblichus*, his time, and his life of Pythagoras, with remarks, showing that he did not aim to oppose Pythagoras to our Saviour, vii. 503—506. another work of his, with remarks, 506-7

JAMES (ST.) son of Zebedee, the first martyr for Christ among the apostles, beheaded by Herod Agrippa, v. 402. said, but without reason, to have planted the gospel in Spain, 402, note ^a

JAMES, (ST.) the son of Alphaeus, his history from the New Testament, whereby it appears that he was an apostle, vi. 162—167. his history from ancient writers, 168—183. who he was, and his history from Jerom, iv. 457-8. he was an apostle according to Epiphanius, 189-90. Augustine, 509. the son of Alphaeus, consequently an apostle, in the Imperfect Work, v. 121

Not esteemed to be an apostle by Eusebius, iv. 122-3. Cyril of Jerusalem, 174. and see the Synopsis, 165. The Constitutions, 226. but see 205. Gregory Nyssen, 298. said to be one of Christ's seventy disciples in the Synopsis of Dorotheus, iii. 162

He presided in the church of Jerusalem after the death of St. Stephen, vi. 165—167, 171—173. he presided in the council at Jerusalem, 166. his excellent character, 167. how he was the Lord's brother, 170, 172, 184—190. according to the Commentary upon St. Paul's thirteen epistles, iv. 383. according to Pelagius, 592. Theodoret, v. 18. Œcumenius, 156. Theophylact, 160-1. why called The Less, vi. 192—194. called also The Just, 194. other marks of respect for him, *ibid.*

His martyrdom in the temple, with the manner and time of his death, vi. 174—183. thirty years after our Lord's ascension according to Bede, v. 145. the account of his death, vi. 498. the paragraph concerning him in Josephus not genuine, 496-7. see i. 83

HIS EPISTLE : Its genuineness, vi. 195—198. when written, 199. to whom, v. 156. vi. 200—202

It seems to be referred to by Clement of Rome, ii. 50—52. by Hermas, 66, 68. how quoted by Origen, 507-8, 511. whether referred to by Commodian, iii. 135. received by the Paulicians, 448. quoted by the younger Arnobius as written by James the apostle, 480. seems to be referred to by Lactantius, 540. received by Athanasius, iv. 155, 157. Cyril of Jerusalem, 173-4. the council of Laodicea, 182, 190. Epiphanius, 187, 190. supposed to be referred to in the Constitutions, 227. received by Gregory Nazianzen, 287. Amphilochius, 293. the Syrian churches, 321, v. 96, 97. Jerom, and generally in his time, iv. 457-8. Augustine, 494, 509. Chrysostom, 548. Sulpicius Severus, 575. Chromatius, Bp. of Aquileia, 581. Innocent, Bp. of Rome, 586. Paulinus, 589. Pelagius, 591. Palladius, v. 6. Cyril of Alexandria, 13. Theodoret, 18. Cassian, 29. Prosper, 36. Salvian, 65. the Imperfect Work, 121. Œcumenius, 156. Theophylact, 161

Not quoted by Irenæus, ii. 179, 181. nor by Clement of Alexandria, 241. nor by Tertullian, 291-2, 295. nor Cyprian, iii. 43. not received by all in the time of Eusebius, iv. 97, 104. and Jerom, 457. doubted of by some, v. 136. especially in the east, 108

- Idacius*, Bp. of Emerita, prosecutor of Priscillian and his followers, iv. 341-2
- Idumeans*, who they were, and their conversion to Judaism, i. 14
- Jehudah*, or Judah, the holy, composer of the Mishna, his time and character, vi. 506—508, 514
- Jeremiah*, the prophet, said by some not to have died, iii. 168, 170. an apocryphal book, with his name, mentioned by Jerom, iv. 463
- Jerom*, his time, iv. 403—405. his history and character, 405—418. his masters in Latin, in grammar, &c. 405. in Hebrew, 406. his account of apocryphal books of the Old Testament, iii. 54. well acquainted with Jewish traditions, vi. 513. his accounts of the Nazarene christians, 384-5. confutes the Manichees in his works, iii. 276. what he says of their fasting, 298. wrote severely against heretics, viii. 307, 327. favoured by pope Damasus, and made his secretary, iv. 276-7. several of his works mentioned, *ibid.* quoted, x. 116, 131, and elsewhere. The time of his stay at Rome, iv. 276. how censured by Palladius, 410-11. An account of his book Of Illustrious Men, 404. of some other of his works, 407. his editions and versions of the scriptures, and commentaries upon them, 468—471. his testimony to the scriptures, 419, &c. select passages, 481-2. once an admirer of Origen, afterwards his enemy, 578. his Latin version of the scriptures quoted by Cassian, v. 31. and Gregory, bishop of Rome, 133
- Jerusalem*, when taken by Pompey, vi. 399, 400. when Titus began to besiege it, 407. when he took it, 407, 460-1. the distresses of the city during the siege, see *Famine*. The number who perished in the siege and in Judea, 462, 470, 551. the city afterwards called Ælia, iii. 221
- JESUS**: the true time of his nativity, i. 369—372. said to be found by the wise men of the East, not in a stable, but in a house, v. 163. the time of the duration of his ministry, i. 384-5. ii. 448—450. iii. 72, 257. iv. 261, 318, 389. v. 79, 144, 163. the time of his crucifixion, i. 400. his age at the time of his baptism, iv. 192. how many passovers in his ministry, 192-3. his ministry said to continue three years and a half, 116
- He wrought no miracles in early life, and disdained ease and luxury, 318, 557. Remarks upon his three miracles of raising the dead, 318. A Vindication of these in answer to Woolston's objections, x. 1—72. owing to modesty that he said of Jairus's daughter, she sleeps, iv. 584. was a philosopher, and truly religious, 87. called the first martyr, 289. all his miracles healing and beneficial, v. 100. he said and did many things not recorded in the gospels, iv. 584. v. 163. his miracles true and certain, and well attested, vi. 566. his predictions of the calamities coming on the Jews, 408. Proofs of his resurrection, iv. 298-9. the evidence of it increased by the scrupu-

lousness of Thomas, 389. the ends of his ministry and death, 531—533. he did not use force, 533. his character by Palladius, v. 7

He had a human soul and body, x. 78, &c. according to the ancient catholic christians, 116. was not an angel, 174-5. is the Messiah, vi. 594. why called Christ, iv. 557. his great dignity as the Messiah, x. 100—102. not reputed to be God while on earth, either by the Jews or by his disciples, v. 21. why called the Son of God, 123, ix. 366—371. x. 92—97

Apocryphal books concerning his nativity, and that he left no written volume, iv. 465-6. his nativity according to Talmudical writers, vi. 516. his journey into Egypt according to the same writers, 517—519. his disciples according to them, 520—522. and his last sufferings, 522—524

Jesus, or Joshua, the son of Ananus, his remarkable story, vi. 452-3, 457

Jewish believers, their opinion concerning the person of Christ, iii. 441, note ⁱ. see *Ebionites* and *Nazarenes*. The faith of early Jewish believers a valuable testimony to the truth of the christian religion, vi. 371—387. their faith a great virtue, 379-80

Jewish canon, by whom received. See *Canon*

Jewish unbelievers, how they treated the primitive christians, vi. 388—392

Jews had the free exercise of their religion in Judea, i. 35, 36. their civil state in Judea, according to the evangelists, 37—76. according to other ancient writers, 76—107. could imprison men, 57, 58. could inflict lesser penalties, 42, 43, 57—59, 81, 82. had a council, 44, 57, 81. could not legally inflict capital punishments, 48—51, 69—76, 88. objections against that supposition considered, 51—57. had a council at Alexandria, 85, 86. decided little differences among themselves at Sardis, 88. privileges bestowed upon them by the Romans and others, 183, &c. excused by the Romans from military service, 240, 278. and from appearance in the courts of judicature on the Sabbath and the preparation, 186. were riotous, 94, 95, 209. practised polygamy, 39. and divorces, 38, 39, 411. were very corrupt and wicked, 145—148. numerous out of Judea, 112—114. their twelve tribes in being at the time of our Saviour and his apostles, 114. the registers of their families also then in being, 282. expected the Messiah, 137—139, 142-3. required a sign, 139-40. why they rejected Jesus, 144-5. their sin in rejecting him very great, vi. 425, 584—590. their enmity to the first christians, i. 94, 172-3, 179-80, 207—210. vi. 388—392. were numerous at Rome, i. 118-19, 186. banished from Rome by Tiberius, 186. by Claudius, 259. uneasy under the Roman government, 227. their request to be under a Roman governor after the death of Herod, 82, 303. crucified by the Roman soldiers before the walls of Jerusalem, vi. 444-5, 462,

545. ript up for the sake of treasure, 446, 544. the numbers that perished at the siege of Jerusalem, and elsewhere, 462, 470, 550-1. many compelled to fight in amphitheatres, 465, 551. required to pay tribute to the capitol at Rome, 469, 646. the advantages which christians have from the dispersion and subsistence of the Jews, iv. 530-1. their circumstances a cogent argument for the truth of the christian religion, vi. 590. Three Discourses on this subject from Rom. xi. 11. ix. 60—91
- Ignatius*, Bp. of Antioch, his time, ii. 73, 74. the smaller epistles ascribed to him genuine, 76. according to Dr. Jortin, who rejects the Apostolical Constitutions, v. 179-80. his testimony to the books of the New Testament, ii. 78, &c. how quoted by Origen, 532. the time of his martyrdom, 77. vii. 20, 21, 61
- Imperial laws* concerning Gentile people and their worship, viii. 163—182
- Imprisonment*, the Roman method, i. 244
- Right Improvement* of time, a sermon, ix. 470
- India*, christians there, v. 101
- Infants* at Bethlehem, their slaughter mentioned by christian writers, and by Macrobius a heathen author, i. 353-4. why not related by Josephus, 346—352
- Innocent I.* Bp. of Rome, persecutes the Novatians, iii. 104. his Catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, iv. 586
- Inquisitiveness* in things of religion recommended, ii. 649-50. vii. 76
- Inscription*, in honour of Titus after the conquest of Judea, vi. 479. concerning the christians in the time of Nero, 623
- Instrument*, that word sometimes used by Latin writers instead of Testament, v. 261
- Job*, his book said to be written by Moses, iii. 189. his dunghill visited by superstitious people in Chrysostom's time, iv. 569
- John the Baptist*, the Manichean opinion of him, iii. 596-7. the boundary of the Old and New Testament, v. 30. said to have been baptized by Christ, 122. how he was revered for his austere character by Josephus and many other Jews, vi. 484—486. the genuineness of the paragraph concerning him in the works of Josephus asserted, 481—485
- JOHN (ST.) APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST**; his history from the New Testament, v. 399—411. called the Divine, iv. 585. v. 14, 94. by Eusebius, iv. 118. Athanasius, 156. and Cyril, 174. he was younger than Peter, and survived all the apostles, 588. was related to the Lord, and why beloved above the other disciples, v. 160. had three mothers, 161. when he left Judea to go to reside at Ephesus, 412. was banished, ii. 287. by Domitian into Patmos, where he wrote the Revelation, iv. 575. v. 140. the time of his banishment, 414—425. how long he was there, and when he returned to Ephesus, 425—427. his age when he was called to be an apostle, and at the time of his

death, 411. he lived to the time of Trajan, iv. 446. and his age, 446-7. what Suidas says of his great age, 549-50. several things said of him by ancient ecclesiastical writers, v. 412—414. several stories concerning him rehearsed and examined, iv. 447—450. whether he met Ebion, or Cerinthus, at a public bath in Ephesus, ii. 95. whether he was cast into a cauldron of boiling oil, 287. he raised a dead man to life at Ephesus, 393. said to have delivered a creed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, 613. his superior knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity, 635. why he and his brother James were surnamed by our Lord Boanerges, v. 401—403. whether he followed our Lord to the high-priest's and let in Peter, 405—407. why our Lord committed the care of his mother to him, 407

His great excellence, and the superiority of his gospel above those of the other evangelists, and above Peter, iv. 446-7, 503, 638-9. v. 14. his gospel was not written by way of opposition to any heretics, 450—454. therein the errors of Cerinthus and others confuted, 450. written the last of the four gospels, and the occasion of writing it, and its superior excellence, ii. 170, 226. v. 158. the time and occasion of writing it according to Victorinus, iii. 176. Theodore of Mopsuestia, iv. 398-9. the occasion of writing it, 95, 398-9, 445, 538, 588. v. 94, 158. the use and importance of it, iv. 540-1. the opinion of divers learned moderns concerning the time when it was written, v. 530—532. that it was written at Ephesus, 94. before the destruction of Jerusalem about the year 68, 431—448. objections to this considered, 448—456. his gospel not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem, iv. 541. before the destruction of Jerusalem, v. 158. about the time of it, 168. many years after it, 166. after his being in Patmos, 145. written the last in the New Testament, 74. before the Revelation, 77. his gospel and epistles written after his return from Patmos, and after the death of Domitian, 145. his gospel said to be written in Asia, 137. in Patmos, 160. at Ephesus according to Irenæus, ii. 170. Ebedjesu, iv. 321

Testimonies of ancient writers to his gospel. v. 427—430. referred to by Ignatius, ii. 80, 81. received by Justin M. 131. Athenagoras, 196. Theophilus of Antioch, 206. called a spiritual gospel, 226. his gospel and first epistle universally received; his second and third epistles not so received in Origen's time, 494-5, 510-11. his gospel the first fruit of the gospels, 515. quoted by Novatus, iii. 111, 113. by Dionysius of Rome, 130-1. by Victorinus, 174. by Anatolius, 144. Theognostus, 152. Archelaus, 258. his gospel and second epistle quoted by Alexander of A. 567-8. his gospel and first epistle universally received in the time of Eusebius and before, iv. 94, 96. his gospel mentioned with marks of great respect, 296, 333. his gospel and epistles and Revelation received by Jerom, 436, 446-7. observations upon his gospel, 456—461. a commentary

upon it by Cyril of A. v. 13. respectfully quoted by Amelius, vii. 373-4. he computes the hours of the day as the other evangelists, after the Jewish manner, v. 449. x. 278—282

His *three epistles*; their genuineness, vi. 275—277. the time of writing the first of them, 278—281. to whom it was sent, 281—284. observations upon the second epistle, 284—288. upon the third, 288—298. when they were written, 298. his first epistle referred to by Polycarp, ii. 108. and the martyrs at Lyons, 164. quoted by Papias, 119, 123, 125. by Clement of Alexandria, 242. by Tertullian, 293, 295. his first and second epistles quoted by Irenæus, 180. his first epistle often quoted by Dionysius of Alexandria, and his second and third spoken of as ascribed to him, 694. whether his second and third epistles were received by Cyprian, iii. 46, 47. his first epistle quoted by Novatus, 118. by Commodian, 135. Methodius, 197. Phileas, 236. and by the Novatians, 116. by Archelaus, 258. and by the Manichees, 404. his three epistles received by the Paulicians, 448. the second and third not received by all, iv. 96, 97, 124. his second epistle quoted by Alexander, iii. 568. by Lucifer of Cagliari, iv. 250. Optatus, 328. his third epistle, and the Revelation, quoted in the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, 383. his first epistle received by all, the other two doubted of, 446. his first epistle said to be written to the Parthians, 510. v. 111, 145. his three epistles received by Innocent, iv. 586. Arethas, v. 104. and all who had the same canon with that now generally received; his second and third epistles doubted of by some, 136

The Revelation published in the time, and after the time, of Domitian, iii. 179. but see 324—328. see *Canon of the New Testament*, and *Catholic Epistles*, and *the Revelation*

John the elder, ii. 117, 121

John the publican at Cæsarea, his good character, i. 231

John of Gischala, how he escaped from that place, and got to Jerusalem, vi. 434. taken prisoner, 550. and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, according to Josephus, 463. the account of his death in Josippon, 550. see, likewise, 572

John, a martyr in Dioclesian's persecution, remarkable for his memory, iii. 222

Jones (J.) quoted, ii. 40. iii. 52, 208. vi. 604, 640. his opinion of the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, ii. 19. a remark of his upon a passage in Justin M. 139. upon St. Mark's gospel, 232. quoted and commended, v. 343. and elsewhere; thinks that Seleucus, in Augustine's book of Heresies, is the same as Leucius, but is mistaken, viii. 515. is mistaken also in making Leucius a Manichee, 523-4

Jortin (Dr.) quoted, i. 466, 482. vii. 54, note ^e, 95, note ^t, 338. viii. 302. x. 97. notes, his observations upon M. Antoninus the philosopher, vii. 135, 144. receives the *Philosophy of Oracles* as a work of Porphyry, 444

- Joseph, Husband of Mary*, on what account he was obliged by the decree of Augustus to enrol himself, i. 281. why he went to Bethlehem to be enrolled, 281-2. a current tradition that he was a widower, and had children by a former wife, viii. 527-8
- Joseph, a Jew*, beaten for reading the gospels, i. 43
- Josephus (Flavius) the Jewish historian*, his time, works, and character, vi. 393—399. made governor of Galilee, i. 84. pretended to prophecy, 295. was a firm Jew, 296, 351. his passages concerning a terrible execution at Jerusalem, in Herod's time, 292—294, 366-7. remarks upon them, 293—300, 348-9. calls Livia, Augustus's wife, Julia, 415. calls Caiaphas, Joseph, 416. his silence no objection against St. Matthew's history of the slaughter of the infants, 346. shy of mentioning christian affairs, 260. some remarkable omissions in his history, 340—342. his speech to the Jews to induce them to surrender to Titus, 285. how he flattered Vespasian and Titus, 295-6. vi. 396, 418, 505. endeavoured to save the honour of the Roman government, and the Jewish nation, i. 229. his works not much respected by the Jews, vi. 398, 532. his History of the Jewish war, and the siege of Jerusalem, and the conquest of Judea, 425—470. the value of his testimony, 471—475. vii. 16. observations upon his writings and testimony, vi. 500—505. Two passages concerning dæmoniacs, with remarks, i. 507—510. his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, iv. 429. Three paragraphs in his works, the genuineness of which are considered: first, concerning John the Baptist, vi. 480—486. second, concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, 486—496. vii. 3—16. correspondence with Dr. Chandler on this subject, i. xciv—xcvii. some farther observations, xcvi—civ. third, concerning James, the Lord's brother, vi. 496—499. what may have been the reason of Josephus not having mentioned any thing concerning our Saviour, 500—505. Josephus mentioned by Anatolius, iii. 143. by the author of the Imperfect Work, v. 123
- Joseph Ben Gorion, or Josippon*, his age, work, and character, vi. 531—534, 556—558. his testimony to the Jewish war, the siege of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the city and temple by Titus, 534—555. observations upon his work, 556—558
- Jotapata*, the siege of that place, and the event of it, vi. 395
- Jovinian*, against whom Jerom wrote, iv. 408
- Irenæus*, bishop of Lyons, his character of Polycarp, ii. 96. his history, time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, 165—193. wrote no commentary upon the Revelation, 137, 182. fragments ascribed to him, 189-90. the time and character of his Latin interpreter, iii. 23—25. he was not a martyr, ii. 169. vii. 311. his account of the Heretics, Basilidians, viii. 350—352. Cainites, 561. Carpocratians, 394—399. Cerdon, 445. Cerinthus, 404. Marcossians, 429—438. Marcionites, 448. &c. Ophians, 565. Saturninus, 347. Sethians, 552, 555. he observes that the heretics bear testimony to the scriptures, 324-5.

- in his long and particular arguments with Valentinus and other heretics, he does not charge them with polytheism, 320-21. quoted, x. 111
- Isaiah*, sawn asunder, iii. 170. his book rather a gospel than a prophecy. iv. 475. his *Ascension* or *Anabaticon*, iii. 289. mentioned again by Jerom, iv. 463
- Isidore*, son of Basilides, ii. 310
- Isidore* of Pelusium, quoted, iv. 412. his time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 8—12. his observations upon the testimony of Josephus, vi. 474
- Isidore*, Bp. of Seville, his time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 135—140
- Italic* version, whether mentioned by Augustine, iv. 525-6. See Abp. of Canterbury's conjecture, v. 229
- Ithacius*, Bp. of Sossuba, prosecutor of Priscillian, iv. 341—346. his character, 352. deposed, 358
- Ittigius* (*Tho.*) his remark upon a passage of Justin M. ii. 138. upon Tatian's Harmony, 149. quoted and commended, vi. 491
- Judaize*, the meaning of that word, vi. 232
- Judas the traitor*, present at the institution of the Lord's supper, iv. 555. observations concerning him, 390, 568
- Judas of Galilee*, his principles, i. 228-9, 303. his time, 303
- Judas*, a christian writer, his history. ii. 583. author of a Commentary upon Daniel's seventy weeks, how he was affected with the cruelty of Severus's persecution, vii. 310
- Jude* (*St.*) his history, vi. 298—304. called also Thaddeus and Lebbeus, 299, 303. not certain that he was a martyr, 300. reasons for thinking that he was an husbandman before he was called to be an apostle, 303-4. the genuineness of the epistle ascribed to him, 304—314. to whom it was sent, 314-15. the time of writing it, 315—317. not quoted by Irenæus, ii. 180. quoted by Clement of Alexandria, 242. and Tertullian, 295. how quoted by Origen, 511-12. why rejected by some, 545-6. not cited by Cyprian, iii. 47. cited by the anonymous author against the Novatian heretic, 64. received by the Paulicians, 448. not universally received in the time of Eusebius, or before, iv. 97, 104-5. whether received by him, 125. quoted by Lucifer of Cagliari, 250. rejected by some, but generally received in Jerom's time, 460. received by Innocent, 586. Isidore of Pelusium, v. 10. Cyril of Alexandria, 13. Cassian, 29. and others. See *Catholic epistles*
- Judea*, first brought into subjection to the Romans, by Pompey, vii. 399. reduced to the state of a province after the removal of Archelaus, i. 79. a branch of the province of Syria, 82, 89, 302. had in it no Roman governor with power of life and death, between Pilate's removal and Herod Agrippa's accession, 90—93. its state under Herod the great, 283—286
- Judgment* (*Private*) its rights asserted, iii. 510-11

- Judith*, how quoted by Origen, ii. 541. not reckoned a canonical book by Jerom, iv. 420-1. nor Rufinus, 484
- Julian, emperor*, his passage concerning our Saviour's enrolment by Cyrenius, i. 271-2. does justice to the Novatians, iii. 99. how he treated Titus of Bostra, 272. his edict forbidding christians to teach grammar, and other parts of literature, iv. 255, 259. a letter of his to Photinus, 238. was a persecutor, v. 171. vii. 552. his time and character, and behaviour towards the christians, 581—601. whom he forbade to teach rhetoric, 589, 639. viii. 52. called the christians Galileans, vii. 599. when he renounced christianity and embraced Hellenism, 594, 643. how he dissembled his real sentiments for a good while, viii. 51, 52. his regard for the Jewish people, and his design to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem, ix. 79. vii. 603—621. extracts out of his work against the christians, which are a testimony to the books of the New Testament, 621—638. the sum of those extracts, 638-9. viii. 160-1. extracts out of his orations and epistles, vii. 639—652. vindicated from some charges, 590—593. his character in Eutropius, viii. 45. makes frequent profession of moderation, and yet was a persecutor, vii. 595—600, 639—641, 648—652. his character by Cave, 601, note ^h
- Juliana, friend of Symmachus*, from whom Origen received his version of the scriptures, ii. 328
- Julius Africanus*. See *Africanus*
- Julius Capitolinus*. See *Capitolinus*
- Julius Cassianus*. See *Cassianus*
- Junilius, an African Bp.* his work, time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 105—108
- Justin Martyr*, his history, ii. 125-6. his works, 126—128. his account of the Jews cursing Christ in their synagogues, i. 179-80. his passages concerning Cyrenius, 269. concerning the slaughter of the infants, 352-3. concerning the Jewish practice of divorces, 39. not author of the epistle to Zena and Serenus, nor of that to Diognetus, nor of some other works ascribed to him, ii. 127, 140-1. the time of his apologies, and of his dialogue with Trypho, 127. the pathetic address at the end of his first apology, vii. 77. his testimony to the scriptures, ii. 129—140. wrote no commentary upon the Revelation, 137. did not use apocryphal books, 137-8. imitated Aristides in his first apology, 309. quoted and animadverted upon, x. 105-6. he wrote against Marcion, viii. 451. Of the *Quæstiones et Responsiones* ascribed to him, ii. 128-9
- Justus of Tiberias*, what Josephus says of him, i. 74. mentioned again, 851. his testimony to the conquest of Judea, by Titus, vi. 475-6
- Justus, præfect of Asia*, a zealous Gentile; his history from Eunapius, viii. 72
- Juvenal*, his time and works, vi. 638. his testimony to Nero's

persecution of the christians, 638-9. and to Domitian's persecution, 639-40

Juvencus, his work and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 168-9

Izates, his conversion to judaism, i. 120. sends money to Jerusalem in a time of famine, 257. his relations in Jerusalem surrender to Titus, and are received by him, vi. 459, 548

K

Kepler, quoted, i. 317, 398

Keuchenius (Pet.) quoted, i. 263, 319-20. quoted and commended, x. 353

King (P.) quoted, x. 173

King (Ri.) who he was, vii. 197-8

Kingdom of Heaven taken by Force, a sermon, ix. 439

Kortholt (C.) his judicious observations upon Pliny's epistle to Trajan, vii. 34. and upon Trajan's rescript, 51, note ^t

Kuster (L.) quoted and commended, v. 59. quoted, vii. 504-5

L

Lactantius, his character of Tertullian's style and apology, ii. 268. how he used the Sibylline books, 344. his character of Cyprian's writings, iii. 13. his character by Jerom, 522-3. his history and time, 481-488. his works, 488-500. whether the book of the Deaths of Persecutors be his, 495-499. vii. 559. select passages from him, iii. 500-515. errors ascribed to him, 516. whether he held Manichæan principles, 516-519. what pope Damasus said of his epistles, 487-8, 489. his character, 522-526. his testimony to the scriptures, 526-549. what he says of the lawyer Ulpian, vii. 334. his accounts of two writers against the christians, at the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution, one anonymous, the other Hierocles, 471-477. takes notice of the cruelties of Dioclesian's persecution, 528. mentioned, x. 131

Laertius (Diogenes) his time and work, vii. 318-19. the inscription on the altar to the Unknown God, in Acts xvii. 23, illustrated by a paragraph in his work, 319-328. whether he refers to the christian eucharist, 329

Lampe (F. A.) quoted, v. 407, 412, 414, 425, 431-2, 446-7, 451, vi. 187, and elsewhere

Ælius Lampridius says that Adrian intended to build temples to Christ, which story is examined, vii. 99-101. supposed to refer to M. Antoninus's deliverance in Germany, 189. his passages relating to Alexander Severus as favourable to the christians, 330-333. what he says of Heliogabalus's design to unite the christian with other religions, 469-70

Laodicea, the church there planted by St. Paul, vi. 151, &c.

- Laodicea* (*The council of*) their catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, with remarks, iv. 182—184
- Laodiceans*, an epistle to them, whether used by the Manichees, iii. 404. rejected by all, according to Jerom, iv. 452. an epistle supposed to be sent to them, but was rather from them, vi. 18, 156, 161
- Lardner* (*Mr. Rich.*) father to the author of this work, his character, i. lxxxviii.-ix
- La Roche* (*Michael*) his Memoirs of Literature quoted, iii. 173
- Latin translation of the Old Testament*, read in christian churches in the first ages, made from the Greek of the Seventy, vi. 523-4. of Jerom's translations, see 524-5. and his works under his name in this Index. The Latin translation of the New Testament said to have been in great disorder in Jerom's time, 477-8. and see 524-5
- Latronian*, a Priscillianist, put to death at Treves, with Priscillian, iv. 338
- Launoy* (*J.*) his dissertation concerning Victorinus of Pettaw, iii. 164
- Lawyers*, who they were, i. 130-1
- Learning not discouraged by the christian religion*, this appears from the catechetical school at Alexandria, in the early days of christianity, ii. 216-17. in which presided Pantænus, Clement, Origen, and others of great fame for learning: the library at Jerusalem, erected by Alexander, Bp. of that city, 419-20. and the library of Cæsarea, erected and furnished by Pamphilus, iii. 216-17, 223-4. from the method of Origen in educating young men under his care, ii. 610-11. and from the many learned christians in every age
- L'Enfant*, his argument concerning the inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 280—282. x. 87, note, quoted, 92, note
- Leo*, Bp. of Rome, how he treated the Manichees, iii. 301. his account of the opinions of the Priscillianists, iv. 367—371. his charges against them considered, 373-4. likewise against the Manichees, iii. 451-2. his want of candour towards such as were called heretics, iv. 367. his time and testimony to the scriptures, v. 62—64
- Leonidas*, Origen's father, divers particulars concerning his family, and suffering martyrdom in the persecution of Severus, ii. 469—471, 606. vii. 310
- Leontius*, Bp. of the Novatians at Rome, iii. 100
- Leontius*, of Constantinople, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 141—144
- Leucius*, a follower of Marcion, and one of the chief of the Docetæ, viii. 518, 533. had different names, 523. his time, iii. 433. viii. 517-18. his opinions, iii. 432-3. viii. 518—520. not a Manichee, 523-4. an account of his writings in general, 521—523. author of an apocryphal book entitled *Travels of the*

- Apostles*, ii. 257. said to be author of the Gospel of Peter, 266, viii. 533. of the History of the nativity of the virgin, 524—526. the Protevangelion, or Gospel of James, 526-7, 529. the Gospel of Nicodemus, or Acts of Pilate, 531-2. said to have interpolated the Gospel of the infancy, 530. writers who mention him, iii. 432. viii. 514—517, 522-3. remarks upon his books, iii. 434. viii. 528-9. these forgeries prove the truth of canonical scripture, 538
- Leusden (J.)* quoted, iv. 428, 432
- Libanius, sophist of Antioch*, his time, works, and character, viii. 14—16. averse to christianity, yet friendly to some christians, *ib.* flourished many years as an author, ii. 322. his letter to Priscian, president of Palestine, concerning the Manichees, iii. 268. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom his scholars, iv. 392-3. extracts out of his epistles, viii. 16—18. out of his other works, 18—20. recommends moderation in things of religion, *ib.* and 28, 29. his Oration for the temples to Theodosius, A. D. 390. with remarks, 20—41
- Liberius, Bp. of Rome*, how treated by Constantius, viii. 48, 49.
- Libertines*, who they were, i. 117—119
- Library at Casarea*, repaired by Enzoius, iii. 595. made use of by Euthalius, v. 68. See *Pamphilus*
- Library*, Four Letters of Mr. Lardner's published in that periodical pamphlet in 1761 and 1762, v. 248—262
- Licinius* marries Constantine's sister Constantia, iv. 13. wars between him and Constantine, 13, 14. his persecution of the christians, and the time of it, iii. 490. put to death, iv. 40
- Lightfoot (Dr.)* his account of the power of the Jews considered, i. 104—106. quoted and commended, vi. 36, 53, 58, 62, 220, note ^m, 507, 509, note, 517, 520—524, 555
- Limborch* quoted, x. 109, 113, 145-6, 161
- Linus*, one of the first bishops of Rome, ii. 31, 32, 176, 187
- Livia*, Augustus's wife, called Julia by Josephus, i. 415
- Locke (J.)* quoted, x. 110, 146, 152, 154
- Logos*, a letter concerning the question whether the Logos supplied the place of a human soul in the person of Jesus Christ, x. 169—185
- Lollia Paulina*, how her head when cut off was examined by Agrippina, i. 20
- Longinian*, the correspondence between him and Augustine, viii. 270—273
- Louginus, the critic*, disciple of Ammonius Saccas, ii. 439. his time and character, vii. 376—378. put to death by Aurelian, ii. 674. speaks honourably of the lawgiver of the Jews, vii. 379. whether he has mentioned the apostle Paul, 280. a curious observation upon one of his fragments, received from Mr. Merrick, *ib.*
- Lord's Day*, mentioned by Commodian, iii. 134. and by Gauden-

- tius, Bp. of Brescia, iv. 389. appointed to be a day of rest by Constantine, 37. esteemed a festival by the early christians, 216—219
- Lord's prayer*, delivered but once, ii. 455-6. how read by Origen, 559. the doxology wanting in some copies, 456, 559-60. See Matt. vi. 13. in the list of *various readings*
- Lowman (M.)* quoted, vi. 325, x. 101. 163
- Lowth (W.)* corrected, ii. 522. quoted, x. 121, 133
- Lucanus*, said by Origen to have corrupted the scriptures, ii. 554
- Lucian, presbyter of Antioch*, his history, iii. 202—206. his editions of the Seventy and of the New Testament, 206—208, 215. his martyrdom, ii. 680. iii. 204-5. his apology for the christian religion, 204, 210. a creed ascribed to him, 211. his opinion upon the doctrine of the Trinity, 212. many of his disciples Arians, 212-13. his character, 215. said to have been a favourer of Paul of Samosata, or Sabellianism, ii. 680. his apology quoted, vii. 109
- Lucian of Samosata*, his time and works, vii. 278-9. a passage from him concerning Peregrinus, in which is a copious testimony to the christians of his time, 279—283. his account of Alexander, who set up an oracle in Paphlagonia, 283-4. passages from his *True History*, wherein there seem to be allusions and references to the book of the Revelation, 284-5. extracts from the Dialogue Philopatris ascribed to him, where are references to the Revelation and other books of the New Testament, 286—291
- Lucifer*, Bp. of Cagliari, his history, works, opinions, character, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 247—251
- Lucius*, Bp. of Rome, his history, iii. 77, 78
- Lucius*, Arian Bp. at Alexandria after Athanasius, iii. 597
- LUKE (ST.) THE EVANGELIST**, his history from the New Testament, v. 350—352. who he was, his profession and country, ii. 129. iv. 100, 118, 167, 188, 296, 436, 439, 443-4, 537, 541—544, 589. v. 70, 158-9, 161, 165-6. whether the same as mentioned Col. iv. 14. iv. 383, 544, 589. and Rom. xvi. 21, v. 58. Testimonies of ancient writers to his gospel and the Acts, 352—358. Remarks upon those testimonies, showing that he was not a painter, nor a slave; doubtful whether he was a Syrian; was a physician and a Jew by birth, and an early believer, though not one of the seventy; may be the same as Lucius of Cyrene; was a writer of two books divinely inspired, a companion of Paul, and acquainted with the other apostles, 358—375. his character, v. 20, 380—382. not certain that he died by martyrdom, 374
- The time and place of his writing, iv. 287, 321, 439. v. 137-8, 158-9. 166, 168. his gospel and the Acts written, A. D. 63, or 64, 375-6. he wrote his gospel in Greece, 376—380
- He wrote a gospel and the Acts according to Irenæus, ii. 171—174. and Clement of A. 234, 236-7. and Tertullian, 274

—280. his gospel referred to by Justin M. 130-1. by the martyrs at Lyons, 162. upon what grounds his and St. Mark's gospels were received by Papias and Clement of A. 121-2, 232—234. by Irenæus, 191-2. Tertullian, 276—278. his gospel said to be Paul's, 276. said by Origen to have been written for Gentile converts, 494. written more especially for Gentiles, iv. 444. for all in general, 539. the occasion of writing his gospel, 95, 96. the third evangelist, wrote a gospel, and the Acts his second book, 99, 100. v. 94

Observations upon his gospel, chiefly the Introduction, 382—388. See also 290—294. A Letter from Dr. Morgan, (writer of the Moral Philosopher,) and Dr. Lardner's answer concerning the first chapter of his gospel, i. lxxvi—lxxxii. Observations upon the Acts of the Apostles, v. 388—398. alterations in his gospel by Marcion, viii. 489-90, 492—498. See *Four gospels*.

Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, i. 22, 23, 30

Lysias, his good character, i. 72, 73, 198. his post and power at Jerusalem, 109, 198, 234

M

Maccabees, those books how quoted by Cyprian and others, iii. 53—55. not a part of the Jewish canon, according to Origen, ii. 542. not received as canonical by Jerom, iv. 420-1. nor by Rufinus, iv. 420-1. see 484, 495. nor by Gregory, Bp. of Rome, v. 127. see also 148. the first book accurate history, the second not so, x. 252, &c. Inquiry into the truth of the seven brothers in the second book, 252—262

Machærus, John the Baptist said to have been beheaded there, vi. 481, 483. how taken by the Romans, 468

Macknight (Dr.) quoted and commended, vii. 444-5. in the notes, ix. 340. x. 238-9, 282

OBSERVATIONS UPON DR. MACKNIGHT'S HARMONY, so far as relates to the history of our Saviour's resurrection, x. 351—392. concerning the time of the application to Pilate for a guard to the sepulchre, 352—355. the visit to the sepulchre attempted by some of the women, 355—363. their preparation of the spices, 363—369. their journey to the sepulchre, and the appearances of our Lord on the day of his resurrection, 369—392

Macrina, Basil's grandmother, ii. 622, 636

Macrobius, quoted, i. 353-4. was a heathen, *ib.* and viii. 84. his time and works, *ib.* his testimony to the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, 85—87. what he says of Numenius, vii. 382

Macrobius, a Donatist writer, iii. 562

Madaura, the correspondence between the people of that place and Augustine, viii. 266—270

Maffei (Scipio) rejects the fragments ascribed to Irenæus, ii. 190. quoted, v. 113

- MAGDALEN HOUSES**, a Letter to Jonas Hanway, Esq. on this subject, x. 237—247. *Mary Magdalene*, not the woman mentioned, Luke vii. 37, 238—242. not only most protestants are of this opinion, but also the learned Benedictine editor of Chrysostom's works, and Du Pin, 245. It was not Mary the sister of Lazarus, 242-3. A book referred to, entitled Thoughts on the plan for a Magdalen House, 246, note
- Magians, or wise men from the East**, did not find Jesus in a stable but in a house, v. 163
- Magic** often imputed to Heretics, viii. 309-10, 396-7. what makes a magician, 310
- Maimonides** quoted, x. 118
- Majorinus**, first Bp. of the Donatists at Carthage, iii. 554, 557
- Malala**, an historian of no great credit, vii. 53
- Malchion, presbyter of Antioch**, his history, iii. 135—137. remarks upon it, 137-8. he directed in the council of Antioch, when Paul of Samosata was deposed, 139. his opinion upon the doctrine of the Trinity not certainly known, *ib.* his testimony to the scriptures, 140. he convicted Paul of Samosata, ii. 667, 672
- Mamertinus**, his panegyric upon Julian, vii. 589-90
- Mammaea**, mother of the emperor Alexander, sends for Origen, ii. 477. said to have been a christian, vii. 333
- Man**, his excellence, according to the Manichees, iii. 362-3, 365. how made, 362—365. said by them to have two souls, 364
- MANI**, his history and doctrine, from Soerates, iii. 261—263. was put to death by a king of Persia, 263-4, 267, 310. the anniversary of his death kept by his followers, 264, 388. his dress, 266-7. lived under several kings of Persia, 264-5. his name and his parents, 303—306. whether he ever was a slave, 307-8. his qualifications, 308-9. believed antipodes, 309. the accounts given of him by Eastern writers, and remarks upon them, 310—312. his time, 312—317. his predecessors, 317—320. his works, 320—327. the genuineness of a saying ascribed to him disputed, 324-5. his followers had many large books, 327. his opinions, 328—330. [and see *Manichees*]; his pretensions, and whether he was an impostor, 332-3. reasons for thinking him an impostor, with remarks, 335—342. additional observations, 342—349. called himself apostle, 337. his three chief disciples, 280. whether he had twelve disciples, 336-7
- MANICHEES**, passages of ancient authors concerning them, iii. 259—268. authors who wrote against them, 268—276. they were in many places, but not numerous, 268, 276-7. eminent men among them, 277—290. their ecclesiastical constitution, with an account of their *Elect* and *Auditors*, 290—294. their manners vindicated from aspersions, 295—299. how they were persecuted, 299—302. their opinions in divers points the same as those of other christians, 328—332. their belief of the

- divine perfections, 349. they believed God to be almighty, but denied his immensity, *ib.* whether they believed two gods, 350. they believed God creator, and a consubstantial trinity, 350-1. whether they worshipped the sun, 352-3. they believed two principles, 353—357. supposed the creation of the world to be occasional, 358. their account of the creation of the world, and the formation of man, 358—364. they condemned marriage, 365. whether they held free will, 368-9. believed the transmigration of souls, 369-70. denied the resurrection of the body, 370-1. believed a future judgment, 372-3. whether they believed the eternity of hell torments, *ib.* their true character, 344—346, 442. vindicated from charges brought against them, 449—455. their notion of Christ, see the word *Christ*; their worship, see *Worship*; their doctrine concerning the scriptures, see *Scriptures*
- Manichæism*, the time of its rise, iii. 260-1, 312—317. its character, 344—346, 442. form of abjuring it, 285
- Manton (Dr. T.)* quoted, ix. 599
- MARC; his time, country, and sect (called *Marcosians*), viii. 428-9. accused of magical arts, 429-30. observations on the accusation, 431-2. the Marcosians unjustly accused of being Docetæ, and holding two principles, 432-3. Irenæus's account of their opinion of Christ hardly intelligible, 433. they received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, believed the facts recorded in the gospel, and practised baptism and the Lord's supper, 433—437. what books of the New Testament they acknowledged, and their apocryphal books, 437-8
- Marcella*, wife of Porphyry, her character, vii. 392
- Marcella*, mother of Potamiæna, and martyr at Alexandria, in the time of Severus, vii. 310
- Marcellinus Ammianus*, his time, and work, and character, viii. 45—47. extracts from his history, 47—60. his character of Constantius, 49. of Julian, 50—52. of the christian religion, 49. his account of Julian's design to build the temple at Jerusalem, vii. 608. ix. 79. his credulity, vii. 614
- Marcellus*, sent into Judea by Vitellius, i. 90, 91
- Marcellus*, Bp. of Apamea in Syria, his remarkable zeal in demolishing heathen temples, viii. 236—240
- Marcellus*, an eminent christian in Mesopotamia, iii. 265—267. whether the letter from Mani to him be genuine, 266-7, 324
- Marcellus*, Bp. of Ancyra in Galatia, a Sabellian, ii. 622. how treated by Eusebius, iv. 77. his time, opinions, character, and testimony to the scriptures, 146—149
- Marcia*, concubine of Commodus, said to have been favourable to the christians, vii. 346
- Marcian, Bp. of Arles*, favoured the Novatians, iii. 96
- Marcianus*, a Novatian Bp. and a learned man, iii. 99, 102
- Marcionus*, to whom Irenæus inscribed one of his works, ii. 167
- MARCION, what Polycarp said to him, ii. 95. See the contents of

his chapter in vol. viii. a general account of him from Irenæus, viii. 448-9. and Epiphanius, 452. the time in which he lived, 449—451. Epiphanius is suspected of inventing the story of his deceiving a young woman, 453—456. his opinions, his notion of the Creator, and distinction between good and just, 459—466

The character of Marcion, what books of the New Testament were received by him, and how he treated them, vi. 142—151, 347—350. viii. 489—513. Rejected the Old Testament and the God of the Jews, 485—489. the genealogy and baptism of our Saviour, 490-1. the Acts of the Apostles, 500. the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews, and the Catholic epistles, ii. 283. viii. 502. and the Revelation, ii. 275. He received the epistle to Philemon, 283-4. his New Testament consisted of two books, a Gospel (that of Luke) and an Apostolicon, ten Epistles of Paul, and these altered, 173, 274-5, 276-7. viii. 489-90, 500—502. his alterations in Luke's gospel, 489—498. in the ten epistles he received, 503—513. asserted that the epistle inscribed to the Ephesians was sent to the Laodiceans, ii. 281. viii. 510

Authors who wrote against Marcion: Justin M. ii. 126. Dionysius of Corinth, 145. Theophilus of Antioch, 204. Philip, Bp. of Gortyna, in Crete, 312. Irenæus and Modestus, 313. Bardesanes, 316, 319. Tertullian, 273. Hippolytus, 421, 424

Marcionites (The) were numerous, viii. 458-9. they were Necessarians, yet believed a future judgment, and that the souls of the virtuous would be happy, 466—468. they admitted the miracles and principal facts recorded of our Saviour, and his death and resurrection, 476—479. they believed that Christ was not a real man, 471—473. nor the Christ foretold by the Jewish prophets, 475. their manners were virtuous, and they had many martyrs, 480. they extolled virginity, 481-2. they had public worship and ordinances, 483. they were charged with corrupting the scriptures, 146, 275-6, 296-7. an argument hence in favour of the authenticity of the New Testament, viii. 513-14

Marcionite woman, a martyr in Valerian's persecution, vii. 365-6

Marianne the second daughter of Herod Agrippa, i. 27. divorced her first husband and married the Alabarch of Alexandria, 87, 411, note¹

Marinus, the remarkable history of his martyrdom in Casarea in the time of Galienus, vii. 370-1

Marinus, successor of Proclus, in the chair of philosophy at Athens, in 485, and author of the life of Proclus; extracts from that life, viii. 132—135. his native country, 140

MARK (ST.) THE EVANGELIST; his history from the New Testament, v. 327—330. from other writers, 330-1. whether he was John Mark, and nephew to Barnabas, iv. 443, 540, 582-3.

v. 155, 159. 325—327, 336. said to be one of Christ's seventy disciples, iv. 167, 188. is said to be a companion and disciple of Peter, ii. 119, 170, 224. iv. 92, 188, 442-3, 540. a fellow-labourer of Paul, according to the Constitutions, 226. for a while he attended Paul and Barnabas, v. 328. was acquainted with Peter and other apostles, *ib.* was with Paul at Rome, 329. probably was with Peter afterwards, 330. said to have been Peter's interpreter, or that Peter dictated the gospel of Mark, ii. 121, 494. iv. 92, 439, 442-3, 459, 540-1. The occasion, time, and place of writing it, ii. 119, 121, 226—233. iv. 92, 93, 287, 321, 442-3, 538, 582-3. v. 94, 137, 140, 158, 167-8. it was written at Rome about the year 64, 338—342. testimonies to it with a view of ascertaining the time of it, and the evangelist's station and character, 332—337. remarks on these testimonies, 337—339

His gospel referred to by Justin M. ii. 131. received by Archelaus, iii. 258. by Titus of Bostra, 274. He is said by Augustine to have followed Matthew as an abridger, iv. 502. which sentiment is examined, 503—505. he has things omitted by Matthew and Luke, 584-5. Observations on his gospel, from which it is evident that he did not epitomize St. Matthew, v. 345—350, 463—469

He is said to have been the first Bp. of Alexandria; by Jerom, iv. 439. by John Cassian, v. 30. buried at Alexandria, according to Jerom, iv. 443. The first commentary upon his gospel, 581-2. See *Four gospels*

Mark, a Novatian Bp. in Scythia, iii. 101

Mark, a magician of Egypt, iv. 340

Marriage, condemned by the Manichees, iii. 365—368, 370

Marriages, *Second*, condemned by the Novatians, iii. 90, 91

Marshal (*N.*) quoted, iii. 14, 38, 55. his edition of Cyprian's works in English commended, 16. corrected, 42

Martial, his time and writings, and testimony to the fortitude of christians, vi. 635—637

Martin, *Bp. of Tours*, reproves Ithacius, and intercedes with the emperor for the Priscillianists, iv. 344-5. his judgment concerning the right manner of treating Heretics, 345, 354, 364. he petitions that tribunes may not be sent into Spain to try Heretics, 355. his opinion concerning the salvation of the fallen angels, 417

Martyrs, how respected by the Novatians, iii. 91, 92. cruel sufferings endured by them in Dioclesian's persecution, 219—222. divers, who suffered with Pamphilus, or near his time, 221-2. spoken of as intercessors, v. 5. excessive respect shown them, 25, 26

Martyrs at Lyons, a large account of their sufferings, vii. 155—169. remarks upon that history, and the uses of it, 169—176. whether they had among them gifts of the spirit, 175

Marullus sent into Judea by Caligula, i. 91

- Mary, our Lord's mother*, the same as the mother of James and Josas, v. 160. said to be of the tribe of Levi, iii. 430. see ii. 352-3. why she went to Bethlehem at the time of the assessment, i. 283. died in Judea, and did not go with John to Ephesus, 412. how aspersed by the Jews, vi. 391
- Other Marias*, three of that name at the foot of the cross of Jesus, iv. 298. Mary Magdalene, Mary sister of Martha and Lazarus, and the woman that was a sinner, supposed to be all one, v. 133. according to Theophylact there are four Marias in the gospels, 161. See *Magdalen Houses*
- Mary*, a woman of good condition in Jerusalem, who killed her child for food in the siege, vi. 449-50, 546
- Massada*, the remarkable siege and surrender of that place, vi. 469
- Massuet*, the Benedictine editor of Irenæus, quoted, vi. 345. viii. 320-1. and often elsewhere
- Maternus (Julius Firmicus)* his history, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 169-171
- Matter*, what powers the Manichees ascribed to it, iii. 355-357. names by which they called it, 354
- MATTHEW (ST.) APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST**, was also called Levi, iv. 439, 441, 583. v. 294-5. said by St. Mark to have been the son of Alpheus, 294, note c. his history, 294-298. testimonies of ancient writers to his gospel, 298-301. seems to be referred to by Barnabas, ii. 28. by Clement of R. 37-39. see 53. by Hermas, 59, 60. referred to in the second epistle ascribed to Clement of R. 55, 56. referred to by Ignatius, 79. by Polycarp, 101-2. in the epistle of the church of Smyrna, 110. referred to by Athenagoras, 195. by Theophilus of Antioch, 205. received, and said to have been written in Hebrew, by Papias, 119. by Irenæus, 170. see also 217. received by Justin M. 130. said by Origen to be universally received, the first written, and delivered to the Jewish believers in Hebrew, 494. received by Archelaus, iii. 258. what Faustus says of it, 395, 398-9. it was of great authority, and universally received, 399
- Remarks upon the testimonies for discovering the true time of it, v. 301-305. characters of time in the gospel itself, 305-308. it was written in Judea, or near it, in 63, 64, or 65, 305. see also 290. when it was written, according to Eusebius and others, iv. 132-134. the time, according to Irenæus, and said by him to have been written for the Jews, ii. 170. there was a Hebrew gospel in the time of Hegesippus, 155. said by Cosmas to have written the first soon after the death of Stephen, at the request of the Jewish believers, before he left Judea to go abroad, v. 94. compare that with what is said by the author of the *Imperfect Work*, 120. supposed by Isidore of Seville, to have been written about eight years after our Lord's ascension, 140. to the like purpose Theophylact, 158. and Euthymius,

165. but Nicephorus says about fifteen years, 168. said by Epiphanius to have written first, because he had been a publican, that sinners might have encouragement to repent, iv. 187. to the like purpose another writer, v. 120

The language in which it was written, 308—313. the opinion that it was written in Hebrew examined, ii. 120. whether Origen was of that opinion, 574—576. This evangelist, as Eusebius says, having first preached to the Hebrews when he was about to go abroad to other people, delivered his gospel to the Hebrews in their own language, iv. 95. written in Hebrew according to Cyril of Jerusalem, 174. and Epiphanius, 187-8. said, in the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius, to have been written in Hebrew, published at Jerusalem, and translated into Greek by St. James, 165. by St. John, vi. 158. see 165. written in Hebrew, according to Augustine, iv. 502. and Chrysostom, 538. and Isidore, v. 137. compare that with what is said by the author of *The Imperfect Work*, 120. whether written in Hebrew, and the sentiments of divers learned moderns about it, iv. 136—139. said by Jerom to have written his gospel in Hebrew, in Judea, for the use and at the request of the Jewish believers, 439, 441. his Hebrew gospel said by Jerom to be in the library at Cæsarea and at Beræa, iii. 223. iv. 441-2. nevertheless he did not consult it when he corrected the Latin version before in use, 477

How Matthew quotes texts of the Old Testament, 442, 475-6. the beginning of his gospel quoted by Isidore, v. 11. Theodoret, 20. and Cosmas, 94. A Commentary upon this gospel, called *The Imperfect Work*, 114. the occasion, design, and character of this gospel, according to the same, 120. this gospel was received by the Nazaræan christians, vi. 386. It is not certain whether this evangelist died by martyrdom, v. 294, note ^b. 297-8. A Letter concerning the omission of our Saviour's ascension by St. Matthew and St. John, i. lxxiii.—lxxvi.

The first chapter of this gospel quoted by Justin M. ii. 130. Tertullian, 278. Novatus, iii. 100, 113. the second chapter referred to by Ignatius, ii. 80. Hegesippus, 154. in the Sybilline verses, 339, 341. by Victorinus, iii. 171. the first and second acknowledged by Cerinthus, viii. 415

Matthias, his Traditions, how quoted by Clement of A. ii. 256-7. and see *Gospel*

Maturus, one of the martyrs at Lyons, vii. 159, 163

Mavilus, a martyr in Africa, in the time of Severus, vii. 311

Maxentius favours the christians, and gives them liberty in Africa, iii. 557. iv. 27

Maximian Hercules, put to death by Constantine's order, iv. 12

Maximilla, a Montanist prophetess, the time of her death, ii. 411. a report concerning the manner of it, 413

Maximin, Bp. of Antioch, successor of Theophilus, ii. 264

Maximin I. or the Thracian, his time and persecution, vii. 347

- 349. his persecution said to be local, and of the christian clergy only, *ib.* nevertheless it may have been general of all clergy every where, 562. and at the same time there was a persecution of other christians in Pontus and Cappadocia, 348
- Maximin* II. his letter to Sabinus in favour of the christians in 312, vii. 539—541. his fuller edict in favour of the christians in 313, 546-7
- Maximin*, an Arian bishop, iii. 597
- Maximus*, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, ii. 262
- Maximus*, Bp. of A. after Dionysius, ii. 651
- Maximus of Madaura*, the correspondence between him and Augustine, with remarks, viii. 222—227
- Maximus, the philosopher*, and favourite of Julian, his history and character, viii. 196—199
- Meir*, an eminent Jewish rabbi, vi. 511, 513
- Melanthon*, quoted and commended, x. 311
- Melania*, how commended by Palladius, iv. 411
- Melchisedechians*, supposed to be a branch of the Theodotians, followers of Theodotus the banker, viii. 578-9
- Meletians*, their time, iii. 240, 242-3
- Meletius*, his character not rightly given by Athanasius, iii. 240—242
- Melito, Bp. of Sardis*, his history and testimony to the scriptures, ii. 157—160. his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament recited, iv. 429. his apology quoted, vii. 93, 95
- Melmoth* (Mr.) his translation of Pliny's Epistles quoted, vii. 30, 40
- Menoch*, a Manichæan woman, iii. 324
- Mensurius*, Bp. of Carthage, iii. 555, 557
- Merrick (J.)* a curious observation upon a fragment of Longinus, communicated by him to the author, viii. 380
- Messiah*, or *Christ*, the ground and reason of that character, x. 176—181. the expectation of his coming general in the time of our Saviour, vi. 424, 587. that Jesus is the Messiah, 593—595
- Methodius, Bp. in Lycia*, his history, iii. 181—185. omitted by Eusebius, 181. and why, 187. testimonies to him, 188-9. his martyrdom, 184. his works, 185—188. he wrote against Origen, 181-2, 186-7. against Porphyry, 181, 184. select passages from him, 189. charged with Arianism, and other errors, 189—193. whether he was a Millenarian, 192. preferred to Origen, without reason, 189. his testimony to the scriptures, 194—198
- Metras*, a martyr at Alexandria, before the publication of Decius's edict, vii. 358
- Michaelis (J. D.)* quoted, x. 141, note ¹
- Middleton (Dr.)* quoted, with disapprobation, viii. 382
- Mill, (J.)* what books of the New Testament he supposes to be owned by Clement of Rome, ii. 54. his opinion concerning a various reading of Rom. chap. i. in Clement's epistle, 41. and

- his quotation of Matt. xxv. 41. 39. concerning Tatian's altering St. Paul's expressions, 150. concerning a reference in Theophilus of Antioch, to Acts xv. 20. 206-7. says that Clement of A. distinguishes apocryphal books from canonical, 250. that Tertullian did not place the epistle of St. James in the canon, 292. quoted, 429, 432-3, 445, 559, 716. iii. 24, 31, 32. v. 185, note ; quoted and commended, iii. 410, 434
- Millenarians*, their opinions, ii. 691-2, 701—705. v. 79
- Millennium*, expected by Commodian and many orthodox christians, ii. 705, 134. by Lactantius, iii. 520. crude notions of it embraced by some, iv. 266. rejected by others, 299, 304. See v. 79
- Miltiades*, author of an apology for the christian religion, and other works, ii. 201-2
- Ministerial office (The)* its value, according as it is performed, iv. 533
- Minucius Felix*, his history and character, ii. 386—389. his testimony to the New Testament, 390-1
- CHRIST'S MIRACLES, the design of them, x. 12, 13. the evangelists did not record them all, 10—12. they aimed at brevity in relating them, 17—19. a summary account of them in Arnobius, iii. 466-7. 476-7. in Lactantius, 531-2. in Eusebius, iv. 89. were healing and beneficial, v. 100. See the word *Woolston*
- Miraculous gifts and powers said to be in the church, after the times of the apostles*, ii. 307, 369. iii. 473, 503. iv. 90, 170, 290, 319, 565-6. v. 21, 108. See likewise the chapter of Gregory, Bp. of Neocæsarea, ii. 611—616, 638. and Dionysius of A. 649. Cyprian, iii. 15. and large extracts relating to this from Chrysostom, iv. 565-6. See also v. 21, 123. Accounts of miracles in church history not always to be relied upon, vii. 619—621. miracles had ceased, v. 121—123
- MISHNA, the time and author of that work, vi. 506—508. extracts out of it, 509—516
- Moderation* commended, especially in great men, vii. 97
- Moderation (Christian)* not understood by Greg. Nazianzen, iv. 289. nor by Amphilochius, 293-4
- Moderation* of christians to be known to all men ; a sermon, ix. 553
- Modestus*, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, ii. 312-13
- Mæragenes*, wrote memoirs of Apollonius Tyanæus, vii. 479, 485, 487
- Moine (A. le)* quoted, x. 121, 142, 177
- Mole's (T.)* letter concerning Dæmoniacs, x. 265—269
- Monasteries*, approved by Basil, ii. 624. disliked by the Neocæsareans, 639
- Monks*, mentioned with great dislike by Julian, vii. 646. by Libanius, viii. 24, 25, 34. by Eunapius, 66. and by Rutilius, 88
- Montanism*, the time of its rise, ii. 161. viii. 589. *Several who*

wrote against it : the churches of Vienne and Lyons, ii. 161. Serapion, Bp. of Antioch, 264. Cl. Apollinarius, 314. Apollonius, 391-2. Caius, 396. Asterius Urbanus, 410-11. How described by Firmilian, 582. two parties among them, 586. they were numerous, and subsisted a good while, viii. 591. probably some were in the Unitarian or Sabellian scheme, 596. were very strict, fasted much, and condemned second marriages, 597-8. would not re-admit those who had been guilty of great sins after baptism, 598. and were Millenarians, 599. the accounts of their mysteries, a mere calumny, 599, 600. their testimony to the scriptures, 601

MONTANUS, the place of his birth, and the reproaches cast on him, viii. 591. his companions and their prophecies, 592—595. a report concerning the manner of his death, ii. 413

Montfaucon (Bernard de) his opinion of the Synopsis Scripturæ, and the Clementine Homilies, ii. 377. censured, iii. 511. quoted, iv. 33. his opinion of Eusebius's Arianism, 82. his opinion concerning Marcellus considered, 148. his figures of the gems called *Abraxei* examined, viii. 377—382. it is wonderful that he did not perceive they were of Pagan origin, 382

Moon, see *Sun and Moon*

Moore (T.) quoted, x. 158

Morris (J.) his sermons referred to, x. 146, note

Mosaic account of the creation, and of the fall of man, x. 213—236

Moses, a martyr at Rome, iii. 81. the time of his martyrdom, 94, 95

Mosheim (J. L.) quoted and commended, iii. 511. v. 473. vi. 175, 290, 293, 619, 625, notes ; his account of the christian Agapæ, or love feasts, vii. 42. some of his observations upon Pliny's epistle concerning the christians, criticised, vii. 48, 50, 55—59, 72, note ^f. His observations upon M. Antoninus commended, 140. and upon his deliverance in Germany, and the Thundering Legion, 193—197. his account of the persecution of Severus examined, 313—319. his observations upon the martyrdom of Marinus, 371. upon the edict of Valerius Maximian in favour of the christians, 531—533. upon Dioclesian's persecution, 549-50. and upon the christianity ascribed to Philip, 351. receives the *Philosophy of Oracles*, as written by Porphyry, 445-6. allows that in the lives of Pythagoras, written by Porphyry and Jamblichus, he is set up as a rival with our Saviour, 504, note ^h. his opinion concerning a disturbance caused in the church by Ammonius and others, rejected, 445-6. his fine observation, showing the obscurity of Apollonius Tyanæus, 487, in the notes. His observations upon the story of the cross appearing to Constantine, 615. upon the treatment given by Constantine to Gentile people, viii. 168. upon the conduct of christian magistrates afterwards, 280. and upon Dr. Warburton's *Julian*, 610, note ^c

- Moyle (Walter)* commended, ii. 387. his observations upon the history of the thundering Legion quoted with approbation, vii. 182, 190-1, 197-8, and note ^g. his opinion concerning the age of Lucian and his station, 278. and concerning the age of the Dialogue called Philopatris, 286
- Municipal places*, their privileges, and that they could not inflict capital punishments, i. 78
- Musæus*, a Jewish writer mentioned by Anatolius, iii. 143
- Musanus*, an ecclesiastical writer, ii. 313
- Musonius, Bp. of Neocæsarea*, his great character from Basil, ii. 626-7. another *Musonius* of that city, 615

N

- Narcissus, Bp. of Jerusalem*, his great age, and other things concerning him, ii. 325-6, 415
- Natalis*, a remarkable history of him, 405
- Nathanael*, learned, as well as sincere, iv. 555-6
- Nativity*, see *Jesus*
- Nazaræan christians*, their opinion concerning Christ, iv. 441, note ^l. vi. 383. x. 102-3, and notes; and the observance of the rites of the Mosaic law, vi. 383, 385. received St. Paul and all the apostles of Christ, and all the books of the New Testament, 384—387, note ^l. they subsisted in the fourth and fifth centuries, 387. x. 104
- Nazarite*, his vow, i. 218
- Nebuchadnezzar*, two computations of his reign, i. 373
- Nectarius*, an honourable Gentile, who interceded for the people of Calama, when they had transgressed the Imperial laws, viii. 246
- Neocæsareans*, their character, ii. 621—623. said to have been Sabellians, 622, 625, 627. defended themselves by the writings of their first bishop, Gregory Thaumaturgus, 624-5
- Nepos, an Egyptian Bp. and Millenarian*, his writings and character, ii. 654-5, 692
- Nero* permits the wall raised by the Jews in the court of the temple to remain, i. 192. the first emperor who persecuted the christians, 206. his persecution, the time of it, v. 534-5. testified by Tacitus, vi. 629. Sulpicius Severus, 630-1. Martial, 636. Juvenal, 638-9. and Suetonius, 643-4. the time of his death, 436. supposed by some ancient christians to be anti-christ, iii. 167, 173-4. an inscription concerning the christians in his time, vi. 623
- Nerva*, favourable to the christians according to Dion Cassius and Orosius, vii. 345-6. did not resign the empire to Trajan, i. 384
- Nestorius*, his opinions, and how treated by Cassian, v. 31, 32
- Nestorius*, high priest of Greece, how he saved Athens by worshipping Achilles with Minerva, viii. 125

- Nethinims*, who they were, x. 293
- Nevita*, made consul by Julian in 362, his character, vii. 588
- New Testament*, see *Testament*
- Newton* (Sir *Isaac*) an examination of his opinion concerning the time of the Revelation, and St. John's banishment into Patmos, v. 418—425
- Nice* (*The council of*) iv. 31, 32. the occasion of it, 55. convened by Constantine, 56. the number of bishops present, *ib.* were chiefly of the eastern part of the Roman empire, 57. who presided in it, 57, 58. its time and duration, 58. whether the Bible was placed before them, *ib.* the points debated by them, with their creed, and epistle and canons, 58, 59. did not compose any catalogue of the books of scripture, 58. the creed signed by almost all the bishops, 59. their sentence upon Arius, *ib.* judgments of ancients and moderns upon this council, 60. their several decisions, with remarks, 61—68
- Nicephorus*, patriarch of Constantinople, his Stichometry, v. 85—88
- Nicephorus Callisti*, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 167—169
- Nicolaitans*, Hippolytus wrote against them, ii. 424
- Nicolas*, one of the seven deacons, divers opinions concerning him, ii. 426
- Nicolas of Damaseus*, his character, and his embassy to Augustus, i. 291, 301. was intimate with Herod, 302, 312. magnified the success of his embassy, 368
- Nitocris*, her good character, vii. 413
- Noah* (*the Precepts of*) x. 301. observations upon them, 302—307
- Noctus*, his time, history, and opinions, ii. 590—600. many of the same sentiment, 595, 597. the holy scriptures received by them, 598-9. *for his time see also* 108
- Nonnus*, his paraphrase of St. John's gospel, v. 7
- Noris* (*Cardinal*) quoted and commended, i. 34
- Novatianism*, its rise, and the concern which Dionysius of Alexandria had with it, ii. 652
- NOVATIANS**, condemned second marriages, iii. 90. baptized such as came to them from the Catholics, 91. their respect for martyrs, 92. their sufferings from the Arians, 99. numerous in several countries, 100-1. favoured by Fabius, Bp. of Antioch, and Marcion, Bp. of Arles, 96. how treated by Constantine, 98. by Julian, 99. by Theodosius, 100. by Cyril of Alexandria, 104. by Innocent and Celestinus of Rome, 104-5. texts of scripture alleged by them as favouring their sentiment, concerning the treatment of great sinners, 116-17. their sentiments concerning the holy scriptures, 119. Eminent men among them, whose names may be found at the proper places in this Index : *Ablabius*, *Acesius*, *Agelius*, *Chrysanthus*, *Eusebius*, *Leontius*, *Marcion*, *Mark*, *Paul*, *Rusticola*, *Sisinnius*,

- Sympronian, Theopemptus.* That Socrates and Sozomen were not Novatians, 104
- Novatus, or Novatianus,* presbyter of Rome, iii. 246-7. reckoned among those called Heretics, ii. 677. his episcopal ordination, iii. 75. Cornelius's account of it, 79—81. remarks upon that account, 81—86. the first antipope, 75. sends letters and deputies to foreign churches, *ib.* the time of their arrival at Carthage, 95. he is said to have suffered martyrdom, 86. his peculiar opinion concerning the treatment of such as had lapsed, 87, 88. the time of his taking up that opinion, 92—96. said to be orthodox upon the Trinity, 89, 90. his works, 105-6. the time of writing his treatise of the Trinity, or of the rule of faith, 106. his character, 111-12. his testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament, 112—120. that his name was Novatus, and not Novatian, 78, 122, 126-7, 246—252
- Novatus,* presbyter at Carthage, said to be the chief author of the schism at Rome, but without reason, vii. 93, 94, 250-1
- Numenius,* a Pythagorean philosopher, was well acquainted with the books of Moses and the prophets, and has allegorized some parts of them ; but his time is uncertain, and he has not referred to any books of the New Testament, vii. 381—383
- Nye (Stephen)* mistakes of his concerning the Manichees, iii. 330, 416

O

- Oath,* taken by the Jews to Cæsar and Herod, i. 292. was the same with St. Luke's enrolment, 294—299, 304, 306
- Obodas, king of Arabia,* differences between him and Herod, i. 290. succeeded by Aretas, 291
- Oecumenius,* his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 154—157
- Olympiodorus,* author of a Roman history, his time, work, and extracts from it, and its character, viii. 90—92
- Olympius,* some time prime minister to Honorius, his character from Zosimus, viii. 119
- Olympius,* a learned and zealous Gentile at Alexandria, viii. 229, 232—234
- Onesimus* knew St. Paul before he came to him at Rome, vi. 131
- Onesiphorus,* at what time he came to St. Paul at Rome, vi. 41, 42
- Ophians, or Ophites,* an account of them from Irenæus, Theodoret, Epiphanius, and others, ix. 565-6. Origen's account of them, with observations, 567-8. can scarce be considered as christian heretics, 569
- Optatus, of Milevi,* his time and character, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 327—329. was of opinion that every man is born with an unclean spirit, ii. 569

Oracle, a fictitious heathen oracle in 398, foretelling the period of the christian religion, viii. 240-1

Order of Heretics, viii. 305-6. in Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philaster, and Augustine, 348-9, 439

Oribasius, *physician to Julian*, his history and works, viii. 73—75

ORIGEN, see the contents of his chapter, ii. 469. went to Rome, 472. allowed his homilies to be taken down in writing, 478. his confessions and sufferings, 479. see also, vii. 357-8. his quotations of Phlegon, 106, 110. what Porphyry says of him, 396-7. the number of his works, ii. 479-80. what of them now extant, 481-2. testimonies to him, 484-5. his character, 485-6. select passages from him, 486—493. his testimony to the scriptures, 493—577. and to our Saviour's unblemished character, in his works against Celsus, vi. 519. refers to a passage in Josephus concerning John the Baptist, 481-2. how he quotes Josephus, as ascribing the destruction of Jerusalem to the sin of the Jews in putting James to death, 488-9. did not receive any books as sacred scriptures, beside those in the present canon, ii. 527—553. and 576-7. his work against Celsus much esteemed, vii. 402, 477. quoted, viii. 335. x. 7, 113, 115. his Greek text amended in two places, ii. 509, 572, note ^b. commended by Anatolius, iii. 143. Victorinus of Pettaw made use of his commentaries upon the scriptures, 172. an edition of his Septuagint by Pamphilus and Eusebius, 206, 224. his commentaries transcribed by Pamphilus, 217. Methodius and others his adversaries, 188-9. his great eminence, 228. how commended by Jerom, in the early part of his life, and how he spoke of him afterwards, iv. 412—414. his peculiar opinions, 415—417. his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament recited, 430. his opinions and his works condemned by a Synod at Alexandria, 577—579. some account of his *Tetrapla*, and *Hexapla*, ii. 327. his account of the Heretics, Apelles, viii. 549. the Basilidians, 388-9. Elcesaites, 614. and Ophians, 567-8. what Porphyry writes of his having been educated in the heathen principles, confuted, ii. 469. vii. 397-8

Another Origen, ii. 470

Origenists, an obscure sect mentioned by Epiphanius, ii. 605—608

Original sin, x. 234—236. not mentioned by Titus of Bostra in his arguments with the Manichees, iii. 273-4. asserted by Gregory, Bp. of Rome, v. 133

Orosius, his memoir concerning the Priscillianists, iv. 366—368. his wrong account of the origin of Trajan's persecution, vii. 55. his account of the treatment given to Gentile people by christian magistrates, vii. 168, 273-4

Earl of Orrery, his Translation of Pliny's epistles quoted, iii. 46, 49—51

Orthodoxy, christians more orthodox in later ages than in the primitive times. iii. 109, 151-2, 193, 521-2

Ossens, nearly the same as the *Elcesaites*, which see. Called also Sampsarans, viii. 616-17
Owen (*Dr. J.*) quoted, x. 81, note ^f, 258

P

- Paeatus*, his panegyric quoted, iv. 349—358
Pacian, *Bp. of Barcelona*, his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 326
Pagi (*Ant.*) commended, i. 374. his judgment, upon the Constitutions, iv. 200-1. upon the christianity of Philip, vii. 355
Palestine, a description of that country, vi. 203
Palladius, author of the Lausiac history, his character of Jerom, and reflections upon him, iv. 410—412
Palladius, author of a dialogue of the life of Chrysostom, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 6, 7
Palmas, *Bp. in Pontus*, and writer in the second century, ii. 312-13
PAMPHILUS, *presbyter at Cæsarea*, his friendship with Eusebius, iii. 216. his life written by Eusebius, 220-1. a library erected by him at Cæsarea, 217, 223-4. which was destroyed before the middle of the seventh century, 226. said to have set up a school or academy at Cæsarea, *ib.* his apology for Origen, 217, 227-8. his edition of the *Seventy*, 224. said to have composed summary contents of the book of the Acts, 229. probably received the epistle to the Hebrews, 226. his affection for the scriptures, which he encouraged men and women of every condition to read, 221, 230-1. his martyrdom, 218—220. his excellent character, 219—221, 229-30. Remarks upon spurious *Acts of his passion*, 218, 231—233
Pan, a fabulous story concerning his death, in the time of the emperor Tiberius, vi. 620—622
Pandects, whether there are now in them any laws against the christians, vii. 336-7
Pantæus, master of the catechetical school at Alexandria, his history, and testimony to the scriptures, ii. 215—219. commended by Alexander, *Bp. of Jerusalem*, 418
Papias, *Bp. of Hieropolis*, his history, character, work, and testimony to the books of the New Testament, ii. 116—125
Papinian, an observation upon his conduct, vii. 318
Parker (*S.*) his Observations upon Philostratus's Life of Apollonius Tyanæus, vii. 502, 508—514
Parmenian, *Bp. of the Donatists at Carthage*, author of a writing against the Catholics, answered by Optatus, iii. 562
Passovers, how many in our Saviour's ministry, v. 457
Patriarchs (*The*) how reviled by the Manichees, iii. 394
Patrick (*Bp.*) quoted, x. 101, 123, 171, 173
Patripassians, the Sabellians and others so called, ii. 594—598

PAUL (ST.) THE APOSTLE, his history before his conversion, and his general character, v. 472—474. vi. 377-8. the place of his birth, iv. 450—453. a Roman citizen, and how he came to be so, i. 236—240

The time of his conversion, v. 474—479. his age at that time, 486-7, observations upon his conversion, and the circumstances of things at that time in Judea, 479—486. iv. 568. his conversion not the cause of the rest of the churches in Judea, i. 103. when he was made an apostle, v. 487—494. received the whole doctrine of the gospel immediately from heaven, v. 21

The **HISTORY** of his travels and preaching, to his coming from Damascus to Jerusalem the first time after his conversion, 495—497. to his being brought to Antioch by Barnabas, 498—501. to his coming up to Jerusalem with the contributions of the christians at Antioch, 501—505. to his coming to the council at Jerusalem about the year 49, 505—512. to his coming to Jerusalem A. D. 58, when he was apprehended and imprisoned, 512—527. his vow, i. 219. his imprisonment and prosecution in Judea, 67—71. the manner of his imprisonment, 243—247. sent to Rome a prisoner that he might not be soon expelled as a Jew, iv. 556. his **HISTORY**, to the end of his imprisonment at Rome, v. 527—529. to the time of his death, 529—536. the time of his imprisonment at Rome, iv. 450. of his martyrdom, 451. was beheaded at Rome, A. D. 64 or 65, ii. 286, 396. v. 534—536. came with Peter from Corinth, from whence they went to Rome, and suffered martyrdom about the same time, ii. 146. in Nero's general persecution, iv. 576, v. 25, 64, 72, 140

Whether he really blamed Peter for his conduct, mentioned Gal. ii. vii. 432-3. x. 347—351. wrought miracles at Athens and at Rome, though not related by St. Luke, v. 397-8. uncertain whether he ever went into Spain, 58. there is no good reason to believe that he ever was in Spain or Britain, 530-1. St. Paul much commended by Origen, ii. 499, 500. Chrysostom, iv. 537-8. Isidore, v. 11, 12. Theodoret, 20, 21. Cassian, 30. Cosmas, 95. Gregory, 129. his eloquence celebrated by Photius, though he has many elliptical expressions, 152-3. character of his style, by Irenæus, ii. 176. by Origen, 495, 573-4. by Jerom, iv. 479-80. vindicated against the reflections of Porphyry, vii. 429—437. he was rejected by the Ebionites, or some of them, ii. 376. vi. 383. but received by other Jewish believers, called Nazarenes, 384—386. how treated by the author of the *Recognitions*, ii. 372-3, 376

His fourteen epistles, their chronology, vi. 3—16. all received by Origen, ii. 497, 500—507, 576. were in the library at Cæsarea, iii. 226. received by Archelaus and Mani, 258. the Manichees, 398, 403. the Paulicians, 447-8. generally received in the time of Eusebius, iv. 96, 98, 119, 145. received by

Athanasius, 155, 157. in the Synopsis ascribed to him, 162-3. by Cyril of Jerusalem, 173-4. Epiphanius, 187. the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, 226-7. Gregory Nazianzen, 287. Amphilochius, 292. Ebedjesu, 321. Theodore, Bp. of Mopsuestia, who also wrote Commentaries upon them, 395. Commentaries likewise were written upon them, by C. M. Victorinus, 254. and Diodorus of Tarsus, 377. received by Jerom, 437, 451. the council of Carthage, 487. Rufinus, 484. Augustine, 493, 506. Chrysostom, 537. Severian, Bp. of Gabala, 571-2. Innocent of Rome, 586. Paulinus of Nola, 589. Theodoret, v. 17. Cosmas, 93, 95. Euthalius, 71. who also published an edition of them, 68. are in the Alexandrine MS. 82, 84. received by Isidore of Seville, 136. a Commentary on them by Sedulius, 57. and as is supposed by Primasius, 59. received by Cassiodorus, 112. Œcumenius, 154. Theophylact, 157

His epistle to the Romans and several other of his epistles referred to by Clement of Rome, ii. 41—50. his first epistle to the Corinthians quoted by the same Clement, 35, 36. and by Hermas, 263. his epistle to the Ephesians quoted by Ignatius, 78, 85. his first epistle to the Corinthians, and his epistles to the Philippians and the Thessalonians, quoted by Polycarp, 99—101, 103. several of his epistles referred to by Hermas, 64—66. by Ignatius, 82—88. by Polycarp, 103—106. see 109. by Justin M. 133—136. see 140. by the author of the epistle to Diognetus, 141—144. by the martyrs at Lyons, 162-3. by Athenagoras, 197—199. by Theophilus of Antioch, 208—213. twelve or thirteen of his epistles received and quoted by Irenæus, 175—177. see 182. all received and quoted by Clement of Alexandria, except the epistle to Philemon, 237—239. all received by Tertullian, except the epistle to the Hebrews, 280—284, 290-1. how many were received by Tatian, 147—151. the author of the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs, appears to have received the book of the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, 360-1. all rehearsed by Caius, except that to the Hebrews, 397. several of his epistles quoted by Firmilian, 581-2. all quoted by Cyprian, except the epistle to Philemon, and that to the Hebrews, which he did not receive, iii. 36—43, 55. several of his epistles quoted by Novatus, 114-15. by Commodian, 134-5. Anatolius, 144. the author of the poem against the Marcionites, 171. Victorinus, 176-7. Methodius, 194. whether the epistle to the Hebrews was received by Eusebius, iv. 102-3, 119-20. it was doubted of by some, particularly the church of the Romans, 98, 293. v. 136. whether written in Hebrew, iv. 138-9. a commentary upon thirteen of the epistles by Pelagius, 590. when they were first divided into sections and chapters, v. 68, 69, 72

The order of his epistles in point of time, iv. 545-6. v. 17, 18, 71, 84, 85, 95, 107, 113

A forged book entitled *The Travels of Paul and Thecla*, re-

- jected and condemned, ii. 305. an apocryphal book called *Acts of Paul*, quoted by Origen, but not received by him as of authority, 539
- Paul's Revelation*, rejected by Sozomen and the ancients, iv. 132
- Paul of Concordia*, a Letter of Jerom to him, iv. 236. told Jerom, that Cyprian used to call Tertullian his master, ii. 269
- Paul of Samosata*, Bp. of Antioch, his history, iii. 666—671. favoured by Zenobia, 671. his opinions, 671-2, 675—681. had a considerable number of proselytes, 686. scriptures received by him, 681. his works, *ib.* his character, *ib.* said to have judaized, 677-8
- Paul*, a Novatian Bp. at Constantinople, iii. 103
- Paul*, a learned Persian, v. 107
- Paula*, Jerom's friend, how commended by Possidonius, iv. 410-11
- Paulianists*, their baptism, ii. 680. their continuance, *ib.*
- Paulicians*, their history and time, iii. 446. reduced their sect to six churches, 294. changed their first names for others, *ib.* how they called their ministers, 446. their testimony to the scriptures, 447—449
- Paulinus*, Bp. of Nola, his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 587—589
- Pausanias*, his testimony to the destruction of Jerusalem by a Roman emperor, vi. 477
- Peace* (The) of the churches in Judea. See *Rest*
- Pearson* (Bp.) a remark of his upon Clement of Rome, ii. 38. upon Ignatius, 92. his opinion concerning the time of Polycarp's martyrdom, 97. concerning the Constitutions, iv. 200. quoted, vi. 608, 619. x. 79, note ^b, 179. censured, vi. 63, 64. quoted and commended, 118, and elsewhere
- Pierce* (J.) quoted, vi. 127, 141. x. 77, note, 85, note, 110, 114. with disapprobation, ix. 583—587
- Pelagius*, his time and works, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 590—593. sometimes confutes the Manichees, iii. 276. quoted, x. 112, 157, 179
- Pelagianism*, how described by Cassian, v. 31. how treated by Vincentius Lirinensis, 42
- Peregrinus*, called also *Proteus*, said by Lucian to have been some while among the christians, and afterwards to have parted from them, vii. 279—281. his death mentioned by several ancient writers, 281-2
- Percennis*, desired Apollonius to plead before the Roman senate, ii. 323
- Perizonius*, his interpretation of Luke ii. 1, 2. represented and considered, i. 318—328
- Perpetua*, a martyr, ii. 584. with Felicitas in the time of Severus, vii. 311
- Persecution*, or force and compulsion in things of religion, con-

demned by our blessed Saviour, viii. 282. by the Abp. of Canterbury, 283. by Tertullian, Lactantius, Athanasius, Constantine, Jovian, Valentinian, Julian, Themistius, Libanius, Ammi-
 anus Marcellinus, 284-5. by De Maussac, a learned Dominican, x. 2. every degree of it may fill our minds with horror, vii. 551. arguments against it in Lactantius, and that christians did not persecute, iii. 512—515. condemned by Athanasius, iv. 153. by the christian religion, 209. all persecution condemned by Sulpicius Severus, 576—579. makes heresies spread faster than otherwise they would, 578-9. how defined by Socrates, v. 171. On the subject of prosecuting the writers against christianity, see Dr. Waddington, Bp. of Chichester's correspondence with Dr. Lardner, i. lxxiii—lxxix. A general account of the heathen persecutions, iv. 575-6. the number of heathen persecutions of the christians, vii. 559—561

PERSIA, the gospel first preached there by the apostle Thaddeus, v. 100. many churches there, 101. the cruelty of a persecution endured there by the christians, and the happy alteration made in the manners of those of them, who embraced the christian religion, 24, 25. the christian religion preached there before the time of Mani, iii. 439-40. before the council of Nice, iv. 56. before the time of Eusebius, 89. the time of a persecution there, 51, 52

Pestilence in the Roman empire, and the time of it, iii. 8, 9

Petavius quoted, iv. 196, note ^k, 216, 218

PETER (ST.) THE APOSTLE, his history to the time of our Saviour's ascension, vi. 203—211. he and his brother Andrew said to have been the first two disciples called by Christ, v. 9. His history to the council at Jerusalem, 211—231. after which he goes to Antioch, where he is reprov'd by St. Paul for dissimulation, 231—233. vii. 432-3. his travels to the time of his coming to Rome, 233—237. said to be at Rome in the time of Claudius, v. 140. his history from Jerom, iv. 459. preached to the Jews in Pontus and Bithynia according to Eusebius, 99. was often in those countries according to Epiphanius, 190. the time of his death, vi. 238. the manner of his death, 242-3. was at Rome and suffered martyrdom there, 243—254. came to Rome in 63 or 64, and suffered martyrdom in 64 or 65, v. 287. 535-6. vi. 233-4. suffered martyrdom at Rome, together with Paul, in the time of Nero, according to Eusebius and Dionysius of Corinth, ii. 146. according to Tertullian, 286. and Caius, 396. and Theodoret, v. 25. was at Antioch, afterwards in Pontus, and at Rome in the time of Claudius, and suffered martyrdom with Paul in Nero's general persecution, iv. 576. v. 25, 63, 64. in the last year of Nero, 145. the place of his interment, iv. 459

Concerning his episcopate at Antioch, vi. 238. said to have been bishop of Rome twenty-five years, 239. Rome Peter's province, according to Ephrem, iv. 319. his children, vi. 240-1.

his wife's martyrdom, 241. his absconding at Rome, 241-2. the manner of his crucifixion, 233, 242. the prerogatives of this apostle, 209—213. miracles wrought at Jerusalem by his shadow passing by, 213. much commended, v. 20. his pre-eminence, 64, 129-30, 153. he and the apostle Paul are expressly mentioned by Hierocles, vii. 475, 479, 482

HIS TWO EPISTLES, their genuineness shown from testimony and internal characters, vi. 254—258. to whom they were sent, 258—264. whether sent to Jews or Gentiles, iv. 303, 460, 510. v. 38, 107, 111, 113, 130, 145, 155-6. the place where they were written, vi. 264—271. the first epistle written at Rome, iv. 583. v. 78, 165. at Babylon in Persia, 97, 100. the time when they were written, vi. 271. Remarks on 1 Pet. v. 13, 272—274

His first epistle seems to be referred to by Clement of Rome, ii. 52. referred to by Polycarp several times, 107-8. by the martyrs at Lyons, 164. received by Theophilus of Antioch, 207, 213. quoted by Papias, 119, 123, 125. Irenæus, 179. Clement of Alexandria, 241. Tertullian, 292-3. universally received in Origen's time, 494. quoted or referred to by Victorinus, iii. 178. Methodius, 196. universally received, iv. 97, 123

Both his epistles received by Athanasius, iv. 155, 157. Cyril of Jerusalem, 173. the council of Laodicea, 182. Epiphanius, 187, 190. Innocent, Bp. of Rome, 586. Pelagius, 599. Cyril of Alexandria, v. 13. Prosper, 36. Salvian, 65. Gregory, Bp. of Rome, 129-30. the author of the Imperfect Work, 121

The second epistle seems to be referred to by Clement of Rome, ii. 52, 53. quoted by the author of *Questiones et R.* 129. by Adamantius, iv. 167. generally received at Alexandria, 303. quoted by Ambrose, 334. by the author of the *Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles*, 383. received by Jerom, 460

The second epistle not quoted by Papias, ii. 123. nor by Irenæus, 179, 182. nor Tertullian, 293, 295. doubted of in the time of Origen, 495. how quoted by him, 509-10. whether received by Firmilian, 582. iii. 45. not quoted by Cyprian, 44. whether referred to by Novatus, 117. or Methodius, 197. not universally received in the time of Eusebius, iv. 97, 124. doubted of by some in the time of Didymus, 303. not received by the churches of Syria, 321—325. not received by Chrysostom, 548. doubted of by some, v. 107-8, 130, 136. because of the difference of the style, 136

Both his epistles probably received by the Manichees, iii. 404. both rejected by the Paulicians, 447—449. See *Catholic epistles*

The Gospel, Acts, Preaching, Judgment, Revelation, and other books ascribed to Peter, rejected by Jerom, iv. 459, 485. See *Acts*, *Gospel*

- PETER's Preaching**, or Preaching of Peter and Paul, how quoted by Clement of Alexandria, ii. 252—254. when written, 255, note v. quoted by Heracleon, and rejected by Origen, 538. called likewise by him, *Doctrine of Peter*, *ib.* censured by the author of *Rebaptizing*, iii. 70. how quoted by Lactantius, with remarks, 547. rejected in Eusebius, iv. 98, 131. and Jerom, 459. that it was not received as a canonical book by Clement of Alexandria, see ii. 538
- Peter's Revelation**; short notes written upon it by Clement of Alexandria. ii. 225. how quoted by him, 256. rejected by Eusebius and the ancients, iv. 98, 132. and by Jerom, 459
- Peter, Bp. of Alexandria**, his history, works, and testimony to the scriptures, iii. 237—239
- Peter of Sicily**, his work against the Manichees, and his time, iii. 285-6
- Petilian**, a Donatist bishop, iii. 562-3
- Petronius**, president of Syria, ordered by Caligula to erect his statue at Jerusalem, i. 92, 101. his precept to the magistrates of Doris in favour of the Jews, 138
- Pfaff (C. M.)** Fragments of Irenæus published by him, and remarks upon them, ii. 189—191. quoted, vi. 353
- PHARISEES**; their principles and practices, i. 123—128. their power under Alexandra, 125. that title appropriated to men of substance and learning, 130, 229. six thousand of them refuse to swear to Cæsar and Herod, 229, 292. their great authority among the Jews, 230, 292
- Phedimus**, Bp. of Amasea, ordains Gregory Thaumaturgus, ii. 612
- Pheroras**, inquiries into the occasion of his death, i. 360-1
- Pheroras's wife** misrepresented by Josephus, i. 297-8
- Philaster**, Bp. of Brescia, what he says of some catholics omitting to read publicly the epistle to the Hebrews, iii. 117. his time and work, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 385—387. his article concerning the Abstinentes, with remarks, 374-5. he wrote a long treatise of heresies, and yet has not been reckoned orthodox by all, viii. 308. he thought that the soul was created before the body, and that the doctrine of the Millennium is a heresy, *ib.* his account of the Heretics, Apelles, 544. Cerdon, 446. Cerinthus, 416. Leucius, 516. the Montanists, 600
- Phileas**, Bp. of Thmuis in Egypt, and martyr, iii. 234—237
- Phileleutherus Dublinensis**. See Bentley
- Philemon**, converted by St. Paul, vi. 130-1, 158. his character and station, 77, 78, 158. Paul's epistle to him, when and where written, 76—78. quoted by Origen, ii. 500. not quoted by Cyprian, iii. 40. received by Marcion, viii. 501-2. rejected by some, iv. 453
- Philip**, tetrarch of Iturca, in the time of John the Baptist, i. 18. married to Salome, Herodias's daughter, 408-9
- Philip**, otherwise called *Herod*, first husband of Herodias, his history, i. 408-9. was a private person, 414

- Philip*, said to be the apostle, lived and died at Hierapolis in Phrygia, and wrought miracles there, and his daughters prophesied, ii. 115, 118. x. 129
- Philip*, Bp. of Gortyna in Crete, ii. 312
- Philip*, the emperor, whether he was a christian, vii. 350-1, 355
- Philippi*, oratory there, by the river's side, i. 115
- Philippians*, (*The epistle to the*) when and where written, vi. 72—75
- Philippus Sidetes*, his account of Athenagoras and Pantænus, ii. 193, 216
- Philo, the Jew*, says, that Pilate dedicated shields at Jerusalem, i. 161-2. speaks of four sons of Herod living in the time of Pilate, 412. mentioned by Anatolius, iii. 143. his divisions of the books of the Old Testament, iv. 427
- Philopatris*, a Dialogue so called, its age, and extracts from it, with remarks, vii. 285—291
- Philoromus*, receiver-general at Alexandria, and martyr in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 234-5
- Philosophers*, their timorousness in declaring the truth, iv. 530. their credulity, and that they did little to improve the sentiments of mankind, vii. 507
- Philostorgius*, his time and writings, and testimony to the scriptures, iii. 597—600. his character, iii. 205
- Philostratus*, his testimony to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, vi. 477-8. his Life of Apollonius Tyanæus, with remarks, and that he did not aim to set up Apollonius as a rival with our Saviour, though Hierocles and other heathens afterwards made that use of it, vii. 486—503, 508—514
- Phlegon*, his time and works, vii. 105-6. supposed to speak of our Saviour's foreknowledge, 106. was credulous, *ib.* a passage in which he is supposed to speak of the miraculous darkness at the time of our Saviour's passion, with notes and observations, 107—121. how quoted by Dr. Clarke and Grotius, 109
- Photinus*, his history, iv. 236—239. opinions, 239—241. writings, 241-2. character, *ib.* scriptures received by him, 242-3. the continuance of his sect, 243-4
- Photinians*, sometimes called *Bonosiacs*, or *Bonosians*, iv. 244. not allowed to hold religious assemblies, 243. mentioned by Augustine as in being in his time, ii, 678, 680
- Photius*, his character of the epistle of Clement of Rome, ii. 29, note ^b. his censure of Irenæus, 169. of Clement of Alexandria, 224. his account of the genuine and supposititious writings of Clement of Rome, 378. his time, and books against the Manichees, iii. 286. his manner of treating them, 275. his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 150—153. quoted and commended, ix. 14
- Pierius*, presbyter of Alexandria, fragments supposed to be his, though ascribed to Clement Apollinarius, ii. 316. his history,

- iii. 156—159. said to have been a catechist, 157. how he speaks of the Trinity, 158. his copies of the Bible, 157. his character, 155, 158-9
- Piety*, the virtue and benefit of early, a sermon, i. 194
- Pilate (Pontius)* his unjust government in Judea, i. 80. stood in fear of the Jews, *ib.* 97. was in Judea at the commencement of John the Baptist's ministry, 389. at Jerusalem at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, 150-1, 154-5. his wife in Judea, 151. the duration of his government, 90, 389. when he came into Judea, and when removed, 389, 392-3. remarks upon his power in Judea, 163-4. of what kind his fear mentioned in John xix. 8, 157—159. brings Roman ensigus into Jerusalem, 160. dedicates shields there, 161. would have brought water thither with the sacred money, 160. his Acts, and Letter to Tiberius, vi. 605—619. made away with himself, i. 395
- Pilgrimages*, disliked by Gregory Nyssen and Jerom, iv. 299
- Piu (E. Du)* his character of Novatus, iii. 112. his character of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, iv. 76. of Eusebius himself, 85. his judgment concerning the Constitutions, 199
- Pinytus*, Bp. of Gnosus in Crete, ii. 312
- Pionius*, an excellent martyr, learned men are not agreed about the time of his martyrdom, ii. 588
- Piso, præfect of Syria*, i. 333. his delays in going to Rome after his removal, 394
- Piso (Lucius)* when made præfect of Rome, i. 377—379
- Plato* quoted, x. 164
- Pliny, the Elder*, his time and character, and whether he refers to the blindness inflicted by St. Paul upon Elymas the sorcerer in Cyprus, vi. 625-6
- Pliny (The Younger)* the time of his provincial government, vii. 18, 19. his Letter to Trajan concerning the christians, 22—25. rehearsed with notes and observations, 26—50. Trajan's Rescript rehearsed with notes and observations, vii. 51—53. observations of learned men upon Pliny's Letter and Trajan's Rescript, 55—61. the uses of those epistles, and general observations upon them, 71—77. Pliny's character and his amiable qualities, 61, 62. was credulous and superstitious, 63—65. his want of equity toward the christians, 31, 32, 49. perverted many, 31, 37. condemned them without law and authority, 34, 35, 50, 51. examined by torture two christian women then in years, 45, 46. was zealous for the honour of the gods and priesthood, 48
- Plotina*, wife of Trajan, commended, vii. 70
- Plotinus* negligent in observing the sacred rites of Gentilism, vii. 372-3
- Plutarch*, his dialogue concerning the cessation of oracles quoted, vi. 619—621. whether he knew any thing of the christians, or their affairs, vii. 374, 383-4. his judicious observations upon the fabulous stories common among the Greeks, 497. quoted, vi. 441

- Plutarch*, brother of Heraclas, scholar of Origen, and martyr, ii. 471
- Polycarp, Bp. of Smyrna*, his time and history, from Irenæus, ii. 94—97. ordained by apostles, 97. his great age and martyrdom, *ib.* wrote several epistles not now extant, 98. in his epistle to the Philippians, his only remaining work, he quotes or refers to the first epistle of St. Peter, and divers other books of the New Testament, 95, 96, 98—109. how he is quoted by Irenæus, 188. the *Responsiones*, ascribed to him, not his, 99. *The relation of his martyrdom*, with notes and observations, 97, 98. vii. 150—155. extracts out of it, containing their testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament, ii. 110—112. quoted, x. 130
- Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus*, his history, and testimony to the scriptures, ii. 259—261. his story concerning St. John's wearing on his forehead a golden plate examined, iv. 447—449
- Pompey*, the time of his conquest of Judea, and taking Jerusalem, and his behaviour there, vi. 399, 400
- Pomponia, Græcina*, a Roman lady, accused of a foreign superstition, (supposed to be christianity,) in the time of Nero, A. D. 57, vi. 627-8
- Ponticus*, a young man, martyr at Lyons, vii. 165-6
- Pontius, deacon at Carthage*, his history, and testimony to the books of the New Testament, iii. 56
- Pontius Pilate*. See *Pilate*
- Popular preaching*, how censured by Jerom, iv. 481
- PORPHYRY, the philosopher**, his time, and history, and works, vii. 390—396. why he was called Bataneotis, 392. he never was a christian, 393. his books against the christians ordered to be destroyed, 396. what he says of Bardesanes, ii. 320—323. of Ammonius, 438-9. his passage concerning Origen, with remarks, 469-70, 484. vii. 396—398. was well acquainted with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, 437. his objections against the book of Daniel, 399—415. remarks upon these objections, and upon the answers to them, 416—420. passages, in which he acknowledges the antiquity of Moses, 421-2. his objection against Gen. iii. 5, 422. Texts in the New Testament objected against by Porphyry, Matt. i. 11, 12, 423. iii. 3, 426. ix. 9, 423-4. xiii. 35, 424. xiv. 25, 425. xxiv. 15, 425-6. xxvii. 45, 426. John vii. 8, 10, 428. Acts v. 1 to 14, 429. Gal. i. 15, 16, *ib.* ii. 11 to 14, 429—436. A review of his testimony to the books of the Old and New Testament, 437. passages concerning christians and their affairs, where also are extracts from a letter of Augustine, with six questions containing difficulties taken from Porphyry, 437—444. a work entitled *The philosophy of Oracles*, ascribed to him, and shown to be spurious, iv. 81. vii. 444—467. his Life of Pythagoras, with remarks, and that it was not written with a design to compare Pythagoras with Jesus Christ, 504—506. his books

- against the christian religion, answered by Methodius, iii. 181, 185. and Apollinarius, iv. 260, 263-4
- Porphyry, servant of Pamphilus*, his martyrdom, iii. 230
- Posidonius*, what he said of Jerom, mentioned by Palladius, iv. 410-11
- Posthumian*, chief speaker in a dialogue of Sulpicius Severus, iv. 415, 577
- Potamiana*, a virgin, martyr at Alexandria in the time of Severus, vii. 310
- Pothinus, Bp. of Lyons*, and predecessor of Irenæus, his age and sufferings, ii. 160-1, 166, 168, vii. 161-2
- Potter (J.)* his Greek antiquities quoted, vii. 324
- Præscens*, see *Bruttius*
- Prætextatus*, a Roman of great distinction, an oration in his praise by Himerius, viii. 4. how he jested with Damasus Bp. of Rome, 57. commended by Ammianus, 56. See likewise 109, 221
- Praxagoras*, his history of Constantine, and great character of him, vii. 579
- Praxeas*, our knowledge of him chiefly from Tertullian, viii. 603. his time and country, 602-3. was persecuted, and once signed a recantation, 604-5. strenuous asserter of the divine unity, and believed the general articles of the christian faith, 605-6. denied that the Father or the Divine nature in Jesus suffered, 607. received both the Old and New Testament, 608—611
- Prayer* in the name of Christ, a sermon, ix. 405. the apostles never prayed, nor mentioned blessings, as given for the sake of Christ, 419
- Preaching of Paul or Peter*, an apocryphal book censured by the author of a work entitled, *Of Rebaptizing Heretics*, iii. 70
- Preaching of Peter* quoted by Lactantius, iii. 547
- President*, this title used in a general way, i. 329-30, 402-3
- Presidents of provinces*, had power of life and death, i. 77—79. were supreme judges in all causes in their provinces, 85. had a council with them, 111. their good conduct toward persons of different religions, 193—197
- Prideaux (Dr.)* his opinion concerning the survey at the time of our Saviour's nativity considered, i. 264—267. his remark upon Herod's cruelty, 347-8. quoted and commended, 134, 415. his account of the Mishna and Talmuds, vi. 506-7. his judicious observations upon Porphyry's explications of the book of Daniel, and upon his objections against that book, vii. 411, 416—418. his judgment upon the Sibylline oracles, ii. 334. quoted, v. 144. x. 256-7
- Priests and Levites*, christian ministers not so called in early times, iv. 212
- Primasius, an African Bp.* his Commentary upon St. Paul's epistles quoted, v. 59
- Primus*, Bp. of Corinth, ii. 155
- Prince*, when used absolutely, equivalent to emperor, i. 379-80

- Principle*, meaning of this word, viii. 459-60
- Priscian*, governor of Palestine, to whom Libanius writes, iii. 268 ..
- Priscillian*, his writings, iv. 337-8. history of him, and his prosecution and death, 339—346. an apology for him and his friends, 347—364. his character, 348
- Priscillianism*, the time of its rise, iv. 340
- Priscillianists*, scriptures received by them, iv. 366—368. their opinions concerning other matters, 366—371. charges against them in Jerom, Augustine, and Leo, considered, 371—374
- Prisoners*, how kept by the Romans, i. 243-4. sent from Judea to Rome, 248. delivered there to the captain of the guard, 249
- Proceresius*, a christian and sophist, professor of rhetoric at Athens, viii. 67—69
- Proclus*, president of the school of philosophy at Athens, author of a treatise against the christians, and many other works, viii. 130—132
- Proclus*, or *Groculus*, a Montanist mentioned by Tertullian, ii. 269, 395—397, 586. with whom Caius had a conference at Rome, 395—398. his history and work against the Valentini-ans, 587. several of that name, *ib.*
- Procopius*, writer of the History of Justinian, and a christian, viii. 150
- Procula*, daughter of Elpidius and Eucrocia, iv. 342, 349
- Proculus*, said to have wrought a remarkable cure by anointing with oil, vii. 308, and note ^b
- Prodicus* and his followers, an account of them from Clem. Alexandrinus and Theodoret, with observations, viii. 417—421. accusations against them, 421—423. respected Christ and the scriptures, 422. their time and general character, 423. did not separate themselves from other christian churches, 424 .
- Prodigies* preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, according to Josephus, vi. 451—457. according to Josippon, 547-8. according to Tacitus, 632-3
- Promise*, annexed to godliness, two sermons, ix. 496
- Prophets*, the origin of that character, signs whereby they may be known, and the great guilt of neglecting the messages of true prophets, vi. 563—569
- Prophets of the O. T.* how far they speak of Christ, v. 12. they wrote the canonical books of the Old Testament, iv. 493-4, 497—499. v. 127
- False prophets* in Judea, before the destruction of Jerusalem, vi. 420—424, 451, and see 470
- Proselytes*, the Jews sometimes proselyted persons of condition, and their different notions about that matter, i. 123—128. there was but one sort of proselytes among the Jews, vi. 216—226. x. 307—317
- Prosper of Aquitain*, his time, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 36, 37. works ascribed to him, 37—40

- Protevangelion*, or gospel of James, composed by Leucius, viii. 526-7
- Proctetus*, presbyter of Cæsarea, and friend of Origen, ii. 473-4
- Provinces*, the division of them made in the time of Augustus, i. 34
- Prudentius (A.)* his time and works, a testimony to the scriptures, v. 3—5. his character of Julian, vii. 600. his books against Symmachus quoted, viii. 213—216
- Psalms*, divided into five books, iv. 295. commentaries upon them by Apollinarius, and several other Greek writers, 260. by Theodore of Mopsnestia, 395. upon some of them by Ambrose of Milan, 335-6
- Publicans*, that some Jews were such, i. 230-1
- Publius*, Bp. of Athens, and martyr, 307-8
- Pyle (T.)* quoted, x. 162

Q

- Quadratus*, mentioned with evangelists, and said to have had the gift of prophecy, ii. 115, 414. whether Quadratus the apologist was Bp. of Athens, 307-8
- Quartus*, a martyr at Rome in the time of Valerian, vii. 369
- Quesnell (M. P.)* some observations of his, iv. 364-5. his opinion concerning some works ascribed to Prosper, v. 37, 38
- Question (The)* or torture used by the Romans, i. 233
- Quinta*, a martyr at Alexandria, before the publication of Decius's edict against the christians, vii. 358
- Quotations*, many books are quoted by ancient christian writers, without giving them authority, iv. 456-7, 484. how texts of the O. T. are quoted by the writers of the N. T. 466-7, 475—477
- Remarkable *quotation* of Judges xiv. 14, vii. 270. Phil. ii. 6. 167

R

- Rabbi*, one baptized at Leyden, ix. 105
- Readings (Various)* their number, and the causes of them, ii. 555. various readings in Faustus the Manichee, iii. 436-7
- Reason*, the value of it according to Irenæus, ii. 184-5. the use of it in things of religion, v. 149. A future state proved by reason, iii. 503. iv. 79
- Recognitions*, not written by Clement of Rome, ii. 35, 364—368. their time, 368. the author an Ebionite, 380, 383. how quoted by Origen, 530. quoted in the *Imperfect Work*, v. 122
- Recommendation* of things virtuous, lovely, and of good report; a sermon, ix. 252
- Redemption* of Gentiles as well as Jews, from the curse of the

- law, ix. 491—493. *Rites of redemption* among the Macro-
sians, viii. 434-5
- Register*; Jewish registers in being at the time of our Saviour's
nativity, and afterwards, i. 282
- Reimar* (*H. S.*) quoted and commended, vi. 440
- Reland* (*Adr.*) his observations upon the arch of Titus, and the
spoils of Jerusalem, vi. 467-8
- Religion* (*Natural*) its reality asserted, iv. 390. the benefit of it,
ii. 492
- Religious parents* (The happiness of having) and other relations,
a sermon, ix. 186. the present advantage of being religious,
507—511
- Reliques*, early instances of translating them, iii. 598
- Repentance*, its value, iii. 506-7
- Responsiones*, a fragment so called, not written by Polycarp,
ii. 99
- Rest*: the rest or peace of the churches, mentioned Acts ix. 31,
accounted for, i. 101, 104. the time and occasion of it, v. 475
—477, 480. vi. 214, 230
- Resurrection*, the meaning of its being past, ii. 332. the resur-
rection of the body denied by the Manichees, iii. 370 1. and
by the Docetæ and other Heretics, viii. 519-20, 547-8. the re-
surrection of the soul, 519-20. good arguments for the truth of
Christ's resurrection, iv. 79, 563-4. The history of our Savi-
our's resurrection, and of his appearances afterwards to his
followers, digested, x. 369—392. this account summed up,
391-2
- REVELATION of St. John**, its genuineness, vi. 318—323. written
by John the apostle, or John the elder, ii. 118. ascribed to
Cerinthus by Caius and others, 401-2. see also, 693, 705. not
written by Cerinthus, 700-1. Dionysius of Alexandria, his ar-
gument upon it, 693—697. with remarks, 697—719. Quoted
as John the apostle's in the Commentary upon thirteen of St.
Paul's epistles, iv. 383
- Its time, vi. 324—328. said by Victorinus to have been pub-
lished in the time of Domitian, iii. 179
- Referred* or alluded to, by Hermas, ii. 69—72. by the mar-
tyrs at Lyons, 164. probably received by Papias, 118, 124. re-
ceived by Justin M. and ascribed by him to John the apostle,
137. received by Melito, Bp. of Sardis, 159-60. by Irenæus,
181—183. and said by him to have been seen in the time of
Domitian; to the like purpose others, iv. 575. v. 114, 140. re-
ceived by Theophilus of Antioch, ii. 203. Clement of A. 245.
Tertullian, 275, 295. a commentary upon it by Melito, 159.
made use of by the composer of the Sibylline oracles, 343. re-
ceived by Apollonius, 393. by Hippolytus, 436. by Origen,
495, 497, 512, 577. Dionysius of Alexandria, his argument
upon it, with remarks, 693—722. received by Cyprian, and the
church of Rome in his time, iii. 47. by the author against the

Novatian heretic, 64, 65. by the author of a Computation of Easter, 73. 74. by Novatus, 118-19. by the Novatians, 121. by Commodian, 135. by the author of the poem against the Marcionites, 171. by Methodius, 197-8. received by the Manichees, 404. quoted by the latter Arnobius, 480. received by Lactantius, 541. by the Donatists, 565. generally received in the time of Eusebius, iv. 103. received by Athanasius, 155. by the author of the Synopsis, 163. by Julius Firmicus Maternus, 171. by Hilary of Poitiers, 179. by Epiphanius, 187, 190. by Faustinus, 251. by Phœbadius, 254. by Victorinus, iii. 178-9. iv. 256. supposed to be received by Basil, 279. Gregory Nazianzen, 287-8. Gr. Nyssen, 296. Ephrem, 313. received by Philaster, 387. by the Egyptians, 324. by Pacian, 326. by Ambrose, 335. by Jerom, 436, 450. by Rufinus, 484-5. by the third council of Carthage, 487. by Augustine, 494, 511-12. by Sulpicius Severus, 575. by Chromatius, 581. by Innocent, 586. by Paulinus, 588-9. by Pelagius, 591. by Prudentius, v. 5. probably by Isidore of Pelusium, 10. received by Cyril of Alexandria, 13. by Cassian, 29. by Prosper, 36. by the author of the Divine promises and predictions, 39. by Salvian, 65. by Gennadius, 74, 75. by Gelasius, 76. by Irenæus, and other early writers, 77, 104. by the christians in Egypt in the time of Cosmas, 98. and at Constantinople in the ninth century, 88. by the author of the *Imperfect Work*, 121. by Gregory, Bp. of Rome. 131. by Isidore of Seville, 136. by Damascenus, 147. by Œcumenius, 157. by Nicephorus Callisti, 168-9. is in the catalogue of Dionysius, called the Areopagite, 74. in the Alexandrian MS. 82-84. A commentary upon it by Andrew, 77. by Arethas, 103. by Cassiodorus, 113. Allusions and references to it in Lucian's *True history*, vii. 285. and in the Dialogue called *Philopatris*, 289

Whether received by Archelaus, iii. 258. *a contradicted* book in the time of Eusebius, iv. 97. whether received by Eusebius, 125-128. *not received* by all in the time of Epiphanius, 190-1. not received by Cyril of Jerusalem, 173, 175. wanting in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, 183. rejected by some according to Amphilochius, 293. whether received by the Syrians, 323-325. generally doubted of by christians in the East, v. 107. said by Jerom not to be received by the Greeks, iv. 456. not received by all in the time of Augustine, 511. never quoted by Chrysostom, 549. said by Sulpicius Severus to be foolishly or wickedly rejected by many, 575. doubtful whether received by Cosmas, v. 98. and Theophylact, 162. looked upon as spurious by some of the ancients, 103. not received by Severian, Bp. of Gabala, iv. 572. nor by Theodoret, v. 19. not publicly read at Alexandria in the fifth century, 70. placed among apocryphal books, 87. Sentiments of divers learned moderns concerning this book, ii. 715-718, 720-1. See also *St. John*

- Revocatus*, a martyr in Africa, in the persecution of Severus, ii. 584
- Rhadagaisus*, a Gothic prince, his remarkable overthrow in the year 405, viii. 247—250
- Rhenford*, on the Heresies of the Jews, viii. 305. his account of the *Rites of redemption* among the Marcosians, 434-5
- Rheticus*, Bp. of Autun, his work and character, iv. 232-3
- Rhetorians*, viii. 304
- Rhodon*, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, ii. 324
- Richardson (J.)* his opinion, that the apostle Peter authorized St. Mark's gospel, ii. 122. quoted again, 186, 241, 296. his dissertation upon Christ's genealogy recommended, 465
- Rigaltius (N.)* his explication of *Authentic letters*, in Tertullian, ii. 284-5
- Righteousness*, its nature, excellence, and importance, three sermons, ix. 136
- River*, the Jews went to pray by a river-side, or by the sea-side, i. 115—117
- Roche (M. de la)* his Literary Journal commended, ii. 281. iv. 250. his judgment upon Philostratus's Life of Apollonius Tyanæus, vii. 489. and upon the Lives of Pythagoras written by Porphyry and Jamblichus, 504. and see 508
- Roman Empire (The state of the)* at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century, iv. 7—14. the extent of it, and its peaceful state, facilitated the progress of the gospel at the beginning, ii. 493
- Romans*, protected people of all sects and religions, i. 180—183. Jews in particular, 183—197. an objection considered, 205-6
- Romans*, the epistle to them difficult, ii. 523. when and where written, v. 26, 27. received by Archelaus, iii. 258. by Serapion, Bp. of Thmuis, 271. and the Manichees, 403
- Rome*, the church there commended, ii. 286, 297. founded by Peter and Paul, 187, 275, 286. the succession of the first bishops there, 31, 32. the number of christians there about the year 250, iii. 80. what authority was assumed by the Bishops of that city, 104-5. besieged, taken, and sacked by Alaric the Goth, in the year 410, viii. 250—253
- Rufinus*, his account of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, ii. 532. iii. 54. he censured the Manichees, 276. published his translation of Origen's books of Principles, iv. 412. his apology for himself, 416. his time, 482. his testimony to the scriptures, 482—484. his explication of the creed much commended, 483. his character of Porphyry, vii. 554-5
- Ruinart (Theodoric)* quoted, ii. 93, 165. censured, 661. commended, iii. 203-4
- Rusticula*, a Novatian Bp. at Rome, iii. 105
- Rutilius*, a martyr in the time of Severus, vii. 311
- Rutilius*, a heathen, his time and character, and poem, with extracts from it, viii. 88—90

S

- Sabbath (The)* how respected by the primitive christians, and the constitutions, iv. 215—219
- Sabellianism*, its rise and time, ii. 657—665. iii. 243—246. called Judaism, ii. 625, 677. increase of it, and received by many, 664-5
- Sabellians*, called Patripassians, but were not, ii. 594—597
- Sabellius*, his opinions, ii. 662—665. scriptures received by him and his followers, 665. his time, iii. 105—109. mentioned by Methodius, 194
- Sabinus, a Gallic prince*, his remarkable history, vi. 440-1
- Sabinus, an Arian historian*, his time and character, iii. 600-1
- Sacrifice*, the Manichees did not think Christ's death was a sacrifice for sin, iii. 383-4
- Sadduc*, a Pharisee, associate of Judas of Galilee, i. 228-9
- Sadducees*, their principles, and opposition to the Pharisees, i. 128. were sometimes in public offices, 129. severe in judicial sentences, 83, 129
- Salome*, Herod's sister, her character, i. 292-3. always faithful to Herod, 412
- Salome*, Herodias's daughter, to whom married, i. 408
- Salonius*, his thoughts of a book called Timothy, written by Salvian, ii. 385
- Salvian*, his answer to Salonius, ii. 384. his time, works, and character, v. 64, 65. his testimony to the scriptures, 65—67
- Samaritans*, their respect for mount Gerizim, i. 134. the enmity between them and the Jews, 134—136. expected the Messiah, and their idea of him, 140-1
- Sanctus*, deacon of the church of Vienne, and martyr at Lyons, vii. 159—163
- Saragossa*, a council there concerning the Priscillianists, iv. 341, 359
- Satan*, his original according to the Manichees, iii. 356
- Saturninus of Antioch*, succeeded Menander, the successor of Simon, an obscure person, whose opinions were similar to those of Basilides, viii. 347-8
- Saturninus*, a martyr in Africa, with Perpetua and others, in the time of Severus, ii. 584
- Saturus*, a martyr, ii. 584
- Sayings ascribed to Christ*, which are not exact quotations from the N. T. by Barnabas, ii. 27, 28. Irenæus, 189. Clement of A. 257
- Scaliger (Jos.)* his interpretation of Luke ii. 2, i. 332-3. his observations upon the martyrdom of Polycarp, and the martyrs at Lyons, vii. 155. upon the Letter ascribed to M. Antoninus, relating to the Thundering legion, 185
- Scapula (Tertullus)* when consul at Rome, and proconsul of Africa, vii. 303. how he treated the christians, 140, 312

Schism defined, iii. 438, note †

Scillitan martyrs in the time of Severus, vii. 311

Scott (Dr. J. N.) quoted, ix. 356

Scribes, who they were, i. 130-1

Scripture, that word sometimes equivalent to writing, or treatise, ii. 186-7, 304. how it is used for the books of the Old and New Testament, v. 255. several sorts of scriptures or writings, canonical, ecclesiastical, and apocryphal, 259-60

Scriptures, ancient christian writers sometimes quoted them by memory, ii. 104-5, 109, 208. some heretics endeavoured to corrupt them, 146. general division of them, 697

THE SCRIPTURES.

I. Their authority, and how respected by Clement of Rome, ii. 37. by Ignatius, 89, 90. by Polycarp, 109. by Justin M. 130—137. by Irenæus, 184-5. by Theophilus of Antioch, 215. by Clement of A. 245—247. by Tertullian, 297-8. publicly read in christian assemblies, and to be read by all, according to Justin M. 132, 139-40. Irenæus, 184-5. Tertullian, 302-3. the author of the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs, 362-3. and see Clement of Rome, 35, 36. and Polycarp, 100, 109. Respect for them, 517. doctrines to be proved by them only, 519. to be read by all, and the reading of them much recommended, iii. 221, 231. publicly read, iv. 521-2. committed to memory, iii. 220—222. respect for them expressed by Novatus, 118-19. Commodian, 135. Anatolius, 144. Methodius, 198. respect for them by the christians in Africa, 551. by Lactantius, 541—543. by the Donatists, 565. Alexander, Bp. of A. 568-9. the Arians, 582-3. open to all men, 543. the rule of faith, iv. 143. Scriptures of the New Testament which were universally acknowledged in the time of Eusebius, and before, 96, 102. the scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be read by all, and respect for them expressed by Pamphilus, iii. 221—231. Eusebius, iv. 142—145. Athanasius, 159-60. the Synopsis, 166. Cyril, 176. Epiphanius, 192. Damasus, Bp. of Rome, 277-8. by Basil, 283-4. by others, 297, 303, 314-15, 335-6. their popular style defended, by Origen, ii. 573-4. by Isidore of Pelusium, v. 11. by Theodoret, 23, 24. Marks of respect for them, and their high authority in Jerom, iv. 471—473. and Augustine, 514-15. publicly read, 521. exhortations to read and study them in Jerom, 471-2. in Chrysostom, 550—554. reading them recommended by Pelagius, 591. Isidore of Pelusium, v. 11. Theodoret, 20. Eutherius, 35. received and quoted by Heretics, 48, 50, 51, 67

II. Their *general titles and divisions*, ii. 697. iii. 274. in Gregory Nazianzen, iv. 288. in Gr. Nyssen, 297. and respect for them in Ephrem, 313—315. their general titles and divisions in Ambrose, 336. in Rufinus, 485. in Augustine, 512—

514. in Chrysostom, 549. and marks of respect for them in Severian, 571. general divisions in Sulpicius Severus, 575. in Cyril of A. v. 14. in Theodoret, 19, 20. Cassian, 30. Leo, 62. Salvian, 65. Cosmas, 98. Facundus, 102. Junilius, 106. tokens of respect for them, their inspiration, and general titles and divisions, in Gregory Bp. of Rome, and the reading of them recommended by him and several others, 131-2. iv. 581, 591. v. 11, 20, 34, 35

III. Their genuineness and integrity, iv. 522-3, 539. observations concerning them in Augustine, 527—529. how the genuineness of the books of the New Testament may be known, 101. several sorts of books, 101-2. they are occasional writings, 109—114. some parts obscure, ii. 525, 573. a threefold sense of scripture, 523. whether christians were from the beginning divided about the books of scripture, 513-14. their sufficiency as a rule of faith and practice, v. 43, 51, 76, 96—98. their integrity, or that the copies of the New Testament have not been corrupted, ii. 426-7, 436. translated into many languages, iv. 555. See also, 524. How disparaged by Vincentius Lirinensis, v. 42—51. mystical interpretations in Gregory, 133

IV. *The Manichæan doctrine concerning the scriptures*, iii. 389. they rejected the Old Testament, 390—396. what Faustus says of St. Matthew's gospel, 395, 398-9. they received the gospels and St. Paul's epistles, 403. they received all the books of the New Testament, 405—408. which were publicly read by them, 385. what they said of the books of the New Testament being interpolated, 408—412. passages of Faustus concerning that matter, 412—416. remarks upon them, 416—425. they used apocryphal books, and what, 425, 428—431. they did not interpolate the scriptures, 425—428. See *Versions*

V. *Books, or texts of scripture, quoted or referred to by Celsus, in his work against the christians*. He appears to have been acquainted with the books of the New Testament, vii. 215—218, 247. he has references to all the four gospels, which he allows to have been written by Christ's disciples, 215, 221, 224, 247. and to almost all the facts recorded in the gospels, 224—242. he has references to the book of the Acts of the apostles, 243, 251-2. and to several of the epistles of the New Testament, 221—224. To be a little more particular: he refers to the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, 216—221. He has references to

Matt. i. and ii. Luke i. and ii. 215-16, 225—228.

Matt. v. 39, and Luke vi. 29, 216

Matt. v. 39. vi. 26, 28. Luke vi. 29, xii. 24, 27, 217-18

Matt. vii. 15. xxiv. 24. Mark xiii. 22, 217

Matt. ix. 13, 219

Matt. xxvi. 39. Luke xxii. 21. John xiii. 26, 28, 236-7.

xxvii. 39 to 44. John xix. 28 to 30, 237-8

Mark xvi. 10. John xx. 10 to 18, 239-40

Luke xviii. 9 to 14, 219

John xx. 11 to 18, 24 to 29, 240

1 Cor. iii. 19, 222

viii. 4, 10, 11, 223

xv. 22, 221. ver. 12, 51 to 54, 245-6

Gal. vi. 14, 223

1 Thess. iv. 13 to 17, 245

2 Tim. ii. 11, 12, 239

1 Pet. iii. 15, 19, 20, 223

1 John i. 1 ; iii. 2, 224

Other testimonies from heathens: See under *Amelius*,

Hierocles, Julian, Laertius, Longinus, Porphyry

Scriptures burnt in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 549—552. and 479. vii. 481, 521, 523

Scriptures of the Lord, or the Lord's Scriptures, the New Testament denoted by that phrase, ii. 146, 183, 247. iv. 253. so likewise *Commentaries*, or *Memoirs*, and *Gospel of the Lord*, meaning the gospels, ii. 277

Seythian, said to be predecessor of Mani, his history, iii. 318. See also 261-2

Sebastian, a Manichee in high offices, iii. 289

Sects among the Jews, i. 123—124, 229-30

Secundinus, a Manichæan author, iii. 289. quoted, 332, 351

Secundulus, a martyr, ii. 584

Sedulius (Cæcilius) his time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 55, 56. quoted, iv. 168

Sidulius (Another) his commentary upon St. Paul's epistles, v. 57

Selden (John) his opinion concerning Annas and Caiaphas, i. 403

Senate of Rome, how they adhered to the ancient rites, according to Zosimus, viii. 113. their petition to the younger Valentinian that the altar of Victory might be restored, 202—211. the number of christians in the senate at that time, 217-18

Seneca (L. A.) the philosopher, his description of cruel sufferings and punishments, vi. 637. not alleged as a witness to christianity, *ib.*

Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, his history, and testimony to the New Testament, ii. 264—266. the time of his death, 417

Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, in Egypt, his history, iii. 270. a saying of his, 271. his testimony to the New Testament, *ib.*

Serapis, the demolition of his temple at Alexandria, in the year 391, viii. 227—232

Sereua, wife of Stilicho, how reflected upon by Zosimus, viii. 120

Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, i. 32

Servius, the grammarian, when he flourished, and taught at Rome, viii. 278-9

- Seth*, an apocryphal book quoted in the *Imperfect Work*, v. 119
- Sethians*, observations concerning them, viii. 552. Epiphanius's account of them, 553. called themselves the descendants of Seth, *ib.* from whom they believed Christ descended, 555-6. by Christ probably they meant the Holy Ghost, 557. ascribed the creation to angels, 555. what books and scriptures they received, 558-9
- Severian, Bp. of Gabala*, his time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, iv. 570—572
- Severus* improved the notions of the Encratites, ii. 148
- Severus (Septimius)* emperor, his time, and that for a while he was favourable to the christians, vii. 308-9. the date of his edict against the christians, from Spartian, 313. the severity and the duration of his persecution, and the sufferings of the christians at that time, 309—318. they underwent grievous sufferings before the publication of his edict, 314-15. an observation of Balduinus upon his reign, 309, 318
- Severus (Alexander)* emperor, his time, vii. 329-30. divers passages from his life, written by Lampridius, showing his regard to Jews and christians, 330—333. and see 553-4. his mother, Mammæa, said to have been a christian, 333. he is entitled to commendation for his moderation, and the justness of his sentiments, 330—333
- Sextus*, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, ii. 262
- Sharistani*, an Arabian author, iii. 309
- Sharpe (Gr.)* quotes the *Philosophy of Oracles*, as a work of Porphyry, vii. 444-5
- Sherlock (T.) Bp. of London*, quoted with respect, vi. 257-8, 313. x. 166
- Sibylline oracles*, used by christians, rejected by the heathens, ii. 258-9. when composed, 334—338. how quoted by Clement of Alexandria, 258-9. by Lactantius, 343-4. our collection the same, in the main, which was used by the ancient christian writers, 343—345. their testimony to divers books of the New Testament, 338—343. not esteemed of sacred authority by Lactantius, iii. 544—547. owe their pretended prophecies concerning our Saviour to our evangelists, v. 248
- Sicarii*, or robbers, their character, i. 147-8
- Sign*, what sign the Jews required, i. 140
- Silas, or Silvanus*, his excellent character, vi. 274
- Silvanus, Bp. of Gaza*, a martyr in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 221-2
- Simeon, Bp. of Jerusalem*, his martyrdom in the time of Trajan, vi. 25, 61
- Simcon Beth Arsam*, his time and testimony to Theodore of Mopsuestia, iv. 396. his reflections upon the same, 402
- Simon the Cyrenian*, that he being transformed suffered instead of our Saviour, an absurd story, viii. 357-8
- Simon Magus* overcome by the united prayers of Peter and

- Paul at Rome, in the time of Nero, iv. 576. See likewise v. 140
- Simon, son of Gioras*, one of the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem, taken prisoner, and reserved for the triumph, iv. 463. led in triumph, at Rome, with other prisoners, and then put to death according to Josephus, 466-7. the account of his death in Josephus, 550. what Tacitus says of him and the other generals, 632
- Simon (R.)* his remarks concerning St. Matthew's gospel, said to be found in India, ii. 218. concerning the institutions of Clement of A. 224
- Simplicius*, his time and works, and his journey with divers philosophers into Persia, and return thence, viii. 148—153. wrote a Commentary on the Enchiridion of Epictetus, vii. 86. his account of Epictetus, 79, 84. wrote against the Manichees, iii. 296
- Siricius*, Bp. of Rome, iv. 347
- Sisinnius*, Novatian Bp. at Constantinople, iii. 102
- Sisinnius*, disciple of Mani, iii. 267-8, 337
- Slaves*, their condition among the Romans, iv. 213
- Socinian writers*, their character, x. 104
- Socinus*, his judgment on the Revelation, ii. 721
- Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian*, was not a Novatian, iii. 104. his fine passages concerning the Novatians, and the treatment given them by the Bps. of Rome and Alexandria, 104-5. concerning the persecution, which the Novatians endured from the Arians, in the reign of Constantius, 99, 100. his passage concerning the Manichees, 261—263, 440. his observation concerning the appointment of festivals, iv. 62, 208. his account of the divisions in the church, after the council of Nice, 63. an account of his History, v. 171-2. his character, *ib.* his respect for the scriptures, 172. quoted, x. 116
- Soldiers (The Roman)* and the Jewish rulers, a sermon, ix. 333
- Solomon*, the book of Wisdom quoted as his by Methodius, iii. 189. wrote three books in the canon, according to Gregory Nazianzen, iv. 286. Amphilochius, 292. Gregory Nyssen, 295-6. Ambrose, 331. Jerom, 420-1, 435. Rufinus, 483. Augustine, 493, 497. and others, v. 10, 15, 90, 93
- Son of God*, the meaning of that character, x. 97, note ; on what account Jesus is so, 92—97, 108-9. ix. 366—372, 601. viii. 606, note *. not because he is of the same essence or substance with the Father, ix. 371. equivalent with Messiah, x. 90—92. ix. 371. Jesus the son of God, a sermon, 366
- Son of Man*, why our Saviour is so called, ix. 358—362. Jesus the Son of man, a sermon, ix. 357
- Sopater*, a philosopher in the time of Constantine, his history and works, from Eunapius, viii. 64, 108
- Sophronius*, his time and writings, iv. 391-2
- Soter*, Bp. of Rome, ii. 33. an excellent custom of that church in his time, 311

- Soul*, some of opinion that it died with the body, and would be raised with it, ii. 478. Transmigration of souls held by the Manichees, iii. 369. who also said, that Christ came to save souls, not bodies, 371. two souls in man, according to them, 364-5. how they return to heaven, 371
- Sozomen*, not a Novatian, iii. 104. a fine passage of his concerning a law of Constantine against heretics, 98. an account of his Ecclesiastical History, v. 172. his character and respect for the scriptures, 172-3
- Spanheim (Fr.)* quoted and commended, vi. 87. vii. 353
- Spartian*, his testimony to the persecution of Severus, vii. 313. a story told by him, of Caracalla, when young, 309
- Spirit*, several acceptations of that word in scripture, x. 117—129, 262—264
- Spirit (The Holy)* said by Eusebius to be made by the Son, iv. 90. according to Victorinus may be styled the Mother of Jesus, 256. this word often signifies a gift, ii. 599, 664. iv. 304. sometimes good things in general, ix. 401-2. An explication of those words, the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of God, as used in the scriptures, x. 117—169. A letter on the Personality of the Spirit, 262—264. Remarks on Dr. Ward's assertion, that the Holy Ghost in the New Testament denotes both a person, and a power, 299. See *Trinity*
- Gifts of the Spirit*, ordinary and extraordinary, v. 134. how general they were in the times of the apostles, x. 153—155. Exhortations to those who were favoured with such gifts, 155—157
- Spoils of the temple delivered to Titus*, vi. 460. carried in triumph at Rome, 466-7. how long preserved, 468. what Josippon says of these, 548-9. what the Talmudists say of their being carried to Rome by Titus, 528-9
- Sprat (Bp.)* quoted, x. 2
- Spurious*, the meaning of that word when applied to books, iv. 101-2, 107
- Spyridion*, Bp. in Cyprus, iv. 234
- Stairs*, leading from the temple to the castle at Jerusalem, i. 108
- Stephen (St.)* his death not legal, but tumultuous, i. 60, 63, 64. the time of it, 100. v. 474, 478-9. how long the persecution lasted which began at his death, i. 100-1. v. 479-80
- Stephen, Bp. of Laodicea*, his history, iii. 146
- Stichometries*, a description of them, v. 85, 86. the stichometry of Nicephorus, 86—88. a stichometry from Cotelerius, 89, 90. another from the same, 91
- Stilicho*, his preferments and death, viii. 119
- Stoic principles*, a general account of them, vii. 85
- Strangers*, among the Israelites, who they were, x. 289, 292—296, 305-6. the same as proselytes, 295
- Strategius*, respected and employed by Constantine, iii. 302. and Constantius, viii. 47, 48

Subintroduced women, ii. 669. x. 202—207

Subscriptions, imposing subscription of speculative articles condemned, iv. 64—68

Suetonius, his time and works, vi. 641. what he says of Chrestus, and of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome, i. 259-60. vi. 642. and of Tiberius's treatment of the Jews, i. 119. his testimony to Nero's persecution of the christians, vi. 624—645. to the Jewish war, and to the desolation of Judea by Vespasian and Titus, 644—646. And see 477. to Domitian's persecution, 646—648. the sum of his testimony, 649

Sufferings, the greatness of Christ in his last sufferings, a sermon, ix. 299. Divine testimonies given him in his last sufferings, a sermon, 324

Suicide, practised by the Jews, that they might not come alive into the hands of the Romans, vi. 395-6, 433-4

Suidas, his time, and a passage from him concerning St. John, iv. 549-50. passages concerning Augustus's Census, i. 260—264

Sulpicius Severus, his time, and works, iv. 573. his character, 573-4. his account of Nero's persecution of the christians, vi. 630-1. his history of Priscillian and his followers, iv. 340—346. did not approve, that civil penalties should be inflicted upon erroneous christians, 364. his testimony to the scriptures, 574-5. select passages from him, and that he condemned all persecution, 575—579

Sun and Moon, the Manichæan notion of them, iii. 352-3. made of pure celestial substance, 360. vessels of passage for souls from earth to heaven, 371

Susanna, the book so called, ii. 465-6, 541

Sykes, A. A. quoted, vi. 260. x. 112, 175

Syllæus, chief minister to Obodas king of Arabia, the difference between him and Herod, i. 285-6, 291-2, 368

Symmachus, author of a Greek version of the Old Testament, his history, and character, and works, ii. 326—330

Symmachus, a heathen, his preferments, works, and character, viii. 220—222. and see also 200

Symphosius, a Priscillianist bishop, iv. 360-1

Sympronian, a learned Novatian, iii. 91

Synagogue, the worship there, i. 217—219. the Jews whipped men in their synagogues, 42, 43

Synesius, Bp. of Ptolemais, a great admirer of Hypatia, viii. 147

Synopsis of Sacred Scripture, ascribed to Athanasius, but not his, ii. 377. iv. 161. mentioned again, ii. 384, extracts out of it, iv. 161—166. another *Synopsis* of Chrysostom, 535—537

Syria, the great authority of the president of that province, i. 343-4

Syrian christians, their canon of the scriptures of the New Testament, iv. 320—322, 325. their versions of the New Testament, 323, 325

Syrianus, president in the school of philosophy at Athens, and predecessor of Proclus, viii. 130-1, 137

T

Tacitus (Cornelius) his time and works, vi. 626-7. his account of Nero's persecuting the christians, i. 206. vi. 628—630. his testimony to the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus, 632—635

TALMUD, the several acceptations of that word, iv. 505-6. times of the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, 507-8. extracts from both, concerning the nativity of Jesus, 516. concerning our Lord's journey into Egypt, 517—520. concerning his disciples, 520-1. concerning James in particular, 522. concerning his last sufferings, 522—526. concerning the power of miracles in Jesus and his disciples, 525-6. and see 517-18. concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by Vespasian and Titus, 527—530

Tarsus, what privileges it enjoyed, i. 236—239

Tatian, his time, ii. 147-8. his principles, 148. his Harmony of the Four Gospels, 149. what Theodoret says of it, *ib.* a commentary upon it, by Ephrem. *ib.* received the epistle to Titus and other epistles of St. Paul, 151. references to the New Testament in his book against the Gentiles, 150-1. wrote a book of difficult questions for explaining the scriptures, 324. his Harmony still extant, 443. extracts out of it, 447—454

TEMPLE at *Jerusalem*, limits prescribed to foreigners, i. 72, 85. its governors, 36. captain of the temple, 46, 109-10. when taken by Pompey, vi. 399, 400. when destroyed by Titus, 407, 450, 464. its magnificence and great riches, 401, 450-1, 463. how rebuilt after the return from the Babylonian captivity, 577—579. forty-six years in building, i. 250—252, 396—398. the times of the duration of the two temples, that built by Solomon, and that built after the return from Babylon, vi. 579-80

The Temple of Onias in Egypt, demolished by orders from Vespasian, vi. 470

The Temple of Peace, erected at Rome by order of Vespasian, after the conquest of Judea, vi. 467-8

Terebinth: See *Buddas*

TERTULLIAN, his father's office, ii. 267. his time, 270-1. his character, 267-8. whether he was once a heathen, 268. the causes of his Montanism, 271-2. ascribes the survey at our Saviour's birth to Saturninus, i. 342, 359. committed great mistakes in history, 343, 362. his remarks upon Trajan's rescript, vii. 52, 56. his pathetic address to Scapula, proconsul of Africa, 140-1. the time of it, 308, 312. his accounts of the different behaviour of governors of provinces to the christians, 304. the time of his apology, 314-15, 564. how he treats the catholics,

ii. 272. asserts human liberty, viii. 585. his testimonies to the books of the New Testament, ii. 273—306. speaks of the heresies in the times of the apostles as only two, those of the Docetæ and Ebionites, viii. 306. his accounts of the Heretics: Apelles, 538-9, &c. Hermogenes, 581—588. Lencius, 517, 520. Marcion, 450-1. several quotations, 472—478, &c. and Praxeas, 603—611. shows that the principal doctrines of the gospel remain certain in Marcion's gospel, 326. quoted, x. 175. *And see the contents of his chapter, ii. 267. Additions to Tertullian, quoted, viii. 578*

Tertullus endeavoured to impose upon Felix, i. 71

Testament, the meaning of that word, and Old and New Testament, a common division of sacred canonical books, v. 260-1. instead of which Latin authors sometimes use the word *instrument*, 261

THE OLD TESTAMENT. See *Catalogues*, and *the Canon of the Old Testament*. The canonical books of the Old Testament written in Hebrew, ii. 466, 542. how quoted by the apostles and evangelists, iv. 442, 467, 475-6. how canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Testament are quoted in the *Imperfect Work*, v. 118-19. Order of the books of the Old and New Testament in the Alexandrian MSS. 84, 85. in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, 86. and other stichometries, 89—91. The Old Testament rejected by the Marcionites, viii. 484—489

THE NEW TESTAMENT consisted of two codes or collections, called gospels and epistles; or gospels and apostles, in the time of Ignatius, ii. 89. in the time of Tertullian, 298-9. the Acts being in the latter division, 300. so likewise in the time of Cyprian, iii. 51, 52. All the books of the New Testament written in Greek except St. Matthew's gospel, iv. 441, 525. their integrity asserted by Tertullian, ii. 296. and their inspiration by the same, 297

The Order of the books of the New Testament, iv. 322. vi. 329—340. that they were early known, 340—352. that none of them have been lost, 352—361. their order in Tertullian, ii. 301. in Origen, 494. in Eusebius, iv. 96, 97. in Athanasius, 154-5. in the Synopsis ascribed to him, 162-3. in Cyril, 172-3. in the council of Laodicea, 182-3. in Epiphanius, 186-7. in Gregory Nazianzen, 286-7. in Amphilochius, 292-3. in Ebedjesu, 321-2. in James of Edessa, 322. in Philaster, 385-6. in Jerom, 435—438, 471-2. in Rufinus, 483-4. in the council of Carthage, 486-7. in Augustine, 493, 511, 513-14. in Chrysostom, 537. in divers authors, 571, 586. v. 52, 71, 76, 84—86, 89, 106-7, 110—113, 137—139, 142, 147, 167—169. See *Canon*

The part of the New Testament received by Marcion, viii. 489—491. his alterations in the New Testament, 486, 489—499 *In-the-testament*, an expression equivalent to canonical, iv. 141-2. v. 96, 167, 169

- Testaments of the twelve patriarchs*, their time, and the character of the author, ii. 346—349. vi. 384. their testimony to the books of the New Testament, ii. 351—353. how quoted by Origen, 352
- Thallus*, a Syrian author, his time, and whether he has mentioned the darkness at the time of our Saviour's passion, ii. 462. vii. 121—123. not quoted by Grotius, or Dr. Clarke, 123
- Thamus, an Egyptian pilot*, a story concerning him in Plutarch, vi. 620—622
- Themison*, a Montanist, ii. 392
- Themistius, philosopher and senator*, his time, writings, and character, viii. 5—7. his account of M. Antoninus's victory in Germany, vii. 189-90. extracts out of his oration to Jovian, commending that emperor for his moderation in things of religion, 7—10. out of his oration to Valens to the like purpose, 11, 12. how he quotes scripture, 6, 7
- Theoctetus* or *Theoctistus*, Bp. of Cæsarea, an admirer of Origen, ii. 416-17. ordains him, 475
- Theodore*, Bp. of Heraclea in Thrace, iii. 601
- Theodore*, Bp. of Mopsuestia, his time, iv. 392-3. his works, particularly his commentaries upon the scriptures, 393—398. a fragment concerning the four gospels, with remarks, 398—400. was a great preacher, 400. reflections upon him after his death, 400—402. two select passages from him, *ib.*
- Theodoret*, his account of Tatian's Harmony, ii. 149-50. his works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 14—19. texts explained by him, 20, 21. select passages from him, 21—26. an account of his *Ecclesiastical History*, 173. reduced heresies of the two first centuries to two kinds, viii. 305-6. his account of the Heretics, Adamians, 427. censured, *ib.* of Artemon, 570. of the Carpocratians, 392, 396-7. Cerdon, 446. Cerinthus, 408. Elcesaites, 619-20, 626. Hermogenes, 581. Marcosians, 432. Marcionites, 490. Ophians, 565. Prodicus, 418. censured, 419. quoted, x. 178
- Theodorus*, about whom heathen people had a consultation in the time of Valens, viii. 189—191
- Theodosius*, an Arian Bp. at Philadelphia, said by some to have been the chief conductor of the council of Laodicea, iv. 184
- Theodosius the first*, a law of his against Arians and others, iv. 293-4. how reflected upon by Zosimus, viii. 110
- Theodotion*, his Greek version of the Old Testament quoted by Irenæus, ii. 168
- Theodotus*, reckoned a Montanist, ii. 413
- Theodotus, the Banker*, ii. 405. viii. 577. supposed to be the author of the sect of the Melchisedechians, 578-9. who are said to have thought Melchisedec to be a greater power than Christ, 579
- Theodotus of Byzantium, the Tanner*, ii. 405-6, his time and opinions, viii. 572-3. accused of denying Christ in a time of

- persecution, 574-5. received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, 575-6. there were several of the same name in the second century, 577
- Theodotus*, a Valentiman, viii. 577
- Theodotus*, Bp. of *Laodicea*, to whom Eusebius inscribed his *Evangelical preparation*; his eminence, and principles, iii. 146-7
- Theognostus* of Alexandria, his history, character, and work, iii. 148—151. his testimony to the scriptures, 152. received the epistle to the Hebrews, *ib.*
- Theonas*, Bp. of Alexandria, his history, and testimony to the scriptures, iii. 153-4
- Theopemptus*, Novatian Bp. at Alexandria, ill-treated by Cyril, iii. 104
- Theophilus*, to whom *St. Luke* wrote, who he was, v. 160, 382-3
- Theophilus*, Bp. of Alexandria, his character and conduct towards some of the most intelligent monks in Egypt, iv. 412—417. his character in Zosimus, viii. 117. from others, 235
- Theophilus*, Bp. of Antioch, his time and works, particularly his remaining books to Antolycus, ii. 203—205. the Commentary upon the gospels doubtful, 205. his testimony to the books of the New Testament, 205—215
- Theophilus*, Bp. of *Cæsarea*, wrote in the controversy about the time of keeping Easter, ii. 325
- Theophylact*, his opinion concerning the occasion of writing *St. Mark's* gospel, ii. 227. and the time of writing *St. Matthew's* gospel, iv. 133-4. quoted, 169. his time, works, and testimony to the scriptures, v. 157—164
- Theotecnus*, Bp. of *Cæsarea*, ordained Anatolius, who was afterwards Bp. of *Laodicea*, iii. 142. mentioned again, 219
- Theotecnus*, an impostor at Antioch, and curator in that city, and a bitter enemy to the christians, in the time of Dioclesian's persecution, vii. 535
- Thessalonians* (*The two epistles to the*) when and where written, vi. 4—6
- Theudas*, his design overthrown, i. 309-10. a difficulty relating to him considered, 425—433
- Thomas*, see *Gospel*
- Thomas* (The Apostle) a sermon, ix. 347
- The Thundering Legion*, see *Antoninus (M.)*
- Tiberian*, his Letter to Trajan not genuine, vii. 54
- Tiberian*, a Priscillianist writer, iv. 338
- Tiberius*, two computations of his reign, i. 373—381. objections against that supposition considered, 381—388. the date of the first computation, 386—388. a dilatory prince, 391, 394-5. what knowledge he had of Jesus Christ, vi. 605—619
- Tiberius Alexander*, his moderation toward the Jews at Alexandria, i. 195

- Tichonius*, a Donatist writer, iii. 563
- Tillemout (L.)* censured, iv. 66. his character of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, 76. his opinion of the Constitutions, 199. his character of Apollinarius, 273-4. quoted, 358. and oftentimes elsewhere. His observations upon the testimony of Josephus to the destruction of Jerusalem, vi. 473. upon his paragraph relating to our Saviour, 492. his remark upon the rescript of Trajan, vii. 53. his observations upon Phlegon, 121. and upon Marcus Antoninus's treatment of the christians, 144, 172
- Tillotson (Abp.)* his observations upon the testimony of Josephus to the destruction of Jerusalem, vi. 473
- Timothy*, apostle in a lower sense, v. 67. an objection against St. Paul's second epistle to him, ii. 544-5. he was left at Ephesus by Paul in his way to Jerusalem, vi. 39, 40. was with Paul at Rome, 47. the first epistle to him, when and where written, 16—21. the second epistle when and where written, 38—72
- Title* written upon our Saviour's cross, i. 165
- Titus (The epistle to)* when and where written, vi. 21—25. that he was converted from idolatry to christianity, 227
- Titus*, his remarkable speech to the chief leaders of the people at Jerusalem, vi. 418-19. his good character from Josephus and heathen writers, 438. unwilling that the temple should be destroyed, 449. proclaimed emperor by the Roman soldiers after taking the temple, 458. his treatment of John and Simon, 458, 463. his journey from Judea to Rome, 466. his arch at Rome, 467, 479, 556. did not refuse to be crowned for the conquest of Judea, 478-9. an inscription to his honour, 479. aspersed by the Jewish rabbins and Talmudical writers, 528-9. 555-6. commended by Josippon, 555
- Titus, Bp. of Bostra in Arabia*, author of a treatise against the Manichees, and other works, iii. 272-3. modern censures of his principles, 273. his testimony to the scriptures, 274. he exaggerates in some things said by him of the Manichees, 409-10. how Titus was used by the emperor Julian, 272
- Tobit*, how quoted by Origen, ii. 541. by Commodian, iii. 134. not received as a canonical book by Jerom, iv. 420-1, 424-5. nor by Rufinus, 484. nor Chrysostom, 537
- Toldoth Jeschu* quoted, vi. 517. quoted again, and the character of that work, 558, note ^a
- Toledo*, a council there in the cause of the Priscillianists, iv. 343, 360
- Tollius (J.)* quoted, vi. 105
- Tongue*, the difficulty of governing, a sermon, ix. 272
- Tostatus (Alphonsus)* quoted, x. 309
- Traitors* of the scriptures and sacred vessels, in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 549—552
- Trajan*, his Rescript to Pliny concerning the christians, vii. 24, 25. rehearsed, with notes and observations, 51—53. Eusebius's

- account of the persecution in his reign, 25, 26. whether Trajan did, by an edict, put an end to the persecution, 53, 54. his character, 67, 68. was worshipped as a god in his lifetime, 36. his edict against the christians was in force, as long as heathenism subsisted in the empire, 60, 95, 562, 564
- Transmigration of souls* held by the Manichees, iii. 369. and Marcionites, vii. 521
- Transubstantiation* not countenanced in the *Imperfect Work*, v. 123
- Travels of the apostles*, an account of that apocryphal book, iii. 432
- Tribes*, the twelve, in being in the times of the apostles, i. 114
- Tribonian*, his eminence; but his christianity doubtful, viii. 280-1
- TRINITY, the Manichees believed a consubstantial Trinity, iii. 351. see also, 287, 330. on account of that doctrine heathens supposed that christians held a plurality of gods, iv. 152. not made known to the Jews, v. 21
- Two Schemes of a *Trinity* considered, and the Divine Unity asserted, in Four Discourses on Phil. ii. 5—11, vol. ix. 576—617. the Scheme commonly received, 578—582. the distinction of persons, 578-9. difficult to apply the commonly received opinion concerning Christ to this text, 581. the Arian Scheme, 582—587. objections to it, 587—590. the *Nazarean* or Unitarian doctrine of one God the Father according to the New Testament, 592—605. our blessed Saviour was a man with a reasonable soul and human body, born of a virgin, conceived by the Holy Ghost, and especially favoured of God, 596—602. the Holy Spirit, God himself, or his power, gift, influence, or manifestation, 602—604. the Text explained, 606—612. application of the subject, 612—617
- Trophimus*, when left by Paul at Miletus, vi. 45, 46
- Tryphon*, a christian writer, and a scholar of Origen, ii. 589
- Turbo*, disciple of *Mani*, his history, iii. 265-6
- Turibius*, Bp. of Astorga, in Spain, iv. 367
- Turkestan*, where situated, iii. 309, 312
- Turner (R.)* his account of the Sibylline oracles, ii. 333-4. quoted and commended, 649, note ^b. his judgment concerning the Constitutions, iv. 199. his work against them, 205. quoted again, 107. and 206, 215. viii. 306, 313-14, 318-19
- Twells (Dr.)* a remark of his examined, ii. 398-9. quoted, 506, 708, 713, 717, and elsewhere
- Tyrannio*, Bp. of Tyre, and martyr in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 184

Valens, deacon at Ælia, his excellent character and martyrdom, iii. 221

- Valentinian, emperor*, his moderation in things of religion commended by Ammianus, viii. 58, 174
- Valentinians*, used St. Luke's gospel, ii. 171. received all the books of the New Testament, v. 246. vi. 345. argued from the several parts of the Old and New Testament, ii. 183. said to have composed a new gospel, 192. and to have corrupted the scriptures, 554. Hippolytus and others wrote against them, 424. as did Proculus, 587
- Valerian, emperor*, his time and character, vii. 361. kind to the christians in the beginning of his reign, 363. his persecution of the christians, ii. 646. general accounts of it from several writers, and how long it lasted, vii. 362. an account of his persecution from Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria, 362—365. from Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage, who also suffered martyrdom in that persecution, 366—370. his son Gallienus by edict gave peace to the churches, 366
- Valesians*, an obscure sect, ii. 600-1
- Vandale (A.)* his judgment upon a work ascribed to Porphyry, vii. 450-1
- Variety of opinions*, no just objection against the truth of christianity, but in the event serviceable to the interest of truth, as has been observed by Origen, Augustine, and Clement of Alexandria, iii. 443-4. viii. 335—339
- Varus (Quintilius)* when he came president into Syria, i. 359-60
- Vegetius*, his account of the military oath in his time, viii. 61
- Venemc (H.)* vi. 113
- Vereelli*, an ancient Latin version of the gospels there, iv. 246
- Verres, prætor of Sicily*, steals images of the gods, i. 181. his government unrighteous and infamous, 197
- Versions of the Scripture* (Greek) of the Old Testament, ii. 326. iv. 295. a Latin version of the New Testament in Tertullian's time, ii. 302. the ancient Latin version, and that made by Jerome, iv. 523-4. v. 31, 111, 133. the scripture said by Augustine to have been translated into many languages, iv. 523. and by Chrysostom, 555. and Theodoret, v. 23, 24. *See Latin translation of the Old Testament*
- Vespasian*, appointed general in the Jewish war by Nero, vi. 430. proclaimed emperor in Judea and at Alexandria, 438. miracles ascribed to him, but not really such, 438—440. his treatment of Sabinus and Epponnina, with remarks, 440-1. his good character, 438. and see 430, note¹
- Vestal virgins*, their number, office, and privileges, viii. 215-16
- Vettius Epagathus*, a martyr at Lyons, vii. 157-8
- Victor of Antioch*, his Commentary upon St. Mark's gospel, iv. 581
- Victor of Capua*, his time and character, ii. 99. what he writes of Tatian's harmony, 149-50
- Victor, Bp. of Rome*, ii. 324

- Victor Tununensis*, his story, that the gospels were corrected in the time of Anastasius, considered, v. 124-5
- Victorinus (C. M.)* his history, particularly his conversion from heathenism to christianity, the character of his writings, and his testimony to the scriptures, iv. 254—257
- Vincentius Lirinensis*, his character of Tertullian and Origen, ii. 270. his works, and time, and testimony to the scriptures, with remarks, v. 41—51. and see the contents of his chapter, 41
- Virtue*, recommended under the similitude of white raiment, a sermon, viii. 450
- Vitellius, president of Syria*, displaceth Pilate and Caiaphas, i. 91-2, 149-50, 389. his expedition to the Euphrates, 98, 389-90. at the request of the Jews forbids his forces to pass through Judea, 99, 100, 187, 390. puts the keeping of the high priest's vestment into the hands of the Jews, and does divers other things at Jerusalem, 389-90. see likewise, 92, 99, 190
- Vitellius*, a Donatist writer, with a remark to the advantage of their authors, iii. 564
- Vitringa (C.)* quoted, vi. 312, 326-7. viii. 345. his judgment concerning the passage in Josephus relating to Jesus Christ, vi. 496
- Vives Ludovicus*, his character of Jerom, iv. 418
- Ulphilas*, Bp. of the Goths, his eminence and usefulness to that people, iii. 602
- Ulpian (D.)* his time, vii. 334. his character, 335. his description of the power of the presidents, and the power of the sword, i. 77, 78. in his book of the Duty of a Proconsul he made a collection of Imperial edicts against the christians, iii. 502. vii. 335. fragments of his work, in the Pandects, 336
- Unitarians*, Archelaus said to speak like one, iii. 257. Unitarian christians called Jews, ii. 677. The Unitarian doctrine of one God the Father, according to the New Testament, ix. 592—605
- Unity of God* asserted, x. 117, 169—174. how held by the Jews, 171, 173. acknowledged by all the ancient Heretics, viii. 320—322. but they are charged with believing that the world was not made by him, 321
- Volusian's* correspondence with Augustine A. D. 412; vol. viii. 253—266
- Vopiscus (Fl.)* one of the Augustan writers, his character, and his account of a Letter of Aurelian to the senate, in which the christians are mentioned, vii. 385—387
- Vossius (J.)* his opinion concerning Hagiographical books, iv. 425-6
- Vow of the Nazarite*, i. 219—223
- Upton's (J.)* edition of Epictetus, quoted, vii. 87, 88. notes
- Urbanus*, Roman president in Palestine, his cruel treatment of the christians in Dioclesian's persecution, iii. 220

Usher's (Jam.) judgment upon the book called the Doctrine of the Apostles, iv. 129-30. his character of the Compiler of the Constitutions, 225. an observation of his upon them, 232

W

Wagenseil (J. C.) his accounts of the time of the Mishna, and of Jehudah, the composer of it, vi. 506, 514. his remarks upon a passage in the Talmud, 522. upon the Toldoth Jeschu, 559, note ^a

Wake (Abp.) his opinion of the *Responsiones* ascribed to Polycarp, ii. 99. his translation of a passage in Ignatius's epistles corrected, 85, note ^s

Wall (Dr. W.) his opinion of Clement of Rome, ii. 529. his interpretation of Phil. ii. 6, 572. quoted, vi. 46, 190, 200-1, 256. x. 104, 137, 145. and elsewhere; his observations upon John viii. at the beginning, vii. 261

War condemned by Archelans, iii. 257. and some think by the Manichees, 369

War with the Romans (Jewish) its time and duration, vi. 407. events preceding it, and the siege of Jerusalem, 409—416. the occasion of it, according to Josephus, 417—425. the history of it and the siege of Jerusalem from Josephus, 425—470. from other histories of it, besides that of Josephus, 475—479

Warburton (Dr.) Bp. of Gloucester, quoted, iii. 462, 524. vi. 496. vii. 201, 610-11, 619

Ward (Dr. John) commended, i. 293, note ^m. his observation concerning the Egyptian impostor, 436-7. a critical observation of his, iv. 13, note ^v. his advice to the author concerning Libanius's oration for the temples, viii. 21. his remarks upon that oration, 25, note ^o. 34, note ^v. REMARKS UPON DR. WARD'S DISSERTATIONS UPON SEVERAL PASSAGES OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, x. 265—350

Waterland (Dr.) his opinion of the Constitutions, iv. 200

Wesselingius (P.) quoted, v. 125

West (Gilbert, Esq.) vii. 270, note ^a

Weston's Inquiry into the rejection of the christian miracles, by the heathens, referred to, i. 477

Wetstein (J. J.) quoted, ii. 442, 447, 455, 553. iii. 29, 32, 229, iv. 491. v. 55, 59, 61, 121, 304, 309, 340-1, 359, 450, 464. vi. 87, 106, 113, 123, 267, 325. an inaccurate quotation of Isidore of Pelusium, in his Greek Testament, vii. 322

A DISSERTATION UPON THE TWO EPISTLES AScribed TO CLEMENT OF ROME, lately published by Mr. Wetstein, x. 186—212

Wetstein (J. Rodolph) quoted, ii. 460

Wharton (H.) his opinion concerning the author of the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs, ii. 347. quoted again, 362

Whiston (W.) his supposition that the Jews were enrolled at the

- request of Augustus, i. 279. his solution of a difficulty concerning the assessment of Cyrenius, 314-15. his opinion concerning the time of Pilate's removal, 393. concerning the time of Herod's death, considered, 443. he defends the larger epistles of Ignatius, ii. 76. his opinion of the Sibylline oracles, 345. of the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs, 346-7, 350. of the author of the Recognitions, 366-7. of the work itself, 369. a mistake of his, *ib.* his opinion of the Constitutions, iv. 202. his canon of the New Testament, v. 266, computes St. John to have written his gospel, before the destruction of Jerusalem, about the year 63, 441, 450. quoted, vi. 399, 444, 493, 504. x. 74, 253
- Whitby (Dr.)* his interpretation of Luke ii. 1, 2. i. 273, 317-18. quoted, vi. 114, 130. his observations upon the testimony of Josephus and the Talmuds to the destruction of Jerusalem, 474. x. 97, note, 110, 128, 149, 158, 185
- Willes (Dr.)* his remarks upon the prodigies preceding the destruction of Jerusalem as related by Josephus, vi. 453
- Wisdom*, quoted as Solomon's by Methodius, iii. 189. not reckoned a canonical book by Jerom, iv. 420—422. nor by Rufinus, 484. nor by Chrysostom, 537. see likewise v. 127, 147
- Wisdom* attainable by those who seek it, a sermon, ix. 163
- Witsius (H.)* commended, vi. 47, 62. x. 146. his observations upon Ulpian and the Pandects, vii. 334-5, 337
- Wolfius (J. C.)* quoted and commended, ii. 529, 713, 717. iii. 31, 295. 343, 426, 447. iv. 280, 302, 328, 428. x. 157
- Woman (The)* who anointed Jesus with precious ointment, a sermon, ix. 425
- Woolston*; A VINDICATION of THREE of our blessed SAVIOUR'S MIRACLES, *viz.* The raising of Jairus's daughter, the widow of Nain's son, and Lazarus; in answer to the objections of *Woolston*, x. 1—72. objection the first, 8. second, 26. third, 28. fourth, 33. fifth, 36. sixth, 38. particular objections to the story of Lazarus, 44—50. his Jewish rabbi's letter answered, 50—57. observations on the relation of the three miracles, 58—72. Letter to Lord Barrington concerning the raising of Jairus's daughter, i. lxx—lxxiii
- WORD, or LOGOS, its several acceptations, ii. 596, 662-3. how used by St. John at the beginning of his gospel, v. 454—456. viii. 606. A LETTER concerning the question, whether the LOGOS supplied the place of a human soul in the person of JESUS CHRIST, x. 73, &c.
- Good works* recommended, iv. 533, 575. v. 9, 37, 153
- Worship*, that of the Manichees: its simplicity, iii. 384-5. they read and explained the scriptures in their assemblies, 385-6. they had baptism, and the eucharist, 386-7. observed the Lord's-day, Easter, and the anniversary of Mani's death, 387-8. their discipline, 388. they met together for divine worship, though prohibited by the laws, 301

- Wotton (Dr.)* his observations upon the testimony of Josephus to the destruction of Jerusalem, vi. 473. upon the two Talmuds, 507, note ^c
Writings of three sorts, genuine, mixed, and spurious, ii. 538, 552. And see iv. 101—108

X

- Xiphilinus (J.)* his account of Marcus Antoninus's deliverance in Germany, vii. 187—189. his Epitome of Dion Cassius, 338-9
Xistus, Bp. of Rome, a martyr in the time of Valerian, vii. 369

Z

- Zacagni (L. A.)* quoted, v. 69. and elsewhere
Zacharias, son of Baruch, put to death at Jerusalem, i. 84, 418-19. a difficulty concerning Zacharias son of Barachias considered, 417—424
Zaccheus called a dwarf, ii. 453
Zeal, private zeal, or zealotism, its nature and rules, i. 63, 223—227
Zealots, how they killed Zacharias son of Baruch, i. 418-19
Zenas, said to be a Jewish lawyer, and a christian, iv. 385. by Jerom he is called *a doctor of the law, and an apostolical man*. Zenam vero, legis doctorem, de alio scripturæ loco quis fuerit, non possumus dicere, nisi hoc tantum, quod et ipse apostolicus vir, id operis, quod Apollo exercebat, habuerit, Christi ecclesias extruendi. *In Tit. T. 4. p. 439*
Zenobia, queen of the Palmyrenes, favoured Paul of Samosata, ii. 671. her character, 673. some remarkable events of her history, vii. 378
Zosimus, his time and work, viii. 93—95. extracts from it, 95—126. general remarks upon those extracts, 127. Dr. Bentley's remarks upon his work, 126. his false account of Constantine's conversion, iv. 25, 26. viii. 98, 99

THE END.

BUNGAY.

STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY J. R. AND C. CHILDS

John is a ...

...

