



**Library of The Theological Seminary**

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



PRESENTED BY

**HENRY VAN DYKE**

















THE  
**WORKS**  
OF  
NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

WITH A LIFE BY DR. KIPPIS.

IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. VI.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

MAY 29 1877

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LONDON :  
WILLIAM BALL, 34, PATERNOSTER-RROW.

MDCCCXXXVIII.

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, BUNGAY.



## CONTENTS OF THE SIXTH VOLUME.

---

### A HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
XII. St. Paul's Epistles - - - - -	3
XIII. That the Epistle inscribed to the Ephesians was written to them - - - - -	112
XIV. That the Churches of Colosse and Laodicea were planted by the Apostle Paul - - - - -	151
XV. Of the Seven Catholic Epistles - - - - -	159
XVI. St. James, the Lord's Brother - - - - -	162
XVII. The Epistle of St. James - - - - -	195
XVIII. St. Peter - - - - -	203
XIX. The Two Epistles of St. Peter - - - - -	254
XX. The Three Epistles of St. John - - - - -	275
XXI. St. Jude, and his Epistle - - - - -	298
XXII. The Revelation of St. John - - - - -	318
XXIII. The Order of the Books of the New Testament - - - - -	329
XXIV. That the Books of the New Testament, consisting of a Collection of Sacred Writings, in two parts, one called Gospel, or Gospels, or Evangelicon; the other called Epistles, or Apostles, or Apostolicon, were early known, read, and made use of by Christians - - - - -	340
XXV. The Question considered, whether any Sacred Books of the New Testament have been lost - - - - -	352

### JEWISH TESTIMONIES.

	Preface - - - - -	365
I.	The Faith of many Jewish Believers in early times, a Valuable Testimony to the Truth of the Christian Religion - - - - -	371
II.	Of the Treatment given to the Primitive Christians by the unbelieving Jews - - - - -	388
III.	Josephus, with his Testimony at large to the fulfilment of our Saviour's Predictions concerning the Destruction of the Temple and City of Jerusalem, and the miseries coming upon the Jewish people - - - - -	393

CHAP.	A. D.	PAGE
IV.		
	Three Paragraphs in the works of Josephus, concerning John the Baptist, our Saviour, and James the Lord's Brother, and Observations upon his Writings and Testimony	480
V.		
	The Mishnical and Tahmudical Writers	505
VI.		
	Joseph Ben Gorion, or Josippon	531
VII.		
	A Recollection of the preceding Articles, and Reflections upon them	558

#### TESTIMONIES OF ANCIENT PÆATHEN AUTHORS.

I.		
	The Epistle of Abgarus, King of Edessa, to Jesus, and the Rescript of Jesus to Abgarus	596
II.		
	Of the Knowledge which the Emperor Tiberius had of our Saviour Jesus Christ	606
III.		
	A Monumental Inscription concerning the Christians in the time of Nero	623
IV.		
	Pliny the Elder	77 625
V.		
	Tacitus	100 626
VI.		
	Martial	635
VII.		
	Juvenal	638
VIII.		
	Suetonius	110 641

A

S U P P L E M E N T

TO THE

SECOND PART

OF THE

CREDIBILITY

OF THE

G O S P E L H I S T O R Y.





A

HISTORY

OF THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

---

CHAP. XII.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

- I. *The Introduction.* II. *The two Epistles to the Thessalonians.* III. *The Epistle to the Galatians.* IV. *The first epistle to the Corinthians.* V. *The first Epistle to Timothy.* VI. *The Epistle to Titus.* VII. *The second Epistle to the Corinthians.* VIII. *The Epistle to the Romans.* IX. *The Epistle to the Ephesians.* X. *The second Epistle to Timothy.* XI. *The Epistle to the Philippians.* XII. *The Epistle to the Colossians.* XIII. *The Epistle to Philemon.* XIV. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*

SECT. I.

*The Introduction.*

I SHALL now endeavour to settle the time of St. Paul's epistles, of which Origen said : ' If<sup>a</sup> any man reads them ' with attention, I am persuaded, he will admire the writer's ' abilities in expressing great things in vulgar language ; or, ' if he does not admire them, himself will appear ridiculous.'

It cannot but afford satisfaction to know the order of time in which they were written. It will not only be attended with pleasure, but will also contribute to the right understanding of them. For wrong dates have been the occasion of many mistakes. Baronius observes, that some

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii.

have imagined the shipwreck at Melita, related in Acts xxvii. to be one of the three mentioned by St. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 25, not considering, that the second epistle to the Corinthians had been written several years before. I have put the passage<sup>b</sup> in the margin, as quoted by Lewis Capellus. The author of the commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, in the fourth century, made <sup>c</sup> the same mistake, and several others of a like kind, in explaining the paragraph of 2 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

Of St. Paul's fourteen epistles, thirteen have been generally received by catholic christians in all times. I therefore need not now allege the testimonies of ancient christian writers, which may be seen in the preceding volumes of this work. But as the epistle to the Hebrews has been sometimes doubted of, I shall observe the evidences of its genuineness. With regard to the others, I shall do little more than show the time when they were written. And I would take it for granted, that they who are disposed to examine the arguments in this chapter, have first read the history of St. Paul, in the preceding chapter: which will be of great use, and prevent the trouble of numerous references.

## SECT. II.

### *The two Epistles to the Thessalonians.*

The first and second epistles to the Thessalonians are now generally allowed by learned interpreters and chronologers

<sup>b</sup> Quantum juvet, quamque sit utile, certo tenere tempus, quo Pauli epistole ab eo fuerunt scriptæ, recte observavit Baronius ad A. C. 58, sect. xlii. Sed hic, inquit ille, et illud necessario monendum putamus lectorem, nonnullis accidisse, ut temporum ignoratione in maximos errores incidant, putantes nimirum naufragium apud Melitam passum, quod Lucas narrat, Aet. xxvii. unum e tribus fuisse a Paulo enumeratis, 2 Cor. xi. non animadvertentes, secundam istam epistolam ad Corinthios longe ante illud naufragium esse scriptam. Quamobrem scrupulosa, quæ videtur, in historiâ temporum indagatio, quantum conferat ad veram atque germanam Divinæ Scripturæ interpretationem, quisque facile judicabit.—Hæc rectissime Baronius. Itaque hac in parte operam nostram ejusmodi indagatione post alios collocavimus. Lud. Cap. Append. ad Hist. Apost. p. 63.

<sup>c</sup> 'Nocte et die in profundo maris fui.'] Hoc factum est, quando missus est Roman, cum appellasset Cæsarem. Tunc desperatione vitæ in alto, id est, in profundo maris fuit, mortem ante oculos habens.—'Periculis in mari.' Jam superius dixit: 'Ter naufragium feci, nocte et die in profundo maris fui.' Quod aliud periculum fuit in mari? Sed hoc est periculum, quando in mari, hoc est, in navi, milites cogitaverant omnes custodias occidere, ne quis enataus effligeret. Quod periculum centurio prohibuit inferri, ne Paulus occideretur, ut eum vivum Roman produceret. In 2 ep. ad Cor. xi. 25, 26. p. 202 ap. Ambros. in App. tom. II.

to be the two first written epistles of St. Paul. The time and place of writing them may be deduced from the epistles themselves, and from the history of St. Paul's travels in the book of the Acts. Some have thought, that<sup>d</sup> the first at least, if not also the second, was written at Athens. But I suppose it to be now generally allowed, that<sup>e</sup> both these epistles were written at Corinth: whereby we are also assured of their time. For it was formerly shown to be probable, that<sup>f</sup> St. Paul came to Corinth before the end of the year 51, and stayed there till the beginning of the year 53.

In the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius, the<sup>g</sup> first epistle to the Thessalonians is said to have been written at Athens, and<sup>h</sup> the second, very absurdly, at Rome.

Theodoret, as<sup>i</sup> before quoted, saw these to be the two first written epistles of the apostle. The<sup>k</sup> first he supposed to have been written at Athens, and the second not long after, either at Athens or Corinth. For he does not seem to say distinctly, at which of these two cities the second was written. Nevertheless I suppose it may be shown that they were both written at Corinth. St. Paul came from Thessalonica to Berea: which place he left in haste, because of the violence of the Jews, who came thither from Thessalonica, and "stirred up the people," Acts xvii. 10--13. "And then immediately," says St. Luke, "the brethren sent away Paul, to go as it were to the sea. But Silas and Timothy abode there still. And they that conducted Paul, brought him unto Athens. And receiving a commandment unto Silas and Timothy to come to him with all speed, they departed," ver. 14, 15. Accordingly, as we may suppose, Silas and Timothy did soon come to him. And Paul, having great concern for the Thessalonians, whilst he was at Athens, sent Timothy to them. As he says, I Thess. iii. 1, 2, "Wherefore, when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone. And sent Timothy, our brother and minister of God, and our fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and comfort you, concerning your faith." From Athens Paul went to Corinth, where he stayed a year and six months. There Timothy

<sup>d</sup> Ante Pauli vincula omnium prima scripta est ad Thessalonicenses utraque. Scriptæ autem omnino videntur duæ istæ epistolæ Athenis. Lud. Cap. Hist. Ap. p. 63.

<sup>e</sup> Pearson, Ann. Paulin. p. 11--13. Mill. Proleg. num. 4. et 6.

<sup>f</sup> See vol. v. ch. xi.

<sup>g</sup> Synops. S. S. n. 66. ap. Athan. T. II. p. 196.

<sup>h</sup> Num. 67. ib. p. 197.

<sup>i</sup> Vol. v. ch. cxxxi.

<sup>k</sup> Præf. in Ep. Pauli, T. III. p. 3.

came back to him from Thessalonica. Comp. Acts xviii. 5, and 1 Thess. iii. 6. And Silas, or Silvanus, and Timothy are joined with the apostle in the inscription of the epistle.

Near the end of this epistle, ch. v. 27, are these remarkable words: "I charge," or adjure, "you by the Lord, *ορκίζω ὑμᾶς του κυριου*, that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." It is likely, that from the beginning all christian assemblies had readings of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Paul, knowing the plenitude of the apostolical commission, now demands the same respect to be paid to his writings, with those of the ancient prophets. This is a direction fit to be inserted in the first epistle written by him. And the manner in which it is given, suggests an argument that this was his first apostolical epistle.

The second epistle to the Thessalonians appears to have been written soon after the first, and at the same place. And Silvanus and Timothy are joined together with the apostle in the inscription of this epistle, as well as of the former.

These two epistles therefore I suppose to have been written at Corinth, in the year of Christ 52. Which is also the opinion of<sup>1</sup> Mill, and others. But by whom these epistles were carried to the Thessalonians, we do not perceive.

Some objections have been made against the above-mentioned date of these two epistles. But the point is so clear, that I do not think it worth the while to prolong this argument in examining them. They who are curious, may see those objections well answered by Dr. Benson, in the second edition of<sup>m</sup> his history of the first planting the Christian religion.

### SECT. III.

#### *The Epistle to the Galatians.*

The epistle to the Galatians is inscribed after this manner: "Paul, an apostle,—and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia." Upon which Jerom observes, 'In<sup>n</sup> other epistles Sosthenes and Silvanus,

<sup>1</sup> Prolegom. num. 4—7.

<sup>m</sup> Vol. ii. p. 119—122.

<sup>n</sup> In aliis epistolis Sosthenes et Silvanus, interdum et Timotheus, in exordio præponuntur: in hac tantum, quia necessaria erat auctoritas plurimorum, omnium fratrum nomen assumitur. Qui et ipsi forsitan ex circumcissione erant, et à Galatis non contemptui ducebantur. Plurimum quippe facit ad populum corrigendum multorum in unâ re sententia atque consensus. Quod autem ait, 'Ecclesiis Galatiæ,' et hoc notandum, quia hic tantum generaliter non ad unam ecclesiam unius urbis, sed ad totius provinciæ scribat, ecclesias:



‘ and sometimes also Timothy, are mentioned at the beginning : but in this, for adding the greater weight and authority, are put “ all the brethren : ” who, perhaps too, were believers of the circumcision, and not despised by the Galatians. And the consent of many is of great use to satisfy people. “ To the churches of Galatia.” Here also, as he proceeds, it is to be observed, that in this place only, Paul writes in general, not to the church of one city only, but to the churches of a whole province : and that he calls them churches, whom afterwards he reproves as corrupted with error. Whence we learn, that a church may be understood in a two-fold manner : both of that which has no spot, or wrinkle, and is indeed the body of Christ ; and of that which is assembled in the name of Christ, without complete and perfect virtues.’

Tertullian<sup>o</sup> seems to have thought this one of St. Paul's first written epistles ; as has been observed by Grotius,<sup>p</sup> who transcribed the passage, though long, into his preface to the epistle to the Galatians. Fabricius<sup>q</sup> likewise has taken notice of it.

Theodoret,<sup>r</sup> the<sup>s</sup> Synopsis of sacred scripture, ascribed to Athanasius, and<sup>t</sup> the author of the Argument in Œcumenius, reckon this among the epistles written at Rome, and consequently a late epistle. But I see no ground for that opinion, there not being in the epistle any notice taken of an imprisonment at the time of writing it.

However Lightfoot<sup>u</sup> was also of the same opinion. He

et ‘ ecclesias ’ vocet, quas postea errore arguat depravatas. Ex quo noscendum, dupliciter ecclesiam posse dici ; et eam, quæ non habet maculam aut rugam, et vere corpus Christi sit ; et eam, quæ in Christi nomine absque plenis perfectisque virtutibus congregetur. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 225.

<sup>o</sup> — ab illo certe Paulo, qui adhuc in gratiâ rudis, trepidans denique, ne in vacuum cucurrisset, aut cureretur, tunc primum cum antecessoribus Apostolis conferebat. Igitur, si ferventer, ut adhuc neophytus, adversus Judæismum aliquid in conversatione reprehendendum existimavit, passivum scilicet convictum, postmodum et ipse usu omnibus omnia futurus, ut omnes lucraretur, Judæis quasi Judæus, et eis qui sub lege, tamquam sub lege ; tu illam solius conversationis, placituræ postea accusatori suo, reprehensionem suspectam vis haberi, etiam de prædicationis erga Deum prevaricatione. Tertull. adv. Marc. l. i. cap. 20. p. 443.

<sup>p</sup> Tertullianus, in primò adversus Marcionem, hanc epistolam inter primas Pauli fuisse existimat, &c. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Gal.

<sup>q</sup> Scripsisse hanc epistolam adhuc neophytum, et in gratiâ rudem, adeoque inter primas non dubitat affirmare Tertullianus. — Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 155.

<sup>r</sup> Τας μὲν ἤν αλλὰς ἀπο τῆς Ῥώμης ἀπεστειλε, καὶ ταυτην μὲν ἠγγραμα τῆν πρὸς Γαλατας γραφηναι. Theod. Præf. in ep. Paul. T. III. p. 5. B.

<sup>s</sup> Ap. Athan. T. II. p. 194.

<sup>t</sup> Aig. ep. ad Gal. ap. Œcum. T. I. p. 713.

<sup>u</sup> Vol. I. p. 323.

supposeth this to have been the first epistle written by St. Paul after his arrival at Rome. He says it was carried by Crescens, arguing from 2 Tim. iv. 10. Which epistle to Timothy he thinks was written at Rome soon afterwards.

Chrysostom<sup>v</sup> says, this<sup>w</sup> epistle was written before that to the Romans. And in like manner<sup>x</sup> Theophylact, probably, borrowing from him.

Divers learned moderns have thought, that this epistle was written at Ephesus, after Paul's arrival there from his journey, related in Acts xviii. 23. and xix. 1. consequently, after that the apostle had been a second time in Galatia. To this purpose<sup>y</sup> Lewis Capellus, <sup>z</sup>Witsius, and <sup>a</sup>Wall. This likewise seems to have been the opinion of <sup>b</sup>Pearson. For he placeth this epistle in the year 57, after the first to the Corinthians, and before Paul left Ephesus. But I do not discern his reasons for so doing.

Grotius<sup>c</sup> thought it difficult to assign the time when this epistle was written: but conjectures, that it was written about the same time with that to the Romans.

Fabricius says, 'the<sup>d</sup> design of the epistle is to dissuade 'the Galatians from putting their neck under the yoke of

<sup>v</sup> See of this work, vol. v. ch. cxviii.

<sup>w</sup> Δοκει δέ μοι και ή προς Γαλατας προτερα ειναι της προς Ρωμαιας. Chrys. Proem. ep. ad Rom. T. IX. p. 427. D.

<sup>x</sup> Αλλα και ή προς Γαλατας προτερα επι ταυτης προς Ρωμαιας. Theoph. Arg. ep. ad Rom.

<sup>y</sup> Per idem tempus, nempe sub finem biennii Ephesini, videtur omnino scripta epistola ad Galatas, &c. Cap. Hist. ap. p. 69.

<sup>z</sup> Epistola ad Galatas temporis sui hos characteres habet. Primum, quod non diu post Pauli ab iis discessum scripta esse videatur. Sic enim ipse, cap. i. 6.—Affuerat autem iis Paulus paulo antequam proficisceretur Ephesum. Act. xviii. 23. coll. eum cap. xix. 1. Unde probabiliter saltem inferitur Ephesi esse datam. Specialius, datam esse 'sub finem biennii,' quod Paulus Ephesi exegit, inde colligit Capellus.—Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. viii. num. xxxii.

<sup>a</sup> 'About this time, A. D. 55, when Paul had been at Ephesus a little while, 'he is supposed to have written his epistle to the Galatians.' Wall's Notes upon the N. T. p. 164.

<sup>b</sup> Scribit primam ad Corinthios epistolam.—Scribit epistolam ad Galatas. Per Demetrium Epheso pellitur. Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. 57.

<sup>c</sup> Tempus, quo scripta est hæc epistola ad Gallogræcos epistola, sicut designate indicare non possum, ita videre mihi video, non longe abfuisse ab eo tempore, quo ad Romanos scripta est epistola. Gr. Pr. ep. ad Galat.

<sup>d</sup> Argumentum epistole est, Galatas dehortari, ne iugo legis Mosaicæ iterum collum animasque supponerent. Idem dissuaserat Romanis, sed ad illos, quos nondum præsens ille docuerat, et scribit minus familiariter, et prolixius iis capita christianæ fidei exponit. Ad Galatas vero, et brevius omnia, et tanquam doctor ipsorum, ita ut nec a gravi increpatione sibi temperet.—Non possum tamen improbare eorum sententiam, qui non diu post epistolam ad Romanos in itinere Hierosolymam versus A. C. 58. exaratam hanc epistolam arbitrantur. Fabr. ubi supra, p. 155.

‘ the Mosaic law. And,’ says he, ‘ to the like purpose the apostle writes to the Romans. But then he had never seen, and he treats them very respectfully, and enlargeth upon the doctrine of the gospel with greater prolixity. To the Galatians he writes more briefly, and as their master, and not without some severity in his reprehensions. He adds, that he is inclined to their opinion, who suppose this epistle to have been written not long after that to the Romans, and in the way to Jerusalem, in the year of Christ 58.’

Mill being a man of great judgment in these things, and what he says appearing at first sight plausible, I shall transcribe it below. He thinks, that<sup>e</sup> this epistle was not written until after that to the Romans, probably at Troas, or some other place in Asia, as Paul was going to Jerusalem. And he thinks that Paul refers to the collections lately made in Macedonia and Greece, Gal. ii. 10. And the apostle writes not only in his own name, but also in the name of all the brethren, mentioned Acts xx. 4. who were with him at Troas, and accompanied him to Jerusalem. Moreover, this epistle was written by the apostle with his own hand, and the more easily and readily, though in a journey, because he had just before treated the same argument in his epistle to the Romans. This epistle therefore is placed by Mill at the year 58.

Upon all which I beg leave to remark, as follows. First, that those words, “ all the brethren which are with me,” need not to be understood of those who were with Paul at Troas, and were setting out with him for Jerusalem. Thereby may be intended the brethren of some other place where Paul was. Secondly, the apostle Paul was able at any time

<sup>e</sup> Paulo post dictatam hanc, quæ Romanis inscripta est, scripsit Paulus epistolam ad Galatas, ut apparet ex cap. ii. 10. ὁ καὶ ἐπέδασα αὐτοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν. His enim verbis aperte indicat Apostolus, epistolam hanc post ministerium seu studium, quod eleemosynis pro ecclesiâ Hierosolymitanâ colligendis impendebat, scripsisse se, dum aoristo utitur, ἐπέδασα—ποιεῖν. In itinere itaque versus Hierosolymam versatus D. Paulus alicubi hanc epistolam exarâsse videtur, et quidem Troade fortassis, ubi septem dies moratus est; postquam in Asiam veniens comperisset Galatas ad aliud evangelium ἐπιταχέως translatos fuisse. Auditâ nempe, jam ut videtur ab appulsu ejus in Asiam, istâ ἀποσασίᾳ, arrepto calamo, propriâ manu, contra quam factum in aliis epistolis, (exceptâ forte unâ ad Philemonem,) totam istam scripsit epistolam, acrem et objurgatoriam, nomine suo, omniumque, qui cum ipso erant, fratrum jam Troade, Sopatri, Aristarchi, Secundi, Gaii, Tychici, Trophimi, Titi, Silæ, aliorum. Scripsit autem eo celerius, et festinantius, quod idem argumentum in hac epistolâ prosequeretur, quod tractaverat paulo ante in epistolâ ad Romanos, cujus fere sensus in hanc transfundit.—Scripta est statim, ut dixi, post epistolam ad Romanos, anno æræ vulgaris lviii. Proleg. num. 30, 31.

to represent the doctrine of the gospel to any churches, suitably to their particular case and circumstances, whether he had just before treated of it in an epistle, or not. So that the agreement between the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, is no proof that they were written very soon one after another. Thirdly, when Paul says, ch. ii. 10, "The same which I also was forward to do:" he cannot intend the collections made in Macedonia and Greece, with which he was going to Jerusalem. If that had been his meaning, he would have expressed himself more particularly, like to what he says to the Romans, ch. xv. 25—27. What he says here, he might have said, when at Ephesus, before he set out for Macedonia, and indeed at any time, and in any place. For he had been always mindful of the poor in Judea. I apprehend, that the apostle's words are to be interpreted in this manner. "The same, which I also had endeavoured to do, or had been careful to perform:" referring to his conduct, even before that proposal of the three apostles at Jerusalem: and intending, probably, in particular, the contributions brought by himself and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, some while before, as related Acts xi. 29. Which contributions, as may be well supposed, had been promoted by our apostle's exhortations. Fourthly, St. Paul says to the Galatians in this epistle, ch. i. 6, "I marvel, that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ, unto another gospel." Those expressions cannot possibly suit the date assigned by Mill, that is, after the passover of the year 58. Which must have been above four years after even Paul's second journey in the country of Galatia.

Another opinion has been proposed by the ingenious and thoughtful author<sup>f</sup> of *Miscellanea Sacra*, and embraced by<sup>g</sup> Dr. Benson: that the epistle to the Galatians was written at Corinth, when the apostle was first there, and made a long stay of a year and six months. Whilst Paul was there, he received tidings of the instability of his converts in Galatia, with which he was much affected. Whereupon he wrote this epistle, and sent it by one of his assistants. At that season he might well say at the beginning of his address to them: "I marvel, that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ." Nor is there in the epistle any hint of his having been with them more than once. The epistle therefore was written at Corinth, or per-

<sup>f</sup> See there the Abstract of the Scripture History of the Apostles, p. 31, and the Postscript to the Preface, p. 56—58.

<sup>g</sup> History of the first Planting the Christian Religion. B. 3. ch. v. sect xi. Vol. ii. p. 118, 119. first edit. p. 136, 137. second edit

haps at Ephesus, when Paul was first there, in his way to Jerusalem, as mentioned, Acts xviii. 19—21.

This opinion is proposed by the above-mentioned author, as his own. And I make no doubt, that it was so, and the fruit of his own inquiries and observations. Nevertheless it is not quite new. Say L'Enfant and Beausobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles: 'We<sup>n</sup> find not in the epistle to the Galatians any mark that can enable us to determine with certainty, at what time, or in what place, it was written. It is dated at Rome in some printed copies and manuscripts. But there is nothing in the epistle itself to confirm that date. Paul does not here make any mention of his bonds, as he does in all his epistles written at Rome. He says indeed, ch. vi. 17, that "he bears in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus." But he had often suffered, before he came to Rome. There are therefore<sup>i</sup> some learned chronologers, who place the epistle to the Galatians immediately after the two epistles to the Thessalonians. They think it was written between the third and fourth journey of Paul to Jerusalem, and between his first and second journey into Galatia. This opinion appears to me very probable. For since the apostle says, "he wonders, that they were so soon turned unto another gospel," this epistle must have been written a short time after he had preached in Galatia. Nor can we discern in the epistle any notice of the second journey which St. Paul made into this country. For this reason it is thought that the epistle to the Galatians was written at Corinth, where the apostle made a long stay, or else in some city of Asia, particularly Ephesus, where he stayed some days in his way to Jerusalem, Acts xviii. 19—21. Therefore, in all probability, the epistle to the Galatians was written from Corinth, or from Ephesus, in the year 52 or 53.'

Nothing could be said more properly. And I think this date may be further confirmed by some other considerations. Paul says to the Corinthians, xvi. 1, "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, so do ye." Which shows that at the writing of that epistle to the Corinthians, in 56, he had a good opinion of his converts in Galatia, and that he had no doubt of their respect to his directions. Which, probably, had been sent to them from Ephesus, during his long abode

<sup>n</sup> Sect. xlii. p. 24—26.

<sup>i</sup> Here, in the margin, are put the names of Usher and L. Capellus, without any references. Nor have I found the places where this opinion is maintained by them.

there, by some one or other of his assistants. This good temper of the Galatians may be supposed owing to the letter sent to them some time before, and to his second visit to them, related, Acts xviii. 23.

And now we shall be better able to account for what appears very remarkable. When Paul left Corinth, after his long stay there, he went to Jerusalem, having a vow. In his way he came to Ephesus. Acts xviii. 19—21, “And when they desired him to tarry longer with them, he consented not. But bade them farewell, saying: I must by all means keep this feast that cometh at Jerusalem. But I will return again unto you, if God will.” When we read this we might be apt to think that Paul should hasten back to Ephesus, and return thither presently after he had been at Jerusalem. But instead of so doing, after he had been at “Jerusalem, he went down to Antioch. And after he had spent some time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, strengthening the disciples,” ver. 22, 23. We now seem to see the reason of this course. At Corinth he heard of the defection of many in Galatia. Whereupon he sent away a sharp letter to them. But considering the nature of the case, he judged it best to take the first opportunity to go to Galatia, and support the instructions of his letter. And both together had a very good effect. Gal. iv. 19, 20, “My little children, of whom I travail in birth again—I desire to be present with you, and to change my voice. For I stand in doubt of you:” or, I am perplexed for you. Now then, we see the reason of the apostle’s not coming directly from Jerusalem to Ephesus. However he was not unmindful of his promise, and came thither, after he had been in Galatia.

Upon the whole, the epistle to the Galatians is an early epistle. And, as seems to me most probable, was written at Corinth, near the end of the year 52, or at the very beginning of the year 53, before St. Paul set out to go to Jerusalem by the way of Ephesus. But if any should rather think, that it was written at Ephesus, during the apostle’s short stay there, in the way from Corinth to Jerusalem, that will make but very little difference. And still according to our computation, this epistle was written at the beginning of the year 53.

Ch. vi. 11, “Ye<sup>k</sup> see how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand.”

Hereby some understand the apostle to say, that this, with what follows to the end of the epistle, was written with his

<sup>k</sup> Ἰδετε πηλικοις ἡμιν γραμμασιον εγραψα τη ηρη χειρι.

own hand. So <sup>l</sup>Jerom, and <sup>m</sup>Grotius. Others understand St. Paul to speak of the whole epistle. So thought <sup>n</sup>Chrysostom, and <sup>o</sup>Theophylact, and <sup>p</sup>Theodoret, and <sup>q</sup>the author of the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles. Which interpretation is approved by <sup>r</sup>Wolfius.

—“How long a letter I have written unto you.” Which some interpret after this manner: “In what large letters I have written unto you,” intending the deformity, or inelegance of the characters. Which sense is also found in divers<sup>s</sup> ancient authors.

But it is not approved of either by <sup>t</sup>Beza, or <sup>u</sup>Wolfius.

<sup>l</sup> *Hi qui circumceidi Galatas volebant, disseminaverant, alia Paulum facere, alia prædicare.—Hanc opinionem quia non poterat Paulus apud omnes præsens ipse subvertere—seipsum per literas repræsentat. Et ne aliqua suppositæ epistolæ suspicio nasceretur, ab hoc ipso usque ad finem manu suâ ipse perscripsit, ostendens superiora ab alio exarata. Hieron. in ep. ad Gal. T. IV. p. 314.*

<sup>m</sup> *In aliarum epistolarum fine quædam scribebat suâ manu. 1 Cor. xvi. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 17; et Col. iv. 18; cætera manu alienâ, ut videre est, Roman. xvi. 22. Hic vero Paulus suâ manu scripsit omnia quæ sequuntur, ut recte putat Hieronymus. Id autem multum erat in homine adeo occupato, et, ut videtur, non multum assueto Græcæ scribere. ‘Quantis literis,’ id est, ‘quam multis.’ Solent adjectiva magnitudinis poni pro adjectivis ad numerum pertinentibus. Sic Græcum *τοσοι*, ‘tanti,’ utroque sensu usurpatum. Grot. ad Galat. vi. 11.*

<sup>n</sup> *Ἐνταυθα εἶδεν ἄλλο αἰνιττεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι αὐτος ἐγραψε τὴν ἐπιτολὴν ἅπασαν, ὁ πολλὴς γνησιοτήτος σημεῖον ην. κ. λ. Chr. in loc. T. X. p. 727. B.*

<sup>o</sup> *In loc. T. II. p. 492.*

<sup>p</sup> *Ἰᾶσαν, ὡς εἰκε, τὴν δὲ τὴν ἐπιτολὴν αὐτος ἐγραψε. Theod. in loc.*

<sup>q</sup> *Auctontatem dat epistolæ suæ.—Ubi enim holographa manus est, falsum dici non potest. In loc. ap. Ambros. in App. p. 230.*

<sup>r</sup> *Idem vero [Grotius] quamvis præeunte Hieronymo, errat, quando hæc verba non ad totam hanc epistolam, sed ad ea tantum, quæ inde usque ad finem leguntur, vult referri. Rectius Chrysostomus.—Addit idem causam, cur totam epistolam suâ manu exararit, ut nempe omnis *νοθίας* suspicio *ἰδιογραφῶ* hoc præcideretur iis, qui dicere alioquin poterant, nonnulla illi inserta, quæ Apostoli sententiæ non responderent. Wolf. in loc.*

<sup>s</sup> *Το δὲ πηλικοῖς, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἂ το μεγαθος, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμορφίαν τῶν γραμματῶν ἐμφανῶν λεγεῖν, μόνον εὐχὴ λεγῶν’ ὅτι οὐτε αὐτὰ γραφῆν εἶδῶς, ὁμῶς ἠναγκασθῆν δὲ ἐμὰν τὰ γραφῆν, ὡς τῶν συκοφαντῶν ἐμφραζῆν το σομα. Chr. ubi supr. p. 727. C.*

<sup>t</sup> *Το δὲ πηλικοῖς γραμμασι, τινες, μὲν μεγαλοῖς, τινες δὲ φανλοῖς ἤρμηνευσαν. Ἐγὼ γὰρ, φησιν, ἐγραψα τὴν ἐπιτολὴν, καίτοι μὴ γραφῶν εἰς κάλλος. Theod. in loc.*

<sup>u</sup> *‘Quam longis,’ πηλικοῖς. Ad verbum ‘quantis.’ Vulgata ‘qualibus.’ In quo explicando miror cur se tantopere torqueant interpretes, dum alii—ad sublimitatem sententiarum referunt, ut Hilarius, alii ad ipsa literarum elementa, quæ grandiuscula fuerint,—alii ad deformitatem characterum, quasi Paulus imperitus fuerit pingendarum literarum, ut exponit Theophylactus, Chrysostomum secutus.—Sunt autem sane longiores epistolæ Romanis et Corinthiis inscriptæ, sed alienâ manu exarate, &c. Bez. ad loc.*

<sup>v</sup> *‘Ecce quantis,’ i. e. ‘quam multis, literis vobis scripsi.’ Ita recte Grotius, addens, adjectiva magnitudinis, pro adjectivis ad numerum pertinentibus,*

They say that this is as long as any of St. Paul's epistles, excepting the epistle to the Romans, the two epistles to the Corinthians, and that to the Hebrews. I may add another thought: that according to our computation this is the third apostolical epistle, written by St. Paul, and is much longer than either of those to the Thessalonians, which had been written before. However, undoubtedly, the apostle has regard to the quantity of his own hand-writing. The rest of his epistles were written by others, while he dictated, (as is generally done by eminent men, much engaged,) and himself wrote only a few words, or sentences, at the end: whereas this epistle was all in his own hand-writing.

And the original word is elsewhere used for epistle, or letter. Acts xxviii. 21, "We<sup>v</sup> have not received letters out of Judea concerning thee."

So far therefore as I am able to judge, our English version is very right. "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with my own hand."

That is <sup>v</sup> Beza's translation. Le Clerc,<sup>x</sup> in his French Testament, and <sup>v</sup> Beausobre, translate in the like manner.

In Beausobre's remarks upon the New Testament, published after his death, is this note upon the text we are considering: "How<sup>z</sup> large a letter, *πηλικοις γραμμασι.*" 'Some, says Theodoret, explain this of the largeness of the letters, others, that the letter was ill written, as if the apostle had said: "I have written to you with my own hand, though I do not write well." St. Jerom, in his commentary upon this place, says, he had heard somewhat of the like kind from somebody. But he does not seem to approve of

poni solere, quemadmodum et Græcum *τοσοι* utroque sensu usurpetur.—Longius autem a vero aberrant, qui *το πηλικος* ad designandam 'characterium,' quibus usus sit, 'magnitudinem,' spectare putant, ut *πηλικά γραμματα* sint literæ majusculæ.—Addit [Le Cene] Apostolum hanc epistolam non potuisse appellare *πηλικην* respectu longitudinis, cum longiores scripserit alias. Imo vero scriptionem non tam multorum verborum, quam quod eam totam suâ manu scripserat, qui alias cæteris pauca quædam subscribere consueverit, longam appellat. Præterea hæc ad Galatas, si tres priores, et unam ad Hebræos exceperis, reliquas omnes longitudine excedit. Wolf. in loc.

<sup>v</sup> *Ἡμεῖς εἶτε γραμματα περι σε εἰξαμεθα απο της Ιεζουας.*

<sup>w</sup> Videtis quam longis literis vobis scripserim meâ manu. Bez.

<sup>x</sup> Voyez quelle grande lettre je vous ai écrite de ma main. Le Clerc.

<sup>y</sup> Voyez quelle grande lettre je vous ai écrite de ma propre main. B.

<sup>z</sup> 'Quelle grande lettre.' Quelques uns, dit Théodoret, expliquoient ce mot de la grandeur des lettres, et d'autres de ce que la lettre étoit mal écrite, les caractères mauvais: 'Je vous ai écrit de ma main, quoique j'écrive mal.' St. Jérôm, dans son Commentaire sur cet endroit dit avoir oui dire quelque chose d'approchant, à quelqu'un dont il ne paroît pas approuver la pensée. Beaus. Remarques sur le N. T. p. 466.



‘ it.’ I transcribe at length<sup>a</sup> below the passage referred to. But Jerom, having mentioned that observation of some learned man of his time, does himself seem to trifle, when he adds, ‘ That St. Paul’s letter to the Galatians was great for the sense. And so were all his letters, though short.’ However, this interpretation may be approved by some. It is in the note of Beza, above<sup>b</sup> transcribed.

## SECT. IV.

*The First Epistle to the Corinthians.*

The first Epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus, as all may perceive. Says the apostle, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9, “ But I will tarry at Ephesus, until Pentecost. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me. And there are many adversaries.” And ver. 19, he says: “ The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord.” Those two good christians had come with Paul from Corinth to Ephesus, when he was first there, and stayed but a short time, as appears from Acts xviii. 18, 19. And there they continued, as we suppose, till after Paul left Ephesus, to go into Macedonia.

This epistle is placed by ‘ Pearson in the year 57. Mill thinks<sup>d</sup> it was written before the passover of the year 57.

According to our computation<sup>e</sup> of St. Paul’s times and travels, this epistle was written at Ephesus, in the spring of the year 56. Which<sup>f</sup> was also the opinion of the French

<sup>a</sup> ‘ Videte qualibus literis scripsi vobis:’ non quod grandes literæ fuerint, [hoc quippe in Græco sonat *πηλικοις*,] sed quod suæ manûs essent eis nota vestigia; ut, dum literarum apices recognoscunt, ipsum se putarent videre, qui scripserat. In hoc loco vir apprime nostris temporibus eruditus, miror quomodo rem ridiculam loquutus sit. Paulus, inquit, ‘ Hebræus erat, et Græcas literas nesciebat. Et quia necessitas expetebat, ut manu suâ epistolam subscriberet, contra consuetudinem curvos tramites literarum exprimebat: etiam in hoc suæ ad Galatas indicia caritatis ostendens, quod propter illos id quod non poterat, facere conaretur.’ Grandibus ergo Paulus literis scripsit epistolam, quia sensus erat grandis in literis.—Grandes Paulus literas non solum tunc ad Galatas, sed etiam hodie scribit ad cunctos: et quamvis parvi sint apices, quibus ejus epistolæ conscribuntur, tamen magnæ sunt literæ, quia in literis magnus est sensus. Hieron. Comm. in Gal. T. IV. p. 315.

<sup>b</sup> See note <sup>1</sup>, p. 13.

<sup>c</sup> Scribat primam ad Corinthios epistolam, cum Sosthene respondens epistolæ Corinthorum. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 15. Anno lvii.

<sup>d</sup> Quando igitur? Haud diu sane antequam ex Asiâ abiret anno æræ vulgaris, lvii. et quidem ante illius anni festum paschale. Proleg. num. 9.

<sup>e</sup> See Vol. v. ch. xi.

<sup>f</sup> La i. Epître aux Corinthiens fut écrite d’Ephèse au printemps de l’année 56. Préf. Gén. sur les Ep. de S. Paul. sect. 45. p. 27.

commentators before named, L'Enfant and Beausobre. Some have argued from ch. v. 7, "For Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us," that it was now the time of the Jewish passover, or that it was just over. But to me it seems, that the apostle might make use of that expression, and build an argument or exhortation upon it in any part of the year. And when a year was begun, he might speak of staying where he was, till some distant feast. And supposing the epistle to have been written early in the spring, he might think of continuing at Ephesus till Pentecost. This letter was carried to Corinth by Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, mentioned, I Cor. xvi. 17, 18, who had come to the apostle from the Corinthians, and are supposed to have brought a letter with them. See I Cor. vii. 1. It was after writing this epistle, that the tumult happened, which was caused by Demetrius. For as Lightfoot<sup>s</sup> says: 'Between ver. 22 and 23 of this sixth chapter of the Acts falleth in the time of St. Paul's writing the first epistle to the Corinthians.' Consequently this epistle was sent away before the tumult raised by Demetrius, and other silversmiths, related by St. Luke, Acts xix. 23—41, nevertheless, after Paul had fought with beasts at Ephesus, as he says, I Cor. xv. 32. When that tumult of Demetrius was appeased, Paul seems to have been at rest. And though he did not judge it prudent to stay any longer there, he took leave of his friends with deliberation. "And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia," Acts xx. 1.

The first epistle to the Corinthians, therefore, according to our account, was written at Ephesus, in the beginning, or the spring, of the year 56.

## SECT. V.

### *The First Epistle to Timothy.*

The first epistle to Timothy was written, according to <sup>b</sup> Pearson, <sup>i</sup> Whitby, <sup>k</sup> Basnage, <sup>l</sup> Cave, <sup>m</sup> Fabricius, <sup>n</sup> Mill, and others, in the year of Christ 64 or 65, some while after St. Paul's release from his confinement at Rome. In <sup>o</sup> Lightfoot this is the epistle written next after the first to the

<sup>g</sup> Vol. I. p. 299.

<sup>i</sup> Wh. in his preface to the epistle.

<sup>l</sup> Cay. H. L. in Paulo.

<sup>r</sup> Proleg. num. 123.

<sup>b</sup> Pearson, Annal. Paulin. An. 64. p. 22.

<sup>k</sup> Ann. 62. n. vii.

<sup>m</sup> Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. T. III. p. 157.

<sup>o</sup> See Harmony of the N. T. Vol. i.

Corinthians. It is the same in <sup>p</sup>Baronius and <sup>q</sup>Estius. Who say, that this epistle was written in Macedonia, when Paul was there the second time. In this date agree in the main <sup>r</sup>Dr. Benson, and <sup>s</sup>Dr Doddridge. This also was the opinion of Hammond, as may be seen in his preface to this epistle. Witsius, after having considered the reasons of Lightfoot and Pearson in behalf of their several opinions, hesitates,<sup>t</sup> and cannot say exactly when this epistle was written: though he does not judge it needful to defer it so long as Pearson did, that is, till after St. Paul's deliverance from his imprisonment at Rome. Lewis Capellus was in doubt which was first written, whether<sup>u</sup> the second epistle to the Corinthians, or the first epistle to Timothy. However, he thinks that both were written not long after St. Paul had left Ephesus, to go into Macedonia. Consequently his opinion was not very different from that of Lightfoot, Baronius, and Estius, before recited.

According to Theodoret, in his general preface to St. Paul's epistles, the first four are the two epistles to the Thessalonians, and the first and second to the Corinthians. 'The <sup>v</sup>fifth, says he, is the first epistle to Timothy. For after the introduction he says: "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some, that they receive no other doctrine," I Tim. i. 3. It is manifest therefore, that when Paul went the second time into Macedonia, he left the most excellent

<sup>p</sup> An. 57. n. 187.

<sup>q</sup> Scripta est autem hæc epistola, posteaquam Paulus, Epheso relictâ, sicut habetur initio xx. cap. Actorum, profectus est in Macedoniam. Id quod ipsius epistolæ verba statim initio declarant. Unde cum Cardinale Baronio colligimus, in Macedoniâ scriptam esse. Est. arg. 1. ep. ad Timoth. p. 758.

<sup>r</sup> History, &c. B. 3. ch. vii. sect. v. p. 167, &c. first edit. p. 184, &c. sec. edit. See also his preface to the first ep. to Tim. sect. iii. <sup>s</sup> See Family Expositor, Vol. III. p. 305. note e, p. 319, note b, p. 332, note r.

<sup>t</sup> Non tamen æque constat, scriptionem epistolæ differendam esse ad solutionem Pauli a Romanis vinculis. Neque enim omnia Pauli itinera descripsit Lucas, sed notabiliora quædam.—Pronuntiemus itaque, de tempore, quo scripta est prior Pauli ad Timotheum epistola, non liquere. Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. 9. num. v.

<sup>u</sup> Posterior ad eosdem Corinthios epistola, et prior ad Timotheum, certant de proprietate, et sub iudice lis est. Utraque autem scripta est paulo postquam Paulus Epheso discessisset, adeoque dum Macedoniam peragraret. Sed utrâ tempore præcedat, non liquet. Lud. Cap. Hist. Ap. p. 72.

<sup>v</sup> Πεντητην ἡγεμαί των προς Τιμοθειον την προτεραν. Μετα γαρ δε το προουμιον ετω φησι Καθως παρεκαλεσα σε προσμειναι εν Εφεσω, πορευομενος εις Μακεδονιαν.—Δηλον τοιουνν, ως ηνικα το δευτερον απο της Εφεσε παρεγινετο εις Μακεδονιαν ο μακαριος Παιλος, τοτε τον παντα αριζον Τιμοθειον εκει καταλελοιπεν, εις επιμελειαν των δεξαμενων το σωτηριον κηρυγμα. Præf. in ep. Paul. T. III. p. 3, 4.

· Timothy at Ephesus, to take care of those who had received the salutary doctrine.’

I shall now endeavour to show at length the grounds of this opinion.

St. Luke expressly says, Acts xx. 1, “And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia.” And St. Paul says, in the place just cited, 1 Tim. i. 3, “As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia.” And St. Luke informs us, ch. xix. 21, 22, “After these things were ended, Paul purposed in spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem.—So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for some season.” Then follows an account of the tumult at Ephesus. Some while after those messengers, Timothy and Erastus, were gone to Macedonia and Greece, Paul, as it seems, wrote and sent away his first letter to the Corinthians. From which letter we plainly perceive, that Timothy was in those parts. For so it is said in 1 Cor. iv. 17, “For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy.” And ch. xvi. 10, 11, “Now, if Timothy come, see that he may be with you without fear.—Let no man therefore despise him, but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me. For I look for him with the brethren.” Whence it appears, that at concluding that letter Paul was in expectation of Timothy’s return to Ephesus. And very probably he did return before Paul went thence. Moreover St. Luke said just now, that after Timothy and Erastus had been sent into Macedonia, “Paul himself staid in Asia for a season.”

St. Paul, in the place above cited, says, 1 Tim. i. 3, that he “besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia.” Does not that term, beseeching, or entreating Timothy, imply some difficulty in the service required of him? And do we not see, what apprehensions Timothy might be under upon being left at Ephesus, where Paul had met with much opposition, and some very lately? ‘A <sup>w</sup> soft word,’ says Beza upon the place, ‘to be used by one of much superior authority.’ But if we consider the dangers of our supposed time, we may see the reason of Paul’s speaking in that manner to Timothy.

<sup>w</sup> Παρεκαλεσα, ‘sum peccatus, vel hortatus.’] Blando vocabulo utitur singulare modestie exemplum relinquens quibusvis, in maximâ etiam auctoritate constitutis. Bez. in loc.

Again. 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15, "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God." Words which mightily suit the present time. St. Paul went into Macedonia, with a design to forward the collections for the poor saints in Judea, and then to go to Jerusalem. And it may be well supposed, that he had then hopes of calling in at Ephesus, in his way to Judea, and there seeing Timothy. However, he could not yet say the time. Which also is plainly agreeable to the apostle's circumstances at this season. For we perceive from what St. Luke writes in the Acts, and from the second epistle to the Corinthians, written some while afterwards in Macedonia, that Paul was not then able long before hand to fix resolutions about the time of journies to be undertaken by him.

Farther, the time assigned by Pearson, and those who agree with him, must be wrong. It appears from Acts xx. 17—that when Paul was going to Jerusalem in the former part of the year 58, there were elders at Ephesus, and probably in the neighbouring cities of Asia. But when Paul wrote this epistle, there seems to have been a want of such officers at Ephesus, or thereabout. For a main design of it appears to be, to instruct Timothy in the proper qualifications of such men, and to admonish him to use great care and caution in the choice of them.

Once more, I am of opinion, that the second epistle to Timothy was written soon after Paul had been brought to Rome a prisoner from Judea. Therefore, if this epistle be prior to it, it must have been written before Paul went to Jerusalem, with the contributions of the christians of Greece, and Macedonia, and other places.

There is, however, a difficulty attending our supposition. For Timothy is joined with Paul in the inscription at the beginning of the second epistle to the Corinthians, generally allowed to have been written in Macedonia. And in Acts xx. 4, Timothy is mentioned among those who accompanied Paul into Asia, when he was going to Jerusalem with the above-mentioned contributions. All which may induce some to think, that either Timothy did not return to Paul, before he left Ephesus, or that Paul took Timothy with him, when he went into Macedonia.

To which I answer: we have showed it to be very probable that Timothy returned to Ephesus before Paul left it. The apostle therefore might send Timothy this letter from Macedonia, and afterwards send for him, to come thither to

him, having some special occasion for his assistance. And though this was not entirely agreeable to the apostle, he might be the rather disposed to it, hoping, that as he went to Jerusalem, he should have an opportunity to leave Timothy at Ephesus. Which, as I apprehend, he did, when he came to Miletus.

Farther, this difficulty is very much abated by the account formerly given of this period of our apostle's history. For it was then shown, that there was a space of almost two years between St. Paul's going from Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia, and his coming to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem. Timothy therefore may have resided at Ephesus above a year, and yet be with the apostle at the writing of the second epistle to the Corinthians, which was not sent to them till near the end of the year 57.

Dr. Benson<sup>x</sup> supposeth this epistle to have been written at Troas, soon after the apostle was come from Ephesus. And indeed many learned men think, that Paul now went into Macedonia by the way of Troas. This has been collected from 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. But that appears to me a difficult text. And it may be disputed, whether Paul there refers to his journey from Ephesus. For it is difficult to conceive, how the apostle could have reason to expect Titus at Troas at that season: considering, that his removal from Ephesus had been sudden, or, however, somewhat sooner than he had intended. How then was it possible for him to have made an appointment for Titus to meet him at Troas punctually at the time of his arrival there.

But allowing Paul to have gone from Ephesus to Macedonia by the way of Troas, it will not follow, that this epistle was written there. It may be concluded from 1 Tim. i. 3, that the apostle was now in Macedonia, or had been there, since he left Ephesus. Accordingly, Lightfoot, Baronius, and Estius, before named, suppose this epistle to have been written in Macedonia. Says <sup>y</sup>Lightfoot: 'It is apparent  
' from 1 Tim. i. 3, that this epistle was written after Paul's  
' setting out from Ephesus for Macedonia.— Now it can-  
' not be conceived to have been written when he was going  
' toward Macedonia. For then he was but newly parted  
' from Timothy. And it is not likely, that he would so  
' write to him, when he was but newly come from him.—  
' Therefore it cannot but be concluded, that this epistle was  
' written whilst he was in Macedonia, or the parts there-

<sup>x</sup> See his preface to the first epistle to Timothy, sect. iii.

<sup>y</sup> Harmony of N. T. Vol. i. p. 307.

‘ about, at this time that we are upon.’ To which I readily assent.

I shall add only what is also already hinted by Light-foot, that it is very improbable, that the apostle should use those expressions, I Tim. iii. 14, “ hoping to come and see thee shortly,” before he had been in Macedonia. St. Paul was much more likely to say this, when he had been some months absent from Ephesus, than when he had been come away but a few days only.

I should now say more particularly when this epistle was written. And I think it must have been written in the year 56. In the beginning of that year, according to our account, Paul wrote the first epistle to the Corinthians. Before Pentecost in that year he left Ephesus. And before the end of that year, I suppose, he might write this epistle to Timothy. The place is not absolutely certain. Before writing this epistle the apostle had been in Macedonia, since he left Ephesus. But whether he was now in that country, cannot, I apprehend, be fully determined by those expressions, I Tim. i. 3. However, this may be reckoned very likely, that the apostle was either in Macedonia, or near it. Lewis Capellus, as before observed, was in doubt which was first written, this epistle, or the second to the Corinthians. About that I have no doubt. We shall soon see clear proof, that the second epistle to the Corinthians was written not long before the end of the year 57. This first epistle to Timothy was written in the year 56, and probably, some good while before the end of it.

## SECT. VI.

### *The Epistle to Titus.*

Says Theodoret immediately after what was transcribed from him above concerning the first epistle to Timothy : ‘ After that, <sup>z</sup>as I think, was written the epistle to Titus. ‘ For being still in those parts, he desired Titus to come to ‘ him, saying : “ When I shall send unto thee Artemas, or ‘ Tychicus, be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis. For I ‘ have determined to winter there,” Tit. iii. 12. They say, ‘ that Nicopolis is a city of Thrace, nigh unto Macedonia.’

<sup>z</sup> Μετα ταυτην υπολαμβανω την προς Τιτον γεγραφθα εν κεινοις γαρ επι διαγων τοις μερεσι, καταλαβειν αυτον παρηγγυησε. Λεγει δε οτως οταν πεμψω Αρτεμαν.— Την δε Νικοπολιν Θρακιην μεν πολιν ειναι φασι, τη δε Μακεδονια πελαζειν. Theod. T. III. p. 4. C.

So writes Theodoret in his general preface to St. Paul's epistles. And in his note upon Tit. iii. 12, he says, 'Nico-  
'polis<sup>a</sup> is a city of Thrace, nigh unto Macedonia. It is  
'manifest therefore, that he wrote this epistle when he was  
'in Macedonia and Achaia.'

Following the opinion of this learned ancient, which I think to be very right, the epistle to Titus was written in the year 56, and Paul spent the winter of that year at Nicopolis.

If it be asked, when was Paul in Crete? I answer, in general, a short time before he wrote this epistle, as may appear from those words: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed thee," ch. i. 5. More particularly, I suppose, that Paul had been in Crete in this year 56, since he came from Ephesus, to go into Macedonia. About this time, I think, he was in Crete and Illyricum, as well as in Macedonia. But as I do not indulge myself in making conjectures, I do not attempt to describe the order of the apostle's voyages. It was before shown to be probable, that<sup>b</sup> between Paul's leaving Ephesus in the spring of the year 56, and his coming to Troas, after the passover, in the year 58, in his way to Jerusalem, there was the space of about two years. In that time Paul might do, and probably did, more than is particularly related by St. Luke. Few learned men, considering the conciseness of St. Luke's manner of writing, can make any difficulty to allow, that<sup>c</sup> he has not related all the apostle's journies. It is observable, that Titus was the person who was sent by Paul into Dalmatia, when he was come to Rome. As it appears from 2 Tim. iv. 10. Which may be reckoned an argument that he had been there before.

About this time the epistle to Titus was written, according to the opinion of divers learned men, to whom I refer: as<sup>d</sup> Baronius, <sup>e</sup> Capellus, <sup>f</sup> Hammond, and <sup>g</sup> Lightfoot. Estius<sup>h</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Της Θρακης εστιν η Νικοπολις, τη δε Μακεδονια πελαζει. Δηλον τοιωνν  
ως κατ' εκεινον τον καιρον, καθ' ον εν τη Μακεδονια και Αχαια διετριβεν, εγραψε  
την επιτολην. Ibid. p. 515, A. <sup>b</sup> See Vol. v. ch. xi. <sup>c</sup> Neque enim  
omnia Pauli itinera descripsit Lucas, sed notabilia quaedam. Wits. de Vitâ  
Pauli. Sect. 9. num. v. <sup>d</sup> Baron. Ann. 57. num. ccix.

<sup>e</sup> Lud. Capell. Hist. Ap. p. 16. et 66. Vid. et Jacob. Cap. Compend. in  
Apost. Hist. Chronol. Tab. <sup>f</sup> Præf. in ep. ad Tit.

<sup>g</sup> Lightfoot's Works, Vol. i. p. 309, 310. <sup>h</sup> Quando scripta sit  
hæc epistola, non liquet, nec facile ex Actis Apost. colligi potest, quod in iis  
non legatur Paulus Cretam ingressus fuisse. Verisimile est, ante captivitatem  
Apostoli, quia vinculorum hic nulla mentio. Imo, cum dicit cap. iii. 'ibi e-  
'nim statui hiemare,' plane significat, non esse vinetum. Est. Argum. ep. ad Tit.



could not determine the time of this epistle exactly: but he thought it was written before the apostle's imprisonment at Jerusalem and Rome.

Cave in his <sup>i</sup> *Historia Literaria* placeth this epistle in the year 63. But, when he wrote the lives of the apostles, he<sup>k</sup> supposed it to have been written soon after the first epistle to the Corinthians.

Mill<sup>l</sup> placeth this epistle in the year 64. Pearson<sup>m</sup> in 65. Paul having, as he supposes, been in Crete, and left Titus there the year before, that is, in 64. And many others may be of the same opinion.

But this appears to me too late a date. All that is said of Paul's going into Spain, and Crete, and some other places, after being released from his imprisonment at Rome, is mere conjecture, without any good authority, either from the books of the New Testament, or very early antiquity. It is not likely that Paul, who in his epistle to Philemon calls himself "aged," should after that undertake new work. It is more probable, that he went to such places, where he had been before, and where he had disciples already: as he intimates in his epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, Philemon, the Hebrews. Nor is it at all likely, that<sup>n</sup> the Cretans should have been so long without being instructed in the doctrine of the gospel, as Pearson supposeth.

I have already shown the most probable date of the first epistle to Timothy. It is likely, that the epistle to Titus was written about the same time. For the state of things in both appears to be very similar. In both are instructions concerning the qualifications of elders, or bishops, and deacons. So 1 Tim. iii. and Tit. i. Nor is it reasonable to think that Paul should have occasion, so late as the year 64 or 65, to send to his assistants and fellow-labourers such particular directions concerning that matter, as are in these two epistles. It is probable, that instructions of that kind had been given sooner. Moreover, the like errors are guarded against in both these epistles. 1 Tim. i. 4, "Neither give heed to fables, and endless genealogies."—Ch. iv. 7, "But refuse profane and old wives' fables."—Ch. vi. 20, "Avoiding profane and vain babblings."—Tit. iii. 9, "But avoid fool-

<sup>l</sup> Epistola ad Titum—data anno 63, e medio aliquo loco inter Macedoniam et Nicopolim. Illic enim hiemare decreverat. H. L. in Paulo.

<sup>k</sup> See there the Life of St. Paul, sect iv. num. ix.

<sup>l</sup> Proleg.

num. 122.

<sup>m</sup> Ann. Paulin. p. 20—22.

<sup>n</sup> Non verisimile est, ad illud usque tempus ignoratum fuisse Christum in Cretâ; quum tota Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, Cyprus, Syria, personarent euangelii præconio. Wits. de Vitâ Pauli, sect. v. num. i.

ish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law. For they are unprofitable and vain." See also ch. i. 10—14. In both are like directions for paying a proper regard to civil magistrates, 1 Tim. ii. 1—6, and Tit. iii. 1—3. There are also like directions concerning relative duties, particularly those of masters and servants, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9, 10. Timothy and Titus are in a like manner exhorted to take heed to themselves and their doctrine, and to be examples of virtue, 1 Tim. i. 18, 19; iv. 6, 16; Tit. ii. 1—8. I might add, that near the conclusion of each epistle the practice of good works is in a very similar manner enjoined upon the converts to christianity.

It appears from many texts of the second epistle to the Corinthians, written in Macedonia, that about this time Paul had the assistance of Titus in those parts. And Tychicus, mentioned Tit. iii. 12, was likewise with Paul at this time: for he was one of the company that went with him into Asia, Acts xx. 4. And therefore, probably, not he, but Artemas, had been sent into Crete, to relieve Titus. Moreover, Apollos was at Ephesus, a little before Paul left that city, to go into Macedonia. That is manifest from 1 Cor. xvi. 12. And it may be reckoned very probable, that he did not stay long at Ephesus after Paul: but either went with him into Macedonia, or came into those parts soon afterwards. So that Paul might now have occasion to recommend him to Titus, in Crete, together with Zenas, Tit. iii. 13.

There are not in this epistle any tokens of Paul's great age, or of his being near the period of his ministry. He is plainly at liberty at the time of writing this epistle. Nor are there any intimations of his having as yet endured any long imprisonment.

This letter may be the shorter, because probably, Paul had lately written at length upon the same subject to Timothy. Moreover, Titus was older, and might have more experience. Chrysostom judged<sup>o</sup> the brevity of this epistle to be an argument of the ability of Titus. He did not need a long exhortation. A few hints were sufficient.

St. Paul says, Tit. iii. 12, "When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis. For I have determined there to winter." Thereby Theodoret understood Nicopolis in Thrace, as seen above. So likewise Chrysostom.<sup>p</sup> But Jerom<sup>q</sup> supposed the apos-

<sup>o</sup> — βραχίαν δε ποιει την επιτολην, εικοτως. Και τετο δε της αρετης τε τιτε τεκμηριον ην, το μη δεισθαι λογων πολλων, αλλ' ωσπερ τινος υπομνησεως. In Tit. hom. i. tom. XI. p. 730. B. <sup>p</sup> Ἡ δ' Νικοπολις της Θρακης εστ. Chrys. in Tit. hom. 6. ib. p. 766. B. <sup>q</sup> Scribit igitur Apostolus

tle to mean Nicopolis in Epirus. Neither of these interpretations is any prejudice to our argument. In which soever of those countries Nicopolis was situated, the apostle was as likely to be there at the time supposed by us, as at any other.

At Nicopolis the apostle wintered, in the year 56, according to my computation. Consequently, this letter was written some time before, in the year 56. When the winter was over, Paul came into Macedonia, where he had been before, since he came from Ephesus. From Macedonia he came into Greece.

## SECT. VII.

### *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians.*

Whilst the apostle was in Macedonia, at this time, he wrote the second epistle to the Corinthians, A. D. 57.

Concerning this there can be no doubt, if we attend to the epistle itself. From which it plainly appears, that the apostle was then in Macedonia, and was going to Greece, particularly to Corinth. So 2 Cor. ix. 1—5. “For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write unto you. For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia: that Achaia was ready a year ago—Yet have I sent the brethren—lest haply, if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not you) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you and make up beforehand your bounty.”—See also ch. viii. and ch. xiii. 1, “This is the third time I am coming to you.”

According to Pearson,<sup>r</sup> this epistle was written in Macedonia, in the year 57; according to<sup>s</sup> Mill, near the end of that year. I likewise think that it was written in the year 57, probably, in September, or October. For the apostle, plainly, was soon to go to Corinth, where he might arrive, as I apprehend, in November.

I suppose it was now above a year since writing the first

ô Paula et Eustochium, de Nicopoli, quæ, in Actiaco littore sita, nunc possessionis vestræ pars vel maxima est, &c. Hieron. Pr. in ep. ad Tit. T. IV. P. I. p. 407.

Nicopolis ipsa est, quæ ob victoriam Augusti, quod ibi Antonium et Cleopatram superavit, nomen accepit. Id. in Tit. cap. iii. ib. p. 439.

<sup>r</sup> Annal. Paulin. p. 15. A. D. lvii.

<sup>s</sup> ———sub finem, ut videtur, anni æræ vulgaris lvii. Proleg. num. 21.

epistle to the Corinthians. The reasons of that supposition were mentioned<sup>t</sup> formerly. And need not to be repeated here.

Timothy was with Paul at writing this epistle: for his name is in the inscription. It is likely that<sup>u</sup> he had come from Ephesus to the apostle in Macedonia, either upon occasion of some affairs of that church, or at the desire of the apostle, who needed his assistance. As before said.

## SECT. VIII.

### *The Epistle to the Romans.*

The epistle to the Romans is dated by Pearson in the year 57, by Mill in the year 58. According to our computation of Paul's journies there can be no reason to hesitate about either the time or the place of this epistle. It was written at Corinth in the beginning of the year 58, before Paul set out on his journey to Jerusalem.

As St. Luke's few words in Acts xx. 1, 2, 3, afford great light, and are a sure guide, I recite them here. "And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed" [from Ephesus] "for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and given them much exhortation, he came into Greece. And there abode three months." In the space of these three months was written the epistle to the Romans.

According to Theodoret the epistle to the Romans<sup>x</sup> is the seventh in order of time, having been written by the apostle after the two epistles to the Thessalonians, and to the Corinthians, the first to Timothy, and the epistle to Titus. He adds, 'That<sup>y</sup> the epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth, is manifest from the conclusion. For there the apostle recommends Phœbe, calling her "deaconess of

<sup>t</sup> See Vol. v. ch. xi.

<sup>u</sup> Fateor, cum Paulus esset in Macedonia, unâ cum illo fuisse Timotheum, 2 Cor. i. 1; et postquam hyemem transgisset in Epiro, Tit. iii. 12, ac per tres menses commoratus in Græciâ, Act. xx. 2, 3, reversusque esset in Macedoniam, illi adfuisse Timotheum, Act. xx. 4, ac recta cum illo ivisse Troadem. Quæ omnia contingere potuerunt, postquam Paulus reliquisset Timotheum Ephesi; ex quâ urbe tamen iverit ad Paulum, sive propter negotia Ephesinæ ecclesiæ, de quibus Paulum consuli ab eo oporteret, vel ut pareret Paulo, quem, ut videmus, et postea invisit, longiore itinere, Romam usque, 2 Tim. iv. 9. Hammond. Præf. in 1 ep. Timoth. ex versione Clerici.

<sup>w</sup> Proleg. num. 26.

<sup>y</sup> Annal. Paulin. p. 15.

<sup>x</sup> Ἐβδόμην τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπέστειλε· μετα γὰρ ἤν ταύτας ἀπάσας ταύτην αὐτοῦ γεγραφεῖναι εἰδίσκει. κ. λ. Theod. T. III. p. 4. C.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 5.

‘ the church in Cenchrea,” which was a borough of the  
 ‘ Corinthians, Rom. xvi. 1. Besides, he says : “ Gaius, my  
 ‘ host, and of the whole church, saluteth you,” ver. 23. By  
 ‘ host he means the person who entertained him. And that  
 ‘ Gaius was a Corinthian we learn from the first epistle to  
 ‘ the Corinthians. For thus he writes to them : “ I thank  
 ‘ God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius,”  
 ‘ I Cor. i. 14. The epistle to the Romans therefore is the  
 ‘ last of the epistles written from Asia, and Macedonia, and  
 ‘ Achaia : and is the seventh in order, as has been shown.  
 ‘ The rest were sent from Rome.’ So Theodoret. Who  
 might have added, as a proof that this epistle was written  
 at Corinth, what follows in ver. 23, “ Erastus, the chamber-  
 lain of the city, saluteth you.” For by the city I suppose  
 to be meant Corinth. But whether this Erastus be the same  
 who is mentioned by St. Luke, Acts xix. 22, as one of St.  
 Paul’s assistants, I cannot say certainly.

The time of writing this epistle is farther manifest hence.  
 It was written after that Paul had completed his collections  
 in Macedonia, and Achaia, and when he was setting out for  
 Jerusalem. For so he writes, ch. xv. 25, 26, “ But now I  
 go unto Jerusalem, to minister unto the saints. For it has  
 pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain  
 contribution for the poor saints which are in Jerusalem.”  
 —ver. 30, 31, “ Now I beseech you, brethren,—that  
 ye strive together with me, in prayers to God for me : that  
 I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea,  
 and that my service, which I have for Jerusalem, may be  
 accepted of the saints.”

Consequently, it is probable, that it was now near the end  
 of the three months, that the apostle staid in Greece.  
 Whence “ he returned to Macedonia, and after the days of  
 unleavened bread sailed from Philippi to Troas,” upon the  
 continent of Asia, Acts xx. 3—6. And then went to Jeru-  
 salem, where he arrived about the time of Pentecost in the  
 year 58.

If St. Paul came to Corinth in November 57, the epistle  
 to the Romans might be sent thence in the month of Febru-  
 ary, in the year 58.

## SECT. IX.

### *The Epistle to the Ephesians.*

Concerning St. Paul’s epistles, written during his impris-  
 onment at Rome, particularly the epistle to the Ephesians.

Soon after writing the epistle to the Romans, as was before hinted, Paul set out from Corinth, on his journey to Jerusalem. In a short time after his arrival there, he was apprehended. And he was kept a prisoner in that country till he was sent to Rome.

During his stay in Judea, we know not of his corresponding with any churches, or particular persons, by writing. But at Rome, though a prisoner, he wrote divers letters. Grotius says, that<sup>z</sup> though all St. Paul's epistles are excellent, he most admires those written by him when a prisoner at Rome. And of the epistle to the Ephesians he says, it<sup>a</sup> surpasseth all human eloquence.

It is generally supposed, that St. Paul wrote there four epistles: to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. Jerom has twice<sup>b</sup> spoken of these four epistles, as written at Rome. Theodoret having spoken of the epistle to the Romans, as the seventh in order, and the last of those that were sent from Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia, says: 'The<sup>c</sup> rest were sent from Rome: the first of which I take to be that written to the Galatians.' Lightfoot<sup>d</sup> likewise supposed the epistle to the Galatians to have been written at Rome, and the first of those that were written there. That is a wrong computation, as must appear from what has been already said. But beside the four above mentioned, the second epistle to Timothy might be written at this season. The epistle to the Hebrews likewise, if it be Paul's, was probably written about this time, either during the apostle's imprisonment, or soon after it, before he left Rome and Italy.

St. Paul's imprisonment, from the time of his being apprehended at Jerusalem, to his coming to Rome, was the space of almost, or quite three years. For a short time he was confined in the castle of Antonia at Jerusalem. Thence he was sent to Cæsarea by the sea-side, the seat of the Roman governor, who at that time was Felix. Where he was kept

<sup>z</sup> Omnes epistolæ Pauli egregiæ sunt; sed omnium in primis, quæ Romæ ex vinculis missæ sunt. Gr. Pr. in ep. ad Col. <sup>a</sup> ——— rerum sublimitatem adæquans verbis sublimioribus, quam ulla unquam habuit lingua humana. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Eph.

<sup>b</sup> Quod Romæ in vincula conjectus, hæc epistolam miserit eo tempore, quo ad Philemonem, et ad Colossenses, et ad Philippenses, in alio loco scriptas esse monstravimus. Hieron. in Eph. cap. iii. T. IV. p. 347.

Scribit igitur ad Philemonem Romæ vinctus in carcere, quo tempore mihi videntur ad Philippenses, Colossenses, et Ephesios epistolæ esse dictatæ. In Philem. ib. p. 445. in.

<sup>c</sup> Τας γαρ ὄη ἀλλας ἀπο της Ῥωμης ἐπεσευλε· και πρωτην μεν ἡγγαμαι την προς Γαλατας γραφηναι. T. III. p. 5.

<sup>d</sup> Lightf. Vol. i. p. 323.

in Herod's judgment-hall, Acts xxiii. 35. And though afterwards there was an order for enlarging the first strictness of his custody, "and that his acquaintance should be permitted to come to him, and minister to him," ch. xxiv. 23, I suppose he was still confined in the above-mentioned prison. And, perhaps, this new order imported little more, than leave for his friends to bring him needful refreshments, and take care of his health. It does not appear, that during the space of two years and several months, whilst he was in Judea, he wrote any letters, or received any, as before intimated. Says <sup>e</sup>Wall: 'Those two years of imprisonment under Felix seem to have been the most unactive part of St. Paul's life. There is no account of any preachings, or disputations, or of any epistles written in this space.' Indeed, considering the violent opposition made by the Jews throughout the whole space of the apostle's being in that country, I apprehend there was no attempt made by Paul, or his friends, to procure him intelligence from the christian churches abroad: and that the Roman governor could not allow of any such thing. He would rather have set Paul at liberty, and let him go quite away. But when Paul was brought to Rome, though he was under a guard, he was "suffered to dwell by himself, in his own hired house." Acts xxviii. 16—30, where he was two years. Having such liberty, he wisely improved it, not only by discoursing with all those who came to him, but also by writing several epistles.

Of all these epistles, the first written seems to me to be that to the Ephesians. I think it was drawn up by the apostle, as soon as conveniently could be after his friends at Rome had taken a lodging for him, and he was settled in it. A. D. 61.

The epistle is inscribed "to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." But I apprehend that the apostle thought of the christians throughout Asia, properly so called, whether living at Ephesus, the chief city of the country, or not. To the like purpose <sup>f</sup>Hammond: and also Mr. Pyle, who paraphraseth the first verse of the epistle in this manner: 'Paul, called to be an apostle, sendeth this epistle to the church of Ephesus, and to all the christians of the lesser Asia, those faithful christians, that

<sup>e</sup> Notes upon the N. T. p. 267, 268.

<sup>f</sup> Ephesum fuisse primam Metropolim Lydiæ, vel proconsularis Asiæ, ostendimus in notis ad Coloss. iv. 16. Itaque epistola hæc, Ephesiis inscripta, non est putanda ad eos solos pertinere, verum etiam ad alias urbes provinciæ, imo et totius Asiæ. Hammond. Præf. in ep. ad Eph.

· firmly rely upon the christian religion for salvation, without the observation of the Mosaical ceremonies.’ We are led to this supposition by what St. Paul says near the conclusion of his first epistle to the Corinthians, written at Ephesus: “the churches of Asia salute you,” 1 Cor. ch. xvi. 19. And that epistle to the Corinthians is addressed “to the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.” And the second epistle to the Corinthians is addressed “to the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia.”

After the salutation of these christians, at the beginning of the epistle, he praiseth God for the gospel-dispensation, now made known to all men, agreeably to the gracious purpose long since formed in the divine counsels. “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world,” ver. 3, 4, to 12. He then reminds them of their first faith in the gospel, and the circumstances of it. “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise. Which is the earnest of our inheritance,”—ver. 13, 14. After which he lets them know, that in his confinement, since he came to Rome, he had heard of the continuance of their faith, and of their love for all christians in general: which had filled him with transports of joy and satisfaction. “Wherefore I also, having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers: that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom:” or that they might be more and more illuminated, and established in the principles of true religion, ver. 15, 16, and to ver. 23.

The account that had been brought him of the christians at Ephesus by Tychicus, as may be supposed, having been very agreeable, the apostle does not censure them for any great irregularities in conduct, as he does the Corinthians, nor for any remarkable deviations from the simplicity of the gospel, or instability therein, as he does the Galatians. But he treats them with mildness. However, he sends them a pathetic exhortation to persevere in a conversation becoming their profession and their privileges, and to guard against the temptations which they might meet with,



either from heathen idolaters, or corrupt and self-interested christians.

At the end he tells them that he had sent Tychicus, who would give them information concerning his affairs, and comfort them, ch. vi. 21, 22. And then adds: "Peace be to the brethren, and love, with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," ver. 23. "Peace be to the brethren," that is, the brethren with you at Ephesus, to whom the epistle is directed. So 1 Thess. v. 27, "I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren:" meaning the brethren or christians at Thessalonica. So to the Philippians. ch. iv. 21, "Salute every saint in Christ Jesus," meaning, undoubtedly, the christians at Philippi. And then at ver. 22, "All the saints salute you:" meaning all the christians in general at Rome. It was not needful to say, of this place. The meaning is obvious.

The concluding words of this epistle are these at ver. 23, "Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity:" which, I think, may be understood and paraphrased after this manner. 'And grace be with all those, who, like you, love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.'

That is a brief and general account of the epistle itself. I must add somewhat in behalf of the early date of it, which is here assigned by me.

There might be many considerations inducing the apostle to write to the Ephesians soon after his arrival at Rome. Ephesus was a place of great importance, being the chief city of Asia, where was a great resort of merchants, and all other people. Here the apostle chose to settle that eminent disciple of his, Timothy. Here also St. John took up his residence after he had left Judea. It was the place where Paul had been longer than in any other city, except Antioch. Here also he had wrought many and special miracles, and had great success in his preaching, Acts xix. Moreover, he had intended them a visit, 1 Tim. iii. 14, but had been prevented. When he went to Jerusalem, it is likely, that it was earnestly desired, and confidently expected by the christians at Ephesus. Such expectations are sufficiently intimated by St. Luke, Acts xx. 15—17. "The next day we came to Miletus. For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia; for he hasted, if possible, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost. And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church." Where having made a pathetic discourse, all present were much affected, and gave testi-

monies of a fervent and high esteem. These things must have made impressions upon the apostle, and have been well remembered by him: and may have induced him to think of writing first to this church upon his coming to Rome, and having liberty of correspondence.

There might be likewise some other reasons for this determination. The epistle is carried by Tychicus, who was of Asia, and probably an Ephesian. Mr. Biscoe<sup>g</sup> thought that Tychicus accompanied the apostle in his voyage to Rome. But for that I see no ground. I rather think, that like divers others of his fellow-labourers, Tychicus had come to Rome of his own accord, to meet Paul, and to attend upon him: or had been sent by the Ephesians, to pay their respects to him, and inquire into the state of his affairs. It seems to me, that Tychicus was one of the first who came to the apostle, and very soon after his arrival at Rome. Yet, possibly, Tychicus was got thither before him, as some other of the apostle's friends likewise might be. However, Tychicus being now at Rome, he was a very fit person to go with a letter from the apostle to Ephesus.

If we duly attend to the apostle's situation, after having been above two years in a close confinement at Cæsarea, we may be able to discern the reason of several things. Particularly, we may perceive, why this is a kind of general epistle, not much concerning itself with the affairs and circumstances of any church: but delivering, first, the doctrine of the gospel, and then the duties of it, with a fulness scarcely equalled in any other of the apostolical epistles. As Theodoret said: 'The<sup>h</sup> former part of the epistle contains the doctrine of the gospel, the latter part a moral admonition.' Or as a learned modern says: 'Being somewhat in the manner of an institute.' The apostle might well judge it best to write thus in his first letter, written after a long silence: and in this manner, to remind his friends and converts in Asia of the principles of the gospel, and their obligations as christians.

We are likewise hence led to discern the great beauty and propriety of the several places of this epistle, where the apostle speaks of his bonds, ch. iii. 1. "I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles." That for their cause he was now in bonds, appears from the history of his imprisonment, as related by St. Luke in the Acts, and particularly, from what is said, ch. xxii. 21, 22, and the following verses. There is an especial suitableness in that expression of the apostle, in a letter written soon after his arrival at Rome, and

<sup>g</sup> Upon the Acts, p. 435.

<sup>h</sup> See Vol. v. p. 17.

especially, if it be the first letter written by him after his being apprehended, as I think it is. And having enlarged somewhat farther upon his having been appointed an apostle by Christ, for forwarding the gospel among Gentiles, he goes on, and endeavours to comfort these christians, and all Gentile converts in general, with regard to the afflictive dispensation, which he was under, and which might appear very strange to many, ver. 13, “Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory.” Again: iv. 1, “I therefore the prisoner of the Lord beseech you.” And ch. vi. 20, he calls himself “an ambassador in bonds.” How suitable is this to the apostle's circumstances, if we consider him now lately arrived in the city of Rome, the capital of the Roman empire, and the seat of the emperor.

I cannot forbear transcribing that passage, ch. vi. 18—20, “Praying for all saints, — and for me, that utterance may be given to me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel. For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.” Wherein I do not think the apostle so much desires these christians to pray for his enlargement, as that he might discharge his commission aright: and speak with the freedom and boldness of an ambassador from a great prince: though he was chained as a prisoner, and had not the outward pomp and state, usual with men of that high character. This was very proper at the time of his arrival at Rome, where he was likely to continue some while.

There is a like passage in Col. iv. 3, 4, which, I think, ought not to be understood very differently.

It is also an argument, that this epistle was written by the apostle soon after his coming to Rome: that here are no expressions, denoting hopes of enlargement, as there are in the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon: written, as we suppose, not long before his deliverance. Nor does he here take any notice of successes obtained at Rome, or give any intimations of converts made by him there, as he does, Philip. i. 12, 13, 14; iv. 22. He seems indeed to have pleased himself with a prospect of recommending the gospel in his present situation, ch. ii. 7—10, like to what he says, 2 Tim. iv. 17, an epistle written about the same time. But he does not intimate any advantages obtained as yet. Nor does he at the end of this epistle send such salutations, as at the end of the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. All which must lead us to think, that the circumstances of the apostle at writing this epistle were dif-

ferent from his circumstances at writing those epistles: when his captivity, as is allowed, was near its period.

Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 12, “And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.” It is likely that the apostle there refers to the epistle of which we are now speaking. He had just sent, or was sending away Tychicus to Ephesus with this epistle. I think I shall presently show, that the second epistle to Timothy was written in the first year of the apostle’s imprisonment at Rome, and not very long after his arrival there. Consequently this epistle, being there referred to, must have been sent about the same time.

That the epistle to the Ephesians is here referred to, has been the opinion of many. So thought <sup>1</sup>Tillemont. Who, supposing that the second to Timothy was written in a second imprisonment of the apostle at Rome, placeth the writing of this to the Ephesians in the year 65. Whitby, in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians, observes, ‘In his close of this epistle St. Paul speaks ‘thus to them, ch. vi. 21, 22, “That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.—Tychicus shall make known unto you all things.”’—And in the second epistle to Timothy he saith, “Tychicus have I sent unto Ephesus,” 2 Tim. iv. 12. So Whitby. But forgetting, as it seems, what he had said in some other places. However, this shows how natural and easy it is to think the epistle to the Ephesians intended in that place of the second to Timothy. And it is what most would think, if not biassed by some prejudice.

Theodoret, in his general preface to St. Paul’s epistles, says, ‘the <sup>k</sup>apostle sent to the Ephesians and the Colossians ‘at the same time, and sent them by the same messenger,’ meaning Tychicus. But in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians, having quoted Eph. vi. 21, 22, he goes on: ‘And<sup>l</sup> that he sent Tychicus from Rome, he shows in his ‘second epistle to Timothy, saying, do thy diligence to come to me shortly. — And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus,’ 2 Tim. iv. 10—12. So Theodoret, without considering the consequence. For he supposed the second to Timothy to have been written but a short time before the apostle’s martyrdom. But if the epistle to the Ephesians was written when the apostle was first at Rome (as Theodoret allows) and if he refers to it in his second epistle to Timothy, it will

<sup>1</sup> Saint Paul, art. 49. et Note 58. Mem. Ec. Tom. I.

<sup>k</sup> Και μεν τῶν καὶ Ἐφεσίοις καὶ Κολοσσαίων κατα τὸν αὐτὸν ἐγράψεν χρόνον, ἐν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἑακοστῶν ἀμφοτέρων χρησαμένους. Theod. T. III. p. 5.

<sup>l</sup> Τὸν δὲ μακαρίων Τυχικὸν ἀπο τῆς Ῥώμης ἀπέστειλε καὶ ταῦτο ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐμοθεὸν δευτέρᾳ εἰδασκεῖ. κ. λ. Ib. p. 292. A.

follow, that this was written soon after that to the Ephesians, and when the apostle was first at Rome.

However, there are difficulties attending this opinion which must be considered.

First, it is said that the epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians were sent by the same messenger. *Comp. Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7, 8.* The epistle to the Colossians was sent away from Rome when the apostle had hopes of enlargement. Consequently, the epistle to the Ephesians was written about the same time.

I answer, that this is no proof. For Tychicus might be sent twice into the same country, in the time of the apostle's two years' imprisonment. Tychicus might be sent to Ephesus, with this letter to the Ephesians, soon after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and come back to him, and be able to take another journey into those parts a year after, when the apostle was about to be set at liberty.

Secondly, it is said that there is a great agreement between the epistle to the Ephesians, and that to the Colossians. This last, as is allowed, was written in the second year of the apostle's confinement, and when it was near its end. Consequently, the epistle to the Ephesians was written about the same time.

To which I answer: undoubtedly, there is an agreement between these epistles in several things, taken notice of by <sup>m</sup>Grotius and others. But it does not therefore follow that they were sent away together. For, as has been observed by <sup>n</sup>Lightfoot, it is likely that the apostle kept copies of his letters. If so, it might be easy for him to write after the same manner at different times, to people not very remote from each other, and whose circumstances were much alike. Indeed, without keeping copies of his letters, I believe it would be no difficult matter for St. Paul to repeat the christian principles, and exhortations to christian virtues, at several times, in like expressions, if the circumstances of men required it.

And there are several things in the epistles themselves, which afford good reason for thinking that they were not

<sup>m</sup> Proxima huic et argumento, et verbis etiam, est illa ad Colossenses, eodem, ni fallor, scripta tempore. Grot. Præf. in ep. ad Eph. Vid. et ejusd. Pr. in ep. ad Coloss.

<sup>n</sup> 'It may be the "parchments," 2 Tim. iv. 13, were the originals of those epistles that he had already written. For that he sent transcripts, and reserved the originals, may be collected from these passages. "I Tertius, who wrote out this epistle," Rom. xvi. 22. See also 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17. For all the epistle beside was written with another hand.' Harmony of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 316.

written and sent away at the same time : and that the epistle to the Colossians was written some while after that to the Ephesians. From what is said in the second chapter of the epistle to the Colossians, concerning the worshipping of angels, and other matters, it may be concluded, that the apostle had received from those parts some intelligence, which he had not, when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians. For there those matters are not at all touched upon.

And though there is a resemblance between these two epistles, they are very different. For the epistle to the Ephesians is a good deal longer than that to the Colossians, though the fore-mentioned article in the second chapter to the Colossians is entirely wanting : and in those places where there is an agreement, there are differences.

Nor is there in the epistle to the Ephesians any notice taken of Timothy, or Epaphras, or Mark, so expressly mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians. Which must be reckoned a very strong, and even a demonstrative argument, that these two epistles were not written and sent away at the same time.

In this date of the epistle to the Ephesians I have followed ° Lightfoot : from whom I have had great assistances in settling the time of St. Paul's epistles. I have likewise had, in this instance, assistances from <sup>p</sup>Baronius, <sup>q</sup>Estius, <sup>r</sup>Hammond, and <sup>s</sup>Witsius.

Baronius<sup>t</sup> and Lightfoot first speak of the second epistle to Timothy, though they do not deny the epistle to the Ephesians to have been written before it. But as we are now inquiring into the order of time, I have judged it best to adhere to that strictly. A few weeks, yea, a few days, might make a great alteration in the apostle's circumstances at this time. And some of his friends and assistants might be daily coming to Rome from the provinces, and getting access to him in his apartment. By comparing these two epistles I am led to think, that when the apostle wrote the second epistle to Timothy, he had been longer at Rome, and was better acquainted with the world about him, than when he wrote the epistle to the Ephesians.

Basnage is singular in his sentiment concerning the time of this epistle. 'That<sup>u</sup> it was written at Rome, when Paul

° As before, p. 325.

<sup>p</sup> Annal. 59. num. xv. Vid. et num. xx.

<sup>q</sup> Præf. in ep. ad Eph.

<sup>r</sup> Præf. in ep. ad Ephes.

<sup>s</sup> Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. xii. num. vi. et ix.

<sup>t</sup> Hæc cum ita sint, nos tamen primun egimus de ipsâ ad Timotheum scriptâ epistolâ, eo quod multa in eâ de rebus suis Romæ gestis ipse significet, ex quibus intexeretur historia; quarum nulla est mentio in Epistolâ ad Ephesios. Baron. Ann. 59. num. xv.

<sup>u</sup> Epistolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exa-

‘ was prisoner there,’ he says, ‘ is manifest. But he thinks ‘ it to have been the last epistle which was sent thence by ‘ the apostle. He argues well enough that it was not sent ‘ with the epistle to the Colossians. And he supposeth that ‘ Tychicus was sent twice into these countries by the apostle ‘ from Rome.’ He should therefore have concluded, that this letter to the Ephesians was carried by Tychicus, not after those other epistles, but before them.

Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 12, “ And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.” I suppose the apostle here to refer to the epistle to the Ephesians, which was carried from Rome to Ephesus by Tychicus. But still, perhaps, it may be questioned, whether those two epistles, that to the Ephesians, and the second to Timothy, were sent away together. Baronius<sup>v</sup> says they were. He says, the apostle puts the preterit for the present. So Eph. vi. 21, 22.—“ That ye may know my affairs, and how I do.—Tychicus—shall make known unto you all things, whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose.” And unquestionably, that way of speaking is not uncommon. Instances are obvious. So Philem. ver. 12, “ Whom I have sent again.” Which may be rendered: “ whom I am sending again” to you. See also ver. 19—21, and Philip. ii. 28. So here in 2 Tim. iv. 12. The words may be rendered: “ And Tychicus I am sending to Ephesus.” Nevertheless, as that interpretation in this place is not certain, I would not be positive. The epistle to the Ephesians, I think, was carried from Rome by Tychicus, either at the same time with the second to Timothy, or a short time only before it.

And, according to my calculation, the epistle to the Ephesians was written at Rome, soon after the apostle's arrival there, in 61, and before the summer of that year. It was the first epistle written by the apostle in that city.

ravit Apostolus, ea quæ ad Ephesios, ultima esse videtur. Ludovico enim Capello non assentimur, qui eodem tempore ad Colossenses et ad Ephesios epistolam scriptam esse statuit.—Agebat Romæ Epaphras, dum Paulus scribit Colossensibus. Col. i. 8. Urbe autem aberat, cum ad Ephesios misit epistolam, in quâ ne verbulo quidem meminit Epaphræ. Quinetiam non, ut ad Colossenses, sic et ad Ephesios, nomine suo et Timothei scribit. Præterea per Tychicum missa est epistola. Eph. vi. 21. Quæ de aliâ prorsus Tychici perfectione intelligenda sunt, quam cujus meminit ad Colossenses iv. 12. Alioquin Timothei ac Epaphræ mentionem quoque injecisset. Ann. 61. num. vii.

<sup>v</sup> Verum eidem tabellario, nempe Tychico, dedit etiam tunc Paulus epistolam ad Ephesios. Licet in eâ ad Timotheum dicat: ‘ Tychicum misi Ephesum: tamen præteritum tempus pro præsentis usurpasse videtur, sicut cum, ad Ephesios de eodem scribens, ait: ‘ Ut autem et vos sciatis, quæ circa me sunt—nota faciet Tychicus—quem misi ad vos ad hoc ipsum.’—Bar. ann. 59. num. xv.

And it was sent away a short time before the second epistle to Timothy, of which I shall speak next, or together with it.

## SECT. X.

### *The second Epistle to Timothy.*

We come now to the second epistle to Timothy, which we suppose to have been sent away together with that to the Ephesians, or soon after it, A. D. 61.

Many learned men speak of a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome, and suppose that this second epistle to Timothy was then written, in 67 or 68. But I do not know that we have any good account of a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome. He suffered martyrdom there, as some think, in 64 or 65, or as others, in 67 or 68. But that he might do, without a previous imprisonment of any duration. For he might be apprehended on a sudden, and be put to death presently. Which may be reckoned as likely as not.

Before I proceed to the proofs that this second epistle to Timothy was written during Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when he was sent thither from Judea by Festus, I would premise, that I suppose, with most learned moderns, that Timothy was now at Ephesus.

It has been thought that Timothy was not there, because it is said, ch. iv. 12, "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus." But that argument is of no force. There was no need to say, I have sent Tychicus to you. There are many similar, or parallel ways of speaking in St. Paul's epistles, 1 Cor. xv. 32. He speaks of his having "fought with beasts at Ephesus:" where he certainly was at that time, as appears from xvi. 8. And 2 Tim. i. 17, he says: "When Onesiphorus was at Rome he sought me out very diligently." He does not say, when he was here. Lightfoot<sup>w</sup> observes, that from the epistle itself it may be concluded, that Timothy was at Ephesus. For, 1. He directs him to salute the household of Onesiphorus, ch. iv. 19, who was an Ephesian, ch. i. 16—18. 2. He directs Timothy to take Troas in his way to him, ch. iv. 13, which was the way that Paul had gone from Ephesus, 2 Cor. ii. 12, and to Ephesus again, Acts xx. 5. 3. He warns him of Alexander, ch. iv. 14, who was an Ephesian, 1 Tim. i. 20; Acts xix. 33. So Lightfoot. To which, I think, may be added, 4. Paul's salutation of Priscilla and Aquila, ch. iv. 19, who, probably, were now

<sup>w</sup> Vol. i. p. 324.



returned to Ephesus, and settled there, where they had been formerly, Acts xviii. 18, 19—26; and 1 Cor. xvi. 19. For certainly they were not now at Rome, where Paul himself was: though they were there when he wrote the epistle to the Romans, ch. xvi. 3, 4.

Here it may be asked: when did Timothy come to Ephesus? And how long had he been there? I answer, that by a very easy and probable conjecture, it may be concluded, that he was left there when Paul was going up to Jerusalem, with the collections which he had made among the Gentile christians, for the poor saints in Judea. For Timothy is expressly mentioned by St. Luke among the apostle's company in that journey, Acts xx. 3, 4, 5. "And as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia, Sopater of Berea—and Timothy, and of Asia, Tychicus, and Trophimus." Timothy therefore was in Paul's company, and went with him as far as Asia, in which Ephesus stood. And so far, I suppose, all above mentioned accompanied Paul, but not into Syria. I apprehend that Timothy and Tychicus stayed in Asia. For we have not any intimations from St. Luke or St. Paul, or any way, that these two were with the apostle at Jerusalem.

Every one is here able to recollect, that when Paul went into Macedonia in the year 56, about the time of Pentecost, he left Timothy at Ephesus, 1 Tim. i. 3. But for some reasons, which may be well supposed to have been good and sufficient, he came from thence to Paul in Macedonia. For he is joined with Paul in the salutation, at the beginning of the second epistle to the Corinthians. And, as has been just seen, he attended Paul when he left Macedonia to proceed to Jerusalem. But no man can doubt that Paul would be willing to replace Timothy at Ephesus, where his presence was of great importance, if an opportunity should offer. Such an opportunity there now was. And, very probably, it was embraced. And Paul parted with him at Miletus, where he had sent for the elders of the church of Ephesus to meet him.

Tillemont says: 'It<sup>s</sup> is not said what became of Timothy during the two years that St. Paul was prisoner in Judea.' I think I may presume to say he was all that time at Ephesus, and parts adjacent in Asia. Du Pin was of the same opinion, whose words I transcribe<sup>y</sup> below.

\* S. Timothée, Mem. T. II.

<sup>y</sup> On pourroit dire néanmoins, et je ne m'éloignerois pas de ce sentiment, que S. Paul le laissa à Ephèse, quand s'étant arrêté à Milet, il envoya quérir les prêtres de l'église d'Ephèse

Tillemont adds presently afterwards : ‘ It is however certain, that Timothy was at Rome, when the apostle wrote to Philemon, the Philippians, and the Colossians : forasmuch as he is named jointly with him in the titles of those three epistles.’ How Timothy came to be then at Rome, we shall see presently.

Paul therefore parted with Timothy at Miletus, as just said. And I think that when the elders of Ephesus were come to Miletus, Timothy joined himself with them, and stood at the head of them : and consequently was one of those, of whom it is said : “ And they all wept sore, and fell on Paul’s neck, and kissed him : sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him to the ship,” Acts xx. 37, 38.

Of this Paul takes notice in the most affectionate manner, 2 Tim. i. 4, “ Greatly desirous to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy.” Doubtless Paul was much affected by the tears of all the rest, but especially Timothy’s : and was now “ greatly desirous to see him,” who had been so deeply struck with the thoughts of never seeing his face any more.

Timothy, then, was at Ephesus when this epistle was sent to him. And he had been there from the time that Paul left Miletus, to go to Jerusalem, and during his imprisonment in Judea.

The observation that Paul here refers to the tears shed by his friends at his parting with them at Miletus, appears to me very obvious : though it has been hitherto entirely overlooked, so far as I know. And it will directly lead us to the true date of this epistle. It is a most proper beginning of a letter sent by Paul to Timothy at Ephesus, soon after his arrival at Rome from Palestine, at the time we suppose : but it is very unlikely to be taken notice of in an epistle written several years afterwards, and after there had been an interview, as there certainly was, when Paul was at Rome.

I shall now observe divers particulars, confirming the supposition, that St. Paul’s second epistle to Timothy was written during the apostle’s imprisonment at Rome, and near the beginning of it.

Act. xx. ver. 17. Car nous lisons, que, comme S. Paul parloit pour aller en Asie par Macédoine, Timothée fut un de ceux qui l’accompagnèrent en Asie. ch. xx. 4. Et nous ne trouvons plus Timothée à sa compagnie, ni à Jerusalem, ni pendant sa prison de Césarée. Si cela est, Timothée aura été établi par S. Paul pour gouverner les églises d’Asie en 58. Du Pin, Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. viii.

I. The circumstances of the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus, and at the time of writing this epistle, are exactly the same.

Says St. Luke, Acts xxviii. 16, "Paul was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him." And ver. 30, "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him."

Here are two remarkable particulars. First, that Paul "dwelt by himself, with a soldier that kept him:" that is, after the manner of the Romans, by an iron chain of convenient length, he was fastened to a soldier, who had one end of the chain upon his left hand, and Paul the other end upon his right hand, as was largely shown<sup>z</sup> formerly. To this St. Paul refers in this his second epistle to Timothy, i. 16, speaking of Onesiphorus: "He oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain." So exactly, Acts xxviii. 20, "Because for the hope of Israel, I am bound with this chain."

Secondly. The other remarkable particular is, that when at Rome, "Paul dwelt in his own hired house, and received all who came in unto him." Such also was his case at writing this epistle, as appears abundantly from ch. iv. 10, and other places. He had with him Demas, Crescens, Titus. The first was gone to Thessalonica, without his approbation: the others were gone, whither he had sent them, as it seems. And Luke was still with him. And at ver. 21, he sends salutations to Timothy from divers persons, and from the church at Rome in general, saying: "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren." Which shows that people had free access to the apostle when he wrote this epistle.

I. Obj. However, it has been objected, that<sup>a</sup> when Onesiphorus came to Rome, Paul was close shut up, and Onesiphorus had much difficulty in finding him. Which is different from the imprisonment of which St. Luke has given an account.

To which I answer, that Onesiphorus had no uncommon difficulty in his access to Paul, whose words are, 2 Tim. i. 16, 17, "The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus.

<sup>z</sup> See Vol. i. B. I. ch. x.

<sup>a</sup> In secundis vinculis alia statim rerum facies fuit. Tunc enim 'Onesiphorus,' inquit, 'cum Romam venisset, sollicite me quæsit, et invenit,' i. 17. An opus erat, ut Onesiphorus *σπευδαοτερον*, et cum tanto studio ac sollicitudine quæreret Paulum, et ex tam sedulâ inquisitione inveniret, si apostolus aut in eadem domo, aut cum eadem libertate, et non in arêta et abdita custodiâ prædicasset? Pearson, De Success. primor. Rom. Episcop. Diss. i. cap. 9. n. viii.

For he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain. But when he was at Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and came unto me :” that is, I think : ‘ Onesiphorus has ‘ been often with me, and refreshed me, with presents, and ‘ with his conversation, without being at all ashamed of me, ‘ though I had a chain upon me.’ Which shows, that Onesiphorus might come to visit the apostle, when he pleased : and might give him as much relief as he saw good. ‘ Yea, ‘ says the apostle, as soon as he came to Rome, he made inquiries after me, and came to see me without delay.’

Here appear not any tokens of Paul’s being under a very strict confinement. But here are evidences of his being in such a condition, as that represented by St. Luke, when he had been brought from Judea to Rome. Onesiphorus seems to have come to Rome soon after the apostle’s arrival there. In order to find him out, and know where he was, it was needful to make some inquiries. How else should any man find a stranger in a great city ? Whether he was quite at liberty, or in one of the prisons of it, some inquiries would be needful. And when Onesiphorus had found the place where Paul was, he came to it without any difficulty.

Witsins<sup>b</sup> speaks exactly to the like purpose : and supposeth, that after some inquiries, (such as are needful, when a man comes to a large city, and wants to see a stranger newly arrived,) Onesiphorus found Paul with the soldier in his own hired house.

The case I take to be this. Onesiphorus came to Rome upon his own secular business. He knew very well that Paul had been carried thither as a prisoner. But what was become of him he did not know : whether he had been set at liberty, or was still a prisoner, or had been put to death. Upon coming to Rome therefore, not long after Paul had been brought thither, he made anxious inquiries after him. And hearing where Paul was, he readily came to him, notwithstanding his disgraceful circumstances, being chained to a soldier. And so long as he stayed in Rome, he made the apostle frequent visits, and afforded him such refreshment as was in his power.

<sup>b</sup> Quando Onesiphorus Paulum Romæ quæsitum venit, non videtur invenisse in carcerem conjectum, arctâque custodiâ detentum, sed militi suo alligatum, in diversiolo. Sic enim Paulus : *Και την ἀλυσιν με οὐκ ἐπησχυνθη.* —Et sane quamvis vincula Pauli nota fuerint in toto Prætorio, non tamen inde consequitur, Pauli domum ita notam omnibus fuisse, ut homini peregre advenienti, in urbe quæ orbis compendium erat, ad captivi Judæi domum inveniendam diligenti inquisitione non fuerit opus. Præsertim si attendamus, facta hæc esse initio vinculorum Pauli, antequam eum celebritatis gradum esset nactus. Wits. ubi supra, sect. 12. num. vi.

2. Obj. But it is urged, that St. Paul says, 2 Tim. ii. 9,<sup>c</sup> —“Wherein I suffer, as an evil doer, even unto bonds.”

To which I answer, that the word, here rendered bonds, is the same that is used in other epistles, written during the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus. Col. iv. 18, “Remember my bonds.” *Μνημονεύετε με των δεσμων.* The same word is used at least four times in the epistle to the Philippians, ch. i. 7, 13, 14, 16, and in Philem. ver. 10, and 13; Hebr. x. 34. And to the Ephesians he says, ch. iii. 1, “I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ,” *ὁ δεσμιος.* And ch. iv. 1, “The prisoner of the Lord.” Not to mention any other places. When Paul was so bound, he had reason to say, “he suffered as an evil-doer,” or malefactor, “even unto bonds.” He was not a malefactor, or notorious offender, nor a criminal: but was innocent in the view of the Roman laws, as well as in point of reason, justice, and equity. But he suffered, “as an evil-doer.” Had he not reason to say so when he was sent bound from Judea to Rome? Had he not been prosecuted as a malefactor? Did not the Jewish multitude, who first laid hold of him, intend to kill him? Acts xxi. 31—36; xxiii. 27; xxiv. 6. Did not the multitude, who heard him with patience for a while, at length say: “Away with such a fellow. For it is not fit that he should live?” ch. xxii. 22. Does not Festus say to king Agrippa, and the large assembly at Cæsarea, “Ye see this man, about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jerusalem, and also here, crying, that he ought not to live any longer?” ch. xxv. 24. So that he was prosecuted as a malefactor all the while that he was in Judea. Nor does it appear that there was any likelihood of his escape, but by appealing to the emperor. And was he not after all sent bound to Rome with many obnoxious persons under the command of a centurion? Certainly, I think, these things afforded sufficient ground for Paul to say what he does in this place to Timothy.

But to insinuate from these expressions that Paul was now in some close confinement, his friends debarred access to him, and himself forbid the use of pen, ink, and paper, I humbly conceive, is altogether without foundation. It is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the epistle, and with the apostle's writing, or inditing, and sending such a letter as this to Timothy. Wherein too he desires Timothy to come unto him.

St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus, was occasioned by his zeal for the liberty of the

<sup>c</sup> *Εν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ μέχρι δεσμων, ὡς κακῆργος.*

Gentiles, as is manifest from Acts xxii. 21, 22. Of which he also takes notice, Eph. iii. 1, saying: "I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for you Gentiles." His imprisonment at Rome, at the time of writing this epistle, was owing to the same thing. For he says here, ch. i. 11, 12, "Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. For the which cause I also suffer these things." This is very observable. And indeed the twelve verses at the beginning of this epistle are a most proper introduction to an epistle sent to Timothy by Paul at the time for which we argue.

Thus the circumstances of Paul's confinement at the time of writing this epistle, compared with the circumstances of that confinement at Rome, of which St. Luke has given a general account, and in which it is allowed that St. Paul wrote epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, show it to be one and the same imprisonment, and that this epistle also was written about the same time with them.

St. Luke was with the apostle at Rome when he wrote this epistle, 2 Tim. iv. 11. And we know from the Acts, that he went with Paul from Judea to Rome, when he was sent thither by Festus. He is likewise mentioned in the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, written during this imprisonment. But it would be presumption to say, that St. Luke was with the apostle at Rome, in another imprisonment, three, or four, or five years after this: especially, when we see that his history of St. Paul in the book of the Acts, concludes with the account of his two years' imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither by Festus.

3. Since the apostle's coming to Rome, he had had with him, beside Luke, who accompanied him, Demas, Crescens, Titus, Tychicus, four of his assistants and fellow-labourers. Which might be likely enough to be expected, when Paul was sent from Judea to Rome. But it cannot be said to have been likely at any other season. But at this it was. For Paul's imprisonment in Judea had lasted above two years. And it must have been known to all Gentile christians throughout the world, and observed by them with astonishment and grief. And his last appearance before Festus and others, at Caesarea, was a very remarkable thing, and must have soon come to the knowledge of all christians in Syria, Asia, Greece, and Italy. At that assembly it was determined that Paul should go to Rome. He took shipping at Caesarea with others. He had a long and dangerous voyage. And after such an imprisonment in Judea, as that

related by St. Luke, with all its circumstances, it may be reckoned highly probable, that some good number of the apostle's affectionate friends, especially his fellow-labourers, if not too much engaged, should form a design, and do their utmost, to meet him at Rome. It seems to me very likely, that some such persons should with this view get to Rome, before Paul himself. Accordingly, we have seen four such persons mentioned by Paul in this epistle. It is a striking circumstance, and exceedingly favours our argument for the time of this epistle.

4. Says St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 20. "Erastus abode at Corinth:" which is agreeable to the account of St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem, as related by St. Luke. For Acts xix. 22, Erastus is expressly mentioned as "one of those who ministered to Paul," whom he sent from Ephesus to Macedonia. Nor is Erastus among those who went with Paul from Macedonia, Acts xx. 4. It<sup>d</sup> is therefore very likely that he stayed at Corinth, and did not go with the apostle to Jerusalem. This Timothy knew very well. Nevertheless, it<sup>e</sup> is very properly mentioned together with other particulars, showing Timothy the reasonableness of his coming to him, and the need which the apostle had of his presence.

We should here recollect what was formerly said of the apostle's situation at Rome, after a long and close confinement in Judea. And then we shall easily account for Paul's mentioning to Timothy divers things which had happened some good while before. In a word, Paul may take the same notice of several things which had happened before parting with Timothy at Miletus, in the same manner that he would have mentioned them, supposing him to have stayed but a few weeks at Jerusalem, and then sailed from Cæsarea to Rome, and soon after his arrival at Rome, had written to Timothy to come to him. For all the time of the apostle's close confinement in Judea had been sunk and annihilated in his computation.

5. In the same verse, "Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick." Another particular leading to that date of this epistle for which we argue.

We know from Acts xxi. 29, that Trophimus was with

<sup>d</sup> 'Erastus remansit Corinthi.'] Fuerat in Macedoniam missus a Paulo. Acts xix. 22. Deinde Corinthum redierat, ibique manserat, nec venerat Romam. Grot. in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

<sup>e</sup> Quod Erastum Corinthi mansisse scribit, non tamquam rem novam incognitamque Timotheo renuntiat: refert tamen, uti affinentem ad scopum suum, &c. Wits. de Vit. Pauli, sect. xii. n. vi.

Paul at Jerusalem. It may be reckoned probable that he set out with Paul from Cæsarea to go to Rome. St. Luke indeed, Acts xxvii. 2, mentions not expressly any companions of Paul in his voyage, beside himself and Aristarchus. Nevertheless Trophimus likewise may have embarked with him. The reason of not mentioning him may be, that he did not complete the voyage, having fallen sick, and therefore had been left at Miletus. This Timothy might know very well. Nevertheless it is fitly taken notice of by Paul, in a letter written soon after finishing the voyage, and when writing to Timothy to come to him.

But when was Trophimus left at Miletus? Beza<sup>f</sup> was inclined to read here *Μελιτη*, Melita, Malta, instead of *Μιλητη*, Miletus, which conjecture is approved by <sup>s</sup>Grotius. But if Miletus should be reckoned the true reading, Beza supposeth that Trophimus might be set on shore in the time of that slow sailing, mentioned, Acts xxvii. 7. Lightfoot<sup>h</sup> concludes from what is in Acts xxvii. 2, that Paul had a good opportunity to leave Trophimus at Miletus.

This will be farther confirmed, if we admit the interpretation given by Wall, without any view to the use which we are about to make of it. ‘Acts xxvii. 2, “Meaning to sail ‘by the coasts of Asia.” *Μελλουτες πλειν τες κατα την Ασιαν τωτες*. The ship meant to call at some places in Asia. This ‘is a different phrase from that, ch. xx. 16, *παρπλευσαι* ‘*Εφεσον*, to sail by Ephesus, that is, to leave it, to pass by ‘it, without calling.’ It is, then, a very easy and natural supposition, that Paul might have an opportunity of setting Trophimus on shore at Miletus.

<sup>f</sup> Nempe in illâ tardâ navigatione cum præterveheretur litus Asiæ, sicuti narratur, Act. xxvii. 7. Quamquam potius conjicio legendum *εν Μελιτη*, in Melitâ, quod vocabulum facile fuit in *Μιλητη* depravare. Bez. in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

<sup>s</sup> Omnino assentior doctissimo Bezæ legenti *εν Μελιτη*.

—In itinere Hierosolymus Paulus Meliten attigit, non Miletum. Grot. in loc.  
<sup>h</sup> ‘But when was he left? Not when Paul went toward Jerusalem, and sent ‘for the elders of Ephesus to Miletus, Acts xx. For Trophimus went, and ‘was with Paul at Jerusalem, xxi. 29. But it was when Paul returned from ‘Jerusalem, as has been said, though it be not particularly mentioned, that he ‘touched there.—Luke says plainly, that at Paul’s coming away from Judea in his voyage to Rome, it was their resolution “to sail by the coasts of ‘Asia,” Acts xxvii. 2. Which would have been a fairer ground to have ‘concluded upon, that Paul was at Miletus in this voyage, since that was a ‘part of those Asian coasts, than to change Miletus into Melita, upon no ‘ground at all. And certainly the very scope of the apostle in that passage ‘will not admit of that change. For he is not telling Timothy of Erastus’s ‘abode at Cornuth, or of Trophimus’s sick stay at Miletus, as things unknown ‘to him, but as things very well known, yet mentioned to him, as making to ‘the apostle’s purpose.’ Lightfoot’s Harmony of the N. T. vol. i. p. 324.



6. St. Paul desires Timothy to come to him shortly, ch. iv. 9. And unquestionably he did so. We find his name in the salutations at the beginning of the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, Philemon, written during this imprisonment, and near its period. Witsius<sup>i</sup> observes, that in the Acts there is no account of Timothy's accompanying Paul to Rome. Timothy therefore not being there at the beginning of the apostle's captivity in that city, he might have occasion to send a letter to him, at the time supposed by us. This particular is well enforced by Witsius at the beginning of his argument upon the date of this epistle.

7. Ver. 11, St. Paul says, "Take Mark, and bring him with thee." And doubtless Timothy did bring Mark to Rome. For he is mentioned with others, Col. iv. 10, and Philem. ver. 24, and comprehended in those general expressions, Philip. iv. 21.

Grotius in<sup>k</sup> his notes upon 2 Tim. iv. 9, 11, says the same of Timothy, Luke, and Mark, that I have done. It is strange that he did not discern the consequence which is so obvious: that this second epistle to Timothy must have been written before the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. But that he discerned this consequence, does not appear clearly from his preface to this epistle. Whether he did, or not, he admits our interpretations. And the consequence is unavoidable. It follows also from what he says upon ver. 20, of Trophimus having been left at Melita, in Paul's voyage from Judea to Rome, as before observed, and from some other things said by him in his annotations on this epistle. Which may be taken notice of hereafter.

8. Ver. 13, "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, especially the parchments."

As St. Paul went to Jerusalem by the way of Troas, we are hereby led to the time of this imprisonment; especially

<sup>i</sup> Pro certo habent, Timotheum initio priorum Pauli vinculorum Romæ non fuisse. Etenim in Actibus Apostolicis nihil ultra de Timotheo dicitur, quam quod Paulum Hierosolymam proficiscentem in Asiam fuerit comitatus, cap. xx. 4. Exinde nulla Timothei mentio; de itinere Hierosolymitano, nedum de navigatione Romanâ, *ἔδει γρον*. Quia vero res ipsius adeo Pauli rebus innexæ fuere, ipseque tam eximiam sustinuit personam, vix videtur præteriri potuisse in tantâ rerum, quæ Paulo acciderunt, varietate, &c. De Vit. Pauli. sect. 12. num. v.

<sup>k</sup> Σπείλασον ελθειν προς με ταχειως; nempe Roman. Et hoc fecit Timotheus, ut apparet, Coloss. i. 1. Philem. i. Hebr. xiii. Philip. ii. 19. Grot. in 2 Tim. iv. 9. vid. et in ver. 11.

Δσκας εστι μονος μετ' εμῶ. Nam post iter illud, quod sine Actorum descripsit, mansit in Italâ cum Paulo. Col. iv. 14. Philem. ver. 24.

Μαρκον αναλαβων αγαγε μετα σεαυτου. — Et hoc desiderium Pauli impletum est. Vide Philem. 24. Coloss. iv. 10. Id. in ver. 11.

when we consider, that Timothy accompanied the apostle in that journey as far as Asia. And Paul here seems to write to Timothy, as knowing Carpus, and that these things had been left with him.

If it be objected, that<sup>1</sup> Paul had at that time several friends with him, who might be willing to take care of those things: we<sup>m</sup> readily answer: it is true. Nor need it be supposed that in any other journey Paul was without a sufficient number of friends, to perform for him any needful service of that kind. There might be other reasons for leaving those things behind him.

We need not inquire, what were those reasons, nor what were those things. However I shall observe here what Lightfoot says of the word, rendered cloak in his account of St. Paul's journey from Troas to Jerusalem: 'when<sup>n</sup> he goes now from thence, it is most likely, was the time when he left his cloak and parchments with Carpus, 2 Tim. iv. 13. His cloak. For he was now going among his own nation in Judea, and there he was to wear his Jewish habit. And he left his Roman garb here, till he should come into those Roman quarters again.'

9. The progress of the gospel at the time of writing this epistle, and the other epistles, confessedly written in the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither from Judea, appears to be the same, or very much alike.

To the Philippians he writes, ch. i. 12, 13, "I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me, have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel: so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places." See also ver. 14—18. In this second epistle to Timothy, he says, ch. ii. 9.—that "though he suffered unto bonds, the word of God was not bound." And see ch. iv. 16, 17. And at ver. 11, he desires that Mark would come to him: "for," says he, "he is profitable to me for the ministry:" supposing, that he should

<sup>1</sup> Quia jubet sibi adferri pænulam, quam Troade apud Carpum reliquerat, et libros.—Ineptum autem est vel cogitare Paulum hæc Troade reliquisse, quum tot secum haberet comites, et collectas Hierosolymam perferendas, et navem ubique conduceret. Ap. Wits. ibid. sect. 12. num. iv.

<sup>m</sup> Respondetur: non magis ineptum esse cogitare, Paulum pænulam suam cum libris quibusdam et membranis Troade reliquisse in illo itinere, quod Lucas meminit, quam in alio, quod supponitur, quocumque. Si enim id consulto factum sit, ratio consilii æque nobis in obscuro manet; quippe nullibi tradita. Si per oblivionem aliquam aut negligentiam ejus qui Paulo ministrabat: quo plures erant, majorisque momenti sarcinæ, eo facilius esse videtur unius alicujus, et vilioris, forsan, neglectus, &c. Wits. ib. sect. 12. num. vi.

<sup>n</sup> As before, p. 298.

have employment for him, wherein he might promote the interest of the gospel. Paul could speak more distinctly of his successes, and of the oppositions which he met with at Rome, in the epistles written a short time before his enlargement. But even now he appears to have had in prospect those things, which were afterwards accomplished.

10. At ch. iii. 11, he reminds Timothy of "the persecutions and afflictions which he had endured at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, all well known to Timothy. Which is very proper and seasonable, at our supposed time of writing this epistle: more seasonable than it would have been several years afterwards.

Some, perhaps, may think it reasonable to expect more notice taken of the apostle's imprisonment in Judea, and at Rome. But we suppose that to be the very imprisonment which he was now under, and of which he often speaks in this epistle, saying, that he "suffered trouble, even unto bonds: that he endured all things for the elect's sake:" that "Onesiphorus was not ashamed of his chain:" that he had "made an apology, when all men forsook him." But if this letter had been written several years after his imprisonment in Judea and at Rome, it would have been reasonable to expect some references to it, as a thing past, in his exhortations to Timothy, in speaking of persecutions and afflictions formerly endured by him.

11. Ch. ii. 22, "Flee also youthful lusts." An exhortation to Timothy more suitable now than several years afterwards. Indeed, this whole epistle is an admonition to Timothy, as a christian and a minister, better suiting the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, when sent thither from Judea, than any later time.

12. Ch. iv. 16, 17, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.—Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear. And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion."

These words afford a strong argument that this epistle was written when Paul was sent bound from Judea to Rome. For it is much more reasonable to think that Paul would speak of such an apology in an epistle written soon after it was made, than in an epistle written five or six years afterwards. That Paul speaks of an apology made at the time supposed by us, is very probable. And this text was so understood by several ancient writers. Eusebius, Jerom, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The words of

° Eusebius I transcribe below in his own language. Jerom's words were transcribed by us<sup>p</sup> formerly, and are fit to be repeated here. They represent the same sentiment with that in Eusebius: from whom, probably, and from some other ancients, he learned it. 'It<sup>q</sup> should be observed, says he, ' that at the time of his first apology, Nero's government not ' being yet quite degenerated, nor disgraced with the horri- ' ble wickedness which historians speak of, Paul was set at ' liberty, that he might preach the gospel in the western ' parts of the world: as himself writes in the second epistle ' to Timothy, dictated by him in his bonds, at the time he ' suffered.' And what follows.

And Chrysostom, in a homily upon the fourth chapter of this epistle: 'How,' says<sup>r</sup> he, 'shall we understand this first ' apology? He was at first brought before the emperor, and ' escaped. But when he had converted his cup-bearer, then ' he was beheaded.'

Theodoret is very express in his comment. 'When<sup>s</sup> upon ' his appeal he was sent to Rome by Festus, having apolo- ' gized for himself, he was dismissed as innocent, and went ' into Spain, and other nations. — By the first apology there- ' fore he meaneth that which was then made. "And I was ' delivered out of the mouth of the lion." So he calls Nero, ' as being emperor, and a cruel man.'

Indeed this defence, or apology, cannot relate to any other time. For he says: "But the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me: that by me the preaching might be fully known, and all the Gentiles might hear." This could not be said at any supposed second imprisonment, when the

° — — — τότε μὲν οὖν ἀπολογησαμένον, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς κηρουγματος διακο-  
μῆν λόγος εχει τελεσθαι τὸν ἀποστολὸν· δευτερον δὲ ἐπιβάντα τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει  
τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν τελεωθῆναι μαρτυρῶ· ἐν ᾧ ἔσομοις ἐχομενοι τὴν πρὸς Τιμοθεῖον  
δευτεραν ἐπιτολὴν συντάττει, ὅμῃ σημαίνων τὴν τε προτεραν αὐτῷ γενομένην  
ἀπολογίαν, καὶ τὴν παραποῦδας τελειῶσιν. — Εἰκος γένοι κατα μὲν ἀρχας  
ἠπιωτερον τῆς Νερωνος διακειμενα, ῥᾶρον τὴν ὑπερ τῆς ῥογματος τῆς Παυλῆ κατα-  
δεχθῆναι ἀπολογίαν· προελθοντος δὲ εἰς ἀθεμιτῆς τολμας, μετὰ τῶν ἀλλων, καὶ  
τα κατα τῶν ἀποστολων ἐγχειρισθῆναι. H. E. l. ii. cap. 22. p. 62. A. et D.

<sup>p</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. exiv. <sup>q</sup> Sciendum autem, in primâ satis-  
factione, necdum Neronis imperio roborato, nec in tanta erumpente scelera,  
quanta de eo narrant historiae, Paulum a Nerone dimissum, ut evangelium  
Christi in Occidentis quoque partibus prædicaret: sicut ipse in secundâ epis-  
tolâ ad Timotheum, eo tempore quo et passus est, de vinculis dictans episto-  
lam, &c. De V. I. cap. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Πῶς δὲ πρώτην ἀπολογίαν  
λεγει; Παρεση ἠδὴ τῷ Νερῶνι, καὶ ἐεφυγεν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸν οἰνοχοῦον αὐτῆ  
κατήχησε, τότε αὐτὸν ἀπετέμεν. In 2 ep. ad Tim. cap. iv. hom. 10. T. XI. p.  
722. B.

<sup>s</sup> Ἦνικα τῇ Εἰσεσι χρησαμενος εἰς τὴν Ῥωμὴν ὑπο τῆ  
Φητῆ παρεπεμφθη, ἀπολογησαμενος ὡς ἄθως ἀφείθη. — Πρωτὴν τοῖνον ἀπο-  
λογίαν τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐκδήμα γεγενημένην ἐκαλεσε. κ. λ. In 2 ep. Tim. iv. 16  
tom. III. p. 506.

apostle was near his end. But must relate to the prospect of success, which he had soon after he was brought from Judea to Rome. At that time these expressions were exceedingly proper, and his expectations were fully answered. As may be collected from Philip. i. 12—20, and ch. iv. 22. Witsius has some observations upon this place, which<sup>†</sup> deserve to be transcribed. So do likewise the observations of another learned writer,<sup>‡</sup> they being well suited to illustrate this text.

For farther clearing up this point, I must stay somewhat longer here. I cannot but think it very evident, that Paul was now brought before the emperor, and that he here refers to it. Lightfoot supposeth, ‘that<sup>§</sup> in those words, “at my ‘first answer,” Paul does not refer so much to what, or how ‘many answers he was called to: but intimates, that even at ‘the first pinch and appearance of danger, all that should ‘have been his assistants started from him.’ And that may be the meaning. Nevertheless it is not impossible, that Paul might make two apologies, one soon after the other, at the first of which all forsook him: whereas, at the second, there were some, who appeared with him, and spoke in his behalf. But however that may be, I am of opinion, that Paul was brought before Nero himself, and that he here speaks of it.

<sup>†</sup> Puto hæc ad ea quæ Romæ tunc gesta sunt referenda esse. Ibi enim constitutus tunc fuit Paulus, ut in summo totius mundi loco, unde evangelii ab ipso prædicati sonus, non tamquam buccinæ, sed tanquam tonitru, quaquaversum audiretur.—Porro ea, quæ Romæ, quæ in Prætorio, quæ ad tribunal Cæsaris dicebantur, vel agebantur, in tantâ confluentum multitudine, celeri famâ, per omnes totius propemodum orbis gentes vulgata fuere. Quibus non parum ponderis ex eo accessit, quod captivus iste, tam mirabilium rerum annunciator, a popularibus quidem suis accusatus, sed a Cæsare absolutus, vel certe non damnatus esset. Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. 12. num. xxxii.

<sup>‡</sup> Idem jam a Paulo indicatum, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. ‘In primâ meâ defensione nemo mihi adfuit, sed omnes,’ nimirum Christiani, Romæ tum Pauli aggregati, ‘me deseruerunt.—Dominus autem mihi adfuit, et confortavit me, ut per me promulgatio evangelii compleretur, et omnes gentes illud audirent: Etenim liberatus fui ex ore leonis,’ quocum jamjam mihi erat depugnandum. Paulus docet, sese, adjuvante Deo, ab intentatâ sibi cum leonæ depugnatione fuisse ereptum; sese causam suam ita dixisse, ut liber et inviolatus fuerit dimissus e Prætorio; Deum hoc pacto promulgationem evangelii promovisse, et in celebritatem deduxisse, ac ad securitatem. Securitas adiunctionis sita est in voce *πληροφορίας*, quæ a nave, plenis velis ac liberrime invehente, est desumpta. Eum igitur finem liberationis suæ Numen Supremum voluerat esse proprium, ut Paulus in posterum eo liberius doctrinam evangelii evulgaret. Roma erat locus celeberrimus. Quidquid ibi gerebatur, id putabatur agi in luce orbis terrarum. Causa itaque Pauli inde innotuit ac increbuit passim, ac quicumque de câ aliquid audiebant, avidi fuerunt redditi doctrinæ quoque ipsius, quam docebat, audiendæ et cognoscendæ. J. Ch. Harenburg. Otia Gandershem. Observ. 8. sect. 3.

<sup>§</sup> As before, p. 322.

Several<sup>w</sup> moderns have perceived this. But though this opinion had never the patronage of any great names, I apprehend it might be deduced with certainty from St. Luke's history in the Acts. He is very concise in what he says of Paul after his arrival at Rome. Nor has he said, that Paul was brought before Nero. But it may be argued, and concluded from what he has said.

When Paul was first brought before Festus at Cæsarea, after he had been left bound by Felix, at the end of two years' imprisonment, and Festus proposed that he should "go up to Jerusalem, and be there judged before him: Paul said, I stand at Cæsar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged," Acts xxv. 9, 10. "Then Festus, when he had conferred with his council, answered, Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar thou shalt go," ver. 12. Therefore that was now determined. When Festus first spoke to king Agrippa about Paul's affair, he said to him, "But when Paul had appealed to be reserved to the hearing, or judgment, of Augustus, I commanded him to be kept, till I might send him to Cæsar," ver. 21. And when Festus actually brought Paul before Agrippa, and the rest, he said, "He himself having appealed unto Augustus, I have determined to send him," ver. 25. After Paul had pleaded before Festus, and Agrippa, and that great company at Cæsarea, it is said, ch. xxvi. 31, 32; "And the king rose up, and Bernice, and they that sat with them. And when they had gone aside, they talked between themselves, saying, This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds. Then said Agrippa unto Festus: This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar." After his appeal therefore the sending Paul to Rome was unavoidable. If Agrippa and the rest of that great company did not dare to dismiss him, though they thought him innocent, but judged it needful that he should go to Rome, it may be reckoned probable, that he was actually brought before the emperor. And Festus wrote a letter concerning Paul to the emperor himself, as may be concluded from ch. xxv. 26, 27. And while Paul was in the voyage to Rome, he had a vision. "An angel stood by him, saying: Fear not, Paul, thou must

<sup>w</sup> I shall cite an author or two here, though they may not agree with me about the time of Paul's appearance before the emperor.

Acts xxvii. 24, "Thou must be brought before Cæsar." 'By this, and by what Paul says, 2 Tim. iv. 17, it seems, that he had a personal hearing before Nero himself.' Wall's Crit. Notes upon the N. T. p. 271.

Nous ne saurions douter au moins que S. Paul n'ait comparu devant Néron peu de temps avant sa mort, comme on le voit par sa seconde épître à Timothée. Tillem. S. Paul. note 40. Mem. T. I. p. 531. Paris.

be brought before Caesar," ch. xxvii. 23, 24. Certainly, therefore, he was brought before him. And that is what he intends, when he speaks of his apology. Which is also confirmed by what follows: "And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." Whereby must be meant Nero himself.

And now we may be able to understand those expressions: "No man stood with me: but all men forsook me." St. Luke's history of Paul's arrival at Rome will give great light to those words, Acts xxviii. 13—15, "And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were desired to tarry with them seven days: and so we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the three taverns: whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage." The affectionate and respectful visit of so many christians from Rome was very refreshing and comfortable to him, after all the fatigues of his voyage, and in the disgraceful circumstances of his appearance. But when he was presented to the emperor, "no man stood by him: but all men forsook him." And these are the men, whom he intends: these, and other christians then at Rome. None of them had courage to appear in his favour, and plead in his behalf, as they might have done. But all drew back, and left him alone. "Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me."

Let me now represent the progress of this affair, as it appears to me, after having consulted \*Lightfoot, and others.

When the prisoners from Judea were brought to Rome, they were all delivered to the captain of the guard, or prefect of the prætorium. At the same time Julius the centurion, to whose charge they had been committed, and who had all along "courteously entreated Paul," [Acts xxvii. 3,]

\* 'Julius, the Centurion, that had brought Paul and the rest of the prisoners ' from Judea, had been his friend and favourer from his first setting out, and so ' continued, till his settling at Rome.—His accusers that were come from ' Judea, to lay in the charge against him, [for we can hardly suppose but that ' some were come,] would be urgent to get their business despatched, that they ' might be returning to their own homes again; and so would bring him to ' his trial, as soon as they could. And that his trial was early this year, appears ' by his own words in the second epistle to Timothy, where he speaketh of his ' answer, and requireth Timothy to come to him before winter,' 2 Tim. iv. 16, 21.

' As he appealed to Nero himself, so Nero himself heard his cause, Philip. i. ' 13; 2 Tim. iv. 16. And here it was possible for Paul and Seneca to see each ' other. At which time all that had owned him before, withdrew themselves ' for fear, and dared not to stand by him, or appear with him in his danger.' Lightfoot, as before, p. 322.

spoke honourably of him to the prefect, or delivered in a written memorial of his voyage, and the several prisoners, whom he had brought with him, inserting, particularly, some things in favour of this prisoner, and also put into his hands the governor's letter to the emperor, concerning Paul. The tenor of which, as may be concluded from the letter of Lysias to Felix, ch. xxiii. 25—30, and from other things afterwards recorded in the Acts, omitting the usual forms, not needful to be mentioned here, was to this purpose: ' My Lord, ' when I came into this province, committed to my charge ' by thy favour, I found a prisoner, named Paul, left bound ' by my predecessor Felix, after he had been two years in ' custody. In a short time grievous complaints were made ' against him by the chief men of the nation, desiring me to ' pass sentence of condemnation upon him. Whereupon I ' appointed them a hearing. And being sat on the judg- ' ment seat, I commanded the man to be brought forth. But ' when the accusers stood up, they alleged no proofs of any ' thing that could render him criminal in the eye of our ' laws. They had only certain questions against him of their ' own religion, and concerning one Jesus, who had died, and ' whom Paul affirmed to be alive. At this time the man ' expressed a desire to be heard at thy tribunal. And hav- ' ing conferred with my council, and considering that he is ' a citizen of Rome, his appeal was allowed to be valid. ' Whereupon I resolved to send him unto thee, as soon as I ' could. In the mean time, king Agrippa and Bernice came ' to the place of my residence. Who being Jews by nation ' and religion, and willing to hear the man, I set him before ' them, that I might be the better informed concerning him ' myself. In their presence, and before me, and many others, ' Roman officers, and principal men of this city, he without ' reserve declared his doctrine, and his concern to promote ' it, and indeed his whole life from the beginning. After ' which, when the assembly (as honourable as can be ex- ' pected to be seen in any of the provinces) were gone aside, ' they talked between themselves. And they were all agreed, ' saying: This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of ' bonds: and he might have been set at liberty if he had ' not appealed to Augustus. To thee therefore I now send ' him. And to thy cognizance his cause is referred.'

When Burrhus, the prefect of the prætorium, brought Paul before the emperor, and delivered the governor's letter, it is not improbable, that he might add some hints in favour of the prisoner, from the character given of him by Julius, either by word, or in his memorial. At this audi-



ence must have been present, beside<sup>y</sup> Burrhus, divers other courtiers, of the greatest eminence and distinction, and perhaps Seneca. It may be likewise supposed, that some Jews, delegated by the council at Jerusalem, appeared, to plead against Paul. If there were none, it must have been understood to be a disrespect to the emperor, and a great prejudice to the cause of the accusers. If there were any such here, it would show the reasonableness of Paul's expectation, that some of the christians at Rome should have attended likewise.

At this time (unless there was another audience soon after) the emperor pronounced sentence upon Paul, and signed the order of his confinement: such as is related by St. Luke, Acts xxviii. 16, 30, 31. And though Paul was not acquitted, nor set at liberty, it may be esteemed a favourable decision.

It was after this audience of the emperor, and this sentence, that Paul sent for the Jews at Rome to come to him. But when he laid before them his case, and spoke of the proceedings against him in Judea, and of his appeal to Cæsar, they were very humble, and even low spirited, and did not choose to enter into discourse upon the matter.

Paul says, Acts xxviii. 19; "But when the Jews spake against it, I was constrained to appeal to Cæsar: not that I had ought to accuse my nation of." These last words may be understood by some, as if he had said, 'Not that I have any cause of complaint against my nation.' Which would be great complaisance indeed, after he had received so much hard usage from the Jews. But the words may be thus rendered: 'Not that I have a design to accuse my nation of any thing.' And in that manner they are rendered by <sup>z</sup>Le Clerc and <sup>a</sup>L'Enfant, in their French translations. And it is agreeable to <sup>b</sup>Beza's annotation upon the place, who is another good judge. This sense is very becoming Paul, and was very suitable to his circumstance and situation at that time. It was very proper to pacify the Jews at Rome, who might have been apprehensive of Paul's making use of his interest in the emperor's court against them, after

<sup>y</sup> Burrhus is computed to have died in the year of Christ 62, and Seneca in the year 65. Vid. Basn. Ann. 62. num. i. et Ann. 65. num. iv.

<sup>z</sup> Mais les Juifs s'y opposant, j'ai été contraint d'en appeler à César, sans que j'aye néanmoins dessein d'accuser ma nation, en quoique ce soit. Cl.

<sup>a</sup> — sans que j'aye dessein néanmoins d'accuser ma nation, en quoique ce soit. L'Enf.

<sup>b</sup> Est autem hoc additum a Paulo, ne putarent Judæi ipsum constituisse criminari gentem suam apud Cæsarem; cum hoc unum potius ageret, ut nullo hostium incommodo causam Christi et innocentiam suam tueretur. Bez.

he had been so ill used in Judea. But all he aimed at was the vindication of his own innocence, that he might with greater liberty preach the gospel.

Here we see the ground of the difference between Paul's imprisonment in Judea, and at Rome. The difference is manifest. Whilst in Judea, it does not appear that he had any communication with other churches out of it. He is wholly engaged in his own defence, and does but just secure his life against the violence of the unbelieving Jews, and their council. But when he came to Rome, and his apology was over, he was permitted to live by himself, in his own hired house. There he receives intelligence by messengers of the churches, who come to him from divers parts. He makes converts, and writes letters, and has fellow-labourers, whom he sends abroad, as he pleaseth. We now see the ground of this. As 'Jerom says, 'the apostle 'being sent to prison by the emperor, he becomes acquainted 'with the emperor's family, and makes the persecutor's 'house a church.' Referring to Philip. iv. 22. When Paul was in Judea, he was the governor's prisoner, whose good will was restrained by the influence of the people of the country. Now he is the emperor's prisoner, who allows what liberty he pleaseth. And when granted, none dare to control, or abridge it in any measure. Hence all the advantages of this imprisonment, and the happy conclusion of it. Having so much liberty, and being able to receive all who came to him, he makes many converts and many friends, some in the emperor's own family, and near his person. Says the apostle in this very epistle, ch. iv. 16, 17, "At my first answer no man stood with me.—Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and all the Gentiles might hear." It is a case much resembling that of our apostle before at Corinth, Acts xviii. 9–11, "Then spake the Lord unto Paul in the night, by a vision: Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace. For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them." And though he was brought before Gallio the governor, and accused; he was acquitted, and continued there yet a good while. In like manner here, "the Lord stood by Paul, strengthened him, and delivered him." And he afterwards "dwelt two whole years at Rome, preaching the kingdom of God, and

<sup>c</sup> A Cæsare missus in carcerem, notior familie ejus factus, persecutoris domum Christi fecit ecclesiam. In ep. ad Philem. T. IV. p. 445. in.

teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus, no man forbidding him," Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

Some may say, that during this space several of the apostle's friends and fellow-labourers were apprehended and imprisoned: which seems inconsistent with the supposition of his being committed by the emperor, with an order for allowing him all the liberty which he enjoyed. For Aristarchus is spoken of as his fellow-prisoner, Col. iv. 10, and Epaphras, Philem. ver. 23. And Timothy is said to have been set at liberty, Heb. xiii. 23. Who therefore must have been confined.

To which I answer, that these imprisonments of some of Paul's friends and fellow-labourers do not at all weaken our supposition, but confirm it: forasmuch as Paul's liberty was not abridged, but continued the same all along, until he was quite enlarged: which affords reason to think that the method of his confinement was appointed and ordered by an authority above control. And it is easy to conceive how it came to pass that some of Paul's friends were imprisoned: when it is considered that he must have had many enemies, and some of his friends acted imprudently, and there were others, who from envy and ill-will were prompted to behave irregularly, with a view of bringing him and his best friends into danger, by exposing them to general resentment, and especially the resentment of men in power. As we learn from Philip. i. 15—17. And yet it does not appear that any of Paul's fellow-labourers endured a long imprisonment. It is not unlikely that they were taken up and imprisoned by some inferior officers, to gratify the fury of the common people, who did not dare to keep them long in custody, nothing material appearing against them. As Jerom<sup>d</sup> observes, such frequent short imprisonments and speedy releases were common at the first rise of the christian religion, before Nero became an open persecutor, and before the publication of such edicts as affected the lives of the followers of Jesus.

All these considerations cannot but be of great weight to

<sup>d</sup> Quod autem crebro Paulus in carcere fuerit, et de vinculis liberatus sit, ipse in alio loco dicit: 'In carceribus frequenter:' de quibus nonnunquam Domini auxilio, crebro ipsis persecutoribus nihil dignum in eo morte inventibus, dimittebatur. Necdum enim super nomine christiano senatus consulta præcesserant; necdum christianum sanguinem Neronis gladius dedicarat. Sed pro novitate prædicationis, sive a Judæis invidentibus, sive ab his qui sua videbant idola destrui, ad furorem populis concitatis, missi in carcerem, rursum impetu et furore deposito, laxabuntur—id agente Domino, ut in toto orbe nova prædicatio disseminaretur. In Philem. ver. 22. T. IV. p. 453.

determine the time of this epistle. However, there are some difficulties that ought to be taken notice of.

1. Obj. "For I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand," 2 Tim. iv. 6.

These expressions led<sup>e</sup> Eusebius of Cæsarea, and <sup>f</sup>Jerom, who followed him, and <sup>g</sup>Chrysestom, though he did not follow either, to say that this was the last epistle of St. Paul, written only a small space of time before his martyrdom. And many learned moderns have been of the same opinion, as is well known.

But let us attend to Lightfoot. 'There<sup>h</sup> is one passage,' says he, 'in this epistle, which has caused some to doubt about the time of its writing. That is what he says, ch. iv. 6; "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand." Which would make one think that he was now ready to be martyred and taken away. And it has made some believe this was the last epistle that ever he wrote. But when we compare his own words again, ver. 17, 18, and Philip. i. 25, and Philem. ver. 22, it maketh past controversy, that he speaketh not of his sudden martyrdom, but that he is to be understood in some other sense. — And indeed the resolution of the difficulty lies open and conspicuous in the very text itself. Paul looked upon Timothy, as the prime and choice man that was to succeed him in the work of the gospel, when he himself should be dead and gone: as being a young man, not only of singular qualifications for that work, but of whom there had been special prophecies to such a purpose, 1 Tim. i. 18. He exhorts him therefore, in this place, to improve all his pains and parts to the utmost "to do the work of an evangelist, to make full proof of his ministry," ch. iv. 5, for that himself could not last long, being now grown old, and worn out with travail, and beside all that, in bonds at present, and so in continual danger. Therefore must Timothy be fitting himself daily to take his work, when he is gone.'

So Lightfoot, and, as seems to me, very properly. To the like purpose Estius upon the same text. Whom<sup>i</sup> I transcribe below.

<sup>e</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. 22.  
V. l. cap. v.

<sup>f</sup> Quoted Vol. iv. ch. cxiv; from De

<sup>g</sup> Quoted likewise as before.

<sup>h</sup> Vol. I. p. 324.

<sup>i</sup> Quare quæ hic ab Apostolo dicuntur non ita sunt accipienda, quasi plane sentiat sese jam jam rapiendum ad martyrium; præsertim cum alia quædam ejusdem epistolæ repugnent huic intellectui. — Sed tantum significant, ipsum, etsi de tempore mortis et passionis incertum tamen per carceres et tribunalia parari ad victimam. — Quocirca non apparet hæc a Paulo dicta fuisse per revelationem aliquam de instante martyrio sibi factam. — Illud etiam con-

I likewise place below<sup>k</sup> a part of Baronius's solution of the same difficulty, which appears to me very sufficient.

That Paul had now no certain and prophetic view of suffering martyrdom immediately, is apparent from several things in this epistle: particularly from his desiring Timothy to come to him, and to bring Mark with him, as "profitable to him for the ministry." He supposed therefore, that he should have an opportunity to employ him in the service of the gospel. He likewise must have hoped to receive, and use the things left at Troas, which he desired Timothy to bring to him.

Obj. 2. St. Paul says, ch. iv. 18, "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." By which many have supposed, that the apostle does not express any hope of being now delivered from death, or the present danger, or any other temporal evil, but from sin, and from all unworthy conduct of his own. So say <sup>l</sup>Le Clerc and <sup>m</sup>Whitby. "Paul had been delivered out of the mouth of the lion." But he did not now expect any such deliverance. He only hoped to be preserved from sin, and to be brought to God's heavenly kingdom.

But I do not think that to be St. Paul's meaning. It is inconsistent with what he had just said: that "the Lord had stood by him, and strengthened him, that by him the

siderandum est, Paulum loqui, ut jam senem, et laboribus confectum, qui proinde non multum vitæ tempus sibi reliquum arbitretur. Ac quoniam non dubitat, se martyrio finiendum, ideo et de eo tamquam brevi futuro loquitur: 'Ego enim,' inquit, 'jam delibor.'—Sensus et connexio est: Idecirco, cum tam seriâ obtestatione te discipulum meum officii tui admoneo, quod jam senex sim, et incertus quamdiu futurus superstes. Jam enim, tamquam victima Christo destinata, per hos carceres, et gravissimos quos patior adversariorum impetus, immolari incipio. Est. ad 2 Tim. iv. 6.

<sup>k</sup> — eo enim sensu hæc putant accipienda esse verba, quasi proxime esset Paulus martyrio coronandus, sicque ab eo spiritu prophetico esse pronuntiata. — Sed dicant velim: Nonne idem ipse Paulus in eadem testatur epistolâ, sibi Dominum apparuisse, dum in summo illo discrimine versaretur, hortatumque esse, ac fore prædixisse, ut per ipsum in omnes Gentes prædicatio impleteretur? Quomodo igitur hæc sibi cohærent, ut instans Pauli consummatio esset, idemque ipse, sic a periculo liberandus, in omnes gentes prædicationem evangelii propagaturus esset? Et reliqua. Am. 59. n. xiii. xiv.

<sup>l</sup> Non de la mort, mais des mauvaises actions, qu'il auroit fallu que S. Paul fit pour l'éviter. Clerc.

<sup>m</sup> Dr. Whitby's note upon ver. 18, is, 'If he will deliver him,' as Chrysostom says, why does he say, "I am offered?" Observe therefore his words. He says not, he will again deliver me "out of the power of the lion:" but only, that "he will preserve me from every evil work, and to his heavenly kingdom.' The place of Chrysostom, which I suppose to be here referred to, may be seen, on 2 ad Tim. cap. iv. hom. x. tom. XI. p. 722. Ed. Bened.

preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear." Which could not be done presently. But must require some time. To me it clearly appears, that the apostle's words express faith in God, and hope of the divine protection in future difficulties and dangers; or, that God would still deliver him, and uphold him in his service, against all the designs of evil men. And when he had done the work, still remaining for him to do, and fulfilled his testimony to the gospel, he should be "brought safe to God's heavenly kingdom." Accordingly, he was preserved for some good while after this, enjoying, so far as we know, as much freedom in preaching the gospel, as ever he did, till a period was put to his life by martyrdom. As before observed, what the apostle says here at ch. iv. 16—18, much resembles what is said, Acts xviii. 9—17. And the apostle's circumstances at Corinth and Rome were much alike.

3. Obj. Once more, it may be said, the state of things shows this epistle to have been written many years after the first epistle to Timothy, and when Paul was near his death. For he says here, ch. i. 15, "This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me. Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes." Which implies that great corruptions now prevailed in Asia, particularly in the church of Ephesus.

To which I answer: that if the Asiatics, here spoken of, were now at Rome, or had been lately there, we are not hereby led to think disadvantageously of the christians at Ephesus, and in Asia in general. That such are the persons here intended, has been the opinion of many, and is very probable. It was formerly observed, that <sup>n</sup>Chrysostom hereby understood such as were at Rome. Estius, upon the place, says, this<sup>o</sup> was the general opinion of the Greek writers. And indeed it is in <sup>p</sup>Œcumenius, who expressly says, that they which are in Asia is the same as they which are of Asia. To the like purpose Theophylact: 'They<sup>q</sup> in 'Asia are such of Asia as were then at Rome.' Dr. Hammond's paraphrase is to this purpose, 'Thou<sup>r</sup> hast heard, I 'believe, that in my affliction I have been deserted by all the

<sup>n</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxviii.

<sup>o</sup> Porro secundum Græcorum expositionem, non est sermo de iis, qui, Paulo hæc scribente, in Asiâ erant, sed qui ex Asiâ Romam venerant. Est. in loc.

<sup>p</sup> 'Οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ἤρτησαν, οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας' Œcum. in loc. T. II. p. 261.

<sup>q</sup> Κατελιπον αὐτον οἱ πάντες ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ἤρτησαν οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐνδεδυμένοι τῇ Ῥώμῃ. Theoph. T. II. p. 806.

<sup>r</sup> Audivisti, ut opinor, ab Asiaticis christianis, qui erant Romæ, excepto solo Onesiphoro, me desertum fuisse, in meâ calamitate. Hammond, in loc. ex versione Cleric.

‘ Asiatic christians at Rome, excepting only Onesiphorus.’ So that this interpretation is confirmed by the connection, it following immediately afterwards, “ The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus. For he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain. But when he was at Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me.” Rightly does Hammond say, that Timothy had heard of this. It was likely, that before this letter came to Timothy’s hands, he might have heard in general, how the christians at Rome, particularly those of Asia, had carried it toward his great master, now in bonds. But it seems by the apostle’s way of speaking, that he thought he gave Timothy some farther information, especially when he added, “ Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.” Beausobre was for the late date of this epistle. Nevertheless he supposeth<sup>s</sup> the apostle to speak of some Asiatics, who had been with him at Rome, but were returned to their own country. Mr. Mosheim<sup>1</sup> speaks largely to this place. He understands hereby some Asiatics, who had left Paul, and were gone home. He thinks they were guilty of unkindness, and are chargeable with inconstancy : but he does not suppose that they forsook the apostle’s doctrine, or endeavoured to make innovations.

There is no ground therefore to suppose that Paul here speaks of a general corruption and defection of the Christians in Asia.

I know not of any other objections that deserve consideration. From what has been argued therefore, I conclude, that this epistle to Timothy was written at Rome, when Paul was sent thither by Festus in the year 61.

For determining the time of the year we may receive assistance, not only from those who are for this early date, but from those likewise who are for a later date of this epistle.

From Paul’s desiring Timothy to come to him, before

<sup>s</sup> Il y a de l'apparence, que quelques Asiatiques, qui avoient suivi S. Paul à Rome, l'avoient abandonné, et s'en étoient retournés dans leur païs. Beaus. upon the place.

<sup>1</sup> Discesserant hi sine dubio, et in patriam reverterant, quod, Paulo Romæ in vincula coniecto, vitæ suæ metuebant, desperabantque, fore aliquando, ut is libertati restitutus itinera, quæ meditabatur, persequeretur. In hoc vitii est aliquid : fratrem enim, et multo magis Dei legatum, cui præsidio et solatio esse possis, in vitæ discrimine positum, relinquere, animi levis est, et christianæ disciplinæ immemor. Verum nihil habet hæc inconstantia, ex quo intelligi possit, ideo hos homines donum rediisse, ut, quæ ex Paulo perceperant, dogmata oppugnarent, novasque res inter christianos molirentur. Mosheim. De Reb. christian. ante Constantin. Sec. i. num. lx. in notis.

winter, Tillemont<sup>u</sup> concludes, that this epistle was written near the middle of the year. Witsius thinks it<sup>v</sup> was written in the beginning of the summer. So likewise <sup>w</sup>Baronius.

It seems very probable, that Paul came to Rome about the end of February, or soon after, before April, or at the utmost in the beginning of it. But before the writing of this letter several things had passed. His apology before the emperor was over, Onesiphorus had made the apostle divers visits. Several of the apostle's assistants or fellow-labourers had been with him, since his arrival, and had taken directions from him. Demas was gone to Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. The epistle to the Ephesians likewise, I suppose to have been written before, and if it had not been sent away, it lay ready, at least, to be carried by Tychicus, together with this to Timothy. If therefore Paul came to Rome in March, this letter might be sent away in May, or the beginning of June. The direction, ch. iv. 21, "Do thy diligence to come before winter," might proceed from tenderness for Timothy, the apostle himself having lately felt the inconveniences of a winter-voyage; and may also lead us to think there would be need of Timothy's making despatch, after the receipt of this letter, lest he should be overtaken by bad weather.

In dating this epistle at the time I have done, I have followed <sup>x</sup>Lightfoot, <sup>y</sup>Baronius, <sup>z</sup>Estius, <sup>a</sup>Hammond, <sup>b</sup>Witsius. Who have all well asserted this date. Witsius, the last mentioned, has an argument upon the point, which he has all along conducted with great candour, and concluded<sup>c</sup>

<sup>u</sup> Il y prie S. Timothée de le venir trouver avant l'hiver, ainsi ce ne pouvoit pas être plus tard que vers le milieu de l'année. S. Paul, art. 49. Mem. tom. I.

<sup>v</sup> Observant, jussisse hæc epistolâ Paulum, ut festinato ad se accederet, et, si fieri posset, ante hiemem, assumto secum Marco. Venit autem Paulus Romam, mense, ut creditur, Februario. Pone, scriptam hanc epistolam esse ineunte æstate: potuit Timotheus cum Marco ante hiemem Romæ esse; ubi fuit, quando illæ scribebantur epistolæ, quibus præfixum illius nomen est: quemadmodum et Marcus ibi fuit, quo tempore scribebatur illa ad Colossenses, et ad Philemonem. Quidquamne probabilius est, quam omnia ista ex mandato Pauli esse facta? Ubi supra. sect 12. num. v.

<sup>w</sup> Sed et eum illud admonet, ut ante hiemem se Romam conferat: certe, si quis exacte consideret tempus, et locum ipsum, Timotheumque agentem in Asiâ, ut ejusmodi reddi posset epistola, et ipse Troadem ad sumendam pœnulam proficisceretur, ac Romam ante hiemem se conferret: plane inveniet, hoc ipso anno, ineunte æstate, hanc ad Timotheum scriptam epistolam. Baron. ann. 59. num. x.

<sup>x</sup> Harmony of the N. T. in his Works, Vol. i. p. 324.

<sup>y</sup> Annal. 59. num. x.

<sup>z</sup> Præf. in 2 ad Timoth.

<sup>a</sup> Præf. in 2 ep. ad Timoth.

<sup>b</sup> De Vitâ et Rebus Pauli

Apost. sect. xii. apud Meletem. Leyd. p. 182, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Mea si desideretur *επικρισις*, fateor equidem aliquamdiu me in rationum



with much modesty: though to me he seems to have removed every difficulty in a very satisfactory manner. And he speaks of Salmero, as being of the same opinion. And besides, in the course of the argument cites from Cocceius, and Solomon Van Till, (with whose writings I am but little acquainted,) divers observations, confirming the same opinion. Cave likewise was of this opinion, when he wrote the Lives of the Apostles, and the first volume of the Lives of the primitive Fathers, in English; expressing himself very clearly, and properly, both in<sup>d</sup> the life of Paul, and<sup>e</sup> the life of Timothy, but when he wrote his *Historia Literaria*, he speaks in the article of St. Paul, as<sup>f</sup> if he had quite changed his mind: though in the article of St. Peter, as it still stands in the new edition at Oxford, he<sup>g</sup> speaks exactly as he had done before.

If he altered his mind, I suppose it must have been in compliance with Pearson, who of late has been followed in this particular by many; who, if they had carefully read the above-named authors, might easily have discerned the superiority of their arguments.

To him<sup>h</sup> likewise I suppose it must be chiefly ascribed,

conflictu animi ancipitem hæsisse, quæ quibus anteponendæ sint. Omnibus tamen perpensis, non dissimulo, eo me magis propendere, ut scriptionem hujus epistolæ ad priora Pauli apud Romam vincula referendam esse arbitrer. *Ib.* sect. 12. num. viii.

<sup>d</sup> 'It is not improbable, but that about this time St. Paul wrote his second epistle to Timothy. I know that Eusebius, and the ancients, and most moderns after them, will have it written a little before his martyrdom, induced thereto by that passage in it, that he was "then ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand." But, surely, it is most reasonable to think that it was written at his first being at Rome, and that at his first coming there, presently after his trial before Nero. In it he appoints Timothy shortly to come to him, who accordingly came, and his name is joined together with the apostle's, in the front of several epistles, to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon.' Cave's *Life of St. Paul*, sect. 7. num. 5. p. 103, 104.

<sup>e</sup> *Life of Timothy*, num. vii.

<sup>f</sup> *Epistolam secundam ad Timotheum scriptam esse Romæ, in primâ Pauli captivitate contendit cl. Hammondus. Sed errat omnino vir eruditissimus. Quisquis enim totius epistolæ contextum, omnesque hujus temporis circumstantias serio perpenderit, quin scripta sit anno 64, paulo ante Apostoli martyrium, dubitare nequit. De S. Paulo. Hist. Lit. tom. I. p. 12.*

<sup>g</sup> *Durante biennali captivitate, Paulus inde scripsit quatuor vel quinque epistolas, ad Colossenses, Ephesios, Philippenses, et Philemonem, in quibus nullæ notæ, nulla indicia, unde vel divinando quis assequi posset, Romæ Petrum tunc fuisse.—In posteriori ad Timotheum, quam hoc etiam tempore scriptam esse, maxime est probabile.—Carcere Romano liberatus, dum adhuc in Italiâ hæreret, scripsit epistolam ad Hebræos. De Petro, H. L. p. 9.*

<sup>h</sup> *Paulus Romæ [A. D. lxxvii.] e carcere in discrimen vitæ vocatur ab altero Nerone, et apologiam habet, sive 'defensionem suam,' vel 'sui,' quod in pri-*

that by the apostle's first answer, or apology, many of late have understood an apology made in a second imprisonment at Rome. Which, as <sup>i</sup> before shown, is contrary to the general opinion of ancient christian writers: and indeed appears to me a <sup>k</sup> very unlikely meaning. And to him I suppose it to be entirely owing that <sup>l</sup> Paul's lion, whom <sup>m</sup> all christians in general had hitherto understood to be the emperor Nero, has on a sudden dwindled into <sup>n</sup> Elius, or Helius, the emperor's freed man and favourite.

Upon the whole, it appears to me very probable, that this second epistle to Timothy was written at Rome, when Paul was sent thither by Festus. And I cannot but think, that this ought to be an allowed and determined point. Accordingly, I now proceed to mention some observations in the way of corollaries.

I. This second epistle to Timothy affords not any argument that Peter was not at Rome, when Paul came thither a second time, and suffered martyrdom.

Upon these words, ch. iv. 16, "At my first answer, no man stood with me, but all forsook me," Beza says: 'Where°

oribus vinculis factum non est; ubi habuit tantum 'defensionem et confirmationem evangelii,' adversus Judæos scilicet. Annal. Paulin. p. 24.

<sup>i</sup> See before, p. 50—53.

<sup>k</sup> Eusèbe, S. Jérôme, S. Chrysostome en quelques endroits, et Théodoret, ont entendu cette première défense de son premier voyage. S. Chrysostome s'en éloigne en d'autres endroits, et l'entend d'une première comparition de S. Paul devant Néron dans son dernier voyage. Mais l'autre sentiment est plus autorisé, et fondé sur le sens le plus naturel du texte, &c. Du Pin, Diss. Prelim. P. II. l. 2. ch. ii. sect. viii. p. 53.

<sup>l</sup> In quâ defensione tantum erat et Pauli et suorum periculum, ut omnes suum desererent, et nemo illi adesset, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. Sed ereptus est ex ore leonis, nempe Helii Cæsareani. Ann. Paulin. ibid.

<sup>m</sup> I refer to the collections of Grotius upon 2 Tim. iv. 17, whereby it appears to have been common to give such denominations to bad princes, not to their officers. And I shall transcribe here a curious passage, to which he only refers, showing, that Nero, for his bad temper, was early called a lion. Adde hæc scholiastis in Juvenalis Sat. v. Seneca sub Claudio, quasi conscius adulteriorum Julæ, Germanici filiæ, in Corsicam relegatus, post triennium revocatus est. Qui etsi magno desiderio Athenas intenderet, ab Agrippinâ tamen, erudendo Neroni, in palatium adductus, sævum inhumanemque natum et sensit cito, et mitigavit, inter familiares solitus dicere; non fore sævo illi leoni, quin, gustato semel hominis sanguine, ingenita redeat sævitiâ. Lipsius in notis ad Tacit. Ann. l. 12. cap. 9.

<sup>n</sup> Nobis sane non probatur conjectura doctissimi Pearson, qui, communis sententiæ pertæsus, Helium Cæsareanum designatum fuisse existimat in Annalibus Paulinis. Neronis potius et furor et dignitas, aptâ câ metaphorâ significatur; quomodo, defuncto Tiberio, Marsias Agrippæ libertus dixit domino suo, Mortuus est Leo. Basnag. ann. 64. n. vi.

<sup>o</sup> Ubi tum Petrus, si Romæ erat? Num enim quæso Paulum deseruisset? Sed quod in genere dicitur, etsi non temere sic loquitur Paulus, ita tamen accipiendum est, ut aliqui excipi potuerint, sed perpauci. Bez. in loc.

‘ was Peter then, if he was at Rome? Did he desert Paul in ‘ the time of his difficulty:’ But the good man adds: ‘ That ‘ Paul’s general expressions need not to be understood absolutely, without any exception.’ That is very charitable and benevolent. But indeed, if Peter had then been at Rome, he could not have afforded any assistance to his brother apostle. Nor would Paul have expected it of him. For Peter was himself an obnoxious person. Paul<sup>p</sup> refers only to such, as by their station were likely to be of some use to him, if they had appeared with him, and had exerted themselves in his behalf.

But though Peter’s not appearing upon that occasion affords not any argument that he was not then at Rome, the entire silence concerning him throughout this epistle, affords good reason to think he was not then at Rome. For ch. iv. 2. Paul sends salutations from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia. If Peter had been then at Rome, he would have been mentioned likewise. We do justly argue from St. Paul’s omitting Peter among his salutations sent to divers of the Roman christians, ch. xvi. that Peter was not then in that city. It is also rightly argued from the silence concerning Peter in the epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, that Peter was not at Rome when they were written. To which ought to be added this second epistle to Timothy, as farther confirming the same thing, if written about the same time. But then, if it was written in the year 61, as I suppose, it will not afford any argument against Peter’s being at Rome in 64 or 65, and then suffering martyrdom there. About which there ought not to be any doubt. That Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome, is said by the same writers that speak of the martyrdom of Paul there. The <sup>q</sup>martyrdoms of both the apostles have a like degree of credibility. For neither is Paul’s martyrdom at Rome founded upon the testimony of any sacred book of the New Testament. If this second epistle to Timothy was written at the time here argued for, we have no proof from scripture that Paul was a second time at Rome. Nevertheless, he must have been there a second time, if he suffered martyrdom there, as ecclesiastical history says. Consequently,

<sup>p</sup> Loquitur de iis qui prodesse poterant, et qui gratiã valebant apud aulicos, — Potest et ita exponi: ‘ Omnes,’ id est, pene omnes. Est. in loc.

<sup>q</sup> Denique si mentitur traditio de loco Petrii martyrii atque sepulchro, quo nobis indicio liquebit Paulum Romæ interfectum fuisse atque conditum? Unum nobis est argumentum fama constans, in quo etiam fundamento collocatur quæ per animos invasit, de Petri in urbem et adventu et morte, immota explorataque Veterum sententia. Basnag. ann. 64. num. x.

the martyrdom of Paul at Rome, has no other, nor better evidence, than the martyrdom of Peter in the same city.

2. We cannot conclude from this second epistle to Timothy, that St. Luke was qualified to write the history of the apostle Paul for the space of several years lower than he has done in the book of the Acts.

Whitby says upon ver. 11, of the fourth chapter of this epistle: 'Hence it appears, that Luke must be alive in the 12th or 13th year of Nero, when this epistle was indited.' St. Luke might be then alive. But this epistle, if written in the 7th or 8th of Nero, affords not any proof that Luke lived to the 12th or 13th of Nero, or that he was then with Paul. And it may be reckoned probable, that St. Luke did not accompany the apostle after his release from his imprisonment at Rome.

Again, says Wall upon Acts xxviii. 30, 31, 'St. Luke wrote this book about the year 63.—It is a wonder that he did not add the history of the rest of his life, whither he went, when he was set free, and what he did in the five years afterwards. One might have guessed, that Luke died about this time. But it was not so. He was with Paul a little before Paul died; as appears from 2 Tim. iv. 11.' But, that St. Luke was alive and with Paul in the year 67, or 68, cannot be inferred from this epistle, if it was written in the year 61.

3. We are now able to vindicate the character of Demas.

Says Wall upon 2 Tim. iv. 10, 'At the former imprisonment, five years ago, Demas was one of Paul's fellow-labourers. As we learn from Philem. ver. 24.' But that remark will appear preposterous, if the second epistle to Timothy was written before that to Philemon, as I think it was.

Upon our order of the epistles the case will stand thus. Some time after Paul's coming from Judea to Rome, upon the appearance of some unexpected difficulties, Demas, who had come to Rome to meet Paul, was discouraged. He did not apostatize from the christian religion. But out of too great regard for his own safety, he absented himself from the apostle, and went where Paul had rather he should not have gone. This is what St. Paul intends, when writing to Timothy, he here says: "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica," ch. iv. 10. But it was not very long before he returned. Accordingly, Paul makes honourable mention of him, Col. iv. 14, and Philem. 24, epistles, written near the end of his confinement at Rome.

How disagreeable to think, that a fellow-labourer of Paul, who had attended him in his bonds, near the end of a two year's imprisonment at Rome, should afterwards forsake him! According to our account his fault, whatever it might be, was first, and his repentance last: and so sincere and complete, that Paul readily accepted of it, and joins him with his best friends in the salutations sent to Colosse, and Philemon. And, perhaps, Demas had been very useful at Thessalonica, though the apostle did not send him thither.

Grotius upon 2 Tim. iv. 10, says: 'we<sup>r</sup> conclude from 'Philem. ver. 24, and Col. iv. 14, that Demas repented of 'his fault.' But that is inconsistent with the late date of the second epistle to Timothy. For if those texts prove Demas's repentance, the second to Timothy must have been written before those two epistles: as <sup>s</sup>Beza perceived, when he allowed the repentance of Demas.

4. Cave's argument<sup>t</sup> for the time of St. Mark's writing his gospel, built upon the supposition, that this second epistle to Timothy, in which that evangelist is mentioned, was written just before St. Paul's martyrdom, is of no value.

5. This second epistle to Timothy, affords not any argument against the supposition, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul in the year 63, about the time of his being released from his confinement at Rome.

Le Clerc in his French edition of the New Testament, in his notes upon Heb. xiii. 23, says: 'Nothing<sup>u</sup> of that kind 'happened to Timothy, during the life of St. Paul, if it had, 'he would not have failed to take notice of it in his second 'epistle to him, written a very short time before his death. 'And he would have thence taken occasion to say something 'to Timothy, by way of commendation and encouragement, 'or otherwise. If then Timothy was not imprisoned, during

<sup>r</sup> Vide hic etiam bonos interdum metu aut malis exemplis mutari. 'Quare, qui stat, videat ne cadat.' Sed et culpæ hujus pœnituisse Denam colligimus ex loco Philem. 24. et Coloss. iv. 14. Grot. ad 2 Tim. iv.

<sup>s</sup> Videtur ille postea resipiscens ad Paulum revertisse, cum fiat ejus mentio in epistolâ ad Philemonem, quam probabile est post hanc scriptam fuisse, cum in eâ fiat mentio Timothei ipsius in inscriptione, atque etiam Marci, quasi jam cum Paulo versantis. Bez. ad Tim. iv. 10.

<sup>t</sup> Factum id circa annum 65, Petro et Paulo jam morte sublatis. Cum enim illum epistolâ secundâ ad Timotheum, non longe ante martyrium scriptâ, Romam accersiverat Paulus; probabile est, Marcum vel eodem, vel saltem sequenti anno illuc venisse, ibique Evangelium vel primum condidisse, vel prius conditum edidisse. H. L. T. I. p. 24. in Marco.

<sup>u</sup> Il n'étoit rien arrivé de semblable à Timothé, pendant la vie de S. Paul, qui lui écrivit sa 2<sup>e</sup> épître très peu de tems avant que de mourir, et qui n'auroit pas manqué d'en parler en quelque occasion. &c. Notes sur. Heb. xiii. 23.

‘ Paul’s life; the mention of these his bonds, and his release, proves this epistle to the Hebrews not to have been written till after Paul’s death.’ Le Clerc speaks also to the like purpose in his ‘*Ecclesiastical History*. And some before Le Clerc must have been affected with this difficulty. As may be concluded from Beza’s Notes upon Heb. xiii. 23.

To which I answer, first, that the original word rendered by us, “set at liberty,” may signify<sup>v</sup> “sent abroad on an errand.” But upon that I do not now insist, and therefore say, secondly, the epistle to the Hebrews is now generally supposed to have been written by Paul in the year 68, soon after his release from his imprisonment at Rome. And we know, from the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon, that Timothy was with Paul at that time, when his imprisonment was near the period. It is not at all improbable, that Timothy might be imprisoned, and soon set at liberty again: as divers of Paul’s fellow-labourers were. But it is unreasonable to expect, that any notice should be taken of these things, in either of the epistles to Timothy: one of which was written before Paul’s first imprisonment, as it is called: and the other soon after the beginning of it.

6. There can be no ground from this epistle to conclude a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome. For it was written in the time of his imprisonment in that city, when he had been sent thither from Judea by Festus.

7. There may be many other things said upon a supposition, that this epistle was written in a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome, in the year 67, or thereabout. All which must now fall to the ground.

It is often said that error is endless. And it is certain, that one error is productive of another. This in particular is so. It has occasioned forced and wrong interpretations of divers texts of this epistle, and many false and groundless suppositions, contrary to the truth of history. I shall take notice of but one more, beside those which have been already mentioned. Tillemont, in his history of St. Paul’s affairs, in the year 65, some while after he had been set at liberty from

<sup>v</sup> Mentio fit Timothei in vincula coniecti et dimissi. cap. xiii. 23. Quod non contigerat ante posteriorem ad Timotheum, ubi nulla ejus rei, uti nec in priore, vel minima mentio. Quam tamen Paulus non prætermisset, si quid simile contigisset, cum ad laudem Timothei, et constantiam in eo augendam, multum faceret. Itaque in vincula, post conscriptas demum ad eum epistolas, aut etiam post mortem Pauli, coniectus fuerit. H. E. A. D. 69. p. 459.

<sup>w</sup> Vid. Mill. Prolegom. num. 68, 69.

his captivity at Rome, says : ‘ It<sup>x</sup> was, perhaps, at this time, ‘ that he suffered at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium, and ‘ Lystra, the afflictions, which he mentions in general, in his ‘ second epistle to Timothy, ch. iii. 11.’ Which to me appears very absurd, and I had almost said, ridiculous.

I shall now mention one observation more, of a different kind.

8 We have no reason upon the whole to regret St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome.

When we read the opinion of that great company which had heard Paul's pleading in Cæsarea. Acts xxvi. 31, “ This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds :” and what Agrippa said to Festus, in the next verse. “ This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Cæsar :” we may be disposed to wish that appeal had not been made, thinking, that in that case he might now have been set at liberty. But if we consider things maturely, we shall perceive it to have been necessary. It was, indeed, prudently made, being the only probable means of his escape from the continued persecutions of the enraged Jews.

But beside that, there are very many advantages attending it : which ought to reconcile us to it, and induce us to acknowledge the over-ruling providence of God in it. Without that appeal Paul would not have been mentioned to Agrippa. Nor should we have had that excellent apology for himself and his doctrine, which he made before Agrippa, and Festus. We should not have had the fine history of the apostle's voyage to Rome, in which are so many affecting incidents. And though he came to Rome as a prisoner, he had there a great deal of liberty. “ Nor was the word of God bound.” As he was able to say in this epistle, written soon after his settlement at Rome, 2 Tim. ii. 9. And in his epistle to the Philippians, ch. i. 12—14, written afterwards, are these remarkable words, “ But I would, ye should understand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me, have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel. So that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places. And many of the brethren waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear. Says St. Luke, “ Two whole years Paul dwelt in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him. Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him,” Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

<sup>x</sup> St. Paul. art. 47. Mem. Ec. T. I.

Jerom thinks it<sup>y</sup> was a handsome dwelling, in which was a spacious room, where Paul could receive a good deal of company, and display his apostolical gifts to advantage. So he beforehand wrote to Philemon, “to prepare him a lodging,” ver. 22. Not that he should want many things for his own accommodation. But he wished to have a dwelling in a frequented part of the city of Colosse, and large enough to admit conveniently all who were desirous to be informed concerning his doctrine.

Paul had a great desire to go to Rome, and testify there the gospel of Christ. He thought, it is likely, that he should there have a good opportunity to propose it to Jews and Gentiles, of inquisitive tempers, and distinguished characters. Rom. i. 9, 10,—“Without ceasing making mention of you always in my prayers: making request (if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God) to come unto you.” And ver. 14, 16, “I am debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also, for I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation,—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.” See likewise ch. xv. 28—32. Well, Paul’s desire was fulfilled. He was brought to Rome: and although not in the way, and in the circumstances which himself would have chosen: yet I suppose, that in the end he had good reason to be well satisfied. Indeed, I think, that the time of his abode at Rome, must have been, upon the whole, as comfortable, and honourable, and useful, as any period of the like duration, since his conversion to the faith of Christ. He was bound, and was guarded by a soldier. But it needs not to be supposed, that the chain was always upon his hand. And notwithstanding the disgraceful circumstance of his bonds, and the disadvantage of his outward appearance in some respects, such were the dignity and importance of his behaviour, such

<sup>y</sup> ‘Simul autem et præpara mihi hospitium.’ Non puto tam divitem fuisse apostolum, et tantis sarcinis onustum, ut præparato egeret hospitio, et non unâ contentus cellulâ, breves corporis sui spatio ædes amplissimas existimaret.—Si autem hoc non dispensatorie, sed vere quis existimet imperatum, apostolo magis quam Paulo hospitium præparandum est. Venturus ad novam civitatem, prædicaturus crucifixum, et inaudita dogmata delaturus, sciebat ad se plurimos concursuros: et necesse erat, primum, ut domus in celebri esset urbis loco, ad quam facile conveniretur. Deinde ut ab omni importunitate vacua, ut ampla, quæ plurimos caperet audientium; ne proxima spectaculorum locis, ne turpi viciniâ detestabilis: postremo, ut in plano potius sita esset, quam in cœnaculo. Quam ob causam eum existimo etiam Romæ in conducto mansisse biennio. Nec parva, ut reor, erat mansio, ad quam Judæorum turbæ quotidie confluebant. Hieron. in Philem. ver. 22. T. IV. p. 453.



the superiority of his discourse above that of all other men, and such the works which God enabled him to perform, as could not but secure him the regard of all serious and discerning men. And<sup>z</sup> success in his work would alleviate all his sufferings. For which reason we also ought to rejoice in them, and on account of the testimony thereby given to the truth and innocence of the christian doctrine.

In the introduction to the first part of this work, where our concern was with facts occasionally mentioned in the books of the New Testament, I said : ‘ Here is withal an account of ‘ proceedings and sentences of courts of judicature, in cities ‘ of the first rank, and most general resort : and of some ‘ discourses made before persons, next under the Roman ‘ emperor, of the highest rank and distinction :’ referring to the history in Acts xxiii. xxiv. xxv. xxvi. But now I should choose to say : ‘ And of some discourses made before persons of the highest rank and distinction, not excepting the ‘ Roman emperor himself.’ From what has been just now argued, it appears to be very probable, that Paul, when brought to Rome, pleaded once, if not twice, before Nero. And though those pleadings may have been very short ; yet from thence, and from the treatment which Paul had presently afterwards in the imperial city, ariseth a very forcible argument for the innocence of the christian doctrine and its teachers.

Every one perceives, that St. Paul’s pleadings upon the occasions before referred to, in the presence of the Jewish council at Jerusalem, and before Felix, and Festus, and Agrippa, at Cæsarea, do us great honour. Particularly, in this last mentioned apology, the doctrine which Paul preached as received from heaven, was reported to those great personages, and the honourable company attending them. He lays before them the history of his life, from his youth up, before he was a christian, and afterwards. He plainly declares his doctrine, and the zeal with which he had spread and propagated it every where, among Jews and Gentiles, and his unwearied diligence in the cause in which he was engaged. And in the end all acknowledge, that he did nothing contrary to the peace of society : and that he might have been set at liberty. But having appealed to the emperor, it was now requisite that the cause should be referred to his tribunal, and be finally determined there.

<sup>z</sup> Simul autem admirandum de magnanimitate apostoli, et in Christum mente ferventis. Tenetur in carcere, vinculis stringitur, squalore corporis, carorum separatione, pœnalibus tenebris coarctatur ; et non sentit injuriam, non dolore cruciatur ; nihil novit aliud, nisi de Christi evangelio cogitare. Hieron. in Philem. tom. IV. p. 450. m.

Here therefore is another testimony to the innocence of Paul and his doctrine. Festus, the governor of Judea, certainly wrote a letter to the emperor, giving an account of Paul. Of this all may be satisfied, who observe what is said, Acts xxv. 24—27. So Lysias, the tribune, and commanding officer at Jerusalem, when he sent Paul to Felix at Caesarea, wrote a letter, containing an account of the prisoner, and the proceedings against him hitherto, ch. xxiii. 25—30. In like manner now acted Festus. Nor can it be imagined, that any governor should presume to falsify, prevaricate, or disguise, in such a letter. It might be very respectful to the emperor, and favourable to the prisoner. But there could be nothing but truth. And there must have been all the truth, that was needful to give a just notion of the cause. And yet Paul is not condemned, but obtains an order for such a custody, as leaves him at liberty to “ dwell by himself, in his own hired house,” and to receive all who came to him, and to discourse to them of his doctrine. Here he was two years: during which time he had no molestation. And at length he was released. He was all that time in one place. And the place of his abode was well known. He might have been called for at any time. But there were no complaints made against him, or none such as could induce those in power to change the order first given.

When Paul lay bound in the castle of Antonia, at Jerusalem, after he had been brought before the Jewish council, and his life was in imminent danger; “ the night following, the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome,” Acts xxiii. 11. Which word of our Lord was fully accomplished: as we are assured in the history, which St. Luke has given of the apostle’s going to Rome, and dwelling in that city two whole years, and in the epistles, written by himself, during that period: which by the divine goodness are still preserved to us.

According to the preceding argument, the second epistle to Timothy was sent away from Rome, about the summer of the year 61, probably in May, or June.

## SECT. XI.

### *The Epistle to the Philippians.*

There still remain three epistles of St. Paul to be considered by us, which are generally allowed to have been written during the time of his imprisonment at Rome: the

epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon. And I shall speak of them in the order in which they have been just named.

The epistle to the Philippians was written in the second year of the apostle's imprisonment. Timothy, who had come to him from Ephesus, according to his desire, 2 Tim. iv. 9—21, is joined with the apostle in the inscription at the beginning of the epistle. It seems to have been written not long before the end of his two years' imprisonment. For he had some hopes of a release, ch. i. 24, 25. "Nevertheless to abide in the flesh, is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide, and continue with you all, for your furtherance, and joy of faith." Yea, he expresseth hopes of making the Philippians a visit, ver. 26, "That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again." And ch. ii. 19, "But I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy shortly unto you,"—and ver. 23, 24, "Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly." But though he had hopes of obtaining his liberty, he was not yet certain of it. As appears from those words just cited, "so soon as I shall see how it will go with me:" and from what he says, ch. ii. 17, "Yea, if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all." See also ch. i. ver. 20. In the mean time, he sends back to them Epaphroditus, who had come to Rome, with a kind present from the christians at Philippi, and who had been dangerously sick, but was now recovered. And it is likely that by him this epistle was carried. So it follows in ver. 25—30, of the second chapter, "Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants.—I have sent him therefore the more carefully: that when ye see him again, ye may rejoice." Of their kind regard to him, he speaks again, ch. iv. 10—19. In the end of the epistle he sends salutations to the Philippians from "the brethren that were with him," and from "all the saints, chiefly these of Cæsar's household." Who may be supposed to be the apostle's converts, and the persons who chiefly contributed to his being set at liberty, and had already given him hopes of it, and may likewise have been friendly to him in other respects. And at the beginning of this epistle, ch. i. 13, speaking of the progress of the gospel, he says: "So that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and all other places."

The salutations in this epistle are singular, being different from those at the end of the other epistles, written about the same time. First it is said, "The brethren which are with me greet you:" intending, as I apprehend, Mark and others, the apostle's fellow-labourers, mentioned by name near the end of the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, but not so mentioned here. Then it is added, "All the saints salute you:" meaning all the christians at Rome in general, "chiefly, they that are of Cæsar's household." The kind present from the Philippians, it is likely, had recommended them to the notice of all at Rome. That testimony of respect for the apostle was highly pleasing, and very edifying to the christians in that city. It seems to have been a handsome sum. And it may be reckoned probable, that the collections made for the apostle at Rome, and the contributions brought in from abroad, were all put into one bank, and lodged in the hands of some person or persons of good credit and substance. Possibly, there was now a superfluity. For St. Paul says to these Philippians, "I have all, and abound. I am full." If there was any thing superfluous, beyond what was requisite for his maintenance at Rome, it would be of use for defraying the expenses of the journies which he had in view. And this may be one reason, why this epistle is inscribed "to all the saints, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." For there must have been such officers in many of the churches to which the apostle sent letters, though they are not mentioned. But the bishops and deacons at Philippi had encouraged the contributions made for the apostle, and had assisted in conveying them to him. And therefore they could not be omitted.

St. Paul came to Rome, as I suppose, in the spring of the year 61. "There he dwelled two whole years in his own hired house," Acts xxviii. 30. Consequently, his captivity ended in the spring of the year 63.

Hereby I am led to think, that this epistle to the Philippians was written in the year 62. It was carried by Epaphroditus. Some time after he was gone, I suppose (as <sup>a</sup> does Mill likewise) that St. Paul sent Timothy to Philippi, agreeably to his design, mentioned, ch. ii. 19—23. And when he wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, in the spring of the year 63, he was in expectation of Timothy's return to him, Heb. xiii. 23. According to this computation, the epistle to the

<sup>a</sup> De visendis enim Philippensibus, ubi primum e carcere evaserit, omnino cogitat.—Et quidem paullo post missas hasce literas libertatem adeptus, Timotheum in Macedoniam misit, uti liquet ex Hebr. xiii. 23, &c. Mill. Prol. num. 68.

Philippians was written, and sent away, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

## SECT. XII.

### *The Epistle to the Colossians.*

The epistles to the Colossians, and Philemon, were sent away together. Chrysostom, as <sup>b</sup> formerly observed, thought that the epistle to Philemon was first written. That he concluded from Col. iv. 7—9. However, I shall first speak of the epistle to the Colossians, according to the order in which the epistles lie in our volume of the New Testament.

The epistle to the Colossians was carried by Tychicus and Onesimus, as we perceive from ch. iv. 7—9, “All my estate shall Tychicus declare unto you.—Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and comfort your hearts: with Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things (which are done) here.”

These two letters, as before said, were sent away at the same time. But it is likely, that the letter to Philemon was first delivered. For till Onesimus had been received by his master, he could not be a fit person to join in delivering a letter to the church of Colosse.

Timothy joins with the apostle at the beginning in the salutation “to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse.” Near the end of the epistle are salutations from Aristarchus, said by the apostle to be his “fellow prisoner,” from Mark. “Jesus called Justus, Epaphras, Luke the beloved physician, and Demas.”

It might have been expected, that this letter should be carried by Epaphras, who had come to the apostle at Rome from Colosse, ch. i. 7, 8. But he was now the apostle’s “fellow prisoner,” as is said, Philem. ver. 23. However, he and Aristarchus may have been set at liberty about the same time with St. Paul. Such things were frequent in the early days of the gospel, and before Nero became a persecutor, according to an observation of Jerom in his commentary upon the epistle to Philemon, ver. 22, cited by us<sup>c</sup> not long ago.

As Timothy joins with the apostle in the salutation at the beginning of this epistle, he was still at Rome, and not yet sent away to Philippi. I therefore conclude, that this epistle was written about the same time with that to the

<sup>b</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cxviii.

<sup>c</sup> See before, p. 57.

Philippians, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

### SECT. XIII.

#### *The Epistle to Philemon.*

Philemon was a citizen of Colosse, in Phrygia. Paul<sup>d</sup> writes this epistle to him in behalf of Onesimus, a slave, who had robbed his master, and run away. Him Paul had converted to the christian faith at Rome, during his bonds, which are several times mentioned in this epistle.

Timothy is joined with Paul in the salutations at the beginning of the epistle. At ver. 23 and 24, the apostle sends salutations from Epaphras, then his "fellow prisoner:" from Mark, whom Timothy had brought with him to Rome, according to Paul's desire, 2 Tim. iv. 11: from Luke and Aristarchus, who had accompanied the apostle in his voyage from Judea to Rome, and had continued with him ever since: and from Demas, who had departed from the apostle for a while, but was now returned. Compare 2 Tim. iv. 10.

From ver. 19, it is argued by <sup>e</sup>Jerom, as well as by some learned commentators of late times, that the whole of this epistle was sent in the apostle's own hand writing.

St. Paul had now good hopes of obtaining his liberty. For he says, at ver. 22; "But withal prepare me also a lodging. For I trust, that through your prayers I shall be given unto you." Nevertheless, as Timothy joins with the apostle in the salutations at the beginning of the epistle, I think it was not yet fully determined. For Paul says to the Philippians, ii. 23, that "he hoped to send him to them presently, so soon as he should see how it would go with him." As Timothy was still at Rome, and not sent away to Philippi, it may be argued, that the apostle did not yet certainly know the success of the attempts made use of by his friends to procure his liberty. I therefore conclude, that this epistle was written about the same time with that to the Philippians, in the year 62, and some while before the end of it.

<sup>d</sup> Totum autem, pro quo rogat, illud est: Onesimus, servus Philemonis, fugam furto cumulans, quædam rei domesticæ compilârat. Hic pergens in Italian, ne in proximo facilius posset apprehendi, pecuniam domini per luxuriam prodegerat, &c. Hieron. in Philem. T. IV. p. 449. Vid. et Theodoretî argum. in ep. ad Philem. T. III. p. 516.

<sup>e</sup> Quod dicit, tale est. Quod Onesimus furto rapuit, ego me spondeo rediturum. Cujus sponsionis epistola hæc et manus testis est propria; quam non solito more dictavi, sed meâ manu ipse conscripsi. Hier. ib. p. 452.

These three epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon, are also placed by Mill<sup>f</sup> in the year 62.

I will now add a few observations concerning the epistle to Philemon.

Philemon's station is not certainly known. Grotius thought he<sup>g</sup> dwelt at Ephesus, and was one of the elders of that church. Beausobre, in his notes upon the first verse of this epistle, speaks of Philemon as<sup>h</sup> one of the pastors of the church of Colosse.

To me it appears evident, that Philemon was an inhabitant of Colosse. For his servant, Onesimus, is recommended by St. Paul to the church in that city, and said to be "one of them," ch. iv. 9. And the christians at Colosse are required by the apostle to "say to Archippus, take heed to the ministry, which thou hast received," ver. 17. Which Archippus is saluted in the epistle to Philemon, ver. 2.

Theodoret expressly says, that<sup>i</sup> Philemon was a citizen of Colosse, and that the house in which he dwelt, was still remaining there. Theophylact<sup>k</sup> calls him a Phrygian. Jerom likewise says, he<sup>l</sup> was of Colosse. But he bestows so many words to make it out, that we may be led to think there were some in his time who disputed it.

Philemon, therefore, was a Colossian. But whether he was an elder there, or only a private christian, in good circumstances, is not so certain. The inscription is,—"unto Philemon, our dearly beloved, and fellow labourer." Which last expression is ambiguous. It may imply, that Philemon was an elder in the church of Colosse. Or no

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Prolegom. num. 68—70. et 80—82.

<sup>g</sup> Philemoni dilecto.] Videtur habitasse Ephesi, ubi Onesimus postea episcopatu funetus est, ut et Ignatii literæ, et alii scriptores tradunt.—'Et adjutori meo.'] Id est uni Presbyterorum illorum, qui Ephesi plures erant, Act. xx. 17. Grot. in Philem. ver. 1. <sup>h</sup> Il paroît par là, que Philéon étoit un des Pasteurs de l'église de Colosses. Beaus.

<sup>i</sup> Πολυν δε ειχε τας Κολοσσας. Και η οικια δε αυτη μεχρι τω παροντος μεμενηκε. Theod. arg. ep. ad Philem. T. III. p. 516.

<sup>k</sup> Theop. ep. ad Philem. T. II. p. 861.

<sup>l</sup> Si autem Philemon, ad quem hæc epistola scribitur, Onesimi dominus est——et ad Colossenses refertur, quod ex iis sit, ratio nos ipsa et ordo deducit, quod et Philemon Colossensis sit, et eo tempore communem ad omnem ecclesiam Onesimus epistolam tulerit, quo privatas et sui commendatrices ad dominum literas sumserat. Est et aliud indicium, quod in hac eadem epistolâ et Archippus nominatur, cui hic cum Philemone scribitur: 'Dicite,' inquit, 'Archippo: Vide ministerium, quod accepisti a Domino, ut illud impleas.'---Ex quo puto, aut Episcopum fuisse Colossensis ecclesiæ, cui admonetur studiose et diligenter præesse, aut evangelii prædicatorem. Aut si ita non est, illud mihi impræsentiarum suffieit, quod et Philemon, et Archippus, et Onesimus ipse, qui literas perferebat, fuerint Colossenses, &c. Comm. in Philem. T. IV. p. 445.

more may be intended thereby, than, in general, that Philemon was some way useful in helping forward the gospel. In the Apostolical Constitutions,<sup>m</sup> Philemon is said to have been ordained bishop of Colosse by the apostles. But their testimony is of very little weight. I do not perceive Jerom to say expressly, that<sup>n</sup> Philemon was bishop, or elder at Colosse. Perhaps he was not positive about it in his own mind. The author of the Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, by some reckoned to be Hilary, deacon of Rome, says, that<sup>o</sup> Philemon had no ecclesiastical dignity, but was one of the laity. And Œcumenius, in his prologue to the second epistle of St. John, formerly<sup>p</sup> cited, appears also to have thought Philemon to be a man in a private station.

Perhaps some have been the rather unwilling to allow, that Philemon was a bishop, or elder, because he had a wife, whose name was Apphia, and because he was a man of substance, who had one slave at least, if not more. Nevertheless we have just observed two learned men, of very good judgment, Grotius and Beausobre, who were not much swayed by those considerations. One of whom thought Philemon to have been an elder in the church of Ephesus: the other, one of the pastors of the church of Colosse. To them I can now add<sup>q</sup> Dr. Doddridge.

However, as the thing is of no great importance, so I must acknowledge, that it is not very easy to be decided. St. Paul's expression, "fellow labourer," as before observed, is ambiguous. His manner of address, which is very earnest, farther induces me to hesitate. If Philemon had been an elder, he must have known his duty: and could not have needed so pressing an exhortation to receive a penitent, and him one of his family.

Onesimus, unquestionably, was received by the church of Colosse, as a good christian, upon the apostle's recommendation. It is as reasonable to think, that Philemon was reconciled to him: and, probably, gave him his freedom. In the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>r</sup> he is said to have been bishop of Berea in Macedonia. When Ignatius wrote his epistle to the Ephesians, about the year 107, their bishop's

<sup>m</sup> Const. Ap. l. 7. cap. 46.

<sup>n</sup> Scribunt igitur Paulus et Timotheus Philemoni carissimo et co-operatori; qui ideo carissimus dictus est, quod in eodem Christi opere versetur. In ep. ad Philem. p. 446.

<sup>o</sup> Philemon nullâ erat ecclesiasticâ ordinationis præditus dignitate, sed vir laudabilis, unus ex plebe, &c. Proleg. in ep. ad Philem.

<sup>p</sup> See Vol. v. ch. ix.

<sup>q</sup> See his preface to Philemon, p. 585, and his Paraphrase of the first verse, p. 589, of the Family Expositor, Vol. V.

Lib. 7. cap. 46.



name was Onesimus. And Grotius<sup>s</sup> thought him to be the same, for whom Paul interceded with Philemon. But that<sup>t</sup> is not certain.

#### SECT. XIV.

##### *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*

I shall inquire, 1. To whom it was written. 2. In what language. 3. By whom. 4. The time and place of writing it.

I. In the first place let us consider to whom this epistle was written, A. D. 63.

Sir Isaac Newton thought, 'that<sup>u</sup> this epistle was written to Jewish believers, who left Jerusalem about the time that the war broke out, and went into Asia.' According to this account, the epistle could not be written till some while after the breaking out of the war in Judea, in the year 66. But it will be difficult to show, that Paul, whom Sir Isaac allows to be the writer, lived so long. Not now to mention any thing else.

Dr. Wall was inclined to the same opinion, or somewhat not very different. 'I<sup>v</sup> agree, says he, that the epistle was written to Hebrews, that is, to the Hebrew Christians of some place. But for the place or country, I think, they were rather the Hebrew Christians of Asia, (Ephesus, Miletus, and thereabout,) Macedonia, Greece, &c. where St. Paul had spent most of his time, than that they were those of Jerusalem,' &c.

The late Mr. Wetstein conjectured, that<sup>w</sup> the epistle was written by Paul to the Jewish believers at Rome, soon after he had been released from his confinement in that city. Which conjecture, I believe, will be followed by very few. And as it has no ancient authority, and is destitute of all appearance of probability, I suppose it need not be confuted.

<sup>s</sup> See before, note<sup>s</sup> p. 77.

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Basnag. Ann. 60. num. xxvii.

<sup>u</sup> 'The epistle to the Hebrews, since it mentions Timothy, as related to the Hebrews, must be written to them, after their flight into Asia: where Timothy was bishop, and by consequence after the war was begun.' Newton's Observations upon the Apoc. of St. John, ch. i. p. 244.

<sup>v</sup> Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 317, 318.

<sup>w</sup> Si conjecturæ locus est, existimaverim potius ad Judæos qui Romæ degebant, et Christo nomen dederant, scriptam fuisse: quo admissio, facile intelligitur, quæ factum, tum ut Paulus, qui Româ quidem, sed non Italiâ, excedere jussus erat, brevi se redituum speraret, tum ut Itali Romanos salutarent Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 386, 387.

Lightfoot thought, ‘ That<sup>x</sup> this epistle was sent by Paul ‘ to the believing Jews of Judea, a people, says he, that had ‘ been much engaged to him, for his care of their poor, ‘ getting collections for them all along in his travels.’ He adds: ‘ It is not to be doubted, indeed, that he intendeth ‘ the discourse and matter of this epistle to the Jews ‘ throughout their dispersion.—Yet does he endorse it, and ‘ send it chiefly to the Hebrews, or the Jews of Judea, the ‘ principal part of the circumcision, as the properest centre ‘ to which to direct it, and from whence it might be best ‘ diffused in time to the whole circumference of the dis- ‘ persion.’

Whitby, in his preface to the epistle to the Hebrews, is of the same opinion, and argues much after the same manner with Lightfoot.

So likewise<sup>y</sup> Mill,<sup>z</sup> Pearson,<sup>a</sup> Lewis Capellus, and Beza in his preface to this epistle, and the editors of the French N. T. at Berlin in their general preface to St. Paul’s epistles, and in their preface to this epistle in particular. Of this Mr. Hallet had no doubt, who in his Synopsis of the epistle says: ‘ This epistle was particularly designed for the He- ‘ brew Christians, that dwelt in one certain place, and was ‘ sent thither, as appears from the apostle’s saying, ch. xiii. ‘ 19, 23. “ I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may ‘ be restored to you the sooner.—I will see you.” And ‘ what particular place can this be supposed to be, but ‘ Judea? There the Christians were continually persecuted ‘ by the unbelieving Jews, as we read in the Acts of the ‘ apostles, and as St. Paul takes notice, 1 Thess. ii. 14. Hebr. ‘ x. 32—36. ch. xii. 4, 5. By these persecutions the He- ‘ brew Christians were tempted to apostatize from Christi- ‘ anity, and to think, there was strength in the arguments ‘ urged by the persecutors in favour of Judaism. The ‘ apostle therefore sets himself to guard against both these ‘ dangers.’ And what follows.

This appears to me to be the most probable opinion.

For J. It is the opinion of the ancient christian writers, who received this epistle.

It may be taken for granted, that this was the opinion of

<sup>x</sup> Harmony of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 340.

<sup>y</sup> Per Hebræos autem istos potissimum fideles Hierosolymitanos intelligit, apud quos ante duos annos versatus fuerat. Hinc illud, *ἵνα ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῶν.* cap. xiii. 19. Mill. Proleg. num. 83.

<sup>z</sup> Annal. Paulin. p. 20, 21.

<sup>a</sup> Ex quibus conjeere licet, hanc epistolam a Paulo sub finem priorum vinculorum Româ scriptum fuisse ad Hierosolymitanos Judæos, qui in Christum crediderant. L. Capel. Hist. Ap. p. 80

Clement<sup>b</sup> of Alexandria, and<sup>c</sup> Jerom, and<sup>d</sup> Euthalius, who supposed this epistle to have been first written in Hebrew, and afterwards translated into Greek. It may be allowed to have been also the opinion of many others, who quote this epistle, as written to the Hebrews, when they say nothing to the contrary. Nor do I recollect any ancients, who say it was written to Jews living out of Judea.

Chrysostom says, that<sup>e</sup> the epistle was sent to the believing Jews of Palestine. And supposeth, that the apostle afterwards made them a visit. Theodoret<sup>f</sup> in his preface to the epistle allows it to be sent to the same Jews. And Theophylact<sup>g</sup> in his argument of the epistle expressly says, as Chrysostom, that it was sent to the Jews of Palestine. So that this<sup>h</sup> was the general opinion of the ancients.

2. There are in the epistle many things especially suitable to the believers in Judea. Which must lead us to think it was written to them. I shall select divers such passages.

1.) Hebr. i. 2,——“Has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.”

2.) Ch. iv. 2, “For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as to them.”

3.) Ch. ii. 1—4, “Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that we have heard——how then shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God also bearing them witness with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.”

Does not that exhortation, and the reason, with which it is supported, peculiarly suit the believers of Judea, where Christ himself first taught, and then his disciples after him, confirming their testimony with very numerous and conspicuous miracles?

4.) The people, to whom this epistle is sent, were well acquainted with our Saviour's sufferings, as they of Judea

<sup>b</sup> Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 14. <sup>c</sup> Scripserat, ut Hebræus Hebræis, Hebraïce, id est, suo eloquio disertissime. De V. I. cap. v.

<sup>d</sup> Argum. ep. ad Hebr. ap. zac. p. 670.

<sup>e</sup> Πᾶς δὲ ἦσαν ἐπιτελλεῖ; Ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν Ἱεροσολυμοῖς καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ.—— Δύο μὲν ἐν ἐτῇ ἐποίησεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ δεδεμένος· εἶτα ἀφείθη, εἶτα εἰς τὰς Σπανίας ἦλθεν· εἶτα εἰς Ἰεδαίαν ἐβῆ, ὅτε καὶ Ἰεδαῖος εἶδε. Καὶ τότε πάλιν ἦλθεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὅτε καὶ ὑπο Νερωνος ἀγῆρευθη. Pr. in ep. ad Hebr. T. XII. p. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Theodoret argum. ep. ad Hebr. <sup>g</sup> Τοῖς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ ἔε καὶ Ἱεροσολυμοῖς ἐπιτελλεῖ. Theophyl. arg. ep. ad Hebr. p. 872.

<sup>h</sup> Voyez la préf. de Beausobre sur l'épître aux Hébr. num. xxxviii

must have been. This appears in ch. i. 3; ii. 9, 18; v. 7, 8; ix. 14, 28; x. 11; xii. 2, 3; xiii. 12.

5.) Ch. v. 12, "For when ye ought to be teachers of others," and what follows, is most properly understood of christians in Jerusalem and Judea, to whom the gospel was first preached.

6.) What is said, ch. iv. 4—6, and x. 26—29, is most properly applicable to apostates in Judea.

7.) Ch. x. 32—34, "But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions—to the end of ver. 34. This leads us to the church of Jerusalem, which had suffered much, long before the writing this epistle, even very soon after they had received the knowledge of the truth. Comp. Acts viii. 1; ix. 1, 2; xi. 19; and 1 Thess, ii. 14. Grotius<sup>i</sup> supposeth as much.

8.) Those exhortations, ch. xiii. 13, 14, must have been very suitable to the case of the Jews of Jerusalem, at the supposed time of writing this epistle, a few years before the war in that country broke out.

9.) The regard shown in this epistle to the rulers of the church or churches, to which it is sent, is very remarkable. They are mentioned twice or thrice: first in ch. xiii. 7, "Remember your rulers, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith imitate, considering the end of their conversation." These were dead, as<sup>k</sup> Grotius observes. And Theodoret's note is to this purpose: 'He<sup>l</sup> intends the saints that were dead, Stephen the proto-martyr, James the brother of John, and James called the Just. And there were many others, who were taken off by the Jewish rage. Consider these,' says he, 'and observing their example, imitate their faith.' Then again at ver. 17, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves. For they watch for your souls."—And once more, ver. 24, "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints." Upon which Theodoret says: 'This<sup>m</sup> way of speaking intimates, that their rulers did not need such instruction. For which reason he did not write to

<sup>i</sup> Post Stephani mortem vehementer vexati fuere illi in Judeâ christiani, ut videre est, Act. xi. 19. 1 Thess. ii. 14. Grot. ad Heb. x. 34.

<sup>k</sup> Loquitur autem de iis, qui jam obierant, ut ostendunt sequentia. 'Qui vobis locuti sunt verbum Dei?' nempe in diversis oppidis: forte etiam diversis temporibus, cum mortuis alii successerint. Id. ad Hebr. xiii. 7.

<sup>l</sup> In ep. ad Hebr. cap. xiii. tom. III. p. 459. D.

<sup>m</sup> Λιγυτεται ὁ λόγος, ὡς οἱ προσηκουστικὸι αὐτῶν τοιαυτῆς διδασκαλίας ἐκ ἐχρήσαν· οὐ δὲ χάριν ἐκ κεινῶν ἐπεσεύειν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Ibid. p. 462. D.

‘ them, but to their disciples.’ That is a fine observation. And Whitby upon that verse, says: ‘ Hence, it seems evident, that this epistle was not sent to the bishops or rulers of the church, but to the whole church or the laity.’ And it may deserve to be considered, whether this repeated notice of the rulers among them does not afford ground to believe, that some of the apostles were in Judea? Whether there be sufficient reason to believe that, or not, I think these notices very proper and suitable to the state of the Jewish believers in Judea. For I am persuaded, that not only James, and all the other apostles, had exactly the same doctrine with Paul: but that all the elders likewise, and all the understanding men among the Jewish believers, embraced the same doctrine. They were, as I apprehend, the multitude only, *πληθος*, plebs, or the men of lower rank among them, who were attached to the peculiarities of the Mosaic law, and the customs of their ancestors. This may be argued from what James and the elders at Jerusalem say to Paul. Acts xxi. 20—22. “ Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are that believe. And they are all zealous of the law.—What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together.”——It is hence evident, that the zeal for the law, which prevailed in the minds of many, was not approved by James, or the elders. That being the case, these recommendations of a regard for their rulers, whether apostles, or elders, were very proper in an epistle sent to the believers in Judea.

For these reasons I think that this epistle was sent to the Jewish believers at Jerusalem, and in Judea.

But there are objections, which must be considered.

1. Obj. Ch. vi. 10, “ God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love,——in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.” Upon which Dr. Wall<sup>n</sup> remarks: ‘ Here again we are put upon thinking, to what church, or what christian this is said. For as to those of Jerusalem, we read much in Paul’s former letters, of their poverty, and of their being ministered to by the Gentile christians of Galatia, Macedonia, Corinth: and in the Acts, by the Antiochians: but no where of their ministering to other saints. If it is of them that St. Paul speaks this, it must be meant of their ministering to their own poor. For that they were famous at first, when the rich men sold their lands, and brought the money to the apostles, and they had all things in common, and none lacked. But in the time since that, they were very poor, and were relieved

<sup>n</sup> Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 366.

‘ by other churches.’ The late Mr. Wetstein, whose ° words I place below, argued much after the same manner with Dr. Wall. This objection perhaps, might be strengthened from Heb. xiii. 2, “ Be not forgetful to entertain strangers.” And from ver. 16, “ To do good, and to communicate, forget not.”

Ans. But the poverty of the Jews in Judea, and the contributions of the Gentile churches for their relief, are no reasons, why such admonitions as these should not be sent to them. They are properly directed to all christians, that they may be induced to exert themselves to the utmost. The Gentile churches, among whom St. Paul made collections for the saints in Judea, were not rich. As he says, 1 Cor. i. 26, “ For ye know your calling, brethren——not many mighty, not many noble, are called.”——And of the churches in Macedonia, he says, 2 Cor. viii. 2.——“ How that in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy, and their deep poverty, had abounded unto the riches of their liberality.” In like manner there might be instances of liberality to the distressed, among the believers in Judea. There is a fine example recorded, Acts ix. 36—39. Nor was there ever any city or country in the world, to whom that exhortation, “ be not forgetful to entertain strangers,” or, “ be not unmindful of hospitality,” *της φιλοξενίας μη επιλανθανεσθε*, could be more properly given, than Jerusalem and Judea. For the people there must have been much accustomed to it at their festivals, when there was a great resort thither from all countries. And the writer of an epistle to the christian inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea would naturally think of such an admonition; being desirous that they should not fall short of others in that respect. And we may here not unfitly recollect the history of St. Paul’s going to Jerusalem, and how he and his fellow travellers were entertained at Cæsarea, in the house of Philip the evangelist, and at Jerusalem, in the house of Mnason, an old disciple. As related Acts xxi. 8—16.

2. Obj. Upon ch. xiii. 18, 19, the same<sup>p</sup> Dr. Wall says, ‘ One would think, that Paul should have prayed and proposed to go any whither, rather than to Jerusalem, where

° Secundo, non possunt intelligi, qui Hierosolymis degebant. Ii enim pauperiores erant, et opus habebant, ut eorum inopia ab aliis ecclesiis sublevaretur.—his vero, ad quos hæc epistola scripta est, commendatur beneficentia, xiii. 16; vi. 10. Erant ergo tales, non qui stipem accipere, sed qui dare debebant, solebantque. Wetst. ubi supr. p. 368. fin.

<sup>p</sup> As before, p. 316.

‘ he had been so used : and where he fell into that five ‘ years’ imprisonment, from which he was but just now de- ‘ livered.’ To the like purpose also<sup>q</sup> Mr. Wetstein.

But there is not any improbability, that Paul might now desire to see his countrymen in Judea ; if he might go thither with safety, as I think he might. Almost three years had now passed since he left Judea ; and his trial, or apology, had been over two years. And he was now set at liberty by the emperor himself. No man, not very presumptuous, would admit a thought of disturbing him. However, I suppose, that the apostle would behave discreetly : so as to give no needless provocation to any, and that he would stay but a short time in Judea, and then go to Ephesus. There have been men of good sense, who have supposed, that Paul went to Jerusalem about this time, particularly Chrysostom<sup>r</sup> among the ancients, and<sup>s</sup> divers moderns, one of whom is<sup>t</sup> Pearson.

3. Obj. ‘ St. Peter’s epistles were written to the Hebrew ‘ christians, scattered in Asia, and Pontus, Galatia, Cappa- ‘ docia, and Bithynia. St. Paul must have written an epis- ‘ tle to those Hebrew christians, to whom St. Peter writes ‘ his two epistles. For St. Peter, 2 epist. iii. 15, cites to ‘ them what “ Paul had written unto them.” No epistle of ‘ Paul was written to Hebrews, particularly, but this. So ‘ that these must be the Hebrews of the above named ‘ countries.’

To which I answer, that St. Peter’s epistles were not sent to Jews, but to Gentiles, or to all christians in general, in the places above mentioned, as will be clearly shown here- after. When St. Peter says, “ as Paul has written unto you,” he may intend Paul’s epistle to the Galatians, and<sup>v</sup> some other epistles written to Gentiles. If he refers at all to this epistle to the Hebrews, it is comprehended under that expression, ver. 16, “ as also in all his epistles.”

4. Obj. This epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been written in Greek. But if it had been sent to the Jewish believers in Judea, it would have been written in Hebrew.

<sup>q</sup> Ubi supra, p. 386.

<sup>r</sup> See before, p. 81.

<sup>s</sup> Lud. Capell. Hist. Apost. p. 39. L’Enfant et Beausobre, Préf. générale sur les épîtres de St. Paul. num. lv.

<sup>t</sup> Paulus e Cretâ eum Timotheo in Judæam navigat. Heb. xiii. 23. Annal. Paulin. p. 21. A. Chr. 64.

<sup>u</sup> Wall, as before, p. 318, 319.

<sup>v</sup> Videtur respicere Petrus ad Rom. ii. 4. ubi de Dei ‘ longanimitate’ similia habet his quæ docet hic Petrus : dicereque ad Asiaticos scriptam epistolam, quæ ad Romanos data, eo quod epistolæ Pauli, quamquam ad singulas ecclesias, et homines singulos, missæ, omnium christianorum illius ævi communes jure haberentur. Cleric. H. E. A. 69. p. 459.

To which I answer, that allowing the epistle to have been written in Greek, it might be sent to the believers in Judea. If St. Paul wrote to the Jewish believers in Palestine, he intended the epistle for general use, for all christians, whether of Jewish or Gentile original. Many<sup>w</sup> of the Jews in Judea understood Greek. Few of the Jews out of Judea understood Hebrew. The Greek language was almost universal, and therefore generally used. All St. Paul's epistles are in Greek, even that to the Romans. And are not both St. Peter's epistles in Greek? and St. John's, and St. Jude's? Yea, did not St. James likewise write in Greek, who is supposed to have resided at Jerusalem, from the time of our Lord's ascension, to the time of his own death? His epistle is inscribed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad." But I presume, that they of the twelve tribes who dwelt in Judea, are not excluded by him, but intended. Nor could he be unwilling, that his epistle should be read and understood by those, who were his special charge. The epistle written by Barnabas, a Levite, or ascribed to him, was written in Greek. Not now to mention any other Jewish writers who have used the Greek language.

II. Thus we are unawares brought to the inquiry, in what language this epistle was written. For there have been doubts about it among both ancients and moderns. So that we are obliged to take some particular notice of this point. But I should have deferred the consideration of it, till we had observed the writer of the epistle, if the just mentioned objection had not brought this inquiry in our way in this place.

And it may be recollected, that<sup>x</sup> I formerly alleged divers learned and judicious moderns, who have been of opinion, that Greek, and not Hebrew, was the original language of this epistle. To them I now add several others: <sup>y</sup> James Capellus, <sup>z</sup> S. Basnage, <sup>a</sup> Mill in his Prolegomena

<sup>w</sup> Ils n'ont point eu d'autre raison de croire, que S. Paul avoit écrit en Hébreu, que celle qu'il écrivoit à des Hébreux. Or cette raison, toute vraisemblable qu'elle paroît, n'est point convaincante, parcequ'il est certain, que la langue Grecque étoit entendue dans la Judée, quoiqu'elle ne fût pas la langue vulgaire. Tous les auteurs du Nouveau Testament ont écrit en Grec, bien qu'ils écrivissent pour tous les fidèles, soit Hébreux, soit Gentils. Beaus. Préf. sur l'épître aux Hébreux. num. xv. <sup>x</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. lxxii.

<sup>y</sup> Jacob. Capell. observat. in ep. ad Hebr. sect. ii. et iii.

<sup>z</sup> Ann. 61. num. vi. <sup>a</sup> Et sane magis adhuc futilis est eorum sententia, qui hanc epistolam Paulo quidem Hebraice scriptam volunt, ab alio autem aliquo tractam fuisse in sermone Græcum. Nihil enim clarius atque evidentius, quam eam linguâ Græcâ primitus conceptam fuisse, &c. Prolegom. num. 95—98.



to the New Testament, and<sup>b</sup> the late Mr. Wetstein, and also Spanheim<sup>c</sup> in his Dissertation concerning the author of this epistle, which well deserves to be consulted. One argument for this, both of<sup>d</sup> Spanheim, and<sup>e</sup> Wetstein, is taken from the Greek paronomasias in the epistle, or the frequent concurrence of Greek words of like sound. Which seems to be an argument not easy to be answered.

Some ancient christian writers were of opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was written in the Hebrew language, and<sup>f</sup> translated into Greek by Luke, or Clement of Rome. Jerom<sup>g</sup> in particular, seems to have supposed, that this epistle was written in Hebrew. And Origen also is sometimes reckoned among those, who were of this opinion. But I think I have shown it to be probable that<sup>h</sup> he thought it was written in Greek. It seems likewise, that they must have been of the same opinion, who considered the elegance of the Greek language of this epistle as an objection against its having been written by St. Paul. For if the Greek epistle had been supposed to be a translation, the superior elegance of the style of this epistle above that of the other epistles of Paul could have afforded no objection against his being the author of it.

Indeed the ancients, as Beausobre said<sup>i</sup> formerly, had no other reason to believe that St. Paul wrote in Hebrew, but that he wrote to the Hebrews. So likewise says<sup>k</sup> Capellus. The title deceived them. And because it was written to

<sup>b</sup> Ad hæc observamus, I. epistolam ad Hebræos, quæ nunc Græce exstat, non esse interpretis, sed ipsius auctoris. Qui putant ad Hebræos non aliter quam Hebræice scribi debuisse, manifesto falluntur. Omnes enim novi fœderis libri, etiam Matthæi, ut ad ipsum vidimus, linguâ Græcâ scripti sunt. Hanc linguam plerique Judæi nôrant. Wetstein. T. Gr. T. II. p. 385.

<sup>c</sup> Spanh. De Auctore epist. ad Heb. Part. III. cap. ii. tom. II. p. 245—252.

<sup>d</sup> Nono, decretorium fere argumentum est a Græcorum idiotismis, hæc in epistolâ passim conspicuus. Pauca hæc de multis. Auctor. cap. v. versu 8. elegantem adhibet *παρωνομασιαν*, Scil. Ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν επαθε, qualem Hebræismus non ferebat. Græci contra mire sibi in talibus placent, &c. Spanh. ubi supr. n. xii. p. 249.

<sup>e</sup> Porro manifestæ reperiuntur paronomasias, et ὁμοιοτελεντα, quæ si in aliam linguam convertantur, pereunt. Hebr. v. 8. et ver. 14. *καλεσ τε και κακε*. vii. 3. *απατωρ, αμητωρ*. xi. 37. *επισθησαν, επειρασθησαν*. ix. 10. *βρωμασι και πορωμασι*. xiii. 14. *μερσαν και μελλσαν*. Talia auctor potius sectatur quam interpretes. Wetst. ib. p. 385.

<sup>f</sup> See Vol ii. ch. ii. xxii. and Vol. iv. ch. lxxii. <sup>g</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxiv.

<sup>h</sup> See Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. and Vol. iv. ch. lxxii.

<sup>i</sup> Vol. iv. ch. lxxii. See likewise here, p. 86. note<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> Qui volunt hanc epistolam Hebræice scriptam, hos decepit titulus. Cum enim ad Hebræos scribebatur, Hebræice quoque scribi debuisse sunt opinati. Sed meminisse debuerant, etiam Hierosolymis magnum fuisse linguæ Græcæ usum. Cis Hierosolymam paucissimi Judæi aliter quam Græce loquebantur. Jacob. Capel. Observat. in Nov. Testam. p. 109.

Hebrews, they concluded it was written in Hebrew. For none of the ancients appear to have seen a copy of this epistle in that language.

III. I now proceed to the third inquiry, who is the writer of this epistle. And many things offer in favour of the apostle Paul.

I. It is ascribed to him by many of the ancients.

Here I think myself obliged briefly to recollect the testimonies of ancient authors, which have been produced at large in the preceding volumes. And I shall rank them under two heads: first, the testimonies of writers who used the Greek tongue, then the testimonies of those who lived in that part of the Roman empire, where the Latin was the vulgar language.

There are some passages<sup>l</sup> in the *épistles* of Ignatius, about the year 107, which may be thought by some to contain allusions to the epistle to the Hebrews. The epistle seems to be referred to by<sup>m</sup> Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, in his epistle written to the Philippians in the year 108, and<sup>n</sup> in the relation of his martyrdom, written about the middle of the second century. This epistle is often quoted as Paul's by<sup>o</sup> Clement of Alexandria, about the year 194. It is received, and quoted as Paul's by<sup>p</sup> Origen, about 230. It was also received as the apostle's by<sup>q</sup> Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria in 247. It is plainly referred to by<sup>r</sup> Theognostus of Alexandria, about 282. It appears to have been received by<sup>s</sup> Methodius, about 292, by<sup>t</sup> Pamphilus, about 294, and by<sup>u</sup> Archelaus, bishop in Mesopotamia, at the beginning of the fourth century, by<sup>v</sup> the Manichees in the fourth, and<sup>w</sup> by the Paulicians, in the seventh century. It was received, and ascribed to Paul by<sup>x</sup> Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in the year 313, and by<sup>y</sup> the Arians in the fourth century. Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, about 315, says, 'There<sup>z</sup> are fourteen epistles of Paul, manifest and well known: but yet there are some, who reject that to the Hebrews, alleging, in behalf of their opinion, that it was not received by the church of Rome, as a writing of Paul.' It is often quoted by Eusebius himself,<sup>a</sup> as Paul's, and sacred scripture. This epistle was received by<sup>b</sup> Athanasius without any hesitation. In his enumeration of St.

<sup>l</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 87, 88.

<sup>m</sup> P. 111.

<sup>n</sup> P. 690, 721.

<sup>o</sup> P. 194—196.

<sup>p</sup> P. 403.

<sup>q</sup> P. 581, 582.

<sup>r</sup> P. 119, 120.

<sup>s</sup> P. 225, 239.

<sup>t</sup> P. 226.

<sup>u</sup> P. 448.

<sup>m</sup> P. 106.

<sup>p</sup> P. 495, 501.

<sup>r</sup> Vol. iii. p. 152.

<sup>u</sup> P. 258.

<sup>x</sup> P. 567.

<sup>z</sup> Vol. iv. p. 98, 102, 103.

<sup>b</sup> P. 155, 157.

Paul's fourteen epistles, this is placed next after the two to the Thessalonians, and before the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. The same order is observed <sup>c</sup> in the Synopsis of scripture ascribed to him. This epistle is received as Paul's by <sup>d</sup> Adamantius, author of a dialogue against the Marcionites in 330, and by <sup>e</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem, in 348, by <sup>f</sup> the council of Laodicea, in 363. Where St. Paul's epistles are enumerated in the same order, as in Athanasius, just taken notice of. This epistle is also received as Paul's by <sup>g</sup> Epiphanius, about 368, by <sup>h</sup> the Apostolical Constitutions, about the end of the fourth century, by <sup>i</sup> Basil, about 370, by <sup>k</sup> Gregory Nazianzen, in 370, by Amphilochius<sup>l</sup> also. But he says it was not received by all as Paul's. It was received by <sup>m</sup> Gregory Nyssen, about 371, by <sup>n</sup> Didymus of Alexandria, about the same time, by <sup>o</sup> Ephrem the Syrian, in 370, and by <sup>p</sup> the churches of Syria, by <sup>q</sup> Diodorus of Tarsus, in 378, by <sup>r</sup> Hierax, a learned Egyptian, about the year 302, by <sup>s</sup> Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, about 347, by <sup>t</sup> Titus, bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, about 362, by <sup>u</sup> Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, about the year 394, by <sup>v</sup> Chrysostom, at the year 398, by <sup>w</sup> Severian, bishop of Gabala, in Syria, 401, by <sup>x</sup> Victor of Antioch, about 401, by <sup>y</sup> Palladius, author of a life of Chrysostom, about 408, by <sup>z</sup> Isidore of Pelusium, about 412, by <sup>a</sup> Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, in 412, by <sup>b</sup> Theodoret, at 423, by <sup>cc</sup> Eutherius, bishop of Tyana, in Cappadocia, in 431, by <sup>dd</sup> Socrates, the Ecclesiastical Historian, about 440, by <sup>ee</sup> Euthalius, in Egypt, about 458, and, probably, by <sup>ff</sup> Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite; by <sup>gg</sup> the author of the *Quæstiones et Responsiones*, commonly ascribed to Justin Martyr, but rather written in the fifth century. It is in <sup>hh</sup> the Alexandrian manuscript, about the year 500, and <sup>ii</sup> in the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, about 806, is received as Paul's by <sup>kk</sup> Cosmas of Alexandria, about 535, by <sup>ll</sup> Leontius, of Constantinople, about 610, by <sup>mm</sup> John Damascen, in 730, by <sup>nn</sup> Pho-

<sup>c</sup> P. 162, 163.<sup>f</sup> P. 182.<sup>i</sup> P. 279.<sup>m</sup> P. 296.<sup>p</sup> P. 321, 322.<sup>s</sup> P. 271.<sup>v</sup> P. 537, 547.<sup>y</sup> Vol. v. p. 6.<sup>b</sup> P. 15, 17.<sup>ee</sup> P. 71.<sup>hh</sup> Vol. v. p. 82.<sup>ll</sup> P. 143.<sup>d</sup> P. 167.<sup>g</sup> P. 187—189.<sup>k</sup> P. 287.<sup>u</sup> P. 303.<sup>q</sup> P. 377.<sup>t</sup> P. 274, 404.<sup>w</sup> P. 571.<sup>z</sup> P. 10.<sup>cc</sup> P. 33.<sup>ff</sup> P. 73, 74.<sup>ii</sup> P. 86.<sup>mm</sup> P. 147.<sup>e</sup> P. 173, 174.<sup>h</sup> P. 227.<sup>l</sup> P. 292, 293.<sup>o</sup> P. 310.<sup>r</sup> Vol. iii. p. 288.<sup>u</sup> Vol. iv. p. 395.<sup>x</sup> P. 586.<sup>a</sup> P. 13.<sup>dd</sup> P. 172.<sup>gg</sup> Vol. ii. p. 129.<sup>kk</sup> P. 95.<sup>nn</sup> P. 150.

tius, about 858, by<sup>o</sup> Œcumenius, about the year 950, and by<sup>p</sup> Theophylact in 1070. I shall not go any lower.

I shall now rehearse such authors as lived in that part of the Roman empire, where the Latin was the vulgar tongue.

Here in the first place offers Clement in his epistle to the Corinthians, written about the year 96, or, as some others say, about the year 70. For though he wrote in Greek, we rank him among Latin authors, because he was bishop of Rome. In his epistle<sup>a</sup> are divers passages, generally supposed to contain allusions, or references to the epistle to the Hebrews. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, about 178, as we are assured by Eusebius, alleged<sup>r</sup> some passages out of this epistle, in a work now lost. Nevertheless, it does not appear, that he received it as St. Paul's. By Tertullian, presbyter of Carthage, about the year 200, this<sup>s</sup> epistle is ascribed to Barnabas. Caius, about 212, supposed to have been presbyter in the church of Rome, reckoning<sup>t</sup> up the epistles of St. Paul, mentioned thirteen only, omitting that to the Hebrews. Here I place Hippolytus, who flourished about 220. But it is not certainly known where he was bishop, whether at Porto in Italy, or at some place in the east. We have seen evidences, that<sup>u</sup> he did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's. And perhaps that may afford an argument, that though he wrote in Greek, he lived where the Latin tongue prevailed. This epistle is<sup>v</sup> not quoted by Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about 248, and afterwards. Nor does it appear to have been received by<sup>w</sup> Novatus, otherwise called Novatian, presbyter of Rome, about 251. Nevertheless it was in after times received<sup>x</sup> by his followers. It may be thought by some, that this epistle is referred to by<sup>y</sup> Arnobius, about 306, and<sup>z</sup> Lactantius about the same time. It is plainly quoted by<sup>a</sup> another Arnobius in the fifth century. It was received as Paul's by<sup>b</sup> Hilary, of Poitiers, about 354, and by<sup>c</sup> Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, in Sardinia, about the same time, and by<sup>d</sup> his followers. It was also received as Paul's by<sup>e</sup> C. M. Victorinus. Whether<sup>f</sup> it was received by Optatus, of Milevi, in Africa, about 370, is doubtful. It was received as Paul's by<sup>g</sup> Ambrose, bishop of Milan, about 374, by<sup>h</sup>

<sup>o</sup> P. 154, 155.

<sup>p</sup> P. 157.

<sup>q</sup> Those passages are alleged,

with remarks, vol. ii. p. 46—50, and see p. 53.

<sup>r</sup> P. 176—178, and 182.

<sup>s</sup> P. 288—291.

<sup>t</sup> P. 397—400.

<sup>u</sup> P. 425, 436.

<sup>v</sup> Vol. iii. p. 40—43, and 55.

<sup>w</sup> P. 115—117.

<sup>x</sup> P. 116, 120, 121.

<sup>y</sup> P. 479.

<sup>z</sup> P. 538, 539.

<sup>a</sup> P. 480.

<sup>b</sup> Vol. iv. p. 179.

<sup>c</sup> P. 250.

<sup>d</sup> P. 251.

<sup>e</sup> P. 256.

<sup>f</sup> P. 328.

<sup>g</sup> P. 334.

<sup>h</sup> P. 366.

the Priscillianists, about 378. About the year 380, was published a commentary upon thirteen epistles of Paul only,<sup>i</sup> ascribed to Hilary, deacon of Rome. It was received as Paul's by<sup>k</sup> Philaster, bishop of Brescia in Italy, about 380. But he takes notice that it was not then received by all. His successor Gaudentius, about 387, quotes this<sup>l</sup> epistle as Paul's. It is also readily received as Paul's by<sup>m</sup> Jerom, about 392. And he says, it was generally received by the Greeks, and the christians in the east, but not by all the Latins. It was received as Paul's by<sup>n</sup> Rufinus in 397. It is also in<sup>o</sup> the catalogue of the third council of Carthage in 397. It is frequently quoted by<sup>p</sup> Augustin as St. Paul's. In one place,<sup>q</sup> he says, 'It is of doubtful authority with some. But he was inclined to follow the opinion of the churches in the east, who received it among the canonical scriptures.' It was received as Paul's by<sup>r</sup> Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, in Italy, about 401, by<sup>s</sup> Innocent, bishop of Rome, about 402, by<sup>t</sup> Paulinus, bishop of Nola, in Italy, about 403. Pelagius<sup>u</sup> about 405, wrote a commentary upon thirteen epistles of St. Paul, omitting that to the Hebrews. Nevertheless it was received by<sup>v</sup> his followers. It was received by<sup>w</sup> Cassian, about 424, by<sup>x</sup> Prosper of Aquitain, about 434, and by<sup>y</sup> the authors of the works ascribed to him: by<sup>z</sup> Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, in 434, by<sup>a</sup> Sedulius, about 818, by<sup>b</sup> Leo, bishop of Rome, in 440, by<sup>c</sup> Salvian, presbyter of Marseilles, about 440, by<sup>d</sup> Gelasius, bishop of Rome, about 496, by<sup>e</sup> Facundus, an African bishop, about 540, by<sup>f</sup> Junilius, an African bishop, about 556, by<sup>g</sup> Cassiodorius, in 556, by<sup>h</sup> the author of the imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, about 560, by<sup>i</sup> Gregory, bishop of Rome, about 590, by<sup>kk</sup> Isidore of Seville, about 596, and by<sup>ll</sup> Bede, about 701, or the beginning of the eighth century.

It may be now needful to make a few remarks.

It is evident that this epistle was generally received in ancient times, by those christians, who used the Greek language, and lived in the eastern part of the Roman empire. I forbear to insist here on the seeming references in Ignatius

<sup>i</sup> P. 381.<sup>k</sup> P. 386, 387.<sup>l</sup> P. 388.<sup>m</sup> P. 436, 451, 454, 455.<sup>n</sup> P. 483, 484.<sup>o</sup> P. 487.<sup>p</sup> P. 494, 506—509.<sup>q</sup> P. 508.<sup>r</sup> P. 581.<sup>s</sup> P. 586.<sup>t</sup> P. 589.<sup>u</sup> P. 590.<sup>v</sup> P. 591.<sup>w</sup> Vol. v. p. 29.<sup>x</sup> P. 36.<sup>y</sup> P. 38, 39.<sup>z</sup> P. 52.<sup>a</sup> P. 57, 58.<sup>b</sup> P. 62.<sup>c</sup> P. 65.<sup>d</sup> P. 76.<sup>e</sup> P. 101.<sup>f</sup> P. 107.<sup>g</sup> P. 110, 113.<sup>h</sup> P. 121.<sup>i</sup> P. 129, 130.<sup>kk</sup> P. 135—137.<sup>ll</sup> P. 144.

and Polycarp. But Clement of Alexandria, before the end of the second century, received this epistle as Paul's, and quotes it as such frequently, without any doubt or hesitation. And had a tradition from some before him, concerning the reason why the apostle did not prefix his name to this, as he did to the other epistles.

Concerning the Latin writers, it is obvious to remark, that this epistle is not expressly quoted, as Paul's, by any of them in the first three centuries. However, it was known to Irenæus, and Tertullian, as we have seen, and possibly to others also. It is generally supposed, that there are divers allusions and references to this epistle, in the epistle of Clement of Rome, written to the Corinthians. However, I formerly mentioned<sup>m</sup> two learned men, who did not think that a clear point. I have since met with another of the same mind, whose words I place<sup>n</sup> below. And I must likewise refer to a consideration, formerly<sup>o</sup> proposed: that the little notice taken of this epistle by Latin writers in the second and third centuries; and Eusebius<sup>p</sup> and Jerom<sup>q</sup> assuring us, that by many of the Romans in their time this epistle was not received; seem to weaken the supposition, that Clement had often alluded to this epistle. For if the church of Rome, in his time, had owned it for an epistle of Paul, it is not easy to conceive, how any Latin christians afterwards should have rejected it, or doubted of its authority.

However, it is manifest, that it was received as an epistle of St. Paul by many Latin writers in the fourth, fifth, and following centuries.

The reasons of doubting about the genuineness of this epistle, probably, were the want of a name at the beginning, and the difference of argument, or subject matter, and of style, from the commonly received epistles of the apostle, as is intimated by<sup>r</sup> Jerom. Whether they are sufficient reasons for rejecting this epistle, will be considered in the course of our argument.

2. There is nothing in the epistle itself, that renders it impossible or unlikely to be his.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 50.

<sup>n</sup> Sed quis dubitaret, quin ex epistolâ ad Hebræos multa habeat, eum Eusebius illud diserte annotet——? Nee tamen illud tam exploratum est. Phrasium et sententiarum æqualitas, ex quâ illud unice derivandum est (nam nusquam a Clemente citatur) non est adeo perfecta et frequens, non adeo singularis, ut ex Ep. ad Hebræos eas repetitas esse, inde evincatur. Herman. Venem. Diss. ii. de Tit. ep. ad Ephes. num. viii. p. 343.

<sup>o</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 54.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 3. p. 72. B. C. and in this work, Vol. iv. ch. lxxii.

<sup>q</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. id.

For the epistle appears to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem; as was of old observed by<sup>s</sup> Chrysostom, and<sup>t</sup> Theodoret, and has been argued also by many moderns.<sup>u</sup> That the temple was still standing, and sacrifices there offered, may be inferred from ch. viii. 4, "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest: seeing there are priests, that offer according to the law:" and from ch. xiii. 10, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle." Moreover, if<sup>v</sup> the temple had been destroyed, and the worship there abolished, the writer would not have failed to take some notice of it, in support of his argument, and for abating the too great attachment of many to the rites of the Mosaic institution. To this purpose speaks Spanheim in a passage which I have transcribed below. And in like manner another learned commentator, to<sup>w</sup> whom I refer. It is also probable,<sup>x</sup> that those words, ch. iii. 13, "While it is called to-day," refer to the patience which God yet continued to exercise toward the Jewish nation. He seems to have had in view the approaching desolation of Jerusalem, which would put an end to that "to-day," and finish the time which God gave to the Jews, as a nation, to "hear his voice." And Lightfoot<sup>y</sup> argues from ch. xii. 4, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood:" that the epistle was written before the war in Judea was begun.

Indeed those words have been the ground of an objection against this epistle having been sent to the believing Jews in Judea, because there had been already several martyrdoms in that country. That difficulty I would now remove. And I have received from a learned friend the following observation, which may be of use. 'It seems to me,' says he, 'that the<sup>z</sup> apostle here, as well as in the preceding

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Chrysost. Pr. in Ep. ad Heb. T. XII. p. 4. C. D.

<sup>t</sup> Theod. in Heb. xiii. 9, 10.

<sup>u</sup> Quærentibus, quo tempore, et unde scripta sit epistola ad Hebræos, nihil est quod respondeamus, nisi scriptam fuisse, cum Judæi adhuc gloriarentur templo Jerosolymitano, et sacerdotio Mosaico: de quibus ubique loquitur scriptor, ut etiamnum stantibus. Cleric. Hist. Ec. An. 69. p. 461.

<sup>v</sup> Quia nata hæc epistola, stante templo et Levitico sacerdotio—Heb. viii. 4. Neque alias necesse fuit declamare in sacrificiorum usum, et praxin sacerdotii, penitus eo templi et urbis et reipublicæ eversione sublato. Neque maxime omnium prægnans argumentum Judæis confundendis, et coërcendis pseudo-apostolis, ab ipsâ jacturâ cultûs, et Hierosolymitanæ sedis restitutionis spe nullâ amplius affulgente prætermisisset. Spanhem. ubi supra, P. II. cap. vi. p. 3. T. I. p. 229.

<sup>w</sup> See Beausobre's preface to the epistle to the Hebrews, num. iii.

<sup>x</sup> The same.

<sup>y</sup> Harm. of the N. T. Vol. i. p. 339.

<sup>z</sup> --- πρὸς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἀνταγωνίζομενοι.

‘ context, alludes to the Grecian games or exercises : and  
 ‘ he signifies, that they, to whom he writes, had not been  
 ‘ called out to the most dangerous combats, and had not  
 ‘ run the immediate hazard of their lives. Which, I sup-  
 ‘ pose, might be said of them, as a body, or church.’ And  
 I shall transfer hither Mr. Beausobre’s note upon this place.  
 ‘ There had been martyrs in Judea, as Stephen, and the  
 ‘ two James’s. But for the most part the Jews did not put  
 ‘ the christians to death, for want of power. They were  
 ‘ imprisoned and scourged. See Acts v. 40, and here ch.  
 ‘ xiii. 3. And they endured reproaches, and the loss of  
 ‘ their substance, ch. x. 32—34. These were the sufferings,  
 ‘ which they had met with. The apostle therefore here  
 ‘ indirectly reproves the Hebrews, that though God treated  
 ‘ them with more indulgence than he had done his people  
 ‘ in former times, and even than his own Son, they never-  
 ‘ theless wavered in their profession of the gospel. See  
 ‘ ver. 12.’

3. There are divers exhortations in this epistle, much resembling some in the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. xii. 3, —“ Lest<sup>a</sup> ye be wearied, and faint in your mind.” Gal. vi. 9, “ And<sup>b</sup> let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.” And see 2 Thess. iii. 13. and Eph. iii. 13.

2.) Heb. xii. 14, “ Follow<sup>c</sup> peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.” An exhortation very suitable to Paul, and to the Jewish believers in Judea: admonishing them not to impose the rituals of the law upon others, that is, the Gentile believers, and to maintain friendship with them, though they did not embrace the law. It has also a resemblance with Rom. xii. 18. But the words of the original are different.

3.) Heb. xiii. 1, “ Let brotherly love continue:” and what follows to the end of ver. 3. Then at ver. 4, “ Marriage is honourable. But fornicators and adulterers God will judge.” Here is an agreement with Eph. v. 2, 3, “ And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us. — But fornication and all uncleanness, and covetousness, let it not be once named among you.” — Ver. 4, “ For this ye know, that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, — has any inheritance in the kingdom of God.”

4.) Ch. xiii. 16, “ But<sup>d</sup> to do good, and to communicate,

<sup>a</sup> — — *ἵνα μὴ κληθεῖτε, ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐκλυόμενοι.*

<sup>b</sup> Το δὲ καλὸν ποιῶντες μὴ ἐκκακώμεν. Καίρω γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερισόμεν, μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. <sup>c</sup> *Ἐιρημὴν ἐδώκετε μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸν ἀγιασμόν*

<sup>d</sup> *Τῆς δὲ ἐμποίας καὶ κοινωρίας μὴ ἐπιλαμβάνεσθε.*



forget not. For with such sacrifices God is well pleased." That exhortation is very suitable to Paul's doctrine, and has an agreement with what he says elsewhere, as Philip. iv. 18,—"An odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." Moreover as is observed<sup>e</sup> by Grotius upon this text, the word communicate, or communion, is found in a like sense in the Acts and in other epistles of St. Paul. See Acts ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ch. ix. 13.

4. In the next place I observe some instances of agreement in the style, or phrases, of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

1.) Heb. ii. 4, "God<sup>f</sup> also bearing them witness with signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost."

"Signs and wonders," together, seldom occur in other books of the New Testament. But they are found several times in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. The phrase is in Matt. xxiv. 24, and Mark xiii. 22, and once likewise in St. John's gospel, ch. iv. 48. But it is several times in the Acts, ch. ii. 19; iv. 30; v. 12; vi. 8; viii. 13; xiv. 3; xv. 12. The most remarkable are these, where there are three different words. Acts ii. 22,—"A man approved of God among you by<sup>g</sup> miracles, and wonders, and signs." Rom. xv. 19,—"Through<sup>h</sup> mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God." 2 Cor. xii. 12,—"In signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds." 2 Thess. ii. 9, "k With all power, and signs, and lying wonders."

2.) Ch. ii. 14,—"That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death." The word *καταργεω* or *καταργεομαι*, is, I think, no where used in the New Testament, except in Luke xiii. 7, and St. Paul's epistles, where it is several times: and is sometimes used in a sense resembling this place, particularly 2 Tim. i. 10, "Who has abolished death:" *καταργησαντος μεν θανατον*. And 1 Cor. xv. 26. Compare Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, Vol. IV. upon 1 Cor. xv. 24.

3.) Ch. iii. 1,—"Holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling:" Philip. iii. 14,—"The prize of the

<sup>e</sup> *Κοινωνιας* vox refertur ad pecunias, et ea, quæ pecuniis comparantur. Vide Act. ii. 42. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 13. Grot. in Heb. xiii. 16.

<sup>f</sup> *Συνεπιμαρτυρησαντος τε θεου σημειοις τε και τερασι, και ποικιλαις δυναμεσι, και πνευματος αγιου μερισμοις.* <sup>g</sup> ——— *δυναμει, και τερασι, και σημειοις.*

<sup>h</sup> ——— *εν δυναμει σημειων, και τερατων, εν δυναμει πνευματος θεου.* <sup>i</sup> ——— *εν σημειοις, και τερασι, και δυναμει.*

<sup>k</sup> ——— *εν παση δυναμει, και σημειοις, και τερασι ψευδους.*

high calling of God in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. i. 9,—  
 "Who has called us with an holy calling."

4.) Ch. v. 12,—“And are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.” 1 Cor. iii. 2, “I have fed you with milk, and not with meat.” However, in the original, there is no great agreement in the words, except that in both places “milk” is used for the first rudiments of the christian doctrine.

5.) Ch. viii. 1,—“Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty on high. Eph. i. 21,—“And set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.”

6.) Ch. viii. 6; ix. 15; and xii. 24, Jesus Christ is styled “mediator.” So likewise in Gal. iii. 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5, and in no other books of the New Testament.

7.) Ch. viii. 5, “Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.”—*και σκια—των επερανιων.* x. 1, “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things.” *Σκιαν εχων—των μελλοντων αγαθων, εκ αυτην την εικονα των πραγαματων.* Col. ii. 17, “Which are a shadow of things to come. But the body is of Christ.” *Α εστι σκια των μελλοντων, το δε σωμα τω Χριστω.*

8.) Ch. x. 33, “Whilst ye were made a gazing-stock,” or spectacle, “both by reproaches and afflictions.” *ονεδισμοις τε και θλιψειςι θεατριζομενοι.* 1 Cor. iv. 9, “For we are made a spectacle unto the world”——*οτι θεατρον εγεννηθημεν τω κοσμω.*

9.) St. Paul, in<sup>1</sup> his acknowledged epistles, often alludes to the exercises and games, which were then very reputable and frequent in Greece, and other parts of the Roman empire. There are divers such allusions in this epistle, which have also great elegance. So ch. vi. 18, “Who have fled for refuge to<sup>m</sup> lay hold of the hope set before us,” or the reward of eternal life, proposed to animate and encourage us. And ch. xii. 1, “Wherefore seeing we also<sup>n</sup> are com-

<sup>1</sup> See 1 Cor. ix. 24—26. 1 Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 5. and ch. iv. 7, 8.

<sup>m</sup> *Κρατησαι της προκειμενης ελπιδος:* ‘ad obtinendam spem propositam,’ sc. vitam æternam. Elegantissima metaphora est vocis προκειμενης, e veterum certaminum ratione ducta. Proprie enim προκεισθαι dicuntur τα αθλα, sc. præmia certaminis, quæ publice proponuntur in propatulo, ut eorum adspectus, certa que eorum adipiscendorum spes certaturos alacriores redderet ad certamen ineundum, victoriamque reportandam; ut interpretabamur supra ad 2 Tim. iv. 8. το αποκεισθαι, quod eandem significationem obtinet. J. Tob. Krebsii Observat. in N. T. e Josepho. p. 377.

Ego vero puto φευγειν accipi pro συντονωσ τρεχειν, et sumptam translationem a gymniciis ludis; quo spectant etiam vocabula κρατησαι, καταπετασματος, et προδρομω. Bez. in loc.

<sup>n</sup> See Mr. Hallet upon the place, note <sup>a</sup> p. 336.

passed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let<sup>o</sup> us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us, and let<sup>p</sup> us run with patience, the race that is set before us. Ver. 2, "Looking unto Jesus, who<sup>q</sup> for the joy that was set before him endured the cross." And ver. 3, "Lest<sup>r</sup> ye be wearied, and faint in your minds." And ver. 12, "Wherefore<sup>s</sup> lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees."

All these texts seem to contain allusions to the celebrated exercises and games of those times. And under each of them I have referred to, or transcribed the notes of some learned critics and commentators, tending to illustrate them. And to these may be added, if I mistake not, the place before<sup>t</sup> taken notice of, ch. xii. 4, "Ye have not resisted unto blood, striving<sup>u</sup> against sin."

10.) Ch. xiii. 9, "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines." *Διδασχαις ποικιλαις και ξεναις μη περιφερεσθε.* Eph. iv. 14, "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine"——*κλυδωνιζομενοι, και περιφερομενοι παντι ανεμω της διδασκαλιας.*

11.) Ch. xiii. 10, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat." 1 Cor. ix. 13, "And they that wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar." And ch. x. 18, "Are not they which eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?"

<sup>o</sup> *Ογκον αποθεμενοι παντα*: 'deponentes omne pondus.' Tota hæc oratio translaticia est; quasi nobis in stadio non sine magnis difficultatibus currendum: quâ translatione sæpe utitur Paulus. In primis igitur monet, ut *ογκον* abjiciamus, qui vocabulo crassa omnis et tarda moles significatur. Bez. in loc.

A stadio sumta similitudo. Ibi qui cursuri sunt, omnia quæ oneri esse possunt, deponunt, &c. Grot. in loc. And see Hallett as before, note <sup>w</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> *Τρεχωμεν τον προκειμενον ἡμιν τον αγωνα.* Loquendi ratio est agonistica, et petita a cursoribus, qui stadium absolvunt. De voce *προκειμαι* satis multa afferebam supra, Cap. vi. 18.——Sensus autem Apostoli est: 'Curramus in stadio, nobis proposito ad currendum:.' voce *αγων* pro loco, sc. stadio, sumta. Krebs. ubi supra, p. 390.

<sup>q</sup> *Ὅς αντι της προκειμενης χαρας, κ. λ.* Vid. Krebs. ib. p. 390.

<sup>r</sup> *Ἴνα μη καμητε, ταις ψυχαις ἡμων εκλυομενοι.*——Hæc duo verba a palæstrâ et ab athletic desumpta sunt, qui proprie dicuntur *καμνειν*, et *ψυχαις εκλυεσθαι*, cum corporis viribus debilitati et fracti, omnique spe vincendi abjectâ, victas manus dant adversario.——Neque dubium est, quin Apostolus eo respexerit. Id. ib.

<sup>s</sup> *Διο τας παρειμενας χειρας και τα παραλελυμενα γονατα ανορθωσατε.* Quemadmodum Paulus sæpissime delectatur loquendi formulis ex re palæstricâ petitis; ita dubium non est, quin hic quoque respexisse eo videatur. Athleticis enim et luctatoribus tribuuntur *παρειμεναι χειρες* et *παραλελυμενα γονατα*, cum luctando ita defatigati, viribusque fracti sunt, ut neque manus neque pedes officio suo fungi possint, ipsique adeo victos se esse fateri cogantur. Id. ib. p. 392.

<sup>t</sup> See here, p. 93.

<sup>u</sup> *Προς την ἁμαρτιαν ανταγωνιζομενοι.*

12.) Ch. xiii. 20, 21, “ Now the God of peace——make you perfect.” Which is a title of the Deity, no where found in the New Testament, but in St. Paul’s epistles. And in them it is several times, and near the conclusion, as here. So Rom, xv. 33, “ Now the God of peace be with you all.” See likewise ch. xvi. 20, and Philip. iv. 9. And 1 Thess. v. 23. And “ the very God of peace sanctify you wholly.” And 2 Cor. xiii. 11, “ And the God of love and peace shall be with you.”

5. The conclusion of this epistle has a remarkable agreement with the conclusions of St. Paul’s epistles in several respects.

1.) He here desires the christians, to whom he is writing, to pray for him, ch. xiii. 18, “ Pray for us.” So Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18, 19; Col. iv. 3; 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1.

2.) It is added in the same ver. 18, “ For we trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly.” Which may well come from Paul, some of the Jewish believers not being well affected to him, or being even offended with him. So says<sup>v</sup> Theodoret upon this place, and Chrysostom<sup>w</sup> to the like purpose, very largely. To which might be added ver. 32, “ And I beseech you, brethren, to suffer the word of exhortation.” It is also observable, that St. Paul makes a like profession of his sincerity, in pleading against the Jews, before Felix, Acts xxiv. 16.

3.) Having desired the prayers of these christians for himself, he prays for them, ch. xiii. 20, 21, “ Now the God of peace——make you perfect——through Jesus Christ: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.” So Rom. xv. 30—32, having asked their prayers for him, he adds ver. 33, “ Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen. Compare Eph. vi. 19—23, and 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16.

4.) Ch. xiii. 24, “ Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.” The like salutations are in divers of St. Paul’s epistles, Rom. xvi; 1 Cor. xvi. 16—21; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Philip. iv. 21, 22. Not to refer to any more.

5.) The valedictory benediction at the end, is that which Paul had made the token of the genuineness of his epistles, 2 Thess. iii. 18. So here, ch. xiii. 25, “ Grace<sup>x</sup> be with

<sup>v</sup> Διαβεβλητο αυτοις, ως τ’ αναντια τω νομο κρηπτων. Διδασκει τουτων αυτους, ως εκ αλλε τε χαριν τετο ποιει, αλλα τω θεω λογω πιθομενος. Δια τετο και την συνειδησιν εις μαρτυριαν εκαλεσε. Theod. in Hebr. xiii. 18. T. III. p. 461.

<sup>w</sup> In Hebr. xiii. hom. 34. tom. XII. p. 313, 314.

<sup>x</sup> Et hoc ad exemplum Pauli. Eph. vi. 24; Col. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15. Qui alibi explicat, quæ sit illa gratia, nempe Christi. Grot. in Hebr. xiii. 25.

you all. Amen." Indeed, sometimes it is "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." But at other times it is more contracted. So Col. iv. 18, "Grace be with you." 1 Tim. vi. 21, "Grace be with thee." See likewise Eph. vi. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15. The same observation is in<sup>y</sup> Theodoret.

6. The circumstances of the epistle leads us to the apostle Paul.

1.) Ch. xiii. 24, "They of Italy salute you." The writer therefore was then in Italy, whither we know Paul was sent a prisoner, and where he resided two years, Acts xxviii. where also he wrote several epistles, still remaining.

2.) Ver. 19, He desires them "the rather to pray for him, that he might be restored to them the sooner." Paul had been brought from Judea to Rome. And he was willing to go thither again, where he had been several times. And though the original words are not the same, there is an agreement between this and Philem. ver. 22, "I trust, that through your prayers, I shall be given to you." This particular is one of the arguments of Euthalius, that<sup>z</sup> this epistle is Paul's, and written to the Jews of Palestine.

3.) Ver. 23, "Know ye, that our brother Timothy is set at liberty. With whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." Timothy was with Paul, during his imprisonment at Rome: as is allowed by all. For he is expressly mentioned at the beginning of the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, written when he was in bonds. He is mentioned again, Philip. ii. 19. When the apostle writes to Timothy, he calls him "his son," or "dearly beloved son." 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2. But when he mentions him to others, he calls him brother. 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 2. In like manner Titus. Comp. Titus i. 4, and 2 Cor. ii. 13.

This mention of Timothy has led many, not only moderns, but ancients likewise, to think of Paul as writer of the epistle, particularly<sup>a</sup> Euthalius. And undoubtedly, many others have been confirmed in that supposition by this circumstance.

The original word, *απολελυμενον*, is ambiguous, being capable of two senses: one of which is that of our translation,

<sup>y</sup> Το συνηθες ακροτελευτον τεθεικε, την της χαριτος μετασιαν. Theod. in loc. T. III. p. 462.

<sup>z</sup> Μαρτυριται δε και εν τοις εξης η επιτολη υπαρχουσα Πανλε, τω γραφειν, οτι και τοις δεσμοις μη συνεπαθησατε, και εκ τε λεγειν, περισσοτερον ευχεσθε, ινα ταχιον αποκαταθω ημιν. Euthal. ap. Zacagn. p. 670.

<sup>a</sup> Και εκ τε λεγειν, γνωσκετε τον αδελφον ημων Τιμοθεον απολελυμενον—ουεις γαρ αν, ομαι, απελυσεν εις διακοιαν Τιμοθεον, ει μη Παυλος. κ. λ. Euthal. ib. p. 671.

“set at liberty,” that is, from imprisonment: the other is dismissed, “sent abroad on an errand.” In this last sense it was understood by Euthalius. Who, in the place just cited, says, ‘That scarcely any one can be thought of, beside Paul, who would send Timothy abroad upon any service of the gospel.’ And indeed this passage doth put us in mind of what Paul says to the Philippians, ch. ii. 19, “But I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort when I know your state. Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly,” ver. 23, 24. Which induced Beausobre to say in the preface to this epistle: ‘The sacred<sup>b</sup> author concludes with asking the prayers of the Hebrews, ch. xiii. 19, “That he may be restored to them.” These words intimate, that he was still prisoner, but that he hoped to be set at liberty. Therefore he adds, in the 23d ver. that he intended to come and see them with Timothy, as soon as he should be returned. If this explication be right, this epistle was written at Rome some time after the epistle to the Philippians, and since the departure of Timothy for Macedonia.’

Thus we are brought to the time of this epistle. Nevertheless, before I proceed to speak distinctly to that, I would conclude the argument concerning the writer of it.

All these considerations just mentioned, added to the testimony of many ancient writers, make out an argument of great weight (though not decisive and demonstrative) that the apostle Paul is the writer of this epistle.

It should be observed, I have hitherto declined the use of two arguments often insisted upon in discoursing of this point.

One of which is the testimony of St. Peter: 2 epist. ch. iii. 15, 16. This I have omitted, because I am not satisfied that he and the author of this epistle write to the same persons. Nor does it appear certain to me, that St. Peter there takes any particular notice of this<sup>c</sup> epistle as one of Paul’s.

<sup>b</sup> Preface sur l’*épître aux Hébreux*. n. 37. p. 429.

<sup>c</sup> Says Mr. Hallet, Introduction, p. 21, “Some learned men have attempted to prove this point from what St. Peter says, 2 Pet. in. 15, 16. If it could be proved, that he speaks of the epistle to the Hebrews, the testimony of this apostle would fully determine the dispute. But as I do not think, it can be certainly proved, that he speaks of this epistle, without proving that St. Paul was the author of it, I cannot argue from this passage. Those on the other side go upon the supposition, that St. Peter’s epistles were written to the Hebrews, or Jews. But it seems to me abundantly more natural to suppose, that they were written to Gentile christians, if we consider many passages of the epistles themselves.’

However as many learned men look upon that passage of St. Peter, as a full testimony to Paul's being the writer of this epistle, I shall refer to several, or transcribe below a part at least of what they say : particularly <sup>d</sup> Mill, <sup>e</sup> Spanheim, and <sup>f</sup> Basnage.

The other argument omitted by me is that taken from Heb. x. 34, "For ye had compassion of me in my bonds." On this insist <sup>g</sup> Spanheim, <sup>h</sup> Mill, and <sup>i</sup> Basnage, to prove that this epistle was written by Paul. But Mr. James Pierce translates the words thus : "For ye sympathized with those who were in bonds." And in his notes says : "Were it certain, that the common is the true reading of the place, there would be little room left to doubt of the epistle's being written by St. Paul. But the Alexandrian, and other manuscripts, of the best note, read here *ἑσπυοις* instead of *ἑσπυοις με*. And the same is confirmed by ancient versions." And that this is the truer reading, may be seen in Bengelius, Wetstein, and Mill himself: though in his argument concerning the author of the epistle, he has been pleased to argue from the common reading. If Paul here referred to his bonds, I should think he intended his imprisonment in Judea, as Mill thought, not at Rome, as Basnage does, in the place just cited. I make no doubt but that the Hebrew believers in Judea afforded St. Paul relief and comfort, whilst he lay prisoner at Cæsarea. But as I do not here discern any plain reference to that, I do not form any argument from this text, in behalf of the writer of the epistle.

<sup>d</sup> Et quidem epistolam hanc eam ipsam fuisse, quam ad Hebræos christianos miserat apostolus noster, disertis verbis D. Petri constat. Ep. 2. cap. iii. 15, &c. Mil. Proleg. num. 86—91.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Spanhem. Diss. de Auct. ep. ad Hebr. Part. I cap. ii.—v.

<sup>f</sup> Hebræis Paulum scripsisse, planum est ex posteriore Petri; 'Paulus pro sibi datâ sapientiâ scripsit vobis.' Hebræos enim adibat scripto Petrus circumcisionis apostolus. Quænam autem Pauli ad Hebræos scripta epistola, si nostra non est?—Ipsa igitur est, quæ omnium in manibus versatur atque oculis. Basn. ann. 61. num. iv.

<sup>g</sup> Prima esto circumstantiâ vinculorum illa mentio. Capite x. ver. 34.—Constat enim, soli Paulo, et fere semper, venisse hoc in usu. Et quas omnes ex Italiâ transmisit epistolas, vinculorum suorum mentione quasi distinxit. Spanh. ib. P. II. cap. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Auctorem habet hæc epistola, si qua usquam alia, D. Paulum. Alloquitur auctor Hebræos istos, velut ipsius in carcere memores, ejusque vinculis *συμπαθησαντας*. Ista apostolo nostro congruere, nemo non videt. Hierosolyma ipse duos ante annos eleemosynas ecclesiarum defulerat, ubi ab universâ illie ecclesiâ benigne exceptus erat, toto tempore, quo Cæsaree mansit incarceratus. Mill. Prol. num. 85.

<sup>i</sup> A manu catenatâ epistolam in Italiâ exaratam fuisse, cernimus et videmus : 'vinculis meis mecum affecti fuistis.' Barnabam vero aut Lucam compedibus in Italiâ fuisse detentos, veterum in monumentis ne minimâ quidem literâ invenimus. Basnag. An. 61. n. iv.

I say no more by way of argument. But there are objections, which ought to be considered.

1. Obj. Heb. ii. 3, “How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?”

Hence it has been argued, that the writer of this epistle placeth himself with those who had received the doctrine of the gospel from Christ’s apostles. But Paul had it from Christ himself, as he says at large in the first chapter of the epistle to the Galatians. This has been thought by <sup>k</sup> Grotius and Le Clerc<sup>l</sup> a good reason why Paul should not be esteemed the writer of this epistle.

To which I answer, that it is not uncommon for Paul to join himself with those to whom he is writing, and to say *us*, where he might say *you*: especially, when he says any thing that is humbling, and that might be thought disagreeable. So Col. i. 12, 13, “Giving thanks to the Father, who——has delivered us from the power of darkness.”——This I take to be a plain instance. To which might be added, according to the judgment of some commentators, Eph. ii. 3, and Tit. iii. 3. The note of Grotius upon this last cited text may be observed. And now I transcribe below<sup>m</sup> the answer of Mr. Wetstein to this objection: which is in the main agreeable to what I have just said.

I would also observe, that there is another instance in this epistle, much resembling the text, upon which the present objection is founded. Heb. xii. 1,——“Wherefore

<sup>k</sup> Præterea Paulo hanc epistolam abjudicat, quod hujus scriptor se iis annumeret, qui non a Christo, sed ab ejus discipulis, notitiam evangelii acceperit. cap. ii. 3. Cum contra Paulus auctoritatem sibi addat inde, quod hanc notitiam a Christo ipso acceperit. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Hebr.

<sup>l</sup> Videtur et scriptor epistolæ ad Hebræos, cap. ii. 3. &c. eorum numero censi velle, qui evangelium acceperant ab iis, a quibus auditus erat ipse Christus.—Quod in Paulum non quadrat, qui evangelium ab ipso Jesu Christo et Deo accepisse se non falso gloriatur, Gal. i. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 69. p. 459.

<sup>m</sup> Hebr. ii. 3. Paulus se iis annumerat, qui notitiam evangelii a discipulis Christi acceperunt; cum tamen ad Galatas non semel testetur, gloriaturque, se non ab hominibus, sed ab ipso Christo fuisse institutum, Gal. i. 1, 12, 17; ch. ii. 6. Ratio discriminis ex modo dictis manifesta est. In epistolâ ad Galatas id agit, ut auctoritatem suam adstruat; hic autem, ubi de supplicio desertoribus impendente loquitur, ut minus ingrata esset comminatio atque admonitio, seipsum illis annumerat, comm. 1. Δει ἡμᾶς προσεχειν τοῖς ἀκασθεῖσιν, μη ποτε παρῆρωμεν——πως ἡμεῖς ἐκφενῶμεθα.—Postquam igitur ita cepisset, consequens erat, ut in eâdem figurâ pergeret, scriberetque ἡτε σωτηρία——εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβραβιωθη. Ita Eph. ii. 3; Col. i. 12, 13; Tit. iii. 3. ubi gentium peccata, et peccatum imminuentem describit, et seipsum illis annumerat. J. J. Wetstein. N. T. tom. II. p. 384.



—let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us.”—And this way of writing is suitable to Paul's style and method in his acknowledged epistles.

Secondly, I would farther add, if it might not be esteemed too prolix, that in divers other places we find Paul, when he asserts the resurrection of Jesus Christ, insisting also upon the testimony of the other apostles, and likewise of other disciples. Thus, preaching at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 30, 31, “ But God raised him from the dead. And he was seen many days of them, which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.” And also I Cor. xv. at the beginning: which I shall recite largely, as full to the point. “ Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel, which I preached unto you, which also ye have received.—By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you.—For I delivered unto you first of all, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures: and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me.”

And this context, perhaps, will justify me in proceeding somewhat farther. When St. Paul says, 2 Tim. ii. 8, “ Remember, that Jesus Christ—was raised from the dead, according to my gospel:” he intends, as I apprehend, to lead Timothy to recollect the gospel, that had been preached by him in such and such circumstances, confirmed by miracles wrought by him, and agreeable to the prophecies of the ancient scriptures, and the testimony of the other apostles, and disciples of Christ. As he also says, at ver. 2, of the same chapter, “ The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses:” literally, “ by many witnesses:” that is, confirmed by many witnesses. And he may be supposed to intend not only<sup>n</sup> the prophets, which is Grotius's interpretation, but likewise the testimony of all the apostles of Christ, and of many others, to which he had appealed in his preaching.

Upon the whole, it seems to me, that the expression of this text is highly becoming the apostle Paul, especially, supposing him to be here writing to the believers of Jerusalem and Judea. And indeed, as before shown, the beginning of this second chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews affords, in

<sup>n</sup> Multis adductis testibus prophetis, qui hæc prædixerant. Hebr. xii. 1. Grot. in 2 Tim. ii. 2.

my opinion, an argument of no small force, that they are the christians to whom it is sent.

2. Obj. Another objection against this epistle being St. Paul's is, that it is supposed to have in it an elegance superior to that of his other writings. This has been judged by Grotius, and Le Clerc, who were formerly ° quoted, sufficient to show, that it was not written by Paul.

In order to judge the better of this, it may be of use to recollect what we have already seen in divers ancient writers, relating to this point.

Eusebius has a passage of Clement of Alexandria, from his institutions, at large cited by us<sup>p</sup> formerly: where Clement says, 'That <sup>a</sup> the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's, and that it was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that Luke having carefully translated it, published it for the use of the Greeks. Which is the reason of that conformity of style, which is found in this epistle, and the Acts of the Apostles.'

The opinion of Origen in his homilies upon this epistle as cited by Eusebius, and by us<sup>r</sup> from him, is, 'That the style of the epistle to the Hebrews has not the apostle's rudeness of speech——but as to the texture of it, is elegant Greek, as every one will allow, who is able to judge of the differences of style.' Again he says, 'The sentiments of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle. This will be assented to by every one who reads the writings of the apostle with attention.' Afterwards he adds, 'If I was to speak my opinion, I should say, that the sentiments are the apostle's, but the language and composition another's, who committed to writing the apostle's sense, and as it were, reduced into commentaries the things spoken by his master.' And what follows.

Eusebius<sup>s</sup> himself, speaking of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, says, 'Paul having written to the Hebrews in their own language, some think that the evangelist Luke, others, that this very Clement, translated it into Greek. Which last is the most likely, there being a great resemblance between the style of the epistle of Clement, and the epistle to the Hebrews. Nor are the sentiments of

<sup>a</sup> See Hist. of the Apost. Vol. v. ch. ii.

<sup>p</sup> Vol. ii. ch. xxii.

<sup>q</sup> Καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παῦλος μὲν εἶναι φησὶ, γεγραφοῦναι δὲ Ἑβραίως Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ. Ἀσκαν δὲ φιλοτιμῶς αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα, ἐκδέναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, κ. λ. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 14. m.

<sup>r</sup> Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. from Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 25.

<sup>s</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. 38.

‘ those two writings very different.’ This passage has been already twice quoted by us: once in the chapter of Clement<sup>†</sup> bishop of Rome, and again in that<sup>u</sup> of Eusebius.

Philaster, bishop of Brescia, about 380, as formerly quoted, says, ‘ There<sup>v</sup> are some, who do not allow the epistle to the Hebrews to be Paul’s: but say, it is either an epistle of the apostle Barnabas, or of Clement bishop of Rome. But some say, it is an epistle of Luke the evangelist. — Moreover, some reject it, as more eloquent than the apostle’s other writings.’

Jerom, about 392, in his article of St. Paul in the book of Illustrious Men, as<sup>w</sup> before cited also, says, ‘ The epistle, called To the Hebrews, is not thought to be his, because of the difference of the argument and style: but either Barnabas’s, as Tertullian thought, or the evangelist Luke’s, according to some others; or Clement’s, bishop of Rome: who, as some think, being much with him, clothed and adorned Paul’s sense in his own language. — Moreover he wrote as a Hebrew to Hebrews in pure Hebrew, it being his own language. Whence it came to pass that, being translated, it has more elegance in the Greek, than his other epistles.’

I need not allege here any more testimonies relating to this matter. We sufficiently perceive by what has been said, that many ancient christians supposed the Greek of this epistle to have a superior elegance to the received epistles of St. Paul. And to some of them the Greek was their native language. And others, as Jerom, though Latins, may be supposed to have been good judges in this matter.

Some learned men of late times, as Grotius and Le Clerc, have thought this to be an insuperable objection. Of this opinion likewise was<sup>x</sup> Jacob Tollius: who in his notes upon Longinus, Of the Sublime, has celebrated the sublimity of this epistle, and particularly the elegance of the beginning of it. Which alone he thinks sufficient to show, that

<sup>†</sup> Vol. ii. ch. ii.

<sup>u</sup> Vol. iv. ch. lxxii.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. ch. ex.

<sup>w</sup> Ibid. ch. cxiv.

<sup>x</sup> Ejusmodi *σηριγμος*, και *αναπαισεις* statim in initio eloquentissimæ, et nescio annon omnem gentilium scriptorum sublimitatem superantis, certe adæquantis epistolæ ad Hebræos reperias; quam vel hoc uno Pauli non esse probaverim. Sed sunt *αναπαισεις* illæ non deorsum ruentis orationis, verum contra ea in cælum ascendentis *σηριγμοι*. Ita vero incipit: *Πολυμερως, και πολυτροπως, παλαι ο Θεος λαλησας τοις πατρωσι*, κ. λ. Ubi tres consequenter sunt positi *Παιones* quarti cum syllabâ post singulas remanente, velut ad subsistendum, dum ita in cælum ad Deum velut gradibus scriptor ascendit. J. Tollius ad Longin. de Sublim. sect. 39. not. 22.

it is not Paul's. Others allow the fine contexture of the style of this epistle; but do not see that consequence. These are obliged to account for it: which they do several ways.

Mr. Wetstein, who allows that the epistle is St. Paul's, and that it was written in Greek, thinks that<sup>y</sup> Paul having now lived two years at Rome, may have improved his Greek style. But in answer to that it may be said, that we have several epistles of Paul, written near the end of his imprisonment at Rome, in which we perceive his usual style.

Again, Mr. Wetstein adds, 'That<sup>z</sup> this is a learned epistle, and may have been composed with more care and exactness than letters written to friends, or to churches, whose urgent necessities obliged him to write in haste.' But neither will this, I believe, be sufficient to account for the difference of style in this, and the epistles received as Paul's. For no care and attention will on a sudden enable a man to alter his usual style, in a remarkable manner.

It remains therefore, as seems to me, that if the epistle be Paul's, and was originally written in Greek, as we suppose, the apostle must have had some assistance in composing it. So that we are led to the judgment of Origen, which appears to be as ingenious and probable as any. 'The sentiments are the apostle's, but the language and composition of some one else: who committed to writing the apostle's sense, and as it were reduced into commentaries the things spoken by his master.' According to this account, the epistle is St. Paul's, as to the thoughts and matter, but the words are another's. Jerom, as may be remembered, said, 'He wrote as a Hebrew to Hebrews in pure Hebrew, it being his own language. Whence it came to pass, that being translated, it has more elegance in the Greek, than his other epistles.' My conjecture, which is not very different, if I may be allowed to mention it, is, that St. Paul dictated the epistle in Hebrew, and another, who was a great master of the Greek language, immediately wrote down the apostle's sentiments in his own elegant Greek. But who this assistant of the apostle was, is altogether unknown.

<sup>y</sup> Potuit Paulus aliter scribere, cum esset in Græciâ, aliter postea, cum in Italian translatus ex usu frequentiori linguæ Græcæ, et Hebraïsmos vitare, et facilius scribere didicisset. Wetst. N. T. Tom. II. p. 385.

<sup>z</sup> Potuit hanc epistolam, quæ erudita est, longiori meditatione elaborâsse, cum alias ad familiares amicos, vel ad ecclesias, ubi necessitas urgebat, festinantius effudisset. Ibid.

The ancients, beside Paul, have mentioned Barnabas, Luke, and Clement, as writers, or translators of this epistle. But I do not know that there is any remarkable agreement between the style of the epistle to the Hebrews and the style of the epistle commonly ascribed to Barnabas. The<sup>a</sup> style of Clement, in his epistle to the Corinthians, is verbose and prolix. St. Luke<sup>b</sup> may have some words, which are in the epistle to the Hebrews. But that does not make out the same style. This epistle, as Origen said, ‘as to the texture of the style is elegant Greek.’ But that kind of texture appears not in Luke, so far as I can perceive. There may be more art and labour in the writings of Luke, than in those of the other evangelists: but not much elegance, that I can discern. This epistle to the Hebrews<sup>c</sup> is bright and elegant from the beginning to the end, and surpasseth as much the style of St. Luke, as it does the style of St. Paul in his acknowledged epistles. In short, this is an admirable epistle, but singular in sentiments and language: somewhat different in both respects from all the other writings in the New Testament. And whose is the language, as seems to me, is altogether unknown: whether that of Zenas, or Apollos, or some other of the apostle Paul’s assistants, and fellow-labourers.

3. Obj. There still remains one objection more against this epistle being written by St. Paul: which is the want of his name. For to all the thirteen epistles, received as his, he prefixeth his name, and generally calleth himself apostle.

This objection has been obvious in all ages. And the omission has been differently accounted for by the ancients, who received this epistle as a genuine writing of St. Paul.

Clement of Alexandria, in his institutions, as cited by us<sup>d</sup> formerly from Eusebius, speaks to this purpose, ‘The epistle to the Hebrews, he says, is Paul’s. But he did not make use of that inscription, “Paul the apostle.” Of which he assigns this reason. Writing to the Hebrews, who had conceived a prejudice against him, and were suspicious of him, he wisely declined setting his name at the beginning, lest he should offend them. He also mentions this tradition: forasmuch as the Lord was sent as the apostle of Almighty God to the Hebrews, Paul out of modesty does not style

<sup>a</sup> Clement est diffus, ———&c. Beaus. Pref. sur. l’épître aux Hébreux. num. vii.

<sup>b</sup> Lucam autem hujus epistolæ scriptorem ostendunt etiam vocabula et loquendi genera quædam Lucæ velut propria. Grot. Præf. in ep. ad Hebr.

<sup>c</sup> Tout le monde reconnoît de l’éloquence et de l’élévation dans l’épître aux Hébreux. Beaus. ibid.

<sup>d</sup> Vol. ii. ch. xxii.

‘himself the apostle of the Hebrews: both out of respect to the Lord, and that being preacher and apostle of the Gentiles, he over and above wrote to the Hebrews.’

Jerom also speaks to this purpose, ‘That Paul might decline putting his name in the inscription, on account of the Hebrews being offended with him.’ So in the article of St. Paul, in his book of *Illustrious Men*. In his commentary upon the beginning of the epistle to the Galatians, he assigns another reason, ‘that Paul declined to style himself apostle at the beginning of the epistle to the Hebrews, because he should afterwards call Christ “the high priest, and apostle of our profession.”’ See ch. iii. 1.

Theodoret says, that Paul was especially the apostle of the Gentiles. For which he allegeth, Gal. ii. 9, and Rom. xi. 13. ‘Therefore writing to the Hebrews, who were not entrusted to his care, he barely delivered the doctrine of the gospel, without assuming any character of authority. For they were the charge of the other apostles.’

I need not quote any others; which would be only a repetition of the same, or like reasons.’

All these reasons may not be reckoned equally good. And, perhaps, none of them are sufficient and adequate to the purpose. But though we should not be able to assign a good reason, why Paul omitted his name; the epistle, nevertheless, may be his. For there may have been a good reason for it, though we are not able to find it out. It is the work of a masterly hand, who for some reason omitted his name. Paul might have a reason for such silence, as well as another.

Lightfoot<sup>i</sup> says, ‘Paul’s not affixing his name to this, as he had done to his other epistles, does no more deny it to

<sup>e</sup> Vel certe quia Paulus scribebat ad Hebræos, et propter invidiam sui apud eos nominis titulum in principio salutationis amputaverat. De V. I. cap. v.

<sup>f</sup> Et in epistolâ ad Hebræos propterea Paulum solitâ consuetudine nec nomen suum, nec apostoli vocabulum præposuisse, quia de Christo erat dicturus: ‘Habentes ergo principem Sacerdotum, et Apostolum confessionis, Jesum;’ nec fuisse congruum, ut, ubi Christus apostolus dicendus erat, ibi etiam Paulus apostolus poneretur. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 225. in.

<sup>g</sup> Ἑβραίοις δὲ γραφῶν, ὧν ἐκ ἐνεχειρισθη τὴν ἐπιμελίαν, γῆμην τῶν ἀξιώματων ἰκοσῶς τὴν ἰδέασκαλιαν προσηνεγκεν ὑπο γὰρ τὴν τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀποστόλων προσηθίαν ἐτέλεον. Theod. in Hebr. T. III. p. 392.

<sup>h</sup> Verum est, Paulum omnibus aliis epistolis, si hanc excipias, et nomen suum præposuisse, et titulos addidisse, quibus sibi auctoritatem conciliaret. Nec tamen inde consequitur, hanc, de quâ agimus, Pauli non esse. Aut enim dicendum erit, nullius esse, quia nomen nullum prefixum est: aut si alius quis contra morem receptum nomen suum reticere potuit, idem æquo jure etiam Paulo licuit. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 384. med.

<sup>i</sup> See his Works, Vol. I. p. 339.

‘ be his, than the first epistle of John is denied to be John’s  
‘ upon that account.’

Tillemont says, ‘ Possibly <sup>k</sup> Paul considered it as a book,  
‘ rather than a letter: since he makes an excuse for its  
‘ brevity, ch. xiii. 22. For indeed it is short for a book,  
‘ but long for a letter.’ The same thought is in <sup>l</sup> Estius.  
This may induce us to recollect an observation of Chry-  
sostom to the like purpose, formerly <sup>m</sup> taken notice of.

It is, I think, observable, that there is not at the begin-  
ning of this epistle any salutation. As there is no name of  
the writer, so neither is there any description of the people,  
to whom it is sent. It appears from the conclusion, that it  
was sent to some people in a certain place. And, undoubt-  
edly, they to whom it was sent, and by whom it was  
received, knew very well from whom it came. Neverthe-  
less there might be reasons for omitting an inscription, and  
a salutation at the beginning. This might arise from the  
circumstances of things. There might be danger of offence  
in sending at that time a long letter to Jews in Judea.  
And this omission might be in part owing to a regard for  
the bearer, who too is not named. The only person named  
throughout the epistle is Timothy. Nor was he at that time  
present with the writer.

Indeed I imagine, that the two great objections against  
this being a genuine epistle of the apostle; the elegance of  
the style, and the want of a name and inscription, are both  
owing to some particular circumstances of the writer, and  
the people to whom it was sent. The people, to whom it  
was sent are plainly Jews in Judea; and the writer, very  
probably, is Paul. Whose circumstances at the breaking  
up of his confinement at Rome, and his setting out upon a  
new journey, might be attended with some peculiar em-  
barrassments; which obliged him to act differently from his  
usual method.

IV. Thus we are brought to the fourth and last part of  
our inquiry concerning this epistle, the time and place of  
writing it. Mill was of opinion, that <sup>n</sup> this epistle was  
written by Paul in the year 63, in some part of Italy, soon  
after he had been released from his imprisonment at Rome.

<sup>k</sup> S. Paul. art. 46. Mem. T. I.

<sup>l</sup> Sed post hæc omnia, an vera ratio omissæ salutationis est, quod hæc  
epistola scripta est per modum libri, non per modum epistolæ? Unde in fine  
dicit: ‘ Etenim perpaucis scripsi vobis.’ Quod de epistolâ non erat dicturus,  
cum sit epistola prolixa. Est. de Auct. Ep. ad Hebr. p. 893.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cxviii.

<sup>n</sup> Interea, mox ut e carcere evasit  
apostolus, recessit in ulteriorem aliquam Italiæ partem, ibique scripsit episto-  
lam ad Hebræos. Proleg. num. 83.

Mr. Wetstein<sup>o</sup> appears to have been of the same opinion. Tillemont<sup>p</sup> likewise placeth this epistle in the year 63, immediately after the apostle's being set at liberty; who, as he says, was still at Rome, or at least in Italy. Basnage<sup>q</sup> speaks of this epistle at the year 61, and supposeth it to be written during the apostle's imprisonment. For he afterwards speaks of the epistle to the Ephesians, and says, it<sup>r</sup> was the last letter, which the apostle wrote during the time of his bonds. L'Enfant and Beausobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles, observe, 'that<sup>s</sup> in the subscription at the end of the epistle it is said to have been written from Italy. The only ground of which, as they add, is what is said, ch. xiii. 24. "They of Italy salute you." This has made some think, that the apostle wrote to the Hebrews, after he had been set at liberty, and when he was got into that part of Italy which borders upon Sicily, and in ancient times was called Italy. Nevertheless, there is reason to doubt of this. When he requests the prayers of the Hebrews, that "he might be restored to them the sooner," he intimates, that he was not yet set at liberty.' Accordingly, they place this epistle in the year 62.

There is not any great difference in any of these opinions concerning the time, or place of this epistle: all supposing, that it was written by the apostle, either at Rome, or in Italy, near the end of his imprisonment at Rome, or soon after it was over, before he removed to any other country.

I cannot perceive why it may not be allowed to have been written at Rome. St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus. Nevertheless he says, ch. xvi. 19, "The churches of Asia salute you." So now he might send salutations from the christians of Italy, not excluding, but including those at Rome, together with the rest throughout that country.

The argument of L'Enfant and Beausobre, that Paul was not yet set at liberty, because he requested the prayers of the "Hebrews, that he might be restored to them the sooner," appears not to me of any weight. Though Paul was no longer a prisoner, he might request the prayers of those to whom he was writing, that he might have a prosperous journey to them, whom he was desirous to visit, and

<sup>o</sup> Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 387. in.

<sup>p</sup> S. Paul. art. 46.

<sup>q</sup> Ann. 61. num. ii.—vi.

<sup>r</sup> Epistolarum omnium, quas primis in vinculis exaravit apostolus, ea, quæ ad Ephesios, ultima esse videtur. Ibid. num. vii.

<sup>s</sup> Préf. gén. sur les épîtres de S. Paul. num. lii.



that all impediments of his intended journey might be removed. And many such there might be, though he was no longer under confinement. Paul was not a prisoner when he wrote the epistle to the Romans. Yet he was very fervent in his prayers to God, that he might have a prosperous journey, and come to them, ch. i. 10.

For determining the time of this epistle, it may be observed, that when the apostle wrote the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon, he had hopes of deliverance. At the writing of all those epistles, Timothy was present with him. But now he was absent, as plainly appears from ch. xiii. 23. This leads us to think that this epistle was written after them. And it is not unlikely, that the apostle had now obtained that liberty, which he expected when they were written.

Moreover in the epistle to the Philippians he speaks of sending Timothy to them, ch. ii. 19—23. “But I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state.” Timothy therefore, if sent, was to come back to the apostle. “Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me.” It is probable that Timothy did go to the Philippians soon after writing the above-mentioned epistles, the apostle having gained good assurance of being quite released from his confinement. And this epistle to the Hebrews was written during the time of that absence. For it is said, Heb. xiii. 23, “Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty. With whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.—Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty:” or ‘has been sent abroad.’ The word <sup>t</sup> is capable of that meaning. And it is a better and more likely meaning, because it suits the coherence. And I suppose that Timothy did soon come to the apostle, and that they both sailed to Judea, and after that went to Ephesus; where Timothy was left to reside with his peculiar charge.

Thus this epistle was written at Rome, or in Italy, soon after that Paul had been released from his confinement at Rome, in the beginning of the year 63.

And I suppose it to be the last written of all St. Paul's epistles, which have come down to us, or that we have any knowledge of.

<sup>t</sup> Et quidem paullo post missas haece [‘ad Philippenses’] literas, libertatem adeptus, Timotheum in Macedoniam misit, uti liquet ex Hebr. xiii. 23.—Neque enim verbis istis significatum vult apostolus, Timotheum tum temporis, secum unà vinculis liberatum fuisse, sed a se ob certa negotia fuisse dimissum. Mill. Proleg. num. 68.

Who was the bearer of it, is not known. At the end of the epistle in some manuscripts, is a subscription to this purpose: 'that it was carried from Italy by Timothy.' But that subscription is esteemed of no authority by all learned men in general, Beza in particular. I put below <sup>u</sup> part of what he says. It is inconsistent with what is said of Timothy, ch. xiii. 23. Timothy was to accompany the writer: the epistle was sent before.

---

## CHAP. XIII.

*That the Epistle inscribed to the Ephesians was written to them.*

THE epistle to the Ephesians is one of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul. There never was any doubt among christians, who was the writer. But there has been, especially of late, a dispute concerning the persons to whom it was sent: some thinking that the common inscription is false, and that this is either a general epistle, or that it was sent to the Laodiceans. Of this opinion is <sup>a</sup> Mill in his Prolegomena to the New Testament, who has had many followers. Some of whom must be here mentioned by me. Mr. James Pierce, <sup>b</sup> who likewise speaks of Mr. Whiston as of the same opinion. The <sup>c</sup> author of a Latin letter, or dissertation in the third volume of Mr. La Roche's Literary Journal, published in the year 1731. That letter is anonymous. But the writer is Artemonius, otherwise Samuel Crellius, author of *Initium Evangelii S. Joannis Apostoli restitutum*. This I was assured of by Mr. La Roche, the editor. W. Wall in his *Critical Notes upon the New Testament*. Dr. Benson. <sup>d</sup> The author of a letter at the end of the second

<sup>u</sup> Puto igitur hanc subscriptionem non satis considerate adscriptam fuisse a quopiam, qui occasionem ex eo arripuerit, quod Timothei et Italorum mentio facta fuerat. Nam etiam et in Claromontano codice, et in Syrâ interpretatione non exstat. Bez. ad cap. xiii. in fin.

<sup>a</sup> Quidni igitur scripta fuerit ad Laodicenses? Proleg. num. 74. vid. ib. num. 71—79. et num. 237.

<sup>b</sup> See an advertisement at the end of his paraphrase upon the Ep. to the Philippians, p. 114, &c.

<sup>c</sup> See La Roche's Literary Journal for April, May, and June, 1731. vol. III. p. 165—183. Et Conf. Artemonii *Initium Evangel. S. Joan. restitutum*. p. 212. edit. Londini. 1726.

<sup>d</sup> See Dr. Benson's *History of the first Planting the Christian Religion*, Vol. II. p. 270—276. first ed. p. 290—297. 2d. ed.

volume of Dr. Benson's History of the first Planting the Christian Religion. Which learned author has also since published a postscript to that letter, which is at the end of the third volume of the same work of Dr. Benson. The unknown author of an edition of the New Testament, in Greek and English, in two volumes octavo, published at London in 1729. Campegius Vitringa, the son, professor of divinity in the university of Frauequer, wrote a dissertation on the same side of the question; and not having therein finished his design, his successor, Mr. Venema, added another dissertation, both together making more than one hundred and thirty pages in <sup>c</sup> quarto. Lastly, Mr. J. J. Wetstein in his notes upon the beginning of this epistle. Who also has put a mark under the text, showing Laodicea to be, in his opinion, the right reading, instead of Ephesus. I here mention no more. But perhaps some others may be taken notice of hereafter.

The common reading however has been defended by <sup>f</sup> several. I mention two authors of great note. One is Le Clerc,<sup>g</sup>

• Dissertat. de genuino titulo epistolæ D. Pauli, quæ vulgo inscribitur ad Ephesios. Ap. Campeg. Vitring. Fil. Diss. Sacr. Frauequeræ. 1731. p. 247—379.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. J. C. Wolf. Curæ in N. T. tom. IV. p. 1—13. I may be allowed likewise to take notice of a Commentary upon the epistle to the Ephesians, published in the Dutch language, by Peter Dinant, a learned minister at Rotterdam, in the year 1721. Of which an honourable account is given in the Bibliotheca Bremensis, where we are assured: *Ampla operi præmisit Prolegomena, in quibus primo loco apostolum Paulum vere epistolæ ad Ephesios scriptorem esse demonstrat.*—*Agit deinde de Epheso, ejusque, cum apostolus hanc epistolam conscriberet, statu: de Dianæ cultu.*—*Hinc refutat Grotium, qui Marcionem secutus non ad Ephesios, sed Laodicenses, scriptam hanc epistolam credidit. Sententia quoque Us-erii, qui non ad solos Ephesios, sed plures ecclesias destinatam, adeoque pro encyclicâ habendam putat, examinatur, ac rejicitur.* Bibliotheca. Hist. Phil. Theolog. Classis quintæ Fasc. tertius. p. 533, 534. Bremæ. 1721.

<sup>g</sup> Postea scripsit epistolam ad Ephesios, quam viri quidam docti [Joan. Millius, in Prolegom. ad N. T. cujus conjectura paucis, credo, probabitur:] suspicantur ad Laodiceos datam, sed sine ullo sat firmo argumento. Volunt quidem in hac epistolâ quædam esse, quæ Ephesiis non conveniunt, ut cum cap. i. 15. Paulus se 'audisse fidem et caritatem' Ephesiorum ait, quas ipse per se nôrat, non ex auditu. Sed nihil vetat, quin Romæ audiverit, Ephesios constanter eas virtutes coluisse, ex quo ipse eos viderat, eoque in hisce verbis respexerit. Similiter, et quæ habet cap. iii. 2. 'Si tamen audistis dispensationem gratiæ Dei, quæ data est mihi in vobis,' in Ephesios optime quadrant, si ita intelligantur, ut si, Græcè, *et γε* non sit dubitantis, sed adfirmantis, et significet 'quandoquidem,' ut cap. iv. 21, et alibi. Ejusdem cap. iii. 4. ait Paulus posse eos, ad quos scribit, 'legentes intelligere prudentiam ejus in mysterio Christi,' quam non tam lectione eorum, quæ in hac epistolâ antecesserunt, quam ex præsentis sermonibus intellexerant Ephesii. Sed nihil nos cogit eo confugere. Nam revera poterat hoc intelligi, vel ex iis quæ superioribus capitibus leguntur. Alia argumenta, leviora multo, et omnium

in his Ecclesiastical History, whose words I have placed below. He had seen Mill's argument, and slighted it. He thought that few would be moved by it. However, he briefly considers, and answers the principal objections, taken from Eph. i. 15; iii. 2, and 4. As for any other arguments, he says, they are of too little moment to be opposed to the general consent of christian writers. So that, says he, there is no reason, why we should doubt, whether this epistle was written to the Ephesians.

The other writer is Whitby, in his preface to this epistle. A part of which I cheerfully transcribe here. 'That this epistle to the Ephesians was indeed written by St. Paul, and directed to them, and not to any other church, we cannot doubt, if we believe either the epistle, or Paul himself. For, first, it begins thus, "Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ to the saints which are at Ephesus." And in this reading all the versions, and all the manuscripts agree. Secondly, in the close of the epistle he speaks to them, "That you may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known unto you all things; whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose."—Ch. vi. 21, 22. And in the second epistle to Timothy, he says, "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus," 2 Tim. iv. 12. Moreover, thirdly, all antiquity agrees, that this epistle was written by Paul to the Ephesians.' And what follows.

Those arguments appear to me a sufficient defence of the present reading. Nevertheless the other opinion, contrary to Le Clerc's expectation, has of late much prevailed: as appears from the number of the patrons of it above named. And as the arguments of those two learned men, whose writings are well known, have not been judged satisfactory; there can be little reason to expect, that any thing said by me should be of much weight. And, indeed, it has sometimes happened, that certain opinions have had a run, and it has been in vain to oppose them: though afterwards they have fallen of themselves, being unsupported by any good evidence.

However, as a fair occasion offers, I shall enlarge upon the arguments just mentioned, in favour of the present reading in our Bibles. After which I will particularly consider the objections brought against it.

1. The present reading at the beginning of this epistle, “to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus,” is the reading of all Greek manuscripts, and of all ancient versions, the Latin, Syriac, Persian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and all others. It is altogether inconceivable, how there should have been such a general concurrence in this reading, if it had not been the original inscription of the epistle.

2. It may be argued from the epistle itself, that it was written to the Ephesians.

Says the apostle here, ch. ii. 19–22; “Now therefore ye are fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. And are built upon the foundation of the apostles, and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. In whom you also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” It has been observed that <sup>h</sup> St. Paul frequently accommodates his style to the persons to whom he is writing. In the first epistle to Timothy, sent to him at Ephesus, he useth architect style. So particularly, ch. ii. 15. In like manner here the apostle may be well supposed to allude to the magnificent temple of Diana, on account of which the people of Ephesus much valued themselves, as appears from Acts xix. 27, 28, 34, 35.

I might, perhaps, refer likewise to ch. iii. 18, but forbear, it being an obscure text.

And that the epistle was sent, not to strangers, but to christians, with whom the apostle was well acquainted, I suppose to be certain from internal characters. But the showing that is deferred till by and by.

3. That this epistle was sent to the church at Ephesus, we are assured by the testimony of all catholic christians in all past ages.

This we can now say with confidence, having examined the principal christian writers from the first ages to the beginning of the twelfth century. In all which space of time there appears not one who had any doubt about it.

The testimony of some of these is especially remarkable, on account of their early age, or their learning, or some other considerations.

One of them, remarkable for his early age, is Ignatius, who was bishop of Antioch in the latter part of the first, and the beginning of the second century, and suffered martyrdom at Rome in the year 107, or, as some think, in 116. In a

<sup>h</sup> See Dr. Beason upon 1 Tim. iii. 15.

letter of his to the Ephesians, written at Smyrna, as he was going from Antioch to Rome, he says, ‘Ye<sup>i</sup> are the companions in the mysteries of the gospel of Paul, the sanctified, the martyr, [or highly commended,] deservedly most happy, at whose feet may I be found, when I shall have attained unto God, who throughout all his epistle makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.’

He plainly means the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, in which the apostle commends those christians, and never blames them.

So I wrote in the first edition in 1734, when I collected the passages of Ignatius, bearing testimony to the books of the New Testament. Afterwards, in 1735, was published the letter above mentioned at the end of the first edition of Dr. Benson’s History of the first Planting the Christian Religion. Which occasioned my adding a note upon that quotation from Ignatius, at p. 154—156, of the second edition of the first volume of this work in 1748.

‘The learned writer of that letter, instead of *μνημονεῖ ἐμῶν* would read *μνημονεῶ ἐμῶν*: meaning that Ignatius himself mentioned the Ephesians in every epistle. In answer to which I said, that conjecture appears to be without foundation: forasmuch as in all the editions of Ignatius’s epistles the verb is in the third person: not only in the Greek of the smaller epistles, which I translate, but also in the old Latin version of the same small epistles. ‘Qui in omni epistolâ memoriam facit vestri in Jesu Christo. So likewise in the Greek interpolated epistles, and in the Latin version of the same. There is therefore no various reading. And a new one ought not to be admitted, unless the sense should require it. Which it does not appear to do here. For Ignatius is extolling the Ephesians. And one part of their glory is, that the apostle throughout his epistle to them had treated them in an honourable manner.’

So I wrote in the note just referred to. And though that learned writer has been since pleased to publish a postscript to his letter, he has not produced any manuscript, or version of this epistle of Ignatius, where the verb is found in the first person.

However, in order to support his proposed reading he excepts to our interpreting the word *μνημονεῶ*, of an honourable mention. In answer to which I did in the same note produce proof of the word’s being used sometimes for an honourable or affectionate mention or remembrance.

<sup>3</sup> Παντὸς σημνοῦται τὰ ἁγιασμένους, τὰ μεμαρτυρημένους, ἀξιωμακαρίτους—ὁς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεῖ ἐμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Ignat. ep. ad Eph. cap. xii.

And the noun *μνημοσυρον*, is evidently thrice used in the New Testament for an honourable memorial, Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark xiv. 9; Acts x. 4. Of these examples I have been reminded by a learned friend.

That learned author excepts likewise to our interpretation of *εν παση επιστολη*, “throughout all his epistle,” and would translate, “who make mention of you in every epistle:” that is, as he understands it, Ignatius tells the Ephesians, to whom he is writing, that he made mention of them in every one of his epistles. In answer to which I said in the above-mentioned note, that Pearson had well defended the interpretation, for which we contend. And I alleged a part of the note of Cotelerius upon this passage of Ignatius. But by some means Valesius is printed there, instead of Cotelerius. I now transcribe that note of Cotelerius at length. Frustra sunt, et Andabatarum more digladiantur viri literati, non videntes, *εν παση επιστολη* esse, in tota epistolâ, ad Ephesios nimirum scriptâ, quâ illos laudat valde, ac semper commendat, ut fuit ab Hieronymo observatum. And I shall place here two instances of the use of the word *πας*, which appear to me altogether similar, and therefore to the purpose. One is taken from the fifth chapter of Ignatius’s epistle to the Ephesians, where he says, ‘If the prayer of ‘one or two be of such force, how much more that of the ‘bishop and the whole church,’ *και πασης εκκλησιας*. The other is in St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians, ch. ii. 21; “In whom all the building,” or the whole building, “fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple to God.” *Εν ω πασα οικοδομη, κ. λ.*

Indeed, Ignatius has mentioned the Ephesians in every one of his epistles, except that to Polycarp. But it is very unlikely, that this should be his meaning here. He is extolling the Ephesians, as companions of Paul in the mysteries of the gospel, and the like. To say to them presently afterwards, and in the same period, that “he made mention of them in every one of his epistles,” would have an appearance of much vanity: with which, I think, Ignatius was never charged. And at the same time it would be very flat and insipid. Moreover, it is observable, that this is not one of the last epistles which Ignatius wrote. But, according to the order in which they are mentioned<sup>k</sup> by Eusebius, it is the very first of his seven epistles.

There is therefore no reason, why we should hesitate to admit the sense, in which this place has been generally understood by learned men.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 36, and this Work, Vol. ii. p. 75.

We also find this sense in some ancient writers. Jerom observes, that<sup>1</sup> when the apostle wrote to the Corinthians, he had occasion to blame them for fornication, for strifes and contentions: but there is no fault found by him in the Ephesians. To the like purpose Primasius in<sup>m</sup> the preface to his Commentary upon St. Paul's epistles, and<sup>n</sup> of his argument of the epistle to the Ephesians in particular.

So that either those ancient writers understood Ignatius as we do, or else they were led by the epistle itself to form the same idea of it that we suppose him to have had.

What Ignatius means by the apostle's mentioning, or being mindful of the Ephesians throughout all his epistle to them, is happily explained by bishop Pearson; whose words<sup>o</sup> I shall transcribe below, as his work is not in every body's hands. Indeed this is a proper character of this epistle, as may be easily perceived. Nor did any of the ancients for that reason hesitate to allow, that it was sent to the church at Ephesus.

I hope, that I have now justified the present reading, and common interpretation of this passage of Ignatius.

The learned writer, with whom I have been arguing, concludes his postscript in this manner. 'Should what has been offered not prove satisfactory, the difficulty will still

<sup>1</sup> Corinthii, in quibus audiebatur fornicatio, qualis nec inter gentes, lacte paseuntur, quia necdum poterant solidum cibum capere. Ephesii autem, in quibus nullum crimen arguitur, ab ipso Domino cœlesti vescuntur pane, et sacramentum quod a seculis absconditum fuerat agnoscunt. Ep. ad Marcell. T. II. p. 628. ed. Martian—animadvertat magnam inter Corinthios et Ephesios esse distantiam. Illis quasi parvulis atque lactentibus scribitur: in quibus erant dissensiones, et schismata, et audiebatur fornicatio, qualis ne inter gentes quidem.—Ephesii vero, apud quos fecit triennium, et omnia eis Christi aperuit sacramenta, aliter erudiantur, &c. In ep. ad Eph. cap. v. T. IV. P. i. p. 389, 390.

<sup>m</sup> Ephesii sane nullâ reprehensione, sed multâ sunt laude digni, quia fidem apostolicam servaverunt. Primas. Præf. ad Comm. in S. Pauli Ep. ap. Bib. P. P. T. X. p. 144. H.

<sup>n</sup> Ephesii sunt Asiani. Hi, accepto verbo, veritatis perstiterunt in fide. Hos conlaudat Apostolus, scribens eis Româ a carcere. Argum. ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 217. A.

<sup>o</sup> —quæ scripsit S. Ignatius, S. Paulum 'in totâ epistolâ memoriam eorum facere in Jesu Christo.' Hæc a martyre non otiose aut frigide, sed vere, imo signanter et vigilantè dicta sunt. Tota enim epistola, ad Ephesios scripta, ipsos Ephesios, eorumque honorem et curam maxime spectat, et summe honorificam eorum memoriam ad posteros transmittit. In aliis epistolis apostolus eos, ad quos scribit, sæpe acriter objurgat—aut parce laudat. Hic omnibus modis perpetuo se Ephesiis applicat, illosque tanquam egregios christianos tractat, evangelio salutis firmiter credentes, et Spiritu promissionis obsignatos, concives sanctorum, et domesticos Dei. Pro iis sæpe ardentè orat, ipsos hortatur, obtestatur, laudat, utrumque sexum sedulo instruit, suum erga eos singularem affectum ubique prodit. Pearson. Vind. Ignat. Part 2. cap. x. sub int.



‘ remain, how to reconcile the present reading in Ignatius, with Dr. Mill’s reasons against St. Paul’s epistle being written to the Ephesians.—The most plausible solution of which seems to be that in Mr. Locke.—’ And what there follows to the end.

I think we should cheerfully accept of Mr. Locke’s, or any other reasonable solution of the difficulty, if there be any. This, so far as I am able to judge, is better than to attempt the alteration of a passage in an ancient author, without the authority of any manuscript, when there is nothing in the coherence, that necessarily requires it. And much better, than to alter a text of an epistle of the New Testament, contrary to the authority of all manuscripts, and the concurring testimony of all ancient christian writers.

Beside that passage, there are in Ignatius’s epistle to the Ephesians, many allusions and references to St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians. Which shows, that he believed that epistle to have been written to the church at Ephesus. Those allusions (though not all of them) were taken notice of by us long<sup>p</sup> ago. And Dr. Jortin having observed, that<sup>q</sup> Ignatius in his twelfth chapter takes notice of St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians, and his martyrdom, adds, ‘ And as he was writing to the same church, he often alludes to the apostle’s letter to them.’

But there is one word in the twelfth chapter of Ignatius’s epistle to the Ephesians, of which I have not yet taken sufficient notice. I mean the word *συμμυσται*. “Ye are,” says he, “the companions of Paul in the mysteries of the gospel:” or, “ye are partakers of the mysteries of the gospel with Paul.” This is said out of a regard to St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians. And it fully shows, that Ignatius thought that epistle to have been sent to the church, to which himself was then writing. For that is their distinguishing character: at least it is a character, which is more especially the character of the christians to whom that letter is written.

I formerly<sup>r</sup> gave an account of Palladius, author of a Dialogue of the Life of Chrysostom, about the year 408. In that work Palladius has an argument, in which he observes, ‘ that Paul had called the Cretans liars, Tit. i. 12; the Galatians stupid, Gal. iii. 1; and the Corinthians proud, 1 Cor. v. 2. On the other hand<sup>s</sup> he calls the

<sup>p</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 85.  
upon Ecclesiastical History, p. 56.

<sup>q</sup> See the first volume of his Remarks  
<sup>r</sup> Vol. v. p. 6.

<sup>s</sup> ———η αναπαλιν πιτες Ῥωμαεις αποκαλων, και μυσας Εφεσιεις, ος και ὑψηλοτερον επιτελλει, και φιλαδελφους Θεσσαλονικεις, μονοις περιεγραψεν τας επαινας; η παντως. Pallad. ap. Chrys. T. XIII. p. 71. E.

‘ Romans faithful, the Ephesians *μυσται*, initiated, to whom  
 ‘ also he writes in a sublime manner, and the Thessalonians  
 ‘ lovers of the brotherhood.’

When Palladius says, that St. Paul called the Romans faithful, it cannot be doubted, that he refers to Rom. i. 8. And when he says that the Thessalonians were called “ lovers of the brotherhood,” he must intend 1 Thess. iv. 9, 10. When he speaks of the Ephesians as “ initiated,” it may not be so easy to determine the text particularly intended by him. But probably it is Eph. i. 9; or that joined with others, such as ch. iii. 3, 4—6, and 9, and v. 32, ch. vi. 19. For in this epistle the word “ mystery” occurs frequently.

However, hereby we are assured, that this was, especially, the character of the christians at Ephesus. And we plainly perceive, that Ignatius supposed that epistle to have been written to them.

Nor will my readers, possibly, blame me for prolixity, if I here allege a passage of Jerom; where he says, ‘ That  
 ‘ still there are in the churches remainders of the same vir-  
 ‘ tues, or vices, for which they were remarkable of old.  
 ‘ The Romans are still faithful and devout, the Corinthians  
 ‘ proud, the Galatians stupid, the Thessalonians lovers of  
 ‘ the brotherhood.’ In that place Jerom says nothing particularly of the Ephesians. But in his Commentary upon the epistle to them he often observes, that “ no epistle of St. Paul was fuller of mysteries: which occasioned obscurity,

<sup>t</sup> Usque hodie eadem vel virtutum vestigia permanent, vel errorum. Romanorum laudatur fides. Ubi alibi tanto studio et frequentia ad ecclesias, et ad martyrum sepulchra concurritur?—Non quod aliam habent Romani fidem, nisi hanc quam omnes Christi ecclesie; sed quod devotio in eis major sit, et simplicitas ad credendum.—Corinthios quoque notat, quod indifferenter vescantur in templis, et inflati sapientia seculari, resurrectionem carnis negant. Macedones in caritate laudantur, et hospitalitate, ac susceptione fratrum. Unde ad eos scribitur, ‘ De caritate autem fraternitatis, non necesse habemus scribere vobis. Ipsi enim vos a Deo didicistis, ut diligatis invicem. Etenim facitis illud in omnes fratres in universa Macedonia.’ In ep. ad Gal. Pr. 2. T. IV. p. 255.

<sup>u</sup> Satis abundeque ostendi, quod beatus apostolus ad nullam ecclesiarum tam mystice scripserit, et abscondita seculis revelaverit sacramenta. Pr. 3. in ep. ad Eph. T. IV. p. 375.

Non vobis molestum sit, si diu in obscurioribus immoremur. Causati enim in principio sumus, inter omnes Pauli epistolas, hanc vel maxime, et verbis et sensibus involutam. Comm. in ep. ad Eph. Ibid. p. 369.

Decenter quoque Ephesiis, qui ad scientie summam conscenderant, scribitur, quod sint lux in Domino. In cap. v. p. 383.

Ephesi vero, apud quos fecit triennium, et omnia eis Christi aperuit sacramenta, aliter erudiuntur. Ib. p. 390.

Hæc ideo universa replicuimus, ut ostenderemus, quare apostolus in hac vel potissimum epistolâ obscuros sensus, et ignota seculis sacramenta congeserit. Pr. i. in ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 322.

and rendered it very difficult to be explained. And in a place already cited, he says of the Ephesians, that they had <sup>v</sup> received the mystery hid from ages: that is, they were initiated, or were partakers of the mysteries of the gospel with Paul. And to the like purpose in several passages, just transcribed at the bottom of the page,

By all which, I think, it must appear very evident, that Ignatius supposed St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians to have been really written to them. And his judgment is decisive: for he could not be mistaken. So says the writer of the letter above mentioned; whose words are these; 'I have been the longer,' says he, 'upon these passages of Ignatius, by reason of the weight his authority might justly claim in this case, was it certain, that he had spoken of this epistle of Paul, as written by him to the Ephesians. For if this epistle was written in the ninth year of Nero, and that of Ignatius in the tenth of Trajan, as bishop Pearson placeth them, the distance of time will be but forty-five years. So that Ignatius being then far advanced in age, could not well be ignorant of the truth of this matter. And besides, Onesimus was bishop of Ephesus at the time Ignatius wrote his epistle to that church, is mentioned in it, and had lately made Ignatius a visit. So that had there been any doubt concerning this affair, he could easily have set him right.'

It might have been added, that <sup>w</sup> Ignatius, at the time of his writing his epistle to the Ephesians, had with him Burrhus, a deacon of the church at Ephesus, and Crocus, Euphus, and Fronto, all members of the church at Ephesus, who were then with him at Smyrna. Who likewise, as may be supposed, afterwards carried his letter to Ephesus.

If therefore by what has been said it appears evident, that Ignatius has spoken of this epistle of Paul, as written to the Ephesians (as I think he does) we have made out what must be reckoned of great weight in this matter.

However, it is not Ignatius's testimony only that is decisive. There are many other ancient writers, whose testimony also is satisfactory and decisive.

For by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, writers of the second and third centuries, this epistle is expressly quoted as written by Paul to the Ephesians. They so quote this epistle, without hesitation, as freely and plainly as they do the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians,

<sup>v</sup> Ephesii—sacramentum quod a seculis absconditum fuerat, agnoscunt. Vid. supr. p. 118. not. 1.

<sup>w</sup> Vid. ep. ad Eph. cap. ii.

the Corinthians, or any other of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

It is quoted in the like manner by all writers in general of every age, Latins, Greeks, and Syrians. I would particularly observe, that it is so quoted by Jerom, who also wrote a commentary upon this epistle, and had seen many ancient manuscripts and editions of the New Testament: who never expresseth any doubt, whether this epistle was written to the Ephesians, nor takes notice of any various reading in the inscription of it. For which I refer to his chapter, in the fifth volume of this work. This epistle is quoted in the like manner by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, and all the writers of every age, and of different and remote countries.

We may also observe here, that in the fifth century there were some christians who had a notion, that this epistle was written to the Ephesians before the apostle had seen them. It is likely that this notion was founded upon Eph. i. 15. Nevertheless, they still thought the epistle to have been written to the Ephesians: which is a proof that they knew nothing to the contrary, and had never heard of any various reading in the inscription of this epistle. Among these is Euthalius, who <sup>x</sup> in his prologue to St. Paul's epistles considers the two epistles to the Romans and Ephesians as epistles written to christians, whom the apostle knew by report only. This is remarkable. It shows, that he had no various reading in this place. If he had, he would have taken notice of it. Euthalius was a learned man. He put out an accurate edition of the catholic epistles, and of St. Paul's epistles, with a general prologue to them. And <sup>y</sup> he had consulted, beside others, the manuscripts in the library at Cæsarea in Palestine. Nevertheless he had not met with any various reading.

And in the argument of the epistle to the Ephesians, now placed in the edition of Euthalius, it is said, that <sup>z</sup> the epistle to the Ephesians was sent by Paul from Rome to them, when he had not yet seen them, and had only heard of them. I do not ascribe this argument to Euthalius. The reasons were assigned <sup>a</sup> formerly. Euthalius wrote a prologue to

<sup>x</sup> Ημεπτη ή προς Εφεσιως κεται, πτωες ανθρωπων, και παραμενοντας, ης εν τη προγραφη το μυστηριον εκθηεται, παραπλησιως, τη προς Ρωμαις αμφοτεροις εε εξ ακοης γνωριμοις. Euthal. ap. Zacagn. p. 524.

<sup>y</sup> See Vol. v. p. 68; and Vol. iii. p. 229.

<sup>z</sup> Ταυτην επιτελλει απο Ρωμης επω μεν ιωρακως αυτες, ακεσας δε περι αυτων. Arg. ep. ad Eph. ib. p. 633.

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. v. p. 69.

St. Paul's epistles. But it does not appear that he wrote arguments to each of his epistles severally. The same thing is also said of the epistle to the Ephesians in the Synopsis<sup>b</sup> of Scripture ascribed to Athanasius. These I reckon one and the same, but different from Euthalius.

And I may here take notice of a small inaccuracy in Mr. Wetstein, who<sup>c</sup> in his notes upon the beginning of the epistle to the Ephesians, quotes both the prologue to St. Paul's epistles, and the argument of the epistle to the Ephesians in particular, as Euthalius's: though in his Prolegomena, in his account of what Euthalius had done, he had observed, and rightly, that<sup>d</sup> those arguments were not composed by Euthalius, but by another.

I therefore here suppose two, that is, Euthalius and another, who wrote the arguments of St. Paul's epistles severally; who may be the same that composed the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius.

However, beside these, there may have been about this time some others of the same opinion. For Theodoret in his preface to the epistle to the Ephesians observes, there<sup>e</sup> were some, who said that Paul wrote to the Ephesians before he had seen them. But he shows it to be a false and absurd opinion, and concludes, saying: 'It<sup>f</sup> is manifest, therefore, that the apostle had preached the gospel to them, before he wrote to them.'

This affords a good argument that there was not in the fifth century, nor before, any notice or apprehension of a various reading in the inscription of this epistle. For if there had, none would have admitted so absurd a supposition, that Paul wrote from Rome an epistle to the Ephesians, before he had seen them.

Another thing deserving notice here is, that before the end of the fourth century there was forged an epistle to the Laodiceans, ascribed to Paul. For<sup>g</sup> it is expressly mentioned by Jerom in his book of Illustrious Men, written about 392. Which must induce us to think, that the epistle to the Ephesians was never called the epistle to the Laodiceans. For then there could have been no pretence for

<sup>b</sup> Ταυτην επιτελλει απο 'Ρωμης, επω μιν αυτες ιωρακως, ακωσας δε περι αυτων. Ap. Athan. T. II. p. 194. ed. Bened.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. N. T. Vol. II. p. 238.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. ejusd. Prolegom. Vol. I. p. 75.

<sup>e</sup> —τον δε Θειοτατον Παυλον μηδεπω τως Εφεσιως τεθειμενοι, την δε επιτολην προς αυτες γεγραφεναι Theod. T. III. p. 290.

<sup>f</sup> Δεδεικται αρα σαφως, ως προκηρυξας αυτοις το ευαγγελιον επως γεγραψε την επιτολην. Ib. p. 292.

<sup>g</sup> Legunt quidam et ad Laodicenses. Sed ab omnibus exploditur. De V. I. cap. v.

forging another with that title, to verify a false interpretation of Col. iv. 16.

I should now proceed to another argument. But I must look back, to secure this, taken from the testimony of ancient christian writers. For it has been argued from a passage of St. Basil, in his books against Eunomius, that he had seen some ancient manuscripts of this epistle, in which these words, “at Ephesus,” were wanting. That passage, as cited formerly, is thus: ‘And Paul writing to the Ephesians, as truly united to him “who is,” through knowledge, called them in a particular sense “such who are,” saying, “to the saints who are, and [or even] the faithful in Christ Jesus.” For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in ancient copies.’ This point having been already examined by us largely, I refer to what was then said.<sup>h</sup> It was then argued by us, that St. Basil does not here intimate, that the word or words, “at Ephesus,” were wanting in any copies seen by him. And I would now observe farther, that our account of this passage is confirmed by the works of other authors, both before and after Basil. There had lived many learned christian writers before his time. There were many learned christians cotemporary with him: as his own brother, Gregory Nyssen, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, and others: and also soon after him, as Theodoret, and Euthalius: not now to mention Jerom, or other learned Latin authors. None of whom have said that the words, “at Ephesus,” were wanting in any copies, which they had seen. The various reading, therefore, intended by Basil, must have been somewhat less, a small matter, not any thing like *εν Εφεσω*, “at Ephesus.” For so remarkable a reading could not have been passed by in silence, unobserved by all others. And every one may see, that in this very place, as well as elsewhere, Basil cites this epistle, as written by Paul to the Ephesians. And they are the christians, of whom Paul had said, that through knowledge they were united to him “who is.”

In the place to which I referred just now, I gave an account of a Dissertation of L’Enfant, vindicating the common reading; which was approved by Wolfius, and others. However, Mr. Kuster was not satisfied. And in the preface to his edition of Mill’s New Testament, he says, ‘That<sup>i</sup>

<sup>h</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. xcvii.

<sup>i</sup> Nec magis *ἠλιαζουτος* apostolus Ephesios, ex sensu Basilii, vocaverit *ουτας* quam Romanos, Philippenses, etc. ad quos scribens eadem plane loquendi formulâ utitur. Kuster.

‘ the argument, or interpretation of Basil, depends upon a  
‘ supposition, that the words, “ at Ephesus,” were wanting  
‘ in the inscription of this epistle. Otherwise the christians,  
‘ to whom that epistle is sent, could not have been reckoned  
‘ more especially united to him, “ who is,” or called “ such  
‘ who are,” rather than the Romans, or Philippians, or any  
‘ other christians to whom Paul wrote.’

To which I answer: that is saying all, and the only thing that can be said, in behalf of the supposition, that the words, “ at Ephesus,” were wanting in some copies, which Basil had seen. But though this may seem specious and plausible, it is not conclusive. We have perceived from Palladius, and Jerom lately alleged, that there were some, who appropriated certain characters to divers churches. The Romans were especially called faithful, the Ephesians initiated, and knowing, and the Thessalonians lovers of the brotherhood.

But it cannot be thence concluded, that other christians were not entitled to the same characters: or that the same things might not be also said of them. As may appear to any one who does but look into St. Paul’s epistles: in which the faith of other churches is spoken of, beside that of the Romans. And others, beside the Thessalonians, are supposed to have been lovers of the saints, or the brotherhood. Says the apostle, 1 Thess. i. 3, “ Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love.” 2 Thess. i. 4, “ So that we ourselves glory in you, in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your persecutions.” 2 Cor. viii. 7, “ As ye abound in every thing in faith.”—— Eph. i. 1, “ To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.” Ver. 15, “ Wherefore——after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints.” Col. i. 2, “ To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse.” Philem. ver. 5, “ Hearing of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.” And others, beside the Ephesians, were partakers of the mysteries of the gospel with the apostle. See Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7; Col. i. 25—27; ii. 2; iv. 3.

That is the very observation of Palladius in the place above cited: that when the apostle blames some for certain vices, and commends others for certain virtues, he by no means intends to intimate, that those vices, or those virtues, were peculiar to the persons blamed or commended by him.

The Romans were called by some in ancient times in an

especial manner faithful, the Ephesians initiated, and the Thessalonians, or Macedonians, lovers of the brotherhood. But they were not so, exclusive of others. For all the churches or christians to whom Paul wrote, were faithful, and initiated, or partakers with him in the mysteries of the gospel, and lovers of the saints, or brotherhood: though they might be reasonably exhorted to abound therein more and more. As are the Thessalonians themselves, 1 epist. ch. iv. 10; see also ch. iii. 12. And indeed, if such properties did not belong to them, they could not have been christians. Nevertheless, when these several characters had been applied to some particularly, it is likely, that few would scruple to follow the same way of speaking, if there was occasion.

So in the present case, that observation in Basil having been applied to the Ephesians by some men of no great judgment, it was left there, and not applied to any others. Indeed it is an impertinent observation, as Jerom<sup>k</sup> calls it. And, as it seems, was made use of by a few only. But it might have been as properly said of other christians, as of the Ephesians.

One thing more I add here. They who are for leaving out the words, “at Ephesus,” must read the place in this manner, “to such as are saints, and faithful in Christ Jesus.” Then this should be a general epistle, not directed to any one place, but to good christians every where. But that it is not a general epistle, is manifest from Eph. vi. 21, 22. without insisting now on any other places. “But that ye may also know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known unto you all things; whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.” This plainly shows, that the epistle had not a general inscription, “to saints and faithful men,” but was inscribed to the saints of some place. And who should they be, but the saints and faithful at Ephesus: to whom it is inscribed in all Greek manuscripts, and in all versions, and in all catalogues of the books of the New Testament, whether composed by councils or others?

4. Once more. St. Paul himself says, 2 Tim. iv. 12, “And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus,” very probably referring to this epistle, as<sup>l</sup> was shown some while ago. This is what Whitby intends at the beginning of his preface to this epistle before transcribed. ‘That this epistle to the Ephe-

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. xcvii.

<sup>l</sup> See before, p. 34.



‘sians was indeed written by St. Paul, and directed to  
‘them, and not to any other church, we cannot doubt, if we  
‘believe either the epistle, or St. Paul himself.’ By the  
testimony of the epistle he means the inscription at the  
beginning, where is “at Ephesus,” in all manuscripts and  
versions. By the testimony of St. Paul himself he means  
what is said, 2 Tim. iv. 12, quoted above.

Having finished the argument in favour of the genuineness  
of the common inscription of this epistle, which to me ap-  
pears sufficient and satisfactory, I now propose to con-  
sider objections, which have been raised by Mill, and others.

1. Obj. ‘It is said, that there are in this epistle divers  
‘expressions, not suited to the christians at Ephesus, where  
‘Paul had been twice, and spent there almost three years.  
‘See Acts xviii. 19—21 ; xix. and xx. 1, and 17—38.’

Says Mr. Pierce, in the place before referred to, repre-  
senting Mill’s argument, ‘He has proved it highly impre-  
‘bable, that the epistle was at first written to the Ephesians.  
‘St. Paul had resided among them, and “kept back no-  
‘thing that was profitable unto them.”——How then  
‘could he write to them, as though he had never seen, or  
‘been among them, but only had heard of them? Eph. i. 5,  
‘“Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord  
‘Jesus, and love to all the saints.” Again, is it likely he  
‘would refer those to whom he had declared all the counsel  
‘of God, so long together, to a bare report of himself?  
‘Eph. iii. 2, “If ye have heard of the dispensation of the  
‘grace of God, which is given me to you-ward.” Or  
‘would he suppose, that they who had heard him preach a  
‘thousand times would need to “understand his knowledge  
‘in the mystery of Christ,” from what he said in a few verses,  
‘or even the whole of that short epistle?” Eph. iii. 4.

To the like purpose another learned author, whom like-  
wise I shall transcribe here, that this objection may appear  
in all its strength, ‘He<sup>m</sup> intimateth, that he had only heard  
‘of their faith in Christ, and of their love to all christians,  
‘ch. i. 15.——Again, he not only mentioneth his “hearing  
‘of their faith in Christ,” but, ch. iii. 1, 2, he speaks, as if  
‘he was dubious, whether they had heard of the extraordi-  
‘nary revelations, which he had received from heaven.——  
‘And verses 3, 4, he intimateth, that if they had never heard  
‘of these things before, they might understand them from  
‘the brief hints which he had given them in this epistle. Is  
‘this like St. Paul’s style to the churches of his own planting?

<sup>m</sup> Dr. Benson’s History of the first Planting the Christian Religion, Vol. II.  
p. 272. first edit. p. 292. second edit.

‘ ———Or could a few lines, or even a larger epistle than this, have given them so clear a knowledge of St. Paul’s illumination, as their hearing him a thousand times? For had he not been among them for the space of three years, warning every one of them night and day with tears?’

But this difficulty, if I mistake not, will disappear upon farther consideration, and a fuller examination of the matter.

First. It appears from the epistle itself that the christians, to whom it is sent, were not unknown to Paul, nor they to him; but they were well acquainted with each other.

That the apostle was acquainted with these christians, must, I think, be evident to all, who read without prejudice the first fourteen verses of the first chapter of this epistle. I insist only upon ver. 13, “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the holy Spirit of promise.” How could the apostle write thus to any, but to such, whose conversion to christianity he was well acquainted with, and that upon their believing they had received gifts of the Spirit? How could any man write thus to people whom he had but lately heard of?

There are also many other passages of this epistle, which show the apostle’s knowledge of the state of these christians, both before, and after their conversion. Some of which I must select here.

Ch. ii. 1, 2, “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world.”——and throughout that chapter to the end.

Then at ch. iii. 13, “Wherefore I desire, that ye faint not at my tribulation for you, which is your glory.” That must be said to christians, of whose tender affection for him he was very sensible: recollecting, it is likely, what had happened at Miletus, as related, Acts xx. 36—38. And indeed it is throughout an affectionate, as well as instructive and useful epistle.

Ch. iv. 20, “But ye have not so learned Christ.” Ver. 21, “If so be,” or “forasmuch as ye have heard him, and

<sup>n</sup> ‘Si tamen illud audistis;] ‘Si tamen,’ Græce, ‘siquidem.’ Non enim dubitans hoc dicit apostolus, sed magis rem ‘confirmans,’ uti post Chrysostomum annotat Theophylactus. Nam et alias interdum vim confirmandi habet conjunctio, si, ut secundæ ad Thessalon. primo vers. 6. Est. ad Eph. iv. 21.

have been taught the truth as it is in Jesus." This the apostle knew very well.

I cannot forbear to recite this place more largely, from ver. 20 to 34, "But ye have not so learned Christ, forasmuch as ye have heard him, and have been instructed in him, as the truth is in Jesus, to<sup>o</sup> put off with respect to the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts, and to be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and to put on the new man, which is created according to God in righteousness and true holiness." Certainly these are St. Paul's own converts and disciples. The case of these people resembles that of the Galatians, Ch. iii. 1, "Before whose eyes Jesus Christ had been evidently set forth crucified among them." But to these christians, at Ephesus, the apostle expresseth himself with more mildness, as was fit, than to the Galatians.

Then ver. 30, "And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption:" or with which ye were sealed in the day of redemption. These Gentile christians had received the Spirit. And from whom, I pray, if not from St. Paul? And that they had a variety of spiritual gifts, is manifest from ch. v. 18—20.

Ch. v. 8, "For ye were sometime darkness: but now are ye light in the Lord. Walk as children of the light." Which shows, that the apostle knew the state of these christians before and after their conversion.

And that St. Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him, appears to me very evident from ch. vi. 21, 22.

Secondly, at ch. i. 15, are words, upon which an objection has been formed, as we have seen. "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints:" that is, according to Mr. Locke's paraphrase: 'Wherefore I also here in my confinement having heard of the continuance of your faith in Christ Jesus and your love to all the saints.' And in his preface to this epistle Mr. Locke has these expressions. 'Wherefore when he heard that the Ephesians stood firm in the faith, whereby he means their confidence of their title to the privileges and benefits of the gospel, without submission to the law, he thanks God for them.'

Whitby's paraphrase of this verse is to this purpose: 'Wherefore I also having heard of your stedfast faith in the Lord Jesus, and your increasing love to all the saints; that

<sup>o</sup> See Dr. Doddridge upon the place, whose version, in the main, I have here adopted.

· is, that the faith and love wrought in you continues sted-  
· fast, and aboundeth.’

To the like purpose also <sup>p</sup> Grotius, whose words I have placed below.

Theodoret’s note upon ver. 15 and 16, is to this purpose :  
· Hence some have supposed, that the apostle wrote this  
· epistle to the Ephesians, when he had not yet seen them.  
· But they should consider, that writing to the Corinthians,  
· concerning whom he had received some disagreeable in-  
· formation, he says, “ It has been related to me of you, my  
· brethren, by them which are of the household of Chloe,  
· that there are contentions among you,” 1 Cor. i. II. As  
· therefore when he had received information of some things  
· disagreeable, he wrote with grief of mind : so when he  
· had received an account of things agreeable concerning  
· these Ephesians, he bestows commendation. He praiseth  
· them, both for their piety and for their liberality to the  
· saints ; whereupon he also gives thanks to God, the author  
· of all good things.’

So that this text was no difficulty at all with Theodo-  
ret. However, it may be expedient that I should enlarge  
somewhat farther.

I observe, then, that St. Paul writes in the same manner  
to Philemon, his own convert, whose faith therefore he cer-  
tainly knew. Philem. 4, 5 : “ I thank my God, making  
mention of thee always in my prayers : hearing of thy love,  
and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and  
toward all saints.” That Philemon had been converted to  
the faith of the gospel by Paul, I suppose to be evident  
from ver. 19 : “ Albeit I do not say unto thee, how thou  
owest to me thy ownself besides.” So that text <sup>q</sup> has been  
generally understood : and how it can be interpreted other-  
wise, I do not conceive.

Whitby’s paraphrase is : “ Albeit I do not say unto  
· thee, how thou owest to me,” by whom thou wast con-  
· verted, “ even thy ownself,” or the well-being of thy soul  
· “ besides.”’

Beansobre and L’Enfant in their preface to the epistle to  
Philemon express themselves in this manner. ‘ Philemon  
· was a considerable person at Colosse, a city of Phrygia.  
· St. Paul had converted him, either at Ephesus, or some

<sup>p</sup> Loquitur autem Paulus de profectu evangelii apud Ephesios, ex quo ipse ab  
illis discesserat. Grot. in Eph. i. 14.

<sup>q</sup> Cæterum, si ad jus meum redeam, propter sermonem Christi, quem tibi  
evangelizavi, et christianus effectus es, teipsum mihi debes. Hieron. in Ep. ad  
Philem. T. IV. p. 452.

‘ other city of Asia, when he preached the gospel in that  
‘ country: or else at Colosse itself, in one of the journies  
‘ which he had made in Phrygia.’

There are some other things to be observed here concerning this person. For in the first verse of that epistle Paul calls Philemon beloved, and his fellow-labourer; which, if I am not mistaken, indicate personal acquaintance, and imply their having laboured together in the service of the gospel at Colosse, or Ephesus, or in some other place. And yet St. Paul, writing to Philemon, speaks of his “having heard of his faith and love.”

Still farther, it appears to me highly probable, that Onesimus, in whose behalf this epistle was written, knew Paul before he saw him at Rome. He either had seen Paul at his master’s house at Colosse, or else at Ephesus, when attending upon his master there. Paul was a prisoner at Rome, and could not go abroad. “He dwelt in his own hired house, with a soldier that kept him,” Acts xxviii. 16, and 30. It is likely, therefore, that Onesimus came first to Paul. Being in straits, and knowing Paul’s benevolent temper, and what civilities he had received from his master, Philemon, he might hope for some relief from him. Or, possibly, hearing that Paul was at Rome, and recollecting the discourses which he had heard him make, when attending on Philemon, he was touched with remorse for the faults which he had been guilty of, and came to Paul for farther instruction in the things of religion, and for advice and comfort. He might also encourage himself with hopes of Paul’s interceding in his behalf, and obtaining a reconciliation with his master.

Says Beausobre in his preface to the epistle to Philemon, ‘ It can hardly be doubted, that the repentance of his fault  
‘ obliged Onesimus to come to Paul, whom he knew to be  
‘ his master’s friend. For otherwise, he might have remained  
‘ unknown at Rome.’

Philemon then was well known to Paul. Nevertheless, at the beginning of his epistle to him, he thanks God, “having heard of his love and faith.” The meaning is, he had received information of the continuance of his faith, and of its bearing good fruit. If Paul could write thus to Philemon, his convert, friend, and fellow-labourer, he might write in a like manner to other christians, to whom he was no stranger.

So likewise to the Colossians, ch. i. 3, 4; “We give thanks to God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you: since we heard of your faith in

Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints :” that is, having heard of the continuance of your faith, and of the good fruits of it. This he had been assured of by Epaphras, who had come to the apostle at Rome. It is not to be supposed, that Paul now first heard of the faith of the Colossians or the Laodiceans. I think that the Colossians were Paul’s own converts, and that the church there had been planted by him. But supposing that to be uncertain, I imagine, it cannot be questioned, that the church there had been planted a good while ago, by some of the apostle’s assistants and fellow-labourers. Consequently, the apostle did not now first know, and hear of the faith and love of the christians at Colosse. He must have known it before he came to Rome, and before he was apprehended at Jerusalem. But he had lately received good tidings concerning their steadiness and perseverance from some, who had come from them to him at Rome.

St. Paul, since his coming to Rome, had received from Tychicus an account of the state of things at Ephesus, which upon the whole was very pleasing. He had received from Epaphras a like account of the state of things at Colosse, and particularly a good account of the conduct of Philemon. For all which he praiseth God in his epistles to them. Indeed it could not but be matter of much joy to the apostle, to hear of the continued faith of christians in several places, notwithstanding the many difficulties attending the profession of christianity, and notwithstanding the discouragement which his own long captivity might have occasioned in the minds of many.

In these three epistles, to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon, are the same expressions, near the beginning, “having heard of your faith and love.” And they are all to be understood in a like manner. If these words were to be understood in the epistle to the Ephesians of “now first hearing:” it might be as well argued, that the epistle could not be written to the Laodiceans. For, as before intimated, it may be reckoned certain, that before Paul came to Rome he knew of the faith of the church at Laodicea.

Thirdly, in the next place I consider that part of the objection, which is raised from Eph. iii. 2, 3, 4, “If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote before in a few words: whereby ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ.”

To which part of the objection I answer, that “if ye have heard of the dispensation,” may be rendered, “since,” or “forasmuch as ye have heard,” and what follows. So Theophylact, approved by Whitby upon the place.

I observe farther. These things are as properly said to the Ephesians, as to any other christians in that country, or thereabout. They were all acquainted, and much alike acquainted with them. If such expressions might be used in an epistle to the Colossians, or the Laodiceans, they might be used in an epistle to the Ephesians. No Gentile christians, whether converted immediately by Paul himself, or by some of his assistants or fellow-labourers, could be ignorant of it. Nor could Paul doubt whether they knew it. Nevertheless he might judge it proper to hint these things, the more to confirm the instructions, and exhortations which he sent them, and to secure their steadiness in the faith and profession of the pure gospel of Christ, as they had been taught. And does he not speak more largely, and more distinctly of this matter, in his epistle to the Galatians, whom none ever denied to be the apostle's converts? Gal. i. 11—20; “But I certify you, brethren, *γυμριζω εε υμων*, that the gospel, which was preached of me, is not after men.—For ye have heard of my conversation in time past—But it pleased God—to reveal his Son in me—Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.” These things the Galatians were not ignorant of. But in his epistle he reminds them of them, and in a very solemn manner.

The writers, from whom this objection was taken, speak of the Ephesians having heard the apostle ‘preach a thousand times,’ and ask: ‘Could the apostle suppose, that they who had heard him preach a thousand times, could need to understand his knowledge of the mystery of Christ, from what he said in a few verses, or even from the whole of this short epistle?’ But those expressions appear to me very strong, and even unjustifiable: though they are warranted by <sup>r</sup> Mill, whom those learned men follow.

He and they seem to conceive of the christians at Ephesus, as a small society, consisting perhaps of two or three hundred people. And they speak, as if they supposed that church to have been formed and planted before the apostle came thither, or very soon after his arrival: and that they had all heard him preach once at least every day of the

<sup>r</sup> Quomodo convenit hoc civibus Ephesinis, qui sexcentis prædicantem audierant apostolum? Mill. Prol. num. 72.

three years that he resided in that city. How else could they think that the christians at Ephesus had heard Paul preach a thousand times? He says indeed to their elders at Miletus, Acts xx. 31, that “for the space of three years he had not ceased to warn every one night and day with tears.” Certainly the apostle was very diligent in making converts, and in confirming the believers there. But conversions were made gradually, not all at once, as is evident from the account, which we have of Paul’s preaching at Ephesus, in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts; where also St. Luke observes, at ver. 10, “that all they which dwelt in Asia, heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.” This may lead us to think that Paul had many converts in several parts of Asia. Some of these may have seen, and heard the Apostle at Ephesus once only, or however not often. To all these the epistle to the Ephesians was sent. The inscription “to the saints and faithful at Ephesus,” the chief city, would comprehend all the believers in the country. And some converts may have been made since the apostle was there. However, though it should be allowed, that most of these christians had heard the apostle often, the reading of this epistle might be of great use to them. For it is an excellent epistle, as all must allow, and not inferior to the most admired of St. Paul’s writings.

I have now considered the first, and, as I suppose, the principal objection,

2. Obj. It is said, ‘that in all St. Paul’s epistles, written to particular churches, there is some particular case mentioned, respecting each church, that seems to be one reason at least for writing to them: which is also observed in his epistle to the Colossians, whom he there cautions against the worship of angels.’

I answer. That is a just observation. And the same may be found in Jerom’s preface to his Commentary upon this epistle to the Ephesians: where he says, as<sup>s</sup> the blessed John in the Revelation, writing to the seven churches, either reproves the faults, or commends the virtues of each: so likewise, he says, does the apostle Paul in his epistles. And

<sup>s</sup> Necessè est enim, ut juxta diversitates locorum, et temporum, et hominum, quibus scriptæ sunt, diversas et causas, et argumenta, et origines habeant. Et, quomodo beatus Joannes in Apocalypsi suâ ad septem scribens ecclesias, in unâquâque earum specialia vel vitia reprehendit, vel virtutes probat; ita et sanctus apostolus Paulus per singulas ecclesias vulneribus medetur illatis, nec ad instar imperiti medici uno collyrio omnium oculos vult curare. Pr. i. in ep. ad Eph. T. IV. p. 320.



he supposeth this epistle to have been written to the christians at Ephesus, and to be suited to their case.

But we are not to expect, that even an apostle should censure, and find fault where there is little or no occasion for it. It becomes him to own the good temper and conduct of any church that deserves it. And what church could be so likely to deserve mild treatment, as the church at Ephesus, which had had so much of the apostle's presence, and of his favourite disciple Timothy, upon whom he has bestowed so great commendations? I Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10; Philip. ii. 19–22; and who undoubtedly would be faithful and diligent, where he was sent occasionally only, or where he was stationed for a while. This was the case here. I suppose that Timothy was left at Ephesus, when Paul went up to Jerusalem. There he continued till after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and after the writing of this epistle to the Ephesians, of which we are now speaking. Moreover, as is well known, when Paul was going up to Jerusalem, he delivered, at Miletus, a most pathetic charge to the elders of that church, and to Timothy with them, as I suppose. See Acts xx. 17–38, particularly 28–31, which certainly must have excited all to faithfulness and zeal in the performance of their duty. Indeed he says, “I know, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.” There would arise men, that would endeavour to devour, and lay waste the church of Ephesus. Nevertheless, I think these earnest warnings of the apostle must have been of great use to defeat the designs of such evil men: so that they should not be able to do much mischief there, at least for some while.

And says the apostle, ver. 31; “Watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one of you night and day with tears.” This the apostle does again very suitably in this epistle, in divers places which cannot be overlooked, nor passed by us here. So Eph. iv. 1, “I therefore the prisoner of the Lord beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.”—ver. 17, “This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles,” and what follows. So also ch. v. 1.—And vi. 12–17. These warnings have, probably, a respect to temptations, which the Ephesians might meet with from their heathen and idolatrous neighbours, and from deceitful and artful men among christians. To such things as these Jerom supposed Paul to have an eye in this <sup>t</sup> epistle.

<sup>t</sup> Scriebat ad Ephesios Dianam colentes.—Scriebat autem ad metropolim

And these written warnings, as well as others, seem to have had a good effect. The church of Ephesus appears to have behaved commendably for a good while. This may be collected from Rev. ii. 1—6. And Ignatius at the beginning of his epistle to them says, ch. vi. ‘And indeed ‘Onesimus himself does greatly commend your good order ‘in God: that you all live according to truth, and that no ‘heresy dwells among you.’ And ch. ix. ‘I have heard of ‘some, who have passed by you, having perverse doctrine: whom you did not suffer to sow among you.’ And to the like purpose in other places of that epistle.

3. Obj. It is said, ‘that Timothy’s name is not mentioned in the introduction to this epistle: though it is found in ‘the beginning of the epistle to the Colossians, and that ‘to Philemon. Hence it is argued, that Timothy was unknown to all, or most of the church, to whom this epistle ‘was written. Consequently it was not sent to the church of ‘Ephesus where Timothy was well known.’

In answer to which I would say, first, that I can see no reason, why St. Paul should scruple to put Timothy’s name at the beginning of an epistle, written to christians, with whom Timothy was not personally acquainted. Secondly, There can be no reason to doubt, that Timothy was as well known to the christians at Laodicea, as at Colosse. Thirdly, Therefore there must have been some other reason for omitting the name of Timothy at the beginning of this epistle. Fourthly, That reason presently offers, and probably was this, that at writing this epistle Timothy was not with the apostle at Rome. I think Timothy was now at Ephesus. How then could his name be placed at the beginning of an epistle written to the Ephesians from Rome?

4. Obj. ‘At Philippi the church was settled with fixed ‘officers, before the apostle wrote. And therefore he ‘directs his epistle not only to the christians in general there, ‘but to the bishops and deacons. But there is no such ‘thing here: though the church of Ephesus had evidently ‘such officers, before the writing of this epistle.’ See Acts xx. 17.

To which I answer, that there must have been fixed officers in many churches, beside that at Philippi. Says

*Asiæ civitatem, in quâ ita idololatria—et artium magicarum præstigiæ viguerant.—Hæc ideo universa replicavimus, ut ostenderemus, quare apostolus in hac vel potissimum epistolâ obscuros sensus, et ignota seculis sacramenta congerent; et de sanctarum contrariarumque virtutum docuerit potestate; qui sint dæmones, quid valeant.—De quibus ait: ‘Non est nobis pugna adversum carnem et sanguinem, sed adversum principatus et potestates.’—Hieron. ubi supr. p. 322.*

St. Luke, in his account of the peregrination of Paul and Barnabas in several places, Acts xiv. 21—23, “ they returned again to Lystra, and Iconium, and Antioch, (in Pisidia,) confirming the souls of the disciples.—And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had believed.” Says Beza upon this text: ‘ In<sup>u</sup> every ‘ church they ordained elders, that is, pastors, and deacons, ‘ and other officers.’ From what is said here Luke leads us to conclude, what was done elsewhere. It was not needful to mention such things every where. But very probably there were church-officers fixed in all the churches in no long time after they were planted, and particularly in Greece and Macedonia. From St. Paul’s epistle we know, that there were bishops and deacons at Philippi, though not mentioned by St. Luke in his history of the apostle’s preaching there. Acts xvi. 12—40. Beza concludes from I Thess. v. 27, that<sup>v</sup> there were fixed officers in the church at Thessalonica. And it is very manifest from ver. 12 and 13 of that chapter: “ And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you: and to esteem them very highly in love, for their work’s sake.” St. Paul says to Titus, ch. i. 5, “ For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed thee.” Whenever Paul was in Crete, it is reasonable to think, that he made there but a short stay. Nevertheless before he left that island, he had given orders to Titus, to ordain “ elders in every city.” And not long after coming thence he wrote to him an epistle, with particular directions for that purpose. Before Paul left Ephesus, it is likely, that he had ordained several elders in that city, and in the district of Asia. And yet he afterwards wrote to Timothy, giving him directions concerning the qualifications of such persons, that he might make a farther supply, where it was wanting. Which must induce us to think, that the apostle was not willing, that any churches should be destitute of fit guides and instructors for any long time after they had been

<sup>u</sup> ‘ Per singulas ecclesias,’ κατ’ ἐκκλησιαν. Sic antea dixit Lucas κατ’ οἶκον, pro ‘ domatim Presbyteros,’ id est, Pastores et Diaconos, et alios ecclesie gubernationi prefectos. Hic enim, ut alibi sæpe, generaliter accipitur Presbyteri nomen. Bez. in Act. xiv. 23.

<sup>v</sup> Vos, ὑμας. Hinc apparet, mitti solitas fuisse apostolicas epistolas presbyterio, ad quod hæc abjuratio et præcedentes duo versiculi proprie pertineant; quoniam alioqui absurda esset hæc petitio, si ad totum ecclesie cœtum referretur. Bez. in I Th. v. 27.

planted. St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians, is inscribed "to the churches of Galatia," without any mention of bishops or deacons. And yet there must have been there men of that character.

St. Peter writes to the christians in Galatia, and other neighbouring parts, and sends an admonition to such. I Pet. v. 1, 2, "The elders which are among you I exhort. — Feed the flock of God, which is among you." And from the epistle itself it may be concluded with certainty, that there were fixed officers in the churches of Galatia, though they are not mentioned in the inscription. For so St. Paul directs, ch. vi. 6, "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." There is no notice taken of any elders in the inscriptions of either of St. Paul's epistles to the Corinthians. And yet there must have been such officers in that church. Clement of Rome, in the first century, in his epistle to the Corinthians, speaking of the apostles, says, ch. xlii. 'They went abroad, publishing the good tidings, that the kingdom of God was at hand. And preaching in countries and cities, they<sup>w</sup> appointed their first-fruits, having first proved them by the spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe.' And afterwards, in ch. xliv. 'Wherefore we cannot think that they may be justly cast out of their ministry, who<sup>x</sup> were either appointed by them [the apostles] or were afterwards chosen by other eminent men with the consent of the whole church.' — So writes Clement. And thus he bears witness to two things. First, that this was the general method of the apostles. And, secondly, he assures us, particularly, that this had been done in the church of Corinth. About which, I suppose, he could not be mistaken. There must therefore have been fixed officers in the churches of Thessalonica, Corinth, and Galatia: though St. Paul has taken no particular notice of them in the inscriptions of his epistles. It cannot then be any just exception against this epistle having been sent to the Ephesians, because their bishops or elders are not named. For it was a common thing with the apostle, to inscribe his epistles to the churches, or saints, of such a place, without any particular notice of their officers, though there were men of that character among them. I have mentioned above, St. Paul's epistles to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. To them might be

<sup>w</sup> — καθιζασαν τας απαρχας αυτων, δοκιμασαντες τη πνευματι, εις επισκοπους και διακονους των μελλοντων πιστεειν.

<sup>x</sup> Της ουν κατασταθιντας υπ' εκεινων, κ. λ.

added the epistle to the Colossians. For that also is inscribed "to the saints, and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse." And yet there must have been elders in that church: one is mentioned whose name is Archippus. However, it is in this manner only: Col. iv. 17, "And say to Archippus, take heed to the ministry, which thou hast received of the Lord, that thou fulfil it." Nor does the apostle send his salutations to the church in Laodicea by him in particular, but by the saints to whom the epistle is inscribed. See ch. iv. 15. Once more, Timothy, as is generally allowed, was at Ephesus when St. Paul wrote to him those two epistles, which we have. When the first was written, there must have been some elders in that church, and yet more at the time of writing the second. It cannot be contested by any. Nevertheless no salutations are sent to the elders of Ephesus, in either of those epistles.

5. Obj. 'If this epistle was sent to the Ephesians, it may be thought very strange, that St. Paul should not salute any of his friends there, where he had many friends and acquaintance.'

But I cannot perceive this to be of much weight. There is no epistle of St. Paul that has so many salutations in it, as that to the Romans, whom he had never seen. There are no salutations of particular persons at the end of the first epistle to Timothy, who was then at Ephesus. I suppose Timothy to have been in the same city likewise, when Paul wrote his second epistle to him. Nevertheless there are in it no particular salutations, except those in ch. iv. 19, "Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus." Tychicus went with this epistle to the Ephesians. And what is said ch. vi. 21—23, would be instead of many particular salutations, and fully answer the end. For Tychicus is there required to "make known unto them all things, and to comfort their hearts." I might add, that no particular persons are saluted by name in either of the epistles to the Thessalonians, nor in the epistle to the Galatians, nor in that to Titus, excepting only Titus himself, to whom the epistle is sent.

6. Obj. Mr. Wetstein says, 'that <sup>y</sup> the epistle to the Ephesians is written to Gentiles, whereas the church at Ephesus consisted chiefly of Jews.'

I answer: That the epistle, called, to the Ephesians, is

<sup>y</sup> Imprimis vero observandum, cum ecclesia Ephesina ex Judæis potissimum collecta fuerit, Act. xviii. 19, 21, 24, 25; xix. 9, 10, 17; xx. 21; Apoc. ii. 2, 7; eam, ad quam hæc epistola scripta est, non ex Judæis, sed ex Gentilibus fuisse congregatam. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 239.

written to Gentiles, or to such chiefly, is allowed, and is very manifest. And it seems to me very evident, from the history which we have of St. Paul's preaching at Ephesus, in the book of the Acts, that the apostle's chief harvest there was from among the Gentiles. For a while indeed he taught in the synagogue, but the behaviour of the Jews obliged him to withdraw. Whereupon he preached in another place. And I should conclude from what is in Acts xix. 17—40, that the apostle had many more converts there among Gentiles, than Jews.

7. Obj. 'It is argued from Col. iv. 16, that this epistle 'was sent to the Laodiceans. For St. Paul says there : ' " and when this epistle is read among you, or has been ' read among you, cause that it be read also in the church ' of the Laodiceans : and that ye likewise read the epistle ' from Laodicea." Hereby, as is argued, must be intended ' the epistle called, to the Ephesians, but really sent to the ' Laodiceans. For, says Mill,<sup>z</sup> and likewise others after ' him, this epistle called, to the Ephesians, and the epistle to ' the Colossians, were both sent by the same messenger, and ' at the same time.'

To which I answer, that if the epistle, called, to the Ephesians, be the epistle intended by the apostle, and sent at the same time with that to the Colossians, it is manifest, that it was not sent to the Laodiceans. This may be concluded from what is said to the Colossians, ch. iv. 15, "Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphias, and the church which is in his house." This plainly shows, that there was not now any epistle sent to the Laodiceans. If there had, there would have been no occasion for the apostle to send this order to the Colossians. For it is impossible to write a letter to any persons, or societies, without saluting them, or doing somewhat that is equivalent. And it is manifest, that in the epistle inscribed to the Ephesians, the christians, to whom it is sent, are saluted. Particularly ch. i. 1, 2, and ch. vi. 21, 22, 23. This has appeared evident to learned men of the first rank, and different communions. So<sup>a</sup> Baronius, and Tillemont. This last says,

<sup>z</sup> Quidni igitur scripta fuerit ad Laodicenses?—Sane per eundem nuntium missa erat hæc epistola, per quem delata erat epistola ad Colossenses, Tycheicum scilicet, nec non eodem tempore. Mill. Prol. num. 74.

<sup>a</sup> Sane nullam eidem tabellario ad Laodicenses fuisse a Paulo datam epistolam, satis constat: dum in eâ, quam tum scripsit ad Colossenses, salutari mandat eos, qui Laodiceæ essent fideles, sic dicens: 'Salutate fratres, qui sunt Laodiceæ.'—Libentius igitur Chrysostomo ac Theodoro inhæremus, quam cæteris, ut nulla a Paulo scripta fuerit epistola ad Laodicenses. Baron. ann. 60. num. xiii.

‘ that<sup>b</sup> since St. Paul orders the Colossians to salute those of Laodicea in his name, it is a certain sign, that he did not write to them at that time.’ Du Pin says: ‘ If<sup>c</sup> St. Paul had written at the same time to the Laodiceans, he would not have charged the Colossians to salute them in his name.’ And James Basnage: ‘ St.<sup>d</sup> Paul did not then write to the Laodiceans, since he salutes them in his letter to the church of Colosse.’ The acute and honest Mr. Peirce, though much inclined to Mill’s opinion concerning this epistle, saw this difficulty and owned it. ‘ But I have one objection,’ says he, ‘ which I cannot so easily get over. And were it not for that, I might fully agree with him. My objection is, that it seems highly improbable, that St. Paul should send his salutations to the Laodiceans, in the epistle which he wrote to the Colossians, in case he had sent that epistle to the Laodiceans by the same messenger.’

I am not unwilling to allow, that the epistle spoken of in the latter part of verse 16, of ch. iv. to the Colossians, is our epistle to the Ephesians: “ and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea:” that is, the epistle that is to come to you from Laodicea. So the place is rendered in the French Testament of L’Enfant and Beausobre, “ and<sup>e</sup> cause likewise to be read among you that which the Laodiceans will send to you.” And their note is this, “ that<sup>f</sup> from Laodicea: that is to say, that which will come to you from Laodicea.” For the original has that sense.’

If the epistle to the Ephesians was sent away by the apostle at the same time with those to the Colossians, and to Philemon: I should think, that Tychicus went first to Ephesus, and there left the epistle to the Ephesians, with an order, that it should be forwarded to Laodicea, and so to Colosse. Tychicus having left that letter at Ephesus, went forward with Onesimus to Colosse: where they delivered the epistles to Philemon, and the Colossians. And then I suppose, that Tychicus’s commission was at an end.

<sup>b</sup> Et puisque S. Paul ordonne aux Colossiens de saluer de sa part ceux de Laodicée, c’est un marque indubitable, qu’il ne leur écrivit point alors. S. Paul. note 69. Mem. Ec. tom. I.

<sup>c</sup> En effet, si saint Paul, eût écrit en même temps aux Laodicéens, il n’eût pas chargé les Colossiens de les saluer de sa part. Diss. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. viii.

<sup>d</sup> S. Paul n’écrivait pas alors aux Laodicéens, puisqu’il leur fait une salutation dans la lettre à l’église de Colosse. Basn. Hist. de l’Eglise, l. 8. ch. 3. n. iii.

<sup>e</sup> Et faites lire de même parmi vous celle que les Laodicéens vous enverront.

<sup>f</sup> Gr. ‘ celle de Laodicée,’ c’est à dire, ‘ celle qui vous viendra de Laodicée.’ Car l’original a ce sens là.

He had no order to go to Laodicea. The apostle's salutations to the brethren at Laodicea were to be taken care of by the Colossians.

But I rather think, as before shown, that the epistle to the Ephesians was written very soon after the apostle's arrival at Rome, and then carried to Ephesus by Tychicus. And when Tychicus went now in the second year of the apostle's imprisonment, with these epistles to the Colossians, and Philemon; he came ashore at Ephesus, and there left express orders, that the epistle, formerly sent to them, should be soon forwarded by them to Laodicea, and so to Colosse. Having so done, he went, as before said, with Onesimus to Colosse: where they joined in delivering the letters to Philemon, and the church at Colosse. And now the commission of Tychicus was at an end.

8 Obj. 'Once more, it is observed by learned men, that Marcion said, this epistle was written to the Laodiceans, or called this the epistle to the Laodiceans.'

To which I answer, first. Humphry Hody denied, that <sup>s</sup> Marcion reckoned the epistle called, to the Ephesians, to have been written to the Laodiceans. And indeed this point seems to lie in great obscurity. Nor is it said by any one beside Tertullian, that I know of.

Secondly. Suppose Marcion to have affirmed this, what does it avail? Grotius says, in his preface to this epistle, 'Marcion <sup>h</sup> called this the epistle to the Laodiceans. Nor was there any reason why he should falsify in this matter.' And to the like purpose others. To which I answer: Catholic writers of the same time, and since, call this the epistle to the Ephesians. Nor is there any reason why they should falsify. Yea, the same is said, not only by all catholics, but likewise by all heretics in general. Let Marcion's

<sup>s</sup> Decem tantum epistolas Pauli, cum particulis quibusdam ex epistolâ ad Laod.——recepit Marcion hæreticus, quas librum apostolicum inscripsit. De cæteris scripturarum libris nullum agnovit, præter Evangelium Lucæ, illudque mutilatum. Epistolas etiam, quas recepit Paulinas, mutilavit, vitavitque.——Simonius, in Hist. Crit. N. T. cap. 15. contendit, Marcionem nullam epist. ad Laod. recepisse, sed epistolam ad Ephesios falso inscripsisse ad Laodiceanos. Sed in hoc Epiphanius falli non potuit, qui in apostolico Marcionis recenset epistolam ad Ephesios loco 7mo, et illam ad Laodiceanos loco 11mo. *προς Λαοδικεας ια*. Ideo vero dicit Tertullianus contra Marc. l. v. cap. xi. 'Epistolam quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus,' a Marcione 'ad Laodiceanos inscriptam fuisse,' quoniam locus, qui ex Epistolâ ad Laodiceanos a Marcione adductus est, in epistolâ ad Ephesios exstabat. Quod etiam observat Epiphanius. Hod. de Bibl. Text. origin. p. 664.

<sup>h</sup> Marcion hanc epistolam vocat ad Laodicensis, ex fide, ut credibile est, ecclesiæ Laodicensis. Nam cur in eâ re mentiretur, nihil erat causæ. Grot. Pr. in ep. ad Eph.



credit be ever so good, this is a sufficient answer. For what interest had the catholics to falsify here? If Marcion said, this epistle was sent to the Laodiceans, he must have been mistaken. We are assured, that what he said is false, from the unanimous testimony of numerous men, who had no interest to deceive, and could not be deceived.

But Marcion's credit is very little in such an affair as this. The same writer, who speaks of Marcion's<sup>i</sup> calling this the epistle to the Laodiceans, I mean Tertullian, does also let us know, that<sup>k</sup> Marcion rejected the epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus. And chargeth<sup>l</sup> him with altering the text of scripture, openly employing a knife, not a stile. And speaks particularly of his leaving out texts<sup>m</sup> in the epistle to the Romans. Will any say, that Marcion had good reason for so doing? or that all this was owing to his superior care and judgment above other christians? For my own part, I think not. And if he said, that this epistle was written to the Laodiceans, not to the Ephesians, he was mistaken at least. He had not, and could not have, any good reason for it.

Mill, <sup>n</sup> and other learned men after him, in defending their opinion concerning this epistle, magnify the care and exactness of Marcion. 'He flourished, they say, in the beginning of the second century, and lived at Sinope, in Paphlagonia, which was in Asia Minor, as well as Laodicea. And he affirmed that the epistle called, to the Ephesians, was actually an epistle to the Laodiceans. Most probably, he had heard so from such as knew the fact, and could inform him: or rather, had seen some of the manuscripts, which gave it that title.'

But all this is said without any ground. Such suppositions are easily made. But there is no proof of the truth of them. If there be any credit to be given to what the ancients say of Marcion, he must have been a very rash, and arbitrary, and careless critic—provided he at all deserve

<sup>i</sup> Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 5. cap. xi.

<sup>k</sup> Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. ult. p. 615.

<sup>l</sup> Marcion enim exertâ et palam macharâ, non stylo usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam eadem scripturarum confecit. Id. de Præsc. Hær. cap. 38.

<sup>m</sup> Quantas autem foveas in istâ vel maxime epistolâ Marcion fecerit, aufereudo quæ voluit, de nostri instrumenti integritate patebit. Adv. Marc. l. 5. cap. 13.

<sup>n</sup> Sed omnino verisimile est, Marcionem, qui Sinope aliquamdiu agebat, haud procul a Laodiceâ, sive ex popularium suorum traditione, seu etiam auctoritate exemplarium quorundam, hanc epistolam tanquam ad Laodicenses scriptam citasse. Mill. Prol. num. 78.

the name of a critic. And if he thought this epistle to have been written to the Laodiceans; it is likely, that he took up that opinion without much inquiry, or examination, and without sufficient reason, and perhaps without assigning any.

Jerom<sup>o</sup> speaking of Marcion and Basilides, who, as he says, were not friendly to the Old Testament, and altered the gospels and epistles of the New Testament, and rejected both the epistles to Timothy, and the epistle to Titus, and that to the Hebrews, he adds: ‘And if they assigned any reasons, why they did not reckon these epistles to be the apostle’s, we should endeavour to make an answer, and perhaps might say what would be sufficient to satisfy the reader. But now since with heretical authority they pronounce, and say, this epistle is Paul’s, and that not: they may be fitly answered on the side of truth, in the same manner that they assert falsehood.’

And Tertullian having spoken of Marcion’s admitting the genuineness of the epistle to Philemon, adds, ‘Nevertheless<sup>p</sup> I wonder, that when he receives an epistle to one man, he should reject two to Timothy, and one to Titus, which treat of the government of the church. He had a mind, I suppose, to alter also the number of the epistles:’ that is, as he had done of the gospels: which passage, as the reader may remember, was quoted by us<sup>q</sup> formerly.

It hence appears, that Tertullian knew not why Marcion rejected the epistles to Timothy and Titus. He knew that Marcion rejected those three epistles. But he was not aware of his having assigned any reasons for so doing:

<sup>o</sup> Licet non sint digni fide, qui fidem primam irritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquor et Basilidem, et omnes hæreticos, qui vetus laniant testamentum; tamen eos aliquà ex parte feremus, si saltem in novo continerent manûs suas, et non auderent Christi—vel evangelistas violare, vel apostolos. Nunc vero cum Evangelia ejus Christi dissipaverint, et apostolorum epistolas non apostolorum Christi fecerint esse, sed proprias, miror, quomodo sibi christianorum nomen audeant vindicare. Ut enim de cæteris epistolis taceam, de quibus quidquid contrarium suo dogmati viderant, eraserunt, nonnullas integras repudiandas crediderunt; ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebræos, et ad Titum, quam nunc conamur exponere. Et si quidem redderent causas, cur eas apostoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid respondere, et forsitan satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero, quum hæreticâ auctoritate pronuntiant, et dicant: Illa epistola Pauli est, hæc non est; eâ auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, quâ ipsi non erubescunt falsa simulare. Hieron. Pr. in ep. ad Tit. T. IV. p. 407.

<sup>p</sup> Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit. Adfectavit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare. Adv. Marcion. 5. cap. ult. p. 615. D.

<sup>q</sup> See Vol. ii. ch. xxvii. num. vii. 11. See also here, note <sup>k</sup>.

which shows, I think, that Marcion acted arbitrarily in such things as these.

Indeed Tertullian, speaking of Marcion's attempting, or designing to alter the inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians, useth this expression: 'as<sup>r</sup> if he had made more than common inquiries about it.' But I suppose Tertullian, to speak by way of irony, and sarcastically: not allowing Marcion uncommon diligence and exactness, but intimating, that a man who acted thus, should be very careful to be rightly informed.

All this I have said in the way of a general answer to the argument taken from the supposed opinion of Marcion. I will now more particularly inquire what Marcion said and did, and what might be the ground and reason of his opinion and conduct. And I think there are but two writers, from whom we can receive any information, Tertullian and Epiphanius.

The first is Tertullian. 'I<sup>s</sup> pass by another epistle,' says he, 'which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but heretics to the Laodiceans.'

Afterwards: 'According<sup>t</sup> to the true testimony of the church, we suppose that epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians. But Marcion once had a mind to alter the title, as if he had made a very diligent inquiry into that matter. But the title is of no importance, since the apostle wrote to all, when he wrote to some.'

I hope I have rightly translated the word 'gestiit.' I think it meaneth, 'had a mind to,' or 'was inclined,' or showed an inclination so to do.

By these passages of Tertullian we are assured, first, that this epistle, which was in the hands of catholic christians, was, in all its copies, inscribed to the Ephesians. And Tertullian was persuaded, that it was the true testimony, or tradition of the church from the beginning.

Secondly, in the first of these passages Tertullian says, that heretics called this the epistle to the Laodiceans: by heretics meaning, as I suppose, Marcion and his followers.

Thirdly, Tertullian says, that once, or upon some occasion, Marcion had a mind to alter the title of this epistle.

<sup>r</sup> See below, note<sup>t</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> Prætereo hic et de aliâ epistolâ, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodiceos. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. xi.

<sup>t</sup> Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceos. Sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in illo diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulo interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad singulos. Ib. cap. xvii. p. 607.

Here it may be questioned, whether by title be meant what we call a running title, affixed to the epistle, or the inscription, which makes a part of the epistle, and is inserted at the beginning of it. I rather think this last to be intended. But take it either way, Tertullian supposed, that Marcion had in his copies the same title, or inscription, with the catholics, that is, to the Ephesians, or at Ephesus. Nor does Tertullian say, that Marcion ever inserted the inscription to the Laodiceans, in any of his copies. It seems to me that he did not.

Consequently, what Tertullian says is, that Marcion, and his followers, sometimes at least, called this the epistle to the Laodiceans, and perhaps quoted it by that title. But he had not in his copies any title, or inscription, different from that of the catholics. Marcion gave out, that the epistle, called by the catholics, to the Ephesians, was written to the Laodiceans. He affirmed this to be right, and that the catholics were in the wrong in calling it an epistle to the Ephesians. For he was persuaded it was written to the Laodiceans.

I think this is the most that is said by Tertullian, or that can be collected from him. Yea, it seems to me, that I have in a strong manner represented the whole of what is said by him.

I now proceed to Epiphanius, who says, ‘ that " Marcion ‘ received only ten epistles of Paul. They are these. The ‘ first is that to the Galatians, the second is the first to the ‘ Corinthians, the third is the second to the Corinthians, the ‘ fourth that to the Romans, the fifth is the first to the Thes- ‘ salonians, the sixth the second to the Thessalonians, the ‘ seventh is that to the Ephesians, the eighth to the Colos- ‘ sians, the ninth to Philemon, the tenth to the Philippians. ‘ He has also some parts of an epistle to the Laodiceans.’ So Epiphanius.

It is well known, that Marcion had an evangelicon, and an apostolicon, or a gospel and an apostle. In the former, as is generally said, he had St. Luke’s gospel only. But concerning the truth of that account I make no inquiries now. Our concern at present is with St. Paul’s epistles only. And Epiphanius here expressly says, that Marcion received ten, and placed them in the order in which they are rehearsed above. He likewise says, that Marcion had

" Έχει δε και επιτολας παρ' αυτω τες άγιες αποστολες δεκα, αις μοναις κεχρηται.—Αι δε επιτολαι αι παρ' αυτω λεγομεναι εισι πρωτη μεν προς Γαλατας—εβδόμεη προς Εφεσιους, ογδοη προς Κολοσσαεις.—Έχει δε και προς Λαοδικιας λεγομενης μερη. Επiph. II. 42. num. ix. p. 310.

some parts of an epistle to the Laodiceans. And he quotes, as from him, those words which are in Eph. iv. 5, 6, after this manner: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Christ, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Having so done, he says: 'Nor<sup>v</sup> did the unhappy Marcion think fit to take that passage from the epistle to the Ephesians, but from the epistle to the Laodiceans, which is not the apostle's.'

This account of Epiphanius led H. Hody to say, that Marcion received eleven epistles of St. Paul. James Basnage was of the same opinion. He says: 'It<sup>w</sup> has been conjectured by some, that Marcion confounded the epistle to the Laodiceans with that to the Ephesians.—But that conjecture cannot be maintained. For he distinguished two epistles of St. Paul, one to the Ephesians, and another to the Laodiceans. And Epiphanius reproacheth him, because he rather chose to take his passage from the epistle to the Laodiceans, which was not Paul's, than from the epistle to the Ephesians, where are the same words.'

And indeed, I apprehend, that if we had Epiphanius only, many might be of the same opinion. But comparing him and Tertullian, and examining carefully the whole article of Epiphanius, I think it must appear more probable, that Marcion did sometimes quote the epistle to the Ephesians, as if it had been sent to the Laodiceans. Nor can I perceive any good reason to think, that any letter to the Laodiceans was forged so early as the time of Marcion.

And now I would observe, that Epiphanius seems to have been well acquainted with Marcion's apostolicon. For he<sup>x</sup> had his writings, and composed a treatise against him, called Scholion, or Scholia, which he inserted, somewhat altered, in his article of the Marcionites, in his large work, called the Panarium, which we have.

Having observed this, I say, that from Epiphanius it

<sup>v</sup> Ου γαρ εδοξε τω ελεινοτατω Μαρκιωνι απο της προς Εφεσιως ταυτην την μαρτυριαν λεγειν, αλλα της προς Λαοδικεας, της μη εσης εν τω αποστολω. H. 42. p. 375. in.

<sup>w</sup> Marcion l'a citée. Il en tiroit même quelque preuve pour son hérésie. On a conjecturé, qu'il la confondoit avec celle des Ephésiens.—Mais cette conjecture ne peut se soutenir, parceque Marcion distinguoit deux lettres de S. Paul, l'une aux Ephésiens, l'autre aux Laodicéens. Et S. Epiphane lui fait une espèce de reproche, de ce qu'il a mieux aimé tirer son passage de l'épître aux Laodicéens, qui n'étoit point de S. Paul, que de celle aux Ephésiens, dans laquelle on trouvoit les mêmes paroles. J. Basn. Hist. de l'Egl. l. 8. ch. 3. num. iii.

<sup>x</sup> Ελευσομαι εε εις τα υπ' αυτη γεγραμμενα, κ. λ. H. 42. cap. ix. p. 309. C.

appears, that in Marcion's apostolicon the epistle to the Ephesians was entitled, and inscribed to them as it was in the copies of the catholics. And all the difference between the catholics and him, upon this head, was, that he sometimes quoted this epistle, as written to the Laodiceans. Epiphanius, who had seen Marcion's apostolicon, found therein ten epistles, all inscribed, as in the catholic copies. One of which, and the seventh in order, was that to the Ephesians. However, in one place of Marcion's works, and <sup>y</sup> but one, he had seen a passage of the epistle to the Ephesians quoted, as from an epistle to the Laodiceans.

Some such thing as this induced Tertullian, a man of a violent temper, to say: 'I pass by another epistle, which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but heretics to the Laodiceans.' However, from Tertullian, as before shown, it appears, that in Marcion's copies of this epistle it had the same title as in the catholic copies, and that he never altered the inscription. And thus Tertullian and Epiphanius agree. For from this last likewise we plainly perceive that in Marcion's Apostolicon was the epistle to the Ephesians: but not exactly in the same order, as with the catholics.

And thus, if I mistake not, Marcion himself confirms the common reading at the beginning of this epistle. And this recompense we have of our diligent inquisition into this affair. So it often happens. Opposition made to truth is the means of establishing it.

This opinion of the case may be farther justified by two considerations, which perhaps deserve to be mentioned. One is, that there is no notice taken of this affair by any other writers, beside Tertullian and Epiphanius. Jerom, and many others, who often speak of Marcion and his principles, say nothing of it. It is therefore very probable, that his inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians was the same as in the catholic copies. If not, his alteration here, as well as in other places, would have been observed. The other is, that all those, called heretics, so far as we know, had this epistle inscribed to the Ephesians. The Manichees agreed with Marcion in divers of his peculiarities. Nevertheless, in their copies this epistle was inscribed to the Ephesians. This has appeared from the quotations of it in the writ-

<sup>y</sup> Præter hanc tamen ad Ephesios epistolam, putat Epiphanius, recepta etiam esse a Marcione epistole ad Laodicenses fragmenta. ἔχει δὲ καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικεῶς μερῆ, inquit. E quibus tamen unicum illud a se productum reperit. Jac. Usser. Diss. de Ep. ad Laod.

ings of Faustus, and Secundinus, formerly <sup>a</sup> taken notice of.

But though the inscription of this epistle was the same in Marcion's, as in the catholic copies, he sometimes quoted it as an epistle to the Laodiceans, and was of opinion that it was written to them. We are therefore now to inquire into the ground and reason of this opinion.

Pamelius <sup>a</sup> in his notes upon Tertullian, as cited by archbishop Usher, (for I have not his edition at hand,) conjectured, that the words of Col. iv. 16, were the occasion of this opinion of Marcion. So likewise says <sup>b</sup> Estius.

It is very probable, that those words <sup>c</sup> gave occasion to the forging an epistle to the Laodiceans. Theodoret, not far from the beginning of the fifth century, as formerly <sup>d</sup> cited by us, says in his commentary upon that text: 'Some have hence imagined, that the apostle had also written to the Laodiceans, and they have forged such an epistle. Nevertheless, the apostle does not say "the epistle to the Laodiceans, but from Laodicea."'

That is the unvaried reading of this text in all the copies of the New Testament, and in all ancient Greek <sup>e</sup> writers. And I have suspected, that the epistle to the Laodiceans was forged by a Latin, and that the Latin version of that text gave occasion to it. Fabricius <sup>f</sup> in the introduction to

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. iii. ch. lxiii. num. iv. 4. num. v. ib. sect. vii.

<sup>a</sup> Jacobus Pamelius, Annot. 259. in lib. 5. Tertulliani adv. Marcionem, 'Fortassis,' inquit, occasionem dedit Marcioni hujus tituli huic epistolæ imponendi, quod legisset, Col. iv. 'Salutate fratres,' &c. Usser. Diss. de Ep. ad Laod.

<sup>b</sup> Sciendum præterea est, Marcionem, antiquum hæreticum, occasione præsentis loci, epistolæ ad Ephesios scriptæ titulum mutasse, inscribendo eam ad Laodiceos, tamquam ea non ad illos, sed ad hos scripta esset, &c. Est. ad Col. iv. 16.

<sup>c</sup> 'Et eam, quæ Laodicensium est, vos legatis.'] Horum verborum occasione abusus quispiam concinnavit, atque evulgavit epistolam quamdam, velut a Paulo scriptam ad Laodiceos. Est. in Col. iv. 16.

<sup>d</sup> See Vol. v. p. 17, 18. <sup>e</sup> As some proof of this, I allege the note of Theophylact upon this verse. 'Which is the epistle from Laodicea? It is the first to Timothy. For that was written from Laodicea. However some say, it is an epistle, which the Laodiceans had sent to Paul. But what good the reading such an epistle could do them, I do not know. *Τις ἐστὶν ἢ ἐκ Λαοδικείας; ἢ πρὸς Τιμοθεὸν πρώτη. Αὕτη γὰρ ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἐγραφή. Τινες δὲ φασιν, ὅτι ἦν οἱ Λαοδικεὺς Παύλῳ ἐπεπελάαν. Ἀλλ' ἐκ οὐδὰ τι ἀνεκείνη εἶδει αὐτοὺς πρὸς βέλτιωσιν.* Theoph. in loc. tom. II. p. 676.

<sup>f</sup> Quamquam hunc Pauli locum nequam puto testimonium perhibere commentitiæ ad Laodicenses epistolæ, tamen quia ex illo, sive Latinâ potius ejus versione ambigûâ ansam cepit quisquis illam supposuit, non fuit a me omittendus. Lectionis nulla est in codicibus Græcis differentia. Omnes enim, quantum scio, habent *τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας*. Ita et Syrus, et Arabs, et interpretes Græci, Chrysostomus, Theodoritus, Theophylactus, Œcumenius. Neque Latinus aliter legisse videtur, etsi vertit: 'Eam, quæ Laodicensium est.' Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. tom. II. p. 853.

his account of the epistle to the Laodiceans speaks to the same purpose.

In like manner I have for a good while been of opinion, that the Latin version of this text was the occasion of the mistaken notion of Marcion.

When I formerly gave an account of a Latin Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, written about 380, I took notice, that<sup>s</sup> the translation of Col. iv. 16, followed by that author, was, "that ye read the epistle of the Laodiceans." *Et vos ut eam, quæ est Laodicensium, legatis.* The same translation is in the Commentary of Pelagius. *Et ea, quæ Laodicensium est, vobis legatur.* Which affords good proof, that this was the translation, which was in the Latin version, then in use.

I also observed in the same place, that this expression is ambiguous. It may import an epistle, written by the Laodiceans: or an epistle, which was their property, as having been written to them. I have since found the same observation in<sup>h</sup> Estius. So Secundinus, the Manichee, in his letter to Augustine, by the epistle of the Ephesians plainly means the epistle to the Ephesians. For his words are these: 'Against<sup>i</sup> whom the apostle, in the epistle of the 'Ephesians, says, "he wrestled." For he says: "we 'wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, and powers,"' Eph. vi. 12.

It is not unlikely, that a good number of the Latins, by "the epistle of the Laodiceans," in Col. iv. 16, understood an epistle written to the Laodiceans. And Marcion also, having before him the Latin version, and understanding the words in that sense, concluded, that St. Paul had written an epistle to the Laodiceans. At length he was brought to think, that the epistle, intended by St. Paul, was the epistle inscribed to the Ephesians. Accordingly, he sometimes quoted it with that title. This will be the more readily admitted, when it is considered, that Marcion made use of the Latin version of St. Paul's epistles. So say both<sup>k</sup> Mill, and<sup>l</sup> Wetstein.

<sup>s</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cix. num. ii. 8.

<sup>h</sup> Fefellet tamen hos omnes ambiguitas verborum hujus loci, prout Latine leguntur. Quod enim dicitur, 'eam quæ Laodicensium est,' intelligi potest, vel ad quos, vel a quibus epistola scripta sit aut missa. Et quidem priori modo Latini fere intellexerunt. Sed hanc ambiguitatem dissolvit Græca lectio, quæ sic habet: 'Et eam quæ ex Laodiceâ est, ut et vos legatis.' Est ad loc.

<sup>i</sup> Contra quos se apostolus in Ephesiorum epistolâ certamen subiisse fatetur. Dicit enim, se non contra carnem et sanguinem habere certamen, sed adversus principes et potestates. Secundin. ep. ad Aug. sect. i. Ap. Aug. T. VIII.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 378. et 606.

<sup>l</sup> Ac principio, quod a nemine adhuc animadversum puto, (nisi a J. Millio



And now, I suppose, it may appear, what regard is due to the authority of Marcion in this matter.

Thus I have at large stated and considered all the material objections against the common reading at the beginning of this epistle, the epistle to the Ephesians. And the solutions that have been offered, seem to me satisfactory. And from the universal agreement of all copies in that reading, and the unanimous testimony of all christian writers for the first twelve centuries, it appears, that there is no more reason to doubt of the genuineness of the inscription of the epistle to the Ephesians, than of any other of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul.

This disquisition has been of greater length than might have been wished. But if any things have been set in a truer light than usual, it will be acceptable to some.

---

## CHAP. XIV.

*That the Churches of Colosse and Laodicea were planted by the apostle Paul.*

IT has been of late a prevailing opinion, that the christians at Colosse and Laodicea were not converted by St. Paul. But to me it seems, that there is no good ground for it.

Says Theodoret, in his argument of the epistle to the Colossians, prefixed to his Commentary, ‘Some<sup>a</sup> are of opinion, that when the divine apostle wrote this epistle, he had not seen the Colossians. And they endeavour to support their opinion by these words, “For I would that ye should know, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh,” ch. ii. 1. But they should consider, that the meaning of the words is this, “I have not only a concern for you, but I have also great concern for those that have not seen me.” And if he be not so understood, he expresses no concern for those who had seen him, and

Prol. 378. suboluisse putemus) comperimus? Marcionis codices N. T. non ex Græcis exemplaribus, sed ex versione Latinâ veteri sive Italicâ conflatos fuisse, &c. Wetsten. Prolegom. p. 79.

<sup>a</sup> Theod. tom. III. p. 342, 343.

‘ had been taught by him. Moreover the blessed Luke says ‘ in the Acts, “ And after he had spent some time there, he ‘ departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and ‘ Phrygia, in order,” ch. xviii. 23. Colosse is a city of ‘ Phrygia. And Laodicea, the metropolis of the country, is ‘ not far from it. How was it possible for him to be in ‘ Phrygia, and not carry the gospel to those places? And ‘ in another place the blessed Luke says, “ Now when they ‘ had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, ‘ and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word ‘ in Asia,”’ ch. xvi. 6.

So says that very learned writer in the fifth century. And those observations had led me to divers considerations, inducing me to think, that the churches of Colosse and Laodicea had been planted by Paul, and that the christians there were his converts.

I. The apostle was twice in Phrygia, in which were Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis. Says St. Luke, in the places already cited by Theodoret, Acts xvi. 6, “ Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia.” And ch. xviii. 23, “ And after he had spent some time there, [at Antioch,] he departed, and went over all the countries of Galatia and Phrygia, in order, strengthening the brethren.” To which St. Luke refers again, ch. xix. 1, “ Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus.” St. Luke does not mention any cities by name. But there is no reason to say, that he was not at Colosse. It is much more reasonable to think, that in one, or rather in both those journies, Paul was at Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, chief cities of Phrygia. For, as Theodoret says, how was it possible, that he should be in that country, yea, and go “ through it,” and “ all over it,” and not be in the chief places of it? St. Luke has not particularly named any places in Galatia, in which Paul was; but he must have been in several towns and cities in that country, where he planted divers churches, Gal. i. 1, 2. So was he, in like manner, in several cities of Phrygia: where also, in all probability, he planted divers churches.

This argument alone appears to me conclusive. The accounts which St. Luke has given of St. Paul’s journies in Phrygia, are sufficient to assure us, that he preached the gospel there, and made converts, and planted churches in the chief cities.

2. Ch. i. 6, “ Which bringeth forth fruit, as it does also in you, since the day ye heard it, and knew the grace of

God in truth." Of this St. Paul was assured. Which renders it probable, that he was their father, or first teacher. He speaks to the like purpose several times. Ch. ii. 6, 7. See likewise ch. i. 23. St. Paul knew that they had been rightly taught the gospel. Nothing more remained, but that they should persevere in the faith, which they had received, and act according to it.

3. Epaphras was not their first instructor in the doctrine of the gospel. This may be concluded from ch. i. 7, the words following those quoted above from ver. 6, "As<sup>b</sup> ye have also learned of Epaphras our dear fellow-servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ." The Colossians had been taught by Epaphras. But he was not their first instructor. However he had faithfully taught them, agreeably to the instructions which they had received.

Theodoret<sup>c</sup> upon ch. i. 7, 8, well observes, 'that the apostle bestows many commendations upon Epaphras, calling him "beloved," and "fellow-servant," and a "faithful minister of Christ," that the Colossians might have the greater regard for him.' If Epaphras had first taught the Colossians the Christian doctrine, I think the apostle, when recommending him to their esteem and regard, would have added, "by whom ye believed," or "by whom ye were brought to the fellowship of the gospel," or somewhat else, to the like purpose. That would have been a great addition to what is said at ver. 7, before cited, and to what is said of him, ch. iv. 12, 13, "Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God. For I bear him record, that he has a great zeal for you, and for them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis."

"Epaphras, who is one of you." Would the apostle have used such an expression concerning Epaphras, if the church of Colosse had been founded by him? Impossible. He says as much of Onesimus, who was but just converted, and was now first going to appear among them as a christian. His words at ver. 9, of the same chapter, are, "Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you."

I imagine, that St. Paul does the more enlarge at ver. 12, 13, upon the affectionate concern which Epaphras had for these christians, being apprehensive of some prejudices taken up against him, that might obstruct his usefulness among them. For he had brought the apostle an account

<sup>b</sup> Καθως και εμαθετε απο Επαφρα.

<sup>c</sup> Ubi supra, p. 344.

of the state of this church. Which, though it was true and faithful, was not in all respects agreeable: as is concluded by commentators from what St. Paul writes in the second chapter of this epistle.

4. St. Paul does in effect, or even expressly, say, that himself had dispensed the gospel to these Colossians, ch. i. 21—25. I shall recite here a large part of that context, ver. 23—25, “If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard——whereof I Paul am made a minister. Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his body’s sake, which is the church. Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil,” or fully to preach, “the word of God.” And what follows to ver. 29.

St. Paul therefore had been the “minister of God” to these Colossians, as well as to other Gentiles. Nor would they have been excluded, but included among other Gentiles, to whom he had preached the word, if commentators had not been misled by a false interpretation of those words in ch. iv. 1, 2, of which we have already seen Theodoret’s account, and shall say more presently. Those words having been misinterpreted, a wrong turn has been given to these likewise.

5. Chrysostom, in his preface to the epistle to the Romans, speaks to this purpose, ‘I<sup>d</sup> see the apostle writing to the ‘Romans and the Colossians, upon the same things indeed, ‘but not in the same manner. To them he writes with ‘much mildness, as when he says——Rom. xiv. 1, 2. To ‘the Colossians he does not speak of the same things, but ‘with greater freedom. “If therefore,” says he, “ye be ‘dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world”—— ‘and what follows, ch. ii. 20—23.’ Does not this observation lead us to think, that the Colossians were the apostle’s own converts, to whom a different address from that used toward others might be very proper? And there are other passages of this epistle beside that alleged by Chrysostom, which might be taken notice of, as confirming the same observation.

6. Ch. ii. 6, 7, “As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: grounded, and built up

<sup>d</sup> Ὅταν γὰρ εἶω Ῥωμαίους καὶ Κολοσσαεῖσιν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μὲν ἐπιελλόντα, οὐχ’ ὁμοίως δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνοις μὲν μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς συγκολλητικῆς.—Κολοσσαεῖσι δὲ οὐχ’ οὕτω περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πλεονοῦς παρήρησις, κ. λ. Proem. in ep. ad Rom. T. IX. p. 427.

in him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.” Certainly these exhortations of the apostle are the more proper and forcible, supposing the Colossians to have been first taught and instructed by him. Nor had he any occasion to be more particular. They knew who had taught them. But I think that in this, or some other of the places, where he reminds the Colossians of what they had heard, and had been taught, if those instructions had been received from another different from himself, that would have appeared in the expressions made use of by him. In short, if they were converted by the apostle, there could not possibly arise in his mind a doubt whether they remembered who had been their first teacher, and who were his fellow-labourers who had accompanied him in his journies, when he was in their country. And therefore there was no need to remind them of himself more expressly than he has done. The thing is supposed all along.

7. The presence of Epaphras with Paul at Rome is an argument that the Colossians had personal acquaintance with the apostle. Indeed Grotius upon ch. i. 7, says, ‘ that Epaphras is the same as Epaphroditus, mentioned in the ‘ epistle to the Philippians.’ But Beausobre well observes upon the same place: ‘ This may be the same name with ‘ Epaphroditus, Philip. ii. 25. But it is not probable that it ‘ is the same person. St. Paul had sent Epaphroditus to ‘ Philippi. But Epaphras was still at Rome. And there is ‘ reason to think, that he was a prisoner there. See Philem. ‘ ver. 23.’ If Epaphras was sent to Rome by the Colossians to inquire after Paul’s welfare, as may be concluded from ch. iv. 7, 8, that token of respect for the apostle is a good argument of personal acquaintance. And it is allowed, that Epaphras had brought St. Paul a particular account of the state of affairs in this church. Which is another argument that they were his converts.

8. Ch. i. 8, “ Who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit :” that is, says <sup>e</sup> Grotius, ‘ how you love us on account of the Holy Spirit given to you.’ Or, as Peirce, ‘ Who also declared unto me the love you bear to me upon ‘ a spiritual account.’ Or, as Whitby, ‘ Your spiritual and ‘ affectionate love to me, wrought in you by the Spirit, whose ‘ fruit is love.’ All thus understanding it of their love of the apostle, and rightly, as seems to me. Nothing else can be meant by it. For before, at ver. 4, he had spoken of “ their love to all the saints.” This I take to be another

<sup>e</sup> Quomodo nos diligatis propter Spiritum Sanctum vobis datum. Grot. in loc

good proof of personal acquaintance. And the place is agreeable to what he writes to the Thessalonians, allowed by all to be the apostle's converts. I Thess. iii. 6, "But now when Timothy came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and charity: [that is the same with Col. i 4, "Since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of your love to all the saints:"] and that ye have good remembrance of us always."

9. Ch. iii. 16, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." This shows, that the Colossians were endowed with spiritual gifts. And from whom could they receive them, but from St. Paul? Apostles<sup>f</sup> only are allowed to have had the power and privilege of conveying spiritual gifts to other christians. This text therefore had been a difficulty with such as have supposed that Paul never was at Colosse. But now that difficulty is removed.

10. Ch. ii. 1, 2, "For I would, that ye knew, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; that their hearts might be comforted." This quick change of persons upon the mention of such as had not seen the apostle's face, seems to imply, that the Colossians, to whom he is writing, had seen him. For if the Colossians had been among those who had not seen him, he would have expressed himself in this manner: "I would that ye knew, what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh, that your hearts might be comforted." But upon the mention of such as had not seen him, he says: "that their hearts might be comforted." And having finished his testimony of concern for such "as had not seen his face," he returns to the Colossians, to whom he was writing, and says, ver. 4, "And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words."

Theodoret, beside what he had said in the preface to this epistle, which has been already transcribed, speaks again to this purpose in his paraphrase of ch. ii. 1, 2, 'I would have 'you be persuaded of my great concern for you, and 'for the Laodiceans: and not only for you and the Lao-

<sup>f</sup> 'Though several of the christians had spiritual gifts, and miraculous 'powers, none but apostles could confer upon others such gifts and powers.' Dr. Benson upon the Acts, Vol. I. p. 157, first edit. p. 162, second edit. In like manner other commentators. And see Acts, ch. viii. 5—25.

‘ diceans, but likewise for all who have not seen me. ‘ And <sup>g</sup> that this is his meaning, appears from what follows : ‘ “that their hearts may be comforted.” He does not say ‘ “your:” but “their:” that is, of such as had not seen ‘ him.’

11. Ch. ii. 5, “ For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying, and beholding your order, and the stedfastness of your faith in Christ.” It is here implied, if I am not mistaken, that the apostle had been with them, and had been present in the assembly of the believers at Colosse.

12. What is said, ch. iv. 7—9, “ All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you,” and the rest, best suits the supposition of personal acquaintance, as before hinted. Indeed, I think it to be full proof, that Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him.

13. The salutations in ver. 10, 11, 14, from Aristarchus, Mark, Luke, Demas, suppose the Colossians to have been well acquainted with St. Paul’s fellow-travellers, and fellow-labourers. And Timothy’s name is in the salutation at the beginning of the epistle. Consequently, the Colossians were not unknown to the apostle, nor unacquainted with him. And the like salutations are also in the epistle to Philemon, an inhabitant of Colosse.

14. Ch. iv. 15, “ Salute the brethren, which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. Ver. 17. And say to Archippus : Take heed to the ministry, which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.” This shows, that Paul was well acquainted with the state of the churches in Colosse and Laodicea. And it affords an argument that he had been in that country, and particularly at Laodicea. He salutes the brethren there, and Nymphas by name, and the church in his house. ‘ It <sup>h</sup> ‘ is probable, says Theodoret, that he was one of the faithful in Laodicea, who had made his house a church, adorning it with piety.’ As for Archippus, the same Theodoret says, ‘ That <sup>i</sup> some had supposed him to have been minister ‘ at Laodicea : but,’ says he, ‘ the epistle to Philemon shows, ‘ that he dwelled at Colosse, where Philemon was.’ See Philem. ver. 2.

15. Ch. iv. 3, 4, “ Withal praying also for us, that God

<sup>g</sup> Οτι δε ταυτα κατα ταυτην αυτω την διανοιαν ειρηται και τα επαγομενα δηλοι ινα παρακληθωσιν αι καρδια αυτων. Ουκ ειπεν υμων, αλλ’ αυτων, τει’ εσι, των μηδεπω τεθειμενων. Theod. ib. p. 350, 351.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 363.

<sup>i</sup> Τινες εφασαν, τειτον Λαοδικειας γεγενησθαι διδασκαλον, κ. λ. Ibid.

would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am in bonds, that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak." And ver. 18, "Remember my bonds." Such demands may be made of strangers. But they are most properly made of friends and acquaintance.

In a word, the whole tenour of this epistle shows, that the apostle is not writing to strangers, but to acquaintance, disciples, and converts.

16. Finally, an argument may be taken from the epistle to Philemon, an inhabitant of Colosse, sent at the same time with this to the Colossians.

From ver. 19th of the epistle to Philemon, I suppose it to be evident, that he had been converted to christianity by St. Paul. Indeed this might be done at some other place. But it may as well have been done at home.

And St. Paul's acquaintance with Philemon and the christians at Colosse, may be inferred from several things in that epistle. At ver. 2, he salutes Apphia by name, probably wife of Philemon: and Archippus, probably pastor at Colosse, at least an elder in that church: who, as before observed, is also mentioned, Col. iv. 17. Once more, at ver. 22, St. Paul desires Philemon "to prepare him a lodging." Whence I conclude, that Paul had been at Colosse before.

We might argue also from the characters of Philemon and Archippus, in the first two verses of the same epistle. The former the apostle calls his "fellow-labourer," and the other his "fellow-soldier." Which expressions imply personal acquaintance, and that they had laboured with him in the service of the gospel in some place. And what place can be so likely as Colosse? There are many, of whom St. Paul speaks in his epistles, as his "fellow-labourers," or "fellow-helpers," or "fellow-soldiers:" concerning whom it may be made to appear, that he and they had laboured together in some one place. And why then should these two be exceptions? Yea, it may be reckoned not improbable, that Archippus had been ordained by St. Paul himself an elder at Colosse. Whether Philemon likewise was an elder there, I do not say: though he may have been so.

From all these considerations it appears to me very probable, that the church of Colosse had been planted by the apostle Paul, and that the christians there were his friends, disciples, and converts. And if the christians at Colosse were his converts, it may be argued, that so likewise were the christians at Laodicea and Hierapolis. None of which places were far asunder.



## CHAP. XV.

OF THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

- I. *The antiquity, and the reason of that Denomination.*  
 II. *Called also canonical.* III. *Concerning their reception in several ages.* IV. *Their order.*

I. THERE are seven epistles, which we call catholic. The antiquity of this denomination may be made manifest from a few quotations. Eusebius, having given an account of the death of James called the Just, and our Lord's brother, concludes : ' Thus<sup>a</sup> far concerning this James, who is said to be the author of the first of the epistles called ' catholic.' In another place he says, ' That<sup>b</sup> in his Institutions Clement of Alexandria had given short explanations of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting those ' which are contradicted. I mean the epistle of Jude, and ' the other catholic epistles.' They were so called therefore in the time of Eusebius, and probably before. Of which likewise we have good proof. For St. John's first epistle is several times called a catholic epistle by Origen,<sup>c</sup> in his remaining Greek works, as well as in others. It is likewise<sup>d</sup> so called several times by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. Athanasius, Epiphanius, and later Greek writers, received seven epistles, which they called catholic. I only observe here farther, that they are so called likewise by<sup>e</sup> Jerom.

They are called catholic, or universal, or general, because they are not written to the believers of some one city, or

<sup>a</sup> Τοιαυτα και τα κατα τον Ιακωβον, ου η πρωτη των ονομαζομενων καθολικων επισολων ειναι λεγεται. H. E. l. 2. c. 23. p. 66. D.

<sup>b</sup> —μη δε τας αντιλεγομενας παρελθων. Την Ιβδα λεγω, και τας λοιπας καθολικας επισολας. Ib. l. 6. cap. 14. in.

<sup>c</sup> See of this work, Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. num. xiii.

<sup>d</sup> —ου το ευαγγελιον το κατα Ιωαννην επιγεγραμμενον, και η επισολη η καθολικη. Ap. Euseb. l. 7. cap. 25. p. 273. D. Vid. ib. p. 274. B. And in this work, Vol. ii. ch. xliii. num. xiv.

<sup>e</sup> Petrus——scripsit duas epistolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur. De V. I. cap. i.

Jacobus——unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quæ de septem catholicis est. Ib. cap. 2.

Judas, frater Domini, parvam, quæ de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Ib. cap. 4.

country, or to particular persons, as St. Paul's epistles are, but to christians in general, or to christians of several<sup>f</sup> countries. This is the case of five, or the greater part of them, with which the two others are joined. Moreover when the first epistle of Peter, and the first of St. John, were called catholic by the most early christian writers, the two smaller of St. John were unknown, or not generally received.

II. These epistles are several times called canonical by<sup>g</sup> Cassiodorius, about the middle of the sixth century, and<sup>h</sup> by the writer of the prologue to these epistles, ascribed to Jerom, though not his. The reason of which appellation is not certainly known. Nor is it easy to perceive the propriety of it. Du Pin says: 'Some<sup>i</sup> Latins have called ' these epistles canonical, either confounding the name with ' catholic, or else to denote, that they also are a part of the ' canon of the books of the New Testament.'

III. Of these epistles two only, the first of St. Peter, and the first of St. John, were universally received in the time<sup>k</sup> of Eusebius. However, the rest were then well known. In proof of which I shall allege one passage only from him. 'Here,'<sup>l</sup> says he, 'it will be proper to enumerate in a summary way the books of the New Testament, which have ' been already mentioned. And in the first place are to be ' ranked the four sacred gospels. Then the book of the ' Acts of the Apostles. After that are to be reckoned the ' epistles of Paul. In the next place, that called the first ' epistle of John, and the first of Peter. After these is to ' be placed, if it be thought fit, the Revelation of John.— ' And among the contradicted, but yet well known to the ' most, [or approved by many,] are that called the epistle of ' James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the ' second and third of John.'

<sup>f</sup> Or, as Leontius expresseth it, 'They are called catholic, because they are ' not written to one nation, as Paul's epistles, but in general to all.' See Vol. v. ch. clviii.

<sup>g</sup> Octavus codex canonicas epistolas continet apostolorum—sed cum de reliquis canonicis epistolis magna nos cogitatio fatigaret, subito nobis codex Didymi Græco stylo conscriptus in expositionem septem canonicarum epistolarum Domino largiente concessus est. De Instit. Div. Lit. cap. 8.

Vid. et Cassiodorii Complexiones canonicarum Epistolarum septem.

<sup>h</sup> Prologus septem Epistolarum canonicarum. Ap. Hieron. tom. I. p. 1667.

<sup>i</sup> Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. ix.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 3. cap. 24. et cap. 25.

<sup>l</sup> ——— αἱ ἐξῆς τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννη προτέραν, καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν Πέτρῳ κηρωτέον ἐπιστολὴν—των δὲ ἀντιλεγόμενων γνωριμῶν δ' ἐν ὁμοίως τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται, καὶ ἡ Ἰζδα' ἢ τε Πέτρῳ δευτέρα ἐπιστολὴ καὶ ἡ ονομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννη. Ibid. c. 25. in. See also in this work, Vol. iv. p. 96.

And in the preceding volumes of this work we have observed all the seven to have been received by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerom, Augustine, and many other writers; but the Syrian churches received<sup>m</sup> three only of these epistles. Nor does it appear, that more were received by<sup>n</sup> Chrysostom or<sup>o</sup> Theodoret. And Amphilochius, in his Iambic poem, says, ‘Of<sup>p</sup> the catholic epistles some receive ‘seven, others three only.’ However, as we proceed, we shall particularly consider the claims of the disputed epistles, under the names of those to whom they are ascribed.

IV. Before I conclude this introduction, I would take notice of the order of these epistles, because there is some variety in ancient authors. In the passage cited from Eusebius at the beginning of this chapter, he says, that the epistle of James was the first of those called catholic. In the passage, since taken from him, where he mentions these epistles according to the degree of authority which they had obtained, he first speaks of the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter. Nevertheless, when he comes to those that were contradicted, the epistle of James is first named. This is the order in the festal epistle of Athanasius: ‘Seven<sup>q</sup> ‘epistles of the apostles,’ says he, ‘called catholic: of James ‘one, of Peter two, of John three, and after them, of Jude ‘one.’ Which is our present order. The same order is observed in the catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerom’s letter to Paulinus Euthalius, Gelasius, bishop of Rome, the Alexandrian manuscript, the Stichometry of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, Leontius, J. Damascenus. The same order is in Bede’s prologue to these epistles, largely transcribed by us<sup>r</sup> in its proper place: where he assigns reasons of this order, and particularly, why the epistle of James was placed first. In other authors is a different order. By Rufinus<sup>s</sup> they are rehearsed in this manner: ‘Two epistles of the apostle Peter, one of ‘James, the brother of the Lord, and apostle, one of Jude, ‘three of John: the Revelation of John.’ One may be apt to think, that St. John’s three epistles are here mentioned last, that they might not be separated from the book of the Revelation. In the canon of the third council of Carthage, they stand in this order: ‘Two<sup>t</sup> epistles of the apostle

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. ciii. and ch. cxix. and Vol. v. ch. cxlviii.

<sup>n</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. iv. and viii. <sup>o</sup> Vol. v. ch. cxxxii. num. iv.

<sup>p</sup> ———καθολικων επιστολων τινες μιν επτα φασιν, οι δε τρεις μονας. Amphil. p. 132. ver. 310, 311. And see Vol. iv. ch. xcix.

<sup>q</sup> Ib. ch. lxxv. num. iii.

<sup>r</sup> See Vol. v. ch. clix.

<sup>s</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxv.

<sup>t</sup> Ch. cxvi.

‘ Peter, three of the apostle John, one of the apostle Jude, one of the apostle James.’ In Augustine’s work of the Christian Doctrine: ‘ Two <sup>u</sup> epistles of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James.’ In the catalogue of pope Innocent: ‘ Three <sup>v</sup> epistles of John, two epistles of Peter, an epistle of Jude, an epistle of James.’ In the commentary of Cassiodorius <sup>w</sup> upon these epistles they are in this order: ‘ Two epistles of Peter, three of John, of Jude one, of James one.’

---

## CHAP. XVI.

### ST. JAMES, THE LORD’S BROTHER.

- I. *His History from the N. T. whereby he appears to have been an apostle.*
- II. *His History from ancient authors. A passage from Eusebius concerning him, with remarks, showing him to be the same with James the son of Alphaeus.*
- III. *A passage of Eusebius, containing two quotations from Clement of Alexandria, mentioning his appointment to be bishop, or residing apostle at Jerusalem, and the manner of his death.*
- IV. *A passage of Origen, speaking of our Lord’s brethren, and the death of James.*
- V. *A Chapter of Eusebius, containing accounts of his death from Hegesippus, and Josephus, with remarks.*
- VI. *The time of his Death.*
- VII. *How he was related to our Lord, and in what respect he was his brother.*
- VIII. *That he was an apostle and the son of Alphaeus.*
- IX. *Why called the Less.*
- X. *Surnamed the Just, and other marks of respect shown him.*
- XI. *A Review of what has been said.*

I. THERE is frequent mention of James in the Acts, and St. Paul’s epistles. If he was an apostle he must be James, the son of Alphaeus, always distinctly named in the catalogues of the apostles,<sup>a</sup> in the first three gospels, and in

<sup>u</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxvii. num. ii.      <sup>v</sup> Ch. cxxii.      <sup>w</sup> Vol. v. ch. cliii. num. iv.

<sup>a</sup> Mat. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13.

the first chapter of the Acts. For<sup>b</sup> there was but one other apostle of this name, James the brother of John and son of Zebedee. However, the proofs of his being James the son of Alphaeus are deferred for the present. I begin with writing the history of James, mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's epistles.

St. Paul, reckoning up the several appearances of our Lord to the disciples after his resurrection, says, 1 Cor. xv. 5—8, "That he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once:" meaning, I suppose, at the place in Galilee, where he had appointed to meet the disciples. "After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles;" meaning, it is likely, when they were witnesses of his ascension. "And last of all he was seen of me also."

By James must be here intended the same that is mentioned by St. Paul elsewhere. Moreover James, the son of Zebedee, had been dead a good while before writing this epistle to the Corinthians, in the year of Christ 56. It is likely, that St. Paul speaks of him, who was still living. And he here speaks of a particular appearance of Christ to him.

We learn from Jerom, that in the gospel according to the Hebrews, there was an account of a particular appearance of our Lord to James, the Lord's brother, who, according to his computation, governed the church of Jerusalem thirty years. It is to this purpose. 'Very<sup>c</sup> soon after the Lord ' was risen, he went to James, and showed himself to him. ' For James had solemnly sworn, that he would eat no ' bread from the time that he had drunk the cup of the Lord, ' till he should see him risen from among them that sleep. ' It is added a little after: "Bring," saith the Lord, "a table ' and bread." And lower, "He took bread, and blessed, ' and brake it, and then gave it to James the Just, and said ' to him: My brother, eat thy bread. For the Son of man is ' risen from among them that sleep.'"

<sup>b</sup> Nulli dubium est, duos fuisse apostolos Jacobi vocabulo nuncupatos: Jacobum Zebedæi, et Jacobum Alphæi. Hieron. adv. Helvid. T. IV. p. 137. fin.

<sup>c</sup> Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, —post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo Sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illâ horâ, quâ biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem ' a dormientibus.' Rursusque post paululum. ' Afferte,' ait Dominus, ' mensam et panem.' Statimque additur. ' Tulit panem, et benedixit, ac fregit, et post dedit Jacobo Justo, et dixit ei: Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.' De V. I. cap. 2.

I think this story may be sufficient to show, that James, called the Just, and the Lord's brother, was in high esteem with the Jewish believers, who used the gospel above mentioned. But some of the circumstances of this account must needs be fabulous. Nor is there any reason to think that James, or any of the apostles, had a certain expectation of the Lord's rising from the dead: nevertheless I shall mention a thought to be considered by candid readers. Possibly this account is founded upon the history recorded in Luke xxiv. 13—35, of the two disciples, to whom the Lord appeared on the day of his resurrection, "to whom he was known in breaking of bread." One thing more may be concluded from this passage. They who used this gospel, thought James, the Lord's brother, to have been an apostle. For here is a reference to his partaking in the eucharist, appointed by our Lord, where none were present beside the twelve.

However, as I have proposed a conjecture concerning the history in Luke xxiv. it ought to be observed, that the two disciples, there mentioned, were not apostles. For at ver. 35, it is said, that when they were returned to Jerusalem, "they found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them."

Upon that text of St. Paul, Dr. Doddridge<sup>d</sup> mentions a conjecture, which had been communicated to him: that James had not seen our Lord after his resurrection, until the time there mentioned by St. Paul. 'That by sickness, or some other accident, James had been detained from meeting his brethren, both on the day of our Lord's resurrection, and that day sevensight, and likewise at the time when Christ appeared to the five hundred. And that he might in this respect be upon the level with them, our Lord appeared to him alone, after all the appearances mentioned before.' But I take that conjecture to be without ground, as well as very improbable. St. Paul's words do not imply that our Lord had not been seen by James before, but that this was a particular appearance to him alone, as<sup>e</sup> Augustine has observed. Who likewise adds very judiciously: 'Nor did Christ now first show himself

<sup>d</sup> See the Family Expositor, Vol. IV. p. 380.

<sup>e</sup> 'Postea,' inquit, 'apparuit Jacobo.' Non tunc autem primum accipere debemus visum esse Jacobo, sed aliquâ propriâ manifestatione singulariter. 'Deinde apostolis omnibus;' nec illis tunc primum, sed jam ut familiaris conversaretur cum eis usque ad diem adscensionis sue. Aug. de Consens. Evang. l. 3. cap. 25. num. 85. tom. III. p. 2.

‘ to all the apostles.’ Which agrees with Lightfoot’s <sup>c</sup> interpretation of that text.

I have one thing more to add. It seems to me, that James here spoken of, was an apostle. And it will afford a good argument, that James, sometimes called by ancient christian writers bishop of Jerusalem, was an apostle.

Gal. i. 18, 19, “Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord’s brother.”

This text seems decisive in favour of the apostleship of James. St. Luke speaks of the same thing in this manner, Acts ix. 27, “Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles.” Comparing these two texts together, I conclude, that James now resided at Jerusalem, and acted there as president of that church. And I imagine, that Barnabas first brought Paul to James, and James brought him to Peter. Thus Paul had communion with all the apostles, though he saw and conversed with none of them, beside James and Peter.

When St. Peter had been delivered out of prison, in the reign of Herod Agrippa, about the time of the passover, in the year 44, “he came to the house of Mary, where many were gathered together, praying. And when he had declared unto them, how the Lord had brought him out of prison, he said : Go show these things to James, and to the brethren,” Acts xii. 12—17. This also gives ground to think, that James now presided in the church of Jerusalem.

Before, Acts xi. 29, 30, it is said : “Then the disciples at Antioch determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea. Which also they did, and sent to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.” Hence, some have concluded, that James was not now at Jerusalem. But there is no reason for that supposition. For it would imply also, that none of the apostles were at Jerusalem; whereas, probably, they were all there, or near it. We have proof from the next chapter, already cited, that James, the son of Zebedee, and Peter were there. For the former was

<sup>f</sup> ‘ After the appearing to above five hundred brethren at once, which we suppose, and not without ground, to have been that last mentioned <sup>h</sup> ‘ apostle relateth that “ he was seen of James,” I Cor. xv. 7, “ and then of ‘ all the apostles.” Which does plainly rank this appearance to James between ‘ that to the five hundred brethren on the mountain in Galilee, and his coming ‘ to all the apostles, when they were come again to Jerusalem. Which James ‘ this was, Paul is silent of, as all the evangelists are, of any such particular ‘ appearance. It is most likely he means “ James the less,” of whom he ‘ speaks often elsewhere.’ Harmony of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 273.

beheaded, and Peter imprisoned at Jerusalem by Herod Agrippa about this time. And when Peter had been brought out of prison he desired his friends to inform James of it, as we have just seen. Therefore he certainly was then at Jerusalem.

There are two ways of understanding that expression. By elders may be meant elders in general, not excluding the apostles. So in the place of Paul, before cited: "After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once." Where the apostles are not excluded, but included in the word brethren. For it is reasonable to think, that divers, yea, most, if not all, of the apostles, were present at that time. So here the apostles may be included in the general denomination of elders. Or by elders may be meant such as are called elders by way of distinction from apostles, as in Acts xv. 4, 22; xxi. 18, who might be persons more especially entrusted with the receiving and the distributing such contributions. Neither of these senses oblige us to think that James was not now at Jerusalem.

When the controversy about the manner of receiving the Gentiles was brought before "the apostles and elders," assembled in council at Jerusalem; "after there had been much disputing," Peter spoke, and then Barnabas and Paul. After all which, James speaks last, sums up the argument, and proposeth the terms upon which the Gentiles should be received. To which the whole assembly agreed. And they sent letters to the Gentiles in several places accordingly. Acts xv. 1—29. It is manifest, I think, that James presided in this council. And it may be thence reckoned probable, that he was an apostle, as well as president of the church of Jerusalem.

Chrysostom, in a homily upon the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, says: 'James <sup>s</sup> was bishop of Jerusalem, and therefore spoke last.' In the same place he justly applauds the propriety of his discourse in the council.

St. Paul, in the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, giving an account of some things which happened when he was that time at Jerusalem, but are not mentioned in the book of the Acts, speaks of James, Cephas, and John, as pillars: "who also gave to him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship." Those expressions strongly imply that James was an apostle, and presiding apostle in the church of Jerusalem.

<sup>s</sup> *Επισκοπος ην της εν Ιεροσολυμοις εκκλησιας ουτος* διο υπερτος λεγει. In Act. Ap. hom. 33, p. 253, T. IX.



Jerom, in his book against Helvidius, allows that <sup>h</sup> the texts, which I have already cited, from the epistle to the Galatians, show James, the Lord's brother, to have been an apostle.

Afterwards, in the same chapter, giving an account of what happened at Antioch : ver. 11, 12, he says, that "when Peter was come thither, he did eat with the Gentiles, before that certain came from James : but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision." This, I think, implies that James resided at Jerusalem, and presided in that church, and that he was greatly respected by the Jewish believers there. Once more, Acts xxi. 17, 18, when Paul went up to Jerusalem, about Pentecost, in the year 58, the day after our arrival, says St. Luke, "Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present ;" and what follows. Here is another proof that James resided at Jerusalem, and superintended in that church.<sup>i</sup>

In what has been now alleged we have perceived evidences of James being related to our Lord, forasmuch as he is called his brother, and that he was much at Jerusalem, and presided in that church, and that, probably, he was an apostle in the highest sense of that word. We have also seen reason to think that he was much respected by the Jewish believers. And though we do not allow ourselves to enlarge upon every thing said of him in the history of the council of Jerusalem, and his reception of Paul when he went up to Jerusalem, and was imprisoned, yet I suppose that every one may have discerned marks of an excellent character, and of his admirably uniting zeal and discretion, a love of truth and condescension to weak brethren. His epistle confirms that character. I think likewise that the preservation of his life, in such a station as his, to the time when he is mentioned last by St. Luke, (which we suppose to have been about the time of pentecost, in the year of Christ 58,) may induce us to believe, that he was careful to be inoffensive in his behaviour toward the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation, and that he was had in reverence by many of them.

<sup>h</sup> —et frater Domini apostolus sit, Paulo dicente: 'Deinde post triduum veni Jerusalem, videre Petrum.' Gal. i. 18, 19. Et in eadem epistolâ: 'Et cognitâ gratiâ, quæ data est mihi' —cap. ii. 9. Adv. Helvid. p. 138. in.

<sup>i</sup> Dr. Whitby, in his preface to the epistle of St. James, has argued in a like manner that I have done, that he was an apostle in the strict acceptation of the word. And to the same purpose also Cave, at the beginning of his Life of St. James the Less, in English.

II. I should now proceed to write the history of this person from ancient authors. But that is a difficult task, as I have found, after trying more than once, and at distant spaces of time. I shall therefore take divers passages of Eusebius, and others, and make such reflections as offer, for finding out as much truth as we can.

Eusebius has a chapter<sup>k</sup> ‘concerning our Saviour’s disciples.’ Where he speaks of all these following, as said to be of the number of the seventy: Barnabas, Sosthenes, who joins with Paul in writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, Cephas, whom Paul resisted at Antioch, of the same name with the apostle Peter, but different from him, Matthias, chosen in the room of Judas, and he who was put up with Matthias, and James, to whom Christ showed himself after his resurrection, as related by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7. ‘He<sup>l</sup> likewise,’ says Eusebius, ‘was one of those called our Saviour’s disciples, and one of his brethren.’

Upon this it is easy to observe, that beside the loose and inaccurate manner in which this chapter is written by our historian, here are, probably, several mistakes. Some things will be readily assented to, as not unlikely; that Matthias, and the other disciple put up with him, were of the seventy. But omitting some other things, there is no good reason to say that Cephas was different from Peter, or that Sosthenes was one of the seventy. If those things are wrong, there is the less reason to rely upon that account which places James, the Lord’s brother, in the number only of his disciples, or of the seventy.

However, we here seem to discern the opinion of our Ecclesiastical Historian, that James, the Lord’s brother, so often mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul’s epistles, was not one of Christ’s apostles. And there we have also his interpretation of these words. Cor. xv. 7, “then he was seen of all the apostles.” By<sup>m</sup> which he understands others, beside the twelve. And to the like purpose<sup>n</sup> Origen. And it was formerly shown at large, in the chapter of Eusebius, that<sup>o</sup> he did not esteem this James an apostle in the highest acceptance of the word. It may be observed likewise, in the large account formerly given of Jerom’s opinion concerning this James, that<sup>p</sup> he seems not to be quite free

<sup>k</sup> Περὶ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. II. E. l. i. cap. 12. p. 30.

<sup>l</sup> Ἐπειτα δ’ ὠφθαί αὐτὸν Ἰακώβου φησὶν εἰς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τοῦ Σωτῆρος μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἦν. Ib. p. 31. B.

<sup>m</sup> Εἰθ’ ὡς παρὰ τῆτοις κατὰ μῆσιν τῶν ἑωδὲκα πλείτων ὅσων ὑπαρξάντων ἀποστόλων ——— προσησὶ λεγῶν ἔπειτα ὠφθη τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πασι. Ib. p. 31.

<sup>n</sup> See Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. num. xxviii. 11. <sup>o</sup> Vol. iv. ch. lxxii. num. ix. 20, 21, 22.

<sup>p</sup> Ch. cxiv. num. viii. 6.

from hesitation. Sometimes he speaks of him as one of the twelve apostles, and sometimes not so. We have also seen reason to think, that <sup>q</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem did not reckon James, called bishop of Jerusalem, to have been one of the twelve apostles. Gregory Nyssen <sup>r</sup> likewise distinguishes James, the son of Alpheus, one of the twelve apostles, from James the Less, who was not of that number. The same opinion appears in <sup>s</sup> the Apostolical Constitutions.

Tillemont says : ‘ The <sup>t</sup> Greek christians of our time distinguished James the son of Alpheus, one of the twelve apostles, and James the Lord's brother, and bishop of Jerusalem, as two different persons : so making us entirely ignorant of the history of James, the son of Alpheus, and excluding the Lord's brother from the number of apostles. But the opinion of the Latins, who believe that they are one and the same person, and the apostle, appears more conformable to the scripture, and is supported by the authority of St. Paul in particular, who gives to James the Lord's brother the title of apostle in the same manner that he gives it to Peter.’ Gal. i. 19.

III. Eusebius has <sup>u</sup> another chapter, entitled, ‘ Of things constituted by the apostles after our Saviour's ascension.’ Which is to this purpose. ‘ The first is the choice of Matthias, one of Christ's disciples, into the apostleship in the room of Judas. Then the appointment of the seven deacons, one of whom was Stephen, who soon after his being ordained was stoned by those who had killed the Lord, and was the first martyr for Christ. Then James, called the Lord's brother, because he was the son of Joseph—— to whom the virgin Mary was espoused. This James, called by the ancients the Just, on account of his eminent virtue, is said to have been appointed the first bishop of Jerusalem. And Clement, in the sixth book of his Institutions, writes after this manner : That after our Lord's ascension, Peter, and James, and John, though they had been favoured by the Lord above the rest, did not contend for honour, but chose James the Just to be bishop of Jerusalem. And in the seventh book of the same work, he says, that after his resurrection, the Lord gave to James the Just, and John, and Peter, the gift of knowledge. And they gave it to the other apostles. And the other apostles gave it to the seventy, one of whom was Barnabas. For there were two named James : one the Just,

<sup>q</sup> Vol. iv. ch. lxxix. num. vii.  
p. 413. B. C.

<sup>r</sup> De Christi Res. Or. 2. tom. III.

<sup>s</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. lxxxv. num. viii. 6.

<sup>t</sup> S. Jacques le Mineur, Art. i. tom. I.

<sup>u</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. i.

‘ who was thrown down from the battlement of the temple, and killed by a fuller’s staff. The other is he who was beheaded. Of him that was called the Just, Paul also makes mention, saying: “ other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord’s brother.” ’

Upon what has been thus transcribed a few remarks may be properly made. In the former part of it Eusebius seems to declare it as his own opinion, that James, called the Lord’s brother, was the son of Joseph, that is, by a former wife.

For clearing up this passage, I would farther observe: I suppose the whole of this quotation to be taken from Clement. Some may indeed at first be apt to think that the second passage of Clement concludes with the word Barnabas. But I rather think that all which follows in this quotation is Clement’s, and nothing of Eusebius’s. One reason of my thinking so is, that in the twenty-third chapter of the same book, where our Ecclesiastical Historian gives an account of the death of James from Hegesippus, who relates, that James was thrown down from the temple, and killed by a fuller’s staff, he twice says, that is, at <sup>v</sup> the entering upon that account, and <sup>w</sup> at finishing it, that this was agreeable to what had been before alleged from Clement. The other reason is, that Eusebius seems not to have been so clear that there were no more than two of this name, as is implied in this passage, particularly in the conclusion of it.

Upon these two passages, cited by Eusebius from Clement, one from the sixth, the other from the seventh book of his Institutions, we are led to observe, first, that James, called the Just, is here supposed to be an apostle. Nor did Clement know of any more of the name James, in the New Testament, beside James the son of Zebedee, and him called James the Just. Secondly, I observe, that James, called the Just, is supposed to have been appointed bishop of Jerusalem, by three apostles especially, Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, and not by our Lord. And the order and coherence of things in this chapter of Eusebius seems to imply, that this was done soon after the martyrdom of Stephen.

Which appears to me agreeable to the history in the Acts, and the passages alleged thence at the beginning of this

<sup>v</sup> Του ἔειπεν τῷ Ἰακωβῷ τελευταίως τροπον ἡδὴ μὲν προτερον αἱ παρατεθεισαι τῷ Κλημεντος φωναὶ ἐιδηλωκασιν, ἀπο τῆς πτερυγικῆς βιβλίσθαι, ξυλφῶν τε τὴν πρὸς θάνατον πεπληχθαι αὐτον ἰσορηκοτος. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 63. C.

<sup>w</sup> Ταῦτα ἕα πλατῆς συνφῶν τῶν Κλημεντι καὶ ὁ Ἠγησιππος. Ibid. p. 65. C.

chapter. Peter always speaks first, as president among the apostles, until after the choice of the seven deacons. Every thing said of St. James after that implies his presiding in the church of Jerusalem. And when St. Paul mentions the three chiefs, who were pillars, Gal. ii. 9, with whom he conferred at Jerusalem, he names James first. The reason of his doing so, I take to be, that James then presided in the church of Jerusalem.

Tillemont<sup>x</sup> thinks, 'That Christ himself may have appointed James to be bishop in that church: but the apostles deferred the declaring it solemnly, till the time of the persecution, which broke out after the death of St. Stephen. Then they thought of providing more particularly for the church of Jerusalem, whence, perhaps, they feared they should be constrained to remove. This obliged them to appoint a proper pastor: who should be obliged to stay there till his death, and should charge himself with every thing necessary for their welfare.'

To me it appears evident, that<sup>y</sup> the apostles did not now leave Jerusalem, nor till a good while afterwards. But they were obliged to live privately. And the circumstances of things made it prudent to appoint one of their number, who should preside in that church, and act in their name. Though they could not all appear in public, it was fit there should be one at least, to whom the faithful might apply at any time, in case of need. This choice, or appointment, is ascribed by Clement to three of the apostles. But it might be done with the consent and approbation of all.

As this episcopate, or superintendence, of James has been thus mentioned, I shall here observe what notice is taken of it by other ancient christian writers.

Eusebius, in one place, says, that<sup>z</sup> James was appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles: in another by<sup>a</sup> Christ and the apostles. So likewise in the<sup>b</sup> Apostolical Constitutions. Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, says, 'that<sup>c</sup> James, surnamed the Just, was ordained bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles, soon after the Lord's passion.' In his Commentary upon the epistle to the Gala-

<sup>x</sup> St. Jacques le Mineur, Art. iv. mem. tom. I.

<sup>y</sup> See Acts viii. 1.

<sup>z</sup> — ὁ πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολυμοῖς ἐγκειμένης θρόνος. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. in. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 1. in. p. 38. B.

<sup>a</sup> Τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβου θρόνον τε πρῶτον τῆς Ἱεροσολυμῶν ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν πρὸς τὸ Σωτήρος καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑποῖξασμεν, κ. λ. l. 7. c. 19.

<sup>b</sup> Constit. l. 8. cap. 35.

<sup>c</sup> Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus.—post passionem Domini statim ab apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus. De V. I. cap. 2.

tians, he speaks as <sup>d</sup> if the Lord himself had given him this high trust: meaning, perhaps, no more than that Christ gave it him by the apostles: or that they in so doing had acted by divine inspiration. Epiphannus <sup>e</sup> ascribes this appointment to our Saviour himself, as do <sup>f</sup> Chrysostom, and <sup>g</sup> Œcumenias, and <sup>h</sup> Photius. The Latin author of a Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, says, James <sup>i</sup> was appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles. Nicephorus's account is, that <sup>k</sup> he was so appointed by our Saviour, or, as some said, by the apostles also. I shall cite no more writers relating to this point, but proceed.

IV. I would now take a passage of Origen, from the tenth tome of his commentaries upon St. Matthew, where he discourseth upon Matt. xiii. 55, 56, "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" 'They <sup>l</sup> thought, ' says Origen, that he was the son of Joseph and Mary. 'The brethren of Jesus, some say, upon the ground of ' tradition, particularly what is said in the gospel accord- ' ing to Peter, or the book of James, were the sons of ' Joseph by a former wife, who cohabited with him before ' Mary. They who say this, are desirous to maintain the ' honour of Mary's virginity to the last: [or her perpetual ' virginity:] that the body chosen to fulfil what is said, ' "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power ' of the Highest shall overshadow thee," Luke i. 55, might ' not know man after that. And I think it very reasonable, ' that as Jesus was the first fruits of virginity among men, ' Mary should be the same among women. For it would be ' improper to give that honour to any beside her. This ' James is he whom Paul mentions in his epistle to the Gala- ' tians, saying: "Other of the apostles saw I none, save ' James, the Lord's brother." This James was in so great ' repute with the people for his virtue, that Josephus, who

<sup>d</sup> Nunc hoc sufficiat, ut propter egregios mores, et incomparabilem fidem, sapientianque non mediam, frater dictus sit Domini; et quod primus ei ecclesie præfuerit, quæ prima in Christum credens ex Judæis fuerat congregata. Dicuntur quidem et cæteri apostoli fratres Domini. Sed præcipue hic frater dicitur, cui filios matris suæ ad Patrem vadens Dominus commendaverat. In ep. ad Gal. cap. ii. 19.

<sup>e</sup> Hær. 78. num. vii.

<sup>f</sup> Chr. in ep. I ad Cor. hom. 38. p. 355. tom. X.

<sup>g</sup> Œc. ad Act. xv. 13. T. I. p. 122.

<sup>h</sup> Phot. Ep. 117.

<sup>i</sup> Jacobum vidit Hierosolymæ, qua illic erat constitutus ab apostolis episcopus. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. 19.

<sup>k</sup> Niceph. l. 2. cap. 38.

<sup>l</sup> Origen. in. Matt. T. X. p. 462, 463. T. III. Bened. p. 223. tom. I. Huet.

‘ wrote twenty books of the Jewish Antiquities, desirous to  
 ‘ assign the reason of their suffering such things, so that  
 ‘ even the temple was destroyed, says, that those things  
 ‘ were owing to the <sup>m</sup> anger of God for what they did to  
 ‘ James, the brother of Jesus, called Christ. And it is won-  
 ‘ derful, that he who did not believe our Jesus to be the  
 ‘ Christ, should bear such a testimony to James. He also  
 ‘ says, that the people thought they suffered those things  
 ‘ upon account of James. Jude wrote an epistle of few  
 ‘ lines indeed, but filled with the powerful words of the  
 ‘ heavenly grace, who says at the beginning: “Jude, a ser-  
 ‘ vant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.” Of Joses and  
 ‘ Simon we know nothing.’

Origen, in <sup>n</sup> his books against Celsus, quotes Josephus again, as speaking of James to the like purpose. But there are not now any such passages in Josephus: though they are quoted as from him, by <sup>o</sup> Eusebius also. But he does not say whether from his Jewish War, or from his Antiquities, or in what book of either, as he sometimes does, when he quotes Josephus. Jerom has twice quoted Josephus for these things: first in this <sup>p</sup> article of St. James, and then in that <sup>q</sup> of Josephus himself: but not much more expressly than Eusebius.

Upon the long passage of Origen, just transcribed, I would observe as follows:

It is strange, that Origen should take such particular notice of the epistle of St. Jude, and say nothing of the epistle of James, whose history he was writing, when it was not unknown to him. It may be suspected that a paragraph has been lost and dropt out of the Commentary in this place. It is also strange that he should say he knew nothing of Simon: when it is probable that he likewise was one of Christ's apostles, called “Simon the Canaanite” by Matthew, ch. x. 4, and Mark iii. 18, “Simon Zelotes” by Luke, vi. 15, and Acts i. 13.

<sup>m</sup> — ερηκεναι, κατα μηνιν θεσ ταυτα αυτοις απηνητηκεναι, δια τα εις Ιακωβον τον αδελφον Ιησους τς λεγομενε Χριστς, υπ' αυτων τετολμημενα. Και το θαυμασον εστιν, οτι τον Ιησουν ημων η καταδεξαμενος ειναι Χριστον, εδε ηρτον Ιακωβω δικαιοσυνην εμαρτυρησε τοσαντην. Λεγει δε, οτι και ο λαος ταυτα ενομιζε δια τον Ιακωβον πεπονθεναι.—Περι δε Ιωσηφ, και Σιμωνος εδεν ισορησαμεν. Ib. p. 463. Bened. p. 223. Huet.

<sup>n</sup> Contra Cels. l. i. p. 35. et l. 2. p. 69. Cantab. l. i. cap. 48. et l. 2. cap. 13. Bened. <sup>o</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 65. C. D.

<sup>p</sup> Tradit idem Josephus, tantæ eum sanctitatis fuisse, et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditum sit, subversam esse Hierosolymam. Hier. De Vir. Ill. cap. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Hic confitetur—et propter interfectionem Jacobi apostoli dirutam Hierosolymam. Ib. cap. 13.

From what Origen says of the death of James it may be concluded, that in his time christians were persuaded that James had died a martyr for Christ, and had been killed by the Jews, notwithstanding his eminent virtue. Though the passages to which Origen refers are not now in Josephus, and though it should be supposed that there was some inaccuracy in Origen's quotations of him, or references to him, I think it must be allowed, that christians had in his time a tradition concerning the death of James, and that it happened in circumstances very dishonourable to those who were the authors of it : insomuch that many were disposed to think it was one of those things for which God was much offended with the Jewish people. Moreover we have already observed a brief account of the death or martyrdom of James in Clement, older than Origen, though in part cotemporary with him.

All farther notice of that passage of Origen is deferred till we come to consider how James was related to our Lord.

V. As the death of James has been mentioned, I shall now immediately take the accounts of it which are in Eusebius. And I will transcribe a large part of the twenty-third chapter of the second book of his Ecclesiastical History.

‘ But when Paul had appealed to Cæsar, and Festus  
 ‘ had sent him to Rome, the Jews being disappointed in  
 ‘ their design against him, turned their rage against James,  
 ‘ the Lord's brother, to whom the apostles had assigned  
 ‘ the episcopal chair of Jerusalem. And in this manner  
 ‘ they proceeded against him. Having laid hold of him,  
 ‘ they required him in the presence of all people to renounce  
 ‘ his faith in Christ. But he, with freedom and boldness  
 ‘ beyond expectation, before all the multitude, declared  
 ‘ our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.  
 ‘ They, not enduring the testimony of a man who was in  
 ‘ high esteem for his piety, laid hold of the opportunity,  
 ‘ when the country was without a governor, to put him to  
 ‘ death. For Festus having died about that time in Judea,  
 ‘ the province had in it no præcurator. The manner of the  
 ‘ death of James was shown before in the words of Clement,  
 ‘ who said, that he was thrown off from the battlement of  
 ‘ the temple, and then beat to death with a club. But no  
 ‘ one has so accurately related this transaction, as Hege-  
 ‘ sippus, a man in the first succession of the apostles, in the  
 ‘ fifth book of his Commentaries, whose words are to this





‘ people. We entreat thee to persuade all that come hither  
 ‘ at the time of passover to think rightly concerning Jesus.  
 ‘ For all the people, and all of us put confidence in thee.  
 ‘ — Stand therefore upon the battlement of the temple,  
 ‘ that, being placed on high, thou mayest be conspicuous,  
 ‘ and thy words may be easily heard by all the people.  
 ‘ For because of the passover, all the tribes be come hither,  
 ‘ and many gentiles. Therefore the scribes and pharisees,  
 ‘ before named, placed James upon the battlement of the  
 ‘ temple, and cried out to him, and said, O Justus, whom  
 ‘ we ought all to believe, since the people are in an  
 ‘ error, following Jesus who was crucified, tell us <sup>t</sup> what  
 ‘ is the gate of Jesus. And he answered with a loud  
 ‘ voice, Why do you ask me concerning the Son of man: he  
 ‘ even sitteth in the heaven, at the right hand of the great  
 ‘ power, and will come in the clouds of heaven. And many  
 ‘ were fully satisfied, and well pleased with the testimony  
 ‘ of James, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David. But the  
 ‘ same scribes and pharisees said to one another, We have  
 ‘ done wrong in procuring such a testimony to Jesus.  
 ‘ Let us go up, and throw him down, that the people may  
 ‘ be terrified from giving credit to him.—And they went  
 ‘ up presently, and cast him down, and said, Let us stone  
 ‘ James the Just. And they began to stone him, because he  
 ‘ was not killed with the fall. But he turning himself,  
 ‘ kneeled, saying, I entreat thee, O Lord God the Father,  
 ‘ forgive them: for they know not what they do. As they  
 ‘ were stoning him, one said, Give over: what do ye? The  
 ‘ just man prays for you. And <sup>u</sup> one of them, a fuller,  
 ‘ took a pole, which was used to beat cloths with, and struck  
 ‘ him on the head. Thus his martyrdom was completed.  
 ‘ And they buried him in that place, and his monument  
 ‘ still remains near the temple. This James was a true  
 ‘ witness to Jews and Gentiles, that Jesus is the Christ.  
 ‘ And soon after Judea was invaded by Vespasian and the  
 ‘ people were carried captive.’ ‘ So writes Hegesippus at  
 ‘ large agreeably to Clement. For certain, James was an  
 ‘ excellent man, and much esteemed by many for his virtue:  
 ‘ insomuch that the most thoughtful men among the Jews  
 ‘ were of opinion, that his death was the cause of the siege  
 ‘ of Jerusalem, which followed soon after his martyrdom:  
 ‘ and that it was owing to nothing else, but the wickedness

<sup>t</sup> See before, note <sup>s</sup>.

<sup>u</sup> *Και λαβων τις απ' αυτων, εις των γραφων, το ξυλον εν ω απεπιεζε τα ιματια, ηνεγκε κατα της κεφαλης τα εικαια.* Ib. p. 65. B.

' committed against him. And<sup>v</sup> Josephus says the same  
 ' in these words : ' These things befell the Jews in vindica-  
 ' tion of James the Just, who was brother of Jesus, called  
 ' the Christ. For the Jews killed him, who was a most  
 ' righteous man.' " The same historian, in the twentieth  
 ' book of his antiquities, relates his death in this manner."  
 ' The emperor being informed of the death of Festus, sent  
 ' Albinus to be prefect in Judea. But the younger Ananus,  
 ' who, as we said before, was made high priest, was haughty  
 ' in his behaviour, and very enterprizing. And moreover  
 ' he was of the sect of the Sadducees, who, as we have also  
 ' observed before, are above all other Jews severe in their  
 ' judicial sentences. This then being the temper of Ananus,  
 ' he thinking he had a fit opportunity, because Festus was  
 ' dead, and Albinus was yet upon the road, calls a council.  
 ' And bringing before them James, the brother of him who  
 ' is called Christ, and some others, he accused them as  
 ' transgressors of the laws, and had them stoned to death.  
 ' But the most moderate men of the city, who also were  
 ' reckoned most skilful in the laws, were offended at this pro-  
 ' ceeding. They therefore sent privately to the king, [Agrippa  
 ' the younger,] entreating him to send orders to Ananus, no  
 ' more to attempt any such things. And some went away  
 ' to meet Albinus, who was coming from Alexandria, and  
 ' put him in mind, that Ananus had no right to call a  
 ' council without his leave. Albinus, approving of what  
 ' they said, wrote a very angry letter to Ananus, threatening  
 ' to punish him for what he had done. And king Agrippa  
 ' took away from him the priesthood, after he had enjoyed it  
 ' three months, and put in Jesus, the son of Damnaeus.'  
 ' " These are the things which are related of James, whose  
 ' is the first of the epistles called catholic." '

Thus I have given a literal version of almost the whole  
 of this chapter, being desirous that my readers should see  
 the accounts which ancient writers have given of James :  
 though they are not altogether so credible, nor so entertain-  
 ing, as might have been wished. Nor do they any where  
 lie in better order than here. And therefore I have chosen  
 this chapter. The same things are transcribed by Jerom  
 from Eusebius, in his chapter of James the Just, in his cata-  
 logue of ecclesiastical writers : but very inaccurately, blend-  
 ing together Hegesippus, and Clement, and Josephus : so

<sup>v</sup> 'Ο γὰρ Ἰωσήπος ἡκ ἀπώκνησε καὶ τὰτ' ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεσθαι, εἰ ὡν  
 φησι λέξεων' Ταῦτα δὲ συμβεβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τῆς δικαίας, ὃς  
 ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τῆς λεγομένης Χριστῆς' ἐπειδὴ περὶ δικαιοτάτου αὐτοῦ οὐτὰ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι  
 ἀπεκτείναν. Ib. p. 65. D.

that, without comparing Eusebius, it could not be known what belongs to one, and what to the other. For which, I think, he deserves to be censured. Nor could I pass it by without notice, as an use may be made of it. For it may induce us to suspect, that to such carelessness and inaccuracy of quotation we owe those passages of Josephus, in which he is said to have assigned the death of James as the sole cause of the ruin of the Jewish people.

And now I proceed to make some remarks upon the chapter of Eusebius, and the passages therein quoted by him.

1. In the first place, it appears from Eusebius's introduction, at the beginning of the chapter, that he supposed the martyrdom of St. James to have happened at a time when there was no Roman governor in Judea, after the death of Festus, and before the arrival of Albinus in the province. What reason he had for this we do not certainly know. We do not observe any notice of that circumstance in what he has transcribed from Hegesippus. It is indeed expressly said in the passage of Josephus. But if that passage be the only foundation for the opinion, its authority may be questioned. For divers learned men have suspected the genuineness of that part of the passage, which speaks of the death of James. As will be shown more particularly by and by.

2. Upon the first quotation, which is from Hegesippus, it is easy for any one to observe, that <sup>w</sup> there are in it many things very unlikely: as <sup>x</sup> that James should live in the manner here represented, and particularly, that he should eat no animal food: that he had a right to enter into the holy place when he pleased, whether thereby be understood the holy of holies, or only the temple: that the scribes and

<sup>w</sup> Et Jacobus Justus, ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ antistes, quem misere trucidârunt: quod ipse Josephus paucis, copiosius Hegesippus apud Eusebium memoriæ prodidit; quamquam in narratione hujus multa sunt, quibus nemo, nisi rerum veterum et christianarum et Judaicarum prorsus ignarus, fidem habeat. Moshem. De Reb. Christian. ante Constantin. Sect. i. sect. xxiii. p. 93.

<sup>x</sup> 'Ille ab uteromatrissanctus fuit?' Nazireatûs nempe voto Deo consecratus, ut sequentia ostendunt. Nec fieri hoc potuisse negârim. 'Nec vinum unquam bibit, nec siceram.' Ita debuit, si Naziræus fuit. 'Ab animantium carnibus abstinuit.' Hoc vero Pythagoricum et superstitiosum fuit institutum, de quo nihil in Mosâicâ lege, et cujus reum fuisse Jacobum, etiam postquam christianus factus est, vix credibile fit. 'Comam nunquam totondit.' Recte, atque ordine. Sic enim Lex jubet. Num. vi. 3—5. 'Neque ungi, neque lavare balneo corpus unquam solitus.' Non tantum præter, sed et contra legem hoc fuit, quâ multæ ablutiones Judæis impostæ. Nec certe sordes quæsitæ quidquam ad sanctitatem faciunt. Cleric. Hist. Ec. Ann. lxii. not. 2. p. 415.

pharisees should place him on a pinnacle, or battlement of the temple, to deliver his opinion to the people concerning Jesus: that they should throw him down thence, and kill him in the temple, or any of the courts of it: that they should bury him near the place in which he is here said to have been killed: when the Jews, and all other people in those times, usually buried their dead without the walls of their cities: and, finally, that he should have a monument, or pillar over him, near the place where he was buried, which remained to the time of Hegesippus, after the war was over, and the city of Jerusalem and the temple had been overthrown. Concerning which last particular, Jerom, in the catalogue above mentioned, says, 'He<sup>y</sup> was buried near the temple, where he had been thrown down. He had a conspicuous monument, till the siege of Titus, and that since by Adrian. Some of our people have thought that he was buried on mount Olivet. But that is a mistaken opinion.' So that even in Judea there were different opinions concerning the place where James was buried. Nevertheless, I presume, all were persuaded that he had suffered martyrdom from the Jews at Jerusalem. There was no different sentiment about that.

However, this difference of opinion concerning the place where St. James was buried, deserves our notice; for it may lead us to suspect some mistake in the account of Hegesippus. Possibly, St. James was buried in mount Olivet, though there was a pillar erected near the place where he was killed. I think this may be of use to remove some difficulties in the account of Hegesippus. The pillar, which he saw, might be erected, after the siege of Jerusalem, by some who remembered the place where St. James had been killed. And some from that monument might conclude he had been buried there, though really he was not.

I have made some remarks upon the passage of Hegesippus. A fuller critique may be seen in other<sup>z</sup> writers: partly aggravating the improbabilities of this account, partly softening them, and striving to remove difficulties. Accordingly Petavius says, 'that<sup>a</sup> though there are in it

<sup>y</sup> — et juxta templum, ubi et præcipitatus fuerat, sepultus est. Titulum usque ad obsidionem Titi, et ultimam Hadriani notissimum habuit. Quidam e nostris in monte Oliveti eum putaverunt conditum; sed falsa eorum opinio est. De V. I. cap. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Joseph. Scaliger. Animadvers. in Euseb. Chron. p. 193, 194. J. Cleric. Hist. Ec. A. D. lxii. Petav. Animadvers. ad Epiphan. Hær. lxxviii. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. et Tillemont, S. Jacques le Mineur, Mem. Ec. tom. 1. Basnag. Ann. 33. num. 184, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Nec diffiteor nonnulla vel ab Hegesippo prodita.

‘several things very unlikely, yet the whole history ought not therefore to be rejected.’ To whom I am not unwilling to accede. But as I have not room to enlarge upon particulars, for showing the reasonableness of that judgment, I must be content with recommending a careful and impartial attention to the observations of the writers to whom I have referred. However, I may by and by have an opportunity to mention a few thoughts, beside what I have already said, for removing difficulties and answering objections.

3. Eusebius says, ‘that many thoughtful men among the Jews were of opinion, that the death of James was the cause of the siege of Jerusalem, and that it was owing to nothing else but the wickedness committed against him, and that Josephus says the same.’

Origen speaks to the like purpose, as we have seen: but not quite so strongly. The same is said by Jerom more than once. I mean <sup>b</sup> in his book of *Illustrious Men*, and <sup>c</sup> also elsewhere. But neither he nor Eusebius expressly say, in what place of Josephus. Which may make us think that they borrowed this from Origen. Nor does Origen inform us in what work of Josephus those things were said, though he has mentioned them several times. Which may dispose us to think that they were no where expressly in Josephus.

4. Eusebius proceeds, and says, that in the twentieth book of his *Antiquities*, Josephus had related the death of James, in a passage which he there transcribes. Which passage is still in the works of Josephus. And what is there said, may be very true, for the most part: ‘that <sup>d</sup> Ananus the younger, being high-priest, and a man of an

vel ab aliis inserta, quæ parum probabilia videantur. Sed totam ipsam historiam nego propterea damnandam esse. Petav. *Animadv. ad Epiph. H.* 78. n. iii. p. 332.

<sup>b</sup> Tradit enim Josephus, tantæ eum sanctitatis fuisse et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditum sit, subversam Hierosolymam. De V. I. cap. 2. Vid. et cap. 13.

<sup>c</sup> Transeamus ad Jacobum, qui frater Domini dicebatur, tantæ sanctitatis, tantæque justitiæ, et perpetuæ virginitatis, ut Josephus quoque historicus Judæorum propter hujus necem Jerosolymam subversam referat. Hic primus episcopus ex Judæis Jerosolymæ credentis ecclesiæ. Adv. Jovin. l. I. T. IV. P. 2. p. 182. in.

<sup>d</sup> Facile quidem crediderim Jerosolymitanos proceres graviter tulisse, quod synedrium suâ auctoritate instituisset, cum dudum jus gladii a Romanis Judæis esset ereptum: quod iterum inconsulto Cæsare ab Anano usurpatum timebant, negenti suæ gravi forta-se pœnâ luendum esset. Sed quæ de Jacobo, Jesu, qui Christus dicebatur, fratre, habentur, merum adsumentum male feriat christiani esse videntur: quâ de re abhi diximus. Cleric. ubi supr. sect. ii. p. 415. Conf. ejusd. *Ars Crit.* part III. sect. i. cap. 14. num. xi.

‘ haughty and enterprizing temper, when there was no  
 ‘ Roman governor in Judea, convened a council, and had  
 ‘ some stoned to death, as transgressors of the laws : and  
 ‘ that many of the most discreet and moderate men among  
 ‘ the Jews were offended at this proceeding : forasmuch as  
 ‘ whilst Judea was in the state of a province, the high-priest  
 ‘ had no right to call the council together, without leave,  
 ‘ and they feared that this action would be resented by the  
 ‘ emperor.’ All this, I say, is very likely. Nevertheless  
 those words, “James the brother of him who is called  
 Christ,” have been suspected to be an interpolation. And  
 probably <sup>e</sup> are so. Supposing <sup>f</sup> those words to be an inter-  
 polation, we can gather no more from that passage, than  
 that Ananus did illegally condemn several persons to death,  
 as transgressors of the Jewish laws. But who they were,  
 or whether any of them were christians, or not, cannot be  
 determined with certainty.

5. Eusebius supposeth, that this passage of Josephus con-  
 firms the account given by Hegesippus : whereas <sup>g</sup> it  
 appears, on the other hand, very difficult to reconcile them.  
 I do not perceive Hegesippus to say any thing of Ananus, the  
 high-priest. Nor has he expressly mentioned the Sad-  
 ducees, of which sect Ananus was. Nor does Hegesippus  
 say a word of the council of the Jews. And as the punish-  
 ment of stoning, when ordered by magistrates, was gene-  
 rally inflicted on men out of the city, it is probable, that  
 they who were put to death by the procurement of Ananus,  
 suffered without Jerusalem. But according to Hegesippus,  
 James died at the temple, or near it, and was buried not far  
 off from the place where he expired.

6. Since what is said of James in the passage of  
 Josephus, is justly suspected to be an interpolation, it  
 ought not to be regarded. Learned men of late times

<sup>e</sup> See Vol. i. p. 83, 84. See here likewise, note <sup>d</sup>.

<sup>f</sup> See Dr. Benson's History of St. James, sect. ii. p. 12. the second edition.

<sup>g</sup> Quid magis contrarium esse potest, quam hæc Josephi, et illa Hegesippi narratio? Nam Josephus quidem damnatum esse scribit in publico Judæorum concilio; Hegesippus vero, per seditionem ac tumultum populi occisum. Et Hegesippus quidem fuste fullonis necatum in mediâ urbe, Josephus autem lapidatum occubuisse narrat. Fiebat autem lapidatio extra portas civitatis, ut notum est. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 41.

Secundo, qui fidem habent narrationi Hegesippi, eos oportet, aut Josephum falsi arguere, aut suspectum habere hunc locum, quo res publice Jerosolymæ gesta, adeoque notissima, aliter narratur; ut mirari subeat, ab Eusebio Josephi et Hegesippi verba allata, eodem capite, nec eum tentasse ea in concordiam redigere, aut alterutrius narrationis fidem in dubium non revocasse. Cleric. Ars Crit. P. III. sect. i. n. xii.

find<sup>h</sup> it very difficult to determine how James died. But that difficulty, as seems to me, is much increased by paying too much regard to a passage, the genuineness of which is far from being certain. Josephus indeed is an older author than Hegesippus, and he is an historian of good credit. But we should be first assured that the account is his. If a passage, or part of a passage, has been inserted in his works, and there is good reason to think it not his, it should be disregarded, and stand for nothing.

If we once set aside that passage, we may soon come to a determination concerning the manner of James's death. That James had suffered martyrdom at Jerusalem, was the general persuasion of christians in the time of Eusebius, and before, as we plainly perceive. Two ancient christian writers of the second century assure us, that his death was completed by the blow of a fuller's pole, with which they are wont to beat wet clothes. And Hegesippus, in particular, and at large, relates that his death was effected in a tumultuous manner. The tumult began at the temple; where the scribes, and pharisees, and other Jews, entered into discourse with James. He, standing upon some eminence, which Hegesippus calls *πτερύγιον*, and we now generally render a battlement, or pinnacle, openly declared and argued, that Jesus was the Christ, or the expected Messiah, and that his doctrine contained full instruction how men may be saved and obtain eternal life. At which some leading men among the Jews were much offended. They then laid hold of him, and perhaps dragged him out of the temple. Some of the people threw stones at him. And though he earnestly prayed to God in the behalf of those who abused him, they persisted in their abuses, till one struck him with a long pole, which put an end to his life.

St. John has recorded two instances of the Jews taking up stones to throw at our Lord, when he was teaching in the temple, ch. viii. 59, and ch. x. 31. The first is in these words: "Then took they up stones to cast at him. But Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by. They took up stones to cast at him." And if our Lord had not saved himself by a miraculous exertion of power, they would have then killed him. Divine Providence not interposing in a like manner, when a like attempt was made upon James, he fell a sacri-

<sup>h</sup> Potest tamen fieri, ut Jacobus hoc tempore mortuus sit. Sed genus mortis ignotum. Cleric. II. E. Ann. lxii. num. iii. in.



fice to the rage of the unbelieving part of the Jewish people at Jerusalem.

Nor ought it to be thought exceeding strange, or absolutely unaccountable, that some scribes and pharisees, or other Jews, should gather about James at the temple, and ask his opinion concerning Jesus, though they knew it very well already: or that they should come to him with pretences of great respect, and assurances of paying a regard to his judgment. For many like things are recorded in the gospels: which every one is able to recollect. I shall therefore take particular notice only of that second instance, mentioned by St. John, of their taking up stones to throw at our Lord, John x. 22—31, “And it was at Jerusalem, the feast of the dedication”——And “Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon’s porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him: How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.——Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him.” They came to Jesus, and desired an answer to a question that had been answered before. But they pretend now to desire it should be answered in the plainest and fullest manner. Nevertheless they could not hear the answer with patience.

I said just now, that two ancient writers of the second century, Clement and Hegesippus, assure us, that the death of James had been completed by a fuller’s pole, after he had been thrown off from the temple. I suppose this must have been the opinion also of Eusebius, who has taken notice of these things, and of other ancient christians. It is the account which<sup>1</sup> Jerom gives of the death of James, in his article, in the book of *Illustrious Men*, and likewise<sup>k</sup> elsewhere. The same is said by<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius.

Let this suffice for the circumstances and the manner of the death of James.

VI. The time of the death of James may be determined without much difficulty. He was alive when Paul came to Jerusalem at the Pentecost, in the year of Christ 58. And it

<sup>1</sup> Qui cum præcipitatus de pinnâ templi, contractis erribus, adhuc semivivus——fullonis fuste, quo uda vestimenta extorqueri solent, in cerebro percussus, interiit. De V. I. cap. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Hic autem Jacobus episcopus Jerosolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Justus: qui et ipse postea de templo a Judæis præcipitatus, successorem habuit Simonem, &c. Comm. in ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 237.

<sup>1</sup> Hær. 78. num. xiv. p. 1046.

is likely that he was dead when St. Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, at the beginning of the year 63. Theodoret,<sup>m</sup> upon Hebr. xiii. 7, supposeth the apostle there to refer to the martyrdoms of Stephen, James the brother of John, and James the Just. According to Hegesippus the death of James happened about the time of the passover, which might be that of the year 62. And if Festus was then dead, and Albinus not arrived, the province was without a governor. Such a season left the Jews at liberty to gratify their licentious and turbulent disposition. And they were very likely to embrace it. We may therefore very reasonably place this event at that juncture.

And it is now the general opinion of learned men, that James died about that time. Pearson,<sup>n</sup> who seems to admit the genuineness of the whole passage of Josephus, placeth the death of James in the year 62. Him Mill<sup>o</sup> follows. Le Clerc, who disputes the genuineness of those words that relate to James, allows that<sup>p</sup> he might die about that time. This also is agreeable to Tillemont's<sup>q</sup> computation. And I refer to<sup>r</sup> Valesius.

VII. It still remains that we consider on what account he was called the Lord's brother, and whether he be the same as James the Son of Alphaeus.

James, as we have seen, is called by St. Paul "the Lord's brother," Gal. i. 19. All christian writers in general speak of him in the like manner. The question is, in what sense he was so.

That James was not the son of Mary, or our Lord's brother by nature, has been well argued by christians in former times, both<sup>s</sup> Latins and<sup>t</sup> Greeks, from our Lord's words upon the cross, recorded John xix. 26, 27, where he

<sup>m</sup> Theod. tom. III. p. 459.

<sup>n</sup> Ann. Paulin. p. 19. A. Chr. lxii.

<sup>o</sup> Prolegom. num. 56.

<sup>p</sup> H. E. An. 62. num. iii.

<sup>q</sup> S. Jacque le Mineur, art. vii. in.

<sup>r</sup> Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 41.

<sup>s</sup> Verum homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinioni suæ auctoritatem, quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse sit traditum. Qui si Mariæ filii fuissent, et non potius Josephi ex priorè conjugio suscepti, nunquam in tempore passionis Joanni Apostolo transcripta esset in matrem, Domino ad utrumque dicente, Mulier, ecce filius tuus, et Joanni, Ecce mater tua; nisi quod desolata solatium caritatem filii in discipulo relinquebat. Hilar. Pict. Comm. in Matt. cap. i. p. 612. Ed. Bened.

<sup>t</sup> *Εἰ ἦσαν δὲ τέκνα τῆς Μαρίας, καὶ εἰ ὑπῆρχεν αὐτῆς ἀνηρ, τὴν λογῶν παρείδωσ τὴν Μαρίαν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην τῆς Μαρίας;* Epiph. Hær. 78. num. x. p. 1042. C.

*Εἰ γὰρ ἐγνώ αὐτὴν, καὶ ἐν τάξει γυναῖκος εἶχε, πῶς ὡς ἀπροσατευτὸν αὐτὴν, καὶ εἰδὲν ἀχρῶσαν, τῷ μαθητῇ παρατίθεται, καὶ κέλευε αὐτῷ εἰς τὰ ἴδια αὐτὴν λαβεῖν;* Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 5. T. VII. p. 77.

recommends the care of his mother to John : requiring her to consider him as her son, and him to take care of her, as his mother.

And indeed it has been the opinion of all christians in general, that Mary was always a virgin, and that she never had any children by Joseph. We must therefore inquire in what respect this James was our Lord's brother, and some others his brothers, or sisters.

Eusebius, in a chapter quoted some while ago, the first of the second book of his ecclesiastical history, without hesitation says, ' that " James was said to be the Lord's brother, ' because he also was called the son of Joseph. And Joseph ' was reckoned his father, because the virgin Mary was espoused to him.'

Origen<sup>v</sup> in a passage also cited<sup>w</sup> above, says, that the brethren of Jesus were the sons of Joseph by a former wife, who had cohabited with him before Mary. And he mentions it as supported by an ancient tradition. This was the opinion<sup>x</sup> of Epiphanius, and of many<sup>y</sup> ancient writers, both Greeks and Latins.

Jerom, in his article of this person, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, says : ' James,<sup>z</sup> who is called the ' Lord's brother, surnamed the Just, was as some think, ' the son of Joseph by another wife, but, as seems to me, ' the son of Mary, sister to our Lord's mother, mentioned by ' John in his gospel, John xix. 25.' And in his book against Helvidius he delivers it as his opinion, that<sup>a</sup> those called our Lord's brethren in the gospels, were so named, as they were cousins, or relations. He speaks to the like purpose also<sup>b</sup> in his commentary upon Matth. xii. 49, 50.

<sup>u</sup> Τοτε δη και Ιακωβον, τον τε Κυρις λεγομενον αδελφον, οτι δη και ουτος Ιωσηφ ωνομαστο παις· τω δε Χριτω πατηρ ο Ιωσηφ, ω μνηρευθεισα η παρθενος, κ. λ. L. 2. c. 1. p. 38. B.

<sup>v</sup> In Matt. T. X. p. 462, 463. T. III. Bened. P. 223. tom. I. Huet.

<sup>w</sup> See before, p. 172. <sup>x</sup> Epiph. Hær. 29. n. iii. et iv. Hær. 51. num. x. Hær. 78. num. viii. et ix. Ancorat. num. lx. p. 62.

<sup>y</sup> Greg. Nyssen. de Christi Resur. Or. 2. tom. III. p. 412, 413. Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 5. tom. VII. p. 77. C. Theophyl. in Gal. i. 19. p. 448. Niceph. Call. l. 2. cap. 3. in Hilar. Pictav. Comm. in Matt. cap. i. p. 612. ed. Bened. Ambros. de Instit. Virg. cap. vi. T. II. p. 260. Bened. Ambrosiastr. Comment. in Gal. i. 19. ap. Ambros. in App. T. II. p. 213.

<sup>z</sup> Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex aliâ uxore, ut mihi videtur, Mariæ sororis matris Domini, cujus Joannes in libro suo meminit, filius. De V. l. cap. 2.

<sup>a</sup> Restat igitur, ut, juxta superiorem expositionem, fratres eos intelligas appellatos, cognatione, non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non naturâ; quomodo Lot Abrahæ, quomodo Jacob Laban est appellatus frater, &c. Adv. Helvid. T. IV. P. 2. p. 140.

<sup>b</sup> Quidam fratres Domini de aliâ uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes

This opinion was at length embraced by Augustine. In his exposition of the epistle to the Galatians, written about the year 394, he speaks dubiously, saying, ‘ that <sup>c</sup> James ‘ was the Lord’s brother, as he was the son of Joseph by a ‘ former wife, or else as he was related to his mother Mary.’ But in works written afterwards, he continually says, that <sup>d</sup> our Lord’s brethren were relations of his mother Mary.

The former, as appears from the authors just cited, was the more ancient opinion. Nor does Jerom allege any before him who held the opinion mentioned as his own. Indeed he seems to have been the first who said that our Lord’s brethren were the sons of Mary, his mother’s sister, and therefore only cousins or relations. But when he advanced this notion, he <sup>e</sup> was inclined to think Joseph also a virgin. As has been well observed by <sup>f</sup> G. J. Vossius.

However Jerom’s opinion has prevailed very much of late. I suppose it may be that <sup>g</sup> of the Romanists in general. It was also the opinion of <sup>h</sup> Lightfoot. It is likewise

deliramenta apocryphorum, et quandam Mescham vel Escham mulierculam confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro, quem contra Helvidium scripsimus, continetur, non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos, intelligimus, materteræ Domini; quæ esse dicitur mater Jacobi minoris, et Joseph, et Judæ; quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis scriptura demonstrat. In Matt. cap. xii. T. IV. p. 53.

<sup>c</sup> Jacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joseph de aliâ uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus debet intelligi. Aug. Expos. ep. ad Gal. cap. i. et ii. num. viii. tom. III. P. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Fratres ejus sic accipite, sicut nôstis. Non enim novum est, quod auditis. Consanguinei virginis Mariæ fratres Domini dicebantur. Scriptura tamen hujusmodi cognationes fratres appellat. Nam Abraham et Lot fratres sunt dicti, cum esset Abraham patruus Lot: et Laban et Jacob fratres sunt dicti, cum esset Laban avunculus Jacob, &c. In Joan. Tract. 28. num. iii. tom. III. P. 2. Vid. ibid. in Matt. Qu. xvii. et in Joan. Tr. x.

Et Lot frater Abrahæ dicitur, cum patruus ejus esset Abraham. Ex quâ vocabuli consuetudine etiam fratres Domini vocantur in Evangelio, non utique quos Maria virgo pepererat, sed ejus consanguinitate omnes propinqui. Contr. Faust. l. 22. cap. 35. T. VIII.

<sup>e</sup> Tu dicis, Mariam virginem non permansisse. Ego mihi plus vindico, etiam ipsum Joseph virginem fuisse per Mariam, ut ex virginitatis conjugio virgo filius nasceretur. Adv. Helvid. tom. IV. p. 142. in.

<sup>f</sup> Et sane, qui Josephum putaret non habuisse uxorem, antequam B. Mariam duceret, ante B. Hieronymum arbitror fuisse neminem; utcumque posterioribus temporibus, in virginitate extollendâ immodicis, avide multi eam fuerint sententiam amplexi. Vos, de Gen. Christi, cap. vi.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Baron. in Apparatu, num. lxi. &c. Est. ad Gal. cap. i. 19. et alibi. Tillem. S. Jacques le Mineur, Art. i. et ii.

<sup>h</sup> See Lightfoot’s Works, Vol. I. p. 270, 541, 660.

embraced by <sup>i</sup> Witsius, and <sup>k</sup> Lampe, and <sup>l</sup> many other protestants. But Valesius, among the Romanists, in his annotations upon the above-cited chapter of Eusebius, says, he <sup>m</sup> thinks that James was the son of Joseph by a former wife. The same opinion has been asserted by several among the protestants, <sup>n</sup> G. J. Vossius, and <sup>o</sup> Basnage, and <sup>p</sup> Cave, in his Lives of the Apostles written in English. Nor does it appear that he had abandoned his first judgment, when <sup>q</sup> he wrote his *Historia Literaria*.

I likewise have for a long time been much inclined to the

<sup>i</sup> At quamvis Eusebius, Epiphanius, Gregorius Nyssenus, plurimique veterum, in eandem concesserint sententiam, non videtur mihi ea probabilibus nisi argumentis. Rectius Hieronymo accedemus, arbitranti eos, qui Domini fratres dicuntur, fuisse ejus consobrinos, loquendi genere etiam Græcis et Romanis noto. Wits. Comm. in ep. Jud. sect. 4. p. 454.

<sup>k</sup> Erat hic frater Jacobi minoris.—Quare fuit consobrinus Christi secundum carnem, natus ex Mariâ, uxore Cleophræ, seu Alphaï, quæ soror erat Mariæ Matris Domini. Lampe, in Evang. Joan. cap. xiv. 22. T. III. p. 167.

<sup>l</sup> Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. 5. n. xi. T. III. p. 165. And see L'Enfant et Beausobre, sur Gal. i. 19. et la préface sur l'épître de S. Jacques. Dr. Benson in his preface to the epistle of St. James, sect. ii. Doddridge in his preface to the same epistle.

<sup>m</sup> Ait igitur Eusebius, Jacobum, qui in Evangelio et epistolâ Pauli frater Domini dicitur, filium fuisse Josephi ex aliâ conjuge, quam Josephus ante Mariam sibi sociaverat. Cum Eusebio consentit Epiphanius—Gregorius Nyssenus—sed Hieronymus, in libro de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis Jacobum hunc idcirco fratrem Domini appellatum esse existimat, quod filius esset Mariæ sororis matris Domini—Multa quidem de hoc argumento discriuit Baronius in Annalibus. Mihi tamen verior videtur opinio eorum, qui Jacobum, et reliquos Domini fratres, Josephi ex priore matrimonio filios esse dicunt. Hæc enim sententia magis convenit verbis Evangelii. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. cap. 1.

Fuit enim Jacobus filius Josephi, ac proinde oriundus ex stirpe David. Id. in Annot. ad l. 2. cap. 23. p. 40.

<sup>n</sup> Voss. de Gen. J. C. cap. vi.

<sup>o</sup> Basnag. ann. ante Christ. 6. num. xxviii. et xxix.

<sup>p</sup> ' He was the son (as we may probably conjecture) of Joseph, afterwards husband to the blessed virgin, and his first wife. Hence reputed our Lord's brother, in the same sense, that he was reputed the son of Joseph.—Jerom, and some others, will have Christ's brethren so called, because sons of Mary, cousin-german, or, according to the custom of the Hebrew language, sister to the virgin Mary. But Eusebius, Epiphanius, and the far greater part of the ancients (from whom, especially in matters of fact, we are not rashly to depart) make them the children of Joseph by a former wife. And this seems most genuine and natural, the evangelists seeming very express and accurate in the account which they give of them. "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Jude?—Matt. xiii. 55, 56. By which it is plain, that the Jews understood these persons not to be Christ's kinsmen only, but his brothers, the same carpenter's sons, having the same relation to him that Christ himself had: though they indeed had more. Christ being but his reputed, they his natural sons.' And what follows. The Life of James the Less, num. 2.

<sup>q</sup> S. Jacobus apostolus—minor dictus, cognomento Justus, frater Domini, Josephi utpote ex priori conjuge, seu, ut Hieronymo placet, Mariæ sororis matris Domini filius. Hist. Lit. tom. I. p. 14.

same opinion ; and have composed an argument upon the question. But I have laid it aside, supposing it to be rather too prolix, and too intricate, to be inserted in this place. And after all, perhaps, some may think that the argument does not afford a complete solution of all difficulties and objections. I therefore enter not at present into any dispute about it, but leave every one to judge as he sees good.

VIII. Whether James was the son of Joseph by a former wife, or the son of Mary, wife of Cleophas, sister to Mary our Lord's mother, or otherwise nearly related to her, he was an apostle. I think it was clearly proved at the beginning of this chapter from the New Testament, that James, called "the Lord's brother," was an apostle in the highest acceptation of the word. Consequently, he must be James the son of Alpheus, or Cleophas. For those names seem to be one differently written.

But how he was so is made out differently. They who say that those called our Lord's brethren were sons of Cleophas, husband of Mary, related to our Lord's mother, seem to have here no difficulty. But they who suppose our Lord's brethren to have been sons of Joseph by a former wife, are somewhat embarrassed. However, I just observe, that the account, given by <sup>r</sup> Epiphanius, is this. Cleophas and Joseph were brothers. The former died without issue, and Joseph raised up seed to his brother. Accordingly, James being the first-born of Joseph, was called the son of Cleophas. In like manner speaks <sup>s</sup> Theophylact. But, as before said, I do not now form any debate about this.

That James, called our Lord's brother, is the same as he, who in the catalogues of the apostles is called the "son of Alpheus," or "Cleophas," is allowed by Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Epiphanius says, that <sup>t</sup> James, by nature the son of Joseph, who was called the Lord's brother, and was an apostle, was appointed the first bishop of Jerusalem. Chrysostom, in his comment upon Gal. i. 19, says, ' that <sup>u</sup> Paul calls James the Lord's brother, giving

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Epiph. Hær. 29. n. iii. iv. II. 51. n. x. II. 78. num. vii. viii. ix. et Ancorat. num. lx.

<sup>s</sup> Πως δὲ ἦν τῆ Κλοπα ; Ἀκκε· Κλοπας καὶ Ἰωσηφ ἀδελφοί. Τῆ Κλοπα ἀπαιδὸς τελευτήσαντος, ὁ Ἰωσηφ ἐξανέστησεν αὐτῷ σπέρμα, καὶ ἐτέκε τῶτον, καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς αὐτῆ ἀδελφῆς, κ. λ. Theoph. in Gal. i. 19.

<sup>t</sup> —καταθέμενος εἰς τὸν Ἰακώβ τῆ ἀδελφῆ Κυρια καλεμένης καὶ ἀποδοῦν ἐπισκοπῆς πρῶτον ἰσὺς Ἰωσηφ φύσει οὗτος, κ. λ. Hær. 29. n. iii.

<sup>u</sup> Εἰ γὰρ σημαίνει ὅν εἰλεγεν ἠθελεν, ἐννῆ καὶ ἐξ ἑτέρῃ γνωρισματος τῆτο ποιησαὶ ἕηλον, καὶ ἔπειν τον τῆ Κλωπα, ὅπερ καὶ εὐαγγελιστῆς εἰλεγεν. Chr. in Gal. cap. i. T. X. p. 678. E.

‘ him that honourable appellation, when he might have said ‘ “ the son of Cleophas,” as he is called in the gospels.’ Theophylact likewise says, ‘ that <sup>v</sup> Paul calls him the Lord’s ‘ brother, by the way of an honourable distinction, when he ‘ might have called him the son of Cleophas. Nor was he ‘ the Lord’s brother according to the flesh, but only thought ‘ to be so.’ I mention no more ancient writers.

And that James, called the son of Alpheus in the catalogues of the apostles, was one of those who are called “ the Lord’s brethren,” I think, may be shown from the gospels, by comparing several texts together.

In all the catalogues of the twelve apostles of Christ, the four last mentioned are these. “ James the son of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him,” Matth. x. 3, 4. “ James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him,” Mark iii. 18, 19. “ James the son of Alpheus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which was also the traitor,” Luke vi. 15, 16. James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James,” Acts i. 13.

Let us now compare the texts in the gospels, where our Lord’s brethren are named. Matt. xiii. 55, “ Is not this the carpenter’s son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?” And Mark vi. 3, “ Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and of Joses, and of Judah, and Simon?”

All these, except Joses, seem to have been apostles. For must not the three apostles, last mentioned before Judas Iscariot, in the first catalogues, and the three last mentioned in the Acts, be three of the four called in the gospels our Lord’s brethren?

And I should choose to translate the texts of St. Luke, where the apostles are named, somewhat differently from what is generally done, in this manner. “ James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas, brethren of James: declaring, that both Simon and Judas were brethren of James, the son of Alpheus, before named. A word must be supplied. And the coherence leads me to think brethren more proper than brother.

<sup>v</sup> Εἶδε δὲ καὶ Ἰακώβον. Μετὰ τῆς ἐε καὶ ταῦτα μνησθῆναι, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τῆ κυριῆς εἰπὼν· οὕτω καὶ βασκανίας ἀπηλλακτοῦ· καιτοί, ἐηβλήτο σημαίνει, εἶπεν αὐτὸν, τὸν τῆ Κλοπᾶ· ἕε γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφὸς ἦν τῆ κυριῆς, ἀλλ’ ἐνομιζέτο. Theoph. in Gal. i. 19.

By all which we are led to conclude, that James, several times mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, is the same who in the catalogues of the apostles, is called "James the son of Alphaeus." For James, mentioned by St. Paul, is called "the Lord's brother," and plainly appears to be an apostle. Consequently, he is "James the son of Alphaeus," mentioned in all the catalogues of the apostles of Christ.

Wall, in his notes upon John vii. at the beginning, says, 'These brethren and kinsfolk of our Lord, as they were but mean persons, so also they were some of the backwardest to believe in him.—They that are most usually called his brethren were James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas. —Two of these, James and Judas, some learned men think to have been two of the apostles. And there were two apostles of those names that were brethren. But this place, if they be of those that are meant in it, is a strong argument against that opinion. For these brethren did hardly yet believe in him; but the apostles did. This was but half a year before he suffered.'

Upon which I would observe: when St. John says, ch. vii. 5, "For neither did his brethren believe in him: he does not intend to say that they had not faith in him. Grotius's comment appears to me very right. 'The <sup>w</sup> meaning is not that they did not believe at all; but that they did not believe as they should.'

Learned men are certainly in the right, when they say that some of our Lord's brethren were apostles. And it seems to me, that all those, who in the gospels are called our Lord's brethren, had early and always an affection and esteem for him. This may be perceived from several places in the gospels, as Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 31; Luke viii. 19; See also John ii. 12. And in time they all believed in him, and that rightly, as the Messiah. St. Luke, in the history of things after our Lord's ascension, Acts i. 13, 14, having mentioned the names of the apostles, adds, "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." And St. Paul, I Cor. ix. 5, speaks of "brethren of the Lord," not apostles, who laboured in spreading the gospel in the world.

They of whom St. John speaks, had worldly views and expectations. They were desirous, that Jesus, if he were indeed the Messiah, should go to Jerusalem, and set up his kingdom in a glorious manner. Even after this, several who

<sup>w</sup> Non omnino, non ut oportebat. Grot. in loc.



certainly were apostles, betrayed great ignorance, or weak faith, or wrong apprehensions, by their discourses, and questions put to our Saviour. Of Thomas, see John xiv. 5. Of Philip, see ver. 8—11, and of Judas, ver. 22, 23.

Those brethren of our Lord proposed that he should hasten to Jerusalem, to the feast of tabernacles, nigh at hand.—“Jesus said to them, my time is not yet come. But your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you. But me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil. Go ye up unto this feast. I go not up yet unto this feast: for my time is not yet full come,” ch. vii. 6, 7, 8. It is manifest, that he taxeth their carnality and worldly-mindedness. As if he had said: ‘It is <sup>x</sup> not proper for me to go up to this feast, as yet, nor till after it is begun. But you may go up at any time, since you have done little or nothing to make the Jews unfriendly to you, as I have done: who by the strictness of my doctrine, and the freedom of my reproofs, have provoked many to a great degree.’

It follows in ver. 9, 10, “When he had said these things unto them, he abode still in Galilee. But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.” These words may afford, in the opinion of some, another objection to the supposition, that these brethren of our Lord were apostles. But to me the objection appears not of much moment. Some of these brethren might nevertheless be among the apostles, and go up to the feast before him. For our Lord seems not to have been attended by all his apostles in that journey. So much is implied in the manner in which it was performed. “He went not openly, but as it were in private:” in a more private manner than he had usually done, and attended by a small number of his apostles only, several of them having gone up to Jerusalem before him, upon occasion of the approaching solemnity.

Chrysostom seems not to have doubted, that some of the brethren of our Lord here spoken of were apostles, or at least among his disciples. For discoursing on John vii. 3, 4, 5, he says: ‘Observe <sup>y</sup> with me the power of Christ. Of them who uttered these words, one was the first bishop

<sup>x</sup> Compare Mr. James Macknight's Harmony of the Gospels, Vol. ii. p. 5.

<sup>y</sup> Σὺ δὲ μοι σκοπεῖ τὴν Χρῆσιν τὴν δύναμιν. Ἀπο γὰρ τῶν τῶν ταῦτα λεγόντων τὰ ῥήματα, ὁ πρῶτος τῶν Ἱεροσολυμῶν ἐπισκοπὸς γεγενῆσθαι, ὁ μακαρίου Ἰακώβου.—Λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰσίδωρος θαυμαστὸς τὴν γεγενῆσθαι. In Jo. hom. 48. T. VIII. p. 284. D.

‘ of Jerusalem, even the blessed James, of whom Paul says :  
 ‘ “ Other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord’s  
 ‘ brother.” And Judas also is said to have been a wonder-  
 ‘ ful man.’ So says Chrysostom, who did not receive the  
 epistle of St. Jude, so far as we can perceive, though he did  
 that of St. James.

IX. This James is called by St Mark, “ the less,” ch. xv. 40. “ There were also women looking on afar off. Among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Less, and Joses, and Salome.” That hereby is meant James, the Lord’s brother, and the son of Alpheus, is generally supposed, and I think reasonably. He can be no other, because Joses is presently afterwards mentioned as his brother, agreeably to other places of the evangelists, where our Lord’s brethren are named, Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3. But interpreters are not agreed why he was so called.

It has been thought, that <sup>z</sup> herein is a reference to James the son of Zebedee, and brother of John, who had been beheaded by Herod in the year of Christ 44. And Lightfoot says, ‘ that <sup>a</sup> James, or Jacob, is commonly called James  
 ‘ the great, in distinction from James the son of Alpheus,  
 ‘ who is called the Less, not for any dignity, or superiority of  
 ‘ apostleship that he had above the other, but either because  
 ‘ this James was the elder, or because of the singular privacy  
 ‘ that Christ admitted him to with himself, as he also did  
 ‘ Peter and John.’

Here are several reasons of this denomination, but though Lightfoot says James the son of Zebedee was commonly called James the great, there is no instance of it in the New Testament.

It may be observed, that the less, in the original, is not a comparative, but a positive, the little, *τὸ μικρὸν*. And so Beza has translated. *Maria Jacobi parvi et Jose mater*. However in the Latin Vulgate it is *Jacobi minoris*. And it is evident that <sup>b</sup> Jerom so understood the word.

Gregory Nyssen <sup>c</sup> thought he was called the Less, as not

<sup>z</sup> Puto ita dictum inter Apostolos ad discrimen Jacobi Zebedaïdæ. Grot. ad Marc. xv. 40. <sup>a</sup> The third part of the Harmony of the four Evangelists, Vol. I. p. 634.

<sup>b</sup> Si non est Apostolus, sed nescio quis Jacobus, quomodo est frater Domini putandus? Et quomodo tertius ad distinctionem majoris appellabitur minor? quum major et minor non inter tres, sed inter duos soleant præbere distantiam. Adv. Helvid. p. 138. in.

<sup>c</sup> Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος Ἰακώβου τὸ μικρὸν καὶ Ἰωσή μητέρα αὐτὴν εἶπεν, ἐπειπερ ἦν ἄλλος Ἰακώβος ὁ τὸν Ἀλφαιῶ, διὰ τὸ μέγας, ὅτι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοῖς ἐσδέκα συναριθμητοῦ ὁ γὰρ μικρὸς ἐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐναριθμῶς. Greg. Nyss. de Christ. Res. Or. 2. P. III. p. 413.

being one of the twelve apostles. Which reason I cannot admit, because I am persuaded he was an apostle, if he was the Lord's brother. Nor do I perceive in the New Testament more than two of this name.

Some say, he was so called, because he was the younger of the two apostles of this name. But of this there is no proof nor probability. For James, the son of Alphaeus, must have been his father's first-born, and may have been as old, or older than James the son of Zebedee.

Some have conjectured that<sup>d</sup> he might be so called on account of his stature. Which conjecture is favoured by the literal sense of the word in the positive degree, James the Little. And some may be apt to think, that this was one reason why the Jews at the temple, according to Hege-sippus, placed him on an eminence, that he might be heard by all the people, when assembled in great numbers. So Zaccheus, being little of stature, and there being a great crowd, climbed up into a sycamore tree, to see Jesus as he passed by, Luke xix. Perhaps this is as likely a conjecture as any.

Nevertheless I shall mention one more. He might be so called on account of his inferiority, in comparison of the other James. It is manifest, that during the time of our Lord's abode on this earth, Peter, and James and John, the two sons of Zebedee, were the most eminent and considerable of the disciples. They were the most favoured, and were admitted by our Lord to some special measure of confidence and freedom. And it is observable, that in all the catalogues of the apostles, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon the Canaanite, or Zelotes, and Judas, are the last mentioned, except Judas Iscariot. Possibly these three, whom I suppose to have been our Lord's brethren, were the latest called to be apostles, and for a while were defective in faith and understanding, or not so considerable and eminent as some of the other apostles, particularly James the son of Zebedee. The question put to our Lord by Judas, one of them, recorded in John xiv. 22, seems a remarkable instance of the slowness of his understanding in the things of religion, under all the advantages which he had enjoyed.

James therefore might be called "the Less," by way of distinction from another of the same name, who had been called to be an apostle before him, and was more eminent.

<sup>d</sup> Potuit etiam Jacobus parvus appellari ad corporis molem ratione habitâ; quomodo apud Romanos ob corporis affectiones Pauli, Magni, Longi, Crassi, Claudii, Pulchri nuncupabantur. Basnag. ann. ante Dom. 6. num. xxxi.

And yet the appellation carried not in it any reflection. This coincides with some things said by Lightfoot above.

However, it is mentioned only as a conjecture, to be considered by those who are disposed to do it. For I am not able to say with assurance, what was the ground and reason of this appellation.

X. We have seen divers proofs of the respect shown to this person, which any one is able to recollect, and therefore they need not to be repeated. However, I shall here take notice of a few such things.

1. He is never called Justus, or the Just, in the New Testament; but he seems to have been so called by many, even in his life-time, as well as afterwards. Eusebius says, that <sup>e</sup> he was called the Just by the ancients on account of the eminence of his virtue. He is several times so called in the passages of Clement of Alexandria, quoted from Eusebius <sup>f</sup> some while ago. Hegesippus says, he <sup>g</sup> had been called the Just by all from our Saviour's time to his own: and afterwards, that <sup>h</sup> on account of his eminent virtue he was called the Just, and Oblias. He likewise says, that <sup>i</sup> the Jews at the temple called him the Just, as may be seen in the account of his death, transcribed above. Jerom <sup>k</sup> in the beginning of his article of this person says, 'that James the Lord's brother was surnamed the Just.'

2. In his commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, at ch. i. 19, he says, 'that <sup>l</sup> James, there spoken of, was in such esteem for his sanctity, that it was no uncommon thing for people to crowd about him, and strive to touch the hem of his garment.'

3. Eusebius says, that <sup>m</sup> the episcopal chair in which James was used to sit, was preserved to his time, and was had in veneration by the church at Jerusalem.

XI. I have not been able to write the history of

<sup>e</sup> Τῶτον δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ Ἰακώβῳ ὄν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπέκλην οἱ παλαὶ δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκαλεῖν προσημασία.—Eus. II. E. l. 2. c. 1. p. 38. B. <sup>f</sup> P. 169, 170.

<sup>g</sup> Ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς κυρίας χρόνων μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν. Ap. Euseb. l. 2. c. 23. p. 63. D.

<sup>h</sup> Δια γένοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτῆς ἐκαλεῖτο δίκαιος καὶ ὠβλιῆς. Ib. p. 64. A. <sup>i</sup> —καὶ ἐκραζῶν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἶπον· Δίκαιε, ὦ πάντες πειθεσθαι ὀφειλομέν. Ib. D. Vid. et p. 65. A. et B.

<sup>k</sup> Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus. De V. l. cap. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Hic autem Jacobus episcopus Jerosolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Justus; vir tantæ sanctitatis et rumoris in populo, ut fimbriam vestimenti ejus certatim cuperent attingere. In Gal. T. IV. p. 237. in.

<sup>m</sup> Τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβῳ θρόνον τῆς πρώτης τῆς Ἱεροσολυμῶν ἐκκλησίας—εἰς αἶνρον πεφωλαγμένον οἱ τῆς κατα διαδοχὴν περιεποιεῖτες ἀδελφοί, κ. λ. II. E. l. 7. c. 19.

this person so regularly, as that of some others. For which reason it may not be amiss to take a summary view of what we have seen.

James, sometimes called the Less, the son of Alpheus, and called the Lord's brother, either as being the son of Joseph by a former wife, or a relation of his mother Mary, was one of Christ's apostles. We have no account of the time when he was called to the apostleship. Nor is there any thing said of him particularly in the history of our Saviour, which is in the gospels. But from the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, we can perceive that after our Lord's ascension he was of note among the apostles. Soon after St. Stephen's death in the year 36, or thereabout, he seems to have been appointed president, or superintendant in the church of Jerusalem, where, and in Judea, he resided the remaining part of his life. Accordingly, he presided in the council of Jerusalem, held there in the year 49, or 50. He was in great repute among the Jewish people, both believers and unbelievers, and was surnamed the Just. Notwithstanding which he suffered martyrdom in a tumult at the temple: and, probably, in the former part of the year 62. He wrote one epistle, not long before his death, of which we shall speak presently.

---

## CHAP. XVII.

### THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

- I. *The Evidences of its Genuineness.* II. *When written.*  
III. *To whom.*

HAVING now done all I am able for clearing up the history of this person, I come to consider the epistle ascribed to him.

Here I would observe the evidences of its genuineness and authority, the time when, and the people to whom it was written.

I. And for the first point. This epistle seems to be alluded, or referred to, by Clement bishop of Rome, Vol. ii. ch. ii. num. xxxvii.—xl. and by Hermas, ch. iv. num. xxviii.—xxxiv. It is not expressly quoted by Irenæus.

Nor are there in him any undisputed references to it, ch. xvii. num. v. 1, 2, 7. Nor do we perceive it to be quoted by Clement of Alexandria, ch. xxii. num. viii. nor by Tertullian, ch. xxvii. num. xi. 1. This epistle is quoted once or twice by Origen, but as of doubtful authority, or not received by all, ch. xxxviii. num. xi. We do not observe any notice to be taken of this epistle by Cyprian, Vol. iii. ch. xlv. num. vii. It seems to be referred to by Commodian, a Latin writer, about the year 270, ch. xlix. num. iii. 6. It is probable that it was received by the Manichees and Paulicians, ch. lxiii. sect. vi. num. iv. 9; sect. ix. num. ii. 5, 10—12. It seems to be referred to by Lactantius, ch. lxxv. num. vi. 5.

From a passage of Eusebius, cited in the<sup>a</sup> preceding chapter, it appears, that in his time, the beginning of the fourth century, all the seven epistles called catholic, were well known, and received by many. And he expressly says, that the epistle of James was the first of them. And to the like purpose again in another passage to be here taken notice of by us. Having given a particular account of the death of James, called the Just, and the brother of the Lord, and bishop of Jerusalem, he concludes the chapter in this manner. ‘Thus far,’<sup>b</sup> says he, ‘concerning James, who is said to be the writer of the first of the epistles called catholic. But it ought to be observed, that it is spurious: [meaning, that it was a contradicted book of scripture, or at the utmost, that it was doubted of, or rejected by many:] forasmuch as there are not many of the ancient writers, who have quoted it: as neither that called Jude’s, another of the seven epistles called catholic. However we know that these also are commonly used [or publicly read] in most churches, together with the rest.’

This passage is very satisfactory. For it assures us who was the writer of this epistle: namely, James, before spoken of, called the Lord’s brother, surnamed the Just, who generally resided at Jerusalem. It also assures us, that though it had been doubted of by some, it was then generally received, and publicly read in the assemblies of christians. They who have leisure and are curious, may see what was farther observed by us formerly, relating to the opinion of

<sup>a</sup> See before, p. 160, 161.

<sup>b</sup> Τοιαυτα και τα κατα τον Ιακωβον, ου η πρωτη των ονομαζομενων καθολικων ειναι λεγεται. Ιτερον δε ως νοθουεται. Ου πολλοι γαρ των παλαιων αυτης εμνημονευσαν, ως ηδε της λεγομενης Ιβδα, μιας και αυτης εσης των επτα λεγομενων καθολικων. Ομως δε ισμεν και ταυτας μετα των λοιπων εν πλειταις εδδημοσιουμεναις εκκλησιας. II. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 66. Comp. Vol. iv. p. 104.

Eusebius himself concerning this epistle, and the writer of it, Vol. iv. ch. lxxii. num. ix. 17—24.

I only add here, that this epistle of St. James is one of the three catholic epistles received by the Syrian christians, and by Chrysostom and Theodoret. And that after the time of Eusebius, this, and the other six catholic epistles, were received by all Greeks and Latins in general: and are in the catalogues of canonical scripture composed by councils and learned authors: as was shown in a foregoing chapter. However, there might be still some few who doubted of its authority, especially in the east, as was observed, Vol. v. ch. clii. 7.

This epistle was received by Jerom, as was distinctly and largely shown in his article, Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 6. Who in one place says, ‘The<sup>c</sup> apostles, James, Peter, John, ‘Jude, wrote seven epistles, of few words, but full of sense.’ It may nevertheless be worth the while to recollect here particularly what he says of it in his book of *Illustrious Men*, transcribed there at p. 125, ‘James, the Lord’s ‘brother,——wrote but one epistle, which is among ‘the seven catholic epistles. Which too<sup>d</sup> is said to have ‘been published by another in his name. But gra- ‘dually, in process of time, it has gained authority. ‘This is he of whom Paul writes in his epistle to the Gala- ‘tians. And he is often mentioned in the Acts of the ‘Apostles.’

‘Which likewise,’ says Jerom, ‘is said to have been ‘published by another in his name:’ that is, even that one epistle is said by some to be spurious, and not really written by James, though it bears his name. But I do not believe there is reason to think that was ever said by any. And I am persuaded, that what Jerom says here is owing to a mistake of his, not rightly understanding Eusebius: who, as may be remembered, says, ‘This James is said to ‘be the author of the first of the epistles called catholic. ‘But<sup>e</sup> it ought to be observed that it is spurious.’ By which Jerom understood Eusebius to say, that this epistle was falsely ascribed to James, and was not his: whereas Eusebius means no more than that it was a contradicted book, not received by all as of authority: or at the utmost, that it was doubted of, or rejected by many. This I sup-

<sup>c</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. v.

<sup>d</sup> Quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus elita asseritur.

<sup>e</sup> ἵστον δὲ ὡς ροθνεῖται μὲν. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 66. C.

pose to have been clearly shown before. See Vol. iv. ch. lxxii. num. viii. 4—6; and also num. ix. 24.<sup>f</sup>

The reason why this epistle was not received by all, I suppose to have been, that it was not certainly known that James, the writer of it, was an apostle. We have observed several ancient writers, who did not allow him to have that high character. There were two apostles of this name: James the son of Zebedee, and James the son of Alphaeus. That the writer of this epistle was not James the son of Zebedee, must have been evident. Nor was it certain that he was the son of Alphaeus. Another reason of doubting of his apostleship may have been that he was often called bishop of Jerusalem, and said by some to have been appointed to that office by the apostles. - This also may have contributed to the doubt, whether he was one of the twelve apostles of Christ.

Other reasons have been assigned in late ages, why some might hesitate about receiving this epistle as a part of canonical scripture. But those reasons are not to be found in the most early antiquity: whereas we can plainly perceive, that not a few learned christians of the first ages were not satisfied the writer was an apostle; which must have occasioned a demur concerning the high authority of the epistle.

If this James was not one of the twelve apostles, he was nevertheless a person of great distinction, as he was the Lord's brother, and resided many years at Jerusalem after our Lord's ascension, as president, or superintendent of the church there, and of the Jewish believers in Judea in general. Accordingly, Eusebius, who did not think this James to be one of the twelve apostles, in his commentary upon Isaiah, reckons fourteen apostles, meaning Paul, and this James, though not equal to him. See Vol. iv. ch. lxxii. num. ix. 23. And Jerom likewise, in one place, formerly taken notice of, reckons this James, brother of the Lord, an additional apostle with Paul, beside the twelve, Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 6.

But I think it manifest, that James the Lord's brother, who resided at Jerusalem, several times mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, and in St. Paul's epistles, was an apostle, one of the twelve, and consequently the same with him who is called the son of Alphaeus. And as this epistle has been all along ascribed to James, the Lord's brother,

<sup>f</sup> I likewise refer to Dr. Leonard Twell's Examination of the late new text and version of the N. T. Part. 2. ch. 2. p. 82; who speaks to the like purpose.



surnamed the Just, I receive it as a part of sacred scripture, and think it ought to be so received.

II. Concerning the time of this epistle, there cannot be very different apprehensions.

Mill<sup>s</sup> says it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and a year or two before his own death, about the year 60: which is also the opinion of<sup>b</sup> Fabricius.

But that appears to me rather too soon. If St. James suffered martyrdom in the year 62, I should be inclined to think this epistle was written in the beginning of that year, or in 61, and but a short time before his death.

Eusebius says, ‘When<sup>i</sup> Paul had appealed to Cæsar, and had been sent to Rome by Festus, the Jews, who had aimed at his death, being disappointed in that design, turned their rage against James, the Lord’s brother, who had been appointed by the apostles bishop of Jerusalem.’ In like manner Tillemont, adopting that thought, says, ‘St. Paul<sup>k</sup> having been sent to Rome near the end of the year 60, by Festus, governor of Judea, the Jews finding themselves not able to accomplish their design against him, turned their rage against James. Nevertheless they did not show it till eighteen months after, when Festus being dead, and Albinus, who succeeded him, not being yet arrived, the province was without a governor.’

That the Jews were much vexed, when Paul was sent to Rome, and had thus escaped out of their hands, is very reasonably supposed. But that their vexation upon that account was the occasion of the death of James, is mere conjecture. Nor does any thing like it appear in the accounts of his death, which Eusebius has transcribed from Hegesippus, and Josephus.

If I likewise may be allowed to mention a conjecture, (which is at least as probable as that just taken notice of,) I should say, I am apt to think, that the death of James was partly occasioned by the offence taken at his epistle: in which are not only sharp reprehensions of the unbelieving Jews for the crimes committed by them, but also affecting

<sup>s</sup> De tempore, quo scripta est, certum est in primis exaratum fuisse ante excidium Hierosolymitanum. De hoc enim, ut et generali Judæorum calamitate veluti jam imminente, loquitur cap. v. 1. Jam vero Jacobus statim post Festi mortem martyrimum obiit, teste Josepho, anno æræ vulgaris, ex rationibus Pearsonianis, quas libenter sequor, lxii. adeoque uno vel altero ante mortem, scriptam censuerim hanc epistolam, circa annum lx. Prol. num. 56.

<sup>b</sup> Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. n. ix. tom. III. p. 165.

<sup>i</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. in.

<sup>k</sup> S. Jacque le Mineur, Art. vii. Mem. Tom. I.

representations of the dreadful calamities coming upon them, ch. iv. 1, 8. v. 1—6.

III. I am now to consider to whom this epistle was sent.

Beza says, it<sup>1</sup> was sent to the believing Jews, dispersed all over the world. Cave<sup>m</sup> seems to say to believing Jews chiefly. And <sup>n</sup> to the like purpose Fabricius. Grotius <sup>o</sup> says, to all the people of Israel living out of Judea. Wall's account of this epistle is this: 'It<sup>p</sup> was written to such Jews (being now Christians) as were dispersed abroad out of Judea.—This epistle consists of general exhortations to piety, patience, and other moral virtues. It has twice or thrice mentioned our Saviour: but has nothing of his miracles, or teachings, or death, or resurrection, or our redemption by him: of which Paul's, and Peter's, and John's epistles are full.'

To me it seems, that this epistle was written to all Jews, descendants of Jacob, of every denomination, throughout the world, in Judea, and out of it. For such is the inscription: "James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes, which are scattered abroad, greeting." No expression can be more general, than "the twelve tribes." There is not any limitation, restraining it to christians, or believers in Jesus. Nor does he wish them grace or peace from Jesus Christ. It is only a general salutation, or greeting. Indeed he does not dissemble his own character. He calls himself "a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ." He takes upon himself the character of a christian, and perhaps of an apostle. But he does not so characterize those to whom he writes. Nor is there any christian benediction at the end of the epistle.

Nor can I see why "the twelve tribes scattered abroad" should not comprehend those of them in Judea, which were the peculiar charge of the writer. And divers things in the epistle seem to belong to them especially. He means therefore the people of the twelve tribes every where, in Judea, and out of it.

A large part of the epistle is suitable to christians. But there are divers paragraphs, that must be understood to be addressed to unbelieving Jews, particularly, ch. v. 1—6. as

<sup>1</sup> —— fidelibus omnibus Judæis, cujuscumque tribus sint, per orbem terrarum dispersis. Bez. ad cap. i. 1. <sup>m</sup> Scripsit, Paulo, ut videtur, ante mortem, epistolam catholicam Judæis εν διασπορα, Christianam præcipue doctrinam professis. Cav. H. L. in Jacobo.

<sup>n</sup> Ad Judæos maxime Christianismum amplexos, qui usquequaque dispersi degebant. Ubi supr. p. 160. <sup>o</sup> Id est, gente Israëlita qui erant extra Judæam. Gr. ad loc. <sup>p</sup> Crit. Notes upon the N. T. p. 144.

is generally allowed. I think likewise, that the first ten verses of ch. iv. are addressed to unbelieving Jews. Where it is said, "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts, that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not. Ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain. Ye fight, and war." These things could not be said to christians. They must relate to those disturbances, which, some while before the Roman war broke out, were every where among the unbelieving Jews.

I am of opinion, that this way of writing was chosen to abate the offence, which the reproofs, and exhortations, and warnings of the epistle were likely to occasion. St. James writes in a general way. Let all apply to themselves those things, which belong to them. Wall's note upon ch. v. 6, is to this effect, 'This is spoken, not to the christians, but to some rich 'heathens, or infidel Jews, that oppressed and murdered 'them. No christians of those times had any wars, or 'fightings, such as ch. iv 1. or killing, as here: viz. not in 'the time of James, bishop of Jerusalem.'

And says Whitby upon ch. iv. 1, "Whence come wars?" 'This epistle seems to have been written about the eighth 'of Nero, and the sixty-second of Christ, the year before 'the death of James: before which time the Jews had 'great wars and fightings, not only with their neighbours, '[see note upon Matt. xxiv. 6,] but even among them- 'selves, in every city and family, saith Josephus: not 'only in Judea, but in Alexandria, and Syria, and many 'other places.' A very proper note upon the text, as seems to me. And what he says upon the following verses of that chapter, and upon ch. v. 1—6, and in his preface to the epistle, sect. v. and vi. deserves also attentive regard. Where indeed he expressly says, 'Since James writes to the whole twelve tribes, I doubt 'not but those of Palestine must be included.'

Mr. Pyle<sup>a</sup> has spoken clearly to the like purpose in the preface to his paraphrase of this epistle.

I shall now transcribe a part of Venerable Bede's note

<sup>a</sup> These circumstances gave occasion to this apostle, the residentiary of the circumcision in Judea, to indite this epistle partly to the infidel, and partly to the believing Jews.—It was directed to the Jews and Jewish converts of the dispersion. Yet, as that to the Hebrews was intended for the general benefit of all the scattered tribes, though directed to the natives of the holy land; so, no doubt, this had an equal respect to them, over whom James immediately presided, in the special character of their bishop. Pyle's Paraphrase, Vol. ii. p. 290, 291.

upon the beginning of this epistle. From the words, "scattered abroad," he is led to think of what is said, Acts. viii. 1, that upon occasion of the persecution against the church at Jerusalem, after the death of Stephen, they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles, and says, ' that<sup>r</sup> James ' writes this epistle to those who were scattered abroad, and ' suffered persecution for the sake of righteousness: nor to ' them only, but also to those, who though they had be- ' lieved in Christ, were not careful to be perfect in good ' works, as what follows in the epistle plainly shows: and ' likewise to such as continued unbelieving, and to the utmost ' of their power persecuted those who believed.' Which appears to me very right.

<sup>r</sup> Legimus, occiso a Judæis B. Stephano, quia facta est in illâ die persecutio magna in ecclesiâ, quæ est Hierosolymis, et omnes dispersi sunt per regiones Judææ et Samariæ, præter apostolos. His ergo dispersis, qui persecutionem passi sunt propter justitiam, mittit epistolum. Nec solum his, verum etiam illis, qui, perceptâ fide Christi, necdum operibus perfecti esse curabunt, sicut sequentia epistolæ plane testantur; necnon et eis, qui etiam fidei exortes durabant, quin et ipsam in credentibus quantum valere, persequi ac perturbare studebant. Bed. Expos. super Jacob. Epist.

## CHAP. XVIII.

## ST. PETER.

- I. *His history to the time of our Saviour's ascension.*  
 II. *To the council of Jerusalem, in the year 49.*  
 III. *He goes to Antioch, where he is reproved by St. Paul for dissimulation.* IV. *His travels, and the time of his coming to Rome.* V. *The time of his death.* VI. *Several things, hitherto omitted, or but lightly touched upon.* 1. *His episcopate at Antioch.* 2. *His having been five and twenty years Bishop of Rome.* 3. *His children.* 4. *His wife's martyrdom.* 5. *His absconding at Rome.* 6. *The manner of his crucifixion.* VII. *That he was at Rome, and suffered martyrdom there.*

I. 'THE land of Palestine,' says<sup>a</sup> Cave, 'at and before the coming of our blessed Saviour, was distinguished into three several provinces, Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. This last was divided into the Upper and the Lower. In the Upper, called also Galilee of the Gentiles, within the division belonging to the tribe of Naphtali, stood Bethsaida, formerly an obscure and inconsiderable village, till lately re-edified<sup>b</sup> and enlarged by Philip the tetrarch, and in honour of Julia daughter of Augustus, called by him Julias. It was situated upon the banks of the sea of Galilee, called also the sea of Tiberias, and the lake of Genesareth, which<sup>c</sup> was about forty furlongs in breadth, and a hundred in length, and had a wilderness on the other side, called the desert of Bethsaida, whither our Saviour used often to retire.'

At this place was born<sup>d</sup> Simon, surnamed Cephas, or Petros, Petrus, Peter, signifying a stone or rock. He was a fisherman upon the fore-mentioned lake or sea: as was also, in all probability, his father Jonas, Jonah, or John. He had a brother, named Andrew. Which was the oldest of the two is not certain. For concerning this there were different opinions among the ancients. Epiphanius<sup>e</sup> sup-

<sup>a</sup> Life of St. Peter, sect. i.

<sup>b</sup> Joseph. Antiq. l. 18. cap. 3. al. 2. in

<sup>c</sup> Id. de B. J. l. 3. cap. 10. al. 18.

<sup>d</sup> John i. 44.

<sup>e</sup> H. 51. num. xvii.

posed Andrew to be the elder. But according to Chrysostom,<sup>f</sup> Peter was the first-born. So likewise<sup>g</sup> Bede, and<sup>h</sup> Cassian, who even makes Peter's age the ground of his precedence among the apostles. And Jerom himself has expressed himself in the like manner, saying, 'that<sup>i</sup> the keys were given to all the apostles alike, and the church was built upon all of them equally. But for preventing dissension, precedency was given to one. John might have been the person. But he was too young. And Peter was preferred upon account of his age.'

St. John<sup>k</sup> has informed us of the first acquaintance of Simon Peter with Jesus, to whom he was introduced by his brother Andrew. "He findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him: We have found the Messiah. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said: Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas. Thou shalt be called Cephas."

Undoubtedly, they had been from the beginning among those, who are said to have "looked for the kingdom of God, and waited for redemption in Israel." Andrew had received Jesus as the Messiah. And his brother Simon readily concurred in the same belief and profession. They had heard John, and, as may be supposed, had been baptized by him, as all Jews in general were. Being from his testimony, and by personal conversation with Jesus, convinced, that he was the Messiah, it is likely, that henceforward they often came to him, and heard him, and saw some of the miracles done by him. We may take it for granted, that they were present at the miracle at Cana in Galilee, it being expressly said, that "Jesus and his disciples were invited to the marriage solemnity" in that place, John ii. 1, 2. It is also said, ver. 11, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory.

<sup>f</sup> Hom. in Matt. 58. al. 59. T. VII. p. 586. D.

<sup>g</sup> In Evang. Joann. cap. i.

<sup>h</sup> Interroganti ergo Domino Jesu Christo, quem eum crederent—respondit primus apostolorum Petrus, unus utique pro omnibus. Idem enim unius habuit responsio, quod habeat [f. habebat] omnium fides. Sed primum debuit respondere, ut idem esset ordo responsionis, qui erat honoris, et ipse antecederet confessione, qui antecederat. Cassian. de Incarn. l. 3. cap. 12. ap. Bib. P. P. tom. VII.

<sup>i</sup> At dicis, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant; et ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut, capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Joannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat: ne adhuc adolescens, ac pene puer, progressæ ætatis hominibus præferretur. Adv. Jovin. l. i. T. IV. p. 168.

<sup>k</sup> Ch. i. 35—42.

And his disciples believed on him :” that is, were confirmed in the persuasion, that he was the Messiah.

The call of Andrew and Peter to a stated attendance on Jesus is recorded by<sup>1</sup> three evangelists. Their father, Jonas, seems to have been dead. For there is no mention of him, as there is of Zebedee, when his two sons were called. It is only said of Andrew and Peter, that when Jesus called them, “they left their nets, and followed him.” At that time Jesus made them a magnificent promise. “Follow me,” said he, “and I will make you fishers of men.” ‘In time you will be qualified by me to gain men, and to recover them, in great numbers, from ignorance and error, folly and vice, and form them to just sentiments in religion, and the practice of virtue.’

From this time they usually attended on our Lord. And<sup>m</sup> when he completed the number of his apostles, they were put among them.

Having before written the history of St. John at large, I need not be so particular in that of Peter, because these two apostles were much together. However, I intend to take notice of the most remarkable things in his life, especially after our Saviour’s ascension.

Simon Peter was married when called by our Lord to attend upon him. And upon occasion of that alliance, as it seems, had removed from Bethsaida to Capernaum, where was his wife’s family. Upon<sup>n</sup> her mother our Saviour in a very gracious manner wrought a great miracle of healing.

And I suppose, that when our Lord “left Nazareth, and came and dwelled at Capernaum,” (as mentioned Matt. iv. 13,) he made Peter’s house<sup>o</sup> the place of his usual abode, when he was in those parts. I think we have a proof of it in the history just taken notice of. When Jesus came out of the synagogue at Capernaum, “he entered into Simon’s house,” Luke iv. 38. Comp. Mark i. 29, which is well paraphrased by Dr. Clarke: ‘Now when Jesus came out of the synagogue, he went home to Peter’s house.’ And there it was that the people resorted unto him in the evening, Luke iv. 40; Matt. viii. 16; Mark i. 32—34.

Another proof of this we have in a history which is in St. Matthew only, ch. xvii. 24—27, of our Lord’s paying at

<sup>1</sup> Matt. iv. 18—20; Mark i. 16—18; Luke v. 1—9.

<sup>m</sup> Matt. x. 1—4; Mark iii. 13—19; Luke vi. 12—16.

<sup>n</sup> Matt. viii. 14, 15; Mark i. 29—31; Luke iv. 38, 39.

<sup>o</sup> It is called “Peter’s house,” Matt. viii. 14. “Simon’s house,” Luke iv. 38. “The house of Simon and Andrew,” Mark i. 29.

Capernaum the tribute-money for the use of the temple, and his directing Peter, when he had found a piece of money, in the manner there prescribed, to pay it for both of them. The text is to this purpose. "And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received the tribute-money, came to Peter, and said: Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him."——The beginning of that account at ver. 24, is thus paraphrased by Dr. Clarke. 'Now when they were come home to Capernaum, where Jesus used to dwell, the officers appointed to gather the yearly offering for the service of the temple came to Peter.'

After the miracle of the five loaves, and two fishes, "straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him to the other side, whilst he sent the multitudes away." In their passage they met with a contrary wind. "In the fourth watch of the night," near morning, "Jesus came toward them, walking on the sea." And there not being yet light enough to know who he was, they were affrighted, thinking it had been an apparition, and cried out for fear. Jesus then spake to them, and they knew him. After which follows a particular concerning Peter, related by St. Matthew only. "Peter <sup>p</sup> answered him, and said: Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus. But when he saw the sea boisterous, he was afraid: and beginning to sink, he cried, saying: Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him.——And when he was come into the ship, the wind ceased." Peter at first presumed too much upon the strength of his faith, and was forward to show his zeal. However, this must in the end have been of use to confirm his faith. He had here great and sensible experience of the knowledge, as well as the power of Jesus. As soon as his faith failed, our Lord suffered him to sink. And upon his calling for help, Jesus immediately stretched out his hand, and saved him.

The next day our Lord preached in the synagogue at Capernaum, as related by St. John, ch. vi. 24—65, where many, who expected from the Messiah a worldly kingdom, were offended at his discourse. And it is said, ver. 66—69, "From that time many of his disciples," who had hitherto followed him, and professed faith in him, "went back, and



walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve : Will ye also go away ? Then Simon Peter answered him : Lord, to whom should we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we know, and are sure, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.”

Some time after this, when our Lord had an opportunity of private conversation with the disciples, he inquired of them what men said of him, and then, whom they thought him to be ? “ Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Matt. xvi. 13—16. So far likewise in Mark viii. 27—29, and Luke ix. 18—20. Then follows in Matthew, ver. 17—19. “ And Jesus answered, and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona : for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven.” That is, ‘ It is not a ‘ partial affection for me, thy master, nor a fond and inconsiderate regard to the judgment of others, for whom thou ‘ hast a respect, that has induced thee to think thus of me. ‘ But it is a just persuasion formed in thy mind by observing the great works which thou hast seen me do by the ‘ power of God, in the confirmation of my mission and ‘ doctrine,’ “ And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church.—And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” By which many interpreters suppose, that<sup>9</sup> our Lord promised to Peter, that he should have the honour of beginning to preach the gospel, after his resurrection, to Jews and Gentiles, and of receiving them into the church. If so, that is personal. Nevertheless, what follows : “ And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.” This, I say, must have been the privilege of all the apostles. For the like things are expressly said to them, Luke xxii. 29, 30, John xx. 21—23. Moreover, all the apostles concurred with Peter in the first preaching both to Jews and Gentiles. As he was president in the college of the apostles, it was very fit, and a thing of course, that he should be primarily

<sup>9</sup> Dr. Clarke is very singular in his paraphrase of that text. Matt. xvi. 18, ‘ You shall be the first preacher of my true religion to the Gentile world.’ And ver. 19, ‘ You shall first open the kingdom of the Messiah, and make the ‘ first publication of the gospel to the Gentiles.’ Upon both verses also referring to Acts x. When I first observed this, I was surprised. Nor could I see the ground of it. But now I guess, that he confined this personal privilege to Peter’s first preaching to Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, because Peter was then alone, and none of the apostles were there with him : whereas after the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, all the apostles were present with him. Acts ii. 14, “ But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lift up his voice.”—

concerned in the first opening of things. The confession, now particularly before us, was made by him. But it was in answer to a question that had been put to all. And he spoke the sense of all the apostles, and in their name. I suppose this to be as true in this instance, as in the other, before taken notice of, which is in John vi. 68, 69.

In the account which St. John has given of our Saviour's washing the disciples' feet, Peter's modesty and fervour are conspicuous, John xiii. 1—10.

When<sup>r</sup> the Jewish officers were about to apprehend our Lord, "Peter having a sword, drew it, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear." Our Lord having checked Peter, touched the servant's ear, and healed him. So great is Jesus every where!

They that laid hold of Jesus, led him away to the house of Caiaphas. The rest of the disciples now forsook their Master, and fled. "But Peter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants to see the end." Here Peter thrice disowned his Lord, peremptorily denying that he was one of his disciples, or had any knowledge of him, as related by<sup>s</sup> all the evangelists. For which he soon after humbled himself, and wept bitterly.

We do not perceive that Peter followed our Lord any farther, or that he at all attended the crucifixion. It is likely that he was under too much concern of mind to appear in public, and that he chose retirement, as most suitable to his present temper and circumstances.

On<sup>t</sup> the first day of the week, early in the morning, when Mary Magdalene, and other women came to the sepulchre, bringing the sweet spices which they had prepared, "they saw an angel, who said unto them, Be not affrighted. Ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen.—Go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead:" as in Matthew. "Tell his disciples, and Peter:" as in Mark. "And behold he goes before you into Galilee." That was a most gracious disposal of Providence, to support the disciples, Peter in particular, under their great affliction.

Our Lord first showed himself to Mary Magdalene, and afterwards to some other women. On the same day likewise on which he arose from the dead, he showed himself

<sup>r</sup> John xviii. 10, 11; Matt. xxvi. 51—54; Mark xiv. 46, 47; Luke xxii. 50, 51.

<sup>s</sup> Matt. xxvi. 57—71; Mark xiv. 53—72; Luke xxii. 54—62; John xviii. 15—27.

<sup>t</sup> Matt. xxviii; Mark xvi; Luke xxiv; John xx.

to Peter, though the circumstances of this appearance are nowhere related. However it is evident from Luke xxiv. 33, 34. For when the two disciples who had been at “Emmaus, returned to Jerusalem, they found the eleven gathered together, and those that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and has appeared unto Simon.” That must be the same appearance which is mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 5, “and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve.” And it has been observed, that as Mary Magdalene was the first woman, so<sup>u</sup> Peter was the first man to whom Jesus showed himself after he was risen from the dead.

In the twenty-first chapter of St. John’s gospel are some appearances of our Lord to his disciples, in which Peter is greatly interested, to which the attentive reader is referred. Our Lord there graciously affords Peter an opportunity of making a threefold profession of love for him: which he accepts, and renews to him the apostolical commission, and as it were re-instates him in his high and important office: requiring him, as the best testimony of love for his Lord, to feed his sheep with fidelity and tenderness. And notwithstanding his late unsteadiness, our Lord encourageth this disciple to hope, that in his future conduct he would set an example of resolution and fortitude under great difficulties, and at length glorify God by his death, in the service to which he had been appointed.

As we have now proceeded in the history of this apostle to the time of our Lord’s ascension, it may be worth the while to look back, and observe those things in the gospels, which imply his peculiar distinction, or at least are honourable to him.

By Mark ch. v. 37, and Luke viii. 51, we are assured, that Peter was one of the three disciples whom our Lord admitted to be present at the raising of Jairus’s daughter. That particular is not mentioned by Matthew, ch. ix. 18–26. From all the first three evangelists we know, that Peter was one of the three whom our Lord took up with him into the mountain, where he was gloriously transformed, Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28. He was also one of the three whom our Lord took with him apart from the other disciples, when he retired to prayer, a little before his last sufferings. As we know from Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33. But that particular is omitted by Luke, ch. xxii. 39–46.

<sup>u</sup> — αλλ’ ἐν ἀνδράσι τῶν πρώτων, τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ποθὲν τι εἶεν. Chrys. in 1 Cor. hom. 38. Tom. X.

And if it might not be reckoned too minute and particular, I would observe some things of this kind mentioned by one evangelist only.

There are several such things deserving notice in St. Matthew. 1. In the catalogue of the apostles, Matthew only <sup>v</sup> calls Peter “chief,” or “the first,” ch. x. 2. He only has the account of Peter’s desiring to come to Christ upon the water; and what follows, ch. xiv. 28–31. 3. He alone has recorded what our Lord said to Peter, when he gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, ch. xvi. 16–19. 4. He only relates our Lord’s paying the tribute-money for Peter, ch. xvii. 24–27. 5. He likewise says that after Peter had denied Christ, “he wept bitterly,” ch. xxvi. 75.

In St. Mark are chiefly two things to be observed, as honourable to Peter. The first is, that he was one of the four apostles to whom our Lord addressed himself, when he foretold the destruction of the temple, and the calamities attending it, Mark xiii. 3. The other is, that in the message, sent by the angel to the disciples after our Lord’s resurrection, Peter is particularly named, ch. xvi. 7.

In St. Luke are these things remarkable. First, that when our Lord warned Peter of his danger, he also assured him, “he had prayed for him that his faith might not fail,” Luke xxii. 31, 32. Secondly, we perceive from St. Luke that our Lord appeared to Peter in particular on the day of his resurrection, though the circumstances of that appearance are not recorded, ch. xxiv. 33, 34.

In St. John’s gospel are divers things honourable to Peter. 1. The profession of faith in Christ, related John vi. 67–69. 2. Peter’s remarkable humility, expressed in an unwillingness that Jesus should wash his feet, with our Lord’s particular discourse to him, ch. xiii. 6–10. 3. Peter’s zeal in cutting off the ear of the high priest’s servant is related by other evangelists. But St. John only mentions Peter by name, ch. xviii. 10. 4. It is, I think, honourable to Peter, that when he and John went together to the sepulchre, John, only stooping down, looked in: but Peter went in, and searched the sepulchre. After which John also went in, ch. xx. 4–8. 5. St. John only mentions Peter’s faith and zeal in “casting himself into the sea,” to go to Christ, ch. xxi. 7. 6. Our Lord’s discourse with Peter concerning his love to him, and his particular, repeated charge to “feed his sheep,” ver. 15–17. 7. Our Lord’s predicting to Peter his martyrdom, and the manner of it, ver. 18, 19.

<sup>v</sup> Πρωτος Σιμων ὁ λεγομενος Πητρος.

It is observable, that Matthew and John, the two apostles, have mentioned more of these prerogatives of Peter than the other two evangelists. We may hence conclude, that the apostles, when illuminated by the Spirit with the knowledge of the true nature of Christ's kingdom, were quite free from envy, and that Peter was not assuming and arrogant among his brethren.

It may be here observed likewise, that as our sacred historians were not envious, so neither were they fond and partial. The several advantages and virtues of Peter are recorded by some only. But his fault in denying Christ, when under prosecution, is related by all.

II. In a short time after our Lord's ascension, Peter, as president in the college of the apostles, proposed, that in the room of Judas another should be chosen out of the men that had accompanied them during the time that Jesus had been with them. And when two such had been nominated, and they had by prayer appealed to God, "who knows the hearts of all men, the lot fell upon Matthias. And he was numbered with the eleven apostles." Acts i. 15—26.

I have here, and elsewhere, spoken of Peter as presiding among the apostles, or having a primacy of order. For it appears in what has been just mentioned, and in other things related afterwards. And it is observable, that in all the catalogues of the twelve apostles Peter is named first, though there is some variety in the order of the names of the other apostles. I might add, that<sup>w</sup> wherever the three disciples, Peter, James, and John, are mentioned together, Peter is always put first, though there is a variety in the order of the names of those two brothers, James and John, sons of Zebedee. He is also first placed, where<sup>x</sup> four are named, Andrew being added to them. And likewise where<sup>y</sup> only he and John are mentioned. There is an exception in Gal. ii. 9, where the order is James, Cephas, and John. The reason of which I take to be, that<sup>z</sup> James there mentioned, then presided in the church of Jerusalem, where Paul then was. I place below<sup>a</sup> the thoughts

<sup>w</sup> See Mark v. 37, and Luke viii. 51; Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28; Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33.

<sup>x</sup> See Mark xiii. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Luke xxii. 8; Acts iii. 1; iv. 13, 19; viii. 14.

<sup>z</sup> See before, p. 167.

<sup>a</sup> Ordinis primatum quod attinet, illum a Petro abjudicari non posse censemus, si qua fides evangelio. Neque ulla ratio assignari potest, cur Apostolorum in indiculo a tribus Evangelistis exhibitio, Petrus semper ordinem ducat. Quippe solâ necessitate numerandi non scribitur Matthæo 'primus Petrus:' (sic enim sequens secundus dici debuisset:) sed quia in divino hoc collegio præsidem agebat. Eo quidem munere functum fuisse, ubique Scriptura testatur.

of Basnage concerning this point, who speaks to the like purpose: without denying the equal dignity of the apostles, or ascribing to Peter any jurisdiction over them. For which there is not any the least foundation either in the Gospels, or the Acts.

On the day of Pentecost next ensuing, the promised gift of the Holy Ghost came down upon the apostles and their company. And upon this occasion "Peter, standing up with the eleven," preached to a great number of people assembled about the apostles, and asserted the resurrection of Jesus, and with such force, that about three thousand were converted and baptized, Acts ii. 14—47.

Afterwards Peter and John healed a poor man at the temple, who had been lame from his birth, a well known person, forty years of age. And many being gathered about them, Peter made an affecting discourse, whereby many were awakened and convinced. And in a short time after this, the number of believers at "Jerusalem was<sup>b</sup> about five thousand," ch. iii. and iv. 4. But the Jewish priests and rulers were much offended. And whilst Peter and John were speaking to the people, their officers came and laid hold on them. And it being then evening, they put them in prison till the next day. On the morrow therefore they were brought before the council. Having been examined, they were at length dismissed, with a charge not to preach any more in the name of Jesus, and were severely threatened if they did, ch. iv. 1—22.

The number of believers being much increased, and many being in low circumstances, "some who were possessed of houses, or lands, sold them, and brought the

Aliorum sane Apostolorum ordinem mutavit Lucas in Actis, primum tamen Petro locum servavit: Petrus, Jacobus, Joannes. Quid, nonne præsidis functio fuit, surgere in medio discipulorum, eosque monere, ut in proditoris Judæ locum alium sufficerent Apostolum? Si ordinis causâ non præerat Apostolis, cur Petrus surgens cum undecim Judæos miraculum linguarum stupentes alloquitur.—Cur etiam dum Joannis erat in comitatu Petrus, et claudum sanandum alloquitur, et senatum Hierosolymitanum compellat, et Simoni Mago minuitur? Rationis est quidem et consuetudinis, ut legatorum primus orationem habeat, quomodo Paulus, qui Barnabam eminebat, præibat in loquendo. Ut ad pauca redeamus, is Petro collatus honor est, ut primus et in Judæis, et in Gentibus, Ecclesiæ fundamenta jaceret. Qui longe maximus honos principem Apostolorum decuit, nec a præsidis munere divelli potest. Annon nobiliores Apostolatûs functiones honoratiori competeabant? Basnag. ann. 31. num. lxxv.

<sup>b</sup> How that five thousand in Acts iv. 4, ought to be understood, was shown at p. 66 of Vol. v. I shall now add here the words of Seueur. Ainsi croissoit l'Eglise Chrétienne parmi les Juifs. Et elle se montoit bien alors à cinq mille personnes. A. C. 35. Histoire de l'Eglise, et de l'Empire, Vol. I. p. 133.

prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet. And distribution was made to every man according as he had need." But a certain man named Ananias, and Sapphira his wife, when they had sold a possession, brought a part of the price, keeping back the rest, though they declared it to be the whole price. For this they were reprov'd by Peter, and were charg'd with having lied to God himself, who acted by the apostles. At this reproof Ananias and Sapphira were both struck dead by the immediate hand of God, in a small space of time, one after the other, ch. iv. 34—37; v. 1—11. We have here, as seems to me, a proof, that Peter now presided in the assembly of the apostles, and the whole church of Jerusalem.

"And," after this, "by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people——insomuch that they brought forth the sick in the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a multitude out of the cities round about Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them that were vexed with unclean spirits. And they were healed every one." Ch. v. 12—16.

I put this in the history of St. Peter, as he has a share in it. But I do not think that all the miracles here spoken of were wrought by his hands, or by his shadow passing by. It seems that many of these miracles were wrought by other apostles, as hinted, or expressly said, at the beginning of the citation, in ver 12. In a word, there were now miracles wrought at Jerusalem in great numbers, by all and every one of the apostles. This may be also farther argued hence, that hereupon all the apostles were taken up, as is said ver. 17, 18, "Then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him, and were filled with indignation. And they laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison." The event may be seen in what follows, ch. v. 17—42. However, I am willing to allow, that there were no miracles wrought by the shadow of any of the apostles, except Peter's. This<sup>c</sup> seems to be most agreeable to St. Luke's expressions.

<sup>c</sup> Omnibus accurate perpensis, illorum opinionis magis sumus, qui soli Petro id auctoritatis concessum fuisse putant, ut ipsius umbrâ ægroti a morbis suis recrearentur. Neque id obscure Lucas indicat. Præmissis enim Apostolorum prodigiis, subinde hoc addit. 'In plateas efferebant ægrotos, et ponebant in lectis, ut venientis Petri vel umbra inumbraret aliquem eorum.' Cur non dixit, 'ut prætereuntium Apostolorum vel umbra,' si facultatem ejusmodi a Christo nacta fuit? &c. Basnag. Ann. 31. n. xviii.

Upon the death of Stephen “there arose a great persecution against the church that was at Jerusalem:” inso-much that all the believers in general “were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. Then Philip,” one of the seven, “went down to Samaria, and preached Christ to them.” And many of the people there believed. “Now when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John,” that they might confer upon them the gift of the Holy Ghost. Which they did by prayer, and laying on of their hands. Here Peter reprov'd Simon of Samaria as he is called: who himself was a believer for a while, but had given proofs of insincerity. These two apostles then returned to Jerusalem, and in their way thither “preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans.” ch. viii. 1–25.

St. Paul, who informs us of his return to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, has assured us, that he then saw Peter and James, and no other of the apostles. Gal. i. 18, 19. And St. Luke having given the history of St. Paul's opposition to the disciples, and of his conversion, and return from Damascus to Jerusalem, says, that “Barnabas brought him to the apostles,” Acts ix. 1–30. These two accounts are easily reconciled. Paul saw only Peter and James. But they received him in the name, and with the approbation of all the apostles, and thus he had communion with them.

It follows in St. Luke's history, Acts ix. 31, “Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.” This rest, as was formerly shown, commenced in the year 40, and probably continued a year or more. This season, as we may well suppose, was improved by all the apostles, and by Peter, in particular. Of whom it is said, that he passed through all parts of the country, “and came down also to the saints that dwelt at Lydda.” Here, in the name of Jesus Christ, he healed Æneas, who had the palsy, and had kept his bed eight years. Whilst he was in that place, a christian woman, named Tabitha, died at Joppa, which was not far off. The disciples therefore sent to Peter desiring him without delay to come to them. Which he did, and there restored her to life. “And he tarried many days at Joppa, with one Simon, a tanner,” ch. ix. 32–43.



Whilst Peter was there, Cornelius of "Cæsarea by the sea-side," (the city where the Roman governor had his residence,) a centurion, a worshipper of God, but not of the house of Israel, nor a Jewish proselyte, had a vision; wherein he was directed by an angel, to send to Joppa for Simon, whose surname was Peter; from whom he would receive farther information in the things of religion. When the vision was over, he called two of his servants, and a pious soldier, and sent them to Joppa. The day after, as they drew near the city, Peter went up to the top of the house to pray, about the sixth hour of the day, or noon. There he fell into a trance or ecstasy, and had a vision. A vessel descended, wherein were all sorts of living creatures, wild and tame, clean and unclean. "And there came a voice to him, saying, Kill and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord. For I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. —While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them. —On the morrow Peter went away with them, and certain brethren from Joppa, six in number, accompanied him." The next day they arrived at Cæsarea, and entered into the house of Cornelius, where were also many others his relations, and intimate friends, whom Cornelius had invited to come thither. "Peter said unto them, Ye know, how that it is an unlawful thing for a Jew to keep company, or to come unto one of another nation. But God has shown me, that I should not call any man common or unclean." —Whilst Peter was preaching, and speaking to them the things concerning Jesus Christ, and before he had finished, "the Holy Ghost fell on all of them that heard the word. And they of the circumcision, which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. —Peter therefore commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days." ch. x.

Thus the door of faith or the kingdom of heaven, or of the Messiah, was opened to Gentiles, and they were received into the church of God. And, if I may say it, God now cleansed all Gentiles, and showed with full evidence and divine attestations, that all men of every nation, who became worshippers of God, and believed in Jesus, were accepted

of him, as his people, and the members of his church, and in the way of salvation, without circumcision, or taking upon them the observation of the rituals of the law of Moses.

While Peter tarried at Cæsarea, the apostles and brethren that were in Judea, heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying: "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." But Peter gave them an account of the transaction from the beginning, and all were satisfied. "When they heard those things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying; Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

An opinion has obtained among christians in late ages, that Cornelius was a proselyte of the gate. Which opinion is founded upon a supposition, that there were among the Jews two sorts of proselytes: some called proselytes of the covenant, or of righteousness, who were circumcised: and others, called proselytes of the gate: who, though they were not circumcised, observed some things, not obligatory in themselves, as is supposed, in order to facilitate commerce between the Jews and them. What those things were, or supposed to be, I do not now inquire.

However, for clearing up this matter I would observe, that there was but one sort of proselytes among the Jews: and that Cornelius was not a proselyte, but a Gentile.

First. There was but one sort of proselytes among the Jews. They were circumcised. So they became Jews by religion, and were admitted to eat the passover, and to partake of all religious privileges, as the Jews by descent did. They were called "strangers, or proselytes within the gates," and "sojourners," as they were allowed to dwell, or sojourn among the people of Israel. And they were so called, because they could not possess land. For according to the law of Moses, all the land of Canaan was to be given to the twelve tribes of Israel, the descendants of the patriarch Jacob. Which enables us to discern the propriety of the expression just mentioned.

What has been now said, may be illustrated by some texts: which, though well known, shall be alleged here.

Exod. xii. 48, "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised. And then let him come near, and keep it. And he shall be as one born in the land. 49, One law

shall be to him that is home-born, and to the stranger that sojourneth among you."

Lev. xvii. 8, "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers, which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt-offering, or sacrifice——ver. 13,——children of Israel, neither any stranger, that sojourneth among you." The same again, ver. 15, "One of your own country, or a stranger."

Numb. ix. 14, "And if a stranger shall sojourn among you, and will keep the passover to the Lord——ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger, and for him that was born in the land."

Numb. xv. 15, "One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you——as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. 16, One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth among you."

In all these places by "stranger," and "stranger that sojourneth among you," I suppose to be meant, men circumcised, according to the law of Moses.

Perhaps, it may be here asked, Could none, then, dwell among the Israelites in the land of Canaan, but proselytes, or circumcised men? To which I answer. It seems to me, that no other had the privilege of a settled abode, or residence there, that is, to sojourn in the land. However, I think, there must have been an exception for travellers, passing through the country, even though they were idolaters, and for some, whose traffic was needful, and therefore allowed of. As Patrick says upon Deut. xiv. 21, 'There were some called Nocherim, which we here translate 'aliens: who were mere Gentiles, and not suffered to have 'an habitation among them, but only to come and go in their 'traffic with them.'

And, if I mistake not, an argument of the apostle may be hence illustrated; Eph. ii. 13, "But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who some time were afar off, are made nigh," very nigh, even to a coalescence, "by the blood of Christ." Ver. 19, "Now therefore ye are no more strangers, and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." The apostle alludes to the state of things in the Jewish commonwealth. "Now therefore," says he, "ye are no more strangers, and foreigners." Those are not terms of distance, as they seem to be in our translation, and as some have supposed, but of nearness. They are expressive of all the favour and privilege which could be vouchsafed to any, not of the natural seed of Israel, be-

fore the manifestation of the gospel. “ Now <sup>d</sup> therefore ‘ ye are no longer guests.’ Such you might be, and be ‘ well, and civilly entertained <sup>e</sup> for a while, though you ‘ were aliens, and sojourners, as the Jewish proselytes ‘ were who might live in the country, but had few privileges, they not being allowed to possess land, nor to have ‘ any share in the government of it; “ but ye are fellow- ‘ citizens with the saints :” you have equal rights of citizenship with the people, and natives of the country; “ and ‘ are God’s domestics.” You are brought into the court ‘ and family of the king of the country, and are admitted ‘ to his presence, and to attend upon his person.’ The whole of this is much the same with what is said, 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10, and Rev. i. 6. I place below a Latin version <sup>f</sup> of this text, which appears to me to be right.

Proselyte is a word of Greek original, equivalent to stranger, long since become a technical word, denoting a convert to the Jewish religion, or a Jew by religion.

In the fourth commandment they are called “ thy stranger within thy gates.” Exod. xx. 10, and Deut. v. 14.

According to the Jewish way of reckoning, agreeably to the law of Moses, there were three sorts of men in the world: Israelites, called also home-born, or natives; strangers within their gates, and aliens. So Deut. xiv. 21, “ Ye shall not eat any thing that dieth of itself. Thou shalt give it to the stranger that is in thy gates, that he may eat it: or thou mayest sell it to an alien.” Or, otherwise, there were two sorts of men, circumcised and uncircumcised, Jews and Gentiles, or Heathens.

A proselyte, as before said, is a man circumcised according to the law of Moses, or a Jew by religion. This is the sense of the word in all the texts of the New Testament, where it is used. Matt. xxiii. 15, “ Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte.” Acts ii. 10, “ Jews and proselytes.” Acts vi. 5, “ Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch.” Ch. xiii. 43, “ Religious proselytes.” There never was any doubt about preaching to these, and receiving them into the church. Such were among St. Peter’s hearers

<sup>d</sup> Ἄρα οὐν οὐκετι ἐπε ξένοι, καὶ παροικοὶ ἀλλὰ συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ οἰκεῖοι τῆς θεοῦ.

<sup>e</sup> The Greek word ξένος, like the Latin word ‘ hospes,’ signifies both a ‘ host’ and a ‘ guest,’ an entertainer, and him that is entertained, et qui domo suscipit, et qui suscipitur. In Rom. xvi. 23, it is used in the former, here in the latter sense.

<sup>f</sup> Nemp̄e igitur non amplius estis hospites, et inquilini, sed concives sanctorum, ac domestici Dei.

of his first sermon. And one such person at least was among the seven deacons in the church of Jerusalem.

In this sense the word is always understood by ancient christian writers. Says Bede, in his exposition of the second chapter of the Acts: ‘ They <sup>ε</sup> called those proselytes, that ‘ is, strangers, who being of Gentile original, had embraced ‘ circumcision, and judaism.’ To the like purpose <sup>h</sup> another Latin writer, of the ninth century, in his commentary upon St. Matthew’s gospel. So likewise <sup>i</sup> Theodoret, and <sup>k</sup> Euthymius. Nor do I believe, that the notion of two sorts of Jewish proselytes can be found in any christian writer before the fourteenth century, or later.

Cornelius is not called a proselyte in the New Testament. It is said of him, that <sup>l</sup> he was “ a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house :” that is, he was a truly good man. What is there said of him is only his personal character. Here is not any thing, denoting a religious denomination, as some have thought. And it is plain, that notwithstanding his piety, he was an alien. Peter would not have conversed with him, if he had not been directed by an express command. The reason is, that there is no appointment in the law of Moses for receiving any men into covenant with God or to communion with his people, but by circumcision : which implied an obligation to obey all the Laws of the Mosaic institution.

Let us now go over, and observe the most remarkable particulars of this history.

Cornelius, and his friends, are called Gentiles, ch. x. 45 ; ch. xi. 1, and 18 ; ch. xv. 7, that is, ‘ gojim,’ a Hebrew word, very frequent in the Old Testament, and rendered by us “ nations,” or “ heathen,” or “ heathens.” And in our version of the New Testament likewise is several times

<sup>ε</sup> ‘ Judæi quoque et proselyti. ] Proselytos, id est, advenas, nuncupabant eos, qui, de Gentibus originem ducentes, circumcissionem et Judaïsimum eligere malebant. Non solum ergo, inquit, [f. inquit,] qui naturâ suâ Judæi ex diverso orbe convenerant ; verum et ii, qui de præputio nati, eorum adhæsere ritui. Bed. Expos. in Act. Ap. cap. ii.

<sup>h</sup> Proselytus dicebatur Græce advena ; quia de alia gente ad legem ipsorum convertebatur, ut fuit Jethro, et Achior. Et multa millia virorum fuerunt, qui de Gentibus circumcisi fuerunt, et Deum cœli crediderunt. Christian. Druthmar. Grammatic. Exp. in Matth. ap. Bib. PP. Tom. XV. p. 156. A.

<sup>i</sup> Οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθοτες, καὶ κατὰ τὰς σὲς νόμους ποθησαντες πολιτευσθαι, τὴν ἀδικὸν παρ’ αὐτῶν σφαγὴν ὑπομένουσιν προσηλυτὸς γὰρ τὴς τῆς ὀνομασε. Theod. in Ps. xciii. al. xciv. ver. 6. Tom. I. p. 775. Conf. Suid. V. Προσηλυτος.

<sup>k</sup> Proselytum vero Judæi appellabant, qui ex Gentili effectus fuisset Judæus. Euthym. in Ps. xciii. p. 396. ap. Bib. PP. T. XIX.

<sup>l</sup> Ἐνσεβης καὶ φοβεμένος τὸν θεόν, σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

put "heathen" instead of "the nations," or "the Gentiles." 2 Cor. xi. 26; Gal. ii. 9, ch. iii. 8.

In the next place we take notice of the vessel let down from heaven, and set before Peter. There were in it "all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air:" some of them altogether abominable, and exceeding filthy in the eye of Jews. Hereby are represented the people, who had sent for Peter, though pious, because they were uncircumcised. But it is likely, that herein are also included, and represented, Gentiles of all sorts, men of every nation, all men uncircumcised in general, whether worshippers of God, or not. Ver. 13—16, "And there came a voice to him, saying: Arise, Peter, kill and eat. But Peter said: Not so, Lord, for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time: what God has cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice; and the vessel was received up again into heaven.——"

"What God has cleansed, that call not thou common:" denoting, that those people, which were most impure in Jewish esteem, were now cleansed or to be cleansed, and to be received as pure and holy.

Omitting some other things, in the next place we observe Peter's address at the house of Cornelius, ver. 28; "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to<sup>m</sup> keep company, or to come to a man of another nation." The people, therefore, to whom Peter had been sent, and among whom he now was, were such, as no Jew might converse with, according to the Law of Moses, and their established custom. "A man of another nation:" *αλλοφυλω*: an alien or foreigner. Jerom observes, that<sup>n</sup>

<sup>m</sup> 'Κολλασθαι η προσερχεσθαι αλλοφυλω. By which words is not to be understood, as if a Jew might have no dealing at all with a Gentile, and traffic with them: for it was next to impossible to do otherwise, they living, very many of them, in Heathen cities. And Gentiles came continually, in the way of trade, to Jerusalem, Neh. xiii. 16. What was unlawful, was conversing with Gentiles in near and close society, as the word *κολλασθαι* signifies, and that especially in these two things, "not to eat with them," and "not to go into their houses." And this is that, for which they of the circumcision excepted at Peter upon his return. "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them," ch. xi. 3.' So Lightfoot in his commentary upon the Acts of the apostles, vol. I. p. 844. Where follow other things, relating to this subject, very worthy of observation.

<sup>n</sup> Pro Philistiim semper lxx. alienigenas interpretati sunt, nomen commune pro proprio; que est hodie gens Palæstinorum, quasi Philistinorum. Hieron. in Is. cap. ii. 6. Tom. III. p. 24.

Philistæos autem, ut sæpe diximus, Palæstinos significat, quos alienigenas

though the Greek word signifies in general a man of another nation : the seventy translators of the Old Testament constantly made use of it, to denote the Philistines, or heathen people of the land of Palestine. That observation is repeated by him. And I have transcribed below several of his passages. This character, an alien, or a man of another nation, satisfies us, that the people, to whom Peter was now sent by divine order, had not been before received into the Jewish church, or admitted to communion with them, but were aliens from their commonwealth.

It follows in the same address of Peter : “ But God has showed me, that I should not call any man common or unclean.” Those expressions are as general and comprehensive as any that can be used ; plainly including all mankind, who now were cleansed, or to be cleansed and purified by faith, and received into the church of God without circumcision.

Cornelius having declared the occasion of sending for him, “ Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons : but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” These expressions are as general and comprehensive as the former, including men of all nations, without exception.

The conclusion of St. Peter’s discourse at the house of Cornelius, is this, “ To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” Which, so far as I am able to perceive, is preaching the gospel as clearly as ever it was preached by Paul himself.

“ While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word.” Or, as St. Peter himself expresseth it, rehearsing the matter of Jerusalem, ch. xi. 15, “ As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on all them, as on us at the beginning ;” whereupon Peter ordered them to be baptized, and so received into the church. And, as he says in the defence of himself, “ Forasmuch then, as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ : what was I that I could withstand God ?”

vulgata scribit editio ; quum hic non unius gentis, sed omnium cæterarum gentium vocabulum sit. Id. in Is. xiv. 29. p. 116.

Videamus autem, quid Philisthim, et urbes ejus peccaverint, quos septuaginta semper alienigenas transtulerunt. Ubicumque enim in veteri testamento *αλλοφυλεις*, id est, ‘ alienigenas,’ legimus, non commune nomen omnium externarum gentium, sed proprie Philisthim, qui nunc Palæstini vocantur, accipiendi sunt. Id. in Amos. cap. i. ib. p. 1376.

That very extraordinary manifestation, the coming down of the Holy Ghost immediately from heaven upon these persons, leads us to think, that the transaction at the house of Cornelius was a very important thing, and no less than cleansing the whole Gentile world: or encouraging the preaching of the gospel to them, and receiving them to communion, without the rites of the law. And from this time forward it was not preached to them, as appears from the history in the Acts.

I suppose that what I have now said is agreeable to the sense of all christians in ancient times: who call Cornelius<sup>o</sup> the first-fruits of the Gentiles, and<sup>p</sup> the beginning of the Gentiles. And say, that<sup>q</sup> in him all Gentiles were cleansed and sanctified, and that<sup>r</sup> the living creatures of all kinds, which were in the vessel let down to Peter, and held by four corners, represented all Gentiles throughout the world.

Many learned men of late times make a great difference between preaching the gospel to what they call “devout Gentiles,” or “proselytes of the gate,” and “idolatrous Gentiles.” But I do not perceive, that christians in ancient times had any notion of this. Nor is there any foundation for it in the New Testament. But all men, uncircumcised, whether worshippers of God, or idolatrous, are called Gentiles. That Cornelius, and his family, and friends, are called Gentiles, though pious, has been lately seen. And in

<sup>o</sup> Ex quibus esse arbitror etiam Cornelium illum, qui Cæsariensis ecclesiæ cum iis cum quibus Spiritum Sanctum meruit accipere, primitiæ merito dicitur. Et non solum hujus ecclesiæ, sed fortassis et omnium gentium primitiæ Cornelius appellandus est. Primus enim credidit ex gentibus, et primus Sancto Spiritu repletus est. Et ideo recte primitiæ gentium appellabitur. Origen. in Num. hom. xi. p. 306. T. II. Bened.

<sup>p</sup> Ὅρας ποθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ γίνεται τῶν ἐθνῶν. Chrys. in Act. Ap. hom. 22. T. IX. p. 180.

<sup>q</sup> Sub Apostolis vero, cum ii, qui in Christum ex circumcissione crediderant, eos qui Gentiles erant, dicebanturque præputium, justificationem gratiæ arbitrarentur participes esse non posse, docet B. Apostolus Petrus, quam indiscretus apud Deum uterque sit populus, si in unitatem fidei denuo convenierint. ‘Cum autem,’ inquit, ‘cœpissen loqui,’ &c. De Vocatione Gentium. Lib. II. cap. 18. <sup>r</sup> Etenim Ecclesia necdum erat in gentibus. In Judæâ crediderunt ex Judæis, et putabant——solos se pertinere ad Christum. Missi sunt Apostoli ad gentes, prædicatum est Cornelio.——Discus ille, qui habebat omnia animalia, significabat omnes gentes. Ideo autem quatuor lineis pendebat, quia quatuor sunt partes orbis, unde futuri populi erant. August. Enarr. in Ps. xcvi. num. 13. Tom. IV.

Siquidem cum Sanctus Petrus per visionem omne genus animalium, de baptizando Cornelio, ac perinde de omnibus gentibus doceretur, atque ille immundum et indiscretum cibum Judaicâ observantiâ recusaret, trina ad eum vox facta sit, dicens: quæ Deus mundavit, tu ne commune dixeris. Prosp. ep. ad Rufin. cap. vi. ap. Aug. T. X. in Append. Ed. Bened.



almost innumerable places of St. Paul's epistles the same word is used of such as then were, or had been idolaters.

Nor can I conceive, how there should be an objection against preaching to idolatrous Gentiles in order to convert them from idolatry. It is well known, that the Jewish people were very diligent in making proselytes to their religion. Our Lord himself has taken notice of it, Matt. xxiii. 15. The obstructions given to Paul were not owing to his converting men from idolatry, but to his manner of receiving them. If he had taught, and required them to be circumcised, and keep the law, all had been well. For certain, I think, there could have been no offence taken by any believers from among the Jews, however bigoted. "And I, brethren," says the apostle to the Galatians, "If I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the offence of the cross ceased," Gal. v. 11.

These thoughts, which are now proposed to public consideration, are not new. A thorough examination of this point was occasioned by the *Miscellanea Sacra*, which was published in 1725. And in a few years I came to a full determination. Nor have I concealed my sentiments. They have been communicated to several; and by some they have been approved.

Nor do I make any question, but that others likewise are of the same opinion. I shall therefore here transcribe a paragraph of a letter from my honoured friend, Mr. Joseph Hallet, of Exeter, received from him in the year 1735. 'It is certain fact,' says he, 'that the scripture never mentions the difference between preaching to devout Gentiles, and idolatrous Gentiles, which some do. The original instruction was: "Go, disciple all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19. "Preach the gospel to every creature," Mark xvi. 15. The order in which the apostles were to preach the gospel, was in "Jerusalem, in all Judea, in Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth," Acts i. 8. In these, and all other places, one and the same character comprehends all Gentiles. When St. Peter stuck at preaching the gospel to Cornelius, the plain reason was, because he was uncircumcised. See Acts xi. 3. Neither he at first, nor they that afterwards quarrelled with him, would have any more hesitated to preach to idolaters, than to Cornelius. Only in that case, they must have begun with proving the unity of God; which they had no need to do in the case of Cornelius, since he already believed it.'

And as I have this opportunity, I shall now communicate to the public some other thoughts of Mr. Hallet, relating to the same subject, which I received from him at the same time. ‘ That the decree in Acts xv. relates to the idolatrous ‘ Gentiles in particular, is manifest. Indeed it is demonstrable from ver. 19, where St. James speaks of those, ‘ “ who from among the Gentiles are turned to God.” ‘ Their being “ turned to God ” here is the same as their ‘ becoming christians. They were not turned to God before. And therefore they were (not devout, but) idolatrous ‘ Gentiles. They were plainly of the same sort with the ‘ Thessalonians, who “ turned to God from idols,” 1 Thess. ‘ i. 9, who are acknowledged to be idolatrous Gentiles. ‘ The same character then will prove, that the others were ‘ so too. The same thing is demonstrable from ver. 17. ‘ For the expression, “ all the Gentiles,” can never be ‘ restrained to a few proselytes of the gate. Farther, the ‘ letter of the church of Jerusalem was directed and sent to ‘ the believing Gentiles in Antioch, &c. ver. 23, to decide a ‘ dispute which was raised there. But the dispute there ‘ was about idolatrous Gentiles in particular, ver. 2, 3, 5. ‘ Consequently, the letter must be interpreted to speak of ‘ the same persons. Nay, the church at Antioch was composed of such as had been idolatrous Gentiles. And ‘ therefore the letter must relate to that sort of men. And ‘ when Paul went through Syria, Cilicia, Derbe, Lystra, &c. ‘ (where it is allowed, there were converts from among the ‘ idolatrous Gentiles,) “ he delivered the decrees to them,” ‘ i. e. the said idolatrous Gentiles, to “ keep,” ch. xvi. 1, 4.’ So Mr Hallet.

Dr. Doddridge, in the third volume of his *Family Expositor*, which is upon the Acts of the Apostles, has many acute and judicious observations, relating to this subject. And I am well satisfied, that he intended to write a dissertation concerning Jewish proselytes. Which is also acknowledged by<sup>s</sup> the learned editor of his posthumous volumes : though no such thing has been found among his papers. And in his general introduction to the first epistle of St. Peter, Dr. Doddridge freely declares, ‘ that ‘ there is no sufficient ground to suppose, that there ever ‘ were any such persons, as proselytes of the gate.’ And he thinks, ‘ that what he has suggested in his notes upon ‘ the Acts may convince an attentive reader.’ And indeed I am of the same opinion concerning what he has said in

<sup>s</sup> See the note at the bottom of p. 218, of the sixth volume of the *Family Expositor*.

those notes. For which reason I do not so much regret the loss of the dissertation, as otherwise I should.

Says Sneur, speaking of St. Peter's vision of the sheet : ' God <sup>t</sup> thereby showed unto his servant, that thenceforward ' he would have all the people of the world, without excep- ' tion, called to partake in his gracious covenant in his son ' Jesus Christ, and to the knowledge of salvation by him.' That it was so understood by the primitive christians, we have lately seen. And that this whole transaction was so understood by the apostles, and by the evangelists, their fellow-labourers, is manifest from the sequel of the history in the book of the Acts.

For removing difficulties, and fully clearing up this point, it may be needful to consider that text. Gal. ii. 1, 2, " Then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel, which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain."

Some <sup>u</sup> who contend for the supposition of two sorts of proselytes among the Jews, and think that the gospel was preached several years to such as they call " proselytes of the gate," before it was preached to idolatrous Gentiles ; and understand the decree of the council of Jerusalem to bind those proselytes only, say, that the conversion of idolatrous Gentiles was unknown to the church at Jerusalem, when that decree was made, and explain the above-cited words after this manner : ' That <sup>v</sup> Paul communicated what ' he had preached to the Gentiles, only to James and ' Peter, and John, the three renowned apostles of the ' circumcision, and that under the seal of the greatest se- ' crecy.'

But that cannot be St. Paul's meaning. For most, if not all the converts at Antioch, must have been idolaters. But, supposing for the present, that they had been devout Gentiles ; it is universally allowed, that before the controversy arose at Antioch about circumcising the Gentiles that believed, the gospel had been preached for a good while by

<sup>t</sup> Et puisque Dieu rompoit cette séparation, il montrait à son serviteur, que de-là en avant il vouloit appeler indifféremment tous les peuples du monde à son alliance de grâce en son fils Jésus Christ, et à sa salutaire connoissance. J. Sneur Hist. de l'Eglise, &c. A. C. 41. Tom. I. p. 165.

<sup>u</sup> See Miscellanea Sacra in the Preface, and Essay iv. and Dr. Benson's History of the first planting the Christian Religion, Vol. ii. chap. iii. sect. i. ii. &c.

<sup>v</sup> Miscell. Sacr. Ess. iv. p. 50. Dr. Benson, as before, Vol. ii. p. 52. second edit.

Paul and Barnabas to idolatrous Gentiles in Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and other places : of which a particular account is given Acts xiii. xiv. And presently after, St. Luke, relating the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, says, ch. xv. 3, 4, “ And being brought on their way by the church [of Antioch] they passed through Phenice, and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles : [or heathens :] and they caused great joy to all the brethren. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received by the church, and by the apostles, and elders ; and they declared all things, that God had done with them.” In which must have been included their preaching not only at Antioch in Syria, but also in all the other countries and cities mentioned just before. Of this they gave an account to the church of Jerusalem in general, and particularly to the apostles and elders.

And Acts xv. 12, in the council. “ Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.”

And ver. 25, 26, the apostles and elders, in their epistle, speaking of Barnabas and Paul, say, “ they were men that had hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Intending, as may be reasonably supposed, the dangers, and sufferings, which they had met with, when preaching the gospel to idolaters at Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, and Lystra, of which St. Luke has given an account, Acts xiii. near the end, and ch. xiv. to which St. Paul also refers, 2 Tim. iii. 11. These things Paul and Barnabas, or the brethren that went up with them from Antioch, had related to the church at Jerusalem, and to the apostles and elders. For we hence plainly perceive, that these things were well known there.

That is St. Luke’s history. Let us now observe St. Paul’s own words in this text. “ Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem.—And I went up by revelation, and communicated to them that gospel, which I preach among the Gentiles :” meaning, as seems to me, the church, or the believing brethren there. So say all the best interpreters in general. Dr. Hammond’s paraphrase is in these words : ‘ And by God’s appointment, either first signified, ‘ or afterwards confirmed to me by vision, (such as Paul ‘ had about several matters,) I went up at this time to Jerusalem, and gave the church there an account of my ‘ preaching, and the success of it among the Gentiles. This

‘ I thought fit to do, and yet first to do it to those that were the principal men among them.’ So Hammond. To the like purpose Estius,<sup>w</sup> whom I transcribe below. Le Clerc’s French version is to this purpose. “ And <sup>x</sup> I explained” in public “ to the saints the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles : the which I also did in particular to them who were in reputation.” And Beausobre’s : ‘ I <sup>y</sup> went thither by revelation, and I conferred with the faithful about the gospel, which I preach among the Gentiles. I conferred about it also in particular with those who were most esteemed among them.’<sup>z</sup>

It follows in the same verse : “ Lest by any means I should run, or had run in vain.” That is : ‘ This I thought fit to do, in order to secure the success of my ministry : for removing obstacles in the way of my preaching for the future, and that the minds of converts already made might not be unsettled. With those views I conferred with the believers at Jerusalem in public, and also in private with those who were most esteemed.’

Ver. 3, “ But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.” The apostle’s taking such particular notice of Titus in a letter to christians converted from idolatry, and calling him a Greek, led us to think, that he was originally idolatrous.

Ver. 4, “ And that because of false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty in

<sup>w</sup> ‘ Et contuli cum illis evangelium, quod prædico in Gentibus.’ Augustinus legit : ‘ Et exposui illis.’ Sed intellige, more conferentis. Id enim vult, etiam Hieronymo teste, quod in Græco est, *ἀνεθεμην αυτοις*. Nam sensus est : Communicavi eum illis qui Jerosolymis erant, de evangelio, quod prædico inter Gentes, deque totâ ratione doctrinæ meæ quam tradidi, et etiam nunc trado Gentibus, quarum sum Apostolus. Non itaque discendi studio, quod supra negavit, evangelium suum nunc demum cum ecclesiâ Jerosolymitanâ confert, &c. Est. ad Gal. ii. 2.

<sup>x</sup> J’y allai——et j’expliquai en public aux saints l’évangile, que j’annonce parmi les Gentils ; ce que je fis aussi en particulier à ceux qui étoient le plus en réputation. Le Clerc. <sup>y</sup> Or j’y allai par révélation, et je conférai avec les fidèles touchant l’évangile, que je prêche parmi les Gentils. J’en conférai en particulier avec les plus célèbres entr’ eux. Beaus.

<sup>z</sup> The interpretation given by me of St. Paul’s phrase *κατ’ ἰδιαν*, as equivalent to separately, particularly, may be much confirmed by a passage of Libanius, which I here transcribe. *Ἐγὼ δὲ σοι μετὰ τῆς ὄλης πόλειως οἶδα χάριν. Οἱ γὰρ με καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς παρ’ ἐκείνοις εἶναι γραμμασι καὶ παλιν ἰδια ταντὸν ποιω.* Liban. [ad Mavimum.] Ep. 1157. p. 553. ed. Wolf. To which may be added another from Josephus. *Ἐπεὶ δ’ ὑπέσχημαι τὴν αἰτιολογίαν ἅπαντων ἰδια συγγραφεμένος παραδῶσειν, εἰς τότε καὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτῆς ἔρημιαν ἀναβαλεμαί.* Antiq. l. 1. cap. i. sect. 1.

Accordingly, the Latin Vulgate is thus : ‘ Scorsum autem iis, qui videbantur aliquid esse.’—And, in the margin of some of our Bibles, for privately is put severally : which I think to be the true meaning

Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.” Ver. 5, “To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour: that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.”

Where St. Paul seems to refer to the rise of the dispute at Antioch, which is thus related by St. Luke, Acts. xv. 1, “And certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and said: Unless ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.” These, as the apostle here says, had intruded themselves into the church of Antioch, that they might bring them into subjection to all the burdensome observances of the law of Moses. Upon that account, and for defeating their design, he went up to Jerusalem, and there acted, as just shown.

This text, and the explication now given of it, may receive illustration from the account which St. Luke gives of Paul’s coming to Jerusalem afterwards, where he first converses with the brethren, and then has a conference with James and the elders. The result of which is soon made known to all. Acts xxi. 17, “And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly.” Ver. 18, “And the day following Paul went in with us unto James. And all the elders were present.” Ver. 19, “And when he had saluted them, he declared to them <sup>a</sup> particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry.” Certainly St. Paul here intends heathens and idolaters. Ver. 20, “And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said to him”——ver. 25, “As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written, and concluded, that they observe no such thing.”——The connection leads us to suppose, that they speak of all Gentiles whatever, idolatrous, as well as others.

Upon the whole the apostle assures the christians, his converts, in Galatia, that his going to Jerusalem, his declaring there to all, the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and his conferring in private with the apostles, particularly with those who were reckoned the chief of them, were all done with a view to their benefit, “that the truth of the gospel might continue with them,” and other Gentiles. And the event, as related by St. Luke, and as represented by the apostle himself in this epistle, was entirely to his satisfaction.

St. Paul in this epistle most earnestly exhorts the Galatians, “to stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has

<sup>a</sup> —— ἐξηγήσατο καθ’ ἑκάστην ὃν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι διὰ τῆς ἰακωνίας αὐτῆς.

made us free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of bondage," ch. v. 1, and he severely censures instability in the genuine faith of the gospel. It would be, as seems to me, very strange, to suppose him to say, that when he was at Jerusalem, a few years only before writing this epistle, he had studiously concealed the doctrine which he preached among the Gentiles, from all but some few apostles. His so doing, whether through fear, or from prudential considerations, or any reasons whatever, must have been a great discouragement to those to whom he is writing. How could it be expected, that they should openly assert before all the world the true evangelical liberty, if himself had been upon the reserve upon a late and important occasion.

St. Paul's having a private conference with some of the apostles, is no proof that he had any secrets withheld from the knowledge of others. But it might be a proper piece of respect to discourse with those who were in great esteem, about what was to be communicated to all.

If St. Paul had desired to conceal his preaching to idolatrous Gentiles, he could not have done it. His preaching at Antioch, and his and Barnabas's peregrination in divers other countries, related in Acts xiii. xiv. were well known to all the christians at Antioch. And when Paul and Barnabas went thence to Jerusalem about the question that had been started there: it is very likely, that some went to Jerusalem upon the same occasion, who were on the imposing side of the question. If Paul had endeavoured to conceal any thing of an offensive nature, they would not have failed to divulge it.

We now proceed in the history.

Peter having by divine appointment and direction performed that important service at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea, and having received Gentiles into communion by baptism, without circumcision according to the law of Moses: and his conduct having been approved by the apostles, and brethren at Jerusalem: "they who had been scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," and had hitherto preached the word to none but Jews only, having heard of this transaction, when they came to Antioch, "spake unto the Greeks, [there,] preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them. And a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord. Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church which was at Jerusalem. And they sent forth

Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch." He afterwards brought Paul thither. And from that time forward the gospel was freely preached to Gentiles, as well as Jews, and with great success. Acts xi. 19–26.

Soon after the conversion of Cornelius, it is likely that "the rest of the churches" before mentioned was abated, till it was quite interrupted. However, Peter, and the other apostles, still continued in Judea. And according to the utmost of their power, as the circumstances of things allowed, employed themselves in confirming the believers, and making additions to their number.

Toward the end of his reign Herod Agrippa became an open persecutor of the believers; "and killed James the brother of John, with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded farther, to take Peter also. [Then were the days of unleavened bread.] And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers, to keep him:" that is, sixteen in all, four of which were by turns to watch him: "intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people," Acts x. 1–4.

The conversion of Cornelius happened, as I suppose, in the year 41 of our Saviour's nativity, according to the vulgar computation. And the Easter, or passover, here mentioned, was probably the passover of the year 44.

"Peter therefore was kept in prison. But prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him," ver. 5. And he was delivered out of prison in a miraculous manner, as related ver. 6–11. The divine being did not allow that a period should be yet put to the life of that apostle. One thing very observable in this history is the composure of Peter's mind in a great extremity, and in the near apprehension of death. For it is said, ver. 6, "And when Herod would have brought him forth, the same night Peter was sleeping between two soldiers bound with two chains." In that posture the angel found him, who at that instant was sent to assist his escape.

Having informed some of his intimate friends, assembled at the house of Mary, in Jerusalem, of his wonderful deliverance out of prison, "he departed and went to another place," ver. 17. Meaning either another house in Jerusalem, or else some city, or village not far from it. Where, probably, he lived privately, till the death of Herod Agrippa, which happened before the end of that year.

Some have thought, that Peter now went to Antioch or



Rome. But there is no good evidence of either of those opinions. Says Mr. L'Enfant upon the place: 'If St. Peter had gone to some celebrated city, for instance, Antioch, according to some, or Rome, according to others, no doubt St. Luke would have mentioned it, and some of the brethren would have accompanied him, according to custom. From the manner in which St. Luke expresseth himself, nothing is more natural, than to suppose, that St. Peter, that he might not expose to danger the faithful at the house where he first called, and where many were assembled, retired to some other place in Jerusalem.'

In the year 49, or 50, was assembled the council of Jerusalem, concerning the question, "whether it was needful to circumcise the Gentiles who believed, and to command them to keep the law." At this assembly Peter was present, and in the debate clearly declared his opinion, that "the yoke of the law should not be laid upon the neck of the disciples" from among the Gentiles. As a cogent argument for his opinion, he reminded the assembly, how by divine appointment he had preached the word of the gospel to Gentiles at Cæsarea, and that God, "who knoweth the hearts of all men," had shown his acceptance of them by giving to them the Holy Ghost, though uncircumcised. By which it had been made manifest, that they might be saved by faith in Jesus Christ, without the rituals of the law.

Whilst Paul was this time at Jerusalem, James, Peter, and John, "gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship," that they might proceed in preaching to Gentiles: whilst they, and the other apostles, still continued in Judea to preach to those of the circumcision. Gal. ii. 6—10.

III. Some short time afterwards, as it seems, Peter was at Antioch, as we learn from St. Paul, Gal. ii. 11—16. I place this journey of Peter to Antioch, after the council of Jerusalem, according to the general opinion. But Basnage argues, that <sup>b</sup> it was before it. If it was not till after it (as I rather think) it could not be long. For Barnabas was now at Antioch. Whereas in a short time after their return

<sup>b</sup> Illud nobis verisimilius, Concilii Hierosolymitani celebrationi antecessisse Petrinam hanc in Syriæ metropoli commorationem. Argumento est disceptatio Pauli eum Petro, cujus dissimulationem obrisset auctoritate Synodi, si jam coacta fuisset. Quin imo nulla Petro, et timendi Judæos, et eorum gratiâ sese separandi a Gentibus, causa fuit, si tum temporis promulgata fuisset Concilii Hierosolymitani Epistola; quo veluti clypeo, ad omnes telorum Judaicorum ictus tutus erat. Basnag. Ann. 46. num. xxv.

thither from Jerusalem, he and Paul parted. Here Peter at first conversed freely with the Gentile converts. But when there came thither from Judea some Jewish believers, zealous for the law, "he separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision." Herein Peter acted contrary to his own judgment and declared opinion, through fear of the displeasure of others. St. Paul therefore represents his conduct, as dissimulation, or hypocrisy. What he now did, in compliance with the zealots for the law, was a thing of very bad tendency. St. Paul therefore justly "withstood him," and so showed him to be blamable, that Peter acquiesced. Hereby, as Paul expresseth it, "he<sup>c</sup> compelled the Gentiles to judaize," or become Jews. For his separating from them, as unfit for converse and communion with the apostles of Christ, and the believers from among the Jews, implied, that they were not acceptable in the sight of God, nor in the way of salvation: and that in order to be saved, it was needful for them to be circumcised, and keep the law.

It was, as I suppose, soon after the council, and the year 50, in which Peter came to Antioch. And I imagine, that he now first of all went abroad out of Judea, into Gentile countries. It is very likely, that he was desirous to see the christian people at Antioch. But hitherto he had been little used to converse with Gentiles. And when some zealous Jewish believers came to Antioch from Jerusalem, he was alarmed: recollecting, it is likely, how some at Jerusalem had contended with him after he was come from Cæsarea, because he had been with men uncircumcised, and "did eat with them," Acts xi. 23, and very well knowing, from long and frequent experience, the prevailing temper of the people of his country. But it is reasonable to think, that Peter never more showed the like unsteadiness, but was firm ever afterwards.

This is the last time that Peter is expressly mentioned

<sup>c</sup> 'He compelled the Gentiles to judaize,' or become Jews.] Our translation is, "Why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" But it is far from being exact. *Τι τα εθνη αναγκαζεις ιουδαιζειν*; to judaize is to become a Jew, or proselyte to the Jewish religion. Esther viii. 17, "And many of the people of the land became Jews." Or, as in the seventy—"were circumcised and judaized." *Και πολλοι των εθνων περιετεμνοντο, και ιουδαιζον*. The Greek word is used in the same sense by Josephus. De B. J. l. 2. cap. 18. n. 2. *Απισκευασθαι γαρ της Ιουδαιας δοκουντες εκατοι, της ιουδαιζοντες ειχον εν υποψια*. To christianize, arianize, sabellianize, is to become a Christian, an Arian, a Sabellian. And to judaize is to become a Jew. Which, if I may be allowed to say it, shows the impropriety of the use of the word Judaizer, now very common among learned moderns, as denoting a man, who is for imposing judaism upon others.

in the New Testament, excepting his own epistles, and 1 Cor. i. 12, and ch. iii. 22. From which texts Pearson concludes, that<sup>d</sup> St. Peter had been at Corinth, before St. Paul wrote his first epistle to the church there. But others think, that<sup>e</sup> there were some at Corinth, who had heard Peter preach in Judea: and some who had seen Christ in person. They who said, “I am of Cephas, or of Christ,” must be supposed to have been Jews, either by descent, or religion.

I do not think these words can prove that Peter had been at Corinth, before Paul wrote this epistle. At ch. iii. 6, St. Paul says: “I have planted, Apollos watered.” He makes no mention of Peter’s labours among the Corinthians. Peter may have been at Corinth afterwards, in his way to Rome. But I do not see any proof from this epistle of his having been there.

IV. We have no where any very distinct account of this apostle’s travels. He might return to Judea, and stay there a good while after having been at Antioch, at the time spoken of by St. Paul in the epistle to the Galatians. However, I formerly quoted Epiphanius, saying, that Peter<sup>f</sup> was often in the countries of Pontus, and Bithynia. And by Eusebius we are assured, that Origen, in the third tome of his exposition of the book of Genesis, writes to this purpose: ‘Peter<sup>g</sup> is supposed to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia. Who at length coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downwards, himself having desired it might be in that manner.’

For the time of Peter’s coming to Rome, no ancient writer

<sup>d</sup> At certissimum est, Petrum non minus quam Paulum Corinthi fuisse, et quidem antequam S. Paulus primam epistolam dedit ad Corinthios. Ita enim Apostolus loquitur. 1 Cor. i. 12. Unde colligitur, non minus Cepham, et Apollo, quam Paulum Corinthi fuisse. Pears. Op. Post. Diss. i. cap. vii. p. 37.

<sup>e</sup> Alii ergo Corinthi ab Apollo instituti post Pauli abitum, alii ab ipso Paulo, alii qui ex Judæâ venerant a Petro, sub illis nominibus, alia atque alia dogmata tradebant.—‘Ego autem Christi.’ Venerant enim ex Judæâ quidam, qui ipsum Christum docentem audierant. Grot. ad 1 Cor. i. 12. Vid. et Wits. de Vita Pauli. sect. 7. num. xx. Meletem. p. 104, 105.

Sunt viri docti qui existimant, Petrum Apostolum hoc anno Corinthum venisse, dum in eâ urbe etiamnum esset Apollo.—Sed propensio in Petrum esse potuit, licet Corinthum pedem non intulisset. Nihil enim vetat fuisse Christianos Corinthi, qui eum Petrum, in Judæâ aut alibi audivissent, magistrum eum suum dictarent, et Paulo præferrent. Itaque iter hoc Petri nimis levî conjecturâ nititur. Cleric. H. E. ann. 55. num. v.

<sup>f</sup> Vol. iv. ch. lxxxiv. num. iv.

<sup>g</sup> Πέτρος ἔειπεν ἐν Πόντῳ—κεκηρυκέναι τοῖς ἐν διάσπορα Ἰουδαίῳ εἰκεν. Ὅτι καὶ ἐπιτέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενομένου, ἀνεκκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτοῦ ἀξιώσας παθεῖν. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. i.

is now more regarded by learned moderns than Lactantius, or whoever is the author of the book of the Deaths of Persecutors: who says, that <sup>h</sup> Peter came thither in the time of Nero. Insomuch that <sup>i</sup> Pagi assents to this account; and has shown it to be altogether improbable that <sup>k</sup> St. Peter came thither in the time of Claudius. He likewise observes <sup>k</sup> some difficulties, which they are liable to, who suppose that he first came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and afterwards in the reign of Nero. But though Peter did not come to Rome before the reign of Nero, which began in the year of Christ 54, we cannot say exactly the time when he came thither, as is also <sup>m</sup> acknowledged by the same excellent chronologer.

However, it appears to me very probable, that St. Peter did not come to Rome before the year of Christ 63, or 64, nor till after St. Paul's departure thence, at the end of his two years' imprisonment in that city.

The books of the New Testament afford a very plausible, and probable, if not a certain argument for it. After our Lord's ascension we find Peter, with the rest of the apostles, at Jerusalem. He and John were sent by the apostles from Jerusalem to Samaria, whence they returned to Jerusalem. When Paul came to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, he found Peter there. Upon occasion of the tranquillity of the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, near the end of the reign of Caligula, Peter left Jerusalem, and visited the churches in the several parts of that country, particularly at Lydda and Joppa, where he tarried many days. Thence he went to Cæsarea by the sea side, where he preached to Cornelius, and his company. Thence he returned to Jerusalem: and some time afterwards he was imprisoned there by Herod Agrippa. This brings down the history of our apostle to the year 44. A few years after this he was present at the council of Jerusalem. Nor is there any evidence that he came thither barely for that occasion. It is more probable, that he had not yet

<sup>h</sup> ——— et per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani imperii per omnes provincias et civitates ecclesiæ fundamenta miserunt. Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit, et editis quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei, datâ sibi ab eo potestate, faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, Deoque templum fidele ac stabile collocavit. Quâ re ad Neronem delatâ—— et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Persec. cap. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Critic. in Baron. ann. 43. num. iii.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. num. ii.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. num. iii.

<sup>m</sup> ——— cum verus ejus adventus annus nos lateat. Id. ann. 54 num. ii.

been out of Judea. Soon after that council he was at Antioch, where he was reproved by St. Paul.

The books of the New Testament afford no light for determining where Peter was for several years after that. But to me it appears not unlikely, that he returned in a short time to Judea from Antioch : and that he stayed in Judea a good while before he went thence any more. And it seems to me, that when he left Judea, he went again to Antioch, the chief city of Syria. Thence he might go into other parts of the continent, particularly Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, which are expressly mentioned at the beginning of his first epistle. In those countries he might stay a good while. It is very likely that he did so ; and that he was well acquainted with the christians there, to whom he afterwards wrote two epistles.

When he left those parts, I think, he went to Rome : but not till after Paul had been in that city, and was gone from it. Several of St. Paul's epistles furnish out a cogent argument of Peter's absence from Rome for a considerable space of time. St. Paul, in the last chapter of his epistle to the Romans, written, as we suppose, in the beginning of the year 58, salutes many by name without mentioning Peter. And the whole tenor of the epistle makes it reasonable to think, that the christians there had not yet had the benefit of that apostle's presence and instructions. During his two years' confinement at Rome, which ended, as we suppose, in the spring of the year 63, St. Paul wrote four, or five epistles, those to the Ephesians, the second epistle to Timothy, to the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon : in none of which is any mention of Peter. Nor is any thing said, or hinted, whence it can be concluded that he had ever been there.

I think therefore that Peter did not come to Rome before the year 63, or perhaps 64. And, as I suppose, he obtained the crown of martyrdom in the year 64, or 65. Consequently, St. Peter could not reside very long at Rome before his death.

It is very remarkable, that <sup>n</sup> Nicephorus at the beginning of the ninth century, in his Chronography, computes St. Peter's episcopate at Rome to have been of two years' duration only. For that passage I am indebted to <sup>o</sup> Basnage,

<sup>n</sup> Οί εν Ρωμη επισκοπευσαντες απο Χριστου, και των αποστολων α' Πιτρος αποστολος ετη β'.—Ap. Scalig. Thes. Temp. p. 308.

<sup>o</sup> Lactantius, Eusebio paullo antiquior, Petrum non Claudio quidem, sed Nerone imperante, Romam venisse tradit. Neque Lactantio propria chronologia hæc est.—In Nicephori enim Chronographiâ legimus : ' Qui Romæ

whose argument upon it I have placed below. Nicephorus, therefore, (and probably others likewise,) must have supposed, that Peter did not come to Rome, till near the end of his life.

As the foregoing is the most likely account of St. Peter's travels, which I have been able to form; I do not see any reason to believe that he ever was in Chaldea. Cosmas of Alexandria, who thought, that by <sup>p</sup> Babylon at the end of St. Peter's first epistle is meant Babylon in Persia, must have supposed, that this apostle was in that country. And learned men <sup>q</sup> who understood Babylon in the same sense, take it for granted, that St. Peter travelled into that part of the world. But I do not perceive them to support their opinion by testimonies of ancient writers; which surely would have been of advantage to it.

And there are some passages of ancient authors, where it would be reasonable to expect an account of such a journey, if there had been in those times any knowledge of it, or well attested tradition about it.

Origen, in the passage cited by Eusebius, and already quoted by us likewise from him, says: 'Peter is said to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia.' Who at length coming to Rome was crucified.

Eusebius, in his Chronical Canon, as published by Scaliger, says, in the Greek, 'that <sup>s</sup> Peter having founded the church in Antioch, went away to Rome, preaching the gospel.'

Jerom in his book of Illustrious Men, in like manner says: 'that <sup>t</sup> Peter having been at Antioch, and preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, and the neighbouring

<sup>q</sup> episcopatum gesserunt a Christo et Apostolis. Petrus apostolus annis duobus.' Quibus consequens est, Petrum biennium circiter ante mortem iter in urbem direxisse. Secus diuturniorem ei episcopatum vindicasset Nicephorus. Basnag. ann. 42. num. x. <sup>p</sup> See Vol. v. p. 98.

<sup>q</sup> Verum ego priorem sententiam tanquam longe verisimiliorem amplector, tum quod in Babylone Parthicâ magna esset Judæorum frequentia, qui *αρχαλωταρχην* suum habuerunt; tum quod Petro Antiochiâ discedenti facilior ac commodior esset in hæc loca transitus, in quibus eum diu prædicasse, nemo, opinor, facile negabit. Cav. H. L. in Petro. p. 6. Et. Conf. Basnag. Ann. 57. num. iii. et ann. 46. num. xxv.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. i.

<sup>s</sup> Πέτρος ὁ κορυθαίως, τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πρώτην θεμελιώσας ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς Ῥώμην ἀπέισε κηρυττῶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Chr. Can. p. 204.

<sup>t</sup> Simon Petrus, — princeps Apostolorum, post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiae, et predicationem dispersionis eorum, qui de circumcisione crediderant, in Ponto — secundo Claudii Imperatoris anno, ad expugnandum Simonem Magum, Romam pergit. De V. l. cap. i.

‘ countries went to Rome.’ In another place Jerom says : ‘ that <sup>u</sup> Christ was with the apostles in all the places ‘ whither they went. He was with Thomas in India, with ‘ Peter at Rome, with Paul in Illyricum, with Titus in Crete, ‘ with Andrew in Achaia.’ Why does he not also say, that Christ was with Peter in Babylon ?

Ephrem the Syrian says, that <sup>v</sup> ‘ Peter preached at Rome, ‘ John at Ephesus, Matthew in Palestine, and Thomas in the ‘ Indies.’

Gregory Nazianzen <sup>w</sup> speaks of Paul, as having for his province all the Gentiles in general ; Peter, Judea ; Luke, Achaia ; Andrew, Epirus ; John, Ephesus ; Thomas, the Indies ; and Mark, Italy.

Why do none of these writers take in Babylon, or Persia, or Chaldea, as the apostle Peter’s province ?

Once more. Says Chrysostom : ‘ This <sup>x</sup> is one prerogative ‘ of our city, (Antioch) that we had at the beginning the ‘ chief of the apostles for our master. For it was fit that ‘ the place which was first honoured with the name of ‘ christians, should have the chief of the apostles for its ‘ pastor. But though we had him for a master awhile, we ‘ did not detain him, but resigned him to the royal city, ‘ Rome. Or rather, we have him still. For though we ‘ have not his body, we have his faith.’ I might refer to other places of Chrysostom, where he speaks of Peter’s having been at Rome. But why does he not also mention Babylon ?

I therefore rely upon the account before given of St. Peter’s travels, as most likely. And in particular I observe, that we have not in ancient christian writers any good assurance of his having ever been in Persia, or Parthia. A learned writer of our time, who contends that he was there, and that his first epistle was written at the Assyrian Babylon, acknowledgeth, that <sup>y</sup> from that epistle of St. Peter alone we have not any assurance of his having been at Babylon.

V. In the history of St. Paul I have already shown it to

<sup>u</sup> Tom. IV. P. I. p. 167. ad Marcell. ep. 148.

<sup>v</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cii. num. vi.

<sup>w</sup> Orat. 25. p. 438. A.

<sup>x</sup> *Εν γὰρ καὶ τὸτο πλεονεκτημα τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως, τὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κορυφαίον λαβεῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ διδασκαλον.—— Ἀλλὰ—οὐκ εἰς τέλος κατέχομεν, ἀλλὰ παρεχώρησαμεν τῇ βασιδεῖ Ῥώμῃ, κ. λ.* In Princip. Act. Ap. hom. 2. T. III. p. 70.

<sup>y</sup> Superest aliquid, quod ex hoc Petri loco discamus. Primum igitur cognoscimus hic, quod aliunde non constat, Babylone etiam fuisse Petrum, magnamque ibi messuisse Christo messem. Heumann. Nova Sylloge Diss. Part. II. p. 113.

be probable, that he and Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome in 64, or 65.

Cave<sup>z</sup> likewise, in his *Life of St. Peter*, written in English in 1676, placeth the death of this apostle in 64 or 65. Nor was his mind much altered when he published his *Historia Literaria* in 1688. For there also he supposeth that St. Peter<sup>a</sup> died a martyr at Rome, in the year of Christ 64, at the beginning of Nero's persecution: and indeed expresseth himself with a great deal of assurance and positiveness.

Jerom concludes his article of St. Peter saying, 'He<sup>b</sup> was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the triumphal way, and is in veneration all over the world.' We likewise formerly<sup>c</sup> saw a passage of Caius, about the year 212, where he speaks of the tombs of the two apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome. And Chrysostom, in a passage lately cited, supposes St. Peter to have been buried in that city.

VI. I shall now take notice of a few things hitherto entirely omitted, or but slightly touched upon. His episcopate at Antioch, his having been five and twenty years bishop of Rome, his children, his wife's martyrdom, said to have absconded at Rome, the manner of his crucifixion.

I. We have seen several authors who speak of Peter's having been at Antioch. Chrysostom seems to have supposed, that<sup>d</sup> he was there a good while. This may be

<sup>z</sup> 'The date of his death is differently assigned by the ancients.—That which seems to me most probable is, that it was in the tenth of Nero, or the year 65. Which I thus compute. Nero's burning of Rome is placed by Tacitus under the consulship of C. Lucanus, and M. Licinius, about the month of July, that is, A. ch. lxiv. This act procured him the hatred and clamours of the people. Which having in vain endeavoured several ways to remove and pacify, he at last resolved upon this project, to drive the odium upon the christians. Whom therefore, both to appease the gods, and please the people, he condemned as guilty of the fact, and caused to be executed with all manner of acute and exquisite tortures. This persecution began, as we may suppose, about the end of that, or the beginning of the following, year. And under this persecution, I doubt not, it was St. Peter suffered, and changed earth for heaven.' Cave's *Life of St. Peter*, sect. xi.

<sup>a</sup> Tandem sub Nerone, forsan circa annum 63, Roman venit, fideles, quos ibi reperit, in ordinem redegit, ecclesiam constituit, auxit, et mox sanguine suo locupletavit.—Obiit igitur sanctus Petrus anno Christi 64, Neronis 10, sub initium persecutionis Neronianæ, ut in opere vernaculo, 'De Vitis Apostolorum,' latius disseruimus. Etenim cum Nero ob grande illud scelus, Romanæ Urbis incendium, in odium omnium venisset, abolendo rumori, inquit Tacitus, erimen coniecit in christianos, eosque hac de causâ quæsitissimis pœnis affecit. Quin hæc occasione rapti sint ad martyrium Apostoli, nemo, cui sanum sinciput, dubitare potest. Hist. Lit. de Petro, p. 5.

<sup>b</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Vol. ii. ch. xxxii. num. i. 1.

<sup>d</sup> See before, p. 236.



also implied in the passage of Jerom before cited <sup>e</sup> from his book of *Illustrious Men*, where he speaks of Peter's episcopate of Antioch. And in his commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, he says, that <sup>f</sup> Peter was first bishop of Antioch, and afterwards bishop of Rome. Eusebius, speaking of Ignatius and his epistles, calls <sup>g</sup> him the second bishop of Antioch after Peter. Jerom <sup>h</sup> calls Ignatius the third bishop of Antioch after Peter. They both suppose Euodius, of whom <sup>i</sup> Eusebius speaks elsewhere, to have been the first bishop of Antioch, or the first after Peter.

What real foundation there is for all this, is hard to say; whether it be built entirely upon what St. Paul writes, Gal. ii. 11—16, or whether there was some other ground for it.

But, as before said in the account above given of St. Peter's travels, I think that St. Peter did not stay long at Antioch, the first time he was there, which is mentioned by St. Paul, but returned to Judea, and after some time leaving that country, he went to Antioch again. Where he might stay a while, and then go and preach in the countries mentioned at the beginning of his first epistle, and then go to Rome.

2. It has been said, that Peter was bishop of Rome five and twenty years. This is said by Jerom in <sup>k</sup> his book of *Illustrious Men*, and <sup>l</sup> in his *Chronicle*, or his Latin edition of Eusebius's Greek *Chronicle*, or *Chronical Canon*, as it is sometimes called: where <sup>m</sup> he added divers things, not said by Eusebius himself.

<sup>e</sup> See before, p. 236, note <sup>t</sup>. <sup>f</sup> Denique primum episcopum Antiochenæ ecclesiæ Petrum fuisse accepimus, et Romam exinde translatum; quod Lucas penitus omisit. Hieron. in ep. ad Gal. cap. ii. 11—13. T. IV. P. I. p. 244. <sup>g</sup> —της κατ' Αντιοχειαν Πετρος διαδοχης

δευτερος την επισκοπιην κεκληρωμενος. H. E. l. 3. cap. 36. p. 106. D.

<sup>h</sup> Ignatius, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ tertius post Petrum apostolum episcopus. De V. I. cap. 16. <sup>i</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. 22.

<sup>k</sup> Post episcopatum Antiochenis ecclesiæ, et prædicationem dispersionis eorum, qui de circumcissione crediderant in Ponto—Romam pergit: ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est decimum quartum. De V. I. cap. i.

<sup>l</sup> Petrus apostolus, quum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset, Romam mittitur, ubi evangelium prædicans xxv annis ejusdem urbis episcopus perseverat. Chron. p. 160. <sup>m</sup> —'Ibid. xxv. annis ejusdem urbis episcopus perseverat.'

Adjecta sunt ab Hieronymo, et ab eodem repetuntur in Catalogo Scriptor. Ecc. Græca enim non habent. Ab Assumptione Domini, ad id tempus, quo Petrus conjectus fuit in vincula ab Herode Agrippâ—Petrus semper fuit in Palæstinâ, aut Syriâ. Herodes obiit quarto anno Claudii. Quomodo igitur anno secundo Claudii profectus est Romam? Quomodo viginti quinque annos Romæ perseveravit? Scaliger. Animad. p. 189.

But this is inconsistent with the history in the Acts. Nor is it any where expressly said by Eusebius : though, perhaps, it might be argued from some things said by him. How the origin of this notion is accounted for by <sup>n</sup> Pagi, and <sup>o</sup> Baluze, both Romanists, may be seen in their own words, which I transcribe below. I refer likewise to <sup>p</sup> Basnage, and Dodwell.<sup>q</sup> In all whom are good observations relating to this point.

3. Clement of Alexandria <sup>r</sup> reckons Peter among those apostles, who had children. According to him Philip was another. Epiphanius says, that <sup>s</sup> Peter came to Christ after he was married, and had children. Jerom, in his first book against Jovinian, takes notice, that <sup>t</sup> in the Circuits, probably meaning the Recognitions, mention was made both of Peter's wife and daughter. But, says he, that is not a canonical book. And still we have a passage in the Recognitions, where St. Peter's wife is mentioned : but, as <sup>u</sup> Cotelerius observes, what was said of Peter's

<sup>n</sup> Præstat hic Lactantii citati verba in medium afferre. 'Apostoli per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani Imperii per omnes provincias et civitates ecclesie fundamenta miserunt. Cunque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romanam adventit.'—Ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apostolorum ex æquo pertinent, orta videtur opinio de xxv. annis, qui vulgo tribuuntur S. Petro in sede Romanâ. Pagi, ann. 43. num. iii.

<sup>o</sup> Fortassis ergo ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apostolorum æque pertinent, orta est opinio de viginti quinque annis, quos quidam veteres, innumerabile recentiorum agmen, sancto Petro apostolo tribuunt in sede Romanâ. Sane licet frustra et supervacaneè a nonnullis negari putem adventum ejus ad urbem Romam, qui clarissimis veterum testimoniis comprobatus est ; de tempore tamen multum ambigo, cum videam tot tantisque difficultates habere eorum sententiam, qui illum Romam venisse volunt Claudio imperante, ut coacti sint duplicare profectionem ejus in urbem, et duplex item ejus cum Simone Mago certamen comminisci, primo quidem temporibus Claudii, dein principatu Neronis. Quæ res quam absurda sit, cum id a nullo veterum proditum sit memoriæ literarum, pervident istarum rerum periti.—Itaque si fas esset recedere a vulgari, et in animis hominum insitâ opinione, ei Lactantianam lubenter præferrem ; id est, Petrum quidem Romæ prædicasse evangelium facile concederem, non sub Tiberio Claudio, ut vulgo putant, sed sub Nerone Claudio, &c. Steph. Baluz. annot. ad libr. de M. P. cap. 2. <sup>p</sup> Ann. 42. n. x. xi.

<sup>q</sup> Diss. Singularis, cap. iii. n. 1. p. 13.

<sup>r</sup> —η και αποστολης αποδοκιμαζουσι ; Πητρος μεν γαρ και Φιλππος επαυδοποιησαντο. Clem. Strom. l. 3. p. 448. D. et ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 30.

<sup>s</sup> Μετα γαρ το γημαι, και τεκνα κекηθησθαι, και πενθεραν εχειν, συνετυχε τῷ σωτηρι, εξ Ιεβουων ὀρρωμερος. Har. 30. num. xxii. p. 147. B.

<sup>t</sup> Possumus autem et de Petro dicere, quod habuerit socrum eo tempore quo credidit, et uxorem non habuerit ; quamquam legatur in *Περιωδεις* et uxor ejus et filia. Sed nunc nobis de canone omne certamen est. Contr. Jovin. l. I. T. IV. P. II. p. 168. in.

<sup>u</sup> 'Die autem postera sedens cum uxore Petri.' Testatur Hieronymus contra Jovinianum scribens, legi in Periodis et uxorem Petri et filiam. Ea

daughter is wanting. Possibly these things may illustrate the words of Peter, recorded Matt. xix. 27, "Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee. What shall we have therefore?" And indeed Origen, in his Commentary upon St. Matthew, says: 'It' seems that Peter did not leave 'nets only, but also a house, and a wife, whose mother the 'Lord healed of a fever, and, as may be supposed, children, and possibly likewise some small estate.'

4. Farther, Clement of Alexandria,<sup>v</sup> cited also by <sup>x</sup> Eusebius, informs us: 'It was said, that the blessed Peter 'seeing his wife led forth to death, rejoiced for the grace 'of God vouchsafed to him, and calling to her by name, 'exhorted and comforted her, saying: "Remember the 'Lord.'" ' If time and place had been mentioned, it would have added to the credibility of the story. However, she might be at Rome, as we know Peter was. And if so, she might suffer about the same time with him. For Nero's persecution took in people of both sexes, and of all conditions, as we know from the accounts given by Tacitus. And we learn from St. Paul, that Peter was attended by his wife in his travels. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

5. It is also said, 'that <sup>y</sup> St. Peter being imprisoned at 'Rome, or being in some imminent danger of suffering, the 'brethren there entreated him to consult his safety by flight, 'and to reserve himself for farther service and usefulness. 'At length he was persuaded, and went out in the dark 'night. But when he came to the gate, he saw Christ entering into the city. Whereupon he said: "Lord, whither

igitur Circuituum pars, in quâ de Petri filiâ (Petronillam illam vocant) sermo erat, nunc desideratur. Uxorem autem memorant præterea Clem. A. Str. 7. ubi et martyrium illius refert verbis, quæ citantur ab Eusebio, iii. 30. Origenes ad Matt. xix. 27. Epiphanius, H. 30. n. 22. Hieronymus, ep. 34. Coteler. ad Recognit. l. 7. cap. 25.

<sup>v</sup> Origen. in Matt. Tom. XV. p. 682. T. III. Bened.

<sup>w</sup> Φασι γυν, τον μακαριον Πετρον θεασαμενον την αυτη γυναικα αγομενην την επι θανατον, ησθησαι της κλησεως χαριν.—επιφωνησαι λε εν μαλα προτροπητικως και παρακλητικως εξ ονοματος προσειποντα' Μεμνησο, ω αυτη, τω κυριω. Str. 7. p. 736. B.

<sup>x</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. 30.

<sup>y</sup> Idem Petrus postea, victo Simone, cum præcepta Dei populo seminare, excitavit animos Gentilium: quibus eum quærentibus, christianæ animæ deprecatae sunt, ut paulisper cederet. Et quamvis esset cupidus passionis, tamen contemplatione populi precantis inflexus est. Rogabatur enim, ut ad instituendum et confirmandum populum se reservaret. Quid multa? Nocte muros egredi cœpit. Sed videns sibi in portâ Christum occurrere, urbemque ingredi, ait: Domine, quo vadis? Respondit Christus: Venio iterum crucifigi. —Intellexit ergo Petrus, quod iterum Christus crucifigendus esset in servulo. Itaque sponte remeavit. Interrogantibus christianis responsum reddidit, statimque correptus, per crucem suam honoravit Dominum Jesum. Ambr. Serm. contr. Aux. T. II. p. 867. A. B. ed. Bened.

‘ art thou going?’ Christ answered: “ I am come hither  
 ‘ to be crucified again.” By which Peter apprehended him-  
 ‘ self to be reprov’d, and perceived that Jesus spake of his  
 ‘ death, and that now he was to be crucified in his servant.  
 ‘ Accordingly Peter turned back, and gave satisfaction to the  
 ‘ brethren. And being soon after taken up, he was cruci-  
 ‘ fied.’

This story is in Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in the fourth century. Tillemont<sup>z</sup> has endeavoured to find some grounds for it, or references to it, in more ancient authors. But they are very obscure and doubtful. Basnage<sup>a</sup> has some remarks upon it, which may be read by such as have leisure.

6. St. Peter’s death, and the manner of it, we saw just now in a passage cited from<sup>b</sup> Origen, and likewise, that when he was to be crucified, he desired it might be in that way. So likewise Jerom, ‘ that<sup>c</sup> he was crucified by order  
 ‘ of Nero, and so crowned with martyrdom, his head down-  
 ‘ ward, and his feet lifted up, saying he was unworthy to be  
 ‘ crucified as his Master was.’ To the like purpose<sup>d</sup> Prudentius. Chrysostom also several times speaks<sup>e</sup> of Peter’s being crucified with his head downwards.

And it is unquestioned, that<sup>f</sup> among the Romans some were so crucified, to add to their pain and ignominy. Nevertheless some ancient writers, who speak of Peter’s martyrdom by crucifixion, do<sup>g</sup> not take notice of that

<sup>z</sup> S. Pierre, art. 35. et note 39. Mem. Tom. I.

<sup>a</sup> Ann. 65. num. xi.

<sup>b</sup> See p. 234.

<sup>c</sup> A quo et affixus cruci, martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso, et in subline pedibus elevatis, asserens, se indignum, qui sic crucifigeretur, ut Dominus suus. De V. I. cap. i.

<sup>d</sup> Primum Petrum rapuit sententia, legibus Neronis,

Pendere jussum præminente ligno.

Ille tamen, veritus celsæ decus æmulando mortis

Ambire tanti gloriam magistri,

Exigit, ut pedibus mersum caput imprimant supinis,

Quo spectet inum stipitem cerebro. Περισεφ. cap. 12.

<sup>e</sup> ——— ἄτε ἐη και πλειονος λαβων ἐνναμιν και μειζον το θαρσος ὑπερ αυτε αποθανειν, και τω τανωη κατα κεφαλης προσομιλησαι, κ. λ. Chr. in Pr. Act. hom. 4. T. III. p. 93. E.

Παυλος δε και Πετρος ἄχι ὅς μεν αποτμηθεις, ὅς ἐς ἀπ’ εναντιας τω ἐεσποτη τῃ τανωη την τιμωριαν ἐξαμενος, οὐτω μετετη της παρσσης ζωης. In Gen. hom. 66. Tom. IV. p. 630. A.

‘Ο Χριστος εταρωθη οὐτος εμελλεν αποκεφαλιζεσθαι ὁ Πετρος κατωθεν ανεσκολοπισθη. In 2 Tim. hom. 5. T. XI. p. 687. D.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Basnag. ann. 65. num. xiv.

<sup>g</sup> Ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur. Tertull. Pr. cap. 36. p. 245. Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, quum cruci adstringitur. Id. Scorp. cap. 15. p. 633.

——— Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Persec. cap. 2.

circumstance. Which has induced <sup>h</sup> Basnage to dispute the truth of it. Allowing that <sup>i</sup> Peter was crucified in that manner, he thinks it is not reasonable to suppose it was at his own request. And it must be acknowledged that his reasoning is plausible.

It seems to me, that Peter might be crucified in that manner, and that it might be owing to the spite and malice of those who put him to death. The saying, that it was at his own desire, may have been at first only the oratorical flight of some man of more wit than judgment. But the thought was pleasing, and therefore has been followed by many.

VII. Some learned men have denied that Peter ever was at Rome, as <sup>k</sup> Scaliger, <sup>l</sup> Salmasius, <sup>m</sup> Frederick Spanheim, and some others. Mr. Bower is much of the same mind. His words are: ‘From <sup>n</sup> what has been hitherto said, every impartial judge must conclude, that it is at best very much to be doubted, whether St. Peter ever was at Rome.’ Nevertheless there have been many learned men among the protestants, as well as Romanists, whose impartiality was never questioned, who have believed, and argued very well that Peter was at Rome, and suffered martyrdom there. I refer to some: <sup>o</sup> Cave, <sup>p</sup> Pearson, <sup>q</sup> Le Clerc, <sup>r</sup> Basnage, <sup>s</sup> Barratier.

I shall therefore remind my readers of some testimonies of ancient writers, relating to this matter, making

<sup>h</sup> Ubi supra, num. xiv. <sup>i</sup> Concesso, ut plures testantur, sublimibus Petrum vestigiis affixum cruci, quin ex Prætoris mandato irrogatum hoc supplicii, quo pereunti adderetur dolor et ludibrium non credere non possumus.—Præpostera sane et vana ea videtur esse modestia, quam ascribunt Petro.—Neque priscorum aliquem martyrum, qui in crucem acti fuerunt, similis unquam incessit humilitas.—Præterea certo certius est, atrocius eorum fuisse supplicium, qui inverso, quam qui recto capite figebantur cruci.—Martyris autem est, imperatam sibi mortem perferre fortiter, non vero poscere, ut intendantur a carnifice tormenta. Id. ib. num. xv.

<sup>k</sup> Quum igitur Petrus ad *περιτομην* missus esset, videtur in *διασπορα* Asianâ periisse, si conjecturæ locus est. Nam de ejus Romam adventu, sedè 25 annorum et supremo capitis supplicio, ibidem, nemo qui paullo humanior fuerit, credere posset. Jos. Scal. annot. ad Joh. xviii. 31.

<sup>l</sup> De Petro vero a Nerone sublato non constat. Si non potest probari Romæ illam fuisse unquam, quomodo ibi crucifixus? Putem ego cum Salmasio Babylone martyrium passum esse, si quid divinare in re incertâ licet. Gallæus ad Lact. Instit. l. 4. cap. 21. Vid. et de Salmasii sententiâ Pearson. De Success. prim. Rom. Episcop. Diss. i. cap. viii.

<sup>m</sup> Diss. de fictâ protectione Petri Ap. in urbem Romam. Opp. Tom. II. p. 331, &c. <sup>n</sup> History of the Popes, Vol. I. p. 5.

<sup>o</sup> Hist. Lit. in Petro. <sup>p</sup> De Successione primorum Romæ episcoporum. Diss. i. cap. vii. et viii.

<sup>q</sup> Hist. Ecc. ann. 67. n. i. et ann. 68. n. 1, 2.

<sup>r</sup> Ann. 64. num. ix. x. xi.

<sup>s</sup> De Successione Episc. Roman. cap. i.

also a few remarks upon them. And then let every one judge.

I begin with Clement of Rome, who wrote an epistle to the Corinthians, before the year of Christ 70, as some think, or about the year 96, as others suppose. In that epistle are these expressions. ‘But <sup>t</sup> not to insist any longer,’ says he, ‘upon examples of former times, let us come to those ‘worthies that are nearest to us, and take the brave examples of our own age. Through zeal and envy they ‘who were the most righteous pillars of the church <sup>u</sup> have ‘been persecuted even to a cruel death. Let <sup>v</sup> us set ‘before our eyes the excellent apostles. Peter through ‘unrighteous zeal underwent not one or two, but many ‘labours, till at last, being martyred, he went to the place ‘of glory that was due to him. Through zeal <sup>w</sup> Paul obtained the reward of patience. Seven times he was in ‘bonds, he was whipped, he was stoned. He preached ‘both in the east and in the west. And having taught the ‘whole world righteousness, and <sup>x</sup> coming to the borders ‘of the west, and suffering martyrdom under the governors, so he departed out of the world, and went to the ‘most holy place, being a most eminent pattern of patience.

‘To <sup>y</sup> these men, who lived a divine life, was joined a ‘great multitude of choice ones, who having undergone ‘through zeal many reproaches and torments, became an ‘excellent example among us.’

From these passages I think it may be justly concluded, that Peter and Paul were martyrs at Rome in the time of Nero’s persecution. For they suffered among the Romans, where Clement was bishop, and in whose name he was writing to the Corinthians. They were martyrs, when many others were an example, or pattern, of a like patience among them. To ‘these apostles,’ says Clement, ‘was ‘joined a great multitude of choice ones,’ or elect, that is, christians. This is a manifest description of Nero’s persecution at Rome, when a multitude of christians there were

<sup>t</sup> Clem. ep. ad. Cor. cap. v. vi.

<sup>u</sup> — — εἰσῶχθησαν καὶ ἕως θανάτου δεινῶ.

<sup>v</sup> Λαβόμεν προ οφθαλμων ἡμων τας αγαθας αποστολας. Πιτρος δια ζηλον αἰκων—καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρησας ἐπορευθη εἰς τον οφειλομενον τοπον της δοξης.

<sup>w</sup> Δια ζηλον ὁ Παυλος ὑπομονης βραβειων ἐπεσχεν.

<sup>x</sup> Καὶ ἐπι το τερμα της ἐνσεως ελθων, καὶ μαρτυρησας ἐπι των ἡγερμενων, οὕτως ἀπηλλαγη τε κοσμου καὶ εἰς το ἅγιον τοπον ἐπορευθη, ὑπομονης γενομενος μεγιτος υπογραμμος.

<sup>y</sup> Τετοις τοις ἀνδρασιν θειωσ πολιτευσσμενοις συνηθροισθη πολν πληθος εκλεκτων, οἱτινες πολλαισ αικαισ καὶ βασανουσ δια ζηλον παθοντες ὑποδειγμα καλλιζον ἐγενοντο ἐν ἡμιν.

put to death under grievous reproaches, and exquisite torments, as we are assured by Tacitus. These were joined to the excellent apostles, Peter and Paul, before mentioned. Therefore Peter and Paul had suffered at that place, and at that time: and, as it seems, according to this account, at the beginning of that persecution. Which may be reckoned not at all improbable.

When Clement says, that "Paul suffered martyrdom under the governors," he may be understood to mean "by order of the magistrate." It cannot be hence inferred, that Peter and Paul did not die by Nero's order, or in virtue of his edict against the christians. It should be considered, that Clement is not an historian. He is writing an epistle, containing divers exhortations. It was not needful for him to be more particular. He does not name the city in which either Peter or Paul died, nor the death which they underwent. But he intimates, that they suffered a cruel death, together with many choice ones among them. Which must mean Rome. And he plainly represents these apostles as martyrs, who had suffered through envy and unrighteous zeal. The place and the manner of their death were well known to the christians at Corinth, to whom Clement was writing.

If we consider where Clement was, he may be reasonably excused from naming the emperor, or being otherwise more particular. This epistle was written soon after some troubles, which the christians at Rome had met with, as appears plainly from the beginning of it: meaning, it is likely, either the persecution of Nero, or of Domitian, the next persecutor of the christians. It is not at all strange, that at such a time Clement should think himself obliged to circumspection in the manner of his expressions.

Indeed the primitive christians were always very careful, not to speak disrespectfully of heathen princes, or other magistrates, how much soever they suffered from them. The epistle begins in this manner. 'The calamities and afflictions, brethren, which have befallen us, have somewhat retarded our answer to your inquiries.' Those afflictions intend, as before said, the persecution of Nero or Domitian. And if so, certainly there is much mildness in the expressions. But a very different style is used presently after in speaking of the dissension which there was among the christians at Corinth. It is called 'a wicked and ungodly sedition, unbecoming the elect of God, fomented by a few rash and self-willed men.'

Bishop Pearson has argued from this place, that <sup>z</sup> Peter and Paul did not die by order of Nero himself, but by order of the prefects of the city, when Nero was absent, and, particularly, on Feb. 22, in the year of Christ 68, and the last year of Nero. And he says, that <sup>a</sup> the Greek word, which I have rendered governors or magistrates, never denotes the emperor, but only the prefects of the city or of the provinces.

But Pearson was very unhappy in that observation. For Nero was at Rome in the beginning of the year 68. Pagi <sup>b</sup> and Basnage <sup>c</sup> have shown, that whereas Nero was absent from Rome almost two years, the greatest part of 66. and 67, he arrived at Rome from Greece in December 67.

And the word, which I have rendered ‘governors,’ is often used, not only for prefects, but also for kings and emperors, or other supreme magistrates. Of <sup>d</sup> which I place several instances in the margin.

However both the noun and the verb are general words, and are used concerning governors supreme and subordinate. As is apparent from that well known text, Luke iii. 1. “Now <sup>e</sup> in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius

<sup>z</sup> S. Paulus (cum Petro) ultimo Neronis anno martyrium fecit. Factum autem id est sub Præfectis in urbe, ut testatur Clemens Romanus, absente scilicet Nerone, Februarii die 22. Ann. Paulin. p. 25. A. D. 68.

<sup>a</sup> Quod si Romam diserte non expresserit, Neronem certe multo minus delineavit. Dicit enim Paulum *ἐπι των ἡγεμενων*.—Neque enim *ἡγεμενοι* Imperatore, in provinciis præsertim, Præsidum loca sub variis nominibus obtinebant.—Neque hæc vox tantum in provinciis solennis fuit, sed etiam Romæ—Tales erant Romæ, ultimo Neronis anno, duo Præfecti Prætorio, Tigellinus et Sabinus, et cum summâ potestate Helius. De Succession. prim. Romæ: Episcop. Diss. i. cap. 8. sect. ix.

<sup>b</sup> Ann. 67. num. ii.

<sup>c</sup> Ann. 66. num. vi. et 67. n. v.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Kings xv. 13, it is said of Asa, “And also Maachah his mother he removed from being queen.” In the LXX. it is thus: *Και την ανα την μητερα εαντα μετεσησε τα μη ειναι ἡγεμενην*. 2 Chron. vii. 18. When God appeared to Solomon, he said, “Then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom. There shall not fail thee a man to be ruler in Israel.” *Ουκ εξαρθησεται σοι ἡγεμενος ανηρ εν Ισραηλ*. 2 Chr. ix. 26, “And he reigned over all the kings from the river.” *Και ην ἡγεμενος παντων των βασιλειων απο τα ποταμια*. When St. Matth. ch. ii. 6, quotes the words of the prophet Micah: “Out of thee shall come a governor, *ηγεμενος*, that shall rule my people Israel:” he does not mean a governor of inferior rank, but the Messiah himself. I shall add only a like instance or two from Josephus, and from a Greek classic, though many might be mentioned—*μεχρι ετους δωδεκατης την Νερωνος ἡγεμονιας*. Joseph. Ant. l. 20. cap. x. sect. ult. n. 2.—*δωδεκατη μιν ετι της Νερωνος ἡγεμονιας*. De B. l. i. 2. cap. 14. n. 4.—*τον πρεσβυτερον αυτων αποδειξαι Ῥωμαιων ἡγεμονα*. Dion. Hal. l. 4. cap. 4. p. 262. ed. Hudson.

<sup>e</sup> *Εν ετι δε πεντεκαθεκατη της ἡγεμονιας Τιβεριου Καισαρος, ἡγεμονευσστος Ποντιου Ηλιατου της Γαλιλαας*.



Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea." As the words are well rendered in our version. But, literally, they might be translated in this manner. "Now in the fifteenth year of the government of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea."

As for the words being in the plural number, it is no uncommon thing to prefer that to the singular, when we are obliged to be cautious, and intend, as I suppose Clement did, to speak in a general way. In short, Clement shows, that Peter and Paul had died by martyrdom, and not in a tumult of the people, but by order of the magistrate, meaning the emperor, though he is not named.

So that I must take the liberty to say, that Pearson's observation, that Peter and Paul were put to death, not by Nero, but by the prefects of Rome, or some other great officer, in the absence of the emperor, appears to be of no value. And it is destitute of all authority from history. For we shall see as we proceed, that the death of these two apostles is continually ascribed to Nero by all who speak distinctly about it.

One thing more I must take notice of. From these passages of Clement it has been argued, that Peter never was at Rome, in <sup>f</sup> this manner. 'Clemens Romanus, (who was personally acquainted with the apostles, and knew very well where they travelled,) writes a letter from Rome to Corinth, and mentions St. Paul's travelling very far to spread the gospel: but in the same section, though he mentions St. Peter's sufferings and martyrdom, yet he says nothing of his travelling much, nor one word of his ever having been at Rome.'

Upon which I beg leave to observe, first. It seems to me that Clement says, Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome, for speaking of the 'great multitude of the elect, who had been an excellent example of patience among them,' meaning the Romans, he says, 'they <sup>g</sup> were joined to' or with 'the good apostles,' before mentioned. Therefore the apostles had suffered in the same place. Certainly Clement, who wrote this, did not think that Peter died at Babylon in Mesopotamia, and Paul at Rome in Italy. Secondly. The reason why Clement so particularly mentions St. Paul's travels, probably, was, because the extent of his preaching was very remarkable. And it is likely, that Clement refers to Rom. xv. 19. Thirdly, his omitting to

<sup>f</sup> See Dr. Benson's Preface to St. Peter's first epistle, sect. iii. p. 157. second edition.

<sup>g</sup> Τῆσιν — — συνηθροισθη πολυ πληθος εκλεκτων.

speak of Peter's travels is not a denial of his having travelled a great deal. Nor does it imply that he had not been at Rome. St. Paul must have been twice in the west, and at Rome, if he suffered martyrdom there. But Clement does not say so, though he knew it very well. As did the Corinthians likewise. But when we speak or write of things well known (as these things were at that time) there is no need to be very particular. It was sufficient if Clement mentioned such things as would render his exhortations effectual.

I shall now transcribe below <sup>h</sup> some like observations of Pearson, in his confutation of Salmasius.

Upon the whole, I cannot but think that these passages of Clement bear a testimony to the martyrdoms both of Peter and Paul, and that at Rome, which cannot be evaded.

Ignatius, about 108, writing to the Romans says, ' I do not command you, as Peter and Paul. They were apostles. I am a condemned person.' Ignatius must have supposed that the christians at Rome had been instructed by Peter, as well as by Paul. The observations of <sup>k</sup> Pearson, and <sup>l</sup> Barratier, upon this place, which I put below, appear very just.

The preaching of Peter, or of Peter and Paul, quoted

<sup>h</sup> Denique manifestum est, nihil hic a Clemente de Urbe vel de Imperatore discrete et expressim dictum esse, quia a Romanis ad Corinthios scripsit, qui hæc omnia, non minus quam ipse, noverunt. Imo Clemens mentionem loci non fecit, non quia ipse ignorabat, sed quia illi cognoverunt. Nam si ignorasset quo in loco, quâ in regione, aut quâ in orbis parte, mortuus est Petrus, quomodo asserere potuit, cum martyrio coronatum fuisse?—Proculdubio hæc loci ommissio non ex ignorantia cujuscumque, aut scriptoris alterius, sed ex certissimâ omnium, ad quos spectabat hæc epistola, tum Romanorum, tum Corinthiorum, aliorumque fidelium cognitione et exploratâ scientiâ quæ ulteriorem expositionem minime requirebat. Ac tandem argumentum hoc negativum ex Clemente productum, non eorum sed nostrum est. Clemens optime novit, et ubi, et quomodo passus est S. Petrus. Idem etiam bene noverunt tum Romani, tum Corinthii. Aliter eos eâ de re certiores fecisset Clemens. Pearson. de Success. prim. Romæ Episc. Diss. i. cap. 8. sect. ix.

<sup>i</sup> Οὐχ' ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Πάυλος διατασσομαι ὑμῖν. Ἐκεῖνοι ἀποστολοὶ, ἐγὼ κατακριτός. Ad Rom. cap. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Quid enim ex his verbis ad Romanos scriptis apertius, quam sanctissimum martyrem in eâ sententiâ fuisse, quod Petrus, non minus quam Paulus, Romæ evangelium prædicavit, et passus sit? Pearson, ib. cap. 7. n. ii.

<sup>l</sup> Ignatius,——Romanis scribens, negat se ipsis, tamquam Petrum et Paulum, præcipere velle. Cur Petrum et Paulum unâ nominat, nisi quod uterque Romæ fuerit? Cur Petrum, si cum Romanis nullum nexum habuerit? Si enim Romæ non fuerit, cum Romanis non scripserit, nil magis cum iis commune habebat, vel iis præceperat, quam Jacobus, vel Judas, vel Joannes. Manifestum est, Ignatium Romanum Petri iter novisse. Barrat. ubi supr. num. iii. p. 5.

by several ancient writers, (as has been shown in this work,) though not as a book of authority, composed<sup>m</sup> about the middle of the second century, or sooner, makes mention of Peter's being at Rome in this manner, as cited by Lactantius. 'After<sup>n</sup> his resurrection Christ opened to his disciples all things that should come to pass, which things Peter and Paul preached at Rome.' And what follows. There<sup>o</sup> is another large quotation of this book in the author of Rebaptizing, written about 256, where it is supposed that Peter and Paul were together at Rome.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about 170, in a letter to the church of Rome, inscribed to Soter their bishop, as cited by Eusebius, takes notice, 'that<sup>p</sup> Peter and Paul going to Italy, taught there, and suffered martyrdom about the same time.'

Irenæus, about 178, speaks of the church of Rome, 'as<sup>q</sup> founded and established by the two great apostles Peter and Paul.' In another place he says, 'that<sup>r</sup> Matthew wrote his gospel whilst Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and establishing the church there.' Irenæus, who was as likely to know as most, had no doubt about these things. And some of his arguments with heretics are partly built upon them; well knowing that they could not be contested, and that they were generally allowed.

According to Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about the year 194, St. Mark's gospel<sup>s</sup> was written at the desire of St. Peter's hearers at Rome.

Tertullian, about the year 200, and after, often speaks<sup>t</sup>

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 255, note v.

<sup>n</sup> Sed et futura aperuit illis omnia, quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt. Et ea prædicatio in memoriam scripta permansit. Lactant. Inst. l. 4. cap. 21. p. 422.

<sup>o</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 70.

<sup>p</sup> Ὁμοίως, δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἰταλίαν ὁμοσε διδάξαντες ἐμαρτυρήσαν κατα τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν. Ap. Euseb. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 68. The same passage is largely quoted, Vol. ii. p. 135.

<sup>q</sup> Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones: maximæ, et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis apostolis, Petro et Paulo, Romæ formatae et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem, et annuntiatam omnibus fidem, &c. Adv. Hæc. l. 3. cap. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Adv. Hæc. l. 3. cap. 1. et ap. Euseb. l. 5. cap. 8.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 15. et lib. VI. cap. 14, and of this work, Vol. ii. p. 224.

<sup>t</sup> Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam.—Ista quam felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt! Ubi Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquatur; ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur. De Præser. Hæc. cap. 36. p. 245.

Nec quidquam refert inter eos, quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit. De Baptism. cap. 4. p. 257.

Videamus quod lac a Paulo Corinthii hauserint.—Quid etiam Romani de

of Peter being at Rome, and teaching there, and suffering martyrdom there, together with Paul, or about the same time.

Caius, about 212, observes, that <sup>u</sup> in his time were to be seen at Rome the tombs of the apostles Peter and Paul, who had established that church.

Origen, about 230, as cited by Eusebius, says, that <sup>v</sup> Peter having preached in Pontus, Galatia, and other places, at length came to Rome, where he was crucified.

Cyprian <sup>w</sup> at Carthage about 248, and afterwards, always supposeth the church of Rome to have been established by Peter. So <sup>x</sup> likewise does Firmilian in Cappadocia, in his letter written in 258.

Lactantius <sup>y</sup> about 306, in his Institutions, ascribes the death of Peter and Paul to Nero at Rome.

The same Lactantius, or whoever is the author of the book of the Deaths of Persecutors, is very clear, that <sup>z</sup> in the reign of Nero, Peter came to Rome, and that by his order Peter was crucified, and Paul also put to death.

Eusebius, both in his Demonstration, and in his Ecclesiastical History, bears witness to the same things. Not now to insist on his Chronicle. In the former,<sup>a</sup> he says,

proximo sonent, quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt. Adv. Marcion l. 4. cap. 5. p. 505. B.

Orientem fidem Romæ primus Nero cruentavit. Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, quum cruci adstringitur. Tunc Paulus civitatis Romanæ consequitur natiuitatem, quum illic martyrii renascitur generositate. Scorpiac. cap. 15. p. 633. B.

<sup>u</sup> — *ἐβρῆσεις τα τροπαια των ταυτην ιδρυσαμενων εκκλησιαν.* Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 68. in. And see in this work, Vol. ii. ch. xxxii. num. i. 1.

<sup>v</sup> Ap. Euseb. l. 3. cap. i.

<sup>w</sup> Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio— cum nemo aute se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri, et gradus cathedræ sacerdotialis vacaret. Cyprian. ad Antonian. ep. 55. p. 104.

Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram, atque ecclesiam principalem—a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre—Cyprian. Cornelio. ep. 59. p. 135. Oxon. 1682.

<sup>x</sup> Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephanam stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit—multas alias petras inducat. Stephanus, qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se predicat, nullo adversus hæreticos zelo excitatur. Firmilian. ep. Cyprian. 75. p. 225.

<sup>y</sup> Itaque post illorum obitum, cum eos Nero interemisset, Judæorum nomen et gentem Vespasianus exstinxit, fecitque omnia quæ illi futura prædixerant. Institut. l. 4. cap. 21. p. 423.

<sup>z</sup> Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit.—et convertit multos ad justitiam—Quâ re ad Neronem delatâ—et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. De Mort. Persec. cap. 2.

<sup>a</sup> *Και Πητρος δε επι 'Ρωμης κατα κεφαλης παρηρται, Πανλος δε αποτεμνεται.* Dem. Ev. l. 3. p. 116. C.

‘ that Peter was crucified at Rome with his head downward, ‘ and Paul beheaded.’ In his ecclesiastical history, speaking of Nero ‘ as <sup>b</sup> the first persecutor of the christians,’ he says, ‘ that he put to death the apostles, at which time ‘ Paul was beheaded at Rome, and Peter crucified, as his- ‘ tory relates. And the account,’ he says, ‘ is confirmed ‘ by the monuments still seen in the cemeteries of that city, ‘ with their names inscribed upon them.’ And what follows. In another chapter of the same work, he says: ‘ that <sup>c</sup> ‘ Linus was the first bishop of Rome after the martyrdom ‘ of Paul and Peter.’ It is needless to refer to any more of the many places of this learned bishop of Cæsarea, where he appears to have been fully persuaded that these two apostles accomplished their martyrdom at Rome.

Athanasius <sup>d</sup> supposes both Peter and Paul to have suffered martyrdom in that city.

Ephrem the Syrian, about 370, says, that <sup>e</sup> Peter taught at Rome.

Epiphanius, as may be remembered, says, ‘ that <sup>f</sup> Matthew ‘ wrote first, and Mark soon after, being a companion of ‘ Peter at Rome.’ In another place <sup>g</sup> he speaks of Peter and Paul as the first apostles and bishops of Rome. After whom, he says, were Linus, Cletus, Clement.

Jerom’s opinion is well known from his article of St. Peter in his Book of Illustrious Men, where he says, ‘ that <sup>h</sup> ‘ Peter was crucified at Rome in the fourteenth year of ‘ Nero’s reign;’ and from <sup>i</sup> his chapter of St. Mark, whom he calls the disciple and interpreter of Peter, and says, ‘ that ‘ at the desire of the brethren at Rome, he wrote a short gos- ‘ pel, according to what he had heard from Peter.’ Not now to refer to any other places.

We lately saw how <sup>k</sup> Chrysostom says, that Peter having been at Antioch, afterwards went to Rome. In another

<sup>b</sup> Ταυτη γων ούτος θεομαχος εν τοις μυλιστα πρωτος ανακηρυχθεις, επι τας κατα των αποστολων επηρθη σφαγας. Παυλος δη ουν επ’ αυτης Ῥωμης την κεφαλην αποτμηθηναι, και Πετρος ὡσαντως ανασκολοπισθηναι κατ’ αυτον ισορρυνται, κ. λ. H. E. l. 2, c. 25. p. 67. Vid. et l. 2, cap. 22. fin. p. 62. D.

<sup>c</sup> Της ἐν Ῥωμαιοων εκκλησιας μετα την Παυλα και Πετρος μαρτυριαν, πρωτος κληροταται την επισκοπην Διως. H. E. l. 3. cap. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Πετρος δε, ὁ διὰ τον φοβον των Ιουδαιων κρυπτομενος, και Παυλος εν σαργανη χαλασθεις, και φυγων, ακεσαντες, εις Ῥωμην δι’ υμας μαρτυρησαι, εκ ανεβαλοντο την αποδημιαν. Apol. pro fugâ suâ, p. 331.

<sup>e</sup> See in this work, Vol. iv. ch. cii. num. vi. 13. et opp. syr. Tom. I. p. 553.

<sup>f</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. lxxxiv. num. iv. 3. from Hæc. 51. num. vi.

<sup>g</sup> Εν Ῥωμη γαρ γεγονασι πρωτοι Πετρος και Παυλος οί αποστολοι και επισκοποι, ειτα Διως, κ. λ. Hæc. 27. num. vi.

<sup>h</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 7.

<sup>i</sup> The same, num. viii. 2.

<sup>k</sup> See before, p. 237

place he says, that<sup>1</sup> after Peter and Paul, Ignatius also suffered martyrdom at Rome. And he thinks it a wise disposal of Providence, that so many should bear the most signal testimony to truth in a place which was then the chief seat of impiety and superstition.

According to Sulpicius Severus, who wrote about the year 401, Paul<sup>m</sup> and Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome in Nero's persecution.

Prudentius, about 405, has several times celebrated the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul at Rome. One place was transcribed from him not long<sup>n</sup> ago.

To him I subjoin P. Orosius<sup>o</sup> about 416.

And Theodoret, about 423, well observes, that<sup>p</sup> though Nero put to death two of the principal christian lawgivers, Peter and Paul, he could not abolish their laws.

I omit Augustine, and many others, who speak to the like purpose. But I would add, for showing how general this tradition is, that Abdias Babylonius, as he is called in his apostolical history, supposes Peter<sup>q</sup> to have been at Rome, and to have suffered martyrdom there.

Nor can any of my readers forbear to recollect the general, and almost unanimous, testimony of ancient writers concerning St. Mark: that he was a disciple of St. Peter, that his gospel is the substance of St. Peter's preaching, and that it was written at Rome.

It is not needful to make many remarks upon this tradition. But it is easy to observe, that it is the general, uncontradicted, disinterested testimony of ancient writers, in the several parts of the world, Greeks, Latins, Syrians. As our Lord's prediction concerning the death of Peter is recorded in one of the four gospels, it is very likely, that<sup>r</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Οἱ δὲ τὴν Ῥώμην οἰκῶντες, ἅτε πολλῆς τότε ἀσεβείας ἔσης ἐκεῖ, πλείονος ἐχρηζόν βοήθειας. Διὰ τῆτο καὶ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνης οὗτος ἐκεῖ πάντες ἐθνόθησαν. Ch. hom. in S. Ig. Mart. T. II. p. 599. A.

<sup>m</sup> Tum Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati. Quorum uni cervix gladio desecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est. Sul. Sev. Hist. Sacra. l. 2. cap. 29. al. 41.

<sup>n</sup> See before, p. 242.

<sup>o</sup> Nam primus Romæ christianos suppliciiis et mortibus adfecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione exercuari imperavit. Ipsumque nomen extirpare conatus, beatissimos Christi apostolos, Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit. Oros. Hist. l. 7. cap. 7.

<sup>p</sup> See before, Vol. v. p. 25. from Theod. Serm. 9. De Legibus, Tom. IV. p. 611. D.

<sup>q</sup> Apostol. Hist. de Petro, sect. xvi. &c. Ap. Fabr. Tom. II.

<sup>r</sup> Non infirmenda esse eâ de re antiquitatis testimonia, multa monent. 1. Convenientissimum sane fuit scribendum, ubi Petro mors oblata est, ad illustrandum Christi de servi sui martyrio oraculum.—Locus autem in ignoratione jacet, si in Romanâ civitate Petrus cruci suffixus non fuit. Basnag. ann 64. n. x

christians would observe the accomplishment of it. Which must have been in some place. And about this place there is no difference among christian writers of ancient times. Never any other place was named, beside Rome. Nor<sup>s</sup> did any other city ever glory in the martyrdom of Peter. There were in the second and third centuries disputes between the bishop of Rome and other bishops and churches about the time of keeping Easter, and about the baptism of heretics. Yet<sup>t</sup> none denied the bishop of Rome to have what they called the chair of Peter.

It is not for our honour, nor our interest, either as christians, or protestants, to deny the truth of events, ascertained by early and well attested tradition. If any make an ill use of such facts, we are not accountable for it. We<sup>n</sup> are not, from a dread of such abuses, to overthrow the credit of all history : the consequence of which would be fatal.

Fables and fictions have been mixed with the accounts of Peter's being at Rome. But they are not in the most early writers. They have been added since. And it is well known that fictions have been joined with histories of the most certain and important facts.

The two traditions, concerning Peter's being at Rome and Paul's preaching in Spain, ought not to be compared together. They are not at all alike. The latter is not attested by so many, nor so early writers, as the other : and is, probably, a mere conjecture, without any foundation,

<sup>s</sup> Gloriæ decorique maximo ecclesiis fuit, quod et doctrinâ et sanguine apostolorum conderentur. Hinc exclamabat olim Tertullianus : 'Felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt.' Qui fit ergo, ut nulla, præter Romanam, ecclesia in morte Petri exultarit et triumpharit? Id. ib.

<sup>t</sup> Cum gravissimos in adversarios inciderint olim episcopi Romani, Cyprianos, Firmilianos, aliosque bene multos, nonne eorum aliquis eam perstrinxisset; et gloriationem, quâ Romana se efferebat ecclesia, utpote quæ nunquam præsentia Petri, sanguineque floruerit, etsi ad ravim usque utroque ornamento superbiret? Id. ib.

<sup>n</sup> Neque ulla unquam traditio fuit, quæ majore testium numero eingat; ut de Petri in urbem adventu dubitari non possit quin omnia historiæ fundamenta convellantur. Basn. ann. 64. n. ix.

Tantus hac in re omnium consensus fuit, ut sane miraculo debuerit esse, quosdam nostris seculis ortos, factum adeo manifestum negare præsumsisse. Barrat. de Success. Ep. Rom. cap. i. num. i.

Verum hi omnium veterum patrum testimonio refelluntur.—Quæ (malum!) impudentia est, id quidem quod nemo veterum dixit, temere affirmare, Petrum scilicet sedem fixisse Babylone; id vero quod veteres omnes ecclesiastici scriptores disertissime prodiderunt, adventum videlicet Petri apostoli in urbem Romanam, pertinaciter negare! Atqui nihil in totâ historiâ ecclesiasticâ illustrius, nihil certius, atque testatius, quam adventus Petri apostoli in urbem Romanam. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. l. 2. c. 15.

but the words of Rom. xv. 28, which are no proof at all.

This argument may be censured by some as prolix, and even needless. But as some of our own times, as well as formerly, have denied or disputed this point, I have thought it expedient to let my readers see the evidences of what appears to myself, as well as to many other protestants, very certain: that St. Peter was at Rome, and suffered martyrdom there.

---

## CHAP. XIX.

### THE TWO EPISTLES OF ST. PETER.

- I. *Their genuineness shown from testimony and internal characters.* II. *The people to whom they were sent.* III. *The place where.* IV. *The time when they were written.* V. *Remarks upon 1 Pet. v. 13.*

HAVING written the history of the apostle Peter, I now proceed to his epistles. Concerning which three or four things are to be considered by us: their genuineness, the persons to whom they were sent, the place where, and the time when they were written.

I. The first epistle was all along received by catholic christians as authentic and genuine. This we learn from<sup>a</sup> Eusebius. Who likewise says: ‘Of<sup>b</sup> the controverted books of the New Testament, but yet well known, and approved by many, are, that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John.’ And in another place: ‘One<sup>c</sup> epistle of Peter, called the first, is universally received. This the presbyters of ancient times have quoted in their writings, as undoubtedly genuine. But that called his second, we have been informed, [by tradition,] has not been received as a part of the New Testament. Nevertheless, appearing to many to be useful, it has been carefully studied with the other scriptures.’ By which, I think, we may be assured, that a great regard was shown to this

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 96—99, 123.

<sup>b</sup> P. 97.

<sup>c</sup> P. 98.



epistle by many christians in the time of our learned Ecclesiastical Historian.

Jerom says : ‘ Peter<sup>d</sup> wrote two epistles, called catholic : ‘ the second of which is denied by many to be his, because ‘ of the difference of the style from the former.’

And Origen before them, in his Commentaries upon the gospel of St. Matthew, as cited by<sup>e</sup> Eusebius, says : ‘ Peter,<sup>f</sup> on whom the church is built, has left one epistle, ‘ [universally] acknowledged. Let it be granted, that he ‘ also wrote a second. For it is doubted of.’

What those learned writers of the third and fourth centuries say of these two epistles, we have found agreeable to the testimony of more ancient writers, whom we have consulted. For the first epistle seems to be referred to by<sup>g</sup> Clement of Rome. It is plainly referred to by<sup>h</sup> Polycarp several times. It is also referred to by the<sup>i</sup> martyrs at Lyons. It was received by<sup>k</sup> Theophilus, bishop of Antioch. It was quoted<sup>l</sup> by Papias. It is quoted in the remaining writings of<sup>m</sup> Irenæus, <sup>n</sup> Clement of Alexandria, and <sup>o</sup> Tertullian. Consequently, it was all along received. But we do not perceive the second epistle to be quoted by<sup>p</sup> Papias, nor<sup>q</sup> by Irenæus, nor<sup>r</sup> Tertullian, nor<sup>s</sup> Cyprian.

However, both these epistles were generally received in the fourth and following centuries, by all christians, except the Syrians. For they were received by Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Jerom, Rufin, Augustine, and others. As may be seen in the alphabetical table, in St. Peter, at the end of the eleventh volume, to which the reader is referred.

Such are the testimonies of ancient writers concerning these two epistles. If we consult the epistles themselves, and endeavour to form a judgment by internal evidence : I suppose it will appear very probable that both are of the same author. And it may seem somewhat strange, that any of the ancients hesitated about it, who had the two epistles before them. For with regard to some of the most ancient writers, it may be supposed that the second epistle had not been seen by them, it not having come to their hands together with the first.

The first epistle being allowed to be St. Peter's, we can argue in favour of the other also after this manner. It

<sup>d</sup> Vol. iv. p. 459.

<sup>f</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 494, 495.

<sup>h</sup> P. 107, 108. See also p. 95, 96.

<sup>l</sup> P. 119, 123, 125.

<sup>p</sup> P. 123.

<sup>q</sup> P. 179, 182.

<sup>e</sup> H. E. l. 6. cap. 25. p. 227. A.

<sup>g</sup> P. 52.

<sup>i</sup> P. 164.

<sup>k</sup> P. 207, 213.

<sup>n</sup> P. 241.

<sup>o</sup> P. 292.

<sup>r</sup> P. 293, 295.

<sup>s</sup> Vol. iii. p. 44.

bears in the inscription the name of the same apostle. For so it begins: "Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ." And in ch. i. 14, are these words: "Knowing, that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ has showed me." The writer of this epistle may have had a particular revelation concerning the time of his death, not long before writing this. But it is probable, that here is a reference to our Lord's predictions concerning St. Peter's death, and the manner of it, which are recorded in John xxi. 18, 19.

From ch. i. 16—18, it appears, that the writer was one of the disciples, who were with Jesus in the mount, when he was transfigured in a glorious manner. This certainly leads us to Peter, who was there, and whose name the epistle bears in the inscription.

Ch. iii. 1, "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you: in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance:" plainly referring to the former epistle, which has been always acknowledged for Peter's. These words are express. But it might have been argued with some degree of probability from ch. i. 12—15, that he had before written to the same persons.

Once more, ch. iii. 15, 16, he calls Paul brother, and otherwise so speaks of him and his epistles, as must needs be reckoned most suitable to an apostle.

The writer therefore is the apostle Peter, whose name the epistle bears in the inscription.

So that we are here led to that observation, which Wall placed at the head of his notes upon this second epistle. 'It is,' says<sup>t</sup> he, 'a good proof of the cautiousness of the ancient christians in receiving any book for canonical, that they not only rejected all those pieces forged by heretics, under the names of apostles:—but also, if any good book affirmed by some men, or by some churches, to have been written and sent by some apostle, were offered to them, they would not, till fully satisfied of the fact, receive it into their canon.' He adds: 'There is more hazard in denying this to be Peter's, than there is in denying some other books to be of that author, to whom they are by tradition ascribed. For they, if they be not of that apostle, to whom they are imputed, yet may be of some other apostle, or apostolical man. But this author is either the apostle, or else by setting his name, and by other circumstances, he does designedly personate him; which no man of piety and truth would do.' And then

<sup>t</sup> Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 358, 359.

he concludes : ' This epistle being written by him but a ' little before his death, ch. i. 14, and perhaps no more than ' one copy sent ; it might be a good while before a number ' of copies, well attested, came abroad to the generality of ' the christian churches.'

What has been just said is sufficient to confute the opinion advanced by Grotius, that <sup>u</sup> this second epistle was written by Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, after James, the Lord's brother. Indeed that opinion cannot be admitted. It is destitute of all authority from antiquity, and is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the epistle itself, or at least with many things in it. As has been well observed by <sup>v</sup> Vitringa, and has been now shown by us.

Jerom, in his article of St. Peter, in his book of Illustrious Men, as already seen, says : ' Peter <sup>w</sup> wrote two epistles, ' called catholic : the second of which was by many denied ' to be his, because of its differing in style from the former.' Of<sup>x</sup> this he speaks likewise in his epistle to Hedibia. Basnage <sup>y</sup> says, he is not able to discern such difference of style in the two epistles. However, Dr. Sherlock, now bishop of London, has largely treated of this point in his Dissertation concerning the authority of the second epistle of St. Peter. Who observes, p. 203, ' that the first and ' third of the three chapters, into which this epistle is now ' divided, agree in style with the first epistle. The only ' difference is in the second chapter, the style of which is ' no more like to that of the other two, than it is to that of ' the first epistle. The occasion of this difference seems to ' be this, that in the second chapter there is a description

<sup>u</sup> Scriptorem autem hujus epistolæ arbitrator esse Simeonem, episcopum post Jacobi mortem Hierosolymis, ejusdemque Jacobi, cujus epistolam habemus, successorem et imitatorum, &c. Grot. in 2. ep. S. Petri.

<sup>v</sup> Verum quâcumque etiam specie se commendat conjectatio hæc Grotiana, hactenus animum inducere non potui, ut eam probem. Epistola Petri posterior talis est, ut scripta censeri nequeat ab impostore. Est enim gravis, et sancto viro dignissima. Quod si ita est, certissime Petro erit vindicanda, quia præter præfationem, non temere rejiciendam, alia per hanc epistolam sparsa sunt, quæ personam Petri nobis digito quasi monstrant, ut cap. i. 18. iii. 15. Vitring. Observat. Sacr. l. 4. cap. 9. num. xlii.

<sup>w</sup> Scripsit duas epistolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur : quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam. De V. I. cap. i.

<sup>x</sup> Habebat ergo Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum ; cujus evangelium, Petro narraute, et illo scribente, compositum est. Denique et duæ epistolæ, quæ feruntur Petri stylo inter se et caractere discrepant, structurâque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus. Ad Hedib. Qu. xi. T. IV. P. I. p. 183. al. ep. 150.

<sup>y</sup> Nos styli discrimen deprehendere non possumus. Neque continet aliquid, quod apostolo sit indignum. Basnag. A. 63. num. iii.

‘ of the false prophets and teachers, who infested the church, and perverted the doctrines of the gospel. Some ancient Jewish writer had left behind him a description of the false prophets of his own, or perhaps earlier times. Which description is applied, both by St. Peter and St. Jude, to the false teachers of their own times.’ It is added by his Lordship, p. 204, ‘ St. Jerom supposed, and others have followed his opinion, that St. Peter made use of different interpreters, to express his sense in his two epistles. But had that been the case, the difference of style would have appeared in the whole, and not in one part of it only : which is the present case. And I see no reason to think that St. Peter did not write both his epistles himself.’

This is the account which his Lordship gives of the difference of the style, which all will allow to be ingenious, whether they admit it to be right, or not. For some may think, that<sup>2</sup> all this difference of style arises from the subject treated of in the second chapter.

I conclude, therefore, that the two epistles, generally ascribed to the apostle Peter, are indeed his.

Mr. Ostervald, of Neufchatel, speaking of the first of these epistles, says : ‘ It contains very weighty instructions, and is one of the finest books of the New Testament.’ Of the second he says : ‘ It is a most excellent epistle, as well as the foregoing, and is written with great strength and majesty.’

Certainly, these epistles, and the discourses of Peter recorded in the Acts, together with the effects of them, are monuments of a divine inspiration, and of the fulfilment of the promise which Christ made to him, when he saw him and his brother Andrew employed in their trade, and casting a net into the sea : “ Follow me,” said he, “ and I will make you fishers of men,” Matt. iv. 19.

II. Concerning the persons to whom these epistles were sent, there have been different opinions among both ancients and moderns.

Eusebius,<sup>a</sup> speaking of St. Peter’s first epistle, as universally acknowledged, says : ‘ It is inscribed by him to the Hebrews, “ scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” ’ They who were desirous to know Jerom’s opinion, may consider what is transcribed from him, Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 7. For he does not seem to me to have any settled judgment about

<sup>2</sup> Concerning this, see more hereafter in the remarks upon St. Jude’s epistle, chap. xxi. near the end.

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 99.

the persons to whom Peter wrote. Didymus of Alexandria supposed <sup>b</sup> St. Peter's first epistle to have been sent to Jews scattered abroad in several countries; to the same purpose Ecumenius, not only in his argument of the epistle, referred to by me <sup>c</sup> formerly, but also in his commentary <sup>d</sup> upon the beginning of the epistle.

Among the moderns not a few are of the same opinion, as Beza and Grotius in their notes upon the first verse of the first epistle, and Mill <sup>e</sup> in his Prolegomena. Cave says, St. Peter's <sup>f</sup> two epistles were written chiefly to Jewish christians. Tillemont, speaking of the first epistle, says it <sup>g</sup> is addressed particularly to the converted Jews in those countries, but it speaks also to the Gentiles, who had embraced the faith.

But though some of the ancients, as just seen, say that St. Peter wrote to the believers of the circumcision, we have in the course of this work observed divers others, who say he wrote to Gentiles: as <sup>h</sup> the author of the Calling of the Gentiles, by some supposed to be Prosper of Aquitain: the <sup>i</sup> author of the Divine Promises and Predictions, <sup>k</sup> Junilius. Cassiodorus in one place <sup>l</sup> speaks of Peter's writing to the Gentiles, in another <sup>m</sup> to believing Jews. Augustine has twice said, that <sup>n</sup> Peter wrote to Gentiles. In like manner another author <sup>o</sup> in a sermon joined with his works, who may be supposed to have been his disciple. Gregory, <sup>p</sup> the first bishop of Rome, expresseth himself as if he thought that St. Peter's epistles were sent to all christians in general, both Jews and Gentiles, in the countries mentioned at the beginning of the first epistle. Bede, in his prologue to the seven catholic epistles, largely cited by us formerly, says, that <sup>q</sup> St. Peter's epistles were sent to such as had been proselyted from gentilism to judaism, and after that were converted to the christian religion. He speaks again to the like purpose at the beginning of his Exposition of St. Peter's first epistle. But the Greek

<sup>b</sup> P. 303.<sup>c</sup> P. 156.

<sup>d</sup> Τοις εκ περιτομης ουτος επι-ελλει, ως ο μακαριος Ιακωβος' αλλ' εκεινος αοριτως πασι τοις υπο την οικουμένην κατοικουσιν Ιαδαισις υπεδηποτε οσιν. Ουτος δε αφωρισμενος τοις κλιμασι Ποντες, κ. λ. *Ecum. T. ii. p. 482. C. D.*

<sup>e</sup> Num. 60.

<sup>f</sup> Reliquit post se epistolas duas, Judæis christianis præcipue inscriptas. *H. L. T. I. p. 5.*

<sup>g</sup> Il l'adresse particulièrement aux Juifs convertis dans toutes ces provinces, quoiqu'elle, parle aussi aux Gentils qui avoient embrassé la foi. *S. Pierre art. 33. Mem. T. I.*

<sup>h</sup> P. 39.<sup>k</sup> P. 107.<sup>l</sup> P. 111.<sup>m</sup> P. 113.<sup>n</sup> Vol. iv. p. 510.<sup>o</sup> The same.<sup>p</sup> Vol. v. p. 130.<sup>q</sup> P. 145.

word, rendered by us “strangers,” is not equivalent to proselytes: as was observed long ago by <sup>r</sup> Œcumenius upon the place, and since by <sup>s</sup> Basnage.

Mr. Wetstein argues from divers texts, that <sup>t</sup> the first epistle was sent to Gentiles. Mr. Hallet in his learned Introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews observes: ‘Some,’ says he, ‘go upon the supposition, that St. Peter’s epistles ‘were written to Jews. But it seems to me abundantly ‘more natural to suppose, that they were written to Gentile ‘christians, if we consider many passages of the epistles ‘themselves.’ Where <sup>u</sup> he proceeds to allege many passages, and, in my opinion, very pertinently. Some of which will be also alleged by me by and by.

Dr. Sykes <sup>v</sup> has lately declared himself in favour of the same sentiment, and argued well for it.

Mr. Basnage supposed that <sup>w</sup> St. Peter’s epistles were written to Jews and Gentiles, chiefly the former.

To me it seems, that St. Peter’s epistles were sent to all christians in general, Jews and Gentiles, living in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia: the greatest part of whom must have been converted by Paul, and had

<sup>r</sup> Σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ὄνομα οὐ ταύτων τῶν προσηλυτῶν, κ. λ. Œcum. Vol. II. p. 483. D.

<sup>s</sup> Fallitur egregie Beda. — A quâ se sententiâ revocasset, si vocem a Petro adhibitam, ἐπιδημιος, attendisset, quâ religionis proselytus nunquam designatur. Basn. ann. 57. n. iv.

<sup>t</sup> Ad eos, qui ex Gentibus electi sunt, ut Christo et veritati obedirent. Cap. i. 8, 18, 21, 22. ii. 10. iv. 3. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 681.

<sup>u</sup> See his introduction, p. 23—25.

<sup>v</sup> ‘This epistle of St. Peter,’ says he, ‘was written to the strangers scattered ‘through several parts of the Lesser Asia. And it is plain, that he meant by ‘them Gentiles converted in those parts of the world to Christ. He does not ‘mean Jews, but such as were elect, according to the foreknowledge of God ‘the Father. Such, “of whose salvation the prophets inquired, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto them,” ch. i. ver. 10; such, “for ‘whom Christ was manifested in these last times,” ver. 20; such as were λαοὶ ‘εἰς περιποίησιν, an acquired people, who had not obtained mercy, ch. ii. 9, ‘10; “as sheep going astray, but now returned,” ver. 25; as men, “who in ‘the time past of their life had wrought the will of the Gentiles,” iv. 3.’ These are marks sufficient to describe the people to whom St. Peter wrote. —The Gentiles were “now begotten in Christ to a lively hope.” They were become now what Jews formerly were, “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people,” &c. The Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ, ch. iii. sect. 252. p. 62, 63; see likewise ch. v. num. 832. p. 306, 307.

<sup>w</sup> Ut nostra fert opinio, ad utrosque scripta est, præcipue tamen ad Judæos, qui sub apostolatam Petri ceciderant. Ad gentes quoque epistolam scriptam fuisse, ex his explorete percipitur: ‘Qui quondam eratis non populus, nunc estis populus Dei,’ I ep. ii. 10. Quæ Ethnicorum præcipue sunt. — Præterea Ethnicorum idolatria his per-stringitur: ‘Incessimus in nefariis idolorum cultibus,’ iv. 3. Basn. ann. 57. num. iv.

been before involved in ignorance, and sin, as all people in general were, till the manifestation of the gospel of Christ.

That St. Peter wrote to all christians in those countries, is apparent from the valedictory blessing, or wish, at the end of the epistle, 1 Ep. v. 14, "Peace be with you all that are in Christ Jesus." Lewis Capellus, who thought that St. Peter's first epistle was written to Jewish believers, allows that <sup>x</sup> the second epistle was written to all christians in general, and particularly to Gentiles, induced thereto by the comprehensiveness of the address at the beginning of that epistle: "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us." He should have concluded as much of the first epistle likewise. For they were both sent to the same people, as is evident from St. Peter's own words, 2 Ep. iii. 1.

Moreover, the inscription of the first epistle seems to be as general as that of the second. Let us observe it distinctly.

"To the elect," *εκλεκτοις*, says Wall upon the place: 'He useth the word *εκλεκτοι*, choice ones, just as St. Paul does the word *αγιοι*, saints, for the word christians. And as St. Paul directs almost all his epistles "to the saints," that is, the christians, of such a place; so St. Peter here, "to the elect," or choice ones, that is, christians, sojourning in the dispersions of Pontus, Galatia, and Bithynia.'

"Strangers," *παρεπιδημοις*. Good men, though at home, are strangers, especially if they meet with opposition, trouble, and affliction, as those christians did to whom St. Peter is here writing. For he speaks of their "trials and temptations," ch. i. ver. 6, 7, and exhorts them, ch. ii. 11, "as sojourners, and strangers, *ως παροικες και παρεπιδημους*, to abstain from fleshly lusts." Says Ecumenius upon ch. i. ver. 1, 2, 'He calls <sup>y</sup> them strangers, either on account of their dispersion, or because that all who live religiously are called strangers on this earth, as David also says: "I

<sup>x</sup> Ad posteriorem autem B. Petri epistolam.—Nec fuit ea scripta, quemadmodum prior, solis Judæis *τοις εκ διασπορας*, sed omnibus in universum fidelibus, tum ex Judæis, tum ex Gentibus, ad Christum conversis. Quod liquet tum ex ver. 1. cap. i. *τοις ισοτιμον ημιν λαχρσει πεινω*, (quod de Gentibus proprie dicitur) tum ex eo quod cap. iii. 15, 16. dicit Paulum ad eos scripsisse in omnibus suis epistolis. Atqui pleræque omnes Pauli epistolæ scriptæ sunt ad Gentes ad fidem Christi conversas. Capell. Hist. Apost. p. 44.

<sup>y</sup> Εκλεκτοις παρεπιδημοις.] Το παρεπιδημοις, ητοι δια την διασποραν ειπεν, η και οτι παντες οι κατα Θεον ζωντες παρεπιδημοι λεγονται της γης, ως και Δαβιδ φησιν, κ. λ. (Ecum. T. II. p. 483.

‘ am a sojourner with thee, and a stranger, as all my fathers were,’ Ps. xxxix. 12.’

“ Scattered throughout Pontus——or, of<sup>z</sup> the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia :—” so he calls them, not because they had been driven out from their native country, but because he writes to the christians of divers countries, who also were but a few, or a small number, in every place where they dwelled.

This may suffice for showing, that these two epistles were sent to all christians in general, living in the countries, mentioned at the beginning of the first epistle.

I shall now show, that these christians were for the most part of Gentile stock and original.

1 Pet. i. 14, “ As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves, according to the former lusts in your ignorance.” This might be very pertinently said to men converted from gentilism to christianity ; but no such thing is ever said by the apostles, concerning the Jewish people, who had been favoured with divine revelation, and had the knowledge of the true God. And ver. 20 and 21, he says, that “ through Christ they did now believe in God.” Therefore they were not worshippers of God, till they were acquainted with the christian revelation. In like manner, ch. ii. 9, St. Peter speaks of those to whom he writes, as “ having been called out of darkness into God’s marvellous light.” Moreover, they once were not God’s people, ver. 10, “ Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God : which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.” Words resembling those of St. Paul, Rom. ix. 24, 25, where he is unquestionably speaking of Gentile converts.

There are also other expressions, which plainly show, that these persons had been Gentiles, and had lived in the sins of gentilism. Ch. i. 18, “ Forasmuch as ye know, that ye were redeemed from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers.” And ch. iv. 3, “ For the time past of our life may suffice us, to have wrought the will of the Gentiles : when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries.” St. Peter does not charge himself with such things. But they to whom he writes had been guilty in those respects. And by way of condescension, and for avoiding offence, and for rendering his argument more effectual, he joins himself with them.

Once more, when St. Peter represents the dignity of

<sup>p</sup> Εκλεκτοις παρεπιδημοις διασπορας Ποντου,——



those to whom he writes, upon account of their christian vocation, ch. ii. 9, "as a chosen generation, a peculiar people, a royal priesthood:" certainly, the expressions are most pertinent, and emphatical, if understood of such as had been brought from gentilism to the faith of the gospel, as indeed they plainly were. For he there says, "they were to show forth the praises of him, who had called them out of darkness into his marvellous light."

To all which might be added, what was hinted before, that the persons to whom Peter writes were, for the most part, the apostle Paul's converts. This must be reckoned probable from the accounts which we have in the Acts of St. Paul's travels and preaching. Whence we know, that he had been in Galatia, and the other countries, mentioned by St. Peter at the beginning of his first epistle. Moreover he observes, 2 Ep. iii. 15, that "his beloved brother Paul had written unto them." We may reasonably suppose, that he thereby intends St. Paul's epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, and Colossians, all in those countries, and for the most part gentile believers. Nor do I see reason to doubt, but that Peter had before now seen and read St. Paul's two epistles to Timothy. And if we should add them, as here intended also, it would be no prejudice to our argument. For those epistles likewise were designed for the use and benefit of the churches in those parts.

To me these considerations appear unanswerable. I shall therefore take notice of but one objection only, which is grounded upon ch. ii. 12, "Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation."

Upon the first clause in that verse Beza says, that <sup>a</sup> this place alone is sufficient to show, that this epistle was sent to Jews. But I think not. From St. Paul may be alleged a text of the like sort, 1 Cor. x. 32, "Give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, [καὶ Ἑλλήσιν,] nor to the church of God." It might be as well argued from that text, that the Corinthians were by descent neither Jews nor Greeks, as from this, that the persons to whom St. Peter wrote, were not originally Gentiles. In the text of St. Paul, just alleged, by Jews and Gentiles, or Greeks, are intended such as were unbelievers. So it is likewise in the

<sup>a</sup> Inter Gentes. *ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.*] Vel unus hic locus tribus illis dispersis proprie fuisse inscriptam hanc epistolam convincit. Bez. in loc.

text of St. Peter, which we are considering : as is apparent from the latter part of the verse, above transcribed at large. St. Peter had a right to distinguish those, to whom he writes, from the gentile people among whom they lived : as he had at the beginning of his epistle called them elect, or choice ones, and strangers, and they likewise went by the name of christians, as we perceive from ch. iv. 16.

St. Peter's two epistles then were sent to all christians in general, living in those countries : the greatest part of whom had been converted from gentilism, or heathenism.

III. Our next inquiry is, concerning the place where these epistles were written.

At the end of the first epistle St. Peter says : " The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you." Which text understood literally, has been thought by some to denote Babylon in Assyria, or Babylon in Egypt. By others it is interpreted figuratively, and supposed to denote Jerusalem, or Rome. So that there are four opinions concerning the place where this epistle is dated. All which must be considered by us.

I. Pearson by Babylon supposes to be meant <sup>b</sup> a town, or city, of that name in Egypt. But it seems to me, that <sup>c</sup> little can be said for this opinion. Babylon in Egypt is an obscure place. It was a frontier town, or strong castle, with a garrison, as it is described by <sup>d</sup> Strabo : in whose time, the reign of Tiberius, was quartered there one of the three Roman legions, appointed to keep the Egyptian people in order. In such a place, as may be supposed, there <sup>e</sup> were but few Jews and not many inhabitants of any sort, beside soldiers. This opinion likewise is altogether without the authority of ancient christians. If St. Peter had written an

<sup>b</sup> Explodatur figurata, admittatur literalis expositio. Non opus erit, ut in Assyriam nos conferamus, si nudo urbis nomine standum esse arbitremur. Alia enim erat urbs Babylonis nomine insignita, eaque Judææ multo vicinior, a Babyloniis, post dira prophetarum vaticinia, Ptolomæorum permissu condita et habitata. Pearson. de Succ. Rom. Episc. Diss. i. num. vii. &c.

<sup>c</sup> Duas enim vetus terrarum orbis habuit Babylones, alteram clarissimam illam Chaldæorum regiam, alteram castellum quoddam Ægypti a Babyloniis conditum. Posteriores hic nominari, nemo crediturus fuisse videtur, nisi fama fuisset vulgata, prioris Babylonis ætate nihil superfuisse, certe nullos prorsus ei fuisse incolas. Heumann. Nova Sylloge Dissertat. P. II. p. 106.

<sup>d</sup> Αναπλευσαντι δ' εστι Βαβυλων φερριον ερημνον——νυνη δ' εστι τρατοπεδον ενος των τριων ταγματων των φοροεντων την Αιγυπτον. Strab. l. 17. p. 807. al. p. 1160.

<sup>e</sup> Abundasse Judæis Ægyptiacam Babylonem, vix probabile videtur, propter et constitutum in eâ civitate Romanorum præsidium, cum signis et aquilis suis quæ Judæis odio erant, et vicinitatem Alexandriæ, in quâ libentius debebant. Basnag. Ann. 46. num. xxvii.

epistle in Egypt, in all probability, it<sup>f</sup> would have been dated at Alexandria. But there is not in early antiquity any intimation, that<sup>g</sup> the apostle Peter was at all at Alexandria, or in any part of Egypt. If St. Peter had been at Babylon in Egypt, and had founded a church there, it would have been a church of great renown among christians: whereas<sup>h</sup> there is not for the first four centuries any notice taken of a church, or bishop in that place.

Le Clerc, who<sup>i</sup> follows Pearson, says, in his notes upon 1 Pet. v. 13, 'Thereby<sup>k</sup> is to be understood, not Babylon, which lay on the east side of the Euphrates, and where Peter never was, but a city in Egypt, so called, and lying not far from the place where now is Cairo.' But what proof is there of Peter's ever having been in Egypt, more than of his having been in Assyria?

2. Lewis Capellus conjectured, that<sup>l</sup> by Babylon is to be understood Jerusalem. But it is a mere conjecture, quite destitute of foundation in antiquity. And therefore, in my opinion, no more to be received, than the preceding interpretation.

3. Divers other learned men think, that by Babylon is

<sup>f</sup> Si Petrus in Ægyptiacâ Babylone versatus est, cui probabile fiet, non petivisse Alexandriam, civitatem totius orbis secundum Romanam nobilissimam, magnoque Judæorum numero frequentem; cum Alexandriæ in vicinâ exstaret Babylon, et moris esset apostolorum, aliquâ in regione vestigium ponentium, metropoles adire, ut majus theatrum haberet evangelii prædicatio, quæ inde veluti ex fonte manabat urbibus provincialibus irrigandis. Id. ibid.

<sup>g</sup> Quod vero in Ægypto unquam versatus fuerit, ne levissima quidem antiquitatis umbra obtendi potest. Cav. de Petro, H. L. p. 6.

Quis vero veterum dixit, Petrum se Alexandriam contulisse? Hocce dissimulâssent tot eruditi scriptores, quos Alexandria peperit ecclesia? Basnag. ib.

<sup>h</sup> Liqueet omnes ecclesias apostolicas magnæ existimationis fuisse veteribus. Hinc illud Tertullianum: 'Percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident.' Proindeque ecclesia, quæ Memphiticâ Babylone fuit, apostolicis esset inferenda, et multo honore cumulata fuisset, utpote a Petro fundata. Jam vero tam obscura fuit Babylonica illa ecclesia, ut labentibus quadringentis amplius annis, in antiquitatis monumentis nullo vestigio reperitur: nullâ fuit episcoporum successione, nullâ martyrum passione nobilis. Quod de ecclesiâ apostolicâ, et in Imperio Romano constitutâ, vix cogitatione fingi potest. Basn. ubi supra.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. ejus H. E. anno. 61. num. vii. et Annot. ad Hammondi Præmonitionem in 1 Petri epistolam.

<sup>k</sup> Il faut entendre, non la Babylone, qui étoit à l'orient de l'Euphrate, et où S. Pierre n'a jamais été; mais une ville d'Egypte, qui se nommoit ainsi, et qui n'étoit pas loin de lieu où est bâti le Caire. Le Clerc. sur. 1. ep. de S. Pierre, v. 13.

<sup>l</sup> Ego potius conjicerem Jerosolymæ fuisse scriptam, et Jerosolymam a Petro fuisse dictam figurate Babylonem; quod tum temporis Jerusalem non esset amplius urbs, sed spiritualis quædam Babylon, in quâ ecclesia Dei captiva quasi tenebatur, et gravi servitute premebatur, quâtenus ipdem a Judæis persecutionem pati cœperat. Cap. Hist. Ap. p. 42.

meant Babylon in Assyria. So <sup>m</sup> Beza, <sup>n</sup> Lightfoot, <sup>o</sup> Basnage. Cave, who supposeth <sup>p</sup> the first epistle of St. Peter to have been written at Babylon in Assyria, thinks that <sup>q</sup> his second epistle was written at Rome.

They who reject this opinion say, that <sup>r</sup> the Assyrian Babylon was at that time almost deserted. On the contrary, they who embrace it, say, there <sup>s</sup> were multitudes of Jews in that country. Which may be true. For there were many Jews in most countries. But it would have been more to the purpose to produce some evidence from antiquity, that Peter was in that country. The primitive christians had in their hands St. Peter's first epistle. And it was universally received as his. And it is dated at Babylon. And yet ecclesiastical history affords no accounts, that this apostle was in Assyria or Chaldea. Is not this a proof, that <sup>t</sup> there was not any very ancient tradition, that he was in that country? We just now observed passages of Origen, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerom, Chrysostom, relating to St. Peter's travels. But none have mentioned Babylon as a place where he travelled and preached the gospel.

Says Mr. Beausobre: 'As <sup>u</sup> Peter was the apostle of the

<sup>m</sup> Babylona proprie accipio pro celebri illâ Assyriæ urbe in quâ tum esset Petrus, circumcissionis apostolus. Bez. in I Pet. v. 13.

<sup>n</sup> See his sermon upon 1 Pet. v. 13. Vol. ii. p. 1141—1147, and many other places in his works. <sup>o</sup> Basn. ann. 46. num. xxvii.

<sup>p</sup> Verum ego priorem sententiam, tanquam longe verisimiliorem, amplector, tum quod in Babylone Parthicâ magna esset Judæorum frequentia, &c. Cav. in Petro, H. L. p. 6.

<sup>q</sup> Epistola secunda Romæ, ut videtur, paullo ante mortem scripta. Id. ibid.

<sup>r</sup> An urbem illam S. Petrus adire maxime concupivit, quam Prophetarum vaticinio, et justo Dei judicio percussam esse novit? Pearson, ubi supr. sect. iv. Paulatim igitur defecit Babylon, a regibus primo, deinde a populo deserta. Ib. num. v.

<sup>s</sup> In Assyriâ, ubi Babylon, immensa fuit Judæorum multitudo, quos sub Petrinum cecidisse apostolatium, certum, exploratumque est; ut nusquam gentium provinciam administrare suam feliciter potuerit. Basnag. ann. 46. num. xxvii.

<sup>t</sup> Sunt qui in dictâ Petri epistolâ Babylonis nomine non Romam, sed Babylonem ipsam, quæ caput fuit Assyriorum, designari contendunt. Verum hi omnium veterum patrum testimonio refelluntur. Certe qui Petrum Babylone sedisse volunt, ostendant nobis oportet successionem episcoporum, qui Babylonis ecclesiam post Petrum administrarunt.—Quæ (malum!) impudentia est, id quidem quod nemo veterum dixit, temere affirmare, Petrum scilicet sedem fixisse Babylone; id vero quod veteres omnes scriptores disertissime prodiderunt, pertinaciter negare! Vales. Annot. in Euseb. l. 2. cap. 15. p. 33.

Negant enim Petrum Romæ fuisse; quod testatur antiquitas. Affirmant autem Babylone fuisse, vel in Ægypto, vel in Chaldæâ; quod nulla prodit historia. Est in 1 Pet. v. 13.

<sup>u</sup> Comme il étoit l'apôtre des Juifs dispersés parmi les Payens, S. Jacques étant demeuré en Judée, il alla à Babylone et dans les provinces voisines, où

' Jews scattered abroad among the Gentiles, St. James having stayed in Judea, he went to Babylon, where a great number of the Israelites had remained.' But may I not take the liberty to ask a question, and say, who assigned to these apostles those several provinces, with such limitations? St. James stayed in Judea. It is allowed. We are certain of it from the history in the Acts. Nevertheless he did not confine his regards to the Jews in the land of Israel. For he wrote an epistle, addressed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad." And if Peter also was an apostle, chiefly, of the circumcision; it was not of those only, who were in Gentile countries, but of those likewise who were in Judea: where, as I apprehend, he spent the greatest part of his life, even after our Saviour's ascension.

Mr. Beausobre says, 'Peter went to Babylon, where a great number of Israelites had remained.' That is, he imagined that he did so. And it was fit for him so to do. As Basnage, in a passage<sup>v</sup> cited not long ago, says: 'There was a multitude of Jews in Assyria, where was Babylon. Nor could he any where more successfully execute his apostolical commission.' And because we imagine that Peter might very fitly preach the gospel in Assyria, we conclude that he went thither. But such reasonings, if calmly considered, are of no weight. It would be much better to allege some ancient testimonies, in behalf of St. Peter's journey into Assyria, or Parthia.

Mr. Wetstein thinks that St. Peter's first epistle was written in the country of Babylon, in Mesopotamia. As there is somewhat new in his argument, I place below<sup>w</sup> a large part of it. In particular, he says, that when a per-

il étoit resté un bon nombre d'Israélites. Hist. de Manich. l. 2. ch. 3. T. I. p. 181.

<sup>v</sup> See note s.

<sup>w</sup> Cur Babylon in Italiâ potius, aut Ægypto, quam in Mesopotamiâ sit quærenda, causam non video. Veteres quidem Romam intelligunt.—Quod recentiores observant, Babylonem proprie dictam, quo tempore Petrus hæc scribebat, habitatam non fuisse, verum est. At (præterquam quod et Stephano Byzantino et Lucano constat, etiam Seleuciam eo tempore nomine Babylonis fuisse appellatam) possumus Babylonem interpretari non urbem, sed totam regionem.—Huic observationi addo aliam, quæ licet mihi nunc primum in mentem venerit, suum tamen apud me pondus habet. Nimirum ubi de pluribus vel provinciis vel urbibus loquimur, vel ubi ad plures scribimus, ordini naturæ convenientius et simplicius videtur, ut incipiamus non ab eâ, quæ loquentibus vel scribentibus est remotissima, sed proxima. Hunc ordinem servavit Paulus, Col. iv. 13. et Joannes ex Patmo, Apoc. i. et ii. Huic ordinem accurate servavit etiam Petrus, si scripsit ex Mesopotamiâ minime autem, si vel ex Ægypto, vel ex Italiâ eum scripsisse existinemus. Wetsten. in 2 Pet. v. 13. T. II. p. 697, 698.

son writes to the people of several cities, or countries, it is natural to begin with that which is nearest to him. So does Paul, Col. iv. 3, and St. John in Patmos, Rev. i. and ii. The like order, says he, is also accurately observed by St. Peter, if he wrote from Mesopotamia, not if we suppose him to have written from Italy or Egypt.

But such observations, though ingenious and plausible, are not demonstrative and decisive, even when they are just and right. Which cannot be said of this. For supposing St. Peter to have been in Mesopotamia, the country nearest to him would be Cappadocia, as lying more eastward and more southward than the two first named. Certainly Pontus and Galatia were farther off from Mesopotamia than Cappadocia. The truth is, St. Peter begins at the north, and so goes round. And that way of beginning does as well suit Rome, as Babylon, so far as I can see.

Beside all this, there offers an argument, which appears to me decisive. If the Assyrian Babylon was not now subject to the Romans, but to<sup>x</sup> the Parthians, (which I suppose to be allowed by all,) it cannot be the place intended by St. Peter. For the people, to whom he writes, were subject to the Romans. And at the time of writing this epistle he must have been within the territories of the same empire, 1 Epist. ii. 13, 14, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake : whether it be to the king," or rather emperor, as formerly<sup>y</sup> shown, "as supreme : or unto governors sent [from Rome] by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." Again, ver. 17, "Honour the king :" or rather, the emperor. If St. Peter had not now been within the Roman territories, he would have been led to express himself in a different manner, when he enforced obedience to the Roman emperor.

This argument appears to me very obvious. And yet I do not know that it has ever been thought of by any before. Which makes me almost suspect the validity of it: though I cannot discern where the defect lies.

St. Peter requires subjection to governors sent by the emperor: undoubtedly meaning from Rome. I suppose that way of speaking might be properly used in any part of the empire. But it might have a special propriety, if the writer was then at Rome: where indeed, in all probability, Peter then was.

4. So that we are now come to the fourth opinion con-

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Strab. l. 16. p. 1081. in al. p. 745.

<sup>y</sup> See Vol. i. p. 89.

cerning the date of this epistle. Which is, that by Babylon St. Peter figuratively means Rome. This is the opinion of <sup>z</sup> Grotius, and <sup>a</sup> Whitby, and <sup>b</sup> Valesius, and all the learned writers of the Roman communion in general.

They have, confessedly, in their favour, the testimony of antiquity; which is no small advantage.

Eusebius having an account of St. Mark's gospel, and of its having been written at the request of St. Peter's hearers at Rome, adds: 'and <sup>c</sup> it is said, that Peter mentions 'this Mark in his epistle, which, they say, he wrote at 'Rome: and that himself calls that city Babylon figuratively in those words: "The church that is at Babylon, 'salutes you, as does Mark my son."''

This interpretation some suppose Eusebius to ascribe to Papias. But <sup>d</sup> Spanheim denies it. And perhaps it is not certain. Whether Papias said so or not it was the prevailing opinion in the time of Eusebius.

Jerom in his book of *Illustrious Men*, in his article of St. Mark, transcribes the just cited passage of Eusebius, but expresseth himself more positively. 'Peter <sup>e</sup> makes mention of this Mark in his first epistle, figuratively denoting 'Rome by the name of Babylon. "The church which is 'at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, as 'does Mark my son."''

<sup>z</sup> De Babylone dissident veteres et novi interpretes. Veteres Romam interpretantur, ubi Petrum fuisse nemo verus christianus dubitabit; novi Babylonem in Chaldaea. Ego veteribus assentior. Nam quod Romam Babylonem vocavit, non in hoc tantum servit, ut si deprehenderetur epistola, non posset inde sciri, quibus in locis viveret. Verum etiam—congruentias plurimas inter Babylonem et Romam vide, Orosii ii. 2, 3, 4. Grot. ad I Pet. v. 13.

<sup>a</sup> See him upon I Pet. v. 13.

<sup>b</sup> Romam Petrus figurate Babylonem vocavit, vel ob magnitudinem et potentiam, vel propter impietatem.—Potest etiam alia ratio hujus cognominis afferri, quod scilicet, ut Babylonii Judæos in servitutem redegerant, sic Romani tunc Judæos ditioni suæ subjecissent. Sunt qui in dictâ Petri epistolâ Babylonis nomine non Romam, sed Babylonem ipsam, quæ caput fuit Assyriorum designari contendunt. Verum hi omnium veterum patrum testimonio refelluntur. Vales. Annot. ad Euseb. H. E. l. 2. c. 15. p. 33.

<sup>c</sup> Τα δὲ Μαρκὰ μνημονεῖν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιτολῇ, ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης σημαίνειν τε τὸ ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικωτέρου Βαβυλώνα, προσειπὸντα διὰ τούτων Ἀσπαζεται ἡμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλώνι συνεκλεκτῇ, καὶ Μαρκοῦ ὁ υἱὸς μου. Eus. H. E. l. 2. c. 15.

<sup>d</sup> Atqui primus omnium Eusebii narrationi de Marco hæc subjungit: 'Esse, qui dicerent Romam figurate Babylonem appellari.'—Nec tamen Papiæ ipsi adscribi eam interpretationem, quidquid vulgo sentiant, Valesio ipso verba hæc a prioribus sejungente, supra demonstratum est. Vid. P. III. num. xii. Spanhem. Diss. de fictâ Profect. Petri ad Rom. Part. iv. num. ii. tom. II. p. 375.

<sup>e</sup> Meminit hujus Marci et Petrus in epistolâ primâ, sub nomine Babylonis figuratè Romam significans: Salutatur vos quæ in Babylone est coëlecta, et Marcus filius meus. De V. I. cap. viii.

Bede,<sup>f</sup> by Babylon understood Rome, as did <sup>g</sup> Ecumenius. However, it may be here properly recollected, that <sup>h</sup> formerly we saw an author, Cosmas of Alexandria, in the sixth century, who hereby seems to have understood Babylon in Assyria.

This opinion concerning the place of writing this epistle is much confirmed by the general tradition of the ancients, that St. Mark's gospel was written at Rome, at the request of Peter's hearers, and that Mark here mentioned is the evangelist. Nor is this contradicted by Cosmas, but confirmed by him. For he expressly says, 'that <sup>i</sup> Mark, the 'second evangelist, wrote his gospel at Rome by the direction of Peter.'

They <sup>k</sup> who reject this interpretation, affect to slight Papias: whereas there is no good reason for it. If he said so, certainly his testimony would be of some value. But we do not clearly perceive that this was in Papias. However, it is said by Eusebius. It was then a common opinion. Nor did he know of a better.

Others insinuate likewise, that <sup>l</sup> the reason why Jerom was willing to confound Rome with Babylon, was, that he was out of humour with the people of Rome; which seems to me to be groundless. Jerom only transcribes what he had found in Eusebius. They who reject the accounts of those two learned ancients should by all means produce some evidence that Peter was in Mesopotamia. We have good assurance that St. Mark's gospel was written at Rome, and that Peter preached and suffered martyrdom there. His two epistles therefore, probably, were written in the same city, a short time before the period of his life.

Mill varies. In his note upon the place, he is for Babylon in Egypt. But in his Prolegomena <sup>m</sup> he is for Rome,

<sup>f</sup> Babylonem typice Romam dicit, videlicet propter confusionem multiplicis idololatriæ, &c. Bed. expos. 1 Pet. v. 13.

<sup>g</sup> Βαβυλωνια δε την Ρωμην οια το περιφανες καλει, ο και Βαβυλων πολλω χρονω εσχηκε. Œcum. in loc. tom. II. p. 526. A.

<sup>h</sup> See vol. v. p. 97, and 100.

<sup>i</sup> P. 94, and 336.

<sup>k</sup> Quod si ut Rufinus interpretatur, teste Papiâ nititur, infirmo sane tibiâne fultum est. Nec temere ad tropum in nominibus urbium aut regionum est recurrentum, nisi ubi propria vocis significatio locum habere non potest. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 697.

<sup>l</sup> C'est une imagination de Papias, que les anciens ont adopté avec trop de facilité, et que S. Jérôme auroit rejetée avec mépris, si, dans la mauvaise humeur où il étoit contre Rome, il n'eût été bien aise de la confondre avec Babylone. Beaus. Hist. Manich. l. 2. ch. 3. T. 1. p. 181.

<sup>m</sup> Romæ eam scriptam fuisse, notant ex traditione veterum Eusebius, Hieronymus in Catalogo, et alii permulti. Hanc enim Babylonis nomine designatam voluit Petrus, ceu communi tum temporis apud Judæos suos appel-



and argues well enough for that opinion. I suppose that to be his final determination.

It may be best for me now to conclude this argument with a part of Whitby's note upon I Pet. v. 13, which is very agreeable also to the note of Estius upon the same text. That Babylon, is figuratively here put for Rome, 'is an opinion so early delivered by Papias, and which afterwards so generally prevailed, (as we learn from Eusebius, Jerom, and Œcumenius,) that I subscribe to the note at the end of this epistle, *εγγραφή απο Ρωμης*, "it was written from Rome," styled also "Babylon" by the author of the Revelations, ch. xvii. and xviii. For the apostle, at the time of writing it, must be at Rome, figuratively, or at some city, properly called Babylon. Now as it is uncertain whether St. Peter ever was at Babylon in Chaldea, or in Egypt, and improbable that he made any considerable stay there: so it is very improbable he should do it when near his end. At Rome and Antioch, where he confessedly resided, church history is copious in giving an account of his successors in those sees. But who can show any thing of this nature, with reference to either of those Babylons? &c. &c.'

IV. The only thing remaining to be observed by us is the time of writing these two epistles. Which I think to be the year 63, or 64, or at the latest 65. I suppose Paul to have left Rome in the spring of the year 63. St. Peter was not then come thither. If he had been there, he would have been mentioned by St. Paul in some of his epistles, written near the end of his imprisonment at Rome. However, not very long after St. Paul was gone, St. Peter might come thither. Here, I suppose, he preached for a while freely, and with great success. And it appears to me probable, that both these epistles were written at Rome, not long before the apostle's death.

That he was old, and near his end, when he wrote the second epistle, is apparent from ch. i. 14. And that the first epistle to the same christians had not been written long before, may be argued from the apology which he makes for writing this second epistle to them; ch. i. ver. 13—15, "Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth. Yea, I think

latione: quæ quidem et in hunc usque diem apud eos obtinet. Abarbinel, aliique recentiores Judæi, commentantes in prophetias de Babylone, ad Romam istas referunt; quod, sicut a Babyloniis olim in servitutem redacti fuerint, ita postea jam a Romanis, &c. Proleg. num. 59, 60.

it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by way of remembrance. Knowing, that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ has showed me. Moreover, I will endeavour, that you may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance.”

It is not unlikely, that soon after the apostle had sent away Silvanus with the first epistle, some came from those countries to Rome, where was a frequent and general resort from all parts, bringing him informations concerning the state of religion among them: which induced him to write a second time for the establishment of the christians, among whom he had laboured. And he might well hope that his last words, and dying testimony to the doctrine, which he had received from Christ, and had taught for many years with unshaken stedfastness, would be of great weight with them.

V. I have now gone through the four inquiries proposed at the beginning of this article. I shall here add only a few remarks upon I Pet. v. 13, “The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you. And so does Mark, my son.”

The word “church” is not in the original, but is inserted in the translation. The same word is supplied in <sup>o</sup> Œcumenius, and <sup>p</sup> in the Latin, and other ancient versions, with the approbation of <sup>q</sup> Grotius, and many others. But Mill<sup>r</sup> in his notes upon this text, where he understands the word Babylon literally, of a city of that name in Egypt, argues, that thereby is intended St. Peter’s wife, or some honourable christian woman, of the city of Baby-

<sup>n</sup> Ασπαζεται υμας η εν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, και Μαρκος ο υιος μου.

<sup>o</sup> Ασπαζεται υμας η εν Βαβυλωνι εκκλησια συνεκλεκτη.

<sup>p</sup> Εκκλησια prefigunt Lin. [marginæ, manu recentiori:] Œcumen. Vulg. Syr. Arab. Æthiop. ex interpretamento Mill. in loc.

<sup>q</sup> Ad vocem συνεκλεκτη, et Syrus, et Arabs, et Latinus, addunt nomen ecclesiæ, recte. Nam et ad ecclesiam scribit, et hæc, et illa, pariter Deo electa, id est, a mundo segregata. Grot. in loc.

<sup>r</sup> Nempe pro indubitato sumitur, ecclesiam Babyloniorum hic intelligi. Atqui vero, si de ecclesiâ hic sermo, quum nulla ejus mentio facta sit in precedentibus, aperte dixisset Petrus εκκλησια εν Βαβυλωνι.—Mihî quidem vehemens suspicio est, per την εν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτην, intelligi hic Petri uxorem, fidei simul susceptæ, vitæ, laborum, sociam; quæ Babylone, Ægyptiacâ tunc, eum hæc scriberentur, egerit.—Si dicas, illud η εν Βαβυλωνι denotare potius feminam aliquam, quæ fixam sedem habuerit in Babylone, nihil equidem repugno. Esto η εν Βαβυλωνι sive uxor Petri, sive etiam opulenta quædam ac illustri loco nata femina apud Babylonios, quæ apostolum hospitio exceperit; certe nihil hoc loco de ecclesiâ Babyloniorum. Mill. in loc.

lon, where he then was. Which conjecture is countenanced by <sup>s</sup> Wall.

Dr. Heumann proceeds farther. First, he says, that <sup>t</sup> by "Mark my son," we are to understand Peter's own son, which he had by his wife. And <sup>u</sup> then by "elected together with you," is to be understood an excellent Jewish woman of Babylon in Assyria, whom, with many others, Peter had there converted to the christian faith, and afterwards married: his first wife, mentioned, Luke iv. 38, by whom he had Mark, being dead.

But it appears to me very unlikely that St. Peter should send salutations to the christians of several countries from a woman, not named by him. Beza says well, that <sup>v</sup> St. Peter omits the noun "church," as is often done with regard to words of common use. What was the sense of christians in former times, appears from Œcumenius, and the versions taken notice of above. The same sense appears in <sup>w</sup> the Complexions of Cassiodorius, and <sup>x</sup> the Exposition of Bede.

With regard to St. Mark, Œcumenius says, ' that <sup>y</sup> Peter ' calls him "his son" according to the spirit, not accord- ' ing to the flesh. Him he permitted to write the gospel. ' But some, as he adds, have presumed to call Mark ' son of Peter according to the flesh, arguing from Luke's ' history, in the Acts of the Apostles: where Peter, having

<sup>s</sup> ' The word "church" is not in the Greek, but put by the translators, as ' understood in the Greek.—Dr. Mill thinks it to mean Peter's wife, who, ' being now at Babylon with her husband, did salute those christians to whom ' the epistle was written. And then the reading of the words will be: "She ' who is your fellow-christian at Babylon, saluteth you.'" Wall, p. 357.

<sup>t</sup> Similem errarunt errorem, qui quem ' filium suum' hic loci nominavit Petrus, eum non naturalem ejus fuisse filium, sed spiritualement arbitratum sunt. —Maneat nunc, Petrum de filio sibi ex conjuge nato loqui; quem facile ex hoc ipso loco cognoscimus fuisse socium paternorum itinerum, et simul *συνεργον εν Χριστω*. Heum. ubi supr. p. 110.

<sup>u</sup> Relinquitur igitur, ut statuamus, loqui apostolum de uxore sua, Babylonie natâ, ac tum, cum ibi versaretur Petrus, unâ cum aliis utriusque sexûs Judæis in ecclesiam Christi traductâ. Hoc enim sibi volunt hæc verba: *ή εν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη*.—Quis nunc non videat, Petrum hanc *νεοφυτον*, singulari haud dubie pietate et prudentiâ conspicuam, duxisse in matrimonium, comitemque postea habuisse sacrorum itinerum? Ex quo sequitur, priorem uxorem, cujus Lucæ iv. 38, mentio, e qua suscepit Marcum, fuisse extinctam. Heum. ibid. p. 112, 113.

<sup>v</sup> Ecclesiæ nomen omittit ut in vocabulis communi usu tritis fieri solet. Bez.

<sup>w</sup> Salutationes quoque ecclesiæ, quam de Babylonîâ, id est, de seculi istius confusione, dicit electam, et Marci filii sui piâ institutione transmittens. Cassiod. in loc.

<sup>x</sup> Expos. in 1 Pet. cap. v.

<sup>y</sup> *Μαρκον δε υιον κατα πνευμα καλει, αλλ' ο κατα σαρκα*. Œcum. T. II. p. 526. A.

· been delivered out of prison by an angel, is said to have  
· “ come to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose  
· surname was Mark,” as<sup>z</sup> if he had then gone to his own  
· house, and his lawful wife.’

That is a wrong deduction from the words of Acts xii. 12. But we hence perceive, that those people supposed Mark the evangelist to have been the same as John, surnamed Mark.

And I would also farther observe here, by the way, ‘ that Œcumenius<sup>a</sup> computes Silvanus, by whom St. Peter sent this epistle, and who is mentioned, chap. v. 12, to be ‘ the same who is several times mentioned by St. Paul in ‘ his epistles, particularly 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. ii. 1.’ Who likewise, very probably, is the same as Silas, often mentioned in the Acts.

Œcumenius there calls Silvanus “ a most faithful man, zealous for the progress of the gospel.” Indeed all must be sensible that he was an excellent man, who from generous principles attended the apostles of Christ in the journeys undertaken by them in the service of the gospel. His deputation from the apostles and elders, and church of Jerusalem, with their letter to the christians at Antioch, is very honourable to him. Acts xv. 27, 32. His stay there, and Paul’s choosing him for his companion in his travels, when he and Barnabas separated, farther assure us of his just sentiments concerning the freedom of the Gentiles from the yoke of the law, and of his zeal for promoting true religion.

<sup>z</sup> —ώς εις την εαυτη οικιαν επανελθουσα, και την νομιμην συζυγον. Ib. B.

<sup>a</sup> Πιτος υπερβαλλοντος ο Σιλουανος ουτος, και περι το κηρυγμα ευθυμως αγωνιζομενος, ειγε και Παυλος αυτη μνημονευει, και συνεργον αυτον μετα Τιμοθεου εν ταις επιτολαις παραλαμβάνει· Παυλος, λεγων, και Σιλουανος και Τιμοθεος. Œcum. ib. p. 525. D.

## CHAP. XX.

## THE THREE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN.

I. *Their genuineness shown from testimony and internal characters.* II. *The time of writing the first of these epistles.* III. *The people to whom it was sent.* IV. *Observations upon the second epistle.* V. *Upon the third.* VI. *The time when they were written.*

I. I HAVE already written the history of St. John, one of Christ's twelve apostles, and an evangelist. I have also observed what is needful concerning the gospel written by him. We are now to consider his epistles.

The regard shown to them by the ancients, may be soon perceived by recollecting briefly what has been largely alleged by us from them in the several volumes of this work.

St. John's first epistle is referred to by Polycarp, vol. ii. p. 108, is quoted by Papias, p. 119, 123, 125, and is referred to by the martyrs of Lyons, p. 164. His first and second epistles are quoted by Irenæus, p. 180. They were also received by Clement of Alexandria, p. 225, 242. And, says Origen, 'John, beside the gospel and Revelation, has left us an epistle of a few lines. Grant also a second, and a third. For all do not allow these to be genuine,' p. 495. Dionysius of Alexandria receives John's first epistle, which he calls his catholic epistle, *ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολικὴ*. He likewise mentions the other two, as ascribed to him, p. 694. The first epistle was received by Cyprian, and, probably, the other two likewise, vol. iii. p. 45—47. The second epistle is quoted by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, p. 568. Eusebius says, 'Beside his gospel, his first epistle is universally acknowledged by those of the present time, and by the ancients: but the other two are contradicted: that is, doubted of by some, vol. iv. p. 96, 97. See also p. 124, 125. All the three epistles were received by Athanasius, p. 155, by Cyril of Jerusalem, p. 173, by the council of Laodicea, p. 182, by Epiphanius, p. 187, 190. All three were received by Jerom, p. 436, but the two last were doubt-

ed of by some in his time, p. 445, 446. All three were received by Rufinus, p. 484, by the third council of Carthage, p. 487, by Augustine, p. 494, 510, 511, and by all those authors, who received the same canon of the New Testament that we do. They are in the Alexandrian manuscript, vol. v. p. 82. All three are also in the catalogues of Gregory Nazianzen, vol. iv. p. 287, and of Amphilochius, p. 293. But this last observes, that some received one of them only. And indeed it is acknowledged, that but one epistle of St. John is received by the Syrian churches, p. 310, 312, 321. Nor were any more received by Chrysostom, p. 537, 548, 549. Venerable Bede, near the beginning of the eighth century, in his Exposition of the second epistle, says, ‘Some<sup>a</sup> have thought this and the following epistle not to have been written by John the apostle, but by another, a presbyter of the same name, whose sepulchre is still shown at Ephesus, whom also Papias mentions in his writings. But now it is the general consent of the church, that John the apostle wrote also these two epistles: forasmuch as there is a great agreement of doctrine and style between these and his first epistle, and there is also a like zeal against heretics.’ They who are desirous to see more quotations of ancient writers, may consult the table of principal matters in the last volume, in St. John, Catholic epistles, and Authors, who had the same canon of the N. T. with that which is now generally received: which article may be found under Canon of the scriptures of the N. T.

All the three epistles are now generally received as St. John’s in these parts of the world. And with good reason, as seems to me. Said Origen: ‘he has also left an epistle of a very few lines. Grant also a second and a third.’ That is very right. One epistle was received by all, as certainly genuine. And it is not worth the while to contend about the other two, when they are so very short, and resemble the first in sentiment, phrase, and manner of writing, as is well observed by<sup>b</sup> Mill. And of the second

<sup>a</sup> Quidam putant, hanc et sequentem epistolam non esse Joannis apostoli, sed ejusdem presbyteri Joannis, cujus sepulcrum usque hodie monstratur in Epheso. Cujus etiam Papias, auditor apostolorum, et in Hierapoli Episcopus, in opusculis suis sæpe meminit. Sed nunc generalis ecclesiæ consensus habet, quod has quoque epistolas Joannes apostolus scripserit, quia revera multam verborum et fidei similitudinem cum primâ ejus epistolâ ostendunt, et simili zelo detestantur hæreticos. Bed. Exp. in 2 e.o. Joan.

<sup>b</sup> Epistolas autem istas habere auctorum Joannem—ex eo plane constat, quod in istis omnibus eadem passim sint νοηματα, idem genus et character dictionis. Secundæ, certe ολιγοσιχη, (neque enim continet ultra tredecim versus ex hodiernis nostris) octo quidem versiculorum cum sensus, tum ipsæ ῥησεις,

epistle, which consists of only thirteen of our verses, eight may be found in the first, either in sense or expression. The title of elder, at the beginning of these two epistles, affords no just exception. It is a very honourable character, well becoming John as an apostle, and now in years, residing in Asia, as superintendent of all the churches in that country. And St. Peter speaks of himself in the same character, in his epistle universally acknowledged, ch. v. 1.

Dr. Heumann supposeth, that <sup>d</sup> here is a reference to St. John's great age, at the time of his writing these two epistles. And he thinks that St. John was then as well known by that title as by his name. The elder therefore is as much, as if he had said, the aged apostle. And he refers to Wolfius, and others, who had before said the same, or what is to the like purpose.

The want of a name at the beginning is no objection. It is rather an argument that they are his: that being agreeable to St. John, who prefixes not his name to that epistle, which is unquestionably his.

And say Beausobre and L'Enfant in their preface to the second and third epistles: 'It is certain, that the writer of the third epistle speaks with an authority, which the bishop of a particular church could not pretend to, and could not suit John the elder, even supposing him to have been bishop of the church of Ephesus, as the pretended apostolical constitutions say he was appointed by John the apostle. For if Diotrephes was bishop of one of the churches of Asia, as is reckoned, the bishop of Ephesus had no right to say to him, as the writer of this epistle

exstant in epistolâ primâ.—Epistola autem tertiâ, ejusdem omnino coloris ac characteris cum secundâ, per omnia sapit Joannem apostolum. Mill. Proleg. num. 153.

<sup>c</sup> Quod aliqui Joanni cuidam alteri, Presbytero vulgo dicto, adscriptas velint has duas epistolas, ii neutiquam vident, quam fortiter contra ipsos militet illud *ὁ πρεσβύτερος κατ' ἐξοχὴν*; quique privato homini, vel etiam episcopo, haudquâquam conveniat—imo vero apostolo nostro peculiariter adaptatum et accommodatum erat: utpote qui jam plusquam nonagenarius fuerit, omnibusque provinciæ Asiaticæ ecclesiis præседerit. Mill. Ibid. num. 153, 154. Vid. et Lamp. Prolegom. in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num. viii.

<sup>d</sup> Deinde articulo *ὁ* docet Joannes, nomen hoc sibi cum nemine commune esse, adeoque viso *τῆ πρεσβυτερῆ* titulo statim scriptorem harum literarum agnovisse.—Nihil proinde restat, quam ut statuamus, a Joanne isto titulo indicari ætatem suam provecitissimam, morisque tum fuisse, cum appellitari honoris ac reverentiæ causâ 'Senem,' sive 'Seniorem,' vel etiam 'Senem apostolum.'—Græca proinde hæc, *Ὁ Πρεσβύτερος Γαῖος*, melius reddi Latine non possunt, quam hoc modo: Grandævus apostolus salutem dicit Gaio.—Heuman. Comm. in Joan. Ep. iii. ap. Nov. Syllog. Diss. P. i. p. 279, 280.

‘ does, ver. 10, “ If I come, I will remember his deeds which he does.” That language, and the visits made to the churches, denote a man, who had a more general jurisdiction, than that of a bishop, and can only suit St. John the apostle.’

II. That may suffice for showing the genuineness of the three epistles. Let us now make some remarks upon each of them, beginning with the first. Concerning which there are two inquiries that may be proper: the time when, and the persons to whom it was written.

Grotius thought this<sup>e</sup> epistle to have been written in Patmos before the destruction of Jerusalem. Hammond and Whitby likewise were of opinion, that it was written before that great calamity befell the Jewish nation. Dr. Benson<sup>f</sup> is inclined to place it in the year of our Lord 68, of Nero 14, that is, after the Jewish war was broke out, and not long before the destruction of Jerusalem. Mill,<sup>g</sup> and Le Clerc,<sup>h</sup> who follows him, place this epistle in the year 91, or 92. Basnage<sup>i</sup> speaks of this epistle at the year 98, and Baronius<sup>k</sup> at the year 99. Beausobre and L’Enfant in their preface to this epistle express themselves after this manner: ‘ Although we cannot say any thing certain concerning the time when St. John wrote this epistle, we may be satisfied, that it was near the end of the first century, when the apostle was far advanced in age.’ Du Pin<sup>l</sup> says, it is not known when it was written, but most probably, near the end of the apostle’s life. Mr. Whiston<sup>m</sup> thought this, and the other two epistles of St. John, to have been written not long after each other, about the year of Christ 82, or 83. Mr. Lampe<sup>n</sup> supposeth this first epistle to have been written after the Jewish war, before St. John’s exile in Patmos, and, probably, some good while before it. Consequently, he and Mr. Whiston do not differ greatly about the time of this epistle.

I must likewise say, though the exact time is not known, I am of opinion, it was not written, till after the Jewish war

<sup>e</sup> Puto autem scriptam, ut alibi dixi, ex Patmo hanc epistolam, non multo ante excidium Hierosolymitanum. Grot. Pr. in 1 Ep. Joan.

<sup>f</sup> Preface to St. John’s first Epistle, sect. iv.

<sup>g</sup> Proleg. num. 148—150.

<sup>h</sup> H. E. ann. 91. num. i.

<sup>i</sup> Ann. 98. num. iv.

<sup>k</sup> Ann. 99. num. vii—x.

<sup>l</sup> Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. xi.

<sup>m</sup> Commentary upon St. John’s three Catholic Epistles, p. 14.

<sup>n</sup> Acquiescimus igitur hactenus in judicio clarissimi Ensii de Canone N. T. p. 270. Scriptæ tamen creduntur Joannis epistolæ ante exilium in Patmum insulam. Neque est ratio, ob quam non statueremus, eas diu ante illud tempus fuisse conscriptas. Lampe, Prol. cap. 7. num. iv. note (h).



was over. My reason is, that the arguments alleged, for proving it to have been written sooner, are not satisfactory. And in examining them, perhaps, some things may occur, affording hints of a later date.

One argument is taken from ch. ii. 18, "it is the last time," or hour: meaning, as <sup>o</sup> some interpreters think, the last hour of the Jewish state and constitution. Nevertheless, there <sup>p</sup> are learned men, who do not assent to that interpretation. Grotius himself owns, that <sup>q</sup> the phrase is sometimes used concerning the world, or mankind in general, as well as the Jews. And Mr. Lampe, who supposeth the phrase to relate to the divine judgment upon the Jewish people, says, it <sup>r</sup> might be used not only at the time when it was inflicting, but also after it was accomplished. Which he supposes to be meant by those expressions, ch. ii. 8, "the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth:": [though <sup>s</sup> Wolfius thinks no such thing there intended.] And therefore, he says, he <sup>t</sup> does not acquiesce in the reasons alleged by Grotius and Hammond, to prove that this epistle was written before that event.

Let me add here also a part of Wall's note upon ch. ii. 18, which to me appears not amiss. 'The saying of St. John, "it is the last time," is spoken as a great many such sayings of St. Paul, and the other apostles, had been, according to the general charge given by Christ to the apostles, and to all other christians, to live in a continual expectation of the judgment. They that interpret it

<sup>o</sup> 'Ultima hora' (id est, ultimum tempus,) ubi ad Judæos sermo est, significat tempus, proximum excidio urbis, ac templi, et reipublicæ Judæorum. Grot. annot. in 1 ep. Jo. ii. 18.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Wolff. Prolegom. in 1 ep. Joann. p. 243, 244. Conf. eund. ad i. ep. cap. ii. ver. 18.

<sup>q</sup> Nomen, 'horæ extremæ' modo totum humanum genus respicit, modo populum Judaicum, ex quo erant apostoli, et non pauci christianorum. Grot. in loca quædam N. T. de Antichristo: speciatim in 1 ep. Jo. cap. ii. Opp. tom. III.

<sup>r</sup> Alii maturius, aut brevi ante, aut saltem circa excidium Hierosolymitanum scriptum esse existimant, qui nobis maxime ad verisimilitudinem accedere videntur. Probabile enim est, per *εσχάτην ὥραν* intelligi tempus judicii divini in Judæos, cap. ii. 18. ejusque consummationem spectare verba cap. ii. 8. Lampe, Prol. l. I. c. 7. n. iv. p. 106.

<sup>s</sup> — sed non video, quomodo imminens illud judicium argumentum esse possit, quo apostolus ad inculcandum et urgendum amorem mutuam uti voluerit. Tenebræ omnino inferunt pristinam et Judæorum et Gentilium conditionem, per quam non solum erroribus, sed et vitiis ita erant immersi, ut *ἰοι σκοτεινὸς* appellari potuerint. Wolf. Curæ in 1 Jo. ii. 8.

<sup>t</sup> Grotius et Hammondus ante excidium Hierosolymitanum scriptam esse suspicantur; quod tamen loca adducta non evincunt. Licet enim excidium illud in actum datum esset, dici tamen etiamnum poterat, quod hora illa ultima venerit. Id. ib. note (*h*).

‘ otherwise, of the destruction of Jerusalem, as Grotius, and Hammond, are forced to suppose this epistle to have been written just before that destruction, about the year 69.— Nor are St. John’s words here like those of any one that was foretelling that event: but rather of one that was speaking of the present state of the christian religion.’

Again, it is argued, that <sup>u</sup> the apostle might refer to the calamities of the Jewish people in these words, ch. ii. 17, “The world passeth away and the lust thereof.” But those are only general expressions, representing the uncertainty of all earthly things. And therefore afford not any argument, that the apostle had therein a regard to affairs in Judea. For, if he had, his expressions would have been more distinct and particular.

Thirdly, an argument is also brought from ch. ii. 13, “I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning.” Whereby St. John has been supposed by some to intend some aged christians, who had seen Jesus Christ upon earth. Which is more likely to have been the case of some in the year 68, about thirty-five years after Christ’s ascension, than many years afterwards. To which I answer, that <sup>v</sup> by “him that is from the beginning,” probably is intended God the Father, not Jesus Christ. It is equivalent to what is afterwards said of others, in the same verse, “I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father.” But it would not sound so well to say: “I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known the Father.” See also ver. 14.

Fourthly, it is <sup>w</sup> argued to the like purpose from ch. ii. 7, “I write no new commandment to you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning.” But thereby may be meant no more than the commandment, which ye had from the beginning of your being christians: or from the time when you were first converted to the christian religion, whenever it was. And, as <sup>x</sup> Wolfius observes, none

<sup>u</sup> Unde etiam per ‘mundum transeuntem cum suis cupiditatibus’ ad idem excidium reipublicæ Judaicæ respicere evangelista potuit. Lampe, ib. p. 106.

<sup>v</sup> ‘Nôstis Deum, qui Senex Dierum.’ Dan. vii. 9, 13, 22. Dat cuique ordini quæ ipsi conveniunt. A primâ ætate novistis Deum, hujus mundi opificem. Is autem is est, qui Christum misit, eumque pro se audiri voluit. Grot. ad ver. 13.

<sup>w</sup> Accedit, quod ad fratres scribat, qui præceptum a principio audiverant. cap. ii. 7. Per quod intelligi debet principium prædicationis evangelicæ. A quo igitur non nimium removeri debent illi, quos apostolus alloquitur. Lampe, ubi supra, p. 106.

<sup>x</sup> Quod ad alteram rationem attinet, nullus eorum, qui Joannis ætate ad Christi cognitionem adducti sunt, ab originibus evangelii nimium removebitur,

of those to whom St. John wrote, in any part of his life, were very far distant in point of time from the first preaching of the gospel.

Since therefore there are no expressions in the epistle, declaring the time of it, or clearly referring to the calamities attending the downfall of the Jewish state, it appears to me probable, that it was not written till a good while after that event, about the year of Christ 80, or later.

III. We are next to consider to whom this epistle was sent.

And here I observe: as the writer does not at the beginning prefix his name, nor any where else mention it in the epistle, so neither does he describe or characterize the persons to whom he writes by the name of their city, or country, or any such thing.

The first expression of address is that in ch. ii. 1, "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not." And the epistle concludes with these words: "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." And he several times calls the christians, to whom he writes, "little children," as ch. ii. 12, 18; iii. 7, 18; iv. 4; v. 21. Our Lord spoke to the disciples in a like manner, John xiii. 33, and xxi. 5. It is a tender and affectionate appellation, denoting paternal authority, love, and concern. As an apostle, it might be used by St. John in any part of life. Nevertheless it seems to imply, together with apostolical authority, advanced age.

Some have thought that this epistle was written to Parthians or Jewish believers in that country. We have seen several ancient Latin authors who speak of it as inscribed to Parthians. So <sup>y</sup> Augustine, <sup>z</sup> Cassidorius, and <sup>a</sup> Bede. I have already spoken of this, and have referred to divers learned moderns <sup>b</sup> whose opinions deserve to be taken notice of. I shall now add Mr. Whiston's thoughts relating to this point, taken from his commentary upon St. John's epistles, published in 1719. 'None of these three epistles 'of St. John,' says he, p. 5, 6, 'were written to the Parthians, as some later Latin writers have supposed: but 'rather to the christians or churches of Asia, near Ephesus. 'This he argues from the perfect silence of all true antiquity, 'as to St. John's ever preaching in Parthia: and from the

sive illi ante, sive post excidium Hierosolymitanum eo pervenerint. Omnes enim sub originibus ejus eam adepti censeri debent, quippe quibus Joannes, ut *αυτοπτης* earum, testis et præco, adfuerit. Wolf. ubi supr. p. 244.

<sup>y</sup> Vol. iv. p. 510.

<sup>z</sup> Vol. v. p. 111.

<sup>a</sup> P. 145.

<sup>b</sup> As note <sup>y</sup>.

‘ account which we have in Eusebius from Origen, that  
 ‘ Parthia was St. Thomas’s province, and Asia St. John’s :  
 ‘ as also from the account in the Recognitions, ix. 29, that  
 ‘ Thomas really preached the gospel in Parthia, without a  
 ‘ syllable of St. John thereto relating. All which,’ says  
 he, ‘ makes it plain that this pretended direction of any of  
 ‘ St. John’s epistles to the Parthians stands upon no good  
 ‘ authority at all. And it is not improbable, that the occa-  
 ‘ sion of this error was barely a false reading in some an-  
 ‘ cient manuscript, where *προς παρθους* was read for *προς*  
 ‘ *παρθενας* : “ to the Parthians,” for “ to the virgins :” which  
 ‘ latter inscription might easily be applied to the first epis-  
 ‘ tle. For as it is chiefly addressed to young christians, yet  
 ‘ uncorrupted, both as to fleshly and ‘spiritual fornication,  
 ‘ such as in St. John’s Revelations are called *παρθενοι*,  
 ‘ “ virgins :” so was the second epistle anciently affirmed  
 ‘ by some to be written “ to the virgins :” as we learn from  
 ‘ Clement of Alexandria, in Cassiodorius :’ that is, from  
 Clement’s Adumbrations upon the catholic Epistles, trans-  
 lated by order <sup>c</sup> of Cassiodorius. For there <sup>d</sup> the second epis-  
 tle of St. John is said to be written to virgins.

And before, at p. 4, of the same commentary, Mr. Whis-  
 ton observes, ‘ St. John says nothing in his first epistle,  
 ‘ by which we can directly gather, to whom it was sent :  
 ‘ though it seems most probably to belong to his own Asia-  
 ‘ tic churches.’

As I have quoted Clement, I must not omit the observa-  
 tion of L’Enfant and Beausobre : ‘ Clement <sup>e</sup> says, that the  
 ‘ second epistle of John was directed to virgins, undoubt-  
 ‘ edly intending by the means of this lady. But there is  
 ‘ nothing in the epistle, which suits virgins, more than other  
 ‘ christians.’

Mr. Lampe says, ‘ This <sup>f</sup> first epistle is written to believers,  
 ‘ as is abundantly manifest from the whole scope of the  
 ‘ epistle. We also,’ says he, ‘ easily admit, that Jewish  
 ‘ believers are especially regarded. Nevertheless we think  
 ‘ that St. John directed it to all believers of his time in ge-

<sup>c</sup> Vol. ii. p. 243.

<sup>d</sup> *Secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est. Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam, Electam nomine. Adumbr. in ep. 2. Joan.* <sup>e</sup> As before, p. 584.

<sup>f</sup> Ad fideles eum scripsisse, abunde patet ex scopo epistolæ, cap. i. 4, totoque ejus argumento. Facile etiam admittimus, speciatim fideles ex Hebræis innui. Universis tamen credentibus sui temporis Joannem hanc epistolam destinasse putamus, quia nulla restrictionis occurrit mentio. Lamp. *ibid.* num. iii. 105.

‘ neral : forasmuch as there appears not in it any expression of limitation.’

Du Pin says, ‘ Though <sup>s</sup> there is no inscription, it appears from the beginning of the second chapter, that it is addressed to many christians. And there is no proof that it is sent to Jews rather than to Gentiles.’

On the other hand, Dr. Benson <sup>h</sup> thinks, ‘ that the apostle wrote this epistle to the Jewish christians in Judea and Galilee.’

But the former opinion appears to me more probable. For, 1. It is always called a catholic epistle. So it was called by Dionysius of Alexandria, as before seen, as well as by later writers. 2. It really appears to be so. For there are not in it any expressions of limitation. 3. There could be very little occasion for that admonition to believers in Judea, in the year 68, after the war was broke out, which is in ch. ii. 15 ; “ Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world.” That admonition is rather suited to people, who were supposed to be in easy circumstances, and are in danger of being ensnared by the allurements of prosperity. 4. Nor has the concluding exhortation of the epistle, “ keep yourselves from idols,” any special suitableness to believers in Judea : but is much more likely to be directed to christians living in other parts of the world.

Œcumenius in his comment upon the last verse of this epistle says, it <sup>i</sup> was written to the whole church in general. And in the proëm to his commentary upon the second epistle he <sup>k</sup> calls the first a catholic epistle. And he says, ‘ that <sup>l</sup> epistle is not written to a certain person, nor to the churches of one or more places, as the blessed Peter’s to the Jews in their dispersion, nor as James’s before him, to the twelve tribes of the Jewish people. But he writes to all the faithful in general, whether assembled together or not. For which reason there is no inscription to that epistle, as there is to the other two.’

To me therefore it seems, that this epistle was designed

<sup>s</sup> Dissertat. sur la Bible. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. xi.

<sup>h</sup> See his preface to St. John’s first epistle, sect. iv.

<sup>i</sup> ——— φαμεν εν, ως επειδαν εκκλησια ὀλη ταυτα εγραφεν, κ. λ. Œcum. T. H. p. 602. B. <sup>k</sup> Ib. p. 605. B.

<sup>l</sup> ——— Ου γαρ προς ὀρισμενον εγραψε προσωπον, ουτε προς εκκλησιαν τοπων των, ὁσπερ εποιησεν ὁ μακαριος Πετρος ἀφορισμενος προς τες εν τη διασπορα επισημαινομενος Ἰεδαίους γραφειν’ και, προ τες ὁ θειος Ἰακωβος ταις ἑωδεκα φυλαις ——— αλλα πασι πιστοις κοινον ποιημενος τον λογον εκκλησιαζεσι και μη εκκλησιαζεσι, τον της προγραφης παρελιπε λογον. Id. p. 606. B. 607. A.

for the churches in Asia under St. John's inspection, and for all other christians, into whose hands it should come. Or in other words, it was designed for all christians in general, especially those under the apostle's inspection, and nearest to him, without excepting the believers in Judea, or in any other country whatever.

Nor am I aware of any thing in the epistle, that should lead us to think Jewish believers in particular to be intended, except what is in ch. ii. 2, where by "our," some have understood Jewish christians, and by "the whole world," Gentiles. But the coherence does not require that interpretation. In the preceding verse is first mentioned that general address, "my little children," which occurs several times afterwards. He there says; "These things write I unto you, that ye sin not." Having delivered that earnest exhortation for avoiding all offensive harshness, he soon afterwards joins himself with those to whom he writes, adding: "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only," 'that is, mine 'and yours, to whom I am now writing, who already believe in Jesus, and have done so for a good while: ' "but also for the sins of the whole world:" that is, of 'all men, of every nation and people, rank and condition, 'in every part and age of the world, who shall believe 'and repent.' Here is nothing to limit what the apostle says to Jewish christians. And that this apostle does frequently join himself with those to whom he writes, with a like view to that above mentioned, must be evident to all who read this epistle with attention. See ch. i. 6—10; ii. 3; iii. 14, 18—22.

However, for the sake of such as are really inquisitive, I shall here subjoin the note of Œcumenius upon those words: "not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 'This<sup>m</sup> he said, either because he wrote 'to Jews, and intended to show, that the benefit of repentance was not restrained to them, but extended to 'Gentiles also; or else, that the promise was not made 'to the men of that time only, but likewise to all in future times.'

IV. St. John's second epistle is thus inscribed: "The elder to the elect lady, and her children." Which has

<sup>m</sup> Ταυτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἵνα οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐγράφη, καὶ ἵνα μὴ μονοῖς ἐκεῖνοις περικλισηται τῆς μετανοίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη ἐξαπλώσῃ ταύτην· ἡ δὲ κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιρὸν ἢ ἐπαγγελία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετεπειτα πασι. Œcum. in 1 ep. Joan. p. 565.

been differently understood by ancients and moderns: whose opinions may be seen in <sup>n</sup> Wolfius, and in Dr. Benson's preface to the second and third epistles of St. John, and briefly in Beza,<sup>o</sup> whom I transcribe below.

Some have hereby understood the christian church in general. So <sup>p</sup> Jerom. But that, as Beza well observes in the place just transcribed, is a way of speaking of which no like instance can be found. And it is inconsistent with what is said in the conclusion of the epistle, where the writer speaks of coming to see her, and sends her the salutations of the children of her elect sister.

Cassiodorius here <sup>q</sup> understood a particular church.

Mr. Whiston <sup>r</sup> says: 'St. John's second epistle was not written to a particular lady, but to a particular church: and not improbably to the church of Philadelphia.' Which last I take to be said without any good foundation.

Œcumenius, in his comment upon the last verse of this epistle, says: 'Hence <sup>s</sup> some argue that this epistle was sent not to a woman, but to a church. About which,' he says, 'he does not choose to dispute.' But in his introduction, or comment upon the beginning of the epistle, he says, 'St.<sup>t</sup> John did not scruple to write to a faithful woman: forasmuch as "in Christ Jesus there is neither

<sup>n</sup> Wolf. Prolegom. in ep. Joann. ii. p. 320--326.

<sup>o</sup> 'Electæ Dominæ.' Nonnulli 'Electæ' nomen proprium esse volunt. Quod non probo. Dicendum enim esset *κυρια Εκλεκτη*, 'Dominæ Electæ.' Alii hoc nomine volunt ecclesiam christianam in genere significari. Quibus repugnat primum, quod hoc dicendi genus sit prorsus inusitatum. Deinde, quod in extremis duobus versibus discrete pollicetur, se ad eam et filios ipsius venturum, additque filiorum sororis salutem, quam et ipsam 'electam' vocat. Puto igitur inscriptam esse epistolam præstanti alicui feminæ, quarum nonnullæ ecclesias suis opibus passim sustentabant; et 'electam' illam vocari, id est, 'eximiam,' additâ Dominæ appellatione—sicut Lucas Theophilum, et Paulus Festum *κρατινον*, id est, 'potentissimum, vel 'præstantissimum,' compellant. Neque enim ab ejusmodi honestis titulis christiana religio abhorret, quâtenus quidem justum ac fas est. Perinde est igitur acsi scriptum esset: Eximie ac præstanti dignitate Dominæ. Etenim cur nomen proprium non addidit? Nempe satis inter se noti ac familiares erant. Quamobrem etiam ne nomen quidem snum exprimendum putavit. Bez. in Joan. ep. secund.

<sup>p</sup> Legimus in Carminum libro—'Una est columba mea.'—Ad quam scribit idem Joannes epistolam: 'Senior electæ dominæ, et filii ejus'—Ad Ageruch. ep. 91. [al. 11.] T. IV. p. 745.

<sup>q</sup> Joannes senior, quoniam ætate provecus, electæ dominæ scribit ecclesiæ, filiisque ejus, quos sacro fonte genuerat. Cassiod. in ep. Jo. ii.

<sup>r</sup> As before, p. 469.

<sup>s</sup> *Δια δε τω προσθηται, ασπαζεται σε τα τεκνα της αδελφης σε της εκλεκτης, βελονται τινες βεβαιων, ως ε προς γυναικα η επισολη, αλλα προς εκκλησιαν περι ου εδεν τω βελομενω διενεχθειην.* Œcum. T. II. p. 612.

<sup>t</sup> *Προς δε γυναικα γραφων πιτην εδεν υπετειλατο, οτι εν Χριστω Ιησω ουκ αρρηνα εδε θηλυ οιδε.* Ib. p. 606. C.

‘ male nor female.’ ’ And before, he speaks <sup>u</sup> of this epistle being written to a particular woman.

In the Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria, as we now have them in Latin, this <sup>v</sup> epistle is said to be written to a Babylonian woman, or virgin, named Electa.

And of late many learned men, whose <sup>w</sup> arguments I place below, choose to read this inscription thus: “ To the lady Electa,” or “ Eclecta.” But in my opinion the conclusion affords an objection. For it is not very likely that two sisters should both have one and the same name. So it may be sometimes: but very seldom, as I imagine. This was a difficulty with <sup>x</sup> Wolfius and <sup>y</sup> Tillemont.

Dr. Heumann supposeth, that <sup>z</sup> this woman’s name was Kuria, or Kyria, and renders the inscription after this manner: “ To the elect Kyria.” Which opinion is embraced by <sup>a</sup> Dr. Benson. But <sup>b</sup> Wolfius is not quite satisfied with it.

Tillemont has observed, that <sup>c</sup> in the Synopsis of Atha-

<sup>u</sup> —καθοτι και πρεσβυτερον εαυτον εν ταυταις γραφει, και προς γυναικα, και ετερον Γαϊον, ενα και αυτον, ωσπερ και την γυναικα μιαν. Id. p. 605. B.

<sup>v</sup> Secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est. Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam, Electam nomine. Significat autem electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ. Clem. A. ed. Potter. p. 1011.

<sup>w</sup> Epistola secunda scripta est ad quandam Babyloniam, Electam nomine, ut legas in Adumbrationibus ad hanc epistolam, quæ feruntur sub nomine Clementis Alexandrini. Nomen enim proprium feminæ esse Electam, recte observarunt viri doctissimi, perinde ut εκλεκτος viri nomen est apud Herodianum. Eandem Joannes κυριαν vocat, quemadmodum Latini feminas honestas vocabant dominas, sive dominas. Et Nazianzenus ep. iv. Κυρια τη μητρι. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. 5. tom. III. p. 343.

εκλεκτη quoque literâ majusculâ scribitur apud Wechelium, et in editione R. Stephani, quam secutus est Millius, quamvis ipse eo nomine christianam feminam indicari existimet. Wolf. in 2 ep. Jo. p. 323.

Electus cubicularius fuit Imp. Commodi genere Ægyptius, &c. Wetstein. ad Joan. ep. 2. p. 729.

<sup>x</sup> Electam proprii nominis vocabulo vix habuerim, per comma 13, ubi matronæ hujus soror itidem εκλεκτη appellatur. Quod ut illius ætatis moribus non respondet, ita soror illa εκλεκτη, tanquam Christiana, commode vocari poterat. Wolf. ib. p. 325.

<sup>y</sup> Et on trouve de la difficulté à croire qu’ εκλεκτη en soit un, [nom propre] parceque S. Jean. ver. 13. le donne aussi à la sœur de cette dame, n’étant pas ordinaire que deux sœurs aient le même nom; et parcequ’ il auroit dû être devant κυρια plutôt qu’ après. S. Jean l’ Evangeliste. note xiv. Mem. T. I.

<sup>z</sup> Heuman. Pœe. T. II. p. 421—427. et T. III. p. 14, &c.

<sup>a</sup> See his preface to the second and third epistles of St. John, sect. iv.

<sup>b</sup> Posterius hoc argumentum me etiam adducit, ut nec Cyriæ nomen proprium hic agnoscam. Ita enim apostolus scripturus erat: Κυρια τη εκλεκτη, quemadmodum ver. 1, epistolæ tertiæ: Γαϊψ τη αγαπητη. Simili scribendi ratione utitur Paulus. Rom. xvi. 5, Ασπασεσθε Επιαινετον τον αγαπητον μω. Vid. etiam ib. ver. 8. et 12. et 13. Wolf. ib. p. 325.

<sup>c</sup> Néanmoins Saint Athanase met γραφει κυρια, και τοις τεκνοις αυτης, par



nasius *κυρια* seems to be taken for a proper name. But that is not clear. The expression is ambiguous, and may be as well rendered: 'the<sup>d</sup> elder writes to a lady, and her 'children,' as to *Kyria*, and her children. So<sup>c</sup> likewise thought Wolfius.

Before I proceed, I must detain the reader, whilst I observe, that the article of the Synopsis, quoted by Tillemont, is exactly the same with the hypothesis, or argument, prefixed to St. John's second epistle in<sup>f</sup> the second tome of Œcumenius. However, I do not suppose it to be really Œcumenius's. I allow it to be a part of the Synopsis, generally thought to have been composed by Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in the fifth century, as<sup>g</sup> formerly shown.

Œcumenius himself seems to me to have supposed this epistle to have been sent<sup>h</sup> to a christian woman, whose name is not known. However in one place, in his prologue, he has these expressions: 'He<sup>i</sup> calls her "elect," either from 'her name, or on account of the excellence of her virtue.'

Finally, then, others understand this inscription agreeably to our own translation: "The elder to the elect lady and her children." This<sup>k</sup> has hitherto been the common opinion, and is favoured by<sup>l</sup> Beza,<sup>m</sup> Mill,<sup>n</sup> Wall,<sup>o</sup> Wolfius,<sup>p</sup> Le Clerc, and others. And Tillemont, in the place before referred to, says: 'The second epistle of St. John is 'inscribed to *εκλεκτη κυρια*. St. Jerom translates the word 'κυρια by *dominæ*, lady. And it is difficult to translate 'otherwise in the fifth verse, where St. John repeats the 'same word.'

It is not easy for me to decide in such a variety of opinions,

où il paroît avoir pris le mot de *κυρια* pour un nom propre. Mem. Ec. T. I. S. Jean l'Évangéliste, note xiv.

<sup>d</sup> Ταυτην ως πρεσβυτερος γραφει κυρια και τοις τεκνοις αυτης. Athan. Synops. S. S. T. II. p. 190. ed. Bened.

<sup>e</sup> Mihi quidem id ex phrasi istà non admodum liquet. Wolf. ib. p. 323.

<sup>f</sup> Œcum. T. II. p. 603.

<sup>g</sup> Vol. iv. p. 161, 162.

<sup>h</sup> Δυο δε τη εκλεκτη ταυτη επιμαρτυρει, κ. λ. Œcum. tom. II. p. 606. D.

<sup>i</sup> Εκλεκτην δε η απο τε ονοματος, η απο της περι την αρετην φιλοτιμιας, καλει. Id. p. 606. B.

<sup>k</sup> Alii utramque vocem pro appellativà habent, matronæque nomen simili silentio tectum censent, quo suum Joannes ipse textit. Hæc communior fere est sententia. Wolf. ib. p. 324.

<sup>l</sup> See before, note <sup>o</sup>, p. 285.

<sup>m</sup> Prolegom. num. 151.

<sup>n</sup> Critical notes upon the N. T. p. 378.

<sup>o</sup> Ubi supra, p. 326.

<sup>p</sup> Quoique ce mot puisse être un nom propre——il est assez vraisemblable que c'est ici un nom appellatif, qui signifie, que c'étoit une Dame Chrétienne, à qui S. Jean écrivoit, et qui étoit connue à ceux qui lui devoient rendre cette lettre, &c. Le Clerc, Remarques sur la 2 ep. de S. Jean.

each one of which is supported by great patrons. The arguments for a proper name, either of *Electa*, or *Kyria*, are plausible, and specious. But it is an object of some moment that this notion was little, if at all, known to the ancients. If it had, they would not have supposed that St. John here writes to the church of Christ in general, or to some christian church in particular. The Latin Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria, as they are called, are not very material. The passage of the Synopsis, quoted by Tillemont, is ambiguous. Œcumenius has just mentioned the opinion, that *Electa* might be the name of the person to whom St. John wrote. But he does not seem to adhere to it, as has been observed by Estius.<sup>4</sup> Nor is there any notice of this interpretation by Jerom, or Cassiodorius, or Bede, authors in which it would be very likely to be found, if it had been known in ancient times. And why it should not have been known, if there is any foundation for it, would not be easily shown. That Jerom did not take *κῤυρία* to be a proper name, appears not only from the Latin version of this epistle, but likewise from his book of the Interpretation of Hebrew names: where, as formerly<sup>r</sup> observed, there are no proper names collected out of the second epistle of St. John, though there are other out of his two epistles, and indeed from all the seven catholic epistles, excepting only this one of St. John's second epistle.

V. The third epistle of St. John is thus inscribed: "The elder to the beloved Gaius." There<sup>s</sup> seem to be two of this name mentioned in the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. In the disturbance at Ephesus, it is said: "Having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's com-

<sup>4</sup> 'Electa.' Non liquet, an hoc sit nomen proprium mulieris, ad quam scribitur epistola, an commune; id quod potius existimandum videtur; quoniam in fine epistolæ etiam soror ejus vocatur 'electa.' Non solent autem in eadem familiâ duæ proles esse cognomines. Posse sumi tanquam commune, Œcumenius suâ expositione ostendit, et recte. Videtur fuisse mulier nobilis sive genere, sive opibus.—Alioqui poterat vocare filiam.—Sed moris est apud bene moratas gentes, infirmiorum sexum titulis et aliis decentibus modis honorare. Est. in Joan. ep. ii. ver. 1.

<sup>r</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. vi.

<sup>s</sup> Gaius quidam inter comites ejus nominatur in tumultu Ephesino, Act. xix. 29. qui Derbæus videtur dici, Act. xx. 4. Habebat etiam Corinthi hospitem Gaium, Rom. xvi. 23. quem ipse baptizaverat, I Cor. i. 14. An hi sint iidem inter se, aut cum Gaio Joannis, quis dispiciet? Beda, Pseudo-Dexter, Lyranus, aliique affirmant.—Id quoque novum procreare dubium potest, quod Gaius Paulinus Corinthi sedem ac domicilium habuerit, noster vero proculdubio in Asiâ habitaverit, brevi ab apostolo visitandus, de cujus extra Asiam post excessum Neronis itineribus tota antiquitas silet. Lampe, Proleg. in Joan. l. I. cap. 7. num. xii.

panions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre." Acts xix. 29. And among the same apostle's fellow-travellers, who accompanied him in his journey toward Jerusalem, is mentioned "Gaius of Derbe," xx. 4. There is another Gaius, who appears to have been an inhabitant of Corinth. 1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23. I see no reason to think that Gaius, or Caius, to whom St. John writes, was one of them. He seems to have been an eminent christian, who lived in some city of Asia, not far from Ephesus, where St. John chiefly resided after his leaving Judea. For at ver. 14, the apostle speaks of "shortly coming to him." Which he could not well do, if Caius lived at Corinth, or any other remote place. Grotius thought him to be a good christian, who<sup>t</sup> lived in one of the churches or cities mentioned in the Revelation.

Mr. Whiston<sup>u</sup> supposes Caius to have been bishop of Pergamos. Mill<sup>v</sup> was inclined to be of the same opinion. But this is said only upon the ground of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, which in this case are of no authority at all.

Dr. Heumann<sup>w</sup> in his Commentary upon this epistle of St. John has some curious and uncommon observations. He<sup>x</sup> does not choose to trouble himself with inquiring who Caius was: the knowledge of which, he thinks, would be of no great use. It is sufficient that we know him to have been a good christian. Nevertheless he appears to slight the opinion just mentioned that<sup>y</sup> he was bishop of Pergamos. And he argues likewise, that<sup>z</sup> he is different from those of the same name mentioned in the Acts, or St. Paul's epistles. And indeed it cannot be thought strange, that in the times of the apostles, there were several christians of this name: which seems to have been as common a name among the Greeks and Romans, as any name whatever.

Dr. Heumann says, that<sup>a</sup> Diotrophes, mentioned by St. John, ver. 9, and said, to "love to have the pre-eminence,"

<sup>t</sup> Vixit hic Caius in aliquâ ecclesiarum, quarum mentio in Apocalypsi. Grot. in 3. ep. Joan. ver. 1.

<sup>u</sup> Commentary upon St. John's Epistles, p. 14, 15, 16.

<sup>v</sup> Alteram vero illam ad Gaium, ecclesiæ Pergamensis episcopum, ab ipso Joanne (si quid Apostolicarum Constitutionum auctori credimus) ordinatum. Mill. Prol. num. 152.

<sup>w</sup> Commentarius in Joan. Ap. epistolam tertiam. Ap. Nov. Syllog. Dissertation. P. I. p. 276—328.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. 277.

<sup>y</sup> Millius, Constitutionibus Apostolicis credulus, Caium hunc ecclesiæ Pergamensæ episcopum scribit in Prolegomenis suis ad N. T. Eandem amplexum esse sententiam Guil. Whistonum in suo in hanc epistolam commentario, quis mirabitur? Ib. p. 277. in notis.

<sup>z</sup> P. 277, 278.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 306, 307.

was not a heathen magistrate, nor a heretic, nor a bishop, but a deacon in the church to which he belonged. Upon which I observe, it was easy to show that Diotrophes was not a heathen magistrate.

Dr Heumann seems likewise to have proved, that<sup>b</sup> Diotrophes was not a heretic. For, as he argues, if Diotrophes had been a corrupter of the true christian doctrine, it would have been the duty of the apostle to caution christians against familiar converse with him, in like manner as he does in the tenth and eleventh verses of his second epistle. Moreover, in that case, the apostle would have signified his errors, and would have directed men to beware of the leaven of Diotrophes. But this he has not done. He only reproves his pride, want of hospitality, and a perverse contempt, not of the apostle's doctrine, but of his direction for receiving strangers. He also quotes<sup>c</sup> Calovius, as speaking to the like purpose.

And the late Mr. Mosheim, who, as I suppose, had not seen Dr. Heumann's Dissertation, and gives a very different account of this epistle in several respects, allows that<sup>d</sup> Diotrophes was not a heretic. So likewise argued Mr. Lampe<sup>e</sup> before either of them.

But I cannot say that Dr. Heumann has proved Diotrophes not to have been a bishop. For I think that every thing said of him in the epistle implies his being president,

<sup>b</sup> Nunc, ille Diotrophes quis fuerit, investigandum venit. Erasmus 'novæ heresis auctorem' vocat in Paraphrasi. Ac ita jam olim sensit Beda——Verrum recte Buddeus hanc sententiam respuit. Quod si enim corruptor doctrinæ apostolicæ fuisset Diotrophes, apostoli fuisset avocare christianos a familiari cum ipso consuetudine; id quod fecit hæreticis in secundæ suæ epistolæ versu decimo et undecimo. Fuisset item apostoli, notare ipsius errores, et, ut a fermento Diotrophis caveatur, præcipere. Jam vero id non facit, sed superbiam duntaxat ejus notat, et inhospitalitatem, et protervam non doctrinæ Joannis, sed præcepti ejus de liberalitate in pios exules exercendâ, contentionem. Ib. p. 302, 303.

<sup>c</sup> Etiam Calovius ad h. l. hac de causâ negat Diotrophen fuisse hæreticum. 'Si hæreticus fuisset,' inquit, 'gravius sine dubio acturus adversus eum, et Caium aliosque, de seductione ipsius cavendâ moniturus fuisset Joannes.' Quod argumentum accepit a Cornelio a Lapide, cujus pene omnes sunt annotationes, quas ad hanc Joannis epistolam exhibet Calovius. Heuman. ib. p. 303, note (z.)

<sup>d</sup> Nullam igitur Diotrophes religionis dogmatibus injuriam inferebat, sed iniquus tantum erat, et ultra modum rigidus dignitatis suæ custos. Mosheim. de Reb. Christianor. p. 176, 177.

<sup>e</sup> De causâ rixæ et contentions inter Diotrophen et Joannem in diversa abeunt interpretes. Bartholomæus Petri: 'Credibile est,' inquit, 'fuisse quempiam ex illis Judæis titulo tenus christianis, qui Christi fidem ita suscipiendam putabant, ut simul servaretur lex cærimonialis Mosis.'——Sed optime observat Calovius, si Joannes id inuisset, quod tum sine dubio acturus adversus eundem, et Caium aliosque de seductione ipsius cavendâ moniturus esset. Nullius sane dogmatis, sed factorum tantum perversorum, Diotrophes ineusatur. Lampe. Prol. l. 1. cap. 7. sect. xiv.

or chief director of things in the church to which Caius belonged. However, we will consider his arguments.

In the first place he says, the<sup>f</sup> principal reason why learned men have thought Diotrephes to be a bishop is because they have understood those words, at ver 10, "and casteth them out of the church," of excommunication. But those words, he says, are capable of another sense. They seem rather to mean, that by ill treatment he forced those strangers to leave the church, to which they had applied for relief, and to go elsewhere.

But granting this interpretation to be right, Diotrephes might nevertheless be a bishop. For that ill treatment might be owing to an abuse of his episcopal power and authority.

Again, says Dr. Heumann, the<sup>g</sup> fault of Diotrephes lay in seeking pre-eminence; which shows he was not a bishop: for then he would have had pre-eminence. Nor does a man seek what he has already.

But I cannot perceive that observation to be very material. For a bishop may show improper love of power and pre-eminence by arbitrary proceedings in the society over which he presides, and by an arrogant behaviour toward neighbouring bishops or superintendants, his equals, and perhaps, in some respects, his superiors.

Finally, not to take notice of any other arguments of this kind, Dr. Heumann thinks, that<sup>h</sup> Diotrephes was deacon,

<sup>f</sup> Alii igitur Diotrephen fuisse illius ecclesiæ episcopum crediderunt, hoc potissimum usi argumento, quod excommunicasse scribatur pios exules. Verum infra docebimus, 'ejicere ex ecclesiâ,' hic non esse excommunicare, atque adeo affingi Diotrephi excommunicationem judicio præcipiti. Ib. 303.

<sup>g</sup> Ac vel verbum *φλοπρωτευων* demonstrat nobis, eum haud fuisse episcopum: episcopus enim est *ὁ πρωτευων* in ecclesiâ. Atqui quod quis jam habet, non expetit. Ib. p. 303, 304.

<sup>h</sup> Jam cum clarissime cognoscamus, nec hæreticum, nec episcopum, nec presbyterum, nec ethnicum scilicet reipublicæ rectorem, fuisse Diotrephen, via satis aperta est ad personam ejus inveniendam. Statim enim mentem nostrum hæc subit quæstio: An forte fuit illius ecclesiæ diaconus, hoc est, bonorum ecclesiasticorum administrator? Hoc enim officium certis hominibus jam initio christianæ ecclesiæ demandatum fuisse, ex Act. vi. notum est. Ac sane facilis nunc et perspicuus nobis videtur totus hic locus noster. Præerat scilicet ærario ecclesiastico Diotrephes. Erat ejus pauperibus inde erogare pecunias. Advenas autem fratres ideo non sublevabat, quod vix ecclesiæ illius pauperibus alendis satis videretur suppetere. Id causatus, alio discedere, aliorum auxilium implorare, jubebat: imo, dum nihil ipsis suppeditabat, cogebat hoc ipso eos *ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, ex illâ ecclesiâ, excedere, atque ita erat *ἐκβαλλων αυτους ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Erant, qui exulibus his ex ærario dari aliquid volebant. Verum non audiebat hos providus, scilicet œconomus, sed suam sequi sententiam cupiebat cæteros christianos omnes. Atque ita erat

and had the charge of the stock or treasure of the church to which he belonged, and therefore he was not bishop.

But neither do I see the force of this argument. For Diotrophes might have the disposal of the church-stock, and yet be bishop. For in ancient times it was a part of the bishop's office and care, to see that the revenues of the church were managed and disposed to the best advantage. This appears from <sup>l</sup> Justin Martyr, and <sup>k</sup> Cyprian. They who desire to see more proofs, may consult <sup>l</sup> Bingham. Since then we allow Diotrophes to have had a right to concern himself in the disposal of the church-stock, it need not affect Dr. Heumann's main argument, whether he was bishop or deacon.

To me, then, it seems, that Diotrophes was bishop in this church, and that Caius was a man in a private station, of good substance, and a liberal disposition. St. John says, ver. 9, "I wrote unto the church:" or rather <sup>m</sup> I would have written unto the church, and at the same time to Diotrophes: "but Diotrophes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence, receiveth us not." For that reason St. John sent this letter to Caius.

Let us now consider what was the case to which St. John refers in this epistle, and what was the fault of Diotrophes. Concerning this there have been various sentiments of learned men. Grotius supposed <sup>n</sup> these strangers here spoken of to be believing Jews, whom Diotrophes, a Gentile, would not receive, because they were Jews, or because they were for joining the rites of the law with christianity. To the

*φιλοπρωτεων* (sive, ut Petrus loquitur, *κατακυριεων*) *αυτων*. Quid? Tam prudens et justus sibi videbatur œconomus, ut ne Joannis quidem apostoli præcepto morem gereret, ratus scilicet, eum, si hic esset, ærariique rationes haberet cognitas, aliter sensurum. Bonum doctorem esse Joannem, non negabat: bonum eum esse œconomum, prudentemque in politicis rebus consiliatorem, id vero negabat. Imo eo temeritatis provehebat, ut ludicra maledicta effutiret in virum sanctissimum, et fortasse 'senem' appellaret, cætera quidem summe venerabilem, sed hoc certe in genere 'delirum.' Ib. p. 306, 307.

<sup>l</sup> 'Οι ευπορευτες δε και βλομενοι κατα προαιρεσιw εκασος την εαυτω, ο βελεται ιδωσι και το συλλεγομενον παρα τη προεσωτι αποτιθεται, και αυτος επικερει ορφανοις τε και χηραις—και τοις παρεπιδημοις σοι ξενοις. κ. λ. Apol. 2. p. 99. A. Par. 1636.

<sup>k</sup> —et stipendia ejus episcopo dispensante perciperent. Cypr. ep. 41. al. 38.

<sup>l</sup> Antiquities of the Christ. Church. B. I. ch. iv. sect. 6.

<sup>m</sup> Scripsissem forsitan ecclesiæ. Vulgat. Vid. et Cleric. H. E. A. D. 92. num. ii. Vid. et Grot. in loc.

<sup>n</sup> Is vero ex illo erat hominum genere, qui Judæos, quanquam Christum professos, si legis ritus observabant, (quod in Judæâ christiani faciebant ad hæc usque tempora, ut Sulpicius nos docet,) ad suos cœtus non admittebant. Grot. in ep. 3. ver. 9.

like purpose ° Le Clerc, and ° Beausobre. This opinion is much disliked by ° Dr. Heumann. Mr. Mosheim ° likewise argues against it, as an opinion quite destitute of foundation in antiquity.

Others think that Diotrephes was a Jew, and zealous for the law, and that he would not receive these strangers, converts from among the Gentiles, because they did not take upon them the observation of the rites and ceremonies of the law of Moses. This opinion is mentioned by ° Lampe. But he argues well against it.

And indeed both these opinions were confuted before, when we showed that Diotrephes was not a heretic, or that there is no reason to think him so.

It has been of late a common opinion among learned men, that ° St. John here speaks of some, particularly Jews, who had gone out into the world to propagate the christian religion. Who had acted upon a generous and disinterested principle, refusing to take any thing from those among whom they laboured, and whom they had converted to the christian faith. And they think that St. John commends Caius for encouraging such teachers, and blames Diotrephes for not receiving and helping them. But that opinion appears to me without foundation. For I see nothing that

° Nolebat autem christianos circumcisos ab incircumcisis, seu Gentilibus, in ecclesiam admitti. Cleric. ib.

° Son nom est Grec. Ce qui fait juger, qu'il étoit Payen d'origine; et c'est peut-être pour cela qu'il ne vouloit pas qu'on recut Chrétiens d'entre les Juifs, fort méprisés par les Gentils. Préf. sur ii. et iii. ep. de S. Jean. p. 585. Voyez aussi la remarque sur l'ep. ii. ver 9.

° Heuman. ubi sup. p. 303. note (a).

° Eam (causam) viri docti quaerunt in conditione eorum, quos beneficiis et amore ecclesiae excludebat. Diotriphen nempe suspicantur origine fuisse Ethnicum, illos vero, quos recipere nolebat, Judaeos. Ex quo efficiunt, insitum Ethnicorum animis contemptum Judaeorum tantum apud eum potuisse, ut sanctissimum amoris praecipuum violaret. In hac conjectura, ut verum fatear, nihil est quo moveri queat aliquis consideratus et rerum christianarum non imperitus. Nam, ut omittam, omnibus eam praesidiis destitutam esse, si nomen Diotriphis excipias, quod Graecum est—ut taceam, nusquam aliquid memoriae proditum extare, unde pateat, tam immani Judaeorum odio et despicientia christianos ex Graecis flagrasse, ut in fratribus eos habere nollent, et omni amoris fructu spoliarent, &c. Mosheim. De Reb. Christian. ante Const. M. p. 175.

° See before, p. 290, note °.

° Tertiam epistolam scripsit Gaio cuidam—Hominis liberalitatem laudat, qui praecones quosdam evangelicos, e Judaea gente, qui a Gentilibus nihil accipere voluerant, opibus suis adjuvisset. Cleric. ubi supr.

Diotriphen duplici nomine S. Joannes objurgat: primum ideo, quod imperium sibi arrogaret in ecclesia—deinde propterea quod durum se ac inhumanum fratribus bene de religione christianam promeritis exhiberet. Egressi erant quidam ex coetu, cujus membrum Diotriphes erat, ad propagandum inter vicinas gentes religionem christianam, &c. Mosheim. ib. p. 175.

should lead us to think preachers here spoken of, but only strangers in want.

Ver. 5, "Beloved," says St. John to Caius, "thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers:" 'that is, to the members of the church to which 'he belonged, and to strangers who came to the city 'where he dwelt: whom he had received civilly, 'and courteously, and relieved generously if they were 'in want.'

Ver. 6, "Which have borne witness of thy character before the church." 'Some such persons, or some members of 'that church, had been at the place where St. John resided. 'And before the church they declared his good temper and 'liberality.' "Whom if thou bring forward on their journey, after a godly sort, thou shalt do well," 'And it will 'be very commendable in you, if after this any other such 'persons should come to your city, you shall act in a like 'manner to them also, receiving them kindly, and forwarding them in their way. This will be very becoming your 'christian profession.'

Ver. 7, "Because that for his name's sake they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles."

We learn from Bede, that<sup>u</sup> there were in ancient times two interpretations of these words. 'For the name of 'Christ they went forth to preach the gospel. Or for the 'faith of Christ, and the profession of his name, they had 'left their native country, or had been expelled from it.' This<sup>v</sup> is the sense for which Dr. Heumann contends, and therefore often calls these strangers exiles.

He supposeth these strangers to have been Gentile converts, who had forsaken their native country, or had been driven out of it, destitute of all things.

However this place may be understood partly otherwise: 'That we who are christians ought to help these strangers 'in their difficulty, especially because they have not sought 'for relief among unbelieving Gentiles: though some even 'of them might have been disposed to give them assistance.'

Grotius<sup>w</sup> explains the place in that manner. The same

<sup>u</sup> Duabus autem ex causis pro nomine Domini sunt profecti, aut ad prædicandum videlicet nomen ejus proprie sponte venientes, aut propter nominis sancti fidem et confessionem a civibus seu contribubibus suis patriâ expulsi. Bed. in 3. Joann. Ep.

<sup>v</sup> Nam exiles illi christiani e patriâ suâ cum egressi sunt, nihil quidquam suorum bonorum acceperunt ab hostibus suis Ethnicis, sed coacti sunt abire sine ullo vitæ subsidio. Heumann. ubi supr. p. 327.

<sup>w</sup> Μηδεν λαμβανοντες απο των εθνικων.—In manuscripto απο των εθνικων.—Potuerant in istâ calamitate adjuvari misericordia των εξω, 'extraneorum.'



sense is likewise in Estius. Whose<sup>x</sup> note upon this text I shall now transcribe at large, it being well suited to illustrate this epistle.

Ver. 8, "We therefore ought to receive such, that we might be fellow-helpers to the truth." 'It should be an allowed maxim, that we are to show kindness to such: otherwise we do not act the part of christians, who ought to encourage those who have a zeal for truth.'

Ver. 9, "I wrote to the church." Or "I should have written to the church," and therein to Diotrophes. But Diotrophes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not." 'I know he would not pay a regard to my directions.'

Ver. 10, "Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds, which he does." That is, 'I<sup>y</sup> will remind him of his actions, and reprove and admonish him, in order to his amendment, of which I do not despair.' "Prating against us with malicious words." He proceeded so far, as to speak of the apostle in a petulant manner. Perhaps he said, that though St. John did well in giving out general rules for the practice of piety; yet he had no right to intermeddle in particular cases, concerning which every one should judge for himself. "And not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church." 'Nor is that all. For he not only refuses to re-

Sed maluerint omnia christianis debere. Grot. ad ver. 7. 'Nos ergo.' Nos christiani ubique locorum *οφειλομεν απολαμβανειν*.—Manuscriptus, *υπολαμβανειν τωις τε*: id vero est, opitulari. Id. ad ver. 8.

<sup>x</sup> Quod ait apostolus, 'istos profectos pro nomine Jesu Christi,' potest bifariam exponi, ait Beda, videlicet, aut ut prædicaturi evangelium ejus sponte sint profecti ad Gentiles convertendos, aut ut propter fidem et confessionem nominis Christi per contribules suos patriâ fuerint expulsi. Similiter, quod sequitur, 'nihil accipientes a gentibus,' ambiguum est, an de gentibus ad fidem Christi jam conversis accipiendum sit, an de nondum conversis. Et uterque sensus suâ nititur probabilitate. Illo modo sensus est, quod hi, quamvis annuntiassent, et deinceps forent annuntiaturi gentibus evangelium seu fidem Christi, essentque jam complures gentilium eorum prædicatione conversi, nihil tamen ab iis exigere, vel accipere voluerint necessariæ sustentationis, hac scilicet de causâ, ne quod offendiculum darent evangelio Christi—De gentibus autem non conversis si sermo sit, tunc significatur, quod isti peregrini, quamvis egerent, quâcumque tantum ex causâ, nihil tamen ab hujusmodi gentilibus accipere, nedum petere, voluerint; ne ii scandalizarentur, et longius a christianâ religione averterentur. Dixissent enim: Ecce nulla est caritas inter christianos—Utraque expositio bene probabilis est. Nec satis liquet, utra sit præferenda. Est. in 3. Joan. ver. 7.

<sup>y</sup> Certe nihil aliud sibi vult apostolus, quam se more suo molissimum, placidissimumque in modum admoniturum esse Diotrephen peccati sui, recitâque eum revocaturum in viam. Heum. ib. p. 309.

‘ ceive and entertain these brethren, but he also discourages  
 ‘ those who would relieve and entertain them. And thus  
 ‘ he obligeth these strangers to leave your church, and go  
 ‘ elsewhere.’

By these last words most interpreters understand St. John to say, that Diotrophes excommunicated, or cast out of the church, “the brethren,” members of it, who were for receiving these strangers. But Dr. Heumann says, that <sup>z</sup> by the persons whom Diotrophes cast out of the church, must be understood these strangers, not the members of the church. For, as plainly appears, Caius was not excommunicated, though he had done what was opposed by Diotrophes. Nor need it be supposed, that all the strangers, here spoken of, were obliged to leave that place, or society. Diotrophes, it is true, discouraged their reception, and some might remove elsewhere. Others of them, however, might continue their abode there, encouraged by Caius and some other pious members of this church, who did not submit to the reasons or the orders of Diotrophes.

In this interpretation it is supposed, that “casting out of the church,” refers not to the persons last mentioned, who would receive these strangers, but to “the strangers,” whom Diotrophes would not have to be received. And Beausobre says, the <sup>a</sup> place may be so understood. Dr.

<sup>z</sup> Universi videlicet, qui hanc tractârunt epistolam, sibi persuaserunt, describi his verbis illud pœnæ ecclesiasticæ genus, quod excommunicatio vocari solet. Facile quidem poterat hic error agnosci. Nam primo, Caium, id, quod fieri nolebat Diotrophes, facientem, ab ipso non fuisse excommunicatum, in propatulo est.—Sed age, rem totam intueamur propius. Initio igitur considerandum quosnam ecclesiâ ejecerit Diotrophes. Ab omnibus, si Beausobrium excipimus, hoc refertur ad propinquius, τῶν βελομένων, hoc est, eos qui volebant exules hospitio excipere. Cum vero jam graves attulimus causas, cur non credi possit hos excommunicatione ejecisse ecclesiâ, sequitur, ut statuamus, hæc verba, ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐβαλλει, pertinere ad remotius, ad fratres exules. His scilicet, dum nec ipse ex ærario aliquid impertiebat, et aliis quoque, ut nihil ipsis darent, suadebat ac persuadebat, hoc ipso migrare eos cogebat alio, atque ita ‘e suâ expellebat ecclesiâ.’ Non erat igitur nostro loco necesse excommunicationem tribuere Diotrophis. Sed satis evidens est id eum effecisse, quod omissam priorum exulum receptionem necessario consequeretur, ut videlicet exirent ecclesiâ, aliamque peterent, opum pariter et misericordiæ abundantiorum.—Apparet hinc etiam facile, cum volentes exulum misereri κωλυειν hic dicitur Diotrophes, non credi eum debere id vetuisse pro imperio, sed allatis duntaxat causis, cur fieri id non oportebat, multos ab hoc pietatis officio revocasse.—Atque hoc ipsum nos admonet, verbo, ἐβαλλειν, non necessario significari, omnes illos exules revera abire coactas, sed id etiam recte usurpari de conatu Diotrophis id efficiendi. Heumann. ibid. p. 310—313.

<sup>a</sup> ‘Les chasse de l’égglise.’ Cela se peut rapporter ou aux frères, ou à ceux qui les reçoiënt, ou aux uns et aux autres. Sur ver. 10.

Heumann blames him for not saying that <sup>b</sup> it ought to be so understood.

There have been various conjectures of learned men concerning the reasons of Diotrephes' conduct, which I do not choose to take notice of now. Dr. Heumann supposeth, that Diotrephes had the disposal of the revenues of the church. There came to the place strangers, who needed relief. But Diotrephes opposed the distribution of any of the common stock, and also discouraged such as were willing to assist them with their own. For all which, as may be supposed, he assigned some reasons. This appears to me to have been the whole of the affair.

But whether these strangers were Jews, or Gentiles, I cannot say. There might be some of both. Grotius <sup>c</sup> and Lampe <sup>d</sup> think they were Jews, who had been driven out of Palestine, or had been reduced to want by the general and grievous calamity of that country, and had come into Asia with hopes of relief, and for the sake of a settlement. Heumann, as before seen, says they were Gentiles. For certain they were christians. And St. John, I think, says, that we ought to receive such, whether they be of Jewish or Gentile stock, "that we may be fellow-helpers to the truth:" "that we also may serve the interests of truth, 'for the sake of which these persons have suffered the loss 'of all things.'

Ver. 11, "Beloved, follow not that which is evil, but that which is good." Here the apostle exhorts Caius to persist in his good conduct, and to be upon his guard, not to be influenced by any bad examples.

In the twelfth verse he recommends to him Demetrius, by whom, as may be supposed, this letter was carried.

In the 13th and 14th verses he sends salutations, and speaks again of coming to the place where Caius dwelled, and of "speaking with him face to face." Which I suppose he did.

And I please myself with the supposition, that his journey

<sup>b</sup> Hic enim in Gallicâ suâ N. T. versione animadvertit, hæc verba etiam ad remotius referri posse, hoc est, ad fratres exules. Debebat vero indulgere meditationi, nec id relinquere dubium et incertum. Heum. ib. 311. note (p).

<sup>c</sup> Ὑπερ τῆς ὀνομασίας αὐτῶ ἐξήλθον' id est, a Judæâ ejecti sunt per Judæos incredulos ob Christum. Grot. ad ver. 7.

<sup>d</sup> Unde colligimus, peregrinos hos, quorum causam Joannes tam impense egit, fuisse Judæos ex Palæstinâ cum eo profugos, qui pro se aliisque, per totalem regionis illius devastationem ad summam egestatem, redactis, opem ecclesiarum Asiæ florentium implorabant. Lamp. Proleg. l. 1. c. 7, num. xvi.

was not in vain. I imagine, that Diotrophes submitted, and acquiesced in the advices and admonitions of the apostle. Of this I have no certain assurance. However I may add, that neither does any one else know the contrary.

VI. Concerning the time of writing these two epistles, nothing can be said with certainty. Mill<sup>e</sup> placeth them about the same time with the first, in 91 or 92. Whiston<sup>f</sup> likewise supposeth that they were all three written about the year 82 or 83. I imagine that St. John was somewhat advanced in age, and that he had resided a good while in Asia, before he wrote any of these epistles. Consequently, I am disposed to think that these two were not written sooner than the first. And as it was before<sup>g</sup> argued, that the first epistle was written about the year 80, these two may be reckoned to have been written between the years 80 and 90.

---

## CHAP. XXI.

### ST. JUDE AND HIS EPISTLE.

I. *His history.* II. *Testimonies to the genuineness of the epistle.* III. *To whom it was sent.* IV. *The time when it was written.*

I. THE writer describes himself in this manner at the beginning of the epistle, ch. i. ver. 1, "Jude,<sup>a</sup> the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James." Those two characters lead us to think that he was one of those called the Lord's brethren, and that he was an apostle. Our Lord's brethren, as enumerated in Matt. xiii. 55, are "James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas." In Mark vi. 3, "James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon." And in the catalogues of the apostles are these. Matt. x. 3, "James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbeus, whose sur-

<sup>e</sup> Proleg. num. 151.

<sup>f</sup> As before, p. 278.

<sup>g</sup> See above, p. 278.

<sup>a</sup> *Ἰωδᾶς, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀδελφός, ἀδελφός δὲ Ἰακώβου.*

name was Thaddæus. Simon the Canaanite." Mark iii. 18, "James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddæus, and Simon the Canaanite." Luke vi. 15, 16, "James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James." Acts i. 13, "James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James."

Thus he appears to have been sometimes called Judas, at other times Thaddæus, or Lebbeus. As I do not inquire into the meaning and origin of these names, I refer to<sup>b</sup> others. I only observe, that it was no uncommon thing among the Jews for a man to have different names, as Simon, sometimes called Simeon, at other times Peter, or Cephas. And Thomas was also called Didymus.

"Jude, servant of Jesus Christ." He does not thereby deny himself to be an apostle. St. Paul does not always take upon himself that character at the beginning of his epistles. It is wanting in his two epistles to the Thessalonians, in the epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. The epistle to the Philippians begins in this manner; "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi."

It follows. "And brother of James:" meaning James, sometimes called the Lord's brother, and son of Alpheus, one of the twelve apostles. And he does fitly so style himself, as that James was the eldest brother, and was of note among the apostles, after our Saviour's ascension, and in great repute among the Jewish believers. As appears from Acts xii. 17; xv; xxi. 18—25; and Gal. i. 19; ii. 9.

We have no account of Jude's vocation to the apostleship. Nor is there any thing said of him particularly in the gospels, except what is related in John xiv. 21—23, in the account, which that evangelist has given of our Lord's most excellent and affectionate discourses with the disciples a short time before his last suffering. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. And he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father. And I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot: Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not unto the world! Jesus answered, and said unto him: If a man love me, he will keep my words. And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

This disciple still had the common prejudice concerning

<sup>b</sup> See Lightfoot's Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. Matthew, Vol. II. p. 176. Witsii Comm. in ep. Judæ. num. ii. Cave's Life of St. Jude, in English. Dr. Benson's Preface to this epistle, sect. i.

the kingdom of the Messiah. And he asks our Saviour with surprise, how he could speak of manifesting himself to a few only, when he was about to set up an universal monarchy in great power and splendour? our Lord tells him (what he might have known before) that his kingdom, as Messiah, was spiritual, a kingdom of truth and righteousness: and that the blessings and privileges of it were peculiar to good men, who obeyed the precepts of true religion, which had been taught by him. Such would be accepted, and approved by himself, and by his heavenly Father, in whose name he had spoken. This they would all know, when he should come again among them, after his resurrection, and when the gift of the Spirit should be bestowed upon them, and others his followers.

As there is little said of Jude in the history of our Saviour before his resurrection, so St. Luke in the Acts has inserted nothing particularly concerning him after it. However, it is unquestionable that he partook of the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost at the pentecost next after our Lord's ascension: and that he joined with the other apostles in bearing an open testimony to our Lord's resurrection at Jerusalem: and that he had a share with them in the reproaches and other sufferings, which they endured upon that account.

It may be also reasonably supposed, that for a while he preached the gospel in several parts of the land of Israel, and wrought miracles in the name of Christ. But what they were, we cannot say, because they are not recorded by St. Luke nor any other credible historian near the time.

As his life seems to have been prolonged, it may be also reckoned very likely, that he afterwards left Judea, and went abroad, preaching the gospel to Jews and Gentiles in other countries. But we have no account of his travels, that can be relied on. Some have said, that he preached in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia: and that he suffered martyrdom in this last-mentioned country. But of these things there remains not any credible history.

Indeed, it may be questioned, whether St. Jude was a martyr. It was formerly observed by <sup>c</sup> us, that Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, reckons <sup>d</sup> among apostles, who had not died by martyrdom,

<sup>c</sup> See Vol. v. ch. v. note <sup>b</sup>.

<sup>d</sup> *Οτι γαρ παντες οι σωζομενοι ομολογησαν την ρια της φωνης ομολογαν, και εξηλθον εξ ων Ματθαιος, Φιλιππος, Θωμας, Λευις, και αλλοι πολλοι. Heracl. ap. Clem. A. Str. l. 4. p. 502.*

Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi. And it was then said, that by Levi, Heracleon probably meant Lebbeus, that is, Judas. Which is allowed by<sup>e</sup> Dodwell, and some other learned writers, to whom we then referred. Nor does Jerom, in his article of St. Jude, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, say any thing of his having died a martyr.

Jerom, in his commentary upon the tenth chapter of St. Matthew, where is the catalogue of the apostles, says, ‘that<sup>f</sup> the apostle Thaddeus, called by the evangelist Luke, “Jude the brother of James,” was sent to Edessa to Abgarus king of Osröene.’ But Eusebius, in his account of that affair, says, ‘that<sup>g</sup> Thomas, one of the twelve, sent to Edessa Thaddeus, one of Christ’s seventy disciples, to preach the gospel in those countries.’ And in the preceding<sup>h</sup> chapter, where he speaks of Christ’s seventy disciples, he reckons Thaddeus, who went to Edessa, one of them. Whence it came to pass, that Jerom called him an apostle, and reckoned him one of the twelve, is<sup>i</sup> not easy to say. But I imagine, that what he says in his commentary upon St. Matthew, is an inaccuracy, owing to his writing in haste. This conjecture receives confirmation hence, that in the article of St. Jude, in the catalogue above mentioned, he says nothing of that journey.

Before I proceed any farther, I must take notice of<sup>k</sup> a Dissertation of the learned Theodore Hasæus : in which he argues, that Judas, called Lebbeus, and Thaddeus, is the same as Levi, of whose call St. Mark, ch. ii. 13—17, and St. Luke, ch. v. 27—32, give an account.

He supposeth, that St. Matthew, ch. ix. 9—13, gives an account of his own call to be an apostle, and that St. Mark and St. Luke give an account of the call of another publican named Levi, or Lebbeus, or Judas.

Upon which I observe :

1. That is a very forced interpretation. The whole history, and all the circumstances of it, show, that one and the same person is spoken of by all the three evangelists.

<sup>e</sup> Diss. Iren. i. num. xxiv.

<sup>f</sup> Thaddæum apostolum, ecclesiastica tradit historia missum Edessan ad Abgarum regem Osrœnæ, qui, ab evangelistâ Lucâ, Judas Jacobi dicitur. In Matt. T. IV. p. 35. in.

<sup>g</sup> H. E. l. i. cap. 13. p. 32.

<sup>h</sup> Cap. 12. p. 31. A.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Vales. Annot. in loc. p. 21.

<sup>k</sup> Theodori Hasæi de Levi a Christo ad apostolatatum vocato : ad loca Marci ii. 14. seq. Luc. v. 27. seq. Disquisitio. Quâ eum non, ut vulgo putatur, Matthæum, sed Judam Thaddæum esse ostenditur. Ap. Biblioth. Brem. Cl. v. Fascic. iii. num. vi. p. 475, &c. Bremæ. 1721.

And the coherence renders it indubitable. The same things precede and follow in those several evangelists; as may be perceived by any one who compares them.

2. So far as we can find, it has been the opinion of the most ancient and learned christian writers, that Matthew and Levi are two names of one and the same man. So thought<sup>l</sup> Eusebius. So likewise<sup>m</sup> Jerom in several places of his works: which shows it was his settled opinion, and that he never hesitated about it. The<sup>n</sup> compiler of the Apostolical Constitutions says the same expressly. Victor of Antioch, in his commentary upon St. Mark, says, that<sup>o</sup> Mark and Luke, when they give an account of his call at the receipt of custom, designedly use a name by which he was not so well known as that of Matthew. Jerom speaks to the like purpose in a passage already<sup>p</sup> transcribed. It is very likely, that Victor had seen that observation in more ancient writers: and possibly in Origen, in<sup>q</sup> whose preface to his commentary upon the epistle to the Romans, as we now have it in Latin only, is somewhat equivalent. However, he plainly says, that Matthew and Levi are only two names of one and the same man.

3. Hasæus argues, that<sup>r</sup> Levi is never said in the gospels to have been also called Matthew, nor is Matthew said to be otherwise called Levi.

To which I answer, there was no necessity that we should

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Dem. Ev. 1. 3. cap. v. p. 119, &c. cited in this work, Vol. iv. p. 91, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Primus omnium Matthæus est Publicanus cognomento Levi, qui evangelium in Judæâ Hebræo sermone edidit. Hieron. Prol. in Matt. T. IV. in citat. supra, Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. vii.

Cæteri evangelistæ propter verecundiam et honorem Matthæi noluerant eum nomine appellare vulgato, sed dixerunt Levi. Duplici quippe vocabulo fuit. Id. in Matt. cap. x. tom. IV. P. I. p. 30.

Matthæus, qui et Levi, ex Publicano Apostolus. De V. I. cap. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Περὶ τῆ ἀναγνωσῶν ἐγὼ Ματθαῖος, ὁ καὶ Λεβί, ὁ ποτε τελωνῆς, διατασσόμεναι. Const. Ap. l. 8. c. 22.

<sup>o</sup> Est autem Levi hic idem omnino cum evangelistâ Matthæo. Et quidem Marcus et Lucas nomen, quod illi familiare erat, primævâ appellatione obnubunt, &c. Victor in S. Marc. ap. Bib. PP. Lugd. T. IV. p. 375. B. citat. Vol. ii. hujus operis, ch. clxxii.

<sup>p</sup> See note<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>q</sup> Prima nobis quæstio de nomine ipsius Pauli videtur exurgere, cur is qui Saulus dictus est in Actibus Apostolorum, nunc Paulus dicatur.—Invenimus igitur in scripturis aliquantos binis, alios etiam ternis usos esse nominibus.—Sed nec evangelia quidem hunc renuunt morem. Nam et Matthæus ipse refert de se, quod, cum transiret Jesus, invenit quendam sedentem ad telonium, nomine Matthæum. Lucas vero de eodem dicit, quia, cum transiret Jesus, quendam vidit publicanum, nomine Levi, &c. Origen. in ep. ad Rom. tom. II. p. 458. Basil.

<sup>r</sup> Nam observabam, Matthæum nunquam dici Levin, vel Levin vicissim appellari Matthæum, &c. Has. ubi supra, p. 477.



be told this. It is allowed, that Thaddeus, and Lebbeus, and Judas, are names of one and the same apostle. And<sup>s</sup> it was also so understood by ancient christians : some of whom I have quoted below. Nevertheless St. Luke has never told us, that Judas was surnamed Thaddeus, or Lebbeus. Nor has St. Matthew, or St. Mark said, that Thaddeus, or Lebbeus, was also called Judas.

These observations, as seems to me, are sufficient to confirm the common opinion. However I will add a thought or two of less moment.

4. St. Matthew, in the catalogue of the apostles, placeth himself in this manner, ch. x. 3, “and Matthew the publican :” και Ματθαιος ο τελωνης. May it not be hence argued with probability, that he was the only publican among the apostles, and that there was no other ?

5. If we were to form a conjecture concerning the employment, that was followed by Jude, before he was an apostle, it<sup>t</sup> would be that of an husbandman. In the Apostolical Constitutions the apostles are made to say : ‘ Some of us are fishermen, others tent-makers, others husbandmen.’ Undoubtedly several of the apostles were fishermen. But by the latter part of the sentence no more may be meant, than that there was among them one tent-maker, even Paul, and one husbandman, intending, perhaps, St. Jude. For Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, writes, ‘ that<sup>u</sup> when Domitian made inquiries after the posterity of David, some grandsons of Jude, called the Lord’s brother, were brought before him. Being asked concerning their possessions and substance, they assured him, that they had only so many acres of land, out of the improvement of which they both paid him tribute, and maintained themselves with their own hard labour. The truth of what they said was confirmed by the callousness of their hands. Being asked concerning Christ, and his kingdom,

<sup>s</sup> Thaddæum apostolum———qui ab evangelistâ Lucâ Judas Jacobi dicitur, et alibi appellatur Lebbeus, quod interpretatur corculus. Credendumque est eum fuisse trinominem ; sicut Simon, Petrus, et filii Zebedæi, Boanerges, ex firmitate et magnitudine fidei, nominati sunt. Hieron. in Matt. x. T. IV. p. 35. in.

Ην γαρ ἕτερος Ἰεδας ο Λεββαίος, ὁ και επικληθεις Θαδδαιος, ὃν Ἰακωβος φησιν ειναι ὁ Λσκας, λεγων, Ἰεδας Ἰακωβος. Chrys. in Matt. hom. 32. [al. 33.] tom. VII. p. 369.

Vid. et Hesychii Quæstiones. Diff. xiv. ap. Coteler. Monum. Gr. tom. III. p. 11.

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Cav. H. L. in S. Juda.

<sup>u</sup> Ἐτι δε περιησαν οί απο γενεας τῃ Κυρια νύκτωι Ἰεδα, τῃ κατα σαρκα λεγομενη αυτῃ ἀδελφῃ, οὗς ἐδηλατορευσαν, ὡς εκ γενεας οντας Δαβιδ. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. xx.

‘ of what kind it was, and when it would appear, they answered, that it was not worldly and earthly, but heavenly and angelical: that it would be manifested at the end of the world: when coming in great glory he would judge the living and the dead, and render to every man according to his works. The men being mean, and their principles harmless, they were dismissed.’

Hence some may argue, that St. Jude himself had been an husbandman. And from this account, if it may be relied upon, we learn, that this apostle was married, and had children.

That may suffice for the history of St. Jude.

II. In the next place I am to observe the evidences of the genuineness, and canonical authority, of the epistle ascribed to him.

Somewhat relating to this point has been already said in the fifteenth chapter, concerning the catholic epistles in general. To which chapter therefore the reader is referred, though I may here transcribe some things from it, for showing the authority of this epistle in particular.

It should be remembered, that Eusebius having enumerated the books of scripture universally received from the beginning, and among them the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John, he adds: ‘ And <sup>v</sup> among the contradicted, but yet well known to the most, [or approved by many,] are that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John.’ So that in his time this epistle was well known, and received by many, though not by all.

This epistle is no where expressly cited by Irenæus, who wrote about the year of Christ 178. Whether he has at all referred to it, was considered formerly. And the reader is referred to what was then <sup>w</sup> said.

Clement of Alexandria flourished about the year 194. Eusebius, giving an account of his works, says that <sup>x</sup> in his Institutions, Clement had given explications of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting those who were contradicted. I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles.

That work, entitled Institutions, is lost. But we have in Latin a small treatise or fragment, called Adumbrations, supposed to be translated from the Institutions. Here

<sup>v</sup> See before, p. 160.

<sup>w</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 181, 182.

<sup>x</sup> ——— μη δε τας αντιλεγομενας παρελθων, την Ιεδα λεγω και τας λοιπας καθολικας επισολας. H. E. l. 6. cap. 14. in.

are notes upon the epistle of Jude : in which is an observation concerning the modesty of the writer : ‘ that <sup>y</sup> Jude ‘ who wrote a catholic epistle, did not style himself at the ‘ beginning of it, brother of the Lord, though he was related to him, but “Jude the servant of Jesus Christ, and ‘ brother of James.” ’

Which observation serves to show whom Clement took to be the writer of this epistle. He supposed him to be one of them, who are called the Lord’s brethren. Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; and an apostle. See Luke vi. 16. In that Adumbration follow brief remarks upon almost every verse of the epistle, except the last, or twenty-fifth verse.

It might be observed likewise, that in that place Clement declares his opinion concerning those called the Lord’s brethren, that they were children of Joseph.

This epistle is also quoted expressly by Clement in two of his works, which remain entire, the Pedagogue or Instructor, and the Stromata or Miscellanies.

In the Pedagogue he speaks to this purpose : “ I will <sup>z</sup> that ye should know,” says Jude, “ that God having once saved the people out of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that believed not. And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he <sup>a</sup> has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.” And afterwards, he emphatically describes the characters of those who are judged. “ Woe unto them, for they have walked in the way of Cain, and run greedily in the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.”——Jude, ver. 5, 6, and 11.

In his Stromata, Clement writes to this purpose : ‘ Of <sup>b</sup> ‘ these, and the like heretics, I think, Jude spoke prophetically in his epistle :’ “ Likewise also these dreamers,” and what follows, to “ And their mouth speaketh great swelling words :” that is, from ver. 8, to ver. 16. And that manner of quoting shows, that the epistle was in the hands of many people, or of all christians in general, to be consulted by them.

<sup>y</sup> Judas, qui catholicam scripsit epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph, extans valde religiosus, quum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, se ipsum fratrem ejus esse. Sed quid dixit? ‘ Jacobus, servus Jesu Christi,’ utpote Domini, ‘ frater autem Jacobi.’ Adumbrat. in epist. Judæ. p. 1007. ed. Oxon.

<sup>z</sup> Pæd. l. 3. p. 239.

<sup>a</sup> — δέσμοις αἰείοις ὑπο ζοφον ἀγριων [al. ἀγιων] ἀγγέλων τετηροηκεν.

<sup>b</sup> Ἐπι τετων, οἰμαι, και των ὁμοιων αἰρεσεων προφητικως Ἰσδαν εν τη επιτολη ειρηκεναι. Ὅμοιος μεντοι και ετοι ενυπνιαζομενοι ὁ γαρ ὑπερ τη αληθειᾳ επιβαλλουσιν ἕως, και το σομα αυτων λαλει ὑπερογκα. Strom. l. 3. p. 431. A. B.

I have been thus prolix in rehearsing these passages of Clement. For they appear to me a sufficient proof of the antiquity and genuineness of this epistle: or that it was written by Jude, one of Christ's twelve apostles. However I would also refer those of my readers, who are willing to look back, to Clement's testimony to this, and to the other catholic epistles, as formerly observed in<sup>c</sup> his chapter.

In Tertullian, about the year 200, is but one quotation of this epistle. But it is very express: 'Hence<sup>d</sup> it is, says he, 'that Enoch is quoted by the apostle Jude.' Intending the 14th verse of the epistle, and making no doubt, that the writer was an apostle.

In Origen, about the year 230, are divers plain quotations of St. Jude's epistle.

In his Commentaries upon St. Matthew, which we have still in Greek, having taken notice of the words of Matth. xiii. 55, 56,—beside other remarks, he says, 'that<sup>e</sup> James is the same 'whom Paul mentions in the epistle to the Galatians, as having been seen by him.' Gal. i. 19. He also observes a passage, said to be in the Antiquities of Josephus, relating to the same James. Then he adds: 'And<sup>f</sup> Jude wrote an 'epistle, of few lines indeed, but full of the powerful words 'of the heavenly grace, who at the beginning says: "Jude 'the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James."'' These passages are of use to show us whom Origen took to be the writer of this epistle.

Again, in the same Commentaries. 'And<sup>g</sup> in the epistle 'of Jude: "To them that are "beloved [or sanctified] in 'God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ and call-  
'ed."'

Once more, in the same Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew's gospel, having quoted 1 Pet. i. 12, he says: 'But<sup>h</sup> if any one receives also the epistle of Jude, let him 'consider what will follow from what is there said: "And 'the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their

<sup>c</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 242—245.

<sup>d</sup> Eo accidit, quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium perhibet. De Cultu Fem. l. 1. cap. 3. p. 172. A.

<sup>e</sup> Ιακωβος δε εστιν ουτος, ον λεγει Παυλος ειδεν εν τη προς Γαλατας επιστολη, ειπων κ. λ. Comment. in Matt. p. 223. C. Heut. p. 463. B. T. 3. Bened.

<sup>f</sup> Και Ιωδας εγραψεν επιστολην, ολιγοστιχον μιν, πεπληρωμενην δε των της κρανιας χαριτος εφρωμενων λογων, οτις εν τη προομιμη εφηκεν Ιωδας, Ιησους Χριστος υψλος, αδελφος δε Ιακωβου. Ibid. p. 223. D. al. p. 463. D.

<sup>g</sup> Και εν τη Ιωδα επιστολη, τοις εν Θεω Πατρι ηγαπημενοις και Ιησους Χριστω τετηρημενοις και κλητοις. Ib. p. 332. A. al. 607. C.

<sup>h</sup> Ει δε και την Ιωδα προσοιτο τις επιστολην, ορατω τι επεται τω λογω δια το Αγγελως τε μη τηρησαντως, κ. λ. Ib. p. 488. E. al. p. 814. C.

‘ own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains  
‘ under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.’”

This epistle is also quoted in those works of Origen, which we now have only in a Latin translation. But forbearing to take farther notice of them here, I refer to the account formerly given at large of Origen’s testimony to the scriptures, in<sup>i</sup> the 2nd volume of this work.

Upon the whole we perceive, that there were some in his time, who doubted of, or denied, the authority of this epistle. But himself, as seems to me, admitted the genuineness and authority of it. For he quotes it expressly, without hesitation, as written by Jude, one of the Lord’s brethren, and brother of James, consequently apostle. And he says, that it was “ full of the powerful words of the heavenly grace.”

I have not observed any notice taken of this epistle<sup>k</sup> in the writings of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about the year 248, and afterwards.

It is quoted by the anonymous author against the Novatian heretic, who wrote about the year 255. But he does not name St. Jude. His words are ; ‘ As<sup>l</sup> it is written : “ Behold he cometh with ten thousands of his angels, to execute judgment upon all,” and what follows,’ that is, the 14th and 15th verses of the epistle.

Eusebius flourished about the year 315. I have already transcribed from him a<sup>m</sup> passage concerning the catholic epistles, and among them concerning St. Jude’s, which ought to be recollected here. There is another taken from him, at<sup>n</sup> the beginning of this article. And I shall here put down again a third passage transcribed above in the chapter of<sup>o</sup> the epistle of St. James. Where having given an account of the martyrdom of St. James, he says : ‘ Thus<sup>p</sup> far concerning James, who is said to be the writer of the ‘ first of the epistles called catholic. But it ought to be ‘ observed, that it is spurious, [that is, contradicted,] foras- ‘ much as there are not many of the ancients, who have ‘ made mention of it : as neither of that called Jude’s, which ‘ likewise is one of the epistles called catholic. How-

<sup>l</sup> Ch. xxxviii. Vol. ii.

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 47.

<sup>i</sup> Sicut scriptum est : Ecce venit cum multis millibus nuntiorum suorum, facere judicium de omnibus, &c. Ap. Cyprian. in App. p. 20. Vid. et hujus operis Vol. iii. p. 64.

<sup>m</sup> See p. 159, of this volume.

<sup>n</sup> P. 304.

<sup>o</sup> P 196.

<sup>p</sup> H. E. l. 2. c. 23. p. 66. C.

‘ever we know, that<sup>q</sup> these also are commonly used [or publicly read] in most churches, together with the ‘rest.’

That passage needs no comment. This epistle was generally received in the time of Eusebius, though not by all.

Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, about 354, has<sup>r</sup> quoted almost the whole of this epistle. He quotes it expressly, as written<sup>s</sup> by the excellent apostle Jude, brother of the apostle James.

I need not particularly mention more authors. For after the time of Eusebius, seven catholic epistles were generally received by all christians, Greeks, and Latins. St. Jude’s epistle therefore, as well as the rest, was received by Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Didymus of Alexandria, Jerom, Rufinus, the third council of Carthage. Augustine, Isidore of Pelusium, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, whose names may be seen in the alphabetical table in the last volume, under the article of seven catholic epistles. But<sup>t</sup> it was not received by the Syrians.

And it may not be amiss to observe here, that we have found this epistle oftener quoted by writers who lived before the time of Eusebius, than the epistle of St. James.

Of the authors above named there are two, of whom I would take some farther notice.

Epiphanius, about 368, in his heresy of the Gnostics, expressly ‘cites<sup>u</sup> the catholic epistle of the apostle Jude, brother of James, and of the Lord, written by inspiration.’ This epistle is received by Jerom, as written by the apostle Jude, as may be recollected by those who have read his chapter in the fourth volume of this work. Where,<sup>v</sup> in his letter to Paulinus, he says, ‘The apostles James, Peter, John, Jude, wrote seven epistles, of few words, but full of ‘sense.’

And in the chapter of St. Jude, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, he says: ‘Jude,<sup>w</sup> brother of James, left

<sup>q</sup> Ὅμως δὲ ἰσμεν καὶ ταυτας μετὰ των λοιπων ἐν πλειταις ἐδημοσιουμινας ἐκκλησιας. Ibid.

<sup>r</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. xci.

<sup>s</sup> Cum exhortetur Judas, gloriosus apostolus, frater Jacobi apostoli, &c. Ap. Bib. PP. T. IV. p. 227. C—E.

<sup>t</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. ciii. Vol. v. p. 96, 97.

<sup>u</sup> Ὡς καὶ περὶ τῶτων, οἰμαι, ἐκινήθη το ἅγιοι πνευμα ἐν τῷ ἀποστολῷ Ἰεῦδα, λεγων ὅτι ἐν τῇ ὑπ’ αὐτῆ γραφῆσῃ καθολικῇ ἐπιτολῇ. Ἰεῦδας δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος, ὁ αἰελφος Ἰακωβῆ καὶ Κυρια λεγομενος. H. 26. n. xi. p. 92. D.

<sup>v</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. v.

<sup>w</sup> Ibid. num. viii. 8.

‘ a short epistle, which is one of the seven called catholic.  
 ‘ But<sup>x</sup> because of a quotation from a book of Enoch,  
 ‘ which is apocryphal, it is rejected by many. However at  
 ‘ length it has obtained authority, and is reckoned among  
 ‘ the sacred scriptures.’

There is some inaccuracy in Jerom’s manner of expression. For a book to be at the same time rejected by the most or many, and to be reckoned among the sacred scriptures, are inconsistent. But it might have been properly said: ‘ that whereas it had been rejected by many, because  
 ‘ of a quotation from an apocryphal book; it had at length  
 ‘ obtained authority, and was reckoned among the sacred  
 ‘ scriptures.’

Many learned men<sup>y</sup> have carefully considered this difficulty. But as the ancients overcame it, and at length admitted the authority of this epistle, perhaps it might have been passed over as a thing of no great consequence. Indeed, if there is a credible testimony to any book, or epistle, that it was written by an apostle, such a passage need not cause much hesitation. Origen has an observation in one of his Latin tracts. ‘ St. Paul<sup>z</sup> says: as Jannes and Jambres  
 ‘ withstood Moses. This is not found in the public scrip-  
 ‘ tures, but in a secret book, entitled Jannes and Jambres.  
 ‘ For which reason some have been so daring, as to argue  
 ‘ against that epistle of Timothy, though in vain.’ For certain such an objection could be of little weight against so well attested a writing as St. Paul’s second epistle to Timothy. Nor ought it to weigh much in this case.

I might conclude here. But for the sake of some, shall add the two following observations.

I. It is not certain that St. Jude cites any book. He only says, that<sup>a</sup> “ Enoch prophesied, saying, The Lord com-

<sup>x</sup> Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in eâ assumitur testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur. Tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, et inter sanctas scripturas computatur. De V. I. cap. iv.

<sup>y</sup> Beausobre and L’Enfant in their Preface to the epistle of St. Jude. Dr. Benson in his Preface to this epistle, sect. i. and many others.

<sup>z</sup> Item quod ait, ‘ sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi,’ non invenitur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto, qui suprascribitur Jannes et Mambres. Unde ausi sunt quidam epistolam ad Timotheum repellere, quasi habentem in se textum alicujus secreti. Sed non potuerunt. In Matt. Tract. 35. p. 193. tom. II. Basil. Et in hoc opere, Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. num. xxv. 14.

<sup>a</sup> Verum quicquid et vetustis patribus et recentioribus quibusdam videatur, non potest ullo mihi pacto probari, Judam apostolum ex libro scripto temporibus ejus extante, tritâque prophetiâ suum illud vaticinium deprompsisse. Nam primo id Judas non testatur. Qui simpliciter habet, *προεφητευσεν*. Prophetiam scriptis ab eo consignatam esse non dicit. J. H. Heidegger. Hist. Patr. Exercita. x. de Prophetiâ Enochii. sect. v. tom. I. p. 271.

eth with ten thousands of his saints.” Which <sup>b</sup> might be words of a prophecy, preserved by tradition, and inserted occasionally in divers writings. Nor is there good evidence, that in St. Jude’s time there was extant any book entitled Enoch, or Enoch’s Prophecies, though there was such a book in the hands of christians in the second and third centuries. Moreover St. Jude might ascribe to Enoch what it is reasonable to believe was the import of his prophecy.

I transcribe here an observation, which I have met with :  
 ‘ St. Jude <sup>c</sup> in his epistle, from the circumstances of the men  
 ‘ and the manners of the people to whom Enoch preached,  
 ‘ gathered what might be the sum of Enoch’s preaching, in  
 ‘ this sort. “ Behold the Lord cometh.” How? As at the  
 ‘ giving of the law, “ with thousands of his angels, to give  
 ‘ judgment against all men, and to rebuke all the ungodly  
 ‘ among them of all their wicked deeds, which they have  
 ‘ ungodly committed, and of all their cruel speakings, which  
 ‘ wicked sinners have spoken against him.” Upon which  
 ‘ words the Greeks, not knowing the course of the Hebrews  
 ‘ in their feigned speeches, imagined, that Enoch left a book  
 ‘ of his preaching behind him.’

Grotius <sup>d</sup> has somewhat to the like purpose.

And J. H. Heidegger <sup>e</sup> approved of this manner of inter-

At neque dicit Judas Henoehum ita scripsisse ; neque in libro qui Henoehi dicitur, prophetiæ hujus vel vola vel vestigium reperitur. Imo credibile est, Judæ ætate suppositum hunc librum ne quidem in rerum naturâ fuisse sed a putido et portenso nescio quo Cabbalistâ Græcanico, vel ab hæretico, et sciolo aliquo Christum professo, sub Henoehi nomine procursum esse. Witsius in ep. Jud. num. xli. p. 502.

<sup>b</sup> Alii denique verisimilius arbitrantur, habuisse Judam ex notâ et confessâ eo tempore traditione, quam veram esse Spiritu magistro cognovit, dignamque judicavit, quam suâ hac epistolâ consecraret æternitati. Cui sententiæ ego quoque hactenus acquiesco. Wits. ubi supr. num. xli. p. 503.

<sup>c</sup> The General Review of the Holy Scriptures, p. 38, by Thomas Hayne, London, 1640, folio.

<sup>d</sup> Solebant Rabbini et angelis et magnis hominibus tribuere ea verba, quæ verisimiliter dicere potuerunt. Tale illud quod de Enocho habebimus, et illud quod Heb. xii. 21. et Actor. vii. 26, &c. Grot. ap. S. Jud. ver. 9.

Solebant, ut modo dixi, Rabbini et angelis et viris magnis tribuere ea dicta, quæ dixisse poterant. Id. ad ver. 14.

Quod tunc Enoch aut dixit, aut dicere potuit, imminente diluvio, idem Judas ad ingentem illam internecionem, quæ Judæis contumacibus imminabat, referre commode potuit. Id. ib. ad ver. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Distinguendum accurate est inter fundamentum prophetiæ, et ejus formulam. Fundamentum quod attinet, est illud totam *εγγραφον*.—Alterum est, quod scriptum reperitur, ‘ Enoehum cum Deo ambulasse.’ Ex eo Judæ proclive fuit conficere Enoehum non pro se tantum quæsivisse Deum, sed etiam alios proposito terrore ultimi judicii ab impietate et injustitiâ deterruisse neque potuisse cum Deo ambulare, vel pii viri officio defungi, nisi judicium Domini venturi cum myriadibus angelorum hominibus suæ ætatis annuntiaret.



pretation. He supposes St. Jude to refer to the words of Moses. Gen. v. 22 and 24; “and Enoch walked with God.” Cocceius, also, as<sup>f</sup> cited by Witsius, argued not very differently, though Witsius did not fully approve of it.

I shall add a thought or two confirming that method of interpretation. St. Peter, 2 ep. ii. 5, calls Noah, “a preacher of righteousness:” referring, I suppose, to the history in Genesis, though it is not expressly said there. And at ver. 7, 8, he says of Lot, that “he was vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: and that dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, he vexed his righteous soul from day to day, with their unlawful deeds.” These things are not expressly said in the book of Genesis. Nevertheless, I make no question but the apostle refers to what is there said, and deduceth these things thence, and not from an apocryphal, or any other writing whatever.

There is no necessity therefore to suppose, that St. Jude quoted a book called Enoch, or ‘Enoch’s prophecies.’

2. Allowing St. Jude to quote such a book, he gives it no authority. It was no canonical book of the Jews. That is certain. Consequently, if there was such a book among them, it was apocryphal. But though it was so, there might be in it some right things. These St. Jude might take, without approving the whole of it. To this purpose<sup>g</sup> Je-

Cum igitur non potuerit non loqui de iudicio Domini superventuro impiis, et ii, de quibus S. Judas loquitur, sint ultimi temporis, conficit, Enochum diu ante diluvium de iis prophetasse—Porro quod formulam attinet prophetiæ, cujus fundamentum ita in Scripturis ostendimus, illam ex iis verbis contexit Judas, in quorum virtute eam latere per *συνεσιω πνευματικῆν*, ‘intelligentiam spiritualem,’ probe scivit. Heid. ubi supra, num. x. p. 277.

<sup>f</sup> Celeberrimus Coccejus conjectat Judam ex historiâ Mosaicâ collegisse. ‘Nam,’ inquit, ‘prophetasse Henochum, satis constat ex sacris literis. Am-  
bulavit enim cum Deo. Ergo cum Deo fecit, defectoribus se opposuit, ver-  
bis sine dubio in Spiritu Sancto dictis, et opere.—Porro Judas talia Henochum prophetasse testatur, quæ optime et pathetice ei attribuuntur in proso-  
popœiâ.’ Quæ quidem non male mihi animadversa videntur; attamen non validum satis firmamentum continere, cui Judæ allegatio commode inædificetur. Nam Judas formulam prophetiæ Henochi adscribit, quæ ex Mose disci non potest. Wits. ib. num. xli. p. 502, et 503.

<sup>g</sup> Qui autem dicunt totum librum debere sequi eum qui libri parte usus sit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enochi, de quo apostolus Judas in epistolâ suâ testimonium posuit, inter ecclesiæ scripturas recipere, et multa alia, quæ apostolus Paulus de reconditis est loquutus. Possumus enim hoc argumento dicere: quia apud Athenienses ignotum Deum colere se dixit, quem illi in arâ annotaverant, debere Paulum et cætera, quæ in arâ scripta fuerant, sequi, et ea quæ Athenienses faciebant facere, quia cum Atheniensibus in culturâ ignoti Dei ex parte consenserat. Hieron. in Tit. T. IV. p. 421.

rom has argued largely, and very well, in his commentary upon the epistle to Titus, upon occasion of St. Paul's quotation of Epimenides. Tit. i. 12. And Cave says, 'It <sup>b</sup> is ' no more strange, that St. Jude should quote an apocryphal ' book, than that St. Paul should put down Jaunes and Jam- ' bres for the two magicians of Pharaoh that opposed Moses. ' Which he must either derive from tradition, or from some ' uncanonical author of those times, there being no mention ' of their names in Moses' relation of that matter.'

As I have said so much about this text, I am induced to take notice of some other like things in this epistle.

Says St. Jude, ver. 2 and 9, "Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, dared not [chose <sup>i</sup> not] to bring against him a railing accusation, but said: The Lord rebuke thee."

Origen, in the third century, supposed that <sup>k</sup> St. Jude might refer to a book, called the Assumption, or Ascension of Moses, though it was not a book of authority. But indeed, there is no good reason to think, that there was any such book extant in the time of St. Jude. It is more probable that it was forged afterwards. Some therefore have imagined, that St. Jude took this passage from some more valuable Hebrew author, of whom however we have no knowledge.

But to me it is apparent, that St. Jude refers to the vision in Zech. iii. 1—3, "And he shewed me Joshua the high-priest, standing before the angel of the Lord," and "Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord" [that is, "the angel of the Lord," before mentioned] "said unto Satan: The Lord rebuke thee." And what follows. The text of St. Jude is parallel with 2 Pet. ii. 11, "Whereas angels, which are greater in power, bring not railing accusation before the Lord." Here also is a plain reference to the vision in Zechariah. The thing itself, and that circumstance, "before the Lord," answering to the expression in Zechariah, "standing before the Lord," or "before the angel of the Lord," put it, as seems to me, beyond question.

Campegius Vitringa <sup>l</sup> has some curious observations upon

<sup>b</sup> Life of St. Jude, in English, p. 205.

<sup>i</sup> Michaël autem *εκ ετολμησε*, non 'sustinuit,' non induxit animum, impingere illi notam maledicti, id est, ultionem maledicendo sumere. Non quod timuerit diabolum, sed quod ex decore omnia agere voluerit. Wits. Comm. in Ep. Judæ, ver. 9. p. 480.

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii.

num. xiv. a citation from Origen's Books of Principles.

<sup>l</sup> Probabile nobis videtur, Judam scripsisse *περι τῆς Ἰησὺ σώματος*, et hodie-

this text of St. Jude. Instead of "the body of Moses," he would read "the body of Joshua." That is ingenious. Nevertheless the common reading may be right, and may be explained very agreeably to the passage of Zechariah. For, according to an interpretation of that vision, formerly <sup>m</sup> taken from Ephrem the Syrian, Joshua, the high-priest, there denotes the Jewish people. Whom St. Jude might call "the body of Moses," as christians are called "the body of Christ" by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 20, 25, 27; Eph. i. 23, and iv. 12, 16; Col. i. 18. The same interpretation was proposed some while ago, and well supported in a Dissertation of a learned writer, who was not acquainted with Ephrem."

Once more. St. Jude says, ver. 6, "And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." To which there is a parallel place in 2 Pet. ii. 4. The learned writer, above quoted, observes, that <sup>o</sup> neither here have these apostles a reference to any Jewish apocryphal book, but to some text of sacred scripture, or of the Old Testament. But he then deferred showing the place. Nor do I know that these texts ever came in his way afterwards. I wish they had. For I also am much inclined to believe, that in all these places the apostles referred to passages of the Old Testament.

This may assist us in forming a judgment concerning the opinion <sup>p</sup> of the bishop of London, that St. Jude in his epis-

nam lectionem esse a manu imperitoris bibliographi, qui, cum nihil in Scripturis memorabile legisset de 'corpore Josuæ,' sed contra ex Historiâ Sacrà intellexisset, quid circa 'corpus Mosis' singulare accidisset, nec interea de loco Zachariæ cogitaret, Josuæ nomen in illud Mosis commutavit. Sed quam certum est, Judam his verbis respexisse locum illum Zachariæ, tam quoque certum est, non scripsisse, Michaëlem disputasse cum Diabolo de 'corpore Mosis.'—Imo ex eâdem ratione liquidissime patet, Judam, quæ hic habet 'de corpore Mosis,' non desumpsisse ex apocrypho aliquo Judaïci ingenii, in quo hanc fabulam offendisset. Respexit Judas, ut jam dixi, ad locum Zachariæ, et inde recte evicit, Satanæ, potentissimi angeli, ab ipso principe angelorum Michaële in judicio in ipsum proferendo magnam habitam esse rationem: ac proin multo minus 'potestates' et 'glorias,' hoc est, potentissimos principes, licet malos, nobisque adversos, a nobis esse vilipendendos. Campeg. Vitring. Observ. Sacr. l. 4. cap. ix. n. 35. p. 1003, 1004.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. iv. ch. cii. num. vi. 6.

<sup>n</sup> See Bib. Raisonnée, tom. XXXI. P. II. art. i. p. 243—269.

<sup>o</sup> Quid Petrus et Judas per alterum illud exemplum 'angelorum,' qui 'peccaverunt, principio et domicilio suo derelicto,' intenderint, et ad quam partem Historiæ Sacræ respexerint, (ad Historiam enim Sacram respexisse certum est,) nunc prætermitto, aliâ forsitan occasione commodiore indicandum. Id. ib. num. 35.

<sup>p</sup> See his Dissertation concerning the authority of the second epistle of St. Peter. And here in this Volume, p. 257.

tle, and St. Peter in the second chapter of his second epistle, copied or imitated some Hebrew writer, who had left behind him a description of the false prophets of his own or former times. Which indeed is ingenious, and plausible. Nevertheless I think, such conjectures ought not to be presently received as certain. St. Peter, and St. Jude, and all the christians in general of their time, had before them the scriptures of the Old Testament. Many of the cases referred to by these apostles are evidently found there, such as Cain, Korah, Balaam, the people of Sodom. And why should not the other instances be taken thence likewise? If they are, I presume, the argument would be more forcible with all, than otherwise it would have been. Nor does the resemblance of style in St. Peter and Jude afford a conclusive argument that they both borrowed from some one Jewish author. The similitude of the subject might produce a resemblance of style. The design of St. Peter and St. Jude was to condemn some loose and erroneous christians, and to caution others against them. When speaking of the same sort of persons, their style and figures of speech would have a great agreement. And certainly I think that the apostles needed not any other assistance in confuting and exposing corrupt christians, than their own inspiration, and an acquaintance with the ancient scriptures of the Jewish church.

III. We are now to consider to whom this epistle was sent.

Witsius says, it<sup>q</sup> was written to all christians every where, but especially to christians converted from judaism: forasmuch as St. Jude refers to Jewish writings and traditions. Moreover he wrote to the same christians to whom Peter wrote, who were such as had been Jews. To the like purpose<sup>r</sup> Estius.

Hammond<sup>s</sup> says, the epistle was written to the Jews scat-

<sup>q</sup> Epistola hæc christianis quidem universim, et potissimum Hebræis scripta est.—Ii quibus scripta est epistola, illis designantur epithetis, quæ sine Gentium distinctione christianis omnibus competunt; quanvis credibile sit, potissimum eos spectari, qui ex Israëlitis in Christo crediderant. Iis enim sæpiuscule argumentis utitur, quæ ex Judæorum libris, vel etiam traditionibus, desumpta sunt. Videnturque prorsus iidem esse cura illis, quos Petrus posteriore suâ epistolâ compellat. Wits. Comment. in ep. Jud. sect. viii. p. 460.

<sup>r</sup> Porro verisimile est, ad eosdem scriptam esse, ad quos scripsit B. Petrus, id est, ad eos præcipue, qui ex circumcissione crediderant.—Id ipsum indicant illa verba versûs 5. ‘Commonere autem vos volo, scientes semel omnia.’ Nam id aptissime Judæis dicitur, a primâ ætate imbutis cognitione historiæ sacræ. Est. Argum. in Ep. Jud.

<sup>s</sup> Videtur autem, sicut epistolæ Jacobi et Petri, scripta fuisse ad Judæos dispersionis, christianam religionem amplexos, ut confirmarentur contra pravos

tered abroad, who believed the christian religion, to secure them against the errors of the Gnostics.

Dr. Benson<sup>1</sup> thinks that St. Jude wrote to Jewish christians, as his brother James had done, and, most probably, to the Jews of the western dispersion.

Let us now observe the inscription of the epistle in the writer's own words. "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called," ver. 1. And ver. 3, "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation: it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered unto the saints."

These expressions, as seems to me, lead us to think, that the epistle was designed for the use of all in general who had embraced the christian religion. And if St. Jude writes to the same people to whom St. Peter wrote, that is a farther argument for this supposition. For that St. Peter wrote to all christians in general, in the countries named at the beginning of his first epistle, was shown<sup>u</sup> formerly.

IV. We now come to the last point, the time of writing this epistle. Here I shall observe the opinions of several.

Dr. Benson's opinion is, 'that<sup>v</sup> this epistle was written 'before the destruction of Jerusalem, a few weeks, or 'months, after the second epistle of St. Peter: forasmuch 'as the state of things, as represented in both these epistles, 'is very much the same.'

Mill's conjecture is, that<sup>w</sup> this epistle was written about the year of Christ 90. But, as he says, there are no clear evidences of the exact time when it was written.

Dodwell,<sup>x</sup> whom Cave<sup>y</sup> follows, argues, that this epistle was written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year 71, or 72. But the reasonings of those learned men are far from being conclusive.

L'Enfant and Beausobre were of opinion, that<sup>z</sup> this epistle

doctrinas Gnosticorum, qui tunc temporis exorti sunt. Hammond. Admonit. in ep. Judæ. Ex versione Clerici.

<sup>1</sup> Preface to this ep. sect. ii. p. 446. See also his paraphrase of ver. 1.

<sup>u</sup> See before, p. 260, &c.

<sup>v</sup> Preface to the epistle of St. Jude, sect. iii. p. 448.

<sup>w</sup> Fortasse quidem circa annum vulgaris æræ xc. Verum de ipso præciso tempore nihil habemus exploratè. Proleg. num. 147.

<sup>x</sup> Diss. Iren. i. num. xiv.

<sup>y</sup> H. L. in S. Juda.

<sup>z</sup> On ne se trompera pas en plaçant cette épître entre les années 70 et 75 de l'ère chrétienne. Préf. sur l'épître de S. Jude.

may be placed with great probability between the year 70, and the year 75.

Witsius thinks it <sup>a</sup> was written in this apostle's old age, and in the last age of the apostles of Christ, and when few, or perhaps none of them, were living, besides St. John.

To the like purpose <sup>b</sup> Estius.

Œcumenius in his note upon ver. 17, 18, of this epistle, "Remember the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: that they told you there should be mockers in the last time,"—"Meaning," says he, 'by <sup>c</sup> Peter in his second epistle, and by Paul in almost all his epistles. Hence it is evident, that he wrote late, after the decease of the apostles.'

If St. Jude referred here to St. Peter's second epistle, it must be allowed that he had seen it, and wrote after St. Peter: which indeed is the opinion of many. So Œcumenius appears to have thought. So also says <sup>d</sup> Estius. Dr. Benson expresseth himself after this manner: 'that <sup>e</sup> it seems highly probable, that St. Jude had seen and read the second epistle of St. Peter. For there are found in St. Jude several similar passages, not only to those in the second chapter of the second of St. Peter, but also in the other parts of that epistle.'

Nevertheless, I must still say, this appears to me doubtful. For it seems very unlikely that St. Jude should write so similar an epistle if he had seen St. Peter's. In that case St. Jude would not have thought it needful for him to write at all. If he had formed a design of writing, and had met with an epistle of one of the apostles, very suitable to his own thoughts and intentions, I think he would have forbore to write.

Indeed the great agreement in subject and design between these two epistles affords a strong argument that they were

<sup>a</sup> Tempus scriptæ hujus epistolæ, uti ad postremam apostolorum ætatem referendum est, quod colligitur ex ver. 17, ita ad extremam quoque Judæ senectutem pertinet, &c. Wits. in Jud. num. ix.

<sup>b</sup> Cæterum apostolis fuit posterior, non omnibus, sed plerisque jam ante vitâ defunctis, ut Petro, et Paulo, et Jacobo. Nam Joannes adhuc supererat. Est. ad Jud. ver. 17.

<sup>c</sup> ——— ὑπο τῶν ἀποστόλων τῶν ὑπο Πέτρος ἐν τῇ δευτέρῃ ἐπιστολῇ, καὶ ὑπο Παύλου ἐν πάσῃ σχεῖδον ἐπιστολῇ. Ἐκ τούτου δὲ ἔδηλον, ὅτι ἐσχάτον μετὰ το παρελθὲν τῆς ἀποστόλης, ἐγράφε ταῦτα. Œcum. T. II. p. 633. D.

<sup>d</sup> Convenit argumentum hujus epistolæ cum iis, quæ B. Petrus scribit in secundâ epistolâ, præsertim capite 2, et initio tertii. Nam quæ hic scribuntur, adeo cum illis similia sunt, ut hujus auctor S. Judas eam non solum legisse videatur, verum etiam, partim contrahendo, partim extendendo, partim iisdem vocibus et sententiis utendo, imitatus fuisset. Est. Argum. Vid. eund. ad ver. epistolæ 17.

<sup>e</sup> Preface to St. Jude, sect. iii.

written about the same time. As therefore I have placed the second epistle of St. Peter in the year 64, I am induced to place this epistle of St. Jude in the same year, or soon after, in 65 or 66. For there was exactly the same state of things in the christian church, or in some part of it, when both these epistles were written.

I do not insist upon the expression, "in the last time," which is in ver. 18. Some would understand thereby the last period of the Jewish state and constitution, immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. But I cannot interpret the phrase, "the last time," in Jude, or "the last days," in St. Peter iii. 3, in so limited a sense. I think that thereby must be meant the days of the Messiah, or the late ages of the world.

However, undoubtedly, that exhortation, ver. 17 and 18, "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ: that they told you there should be mockers in the last time:" do imply, as Witsius and Estius observe, that it was then the last age of the apostles: when several of them had left the world, and few of them were still surviving. Which well suits the date before mentioned, the year 64, or 65, or 66.

When St. Jude adviseth the christians to recollect, "and be mindful of the words of the apostles of Christ," he may intend their preaching, which these christians had heard, or the writings of apostles, which they had read, and had in their hands. Such discourses of St. Paul may be seen recorded in Acts xx. 29, 30. And he writes to the like purpose 1 Tim. iv. 1—5, and 2 Tim. iii. and iv. They who suppose that St. Jude had seen and read the second epistle of St. Peter, must think that he refers also to 2 Pet. ch. iii. 1—5.

There are some other expressions in this epistle which may deserve to be here taken notice of by us. Ver. 3, "It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that you should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints;" and ver. 5, "I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this." These expressions seem to imply, that now some considerable time had passed, since the whole scheme of the christian doctrine had been published to the world, and since the persons to whom the apostle is writing were first instructed in it.

Upon the whole, as before said, this epistle might be written in the year of Christ 64, or 65, or 66.

## CHAP. XXII.

## THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

- I. *Its genuineness shown from testimony.* II. *From internal characters.* III. *Its time.*

I. WE are now come to the last book of the New Testament, the Revelation : about which there have been different sentiments among christians, many receiving it as the writing of John, the apostle and evangelist, others ascribing it to John a presbyter, others to Cerinthus, and some rejecting it without knowing to whom it should be ascribed.

I shall therefore here rehearse the testimony of ancient christians, as it ariseth in several ages.

It is probable, that Hermas had read the book of the Revelation, and imitated it. He has many things resembling it, vol. ii. p. 69—72. It is referred to by the martyrs at Lyons, p. 164. There is reason to think it was received by Papias, p. 118, 123. Justin Martyr, about the year 140, was acquainted with this book, and received it, as written by the apostle John. For in his dialogue with Trypho he expressly says : ‘ And a man from among us, by name ‘ John, one of the apostles of Christ, in the revelation made ‘ to him, has prophesied, that the believers in our Christ ‘ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem, and after that ‘ shall be the general, and, in a word, the eternal resurrection and judgment of altogether,’ p. 136, 137. To this very passage we suppose Eusebius to refer in his ecclesiastical history, when giving an account of Justin’s works, he observes to this purpose : ‘ He also mentions the Revelation ‘ of John, expressly calling it the apostle’s.’ See p. 137, note (s.) Among the works of Melito, bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches of Asia, about the year 177, Eusebius mentions one, entitled, ‘ Of the Revelation of John,’ p.



159. It is very probable, that Melito ascribed this book to the apostle of that name, and esteemed it a book of canonical authority. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, about 178, who in his younger days was acquainted with Polycarp, often quotes this book as ‘the Revelation of John, the disciple of the Lord,’ p. 181. And in one place he says: ‘It was seen not long ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian.’ *Ibid.* And see p. 167.

Theophilus was bishop of Antioch about 181. Eusebius, speaking of a work of his against the heresy of Hermogenes, says, ‘he therein made use of testimonies or quoted passages, from John’s Apocalypse,’ p. 204. The book of the Revelation is several times quoted by Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about 194, and once in this manner: ‘Such an one, though here on earth he is not honoured with the first seat, shall sit upon the four and twenty thrones judging the people, as John says in the Revelation,’ p. 245. Tertullian, about the year 200, often quotes the Revelation, and supposeth it to have been written by St. John, the same who wrote the first epistle of John, universally received, p. 295. Again; ‘the apostle John in the Apocalypse describes a sharp two-edged sword coming out of the mouth of God,’ *ibid.* He also says, ‘We have churches, that are disciples of John. For though Marcion rejects the Revelation, the succession of bishops, traced to the original, will assure us, that John is the author:’ *ibid.* By John undoubtedly meaning the apostle.

From Eusebius we learn, that Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists about the year 211, quoted the Revelation, p. 393. By Caius, about the year 212, it was ascribed to Cerinthus, p. 401. It was received by Hippolytus, about the year 220, p. 436, and by Origen about 230, p. 495. It is often quoted by him. He seems not to have had any doubt about its genuineness. In his commentary upon St. John’s gospel, he speaks of it in this manner: ‘Therefore John, the son of Zebedee, says in the Revelation,’ p. 512. See also p. 513, 577.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, about the year 247, or somewhat later, wrote a book against the Milleuarians, in which he allows the Revelation to be written by John, a holy and divinely inspired man. But he says ‘he cannot easily grant him to be the apostle, the son of Zebedee, whose is the gospel according to John, and the catholic epistle,’ p. 694. He rather thinks it may be the work of John, an elder, who also lived at Ephesus, in Asia, as well

as the apostle, p. 695. See likewise p. 718, 719, 720. Moreover, it appears from a conference, which Dionysius had with some Millenarians, that the Revelation was about the year 240, and before, received by Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, and by many others in that country, p. 654, 692, 693, and that it was in great reputation, p. 718, 719. It was received by Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about 248, and by the church of Rome in his time, vol. iii. p. 47, 48, and by divers Latin authors, whose history is written in the third volume of this work. As may be seen in the alphabetical Table of Principal Matters, in the article of the Revelation.

The Revelation was received by Novatus, and his followers, p. 118, 119, and by divers other authors, whose history is written in that volume.

It is also probable, that it was received by the Manichees, p. 404.

It was received by Lactantius, p. 541. and by the Donatists, p. 565, by the latter Arnobius, about 460, p. 480, and by the Arians, p. 581.

In the time of Eusebius, in the former part of the fourth century, it was not received by all. And therefore it is reckoned by him among contradicted books, vol. iv. p. 97. Nevertheless it was generally received, p. 103, 125. Eusebius himself seems to have hesitated about it. For he says, ‘It is likely, that the Revelation was seen by John the elder, if not by John the apostle,’ p. 125. It may be reckoned probable, that the critical argument of Dionysius of Alexandria, was of great weight with him, and others of that time. See p. 127, 128. The Revelation was received by Athanasius, p. 155, 157, and by Epiphanius, p. 187, 190, 191. But we also learn from him, that it was not received by all in his time, p. 190, 191. It is not in the catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem, about 348, and seems not to have been received by him, p. 173—175. It is also wanting in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, about 363, p. 182. Nevertheless I do not think it can be thence concluded, that this book was rejected by the bishops of that council. Their design seems to have been to mention by name those books only which should be publicly read. And they might be of opinion, that upon account of its obscurity, it should not be publicly read, though it was of sacred authority. And some may be of opinion, that this observation should likewise be applied to Cyril’s catalogue just taken notice of.

The Revelation is not in Gregory Nazianzen's catalogue, p. 287. Nevertheless it seems to have been received by him, p. 287, 288. It is in the catalogue of Amphilochius. But he says, it was not received by all, p. 293. It is also omitted in Ebedjesu's catalogue of the books of scripture, received by the Syrians, p. 321; nor is it in the ancient Syriac version, p. 323.

It was received by Jerom, p. 436, 437, 446, 450. But he says, it was rejected by the Greek christians, p. 456. It was received by Rufin, p. 484, by the third council of Carthage in 397, p. 487, and by Augustine, p. 494, 514. But it was not received by all in his time, p. 511. It is never quoted by Chrysostom, and, probably, was not received by him, p. 549. It is in the catalogue of Dionysius, called the Areopagite, about 490, vol. v. p. 74. It is in the Alexandrian manuscript, p. 82, 84. It was received by Sulpicius Severus, about 401, vol. iv. p. 575, and by J. Damascenus, vol. v. p. 147, and by Œcumenius, p. 156, 157, and by many other authors, whose history is written in the fifth volume. Andrew, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century, p. 77, and Arethas, bishop of the same place in the sixth century, wrote commentaries upon it, p. 103. But it was not received by Severian, bishop of Gabala, vol. iv. p. 572, nor, as it seems, by Theodoret, vol. v. p. 19,

Upon the whole it appears, that this book has been generally received in all ages: though some have doubted of it, or rejected it, particularly the Syrians, and some other christians in the east. However, for more particulars, see St. John, and the Revelation, in the alphabetical table, which is in the last volume of this work.

It may not be improper for me here to remind my readers of the sentiments of divers learned moderns concerning this book, which were put together in Vol. ii. ch. xliii, num. xv. and xvi. after having largely represented the criticisms of Caius, and Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century, upon the style of this book, and of the other writings ascribed to St. John. Where also is proposed this observation, 'It may be questioned whether their exceptions, 'founded in the difference of style, and such like things, 'or any other criticisms whatever, can be sufficient to 'create a doubt concerning the author of this book: which 'was owned for a writing of John, the apostle and evangelist, before the times of Dionysius and Caius, and so far 'as we know, before the most early of those who disputed 'its genuineness.'

II. Having thus represented the external evidence of the genuineness of the book of the Revelation, or of its being written by St. John, I should proceed to consider the internal evidence. But I need not enlarge here, because the objections taken from the style, and some other particulars, were stated and considered in the first volume, in the article of Dionysius, above named, bishop of Alexandria.

I now intend therefore only to take notice of a few things, of principal note, which learned men insist upon, as arguments, that the Revelation has the same author with the gospel and epistles, that go under the name of the apostle and evangelist John.

1. Ch. i. ver. 1, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass. And he sent, and signified it by his angel, unto his servant John."

Hence it is argued, that <sup>a</sup> John styles himself the "servant of Christ," in a sense not common to all believers, but peculiar to those who are especially employed by him. So Paul, and other apostles, call themselves "servants of God and of Christ." Particularly Rom. i. 1, "Paul a servant of Jesus Christ." James i. 1, "James a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. i. 1, "Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ." Jude v. 1, "Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ." So Moses is called "the servant of God." Numb. xii. 7, and Heb. iii. 2. And in like manner divers of the prophets. And in this very book, ch. x. 7, is the expression: "as he has declared unto his servants the prophets."

This observation may be of some weight for showing that the writer is an apostle. But it is not decisive. And in the same verse, whence this argument is taken, the phrase is used in its general sense. "Which God gave unto him to show unto his servants."

2. Ver. 2, "Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw."

Some suppose the writer herein to refer to the written gospel of St. John, and to say that he had already "borne testimony concerning the word of God, and Jesus Christ." But, as formerly <sup>b</sup> observed, these words may be under-

<sup>a</sup> Sed esse se 'inter notabiles Christi Jesu ministros,' quos ad ecclesiam suam docendam, regendam, et curandam adhibebat.—Hoc sensu Moses, David, Jesaias, et prophetæ omnes sub œconomiâ vetere, et Paulus, et alii apostoli sub œconomiâ novâ, vocantur servi Dei. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. 1.

<sup>b</sup> See Vol. ii. ch. xliii. num. xv.

stood of this very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer says here very properly, at the beginning, and by way of preface, that he had performed his office in this book, having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, which he had received from Jesus Christ.

For certain, if these words did clearly refer to a written gospel, they would be decisive. But<sup>c</sup> they are allowed to be ambiguous, and other senses have been given of them. By some they have been understood to contain a declaration, that the writer had already borne witness to Jesus Christ before magistrates. Moreover, I think, that if St. John had intended to manifest himself in this introduction, he would have more plainly characterized himself in several parts of this book than he has done.

This observation therefore appears to me to be of small moment for determining who the writer is.

3. Farther, it is argued, in favour of the genuineness of this book, ‘that there are in it many instances of conformity, ‘both of sentiment and expression, between the Revelation ‘and the uncontested writings of St. John.’

Divers such coincidences, or instances of agreement, were taken notice of formerly, and remarks were made upon them, Vol. ii. p. 710—715. That which is at p. 713, appears to me as striking as any. I shall therefore enlarge upon it here. Our Saviour says to his disciples, John xvi. 33, “Be of good cheer. I have overcome the world.” Christian firmness under trials is several times represented by “overcoming,” or “overcoming the world,” or “overcoming the wicked one,” in St. John’s first epistle, ch. ii. 13, 14; iv. 4; v. 4, 5. And it is language peculiar to St. John, being in no other books of the New Testament. And our Lord says, Rev. iii. 21, “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.” Compare ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21; and xxi. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Ver. 2. ‘Qui testatus est sermonem Dei, et testimonium J. C. et quæ vidit.’] Duplici modo hæc accipi possunt, vel Joannem confessionem veritatis solennem eorum tribunali Præfecti Asiæ Romani edidisse, ob quam ipse missus fuerit in exilium; vel ipsum, evangelio a se edito, solenne de Christo, ejusque dietis et gestis edidisse testimonium. Priore sensu vox *μαρτυρεῖν* scriptoribus Græcis posterioris temporis receptissima est, et manifeste etiam sumitur a Paulo, 1 Tim. vi. 13.—Veni igitur ultro in illam sententiam, quæ hæc Joannis verba refert ad evangelium non prædicatum tantum a Joanne solenniter, sed et scriptis confirmatum.—Quæ si sane sit hujus loci interpretatio, certo simul testabitur de illius auctore, Joanne apostolo, ac proinde de libri hujus divinitate, et summâ auctoritate. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2.

III. Concerning the time of writing this book, I need not now say much, having before shown, in <sup>d</sup> the history of St. John, that it is the general testimony of ancient authors, that St. John was banished into <sup>e</sup> Patmos, in the time of Domitian, in the latter part of his reign, and restored by his successor Nerva. But the book could not be published till after St. John's release and return to Ephesus in Asia.

As Domitian died in 96, and his persecution did not commence till near the end of his reign, the Revelation seems to be fitly dated in the year 95 or 96.

Mill <sup>f</sup> placeth the Revelation in the year of Christ 96, and the last year of the emperor Domitian. At first he supposed that the Revelation was written in Patmos. But afterwards he <sup>g</sup> altered his mind, and thought it was not written until after his return to Ephesus from Patmos. He builds upon the words of Rev. i. 9. If so, I apprehend it might not be published before the year 97, or, at the soonest, near the end of the year 96.

Basuage <sup>h</sup> placeth the Revelation in the year of Christ 96.

Le Clerc <sup>i</sup> likewise, who readily admits the genuineness of this book, speaks of it at the same year.

<sup>d</sup> See Vol. v. ch. ix. num. v.

<sup>e</sup> Eodem ordine septem istæ Asiæ civitates enumerantur, quo ex Patmo insulâ adiri debebant. Wetsten. in Apoc. i. 11. tom. II. p. 750.

<sup>f</sup> Paucis post conscriptas has epistolas annis, exorta est christianorum persecutio sub Domitiano.—In insulâ vero Patmo, in quam relegatus erat Joannes, Domitiani ultimo, seu anno æræ vulgaris xvi.—facta est ipsi Revelatio, quam universam postea expresso Christi mandato scriptis consignavit. Scriptamque Domini ejusdem jussu misit ad septem ecclesias Asiæ. Unde manifestum est, visionem non modo Joanni factam fuisse, sed etiam ab eo literis traditam in insulâ Patmo.—Scriptam fuisse ex predictis constat anno vulgaris æræ xvi. seu Domitiani xvi. et quidem ad finem ejusdem imperii, inquit Irenæus, seu tempore æstivo æræ vulg. xvi. Proleg. num. 157.

<sup>g</sup> Subjiciemus hic verba Millii, quæ in emendandis posuerat: 'Hic sententiam,' inquit, 'mutavimus. Constat enim ex ipsis Joannis verbis Apoc. i. 9, eum post reditum ad Ephesum hunc librum scripsisse.' Kuster. in notis. num. 157. Proleg. p. 19.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. ann. 96. num. xii.

<sup>i</sup> At nemo de auctoritate ejus dubitârat ante Caium, Romanum presbyterum, qui circa finem ii. seculi vixit. Cum Cataphryges eo libro abuterentur —fatum hunc esse apostoli negare, atque a Cerintho, præscripto ejus nomine, editum dicere maluit. At Justinus, et Irenæus, eo antiquiores, et qui cum Joannis discipulis versati erant, apostolo hoc opus tribuerunt. Similiter, cum medio seculo iii. Nepos, in Ægypto episcopus, Chiliastarum deliria eodem libro tueretur, Dionysius Alexandrinus eadem de causâ Joanni eum abjudicavit. Sed aliter senserant, quicumque Apocalypseos antea mentionem fecerant, excepto Caio, quos sequuti etiam posteri omnes ad unum.—Multo fide dignior Irenæus, qui passim hunc librum, quasi Joannis apostoli, ad testimonium vocat, et discrete, lib. v. c. 30. 'Neque enim ante multum tempus visa est, sed ferre nostrâ ætate, sub finem imperii Domitiani.' Quæ ejus verba Græca habet Eusebius, l. 5. c. 8. J. Cleric. H. E. An. 96. num. v.

Mr. Lowman<sup>k</sup> supposes St. John to have had his visions in the isle of Patmos in the year 95.

But Mr. Wetstein<sup>l</sup> favours the opinion of those, who have argued, that the Revelation was written before the Jewish war. He moreover says, that<sup>m</sup> if the Revelation was written before that war, it is likely that the events of that time should be foretold in it. To which I answer, that<sup>n</sup> though some interpreters have applied some things in this book to those times, I cannot say whether they have done it rightly, or not, because I do not understand the Revelation. But to me it seems, that though this book was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, there was no necessity that it should be foretold here: because our blessed Lord had in his own preaching at divers times spoken very plainly, and intelligibly, concerning the calamities coming upon the Jewish people in general, and the city and temple of Jerusalem in particular. And his plain predictions, and symbolical prefigurations of these events, were recorded by no less than three historians and evangelists, before the war in Judea broke out.

Grotius, who, as<sup>o</sup> formerly seen, placeth this book in the reign of Claudius, was of opinion, that<sup>p</sup> the visions of this

<sup>k</sup> See the scheme and order of the prophecies in the book of the Revelation, which is prefixed to his paraphrase.

<sup>l</sup> Nos quidem, omnibus expensis, cum iis facimus, qui statuunt, Apocalypsin ante bellum judaicum fuisse scriptum. Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 746. m.

<sup>m</sup> Quæstio est non levis momenti, cum vera Apocalypseos interpretatio maximam partem inde pendeat. Si enim scripta est ante bellum judaicum, et bella civilia in Italiâ; nullo modo probabile est, tantam rerum conversionem omnino præteriri atque negligi potuisse. Sin autem post illos motus compositos scripta est, probabilior erit eorum sententia, qui eventus in Apocalypsi prædictos in seculorum sequentium historiâ quærendos existimant. Id. ib.

<sup>n</sup> Lightfootus in genere censet, Apocalypsin hanc editam esse ante novissimum Hierosolymorum excidium. Et certe si Joannes hanc Revelationem vere a Christo Jesu accepisset sub Claudio, magnâ cum specie negari non posset doctissimis his viris, quædam ‘sigillorum visa’ ad fata judaismi non adeo incommode applicari posse. Sed obstant graves rationes, quæ nos in hanc sententiam ire vetant. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2. p. 7. Vid. et in cap. vi. ver. 1, 2. p. 101—105.

<sup>o</sup> See Vol. v. ch. ix. num. v. 2.

<sup>p</sup> ‘Et mitte septem ecclesiis.’ Nempe hujus visi descriptionem. Neque ad cætera hujus libri pertinet. Diversa visa diversis temporibus Joanni obtigere, ut et prophetis aliis. Grot. ad Apoc. cap. i. 11.

Post absolutum Visum, monita salutaria continens ad septem episcopos et ecclesias—sequuntur Visa alia, quæ diversis temporibus apostolo obtigere, et postea in unum volumen redacta sunt; quod et in prophetis aliis evenit, sæpe etiam non annotato temporis discrimine, sed dato intelligi ex iis quæ loco quoque continentur. Pertinent autem hæc Visa ad res Judæorum usque ad finem capitis undecimi; deinde ad res Romanorum, usque ad finem capitis vicesimi; deinde ad statum florentissimum ecclesie christianæ ad finem

book were seen at several times, and afterwards joined together in one book, in like manner as the visions and prophecies of some of the prophets of the Old Testament.

Concerning this opinion it is not proper for me to dispute, though there appears not any foundation for it in the book itself, as <sup>q</sup> Vitringa has observed. But that the book of the Revelation, in its present form, sent as an epistle to the seven churches of Asia, ch. i. ver. 4, was not composed and published before the reign of Domitian, appears to me very probable from the general, and almost universally concurring testimony of the ancients, and from some things in the book itself.

Now therefore I shall transcribe <sup>r</sup> a part of L'Enfant's and Beausobre's preface to the Revelation, at the same time referring to Vitringa <sup>s</sup> in the margin, who has many like thoughts.

usque, &c. Ejusdem Annot. ad cap. iv. init. Vid. et ejus Commentatio ad loca quæd. N. T. &c. citat. in hujus Supplementi volumine primo, p. 176.

<sup>q</sup> Et vero Grotius et Hammondus ipsi causam suam produnt, ubi posteriorem Apocalypseos partem sub Vespasiano Ephesi scriptam concedunt. Quis enim illos docuit, Visa Joannis in Apocalypsi hoc modo distinguere, et diversa illis et tam longe dissita assignare tam tempora quam loca? Nullum indicium, nulla significatio illius rei in ipsâ Apocalypsi exstat. Contra dicitur Joannes, quæ vidit, 'vidisse in insulâ Patmo.' Vit. ib. p. 11, 12.

<sup>r</sup> Preface sur l' Apoc. de S. Jean. p. 613, 614.

<sup>s</sup> Primo dubium non est, quin si testimoniis Veterum res conficienda sit, communis antiquæ ecclesiæ traditio, firmata auctoritate Irenæi, hic multum præponderet testimonio Epiphani. Irenæus enim temporibus Joannis apostoli propior fuit, tanquam qui eodem adhuc seculo cum Joanne vixerit, et traditionem nobis retulit suâ ætate communem, et omnibus notissimam.

Sed, quod plus etiam momenti causæ nostræ addit, non nititur nostra hæc sententia de tempore scriptæ Apocalypsis solâ traditione Veterum. Potest illa ex ipso hoc libro, etiam absque ullâ traditione veteris ecclesiæ, demonstrari. Quare secundo observari velim, ex ipsâ Apocalypsi evidentissimas adduci posse probationes, ex quibus evineatur, hunc librum non utique sub Claudio, sed omnino post Claudii et Neronis tempora, quinimo sub Domitiano, demum in lucem editum esse.—Quo tempore scripta est Apocalypsis, ecclesiæ jam per Asiam inferiorem in celeberrimis locis non tantum erant fundatæ et constabilitæ, sed jamdudum fundatæ et stabilitæ fuisse supponuntur. Redarguuntur enim pleræque a Domino gravium vitiorum et criminum, quæ tractu longioris temporis ecclesias illas obreperant. Ephesina jam 'reliquerat primam suam caritatem.' Sardicensis dicebatur, 'nomine vivere, sed vere mortua esse.' Laodicenam 'magnus occupaveret tepor,' eratque 'ærumnosa et miserabilis.' Hæc vero quam belle conveniunt temporibus Claudii! Ex ecclesiis enim septem, quæ hic memorantur, in Actibus Apostolorum, aliarum mentio non est, quam Ephesinæ et Laodicenæ. Ephesina autem a Páulo apostolo demum fundata est, secundum Annales Cestriensis, anno Claudii Imperatoris extremo.—Liquet ex iisdem epistolis Joannis, illo tempore, quo edita est Apocalypsis, Gnosticorum hæreses quæ dicuntur, in florentissimis Asiæ ecclesiis altas jam egisse radices. Ad illas enim carnalium hominum doctrinas sub mysticis nominibus Bileamitarum et Nicolaitarum in



Having quoted Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and divers other ancients, placing St. John's banishment in Patmos in the latter part of the reign of Domitian, and saying, that he there saw the Revelation, they say: 'To these incontestible witnesses it is needless to add a long list of others, of all ages, and of the same sentiment: to whom the authority of Epiphanius is by no means comparable.' And then they go on: 'We must add to so constant a tradition other reasons, which farther show, that the Revelation was not written, till after Claudius, and Nero. It appears from the book itself, that there had been already churches for a considerable space of time in Asia: forasmuch as St. John in the name of Christ reproves faults, that happen not but after a while. The church of Ephesus "had left her first

variis locis alluditur. Illam hæresim prævidebat Petrus in ecclesiâ brevi exorituram, quando epistolam suam scribebat posteriorem, non longe ante Hierosolymorum excidium. Judas, qui epistolam suam edidit, ut probabilis ratio suadet, post Hierosolymorum illud excidium, hoc semen in primâ vidit herbâ. Sed quo tempore scripta est Apocalypsis, non nata tantum, sed confirmata erat hæc hæresis, et præcipuas Asiæ ecclesias inquinaverat. Quare si Judas apostolus epistolam suam scripsit sub Vespasiano, quis neget, Apocalypsin editam esse sub Domitiano? In ipsis illis epistolis passim supponuntur afflictiones graviores, quas ecclesia Christi religionis suæ causâ jam sustinebat, et sustinuerat; et inter illas supplicium capitale, quo confessores veritatis afficiebantur. Sic Dominus ad angelum ecclesiæ Ephesinæ: 'Novi laborem tuum, και την ὑπομονήν σου, et tolerantiam in afflictionibus.' Ad angelum Smyrnenis: 'Novi opera tua,' et την θλίψιν, 'afflictionem, et paupertatem.' Ad angelum Pergamenæ: 'Nec abnegasti fidem meam, ne quidem in diebus, quibus Antipas, testis meus fidelis, ἀπεκτανθη, occisus est.' Supponunt hæc manifeste, tempore editæ Apocalypsis Gentiles jam cœpisse in christianos sævire, et ipsam etiam mortem pænæ loco illis quandoque solennibus judiciis irrogasse. Id vero hactenus non liquet factum esse imperante Claudio. Nero, postquam humanitatem exuisset, sanguinem christianorum primus bibit; Romæ tamen, magis quam in provinciis. Post Neronem Domitianus, ultimis imperii sui, idem tentavit. Ad quas postremas Domitiani persecutiones in his locis haud dubie alluditur. Neronis enim illam persecutionem in provinciis Romani Imperii æque ac Romæ arsisse, nec liquet, nec probabile est. Ad Domitiani itaque persecutionem hic manifeste alluditur. Quod argumento est, Apocalypsin hanc sub ipso editam esse. Ejusdem hujus Domitianæ temporis manifestum habemus characterem in Joanne. Dicit enim exerte, 'se accepisse hanc revelationem a Domino Jesu, cum ob confessionem veritatis evangelicæ ageret in insulâ Patmo.' Vocatque se christianorum, illo tempore 'afflictorum, socium in afflictione, regno, et patiente exspectatione Jesu Christi.' Fuit igitur Joannes 'in exilio,' causâ veritatis relegatus in insulam Patmon. Id vero quo modo accideret sub Claudio? Illum enim in christianos in provinciis aut exilio aut cæde sævisse, nullibi legitur.—Domitiani igitur hic, et nullius alius Imperatoris character est. Nero enim christianos capitali supplicio Romæ affecit: sed Domitianus plures exilio, paucos morte punivit, ut certi testes sunt Dio et Eusebius, et pluribus prosecutus est Dodwellus. Diss. xi. De Pauc. Mart. sect. xvii. Quid cessamus itaque, tam evidentibus probationibus convicti, fidem adhibere traditioni Veterum apud Irenæum? Vitring. in Apoc. cap. i. ver. 2. p. 9—11.

‘ love.” That of Sardis “ had a name to live, but was dead.”  
 ‘ The church of Laodicea was fallen into lukewarmness and  
 ‘ indifference. But the church of Ephesus, for instance,  
 ‘ was not founded by St. Paul, before the last years of  
 ‘ Claudius. When in 61, or 62, St. Paul wrote to them  
 ‘ from Rome, instead of reproving their want of love, he  
 ‘ commends their love and faith, ch. i. 15. 2. It appears  
 ‘ from the Revelation, that the Nicolaitans made a sect, when  
 ‘ this book was written, since they are expressly named:  
 ‘ whereas they were only foretold, and described in general  
 ‘ terms by St. Peter in his second epistle, written after the  
 ‘ year sixty, and in St. Jude’s about the time of the de-  
 ‘ struction of Jerusalem by Vespasian. 3. It is evident, from  
 ‘ divers places of the Revelation, that there had been an  
 ‘ open persecution in the provinces. St. John himself had  
 ‘ been banished into Patmos for the testimony of Jesus. The  
 ‘ church of Ephesus, or its bishop, is commended for their  
 ‘ “ labour and patience,” which seems to imply persecution.  
 ‘ This is still more manifest in the words directed to the  
 ‘ church of Smyrna, ch. ii. 9, “ I know thy works and tri-  
 ‘ bulation.” For the original word always denotes perse-  
 ‘ cution, in the scriptures of the New Testament: as it is also  
 ‘ explained in the following verse. In the thirteenth verse  
 ‘ of the same chapter is mention made of a martyr, named  
 ‘ Antipas, put to death at Pergamus. Though ancient ec-  
 ‘ clesiastical history gives us no information concerning this  
 ‘ Antipas, it is nevertheless certain, that according to all the  
 ‘ rules of language, what is here said, ought to be under-  
 ‘ stood literally.—All that has been now observed concern-  
 ‘ ing the persecution, of which mention is made in the first  
 ‘ chapters of the Revelation, cannot relate to the time of  
 ‘ Claudius, who did not persecute the christians, nor to the  
 ‘ time of Nero, whose persecution did not reach the provin-  
 ‘ ces. And therefore it must relate to Domitian, according  
 ‘ to ecclesiastical tradition.’

The visions therefore here recorded, and the publication of them in this book, must be assigned, so far as I can see, to the years of Christ 95, and 96, or 97.

## CHAP. XXIII.

### THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

*I. Their order in ancient authors. II. General observations upon their order. III. The order of the several parts of the N. T. 1. The gospels. 2. The Acts. 3. St. Paul's epistles in general. 4. Their order severally. 5. Of placing them in the order of time. 6. The order of the catholic epistles. 7. The Revelation.*

I. IN showing the order of the books of the New Testament, I begin with a passage of Eusebius, in a chapter, which is 'entitled, Concerning the<sup>a</sup> divine scriptures, which are universally received, and those which are not such.' 'But,' says he, 'it will be proper to enumerate here in a summary way the<sup>b</sup> books of the New Testament, which have been already mentioned. And in the first place are to be ranked the sacred four gospels. Then the book of the Acts of the Apostles. After that are to be reckoned the epistles of Paul. In the next place, that called the first epistle of John, and the [first] epistle of Peter, are to be esteemed authentic. After these is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the Revelation of John, about which we shall observe the different opinions at a proper season. Of the controverted, but yet well known, [or approved by the most, or many,] are that called the epistle of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and the second and third of John: whether they are written by the evangelist, or by another of that name.'

This passage, as my readers may well remember, was transcribed by us<sup>c</sup> formerly. And here the order is very observable: the four gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's epistles, the two catholic epistles of St. John and St. Peter, which were universally received, and then the books that were controverted, that is, not received by all, though by many.

The same order seems to have been followed by that ancient writer Irenæus. For in the third book of his works

<sup>a</sup> Περὶ τῶν ὁμολογούμενων θεϊῶν γραφῶν, καὶ τῶν μὴ τοιαύτων. H. E. l. 3. cap. 25.

<sup>b</sup> ——— τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης γραφᾶς.

<sup>c</sup> Vol. iv. p. 96, 97.

against heretics, where he is confuting the Valentinians, he <sup>d</sup> in several chapters argues from the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Then in the twelfth chapter of that book he largely quotes the book of the Acts. After which he considers the authority of the apostle Paul, and quotes both him and Peter.

In the festal epistle of Athanasius, the books of the New Testament are enumerated in this order. ‘The <sup>e</sup> four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the seven catholic epistles, the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and the Revelation.’ They stand exactly in the same order in <sup>f</sup> the Synopsis ascribed to him, though not composed till more than a hundred years after his time. The same is the order <sup>g</sup> of our Alexandrian manuscript. So likewise in <sup>h</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem: ‘the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, seven catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul.’ He omits the Revelation. The same is the order of <sup>i</sup> the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, omitting also the Revelation. So likewise in the <sup>k</sup> catalogue of John Damascenus: ‘the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the catholic epistles, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and the Revelation.’ The same is the order of <sup>l</sup> Leontius. And in the Syrian catalogues as given by <sup>m</sup> Ebedjesu: ‘the four gospels, the Acts, three catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles of Paul.’

Rufinus’s order is ‘the <sup>n</sup> gospels, the Acts, Paul’s epistles, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.’ The same order is in <sup>o</sup> the catalogue of the third council of Carthage. In Gregory Nazianzen <sup>p</sup> also ‘the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of Paul, the catholic epistles.’ The Revelation is wanting. The same order is in the catalogue of <sup>q</sup> Amphilocheus, with the Revelation at the end, mentioned as doubtful. In the Stichometry <sup>r</sup> also of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople about the year 806, ‘the four gospels, the Acts, Paul’s fourteen epistles, and the seven catholic epistles.’

That is the order of Eusebius, and probably of Irenæus likewise, as before shown, consequently, the most ancient. It is also the order which is now generally received. And to me it appears to be the best.

<sup>d</sup> Iren. l. 3. cap. ix. x. xi.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. iv. p. 155.

<sup>f</sup> P. 163.

<sup>g</sup> Vol. v. p. 82.

<sup>h</sup> Vol. iv. p. 173.

<sup>i</sup> P. 182.

<sup>k</sup> Vol. v. p. 147.

<sup>l</sup> P. 142.

<sup>m</sup> Vol. iv. p. 321.

<sup>n</sup> P. 483, 484.

<sup>o</sup> P. 487.

<sup>p</sup> P. 287.

<sup>q</sup> P. 292, 293.

<sup>r</sup> Vol. v. p. 86.

In Epiphanius <sup>s</sup> the books of the New Testament are enumerated in this order: ‘the four sacred gospels, the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, the seven catholic epistles, and the Revelation.’

I imagine that this must have been the order of Euthalius. For <sup>t</sup> he is supposed to have first published an edition of Paul’s epistles, and afterwards an edition of the Acts, and the catholic epistles, about the year 490. In his prologue to the Acts of the Apostles, addressed to Athanasius, then bishop of Alexandria, he says: ‘Having <sup>u</sup> formerly divided the epistles of Paul into sections, I have now done the like in the book of the Acts, and the seven catholic epistles.’ Hence I am led to argue that this was his order: Paul’s epistles, the Acts, and the catholic epistles.

Jerom’s order, in his letter to Paulinus, is <sup>v</sup> ‘the four gospels, St. Paul’s epistles, the Acts, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.’ Which is very agreeable to the order of Epiphanius, and also of Euthalius, if I understand him aright. But in Jerom’s work of the interpretation of Hebrew names the order is thus: ‘The <sup>w</sup> gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the seven catholic epistles, the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the Revelation.’ In the letter to Læta, the order is, ‘the <sup>x</sup> gospels, the Acts, and the epistles of the apostles.’

Augustine varies. In his work of the Christian Doctrine, the scriptures of the New Testament are rehearsed in this manner: ‘The <sup>y</sup> four books of the gospels, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the seven catholic epistles, the Acts of the apostles in one book, and the Revelation of John in one book.’ In another work: ‘the gospels,<sup>z</sup> the epistles of apostles, [meaning Paul’s epistles, and the catholic epistles,] the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation of John.’ In one of his works he quotes texts from the books of the New Testament in this order: first <sup>a</sup> from the gospels, next from several of the catholic epistles, then from almost all the epistles of Paul, after that from the Revelation, and lastly from the Acts of the Apostles.

In the catalogue of Innocent the first, bishop of Rome, this order is observable: ‘The <sup>b</sup> four gospels, St. Paul’s fourteen epistles, seven catholic epistles, the Acts, and the

<sup>s</sup> Hær. 76. p. 941. cited Vol. iv. p. 187.

<sup>t</sup> See Vol. v. p. 68.

<sup>u</sup> *Εναγκος τουνν ως εφην, την Παυλς βιβλον ανεγνωκως, αυτικα δητα και τηνδε την των αποστολικων Πραξεων, αμα τη των καθολικων επιτολων ιβδομαδι, πονησας, αρτως σοι πεπομφα.* Euthal. ap. Zacagn. Monum. Vet. p. 405.

<sup>v</sup> Cited, vol. iv. p. 436.

<sup>w</sup> P. 437.

<sup>x</sup> P. 471, 472.

<sup>y</sup> P. 494.

<sup>z</sup> P. 512.

<sup>a</sup> P. 514.

<sup>b</sup> P. 586.

‘Revelation.’ Isidore of Seville, in his several works, has three or four catalogues of the books of the New Testament. In<sup>c</sup> all of them we see this order: ‘first, the gospels, then the epistles of the apostle Paul, then the catholic epistles, after them the Acts, and then the Revelation.’ There were, according to him, two parts or divisions of the New Testament, one called the gospels or the evangelists, the other the apostles or the epistles. And in this last part the book of the Acts was placed. The same is the order in the Complexions or short Commentaries of Cassiodorius: they<sup>d</sup> are upon St. Paul’s epistles, the catholic epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation.

The three writers, alleged in this last paragraph, agree very much with Augustine in the two passages first cited from him in the preceding paragraph.

Chrysostom’s order in the Synopsis ascribed to him, as formerly observed, is very singular: ‘the<sup>e</sup> fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the four gospels, the book of the Acts, and three catholic epistles.’

The catalogue of Gelasius also is particular for the place of the Revelation. For he enumerates the books in this order: ‘the<sup>f</sup> four gospels, the Acts, St. Paul’s fourteen epistles, the Revelation, and the catholic epistles.’

I suppose I ought not to omit the order of the books in the 85th Apostolical Canon, as it is called, which is this. ‘The<sup>g</sup> four gospels, Paul’s fourteen epistles, seven catholic epistles, two epistles of Clement, the Constitutions, the Acts of the Apostles.’

I shall transcribe nothing more of this kind. They who are desirous to see more examples may consult the alphabetical table at the end of the last volume, in that article, “The New Testament.” Here is enough to be a foundation for such remarks as are proper to be made, relating to this point.

II. It is obvious to remark upon what we have now seen, that in the several ages of christianity, and in several parts of the world, there has been some variety in the disposition of the books of the New Testament, in two particulars especially. For in some catalogues St. Paul’s epistles precede the catholic epistles, in others they follow them. And the book of the Acts is sometimes placed next after the gospels, in other catalogues it follows all the epistles.

Dr. Mill, who, in his Prolegomena, has an article concern-

<sup>c</sup> Vol. v. p. 139.

<sup>d</sup> P. 113.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. iv. p. 537.

<sup>f</sup> Vol. v. p. 76.

<sup>g</sup> Vol. iv. p. 230.

ing the order of the books of the New Testament, with regard to the first particular, the placing in divers catalogues the catholic epistles before St. Paul's, says, 'that<sup>b</sup> possibly ' the christians of those times supposed them to deserve ' precedence, because they were not directed to one church ' or person only, as St. Paul's are, but to christians in gene- ' ral, and many churches scattered over the world. Some ' might also think the catholic epistles entitled to prece- ' dence, because they were written by those who were apos- ' tles before Paul, and had accompanied our Lord in his ' personal ministry here on earth.'

Mill likewise argues, that this was the most ancient order, because it is that of the Alexandrian, and some other ancient manuscripts. But I do not think that to be full proof. For Eusebius is older, and his order is the same as ours. The same order is in the catalogues of Rufin, the council of Carthage, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, and divers others, very probably older than any manuscripts now in being. And in many other writers likewise of great antiquity, St. Paul's epistles precede the catholic epistles. Whereby I am induced to think this must have been the most ancient order.

The reason why the book of the Acts was sometimes placed after all the epistles, some may think was because it was not so generally received as the gospels, the thirteen epistles of Paul, and some of the catholic epistles. Mr. Wetstein<sup>1</sup> hints at that reason. But I rather think, that by some it was judged proper, that the epistles of apostles should immediately follow the gospels, containing the history of our Lord himself: and that the history of the apostles and of their preaching, written by an apostolical man, should not precede, but rather follow their writings. For by Eusebius, as we have seen, the book of the Acts of the Apostles is reckoned among scriptures universally acknow-

<sup>b</sup> In epistolarum quidem dispositione variatum est. In antiquissimis quæc habemus manuscriptis, etiam Alexandrino nostro, Paulinis præmissæ sunt catholicæ; eo quod hæc Judæis per orbem quaquaversum dispersis, adeoque pluribus ecclesiis, inscriptæ sint; illæ vero singulis sive ecclesiis, sive etiam hominibus. Ne dicam, quod in isthac dispositione rationem forsitan habuerint dignitatis apostolorum, a quibus scriptæ sunt; ut nempe apostoli Judæorum, iique jam ab initio electi a Domino, ac cum eo per omne ministerii ipsius tempus versati, præponerentur Paulo, apostolo gentium, ac cui novissime omnium Christus visus erat. Postea autem Paulinæ positæ sunt ante catholicas. Mill. Proleg. num. 236.

<sup>1</sup> Apud orthodoxos vero hic Actuum liber non videtur eodem loco fuisse habitus, quo reliqui N. T. libri. Wetsten. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

ledged by catholic christians. It is so considered likewise by<sup>k</sup> Origen. And indeed, that this has been all along an universally-acknowledged sacred book of the New Testament, appears from our collections from every age of christianity from the beginning. See "Acts of the Apostles" in the alphabetical table of matters at the end of the last volume.

Mr. Wetstein<sup>l</sup> argues from the 85th Apostolical Canon, where the Acts of the Apostles are mentioned last. To which I answer, first, that the age, when those canons were composed, is uncertain. And secondly, that order may have been there chosen out of a regard to the common rules of modesty. For it is thus: 'the<sup>m</sup> gospels, Paul's epistles, ' the catholic epistles, two epistles of Clement, the Consti- ' tutions, and<sup>n</sup> the Acts of us the apostles.' When a man took upon himself the character of the apostles, and expressed himself in that manner, it was natural enough to reckon the book, which contained the history of their own actions, last of all. Surely it is trifling to form an argument from that position in this canon. And Mr. Wetstein might have observed, that in many catalogues, undoubtedly ancient, the Acts immediately follow the gospels: and that, not only in those catalogues where St. Paul's epistles have the precedence before the catholic epistles, but in divers others likewise, where the catholic epistles precede.

III. Having made these general observations, I now propose to consider distinctly the order of these several parts of the New Testament: the gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's epistles, the catholic epistles, and the Revelation.

I. The order of the four gospels has generally been this, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. This is their order in<sup>o</sup> Irenæus, <sup>p</sup> Origen, <sup>q</sup> Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, and in his ten Canons, as represented in his letter to Carpian, <sup>r</sup> Athanasius, <sup>s</sup> the council of Laodicea, <sup>t</sup> Epiphanius, <sup>u</sup> the 85th Apostolical Canon, <sup>v</sup> Gregory Na-

<sup>k</sup> Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. num. viii.

<sup>l</sup> In. Can. Ap. 85. ordo librorum iste reperitur. iv. Evangelia, Epistolæ Pauli xiv. Petri, Joannis, Jacobi, Judæ, Clementis duæ, Constitutiones, Acta. Wetst. ubi supr. p. 455.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 230.

<sup>n</sup> Καὶ Πράξεις ἡμῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων.

<sup>o</sup> Vol. ii. p. 170.

<sup>q</sup> Vol. iv. p. 95.

<sup>s</sup> P. 182.

<sup>u</sup> P. 230.

<sup>p</sup> P. 493.

<sup>r</sup> P. 155, 163.

<sup>t</sup> P. 188.

<sup>v</sup> P. 285.



zianzen, <sup>w</sup> Amphiloehius, <sup>x</sup> the Syrian catalogue, <sup>y</sup> Jerom, <sup>z</sup> Rufin, <sup>a</sup> Augustine, <sup>b</sup> the Alexandrian manuscript, <sup>c</sup> the Stichometry of Nicephorus, <sup>d</sup> Cosmas of Alexandria, <sup>e</sup> Junilius, an African bishop, <sup>f</sup> Isidore of Seville, <sup>g</sup> Leontius of Constantinople. And in like manner in all authors and catalogues in general, distinctly taken notice of in the several volumes of this work.

Nevertheless, in considering the testimony of Tertullian, we thought we saw reason to apprehend, that <sup>h</sup> in his time, in the African churches at least, the gospels were disposed according to the quality of the writers: in the first place those two, which were written by apostles, then the other two, written by apostolical men. This was inferred from some expressions in his <sup>i</sup> works. But perhaps the argument is not conclusive. However the four gospels are in the same order in <sup>k</sup> some Latin manuscripts, still in being, and also in <sup>l</sup> the Cambridge manuscript, which is Greek and Latin: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But by Mr Wetstein, we are assured, that <sup>m</sup> it is the only Greek manuscript in which the evangelists are so disposed. For certain the other order must have generally prevailed.

2. Concerning the Acts the question is, in which part of the New Testament it was generally placed by the ancients: whether in the Evangelicon, or the Apostolicon. And undoubtedly, by those who mention it after St. Paul's epistles, or after all the epistles of the apostles, it was placed in the latter part. But, as we have seen, it is often mentioned by ancient writers next after the four gospels. Was it then reckoned a part of the Evangelicon, or of the Apostolicon? From some passages of Tertullian it was formerly argued by us, that <sup>n</sup> the book of the Acts was placed in the second part of the New Testament, and at the beginning of it. I would now add, that I think the same may be argued from Irenæus, who, <sup>o</sup> having alleged passages from the four gos-

<sup>w</sup> P. 292, 293.

<sup>x</sup> P. 321.

<sup>y</sup> P. 436, 437, 439, 441

<sup>z</sup> P. 483.

<sup>a</sup> P. 494.

<sup>b</sup> Vol. v. p. 82.

<sup>c</sup> P. 86.

<sup>d</sup> P. 93, 94.

<sup>e</sup> P. 106.

<sup>f</sup> P. 138.

<sup>g</sup> P. 142.

<sup>h</sup> See vol. ii. p. 301.

<sup>l</sup> Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant; ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant, iisdem regulis exorsi. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 2. p. 503. A. Vid. et ibid. cap. 5. p. 505. C. D.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Joseph Blanchini Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinæ Versionis Antiquæ. <sup>l</sup> Vid. Mill, Prolegom. num. 1269.

<sup>m</sup> Vidit tamen, nisi admodum fallor, hunc ipsum codicem Cantabrigiensem, qui unus et solus omnium codicum Græce Scriptorum hunc ordinem servat. Wetsten. Prolegom. p. 28.

<sup>n</sup> Vol. ii. p. 300.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Iren. contr. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. fin. et cap. xii. in.

pels, proceeds to the Acts, and considers what he allegeth thence as the doctrine, particularly of the apostles. And Mill supposeth, that<sup>p</sup> in the most ancient times the Acts were placed with the epistles, but before them, as the first book of that part. However it is observable, that the Cambridge manuscript has the Acts of the Apostles, though it has not the epistles. But then Mill says, that<sup>q</sup> volume once had the epistles, as well as the gospels. And therefore, probably, the book of the Acts stood at the head of that part which contained the epistles. And for certain, I think it best that the historical books of the New Testament should appear together. Accordingly, as we have seen, the Acts do in many ancient catalogues immediately follow the gospels. And I wish that Mr. Wetstein had followed that order which now prevails, and that he had not placed the Acts of the Apostles, as he has done, at the head of the catholic epistles, and after the epistles of St. Paul.

3. In the catalogues lately alleged, we have seen St. Paul's epistles sometimes preceding the catholic epistles, at other times following them. Here the order, as seems to me, is of little consequence. But I rather prefer our present order, which places St. Paul's epistles first: because, excepting only the epistle to the Hebrews, all of them have been all along universally acknowledged: whereas among the seven catholic epistles, there are but two, which have not been at some times contradicted books. Moreover St. Paul's epistles immediately follow the historical books in Eusebius. Whence I am willing to infer, that it is the most ancient order.

4. I must say something about the order of St. Paul's epistles severally. Our order is that of his thirteen epistles, which have been universally acknowledged, and then the epistle to the Hebrews, about which there had been doubts in the minds of many for a good while.

Among the ancients there is some variety. To the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, Hebrews, Timothy, Titus, Philemon. So<sup>r</sup> in the Festal Epistle of Athanasius,

<sup>p</sup> Primo loco posita sunt Acta Apostolorum.—Subsecutæ sunt epistolæ indubitato apostolicæ, quas corrogare undique liceret. Proleg. num. 195.

<sup>q</sup> Marci evangelio suffixa est etiam notula, significans, post illud proxime poni librum Actuum. Verum hæc est scribæ recentioris. Sequens enim folium, quod primâ facie duodecim postremos versus epistolæ tertiæ B. Joannis exhibet, alterâ primam partem capitis primi Actorum, clare indicat Exemplar hoc jam olim, præter Evangelia et Acta, complexum fuisse catholicas saltem epistolas. Mill. Proleg. num. 1270.

<sup>r</sup> Vol. iv. p. 155.

and <sup>s</sup> in the Synopsis ascribed to him, and <sup>t</sup> in the catalogue of the council of Laodicea, and <sup>u</sup> in the Alexandrian manuscript. In others may be found our present order, as <sup>v</sup> in the iambic poem of Amphiloehius, the <sup>w</sup> Syrian catalogue in Ebedjesu, <sup>x</sup> Jerom, in his article of St. Paul, <sup>y</sup> Augustine in his work of the christian doctrine, <sup>z</sup> Œcumenius, and many others.

Epiphanius, observing how Marcion had disturbed the order of St. Paul's epistles, says, that <sup>a</sup> in some editions of the New Testament, the epistle to the Hebrews was the fourteenth, in others the tenth, being placed before the two epistles to Timothy, and the epistles to Titus and Philemon : and that <sup>b</sup> in all good copies the epistle to the Romans was the first, not that to the Galatians, as Marcion had disposed them.

Theodoret <sup>c</sup> and Chrysostom <sup>d</sup> have particularly taken notice, that the epistle to the Romans was placed first, though it was not the first in the order of time.

Concerning the reason of that disposition of the epistle to the Romans, Theodoret observes, ' that <sup>e</sup> it had been placed first, as containing the most full and exact representation of the christian doctrine in all its branches. But some say, it had been so placed out of respect to the city to which it had been sent, as presiding over the whole world.'

I have sometimes thought that first observation might be applied to all St. Paul's epistles, as the ground and reason of their situation. For the first five epistles, that to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, and the epistles to the Galatians, and the Ephesians, are the largest of St. Paul's epistles. And all that follow are shorter, excepting the epistle to the Hebrews, which has been placed after those sent to churches, or last of all, after those likewise which were sent to particular persons, because its genuineness was not universally allowed of.

But the other, the dignity of the cities and people to whom the epistles were sent, has been more generally supposed to be the ground and reason of the order in which they are

<sup>s</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 163.

<sup>t</sup> P. 182.

<sup>u</sup> Vol. v. p. 82.

<sup>v</sup> Vol. iv. p. 292.

<sup>w</sup> P. 321, 322.

<sup>x</sup> P. 451.

<sup>y</sup> P. 494.

<sup>z</sup> Vol. v. p. 154, 155.

<sup>a</sup> Hær. 42. p. 373. C.

<sup>b</sup> Παντα δε τα αντιγραφα τα σωα και αληθη την προς 'Ρωμαιους εχουσι πρωτην, πχ' ως συ Μαρκιων, την προς Γαλατας εταξας πρωτην. H. 42. p. 373. D.

<sup>c</sup> Vol. v. p. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. vii. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Προτεταχασι δε την προς 'Ρωμαιους, ως παντοδαπην εχουσαν διδασκαλιαν, και την των λογματων ακριβειαν δια πλειονων διδασκεσαν. Τινες δε φασιν, ότι και την πολυν τιμωντις, κ. λ. Theod. Pr. in Ep. S. P. T. III. p. 6.

placed. How this is represented by Mill, may appear in his own words, which I place below.

I also shall show this as well as I can. Epistles to churches are placed first. Afterwards those to particular persons. The epistles to churches are placed very much according to the rank of the cities or places to which they were sent. The epistle to the Romans is placed first, because Rome was the chief city of the Roman empire. The two epistles to the Corinthians come next, because Corinth was a large, and polite, and renowned city. Galatia was a country in which were several churches, and therefore the epistle to them might be placed before others, written to one church only. Nevertheless, the epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians have been preferred, as is supposed, upon account of the great eminence of those two cities. The epistle to the Ephesians follows next, because Ephesus was the chief city of Asia, strictly so called. Afterwards follow the epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians. But how to account for this order, according to the method we here observe, I do not well know. Colosse indeed might be reckoned a city of inferior rank, and Philippi was a Roman colony. But Thessalonica was the chief city of Macedonia, in which Philippi stood. And if the epistles were disposed according to the dignity of places, it is not easy to conceive why the two epistles to the Thessalonians were placed after those to the Philippians, and the Colossians. So that in this method, as seems to me, the order of the epistles is made out in but a lame and imperfect manner. And there may be reason to apprehend that the brevity of the two epistles to the Thessalonians, especially of the second, procured them this situation, though they are the first written epistles of our apostle, and indeed the first written of all the sacred scriptures of the New Testament.

Among the epistles to particular persons, those to Timothy have the precedence, as he was a favourite disciple of St. Paul, and those epistles are the largest and fullest. The epistle to Titus comes next, as he was an evangelist. And that to Philemon is last, as he was supposed by many to be

<sup>1</sup> In iis vero disponendis, (exceptâ unâ ad Hebræos, de quâ mox,) spectata est omnino dignitas ecclesiarum et hominum, quibus missæ sunt. Epistola ad ecclesias Galatiæ, quæ erat integra provincia, merito præcedebat illas, quæ ad unam datæ erant civitatem, Laodiceam, Philippas, Colossenses, Thessaloniam. His tamen præponere visum est epistolas ad Romanos et Corinthios, ob eminentem harum urbium dignitatem, quâ provinciam istam superare videbantur. Epistolas integris ecclesiis inscriptas sequuntur, quæ ad singulos homines datæ sunt. Proleg. num. 237.

only a private christian. Undoubtedly Titus was a person of greater eminence, and in a higher station than Philemon. Moreover, by many the design of that epistle was thought to be of no great importance.

The epistle to the Hebrews is fitly enough placed after the rest, because for a while it was doubted of, as before said. I likewise think it to be the last written of all St. Paul's epistles.

5. Some learned men, who have examined the chronology of St. Paul's epistles, have proposed, that they should be placed in our Bibles according to the order of time. Dr. Wall, at the end of the preface to his Critical Notes upon the Testament, has an argument to this purpose.

But first, it will be difficult to alter the order which has been so long established in all editions of the original Greek, and in all versions. Secondly, The order of their times has not been yet settled. Many, I suppose, are of opinion, that Dr. Wall's order is not right. Must the order be altered again and again, to suit every one's fancy? That would create a very troublesome and disagreeable confusion.

I think that the knowledge of the order in which St. Paul's epistles were written, must be very entertaining and useful: and I have done what is in my power to find it out. But I am far from desiring that they should be placed, and bound up together, according to my calculations. Before an attempt of that kind is made, the order of time should be settled, and determined, to the general satisfaction of all learned and inquisitive men. And judicious christians, who have studied the chronological order of the writings of the New Testament, may have an advantage by it, though the books are continued in their present order.

6. I say nothing here concerning the order of the seven catholic epistles, because I have spoken to it sufficiently in a preceding <sup>g</sup> chapter.

7. Finally, the book of the Revelation is now placed the last of all, and has been generally so placed in former times, and very fitly, as<sup>h</sup> Mill says in his observations upon the

<sup>g</sup> See this Vol. p. 161, 162.

<sup>h</sup> Agmen vero Novi Fœderis librorum claudit Apocalypsis; quæ cum circa diversum plane a reliquis versetur argumentum, atque minus apte inter evangelia et epistolas media fuisset interposita, commodissime in fine omnium collocata fuit; quoniam tanquam liber propheticus futura respicit adhuc implenda; ac denique insignem illam habet in calce clausulam de non addendo quidpiam isti prophetiæ, vel ab eâ detrahendo: quâ etiam ad omnes N. T. libros accommodatâ, canonem universum veluti obsignare convenientissimum videbatur. Mill. Proleg. num. 239.

order of the books of the New Testament, 'it being prophetic of things to be hereafter fulfilled, and therefore of a different kind from the rest : and having also near the end that remarkable clause, ch. xxii. 18, 19, containing a caution against adding to, or taking from it : which may be applied to all the books of scripture.' To which might be added, that there are not wanting divers reasons to think it is the last written of all the books of the New Testament.

---

## CHAP. XXIV.

*That the Books of the New Testament, consisting of a collection of sacred writings, in two parts, one called Gospels, or Evangelicon, the other Epistles, or Apostle, or Apostles, or Apostolicon, were early known, read, and made use of by christians.*

THAT the gospels, the Acts, and the epistles of the New Testament, or divers of those epistles, were soon well known, much read, and collected together, may be argued from internal marks and characters, and from testimony.

1. Internal marks and characters are such as these.

1. It is obvious from the nature of the thing. Who composes and publishes any works without desiring to have them perused? It is very likely, therefore, that the authors of the books of the New Testament, who were at the pains of writing histories, or epistles, would take care that they should be known. The same zeal that prompted any man to write, would induce him to provide for the publication. The importance of the subject would justify a concern to spread the work. All must allow, that there never were, and that there cannot be, any writings, containing more important facts and principles. To suppose that any of these writers were indifferent about the success and acceptance of what they had composed, is very absurd and unreasonable.

2. All the writings, of which the New Testament consists, were addressed to some, who would set a great value on them, and would willingly recommend them to others. All the epistles, and the Revelation, as is manifest, are sent to

christian societies, or particular persons. St. Luke's gospel, and the Acts, were sent to the most excellent, or most noble Theophilus. St. John intended his gospel for some whom he had in his eye. As appears from ch. xx. 30, 31, and from ch. xxi. 24, 25. And it is very likely, that St. Matthew and St. Mark also wrote for some, who would gladly receive and highly value their books, and get them copied for the use and satisfaction of others.

3. In several of the books of the New Testament directions are given, which would tend to make them well known. St. Paul, at the end of his first epistle to the Thessalonians, one of his first written epistles, enjoins, "that it should be read to all the holy brethren," 1 Thess. v. 27. The same method, undoubtedly, was observed with regard to the second epistle, sent to the same Thessalonians, and written not long after. Probably, the same practice obtained in all the christian churches, to which St. Paul afterwards sent any epistle. And the christian people of other churches, beside those who had letters sent to them, would be desirous to see the epistles of their great apostle, by whom they had been converted, and would therefore get them transcribed for their own use. At the end of the epistle to the Colossians, ch. iv. 16, he directs: "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye read the epistle from Laodicea:" meaning, probably, the epistle to the Ephesians, which was to come round to Colosse from Ephesus, by the way of Laodicea. The apostle therefore was willing, and even desirous, that his epistles should be read by others, beside those to whom they were sent, for the sake of general edification. And can it be questioned, whether other Gentile churches in these parts, all which were of his own planting, would not thankfully embrace the encouragement hereby given them to look into his epistles, and to get them transcribed, and read in their assemblies also?

4. St. Peter writes to this purpose in his second epistle, which we may suppose to have been written in the year 64. "And account, that the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation, even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, has written unto you. As also in all his epistles, speaking of these things, in which there are some things hard to be understood. Which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do the other scriptures, unto their own destruction," 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

Here are several things to be observed. First, Peter speaks of epistles of Paul sent to the same christians, to

whom himself was writing. Secondly, he speaks of other epistles of Paul: as also in all his epistles. Thirdly, Peter therefore had a knowledge of several epistles of Paul, sent to the christians of those countries, and likewise of divers others, which he intends in the phrase "all his epistles." Fourthly, the christians, to whom Peter writes, were well acquainted with the epistles which Paul had written to them, and with the rest of his epistles, or divers of them. Fifthly, it is supposed, and implied, that all, or at least many of Paul's epistles, were well known and much read. For Peter speaks of some, whom he calls unlearned, and unstable, who wrested Paul's epistles, or some things in them, to their own destruction. And very probably there were other readers of the same epistles, who improved them to their edification and salvation.

It seems to me, that what Peter says here, affords reason to think, that at the time of writing this epistle, Paul's epistles (most, or all of them) were well known among christians, and that Peter had good evidence of it.

When Peter says, "as our beloved brother Paul has written unto you:" some learned men, Mill<sup>a</sup> in particular, have supposed, that thereby Peter intended the epistle to the Hebrews. But I think without reason, as Mr. Hallett<sup>b</sup> has largely shown. St. Peter's epistles are addressed to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." It is not unlikely, therefore, that St. Peter intends Paul's epistles to the Galatians, and the Ephesians, and the Colossians, all situated in those countries: and likewise the two epistles to Timothy, who resided much at Ephesus, and must have received the epistles written to him, when in that city, and the epistle to Philemon, who was of Colosse. And in the expression, "all his epistles," some others must be intended, and included: such as the epistles to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, Titus: so many, however, as the apostle Peter was then acquainted with. Mill has observed passages in<sup>c</sup> the first epistle to the Thessalonians, and in<sup>d</sup> the epistle to the Romans, and in<sup>e</sup> that to the Philippians: in which are "some of those things hard to be understood," to which St. Peter may be supposed to have an eye.

These marks and characters there are in the books of the New Testament, which may induce us to believe, that

<sup>a</sup> Prolegom. num. 86.

<sup>b</sup> See his introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 21, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Prolegom. num. 5.

<sup>d</sup> *Ib.* num. 28.

<sup>e</sup> *Ib.* num. 70.



they were soon dispersed among christians, and well known to them.

This is also manifest from testimony.

1. The accounts, which we find in the ancients, concerning the occasions of the several gospels, lead us to think, that they were soon spread abroad after they were written. Matthew is said to have written his gospel at the request of the believers in Judea : and Mark his, at the desire of the christians at Rome, for the assistance of their memories. When therefore those gospels had been written, divers copies would be soon taken, that the ends, for which they had been written, might be answered. The several defective and imperfect accounts, which had been published of our Lord's words and works, induced St. Luke to write. And when his fuller and exacter account was published, it must have been attended to, and would be transcribed, and communicated to many. Before St. John wrote, he had seen the other three gospels. And the christians in Asia, where he resided, were acquainted with them. Therefore they were well known, and joined together. And when his gospel was written, undoubtedly it was added to them, and they were all joined together in one volume, for general use.

That the first three gospels were well known in the world, before St. John wrote, is supposed by Eusebius of Cæsarea, who was well acquainted with the writings of christians before his time. These are the words of that eminent man. Having spoken of St. Matthew's gospel he goes on : ' And <sup>f</sup> when Mark and Luke had published the gospels according to them, it is said that John, who all this while had preached by word of mouth, was induced to write for this reason. The three first-written gospels being now delivered to all men, and to John himself, it is said, that he approved them.' And what follows. Before this last evangelist wrote, the ' other three gospels had been delivered ' unto all men, and to John.' He therefore had seen them before, and they were in the hands of many people.

What has been now said of the gospels, is applicable, in a great measure, to the Acts, and the epistles of the New Testament : as may be perceived by all, without my enlarging any farther.

2. Ignatius, who was honoured with the crown of martyrdom about the year 107, does, in his epistles, use expressions, denoting <sup>g</sup> two codes, or collections, one of gospels,

<sup>f</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 95.

<sup>g</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 89, 90, 94; and Vol. v. p. 185, 186, 188.

the other of epistles of apostles. Such volumes there were then, and may have been some good while before.

I shall here remind my readers of a few other like instances. In the epistle to Diognetus, certainly very ancient, and by some ascribed to Justin Martyr, are these expressions: ‘The fear of the Lord<sup>h</sup> is celebrated, and the grace of the prophets is known, the faith of the gospel is established, and the tradition of the apostles is kept.’ By these last expressions denoting, as is reasonable to think, a volume of the gospels, and another of epistles of apostles. Irenæus speaks of the evangelic and apostolic writings, in a passage, which will be alleged presently. Tertullian speaks<sup>i</sup> of ‘the sayings of the prophets, the gospels, and the apostles.’ And in another place says: ‘This<sup>k</sup> I perceive both in the gospels, and the apostles.’ I go no lower, my intention at present being only to allege a few writers of the earliest times.

3. As before shown<sup>l</sup> from Eusebius, they who in the reign of Trajan, about the year 112, travelled abroad to teach the christian religion in remote countries, ‘took with them the scriptures of the divine gospels.’ Nor can there be any reason to doubt, that our ecclesiastical historian here speaks of the four gospels, so well known in his own time.

4. By Justin Martyr, about the year 140, in his account of the christian worship, which is in his apology to the emperor and senate of Rome, the whole world was assured, that<sup>m</sup> the gospels which he calls Memoirs of the apostles, and their companions, were publicly read in the assemblies of christians every Lord’s day.

Certainly, the gospels were then well known, and had been so for some while before.

5. Tatian, who flourished some time before and after the year 170, composed a harmony of the four gospels. We<sup>n</sup> have full assurance of it. Is not this sufficient evidence, that the gospels were then, and had been for a good while, generally known, and in common use? And does it not also afford reason to believe, that it was then, and had been for some while, an established, or generally received opinion

<sup>h</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 144.

<sup>i</sup> *Compendiis paucorum verborum, quot attinguntur edicta prophetarum, evangeliorum, apostolorum?* De Oratione, cap. 9. p. 125. C. quoted Vol. ii. p. 299.

<sup>k</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>l</sup> P. 115; and Vol. v. p. 189.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 131, 132; and Vol. v. p. 190.

<sup>n</sup> Vol. ii. p. 148, 149, 439; and Vol. v. p. 190.

among christians, that there were four, and no more than four authentic memoirs or histories of Jesus Christ?

6. I forbear to allege any thing from Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, or Tertullian, for showing the notoriety of the books of the New Testament in early times, because I now insist only upon writers of the highest antiquity. But I shall take notice of some things, which we have in the accounts of the heresies of the second century.

However, that this argument may not be too prolix, I entirely pass by Basilides.

7. Valentinus is placed by Cave<sup>o</sup> as flourishing about the year 120. By Basnage<sup>p</sup> he is placed at the year 124. By Mill<sup>q</sup> between 123, and 127. And by Irenæus we are assured, 'that<sup>r</sup> the Valentinians endeavoured to support 'their opinions from texts of the evangelic and apostolic 'scriptures, or of the gospels and apostles, that is, both 'parts of the New Testament: and that<sup>s</sup> they argued 'especially from the gospel according to John.'

And Tertullian allows, that<sup>t</sup> Valentinus used the books of the New Testament entire, without altering them, as Marcion did.

Mr. Wetstein says, the<sup>u</sup> Valentinians rejected the Acts of the Apostles. And he thinks this appears from Irenæus. But to me it appears manifest from Irenæus, that they received the Acts. For in his confutation of them, in his third book against heresies, he<sup>v</sup> argues against them largely, first from the gospels, then from the book of the Acts, and lastly from the epistles of apostles. And Massuet, the learned Benedictine editor of Irenæus, allows, that<sup>w</sup> accord-

<sup>o</sup> Hist. Lit. p. 50.

<sup>p</sup> Ann. 124. num. vii.

<sup>q</sup> Proleg. num. 265.

<sup>r</sup> *Και ου μόνον εκ των ευαγγελικων, και των αποστολικων περιωνται τας αποδειξεις ποιεισθαι.* Iren. l. i. c. 3. n. 6. p. 17.

<sup>s</sup> Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Joannem plenissime utentes, ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum, ex ipso deteguntur, nihil recte dicentes. Id. l. 3. cap. xi. n. 7. p. 190.

<sup>t</sup> Alius manu scripturas, alius sensus expositione, intervertit. Neque enim si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion, manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exerte et palam machærâ, non stylo, usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam cædem scripturarum confecit. Valentinus autem pepercit; quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed materiam ad scripturas, excogitavit. De Præsc. Hær. cap. 38. p. 246.

<sup>u</sup> Acta Apostolorum rejecerunt Valentiniani. Quod constat ex Irenæo. Hær. iii. 2. Wetsten. N. T. tom. ii. p. 455.

<sup>v</sup> Vid. Iren. contr. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. xii.

<sup>w</sup> At ipsi Valentino nihil simile usquam adscribit Irenæus. Imo cum loco mox citato, tum lib. 1. cap. viii. et ix. et alibi passim, satis significat Valentinianos sibi coævos sic canonem scripturarum novo evangelio auxisse, ut nihil quidquam, nullum librum integrum, nullam ejusdem partem, (quod Mar-

ing to that ancient writer, the Valentinians did not reject any books of the New Testament.

Irenæus, as we have just seen, says, that the Valentinians endeavoured to support their opinions by the evangelic and apostolic scriptures. The Acts were included in this second volume of the New Testament according to the method of the ancient christians.

8. Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, is supposed by <sup>x</sup> Grabe to have been contemporary with his master, Valentinus, and to have appeared about the year 123. However, he might continue a good while after that. Basnage<sup>y</sup> speaks of him at the year 125. And Cave<sup>z</sup> placeth him at 126. They who are so pleased, may recollect what was said of his age<sup>a</sup> formerly.

Heracleon seems to have written commentaries upon several parts of the New Testament. Clement of Alexandria, having quoted the words of Matt. x. 32, or Luke xii. 8, and of Luke xii. 11, 12, says: ‘Heracleon,<sup>b</sup> explaining this place, has these very words,’ which I need not transcribe at present, though it be a valuable passage. There is in Clement<sup>c</sup> another short passage of Heracleon’s commentary upon St. Luke.

Origen, in his commentary upon St. John’s gospel, often quotes Heracleon. The passages of Heracleon’s commentary upon that gospel, with Origen’s remarks, are collected by<sup>d</sup> Grabe. And from him they have been placed by Massuet in his appendix to Irenæus. The passages of Heracleon, quoted by Origen, are above forty in number, and some of them long.

Heracleon’s commentaries upon the gospels of St. Luke and St. John, are an early proof of the respect shown to the books of the New Testament. And it may be reasonable to think, that others beside Heracleon, both catholics and heretics, published about the same time commentaries upon some of the books of the New Testament.

Origen<sup>e</sup> has at once given us Heracleon’s observations upon Matt. viii. 12 and Is. i. 2.

cioni non semel exprobat) ab eo abjecissent; sed ‘vel parabolas Dominicas, vel dictiones propheticas, aut sermones apostolicas,’ ad hypothesim suam aptare conatos, calumniam intulisse scripturis. Massuet. Diss. i. num. ix. p. xvii.

<sup>x</sup> Spicil. T. I. p. 62. T. II. p. 69, et 80.

<sup>y</sup> Ann. 125. num. iii.

<sup>z</sup> H. L. p. 53.

<sup>a</sup> Vol. ii. p. 255, 256, note v.

<sup>b</sup> Τητον εξηγγεμενος τον τοπον Ηρακλειων—κατα λεξιν φησιν.—

Strom. l. 4. p. 502. A—D.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Eclog. Proph. ap. Cl. Al. p. 804. D. et Grabe, Spic. T. II. p. 85.

<sup>d</sup> Spic. T. II. p. 85—117.

<sup>e</sup> Origen. Comm. in Joan. T. II. p. 256. C. Huet.

Heracleon likewise received St. Paul and his writings. For <sup>f</sup> he quotes, as his, the beginning of the twelfth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. Moreover Origen <sup>g</sup> has given us Heracleon's interpretation of I Cor. xv. 53, 54.

I might add here some other things. But this is sufficient to show that in the very early days of christianity, the books of the New Testament were well known, much used, and greatly respected.

9. Marcion about <sup>h</sup> the year 138, placed by some <sup>i</sup> sooner, in 127, or 130, had, and probably in imitation of other christians, a <sup>k</sup> gospel, and an apostle, or an Evangelicon, and Apostolicon.

In the former as is generally said, was <sup>l</sup> St. Luke's gospel only, and that curtailed. But Mr. Lampe says, that <sup>m</sup> Marcion did not reject the other gospels, though he preferred St. Luke's. This he infers from a passage in Tertullian, which seems to show that Marcion did not reject St. Matthew's gospel.

I shall add another from Isidore of Pelusium, where he says: 'Take <sup>n</sup> the gospel [or the Evangelicon] of Marcion,

<sup>f</sup> —καθ' ὃ και ὁ αποστολος διδασκει, λεγων, λογικην λατρειαν την τοιαυτην θεοσεβειαν. Ap. Orig. ib. p. 217. E. et Grabe Spic. p. 101.

<sup>g</sup> Ap. Orig. ib. p. 255. D. et Grabe, p. 110.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 144. n. iii. et Asseman. Bib. Or. T. I. p. 389, note (4.)

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Cav. H. L. p. 54. &c. S. Basnag. ann. 131. iii.—v. 133. iv. Mill. ProL. num. 306, 307.

<sup>k</sup> Adamant. *Απο ποιων γραφων δειζει ταυτα επαγγελλη; Marc. Απο τῶν εὐαγγελιῶν και τῶν ἀποστολῶν.* Dial. contr. Marcion. sect. 2. p. 54. Basil. 1674. p. 821. D. T. I. Bened. Vid. et Epiph. H. 42. n. ix.

<sup>l</sup> Et super hæc, id quod est secundum Lucam evangelium circumcidens. Iren. l. 1. cap. 27. 2. al. cap. 29.

Nam ex iis Commentoribus, quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse, quem cæderet. Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 4. cap. 2. p. 503. Vid. et Epiph. Hær. 42. n. ix.

<sup>m</sup> Verum hinc quoque plus elicitur, quam voluit Marcion. Non enim asserere Marcion ausus est, evangelia, quæ extra Lucam habemus, esse conficta et falso evangelistis supposita. Nemo Patrum antiquiorum hujus criminis Marcionem accusavit. Id tantum voluit, Lucæ evangelium, ductu Pauli conscriptum, reliquis evangelis præferendum esse.—Clarissima hæc esse puto. Et quod prætensionem interpolationis attinet, hujus insigne statim cap. 7, [lib. 4. contr. Marc.] exemplum affertur: 'Cæterum et loco et illuminationis opere secundum prædicationem occurrentibus Christo, jam cum prophetam incipimus agnoscere, ostendentem in primo ingressu venisse se, non ut legem et prophetas dissolveret, sed ut potens adimpleret. Hoc enim Marcion, ut additum erasit.' Cum enim hæc verba Matthæi v. 17, inveniantur, hinc inferimus, Marcionem evangelium Matthæi non simpliciter negasse, sed quæcumque erroribus ejus non patrocinantur, pro lubitu erasisse. Atque ita proculdubio etiam cum reliquis evangelistis egit. Lampe Proleg. ad Joan. Evang. l. 2. cap. 1. n. iv. p. 136, 137.

<sup>n</sup> *Εἰ προΐσχηται ὁ τῆς Μαρκωνος συνηγορος βλασφημίας, τὸ παρ' ἐκεينوῦ ὀνομαζόμενον εὐαγγέλιον λαβὼν ἀναγνώθῃ, και εὐρησεις εὐθὺς ἐν προομιῇ τὴν*

‘ and you will presently see at the very beginning a proof  
 ‘ of their impudence. For they have left out our Lord’s  
 ‘ genealogy from David and Abraham. And if you pro-  
 ‘ ceed a little farther, you will see another instance of their  
 ‘ wickedness, in altering our Lord’s words. “I came not,”  
 ‘ says he, “to destroy the law or the prophets.” But they  
 ‘ have made it thus: “Think ye, that I came to fulfil the  
 ‘ law or the prophets? I am come to destroy, not to ful-  
 ‘ fil.”’ Matt. v. 17.

It might be also argued from the dialogue against the Marcionites, that they used St. Matthew’s gospel. But I forbear to allege any places in particular.

So that it may be reckoned probable, that Marcion did not reject any of the four gospels. But undoubtedly he made alterations in them, agreeable to his own particular opinion, under a pretence that <sup>o</sup> they had been corrupted by some before his time.

Perhaps <sup>p</sup> Marcion filled up St. Luke’s gospel out of the rest, taking from them such things as suited his purpose. Tertullian says, that <sup>q</sup> his gospel, or Evangelicon, had no title. That may have been the reason of it. And we can hence conclude, that in very ancient times, among the catholics, the four gospels were entitled, and inscribed, with the names of the several evangelists. Which <sup>r</sup> has been denied, or doubted of by some.

Marcion had also an Apostolicon. In this were ten epistles only of St. Paul, and those diminished, at least some of them. Their order according to him, as we are informed by <sup>s</sup> Epiphanius, was this: the epistle to the Galatians, the first and second to the Corinthians, to the Romans, the first

*αποπειαν. Αυτην γαρ την καταγρυσαν επι Χριστον απο Δαβιδ και Αβρααμ γενεαλογιαν απετειμεν. Και μικρον υπερον προϊων αλλην οψει κακονοιαν. Αμειψαντες γαρ την τε Κυριε φωνην, Ουκ ηλθον, λεγοντος, καταλυσαι, τον νομον, η τες προφητας, εποιησαν. Δοκειτε, οτι ηλθον πληρωσαι τον νομον, η τες προφητας; Ηλθον καταλυσαι, αλλ’ η πληρωσαι. Isid. Pel. l. i. ep. 371.*

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 4. cap. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Occurrit primo loco Marcion et Marcionitæ, qui corruerunt libros N. T. re-rectis omnibus iis, quæ Judaicæ religioni favere putabant, et contracto toto N. T. in duos codices, quorum priorem vocabant evangelium, ex Lucâ maximam partem conflatum, et subinde ex reliquis evangelistis integratum. Wetst. Proleg. N. T. tom. I. p. 79.

<sup>q</sup> Contra Marcion evangelio, scilicet suo, nullum adscribit auctorem; quasi non leuerit illi titulum quoque adfingere, cui nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evertere. Et possem hic jam gradum figere, non agnoscendum contendens opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam constantiam præferat, nullam fidem repromittat de plenitudine tituli, et professione debitâ auctoris. Contr. Marc. l. 4. cap. 2.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Mill. Prol. num. 347.

<sup>s</sup> Her. 42. num. ix. et abbi.

and second to the Thessalonians, to the Ephesians, the Colossians, Philemon, the Philippians.

He received not any other epistles of St. Paul. It is supposed likewise, that he rejected the catholic epistles, and the Revelation. Whether he received the Acts of the Apostles, I cannot say certainly: though <sup>t</sup> some learned men think he did not receive them. But then it should be observed by us, that <sup>u</sup> the Marcionite Apostolicon was reckoned very defective by the catholic christians.

And it may be inferred from the accounts which we have in the best writers of the most early ages, that Marcion was the most arbitrary and most licentious of all the ancient heretics, in his judgment concerning the scriptures that should be received, and in his manner of treating such as were received by him. So that his opinion can be no prejudice to the genuineness or the notoriety of any of those books of the New Testament, which were received by the catholics, and indeed by most heretics likewise. I shall place below <sup>v</sup> a remarkable passage of Irenæus, where he says: ‘ Marcion and his followers curtail the scriptures with great assurance, rejecting some entirely, and diminishing the gospel according to Luke, and the epistles of Paul, affirming those parts of them alone to be genuine which they have preserved.—All others, who are puffed up with the science falsely so called, receive the scriptures, whilst they pervert them by wrong interpretations.’

In another place he says, ‘ that <sup>w</sup> Marcion alone had openly dared to curtail the scriptures.’ And my readers can easily recollect, how <sup>x</sup> severely Tertullian censures Marcion <sup>y</sup> for altering the text of the scriptures, openly employing a knife, as he says, not a style, to render them agreeable to his erroneous opinions.

<sup>t</sup> Acta Apostolorum rejecerunt Marcionitæ.—Tertullianus adv. Marcionem, lib. v. cap. 2. ‘ Si ex hoc congruunt Paulo Apostolorum Acta, cur ea respuatis, jam apparet.’ Wetst. N. T. tom. II. p. 455.

<sup>u</sup> Προενεγκε το Αποστολικον σβ, ει και τα μαλιζα περικεκομμενον εστι. Dialog. adv. Marcion. sect. i. p. 8. Basil. p. 806. T. I. Bened.

<sup>v</sup> Unde et Marcion, et qui ab eo sunt, ad intercendendas conversi sunt scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem evangelium, et epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc sola legitima esse dicunt, quæ ipsi minoraverunt.—Reliqui vero omnes, falso scientiæ nomine inflati, scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt. Iren. adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. xii. n. 12. p. 198. b. Massuet.

<sup>w</sup> Sed huic quidem, quoniam et solus manifeste ausus est circumcidere scripturas, &c. Iren. l. i. cap. 27. n. 4. p. 106. [al. cap. 29.] Vid. ib. num. 2.

<sup>x</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 297.

<sup>y</sup> Marcion enim exerte et palam machærâ, non stylo, usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam cædem scripturarum confecit. De Præscr. Hær. cap. 38. p. 246. C.

However, I think, here is full proof, that the books of the New Testament were well known in Marcion's time, and before him: and that they were collected together in two parts or volumes, an Evangelicon and Apostolicon. He and other christians had a gospel and an apostle. But theirs were fuller than his.

10. We might, perhaps, not unprofitably recollect here those <sup>z</sup> passages of Eusebius of Cæsarea, where he speaks of the scriptures of the New Testament: some of which were universally received, others were contradicted: divers of which last, nevertheless, were received by many. The universally received by the sounder part of christians, were the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, one of Peter, one of John. It may be reckoned not unlikely, that all these had been from ancient time inserted by most christians in their two volumes of the gospel and apostle. And, probably, divers of the other books, called controverted, or contradicted, were joined with the rest in the volumes of a good number of christians.

III. There are some observations of Mr. Henry Dodwell concerning the late forming of the canon of the New Testament, which cannot be easily overlooked, and seem to require some notice in this place.

I. He says, 'that <sup>a</sup> the canon of the sacred books was not determined, nor what number of them should be of authority in points of faith, before the time of the emperor Trajan, who began his reign in the year of Christ 98.'

Ans. If hereby be meant all the books of our present canon, this may be true. But then it is a trifling proposition. For some of them were not written, or have been supposed by many not to have been written, till near the end of the first century. How then could they be sooner made a part of sacred scripture? or how could they be placed in the number of books, esteemed to be the rule of faith? But the first three gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and possibly the fourth likewise, St. John's, and many of the epistles of the New Testament, were well known before the reign of Trajan, even as soon as they were written. And wherever they were known, and by whomsoever they were received, they were reckoned a part of the rule of faith.

<sup>z</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 94—100.

<sup>a</sup> Atqui certe ante illam epocham, quam dixi, Trajani, nondum constitutus est librorum sacrorum canon, nec receptus aliquis in ecclesiâ catholicâ librorum certus numerus, quos deinde adhibere oportuerit in sacris fidei causis djudicandis; nec rejecti hæreticorum pseudepigraphi, monitive fideles, ut ab eorum usu deinde caverent. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. num. 39. in. p. 67.



2. The same learned man says, likewise, the<sup>b</sup> canonical scriptures of the New Testament ‘lay hid in the cabinets of particular churches and private persons, till the reign of Trajan, and perhaps till the reign of Adrian.’

But I presume we have now sufficiently shown the falsehood of this, and that the gospels, and other books of the New Testament, were written and published with a design to be read and made use of, and that they were soon divulged abroad, and not purposely hid by any.

3. Farther says Mr. Dodwell: ‘The<sup>c</sup> epistles of Paul were well known soon after they were written. His many travels, and the mark of his hand at the end of them, occasioned this.’

We readily acknowledge it. It is very true. We think also, that the gospels, the Acts, and other books of the New Testament, were well known soon after they were written: and that in a short space of time many copies were taken of them, and thus they were divulged abroad. The first three gospels were well known to St. John, and to many others, before he wrote his gospel. Which must have been written before the end of the first century, and, probably, a good while before the end of it.

4. The same learned writer, speaking of the apostolical fathers, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, says, they<sup>d</sup> several times quote apocryphal books. And he so expresseth himself, as if he intended to affirm this of all of them.

To which I must answer, that so far as I am able to perceive, after a careful examination, there are not any quotations of apocryphal books in any of the apostolical fathers. They who are desirous of farther satisfaction therein, are referred to their several chapters in the second volume of this work, and to<sup>e</sup> some additional observations in the Recapitulation of the second part of the Credibility, which is in the fifth volume.

<sup>b</sup> Latitabant enim usque ad recentiora illa seu Trajani, seu etiam fortasse Hadriani tempora, in privatarum ecclesiarum, seu etiam hominum scriniis, scripta illa canonica, ne ad ecclesiæ catholicæ notitiam pervenirent. Ibid. num. 38. p. 66.

<sup>c</sup> Sequuntur epistolæ Paulinæ, quas a primâ usque scriptione celeberrimas fecere ipsius apostoli tam crebræ peregrinationes, et nota ejus in omni epistolâ manus.—Proinde meminit eorum et Petrus, meminit S. Clemens, meminit Ignatius, et Polycarpus. Ibid. num. 41. p. 73.

<sup>d</sup> Habemus hodieque horum temporum scriptores ecclesiasticos luculentissimos, Clementem Romanum, Barnabam, Hermam, Ignatium, Polycarpum.—Sed et apocrypha adhibent iidem aliquoties, quæ certum est in hodiernis non haberi evangeliiis. Ibid. n. 39. p. 67.

<sup>e</sup> See Vol. v. p. 188, 244, &c.

5. Once more. The same learned writer says, ‘that <sup>f</sup> before the reign of Trajan, the pseudepigraphal books of heretics had not been rejected. Nor had the faithful been cautioned not to make use of them.’

Which appears to me an observation of little or no importance. If those pseudepigraphal books were not in being before the reign of Trajan, how should they be rejected before that time? That they were not sooner in being, has been <sup>g</sup> sufficiently shown. They are the productions of heretics, who arose in the second century: who asserted two principles, had a disadvantageous opinion of marriage, and denied the real humanity of our Saviour. In that second century many pseudepigraphal gospels, Acts, travels, or circuits of apostles, were composed. Which were afterwards made use of by the Manichees, the Priscillianists, and some others.

But those pseudepigraphal books of heretics never were joined with the genuine writings of the apostles and evangelists. They were always distinguished from them, and were esteemed by all catholic christians in general to be of little value, and no authority. As appears from our collections out of ancient authors, and particularly from the accounts given of those books by <sup>h</sup> the learned bishop of Cæsarea at the beginning of the fourth century.

---

## CHAP. XXV.

*The question considered, whether any sacred Books of the New Testament have been lost.*

THERE is a question which has been proposed by some learned men: whether any sacred books of the New Testament, or any epistles of apostles and evangelists, written by divine inspiration, have been lost? And some have taken the affirmative, particularly <sup>a</sup> Mr. John Ens,

<sup>f</sup> See before, p. 350, note <sup>a</sup>.

<sup>g</sup> Vol. v. p. 247, 248.

<sup>h</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 97, 98; and Vol. v. p. 244, 245.

<sup>a</sup> Et certe, pæce et incolumi amicitia dissentientium id dictum sit, affirmativa nobis eligi debere videtur sententia, et concedi, quod multi divini libri perierint. Joh. Ens, Bibliotheca Sacra, cap. 4. sect. iv. p. 19. Amst. 1710.

and <sup>b</sup> Mr. C. M. Pfaff, in a work published by him in the early part of his life. Herman Witsius likewise <sup>c</sup> has argued on the same side in several of his works.

I. Here, in the first place, I observe, that some suppositions have been made, and propositions laid down by learned men, which may form a prejudice in favour of the affirmative side of the question, but afford no proof. Such things should not be advanced by fair disputants.

As first, that <sup>d</sup> the apostles of Christ were ever ready to serve all the exigences of the church; which is very true. And yet it does not follow that any epistles, or other writings, were composed by them for the general use of christians, beside those which we have. And, secondly, that <sup>e</sup> it is unlikely that all the apostles of Christ should have written no more letters than now remain: as it is also, that <sup>f</sup> Paul should have written no more than fourteen epistles. These, and such like observations, though adopted by <sup>g</sup> Witsius, as well as some others, I choose to dismiss without

Itaque hoc misso, inspiciamus et rite perpendamus, quid probationi inserviat, ad evincendum, quod apostoli plura exarârint scripta vere *θεοπνευτα* et divina, quam nunc extant. Id. ib. sect. vi. p. 22.

<sup>b</sup> Chr. Matth. Pfaffii Dissertatio Critica de genuinis Librorum N. T. Lectionibus. p. 46—48. Amst. 1709.

<sup>c</sup> Coccejus asseveranter dicit, Judam, præter hanc epistolam, non scripsisse, neque necesse habuisse scribere, neque a Spiritu Sancto impulsu fuisse ut scriberet. Id mihi non videtur certum, imo nec probabile. Apostoli enim, quum universalis ecclesiæ doctores et directores essent, et corpore ubique præsentem esse non possent, et frequenter sine dubio ab ecclesiis consulere, necesse habuerunt frequenter scribere.——Non autem magis opus fuit omnes apostolorum epistolas superstites manere, quam omnes sermones Christi. Sufficiunt quos habemus, ad perfectum canonem. Wits. Comment. in Ep. S. Jud. sect. xii. p. 463. Vid. Id. De Vitâ Pauli apostoli. sect. 7. n. xi. sect. 8. n. xxi. et sect. 12. n. xvi.

<sup>d</sup> Prima observatio est, quod alacres et paratissimi fuerint apostoli ad omnia conferenda, quæ usui et utilitati ecclesiæ inservire poterant. Ens, ubi supr. sect. xx. p. 35.

<sup>e</sup> Porro attendamus, secundo, quod quatuordecim habeamus epistolas a solo Paulo conscriptas: et judicet unusquisque, an sibi probabile videatur, Bartholomæum, Thomam, Jacobum, Alphæi Andream, Philippum, et Simonem Zelotem, quorum nulla habemus scripta, ne unicam quidem ad ecclesiæ ædificationem epistolam scripsisse, atque Jacobum et Judam unicam tantum, Petrum duas, et Joannem tres exarâsse; quum Paulus toties scripserit. Ens, ib. sect. xxxiii. p. 38.

<sup>f</sup> Immo nec illud veritatis speciem habet, ipsum Paulum non plures quam quatuordecim epistolas scripsisse. Quod tertio observari velim. Id. sect. xxv. p. 41.

<sup>g</sup> Nullus equidem dubito, quin apostoli omnes pro singulari suâ diligentia frequentissimas literas ad ecclesias curæ suæ commissas dederint: quibus præsentem semper adesse non licebat, et quibus multa tamen identidem habebant inculcanda. Wits. De Vitâ Pauli, sect. 7. num. xi. p. 98.

Laudanda profecto Dei benignitas est, quod ex tot Paulinis epistolis, quæ perierunt, hanc tamen [ad Philem.] mole exiguam, et de re domesticâ agentem, superare voluerit. Id. ib. sect. 12. num. xvi.

a particular discussion, as they contain not any real argument.

A man who thinks of our Lord's great character and the unparalleled excellence of his discourses, and the great number of his miraculous works, and that he had twelve apostles, and seventy other disciples, employed by him, all zealous for the honour of their Master, and the good of his people, might be disposed to say: Certainly, there were many gospels, or authentic histories of his life, written before the destruction of Jerusalem. And yet, if there is any credit to be given to ecclesiastical history, when John was desired to write his gospel, about the time of that event, or after it, there were brought to him no more than three gospels, to be confirmed by him, or to have some additions made to them. One of which only had been written by an apostle, even Matthew's. And it is the concurrent testimony of all christian antiquity, that there were but four gospels, written by apostles, and apostolical men. And yet we have no reason to say that the true interest of mankind has not been duly consulted.

II. I observe, secondly: it is generally allowed by learned men, and by <sup>h</sup> Mr. Ens, and <sup>i</sup> Witsins, that the epistles to the Thessalonians are among the first of St. Paul's epistles that remain, or were written by him. And I think, that the conclusion of the first epistle to the Thessalonians suggests a very probable argument, that it is the first epistle which was written by him with divine and apostolical authority for the edification of christians. The words intended by me, are those of I Thess. v. 27, "I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." This, as <sup>k</sup> was formerly observed, I take to be the first instance of enjoining the reading of a christian writing in their religious assemblies, as a part of their worship. Christian people had before now, very probably, read in that manner the books of the Old Testament. St. Paul, who knew the fulness of the apostolical inspiration, asserts his authority, and requires that the same respect should be now shown to his epistle, and that it should be publicly read among them for their general edification. If any such thing had been done before, there would not have been occasion for so much earnestness as is expressed in this direction. This epistle is supposed to have been written in

<sup>h</sup> Ens, ubi supra, sect. xxviii. p. 45.  
epistolis nunc est agendum; quarum, quæ supersunt, primas esse constat utramque ad Thessalonicenses, Corinthi, ut initio dixi, scriptas. Ubi supra, sect. 7. num. xii. p. 99.

<sup>i</sup> At nobis de Paulinis  
<sup>k</sup> See before, p. 6.

the year 52, consequently not till near twenty years after our Lord's ascension. If this be the first epistle of Paul, written with apostolical authority, there were no sacred writings of his of a more ancient date to be lost. And his other remaining epistles are as many as could be reasonably expected.

III. There are many considerations, tending to satisfy us that no sacred writings of the apostles of Christ are lost.

1. The four gospels, which we have, were written<sup>l</sup> for the sake of those who certainly would receive them with respect, keep them with care, and recommend them to others. And if any other such authentic histories of Jesus Christ had been written by apostles, or apostolical men, they would have been received, and preserved in the like manner, and would not have been lost.

2. We can perceive from the testimony of divers ancient christian writers, that<sup>m</sup> the book of the Acts, which we still have, was the only authentic history of the preaching of the apostles after our Lord's ascension, which they had in their hands, or had heard of; consequently, there was no other such history to be lost.

3. The epistles of Paul, James, Peter, John, Jude, were sent to churches, people, or particular persons, who would show them great regard, when received, and would carefully preserve them, and readily communicate them to others, that they might take copies of them, and make use of them, for their establishment in religion and virtue. If those apostles had written other epistles, and if other apostles had sent epistles to churches planted by them, or to particular persons, their disciples, or christian friends, the case would have been much the same. Those epistles would have been esteemed, preserved, and frequently copied, and could not easily have been lost.

4. Moreover, the apostles and evangelists, who drew up any writings for the instruction or confirmation of christian people, must have been careful of them. The same principle of zeal for the doctrine taught by them, and for the welfare of christian people, which induced them, amidst their many labours, fatigues, and difficulties, to compose any writings, would lead them to take due care that they should answer the ends for which they were composed. Proofs of such care we evidently discern in divers of the epistles of apostles, which we have. A like care, probably, was taken of the rest, and would be taken of epistles written by any

<sup>l</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 109, 110.

<sup>m</sup> See particularly Vol. ii. p. 174, 280; Vol. v. p. 142, 143, &c.

other apostles. They would be sent by fit messengers, and be faithfully delivered. And they might be accompanied with some proper directions, such as we find in several of St. Paul's epistles: as that in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, requiring it to be read to all the brethren: and that in the epistle to the Colossians, iv. 16, that it should be read first among themselves, and then sent to the church of the Laodiceans: and that they likewise should read the epistle that would be brought to them from Laodicea.

All which considerations must induce us to think, that no sacred writings of apostles, composed for the instruction and edification of christian people, their friends, and converts, could be easily lost.

IV. There are no sufficient reasons to believe, that any sacred writings of the New Testament have been lost. Let us however see what they are. For divers difficulties have been thought of.

1. St. Paul says,<sup>n</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2, "Now we beseech you, brethren,—that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand."

These words, as I apprehend, afford not any proof that St. Paul wrote more epistles to the Thessalonians, than those which we have. For a person, who had never written one letter before, might use such expressions, if he had any ground to suspect that some men were disposed to forge letters in his name,

2. 2 Thess. iii. 17,<sup>o</sup> "The salutation of Paul with my own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write."

But I think he might say this, though it were the very first epistle written by him: provided he thought that he should have occasion to write more, and had reason to suspect that there were some men who might be disposed to falsify his name. Nor does it follow that he afterwards wrote any more epistles to the Thessalonians. However, he could not be certain that he should not have occasion to

<sup>n</sup> Atqui hujus rei nullum fuisset periculum, nulla monendi necessitas, nisi varias acceperunt Thessalonicenses epistolas a Paulo missas. Qui enim unam ac alteram solummodo ad ecclesias scribebat epistolas, illius nomen falsæ epistolæ ad ecclesias datæ non facile mentiri poterat. J. Ens, ubi supr. sect. xxix. p. 46.

<sup>o</sup> Illud idem iterum agnoscit apostolus, statim allegato, cap. iii. 17, dato signo epistolis suis peculiari, quo nullæ epistolæ a se missæ carent.—Se dicit *γραφειν*, 'scribere.' Quod paucis admodum epistolis vix congruum videtur; præsertim quando dicit, se *ούτω γραφειν*, ut saluatio propriâ manu sit signum *εν παση επιτολη*, 'in quâcumque epistolâ.'—Quid erat periculi, quod datis epistolis committeretur fallacia, si nullas, præter et post hæc duas, ad illos daret epistolas? Id. ib. sect. xxx. p. 46, 47.

write to them again. And he might judge it to be very likely that he should write more letters, either to them, or to others. This declaration, then, was a proper mark, which might be of use to the Thessalonians, and to others, and a security against all impositions of that kind.

3. 2 Cor. x. 9, 10, 11, "That I may not seem as if I would terrify you by letters. For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible. Let such an one think this, that such as we are in word by letters, when we are absent, such will we be also in deed, when we are present."

Hence it is argued, that<sup>p</sup> the apostle had before now written more than one, even several letters, to the Corinthians.

To which I answer. It is very common to speak of one epistle in the plural number, as all know. And St. Paul might well write, as he here does, though he had as yet sent but one letter to those to whom he is writing. And from so long a letter, as is the first to the Corinthians, men might form a good judgment concerning his manner of writing letters, though they had seen no other.

4. 1 Cor. v. 9, "I wrote unto you in an epistle, not to company with fornicators."

Hence it is argued, that<sup>q</sup> St. Paul had written an epistle to the Corinthians, before he wrote the first of those two, which we have. Consequently, here is proof of the loss of a sacred writing, which would have been canonical, if extant.

And it must be acknowledged, that several<sup>r</sup> learned men have concluded as much from this text. Others however see not here any such proof. And on this side have argued<sup>s</sup> Whitby and<sup>t</sup> others. And I think it is of no small weight, that several ancient writers understood the apostle to say :

<sup>p</sup> Cum duobus illis ex epist. ad Thessalonicenses locis conferam Pauli dictum ad Corinthios. 2. x. 9, 10, 11.—Quibus verbis apostolus statuit, quod non unam epistolam, sed plures, ad Corinthios scripserit. Id. ibid. sect. xxxiii. p. 49.

<sup>q</sup> Inter illas est epistola quædam—ad Corinthios scripta ante illam, quæ nobis prima est, de qua apostolus: Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, 'scripsi vobis in epistolâ.' 1 Cor. v. 9. Ens, ib. sect. xxxiii. p. 51.

<sup>r</sup> Ex quibus verbis hoc concludo, ante hanc ad Corinthios epistolam aliam exstitisse, ubi Paulus a conversatione cum fornicatoribus eos dehortatus fuerit. C. M. Pfaff. ubi supr. p. 46.

Hinc autem apparet, aliam ante hanc a Paulo scriptam fuisse epistolam ad Corinthios, quæ post interciderit. Estius in loc. Vid. et Grot. in loc. H. Wits. de Vit. Paul. Ap. sect. 8. n. xxi. Mill. Prolegom. n. 8.

<sup>s</sup> See him upon the place.

<sup>t</sup> Wolf. curæ in loc. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 918, &c.

“I have written to you in this epistle.” So <sup>u</sup> Theodoret, <sup>v</sup> Theophylact, and <sup>w</sup> Photius in Œcumenius. They suppose that the apostle here refers to somewhat before said by him in the same epistle, and in this very chapter, ver. 2, or 6, 7.

And that hereby is meant this epistle, seems to me very evident. That interpretation suits the words. And there are divers other places, where the same phrase is, and must be so rendered, Rom. xvi. 22, “I Tertius, who wrote this epistle,” *Ὁ γραφας την επιστολην.* 1 Thess. v. 27. I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle “be read unto all the holy brethren,” *αναγνωσθηται την επιστολην πασι τοις αςμοις.* And 1 Thess. iv. 6, “That no man go beyond, and defraud his brother in any matter:” or “in this matter,” *μη υπερβαινειν και πλεονεκτειν εν τω πραγματι τον αδελφον αυτης.*<sup>x</sup>

Fabricius says, the <sup>y</sup> words, “I have written unto you,” may be understood as equivalent to, “I do write.” And it may be remembered, that <sup>z</sup> some while ago I quoted an ancient writer, who gives this interpretation, “I<sup>a</sup> have ‘written unto you,’” that is, ‘I write.’ And intending, I think, somewhat to be afterwards said by the apostle in this epistle: which appears to me to be right. Many like instances might be alleged. I shall put in the margin some passages <sup>b</sup> from A. Gellius, where it is said: ‘I have sub-

<sup>u</sup> Ουκ εν αλλη, αλλ’ εν ταυτη. Προ βραχειων γαρ εφη· Ουκ οιδατε, οτι μικρα ζυμη ολον το φυραμα ζυμοι; Theod. in loc.

<sup>v</sup> Εν ποια επιστολη: Εν αυτη ταυτη. Επειδη γαρ ειπεν ανωτερω, οτι εκκαθαρατε την παλαιαν ζυμην, τον πορνευκοτα, ως δεδηλωται, αιμιττομενος, δι’ ου εδηλωτο το μη συναμιγνυσθαι πορνοις· ιως υπενοησαν αν οτι παντων των πορνων, και των παρ’ Ελλησι χωριζεσθαι δει. Ερμηνευει τουνν περι ποιων παρηγγελει. Theoph. in. loc.

<sup>w</sup> Ηε εγραψεν; Εν οίς λεγει, και εχι μαλλον επενησατε, κ. λ.—Και παλι εκκαθαρατε την παλαιαν ζυμην, κ. λ.—Τοις πορνοις τε κοσμε τειτε.] Ινα μη νομισωσιν, οφειλειν και τοις των Ελληνων πορνοις μη συναμιγνυσθαι, οπερ ην αδυνατον τοις πολιν οικεσι, διορθωται αυτο. Apud. Œcum. in. loc.

<sup>x</sup> I might refer to many other texts of scripture, and to passages of other writers, Matt. xxvii. 8. εως της σημερον. xxviii. 15.—μεχρι της σημερον.—Apoc. i. 3. και οι ακουοντες τεσ λογεσ της προφητειασ. Id est, ταυτης προφητειασ, quomodo accepit Latinus. Grot. in loc. So Liban. ep. 1174. p. 558. Εμελλε μεν, και μη δοντος με την επιστολην, κ. λ. Etiamsi ego has literas non scripsissem.—Ep. 1177. p. 559. Και μην κκακεινο δηλον, οτι μειζονος απολαυσει της παρα σε προνοιασ, μετα την επιστολην—post traditas has literas.

<sup>y</sup> Possunt etiam verba, εγραφα υμιν, reddi, ‘scribo vobis,’ &c. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. III. p. 154.

<sup>z</sup> See Vol. v. p. 58; See likewise Vol. iv. p. 592.

<sup>a</sup> ‘Scripsi vobis.’] Pro scribo. Vel ideo præteritum dicit, quia, cum legeretur, tempus scribendi præteritum esset. Sedul. Comm. in loc. Ap. PP. Lugd. T. VI. p. 540. C.

<sup>b</sup> Verba Varronis subjeci. A. Gell. Noct. Att. l. 2 cap. 20.



‘joined the words of Varro:’ that is, I shall subjoin them. In another place, ‘I have transcribed the words of Plutarch.’ And in like manner often: when the words of an author had not yet been transcribed, but were to be transcribed soon after.

In John iv. 38, our Lord says to the disciples: “I sent you to reap that whereon ye have bestowed no labour.” Nevertheless the disciples had not yet been sent forth by him. But knowing what he designed to do, and also knowing before-hand what would be the circumstances of their mission, he says to them: ‘When I shall send you to preach the gospel, you will find the case to be as I now represent it.’

In like manner St. Paul, having in his mind the whole plan of the epistle which he was writing, and considering some directions which he should give in the remaining part of the epistle, says: “I have written unto you.” If it be asked, where are those directions? I answer: I think they are in the tenth chapter of this epistle, where the apostle cautions against idolatry, and dangerous temptations to it, and against doing what might be understood to be religious communion with idols and idolaters. These things I apprehend the apostle then had in his mind.

What he says therefore here in ch. v. 9, 10, 11, is to this purpose: ‘I shall in this epistle deliver some cautions against a dangerous and offensive intimacy with idolaters: but when I do so, it is not my intention to prohibit all civil commerce with Gentile people, “who are fornicators, or covetous, or extortioners, or idolaters.” For at that rate you could not live in the world. But here I am speaking of such as are professed christians. “And I have now written unto you,” that is, I now charge you, and require it of you: “If any man called a brother,” a professed christian, “be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or an extortioner, with such an one, no not to eat:” that is, not to have any conversation with him.’ Compare 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

That appears to me the most probable account of this text. But if any hesitate about the reference to a place that follows in the remaining part of the epistle, I still

Propterea verba Atteii Capitonis ex quinto Librorum, quos de Pontificio Jure composuit, scripsi. Ib. l. 4. cap. 6.

Verba ipsa Plutarchi, quoniam res inopinata est, subscripsi. Ib. cap. 12.

Ex quo libro plura verba adscriptimus, ut simul ibidem, quid ipse inter res gestas et annales esse dixerit, ostenderemus. Ib. l. 5. cap. 18.

Ipsa autem verba Chrysippi, quantum valui, memoriâ adscripsi—In libro enim *περι προνοιας* quarto dicit.—Ib. l. 6. cap. 2.

hope I may insist upon it, that *εν τη επιστολη*, which we have rendered ‘in an epistle,’ does, and must signify, ‘in this ‘epistle.’

5. 2 Pet. i. i. 15, 16, “And account, that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation: even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, has written unto you.”

Hence it is argued, that <sup>c</sup> St Paul wrote several letters to the dispersed Jews, which are now lost. I answer, that this argument depends upon the supposition, that the epistles of St. Peter were sent to believing Jews: which is far from being certain. It is more probable, as was <sup>d</sup> formerly shown, that St. Peter’s epistles were sent to believing Gentiles in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, or to all christians in general in those countries. To which christians Paul had indeed sent several letters. To them were sent his epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians. To which might be added, his two epistles to Timothy, then residing at Ephesus, the chief city of Asia. To these, and other epistles of the apostle Paul, St. Peter might refer. Nor can I see any reason at all to doubt, whether the epistles of Paul, intended by St. Peter, are not still in being.

6. 3 John, ver. 9, “I wrote unto the church.” Hence <sup>e</sup> some have argued, that St. John wrote an epistle to the church, where Diotrephes affected to have pre-eminence, which is now lost.

Indeed this text has exercised the thoughts of many critics, as may be seen in *Wolfii Curae*. However, the words may be translated thus: “I had written,” or “I would have written to the church.” This version has been approved by <sup>f</sup> some. And to me it appears very right. If this interpretation be admitted, there is no reason to conclude, that <sup>g</sup> any writing of St. John has been lost.

<sup>c</sup> S. Petrus, 2 ep. iii. 15, 16, plures literas ad dispersos Hebræos allegat, quæ jam dudum periere. Neque enim, uti Millius putavit, f. x. col. 2. hic citatur epistola ad Hebræos, quæ exstat, &c. Pfaff. ubi supra. p. 47. Conf Ens, ubi supra. sect. xxxvi. xxxvii. p. 53, 54.

<sup>d</sup> See before, p. 261, &c.

<sup>e</sup> Eodem modo et literæ S. Joannis ad ecclesiam, in quâ Diotrephes *ὁ φιλοπρωτευων* erat, scriptæ et 3 Joh. ver. 9, memoratæ, periere. Pfaff. ib. p. 47.

<sup>f</sup> See Whitby upon the place, and Dr. Benson. And see before, p. 292, note <sup>m</sup>.

<sup>g</sup> ‘Some would from hence gather, that St. John wrote an epistle which is ‘now lost. But the primitive christians were not so careless about preserving ‘the apostolic writings. There is not the least hint among the ancients, that ‘there ever was such an epistle. And the apostle’s words, in this place, are ‘fairly capable of another interpretation.’—Dr. Benson upon the place, p. 703.

7. It is argued, that<sup>b</sup> Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, expresseth himself, as if he thought St. Paul had written to them more epistles than one.

To which it is easy to answer, that though the word be in the plural number, one epistle only might be meant. Secondly, it is not improbable, that Polycarp intended the epistle to the Philippians, and also the two epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, who were in the same province of Macedonia, as was shown<sup>i</sup> formerly. Indeed this objection is so obviated by what was said, when we largely considered the testimony of Polycarp to the New Testament, that I think nothing more needs to be added here.

V. In treating this subject Mr. Ens could not help thinking of those passages of Origen and Eusebius, where they speak of the apostles not being solicitous to write many volumes. Which passages were taken notice of by us<sup>k</sup> long ago. He endeavours to evade the proper conclusion to be thence drawn. But he owns, that<sup>e</sup> the ancients had no knowledge of those writings of the apostles, which he and some others have imagined to be lost. And he thinks it almost miraculous, or however a very wonderful dispensation of providence, that they should so soon perish, as to be unknown to the ancients, as well as to us.

But does not that show, that this whole argument is frivolous and insignificant? For plausible speculations cannot be valid against fact and evidence. If the primitive christians knew not of any apostolical writings, beside those which have been transmitted to us, it is very probable there were none.

<sup>b</sup> Memorat quoque Polycarpus in literis ad Philippenses, S. Paulum non unam sed plures ad eos *επιτολας* absentem scripsisse. Pfaff. *ib.* p. 47. Conf. Ens, p. 51—56.

<sup>i</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 100, 101.

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 494; and Vol. iv. p. 95, 96.

<sup>l</sup> Fateor ingenue, vix concipi potest, unde tam cito tanta fuerit inter veteres ignorantia de eo, quod apostoli multo plura scripserint, quam quidem illorum et nostras pervenit ad manus. Fateor, vix concipi potest, ubi tam profunde latere potuerint scripta illa apostolica, ut omnium fugerint oculos. At divina hic mihi admiranda ac adoranda videtur providentia, quæ ad tempus data scripta, dum aliorum quæ permanerent in vitæ canonem perpetuum nondum esset in ecclesiis copia, deinde protinus e medio tolli voluerit. Ens, *ibid.* sect. li. p. 68.



A  
LARGE COLLECTION  
OF ANCIENT  
JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES  
TO THE TRUTH OF THE  
CHRISTIAN RELIGION;  
WITH  
NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS.  
VOLUME I.  
CONTAINING  
THE JEWISH TESTIMONIES, AND THE TESTIMONIES OF  
HEATHEN AUTHORS OF THE FIRST CENTURY.



## P R E F A C E.

IT is well known that I have long since intended a collection of passages of Jewish and heathen authors, who bear testimony to the books or facts of the New Testament, or the affairs of christians in their own times. I have also intimated, that I had by me large materials for that purpose; at the same time expressing my doubts, whether I ever should be able to put those materials into order. But God, in his good providence, has prolonged my life. And, having completed the Supplement to the second part of the Credibility of the Gospel History, I have now put my collections of Jewish and heathen Testimonies into such order, that it has been judged not improper to begin the publication.

This part of my design has been long deferred; but I hope it is not the worse for that.

Many others of late times have made collections of this kind.

This argument was not omitted by Mr. Addison, in his Evidences of the Christian Religion, who has insisted, though briefly, upon the testimonies of Tacitus, Suetonius, Phlegon, Dion, Celsus, Macrobius, and other heathen authors, and made good remarks upon them: intending likewise to add the testimonies of Jewish writers, but was prevented by death.

In the year 1733 was published a book with this title—*An Appeal to the genuine Records and Testimonies of Heathen and Jewish Writers in Defence of Christianity*: by Thomas Dawson, D. D. Vicar of New Windsor, some time Member of Convocation.<sup>a</sup>

That work has a pompous title, from which a great deal might be expected; but it is little more than an angry declamation against Dr. Sykes, for not showing due respect to Phlegon, and Dionysius the Areopagite. I have made no use of that work. Nor do I know that I shall have occasion to take any farther notice of it.

*An Argument in Defence of Christianity*, taken from the

<sup>a</sup> It is in two parts; 201 pages for the first part, and 112 for the second; in octavo.

Concessions of the most ancient Adversaries, Jews and Pagans, Philosophers and Historians: by Gregory Sharpe L. L. D. Fellow of the Royal Society, and of the Society of Antiquarians.<sup>b</sup> I am indebted to this learned author, and shall quote him sometimes.

In 1725 J. A. Fabricius published a volume in quarto, concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion.<sup>c</sup> In the 32d chapter of which volume is a catalogue of authors, who have supported the evidence of the Jewish and christian religion by testimonies of heathen writers:<sup>d</sup> where are mentioned many authors, with whom I am unacquainted, as well as others, whom I have seen, and of whom I shall take notice presently.

Le Clerc, who, in the year 1727, revised that work of Fabricius, in his *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne*, observes, that<sup>e</sup> ‘there are in Pagan authors, still remaining, testimonies and events, which may be of great use to confirm the truth of the christian religion. The same is said

<sup>b</sup> A small volume of 166 pages, published in 1755.

<sup>c</sup> *Delectus argumentorum, et syllabus scriptorum, qui veritatem religionis christianæ adversus atheos deistas,——lucubrationibus suis asseruerunt.* Hamb. 1725.

<sup>d</sup> Cap. xxxii. *Ethnicorum testimonia, veritati religionis naturalis, judaicæ, et christianæ suffragantia.* Ibid. p. 634—643.

<sup>e</sup> Il y a dans les auteurs Payens qui nous restent des témoignages et des évènements, qui peuvent beaucoup servir à confirmer la vérité de la religion chrétienne. C’ étoit le sentiment d’ Herman Conringius, qui étoit, comme l’on fait, un très-savant homme. *Bib. A. et M. T.* 27. P. i. p. 71.

Le Clerc here follows the modern way of speaking; which indeed is now in use with all learned men in general. But heathen people were not called Pagans, ‘Pagani,’ before the year of Christ 365, about which time, and afterwards, that denomination became common in Latin authors, as Prudentius, Salvian, Orosius, Augustin. That denomination is supposed to have had its rise from the state of things at that time. Sacrifices were prohibited by christian emperors in cities, but allowed of for a while in villages and country-places. But I do not recollect that this way of speaking is adopted by the Greek ecclesiastical historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret; though they wrote after this style was common in Latin authors. To me it seems not quite proper to call those writers Pagans, who lived before the times of the christian emperors. I therefore generally say, Heathens, Gentiles, Greeks; Heathenism, Gentilism, Hellenism.

*Hæc omnia, ut in urbibus primo sublata, sic permissa ad tempus in pagis et vicis, ubi templa aliquamdiu Gentilibus patuere.——Unde Paganorum nomen enatum est, primum auditum sub imperatoribus christianis, primaque Paganorum mentio exstat in L. xviii. Cod. Theod. De Episcopis, &c. Valentino et Valente. A. A. Coss. Spanhem. Hist. Christ. Sec. iv. T. i. p. 836. Vid. et Jac. Gothofred. in notis in Tit. de Paganis. Et C. n. Pagi ann. 351. num. v.*

*Præceperas mihi, ut scriberem adversus vaniloquam pravitatem eorum, qui alieni a civitate Dei, ex locorum agrestium compitis et pagis, Pagani vocantur, sive Gentiles.* Oros. Hist. l. 1. cap. 1.



‘ by Herman Conringius, who, as is well known, was a very learned man.’

Unquestionably, Conringius of Brunswick was a very learned man, author of many valuable works, and in great esteem with divers princes<sup>f</sup> of Germany. But I wish that Le Clerc had quoted his words at length, or referred to the work in which Conringius delivered judgment upon this point, and where, possibly, he so enlargeth upon it, as to afford us some instruction.

Houtteville, in his work entitled, *The Christian Religion proved by Facts*; and in his *Historical and Critical Discourse*, prefixed to it,<sup>g</sup> has alleged the testimonies of many Jewish and heathen writers: Celsus, the emperor Julian, Porphyry, Jamblicus, the Talmud, and the Rabbins. Fabricius, in the fore-cited volume, has given a large account of this performance.

I may not omit Tobias Eckhard, who has published a learned and useful work, entitled,<sup>h</sup> *The Testimonies of such as are not Christians, collected from ancient Monuments*. Of which there have been two editions, both in my hands, and from which I have reaped benefit. This author also is in the fore-mentioned catalogue of Fabricius.

The<sup>i</sup> *Christian Religion confirmed by the Testimonies of ancient Pagan authors*; by Dominique Colonia, of the Society of Jesus. This author likewise is in the catalogue of Fabricius, who<sup>k</sup> calls him a polite and eloquent writer.

This work has a nearer resemblance with mine, than any other which I have met with. Many authors are here<sup>l</sup> quoted: and Colonia gives some account of them, for showing the value of their testimony. I shall often quote

<sup>f</sup> See the Dictionary and Supplement of Moreri.

<sup>g</sup> A large volume in quarto, at Paris in 1722.

<sup>h</sup> *Non Christianorum de Christo Testimonia, ex antiquis Monumentis proposita et dijudicata*. Quarto. 1725, et 1736.

<sup>i</sup> *La Religion Chrétienne autorisée par le Témoignage des anciens Auteurs Payens*. Par le P. Dominique de Colonia, de la Compagnie de Jesus. A Lyon. 1718.

<sup>k</sup> —elegans ac disertus scriptor. Fabr. ubi supra, p. 635.

<sup>l</sup> Tom. 1. ch. 1. Phlegon, et Thallus, ch. II. Ammianus Marcellinus. III. Marcus Antoninus, Dion, Capitolinus, Claudian, Themistius. IV. Plutarch; where comes in the pilot Thamus, Strabo, Lucan, Juvenal. V. Claudian. Again, VI. Chalceidius, Amelius, and Macrobius. VII. Cornelius Tacitus. VIII. Celsus, the epicurean. IX. The philosopher Porphyry—Tom. 2. ch. I. Lampridius. II. The younger Pliny. III. The sophist Libanius. IV. The emperor Julian the apostate. V. Lucian, of Samosata. VI. Rutilius Claudius Numatianus. VII. The emperor Antoninus the pious. VIII. The emperor Marcus Antoninus again. IX. The false prophet, Mahomet. X. Josephus the historian. XI. The true acts of Pilate.

him, or refer to him; whereby the character of the work, and the judgment of the author, will be apparent to my readers. Undoubtedly, he has learning and zeal, but some allowances must be made for the credulity of his church.

However, it can little become me to pass censures upon others, who am as liable to be censured; and may fall into mistakes, notwithstanding my best care to avoid them.

One fault in my work may be reckoned to be very obvious, which is the prolixity of it. In regard to which I beg leave to say beforehand, that I am to be distinct and particular. These things have been already slightly touched upon by many. I propose to enlarge, and set them in a fuller light. I allege passages of ancient authors, at length: I settle their time: I distinguish their works, and endeavour to show the value of their testimonies. I intend likewise to allege the judgments of divers learned moderns, who have gone before me in this service. All the persecutions of this time are a part of my subject, as they were appointed by edicts of heathen emperors, and were carried on by heathen governors of provinces, and officers under them. I shall have an opportunity to show the patience and fortitude of the primitive christians; and the state of judaism, gentilism, and christianity, in the first four centuries. As most of the authors to be quoted by me, are men of great distinction in the republic of letters, some occasions will offer for critical observations, which cannot be all declined: but nice and intricate questions will be carefully avoided, that the whole may be upon the level with the capacities of all who are inquisitive, and disposed to read with attention.

In the first volume are the Jewish Testimonies, and the Testimonies of Heathen Authors, who lived in the first century.

In the second volume are Heathen Writings of the second century; among which are the letter of the younger Pliny to Trajan, and that emperor's rescript; which will give occasion for many observations concerning the sufferings of the christians at that time, and afterwards; and the remains of the work of Celsus against the christians, preserved in Origen; which afford an early and very valuable testimony to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, and to the truth of the evangelical history

In the third volume will be Ulpian, Dion Cassius, Porphyry, Hierocles, and other heathen writers, and a history

of the several persecutions of the christians in the third century, concluding with that of the emperor Diocletian.

The fourth and last volume, in which will be the emperor Julian, Ammianus Marcellinus, Libanius, and other heathen writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, may be as entertaining as any of the rest ; but it cannot be so important. Julian, in his work against the christians, may mention the names of the evangelists, and of the other writers of the New Testament, and quote the books more distinctly than Celsus ; but his testimony to the scriptures, in the fourth century, cannot be so valuable as that of Celsus in the second. However, these also deserve to be collected, and put together in their proper order. We shall there see the last struggles of expiring gentilism, and some attempts to restore it, after it had been for a while exploded with scorn and disdain. And we may meet with more than a few men of great learning, and fine abilities, who were still tenacious of the ancient rites, and fond of all the fables upon which they were founded, and by which they had been long upheld and encouraged.

The author professes great impartiality : for which reason he is not without hopes that his work, notwithstanding some imperfections, may be approved by the candid of every denomination. If it shall be of some use to promote good learning, and true religion, he will have great reason to be well pleased.



A

## LARGE COLLECTION

OF ANCIENT

# JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES.

---

## JEWISH TESTIMONIES.

### CHAP. I.

THE FAITH OF MANY JEWISH BELIEVERS IN EARLY TIMES,  
A VALUABLE TESTIMONY TO THE TRUTH OF  
THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

I. *That many of the Jewish people believed in Jesus as the Christ, shown from the books of the New Testament.* II. *From other ancient writings.* III. *Their faith a valuable testimony.*

I. THE Lord Jesus was born at Bethlehem, and brought up at Nazareth; and in Judea (understanding thereby the land of Israel) he fulfilled his ministry. At Jerusalem he was crucified: there he arose from the dead, and thence he ascended to heaven.

A short time before his appearance in the world, John, called the Baptist, a man of an austere character, and acknowledged by all to be a prophet, who acted with a divine commission, preached to the people, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." "Be persuaded by me 'to reform your lives, and break off every evil course, by 'repentance; for the kingdom of God by the Messiah, long 'since promised by God, and foretold by the prophets, is 'now about to be erected among you, which is a dispensa-

tion of the greatest purity and perfection, the privileges of which are appropriated to sincere penitents only, and really good men.' He also pointed to Jesus, as the person who was to set up that kingdom, and was much greater than himself.

Soon after which Jesus also appeared, preaching the like doctrine in the name of God: recommending the practice of strict and sublime virtue in heart and life; with a view, not to honour from men, or any other worldly advantages, but with an eye to the favour and approbation of God, who knows all things. These were the general terms proposed by him; forgiveness of past sins upon repentance, and eternal life to perseverance in the profession of the truth, and the practice of virtue; without any assurances of worldly riches, honour, or preferment; and with frequent intimations of many difficulties, and external discouragements.

As he went about preaching that doctrine, he wrought many miracles, healing all men, who came to him, of the diseases they laboured under; and raising to life some who had died. And twice he miraculously fed in desert places, with a few loaves and small fishes, great numbers of men, who had long attended upon his discourses. At the beginning of his ministry, and during the time of it, there were some extraordinary manifestations from heaven, bearing testimony to him, as the "beloved Son of God," or the Messiah, the great and extraordinary person, who had been long since foretold, and promised, as the "seed of the woman, that should bruise the head of the serpent, the seed of Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth should be blessed," and "the Son of David," in whom the promise of an extensive and everlasting kingdom was to be fulfilled. Of all which things the blessed Jesus sometimes, in the latter part of his ministry, reminded the Jewish people, his hearers, to induce them to act according to evidence, and to improve the present opportunity, and accept the blessings offered to them, lest they should expose themselves to the divine displeasure and resentment. But, as before hinted, he never invited any with assurances of worldly advantages from him: and all were at liberty to act according to their own judgment, and to "go away," or stay with him. John vi. 66—71.

Wherever he went, preaching that excellent and heavenly doctrine, he was attended by many; who plainly discerned it to be superior to that of their ordinary teachers, the scribes and pharisees, and that he spoke and acted as a

prophet, with divine illumination and authority. The people in general were so well satisfied of his great character, that they could not help wondering, that their scribes and rulers, for whom they had a great respect, did not publicly acknowledge him to be the Messiah. "And many of the people believed on him, and said: When the Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man has done?" John vii. 31. Again: "And many resorted unto him, and said: John did no miracle. But all things that John spake of this man were true. And many believed on him there," John x. 41, 42.

"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: For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God," John xii. 42, 43. But Nicodemus, a pharisee, and a ruler, and in the very early part of our Lord's ministry, came to him of his own accord, and acknowledged him to be a "teacher come from God," John iii. And it is very likely that he went away fully convinced that he was the Christ. And when the Jewish council reproved their officers for not having apprehended Jesus, and brought him before them, Nicodemus, "being one of them," pleaded his cause, saying, "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doth?" John vii. 51. For which he was reviled, as very ignorant and greatly mistaken. However, he afterwards attended the burial of Jesus, together with "Joseph of Arimathea," another "disciple of Jesus; but secretly, for fear of the Jews. He was a rich man, and an honourable counsellor: who went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus, and wrapt it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, hewn out of a rock," John xix. 38—42; Matt. xxvii; Mark xv; Luke xxiii.

Beside them, Jairus, ruler of a synagogue, and a nobleman of Capernaum, were disciples of some distinction. And there may have been some others in like stations, who paid their respects to Jesus, though they are not named. The centurion at Capernaum had such faith in Jesus, as to believe him able to heal his sick servant at a distance, by speaking a word only. He was a Gentile, but he was in esteem with "the elders of the Jews," who lived in that city. And they also joined with him in the request to Jesus to heal his sick servant, saying, "that he was worthy, for whom he should do this," Luke vii. 4. So that they also were persuaded in their minds, that Jesus had power to perform so great a miracle. Not now to take any notice of

our Saviour's female disciples, though they also were, some of them, respectable for their outward condition, as well as for their eminent virtue.

Out of the number of his disciples Jesus chose twelve, to be generally with him, and to be employed by him, whom he named apostles; who, notwithstanding some imperfections and failings, owing to the prevailing prejudices of the Jewish people, all continued faithful to him, excepting only Judas the traitor, a man of a worldly and covetous disposition. And though the miscarriage and loss of Judas could not but be a great grief and discouragement to them, the other eleven kept together, even after the death of their Lord.

When he was risen from the dead, he came again among them, and showed himself to them: and though they were not to be persuaded without good proof, in the end they were all satisfied that it was he.

Having, in the space of forty days, been often seen by them, and having frequently conversed with them, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, he was in their sight taken up into heaven." Acts i.

Soon after which, when they were assembled together, to the number of "about one hundred and twenty," another, named Matthias, was chosen in the room of Judas, to be a witness with the rest of the things concerning the Lord Jesus, and particularly his resurrection from the dead.

At the next following Pentecost, the Holy Ghost, in a remarkable manner, came down upon the apostles and their company, agreeably to the promise which Jesus had made to them. And henceforward the apostles, being fully qualified, preached to all men in the name of Christ, exhorting them to repentance, with the promise of the remission of sins, and everlasting salvation. Acts ii.

Such was the effect of St. Peter's first discourse at Jerusalem, after our Lord's ascension, that "there were added to them about three thousand souls;" and afterwards such accessions were made, that their number was "about five thousand," Acts ii. 41; iv. 4.

But though many miracles were done by the hands of the apostles, and the whole company of the believers behaved in a very becoming manner, insomuch that it is said, "they had favour with all the people;" Acts ii. 49: and again, that "the whole multitude of them that believed was of one heart, and of one soul; neither said any of them, that ought of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had



all things common ;” Acts iv. 32 : yet they met with many difficulties, and were ill treated by the Jewish rulers. Peter and John were apprehended and brought before the council, and examined, and were then commanded, not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus :” Acts iv. And they were farther threatened, if they transgressed that order. But they, nevertheless, thinking themselves obliged to persist in their work, and “to obey God, rather than men ;” in a short time afterwards, all the apostles were taken up, and put “in the common prison,” and then brought before the council : and having been “beaten,” and again “commanded not to speak in the name of Jesus,” they were dismissed, Acts v. Soon after this, Stephen, a man of great eminence and usefulness among the disciples, was stoned ; Acts vi. vii. And James, brother of John, one of the chief apostles of Jesus, was beheaded by order of Herod Agrippa, then king in the land of Judea. “And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded farther to take Peter also, and put him in prison, intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people ;” Acts xii. But now Divine Providence interposed : Peter was miraculously delivered out of prison ; and Herod died under tokens of divine displeasure. What is added is well worthy of observation, “But the word of God grew, and multiplied.”

And gradually the apostles and their fellow-labourers, with divine approbation and encouragement, enlarged their views, and preached the gospels to Samaritans, and then to Gentiles. But, wherever they went, they first addressed themselves to the Jewish inhabitants, and particularly in their synagogues, which there were at that time in many cities of Greece, and elsewhere, and usually had some converts among them. The evidences of the christian religion were fairly and openly proposed, and to many they appeared sufficient and satisfactory. The whole argument is briefly summed up in those words of St. Paul before the governor Festus, and king Agrippa, and the rest of that great audience. “Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue to this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come ; that the Christ should be liable to sufferings ; and that, being the first who rose from the dead,” to die no more, “he should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles,” Acts xxvi. 22, 23. Thus, at Antioch in Pisidia, it is said of Paul and Barnabas, Acts xiii. 14, “they went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day ;”

where Paul made a long discourse—"Now, when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews, and religious," or worshipping "proselytes, followed Paul and Barnabas, who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God." Afterwards, at Iconium, "they went both into the synagogue, and so spake, that a great multitude of the Jews, and also of the Greeks, believed," Acts xiv. 1. And in like manner at other places. And particularly at Thessalonica, Acts xvii. 1; and at Berea, ver. 10; at Athens, ver. 17; at Corinth, xviii. 4; at Ephesus, xviii. 19, and 26. When Paul came to Rome, he was a prisoner. He therefore could not go to any Jewish synagogue. But being "suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him, he called the chief of the Jews together—And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law and the prophets, from morning to evening. And some believed, and some believed not," Acts xxviii. 16—24.

As for the Jews at Jerusalem, we know, from the history of the council, held there in the year of Christ 50, about the terms upon which the Gentiles should be received, that the believers were then numerous there, and greatly concerned for the establishment and propagation of the gospel, Acts xv. And when St. Paul came thither again, at the Pentecost of the year 58, as we compute, the believers there were still steady and numerous. And St. James, the apostle who presided there, and the elders, reminded him, saying; "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are that believe," Acts xxi. 20. By which I suppose to be intended chiefly the church at Jerusalem; though some others may be included, who were come up thither upon occasion of the feast. And about four years after this, near the end of his imprisonment at Rome, or soon after it, Paul wrote his epistle to the Hebrews, or the believers at Jerusalem and in Judea, not excluding such as lived elsewhere, to confirm and strengthen them, and fortify them against discouragements.

Indeed, it should be particularly observed by us, that there were societies of believers in other parts of Judea, beside Jerusalem. For in the account of things about the year of Christ 40, it is said, (Acts ix. 31,) "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified; and, walking in the fear of the

Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied." And St. Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, speaks of his being "unknown by face unto the churches of Judea, which are in Christ," Gal. i. 22. See likewise 1 Thess. ii. 14.

Nor were all these men of the lowest rank and condition. For, in the general account of the early progress of the gospel, we are told, Acts vi. 7, "And the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly: and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." And we can reckon up some by name, who, upon several accounts, were men of eminence, Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch, then residing at Jerusalem, who generously undertook a share in providing for the poor of the church: a man of substance undoubtedly, and probably a man of good understanding, and great probity. Barnabas, a Levite, a native of Cyprus, where he had an estate in land, which he sold for the relief of those believers in Jesus who were poor and indigent. Paul, a Pharisee, son of a Pharisee, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, educated in Jewish learning at Jerusalem under "Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, and had in reputation among all the people," Acts iv. v. and xxii. and not unacquainted with Greek literature, and a person of uncommon acuteness; who of a violent persecutor, became a sincere convert to the faith, and a zealous preacher of the gospel. In which service he laboured as fervently, and as successfully, as any other of the apostles; showing therein great fidelity and self-denial: whose disinterestedness had been so conspicuous, that he could openly appeal to the world, and say; "Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant to all, that I might gain the more," 1 Cor. ix. 19.

The character of this person is so extraordinary, that I must enlarge somewhat in his history: notwithstanding the brevity which I have prescribed to myself in this article. By the special choice and designation of Jesus Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, he was added to the other twelve apostles, "that he might bear his name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel:" Acts ix. and xxvi. though it was foreseen, that he would "suffer many things" in that service. In the course of his ministry he preached and asserted the christian doctrine to the Jewish people in general, and before the Jewish council at Jerusalem. He pleaded also, and preached the doctrine of Christ before Felix and Festus, Roman governors of Judea, and before king Agrippa, and his sisters Drusilla and Ber-

nice, who were Jews by religion; and in the presence of many other personages of great distinction at Cæsarea, the residence of the Roman governor. Acts xxii.—xxvi. He also pleaded<sup>a</sup> before the emperor Nero at Rome; by whom was signed the order of his confinement in that city, which was a kind of free custody: where he “dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence,” and with great success, “no man forbidding him,” Acts xxviii. 30, 31. At the end of which period he was discharged, and set at liberty by the same authority by which he had been confined. And then he went abroad again, preaching the gospel, as he had done before, and visiting and confirming the christian churches in several places. Afterwards, as we have reason to believe, he came to Rome again. And there, in the year 64 or 65, in the persecution of the christians, ordered by the same emperor, he suffered martyrdom, being beheaded, as a Roman citizen; so bearing his final testimony to the truth of that doctrine, which he had long preached with great zeal and diligence. I now proceed.

The chamberlain and treasurer of “Candace, queen of the Ethiopians,” a Jewish proselyte, “who had come up to Jerusalem to worship,” Acts viii. 27. His high station, and the great trust reposed in him, are arguments of his ability and fidelity. His journey to Jerusalem indicates his zeal for the religion which he had embraced: and his reading the Jewish sacred scriptures, as he was returning in his chariot, shows his studiousness to understand them. His discourse with Philip, a disciple of Jesus, who drew near to him, manifests inquisitiveness and openness to conviction, which are laudable dispositions. And his conversion to the faith of Jesus is therefore a testimony to the truth of the christian religion, which cannot be slighted.

“Judas and Silas, chief men among the brethren” at Jerusalem; Acts xv.—xviii. and the latter of them, as it seems, a Roman citizen. Aquila and Priscilla, Jews of Pontus, persons of good understanding, and uncommon piety. Timothy, a young man of good understanding at Lystra, who from his childhood had been instructed in the scriptures of the Old Testament, being the son of a Jewess, 2 Tim. i. His mother Eunice, and his grandmother Lois, also were believers, Acts xii. 12. John Mark, an evangelist,

<sup>a</sup> See the second Vol. (in the fifth of this edition) of ‘The Supplement to the Credibility,’ &c.

son of Mary, a woman of great zeal and courage in the profession of the christian religion, an inhabitant of Jerusalem, and nephew to Barnabas, Col. iv. 10. Luke, another evangelist, by some thought to be the same as Lucius of Cyrene; Acts xiii. 1. If so, he was a Jew by birth. If he was not that Lucius, yet very probably he was a Jewish proselyte before he became a christian. With that Lucius of Cyrene is mentioned, in the place just referred to, "Mannaen, who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch." A <sup>b</sup> person, undoubtedly, of a liberal education.

Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria, an eloquent or learned man, and "mighty in the scriptures" of the Old Testament, Acts xviii. Crispus and Sosthenes, rulers in the Jewish synagogue at Corinth, I Cor. 1; and Zenas, a Jewish lawyer, Tit. iii. 18.

All these I have reckoned up briefly and imperfectly <sup>c</sup> among the Jewish believers; designedly omitting converts from among the Gentiles. All these Jews, by their faith and profession, bore a testimony to Jesus, well deserving our regard. For they must have acted under as great discouragements as can be conceived. They underwent the keenest reproaches from the unbelieving Jews, their neighbours, for receiving a person as the Messiah, who, instead of working out a great deliverance for their nation, as was generally expected and earnestly desired, had himself undergone an ignominious death. For my own part, I always think of these early Jewish believers with peculiar respect. I am not able to celebrate all the virtues of their willing and steady faith under the many difficulties which they met with. But I am persuaded that when the Lord Jesus shall come again, he will bestow marks of distinction upon those who extricated themselves out of the snares, in

<sup>b</sup> *Μαννηντε Ἡρωῶς τε τετραρχῆς συντροφός.* 'Herodis tetrarchæ collectaneus.' Vulg. 'At vocabulum *συντροφός* latius patet, significatque 'eum, qui a primâ ætate cum altero educatus est.' Grot. in loc.

<sup>c</sup> I say 'imperfectly.' For I have not rehearsed all the Jewish believers, who are expressly mentioned, and by name. I have omitted several: as Jason, who was so friendly to St. Paul at Thessalonica, as related, Acts xvii. 5—9; Sopater of Berea, Acts xx. 4. These two seem to be the same who are mentioned again, Rom. xvi. 21, where they appear to have been the apostle's kinsmen, and therefore must have been Jews. Aristarchus, a Thessalonian, Acts xx. 4, who is mentioned again in the epistle to the Colossians, iv. 10, 11, written during the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, or near the end of it, in the year 62. Where St. Paul calls him "his fellow-prisoner;" and reckons him among those "of the circumcision, who had been his fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God." "Mnason of Cyprus, an old disciple;" Acts xxi. 16. And there are divers others, who may be observed by attentive readers of the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles.

which their close connections with others had involved them. And as "they were not ashamed of him, and his words, but confessed his name in the midst of an adulterous and sinful generation, he will not be ashamed of them, but will confess them," and own them for his, "when he shall come in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels," Mark viii. 38; Mat. x. 32.

For certain, I apprehend, that the faith of the Jewish believers is of greater importance than the unbelief of other Jews in the time of Jesus and his apostles.

II. What has been hitherto alleged we know from the books of the New Testament. It will be worth while to attend also to the informations of ecclesiastical history.

There is good reason to believe, that no christians were involved in the miseries of the last siege of Jerusalem. They are supposed to have left it before the siege began. Some went to Pella, as mentioned by Eusebius,<sup>d</sup> a city on the other side of Jordan. Others might go elsewhere, into<sup>e</sup> Asia, or<sup>f</sup> other remote countries, where they could get a settlement. St. John,<sup>g</sup> as I suppose, left Judea, and went to Ephesus in the year 66, or thereabout, a short time before the war commenced. Some Jews of Jerusalem, and other parts of Judea, might go with him, or follow him afterwards. And, under his direction and assistance, they might procure a comfortable settlement in some places not far from him.

After the war was over in Judea, it is supposed, that the believers, who had retired into the country beyond Jordan, returned to Jerusalem, and formed a church there.

James, the Lord's brother, who had presided in the church of Jerusalem, died, as we suppose, in the year of Christ 62; who was succeeded by Simeon. In his Ecclesiastical History<sup>h</sup> Eusebius placeth his election after the destruction of Jerusalem; but in his Chronicle<sup>i</sup> it is so expressed, as if it had been done immediately after the death of James. That is no very material circumstance: nor are we able to determine which is right, for want of sufficient

<sup>d</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. 5. p. 75. A. Vid. et Epiph. H. 29. vii. H. 30. n. ii.

<sup>e</sup> See The Supplement, in this Vol. ch. ix. sect. iii. and ch. xx. sect. vi.

<sup>f</sup> Credibile est, Judææ christianos, non tantum Pellæ, ad ortum Jordanis, commoratos esse, sed et per vicinas, immo et remotiores Romani imperii provincias, in quibus tutiores esse poterant, sparsos esse, &c. Cleric. H. E. ann. 71. num. i.

<sup>g</sup> See The Supplement to the Credib. in this Vol. chap. ix. sect. iv.

<sup>h</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. xi.

<sup>i</sup> Jacobus, frater Domini, quem omnes Justum appellabant, a Judæis lapidibus opprimitur; in cujus thronum Simeon, qui et Simon, secundus assumitur. Chr. p. 161.

evidence. By Hegesippus he is<sup>k</sup> said to have been son of Cleophas, brother of Joseph; and therefore was our Lord's cousin-german. But Eusebius mentions that in a doubtful manner. We should therefore, as I apprehend, be cautious of being too particular in our decisions about it. However, Eusebius<sup>l</sup> justly reckons him among the eye and ear-witnesses of the Lord: and according<sup>m</sup> to Hegesippus, whose ecclesiastical history Eusebius had before him, he suffered martyrdom in Trajan's persecution. We therefore without hesitation, place his death at the year of our Lord 107; where also it is placed by Eusebius in<sup>n</sup> his Chronicle. Simeon was then 120 years old. By order of Atticus, president of Syria, he was crucified; he must therefore have been born several years before our Lord; and supposing him chosen bishop of Jerusalem in the year 62, he presided in that church more than forty years.

He was succeeded by Justus, a Jew; and, as Eusebius adds, 'there<sup>o</sup> were then many believers of the circumcision.' 'The<sup>p</sup> times of the ensuing successions of bishops at Jerusalem, Eusebius says, he could never learn: but 'it was said they had sat in the see for a short time only. 'This he had learned from ancient writers, that to the war in Adrian's time, (about the year 132,) there had been 'fifteen successions, who were all Hebrews by birth, and 'had held the genuine doctrine of Christ.' Whose names are all put down by him. In this catalogue of fifteen, Eusebius reckons James the first, Simeon the second; after which there follow thirteen more. Why their times were so short we cannot say, there is no reason to think that any of them were taken off by persecution: but possibly they were all in years, seniority being esteemed a ground of preference. After<sup>q</sup> their defeat by Adrian, the Jews were forbid to come to Jerusalem: from that time the

<sup>k</sup> —— *Ανεψιον, ὡς γε φασι, γεγονοτα τῶ σωτηρος. Τον γαρ εν Κλωπαι, αδελφον τῶ Ιωσηφ υπαρχειν Ἡγησιππος ιστορει. H. E. l. 3. c. xi. p. 87. Conf. l. 4. cap. 22. p. 142. C.*

<sup>l</sup> *Λογισμῳ δ' αν και τον Συμεωνα των αυτοπτων και αυτηκων ειποι αν τις γεγονεναι τῶ Κυρις. L. 3. c. 32. p. 104. B.*

<sup>m</sup> *Ap. Eus. H. E. l. 3. c. 32. p. 104. C.*

<sup>n</sup> *Traiano adversus christianos persecutionem movente, Simon, filius Cleopæ, qui in Jerosolymis episcopatum tenebat, crucifigitur. Cui succedit Justus. Ignatius quoque Antiochenæ ecclesiæ episcopus, Romam perductus, bestiiis traditur. Chr. p. 165.*

<sup>o</sup> —— *Τῆς εν Ἱεροσολυμοις επισκοπῆς τον θρονον Ιεδαιος τις ονομα Ιετος, μυριων ὄσων εκ περιτομῆς εις τον Χριστον τηρικαυτα πεπιτευκοτων εις και ατος ων διαδεχεται. l. 3. c. 35. p. 106.*

<sup>p</sup> *L. 4. cap. v.*

<sup>q</sup> *Ib. l. 4. cap. 6. vid. et Chr. p. 167.*

church there consisted of Gentiles, whose first bishop was named Mark.

That there were Jews who believed in Jesus, we are assured even by Celsus the epicurean, who wrote against the christians about the middle of the second century. In divers parts of his work he personates a Jew: it is likely that he had conversed with divers unbelievers of that nation. He consulted them, that they might assist him in his argument against the christians, and likewise furnish him with scandal against them if they could. ‘In<sup>r</sup> this manner,’ says Origen, ‘this personated Jew addresseth those who had believed from among the Jews—What ailed you, fellow-citizens, that you forsook the law of your country, to follow him, whom we mentioned just now, by whom you have been miserably deceived, leaving us, and going over to another name, and another way of living?’

And Origen, in his books against Celsus, says, ‘that<sup>s</sup> the Messiah had been foretold so long, and by so many, that the whole nation of the Jews were in earnest expectation of his coming; but since the birth of Jesus they have been divided in their opinion; for many of them have believed that Jesus is the person whom the prophets foretold; but others rejected him, despising him because of the meanness of his outward character.’

Irenæus says, ‘there<sup>t</sup> were many of the circumcision who believed in Jesus, who rose from the dead, hearkening to Moses and the prophets, who beforehand preached the coming of the Son of God.’

Among these Jewish believers there were different sentiments. Origen says, ‘there<sup>u</sup> were two sorts of Ebionites; some who believed Jesus to have been born of a virgin, as we do; some who supposed Jesus to be born as other men are.’ Origen speaks of both sorts of these men, as fond of the Jewish observances. Afterwards,<sup>v</sup> in the same

<sup>r</sup> Contr. Cels. l. 2. sect. 1. p. 57. Conf. sect. 3. p. 58, 59.

<sup>s</sup> ———— ‘Ὡς τε το Ἰουδαίων ὅλον ἔθνος ἠρτημένον τῆς περὶ τῶ ἐπιζόμενης ἐπιδημίας προσδοκίας, εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ζήτησιν ἐληλυθεναι, τῶ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιδημίαςαντος· καὶ πολὺ μὲν πλῆθος αὐτῶν ὁμολογηκεναι Χριστὸν, καὶ πεπεισενκεναι αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν προφητευόμενον· τὰς δὲ μὴ πιστευούσας, κ. λ. Contr. Cels. l. 3. n. 28. p. 127.

<sup>t</sup> ———— etiam ipsum Dominum, qui resurrexit a mortuis, in quem et credunt multi qui sunt ex circumcisione, qui et Mōysen et prophetas audiunt prædicantes adventum filii Dei. Iren. l. 4. cap. ii. sect. 4.

<sup>u</sup> ———— ἐτι δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἰουδαίων νόμον, ὡς τὰ Ἰουδαίων πλῆθη, βίην ἐθειλοντες. Οὗτοι δ’ εἰσιν οἱ εἰπτοὶ Ἐβιοναῖοι, ἧτοι ἐκ παρθενίας ὁμολογῶντες ὁμοίως ἡμῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ οὐχ οὕτω γεγεννησθαι, ἀλλ’ ὡς τὰς λοιπὰς ἀνθρώπων. Contr. Cels. l. 5. sect. 61. p. 272

<sup>v</sup> Εἰσι γὰρ τινες αἵρεσεις, τὰς Παῦλος ἐπιτολάς τε ἀποστολὰς μὴ προσεμεναι, ὡς περὶ Ἐβιοναῖοι ἀμφοτέροι, καὶ οἱ καλε-



book against Celsus, he says, that both sorts of the Ebionites, like the Encratites, rejected St. Paul's epistles; nor did they consider him as a wise or good man.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, in a chapter entitled, Of the Heresy of the Ebionites, speaks to the like purpose. 'Some,'<sup>w</sup> says he, 'who are not to be moved by any means from their respect for the Christ of God, are in some respects very infirm. They are called by the ancients Ebionites, because they have but a low opinion of Christ, thinking him to be a mere man, born of Joseph and Mary, honoured for his advancement in virtue; and esteeming the ritual ordinances of the law necessary to be observed by them, as if they could not be justified by faith in Christ only. Others of them do not deny, that Jesus was born of a virgin by the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, they do not acknowledge his pre-existence as God the Word: and, like the others, they are fond of the external observances of the law of Moses. They also reject Paul's epistles, and call him an apostate from the law.'

These two learned ancient authors speak of two sorts of Ebionites, therein, as<sup>x</sup> may be supposed, including those who are sometimes called Nazarenes, and were the descendants of the Jewish believers at Jerusalem.

It may be also here observed by us, that many learned men are now of opinion, that there never was any man named Ebion, the leader of a sect; but that the Ebionites were so called from their low opinion concerning the person of Christ, and their attachment to the external rites of the law of Moses, and that opinion, as I apprehend, is much countenanced by the passages which have been just quoted.

We cannot deny that there were some believers who supposed Jesus to have been born as other men: but I apprehend that the number of these was very small: nor do I re-

μενοι Εγκρατηται. Ουκ αν εν οι μη χρωμενοι τω αποστολω ως μακαριω τινι και σοφω. Ib. n. 65. p. 274.

<sup>w</sup> Άλλως δε ο πονηρος λαιμων της περι τον Χριστον τε Θεω διαθεσεως αδυνατων εκσεισαι, θατεραληπτως ειρων, εσφετεριζετο. Εβιοναιως τετως οικειως επεφημιζον οι πρωτοι, πτωχος και ταπεινος τα περι τω Χριστω δοξαζοντας λιτον μεν γαρ αυτον και κοινον ηγγεντο, κατα προκοπην ηθως αυτο μονον ανθρωπον δεδικαιωμενον, εξ ανδρος τε κοινωνιας και της Μαριας γεγεννημενον—Άλλοι δε παρα τωτοις της αυτης οντες προσηγοριας, εκ παρθενω και τω αγιου πνευματος μη αρνουμενοι γεγονεναι τον Κυριον, ε μην εθ' ομοιως και οντοι προϋπαρχειν αυτον Θεον λογον οντα και σοφιαν ομολογουντες, κ. λ. L. 3. cap. 27. p. 99.

<sup>x</sup> Et Origenes, cum duplices facit Ebionæos in disputatione contra Celsum, Ebionæorum nomine abutens, sub priore illâ notâ Nazaræos, ut credibile est, describit. Grot. Prol. in Matt. p. 5.

collect any christian writing, now extant, where that opinion is maintained.

We must also allow that there were some who<sup>y</sup> rejected the apostle Paul, whilst they received the other apostles: these likewise I suppose to have been few in number. I know no work of any ancient author now remaining, who speaks disrespectfully of him, excepting only<sup>z</sup> *The Recognitions*, or *Clementine Homilies*, of which we formerly took particular notice.

As for the other Ebionites, called also Nazareans, it is allowed, as we have just seen, that they believed Jesus to be born of a virgin, by an especial interposition of the power of God, or by the Holy Ghost. These also received the apostle Paul. The Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs were written by a Jewish believer of this character in the second century. He plainly received Paul and his epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, as was shown<sup>a</sup> formerly. It is a very curious work. When it came in my way I enlarged in my extracts of it. Nor do I now repent of that labour.

That the Nazareans, called also believers from among the Hebrews, received Paul, is apparent from Jerom's commentary upon Is. iv. 1—3, quoted Matt. iv. 15, 16. 'The<sup>b</sup> Nazareans,' says he, 'whom I before mentioned, endeavour to explain this text after this manner. When Christ came, and began to enlighten the world with his doctrine, the land of Zabulon and Naphtali was first delivered from the errors of the scribes and pharisees, and shook off from their necks the heavy yoke of Jewish traditions. Afterwards, by the preaching of the apostle Paul, who was the last of all the apostles, the preaching was increased, and even multiplied; and the gospel of Christ shone out among the Gentiles, and by the way of the sea. At length

<sup>y</sup> Nota, quod primi apostoli salvatoris literam Sabbati destruunt adversus Ebionitas, qui quum cæteros recipiant apostolos, Paulum, quasi transgressorem legis, repudiant. Hieron. in Matt. xii. 2. T. 4. P. i. p. 46.

<sup>z</sup> See *The Credib.* P. ii. Vol. ii. p. 373, and p. 380.

<sup>a</sup> See *The Credib.* P. ii. Vol. ii. p. 360.

<sup>b</sup> Hebræi credentes in Christum hunc locum ita edisserunt——Nazaræi, quorum opinionem supra posui, hunc locum ita explicare conantur. Adveniente Christo, ac prædicatione illius coruscante, prima terra Zabulon et terra Naphtali scribarum et pharisæorum est erroribus liberata, et gravissimam traditionum judaicarum jugum excussit de cervicibus suis. Postea autem per evangelium apostoli Pauli, qui novissimus omnium apostolorum omnium fuit, ingravata est, id est, multiplicata prædicatio: et in terminos gentium, et viam universi maris Christi evangelium splenduit. Denique omnis orbis, qui ante ambulabat, vel sedebat in tenebris, et idololatræ ac mortis vinculis tenebatur, claram evangelii lucem aspexit. In Is. cap. ix. T. 3. p. 83.

‘ the whole world, that had walked, or ‘ sat in darkness,’  
 ‘ and had been held in the chains of idolatry and death, saw  
 ‘ the clear light of the gospel.’ So he says that text was  
 explained by the Nazarenes, whom just before he called the  
 Hebrews that believed in Christ.

That the Nazarenes received all Christ’s apostles, is evi-  
 dent from the passage just transcribed. It is also manifest  
 from Jerom’s commentary upon Is. xxxi. 6—9. ‘ The<sup>c</sup> Na-  
 ‘ zarenes,’ says he ‘ understand this place after this manner :  
 ‘ O ye children of Israel, who under the worst direction de-  
 ‘ nied the Son of God, return to him, and to his apostles :  
 ‘ for if you do that, you will then cast away your idols,  
 ‘ which have been a sin to you ; and the devil shall fall be-  
 ‘ fore you, not by your own power, but by the mercy of  
 ‘ God ; and his young men, who before fought for him, shall  
 ‘ be tributary to the church, and all his strength and power  
 ‘ shall be subdued.’

The Ebionites<sup>d</sup> are said to have adhered to the injunc-  
 tions of the law of Moses, after they had received the gos-  
 pel of Christ. ‘ Some of them,’ as<sup>e</sup> Jerom intimates, ‘ were  
 ‘ for imposing the legal observances upon all men, as ne-  
 ‘ cessary to salvation ; but the other Ebionites, (or Naza-  
 ‘ renes,) as the same ancient and learned writer owns, observ-  
 ‘ ed these appointments themselves, as being of the seed  
 ‘ of Israel, without imposing them upon others.’ These  
 were evidently of the same opinion with the believers in  
 the church of Jerusalem : see the Acts of the Apostles, ch.  
 xxi. And divers learned moderns<sup>f</sup> are now convinced of  
 this, and readily allow that the Jewish believers, who were  
 called Nazarenes, did not impose the ordinances of the law  
 upon others, though they observed them as descendants of  
 Israel and Abraham.

<sup>c</sup> Nazaræi locum istum sic intelligunt. O filii Israël, qui consilio pessimo  
 Dei Filium denegastis, revertimini ad eum, et ad apostolos ejus. Si enim hoc  
 feceritis, omnia abjicietis idola, quæ vobis prius fuerant in peccatum : et cadet  
 vobis diabolus, non vestris viribus, sed misericordiâ Dei : et juvenes ejus qui  
 quondam pro illo pugnaverant, erunt ecclesiæ vectigales, omnisque fortitudo  
 et petra illius pertransibit. In Is. cap. xxxi. T. 3. p. 267.

<sup>d</sup> Simul arat in bove et asino Ebion, dignus pro humilitate sensus paupertate  
 nominis sui, qui sic recipit evangelium, ut judaicarum superstitionum, quæ in  
 umbrâ et imagine præcesserunt, cæremonias non relinquunt. Hieron. in Is.  
 cap. i. T. 3. p. 9.

<sup>e</sup> Audiant Ebionæi, qui post passionem  
 abolitam legem putant esse servandam. Audiant Ebionitarum socii, qui  
 Judæis tantum, et de stirpe Israëliti generis hæc custodienda decernunt.  
 Id. in Is. cap. i. T. 3. p. 15.

<sup>f</sup> Ego ad eos accedere non vereor, qui statuunt, Nazaræos, nullos chris-  
 tianorum, nisi Judæos, et Abrahæ posteros, legi Mosaicæ alligare voluisse,  
 &c. Moshem. de Reb. Chr. ante C. M. p. 330.

The Ebionites, or some who went under that denomination, must have received the Acts of the Apostles. ‘For, ‘ as <sup>s</sup> we learn from Epiphanius, they said they were called ‘ Ebionites, or Poor, because in the times of the apostles, ‘ they sold their goods, and laid them at the apostles’ feet, ‘ and by that means they had voluntarily reduced themselves to poverty. For that reason men called them poor, ‘ but they gloried in the name.’ Manifestly referring to the history in the fourth and fifth chapters of the Acts. They who received that book must have received Paul and all the apostles of Jesus, and very probably all their writings which were received by other christians.

I suppose likewise, that all the Jewish believers in general received the gospel of St. Matthew entire, with the genealogy at the beginning. The testimony of Irenæus, as seems to me, without searching for any other authority, is sufficient to put it out of question: ‘ The <sup>h</sup> gospel according to Matthew,’ he says, ‘ was written to the Jews; for ‘ they earnestly desired a Messiah of the seed of David: ‘ and Matthew, having the same desire to a yet greater degree, strove by all means to give them full satisfaction, ‘ that Christ was of the seed of David; wherefore he began ‘ with his genealogy.’ <sup>i</sup>

Eusebius in a place above cited, says, ‘ that even those ‘ Ebionites, (or Nazarenes,) who believed Jesus to be born ‘ of a virgin by the Holy Ghost, did not acknowledge his ‘ pre-existence, as God the Word.’ Nevertheless, I presume they did believe Jesus Christ to be the Word, and Wisdom, and Power of God. But they did not believe the pre-existence of the Word as a distinct person, and separate from God the Father; as Eusebius and some Arian-

<sup>s</sup> Αυτοι δε διηθεν σεμνηνονται, ιαντες φασκοντες πτωχεις, δια το, φισιν, εν χρονοις των αποστολων πωλειν τα αυτων υπαρχοντα, και τιθειναι παρα τες ποδας των αποστολων, και εις πτωχειαν και αποταξιαν μετεληλυθεναι και δια τωτο καλεισθαι υπο παντων, φασι, πτωχοι. II. 30. n. xiii. p. 141. A.

<sup>h</sup> Iren. 147. Mass. and see The Credibil. P. 2. Vol. ii. p. 171.

<sup>i</sup> As many mistakes have been entertained about the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it may not be unseasonable to observe here, that probably it was an Hebrew translation of St. Matthew’s original Greek gospel, with additions from the other gospels: to which possibly might be added some few particulars received by tradition from the early Jewish believers. See Credibility, P. 2. Vol. i. ch. v. and Vol. ii. ch. xxix. Epiphanius therefore says, that the Hebrew gospel of Matthew, used by the Nazarenes, was a full gospel. Εχρησι δε το κατα Ματθαιων ευαγγελιον πληρεςατον Εβραϊσι. H. 29. num. ix. p. 124. The Nazarenes therefore did not reject the authority of the other evangelists, but owned and acknowledged it. That St. Matthew wrote in Greek, see The Supplement, in this Vol. p. 309. Says Lampe, Synops. H. E. p. 73. Græcâ vero linguâ omnes ne Matthæo quidem excepto, usi sunt, ut a Judæis et Gentibus uterentur.

izing christians of his time did. That I take to be truth, and the ground and reason why Eusebius expresseth himself as he does. And it might be easily shown, that<sup>k</sup> the Nazarean christians did not reject St. John's gospel, nor hold any principles that obliged them to reject or dislike it.

Finally, we are assured by St. Jerom, 'that<sup>l</sup> in his time ' there were many all over the East called Nazareans, ' upon whom the Jews pronouaced their curses as hereties. ' They profess,' says Jerom, ' that they believe in Christ, ' the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, who suffered ' under Pontius Pilate, and rose again from the dead, the ' same in whom we also believe.'

I shall proceed no farther in this argument, nor go any lower. There were for the first four centuries many Jews who professed faith in Jesus as the Christ, notwithstanding the difficulties and discouragements to which they were exposed; for they were in an especial manner the object of the spite and enmity of the unbelieving part of their nation: and, besides, they<sup>m</sup> were too much slighted and disregarded by the Gentile christians.

III. I now leave it to my readers to judge, whether the faith of so many Jewish believers, in the early days of the gospel, be not a valuable testimony to the truth of the christian religion.

Some Jews have all along, in every age since, embraced the christian religion, who have joined themselves to the Gentile believers, and have been incorporated with them. These are not now the subjects of my history.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Lamp. Prol. in Joh. Evang. l. 2. cap. i. sect. 1, 2, 3, et cap. iii. num. 38—43.

<sup>l</sup> Usque hodie per totas Orientis synagogas, inter Judæos hæresis est, quæ dicitur minæonem, et a Pharisæis nunc usque damnatur; quos vulgo Nazaræos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum Filium Dei, natum ex virgine Mariâ, et eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est, et resurrexit, in quem et nos credimus, &c. Hieron. ad August. ep. 74. [al. 89.] tom. 4. p. 623.

<sup>m</sup> See W. Wall, in the preface to his Notes upon the O. T. p. xi. xii.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the treatment given to the primitive christians by the unbelieving Jews.*

JUSTIN, in his Dialogue with Trypho,<sup>a</sup> speaks to this purpose—‘ For ye have killed the Just, and his prophets before him ; and now you despise, and, as much as in you lies, disparage them who hope in him, and in God Almighty, Lord of the whole world, who sent him, cursing in your synagogues those who believe in Christ. For it is not now in your power to lay hands upon us, being hindered by them who have the chief government of things. But whenever you have had it in your power, you have done that also—For no other people are so averse to us and Christ, as you, who are the authors of all the prejudices which others have against Him and us : for after that you had crucified Him, that one unblamable and righteous Man, by whose stripes they are healed who come to the Father through Him ; and when ye knew that he was risen from the dead, and was ascended into heaven, as the prophets had foretold ; you not only did not repent of the evil that you had done, but you sent out chosen men from Jerusalem into all the earth, saying, that an atheistical sect, called christians, had arisen among you : thus spreading abroad all those evil reports concerning us, which all who are ignorant of us now believe. So that you have been the causes not only of your own wickedness, but likewise of the wickedness of others.’

Eusebius,<sup>b</sup> rehearsing the works of Justin, has transcribed this passage from his Dialogue with Trypho.

And afterwards, in the same dialogue, or the second part of it—‘ Notwithstanding<sup>c</sup> all that Christ said to you, you did not repent. So far from it, that after he was risen from the dead you sent forth chosen men into all the world, giving out, that a wicked and atheistical sect was risen, the author of which was one Jesus of Galilee, an impostor ; whom, when you had crucified, his disciples stole out of the sepulchre by night, where he had been laid after his crucifixion, and that they deceived men,

<sup>a</sup> Just. M. Dial. p. 234, 235. Paris. sect. 16, et 17. p. 127. Bened.

<sup>b</sup> H. E. l. 4. cap. 18.      <sup>c</sup> Dial. p. 335. Paris. sect. 108. p. 202. Bened.

‘ saying, that he was risen from the dead and ascended into  
 ‘ heaven. Moreover you gave out, that he taught those  
 ‘ wicked and impure and abominable things, which you  
 ‘ every where charge upon all those who confess Him to  
 ‘ be the Christ, and their master, and the Son of God.  
 ‘ And though your city has been taken, and your country  
 ‘ laid waste, you do not repent; but still pronounce curses  
 ‘ upon him, and upon all who believe in him.’

He has somewhat to the like purpose, once more afterwards, in the same<sup>d</sup> dialogue; where he chargeth them with hating all who believed in God through Christ, and killing them when they had power, and still continually devoting him and them to destruction.

Tertullian does not expressly say all this; but<sup>e</sup> he often intimates, that the Jews were the principal authors of the reproaches cast upon the christians: and he speaks of one calumny in particular, which had been then lately forged by them, in his own time.

Origen says much the same that Justin does. Having taken notice of some things in Celsus, he says, ‘ that<sup>f</sup>  
 ‘ therein he acted much like the Jews of old, who at the  
 ‘ rise of the christian religion spread abroad calumnies  
 ‘ against it; as if the christians killed a child, and ate it,  
 ‘ and putting out the lights practised promiscuous lewd-  
 ‘ ness. Which calumnies, though very absurd, were in for-  
 ‘ mer times believed by many.’

And Eusebius, in his commentary upon Is. xviii. 1, 2.  
 ‘ We<sup>g</sup> find in the writings of the ancients,’ says he, ‘ that

<sup>d</sup> Dial. p. 363. Paris. sect. 133. p. 225. Bened.

<sup>e</sup> Nova jam de Deo nostro fama suggestit. Adeo nuper quidam perditissimus in istâ civitate, etiam suæ religionis desertor, solo detrimento cutis, Judæus——picturam in nos proposuit sub istâ proscriptione, Onochoetes. Is erat auribus canteriorum, et in togâ, cum libro, altero pede ungulato. Et credidit vulgus Judææ. Quod enim aliud genus seminarium est infamiæ nostræ? Itaque in totâ civitate Onochoetes prædicatur. Adv. Nat. l. i. cap. 14. p. 59. Vid. et Ap. cap. 16. p. 17. D. et conf. Minuc. Fel. cap. ix. et xxviii.

Dehinc, cum ex perseverantiâ furoris, et nomen Domini per ipsos blasphemaretur, sicut scriptum est: ‘ Propter vos blasphematur nomen meum in nationibus:’ (ab illis enim cœpit infamia:) et tempus medium a Tiberio usque ad Vespasianum, non pœnitentiam intellexissent, facta est terra eorum deserta, civitates eorum exustæ igni; regionem eorum sub eorum conspectu extranei devorant. Adv. Marcion. l. iii. cap. 23. p. 498. B.

<sup>f</sup> Καὶ ἔοικε μοι παραπλησιον Ἰαδαίως πεποιηκεναι, τοις κατα την αρχην της τῆς χριστιανισμῆς διδασκαλιας κατασκεδασασι ἐνσφημιαν τῆς λογῆς ὡς ἀρα καταθυσαντες παιδιον, μεταλαμβάνουσι αὐτῶν των σαρκων’ και παλιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀπο τῆς λογῆς, τὰ τῆς σκοτῆς πραττειν βελομενοι σβεννυουσι μὲν το φως, ἕκατος δὲ τῆ παρατυχῶση μινυται. Contr. Cels. l. 6. num. 27. p. 293.

<sup>g</sup> Εἶρομεν ἐν τοις παλαιων συγγραμμασιν, ὡς οἱ τὴν Ἰερουσαλημ οἰκωντες τῆ των Ἰαδαίων ἐθνῶς ἱερεῖς και πρεσβυτεροι γραμματα διαχαραξαντες εἰς παντα

‘ the priests and elders of the Jewish nation, who dwelt at  
 ‘ Jerusalem, wrote letters which they sent to the Jews  
 ‘ abroad in all countries, traducing the doctrine of Christ,  
 ‘ as a new and strange heresy, and exhorting them not to  
 ‘ embrace it.’

Whether the Jews did send out men in this manner, before the destruction of Jerusalem, to asperse the followers of Jesus, is not quite certain. The question is particularly considered by the Benedictines<sup>h</sup> in their preface to Justin Martyr. The origin of the early calumnies upon the christians is somewhat doubtful. Some have supposed them to have been occasioned by the absurd doctrines, and vicious lives, of those called heretics. However, I formerly<sup>i</sup> proposed some observations, tending to show that they are not to be accounted for in that way.

It is certain that the christians were very early aspersed with crimes of which they were not guilty. When St. Paul was come a prisoner to Rome, he sent for the chief of the Jews of that city to come to him, who say to him—“As for this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against,” Acts xxviii. 22. Those words might be spoken in the year of Christ 61, and not far from the beginning of it. And Tacitus, giving an account of Nero’s persecution of the christians, which seems to have begun in the year 64, intimates, ‘ that<sup>k</sup> the christians were generally hated for ‘ the crimes imputed to them.’

Whether the Jewish rulers did, before the destruction of Jerusalem, send abroad messengers and letters on purpose to defame the doctrine of Christ and his followers, or not, it must be allowed to be true, which Justin says, that no other people were so averse to Christ and his followers as the Jews. It must be allowed to be very true, which he likewise says of them, that they continued to anathematize Jesus Christ and his followers.

In the authentic account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, at Smyrna, when he was condemned to be burnt, it is said, ‘ that<sup>l</sup> presently the people brought together dried wood, ‘ and branches of trees from their shops, and from the

*ἐπεμψαντο τα εθνη τοις πανταχθ Ιεδαιοις, διαβαλλοντες την Χριστη διδασκαλιαν, ως αιρεσιν καινην και αλλοτριαν τε Θεο, παραγγελλοντες ἐι επιτολων μη παραδειξασθαι αυτην.* Euseb. in Es. c. xviii. p. 424.

<sup>h</sup> Pr. Part. 3. c. iv. p. 76, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Credib. P. ii. ch. xxxix. in Vol. ii.

<sup>k</sup> Ergo abolendo rumorī Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis pœnis affecit, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus christianos appellabat. Tac. Ann. l. 15. c. 44.

<sup>l</sup> ——μαλιτα Ιεδαιων προθυμως, ως εθος αυτοις, εις τετο υπεργεντων. Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 4. cap. 15. 133. A.



‘baths; in which, the Jews especially, as is usual with them, readily assisted.’

We are assured by Jerom, that the Jews anathematized the christians under the name of Nazareans, in their synagogues, thrice every day. So he writes in <sup>m</sup> his commentary upon Is. v. 18, 19. And again <sup>n</sup> in like manner upon Is. xlix. 7, and <sup>o</sup> upon the first chapter of the prophecy of Amos.

Epiphanius says, ‘that <sup>p</sup> the Jews three times every day anathematized the Nazareans in their synagogues. For they were more especially displeased with them, because, though they were Jews, they believed in Jesus as the Christ.’

All which may be very true. The Jews, as Jerom says, anathematized in their synagogues all christians under the denomination of Nazareans; and yet, as Epiphanius says, they were more especially displeased with those believers who were of the seed of Israel.

These passages of ancient christian writers do sufficiently attest the early and continued enmity of the unbelieving Jews, to all christians of every denomination.

There are still some other things to be here taken notice of. For some time after our Saviour’s ascension, they aspersed the character of Mary, our Lord’s mother, and reproached him with a spurious nativity. When these aspersions were first given out, we cannot say exactly; but they are in <sup>q</sup> Celsus, who wrote against the christians about the middle of the second century; and doubtless he had them from the Jews: they are also in the Talmudical writings, as we shall see hereafter.

<sup>m</sup> Dicuntur autem hæc ad principes Judæorum, qui supra arguti sunt in avaritiâ et luxuriâ; quod, provocati a Domino ad penitentiam, et postea ab apostolis ejus, usque hodie perseverant in blasphemiiis; et ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis sub nomine Nazarenorum anathematizant vocabulum christianum. In Is. cap. v. T. 3, p. 53.

<sup>n</sup> Ipse enim bonus pastor posuit animam suam pro ovibus suis, et contempsit eam; qui abominationi est genti Judæorum, cui ter per singulos dies sub nomine Nazarenorum maledicunt in synagogis suis. Id. in Is. c. xlix. T. 3. p. 353.

<sup>o</sup> — antiquumque furorem et iracundiam tenentes, usque hodie in synagogis suis sub nomine Nazarenorum blasphemant populum christianum, et, dummodo nos interficiant volunt igne comburi. In Amos. cap. i. p. 1378. fin.

<sup>p</sup> Ου μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τέτρες κεκτῆνται μισος, ἀλλ’ ἀνταρμῆνοι εὐθελ, καὶ μεσησ ἡμέρας, καὶ περὶ ἑσπέραν, τρεῖς τῆς ἡμέρας, ὅτε εὐχὰς ἐπιέλθουσιν ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρωνται αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι, φασκόντες, ὅτι ἐπικαταρασαὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς Ναζωραίας. Καὶ γὰρ τέτοις περισσοτέρου ἐνεχέουσι, εἰα το ἀπο Ἰουδαίων αὐτῆς ὄντας, Ἰησοῦν κηρυσσέειν εἶναι Χριστόν, κ. λ. Epiph. H. 29. sect. ix. p. 124.

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Orig. Contr. Cels. l. i. num. 28, et 32. p. 22, et 26.

In order to disparage our Lord's miracles, they gave out that they were performed by magical arts, such as he had learned in Egypt. This calumny also is in <sup>r</sup> Celsus; and doubtless he had it from the Jews. It is also in the Talmudical writers, as we shall see hereafter.

In the time of the emperor Adrian, about the year of Christ 132, the Jews rebelled under the conduct of the impostor Barchochebas, who set up himself for the Messiah, 'who<sup>s</sup> inflicted heavy penalties upon the christians, to induce them to deny and blaspheme Jesus Christ; and if they did not, he ordered them to be put to death.' So writes Justin Martyr, who lived at that time. Some have censured Justin for saying that Barchochebas tortured christians only; but without reason, as seems to me. For certain, the christians were, above all men, objects of his and his followers' enmity: nor could any be called upon to deny Jesus Christ, but such as had received him for the Messiah. Of the sufferings of the christians at that time, Eusebius speaks in <sup>t</sup> his Chronicle, and in <sup>u</sup> his Ecclesiastical History; not now to refer to any <sup>v</sup> others.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Orig. Contr. Cels. l. i. sect. 28. p. 22.

<sup>s</sup> Και γαρ εν τω νυν γεγενημενω ιεδαιικω πολεμω, Βαρχοχεβας, ο της Ιεδαιων αποσασειως αρχηγετης, χοιτιανως μονως εις τιμωριας δεινας, ει μη αρνουιτο Ιησυν τον Χριστον, και βλασφημοιεν, εκελευσατο απαγεσθαι. Ap. i. p. 72. E. Par. p. 62. Bened.

<sup>t</sup> Cochebas dux judaicæ factionis nolentes christianos adversum Romanum militem ferre subsidium omnimodis cruciatibus necat. Chron. p. 167.

<sup>u</sup> H. E. l. 4. c. 6.

<sup>v</sup> Vid. Moshem. de Reb. Christianor. ante Const. p. 238, 239.

## CHAP. III.

JOSEPHUS, WITH HIS TESTIMONY AT LARGE TO THE FULFILMENT OF OUR SAVIOUR'S PREDICTIONS CONCERNING THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE AND THE CITY OF JERUSALEM, AND THE MISERIES COMING UPON THE JEWISH PEOPLE.

*I. His time, works, and character. II. The state of things in Judea in the time of our Saviour, and some while before. III. Our Lord's predictions concerning the destruction of the temple and the city of Jerusalem, and the miseries to be endured by the Jewish people—with the several signs preceding those calamities, as recorded in the gospels. IV. The dates of several events; viz. the commencement and the duration of the war, and the siege of Jerusalem—when the temple was burnt, and the city taken. V. Of the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place. VI. The actual accomplishment of our Saviour's predictions concerning divers events that should precede the great calamities coming upon the Jewish people—the gospel preached all over the world—the disciples of Christ persecuted in many places—deceptions among his followers—famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places—wars and commotions. VII. The occasion of the Jewish war with the Romans, as represented by Josephus. VIII. The history of the Jewish war from Josephus, with his account of the siege of Jerusalem, and the miseries endured therein, and the demolition of the temple and city of Jerusalem, and the desolation of the land of Judea, being his testimony to the fulfilment of our Lord's predictions of those events. IX. Reflections upon the preceding history, and the value of the testimony of Josephus. X. Other ancient writers, who have borne witness to the accomplishment of our Lord's predictions in the conquest of Judea by Vespasian and Titus—Justus of Tiberius—Pausanias—Antonius Julianus—Suetonius—Tacitus—Dion Cassius—Philostatus—The arch of Titus.*

**I. JOSEPHUS**, son of Matthias, of the race of the Jewish priests, and of the first course of the four and twenty, by his mother descended from the Asmonean family, which for

a considerable time had the supreme government of the Jewish nation, was born in the first year of the reign of Caligula, of our Lord <sup>a</sup> 37.

He was educated together <sup>b</sup> with Matthias, who was his own brother by father and mother, and made such proficiency in knowledge, that when <sup>c</sup> he was about fourteen years of age, the high priests, and some of the principal men of the city, came frequently to him to consult him about the right interpretation of things of the law. In the sixteenth year of his age he retired into the wilderness, where he lived three years an abstemious course of life, in the company of Banus. Having fully acquainted himself with the principles of the three sects, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, he determined to follow the rule of the Pharisees. And being now nineteen years of age, he began to act in public life.

Felix, when procurator of Judea, sent some priests of his acquaintance for a trifling offence to Rome, to be tried before Cæsar. Josephus, hearing that they behaved well, resolved to go to Rome to plead their cause: but he had a bad voyage; the ship was wrecked; and out of six hundred persons, not more than eighty were saved. Soon after his arrival at Rome, he became acquainted with Aliturus, a Jew by birth, but a stage-player, in favour with Nero. By him he was introduced to Poppæa, the emperor's wife; by whose interest he procured that the priests should be set at liberty. Josephus, who never omits what may be to his own honour, adds, that <sup>d</sup> beside that favour, he also received from Poppæa many valuable presents; and then he returned home. This voyage was made, as he <sup>e</sup> says, in the 26th year of his age, which must have been in the 62d or 63d year of <sup>f</sup> Christ.

Upon his return to Judea he found things in great confusion, many <sup>g</sup> being elevated with hopes of advantage by

<sup>a</sup> Joseph. in Vitâ suâ. cap. i.

<sup>b</sup> Cap. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Ἐπι δὲ πιας ὧν περὶ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατον ετος—συνιόντων αει των αρχιερεων και των της πολεως πρωτων ὑπερ τῶ παρ' εμῶ περὶ των νομιμων ακριβεστερον τι γνωμαι. Cap. 2.

<sup>d</sup> —μεγαλων δὲ ὥρων προς τη ενεργεια ταυτη τυχων παρα Ποπηῆας. C. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Μετ' εικοσον και ἑκτον ενιαυτον εις Ῥωμην μοι συνεπεσεν αναβηραι. Ib.

<sup>f</sup> Felix must have been removed from his government some while before that; which may be thought to create a difficulty in this account: but it may be observed, that Josephus had heard of the good behaviour of those priests at Rome before he left Judea; consequently they had been some while at Rome before he set out on his journey.

<sup>g</sup> —και πολλῶς επι τη Ῥωμαίων αποτασει μεγα φρονωντας. Vit. c. 4.

a revolt from the Romans. He says, he did what lay in his power to prevent it, though in vain.

Soon after the beginning of the war, in the year of Christ 66, (when he must have been himself about thirty years of age,) he was sent from Jerusalem to command in<sup>h</sup> Galilee; where, having ordered matters as well as he could, and made the best preparations for war, by fortifying the cities in case of an attack from the Romans, he was at length shut up in the city of Jotapata: which, after a vigorous defence, and a siege of seven and forty days, was taken by Vespasian,<sup>i</sup> on the first day of July, in the 13th year of Nero and the 67th of our Lord.

When that city was taken, by Vespasian's order strict search was made for Josephus; for if<sup>k</sup> that general was once taken, he reckoned that the greatest part of the war would be over. However, he had hid himself in a deep cavern, the opening of which was not easily discerned above ground. Here he met with forty persons of eminence, who had concealed themselves, and had with them provisions enough for several days. On the third day the Roman soldiers seized a woman that had been with them. She made a discovery of the place where they were; whereupon Vespasian sent two tribunes, inviting him to come up, with assurances that his life should be preserved. Josephus, however, refused. Vespasian therefore sent a third tribune, named Nicanor, well known to Josephus, with the like assurances. Josephus, after some hesitation, was then willing to surrender himself. But the men who were with him exclaimed against it, and were for killing him and themselves rather than come alive into the hands of the Romans. Hereupon he made a long speech unto them, showing that it was not lawful for men to kill themselves, and that it was rather a proof of pusillanimity than courage: but all without effect. He then proposed an expedient; which was that they should cast lots, two by two, who should die first. He who had the second lot should kill the first, and the next him, and so on, and the last should kill himself. It happened that Josephus and another were preserved to the last lot. When all the rest were killed, he without much difficulty persuaded that other person to yield up himself to the Romans. So they two escaped with their<sup>l</sup> lives.

This<sup>m</sup> has been judged to be a remarkable providence,

<sup>h</sup> Vit. cap. 7, 8. De B. J. l. 2. c. 20.

<sup>i</sup> De B. J. l. 3. cap. 7.

Conf. cap. 8. sect. 9.

<sup>k</sup> *μεγιστη γαρ ην μοιρα της πολεμικης ληθηεις.*

De B. J. l. 3. c. 8. in.

<sup>l</sup> De B. J. l. 3. c. 8. sect 1—7.

<sup>m</sup> See Tillotson's Sermon, num. 186. Vol. 2. p. 564.

by which Josephus was preserved to write the history, of which we are now able to make so good use.

When <sup>n</sup> Josephus had surrendered, Vespasian gave strict orders that he should be kept carefully, as if he had intended to send him to Nero. Josephus then presented a request that he might speak to Vespasian in private, which was granted. When all were dismissed, except Titus and two friends, he spoke to Vespasian after this manner: ‘ You <sup>o</sup> think, Vespasian, that you have in Josephus a mere prisoner. But I am come to you as a messenger of great tidings. Had I not been sent to you <sup>p</sup> by God, I know what the law of the Jews is, and how it becomes a general to die. Do you intend to send me to Nero? Are they, who are to succeed Nero before you, to continue? You, Vespasian, will be Cæsar: you will be emperor. So will likewise this your son. Bind me therefore still faster, and reserve me for yourself. For you are lord, not of me only, but of the earth, and the sea, and all mankind. And I for punishment deserve a closer confinement if I speak falsehood to you in the name of <sup>q</sup> God.’ Vespasian, as he says, at first paid little regard to all this; but afterwards his expectations of empire were raised. ‘ Besides,’ as he goes on to say, ‘ he found Josephus to have spoken truth upon other occasions: for when one of his friends, who was admitted to be present at that interview, said, It appeared strange to him that Josephus should not have foretold to the people of Jotapata the event of the siege, nor have foreseen his own captivity, if all he now said was not invention to save his own life; Josephus answered, that he had foretold to the people of Jotapata, that the place would be taken upon the forty-seventh day of the siege, and that himself should be taken alive by the Romans. Vespasian, having privately inquired of the prisoners concerning these predictions, found the truth of <sup>r</sup> them.’

All these things I have inserted here for showing the

<sup>n</sup> De B. I. l. 3. c. 8. sect. 8.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. sect. 5.

<sup>p</sup> That is, that a Jewish general should make away with himself, rather than be taken prisoner alive by heathen people. We know not of any such law in the books of the Old Testament. And it seems to be a manifest contradiction to what he says in the speech before referred to.

<sup>q</sup> Josephus’s address to Vespasian is very precise and formal, predicting things then future. Possibly, this speech was improved afterwards, and at the time of writing this history made more clear and express, and more agreeable to the event, than when first spoken.

<sup>r</sup> Among other presages of Vespasian’s empire, Suetonius has mentioned this of Josephus. *Et unus ex nobilibus captivis, Josephus, cum conjiceretur in vincula, constantissime asseveravit, fore, ut ab eodem brevi solveretur, verum, jam imperatore.* Sueton. Vesp. c. 5.

character of this writer : though the prolixity of my narration be thereby increased.

It is very likely, that he<sup>s</sup> often thought of Joseph in Egypt, and of Daniel at Babylon ; and was in hopes of making a like figure at the court of Rome. But I suppose it may be no disparagement to Josephus to say, that he was not equal to them in wisdom, or in virtue and integrity. And the circumstances of things were much altered : the promised Messiah was come ; and the Jewish people were no longer entitled to such special regard, as had been shown them in times past. Nor was it then a day of favour and mercy for them, but the day of the Lord's vengeance against them, as Josephus himself saw : and they were entering into a long captivity, of which they have not yet seen the end, after a period of almost seventeen hundred years, though they are still wonderfully preserved.

Josephus was still a prisoner : but when Vespasian had been proclaimed emperor, he ordered his iron chain to be cut<sup>t</sup> asunder. When Vespasian went to Rome, Josephus continued to be with Titus, and was present at the siege of Jerusalem, and saw the ruin of his city and country.

After the war was over, when Titus went to Rome, he went with him ; and Vespasian allotted him an apartment in the same house in which himself had lived before he came to the empire : he also made him a citizen of Rome, and gave him an annual pension ; and continued to show him great respect so long as he lived. His son Titus, who succeeded him, showed him the like regard. And afterwards Domitian, and his wife Domitia, did him many kind<sup>u</sup> offices.

Josephus, however, does not deny that<sup>v</sup> he had many enemies : but the emperors, in whose times he lived, protected him. Indeed, it is very likely that the Jews should have little regard for a man who was with the Romans, in their camp during the siege of their city. He particularly says, that<sup>w</sup> upon the first tidings of the taking of Jotapata, the people of Jerusalem made great and public lamentations for him, supposing that he had been killed in the siege : but when they heard that he had escaped, and was with the Romans, and was well used by them, they loaded him with all manner of reproaches, not excepting treachery

<sup>s</sup> Josephus has several times spoken of his having had prophetic dreams, and of his ability to interpret dreams that were ambiguous. Vid. De B. J. l. 3. viii. 3 et 9, et de Vit. sect. 42.

<sup>t</sup> De B. J. l. 4. cap. x. sect. 7.

<sup>u</sup> Vit. cap. 76.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid.

<sup>w</sup> De B. J. l. 3. cap. ix. sect. 7.

itself. Nor do we find that<sup>x</sup> the Jewish people ever had any great respect for his writings; though they have been much esteemed, and often quoted, by christian and<sup>y</sup> other writers, in early and latter times.

Of them<sup>z</sup> we are now to take some notice.

The first is The History of the Jewish war, and the taking of Jerusalem, in seven books. In which work he goes back to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees. In the preface he says, that he<sup>a</sup> first wrote it in the language of his own country, for the sake of such as lived in Parthia, Babylonia, Arabia, and other parts: and afterwards published it in Greek for the benefit of others, which is what we have: it is generally supposed to have been published by him in the seventy-fifth year of Christ, and the thirty-eighth year of his own age. He professeth to have written with great<sup>b</sup> fidelity: and for the truth of his history appeals to Vespasian and Titus, and King Agrippa, then<sup>c</sup> living. He<sup>d</sup> presented it to Vespasian and Titus; which last<sup>e</sup> not only desired the publication of it, but with his own hand signed the book, that should be reckoned authentic.

2. The Jewish Antiquities, in twenty books, or the history of the Jews from the creation of the world, to the twelfth year of Nero, in which the war began. This work was finished by him<sup>f</sup> in the fifty-sixth year of his own life, in the third year of the reign of Domitian, and the year of Christ 93.

3. To this work is subjoined, as a part of it, or an appendix to it, His Life, written by himself some time afterwards.

4. After the several above-mentioned works, he published another work in two books, entitled, Of the Antiquity of the Jews against Apion; being a vindication of the Jewish people against the calumnies of that Egyptian author.

5. To Josephus likewise is generally ascribed a book en-

<sup>x</sup> Quamvis enim ejus scripta apud Judæos in nullo pretio fuerint——Gentiles tamen pariter et christiani Josephum, licet Judæum, ejusque opera, magni æstimârunt. Ittig. Proleg. pag. 88. ap. Havercamp.

<sup>y</sup> Josephus is quoted by Porphyry, not in his books against the christians, but elsewhere. See the testimonies prefixed to the works of Josephus.

<sup>z</sup> Particular accounts of them are to be seen in Cav. Hist. Lit. Fabric. Gr. l. 4. cap. 6. tom. 3. p. 228, &c. Tillemont La Ruine des Juifs. art. 79. &c. Hist. des Emp. tom. i.

<sup>a</sup> De B. J. l. i. in Pro. sect. 2.

<sup>b</sup> In Proleg. sect. 5, &c. et l. 7. cap. ult. fin.

<sup>c</sup> In Vit. cap. 65. Adv. ap. l. i. c. 9.

<sup>d</sup> Ἄλλ' αυτοῖς ἀπέδωκα τοῖς αυτοκράτοσι τὰ βιβλία. Vit. sect. 65. Conf. Adv. Ap. ut supr.

<sup>e</sup> ὥτε χαραξῆς τῆ ἑαυτῆ χειρὶ τὰ βιβλία ἐημοσιενσεσθαι προσεταξεν. Vid. sec. 65.

<sup>f</sup> Ant. l. 20. cap. ult. fin.



titled, *A Discourse of the Maccabees*; but, as <sup>s</sup> Cave says, there is good reason to doubt of its genuineness: and <sup>h</sup> Mr. Whiston, who made an English translation of all the above-named works of this writer, declined to translate this, and would not publish it among the rest.

The works of Josephus, notwithstanding many things in them liable to exception, which may be observed by careful and impartial readers, are very valuable. In his larger work, *The Jewish Antiquities*, he confirms the truth of the history of the Old Testament: and, as in several of the last books of that work he has brought down the Jewish history from the ceasing of prophecy among them to the twelfth of Nero, he has let us know the state of affairs in Judea during the time of the evangelical history. And he had before done the like in the first two books of *The Jewish War*. What he has therein said of Herod and his sons, of the Roman governors in Judea, the Jewish sects and their principles, the manners of the Jewish people, and likewise concerning the Samaritans, greatly confirms and illustrates the history of our evangelists; as was formerly shown in the first part of this work, *The Credibility of the Gospel History*: the design of which was to confirm the facts occasionally mentioned in the New Testament by passages of ancient <sup>i</sup> authors.

We are now to consider, whether there is any thing in the works of this Jewish author more directly confirming the principal facts of the New Testament: particularly, whether he affords any evidences of the fulfilment of our Lord's predictions concerning the destruction of the temple and city of Jerusalem, and the great calamities coming upon the Jewish people; and whether he has said any thing of John the Baptist, our Lord's forerunner, or of our Lord himself, or of any of his apostles.

I shall begin with the first article; for it is very likely, that in his *History of the Jewish War* we should find many things giving credit to the fulfilment of our Lord's predictions concerning the Jewish people.

II. Judea was first brought into subjection to the Romans by Pompey; who, after a siege of three months, took Jerusa-

<sup>s</sup> Nihilominus ad genuinum sit Josephi opus, justa est dubitandi ratio. Cav. H. L. de Josepho, p. 35.

<sup>h</sup> See his note at the end of his Translation of Josephus.

<sup>i</sup> Quam in multis capitibus evangelistarum narrationi suffragetur Josephus, erudite nuper demonstravit Nathan'el Lardnerus in opere Anglice edito, de Fide Historiæ Evangelicæ. Lond. 1727, 8vo. 2 volum. J. A. Fabric. Lux Evangelii. p. 16. not. (A).

lem in the year 63 before the christian era, about the time of our<sup>k</sup> Midsummer. Josephus always dates<sup>l</sup> the loss of their liberty at that time. The same is said by<sup>m</sup> Tacitus.

But though the Jewish people then became subject to the Romans, and it may be said, that from that time forward the rod of heaven hung over them, they enjoyed many privileges, and the freedom of their worship, under the mild government of those masters; as appears both from Josephus, and from the historical books of the New Testament.

When Pompey became master of Jerusalem, he<sup>n</sup> and some of his officers entered into the temple, and the most holy places of it; but he took nothing away. There were then in it the table, the candlestick, with its lamps, the pouring vessels, and the censers, all of gold, and great quantities of spices, and two thousand talents in money; all which he left untouched; and the day after he gave orders that they who had the charge of the temple should cleanse it, and perform the accustomed sacrifices. And he restored the priesthood to Hyrcanus.

And that after this the Jewish people were, sometimes at least, in a flourishing condition, appears from many considerations. It was during this period that<sup>o</sup> Herod repaired the temple. Excepting the cloud of glory with which the first temple had been favoured, that erected by Herod may be reckoned to have been equal to it in the splendour and magnificence of the building, and in rich and costly presents, and other ornaments.

When the Jewish people, after their return from the Babylonish captivity, laid the foundation of the new house, “many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, wept with a loud voice,” Esr. iii. 12. But God encouraged them by the prophet Haggai, in this manner, ch. ii. 3, “Who is left among you that saw this house in its first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes, in comparison of it, as nothing? Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord——and be strong, all ye people of the land, and work; for I am

<sup>k</sup> See Prideaux, in the year before Christ 63, p. 439. And Joseph. Antiq. l. 14. c. iv. 4. De B. J. l. i. c. vii. sect. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Τετρα τε παθες τοις Ἱεροσολυμοις αιτιοι κατεσησαν Ὑρκανος και Απιτοβελος προς αλληλως πασιαζοντες. Την τε γαρ ελευθεριαν απεβαλομεν, και ὑπηκοοι Ῥωματων κατεσημεν. Antiq. l. 14. iv. 5. And compare what Agrippa says to the Jews at Jerusalem. De B. J. l. 2. c. xvi. 4. p. 187.

<sup>m</sup> Romanorum primus Cn. Pompeius Judæos domuit, templumque jure victoriæ ingressus est. Tacit. II. l. 5. c. 9.

<sup>n</sup> De B. J. l. 1. c. vii. 6. Conf. Antiq. l. 14. cap. iv.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Antiq. l. 15. cap. xi. De B. J. l. i. cap. xxi. et l. 5. cap. v.

with you, saith the Lord of hosts——For thus saith the Lord of hosts——I will shake all nations: and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith the Lord of hosts. And in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts.”

Here is undoubtedly, a renewal of the great promise concerning the coming of the Messiah, the true Shechinah, whose presence would make this second temple more glorious than the first. But here is also a gracious assurance of external grandeur and splendour. ‘Silver and gold, and all the riches of the world, says God, are mine to bestow on whom I please. And notwithstanding the present mean and despicable appearance of the building before your eyes, I will fill it with glory, and will cause it to equal, or even surpass, the former in splendour and magnificence ——“For in this place will I give peace.” My purpose is to bless you abundantly, and to give you great prosperity.’ Which gracious declaration was fulfilled.

That they were in flourishing circumstances at the time of our Lord’s preaching among them, is apparent: though they were uneasy under subjection to the Romans. Josephus continually speaks of the temple, as very grand and magnificent; and it appears to be so from his large and particular description of it, in the fifth chapter of the fifth book of his Jewish War, just before its final ruin. And when Titus, upon the fire having seized the temple, entered it, with some of his officers, he says, ‘that <sup>p</sup> Titus saw it to be far superior to the report of strangers, and not inferior to our boastings concerning it.’ And having related how it was burnt, he says, it might be justly lamented, ‘since <sup>q</sup> it was the most admirable of all the works which we have seen or heard of, for its curious structure and magnitude, and for all the wealth bestowed upon it, as well as for the reputation of its sanctity.’ And he expressly calls it <sup>r</sup> the temple that was built, or begun to be built, in the second year of Cyrus, under the direction of the prophet Haggai. And our Lord’s disciples bear wit-

<sup>p</sup> ——παρελθων μετα των ηγεμονων ενδον εθεασατο τα ναα το αγιον, και τα εν αυτω, πολυ μεν της παρα τοις αλλοφυλοις φημης αμεινω, τα δε κομπα και της παρα τοις οικειοις δοξης εκ ελαττω. De B. J. l. 6. cap. iv. 7.

<sup>q</sup> L. 6. iv. 8. Conf. l. 6. x. fin.

<sup>r</sup> Απο δε της υπερον, ην ετει δευτερω Κυρη βασιλευοντος εποιησατο Αγγαιος. L. 6. c. iv. 8.

ness to the same, in some passages that will come before us in reciting his predictions, of which we are now to take notice, and then observe the fulfilment of them.

III. We find our Lord's disciples speaking of the magnificence of the temple with admiration. So in Mark xiii. 10, "And, as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him: Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings are here! And Jesus, answering, said unto him: Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, asked him privately: Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign, when all these things shall be fulfilled? And Jesus answering them, began to say: Take heed, lest any man deceive you; for many will come in my name, and say, I am Christ. And will deceive many. And when ye shall hear of wars, and rumours of wars, be ye not troubled; for such things must needs be: but the end shall not be yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be earthquakes in divers places; and there shall be famines and troubles: these are the beginnings of sorrows—And the gospel must first be published among all nations." And ver. 14—20, "But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains. And let him that is on the house-top not go down into the house, neither enter therein, to take any thing out of his house. And let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment. But woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days. And pray ye, that your flight be not in the winter, for in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created, unto this time, neither shall be."

The like things are in St. Matthew xxiv. 1—35, "And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to him, for to show him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them: See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying: Tell us when these things shall be, and what will be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? And Jesus answered, and said unto them:

Take heed that no man deceive you; for many will come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and will deceive many. And ye will hear of wars, and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass: but the end is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there will be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are the beginnings of sorrows. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye will be hated of all nations for my name sake. And then will many be offended, and will betray one another, and will hate one another. And many false prophets will arise, and will deceive many. And, because iniquity shall abound, the love of many will wax cold; but he that shall endure to the end shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations. And then shall the end come. When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand) then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains. Let him which is on the house-top not come down to take any thing out of his house: neither let him that is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them which are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days. But pray ye, that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath-day. For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved. But for the elect's sake, those days shall be shortened. Then, if any say unto you: Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not; for there will arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that (if it were possible) they should deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth; Behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be; for wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.—Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled; Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away.”

Those inquiries of the disciples, and our Lord's answers to them, are made in private; but they plainly refer to

things said by our Lord publicly in the courts of the temple; we may do well therefore to look back to what precedes, as related in St. Matthew's gospel especially; where are recorded the many woes pronounced by our Lord upon the scribes and pharisees, and the people in general, who were under their influence and direction; Matt. xxiii. 29—39, "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous: and ye say, If we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets: wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them that killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell! Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye will kill and crucify; and some of them ye will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city; that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings! and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: for I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Compare Luke xi. 47—51.

The like things are recorded by St. Luke, ch. xxi. 5—28, a part of which I shall also transcribe here. "And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones, and gifts, he said: As for these things, which ye behold, the days will come, in the which shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And they asked him saying: Master, but when shall these things be? and what signs will there be when these things shall come to pass? And he said: Take heed that ye be not deceived; for many will come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and the time draws near: go ye not therefore after them. But when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified; for these things must first come to pass: but the end is not by and by. Then said he unto them: Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:

and great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences, and fearful sights, and great signs shall there be from heaven: but before all these things they shall lay their hands upon you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake. And it shall turn to you for a testimony——And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolk, and friends. And some of you shall they cause to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. But there shall not an hair of your head perish. In your patience possess ye your souls. And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh: then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out. And let not them that are in the country enter thereinto: for these are the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days. For there will be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people: and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations. And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

And before this, when he was making his public entrance into Jerusalem, says St. Luke, xix. 41—44, "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying: If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace! But now they are hid from thy eyes! For the days will come upon thee, that thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and will lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee: and they will not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

And afterwards, when they were leading him away to be crucified, Luke xxiii. 27—31, "And there followed him a great company of people, and of women; which also bewailed and lamented him. But Jesus, turning unto them, said: Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children; for behold the days are coming, in which they will say: Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck. Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do such things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry!"

Our Lord delivers these predictions, of which he had the foresight, with marks of great and undissembled compassion and tenderness. If all these desolations and calamities had been now present, and before his eyes, and if they had been the calamities of his best friends, he could not have been more affected. He is particularly touched with the foresight of the difficulties of such as are most helpless, the distresses of women with child, or who have infants at their breasts. This is true compassion, the effect of the sensibility of the human nature; which he is not ashamed of, and does not dissemble. And that the apprehension of these calamities, impending on the Jewish people, lay much upon his mind, is manifest from his so often speaking of them.

And there are references likewise to the calamities coming upon the Jewish people in divers parables. Luke xiii. 6—9; Matt. xxii. 1—7; Luke xiv. 17—24; Matt. xxi. 33—46; Mark xii. 1—12; Luke xx. 9—19;—Luke xix. 11—27. Compare Matt. xxv. 14—30, and also in the miracle of the barren fig-tree. Matt. xxi. 18, 19; Mark xi. 12, 13, and 20, 21.

In what has been just transcribed from the evangelists, are observable these several things:

1. Our Lord foretells the destruction of the temple and city of Jerusalem.

2. He speaks of great and extraordinary afflictions and distresses, which the Jewish people would suffer at that time.

3. He says, that the doctrine of the gospel should be preached in all the world, or all over the Roman empire, before the final ruin and overthrow of the Jewish nation.

4. He foretells, that his disciples and followers would be brought before kings and governors for his name's sake, and would suffer many hardships; and that some of them would be put to death.

5. He intimates, that among his followers there would be great declensions, and that they would betray each other.

6. He foretells, that there would be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places.

7. He speaks of wars and tumults in many places, preceding the final ruin of the Jewish nation, and as preludes of it.

8. He likewise says, that at that time, and before it, would appear many false prophets, and impostors, by whom many would be deceived; and he warns men against hearkening to them.

9. He declares that all these things would come to pass before the end of that age or generation of men.



10. He forewarns and advises those who regarded their own welfare, to flee out of Judea and Jerusalem, when they perceived the near approach of the calamities which had been spoken of by him, which they might know when they should see the Roman armies, with their idolatrous ensigns, standing were they ought not; that is, near Jerusalem, or in the land of Judea.

Of all these several things I propose to show the fulfilment: though not exactly in the order in which they have been just now mentioned.

IV. Before I enter upon the history of the fulfilment of these predictions, it may be of use to observe, in general, the dates of some events.

The war began, as<sup>s</sup> Josephus says, in the second year of the government of Gessius Florus, who succeeded Albinus, successor of Porcius Festus, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, in the month of May, in the twelfth year of the emperor Nero and the seventeenth year of Agrippa, mentioned, Acts xxv. and xxvi. that is, in the month of May, in the year of our Lord 66.

‘The<sup>t</sup> temple was burnt on the tenth day of the month of August, [in the year of Christ 70,] the same day and month on which it had been burnt by the king of Babylon.’ Which<sup>u</sup> Josephus repeats again afterwards.

The<sup>v</sup> city was taken on the eighth day of September, in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, or the year of Christ 70.

That was the end of the siege of Jerusalem, which began, as the same author<sup>w</sup> observes several times, about the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, or our April.

The war therefore lasted four years and four months, computing from May 66, to September in the year 70: and the siege lasted about five months, computing from the fourteenth day of April to the eighth of September, in the year 70. If we carry on our computation to the taking of the

<sup>s</sup> Και δη την αρχην ελαβεν ο πολειμος δευτερω μεν ετει της επιτροπης Φλωρου, δωδεκατω δε της Νερωνος αρχης. Antiq. l. 20. xi. 1

Και προσελαμβανε την αρχην ο πολειμος δωδεκατω μεν ετει της Νερωνος ηγεμονιας, επτακαιδεκατω δε της Αγριππα βασιλευιας, Αρτεμισις μηνος. De B. J. l. 2. cap. xiv. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Παρην δ' η εμιαρμενη χρονων περιοδος, ημερα δεκατη Λως μηνος, καθ' ην και το προτερον υπο τω των Βαβυλωνιων βασιλευω ενεπρησθη. De B. J. l. 6. iv. 5.

<sup>u</sup> Θαυμασαι δ' αν τις εν αυτη τη περιοδω την ακριβειαν και μηνια γων, ως εφην, και ημεραν επετηρησε την αυτην, εν η προτερον υπο Βαβυλωνιων ο ναος ενεπρησθη—η γεγονεν ετει δευτερω της Ουεσπασιανης ηγεμονιας. Ib. sect. 8.

<sup>v</sup> Εαλω μεν ουτος Ιεροσολυμι ετει δευτερω της Ουεσπασιανης ηγεμονιας, Γορπιας μηνος οχθω. Ib. l. 6. cap. x. iii.

<sup>w</sup> De B. J. l. 5. cap. iii. l. cap. xiii. 7. l. 6. cap. ix. 3.

castle of Massada, which happened in the year 73, (as we shall see hereafter,) the war lasted seven years.

V. I think it proper here also to take notice of our Lord's expressions concerning the sign whereby the approach of these calamities might be discerned, Matt. xxiv. 15, 16, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, ——stand in the holy place; then let them which be in Judea, flee to the mountains." Mark xiii. 14, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not——then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains." Luke xxi. 20, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

By "the abomination of desolation," or the abomination that maketh desolate, therefore, is intended the Roman armies with their ensigns. As the Roman ensigns, especially the eagle, which was carried at the head of every legion, were objects of worship, they are, according to the usual style of scripture, called "an abomination."

By "standing in the holy place," or "where it ought not," needs not to be understood the temple only, but Jerusalem also, and any part of the land of Israel.

There are several things in Josephus, which will confirm this interpretation. 'Pilate,<sup>x</sup> says he, 'the prefect of Judea, sending his army from Cæsarea, and putting them 'into winter quarters at Jerusalem, brought the carved 'images of Cæsar, which are in the ensigns, into the city, 'in violation of the Jewish laws; since our law forbids the 'making of images. For which reason the former govern- 'ors were wont to come into the city with ensigns destitute 'of these ornaments. Pilate was the first who set up 'images in Jerusalem: and he did it privately, the army 'making their entrance in the night time: but, as soon as 'the people knew it, they went in a large body to Cæsara, making earnest supplications that the images might 'be removed——And at length Pilate gave orders 'for bringing back the images from Jerusalem to Cæsarea.'

And not long after that, Vitellius, president of Syria, received orders from Tiberius, to attack Aretas, king of Petra; whereupon he was going to march through Judea: 'But<sup>y</sup> some of their chief men waited on him, and entreated 'him not to lead his army through their country, because 'it was contrary to their laws that any images should be 'brought into it, whereas there were a great many in his

<sup>x</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. iii. sect. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Antiq. l. 18. cap. vi. 3.

‘ army. And he hearkened to them, altered his intention, and marched his troops another way.’

Our Lord’s disciples and followers therefore might well be alarmed as soon as they saw Roman armies, with their idolatrous ensigns, appear in an hostile manner in any part of the land of Israel ; but as they approached to Jerusalem, the danger would be more imminent and pressing.

And as men unwillingly leave their native country, and their accustomed habitations, and removals are always attended with dangers and difficulties, our Lord recommends flight in very urgent terms, lest any of those who loved him, and respected his doctrine, should partake in the dreadful calamities of the siege.

VI. We now observe some events spoken of by our Lord, which would precede the great calamity coming upon the Jewish nation.

I. One is, that “ the doctrine of the gospel” should be preached throughout the Roman empire, and in other places adjoining to it.

“ And this gospel of the kingdom,” says he, “ shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations ; and then shall the end come :” Matt. xxiv. 14. “ And the gospel must first be published among all nations,” Mark xiii. 10.

And however unlikely that might seem when those words were spoken by our Lord, they were verified. The epistles of the New Testament, still extant, and written to christians in divers cities and countries, are a standing monument of it : for they are sent to believers at Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, Thessalonica, and the Hebrews ; all written by St. Paul. And the epistles of the apostle Peter are directed to christians, residing in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. And the four gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, afford evidence, that there were numerous converts to the faith of Jesus ; for they were written for the use of such. St. Paul says, Rom. xv. 19, that, “ from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, he had fully preached the gospel of Christ.” He reminds the Romans, i. 18, “ that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world.” To the Colossians he observes, “ that the gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven ;” ch. i. 23, and see ver. 6. The prediction therefore of that great event had been accomplished within the limits of the time assigned for it.

And Tacitus<sup>z</sup> bears witness that the christian religion,

<sup>z</sup> Ann. l. 15. cap. 41.

which had its rise in Judea, had spread into many parts, and had reached Rome itself, where the professors of it were numerous, and many of them underwent grievous torments in the reign of Nero, about the year of our Lord 64, and afterwards.

2. Our Lord also says to his disciples, in his prophetic discourses concerning the coming calamities upon Judea; "Before all these things they will lay their hands upon you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake—And some of you shall they cause to be put to death. And ye will be hated of all men for my name's sake," Luke xxi. 12, and 16, 17. And to the like purpose in the other evangelists.

The full accomplishment of these things is well known to christians, from the book of the Acts, and the epistles of the New Testament. The apostles of Jesus met with great difficulties in preaching the gospel: and the converts made by them were exposed to many sufferings. Peter and John, and all the apostles, were brought before the Jewish council, and were imprisoned, and beaten, and further threatened: Acts iv. Stephen, an eminent disciple and evangelist, suffered death by stoning; vi. vii. James, the brother of John, was beheaded by King Agrippa; who also shut up Peter in prison, with intention to put him to death also: but he was miraculously delivered; ch. xii. Paul was kept in prison two years in Judea, and afterwards as long at Rome. He pleaded before Felix and Festus, Roman governors in Judea, and King Agrippa the younger, as well as before the Jewish council at Jerusalem; xxi.—xxviii. And there is good reason to believe that<sup>a</sup> he was brought before Nero himself. Many of his sufferings and dangers are enumerated in 2 Cor xi. 23—33.

They who received the doctrine taught by the apostles, had also their share of afflictions and trials. Paul, whilst he was their enemy, "made havoc of the church, entering into every house; and, haling men and women, committed them to prison: and when they were put to death he gave his voice against them:—He punished them in every synagogue, and persecuted them even into strange cities:" Acts viii. 3, and xxvi. 10, 11. And in his epistle to the Hebrews, he observes to them, that "they had endured a great fight of afflictions: partly whilst they were made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly whilst

<sup>a</sup> See that fully proved in *The Supplement to the Credibility, &c.* in this Vol. ch. xii. sect. 10.

they became companions of those who were so used; and that they had joyfully taken the spoiling of their goods: ch. x. 32—34. And Agrippa, before mentioned, began with “laying his hands upon certain of the church;” Acts xii. 1. And that the believers suffered afflictions in other places beside Judea, is manifest from 2 Thess. i. 3—6; James ii. 5—7; 2 Pet. iv. 12—19. And the Jews at Rome, whom Paul sent for to come to him, say; “As concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against.”

Tacitus confirms the truth of these predictions of our Lord. He has given a particular account of the sufferings of many christians at Rome, before the desolations of Judea. In the tenth year of Nero, the sixty-fourth of our Lord, there happened a great fire at Rome. Nero was suspected to have set it on fire himself. ‘For’ suppressing that ‘common rumour, Nero procured others to be accused, and ‘inflicted exquisite punishments upon those people, who ‘were in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly ‘known by the name of Christians.’ And he says, that ‘they were condemned, not so much for the crime of burn- ‘ing the city, as for their enmity to mankind.’ Thus Tacitus bears witness, not only to their undeserved sufferings, but also to the reproaches they underwent, agreeably to what our blessed Lord has said, that “they would be hated of all men for his name’s sake.” However, these innocent sufferers had their supports: for their unerring Master, all whose words were true, has said; “Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.”

3. Further, our Lord intimates, that before the full accomplishment of his predictions concerning the miseries coming upon the Jewish nation, there would be declensions of zeal among his own professed disciples and followers.

“And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another—and because iniquity will abound, the love of many will wax cold;” Matt. xxiv. 10, 12, and see Mark xiii. 12, 13, and Luke xxi. 16.

What is said of this matter in the gospels may be verified from the epistles of the New Testament. The whole epistle to the Hebrews is an argument to steadfastness, implying the great danger of apostasy from the faith, or of abatements of zeal for it: “Let us,” says he, “hold fast

° Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et exquisitissimis pœnis affecit, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus christianos appellabat—Igitur primo correpti qui fitebantur; deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti sunt, &c. Ann. 15. c. 44.

the profession of our faith without wavering——And let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; Heb. x. 23—25; and onwards to ver. 39. And ch. xii. 12, “Wherefore lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees.” In ch. vi. 4—9, he shows the great guilt, and the deplorable condition, of such as apostatize. In his second epistle to Timothy, ch. i. 15; “This thou knowest,” says he, “that all they which are of Asia [probably meaning such as were then at Rome] are turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.” And afterwards, ch. iv. 16, he complains of other christians at Rome who deserted him when he made his appearance there before Nero. “At my first answer [or apology] no man stood with me: but all men forsook me.” And again, in the same epistle, ch. ii. 17, he speaks of Hymeneus and Philetus: “who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some:” and see I Tim. i. 19, 20. I allege nothing more from the books of the New Testament.

Tacitus, in his account of Nero’s persecution of the christians already quoted more than once, does also confirm the truth of this prediction of our Lord: who says that ‘at first they only were apprehended, who confessed themselves to be of that sect: afterwards, many more were taken up, whom they discovered to be of their number.’

Nor ought this to be thought exceeding strange, notwithstanding the perfection of the christian doctrine, and the evidences of its truth. For, in a great number of men, it is very likely that some should be overcome by the difficulties and dangers attending the profession of it. So says the chief sower of his heavenly doctrine: “some seed fell in stony places. The same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it: yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended.”

4. Our blessed Lord said that before the great calamity, predicted by him, there would be “famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places.”

We know, from the history in the Acts of the Apostles, that there was a famine in Judea in the time of the emperor Claudius; ch. xi. 25—30. It was not an accidental scarcity at Jerusalem only, but it was a famine all over that country. It began in the fourth year of that emperor, and lasted se-

<sup>c</sup> Igitur primo correpti, qui fatebantur; deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, &c. Ann. 15 c. 44.

veral years. We have a particular account of it in <sup>d</sup> Josephus. He also says it was a very severe <sup>e</sup> famine. And in another place <sup>f</sup> he mentions the high price of corn at that season; and says that this famine happened in the reign of Claudius, not long before the war.

That famine is also taken notice of by Eusebius in <sup>g</sup> his Chronicle, and <sup>h</sup> in his History, and by <sup>i</sup> Orosius.

There was also a famine at Rome, and in Italy, mentioned <sup>k</sup> by Dion Cassius, which began in the first year of Claudius, and continued in the next year.

There was another famine in the same reign, mentioned <sup>l</sup> by Tacitus and <sup>m</sup> Eusebius; which seems to have been chiefly in the tenth or eleventh year of that emperor.

To all these <sup>n</sup> Suetonius seems to refer, though he does not mention the years in which they happened.

Concerning the famines in the reign of the emperor Claudius, some <sup>o</sup> modern historians and chronologers might be consulted.

Our Lord speaks also of “pestilences.” By Josephus we are informed that, about the year of Christ 40, there was <sup>p</sup> a pestilence at Babylon, in which the Jews suffered.

In the <sup>q</sup> sixty-fifth year of the christian æra there was a great mortality at Rome. At the same time there were other calamities in divers parts of the Roman empire, as we learn from <sup>r</sup> Tacitus and <sup>s</sup> Suetonius, as well as from <sup>t</sup> Orosius, who might transcribe from them.

<sup>d</sup> Ant. l. 20. ii. 6.

<sup>e</sup> *Επι τριστοις διη και μεγαλυμον κατα*

*την Ιερουσαλημ συνεβη γενεσθαι.* Ib. cap. v. 2.

<sup>f</sup> — *α μην αλλα και τα δε τα πολεμια μικρον εμπροσθεν, Κλαυδιου Ρωμαιων αρχοντος, και λιμου την χωραν ημων καταλαβοντος, ως τεσσαρων δραχμων πολεισθαι τον ασταρωνα.* Ant. l. 3. xv. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Chr. p. 160.

<sup>h</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. xii.

<sup>i</sup> Or. l. 7. cap. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Dio. l. 60. p. 671. al. §49.

<sup>l</sup> *Frugum quoque egestas, et orta ex eo fames, in prodigium accipiebatur.* Tac. Ann. l. 12. c. 43.

<sup>m</sup> *Fames facta in Græciâ. Modius sex drachmis venundatus est.* — *Magna fames Romæ.* Chr. p. 160. infr. m.

<sup>n</sup> *Aretiore autem annonâ propter assiduas sterilitates, &c.* Suet. Claud. c. 18. Vid. et cap. 19, et 20.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Pagi, A. D. 72. n. vii. Reinari Annot. ad Dion. Cass. p. 948. See also Credib. P. i. B. i. ch. x.

<sup>p</sup> — *φθορα εν Βαβυλωνι εγενετο αυτων.* Ant. l. 18. ix. 8.

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Pagi, A. D. 67. n. iii.

<sup>r</sup> *Tot facinoribus fœdum annum etiam Dii tempestatibus et morbis insignaverunt. Vastata Campania turbine ventorum, qui villas, arbusta, fruges passim disjecit, pertulitque violentiam ad vicina urbi; in quâ omne mortalium genus vis pestilentiae depopulabatur, nullâ cœli intemperie, quæ occurreret oculis. Sed domus corporibus exanimis, itinera funeribus complebantur. Non sexus, non ætas periculo vacua. Servitia perinde ac ingenua plebes raptim exstingui, inter conjugum et liberorum lamenta; qui dum assident, dum deflent, sæpe*

—and “earthquakes.”

Tacitus<sup>u</sup> speaks of an earthquake at Rome in the time of Claudius, and of another<sup>v</sup> at Apamea in the same reign.

In the reign of Nero there was an earthquake at Laodicea, mentioned by<sup>w</sup> Tacitus; and likewise by<sup>x</sup> Eusebius in his Chronicle; who says that in Asia three cities, namely, Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse, were overturned by an earthquake. And in like manner<sup>y</sup> Orosius. Possibly the earthquake, which was most violent at Laodicea, was felt in the other cities likewise.

In the same reign there was an earthquake in Campania mentioned by<sup>z</sup> Tacitus and<sup>a</sup> Seneca. By the former it seems to be placed in the year of Christ, 62, by the latter in the year 63. And there may have been other earthquakes in the time of the just-mentioned emperors.

5. Our Lord foretells “wars and commotions” preceding the final ruin: Matt. xxiv. 6; Mark xiii. 7; Luke xxi. 9.

Josephus<sup>b</sup> has a long story of a disturbance in Mesopotamia, occasioned by the ambition and indiscretion of two

eodem rogo cremabantur. Equitum, senatorumque interitus, quamvis promiscui, minus flebiles erant, tanquam communi mortalitate sævitiam principis prævenirent. Tacit. Ann. 16. cap. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Accesserunt tantis ex principe malis, probrisque, quædam et fortuita: pestilentia unius autumnî, quo triginta funerum millia in rationem Libitinæ venerunt; clades Brittannica, quâ duo præcipua oppida, magnâ civium sociorumque cæde direpta sunt: ignominia ad Orientem, legionibus in Armeniâ sub jugum missis, ægreque Syriâ retentâ. Sueton. Nero. cap. 39.

<sup>t</sup> Oros. l. 7. c. 7. <sup>u</sup> Multa eo anno prodigia evenere. Insessum diris avibus Capitolium; crebris terræ motibus prorutæ domus. Ann. 12. cap. 43. <sup>v</sup> Tributumque Apamiensibus, terræ motu convulsis, id quinquennium remissum. Id. l. 12. c. 58.

<sup>w</sup> Eodem anno ex illustribus Asiæ urbibus Laodicea, tremore prolapsa, nullo a nobis remedio, propriis viribus revaluit. Ib. l. 14. c. 27.

<sup>x</sup> In Asiâ tres urbes terræ motu conciderunt. Laodicea, Hierapolis, Colossæ. Ens. Chr. p. 161.

<sup>y</sup> Oros. l. 7. cap. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Iisdemque Consulibus gymnasium ictu fulminis conflagravit, effigiesque in eo Neronis ad informe æs liquefacta. Et motu terræ celebre Campaniæ oppidum Pompeii magnâ ex parte proruit. Ann. l. 15. c. 22.

<sup>a</sup> Pompeios, celebrem Campaniæ urbem—desedisse terræ motu, vexatis quâcumque adjacentibus regionibus, Lucili virorum optime, audivimus: et quidem diebus hibernis, quos vacare a tali periculo majores nostri solebant promittere. Nonis Febr. fuit motus hic, Regulo et Virgilio Consulibus, qui Campaniam nunquam securam hujus mali, indemnem tamen, et toties defunctam metu, magnâ strage vastavit. Nam et Herculaniensis oppidi pars ruit, dubieque stant etiam quæ relicta sunt. Et Nucirinorum colonia, ut sine clade, ita non sine querelâ est. Neapolis quoque privatim multa, publice nihil amisit, leviter ingenti malo perstricta. Villæ vero præruptæ passim sine injuriâ tremuere. Adjiciunt his sexcentarum ovium gregem exanimatum, et divisis statuas, &c. Sen. Not. Qu. l. 6. c. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. l. 18. cap. ix.



Jews, who were brothers. It seems to have happened <sup>c</sup> about the year of Christ 40. Josephus says it <sup>d</sup> was not inferior to any calamity which the Jews had suffered hitherto; and that it <sup>e</sup> occasioned the death of more than fifty thousand people.

When Cuspius Fadus came procurator into Judea, in the reign of Claudius, in the year of Christ 44 or 45, as <sup>f</sup> Josephus says, 'he found the Jews in Peræa in a riot fighting with the Philadelphians about the limits of the village Mia. And indeed the people of Peræa had taken up arms without the consent of their chief men, and had killed a good number of the Philadelphians. When Fadus heard of it, he was much displeas'd that they had taken up arms, and had not left the decision of the dispute to him, if they thought the Philadelphians had done them any injury. Three of the principal men, who were the causes of the sedition, were apprehended and put in prison, one of whom was afterwards put to death, and the two others banish'd.'

Afterwards, in the year of our Lord 49, whilst Cumanus was procurator of Judea, there <sup>g</sup> happened a tumult at Jerusalem at the time of Passover. The number of Jews that perished in it was not less than twenty thousand, as it is in his Antiquities; but in the Jewish War the number is no more than ten thousand.

Whilst Cumanus was yet in Judea there <sup>h</sup> happened a disturbance between the Jews and the Samaritans, in which many were killed on both sides.

Josephus also says that <sup>i</sup> under Cumanus the troubles of the Jewish people began, and that in his time they suffered very much.

These disturbances went on increasing. At Cæsarea there had long been contentions between the Jewish people and the other inhabitants. 'And,' as <sup>k</sup> Josephus says, 'in one hour's time more than twenty thousand Jews were de-

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Usser. A. P. J. 4753. p. 864. Basnag. ann. 40. n. xiii. Tillen. Ruine des Juifs. art. xxviii.

<sup>d</sup> Γίνεται δε και περι της εν τη Μεσοποταμια και μαλιτα την Βαβυλωνια οικουσας Ισδαιας συμφορα δεινη, και εδειμας ης τινος ελασσων. φονος τε αυτων πολυς, και οπισσος εχ' ισορημενος προτερον. Ib. sect. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Ib. sect. 9.

<sup>f</sup> Ant. 1. 20. cap. i. 1.

<sup>g</sup> Antiq. 1. 20. c. v. 3. De B. J. 1. 2. c. xii. 1.

<sup>h</sup> Antiq. 1. 20. vi. 1. De B. J. 1. 2. xii. 3.

<sup>i</sup> ————εφ' ου θορυβοι τε ηρξαντο, και φθορα παλιν Ισδαιων εγενετο. De B. J. 1. 2. c. xii. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Της δε αυτης ημερας και ωρας, ωσπερ εκ δαιμονις προνοιας, ανηρθν οι Καισαρις της παρ' αυτας Ισδαιας ως υπο μιαν ωραν αποσφαγγηται μεν υπερ δισμυριας, κινωθηται δε πασαν των Ισδαιων Καισαρειαν. De B. J. 1. 2. cap. xviii. 1.

stroyed, and all Cæsarea was at once emptied of its Jewish inhabitants. Some fled, whom Florus caught, and sent them bound to the galleys: at which the whole nation was enraged. They therefore divided themselves into several parties, and laid waste the villages of the Syrians, and their neighbouring cities Philadelphia, Sebonitis, Gerasa, Pella, and Scythopolis: and after them Gadara and Hippos: and falling upon Gaulanitis, some cities they demolished there, others they set on fire. Then they went to Kedessa, belonging to the Syrians, and to Ptolemais, and Gaba, and Cæsarea. Nor was Sebaste or Ascalon able to withstand the violence with which they were attacked. When they had burnt these to the ground, they demolished Anthedon and Gaza. Many also of the villages round about these cities were plundered; and an immense slaughter was made of the men found in them.’

‘The<sup>l</sup> Syrians destroyed not a less number of the Jews: so that the disorders all over Syria were terrible. For every city was divided into parties armed against each other; and the safety of the one depended upon the destruction of the other. The days were spent in slaughter, and the nights in terrors, which were the worst of the two. It was common to see cities filled with dead bodies, lying unburied, those of old men mixed with infants, all dead and scattered about promiscuously, and women without covering for their nakedness.’

‘At<sup>m</sup> Scythopolis the contention was carried so far, that above thirteen thousand Jews were killed.’

‘After that,<sup>n</sup> other cities also rose up against the Jews that were among them. They of Ascalon slew two thousand and five hundred; they of Ptolemais two thousand, and put many others into prison. The Tyrians acted in the likemanner; as did also Hippos and Gadara and divers other cities of Syria.’

‘At<sup>o</sup> Alexandria fifty thousand lay dead in heaps: nor would the remainder have been spared if they had not petitioned for mercy.’

Not long after that, the<sup>p</sup> men of Damascus having got the Jewish inhabitants into the place of exercise, *εν τῷ γυμνασίῳ*, they came upon them unarmed, and slew ten thousand in an hour’s time.

These are what our Lord calls “the beginning of sorrows,” when there were “wars and rumours of wars, one people and nation rising up against another. The end was not yet.” Jerusalem was not yet besieged, nor the people

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. sect. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Ib. sect. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. sect. 5.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. sect. 7, 8.

<sup>p</sup> De B. J. l. 2. c. xx. sect. 2.

in it shut up for universal destruction. But that period was nigh. See Matt. xxiv. 6—8; Mark xiii. 7, 8; Luke xxi. 9, 10.

VII. And now I think it may not be improper for us to take notice of Josephus's accounts of the occasion of the war.

Giving an account of the contentions of the Jews and Greeks, or Syrians, at Cæsarea, where the latter obtained a decree from Nero that the government of the city belonged to them, he says: 'And this<sup>q</sup> occasioned the war which began in the twelfth year of Nero.' Soon after which the Jews at Cæsarea were treated very contemptuously and injuriously, till they were all destroyed, as he there proceeds to relate; and we have already in part transcribed from him.

In the last chapter of the Jewish Antiquities he complains much of Albinus, and still more of Florus, who succeeded him, and exceeded him in avarice and cruelty: insomuch, that the Jews were ready to consider Albinus as a benefactor. 'Finally,'<sup>r</sup> says he, 'without adding any thing more, it was Florus who compelled us to take up arms against the Romans, thinking it better to be destroyed all at once than by little and little.'

In his own life he says: 'I<sup>s</sup> have mentioned all these things to show that the Jews' war with the Romans was not their own choice, but rather that they were compelled by necessity.'

In another place he says: 'And<sup>t</sup> at the temple Eleazar, son of Ananias the high-priest, a young man of a daring temper, and then governor, persuaded those who officiated in the divine service not to accept of the gift or sacrifice of a foreigner. That was the origin of the war with the Romans: for thus they rejected the sacrifice of Cæsar for them.' [That is, as I apprehend, they refused to offer prayers and sacrifices, as subjects ought to do, for the emperor, and for the prosperity of the Roman empire.] 'And though many of the high-priests, and of the principal men of the nation,

<sup>q</sup> Εν δε τετρω και οι Καισαρων 'Ελληνες νικησαντες παρι Νερωνι της πολεως αρχην, τα της κρισεως εκομισαν γραμματα. Και προσελαμβανε την αρχην ο πολεμος δωδεκατω μεν ετει της Νερωνος ηγεμονιας. De B. J. l. 2. c. xiv. 4. <sup>r</sup> Και τι δει πλειω λεγειν; Τον γαρ προς 'Ρωμαις πολεμον ο καταναγκασας ημας αρασθαι, Φλωρος ην, κρειττον ηγεμενους αθροους, η κατ' ολιγον απολεσθαι. Antiq. l. 20. xi. 1.

<sup>s</sup> ——— οτι η προαιρεσις εγενετο τω πολεμω προς 'Ρωμαις Ιουδαιις, αλλα το πλεον αναγκη. Vit. sect. 6.

<sup>t</sup> ——— αναπειθει μηδενος αλλοφυλες δωρον η θυσιαν προσδεχεσθαι. Τωτο δε ην τω προς 'Ρωμαις πολεμω καταβολη. Την γαρ υπερ τετρων θυσιαν Καισαρος απεβριψαν. De B. J. 2. xvii. 2.

earnestly entreated them not to omit the customary respect for their governors, they could not prevail.’

Afterwards, near the conclusion of his *History of the Jewish War*, when the city was actually taken, he says : ‘ But <sup>u</sup> that which principally encouraged them to the war, was an ambiguous oracle, found also in their sacred writings, that about this time some one from their country should obtain the empire of the world. This they understood to belong to themselves ; and many of the wise men were mistaken in their judgment about it : for the oracle intended the government of Vespasian, who was proclaimed emperor in Judea.’

That is a very remarkable passage : some farther notice shall be taken of it by and by.

That the Jewish people were uneasy under subjection to the Romans, even in our Saviour’s time, long before the war broke out, appears from many things recorded in the gospels : as their great aversion to the publicans, though Jews, who were employed in collecting the Roman tribute ; from the question brought to our Saviour “ whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not :” *Matt.* xxii. 15—22 ; *Mark* xiii. 13—17 ; *Luke* xx. 19—26 ; from the attempt of some who followed our Lord for a time to make him a king : *John* vi. 15 : from their frequent and importunate demands that he would “ show them a sign from heaven ;” meaning some token that he intended to work out for them a temporal deliverance, “ that they might believe in him,” and have full assurance of his being the Christ : *Matt.* xii. 38 ; xvi. 1—4 ; and elsewhere : and from divers other things, which must be obvious to all who have read the gospels with attention.

This uneasiness under the Roman yoke continued and increased. Observable here is the answer which was made by Titus, after the temple was burnt, to the petition of Simon and John, the two great leaders of the factions in Jerusalem : ‘ You <sup>v</sup> have never ceased rebelling since Pompey first made a conquest of your country : and at length ‘ you have declared open war against the Romans.—Our ‘ kindness to you has encouraged your enmity against us ; ‘ who have let you live in your country in peace and quiet- ‘ ness. In the first place we gave you your own country to ‘ live in, and set over you kings of your own nation ; and far- ‘ ther, we preserved to you your own laws : and withal we ‘ have permitted you to live either by yourselves, or among ‘ others, as you liked best. And, which is the greatest favour

<sup>u</sup> De B. J. l. 6. cap. v. 4.

<sup>v</sup> De B. l. 6. cap. vi. 2.

‘ of all, we have given you leave to gather up that tribute  
 ‘ which you pay to God, together with all such other gifts  
 ‘ as are dedicated to him. Nor have we called those to ac-  
 ‘ count who carried such donations, nor given them any  
 ‘ obstruction: till at length you became richer than our-  
 ‘ selves, even when you were our enemies, and you have  
 ‘ made preparations for the war against us with our own  
 ‘ money.’

There are other things likewise in Josephus, which deserve to be taken notice of in this place. Giving an account of the assessment made in Judea after the removal of Archelaus, he says: ‘ At<sup>w</sup> the persuasion of Joazar the high-priest, the Jews did generally acquiesce. However, Judas the Gaulanite, of the town called Gamala, associating to himself Sadduc a pharisee, excited the people to rebellion, telling them that an assessment would bring in downright slavery, and exhorting the whole nation to assert their liberty. The whole nation heard their discourses with incredible pleasure. And it is impossible to represent the evils the nation has suffered, which were owing to these men: for Judas and Sadduc brought in among us this fourth sect: and there being many who embraced their sentiments, they not only caused disturbances in the government at that time, but laid the foundation of those evils which followed: which indeed are owing to this principle, till then unknown among us.’

He then delivers the character and principles of the three chief and more ancient sects of the Jews, as he calls them: and after that returns again to the men of whom he had been speaking before. ‘ Judas<sup>x</sup> the Galilean was the leader of the fourth sect. In all other points they hold the same sentiments with the pharisees: but they have an invincible affection for liberty, and acknowledge God alone their Lord and Governor. From that time the nation became infected with this principle: and Florus, by abusing his power when he was governor, threw them into despair, and provoked them to rebel against the Romans.’

Those two passages were cited by<sup>y</sup> me formerly; and divers observations were made upon them, which still appear to me not impertinent. But I am unwilling to repeat them here: and I think that, in the connection in which they are now cited by me, it must be apparent from them, without farther remarks, that the nation in general was infected with the doctrine of Judas of Galilee. They had an

<sup>w</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. i. sect. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. sect. 6.

<sup>y</sup> Vol. i. p. 228, &c.

invincible zeal for liberty, scorned subjection to the Romans, their masters, and took up arms against them. As Capellus says, ‘Florus,<sup>z</sup> by his exactions, forced them ‘against their consent, or rather drove them who were already disposed to it, and wanted no incitement to rebel ‘against the Romans.’

I would now take farther notice of the passage above cited, wherein our Jewish historian says, ‘what principally encouraged them to the war was an ambiguous oracle found in their sacred writings, that about that time some one from their own country should obtain the empire of the world.’

The truth and importance of that observation, as I apprehend, may be confirmed and illustrated by the accounts which Josephus has given of numerous impostors or false prophets, which arose among them about this time, agreeable to our Lord’s predictions, as I shall now show.

‘Whilst<sup>a</sup> Fadus was procurator of Judea, a certain impostor, called<sup>b</sup> Theudas, persuaded a very great multitude, taking their effects with them, to follow him to the river Jordan: assuring them that he was a prophet, and that, causing the river to divide at his command, he would give them an easy passage over: by such speeches he deceived many. But Fadus was far from suffering them to go on in their madness; for he sent out a troop of horse, who, coming upon them unexpectedly, slew many, and took many prisoners. Theudas himself was among the last mentioned. They cut off his head and brought it to Jerusalem. These things happened in Judea whilst Cuspius Fadus was procurator.’

Fadus was sent into Judea by the emperor Claudius, after the death of Herod Agrippa. This affair of Theudas therefore must be rightly placed in the year of Christ 45 or 46.

That is transcribed from the twentieth and last book of the Antiquities. In the same book afterwards, in another chapter, in the history of transactions in the time of Nero, Josephus says; ‘But<sup>c</sup> affairs in Judea went on continually growing worse and worse. The country was again filled with robbers and impostors, who deceived the people; but Felix time after time apprehended and put to death many of

<sup>z</sup> Florus, pessimus homo, qui modis omnibus Judæos cum vexaret et opprimeret, cogit vel invitos, aut potius ultro ruentes impulit, adversus Romanos rebellare. L. Capp. Hist. Jud. p. 121.

<sup>a</sup> Ant. l. 20. cap. v. 1.

<sup>b</sup> That Theudas is different from him mentioned by Gamaliel, Acts v. 36, as was shown formerly, Vol. i. B. ii. ch. vii.

<sup>c</sup> Antiq. l. 20. cap. viii. 5.

them.' A little lower: 'And<sup>d</sup> indeed, by means of the crimes committed by the robbers, the city was filled with all sorts of impiety: and impostors and deceivers persuaded the people to follow them into the wilderness; where, as they said, they should see manifest wonders and signs performed by the providence of God. And many hearkening unto them, at length suffered the punishment of their folly: for Felix fetched them back and punished them. About the same time there came a man out of Egypt to Jerusalem, who said he was a prophet: and having persuaded a good number of the meaner sort of people to follow him to the mount of Olives, he told them that thence they should see the walls of Jerusalem fall down at his command, and promised through them to give them entrance into the city. But Felix being informed of these things, ordered his soldiers to their arms; and, marching out of Jerusalem with a large body of horse and foot, he fell upon the Egyptian, and killed four hundred of them, and took two hundred prisoners: but the Egyptian, getting out of the fight, escaped.'

This same story is also in *The War*, with some differences in the numbers, which were considered<sup>e</sup> formerly.

There the account concludes in this manner: 'When<sup>f</sup> they came to engage, the Egyptian fled, followed by a few only. A large part of those who were with him were either slain or taken prisoners. The rest of the multitude, being scattered, shifted for themselves as they could.'

This is supposed to have happened in the year of Christ 55.

In *The War*, in the paragraph preceding his account of the Egyptian impostor, having just before related how Judea then abounded with robbers, called Sicarii, he says: 'Beside<sup>g</sup> them, there was another body of wicked men, whose hands indeed were cleaner, but their intentions were as impious; who disturbed the happy state of the city no less than those murderers. For deceivers and impostors, under a pretence of divine inspiration, aiming at changes and innovations, made the people mad: and induced them to follow them into the wilderness, pretending that God would there give them signs and wonders. Felix judging these proceedings to be no less than the beginning of a revolt, sent out his soldiers, both horse and foot, and destroyed great numbers of them.'

In the fore-cited chapter of the twentieth book of the *Antiquities*, speaking of the robbers in the time of Por-

<sup>d</sup> *Ib.* sect. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. i. ch. viii.

<sup>f</sup> *De B. J.* l. 2. c. xiii. 5.

<sup>g</sup> *Ib.* sect. 4.

cus Festus, about the year of Christ 60, he says that ‘he<sup>h</sup> also sent out both horse and foot to fall upon those who had been seduced by a certain impostor, who had promised them deliverance and freedom from the miseries under which they laboured, if they would but follow him into the wilderness. The forces destroyed him that had deceived them, and those that followed him.’

Josephus speaks of six thousand who perished in the outer courts of the temple after it had been set on fire. ‘The<sup>i</sup> soldiers,’ says he, ‘set fire to the portico; whereupon some threw themselves headlong down the precipice, others perished in the flames: and not one out of so great a number escaped. A false prophet was the occasion of the ruin of those people, who on that very day had made proclamation in the city, assuring them that God commanded them to go up to the temple, where they would receive signs of deliverance. And indeed there were then many prophets suborned by the tyrants to impose upon the people, and telling them that they ought to wait for help from God.’

And presently after, proceeding to relate the omens and prodigies foresignifying the calamities coming upon the Jewish people, and the city of Jerusalem, which shall be recited by and by, he says: ‘Impostors,<sup>k</sup> who spake lies in the name of God, deceived this miserable people. They neither attended to, nor believed, the manifest signs foresignifying the coming desolation: but like infatuated men who have neither eyes to see, nor minds to perceive, they neglected the divine denunciations.’

So truly did our Lord say: “I am come in my Father’s name, and ye receive me not. If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive:” John v. 43.

Our blessed Lord says, Matt. xxiv. 24, “For there will arise false christs, and false prophets, and will show great signs and wonders, insomuch that (if it were possible) they will deceive the very elect.” But our Lord does not intend to say that any of those false prophets would exhibit or perform great wonders. The original word is *δωσσει*, they will give: the same word that is in the Septuagint version of Deut. xiii. 1, “If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and he giveth thee a sign, or a wonder; *και δω σοι σημειον η τερας*, that is, shall propose, or promise, some sign or wonder, as the sequel shows. Parallel with the text just cited from St. Matthew is Mark xiii. 22, “For false christs and false prophets will arise, and will show

<sup>h</sup> Ant. l. 20. cap. viii. sect. 10.

<sup>i</sup> De B. J. l. 6. cap. v. sect. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. sect. 3



signs and wonders," the same word again, *καὶ ἔωσθαι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*, "in order to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect."

The accounts which Josephus has given of the impostors in his time, show the exact accomplishment of these predictions of our Lord: "They persuaded the people to follow them into the wilderness, where, as they said, they would see manifest signs and wonders, performed by the power of God:" or, assuring them, "that God would there give them signs and wonders:" or, that "they should there receive signs of deliverance," and the like.

The passages of Josephus bear witness to the fulfilment of our Lord's prediction, "that many false prophets would arise, and deceive many," Matt. xxiv. 11.

Our Lord does also say there, at ver. 5, "And many will come in my name saying, I am Christ: and will deceive many." And it is easy to believe that<sup>1</sup> some of the many false prophets did expressly take to themselves that title, though Josephus does not say it. But whether they did or not, our Saviour's predictions are verified in the appearance of those false prophets. 'Josephus,' says<sup>m</sup> archbishop Tillotson, 'mentions several of these; of whom, though he does not expressly say that they called themselves the Messias, yet he says that which is equivalent—that they undertook to rescue the people from the Roman yoke. Which was the thing which the Jews expected the Messias would do for them. And therefore we find that the disciples who were going to Emmaus, and knew not that Christ was risen, and were doubtful what to think of him, say: "We hoped this had been he that should have redeemed Israel:" that is, they hoped this had been the Messias; that being, it seems, a common periphrasis of the Messias, that he was "he that was to deliver Israel."' Which is agreeable to a note of<sup>n</sup> Grotius upon the place. All they therefore, who pretended that they were inspired, and sent by God to deliver the Jewish people, were indeed "false Christs." They took upon themselves the character of the Messiah.

We may now readily admit the truth of what Josephus says in the passage transcribed not long ago: 'That what principally excited the Jewish people, the wise men, as he

<sup>1</sup> See Tillemont, Ruine des Juifs, art. 36. A. D. 52.

<sup>m</sup> Vol. iii. p. 552.

<sup>n</sup> Christi nomiae populus judæicus intelligebat vindicem libertatis. Nam illud, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐλπίζομεν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ μελλῶν λυτρωθῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, descriptio est nominis Christi. Quare quicumque se missos divinitus liberatores populi judæici dicebant, eo ipso Christos se profitebantur, et erant ψευδοχριστοὶ, &c. Grot. in Matt. xxiv. 5.

calls them, as well as others, to the war with the Romans, was the expectation of a great deliverer to arise among them, who should obtain the empire of the world.' This great deliverer was the Messiah. The numerous "false prophets" and "false Christs," of whom Josephus speaks so frequently and so distinctly, are full proofs of it.

The expectation of the coming of the Messiah, about the time of the appearance of Jesus, was universal, and had been so for some<sup>o</sup> while. But with the idea of a prophet, or extraordinary teacher of religion, they had joined also that of a worldly king and conqueror, who should deliver the Jewish people from the burdens under which they laboured, raise them to a state of independence, and bring the nations of the earth into subjection to them, to be ruled and tyrannized over by them; and because our Lord did not perform, nor attempt this, they rejected and crucified him. If he would but have assumed the state and character of an earthly prince, scribes and pharisees, priests and people, would all have joined themselves to him, and have put themselves under his banner. Of this we see many proofs in the gospels. This disposition prevailed to the last. The people therefore, though they had already met with many disappointments, when our Lord entered into Jerusalem, in no greater state than riding upon an ass, accompanied him with loud acclamations, and other tokens of respect, saying: "Hosanna to the son of David. Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord." And Jesus, our Lord, not assuming then the character of an earthly prince, was a fresh disappointment, and left deep resentments; which rendered them susceptible of the worst impressions from the chief priests, and their other rulers. And at their instigation they desired Pilate, the Roman governor, to set Barabbas at liberty, and crucify Jesus. With which clamorous and importunate demand he at length complied, still bearing testimony to the innocence of him whom he unwillingly condemned. The account of St. Matthew alone, without any other, will suffice for showing this amazing transaction: "Pilate saith unto them: What shall I do then with Jesus, who is called Christ? They all say unto him: Let him be crucified. The governor said: Why? what evil has he done? But they cried out the more, saying: Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he prevailed nothing, and that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying: I am inno-

<sup>o</sup> Proofs of this, together with divers remarks, may be seen in Vol. i. p. 138, &c.

cent from the blood of this just person : see ye to it. Then answered all the people: His blood be upon us, and our children. Then released he Barabbas unto them. And when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified :” Matt. xxvii. 22—26.

The continued expectation of the Messiah, as a worldly king and conqueror, as we have just seen in Josephus, and their uneasiness under the Roman yoke, were the immediate occasions of their rebelling against the authority to which they were then subject. And the same principles that induced them to reject and crucify Jesus, brought upon them their utter and final ruin.

As the sin of the Jewish people in rejecting and crucifying Jesus, after a life of perfect innocence and consummate virtue, after speaking as no man had done before, and doing works which no other man had done at Jerusalem, and in every part of the land of Israel ; after such preparations as had been made for his reception by the prophets, and by the testimony of John the Baptist, his forerunner : was<sup>p</sup> very great and aggravated : and as they rejected the renewed offers of mercy, and repeated and earnest calls to repentance made by Christ’s apostles, and went on increasing in wickedness ; God at length suffered the Romans to come upon them with an armed force, demolished their temple, and made desolate their city, and their whole country, with many circumstances of uncommon and even unparalleled distress. All which having been foreseen and often foretold by the Lord Jesus in his public discourses, the accomplishment of these predictions, in the event, is an argument of great force in favour of his divine mission, and of his being indeed the Messiah, additional to the excellent doctrine and wonderful works of his ministry.

VIII. Having shown the occasion and causes of the war, and having also observed the several things foretold by the Lord Jesus, as preceding it, I now proceed to The History of the War itself, collecting it from Josephus, and making my extracts in his own words.

The disturbances still increasing at Jerusalem, and the animosity against Florus being very great, ‘ Cestius Gallus,’<sup>q</sup> president of Syria, judged it not proper for him to lie still

<sup>p</sup> “ If ye were blind, ye should have no sin : but now you say, we see, therefore your sin remaineth :” John ix. 41. “ If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin : but now they have no cloak for their sin. If I had not done among them the works which no other man did, they had not had sin : but now they have both seen, and hated, both me and my Father :” John xv. 22—24.

<sup>q</sup> De B. J. l. 2. cap. xviii. sect. 9.

any longer; he therefore determined to march into Judea: whereupon he took out of Antioch the twelfth legion entire, and out of the rest two thousand chosen men, with six cohorts of foot, and four troops of horse, beside the auxiliaries which were sent by the kings: of which Antiochus sent two thousand horse, and three thousand foot, all archers. Agrippa sent a thousand horse and two thousand foot. Sohemus followed with four thousand. He then marched to Ptolemais. Agrippa accompanied Cestius as a guide in the journey, and as capable of being useful to him in other respects. After he was come thither, Cestius took a part of his army and marched hastily to Zabulon, a strong city of Galilee, which separates the country of Ptolemais from our nation: that he found destitute of its men, the multitude having fled to the mountains, but full of all good things, which he allowed the soldiers to seize as plunder: and he set fire to the city, though its buildings were very beautiful, resembling those of Tyre and Sidon, and Berytus. After that he overran the neighbouring country, seizing whatever came in his way, and setting fire to the villages: and then returned to Ptolemais.' At this very time, as Josephus adds in the same paragraph, the Jews found means to destroy about two thousand Syrians, at Berytus, and near it, Cestius being at a distance.

'Now<sup>r</sup> Cestius himself marched from Ptolemais, and came to Cæsarea; and then sent part of his army before him to Joppa; who coming suddenly upon that people, who were prepared neither for flight nor for their own defence, slew them with all their families, and then plundered and burnt the city. The number of the slain were eight thousand and four hundred. In like manner he sent a number of horse into the toparchy of Nabata, not far from Cæsarea, who slew many of the inhabitants, plundered their goods, and set fire to the villages.'

'Now<sup>s</sup> also Cestius sent Gallus, commander of the twelfth legion, into Galilee, where he slew more than two thousand.'

'Gallus<sup>t</sup> then returned to Cæsarea, and Cestius moved with his whole army and came to Antipatris. Thence he set forward to Lydda, where he found the place empty of men, the people being gone up to Jerusalem upon account of the Feast of Tabernacles. However, he found there fifty men, whom he slew, and burnt the city, and then marched onward; and going up by Bethoron, he pitched his camp at Gaba, fifty furlongs from Jerusalem.'

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 10.

<sup>s</sup> *Ib.* sect. 11.

<sup>t</sup> *Ib.* cap. xix. sect. 1.

‘ The <sup>u</sup> Jews, seeing the war approaching to their metropolis, relying upon their numbers, went out to fight in a hasty and disorderly manner, even in the time of the festival. But the rage which made them forget their religion did also make them superior to their enemies. Cestius with his whole army was in danger. Five hundred and fifteen of the Romans were slain, whilst the Jews lost only two-and-twenty. The most valiant of the Jews were Monobazus, and Kenedæus, related to Monobazus, king of the Adiabenes. Next to them were Niger of Peréa, and Silas of Babylon, who had deserted from king Agrippa to the Jews, and Simon son of Gioras, to be hereafter often mentioned. After that the Jews retired into the city. Cestius staid there three days.’

‘ At <sup>v</sup> this time Agrippa with the consent of Cestius sent to the Jews two ambassadors, Boreæus and Phœbus, men well known to them, with assurances of plenary forgiveness from Cestius if they would lay down their arms and submit. But the Jews would not so much as receive the ambassadors. Phœbus they fell upon, and slew him, before he had spoken a word. Boreæus too was wounded: but he retreated and escaped.’

‘ Soon <sup>w</sup> after that, Cestius moved forward with his whole army, and encamped upon an elevated spot of ground called Scopos [signifying the prospect or watch-tower]. Here he rested three days. On the fourth day, which was the thirtieth of October, he brought his army into the city. The seditious, as Josephus calls them, ‘ were much terrified, and retired from the suburbs to the inner part of the city and the temple. Cestius soon set fire to the place called Bezetha, or the new city, and to the wood-market. After which he came forward to the upper part of the city, and pitched his camp over against the royal palace. And if at that time he had attempted to make his way within the walls by force, he would have won the city presently, and put an end to the war at once. But Tyrannus Priscus, a general in the army, and many officers of the horse, who had been corrupted by Florus, diverted him from that design: which was the occasion that this war lasted so long, and the Jews were involved in such grievous calamities.’

So writes Josephus. And afterwards he says: ‘ If <sup>x</sup> Cestius had continued the siege a little longer he had certainly taken the city. But God, as I think, for the wickedness of the people abhorring his own solemnities, suffered not the war to come to an end at that time.’

<sup>u</sup> Ib. sect. 2.<sup>v</sup> Ib. sect. 3.<sup>w</sup> Ib. sect. 4.<sup>x</sup> Sect 6.

‘Cestius<sup>y</sup> then withdrew from the city. The Jews resumed courage, and went after him; and coming upon his rear, destroyed a good number both of horse and foot. That night Cestius lay at his former camp, Scopos. As he went farther off the next day, he even invited his enemies to pursue him. The Romans suffered greatly. Among the slain were Priscus, commander of the sixth legion, Longinus, a tribune, and Æmilius Secundus, commander of a troop of horse. It was not without a great deal of difficulty that they got to Gabao, their former camp, and leaving behind their baggage. There Cestius staid two days, and was in great perplexity how to proceed. On the third day he judged it expedient to move.’

‘That<sup>z</sup> he might march on with the greater expedition, he threw away every thing that might retard his march. He killed the mules, and the other beasts, excepting only such as carried weapons of war; which the Romans kept for their own use, and that they might not fall into the hands of the Jews to be afterwards employed against them. In that march they met with such difficulties, that the Jews were near taking the whole army of Cestius prisoners; and would have effected it, if night had not come on.’

‘In<sup>a</sup> their flight they left behind them many engines, for sieges, and for throwing stones, and a great part of their other instruments of war. The Jews pursued them as far as Antipatris, and then returned, taking up the engines, spoiling the dead bodies, and gathering up the prey which the Romans had left behind them. So they came back to their metropolis with great rejoicings. They lost but a few men themselves. But they had slain of the Romans and their auxiliaries five thousand and three hundred foot, and three hundred and eighty horse. These things happened on the eighth day of November, in the twelfth year of the reign of Nero.’

‘After<sup>b</sup> that calamity had befallen Cestius,’ says Josephus, ‘many of the most considerable of the Jewish people forsook the city, as men do a sinking ship.’

And it is very likely that at this time many of the christians also withdrew from Jerusalem and Judea. Eusebius says that<sup>c</sup> before the war began, the christians left Jerusalem, and went to a place beyond Jordan called Pella.

<sup>y</sup> Ib. sect. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 8.

<sup>a</sup> Sect. 9.

<sup>b</sup> Μετα δὲ τὴν Κεστιοῦ συμφορὰν, πολλοὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν Ἰσραηλιῶν, ὡς περὶ βαπτίζομενης νεώς, ἀπερχοῦντο τῆς πόλεως. De B. J. l. 2. c. xx. sect. 1.

<sup>c</sup> ————πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου, μεταστῆναι τῆς πόλεως, καὶ εἰς τῆς Περραιῶς πόλιν οἰκεῖν.—Ἡ ἑλληνικὴ ἀντιγὰρ οὐνοῦ. H. E. l. 3. c. v. p. 75. A.

Epiphanius<sup>d</sup> speaks to the like purpose. Eusebius does not quote any ancient author for what he says : but it might be founded upon tradition, and such as could be relied upon. As he resided near the place he might have satisfactory information of it, and receive the account from the descendents of those Jewish believers.

However, some of them may have gone abroad into other countries. St. John, as is well known, lived for some time in Asia. When he came thither we cannot say exactly ; but probably in the year of Christ 66, or sooner. Some of the Jewish believers might go with him out of Judea, or come to him into Asia afterwards. St. John, in his third epistle, ver. 6, speaks of “strangers” who were under difficulties. Some learned men have supposed that<sup>e</sup> thereby are meant Jewish believers, who had been driven out of Palestine, or had fled from it, induced thereto by the necessity of the times and their fidelity to Christ, and had left their substance behind them.

I think we may reckon it to be certain, or at least highly probable, that none of the faithful disciples of Jesus were shut up in Jerusalem at the siege : and that most of them left it some while before it began, in the year of Christ 66, or thereabouts, or sooner.

Our blessed Lord, speaking of the difficulties of these times, and of the declensions of some of his followers, encourages faithfulness in strong terms : Mark xiii. 13, “And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake ; but he that shall endure unto the end shall be saved.” And Luke xxi. 17—19, “And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake ; but there shall not an hair of your head perish. In your patience possess ye your souls.” And compare Matt. x. 21, 22. These gracious assurances were now fulfilled. The difficulties which the followers of Jesus met with were very great ; and the “love of many waxed cold,” and some apostatized to judaism, to avoid sufferings : nevertheless they gained nothing by it. They joined themselves to the unbelieving part of the nation, and had part with them in the heavy calamities which befell them. But the faithful followers of Jesus, who were steady to their profession, and attended to his predictions concerning coming calamities, and observed the signs of their near approach, escaped, and obtained safety, with only the lesser difficulties of a flight, which was necessary in the time of a general calamity.

The<sup>f</sup> Jews, who had defeated Cestius, upon their return

<sup>d</sup> H. 29. sect. vii.

<sup>e</sup> See this volume, chap. xx. sect. v

<sup>f</sup> Ib. c. xx. sect. 3, 4

to Jerusalem, appointed governors and commanders for several places. Joseph, son of Gorion, and Ananus the high priest, were chosen to govern the city, and to repair the walls. Josephus, son of Matthias, our historian, was made governor of both the Galilees. Others were sent to other places.

Cestius<sup>g</sup> sent messengers to Nero in Achaia, to give him an account of what had happened, and of the state of affairs in Judea, and to lay the blame of all the disturbances upon Florus.

Nero,<sup>h</sup> as Josephus says, was not a little moved at these things, though he dissembled his concern. However, he chose for a general a man of known valour and experience in war, several of whose important services are here mentioned by Josephus, agreeably to the testimony of the Roman<sup>i</sup> authors, who represent Vespasian to have been chosen for this service out of regard to his merit, when, upon some accounts, he was disagreeable to Nero.

Vespasian<sup>k</sup> sent his own son Titus from Achaia, where he then was, to Alexandria, to fetch thence the fifth and tenth legions. Himself having crossed the Hellespont, went by land into Syria, where he gathered together the Roman forces, and a good number of auxiliaries from the neighbouring princes.

The<sup>l</sup> Jews, elevated by the advantages which they had gained over Cestius, determined to carry the war to a greater

<sup>g</sup> Ib. c. xx. sect. 1.

<sup>h</sup> De B. J. l. 3. c. i. sect. 1, 2.

<sup>i</sup> Missu Neronis, Vespasianus fortunâ famâque, et egregiis ministris, &c. Tacit. Hist. L. v. cap. 10.

Claudio principe, Narcissi gratiâ legatus legionis in Germaniam missus est; inde in Britanniam translatus, tricies cum hoste confligit.—Peregrinatione Achaïca inter comites Neronis, cum, cantante eo, aut discederet sepius, aut præsens obdormisceret, gravissimam contraxit offensam. Prohibitisque non contubernio modo, sed etiam publicâ salutatione, secessit in parvam ac deviam civitatem, quoad latenti, etiamque extrema metuenti, provincia cum exercitu oblata est. Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæâ profecti rerum potirentur. Id de Imperatore Romano (quantum eventu postea patuit) prædictum Judæi ad se trahentes, rebellârunt; cæsoquo præposito, legatum insuper Syriæ consularem suppetias ferentem, raptâ aquilâ fugaverunt. Ad hunc motum comprimendum cum exercitu ampliore, et non instrenuo duce, cui tamen tuto tanta res committeretur, opus esset, ipse potissimum delectus est; et, ut industriæ expertæ, nec metuendus ullo modo ob humilitatem generis ac nominis. Additis igitur ad copias duabus legionibus, octo alis, cohortibus decem, atque inter legatos majore filio assumpto, ut primum provinciam attingit, proximas quoque convertit in se; correctâ statim castrorum disciplinâ: uno quoque et altero prælio tam constanter initio ut in oppugnatione castelli lapidis ictum genu, scuto sagittas aliquot exceperit. Sueton. Vespasian. c. iv.

<sup>k</sup> De B. J. l. 3. c. i. sect. 3.

<sup>l</sup> Ib. c. ii. sect. 1, 2, 3.



distance. Accordingly they marched to Ascalon, a city always at enmity with them, distant from Jerusalem five hundred and fifty furlongs; [more than sixty miles.] Here the Jewish people were defeated in two attacks, losing more than eighteen thousand men, and two of their generals, John the Essene, and Silas the Babylonian. Niger the Peraite, the third general, narrowly escaped with his life.

Vespasian,<sup>m</sup> when he arrived at Antioch, the metropolis of Syria, reckoned the third city of the Roman empire for magnitude and dignity, found there Agrippa waiting for him, and taking the whole army with him, he soon marched forward to Ptolemais.

Titus<sup>n</sup> making greater expedition than could have been expected, especially in the winter season, came to his father at Ptolemais, bringing with him the fifth and tenth legions: to which were added the fifteenth legion, and eighteen cohorts. There were also five cohorts from Cæsarea, with one troop of horse, and also five other troops from Syria. There was also a considerable number of auxiliaries from the kings Antiochus [of Comagene], and Agrippa, and Seleucus, and Malchus the Arabian. So that the whole army of Romans and auxiliaries, horse and foot, amounted to about sixty thousand men, beside servants, whom Josephus represents as far from being useless, according to the Roman discipline.

Thus we have pursued the history to the end of the year 66, and into the beginning of the year 67.

Vespasian<sup>o</sup> staid some while at Ptolemais. However Placidus, who was before sent into Galilee, destroyed many whom he met with in the open countries. He also made an attack upon Jotapata, but was repulsed.

Vespasian<sup>p</sup> leaves Ptolemais, and marcheth with his army in great order into Galilee.

The<sup>q</sup> first place taken by Vespasian was Gadara, which at that time had in it few men of a military age. But he slew all the young people: the Romans, from hatred of the Jews, and resenting the defeat of Cestius, having no mercy on any age. He also set fire to the city, and burnt all the villages and smaller towns round about; making some totally desolate, in others taking some captives.

Josephus<sup>r</sup> leaves Tiberias, and enters Jotapata on the twenty-first day of May.

The<sup>s</sup> next day Vespasian marches to Jotapata, at<sup>t</sup> the siege of which he received a slight wound in one of his feet.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. sect. 4.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. c. iv. n. 2.

<sup>o</sup> L. 3. c. vi. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Ib. n. 2, 3.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. vii. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 3.

<sup>s</sup> Ib. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Ib. sect. 22.

‘ Whilst <sup>u</sup> Vespasian lay with his army before Jotapata, he sent Trajan, commander of the tenth legion, to Japha, not far off. The place was strong and surrounded by a double wall. A large number made a sally upon the Romans. Being beaten back they retired within the outer wall: but when they came to the inner wall, their fellow-citizens refused to admit them, lest the Romans should also force their way in with them. And <sup>v</sup> now,’ says Josephus, ‘ it might be seen that God had given up the Galileans to the Romans to be destroyed by their cruel enemies. The number of the slain in the distress between the two walls, was twelve thousand. Of this Trajan gave information to Vespasian, desiring him to send his son Titus thither, that he might have the honour of completing the conquest.’

‘ Vespasian, suspecting there might still be some difficulty, sent Titus with five hundred horse and a thousand foot. When the place was taken, all the people, young and old, were destroyed. None were saved excepting the male infants and the women, who were made slaves. The number of those who were slain now, and in the former attack, were fifteen thousand. The prisoners were two thousand a hundred and thirty. This calamity befell the Galileans on the five-and twentieth day of May.’

At <sup>w</sup> the same time the Samaritans got together in a riotous manner at mount Garizim. Whereupon Vespasian sent against them Cerealis, commander of the fifth legion, with six hundred horse, and three thousand foot; who slew them all to the number of eleven thousand and six hundred. This happened on the twenty-fifth day of the month of June.

Now <sup>x</sup> the final attack was made upon Jotapata, which was taken after a siege of forty-seven days. All of every age were slain, except infants and women. The captives were a thousand and two hundred. The number of slain in the last attack, and in the former encounters, was forty thousand. Vespasian ordered the city to be demolished, and set fire to all the castles. Thus Jotapata was taken on the first day of July, in the thirteenth year of the reign of Nero.

I think it may be worth the while to observe here, for showing the violent and desperate disposition of the Jewish people at this time, ‘ that <sup>y</sup> in the distress of the last attack,

<sup>u</sup> Ib. sect. 31.

<sup>v</sup> Θεός δ' ἦν ἀρα, ὃ Ῥωμαῖοις τὰ Γαλιλαίων παθὴν χαρίζομενος, κ. λ. Ibid.

<sup>w</sup> Ibid. p. 32.

<sup>x</sup> Sect. 33—35.

<sup>y</sup> Τὸτο πολλὰς καὶ περὶ τὸν Ἰωσηπὸν ἐπιδικτῶν, ἐπ' αὐτοχειρίαν παρῶξεν.

when the Romans were got within the walls of Jotapata, many of the people made away with themselves rather than come into the hands of the Romans. Josephus calls them chosen men, who were near his person: they could not kill the Romans; and they resolved not to be killed by them.'

Undoubtedly my readers recollect here what was taken notice of<sup>a</sup> formerly, which happened presently afterwards, in the cave where<sup>b</sup> Josephus and forty other persons of distinction had hid themselves. And several other like instances may appear hereafter, as we proceed in this history, which ought not to pass unnoticed.

Josephus<sup>b</sup> now came into the hands of the Roman general. He was still a prisoner, and carried a chain: but he had change of apparel given him, and was otherwise well used.

The<sup>c</sup> siege of Jotapata being over, on the fourth of July Vespasian returned to Ptolemais. Thence he went to Cæsarea by the seaside. Here he put two legions, for some while, for their refreshment: but sent the tenth and fifth to Scythopolis, that Cæsarea might not be over-burdened.

'In<sup>d</sup> the mean time he sent some of his soldiers, both horse and foot, to Joppa; which, though it had been demolished not long since by Cestius, was re-peopled by men who had escaped from other cities. Here they built many ships, and exercised a kind of piracy. Upon the approach of the Romans, they betook themselves to their ships, which met with a violent storm and were cast away. The number that perished was computed to be four thousand and two hundred. Here<sup>e</sup> also some, rather than be drowned, or be cast on the shore, and then be killed by the Romans, put an end to their own lives. The place was now entirely demolished. However, by Vespasian's direction, a number of horse and foot were left here, with orders to destroy the neighbouring villages. So those troops overrun the country, as they were ordered, and laid waste the whole region.'

In<sup>f</sup> a short time Vespasian went from Cæsarea before mentioned, to Cæsarea Philippi, to pay a compliment to king

Κατιδόντες γὰρ, ὡς εἶδεναι τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀνελεῖν δύνανται, τογε μὴ πεσεῖν αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων προελθόντες, καὶ συναθροισθέντες ἐπὶ τὰ καταληγόντα τῆς πόλεως σφῆς αὐτῆς ἀνείδον. Sect. 34. <sup>z</sup> See p. 395.

<sup>a</sup> ——— ἐνθα τεσσαρακοῦτα μὲν τῶν ἐπισημῶν ἀνδράς καταλαμβάνει λανθανόντας. Ib. c. viii. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. cap. 9. sect. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Ib. sect. 9.

<sup>d</sup> Sect. 2—4.

<sup>e</sup> Τινες δὲ, ὡς κρησποτέρῳ, τὴν θαλάσσαν ἐφθάνον, τῷ σιδηρῷ σφῆς αὐτῆς ἀναίρωντες. Ib. sect. 3.

<sup>f</sup> Ib. sect. 7.

Agrippa, by whom he had been invited, and by whom he was now entertained twenty days.

Hearing<sup>g</sup> of the revolt of Taricheas, Vespasian sent thither his son Titus. Taricheas<sup>h</sup> was a strong place, and had been fortified by Josephus. The number of people who perished in the several attacks, and in taking the city, was six thousand and five hundred.

After<sup>i</sup> which Vespasian sat on his tribunal to consider what should be done with the people that remained. And at length by his order all the old men, and other useless people, to the number of twelve hundred, were slain. Out of the young men he chose six thousand of the strongest, whom he sent to Nero to work at the Isthmus. The rest he sold for slaves, who were in number thirty thousand and four hundred. This was done on the eighth day of September.

The place<sup>k</sup> to which Vespasian went was Gamala. Where he met with great difficulties, and many of the Romans were slain. It was taken at last on the twenty-third day of October. When there was no way of escaping left, many Jews threw their children, their wives, and themselves, from the hill on which the citadel was built, into the deep valley below. The number of those who thus precipitated themselves was computed to be five thousand. The rest amounted to four thousand. For here the Romans spared none, not even infants. None escaped except two women.

To Gischala<sup>l</sup> Vespasian sent Titus: here about six thousand were slain. But John, son of Levi, who had commanded in the place, escaped and got to Jerusalem, with some others: which,<sup>m</sup> as our historian says, was the work of God, who saved John for the destruction of Jerusalem.

‘Thus,’ says<sup>n</sup> Josephus, ‘was all Galilee subdued, after it had cost the Romans much labour.’

The<sup>o</sup> next chapter of our author contains an account of the state of things in Jerusalem after John came into it. Where he likewise says: ‘At<sup>p</sup> the same time there were disturbances and civil wars in every city. And all they who were quiet from the Romans, turned their hands one against another. At this time robbers, and others of the

<sup>g</sup> Ib. sect. 7.

<sup>h</sup> ————Cap. x. 1—10.

<sup>i</sup> Sect. 10.

<sup>k</sup> De B. J. l. 4. cap. 1. sect. 1—10.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. cap. ii. n. 1—5.

<sup>m</sup> Οὕτω δὲ ἦν τὸ ἐργον, ἀρα τὴ σωζούτος τὸν Ἰωαννὴν ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν Ἱεροσολυμῶν οὐλίθρον. Sect. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Γαλιλαία μὲν ἐν οὕτως ἔαλω πᾶσα, πολλοὶς ἰδρωσὶ προσημασασα Ῥωμαίως. Sect. 5.

<sup>o</sup> Ib. cap. 3.

<sup>p</sup> Ib. sect. 2, 3

worst characters, came into the city, where it had been long usual to receive all who came: but their numbers consumed those provisions, which might have been of use in a siege.’

They <sup>q</sup> now exercised tyranny over the most considerable men. Antipas, a man of royal lineage, the most potent man in the city, to whom the care of the public treasure had been committed, they laid hold of, and sent to prison: and after him Levias, a man of great distinction, and Sophas, son of Raguel, a man of like eminence, and both of royal lineage. And <sup>r</sup> not thinking themselves safe whilst they were living, they sent some men, of desperate characters, to put them to death in the prison.

Dissensions <sup>s</sup> increasing, there were slain <sup>t</sup> in one night eighty thousand and five hundred; and afterwards <sup>u</sup> twelve thousand of the better sort, beside many others. Here also are mentioned by name, as put to death by the zealots, or others, divers men of great eminence, whose deaths our historian laments in pathetic terms: Ananus, <sup>v</sup> the most ancient of the high-priests; Jesas, also high-priest, inferior to Ananus, but yet a person of great eminence; and Zacharias, son of Baruch; different from Zacharias mentioned in Matt. xxiii. 35, and Luke xi. 51, as was shown in another <sup>w</sup> place.

Soon <sup>x</sup> after this, was put to death by the zealots, Gorion, a man of great eminence for his own virtues, as well as upon account of his family, nor did Niger, the Peraite, escape their hands, though he had been so serviceable to them in this war. ‘When <sup>y</sup> they were killing him, he uttered this imprecation upon them—that, beside the war, they might undergo famine and pestilence, and, after that, come to the mutual slaughter of each other. All which imprecations God ratified against those wicked men. And most justly did they soon after reap the fruit of their madness in their mutual dissensions.’

These <sup>z</sup> things being heard of in the Roman camp, the commanders were for hastening the attack upon the city; but Vespasian, as Josephus says, answered them, that the Jews were not now making armour, nor building walls; but they are every day tearing themselves to pieces by intestine wars and dissensions, and suffer greater miseries than could

<sup>q</sup> Sect. 4.<sup>r</sup> Sect. 5.<sup>s</sup> L. 4. cap. v. Et conf. cap. iii. sect. 7.<sup>t</sup> Cap. v. sect. 1<sup>u</sup> Μυριοι δὲ καὶ ἑσχαλιοὶ τῶν εὐγενῶν οὕτω διεφθάρησαν. Sect. 3.<sup>v</sup> Sect. 2, et 4.<sup>w</sup> See Vol. i. ch. vi.<sup>x</sup> Ib. cap. vi. sect. 1.<sup>y</sup> Ib. sect. 1.<sup>z</sup> Ib. sect. 2

be inflicted upon them by us, if they were in our hands. And it was the best way to let the Jews destroy one another.

These things we suppose to have happened at the end of the year 67, and the beginning of 68.

‘ However, Vespasian was not inattentive to affairs, and took care to reduce other places before he went to Jerusalem. He then left Cæsarea for a while, and marched to Gadara, the metropolis of Perea,’ as Josephus says, ‘ and entered it on the fourth day of March.’

‘ After which he returned to Cæsarea, and left Placidus to carry on the war in those parts; who<sup>a</sup> took Abila, Julias, and Besemoth, and other smaller cities and villages, as far as the lake Asphaltites; insomuch that now all Perea was in the hands of the Romans, excepting Macherus. This expedition was very fatal to the Jews. Many of the Jewish people were slain by the sword, others were driven into the river Jordan. The number of the slain was not less than fifteen thousand, beside two thousand and two hundred which were made captives. And Placidus had a rich booty of asses and sheep, camels and oxen. This disaster was equal to any that had yet befallen the Jews.’

In the mean time<sup>b</sup> Vespasian with a part of his army went from Cæsarea to Antipatris; where he spent two days in settling the affairs of that city. On the third day he marched on, laying waste and burning all the villages. And when he had laid waste all the places about the toparchy of Thamnas, he passed on to Lydda and Jannia; and then came to Ammaus. Thence he went to the toparchy of Bethleptephon; and destroying that and other neighbouring places, he slew more than ten thousand, and made captives more than a thousand; and on the second day of the month of July he pitched his camp at Corea, not far from Neapolis, called by the people of the country Mabortha, and then went to Jericho.

Not long afterwards he returned to Cæsarea. And<sup>c</sup> now, when he was getting ready all his forces for the siege of Jerusalem, he hears of the death of Nero, which happened on the tenth of June, in the year of our Lord 68. Wherefore Vespasian for a while put off his intended expedition against Jerusalem, waiting to see to whom this empire would be transferred, and expecting to receive orders from him.

During the remaining part of the year 68 and the year 69, little<sup>d</sup> was done by the Romans in the war against the

<sup>a</sup> L. 4. cap. vii.

<sup>b</sup> Ib. cap. viii. l.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. cap. ix. l. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Nihil hoc anno alicujus momenti in Judæâ gestum. Pag. ann. 69. n. xiii.

Jews. They kept garrisons in the places already conquered, and fortified some places : but they made little progress, and the siege of Jerusalem was deferred. This delay was a favourable opportunity for the Jewish people to consider and relent, and make peace with the Romans their enemies, having first repented of their sins, and humbled themselves before God : but nothing of that kind came to pass. They went on in their old way, quarrelling among themselves, and forming parties, weakening themselves by divisions and contentions, and thereby hastening their ruin.

Our Lord foresaw this, as appears from the terms of all his predictions concerning them. He foresaw that nothing would reclaim them, after his own teachings had failed of the effect. When he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying : If thou hadst known, even thou, in this thy day the things that belong to thy peace : but now they are hid from thine eyes : for the days will come upon thee that thy enemies shall compass the round, and lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation :” Luke xix. 41—44. He would still send among them prophets, wise men, and scribes, his apostles and evangelists ; but they would not hearken to them. They would reject their message and abuse them : xxiii. 34.

At <sup>e</sup> this time, says Josephus, a new war began at Jerusalem. And Simon, son of Gorias, who for a while had been troublesome to the people there by his furious attacks upon the place, was admitted <sup>f</sup> into the city in the month of April, near the end of the third year of the war.

On the third day of July, in the year of our Lord 69, Vespasian was proclaimed emperor <sup>g</sup> by the Roman army in Judea ; as <sup>h</sup> he had been proclaimed on the first day of the same month at Alexandria ; which day was reckoned the beginning of his reign.

And may we not be allowed to suppose that Vespasian and Titus were thus advanced by way of recompence for their services, as instruments in the hand of Providence for inflicting that punishment upon the Jewish people which

<sup>e</sup> Επανιζαται δε αλλος τοις 'Ιεροσολυμοις πολεμος. L. 4. c. ix. sect. 3. in.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. ix. sect. 12.

<sup>g</sup> Ib. cap. x.

<sup>h</sup> Initium ferendi ad Vespasianum Imperii Alexandriae ceptum, festinante Tiberio Alexandro, qui Kal. Jul. sacramento ejus legiones adegit. Isque primus principatus dies in posterum celebratus, quamvis judaicus exercitus v. nonas Jul. apud ipsum jurasset, eo ardore, ut ne Titus quidem filius expectaretur, Syriâ remeans, et consiliorum inter Municianum et patrem nuntius. Tacit. Hist. 2. cap. 79. Conf. Sueton. Vespasian. cap. 6. Vid. et Pagi, ann. 69. n. vii. et Basnag. ann. 69. n. xxi.

their crying sins deserved, and thus accomplishing the predictions concerning it? We cannot say that they were truly virtuous; but they were persons of great eminence, and many abilities: and they had a more social and benevolent disposition than many others. Titus in particular is represented by Roman authors as a man of a very amiable<sup>i</sup> character. And Josephus, who was present with him in the war, often says that he unwillingly treated the Jewish people so severely as he did, and that he often made them offers of mercy, if they would lay down their arms, and accept of reasonable terms.

Vespasian,<sup>k</sup> not long after this, went to Alexandria, and thence to Rome, leaving his son Titus to carry on the war in Judea.

Vespasian staid some months at Alexandria, waiting for a fair wind and good weather, or upon account of some political views and considerations. Several extraordinary things are related to have happened during his stay there, which are related very briefly by<sup>i</sup> Dion Cassius, more particularly by<sup>m</sup> Suetonius, and still more prolixly by<sup>n</sup> Tacitus.

‘Two men of low rank at Alexandria, one of them blind,

<sup>i</sup> Titus, cognomento paterno, amor ac deliciae humani generis. Sueton. Tit. cap. i.

<sup>k</sup> Jos. de B. J. l. 4. cap. xi.

<sup>l</sup> Dio. l. 66. n. 8. p. 1082.

<sup>m</sup> Auctoritas et quasi majestas quaedam, ut scilicet inopinato et adhuc novo principi, deerat: hæc quoque accessit. E plebe quidam luminibus orbatus, item alius debili crure, sedentem pro tribunali pariter adierunt, orantes opem valetudinis, demonstratam a Serapide per quietem, restitutum oculos, si inspisset; confirmatum crus, si dignaretur calce contingere. Cum vix fides esset rem ullo modo successuram, ideoque ne experiri quidem auderet; extremo, hortantibus amicis, palam pro concione utrumque tentavit, nec eventus defuit. Sueton. Vespas. cap. vii.

<sup>n</sup> Per eos menses, quibus Vespasianus Alexandriae stans æstivis flatibus dies, et certa maris operiebatur, multa miracula evenere, quibus cœlestis favor et quaedam in Vespasianum inclinatio numinum ostenderetur. Ex plebe Alexandria quidam, oculorum tabe notus, genua ejus advolvitur, remedium cœcitatatis exposcens gemitu; monitu Serapidis dei, quem dedita superstitionibus gens ante alios colit. Precabaturque principem, ut genas et oculorum orbis dignaretur respergere oris excremento. Alius manu æger, eodem deo auctore, ut pede ac vestigio Cæsaris calcaretur, orabat. Vespasianus primo irridere, aspernari; atque, illis instantibus, modo famam vanitatis metuere, modo obsecratione ipsorum, et vocibus adulantium, in spem induci: postremo æstimari a medicis jubet, an talis cœcitas ac debilitas ope humanâ superabiles forent. Medici varie disserere: Huic non exeam vim luminis, et redituram, si pellerent obstantia; illi illapsos in pravum artus, si salubris vis adhibeatur, posse integrari.—Igitur Vespasianus cuncta fortunæ suæ parere ratus, nec quidquam ultra incredibile, læto ipse vultu, erectâ quæ adstabat multitudine, jussa exsequitur. Statim conversa ad usum manus, ac cœco reluxit dies. Utrumque, qui interfuere, nunc quoque memorant, postquam nullum mendacio pretium. Tacit. Hist. 4. cap. 81.



the other lame in one of his hands, came both together to him in a humble manner, saying that they had been in a dream admonished by the god Serapis to apply to him for cure of their disorders; which they were assured might be done for the one, if he would be pleased to anoint his eyes and face with his spittle; and for the other, if he would vouchsafe to tread upon his hand. Vespasian, as is said, hesitated for a while. However, the physicians having been consulted, they gave their opinion that the organs of sight were not destroyed in the blind man, and that sight might be restored if obstacles were removed; and that the other's hand was only disjoined, and with proper remedies might be set right again. At length, moved by the entreaties of the distempered persons, and encouraged by the flatteries of those about him, Vespasian performed what had been desired, and the effect was answerable; one of them presently recovered the use of his hands, and the other his sight.'

I do not see reason to believe that any miracle was now wrought. It was a contrivance between Vespasian and his friends and favourites. Nor<sup>o</sup> could it be safe for any to examine and make remarks upon an event, which an emperor and his favourites recommended to public belief.

Suetonius has accounted for these stories in the introduction to his narration, saying that 'somewhat was wanting to give dignity and authority to a new chosen emperor.' And at the beginning of his Life of Vespasian, he observes, that 'the<sup>p</sup> Flavian family was not renowned for its antiquity.' And it is easy for any to discern, from several things said by Suetonius and Tacitus, that Vespasian was very willing to encourage the belief of extraordinary things concerning himself.

I think that what<sup>q</sup> Spartian writes of some miracles

<sup>o</sup> Ad rei ipsius veritatem quod adtinet, non facile adfirmantibus credere licet, cum vix tutum esset id negare, quo Imperatori obsequentiores Ægyptii, et quod proinde intererat Imperatoris, verum videri. Fraudes ejus retegere, qui fallere vult, et omnibus Reipublicæ copiis instructus est, nunquam tutum fuit, &c. Cleric. Ann. 138. n. iii.

<sup>p</sup> Imperium suscepit, firmavitque tandem gens Flavia, obscura illa quidem, ac sine ullis majorum imaginibus. Vespasian. cap. i.

<sup>q</sup> Eâ tempestate supervenit quædam mulier, quæ diceret, somnio se monitam, ut insinueret Adriano ne se occideret, quod esset bene valiturus: quod cum non fecisset, esse cœcatam: jussam tamen iterum Adriano eadem diceret, atque genua ejus oscularetur, receptura visum, si id fecisset. Quod cum in somnium implêsset, oculos recepit, quum aquâ quæ in fano erat, ex quo venerat, oculos abluisset. Venit et de Pannoniâ quidam natus cœcus ad febrientem Adrianum, eumque contigit; quo facto et ipse oculos recepit, et Adrianum febris reliquit: quamvis Marius Maximus hæc per simulationem facta commemoret. Spartian. Hadrian. cap. 25.

ascribed to Adrian may illustrate this history: and therefore I have transcribed him below very largely. Spartian lets us know that Marius Maximus, who before him had written the life of Adrian, and some other emperors, said those miracles were mere fictions. And says the learned and judicious Reimar, in his notes upon Dion Cassius: ‘Nor<sup>r</sup> ought we to form any other judgment of the miracles ascribed to Vespasian.’ And perhaps it may deserve notice, that, notwithstanding such fine things were ascribed to Vespasian, Dion presently afterwards says ‘he<sup>s</sup> was not at all acceptable to the Alexandrians; but they hated him, and ridiculed and reproached him both in public and private.’

However, Crevier’s observation is to this effect: ‘At<sup>t</sup> the same time we ought carefully to observe that these disorders, which Vespasian cured, were not of an incurable nature: and consequently we are at liberty to think that the healing them did not exceed the power of the dæmon.’ And indeed popish saints and heathen dæmons are much alike: nor is there any great difference between heathen and popish credulity.

I cannot forbear to take notice of one remarkable history in this<sup>u</sup> reign. Sabinus<sup>v</sup> in Gaul engaged with some others in a revolt from the Romans, but was soon defeated. He might then have escaped into Germany; but affection for his wife, the best of women, whom he could not carry with him, led him into another scheme, which he communicated to two only of his freed-men, in whom he could confide. His country-house was burnt down, and he was supposed to have perished in the flames: but really he retired into a large subterraneous cavern, which he had near it. It was universally believed that he had made away with himself: and his wife Epponina abandoned herself to all the excesses of grief, and for three days and three nights refused to take any sustenance. Sabinus hearing of it, and

<sup>r</sup> Sed Marius Maximus hæc per simulationum facta commemorat. Ita diserte Spartianus, Hadr. c. 25. Nec aliter de Vespasiani miraculis existimandum. Reimar. in Dion. Cass. l. 66. sect. 50. p. 1083.

<sup>s</sup> Το μὲν θεῖον τῆτοις αὐτὸν ἐσεμνυεν. Οὐ μὲντοι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρεις ἐχαιρον αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντῃ ἠχθοντο, κ. λ. Dio. p. 1082.

<sup>t</sup> Hist. of the Rom. Emp. Vol. 6. p. 32.

<sup>u</sup> See Tillem. Vespasian. art. vi. et xvii. Crevier’s Hist. of the Roman Emperors, Vol. vi. p. 103, 104.

<sup>v</sup> Fusi Lingones. Sabinus festinatum temere prælium pari formidine deseruit. Utque famam exiti sui faceret, villam, in quam perfugerat, cremavit; illic voluntariâ morte interisse creditus. Sed quibus artibus latebrisque vitam per novem annos traduxerit, simul amicorum ejus constantiam, et insigne Epponnæ uxoris exemplum, suo loco reddemus. Tacit. Hist. 4. cap. 67.

dreading the consequences, sent one of his freedmen to her, to assure her of his life, and to advise her to keep up the appearance of a mourner, still avoiding extremities. Afterwards she had access to him, and bore two children, of which she delivered herself in the cavern. By various artful pretences, and the faithfulness of friends, the truth was kept secret, and Sabinus lay concealed nine years: in which interval there were once some hopes of obtaining the emperor's pardon; and Epponina had Sabinus to Rome, so disguised that none knew him. But, being disappointed in those expectations, they returned to the place of their retreat. At length <sup>w</sup> Sabinus was discovered. He, and Epponina, and their two sons, were brought before Vespasian. She behaved with becoming firmness, yet endeavoured to move the emperor's pity. Presenting her two sons to him: 'These,' says she, 'Cæsar, I have brought forth, and nursed in the cavern, that I might increase the number of your supplicants.' And, as is said, neither the emperor himself, nor any others with him, could refrain from tears. However, perceiving that he did not yield, she then upbraided him; and told him she had lived more happily in the darkness of a cave than he upon his throne. Sabinus and his wife were condemned, but the children were spared. Plutarch says, that 'thereby <sup>x</sup> Vespasian provoked the vengeance of heaven, and brought upon himself the extinction of his family. It was,' says he, 'the most tragical action of that reign; a thing which neither gods nor dæmons could bear the sight of.' Indeed, not only he, but Tacitus and Dion show a dislike of that action. But we have not Tacitus's conclusion of the story, he having deferred it to a following book, which is now wanting. It must appear not a little strange, that a general and his wife should be put to death nine years after a disturbance had been suppressed, and which had no bad consequences. When likewise, of the two miscreant rebels and tyrants at Jerusalem, one only was condemned to death, and the other to perpetual imprisonment. Vespasian did not live long after this. We now proceed in our history.

About <sup>y</sup> this time the Jews became divided into three parties, or factions; the leaders of which were John, Eleazar, and Simon; by whom the city, and every part of it, and the temple itself, were filled with slaughter and bloodshed. This happened, as <sup>z</sup> Josephus expressly says, whilst Titus was with his father at Alexandria, and must therefore be

<sup>w</sup> Dio. l. 66. p. 1090.

<sup>y</sup> L. 5. cap. i. sect. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Erot. sub fin.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid.

rightly placed by us in the year 69, and perhaps not far from the end of it. ‘So,’ as the same writer says, ‘one faction fought against the other: which<sup>a</sup> partition in evil cases may be said to be a good thing, and the effect of divine justice.’

Eleazar<sup>b</sup> had the temple, John was below him in the city, Simon had the upper part of the city. Simon<sup>c</sup> had with him ten thousand, beside the Idumeans: his own men had fifty commanders, of which he was supreme. The Idumeans that joined with him were five thousand, and had ten commanders. With Eleazar were two thousand and five hundred of the zealots. John had six thousand armed men under twenty commanders; but soon after the beginning of the siege these two parties united into one; after which there were but two factions, John’s and Simon’s.

‘But before that union, whilst they were in three parties, out of spite to each other, as it seems, they set fire<sup>d</sup> to several storehouses that were full of corn and other provisions; as if they had done it on purpose to serve the Romans: destroying what had been sufficient for a siege of many years. So they were taken with the famine: which could not have been, if they had not by this means brought it upon themselves.’ So says our Jewish historian.

Titus<sup>e</sup> now leaves Alexandria, and comes to Cæsarea, designing to move forward to Jerusalem, and lay siege to it, having with him an army of about sixty thousand men, Romans and auxiliaries. He<sup>f</sup> pitched his camp at the place called Scopus, making however two other encampments at a small distance, one of which was on the Mount of Olives. He<sup>g</sup> presented himself before the city about the time of Passover, which was on the fourteenth day of the month of April, in the year of Christ 70: here he met with difficulties at the first, as the Jews made furious sallies upon his army; some of his soldiers were put by them into disorder, and suffered very considerably.

The<sup>h</sup> city of Jerusalem was surrounded by three walls, excepting in such parts where were deep vallies which rendered the place inaccessible: there it had but one wall.

<sup>a</sup> ὅπερ αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἐν κακοῖς, ἀγαθὸν εἶποι, καὶ δίκης ἐργον. Ibid.

<sup>b</sup> Ib. sect. 2, 3. <sup>c</sup> L. 5. cap. vi. 1. Vid. et cap. iii. 1.

<sup>d</sup> — ὑπερπιπρά τας οἰκίας σιτῆ μετὰς, ὅτι παντοδαπῶν ἐπιτηδείων— κατακαήναι δὲ πλὴν ὀλίγα πάντα τὸν σίτον, ὅτι αὐτοῖς ἔκ ἐπ’ ὀλίγα διηρκεσεν ἐτη πολιορκημένοις. Λίγη γὰρ ἔαδωσαν, ὅπερ ἤκιστα δυνατὸν ἦν, εἰ μὴ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προπαρισκεύασαν. L. 5. cap. 1. sect. 4.

<sup>e</sup> De B. J. l. 4. cap. xi. n. 5. L. 5. cap. i. et cap. ii. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. ii. sect. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Cap. iii. 1.

<sup>h</sup> L. 5. cap. iv.

On<sup>i</sup> the fifteenth day of the siege, which was the seventh day of May, the Romans got possession of the first wall, and demolished a great part of it. Titus<sup>k</sup> then encamped within the city, in a place called the Assyrians' camp. On<sup>l</sup> the fifth day after that, he got possession of the second wall, but was repulsed and beat out of it again. 'Whereupon those Jews, who were armed, and were the fighting men,' as our historian says, 'were much elevated, persuading themselves that the Romans could never conquer the city: for<sup>m</sup> God had blinded their minds for the transgressions which they had been guilty of, so that they did not consider the superior force of the Romans, nor discern how the famine was creeping in upon them: for hitherto they had fed themselves out of the public distresses, and drank the blood of the city. But poverty was now become the lot of many good men, and a great many had already perished for want of necessaries: but they supposed the destruction of the meaner people to be a benefit to them.' However, Titus renewed the attack. The Jews defended themselves resolutely for three days: but on the fourth day he again became master of that wall; and then he demolished all that part which lay to the north, and fortified the south side with towers, and placed soldiers in them: and then considered how he might attack the third and inmost wall.

Now<sup>n</sup> Titus thought fit to relax the siege for a while, in order to ease the soldiers, and to pay them subsistence-money, as also to see whether the Jews would relent, and make some proposals for surrendering, that he might show them mercy.

Moreover Josephus,<sup>o</sup> by order of Titus, took this opportunity to address the Jews in a pathetic discourse: having sought out a place to stand in, where he might be heard, and be in safety. In that speech he entreats the Jews to save themselves, their temple, and their country, and tells them that they were fighting against God.

'Moreover,' says he, 'as for Titus, those springs which were almost dried up when they were in your power, since his coming, they run more plentifully than they did before; accordingly, you know that Siloam, as well as all the other springs about the city, did so far fail, that water was sold in pitchers: whereas they now have such a quantity for your enemies as is sufficient for themselves, and for their

<sup>i</sup> ———cap. vii. sect. 2.

<sup>k</sup> ———ib. sect. 3.

<sup>l</sup> Cap. viii. sect. 1, 2.

<sup>m</sup> *Επισκοπετε γαρ αυτων ταις γυνωμαις*  
*δια τας παρανομιας ο Θεος, κ. λ.* Ib. sect. 2.

<sup>n</sup> L. 5. cap. ix. sect. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Sect. 3, 4.

cattle, and for watering gardens. The same wonderful sign you had experience of formerly, when the aforementioned king of Babylon made war against us, who took this city, and burnt the temple; though<sup>p</sup> the men of that time, I believe, were far from being such transgressors as you are.'

With regard to that particular, the flowing of the springs without the city in the time of the king of Babylon, Mr. Whiston says in a marginal note upon the place: 'The history of this is now wanting elsewhere.'

Four days were spent in that relaxation. On the fifth day, when no offers of peace came from the Jews, Titus began to raise new banks at several places.

'The<sup>q</sup> famine now began to be very severe; and with the famine increased also the madness of the seditious' [as Josephus calls them, meaning John and Simon and the officers under them]. 'There could no corn appear publicly any where, but those robbers came running for it: they also searched private houses; if they found any corn, they tormented the people, because they had denied it; if they found none, they tormented them nevertheless, because they supposed the people had concealed it.'

Here<sup>r</sup> Josephus enlargeth upon the miseries of the people, and the great wickedness of their present governors. 'But,' says he, 'it is impossible to enumerate every instance of the iniquity of those men: but, in a word, never did any city suffer so great calamities; nor was there ever, from the beginning of the world, any time more fruitful of wickedness than that—These were the men who overthrew the city, and compelled the Romans unwillingly to gain a disagreeable victory. They did little less than throw fire upon the temple, and seemed to think it came too slowly.'

'At<sup>s</sup> this time many came out of the city to seek for food, or with a view of making an escape, who were apprehended by the Romans, and crucified before the walls; and many of them were scourged before they were crucified. This seemed to Titus very grievous; for five hundred Jews were taken in a day, and sometimes more; nevertheless he allowed of it. To dismiss them and let them go off, would not have been safe; nor could he spare men enough to keep guard upon so many. Moreover, he hoped that the sight of these miserable objects might dispose them in the city to think of surrendering. The soldiers, out of anger, and hatred

<sup>p</sup> ———— εδεν οίμαι των ποτε ησεβηκοτων τηλικατων ηλικα ημεις. Ib. sect 4. p. 350. Haverc.

<sup>q</sup> L. 5. cap. x. sect. 1, 2.

<sup>r</sup> Cap. x. sect. 4, 5.

<sup>s</sup> Cap. xi. sect. 1

of the Jews, hung them upon the crosses, some one way, some another, as it were in jest; and so great was the number, that room was wanting for crosses, and crosses were wanting for bodies.'

' Now <sup>t</sup> also Titus ordered the hands of some of them who had come out of the city to be cut off; and then he sent them back, to let the people within the city know that henceforward he should carry on the siege with vigour; however, still wishing them to repent and not compel him to destroy their city, and their admired temple. But they who stood upon the wall returned reproaches upon him, and upon his father Vespasian, telling him that death was better than slavery, and that so long as they had breath they would do the Romans all the harm they could. As for the temple, they believed it would be preserved by him who inhabited it: having him for their helper, they despised all his threatenings; for the event depended upon God only.'

The<sup>u</sup> Romans were employed in raising batteries: but though they had begun to raise them on the twelfth day of May, they had much ado to finish them by the twenty-ninth day of the same month, after having laboured hard for seventeen days successively: in which time, however, four batteries were completed.

But John found means to undermine them: so that they fell down all at once, causing great confusion among the Romans; and after that, Simon and his men made a furious sally upon the Romans.

The Roman army was greatly discouraged to see their batteries ruined in one hour, which had cost them so much labour: and many despaired, thinking it impossible to take the city with the usual engines of war.

Titus<sup>v</sup> consulted with the officers what might be fit to be done: at length it was determined to encompass the city with a wall; which was completed in three days, with towers at proper distances to place soldiers in as garrisons.

Our blessed Lord says, Luke xix. 43: "For the days will come upon thee, that thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side." Some think that this prophecy was now particularly fulfilled in the building of the wall here mentioned by Josephus: others may suppose that it had its accomplishment when the Romans laid siege to the city of Jerusalem, and encompassed it with an army.

' The<sup>w</sup> famine now increasing, it devoured whole houses.

<sup>t</sup> Ib. sect. 5.

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 4.

<sup>v</sup> Cap. xii. sect. 1, 2.

<sup>w</sup> Sect. 3.

For a while they, who had no relations to take care of them, were buried at the public expense: afterwards the dead were thrown over the wall into the ditch.’

‘When <sup>x</sup> Titus, in going his rounds near the vallies below the walls, saw the dead bodies, and the putrefaction issuing from them, he fetched a deep sigh; and, lifting up his hands to heaven, called God to witness that this was not his doing.’ However, he proposed erecting new platforms, which was a difficult work, as all the timber near the city was already consumed, and it was now to be fetched from a great distance.

In the next chapter <sup>y</sup> Josephus relates the death of Matthias, son of Boethus, one of the high-priests, and several other persons of eminence, and divers others, who were slaughtered by order of Simon in a most shameful manner. Matthias was the person who had advised the admitting of Simon into the city, contrary to the inclinations of many others. Matthias had four sons, one of which had saved himself by getting away to Titus; the other three were all put to death together with their father; but with this express order from Simon—that the sons should be first slain before the eyes of their father; nor was burial allowed to them. The execution was committed by Simon to Ananus, son of Bamadus, the most barbarous man of his guards. After them were slain Ananias a priest, and Aristneas, scribe of the Sanhedrim, and fifteen other men of eminence among the people. They also slew such as made lamentation for these persons without farther examination.’

‘Many <sup>z</sup> did still find means to get out of the city: some leaped down from the wall, others went out of the city with stones in their hands, as if they were going to fight with the Romans: but most of them died miserably. Some perished by excessive eating upon empty stomachs. Moreover some of them had swallowed gold, and were detected afterwards in searching for it in their excrements. This, having been observed in a few instances, excited the avarice of the soldiers, who concluded that all the deserters were full of gold; they therefore cut up their bellies and searched their entrails. In this way,’ as Josephus says, ‘there perished two thousand in one night. Nor does it seem to me that any misery befell the Jews more terrible than this.’

‘When Titus heard of it he was greatly displeased; especially when he found that not only the Syrians and Arabians had practised this cruelty, but the Romans likewise; he therefore gave orders that all, who for the future

<sup>x</sup> Sect. 4.

<sup>y</sup> Cap. xiii. sect. 1.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 4, 5.



acted in that manner, should be put to death; but the love of money prevailed against the dread of punishment: and indeed it was God who had condemned the whole nation, and defeated every method taken for their preservation.'

About<sup>a</sup> this time John melted down many of the sacred utensils in the temple to make use of them as instruments of war. He also distributed the sacred wine and oil for common use to persons who, in drinking and anointing themselves, wasted them in a profuse manner.

'But<sup>b</sup> why do I stay to relate particularly these several calamities? for at this time Manuæus son of Lazarus, fled out of the city, and came to Titus; and told him that through the one gate, which had been entrusted to his care, there had been no fewer than a hundred and fifteen thousand eight hundred and eighty dead bodies, from the day that the Romans encamped near the city, the fourteenth day of the month of April, to the first day of July. That was a prodigious number! The man was not a governor at the gate, but he was appointed to pay the public allowance for carrying the bodies out, and therefore was obliged to number them. Others were buried by their relations, though their burial was no other than to bring them and cast them out of the city. After that man there came to Titus several other deserters of good condition, who told him that the whole number of the poor, who had been thrown out at the gates, was not less than six hundred thousand: the number of the rest could not be exactly known. They farther told him that, when they were no longer able to carry out the dead bodies of the poor, they laid them in heaps in large houses, and then shut them up. They likewise said that a measure of wheat had been sold for a talent: and that afterwards, when it had been impossible to come out to gather herbs, because the city was encompassed with a wall, some were driven to such distress, as to search the common shores and old dunghills of cattle, and to eat the dung which they found there; and that what they could not before endure to see, they now made use of for food. When the Romans heard of these things, they commiserated their case: but the seditious, who saw them, did not repent till the same distress reached themselves: for<sup>c</sup> they were blinded by that fate which was coming upon the city and themselves.'

There ends the fifth book of our author's History of the Jewish War. The sixth book contains the progress of the

<sup>a</sup> Sect. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Sect. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Πεπληροῦτο γὰρ ὑπο τῆ χρεῶν, ὃ τῆτε πόλει καὶ αὐτοῖς ἤδη παρήν.

siege, and the miseries of the people, till the city was taken by Titus.

The<sup>d</sup> Roman batteries are now raised at the end of one-and-twenty days' hard labour, and the miseries of the city increase. The Romans begin to batter upon the walls of the tower called Antonia: the Jews make a vigorous defence: but the Romans gained possession of it about the middle of July.

Titus<sup>e</sup> thereupon ordered his soldiers to dig up the foundations of the tower Antonia, to make way for him to come up with his whole army; and being informed that on that very day, the seventeenth of July, the daily sacrifice had failed, and that it had not been offered up for want of men, and that the people were greatly concerned at it, he sent for Josephus, and commanded him to say to John the same things that had been said before. Accordingly Josephus sought for a proper place to stand in; and in the name of Titus himself earnestly exhorted John, and those that were with him, to spare their own country, and to prevent that fire which was ready to seize upon the temple, and to offer to God therein their usual sacrifices. But John cast many reproaches upon Josephus, with imprecations; adding withal, that<sup>f</sup> he did not fear the city should ever be taken, which was God's own city: after which Josephus went on with a pathetic speech, which, though it did not persuade John and his adherents, was not altogether without effect.

And<sup>g</sup> some, watching for an opportunity, fled to the Romans; of whom were the high priests Joseph and Jesus, and of sons of high-priests three, and four sons of Matthias, as well as one son of the other Matthias, formerly mentioned, who with three of his sons had been killed by order of Simon, son of Gioras; and many others of the nobility: all whom Titus received very kindly, and sent them to Gophna, a small city, where they might live quietly, following their own customs; which offer they cheerfully accepted: but as they did not appear, the seditious within the city gave out that those men had been slain by the Romans. It was in vain therefore, they said, for any to go over to the Romans, unless they were willing to be put to death.

Titus<sup>h</sup> therefore sent for those men from Gophna, and let them go round near the wall with Josephus, to assure the people that they might come over to him with safety.

<sup>d</sup> L. 6. cap. i. sect. 1—8.

<sup>e</sup> Cap. ii. sect. 1.

<sup>f</sup> ————ὅς ουκ αν ποτε δεισειεν ἀλωσιν, Θεου γαρ ὑπαρχειν την πολιν.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. cap. ii. sect. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. sect. 3.

If all this be true, as Josephus writes, it is a proof of the good temper of Titus. Moreover, the Romans were now pushing their conquests upon the temple itself, which Titus seems unwilling to have destroyed.

‘And,’<sup>i</sup> as Josephus adds, ‘Titus was much affected with the present state of things, and reproached John and those with him: reminding them of the regard which had been shown to the temple by the Romans, who had allowed them to erect in the courts of it a partition wall, with inscriptions in Greek, forbidding all foreigners to enter within those limits, and allowing them to kill such as did so, though they were Romans. I call to witness,’ says he, ‘the gods of the country, and every god, who ever had a regard to this place; (for I do not now suppose it to be regarded by any of them;) I also call to witness my own army, and the Jews who are with me, and your own selves, that I do not compel you to pollute your sanctuary: and if you will change the place of combat no Roman shall come near it; for I will endeavour to preserve your temple, whether you will or not.’

Such<sup>k</sup> things were spoken by Titus, and by Josephus after him in Hebrew, to John and the rest with him; but they perverted it, as if all these fine offers proceeded from fearfulness, and not from any good will to them.

Titus<sup>l</sup> therefore proceeded in his attacks. His soldiers fought with the Jews at the temple, whilst he continued on the higher ground in Antonia to observe their conduct.

They<sup>m</sup> had now made a broad way from the tower Antonia to the temple, and began to play on the temple with their battering engines.

The<sup>n</sup> fight was very desperate. A cloister near Antonia was set on fire. On the twenty-fourth day of July the Romans set fire to another cloister, when the fire proceeded fifteen cubits farther.

‘Whilst<sup>o</sup> the Jews and Romans were thus fighting at the temple, the famine prevailed in the city, till at length they did not abstain from girdles and shoes. The very leather that belonged to shields they took off and gnawed. Wisps of old straw became food to them.’

At<sup>p</sup> this time a woman named Mary, of a good family beyond Jordan, who had fled from her native place to Jerusalem, to avoid the inconveniences of the war in the open country, when all she had brought with her was consumed, or taken from her by the rapaciousness of the tyrants and

<sup>i</sup> Sect. 4.<sup>k</sup> Sect. 5.<sup>l</sup> Sect. 5, 6.<sup>m</sup> Sect. 7.<sup>n</sup> Sect. 8, 9.<sup>o</sup> Cap. iii. sect. 3.<sup>p</sup> Sect. 4.

their adherents, was reduced to such extremity that she killed her sucking child, and dressed it for food.

On <sup>q</sup> the eighth day of the month of August the Roman batteries were completed, and Titus ordered the batteries to play upon the temple. The battle between the Jews and Romans was very desperate.

‘Titus <sup>r</sup> retired to the tower of Antonia, and resolved the next day early in the morning to storm the temple with his whole army, and to encamp about it. But certainly the divine sentence had long since condemned it to the fire: and now the fatal day was come, according to the revolution of ages; it was the tenth day of the month August, the same day upon which it had been formerly burnt by the king of Babylon.’

‘The <sup>s</sup> temple was now on fire: nevertheless Titus, still desirous to save it, if possible, came near and went into the sanctuary of the temple with his commanders, and saw it, with what was in it: which he found to be far superior to the accounts of foreigners, and not inferior to our boastings and persuasion concerning it.’

As <sup>t</sup> the fire had not yet reached the inner parts of the temple, Titus gave fresh orders for extinguishing the fire, and preserving the temple; but to no purpose: such was the enmity of the soldiers against the Jews: filled also with the hopes of plunder, and now animated with the rage of war.

‘Nor <sup>u</sup> can we forbear to wonder at the accuracy of the period: for this happened, as before said, in the same month, and day of the month, in which the temple had been burnt by the Babylonians. And the number of years, from its first foundation by King Solomon to this its destruction in the second year of Vespasian, are collected to be one thousand and thirty, and seven months and fifteen days. And from its second building by Haggai, in the second year of king Cyrus, to its destruction by Vespasian, there were six hundred and thirty-nine years, and forty-five days.’

Whilst <sup>v</sup> the temple was burning, every thing was plundered that came to hand, and ten thousand of those who were caught, were slain: nor was there any regard had to age or condition; but children and old men, profane persons and priests, were all slain in the same manner.

‘At <sup>w</sup> this time the treasury chambers were burnt, where was an immense quantity of money, and an immense number of garments, with other precious things: for there it was

<sup>q</sup> Cap. iv. sect. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 5.

<sup>s</sup> Sect. 7.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 8.

<sup>v</sup> Cap. v. sect. 1.

<sup>w</sup> Sect. 2

that the riches of the Jews were heaped up. The soldiers also came to the rest of the cloisters in the outer court, where were women and children and a mixed multitude of people, to the number of six thousand: and before Cæsar had given any orders about it, the soldiers in a rage set fire to the cloister. Nor did any one of that multitude escape with his life. A false prophet was the occasion of their destruction: who that very day had made proclamation in the city that God commanded them to go up to the temple, where they would receive signs of deliverance. And indeed there was then a great number of false prophets suborned by the leaders of the factions to impose upon the people, who told them that they should wait for deliverance from God.

‘Thus,’<sup>x</sup> as our author goes on in the words next following, ‘was this miserable people deceived by impostors, who spoke lies in the name of God. But they did not attend nor give credit to those prodigies which evidently foretold their future desolation; but like men infatuated, who have neither eyes to see nor minds to consider, they disregarded the divine denunciations. There<sup>y</sup> was a star, a comet resembling a sword, which stood over the city and continued for a year. And before the rebellion, and before the war broke out, when the people were come together in great multitudes to the feast of unleavened bread, on the eighth day of the month of April, at the ninth hour of the night, so great a light shone round the altar and the temple that it seemed to be bright day: which light continued for half an hour. This, to the unskilful, seemed to be a good sign; but, by the sacred scribes, it was judged to portend what has since happened. And at the same festival a heifer, as she was led by the high-priest to be sacrificed, brought forth a lamb in the midst of the temple. Moreover, the eastern gate of the inner court of the temple, which was of brass, and very heavy, which was not without difficulty shut in the evening by twenty men, and rested upon a basis armed with iron, and was fastened with bolts that went deep into the floor, which was made of one entire stone, was seen to open of its own accord at the sixth hour of the night: whereupon they who kept watch at the temple went to the captain and told him of it. He then came thither, and not

<sup>x</sup> Ib. sect. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Τετο μεν ὅτε ὑπερ την πολιν αστρον εση ῥομφαια παραπλησιον, και παρατεινας επι εναντων κομητης.

Mr. Whiston’s translation is; ‘Thus there was a star resembling a sword, which stood over the city; and a comet that continued a whole year.’ And he has a note to this purpose; ‘Whether Josephus means that this star was different from that comet which lasted a whole year, I cannot certainly determine. His words most favour their being different one from another.’

without difficulty had it shut again. This also appeared to the vulgar a good sign; as if thereby God opened to them the gate of happiness. But the wiser men concluded that the security of the temple was gone, and that the gate was opened for the advantage of their enemies; and they said it was a signal of the desolation that was coming upon them. Beside these, a few days after that festival, on the one-and-twentieth day of May, there appeared a wonderful phenomenon, almost exceeding belief; and the account of it might seem fabulous if it had not been related by those who saw it, and if the following events had not been answerable to such signs: for before sunset chariots and troops in armour were seen carried upon the clouds, and surrounding cities. And at the festival, which we call the Pentecost, as the priests were going by night into the inner court of the temple, as the custom was, to perform their ministrations, they first felt, as they said, a shaking, accompanied with a noise, and after that a sound, as of a multitude, saying, "Let us remove hence." But, which is still more awful, there was one Jesus, son of Ananus, of a low condition, and a countryman, who four years before the war began, when the city enjoyed profound peace and flowing prosperity, came up to the festival, in which it is the custom for us all to make tabernacles, who on a sudden began to cry out in the temple: "A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the temple, a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides, a voice against the whole people." This was his cry, as he went about both by day and by night, in all the lanes of the city. Some of the chief men were offended at this ill-boding sound, and, taking him up, laid many stripes upon him, and had him beaten severely. Yet he said not a word for himself, nor made any peculiar complaint to them that beat him; but went on repeating the same words that he had said before. Hereupon the magistrates, thinking it to be somewhat more than ordinary, as indeed it was, bring him before the Roman governor; where he was whipped till his bones were laid bare. All which he bore without shedding any tears or making any supplications: but with a mournful voice at every stripe, cried out: "Woe to Jerusalem." Albinus, the governor, asked him who he was, and whence he came, and why he uttered those words. To all which he made no answer, but continued making his mournful denunciations to the city. Albinus, thinking him to be mad, dismissed him. And thenceforward, to the time of the war, he did not go to any of the citizens; nor was he seen

speaking to any ; but only went on with his mournful denunciation, as if it had been his premeditated vow : “ Woe, woe to Jerusalem.” He did not give ill language to those who beat him, as many did frequently ; nor did he thank those who gave him food : but went on repeating to all the doleful presage. But especially at festivals his cry was the loudest. And so it continued for seven years and five months, without his growing hoarse, or being tired therewith, till he saw his presage in the siege ; then he ceased : for going round upon the wall, with his utmost force he cried out : “ Woe, woe once more, to the city, and to the people, and to the temple.” And then at last he added : “ Woe, woe to myself also.” At which instant there came a stone out of one of the engines that smote him, and killed him immediately : and whilst he was uttering these mournful presages, he gave up the ghost.’

‘ If<sup>z</sup> any one considers these things,’ adds Josephus, ‘ he will be convinced that God takes care of mankind, and by all ways possible foreshows to our race what is for their benefit ; and that men perish by those miseries which they madly and voluntarily bring upon themselves.’

Thus I have transcribed this whole article of Josephus at length, and in the place and order in which it stands in his own work. I must be so candid as to take notice of the reflections which some learned men have made upon it.

To this purpose speaks Dr. Willes, in his first<sup>a</sup> discourse upon Josephus : ‘ The prodigies, that he saith happened before the destruction of Jerusalem, would agree better to Livy or Tacitus, than to a Jewish historian.—The flying open of the great brazen gate of the temple is the same as happened at Thebes, just before the great battle of the Lacedæmonians at Leuctra, when the great gates of the temple of Hercules opened of themselves, without any one’s touching them. I omit many other things of the like nature ; whence it is evident that Josephus endeavoured to Grecise and shape the history of the Jews, as like as he could to those of the Greeks and Romans.’ So Dr. Willes. And I shall transcribe below the passage of Cicero de Divinatione,<sup>b</sup> to which he refers.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Prefixed to L’Estrange’s edition of Josephus, p. 3, 4. 8vo.

<sup>b</sup> Quid ? Lacedæmoniis paullo ante Leuctricam calamitatem, quæ significatio facta est, cum in Herculis fano arma sonuerunt, Herculisque simulacrum multo sudore manavit ? At eodem tempore Thebis, ut ait Callisthenes, in templo Hereulis valvæ, clausæ repagulis, subito se ipsæ aperuerunt ; armaque, quæ fixa in parietibus fuerant, ea sunt humi inventa. De Divin. l. 1. c. 24. n. 74.

Basnage<sup>c</sup> in his History of the Jews speaks after this manner: ‘ Besides, deception was easy in many of the things related by him. The bright light round the altar in the night-time: the cow that brought forth a lamb as she was led to the altar: the chariots of fire that were seen in the air, and passed over the city with a frightful noise, are very liable to suspicion: the opening of the temple seems to be rather better attested than the others, because it is said that the magistrate came to shut it. But the meaning was doubtful. To some it seemed to be an assurance that God had opened the treasures of his benediction; whilst others concluded that he had abandoned the protection of his temple. But it is not easy to deny the truth of the history of the man that cried, “ A voice from the east, a voice from the west,” and every day predicted the ruin of the city: for this man was brought before Albinus, who examined him. He was severely scourged, and he was often beaten by the people, who could not endure so dismal a noise: but he was all along unmoved. His cry continued for the space of seven years. At length he was killed upon the walls of the city, at the beginning of the siege. This is not a thing about which men might be deceived. Josephus, who relates it, was at Jerusalem when this preacher, who was treated as a madman, denounced its desolation: and he might inform himself concerning his death. So that if there are any things to which we ought to attend, it is this, in which we must acknowledge somewhat extraordinary.’ So says Basnage.

I am inclined to go over and examine every one of these prodigies.

‘ There<sup>d</sup> was a star, a comet resembling a sword, which stood over the city, and continued for a year.’

How Mr. Whiston understood this has been seen already. L’Estrange translates thus: ‘ What shall we say to the comet that hung over Jerusalem, for one whole year together, in the figure of a sword?’ Archbishop Tillotson<sup>e</sup> in this manner: ‘ At a little before the destruction,’ he tells us, ‘ there hung over their city a fiery sword, which continued for a year together. A little before their rebellion against the Romans there appeared a comet, which shined so clear in the temple, and about the altar, as if it had been day.’ It must be confessed that is not exact. Tillemont:

<sup>c</sup> L. i. ch. viii. sect. 3. p. 224.

<sup>d</sup> Έβλεπο μεν οτε υπερ την πολιν αστρον εση ρομφαια παραπλησιον, και παρατεινας επ’ ενιαυτον κομητης.

<sup>e</sup> As before, p. 554.



There<sup>f</sup> was also a comet which appeared for a year, and ‘over Jerusalem an extraordinary star, which seemed to be a sword. But Josephus does not say the time.’ Neither is this very exact. However, I have also transcribed below the words of Josephus himself.

This is the first prodigy. And indeed it is a wonderful and very awful thing. A star, resembling a sword, hanging over a city, for a whole year.—Upon this we cannot forbear to observe that Josephus has not told us the time when this star or comet appeared. He says, ‘it continued for a year.’ But does not say when. A very strange omission. I must take the liberty to add, that if, about the time of the siege of Jerusalem, or some period within a few years before, there had been a star resembling a sword, which hung over that city for a year together, I should expect to find it in some author beside Josephus, and an author that does not depend upon him or borrow from him.

Tacitus<sup>g</sup> has mentioned several of the prodigies preceding the ruin of the Jewish people, but he does not mention this: however, it must be owned that his omitting it is of no great importance, as he does not appear to have been careful to put down every thing of this kind.

2. It follows: ‘And before the rebellion, and before the war broke out, when the people were come together in great multitudes to the feast of unleavened bread, on the eighth day of the month of April, at the ninth hour of the night,’ or three hours after midnight, ‘so great a light shone round the altar, and the temple, that it seemed to be bright day: which light continued for half an hour.’ This prodigy is related by Josephus so particularly and circumstantially, as happening too at the time of passover, when Jerusalem was full of people, and in the year 65, as it seems, that I am not at all disposed to contest the truth of it. I think it must have so happened. But the design of this appearance is ambiguous. And, as Josephus says, some thought it to portend good, others bad things. But that does not affect the truth of the fact.

3. ‘And at the same festival a heifer, as she was led by the high priest to be sacrificed, brought forth a lamb in the

<sup>f</sup> Il parut aussi une comète pendant un an, et sur Jérusalem un astre extraordinaire, qui sembloit être une épée. Joseph n’en marque pas le temps. Ruine des Juifs, art. 41.

<sup>g</sup> Evenerant prodigia, quæ neque hostiis neque votis piare fas habet gens superstitioni obnoxia, religionibus adversa. Visæ per cælum concurrere acies, rutilantia arma, et subito nubium igne collucere templum. Expassæ repente delubri fores, et audita major humana vox, ‘Excedere Deos:’ simul ingens motus excedentium. Tacit. Hist. l. 5. c. 13.

midst of the temple.’ Here again I hesitate. I am surprised to see so trifling a story in a grave writer. I think Josephus inserted this to gratify his Greek readers.

4. The next prodigy is the opening of the ‘eastern gate of the inner court of the temple at midnight:’ which, as before observed by Dr. Willes, has such a resemblance with like stories told by credulous heathen people, that it seems to be only an imitation of them, and has therefore the appearance of a fiction, by way of accommodation to the judgment of heathen readers.

5. ‘Beside these, a few days after that festival, on the one-and-twentieth day of the month of May, there appeared a wonderful phenomenon, almost exceeding belief: and the account of it might seem fabulous, if it had not been related by those who saw it, and if the following events had not been answerable to such signs. For before sunset chariots and troops of soldiers in armour were seen carried upon the clouds, and surrounding cities.’

Such seeming appearances have often been the effect only of imagination, without any reality. But this is related by Josephus so particularly, and with so much solemnity, that it is hard to contest the truth. And if it be true, this, and the ‘light surrounding the altar and the temple’ before mentioned, may be some of those things intended by our Saviour when he said: “And fearful sights, and great signs, shall there be from heaven:” Luke *xxi.* II. Of this <sup>h</sup> Crevier speaks in this manner: ‘I say nothing of the armed ‘chariots and troops of warriors that were seen fighting in the ‘air. That might be the natural effect of a phenomenon then ‘not understood, but which we are now well acquainted with, ‘and call the Aurora Borealis, or northern light.’ A wise observation truly! Who ever before saw or heard of an Aurora Borealis in the day time? Josephus expressly says that these chariots and warriors were seen ‘before sun-setting.’

6. ‘And at the festival, which we call the Pentecost, as the priests were going by night into the inner court of the temple, as the custom was, to perform their ministrations, they first felt, as they said, a shaking, accompanied with a noise, and then a sound, as of a multitude, saying, “Let us remove hence.”’

This passage is quoted by <sup>i</sup> Eusebius, and this particular is taken notice of by <sup>k</sup> divers ancient christian writers:

<sup>h</sup> History of the Rom. Emp. Vol. vi. p. 240. <sup>i</sup> H. E. l. 3. c. vii. Dem. Ev. l. 8. p. 402. And see the Credib. Vol. iv. p. 81.

<sup>k</sup> Και Ιωσηπος δε μετα βραχυν γενομενος χρονον, εφη, τινας αγγελιας της επι

but they do not always quote so accurately as might be wished.

I beg leave to observe upon it; First of all, this is said to have happened in the ‘night time,’ and therefore deserves the less regard. Secondly, I do not know what ministrations the priests had to perform in the inner temple in the night. Doubtless they kept watch at the temple by night as well as by day: but, so far as I can recollect, the ministrations at the temple, which were of divine appointment, were performed by daylight. Thirdly, the sound of a multitude, saying, “Let us go hence,” has much of an heathenish air.

All these signs or prodigies, just mentioned, (excepting the star like a sword, of which before,) seem to be placed by Josephus in the year of Christ 65; the year before the war commenced.

7. The seventh and last is that of ‘Jesus, son of Ananias, who four years before the war began came up to the festival, which we call the feast of tabernacles, and on a sudden began to cry out: “A voice from the east——a voice against Jerusalem and the temple.” And so it continued for seven years and five months, till he saw his presage fulfilled in the siege.’ He therefore began this cry near the end of the year 62. This last Josephus calls more ‘awful than the rest,’ *το δε τετων φοβερωτατον*. And, as Le Clerc<sup>1</sup> observes, ‘if it be true, Josephus rightly says it was somewhat ‘divine.’ I hope we may depend upon the truth of this history, which is related with so many particulars and circumstances.

All these things Josephus has recorded as affecting signs, warnings, and presages of great calamities coming upon the Jewish nation: omitting entirely the warnings, and predictions, and admonitions, of Jesus Christ, and of his apostles after him; and also the three hours’ darkness over the whole land of Judea, and the rending the veil of the temple, and the earthquake near Jerusalem at the time of our Saviour’s

*παραμενοντας, ει μη βδληθειεν εκεινοι μεταζηραι, καταλιπειν αυτους.* Chr. in Jo. Hom. 64. [al. 65.] p. 390. T. 8.

Josephus quoque refert, virtutes angelicas, præsidēs quondam templi, tunc pariter conclamasse: Transeamus ex his sedibus. Hieron. in Matt. xvii. 51. T. 4. p. 139. Conf. ep. ad Hedib. sect. viii. T. 4. P. i. p. 176.

Unde et Josephus in suâ narrat historiâ, quod, postquam Dominus crucifixus est, et velum templi scissum est, sive liminare templi fractum corruit, audita sit vox in adytis Templi Virtutum cœlestium, Transeamus ex his sedibus. Id. in Ezech. c. 47. p. 1058.

<sup>1</sup> Quæ si vera sunt, non immerito Josephus rem divinitus contigisse censuit. Cleric. H. E. An. 62. n. v.

crucifixion. And though all these signs and warnings, related by himself, are considered by him as very affecting, he acknowledgeth that they made not any great impression upon his nation. And says: ‘But they did not attend or give credit to those prodigies, which evidently foretold their desolation; but like men infatuated, who have neither eyes to see, nor minds to consider, they disregarded the divine denunciations.’ And his history verifies the truth and justness of this observation.

‘Now<sup>m</sup> the Romans brought their ensigns to the temple, and set them over against the eastern gate. There they offered sacrifices to them, and there they made Titus emperor, with the greatest acclamations of joy. And all the soldiers had such vast quantities of spoils, which they got by plunder, that in Syria a pound weight of gold was sold for half its former value.’

There<sup>n</sup> were some priests, as Josephus says, sitting upon the wall of the temple, who continued there till they were pined with hunger; then they came down and surrendered themselves. When they were brought by the guards to Titus, they begged for their lives. But Titus answered, that the time of pardon was over as to them, that being destroyed, for the sake of which alone he should have saved them; and it was very fit that priests should perish with their temple. Whereupon he ordered them to be put to death.

Now<sup>o</sup> Simon and John, and they that were with them, desire a conference with Titus; which he granted. He placed himself on the western side of the outer court of the temple, and there was a bridge that parted them. There were great numbers of Jews waiting with those two tyrants, and there were also many Romans on the side of Titus. He ordered the soldiers to refrain their rage, and appointed an interpreter: and, being conqueror, he spoke first. He then reproached them in very bitter terms, and very justly. And then concluded: ‘However, I will not imitate your madness. If you will throw down your arms, and deliver up your bodies to me, I grant you your lives. I will act like a mild father of a family. What cannot be healed shall be destroyed. The rest I will reserve for my own use.’

‘They answered, they could not consent to that, because they had sworn never to do it. They asked leave to go through the wall that surrounded them with their wives and children; so they would go into the desert and leave the city to him. At which Titus was greatly provoked, that, when they were now already in the case of men taken cap-

<sup>m</sup> L. 6. c. vi. sect. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> Sect. 2.

tives, they should pretend to make their own terms with him, as if they were conquerors. He then gave orders that proclamation should be made to them, that henceforward none should be allowed to come over to him as deserters, nor hope for security; for that now he would spare nobody, but fight them with his whole army. He therefore gave orders to the soldiers both to burn and to plunder the city. On that day however they did nothing. But the day following they set fire to the repository of the archives, to the council houses, to Acra, and to the place called Ophilas: at which time the fire proceeded as far as to the palace of queen Helena, which was in the middle of Acra. The lanes also were burnt down, as were all the houses that were full of the dead bodies of such as had died by the famine.’

‘On<sup>p</sup> the same day the sons and brothers of king Izates, and<sup>q</sup> with them many other eminent men of the city, got together, and besought Titus to give them his right hand for their security. Whereupon, though he was now very angry and much displeas’d with all who were still remaining, he did not depart from his wonted moderation, but received them. However he kept them all in custody. And having bound the king’s sons and kinsmen, he took them with him to Rome, to be kept there as hostages for the fidelity of their country.’

Here, as I apprehend, we see a proof of the zeal of the Jewish proselytes at this time. For such were the relations of king Izates. These persons had chosen to reside much in the holy city of Jerusalem: or they had come up thither to the feast of the Passover this year, notwithstanding the danger it was in from the approaches of the Roman army. And it was, as seems to me, a remarkable instance of the moderation of this prince, that he now showed mercy to these persons who might have come over to him long before, and did not surrender themselves till matters were brought to the utmost extremity, and after he had publicly declared that he would spare none.

Titus<sup>r</sup> still had difficulties remaining in taking the rest of the city.

‘Some<sup>s</sup> there were who deserted to Titus, notwithstanding the care of the tyrants to prevent it. These were all received by the Romans, because Titus grew negligent as to his former orders, and because the soldiers were weary of killing, and because they hoped to gain money by spar-

<sup>p</sup> Sect. 4.

<sup>q</sup> ———— *προς οίς πολλοί των επισήμων δημοτών εκει συνελθόντες, ήκετευσαν Καισαρα, κ. λ.*

<sup>r</sup> Cap. vii. et viii.

<sup>s</sup> Cap. viii. sect. 2.

ing them. They therefore sold them with their wives and children, though at a very low price. For there were many to be sold, and but a few purchasers. Indeed the number of those who were sold was prodigious. And<sup>t</sup> yet there were forty thousand of the people saved, whom Titus permitted to go where they pleased.’

And now were fulfilled those words of Moses: “And ye shall be sold for bondmen and bondwomen; and no man shall buy you:” Deut. xxviii. 68. And likewise those words of our Lord, Luke xxi. 24; “And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations. And Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.”

‘At<sup>u</sup> this time one of the priests, son of Thebutus, whose name was Joshua, upon his having security given him by the oath of Cæsar that he should be preserved, upon condition that he should deliver to him certain of the precious things deposited in the temple, came out and delivered to him from the wall of the temple two candlesticks, like to those that lay in the temple, together with tables and cisterns, and vials, all of solid gold, and very heavy. He also delivered to him the veils, and the garments of the high priests, with the precious stones, and many other vessels belonging to the sacred ministrations. And now was seized the treasurer of the temple, whose name was Phineas, who discovered to him the coats and girdles of the priests with a great quantity of purple and scarlet, which were repositied for the use of the veil; as also a great deal of cinnamon and cassia, and other sweet spices, which used to be mixed and offered to God as incense every day. A great many other precious things and ornaments of the temple were delivered by the same person. Which things so delivered to Titus, obtained for that man the same pardon that was allowed to such as deserted of their own accord.’

‘At<sup>v</sup> length, after great labour, and against a furious opposition, the Romans became masters of the rest of the city, and set their ensigns upon the walls in triumph, and with great joy. They then plundered the houses, and killed every one whom they met with in the streets. They set fire to the city, and made the streets run with blood to such a degree, that the fire of many houses was quenched with men’s blood. However it so happened that, when the slayers had left off in the evening, the fire greatly prevailed in the night. As all was burning, the eighth day of the month of

<sup>t</sup> Οἱ δημοτικοὶ δὲ ἐσωθῆσαν ὑπὲρ τετρακισμυριας, οὓς ἐιάφηκε Καῖσαρ, ἢ ῥαλον ἢ ἰκατάρ. Ibid. <sup>u</sup> Cap. viii. sect. 3. <sup>v</sup> Sect. 4, 5.

September, came on to Jerusalem, a city which had suffered so many calamities during the siege, of which it was upon no account so deserving, as upon account of its producing such a generation of men as occasioned its overthrow.

‘When <sup>w</sup> Titus was come into this upper city, he admired some places of strength in it, and particularly those strong towers which the tyrants in their madness had relinquished. And he expressed himself in the following manner: “We <sup>x</sup> have certainly had God for our helper in this war. It is God who has ejected the Jews out of these fortifications. For what could the hands of men, or any machines do, towards throwing down such <sup>y</sup> fortifications?” At which time he had many like discourses with his friends. He also set at liberty such as had been bound by the tyrants, and were still in the prisons. And when he entirely demolished the rest of the city, and overthrew its <sup>z</sup> walls, he left those towers to be monuments of his fortune, which had fought with him, and had enabled him to take what otherwise would have been impregnable.’

‘The <sup>a</sup> soldiers were weary of killing. But there were many still alive. Titus therefore gave orders that none should be killed but such as were in arms or made resist-

<sup>w</sup> Cap. ix. sect. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Συν Θεῷ γ' ἐπολεμησαμεν—κ. λ. Πι.

<sup>y</sup> Undoubtedly Titus, upon entering into that part of the city which was now taken, and so becoming master of the whole city of Jerusalem, had some discourses with his generals suitable to the occasion. But Josephus, in imitation of the Greek and Roman historians, who made speeches for their generals, embellisheth here; and he makes Titus say some things which he did not say. The tyrants, as Josephus calls them, were guilty of mad conduct in their divisions, in destroying, as they had done, many stores proper for sieges, and in other respects. But Titus could not charge them with folly and madness in relinquishing the three towers here referred to. Josephus has given a particular description of them. De B. J. l. 5. c. iv. sect. 3. They were strong and lofty buildings, raised upon the north wall of the city. Herod had displayed his magnificence in them: but they were not fit for garrisons, or to be made places of defence. They were rather summer-palaces, fitted for diversion and entertainment, with splendid apartments and sumptuous furniture. The Jews did not relinquish any places of defence. They vigorously defended their several walls, and the tower Antonia, and the temple. They had fully exercised all the military skill and courage of Titus, and his many generals, and tired his soldiers: and induced them more than once to despair of victory, as our historian himself has informed us. It appears however from Josephus, that Simon made use of the tower Phaselus for his own habitation, during a good part of the siege, *Τηνικαυτα γεμην τυραννεων απειδεχθη του Σιμωνος.* Ib. sect. 3. p. 330. in.

<sup>z</sup> Αυθις δε την αλλην αφανιζων πολιν, και τειχη κατασκαπτων, τετες της πυργος κατελιπε μνημιον εναι της αυτη τυχης, η συζηρωσιδι χρησιμημος κρατησε των αλωναι μη δυναμενων. L. 7. c. ix. sect. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Cap. ix. sect. 2.

ance, and to take the rest captive. Nevertheless the soldiers slew the aged and the infirm: but for those who were in their flourishing age, and might be useful to them, they drove them together into the temple and shut them up within the walls of the court of the women; over whom Titus set one of his freed-men, and Fronto, one of his friends, who was to determine the fate of each one according to his desert. Many were ordered to be slain. But of the young men he chose out the tallest, and the most beautiful, and reserved them for the triumph. Such as were above seventeen years of age he bound, and sent them to work in the mines in Egypt. Titus also sent a great many into the provinces, as presents to them, that they might be destroyed in their theatres, either by the sword or by wild beasts. They who were under seventeen years of age were sold for slaves. And during the time that Fronto was determining the fate of these men, there perished eleven thousand for want of food. Some of them had no food through the ill-will of those who guarded them. Others would not take what was given them. And indeed there were so many, that there was not food for them.'

Josephus does not here speak of any Jews being crucified at this time. Nevertheless, I apprehend that many now suffered in that manner. For in<sup>b</sup> one of the last sections of his life, giving an account of things presently after the city was taken, he says he was sent by Titus with Cerealis, one of his generals, and a thousand horse, to a village called Thekoa, to see whether it was a place fit for a camp. 'As I came back,' says he, 'I saw many of the captives crucified. Among them I discerned three of my former acquaintance, which gave me great concern. I thereupon went to Titus with tears in my eyes, and spoke to him; who immediately gave orders to have them taken down, and that the best care should be taken of them for their recovery. However two of them died under cure: the third survived.'

The<sup>c</sup> number of those who were taken captive during the whole war was computed to be ninety and seven thousand: and the number of those who perished during the siege eleven hundred thousand. The greater part of them were indeed of the same nation, but not inhabitants of the city. For they were come up from all the country to the festival of unleavened bread, and were on a sudden shut in by the army; which occasioned<sup>d</sup> so great a straitness that there

<sup>b</sup> D. Vit. sect. 75.

<sup>c</sup> Sect. 3.

<sup>d</sup> Ὡστε το πρωτον αυτοις την πεινοχωριαν γενεσθαι λογιμωδη φθοραν, αυθις δε και λιμον ωκυτερον.



came on a pestilential disorder, and then a famine, which was more severe.’

And presently afterwards: ‘This<sup>e</sup> great multitude was collected from other places. The whole nation was shut up as in a prison: and the Roman army encompassed the city, when it was crowded with inhabitants. Accordingly,<sup>f</sup> the multitude of those who perished therein exceeded all the destructions that men or God ever brought on the world.’

‘As<sup>g</sup> many were hid in caverns, the Romans made searches after them. If any were found alive they were presently slain. But beside them they found there more than two thousand: some killed by themselves and by one another, and more destroyed by famine. The ill savour of the dead bodies was offensive: nevertheless, for the sake of gain, many of the soldiers ventured into the caverns, where was found much treasure.’

‘John,<sup>h</sup> and his brethren who were with him in the cavern, wanted food. Now therefore he begged that the Romans would give him the right hand for security, which he had often rejected before. But Simon struggled hard with the distress he was in, till he was forced to surrender himself, as we shall relate hereafter. So he was reserved for the triumph, and to be then slain. John was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. And<sup>i</sup> now the Romans set fire to the extreme parts of the city, and burnt them down, and demolished the walls to the foundation.’

‘Thus<sup>k</sup> was Jerusalem taken in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, on the eighth day of the month of September. It had been taken five times before. This is the second time of its desolation.’ Josephus then enumerates these several times, and computes how many years it was from the time of its being first built, and then adds: ‘But neither its antiquity, nor its immense riches, nor the reputation of the nation, celebrated throughout the whole world, nor the great glory of its religion, has been sufficient to preserve it from destruction. Such was the end of the siege of Jerusalem.’ These are the last words of his sixth book of the Jewish War.

Then, at the beginning of the seventh book, he says: ‘And<sup>l</sup> now, when no more were left to be slain, nor any

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Πασαν γαρ ανθρωπινην και δαιμονιον φθοραν υπεμβαλλει το πληθος των απολωλοτων. Ib.

<sup>g</sup> Sect. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. sect. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Ῥωμαιοι τας τε εσχαιας τε αστους ενεπρησαν, και τα τειχη κατεσκαψαν. Ibid.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. x. *ibid.*

<sup>l</sup> L. 7. cap. i. sect. 1.

more plunder remained for the soldiers, Cæsar gave orders that they should demolish to the foundation the whole city, and the temple; leaving only the fore-mentioned towers Phaselus, Hippicus, and Mariamme, and so much of the wall as was on the west side of the city: that was spared in order to afford a camp for those who were to lie in garrison; but<sup>m</sup> as for all the rest of the whole circumference of the city, it was so thoroughly laid even with the ground, by those who dug it up to the foundation, that there was nothing left to make those who came thither to believe it had ever been inhabited.' So said our Lord, Luke xix. 44, "And they shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee: and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

The soldiers who were left in garrison near the city must have been instruments in digging up every part of it to the foundation. For Josephus, afterwards describing the journey of Titus through Palestine to Alexandria, and observing how Titus was affected at the sight of the deplorable condition of the place, has these expressions: 'And<sup>n</sup> no small part of its riches had been found in its ruins: this the Romans dug up. They found a great deal of gold and silver, and other precious things, which the owners had treasured up under ground against the uncertain fortunes of war; and they were assisted by the captives in the discovery of such things.'

And Eleazar, in one of his speeches at Massada, to be farther taken notice of hereafter, where he persuades the people with him to consent to be put to death, has these expressions: 'Where<sup>o</sup> is now that great city, the metropolis of the whole Jewish nation?—Where is that city which we believed to have God inhabiting in it? It<sup>p</sup> is rooted up to the foundation, and has no other monument left but the army of those who have destroyed it, encamping upon its ruins—Who can consider these things and not be sorry that he is still alive? I cannot but wish that we had all died before we had seen that holy city overthrown by its enemies, and<sup>q</sup> the holy temple so profanely dug up to the foundation.'

<sup>m</sup> Ἄλλον ἅπαντα τῆς πόλεως περιβολὸν οὕτως ἐξωμάρισαν οἱ κατασκαπτόντες—κ. λ. Ibid.

<sup>n</sup> L. 7. cap. v. sect. 2. p. 412. Hav. Et. conf. l. 6. cap. ix. sect. 4.

<sup>o</sup> L. 7. cap. viii. sect. 7. p. 430. Hav.

<sup>p</sup> Προφύζως ἐκ βαθρῶν ἀνηρπάσαι—

<sup>q</sup> ————πρὶν τὸν γαῖον τὸν ἅγιον οὕτως ἀνοσιῶς ἐξορρυγμένον. Ibid.

And Whitby, in his notes upon Matt. xxiv. 2, says: ‘The Jewish Talmud and Maimonides add, that Turnus [i. e. Terentius Rufus] captain of the army of Titus, did with a ploughshare tear up the foundations of the temple, and thereby signally fulfil those words in Micah iii. 12: “Therefore shall Zion for your sakes be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest.”’

Grotius has well observed upon Matt. xxiv. 1: ‘That the temple which had been repaired, or rebuilt by Herod, was rightly esteemed to be the same temple that had been built by Zerubbabel. So therefore Josephus says that the temple had been twice destroyed; once by the Chaldeans, a second time by Titus. And the Jewish masters call the destruction made by Titus, “the destruction of the second temple.” Whilst this temple stood the Messiah was to be expected, not only according to the prophecy of Daniel, but likewise of Haggai, ch. ii. 8, and Malachi, ch. iii. 1.’

‘Cæsar<sup>r</sup> determined to leave there as a guard the tenth legion, with some troops of horse and companies of foot. Having now completed the war, he returned thanks to his whole army, and distributed rewards among them. For this purpose he had a large tribunal erected for him in the place where he formerly encamped. That was a work of three days.’

‘The<sup>s</sup> rest of the army was sent away to several places; but he permitted the tenth legion to stay as a guard upon Jerusalem. Then he went to Cæsarea by the seaside, taking with him two legions, the fifth and the fifteenth, to attend him, till he should go to Egypt. At Cæsarea he laid up the spoils in great quantities, and gave orders that the captives should be kept there.’

‘From<sup>t</sup> that Cæsarea Titus went to Cæsarea Philippi, where he stayed some while, and exhibited all sorts of shows. Here many of the captives were destroyed: some were thrown to wild beasts, others in great numbers were compelled to fight with each other. Whilst he was there he heard of the seizure of Simon, son of Gioras, who during the siege had commanded in the upper city, and who had concealed himself under ground as long as he could, but now fell into the hands of Terentius Rufus, who had been left to keep guard at the ruins of Jerusalem. When Titus was returned to Cæsarea by the seaside, Simon was brought bound before him, who ordered him to be kept for the triumph at Rome.’

<sup>r</sup> L. 7. cap. i. sect. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Sect. 2.

<sup>t</sup> Cap. ii. sect. 1

‘ At <sup>u</sup> Cæsarea Titus solemnized the birthday of his brother Domitian, on <sup>v</sup> the twenty-fourth day of October, in a splendid manner, doing honour to him in the punishment of the Jews ; for the number of those who were now slain, in fighting with beasts, or were burnt to death, or fought with one another, exceeded two thousand and five hundred : yet did all this seem to the Romans, though they were destroyed ten thousand ways, beneath their deserts. Afterwards Titus went to Berytus, a city in Phœnicia, and a Roman colony ; there he stayed a longer time, and exhibited a more pompous solemnity on his father’s birthday, [November 17.] Here a great number of the captives were destroyed in the like manner as before.’

‘ Having <sup>w</sup> stayed some while at Berytus, he set forward to Antioch ; and as he went exhibited magnificent shows in all the cities of Syria, making use of the captives as public instances of the overthrow of the Jewish nation.’

At <sup>x</sup> Antioch he was received with loud acclamations. Thence he went to Zengma, which lies upon the Euphrates : whither came to him messengers from Vologesus, king of Parthia, who brought him a crown of gold, congratulating him upon his victory over the Jews, which he accepted. There he feasted the king’s messengers, and then returned to Antioch.

It does not appear that Titus celebrated any shows there ; and when the people of that place requested him to expel the Jews out of their city, he refused to comply with them, and confirmed to them all the privileges which they had hitherto enjoyed there.

Having <sup>y</sup> sent away the two before-mentioned legions by which he had been attended, one to Mysia, the other to Pannonia, and having given orders for sending Simon and John, and seven hundred of the tallest and handsomest of the captives, to appear in the triumph at Rome, he went to Alexandria, and thence to Rome, and passing through Palestine, in his way to Egypt, he was much moved, as Josephus says, at the sight of the desolations of that country.

When <sup>z</sup> Titus came near Rome he was received with great rejoicings by the people, who came out to meet him, as also by his father Vespasian : and though the senate had decreed to them two several triumphs, they chose to have but one. Josephus has not informed us exactly concerning the time of

<sup>u</sup> Cap. iii. sect. 1.

<sup>v</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 70. n. iii. et Basnag. ann.

70. n. xviii.

<sup>w</sup> Cap. v. sect. 1.

<sup>x</sup> —Sect. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 2, 3.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 3, 4.

it; and learned critics are now of different opinions: some <sup>a</sup> place it near the end of the month of April, in 71: others <sup>b</sup> argue that it must have been later.

‘Many <sup>c</sup> other spoils,’ says Josephus, ‘were carried in great abundance; but the most considerable of all were those taken out of the temple at Jerusalem. There was the golden table of many talents; and the candlestick, likewise of gold, with its seven lamps, a number much respected by the Jews: the last of all the spoils was the law of the Jews: after which were carried images of Victory, made of gold or ivory; after which came Vespasian first, on horseback, then Titus; Domitian also was there splendidly attired, and riding upon a beautiful horse.’

‘The <sup>d</sup> end of this pompous show was at the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. When they came thither they stood still; for it was the ancient custom of the Romans to stay till word was brought that the general of the enemy was slain. This was Simon, the son of Gorias, who had been led in the triumph among the captives. A rope was put about his neck, and he was led to a proper place in the forum, where malefactors were put to death. When tidings of his death were brought, all the people set up the shout of joy, and sacrifices were offered up, with the accustomed prayers. The emperor then went to his palace, and feasting was made every where.’

‘And <sup>e</sup> now Vespasian determined to build a temple to Peace, which was finished in a short time, and in a splendid manner. Here he laid up those golden vessels and instruments, that were taken out of the Jewish temple, as ensigns of his glory: but their law, and the purple veils of the holy place, he ordered to be deposited in his palace.’

‘That <sup>f</sup> temple was adorned with paintings and statues. In it were collected and repositied all such curiosities as men are wont to wander all over the world to obtain a sight of.’

The book of the law does not now appear in what is called the triumphal arch of Titus, though the table and the candlestick are very visible.

Josephus, in his Life, says, that ‘when the city was taken, Titus gave him leave to ask what he pleased.’ One of his requests <sup>g</sup> was to have the sacred books, which were granted to him. Here, in the History of the War, he seems to say

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 70. n. vi

<sup>c</sup> Sect. 5.

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 7.

<sup>g</sup> ——— και βιβλιων ιερων ελαβον χαρισματα Τιτου. Vit. sect. 75.

<sup>b</sup> Basnag. 71. n. iii.

<sup>d</sup> Sect. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Ib. Sect. 7.

they<sup>h</sup> were deposited in the emperor's palace : possibly they were placed there : but Josephus was allowed to have the use of them when he desired it.

The temple of Peace, according to the description which Josephus has given of it, appears to have resembled our British Museum, and other like rich cabinets of princes in several parts of Europe.

The temple of Peace was burnt down in the reign of Commodus ; but it is likely that many of the curiosities deposited in it were preserved from the flames. And the Jewish spoils were in being in the fifth century, and afterwards, though not at Rome, as we learn from<sup>i</sup> Adrian Reland.

We have seen the overthrow of the city and temple of Jerusalem ; but there still remained some strong places in Judea not yet taken by the Romans, of which Josephus has given an account ; and it is fit we should trace him to the end of his History of the Jewish War : for, as our Lord said, "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together : " Matt. xxiv. 28. And see Luke xvii. 37.

Lucilius Bassus<sup>k</sup> was sent into Judea by Vespasian as lieutenant, where he received a sufficient army from Cerealis Vitellianus : he soon took Herodion, and made the garrison prisoners.

He<sup>l</sup> then determined to go to Machærus : by means of an accident, well improved, he became master of it without much loss on either side.

' Having<sup>m</sup> settled affairs there, he marched hastily to the forest of Jardes ; where, as he was informed, many were gathered together who during the siege had escaped from Jerusalem and Machærus. When they engaged, the battle was fierce and obstinate on both sides ; nevertheless, of the Romans there were not more than twelve killed, and not many wounded ; but of the Jews not one escaped out of the battle, but they were all killed, being not fewer in number than three thousand : and with them their general, Judas, the son of Jairus, who had been captain of a band in the siege of Jerusalem, and by getting out, through a vault under ground, had privately escaped.'

<sup>h</sup> Τον ἔε νομον αυτων, — προσεταξεν εν τοις βασιλαιοις αποθιμενες φυλαττειν. L. 7. c. v. sect. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Imperante Commodo deflagavit hoc templum Pacis, teste Herodiano, L. i. cap. 14. sed cum eo non periisse spolia Hierosolymitana certum est, quoniam seculo quinto a Christo nato ea in Africam delata sunt, ut mox videbimus, &c. Reland. De Spoliis Templ. Hieros. cap. 13. p. 133.

<sup>k</sup> L. 7. cap. vi. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Ib. sect. 1—1.

<sup>m</sup> Ib. sect. 5.

‘ About <sup>n</sup> this time the emperor sent orders to Lucilius Bassus, and Liberius Maximus, that all Judea should be exposed to sale: for he founded not any city there, but reserved the country to himself. However, he assigned a place for eight hundred men, whom he dismissed from the army, which he gave them for their habitation. It is called Ammaus, and is distant from Jerusalem sixty furlongs: he also laid a tribute upon the Jews wherever they were, requiring that every one of them should bring two drachmas [half a shekel] every year to the capitol; the same that they had been used to pay to the temple at Jerusalem.’

Bassus <sup>o</sup> having died in Judea, Flavius Silva was sent to succeed him in the government of that country; who soon made an expedition against Massada, the only remaining fortress; it was in the possession of Eleazar, a commander of the Sicarii: he was a descendant of Judas, who had persuaded many of the Jews, as formerly related, not to submit to the assessment made by Cyrenius when he came into Judea after the removal of Archelaus.

When <sup>p</sup> there was no room left for escaping, Eleazar called together the principal persons, and consulted with them what might be best to be done: at which time he made an oration to them to induce them to kill themselves rather than fall into the hands of the Romans.

That <sup>q</sup> oration had great effect upon many: some however there were who hesitated: he therefore went on, and made another oration to the like purpose: all now were persuaded.

They <sup>r</sup> then chose ten men of the number by lot to slay all the rest. When these ten men had without fear slain all the rest, men, women, and children, as determined, they cast lots upon themselves, and he who had the first lot killed the other nine, and then himself. These people so died with the intention that they might not leave so much as one man among them to be subject to the Romans. However, there was one ancient woman, and another woman related to Eleazar, who exceeded most women in knowledge and prudence, and five children, who had hid themselves in a cavern under ground: they had carried water with them for their drink, and lay quiet there, whilst the rest were intent upon the slaughter of each other. The whole number of these people, including the just-mentioned women and children, was nine hundred and sixty. This slaughter was made on the fifteenth day of the month of April, in the year 73, as may be computed.’

<sup>n</sup> Sect. 6.

<sup>o</sup> Cap. viii. sect. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Sect. 6.

<sup>q</sup> Ib. sect. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Cap. ix. sect. 1, 2.

When the Romans entered the place the next morning, their surprise was very great, as may be well supposed.

Soon <sup>s</sup> after this some turbulent Jews were the occasion of disturbances at Alexandria, where six hundred were slain; and after that in Cyrene, where more than three thousand suffered. The disturbance there was occasioned by the imposture of Jonathan, a weaver, who <sup>t</sup> persuaded many people of the meaner sort to follow him into the wilderness, where he promised to show them signs and wonders. Moreover Vespasian sent express orders that the Jewish temple of Onias, as it was called, built in the præfecture of Heliopolis in Egypt, should be demolished: which was done in the year of Christ 74, about two hundred and twenty-four years after it had been first built, as <sup>u</sup> Prideaux computes.

We before saw what was the number of those who were computed to have perished in the siege of Jerusalem: but, taking in also those who had suffered in other places out of Jerusalem, these, added to the eleven hundred thousand that perished in the siege, make the whole number thirteen hundred and thirty-seven thousand four hundred and ninety; an innumerable company still being omitted that perished through famine, banishment, and other <sup>v</sup> miseries. Which I think to be no aggravation at all.

IX. Let us now reflect.

I. All these things have we seen in Josephus, who at the beginning of his work says: ‘I <sup>w</sup> Josephus, son of Matthias, by birth a Hebrew of Jerusalem, and a priest, who myself at first fought against the Romans, and was afterwards forced to be present at the things that were done, have written this history.’

The conclusion of the whole work, at the end of the seventh and last book of the Jewish War, is to this effect: ‘Here <sup>x</sup> we put an end to our history, which we promised to deliver with all accuracy to those who are desirous to know how this war of the Romans with the Jews was managed. Concerning the style let the readers judge: concerning the truth, I may boldly say, that only has been aimed at throughout the whole work.’

Perhaps likewise it may not be amiss to observe what he

<sup>s</sup> Cap. x. xi.

<sup>t</sup> —*ἄκ ολίγης τῶν ἀπορῶν ἐνεπίσει προσεχεῖν αὐτῷ, καὶ προηγαγεν εἰς τὸν ἐρημὸν, σημεῖα καὶ φάσματα δεῖξειν ὑποσχομένους.* cap. xi. sect. 1.

<sup>u</sup> See his *Connexion*, &c. year before Christ 149. p. 266.

<sup>v</sup> See Usher's *Annals*, p. 907. in English, Lond. 1658.

<sup>w</sup> De B. Jud. in Pr. sect. 1.

<sup>x</sup> L. 7. cap. xi. sect. 5.



says of this work in his first book against Appion, written long afterwards, near the period of his life.

‘As<sup>y</sup> for myself I have composed a true history of that war, and of all the particulars that occurred therein, as having been concerned in all its transactions: for I acted as general among those among us who are called Galileans, as long as it was possible for us to make any opposition: and when I was taken captive by the Romans, Vespasian and Titus had me kept under a guard, but obliged me to attend them continually. At first I was in bonds; afterwards I was set at liberty, and was sent to accompany Titus when he came from Alexandria to the siege of Jerusalem; during which time nothing was done which escaped my knowledge. What happened in the Roman camp, I saw, and wrote it down carefully; what information the deserters brought out of the city, I was the only man that understood it: afterwards I got leisure at Rome: and when all my materials were prepared, I procured the help of one to assist me in writing Greek. Thus I composed the history of those transactions. And I was so well assured of the truth of what I related, that I first appealed to those who had the supreme command in that war, Vespasian and Titus, as witnesses for me; for to them I first presented those books, and after them to many of the Romans who had been in the war. I also communicated them to many of our own men, who understood the Greek philosophy; among whom were Julius Archclaus, and Herod, a person of great gravity, and king Agrippa himself, who deserved the greatest admiration: all these bore testimony to me that I had the strictest regard to truth; who would not have dissembled the matter, nor have been silent, if through ignorance, or out of favour to either side, I had altered or omitted any thing.’

2. Josephus’s History of the Jewish War is an ample testimony to the fulfilment of all the predictions of our Lord, concerning the demolition of the temple and city of Jerusalem, and the miseries to be endured by the nation during the siege, which were such as had never before happened to any people, nor were likely to happen again.

3. The sufferers in these calamities were generally men of the worst characters, robbers and Sicarii, and others too much resembling them. It is reasonable to believe that no christians were then shut up in the city, nor many other good men, to partake in the miseries of that long and grievous siege. As St. Peter says, having instanced in the preservation of “Noah the eighth person, when God brought in the

<sup>y</sup> Contr. Ap. l. i. sect. 9.

flood upon the world of the ungodly, and then delivering just Lot, when the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were turned into ashes," adds, with a view to other like cases, and probably to the destruction of Jerusalem itself: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished," 2 Pet. ii. 5—9.

4. I think it ought to be observed by us that there was not now any pestilence at Jerusalem, but the Jews perished by the calamities of war. It might have been expected that the bad food, which they were forced to make use of in the straitness of the siege, and the noisome smell of so many dead bodies lying in heaps in the city itself, and in the vallies or ditches without the walls, should have produced a plague: but nothing of that kind appears<sup>2</sup> in the History: which must have been owing to the special interposition of Divine Providence. Josephus,<sup>3</sup> in some of the places where he speaks of the putrefaction of the dead bodies, may use expressions equivalent to pestilential; but he never shows that there was an infection: if there had, it would have equally affected the Romans and the Jews, and the siege of the place must have been broken up, and the Romans would have gone off as fast as they could.

5. None can forbear to observe the time when all these things came to pass. Our Lord says, Matt. xxiii. 36, "Verily, I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." And xxiv. 34, "Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." So likewise Mark xiii. 30, and Luke xxi. 32. So it was. All these things foretold by our Lord came to pass before the end of that generation of men. Jerusalem and the temple were no more, before the end of the year 70 of the christian epoch, and within forty years after his crucifixion.

Concerning the time also our Lord said: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations:" Matt. xxiv. 14. Comp. Mark xiii. 10.

This we know from christian writings, particularly the books of the New Testament, most of which were written

<sup>2</sup> Il est difficile que tant de peuples renformés dans une ville durant les chaleurs de l'été, de si méchantes nourritures et surtout la puanteur de tant de corps morts, n'aient joint la peste à la famine. Joseph n'en parle néanmoins qu'en un endroit, en passant; ce qui marque qu'elle ne fut pas considérable. Till. Ruine des Juifs. art. 67. p. 960.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. De B. Jud. l. 5. cap. xii. sect. 4.

before the destruction of Jerusalem. They bear witness that the gospel had been preached to Jews and Gentiles in Judea, Syria, Asia, Greece, Macedonia, and Rome, and other places, and with great success: and the preaching of the gospel throughout the world was a testimony to all nations that the calamities inflicted upon the Jewish people were just and fit. They bear witness that the Jewish nation had been called upon to repent, and were faithfully, and affectionately, and earnestly warned and admonished; but they refused to hearken. See the Acts of the Apostles, and Mark xvi. 20; Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 6, and 23.

Says archbishop Tillotson: ‘We<sup>b</sup> have this matter related, not by a christian, (who might be suspected of partiality and a design to have paralleled the event with our Saviour’s prediction,) but by a Jew, both by nation and religion, who seems designedly to have avoided, as much as possibly he could, the very mention of the christian name, and all particulars relating to our Saviour, though no historian was ever more punctual in other things.’

Says Mr. Tillemont: ‘God had been pleased to choose for our information in this history, not an apostle, nor any of the chief men of the church, but an obstinate Jew, whom neither the view of the virtue and miracles of the christians, nor the knowledge of the law, nor the ruin of his religion and country, could induce to believe in and love the Messiah, who was all the expectation of the nation. God has permitted it so to be, that the testimony which this historian gave to an event, of which he did not comprehend the mystery, might not be rejected either by Jews or heathens; and that none might be able to say that he altered the truth of things to favour Jesus Christ and his disciples.’

Dr. W. Wotton says of Josephus: ‘He<sup>d</sup> is certainly an author very justly to be valued, notwithstanding all his faults. His History of the Jewish War is a noble demonstration of the truth of the christian religion; by showing, in the most lively manner, how the prophecies of our blessed Lord, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, were literally fulfilled in their fullest extent.’

And Dr. Doddridge, in his notes upon chap. xxiv. of St. Matthew’s gospel, says: ‘Christian writers<sup>e</sup> have always

<sup>b</sup> Vol. 2. p. 563. serm. 186, the seventh sermon upon 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

<sup>c</sup> Ruine des Juifs, art. i. p. 722.

<sup>d</sup> Preface to his Miscellaneous Discourses relating to the Traditions and Usages of the Scribes and Pharisees, p. xlix. The faults, which he observes in Josephus, may be seen at p. xxxiii. &c.

<sup>e</sup> The Family Expositor, sect. 160. Vol. 2. p. 373.

‘ with great reason represented Josephus’s History of the  
 ‘ Jewish War as the best commentary upon this chapter.  
 ‘ And many have justly remarked it as a wonderful instance  
 ‘ of the care of Providence for the christian church, that he,  
 ‘ an eye-witness, and in these things of so great credit,  
 ‘ should (especially in so extraordinary a manner) be pre-  
 ‘ served to transmit to us a collection of important facts,  
 ‘ which so exactly illustrate this noble prophecy, in almost  
 ‘ every particular circumstance. But as it would swell my  
 ‘ notes too much to enter into a particular detail of those  
 ‘ circumstances, I must content myself with referring to  
 ‘ Dr. Whitby’s excellent notes upon the twenty-fourth of  
 ‘ Matthew, and to archbishop Tillotson’s large and accurate  
 ‘ discourse on the same subject, in the second volume of his  
 ‘ posthumous works. Serm. 183—187.’

Isidore of Pelusium, who flourished about the year 412, in one of his epistles has these expressions: ‘ If<sup>f</sup> you have  
 ‘ a mind to know what punishment the wicked Jews under-  
 ‘ went, who ill-treated the Christ, read the history of their  
 ‘ destruction, written by Josephus, a Jew indeed, but a lover  
 ‘ of truth, that you may see the wonderful story, such  
 ‘ as no time ever saw before since the beginning of the world,  
 ‘ nor ever shall see. For that none might refuse to give  
 ‘ credit to the history of their incredible and unparalleled  
 ‘ sufferings, truth found out not a stranger, but a native, and  
 ‘ a man fond of their institutions, to relate them in a doleful  
 ‘ strain.’

Eusebius often quotes Josephus, and, in his Ecclesiastical History, has transcribed from him several articles at large. Having rehearsed from the gospels divers of our Lord’s predictions of the evils then coming upon Jerusalem and the Jewish people, he adds: ‘ Whosoever<sup>g</sup> shall compare these  
 ‘ words of our Saviour with the history of the whole war,  
 ‘ published by the above-mentioned writer, must admire our  
 ‘ Lord’s great wisdom, and acknowledge that his foresight  
 ‘ was divine.’

In his Chronicle, as we have it from Jerom in Latin, Eusebius says: ‘ In<sup>h</sup> subduing Judea, and overthrowing Je-

<sup>f</sup> Lib. 4. ep. 75. vid. et ep. 74.

<sup>g</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. 8. p. 81. D.

<sup>h</sup> Titus, Judæâ captâ, et Jerosolymis subversis, DC millia virorum interfecit. Josephus vero scribit undecies centena millia fame et gladio periisse, et alia centum millia captivorum publice venundata. Ut autem tanta multitudo Jerosolymis reperirentur, causam Azymorum fuisse refert; ob quam ex omni genere Judæi ad templum confluentes urbe quasi carcere sunt reclusi. Oportuit enim in iisdem diebus eos interfici, in quibus Salvatorem crucifixerant. Chron. p. 162.

‘ Jerusalem, Titus slew six hundred thousand people : but Josephus writes, that eleven hundred thousand perished by famine and the sword, and that another hundred thousand were publicly sold and carried captives : and he says that the occasion of there being so great a multitude of people at Jerusalem was this, that it was the time of passover ; for which reason the Jews, having come up from all parts to worship at the temple, were shut up in the city as in a prison. And indeed it was fit they should be slain at the same time in which they crucified our Saviour.’

It is certainly very fit that christians should attend to the fulfilment of our Lord’s predictions relating to the Jewish people, which are so frequent, so solemn, and affectionate. The testimony of Josephus is the most considerable of all : it is the most full, and particular, and exact of any we have, or have the knowledge of : and he was an eye-witness ; and he was manifestly zealous for the honour of his country : he had a great respect for the temple, and its worship, and for all the peculiarities of the Mosaic law ; and he continued to have the same to the last, as appears from his own life and his books against Appion.

X. Josephus, in the preface to his own work, intimates that some histories of the war had been before written by others : but he represents them as partial and defective, and composed by men who were not well informed. Undoubtedly none of these remain now : they have been lost long since.

Justus of Tiberias, contemporary with Josephus, between whom there were many differences, also wrote a history of the War. Josephus in his Life chargeth him with falsehood, and blames him for not publishing his work until after the death of Vespasian and Titus, and king Agrippa.

Josephus owns<sup>i</sup> that Justus was well skilled in Greek learning : and he plainly says that he wrote of the war.

I do not clearly perceive Eusebius<sup>k</sup> to have known any thing of Justus but what he learned from the testimonies of Josephus, above referred to by me.

Justus<sup>l</sup> is in Jerom’s Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. He seems to ascribe to him two books.

Photius<sup>m</sup> I think speaks of but one work of this author,

<sup>i</sup> Καὶ γὰρ ὁδ’ ἀπειρος ἦν παιδείας τῆς παρ’ Ἑλλήσιν, ἢ θαρρόων ἐπεχειρήσειν καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν πραγμάτων τετῶν ἀναγραφῶν, κ. λ. Joseph. Vit. sect. 5. Vid. et sect. 65.

<sup>k</sup> H. E. l. 3. cap. x. p. 86. B.

<sup>l</sup> Justus Tiberiensis, de provinciâ Galilæâ, conatus est et ipse judaicarum rerum historiam texere, et quosdam commentariolos de Scripturis componere, &c. De V. I. cap. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Ἀνεγνωσθη Ἰστὸν Τιβερεως χρονικον, κ. λ. Cod. 33. p. 20.

which he calls a Chronicle. He says it began with Moses and ended at the death of Agrippa. He also takes notice of Josephus's censures both of the author himself and his work.

Stephanus Byzantinus, in his article of Tiberias, says :  
 ' Of <sup>n</sup> this city was Justus, who wrote of the Jewish war in  
 ' the time of Vespasian.'

Diogenes Laertius,<sup>o</sup> in his Life of Socrates, quotes a passage from Justus of Tiberias, and seems to quote the same book that was read by Photius.

Several learned moderns<sup>p</sup> are of opinion that Justus, like Josephus, wrote two books, one of the Jewish War, another of the Jewish Antiquities. Menage,<sup>q</sup> in his notes upon Diogenes Laertius, ascribes to Justus three books, that is, Memoirs, beside the two before mentioned. I rather think there was but one, and that what Justus wrote of the war was comprised in the Chronicle. Menage's argument from Suidas is of no value ; for Suidas expresseth himself inaccurately ; nor does he mention more than two works : the Memoirs, *ὑπομνηματα*, are the same with Jerom's Commentarioli de Scripturis. Indeed Suidas only transcribes Jerom, or his interpreter Sophronius, and has done it inaccurately.

Some<sup>r</sup> learned men lament the loss of this work. Others<sup>s</sup> think it was of little value. I cannot but wish that the work, which was in being in the time of Photius, had also reached us. It must have been of some use. Perhaps the censure passed upon it by Josephus, who was in great credit, has been a prejudice to it.

I have allowed myself to enlarge in my notice of this writer, who lived at the time, and was an actor in the Jewish war with the Romans. Though his work is not extant, he is a witness to that important transaction.

<sup>n</sup> Ἐκ ταύτης ἦν Ἰστρος, ὁ τὸν Ἰεδαϊκὸν Πόλεμον τὸν κατὰ Οὐεσπασιανῆς ἰστορήσας. Steph. Byz.

<sup>o</sup> Φησὶν Ἰστρος ὁ Τιβερεὺς ἐν τῷ σεμμάτι. Diog. La. l. 2. sect. 41.

<sup>p</sup> Unde collige, (ex Hieronymi Catalogo,) ut Josephus, ita et Justum, non modo de Antiquitatibus Judaïcis, sed seorsum etiam de Bello Judaïco scripsisse. Voss. de H. Gr. Vid. et Vales. Ann. in Euseb. l. 3. cap. x. Tillem. Ruine de Juifs. art. 82.

<sup>q</sup> Scripsit ille Historiam Judaïcam, eodem tempore quo Josephus, a quo mendacii arguitur. Scripsit præterea ὑπομνηματα, quorum meminuit Suidas. Scripsit et Chronicon Regum Judæorum, qui coronati fuerunt ; ut est apud Photium : quod opus signat hic Laërtius. Menag. in loc. p. 94.

<sup>r</sup> Josephus, in Vitâ suâ, et alibi, quasi parum fido scriptori conviciatur. Sed, de inimico, non magis ei crediderim, quam Justo de Josepho crederem, si historia ejus exstaret, atque in eâ æmulo ab eo detractum viderem. Utinam vero, quæcumque fuerit, ad nos usque pervenisset. Cleric. H. E. A. C. C. cap. vii.

<sup>s</sup> Tillem. as above, art. 80.

Pausanias, who<sup>t</sup> lived in the second century, and wrote after the year of our Lord 180, speaks<sup>u</sup> of a monument of queen Helena at Jerusalem, which (city) an emperor of the Romans had destroyed to the foundation.

‘Minucius Felix refers<sup>v</sup> the heathen people not only to Josephus, but also to Antonius Julianus, a Roman author, from whom they might learn that the Jews had not been ruined nor abandoned of God till they had first abandoned him: and that their present low condition was owing to their wickedness and obstinacy therein, and that nothing had happened to them but what had been foretold.’

Who that Julianus was cannot be said. There have been several of that name, one<sup>w</sup> of whom was procurator of Judea, and was present with Titus at the siege of Jerusalem, as we know from Josephus. Tillemont says that<sup>x</sup> possibly he wrote a history of the siege of Jerusalem. G. Vossius,<sup>y</sup> upon the ground of this passage of Minucius, puts Antonius Julianus among Latin historians who had written a history of the Jews.

Minucius reckons Josephus among Roman writers. Dr. Davis suspects it to be an interpolation, and assigns not improbable reasons in his notes upon the place.

Suetonius<sup>z</sup> has mentioned the occasion of the war, the appointment of Vespasian to be general, his and his son's triumph at<sup>a</sup> Rome, and several other material things, which have been already observed, or will in time be observed by us from him.

What<sup>b</sup> Tacitus has written upon this subject, so far as it remains, may be taken notice of hereafter.

Dion Cassius<sup>c</sup> is another witness, whose testimony also may be taken more at large hereafter.

<sup>t</sup> See Tillem, L'Emp. Marc. Aurele. art. xxxii.

<sup>u</sup> 'Εβραϊος ἐπὶ Ἑλληνῆς γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας ταφὸς ἐστὶν ἐν πόλει Σολυμοῖς, ἣν εἰς εἰδαφὸς κατέβαλεν ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς. Pausan. l. 8. cap. 16. p. 633.

<sup>v</sup> Scripta eorum relege. Vel si Romanis magis gaudes, ut transeamus veteres, Flavii Josephi, vel Antonii Juliani, de Judæis require. Jam scies, nequitia sua hanc eos meruisse fortunam: nec quidquam accidisse, quod non sit his, si in contumacia perseverarent, ante prædictum. Ita prius eos deseruisse comprehendes, quam esse desertos; nec, ut impie loqueris, cum Deo suo esse captos, sed a Deo, ut disciplinæ transfugas, deditos. Minuc. c. 33. Conf. c. 10.

<sup>w</sup> Καὶ Μάρκος Αντωνίος, ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπιτροπὸς. Jos. de B. J. l. 6. cap. iv. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Ruine des Juifs, art. 72.

<sup>y</sup> Antonius Julianus Judæicam videtur Historiam consignasse, &c. De Hist. Lat. l. 3. De Historicis incertæ ætatis.

<sup>z</sup> Sueton. Vespas. c. 4, 5.

<sup>a</sup> ———ac triumphum utriusque judæicum, equo albo comitatus est. Domit. c. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Tac. Hist. Lib. v

<sup>c</sup> Dio. l. 66. sub. in.

Philostratus says that ‘when <sup>d</sup> Titus had taken Jerusalem, and filled all about it with dead bodies, and the neighbouring nations offered him crowns, he said he was not worthy of such an honour, nor had he himself, he said, done that great work. He had only lent his hand in the service of God, when he was pleased to show his displeasure.’ Philostratus says that Apollonius was much pleased with that token of wisdom and humanity. He likewise says that Apollonius wrote a letter to Titus, and sent it by Damis, to this purpose: ‘Apollonius sendeth greeting to Titus emperor of the Romans. Since you refuse to be applauded for bloodshed and victory in war, I send you the crown of moderation. You know for what things crowns are due.’

Hence divers learned men have argued that Titus refused to be crowned for his victory over the Jews. Basnage,<sup>e</sup> and other learned men, on the contrary, are of opinion that we may rely upon the authority of Josephus, who tells us that ‘he went from Antioch to the Zeugma, whither came to him messengers from Vologesus, king of Parthia, and brought him a crown of gold upon the victory obtained by him over the Jews; which he accepted of, and feasted the king’s messengers, and then returned to Antioch.’ Moreover he accepted of a triumph for his victory over the Jews, and all other honours customary upon the like occasions. Nevertheless, Olearius, in his notes upon the place, argues that<sup>f</sup> Philostratus needs not be understood to say that Titus refused the crowns offered him, but only said that he was unworthy of that honour, he having been only an instrument in the hand of God for displaying his just vengeance against guilty men.

And it must be owned that Olearius expresseth himself with great judgment and moderation. Either way those learned men are to be reckoned mistaken, who have main-

<sup>d</sup> Επει δὲ Τίτος ἤρῃκει τὰ Σοδύμα, καὶ νεκρῶν πλεῖα ἦν πάντα τὰ ὄμορα τε εἰρη εὐεφάνων αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἐκ ἑξῆς ἑαυτοῦ τῆσθ’ μη γὰρ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα εἰργασθαι, Οὐδὲν δὲ οργὴν φησαντι ἐπεδεδῶκεναι τὰς ἑαυτῶ χεῖρας, κ. λ. Philos. de Vit. Apol. l. 6. cap. 29.

<sup>e</sup> Modestiam Titi laudibus effert Baronius, quod, ‘oblatâ sibi coronâ aurâ a provinciis, noluit coronari, testatus se prorsus indignum.’ Usserius, alii que eruditi, illud et ipsum tradunt, freti auctoritate Philostrati.—Basnag. ann. 70. n. xvi.

<sup>f</sup> Quem tamen Josephi locum immerito Philostrato opponi putem.—Neque enim Philostratus ‘repudiâsse coronam.’ Titum ait, atque eâ non acceptâ legatos dimisisse, quod viro docto interpretes persuasere, sed hoc tantum, quod eo honore se indignum dixerit; justitiæ Dei vindicatrici instrumentum, cujus nullæ fuerint in istis patrandis propriæ vires, sese exstitisse agnoscens, &c. Olear. in loc.



tained that Titus refused to be crowned for his victory over the Jews.

However, we are still to reckon Philostratus, at the beginning of the third century, a good witness to the overthrow of Jerusalem by Titus.

These are early heathen authors who have related the destruction of Jerusalem, and thereby bore testimony to the accomplishment of our Lord's predictions concerning it.

Nor can any forget the triumphal arch of Titus, still standing at Rome, of which we before took notice.

'There <sup>ε</sup> is also an ancient inscription to the honour of Titus, who, by his father's directions and counsels, had subdued the Jewish nation, and destroyed Jerusalem, which had never been destroyed by any princes or people before.'

Which has occasioned some learned men to say that even inscriptions are not free from flattery. But then it must be owned that <sup>h</sup> the genuineness and antiquity of this inscription has been called in question: and there are some reasons to doubt whether this comes from the senate of Rome itself, as is pretended.

<sup>ε</sup> Imp. Tito. Cæsari. Divi. Vespasiani. F.  
 Vespasiano. Aug. Pontifici. Maximo.  
 Trib. Pot. x. Imp. xvii. Cos. viii. P. P.  
 Principi. suo. S. P. Q. R.  
 Quod. Præceptis. Patris. Consiliisque. et  
 Auspiciis. Gentem. Judæorum. Domuit. Et  
 Urbem. Hierosolymam. Omnibus. Ante. Se  
 Ducibus. Regibus. Gentibusque. aut. Frustra  
 Petitam. aut. omnino. Intentatam. Delevit.

Ap. Gruter. p. 244.

<sup>h</sup> Ubi steterit, ignoratur. Scaliger vult ab Onufrio fictum. Ap. Gruter. Ib

## CHAP. IV.

THREE PARAGRAPHS IN THE WORKS OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING JOHN THE BAPTIST, OUR SAVIOUR, AND JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER; AND OBSERVATIONS UPON THE WRITINGS OF JOSEPHUS.

I. *Of John the Baptist.* II. *Concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.* III. *Concerning James, the Lord's Brother.* IV. *Concluding observations upon the writings and testimony of Josephus.*

I. 'ABOUT this time,' says<sup>a</sup> Josephus, 'there happened a difference between Aretas king of Petraea and Herod upon this occasion. Herod the tetrarch had married the daughter of Aretas, and lived a considerable time with her. But, in a journey he took to Rome, he made a visit to<sup>b</sup> Herod his brother, though not by the same mother——Here falling in love with Herodias, wife of the same Herod, daughter of their brother Aristobulus, and sister of Agrippa the great, he ventured to make to her proposals of marriage. She not disliking them, they agreed together at that time, that when he was returned from Rome she would go and live with him. And it was one part of the contract, that Aretas's daughter should be put away. This<sup>c</sup> was the beginning of the difference; and there being also some disputes about the limits of their territories, a war arose between Aretas and Herod. And in a battle fought by them Herod's whole army was defeated.'

'But,' says<sup>d</sup> Josephus, 'some of the Jews were of opinion

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 18. cap. v. sect. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Our evangelists call him Philip, Matt. xiv. 3, and elsewhere. That difficulty was considered formerly. Josephus and the evangelists mean the same person, though they call him by different names. See Vol. i. B. ii. ch. v.

<sup>c</sup> 'Ὁ δὲ ἀρχὴν ἐχθρὰς ταυτὴν ποιησάμενος, περὶ τε ὄρων ἐν τῇ γῇ τῇ Γαλαλιτῆϊ, καὶ ἐναντιῶς ἑκατέρῃ συλλεγείσης, εἰς πόλεμον καθίσταται· καὶ μάχης γενομένης, ἐεφθάρη παρ' ὃ Ἡρώδης στρατός, κ. λ. Ib. sect. 1.

<sup>d</sup> 'Τισὶ δὲ τῶν Ἰεζαίων ἐδοκεῖ, ὀλωλεῖναι τὸν Ἡρώδης στρατὸν ὑπὸ τῶ Θεοῦ, καὶ μάλα ἔκαιοως τιννημένῳ κατὰ ποιητὴν Ἰωάννη τῶ ἐπικαλούμενῳ Βαπτιστῶ. Κτείνει γὰρ τῶτον Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἀνδρα, καὶ τῶς Ἰεζαίως κεινοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκεντας, καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐκαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους, βαπτισμῷ συνιεναι· οὕτω γὰρ τὴν βαπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανείσθαι, μὴ ἐπιτινῶν ἁμαρταδῶν παραιτησῆι χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἄγνεια τῶ σώματος, ἄτε δη καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκαιοσύνη προεκεκαθαρημένης. Καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν συτρεφομένων'

that God had suffered Herod's army to be destroyed as a just punishment on him for the death of John, called the Baptist. For Herod had killed him, who was a just man, and had called upon the Jews to be baptized, and to practise virtue, exercising both justice toward men and piety toward God. For so would baptism be acceptable to God, if they made use of it, not for the expiation of their sins, but for the purity of the body, the mind being first purified by righteousness. And many coming to him, (for they were wonderfully taken with his discourses,) Herod was seized with apprehensions, lest by his authority they should be led into sedition against him; for they seemed capable of undertaking any thing by his direction. Herod therefore thought it better to take him off before any disturbance happened, than to run the risk of a change of affairs, and of repenting when it should be too late to remedy disorders. Being taken up upon this suspicion of Herod, and being sent bound to the castle of Machærus, just mentioned, he was slain there. The Jews were of opinion that the destruction of Herod's army was a punishment upon him for that action, God being displeased with him.'

The genuineness of this passage is generally admitted by learned men: though <sup>e</sup> Blondell hesitated about it. Tanquil Faber <sup>f</sup> received it very readily.

The genuineness of this paragraph may be argued in the following manner:

It is quoted or referred to by Origen in his books against Celsus. 'Besides,'<sup>g</sup> says that ancient writer, 'I would have Celsus, who personates a Jew, who after a sort admits John the Baptist, and that he baptized Jesus, to consider that an author, who wrote not long after the time of John and Jesus, says that John was a baptist, and that he baptized

και γαρ ηρθησαν επι πλειστον τη ακροασει των λογων, υεισας 'Ηρωδης το επι τοσονδε πιθανον αυτη τοις ανθρωποις μη επι αποσασει τινη φεροι, παντα γαρ ερκεσαν συμβαλη τη εκεινη πραζοντες· πολυ κρειττον ηγειται, πριν τι νεωτερον εξ αυτη γενεσθαι, προλαβων ανααιρεν, η μεταβολης γενομενης, εις τα πραγματα εμπεισων μετανοειν. Και ο μεν υποψια τη 'Ηρωδη δεσμος εις τον Μαχαριρηντα πεμφθεις, το προειρημενον φερριον, ταυτη κτιννυται. Τοις δε Ιωδαϊοις δοξαν, επι τιμωρια τη εκεινη τον ολεθρον επι τω στρατευματι γενεσθαι, τς Θεα κακως 'Ηρωδη θελοντος. Ib. sect. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Des. Sibylles, l. 1. c. vii. p. 28, 29.

<sup>f</sup> Fab. ap. Haverc. p. 269, 270.

<sup>g</sup> Εβζλομην δ' αν Κελσω, προσωποιοησαντι τον Ιωδαϊον παραδεξαμενον πως Ιωαννην ως βαπτιστην, βαπτιζοντα τον Ιησυν, ειπειν' ότι το Ιωαννην γεγομεναι βαπτιστην, εις αφεσιν αμαρτηματων βαπτιζοντα, ανεγραψε τις των μετ' η πολυ τς Ιωαννης και τς Ιησς γεγεννημενων. Εν γαρ τω οκτωκαιδεκατω της ιωδαϊκης αρχαιολογιας ο Ιωσηπος μαρτυρει τω Ιωαννη ως βαπτιστη γεγενομενω, και καθαροσιν τοις βαπτισαμενοις επαγγελλομενω. Contr. Cels. l. 1. sect. 47. p. 35.

‘ for the remission of sins. For in the eighteenth book of his Jewish Antiquities Josephus bears witness to John that he was a baptist, and promised purification to those who were baptized.’

Here it may be objected that Origen supposes Josephus to say, that John promised purification, or forgiveness of sins, to those who were baptized : whereas Josephus says of John, that ‘ he taught the people to make use of baptism, not for the expiation of their sins, but for the purity of the body.’

But I do not think that a sufficient reason why we should hesitate to allow that Origen refers to the passage which we now have in Josephus. Certainly Origen did not design to say, or intimate, that John promised to men the forgiveness of their sins barely upon their being baptized : but only upon the condition that they repented, or, as the phrase is in the gospels, that they “ brought forth fruits meet for repentance :” or, as in Josephus, ‘ the mind being first purified by righteousness.’ I therefore proceed.

This passage of Josephus is distinctly and largely quoted by <sup>h</sup> Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.

Jerom <sup>i</sup> also must be allowed to refer to the same in his book of Illustrious Men, though he does it very inaccurately.

This passage was read in Josephus by <sup>k</sup> Photius, as is apparent.

I do not think it needful for me to refer to any more ancient authors : but I shall consider some difficulties.

Obj. 1. In the first place, it has been said that this passage interrupts the course of the narration.

In answer to which I must say that I do not perceive it : the connexion is very good in my opinion.

Obj. 2. Secondly, it is objected that in the preceding section Machærus is spoken of as subject to Aretas ; therefore John the Baptist could not be sent prisoner thither by Herod the tetrarch.

To which I answer : it is there said to be subject to Aretas, father of Herod’s wife : *τοτε πατρι αυτης υποτελη.* But it is also there said to be in the borders of the government of Aretas and Herod : *μεθοριον δε εστι της τε Αρετα και Ήρωδω αρχης.*

<sup>h</sup> H. E. l. 1. cap. xi.

<sup>i</sup> Hic in decimo octavo Antiquitatum libro manifestissime confitetur, propter magnitudinem signorum Christum a pharisæis interfectum ; et Johannem Baptistam vere prophetam fuisse. De V. l. cap. xiii.

<sup>k</sup> Cod. 238. p. 972.

The history in that very section does not lead us to think that Machærus was in the possession of Aretas, but of Herod. It is thus: ‘Herod’s wife, daughter of Aretas, having discovered the agreement he had made with Herodias to come and live with him; and having discovered it before he had notice of her knowledge of the design, she desired him to send her to Machærus, a place in the borders of the dominions of Aretas and Herod, without informing him of her intentions. Accordingly, Herod sent her thither, as thinking his wife had not perceived any thing of the affair.’

By that means she got to her father. But hence, I think, it may be collected that Machærus was not then a part of her father’s dominions: for if it had, her request to be sent thither would have occasioned suspicions in Herod’s mind. Moreover, it may be argued, from many things in Josephus, that Machærus was now in the possession of Herod the tetrarch. It belonged to his father, Herod the Great, who had both adorned it and fortified it: and it was in the hands of the Jewish people during the time of the war, and was<sup>1</sup> one of the last places that were taken by the Romans after the siege of Jerusalem was over.

Obj. 3. According to our evangelist, the daughter of Herodias obtained the promise of John the Baptist’s head at the time of a public entertainment: and it was delivered to her presently. But how could that be done if John was imprisoned at Machærus, at a great distance from Herod’s court?

To which I answer, first, that Herod the tetrarch may have kept his birthday and made that entertainment at Machærus; for his father, Herod the Great, had built a palace there, with large and beautiful<sup>m</sup> apartments. Says Tillemont: ‘We<sup>n</sup> learn from Josephus that he was beheaded at Machærus, where it is easily supposed that Herod made his feast: [Mald. in Matt. p. 304, a.] for it was a palace as well as a ‘citadel.’ Secondly, supposing the entertainment to have been made at the capital city of Galilee, the promise might be made at the time of the entertainment, but the execution might be deferred till the next day, or till several days after.

Obj. 4. Still it may be said that this paragraph contradicts our evangelists: for, according to them, it was at the solicitation of Herodias and her daughter that John was

<sup>1</sup> Vid. De B. J. l. 7. cap. vi.

<sup>m</sup> Μεσον ἐε τῶ περιβολῆ βασιλειῶν ἠκοδομησατο, μεγεθῆ τε καὶ καλλίῆ τῶν οἰκησῶν πολυτελες, κ. λ. De B. J. l. 7. c. vi. sect. 2.

<sup>n</sup> S. Jean Baptiste, art. viii. p. 101. Mem. Ec. T. i.

beheaded. But here it is said that Herod put John to death, because he feared he might be the cause of a sedition.

But there is no inconsistency in these things; for Herod might, as is said in this paragraph, have apprehensions from John's popularity, and be disposed, upon that account, to take him off. Lesser differences there may be in several historians, who write of the same matter with different views; and some circumstances may be mentioned by one writer which are omitted by others.

I shall give an instance from the writings of the New Testament: Acts ix. 22—25, "But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ. And after that many days were fulfilled, the Jews took council to kill him; but their lying in wait was known to Saul: and they watched the gates day and night to kill him. Then the disciples took him by night, and let him down by the wall in a basket." So says St. Luke. Let us now observe St. Paul himself. 2 Cor. xi. 31—33, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not. In Damascus the governor, under Aretas the king, guarded the city of the Damascenes, desirous to apprehend me; and through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped him." St. Luke and St. Paul write of the same thing, as is apparent, and is allowed by all commentators and ecclesiastical historians: nevertheless, here is a very considerable difference of circumstance. St. Paul says nothing of the Jews, and St. Luke says nothing of the governor of Damascus. But we can conclude from St. Paul that the Jews had engaged the governor in their interest, who, with the soldiers, kept strict guard at all the gates of the city: but there was a window or opening in some part of the wall, to which his friends had access; and through that they let him down by the side of the wall, in a basket held by a rope, and he escaped. The danger was very pressing, and the apostle was much affected with it.

So far from contradicting the evangelists, this account in the paragraph greatly confirms them. In the preceding paragraph Josephus assures us of the unlawful contract made by Herod, that Herodias should leave her first husband and come and live with him. In this paragraph he gives an account of John's doctrine, very agreeable to that in the gospels—that he earnestly recommended the practice of righteousness toward men, and piety toward God; that he taught

men not to rely on baptism, or any other external rites, for the forgiveness of their sins, unless their minds were also purified by righteousness: and he assures us that John was in great esteem with the Jewish people. The same is also said by our evangelists, who tell us that "all men held John for a prophet." He likewise says that John, called the Baptist, was imprisoned by Herod, and afterwards put to death by his order.

We may be the more induced to admit the genuineness of this paragraph, because there is nothing in it out of character. Josephus did not receive our Jesus as the Christ: nor is there here any mention made of that part of John's character, that he was the forerunner of the Christ, or referred men to him.

There may have been many Jews who had a great regard for John, and yet did not believe in Jesus as the Christ. St. Paul met with twelve Jews of that sort at Ephesus, about the year of our Lord 53, as appears from a history at the beginning of Acts xix, "He said unto them: Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? 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." These men had received John's baptism as the baptism of repentance, but they had not attended to that other part of his preaching, that "they should believe on him who came after him," till they were reminded of it by St. Paul; and then they were presently satisfied, "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." And what follows.

Possibly those men, or most of them, had seen and heard John, and been baptized by him; and left Judea before Jesus had begun his public ministry: and being at a distance from the land of Judea, had never had any distinct account of the transactions there: but now being informed of them, and being open to conviction, they became disciples of Jesus, and believed in him as the Christ.

But many other Jews, not so well disposed, might stand out. They might retain a great respect for John, as we suppose Josephus to have done, as an holy man of an austere character, who had recommended the practice of virtue, and had been put to death by the tetrarch of Galilee, without believing in Jesus as the Christ.

Origen was well acquainted with the Jewish sentiments, having often conversed with their learned men. And in his answer to Celsus, he puts him in mind that ‘the ° Jews ‘ always make a difference between John and Jesus, and ‘ between the death of each of them.’

Indeed both were for a while in great repute with the Jewish people. But Jesus had greatly disappointed them in not assuming the character of a temporal prince, as they expected the Messiah should have done. And John was put to death by a prince not much beloved : but Jesus was crucified at the importunate demand of the Jewish rulers and people in general.

Josippon, in the ninth or tenth century, though he says nothing of Jesus Christ, or James, the Lord’s brother, mentions the death of John the Baptist, and more agreeably to the evangelists than this passage of Josephus which we are considering. He represents the tetrarch Herod as a very wicked prince. He says, ‘ that he ° took to himself, to be ‘ his own wife, the wife of his brother Philip, though his brother was still living, and she had children by him. He ‘ killed many wise men in Israel : and he killed that great ‘ priest John, the baptizer, because he had said to him, “ it ‘ is unlawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife.” ’ Many Jews, as it seems, have respected John the Baptist as an eminently good man, without allowing him to have any connexions with Jesus Christ.

II. In the same eighteenth book of Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities, but in a chapter preceding that in which is the account of John the Baptist, just considered, is this paragraph.

‘ At ° that time lived Jesus, a wise man, if he may be call-

° ——— *αναγκαιον αυτω παρασησαι, οτι και τωτο εκ οικειως τω ιωδαϊκω προσωπω περιεθηκεν. Ουδε γαρ συναπτει τον Ιωαννην οι Ιωδαιοι τω Ιησω, και την Ιωαννα την τω Ιησω κολασει.* Contr. Cels. l. i. cap. 48. p. 38.

° Ipse accepit uxorem Philippi fratris sui adhuc viventis in uxorem, licet illa haberet filios ex fratre ejus : eam, inquam, accepit sibi in uxorem. Occidit autem multos sapientes Israël. Occidit etiam Jochanan sacerdotem magnum, ob id quod dixerat ei : Non licet tibi accipere uxorem fratris tui Philippi in uxorem. Occidit ergo Jochananem Baptistam. Josipp. l. 6. cap. 63. p. 274.

° Γινεται δε κατα τωτον τον χρονον Ιησως, σοφος ανηρ, εγε ανδρα αυτον λεγειν χρη. Ην γαρ παραδοξων εργων ποιητης, διδασκαλος ανθρωπων των ηδουνη τ’ αληθη εχομενων. Και πολλας μεν Ιωδαιας, πολλας δε και τω Έλληνικω επηγαγο. Ο Χριστος ουτος ην. Και αυτον ενδειξει των πρωτων ανδρων παρ’ ημιν, σωρω επιτετιμηκοτος Ηλιατω, εκ επαυσαντο ογε πρωτον αυτον αγαπησαντες. Εφανη γαρ αυτοις τριτην εχων ημεραν παλιν ζων, των θεων προφητων ταυτα τε και αλλα μυρια θαυμασια περι αυτω ειρηκοτων. Εις επι νυν των χριστιανων απο τωδε ωρομασμενων ουκ επελιπε το φυλον. Antiq. Jud. l. 18. cap. iii. sect. 3.



ed a man; for he performed many wonderful works. He was a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him many Jews and Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the instigation of the chief men among us, had condemned him to the cross, they who before had conceived an affection for him did not cease to adhere to him. For on the third day he appeared to them alive again, the divine prophets having foretold these and many other wonderful things concerning him. And the sect of the christians, so called from him, subsists to this time.'

This passage is received by <sup>r</sup> many learned men as genuine: by others <sup>s</sup> it is rejected as an interpolation. It is allowed on all hands that it is in all the copies of Josephus's works, now extant, both printed and manuscript: nevertheless, it may be for several reasons called in question. They are such as these.

1. This paragraph is not quoted nor referred to by any christian writers before Eusebius, who flourished at the beginning of the fourth century and afterwards.

If it had been originally in the works of Josephus, it would have been highly proper to produce it in their disputes with Jews and Gentiles: but it is never quoted by Justin Martyr, or Clement of Alexandria, nor by Tertullian or Origen; men of great learning, and well acquainted with the works of Josephus. It was certainly very proper to urge it against the Jews; it might also have been fitly alleged against Gentiles. A testimony so favourable to Jesus in the works of Josephus, who lived so soon after the time of our Saviour, who was so well acquainted with the transactions of his own country, who had received so many favours from Vespasian and Titus, could not be overlooked or neglected by any christian apologist.

If this passage had related only to some one of the first followers of Jesus, the omission had not been so remarkable; but it relates to Jesus himself; it declares his proper character, his miracles, his crucifixion, and resurrection; and that all this was agreeable to the predictions of the prophets.

This passage is not only not quoted by Origen, but we can

<sup>r</sup> Cav. H. L. in Josepho. Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop. iii. p. 32, &c. Fab. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. vi. Tom. 3. Whiston in his first dissertation. Spanhem. Opp. T. i. p. 531. Tillem. Ruine des Juifs, art. 81. and note xl. H. E. Tom. i.

<sup>s</sup> J. Ittigii Prolegom. ap. Havercamp. p. 89. Blondel. des Sibylles, p. 18. Tan. Fabr. ap. Havercamp. p. 267, &c. Cleric. H. E. An. 25. n. iv. et Ars Crit. p. 3. cap. xiv.

perceive that he had it not ; for in the words next following the notice taken of John the Baptist, as mentioned by Josephus, and before quoted by us, he adds ; ‘ The <sup>t</sup> same writer, though he did not believe Jesus to be the Christ, inquiring into the cause of the overthrow of Jerusalem, and the demolition of the temple, when he ought to have said that their attempt upon Jesus was the cause of the ruin of that people, forasmuch as they had put to death the Christ before prophesied of ; he, as it were unwillingly, and not erring far from the truth, says : These things befell the Jews in vindication of James called the Just, who was the brother of Jesus called the Christ : forasmuch as they killed him who was a most righteous man. That James is the same whom Paul, that genuine disciple of Jesus, says he had seen, and calls the Lord’s brother, [Gal. i. 19.] not so much for the sake of consanguinity, as their common education, and agreement in manners and doctrine. If <sup>u</sup> therefore he says the destruction of Jerusalem had befallen the Jews for the sake of James, with how much more reason might he have said that this had happened for the sake of Jesus who was the Christ, to whose divinity so many churches bear witness ; who, being now recovered from the pollutions of vice, have given up themselves to the Creator, and endeavour to please him in all things ?’

Afterwards, in his second book against Celsus, he argues our Saviour’s knowledge of futurities from his predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, which had not been effected till the times of Vespasian and Titus. ‘ Which,’ <sup>v</sup> as Josephus writes, ‘ happened upon account of James the Just, the brother of Jesus called the Christ ; but in truth upon account of Jesus the Christ, the Son of God.’

Origen speaks again to the like purpose in his commentary upon St. Matthew ; and says that ‘ this <sup>w</sup> James, the same that is mentioned by Paul in his epistle to the Galatians, [i. 19.] was so respected by the people for his righteousness, that Flavius Josephus, who wrote the Jewish Antiquities in twenty books, being desirous to assign the

<sup>t</sup> ‘Ο δ’ αὐτός, καιτοεγε απιζων τω Ιησὺ ὡς Χριστῷ, ζητων την αιτιαν της των Ἱεροσολυμων πτωσεως, και της τε νας καθαιρεσεως· δεον αυτον ειπειν, ὅτι ἡ τῶ Ιησὺ ἐπιβλη τῆτων αιτια γεγρονε τῷ λαῷ, ἐπει απεκτειναν τον προφητευομενον Χριστον, κ. λ. Contr. Cels. l. 1. c. 47. p. 35.

<sup>u</sup> Ειπερ εν δια Ιακωβον συμβεβηκεναι λεγει τοις Ιουδαιοις τα κατα την ερημωσιν της Ἱερουσαλημ, κ. λ. Ib.

<sup>v</sup> ——— ὡς μεν Ιωσηπος γραφει, δια Ιακωβον τον δικαιον, τον αδελφον Ιησὺ τῶ λεγομενα Χριστῷ ὡς δὲ ἡ ἀληθεια παριτησι, δια Ιησὺν τον Χριστον τον υἱον τῶ θεοῦ. Contr. Cels. l. 2. sect. 13. p. 69.

<sup>w</sup> Comm. in Matt. Tom. x. sect. 17. p. 463. Bened. T. i. p. 223. Huet

‘ cause why that people suffered such things, so that even  
 ‘ their temple was demolished to the foundation, says that  
 ‘ those things had happened because of the anger of God  
 ‘ against them, for what they had done to James the brother  
 ‘ of Jesus called the Christ. And it is wonderful that he  
 ‘ who did not receive our Jesus as the Christ, should ascribe  
 ‘ such righteousness to James. He says that the people also  
 ‘ were of opinion that they suffered these things upon ac-  
 ‘ count of James.’

After Origen, the same saying of Josephus concerning James is also alleged by <sup>x</sup> Eusebius and <sup>y</sup> Jerom; but without saying any more than Origen what work of Josephus, or what book of his works, it was in.

There is not now any thing of that kind in any of his works: nor is it easily conceivable that <sup>z</sup> there ever was. But what I now allege these passages of Origen for, is to show that it may be hence evidently and certainly concluded that Origen never read in Josephus that testimony to Jesus which we now have in his works.

I have above mentioned no other Latin author but Tertullian, to <sup>a</sup> whom Josephus was well known. But I might also have insisted upon the silence of the other Latin apologists for christianity of the first three centuries, as Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius; to whom so extraordinary a testimony to our Saviour, in so celebrated a Jewish writer, would not have been unknown if it had been in him.

Eusebius then, who flourished about the year of Christ 315, and afterwards, is the first christian writer in whom this paragraph is found; and by him <sup>b</sup> it is twice quoted at large. After him, as is well known, it is quoted by <sup>c</sup> Jerom, <sup>d</sup> Sozomen, and many other following writers.

But it is observable that this paragraph is never quoted by Chrysostom, whom I suspect to have had but little regard

<sup>x</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. xxiii. p. 65.

<sup>y</sup> Tradit idem Josephus, tantæ eum sanctitatis fuisse, et celebritatis in populo, ut propter ejus necem creditum sit, subversam esse Hierosolymam. De V. I. cap. 2. vid. et cap. 13.

<sup>z</sup> Quod vero attinet ad ista, *ταυτα συμβεβηκεν Ισδαιοις κατα εκδικησιν Ιακωβου τῆς ἰκαίας*, κ. λ. quæ, tanquam a Josepho probata in Antiquitatum libris, affert Origenes,——et ex eo, ut puto, Eusebius, aliique, versimile est, ea referri debere *μνημονικῶ ἀμαρτηματι* Origenis——Certe nullibi, quod sciam, haberi potuerunt in Antiquitatibus, ut quæ non agant de Hierosolymorum excidio. Hudson. annot. ad Jos. Antiq. l. 20. c. ix. sect. 1. p. 976. ed. Hav. Vid. et Cleric. *Ars Crit.* p. 3. c. xiv. sect. 8—10.

<sup>a</sup> ——et qui istos aut probat aut revincit Judæus Josephus Antiquitatum judaicarum vernaculus vindex. Tert. Ap. c. 19. p. 19. <sup>b</sup> H. E. l. 1. c. xi. Dcm. Ev. l. 3. p. 124. <sup>c</sup> De V. I. c. 13. <sup>d</sup> Soz. l. 1. c. 1. p. 399.

for Eusebius of Cæsarea. He several times refers to Josephus as a proper writer, from whom men might learn what miseries the Jewish people had undergone in their war with the Romans, 'he<sup>e</sup> not being a believer, but a Jew, and zealous for the Jewish rites, even after the rise of christianity.' He refers likewise<sup>f</sup> to what Josephus says of John the Baptist, though inaccurately, as must be acknowledged: but he never takes any notice of this testimony to Jesus; which surely he would not have omitted, in his many arguments with the Jews, if he had been acquainted with it, and had supposed it to be genuine.

Some have supposed that this testimony of Josephus was alleged by Macarius in the time of Dioclesian. But<sup>g</sup> Fabricius has honestly and judiciously observed that there is no reason to take that passage of Macarius for genuine.

2. This paragraph was wanting in the copies of Josephus which were seen by Photius in the ninth century.

I make a distinct article of this writer, because he read and revised the works of Josephus as a critic. He has in his *Bibliothèque*<sup>h</sup> no less than three articles concerning Josephus, but takes no notice of this passage. Whence it may be concluded that it was wanting in his copies, or that he did not think it genuine: but the former is the more likely. He refers to the passage concerning John the Baptist in this manner: 'This<sup>i</sup> Herod, tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, son of Herod the great, is he who put to death the great John the forerunner, because, as Josephus says, he was afraid he would stir up the people to rebellion. For all men paid great regard to John upon account of his transcendent virtue. In his time also our Saviour suffered.' How fair an occasion had Photius here to refer also to the testimony given to Jesus, which we now have, if he had seen it? Upon this article

<sup>e</sup> ——— και γαρ Ισδαιος ην, και σφοδρα Ισδαιος, και ζηλωτης, και των μετα την Χριστη παρρησιαν. In Matt. hom. 76. [al. 77.] T. 7. p. 732. Vid. et in Matt. hom. 75. [al. 76.] p. 727. et in Jo. hom. 64. [al. 65.] T. 8. p. 390.

<sup>f</sup> In Jo. hom. 12. [al. 13.] T. 8. p. 73. A.

<sup>g</sup> Hoc Josephi loco non utuntur Justinus, Tertullianus, Chrysostomus, alique complures, quando contra Judæos disputant. Non produxit Origenes, alia Josephi laudans in libris contra Celsum. Nec Photius quidem tanto junior meminit, in cujus *Bibl. Antiquitates Josephi* bis recensentur, cod. 76, et 238. Ante Eusebium tamen——allegaverit illum Marcarius quidam, cubiculi imperatorii præfectus, siquidem genuinus sit hujus ad Diocletianum sermo, qui refertur in Actis Sanctorum Macarii, a Cl. viro W. E. Tenselio, primum in *Dialogis* mensuris Germanice editis, A. 1697. p. 556. Sed merito existimandum, hæc Acta martyris Macariani, si non longe post Diocletianum plane conficta, saltem interpolata, atque locum Josephi insertum a recentiore manu esse. Fabr. *Bib. Gr.* T. 3. p. 237.

<sup>h</sup> Cod. 48, 76, et 238.

<sup>i</sup> Cod. 238. p. 973.

of Photius the very learned Ittigius in his Prolegomena to Josephus<sup>k</sup> has just remarks, invincibly asserting the absolute silence of this great critic concerning this paragraph of Josephus.

And very observable is what Photius says in his article of Justus of Tiberias. ‘This<sup>l</sup> writer, labouring under the common prejudice of the Jews, and being himself a Jew, makes not any the least mention of the coming of Christ, or the things concerning him, or the miracles done by him.’ This is very remarkable. This silence of Justus concerning our Saviour was not peculiar to him, but was common to other Jewish writers with him, very probably intending Josephus. If Josephus had been an exception, he would not have been omitted, but would have been expressly mentioned.

3. This paragraph concerning Jesus interrupts the course of the narration; and therefore is not genuine, but is an interpolation.

In the preceding paragraph Josephus gives an account of an attempt of Pilate to bring water from a distant place to Jerusalem with the sacred money; which occasioned a disturbance, in which many Jews were killed, and many others were wounded.

The paragraph next following this, about which we are now speaking, begins thus: ‘And<sup>m</sup> about the same time another sad calamity gave the Jews great uneasiness.’ That calamity was no less than banishing the Jews from Rome by order of the emperor Tiberius: ‘occasioned,<sup>n</sup> as he says, by the misconduct of some Jews in that city.’

This paragraph therefore was not originally in Josephus. It does not come from him: but it is an interpolation inserted by somebody afterwards. This argument must be of great weight with all who are well acquainted with the writings of Josephus, who is a cool and sedate writer, very exact in connecting his narrations, and never failing to make transitions where they are proper or needful.

I believe it is not easy to instance another writer who is so exact in all his pauses and transitions, or so punctual in the notice he gives when he has done with one thing and

<sup>k</sup> Ap. Havercamp. p. 89.

<sup>l</sup> ὡς δὲ τὰ Ἰσραηλίων νοσῶν, Ἰσραήλιος τε καὶ αὐτοὺς ὑπάρχων το γένος, τῆς Χριστοῦ παρρησίας, καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν τελεσθέντων, καὶ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τερατουργηθέντων, εἰδένος ὁλῶς μνημὴν ἐποίησατο. Cod. 33. p. 20.

<sup>m</sup> Καὶ ὑπο τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους ἕτερον τι δεινὸν ἐθορυβε τοὺς Ἰσραηλῆας. L. 18. c. 3. sect. 4. <sup>n</sup> Καὶ οἱ μὲν δια κακίαν τεσσαρῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐλαυνοντο τῆς πόλεως. Sect. 5. fin.

goes on to another. That must make this argument the stronger.

Tillemont was sensible of this difficulty, though he thinks that the writers who maintain the genuineness of this passage have made good their point. ‘It<sup>o</sup> must be owned, ‘however,’ says he, ‘that there is one thing embarrassing in ‘this passage, which is, that it interrupts the course of the ‘narration in Josephus. For that which immediately follows begins in these terms: “About the same time there ‘happened another misfortune which disturbed the Jews.” ‘For those words, “another misfortune,” have no connection with what was just said of Jesus Christ, which is not ‘mentioned as an unhappiness. And, on the contrary, it ‘has a very natural reference to what precedes in that place: ‘which is a sedition in which many Jews were killed or ‘wounded. Certainly it is not so easy to answer to this ‘difficulty as to the others. I wish that Mr. Huet and Mr. ‘Roie had stated this objection, and given satisfaction upon ‘it. As for myself, I know not what to say to it; but that ‘Josephus himself might insert this passage after his work ‘was finished; and he did not then think of a more proper ‘place for it than this, where he passed from what happened ‘in Judea under Pilate to somewhat that was done at the ‘same time at Rome; and he forgot to alter the transition, ‘which he had made at first.’

Undoubtedly the difficulty presses very hard, which will allow of no better solution.

4. Let us now observe the paragraph itself, and consider whether it be suitable or unsuitable to the general character of Josephus.

‘At the same time lived Jesus, a wise man, if he may be called a man; for he performed many wonderful works.’

But why<sup>p</sup> should Josephus scruple to call Jesus ‘a man?’ Were not Moses, Elijah, Elisha, and other prophets, men? The wonderful works done by them were not done by their own power, but by the power of God, bearing testimony to their commission, or supporting them in the execution of

<sup>o</sup> Ruine des Juifs, note xl. Hist. des Emp. Tom. i.

<sup>p</sup> Sed quo judicio scriptum est quod sequitur: *ειπε ανδρα αυτον λεγειν χορη*. Quænam, quæso, ratio est? Quia, inquit, *παραδοξων εργαων ποιητης ην*. Itaque adeo, quando ita vult, dubitabitur in posterum a nobis, dii an homines appellandi sint Moses, Elias, Elisæus? Nam et illi fuerunt *παραδοξων εργαων ποιηται*. Deinde, cum ait *ειπε ανδρα αυτον λεγειν χορη*, quid, quæso, aliud innuere vult, nisi Jesum Dominum esse Deum? In quo graviter eriat hic pius impostor. Judæi enim ne suspicabantur quidem, Messiam seu Christum fore Deum, sed præstantissimum aliquem principem ex semine Davidis. Tan. Fab. ap. Havercamp. Joseph. p. 269.

it. Moreover, Moses himself, who<sup>a</sup> is so highly extolled and magnified by Josephus, is<sup>r</sup> often called by him a man. Why then should he scruple to say the same of Jesus? However it should be owned that he has this expression concerning Moses: ‘So<sup>s</sup> that his legislation, which was from God, made this man to be thought superior to his own nature.’

‘He was a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure.’

Very honourable to Jesus and his followers! But would Josephus say this of them? And would he call the christian religion ‘the truth?’

‘He drew over to him many Jews and Gentiles.’

That is not true of the Lord Jesus, if intended of his own personal preaching, before his crucifixion. It was done indeed afterwards. But this manner of speaking is more suitable to a writer of the second or third century than to Josephus.

‘This was the Christ.’

Jerom, in his article of Josephus, in his book of *Illustrious Men*, quoting this passage, puts it thus: ‘And<sup>t</sup> he was believed to be the Christ.’ Which is a qualifying expression for which there is no ground. Nor<sup>u</sup> did Sophronius, Jerom’s Greek interpreter, follow that translation, but puts it as it is in Eusebius, and other Greek<sup>v</sup> writers: ‘This was ‘the Christ.’ But it cannot be supposed that Josephus either thought or said that Jesus was the Christ.

It follows: ‘And when Pilate, at the instigation of the chief men among us, had condemned him to the cross, they who before had conceived an affection for him did not cease to adhere to him: for on the third day he appeared to them alive again, the divine prophets having foretold these and many other wonderful things concerning him.’

All must be sensible that this could not be said by any man but a professed christian, which Josephus was not; therefore he could not write this.

‘And the sect of the christians, so called from him, subsists to this day.’

Which Mr. Whiston translates in this manner: ‘And the ‘tribe of christians, so named from him, are not extinct at

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 3. c. xv. l. 4. c. viii. et alibi.

<sup>r</sup> Θανματος δε της αρετης ο ανηρ, κ. λ. Ant. l. 3. c. xv. sect. 3.

<sup>s</sup> Ουτως η νομοθεσια τε θεε δοκεσα τον ανδρα πεποιηκε της αυτε φυσειως κρειττονα νομιζεσθαι. Ibid. <sup>t</sup> Et credebatur esse Christus.

<sup>u</sup> Ο Χριστος ουτως ην.

<sup>v</sup> See particularly Sozomen, l. 1. cap. i. p. 399.

‘this day.’ But Mr. W——, who thinks this passage to be Josephus’s, should not have rendered *φυλον*, tribe, because *φυλη* is the word always used by Josephus for tribe; and *φυλον*, which we have here, always signifies nation <sup>w</sup> in Josephus: nor were the christians a nation or political society in the first three centuries.

Here it is put for sect: it cannot signify any thing else in this place. Jesus is called a ‘wise man,’ and is said to have ‘been a teacher of such as received the truth with pleasure.’ And though he had been crucified, ‘they who had before conceived an affection for him did not cease to adhere to him, because he appeared to them alive again.’

Here the word denotes sect. But *αἵρεσις*, heresy, is the word generally used by Josephus in speaking <sup>x</sup> of the pharisees, sadducees, and Essenes, the three prevailing sects, or different ways of philosophizing among the Jews.

The phrase <sup>y</sup> *χριστιανων φυλον*, here used, resembles the phrase *χριστιανων εθνος*, which was in use in the time of Eusebius, at the beginning of the fourth century, and denotes ‘the sect of the christians.’

Moreover, the expression, ‘subsists to this time,’ or, is not extinct at this day, imports a considerable space of time since the crucifixion of Jesus; and does very reasonably lead us to think that the composer of this paragraph lived later than Josephus.

These considerations, as seems to me, are sufficient to determine the point in question, and to satisfy all men that Josephus was not the author of this paragraph. However, I shall add one consideration more.

5. If Josephus were the author of this paragraph, it would be reasonable to expect in him frequent mention of Christ’s miracles, whereas he is every where silent about them.

Josephus was a pharisee: he believed the miracles of Moses and the Jewish prophets: he believed a divine providence superintending human affairs, the immortality of the soul, and the rewards of a future state. And he is willing enough to relate extraordinary things, or such things as had an appearance of being so.

Therefore <sup>z</sup> he tells a story of Eleazar’s dispossessing a

<sup>w</sup> ——— *ὅτι καὶ Ἰαρθοὶ, τὸ πολεμικώτατον φυλον.* De B. J. l. 2. c. 16. sect. 4. p. 189. Hav. *Ἦαν ἕμων τὸ φυλον.* Ib. p. 191. et passim.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. De B. J. l. 2. c. viii. Ant. Jud. l. 13. c. v. sect. 9. c. x. sect. 5. l. 14. c. i. et passim.

<sup>y</sup> ——— *τῶ εἰθνεὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἑαυτοὺς συμμειχότας.* Maximin. ap. Euseb. II. E. l. 9. c. ix. p. 360. C.—ad christianorum sectam se applicuisse cernerent. Vales.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. de. B. J. l. 7. c. vi. Ant. l. 8. c. ii. sect. 5.



dæmon by virtue of some incantations, and the use of a certain root called Baanas.

Therefore<sup>a</sup> he relates a dream of Archelaus, and then another of Glaphyra, as very extraordinary, as<sup>b</sup> confirming the doctrine of the immortality of souls, and the belief of a divine providence concerning itself about human affairs. Those dreams are related by him both in the History of the Jewish War, and in his Antiquities; and yet that dream of Glaphyra is now considered<sup>c</sup> by divers learned men as a mere fiction.

I might refer to another silly story of the fulfilment of a prediction of Judas an Essene: which<sup>d</sup> is related by him also in both those works, the War and the Antiquities.

Would any man please himself with such poor things as these, and relate them to the world as matters of importance, if he had any respect for the doctrine and miracles of Jesus Christ? No. He was either unacquainted with them, or resolutely silent about them; and never can be supposed author of the honourable testimony here borne to Jesus as the Christ.

Supposing these arguments to be of great weight, some may ask how this paragraph came to be in the works of Josephus? In that case I should answer, that probably some learned christian, who had read the works of Josephus, thinking it strange that this Jewish historian should say nothing of Jesus Christ, wrote this paragraph in the margin of his copy, and thence it came to be afterwards inserted into many copies of the works of Josephus: but for a good while it was not in all: and therefore Photius did not see it in that copy which he made use of.

Who was the first author of this interpolation cannot be said. Tanaquil Faber<sup>e</sup> suspected Eusebius. I do not charge it upon him; but I think it was first made about his time; for, if I am not mistaken, we have seen sufficient reason to believe that this paragraph was not quoted by Origen, nor by any ancient christian writer before Eusebius, that we have any knowledge of.

Though many learned men have maintained the genuine-

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 17. c. xiii. sect. 3—5. De B. Jud. l. 2. c. vii.

<sup>b</sup> ——— τριτε αμφι τας ψυχας αθανασιας εμφεροσ, και τσ θεισ προμηθεια τα ανθρωπινα παρειληφοτος τη αυτε, καλωσ εχειν ενομισα ειπειν. Ant. l. 17. xiii. 5.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Noris. Cenotaph. Pis. Diss. 2. cap. xii. p. 238. et Le Clerc. Bib. Ch. T. iv. p. 60.

<sup>d</sup> De B. J. l. 1. cap. iii. sect. 4, 5. Ant. l. 13. cap. xi. sect. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Itaque constet necesse est, id intra illud tempus admissum fuisse, quod ab Origene ad Eusebium fluxit. Mihi autem imprimis credibile fit, auctorem hujus τεχνασματος esse Eusebium. Fabr. ap. Havercamp. p. 272.

ness of this paragraph, others have rejected it. And for avoiding the charge of singularity, and for giving satisfaction to some scrupulous persons, I shall, beside the authors<sup>f</sup> before referred to, transcribe at the bottom of the page<sup>g</sup> the observations of Vitringa. And I add the judgment of Dr. Warburton, now bishop of Gloucester, who has expressed himself upon the subject in very clear and strong terms. ‘If a Jew,’ says<sup>h</sup> his Lordship, ‘owned the truth of christianity, he must needs embrace it. We, therefore, certainly conclude that the passage where Josephus, who was ‘as much a Jew as the religion of Moses could make him, ‘is made to acknowledge that Jesus is the Christ, in as strong ‘terms as words could do it, is a rank forgery, and a very ‘stupid one too.’

III. There is yet one passage more in the works of Josephus, which ought to be here taken notice of: it is in the twentieth book of his Antiquities, and to this purpose.

‘The<sup>i</sup> emperor having been informed of the death of Festus, sent Albinus to be præfect in Judea. And the king [meaning Agrippa the younger] took away the high-priesthood from Joseph, and bestowed that dignity upon the son of Ananus, who also was named Ananus—This younger Ananus, who, as we said just now, was made high-priest, was<sup>k</sup> haughty in his behaviour, and very enterprising: and moreover he was of the sect of the sadducees, who, as we have also observed before, are above all other Jews severe in their judicial sentences. This then being the temper of Ananus, and he thinking he had a fit opportunity because Festus was dead, and Albinus was yet upon the road, calls<sup>l</sup>

<sup>f</sup> See p. 487, note <sup>g</sup>.

<sup>g</sup> Sed vehementer dubito, post doctissimas etiam Huetii curas, an non hic fetus Josepho sit suppositus, et ab alienâ manu in textum intrusus. Utique pro certo et indubio habeo, totum locum, ut nunc apud Josephum habetur, e calamo Josephi non effluxi-se: sed, si omnino Josephus Christi Jesu hoc in contextu meminerit, locum a manu christianâ esse interpolatum mutatumque. Quod jam si dicamus, ne sic quidem omnis sublata erit difficultas: sed restat longe maxima de cohærentiâ horum verborum Josephi, quibus Christo testimonium perhibet eum sequentibus; ‘Circa eadem tempora aliud etiam Judæos turbavit incommodum,’ &c. Quæ tamen verba, si testimonium de Christo e contextu Josephi sustuleris, egregie cum præcedentibus conspirabunt. Ad quam difficultatem removendam nuper nihil aliud a doctissimo Tillemontio produci potuit, quam verba Josephi, quæ de Christo agunt, contextui παρενθετικως inserta esse. In quo tamen dubito, an docti acquieturi sint. Vitring. Observ. Sacr. l. 4. cap. 7. sect. xi. p. 971.

<sup>h</sup> See Divine Legation of Moses, B. 2. Sect. C. p. 295. Vol. i.

<sup>i</sup> L. 20. cap. viii. sect. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Θρασως ην τον τροπον, και τολμητης διαφεροντως.

<sup>l</sup> — καθιζει συνεδριον κριτων και παραγαγων εις αυτο τον αδελφον Ιησους λεγομενους Χριστους, Ιακωβους ονομα αυτων, και τινας ετερους, ως παρανομησαντων κατηγοριαν ποιησαμενος, παρεθεωκε λευσθησομενες.

a council of judges: and, bringing before them James the brother of him who is called Christ, and some others, he accused them as transgressors of the laws, and had them stoned to death. But the most moderate men of the city, who also were reckoned most skilful in the laws, were offended at this proceeding. They therefore sent privately to the king, [Agrippa before mentioned,] entreating him to send orders to Ananus no more to attempt such things: and some went away to meet Albinus who was coming from Alexandria, and put him in mind that Ananus had no right to call a council without his leave. Albinus, approving of what he had said, wrote to Ananus in much anger, threatening to punish him for what he had done; and king Agrippa took away from him the high-priesthood, after that he had enjoyed it three months, and put in Jesus the son of Damnaeus.'

This passage is cited from Josephus by <sup>m</sup> Eusebius, and from the twentieth book of his Antiquities. It is also quoted by <sup>n</sup> Jerom, but very inaccurately. We perceive likewise that <sup>o</sup> it was in the copies of Josephus in the time of Photius.

Nevertheless, there are learned men, of good judgment,<sup>p</sup> who think that the words which we now have in Josephus concerning James are an interpolation.

They were in Josephus in the time of Eusebius, and afterwards: but it does not follow they were always there: indeed, there is a good deal of reason to believe that they were not originally in Josephus.

I have elsewhere<sup>q</sup> carefully examined the most ancient

<sup>m</sup> H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 65, 66.

<sup>n</sup> De V. I. cap. ii. De Jacobo fratre Domini.

<sup>o</sup> ——— *αυθεντισας καθιζει συνεδριον, και Ιακωβον τον αδελφον τῃ Κυρια, συν ἑτεροις, παρανομων αιτιασαμενος, λιθοις αναριθηναι παρασκευαζει, κ. λ.* Phot. cod. 238. p. 977.

<sup>p</sup> Facile quidem crediderim, Jerosolymitanos proceres graviter tulisse, quod synedrium suâ auctoritate instituisset, cum dudum jus gladii a Romanis esset Judæis ademptum; quod iterum inconsulto Cæsare ab Anano usurpatum timebant, ne genti suæ gravi fortasse pœnâ luendum esset. Sed quæ de Jacobo, Jesu, qui Christus dicebatur, fratre, habentur, merum adsummentum male feriat christiani esse videntur. Cleric. H. E. ann. 62. n. ii. p. 415.

Sunt quoque rationes sat graves, quæ persuadeant hæc fuisse interpolata, et scripsisse duntaxat Josephum: *και παραγαγων εις αυτο τινας, και ως παρανομησαντων κατηγοριαν ποιησαμενος, κ. λ.* Statutosque coram eo nonnullos, et accusatos perfractæ legis, tradidit lapidibus obruendos. Id. Ars Crit. P. 3. cap. 14. sect. 12. Vol. 2. p. 289.

Illa de Jacobo, Jesu, qui Christus dicebatur, fratre, (licet agnita ab Eusebio, aliisque eum sequutis, disertimque a Photio,) pro mero adsummento male feriat christiani habentur a nonnullis; quam recte, *κριτικωτερον* esto judicium. Hudson, annot. ad Antiq. l. 20. c. ix. sect. 1.

<sup>q</sup> See this Vol. ch. xvi. sect. iii. v. vi.

accounts of the death of James, called the Just, and the brother of Jesus: those disquisitions will be of use here. The persons of whom Josephus speaks, who were tried and condemned by the Jewish council at the instigation of Ananus, were stoned, and probably without the city. But according to the history of the death of James, given by Hegesippus, a learned Jewish believer and writer in the second century, the death of James was effected in a tumultuous manner; the disturbance began at the temple, and he died there, or near it. Some flung him down and threw stones at him: but his death was completed by a blow on the head with a long pole, such as fullers make use of in beating wet clothes. This is said by Clement of Alexandria in his Institutions, as cited by<sup>r</sup> Eusebius, and by<sup>s</sup> Hegesippus, as cited also by him. That therefore is the true and ancient account of the death of James, the Lord's brother: and the christians of the second century knew nothing of that account of his death which we now have in Josephus: therefore, probably there was then nothing in him about it; for if there had, they would not have been ignorant of it.

Moreover, it is very observable that, according to the long and particular history of the death and martyrdom of James, which we have in Hegesippus, that apostle suffered alone: there was no attempt made upon any others, as the passage now in Josephus intimates. And it is inconsistent with the whole narrative that any others should be joined with him.

And that James suffered martyrdom, not by order of council, as now in Josephus, but in a tumultuous manner at the temple, or near it, and by a blow on the head with a fuller's pole, appears to have been the general and prevailing opinion of christians in the fourth century, as well as before: for it is mentioned by<sup>t</sup> Jerom, and<sup>u</sup> Epiphanius, very agreeably to Hegesippus.

<sup>r</sup> Δυο δε γεγονασιν Ιακωβοι· εις ο δικαιος, ο κατα τη πτερυγι βληθεις, και υπο γραφειωσ ξυλω πληγεις εις θανατον. Clem. A. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 2. c. i. p. 38. D. Conf. ib. cap. 23. p. 63. C. et 65. C. And see in this work, the present Vol. ch. xvi. num. iii.

<sup>s</sup> Και λαβων τις απ' αυτων, εις των γραφειων, το ξυλον εν φ' απεπιεζε τα ιματια, ηνεγκε κατα της κεφαλης τε δικαιοσ. Και οδτωσ εμαρτυρησεν. Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 23. p. 65. B.

<sup>t</sup> Qui cum præcipitatus de pinnâ templi, contractis cruribus, adhuc semivivus——fullonis fuste quo uda ve-timenta extorqueri solent, in cerebro percussus interiit——et juxta templum, ubi et præcipitatus fuerat, sepultus est. Hier. de V. I. cap. 2.

Qui et ipse postea de templo a Judæis præcipitatus successorem habuit Simonem, quem et ipsum tradunt pro Domino crucifixum. Id. Comm. in ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. 4. p. 237.

<sup>u</sup> Hær. 78. num. xiv. p. 1046.

In this place therefore Josephus gave an account of some who were accused by Ananus, and condemned by his council as transgressors of the Jewish laws: and what Ananus did was upon several accounts disliked by many discreet and moderate men: but there is not sufficient reason to believe that James was particularly mentioned by him as one of them.

It is certain we ought to be very cautious in admitting quotations from Josephus by later christian writers; for they had a great regard for him, and were fond of having his testimony, whether there was ground for it or not. Theophylact, upon John xiii. 33, and referring also to John vii. 34, says, 'The <sup>v</sup> Jews sought him when their city was taken, and the wrath of God fell upon them on all sides; as also Josephus testifies, that those things happened to them upon account of the death of Jesus.'

So says Theophylact. But from Origen, as before seen, we have good reason to believe that there was no such account in the works of Josephus, and that he never said any such thing.

In Suidas is a long article at the word JESUS, where it is said that 'Josephus,<sup>w</sup> who is often quoted by Eusebius Pamphili in his Ecclesiastical History, expressly says, in his History of the Jewish War, that Jesus sacrificed with the priests at the temple.'

There is no such thing there now; and probably never was in any good copies of the works of Josephus: but as he was an author in great repute with christians, and he was often appealed to, and too often quoted inaccurately, (of which Jerom, in his <sup>x</sup> article of St. James, is a remarkable instance,) his works were as likely to suffer some interpolations as any writer's whatever.

Blondel supposed, that to this desire of making an advantage from Josephus we owe the insertion of the remarkable testimony to Jesus which we have above so largely considered. What Blondel says appears to me so judicious, and so apposite to the purpose, that I shall transcribe him

<sup>v</sup> ——— ὡς και Ιωσηπος μαρτυρει, ἕια τον θανατον τῶ Ιησῶ ταυτα αυτοις γενεσθαι. In Ev. p. 762. A.

<sup>w</sup> Εύρομεν εν Ιωσηπον, τον συγγραφεα της ἀλωσεως Ἱεροσολυμων (οὐ μνημηνη πολλην Ευσεβιος ὁ Παμφιλῆ εν τη εκκλησιαστικῃ αυτη ἱστοριῃ ποιειται) φανερωσ λεγοντα εν τοις της αιχμαλωσιας αυτη ὑπομνημασιν, ὅτι Ιησῶς εν τῷ ἱερῷ μετα των ἱερεων ἡγιαζε. Suid. V. Ιησῶς.

<sup>x</sup> De V. I. cap. ii. To Jerom might have been added Eusebius, and divers other christian writers. Concerning Eusebius's inaccurate quotations of Josephus somewhat was said formerly, Vol. iv. p. 80, 81. And they have been observed and censured by Scaliger, and other learned moderns.

below in his<sup>y</sup> own words: and let his judgment be added to those of Vitranga and the bishop of Gloucester above quoted.

IV. Supposing Josephus not to have said any thing of Jesus Christ, some may ask: What could be the reason of it; and how can it be accounted for?

To which I might answer, that such a question is rather more curious than judicious and important; and it may be difficult to propose a solution that shall be generally approved of. However, I shall hazard a few observations upon the point.

It is easy to believe that all Jews who were contemporary with Christ or his apostles, and did not receive Jesus as the Christ, must have been filled with much enmity against him and his followers. We are assured by early christian writers of good credit, such as<sup>z</sup> Justin Martyr,<sup>a</sup> Tertullian, and others, that the ruling part of the Jewish nation industriously spread abroad false and injurious reports among the nations concerning the followers of Jesus. But the polite and learned writers, such as Justus of Tiberias, and Josephus, might think it expedient to be silent. They had nothing to say against Jesus or the christians with an appearance of truth and credibility; they therefore thought it better to be silent, and thereby, if possible, bury them in utter oblivion.

It is not easy to account for the silence of Josephus any other<sup>b</sup> way. Many things are omitted by him of which he

<sup>y</sup> A même dessein, de tirer avantage de Joseph, quelque main hardie a inséré dans ses Antiquités, lib. 18. c. 4, des paroles qui lui sont d'autant moins convenables, qu'elles contiennent un témoignage honorable, tant de la personne de notre Seigneur, que de la sainteté et vérité du christianisme, de la profession duquel cet auteur a toujours été très éloigné: et d'ailleurs qu'elles sont notoirement une pièce d'attache sans liaison avec le reste de son discours, tant précédant que suivant, et placée à l'endroit qu'elle occupe par affection de parti plutôt que par raison. Blondel des Sibylles. p. 28.

<sup>z</sup> Dial. cum Tryph. p. 234. D. Par. sect. 18. p. 102. Bened.

<sup>a</sup> Ad Nat. l. i. cap. 13. p. 59. D. et adv. Marcion. l. 3. cap. 23. p. 498.

<sup>b</sup> Le Cardinal Noris se fâche avec raison contre Joseph, de ce qu'il expédie en dix lignes les neuf années du règne d' Archélaüs—pour raconter au long les deux songes, dont on a parlé eïdessus. Mais on a encore plus de sujet de se plaindre de la négligence, ou plutôt du silence affecté de cet Historien, touchant le dénombrement, dont S. Luc parle, et touchant le meurtre des enfans de Bethléhem, du tems de la naissance de notre Seigneur: pour ne pas parler de sa vie, et de sa mort, dont il ne dit rien non plus: car on ne peut guère douter, que le passage, où il en est parlé, ne soit fourré, par un chrétien malhabile, dans Joseph. S'il eut dit seulement un mot du dénombrement, et du massacre de Bethléhem, on n'auroit point la peine de chercher le tems de la naissance de Notre Seigneur. Mais ce Juif malicieux a voulu, autant qu'il étoit en lui, ensevelir cette histoire dans un éternel oubli, en haine des chrétiens. Le Clerc. Bib. Ch. T. 4. Art. i. p. 74, 75.

could not be ignorant : he must have known of the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem soon after the birth of Jesus. The arrival of the wise men from the East, who were conducted by a star, gave concern not only to Herod, but to all Jerusalem ; Matt. ii. 8. Josephus was a priest : he could not but have heard of the vision of Zacharias the father of John the Baptist at the temple, Luke i. and it was a thing very proper to have had a place in his History. The prophecies of Simeon and Anna at the temple, and other things that happened there about that time, as we may think, must have been well known to him : then the preaching and miracles of our Saviour and his apostles at Jerusalem, and in Galilee, and all over Judea ; the crucifixion of Jesus at Jerusalem at the time of a passover ; the darkness for three hours at Jerusalem, and all over Judea ; the death of James the brother of John at Jerusalem, by Herod Agrippa : all these things must have been well known to him.

Moreover, before Josephus had finished his work of the Jewish Antiquities, or even the History of the Jewish War, christianity had spread very much in Asia and in other parts, and at Rome itself, where also many had suffered, and that several years before the final ruin of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. The progress of the christian religion was a very considerable event ; and it had its rise in Judea.

The sect of the christians, which had its rise in Judea, and consisted partly of Jews, partly of men of other nations, was as numerous, or more numerous, in the time of Josephus, than any of the three Jewish sects, the sadducees, pharisees, and Essenes, whose principles are particularly described by him in the <sup>c</sup> War, and in <sup>d</sup> the Antiquities ; and therefore, as we may think, were deserving of notice : but they were not Jewish enough ; they were not entirely Jewish : and they were followers of a leader whom our author did not, and could not esteem, consistently with his prevailing views and sentiments.

Josephus was well acquainted with affairs at Rome, and in all the settlements of the Jewish people in Asia, and parts adjacent. He is as exact in the account of the several successions in the Roman empire as any Roman historian whatever. What <sup>e</sup> a long and particular account has he given of the conspiracy against Caligula, and his death, and the succession of Claudius ?

I do not say that Josephus had read the books of the New

<sup>c</sup> De B. J. l. 2. cap. viii.

<sup>d</sup> Antiq. l. 13. cap. v. et l. 18. cap. 1

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. l. 19. cap. i—iii.

Testament: he might have come to the knowledge of most of the things just mentioned another way: they are great and remarkable events, about which a contemporary, and a man of good intelligence, engaged in public life, could not be ignorant: his silence therefore about christian affairs is wilful and affected. It cannot be owing to ignorance, and must therefore be ascribed to some other cause, whatever it may be.

His profound silence, however, concerning the affairs of the Christians in his time is no objection to their truth and reality. The history of the New Testament has in it all the marks of credibility that any history can have. Heathen historians <sup>f</sup> of the best credit have borne witness to the time of the rise of the christian religion, the country in which it had its origin, and who was the author of it, and its swift and early progress in the world.

Of all those things which are recorded in the gospels and of the progress of christianity afterwards, we have uncontested evidence from the evangelical writers themselves, and from ancient christian authors still extant, and from heathen writers concurring with them in many particulars.

And Josephus, the Jewish historian, who believed not in Jesus, has recorded the history of the Jewish people in Judea, and elsewhere: and particularly the state of things in Judea, with the names of the Jewish princes and Roman governors, during the ministry of our Saviour and his apostles. Whereby, as <sup>g</sup> formerly shown at large, he has wonderfully confirmed, though without intending it, the veracity and the ability of the evangelical writers, and the truth of their history. He has also, as we have now seen in this volume, borne testimony to the fulfilment of our Lord's predictions concerning the coming troubles and afflictions of that people; which is more credible, and more valuable, than if given by a believer in Jesus, and a friend and favourer of him; so that, though all the passages in his works which have been doubted of should be rejected, he would be still a very useful writer, and his <sup>h</sup> works very valuable.

<sup>f</sup> — quos vulgus christianos appellabat. Auctor hujus nominis Christus, qui, Tiberio imperante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstîtio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam originem ejus mali, sed per Urbem etiam, &c. Tacit. Ann. l. 15. cap. 44.

<sup>g</sup> See Vol. i.

<sup>h</sup> Evangelicam quoque et apostolicam historiam Josephus confirmat in multis, etiamsi vel maxime ponamus dubitandum esse de *γενησιουτητι* locorum de Christo servatore. lib. xviii. Antiq. cap. 4. de Joanne Baptistâ lib. xviii. cap. 7. de Jacobo. l. 20. c. 8. et quæ de dirutis propter Jacobi necem injus-



Josephus knew how to be silent when he thought fit, and has omitted some things very true and certain, and well known in the world. In the preface to his Jewish Antiquities, he<sup>l</sup> engages to write of things as he found them mentioned in the sacred books, without adding any thing to them, or omitting any thing in them: and<sup>k</sup> yet he has said nothing of the golden calf, made by the Jewish people in the wilderness; thus dropping an important narrative, with a variety of incidents recorded in one of the books of Moses himself, the Jewish lawgiver, the most sacred of all their scriptures.

The sin of the molten calf is also mentioned in other books of the Old Testament in the confessions of pious Israelites: as Neh. ix. 18, and Ps. cvi. 19. Nevertheless Josephus chose to observe total silence about it.

A learned critic observed some while ago, as somewhat very remarkable, that<sup>l</sup> Josephus has never once mentioned the word *Sion*, or *Zion*, neither in his Antiquities nor in his Jewish War, though there were so many occasions for it, and though it is so often mentioned in the Old as well as the New Testament: and he suspects that omission to be owing to design and ill-will to the christian cause.

And, if I was not afraid of offending by too great proximity, I should now remind my readers of a<sup>m</sup> long argument of old date, relating to the assessment made in Judea by order of Augustus, at the time of our Saviour's nativity, near the end of Herod's reign, recorded by St. Luke, ch. ii.

tam Hierosolymis—ex iisdem Josephi libris laudant Origenes, 1. contr. Cels. et l. 2. et in Matthæi cap. xiii. Eusebius, 1. 2. c. 23. H. E. Hieronymus, Catalogo Script. Ec. cap. 2, et 13. Suidas, *Ιωσηπος*, et *Ιησας*, hodie vero in Josephi libris non reperiuntur. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. vi. T. 3. p. 237, 238.

<sup>l</sup> *Τετογαρο δια ταυτης ποιησειν της πραγματειας επηγγελιαμην, εδεν προσθεις, εδ' αν παραλιπων.* Antiq. Pr. sect. 3. p. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Eruditionem, diligentiam, prudentiam, fidem, omnes collaudant, præterquam ubi nimio est in suam gentem affectu; v. gr. in rebus Mosis et Salomonis—silentium nonnunquam affectatum, ut in iis quæ probro cederent suæ genti. Qualis ex. gr. fuit vituli aurei fabrica, et adoratio, tacita Josepho: ita et in iis quæ faverent christianæ rei, eruditi passim notârunt, et nos subinde in locis suis. F. Spanhem. H. E. T. i. p. 258. Conf. J. Otton. Animadversiones in Joseph. sect. ii. p. 305. Havercamp.

And by all means see Tillemont's remarks upon this Author's Antiquities, Ruine des Juifs, art. 81.

<sup>l</sup> *Sion*, *Tzion* nomen, montem, munimentum, semel iterumque apud Josephum quærens, nullibi inveni, neque iis etiam in locis, ubi expugnationem arcis *Tzion* expresse tractat; quum tamen centies et millies ipsi occasio data fuerit, ita ut plane sentiam ipsum studio et datâ operâ hoc tam gloriosum pro Novo Testamento nomen pressisse silentio, &c. J. B. Ottii Animadversiones in Joseph. ap. Havercamp. T. 2. p. 305

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 290—305.

I<sup>n</sup> then quoted a passage from the Antiquities of Josephus, whence it appears that there were then great disturbances in Herod's family, and there were some pharisees who foretold, or gave out, that 'God had decreed to put an end to the government of Herod and his race, and transfer the kingdom to another.' Josephus here takes great liberties: and though he was himself a pharisee, and at other times speaks honourably of that sect, he now ridicules them. He says<sup>o</sup> 'they were men who valued themselves highly for their exact knowledge of the laws; and talking much of their interest with God, were greatly in favour with the women; who had it in their power to control kings; extremely subtle, and ready to attempt any thing against those whom they did not like.' But it appears that the king, who was then talked of, and who was to be appointed according to the predictions of the pharisees, was a person of an extraordinary character, for he says that Bagoas, an eunuch in Herod's palace, 'was elevated by them with the prospect of being a father and benefactor to his country, by receiving from him a capacity of marriage, and having children of his own.'<sup>p</sup>

All these particulars, though not expressed with such gravity, as is becoming an historian, and is usual in Josephus, cannot but lead us to think that he was not unacquainted with the things related in the second chapter of St. Matthew's gospel. Says the evangelist: "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the East to Jerusalem, saying: Where is he that is born king of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East, and are come to worship him. When Herod the king had heard these things he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." The word rendered "troubled" is of a middle meaning. How Herod was moved may be easily guessed, and is well known. The inhabitants of Jerusalem were differently moved and agitated, partly with joyful hopes of seeing their Messiah "king of the Jews;" partly filled with apprehensions from Herod's jealousy, and the consequences of it.

It seems to me that Josephus had then before him good evidences that the Messiah was at that time born into the world: but he puts all off with a jest. Perhaps there is not any other place in his works where he is so ludicrous.

<sup>n</sup> The quotation is as above, p. 292, 295, taken from the Antiquities, l. 17. cap. 2 sect. 4. p. 831. Havercamp. <sup>o</sup> P. 292.

<sup>p</sup> Whiston translates: And for Bagoas, he had been puffed up by them; for that this king would have all things in his power, and would enable Bagoas to marry, and to have children of his own body begotten.

We are not therefore to expect that ever after he should take any notice of the Lord Jesus, or things concerning him, if he can avoid it.

And why should we be much concerned about any defects in this writer's regard for Jesus Christ and his followers: who out of complaisance, or from self-interested views, or from a mistaken judgment, or some other cause, so deviated from the truth as to ascribe the fulfilment of the Jewish ancient prophecies concerning the Messiah to Vespasian, an idolatrous prince: who was not a Jew by descent nor by religion; who was neither of the church, nor of the seed of Israel?

Josephus was a man of great eminence and distinction among his people; but we do not observe in him a seriousness of spirit becoming a christian, nor that sublimity of virtue which is suited to the principles of the christian religion; nor do we discern in him such qualities as should induce us to think he was one of those who were well disposed, and were "not far from the kingdom of God:" Mark. xii. 34. He was a priest by descent, and early in the magistracy; then a general, and a courtier; and in all showing a worldly mind, suited to such stations and employments; insomuch that he appears to be one of those, of whom, and to whom, the best judge of men and things said, "How can ye believe who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?" John v. 44.

---

## CHAP. V.

### THE MISHNICAL AND TALMUDICAL WRITERS

- I. *The age and the authors of the Mishna and the Talmuds.*
- II. *Extracts from the Mishna, with remarks.* III. *Extracts from the Talmuds.* 1. *Of our Saviour's nativity.* 2. *His journey into Egypt.* 3. *His disciples.* 4. *James in particular.* 5. *His last sufferings.* 6. *The power of miracles in Jesus and his disciples.* 7. *A testimony to the destruction of the temple by Vespasian and Titus, with remarks.*

I. THE word Talmud is used in different senses; sometimes it denotes the Mishna, which is the text; at other times it is

used for the commentaries upon the Mishna : at other times it includes both : I shall generally use it as distinct from the Mishna, denoting the commentaries upon it, of which there are but two, the Jerusalem and the Babylonian : of all which good accounts may be seen in Wagenseil's preface to his *Tela Ignea Satanæ*, and in Dr. Wotton's *Discourses upon the Traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees*, and in many other writings. The most authentic account is that of M. Maimonides, in his preface to the Order of Seeds, which is the first of the six orders into which the whole work is divided ; and may be seen in Pocock's *Porta Mosis*, as it is also prefixed to the first volume of Surenhusius's edition of the Mishna.

The compiler of the Mishna is Rabbi Jehudah Hakkadosch, or the Holy, upon whom the highest commendations are bestowed by Maimonides, <sup>a</sup> as eminent for humility, temperance, and every branch of piety, as also for learning and eloquence, and likewise for his riches ; which are magnified by him and other Jewish writers, beyond all reasonable bounds of probability.

But it may not be amiss for me to give my readers some farther insight into this work, by reciting an article of Dr. Prideaux in his *Connexion of the History of the Old and New Testament*. He observes how the number of Jewish traditions had increased : ‘ And <sup>b</sup> thus,’ says he, ‘ it went on ‘ to the middle of the second century after Christ, when Antoninus Pius governed the Roman empire, by which time ‘ they found it necessary to put all these traditions into writing : for they were then grown to so great a number, and ‘ enlarged to so huge a heap, as to exceed the possibility of ‘ being any longer preserved by the memory of men. And ‘ therefore there being danger, that under these disadvantages they might be all forgotten and lost, for the preventing hereof it was resolved that they should be all collected ‘ and put into a book ; and Rabbi Judah, the son of Simeon, ‘ who, from the reputed sanctity of his life, was called Hakkadosh, that is, the Holy, and was then rector of the school ‘ which they had at Tiberias in Galilee, undertook the work, ‘ and compiled it in six books, each consisting of several ‘ tracts, which all together make up the number of sixty ‘ three—This is the book called the Mishna ; which book ‘ was forthwith received by the Jews with great veneration ‘ throughout all their dispersions, and hath ever since been held in high esteem among them—And therefore, as soon

<sup>a</sup> Ap. *Port. Mosis*, p. 35, 36.

<sup>b</sup> The year before Christ 446, p. 326, &c. Vol. i.

‘ as it was published, it became the object of the studies of  
‘ all their learned men; and the chiefest of them employed  
‘ themselves to make comments upon it: and these with the  
‘ Mishna make up both their Talmuds, that is, the Jerusalem  
‘ Talmud, and the Babylonish Talmud. These comments  
‘ they call the Gemara, that is, the Complement; because  
‘ by them the Mishna is fully explained, and the whole tra-  
‘ ditionary doctrine of their law and their religion complet-  
‘ ed: for the Mishna is the text, and the Gemara the com-  
‘ ment; and both together is what they call the Talmud.  
‘ That made by the Jews of Judea is called the Jerusalem  
‘ Talmud, and that made by the Jews of Babylonia, the Ba-  
‘ bylonish Talmud. The former was completed about the  
‘ year of our Lord 300, and is published in one large folio;  
‘ the latter was published about two hundred years after, in  
‘ the beginning of the sixth century, and hath had several  
‘ editions since the invention of printing: the last published  
‘ at Amsterdam, is in twelve folios. And in these two Tal-  
‘ muds is contained the whole of the Jewish religion that is  
‘ now professed among them: but<sup>c</sup> the Babylonish Talmud  
‘ is that which they chiefly follow.’

The same learned author again afterwards computes that the Mishna was composed about the one hundred and fiftieth year of our Lord, the Jerusalem Talmud about the three hundredth year, and the other Talmud about the five hundredth year of our Lord.

And Wagenseil observes, that <sup>d</sup> Rabbi Jehuda was contemporary with Antoninus the pious. Mr. Lampe,<sup>e</sup> speaking of several of the Jewish rabbins celebrated about this time, says that R. Jehuda, author of the Mishna, died about the year of Christ 194, or according to others in the year 230.

Dr. Lightfoot [Fall of Jerusalem, sect. vii. vol. i. p. 369.] says, that ‘ R. Judah outlived both the Antonines, and Com-  
‘ modus also.’ And afterwards, in the same page: ‘ He  
‘ compiled the Mishna about the year of Christ 190, in the  
‘ latter end of the reign of Commodus; or, as some compute,

<sup>c</sup> Dr. Wotton, as above, p. 22, 23, says: ‘ The Jerusalem Talmud wants  
‘ the impertinences, and, consequently, the authority of the Babylonish Gemara  
‘ ———It has little of that hyperbolical and fabulous stuff, for which the  
‘ other is so highly valued by the modern Talmudists.’

<sup>d</sup> Rabbi Jehudam, qui Sancti cognomen inter suos meruit, et Antonini Pii Imperatoris æqualis fuit, metus invaserat, ne, ob tantas gentis suæ miseras, et in remotissimis terris deportationes, Oralis Lex plane in hominum animis obliteraretur. Wagens. Pr. p. 55.

<sup>e</sup> Sed præcipue emittit R. Jehuda, quem Sanctum nominant, Mishnæ auctor, qui circa annum 194, aut secundum alios 230, obiisse creditur. Lampe, Synops. H. E. P. 111.

‘ in the year of Christ 220, and a hundred and fifty years after  
 ‘ the destruction of Jerusalem.’

I do not take upon me to contest at all what Prideaux says of the times of the two Talmuds: but I must say a few things about the time of the Mishna. I allow that Rabbi Jehudah, the composer of it, was contemporary with Antoninus the pious; though the stories told by the Jewish writers, of the favours shown him by that emperor, must be reckoned partly fabulous. But, allowing him to be contemporary with Antoninus, who died in the year 161, it does not follow that the Mishna was composed so soon as the year of Christ 150. R. Jehudah is supposed to have had a long life; and the compiling of the Mishna, which must have been the work of many years, and much leisure and deliberate thought and consideration, may not have been finished before the year 190, or <sup>l</sup> later. If therefore I place this work at the year 180, I think I place it soon enough. Besides, it is said that R. Jehuda had several sicknesses, some of long continuance, which are particularly mentioned both in the Jerusalem and the Babylonian Talmud, though with some variations. These must have been obstructions to him in his studies, and must have prolonged the labours of his work. The nature of the work also required time. It is not a speculation which might be spun out of a man’s head at once. But it is a collection<sup>g</sup> of traditions from all quarters, and from the contributions of other learned men of the nation, who had treasured up these hitherto unwritten traditions in their memories.

One thing more I may premise here, that <sup>h</sup> it is the opinion

<sup>l</sup> Talmudici Operis fundamenta hoc seculo jaeta, circa A. C. 190. Magistri citius, imperante Antonino Pio. Fred. Spanh. Opp. T. i. p. 687. Vid. et p. 793.

<sup>g</sup> Quamobrem, adhibitis in consilium auxiliumque sapientissimis quibusque, sedulo ab iis, quibus licebat, Judæis, voce ac per epistolas seiscitatus est, quænam a parentibus oralis legis scita didicissent, quin et schedas undique conquisivit, quibus hactenus memoriæ causâ traditiones iascriptæ fuerant. Ea omnia, secundum certa doctrinæ capita disposuit, et in unum volumen redegit, cui nomen hoc Mishna, hoc est, *δευτερωσις* imposuit. Wagenseil. Pr. p. 55.

<sup>h</sup> Scilicet, si per Talmud solam Mishnam intelligam, vere affirmavero, nullam in toto Talmude reperiri blasphemiam, nihil christianis adversum, nullam fabulam quoque, imo nec quicquam quod valde a ratione sit alienum. Continet enim meras tantum *πατροπαραδοσεις*, et est, eeu diximus, corpus juris judæici olim non scripti. Rem ita se habere, testem idoneum ac loepletem sistere possumus, virum harum rerum scientissimum, omnique dignum præconio, Josephum de Voisin.—Wagenseil. Præf. p. 57.

Quippe, quod in præfatione hujus voluminis satis dixi, id tamen nunc iterum dico, in universâ Mishnâ, de Jesu servatore, nec vola nec vestigium ullum apparet, imo ne de christianis quidem, ejus nomen profitentibus. Id in Confut. Toldos Jeshu. p. x. sect. 4.

of divers learned men, well skilled in this part of learning, that in the Mishna, which is a collection of Jewish traditions, there is little or nothing concerning our Saviour or his followers. I allow also that here are none of those open blasphemies which may be found in some other Jewish writings.

II. I shall now make some extracts out of the Mishna.

I. In the tract concerning fasts are these words: ‘Five<sup>i</sup> heavy afflictions have befallen our ancestors on the seventeenth day of the month Tammuz [June,] and as many on the ninth day of the month Ab [July:] for on the seventeenth day of Tammuz the tables of the law were broken; the perpetual sacrifice ceased; the walls of the city were broke open; the law was burnt by Apostemus; and an idol was set up in the temple. On the ninth day of the month Ab, God determined concerning our fathers, that they should not enter into the promised land; the first and second temple was desolated; the city Bither was taken; the holy city was destroyed: for which reason, as soon as the month Ab begins, rejoicings are abated.’<sup>k</sup>

<sup>i</sup> Quinque res luetuosæ patribus nostris acciderunt die septimo decimo mensis Tammuz [sc. Junii.] totidemque die nono mensis Abh [sc. Julii.] Nam xvii. Tammuz fractæ sunt tabulæ Legis: cesavit jure sacrificium: Urbis mœnia perrupta: Lex ab Apostemo combusta, idolumque in templo statutum. Nono autem die mensis Abh, decrevit Deus de patribus nostris, non ingressuros eos in terram promissam: desolatum est templum primum et secundum: capta est urbs B.ther: diruta urbs sancta. Unde ex quo mensis Abh incipit, lætitia imminuunt. Tract. de Jejuniiis, c. 4. sect. 7. Pars 2. p. 382. edit. Surenh.

<sup>k</sup> I think it cannot be disagreeable to my readers, if I here transcribe some observations of Dr. Lightfoot, from what he calls a Parergon. Concerning the fall of Jerusalem. Of his works, Vol. i. p. 362, though they are long: ‘The temple was burnt down, as Josephus a spectator setteth the time, “on the tenth day of the month Lous.” Which he saith was a fatal day to the temple; for it had been burnt down by the Babylonians before on that day. De Bell. l. 6. c. vii. And yet his countrymen, who write in the Hebrew tongue, fix both these fatalities to the ninth day of that month, which they call the month Ab. And they account that day fatal for three other sad occurrences besides. “On the ninth day of the month Ab,” say they, “the decree came out against Israel in the wilderness that they should not enter into the land. On it was the destruction of the first temple, and on it was the destruction of the second. On it the great city Bither was taken, where thousands and ten thousands of Israel, who had a great king over them, [Ben Cozba,] whom all Israel, even their greatest wise men, thought to have been Messias. But he fell into the hands of the heathen, and there was great affliction as there was at the destruction of the sanctuary. And on that day, a day allotted for vengeance, the wicked Turnus Rufus ploughed up the place of the temple, and the places about it, to accomplish what is said, “Sion shall become a ploughed field.” Talmud. in Taanith. per. 4. halac. 6. Maimon. in Taanith. per. 5.’

‘It is strange, that men of the same nation, and in a thing so signal, and

Who is meant by Apostemus, or Appostemus, is not very material, and therefore I do not inquire. I allege this passage as an early Jewish testimony to the destruction of the holy city, or Jerusalem, and the second temple, as it is here called.

2. In the tract concerning the woman suspected of adultery, are these words: 'When<sup>1</sup> the war of Vespasian began, the coronets and bells of bridegrooms were forbidden by a public decree. When the war of Titus began, the coronets of brides were forbidden, and that no man should educate his son in great learning. Because of the final issue of that war every bride was forbidden to come abroad under an umbrella. Nevertheless, our masters have [since] thought fit to allow of it.'

'of which both parties were spectators, should be at such a difference: and yet not a difference neither, if we take Josephus's report of the whole story, and the other Jews' construction of the time. He records that the cloister-walks, commonly called the Porticoes of the temple, were fired on the eighth day, and were burning on the ninth: but that day Titus called a council of war, and carried it by three voices, that the temple should be spared. But a new bustling of the Jews caused it to be fired, though against his will on the next day. Joseph. ubi supr. c. 22, 23, 24. Now their Kalendar reckons from the middle day of the three, that fire was at it as from a centre. And they state the time thus: "It was the time of the evening when fire was put to the temple; and it burnt till the going down of the sun of the next day. And behold what Rabban Jochanan Benzaccai saith: If I had not been in that generation, I should not have pitched it upon any other day but the tenth, because the most of the temple was burnt that day. And in the Jerusalem Talmud it is related that Rabbi and Joshua Ben Levi fasted for it the ninth and tenth days both." Gloss. in Maim. in Taanith. per. 8.'

'Such another discrepancy about the time of the firing of the first temple by Nebuchadnezzar, may be observed in 2 Kings xxv. 8, 9, where it is said that "in the fifth month, on the seventh day of the month, came Nebuzardan, captain of the guard, and burnt the house of the Lord:" and yet in Jer. li. 12, it is said to have been "in the fifth month, on the tenth day of the month." Which the Gemarists in the Babylon Talmud reconcile thus: "It cannot be said on the seventh day, because it is said on the tenth. Nor can it be said on the tenth, because it is said on the seventh. How is it then? On the seventh day the aliens came into the temple and ate there, and defiled it the seventh, eighth, and ninth days. And that day, towards night, they set it on fire, and it burnt all the tenth day, as was the case also with the second temple." Taanith. fol. 29.'

'The ninth and tenth days of the month Ab, on which the temple was burnt down, was about the two and three-and-twentieth days of our July. And the city was taken and sacked the eighth day of September following. Joseph. supr. c. 47.' So Lightfoot.

<sup>1</sup> Orto bello Vespasiani, decreto publico abrogatæ sunt coronæ sponzorum et tympana. Orto bello Titi, cautum est de coronis sponsarum, et ne quis filium in Græcicis erudret. Propter postremum belli impetum, prohibebatur sponsa in publicum prodire sub uranisco. Sed magistris nostris visum est, facultatem ejus rei indulgere. Tractat. de Uxore Adulterii suspectâ. num 11. P. 3. p. 304. Edit. Surenh.



This also is an early testimony to the war, in which the Jewish people were subdued by those two great generals, Vespasian and Titus.

3. I shall now transcribe below another long passage from the same tract: a part of which shall be translated.

‘When <sup>m</sup> Rabbi Meir died, there were none left to instruct men in wise parables.’——

——‘When Simeon, son of Gamaliel, died, there came locusts, and calamities were increased. When R. Akiba died, the glory of the law vanished away. Upon the death of Gamaliel the Aged, the honour of the law vanished, and there was an end to purity and sanctimony. When Rabbi Ishmael, son of Babi, died, the splendour of the priesthood was tarnished. When Rabbi [Judah] died, there was no more any modesty or fear of transgression. Rabbi Pinchas, son of Ishmael, said, When the temple was destroyed, all men were covered with shame, both wise men and nobles; and all now cover their heads: the bountiful are reduced to poverty, and the violent and slanderers prevail: nor is there any to explain the law, nor are there any who ask and in-

<sup>m</sup> Mortuo R. Meir, defecere qui homines erudiebant [doctis] parabolis.—Mortuo R. Simeone Filio Gamalielis, venerunt locustæ, et auctæ sunt calamitates.—R. Ahibâ mortuo, decus legis evanuit.—Mortuo R. Gamaliele Sene, evanuit honor legis, simulque mundities et sanctimonia, intermortuæ. R. Ismaële filio Babi defuncto, occubuit splendor sacerdotii. Mortuo Rabbi [Judâ Sancto] cessavit modestia, et timor peccati. R. Pinchas F. J. ait diruto templo pudore suffusi sunt sapientes pariter et nobiles; obnubuntque capita. Liberales ad pauperiem sunt redacti, contra invaluerunt violenti, et calumniatores: nec superest explicans, nec quærens, nec interrogans. Cui ergo innitendum est nobis? Patri nostro cœlesti. R. Eliezer, cognomento Magnus, ait: Ex quo templum devastatum est, cœpere sapientes similes esse scribis, scribæ Ædituis, Æditui vulgo hominum. Vulgus autem hominum, in pejus in dies ruit: nec quis rogans, aut quærens superest. Cui ergo innitendum? Patri nostro cœlesti. Paulo ante adventum Messiæ impudentia augebitur, et magna erit annonæ caritas. Vitis proferet fructum, sed vinum nihilominus care vendetur. Summum in orbe imperium obruetur opinionibus pravis, et nulli locum habebit correptio. Synagogæ convertentur in lupanaria, limites Judææ desolabuntur, et regio, quanta quanta est, devastabitur. Viri insignes oppidatim circuibunt, nec ulla humanitatis officia experientur. Fœtebit sapientia magistrorum, a delictis sibi caventes spernentur, et veritatis magnus erit defectus. Juvenes confundent ora senum. Senes coram junioribus surgent. Filius irritabit patrem. Nata insurget adversus matrem, nurusque contra socrum. Denique, suos quisque domesticos inimicos habebit. Scilicet seculo isto canina facies erit, nec verebitur filius parentem. Cui ergo confidendum? Patri cœlesti.—R. Pinchas F. J. ait: Providentia causa alacritatis.——Timor sceleris ducit ad pietatem. Pietas causa est [‘gratiæ’] S. Spiritus. Spiritus S. [‘fideles’] facit participes resurrectionis mortuorum. Resurrectio mortuorum obtinget interventu Eliæ, cujus memoria sacra esto et sancta——Deus æternus benigne concedat ut adventu illius cito salvi sanique fruamur. Amen. Tr. de Uxore Adulterii suspectâ. num. 15. P. 3. p. 303, 309. Surenh

quire. What then shall we do? Let us trust in our heavenly Father. R. Eliezer, surnamed the Great, says, From the time that the temple was destroyed the wise men began to be like scribes, the scribes like sextons, and sextons like the vulgar; and the vulgar are continually degenerating from bad to worse: nor are there any who ask and inquire. What then shall we do? Let us trust in our heavenly Father. A short time before the coming of the Messiah impudence will be increased, and great will be the price of provisions. The vine will bear fruit; nevertheless wine will be sold at a high price. The supreme empire of the world will be overwhelmed with bad opinions: nor will there be room for any to correct them. Synagogues will be turned into brothel houses, and the whole land of Judea will be laid waste. Excellent men will wander from town to town, and experience no offices of humanity. The wisdom of the masters will be slighted, and all who strive to avoid transgression will be contemned, and great will be the dearth of truth. Young men will cover the faces of the aged with shame: and the aged will rise before the young. The son will dishonour the father: and the daughter will rise up against her mother: and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's enemies will be they of his own household. In a word, that age will have a canine appearance. Nor will the son reverence the father. What then shall we do? Let us trust in our heavenly Father.—May the coming of Elias be hastened. And may the eternal God graciously vouchsafe that we may be preserved to that time.'

This passage may deserve an attentive regard, and will require divers observations. But I shall take no particular notice of what is here said about 'the coming of Elias,' that not being reckoned certainly genuine.

1. In the first place, this passage ought to be compared with Jerom's commentary upon Is. ch. viii. 14, where<sup>n</sup> he mentions divers of the Jewish masters, who flourished and were very eminent about the time of our Saviour, and some while after; Sammai, Hillel, Meir, Akibas, Johanan the son

<sup>n</sup> Deus domus Nazaræi——duas familias interpretantur, Sammai et Hillel: ex quibus orti sunt scribæ et pharisæi, quorum suscepit scholam Akibas, quem magistrum Aquilæ proselyti autumant: et post eum Meir, cui successit Johanan filius Zachai: et post eum Eliezer, et per ordinem Delphon: et rursus Joseph Galilæus: et usque ad captivitatem Jerusalem Josue. Sammai igitur et Hillel non multo priusquam Dominus nasceretur, orti sunt in Judæa, quorum prior 'dissipator' interpretatur, sequens 'profanus:' eo quod per traditiones et *δευτερωσεις* suas legis præcepta dissipaverit, atque maculaverit, &c. In Is. cap. viii. T. 3. p. 79.

of Zachai, and some others. In <sup>o</sup> another place he censures the numerous traditions, or secondary laws, of the pharisees. Undoubtedly Jerom was not unacquainted with Jewish traditions. But I cannot say that these passages amount to a proof that he had seen the volume of the Mishna.

2. Here is another testimony to the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem.

3. I suppose likewise that here is a reference to the disasters of the Jews, occasioned by the rebellion of Barchochebas in the time of Adrian. This I suppose to be intended in these words: ‘And the whole land of Judea will be laid waste, and excellent men will wander from place to place, and experience no offices of humanity.’ Moreover, in the passage first cited, the taking of the city Bithur is mentioned as one of the most remarkable calamities that had befallen the Jewish people. It was the concluding event of the Jewish war with Adrian, about the year 136. Which shows that the Mishna was not composed till some while afterwards.

4. Meir, the first rabbi here mentioned, is said to have been <sup>p</sup> one of the principal of the Jewish doctors after the destruction of Jerusalem.

5. Rabbi Akibas <sup>q</sup> was a man upon whose praises the Jewish writers enlarge mightily: and his sayings are often mentioned in the Mishna and the Talmud. He was a zealous follower of the impostor Barchochebas, who took upon him the character of the Messiah, in the time of Adrian, about the year of Christ 132; and he perished with him. This shows the temper of Akibas: and we can hence conclude how he stood affected to the Lord Jesus. The honourable mention here made of him shows also the temper of the compiler of this work, the Mishna.

6. Gamaliel the Aged is supposed to be Gamaliel, St. Paul’s master, mentioned by him, Acts xxii. 3, and in ch. v. 34, to be “one of the council, a pharisee, and doctor of the law, had in reputation with all the people.” From what is here said of him, in the passage now before us, he appears

<sup>o</sup> Quantæ traditiones pharisæorum sint, quas hodie vocant δευτερωσεις, et quam aniles fabulæ, evolvere nequeo. Neque libri patitur magnitudo; et pleraque tam turpia sunt, ut erubescam dicere. Ad Algas. Qu. x. T. 4. P. i. p. 207.

<sup>p</sup> See Basnag. Hist. des Juifs, l. 6. ch. x. sect. iv. &c.

<sup>q</sup> Of Akibas may be seen Basnage Hist. des Juifs, liv. vi. ch. ix. sect. 14—25. Vid. et Basnag. ann. 134. num. iii. Raymund. Martini Pug. Fidei, p. 256—264. Edzardi Avodazara, Vol. i. p. 162, 338. Lightfoot in the Fall of Jerusalem, sect. iv. vol. i. p. 366, 367. Dr. Sharpe’s Argument for Christianity, p. 35.

to have been in great esteem with the Jewish people; and he is often mentioned in the Mishna. What is here said of him, therefore, confirms the truth of what is said of him in the book of the Acts. Moreover, we are hereby assured that Gamaliel never was converted to christianity, as some christians, especially of the church of Rome, have fondly and weakly imagined. And indeed from what St. Paul says, in the text before quoted, it may be argued that Gamaliel was still a firm Jew: otherwise it had not been to the purpose to take notice of his education under him, in the critical circumstances which he was then in.

7. Of Rabbi, [Jehudah,] the compiler of the Mishna, here and elsewhere called Rabbi, or the master, without any other distinction, so much has been said already, that little more needs to be added now: It is here said that ‘when he died, there remained no longer any modesty or fear of transgression.’ Maimonides, in his character of Jehudah the Holy, did not omit<sup>r</sup> this particular. But here is somewhat which could not be said by himself: it must have been inserted after his death. Wagenseil therefore acknowledgeth that<sup>s</sup> there were some additions made to the Mishna. But he says there are not many, and they were soon made, and chiefly regard R. Jehudah himself, which I see no reason to contest. For I am willing to allow this volume to be a work of the second century. Nevertheless this manner of speaking may perhaps induce us to think that more hands than one were employed in compiling it.

8. Once more in the eighth place. This whole passage appears to me to be a disguised and invidious representation of the state of things under the gospel dispensation since the appearance of Jesus, whom his disciples and followers have received as the Messiah: and especially after the destruction of Jerusalem, when christianity prevailed and judaism declined.

For, (1.) The destruction of the Jewish temple is acknowledged. Nevertheless here are no tokens of repentance and humiliation, but complaints and reflections upon others. The times were bad. But the blame is all laid upon others.

(2.) The ‘supreme empire of the world,’ he says, ‘will be,’ or is ‘overwhelmed with bad opinions:’ meaning, as

<sup>r</sup> In summo etiam pietatis, et humilitatis, et abstinentiæ a voluptatibus gradu: uti etiam dixerunt: Ex quo mortuus est Rabbi, cessavit humilitas, et timor peccati. Maim. Porta Mosis, p. 55.

<sup>s</sup> Accessisse, post obitum R. Judæi, quasdam interpolationes, non negaverim: sed eæ paucæ sunt, ac mature fuerunt adjectæ, ipsumque R. Judam potissimum recipiunt. Wag. ib. p. 55.

I think, the christian religion, and the several sects and heresies which arose in the second century, and some of them not far from the beginning of it.

(3.) ‘Synagogues will be turned into brothel houses.’ He refers to the common reports among the vulgar, that the christians practised promiscuous lewdness in their religious assemblies. And he adopts the calumny.

(4.) In what follows, the author adopts the words of our Lord, recorded, Matt. x. 35, 36, and Luke xii. 51—53; which words are also in Micah vii. 6, concerning the dissensions that would be in families; some cheerfully embracing his doctrine, whilst others obstinately rejected it, and were bitter towards those who received it. Which the compiler of this work represents as the utmost distress and misery, and as hitherto unknown and unparalleled wickedness.

(5.) And what do all the clamours of this paragraph mean concerning the ‘failure’ or dearth ‘of truth, the multiplicity of bad opinions, whilst there was no room left for reproof or correction?’ What is intended by the complaints that ‘the wisdom of the masters was slighted, that there was an end to purity and sanctimony, to modesty and the fear of transgression, and that the young covered the faces of the aged with shame, and the aged rose up to the young?’ and the rest.

All these complaints, as seems to me, refer to the resolution and steadiness of the converts to christianity from judaism and Gentilism, who judged for themselves, and admitted the evidences of the truth of the new religion, which overpowered their minds. Of which therefore they made an open profession, notwithstanding the sophistry, the entreaties, and the menaces of the world about them; many of whom were their superiors in age, learning, and outward circumstance and condition. Of all this we have in this passage, as seems to me, a graphical description.

I cannot but understand this passage after this manner. And I refer these thoughts to the consideration of my readers. This paragraph, if my interpretation be right, is very curious.

I am unwilling to enter into a controversy about the Mishnical tract ‘*Avoda zara, de Cultu Peregrino*’ [of strange or idolatrous worship]. I pay a great regard to the judgment of those learned men who say there is in it no reference to the christians. Nevertheless there seems to me a defect in their reasonings upon that point. I think that when the Mishna was compiled the christians were more numerous, more considerable, and of more consequence,

than those learned men suppose in their argument concerning that tract.

III. I have done with the Mishna. I proceed to the Talmud.

I. The first passage to be taken thence will relate to our Lord's nativity.

'Upon<sup>t</sup> a certain day, when several masters were sitting at the gate of the city, two boys passed by before them; one of whom covered his head, the other had his head uncovered. Concerning him who, contrary to all the rules of modesty, had boldly passed by with his head uncovered, Elieser said he believed he was spurious: R. Joshua said he believed he was the son of a woman set apart: but R. Akiba said he was both. The others said to Akiba, Why do you differ from the rest of your brethren? He answered that he would prove the truth of what he had said. Accordingly he went to the mother of the boy, whom he found sitting in the market, and selling of herbs. He then says to her, "My daughter, answer me a question which I am going to put to you, and I assure you of a portion of happiness in the world to come." She answered: "Confirm what you say with an oath." Akiba then swore with his lips, but at the same time absolved himself in his mind. Then he said to her: "Tell me the origin of this your son?" Which she did, and confessed that it was as he had said. When he returned to his colleagues and told them the dis-

<sup>t</sup> Juramentis vero illorum nihil prorsus est tribuendum, quia in ipso Talmude docentur, posse juramenta, dum præstantur, confestim in mente aboleri, ut non obligent. Exemplo est R. Akifa, de quo Cod. Kolla, fol. 18. col. 2, med. sequens refertur historia. Cum aliquando Seniores sederent in portâ [urbis] præterierunt ante ipsos duo pueri, quorum alter caput texerat, alter retexerat. Et de eo quidem, qui caput [proterve, et contra bonos mores] retexerat, pronuntiavit R. Elieser, quod esset spurius. R. Josua autem dixit, eum esse a muliere menstruatâ conceptum. At R. Akifa subjecit, esse illum et spurium et filium menstruatæ. Unde cæteri interrogârunt R. Akifam, quomodo tam audaciter collegis suis contradiceret. Sed ille regressit, se dicta sua esse confirmaturum. Abiit ergo ad matrem pueri istius, quam cum videret sedentem in foro, et vendentem legumina, dixit ad illam, Filia mea, si tu mihi ingenue indicaveris id quod sum interrogaturus, efficiam ut potiaris vitâ seculi futuri. Ipsâ autem postulante, ut jurejurando assertum suum roboraret, juravit R. Akifa labiis suis, sed corde suo jusjurandum hoc statim reddidit irritum. Tum R. Akifa, Dic, inquit, mihi qualis sit hic filius tuus? Ad quæ illa: Quando ego nuptias celebrarem, laborabam a menstruis. Ideoque secessit a me maritus, paranymphus autem meus [occasione arreptâ] congressus mecum est. Atque ex eo concubitu exstitit mihi filius hic. Unde apparuit, puerum istum esse non modo spurium, sed et menstruatæ filium. Cumque id percepissent cæteri assessores, dixerunt: Magnus est Akifa, quando correxit doctores suos. Edzard. Avoda Sara, Tom. i. p. 279. Conf. Wagenseil. Confut. Tol. Jeschu. p. 14, 15. et Buxtorf. Syn. Jud. c. vii. p. 132, 133.

covery he had made, they said : “ Great is Akiba, who had corrected the rest of the masters.” ’

An absolute fiction, the fruit of deep-rooted malice ! Though <sup>u</sup> no person is here named, there can be no doubt who is intended. And it is adopted by <sup>v</sup> the author of *Toldoth Jeschu*.

2. Upon *Matt. ii. 14*, Lightfoot observes as follows : ‘ There <sup>w</sup> are some footsteps in the Talmudists of this journey of our Saviour into Egypt, but so corrupted with venomous blasphemy, (as all their writings are,) that they seem only to have confessed the truth that they might have matter more liberally to reproach him : for so they speak [*Bab. Sanhedr. fol. 107. a.*] “ When Jannay the king slew the rabbins, R. Joshua Ben Perachiah and Jesus went away unto Alexandria in Egypt. Simeon Ben Shelah sent thither, speaking thus : From me Jerusalem, the holy city, to thee, O Alexandria in Egypt, my sister, health. My husband dwells with thee, while I in the mean time sit alone. Therefore he rose up and went. And a little after he brought forth four hundred trumpets, and anathematised” [*Jesus.*] And a little before that, ‘ Elizæus turned away Gehazi with both his hands, and R. Joshua Ben Perachiah thrust away Jesus with both his hands.’ ’

‘ And [*Schabb. fol. 104, 2.*] “ Did not Ben Satda bring enchantments out of Egypt in the cutting which was in his flesh ?” Under Ben Satda they wound our Jesus with their reproaches.’

The story of our Lord’s journey to Alexandria with Joshua Ben Perachiah, when king Jannay killed the rabbins, may be seen more at large in some other authors,<sup>x</sup> to whom I refer. And I shall transcribe it<sup>y</sup> below, though I do not

<sup>u</sup> Hæc historia tecte videtur loqui de Christo. Buxtorf. ubi supr. p. 133.

Ac de infantia quidem et natalibus Jeschu, credo ego, creduntque Judæi hoc mecum, sermonem esse, quanquam nomine penitus suppresso, in *Massechet Calla*, quam et ipsum allegare convenit. Wagens. ut supr. p. 14.

<sup>v</sup> Apud Wagens. p. 5.

<sup>w</sup> Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations, p. 111, 112.

<sup>x</sup> Vide B. Scheidii. *Loca Talmudica*, in quibus Jesu et discipulorum ejus fit mentio, p. 6. et Wagensel. *Confutatio libr. Toldos Jeschu*. p. 15, 16.

<sup>y</sup> In *Tr. Sanhedrin*, f. 107. 2. et *Sota*, f. 47. 1. Quum Jannai rex interficiebat Rabbinos, fugiebat R. Josua filius Parachiaë et Jesus Alexandriam Ægypti. Pace reddita, in hæc verba Simeon Schetachides R. Josuæ Parachiaë filio scribit. Hierosolymæ civitas sancta, tibi Alexandriae Ægypti. O soror mea, maritus meus in medio tui degit ; at ego sede desolata. Surgens ergo ille veniebat eo, et pervenit ad quandam hospitam, quæ omnibus honoris officiis eum prosequebatur. Tum dicebat, [Josua,] Quam pulchrum est hoc hospitium. Sed discipulus de hospita sermonem excipiens, dicebat ei : Mi magister, oculi ejus sunt teretes. Cui ille respondebat : Impie, taliane tu curas ? atque feminas spectas intentius ? Nec mora. Pro ductis ergo 400 tubis,

translate it entire. It is obscure. Nevertheless the folly, the malice, and the falsehood of it, are apparent.

It should be observed that this story of our Lord's journey into Egypt, with Joshua Ben Perachiah, has little agreement with the true history in Matt. ii. 13—23. For, according to the evangelist, Jesus was carried thither when an infant, and was soon brought back again into Judea. But, according to the Talmudists, Jesus was a young man when he went thither with Joshua Perachides, who is supposed to have been his master or tutor. And according to them, when Perachides and Jesus had been some while in Egypt, they were informed that peace was restored in Judea. As they were returning back they were well received at an inn. Here Perachides and Jesus disagreed, and parted asunder; nor could they ever be reconciled again, though some attempts on both sides were made toward a reconciliation. After that Jesus, as is said, wholly gave up himself to magical practices, and was excommunicated.

If by king Jannai be intended Alexander Jannæus, here is a great anachronism; for he died fourscore years<sup>2</sup> before the christian epoch. But I do not insist upon that; for, perhaps, it is owing to design and not to ignorance.

If, in the discourse between Perachides and Jesus at the inn, where they first disagreed, there be an aspersion of our Lord's moral character, as if he too attentively observed the faces of women, it is of a piece with another charge of theirs, that Jesus endeavoured to seduce men to idolatry; which we shall see presently.

I do acknowledge, however, that when I first observed this paragraph, I was not a little surprised. For Origen says, that 'though<sup>a</sup> innumerable lies and calumnies

proclamari curabat eum [Jesus] esse excommunicatum. Sæpenumero adibat [discipulus] magistrum, obsecrans, ut sese denuo reciperet. Verum ipse ejus nullam habuit rationem. Die quodam, cum recitasset [Josua Perachides] lectionem, Audi Israël, Deut. vi. 4. accedit [Jesus] Perachidem. Nam putabat se receptum iri. Indicabat ei R. Josua filius Perachiae manu suâ, quod vellet recipere eum. Ipse [Jesus] putabat, quod repellendo repelleret se. Abibat ergo, et suspendens laterem, eum adorabat. Dicebat [Perachides] illi: Recipisce. Cui ille respondebat: Sic a teipso didici: Quod nulli, qui peccavit, et ad peccandum multis fuit auctor, facultas agendi poenitentiam suppeditetur? Nam dixerat Mar ['doctor Talmudicus'] Jesus ad magiam seduxit, et erinæm, Deut. xiii. 5, 6. impulsione, vetitum commisit, et Israëlitis ad peccandum auctor fuit. Ergo, cum Gemarici volunt, deserto Perachide præceptore, Jeschu totum se deinde magicis artibus in Ægypto addixit: omnique has intus et in cute teneret, in Judæam se contulit.' Apud Scheid. et Wagens. ubi supra. <sup>2</sup> Pridcaux's Connection, year before Christ 79. p. 396, 397.

<sup>a</sup> ———— πρὸς τὸν σιμὸν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, οὐ μὴδὲ οἱ μύρια κατηγορησαντες, καὶ ψευδῆ ὅσα περὶ αὐτοῦ λεγοντες, διδυννηται καταπιειν, ὡς καὶ τὸ τυχὸν ἀκολασίας καὶ ἐπ' ὀλίγον γευσάμενα. Contr. Cels. l. 3. num. 36. Bened. p. 32. Spere



‘ had been forged against the venerable Jesus, none had dared ‘ to charge him with any intemperance whatever.’ So says Origen about the middle of the third century. He speaks confidently with full assurance. If he had ever met with such a calumny, he would not have denied it; for he was perfectly honest and sincere. And if such a calumny had appeared, he was as likely to know it as any man; for he was acquainted with all sorts of people: and he had often conversed with the learned men of the Jewish nation, as well as others. This story therefore was not in being in his time, nor till after it. But reflections upon a man’s character, unknown till long after his departure out of the world, are destitute of authority, and deserve no regard. They only show the bad temper of those who receive, or who invent and forge them.

Let me add one thought more here. We may reasonably conclude, and reckon it certain from Origen’s work, that Celsus knew nothing of this story; consequently it was not yet invented: for he had conversed with Jews, and made use of them to assist him in his argument against the christians, and had picked up all the scandal he could get.

I must be allowed to observe yet farther: Celsus had made use of some disparaging expressions concerning our Saviour. Wherenpon Origen says: ‘ If<sup>b</sup> Celsus had alleged ‘ any kind of infamous actions in the life of Jesus, we would ‘ have done our best to answer to every thing that might ‘ appear so to him. As to the miserable death of Jesus, ‘ the same may be objected to Socrates and Anaxarchus ‘ just mentioned.’ Celsus therefore knew not of any such thing.

Finally, I do not recollect in the remains of Celsus, who wrote in the second, nor in Origen, who wrote in the third, century, any traces of this journey of our Lord into Egypt, with a tutor. This story therefore is a late, as well as a malicious fiction without ground.

The second quotation in Lightfoot shall now be more distinctly transcribed. ‘ In<sup>c</sup> the Mishnical tract, called Schab-

<sup>b</sup> *Εἰ γὰρ τὰ εἰδη τὰ ἐπιρρήτοτατα βίαι ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτῆ φαινόμενα αὐτῷ ἐπιθεμένος ἦν, κἀν ἠγωνισαμέθα πρὸς ἕκατον τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι αὐτῷ ἐπιρρήτοτατων.* Contr. Cels. l. 7. sect. 56. Ben. p. 369. f. Spere.

<sup>c</sup> In tractatu Schabbath, fol. 104. 2. in Mishnâ dicitur. Si quis [die Sabbati] lineam ducat, seu incisuram faciat super carnem suam, R. Eliezer eum reum censet sacrificii peccati. Sapientes autem absolvunt. Postea in Gemarâ, ad hæc verba notatur: Traditio. Dixit R. Elieser ad sapientes: At ammon filius Stadæ extulit magicas artes ex Ægypto, in incisurâ, quæ erat super carne ejus? Glossa. Quia non poterat eas enferre, vel educere, scriptas; quia magi

‘ bath, it is said : “ If any one, especially on the sabbath, draws a line, or makes a cut in his flesh, he is obliged to bring a sin-offering : but the wise men absolve him.” Upon which words it is remarked in the Gemara, A tradition ; R. Eliezer said to the wise men : “ But did not the son of Stada bring magical arts out of Egypt, in a cutting in his flesh ? The Gloss says : “ The reason of that was that he could not bring them away in writing, because the priests diligently searched all at their going away, that they might not carry out magical arts to teach them to men dwelling in other countries.” ’

This is said, I suppose, to insinuate that all the great works ascribed to our Saviour were performed by virtue of magical arts which he had learned in Egypt. This insinuation has been considered, and well confuted, by Grotius,<sup>d</sup> to whom I now refer. Hereafter I shall transcribe his words at length, in the chapter of Celsus, where this charge will come over again.

3. Let us now observe whether Jesus gained any disciples.

Lightfoot, upon Matt. ix. 9, speaks to this purpose : ‘ Five disciples of Christ are mentioned by the Talmudists, [Bab. Sanhedrim. fol. 431.] among whom Matthew seems to be named. The rabbins deliver there were five disciples of Jesus, Matthai, Nakai, Nezer, Boni, and Thodah. These they relate were led out and killed. Perhaps five are only mentioned by them because five of the disciples were chiefly employed among the Jews : namely, Matthew, who wrote his gospel in Judea, Peter, James, John, and Judas.’

I shall now transcribe at length the passage of the Babylonian Talmud, to which Lightfoot refers ; though it is so silly, that, when produced, some may think it might have been omitted.

‘ The<sup>e</sup> rabbins have taught that there were five disciples

diligenter inquirebant in omnes qui exibant, ne efferrent artes magicas, ad docendum eas alios homines alibi terrarum habitantes. Scheid. ib. p. 1. et Wagenseil. Confut. Told. Jeschu. p. 17.

<sup>d</sup> De V. R. Chr. l. 5. cap. iii.

<sup>e</sup> Sanhedr. cap. vi. fol. 43. fin. Quinque tantum discipuli dicuntur fuisse Jesu Nazareno, quorum nomina, Matthai, sc. Matthæus, Nakai, Nezer, Boni, et Toda, sc. Thaddeus, qui alio nomine Lebbæus fuit appellatus, Matt. x. 3. Verba integre ita habent. Rabbini docuerunt, quinque discipulos fuisse Jesu, Matthai, Nakai, Nezer, Boni, et Toda. Cum adduxissent Matthai, [ut capitis ipsum damnarent,] dixit ille ad judices : Num Matthai occidetur ? Atqui scriptum est, Quando [Matai] veniam, ut compaream coram facie Dei ? Ps. xlii. 2. Sed illi regesserunt : Omnino Matthai occidetur, quia scriptum est, Quando [Matai] morietur, ut pereat nomen ejus ? Ps. xli. 5. Cum adduxissent

of Jesus, Matthai, Nakai, Nezer, Boni, and Toda. When Matthai was brought forth [to be condemned to death] he said to the judges: Shall Matthai be slain? But it is written: "When shall I come" [Matai] "and appear before God?" Ps. xlii. 2. But they answered: Yes, Matthai shall be slain. For it is written: "When" [Matai] "shall he die, and his name perish?" Ps. xli. 5. When Nakai was brought out, he said: Shall Nakai be slain? But it is written: "Thou shalt not kill the innocent" [Nakai] "and the just:" Ex. xxiii. 7. But they said: Yes, Nakai shall be slain. For it is written: "In the secret places does he murder the innocent." [Naki.] Ps. x. 8. When they brought forth Nezer, he said to them: And shall Nezer be slain? But it is written: "A branch" [Nezer] "shall grow out of his roots," Is. xi. 1. But they answered: Yes, Nezer shall be slain. For it is written: "Thou art cast out of thy grave as an abominable branch," Is. xiv. 19. When they brought out Boni, he said: And shall Boni be slain? But it is written: Israel is "my son" [Beni] "even my first-born," Ex. iv. 22. But they said: Yes, Boni shall be slain. For it is written: "Behold, I will slay thy son," [bincka,] "thy first-born," Ex. iv. 23. When they brought out Toda, he said to them; And shall Toda be slain? It is written: "A psalm to praise" [Lethoda.] Ps. c. But they answered: Yes, Toda shall be slain. For it is written: "Whoso offereth praise" [Toda] "glorifieth me."'

Here it may be asked: Why do the Talmudists speak only of five disciples of Jesus? Lightfoot, as before seen, supposeth it to be, that these five men were chiefly employed among the Jews. Edzardus says: 'We<sup>f</sup> hence see how false

Nakai, dixit ille: Num Nakai occidetur? Atqui scriptum est, Ex. xxiii. 7, Insonthem [Naki] et justum non occides. Sed illi responderunt: Omnino Nakai occidetur, sicut scriptum est, Ps. x. 8, In latibulis occidit insonthem. [Naki.] Cum adduxissent Nezer, dixit ad illos: Num Nezer occidetur? Atqui scriptum est, Es. xi. 1, Nezer e radicibus ejus fructum feret. Sed illi responderunt: Omnino Nezer occidetur, quia scriptum est, Es. xiv. 9, Tu autem ejectus es e sepulcro tuo, ut sureulus [Nezer] abominabilis. Cum adduxerunt Boni, dixit ille: Num Boni occidetur? Atqui scriptum est, Ex. iv. 22, Filius meus [Beni] primogenitus est Israel. Sed illi regesserunt: Omnino Boni occidetur, sicut scriptum est, Ex. iv. 23, Ecce ego occidam filium tuum [Bincka] primogenitum. Cum adduxissent Todam, dixit ad illos: Num Toda occidetur? Atqui scriptum exstat, Ps. c. 1, Psalmus [Lethoda] eucharisticus. Sed illi responderunt: Omnino Toda occidetur, quemadmodum scriptum est, Ps. l. 23, Qui sacrificat laudem, [Toda,] is honorabit me. Ap. Edzard Avoda Sara. T. i. p. 298, 299. Conf. B. Scheidii Loca Talmudica de Jesu et Discipulis ejus et Wagenseil. Confut. T. I. p. 17.

<sup>f</sup> Quod si autem quinque tantum discipuli hi Jesu Nazareno fuerunt, unde ergo sextus, Jacobus Sechaniensis, cujus nomen inter quinque numeratos non

‘and fabulous every thing is which the Talmudists say of ‘Christ and his disciples.’ Which surely is not amiss. However, to me it seems that the Jewish rabbins affected silence and reserve about Jesus and his history, and said little about it, the better to keep their own people in ignorance and bondage. Wagenseil’s reflections upon this passage are somewhat different: I place them<sup>s</sup> below, though nothing material can be said upon what is so exceeding trifling.

4. It may be questioned whether James be one of the five disciples there named: I shall therefore allege a passage of the Talmud where he is mentioned.

R. Akiba and Rabbi Eliezer are talking together. ‘Eliezer<sup>h</sup> says, O Akiba, you have brought something to my ‘mind. As I was walking in the high street of Zipporis, I ‘met one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, whose name ‘is James, a man of the town of Shecaniah. He said to me; ‘In your law it is written, “Thou shalt not bring the hire ‘of a harlot,” Deut. xxiii. 18. I did not make him any ‘answer. But he added, and said to me: Jesus of Nazareth ‘taught me the meaning. “She gathered it of the hire of a ‘harlot; and they shall return to the hire of a harlot,” Mic. ‘i. 7. “From an impure place they came, and to an im- ‘pure place they shall return.” Which interpretation, ‘(says Eliezer,) did not displease me.’

5. We will now observe some passages concerning our Saviour’s last sufferings.

Says Lightfoot upon Matt. xxvii. 31. ‘These things<sup>i</sup>

apparet? Constat hinc, quam fabulosa sit Talmudistarum narratio de iis quæ contra Christum atque discipulos ejus deblaterant. Ut aliâ confutatione non sit opus, cum seipsos suis contradictionibus jugulent. Edz. ibid. p. 299.

<sup>h</sup> Apparet, ista huc tendere, quasi in viros illos, quorum nomina exprimuntur, ultimis pœnis fuerit animadversum; etsi magis est ut credamus, ab otioso aliquo, et scripturæ dicta in lusum et jocum sic detorquente, delirantis ingeniosi ostentandi causâ, ineptias has esse confictas. Wagens. ib. p. 18.

<sup>i</sup> In Tr. Avoda Sara. f. 16. 2. Tradiderunt Rabbini—Tum P. Eliazar: In memoriam mihi, O Akiba, revocâsti, aiebat, me aliquando spatiatum in foro superiori urbis Zipporis, obvium habuisse aliquem ex discipulis Jesu Nazareni, cui nomen erat Jacobus, civis Caphar, vel viri Saccaniensis, qui dicebat mihi: In Lege vestrâ scribitur: Non affères mercedem meretricis—Quo audito, nihil prorsus ei respondebam. Illo autem pergente mihi dicere: Sic docuit me Jesus Nazarenus. Si ex mercede meretriciâ, meretrix quid colligat, usque ad mercedem meretricis revertetur. Ex loco impuro si qua venerint, in locum impurum redibunt. Et profuit mihi verbum hoc operâ hujus—ap. Schcid. Loca Talmud. p. 5, 6. Et conf. Edzardi Avoda Sara. Vol. i. p. 130.

<sup>i</sup> I shall here put an exact Latin version of the same. Tr. Sanhedrim, fol. 43, Mishna. Inventâ reâ partis innocentiam, reus ille liber dimittitur. Sin minus, exit, ut lapidetur. Præco autem exit ante eum, his verbis proclamans: Vir iste N. N. Filius alicujus N. N. exit, ut lapidetur, quia transgressus est talem transgressionem. Cujus rei testes sunt hi, N. N. et N. N. Quicumque

‘ are delivered in Sanhedrim [cap. vi. Hal. 4.] of one that is  
 ‘ guilty of stoning: If there be no defence found for him,  
 ‘ they lead him out to be stoned, and a crier went out before  
 ‘ him, saying aloud thus: N. N. comes out to be stoned,  
 ‘ because he has done so and so. The witnesses against him  
 ‘ are N. N. Whosoever can bring any thing in his defence  
 ‘ let him come forth and produce it. On which thus the  
 ‘ Gemara of Babylon. The tradition is, that, on the evening  
 ‘ of the passover, Jesus was hanged, and that a crier went  
 ‘ before him for forty days, making this proclamation: This  
 ‘ man comes forth to be stoned, because he dealt in sorce-  
 ‘ ries, and persuaded, and seduced Israel. Whosoever  
 ‘ knows of any defence for him, let him come forth and  
 ‘ produce it. But no defence could be found: therefore  
 ‘ they hanged him upon the evening of the passover.  
 ‘ Ulla saith his case seemed not to admit of any defence,  
 ‘ since he was a seducer, and of such God has said, “Thou  
 ‘ shall not spare him nor conceal him:” Deut. xiii.’

There is another place relating to the same event, the death of our Saviour, to be taken from the Babylonian Talmud. ‘ The<sup>k</sup> Mishna, explaining Deut. xiii. and showing

noverit aliquid de ejus innocentia, veniat, et doceat de eo. Postea in Gemara ad verba Mishnae: praeco autem exit ante eum, &c. notatur. Atqui traditio est: Die Parasceves Sabbati suspenderunt Jesum, et praeco exibat ante eum 40 diebus, his verbis prolatis proclamans: Exit ut lapidetur, quia magicas artes exercuit, seduxit, et impulit Israelitas. Quicumque ergo noverit aliquid de ejus innocentia, veniat, et doceat de eo. Cum autem nihil de ejus innocentia comprobanda inveniri potuisset, suspenderunt eum die Parasceves Paschatis. Dixit Ula: Et putetur, quod filius versorum seu contrariorum innocentiae ipse seductor est. Dixit autem Deus, Deut. xiii. 8, Non parces, neque teges super eo. Deut. xiii. 8. et conf. 5. et 6. Scheid. Loca Talmud. p. 7, 8. Conf. Wag. Confut. T. I. p. 19.

<sup>k</sup> Sanhedrim. f. 67. 1. Mishna, de quo Deut. xiii. 6. Ex omnibus qui morti adjudicantur in lege, nulli insidiae collocantur, hoc excepto—Postea, in Gemara notatur: Ex omnibus qui morti adjudicantur in lege, nulli insidiae collocantur, hoc excepto [seductori, qui aliud ad idololatriam, et cultum alienum cupit seducere]. Quomodo faciunt id ei? Accendunt illi candelam in conclavi interiori, et testes collocant in cubiculo exteriori, ut hi ipsum videre, et vocem ejus audire possint. Sed ipse non videt illos. Tum ille, quem antea conatus erat seducere, dicit ei, Repete, quaeso, id quod antehac dixisti hic privatim. Tum, si id dicat, hic regerit ei: Quomodo relinquemus Deum nostrum in caelis, et servimus idolis? Ad hoc si convertatur, poenitentiam actam, bene est. Si vero dicat: hoc est officium nostrum, atque ita omnino deceat nos facere, testes exterius audientes, eum ad domum judicii abducunt, et lapidant. [Conf. Schabbath. f. 104. 2.] sic fecerunt filio Stadae [vel Stadtæ] in Lud, et suspenderunt eum in vespere Paschatis, seu pridie diei Paschatis. Filius Stadae filius Pandiræ est. Dixit R. Chasda: Maritus seu procus matris ejus fuit Stada, iniens Pandiram—Maritus Paphus filius Judæ ipse est, mater ejus Stada, mater ejus Maria, plicatrix capillorum mulierum erat: sicut dicimus in Pompeida. Declinavit hæc a marito suo. Glossa: Ideo quia scortata hæc erat, vocabatur ita. Schedii Loca Talmud. p. 1. et 2.

who is the seducer there spoken of, says, Of all that are adjudged to die, to none of them are snares to be laid, excepting a seducer: for, if he has attempted two, and they bear testimony against him, he is to be stoned. Upon this it is said in the Gemara: Against none are snares to be laid, except against a seducer of the people; [meaning one who seduces to idolatry;] and that is done after this manner. They light a candle in a closet or inner room, and place witnesses in another room, so that they may see him, and hear his voice, but he does not see them: there he, whom some time before he had endeavoured to seduce, (being with him,) says to him: Repeat to me now in private what you before said to me. If he then repeats it, the other says to him: How can we leave our God who is in the heavens, and serve idols? If he then owns his fault and repents, all is well. But if he says: This is our duty, and so we ought to do; the witnesses who are in the outer room carry him to the house of judgment, and stone him. So they did to the son of Stada in Lud, and hanged him on the evening of the Passover. Rabbi Chasda said: The son of Stada is the son of Pandira——His mother was Stada.——She was Mary the plaiter of women's hair; as we say in *Pompedita*, she departed from her husband. In the Gloss it is said: She was so called because she transgressed the laws of chastity.'

This is translated by Lightfoot upon Matt. xxvii. 56, p. 270, after this manner: 'They stoned the son of Satda in Lydda, and hanged him up on the evening of the passover. Now this son of Satda was son of Pandira. Indeed Rabbi Chasda said the husband [of his mother] was Satda, her husband was Pandira, her husband was Pappus, the son of Juda. But yet I say his mother was Satda, namely, Mary the plaiter of women's hair; as they say in *Pombedita*, she departed from her husband.'

In several other places of these Talmudical writers, Mary is called a 'plaiter of women's hair,' as may be seen in Lightfoot, p. 270.<sup>1</sup> And from some things alleged just now it seems that thereby they denote a transgressor of the laws of purity. And we are led to think that by this description they intended to represent not her outward condition, but her moral character.

Upon the two foregoing passages, relating to the event of our Saviour's death, we may now make some remarks.

First, it is here acknowledged that Jesus suffered death as a malefactor; and that he was put to death at the time

<sup>1</sup> Vid. et Scheid. *Loca Talaud.* p. 3.

of a Jewish passover, or on the evening of it, as the expression is.

Secondly, but here are many great and notorious falsehoods. It is here said that Jesus was put to death at Lud : whereas it is certain that he suffered at Jerusalem. It is insinuated that he endeavoured to persuade men to forsake the true God, and worship false gods, and idols : another abominable falsehood. It is also insinuated that he carried on this evil design of seducing men from the worship of the true God in a clandestine manner ; whereas nothing is more certain than that Jesus lived, and acted, and taught, publicly before all the world. Farther, it is intimated that, for many days before his death, proclamation was made, that any who could say any thing in his defence might appear and plead for him, but no defence was made. It is also said that he was put to death by stoning, and then hanged up : (which indeed was the usual method among the Jews, first to put criminals to death, and then hang them up ;) but Jesus was crucified ; and though the Jews were his prosecutors, he was condemned and put to death by a Roman magistrate.

It is truly surprising to see such falsities contrary to well known facts. For the sufferings of Jesus, and the circumstances of them, are recorded in the gospels, well known histories, written in a language which was then almost universal in Europe, Asia, and Africa. That Jesus was crucified at Jerusalem, when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, under the emperor Tiberius, was in all christian creeds, and attested by Roman authors of good credit, and indeed was well known to all Greeks and Romans in general. How then was it possible for the Jewish rabbins, whose testimonies are collected in their Talmuds, to speak in the manner which we have now seen ? Perhaps it is not easy to be accounted for ; but I apprehend the case to be this : The rabbins taught and wrote in a language little known to any in the fourth and fifth centuries but themselves, and the men of their own nation. Their people were ignorant, and they endeavoured to keep them so. Their people had a great respect for them, and so they presumed to say whatever they pleased.

6. There seems to be in these writings an acknowledgment of the power of miracles in Jesus and his disciples. ‘ In <sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> Similis locus habetur infra in Gemarâ, fol. 27. col. 2. med. Sed insto ego. In Bareitha docemur. Non conversabitur quisquam cum hæreticis, neque licet medicinam ab illis admittere, etsi morbus videatur ita desperatus, ut ægrotus non sit ultra unius horæ spatium superfuturus. Exstat quoque hujus rei exemplum in filio Damæ, nepote R. Isnaëlis ex sorore, quem cum momordisset

the Gemara, upon Avoda Sara, in Bereitha, it is said: No man may converse with heretics, nor receive medicines from them, though the disease be mortal and desperate. Of this there is an example in the son of Dama, nephew to R. Ishmael by his sister: When he had been bit by a serpent, James of Shechania [a disciple of Jesus] came to heal him; but R. Ishmael did not allow it to be done. The son of Dama said to R. Ishmael: O Rabbi Ishmael, my unele, let me be healed by him: I will allege a text out of the law which allows of it. But before he had finished all he would say, he expired. Then Ishmael pronounced this speech over him: Thou art happy, O son of Dama: for thy body has remained pure, and thy soul also, has gone pure out of it: and thou hast not transgressed the words of thy brethren.'

This<sup>n</sup> is supposed to be an acknowledgment of the power of working miracles in the name of Jesus, at the same time that it shows the virulent temper of the Jewish doctors against him and his disciples.

There is another like instance alleged from the Jerusalem Talmud: 'A<sup>o</sup> child of a son of Rabbi Joses, son of Levi, swallowed somewhat poisonous. There came a man who pronounced some words to him in the name of Jesus, son of Paudira, and he was healed. When he was going away, R. Joses said to him: What word did you use? he answered, Such a word. R. Joses said to him: Better had it been for him to die, than to hear such a word. And so it happened, that is, he instantly died.'

serpens, venit Jacobus Secaniensis ad sanandum ipsum. Sed non permisit ei R. Ismaël. Dicebat quidem filius Damæ ad R. Ismaëlem: O Rabbi Ismaël frater [i. e. cognate, avuncule] mi! Sine ipsum, ut saner ab ipso. Afferam enim textum e Lege, qui id concedat. Sed nondum absolverat omnia, quæ constituerat dicere, cum jam efflaret animam, atque moreretur. Tum R. Ismaël sequentem super ipsum conciumculam habuit. Beatus es, o fili Damæ! quod corpus tuum manserit mundum, etiamque anima tuo corpore exierit munda, neque fueris transgressus verba sociorum tuorum, &c. Edzard. Avoda Sara. Vol. i. p. 312. Conf. Martini Pug. Fidei, P. 2. cap. 8. p. 289.

<sup>n</sup> Memorabile hujus rei exemplum occurrit, Cod. Abhoda zara f. 27. 2. de R. Ismaële vetante aliquem sanari in nomine Jesu—Exemplo est B. Dama—Insignis sane historia, et præclarum veritatis evangelicæ testimonium, ab ipsis Judæis dictum. J. Rhenford. Diss. de Redemptione Marcosiorum et Heraclonit. sect. I. p. 215.

<sup>o</sup> Item in lib. Sabbat Jerosolymitano, distinctione Shemona Scheratzin—Filius filii R. Jose filii Levi glutiverat toxicum scilicet, vel aliud morbiferum. Venit itaque vir quidam, et conjuravit ei in nomine Jesu Pandirini, et sanatus est, sive quævit. Cumque exivisset, ait ei, Quomodo conjurasti eum? Ait ei, Tali verbo. Ait ei: Remissus fuisset ei, si mortuus fuisset, ut non audivisset verbum tale. Et factum est sic ei: id est, statim mortuus est. Pug. Fid. ib. p. 290.



Another<sup>p</sup> proof this of the power of miracles inherent in the disciples of Jesus, and at the same time a mark of the malignity of the Jewish rabbins.

That passage I have transcribed as it is in the *Pugio Fidei*: I shall now<sup>q</sup> put it down below as it stands in *Edzardi Avoda zara*.

7. It will certainly be worth the while to take a testimony from these writers to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the temple there. I shall therefore transcribe and translate almost word for word a long passage out of the *Babylonian Talmud*, in the title *Gittin*, chapter *Hannisah*.

‘This<sup>r</sup> is the tradition. Rabbi Eliezer said: Go, and see

<sup>p</sup> Si quis diligenter advertat has duas traditiones, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi fuisse facta miracula judaicarum scripturarum testimonio comprobabit. Raym. Martin. *ib.*

<sup>q</sup> Similis textus est in Talmude Hierosolymitano: *Avoda S. Fol. 40. 4. et Schabb. fol. 14. 4. med.*—Nepos R. Josuæ filii Levi laborabat ab absorpto: [id est, diglutiverat aliquid, quod ipsi in gutture hærebat, et suffocationem minabatur.] Venitque quidam, qui illi clam insurravit, [id est, jussit ipsum convalescere,] in nomine Jesu filii Pandiræ. Unde confestim respiravit. Quando autem egressus est inde, dixit ad eum R. Josua filius Levi: Quid insurrasti ei? Respondit ille: Vocem hanc [i. e. nomen Jesu]: Tum R. Josua: Præstitisset ipsum fuisse mortuum, et non audivisse nomen illud. Atque hoc ipsum etiam ei [haud longe post] contigit. *Edzard. Avoda zara. Vol. 2. p. 311, 312.*

<sup>r</sup> Traditio est. Dixit R. Elieser: Exi, et vide quanta est virtus pudoris, quia ecce Deus sanctus et benedictus juvit Barkamta, et destruxit domum suam, et exussit templum suum, et desolavit Jerusalem—Ivit Roman, et dixit Neroni Cæsari: Judæi rebellârunt contra te. Dixit ei: Quis dicit? Dixit ei, Mitte illis sacrificium. Videbis, si illi offerent. Ivit filius Kamtza, et misit per manus ejus vitulam trimam. Ipse autem rediens impressit in eâ maculam in orâ labii ejus. Alii dicunt, quod in pupillâ oculi ejus maculam impressit: secundum aliquorum opinionem est macula, et secundum opinionem aliorum non est macula. Rabбини censebant itaque illam sacrificandam propter pacem regni. Dixit eis R. Zacharias filius Onkelos: dicetur, Maculata offeruntur super altare. Voluerunt occidere eum, ne iret, et diceret. Dixit eis R. Zacharias, dicens: Mittens maculam in Sanctuarium occidetur. Dixit R. Jochanan: Superstitio R. Zachariæ destruxit domum nostram, et combussit templum nostrum, et urbem nostram evertit, et fecit ut nos e terrâ nostrâ captivi duceremur. Misit itaque Bar-Kamtza super his ad Neronem Cæsarem. Quando venit, jecit sagittam ad orientem. Cecidit ad Jerusalem ad occidentem—Dixit puero. Lege mihi versum tuum. Dixit ei Ezech. xxv. 14.—Dixit Nero: Deus sanctus, benedictus, vult per me destruere domum suam. Misitque contra illos Vespasianum, qui venit, et obsedit Jerusalem tres annos, et dimidium. Interim venit nuntius ad eum, dicens illi: Surge, quia mortuus est Nero Cæsar, et consenserunt tibi optimates Romanorum, ut te constituent principem—Ivit, et misit Titum impium filium suum—Hic est Titus impius, qui blasphemavit, et maledixit contra Justum, i. e. Deum. Quid fecit? Cepit meretricem in manu suâ, ei ingressus in Sancta Sanctorum stravit librum legis, et transgressus est super illum transgressionem. Et accepit gladium, et dirupit vela, et factum est miraculum. Et fuit sanguis erumpens et exiens. Et putavit occidisse ipsam substantiam Dei sancti benedicti, i. e. ipsum Deum.—Quid fecit? Accepit vela, et fecit illa sicut saccum, et adduxit omnia vasa quæ erant in Sanctuario, et

how the blessed and holy God helped Bar-kamtza, and he destroyed his house, and burnt up his temple, and made Jerusalem desolate.' [Here is inserted an account of a trifling discourse and difference between some rabbins.] 'Whereupon he [Bar-kamtza] went to Rome, and said to the emperor Nero, The Jews have rebelled against thee. Who says this? said the emperor. Kamtza answered: Send to them a sacrifice; see if they will offer it. Bar-kamtza returned. Nero sent by him an heifer, three years old. As he was going he made a blemish in the mouth of it; others say in the pupil of its eye: according to the opinion of others it was no blemish. The rabbins therefore thought it ought to be offered for preserving the peace of the nation. But Rabbi Zacharias, son of Onkelos, said: Shall blemished sacrifices be offered upon the altar? He that brings blemished sacrifices into the sanctuary ought to be put to death. R. Jochanan said: The superstition of R. Zacharias has destroyed our house, and burnt up our temple, and overthrown our city, and caused us to be led captive out of our land. Bar-kamtza therefore sent an account of these things to Nero—Nero said; The great and blessed God has determined by me to destroy his house. And he sent against them Vespasian, who came and besieged Jerusalem three years and a half. In the mean time there came a messenger to him, who said: Arise, for the emperor Nero is dead, and the nobles of the Romans have agreed to make thee emperor. He went and sent the impious Titus his son—This is the impious Titus, who blasphemed the Most High, even God himself. What did he do? He took a harlot into the holy of holies, and there lay with her: and he took a sword and cut the veils; at the same time there was a miracle, for blood burst out: he thought he had killed God himself—Well, what did he? He took the veils and made a sack of them, and put into it all the vessels of the sanctuary: and then put them in a ship, that he might go and triumph in his city—There stood against him a dragon, that he might

posuit illa in illo. Et collocavit illa in navi, ut iret, et gloriaretur in urbe suâ —Stetit contra draco, vel tempestas, in mari, ut demergeret illum in mari. Dixit: Puto ego, quod Deus horum nullam habet potentiam nisi in mari: Venit Pharaon et submersit eum in mari. Stat etiam contra me, ut me submergat. Si fortis est, ascendat in siccam, et faciat bellum mecum. Exivit filia vocis, et dixit ei, Impie fili impij, fili filij impij Esau: Creatura vilis est mihi in mundo meo, et eulex est nomen ejus. Ascende in siccam, et bellum contra illam geres. Statim innuit Deus mari, et quiescit. Ascendit in siccam, et venit eulex, et ingressus est in nasum ejus, et perforavit illi cerebrum. septem annis, et occidit illum. Ex libro Gittin, capite Hannisakin, ap. R. Martin. Pug. Fid. P. 3. cap. xxi. p. 703, 704.

drown him in the sea. He said, I think the God of these men has no power but in the sea. Pharaoh arose, and he drowned him in the sea. He has a mind to destroy me in the like manner: if he has power, let him come upon the dry land and make war with me. There went forth a voice and said to him: O impious son of the wicked man, O son of the impious son of Esau, there is a contemptible creature in my world, called a guat: go upon the dry land, and you shall make war against it. God presently rebuked the sea, and it was calm. He went out upon the dry land, and the guat came, and entered into his nose, and gnawed his brain seven years, and killed him.'

J. De Voisin, in his notes upon this passage, particularly the last words of it, quotes some Jewish authors who say, 'The<sup>s</sup> story of the fly is not to be understood literally, but mystically, and allegorically, intending to insinuate in men's minds a persuasion of the power of God, and that he is able to abase those who rise up against him, and to punish the proudest of men by very contemptible creatures.' Nor is it any wonder that some should be ashamed of this silly story of the fly getting up a man's nose, and dwelling there seven years. But men of true wisdom can find out more cleanly allegories than this, when they are disposed to make use of that kind of instruction.

Nor has Voisin alleged any Jewish authors, who condemn the horrible story of Titus defiling the sanctuary of the temple with lewdness: though Martini has alleged another Jewish writing in great repute, where<sup>t</sup> the same story is told with all the same horrible, or yet more horrible, circumstances of filthiness, if such there can be: nor is the concluding part of that narrative of the Talmud there omitted. But I presume the

<sup>s</sup> Alii asserunt illud de culice, sive muscâ ejusmodi, non juxta literalem sensum intelligendum esse, sed sensum habere mysticum—Itaque poteris de historiâ Titi libere pronuntiare, quod narratio ejus nihil aliud sit, quam inventio, sive fabula, atque modus doctrinæ usitatus apud eruditos ad stabiliendum in corde plebis, quod magnus est Dominus noster, et potentissimus, ad retribuendum illis qui contra ipsum insurgunt; sed in primis ad puniendum superbos etiam per minimam creaturam. Ap. Pugion. Fid. p. 714.

<sup>t</sup> Hucusque Talmud. Legitur quoque in Midrash Kohelet super illud Eccles. cap. v. 8.—Dixit Deus sanctus benedictus prophetis: Quid vos putatis, quod si vos non eatis in missionem meam, non sit mihi alius nuntius? In omni ego do missionem vel legationem meam, etiam per serpentem, vel scorpionem, vel culicem, vel ranam. Titus impius ingressus est in Sancta Sanctorum, quando destruxit domum Sanctuarii, et gladius ejus districtus in manu suâ, et dirupit duo vela, et accepit duas meretrices in manu illarum, et coivit eum illis, cum unâ super altare, cum alterâ super librum legis, et exivit et gladius ejus plenus sanguine. Et incepit blasphemare, et exsecrari. Quid fecit? Collegit omnia vasa Sanctuarii, et posuit illa in sacco, et descendit ad navem. Et reliqua, sicut modo ex Talmude citata sunt. Ibid. p. 704, 705.

Divine Being never arms his feeble creatures to destroy or annoy men for no fault at all ; for none, but such as are only imputed to them by those who give a loose to their tongues, to lie and calumniate as they please : for Titus, when he went into the temple at Jerusalem all in flames, neither committed lewdness there, nor did he blaspheme the Deity.

Behold then the temper, the incorrigible temper, of the Jewish people, and their rabbins, the Talmudical writers. Their temple had been burnt up, their city destroyed, their land laid waste, and they carried into captivity : but, instead of repenting, they revile him who, under God, had been the instrument of their chastisement ; a prince, who, as good authority says, was as remarkable for the humanity, the compassion, and equity, in his manner of subduing them, as for his military skill and courage. Who then are the men who exalt themselves against God ?

But I may no longer indulge myself in such reflections as these. Let us attend for our own benefit. Here is a testimony to the destruction of Jerusalem from Talmudical writers : they agree very much with Josephus in their account of the origin of the war. He says that ‘ Eleazar, ‘ then captain at the temple, persuaded those who officiated ‘ in sacred things, not to accept the gift or sacrifice of a stranger : which was the occasion of the war.’ The Talmudists say the same thing in different words, after their manner. According to this account also, the war broke out near the end of the reign of Nero, who sent Vespasian general into Judea. Whilst Vespasian was there, carrying on the war, Nero died, and he was chosen to succeed him. When he was chosen emperor at Rome, he sent Titus to carry on the war in Judea : the issue of which was that the temple was burnt up, their city destroyed, and their whole government overthrown, and they carried into captivity. Moreover, as they here own, Titus was in possession of the veils and sacred vessels of the temple, which he took with him to adorn his triumph at Rome. All this (though they relate not particularly the distresses of the siege of Jerusalem) is said, not very differently from Josephus, and more agreeably to him in some respects, than by Josippon, who afterwards wrote at length the history of the war, as we shall see by and by.

<sup>u</sup> De B. J. l. 2. cap. 17. sect. 2. p. 192.

## CHAP. VI.

JOSEPH BEN GORION, OR JOSIPPON.

I. *His age, work, and character.* II. *Extracts from his work; showing his history of the Jewish war with the Romans, and the destruction of Jerusalem.* III. *Concluding remarks.*

I. WE are now coming to an author of a very extraordinary, or even a singular, character, writer of<sup>a</sup> *The Jewish History* in six books, who styles himself Josippon, or Joseph Ben Gorion.

He had a very high opinion of himself, and has now been for some while in great reputation with the learned men of the Jewish nation.

At the beginning of the thirty-sixth chapter, which is the first chapter of the fifth book, he writes: ‘So<sup>b</sup> says Joseph Ben Gorion the priest, who has written the things which have happened to Israel, and his calamities, to be a memorial and instruction to his posterity——From this day, and henceforward, this book is to be a testimony to other writers who shall come after me, and attempt to write of the same things, and shall allege proofs of what they write. For they will say: “So and so has recorded Joseph the priest, who is the prince of all writers, who have published books among the people of Israel, excepting only the writers of the four and twenty sacred books.”’

And indeed so it has happened. For Rabbi Tham, who published this work in the Hebrew original at Constantino-ple in the year 1510, and made another edition of it at Ve-

<sup>a</sup> Josippon, sive Josephi Ben Gorionis Historiæ Judaicæ libri sex. Ex Hebræo vertit, Præfatione et Notis illustravit Joannes Gagnier. A. M. Oxon. 1706, 4to.

<sup>b</sup> Sic ait Joseph Ben Gorion Sacerdos, qui rerum historiam texuit, quæ contigerunt Israël, et calamitatem ejus, ut sit memoria earum in documentum, et eruditionem posteris ejus.

Hic autem liber ab hac die, et demceps futurus est in testimonium cæteris scriptoribus, qui post me venturi sunt, et aggredientur scribere, et testimonia allegare. Dicent enim: ‘Sic et sic memoriæ prodidit Joseph Sacerdos, qui est princeps scriptorum omnium, qui libros ediderunt, quotquot reperti sunt in Israël, exceptis quidem scriptoribus quatuor et viginti librorum sanctorum.’ lib. 5. c. 36. p. 170.

nice in 1544, says of it in his preface : ‘ Although <sup>c</sup> this book resembles other books in some respects, it is very different from them in others. The great difference between books consists in their truth or their falsehood. The words of this book are all justice and truth, nor is there any thing perverse in it. The evidence of it is this, that it approacheth nearer to prophecy than any other book written since the sacred scriptures : for it was written before the Mishna and the Talmud. Upon that man was the hand of the Lord when he wrote this book. And it may be said that his words are well-nigh equal to the words of a man of God.’

This work is not so ancient as the author and his admirers pretend, as will be shown presently. But from the time that he has begun to be taken notice of, as Mr. Gagnier observes in the preface to his edition of this work, ‘ All <sup>d</sup> Jewish writers, whether commentators, or historians, or philologers, continually allege it, and quote authorities and testimonies from it, as an authentic and fundamental book.—As for the Greek Josephus, they have little regard for him, or rather none at all ; but declaim against him as a lying historian, full of falsehoods and flatteries. But their Josippon they extol and magnify as true and almost divine.’

But christian critics, of the best credit, have argued that the work is the production of a late age. They show this from the work itself ; in which, as <sup>e</sup> Joseph Scaliger has

<sup>c</sup> *Quamvis autem hic liber cum cæteris libris in genere conveniat, tamen ratione argumenti plurimum ab eis differt. Differentia autem illa præcipue consistit in veritate aut in falsitate. Porro hujus libri verba omnia sunt justitia et veritas ; neque perversitas ulla invenitur in eo. Cujus quidem rei signum est, quod propius accedat ad prophetiam, quam cæteri omnes libri, qui post scripturas sacras editi sunt. Siquidem ante Misnam et Talmud scriptus fuit. Adde quod super virum illum fuit manus Jehovæ, dum hunc librum componeret : et parum abest, quin ejus verba sint verba viri Dei. Præf. R. Tham. De Scopo Libri.*

<sup>d</sup> *Deinde omnes, qui secuti sunt, Judæi scriptores, sive commentatores, sive historici, sive philologi, ubique cum allegant, et tanquam ex libro fundamentalis atque authentici testimonia et auctoritates depromunt——Nam quod ad Josephum Græcum adtinet, illum non in magno solent habere pretio, imo ei nullam habent fidem, et, tanquam in historicum mendacem et adulatorum, adversus illum acriter invehuntur. Suum vero Josippon quasi hominem veracem et pene divinum summis laudibus ad sidera evehunt, extollunt, et prædicant, &c. Gagnier, in Præf. p. xxix.*

<sup>e</sup> *De Josepho Gorionide satis est, si ostendero ejus fuit, quando vixit, cujusmodi scriptor est. Gallum Judæum fuisse ex agro Turonensi non difficile est colligere, ut qui plus de illis quam de aliis Galliæ tractibus agat. Recentem admodum fuisse arguunt verba locorum recentia, quibus utitur, Tours, Amboise, Chinon. Quæ loca post DC annos a natali Christi adhuc Turones, Ambasia, Kainon vocabantur. Quare cum Munsterus videret eum Francorum et Gothorum mentionem facere, et Francos interfuisse exsequiis Herodis, quos *Ραδαται* Josephus vocârit, ex eo solo potuit odorari hunc scriptorum recentis-*

observed, people and countries are called by modern names, not in use till more than six hundred years after our Saviour's nativity. And he supposeth him to be a Jew that lived in France. He therefore considers him as an impostor.

Fabricius<sup>f</sup> has argued in the like manner. He supposeth him to have been a Jew who lived in Bretagne in France, in the ninth or tenth century. The many modern names of people and countries made use of by him plainly declare his late age. His Hebrew history is translated, or more properly extracted, from the Greek of Josephus, or rather from a Latin translation of him: taking from him what he likes, omitting some things, and adding others.

To the like purpose Gagnier, in his preface, already cited more than once. Who also says that 'Rabbi<sup>g</sup> Saadiah Gaon, ' who wrote his commentary upon the book of Daniel in the ' year of Christ 936, is the first author who has mentioned ' Josippon Ben Gorion. He does not expressly name his ' work, though probably he refers to it.' Gagnier adds: 'The<sup>h</sup> first writer, who has expressly mentioned this work ' with the name of Josippon Ben Gorion, and quoted au- ' thorities from it, is Rabbi Solomon Jarchi, who flourished ' about the year of Christ 1140.'

I refer likewise to<sup>i</sup> Ittigius, and Basnage, who in<sup>k</sup> his History of the Jews, has a long article concerning this writer and his work. He says Josippon lived in the tenth or eleventh century: which he argues after this manner: 'So- ' lomon Jarchi,<sup>l</sup> who wrote in the year 1140, is the first who ' has quoted this Hebrew Joseph. Abraham Ezra, and

simum esse, ac proinde planum, qui nomen Josephi Historici sibi vindicavit. Jo. Scalig. in Elencho Triher. Vid. Gagnier, Præf. p. xlviii.

<sup>f</sup> Cæterum eruditis hodie plerisque dubium non est, Josephum huncce Hebraicum ex Græco, vel potius ex Latinâ Josephi versione, esse expressum, vel excerptum potius: nec Josephum ipsum auctorem, sed longe recentiore aliquem, qui in Britannia Galliaë Armorica non ante nonum vel decimum seculum vixit, et pro lubitu digessit, addidit, interpolavit, omisit quæcunque ipsi videbantur addenda esse vel omittenda——Ita recentiora longe Josepho tempora arguit, quod memorat Francos, et Burgundiæ populum, et Daniscos, ac Danemanam, et Anglicam gentem, et quæ in Irlanda sive Hiberniâ. Fab. Bib. Gr. lib. 4. c. 6. T. 3. p. 249. et apud Havercamp. Joseph. T. 2. p. 68.

<sup>g</sup> R. Saadiah Gaon, qui scribebat circa annum 936, min. suppl. Christ. 936, in suo commentario in Danielem primus omnium Josephi Ben Gorionis meminit—Gagn. Pr. p. xxvii.

<sup>h</sup> R. Salomo Jarchi, qui florebat circa annum Christi 1140, primus est, qui diserte citat hunc librum sub nomine Josippon, vel Josephi Ben Gorionis, et auctoritates ex eo adducit, quarum loca habes infra in Testimoniis. Gagn. ib. p. xxviii.

<sup>i</sup> Ittigii Prolegom. ap. Joseph. Havercamp. Tom. 2. p. 87.

<sup>k</sup> Basnag. Hist. des Juifs, liv. 7. ch. vi. p. 1539. 1570.

<sup>l</sup> Ib. sect. xxv. p. 1564.

‘ Abraham Ben Dion, who by their quotations gave the work credit, lived in the same age. It would be very strange that a work should be unknown for three or four hundred years to the nation for whose sake it was composed. But if it was written near the end of the tenth, or the beginning of the eleventh, century, it is not at all strange that it did not begin to be taken notice of till some while after.’

I say nothing more in the way of introduction. I shall now make such extracts out of this work, as may be sufficient to show the writer’s character, and his testimony to the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus. I have placed him in the tenth century, not very far from the beginning of it, in the year of Christ 930.

II. The work is divided into six books and ninety-seven chapters. The sixth and last of which books consists of five and fifty chapters.

The forty-third chapter, which is the first of the sixth book, begins in this manner. ‘ Thus <sup>m</sup> says Joseph Ben Gorion the priest, the same who is also called Josippon—This is the book which I have entitled, The Wars of Jehovah, because it contains the history of the calamities of the house of our sanctuary, and of our land and our glory.’

My readers cannot but remember that our Greek<sup>n</sup> Josephus, when he gives an account of the determination of the Jewish people to go to war with the Romans, informs us that they appointed Joseph Gorion and Ananus the high priest, to preside at Jerusalem. Others were sent as generals into several parts of the country; and himself, Joseph son of Matthias, was appointed governor of the two Galilees, together with the præfecture of Gamala annexed to them.

Our author’s account of the same determination is to this purpose: ‘ The <sup>o</sup> Jews, out of their generals which were at

<sup>m</sup> Sic dicit Joseph Ben Gorion sacerdos. Ipse est Josippon, nomine quidem diminutivo Josippon——Hic est liber ille, quem appellavi titulo, Bella Jehovahæ, eo quod continet historiam calamitatum desolationis domûs Sanctuarii nostri, et terræ nostræ, et gloriæ nostræ. Lib. 6. c. 43. p. 189.

<sup>n</sup> D. B. J. l. 2. cap. 20.

<sup>o</sup> Quæ omnia cum audissent Judæi, elegerunt e duobus, qui erant in Judæa et Jerusalem, tres principes fortissimos bello, me scilicet, Joseph sacerdotem fortissimum bello cum auxilio Jehovahæ, et Anani sacerdotem et Eleazar sacerdotem filium ejus; et præfecerunt illos super terram, et partiti sunt terram Judææ inter illos per sortem, dederuntque illis præsidio manum Judæorum ad bellum gerendum. Et obtigit tertia pars terræ per primam sortem, scilicet, omnis terra Galileæ a terrâ Nephtali, et deinceps, Josepho filio Gorionis sacerdoti, in honorem et gloriam. Et appellaverunt illum Josippon in titulum dignitatis et laudis; quia tunc unctus fuit unctione militari. Deinde sors



Jerusalem, chose three princes valiant for war; me, Joseph the priest, valiant for war with the help of Jehovah, and Ananus the priest, and Eleazar his son, priests also, and by lot they divided to them the several parts of the country in which they should carry on the war. The third part, which was the first lot, containing the land of Galilee and Naphthali, came out to Joseph Ben Gorion the priest; and they called him Josippon by way of praise and honour: forasmuch as he was then anointed with the military ointment for the war. The second lot came out to Ananus the high priest, to govern at Jerusalem and the adjoining country. The third lot came out to Eleazar, son of Ananus, and what follows.' This should be compared with what is written by<sup>p</sup> Josephus.

Thus he adopts the appellation of Joseph son of Gorion,<sup>q</sup> but personates Joseph son of Matthias; and like him he is appointed governor of Galilee: and all along he will be Josephus in the main, and another person when he pleaseth. He will also transcribe the Greek Josephus, and copy a large part of his History of the Jewish War without taking any notice of him. If he differs from him, and adds to him, it is not taken out of any other writers better informed, but from his own invention only.

Being come into Galilee, he there orders things very agreeably to what we have formerly seen in our Greek Josephus. At length he<sup>r</sup> flies from Vespasian and Titus and the Roman army, and shuts himself up in Jotapata. Vespasian<sup>s</sup> with his army comes before Jotapata. The<sup>l</sup> city is taken after a siege of eight-and-forty days. Joseph<sup>u</sup> him-

secunda exiit pro Anano sacerdote magno, Jerusalem scilicet, et omnia circum vicina loca.—Sors denique tertia egressa est Eleazaro filio Anani, &c. Josipp. c. 67. p. 293. <sup>p</sup> De B. Jud. lib. 2. c. 20. sect. 1—3.

<sup>q</sup> Gagnier, in his notes upon this place, p. 293, assigns some reasons why this writer chose to be thought the son of Gorion, rather than the son of Matthias. Cur autem hic noster Gorionis filius quam Matthiæ esse voluerit, ratio videtur fuisse, quod cum nomen Gorionis ejusdam insignis viri mentio aliquando in Talmude occurrat, atque etiam Nicodemi filii Gorionis, in eam familiam ipsi se adoptare visum est, ut proderet in lucem gratior contribulibus suis, eisque facilius imponeret. Vid. reliqua ibid. Et conf. not. <sup>p</sup>, ap. Jos. Havercamp. p. 207.

<sup>r</sup> At vero ut audivit Josephus, quod venit Vespasianus, et cum eo filius ejus Titus, omnisque exercitus ejus, ut prælium committeret, fugit Josephus a facie eorum in Jotapatam, urbem magnam, quæ est in Galilæâ; et inclusit se Josephus et omnis exercitus intra illam. c. 68. p. 299.

<sup>s</sup> Cap. 69. p. 300. et cap. 70. p. 301, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Cap. 71. p. 307.

<sup>u</sup> Tunc surrexit Josephus ipse, et quadraginta viri ex militibus, qui residui erant cum illo, et egressi sunt ex urbe, fugeruntque in sylvam, ubi inventâ cavernâ illuc intraverunt, delitueruntque omnes in illâ cavernâ, &c. Cap. 71. p. 307.

self, and with him forty more, go out of the city and hide themselves in a cave. Vespasian sends Nicanor to Joseph with offers of peace and safety if he would surrender. But<sup>v</sup> the forty men who were with him chose rather to die by their own hands. After long arguing, Joseph proposeth that they should cast lots till they were all killed. Which being done, there were none left alive but Joseph and one more, who at length consented to surrender. Joseph<sup>w</sup> then calls to Nicanor, and they yield up themselves to him. Vespasian, when Joseph was brought before him, treated him kindly, and carried him about with him from place to place, together with<sup>x</sup> Agrippa.

So far there is a great agreement between our Josephus and Joseph Ben Gorion. But now they differ. For Josippon entirely omits the compliments which our Josephus paid to Vespasian.

Upon<sup>y</sup> the death of Nero, and after the short reigns of Galba and Vitellius, Vespasian is declared emperor by the soldiers in Judea; and, after some hesitation, he is persuaded to accept of the diadem from them.

Some while<sup>z</sup> after that, Vespasian takes part of the army and goes to Rome; but leaves the other part with Titus to carry on the siege of Jerusalem. However he orders Titus to stay at Alexandria till he shall send to him from Rome.

‘When<sup>a</sup> Vespasian left Judea to go to Rome, he took with him Agrippa, and his son Monbaz, lest they should rebel against him. With himself and them he also took me Joseph the priest, bound with iron chains.’ And when Vespasian was come to Rome, he ordered that<sup>b</sup> Joseph should be sent to prison, and kept bound there.

Vespasian upon his arrival at Rome was received joyfully by the senators and all the people in general. And<sup>c</sup> in a

<sup>v</sup> Cap. 72. p. 315—319.

<sup>w</sup> Cap. 73. p. 319, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Cum ergo audivisset Vespasianus Titum filium suum, recta visa sunt verba illius in oculis ejus, et clementiâ usus est erga Josephum sacerdotem, et prohibuit, quo minus moreretur gladio, et constituit eum principem, et magnum inter principes suos, et secum ducebat de urbe in urbem cum Agrippâ rege. c. 73. p. 321.

<sup>y</sup> Cap. 75. p. 333, 334.

<sup>z</sup> Cap. 77. p. 340.

<sup>a</sup> Abiit itaque Vespasianus Romam. Cumque pergeret, ut iterum acciperet illic coronam regni, duxit secum Agrippam regem, et Monbaz filium ejus. Dixerat enim, ne forte rebelleat contra me. Duxit præterea cum eis, et secum, meipsum Josephum sacerdotem, vinctum catenis ferreis. Cap. 77. p. 340.

<sup>b</sup> Tunc jussit, et vinxerunt me in domo carceris. Agrippam vero et filium ejus ipsorum arbitrio reliquit. Ib. p. 341.

<sup>c</sup> Postridie illius diei congregati sunt omnes senatores Romani, ut Vespasianum Cæsarem crearent, secundum jus Cæsareæ dignitatis pro consuetudine

short time he is inaugurated with great solemnity. Agrippa and his son are allowed to be with the senators; and Joseph himself, though a prisoner, is allowed by the keeper of the prison to have a place where he may see all.

The<sup>d</sup> coronation is then described by him in a pompous manner; seven electors of the empire attending, agreeably to the coronations of the emperors in late ages, a good while after the time of Charles the Great, as<sup>e</sup> Gagnier observes in a note which I shall place below. Basnage thinks that<sup>f</sup> this Hebrew Joseph intends the coronation of Otho the first, or his son Otho the second. And he considers this article as a proof that Josippon lived in the tenth, or rather in the eleventh century.

‘Soon after his coronation,’ as this author says, ‘Vespasian<sup>g</sup> was offended with Agrippa upon account of some calumnies cast upon him, which he had received from wicked men of the Jewish nation: whereupon he slew Agrippa, and his son Mombaz, with the sword. Which was done three years and a half before the desolation of the house.’

So writes this author. Supposing Agrippa to have been put to death at this time, I do not conceive how it could be done three years and a half before the destruction of the temple. Besides, Agrippa survived the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem many years: as is attested not only by Josephus, but also by ancient medals<sup>h</sup> still extant.

Romanâ. Porro Agrippa et filius ejus erant cum illis. At ego supplex rogavi principem domûs carceris—Et inveni gratiam in oculis ejus, et introduxit me in consessum regni, ubi fieri debebat inauguratio Cæsaris; attamen vincetum catenis ferreis et collocavit juxta se in loco, unde vidi omnia quæ facta sunt. Ib. p. 341.

<sup>d</sup> Cum itaque perventum est ad illum locum, accedunt ad eum septem reges coronis suis insignes, quas acceperunt de manu Cæsaris, electi vero jussu Senatûs Romani, &c. ibid.

<sup>e</sup> Fingit hic fabulator Josephum, id est, seipsum a Vespasiano Romam perductum fuisse, ut ibi spectator adesset ejus coronationis, quam describit cum omni illâ cæremoniâ inaugurationis Cæsarium, qualis longe post tempora Caroli Magni, sub Romanis pontificibus instituta fuit, præsentibus nempe et ministrantibus septem Imperii Electoribus, cum toto illo apparatu, quem fuse et lepide narrat. Gagn. p. 341.

<sup>f</sup> Tous ces caractères nous font croire, que le Josèphe Hébreu n'a vécu qu'à la fin de dixième, ou plutôt dans l'onzième siècle, et que le couronnement, dont il a laissé la description, est celui d'Othon I. ou de son fils Othon II. Basnag. ut supr. sect. xxiv. p. 1563.

<sup>g</sup> Post aliquot autem dies, ex quo Vespasianus Cæsar factus fuit, indignatus est adversus Agrippam, quia calumniati sunt eum impii Israël, dicentes eum cogitasse perfide agere in illum, et idcirco misisse literas in Jerusalem eâ de re. Interfecit itaque illum et filium ejus Mombaz gladio. Quod quidem contigit tribus annis cum dimidio ante desolationem domûs, &c. c. 77. p. 344.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Gagnier, in loc.

Rabbi Isaac, in his *Munimen Fidei*, written in the<sup>i</sup> sixteenth century, has quoted this passage of our author. And I have put down his words in the margin: though, perhaps, they may be taken notice of again hereafter.

In<sup>k</sup> the same year and month that Agrippa and his son were put to death, Vespasian sent for Joseph, and spake comfortably to him, and released him from his bonds. Joseph complained of the death of Agrippa; but Vespasian assured him he had good reason for so doing. And now Vespasian sent Joseph to Titus at Alexandria, with a letter of recommendation. Joseph goes to Alexandria. Titus<sup>l</sup> and all his counsellors rejoiced at the arrival of Joseph: 'For he was full of the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and valour, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.' Is. xi. 1, 2. After<sup>m</sup> some consultation it was determined to go up to Jerusalem and besiege it. 'For Joseph knew that it was of the Lord, and that it was not possible that the word of the Lord should be turned back.' Titus therefore went from Alexandria to Judea.

In<sup>n</sup> the first year of the reign of Vespasian, in the tenth month, and the seventh day of the month, came Titus with Joseph, with all his forces, and his army, to the delightful city of Cæsarea; where he was employed in collecting his forces from all parts, till he had completed his army for besieging Jerusalem. There<sup>o</sup> he stayed all the winter till the

<sup>i</sup> Verba, 'Væ pastori meo nihili derelinquenti gregem,' [Zach. xi. 17.] Agrippam respiciunt, qui Romam se contulit, atque inde evocavit Vespasianum, hujusque privignum Titum, adversus Hierosolymas. Tandem autem irasci illi cœpit Vespasianus, eumque unâ cum Monbaso filio securi percussit, tribus et dimidio annis ante templi desolationem. Cæterum ob illam, quæ inter regem Agrippam et improbos duces factiosorum exorta fuerat contentionem, denique desolatum fuit templum, uti ex Josepho constat. *Munimen Fidei*, p. 417.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. 78. p. 344.

<sup>l</sup> Postea profectus Josephus Româ venit Alexandriam. Cumque audisset Titus de adventu Josephi, lætatus est plurimum ipse, et omnes seniores et sapientes qui cum illo erant. Josephus enim plenus erat spiritu sapientiæ et intelligentiæ, spiritu consilii et fortitudinis, spiritu scientiæ, et timoris Jehovæ. cap. 78. p. 346.

<sup>m</sup> Postea consilium inierunt inter se, ut ascenderent in Jerusalem, et obsiderent eam. Sciebat enim Josephus a Jehovâ hoc esse, neque possibile esse, ut verbum Jehovæ convertatur retrorsum. *Ib.* p. 347.

<sup>n</sup> Anno primo regni Vespasiani, mense decimo, die septimo mensis, venit Titus cum Josepho, et cum omnibus copiis suis et exercitu suo, in urbem Cæsareæ, gratissimam et desideratissimam omnibus, qui illam viderunt. cap. 79. p. 347.

<sup>o</sup> Mansitque illic, donec complerentur dies brumæ, et dies hiemis, et donec venirent dies Abib. Toto autem hoc anno primo regni Vespasiani, quo erectus est super regnum Romanorum,——ingruerunt prælia durissima in medio Jerusalem inter habitatores ejus per crudelitatem iræ

mouth of Abib, or March. During the whole year, the first year of the reign of Vespasian, were grievous wars and fightings in the midst of Jerusalem. From the time that Vespasian left Judea to go to Rome, there to receive the confirmation of the empire, in summer and winter were perpetual quarrels and contentions between the three parties, into which the people of Jerusalem were divided, and headed by three leaders, Simon, John, and Eleazar. ‘For<sup>p</sup> at that time God poured out a spirit of insensibility in the midst of Jerusalem:’ Is. xxix. 10. And they destroyed, as<sup>q</sup> this writer says, a thousand and four hundred garners, filled with things that might have been useful in a siege; for there were in them provisions sufficient to maintain two hundred thousand people for twenty years. But by the madness of these robbers all was consumed by fire: which brought on the famine in Jerusalem.

And now this writer makes a long and grievous lamentation over<sup>r</sup> Jerusalem: which in the Hebrew original, as<sup>s</sup> Gagnier observes, is a sort of metrical composition, not in use among the Jews till long after the supposed time of the author.

Titus<sup>t</sup> draws out his numerous forces, and reviews them in a plain near Cæsarea, and then moves toward Jerusalem.

It is not my intention to relate particularly from this writer, as I have done from Josephus, the attacks of Titus, and the defences of the people in the city. I shall pass over a great deal.

‘Whilst<sup>u</sup> they were hard pressed by the Romans, the

et furoris: et percutiebant unusquisque proximum suum, nullâ interpositâ quiete aut morâ. Quinetiam nulla cessatio belli fuit inter illos totâ hieme, ut post est universæ terræ; sed et æstate et hieme duraverunt prælia Simonem inter et Jehochananem. Porro tertius fuit Eleazarus. Atque hoc ab ipso die, quo proficiscens Vespasianus de terrâ Juda abiit Romam, ut illic de novo susciperet regnum Cæsareæ dignitatis, secundum jus consuetudinis Romanæ. Ibid.

<sup>p</sup> Eo anno effudit Jehova spiritum vertiginis in medium Jerusalem—p. 348.

<sup>q</sup> Porro numerus horreorum illorum in Jerusalem erat mille et quadringentorum: et omnia plena commeatibus victûs pro tempore obsidionis. Tempore autem, quo Vespasianus venit in urbes Galileæ, seniores et viri fide digni, qui æstimaverunt quantitatem proventus horreorum illorum, invenerunt in illis esse commeatus et victus pro ducentis mille animabus per viginti annos. Et tunc, in bello latronum, hæc omnia cremata sunt. Cœpitque fames in Jerusalem. p. 350.

<sup>r</sup> Lamentatus est itaque Josephus lamentationem hanc super Jerusalem, et dixit——c. 80. p. 350—355.

<sup>s</sup> Lamentatio Josephi. In Hebræo est carmen rhythmicum; quod genus proëseos multis post seculis a recentioribus Judæis, Arabum exemplo, usurpatum est. Gagn. not. p. 350.

<sup>t</sup> Postea Titus venit in planitiem Cæsareæ cum exercitu, et recensuit exercitum suum, &c. cap. 81. p. 355.

<sup>u</sup> Quando instabat prælium Romanorum, omnes ad invicem coalescebant,

three parties within agreed, and joined together, in opposing the common enemy. But, as soon as the Romans gave them any respite, the three rulers of the robbers within exercised a cruel war with one another; insomuch that the blood of the citizens ran like a torrent out of the gates of Jerusalem in the sight of the Romans, who could not forbear to pity them.' Those expressions are extravagant. But what is here said may be compared with Josephus, de B. J. l. 5. cap. vi. sect. 1. Upon this occasion our author made another lamentation.

After <sup>v</sup> having carried on the siege for some while, Titus draws off from the city, and for several days ceaseth to make any attacks. And by Joseph, who addresseth them in a very long speech, in their own language, he makes them offers of peace, that he might preserve their temple and city. But they hardened their necks, and would not hear. In <sup>w</sup> this speech he tells them, not disagreeably to what the Greek Josephus says, [de B. J. l. 5. cap. ix. p. 350.] that, for their sins, the waters of Siloam had before failed on a sudden: but now they flowed plentifully in the camp of the Gentiles fighting against them. In this speech he goes on and says: 'Though I <sup>x</sup> am in the camp of the Romans, I am

tanquam unus vir ad pugnam; et pugnabant contra Romanos, fugabantque illos a se. Et postquam fugaverant a se Romanos, revertebantur ad se, et incipiebant pugnare unusquisque in fratrem suum. Tuncque fiebat prœlium magnum et durum inter tres principes latronum crudelium, donec egrederetur sanguis extra portas Jerusalem, tanquam torrens scaturiens de scaturigine aquarum. Videbantque Romani sanguinem egredientem de portis Jerusalem. Et contrebatur cor eorum in medio ipsorum, et flebant, et dolebant eâ de re. Josephus autem sacerdos stabat cum eis. Tunc lamentatus est Josephus lamentationem hanc iterum super Jerusalem. Et prolocutus est Josephus alte proferens vocem lamentationis, et dixit, &c. c. 82. p. 362, &c.

<sup>v</sup> Tunc temporis jussit populum suum discedere a muro extra urbem, et cessare a bello per aliquot dies, ut clamaret pacem in auribus Judæorum. cap. 84. p. 369—377. et cap. 85. p. 378—385.

<sup>w</sup> Nunc autem videte malum vestrum esse maximum, et quod Jehova non sit in medio vestri, quia propter bella, quæ geritis unusquisque cum fratre suo, mox brevi siccata sunt apud vos aquæ Siloë. At vero in castris Gentium, quando congregatæ sunt contra vos, ecce aquæ Siloë redundant, et fluunt instar torrentis, et fluvii magni pleni super omnes margines suos. cap. 85. p. 383. m.

<sup>x</sup> Porro, quamvis ego sim in castris Romanorum, tamen reputor idem, ac si essem vobiscum; quia ecce nunc uxor mea dilectissima, carissima, vobiscum est, uxor nempe juventutis meæ. Neque respuo illam; et, licet filii ex eâ non sint mihi, nihilominus illam diligo plurimum, cum sit ex familiis nobilissimis et optimis populi Dei, et populi virorum. Quin et pater meus et mater mea, infelices, pauperes, sancti, senes, provecti in diebus apud vos sunt. Nam et pater meus est centum et trium annorum hodie. Mater vero mea octoginta et quinque annorum est hodie. Ego vero paucos et malos, et per varias tribulationes et ærumnas sexaginta et quatuor annos exegi, ac nondum attingi terminum, qui postulet mortem juxta viam naturæ, &c. cap. 85. p. 383. fin.

still considered as one of you. For with you is my dear wife, the wife of my youth, whom I still embrace, though I have had no children by her. With you also are my father and mother. He is now an hundred and three years old, and my mother eighty-five. I am sixty-four years of age, and have not yet attained to the term of human life.<sup>y</sup>

Many, he<sup>y</sup> says, wept at hearing him; and many people of meaner rank would willingly have gone out of the city to surrender themselves to Titus; but the three leaders of the factions, Simon, and Eleazar, and John, prevented them by their severe threatenings, and the strict guard they kept over them.

In<sup>z</sup> the mean time the famine increased, and was very grievous. The people ate mice, spiders, weasels, serpents, toads: and if the carcase of a horse or other beast was found in any of the streets of Jerusalem, multitudes contended for it.

Titus<sup>a</sup> continues his attacks, but the Jews gain great advantages over him. They killed a great number of his men, and destroyed his platforms, which gave him<sup>b</sup> great concern.

Soon after that, <sup>c</sup> Titus, as this author says, received numerous recruits from all nations and countries subject to the Roman empire. At their arrival, Titus represents to their [generals and chief men the state of things, and how the Jews had prevailed, and still had great strength remaining. These recruits, however, are very willing to engage with the Jews: and <sup>d</sup> out of the vast numbers of fresh men,

<sup>y</sup> Cum ergo audivisset populus verba Josephi sacerdotis, fleverunt plurimum ——— Et quidem summopere optabat plebs infima exire ad Titum, et pacem inire cum illo juxta consilium Josephi. Sed astabant Simon, Eleazarus, et Jochanan, principes latronum, et præposuerunt viros fortissimos ad portas ——— &c. c. 86. p. 385.

<sup>z</sup> Interea fames ingravescebat in Jerusalem ——— Crescebat autem ma'um eo usque, ut populus comederet omne genus reptilium terræ a mure usque ad araneam, et ad serpentem, et mustellam, et bufonem. ——— Si forte inveniretur in Jerusalem cadaver equi, aut cadaver cujuslibet bestię, multi ex Israël inter se pugnabant, et mortui corruerant, dum pugnarent super cadaver bestię, aut super cadaver feræ ——— cap. 86. p. 385, 386.

<sup>a</sup> Cap. 87. p. 388—391.

<sup>b</sup> Cap. 88. p. 391, 392.

<sup>c</sup> Eo tempore congregatæ sunt innumeræ turbæ ex omnibus gentibus, et venerunt contra Jerusalem in auxilium Romanorum ex omnibus dominiis Cæsareæ dignitatis ad Romam pertinentibus ——— Narravit autem Titus senioribus gentium, quæ sibi venerant in auxilium, ea omnia, quæ sibi contigerant dum oppugnavit Jerusalem ——— Narravit etiam, quomodo perdiderant milites suos, et principes suos, ——— omnesque machinas suas dirutrices, et omnia instrumenta belli, quæ secum habebat, corruerant. cap. 88. p. 393, 394.

<sup>d</sup> Electi sunt itaque ex turmis nationum illarum octoginta millia virorum,

supposed to be capable of doing more than the Romans who were fatigued and worn out, and discouraged with the fatigues of a long siege, were selected eighty thousand men, Macedonians, Britons, Syrians, Africans, Burgundians, Persians, Chaldeans. All these, without any Romans joined with them, marched in order toward Jerusalem, and encamped near it. And then they began to attack the wall, and to fight with the Jews that were upon it.

‘ Now <sup>e</sup> the three leaders within the city, John, and Simon, and Eleazar, consult together between themselves, and with their friends, what was best to be done. It was agreed that two should go out of the city, and the other abide within. John then and Eleazar went out, having with them fifteen hundred of the most valiant of their men. They prevailed and slew their enemies with the edge of the sword from morning to evening. The day on which this battle was fought,’ he says, ‘ was the ninth day of the month Thebet, which was the tenth month from the arrival of Titus before Jerusalem. And they slew of the hosts of the Gentiles seven-and-fifty thousand and five hundred. They took captive three thousand of their chiefs, putting the rest to flight. Of the Jews there fell on that day seven men. And they brought off their dead and their wounded to Jerusalem: where they buried their dead, that the uncircumcised might not insult them.’

‘ Whereupon <sup>f</sup> John and Eleazar returned to Jerusalem

scilicet decem millia Macedonum, viginti millia virorum Britannæ, quinque millia Syrorum, decem millia virorum Africæ, decem millia fortissimorum ex viris Borgoniæ, quinque millia de filiis Cedar, decem millia militum ex fortissimis Persarum et Chaldæorum. Et progressi sunt eo ordine, quo venerunt; neque unus Romanus ex illis. Abierunt autem in planitiem, quæ erat e regione sepulcri Jehochanan, sacerdotis magni. Et cœperunt miscere prælia cum Judæis, qui erant super murum, et admovere scalas, cum instrumentis ligneis quibus tegebantur, ut ascenderent ad eos supra murum. *Ib.* p. 394, 395.

<sup>e</sup> Egressi sunt ergo Jehochanan et Eleazarus cum mille et quingentis fortissimis latronum, et percusserunt turmas gentium plagâ gladii—a mane diei pugnæ usque ad vesperam. Quod quidem contigit nonâ die mensis Thebet, qui fuit decimus ab adventu Titi in Jerusalem; et prostraverunt ex turmis gentium illarum quinquaginta septem millia cum quingentis. Et ceperunt ex eis vivos ter mille principes, cæteris in fugam coniectis. Ex Judæis autem ceciderunt illâ die septem viri; et vulneratos suos secum extulerunt latrones, ut illos sepelirent, ne insultarent eis incircumcisi. *Ib.* p. 395.

<sup>f</sup> Venerunt itaque Jehochanan et Eleazarus in Jerusalem cum fratribus suis, cantantes hymnum, et gratiarum actiones Jehovæ. Reliquiæ autem fugientium ex turmis nationum illarum reversæ sunt ad castra Titi cum ignominia—Postridie latrones acceperunt tria millia principum, quos comprehenderant vivos, effoderunt unicuique eorum oculum, manumque amputaverunt, atque ita remiserunt eos ad castra Titi, ut ipsi essent dedecori et opprobrio. *Ib.* p. 395.



with their brethren, singing a hymn of triumph, and offering praises to Jehovah. The rest of those nations returned to the camp of Titus in shame and confusion.—The day after, the robbers took the three thousand chiefs, whom they had brought captives, and put out an eye of every one of them, and also cut off one of their hands, and so sent them back to the camp of Titus.’

All fiction, surely; without any ground or authority from Josephus, or any other ancient writer that we know of! We here plainly see that the author was an artful man. He knew how to flatter and please his own nation. And he has obtained his end. He is in admiration with them.

At that<sup>s</sup> time Titus consulted with his generals and soldiers, and his whole army, that it might be determined what was best to be done, especially considering the strength and fortitude of the Jewish people. After a long consultation, the opinion of Titus, which he was resolved to adhere to, was, that the siege of the city should be continued without making any attacks upon it. ‘For,’ says he, ‘their provisions fail already, and will be all speedily consumed. Moreover, they will quarrel among themselves, and thus hasten their ruin; and we shall overcome.’

‘And indeed,’ says<sup>h</sup> this writer, ‘the famine prevailed greatly. And if it had not, the city could not have been broken up nor taken for ever: for the valiant of Israel were “swifter than eagles, and stronger than lions,” 2 Sam. i. 23. But the famine consumed them. The streets were filled with dead bodies; nor were there any to bury them. And when Titus saw the dead cast out from the city, like dung upon the earth, he was much affected at the sight; and lifting up his hands to heaven, he fell down upon his knees and said: “This is not my work.” He had desired peace: but the people would not accept of it.’

In<sup>i</sup> the following, the eighty-ninth chapter, is an account

<sup>s</sup> *Eo tempore Titus consilium inivit cum principibus et militibus suis, et cum filiis populi sui Romanis, et cum populo omnium nationum, quæ cum eis convenerant, dicens: Quid faciemus contra Israël, et contra fortitudinem ejus? — At consilia eorum omnium contentui fuerunt coram Tito — Dixit ergo eis Titus, Hoc est consilium meum, quod a me ipso juxta rectam rationem profertur, neque ab eo recedam. Cedo, teneamus urbem hanc obsessam, neve oppugneinus illam amplius. Victus enim et commeatus eorum omnino defecerunt, neque cibus est apud illos. Haud dubium, quin fames illos consumtura est: neque etiam dubium est, quin, quando viderint nos non amplius miscere prælia cum illis, ipsi prælia misceant inter se, unusquisque adversus fratrem suum. — Ib. 395, 396.*

<sup>h</sup> *Porro nisi grassata fuisset fames in Jerusalem, nunquam perrupta fuisset urbs, neque capta in æternum. Fortes enim Israël erant velociores aquilis, et fortiores leonibus. — Ib. p. 396.*

<sup>i</sup> *Cap. 89. p. 397—406.*

of several acts of cruelty committed by Simon in putting to death Amittai, or Matthias, and others.

In<sup>k</sup> the mean while, as he says in the ninetieth chapter, Gorion the priest, father of Joseph, who wrote this book for Israel, to be a memorial and testimony to them, was a prisoner in one of the towers upon the wall, bound in iron fetters. Joseph came near to the place hoping to see his aged father : but the Jews cast stones at him, and wounded him. And now likewise, he at length gets a sight of his mother. She was not bound with chains, though she was kept prisoner in the house of Simon. But she got upon the wall to see her son and make her lamentations to him. His father was about one hundred and three years of age, and his mother eighty-five.

It is observable that about this time, after the slaughter of Amittai, or Matthias, and his sons, by order of Simon, Josephus<sup>l</sup> also makes mention of his father and mother, as being in Jerusalem. And about this time also Josephus was wounded : not for attempting to see his father or mother, but as he was going round the city near the walls of it, proposing arguments to the people within to surrender to Titus for their benefit.

The<sup>m</sup> famine being very severe in the city, many Jews in good circumstances went out in order to go over to the Romans. But it being found that some of them had gold and jewels hid in their bowels, they were ripped up by the Arabian and Syrian soldiers which were in the army of Titus. Some of the Roman soldiers did the like. In this practice the Arabians and Syrians killed a thousand Jews. When Titus heard of it he was exceedingly grieved and provoked. And he gave orders that all who had done this thing should

<sup>k</sup> Interea Gorion sacerdos, pater Josephi sacerdotis, qui scripsit hunc librum Israëlî, ut esset illis in testimonium, et in memoriale, tunc erat vinctus catenis ferreis, et in vinculis æreis in unâ e turribus Jerusalem. Ipse autem senex processerat in diebus, natus scilicet centum et trium annorum—Eo tempore venit Josephus, filius ejus, versus murum e regione turris, in quâ erat pater ejus Gorion sacerdos, tunc illic vinctus—cap. 90. p. 406, &c.

<sup>l</sup> De B. J. l. 5. c. xiii. num. 1—3.

<sup>m</sup> Porro Judæi, qui egressi fuerant de Jerusalem ad castra Romanorum—deglutierunt aurum, et argentum, et gemmas, et lapides pretiosos—Cumque animadvertissent nonnulli ex Syris et Arabibus illos ita facere, indicavit rem unusquisque socio suo—Tum apprehenderunt illos, et scissis eorum visceribus, invenerunt intra viscera aurum, et lapides pretiosos—Factusque numerus scissorum per manus Syrorum et Arabum mille animarum. Cumque audisset Titus rem illam pessimam,——indignatus est, et accensus est furor ejus admodum. Tunc jussit comprehendi omnes, qui patravant hujusmodi facinus pessimum, et jugulari, ac deinde dari omnes facultates eorum Judæis vivis hæredibus mortuorum. Et mortui sunt propter hoc facinus, jussu Titi, tum ex Syris, tum ex Arabibus, sex millia virorum. cap. 91. p. 411, 412.

be put to death, and that their goods should be given to living Jews, heirs of the dead. Upon this occasion six thousand Arabians and Syrians suffered death.

A most unlikely thing, and mere romance! No general would show such favour to a resolute people, whom he was besieging with an army. Josephus says that<sup>n</sup> two thousand of the Jews were thus cruelly destroyed by the Syrian and other soldiers for the sake of the gold hid in their bodies. He also says, Titus was much displeased, and would have ordered his horse to surround the criminals and kill them with darts; but he considered that the number of the guilty exceeded that of the slain. He therefore was obliged to content himself with forbidding that cruelty for the future, upon the pain of heavy punishment.

This author moreover says, that ‘strict<sup>o</sup> inquiry was made by Titus after the Romans who had been guilty of the like action; and they were found to be three hundred and twenty men, whom Titus ordered to be burnt to death in one pit or cistern. After which all Jews who came over to Titus were treated by the soldiers very civilly, and they lived very quiet and unmolested in his camp.’ All fiction from this author’s fruitful invention! And the story is made out, as it seems, to do honour to his nation, at the same time that their city was falling into ruin, and they going into captivity!

He likewise tells the story which Josephus has done, of the crucifixion of the Jews before the walls of the city, five<sup>p</sup> hundred in a day, and sometimes more, as Josephus says. But this author tells it very differently in this manner. Some<sup>q</sup> went out of the city with their wives, and sons and

<sup>n</sup> De B. J. l. 5. c. xiii. sect. 4, 5. p. 361, 362.

<sup>o</sup> Fuitque numerus eorum, qui reperti sunt, tum eorum qui fecerunt, tum eorum qui noverant, trecentorum et viginti virorum. At jussit Titus servis suis, et combusserunt omnes in medio cisternæ unius. Et deinceps Judæi cum fiducia in castris Titi degebant, neque ultra fuit adversarius, aut incursus malus. Sed quotiescumque Romanus inveniebat Judæum aliquem perplexum aut errantem extra castra procul, clam illum deducens comitabatur usque dum ad castra incolumem, et tranquille, et cum securitate bonâ reduxisset. cap. 91. p. 413.

<sup>p</sup> De B. J. l. 5. cap. xi. n. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Quando aliqui ab urbe exibant cum uxoribus, et filiis, et filiabus, et parvulis suis, ut invenirent herbas,——Romani, qui illos inveniebant, jugulabant natos eorum, et dicebant: Jugulemus hos parvulos, ne adolescant, et successu dierum pugnent nobiscum, sicut patres illorum. Idcirco Romani trucidabant infamam plebem, quotquot exibant ab urbe, et suspendebant illos ad arbores ex adverso portæ Jerusalem. Sicque faciebant Romani quotidie. Pervenitque numerus occisorum et suspensorum ad quingentas animas. Idem etiam faciebant Simon, Jehochanan, et Eleazarus, iis omnibus, quos capiebant ex cohortibus Romanorum postquam illos per insidias circumvenerant. Eodem modo animadvertabant in eos, qui quærebant exire, ut perfererent ad illos. Jugulabant enim eos, et cadavera suspendebant super murum ex adverso Roma-

daughters, and little ones, to gather herbs for food ; and the Romans slew all the young people, saying : ‘ Let us kill these, lest they grow up and fight against us, as their fathers have done.’ So the Romans acted from day to day, till the number of slain and hanged-up amounted to five hundred. The like to this was done within the city by Simon, and John, and Eleazar. They killed and hung up upon the walls all the Romans which they could catch, and all their own people who endeavoured to go out of the city, till they amounted also to the number of five hundred ; which when Titus saw, he gave strict orders to all the men of his army not to kill any Jews that came out of Jerusalem. If any did so, they should be put to death. For his bowels yearned over Israel.

So says this fantastical writer.

He computes the taking of Antonia to have been on the fifth day of Sivan, the third month, on the eve of the feast of weeks, or Pentecost ; the fourteenth month from the coming of Titus to besiege Jerusalem. So<sup>r</sup> at the end of ch. 91.

He proceeds,<sup>s</sup> in the ninety-second chapter, to relate contentions and fightings of the Jews and Romans at the temple, or near it ; which I need not rehearse particularly : especially since it is not all exact truth or matter of fact, but exaggeration agreeable to this author’s fancy.

At the beginning of the<sup>t</sup> ninety-third chapter he tells the story of Mary, who, in the extremity of the famine, killed her only child, and dressed it, and ate a part of it. The same story that is told by<sup>u</sup> Josephus : but their harangues upon the event are different.

In the next chapter<sup>v</sup> the temple is on fire, and the doors norum——Fuitque numerus suspensorum per manus latronum quingentorum virorum, tot scilicet numero, quot suspendebant Romani ex Judæis. Itaque Titus præcepit omnibus viris exercitûs sui, dicens : Quicumque interfecerit aliquem ex iis qui egrediuntur de Jerusalem, morietur. Et quidem ita fecit Titus, quia flagrabant viscera ejus super Israël. cap. 86. p. 386.

<sup>r</sup> Ut autem vidit Titus turrin Antoniam esse in laqueum Romanis, jussit Titus ut diruerent illam : quod quidem contigit in quintâ in Sivan, mense tertio, in vespertâ festi Hebdomadaram. Ipse est mensis quartus decimus ab adventu Titi ad obsidendam Jerusalem. cap. 91. in fin. p. 420.

<sup>s</sup> P. 420—431.

<sup>t</sup> P. 431.

<sup>u</sup> De B. J. l. 6. cap. iii. sect. 4.

<sup>v</sup> Postridie congregati Romani miserunt ignem in Sanctum Sanctorum in circuitu.——Mox incaluit aurum, et combusta sunt ligna valvarum, et ceciderunt in terram, et aperta fuit domus Sancti Sanctorum in oculis omnium mense quinto, nonâ die mensis, eo ipso die, quo aperta fuerat domus Sancti Sanctorum in diebus Chaldæorum. Et statim ut aperuerunt Romani portam Sancti Sanctorum, et ceperunt illud, tunc vero vociferati sunt clamore magno mirum in modum præ lætitiâ——Cucurrit autem Titus totis viribus suis, ut extingue-

of the house of the sanctuary were opened on the ninth day of the fifth month, the same day of the month in the which it had been opened in the time of the Chaldeans. The soldiers rejoiced greatly. But Titus was much concerned, and ran towards the temple, and did all in his power to have the fire extinguished, calling aloud to his men, till he was hoarse, and persisting in his exclamations, as this author says, till he fell to the ground almost dead. And the priests at the temple fought as long as they were able; and when they saw the fire prevail, they threw themselves into it. As there remained no hopes of preserving the temple, Titus, before it was entirely consumed, went in, and greatly admired it——Soon after that the Romans set up their idols and images in the temple, and offered sacrifices to them, and reviled the Jews, and blasphemed their law before their idols.

He now comes to the signs and prodigies, foreshadowing the calamities that were coming upon the Jewish people, which also are mentioned by Josephus <sup>w</sup> in this same place, after the burning the temple. ‘Nor<sup>x</sup> did the Jews attend to the words of the signs which happened in Jerusalem, though they were very awful. For a year before Vespasian came, there appeared over the temple a blazing star in the shape of a man, in whose hand were drawn swords. The day in which this sign was seen, was the first of the feast of the Passover? and during the whole night the temple was illuminated as if it had been day: and so it continued throughout the seven days of the Passover.’ Thus confounding, as it seems, the first two signs in Josephus, and making them one only, and likewise representing the blazing star

ret ignem——Ac tandem defessus defatigatusque corruit ad terram viribus exhaustus——Postquam itaque incensa fuit domus Sancti Sanctorum, surrexit Titus, et ingressus in Sanctum Sanctorum vidit gloriam domus, et decorem ejus, et splendorem illius ——Nondum enim tota domus incendio consumpta erat, ut pulchritudinem illius, et majestatem ejus contempleretur. Tunc dixit Titus: Nunc cognovi, quia non est hic aliud, nisi domus Dei. Hoc est habitaculum Dei cœlorum, et tabernaculum ejus ——Quia magna est majestas domus hujus, et magnus splendor majestatis templi ejus longe supra templum Romanorum, et omnia templa nationum, quæ vidi——Deinde surrexerunt Romani, et, extincto incendio, idola et imagines suas in templo statuerunt. Et obtulerunt eis holocausta, et probro affecerunt Judæos, et legem eorum coram idolis suis blasphemârunt. cap. 94. p. 436—438.

<sup>w</sup> De B. J. l. 6. cap. v. num. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Neque Judæi animum adverterant ad verba signorum, quæ contigerunt in Jerusalem——Nam anno uno antequam veniret Vespasianus, apparuit super templum stella quædam scintillans instar formæ hominis, in ejus manu gladii districti. Dies autem, quo visum est signum illud, fuit primus ex diebus festi Paschatis; et totâ nocte illius diei templum fulsit, et resplenduit tanquam lux diei; et ita factum est per totos septem dies Paschatis.—Cap. 94. p. 438.

somewhat differently from Josephus. Then follow in him the other signs taken from Josephus; but I shall not rehearse them. He has, particularly, that of the man of low rank, who for several years travelled through the streets of Jerusalem, with his mournful denunciation of ‘Woe to the city;’ whom<sup>y</sup> he calls Joshua, son of Hananiah.

When<sup>z</sup> the Romans had got possession of the temple, the Jews fled to mount Sion. Here our author useth a different style from Josephus, who has never used the word Sion in his writings, but always describes that part of the city by other names.

Now<sup>a</sup> some priests came to Titus entreating mercy; but he would not grant it, and ordered them to be put to death.

Now<sup>b</sup> also John and Simon sent messengers to Titus, proposing to surrender to him, if he would grant them their lives; but Titus rejected their proposal, and reproached them severely.

Whereupon<sup>c</sup> Titus ordered the war to be renewed, and carried on by his army with vigour.

At<sup>d</sup> this time Zarach [or Izates] of royal descent, and his brothers, came down from mount Sion, and surrendered to Titus, and were well received by him. Whereupon Simon and his adherents set fire to their goods and treasures which they had left behind them, that they might not come into the hands of the Romans.

Simon<sup>e</sup> and John escape, and hide themselves in a cavern.

<sup>y</sup> Porro quatuor annis ante hæc signa fuit vir quidam in Jerusalem, de populo terræ, seu plebeius, nomine Jehoshua, filius Chananiæ, et cœpit clamare voce magnâ die ipso festi Tabernaculorum—Oderunt autem illum omnes cives urbis, &c. Ibid. p. 439.

<sup>z</sup> Postquam itaque ingressus fuit omnis exercitus Romanorum in templum, diffugerunt Judæi ad montem Sion. Cap. 95. in. p. 440.

<sup>a</sup> Postquam autem libaverunt Romani coram domino suo Tito, ecce pars sacerdotum, qui capti fuerant juxta templum, deprecati sunt Titum, ut seipsos vivos servaret, neve interficeret—Tunc Romani irruerunt in illos, et mortui sunt omnes. Cap. 95. p. 440.

<sup>b</sup> Simon autem et Jochanan miserunt ad Titum sermones pacis et deprecationis, orantes pro seipsis, ut vivos servaret—Ibid. 440.

<sup>c</sup> Tunc jussit Titus Romanis instaurari bellum cum principibus latronum Jehochanane et Simone, quandoquidem se tam pertinaciter gerebant—Ib. p. 441.

<sup>d</sup> Eo tempore surrexit Zarach, qui quidem erat de filiis Regum, de monte Sion, cum fratribus suis, et cum omnibus filiis seminis regii,—et venerunt ad Titum, qui excepit illos cum honore,—et benigne tractavit—Cum ergo vidissent Jochanan et Simon principes latronum abiisse Izatam cum cæteris filiis regis,—abierunt ita si, et combusserunt omnia quæ pertinebant ad filios regis, et incenderunt domum, et omnes thesauros ejus combusserunt, ne acciperent eos Romani—p. 441.

<sup>e</sup> Tunc temporis fugientes Simon et Jehochanan, in quâdam latebrâ absconderunt se, quocumque se contulerint. Cæteri vero eorum, qui erant cum eis,

Many Jews of good condition surrender to Titus, and he receives them favourably.

Joshua<sup>f</sup> a priest, son of Shebuthi high-priest, comes to Titus, bringing with him two golden candlesticks, which were in the sanctuary, and golden tables, and divers other rich utensils of the temple, and vestments of the priests, and precious stones, all which he made a present of to Titus, who received him graciously.

At<sup>g</sup> this time also came out Gorion the priest, father of the writer of this history, and his mother, with their son Bonian. They came out of the house of Simon, in which they had been kept prisoners. Gorion<sup>h</sup> lived twenty months after taking the city of Jerusalem. Bonian was a wise and good man. Titus did not take him to Rome with himself, as he did Joseph, but left him to preside over the priests in that country. Now also Phineas, a priest, brought more of the holy things out of the temple to Titus. But our author blames both these priests for delivering such things into the hands of an enemy of the people of God. However, I do not perceive him to make any mention here of the book of the law.

At<sup>i</sup> that time therefore was taken Jerusalem, with all its

et principes Jerusalem, et nobiles Juda,——statim atque viderunt fugisse Simonem et Jehochananem,——tunc descenderunt——et venientes ad Titum, procubuerunt ante faciem ejus in terram——Et Titus benigne excepit illos——  
Ib. p. 442.

<sup>f</sup> Sub id tempus venit ad Titum Jehoshua, sacerdos, filius Shebuthi, Sacerdotis Magni, et attulit secum duo ex candelabris aureis, quæ fuerant in Sanctuario. Avexit autem secum omnes mensas aureas, et omnia vasa aurea,——et crateres, et acerras,——et scutellas, ac etiam vestes ministerii, et vestes sanctitatis coopertas auro, et circumcinctas lapidibus pretiosis, cum magnâ copiâ gemmarum——Quæ omnia donavit Tito, a quo benigne acceptus est——Ib. p. 442.

<sup>g</sup> Tunc temporis egressus est Gorion, sacerdos, pater Josephi sacerdotis auctoris historiarum libri hujus, de carcere suo, de turri videlicet domûs Simonis latronis, cum uxore suâ, et cum filio Bonian. Is erat frater Josephi sacerdotis natu minor. Iste quoque Bonian fuit sapiens, magnus, et sacerdos sanctus——Nam reliquit eum Titus in Jerusalem, neque abductus fuit ab eo, quemadmodum Josephus. Vixit autem pater Josephi postquam capta est Jerusalem, viditque Josephum filium suum, per viginti menses, et mortuus est. Tunc etiam temporis captus est Phinehas sacerdos, custos cellarum sacrarii, in quas contulerat omnes thesauros sacerdotum, et vestes sacerdotum sanctas, et dedit Tito thesaurum unguenti optimi, et aromata, et vestes purpureas, quibus sanctificaverant Sanctuarium Reges domus secundæ, et omnia vasa aurea, quæ apud se habebat de vasis domûs Jehovæ. Ib. p. 443.

<sup>h</sup> According to Josephus, Gorion was put to death by the zealots, before the siege of the city began: see above, p. 436, and De B. J. l. 4. cap. vi. sect. 1. What therefore this author says of his father and mother must be all fiction and falsehood.

<sup>i</sup> Tunc itaque temporis capta fuit Jerusalem, cum omnibus rebus desirabilibus ejus. Deinde ascendit Titus in montem Sion, et cepit illum. Jussit autem destrui murum civitatis Sion. Jam vero

desirable things: and then Titus went up to Mount Sion and took it, and ordered that the wall of the city of Sion should be demolished. And three days after that, John, one of the princes of the robbers, being pinched with hunger, came out of his hiding-place, and surrendered to Titus, begging mercy of him; but Titus commanded him to be bound with heavy iron chains, and gave orders that he should be led about before his soldiers, to be derided and insulted by them, and after seven days he was hanged. And now also, immediately in the same connection, he relates the appearance of Simon, though it could not be till some while afterwards. He was first brought before the Roman general Rupha, or Rufus, and then before Titus: who commanded him to be bound, and to be led round the whole army, to be exposed and insulted by them, as John had been: after which he was beheaded, and his body was cut to pieces, and thrown to the dogs.

Moreover,<sup>k</sup> as he goes on, the number of the people that

elapso triduo, deficiebat anima Jehochanani principis latronum, præ fame. Surrexit itaque de loco ubi latebat, et egressus inde abiit ad Titum, et corruens ante faciem ejus, et deosculatus pedes ejus dixit ei; *Serva, quæso, Domine mi Rex.* Tunc jussit illum Titus constringi vinculis ferreis gravissimis, et obduci illum, et circumvehi per totum exercitum suum, atque ignominiose tractari——tandem post septem dies mortuus est strangulatus——Postea egressus est etiam Simon lauro, homicida impius, de loco latebræ suæ, quia fames graviter premebat illum——Tunc dixit eis: *Venite, et vocate mihi ducem, et tradam me illi.*——Et vocaverunt Rupha,——qui tunc erat Rector seu præfectus militiæ Romanorum——Et sic fecit ille, deduxitque eum ad Titum. Statim autem ut vidit Titus Simonem, jussit illum vinculis constringi,——et abduci, et circumvehi per totum exercitum suum, et ignominiose tractari, et subsannari, quemadmodum fecerant Jehochanani. Erat autem victus catenis æreis. Tum denique jussit Titus interfici illum in vinculis. Itaque amputaverunt illi caput antequam moreretur. Tum dissecerunt eum in partes, et projece-  
runt membra cadaveris ejus canibus. *Ib. p. 443, 444.*

<sup>k</sup> Porro numerus totius populi eorum, qui occisi sunt, quatenus potuerunt cognosci tunc gladio cecidisse sive per Romanos, sive per latrones, ex populo Judæorum, sive qui de proximo, sive qui de longinquo venerant ad festum, festum scilicet Jehovæ in Jerusalem, et restiterant illic propter obsidionem, corrueruntque gladio; numerus, inquam, fuit millia millium, et centum millia: præter illos, qui quidem occisi sunt, sed cognosci non potuerunt, ut numerarentur. Illi enim tantummodo numerati sunt, qui sepulti et cogniti fuerunt. Qui autem cognosci non potuerunt non recensiti sunt in numerum. Præter eos quoque, qui postea mortui sunt cum Elezaro, filio Anani sacerdotis, post mortem Jehochanani, et Simonis, latronum et tyrannorum crudelium.

Numerus autem populi ex Judæis, qui abierunt cum Tito in captivitatem, et quos abduxit secum Romam, sexdecim millia. Et abduxit quidem Romam Josephum sacerdotem: Bonian vero, ejus fratrem, reliquit in antistitem super sacerdotes, qui remanserunt in Jerusalem. Ita enim deprecatus fuerat Josephus frater ejus; et suscepit faciem ejus, et ita fecit.——Nam quoad cæteros ex eis, quos Titus cepit vivos, ne unum ex eis vivere passus fuit: sed omnes latrones residuos, quotquot vivos comprehendit, interfecit Titus morte probrosâ,



were slain, so far as could be found, who were killed by the Romans, or the robbers, of all the people of the Jews, who, from the neighbouring country, or from far off, had come up to Jerusalem to the feast, the feast of the Lord, and were shut up in the city by the siege, was eleven hundred thousand, beside many others whose number was not found, and beside those who died with Eleazar, after the death of John and Simon.

The number of the people of the Jews who were taken captive by Titus, and carried with him to Rome, he says, were sixteen thousand. He also took with him to Rome Joseph the priest; but Bonian, his brother, he left to preside over the priests in that country; but as for those whom he took captives, he says that Titus put to death at Jerusalem all, and every one of them, in an ignominious manner, excepting only such as he reserved to take with him; and them he caused to die in a very ignominious manner: for in all the cities, where he made any stay, in his return to Rome, he ordered some of them to be thrown to lions, and other wild beasts, until all whom he had taken with him were destroyed.

So says our author. The number of the captives, according to Josephus, [De B. J. l. 6. ix. 3.] were ninety and seven thousand; many of whom, according to him, were sold for slaves: but this, so far as I see, is quite omitted by our author, as also the triumph of Vespasian and Titus for their conquest of Judea.

But why does he omit these things? To me it seems to be owing to the pride of his heart. The temple had been burnt, Jerusalem was destroyed; the whole country of Judea had been subdued by the Romans, uncircumcised and idolatrous people; facts which he could not deny, or disown, however dishonourable and reproachful to his nation; and he has himself related these events in his way and manner. But yet he was, as it seems, desirous to save his nation from some circumstances of reproach and dishonour; he therefore forbore to say any thing of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus, though performed in the metropolis of the vast

et ignominiosâ in Jerusalem. Quosdam tamen ex eis secum superstites asser-  
vavit, ut contumeliâ eos afficeret per singulas urbes transitûs sui, cum contenderet Romam. Cum itaque profectus est Titus de Jerusalem, accepit eos secum, et abduxit etiam secum reliquum populum captivitatis, quem captivum fecerat ex Judæis: cunque morabatur in singulis urbibus transitûs sui, dum iter faceret Romam, in quâcumque urbe ubi castra metabatur, educebat quosdam ex latronibus illis, et jubebat illos objeci leonibus, et feris pessimis, ut devorarent illos, donec consumpti sunt omnes latrones, quos secum habebat. Cap. 95. p. 444, 445.

empire of the Romans, and published and recorded in public and durable monuments, as well as in writings of the best credit. From the same principle of pride and vanity, he forebore to say that at this time many Jews, the people of Israel, had been sold for slaves, to live in slavery to un-circumcised Gentiles: so it seems to me. And I think it may deserve to be taken notice of by us, that in the fictitious history which he has given of his journey to Rome, and the inauguration of Vespasian there, he has mentioned a particular, somewhat resembling this: ‘For after the coronation of Vespasian, and the death of Agrippa, and his son Monbaz before mentioned, when Vespasian began to show favour to Joseph, and ordered his chains to be struck off, Joseph<sup>1</sup> presented a petition to Vespasian in behalf of all sons of Israel, who were then in prison at Rome, entreating that they might be set at liberty; and upon that condition promising that he would for the future be a faithful counsellor to the emperor, and serve him according to the utmost of his ability: which petition was granted by the emperor: and all Israelites who had been bound at Rome, were set at liberty.’ Which must be allowed to be one of the fictitious events of that voyage to Rome which is throughout the fiction of this writer’s fertile invention, who says what he pleaseth.

After this our author<sup>m</sup> tells the story of Eleazar, and his men at Massada, but somewhat differently from<sup>n</sup> Josephus. He does not say that they determined to kill themselves and one another: his account is, that<sup>o</sup> after the speech of Eleazar, they killed their wives and daughters that they might not fall a prey into the hands of the enemy: and<sup>p</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dixit vero Josephus: Nonne opprobrium mihi est reserari a me catenas ferreas, et interim vincula filiorum Israël, qui mecum sunt Romæ, non etiam reserari tuo jussu? Si ergo nunc audieris me, quandoquidem inveni gratiam in oculis tuis, solves, quæso, vincula omnium Israëlitarum, qui mecum sunt Romæ; et ero tibi consiliarius fidelis omnibus diebus, et inimicus ero inimicis tuis, et adversabor adversariis tuis. Fecit itaque Vespasianus secundum sermonem Josephi, et solvit omnia vincula omnium victorum filiorum Israël, qui erant cum Josepho Romæ. Lib. 6. cap. 78. p. 346.

<sup>m</sup> Cap. 96. p. 447, 488. et cap. 97. p. 452.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. de B. J. l. 7. cap. viii. ix.

<sup>o</sup> Tunc surgentes viri uxores suas et filias suas accersunt, quas osculati et complexi, ita alloquuntur. Melius est in oculis nostris, ut moriamini in terrâ vestrâ cum sanctitate et honore, quam ut eatis in captivitatem, et cum opprobrio in terram inimicorum vestrorum, et cum idolis gentium,——et contumeliâ moriamini——Cap. 97. p. 452.

<sup>p</sup> Postea egressus est Eleazarus sacerdos cum omnibus viris bellatoribus qui secum erant ex urbe, et miscuerunt ingentem pugnam cum multitudine exercitus Romanorum, et occiderunt multos ex eis absque numero. Ac tandem pugnantes Judæi contra proprias ipsorum animas, donec omnes absumerentur

then the men went out of the city and fought with the Romans: of whom they slew very many, till they were themselves all killed. ‘And,’ says he, ‘here end the wars of the second house.’

After which follows <sup>a</sup> this author’s final lamentation, and in a rythmical sort of poesy, as Gagnier<sup>r</sup> observes, very different from that among the Hebrews at the time when their temple was destroyed.

‘Woe<sup>s</sup> is now unto us!

For the city of our glory is laid waste,  
 And the house of our sanctuary is thrown down,  
 In which our hope was placed,  
 And all the desires of our hearts.  
 And our temple is consumed with fire;  
 And we have been carried out of our country,  
 And from the heritage of our fathers;  
 Nor have we stretched out our hands to God,

in prælio illo mortui pro Jehovâ, et pro sanctuario ejus. Huc usque desinunt bella domus secundæ. Cap. 97. p. 452.

<sup>a</sup> Tunc lamentatus fuit Josephus, sacerdos Dei, lamentationem hanc——  
 p. 452.

<sup>r</sup> Lamentatio Ben Gorionis ultima, eaque rythmica, quâ, ut Leoninæ cujusdam inter Judæos specimen poëseos non injucundum, hic Hebraïce subjunximus. Et credat lector, si potest, sine risu, hanc ab ipso Flavio Josepho compositum fuisse tempori templi excidii. Gagnier. Not. p. 452.

<sup>s</sup> Væ nunc nobis!

Quia desolata est civitas gloriæ nostræ,  
 Et eversa est Domus Sanctuarii nostri,  
 In quo posita fuit spes nostra,  
 Et omnia desideria cordium nostrorum.  
 Et incensum est Templum nostrum;  
 Et migravimus de terrâ nostrâ,  
 Et ex hæreditate patrum nostrorum;  
 Neque ad Deum [extendimus] manus nostras,  
 Ut liberaremur de exiliis nostris,  
 Quæ aggravaverunt super nos.  
 In illum [commissæ] iniquitates nostræ;  
 Et redegerunt nos in captivitatem peccata nostra;  
 Et humiliaverunt in terram capita nostra prævaricationes nostræ.  
 Sed adhuc veniet dies, et terminus  
 Redemptionis; et adjiciet Deus noster,  
 Ut recordetur juramenti sui ad patres nostros;  
 Et ædificabit civitatem nostram,  
 Et restaurabit templum nostrum,  
 Et colliget dispersos nostros,  
 Et reducet captivitatem nostram,  
 Et accelerare faciet Messiam nostrum,  
 Et festinabit ad redimendum nos,  
 Et prosternet inimicos nostros,  
 Et humiliabit oses nostros,  
 Et perdet et delebit hostes nostros,  
 Et nos restituet, sicut in principio.

Cap. 97. p. 452, 453.

That we might be delivered from our exiles.  
 And our sins and iniquities  
 Have been aggravated upon us.  
 Our transgressions have carried us into captivity ;  
 And our apostasies have brought us down to the earth.  
 But the day will come, and the time of our redemption ;  
 And our God will deliver us.  
 He will remember the oath made with our fathers ;  
 And will build up our city,  
 And restore our temple,  
 And gather our dispersions,  
 And will bring back our captivity,  
 And hasten the coming of our Messiah,  
 And will speedily deliver us,  
 And will cast down our enemies,  
 And will humble those who hate us,  
 And will destroy, and root out all our adversaries,  
 And will restore us, as at the beginning.’

Here, beside other things which an attentive reader will observe, he expresseth his expectation of the rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem. So likewise, when he gave an account of Herod’s building, or repairing the temple, he describes the rejoicings made upon that occasion : ‘For<sup>t</sup> the building,’ says he, ‘of the house of the Lord, which we have seen both built and destroyed ; but it shall be raised a third time in honour and glory, and shall be established for ever.’ And in like manner in another<sup>u</sup> place. He is therefore a good witness to the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, which had been raised after the return from the Babylonish captivity ; in which, as we say, the prophets had foretold the Messiah would make his appearance : see Hag. ii. 6—9, and Mal. iii. 1.

After his lamentation this author adds, ‘But<sup>v</sup> Titus left a remnant of Israel in the land of Israel, in the city Jabne, and its towns, and in the city Bether, and in its towns, and in Osha, and its towns.’ Of all which cities, as Gagnier<sup>w</sup>

<sup>t</sup> Et laudaverant Jehovam cum gaudio——propter ædificiũm Domũs Jehovæ, quam vidimus, et ædificatam, devastatam. Sed adhuc reædificabitur tertio eum laude, et celebritate, et gloriã ; et firmabit eam Jehova in æternũ. I. 6. cap. 55. p. 243.

<sup>u</sup> Cap. 65. p. 288. sub fin. et p. 289.

<sup>v</sup> Reliquit autem Titus Israëlĩ reliquias in terrã Israël, in urbe Jabne, et in oppidis ejus, in urbe Bether, et in oppidis ejus, et in Osha, et oppidis ejus. Cap. 97. p. 454. <sup>w</sup> Tres illas urbes, viz. Jabneh, Bether, et Oshali, hoc loco commemorat Ben-Gorion noster, non ex Josepho auctore suo, qui nihil hic habet de hac belli Judaïci coronide, sed ex Pandectis Talmudicis, ubi frequentissima illarum mentio occurrit. De quarum urbium situ et cele-

in his notes observes, there is no notice taken by Flavius Josephus; though there is in the Talmudical writings; and he refers to Lightfoot's works such as are inquisitive.

This author proceeds: 'Moreover,<sup>x</sup> Titus reigned two years after he had taken Jerusalem, and then died. Titus was a wise king, and composed many valuable books both in the Greek and in the Roman language. Titus was a just and upright man, and all his judgments were in righteousness; but being compelled by necessity he destroyed and laid waste Jerusalem: all which evil came upon Jerusalem because of the robbers which were in Israel, and because of their wickedness; as we have shown in this history.'

He here says that 'Titus reigned two years after he had taken Jerusalem,' which is very inaccurate. Vespasian did not die before the year of our Lord 79: after him Titus reigned more than two years, and died in the year of Christ 81: nor does our author say any thing here of Vespasian, as he ought to have done. But we must not stay to remark upon the defects or inaccuracies of this writer; if we had so done we should never have got through his work; and every reader is able to observe many such things without my mentioning them.

This author gives a good character of Titus; and he could do no less, after having before related so many favours and civilities conferred by him upon the Jews. Titus also, as all know, is much commended in the History of the Jewish War, written by Flavius Josephus, from which this writer had all his materials that are of any value. But<sup>y</sup> herein he differs from the Talmudical writers, as Gagnier observes

britate maxime post eversa Hierosolyina, consulenda est doctissimi Lightfooti Chorographia Terræ Israël. Cap. xv. lii. et lxxxiv. Gagn. Not. p. 454.

<sup>x</sup> Regnavit autem Titus duobus annis postquam cepit Jerusalem, et mortuus est. Porro Titus rex fuit sapiens, magnus in scientiâ eloquentiæ, tum in linguâ Græcâ, tum in linguâ Romanâ, et composuit libros multos cum scientiâ Græce et Romane. Fuitque Titus vir justus et rectus, et omnia judicia ejus erant cum justitiâ. Verum necessitate coactus desolavit et delevit Jerusalem. Et quidem desolavit et delevit eam, quia omne malum illud, quod venit super Jerusalem, non venit nisi per latrones, qui erant in Israël, et propter impietatem illorum, uti memoravimus. Cap. 97. p. 456.

<sup>y</sup> Hic magna est discordia Ben-Gorionem inter et Talmudicos Doctores, quam non diffitentur ipsi Rabbini. Nec deesse tamen asserunt sapientes, qui illam contradictionem concilient, quemadmodum affirmat R. David Ganz. Sed quo judicio id tentaverint, judicium sit penes lectorem.

Quoad nostrum Ben-Gorionem, illum hoc loco sibi constare fatendum est. Cum enim in versione Rufini ubique magnas Titi Imp. virtutes summis laudibus prædicari legerit, ipseque, Flavium Josephum secutus, illum sæpius multis elogiis ornavisset, non ausus fuit suos Doctores Talmudicos cum famæ suæ dispendio sequi, ne videlicet sibi contrarius videretur. Gagn. p. 456.

in his notes upon this work ; for they represent Titus as exceeding impious and profane, as we also have seen. How the learned Jews can reconcile these contradictions is not easy to comprehend ; but they continue to pay respect to this author as well as to the Talmudical doctors.

Reland,<sup>z</sup> likewise, in his Notes upon the Triumphal Arch of Titus, takes notice of the grievous reproaches and scandalous reflections upon him in the Jewish writers ; whereby they have shown that they are skilful in the art of slandering, and spare not when they attempt it. Moreover, in this their enmity to Titus, they bear witness to that great event, the overthrow of their city and temple, of which he was, under God, the instrument.

III. I may now make some general remarks ; but they need not to be many nor long.

1. This writer is evidently an impostor, a detestable character, which cannot be too much disliked, nor too much censured : he did not live in the time of Vespasian and Titus, as he pretends ; nor is he Joseph the son of Gorion the priest, who was appointed to preside in Jerusalem, or to govern in Galilee.

2. Nevertheless he is a witness to the burning of the temple and the taking of Jerusalem, and the conquest of Judea, by the fore-mentioned emperors : to those events he has borne his testimony, and his testimony is received by the people of his own nation ; especially by the learned among them.

3. He says that ‘ Titus was compelled by necessity to destroy Jerusalem, and that all this evil had come upon Jerusalem because of the robbers and their wickedness.’

He therefore does not ascribe the calamities which befell the Jews, in the time of Vespasian and Titus, to their sin in rejecting Jesus, and not receiving him as the Messiah. Their calamities he owns, and thereby bears witness to the fulfilment of our Saviour’s prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem : but he does not acknowledge any guilt contracted by his people in crucifying the Lord Jesus, and persecuting his followers : nor does Josephus : nor<sup>a</sup> in-

<sup>z</sup> Hebræi narrant, sed ex odio Titi, quem illum impium vocant, ac si hominem longe post homines natos sceleratissimum dicerent, non modo velis sacris eum vasa templi imposuisse, sed et contaminasse adytum impio facinore, in Gemara Gittin. fol. 56. 2. Cepit meretricem, eaque inductâ in sanctum sanctorum, stratoque legis volumine, facinus patravit super illud. Dein stricto gladio velum perripit, unde sanguis, facto miraculo, missus est, sic ut exiens Titus putaret se Deum ipsum peremisse——Reland. de Spoliis Templi in Arcu Titiano. cap. 13. p. 130, 131.

<sup>a</sup> It is said by some learned men, that Maimonides ascribes the destruction

deed can I well see how any unbelieving Jews can make such acknowledgments. Rabbi Isaac, in his *Munimen Fidei* above quoted, which is written against the christians, quotes John xix. 15, “The chief-priests answered: We have no king but Cæsar.” Upon which he remarks in this manner: ‘This<sup>b</sup> shows that, before Jesus was crucified, the Jews were subject to the Roman emperors. The emperor here intended was Tiberius, who sent Pilate to preside at Jerusalem, as appears from the third chapter of Luke at the beginning. This may suffice for an answer to an objection of the Nazarenes, who say the Jews lost their kingdom for their sin in hanging Jesus.’ This, though it be no better than an evasion, shows the Jewish temper and principles. I say it is no better than an evasion. The Jewish people, as we know very well, were subject to the Romans in our Saviour’s time: but the case was much altered with them afterwards. They were then very happy, and were so for some good while after that, enjoying, under the mild government of the Romans, the free exercise of their religion, and the temple-worship, and many other privileges. The distress, and other circumstances of the siege of Jerusalem, were very uncommon, sufficient to raise the attention of all serious men, and the long duration, and other circumstances of their captivity and dispersion ever since, are also very uncommon and extraordinary; but this is not a time or place for me to enlarge upon them any farther. But it is reasonable to think that unbelieving Jews must endeavour, some how or other, to evade the argument in favour of christianity, taken from the destruction of Jerusalem, and their long-continued captivity and dispersion. And beside the passage just now alleged, the same Rabbi Isaac, in the place before referred to, relating to the death of Agrippa, says, ‘That the<sup>c</sup> difference of Jerusalem to our Lord. So Dr. Sharpe in his argument, &c. p. 38, 39. And De Voisin in *Pr. Rugion. Fidei*. p. 127. Certe R. Moses in tract. *De Regibus, et De Bell.* cap. 11, propter Jesum Christum excidium Jerosolymitanum contigisse fatetur.——Id est, ‘Ille, qui visus est esse Messias, et occisus est sententiâ judiciali, &c. ille fuit causa, cur Israël gladio perierit, et reliquæ Israël dispersæ sint, et depressæ, et cur lex mutata sit.’ But how this is to be understood, I cannot well say. I have not the tract of Maimonides here referred to.

<sup>b</sup> Hæc ibi. Ecce hoc dicto ostenditur, ante Jesu cruci affixionem jam tum Cæsares Romanos Judæis imperitasse. Atque is Cæsar [de quo ibi sermo] Tiberius fuit, qui Pilatum Hierosolymis præfecerat, ceu constat ex capituli iii. Lucæ initio. Valebit hoc pro responso adversus objectionem Nazaræorum, quæ clamitant, Judæos propter peccatum suspensionis Jesu perdidisse regnum suum, &c. R. Isaaci *Munimen Fid.* p. 446. Conf p. 55, 56. *ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> Cæterum, ob illam, quæ inter regem Agrippam et improbos duces factionum exorta fuerat contentionem, denique desolatum fuit templum, uti ex Josepho constat. *Munim. Fid.* p. 417. And see before, p. 538, note ‘.

‘ences between king Agrippa, and the wicked leaders of the factions, at length brought on the desolation of the temple.’

4. This work of Josippon confirms the history of the Jewish war written by Flavius Josephus, son of Matthias; and it must induce us to set a real value upon Josephus, and raise our esteem for him. They are both fond of their own people: but Josephus was indeed contemporary with the events which he records, and with the principal actors in them, and therefore he must have the preference. This author is a plagiarist, and knows nothing of the war of which he writes, but what he has stolen from another, without naming him: and, with all his Greek politeness, Josephus has more the air of sincerity and simplicity than this Hebrew writer. Indeed, it would have been a bad exchange, if, instead of the History of the Jewish War, written by Flavius Josephus, we had palmed upon us the History of the Wars of Jehova, written by Josippon; who neither was the son of Gorion who presided at Jerusalem, nor the son of Matthias who governed in Galilee.

---

## CHAP. VII.

### A RECOLLECTION OF THE FOREGOING ARTICLES, AND REFLECTIONS UPON THEM.

I. *The preceding articles recollected.* II. *Reflections upon them.* III. *Concluding observations.*

I. I QUOTE no more Jewish<sup>a</sup> writers. I therefore now proceed to recollect what we have seen, and to make re-

<sup>a</sup> Some learned men have of late appealed to a book entitled Toldoth Jeschu. I am of opinion that christianity does not need such a testimony, nor such witnesses. I have looked it over several times, with an intention to give some account of it; but, after all, I could not persuade myself to attempt it: for it is a modern work, written in the 14th or 15th century, and is throughout, from the beginning to the end, burlesque and falsehood; nor does the shameless writer acknowledge any thing that has so much as a resemblance of the truth, except in the way of ridicule. I shall however put down here the short censure of Grotius upon this work, though he does not mention the title of it; not thinking it, as I suppose, worthy to be named. ‘Some of the Jews ascribe the miracles of Jesus to a certain secret name,



marks ; but I need not recollect the first two chapters : I hope they have not been improperly premised to this work ; but they need not to be brought in here in the way of recapitulation and recollection : I shall recollect only what we have seen in Jewish writers, beginning with Josephus.

Two things are to be regarded by us—their testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the destruction of Jerusalem.

In Josephus there is a paragraph where JESUS is mentioned very honourably, and agreeably to his true character : but it is not universally received by learned men as genuine. Many are rather of opinion that it has been inserted in his works since his time.

There is in him another paragraph concerning John the Baptist, which is generally received as genuine : and it is a valuable testimony to his preaching, and therein calling men to the practice of virtue. He likewise says that he was put to death by Herod the tetrarch ; but he says nothing of that part of his character, that he appeared as the forerunner of the Messiah.

He likewise acknowledgeth that there was then in Judea a general expectation of a great person to arise from among them, who should obtain the empire of the world ; and that this expectation was one great occasion of the war with the Romans, and that it was built upon an oracle found in their sacred writings ; and that many of their wise men embraced it, and acted upon it in their engaging in the war. He has also spoken of many false prophets who appeared at that time, promising great advantages to the people if they would follow them, and that many were deceived by them. If they did not call themselves Christs, as well as prophets, they did in effect take upon them the character of the Messiah.

In the Mishna it is allowed that there is no express mention of Jesus Christ, the design of that work being to make a collection of the numerous traditions which hitherto were unwritten ; but I have alleged a paragraph<sup>b</sup> which I think contains an invidious representation of the state of things under the gospel dispensation, in the second century.

‘ which was put in the temple by Solomon, and kept by two lions, for above a thousand years, but was conveyed thence by Jesus ; which is not only false, but an impudent fiction, [non mendaciter modo, sed et impudenter confictum est.] For, as to the lions, so remarkable and wonderful a thing, neither the books of the Kings, nor the Chron.cles, nor Josephus, mention any thing of them. Nor did the Romans, who before the times of Jesus entered the temple with Pompey, find any such thing.’ Grotius, *Of the Truth of the Christian Religion*. B. 5. sect. iv. in the version of Dr. John Clarke. And I refer to Wagenseil’s *Confutation of the Toldoth Jeschu*.

<sup>b</sup> See above, p. 511—516

In the Talmudical writings Jesus is mentioned : but as Lightfoot, who was well acquainted with them, says, it was chiefly with a view to wound and reproach him. They call his mother by the name Mary ; but they have aspersed her character, and have assigned to Jesus a spurious nativity. They have mentioned several of our Saviour's disciples, who, as they say, were put to death. They say our Saviour suffered as a malefactor at one of the Jewish Passovers, or in the eve of it, as the expression is. They seem in some places to acknowledge the power of miracles in Jesus and his disciples : and if they had not known that many miraculous works were ascribed to him, they would not have insinuated that he learned magical arts in Egypt, and brought them thence in a private manner, and then set up himself among his countrymen as an extraordinary person.

That is the sum of their testimony upon this article. It would be in vain to expect a great deal from Jews upon this head, who are our enemies. Such are their prejudices, that they are, and always have been, the most inveterate enemies of Jesus and his followers.

Concerning the other point, the destruction of Jerusalem, their testimony is more material, indeed very valuable. Josephus, without intending it, has borne testimony to the fulfilment of all our Saviour's predictions concerning the miseries of the siege of Jerusalem, the desolation of the land of Judea, and the dispersion of his nation. We have above transcribed his account at large. His testimony has been repeated, with some variations, in Josippon's History of the Jewish War : and the Mishna, and the Talmuds likewise, acknowledge the conquest of Judea by Vespasian and Titus, the burning of the temple, or the second house, and the overthrow of Jerusalem, which was dug up to the foundation.

II. But how should this be? How could this come to pass? What should be the reason of it? Does not this deserve serious consideration? Amos iii. 6, "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord has not done it?" Such things are not the effect of chance, but are owing to the direction of Providence. Is. xlv. 7, "I form the light, and create darkness : I make peace, and create evil : I the Lord do all these things." But if God inflict calamities upon any people, it is not without reason ; for all his works are done in truth. So again, in the fore-cited chapter of Amos, ver. 1 and 2 : "Hear this word, that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family, which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying : You only have

I known of all the families of the earth. Therefore I will punish [or visit] you for all your iniquities.”

It is a reasonable maxim : “ Unto whom much is given, of him shall much be required ; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more : ” Luke xii. 48. The people of the Jews had been favoured by God with many privileges ; a suitable improvement might be expected ; if they transgress the laws of God, their punishment will be exemplary ; nor could any thing else but sin alienate the mind of God from them. Is. lix. 1, 2 : “ Behold the Lord’s hand is not shortened that it cannot save : neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear. But your iniquities have separated between you and your God.” And Lam. i. 8 : “ Jerusalem has grievously sinned ; therefore she is removed.” According to the declarations of Moses and all the prophets, the prosperity and adversity of this people would be proportionate to their regard or disregard of the laws of God ; for this I refer to Leviticus, ch. xxvi. and Isaiah, ch. i. And I shall make quotations from the book of Deuteronomy, ch, xxviii. 1, 2 : “ And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all the nations of the earth. And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God——ver. 15. But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments, and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee : 25. The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies. Thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them, and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth——ver. 37. And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb and a by-word among all the nations, whither the Lord shall lead thee——ver. 49, 50. The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far from the end of the earth, [as swift] as the eagle flieth, a nation, whose tongue thou shalt not understand : a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favour to the young : ——ver. 52—59. And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst throughout all thy land. And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, throughout all thy land, which the Lord thy God hath given thee. And thou shalt eat the

fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege, and in the straitness wherewith thy enemies shall distress thee. So that the man, who is tender among you, and very delicate, his eye shall be evil toward his brother, and toward the wife of his bosom, and toward the remnant of his children which he shall leave: so that he will not give to any of them of the flesh of his children, which he shall eat: because he has nothing left him in the siege, and in the straitness wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee in all thy gates. The tender and delicate woman among you which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground, for delicateness and tenderness, her eye shall be evil toward the husband of her bosom, and toward her son, and toward her daughter, and toward her young one that cometh from between her feet, and toward her children which she shall bear. For she shall eat them for the want of all things secretly in the siege, and straitness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates. If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law, which I have written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, the Lord thy God: then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance."

We may be hence apt to think that Moses foresaw the distresses of the siege of Jerusalem, in the year of our Lord 70, and all the calamities endured by the Jewish people about that time, throughout their whole land, and their dispersion afterwards. If he did not foresee them, the words spoken by him were then fulfilled; and all the calamities which then befell the Jewish people, or have since befallen them, are exactly according to the original plan of Divine Providence concerning them.

When the law of the ten commandments was delivered at mount Sinai, the people were greatly terrified; and they earnestly requested that God might speak to them no more in that way: if he would be pleased to speak to them by Moses, they engaged to hear and obey him. God accepted of this request, and assured them that for the future he would reveal his mind to them in a more familiar manner: he would speak unto them by Moses, and afterwards by prophets like unto him: and that there might be no room for mistake, deceit, or delusion, he would furnish those, whom he should send unto them, with sufficient credentials of their mission. If any should come to them in his name

without such credentials, they might be slighted and despised; but if they came with proper credentials, they ought to be heard and obeyed; and if not, it would be resented. This is related several times in the books of Moses, and deserves to be attended to by us.

Ex. xx. 18, 19: "And all the people saw the thundering, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpets, and the mountain smoking.—And they said unto Moses: Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die."

Deut. v. 22—29, "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice—And it came to pass, when ye heard the voice out of the midst of the darkness, (for the mountain did burn with fire,) that ye came near unto me, even all the heads of your tribes and your elders. And ye said: Behold, the Lord our God has shown us his glory, and his greatness, and we have heard his voice out of the midst of the fire—Now therefore, why should we die? For this great fire will consume us. If we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more we shall die—Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say, and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee, and we will hear, and do it. And the Lord heard the voice of your words when ye spake unto me, and the Lord said unto me, I have heard the voice of the words of this people which they have spoken unto thee; they have well said all that they have spoken; O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever!" Which words are supposed to be wonderfully emphatical, expressive of a most ardent wish and desire.

Once more, Deut. xviii. 15—18, "The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me: unto him shall ye hearken. According to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb, in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord thy God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken—I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren," and what follows.

Here is the origin of the prophetic character; men sent from God with a special commission to declare to mankind his mind and will. And from the occasion of this institution

(the great terrors of mount Sinai, and the request thereupon made) it might be argued that, if ever a prophet should arise among the people of Israel, like unto Moses, and meeker than he, and if his miracles, the signs and proofs of his mission, should be more universally saving and beneficent than those of Moses, it should not be any disadvantage to him, nor lessen the respect fit to be shown unto him.

We proceed in considering the texts lying before us.

Deut. xviii. 18—22. Says God to Moses: “I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken to my words, which he shall speak in my name, *I will require it of him.* But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thy heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord has not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord has not spoken, but the prophet has spoken presumptuously. Thou shalt not be afraid of him.”

Here is a general rule for discerning the mission of prophets, or such as should come in that character, as from God. It is a rule that would be of use in all ages; and is here delivered for that purpose.

“If the thing follow not nor come to pass.” Those words do not intend any prediction of some distant good or evil, to come some while hereafter; but they intend a prodigy, or some work above the ordinary course of nature; which he who takes upon him the character of a prophet proposeth, as a sign, or token, or proof of his mission. If the sign proposed by any man, as a token and proof of his mission, be performed, he ought to be hearkened to; if it is not performed, there is no reason to apprehend any harm from despising and rejecting him; he has no message from God; “he has spoken presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him.”

This may appear farther from what is said, ch. xiii. 1, 2, 3: “If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and he giveth a sign, or a wonder;” that is, proposeth some great work as a proof of his mission, “and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods (which thou hast not known) and serve them; thou shalt not hearken to the

words of that prophet, or dreamer of dreams. For the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul.”—ver. 5. “And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death—So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee.”

Here is a case put which never would happen; never would any man be able to perform a miracle in order to induce the people of Israel to worship other gods; but supposing it, he was nevertheless to be disregarded.

In all other cases, the rule here laid down for judging of prophets would hold, and was to be observed by all. If a man proposed some extraordinary work as a proof of his mission, which was not performed, he was not to be regarded. So all the false prophets, spoken of by Josephus, who appeared in the times of Felix, Festus, and other governors of Judea, some while before the destruction of Jerusalem, in order to induce people to follow them, in hopes of deliverance from subjection to the Romans, engaged that they should “see the walls of Jerusalem fall down before them,” to give them easy entrance into the city; or that they “should see the waters of Jordan divided,” that they might go over upon dry ground; or “that God would show them signs in the wilderness,” and the like. But nothing of that kind came to pass.

But if a prophet gave, or proposed a sign or wonder in proof of his mission, and it came to pass, or was performed, it would be decisive in his favour. So, when there were murmurings and disputings among the people of Israel in the wilderness, which tribe should have the priesthood, it was proposed that “twelve rods, each having the name of the prince of the tribe upon it, and another rod, with Aaron’s name upon it, for Levi, should be laid up in the tabernacle, before the testimony;” and his rod which blossomed should be known to be the man whom God had chosen. “Moses then laid up the rods before the Lord, in the tabernacle of witness. And it came to pass, that on the morrow Moses went into the tabernacle of witness; and behold, the rod of Aaron, for the house of Levi, budded, and brought forth blossoms, and yielded almonds. And Moses brought out all the rods from before the Lord unto all the children of Israel; and they looked, and took every man his rod:” Numb. xvii. So that point was determined, and the “murmurings of the children of Israel ceased.” And so it must be in all other like cases. If a “sign,” or “wonder,” has

been “given” or proposed, and it is performed, or “comes to pass,” it is decisive.

Here then is the rule. If a man come, and speak in the name of God, and prove his commission by signs and wonders, he is to be regarded and received as a prophet. And God declares “whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, *I will require it of him,*” Deut. xviii. 19. It cannot be otherwise. The consequence of disobedience to the word of the Lord, so manifested and confirmed, must be dreadful.

Let us now apply this. Jesus spoke in the name of God, faithfully delivered the words which he had received from God, and performed many miracles in proof of his commission. John xii. 49, 50, “For I have not spoken of myself: but the Father, which hath sent me, he gave me commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting. Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.” Ch. viii. 42, “I proceeded forth and came from God: neither came I of myself, but he sent me.”

And in proof of his mission he appealed to his works, which were great and numerous, and openly performed in the view of all men. John v. 31, 32, 33, “If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me, and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. 36 But I have greater witness than that of John; for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, they bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me.” And ch. xv. 24, “If I had not done among them the works which no other man did, they had not had sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.”

If Moses and the ancient prophets wrought miracles, there is as good reason to believe Jesus likewise did so, and more than any of them, or than all of them together. For the testimony of the writers of the New Testament is as credible as that of the writers of the Old Testament. And

<sup>c</sup> Si quis paganus ab ipsis Judæis quærat, cur credant miracula a Mose facta, nihil dicant aliud, quam inter suos adeo perpetuam constantemque ejus rei fuisse famam, ut non potuerit, nisi ex testimonio eorum qui vidissent, proficisci. Sic ab Elisæo [2 Reg. cap. iv.] auctum apud viduam oieum; purgatum [cap. v.] subito a malâ scabie Syrum, hospitæ [ib. iv.] filium ad vivum revocatum, et similia alia credunt Judæi, non aliam sane ob causam, quam quod testes bonæ fidei id proditum ad posteros transmiserunt. Grot. de V. R. C. l. v. sect. ii.



if it be said that Elijah was taken up to heaven, it<sup>d</sup> is as credible that Jesus was raised from the dead, and afterwards ascended up to heaven.

Our Lord asserted his prophetic character, and his peculiar character of the Messiah; and often reminded the Jews of the terrible consequences of rejecting him who spake in the name of God, or, in the words of Moses, that it "would be required of them." John viii. 24, "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Ver. 25, "They said unto him, Who art thou? Jesus said unto them, Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning." John the Baptist often said the same—that "he was not the Christ, but was sent before him," John iii. 28; and see ch. i. 19—37.

But, not to multiply texts, I shall quote Matt. xxi. 33—44, "Hear another parable. There was a certain householder, who planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen that they might receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again he sent other servants unto them, more than the first; and they did unto them likewise. Last of all he sent unto them his son, [the Messiah,] saying: They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves: This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When therefore the Lord of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him: He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their season. Jesus saith unto them: Did you never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes:" Psalm cxviii. 22, 23, "Therefore I say unto you: The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but

<sup>d</sup> De Eliæ vero in cœlum raptu, unius Elisæi, tanquam viri omni exceptione majoris, testimonio fidem habent. At nos de Christi adscensu in cœlum duodecim proferimus testes vitæ inculpatæ; de Christo post mortem in terris viso multo plures. Quæ si vera sunt, verum sit necesse est Christi dogma: planeque nihil a Judæis pro se adferri potest, quod non et nobis pari aut potiori jure possit aptari. Grot. ib.

on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder. And when the chief-priests and pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them. This should be compared with Luke xx. 9—18.

Here our Lord speaks of the ancient prophets, and then of himself, and shows the dreadful consequences of rejecting him, and his message. There is another thing that should be observed, which is what our Lord added concerning the treatment to be given to his apostles and evangelists, the prophets of the New Testament, also sent to the Jewish people. Matt. xxiii. 29—39, “Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites, because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye are witnesses to yourselves that ye are the children of them who slew the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes. And some of them ye will kill and crucify, and some of them ye will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, [rather son of Jehoiada, 2 Chron. xxiv. 17—22,<sup>e</sup>] whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee! How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you: Ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.”

All this is properly said by our Lord in his prophetic denunciations. Not only the rejection of Jesus himself would be “required of them,” but likewise their refusal to hearken to his apostles. For they likewise were prophets, and spake by divine inspiration. They spake in the name of God, and delivered his mind and word, and proved their mission by miraculous works. If therefore, after having crucified the Lord Jesus, the Jewish people should proceed to treat in like manner his disciples, who were sent to them; if they should “scourge them in their synagogues,” and

<sup>e</sup> See Vol. i. B. ii. ch. vi. &c.

put some of them to death, "and persecute them from city to city," (as he foresaw they would,) they would then bring upon themselves, in the end, a terrible condemnation: and such miseries would befall them, that it would seem as if all the righteous blood shed from the foundation of the world had been required of them.

And that they did so treat the apostles and other disciples of Jesus, appears from the books of the New Testament. These things may have been already taken notice of by us: nevertheless they must be here briefly recollected. How the apostles of Jesus were apprehended, imprisoned, beaten, and farther threatened, may be seen in the book of the Acts, ch. iv. and v. Somewhile afterwards, ch. vi. and vii. "Stephen was stoned, and there was a great persecution against the church, which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." Some time after this, when Herod Agrippa had been advanced to the kingdom of Judea by the Romans, we are informed, ch. xii. 1—4, that "he stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded farther to take Peter also." But after he had been imprisoned he was miraculously delivered "out of the hands of Herod, and from the expectation of all the people of the Jews." St. Paul, writing to the Hebrews, ch. x. 33, 34, bids them "call to remembrance the former days, in which, after they had been illuminated, they had endured a great fight of afflictions: partly," says he, "whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly whilst ye were companions of those who were so used. For ye had compassion upon those who were in bonds, and bore joyfully the spoiling of your goods: knowing that ye have in heaven a better and a more enduring substance." And we have good reason to believe that James, called the Lord's brother, the apostle, who generally resided at Jerusalem, was put to death by the Jews there in a tumultuous manner, about the year of Christ 62.

How Paul acted in the early days of the gospel, and whilst he was under the direction of the chief-priests and pharisees, we know partly from the Acts of the Apostles, and partly from his own epistles. It is said, Acts viii. 1, that he "was consenting to the death of Stephen." And ch. vii. 58, "When he was stoned, the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was Saul." And afterwards, chap. ix. 1, 2, "But Saul, yet breathing out

threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high-priest and desired of him letters to Damascus, to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." And in his speech before king Agrippa, and the governor Festus, Acts xxvi. 9—12, he says himself: "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which thing I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and, being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities. Whereupon he set out for Damascus, with authority and commission from the chief-priests." But in his way thither he met with a check, received new light, to which he submitted, and became a true penitent and sincere convert; and then preached the faith, which for some while he had endeavoured to destroy. Compare Gal. i. 13—24; 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9; Eph. iii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 12—14.

How he was treated by the Jews, after his conversion, we know from the history in the Acts, and from his own epistles. For when he began to preach the gospel at Damascus, "the Jews laid wait for him, and they watched the gates day and night to kill him. But the disciples took him by night, and let him down by the wall in a basket," Acts ix. 24, 25. Of which great danger, and his wonderful escape, he speaks himself in an affecting manner, 2 Cor. xi. 31—33. When he came to Jerusalem from Damascus, "and disputed with the Grecians," or Jewish proselytes, "they went about to slay him," Acts ix. 29. For which cause the disciples found it prudent to bring him down to Cæsarea, that he might go to Tarsus.

The Jews out of Judea acted in the like manner. At Antioch in Pisidia, Paul having preached there with some success, both among Jews and Gentiles, "the Jews, moved with envy, stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts:" Acts xiii. 50, and see ver. 45. They therefore went to Iconium, where also they had some converts among Jews and Gentiles. "But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected toward the brethren—But the multitude of the city was divided—And

when there was an assault made both of the Gentiles and of the Jews, with their rulers, to use them despitefully, and to stone them, they were aware of it, and fled to Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and unto the region that lieth round about. And there they preached the gospel:" ch. xiv. 1—7. At Lystra a great miracle was wrought by Paul upon a "lame man, who had been a cripple from his mother's womb, and never had walked." And the people of the place were disposed to give divine honours to Paul and Barnabas, which they refused to accept. "But there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the people. And, having stoned Paul, they drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead. Howbeit, as the disciples stood round about him, he rose up and came into the city. And the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe:" chap. xiv. 1—20. And having passed through several places they returned to Antioch in Syria, from which place they had been sent out with special recommendations to the grace of God: ver. 21—28. All which things therefore happened in what is sometimes called the first peregrination of Paul and Barnabas.

How the Jews acted at Thessalonica, may be seen, Acts xvii. 1—9; at Berea, may be seen, ver. 10—15. How they behaved at Corinth, may be seen, ch. xviii. ver. 5—20, And when Paul came to Jerusalem, afterwards, in the year of Christ 58, as we compute, he was very hard pressed by the Jews there, where was their great council, and where the whole nation was gathered together at the feast of Pentecost, as is related, Acts xxi. and xxii. Nor was there any visible means of his escaping out of their hands with his life, but by appealing to the emperor himself, notwithstanding the favourable dispositions of the Roman governors, Felix and Festus, to show him equity: by which appeal he obtained leave to go to Rome, where he lived two whole years in a kind of free custody, "receiving all that came in unto him, and preaching the kingdom of God, and those things which concern the Lord Jesus, with all confidence, no man forbidding him:" chap. xxviii. 30, 31. And then he was set at liberty, and went abroad again.

Thus the Jews resisted the counsel of God, and went on accumulating guilt, and laying up a store of vengeance to fall upon them, when God saw fit, and when the measure of their iniquity was full. As St. Paul says to the Thessalonians, I ep. ii. 14, "For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God, which in Judea are in Christ Jesus. For ye also have suffered the like things of your country-

men, even as they have of the Jews; who have killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles, that they may be saved, to fill up their sins always. For the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost."

For certain, such things cannot be overlooked by the sovereign Lord and Governor of all nations, and of the Jewish nation especially. For he has said, and it is agreeable to reason, and to all the rules of right government, that "if he raiseth up a prophet, and putteth his words in his mouth, and he speaks all that he has commanded him, it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, *I will require it of him*;" Deut. xviii. 18, 19. This rule was laid down and promulgated by Moses himself, the great lawgiver of the Jews; and, as before observed, it was to be a standing rule. If faithful messengers, who deliver truly the message they have received from God are rejected, and not only not hearkened to, but abused, the God of the prophets will resent it, and show his displeasure. Accordingly, soon after the events before related, wrath did come upon the Jewish people to a very remarkable degree. And the numbers of those who perished at Jerusalem and in Judea, by the famine and by the sword, and by intestine feuds and divisions, or otherwise, was very extraordinary, and even unparalleled, as we know from Josephus, a contemporary writer of their own nation, and from Josippon, a Jew likewise, and from others.

Josephus, who was a witness of that awful scene, often acknowledgeth the hand of God in it. Cestius Gallus, president of Syria, made a successful attempt upon Jerusalem, and then withdrew: whereupon he says, 'If<sup>f</sup> Cestius had continued the siege a little longer, he would have taken the city; but God, as I think, for the wickedness of the people abhorring his own solemnities, suffered not the war to come to an end at that time.' When John of Gischala escaped from out of the hands of Vespasian, and got to Jerusalem, he says, 'It<sup>g</sup> was the work of God, who saved John for the destruction of Jerusalem.' In another place<sup>h</sup> he says, that 'God had blinded their minds for the transgressions which they had been guilty of.' And 'Never<sup>i</sup> did any city endure so great calamities: nor was there ever from the beginning of the world any time more fruitful of wick-

<sup>f</sup> See before in this volume, p. 127.

<sup>g</sup> P. 434.

<sup>h</sup> P. 443.

<sup>i</sup> P. 441.

‘edness.’ Again, ‘Indeed<sup>k</sup> it was God who had condemned the whole nation, and defeated every method taken for their preservation.’ When the temple was burning, he says, ‘Certainly<sup>l</sup> the divine sentence had long ago condemned it to the fire.’ He also observes, that ‘they<sup>m</sup> did not attend to the prodigies which evidently foretold their desolation; but like men infatuated, who have neither eyes to see, nor minds to consider, they disregarded the divine denunciations.’ He also observes, that ‘the<sup>n</sup> whole nation was then shut up as in a prison; and the Romans encompassed the city when it was crowded with inhabitants. Accordingly, the multitude of them who perished therein exceeded all the destructions that ever man or God brought upon the world. And<sup>o</sup> the whole circumference of the city was so thoroughly laid even with the ground, by them who dug it up to the foundation, that there was nothing left to make those who came thither believe it had ever been inhabited.’ So writes Josephus, in the Greek language, in the face of the whole world, not many years after the Jewish war was ended. And says Eleazar, in his speech at Massada, recorded by the same historian, ‘The metropolis of the whole nation, the city, which we believed to have God inhabiting it, has been rooted up to the foundation, and the holy temple has been profanely dug up to the foundation.’

Such was the end of the siege of Jerusalem in the second year of Vespasian, and the year of Christ 70. And thus were accomplished the predictions of Jesus concerning the city of Jerusalem, and the temple, and the Jewish people, if they did not repent.

Here I might conclude: but if any should be desirous to see this argument in all its force, and in its full light, it will be requisite to look farther back, and ascend up to the origin of this people; and then trace their history through the several periods of it: for they are a people separated from all other nations, chosen of God, for very great ends and purposes, to uphold the belief of the Divine Unity, the doctrine of a Divine Providence concerning itself in the affairs of mankind, upon the belief of which all religious worship depends, and to preserve the expectation of the coming of a great person to redeem the human race from error and vice, and the bad consequences of their deviation from truth and virtue: Gen. iii. 15.

For these ends God chose Abraham, and brought him out

<sup>k</sup> P. 447.

<sup>n</sup> P. 462.

<sup>l</sup> P. 450.

<sup>o</sup> P. 463.

<sup>m</sup> P. 451.

<sup>p</sup> P. 464.

of<sup>9</sup> “Ur of the Chaldees. When he called him out of his country, and from his kindred, and from his father’s house, he said: I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing—And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed:” Gen. xii. 1—3. The fulfilment of which magnificent promise was limited to Isaac, or his seed by Sarah: Gen. xvii. and afterwards to Jacob: Gen. xxvii. xxviii. And when his posterity was greatly increased, after their sojourning a while in Egypt, where they had been treated in a servile manner, God brought them out of that country, with a “mighty hand and an out-stretched arm,” working many great and conspicuous miracles for their safety. Whilst they were in the wilderness he gave to them a system of laws, the ten principal of which were delivered from mount Sinai with great solemnity, and then engraved on tables of stone by the finger of God. God then brought them into the land of Canaan, where they became a flourishing and powerful nation, according to the promise made to Abraham concerning Sarah, when she was yet barren, that “she should be a mother of nations, and kings of people should be of her:” Gen. xvii. 16.

David intended to build a house for the name of the Lord: but that honour was reserved for his son Solomon: the divine approbation of David’s design is manifest; and God, by inspiration, gave him the form and dimensions of the house, and the order of the worship to be performed there; 1 Chr. xxviii. 11—13: “Then<sup>r</sup> David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of the porch, and of the houses thereof, [or of the house, and the apartments thereof,] and of the treasuries thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the place of the mercy-seat; and the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and of all the chambers round about, of the treasuries of the house of God, and of the treasuries of the delicate things. Also for the courses of the priests and the Levites, and for all the work of the service of the house of the Lord—ver. 19. All this,” said David, “the Lord made me to understand in writing [as if it were inscribed on his mind] by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern.”

When the house was finished, and dedicated by a prayer

<sup>9</sup> Gen. xv. 7. Neh. ix. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Dedit autem David Salomoni filio suo descriptionem—id est, dedit ei fornax conspicuam, qualem Deus animo inscripserat, ut dicitur infra, ver. 19. Grot.



suitable to the great occasion, 2 Chr. v. vi. we are informed, ch. vii. 12, “ that the Lord appeared to Solomon by night, and said unto him : I have heard thy prayer, and have chosen this place to myself for an house of sacrifice. 15, 16, Now mine eyes shall be open, and mine ears attent unto the prayer that is made in this place. For now have I chosen and sanctified this house, that my name may be there for ever, and mine eyes and my heart shall be there perpetually —19—22. But if ye turn away, and forsake my statutes and my commandments, which I have set before you, and serve other gods, and worship them, then will I pluck them up by the roots out of my land which I have given them. And this house, which I have sanctified for my name, will I cast out of my sight, and make it to be a proverb, and a by-word among all nations. And this house, which is high, shall be an astonishment to every one that passeth by it, so that he shall say : Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land, and to this house ? And it shall be answered, Because they forsook the God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and laid hold on other gods, and worshipped them ; and served them : therefore hath he brought all this evil upon them.”

And though God is ever merciful, and full of compassion, “ and forgave their iniquity, and many a time turned away his anger, and did not stir up all his wrath,” [Ps. lxxviii. 38, and what follows, and Neh. ix.] yet at length the provocation of their repeated idolatries, and gross immoralities, after the renewed admonitions of his prophets, was such, that God gave them up into the hands of their enemies. So this is related, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15—20, “ And the Lord God of their fathers sent unto them by his messengers, rising up early, and sending them, because he had compassion upon his people, and his dwelling-place. But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord rose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword, in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age : he gave them all into his hand ; and all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king, and of his princes ; all these things brought he to Babylon. And they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof.

And them that had escaped from the sword carried he to Babylon: where they were servants to him, and his sons, until the reign of the kingdom of Persia.”

That was the overthrow of the temple and city of Jerusalem, and the kingdom of Judah at that time. All which is related at large, and rather more particularly, in the fifty-second and last chapter of the book of Jeremiah: and may be seen also in 2 Kings, ch. xxiv. xxv.

And it may be worth the while to observe here, Jer. xxv. 1—11, “ The word that came unto Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, which was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon: Which Jeremiah the prophet spake unto all the people of Judah, and to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying: From the thirteenth year of Josiah the son of Amon, king of Judah, even unto this day, (that is, the three-and-twentieth year,) the word of the Lord hath come unto me, and I have spoken unto you, rising early, and speaking, but ye have not hearkened. And the Lord hath sent unto you<sup>s</sup> all his servants the prophets, rising early, and sending them, but ye have not hearkened, nor inclined your ear to hear. *They said,* Turn ye again now every one from his evil way, and from the evil of your doings, and dwell in the land that the Lord hath given to you, and to your fathers for ever. And go not after other gods to serve and to worship them, and provoke me not to anger with the works of your hands, and I will do you no hurt. Yet ye have not hearkened unto me, saith the Lord, that ye might provoke me to anger, with the works of your hands to your own hurt. Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, because ye have not heard my words, behold I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon my servant, and bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof—And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment. And these nations shall serve the king of Babylon<sup>t</sup> seventy years.”

It ought to be here particularly observed by us, that this calamity is said to have been brought at length upon this

<sup>s</sup> Jeremiah seems there to intend, as prophets of former times, so also some who were contemporary with him, two of which are mentioned in scripture, Zephaniah, whose prophecies we have, and Urijah, mentioned here, ch. xxvi. 20. See Lowth upon the place. And says Grotius upon ver. 1. A tertio anno regni Josiæ. — Nam 31 annis regnavit Josias. Ab his deme 12, et adde annos 4 Joakimi; sunt ipsi anni 23. Per quos nullo labore et se et socios suos abstinnisse ait Jeremias, ut ad meliorem frugem populum reduceret.

<sup>t</sup> Prædictio insignis, ob ita exactam temporis designationem. Grot.

people “because they had refused to hearken to the words of God, spoken to them by the prophets.”

The vessels of the temple were carried to Babylon, and lodged in the temple there dedicated to Belus. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 7, “Nebuchadnezzar also carried of the vessels of the house of the Lord to Babylon, and put them in his temple at Babylon.” They are more particularly enumerated, Jer. lii. 17—23. This, undoubtedly, was intended by way of scorn and insult to the conquered people of Israel, and as a triumph over the God whom they worshipped. Nevertheless they were thereby preserved, and many of them were afterwards returned. That they were there near the end of the captivity we learn from the profane and unseasonable feast made by Belshazzar, as related, Dan. v. 1—4. “Who then commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels, which his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple, which is at Jerusalem, that the king and his princes, and his wives and concubines, might drink therein.” At the end of the captivity, when Cyrus permitted the people to return to their own country, he also gave orders for the restoring of these vessels, as related at the beginning of the book of Ezra, ch. i. 1—11, “Now, in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, (that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled,) the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made proclamation, throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying: Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia. The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? His God be with him, and let him go to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God which is at Jerusalem —Also Cyrus the king brought forth the vessels of the house of the Lord, which Nebuchadnezzar had brought out of Jerusalem, and had put them in the house of his god. Even these did Cyrus king of Persia bring forth by the hand of Mithredath the treasurer, and numbered them unto Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah. And this is the number of them: thirty chargers of gold, a thousand chargers of silver, nine-and-twenty knives: thirty basons of gold: silver basons of a second sort, four hundred and ten, and other vessels a thousand. All the vessels of gold and silver were five thousand and four hundred. All these did Sheshbazzar bring up with them of the captivity, that were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem.”

The first thing that was done by them, after their return to

Jerusalem, was restoring the altar for burnt-offerings. Ezra iii. 2, "Then stood up Joshua, the son of Josedeck, and his brethren the priests, and Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, and his brethren, and builded the altar of the God of Israel to offer burnt-offerings thereon—From the first day of the seventh month began they to offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord, But the foundation of the temple of the Lord was not yet laid." The building of the temple met with opposition; and therefore it was several years before it was finished: which is mentioned, Ezra vi. 14—16, "And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet, and Zachariah the son of Iddo, and they builded, and finished it, according to the commandment of Cyrus and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia. And this house was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king. And the children of Israel, the priests and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house with joy."

At first they were discouraged by the little prospect they had of raising the temple suitably to their wishes. Ezra iii. 12, "Many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, who had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice, and many shouted aloud for joy." But God himself encouraged them to proceed with the most gracious assurances. Haggai ii. 1—7. "In the seventh month, in the one-and-twentieth day of the month, came the word of the Lord by the prophet Haggai, saying: Speak now to Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and to Joshua, the son of Josedeck the high-priest, and to the residue of the people. Who is left among you that saw this house in its first glory? And how do you see it now? Is it not in your eyes, in comparison of it, as nothing? Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedeck, the priest, and be strong all ye people of the land, saith the Lord of hosts, and work: for I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts. According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts: Yet once a little while—And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come. And I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." See likewise ch. i. and Zech. i. ii. iii. and viii.

And now they restored the worship of God at the temple,

according to the prescriptions of the law of Moses, for offering sacrifices. They kept the feast of the passover, and other great feasts, according to the law of Moses, and the priests and Levites were set to officiate in their courses. So, after the setting up the altar of burnt-offering, and their beginning to lay the foundation of the temple, it is said, Ezra iii. 10, "And when the builders laid," or were laying, "the foundation of the temple of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals, to praise the Lord after the ordinance of David king of Israel." And afterwards, when the temple was raised, it is said, Ezra vi. 18, "And they set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God, which is at Jerusalem, as it is written in the book of Moses." Then it follows, ver. 19, "And the children of the captivity," that is, who were returned from their captivity, "kept the passover, upon the fourteenth day of the first month."

Thus the worship of God was again restored, and set up at his temple in Jerusalem. And though, undoubtedly, in the intermediate space the Jews met with various difficulties from surrounding enemies, and were now in subjection to the Romans, yet in the time of our Saviour and his apostles the Jewish people had free access to the temple, performed their sacrifices there, kept the Passover and Pentecost, and other great solemnities, according to the appointments of the law of Moses; and the genealogies of their tribes were in being: Jesus, our Lord, was of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David, though then in low circumstances: Matt. i. and ii; Luke i. and ii. Zacharias, father of John the Baptist, was of the course of Abia, and his wife Elisabeth was of the daughters of Aaron: and he executed the priest's office before God at the temple, in the order of his course. Luke i. 5—12, "Anna, a prophetess," is said to have been "the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser, a widow of fourscore years of age, who departed not from the temple, and served God with fastings and prayers night and day."

But it is not needful to add any thing more, it being apparent from the books of the New Testament, and from Josephus, as well as from other writings, that the worship at the temple in Jerusalem subsisted till the second year of Vespasian, and the year of Christ 70, in which year they had come up in great numbers to keep the Passover, and were suddenly shut up in the city by the Roman army.

The times of the first and second temple are computed by

Dr. Lightfoot in this manner ; ‘ The <sup>u</sup> time of the standing  
 ‘ of the first temple, from its finishing in the eleventh year  
 ‘ of Solomon, to its firing by Nebuzaradan, was four hundred  
 ‘ and twenty years.’ ‘ From the <sup>v</sup> first year of Cyrus (in  
 ‘ which he proclaimed redemption to the captives, and gave  
 ‘ commandment to restore and build Jerusalem) to the  
 ‘ death of Christ were four hundred and ninety years, as  
 ‘ they are summed up by an angel, Dan. ix. and from the  
 ‘ death of Christ to the fatal and final destruction of Jerusa-  
 ‘ lem, were forty years more ; five hundred and thirty years in  
 ‘ all.’ Which two numbers make no more than nine hundred  
 and fifty years. In another place <sup>w</sup> he computes the times  
 of the two temples to be exactly one thousand years. Others  
 may make different computations ; but now we need not  
 concern ourselves about a nice exactness : however, I refer  
 to <sup>x</sup> Prideaux, who may be consulted.

III. I shall now shut up these reflections with some con-  
 cluding observations.

Obs. I. The temple at Jerusalem was designed by David,  
 and erected by Solomon with divine approbation ; and the  
 worship there performed was of divine appointment : and  
 as the building itself, and the worship there, had a divine  
 sanction, it was fit that a suitable respect should be shown  
 to the place itself, and to the ordinances there enjoined,  
 by all the worshippers of the true God.

Solomon,<sup>y</sup> and all understanding Israelites, were per-  
 suaded of the divine omnipresence. Nevertheless, as God  
 had determined to make peculiar manifestations of himself  
 at the temple, it was fit that respect should be shown to it.  
 1 Kings viii. 27—30, “ But will God dwell on this earth ?  
 Behold the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee : how  
 much less this house that I have built ? Yet have thou re-  
 spect unto the prayer of thy servant——That thine eyes  
 may be open toward this house, night and day, even toward  
 the place of which thou hast said, My name shall be there :  
 [Deut. xii. 11.] And hearken thou to the supplication of

<sup>u</sup> The Temple as it stood in the Time of our Saviour, ch. 40, p. 2063.

<sup>v</sup> Ib. p. 2064.

<sup>w</sup> ‘ If Jerusalem was destroyed exactly  
 ‘ forty years after our Saviour’s death, as it is apparent,—then that destruction  
 ‘ of it befell just in the four thousandth year of the world. And so, as the  
 ‘ temple of Solomon had been finished anno mundi exactly 3000, so in anno  
 ‘ mundi exactly 4000 both the city and the temple that then was, were de-  
 ‘ stroyed, never to be repaired or rebuilt again. And from that time most  
 ‘ properly began the kingdom of heaven, and the New Jerusalem, when that  
 ‘ earthly kingdom, and that old city, were utterly ruined.’ Harmony of the  
 four Evangelists, vol. i. p. 487.

<sup>x</sup> See his Connexion, &c. year before Christ, 458, vol. i. p. 262, &c.

<sup>y</sup> See his letter to Hiram, king of Tyre, 2 Chr. ii. 1—7.

thy servant, and of thy people Israel, when they shall pray toward this place. And hear thou in heaven thy dwelling place, and when thou hearest forgive." See likewise ver. 45—50.

“And when Solomon had made an end of praying, fire came down from heaven, and consumed the burnt-offering, and the sacrifice; and the glory of the Lord filled the house,” 2 Chr. vii. 1. “And the Lord appeared to Solomon by night, and said unto him: I have heard thy prayer, and have chosen this place to myself for an house of sacrifice. If I shut up heaven, that there be no rain—or if I send pestilence among my people, if my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land——For now have I chosen and sanctified this house, that my name may be there for ever: and mine eyes and my heart shall be there perpetually:” ver. 12—16.

Accordingly, Daniel, who was renowned for secular wisdom, as well as for divine illuminations, and eminent piety, when his fidelity to God met with a severe trial, as we are told, ch. vi. 10, “he went into his house, and, his window being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled down upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.” Comp. 1 Kings viii. 48; Ps. v. 3; Jonah ii. 4. And the Lord Jesus was often at Jerusalem, especially at the great festivals. And twice in the course of his ministry he cleared the temple of some abuses and incumbrances, and severely rebuked those who practised those indecencies, or connived at them.

Obs. 2. The temple and the city of Jerusalem were twice destroyed; once by the Chaldeans, a second time by the Romans.

The city of Jerusalem was besieged and taken several times besides; by Antiochus Epiphanes, Pompey, and Herod the Great, and others. But now we confine ourselves to those seasons when the city was ruined, and the temple also was destroyed.

Obs. 3. The taking of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans was a very grievous calamity.

The particulars are related, Jer. lii; 2 Kings xxiv. xxv; 2 Chron. xxxvi. Daniel, in his confessions, ch. ix. 12, says: “For under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem.” It was a calamity not easy to be paralleled in all its circumstances. Which was agreeable

to the maxim before observed, "that where much is given, there also much will be required," and to the words of God by the prophet Amos: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities."

Obs. 4. The final captivity of the Jewish people by the Romans has been a much greater calamity than that by the Chaldeans. It exceeds in many respects.

(1.) The distresses of the siege of Jerusalem, and the numbers that perished there by famine or sword, by the hands of the Romans, or by their own intestine divisions, and the numbers carried captive, exceeded all the desolations that ever were. It happened when the city was crowded with people, they being assembled together at one of their festivals; and the city itself, its buildings, its walls, and the temple were demolished, and thrown down to the foundation, so as they had never been before. So our Lord foretold, Matt. xxiv. 21, "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world, to this time: no, nor ever shall be." So Jesus said it would be; and Josephus says, it was so, and that 'it exceeded all the 'destructions ever brought upon the world by God or 'man.'

(2.) The captivity by the Romans has exceeded the former in duration.

This second captivity has now already lasted almost seventeen hundred years, without any the least prospect of a period to it. That was limited to seventy years only, according to the word of God by Jeremiah, ch. xxv. 12—18; xxix. 10—14; and Dan. ix. 1, 2.

(3.) During the captivity by the Chaldeans, the Jewish people had prophets among them, but now they have none.

In this second captivity, as they are without altar, and sacrifice, and temple, and city of their own, so are they, all this while, without visions, and prophecies, and divine illuminations of every kind.

In the former captivity they had several prophets of great eminence. Jeremiah continued to prophesy to the remains of the people in Judea several years after the beginning of the captivity. Ezekiel and Daniel prophesied in Babylon. These, and other good men, may have been of great service for bringing men to repentance, and fitting them for the expected deliverance. And, during that period of seventy years, there were miraculous deliverances vouchsafed to some: the preservation, particularly, of the three young men



in the fiery furnace : Dan. iii. Then Daniel's satisfactory interpretations of Nebuchadnezzar's dreams, ch. ii. and iv. and Daniel's great advancement, and some other extraordinary occurrences, were much in their favour. They must have tended to influence the minds of the great princes to whom they were subject; and must have been means of facilitating their deliverance, and accomplishing their safe return into their own country, and to their happy settlement in it. But we hear not of any such like favourable appearances in the present captivity and dispersion.

Obs. 5. All these calamities, those of the former and of the latter captivity, have happened to the Jewish people, agreeably to the original plan of divine dispensations concerning them.

This observation was mentioned formerly : but it is repeated here as a thing of great importance : and we have an acknowledgment of it in Daniel's confessions, with regard to the Babylonish captivity, ch. ix. 11 : "Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice. Therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses, the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. —13 : As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us." See Lev. xxvi. 14—46; Deut. xxviii. 15, &c. What is here said of the captivity by the Chaldeans, is as true of the captivity by the Romans, and ought to be in like manner acknowledged.

Obs. 6. Our blessed Lord's predictions therefore of evil coming upon Jerusalem and the people of Judea, did not proceed from private resentment, enmity, malice, ill-will, or any other unsociable affection, from which the mind of the blessed Jesus was always free : but they were declarations of the counsel of God, prophetic denunciations of evil to come, if men did not repent ; faithful warnings to men to take heed to themselves ; and earnest and affectionate calls to repentance and reformation, that the impending and threatened calamities might be averted and avoided.

A prophet, who is intrusted with the mind of God, must faithfully deliver both promises to obedience, and threatenings to disobedience, as is required. Says Moses to the people under his care, for whose welfare and prosperity he was greatly concerned, Deut. iv. 5 : "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me.—ver. 25, 26. "But if thou do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger, I call heaven and earth to witness that ye shall soon utterly perish

from off the land, whereunto you go over Jordan to possess it : ye shall not prolong your days upon it : but shall utterly be destroyed." Nor was Jeremiah to be charged with ill-will to the Jewish people when he foretold the desolations of the Chaldean captivity.

Obs. 7. The great aggravation of the transgressions of the Jewish people, lay in their not hearkening to the messages of the prophets, which God sent among them.

This was observed before from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15, 16, and from Jerem. xxv. 1—11, to which I now add that it is particularly mentioned by Daniel in his devout and humble confession of the sins of that people, which brought upon them the Babylonish captivity, ch. ix. 5, 6, "We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled even by departing from thy precepts and thy judgments. Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, who spoke in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of Israel." By which, certainly, these prophets manifested their fidelity. And the reason of this is, that refusing to hearken to messages of God, faithfully delivered by his prophets, demonstrates obstinacy and irreclaimableness. This is represented by our Lord in the parable of the fig-tree, Luke xiii. 6—10, and of the husbandmen, Matt. xxi. 33, &c. and in other parables and discourses. The parable of the fig-tree, just mentioned, is thus : "A certain man had a fig-tree planted in his vineyard. And he came, and sought fruit thereon, and found none. Then said he to the dresser of the vineyard : Behold these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, and find none ; cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground ? And he answering said : Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it : if it bear fruit, well ; if not, thou shalt cut it down." So God said of old to the people of Israel by Isaiah, after having in a like manner represented his care and cultivation of his vineyard. Is. v. 3—5, "And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, than I have done in it ? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes ? I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard ; I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up : and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down."

This was the case in the time of our Saviour. After all other prophets, came Jesus, who taught the people in the name of God, and faithfully delivered his mind to them, and

called them to repentance, and wrought many wonderful works. There was then a great profusion of spiritual gifts in himself and his apostles. If their message was not hearkened to, but rejected, and they abused, it would be an aggravated provocation, and would be required of the people to whom they had spoken in the name of God.

Obs. 8. Finally, in the eighth and last place, let us now inquire and consider what was the sin, what the sins or offences, that occasioned the great calamity which befell the Jewish people about forty years after the times of the Lord Jesus, under the conduct of those two generals Vespasian and Titus.

We have seen accounts in Josephus, and other Jewish writers, of the distresses then suffered by the Jewish people at Jerusalem, and in other parts of Judea, and of the destruction and demolition of their city and temple, and their captivity and dispersion, which still continue. And we have seen evident proofs that the hand of God was therein, and that all came to pass by the overruling providence of God. It is an affecting subject. And if we make inquiries into the reasons and causes of these great calamities, we should do it seriously and impartially, and may be disposed also to compassion and candour.

When God appeared to Solomon, after he had finished and dedicated the temple, he graciously assured him that he accepted the prayer which he had made, and that he would hearken to the prayers which his people should make to him toward that place in their distresses. Nevertheless he declares, 2 Chron. vii. 19—22: “But if ye turn away and forsake my statutes, and my commandments, which I have set before you, and serve other gods, and worship them: then will I pluck them up by the roots out of my land which I have given them. And this house which I have sanctified for my name will I cast out of my sight, and will make it to be a proverb, and a by-word among all nations. And this house, which is high, shall be an astonishment to every one that passeth by it: so that he shall say; Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land and unto this house? And it shall be answered, Because they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, who brought them out of the land of Egypt, and laid hold on other gods and worshipped them, and served them. Therefore hath he brought all this evil upon them.”

This was fulfilled in the Babylonish captivity, when Jerusalem was taken, and the temple built by Solomon was burnt down. That was an event which occasioned inquiries into

the reasons and causes of it. And shall we not consider and make like inquiries concerning the captivity by the Romans, which has been attended with so many awful circumstances? Shall we not say: "Why has the Lord done thus unto this land and to this house?" meaning the second house, built after the return from the Babylonish captivity. For that house also was high, and had been erected with divine approbation and encouragement: and the worship had been restored there according to the appointment of Moses, and was so continued there till its final desolation.

If now we ask, "Why has the Lord done thus to this land and people, and to this house?" it cannot be said, "because they laid hold on other gods, and worshipped them, and served them." For after the return from the Babylonish captivity, they were for the most part free from the sin of idolatry, into which they had so often relapsed before. Nor are they now guilty of that sin, for which their dispersion should be continued. For some while before the last destruction of Jerusalem, they appear from all accounts to have been generally very zealous for the law of Moses, and the rites of it, and very diligent in their attendance on the temple at Jerusalem, to which they resorted in great numbers, from all parts of the world where they inhabited, at the solemn festivals; and where a large part of the nation was assembled to keep the passover, when the final overthrow befell them.

We are therefore led to think that these calamities befell the Jewish people because they rejected and crucified the Lord Jesus, who was a prophet mighty "in deed and word before God and all the people," Luke xxiv. 19; who spake as never man spake before, and performed many wonderful works which none had done before. And God has "required it of them," as he said by Moses he would do, Deut. xviii. 19. And I must again recite here those affecting and awful, but true, sayings of our Lord, recorded, John xv. 22, 24, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak [or excuse] for their sin. If I had not done among them the works which no other man did, they had not had sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father."

The expectation of the Messiah is no new thing. It had not its rise from Jesus or his disciples. It was in being long before the nativity of Jesus. We are assured<sup>2</sup> by Suetonius, and Tacitus, and Celsus, heathen writers of great

<sup>2</sup> See the passages of those heathen authors, and of Josephus, all alleged Vol. i. p. 138—140.

learning, as well as from Josephus, that ‘There had been for a long time, all over the east, a notion firmly believed, that, at that very time, some one coming from Judea should obtain the empire of the world.’ Heathen writers say this was contained in the book of the fates: Josephus, who at the time of his writing the *History of the War*, was disposed to think as the heathen writers above mentioned do, that Vespasian was thereby intended, says, that this expectation was founded upon an ambiguous oracle. Nevertheless he owns that the expectation was general among the Jewish people, and that it was embraced by ‘many of the wise men among ‘them,’ as well as by others, and that it was the thing which ‘principally encouraged them to undertake the war ‘with the Romans.’ But upon this head there is now no difference between the Jews and us; all allowing that the expectation of a Messiah is founded on the writings of Moses and the prophets.

That this was the time of his appearance they may have argued and collected from divers texts of scripture, as Dan. ii. 34—45; vii. 14; ix. 24; and from Hag. ii. 4—9; Mal. iii. 1; iv. 5, 6.

How general and prevailing the expectation of the appearance of the Messiah then was among all sorts of men, the rulers as well as the common people, we farther know from the books of the New Testament. Luke iii. 15, 16: “And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not, John answered, saying unto them all: I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; he will baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.” And from John i. 19—34, we know that the Jews sent priests and Levites, who were of the sect of the pharisees, to John, where he was baptizing, to ask him who he was. He declared “he was not the Christ, but was sent before him; and said: There standeth one among you, whom ye know not. He it is who, coming after me, is preferred before me; whose shoes’ latchet I am not worthy to unloose.” I need not cite any other texts.

At that very time Jesus appeared and wrought many wonderful works, irrefragable attestations to his divine mission and authority, and the truth of his doctrine; of which we are as well assured from the concurring and unanimous testimony of all the writers of the New Testament, as we can be of any thing that ever was done in the world; or as the Jews are of the miracles wrought by Moses and the prophets.

Here therefore we may adopt the words of our Lord spoken to his disciples, Matt. xvii. 12, "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already. And they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them." As he did soon afterwards. For which God has reckoned, and is still reckoning with them.

However, though the treatment given to Jesus and his apostles, was a very great offence, there may have been other provocations which occasioned the displeasure of God against his people, and concurred to bring down the vengeance of heaven upon them. One sin is never alone. There is generally a complication of guilt in all great and aggravated transgressions. Though the Jewish people often fell into the practise of heathen idolatry, and that was one great occasion of the Babylonish captivity, that was not the only sin with which they were chargeable. All sorts of immoralities abounded among them. And Daniel, in the confession which he makes of the sins of his people, says, ch. ix. 5, "We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and thy judgments." So now the greatness of their guilt lay in rejecting and crucifying Jesus the Messiah. But that would not have been done if wickedness had not greatly prevailed among them. Josephus owns, that 'never was there a time 'more fruitful of wickedness than that.' In the gospels the men of that time are spoken of as an "untoward generation, and a wicked and adulterous generation." They were chargeable with all kinds of evil, and were openly reprov'd for them by the faithful teacher and prophet whom God sent among them, and whom they so ungratefully used. They were covetous and worldly-minded: Luke xvi. 14, 15. They were exceeding proud and ambitious of respect and honour. "They did all their works to be seen of men. They made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments. They loved the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi;" Matt. xxiii. 5, 6; and see Mark xii. 38, 39; and Luke xx. 46; and Luke xiv. 7. They were extremely uneasy and impatient under the Roman government, to which, by the disposal of Divine Providence, they were subject. They were very deceitful and hypocritical, who "devoured widows' houses, and for a pretence made long prayers:" Mark xii. 40, and see Matt. xxiii. 23—28. At the same time they depended upon their descent from Abraham, and other external privileges; which rendered all

exhortations to repentance fruitless and ineffectual. See Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33, and 39. Accordingly they are represented to have "hardened their hearts, and shut their eyes:" for which reason they did not understand, nor attend to the signs of the times, and the evidences of truth set before them: Matt. xiii. 14, 15; John xii. 37—41. And moreover, they were at this time very fond of traditions, which made void the moral law of God.

All these charges, now collected from the gospels, might be verified by examples and observations in Josephus. These evil dispositions prevailing among them, especially in their great men who had the chief influence on the people, they did not, and could not believe, but rejected and ill treated the Lord Jesus Christ. Let me recite here John v. 39—41; "Search the scriptures," impartially. "For in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come unto me that ye might have life. I receive not honour from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you—How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?"

One thing more I must add here. That the time in which our Lord appeared was not a time of gross ignorance. The Jews now had synagogues every where in all parts of Judea, and in many places out of it, where the law of Moses and the prophets were read and explained. The common people in general were well acquainted with those scriptures, and with the explications given of them by their rabbins. Among the scribes and pharisees were many men of very good abilities. Their acuteness and subtilty are manifest in their cavils with our Saviour. Nor were the Jewish people now altogether unacquainted with the Greek literature. Their three sects of the pharisees, sadducees, and essenes, had occasioned disputes and controversies, and spread the knowledge of the things of religion among them.

It is amazing that a prophet who teaches men a reasonable doctrine, and works many miracles, all useful and beneficent, should be rejected. And it would be still more amazing, were it not that we are in some measure able to account for it, by the bad dispositions before taken notice of. Jesus gave no sign from heaven to induce them to expect from him (what suited their carnal and ambitious views) a deliverance from the Roman government. And all other works, of mighty power and of great goodness, were slighted and despised. Thus prejudice and passion prevailed against evidence. And it is a great aggravation of

the guilt of any men, who are knowing and discerning, if they reject the truth of which good evidences are set before them. Our Lord having made some remarks after the cure of the man born blind, and after his being excommunicated by the pharisees, John ix. 39—41, some of them who heard him said unto him: “Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them: If ye were blind ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.”

Thus they were incurable. And these evil dispositions prevailing in them, brought on that great sin of rejecting and crucifying the Lord Jesus, which God has required of them.

The destruction therefore of the city of Jerusalem, and the temple, and the continued dispersion of the Jews, are a cogent argument for the truth of the christian religion. They confirm the history of the New Testament, and every part of it. If they had not sinned, as they are there said to have done, these calamities had not befallen them. Their sufferings bear witness to the spotless life, and excellent doctrine, and wonderful works, of the Lord Jesus. They testify that there had been one among them greater than Jonah, and wiser than Solomon; but they slighted all his wisdom and repented not, as the people of Nineveh did at the preaching of Jonah.

They confirm particularly the history recorded in Luke xxiii. 1—25: “And the whole multitude of them” [that is, many of the Jewish council] “arose, and led him unto Pilate, saying: We found this man perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying, that he himself is Christ, a king. Pilate then asked him, saying: Art thou the king of the Jews? And he answered him, and said, Thou sayest it.” [It is as you say.] “Then said Pilate to the *chief priests, and to the people*, I find no fault in this man. And they were the more fierce, saying: He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee to this place.” He then sent Jesus to Herod, who sent him back again to Pilate. “After which, when Pilate had called together *the chief priests, and the rulers, and the people*, he said unto them; Ye have brought this man unto me as one that perverteth the people; and behold, I having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching these things whereof ye accuse him. No, nor yet Herod; for I sent you to him. And lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him. I will therefore chastise him, and release him. For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast. And they cried out, all at once, saying: Away



with this man, and release unto us Barabbas : (who, for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison :) Pilate therefore, willing to release Jesus, spake again to them. But they cried, saying: Crucify him, crucify him. And he said unto them the third time: Why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him. I will therefore chastise him and let him go. And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified: and the voices of them and the chief-priests prevailed. And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required. And he released unto them him that for sedition and murder was cast into prison, whom they desired: but he delivered Jesus to their will." Or as in Matt. xxvii. 24, 25, 26, "When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying: I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said: His blood be upon us, and our children. Then released he Barabbas unto them. And when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified."

To these things the destruction of Jerusalem, and the present circumstances of the Jews, bear witness; as also to the resurrection of Jesus, and his ascension to heaven, and to the plentiful effusion of spiritual gifts afterwards upon his apostles, and others; whereby they were enabled to preach the heavenly doctrine, in which their Lord and Master had instructed them. He commanded them to "preach repentance and remission of sins in his name, beginning at Jerusalem," Luke xxiv. 47. And that they did so, preaching repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ:" or, that they did earnestly call upon the Jewish people in Judea, and elsewhere, to repent of their sins, and believe in the Lord Jesus; and that they did not receive their instructions and warnings, but 'killed some of them, scourged others, and persecuted them from city to city;' To all these things, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and other calamities brought upon the Jewish people, bear witness: and thus they filled up the measure of their iniquity.

The argument, upon which I have now insisted, is not new; it is old; and has been well managed by divers ancient christian writers. I shall place below the observations made upon the long captivity of the Jews by Jerom<sup>a</sup> and by Pru-

<sup>a</sup> Multa, Judæe, scelera commisisti; cunctis circa te servisti nationibus. Ob quod factum? Utique, propter idololatriam. Quinque servisses, crebro

dentius<sup>b</sup> in their own language. I believe they will be perused with pleasure by some of my readers : and I refer to a<sup>c</sup> place of Chrysostom which was formerly quoted more at large. I likewise refer to<sup>d</sup> Origen.

Nor can it be said that God has been unrighteous in his dealings with them. All these judgments befell them, according to the original plan of providence concerning them, and according to the prophetic denunciations of their law-giver Moses. Nor can it be said that their continued dispersion is unrighteous, since they persist in the sin which first occasioned it, and reject Him whom God has sent unto them ; and not only reject him, but reproach and revile him, so as no other people do. And, finally, whenever they repent, they may obtain forgiveness, and be received into

misertus tui est Deus : et misit iudices et salvatores, qui te de famulatu Moabitum et Ammoritarum, Philistinum quoque et diversarum gentium liberarunt. Novissime sub regibus offendisti Deum ; et omnis tua provincia, gente Babylo-nicâ vastante, deleta est. Per septuaginta annos templi solitudo permansit. A Cyro rege Persarum est laxata captivitas. Esdras hoc et Nehemias plenissime referunt. Exstructum est templum sub Dario rege Persarum a Zorobabel filio Salathiel, et Jesu filio Josedec, sacerdote magno. Quæ passisitis a Medis, Ægyptiis, Macedonibusque, non enumero. Nec tibi adducam in memoriam Antiochum Epiphanem, crudelissimum omnium tyrannorum ; nec Cn. Pompeium, Gabinium, Scaurum, Varum, Cassium, Sosiumque replicabo, qui tuis urbibus, et præcipue Jerosolymæ, insultavere. Ad extremum sub Vespasiano et Tito urbs capta, templumque subversum est. Deinde civitatis usque ad Hadrianum principem per quinquaginta annos mansere reliquæ. Post ever-sionem templi paullo minus per quadringentos annos et urbis et templi ruinæ permanent. Ob quod tantum facinus ? Certe non colis idola ; sed etiam ser-viens Persis atque Romanis, et captivitatis pressus jugo, ignoras alienos deos. Quomodo clementissimus quondam Deus, qui nunquam tui oblitus est, nunc per tanta spatia temporum miseriis tuis non adducitur ut solvat captivitatem, et, ut verius dicam, expectatum tibi mittat Antichristum ? Ob quod, inquam, facinus, et tam execrabile scelus, avertit a te oculos suos ? Ignoras ? Memento vocis parentum tuorum. Sanguis ejus super nos, et super filios nostros. Et : Venite, occidamus eum, et nostra erit hæreditas. Et : Non habemus regem, nisi Cæsarem. Habes quod elegisti ; usque ad finem mundi serviturus es Cæ-sari, donec gentium introëat plenitudo, et sic omnis Israël salvus fiet ; ut quæ quondam erat in capite, vertatur in caudam. Hieron. ad Dardan. T. 2. p. 610, 611.

<sup>b</sup> Quid mercare, Titus docuit : docuere rapinis  
Pompeianæ acies, quibus extirpata per omnes  
Terrarum plagique plagas tua membra feruntur.  
Exiliis vagus huc illuc fluitantibus errat  
Judæus, postquam, patriâ de sede revulsus,  
Supplicium pro cæde luit, Christique negati  
Sanguine respersus commista piacula solvit.

Prud. Apoth. ver. 238, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Adversus Judæos Or. vi. T. i. p. 652, 653.

<sup>d</sup> Contr. Cels. l. 2. sect. 13. Bened. p. 69. Spenc. l. 4. sect. 22. Bened. p. 174. Sp. et sect. 73. Ben. p. 212. Sp. l. 8. sect. 42. Ben. p. 405. Spenc. seu Cantab.

the church of Christ, and partake in all the privileges of it, and in the end obtain everlasting life, which God through Jesus Christ has promised to all those who love him. "For God has not cast away his people whom he foreknew; and if they abide not still in unbelief," they will be graciously received. Rom. xi. 2, and 23.

The circumstances of the Jewish people deserve the attentive regard and serious consideration of all mankind, Jews, and christians, and the men of all nations and religions, where their history is known: as it now generally is, from the books of the Old and New Testament, and from Josephus, and other writings.

The writings of the apostles and evangelists, contained in the New Testament, are faithful records of the life of Jesus, and the promises of the gospel. And the continued subsistence of the Jewish people in a dispersed condition, all over the earth, bears testimony to the truth of every thing related by them. Thus God, the Sovereign Lord of all, in his great wisdom, has provided a perpetual and universal living monument to the memory of the transactions and sufferings of Jesus in Judea; and of his own veracity in "performing the mercy promised to their fathers, and the oath which he sware to Abraham;" Luke i. 72, 73, Gen. xxii. 15—18, and, that "when the fulness of the time was come, he sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem" mankind from idolatry, and all vice, and from all burdensome rites, whether of Jewish or heathen original. Gal. iv. 4, 5.

The circumstances of the Jewish people confirm the faith of christians, and are a loud call to themselves to think, and consider, and repent, and believe. And it should in a like manner affect and awaken all other people. It is a voice which may be heard by those who have not yet seen the gospels, and perhaps are averse to them; and it should induce them to look into them, and carefully examine them.

That Jesus is the Christ, is manifest from his agreeing to all the prophetic descriptions concerning that great person, which are recorded in the Jewish scriptures, that he might be known when he came. He is the seed of Abraham, and the son of David: "the rod out of the stem of Jesse—And the spirit of the Lord rested on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and of might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. And to him the Gentiles have sought," Is. xi. 1, 2, 3, 10. He was born of a "virgin," Is. vii. 14, "at Bethlehem in Judea," Mic. v. 2. "In him all the families of the earth have been

blessed," according to the promise made to Abraham, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18. He is "the servant of God, whom he upheld, his elect, in whom his soul delighteth," [or God's well beloved Son,] "and hath brought forth judgment to the Gentiles," Is. xlii. 1. "He hath been a light to lighten the Gentiles, and salvation to the ends of the earth," Is. xlix. 6. "The isles waited for his law, and have received it," Is. xlii. 4. "And the earth is now full of the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea," Is. xi. 9. We have "a new heaven, and a new earth," Is. lxxv. 17. "All the gods of the earth have been famished," Zeph. ii. 11. Heathen idolatry, once so general, and so much delighted in by princes and people, is now no more in this part of the world; their temples are demolished, or put to other uses; their oracles are silent; nor do they receive human or other sacrifices. And God himself, the Lord of heaven and earth, is no longer served with sacrifices of animals, or oblations of fruits of the earth, but with prayers and praises, and good works of righteousness and mercy; nor is his worship now confined to any one particular place. The time is come, "when men should neither at mount Gerizim, nor at Jerusalem, worship the Father: and when the true worshippers of God shall worship him in spirit and in truth," John iv. 21—23. And "in every nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him," Acts x. 35. Jesus had "the words of eternal life," John vi. 68. And "God has poured out of his spirit upon all flesh," Joel ii. 28, Is. xliv. 3, Acts ii. 17. And "all men now know God from the least to the greatest of them," Jerem. xxxi. 3, 4. All have just sentiments, and are able to discourse rationally concerning God, the Creator of all things, and his overruling Providence, and future rewards and punishments. We now worship God on earth, through Jesus Christ, in a reasonable, spiritual, liberal manner, in hopes of obtaining, hereafter, perfection of holiness and happiness in the kingdom of our heavenly Father.

Jesus, then, is the promised Messiah who was to come. Nor is there any reason why we should look for another.

I have formerly repeated<sup>e</sup> this subject. But the large and copious testimony of Josephus to the fulfilment of our Saviour's predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the miseries coming upon the Jewish people, and the repeated acknowledgments of the destruction of the

<sup>e</sup> The circumstances of the Jewish people an argument for the truth of the christian religion. Vol. ix. p. 60—91.

temple in the Mishnical and Talmudical writers, have compelled me to enlarge here, as I have now done.

Finally, to put an end to this long argument ; if we have obtained the invaluable treasure of the gospel, that “ pearl of great price,” let us be thankful to God who has so enriched us by Jesus Christ. And let us be careful to keep it entire, and in all its purity, unalloyed with base mixtures, and undisguised by false colourings. Our own glory and the credit of our religion depend upon this.

As for the Jewish people, I believe all good christians will readily join with the apostle Paul, and say : “ Our hearts’ desire, and prayer to God for Israel, is, that they might be saved,” Rom. x. 1. Nevertheless I acknowledge that I see no immediate prospect of their general conversion ; and must assent to what the same apostle says in another place, who had great dealings with them, after his conversion to the christian faith, as well as before, and had full experience of their untractable temper, which is still too much the same that it was in his time : “ But their minds were blinded ; for until this day remaineth the same vail, untaken away, in the reading of the Old Testament ; which vail is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away,” 2 Cor. iii. 14—16.

God grant that we may all know and mind the things which are conducive to our true interests both here and hereafter !

TESTIMONIES  
OF  
ANCIENT HEATHEN AUTHORS.

---

CHAP. I.

*The Epistle of Abgarus king of Edessa to Jesus, and the  
Rescript of Jesus to Abgarus.*

AS the authority of these epistles depends entirely upon Eusebius, I shall here transcribe his account at length, which is in the thirteenth or last chapter of the first book of his Ecclesiastical History.

‘ A <sup>a</sup> History concerning the Prince of the Edessens.’

‘ The divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,’ says Eusebius, ‘ being every where talked of by reason of his  
‘ wonderful power in working miracles, it drew after him  
‘ many people from other countries, and some very remote  
‘ from Judea, who were filled with hopes of relief under all  
‘ sorts of pains and sicknesses. For which reason king Ab-  
‘ garus, who <sup>b</sup> with honour governed the nations beyond  
‘ the Euphrates, labouring under a grievous distemper, in-  
‘ curable by human skill, when he heard of the fame of  
‘ Jesus, which was much celebrated, and his wonderful  
‘ works attested by the unanimous testimony of all men,  
‘ sent a letter to him by a messenger, entreating him to cure  
‘ his distemper. But he did not then comply with his re-  
‘ quest, yet he vouchsafed to write to him a letter, wherein  
‘ he promised to send one of his disciples who should cure  
‘ his distemper, and also bring salvation to him, and to all  
‘ with him: which promise was not long after fulfilled: for  
‘ after the resurrection of Christ, and his ascension to  
‘ heaven, Thomas, one of the twelve apostles, moved by a

<sup>a</sup> Ἱστορία περι τῶν τῶν Ἐδεσσηνῶν ἰσχυρῶν. H. E. l. i. cap. 13. p. 31.

<sup>b</sup> ‘ Who governed the nations beyond the Euphrates.’ That is the lofty style of the eastern people. Abgarus was governor of only a small territory.

‘ divine impulse, sent Thaddeus, one of Christ’s seventy dis-  
‘ ciples, to Edessa, to be a preacher and an evangelist of  
‘ Christ’s doctrine, by whom all things promised by our  
‘ Saviour were fulfilled. The evidence of this we have from  
‘ the records of the city of Edessa: for among the public  
‘ records, wherein are entered the antiquities of the city,  
‘ and the actions of Abgarus, these things are still found  
‘ preserved to this day. It<sup>c</sup> will therefore be worth the  
‘ while to attend to the letters, as taken by us [or for us]  
‘ from the archives, and translated word for word from the  
‘ Syriac language.

‘ *The copy of the letter which was written by Abgarus the*  
‘ *toparch to Jesus, and sent to him at Jerusalem by the*  
‘ *courier Ananias.*

‘ “ Abgarus, toparch [or prince] of Edessa, to Jesus the  
‘ good Saviour, who has appeared at Jerusalem, sendeth  
‘ greeting. I have heard of thee, and of thy cures, performed  
‘ without herbs, or other medicines. For it is reported that  
‘ thou makest the blind to see, and the lame to walk: that  
‘ thou cleansest lepers, and castest out unclean spirits and  
‘ dæmons, and healest those who are tormented with diseases  
‘ of a long standing, and raisest the dead. Having heard of all  
‘ these things concerning thee, I concluded in my mind one  
‘ of these two things—either that thou art God come  
‘ down from heaven to do these things, or else thou art the  
‘ Son of God, and so performest them. Wherefore I now  
‘ write unto thee, entreating thee to come to me, and to heal  
‘ my distemper. Moreover I hear that the Jews murmur  
‘ against thee, and plot to do thee mischief. I have a city,  
‘ small indeed, but neat, which may suffice for us both.’  
‘ Now let us attend,’ says Eusebins, ‘to the letter which  
‘ Jesus returned by the same courier, short indeed, but very  
‘ powerful. It is in these words.”

‘ *The rescript of Jesus to the toparch Abgarus, sent by the*  
‘ *courier Ananias.*

‘ “ Abgarus, thou art happy, forasmuch as thou hast be-  
‘ lieved in me, though thou hast not seen me.’ John xx.  
29. ‘For it is written concerning me, that they who have  
‘ seen me should not believe in me, that they who have not  
‘ seen me might believe and live. As for what thou hast

<sup>c</sup> ——— απο των αρχειων ημιν αναληφθεισων, και τονδε αυτοις ρημασιν εκ της Συρων φωνης μεταβληθεισων του τροπον. p. 32. B

‘ written to me desiring me to come to thee, it is necessary  
 ‘ that all those things, for which I am sent, should be ful-  
 ‘ filled by me here : and that after fulfilling them, I should  
 ‘ be received up to him that sent me. When therefore I  
 ‘ shall be received up, I will send to thee some one of my  
 ‘ disciples, that he may heal thy distemper, and give life  
 ‘ to thee, and to those who are with thee.”

‘ To these epistles,’ as Eusebius goes on to say, ‘ are sub-  
 ‘ joined the following things, and in the Syriac language—  
 ‘ That after Jesus had been taken up, [or after his ascen-  
 ‘ sion,] Judas, called also Thomas, sent the apostle Thad-  
 ‘ deus, one of the seventy ; who, when he came to Edessa,  
 ‘ took up his abode with Tobias, son of Tobias. When his  
 ‘ arrival was rumoured about, and he had begun to be  
 ‘ known by the miracles which he wrought, it was told to  
 ‘ Abgarus, that an apostle was sent to him by Jesus, accord-  
 ‘ ing to his promise. Thaddeus therefore by the power of  
 ‘ God healed all sorts of maladies, so that all wondered.  
 ‘ But when Abgarus heard of the great and wonderful works  
 ‘ which he did, and how he healed men in the name and by  
 ‘ the power of Jesus Christ, he was induced to suspect [*εν*  
 ‘ *υποποια γεγορευεν*] that he was the person about whom Jesus  
 ‘ had written to him, saying, “ When I am taken up, I will  
 ‘ send to thee some one of my disciples, who shall heal thy  
 ‘ distemper.” Sending therefore for Tobias, at whose house  
 ‘ he was, he said to him : “ I hear that a man, endowed with  
 ‘ great power, and come from Jerusalem, is at thy house, and  
 ‘ that he works many cures in the name of Jesus.” To  
 ‘ which Tobias answered, “ Yes, Sir ; there is a stranger  
 ‘ with me, who performs many miracles.” Abgarus then  
 ‘ said : “ Bring him hither to me.” Tobias coming to Thad-  
 ‘ deus, said to him : “ The<sup>d</sup> prince Abgarus, has bid me  
 ‘ bring thee to him, that thou mayest heal his distemper.”  
 ‘ Whereupon Thaddeus said : “ I go ; for it is upon his ac-  
 ‘ count, chiefly, that I am sent hither.” The next day, early  
 ‘ in the morning, Tobias taking Thaddeus came to Abgarus.  
 ‘ As he came in, the nobles being present, there appeared to  
 ‘ Abgarus somewhat very extraordinary in the countenance  
 ‘ of Thaddeus ; which<sup>e</sup> when Abgarus saw, he worshipped  
 ‘ Thaddeus ; which appeared strange to all present ; for they  
 ‘ did not see that brightness which was discerned by Abgarus  
 ‘ only. He then asked Thaddeus, “ If he were indeed the  
 ‘ disciple of Jesus the Son of God, who had said to him :  
 ‘ “ I will send to thee some one of my disciples who shall

<sup>d</sup> Ο τοπαρχης.

<sup>e</sup> Ἀπερῖδων Ἀβγαρος προσεκυνησε τῷ Θαδδαιῳ.—p. 33. D.



heal thy distemper, and give life to all with thee.” Thaddeus answered : “ Forasmuch as thou hast great faith in the Lord Jesus, therefore am I sent unto thee : and if thou shalt increase in faith in him, all the desires of thy heart will be fulfilled according to thy faith.” Then Abgarus said to him : “ I have so believed in him, that I would go with an army to extirpate the Jews who crucified him, if I were not apprehensive of the Roman power.” Then Thaddeus said : “ Our Lord and God Jesus Christ has fulfilled the will of his Father : and, having fulfilled it, he has been taken up to his Father.” Abgarus then said : “ I have believed in him, and in his Father.” And thereupon said Thaddeus : “ Therefore I put my hand upon thee in the name of the Lord Jesus.” And, upon his so doing, Abgarus was healed of his distemper. And Abgarus wondered, that as it had been reported concerning Jesus so it had been done by his disciple and apostle Thaddeus ; insomuch as he had healed him without herbs, or other medicines. Nor did he heal him alone, but also Abdus, son of Abdus, who had the gout. For he came to him, and fell down upon his knees before him, and by the laying on of his hands with prayer he was healed. The same apostle healed many other citizens of the same place, and wrought many and great miracles as he preached the word. After which Abgarus spoke to this purpose : “ Thou Thaddeus doest these things by the power of God, and we admire thee. But I beseech thee to inform me about the coming of Jesus, how it was, and of his power, and by what power he did all those things which we have heard of.” To which Thaddeus answered : “ Now I forbear, though I am sent to preach the word ; but to-morrow gather together all the citizens, and then in their hearing I will preach the word, and sow in them the word of life, and will inform them of the coming of Christ, how it was, and concerning his mission, and for what cause he was sent by the Father, and concerning the power of his works, and the mysteries which he spoke in the world, and by what power he did these things, and concerning his new doctrine, and about the meanness and despicableness of his outward appearance, and how he humbled himself, and died, and <sup>f</sup> lessened his deity ; how many things he suffered from the Jews, and how he was crucified, and descended into hell, and rent asunder the inclosure never before separated, and arose, and raised up the dead who had been buried many ages ;

<sup>f</sup> Και εσμικρυνεν αυτη την Θεοτητα. ρ. 35. Α.

‘ and how he descended alone, but ascended to his Father  
 ‘ with a great multitude; and how he is set down on the  
 ‘ right hand of the Father with glory in the heavens; and  
 ‘ how he will come again with glory and power to judge  
 ‘ the living and the dead.” Abgarus therefore issued  
 ‘ out orders that all the citizens should come together  
 ‘ early the next morning, to hear the preaching of Thad-  
 ‘ deus. And after that he commanded that gold and  
 ‘ silver should be given to him, but he did not receive it,  
 ‘ saying: “When we have left our own things, how should  
 ‘ we receive those things which belong to others?” This  
 ‘ was done in the four hundred and thirtieth year. These  
 ‘ things, translated from the Syriac language, word for  
 ‘ word, we have placed here, as we think, not impro-  
 ‘ perly.’

Thus I have now translated this whole history from Eusebius at large, thinking that to be the shortest way to a good conclusion, and that all my readers may be the better able to judge of the remarks that shall be made.

Various are the opinions of learned men concerning this history, some receiving it as true, or at least <sup>g</sup> being favourable to it; others rejecting it <sup>h</sup> as false and fabulous. I shall put down here the following observations.

1. In the first place, then, I think, we are not to make any doubt of the truth of what Eusebius says, that all this was recorded in the archives of the city Edessa in the Syriac language, and was thence translated into Greek. Eusebius has been supposed by some to say that himself translated it from the Syriac: but that is not clear; nor is it certain that he understood Syriac; much less have we any reason to say that he was at Edessa, and took this account from the archives himself.

2. This history is not mentioned by any before <sup>i</sup> Eusebius:

<sup>g</sup> Cav. H. L. Grabe, Spic. Assem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 554. Abp. Wake's Introduction to his Translation of the Apostolical Fathers, ch. ix. Tillem. Mem. Ecc. St. Thomas, T. i. p. 360. Addison of the Christian Religion, section i. num. viii. p. 280.

<sup>h</sup> J. Basnage, Hist. de l'Eglise, l. 21. ch. n. p. 1312. Hist. des Juifs. Vol. i. p. 200. S. Basnag. Ann. 29. n. xxxviii.—xlii. Fr. Spanh. H. E. T. i. p. 578, et 794. Pagi, ann. 244. n. vii. Cleric. H. E. p. 332. et Bib. ch. T. xvi. p. 99. Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. T. i. p. 319, &c. Philp. Jacob. Sklerandr. H. Antiq. Ec. Chr. cap. vii. not. 65. J. Jones upon the Canon of the N. T. Vol. 2. p. 1, &c. Du Pin, Diss. Prelim. Tom. ii. Vid. et Vales. Annot. in Euseb. Colonia, La Religion Chrét. autorisée par les Payens. T. 2. p. 339, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Tous les écrivains ecclésiastiques, qui ont été depuis J. C. jusqu'au temps d'Eusèbe, ne nous parlent ni près ni loin de cette Histoire, ni de ces Epîtres. Et qui croira, qu'ils n'en eussent rien dit, si elle leur eut été connue? &c. Sueur. Histoire de l'Eglise, et de l'Empire. A. J. C. 31. T. i. p. 103, &c.

not by Justin Martyr, nor Tatian, nor Clement of Alexandria, nor Origen, nor by any other; nor does Eusebius give any hint of that kind; he had it from Edessa; it was unheard of among the Greeks till his time; but, having received it, he thought it might be not improperly transcribed into his Ecclesiastical History.

3. It is not much taken notice of by succeeding writers. It is not mentioned, I think, by Athanasius, nor Gregory Nyssen, or Nazianzen, nor Epiphanius, nor Chrysostom: Jerom has once mentioned it, and will be cited by and by: but he has not inserted, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, either Jesus, or Abgarus; neither of whom would have been omitted if he had any respect for the epistles here produced by Eusebius. This affair is indeed mentioned, or referred to, by Ephrem the Syrian, in his Testament: but that is not a work of so much authority as has been supposed by some: and it is interpolated in several places, both in the Greek and Syriac copies of it; as was observed <sup>k</sup> formerly.

4. This whole affair was unknown to Christ's apostles, and to the believers, their contemporaries, both Jews and Gentiles, as is manifest from the early disputes about the method of receiving Gentile converts into the church. If Jesus Christ had himself written a letter to a heathen prince, and had promised to send to him one of his disciples, and if that disciple had accordingly gone to Edessa, and there received the king and his subjects into communion with the church without circumcision, there could have been no room for any doubt or dispute about the method of receiving Gentile converts to christianity. Or if any dispute had arisen, would not this history of the visit of Thaddeus have been alleged? which would have been sufficient to put all to silence. Nor is there any room to say that this visit of Thaddeus at Edessa was after St. Peter's going to the house of Cornelius, or after the council of Jerusalem: for it is dated in the three hundred and fortieth year, that is, of the æra of the Seleucidæ, or of the Edessens: which is computed to be the fifteenth or sixteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, and the year of Christ 29; when, according to many ancient christians, our Lord died, and rose again, and ascended to heaven. Indeed I think it is impossible to reconcile this account with the history in the Acts of the Apostles.

5. If Jesus Christ had written a letter to king Abgarus, it would have been a part of sacred scripture, and would

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 306.

have been placed at the head of all the books of the New Testament: but it was never so respected by any ancient christian writers. It does not appear in any catalogues of canonical books which we have in ancient authors, or in councils. In the decree of the council of Rome, in the time of pope Gelasius, in the year 496, the epistle of Christ to Abgarus is expressly called <sup>l</sup> apocryphal. Nor does Eusebius himself upon any occasion reckon it up among canonical scriptures, received by those before him. The titles of the chapters of his Ecclesiastical History are allowed to be his own. The title of the chapter which has been just transcribed from him is this: A History concerning the Prince of the Edessens. It was a story which he had received; and he afterwards tells us particularly where he had it. And in the first chapter of the second book of the same work, having mentioned the choice of Matthias in the room of Judas, and the choice of the seven deacons, and the death of St. Stephen, from the Acts, he recites again briefly the history before told concerning Abgarus, and says: ‘This <sup>m</sup> we have learned from the history of the ancients. Now we return to the sacred scripture;’ where he proceeds to relate from the Acts what followed after the martyrdom of St. Stephen. In short, though Eusebius would not pass over this affair without notice, he seems not to have placed any great weight upon it: and succeeding writers have better understood his meaning than some of late times, who have shown so much regard to this relation.

6. It was the opinion of many of the most learned and ancient christians, that our Lord wrote nothing: therefore this epistle was unknown to them, or they did not suppose it to be genuine. To this purpose speak <sup>n</sup> Origen, <sup>o</sup> Jerom, and <sup>p</sup> Augustine.

7. There are several things in this epistle to Abgarus which are liable to exception.

(1.) At the beginning of the epistle our Lord is made to say: ‘Abgarus, thou art happy, forasmuch as thou hast believed in me though thou hast not seen me. For it is written concerning me, that they who have seen me, should not believe in me, that they who have not seen me might believe in me and live.’ Says Du Pin, and to the like purpose

<sup>l</sup> Epistola Jesu ad Abgarum Regem apocrypha.

<sup>m</sup> Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἱστορίας εἰρησθῶ. Μετιωμεν δ’ αὐτῶς ἐπιτην θεϊαν γραφήν. L. 2. c. 1. p. 39. B.

<sup>n</sup> Contr. Cels. l. i. sect. 45. p. 34.

<sup>o</sup> Hieron. in Ezech. c. xlv. T. iii. 1034.

<sup>p</sup> De Consens. Evang. l. i. c. 7. et Retract. l. 2. c. 16

say others : ‘ Where<sup>a</sup> are those words written ? Does not one ‘ see that he who made this letter alludes to the words of ‘ Jesus Christ to St. Thomas : “ Blessed are they who have ‘ not seen, and yet have believed,” John xx. 29. Words ‘ which were not spoken by Jesus Christ until after his ‘ resurrection, and which were not written until long after- ‘ wards : which manifestly shows the forgery of this epistle.’

(2.) Our Lord here seems to speak more clearly of his resurrection, or being taken up to heaven, than he does to the disciples in the gospels.

(3.) Christ here defers to cure Abgarus of his distemper. He tells him that ‘ some time hereafter he would send one ‘ of his disciples to him, who should heal him.’ Which is altogether unworthy of the Lord Jesus, and different from his usual and well-known conduct, who never refused to grant the requests of those who sought to him, and expressed faith in his power. Instead of what is here said to Abgarus, after commending his faith, our Lord would have added and said : ‘ Henceforth thou art healed of thy distemper :’ or, ‘ be it unto thee according to thy faith :’ or, ‘ as thou hast ‘ believed, so be it done unto thee.’

This we can conclude from similar cases, recorded by authentic witnesses : Matt. viii. 13 ; xv. 28 ; Mark vii. 29.

8. There are several other things in this history which are very liable to exception.

(1.) It is said that, after our Lord’s resurrection and ascension, Thomas sent to Edessa Thaddæus, one of Christ’s seventy disciples. But Thaddæus was an apostle, as we learn from Matt. x. 3, and Mark iii. 18. It is likewise here said that ‘ Judas, called also Thomas, sent Thaddæus.’ Upon which Valesius<sup>r</sup> observes : ‘ Thomas, who was one of the ‘ twelve, was also called Didymus, as we learn from St. ‘ John ; but that he was also called Judas, is no where said ‘ but in this place : for which cause this story is justly sus- ‘ pected.’ Jerom, speaking of this matter,<sup>s</sup> says, ‘ ecclesi- ‘ astical history informs us, that the apostle Thaddæus was ‘ sent to Edessa to Abgarus king of Osroene, who by the ‘ evangelist Luke is called Judas brother of James : Luke

<sup>a</sup> Diss. Prelim. liv. 2. ch. vi. sect. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Thomas quidem, qui fuit unus ex duodecim, dicebatur Didymus, teste Joanne evangelistâ. Sed eundem Judam esse cognominatum, alibi, quod sciam, non reperitur. Itaque et hoc nomine narratio ista merito in suspicionem venit. Vales. in loc. p. 21.

<sup>s</sup> Thaddæum apostolum, ecclesiastica tradit historia missum Edessam ad Abgarum regem Osroenæ, qui ab evangelistâ Lucâ Judas Jacobi dicitur, et alibi appellatur Lebbæus, quod interpretatur corculus. Credendumque est eum fuisse trinominem. Hieron. in Matt. x. 3. Tom. iv. P. i. p. 35.

‘ vi. 16 ; and Acts i. 13 ; and elsewhere is called Lebbeus ;  
 ‘ Matt. x. 3. So that he had three names.’

(2.) When Thaddeus comes to Edessa, he does not go immediately to the king, to whom he was sent, as might be reasonably expected ; but he goes to the house of Tobias, where he stays some while, and works many miracles ; which being noised abroad, the king hears of him, and sends for him. All this is very absurd. If Thaddeus, a disciple of Jesus, had been sent to the king of Edessa, he ought and would have gone to him directly, or would have made application to one of the courtiers to introduce him to the prince. This therefore cannot be true history, but must be the invention of some ignorant though conceited person.

(3.) ‘ It looks not a little fabulous,’ says Mr. Jones, ‘ that upon Thaddeus’s appearing before the king he should see somewhat extraordinary in his countenance, which none of the company else could perceive. Eusebius call it *οραμα μεγα*, a great vision : Valesius renders it *divinum nescio quid*, some divine appearance.’

(4.) ‘ The account in the history,’ says the same laborious author, ‘ that Abgarus designed to make war upon the Jews for crucifying Christ, seems very unlikely ; because it is plain he was prince only of a small city, and that at a vast distance from Judea ; and therefore could never be so extravagant as to imagine himself able to destroy so powerful a nation as the Jews then were.’

(5.) Abgarus is said to have had a grievous and incurable distemper, for which he desired relief of Jesus. This is said over and over. But what the distemper was is not said. Learned moderns,<sup>t</sup> who are not wanting in invention for supplying the defects of ancient history, say, some of them, that it was the gout, others the leprosy. However, presently after the cure of the prince, we are told of one Abdus, son of Abdus, whom Thaddeus cured of the gout.

(6.) We read not of any other city or country, in the first three centuries, where the people were all at once converted to the christian faith. If the people of Edessa had been all christians from the days of the apostles, it would have been known before the time of Eusebius. And I may add, that if this story, told by our ecclesiastical historian, had been

<sup>t</sup> Cet Abgare est qualifié tantôt Toparque, ou Prince, et tantôt Roy. Procope en dit bien des choses, qui sont agréables, mais qui sentent fort la fable.

Ce prince étoit travaillé d’une maladie fâcheuse et incurable, (ce que Procope entend de la goutte, et les nouveaux Grecs de la lèpre,) &c. Tillem. as before, M. E. T. i. p. 361.

esteemed credible, it would have been much more taken notice of by succeeding writers than it<sup>u</sup> is.

(7.) I forbear to remark, as I might, upon that expression of Thaddens in his discourse with Abgarus : ‘ Jesus Christ, ‘ our Lord and God, fulfilled the will of the Father :’ or upon what is here said of Christ’s descent into hell.

9. The observations which have been already made are sufficient to show, that the letter of Abgarus to Jesus Christ, and our Lord’s rescript, cannot be reckoned genuine. The whole history is the fiction of some christian at Edessa in the time of Eusebius, or not long before. The people of Edessa were then, generally, christians, and they valued themselves upon it. And they were willing to do themselves the honour of a very early conversion to the christian faith. By some one or more of them, united together, this history was formed, and was so far received by Eusebius as to be thought by him not improper to be inserted in his Ecclesiastical History. Nor could I omit to take some notice of it, as great regard has been shown to it by some. But all my readers may perceive that I bring not in this thing as a testimony of the first antiquity : though it may afford good proof of the christianity of the people of Edessa, at the beginning of the fourth century, when Eusebius flourished, or before.

---

## CHAP. II.

### OF THE KNOWLEDGE WHICH THE EMPEROR TIBERIUS HAD OF OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

- I. *The Acts of Pontius Pilate, and his letter to Tiberius.*
- II. *The story of Thamus, in Plutarch, concerning the death of Pan, considered.*

I. JUSTIN MARTYR, in his first Apology, which was presented to the emperor Antoninus the Pious, and the senate of Rome, about the year 140, having mentioned our Saviour’s

<sup>u</sup> The conversion of the whole city is implied in what is above transcribed ; and so Eusebius understood it ; for he says, in the first chapter of the second book, p. 39. Α. Εισετι τε νυν εξ εκεινη η πασα των Εδεσσηνων πολις τη τε Χριστη προσανακειται προσηγορια.

crucifixion, and some of the circumstances of it, adds: ‘And<sup>a</sup> that these things were so done you may know from the Acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate.’

Afterwards, in the same Apology, having mentioned some of our Lord’s miracles, such as healing diseases and raising the dead, he adds: ‘And<sup>b</sup> that these things were done by him you may know from the Acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate.’

Tertullian, in his Apology, about the year 200, having spoken of our Saviour’s crucifixion and resurrection, and his appearances to the disciples, and his ascension to heaven in the sight of the same disciples, who were ordained by him to preach the gospel over the world, goes on: ‘Of<sup>c</sup> all these things, relating to Christ, Pilate, in his conscience a christian, sent an account to Tiberius, then emperor.’

In another chapter or section of the same Apology, nearer the beginning, he speaks to this purpose; ‘There<sup>d</sup> was an ancient decree, that no one should be received for a deity unless he was first approved of by the senate. Tiberius, in whose time the christian religion had its rise, having received from Palestine in Syria an account of such things as manifested our Saviour’s divinity, proposed to the senate, and giving his own vote as first in his favour, that he should be placed among the gods. The senate refused, because he had himself declined that honour. Nevertheless the emperor persisted in his own opinion, and ordered that if any accused the christians they should be punished.’ And then adds: ‘Search,’ says he, ‘your own writings, and you will there find that Nero was the first emperor who ex-

<sup>a</sup> *Και ταυτα οτι γεγονε, δυνασθε μαθειν εκ των επι Ποντιω Πιλατω γενομενων ακτων.* J. M. Ap. i. p. 76. C. Paris, 1636. num. 36. p. 65. Bened.

<sup>b</sup> *’Οτι δε και ταυτα εποιησεν, εκ των επι Ποντιω Πιλατω γενομενων ακτων μαθειν δυνασθε.* Ib. p. 84. C. Paris. num. 48. p. 72. Bened.

<sup>c</sup> Delphine, ordinatis eis ad officium prædicandi per orbem, circumfusâ nube in cælum est ereptus, multo melius quam apud vos asseverare de Romulis Proculi solent. Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro suâ conscientia christianus, Cæsari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit. Tertull. Ap. c. 21. p. 22. C.

<sup>d</sup> Ut de origine aliquid retractemus ejusmodi legum. Vetus erat decretum, ne qui deus ab imperatore consecraretur, nisi a senatu probatus. Scit M. Æmilius de deo suo Alburno. Facit et hoc ad causam nostram, quod apud vos de humano arbitrato divinitas pensatur. Nisi homini deus placuerit, deus non erit. Homo jam deo propitius esse debet. Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen christianum in seculum intravit, annuntiata sibi ex Syria Palestinâ quæ illic veritatem istius divinitatis revelârant, detulit ad senatum eum prærogativâ suffragii sui. Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit. Cæsar in sententiâ mænsit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus christianorum. Consulite commentarios vestros. Illic reperietis, primum Neronem in hanc sectam, tunc maxime Romæ orientem, Cæsariano gladio ferocisse. Ib. cap. 5. p. 6.



‘ exercised any acts of severity toward the christians, because  
‘ they were then very numerous at Rome.’

It is fit we should now observe what notice Eusebius takes of these things in his Ecclesiastical History. It is to this effect.

‘ When<sup>e</sup> the wonderful resurrection of our Saviour, and  
‘ his ascension to heaven, were in the mouths of all men, it  
‘ being an ancient custom for the governors of provinces to  
‘ write to the emperor, and give him an account of new and  
‘ remarkable occurrences, that he might not be ignorant of  
‘ any thing; our Saviour’s resurrection being much talked  
‘ of throughout all Palestine, Pilate informed the emperor of  
‘ it, as likewise of his miracles, which he had heard of; and  
‘ that, being raised up after he had been put to death, he  
‘ was already believed by many to be a god. And it is said  
‘ that Tiberius referred the matter to the senate; but that  
‘ they refused their consent, under a pretence that it had not  
‘ been first approved of by them; there being an ancient  
‘ law that no one should be deified among the Romans with-  
‘ out an order of the senate; but indeed because the saving  
‘ and divine doctrine of the gospel needed not to be con-  
‘ firmed by human judgment and authority. However, Ti-  
‘ berius persisted in his former sentiment, and allowed not  
‘ any thing to be done that was prejudicial to the doctrine  
‘ of Christ. These things are related by Tertullian, a man  
‘ famous on other accounts, and particularly for his skill in  
‘ the Roman laws. I say he speaks thus in his Apology for  
‘ the christians, written by him in the Roman tongue, but  
‘ since translated into Greek. His words are these: “There  
‘ was an ancient decree, that no one should be consecrated  
‘ as a deity by the emperor, unless he was first approved of  
‘ by the senate. Marcus Æmilius knows this by his god Al-  
‘ burnus. This is to our purpose, forasmuch as among you  
‘ divinity is bestowed by human judgment. And if God  
‘ does not please man, he shall not be God. And, according  
‘ to this way of thinking, man must be propitious to God.  
‘ Tiberius, therefore, in whose time the christian name was  
‘ first known in the world, having received an account of  
‘ this doctrine out of Palestine, where it began, communi-  
‘ cated that account to the senate: giving<sup>f</sup> at the same  
‘ time his own suffrage in favour of it. But the senate re-  
‘ jected it, because it had not been approved by themselves.  
‘ Nevertheless the emperor persisted in his judgment, and

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Δηλος ων εκεινοις, ως τω δογματι αρεσκεται. Ἡ δὲ συγκλητος, ἐπι οὐκ  
χύτη δεδοκιμακει, απωσατο. p. 41. C.

‘ threatened death to such as should accuse the christians.’  
 ‘ Which,’ adds Eusebius, ‘ could be no other than a disposal  
 ‘ of Divine Providence, that the doctrine of the gospel, which  
 ‘ was then in its beginning, might be preached all over the  
 ‘ world without molestation.’ So Eusebius. I forbear as  
 yet to take particular notice of what is said of this matter by  
 later writers.

Divers exceptions have been made by learned moderns to  
 the original testimonies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian.  
 ‘ Is there any likelihood,’ say they, ‘ that Pilate should  
 ‘ write such things to Tiberius concerning a man whom he  
 ‘ had condemned to death? And, if he had written them, is  
 ‘ it probable that Tiberius should propose to the senate to  
 ‘ have a man put among the number of the gods upon the  
 ‘ bare relation of a governor of a province? And if he had  
 ‘ proposed it, who can make a doubt that the senate would  
 ‘ not have immediately complied? So that, though we  
 ‘ dare not say that this narration is absolutely false, yet it  
 ‘ must be reckoned at the least doubtful.’ So says<sup>g</sup>  
 Du Pin.

These and other difficulties shall be considered.

Now therefore I shall mention some observations.

In the first place, I observe that Justin Martyr and Ter-  
 tullian are early writers of good repute. That is an obser-  
 vation of bishop<sup>h</sup> Pearson. These testimonies are taken  
 from the most public writings, Apologies for the christian  
 religion, presented, or at least proposed and recommended,  
 to the emperor and senate of Rome, or to magistrates of  
 high authority and great distinction in the Roman empire.

Secondly, It certainly was the custom of the governors  
 of provinces to compose Acts, or memoirs, or commentaries,  
 of the remarkable occurrences in the places where they  
 presided.

In the time of the first Roman emperors there were Acts  
 of the Senate, Acts of the City or People of Rome, Acts of  
 other cities, and Acts of governors of provinces. Of all  
 these we can discern clear proofs and frequent mention in  
 ancient writers of the best credit.

Julius Cæsar ordered that<sup>i</sup> Acts of the Senate, as well as  
 daily Acts of the People, should be published.

<sup>g</sup> Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. i. p. 24, a.

<sup>h</sup> Nihil igitur est, quod in hac historiâ refelli possit. Et, cum Tertullianus  
 adeo gravis, adeo antiquus auctor, adeo rerum Romanarum peritus fuerit,  
 tutius multo est istam Tiberii ad senatum de divinitate Christi relationem  
 amplecti. Pearson. *Lectio. in Acta Apost. iv. sect. xv. p. 65.*

<sup>i</sup> Inito honore, primus omnium instituit, ut tam Senatûs quam Populi diurna  
 Acta conficerentur. Sueton. *Jul. Cæs. c. 20.*

Augustus<sup>k</sup> forbade publishing the Acts of the Senate.

There<sup>l</sup> was an officer, himself a senator, whose province it was to compose those Acts.

The Acts of the Senate must have been large and voluminous, containing<sup>m</sup> not only the question proposed, or referred to the senate by the consul, or the emperor, but also the debates and speeches of the senators.

The<sup>n</sup> Acts of the People, or City, were journals or registers of remarkable births, marriages, divorces, deaths, proceedings in courts of judicature, and other interesting affairs, and some other things below the dignity of history.

To<sup>o</sup> these Acts of each kind Roman authors frequently had recourse for information.

There were such acts or registers at other places beside Rome, particularly at Antium. From them<sup>p</sup> Suetonius learned the day and place of the birth of Caligula, about which there were other uncertain reports. And he speaks of those Acts<sup>q</sup> as public authorities, and therefore more decisive and satisfactory than some other accounts.

There were also Acts of the governors of provinces, registering all remarkable transactions and occurrences. Justin Martyr and Tertullian could not be mistaken about this: and the learned bishop of Cæsarea admits the truth of what they say. And in the time of the persecuting emperor Maximin, in the year of Christ 307, or thereabout, the heathen people forged Acts of Pilate, derogatory to the

<sup>k</sup> Auctor et aliarum rerum fuit; in quæis ne Acta Senatûs publicarentur. Sueton. Aug. c. 36.

<sup>l</sup> Fuit in Senatu Junius Rusticus, componendis patrum Actis delectus a Cæsare; eoque meditationes ejus introspicere creditur. Tacit. Ann. l. 5. c. 4.

<sup>m</sup> Nescio an venerint in manus vestras hæc vetera, quæ et antiquorum bibliothecis adhuc manent, et nunc maxime a Minuciano contrahuntur; ac jam undecim, ut opinor, Actorum libris, et tribus epistolarum, composita et edita sunt. Ex his intelligi potest, Cn. Pompeium et Marcum Crassum, non viribus modo et armis, sed ingenio quoque et oratione valuisse, &c. Tacit. seu quis alius, in Dialog. de Orator. c. 37.

Acta Senatûs vocabant commentarios, Græce *ὑπομνηματα*, quibus breviter inscriptum quidquid apud Patres diceretur, agereturque—Venio ad populi, &c. Lipsii Excurs. ad Taciti libr. v. Annal. cap. 4.

<sup>n</sup> Nerone secundum et Lucio Pisone consulibus, pauca memoriâ digna evenere; nisi cui libeat, laudandis fundamentis et trabibus quis molem amphitheatri apud Campum Martis Cæsar extruxerat, volumina implere; cum ex dignitate populi Romani repertum sit, res illustres annalibus, talia diurnis urbis actis mandare. Tacit. Ann. l. 13. cap. 31.

<sup>o</sup> Matrem Antoniam non apud auctores rerum, non diurnâ Actorum scripturâ, reperio ullo insigni officio functum. Tacit. Ann. l. 3. c. 3.

<sup>p</sup> Ubi natus sit, incertum diversitas tradentium facit,—Ego in Actis Antium inveno editum. Sueton. Cal. cap. 8. Vid. et Tiber. cap. 5.

<sup>q</sup> Sequenda igitur est, quæ sola restat, publici instrumenti auctoritas. Id. Calig. cap. 8.

honour of our Saviour, which were very diligently spread abroad, to unsettle christians, or discourage them in the profession of their faith. Of this we are informed by Eusebius in his *Eccelesiastical History*.<sup>r</sup>

Thirdly, It was customary for governors of provinces to send to the emperor an account of remarkable transactions in the places where they<sup>s</sup> presided.

So thought the learned Eusebius, as we have seen. And Pliny's letters to Trajan, still extant, are a proof of it. Philo<sup>t</sup> speaks of the Acts or Memoirs of Alexandria, sent to Caligula, which that emperor read with more eagerness and satisfaction than any thing else.

The<sup>u</sup> Acts of Pontius Pilate, and his Letter to Tiberius, which we now have, are not genuine, but manifestly spurious. Nevertheless, it must be allowed by all, that<sup>v</sup> Pontius Pilate composed some memoirs concerning our Saviour, and sent them to the emperor, whether Justin Martyr and Tertullian have given a just account of them or not.

Fourthly. It<sup>w</sup> is said to be very unlikely that Pilate should write such things to Tiberius, concerning a man whom he had condemned to death.

To which it is easy to reply, that, if he wrote to Tiberius at all, it is very likely that he should speak favourably and honourably of our Saviour. That<sup>x</sup> Pilate past sentence of condemnation upon our Lord very unwillingly, and not without a sort of compulsion, appears from the history of the evangelists: Matt. xxvii. 11—26, 62—65; Mark xv. 1—15; Luke xxiii. 1—25; John xviii. 28—40, xix. 1—13. Pilate was hard pressed. The rulers of the Jews vehemently accused our Lord to him. They said they had found him perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to

<sup>r</sup> Vid. H. E. l. i. c. ix. et l. 9. e. v.

<sup>s</sup> Omnino igitur credendum est aliqua fuisse Pilati acta, ipsius auctoritate confecta, et ad Tiberium transmissa. Pearson. Lect. iii. in Act. Ap. sect. iv.

<sup>t</sup> —τη μὲν ταῖς ὑπομνηματικαῖς ἐφημερίσιν, ἄς ἀπο τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρειας διεπεμ-  
τόντο τινες, προσεχών ἠδίτον γὰρ ἦν ἀναγνώσμα τὰτο αὐτῷ ὡς τα ἄλλων  
συγγραφεῶν καὶ ποιητῶν ἀηδέστατα συγκρίσει τῆς ἐν τέτοις χαρίτος νομιζέσθαι.  
κ. λ. Philo de Legat. ad Caium, p. 1016. A.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Fabric. Cod. Apoer. N. T. p. 298. et p. 972, &c.

<sup>v</sup> Imo non potuit Pilatus officii sui rationem tantopere negligere, ut tantæ rei in suâ provinciâ gestæ notitiam imperatori? non impertiretur. Pearson. ubi supr. Lect. iv. n. xiv. Vid. et Tob. Echard. c. iv. n. xi. p. 126.

<sup>w</sup> Negare interim minime velim, Pilatum aliquid super tali ac tanto negotio scripsisse: at incertum esse quid ac quale id fuerit, atque ideo prudentiores, Eusebium, Hieronymum, similesque, talia cautius prodidisse. Ant. Vandale Diss. de Actis Pilati, p. 615. Amst. 1700.

<sup>x</sup> —cujus et Pilatus, qui nolens compulsus est contra Dominum ferre sententiam, Hieron. adv. Jovin. l. 2. p. 218. Tom. 4.

Cæsar, saying that himself is Christ a king, and the like: and all without effect for a great while. Pilate still sought for expedients to set Jesus at liberty. As his reluctance had been very manifest and public in a court of judicature, in the chief city of the nation, at the time of one of their great festivals, it is highly probable that when he sent to Rome he should make some apology for this conduct. Nor could any thing be more proper than to allege some of our Saviour's miracles which he had heard of, and to give an account of the zeal of those who professed faith in him after his ignominious crucifixion, and openly asserted that he was risen from the dead and ascended up to heaven.

If Pilate sent any letter to Tiberius, (as very probably he did,) he would not dare to write falsehood, nor to conceal the most material circumstances of the case about which he was writing. At the trial of Jesus he publicly declared his innocence: and told the Jews several times that "he found in him no fault at all." And when he was going to pronounce the sentence of condemnation, "he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying: I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it," Matt. xxvii. 24. When he wrote to Tiberius, he would be very naturally led to say something of our Lord's wonderful resurrection and ascension, which were much talked of and believed by many, with which he could not possibly be unacquainted. The mention of these things would be the best vindication of his inward persuasion, and repeated declarations of our Lord's innocence upon the trial, notwithstanding the loud clamours and united accusations of the Jewish people and their rulers.

Pilate, as has been said several times, passed condemnation upon Jesus very unwillingly, and not till after a long trial. When he passed sentence upon him, he gave orders that this title or inscription should be put upon the cross; "Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews." When he had expired, application was made to Pilate, by Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable counsellor, that the body might be taken down and buried. To which he consented; but not till after assurance received from the centurion that he had been some time dead. The next day some of the priests and pharisees came to him, 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, make it sure as you can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch." Whilst they were at the sepulchre there was a "great earthquake," the stone was rolled away by an angel, "whose countenance was like lightning, and for fear of whom the guards did shake, and became as dead men. Some of the guards went down into the city, and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done." Nor can there be any doubt that those things came also to<sup>y</sup> the governor's ears. Pilate therefore was furnished with many materials of great importance relating to this case, very proper to be sent to the emperor. And very probably he did send them; for he could do no otherwise.

Fifthly, It is said, that<sup>z</sup> if Pilate had sent such things to Tiberius, it is nevertheless very unlikely that Tiberius should propose to the senate, that our Saviour might be put among the number of the gods. For that emperor had little or no regard to things of religion.

But it is easy to answer that such observations are of little or no importance. Few princes are able to preserve uniformity in the whole of their conduct. And it is certain that Tiberius varied from himself upon many occasions, and in different parts of his life.

Sixthly, It is farther urged, that,<sup>a</sup> if Tiberius had proposed the thing to the senate, there can be no doubt that the senate would have immediately complied.

But neither is this difficulty insuperable: for we are assured by Suetonius, that<sup>b</sup> Tiberius let several things be decided by the senate, contrary to his own opinion, without showing much uneasiness.

And when he had determined to remove and destroy Sejanus, who had long been his favourite, he was far from

<sup>y</sup> *Hiud certe dubitare non possumus, Pilatum vocasse ad se hos milites, ex iisque rem vere gestam cognovisse. Heumann. Testimonium militum de Resurrectione Christi, p. 100. ap. Primitias Gotting.*

<sup>z</sup> *Mihi certe,—haud facile persuaserim, Tiberium Cæsarem, cujus mores ab omni religionum omnium cultu perquam fuisse alienissimos, comperior, de Christo Dom. et christianâ religione tantopere curasse, ut de illâ retulerit ad senatum.—Tota hominis vita nil aliud prædicat, quam quod dico. Et Suetonio dictum est expresse et signanter, 'Circa deos ac religiones negligentior, quippe addictus mathematicæ, persuasionisque plenus cuncta fato agi.' Tan. Fab. l. 2. Ep. 12. p. 35.*

<sup>a</sup> *Hein! Respuit senatus, quod Tiberio placuit. T. Faber. ibid.*

<sup>b</sup> *Quædam adversus sententiam suam decerni ne questus quidem est—Cum senatûsconsultum per discessionem forte fieret, transeuntem eum in alteram partem, in quâ pauciores erant, secutus est nemo—&c. Sueton. Tiber. cap. 31.*

being certain of the senate's compliance. He<sup>c</sup> employed the utmost art and skill, and yet was for some while anxious and doubtful of the issue.

Seventhly, The right interpretation of the words of Tertullian will be of use to remove difficulties, and to confirm the truth of the account.

I have translated them in this manner: 'When Tiberius referred the matter to the senate, that our Lord should be placed in the number of the gods, the senate refused, because he had himself declined that honour.' The words are understood to the like purpose by<sup>d</sup> Pearson.

There is another sense, which is that of the Greek translation of Tertullian's Apology, made use of by Eusebius. 'The senate refused because it had not itself approved of it.' But that sense, if it be any sense at all, is absurd, and therefore unlikely. If none beside the senate had a right to consecrate any for a deity, yet certainly the consul or the emperor might refer such a thing to that venerable body. According to Tertullian's account the whole is in a fair way of legal proceeding. By virtue of an ancient law, no one might be reckoned a god, (at least by the Romans,) without the approbation of the senate. Tiberius having been informed of some extraordinary things concerning Jesus, referred it to the senate, that he also might be placed in the number of the deities. Was it possible after this that the senate should refuse it, under a pretence that Tiberius had bestowed divinity upon Jesus without their consent, when he had done no such thing, and at that very time was referring it to their judgment in the old legal way?

Le Clerc objects that<sup>e</sup> the true reading in Tertullian is not *quia in se non probaverat*, but *quia non ipse probaverat*. Be it so. The meaning is the same. *Ipsē* must intend the emperor, not the senate. The other sense is absurd, and next to a contradiction, and therefore not likely to be right, and at the same time it is a rude and needless affront. The other interpretation represents a handsome compliment, and a compliment not without foundation. For it is very true that<sup>f</sup> Tiberius had himself declined receiving divine honours.

<sup>c</sup> Sejanum res novas molientem—vix tandem, et astu magis ac dolo, quam principali auctoritate, subvertit. Sueton. ib. cap. 65.

<sup>d</sup> 'Senatus,' inquit Tertullianus, 'quia in se non probaverat.' Ubi optima facti ratio redditur. Senatus antea Tiberio divinitatem obtulerat, quam ille sibi oblatam respuit. Tempia, flamines, sacerdotes decerni sibi prohibuit—ut refert Suetonius. Quia igitur divinitatem in se non probaverat Tiberius, sed oblatam rejecerat, tutissimum putabat senatus alium neminem in deos suos referre, ne cum Tiberio majorem efficere viderentur. Pearson, Lect. 4. numb. xiv. <sup>e</sup> Cleric. H. E. an. 29. n. 97. <sup>f</sup> Tempia, flamines, sacer-

Eighthly, It has been objected, that Tiberius was unfriendly to the Jewish people, and therefore it must be reckoned very improbable that he should be willing to put a man, who was a Jew, among the number of the gods.

But there is little or no ground for this objection. It was obviated long ago in the first part of this work, where, beside other things, it is said : ‘ In the<sup>s</sup> reign of Tiberius the Jewish people were generally well used. They were indeed banished out of Italy by an edict ; but it was for a misdemeanour committed by some villains of that nation. The great hardship was, that many innocent persons suffered beside the guilty. Upon other occasions Tiberius showed the Jews all the favour they could desire, especially after the death of Sejanus ; and is much applauded for it by <sup>h</sup> Philo.’ And what there follows.

Ninthly, Still it is urged, ‘ Nothing<sup>i</sup> can be more absurd than to suppose that Tiberius would receive for a deity a man who taught the worship of one God only, and whose religion decried all other deities as mere fiction.’

Upon which I must say, nothing can be more absurd than this objection. Tertullian does not suppose Tiberius to be well acquainted with the christian religion, or our Saviour’s doctrine. All he says is, that, having heard of some extraordinary things concerning him, he had a desire to put him among the Roman deities.

Tenthly, Tertullian proceeds : ‘ Nevertheless the emperor persisted in his opinion, and ordered that if any accused the christians they should be punished.’

This was very natural. Though the senate would not put Jesus in the number of the deities, the emperor was still of opinion that it might have been done. And he determined to provide by an edict for the safety of those who professed a high regard for Jesus Christ. Which edict, as Eusebius reasonably supposes, was of use for securing the free preaching of the gospel in many places. But the authority of that edict would cease at the emperor’s demise, if not sooner. Undoubtedly it could not be in force, or have any great effect, for a long season.

dotes, decerni sibi prohibuit ; etiam statuas, atque imagines, nisi permittente se, poni : permisitque eâ solâ conditione, ne inter simulacra deorum, sed inter ornamenta ædium, ponerentur. Sueton. Tiber. cap. 26.

<sup>i</sup> See vol. i. p. 186, 187.

<sup>h</sup> De Legat. ad Caium, p. 1015. C. D.

<sup>1</sup> Noverat Jesum fuisse hominem Judæum, unusque Dei cultorem, et qui omnes alios deos, quasi hominum commenta, rejiceret : ac proinde religionem, quâ cum iis conjungeretur, summopere improbatum, si in cœlo viveret ; et tamen eum unâ cum Romanis diis coli voluisset. Quo nihil absurdius fingi poterat. Cleric. H. E. an. 29. n. 96.



Nor need we to consider the ordering such an edict as this in favour of the christians as an incredible thing, if we observe what Philo says, who assures us, that ‘Tiberius<sup>k</sup> gave orders to all the governors of provinces, to protect the Jews in the cities where they lived in the observation of their own rights and customs; and that they should bear hard upon none of them, but such as were unpeaceable and transgressed the laws of the state.’

Nor is it improbable that the christians should partake of the like civilities, they being considered as a sect of the Jews. And it is allowed that the Roman emperors did not openly persecute the christians, till they became so numerous that the heathen people were apprehensive of the total overthrow of their religion.

In the eleventh place. Says a learned and judicious<sup>l</sup> writer, ‘It is probable that Pilate, who had no enmity toward Christ, and accounted him a man unjustly accused, and an extraordinary person, might be moved by the wonderful circumstances attending and following his death, to hold him in veneration, and perhaps to think him a hero and the son of some deity. It is possible that he might send a narrative, such as he thought most convenient, of these transactions to Tiberius: but it is not at all likely that Tiberius proposed to the senate that Christ should be deified, and that the senate rejected it, and that Tiberius continued favourably disposed toward Christ, and that he threatened to punish those who should molest and accuse the christians.’ ‘Observe also,’ says the same learned writer, ‘that the Jews persecuted the apostles, and slew Stephen, and that Saul made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committing them to prison, and that Pilate connived at all this violence, and was not afraid of the resentment of Tiberius on that account.’

Admitting the truth of all these particulars just mentioned, it does not follow that no orders were given by Tiberius for the protection of the followers of Jesus. For no commands of princes are obeyed by all men every where. They are oftentimes transgressed. Nor was any place more likely than Judea, where the enmity of many against the disciples of Jesus was so great. Nor need it to be supposed that Tiberius was very intent to have this order strictly regarded. For he was upon many occasions very indolent and dilatory; and he was well known to be so. Moreover the death of Stephen was tumultuous, and not an act of the Jewish coun-

<sup>k</sup> ——— αλλ’ ἐπι μόνῃς τῆς αὐτοῦ. De Legat. ad Caium, p. 1015. C.

<sup>l</sup> Dr. Jortin’s Remarks upon Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 2—4.

cil. And farther, the influence of Pilate in that country was not now at its full height. We perceive from the history of our Lord's trial before him, as recorded in the gospels, that he stood in fear of the<sup>m</sup> Jews. 'He<sup>n</sup> was apprehensive that, if he did not gratify them in that point, they might draw up a long list of mal-administrations for the emperor's view. His condemnation of Jesus at the importunity of the Jews, contrary to his own judgment and inclination, declared to them more than once, was a point gained: and his government must have been ever after much weakened by so mean a condescension. And that Pilate's influence in the province continued to decline is manifest, in that the people of it prevailed at last to have him removed in a very ignominious manner, by Vitellius president of Syria.'

Pilate was removed from his government before the Pass-over in the year of Christ 36. After which<sup>o</sup> there was no procurator, or other person with power of life and death, in Judea, before the ascension of Herod Agrippa, in the year 41. In that space of time the Jews would take an unusual licence, and gratify their own malicious dispositions, beyond what they could have otherwise done, without control.

Twelfth, Some have objected, that Tertullian is so absurd as to speak of christians in the time of Tiberius; though it be certain that the followers of Jesus were not known by that denomination till some time afterwards.

But that is a trifling objection. Tertullian intends no more by christians than followers of Jesus, by whatever name they were known and distinguished: whether that of Nazarenes, or Galileans, or disciples. And it is undoubted, that the christian religion had its rise in the reign of Tiberius; though they, who professed to believe in Jesus, as risen from the dead and ascended to heaven, were not called christians till some while afterwards. So at the beginning of the paragraph he says, 'There was an ancient law that no god should be consecrated by the emperor, unless it was first approved by the senate.' Nevertheless Tertullian was not so ignorant as not to know that there were not any emperors when that ancient decree was passed. His meaning is, that no one should be deified by any man, no not by a consul or emperor, without the approbation of the senate.

Finally, We do not suppose that Tiberius understood the doctrine of our Saviour, or that he was at all inclined to

<sup>m</sup> See particularly John xix. 12.

<sup>n</sup> Vol. i. p. 97. Comp. p. 389.

<sup>o</sup> See vol. i. as before, p. 98.

be a christian. Nor did Tertullian intend to say any such thing, for immediately after the passage first cited from him, he adds: ‘But<sup>p</sup> the Cæsars themselves would have believed ‘in Jesus Christ, if they had not been necessary for the ‘world, or if christians could have been Cæsars.’

Grotius<sup>q</sup> appears to have rightly understood the importance of these passages of Tertullian; whose note therefore upon Matthew xxiv. 11, I have transcribed below.

Admit then the right interpretation of Tertullian, and it may be allowed that what he says is not incredible nor improbable. The Romans had almost innumerable deities, and yet they frequently added to that number, and adopted new. As dedications were very frequent, Tiberius might indulge a thought of placing Jesus among the established deities, without<sup>r</sup> intending to derogate from the worship or honour of those who were already received. But the senate was not in the humour to gratify him. And the reason assigned is, because the emperor himself had declined that honour; which is so plausible a pretence, and so fine a compliment, that we cannot easily suppose it to be Tertullian’s own invention; which therefore gives credibility to this account.

Eusebius, though he acknowledgeth the overruling providence of God in the favourable disposition of Tiberius toward the first followers of Jesus, by which means the christian religion in its infancy was propagated over the world with less molestation, does also say, at the beginning of the chapter before quoted, ‘The senate refused their consent to the emperor’s proposal, under a pretence that they ‘had not been first asked, there being an ancient law, that ‘no one should be deified without the approbation of the ‘senate. But indeed,’ adds he, ‘because the saving and ‘divine doctrine of the gospel needed not to be ratified by ‘human judgment and authority.’

Chrysostom’s observation is to the like purpose, but with

<sup>p</sup> Sed et Cæsares credidissent super Christo, si aut Cæsares non essent seculo necessarii, aut si et christiani potuissent esse Cæsares. Apol. cap. 21. p. 22. C.

<sup>q</sup> Cum paganismo christianam religionem miscere aggressus est omnium primus Simon Magus, Claudio imperante. Nam et ipse pro deo haberi voluit. Credibile est, pervenisse ad eum finem consilii ejus, quod a Tiberio datum senatui Romano legimus, ut Christus adderetur deorum numero. Qualem rerum plane insociabilium mixturam postea quoque Adrianus, Severus, Helio-gabalus, sed frustra, efficere conati sunt. Grot. ad Matt. xxiv. 11.

<sup>r</sup> Tiberius autem non ita Christum voluit deum recipi, ut suetus Romanorum cultus abrogaretur, sed ut juxta coleretur, uti Julium Cæsarem Augustus, et Augustum ipse Tiberius consecraverat, et colit secundum cæteros deos volebat, &c. Tob. Echard. cap. 4. n. 8. p. 122.

some inaccuracies. It is likely that he was not at all acquainted with Tertullian; and he was no admirer of Eusebius. Perhaps he builds upon general tradition only. ‘The<sup>s</sup> Roman senate,’ says he, ‘had the power of nominating and decreeing who should be gods. When therefore all things concerning Christ had been published, he, who was the governor of the Jewish nation, sent to them to know if they would be pleased to appoint him also to be a god. But they refused, being offended and provoked, that, before their decree and judgment had been obtained, the power of the crucified man had shined out, and had attracted all the world to the worship of him. But,<sup>t</sup> by the overruling providence of God, this was brought to pass against their will, that the divinity of Christ might not be established by human appointment, and that he might not be reckoned one of the many who were deified by them.’ Some of which, as he proceeds to show, had been of infamous characters.

I shall now transcribe below<sup>u</sup> in his own words what Orosius, in the fifth century, says of this matter, that all my readers may have it at once before them without looking farther for it.

And I refer to Zonaras<sup>v</sup> and<sup>w</sup> Nicephorus. The former only quotes Eusebius, and transcribes into his Annals the chapter of his Ecclesiastical History above quoted by me. Nor has Nicephorus done much more.

Upon the whole, I think the accounts of those ancient authors, Justin Martyr and Tertullian, deserve some regard. It is upon them that I have made my comments; and my defence is confined to them. And we can perceive from Eusebius, and other later writers, that their accounts were

<sup>s</sup> Chrys. Hom. 26. in 2 Cor. T. x. p. 624. A

<sup>t</sup> Ταυτο δε φηρορομητο και ακουτων αυτων, ωτε μη εξ ανθρωπινε ψηφε την θεοτητα ανακηρυθηναι τω Χριστω. κ. λ.

<sup>u</sup> At postquam passus est Dominus Christus, atque a mortuis surrexit, et discipulos suos ad prædicandum dimisit, Pilatus, præses Palestinæ provinciæ, ad Tiberium imperatorem atque senatum retulit de passione et resurrectione Christi, consequentibusque virtutibus, quæ per ipsum palam factæ fuerant, vel per discipulos ipsius in nomine ejus fiebant, et de eo quod crescente plurimorum fide Deus crederetur. Tiberius cum suffragio magni favoris retulit ad senatum, ut Christus deus haberetur. Senatus, indignatione motus, quod non sibi prius secundum morem delatum esset, ut de suscipiendo cultu prius ipse decerneret, consecrationem Christi recusavit, edictoque constituit, exterminandos esse Urbe christianos; præcipue cum et Sejanus, præfectus Tiberii, suscipiendæ religioni obstinatissime contradiceret. Tiberius tamen edicto accusatoribus christianorum mortem comminatus est. Itaque paulatim immutata est illa Tiberii Cæsaris laudatissima modestia, in pœnam contradictoris senatûs. P. Oros. l. 7. c. 4.

<sup>v</sup> Zonar. Ann. T. 2. p. 176

<sup>w</sup> Nicephi. l. 2. c. 8. Conf. l. i. cap. 16.

received as true. But some make additions or alterations in Tertullian's original narration, which diminish the credibility of the whole. Orosius not only says that the senate refused to comply with the proposal of Tiberius, but also that they were so provoked as to order, by an edict, 'that the christians should be expelled the city:?' which is loading the history with two great absurdities. For it is very improbable that the christians should be so numerous at Rome, in the time of Tiberius, as to occasion an uneasiness to the senate. And it is equally improbable that the senate should behave so rudely to the emperor. Tertullian's account is free from such things, and ought not to be rejected because of additions made by later writers.

The truth of Tertullian's account has been contested by divers learned moderns. I have already taken notice of what is said by Du Pin, and have also considered the objections of some others. I now willingly refer to divers others<sup>x</sup> on the same side. Other learned men<sup>y</sup> have embraced it as true, and have taken a good deal of pains to vindicate it against objections. Pearson,<sup>z</sup> in particular, is very favourable to this history; and in the course of my argument I have quoted him several times. The late Mr. Mosheim<sup>a</sup> also was of opinion that it ought not to be en-

<sup>x</sup> Tan. Fabr. l. ii. Ep. xii. Vandale de Orac. p. 455. et Diss. de Actis Pilati. p. 608, &c. Amst. 1700. Cleric. H. E. ann. 29. n. 96, &c. Basnag. ann. 33. n. 192—196. et Exercitat. p. 136, &c. Sig. Havercamp. Annot. ad Tertullian. Apol. cap. v. Jortin's Remarks upon Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. i. p. 2—4.

<sup>y</sup> Sueur Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire. Tom. i. p. 130, 131. Tillen. Mem. Ecc. T. i. S. Pierre art. 19. et notes xvi.—xix. Fr. Balduin. Comment. ad Edicta veterum Principum Roman. de Christianis. p. 20—24. 1727. Tob. Eckhard. non christianorum de Christo Testimonia. cap. iv. J. A. Fabr. Lux Evangelii. cap. xii. p. 220—222. La Religion Chret. autorisée par le témoignage des anciens auteurs Payens. Par D. Colonia. Tom. 2. ch. xi.—Lettre de M. Iselin Docteur et Professeur en Théologie à Basle, sur le projet conçu par Tibère, de mettre N. S. J. C. au nombre des Dieux de Rome. Bib. Germanique, T. 32. p. 147, &c. et T. 33. p. 12, &c.

<sup>z</sup> Pearson. Lection. in Act. Ap. iii. et iv.

<sup>a</sup> Negant hodie viri sagaces et eruditi, fidem huic narrationi habendam esse. Ego vero superstitiosi nomen minime formido, si dixerò, non prorsus eam mihi rejiciendam videri. Moshem. Institution. H. Christianæ Maj. Sec. i. P. i. c. 4. sect. ix. p. 109. A. D. 1739.

Sunt quidem viri eruditi, quibus hoc alienissimum a vero videtur: sed his alii, doctrinâ non inferiores, rationes opponunt haud facile destruendas. Id. de Reb. Christian. ante Const. M. p. 92.

Erudite, post Theod. Hasæum peculiari libello de Decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum Deorum, Ersurti 2715. 4. edito, pro veritate hujus facti militavit ven. Jac. Christoph. Isellus, epistolâ Gallicâ, quæ legitur Bibliothéque Germanique. T. 32. p. 147. T. 33. p. 12. Moshem. Insti. Hist. Ec. p. 30. ed. 1755. Conf. supr. not. <sup>b</sup>.

tirely rejected, and has spoken in favour of it in several of his works.

II. There is another thing which may not be omitted here, though it appears to me to be of little or no importance.

It is a story told by Cleombrotus, one of the speakers in Plutarch's dialogue concerning the cessation of oracles: 'He<sup>b</sup> had it from Epitherses, his master in grammar. He said he was sailing for Italy in a ship well freighted with merchandize, in which also were many passengers. When they were one evening among the islands, called Echinades, in the Ægean sea, the ship was becalmed. Most of the passengers were awake, and some were carousing after supper; at the same time there came a voice from the island Paxæ, which called aloud for Thamus. He was an Egyptian, and the pilot, and not so much as known by name to many of the passengers. He suffered himself to be called twice without making any answer; but at the third call he spoke. The voice then with great vehemence said to him: "When you come to the Palodes, declare that the great Pan is dead." They were all astonished when they heard this, and debated the matter, whether it were fit to perform the order or not. Thamus determined that if, when they were arrived at the appointed place, there was wind enough to sail forward, he would pass by in silence; but if the vessel was becalmed, he would publish what he had heard. When they came over against Palodes, the winds and waves were all calm. Thamus therefore placing himself at the stern of the vessel, with his face toward the land, declared as he had been told, "that the great Pan was dead." Scarcely had he done speaking, when they heard from the shores groans and lamentations, not of one, but as of a great multitude. As there were many in the ship who were witnesses of this affair, the fame of it spread in a short time so far as Rome, and Thamus was sent for by the emperor Tiberius; and Tiberius gave such credit to the account that he called together several learned men, to inquire of them who this Pan was. They delivered it as their opinion that he was the son of Mercury and Penelope.'

As this story is placed in the time of Tiberius, some learned men have been of opinion that<sup>c</sup> by the great Pan

<sup>b</sup> Plut. de Oracl. Defectu. Et vid. Euseb. Pr. Ev. p. 206.

<sup>c</sup> Ex hisce audiamus, quæso, primo loco, Boissardum in hunc modum loquentem—Quidam existimant vocem illam locutam fuisse de Christi servatoris morte, cum audita sit anno decimo nono imperii Cæsaris, quo Christus cruci-

was meant Jesus Christ, the Lord of the universe, who suffered in the time of that emperor. Huet<sup>d</sup> gives credit to this story, and supposeth that thereby the death of Christ, who is the true Pan, the parent of all things, and the author of all nature, was notified to heathen people.

I shall now make two or three remarks, which are referred to the consideration of my readers.

1. The whole story is improbable, and has more the appearance of fiction than of truth and credibility.

2. The story is all over heathenish. If there be any truth in the account, when it was brought to Rome, and the affair was examined by the learned philologists at the court of Tiberius, their determination was, that the Pan, who was reported to be dead, was the son of Mercury and Penelope. Neither Thamus, nor Epitherses, nor Tiberias, nor the learned men whom he consulted, nor yet Plutarch and his company, who lived some good while after the death of our Lord, and the publication of his gospel, had any notion that this related to Jesus Christ.

That this story is throughout heathenish may be argued from what is said presently afterwards by Demetrius, another of the speakers in that dialogue of Plutarch: ‘that  
‘ most of the islands near Britain are desert, and consecrated  
‘ to dæmons and heroes; and that, being sent by the em-  
‘ peror to take a survey of those islands, he landed on one  
‘ of them which had a few inhabitants; and that, soon after  
‘ his arrival, there happened a tempest, with terrible claps  
‘ of thunder and lightning. When the tempest was over,  
‘ the people of the island gave out that some one of the prin-  
‘ cipal dæmons was dead. A candle, said they, when it  
‘ burns is pleasant; but when it goes out it leaves a stink  
‘ behind: even so the deaths of great souls produce storms,  
‘ and sometimes a pestiferous air.’ To which Demetrius

fixus est. Et hunc credimus universæ naturæ et totius mundi Dominum et Formatorem. Vandale de Orac. p. 435.

Huic narrationi fidem creat circumstantia temporis. Incidit enim hæc res in tempus, quo Christus mortuus est. Estque verisimile, ejulationes dæmonum inde ortas, quod scirent, morte Christi satanæ regnum concidisse. Est enim Pan vox aptissima ad significandum Dominum universi, qui est omnia in omnibus, ut ait Paulus, I Cor. xv. 28. Petrus Mornæus, citat. a Vandale. ib. p. 437.

<sup>d</sup> Ethnicis vero stupendo miraculo Christi Jesu significata mors est, quod in libello de desitis oraculis Plutarchus refert. Id, quanquam a vulgo scriptorum tritum est, minime tamen ob admirabilitatem rei pigeat hic adscribere—Narrat id apud Plutarchum Æmilianus Rhetor, ut sibi a patre Epitherse, rei teste, traditum. Atqui id convenit in tempus mortis Christi Jesu, qui verus Pan est, rerum omnium parens, ac naturæ totius auctor, quam Panos symbolo Mythologi signatam voluerunt. Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop. ix. cap. 136. p. 630. See likewise Tillemont. Mem. Ec. J. C. art. 21. et note 31.

added, ‘that in one of those islands Satan was bound, and ‘guarded by Briarius, and that there were many dæmons ‘attending upon him, as his slaves and ministers.’ All fiction surely; but representing, as may be supposed, the doctrine of credulous heathens concerning dæmons.

All which, however, is quoted by Eusebius<sup>e</sup> from Plutarch, to prove the cessation or the declension of oracles soon after the coming of Christ.

His remark is to this purpose: ‘So far Plutarch. But it ‘will be worth the while to observe the time when he says ‘the death of that dæmon happened: it was in the time of ‘Tiberius. At that time our Saviour dwelt among men; ‘and it is written of him that he expelled all sorts of ‘dæmons; and some of them fell down before him, entreat- ‘ing him that he would not send them into the abyss. Here ‘then you have the true time of the expulsion of dæmons out ‘of this world. A thing never heard of before. Nor was ‘there an end put to human sacrifices, so common among ‘the Gentiles, till the evangelical doctrine had been preached ‘to all men.’ So Eusebius.

And though<sup>f</sup> Colonia flourisheth mightily upon this story, he in the end finds it prudent to content himself with considering it as an argument, ‘that<sup>g</sup> the Gentiles themselves ‘acknowledged the general downfall or declension of their ‘oracles, after the time of Tiberius, and the coming of ‘Christ, and that two centuries before Eusebius.’ A point about which I do not now particularly concern myself.

Before I conclude this article, I would observe, that<sup>h</sup> Baronius did not fully rely upon the truth of the story told in Plutarch, concerning the pilot Thamus: and that<sup>i</sup> the centuriators of Magdeburg consider it as an absurd and ridiculous fiction. So likewise does<sup>k</sup> Basnage, who has offered more reasons in behalf of his opinion than need to be repeated by me here.

<sup>e</sup> Præp. Evang. l. v. cap. 17. p. 206—208.

<sup>f</sup> La Religion Chrétienne, &c. Tom. i. p. 124, &c.

<sup>g</sup> P. 129.

<sup>h</sup> Hactenus de Pane Eusebius ex Plutarcho — Sane quidem si rei gestæ fidem adhibendam esse putamus, &c. Baron. Ann. 34. num. 130.

<sup>i</sup> Ubi et de Pane mortuo ridicula narrat. Centur. Magdeb. Sec. i. lib. 2. cap. xv.

<sup>k</sup> Nobis vero propius est, hanc Epithersis narrationem esse fabulis apponendam: neque Christi passionem Panis morte significatam—Basn. ann. 33. num. 124.



### CHAP. III.

#### A MONUMENTAL INSCRIPTION CONCERNING THE CHRISTIANS IN THE TIME OF NERO.

WHAT offers next is an inscription of the emperor Nero, on a monument found in Portugal.<sup>a</sup>

TO NERO CLAUDIUS CÆSAR,  
AUGUSTUS, HIGH-PRIEST,  
FOR CLEARING THE PROVINCE  
OF ROBBERS, AND THOSE  
WHO TAUGHT MANKIND  
A NEW SUPERSTITION.

None can doubt that by the new superstition is here intended christianity. Some have questioned the genuineness of this inscription, because, say they, Nero's persecution extended no farther than Rome. The pretence for punishing them there was a charge of having set fire to the city. But it could not be so much as pretended that they who dwelt in remote countries were concerned in that fact.

If this be the only objection, the inscription may be reckoned very good. For if the christians living at Rome were charged with so great a crime, all of that sect in any place would share in the scandal, and might be judged a vile sort of people, fit to be destroyed. And indeed the christians at Rome were as innocent as they at the greatest distance. Besides, it will presently appear, from Tacitus, that the christians were then much hated, and that they suffered at Rome, not barely as guilty of setting fire to the city, but also for their supposed enmity to mankind. And Suetonius, in his account of the sufferings of the christians in this reign, says nothing of any concern in the fire; but only that they were a people of a new and pernicious, or magical, superstition.

<sup>a</sup> In ruinis pagi Marquosizæ in Lusitaniâ. Ap. Gruter. p. 238. 3.

NERONI. CL. CAES.  
AUG. PONT. MAX.  
OB PROVINC. LATRONIB  
ET. HIS. QUI. NOVAM  
GENERI. HUM. SUPER.  
STITION. INCULAB.  
PURGATAM.

Which leads me to observe farther, that the style of the inscription is agreeable to that of Tacitus and Suetonius, some of the earliest heathen writers who have mentioned the christians.

If the persecution in Nero's time never became universal, it might take place in some of the provinces, particularly in that part of Spain which is now called Portugal. The christian writers, who speak of Nero's persecution, do<sup>b</sup> in effect, or expressly, say it was general;<sup>c</sup> that from Rome it spread into the provinces, and was authorized by public edicts.

Though there remain this monument only, there may have been others of the like kind, which have been destroyed out of aversion to the memory of Nero, or by some of those many accidents to which all things are liable in a long course of years.

If this inscription be genuine, it is as early an heathen monument as we could expect to find remaining concerning christianity; especially so far off from Judea as Lusitania, now called Portugal. It must have been set up in the lifetime of Nero, who died in June, A. D. 68, or, at the utmost, before his death was publicly known; for after that no people paid him any honours.

I have shown that the style of this inscription is agreeable to early antiquity; and I have answered the objection taken from the supposed narrow limits of Nero's persecution. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged, that the genuineness of it is not assented to by all. Joseph Scaliger<sup>d</sup> doubted. Pagi<sup>e</sup> and others have endeavoured to vindicate it. Some others still<sup>f</sup> hesitate. This monument, they say, has been

<sup>b</sup> Consulite commentarios vestros. Illic reperietis, primum Neronem in hanc sectam, cum maxime Romæ orientem, Cæsareano gladio frocisse. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis nostræ etiam gloriamur. Tertullian. Ap. cap. 5.

Cum animadverteret Nero, non modo Romæ, sed ubique quotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum—prosiluit ad excidendum cœleste templum, delendamque justitiam, et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, &c. Lactant. vel Cæcilius de M. P. cap. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Hoc initio in christianos sæviri cœptum. Post etiam datis legibus religio vetabatur: palamque edictis propositis christianum esse non licebat. Sulp. Sev. Hist. l. 2. cap. 41.

Primus Romæ christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciarî imperavit. Oros. l. 7. c. 7.

<sup>d</sup> Neque solum Romæ sævitum in christianos, sed etiam in provinciis. Exstat vetus inscriptio in Hispaniâ, loco Pisurga vocato, in quo sine dubio hæc crudelitas tangitur, siquidem vera est illa inscriptio. Nam dubito. De Emend. Temp. p. 471.

<sup>e</sup> Pagi ann. 64. n. iv. J. E. I. Walchius De Persecutione Christian. Neronianâ in Hispaniâ.

<sup>f</sup> Exstat celebris hæc inscriptio apud Jan. Gruter. p. 238. n. 9. Ipsi vero præstantissimi Hispanorum viri auctoritatem hujus inscriptionis tueri non

seen by few or none : and the credit of the first publisher of the inscription is not established above all suspicion of falsehood and imposture.

I therefore must not insist upon it as certainly genuine and ancient ; though I could not forbear to propose it to be considered : nor do I think that any can dislike my placing it here before my readers.

## CHAP. IV.

### PLINY THE ELDER.

**CAIUS PLINUS SECUNDUS**, or<sup>a</sup> Pliny the elder, was born at Neronæ, in the reign of Tiberius. He had divers public posts under the emperors Vespasian and Titus ; notwithstanding which he redeemed a great deal of time for reading and writing, in which he was indefatigable. He was suffocated in the smoke and ashes of Vesuvius, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and the first year of the reign of Titus, in the year 79. His Natural History was published, and inscribed to Vespasian ; or, as others think, to Titus, in the year of our Lord 77, before he was emperor.

In his History is a chapter concerning the origin of magic ; where are these words : ‘ There<sup>b</sup> is another sect of magicians, depending on (or deriving from) Moses, and Jamnes, and Jotapes, who were Jews, but many thousand years since Zoroaster. Still so much later is the Cyprian.’

audent, quippe quam nemo unquam vidit, et Cyriacus Anconitanus primus protulit, homo, quod omnes sciunt, fallax, et, si quis alius, malæ fidei, &c J. L. Moshem. Instit. Hist. Ec. p. 37.

Verum magni homines post Scaligerum dubitant, quid de fide et auctoritate monumenti hujus statuendum sit : et, ut arbitror, justissimas habent dubitandi causas. Nemo enim vel Hispanorum, vel Lusitanorum, lapidem hunc unquam vidit, quod ipsi doctissimi Hispaniæ viri non diffitentur. Is vero, si aliquando extitisset, magnâ certe curâ ob insigne pretium asservatus fuisset. Id. De. Reb. Christian. p. 109.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Plin. Ep. l. vi. 16. et 20. Voss. de H. l. i. cap. 29. Fabr. Bib. Lat. l. 2. c. 13. Basnag. ann. 77. ii. et 79. v. Tillem. H. E. Tite. art. vi. Crevier's History of the Roman Emperors. B. xvii. vol. 6. p. 291.

<sup>b</sup> Est et alia Magicis factio, a Mose, et Jamne, et Jotape Judæis pendens, sed multis millibus annorum post Zoroastrem. Tanto recentior est Cypria. Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 30. cap. i. De Origine Magicæ artis, quando, et a quibus cæperat, &c.

Some have thought, that in this last Pliny refers to the blindness inflicted by St. Paul on Elymas the sorcerer, in the presence of Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, and related in Acts xiii. but I do not affirm it.

---

## CHAP. V.

### TACITUS.

- I. *His history, time, and works.* II. *Pomponia Græcina, a Roman lady, accused of a foreign superstition in the year of Christ 57, the fourth year of Nero's reign.* III. *His account of Nero's persecution of the christians.* IV. *His testimony to the Jewish war, and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.*

I. **CAIUS CORNELIUS TACITUS**,<sup>a</sup> whose ancestors are unknown, was<sup>b</sup> older than the younger Pliny, who was born in the year of our Lord 61 or 62. In the year 77 or 78 he married the daughter of Cnæus Julius Agricola,<sup>c</sup> famous for his consulship, and government of Britain. He<sup>d</sup> enjoyed divers posts of honour and trust under Vespasian, and the following emperors. He was prætor of Rome, under Domitian, in 88, and consul in the short reign of Nerva, in 97. The year was opened by Nerva and T. Virginus Rufus, who were then both of them the third time consuls. Virginus Rufus, who was a man of great eminence, and then of a great age, died in his consulship; whereupon<sup>e</sup> Tacitus was substituted in his room, and pronounced his panegyric.

But, as has been often observed, his writings have gained him more honour than all his dignities. His works seem to have been published by him in this order: first, his De-

<sup>a</sup> Vid. G. J. Voss. de Hist. Lat. Lipsii Vit. Tacit. Fabric. Bib. Lat. Tom. i. Bayle Diction. Tillemont, II. E. Trajan. art. 27.

<sup>b</sup> Equidem adolescentulus, quum jam tu fanâ gloriâque floreres, te sequi, tibi longo sed proximus intervallo et esse et haberi concupiscebam. Plin. l. 7. Ep. 20.

<sup>c</sup> Consul egregiæ tum spei filiam juveni mihi despondit, ac post consulatum collocavit, et statim Britannix præpositus est, adjecto pontificatus sacerdotio. Tacit. Vit. Agr. cap. 9.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Tacit. Hist. l. i. cap. i.

<sup>e</sup> Laudatus est a consule Cornelio Tacito. Nam hic supremus felicitati ejus cumulus accessit, laudator eloquentissimus, &c. Plin. l. i. ep. 2.

scription of Germany, next, *The Life of Agricola*, his father-in-law; after that his *History*, beginning with Galba, and ending at the death of Domitian; and lastly, his *Annals*, beginning with Tiberius, and ending at the death of Nero. Both these works are now imperfect.

Tacitus and Pliny the younger lived together in intimate friendship. They <sup>f</sup> revised each other's writings before publication. Divers of Pliny's letters are written to him; in particular those <sup>g</sup> two wherein Pliny gives an account of the eruption of Vesuvius, and the death of his uncle. They were sent as memoirs, to be inserted by Tacitus in his histories.

It is allowed that <sup>h</sup> Tacitus flourished in the first century; I therefore place him here in the year 100, the third of the emperor Trajan: and though the two last, and principal of his works, were not published till some time after, undoubtedly he was now employed in collecting materials for them, and in composing them. Nor did either of them come down any lower than the death of Domitian.

II. In his *Annals*, at the year of our Lord 57, he writes thus: 'And <sup>i</sup> Pomponia Græcina, a lady of eminent quality, married to Plautius, who, upon his return from Britain, had the honour of an ovation, being accused of practising a foreign superstition, was referred to the cognizance of her husband. And he, according to ancient institution, in the presence of the family, sat in judgment upon the life and reputation of his wife, and pronounced her innocent. Pomponia lived to a great age, and in perpetual sorrow, after the death of Julia, daughter of Drusus, procured by the intrigues of Messalina. For the space of forty years she wore no habit but that of mourning, nor admitted any sentiments but those of grief. And this behaviour, which in the

<sup>f</sup> Librum tuum legi, et, quam diligentissime potui, annotavi quæ commutanda, quæ eximenda arbitrarer.—Nunc a te librum meum cum annotationibus tuis exspecto. O jucundas, O pulchras vices! Plin. l. 7. ep. 20. Vid. et l. 8. ep. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Petis, ut tibi avunculi mei exitum scribam, quo verius tradere posteris possis. Gratias ago. Nam video, morti ejus, si celebretur a te, immortalem gloriam esse propositam. L. 6. ep. 16. Vid. et ep. 20.

<sup>h</sup> Tacite——Historien Romain, a fleuri dans le premier siècle. Bayle Diction.

<sup>i</sup> Et Pomponia Græcina, insignis femina, Plautio, qui ovans se de Britannis retulit, nupta, ac superstitionis externæ rea, mariti judicio permissa. Isque prisco instituto, propinquis coram, de capite famâque conjugis cognovit, et infontem nuntiavit. Longa huic Pomponiæ ætas, et continua tristitia fuit. Nam, post Juliam Drusi filiam dolo Messalinæ interfectam, per quadraginta annos, non cultu nisi lugubri, non animo nisi mæsto egit. Idque illi imperitante Claudio impune, mox ad gloriam vertit. Tacit. Ann. l. 13. c. 32.

reign of Claudius escaped with impunity, afterwards re-dounded to her glory.'

As it was about fourteen years from the death of Julia, to this trial of Pomponia, Lipsius<sup>k</sup> suspects the reading of ' forty years ;' and his emendation is approved by some, rejected by others. I rather think it to be right, as it is in all copies. Nor does Tacitus compute from the death of Julia to the time of this trial, but to the time of Pomponia's death. ' She lived,' he says, ' to a great age : and all the time from the death of Julia to her own death, which was the space of forty years, she was a perpetual mourner.'

This foreign, or extraneous superstition, of which Pomponia was accused, is supposed by Lipsius, in his<sup>l</sup> notes, and by<sup>m</sup> others, to be the christian religion : and we may be inclined to that opinion ; but we cannot be certain of it. I have transcribed the whole account of this lady, that every one may the better judge for himself.

III. After a description of the terrible fire at Rome, in the tenth of Nero, and the sixty-fourth of our Lord, in which a large part of the city was consumed, and an account of the orders given for rebuilding and beautifying it, and the methods used to appease the anger of the gods, Tacitus adds : ' But<sup>n</sup> neither all human help, nor the liberality of the emperor, nor all the atonements presented to the gods, availed to abate the infamy he lay under of having ordered the city

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Not. ad loc.

<sup>l</sup> *Superstitionis externæ rea.*] Christianismi credo accusatam, sive, ut tunc confundebant, judaismi. Lipsius in loc.

Forte christianam pietatem intelligit. Nam apparet, sanctam mulierem fuisse Pomponiam Græcinam. Tacitus loquitur ut Ethnicus. Rhenanus in loc.

<sup>m</sup> Christi doctrinam a Pomponiâ fuisse degustatam, non immerito conjicimus. Basnag. ann. 57. p. ii. Pomponia Græcina fut accusée de suivre une superstition étrangère, dit Tacite ; ce qui se peut entendre du christianisme. Tillem. Neron. art. v.

<sup>n</sup> Sed non ope humanâ, non largitionibus principis, aut deum placamentis decedebat infamia, quin jussum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis pœnis affectit, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui, Tiberio imperante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressa in præsens exitiabilis superstitione rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per Urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocitas aut pudenda confluunt, celebranturque. Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis, convicti sunt. Et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contacti, laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque, ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur. Hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat, et Circense ludicrum edebat, habitu aurigæ permixtus plebi vel circulo [curriculo legit Lipsius] insistens. Unde, quanquam adversus sontes, et novissima exempla meritos, miseratio oriebatur, tanquam non utilitate publicâ, sed in sævitiam unius absumerentur. Ann. l. xv. c. 44.

to be set on fire. To suppress therefore this common rumour, Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishment upon those people, who were in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of christians. They had their denomination from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius was put to death as a criminal by the procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread, not only over Judea, the source of this evil, but reached the city also; whither flow from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement. At first they only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards a vast multitude, discovered by them: all which were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city, as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; others, having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night time, and thus burned to death. Nero made use of his own gardens as a theatre upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the Circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer, at other times driving a chariot himself: till at length these men, though really criminal, and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated, as people who were destroyed, not out of a regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man.'

Divers facts of the evangelical history are here attested: that our Saviour was put to death as a malefactor by Pontius Pilate, procurator under Tiberius: that from Christ the people called christians had their name and sentiments: that this superstition, or religion, had its rise in Judea, where also it spread, notwithstanding the ignominious death of the founder of it, and the opposition which his followers met with from the people of that country afterwards: that thence it was propagated into other parts of the world, and as far as Rome, where in the tenth or eleventh year of Nero, and before, christians were very numerous: and that the professors of this religion were reproached, and hated, and underwent many and grievous sufferings. Certainly the great number of christians at Rome at this time, and their sufferings, are two things very observable.

And though they were so hated, and Tacitus himself is so much offended with them, he owns the cruelty with which they were treated was so excessive as to excite compassion.

Nay, it seems their destruction was looked upon by many, not as a public benefit, but an act of savage cruelty. Which shows, after all, that they were not such monsters of wickedness as they are here represented.

And all this guilt, this enmity to mankind, which Tacitus imputes to them, could be nothing else, as has been well observed<sup>o</sup> by learned men, but their neglect of the ordinary worship of the gods.

It will not be disagreeable to compare this article of Tacitus with the account of the fire at Rome, and the ensuing persecution of the christians, which is given by Sulpicius Severus, an elegant christian writer of history and in the Latin tongue, who flourished about the year 400.

‘In<sup>p</sup> the mean time,’ says Sulpicius, ‘when the number of the christians was greatly increased, there happened a fire at Rome while Nero was at Antium. Nevertheless, the general opinion of all men cast the blame of the fire upon the emperor. And it was supposed that his aim therein was that he might have the glory of raising the city again in greater splendour. Nor could he by any means suppress the common rumour that the fire was owing to his orders. He therefore endeavoured to cast the reproach of it upon the christians. And exquisite tortures were inflicted upon innocent men: and moreover new kinds of death were invented. Some were tied up in the skins of wild beasts, that they might be worried to death by dogs. Many were crucified. Others were burnt to death; and they were set up as lights in the night-time. This was the beginning of the persecution of the christians. Afterwards the profession of the christian religion was prohibited by laws; and edicts were published that no man might be a christian. At that

<sup>o</sup> Tacitus libro xv—de christianorum suppliciis—Ubi ‘flagitia,’ et ‘odium humani generis,’ nihil aliud sunt, quam falsorum deorum neglectus; quam eandem causam etiam Judæis maledicendi Tacitus habuit, et Plinius major, cui Judæi dicuntur ‘gens contumeliâ nimum insignis.’ Cleric. Annot. ad Grot. de Ver. Rel. Christian. l. 2. sect. ii.

<sup>p</sup> Interea, abundante jam christianorum multitudine, accidit, ut Roma incendio conflagraret, Nerone apud Antium constituto. Sed opinio omnium invidiam incendi in principem retorquebat, credebaturque imperator gloriam innovandæ urbis quæsisse. Neque ullâ re Nero efficiebat, quin ab eo jussum incendium putaretur. Igitur vertit invidiam in christianos; actæque in innoxios crudelissimæ quæstiones. Quin et novæ mortes excogitatæ, ut ferarum tergis contacti, laniatu canum interrent. Multi crucibus affixi, aut flammâ usti. Plerique in id reservati, ut, cum defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur. Hoc initio in christianos sæviri cœptum. Post etiam, datis legibus religio vetabatur; palamque edictis propositis, christianum esse non licebat. Tum Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati, quorum uni cervix gladio desecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est. Sulp. Sever. Sac. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 41. al. cap. 29.



‘time Paul and Peter were condemned to death. The former was beheaded, Peter was crucified.

So writes Sulpicius. It is not unlikely that he had read Tacitus. However, I think it ought also to be supposed that he had other memoirs besides.

Sulpicius says that Nero was at Antium when the fire began. The <sup>9</sup> same thing is observed by Tacitus, who also says, that Nero did not come to Rome till the fire had approached his own palace, which at length, with every thing near it, was consumed.

IV. It is not needful for me to translate or transcribe all that Tacitus says of the Jewish people, of <sup>r</sup> whose original he was ignorant, and writes very absurdly, and therefore is called by Tertullian <sup>s</sup> a great liar. Nor need I translate exactly his history of the Jewish war. I observe however these following particulars.

He says, that <sup>t</sup> Judea was first brought into subjection to the Romans by Pompey. After which he gives a summary account of their affairs under Herod and his sons, the emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero. ‘He mentions <sup>u</sup> Felix, whom he represents as a bad man, and tyrannical in his government. However, the Jews,’ he says, ‘bore the exactions of their governors, till the time of their procurator Gessius Florus, under whom the war began. Cestius Gallus, president of Syria, came to his assistance: but he being defeated, Nero sent Vespasian into Judea, who was a general of great merit and reputation, and having also under him good officers, in the space of two years,’ meaning the years 67 and 68, ‘he reduced the open country, and all the cities of Judea, excepting Jerusalem. The next year,’ 69, ‘was taken up in civil wars;’ meaning the time of the short reigns of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, till the acces-

<sup>9</sup> Eo in tempore Nero Antii agens, non ante in Urbem regressus est, quam domui ejus, quâ Palatium et Mæcenatis hortos continuaverat, ignis propinquaret. Neque tamen sisti potuit, quin et Palatium et domus et cuncta circum haurirentur. Tacit. Ann. l. 15. cap. 39. <sup>r</sup> Tacit. Hist. l. v. cap. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Cornelius Tacitus, sane ille mendaciorum loquacissimus. Apol. c. 16. p. 17. A. <sup>t</sup> Romanorum primus Cn. Pompeius Judæos

domuit, templumque jure victoriæ ingressus est. H. l. v. cap. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Claudius, defunctis regibus, aut ad modicum reductis, Judæam provinciam equitibus Romanis aut libertis permisit, e quibus Antonius Felix, per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem, jus regium servili ingenio exercuit——Duravit tamen patientia Judæis, usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem. Sub eo bellum ortum, et comprimere cœptantem Cestium Gallum Syriæ legatum, varia prælia ac sæpius adversa exceperet. Qui ubi fito aut tædio occidit, missu Neronis, Vespasianus fortunâ famâque et egregiis ministris intra duas ætates, cuncta camporum, omnesque præter Hierosolyma urbes, victore exercitu tenebat. Proximus annus, civili bello intentus, quantum ad Judæos per otium

sion of Vespasian. ‘The following year, [and the beginning of it,] Titus was appointed to attend the affairs of Judea; who now drew near to Jerusalem and besieged it. Tacitus supposeth that Titus was in haste to go to Rome to enjoy the pleasures and splendour of the city. He therefore carried on the siege with the greatest vigour. The army likewise was intent upon plunder, and eager to gratify their revenge. The city however was strong by situation, and with good walls and ramparts: the high tower Antonia, conspicuous from far. The temple itself was like a citadel well fortified. They had a fountain of water that ran continually, and the mountains were hollowed under ground. Moreover they had pools and cisterns for preserving rain water. And there was a great confluence of people. For the men of the other cities that had been reduced, and in general all the turbulent and seditious people of the nation, came hither. There were three captains, or heads of factions, ‘and as many armies, Simon, John, called also Bargioras, and Eleazer, who occupied several parts of the city. Among themselves they had fierce contentions, and therein great quantities of provisions were consumed. Eleazer being killed, they were reduced to two factions. These fought with each other till the near approach of the Romans obliged

transiit. Pace per Italiam partâ, et externæ curæ rediere. Augebat iras, quod soli Judæi non cessissent. Simul manere apud exercitus Titum ad omnes principatûs novi eventus casusve utilius videbatur. [Ejusdem anni principio Cæsar Titus perdomandæ Judææ delectus a patre. Lib. v. cap. i. in.] Igitur castris, uti diximus, ante mœnia Hierosolymorum positus, instructas legiones ostentavit. Judæi sub ipsos muros struxere aciem——Mox cessere hostes, et sequentibus diebus crebra pro portis prælia ferebant, donec assiduis damnis intra mœnia pellerentur. Romani ad oppugnandum versi. Neque enim dignum videbatur, famem hostium opperiri: posebantque pericula, pars virtute, multi ferociâ, et cupidine præmiorum. Ipsi Tito Roma, et opes, voluptatesque ante oculos: ac, ni statim Hierosolyma conciderent, morari videbantur. Sed urbem, arduam situ, opera molesque firmaverant, quis vel plana satis munirentur. Nam duos colles immensum editos claudabant muri per artem obliqui, aut introrsus sinuati. [Conf. l. 2. cap. 4.]——Alia intus mœnia, regie circumjecta. Conspicuoque fastigio turris Antonia, in honorem M. Antonii ab Herode appellata. Templum in modum arcis propriique muri, labore et opere ante alios. Ipsæ porticus, quæ templum ambiebatur, egregium propugnaculum. Fons perennis aquæ, cavati sub terrâ montes, et piscinæ cisternæque servandis imbribus——magnâ colluvi, et cæterarum urbium clade aucti. Nam pervicacissimus quisque illuc perfugerat, eoque seditiosius agebant. Tres duces, totidem exercitus. Extrema et latissima mœnium Simon; mediam urbem Joannes, quem et Bargioram vocabant; templum Eleazarus firmaverat. Multitudine et armis Joannes ac Simon, Eleazarus loco pollebat. Sed prælia, dolus, incendia, inter ipsos, et magna vis frumenti ambusta. Mox Joannes, missis per speciem sacrificandi, qui Eleazarum manumque ejus obrutarent, templo potitur. Ita in duas factiones civitas discessit, donec, propinquantibus Romanis, bellum externum concordiam

them to agreement. There were many prodigies foresignifying their ruin, which were not to be averted by all the sacrifices and vows of that people, superstitious in their own way of worship, though different from all others. Armies were seen fighting in the air with brandished weapons. A fire fell upon the temple from the clouds. The doors of the temple were suddenly opened. At the same time there was a loud voice declaring that the gods were removing: which was accompanied with the sound as of a multitude going out. All which things were supposed by some to portend great calamities. But the most had a strong persuasion that it was said in the ancient writings of the priests, that is, ancient writings in the custody of the priests, 'that at that very time the East should prevail, and that some who came from Judea should obtain the empire of the world. Which ambiguities foretold Vespasian and Titus. But the common people, according to the usual influence of human passions, having once appropriated to themselves this vast grandeur of the fates, could not be brought to understand the true meaning by all their adversities. We have been assured, that the number of the besieged amounted to six hundred thousand. And more bore arms than could have been expected from that number. For great was the resolution of all, both men and women. Against this city and people was Titus sent. As the city could not be taken by assault, different posts were assigned to the several legions. Battering engines of all kinds were prepared: and all the methods hitherto practised in sieges by the ancients, as well as new inventions, were employed on this occasion.'

So writes Tacitus, who could and might have been more particular in his history of the Jewish war in the several

pareret. Evenerant prodigia, quæ neque hostiis, neque votis piare fas habet gens superstitioni obnoxia, religionibus adversa. Visæ per cælum concurrere acies, rutilantia arma, et subito nubium igne collucere templum. Expassæ repente delubri fores, et audita major humanâ vox, 'Excedere deos:' simul ingens motus excedentum. Quæ pauci in metum trahebant: pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judæâ rerum potirentur. Quæ ambages Vespasianum ac Titum prædixerant. Sed vulgus, more humanæ cupidinis sibi tantam fatorum magnitudinem interpretati, ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur. Multitudinem obsessorum, omnis ætatis, virilis ac muliebris sexûs, sexcenta millia fuisse accepimus. Arma cunctis, qui ferre possent; et plures quam pro numero audebant. Obstinatio viris feminisque par. Ac si transferre sedes cogentur, major vitæ metus quam mortis. Hanc adversus urbem gentemque Cæsar Titus, quando impetum et subita belli locus abnueret, aggeribus vineisque certare statuit. Dividuntur legionibus muria, et quies præhiorum fuit: donec cuncta expugnandis urbibus reperta apud veteres, aut novis ingeniis, strucentur. Tacit. Hist. l. v. cap. 9—13.

parts of that country, and likewise of the siege of Jerusalem. But his dislike of the subject, as it seems, and his love of brevity, have made him very concise.

However, it is not unlikely that in the next book, which, with all the following books of that work, is lost, there was an account of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus at Rome in the following year. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose, that there were also some more particulars concerning the event of the siege of Jerusalem: but what they were we cannot now say.

It is also worth our while to observe, that in this fifth book of his history, from which the preceding article has been taken, at his entrance upon his account of the war, he says, ‘ he<sup>v</sup> was going to relate the final end of the renowned city of Jerusalem.’

He likewise takes notice that ‘ Jerusalem<sup>w</sup> was the capital city of Judea, and that the temple there had in it immense riches.’

Nor should we omit to observe, that in the first chapter of this book he has reckoned up the forces with which Vespasian was furnished for carrying on this war, and not very disagreeably to Josephus: ‘ For<sup>x</sup> he mentions the three legions quartered in Judea, the twelfth brought in from Syria, and other legions from Alexandria, beside the armies of the Roman allies, the kings Agrippa, Sohemus, and Antiochus, and a large body of Arabians, always averse to the Jews, and some volunteers of distinction even from Rome and Italy, who were willing to serve under Titus, a general of such renown and expectation, desirous to signalize their valour before him, and thereby to recommend themselves to his favour.’

And though we do not find in Tacitus every thing that we might wish for, certainly what we have in his remaining works is a very valuable testimony to the accomplishment

<sup>v</sup> Sed quia famosæ urbis supremum diem tradituri sumus, &c. *Histor.* l. 5. c. 2. in. <sup>w</sup> Magna pars Judææ vicis dispergitur. Habent et oppida. Hierosolyma genti caput: Illic immensæ opulentiaë templum. &c. *Ibid.* c. 8.

<sup>x</sup> Ejusdem anni principio, Cæsar Titus perdomandæ Judææ delectus a patre——Tres enim in Judæâ legiones, quinta et decima, et quintadecima, vetus Vespasiani miles, exceperunt. Tradidit et Syria duodecimam, et adductos Alexandriâ duo et vicesimos tertianosque. Comitabantur viginti sociæ cohortes, octo equitum alæ. Simul Agrippa Sohemusque reges, et auxilia regis Antiochi, validaque et solito inter accolos odio infensa Judæis Arabum manus. Multi, quos Urbe atque Italiâ suâ quemque spes acciverat occupandi principem adhuc vacuum. His cum copiis fines hostium ingressus, composito agmine, cuncta explorans, paratusque decernere, haud procul Hierosolymis castra facit. *Tacit. Hist.* l. 5. cap. i.

of our Lord's predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish people.

He must have read Josephus; many things are evidently taken from him; however he differs from him sometimes. It is somewhat strange that he should not compute a greater number within Jerusalem at the time of the siege than six hundred thousand. How shall we account for this? I answer, that perhaps Tacitus had met with some other accounts of the Jewish war beside that of Josephus. And I am apt to think it not unreasonable to believe, that Tacitus never read Josephus with so much care and diligence as we christians have since read him. Moreover, six hundred thousand may be a certain number, used for an uncertain, denoting, that the city was then very full of people, and not intending to say there were no more.

## CHAP. VI.

MARTIAL.

### I. *His time and writings.* II. *His testimony to the fortitude of christians.*

I. MARTIAL,<sup>a</sup> or M. Valerius Martialis, author of fourteen books of epigrams, was born at Bilbilis in Spain, in the reign of Claudius. He is supposed to have come to Rome in the reign of Nero, when he was about twenty years of age, and to have lived there thirty years, beloved by the emperors, especially Domitian, after whose death he retired into his own country. As he lived long enough to<sup>b</sup> write some epigrams in commendation of Nerva and Trajan, I have placed him so low as the last year of the first century, and<sup>c</sup> the third of Trajan. He was intimate with Juvenal, and well acquainted with Pliny the younger. Martial was poor. When<sup>d</sup> he left Rome, Pliny made him a handsome present;

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Voss. de Poet. Lat. Tillemont, H. E. Domitien. art. 23.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. L. 12. Epigr. v.—ix. L. xi. 4, 5. x. 34.

<sup>c</sup> ——— Domitiani, Nervæ, et Trajani, tempora ingenio suo illustravit. Senex autem, Urbe relicta, patriam suam repetens, in illâ obiit sub eodem Trajano. Fabric. Bib. Lat. l. 2. c. 20. De M. V. Martiali.

<sup>d</sup> Audio, Valerium Martialem decessisse. Et moleste fero. Erat homo ingeniosus, acutus, acer, et qui plurimum in scribendo et salis haberet, et

and when he heard of his death, he lamented it very affectionately.

II. This writer has been supposed to refer to the patient fortitude of christians, in voluntarily enduring the greatest pains, rather than sacrifice to the gods, or do any thing contrary to the principles of their religion.

‘You<sup>e</sup> have, perhaps, lately seen acted in the theatre, Mucius, who thrust his hand into the fire. If you think such an one patient, valiant, stout, you are a mere senseless dotard. For it is a much greater thing when threatened with the troublesome coat, to say I do not sacrifice, than to obey the command—burn the hand.’

However, the two last verses of the epigram may be otherwise rendered, after this manner: ‘For it is a much greater thing, when threatened with the troublesome coat, you are commanded to burn your hand, to say; I will not.’

But I can see no reason for bringing in the troublesome coat to oblige a man to act the part of Mucius in the theatre. And I much rather incline to the sense given in the first translation.

I shall therefore place below the remarks<sup>f</sup> of Stephen Le Moyne upon this epigram, who makes no doubt that Martial refers to the christians, and declares that what Mucius did, is not comparable to the resolution of christians under the sufferings which they endured.

The troublesome coat, or shirt, here mentioned, a cruelty which, as we have before learned from Tacitus, the innocent

*fellis, nec candoris minus. Prosequutus eram cum viatico discedentem. Dederam hoc amicitiae: dederam etiam versiculis, quos de me composuit Plin. Lib. 3. E. p. 21.*

- <sup>e</sup> In matutinâ nuper spectatus arenâ  
 Mucius, imposuit qui sua membra focus,  
 Si patiens fortisque tibi durusque videtur,  
 Abderitanae pectora plebis habes.  
 Nam, cum dicatur, tunicâ præsente molestâ,  
 Ure manum, plus est dicere: Non facio.

Martial. l. x. Epigr. 25.

<sup>f</sup> Pacinus Mucii non videtur, inquit Martialis, cum fortitudine christianorum comparandum. Ille ustulandam manum suam flammis exhibuit, ut istâ constantiâ reliquum corpus suum servaret. Sed christiani totum corpus igni vorandum tradunt, uno igni lento; et patiuntur se supervestiri cereo indumento, ut instar cereorum ardeant; quod tamen possent declinare, si vellent, et si religioni popularium suorum, et sacris imperatoris, faciles se alligarent. Sed malunt in cineres et favillas redigi, et se vivos ardere, quam sacrificare, vel thura adolere: et cum ad id compelluntur, dicunt, Non facio, non sacrifico—et tunicæ moleste præsens et tremendum supplicium illos a sacris suis non potest avellere, vel minimum terrere. St. Le Moyne *Varia sacra*. p. 1041, 1042. Vid. et Kortholt. *De persecutionib. primit. Ec.* p. 25.

christians unjustly suffered, was made like a sack, of paper or coarse linen cloth; and having been first besmeared within and without with pitch, wax, rosin, sulphur, and such like combustible materials, or dipt all over in them, was put upon the person for whom it was appointed; and that he might be kept upright, the more to resemble a flaming torch, his chin was fastened to a stake fixed in the ground.

That this was esteemed a cruel death is manifest from Seneca; who, describing the greatest causes of fear, writes to this purpose: ‘Imagine<sup>s</sup> here,’ says he, ‘a prison, cross-  
‘es, and racks, and the hook, and a stake thrust through  
‘the body and coming out at the mouth, and the limbs torn  
‘by chariots pulling adverse ways, and that coat besmeared  
‘and interwoven with combustible materials, nutriment for  
‘fire, and whatever else beside these cruelty has invented.  
‘It is no wonder if, in such a case, fear riseth high, where  
‘the variety of evils is so great, and the preparation is so  
‘terrible.’

It is hence apparent, that this was one of the worst punishments which cruelty had invented.

I do not know but some may think I ought to have quoted this passage of Seneca, not only as a description of this coat and the cruelty of it, but also as an allusion to the sufferings of the christians, who felt it in so great numbers; for Seneca’s death happened not<sup>h</sup> before April in the year 65; whereas the fire at Rome began in July the preceding year, and the persecution of the christians<sup>i</sup> commenced in November following; but, in my opinion, it is better not to insist upon any reference here to the sufferings of the christians.

<sup>s</sup> Cogita hoc loco carcerem, et cruces, et eculeos, et uncum, et adactum per medium hominem, qui per os emergat, stipitem, et distracta in diversum actis curribus membra, illam tunicam, alimentis ignium et illitam et intexam; quicquid, aliud, præter hæc, commenta sævitia est. Non est itaque mirum, si maximus hujus rei timor est, cujus et varietas magna, et apparatus terribilis est. Senec. Ep. 14.

<sup>h</sup> See Tillemont, Neron. art. xxii.

<sup>i</sup> See vol. v. ch. xi. near the end of the chapter.

## CHAP. VII.

## JUVENAL.

- I. *His time and writings.* II. *His testimony to Nero's persecution of the christians.* III. *His testimony to Domitian's persecution.* IV. *An observation concerning Seneca the philosopher.*

I. DECIMUS JUNIUS JUVENALIS,<sup>a</sup> or Juvenal, author of sixteen satires, which we still have, is computed to have flourished in the reigns of Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, and Adrian. And, as Lipsius well says, he<sup>b</sup> was contemporary with Pliny the younger, Tacitus, and others of that age. Nevertheless we do not find Juvenal at all mentioned in any of the letters of Pliny now extant. I place him next to his friend Martial, and in the same year, the last of the first century of the christian epoch.

II. He seems to refer to Nero's persecution of the christians in some lines<sup>c</sup> of his first satire, which are thus translated by Mr. Dryden :

But if that honest licence now you take,  
 If into rogues omnipotent you rake,  
 Death is your doom, impal'd upon a stake,  
 Smear'd o'er with wax, and set on fire to light  
 The streets, and make a dreadful blaze by night.

Or, more literally : ' Describe a great villain, such as was Tigellinus, (a corrupt minister under Nero,) and you shall suffer the same punishment with those who stand burning in their own flame and smoke, their head being held up by a stake fixed to their chin, till they make a long stream (of blood and running sulphur) on the ground.'

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Lips. Epist. Qu. l. 4. Ep. 20. Fabr. Bib. Lat. l. 2. cap. 18. Tillem. H. E. Domitien, art. 24. <sup>b</sup> Ergo, meo arbitrio, compar Juvenalis Plinio juniore, Tacito, et illi classi fuit. Lips. l. e.

<sup>c</sup> Pone Tigellinum, tædâ lucebis in illâ,  
 Quâ stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture fumant,  
 Et latum mediâ sulcum deducit arenâ.

Juven. Sat. i. ver. 155, &c.



It<sup>d</sup> is the opinion of Joseph Scaliger, and many other learned men, that Nero's cruelties to the christians are here intended: and that some punishments of men accused of magic in the reign of Nero are here referred to, is affirmed by an<sup>e</sup> ancient scholiast upon this place of Juvenal; who<sup>f</sup> likewise speaks of them as exhibited for a spectacle; as is particularly described by Tacitus. And Suetonius (as we shall presently see) calls the christians, 'men of a new and 'magical superstition.'

In another satire<sup>g</sup> Juvenal speaks of the pitched shirt, or troublesome coat, which they were covered with who were condemned to that punishment. And I shall place below<sup>h</sup> a part of Prateus's note upon that place.

III. In another satire Juvenal speaks of the death of Domitian in this manner; 'Many<sup>i</sup> illustrious men he destroyed who found no avenger; at last he perished, when he became formidable to the rabble. This ruined him, who long before was stained with the noble blood of the Lamiaë.'

The verses are thus translated by Mr. Stepny:

What folly this! But oh! that all the rest  
Of his dire reign had thus been spent in jest!  
And all that time such trifles had employed,  
In which so many nobles he destroyed.  
He safe, they unrevenged, to the disgrace  
Of the surviving, tame, Patrician race.  
But when he dreadful to the rabble grew,  
Him, who so many lords had slain, they slew.

<sup>d</sup> Scholia Juvenalis: 'Nero maleficos homines tædâ et papyro et cerâ 'supervestiebat, et sic ad ignem admoveri jubebat, ut arderent.' Hæc Scholiastes ille in illos versus Juvenalis, qui sine dubio de christianis dicti sunt. Jos. Scaliger. Animadv. in Euseb. Chron. p. 197. Videatur Id. De Emendat. Temp. l. v. p. 471.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. not. <sup>d</sup>, supra.

<sup>f</sup> Idem Scholiastes: 'Vivus ardebis, quemadmodum in munere Neronis 'vivi arserunt, de quibus ille jussit cereos fieri, ut lucerent spectatoribus quum 'fixa essent guttura, ne se curvarent.' Id. Scalig. l. c. p. 197. Et vide annot. ad Juvenalis locum.

<sup>g</sup> Ausi quod liceat tunicâ punire molestâ.

Sat. 8. lin. 235.

<sup>h</sup> Vestis erat e chartâ, cannabe, stuppâ. Illinebatur bitumine, resinâ, pice. Tum circumdabatur iis qui grave quidpiam, et maxime incendia, moliti fuerant. Quâ demum incensâ vivi comburebantur. Annot. in loc. ed. in usum Delphini.

<sup>i</sup> Atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset

Tempora sævitix, claras quibus abstulit Urbi

Illustresque animas impune, et vindice nullo.

Sed periit, postquam cerdonibus esse timendus

Cœperat. Hoc nocuit Lamiarum cæde madenti.

Sat. iv. ad fin.

Ælius Lamia, whose death is likewise particularly mentioned by <sup>k</sup> Suetonius, undoubtedly was a man of a very ancient and noble family. And Domitian had killed many other senators. The christians were generally of the meaner rank of people, and more despised still for their religion than their condition. But they were not all of the rabble, or cobblers and tailors, as Juvenal would insinuate. Anc. Flavius Clement, one of those whom Domitian put to death near the end of his reign, and whose death, as Suetonius expressly says, hastened Domitian's ruin, was of the imperial family; and, as we think, a christian. However, it is observable, that Juvenal says Domitian's death soon followed after some acts of cruelty toward mean people. Herein he agrees with and confirms the accounts of some christian writers, particularly that of Cæcilius, or Lactantius, in his book of the Deaths of Persecutors; who observes, that 'Domitian<sup>l</sup> had been long permitted to exercise great cruelties upon his subjects: but when he began to persecute the servants of God, he was soon delivered up into the hands of his enemies.'

IV. It may be observed, that I do not allege, among witnesses to christianity, or the affairs of christians, the philosopher, L. A. Seneca. There is extant a correspondence between him and St. Paul, in fourteen letters; which may be seen in Latin, in <sup>m</sup> Fabricius, and in Latin and English in <sup>n</sup> Mr. Jones, with remarks. They were in being in St. Jerom's time, and Seneca therefore is mentioned by him <sup>o</sup> in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. But they are manifestly spurious and of no value; and therefore are not entitled to a place here: nor do they deserve any regard.

I have put this advertisement here, at the end of the chapter of Juvenal, because he is the last author of the first century who is alleged by me.

<sup>k</sup> Sueton. Domit. cap. x.

<sup>l</sup> Post hunc, [Neronem] interjectis aliquot annis, alter [Domitianus] non minor tyrannus orsus est: qui cum exerceret invisam dominationem, subjectorum tamen cervicibus incubavit quam diutissime, tutusque regnavit, donec impias manus adversus Dominum tenderet. Postquam vero ad persequendum justum populum instinctu dæmonum incitatus est, tunc traditus in manus inimicorum luit pœnas. Cæc. al. Lact. De M. P. c. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Cod. Apocr. N. T. Tom. 2. p. 880, &c. Conf. ejusd. Bibl. Lat. T. i. p. 367.

<sup>n</sup> See Jones of the Canon of the N. T. Vol. 2. ch. x. p. 80, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Lucius Annæus Seneca Cordubensis, Sotionis Stoïci discipulus, et patruus Lucani poëtæ, continentissimæ vitæ fuit. Quem non ponerem in Catalogo Sanctorum, nisi me illæ Epistolæ provocarent, quæ leguntur a plurimis, Pauli ad Senecam, et Senecæ ad Paulum. In quibus, cum esset Neronis magister, et illius temporis potentissimus, optare se dicit, ejus esse loci apud suos, cujus sit Paulus apud christianos. Hic ante biennium, quam Petrus et Paulus coronarentur martyrio, a Nerone interfectus est. Hieron. De V. I. cap. xii.

## CHAP. VIII.

SÜETONIUS.

I. *His history, time, and works.* II. *The Jews expelled from Rome in the reign of Claudius.* III. *His account of Nero's persecution.* IV. *His testimony to the Jewish war, and the overthrow of the Jewish people.* V. *Of Domitian's persecution of the christians.* VI. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. CAIUS SÜETONIUS TRANQUILLUS,<sup>a</sup> son of Suetonius Lenis,<sup>b</sup> flourished in the reigns of Trajan and Adrian, to the latter of whom he was secretary: which<sup>c</sup> place he lost about the year 121. Pliny the younger had a particular friendship for him. Several of Pliny's letters still extant are written to him; and he performed for him divers good offices. Suetonius, having no children by his wife, Pliny procured for him from Trajan *jus trium liberorum*, or the privilege of those who have three children. His recommendation of him to the emperor is very affectionate, and exhibits a very amiable<sup>d</sup> character.

That he was born about the beginning of the reign of Vespasian, is argued hence—that<sup>e</sup> about twenty years after the death of Nero, or in 88, he speaks of himself as a young man. It may be supposed therefore, that in the thirteenth of Trajan, or the year of our Lord 110, he was not less than forty years of age.

He was the author of a good number of books, of which there are now none remaining, but his 'Lives of the First Twelve Cæsars,' and a part of a work 'concerning Illustrious Grammarians and Rhetoricians.'

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. i. cap. 26. Bayle, Diction. Hist. et Crit. Suetone. Tillemont, H. Emp. Adrien, art. 24.

<sup>b</sup> Interfuit huic bello pater meus Suetonius Lenis, tertię decimę legionis tribunus angusticlavius. Sueton. Orthon. c. x.

<sup>c</sup> Scepticio Claro præfecto prætorii, et Suetonio Tranquillo, epistolarum magistros, multisque aliis, qui apud Sabinam uxorem, injussu ejus, familiaris se tunc egerant, quam reverentia domus aulicę postulabat, successores dedit—Spartian. in Adrian. cap. xi.

<sup>d</sup> Suetonium Tranquillum, probissimum, honestissimum, eruditissimum virum, et mores ejus secutus et studia, jam pridem, Domine, in contubernium assumpsi, &c. Plin. l. x. ep. 95.

<sup>e</sup> Denique cum post viginti annos, adolescente me, exstitisset conditionis incertę, qui se Neronem esse jactaret, &c. Sueton. in Neron. cap. ult.

II. Suetonius, in the life of the emperor Claudius, who reigned from the year 41 to 54, says of him: ‘He<sup>f</sup> banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Chrestus being their leader.’

This passage undoubtedly confirms what is said, Acts xviii. 2, that “Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome.”<sup>g</sup> Some learned men are not satisfied that this relates to the christians; but it is well known that our Saviour was sometimes called<sup>h</sup> Chrestus by heathen people. And it is not impossible that the Jewish enmity against those of their own country, or others who had embraced christianity, might produce some disputes and disturbances which came to the emperor’s knowledge. This seems to be the meaning of Suetonius, that ‘there were disturbances among the Jews and others at Rome, upon occasion of Christ and his followers.’

If this passage were clear, we should have a testimony from an heathen author of good note, that there were christians at Rome before the end of the reign of Claudius; as indeed we know there were from an authentic writer of our own. Acts xviii. 2, and 26. And compare Rom. xvi. And though it should not be reckoned clear and decisive, it has such an appearance of probability as has satisfied many learned men of good<sup>i</sup> judgment.

This passage of Suetonius is expressly cited by<sup>k</sup> Orosius, a christian historian of the fifth century. But he was not clear about the meaning of it.

III. In the life of Nero, whose reign began in 54, and

<sup>f</sup> Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes, Româ expulit. Claud. cap. 25.

<sup>g</sup> See Vol. i. p. 259.

<sup>h</sup>—Perperam Christianus pronunciatur a vobis, &c. Tertull. Ap. c. 3. Sed exponenda hujus nominis ratio est, propter ignorantium errorem, qui cum immutatâ literâ Chrestum, solent dicere. Lact. Divin. Inst. l. 4. c. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Cum dixi supra, sub Judæorum nomine comprehensos christianos, id dixi quod complures ante me, multo me eruditiores. Neque tamen id impedit quo minus durior fuerit conditio christianorum, ut etiam in judaicâ religione multa novantium, pluresque homines a paganismo abducentium. Quo spectat illud Suetonii de Claudio, ‘Judæos, impulsore Chresto,’ (id est, per christianum dogma,) ‘assidue tumultuantes, Româ expulit, &c.’ Grot. App. ad. Comm. de Antichristo, p. 499. Vid. et Cellarii Diss. de primo principe christiano, § viii. et Basnag. ann. 51. num. 68. Cleric. H. E. ann. 29. n. xc. Heumannii Diss. de Chresto Suetonii ap. Dissertation. Syll. T. i. p. 536, &c. Kortholt. De Persecut. Ecc. p. 4. Tob. Eckhard. non Christianorum Testimonia, c. 1. S. Havercamp, annot. ad Tertullian. Apol. cap. 3. p. 42.

<sup>k</sup> Sed me magis Suetonius movet, qui ait hoc modo. ‘Claudius Judæos, impulsore Christo, assidue tumultuantes, Româ expulit.’ Quod utrum contra Christum tumultuantes Judæos coerceri et comprimi jusserit, an etiam christianos simul, velut cognatæ religionis homines, voluerit expelli, nequâquam discernitur. Oros. Hist. l. 7. c. 6.

ended in 68, Suetonius says: 'The<sup>l</sup> christians were punished; a sort of men of a new and magical superstition.'

Suetonius here assures us, that the christian religion was lately arisen, and that it had already gained footing in the empire. From his calling it a 'magical superstition,' it may be argued that<sup>m</sup> there were some things of an extraordinary nature performed by the christians: or that they endeavoured to justify their embracing the religion of Christ, as of divine original, upon the ground of some wonderful works, which bore testimony to its truth and authority.

I have translated the word 'malefica,' used by Suetonius, 'magical,' agreeably to the judgment of divers learned men. But Mr. Mosheim<sup>n</sup> thinks the word to be equivalent to 'exitiabilis,' in Tacitus, meaning 'pernicious.' The christians were singular in their religious sentiment, and opposed the religions of all nations. The Romans therefore considered them, he thinks, 'as enemies to all mankind,' and disposed to disturb the public peace.

In the word 'new,' undoubtedly, there is a sting. For, as Tacitus says of the Jews, 'Whatever<sup>o</sup> might be the origin of their religion, it has the advantage of antiquity.'

That the christians were roughly handled in the reign of Nero, we have seen from Tacitus, a contemporary writer. Nevertheless, it has been observed by some learned men, that<sup>p</sup> Suetonius does not say particularly that they were

<sup>l</sup> Afflicti supplicii christiani, genus hominum, superstitionis novæ et maleficæ. Sueton. Nero. cap. 16.

<sup>m</sup> 'Maleficos' incantatores, magicis rebus studentes, venenarios, interpretatur Barth. Adv. viii. 17. x. 6, 45, 57.—Pro talibus christianos habuerunt deterrimis Gentiles, forte quia dæmonia illis parebant, et ad illorum contestationem ejiciebantur—Exinde capiendum putat Barthius, Luc. vi. 22. *Και εκβαλωσι το ονομα ἡμων, ὡς πονηρον.* Nec mirum. Hoc enim genere 'maleficii' D. Jesum calumniabantur Gentilium accusationes. Arnob. p. 25. 'Occursurus 'forsitan rursus est cum aliis multis calumniosis illis, et puerilibus vocibus: Magnus fuit, clandestinis artibus omnia illa perfecit.' Sed D. Jesu causam satis accurate ibid. agit Arnobius. Pitiscus ad Suetonii locum.

<sup>n</sup> Neque Romanam solum, sed omnium etiam aliarum gentium religiones christiani hostiliter invadebant: ex quo Romani concluderant, sectam christianam non modo præter omnem modum arrogantem, verum paci ac tranquillitati publicæ inimicam, et ad bella civilia cienda aptam esse. Hoc illud est, si recte conjicio, quod Tacitus christianis exprobrat, 'odium generis humani.' Nec aliunde rationem putem duci debere, cur idem christianorum religionem, 'superstitionem exitiabilem,' Suetonius autem 'maleficam,' nominet. Mosheim. Instit. H. E. p. 33, 34.

<sup>o</sup> Hi ritus, quoquo modo inducti, antiquitate defenduntur. Tacit. Hist. l. 5. cap. 5. p. 518.

<sup>p</sup> Nec refert, quod Tacitus de iis, quæ in provinciis adversus christianos gesta, sermonem non habeat, cum Suetonius de Nerone, cap. 16, persecutionem ad urbem Romanam non restringat. Pagi ann. 64. n. iv.

Et quidem Suetonius, a Nerone 'afflictos supplicii christianos' comme-

‘punished at Rome,’ or for setting fire to the city. His expressions are general, and may include more extensive sufferings in the provinces, as well as the city. Of which we have good assurance <sup>9</sup> from divers ancient christian writers.

Once more. It may be observed, that Suetonius speaks with approbation of the sufferings which the christians endured in this reign. For <sup>r</sup> they are mentioned together with divers other acts, ordinances, or institutions of Nero, which were entitled to some commendation: as <sup>s</sup> any one will allow who observes the several articles in the same chapter.

IV. In his Life of Vespasian, Suetonius writes to this purpose: ‘When <sup>t</sup> Nero went into Achaia, Vespasian was one of the court. But showing a dislike to that emperor’s extravagances, he lay under his displeasure, and was apprehensive of the consequences of his resentment. Vespasian therefore retired into a private place at some distance, where an honourable province, with a powerful army, was assigned him. There had been for a long time, all over the east, a prevailing opinion that it was in the fates, [in the decrees or books of the fates,] that at that time some one from Judea should obtain the empire of the world. By the event it appeared that a Roman emperor was meant by that prediction. The Jews, applying it to themselves, went into a rebellion. At first they had such success that they not only overcame their own governor, but also defeated the proconsular governor of Syria who came to his assistance. There being now manifest occasion for a general of great

morans, nullam Romani incendii facit mentionem, sed eos ‘genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ’ appellat. Quæ cum referat Suetonius inter ea, quæ a Nerone instituta fuerant, haud dubium est, quin edictum adversus christianos ab eo tyranno scriptum fuerit, Ruinart. Pr. in Acta Mart. n. 26. p. 32.

<sup>9</sup> —ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excrucitari imperavit. Oros. l. 7. cap. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Id sane ita Suetonio persuasum erat, ut inter ea, quæ aliquâ laude digna a Nerone sancita commemorat, ait, ab ipso fuisse ‘afflictos supplicis christianos.’ Ruinart. Ib. n. 25. p. 29.

<sup>s</sup> Adhibitus sumptibus modus, &c. eod. cap. 16.

<sup>t</sup> Peregrinatione Achaicâ inter comites Neronis, cum, cantante eo, aut discederet sæpius, aut præsens obdormisceret, gravissimam contraxit offensam; prohibitusque non contubernio modo, sed etiam publicâ salutatione, recessit in parvam et deviam civitatem, quoad latentem, etiamque extrema metuenti, provincia cum exercitu oblata est. Percubuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæâ profecti rerum potrentur. Id, de imperatore R. quantum eventu postea prædictum paruit, Judæi ad se trahentes rebellârunt. Cæsoque præposito, legatum insuper Syriæ proconsularem supplicias ferentem raptâ aquilâ fugaverunt. Ad hunc motum comprimendum cum exercitu ampliore, et non instrenuo duce——opus esset, ipse potissi-

reputation, and a numerous army, Vespasian was appointed for that service; who, among other commanders under him, had his eldest son Titus. Having put his army into good order, he entered upon the war with great vigour, and not without hazard to his own person, having been slightly wounded in an attack made at one of their towns, and received several darts upon his shield.' Suetonius proceeds to relate the accession of Vespasian to the empire, whilst he was in Judea, and takes notice of what Josephus, one of the Jewish prisoners, had beforehand said to him relating to that matter. And he expressly mentions Vespasian's triumph over the Jews at Rome.

In his life of Titus, he says, ' that <sup>u</sup> whilst he yet served under Vespasian, he took Tarichea and Gamala, two strong cities of Judea: and that, having in an engagement lost his own horse, he mounted another, whose rider had been killed in fighting against him.' And he says, that <sup>v</sup> Titus having been left in Judea to complete the reduction of that country, he, in the last siege of Jerusalem, killed seven of the enemy with as many darts: and that he took that city on his daughter's birth day, and was then saluted by the soldiers with the title of emperor.' He also says, ' that <sup>w</sup> Titus triumphed at Rome with his father.'

Suetonius is a biographer; and therefore does not write of the Jewish war so particularly, as an historian of another character might do: nevertheless, he may be justly reckoned a witness to the fulfilment of our Saviour's predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish people. He bears testimony to the Jewish war, and the occasion of it; he mentions the generals employed

mum electus est——Additis igitur ad copias duabus legionibus, octo alis cohortibus decem, atque inter legatos majore filio assumto, ut primum provinciam attigit, proximas quoque convertit in se; correctâ statim castrorum disciplinâ; uno quoque et altero prælio tam constanter inuito, ut in oppugnatione castelli lapidis ictum genu, scuto sagittas aliquot exceperit——Et unus ex nobilibus captivis Josephus, cum conjiceretur in vincula, constantissime asseveravit fore, ut ab eodem brevi solveretur, verum jam imperatore——Talis, tantâque cum famâ in Urbem reversus, acto de Judæis triumpho, consulatus octo veteri addidit. Sueton. Vespasian. cap. 4—8.

<sup>u</sup> Ex Quæsturâ deinde honore legionis præpositus, Tarichæam et Gamalam, urbes validissimas Judææ, in potestatem redegit; equo quâdam acie sub feminibus amisso, alteroque incenso, cujus rector contra se dimicans occubuerat. Tit. cap. 4.

<sup>v</sup> ——et ad perdomandam Judæam relictus, novissimâ Hierosolymorum oppugnatione vii. propugnatores totidem sagittarum confecit ictibus: cepitque eam natali filiæ suæ, tanto militum gaudio ac favore, ut in gratulatione imperatorem eum consalutaverint. Ib. cap. 5.

<sup>w</sup> Triumphavit cum patre, Censuramque gessit unâ. Ib. cap. 6.

in it, and the issue of it in the taking of Jerusalem, and the reduction of Judea, and the triumph thereupon at Rome.

In the life of Domitian, whose reign began in the year 81, and ended in 96, Suetonius says : ‘ And <sup>x</sup> beside others, the Jewish tax was exacted with the greatest severity, and was demanded of those who lived in the city according to the Jewish customs, without entering themselves as Jews, or who, dissembling their original, had omitted to pay the tax laid upon that nation.’

It is well known that, after <sup>y</sup> the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish people, wherever they dwelt, were required by Vespasian and Titus to pay that tribute to the capitol at Rome, which they had been wont to pay for the use of the temple at Jerusalem. Among those, of whom this tax was now exacted, it is likely there were divers sorts of men. Some Gentiles, who had embraced christianity, might be looked upon as Jews : these were under no obligation to pay this tax. Beside them, some Jews, who were become christians, might think themselves excused from paying this tribute ; whether reasonably or not, I do not determine : for, according to the letter of the law, they were obliged to pay it, as being circumcised, though they might think that in equity they had a right to plead an exemption. And, beside all these, there might be some Jews, both by nation and religion, who declined this tax. These, I suppose, will not be vindicated by any, unless they scrupled to contribute to a heathen temple.

To these several sorts of men, probably, Suetonius here refers. Nor can it be doubted that some christians met with sufferings upon this account, under the name and character of Jews, from whom they had received their religion. And, perhaps, this story of Suetonius has a reference to Domitian’s persecution of the christians, commonly called the second persecution.

This <sup>z</sup> tax was not exacted with the same rigour under that good emperor Nerva ; but it was not abolished, as some have thought.

<sup>x</sup> Præter cæteros, judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est ; ad quem deferebantur, qui vel improfessi judaïcam inter urbem viverent vitam, vel dissimulatâ origine, imposita genti tributa non pependissent. Interfuisse me adolescentulum memini, cum a procuratore, frequentissimoque concilio, inspiceretur nonagenarius senex, an circumsectus esset. Domitian. cap. 12.

<sup>y</sup> Vid. Joseph. De B. J. l. 7. cap. vi. § 6. p. 119. Haverc.

<sup>z</sup> —Itum fiscus judaïcus, ut Suetonio, Domit. 12. qui cum acerbissime ageretur sub Domitiano, JUDÆICI FISCO CALUMNIA SUBLATA est sub Nerva, ut testatur nummus apud Oiselim—Unde tamen plane cessâsse hoc tributum non evincitur, sicut Bergerus et Spanhemius jam demonstrarunt. Reinhar. Annot. ad Dion C. p. 1082. sect. 43.



This passage ought to be understood as another testimony from the same writer, to the final overthrow of the Jewish people by the Romans, as Jesus had foretold.

V. Among the cruelties of the latter part of Domitian's reign, Suetonius mentions this: 'And lastly,<sup>a</sup> he put to death his cousin Flavius Clement, a man of an indolent temper, even to contempt, whose sons, when they were as yet infants, he had publicly declared his successors; and, changing their former names, he called the one Vespasian, and the other Domitian. Him he put to death on a sudden, upon a slight suspicion, when he was but just out of his consulship; by which action, more than by any other, he hastened his own ruin.'

This happened in the year of our Lord<sup>b</sup> 95. Suetonius does not expressly say that Flavius Clement was a christian; that may be farther cleared up<sup>c</sup> hereafter. However, it may be argued from the character here given of Clement, that he was 'a man of an indolent temper, even to contempt;' that having been a reproach frequently cast upon the christians by heathen people, that they were useless, and unprofitable to the public; as we learn from<sup>d</sup> Tertullian, and<sup>e</sup> other ancient writers.

In this character of Clement there seems to be a censure of him for excessive indolence. But I think the chief and direct intention of Suetonius is to aggravate the cruelty of Domitian, who put to death so near a relation, in whom there was not one spark of ambition, and therefore there could be no reason to fear any thing from him.

Before I shut up this article, I must observe some things for explaining the last-cited passage of Suetonius.

Flavius Clement was cousin-german to Domitian. There<sup>f</sup> were two brothers, Flavius Sabinus, and Flavius Clement,

<sup>a</sup> Denique Flavium Clementem, patrualem suum, contentissimæ inertæ, cujus filios, etiam tum parvulos, successores palam destinaverat; et abolito priore nomine, alterum Vespasianum appellari jusserat, alterum Domitianum; repente, ex tenuissimâ suspicione, tantum non in ipso ejus consulatu interemit. Quo maxime facto maturavit sibi exitium. Domit. cap. 15.

<sup>b</sup> Vide Pagi ann. 96. num. ii. et Basnag. ann. 95. n. iv.

<sup>c</sup> See the chapter of Dion Cassius, in the next volume.

<sup>d</sup> Sed alio quoque injuriarum titulo expostulamur, et infructuosi in negotiis dicimur. Tert. Ap. cap. 42.

<sup>e</sup> Cum autem hunc Flavium Clementem contentissimæ inertæ hominem vocat Suetonius, eo ipso christianum fuisse demonstrat. De quo injuriæ in christianos titulo, quod inertes, et inutiles, et infructuosi dicerentur. Tertull. Ap. cap. 42. Torrent. in Sueton. loc.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Sueton. Vespas. cap. 12. et Vitell. cap. 15. Tacit. Hist. l. 3. cap. 65. Eutrop. l. 7. cap. 18. Victor. de Cæs. cap. vii. Joseph. de B. J. l. 4. cap. x. sect. 3. Conf. ib. cap. xi. sect. 4.

sons of Flavius Sabinus, Vespasian's elder brother. Sabinus, the elder of those two brothers, had been put to death by Domitian some while before, as is related by <sup>s</sup> Suetonius. The second was put to death now, as just related. The death of Flavius Clement is also mentioned by <sup>h</sup> Dion Cassius, as will be more particularly observed by us hereafter; it is also mentioned by <sup>i</sup> Philostratus, in his Life of Apollonius Tyanæus, and as a thing that hastened the death of Domitian himself. And we ought to recollect here what we before saw in <sup>k</sup> Juvenal.

Suetonius assures us, that 'Domitian had publicly declared the sons of this Clement to be his successors, and he changed their names, calling the one Vespasian, and the other Domitian.' Undoubtedly, they are the two young persons whom Domitian had committed to the care and institution of <sup>l</sup> Quintilian; who calls them 'the grand-children of Domitian's sister.' Domitian's only sister, Domitilla, died before Vespasian came to the empire, as we learn from <sup>m</sup> Suetonius: but she must have left a daughter of the same name, whose sons therefore were her grandsons. What became of them afterwards we are not informed.

Finally, Dion Cassius, in the place above cited, calls Clement consul. Suetonius says, 'he was put to death on a sudden, when he was just out of his consulship.' But there is no disagreement between them in this; for <sup>n</sup> the ordinary consuls did not then serve out the whole year, but others were substituted in their room, after a few months or a less space. However, the year was still reckoned with the names of the ordinary consuls, and they preserved the title throughout the whole year; Clement therefore was still consul, though another, or several, one after another, had been substituted. As before said, Clement was put to death in 95, the year of his consulship.

VI. We have seen so many things in Suetonius, that it may not be improper to recapitulate; for he bears witness to

<sup>s</sup> Flavius Sabinus alterum e patruelibus, [occidit,] quod, &c. Sueton. Domit. cap. x.

<sup>h</sup> — αλλες τε πολλες, και τον Φλαβιον Κλημεντα υπατενοντα, και περ ανεψιον οντα, κατισφαζειν ο Δομιτιανος. Dio. l. 67. c. 14. p. 1112. al. p. 766.

<sup>i</sup> Εωθεν δε θεοι Δομιτιανον ηδη της ανθρωπων προεδριας. Ευχε μεν γαρ Κλημεντα απεκτονωσ, ανδρα υπατον, ω την αδελφην την ιαντε εξεδωκει. Philost. de V. A. T. l. 8. cap. 25. <sup>k</sup> P. 639.

<sup>l</sup> Cum vero mihi Domitianus Augustus sororis suæ nepotum delegaverit curam. Quintil. Imp. l. 4. Pr.

<sup>m</sup> Ex hac liberos tulit Titum, et Domitianum, et Domitillam. Uxori et filiae superstes fuit: atque utramque privatus amisit. Sueton. Vespas. cap. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Pagi et Basnag. ut supra, note <sup>b</sup>, p. 647. et Reimar. in Dion. Cas. 1112.

the expulsion of the Jews and christians out of Rome in the reign of Claudius; to the persecution of the christians in the time of Nero; to the Jewish war, and the reduction of Judea by Vespasian and Titus, and therein is a witness to the accomplishment of our Saviour's predictions concerning the calamities coming upon that people. He likewise mentions the death of Flavius Clement, which we suppose to have happened in the time of Domitian's persecution of the christians.

To all these things does Suetonius bear testimony, who is an historian of the best credit, and lived at the end of the first, and the beginning of the second century.

Our next author will be the younger Pliny, at the beginning of the second century.

I have placed Suetonius before him, and in this volume, because his testimony has a near affinity with the particulars mentioned by Tacitus, and the two other last mentioned writers.

END OF THE SIXTH VOLUME.









2365TC

LBC

678

03-03-05 32100

MC







Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01255 0887



