

HORÆ APOSTOLICÆ,

BY THE

REV. T. R. BIRKS, A.M.,
LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

LONDON:
THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY

MD CCC L.

From a Single Volume Containing:

HORÆ PAULINÆ by WILLIAM PALEY, D.D.
Page Numbers: i to viii and 1 to 186

and

HORÆ APOSTOLICÆ by REV. T. R. BIRKS, A.M.
Page Numbers: 187 to 412

HORÆ APOSTOLICÆ

INTRODUCTION

BOOK I.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

- I. THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS
- II. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS
- III. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS
- IV. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS
- V. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS
- VI. THE EPISTLES TO ASIA FROM ROME
- VII. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS
- VIII. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS
- IX. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY
- X. THE EPISTLE TO TITUS
- XI. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

BOOK II.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Introduction, etc

BOOK III.

THE APPLICATION TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

Introduction

- I. The Testimony of St. Paul's Epistles
- II. The Testimony of the Book of Acts
- III. The Internal Coincidences of the Four Gospels

Conclusion

Chronology of the Book of Acts and of St. Paul's Epistles

HORÆ APOSTOLICÆ

OR,

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

THE external evidence, which proves the genuineness of nearly all the books of the New Testament, is far superior to that which attests almost every other work of the same antiquity. A chain of witnesses is continued from the first century down to the present day; while the publicity of the writings, the high importance attached to them, and their wide diffusion, have no parallel in the works of heathen literature. When the Son of God had come down from heaven, assumed our nature, and made atonement by his death for the sins of the world, it was fitting that the records of so stupendous a fact, the title-deeds of eternal life to those who believe, should have their authenticity confirmed by ample evidence. Accordingly, no other books, transmitted through so many ages, can offer such full proofs of their genuineness, as the writings of the New Testament.

But the faith of the Christian does not rest simply on this external testimony, however full and conclusive it may be. The word of God contains its own evidence. It exhibits, to the thoughtful and candid inquirer, internal proof that it reveals to us a genuine history, and that this history is the record of a Divine revelation.

In the *Horæ Paulinæ*, Dr. Paley has clearly *explained* the nature of that argument, to establish the genuineness of two or more separate works, which results from the undesigned coincidences between them, and has then applied it to the Book of Acts and St. Paul's Epistles, The work is perhaps the most valuable of his writings, at once for the acuteness of observation which it displays, and the remarkable felicity of its reasoning. No one can read it, unless enslaved by some invincible prejudice, and not feel convinced that the letters are genuine, and the history, so far as it runs parallel with them, a true and faithful narrative.

It seems desirable that the same mode of reasoning should be extended still further, and applied, as far as the case will allow, to the whole of the New Testament. No argument is perhaps better adapted to convince gainsayers, or to establish the faith of plain and unlearned Christians. It is true that the Catholic Epistles, and even the book of Revelation, do not lend themselves easily to its application; since they proceed from four different writers, and are brief in extent, or nearly devoid of local and personal allusions. Even the four Gospels themselves present some difficulty if the argument is to retain a simple and popular form. Their resemblances and differences are so peculiar, and have been accounted for so variously, as to complicate and embarrass every argument, which rests on examples of *undesigned* agreement. It is certain that St. John would have seen the earlier gospels, and highly probable, at least, that St. Mark and St. Luke had seen that of St. Matthew. And hence it plainly becomes a delicate question, how far any particular coincidence can be shown to be, in the full sense of the word, unintentional and undesigned. In the present supplementary work,

this branch of the subject is therefore confined, of necessity, within narrow limits; since its complete investigation would demand a distinct treatise, and the prosecution of some deep and difficult inquiries.

The argument, however, is by no means exhausted, within the limits thus assigned. The book of Acts, and the Epistles of St. Paul, yield a variety of additional evidence, besides those coincidences which the *Horæ Paulinæ* has developed with such ability. The genuineness and veracity of these books, thus doubly confirmed, supplies a clear and simple proof of several main particulars in the gospel history; while other coincidences in the Gospels themselves, even independent of those which would require a more profound investigation to complete this branch of the argument, and must carry a full conviction of their veracity and historical reality to any thoughtful mind.

The work of Paley conducts the argument to this point, that the authenticity of St. Paul's thirteen letters is fully established, subject only to a doubt, in one instance, as to the right address; while the fidelity of the historian, at least in one main portion of the narrative, is also thoroughly proved. The present work, designed to complete his line of argument, will consist of three parts. THE FIRST BOOK will relate directly to St. Paul's epistles, including the Epistle to the Hebrews, and will trace those further coincidences of the letters with each other, or with the history, which may have been overlooked in the *Horæ Paulinæ*. Several questions which Paley has left undecided, will also receive a further discussion so as to increase the whole amount of internal evidence. It will be endeavoured, also, to fix the true place of those epistles which have been variously assigned by more recent authors. THE SECOND BOOK will relate to the book of Acts. Its aim will be to establish the truth of the narrative through its whole extent, from the coincidence of one part with another, and of the whole with the letters. THE THIRD BOOK will apply the argument to the four Gospels, in three distinct chapters. Of these the first will exhibit the testimony of the epistles, and the second, that of the book of Acts, to many leading facts recorded in the gospel history; while the third will present some of those internal coincidences, in the four Gospels themselves, compared with each other and the rest of the New Testament, which admit of being extricated from the controversies of harmonists, and exhibited in a clear and popular form. The full exhibition of their mutual harmony and historical evidence demands, from its importance, a distinct and more complete inquiry.

May He who is the Giver of all wisdom, prosper this humble attempt to illustrate the truth of his word, and to unfold some of its more hidden treasures! May He graciously cause it to minister to the conviction of doubting inquirers, the instruction of simple-hearted believers, the increase of Scriptural light in patient students of the inspired oracles, and the glory of that Divine Saviour, whose holy example, atoning sacrifice, and triumphant resurrection, are there so clearly revealed!

BOOK I.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

THE numerous coincidences, developed in the *Horæ Paulinæ*, are enough to place the authenticity of St. Paul's letters on a basis of evidence, quite impregnable. Yet since there are others which Paley has overlooked, and several points affecting the consistency of one with another, and of all with the history, which he has not determined; it is well to fill up and complete this first branch of the general inquiry, before the argument is applied to the rest of the New Testament

In tracing this additional evidence, the order of time will be followed, so far as possible, and will lend some help towards a clear apprehension of the whole argument. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians will therefore claim the first place. Since they are short and intimately connected, they will be joined in one chapter. The *Horæ* contains six articles on the first, and three on the second letter. It is desirable that these should be read, immediately before the following chapter, and so in the other letters, in order to see the collective force of the whole argument.

CHAPTER I.

THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

No. I.

1 Thess. 2:18. "Wherefore we would have come unto you, *even I, Paul*, once and again; but Satan hindered us."

These two letters are both of them written in the joint names of Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, after St. Paul had been at Athens, and when Timothy had lately rejoined him a second time. Here we have a direct agreement with the history, which states that they preached the gospel together at Thessalonica, and met afterwards at Corinth. In the present verse, however, the apostle isolates himself from his two companions, and speaks simply in his own name. It is thus implied that Silvanus and Timothy had either stayed with the Thessalonians, or revisited them, when Paul was hindered from so doing.

Let us now compare the history, (Acts 17:10, 14, 16; 18:5). It states that Silas and Timothy stayed at Berea, when Paul left for Athens, and that they had a charge to come to him with speed. It adds that Paul waited for them at Athens, and that they rejoined him, some time later, at Corinth. The letter adds another fact, which relieves the seeming contradiction between the charge given them at parting, and their long delay; that Timothy did really arrive at Athens, and was sent again to Thessalonica. Silas, it is plain, either stayed in Macedonia, or returned to it also.

It thus appears, from this indirect comparison, that Timothy did revisit Thessalonica, and that Silvanus either revisited it, or remained in the neighbourhood, during the very interval to which the above statement refers. The words, therefore, could apply only to St. Paul himself, and not to his companions. Yet how evidently undesigned is this coincidence. It is marked in the briefest manner possible by the insertion of three

words (*ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος*) without further comment or explanation. The correction is quite incidental, while the mind of the writer clearly rests on his main subject, his own deep yearning of love towards the young converts of Thessalonica.

But we may trace a coincidence, still more minute. The letter implies that there were two occasions, when his desire to revisit them was peculiarly strong, and special hindrances stood in the way; and that both of these were previous to the mission of Timothy from Athens.

The history supplies a probable key to this remark also. It was Jews from Thessalonica by whom Paul was driven from Berea, when the brethren conducted him to the sea. In the certainty that these bitter adversaries would return to their own city, and renew their persecution of his young converts, he must have felt a strong desire at that time to revisit them and confirm their faith. Again, when Timothy reached him at Athens, and reported the continuance of those persecutions, the desire would revive with increased intensity. Still, however, there were powerful motives, which prevented his return. On this second disappointment, however, he “could no longer forbear,” but sent Timothy back to them once again. We have thus a natural explication of the statement, that “once and again” he had specially sought to revisit them, and found it impossible.

No. II.

1 Thess. 2:2. “But even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, *as ye know*, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with much contention.”

1 Thessalonians 3:4. “For verily, when we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer persecution; even as it came to pass, *and ye know*.”

There is here a direct allusion to the persecutions at Philippi and Thessalonica, recorded in the history. It is the peculiar nature of this reference which furnishes a mark of reality. No details are offered, but the Thessalonians are simply referred to their own previous knowledge of the circumstances. The facts, assumed to be notorious, are made the ground of a double appeal; in the first case, to confirm the sincerity, and in the other, to prove the foresight and honesty of the apostle, who warned them of these troubles before they came. This is exactly what would be likely to occur in a real letter, while a forgery would have probably overlooked the actual knowledge of the Thessalonians, and given us a detailed repetition of the history.

No. III.

1 Thessalonians 2:15, 16. “Who both killed the Lord Jesus Christ, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway.”

No one can fail to remark a tone of peculiar earnestness and holy indignation, in this catalogue, which Paul gives, of the sins of the Jews. The fact of their constant opposition to the spread of the gospel among the Gentiles, runs through the whole

history, and might therefore have been possibly embodied, even in a forged letter. But the tone of the passage, without asserting, seems to imply, a peculiarly vivid sense of their guilt on the mind of the apostle at this time.

Let us now compare the history. The letter was written soon after Timothy reached the apostle at Corinth. What was the state of things in that city?

“And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ. And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.”

What commentary on the words in the letter, where the sins of the Jews are exposed, could be more satisfactory and complete? Yet the coincidence is indirect, between the probable intensity of the apostle’s feelings at such a time, and the almost passionate earnestness of his denunciation.

No. IV.

1 Thess. 3:6, 7. “But now when Timotheus came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and charity, and that ye have good remembrance of us always, desiring greatly to see us, as we also to see you: therefore, brethren, we were comforted over you, in all our affliction and distress by your faith.”

With these words let us compare the same passage, Acts 18:5, observing that the best editions read, instead of “Paul was pressed in the spirit (*πνένκατι*)” “Paul was pressed by their report (*τῇ λόγῳ*).” The time in both places is the same, soon after the return of Timothy to Corinth. In both the apostle is described as powerfully affected by the message he received. Yet there is a diversity which proves that they are no copies. Silas and Timothy are both mentioned in the narrative, but only Timothy in the letter. The joy of St. Paul is mentioned in the one, in the other his feelings of sorrow. One dwells on his inward emotion towards the Macedonian converts, the other on his outward conduct to the Jews of Corinth. This is the indirect and beautiful harmony of a real letter with a genuine history. For the report of Timothy must have awakened both joy and sorrow —joy for the constancy of the Thessalonian converts, and sorrow for the impenitence and persevering hostility of the Macedonian Jews. In writing to those converts, it was natural that St. Paul should dwell chiefly on the joy which the report of Timothy had awakened, from their steadfastness under suffering; but the historian, just as naturally, dwells on the immediate result of his sorrow, in a more earnest testimony than ever to the Jews at Corinth. “Paul was pressed by their report, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ.”

No. V.

1 Thessalonians 4:11. “And that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, *as we commanded you.*”

2 Thessalonians 3:10-12,14. “For even when we were with you, *this we commanded you*, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly (*ἀτάκτως*) working not at all, but are busybodies.

Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread.—And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.”

In both letters we have the same thing affirmed, that St Paul, before he left Thessalonica, had given the converts a strict charge to work with their own hands. Yet there is a marked difference between the two passages. In the first letter, he repeats his command in general terms, and rather implies than asserts their partial neglect of it. When he urges the duty of brotherly love, he also praises them for fulfilling it already. “And indeed ye do it, . . . but we beseech you to abound more and more.” When he proceeds to enforce industry, though he refrains from direct censure, there is no similar commendation. In the next chapter, amidst several general instructions, he implies more clearly that some were neglecting this duty, by the brief caution, “warn the disorderly.” In the second epistle the tone is different. The same command is repeated once more, with an authority that resembles sternness. The disobedience of some among them is distinctly affirmed. The duty of industry is enforced at length, and instructions are given how to treat any one who should persevere in this fault. “Note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.”

How can this difference be explained? Simply by the facts themselves. At the time of the first letter, he had just learned their state from Timothy; and though signs of the evil had appeared, amidst such causes of joy for their fidelity under persecution, he contents himself with a general and indirect admonition. Since then, messengers who carried the first letter had brought later intelligence. The evil had increased, and even his own letter seems to have been one occasion of its growth; since they had been “shaken in mind, and troubled” by a false impression that the day of Christ was close at hand. Hence the greater urgency of the exhortation in the second letter.

This incidental agreement, in the fact of St. Paul’s admonition while at Thessalonica, and this diversity and contrast of tone between the second and third repetition of the command, form a clear token that the letters are authentic, and founded in each instance on the actual wants of the Thessalonian church.

It is worth observing, that while St. Paul gave these earnest admonitions, the history proves that he enforced them by a bright example. “Because he was of the same craft” with Aquila and Priscilla, “he abode with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tent-makers,” Acts 18:3.

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

THERE is no epistle, on the date of which there has been so great a diversity of opinion, as on this Epistle to the Galatians. Some have placed it as early as St. Paul’s residence at Antioch, before his journey with Silas; while Theodoret and the Subscription place it after his imprisonment, during his stay at Rome. Michaelis supposes it to be written from Thessalonica on his first visit, with whom Canon Tate agrees; Dr. Benson and Lardner a little later, during his stay at Corinth; Capellus, Witsius, Bishop Pearson, and Dr. Burton, during his abode at Ephesus; others after leaving Ephesus, in Macedonia; and others again on his return from Corinth. It is

desirable, then, to delay this inquiry, till those coincidences have been considered, which are less open to dispute. The book of Acts records two visits of Paul to Galatia, 16:6, 18:23. The former was on his route from Antioch, before he entered Europe; and the latter, after his return to Jerusalem and Antioch, before his abode of two years at Ephesus. The object of the latter visit was to confirm and strengthen the disciples. It is certain that the letter was written after the former visit; but whether before or after the second, is a controverted question, which will be examined at the close of the chapter. A question still more vital to the present argument, is the reference of the journey, Gal. 2:1; whether it was the visit to the council, in Acts 15:, or some earlier or later visit to Jerusalem.

No. I.

Gal. 1:18. "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter; and abode with him fifteen days."

Paley has remarked the seeming incongruity between this statement and the passage in Acts 9:28, and the indirect manner in which they are reconciled by the statement in Acts 22:17, 21, where St. Paul himself explains the shortness of his visit. In this comparison it is assumed, however, that the same visit is referred to in the letter and in the public apology. Mr. Biley, in his valuable Supplement, has questioned their identity, and endeavoured to show that St. Paul refers there to his second visit, Acts 11., which was also of short duration. Dr. Lardner adopts the same view.

Now this very doubt is enough to show that, in either case, the reference was spontaneous, and not for an artificial purpose. But a closer view of the text will establish Paley's opinion, and leave the coincidence he has pointed out, which is very curious and indirect, its entire weight in the proof of authenticity.

After mentioning the recovery of his sight, the apostle continues his narrative in these words: "And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance; and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee: and when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. And he said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles."

There are several things in this statement which prove that the apostle refers to his first visit. It was then only that he "returned back" (*ὑποστοέψαντι*) from that absence, which he has described just before; and the journey *to* Damascus, and the return *from* Damascus, are here in evident contrast.

The other return was from quite a different place. It was not properly a return at all, but a journey, from which he *returned* to Antioch, his actual abode. (Acts 12:25.)

Again, the apostle is explaining why he did not labour at home among his own countrymen, but at a distance among the Gentiles. It was the most natural and simple answer, that he had desired so to do, as soon as the Lord had appeared to him, and had been charged by a vision to depart. But this would be no apology for his first long

absence, if the account refers to the second visit. The emphasis of his defence will then be lost.

Again, the vision must have been at some visit, when the apostle was bearing an actual testimony to the Jews, with some clear proofs of their rejection of the message. But this applies only to the first visit, when “he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians, but they went about to slay him.” Nothing similar appears on the second visit. Its express object was not to preach the gospel, but to convey a contribution, and the apostles seem to have confined themselves to this immediate duty. When James was martyred, and Peter was in prison with the prospect of death, it was not a likely hour for one still more hated to begin a public testimony, and no hint of it occurs.

Lastly, the appeal of St. Paul to the notoriety of his former conduct as a persecutor, and to its probable effect on the minds of the Jews, in giving power to his message, would be far more natural and striking after an interval of three, than of six or seven years. On all accounts, therefore, the view of Paley is just, and the coincidence which he has founded upon it is beautiful and impressive.

No. II.

Gal. 1:19. “But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord’s brother.”

There is here a minute feature of historical consistency, which Paley has not noticed. The apostle James is named three times in the letter, but only here with this distinctive title. The history supplies a full key. For this visit is evidently the same as in Acts 9:26-30, while the one in the next chapter was much later, at or near the time of the council, Acts 15: Hence the first was before the death of James the son of Zebedee, and the other long after it. A distinctive addition to the name was thus as natural in the one case, as it would be superfluous and even suspicious in the other.

The same distinction is observed in the book of Acts. In the earlier part, each has his own title, the brother of John, or the son of Alphaeus. But after the elder James was martyred, the other is three times called James simply, without any addition. This minute propriety is too delicate and refined to be easily accounted for, except by the fact that Luke and Paul were contemporary with the events they record.

There is another coincidence in the present verse, and it reconciles the previous statement with the history. St. Paul has told us that he went up to see St. Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. The historian tells us, that Barnabas took him, and brought him to the *apostles*. Now, the statements, if completed here, would be opposite; but when we learn that he met with a second apostle, though it were one only, they are reconciled; since the plural term requires more than one apostle to have been present, but cannot with certainty imply a still greater number. It is true, that the history represents most or all of the apostles to have been at Jerusalem, about the time of Saul’s conversion, when Peter and John were sent down to Samaria; but the letter teaches us, what we do not learn from the history, that there was an interval of at least three years; and in the next verses it exhibits Peter on a kind of circuit in Judæa. There is thus nothing improbable in the absence of the other ten apostles during those fifteen days. Indeed, the circuit of Peter just afterwards, and the mention of James as the only

other apostle present, seems to imply that his designation to a special charge over the mother church had now taken place, and that the others had begun to leave Jerusalem, agreeably with our Lord's own instructions, not long after the martyrdom of Stephen, and the persecution which followed.

No. III

Gal. 1:21-24. "Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia: and was (continued) unknown by face to the churches of Judæa which were in Christ: but they had heard only, (kept hearing, ἀκούοντες ἤσαν) That he which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me."

In No. II. 4, on this epistle, Paley observes, that "there is a difficulty in this passage, which is removed by the supposition of a land journey from Cæsarea to Tarsus. The passage has little significance, and the connexion is inexplicable unless St. Paul went through Judæa (though, probably, by a hasty journey) at the time when he came into Syria and Cilicia." He would then "come into those regions in the very order in which he mentions them in the epistle."

These remarks are certainly groundless. The apostle clearly does not refer exclusively or mainly to the few days of his journey, but to his stated residence for many years. Syria is named before Cilicia, perhaps because Antioch was a more important place than Tarsus, and his stay there was so much longer. On the other hand, it is quite evident from the book of Acts that he went by sea. The brethren conducted him to Cæsarea because it was the main sea-port, and that he might escape as quickly as possible from the malice of the Jews. He would therefore, no doubt, embark at once for Tarsus. The connexion in the above passage is clearer than on the hypothesis of a land journey; since his voyage would help to explain the fact that he was personally unknown to the great body of the Jewish Christians. It is probable that a more careful notice of the tenses in the original would have preserved Paley and others from this unnatural and useless conjecture.

But the passage has a more serious difficulty:—why the apostle should pass by in total silence his visit described in Acts 11. For although some have fancied this to be the same with Gal. 2:1, it is quite clear that their view is untenable. Every feature of the two visits, in the motive and the results, is entirely different. How, then, could he pass over this visit, without being guilty of a partial collusion, since it seems to interfere with his course of reasoning?

If now we examine the account of that visit closely, the difficulty will be removed. It was for a limited and special object, to convey the alms of the church from Antioch to Jerusalem. It concurred with a severe persecution, when James was martyred, and Peter kept in prison, and even after his deliverance obliged to conceal himself by retirement. The words of Acts 12:17 seem to imply that James, the Lord's brother, was the only apostle then in Jerusalem. We are told that "Barnabas and Saul returned when they had fulfilled their ministry," which could occupy them only a few days. The public assemblies of the believers at Jerusalem would be suspended while this persecution continued; most of them dispersed, perhaps, throughout Judæa. Very few of them could, therefore, see the apostle face to face, and no public question could be

raised which would affect his authority. It was, therefore, quite natural that he should pass over this visit, since his object was not to give a full biography, but simply enough of detail to prove his separate commission.

No. IV.

Gal. 2:1-9. "Then, after fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, and privately to them of reputation, lest by any means I should run or had run in vain. But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised. Now it was because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, and to bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. But from those who seemed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me, God accepteth no man's person); for they who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing unto me. But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision unto Peter (for he that wrought mightily in Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision, the same wrought mightily in me also towards the Gentiles): And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given to me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the heathen, and they to the circumcision."

The corrections of the received version, in this passage, are either self-evident, or will be discussed in the course of the article.

This journey is usually held to be the same as in Acts 15:, when Paul and Barnabas went up to the council at Jerusalem, Three other views, however, have been maintained; that it was the visit in Acts 11., as Mr. Browne in the *Ordo Sæclorum*; the visit in Acts 18:, as in Greswell's *Dissertations*; and a private visit, not mentioned in Acts, a little before the council, to which view Paley himself inclines, adopted also by Canon Tate in his *Continuous History of St. Paul*.

The most usual view, that the visit is the same as in Acts 15: is confirmed by several features of strong resemblance. On the other hand, the apparent discrepancies are so considerable, as to have disposed Paley and several others to an opposite opinion, that the visit in the letter was distinct, and somewhat earlier. This hesitation makes it clear, at the least, that the two accounts were not purposely fitted to each other. Now if, without straining either narrative, the discrepancies can be removed, and new points of agreement detected which are below the surface, the passage will become a most powerful evidence that the history is faithful, and the letter genuine.

1. The points of direct agreement are important. The time, at a rough estimate, would seem nearly to correspond. Fourteen years is an adequate, but not an excessive allowance for the interval from Acts 9:21, to 15:1-4. In each case, Paul and Barnabas journey together, with one or more companions. The occasion of the journey in Acts is the discord produced by the arrival of Judaizing teachers at Antioch. In the epistle, it is because of false brethren unawares brought in, who come in privily to spy out the liberty of the Gentile converts. In each case, Paul and Barnabas confer with Peter and

James, and the result is a direct and public testimony to their faithfulness. In each narrative, James and Peter are foremost in the conference on the part of the church at Jerusalem. The renewed mission of Paul and Barnabas to the Gentiles is implied in the one, and openly expressed in the other. With so many features common to both, it is difficult to believe that the visits are not the same.

2. The first apparent difference is in the companions of the journey. In the Acts “certain other brethren” attend Paul and Barnabas, while only Titus is named in the letter. But there is here no real contrast. There is a plain reason in the letter why Titus is named, and one which applies to him exclusively; but nothing forbids us to suppose that there were several others also. It is one mark of the history not being derived from the letters, that Titus is never once named in its whole course.

3. The epistle states, that Paul went up by revelation; in the Acts, he is said to have been sent by the church at Antioch. Paley, who slights the former difficulty, and with much reason, views this as one of great weight. Yet surely it is soon removed. We are told, in Acts, that before the journey was resolved upon, there had been much disputation. What would be more natural than a revelation to St. Paul, suggesting this journey, and then a deliberate assent of the church, on the proposal being made? Or, again, if the first proposal came from others, what more natural than for St. Paul to resist a plan, which might seem to compromise his authority; until he was taught by a distinct revelation that it was the will of God, and that the result would be to confirm the peace of the church, and sustain the purity of the gospel?

4. Another difficulty is found in the words, “but privately to them of reputation.” How could he communicate privately what was the professed object of a public message? Here a reference to the text, or even to the margin, removes the difficulty, and suggests a better version: “and severally to them of reputation.” The apostle first declares, “I communicated to *them*,” namely, to the churches of Judæa, the gospel which he preached, and then adds a further statement, that he also explained it individually, and in private conversation, to the main pillars of the church, or the three leading apostles; so that they might come to the public discussion with an accurate knowledge of the facts, and previous meditation on the great question at issue.

On this view, which results naturally from the very force of the words, the supposed contradiction becomes a proof that the visit was the same, and reveals an undesigned coincidence. For when was it so likely that the apostle would use this diligence in explaining his doctrine and his practice, as on the eve of that eventful council, when a right decision was so vital to the welfare of the whole church? Nay, more, on reading the history, it is clear that Peter and James were prepared to second St. Paul with the full weight of their authority, and even probable that they had agreed how to encounter most effectually the strong tide of Jewish prejudice. After much discussion by those of lower rank in the church, Peter utters a few pointed and decisive words, in which he refers to his own part in the call of Cornelius, and reasons from the gift of the Holy Ghost then bestowed. The multitude being now stilled, give an attentive audience to Paul and Barnabas, while they report the wonders and signs God has wrought by them among the Gentiles. When their narrative has had its full effect, James arises, and joins the statement of Peter with those of the prophets, so as to be the basis of a final decision, in which, however, he tempers the great principle of Gentile liberty by a wise and limited respect to the habits and prejudices of the Jews.

If they had concerted how and when to speak, so as. to surmount the difficulty from the number of less enlightened elders, they could not have adopted a more suitable plan. And hence the statement of the letter is really a key which explains the details of the history.

5. The main difficulty still remains. If the visits were the same, why is St. Paul entirely silent respecting the council and the decree?

Now, first, since the letter was plainly much later than the council, the silence equally needs explanation, if the visits were different. The remarks of Paley, to account for it on the hypothesis of two journeys, apply with almost equal force, if the journeys were the same.

The full solution of this difficulty is probably rather different. It is almost certain that the Galatian churches would receive copies of the decree, along with the preaching of the apostle, and before he parted from them. And hence it must be highly probable that the false teachers, whose views it opposed, would give a garbled statement respecting the council itself, so as to evade the force of the decree, and undermine St Paul's authority. They alleged, it is plain, that he was no apostle, but a teacher of inferior rank, and hence that he had submitted his doctrine to the judgment of those who were apostles indeed. They would probably remark, that the decree gave him no such title, that the liberty it gave was a special indulgence to the weakness of the Syrian and Cilician believers; but that St. Paul himself on some occasions preached and practised circumcision, and that the usage of the twelve and of the Jewish churches was the only true standard of Christian perfection; though local indulgence might be granted to the weakness of Gentile converts, of low attainments in the faith.

By this probable supposition every statement in the epistle is fully explained. St. Paul, in the first place, proves the independent source of his authority, from a direct revelation of Christ; and its independent exercise, for three years, before he had seen one of the apostles, and for fourteen, in almost entire separation from the churches of Judæa. He then places his visit at the time of the council in its true light, since it had been misrepresented by the false teachers. It was not until fourteen years after he had begun to exercise the office of an apostle. It was from no sense of inferiority to the other apostles, nor in dependence upon their decision, but in obedience to an immediate and Divine revelation. He had private as well as public intercourse with the chief apostles, and his doctrine and practice had their full approval. It was admitted, not only in theory but in practice, as was proved evidently by the case of Titus, his companion. The reason for the visit was no doubt in the apostle's own mind, but simply the entrance of false brethren, and that they might be deprived of every pretence for their corruption of the gospel. Instead of borrowing from the other apostles, the most eminent among them, when he conferred with them, added nothing to his message. They even recognised in him a commission to the Gentiles, similar in authority and dignity with their own to the circumcision, and their only admonition, to remember the poor, had been anticipated in his own practice.

On this view of the argument, all is fully reconciled. The statement of St. Paul, in which he rectifies the garbled account of the false teachers, becomes naturally a supplement to the direct narrative, since its object is to detail those circumstances of the visit, which were not of the same notoriety with the decree itself. The harmony of

the two passages, when thus explained, and the complete solution of difficulties, so formidable at first sight, becomes a strong evidence for the genuineness of the letter, and the truth of the history.

No. V.

Gal. 2:10. "Only they would that we should remember the poor, the same which I also was forward to do."

In the direct narrative of the council, no allusion to this subject appears. Indeed the history, by its silence, would almost seem to contradict the statement of the letter. After the council, we read of a journey through Syria and Cilicia, through Lycaonia, through Galatia and Phrygia, of St. Paul's entrance into Europe, with details of his labours at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth, and still no trace of this forwardness, and no syllable relating to the poor in Judæa. We have then his call at Ephesus, his circuit by Jerusalem and Antioch, his second visit to Galatia and Phrygia, and his long abode at Ephesus; then a journey through Macedonia to Corinth, and again from Corinth, by Philippi and Troas, to Miletus and Jerusalem, and not one word on this subject. At length, in the third defence of the apostle, before Felix, one short sentence appears incidentally, and turns the contrast into a plain coincidence. "Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings." This brief notice is all that we find in the history. It is enough to explain the truth of the statement in the letter, but far too brief and transient, to be ascribed to the design of producing a conformity. But the other epistles amply supply the rest. We have only to read Rom. 15; 1 Cor. 16; and 2 Cor. 8; 9, to see the truth of St. Paul's assertion, that he was forward to remember the poor saints at Jerusalem, abundantly confirmed.

No. VI.

Gal. 3:2, 5. "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? He therefore that ministered to you the Spirit, and wrought miracles among you, *did he* it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?"

It is here implied (though the expression is so brief and general that its meaning might easily be overlooked) that the Galatians had received the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, that St. Paul was the person by whom they had received them, and that he had wrought direct miracles among them. There can be no real doubt that the passage should be rendered, as above, by the imperfect tense, and not the present, and that St. Paul alludes to the time of his visit, when these gifts had been imparted, and these miraculous powers exercised.

Now this may be called an indirect coincidence, for the history passes over that visit in three words, without the least allusion to the fact of such miracles, or the impartation of such gifts. Yet the next chapter after his second visit mentions both of these things at Ephesus, the bestowment of the gifts, and miracles, and mentions them in such a manner as evidently implies their occurrence in the other scenes of his labours. The history does not assert the fact in Galatia, but assumes it as usual, in the narrative of events at Ephesus. The letter does not pause to assert it, but reasons from it as previously known.

No. VII.

Gal. 1:6. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel."

These words introduce us to a very controverted and difficult subject, the date of the letter. A decision on this point is not essential to the previous coincidences; but still, if attainable, it must be a further help to our apprehension of the apostle's argument, and deepen the impression of authenticity.

The first visit to Galatia is mentioned Acts 16:6, after Paul and Silas had left Antioch, and before their visit to Europe. The second was between two and three years later, after the return of Paul from Corinth to Jerusalem and Antioch, and before his stay at Ephesus for nearly three years. Macknight would place the epistle before the first of these visits, assuming that Galatia was evangelized by Paul and Barnabas on their former circuit. The only pretext for this opinion is in Acts 14:6, where they are said to have preached in Lystra and Derbe, and the region round about. These towns, however, lie further from Galatia than Iconium, and hence their position excludes the idea that any part of Galatia was then evangelized. Hence the letter was certainly later than the visit in Acts 16:, when those churches were really founded.

It is harder to decide whether it was before or after the second visit in Acts 18: Michaelis, Benson, Lardner, Tate, place it before, and Paley seems to favour this view. Tertullian and Epiphanius adopt it among earlier writers. On the other hand, Capellus, Witsius, Wall, Lightfoot, Grotius, Pearson, Dr. Mill, Professor Hug, and more recently Dr. Burton, Mr. Greswell and Mr. Biley, all place it after the second visit, whether at Ephesus, in Macedonia, at Corinth or Troas, or even as Lightfoot, Theodoret, and the Subscription during the residence at Rome. Michaelis and Tate, who refer it to the interval of the two visits, date it from Thessalonica, but Benson and Lardner somewhat later, from Corinth. We shall find, if I mistake not, that this last opinion is the only one which is really tenable.

And first, the above passage naturally implies that their declension had followed quickly after their first calling, and that no intermediate visit had occurred; for in this case it seems hardly possible that the apostle should not allude to it, and speak of his having confirmed them in the faith, as well as called them. Any time before his second visit would be short enough to explain the expression, or even a longer interval; but if a second visit had occurred, the chief aggravation of their sin would be in the circumstance, to which no allusion is made, that, even after repeated instructions, they were turning aside from the faith.

Another passage (4:18.) is perhaps a still stronger argument for this view. "But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you." If they had persevered in the faith during three years of his first absence, and only turned aside after his second visit, the point of this appeal is lost. They could not then be truly charged with adhering to the truth only when he was present. But if their decline had begun immediately after he left them to preach the gospel in Europe, and the letter was written before his return to them, the reproof will be strictly applicable to their real conduct. For his first absence was longer than both his visits, and they would have obeyed longer in his absence than in his presence, unless their

departure from the faith began during the interval, and the reproof was addressed to them at that time. This argument seems to me almost decisive of the whole question.

The chief ground of the opposite view, as maintained by Dr. Benson, Professor Hug, Dr. Burton, Mr. Greswell, and Mr. Biley, is taken from the passage Gal. 4:13, "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first." (*τὸ πρότερον*). They argue that this comparative implies two visits, and that the earlier of these is specified in contrast with the second.

This interpretation, though Professor Hug, Dr. Burton, and Mr. Greswell, all speak of it as clear and plain, has no real solidity whatever. It is true that the word implies a comparison of two different points of time, but it is equally true that one of these may be the time present and not that of a second visit. The other passages where it occurs are these; John 6:62, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was *before*?" 7:51, "Doth our law judge any man, *before* it hear him?" 2 Cor. 1:15, "In this confidence I was minded to come unto you *before*, that ye might have a second benefit." 1 Tim. 1:13, "Who was *before* a blasphemers." Heb. 4:6, "They to whom it *was first* preached entered not in because of unbelief." 7:27, "Who needeth not to offer up sacrifice, *first* for his own sins, and then for the people's." 10:32, "Call to remembrance the *former* days." In all these places, the comparison is with the present time, except in 2 Cor. 1:15, and even there the meaning is ambiguous. St. Paul may, perhaps, mean that his purpose was to have paid his visit earlier, in order to have time for a second one, in which case this passage would agree with all the others. It is clear, at the least, that the word *τὸ πρότερον* can never prove a second visit, but may imply simply that the visit alluded to was some time before he wrote, and thus be paraphrased, "at that former time when I was with you."

In fact, this very passage, when closely examined, tends to disprove a second visit. Hug explains it thus, that at the first visit Paul had allowed for human frailty, (*δι' ἀσθένεια σαρκὸς*) for the sake of not giving offence by severer doctrines, but at the latter had plainly stated the abolition or unprofitableness of the Jewish law, upon which they became hostilely inclined to him. But no hypothesis can be more groundless or more derogatory to the apostle. The whole scope of the letter implies that the alteration was in the state of the Galatians, and not in the tenor of his preaching. How futile on such a view, the solemn adjuration in the first chapter: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." The exposition of the "infirmity of the flesh" thus offered is also absurd; it evidently denotes some bodily infirmity under which he laboured, and which had not prevented the Galatians from showing him the utmost reverence. The view of it which Hug suggests is flatly opposed to the words which follow. On the other hand, the whole passage is silent about any other visit, which the apostle could hardly have failed to mention, if such had occurred. His plain object is to contrast their zealous love while he was present, with their comparative coldness, now that he was absent, and not to contrast his mode of preaching at a first and a second visit, which the other construction of *τὸ πρότερον* requires us to suppose. We have no room to doubt that the same infirmity of the flesh attended him on both visits, since it continued still later, when he wrote the second letter to Corinth. How then could he make it a distinctive feature of the former visit only?

Why, then, does he use the comparative at all? It is accounted for, I think, by the

previous verse, which should be translated as follows, "Brethren, I beseech you be as I am, for I *was* as ye are, ye have not injured me at all." "You have not done injustice to my natural character, when you charge me with a self-righteous trust in the law; I was once ignorant of God, and therefore self-righteous, as you were before you heard the gospel. My state by nature was no better than yours; cleave then like me to the free grace of the gospel." There is thus a reference backward to his *first* state before his conversion, and hence the reference to a much later time, when he preached in Galatia, is accurately expressed by the comparative. It was the former time compared with the present, but not the earliest then under comparison. The misconception of the word being removed, the whole context points strongly to the conclusion that he had paid them one visit only; if otherwise, some distinct allusion to it was essential in this place.

Mr. Biley, however, proposes another argument, which seems to him conclusive for a later date. The general resemblance of this epistle and that of the Romans has often been remarked, and as some presumption, however slight, that they were composed near together; but he thinks that many traces of thought are similar to those in the second to the Corinthians, so as to prove that they were nearly synchronous, as Paley shows of the letters to Ephesus and Colosse. This is certainly a weighty presumption, if it can be fairly established. I would observe, however, in the first place, that such an argument loses much of its force, when the resemblance has to be shared between two different epistles. In the next place, the sameness of the doctrinal purpose would alone account for a great resemblance between the letters to the Galatians and the Romans; and the sameness of the practical object, the reproof of false teachers, for a similar conformity with the second to the Corinthians. Mr. Biley thinks the agreement too close to have sprung merely from the somewhat similar treatment, which the state of the two churches required. Now it is thus admitted that the question is one of degree, and this can be tested in no better way than by the usual impression of readers. There is, perhaps, not one intelligent reader in a hundred, who has not noticed the close resemblance between the epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians; and not one in ten who has not observed a similar likeness between the first to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus. The resemblance between those to the Galatians and the Romans is also commonly observed; yet probably not one reader in ten, perhaps hardly one in a hundred, has suspected any special resemblance between that to Galatians and the second to the Corinthians. It must be quite plain, therefore, that it is by no means so strong as to form any true test of their relative date of composition. My own impression is, that there is just likeness enough to be explained by the similarity of the object, and no more. The plan and outline of the two epistles are altogether different. The resemblance is confined almost entirely to the third part of the longer letter, where St. Paul contends with the false teachers at Corinth, and although he enforces his claims as apostle in both, the style and order of his vindication is widely different. In the one to the Galatians there is no enumeration of his sufferings, no mention of his abundant revelations, no allusion to his forbearance in preaching the gospel freely. Nearly all the topics are different, though some allusions are common to them both.

Another presumption for the later date of the epistle has been sought in the statement (6:17), "From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." But such an expression would be quite suitable after his sufferings at Philippi and Thessalonica, as well as after his later persecutions at Ephesus. If the allusion be to actual scars, which seems most probable, we have distinct mention of

his being publicly scourged at Philippi, but not at Ephesus, nor for a long time after his second visit to Galatia. It is true that when he wrote the second time to Corinth, he mentions that he had been thrice beaten with rods, and one only out of the three instances is recorded in the history. Still the phrase appears to lend some countenance to the view, that the letter was written during the same journey when he was scourged and thrust into prison at Philippi. The marks would probably continue no little time. The words seem to imply that these marks had been lately inflicted on him, since he had left Galatia; which agrees perfectly with a date, either at Thessalonica or Corinth.

If now we examine the whole epistle, we find an entire silence about a second visit. The drift of the whole is, that he had called them to the grace of Christ, that they had then been zealous for the gospel, and suffered in its cause, and loved him with deep affection; that very soon after he left them, false teachers had begun to corrupt their minds, that they were ready to turn back to weak and beggarly elements, and that their love to the apostle was greatly abated, through the arts of these Judaizing teachers. Hence his surprise at their rapid declension, his appeal to their promising outset in the faith, and his longing to be with them again, since now he travailed in birth again for their souls, as at the time of their conversion, when he called them to the faith of Christ.

If the letter is thus fixed to the interval between the visits, at what period, in that interval, is it most likely to have been written? Not, certainly, till after his arrival in Europe, nor till some months later. However rapid the influx of corruption, it must have had time to affect several, perhaps many churches, before such a letter could have been written. It is even more probable that St. Paul's knowledge was gained by the return of a special messenger, as when Timothy was sent to Thessalonica, than that the Galatians informed him themselves of this serious change. It must have been some time before he had the prospect of a second visit, or else there would naturally be some allusion to his probable return. Hence it is most reasonable to place it about half-way in the interval of the two visits, perhaps in the second half-year of his residence at Corinth, or at a distance of a year and a-half since he left Galatia.

On this view of the probable date, we may trace, I think, several coincidences, which agree remarkably together.

1. In Gal. 6:11 we have these words: "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand." We may infer that St. Paul had written other letters, known to the Galatians, and known also to be in the handwriting of another. Now such are the two letters to the Thessalonians, written from Corinth in the previous year. Copies of these would probably be taken to Galatia by the same messenger who brought back tidings of their previous declension. When the apostle had so lately expressed his purpose of simply attesting his letters by the signature, 2 Thessalonians 3:17, his deep interest for the Galatians would be doubly marked by writing the whole letter with his own hand. This verse appears decisive against the date of Michaelis and Tate, who refer the letter to the first stay at Thessalonica. The form of the statement, also, favours the idea, that this was the longest letter St. Paul had yet written. Now this could be true only before the first letter to Corinth, though it would not forbid a date from Ephesus after the second visit. It agrees best, however, with the date from Corinth already assigned.

2. In Gal. 5:11, St. Paul inquires, "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased." It is plainly taught that the apostle was undergoing persecution while he wrote the letter, and this from the Jews. Now such persecutions are recorded at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and again at Corinth, after which no mention of them occurs again until near the close of his stay at Ephesus. Hence, the words suit perfectly with the state of things at Corinth about a year after his residence began.

3. The superscription affords another coincidence. In the two letters to Thessalonica, the apostle drops his own title of authority, and simply ranks himself with Silvanus and Timothy. In every later epistle, except the one to Philippi, the title is used. Here it occurs with a peculiar emphasis, "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father." Several brethren are with him, probably Silvanus and Timothy, and yet none of them are mentioned by name. How consistent and natural, if the order just proposed be real! The questioning of his apostleship among the Galatians leads him not only to assert it here with the greatest energy in the very superscription, but to change his former practice, the instinct of deep humility, and to affirm his authority thenceforward in the forefront of every letter.

4. Another coincidence appears at the close of the two letters, which thus follow in order.

2 Thessalonians 3:13. "But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing."

Gal. 6:9. "And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."

These verses, just at the close of each letter, are almost verbally the same. It is simply explained, if the second of them was written at Corinth not long after the other.

5. It is a more decisive coincidence, that by assigning this date to the letter, we find a remarkable agreement with the history as to the probable intrusion of the false teachers. Not two years would have passed since their reception of the gospel until the time of this rebuke, and hence the apostle might well marvel at the rapid progress of the evil; yet the whole course of the narrative in the book of Acts renders the entrance of such an evil at the time probable and almost certain. Paul and Barnabas had contended long at Antioch against the Judaizers before the council at Jerusalem, and the result was the decree addressed to the Syrian and Cilician churches. On the next circuit of Paul and Silas, they went through Syria and Cilicia, and then through Pisidia and Lycaonia, leaving copies of the decree for all the existing churches. Then, after preaching the gospel for the first time in Phrygia and Galatia, they passed over into Europe. During their long absence at such a distance, accompanied by other faithful helpers, it was almost certain that the false brethren, who had resisted Paul and Barnabas so pertinaciously at Antioch, and who would find the decree a powerful barrier in Syria and Cilicia, to which places it was addressed, would begin to disseminate their views in these new churches, while the apostle was far away, and the decree seemed to offer them less impediment. They would thus, as they flattered themselves, complete the work which he had imperfectly begun. The rapid entrance and growth of the evil is thus explained, though still the apostle might well marvel at

the sudden change.

6. This view of the date throws a further light on the brief statement in the Acts respecting the second visit. In the former case Phrygia took the precedence. “When they had gone through Phrygia, and the region of Galatia.” But on his return, Galatia is first visited. “He departed and went over the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples.” Now this priority would be the natural result of his intense anxiety about the Galatian churches.

Again, the closing words are a secret allusion to that state of the Galatian Christians which the letter discloses. It is an antithesis to the term employed by the council, Acts 15:24, and by St. Paul in the letter, 1:7, in describing the baneful effects of the Judaizing teachers. It is also the very term used to describe the exhortations of Judas and Silas, which served for an antidote to the same corruption of the faith in the church of Antioch. They “exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them,” (*καὶ ἐπεστήριζαν.*) In like manner Paul, on his second visit, passed through Galatia, “confirming all the disciples,” (*ἐπιστηρίζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς.*)

7. The historical analogy on this view is worthy of observation. Paul and Barnabas preach the gospel in Syria, Cilicia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia. False brethren enter in, and trouble the disciples. The decree or letter of the council is procured and sent, and then Paul and Silas pass through Syria and Cilicia, “confirming (*ἐπιστηρίζοντες*) the churches.” They next preach throughout Phrygia and Galatia. During their absence in Europe, false teachers trouble the Galatian churches. Paul writes this severe letter of rebuke; and then, about a year afterwards, “departed and went in order through the country of Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening all the disciples.” He preaches at Thessalonica after he has left Galatia. When he proceeds to Corinth disorders creep in. He writes two letters of admonition, and then, after a longer delay, goes into Macedonia on a second visit, and gives them much exhortation, Acts 20:2. In like manner he labours at Corinth for eighteen months. During his absence, great disorders and abuses arise. He writes two letters of faithful and affectionate reproof, and then he pays them a second visit. This uniform analogy, in four distinct and successive theatres of apostolic labour, is a powerful confirmation of the view now offered, and may even be regarded as an indirect coincidence, that evinces the truth and reality of the whole narrative.

No. VIII.

Gal. 2:5. “To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.”

More correctly, that the truth of the gospel might continue unto you (*διαμείνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς*). In other words, that it might continue so as to reach unto you. This is a minute and delicate agreement with the history, so delicate that it is lost in the usual version. At the date of the council, Galatia had not yet received the gospel; but the apostle visited them, and founded churches among them, on his very next journey.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

THE two epistles to the church at Corinth abound with local and personal allusions, and have naturally supplied Paley with the largest materials for his work. The *Horæ* contain twelve articles upon each letter, and many of the coincidences developed in them are remarkably interesting and conclusive. After so large a harvest, it would occasion no surprise if we found only a scanty gleanings. This, however, is not the case. Several of the coincidences that remain are perhaps equally striking as those which he has already developed. Since the argument is cumulative, the chapter on this epistle in the *Horæ* should first be read, before examining the further coincidences, which will be given in the following pages.

No. I.

1 Cor. 1:1. "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth."

These words, in the opening of the letter, are the subject of a note in the *Horæ* *Paulinæ*, which Paley has not inserted in the text, because the coincidence is made to depend on a various and less authentic reading. If however, we can discover a probable coincidence, without recourse to critical violence, it may claim a lawful place in the argument.

First, it is remarkable that, while Silvanus and Timothy are joined in the superscription of two letters, and Timothy alone in four others, Sosthenes is joined here in the address to the Corinthians, while his name never occurs again in all the thirteen letters. Silvanus is named in the epistles four times, and Timothy eighteen times; but Sosthenes here only. Many others, as Luke, Demas, Aristarchus, are named repeatedly, who are never joined in the superscription. It is natural to conclude that there must be some reason, peculiar to the church of Corinth, why Sosthenes is thus associated with the apostle in this letter only.

When we turn to the history of Paul's abode at Corinth, we have the following statement:

Acts 18:12-17. "And when Gallio was deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat, saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law. And when Paul was now about to open his mouth, Gallio said unto the Jews, If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you: but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters. And he drave them from the judgment seat. Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment seat; and Gallio cared for none of these things."

If Sosthenes had been beaten by the Jews, no one would have doubted that the same person was meant, here and in the epistle. Some manuscripts have that reading, while others omit either term. Paley conjectures that this last was the original text, and that

various supplements have been added, according to the views of the transcribers. But besides the fact that most manuscripts read "all the Greeks," it is required by the scope of the passage. When the Jews had been repelled with ignominy from the judgment seat, it would be a most unlikely moment for them to venture on an act of violence, even in Gallio's presence; and not less unlikely that the actual ruler of the synagogue should be a Christian and not simply a Jew. The passage clearly speaks its own tale. On the contemptuous repulse of the Jews, the Greek mob, who disliked their religion, and still more their turbulence, seized the opportunity given them by this public disgrace, to inflict a kind of rude justice, as they would reckon it, on the ruler of the synagogue, the leader of those Jews, whom Gallio had driven away as foolish and troublesome accusers. Gallio himself, secretly pleased that the mob should second his own contempt for the Jews, looked on coolly, and refused to interfere. It is thus morally certain that Sosthenes is here exhibited as the leader of the unbelieving and calumnious Jews.

How, then, can the two passages be shown to coincide? Simply by a reference to the statement a few verses before. "And Crispus, *the chief ruler of the synagogue*, believed on the Lord with all his house." If one chief ruler had already been converted to the faith, clearly the supposition is not at all violent, that the same change might also occur in the case of Sosthenes, his immediate successor in the office. The history will even go still further, and suggest a very probable occasion of his conversion. It is plain that, after the repulse by Gallio, the Jews were the objects of popular odium, and endured a sort of temporary persecution. We are sure that Paul would have no sympathy with the Greek rioters; and it is almost certain, from his conduct on other occasions, that one of his first efforts would be to express his sympathy for the chief ruler of the synagogue, now in his turn the object of scorn and ill treatment from a licentious populace like that of Corinth. It would not be surprising if such an exhibition of love to an enemy, at such a time, were the means of bringing him to repentance, and turned the ringleader of opposition into "Sosthenes our brother."

We have thus two imperfect presumptions in the history, from the case of Crispus his predecessor, and the probable conduct of St. Paul at a critical season, to render the conversion of Sosthenes highly credible. His name, in the superscription of the letter, since it must be the name of some one well known at Corinth, and of influence there, turns this credible conjecture into a certainty. And now the history, in its turn, explains the superscription. For if Sosthenes had been the ruler of the Jewish synagogue at Corinth, the leading adversary of the apostle, and since then a convert to the faith, and a beloved brother, no name could be so suitable and impressive to unite with his own in the opening salutation. Saul the persecutor and blasphemer, turned into Paul the apostle, and Sosthenes the leader in persecution against that apostle, now become Sosthenes our brother, were two trophies of Divine grace that might fitly stand side by side, and which, when combined, would appeal with double power to the church at Corinth. We have thus a coincidence, most indirect and circuitous, yet beautifully complete. The evidence of personal identity, though constructive, amounts to a moral certainty, while the previous history of Sosthenes is a complete key to his place in the superscription of this one epistle alone.

No. II.

1 Cor. 1:4-7. "I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in everything ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge,.... so that ye come behind in no gift."

It appears from these opening words that the Corinthian converts had eminent gifts of "knowledge and utterance," and hence, from the comparatively low moral standard they had attained, they must have been exposed to a great danger of pride in these endowments.

Now if we read the letter with care, we shall discover a peculiar style of remonstrance running through its whole course, and exactly suited to counteract and expose this evil. To show this, it is necessary to quote several passages, and if they are read in their own context, the truth will be placed in a still clearer light.

In the first chapter, towards the close, we have this animated appeal,— "Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"

In the third chapter we have a double statement bearing on this main evil. "*Know ye not* that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" And again, "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

In the fourth chapter, in reference to his own intended visit, he gives this warning, "I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know, *not the speech of them which are puffed up*, but the power. For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power."

In the sixth chapter we have no less than five distinct appeals to them, with reference to their supposed knowledge, and the practical use to which it should be applied. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?.... Know ye not that we shall judge angels? . . . Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? ... Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?... What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?"

The eighth chapter begins with an appeal that is still more pointed in its application, and where our translation needs improvement, to remove its obscurity, and bring out the true meaning.

"Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know (because we all have knowledge; knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. And if any man thinketh that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of Him.) As touching, then, the eating of things offered to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world."

In the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters the same indirect lesson re-appears. "And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, . . . and have not charity, I am nothing. . . . What? came the word of God out from you?"

or came it unto you only? If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.”

“Charity never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.”

This unity of remonstrance and caution amidst such a variety of topics, this strain of delicate irony pervading the whole letter, when compared with the thanksgiving in the opening verses for their gifts of knowledge and utterance, is a mark of reality not to be mistaken. It is true that the coincidence is entirely within the limits of the letter itself, but it is not, on this account, the less complete and powerful. The harmony between that statement and these various reproofs could exist only for a mind like that of the apostle, who could thank God for the gifts they had received, while fully alive to the abuse of those gifts on the part of the Corinthians, and who could mingle reproof, in the gentlest and most indirect manner, with all the variety of instructions he had to convey.

No. III.

1 Cor. 1:12. “Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.”

Ch. 3:21, 22. “All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come.”

The agreement with the history, as to Paul and Apollos, has been noticed by Paley, in No. V. of his remarks on this epistle. But the mention of Cephas will supply another mark of reality, less obvious, but hardly inferior in strength.

We may clearly infer, from this repeated mention of Cephas, that there was a third party at Corinth, distinct from those of Paul and Apollos, who looked up to St. Peter as their favourite authority. From the order in both places, we may conclude that it was only the third in numbers and influence.

The history relates that St. Paul founded the church, and that it was greatly profited, after his departure, by the instructions of Apollos. We have no hint respecting any visit of St. Peter. Mr. Greswell, indeed, would infer it from these very passages (Diss. ii. 106, 107). But if we observe that St. Paul mentions himself and Apollos only as having actually laboured at Corinth, we may fairly deduce from his words the very opposite, that Cephas or Peter had not preached at Corinth. How, in that case, could his name be placed after Apollos, as if his influence were inferior; or how could the history, which mentions the visit of Apollos, pass over his in silence? It is natural, however, that the partisans of Cephas who had never been at Corinth, should be fewer than those of Paul and Apollos, who resided so long among them.

But why should Peter, if he had not visited Corinth, have any distinct party there whatever? The explanation is very simple. The church, there as elsewhere, began from the Jewish synagogue; and Crispus the chief ruler, and even Sosthenes his successor, as has just been shown, became converts. Hence there were many Jews

among its members, though the majority were Gentiles. Now Peter was the most eminent apostle of the circumcision. And hence those Jewish converts, who clung most firmly to their national customs, would look to him as their favourite authority, although he had never paid a visit to Corinth.

Now when we compare the two epistles, it is plain that Judaism was not the chief danger at Corinth, as it was among the Galatians, but Gentilism, or undue conformity with heathenish customs. This is evident from the eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of the first epistle, and the sixth chapter of the second. In fact, the greater part of the letters give us no trace of a Jewish party, distinct from the more powerful sections who gloried in the names of Paul and Apollos.

When we turn, however, to the close of the second epistle, this third party comes into view. Its existence is clearly implied in those questions of St. Paul with reference to the false teachers, who sought to disparage his authority, "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? I speak as a fool, I am more."

We have thus an indirect proof, by comparing the history with the second epistle, of what is implied in these verses of the first epistle; that there was a Jewish party at Corinth, distinct from those of Paul and Apollos, and that it was weaker and less important than the two others.

No. IV.

1 Cor. 4:17. "For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ."

In No. III. of the *Horæ* on this epistle, Paley traces out the undesigned agreement of these words with those in Acts 19:22. Since, however, Mr. Greswell supposes that the two were distinct missions, it is needful to examine the question anew.

And first, the hypothesis is highly improbable, on a bare inspection of the two passages. For the mission in Acts was expressly to prepare for St. Paul's own journey. In like manner, the mission in the letter was when St. Paul was on the eve of that journey. "I will come unto you, when I have passed through Macedonia, for I do pass through Macedonia." This proof alone is sufficient, without strong counter-evidence, and none such is to be found.

The first reason alleged is, that St. Paul had decided on his journey to Jerusalem and Rome at the time of the mission in Acts, but not at the time of the epistle. Of this latter assertion, however, there is no proof, nor even a reasonable presumption. For it is plain that the apostle, of set purpose, reserved the full statement of his plans from the Corinthians, until he should know the effect of his admonitions. He discloses more in the second letter than in the first, and more, doubtless, on his arrival than in the second letter, but no change of plan is implied in this gradual communication.

Next, it is alleged that, at the date of the epistle, he had not yet determined on passing through Macedonia, and so to Achaia, which he had determined at the time of the

mission in Acts. But the text just referred to (1 Cor. 16:5,) proves the exact reverse, that this determination was already made.

The third reason is, that after the mission in Acts, Paul rejoined Timothy, and not Timothy St. Paul. But this is no presumption for a double mission, since the same might equally be true of the absence mentioned in the letter. It is true that St. Paul then expected Timothy to return, but it is equally certain that he himself left Ephesus sooner than he intended, and it is also probable that Timothy might be detained in Macedonia beyond the apostle's expectation.

The last reason urged is, that in the second letter St. Paul speaks of being ready to come for the third time. Now there is such a promise in the first and also in the second epistle, but not a third, unless in the mission of Timothy,—either the one in Acts, or some prior mission. And the latter is thought more probable, because the Acts do not state that Timothy was sent into Achaia, but there is proof in the epistle that he was sent to Corinth.

There seems to be here a succession of errors. The natural meaning of the words—“this is the third time I am ready to come to you,” is that this would be the third visit, including the one of which he had been disappointed. Such is the view of Grotius and Paley, and is a simple explanation. But to explain it as a third purposing of this second visit is an improbable view, refuted by the apostle's words, who speaks of one change of purpose, and one only. Again, the silence about Achaia in the Acts is no proof that Timothy was not intended to visit Corinth; while that intention, as expressed in the letter, is no proof that he actually reached it. And thus every one of the three premises is quite baseless.

In fact, the double mission of Timothy is not only improbable, but irreconcilable with the plain scope of both passages. That the mission in Acts was very shortly before the apostle left Ephesus, is clearly expressed by the historian. But the mission in the letter was also shortly before that departure, since the apostle describes himself, as if setting out already. “I will come unto you when I have passed through Macedonia, for I do pass through Macedonia.” And again, soon after, “I will not see you just now by the way.” The hypothesis of a double mission is therefore on the indirect coincidence untenable, and the remarks of Paley are accurate and true.

No. V.

1 Cor. 5:9.—“I wrote unto you in an epistle, not to company with fornicators; yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then ye must needs go out of this world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no, not to eat”

There has been a division of opinion on these verses, whether the apostle refers merely to the letter he was writing, or to some other, which is not extant. Many have embraced the former view, being unwilling to suppose that any letter of St. Paul should have perished. This is the construction of Chrysostom and Theodoret, and a great number of commentators. On the other hand, there are many critical authorities

for the second view, which is held by Calvin, Grotius, Doddridge, Hug, Rosenmüller, and is plainly adopted by the translators of our English Bible. The words of Calvin are these— *“Ista epistola, de quâ loquitur, hodie non extat. Nec dubium quin multæ aliæ exciderint; sed satis est, quod nobis supersunt quis sufficere Dominus providet.”*^{*} This question must first be settled, before we can trace any coincidence from these words.

Now if the reference be to the actual letter, it must either be to a command implied in the previous passage, or to the words just passing from his pen. It cannot, however, be the former. For the command of which he speaks is one so generally expressed, as to need limiting afterwards to the case of a Christian brother. But the only implicit command, deducible from the previous passage, is limited of its own nature to fellowship with a Christian brother; since the incestuous person was a member of the church. Hence the charge cannot be one implicitly contained in the preceding verses.

Is it then, perhaps, the charge he is actually writing? But in a passage of such intense feeling, how could he adopt such an indirect and ambiguous mode of expression, instead of that direct and simple form, which meets us in Ephesians, “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.” In such a case, he would doubtless have written here— “Have no fellowship with fornicators:” and the added words— “I have written to you in my letter,” would be nothing else than verbiage, weakening and obscuring the force of the appeal.

The reasons, then, for this view seem quite decisive. It is the natural construction, which would suggest itself instinctively to the general reader. The form of the phrase is exactly the same as in 2 Cor. 7:8, where the reference is to a former letter; and this sets aside the objection, that in this case he would have written *τῇ παροτέρᾳ ἐπιστόλῃ*. It is most probable that St Paul would write more letters in twenty years than the fourteen which are in the canon. There is also a plain contrast between the former direction, and the more specific instruction in the present passage.

The only ground of the opposite opinion is a reluctance to admit that any letters of St Paul can have perished. Yet there is no more real difficulty in supposing him to have written several, not now extant, than in the certain fact that so many inspired discourses of our Lord and his apostles were never written at all. Either in an oral or written message, inspiration alone would not constitute it a part of the canon. There would be needed an express purpose of the Holy Spirit, indicated to the writer or to others, that it was to be permanently recorded for the instruction of the whole church. An opposite view would imply that the apostles were wholly debarred from the natural use of writing, except for one very limited and peculiar purpose, which is surely most unreasonable. The existence, then, of such a previous letter is open to no solid objection of a theological nature, from the peculiar character of inspired writings.

If now we turn to the narrative, the view here maintained has the utmost historical probability in its favour. It was little more than two days’ sail from Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, to Ephesus, and there was a continual commerce between them. The stay

^{*} That epistle, of which he speaks, is not now extant. Nor is it doubtful that many others have perished; but it is enough that those remain which the Lord foresaw to be sufficient.

of the apostle at Ephesus was between two and three years. And hence, when we remember his long abode at Corinth, and his deep interest in the church he had founded, it is impossible that repeated communications should not have passed between them. It is also most unlikely that he should never once, till the very close of that time, have added a short written message by the hand of the messengers. The fact, therefore, implied in the above passage, taken in its only natural sense, has the highest degree of historical probability.

Let us now compare 2 Cor. 10:10, 11. The apostle there repeats the remark of some false teacher at Corinth, who disparaged his authority. "For his letters, saith he, 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." Here, not only in the words which St. Paul quotes, but in his own rejoinder, we are taught that more letters than one had reached the Corinthians, For that the allusion is not to other letters, as those to Thessalonica, is plain from the contrast. "Such as we are in word by letters when we are absent, such will we be also in deed when we are present." They were letters, therefore, of admonition and partial rebuke to the Corinthians themselves. Hence these two incidental notices agree perfectly with each other, while they are in equal harmony with the history, in the apostle's long abode at Ephesus, within two or three days' sail of Corinth.

Let us see next whether we cannot trace these communications a little further. The apostle had now received at least two reports or messages from Corinth, one by the house of Chloe, 1 Cor. 1:11, and another by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, who seem to have brought a letter, with written cases for his decision, 1 Cor. 7:1; 16:17. Still earlier, however, Apollos, who was at Corinth when Paul reached Ephesus, (Acts 19:1,) had returned to Ephesus himself, and was there at the date of this letter, 1 Cor. 16:12. The report about the incestuous person seems to have reached the apostle from several sources, (1 Cor. 5:1), and from the order of its mention, most probably by some channel later than the report from Chloë's household, and before the arrival of Stephanas with the Corinthian letter. Hence, even before that letter came, St. Paul had not only changed his plan of visiting Corinth on his way to Macedonia, but had informed them of the change, so as to have heard its effect upon their minds. "Now some are puffed up, as though I would not come unto you." In the second epistle, he inquires, "Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you?" He mentions one instance, the mission of Titus with a brother, but implies evidently that he had sent other messages beside. And even that journey of Titus is not the same as when he carried the first epistle, which we may infer as follows. The first epistle was written before the Pentecost, after the winter, and near to the time of the passover (see *Horæ*, No. XII.) The second, when St Paul was still in Macedonia, some little time before he reached Corinth, not later probably than September. Yet the mission of Titus, to begin the contribution at Corinth, was then a full year distant, 2 Cor. 8:10; 9:2. And hence there must have been a mission of Titus in the previous year to that of the first epistle, of which he was also the bearer to Corinth.

We have thus four or five distinct occasions, when tidings might reach the apostle from Corinth; by the return of Apollos, by the house of Chloe, by nameless reporters, who told of the incestuous person, by the return of Titus the previous year, and lastly, by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, when they brought the letter from the

church. We have also several messages to Corinth, even before the first epistle, by other brethren, 2 Cor. 12:17; by the former visit of Titus, and by those who announced his change of plan, before sending Timothy into Macedonia. For this must have been shortly before the first epistle, and not the same with the visit of Titus, to begin the contribution. All these hints agree with each other.

But the coincidence, on further investigation, becomes still more complete. The letter alluded to contained a charge, not to company with fornicators. We may fairly conclude that it was one of grave authority and faithful warning. Thus the words of the objector are explained, "his letters are weighty and powerful;" that is, they have a tone of dignity and authority. Such is clearly the character of the first extant epistle, and from the one hint that is left, was equally true of its predecessor.

Again, the change of route, 2 Cor. 1:23, was in order to spare the Corinthians, after St. Paul had learned of the disorders among them. It was after this change that Timothy was sent into Macedonia, with the intention that he should also proceed to Corinth. Now when the first epistle was written, St. Paul had already announced his purpose of delaying his visit; for he had heard that some were puffed up, as though in so doing he had treated them with indifference. A communication, we may infer with certainty, had taken place, since the tidings of the abuses had reached him. There is thus, gathered laboriously from the collation of hints easily overlooked, a full explanation of the statement respecting the previous letter, and its contents of faithful warning. "I wrote unto you in an epistle, not to company with fornicators."

The direction at that time was more general. Now, after fuller intelligence, it is more carefully explained in its true limit, and rendered more specific in the application. "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator,... with such an one no not to eat." And there is here also a probable and sufficient reason why the former letter should not be preserved. It was of the same general character with the first epistle now extant, but founded on more imperfect information, and more brief and general in its admonitions. And hence the apostle himself might be directed to forbid copies of it for the other churches, since every purpose it would fulfil was answered more completely by the one which followed.

No. VI.

1 Cor. 5:7. "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast."

In No. XII. on this epistle, Paley infers from the above passage, compared with others, that the letter was written about the time of a passover. It is desirable to inquire whether its date can be more exactly determined, since the force of one or two other coincidences will be affected by it, and Mr. Greswell throws back its date to the very beginning of the year, or three complete months before the time of the Passover.

In favour of this opinion it is urged that the expression, "let us keep the feast," could not be used with propriety, unless this festival were still in prospect. But this is an evident misinterpretation. The apostle's allusion is rendered more vivid, if he wrote about the time of the Jewish feast, but clearly he is not enforcing an actual

celebration, and simply transfers the type to its spiritual counterpart in the whole life of the Christian, which was to be a rejoicing in the sacrifice of Christ in sincerity and truth.

There are several reasons of much greater force which prove that the letter was rather after the passover than before it. The intended limit of the stay at Ephesus was the feast of Pentecost, seven weeks after the other. But several hints imply that the actual interval was very short from the date of the letter. Though St. Paul intended to go through Macedonia first, he still regards his visit to Corinth as near. "I will come to you shortly," (4:19.) He leaves many particulars to be set in order, "when I come," (11:34.) He speaks of his journey almost as if begun, "I am passing through Macedonia ... I will not see you just now by the way." The manner in which he speaks of tarrying till Pentecost implies that it was only a few weeks distant, so that he might almost view himself as starting already on his way, and only prolonging his stay till a feast, probably because the absence of so many Jews might seem a favourable occasion for quitting a sphere, where they had been such bitter adversaries. Again, he had sent Timothy into Macedonia, and informed the Corinthians of his change of plan, before Stephanas set out from Corinth. And it is probable that Timothy would not be sent out until the winter was fairly over. The passover was celebrated in Judæa, where alone the sacrifices could be offered; and hence the allusion to it would be as natural at the time when the Jews were returning from thence to Ephesus, as at the actual time of celebration. This would be two or three weeks after the close of the feast. By comparing the two epistles, it appears that Titus was not directed to rejoin the apostle at Ephesus, but at Troas, which is a further proof that Pentecost, the intended limit, was not very distant. Hence, on the whole, the most probable date seems to be about three weeks after the passover-day, when multitudes of the Jews would be returning from Palestine after attending the feast, and four weeks before Pentecost. Since the departure of the apostle was hastened by the tumult, this might really be not more than a fortnight or three weeks, after the letter was written.

No. VII.

1 Cor. 15:30, 31. "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by my rejoicing for you, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily. If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die."

When the epistle was written, St. Paul was still in or near Ephesus, where he intended to stay until Pentecost. It was, therefore, prior to the tumult, Acts 19, after which he set out at once for Macedonia. Yet it could not, as we have seen, be much earlier, but probably was two or three weeks before the tumult arose.

There is thus a coincidence between the time when the letter was written, inferred very indirectly from several slight hints, which fix it only by their combination, and the danger of St. Paul, described in this animated passage. Besides the old hatred of the Jews, which led them to speak evil of that way before the multitude, the selfishness of the craftsmen, and the superstitious patriotism of the Ephesians, were now combining against him, and mounted soon to a perfect paroxysm of rage. It is true that the history gives us no details of the opposition before that final explosion, but it is morally certain that for several weeks, perhaps months, before such a

universal mutiny of the populace, St. Paul would indeed “stand in jeopardy every hour,” and feel himself exposed daily, as he here assures the Corinthians in the most solemn manner, to the peril of death.

And this leads us to examine the other expression, which is involved in some doubt and obscurity. And first, the phrase *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, in St. Paul’s epistle, denotes constantly “to speak after the manner of men,” as Rom. 3:5; 1 Cor. 9:8; Gal. 3:15. There are only two interpretations which seem possible, without great violence; that St. Paul refers to some actual and literal combat with wild beasts, or that he employs this metaphor to describe the fierceness of his adversaries. If the allusion be to a literal conflict, the manner of it will imply that the fact was well known to the Corinthians, and hence would be a moral proof that the letter is genuine. But the phrase itself points us to a different explanation. Why should St. Paul use the qualifying expression, “to speak as men,” if he referred to a literal conflict? Chrysostom explains it to mean, “so far as depended on man’s will,” or that the furious multitude demanded this punishment. But it is surely unnatural for the apostle to instance sufferings never inflicted, and to pass over those which were really endured. A recent popular commentator explains it, that he was thrown to the wild beasts, and had every human prospect of being destroyed. This, however, instead of being the fair and obvious meaning, is inconsistent with the words, and would require a different phrase. “If, after human appearance, I was *slain* by wild beasts at Ephesus.” On the other hand, it would be a mode of speech usual among men, to call his conflict with fierce adversaries a combat with wild beasts. The scope of the passage almost requires a reference to some continued danger, which might have been averted by a worldly course, but which he persevered in enduring through his hope of a better resurrection.

Now on this view, the only one which really satisfies the meaning of the whole phrase, we have an indirect and unsuspecting agreement with the history. The time is not that of the tumult itself, but still it was only a very few weeks earlier, possibly not more than a fortnight. Nothing could be more natural than for the apostle, living in the midst of such fierce enemies, and aware of their gathering hatred, to express his own sufferings by this vivid metaphor, which their violence and rage in the amphitheatre turned, very soon, into a direct prophecy. What could bear a closer resemblance to the raging of hungry wild beasts, let loose from their dens, than that scene at Ephesus? How vivid and appropriate is the description St. Paul here gives us of his own state, a few weeks before the catastrophe, when we compare it with the frightful spectacle itself! “And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by my rejoicing for you, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily. Yet although, to speak in the language of men, I have contended with wild beasts here at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.” Let us renounce at once that course of zeal and faithfulness, which draws down upon me the rage of adversaries, furious as the beasts of prey, and purchase peace by joining in worldly revelry, instead of continuing to brave their fierce hatred.

What mark of reality can be more impressive than that which is furnished by this passage, when correctly explained, and then compared with the sacred history?

No. VIII.

1 Cor. 16:1. “Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the

churches of Galatia, even so do ye.”

These words have been cited in the *Horæ*, from their coincidence with the statements of the history, that Galatia was visited shortly before St. Paul arrived at Ephesus, and with one hint in the Epistle to the Galatians. They are here adduced for a distinct purpose, to throw light on several indirect allusions in that former letter.

Reasons have been already given, to show that the Epistle to the Galatians was written from Corinth, about midway or later, in the apostle's absence from them, and before his second visit. We find, in the case of Macedonia and Achaia, that St. Paul did not think it wise to set on foot a contribution for Judæa in the first infancy of these churches, but waited till their faith was confirmed. It would have made the gospel too much like a Jewish scheme for levying contributions for Palestine, if this duty had been very early enforced on the converts in their novitiate. It was just before the second visit to these places that the contribution was set on foot, and completed soon after. A time of doctrinal corruption, it is plain, would also be premature for enforcing such a duty, which would then be regarded with jealousy, or else made the food of self-righteous error. It was natural, then, and almost necessary, that St. Paul should not set on foot this contribution on his first visit to Galatia, nor during that interval of decay and false doctrine, which filled him with deep anxiety, but only when his rebukes had produced a wholesome repentance, and he had paid them a second visit, “strengthening all the disciples.” So far, the coincidence is the same which Paley has noted, with one added feature of truth, in the special suitableness of the second visit, Acts 18:23, for those directions, which this passage in the letter proves to have been given at that time, and not before.

But a more delicate harmony remains still to be noticed. If St. Paul, when he wrote to the Galatians, felt their actual state unsuitable for any direct charge about the contribution, and yet designed fully to urge it upon them, in a second visit, if they were reclaimed by his letter, he would naturally seek to prepare their minds for it by hints in that letter, which might work their effect silently, and bear fruit in due season. Let us now see whether there are not unobtrusive, and still unquestionable tokens of such a secret purpose.

First, in his review of the history, what is the solitary point which he names, as the suggestion of the other apostles, the pillars of the church, with which he was prompt and ready to comply? “Only they would that we should remember the poor (that is, of the Jewish believers), the same which I also was forward to do.”

What instruction does he give for their conduct towards all those from whom they received spiritual blessings? “Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things.” This is the very maxim on which he rests the contribution in the two later epistles to Corinth and Rome; that the Gentiles had been partakers from the Jews of spiritual things, and ought therefore to minister to them in carnal or temporal things.

Not satisfied with this double hint, bearing on the duty of liberality, he repeats it once more, in a form directly and plainly applicable to the future contribution. “And let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. As we have, therefore, opportunity, let us do good to all men, and especially to them who are

of the household of faith.” Surely this is a prospective instruction, which he proposed to unfold more clearly, by the orders he afterwards gave to the churches of Galatia respecting the contribution for Judæa, before he reached Ephesus, and wrote similar instructions to Corinth.

No. IX.

1 Cor. 16:6. “And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go.”

The apostle, having once disappointed the Corinthians, though for a weighty and sufficient reason, would not lightly disappoint them again. He speaks with some doubt, because he was still uncertain what effect his letter would have, and he had determined not to visit them again, till he might do it with joy. Since, however, we learn from the second epistle that the result of the first even surpassed his hopes, we may be sure that he would keep his present engagement, if it were at all possible. His departure from Ephesus was only hastened, not hindered by the tumult, and thus would concur with the same design. Although in form it is a doubtful and conditional promise, we know that the main cause of doubt was removed, and hence may view it as a simple prediction.

Let us now turn to the history. We are there informed that Paul sent for the elders of the church to Miletus, for he “had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost.” The urgent haste, which is essential to explain the summons of the elders, is only half accounted for by this fact alone, of the proposed termination of the voyage, unless we knew also its commencement; and for this reason, doubtless, the historian told us before, “We sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread.” One other note of time is given, the character of which is best shown by a full quotation.

“And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia Sopater of Berea; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus.”

Now if St. Paul and St. Luke sailed from Philippi after the passover, they probably reached it before the feast began. If companions were with them from Thessalonica and Berea, it is likely that the apostle touched at those places in his way, and gave “a second benefit” to those churches as well as Philippi. He must therefore, it is probable, have left Corinth a month before the passover began, or not later than the end of February or the first week of March. But since he spent three months in Greece or Achaia, and the phrase implies that these were complete, he must have reached it about the last week of November, or the first of December. There was thus a punctual fulfilment of his conditional promise.— “It may be that I shall abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go.” The only shade of difference between the promise and its accomplishment bears a further trace of real

history. The apostle seems to have reached Corinth later in the winter season than he expected before leaving Ephesus, a very natural result of unforeseen delays in an extensive circuit through all Macedonia.

No. X.

1 Cor. 16:12. "As touching our brother Apollos, I greatly desired him to come unto you with the brethren: but his will was not at all to come at this time; but he will come when he shall have convenient time."

It seems here implied that the Corinthians, in their message to St. Paul, expressed a desire for Apollos to come, if he himself were hindered. It is plain that St. Paul urged his coming, and that Apollos declined the visit with equal perseverance.

All these circumstances are exactly what we might expect from the facts disclosed in these epistles, or detailed in the history. Yet the harmony is of a deep and hidden nature, since to perceive it the character of these eminent teachers requires to be thoughtfully weighed. St. Paul had founded the church, and Apollos had greatly helped its progress. There were two parties, forming the greater part of the whole church, who attached themselves to these leaders even with a sinful emulation. When St. Paul had expressed his resolution to delay his visit, it was very natural that they should desire the return of Apollos, who also was now at Ephesus. It agrees well with the noble character of the apostle, and his freedom from all selfish jealousy, that he should urge Apollos to comply with their request. It was equally natural that Apollos, who had heard by the same messengers of these feuds in the church, and of the abuse of his own name in party rivalry to St. Paul himself, should decline the visit with similar earnestness. The same motive which led to the apostle's solicitation would prompt his own persevering refusal. Yet St. Paul, as he could not yet disclose fully his own motive for delaying his visit, which he first reveals in his second letter after their repentance, was equally precluded from stating the motive of Apollos, which turned upon the same unhappy divisions. Hence he says only in general terms, which imply more than they express, "Altogether it was not his will to come at this time, but he will come when the time shall be convenient."

The coincidence here is not of the letter with the history, but of a passing hint in the letter with the character and circumstances of Paul and Apollos, as deduced both from the letters and the history in the actual crisis of the Corinthian church.

No. XI.

1 Cor. 16:19. "The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house." Why this one word of emphatic addition in the mention of Aquila and Priscilla? If we turn to Acts 18:2, 3, we learn that they had stayed long at Corinth with the apostles, and been his most intimate companions, working with him daily in the same occupation of tent-makers. If we next consult the close of that same chapter, we find that they were the instructors of Apollos, who expounded to him the way of God more perfectly, and then joined with others in giving him letters of commendation to the believers in Achaia. Hence, from their long abode at Corinth, even longer than that of the apostle, their peculiar intimacy with St. Paul, dwelling in the same house, and working at the same trade,

and their relation to Apollos as his spiritual helpers and instructors, they would have a threefold reason for special interest in that church which Paul had planted and Apollos watered. Yet how unstrained and unobtrusive the significance of that one little word,—“Aquila and Priscilla salute you *much* in the Lord!”

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

THE marks of earnest reality in every part of this letter are so conspicuous, that it seems like holding up a candle to the sun, to dwell on the consistency of particular passages as proof of its authenticity; and indeed so many of these have been traced already in the *Horæ*, in twelve articles, that any increase of their number may appear doubly needless. The remark of Paley on the first of them (2 Cor. 3: 3-11, Acts 19:23-41) is very just, that this alone would satisfy him the epistle was written by St. Paul, and by St. Paul under the actual circumstances in which the history places him.

Yet, however superfluous they may be deemed in the way of proof, all such internal marks of congruity are of real value. They tend not only to confirm the faith of the Christian, and to illustrate the superabundant evidence of these sacred records, but also to render our impressions of the narrative more vivid, and to give us a deeper insight into the more delicate and hidden harmonies of the word of God.

No. I.

2 Cor. 1:1. “Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia.”

Chap. 2:12,13. “Furthermore, when I came to Troas to preach Christ’s gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into Macedonia.”

The agreement between the second of these verses, and the narrative of St. Paul’s return into Asia, has been noticed in the *Horæ*; but the careful comparison of both passages with the former epistle and the history gives rise to some further remarks, and seems to disclose a very indirect and still an indisputable coincidence.

It appears from the first epistle that Timothy had already gone into Macedonia, and that he was intended by Paul to visit Corinth, and then to rejoin the apostle, we might naturally suppose, at Ephesus. Accordingly, those who refer the first Epistle to Timothy to this date, suppose that he did rejoin him, and was then left behind at Ephesus, till he afterwards rejoined him a second time in Macedonia.

Again, Mr. Biley supposes that Titus had directions on leaving Corinth to return by way of Macedonia and Troas, so as to explain the conduct of the apostle, who, when disappointed in meeting him at Troas, crossed at once into Macedonia.

The former of these views is open to insurmountable objections, and even the latter

seems highly improbable. The passage in Acts implies that St. Paul rather intended to follow Timothy than to await his return to Ephesus, and his own departure was hastened by the tumult. Even if Timothy had time to rejoin him there, it is most unlikely that St. Paul would leave him behind, as if for a prolonged stay, when the storm compelled his own departure; and it is impossible that he should speak of returning thither shortly, when the double delay of a circuit through all Macedonia, and a winter abode at Corinth, were fully in view. It is certain that he could not expect to rejoin him in much less than a year, and improbable that Timothy should desert the post, if thus assigned him, and return to Macedonia, when the apostle charges him to stay till he himself shall come (1 Tim. 4:13). This view, then, is wholly untenable.

Again, it is most unlikely that Titus would be instructed to return by Macedonia, when the desire of St. Paul was evidently to gain the earliest tidings of his visit. There would be no purpose in his visit to Macedonia, since Timothy had already been sent thither with full instructions. The journey from Corinth to Ephesus, or even to Troas, is shorter than to Philippi, and hence the supposed circuit would involve a needless and improbable delay.

Let us now inquire whether the history and the two letters, compared together, will not supply their own key, though so difficult to discover, and as these attempts may show, very easy to misunderstand. We have seen it probable that Titus was sent to Corinth about a month before Pentecost, the proposed limit of the apostle's stay at Ephesus. Hence, with the double voyage and the probable delay, St. Paul could not expect him to return before his own departure. He would naturally, therefore, make an appointment to meet at the first station on his own route, which appears, both from Acts 20:6, and the above passage, to have been Troas. He thought it probable that Timothy would reach Corinth during the stay of Titus, though not certain (1 Cor. 16:10, 11), and in this case expected their return together. This return, however, would be to Troas, and not to Ephesus, as results from the previous conclusion. Two contingencies, however, were possible, that either Timothy or Titus might be delayed beyond their expectation. How would these be provided for? Since the object of the apostle was to meet Titus as soon as possible, and still to prosecute his route into Macedonia, he would naturally direct his return to Troas before some fixed time, rather later than Pentecost; but, if he were delayed longer, would instruct him to proceed at once to Philippi, the next station on his own journey. His hasty departure from Ephesus gave him rather more time than he had expected at Troas, so that there was a promising field open; but his eager desire to meet with Titus would not suffer him to stay when the fixed time was past, and he hastened forward into Macedonia. Again, though Timothy probably set out before the journey of Titus had been decided upon, it was after the apostle had settled both his route and the time of his departure. Hence, if he were delayed in Macedonia a few weeks beyond his expectation, to return by way of Corinth to Ephesus, as he was instructed in case of a speedy visit, would become useless, since instead of rejoining the apostle at once he would actually be travelling away from him, without a chance of overtaking him till he had passed by Corinth, Ephesus, and Troas, into Macedonia again. He would therefore return to Philippi, and Titus would change his route and proceed thither, that both might report their success to the apostle at the first opportunity.

Every circumstance on this view is consistent and natural, yet how circuitous and indirect is the evidence by which it is proved. To obtain this harmonious result we

need to determine, with tolerable accuracy, the date of the first letter, which depends on three or four passages combined together. We need, secondly, to consider the arrangement which St. Paul was likely to make with Titus, that he might hear the report as soon as possible, on the double contingency of a shorter or longer delay. We need, in the third place, by the help of this conclusion, to interpret the passage (1 Cor. 16:11) as importing a return of Timothy along with Titus, not to Ephesus, but to Troas. We need, lastly, to consider the ground of the doubt in that expression—“Now if Timotheus come,” and to reflect on the most probable course that would be prescribed, if unexpected delays intervened at the very time when Paul had resolved to set out for Macedonia. Combining all these elements, at length we have a full explanation how Timothy should be present with the apostle in Macedonia, and how the disappointment in not meeting with Titus at Troas should lead the apostle to cross the sea at once, with the certain hope of meeting him somewhere in Macedonia. There is perhaps no one coincidence more indirect, derived from more complicated elements, and, when duly weighed, more demonstrably complete.

No. II.

This epistle has been often charged with the want of a regular arrangement. And certainly the order is less easy to discern than in most of the others. Yet in reality there is a principle of arrangement running through the whole, which is so unobtrusive as to be hardly ever noticed, and can only be accounted for by its historical truth.

It is plain that the letter includes three main subjects, besides the introduction; namely, the explanation of the new covenant and the gospel ministry, the message respecting the contribution, and the vindication of his authority against the false teachers. But along with this general division there is a secret order of historical succession, the advice and exhortations being interwoven, either briefly or at greater length.

The letter begins with an apostrophe of thanksgiving for his recent deliverance from the fury of the Ephesian populace. We have, then, in regular sequence, the following events.

First, his original plan to visit Corinth on his way to Macedonia. “In this confidence I was minded to come unto you before, that ye might have a second benefit; and to pass by you into Macedonia,” 1:15, 16.

Second, his change of plan, with its motive (1:17, 23), “I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet to Corinth.”

Thirdly, the writing of the first letter, with reflections arising out of it. “I wrote this same unto you, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice,” 2:3-11.

Fourthly, his arrival at Troas, and disappointment, 2:12, 13.

Fifthly, his continued journey into Macedonia, 2:13.

Then follows the first main digression from the narrative, with an exposition of the

character of the new covenant and the gospel ministry, occupying four chapters, or nearly one-third of the whole. The sequence is then resumed, as follows:

Sixthly, his troubles in Macedonia, after his arrival. "For when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side," 7:5.

Seventhly, the arrival of Titus, and his report of the wholesome effects of the letter, 7:6-16.

Eighthly, his own account of the zeal and liberality of the Macedonian converts, 8:1-5.

Ninthly, the request that Titus would revisit Corinth, and his ready compliance, 8:6-17.

Tenthly, the choice of his companions, and instructions how to welcome them, 8:18-24.

We have then a chapter of advice on the contribution, two chapters of exhortation, on the more general and distant prospect of St. Paul's own visit, and a final warning of it as very near at hand, with an anticipation of his own course upon his arrival at Corinth.

Now this perfect continuity, amidst long and various digressions, this thread of concealed narrative, interwoven with doctrinal instructions and earnest practical appeals, is quite conceivable and natural in the apostle himself, writing in the midst of the events, but is without example in any spurious writing. I am not aware of any critic or commentator, who has ever detected this secret principle of arrangement; yet when once pointed out, its existence is evident, and becomes a conspicuous sign of historical reality.

No. III.

2 Cor. 8:18,19. "And we have sent with him our brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches; and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind."

Vers. 22, 23. "And we have sent with them our brother, whom we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent, upon the great confidence which he hath in you. Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ."

2 Cor. 12:18. "I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? walked we not in the same spirit? walked we not in the same steps?"

This mode of introducing the companions of Titus, without so much as naming them, yet with a distinctive commendation of each, has a great air of reality. It is just what would be natural in St. Paul, who was sure that the Corinthians either knew their

names already, or would learn them upon their arrival, but whose description of their merits was essential, to secure them a due welcome. Yet this mention could answer no object of a spurious writing, since to this hour there is a great diversity of opinion, who these companions really were. Let us see if we cannot discover a very probable solution, which bears the marks of a real coincidence.

First, is the brother in the second passage the same with the first or second of those in the former text, or distinct from both? It is sometimes assumed that he was the same with the former. Yet I think this the least likely of the three alternatives. For if this brother had visited Corinth so lately, and was therefore well known to them in person, would St. Paul have thought this full introduction requisite, which contains no allusion to his presence with them previously? On the other hand, the shorter description of the second brother, who had often been diligent in similar errands, will suit perfectly with the hypothesis that he had attended Titus once before. The force of the article is also better explained on this view, than if we suppose a third brother introduced in the second passage. The visit of Titus, however, it has been shown already, was not the same as when he brought the first epistle, but one still earlier, in the previous year, when he set on foot the contribution at Corinth.

Mr. Biley, in his Supplement to the *Horæ*, supposes that Erastus is meant by the first brother in this passage. He argues that there was no reason why St. Paul should speak to them in this way of a stranger, known merely as his companion, but only of a Corinthian. Now Erastus was a Corinthian, a companion of St. Paul in his travels, and was probably with him when this letter was written, since he had been sent along with Timothy into Macedonia. Also that he would naturally delay his return, like Paul and Apollos, while the disorders prevailed, and hasten back when he learned the wholesome effect of the apostle's letter.

To this view there is one decisive and fatal objection. The brother in question was not only a companion of St. Paul, but chosen by the churches to travel with him as a trustee of the pecuniary contribution. This is quite plain from ver. 20, 21. Hence he must be one who attended St. Paul to Jerusalem. But this was not true of Erastus, for his name does not appear in the book of Acts among the companions of the apostle on that journey.

Indeed, the description of this brother seems more suitable, if he were almost or altogether a stranger to the Corinthians. Men do not give notes of introduction for a person to his intimate friends. It is a more natural inference, that the first brother, described more fully, was a comparative stranger to the Corinthians, and the other, more briefly introduced, either a Corinthian, or considerably better known among them.

Let us see now whether the marks given will not be enough to identify him, with the help of the history. He was chosen, we are told, by the churches, to travel along with St. Paul, as a kind of trustee in the business of the contribution. Now in Acts 20:4, we have a list of his companions at the outset, namely, Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Timothy, Tychicus, Trophimus, and Luke himself, the historian. To one of these our choice is therefore rigorously confined. Sopater, from the text, seems only to have gone as far as Asia. Timothy is not intended, since the apostle joins him in the superscription of the letter. The choice is thus restricted to Aristarchus, Secundus,

Gaius, Tychicus, Trophimus, and Luke. Three only of these are expressly shown in the history to have attended St. Paul as far as Jerusalem, namely, Luke, Aristarchus, and Trophimus. Hence it is much more probable, at least, that one of these is the person intended by the apostle. To which of them, it remains to inquire, will the title most fully apply, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches? Even apart from the written gospel, it is clear that St. Luke has the fairest claim. For he was St. Paul's companion in preaching the gospel at his first entrance into Europe (Acts 16:10), while Aristarchus was a Jew of Thessalonica (Acts 27:2; Col. 4:10, 11), and Trophimus, a Gentile of Ephesus (Acts 21:29), and therefore most probably converted to the faith after the labours of St. Luke as an evangelist were already begun.

The words, however, seem plainly used as a distinctive title, by which this companion of St. Paul might be discriminated from others. If the name of this brother had been given, we should naturally interpret the commendation as a simple statement, which might be equally true of many others besides. But here it replaces his name as a more expressive definition. Now we have seen already that our choice is limited, probably to three, certainly to six persons, independently of this phrase. And since one of these is distinguished from all the others, and indeed from all St. Paul's companions, as the only author of a written Gospel, and of that Gospel which bears internal marks of being specially designed for the Gentile converts, we are shut up to the conclusion, that St. Luke, and he only, is the person really intended by this description.

The only ground for reasonable hesitation arises from the doubt whether his Gospel was written so early. Many critics, it is true, place it six or seven years later, though on very insufficient grounds. In fact, this passage itself, which almost forces us to the conclusion above, is of far more weight, in such a minute question of chronology, than all the later evidence, which is of a very vague and uncertain kind. If the first Epistle to Timothy were written, as many critics hold, about the same time as this epistle, the question would be settled at once; since the Gospel of St. Luke is distinctly quoted in it as inspired Scripture. And even placing it more correctly near seven years later, still the quotation of it, as of equal authority with the law of Moses, within so few years, must be a strong presumption that it was already in circulation at the earlier date.

The coincidence thus deduced is very striking. St. Paul, before he visits Corinth, sends with Titus "the brother, whose praise is in the gospel and throughout all the churches," and whom they had chosen to assist in conveying their alms to Jerusalem. This seems to imply that he had resided some time among them before this visit of St. Paul, whose companion he was to be henceforward until the commission was fulfilled. In the history, St. Luke, one of the two evangelists who were not apostles, after parting from St. Paul at Philippi six years before, and having since then ceased to be his constant attendant in his journeys, as he silently marks by his change of the pronouns in his history, is found in his company in Macedonia after this visit to Corinth, and attends him afterwards to Jerusalem, and even to Rome, as an inseparable companion. Yet these facts are indicated in the most unobtrusive manner, by a mere change in the pronouns. "We sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread."

It remains to inquire who is the second brother. We may here attain a probable, though not so certain a conclusion. He was not a Corinthian, or St. Paul could hardly

have used those words, “whether our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers of the churches and the glory of Christ.” He was not a Macedonian, for then the contrast would be lost; “Lest haply if they of Macedonia come, and find you unprepared,” etc. If, as most probable, the same who had been sent with Titus before, (12:18,) he was then sent from Ephesus, and would probably be an Ephesian. If he took such a prominent part in forwarding the contribution at Corinth, he would be not unlikely to take a similar part in accompanying it to Jerusalem. Now this might possibly be true of Tychicus, but was certainly true of Trophimus only; and therefore it is likely that Trophimus was the second companion of Titus now, as well as his sole companion on the former visit, a year before.

It is true that the brief hints do not allow us to decide, in this case, with absolute certainty. Yet it is a strong sign of truth that we find two characters in the history in whom all these various hints, as to the second brother, would be satisfied, while there is one, and only one, who fully satisfies the more definite description of the brother whose praise in the gospel was throughout all the churches.

No. IV.

2 Cor. 11:32, 33. “In Damascus, the governor (or ethnarch) under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me: and through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands.”

Let us compare the passage in Acts: “And after many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him: but their laying await was known of Saul. And they watched the gates day and night to kill him. Then the disciples took him by night, and let him down by the wall in a basket.”

Paley has observed on these passages, that they agree in the main fact, but with such a difference of circumstances, as to make it utterly improbable that one was derived from the other. Hence their agreement can be explained only by the reality of the fact to which they refer as their common foundation.

This general remark admits of further confirmation. For these very differences, when closely examined, present new points of coincidence. The plot is ascribed to the Jews in the history; but in the epistle, to the governor or ethnarch under Aretas the king. Now the ethnarch, we may learn from other authorities, was a Jewish officer, to whom the heathen rulers gave separate authority over the Jews, in the large cities, where they were numerous, like Damascus and Alexandria. Also the ambush of the Jews, in Acts, is referred to a *συμβουλή*, or deliberate consultation, which almost implies a public or official, though a secret conspiracy.

Again, the historian says nothing of the window, nor the epistle, of its happening in the night. Yet it is equally natural that a time of darkness should be chosen for his escape, and that a window in the upper part of the wall should be preferred, as less exposed to observation, than an attempt to let him down over the parapets.

The passage in the epistle appears like an after thought. It is added, when he has already given a rapid sketch of his sufferings, and confirmed it by that solemn declaration: “The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever,

knoweth that I He not.” Now the event itself was soon after his conversion, before the commencement of his labours as the apostle of Christ. It was the most remote instance of the persecutions he endured, and stood alone. How natural that it should have been omitted at first in this brief and condensed catalogue; and that the apostle, after a pause of thought, reviewing his whole course a second time, should then revert to this earliest persecution, the pattern and warning of so many that were to follow. Any one writing later, or deriving his knowledge at second hand, would have mentioned the occurrence, if introduced at all, in its historical order, and have placed it at the head of the list.

No. V.

2 Cor. 12:12,13. “Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein you were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me this wrong.”

The former verse contains a distinct assertion, that St. Paul had wrought many miracles during his stay at Corinth. Yet the very next verse, when closely examined, discloses marks of historical reality beyond the reach of imitation.

First, it is implied that the Corinthians had not contributed to his support. And this is confirmed by the history, which says, that he abode with Aquila, and wrought there at tentmaking; by the letter to the Philippians, where he says, that no other church contributed to his support at that time, “in the beginning of the gospel, when he departed from Macedonia;” and by the former epistle: “Have we not power to eat and to drink? But I have used none of these things.”

Next, it is further implied that a claim to such support was one privilege of the apostolic office. The turn of thought can only be explained by this key. Every other sign, he tells them, was given them, except this one only. Now this view agrees with his own statement to the Thessalonians— “We might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ.” Next, in the former epistle: “Am I not an apostle? Have we not power to eat and to drink?” Lastly, with the principles he has twice or three times laid down, Rom. 15:27; 1 Cor. 9:11.

Finally, it is here implied, that his refusal of such support from the Corinthians was really the denial of a privilege, and a mark of their spiritual inferiority. Now that this was really the view of the apostle appears, first, from his words to the elders at Miletus, Acts 20:35: “I have showed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the *weak*, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.” Next, from his statement to the Philippians: “No church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only Not because I desire a gift: but I desire fruit that may abound to your account.” Thirdly, from the reason before assigned for his own conduct: “As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia. Wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth. But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion.” It was the readiness of some among them to view his conduct with suspicion, which compelled him to withhold this mark of his full confidence. The same view of their spiritual backwardness appears also 1 Cor.

3:1-4.

Now it is only when these various hints are combined, that the exact meaning of the second verse comes to light, and the mingled justice and delicacy of the reproof. They ought to have felt it the denial of a privilege, and a mark of spiritual nonage, that St. Paul refused so perseveringly to borrow any part of his own support from them. In their actual state, Christian wisdom prescribed this conduct to him. But he felt it, as the more spiritual among them would also feel it, not so much the relieving them from a burden, as the denial of one sign of his apostleship, a natural result and open badge of their spiritual weakness. Hence the same words, which are a serious excuse for his conduct, as addressed to the more faithful among them, are a refined and delicate irony to the selfish and suspicious. "Wherein were ye inferior to other churches," what other sign of my apostleship was withheld, "except that I myself did not burden you? Forgive me this wrong." Such a stroke of mingled satire and pathos, confirmed in the fact it assumes and the principles on which the appeal is founded, by such a variety of coincidences, is inimitably real. Yet its whole force depends on the fact being notorious to all the Corinthian believers, that every other sign of apostleship had really been exhibited among them, "*in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds*"

CHAPTER V.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

THIS letter of St. Paul, being addressed to a church he had never visited, is naturally less fertile in historical allusions than those to the Corinthians. Paley, however, has traced out, in eight distinct articles, many indirect coincidences with the history and the other letters, and most of them are peculiarly striking and impressive. Those which remain to be noticed are rather to be viewed as supplementary to his remarks than as opening fresh topics which had not been already touched upon. Yet some of them may perhaps deserve to be ranked as distinct arguments.

No. I.

Rom. 14:1. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations."

The whole passage, which begins with these words, has a remarkably close resemblance to another in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (8:1-13, 9:1-20). Let us compare them with each other.

The general subject, in both cases, is certain scruples of conscience with regard to particular kinds of food. In both, the apostle lays down the same principle, the lawfulness of these meats in themselves, and the duty of regarding the consciences of weak brethren. But the very phrases and succession of thought are nearly the same.

Ch. 14:14. "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean."

1 Cor. 8:8. "But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse."

Ch. 14:15. "But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died."

1 Cor. 8:9-11. "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak. For if any man see thee which hath knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols? And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?"

Ch. 14:19. "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another."

1 Cor. 10:32, 33. "Give none offence, neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved."

Ch. 14:21. "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak."

1 Cor. 8:13. "Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."

Ch. 15:2. "Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification."

1 Cor. 10:24. "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth."

A view of the entire passage, in each case, will render the comparison still more striking. Now the circumstances of time and place, when combined together, render this agreement very natural. The interval of the letters was not great, being about nine or ten months, from April or May in one year until February in the year following. What explains it still more completely is, that the second letter was written from the very place to which the former was addressed; so that the apostle, for three months before, had doubtless been repeating his written instructions, by word of mouth, to the very parties for whom the letter was written. It is therefore doubly natural that, in writing to the Romans from Corinth, the same train of thought on this practical subject should reappear.

There is a further harmony with the facts in the difference of the two passages. The decree of the council, which confirmed the liberty of the Gentiles, and still imposed a few simple restrictions out of regard to the habits of the Jews, would be exposed to infraction in two opposite ways. The Judaizers would desire to reimpose the whole of the ceremonial law, while an opposite party would urge the general principle, in order to supersede the restrictions that were still enjoined. St. Paul, in writing to the Galatians, has to defend the liberty of the gospel against the first class of adversaries. In writing to the Corinthians, where the Gentile party was much the most numerous, and pride of knowledge the besetting sin, he has to contend against the opposite extreme, and to urge the obligation of waving the use of an abstract liberty, whenever it served to perplex and confound the conscience of others. He thus vindicates against the Corinthian converts from among the Gentiles the restriction against the use of

meats offered to idols, at the same time explaining under what circumstances the prohibition would really apply.

On the other hand, in writing to the Romans, whom he had not visited, and where the Gentile accessions hitherto were, perhaps, hardly a balance for the Jewish converts, he follows a middle course, and holds the scales with an even balance. Every caution against a needless scrupulosity is paired with another against an uncharitable laxity. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him." "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." "I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

This one-sidedness in the reasoning with the Judaizing Galatians, and the Gentilizing Corinthians, and this studied balance of warning and caution to the Romans, where it is reasonable to believe that the parties were nearly balanced, or at least, where the apostle gave an abstract lesson to guard against probable evils, is just what might be expected in real letters. If the remarks are well founded, as careful observation will prove, they exhibit a coincidence far too delicate and profound to be explained by anything else than the reality of the correspondence, and the deep wisdom of the great apostle.

No. II.

Rom. 15:20-24. "Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation: but as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand. For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming to you. But now having no longer a place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company."

In No. III. on this epistle, Paley derives a striking argument from the comparison of this passage with one in Acts 19: It will furnish another, however, scarcely less conclusive, by comparing it with 2 Cor. 10:14-16, which Paley has also adduced (No. XII.) for a different purpose.

"For we stretch not ourselves beyond our measure, as though we reached not unto you; for we are come as far as to you also in preaching the gospel of Christ: not boasting of things without our measure, of other men's labours; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, to preach the gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand."

The principle, on which the apostle declares himself to have acted, is the same in both

passages, though under a different metaphor, from the measure of a field, or from the foundation and progress of a building. In one case, it is given simply by way of explanation; in the other, as a reproof to the vainglory of false teachers, who sought to lessen his authority in a church which he alone had founded. The actual purpose in both cases is the same also, but stated with a similar diversity. When writing to Corinth, his chief object was to rebuke the self-conceit of these false apostles, and hence his plan is stated in the most general terms. He hoped, if his visit to them were successful, to preach the gospel in certain regions beyond them, where Christ was not yet named. In writing to Rome, his object is to explain his plan for visiting them, and he therefore enters into a fuller statement. Spain, it now appears, is the region he had in view; but still he purposed to touch at Rome in his way, that he might impart to them some spiritual gifts, and be refreshed by their sympathy. Still, he would not make it his chief object, because the foundation had been already laid in that city by others. This substantial agreement of the two passages, while there is such a contrast in their explicitness of statement, and when we remark further how appropriate each of them is in its own context, and how pertinent to the design of the apostle, is a clear proof, even if it stood alone, that both letters grew out of real circumstances, and are historically genuine.

No. III

Rom. 16:3, 5. "Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus: who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Likewise greet the church that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved Epenetus, who is the first fruits of Achaia (*Asia, Bengel, Griesb. Scholz.*) unto Christ."

In No. II. of the *Horæ*, this passage is adduced for several congruities which it supplies respecting the character and residence of Aquila and Priscilla. The present commendation is referred by Paley to their conduct during their stay with the apostle at Corinth. In this one particular his view seems to admit of correction and improvement, while a new light is thrown on the reality of the whole statement.

And first, the words are most natural, if the occurrence itself was of recent date. It would then be impressed more vividly on the mind of the apostle, and be more suitable for a commendation of Aquila and Priscilla to the brethren at Rome. The abode at Corinth, however, was five or six years before, and the apostle laboured in that city without actual peril of death, since he had the distinct promise from the first, "No man shall set on thee to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city." The abortive attempt of the Jews only recoiled upon themselves.

Only nine or ten months, however, before the date of this letter, as may be deduced by a careful comparison of many notes of time, the apostle had suffered the most imminent danger at Ephesus. In the last epistle before the present one, he speaks of it in the strongest terms. "We would not have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life." And again, "Who delivered us out of so great a death, and doth deliver, in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us."

But since Aquila and Priscilla were now at Rome, was it possible or probable that

they should be present with the apostle in this time of trouble? The answer is found in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, written, as I have shown, about a month before the tumult: "Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord."

Is there, however, any hint or likelihood that they endangered their own lives for the apostle at this time? If we turn to the history, we have a statement which tallies well with the supposition, though Aquila is not named. "And the whole city was filled with confusion: and having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre. And when Paul would have entered in unto the people, *the disciples suffered him not.*" Now we know from the epistle that Aquila and Priscilla were then at Ephesus, and from the history that they were St. Paul's most intimate friends. Hence it follows, almost of necessity, that they were among those disciples who interfered to prevent him from endangering his life still more in the theatre. It is true that the history does not supply the fact mentioned in the letter; but it supplies every circumstance, when compared with 1 Cor. 16:, which could make such an occurrence highly probable;—their intimate friendship with the apostle, their presence at Ephesus just before the tumult, his imminent peril, so that he despaired of life, the love of the disciples, which kept him back from almost certain destruction, and the enduring rancour of the Jews of Ephesus, as proved by their outcry not long after at Jerusalem. We cannot doubt that Aquila and Priscilla would be foremost, in that hour of danger, with their most strenuous exertions to save the apostle; and at such a crisis it would be, almost certainly, at the peril of their own lives.

The words that follow are a further coincidence. For all the best critics adopt the reading, which seems undoubtedly correct. "Salute my well-beloved Epenetus, who is the first fruits of *Asia* unto Christ." If the apostle had just reverted to his peril in Asia, he would naturally, by association of thought, continue his salutation with one who was "the first fruits of Asia" among all his acquaintances at Rome. It is also a very reasonable conjecture that Aquila, Priscilla, and Epenetus, had all been compelled to leave Ephesus soon after the tumult, in consequence of their zeal in defence of the apostle at that time.

One possible objection alone remains. If the allusion were to this Gentile tumult, why should the apostle specify "the churches of the Gentiles" as those on whose gratitude Aquila and Priscilla had so strong a claim? It is a sufficient reply, that St. Paul was confessedly the apostle of the Gentiles, and the preservation of his life, by whatever enemies it was endangered, would be a solid ground for this appeal to the Gentile churches. And besides, it is certain that Jewish opposition was uncommonly bitter at Ephesus, and quite possible that, even at the time of the tumult, the immediate danger which Aquila incurred was from the malice of the Jews, rather than of the Gentiles.

No. IV.

The salutations which occupy the last chapter of the epistle, being addressed to a place which St. Paul never visited, until the close of St. Luke's history, it becomes impossible, from the want of materials for comparison, to bring to light many coincidences. Yet there are not a few marks of reality, of a more general nature, which may be detected even here. It may be convenient to include these in one miscellaneous article, with one or two slight corrections of Paley's observations.

First, it may seem strange that there should be so large a list of salutations in this letter to a church which St. Paul had never visited. But when we remember that Rome was the grand centre of intercourse, and the metropolis of the world, and that Jews from Rome were present and converted, even on the day of Pentecost, we shall find in this circumstance one mark of consistency and truth.

“Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour upon us.” This Jewish name was so common, that the person intended could only be known by the circumstance of her having ministered personally to the apostle. It seems also implied that the numbers of the church were comparatively small, and the members, with the leading facts of their previous life, known to each other.

“Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me.” This passing tribute of honour was only possible from the peculiar facts of St. Paul’s history. There was no other apostle who could have addressed such a statement with truth to any individual in any of the churches. The other phrase is obscure, and that very obscurity is a sign of historical truth. Its most natural meaning is, that they were conspicuous among a class here called apostles. Yet it is certain that they were not apostles of Christ, like St. Paul and the twelve. But the difficulty is removed by another passage, 2 Cor. 8:23, where St. Paul writes of the two companions of Titus, in his visit to Corinth: “They are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ.” It is quite natural that these kinsmen of St. Paul, who were converted before him, and had suffered imprisonment along with him, should hold a conspicuous place among these messengers of the churches, whose honour was inferior only to that of the apostles themselves.

Again, this is the only letter where Timothy is present, and not joined in the superscription. The reason of the difference is clear. Since Paul had not been at or near Rome, his ground for addressing them rested solely on his apostolic office, and not on his personal labours among them. Hence Timothy is excluded from the superscription with the same propriety which accounts for his mention in the other cases. For even in the epistle to Colosse, though Paul and Timothy had probably not visited it, they had preached together in all the surrounding region, both in Pamphylia to the east, and Asia to the west.

Paley has remarked, that of the seven names in the salutation, three are found with Paul on leaving Macedonia, a coincidence as great as could be expected from reality, though less than would have been produced by design. It is tolerably clear that two only are the same. For the Gaius in the epistle is a Corinthian, but the Gaius in Acts is of Derbe in Asia Minor. And it seems that a third Gaius, a Macedonian, is mentioned in the previous chapter. It is certainly possible that Gaius of Derbe, and Gaius the Macedonian, might be the same, one being his native place, and the other his home; but it is hardly possible that the host of the whole church at Corinth, and one of the first believers baptized in that city, should be a Macedonian, or a native or inhabitant of Derbe. But when we remember that Gaius was nearly the most common name among the Romans, the setting aside of a spurious coincidence only reveals another feature of internal probability.

The conjecture that Lucius may be the same with Lucas, is also probably unfounded. The double form, Silas and Silvanus, implies that Lucanus, and not Lucius, would be the only alternative form of the name of the evangelist. And since Titus does not appear in the list, nor Tychicus or Trophimus, it may be inferred that all those messengers who were sent to Corinth returned to Macedonia before the present letter was written. It is possible that he is the same with Lucius of Cyrene. Yet another conjecture is more natural. Jason, we know, was of Thessalonica, and Sosipater, or Sopater, of Berea; and it is probable that, since Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea, were the three successive stations and centres of St. Paul's labours in Macedonia, one companion from each would attend him to Corinth, and that Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, were from those towns respectively. We shall still have this imperfect coincidence, that Lucius alone of the three was a Roman name, and that Philippi alone of the three cities was a Roman colony.

The greeting from Erastus not only accords with the passage in the second to Timothy, but with the statements in the book of Acts. He was one of those who ministered to the apostle, and was sent before him into Macedonia along with Timothy. Yet Timothy is among his companions on leaving Macedonia, but not Erastus. It is thus implied that he stayed behind, either in Macedonia or Achaia. The letter indirectly explains the circumstance. He held, it seems, a public station at Corinth, and, after an absence of more than a year, his stay might be almost necessary.

These correspondencies, though separately they may be somewhat hypothetical, form a cumulative presumption of reality, which has no little weight.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EPISTLES TO ASIA FROM ROME.

It is generally agreed that the three letters to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon, were written from Rome during the two years' imprisonment, with which the sacred history closes. The usual opinion is, that they were written very nearly together, and dispatched by the same messengers in one single journey. In this case it is plain, from the letter to Philemon, that their date was towards the close of that imprisonment. The first of them is almost entirely destitute of historical allusions, and the two others are addressed to a place which St. Paul seems not to have visited. These reasons conspire with their date, at the very close of the book of Acts, to prevent us from expecting numerous coincidences. The twelve articles in the *Horæ* have nearly exhausted the subject; but still a short chapter may be usefully occupied with a few topics, which deserve, and will perhaps repay, a fuller examination.

No. I.

Eph. 1:1.—“Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.”

In the *Horæ Paulinas*, Paley has touched on the much debated question, whether the present epistle were addressed to Ephesus or Laodicea, and has decided in favour of the latter view. Grotius, Wetstein, and others before him, and more recently Mr. Greswell in his *Dissertations*, give the same decision. There is a third alternative

which he has not considered, in the view of archbishop Usher, Hammond, Koppe, Hug, Michaelis and others, that it was a circular epistle, designed for several churches, including both Ephesus and Laodicea.

The claim of Ephesus lies in the external evidence, since the name occurs in nearly all the existing manuscripts and versions. But there are two or three facts which diminish its force considerably. Marcian is blamed by Tertullian for calling it the letter to the Laodiceans. Again, in the Vatican manuscript, the words, “in Ephesus,” are only in the margin, though by the same hand. But the chief testimony is that of Basil, writing against Eunomius, in these words—

“For in another place also the same apostle, speaking by the Spirit of God, calls the Gentiles ‘things which are not,’ from their being deprived of the knowledge of God, saying that God hath chosen the things which are not. For since God *is* in truth and life, they who are not united by faith to the God who is, but are settled in disobedience and falsehood by the delusion of idolatry, through their privation of the truth, and alienation from the life, are reasonably, I think, styled ‘those who are not.’ Nay, moreover, writing to the Ephesians, as truly united by knowledge to Him who is, he called them distinctively, ‘those who are,’ saying ‘to the saints who are, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.’ For so those who lived before us have handed down, and we have found it so in the ancient copies (*καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαίοις τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὐρήκαμεν*)”

Three or four manuscripts, old in the time of Basil, if they were now extant, would be held to balance or outweigh in authority all the rest. Yet from this express declaration, we may be almost as certain that the words, “in Ephesus,” were then absent in several earlier manuscripts, as if they were now under our own eyes. And hence the argument from external consent is almost, if not altogether, neutralized by this very plain testimony, that a different reading, without name of place, was very usual in the earliest times.

Next, the words in the epistle to the Colossians are a decisive proof that the other was designed, at least, inclusively for the Laodiceans. “And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.” It is plain that the allusion is to some other letter of the apostle, which was to reach Colosse by way of Laodicea, after being publicly read in that church. Now this must plainly be the actual letter to the Ephesians. For this was written at the same time, and forwarded by the same messenger, besides the agreement in the general character of both letters. Hence that letter must have been intended, by express instructions of the apostle, to be sent to the Laodiceans, and read publicly in their church.

Thirdly, the letter was not properly or exclusively to the Laodiceans; for this is opposed to all the external and also to internal evidence. All the existing manuscripts read, “to the saints in Ephesus,” and all those early manuscripts which Basil consulted, “to the saints which are,” without any name of place; but we have no testimony to any manuscript with the reading, “to the saints in Laodicea.” And again, if it were properly a letter to the Laodiceans, why should not St. Paul have so described it, instead of the more general phrase, denoting the place where it would be found, not necessarily the parties addressed— “the letter from Loadicea?”

Again, it is very unlikely that St. Paul, writing from Rome by Tychicus, an Ephesian, should entirely overlook the church where he laboured three years, and address two letters to two places he had never visited, within fifty miles of each other. This internal difficulty is perhaps even more decisive than the one just explained, against an exclusive direction to Laodicea.

Finally, that it was not exclusively designed for the church at Ephesus, as Paley has shown, rests on the strongest internal evidence. We must set aside all those marks of con-gruity, by which every other letter proves itself so admirably suited for its specific object, before we can acquiesce in such a view. On this hypothesis, the letter addressed to the church where St. Paul laboured the longest is precisely the most devoid of local and personal allusions. Nor is this, however grave, the sole difficulty. Let us weigh the two following passages, and their inconsistency with such an exclusive destination is apparent.

“Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers.”

“For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles—if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to youward, how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may be able to understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ) whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power.”

These reasons, when all combined, serve to establish the view of Usher, adopted since by Koppe, Hug, Michaelis and others, that the present was a circular epistle, designed for several churches of Lydian Asia, and in which the name of the place was left vacant, to be supplied by the reader in each of the churches for which it was designed.

It may perhaps be objected, as it is by Mr. Greswell, who advocates an exclusive address to Laodicea, that if Ephesus were included, the conjecture leaves us in the same perplexity as before. But the objection is clearly groundless. A letter expressly designed for the use of many churches, must have been adapted to the state of the greater number; and if none of them, except Ephesus, had been visited by the apostle, the letter must have assumed its present character, just as if Ephesus had been excluded entirely.

Again, it may seem incongruous, that a circular letter should be sent to several churches, including one where St. Paul had stayed so long, and a distinct letter to Colosse, which he had never visited. But here also the solution is easy. The mission of Onesimus rendered it necessary that St. Paul should write to Philemon. In this case it was only suitable and natural that he should write also to the church at Colosse, of which Philemon was a private member. On the other hand, the instruction added for a mutual communication with Laodicea, removes all appearance of inequality. And besides, Colosse was in Phrygia, and might be viewed as representing the churches of another province.

But if the letter was a circular, for what churches was it designed, and how may we

suppose that it was communicated to them? The most natural reply is, to the seven churches, afterwards addressed by St. John, or those of them which already existed, and this might be true already of the whole number. The view of Michaelis, that St. Paul had several copies written, and filled with the name of different places, is highly improbable, and will not explain the reading to which Basil refers. We may suppose rather that Tychicus and Onesimus landed with it at Ephesus, and read it first in that church, supplying the name in the public reading, and communicating orally whatever was special to that place in the instructions of the apostle. They might then proceed in order through the other churches, to Laodicea, where they might leave it to be copied and then forwarded, while they went on to fulfil their mission at Colosse. It would thus be, by the instructions of St. Paul himself, the letter from Laodicea, when it reached the Colossians. Tychicus would probably wait at Colosse till its arrival, and then return with it to Ephesus, and there deposit it in the custody of the parent church, the first in order of those to which it was addressed. We thus account at once for the absence of any name in the ancient copies which Basil consulted, which would be exact copies of the autograph, and from the insertion of Ephesus alone in all the others, since the custody of it was committed to that church. This view alone seems to remove all difficulty, and to reconcile the internal and external evidence. The obscure text in Colossians thus becomes a remarkable coincidence, and the key to explain the peculiar character of the letter, and to reconcile the statements of Basil with the actual text.

No. II.

Eph. 6:21. "But that ye also may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things."

In these words we have a probable confirmation of the above, and that the letter was not addressed to Ephesus alone. For in this case it would be as natural for St. Paul to say here of Tychicus as he does of Onesimus in the letter to Colosse, "the faithful and beloved brother, *who is one of you.*"

It is assumed in the Hora that this journey of Tychicus is the same as when he conveyed, along with Onesimus, the two other letters to Colosse. Since, however, professor Hug views them as distinct, and even places the second Epistle to Timothy between them, a few words in proof of their identity seem desirable, to preclude all doubt of the force of Paley's observations. It is indeed strange that the learned writer, could suppose a letter, so totally different in its character and tone, to have intervened between these, where the resemblance is so marked and peculiar. The hypothesis would entirely set aside all possibility of inferring the comparative date from the general style. But in reality, the conclusions from the style, and from the historical marks, agree perfectly together.

The hypothesis of professor Hug is the following:—"Tychicus carried both epistles to Asia, but at different times; first, that to the Ephesians and the second to Timothy, then those to the Colossians and Philemon; the first two at the beginning of his imprisonment, before Paul was examined, and the last two in the following year, when his fortune gradually brightened; for in the Epistle to Philemon, the apostle expects his speedy liberation.

“When the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, Timothy was not with him, but joined him at a later period, and in the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon his name stands side by side with the apostle’s. Secondly, Luke was in company with St. Paul, (Col. 4:14; Philem. 24). Thirdly, Mark was also with him at the date of these two later epistles. Fourthly, Tychicus was at that time a letter-bearer and a deacon, and sent especially to Asia, Eph. 4:21; Col. 4:7, 8. All these circumstances appear again in the second to Timothy. He was not with Paul, but was summoned by him. Secondly, Luke was with him. Thirdly, he desires Mark to come with Timothy, so that he must have been with him during the imprisonment. Fourthly, Tychicus was present as the letter-bearer, and sent especially to Asia, 2 Tim. 4:11, 12.”

These remarks merely prove how seductive and dangerous a proof of identity may be which rests only on a selection of particulars. That Timothy, Mark, and Luke should be present with St. Paul in each imprisonment, and that in each of them Tychicus should be sent to Asia, is surely not at all improbable. Yet this is the whole amount of the argument. For the absence of Timothy, at the date of the letter to the Ephesians, is inferred much too confidently from the usage in other epistles. He was present when St. Paul wrote to Rome, and still his name does not appear in the superscription.

The three arguments of Paley are decisive. First, Demas had forsaken St. Paul at the date of the letter to Timothy, but he is still present in those to Colosse and Philemon, which the hypothesis fixes later. Next, it would be needless to tell Timothy that Erastus stayed at Corinth, if the reference were to the journey in Acts, since Timothy was with St. Paul at the time. Thirdly, Trophimus was not left at Miletus on that journey, but attended St. Paul to Jerusalem.

But other objections remain of equal weight. If the letter to Timothy was written in the first year of that imprisonment, and he was expected to arrive from Asia before winter, it must have been written not much later than midsummer, only three or four months after St Paul arrived at Rome. But Aristarchus was present with St Paul as a fellow-prisoner on that voyage, and at the date of the letter to Colosse. It is morally certain, then, that he continued a prisoner with him during the interval, or at the very least, that if he were absent, St. Paul would have mentioned his departure. But no mention occurs either of the presence or absence of Aristarchus in the letter to Timothy. There is the same silence respecting Jesus Justus, and Epaphras. When St. Paul parted from Asia before that imprisonment, not only Timothy was with him, but there was no such desertion as is described 2 Tim. 1:15. It is improbable, again, that Titus would be sent to Dalmatia at a time when St Paul had not visited that province, and hardly approached its border, and the instruction respecting the cloak at Troas becomes very unnatural, if we suppose that the interval was one of three years, as in this case it must have been. Why should not the apostle have sent for it during his stay for two years at Cæsarea, when his acquaintance were allowed to visit him, and messengers or converts from that district must have so often come to Palestine. That all should forsake the apostle within a few months after his arrival is most improbable, when we observe that his accusers, the Jews, had not even ventured to send in their charge, and Festus and Agrippa had both declared before the voyage that there was no ground for sending him to Borne but his own appeal. An interval of three years, instead of six or seven, is much less likely, for the return of Aquila and Priscilla to Ephesus, who had left it for Rome during the apostle’s last visit to Greece in the book of Acts.

The disproof of Hug's hypothesis being thus complete, we may safely infer that Tychicus was sent once only to Asia during the first imprisonment, and that the three letters, as Paley assumes, were carried to their destination in one and the same journey.

No. III.

Col. 4:10. "Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas, (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him.)"

The coincidence in the words before the parenthesis has been unfolded by Paley, in No. II. on this epistle. But the parenthesis itself offers another more easily overlooked, and therefore perhaps even more striking.

First, why should a special direction be given them, to receive Mark, when no similar instance is found in all the epistles? Let us turn to Acts 15:37-40, and the reason will be plain.

"And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other: and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed to Cyprus; and Paul chose Silas, and departed, being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God."

Mark, it is thus plain, was for a time under a kind of ban or disgrace with the apostle, such as had occurred with no other Christian teacher. To undo the effects of this public censure at a later period, there would probably be required some special instruction to the churches.

Next, why should this allusion be found only in the letter to Colosse? It was a church which St. Paul had not founded, or even visited, as appears from Col. 2:1, and the strain of the whole letter. How should they know of this censure under which Mark had lain, and why should they need instruction to receive him, as if otherwise they would have repelled him with a watchful suspicion?

The answer here also is very simple, though I am not aware whether it has been suggested by any commentator on the epistle. It was at Perga in Pamphylia (Acts 13:13; 15:38) that Mark deserted Paul and Barnabas, and "went not with them to the work." Now Colosse is only about a hundred and ten miles from Perga, and less than twenty from the confines of Pisidia, throughout which province Paul and Barnabas preached on their return during the same journey. Perga and Antioch in Pisidia are the nearest to Colosse of all the stations of St. Paul recorded in the history. On his next journey, after the separation, through the central parts of Asia Minor, his displeasure against Mark, and the reason why Silas and not Barnabas was with him on the mission, would be deeply impressed on the Pisidian and Phrygian churches. Now, since these were the nearest to Colosse, and were evangelized several years before Ephesus, it is morally certain that Colosse would receive the gospel from them, and

partake in their prejudice against Mark, as a deserter from the work of the Lord. In this local relation of Colosse to Perga, and to the theatre of those two early circuits throughout Pisidia and Phrygia, we have a coincidence as real as it is evidently undesigned.

A third question arises, how and when could the Colossians have received this commandment, reversing the sentence against Mark, and recognising his return to the favour and confidence of the apostle? It is quite possible that such a message might have been sent from Rome, as soon as the apostle had found the comfort of Mark's help in the gospel. Yet we have no hint in the letters of such a previous message to Asia, and it seems rather unlikely that St. Paul should have sent one before to Colosse for such a purpose. Nor is it natural to suppose that ten years elapsed before the reconciliation.

But the history itself supplies a simpler and more probable key to this passage. After, the separation and first journey of Paul and Silas through Pisidia and Phrygia they passed into Europe and stayed long at Corinth. The apostle then returned to Jerusalem at some feast, probably that of Pentecost. On this visit, he would be likely to meet with Mark and Barnabas, at Cæsarea or Jerusalem, returning to the same feast; or if not, at least he would be sure to hear of the consistent labours of the evangelist since they parted. Soon afterwards, St. Paul went down to Antioch, and then passed through Galatia and Phrygia, before he came down to the coast, and resided at Ephesus. It is therefore most likely that he would instruct the churches of Phrygia respecting his change of feeling towards Mark, and give them a charge to receive him with due honour whenever he should visit them as an evangelist of Christ. Now Colosse, though St. Paul had not visited it, belonged to the province of Phrygia. And if Mark was now proposing to visit Asia, and St. Paul had still fuller experience of his worth, it was very natural that he should enforce his general instruction to the Phrygian churches some years before, by a special admonition to Colosse, "Touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him."

The coincidence here is, to a certain extent, inferential and constructive. But it can scarcely be denied that the explanation just proposed is highly probable; that it brings to light a beautiful and concealed harmony, and that it lies far removed from all suspicion of design.

No. IV.

Col. 4:18. "The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you. Amen."

Philem. 19. "I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it: albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides."

These two letters were sent by the same messenger, one to the church of Colosse, and the other to Philemon. Yet we learn from these verses that, while in one letter St. Paul merely added the subscription, he wrote the other entirely with his own hand. Nothing can be more natural than the mention of the circumstance in the second case, to confirm the truth of his promise respecting Onesimus. And yet how appropriate and delicate the compliment to Philemon, that the apostle who wrote to the church by an

amanuensis, should *in* his case deviate from his own ordinary practice, and prove his interest in the, reconciliation of Onesimus to his master, by writing the whole letter with his own hand.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

THIS epistle, as it appears from the internal evidence, was written near the close of St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, almost at the same point of time where the narrative in the book of Acts comes to an end. Short as it is, Paley has detected in it seven distinct marks of reality, which are developed very clearly in the *Horæ*. Enough still remain to reward our further inquiry.

No. I.

Phil. 1:1. "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons."

This is the earliest letter of St. Paul where bishops and deacons are mentioned, and the only one where they are separately addressed in the salutation.

Now, here we may trace an agreement with the probable course of events, deduced alike from the letters and the history. While the apostles were constantly visiting the young churches, whether in person or by messengers, the appointment of regular pastors would either be delayed, or be felt of less importance. But when some of them were removed by death, and others removed to a distant sphere, or shut up in prison, it would be needful to provide for the permanent order of the various churches. Hence the three letters, which come later than the present one, are mainly occupied with instructions on these points, or warnings of the evils that would assail the church after the departure of the apostle. The previous letter to Colosse implies also that a pastoral appointment had recently occurred in that place. "Say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it."

It agrees exactly with this new want of the church, when other apostles had been martyred or removed far away, and St. Paul imprisoned for two years, in doubt of his life, and was now already "Paul the aged," that bishops and deacons should be prominent, for the first time, in the opening salutation. It is like an admonition of the Spirit, that the churches were to acquire the habit of looking up with reverence to their own pastors and teachers, now that the miraculous gifts were beginning to pass into God's ordinary providence, and the presence of the inspired apostles, the immediate dispensers of those gifts, was to be speedily withdrawn.

No. II.

Phil. 2:19, 23-25. "But I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. . . . 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. Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, and fellowsoldier, but your

messenger, and he that ministered to my wants.”

Here three visits to Philippi are proposed in a distinct order. Epaphroditus was to set out at once, and plainly to be the bearer of the letter. Timothy was to follow immediately after the apostle’s liberation was decided, but not before. St. Paul himself hoped also to revisit them before long.

But why, we may ask, this complex arrangement? Was it not more natural that Epaphroditus should delay till Timothy could accompany him, or that Timothy should hasten his journey to travel with Epaphroditus, or delay it, so as to accompany the apostle? The brief statement in the text, though rapid and condensed, supplies a full key to the arrangement. Epaphroditus had been delayed by sickness beyond the natural time of his absence, and thus had caused great anxiety to the Philippians. On his recovery, the apostle did not think it right to detain him still longer, to go with Timothy, and therefore dismissed him with the present affectionate letter. But why should not the journey of Epaphroditus spare the need of another of Timothy? Because he was to stay at Philippi, and what the apostle desired was more recent tidings of their prosperity. Then why should not Timothy go at once, along with Epaphroditus? Because he was to rejoin the apostle, while on a journey. If he had set out before the apostle knew the decision of his cause, and the time of his freedom, he must either have lost time in waiting for Timothy at Rome, or Timothy have been ignorant where to proceed, so as to bring tidings at once from Philippi. But why should not the apostle, if his deliverance was near, proceed at once to Philippi, and spare Timothy this separate journey? We shall see, from the later epistles, that he had decided on a much wider circuit, by Crete, Jerusalem, and Asia, before he could reach Macedonia. Finally, if St. Paul had heard of them so lately by Epaphroditus, why this urgent desire to hear from them again by Timothy? First, the letter implies that they were actually exposed to fierce opposition; and next, an illness of considerable length had intervened, so as to make the actual interval considerable. It is very probable that he would be sent from Philippi in the spring or summer of the second year. His illness would delay his return until the winter season rendered his departure unadvisable, and then the apostle, as soon as navigation became easy, sent him back to Philippi. Hence nearly a year might have passed since he sent out to Rome, and the apostle be desirous of later information. Thus every feature of the arrangement, though tried by these various tests, approves itself to the judgment, and becomes a pledge of the historical reality of the whole.

No. III.

Phil. 2:20. “For I have no man likeminded, who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ’s.”

This verse, at first sight, appears startling. St. Paul, when he wrote to Colosse, had Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, Jesus Justus, and Epaphras, all with him. Does he mean here to condemn the fellow-prisoner and companion, who had partaken in all the perils of his voyage, and who seems to have stood before so high in his esteem? Or does he intend, when Timothy was about to visit Philippi, to teach him on his arrival his superiority to Luke and Mark, and Aristarchus, all probably his superiors in age, and apparently not less constant in their love to the apostle in this imprisonment?

On turning to the close of the epistle, this doubt is removed. Neither Mark, Luke, nor Aristarchus are there named as present, though two of them, at least, were well known at Philippi, and their greeting was sent to Colosse, which they probably had never visited. This is in itself a strong presumption that they had left him before this time: and this is confirmed by other reasons. Before this time, at the date of the letter to the Colossians, Mark seems to have purposed returning to Asia. The book of Acts, again, was most probably written about the close of St. Paul's imprisonment, and it is not unlikely that St. Luke would leave Rome, and return to Cæsarea or Antioch, before he began its composition. Aristarchus, having been detained so much longer with the apostle than was contemplated at the outset of the journey, might also very probably have already left Rome, on his return to Thessalonica. It is a further presumption for this view, that none of their names appear in the Epistle to the Hebrews, written soon after from Italy, though all of them were well known to the Christians of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. This coincidence is imperfect, from the want of fuller evidence; but so far as the evidence extends, it is satisfactory and complete. The expression used in praise of Timothy would seem invidious and perplexing, if Mark, Luke, and Aristarchus were with St. Paul at the time, as we know that they were a little before. But the absence of their names, both at the close of this letter and of that to the Hebrews, the hint respecting Mark in Colossians, the probable time and place when the book of Acts was written by Luke, and the home of Aristarchus, are all presumptive signs that they had left the apostle before now, when his full assurance of a speedy liberation rendered their stay no longer necessary.

No. IV.

Phil. 3:4-6. "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless."

This passage has been noticed by Paley, in his Introduction, as one where the coincidence is so direct and clear, as to be unfit for his line of argument. "It is made up of particulars so plainly delivered in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Galatians, that I cannot deny it would be easy for an impostor, who was fabricating a letter in the name of St. Paul, to collect these articles into one view. This, therefore, is a conformity which we do not adduce."

There is much truth in this remark. Yet, even after this admission, the passage may fairly claim a subordinate place in the general argument.

And first, let it be observed on what a limited hypothesis the explanation of such a forgery becomes possible. The particulars may be collected from three other writings, the book of Acts, and the two letters to the Romans and Galatians. Assuming their genuineness, this passage will not prove that the letter to the Philippians might not be framed out of them. But who would ever seriously maintain a hypothesis so peculiar? Who would concede the genuineness of the two other letters, and deny that of the letter to the Philippians?

On the other hand, when the simpler question is proposed, whether the letters could be forged out of the history, or the history compiled out of the letters, the passage

becomes evidence once more. For the history never states that St. Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin; which is mentioned here, and also in the Epistle to the Romans, and in both in the most incidental manner, along with particulars which the history does record. Yet it is, perhaps, an indirect coincidence, in the habitual association of thought, that while Stephen passes at once to the reign of David, St. Paul dwells distinctly on his royal namesake, of his own tribe, in his summary of the sacred history. "And afterward they desired a king, and God gave unto them Saul, the son of Kish, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years," Acts 13:21. This is either a coincidence, or very much resembles it, and is clearly undesigned, since the historian never tells us to what tribe the apostle belonged.

Again, the fact that St. Paul was a Pharisee is very prominent in the history, which states also that he was the son of of a Pharisee. Yet this brief clause "as touching the law, a Pharisee," is the only one in all the letters where that sect is so much as named. Nor is he here called the son of a Pharisee, but simply a Hebrew of Hebrews, where the language, and not the sect, of his father seems to be specified. Yet if he were the son of a Pharisee, how natural the occasion when it is mentioned, in his defence before the Jewish council. "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: touching the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question," Acts 23:6.

There is a further peculiarity in this passage, compared with 2 Cor. 11:21, 22, and Rom. 11:1, which marks their common reality. In all of them there is an apparent tautology. If the apostle were a Benjamite, he would, of course, be an Israelite; and if an Israelite, then a Hebrew in the wider sense, or if a Hebrew-speaking Jew, then an Israelite. So in Romans, if a Benjamite, of course he was an Israelite, and if an Israelite, of course of the seed of Abraham. In Corinthians we have the same triple enumeration. A double explanation is possible; that these phrases, being in frequent use at the time, had each a distinctive and conventional shade of meaning, now lost; or else that their pride of descent led the Jews to multiply and vary the terms by which it was described. Either explanation implies the historical reality of the statement.

No.V.

Phil. 3:2, 3. "Beware of the concision. For we are the circumcision, who worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."

There is a remarkable gradation in the language of the apostle respecting this Jewish ordinance, when we compare the epistles in the order of time.

In the first recorded discourse of the apostle, at Antioch, though circumcision is not named, it is included in the negative description, as a part of the law which could not justify. "By him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts 13:39.

In the epistle to the Galatians, the first where it is named, and written six or seven years later, its spiritual inefficiency is argued, defensively, against those who would impose it on the Gentile converts. It is left as the proper and distinctive title of the Jews. "That we should go to the heathen, and they to the circumcision." "Fearing them of the circumcision." "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith, which worketh by love." "In Christ Jesus neither

circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” The same point of indifference is continued in the next epistle to the Corinthians. “Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised? Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God,” 1 Cor. 7:18,19.

In the later Epistle to the Romans, we advance a step further, and the substance of the ordinance is claimed for every true believer, while only the shadow is assigned to the unbelieving Jews. “For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God,” Rom. 2:28, 29.

Still later, in the epistle to the Colossians, this idea of the true circumcision as the exclusive privilege of the Christian believer, is expounded more fully. “In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ.” While the indifference of the outward rite is asserted once more: “Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision: but Christ is all and in all.” Col. 2:11; 3:11.

Last of all, in the present passage, not only the true circumcision is claimed for the Christian believer, but the very name is denied, and an expressive term of reproach substituted, for those who, resting in their outward circumcision, rejected or perverted the gospel. “Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the *concision*. For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.”

There is an evident gradation and progress in these statements. The outward rite, once obligatory on all the people of the covenant, then reduced simply to a national distinction by the call of the Gentiles, on the footing of liberty from the law of ceremonies, was more and more associated, in the apostle’s experience, with the open hostility of the unbelieving Jews, and the perverse teaching of false brethren.

Now this coincidence is the most multiform and indirect which can be well imagined. It only comes to light as the result of those many hints, some of them plain, others complex and obscure, by which we determine the relative place of the whole series of letters. It is like a delicate golden thread of truth, running through and connecting the whole.

No. VI.

Phil. 4:2,3. “I beseech Euodia, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord. And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, along with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life.”

There is some obscurity in this passage in the common version, which is removed by a more exact rendering. There is no real doubt, from the text, that the same persons are meant in both verses, and hence that Euodia (not *Euodias*) and Syntyche, are the

names of women. It is not so likely, however, that the “true yokefellow” was charged to promote their reconciliation, as to cooperate with them, when reconciled; nor is it clear that the difference amounted to a quarrel, but only to some decided opposition of judgment, in their mode of helping forward the gospel.

The history gives us the following account of the first rise of the Philippian church:—

“And on the sabbath day we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.”

Of all the places named in the history, Philippi is the only one where women are said to have been the first hearers of the gospel, and one of them the earliest convert. Of all the letters, this to Philippi is the only one where a special instruction is given to women, who had laboured with St. Paul in the gospel. It is plain that, in these early churches, priority of conversion formed one main rule in the selection of their first teachers and spiritual officers. Euodia and Syntyche might very likely be two of the women, who resorted to the *proseucha* by the river side, and among the very first converts. The history, when closely examined, will be found to allude, not to one single sabbath day, but to a course of repeated instruction (*ἡκονεν*) and to the continued attention of Lydia and others. None would be so likely, as the women then converted, to take an active part in teaching the younger female disciples, who were called at a later period.

Who is meant by the “true yokefellow,” we have not sufficient evidence to decide. Yet since it has been shown to be very probable that Luke and Aristarchus had now left the apostle, it is quite possible that one of them was gone to Philippi; and the phrase would be peculiarly appropriate to either of them, as the companions of St. Paul in his voyage and double imprisonment.

No. VII.

Phil. 4:17. “Not because I desire a gift: but I desire fruit that may abound to your account.”

At the close of the Epistle to the Romans we meet with a similar expression. “When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain.”

The resemblance here is not simply in the metaphor of *fruit*, applied to acts of Christian liberality, but in its association with another metaphor, and the harshness of the transition, “*fruit* which may abound to your *account*,—when I have *sealed* to them this *fruit*? The sealing has evidently a secret reference to the idea of an account or receipt, which has been properly ratified and confirmed. This indirect, but real analogy in a peculiar transition of thought, is a proof, to use the words of Paley, “that the same mind dictated both passages.”

No. VIII.

Phil. 4:22. "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household."

Why should the saints of Cæsar's household claim a special place in this brotherly greeting? One probable reason may be assigned, and two others that are certain. First, Philippi, as we read in Acts, was a Roman colony, and hence there might be official or family bonds of intimacy between these Roman colonists, and the native Roman converts in the imperial palace. Secondly, there was a numerous church at Rome before St. Paul arrived. But the saints in Cæsar's household, like the Philippian church, were converts of the apostle himself, and hence there would be a special link of spiritual brotherhood. Finally, the apostle had been imprisoned at Philippi, as he was now a prisoner at Rome, and in each case his sufferings had been one chief cause of the conversions that followed. On this account, also, the saints of Cæsar's household, the spiritual sons of the apostle, in his bonds, like Onesimus, would feel a peculiar ground of sympathy with the Philippian Christians.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THIS letter, unlike the others, does not bear the name of St. Paul, though it is ascribed to him by the almost universal tradition of the early church. Some, however, ascribe the authorship, in whole or in part, to Barnabas, to Luke, to Clement, and to Apollos. Many critics within the last century have also rejected the claim of the apostle, from supposed inconsistencies of style; but their objections have been fully sifted by Mr. Foster and professor Stuart, in two independent works, and received a decisive and complete refutation. Even on the ground of style only, there is no other claim which at all rivals that of St. Paul himself. The historical allusions, while they further establish the same truth, offer also several examples of undesigned coincidence. Mr. Biley has traced these with considerable force and accuracy, though one or two important modifications seem required, and will be found to increase the consistency and clearness of the whole argument.

No. I.

Let us consider, in the first place, the evidence in the epistle itself, that St. Paul was the author. First, the writer supposes himself to be well known to the Hebrew or Palestine Christians, ch. 10:34; 13:18. Secondly, he had been imprisoned in Palestine, where many of them had ministered to him, 10:34. It is true that here the reading is disputed, but still the external evidence seems really to favour strongly the received text, and the internal still more. Thirdly, Timothy was well known to be his intimate companion, and the writer expected that he would accompany him to Jerusalem. Fourthly, he uses generally the language of apostolic authority, though in a modified form, as writing evidently to Christians of the mother church, 13:1-6. Fifthly, he reproves the great body of that church for their slowness and dulness of spiritual understanding, 5:11-14. Sixthly, he charges them, as with authority, to be in obedience to their own pastors and rulers, 13:7-17. Finally, he was in Italy when he wrote the letter, and was authorized to convey the greeting of all the Italian Christians,

13:24. There is no one with whom all these marks can possibly agree, but the great apostle of the Gentiles; and no time, except about the close of his long imprisonment at Rome.

The absence of his name, in the opening of the letter, is often made an objection to this view. Yet in reality it is a strong, indirect confirmation of its truth. It is impossible that any one else, who wished the letter to pass for one of the apostle's, should omit his name; but St. Paul himself, under the actual circumstances, had sufficient and weighty motives for this omission. We learn, from the book of Acts, how bitterly he was hated by the Jews on his last visit to Jerusalem. The whole city was filled with uproar, and the multitudes shouted after him— "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live." The chief captain had great difficulty in rescuing him from their violence, which seemed ready to break out in an open rebellion. Forty Jews deliberately bound themselves, by a dreadful oath, to effect his murder, and this too with the assent of the chief priests; and to escape from their malice, he was sent away in the night, with an escort of nearly five hundred men. Even among the great body of the Christian Jews there was considerable prejudice against him. "Thou seest, brother, how-many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs," Acts 21:20, 21.

These violent prejudices of the unbelieving Jews would have abated very little during the two years of his absence. And hence the insertion of his name, in the opening of the letter, might have been a complete bar to every hope that the truths it unfolds so powerfully, would reach their ears. On the other hand, the topics of the letter, and the manner in which they are treated, were eminently suited to arrest the attention of multitudes who were not converts to the faith. It was clearly designed to be read publicly in the Christian assemblies of Palestine, where many inquirers might be present. If not repelled by the name of St. Paul at the opening, they would be powerfully impressed by a style of argument so thoroughly adapted to the Jewish mind. And thus there was a most weighty motive of Christian expediency, why the apostle should forbear to prefix his name. That the writer intended to be clearly recognised by the believers to whom he wrote, is plain, from the close of the letter; but such an indirect discovery of himself, in a way so unobtrusive and silent, could have none of the mischievous effect, which would naturally follow, upon the insertion of a name so obnoxious in the opening verse. Its absence is therefore, in reality, a beautiful instance of congruity between the situation of the apostle, and his actual conduct, and an additional pledge of its authenticity, as his writing.

No. II.

Heb. 13:23, 24. "Know that our brother Timothy is set at liberty (*or* sent away, ἀπολελύμενον); with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you."

The exact meaning of this verse is rather ambiguous, and needs to be determined, before we can safely reason upon it. Professor Hug, Mr. Greswell in his Dissertations, and Mr. Biley, in his Supplement to the Horæ, all assume the correctness of the received version. "The epistle," observes the last writer, "speaks of an imprisonment

of Timothy, of which we have no mention anywhere else.” Yet it is clear that the rest of the verse points to the other version, *dismissed*, or *sent away*, which is rather more usual in the New Testament. The true meaning of the word, in every case, is a dismissal after some previous detention, but sometimes one idea is prominent, sometimes the other. Sometimes the dismissal may be only from the court of justice, or the precincts of a prison, and sometimes the detention may be only that of duty, or urgent business. Now the dismissal of Timothy would explain his absence, and the uncertainty about his return; but a mere release from prison, even if there were other evidence of the fact, which there is not, would explain neither the one nor the other. Hence a great number of the best critics, with good reason, prefer the other rendering, *dismissed*, or *sent away*. The word is the same which is used for the dismissal of Saul and Barnabas on their first mission, and for that of Judas and Silas, after their message to Antioch was fulfilled.

Mr. Greswell, indeed, charges this view with an absurdity. “If the writer was in Italy, waiting to be joined by Timothy, and knowing that Timothy was already on his road to him, he could not speak in so much uncertainty about his joining in a certain time or not. Not so, if he merely knew that he was at liberty to set out, that he was his own master, and might travel in any direction, or within whatever time he pleased.” But this is a double oversight. If Timothy was sent away on a mission from Italy, it does not follow that the apostle knew him to be on his road back again, and his uncertainty about the time, though the return itself was certain, is just what we should expect to occur. Unforeseen delays might well occur in the double journey, and in the business itself, whether he were sent to Greece or Asia. On the other hand, it is totally to misconceive the relation of Timothy to the apostle, if we suppose that his movements were independent, and not in strict reference to instructions he had received. And besides, the suppositions that Timothy had been imprisoned at Rome, after the date of the letter to the Philippians, that St Paul had left him in prison, and gone elsewhere, that the Christians of Palestine had heard of this imprisonment, and that St. Paul, being in Italy, should be doubtful whether Timothy would soon rejoin him, after being released at Rome, are one and all of them highly improbable. The other explanation is simple and complete. If Timothy had been sent by St. Paul on a mission to Greece, the time of his return would be uncertain. If it were long delayed, the apostle might think it necessary to visit Jerusalem before it took place. He was so accustomed to give the greeting of Timothy, and he had parted from him so recently, that he thinks it well to explain the seeming omission.

The verse, thus explained, tallies remarkably with the promise in the Epistle to the Philippians. At that time Paul was still a prisoner, but confident of a speedy release. Till his case was decided, he purposed to detain Timothy, but to send him away to Philippi, “so soon as he should see how it would go with him.” In the letter to the Hebrews, the writer “sees how it will go with him,” and plans the course and time of his visit to Palestine— “With whom, if he come rather soon, I will see you.” But he is still in Italy, for he sends the greeting of the Italian Christians. Timothy, also, as it now appears, has been sent away to some distance, and not to Palestine, for the Christians there are to learn of his absence by this letter. This absence, however, followed some detention, the cause of which is supposed to be already known. And this would naturally be true, if any message had reached Palestine from Rome, about the time of the letter to Philippi, or even earlier.

Timothy is first detained to be near the apostle, while a prisoner; then sent away to Philippi, as soon as Paul's liberty is secured; then is absent, having been thus dismissed, and expected to return, while the apostle is ready to start for Jerusalem; then is found journeying with him, as he passes near Ephesus, and finally stays behind, while the apostle visits Philippi according to his promise, the place which Timothy would have visited not long before. No dovetailing of separate hints could be more complete.

No. III.

Heb. 13:22. "And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you in few words."

When St. Paul writes to the Gentile churches he had founded, as those of Corinth and Galatia, he speaks with a tone of authority, and insists at length on his apostolic character. When he writes to the Romans, where the church, though perhaps a majority were Gentiles, was founded by others, he uses greater delicacy. Though he states his own authority, as the apostle of the Gentiles, he mingles a gentle apology for the freedom of his exhortations. "I am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another. Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you (partly, as putting you in mind), because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."

In the above passage, the same principle is carried a step further. St. Paul and the other apostles, as it would seem, had agreed that the Gentiles should be his peculiar province, and the Hebrews, or Jewish Christians, their own, Gal. 2:9 Since, therefore, he is here writing to Jews and not to Gentiles, and to a church founded before his own conversion, he forbears to insist directly on his apostolic authority, and uses rather the language of courteous entreaty. "I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation, for I have written a letter to you in few words."

No. IV.

Heb. 5:11, 12. "Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing. For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God."

It may seem strange at first, that St. Paul himself should use such language as this, in addressing the churches of Judæa, which were the earliest in receiving the gospel, and had since enjoyed the presence and labours of all the apostles for many years. The history, however, explains the reproof, and proves that they were in a state, which St. Paul would certainly regard as one of immaturity in the faith. In his last visit, St. James and the elders had counselled him as follows:—

"Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? The

multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: we have four men which have a vow on them: them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from (things) strangled, and from fornication. Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them.”

With this description of the actual state of the Jewish Christians, that they were all zealous for the ceremonial law, and disposed on this account to regard the apostle with suspicion, after all his abundant labours, and extraordinary success in spreading the gospel, let us compare those statements, which the apostle includes in the doctrine of perfection, and for which he endeavours to prepare them by this affectionate rebuke. Heb. 7:11, 12, 18, 19. “If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchizedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.....For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope *did*, by the which we draw nigh unto God.”

When we consider this contrast between the place held by the ceremonial law, in the minds of these Jewish Christians, and in the argument of the apostle, can we be surprised that he should preface his statement by that earnest reproof of their spiritual dulness— “When for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat?”

This coincidence, between the state of the Jewish believers, the larger views of the apostle, and the rebuke he here administers, is one which could be produced by reality alone.

No. V.

Heb. 10:34. “For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.”

Let us compare the passage in the history, relating to St. Paul’s imprisonment at Cæsarea. “And Felix commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister or to come to him.....He hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him: wherefore he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him. But after two years Porcius Festus came into Felix’ room: and Felix, willing to show the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound.”

These passages have every sign of being independent. The letter mentions neither the time nor the place, nor one circumstance of the imprisonment, nor even the name of the writer. The history, on the other hand, makes no direct mention of any compassion shown to St Paul by the Palestine Christians, nor any confiscations to which they were exposed.

Yet there is a real harmony between these two accounts. For the history *implies* that the acquaintance of Paul did visit him, as they were allowed to do, and show him great sympathy, which, perhaps, encouraged Felix to hope for a large ransom. Again, the known rapacity of the governor, implied also in the narrative, and the bitter hatred of the Jewish rulers, make it highly probable that those who were most forward in their love to the apostle, would be exposed to heavy loss, and possibly to fines. The words of the writer imply, further, that his own imprisonment had been one of the most signal occasions on which the Jewish believers had been called to suffer for the gospel. And no one can read the narrative carefully, without feeling that such a result would be almost inevitable, from the cool, sordid covetousness of Felix, the deliberate malice of the rulers, and the maddened passions of the multitude at Jerusalem.

No. VI.

Heb. 13:7. "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God."

Ver. 17. "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account."

Ver. 24. "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints."

This threefold mention of the rulers is quite peculiar, and occurs in no other epistle. In other cases, St. Paul does not name any rulers, distinct from the body of the church, or else he includes them in the same exhortation. But here the whole address is limited to the general body of the church, in contrast with these rulers, to whom they are charged to yield a reverent submission. Now this feature is just what might be expected, when the apostle of the Gentiles was writing to the Palestine Christians, among whom James, and the other eleven apostles, had exercised a more immediate authority. It was most important that he should not seem to place himself in opposition to their actual guides, but rather strengthen their hands, and enforce their exhortations. No authority is claimed, directly or indirectly, over these rulers themselves.

No. VII.

Heb. 13:18. "Pray for us: for we trust that we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly."

This language certainly seems strange in the lips of an apostle. Why should he not only conceal his name, but use a plea of such extreme modesty in desiring their prayers?

There are two passages in the history, which seem to throw light on the expression. The first is in the defence before Ananias, "Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day. And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth. Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" 23:1-3.

The second is in his defence before Felix, soon after, "And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men," 24:16.

The third is in the speech of James and the elders, respecting the impressions of the Jewish Christians, "And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, nor lo walk after the customs," 21:21.

It has been thought that St. Paul betrayed a sinful impatience in his reply to Ananias, and that the recollection of his fault accounts for this language of diffidence and humility, in writing to those who might have witnessed that scene. But this view is disproved by Acts 24:20, 21, where he clearly disclaims the consciousness of a fault in his behaviour before the council. Indeed his words were a direct prophecy, fulfilled soon after, and probably dictated, according to Christ's promise, by immediate inspiration. Also the proper meaning of the passage before us is to express confidence, and not doubt. "We are persuaded, (*πεποιθήμεν*) that we have a good conscience."

Yet though this explanation is certainly erroneous, there is here a tacit and beautiful reference to the circumstances of his trial and long imprisonment. He had been charged with being a pestilent fellow, who had gone about to profane the temple. When he professed his own uprightness before the council, he had been brutally interrupted and insulted by the high priest himself, in the presence of a great multitude. When he renewed the statement before Felix, it was practically answered by a two years' imprisonment. When a third time he offered the like plea before Festus, it availed as little as before, and he was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar. Even the Jewish believers themselves had been ready to entertain calumnious reports against him, and his desire to remove their groundless and injurious suspicions, had been the very occasion of all his protracted troubles. Now, after shipwreck, and two years more of imprisonment, his cause had been heard, and his innocence practically declared by his restoration to liberty. How suitable and emphatic, at such a time, the declaration in which he entreats their prayers, when about to revisit Judæa, and how delicate the rebuke of those injurious suspicions against him, on their part, which had led to these heavy trials! "Pray for us: for (in spite of your former jealousy, and the malicious charges of my enemies) we are persuaded that we have a good conscience, in all things desiring to live honestly." What coincidence can be less obtrusive, or more deeply inwrought into the moral texture of the apostle's whole history?"

CHAPTER IX.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

THERE has been a great division of opinion on the date of this epistle, and the journey into Macedonia, which is named in the opening verses. Most early commentators refer it to the second visit of St. Paul to that province, after the tumult at Ephesus. Paley, however, has adopted the view of bishop Pearson, that it was a journey later than the first imprisonment at Rome; and most writers since, who have attended specially to the subject, including Greswell, Biley, and Canon Tate, concur in his opinion. Yet since the earlier date has still several advocates, as Dr. Burton, and Canon Townsend, and the author of the Literary History of the New Testament, the question seems to require a further examination. The two following articles will, therefore, be devoted to it. In the first, the hypothesis of the early date will be sifted more fully; while the second will examine the objections which may be urged against the view of Paley and bishop Pearson, and present their hypothesis in a modified and more unobjectionable form.

No. I.

1 Tim. 1:3. "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine."

The main difficulty of the earlier date, advocated by so many critics, is that it requires Timothy to be left behind at Ephesus, there to await Paul's return, at the very time when the book of Acts affirms him to have been sent into Macedonia, or when the second letter to the Corinthians, by its superscription, proves that he was with the apostle on his circuit through that province. In professor Hug's introduction, we have, perhaps, the most ingenious and laborious attempt to remove this great objection. The present article will, therefore, be devoted to an examination of this theory.

The date which he assigns to the letter, is between the first and the second of those to Corinth, almost as soon as the apostle had reached Macedonia on his second visit. Timothy, he assumes, accompanied Stephanas and the others on their return to Corinth, as the deputy of the apostle; and setting out the first week in March, and going round by Macedonia, they might reach Corinth the first week in April, or before the passover. If he returned by sea, he might reach Ephesus thirty-four days, if by land, nineteen days, before Pentecost, and the departure of Paul was only very slightly hastened by the tumult. Titus was sent to Corinth rather later than Timothy, to observe the effects of the letter, and report them to the apostle, and then rejoin him at Troas. When the apostle was obliged to leave Ephesus, he left Timothy behind, and gave him the commissions named in the letter. It was written, almost as soon as he reached Macedonia, or the instructions might have come after the work was completed. But the danger compelled Timothy to leave, as soon as his commission was fulfilled. The apostle spent at least four months in the circuit of Macedonia. And hence Timothy might remain two months at Ephesus, and still have two months to overtake the apostle, so as to be with him at the date of the second letter to Corinth. This explanation, though it looks well on a distant and general view, breaks down at every point, when we submit it to a close and exact inquiry.

1. First, the book of Acts tells us that Timothy and Erastus were sent before the apostle into *Macedonia*. This does not exclude a further commission to Corinth, but it proves that they did not merely pass through Macedonia as travellers, but were sent expressly to visit the churches, and prepare them for St. Paul's own arrival. We must suppose that they visited Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea, and probably Troas, and stayed at least a week in each place. This delay of a month must be added to the time of Timothy's absence, as arranged in the above scheme. Allowing with the professor, thirty-one days for the journey, we have thus a total of fifty-nine days before reaching Corinth. We must suppose a delay of one week in that city, and with sixteen days allowed by the professor for the return, we have a total of eighty-two days. He is supposed to have started a month before the passover; and therefore he would only reach Ephesus a few days after Pentecost, when the apostle had already left, being hastened by the tumult.

2. The history mentions only Erastus as the companion of Timothy. But, on the above view, he was accompanied by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus. When the number, *two*, is specified, there is something very like a contradiction.

3. If Timothy was the bearer of the letter, St. Paul could have no uncertainty about his coming to Corinth. Yet he expresses this uncertainty in the letter itself. "Now if Timotheus come, see that he be with you without fear."

4. Fourthly, as we have seen how unlikely it is that Timothy could rejoin Paul at Ephesus, allowing a moderate time for his commission in Macedonia, so the letters prove that St. Paul did not expect him till after his departure. He says, in the first letter, "If Timotheus come, conduct him forth in peace, for I look for him with the brethren." These brethren, it is plain, are Titus and others, who were sent direct to Corinth from Ephesus. Hence St. Paul expected Timothy, *at the earliest*, to return with them. But it appears from the second letter, that he expected them, not at Ephesus, but at Troas (2 Cor. 2:12, 13). This fully confirms our previous reckoning by the apostle's own statement.

5. Fifthly, if Timothy had been the bearer of the letter to Corinth, and had since rejoined the apostle at Ephesus, how is it possible that not one allusion to the fact should occur throughout the second letter? It is full of St. Paul's joy at their reception of Titus, and at the report which Titus brought to him, but not one word about their reception of Timothy and tidings received by him also. This alone is a fatal objection to the whole scheme.

6. Sixthly, if St. Paul had heard from Corinth by Timothy, a few days before leaving Ephesus, and since they received the letter, why this intense anxiety to meet with Titus at Troas? On this view, his eagerness is quite inexplicable. It is clear from that chapter that Titus was to bring him the *first* tidings from Corinth.

7. Seventhly, if St. Paul was obliged to leave Ephesus, because of the imminent danger, was it likely that he would leave the youthful Timothy, at such a moment, to face the peril which compelled him to withdraw? How unlike would this be to the boldness of the apostle, and his tender care for his son in the faith!

8. Again, if Timothy were deliberately left at Ephesus, when the danger was at its

height, it is most unlikely that he would desert his charge, when the peril must have diminished. The charge of St. Paul in the letter is distinctly given, "Till *I* come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine," 1 Tim. 4:13. How unnatural that St. Paul should never once allude, in the letter, to the contingency of Timothy being compelled to leave; and that, without one such allusion, or even a tacit permission, his deputy should forsake his post, and return to the apostle, within a month after receiving these instructions!

9. The instructions themselves exclude the idea of a very brief stay. They contain directions as to the choice of bishops and deacons; continued attendance to reading, exhortation, and doctrine; a constant meditation of the work, so that his progress and advancement in zeal might become conspicuous to others; admonitions to elders and younger men, in cases of offence; the selection of widows to be sustained by the alms of the church; the marriage of younger widows; degrees of honour to the elders, according to their various diligence; rules for the treatment of any charges that might be brought against them, and the ordination of fresh persons to the office. That all this should be the work of one, or even of two months only, is clearly impossible.

10. Tenthly, in the letter St. Paul contemplates a return to Timothy before very long. "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly." But when he reached Macedonia on his second visit he already had formed a distinct purpose to spend the summer in that province, and to winter at Corinth (1 Cor. 16:6), before returning to Asia. In other words, he reckoned on a delay of nine months. This is clearly incompatible with the words just quoted from the Epistle to Timothy.

11. On the same hypothesis, this letter was written to Timothy after an absence of only two or three weeks, when they had met just before at Ephesus. How unreasonable to suppose that the apostle would give him his instructions by letter after so short an interval, when he might have conveyed them still more fully by a verbal communication just before!

12. Finally, this hypothesis, as it would require us to fix the letter to Timothy immediately after he had parted from the apostle, compels us also to place the second letter to Corinth, near the close of St. Paul's circuit in Macedonia, and only about a month before he arrived in Achaia. Now this contradicts several marks of time in that letter. He alludes in it to his trouble in Asia as a recent event, of which no distinct report might possibly have reached them. His meeting with Titus, whom he expected at Troas, must have been soon after he crossed into Macedonia. But his renewed commission seems not to have been long delayed, both from the forwardness of Titus himself, and the desire of the apostle to express his joy on their repentance and obedience. And, besides, the work of preparing their contribution beforehand must naturally have required several weeks. Allowing a fortnight for their journey, we cannot well suppose a less interval than two months between their departure and the arrival of the apostle at Corinth, and a still earlier date is more probable. It would therefore be hardly possible for Timothy to have rejoined him, after any reasonable allowance for his stay at Ephesus. And, besides, how entirely it destroys the force of the allusion to his own troubles of Asia, if he had left Timothy to endure them after he was gone, and they had compelled his young companion to neglect his instructions, and to rejoin the apostle shortly before the letter was written!

Every one of these reasons is weighty. When they are all combined, they constitute an insuperable mass of evidence, to disprove the proposed date of the present letter to Timothy. And there is no other modification of the view, by which the inconsistency can be remedied. The main features are decidedly opposite in the two cases. On his second journey to Greece, Paul sent Timothy from Ephesus into Macedonia to prepare for his own arrival, and overtook him in that province before Timothy had reached Corinth, after which they continued together, till they reached Miletus again. At the date of the letter, Paul left Timothy behind at Ephesus, while he himself went forward to Macedonia; wrote to him after some considerable interval, charging him to continue there till his own return; appointed him business that would occupy several months; expressed his hope of returning very soon to Asia, but left it uncertain, and gave no permission, and indulged no hope, as to meeting Timothy in Europe, or before his own return. Thus every feature is a total contrast. We have seen already how minutely the details correspond with each other, when we compare the history and the two letters to Corinth on that second visit. But the attempt to interpolate the letter to Timothy out of its place falsifies every point of real agreement, contradicts the scope of the letter itself, and turns a series of delicate harmonies into a string of inconsistencies and historical contradictions.

No. II.

The view of Paley has now to be examined, with the objections to which it is exposed, and the partial modification it may require. He supposes that St. Paul, after his liberation, “sailed into Asia, taking Crete in his way; that from Asia, and from Ephesus, the capital of that country, he proceeded into Macedonia, and, crossing the peninsula in his progress, came to the neighbourhood of Nicopolis. We have thus a route which falls in with everything. It executes his intention of visiting Colosse and Philippi, as soon as he was set at liberty at Rome. It allows him to leave Titus at Crete, and Timothy at Ephesus, as he went into Macedonia, and to write to both not long after from the peninsula of Greece, thus bringing together the dates of these two letters, and thereby accounting for the affinity between them.”

There are two chief reasons which have been urged against this date of the epistle, and the route which is here supposed. The former is soon removed, but the other constitutes a serious difficulty.

And, first, the epistle, according to professor Hug, suggests the idea that *the* teachers and superintendents of the church were not yet nominated. This, however, took place a few months afterwards, when St. Paul on his return appointed them to meet him at Miletus, that he might see them in their new vocation, and impress on them the obligations of their new office. Hence the epistle was previous to that return.

Now, in reality, this very subject furnishes a powerful argument against the earlier date; for the epistle clearly supposes that there were many elders already in the church, and only gives directions to Timothy as to fresh appointments. At the very opening, he is directed to charge some that they teach no strange doctrine, and these must plainly have been elders of the church. So also the directions, chap. 5:1,17,19, imply clearly that the church had many elders when the apostle wrote. The passage in Acts, also, contains no proof whatever that the elders had been recently appointed; and since the apostle intended leaving at Pentecost, and was only driven away a few

days before, it is morally certain that he would not have left such an important business to his young companion, but have completed it before his own departure. On the other hand, after an absence of six years, new appointments would be needful, and the commission to Timothy would be highly appropriate and consistent. The instruction, also, to prove the deacons before appointing them, could never apply to a hurried stay of Timothy for two months at the most, in a time of disquiet and extreme danger. Hence this objection is really a powerful argument for the date after the first imprisonment.

The other difficulty is far more serious. St. Paul had declared to the elders at Miletus, "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." A later visit to Ephesus, such as Paley has supposed, appears directly to falsify this prediction.

Two or three explanations have been offered, to remove this difficulty. And, first, Dr. Paley conceives that St Paul might give merely his own mistaken impression, from the repeated warnings of bonds and afflictions in every city. To confirm this view, he argues from Phil. 1:25, 2:23, 24, that the apostle uses the same phrase in a case where he was still uncertain. But this is clearly a mistake. There is nothing in Phil. 2:23, 24, when correctly translated, which implies any doubt of a favourable issue. The only uncertainty relates to the exact time when he could send Timothy. In reality, the predictions, Acts 20:29, and Phil. 1:25, according to Paley's own view, were both of them accurately fulfilled. And since the phrase here is exactly the same, the solution appears to be quite untenable.

Mr. Biley, again, suggests that the word *ovketi*, does not denote here, *never again*, but simply, *no longer*, or that his intercourse would be suspended for a season. This, however, had been the case already for almost a whole year, so that such a meaning is evidently excluded by the facts of the history. And, besides, this would not explain their grief at the statement. "Sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they would see his face no more." This solution, then, is inadmissible, like the other.

Again, Mr. Greswell supposes that the word, *all*, receives the emphasis. St Paul, on this view, does not mean to say that none of them would see him again, but simply, that they would not, all of them, see him any more. This, however, is too usual a result of temporary absence, when the parties are numerous, to account for their deep emotion. All these explanations, which lower and neutralize the natural meaning of this affecting passage, leave the difficulty in its full strength. Why should the deep emotion of the elders be so carefully noted, if either Paul was in error himself, or they had mistaken his real meaning?

Does then the epistle, assuming the truth of its date after the apostle's liberation, affirm distinctly a later visit to Ephesus? This has been assumed far too lightly, both by the advocates and opponents of that date; and, if it were true, would leave a painful sense of contradiction to the discourse at Miletus, which no proffered explanation could entirely remove. But the letter compels us to no such admission. Its words are abundantly satisfied, if the apostle passed once again near to Ephesus, and desired Timothy, instead of accompanying him further, to leave him at the nearest point of the route, and stay at that city. Indeed, this view agrees better with the instructions of the apostle, since it is most natural to suppose that he had no opportunity of giving those

commands in person, which he commissions Timothy to deliver in his name.

One reason, however, has been given by Paley for the opposite view. "If the apostle executed his purpose, and came to Colosse, it is very improbable that he would omit to visit Ephesus, which lay so near it, and where he had spent three years of his ministry." To which we may add, that if he refrained from a visit, merely to secure the truth of his former prediction at Miletus, that warning loses much of its force and beauty, though not so entirely as on the other view. But, in reality, the length of his previous stay might form one reason for declining an actual visit. He was now aged, and might possibly be warned, like Peter, that the time of his departure was at hand. He had many places to visit, and several, like Colosse, which he had never visited before. No place had enjoyed so large a share of his time and labour as Ephesus, and other churches might justly advance a more powerful claim on the little time which now remained to him. Besides, the opposition to which he was there exposed was peculiarly bitter; and though fear alone would not have deterred him, duty would require him to husband his remaining years for the church of God, and not to expose himself again to the malice of the Jews of Asia by a second visit, while other places were eagerly desiring his presence. His plan for wintering at Nicopolis implies that this circuit was chiefly devoted to those outlying churches which had enjoyed little or nothing of his personal instructions before. Crete, Colosse, and Epirus, were all, it appears, visited now for the first time. Hence he might very naturally avoid a needless delay, by visiting Ephesus; where his absence, after that solemn parting, might preach to them more powerfully than even his presence would have done.

On the whole, this hypothesis, that St. Paul passed near to Ephesus on his route, without an actual visit, maintains equally the coincidence in the time of his route from Colosse to Philippi, while it removes a very serious difficulty, amounting almost to a direct and inexplicable contradiction. The return to Timothy, which he contemplated, might be of the same kind; so that they might meet again at Miletus or Troas, and continue the rest of their journey together, or, at least, that he might give him still fuller instructions in a personal interview.

No. III.

1 Tim. 2:11-14. "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."

With this passage we may compare 1 Cor. 14:34. "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law."

The same general precept is here given in both cases, and confirmed by an appeal to the Old Testament. The resemblance, so far, is direct and clear, and would be equally possible, whether the letters were fictitious or genuine. But there is a more secret relation between the two passages, which may prove that they really proceeded from the apostle. In the earlier letter, to the Corinthians, the particular text of the Pentateuch is not named, but the description applies only to Gen. 3:16: "And thy

desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.” In the other letter, the writer enforces the same duty; but instead of quoting the law of God, referred to before, he reasons from the context of the same passage: from the creation, Gen. 2:18-24; the fall, 3:1-6; and the promise connected with the sorrows of childbirth, 3:15, 16. This is an indirect agreement, which would result from a real association of thought in the mind of the apostle, and can be easily explained in no other way. The express law of God is alluded to, but not specified, in the letter to the church; but in a later epistle to the apostle’s companion, who was familiar with the Scriptures, and had read that former letter, other reasons from the context are substituted in its stead.

No. IV.

1 Tim. 5:17,18. “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine. For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward.”

1 Cor. 9:8-10. “Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written, that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.”

In both passages the same text of the law is applied to establish the same general duty; while the use of it is characteristic and peculiar. This tends to prove that the writer is the same. But there are two features of contrast, which, from their congruity with the circumstances, form a proof that both passages are genuine, and from the apostle’s own pen. In the letter to the Corinthians, the writer reasons out his application of the text, since otherwise his meaning might be doubtful and obscure. In the Epistle to Timothy, who must have seen the other letter, and was also quite familiar with St. Paul’s train of thought, the text is simply quoted without one word of explanation. Again, it is applied in the first letter to the general duty of supporting the preachers of the gospel. In the second, it is applied to a further and more special duty, of proportioning the honour or reward to the actual labour. These minute diversities are fully explained by a comparison of the dates of the letters, and of the parties to whom they were addressed, but is far too delicate and unobtrusive to be explained in any other way.

No. V.

1 Tim. 5:19, 20. “Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before (with, ἐπι) two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.”

2 Cor. 13:1-4. “This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second time; and being absent now, I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all the others, that, if I come again, I will not spare.”

The agreement between these two passages is apparent. In one of them, St. Paul states the rule which would guide his own conduct, when administering discipline at

Corinth; and in the other, he prescribes a rule to Timothy for *his* exercise of a like discipline in the church of Ephesus. It is the harmony of a general precept with a particular example.

But perhaps this agreement may be thought too plain and simple for our object, since the rule is only borrowed from the Mosaic law. We may observe, then, a minute and observable variation, which bespeaks reality in each case. In his conduct, St. Paul merely states that no charge should be held to be proved, unless by the consent of two or three witnesses. Timothy, however, is directed to require the same amount of testimony, even before the charge is received for further investigation. Whence this important difference between the apostle's precept and his own example? The reason is plain, that the precept related solely to accusations against elders. A due regard for their office, and perhaps also a secret reference to the youth of Timothy, invested with a perilous authority over his superiors in age, required a double caution in entertaining charges of this peculiar kind. This variation, while it illustrates the practical wisdom of the apostle, proves also that the letters are genuine. The difference is more in the idea than in the words, and is easily overlooked without a close examination.

No. VI.

1 Tim. 3:14, 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,—"

These words, as we have seen, are a full disproof of the earlier date of the epistle. When St. Paul entered Macedonia on his second visit, he plainly did not intend to return to Asia until after the winter, an interval of nine months, and he fully purposed in the spirit that he would return at that time on his way to Jerusalem. It remains now to see what light they throw on his later journey, on which they were actually written.

From the opening of the letter it has been inferred, by Paley and most others, that St. Paul wrote it in Macedonia. But this conclusion seems to be ill-founded; for the words are still more appropriate, if he had now left Macedonia, and proceeded onward to Greece. It is not likely that he would write to Timothy as soon as he left him, but rather after some considerable interval. Indeed this passage implies that he had now almost completed his original plan, and was deliberating whether he ought to prolong it, by visiting some other field of labour before his return. It would doubtless have been his original design to visit Macedonia and Achaia, in succession, as he had done twice before; and his doubt might be, whether to return at once from the peninsula, or to extend his journey up its western side, through Epirus and Dalmatia. He would probably choose for writing to Timothy some point of the circuit where the communication with Ephesus was rapid and easy; and no place would be so suitable as Corinth, or Cenchrea, its eastern port. Towards the close of his stay in that place, his first plan would be nearly complete, but he would naturally desire to extend his labours by a visit to Epirus and Dalmatia. In this case, he would return to Asia by the Egnatian road, Neapolis, and Troas, and his meeting with Timothy be very considerably delayed. And this will fully explain his double statement. "These things I write, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house of God."

Are there now any internal signs, which tend to confirm the view that the letter was written in or near Corinth? There are several indications, although slight in themselves, which rather countenance this opinion. First, the three coincidences just observed are with the two letters to Corinth. We have seen that the explanation, by an intermediate date, is demonstrably untrue. But if the apostle were now in the very place where these directions had been enforced, as to the silence of the women in the churches, the mode of receiving accusations, and the maxim of due provision for teachers, it is still more natural that traces of them should reappear in the present letter.

Again, there are two passages, which imply rather strongly that the apostle had before his eyes the preparation for some public games. “But exercise thyself rather unto godliness; for bodily exercise profiteth for little; but godliness is profitable unto all things.” “Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life” (*ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα*). Both of these allusions are doubly emphatic, if the apostle was at Corinth not long before a celebration of the Isthmian or Olympic games. A further presumption for this view, as to the place from which the letter was sent, will arise in considering the Epistle to Titus, which comes next in order.

CHAPTER X.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

No. I.

Tit. 1:5. “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 had appointed thee.”

Besides the view of Paley, who places the visit here spoken of on the return of St. Paul from Rome, and dates the letter from Greece on his subsequent circuit, there have been two other chief varieties, which both assign it a much earlier date. The first is that of professor Hug, who places the visit on the voyage, Acts 18: from Corinth to Ephesus; and the second that of Michaelis, who supposes an excursion of St. Paul from Corinth to the island during his long stay. In this first article these two alternatives will be examined.

The first view supposes that St. Paul embarked at Cenchrea, and that the ship was either bound for Crete, or driven to the island by stress of weather, when one of the perils by sea (2 Cor. 11) may have happened. He left Titus behind, and wrote the letter to him on arriving at Ephesus. Apollos had already reached that city, and St. Paul instructs Titus to forward him on his journey, probably by way of Crete to Corinth. The Nicopolis (Tit 3:12) is that in Cilicia, between Antioch and Tarsus, which would be the best known to Titus, a Greek of the Asiatic provinces, and also lay quite in the route of the apostle.

This hypothesis seems encumbered, in every part, with fatal objections. First, the island lies quite in the way from Corinth to Syria, but out of the way from Corinth to Ephesus. We can account for St. Paul taking Ephesus in his way only by one of two reasons, that the vessel was bound thither, or that the winds compelled it to a more

northward course. In the latter case, a circuit by Crete was plainly impossible. On the other view, either the vessel could keep her course or was driven from it. If she could, she would make the port of Ephesus, without sailing to Crete. But if driven southward to Crete, the wind would favour St. Paul's progress to Syria, and hinder his return to Ephesus, and consequently he would not have returned thither at all.

Next, if St. Paul sailed by Crete to Ephesus, there seems no reason why the historian should not have noticed the fact, as well as the visit to Ephesus itself. Either was an episode to the main object, the voyage to Jerusalem; and if one were mentioned, the other, which was a greater deviation from the natural route, would almost certainly have been noticed also.

Thirdly, the apostle was pressed for time on this voyage. From analogy with the other voyage it is probable that he left Corinth after the Passover, and that he aimed to reach Jerusalem by the Pentecost. He would then have time for the circuit by Ephesus, and for a short delay there, but certainly not for a further circuit by Crete, and a stay there of some continuance. Even if he set out at the beginning of March, we must allow near thirty days for the double voyage to Crete and Ephesus, one of them almost certainly with a head-wind. The epistle implies a stay of some length in the island, which would require six or seven weeks, in order to visit a few of its principal towns only. And hence it is most unlikely that time would be left for the apostle to go back to Ephesus before sailing into Syria.

Fourthly, it is quite plain from the book of Acts that Apollos did not reach Ephesus until Paul had left it, and that the apostle did not return to it after the circuit through the upper parts until Apollos was at Corinth. The order in the history is perfectly clear. St. Paul leaves Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus. After he is gone, and while he is in some part of the Asiatic circuit, Apollos arrives, and Aquila and Priscilla instruct him in the absence of the apostle. They and other brethren give him letters, and he arrives at Corinth. After his arrival, Paul, having completed his circuit in the upper parts, comes down to Ephesus. And hence it becomes absolutely certain that the letter to Titus could not be written during that short stay at Ephesus.

The explanation of Nicopolis is equally unsatisfactory. What possible reason can be given why the apostle should winter there, rather than in Tarsus or Antioch, the two great centres of the church in that immediate vicinity? Either of them would be a far more likely place for Titus to rejoin him.

Finally, at the date proposed, the gospel had scarcely reached Ephesus, and it is very doubtful whether Tychicus, the Ephesian, could have been already a convert. His proposed mission to Crete, so early in the history, is another improbability. But the two objections, from the route of the apostle, and from the mention of Apollos, are alike fatal to the whole hypothesis.

The second opinion is that of Michaelis and others, that St. Paul took a voyage to Crete during his stay at Corinth, and was driven to Epirus by stress of weather on his return; that he spent the winter there, and preached the gospel among them, and then resumed his stay at Corinth again.

The objections to this view are equally decisive. First, it is plain that Apollos did not

reach Corinth till St. Paul had left it, nor even till he had left Ephesus, and apparently, not until he was far advanced on his circuit in Asia Minor. Otherwise, his abode at Corinth would be a very imperfect definition of the time when St. Paul reached Ephesus. It is thus quite impossible that St. Paul should commend Apollos to Titus at this time, when it is clear that they had not hitherto met, and that Apollos, until some time later, was merely a disciple of John.

Again, the history tells us that St. Paul settled (*ἐκάθισέ*) at Corinth a year and six months. The phrase itself is adverse to the notion of such a voyage. But let us consider the definition of time more closely. Since he left it about March or April, he must have reached it about September. It is plain that he would not take a voyage to Crete, leaving his new post, before the winter began. We must therefore suppose that he spent the second winter at Nicopolis, and then sailed in the next spring to Corinth. But he left Corinth in March or April, and had tarried there a good while before this voyage began. Also before that delay, his assiduous labours in the place led to the insurrection of the Jews against him. This does not agree at all with an absence at Crete and Epirus for six months previous. For he would hardly undertake the voyage after the autumnal equinox, and must therefore have been absent from August until the next February. On this account, as well as the former, the hypothesis is untenable.

Again, if Tychicus was to be sent to Crete from the apostle, he must have been with him before the voyage. But that Tychicus the Ephesian should be an active and trusty helper of St. Paul two years or more before the gospel was planted at Ephesus, is utterly improbable. These three reasons appear quite decisive against the second hypothesis, and we are thus compelled, by demonstrative evidence, to place the visit of the apostle after his return from Rome.

No. II.

Let us now examine whether all these difficulties are not removed by the later date of the epistle, and succeeded by as many points of observable harmony.

First, St. Paul, in his latest letter from Italy, had expressed his hope of soon visiting the believers of Palestine. Since he coasted Crete, while a prisoner, on his voyage from Cæsarea to Rome, he would naturally pay it a visit on returning from Italy to Cæsarea. We have no need to suppose adverse winds, or a voyage of which no hint occurs, but only that St. Paul fulfilled his deliberate purpose, when he would certainly pass by the island, and having never visited it before, would be sure to visit it now, that he might strengthen and establish the disciples

Next, since the island was large, and St. Paul could stay only a short time, consistently with his promises to the Colossians and Philippians, as well as the Christians of Palestine, much would remain for Titus to do after his departure. Nor is it likely that the apostle would write to him very soon after their separation. At the date of the letter it is clearly expected that Titus would almost have fulfilled his commission. Now if St. Paul made a circuit by Cæsarea, Antioch, Colosse, and Philippi, some considerable interval must have elapsed before he came round into the neighbourhood of Crete, so as to write the present letter. Hence it is likely that Titus would nearly have fulfilled his task, as the apostle clearly expected, at the time when the letter was written.

Thirdly, on the same view, Apollos had already met the apostle at Ephesus six or seven years before the date of the letter, and Tychicus had already been employed for the same number of years as one of his helpers and fellow-labourers. Hence the mention of them both is consistent and natural, while it is a fatal objection to either of the two earlier dates from Corinth or Ephesus.

Fourthly, the Actian Nicopolis was both the most celebrated and flourishing at the time, and also the nearest to the island of Crete. Hence, in the abstract, it is by far the most likely to be intended by the apostle. But if he had reached the peninsula of Greece, and wrote from almost any part of it to Titus, that city would be a very natural place of meeting, before a further mission along its western side in the direction of Illyricum and Dalmatia.

Finally, by this means the epistles to Timothy and to Titus, which have so strong a resemblance, are shown to be written almost together, during the apostle's final circuit through the peninsula of Greece.

The general view, therefore, which places the epistle during this last journey, is established by the firmest reasons. But there is still some variation in the time and place assigned to this and the former epistle. Paley supposes the letter to Timothy to have been sent from Macedonia, and the present one to Titus from Nicopolis or its neighbourhood. Mr. Greswell reverses the order, and supposes that St. Paul wrote to Titus from Macedonia, and to Timothy, not long afterwards, from Nicopolis.

Each of these opinions, though certainly not very wide of the truth, is open to real objection. If the one letter does not imply that St. Paul was still in Macedonia, the direction to Titus implies still less that the apostle had reached Nicopolis. On the contrary, the appointment implies the joint interval between two separate messages, and of a direct and return voyage before Titus could arrive at Nicopolis. If St. Paul resolved to winter there, it is probable that he would arrange not to arrive at the place long before the winter season. His words to Timothy are most natural, if he had already left Macedonia, and the instructions to Titus clearly suppose that he would not reach Nicopolis until some weeks or months later.

What, then, would be the most likely place for a message to Crete from the peninsula? Of all those where St. Paul is known to have been, unquestionably Corinth. After an absence of six years, he could hardly fail to pay that church a visit, as well as Colosse and Philippi, and would probably make a short circuit to other stations in the province of Achaia. He would then be at the most favourable point for sending a message, either to Crete or Ephesus, while his prolonged absence from Timothy and Titus would render a letter peculiarly seasonable. The resemblance of the epistles is thus accounted for, even more fully than by the two other schemes mentioned above.

Which letter, again, must we suppose to have been first written? This question, also, allows of a distinct answer. When St. Paul wrote to Timothy, he had some hope of returning to Asia shortly, but thought it possible that he might make a longer delay. When he wrote to Titus, he had come to a resolution (the word implying, perhaps, a previous suspense of judgment) to spend the winter at Nicopolis on the western coast. This decision not only would necessitate a continued absence from Asia, but

presuppose a visit to Epirus and the adjoining districts in the spring, and an intention of returning across Macedonia by a longer route before coming to Asia again. We may suppose the letter to Timothy to have been written, therefore, soon after his arrival at Corinth, before he had resolved on this western circuit, but when its desirableness first began to appear; and the letter to Titus, near the close of that same residence, when he had planned one part of his journey until the winter, and designed to continue it, perhaps by coasting, with the first days of spring. The analogy of the two letters to the Ephesians and the Colossians is thus retained, the second in each case being shorter than the first, and a brief repetition of the same instructions to other parties.

No. III.

There is one difficulty which may be started against the conclusion just established, that the epistle was written from Corinth or its neighbourhood, on St. Paul's return to Greece after his long imprisonment. Since his stay at Crete must have been short, on that return voyage, to be consistent with his promises to others, how is it likely that elders should need so soon to be ordained in every city?

Now here the facts disclosed in the history, compared with the position of Crete, will supply a full answer, and turn the difficulty into a mark of truth. Even on the day of Pentecost Cretan Jews were present, and some of them were probably numbered among those first converts. Cyprus received the gospel as early as the persecution of Stephen (Acts 11:19), more than twenty-five years before the date of this letter. It was more fully visited by Paul and Barnabas on their first journey, and again by Barnabas and Mark after the separation. Corinth and Achaia had received the gospel on Paul's first visit to Europe, ten or eleven years previous, and he had stayed there no less than eighteen months. He had since continued between two and three years in Ephesus, so that all who were in Asia heard the word of God. When he was last at Corinth, five years before his visit to Crete, there was a numerous church at Rome, and had been for many years. Apollos was from Alexandria, and there is little doubt that Egypt must have received the gospel not later than Ephesus. Several of the first preachers of the gospel, at the time of Paul's conversion, were Jews of Cyrene (Acts 11:20). Now Crete lay in the intersection of all the routes, from Judea to Rome, from Gyrene to Cyprus and Antioch, from Alexandria to Corinth, and from Corinth to Cyrene, to Alexandria, and to Cæsarea. The winds of the Levant are favourable to a voyage from the Peloponnesus to the island, and from Argos near Corinth, to Cydonia, would be only two days' voyage with a prosperous wind. Thus it is morally certain that the gospel would have been preached extensively in Crete for eight or ten years before St. Paul returned from Rome. It is not unlikely that Barnabas and Mark, after preaching in Cyprus, might proceed thither, and make it their next missionary station.

The brief statement in the letter is thus highly consistent with the probable course of events. Since this had been the first visit of the apostle to the island, he would naturally stay one or two months, to confirm the churches where probably no apostle had been before him. This time, however, would be far too short for the wants of so large an island, and other engagements were pressing, and would forbid a longer stay. Hence he might, with much propriety, desire Titus to stay behind, and to complete more at leisure those ecclesiastical arrangements he himself had begun. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou mightest set in order the things that were wanting,

and ordain elders in every city.”

The selection of Titus for this post, though it might be caused by many reasons now hidden from us, agrees well with the slight notices in the history and the previous letters. He is mentioned last as the messenger to Corinth, just before St. Paul’s second visit. The history never speaks of him, but proves, by the list of Paul’s companions when he sailed from Philippi, that Titus did not accompany him on his course to Jerusalem. He is not mentioned in any one of the four letters, written from Rome during the first imprisonment. From his forwardness in visiting Corinth at his last mission, and the fact that he had been sent thither twice before, and walked consistently in the same spirit and steps with the apostle, he was perhaps left to superintend the churches of Achaia, before St. Paul set out on that voyage. In this case, during the five years’ interval he would most likely have gone to Crete, to extend the gospel in that island, which adjoined so closely to the churches of Achaia. And thus we have a very probable explanation why he might be selected by St. Paul for his present commission, to ordain elders throughout the Cretan cities.

No. IV.

Tit. 3:12. “When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis: for I have determined there to winter. Bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them.”

The Actian Nicopolis was the nearest to Crete, and the most noted city of that name. It has been shown above that it is certainly intended in this passage. The words do not imply that St. Paul was already there, but the reverse, that he was proceeding on a circuit, to end at Nicopolis about the winter. The letter, then, was written in the summer or autumn, and probably, as we have seen, from Corinth. A circuit through Ætolia, Acarnania, and part of Epirus, might well occupy the apostle until winter. A large and flourishing sea-port would be an excellent place for his labours during the winter season, and he could then pursue his circuit northward along the coast with the early spring.

Now this view agrees well with the notice, that Tychicus was with the apostle. He had been sent to Ephesus and Colosse from Rome, when St. Paul hoped to visit Philemon before long. He would probably remain in that neighbourhood, and await his arrival. But St. Paul had now paid his visit to Colosse, and crossed over into Europe, and it is probable that he would retain Tychicus for some time, after their long separation. The doubt as to the messenger might arise from his having been made the bearer of the letter to Timothy a few weeks before, so that the time of his return would be rather uncertain.

The commission about Apollos has been variously explained. Some, as Hug, refer it to his first journey from Ephesus to Corinth, which is clearly disproved by the history. Canon Tate has supposed that Apollos and Zenas might be the bearers of the letter to the Hebrews. But this involves clearly a great anachronism, since not only the letter must have reached Palestine before now, but St. Paul would have paid them his visit, and pursued his journey by Colosse and Philippi into Greece. Mr. Biley supposes that they were now with Titus, and that St. Paul desired him to bring them along with him, or help them on their way to join himself. It is far more simple to explain it thus, that

they were the bearers of this letter to Titus, and then were about to proceed elsewhere; so that St Paul seized the occasion of sending a letter by them, though a further message would be necessary before Titus could return. Now the last previous mention of Apollos (1 Cor. 16:12) implied his fixed purpose of visiting Corinth again, and it has been shown that St. Paul was in or near Corinth at the date of this letter. Again, Apollos was a Jew of Alexandria; and whether he were journeying to Palestine, to one of the national feasts, or returning to his native place, on either supposition Crete would be exactly in the line of his journey. The coincidence here, though inferential, has a high probability, and is certainly free from the remotest suspicion of design. It supplies also a beautiful lesson, that the last mention of Apollos shows him to have fulfilled his promise to the Corinthians; that he was there in fellowship with the apostle, where their names had once been the signal of unholy rivalry; that he willingly undertakes to be the bearer of the apostle's message to Titus; while the apostle, in his turn, commends him most affectionately to the care of his youthful friend, in providing for his comfort on his proposed journey.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

THAT this letter was written during St. Paul's second imprisonment has been argued already, in the remarks on the epistle to the Ephesians, and is so generally allowed, that perhaps further proof is needless. It will be enough to trace at once, in succession, those secret harmonies of truth which are detected, when the epistle is thus referred to its proper date.

No. I.

2 Tim. 1:6. "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands."

In Acts 8:18, 19, at the time when the gospel was preached by Philip in Samaria, we have a remarkable statement with regard to the conduct of Simon Magus.

"And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."

We are thus taught by the history, before the date of Saul's conversion, that to communicate the gifts of the Spirit by imposition of their hands was a privilege peculiar to the apostles. Here, again, in the latest letter of the apostle, on the eve of his death, he reminds Timothy of the gifts of the Spirit he had received, and that it was by the imposition of his own hands he had received them. The coincidence is simple and complete. It is the more observable, because in the former letter he had mentioned Timothy's reception of these gifts, without any assertion of this important particular, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given by prophecy, with laying of the hands of the presbytery."

No. II.

2 Tim. 1:15. "This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me, of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes."

This passage, at first sight, may well occasion some perplexity. How could the whole church of Ephesus, where St. Paul laboured with such zeal for nearly three years, have apostatized from the faith, or perseveringly renounced their friendship for the apostle? How is it that Timothy is informed thus briefly of the defection of the whole flock, where he had been appointed to labour, and to establish the disciples, not long before?

The first step towards a removal of the difficulty consists in a simpler and more exact version. "This thou knowest, that all they who are in Asia turned away from me." When St. Paul wrote to Timothy before, he was journeying, and at liberty, but now he is a prisoner at Rome. We are not told where he was apprehended, but the last town on his route to which we can trace him, is Miletus, where he left Trophimus sick. The words before us allude, when translated simply, to some particular occasion which had intervened, and was known to Timothy, though not stated fully in the letter. Hence we may infer that he was apprehended somewhere in the province of Asia, and examined by some provincial governor, before he was sent a prisoner to Rome. On this view we find an exact parallel to the present verse at the close of the letter. "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. 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." (2 Tim. 4:16.)

If the Christians at Rome all forsook the apostle in this crisis, it is not surprising that the same should be true of those in Asia, whatever the town where he was seized, and brought for his defence before the Roman deputy. The time of Nero's cruelty was now begun, and hence the danger was far greater than in the former imprisonment. The fact, that two names only are specified, out of the whole number of believers, implies that some special occasion was meant, already known to Timothy, and that the charge has an important limitation. All those of Asia who were near at hand, and had it in their power to befriend him in his hour of danger, drew back through fear, and two are named, as more guilty than the rest, whether from their special opportunities of helping him, or from their station in the church. The comparison, then, removes the strangeness of the declaration, while it reveals a secret harmony between the two descriptions of the guilty timorousness of the Christians, both in Asia and at Rome.

Still, if Timothy were now at Ephesus, it seems unnatural that he should be informed in this manner of facts which would seem to involve him in a share of the guilt, and to have passed under his own eyes. Now if we examine the rest of the letter, this difficulty will also be removed. Timothy, it seems, was not at Ephesus, but at some distance to the east or north. For he is told of the mission of Tychicus to Ephesus, and of Trophimus having stayed at Miletus, and is charged to bring the cloak from Troas. Hence it seems pretty clear that he was not actually in any of those cities, though he might have to pass through them on his journey to Rome. This absence of Timothy from Ephesus, which is obscurely implied, completes the explanation of a verse which at first sight is almost inexplicable. Long before the letter arrived, Timothy would

have learned the place and time of the apostle's apprehension, and the conduct of the Christians around him, when he was thus arraigned. Hence the notice of the fact is so brief, that it now appears almost hopelessly obscure.

No. III.

2 Tim. 4:9,10. "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me: for Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia; *Titus unto Dalmatia*"

Two of these names are familiar to us in the letters, but Crescens is mentioned here only. This is the kind of coincidence which we should look for in a history of real occurrences. St. Paul had several constant, and others, more numerous, who were occasional companions in his journeys.

The mention of Titus supplies a very circuitous coincidence, of the reality of which, on close inquiry, there is little doubt. In his letter, the apostle requested him to rejoin him at Nicopolis. This has been shown to be Nicopolis in Epirus, and the letter to be from the neighbourhood of Corinth. Hence the purpose of the direction was clearly that Titus might be with the apostle in Epirus during the winter, and resume his labours along with him up the western coast of the Adriatic early in the next spring. If time was pressing, and other churches to the north required a visit, St. Paul would naturally send Titus, one of his most faithful and trusty helpers, to fulfil the same office as in Crete the previous year. On crossing over to Troas, he seems to have been arrested in Asia, and sent off at once a prisoner to Rome. Since Timothy was absent elsewhere in Asia Minor, this letter might give him the first account of that absence of Titus which made his own return the more necessary. The intervals of time will quite agree with this view. Titus might leave the apostle in April for Dalmatia, possibly near Dyrrachium. St. Paul might reach Miletus towards the end of May, and, after his arrest, be conveyed to Rome by the beginning or middle of July, and examined in the same month. He might write to Timothy in August, who was then in Asia, and not at the sea coast; and since he had several commissions to fulfil on the way, he would require diligence to rejoin the apostle at Rome before the winter was set in.

To detect the secret coincidence in this case, how many steps are necessary! We have first to ascertain carefully the true date of both letters, and the neighbourhood where the one to Titus was written, all of them points that require the most careful examination, as is proved by the mistakes of so many learned men. We have next to infer, from the message to Titus, the probable route of the apostle after that winter was over, and from this letter to Timothy, the place of his apprehension, and the fact of his return to Rome. We have also, by minute observation, to discover the absence of Timothy from Ephesus and Miletus, and, by a complex estimate of the journeys, to ascertain that the two winters, in the two letters, are those of two successive years. Thus, by this complicated inquiry, where every link, however, seems to be firm, we obtain a result which not only clears Titus from the suspicion of wilfully deserting the apostle, but accounts for his absence in Dalmatia, a province never once named elsewhere either in the history or the other letters.

No. IV.

2 Tim. 4:11. "Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry."

The last mention of Mark was in the Epistle to Colosse, from which it appeared that he was intending to visit that neighbourhood about the close of the former imprisonment, which was probably about two years before the present message.

Timothy, also, seems now to have been absent from Ephesus, in the interior of Asia Minor. And hence the instruction that he should bring Mark along with him is readily explained.

But why is the remark added, "for he is profitable to me for the ministry?" If we turn to the history, we find that Mark had "ministered" to Paul and Barnabas in their first journey; that he forsook them at a critical moment, and fell under Paul's displeasure; that on the next journey, he parted from Barnabas on this very account, because he thought Mark disqualified to be their companion, and that, after their separation, he selected Timothy to fill the very post which Mark had occupied before him. There is thus a double propriety in this brief commendation. The aged apostle, now on the point of death, would not only leave it on record how completely the breach had been healed by the faithfulness of the evangelist in later years, but would also guard his beloved son in the faith against a self-complacent comparison with an elder brother, by bequeathing to him this beautiful and simple testimony to the value of Mark's services in the gospel. What secret allusion could be more beautifully delicate and refined, and further beyond the reach of fraudulent imitation!

No. V.

2 Tim. 4:13, 21. "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.

"Do thy diligence to come before winter."

The deep and touching significance of this direction, however trivial it may seem, has been beautifully explained by Mons. Gaussen, in his *Theopneustia*.

"During near thirty years he had been poor, in labours more abundant than others, in stripes above measure beyond them, in prisons more frequent than they: of the Jews he had five times received forty stripes save one, thrice he had been beaten with rods, once stoned, thrice shipwrecked, in journeyings often, in perils at sea, in towns, in deserts, among the heathen, and among his own countrymen, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness, with the care of all the churches. He was now Paul the aged, and in his last prison at Rome, expecting the sentence of death, and ready to be offered; he had fought a good fight, finished his course, and kept the faith. Even his friends had shrunk from him on his first arraignment; only Luke was with him, the rest had left or forsaken him; the winter was about to set in, and in the chilly dungeons of Rome he was in want of his cloak, which he had left with Carpus at Troas, two hundred leagues away. The writer was himself in Rome last year, at the commencement of November; and with what vivid reality, under the influence of the

evening cold, could he imagine the aged apostle in the dungeons of the Capitol, dictating the last of his letters, regretting the absence of his cloak, and begging Timothy to bring it before winter.”

In another view, these passages bear the same impress of reality. The apostle had wintered at Nicopolis, journeyed northward early in the spring, dismissed Titus to Dalmatia, crossed Macedonia by the Egnatian Way to Neapolis, and embarked for Troas; proceeded to Miletus, and in that neighbourhood been seized, examined, and sent off to Rome, from whence he writes to Timothy, in time for him to return, but only with a speedy journey, before winter sets in again. From this outline, deduced by a careful comparison of many scattered hints, about what time would he have passed through Troas? Most probably, about the month of May. How natural for him to leave his cloak behind, when the summer months were now begun, and especially if he purposed to return by the same route, so as to winter in Thrace or Macedonia! Yet, as Mr. Biley has justly observed, “there is no allusion to the season in the first letter to Timothy; no allusion to the proposed return to Asia after the winter, in that to Titus; no allusion to the winter at Nicopolis, or to the second interview with Timothy, in the present letter. The harmony is as completely hidden below the surface as it could possibly be.”

No. VI.

2 Tim. 4:14. “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works: of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood our words.”

1 Tim. 1:19, 20. “Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning the faith have made shipwreck: of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.”

Acts 19:33. “And they drew Alexander out of the multitude, the Jews putting him forward. And Alexander beckoned with his hand, and would have made his defence unto the people. But when they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.”

These three passages have all some affinity with each other. In each of them an Alexander is mentioned, but in so general a way, that it is by no means clear, whether one, or two, or three parties are really intended. It is not even clear, from the statement in this letter, that Alexander the coppersmith lived at Ephesus. In the second passage, the phrase “whom I have delivered to Satan,” requires a reference to another epistle, to fix its meaning, and no record is given in the history of the place or time of his excommunication. Some have conceived that the Alexander in the book of Acts was a Christian, and others, that the Alexander of the first epistle was simply a heretic, but Alexander the coppersmith, a heathen or Jewish adversary. Yet I think that an exact inquiry will go far to remove this obscurity, and reveal, at least with considerable probability, a concealed and indirect coincidence.

First, Hymenæus is named, in both letters to Timothy, as an example of heresy. The former letter was addressed to him for his guidance, when at Ephesus; and the second, in a great measure for the same purpose, though with instructions also for his journey

to Rome, when Ephesus would be in his way. We may infer that Hymenæus belonged to Ephesus, or the Asian province. The description is similar in both places, and hence, the same party is designated in both letters.

Next, the Alexander of 1 Tim. 1:20, and the Philetus of 2 Tim. 2:17, since they are coupled with Hymenæus, were probably also of that province, and perhaps of Ephesus, and ringleaders in heresy, or in some kind of opposition to the truth.

Thirdly, in each letter to Timothy, when at or near Ephesus, only one Alexander is named as an enemy to the gospel. The Alexander of the former letter, had been excommunicated, that he might be taught not to blaspheme, and continued impenitent, about a year before the date of the second letter. In that second letter itself, Alexander the coppersmith is described as the most malignant enemy of the apostle, who had greatly withstood his words. It was only in rare and extreme cases that St. Paul singled out any one by name for such severe reprobation. It is surely improbable that at the same time, in the same district, there were two Alexanders thus pre-eminent in wickedness, and that one of them should be named in each epistle, without some clearer mark of distinction between them. But no such mark can be found in these passages. Alexander might be sufficiently defined in the first passage by his being joined with Hymenæus; but where he was named alone, some surname would be needful, to avoid all risk of mistaking the party, and hence the mention of his trade, in this case only, may be readily explained, without recourse to the supposition that it was some different person.

It has been supposed, however, that Alexander the coppersmith did not live at Ephesus, but in Macedonia, or at the station next to Troas, in the route of Timothy. There seems no solid reason for this view. The journey of Timothy was to be as speedy as possible; and during its course, he would not be likely to incur any risk from this adversary, merely because he had to pass rapidly through some town in Macedonia, where he might happen to live. The danger could only refer to Timothy's ordinary residence, in or near Ephesus, and the injury done to Paul must relate either to the time of his long stay in that city, or to his recent apprehension, which took place in Asia. The phrase "he hath greatly withstood our words," may refer either to the whole course of St. Paul's teaching, or to his recent defence in Asia before the Roman deputy, when this Alexander might have been forward among his accusers. Everything points to a residence in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, where Timothy had a charge, where Paul had preached so long, and where he had been lately apprehended as a disturber of the peace, and sent to Rome for trial. The Alexander of the first epistle is coupled with Hymenæus, as if they were excommunicated together, and this implies that he also lived in or near Ephesus.

Now, if this identity is thus rendered highly probable, we may next inquire, what was the time of the excommunication of Hymenæus and Alexander? The words are simply, "whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." Hence there is nothing in the expression to prove that it was a very recent event. It is rather spoken of, as one already notorious. It has been shown to be probable that St. Paul did not really visit Ephesus after his return from Rome. The excommunication, therefore, if inflicted when he was present, must have been during his last visit, and since the church was founded during the same visit, it was probably towards its close, a short time before the tumult drove the apostle from the city. Now Timothy had been

sent into Macedonia at that very time, before St. Paul left Ephesus; and thus the excommunication, if it were near the close of that residence, would occur during Timothy's absence. Hence it would be more natural for St. Paul thus to remind him of it, than if he had actually witnessed it with his own eyes.

We are thus led to conclude that Hymenæus and Alexander had been excommunicated by the apostle at Ephesus, not very long before the tumult arose; that Hymenæus had continued ever since to propagate his heresy, and had been joined in it by Philetus also; that Alexander, far from repenting of his sin, and his railing against the gospel, had persevered in it, and become the most malignant opposer of the apostle, and that he was probably the occasion of his being apprehended on this journey, and sent a prisoner to Rome.

Let us now turn to the history. From the abrupt manner in which the writer introduces the name in that passage (Acts 19:33), it is clear that he supposes him to be a person well known by report to Theophilus, and to most of his readers." They drew Alexander (not, one Alexander) out of the multitude." He must, therefore, have been some one at Ephesus, whose name was of notoriety when St. Luke wrote, at the close of St. Paul's first imprisonment. Was he then a favourer or an adversary of the apostle? The question is solved by the eagerness of the Jews to thrust him forward, that he might make a defence to the people. Their object must have been to increase the odium against the apostle, and to remove it from themselves, and Alexander was the pleader whom they thought the best adapted for this purpose. Now, who could be more likely to answer their design than a Jew of determined character, who had once been a disciple, but since been expelled from the church, and who was now full of bitter hatred against it? Alexander the coppersmith, if the same who had been shortly before excommunicated, along with Hymenæus, for his blasphemous speeches, would just be the advocate they would desire, to work evil to the apostle at that crisis; and his later conduct justified their expectations, since he is singled out, six years later, for the malignity and success of his opposition.

This agreement between the two epistles and the history, though it results only from a minute comparison, on adopting in each case the more probable opinion, can never, perhaps, from the brevity of the passages, be considered certain and demonstrative. Yet when we find that the excommunication of Alexander is thrown back, by the address at Miletus, to the time just before the tumult, and that some Alexander, well known in the church, was then prominent as the chosen mouthpiece of the Jews; when we remember that it was Demetrius the silversmith who raised the disturbance, by getting together the workmen of similar trades, and hence that Alexander the coppersmith was more likely than other Jews to gain a hearing; when we remember, too, that it was Jews from Asia or Ephesus who caused the apostle's first imprisonment, and their malice which also led to his apprehension a second time, and thus procured his death, there seems to be a chain of circumstantial evidence, to prove the identity, which may well satisfy a thoughtful mind. And this being once allowed, it is certain that no coincidence can be more evidently beyond the suspicion of an artificial origin. The correspondence must have resulted from reality, and from that alone.

No. VII.

2 Tim. 4:19. "Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus."

These are here the only parties to whom St. Paul sends his greeting. To learn the reasons of this special notice we must consult the first part of the letter, and the previous history. Onesiphorus had shown special kindness to St. Paul during his former stay at Ephesus, and more lately at Rome. His household, therefore, who were still at Ephesus, had a claim to his peculiar love. Aquila and Priscilla had not only lived and wrought with him, both at Corinth and Ephesus, but even had laid down their own necks to save him from danger. They were at Ephesus when he wrote the first time to Corinth; at Rome, about a year later, when he addressed a letter to that church; and now, after six years, they are implied to be at Ephesus again. This exclusive mention of Onesiphorus, whose kindness is recorded here only, and of Aquila and Priscilla, whose intimacy with the apostle appears in the history, and in two earlier letters, is a feature of reality not easy for any counterfeit to produce.

No. VIII.

2 Tim. 4:20, 21. "Erastus abode at Corinth: but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick. Do thy diligence to come before winter."

The coincidence with regard to Erastus, a citizen of Corinth, has been noted in the *Horæ*. Two points, however, require elucidation; how far these statements are in harmony with the route of St. Paul, and their real drift, as a message to Timothy.

It has been shown that the two former letters were probably written at or near Corinth, where the apostle must have stayed a short time, after visiting Macedonia, and before the circuit of Epirus. Since Erastus was a citizen of Corinth, it is likely that he would stay there, after attending the apostle so far on his circuit. Also, if St. Paul travelled from Macedonia to Troas, where he left the cloak with Carpus, he would be likely to proceed to Miletus, as he had done before, when he parted from the Ephesian elders. If he was arrested there, before Timothy had returned from the interior district, the knowledge that Erastus had stayed at Corinth, and that Trophimus had been left sick at Miletus, would probably reach him first by this letter. All these indications of the route fully agree.

But why does the apostle mention these persons? It has been supposed that they were meant for an instruction to Timothy to call on them in his way, and bring them with him. This is possible, but hardly probable. The presence of Luke, Mark, and Timothy, would be enough for his purpose. The object seems rather to explain how it happened that Luke alone was with him, and to show the pressing need that Mark and Timothy should come to him. With this view he first reminds him how many of his former helpers were absent, one of them through cowardice, and the others by commissions given them on the previous circuit. He next relieves his anxiety about his own charge, by telling him that Tychicus, the fittest substitute, had been sent away to supply his absence, who was probably the bearer of this letter. "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus." Presently he remembers that there were two others of his helpers whose absence he had not explained, Erastus and Trophimus. Having thus shown how widely his companions were scattered, only Luke being now with him, he renews his

entreaty once more, with all the urgency of love. "Do thy diligence to come before winter."

All this bespeaks reality in a manner which can be mistaken by no thoughtful and serious mind.

BOOK II.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Introduction.

THE argument, unfolded in the *Horæ Paulinæ*, not only proves the authenticity of St. Paul's letters, but supplies most powerful evidence to confirm the truth and accuracy of the narrative in the book of Acts. This proof, however, is partial and incomplete, since those parts of the history with which the letters are contemporary form hardly one-fifth of the whole. It is true that many statements of the historian, in the rest of the work, are also confirmed by the same letters; but still the assertions respecting earlier occurrences which these contain are different in their own nature from the facts which they substantiate at the very time of their being written. Hence it is desirable to extend the argument to the whole narrative, and to exhibit those internal coincidences, which prove it to be authentic history. Since the instances to be given are independent of each other, a rigorous classification is superfluous. Those will, in general, be placed first in order which are derived from the history alone; next, those which require a comparison with the letters; and lastly, those which suppose the letters to have been already proved authentic, before they can supply a valid argument.

No. I.

First of all, the book of Acts is consistent with itself, in the local origin which it ascribes to the new religion of Christ, and in its allusion to the prejudice it had to encounter on this very account. The statements, in each case, are plainly incidental, natural, and almost necessary in their own context, but all agree thoroughly with each other.

The first occurs in the words of the angels, at the Ascension. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1:11.)

The second in the language of the Jews on the day of Pentecost.

Acts 2:6-8. "Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language. And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galilæans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?"

Two others occur in the discourses of Peter to Cornelius, and of Paul at Antioch.

Acts 10:36, 37. "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:) that word I say ye know, which was published throughout all Judæa, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power."

Acts 13:30, 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."

In these four passages, the same fact appears under various forms, that the preaching of Christ began from Galilee, and that the apostles were all Galilæans, and had come up together with Jesus before his death, from Galilee to Jerusalem. The title used so repeatedly, Jesus of Nazareth, is in harmony with these statements. If the founder of the new doctrine had his home at Nazareth, it was a natural consequence that his first disciples should be Galilæans.

But if these statements are thought to be too plain, and the fact itself too certain, to constitute any argument, there is a further coincidence, entirely free from this suspicion. If the new doctrine arose in Galilee, its founder lived at Nazareth, and all his first disciples were Galilæans, it is very natural that this should arouse the prejudices of the Jews, especially those who lived at Jerusalem, and regarded the holy city as the natural centre of their religious system, and the great fountain of ecclesiastical authority. It is equally natural that the dislike and hatred of the gospel, aggravated by this local prejudice, should display itself in some nickname of reproach applied to these teachers from despised Galilee.

Now this fact, so natural and inevitable under the real circumstances, is incidentally disclosed to us, not in the narrative itself, which might be open to suspicion, but in the very place where it would be likely to appear, the discourse of a public accuser. Let us examine the words of Tertullus, pleading against St. Paul before the Roman governor.

Acts 24:4, 5. "Notwithstanding, that I be not further tedious unto thee, I pray thee that thou wouldest hear us of thy clemency a few words. For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a *ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes*?"

Nothing can be more natural and consistent than these statements; that, since the founder of the gospel lived at Nazareth, his first disciples should be from Galilee; that the odium of the new doctrine should be increased among the Jews of Judæa, and their rulers at Jerusalem, by its obscure and provincial origin; that their dislike and contempt should give currency to an opprobrious nickname; and finally, that a professional accuser should make use of this nickname, in seeking to crush a hated teacher of the new faith, and to render his cause odious to the Roman governor. Yet how truthful, and evidently undesigned, is the way in which it is introduced by the historian, who never hints the existence of such a nickname, when speaking in his own person. The sting of this reproach is clearly essential, in a faithful report of the orator's address to Felix; while the fact, that this was the nickname in popular use against the disciples, is an undesigned confirmation of the whole history.

No. II.

Acts 4:36, 37. "And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation,) a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet."

There is an observable, though secret harmony, as professor Blunt has remarked, in all the notices of the history of Barnabas. We are here told that he was a native of *Cyprus*; and this statement is a key to explain several facts in the course of the narrative.

And first, when Saul came up to Jerusalem, after his conversion, and was suspected by all the disciples, we are told that it was Barnabas who took him, and brought him to the apostles. Now Saul was a native of Tarsus, the chief town of Cilicia, and Cyprus was usually annexed to that province. It was a city famous for its schools, to which many resorted. And since Barnabas was a Levite, and had landed property, he would most probably be well acquainted with Tarsus, and the more eminent Jews of that place. It appears elsewhere from this history, that Saul was the son of a Pharisee, and sent to Jerusalem to complete his education (23:6, 22:3). Hence, the family would in all probability be known to Barnabas; while his proverbial gentleness, as "the son of consolation," would further dispose him to notice the young convert, and make him the fittest person to introduce him to the other disciples.

Again, when the first Gentile converts were gathered at Antioch, tidings came to the mother church, "and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch." No reason is assigned for their choice. Beside, however, his general qualifications, we are told, a little before, that it was *men of Cyprus and Cyrene*, who had been the instruments in these conversions. How natural, then, and suitable, that Barnabas, the most eminent believer from Cyprus in the parent church, should be sent to examine their success, and superintend their further labours, in this new and important sphere. Again, when Barnabas and Saul set out on their first circuit among the heathen, "they departed unto Seleucia; and from thence *they sailed to Cyprus*," (13:4). In this island the first convert from the idolatrous heathen, of whom we have a record, was brought to the faith, in the person of the Roman deputy, Sergius Paulus. This choice of Cyprus for their first station on their journey, is readily explained, when we remember that Barnabas was "a Levite of Cyprus."

On their second journey, when Paul and Barnabas parted company, we find a similar coincidence. "Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto, Cyprus." He naturally chose to visit first his native island, the earliest scene of their labours in their former journey.

These coincidences are found in the narrative, when taken alone, and are sufficiently striking. But their effect will be increased by a comparison with St. Paul's letters. We there learn, quite incidentally, at the close of the Epistle to the Colossians, that Mark was "sister's son to Barnabas." (Col. 4:10.) By this passing hint, three or four other features of internal harmony are brought to light.

First, it follows that "Mary the mother of John, whose surname was Mark," was the own sister of Barnabas. It is no wonder, then, that her house was a place of chief resort to the early Christians, and that "many were gathered together, praying." A

sister of Barnabas, if a sharer in her brother's faith and piety, would naturally hold an eminent place among the early believers at Jerusalem.

Next, it is explained further, why Barnabas and Saul, on their return from Jerusalem, should "take with them John, whose surname was Mark." It was natural that the uncle should select his own nephew for his future companion, if otherwise qualified.

Again, it was when they loosed from Paphos and came to Pamphylia, that "John, departing from them, returned to Jerusalem." Since his mother was the sister of Barnabas, Cyprus would be her native island; and the journey of Mark, so far, might be accounted for by his local attachments, apart from a deep interest in the cause of Christ. And hence, perhaps, the refusal of St. Paul afterwards to receive him for his companion in the second journey.

Lastly, when the dispute arose, the zeal of Barnabas in favour of Mark, and his separation from St Paul, rather than part with his young friend, is explained, in part, by the relation between them. His sister's son would be the object of a peculiar affection on that ground alone. And thus the ties of nature would conspire with the gentleness of disposition, in "the son of consolation," to produce a more lenient interpretation of Mark's former secession, and a fuller confidence in his faithfulness for the time to come.

When we compare these different incidents, and observe how they enter into the very texture of the narrative, while they secretly correspond with each other, the remark of professor Blunt is hardly too strong, that "the harmony pervading everything connected with Barnabas is enough in itself to stamp the book of Acts as a history of perfect fidelity."

No. III.

Acts 7:58. "And they cast him out of the city, and stoned him; and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul."

This is the first mention in the history of that great apostle, whose labours and conversion occupy almost two-thirds of the whole narrative. It must strike one, at first sight, as very abrupt. Even allowing that the fierce zeal of the young pharisee would make him forward in such a cause, why should a young man, and he too a stranger in Jerusalem, be so prominent in the narrative? There were numbers of zealots, equally fierce against the new sect, who might seem to have a better claim to appear.

Though the earnest, conscientious zeal of the youthful bigot will doubtless go far to explain his abrupt appearance, there is another circumstance, overlooked by most readers, which completes the explanation. In the narrative of his conversion, his native place first comes into view, in the words of our Lord in vision, "Inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for, behold, he prayeth." In his own words to the chief captain it is stated more fully still. "I am a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city," (21:39.) Now if we turn to inquire who were the leaders in the controversy with Stephen, the historian has the following statement. "There arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and some of them of Cilicia and Asia,

disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake: then they suborned men.” Hence it appears that two synagogues of foreign Jews were the leaders in the persecution, and that one of them belonged to the Jews of Cilicia and Asia. How natural that a young Cilician Jew, of Tarsus the capital, and trained at the feet of Gamaliel for several years at Jerusalem, should appear in the foreground at the time of the martyr’s death.

No. IV.

Acts 8:5. “Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them.” (5:25:) “And they, when they had testified and preached the word of the Lord, returned to Jerusalem, and preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans.”

It is plain how simply and naturally this visit of Philip to Samaria flows out of the narrative of the previous persecution, and is followed by the preaching of Peter and John in the Samaritan villages.

Now the sequence of the history, so natural and unforced in itself, presents a marked coincidence with the previous statement of the historian, where he places on record the parting words of our Lord to his apostles. “It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth,” Acts 1:8. The history, without the least effort or violence, falls exactly into this order. The church, first of all, was founded in Jerusalem (Acts 2:1). It then spreads to the cities round about (ch. 5:16). After the martyrdom of Stephen, for the first time it extends to Samaria, by the preaching of Philip, of Peter, and John (ch. 8:5-25). Then, and not before, provision is made for the call of the Gentiles, first by the conversion of Saul, and his commission to be the apostle of the Gentiles; and next, by that of Cornelius, when Gentile converts were actually gathered into the fold of Christ. Yet the prediction is given so briefly, and the order of events is so natural and spontaneous, as to evince clearly the absence of all artificial design.

No. V.

Acts 8:40. “But Philip was found at Azotus: and passing through, he preached in all the cities, till he came to Cæsarea.”

Here the history of Philip ceases abruptly, and the narrative of Saul’s conversion begins. We are left to conjecture why Cæsarea should be the end of his journey. It might have been his previous home; or else, while persecution raged at Jerusalem, he might choose this main seaport of Palestine, as the place best suited for carrying on his missionary labours among the multitudes of Grecian Jews, who kept arriving or setting out from the Holy Land. The historian passes all these conjectures in silence, and simply leaves the evangelist at Cæsarea. He then relates the conversion of Saul, the resurrection of Tabitha, the conversion of Cornelius, the formation of the first Gentile church at Antioch, the persecution of Herod, and martyrdom of James, with the sudden death of the persecutor. He continues with a narrative of the first circuit of Barnabas and Saul, the return to Antioch, and the council at Jerusalem; the second circuit of Paul and Silas, the entrance into Europe, the preaching of the apostle at

Philippi, at Thessalonica, Berea, and Athens, and his stay of eighteen months at Corinth, We have then his return, by way of Ephesus, to Jerusalem and Antioch, a second circuit through Galatia and Phrygia, till he comes down to the coast, and takes up his abode for three years at Ephesus. Then follows his journey through Macedonia to Corinth, and again from Corinth to Philippi, where the historian rejoins him. The course of their voyage is next given, with the accuracy of an eye-witness, by Troas, Assos, Mitylene, Chios, Trogyllium, and Miletus; then by Coos, Rhodes, and Patara, and by the western side of Cyprus, to Tyre, with their short delay in that place with the disciples. They next arrive at Ptolemais, and then at Cæsarea, where their voyage is at an end. And here the evangelist comes into sight once more, with an explanation why the historian parted from him before on his reaching this city. “And the next day, we that were of Paul’s company departed, and came unto Cæsarea: “and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven; and abode with him. And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophecy,” Acts 21:8, 9.

Thus it appears, by this incidental statement, that Philip took up his abode at Cæsarea, and had children in that place, who trod in the steps of their father’s faith, and were now, it would seem, grown up to full age, which might very well be the case, after an interval of about twenty years. The juncture in the loops of the Mosaic tabernacle was not more perfect than the correspondence of these two passages with each other. Yet who that reads them in their own context can possibly imagine that this agreement is artificial.

No. VI.

Acts 6:1-5. “And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.—And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch.”

The party who complain, in this narrative, are the Grecians, or Jews who spoke the Greek language, and were the minority at Jerusalem. The apostles advise that seven men should be selected from the disciples, to redress the alleged grievance. The choice is left with the whole multitude, and no restriction is imposed, except that they should be “men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.” Yet it appears, in the most indirect manner possible, that they were all chosen from among the party who felt aggrieved. All the names, without one exception, are clearly Grecian.

Now that such should have been the case is very natural, when we remember the description, just before, of the glowing love among the early Christians, which seems to have had no interruption until this unhappy murmuring arose. The circumstance is as beautiful in the moral lesson it affords, as historically probable from the other facts already recorded, yet how indirectly it is revealed by the historian, who simply mentions the names of the seven who were chosen, but forbears a single word of comment!

No. VII.

The conversion of Saul is related three times in the book of Acts, once by the historian, and twice by the apostle himself; in the former case before a Jewish, in the latter before a mixed audience, consisting mainly of Gentiles. The comparison of these accounts will bring to light several marks of truth, in the partial variation amidst substantial agreement

Acts 9:1-9. "And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem. And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink."

Acts 22:4-11. "And I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women. As also the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders; from whom also I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damascus, to bring them which were there bound unto Jerusalem, for to be punished. And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest. And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus."

Acts 26:10-18. "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 as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests, at midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them which journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom

thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.”

There is one apparent contradiction, between the first and second of these accounts, which alone may exclude every suspicion of a merely artificial and collusive agreement. The companions of Saul, according to the historian, “heard the voice, but saw no man.” Yet he reports St. Paul himself to have told the Jews, that they “saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me.” The seeming opposition is not hard to reconcile. It is perfectly consistent that the companions of Saul might see the light, without being able to discern the person of our Lord, which was visible to Saul only. And this solution, in one case, which an exact comparison supplies to us, will suggest another, precisely similar, as to the voice. They heard the voice (*τῆς φωνῆς*) but they did not hear the voice of him that talked with me (*τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι*). Both the difference of the two phrases, and the analogy with regard to the light, teach us that they heard the sound of the voice, but could not distinguish the words that were uttered. The traditional idea of the *Bath-kol* among the Jews, was a sound from heaven, like thunder, accompanied by articulate words. On this view both statements are fully reconciled, and the scope of each appears the very same. His companions saw and heard enough to confirm the reality of the vision, but were not permitted to see and hear the person and words of our Lord, a privilege reserved for the future apostle alone.

The substantial agreement of the three accounts is evident, but might equally exist, whether the history were spurious or genuine. It is in the minute variations, and their exact propriety in each instance, that these passages become a proof that the narrative is real.

The commission from the high priest is mentioned in each passage, but with some difference. First, by the writer himself, in the simple order of time. “He went to the high priest, and desired letters.” In the apostle’s defence before the Jews, with an appeal to him as a present witness, and with a fuller mention of the whole Jewish council. “As also the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders; from whom also I received letters, etc.” In the defence before Agrippa, since here it was of less importance, except to show the notoriety of his conduct, it is introduced in a parenthesis. “Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests, etc.” This is in thorough keeping with the circumstances and special object in every instance.

The voice spake to Saul in the Hebrew tongue. This circumstance, as being minute, is naturally omitted in the direct narrative (9:4), and as naturally specified by Paul himself, (26:14), since the account of an eye and ear witness has commonly more of detail than suits a general history. Why, however, in this case should he not have specified it on both occasions alike? The answer is easy, that before the Jews he was himself speaking in the Hebrew tongue. (Acts 22:2.)

There is a similar variation in the descriptive names. The historian describes the objects of the persecution by their simple title, "the disciples of the Lord." The apostle, before the Jews, employs a neutral term, which could not arouse their prejudices, "them of this way." But before Agrippa, where there was no such need of caution to avoid offending the ears of bigots, he indulges his own feelings, by giving them a title of honour which aggravates his own guilt.— "Many of the saints did I shut up in prison." In like manner, when speaking to the Jews, he gives the national title of "brethren" even to the unbelieving Jews of Damascus. This is one of those conciliatory touches which mark a real discourse.

Again, the message is given at much greater length in the address to Agrippa. It was natural for St Paul himself to give a more particular account of it than the historian. On the other hand, this additional matter would have defeated his purpose in the address to the Jews, which was to prepare them gradually for the unwelcome statement, that he was sent "far away to the Gentiles." But this same part was especially suitable to mention before Festus to Agrippa, since it justified all his later conduct. "Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." All this is an example of entire consistency with the actual circumstances.

The vision itself is described twice in nearly the same words. Yet the first defence has two slight additions, that it was about noon, and that the light was great. In the second defence, where the apostle was more at liberty to state his own impressions, it is given still more fully. "At midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun," and its reality is indirectly confirmed by the words "shining round about me and them which journeyed with me."

Again, the history mentions simply the fact of his blindness, but the apostle states its cause, as an eye-witness would naturally do.—"And when I could not see *for the glory of that light*."

All these minute differences are accounted for at once, if the vision really occurred, and the two defences were really made, just as given in the history; but can be reasonably explained in no other way.

No. VIII.

The interview of Ananias with the apostle, which followed the vision, is related, twice only, in these words:—

Acts 9:10-18. "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias; and to him said the Lord in a vision, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for *one* called Saul, of Tarsus: for, behold, he prayeth, and hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight. Then Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem. And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake. And Ananias went his way, and entered into the

house; and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized.”

Acts 22:12-16. “And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there, came unto me, and stood, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard. And now, why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.”

Here, also, there are many features of minute propriety, which reveal themselves on close observation. There is a substantial agreement, while yet the varieties present an evident coincidence with the general object of the history, and the special purpose of the apostle’s defence.

First, the account is omitted entirely before Festus and Agrippa, since it was not needful to explain the conduct of the apostle. The vision in the way to Damascus was a sufficient warrant, when the words of the Lord were fully given. But the same motive which led St. Paul to be silent, before the Jews, about the commission to the Gentiles in that first vision, rendered the mention of Ananias necessary, in order to prepare for the mention of it in the later vision at Jerusalem. The unwelcome truth is thus announced, only when it has had the authority of three Divine messages.

Next, the historian calls Ananias a *disciple*; but the apostle, “a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there.” Such a description was admirably suited to his immediate object, to conciliate his audience in every lawful way. How consistent it was with the other account appears from Acts 21:20, in the words of James: “Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and *they are all zealous of the law.*”

The words of Ananias have two parts, one before, and the other after, Saul’s recovery of sight. In the defence before the Jews the former part is shortened, for the same reason that the vision to Ananias is omitted, since the repeated mention of Jesus as Lord might arouse their prejudices too violently. Hence only what is essential is given, in the words, “Brother Saul, receive thy sight.” The second part is given fully, for two reasons. The title used, “The God of our fathers,” was adapted to conciliate a Jewish audience; while that ascribed to our Lord was also the gentlest assertion of his claims, the Just One, and the unwelcome disclosure that was to follow is mitigated, being introduced by the more general statement.— “Thou shalt be a witness *to all men*, of what thou hast seen and heard.” In the history, the speech is omitted, but its immediate effect is related, that “he arose and was baptized.”

Even in the recovery there is a remarkable propriety in the narrative. The historian describes it, as it would be observed by the bystanders. “Immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith.” But the apostle, by one slight touch, places his own experience of the change vividly before us. “And the same hour *I looked up upon him.*” The first object he saw was a Christian brother, the

messenger to him of mercy from the Lord. All these features imply a history of real events, with a real apology before a Jewish audience.

No. IX.

Acts 11:12,13. "And the Spirit bade me go with them, nothing doubting. Moreover these six brethren accompanied me, and we entered into the man's house: and he showed us how he had seen an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter."

The report given by Peter, and the direct narrative of the historian, are almost verbal copies of each other, only that the apostle confines himself to that order in which the circumstances disclosed themselves to him. Hence he begins with his own vision, and mentions that of Cornelius, only as reported by Cornelius himself. Yet here we have two or three circumstances added, which bespeak the reality of his vindication. He mentions the number of his companions, and alludes to them as present, to confirm his statement. It was equally natural that he should call them "these six brethren," when they were by his side, as that the history should speak of them more generally as "certain brethren from Joppa," or "they of the circumcision, as many as were with Peter."

The presence of these six brethren is an equally natural circumstance. They had just witnessed an event which filled them with wonder, so foreign was it from their own expectations. They must have known what mingled curiosity and suspicion it would excite among the whole Jewish church at Jerusalem. How probable, and almost inevitable, that they would accompany Peter, to confirm his statements by their own testimony! And hence the words, "Moreover these six brethren accompanied me," form one of those minute touches, which distinguish the statements of a contemporary from those of a remote historian.

One further coincidence may be traced in the words of Peter, which is lost in our version. "He showed us how he had seen the angel, *etc.*" Why is the article prefixed? That the reason is not at all self-evident appears from the fact, that our translators have passed it by as unmeaning. Yet a little reflection will explain it. When Peter came to Jerusalem, the rumour of what had occurred had reached the church, and gave rise to their expostulation with him. However vague and general the account, it would be sure to make mention of that angelic vision to Cornelius, which had been spoken of before a large company, and which the six brethren had probably made known before the discussion occurred. Hence St. Peter would naturally allude to it as a fact which they had learned already. "And he showed us how he had seen the angel in his house." This is another of those minute touches of reality which mark authentic history.

No. X.

Acts 13:1. "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, the foster brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul."

This mention of one Lucius of Cyrene, among the foremost teachers at Antioch, completes a chain of notices which agree remarkably together.

Among the multitude of foreign Jews on the day of Pentecost, who marvelled at the gift of tongues, and who probably furnished most of the three thousand converts, we have express mention of those who came “from the parts of Lybia about *Cyrene*.”

When the seven deacons were appointed, and Stephen wrought great wonders among the people, among the foremost of his adversaries were they of the synagogue of the Libertines, and *Cyrenians*, and Alexandrians. It is very likely that on both of these occasions there would be not a few converts from among the Jews of Cyrene.

On the dispersion, again, which followed the death of Stephen, we are told that some travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching to Jews only. “And some of them were men of Cyprus and *Cyrene*, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus.”

Now since it appears that Cyrenian teachers took a main part in founding the church of Antioch, it is quite natural and consistent that, even in this short list, we should find one “Lucius of Cyrene.” It is also possible that the Roman surname of Simeon “that was called *Niger*” (or *black*) may be explained by the supposition that he also was a Cyrenian or African Jew. If not, we may suppose him to represent the teachers of Cyprus, as Lucius was the most distinguished of those from Cyrene.

No. XI.

Acts 13:8, 9. “But Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith. Then Saul, (who also is called Paul,) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him.”

The repeated mention of a double name, in the case of the sorcerer and the apostle, suggests another mark of real history, which extends through the whole work. This consists in the agreement of the names and surnames with the probable circumstances in almost every instance.

The native language of Palestine was the Syriac, or that modified form of Hebrew which prevailed after the return from Babylon. Yet many causes had induced an extensive prevalence of the Greek tongue,—the rule of a Grecian dynasty, for three centuries, in Syria and Egypt, the erection of many Greek cities, the systematic policy of Herod the Great and his sons, and the necessities of commerce, since Greek was the constant medium of commercial and literary intercourse. More recently, Judæa had become a Roman province. A Roman army was constantly resident among them, and multitudes of Roman Jews resorted to the annual feasts. Hence the three languages were more or less mixed together, Greek and Syriac struggling for the mastery, with a considerable infusion of Latin words and phrases also.

The effect of this state of things in Palestine will be naturally seen in the proper names. Names, which are strictly such, are usually left untranslated, but when they are significant surnames, it is natural to translate them into the most familiar language. Also some names are usual in one country and others in another. With these prefatory remarks, let us now consider the names that meet us in the history.

First, the names of the apostles are all Jewish, with two exceptions. But Peter, we know otherwise, is only a surname, answering to the Syriac, *Cephas*, while his proper name, Simon, was Jewish. Philip is the only purely Greek name; and this is easily explained, since Philip the tetrarch had been ruler of the district nearest to Galilee, from the time of our Lord's birth. It was always usual for parents to name their children after the rulers of their own day.

Next, one of the two candidates for the apostleship was "Joseph, called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus." The two names are both Jewish; but the surname is Roman, and is retained, like the two Hebrew names, in the Greek history. It might possibly be given him by the Romans in Judæa for his integrity, and hence applied to him by others as an untranslated surname.

The names in the assembly of Jewish priests are, Annas and Caiaphas, John and Alexander. Three of these are Jewish, the last is purely Greek. It is, however, well known that it had been a frequent name among the Jewish rulers. A king Alexander, and a queen Alexandra, had governed them before Hyrcanus, and one of the sons of Herod, a favourite with the people, had the same name.

Again, Joses was surnamed Barnabas by the apostles. It was a name of honour, given him at Jerusalem, where Hebrew prevailed; and hence the historian expounds its meaning—the son of consolation. Ananias and Sapphira are both of them Hebrew names also, and the first of them occurs three times, once here, once as the name of a disciple at Damascus, and again as the name of the Jewish high priest.

Two centurions only are named in the history, and both of the names are eminently Roman. Cornelius was the name of a Roman family, and Julius had become doubly common from the reputation of Julius Cæsar. The names of the two companies are equally appropriate, the *Italian*, from the country, and the *August*, from the title of the emperor.

The disciple at Joppa was named Tabitha, by interpretation, Dorcas. The historian speaks of her under the latter name, but makes Peter address her under the former. The mixture and conflict of the native or colloquial, and the literary language, could scarcely be shown in a more expressive way.

We have next the mention of "John, whose surname was Mark." The name is Jewish, the surname Roman. Now from the Gospel of Mark it is plain that this evangelist had to do afterwards with the Latin Christians. It is quite possible that his mother, the sister of Barnabas, was married to one of the *ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι*, or Roman Jews dwelling at Jerusalem, who are mentioned earlier in the history. In this case he would naturally have a Hebrew name and a Roman surname; while in his missionary labours, the latter name, being much more distinctive, would supersede the former.

The apostle himself was the child of a zealous Jew, and was also by birth a Roman citizen (23:6, 22:28). Accordingly the history tells us that he had two names, one of a Jewish king, and the other of a Roman family, as the Conqueror Paullus Æmilius, and the Roman deputy, Sergius Paulus, may prove. There is thus an indirect coincidence between his double character and the double name which he bore. It is in exact agreement with these remarks, that he begins to assume his Roman, in preference to

his Jewish name, at the opening of his first missionary circuit among the Gentiles. For the change is evidently not from the mere choice of the historian, but a real fact in the history. It appears in the wording of the apostolic decree, and in the language of the Jewish exorcists and Gentile craftsmen at Ephesus.

We have next the names of the two prophets, Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas. The former has a Jewish name and surname, each of them found elsewhere, in Joseph Barsabas, called Justus, and in Judas the brother of James. The other is probably Roman, and a contraction of Silvanus, which is evidently a Roman name. Accordingly, we find that Judas returns to Jerusalem, as if his calling were rather the gospel of the circumcision; while Silas remains at Antioch, and is chosen by Paul as the fittest companion on his mission to the Gentiles. It is a coincidence still more striking, that Silas, who has a Roman name, proves to be really a Roman citizen (16:37, 38). “They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans.....And the Serjeants told these words unto the magistrates; and they feared, when they heard that they were Romans.”

Again, Timothy, the son of a Greek father, had a purely Greek name; yet one which is naturally indicative of the faith of his Jewish mother. Lydia, a Greek from Thyatira, has a Greek name, borrowed from the neighbouring province. The names of Dionysius and Damaris are equally in keeping with their country. Those of Aquila and Priscilla are apparently Roman, and though Pontus was his birthplace, it is very possible that, during a long residence at Rome, these names of Latin origin had superseded any other. The names of Paul’s companions are equally in harmony with their origin. They are all Greek, except Secundus and Gaius, which are Roman names. Yet Sopater and Aristarchus were Jews, as we learn from the epistles, but Jews of the dispersion, from Thessalonica and Berea.

We have another agreement in the case of the chief captain, Lysias. We are told that he was not a Roman citizen by birth, but obtained that freedom at a great cost. Accordingly, his name, Lysias, is thoroughly Greek, though his prenomen, Claudius, is Roman. From first to last the harmony is unobtrusive, and still complete. The character of the names agrees perfectly with the history of the persons to whom they belong.

No. XII.

Acts 16:12. “And from thence we came to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony.”

Here a fact is mentioned, in passing, which appears in no other historian, and yet is confirmed by the evidence of coins, that Philippi was a Roman colony. Now let us observe how the same truth comes out in the subsequent narrative. After the dispossession of the damsel, who had a spirit of divination, we read as follows:—

“And when her masters saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market place, unto the rulers, and brought them to the magistrates, saying, These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, *being Romans*”

It is this appeal to their pride, as Romans, which seems to excite the violence of the multitude, and hurry the magistrates on to acts really unlawful. "And the multitude rose up together against them: and the magistrates rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them." Thus the whole account really hinges on the brief notice above, that Philippi was "a colony." Nor is the force of the coincidence much affected, if we suppose that the mention of this fact is prospective, and not incidental. Though not undesigned, it will equally have clear marks of reality. There is so much said as may be consistent with a design to explain the tumult, but not so much as to be consistent with any fraudulent purpose. For the whole is contained in three words, and the allusion is as brief and transient as it was possible to be.

No. XIII.

There is a remarkable unity of statement, in various passages, with regard to the high reverence paid to the character of a Roman citizen. This is a harmony without possibility of being the result of design, since it is so thoroughly unwrought into the texture of the history.

The first instance occurs at Philippi, after the tumult mentioned above. It will be desirable to give the whole context.

Acts 16:35-39. "And when it was day, the magistrates sent the serjeants, saying, Let those men go. And the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul, The magistrates have sent to let you go: now therefore depart, and go in peace. But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out. And the Serjeants told these words unto the magistrates; and they feared, when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought them out, and desired them to depart out of the city."

Many chapters, and several years intervene, before the subject is introduced again. When Paul was brought before Gallio at Corinth, the cause was dismissed, before any question of citizenship could arise. But on his last return to Jerusalem, and after his defence before the people, the narrative continues.

"And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard *that*, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest; for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born. Then straightway they departed from him which should have tortured him; and the chief captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him."

The coincidence between these two narratives is striking, and still it is evidently undesigned. The fact related is essential, in each case, to the sequence of the history. On the former occasion, it explains the departure from Philippi, and here, the renewed examination before the Jewish council. There is a further harmony, even in the

features of contrast. At Philippi, the magistrates had proceeded to the utmost reach of injustice, without suffering the apostles to raise their voice against it. Hence the indignant tone of the apostle, "Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out." In the present instance, the chief captain was not only ignorant that Paul was a Roman citizen, but had reason to suspect, from the fury of the Jews against him, that he must have been guilty of some notorious crime. Hence that inquiry just before: "Art not thou that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and led out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?" This explains the modest expostulation, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?"

Nor is this the whole of the coincidence. We have seen that the chief captain is represented to have been seriously alarmed, when he learned that he had bound a Roman citizen. How does he extricate himself from the danger which his rashness had brought upon him? First, by a scrupulous and even zealous care to protect him from violence; and next, by making a merit of his conduct on this very ground. When the dissension arose in the council, "the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down, and to take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle." When he learns of the conspiracy, he sends no less than four hundred and seventy soldiers for his escort to Antipatris. The words of his letter reveal the motive of his conduct, to wipe away the memory of his fault, in binding a Roman citizen, by double zeal in behalf of his privileges.

"Claudius Lysias unto the most excellent governor Felix, greeting. This man was taken of the Jews, and should have been killed of them: then came I with an army, and rescued him, having understood that he was a Roman."

Hence he not only conceals the binding of Paul, and the command to scourge him; but by a politic anachronism, represents the rescue at the first to have been the effect of his own zeal, in vindicating the safety and honour of a Roman citizen. This is just what we might expect under the circumstances, from a clever worldling, who had more regard for the favour of his superiors than for truth. Yet it furnishes an indirect testimony to the dignity of the Roman citizen, more striking, perhaps, than even the two former, while the harmony of all the three passages is complete.

No. XIV.

Acts 21:10. "And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judæa a certain prophet named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles."

The same prophet, Agabus, previous to St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, had come down to Antioch, and there announced the approaching famine. It is in both cases a similar gift which is ascribed to him, and exercised under similar circumstances, to warn of coming trials. But the passage is here quoted, not for this agreement, which deserves a passing notice, but for a difficulty which has to be removed, and which turns on examination into a minute coincidence. If the apostle hurried past Ephesus,

because he was anxious to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost, how are we to account for his tarrying at Cæsarea many days?

Our first step towards solving this doubt consists in a more exact version. The word used is not many (*πολλας*), but a *good many*, *several*, or *more than usual* (*πλειους*). There is a tacit comparison with their stay at other places on their journey, of which several were only of one day, and the two longest of seven days, at Troas and Tyre. Hence an interval of ten to fourteen days would fully satisfy the statement.

Next, we may infer, from the various details of the narrative, that such must really have been the length of their stay at Cæsarea. They sailed from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, were five days on their voyage, and tarried seven days at Troas, of which the last was the Lord's day. Hence the first day of unleavened bread would be Thursday, and eighteen days expire with their departure from Troas. We have one day's voyage to Mitylene, a second to Chios, a third to Trogyllium, and a fourth to Miletus, in all twenty-two days. We may allow two clear days for the delay at Miletus, the voyage being resumed immediately after the parting interview. Three days brought them to Patara, making a total of twenty-seven days. Four days, since the wind seems to have been favourable, would bring them to Tyre, where they tarried seven days. One day was spent on the voyage from Tyre, and at Ptolemais, and another in reaching Cæsarea, a total of thirty-nine days. Hence there would be thirteen days left, inclusive of both extremes, till the day of Pentecost. Now it is plain that the apostle waited at Cæsarea, that he might go up to Jerusalem on the eve of the feast-day; so that the expression of St. Luke is perfectly accurate, and the whole narrative thoroughly consistent. And since there is no further allusion to the circumstance, that the design of reaching Jerusalem by the Pentecost was attained, the whole is a clear example of undesigned coincidence.

No. XV.

Acts 21:29. "For they had before seen with him in the city Trophimus an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the temple."

There are several circumstances in this whole account, which agree remarkably with each other, and with the previous history. And first, we were told previously, that "of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus" accompanied the apostle on his journey. It is consistent that "Trophimus the Ephesian" was seen with him at Jerusalem. But how came he to be at once recognised as a Gentile? We are told that it was "the Jews which were of Asia," or from Ephesus and its neighbourhood, who raised the outcry. But why should these Jews be more forward than any other, in raising a tumult against the apostle? In the first place, the Jews of this district were not the most backward in opposing the gospel, even in the time of Stephen, but are mentioned distinctly among his adversaries. And, what is more important, Ephesus was the latest scene of Paul's continued residence. He had stayed nowhere so long, and nowhere had encountered such furious opposition. Hence it is very natural that Jews from Asia should be the ringleaders in exciting a tumult against him; that they should recognise Trophimus, who came from their own city, and know him to be a Gentile; and that their hasty passion should infer that Paul had brought this Gentile stranger into the temple. His intercourse with such Gentiles was itself an infraction of Jewish habits and prejudices, which Peter only surmounted after a double vision; and hence they would readily

infer the commission of a similar offence, by the introduction of Trophimus into the temple.

No. XVI.

There is something strange, at first sight, in the conduct of Gamaliel, Acts 5:33-40. The whole Jewish council seem on the point of adopting extreme measures against the apostles, and their death is almost determined upon, when this eminent teacher of the law interferes. It was at his feet that Saul was trained up (22:3), and imbibed his fierce zeal against the infant church. And yet Gamaliel is the very party who mitigates the decision, interposes prudential reasons, nay, even seems to intimate a possibility of truth in the apostle's message. "But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

Let us now compare the account of Paul's trial, and see whether it will not help to explain the mystery.

Acts 23:6-9. "But when Paul perceived that one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees: and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God."

We see here how strong was the jealousy of these two parties, and how rooted their antipathy, where their respective opinions were concerned. The Pharisees are turned, for the moment, from fierce persecutors into zealous advocates of the apostle, when his words give them a fair opening for maintaining their creed against the heterodoxy of the Sadducees. They are willing to suppose that he has really had a vision from a spirit or angel, and that their rivals might be fighting against God through their own incredulity. The whole is an extreme instance of the jealousy between them, since both had been forward in the persecution, till this watchword of strife was given.

Let us now return to the former passage, and see whether the conduct of Gamaliel is not explained by this later occurrence. And first, the leaders in the persecution were Sadducees. "Then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him, (which is the sect of the Sadducees,) and were filled with indignation, and laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison." In the next place, it was a doctrinal offence which was charged upon them. "Ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine." Again, the answer of Peter, while an explicit testimony to the claims of Jesus, is an equally plain avowal of the doctrine of the resurrection. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus." When Gamaliel interposes, it is noted that he was "a Pharisee, a doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people." He might probably fear lest the Sadducees, under the cover of their zeal against the apostles, were securing a triumph for their party, and aiming a covert blow at the orthodox creed of the Pharisees. Hence, while he would not shield the apostle entirely, he would interpose the whole weight of his authority, and that of his followers, to hinder a Sadducean high priest from crushing these irregular, but powerful advocates, of the doctrine of a

resurrection. "And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God" It is difficult, when the two passages are compared, to resist the natural conclusion, that such were the motives of Gamaliel; and the two occurrences thus present a striking specimen of unobtrusive coincidence.

No. XVII.

There is a remarkable consistency in the statements, not only respecting the deep jealousy of the two Jewish parties, but the conduct and spirit of the Roman governors.

First, we have three independent examples of their contempt and indifference for these Jewish parties, with their doctrinal disputes.

Acts 18:12-17. "And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment-seat, saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law. And when Paul was now about to open his mouth, Gallio said unto the Jews, If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you: but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters. And he drave them from the judgment-seat. Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment-seat. And Gallio cared for none of these things."

Acts 23:26-29. "Claudius Lysias unto the most excellent governor Felix, greeting. This man was taken by the Jews, and should have been killed by them: then came I with the army, and rescued him, having understood that he was a Roman. And when I would have known the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him forth into their council: whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds."

Acts 25:18-20, in the words of Festus to Agrippa, "Against whom when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And because I doubted of such manner of questions, I asked whether he would go to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these matters."

The same indifference or contempt is conspicuous in Gallio, in Lysias, and in Festus, when they allude to these questions of the Jewish law, or superstition.

Another feature, equally natural and consistent, is the anxiety of the Jewish governors to secure the favour of the Jews, and the indifference of those in other places. We have seen that Gallio drove them contemptuously from the judgment-seat. The zeal of the magistrates at Philippi was for the multitude, as Romans, against Jewish disturbers, as the apostles were described to be. When the Jews are the accusers at Thessalonica, though the charge of treason against Cæsar compels the rulers to act against their will, they are satisfied with Jason's security, since they evidently suspect that it is a Jewish quarrel, and nothing more. At Ephesus, the popular clamour is against the Jews, as well as the apostle, and the courtesy of the town-clerk is reserved

for a Gentile tumult.

But in Judæa the case is different. With all their contempt for these Jewish questions, the governors are forward to seek the favour of the Jews themselves. "After two years Porcius Festus came into Felix' room; and Felix, willing to show the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound." The same spirit animates his successor. "But Festus, willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me?"

It is evident that all these are so many signs of reality and historical truth.

No. XVIII.

Acts 24:23. "And he commanded *the centurion* to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister or come unto him."

What centurion can be alluded to in this definite manner? A close attention to the history will explain it. When Lysias sent Paul with an escort to Cæsarea, "he called onto him two centurions," who were to take two hundred soldiers, and horsemen threescore and ten, and two hundred spearmen. On the morrow, the horsemen went forward from Antipatris to Cæsarea, and the infantry returned to Jerusalem. It is natural to suppose that two centurions were employed, in order that one might take charge of each party after the separation. When the horsemen arrived, they were ordered to keep their prisoner in Herod's prætorium. Hence the mention of *the centurion* is explained. It is doubtless the same who took charge of the horsemen, while the other returned with the foot soldiers to Jerusalem. Yet how indirect is the allusion, so delicate that it is entirely lost in the usual version!

Again, since the character of Felix is notorious in general history for his rapacity, whence this unusual gentleness, in suffering the acquaintance of Paul to come to him? We are told, soon after, that "he hoped money would have been given him by Paul, to have loosed him." If a ransom was to be found, the free admission of his friends was almost necessary. But why should Felix expect a large ransom from a prisoner whose personal habits, we may be sure, gave no particular signs of wealth? Perhaps the key may be found in the statement of Paul, shortly before. "Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings." And besides, since Felix had "a more perfect knowledge of that way," he was doubtless aware of the strong attachment which the Christians felt for each other. These notices, though they occur near together, have no trace of intentional accommodation.

No. XIX.

The last chapters of the history have lately been placed in a clear light in Mr. Smith's valuable work, the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, and the fidelity of the whole narrative established, by an appeal to the geography of the Levant, the usual course of the winds, the descriptions of ancient ships, and the laws of seamanship and navigation. Yet even without this convincing appeal to foreign sources of information, the narrative contains several internal marks of truth.

First, we are told that they sailed under Cyprus, that is, on its lee side, the winds being contrary. In their former voyage, from Patara to Jerusalem, when the wind was favourable, they passed the island on their left, or sailed by its western extremity. Since the wind now compelled them to leave their direct course, they must consequently have sailed by its eastern side. Now this is confirmed by the next verses, when strictly rendered, that they sailed *through* the sea *along* Cilicia and Pamphylia. This coincidence, though based on two successive verses, is worthy of notice; since learned commentators have mistaken the route, perhaps from neglecting to compare the former voyage; while the inference from ver. 5 is almost lost in the common version. So, delicate and evanescent, in some cases, are the tests of truth.

Again we read (ver. 6) that the centurion “found a ship of Alexandria, sailing into Italy,” and put them therein. When they had reached the Fair Havens, St. Paul told them that there would be loss “not only of the *lading* (or *cargo*) and ship, but also of their lives.” After the vision which reversed this threatening, as far as their lives were concerned, we are told (ver. 38) that “when they had eaten enough, they lightened the ship, and cast out the wheat into the sea.”

“The ship,” as professor Blunt observes, was evidently a merchant ship, for mention is made of its lading. The nature of its lading, however, is not directly stated. It was capable of receiving Julius and his company, and bound to the right place for them. This was enough, and all that St. Luke cares to tell. Yet in ver. 38 we find by the merest chance of what its cargo consisted. The tackling was thrown overboard in the early part of the storm; but the freight was, naturally enough, kept till it could be kept no longer, and then we discover, for the first time, that it was wheat. The *wheat* was cast into the sea.

“Now it is a notorious fact that Rome was in a great measure supplied with corn from Alexandria, that in times of scarcity the arrival of the vessels was watched with intense anxiety, that they were of a size not (greatly?) inferior to our line-of-battle ships, a thing by no means usual in the vessels of that day; and hence that such a one might well accommodate the centurion and his numerous party, in addition to its own crew and lading.”

No. XX.

Acts 11:26 “And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.”

Ch. 26:27, 28. “King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.”

1 Pet 4:16. “Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf!”

These are the only three places in the New Testament where the name, Christian, occurs. It is plain that for a long time there was no commonly recognised term of this kind. Hence they are called variously, “they that believed” (2:44), “the disciples” (6:1), “the disciples of the Lord” (9:1), “those of the way” (9:2), “the way of God” (18:26), or simply, “the way” (19:9). Again, the name of Nazarenes was applied to them by the Jews, as a term of reproach, but plainly arose before the extension of the

faith to the Gentiles. It was at Antioch that the large accession of Gentiles first made it impossible to look upon them merely as a Jewish sect, and required the use of some more distinctive title. It was natural, therefore, that the use of such a title should first prevail at Antioch. When the book was written, towards the close of Paul's imprisonment at Rome, the formation of churches in the chief cities of almost every province would awaken inquiry as to the origin of this new name, that was already in every one's mouth. How suitable, then, would be this passing remark of the historian, to show when and where it began to be current.

Again, from the circumstances which gave rise to this new name, it would clearly be in use among the Gentiles, while Christians themselves would usually prefer the names endeared to them by earlier use—the brethren, the disciples of the Lord, believers, the household of faith; and the Jews would cling to their old nick-name, the Nazarenes. Now, in agreement with this view, the name only occurs once again in the history, in the mouth of Agrippa, who was rather a Gentile than a Jew in all his habits of thought, and in the presence of Festus and a Gentile audience. It is found once only in all the epistles, where St. Peter speaks of the persecution to which believers were exposed from the heathen around them. “Yet let none of you suffer as an evil-doer. . . . Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed.” All this exhibits the consistency of truth, in the minute circumstances connected with the early adoption of this ever-memorable name.

No. XXI.

Acts 12:17. “But he, beckoning unto them with the hand to hold their peace, declared unto them how the Lord had brought him out of the prison. And he said, Go show these things unto James, and to the brethren. And he departed, and went into another place.”

Ch. 21:17, 18. “And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly. And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present.”

In the list of the apostles (Acts 1:13), James, the son of Zebedee, holds the second place, but the son of Alphaeus, the ninth only. Yet after the death of the elder James, and apparently even before, we find James the Less to have a local priority in the church of Jerusalem. Here Peter mentions him in distinction from the whole church, and is silent respecting the other apostles, though it is clear that Paul and Barnabas, at least, were present at the time. In the second passage, the fact is still more evident. It seems implied in the narrative of the council, where this apostle pronounces the final judgment. For this promotion no reason is given in the history, and even no allusion to the time and manner of its occurrence; although the fact is confirmed by a double statement.

Now if we turn to the Epistle to the Galatians, we meet an independent confirmation of the fact, and a possible reason, why this apostle received such a distinction.

Gal. 2:11, 12. “But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For *before that certain came from James*, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself,

fearing them which were of the circumcision.”

It is here plain that, just as in the history, “We went in unto James,” denotes their public interview with the church at Jerusalem, so here “to come from James,” means to come from the same parent church at Jerusalem. The correspondence is more striking from the contrast in the two passages.

Again, we have a reason for the distinction, which is not stated in the book of Acts, in these words of St. Paul (Gal. 1:19), “But other of the apostles saw I none, save James *the Lord’s brother*.”

No. XXII.

Acts 4:36, 37. “And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation,) a Levite of the country of Cyprus; having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles’ feet.”

This fact is singled out by the historian, as conspicuous among many instances of self-denying liberality. Barnabas, like a true Levite, though he was the owner of landed property, parted with all for the cause of Christ. No further notice of the fact occurs in the narrative, where he is afterwards commended for other excellences, but not for his generosity.

In the latest mention of him, however, in the epistles, the same feature appears once more. In 1 Cor. 9:1-7, St. Paul writes as follows: “Or I only and Barnabas, have we not power to forbear working?” Thus, after twenty years and more, we have a parting glimpse of this eminent servant of Christ, and he is still conspicuous for the same excellent grace of generosity, which marked him from the beginning. He appears, first, as a signal pattern of self-sacrifice, in parting with his landed possessions for Christ: and the last mention of him shows that, like St. Paul himself, he alone forbore his just claim to be supported by his converts, and chose rather to “labour, working with his own hands.” This is a harmony, plainly undesigned, a unity of moral character, which speaks not only to the judgment, but to the heart.

No. XXIII.

Acts 15:37, 38. “And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other.”

The history here records a temporary distrust and rejection of Mark, on the part of the apostle. No account is afterwards given of their reconciliation. Yet we find, from Philem. 23, 24, that Mark then held a high place among the apostle’s fellow-labourers at Rome. “There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus; Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellowlabourers.” And again, in 2 Tim. 4:11, we have still clearer proof of the high esteem in which he was held by St. Paul, just before his death. “Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.”

How, then, shall we reconcile this seeming discrepancy? Let us turn to Col. 4:10, and we shall see that a previous reconciliation had occurred, and that the apostle had formally notified his esteem for the evangelist to some of the Asiatic churches. "Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you; and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas, (*touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him.*")

Here we have a very clear, though indirect coincidence, For the epistles make no mention of the dispute with Barnabas, or of the circumstances which made such a special charge necessary; while the history is silent about the relation of Mark to Barnabas, his reconciliation to the apostle, or any charge respecting him to the eastern churches.

No. XXIV.

Acts 15:40. "And Paul chose Silas, and departed, being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God."

An able and ingenious writer* has lately started the hypothesis that Silas and Luke are only two names of the same person. This opinion must be sifted, before the force of the present and the following coincidence can be fully perceived.

The reasons urged are these. There is nothing to warrant the supposition that a new companion joined St. Paul at Troas. The resolve to go into Macedonia bears a relation to the previous purpose, to visit Bithynia, and must be understood of the same parties. And besides, if the writer first joined the apostle at Troas, this would not warrant him in speaking of himself as Divinely called to preach the gospel. The only persons to whom this could apply were Paul and Silas, who had been specially recommended by the brethren to the grace of God for that very work. Accordingly, in the epistles to Macedonia, only Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus are joined in the salutation; while the writer of the history would not have been omitted, if really a different person. Silas parted from St Paul at Berea, and during the interval, till he rejoined at Corinth, the first person is not used. Leaving him at Corinth, Paul went to Jerusalem, and did not rejoin him till his next visit to Corinth, whence they proceeded to Philippi, and embarked for Troas. The resemblance of the names is urged also, Silas or Silvanus, from *silva*, a wood; and Lucas or Lucanus, from *lucus*, a grove; being of the same meaning and formation.

The following remarks appear, very decisively, to disprove this novel theory:—

First, the writer describes himself to have been the constant companion of the apostle throughout the nine latest chapters of the history; yet the name, Silas, never once appears, and he indicates his presence only by using the first instead of the third person. We may safely infer, by every rule of natural induction, that he follows the same practice in the earlier chapters.

Next, the two proofs of identity alleged above are both of them nugatory and deceptive. A Divine call to accompany Paul and Silas might be given in many ways,

* Lit. Hist. New Test.

though the writer, observing his usual modesty, has not paused to acquaint us with the details. He might have come from Antioch, by a special intimation of the Spirit, to join them on their leaving Galatia, or he might have been already at Troas, and the apostle have been directed to take him for a companion, as he had done before with Timothy. Again, the absence of his name in the two letters to Thessalonica is no proof whatever of his identity with Silas, since the history, by its use of the pronoun, implies clearly that he stayed at Philippi. How then could his name appear in the superscription to the Thessalonians?

Thirdly, on this hypothesis, Luke or Silas was at Corinth when both letters to that church were written, and during the whole stay of Apollos. But this is refuted by the entire silence of both letters on the subject, and the absence of any allusion, however slight, to these long continued labours among them, apart from the apostle. His name is introduced once only as a companion of St. Paul in his first visit. This fact is a clear proof that Silas did not remain at Corinth, as the hypothesis requires.

But there is another reason equally decisive. Silas or Silvanus having taken part with St. Paul from the first in preaching the gospel is joined with him in the superscription, and naturally takes precedence of Timothy. This occurs in three places, wherever Silas is mentioned in the epistles, 1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2 Thessalonians 1:1; 2 Cor. 1:19. But whenever Luke is named in the epistles, though Timothy is twice named in the superscription of the same letters, the name of the evangelist appears only in the salutations at the close. No contrast could more plainly denote the entire distinctness of these two persons whom it has been sought, hastily and unwisely, to confound together. And indeed the use of two names, so entirely distinct, for the same person, in compositions so exactly similar as the letters are to each other, is of itself highly improbable. It would turn the passages into an enigma of the most useless and perplexing kind. That Luke, then, is a different person from Silas or Silvanus, as it has been the constant opinion of the church, may also be viewed as capable of a strict internal demonstration.

No. XXV.

Acts 16:10. "And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the gospel unto them."

Here the writer of the history, by the change of persons, first indicates his own presence as a companion of the apostle. It is well known that this book of Acts, as well as the third Gospel, are ascribed to St. Luke by the universal tradition of the church; but it seems never to have been shown that the same conclusion may be reached, simply and rigidly, by the internal evidence alone. If this can be done, it may fairly be reckoned among the most curious examples of undesigned coincidence.

The writer then, so far as we can learn from the history, was present with the apostle from Troas to Philippi in his first visit to Europe; was absent from him, or not distinctly present, after his departure from Philippi, during his double stay at Corinth and Ephesus; and having joined him at Philippi, again continued his companion during his voyage from Greece to Palestine, his imprisonment at Cæsarea, his second voyage, and at least the earlier part of his imprisonment at Rome.

None of St. Paul's letters, we have seen already, were written until his arrival at Corinth, when the first separation had taken place. Six of them, the first and second to Thessalonica, the Epistle to the Galatians, the first and second to Corinth, and the Epistle to the Romans, were written during the interval of the writer's apparent absence. His name could not then be expected to occur in these letters among the friends who were present with St. Paul, and who joined in the salutations.

Four other letters, to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians were written during the first imprisonment at Rome. Now since the writer had been a companion of the apostle for three whole years before that imprisonment, had attended him on the voyage with only one or two others, and had continued with him till his arrival at Rome, it is most improbable that he would leave him at once, and not cheer him by his presence and friendship, as in the previous long delay at Cæsarea. In these letters, therefore, if the helpers present with St. Paul are at all mentioned, his name will be likely to appear. And since he had been so intimate a companion, and attended him faithfully so long, it seems almost certain that the apostle, if he specified his chief helpers and friends who were with him, could not omit one so conspicuous. The writer, we may thus infer, was either Tychicus, Timothy, Epaphroditus, Epaphras, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, Luke, or Demas, the only persons whose names appear in the salutations of these four letters.

But this choice is soon reduced within narrower limits. Timothy, Tychicus, and Aristarchus could none of them be the writer, since they accompanied Paul and himself on the voyage from Greece (Acts 20:4, 5). Onesimus is excluded, since he was converted by St. Paul during his imprisonment at Rome (Philem. 10). Mark is also excluded, since he is mentioned repeatedly in the history, and was rejected by St. Paul as a companion in that very journey, in which the writer soon afterwards joined him. Epaphroditus clearly was not with the apostle when the imprisonment began, but was sent to him from Philippi when they heard tidings of his necessities. Epaphras appears to have been a local pastor from Colosse, who arrived also at Rome after the imprisonment there had begun. Thus Jesus Justus, Luke, and Demas are the only three names which are not absolutely excluded by these texts.

That Jesus Justus was not the writer may be gathered from two presumptions of considerable weight. First, he was of the circumcision, or a Jew by birth; while several indications in the book of Acts lead us to suppose that the writer was a Greek, and only a proselyte, rather than a native Jew. The title, barbarians, applied to the people of Miletus, is one token of the fact, and there seem to be others. And next, Jesus Justus is named only once, while the two others are mentioned three times in these epistles. Now the companion of the apostle for so many years, and through so many dangers, would not be likely to be left thus entirely in the background, compared with others.

The choice will now be confined to Luke and Demas, each of whom is mentioned three times, and always near together. In the last instance, however, there occurs a remarkable contrast. In his second imprisonment, as we learn from 2 Tim. 4:10, 11, Demas forsook the apostle through love of the world, and only Luke continued with him, while every other helper was absent. It would be a high degree of moral incongruity to suppose that this apostate, whether his apostasy were temporary or final,

and not the companion who was faithful to the last, was the same with the faithful companion during shipwreck and imprisonment, and the honoured writer of two main books of the sacred canon. And thus, by internal evidence alone, we are led to the conclusion that Luke, and no other, was the real author of the Gospel and the book of Acts. The circumstantial evidence limits our choice to three names, while the moral evidence, hardly less forcible, confines it among these to St. Luke only.

Nothing can be more indirect and circuitous than this train of reasoning. The coincidence of the result thus obtained, with the unbroken testimony of external tradition, is a proof of reality of the most complete and unsuspecting kind. Like the agreement between the independent determinations of the velocity of light from phenomena totally distinct, the eclipses of Jupiter's satellites, and sidereal aberration, it forms the most convincing evidence, that the tradition is accurate, and the letters and the history alike genuine.

BOOK III.

THE APPLICATION TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

Introduction.

THE extension of the argument from undesigned coincidence to the four gospels is attended with some difficulty, arising from their peculiar character. When a history is compared with a series of letters, or with another narrative, widely different in its general outline, the points of agreement will usually speak for themselves, and often exclude all suspicion of being the result of design. In the present instance, however, we have four narratives, very similar in plan and purpose, which relate the same biography, and to a great extent record the same incidents, and were probably written by persons mutually acquainted, at no very great interval of time. Hence it becomes more difficult, where they coincide, to prove that the coincidence is spontaneous, and where they seem to differ, that the diversity is not a real contradiction. If they agree closely, they may be charged with merely copying one another; and if they diverge considerably, they are exposed to the opposite charge, that their statements are historically false, and mutually disproved. Indeed this has of late been the chosen battle-field of infidelity. It has been maintained that the gospels are late in their origin, and inconsistent in their testimony, and that they merely embody vague, floating ideas of the Messiah, which were prevalent in the early church, and are a series of mystical traditions rather than genuine histories. To unfold thoroughly the evidence which the gospels supply, in refutation of this wild and senseless theory, would require a distinct work, and an inquiry into many questions which have exercised critics and harmonists down to the present day. Meanwhile, apart from this deeper investigation, the argument in the *Horæ Paulinæ* admits, within narrower limits, of a useful and important application to the gospel history. For every part of the New Testament, of which the authenticity is clearly established, serves to reflect a part of its own evidence on all the rest. The epistles of St. Paul, and the Acts of the Apostles, will thus authenticate many leading events which are narrated in the gospels. There will also be found, on comparing the gospels among themselves, or with the rest of the New Testament, several coincidences like those in the letters of St. Paul, which are independent of questions fairly disputable, and are clear indications of their genuineness. The present book, therefore, will aim at establishing these three

propositions.

I. That the epistles of St. Paul, which are proved to be genuine by their internal evidence, authenticate many leading facts in the four gospels.

II. That the book of Acts, which is also proved to be an authentic narrative by the same argument, authenticates the same facts, with several others, also contained in the gospel narratives.

III. That while the main outline of the gospels is thus confirmed by the Acts and epistles, they exhibit, on comparison, many undesigned coincidences, which can arise only from their historical truth and reality.

One chapter will now be occupied with each of these propositions.

CHAPTER I.

THE TESTIMONY OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

THE letters of St. Paul, it results from the copious evidence already adduced, were actually addressed to the churches and individuals whose names they bear, between the apostle's entrance into Europe and the time of his death. The date of the earliest may be placed about twenty two, and that of the latest about thirty-six years after the crucifixion. And since their main object is to enforce the great facts, the doctrines, and the duties of Christianity, their testimony with regard to the facts of the gospel history must be of the highest importance. It is a pledge to us of the opinions which prevailed among many thousands of Christians, within thirty years from the close of our Lord's ministry. It will be convenient to present the testimony of these epistles in the order of time.

No. I.

The two epistles to the Thessalonians were written from Corinth, and probably about twenty-two years after the date of the crucifixion. We gain from them the following leading facts concerning the history of our Lord.

First, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead was undoubtedly believed by the apostle and the Christians of Thessalonica.

1 Thessalonians 1:9, 10. "For they themselves show of us what entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come."

The mention of the fact, as in a parenthesis, shows clearly with what unhesitating faith it was held by the writer, and the Christians to whom he wrote.

The same letter affirms, though indirectly as before, that the Lord Jesus had suffered a violent death by the malice of his own countrymen, the Jews.

1 Thessalonians 2:14,15. "For ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men."

The persecution and violent death of the Lord Jesus is here placed between two similar events; the persecution of the Jewish prophets, and the actual sufferings of the apostles, as equally historical and equally notorious.

Again, these two facts are brought together, as the common foundation of the hope of all Christians.

1 Thessalonians 4:13,14. "But I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

And again, 1 Thessalonians 5:9,10. "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."

We have thus a distinct and repeated testimony, alike to the death and resurrection of Jesus, in this earliest epistle, almost within twenty years from the time when they occurred.

No. II.

The Epistle to the Galatians was written, it seems most probable, about a year later than those to Thessalonica, or twenty-three years after the crucifixion. Its testimony is of great importance.

First, the apostle asserts, in the most solemn manner, that he had seen the Lord Jesus after the resurrection, that he was thus made a convert to the faith, and was commissioned to preach the gospel to the heathen.

Gal. 1:1. "Paul an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;) and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia."

Ver. 11, 12. "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

It is repeatedly affirmed, in the same letter, that our Lord's death was by crucifixion, and that this fact was one stumblingblock, which repelled many from receiving the gospel

Gal. 2:20. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God,

who loved me, and gave himself for me.”

Ch. 3:1. “O foolish Galatians . . . before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you!”

Ch. 3:13. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.”

Ch. 4:24. “They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.”

Ch. 5:11. “And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased.”

Ch. 6:12. “As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.”

Ch. 6:14. “But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

We are taught, further, that James, Cephas, and John were the names of three chief apostles, and that St. Paul had intercourse with the two former at Jerusalem, only three years after his conversion, or probably not more than ten years after the crucifixion, and that they all agreed in preaching the same gospel.

Gal. 1:18, 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. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not”

Ch. 2:9. “And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.”

It is further stated that our Lord was born of a human mother, while his pre-existence as the Son of God, is also evidently affirmed.

Gal. 4:4, 5. “But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law; to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.”

It is further implied that the apostle, in the exercise of his office, was known to have wrought miracles, and to have conferred miraculous gifts, among these churches of Galatia.

Gal. 3:2, 5. “This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? . . . He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?”

There seems no doubt that the above is the true version, and that the writer refers to

his own history while among them. The indirect nature of the assertion renders the testimony doubly important. In a series of condensed and earnest reasoning, the fact in question, that he had wrought miracles among them, is assumed as perfectly notorious, as well as the kindred fact, that they had received spiritual gifts at his hands.

The pre-existence of the Lord Jesus, his birth, his crucifixion, and his resurrection; the appointment of several apostles, including James, Cephas, and John; the miraculous appearance to St. Paul, his conversion, his intercourse with two of his brother apostles, and his exercise of miraculous powers, through the name of Jesus, are thus all attested within twenty-three or four years after the crucifixion occurred; and attested as matters of general notoriety among all Christians.

No. III.

The first Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus, and probably twenty-seven years from the time of our Lord's crucifixion. It yields a full and varied testimony to the great facts of the gospel history.

First, the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus is affirmed or implied in four or five places, and his death in several others; 1 Cor. 1:13, 17, 18, 23; 2:2, 8; 5:7; 8:11; 11:26; 15:3. But other particulars are also given, that he was betrayed to his enemies, and the same night instituted the Lord's supper, in virtue of which institution it was observed in all the churches.

1 Cor. 11:23. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. . . . For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

Again, we have here, within twenty-seven years from the resurrection, a very full statement of the evidence by which it was proved, with the important fact that several hundreds of the witnesses of it were still alive.

1 Cor. 15:3-8. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, 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 above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

Here St. Paul not only affirms that the resurrection of Jesus was the foundation of Christianity, that it was preached alike by all the apostles, and firmly believed by all Christians, but he also states the distinct appearances which proved its reality. He includes himself last in order, among its eye witnesses. He specifies five other distinct appearances of Christ after his resurrection, one of which is not mentioned in the gospels, and therefore proves that the accounts are independent and unborrowed. What is still more important, he affirms that, in the third of these five appearances,

more than five hundred witnesses were present, of whom the greater part were still actually alive. And this is in full agreement, after such an interval, with the natural result, as deduced from the best tables of mortality. Supposing the age of these witnesses to range from twenty to fifty years, three-fifths of the whole number would probably survive after twenty-seven years.

It may be inferred, from the same epistle, that our Lord's death took place at the time of the Jewish passover. Only on this view would the passage seem appropriate, in the ears of those who knew that the time of celebration was an essential part of the ordinance. "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast."

We are further taught, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, that St. Paul had seen the Lord after the resurrection, and had been commissioned by him to preach the gospel; and that Cephas and certain brethren of the Lord were included among the original apostles, with the further circumstance, that they were married men.

1 Cor. 9:1, 5. "Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye my work in the Lord? . . . Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?"

It is also clearly affirmed that the apostle had miraculous gifts, and that these were very frequent in the church of Corinth, and in other places.

1 Cor. 12:28. "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers; after that miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret? But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet show I unto you a more excellent way."

Ch. 14:18, 19. "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all. Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

Here the indirect manner in which these gifts are mentioned and the whole character of the context, becomes a clear sign and pledge of their actual reality.

No. IV.

The second Epistle to the Corinthians was written only a few months later than the first. The facts of the crucifixion and resurrection are affirmed, here also, with equal plainness.

2 Cor. 4:10. "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our body."

Ch. 5:15. "And he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

Ch. 13:4. "For though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power

of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him by the power of God towards you.”

The pre-existence of Christ in glory, with his actual poverty during his life on earth, are also evidently asserted in the same letter.

2 Cor. 8:9. “For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.”

The apostle also asserts plainly his own repeated experience of supernatural visions, and frequent exercise of miraculous powers.

2 Cor. 12:7. “And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.”

Ver. 12. “Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.”

No. V.

The Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth, a few months after the second letter had been addressed to that church, or within twenty-eight years from the crucifixion. The death of our Lord, though not the precise manner of his death, and his resurrection, are repeatedly asserted as before, Rom. 1:4; 3:25; 4:24, 25; 5:8; 6:4, 5, 8-11; 7:4; 8:3, 11, 32; 10:7, 9; 14:9, 15. In one place, however, it is plainly implied that his death was by crucifixion.

Rom. 6:6. “Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.”

It is further taught that our Lord was of Jewish descent, and of the race of David; that his life was one of great suffering, and of sinless obedience; and that he was specially sent to the Jewish nation, as an apostle or preacher of righteousness; and that he endured great reproach in the exercise of this Divine commission.

Rom. 9:5. “Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.”

Ch. 1:3,4. “Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by resurrection from the dead.”

Ch. 8:17. “If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.”

Ch. 5:18,19. “Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”

Ch. 15:8. "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

Ch. 15:3. "For even Christ pleased not himself, but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me."

The apostle affirms, also, in this epistle, his own exercise of miraculous powers, derived from Christ, and extending through a wide circuit of apostolic labour, from Jerusalem to Illyrium.

Ch. 15:17-19. "I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ."

This attestation is doubly important, when we remember that the letter was written from Corinth, with the salutations of several Corinthians, and that he had addressed a letter a few months before to that church, where he makes the same appeal to miracles, and these, wrought in the midst of them. "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds."

No. VI.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, the first of those from Rome, bears testimony to the same general facts, of the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus, and adds the further statement, that the gifts bestowed on the apostles and prophets of the church were a direct consequence of his ascension. All these facts appear in the most indirect manner.

Eph. 1:19,20. "According to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places."

Ch. 1:7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."

Ch. 2:16. "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby."

Ch. 4:9,10. ("Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up, far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers."

Ch. 5:2. "Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."

The same facts appear also in the Epistle to the Colossians, with a further allusion to our Lord's circumcision, his burial, and the sufferings he had to endure.

Col. 1:14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

Ch. 1:18-20. "Who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself."

Ch. 1:23,24. "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."

Ch. 2:11,12. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

Ch. 3:1. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."

In the Epistle to the Philippians, the same facts are proclaimed with equal clearness.

Ch. 2:5-11. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

We have here the view respecting the person of Jesus, his life, death, and resurrection, which was familiar to Christians, both in Greece and Italy, within thirty-three years from the time when that death occurred. The facts are supposed to be so certainly known, that they may be assumed at once in the forefront of every practical exhortation.

No. VII.

The remaining epistles, which may be placed from thirty-three to thirty-six years after the crucifixion, still assume everywhere the truth of the leading facts in the Gospel, with a few additional particulars.

First, that our Lord was of the race of Abraham, and of the royal tribe of Judah.

Heb. 2:16. "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham."

Ch. 7:14. "For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood."

Secondly, that he took upon him our nature, and thence was exposed to temptation, while he maintained a perfect obedience.

Ch. 2:14,18. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death. . . . For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted."

Ch. 4:15. He "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

Ch. 5:8. "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."

That, while on earth, he offered up earnest prayers to God.

Ch. 5:7. "Who in the days of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death."

That, after becoming a sacrifice for sins, he entered into heaven.

Ch. 9:27, 28. "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

That the scene of his death lay without the gate of Jerusalem.

Ch. 13:11, 12. "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate."

That he made an open declaration of his kingly authority before Pontius Pilate.

1 Tim. 6:13. "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession." It is plain, from the context, that this confession related to the character of our Lord, as a true and rightful king.

No. VIII.

From a review of this various evidence, it appears that the following main elements of the gospel history are all confirmed by the direct and indirect testimony of the Pauline epistles. The apostle, in the first place, had seen the Lord Jesus after the resurrection, and received from him a direct commission to the Gentiles (Gal. 1:1, 2, 11, 12; 1 Cor. 9:1, 15:7, 8; Eph. 3:2, 3; 1 Tim. 1:11-13; 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:10, 11). He affirms the resurrection, as the universal belief of the church, proclaimed by all the apostles, and confirmed, after nearly thirty years, by hundreds of living eye-witnesses (1 Thessalonians 1:9,10; 4:14; 1 Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 4:10, 11, 14; 5:14, 15; 13:3, 4; Rom.

1:3; 4:23-25; 5:10; 6:4, 8, 9; Eph. 1:18-21; 2:4, 5; Col. 1:18; Phil. 3:10; 2 Tim. 2:8; 1 Cor. 15:9-11; Heb. 2:2, 3). He states that our Lord was born of a human mother, of the tribe of Judah, and the race of David (Rom. 1:3; 9:4, 5; 15:12; 2 Tim. 2:8; Heb. 7:14; Gal. 4:4; Heb. 7:1-3); that he was circumcised, and obedient to the law of Moses (Col. 2:11, 12; Rom. 5:19; 8:3; Heb. 4:15; Phil. 2:8); that he endured reproach, temptation, and suffering (Rom. 15:3; 2Cor. 1:5; Col. 1:24; Heb. 12:3; 2:18; 4:15); that he was betrayed, and the same night instituted the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:23-26); that he was crucified, dead and buried (Gal. 2:20; 3:1, 13; 5:24; 6:14; 1 Cor. 1:13, 17, 18, 23; 2:2, 7, 8; 13:4; Rom. 6:6; Eph. 2:15, 16; Phil. 2:8; 3:18; Heb. 12:2; 1 Cor. 15:4; Col. 2:12; Rom. 6:4); that he suffered without the gate of Jerusalem (Heb. 13:12); that he offered fervent prayers, and underwent a bloody agony, before his death (Heb. 5:7; 12:2-4); that his resurrection took place on the third day (1 Cor. 15:4); that he ascended afterwards into heaven (Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:19, 20; 4:8-10; Col. 3:1; Phil. 2:9; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 8:1; 9:24); that he appeared after his resurrection, at least five times, and to more than five hundred witnesses (1 Cor. 15:5-7); that he appointed twelve apostles, to be messengers of the gospel (1 Cor. 4:9; 9:5; 12:28; 2 Cor. 11:5; Gal. 1:17; 12:11, 12; 1 Cor. 15:5, 7; Eph. 2:20); and that James, Cephas, and John were three of the most eminent (1 Cor. 15:5, 7; Gal. 2:9, 11, 12); and that these apostles, as well as St. Paul himself, were endued with miraculous powers, exercised in the name of the Lord Jesus (Heb. 2:3, 4; 1 Cor. 12:28, 29; 14:18; 2 Cor. 12:11, 12; Gal. 2:8; Rom. 15:18, 19.)

It has of late been objected to the Gospel history, by philosophical unbelievers, that the epistles are silent respecting the miracles of our Lord, and thus are negative witnesses against them. The objection betokens either great blindness, or utter insincerity. The epistles not only affirm, in more than fifty passages, the crowning miracles of our Lord's resurrection and ascension, but repeatedly assert, as a notorious fact, the actual exercise of miraculous powers, by St. Paul himself and the other apostles, and even by many Christians far less distinguished in the churches. This is taught in both letters to Corinth, and in those to the Galatians, the Romans, the Ephesians, and Colossians. Hence not even our Lord's resurrection *is* more plainly a part of the apostle's faith, than this actual presence of miraculous powers in the church. And it is equally plain that all these gifts and miracles are directly ascribed to the risen Saviour, as their true and secret author. Finally, it is declared that miracles were the signs of an apostle (2 Cor. 12:12), while this very title of apostle is directly applied to the Lord Jesus (Heb. 3:1). And hence, combining these particulars, it is as clear and certain that St. Paul recognised the fact, that miracles were wrought by the Lord Jesus during the course of his ministry in Palestine, as if he had stated his conviction in the most explicit form.

CHAPTER II.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

THE book of Acts, from its own internal evidence and a comparison with the epistles of St. Paul, has been shown already to be a faithful history, and in all its later chapters the production of an eye-witness. As a direct narrative, commencing more than twenty years earlier than the first of St. Paul's letters, we might reasonably expect that it would furnish more copious information on the facts of the Gospel history. Such we find to be the case on actual investigation. It remains now to examine the amount of

evidence thus obtained before we trace the internal coincidence of the gospels themselves. It will be convenient to arrange the whole under distinct articles as before.

No. I.

First, the book of Acts confirms fully the assertion in the letters that St. Paul had personally seen the Lord Jesus after the resurrection, and all the other hints relative to his conversion and apostleship, while it adds more copious details of the place, time, and circumstances of these events.

There are three passages where these facts are stated in the history; once in the direct narrative (9:1-20); once in the defence before the Jews (22:1-21); and a third time before Festus and Agrippa, Acts 26:1-23. These passages may suggest a few general remarks.

1. The apostle asserts in the letters that he had seen the Lord Jesus, 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:3-8. This fact appears also in each of the above passages, but with many specific details; that he was on a journey to Damascus, and drew near to the city, that this first vision occurred at noon-day, that it was followed by a blindness of three days, that his companions saw the light and heard a voice, but did not see the person or distinguish the words of the Lord Jesus, and that the message was given in the Hebrew tongue,—“Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?”

2. The apostle states in the letters that he had been previously “a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious.” The same truth appears in the history, but with fuller details; that his acts of persecution began at the death of Stephen, when he kept the raiment of them that slew him; that they were exercised first at Jerusalem towards women as well as men; that they extended afterwards to the other cities of Judæa, and at length, that he persecuted them even to foreign cities, and his zeal led him to procure letters from the high priest for Damascus, where the vision occurred.

3. The apostle affirms in his letters that the Lord Jesus himself constituted him an apostle to the Gentiles. And this is taught with equal plainness in the defence before Agrippa, and also in the defence at Jerusalem. But the history shows us further that this commission was twice given, once at the time of his conversion, and again, in the temple at Jerusalem, 26:16-18; 22:17-21.

4. St. Paul affirms in the letters that the other apostles bore the same witness as himself to the resurrection of Jesus, of which they had been eye-witnesses much earlier, 1 Cor. 15:3-11. The same statement is given by him, according to the history, in his discourse at Antioch, “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.”

5. St. Paul in the letters affirms that he had repeated visions or revelations of the risen Saviour. The history repeats the statement with specific details. Four such visions are recorded in the course of the narrative; the first at his conversion, a second in the temple at Jerusalem on his first visit, a third during his stay at Corinth, and a fourth soon after his imprisonment at Jerusalem.

6. St. Paul in the letters asserts his own exercise of miraculous powers. The narrative asserts the same fact, but with more specific details. The letters affirm them to have been exercised in Galatia and at Corinth, and in the region round about unto Illyricum. The history, as if to show that it was no artificial accordance, does not specify any miracles either in Galatia, in Greece, or at Corinth. On the other hand, it gives specific details of blindness inflicted on Elymas at Paphos; of the cure of the impotent man at Lystra, with signs and wonders at Iconium; of various miracles at Ephesus, both of cures and dispossessions; of the recovery of Eutychus at Troas; of the vision of an angel during the voyage; of immunity from the poison of serpents at Melita, and of other miraculous cures of disease, wrought during the presence and under the eye of the historian. Thus all the statements of the epistles are confirmed by the narrative, and ampler details are given.

No. II.

The narrative agrees with the epistles in representing the resurrection of the Lord Jesus as the foundation of the church, and the subject of distinct testimony by the apostles before Saul's conversion, and from the very year and month of its occurrence.

First, in the choice of a new apostle in the place of Judas, this is mentioned to have been the very purpose of the appointment. "Of these men which have Companioned with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection."

Next, it is a main subject of the first discourse of Peter on the day of Pentecost. "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.—He, seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses."

In the second discourse, on the healing of the cripple in the temple, this testimony is equally prominent. "But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses. . . Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

This truth appeal's again in the defence before the council. "By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead even by him doth this man stand here before you whole."

It appears again in the summary of the apostolic teaching after their dismissal. "And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all."

Once more, it appears in the second defence before the Sadducees, the great deniers of the resurrection. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour."

Last of all, it appears in the words of Stephen, in the very hour of his death. "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God."

It is needless to continue the quotations further, as they now become contemporary with St Paul's own testimony, whose conversion is related soon after.

No. III.

The history, like the letters, affirms that Jesus was born of the seed of David; but it also states that his mother survived the time of the resurrection, while it never alludes to any earthly father, and thus agrees with the view implied in the letters, and distinctly taught in the gospels, of his miraculous birth from a virgin mother.

Acts 1:14. "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren."

Ch. 2:30. "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he (David) seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ . . . This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses."

Ch. 13:22,23. "And when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king. . . Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus."

No. IV.

In the history we are further taught that the home of Jesus was at Nazareth, that his teaching was mainly in Galilee, and that it was preceded by the ministry of John the Baptist, his forerunner.

The name, Jesus of Nazareth, occurs six times in the history (2:22; 3:6; 4:10; 6:14; 22:8; 26:9). The first and third instances are found in the discourses of Peter on the day of Pentecost, and before the Sanhedrim; the second in the cure of the impotent man at the gate of the temple; the fourth in the accusation against Stephen; and the two others in the discourses of St. Paul, first before the Jews, and afterwards before Festus and Agrippa. The same fact appears in another form in the words of Tertullus, when he styles the apostle "a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes."

That the apostles were Galilæans is taught by the language ascribed to the angels at the ascension, and of the Jews on the day of Pentecost. And that the teaching of Jesus was chiefly in Galilee appears from the words of Peter to Cornelius (Acts 10:37).

That our Lord was preceded by John the Baptist as his forerunner is no where affirmed by the historian in his own person, except in chap. 18:25, where he says of Apollos, that "he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John." Yet it is remarkable in how many ways the same truth is indirectly affirmed. First, in the parting promise of Christ: "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Next, in the rule prescribed by Peter for the choice of an apostle: "Beginning from the baptism of John

.... must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.” Thirdly, in the discourse to Cornelius; “That word ye know, which was published throughout all Judæa, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached.” Fourthly, in the speech of Paul in the synagogue at Antioch: “When John had first preached before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel.” It is here even joined with some particulars of John’s teaching: “And as John fulfilled his course, he said, Whom think ye that I am? I am not he. But, behold, there cometh one after me, whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose.” Fifthly, in his conversation with the disciples at Ephesus: “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.”

No. V.

The history not only implies in every part, but openly asserts in two passages, that the Lord Jesus wrought many miracles during his ministry before his resurrection.

The first statement is found in the discourse of Peter on the day of Pentecost: “Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know.” There is here a double assertion, not only of the fact itself but that it was public and notorious.

The next is in the address to Cornelius: “How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem.”

That only two such passages are found in the whole history, although these miracles are evidently presupposed in every part, is another mark of reality. While signs and wonders were wrought continually by the apostles themselves, and the resurrection was the distinguishing glory of the Lord Jesus, and the communication of these miraculous powers to his followers, rather than their personal exercise, it is natural that his own miracles should be mentioned only in such an historical review as Peter gave to Cornelius, or to the multitudes at Jerusalem. Now the epistles contain no example of such a historical retrospect of events earlier than the crucifixion and the last supper, and hence it is quite natural that no such express averment should be found in them. Yet the fact of these miracles is plainly implied in every part of the history, as well as of the letters, since the miracles of the apostles themselves are said to be wrought, not by their own power, but by the power and in the name of the Lord Jesus.

No. VI.

The book of Acts agrees with the epistles in fixing the number of the apostles at twelve, and in assigning a priority to three of the number, Peter, James, and John. For though the elder James has the second place in the list, given at first, it is plain that after his death the other James is the only one, besides Peter and John, who is named at all in the history. But besides this entire agreement with the conclusions brought us by the letters, the history proceeds further, and gives us the names and order of all the

twelve, in entire harmony with the three earlier gospels.

Acts 1:13. "And when they were come in, they went up into an upper chamber, where both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James."

Ver. 17. "For he (Judas, who was guide to them that took Jesus) was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry."

The history teaches us further, that these twelve had Companioned with Jesus from the very time of John the Baptist's ministry. The gospels affirm this plainly of six out of the whole number, and place the ordination of the whole number before the time of the Baptist's death.

No. VII.

The book of Acts affirms many other particulars respecting our Lord, which are contained in the four gospels, and form together a main element of the Gospel history.

1st. That our Lord appeared repeatedly after his resurrection, through a space of forty days, and ate and drank with the apostles, Acts 1:3, 4; 10:41; 13:31. Indeed the length of this interval is specified here only; but the gospels evidently require one of three weeks at the least.

2nd. That our Lord ascended from the neighbourhood of Bethany, or some part of the Mount of Olives, and was taken up into heaven, Acts 1:9-12.

3rd. That several women, including the mother of Jesus, had accompanied our Lord from Galilee to Jerusalem, Acts 1:14; 13:31.

4th. That Judas, one of the twelve, betrayed the Lord Jesus, and was a guide to those who took him, and died soon after in remorse by a violent death, so that a well-known field at Jerusalem derived its name from the event, and was called, "The field of blood," Acts 1:16, 19.

5th. That our Lord's death was at or near the time of the Jewish passover. This appears from the history by plain inference; for we are told that our Lord rose the third day, that he was seen forty days by the apostles, that the baptism of the Spirit was to be not many days after his ascension, and that it took place on the day of Pentecost. Assuming ten days for the interval, which is indeterminate, the death of our Lord would fall on the very day of the passover.

6th. That Pilate had determined to release Jesus, and was only prevented from so doing by the hatred and obstinacy of the Jewish rulers, Acts 3:13. That, while they publicly rejected Christ, they desired as a favour the acquittal of a murderer in his stead, ver. 14.

7th. That not only Pilate, but also Herod, and Jews and Gentiles alike, had some active share in the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus, Acts 4:27.

8th. That our Lord rose again the third day, and appeared afterwards, not to all the people, but only to chosen witnesses, and especially to the apostles, Acts 10:40, 41.

9th. That our Lord, before he ascended, promised to send down the Spirit upon his followers before they left Jerusalem, Acts 11:16.

10th. That the Pharisees and the Sadducees were the two leading sects among the Jews, of whom the Sadducees denied a resurrection, while the Pharisees and the great body of the nation fully believed in it, Acts 23:7, 8; 24:15; 26:6,7.

11th. That it was predicted of the Christ that he would suffer death, and be the first to rise from the dead, and afterwards become a light of the Gentile nations, Acts 26:23.

No. VIII.

There are a few general remarks, which are naturally suggested by this review of the testimony contained in the book of Acts to the gospel history.

And first, nearly all the facts which the epistles announce respecting our Lord's personal history are confirmed by the book of Acts; while not one contradiction, even in appearance, exists between them.

Secondly, since it is a direct narrative, and mounts twenty years higher than the letters, as far back as to the time of the ascension, the book of Acts reveals many other particulars which do not appear in the letters. Such are the names of the other nine apostles, besides Peter, James, and John, the interval from the resurrection to the ascension, the name of our Lord's mother, his residence at Nazareth, the baptism of John, and the continuance of his disciples more than twenty years after the crucifixion, the treachery of Judas and his fearful end, the concurrence of Herod and Pilate in our Lord's death, the desire of Pilate for his release and the opposition of the Jews, the scene of the ascension, and the conversation of Christ with the apostles after his resurrection.

Thirdly, all these facts, which are contained in the book of Acts, appear again in the four gospels, but with still more copious details. There is no appearance of contradiction, although there are several points where the coincidence is only indirect. Such is the exact length of the interval from the resurrection to the ascension, the end of Judas after his treachery, and the circumstances relating to the field of blood, the exact place of the ascension, the course of our Lord's ministry, beginning in Galilee and closing at Jerusalem, and the upper room where the apostles were assembled at the day of Pentecost. There is here exactly the gradation which we should naturally expect in a direct narrative of our Lord's life, a narrative of events beginning at its close, where some retrospective allusions would be sure to occur, and a series of letters, of which the earliest is more than twenty years later, yet all of them alike based upon the certain truth of a public and notorious history.

Finally, these retrospective allusions, while they include all the main elements of the gospel history, are so imbedded in the narrative, and are presented in such various forms, that they cannot be set aside without a rejection of the whole narrative. Some

of them occur in the statements of the historian himself; but others in the discourse of Peter after the ascension, others on the day of Pentecost, others in the address to Cornelius, others in the discourse of Paul at Antioch, and others in the history of his stay at Ephesus, and others, finally, in his defence before Agrippa. The woof of Divine truth is so skilfully woven, that the attempt to get rid of one thread can only succeed by a desperate determination to sacrifice the whole. The epistles and the Acts, by mutual comparison, prove their own truth and authenticity, and then, by their joint allusions, they establish the main facts of the evangelical narrative, before we enter on the internal testimony of the gospels themselves.

CHAPTER III.

THE INTERNAL COINCIDENCE OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

THE allusions in the book of Acts and in the epistles of St. Paul, it has now been clearly shown, establish the truth of the main outlines of the Gospel history. To complete the line of reasoning adopted in the "*Horæ Paulinæ*," we should now consider the undesigned coincidences in the four gospels themselves. This inquiry, however, to be pursued thoroughly, would require a distinct work, and a full investigation of their probable dates, their mutual relations to each other, the proper mode of harmonizing their narratives, and the other main questions which have occupied harmonists and critics in every age of the church until now. In this closing chapter a few only of those coincidences will be selected which are most capable of a separate exhibition, apart from all deeper research into the order and connexion of the whole evangelical history. It will merely be assumed that the fourth gospel, of St. John, was composed later than the others, and that these were in existence before the latest epistles of St. Paul were written.

No. I.

Matt. 8:16. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick."

There is here no reason assigned why the sick were not, on this occasion, brought to Jesus until the evening. On turning, however, to the narrative in the other gospels, Mark 1:32; Luke 4:40, 41, this reason is apparent. We are told that on the sabbath day Jesus entered into the synagogue at Capernaum, and taught; that immediately on leaving it he entered into the house of Simon, and it was the very same evening on which this crowd of applicants for mercy were gathered at the door. Now from Matt. 12:10, it also appears that the opinion was common among the Jews, that it was not lawful to heal on the sabbath day. We have thus a clear reason why the people waited until the evening, but one of which no trace exists in Matthew's narrative, taken alone.

No. II.

Matt. 10:2. "Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: the first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother;

Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphæus, and Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.”

In the two other gospels, the seventh and eighth names occur in a different order. Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, where the distinctive title, the publican, is also wanting. The whole list is composed of six pairs of names, the order of which seems to have been determined by the order of their call, whether to be disciples or apostles. Matthew places his own name second in the pair to which it belongs, and adds the offensive epithet, the publican. Mark and Luke, on the contrary, place his name before that of his comrade, and withhold the title which he himself has added in a feeling of humility. This minute difference is naturally explained by the modesty of the evangelist, and thus becomes a pledge for the genuineness of the whole Gospel where it appears.

No. III.

The four gospels, without any direct assertion, lead us to the same conclusion, that Joseph was dead before our Lord’s ministry began. This will appear by collating the passages.

John 2:1, 2, 12. “And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage.— After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples: and they continued there not many days.”

Matt 12:46,48. “While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?”

Ch. 13:55, 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?”

Mark 3:31. “There came then his brethren and his mother, and standing without, sent unto him, calling him.”

Ch. 6:3. “Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?”

Luke 8:10. “Then came to him his mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press.”

John 19:25. “Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son. Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.”

There is thus no mention of the presence of Joseph at the feast in Cana, or the return to Capernaum, during the message of our Lord's relatives, the visit to Nazareth, or the crucifixion. All the four narratives agree, indirectly, in leading to the same conclusion, that the death of Joseph was earlier than our Lord's ministry. This agreement is unlikely to have occurred in fictitious narratives, and is therefore one mark, in the gospels, of their historical reality.

No. IV.

Matt. 13:2. "And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into the ship (*τὸ πλοῖον*) and sat."

The meaning of the definite article in this passage is so far from being evident, that our translators have omitted it entirely. No ship has been mentioned in this context, to which it can be referred. How, then, can the peculiar expression be accounted for?

On turning to the Gospel of St. Mark, not in the parallel passage, but somewhat earlier, we meet with a simple explanation in these words: "And he spake to his disciples, that a small ship should wait on him because of the multitude, lest they should throng him," 3:9. It is plain that this ship or boat, provided expressly for such a purpose, would be familiar to the thoughts of the apostle, and hence we may explain the force of the phrase, "he entered into the ship, and sat"

The same explanation will equally apply to Matt. 14:22, where the same expression recurs: "And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into the ship (*εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*), and to go before him to the other side, while he sent the multitudes away."

This coincidence, from its very minuteness, depending merely on the insertion of the article, is so much the more unsuspecting and complete.

No. V.

In each gospel an account is given of the miracle of the five thousand. We are told also, in every case, that the disciples took up twelve baskets of fragments. Matt. 14:20; Mark 6:43; Luke 9:17; John 6:13. In every gospel, also, these baskets are termed *cophini* (*δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις*).

The similar miracle of the four thousand is recorded only by St. Matthew and St. Mark, who state that the disciples took up seven baskets of fragments. Here, however, a different term is employed, and in each gospel the baskets are called *spyrides*, Matt. 15:37; Mark 8:8 (*ἐπτά σπυρίδας*).

Now it is remarkable that, when our Saviour rebukes his disciples, after crossing from Dalmanutha, the same distinction is accurately observed, Matt. 16:9, 10; Mark 8:19, 20.

"Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? (*πόσους κοφίνους ἐλάβετε*;) Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets (*σπυρίδας*) ye took up?"

“When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets (*κοφίνους*) full of fragments took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve. And when the seven among four thousand, how many baskets (*σπυρίδας*) full of fragments took ye up? And they said, Seven. And he said unto them, How is it that ye do not understand?”

From the word *σπυρίς* being used, Acts 9:25, where Paul was let down in a basket by the wall of Damascus, it is natural to infer that it denotes baskets of a large size. The *cophini*, being twelve, might, perhaps, be the provision baskets of the apostles. But whatever was the exact nature of the distinction, the constant mention of *cophini* in reference to one miracle, and of *spyrides* in connexion with the other, is a minute and striking evidence of historical reality, and proves how the details of each event were fixed in the memory of the apostles.

No. VI.

John 6:5. “When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw a great multitude come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat? And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do. Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.”

This apostle is never once named, in the first three gospels, as having any special question put to him, or taking part in the conversation of our Lord, and only once beside in the Gospel of St. John. Why should the question now be addressed to him rather than the others? The passage itself offers no key to the incident, and we might readily suppose that it was an accidental circumstance.

Let us turn to St. Luke 9:10, where the same miracle is recorded, and we find this further circumstance mentioned, which fixes the scene of the miracle. “And he took them, and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida.” The miracle is then said to have been wrought at the close of that very day.

If now we turn once more to St. John’s Gospel, we find in the first chapter this passing intimation, “Now Philip was of Bethsaida, from the city of Andrew and Peter.” Two different prepositions are here used, one of which seems to denote the birthplace, and the other the usual abode. Hence the meaning seems to be that Philip, though a native of Capernaum, was an inhabitant of Bethsaida. It is thus explained why our Lord should address the inquiry to him rather than the others. They were in a desert place, belonging to Bethsaida; and hence Philip was more likely than any of the rest to know where a supply of provisions might possibly be found.

One doubt, however, still remains. There were two Bethsaidas near the sea of Tiberias, some have even supposed a third. For this last opinion, however, there is no evidence, and it has arisen only from a misconstruction of this very passage. Many have thought that the scene of the miracle was Bethsaida-Julias, to the north-east of the lake. If so, the coincidence would be deceptive, since Philip belonged to Bethsaida of Galilee, John 12:21.

There are conclusive reasons, which forbid us to place the scene in the neighbourhood

of Julias. The suburbs of one of the largest cities near the lake would be ill suited for the purpose of retirement. The course of the disciples on their return is also inconsistent with such a view of the locality. They crossed over towards Bethsaida, while the route from Julias to Capernaum would not bring them near to Bethsaida of Galilee.

One easy supposition removes all difficulty, and maintains the reality of the coincidence. Capernaum, Bethsaida, Chorazin were fishing towns on the west of the lake, and would very likely have separate districts belonging to them on the opposite side, for the convenience of the crews in their frequent short voyages across the lake. If the miracle occurred in such a district belonging to Bethsaida of Galilee, and lying opposite to it on the further side of the lake, the whole becomes consistent and natural, and the appeal to Philip, as an inhabitant of Bethsaida, and acquainted with its localities, retains its strict propriety.

No. VII.

John 6:24. "When the people saw therefore that Jesus was not there, neither his disciples, they also took shipping, and came to Capernaum, seeking for Jesus."

The surprise of the people at not finding Jesus is easily explained, since they saw that he had not entered the ship, and no other vessel was near, until the arrival of the other boats from Tiberias, early the next morning. But why should they expect the disciples to be there, whom they had seen embark the evening before? An answer is found in St. Mark's Gospel. When Jesus came to them in the fourth watch, "he saw them toiling in rowing; *for the wind was contrary.*" With a stormy and adverse wind, that lasted until three or four in the morning, it was very natural to suppose that the disciples would have put back again, and be found along with Jesus on the eastern shore.

No. VIII.

John 18:36. "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews."

Why did not the adversaries of our Lord mention the fact, that one of his followers had really fought, and wounded a servant of the high priest? Their silence, if we consider only their eager malice, might seem unaccountable, and a kinsman of Malchus was present at the trial. But the Gospel of St. Luke solves the difficulty. As soon as the blow was struck, Jesus had said, "Suffer ye thus far: and he touched his ear, and healed him." Any reference to Peter's offence would thus have brought to light the Divine power of the Lord, as well as his innocence, and have turned to their own confusion.

But further, these words of Christ do really allude to that event, although the allusion is so delicate as to be entirely lost in the usual version; for their precise meaning, if we observe the tense of the original Greek, seems to be, "Then would my servants have gone on fighting (*ἡγωνίζοντο*), that I should not be delivered to the Jews." The form of the phrase is clearly retrospective, and the use of the imperfect, instead of the

orist, implies continuance. So that our Lord really appeals to that very act of forbearance by which he had arrested the hasty zeal of his followers, while he manifested his Divine power in healing the servant whom they had wounded. No allusion could be more delicate and unobtrusive, or afford a clearer sign of historical reality.

No. IX.

Matt. 4:11,12,17. "Now when Jesus had heard that John was delivered up, he departed into Galilee; and leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum.....From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

John 3:22-24. "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Æon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized. For John was not yet cast into prison."

John 4:1,2. "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that; Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples), he left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee."

In the "Leben Jesu," by Dr. Strauss, these passages are referred to as a pattern of those direct and positive contradictions, which prove the gospels to be mythical and not historical. "One gospel," it is said, "represents the first appearance of Jesus in Galilee as subsequent to the imprisonment of John the Baptist; whilst another remarks, long after Jesus had preached both in Galilee and Judæa, that 'John was not yet cast into prison.'"

Now, in reality, this alleged contradiction is a most beautiful example of undesigned and perfect harmony, and a convincing pledge of the historical fidelity of both the gospels.

And, first, the contradiction is produced by a double misstatement of what the gospels really affirm. St. Matthew tells us that, after John's imprisonment, Jesus returned into Galilee; but there is not one word about its being his first appearance in the province. On the contrary, he represents him to have resided there for nearly thirty years previously, and there is nothing in the passage which forbids us to suppose a previous return thither after his baptism, if not attended with a course of public preaching. On the other hand, St. John does not assert any public ministry of Christ in Galilee before John's imprisonment. All that he records is a single miracle in a private festival, and a stay, apparently of a very few days, before the first passover.

If we examine the passages more closely, their mutual harmony will become very conspicuous.

1. First, St. Matthew tells us that our Lord's return to Galilee was in consequence of the tidings having first reached him that John had been cast into prison. Now since he states that our Lord's home was Nazareth, there is here implied, though in a most indirect manner, some previous stay in Judæa, besides what was required by the fact of his baptism. The most natural implication will be, that he had begun his ministry in

Judæa; but that the imprisonment of John being a signal of danger if he should continue there any longer, he transferred it to Galilee. Now this obscure intimation of St. Matthew is precisely what we find confirmed by the Gospel of St. John, which states a previous exercise of our Lord's ministry in Judæa, before John's imprisonment.

2. Two returns into Galilee are specified in St. John's Gospel, 1:43; 4:43-45. The first question is, which of these answers to the description of St. Matthew. Now even apart from the reference to John's imprisonment, it is only the second, not the first, which fulfils the description. For, after the return in Matthew, our Lord began at once a course of public teaching in Galilee, and a circuit of the whole province. But nothing of the kind appears after the first return in St. John's Gospel. On the contrary, his stay is expressly said to have been "not many days," and no act of public teaching is expressed, or even implied. On the contrary, it is evidently taught us that our Lord delayed the commencement of his public ministry till he could open it with more solemnity at Jerusalem, at the feast of the passover.

3. Let us now examine the statement of the later gospel, that "John was not yet cast into prison." Here it is plainly implied that the imprisonment took place soon after, and that, without such a cautionary remark, the readers might naturally have supposed it was already begun. The words are evidently inserted as a parenthesis, to remove a probable misapprehension from their minds. Now whence could that impression have arisen, which alone rendered the cautionary remark necessary? Plainly, from the three earlier gospels, which mention no public ministry of our Lord until after John's imprisonment was begun. The words are, therefore, a tacit intimation of St. John to his readers, that his narrative is here a supplement to the other gospels, and relates to an earlier part of our Lord's ministry which they had not recorded. If this earlier ministry, however, had been placed in Galilee, it would have contradicted their statements; but since the scene as well as the time was different, instead of a contradiction, it is a coincidence, and illustrates the force of their statement, that John's imprisonment was the signal for our Lord's departure into Galilee.

4. There is still one point of divergence in the two gospels which needs explanation. According to St Matthew, it was the tidings of John's imprisonment which occasioned the return of Jesus into Galilee. According to St. John, it was his knowledge that the Pharisees had heard of his popularity, and that he was making and baptizing more disciples than John. There is here a very near approach to a contradiction, which only illustrates more strikingly the truth and accuracy of both evangelists. Mr. Greswell infers, from John 4:1, that the Baptist was not imprisoned when our Lord set out from Judæa; and from the other gospels, that he was imprisoned before the arrival in Galilee, and hence places it during the stay of two days in Samaria. This, however, creates a real contradiction, since Matthew affirms that Jesus had *heard* of the imprisonment before he departed into Galilee. On the other hand, the words John 4:1, are most naturally understood of a report that both Jesus and John were baptizing, with this only difference, that the followers of Jesus were more numerous than those of John. How, then, shall this partial discrepancy be reconciled, and the two accounts be shown to agree?

The solution, on close inquiry, is very simple. Our Lord and the Baptist were alike baptizing at the Jordan, and not far from each other. The tidings of the imprisonment

would, therefore, reach our Lord, it is most likely, in a single day. Machærus, where John was confined, is close to that part of Jordan which borders on the land of Judæa. Hence the tidings would reach our Lord either on the same, or at furthest on the following day. But the Pharisees, to whom allusion is made, are evidently the ruling party of the Jews in the sanhedrim at Jerusalem. The increase of our Lord's popularity was gradual, though rapid. The whole continuance of his ministry in Judæa did not probably exceed two months; and it would only be during the last two or three weeks that it would be likely to have surpassed the ministry of John in the numbers who followed it. Three days would; probably, be required for tidings from Ænon, where John was baptizing, so that the comparison could be fully made. And hence it is probable that the report of our Lord's superior popularity would have ripened into full conviction in the minds of the Pharisees only for ten days or a fortnight before John's imprisonment. That event, as soon as it was known, would concentrate all their opposition upon Jesus himself, already become the more dangerous adversary, and would thus be a motive for his removal, not so much in itself, as on account of the fresh impetus which it would give to their malicious opposition. Thus the two circumstances will agree perfectly in respect of time, while the statement of St. John is a supplement to that of St. Matthew, in the key which it supplies to the motives of our Lord. In fact, if his chief danger were from Herod, it is strange that he should remove out of Judæa, which was not subject to his power, into Galilee, which was the chief part of his tetrarchy. But the words of St. John remove the difficulty. It was not Herod himself who was the source of danger, but the jealousy of the Pharisees, already awakened by his growing popularity, and sure to be concentrated upon him, now that the Baptist was put out of the way.

No. X.

John 4:43,44. "Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country."

Luke 4:23,24. "And he said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country. And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country."

Matt. 13:57. "And they were offended in him. But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house. And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief."

The harmony between these passages, in their report of our Lord's own saying, is direct and simple; but, for this very reason, forms no part of the present argument. It is their difficulties and apparent obscurities which really furnish us with a most convincing proof of their historical reality.

And first, the statement in St. Luke belongs to our Lord's visit to Nazareth, before he went down to Capernaum, and there began his public ministry. It thus appears to involve a strange oversight and complete anachronism; for if our Lord had not yet removed to Capernaum, or opened his public ministry, which seems to have begun in his own city by that solemn appeal to prophecy, how could the Nazarenes make that appeal to him, "Whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy

country.”

Now here the Gospel of St. John supplies an indirect but complete answer. We are there told that our Lord returned first to Cana in Galilee; that while at Cana, a nobleman of Capernaum came to him and entreated that he would heal his son; that the cure was wrought by Jesus, without his going to that city in person, and led to the conversion of the whole household. Here, then, was a cure wrought in Capernaum, even before Jesus himself had taken up his residence in that city, exactly of the kind which might elicit the request of the Nazarenes; for it was plainly a miracle of healing which they demanded from him.

Another difficulty is found in the passage of St. John's Gospel. For since our Lord dwelt at Nazareth, and this is always called his own country in the other gospels, how could this saying of Christ explain his removal into Galilee? Here most commentators have felt some perplexity. They suppose, in general, that there is a tacit allusion to the particular part of Galilee, to which our Lord returned, as if the ellipsis were to be supplied— “not, however, to Nazareth, but to Cana and Capernaum.” The adage is then applied in both cases to the very same circumstance, the removal from Nazareth to some other part of Galilee. But the ellipsis is most harsh and unnatural; for the remark occurs upon the mention of the province, and not of the particular town to which he returned. Had such been the meaning of the writer, he would surely have arranged his statement differently. “Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. And he came again to Cana, where he made the water wine. For Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country.” But since he has not adopted this order, we may fairly reject the explanation as strained and unnatural.

We are thus thrown back upon a much simpler interpretation, where all is consistent; that Judæa, in the view of the evangelist, was our Lord's own country, and in this respect the most natural scene of his ministry. Now this is in entire agreement with the facts, though not with the phraseology, of the other gospels; for, according to both Matthew and Luke, Jesus was born at Bethlehem of Judæa, and was of the royal lineage of David. According to St. Matthew, the return to Nazareth, after the visit of the magi, was by a Divine admonition, to avoid the danger of a longer continuance at Bethlehem, the natural home of the promised Son of David. Hence it is plain that Judæa, in contrast with Galilee, was our Lord's natural home and proper country; though, from his later residence there, Nazareth was his own country, in contrast to every other part of Galilee.

Now the passage, when thus explained (and no other explanation is consistent with the plain meaning of the words), becomes a remarkable example of undesigned coincidence. For this gospel, though it states the difficulties and objections of the Jews, because of our Lord's supposed birth-place at Nazareth, and home in Galilee, does not state any where his true birth-place, or the tribe to which he belonged. The use of the phrase, “his own country,” as applied to Judæa, though fully justified by the facts in the other gospels, is without a parallel, since they always refer it to Nazareth only. Yet there is here a further congruity. For those gospels are occupied entirely with the ministry in Galilee, except on the last visit to Jerusalem; and Nazareth was certainly our Lord's own country, in contrast with the rest of Galilee. But St. John records almost entirely the ministry in Judæa, and in stating the first transfer of that ministry to Galilee, it was equally natural and appropriate that he should style Judæa

“his own country.”

The saying, it thus appears, received two distinct and successive fulfilments; first in the departure from Judæa, the proper home of the son of David, to despised Galilee, because of the unbelief of the Jews; and next, in the transfer of his home from Nazareth to Capernaum, through the similar unbelief of the Nazarenes.

No. XI.

The first three gospels agree in giving us a list of the twelve apostles, and the order is the same, with one or two slight variations. In St. Matthew's Gospel his own name is placed after that of Thomas, which follows it in the two others. In St. Mark, Andrew is the fourth in order, following the two sons of Zebedee, while in St. Luke, Judas the brother of James, being the same with Lebbæus, comes after Simon Zelotes, just before the name of the traitor. With these exceptions, the arrangement is the same in all the lists.

Now a reason for this order, in the priority of the first four apostles, may be found in the narrative of their call, when Simon and Andrew were first invited to follow Christ, and then James and John, the sons of Zebedee. With regard, however, to the place of the two others which follow next, there is no key to explain it, and indeed their names never occur elsewhere in these gospels.

On turning, however, to the fourth gospel, we have an explanation, which bears every mark of undesignedness. Indeed it requires a very careful attention, to decipher its meaning so plainly, as to make it applicable in this inquiry. It will be necessary to quote at some length.

John 1:35-47. “Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God! And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, where dwellest thou? He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: it was about the tenth hour. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone. The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me. Now Philip was of Bethsaida, from the city of Andrew and Peter. Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see. Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.”

It is plainly deducible from the connexion, that these incidents occurred after the forty days' temptation, at the very beginning of our Lord's ministry. It was the first introduction of these disciples to Jesus, and they seem to have been the first disciples who

followed him.

The name of the other disciple, who heard John speak and followed Jesus, is not given. Yet we may infer with certainty, that it was one of the sons of Zebedee, and probably the evangelist himself. For when it is said of Andrew, “he first (*οὗτος πρῶτον*) findeth his own brother Simon,” it is implied that the other disciple also had an own brother, whom he brought to Jesus. St. John also invariably conceals his own name throughout the Gospel. On this view the word *first* has a double emphasis. Not only each of these disciples brought a brother to Jesus, but Andrew was earlier than his companion in so doing. Hence it follows that the first pair of disciples who came to Jesus, were Simon and Andrew, and the next in order were James and John, and since their discipleship began on the same day, the elder brother, perhaps, in each case took the priority. The narrative next describes the call of Philip, and then of Nathanael, who is mentioned again, John 21:2, and clearly as one of the apostles. Hence he is doubtless the same with Bartholomew, by which patronymic he is termed in the other gospels. Philip and Bartholomew are united there, as Philip and Nathanael are in this passage, and the two names, Nathanael and Bartholomew, never occur together.

Thus, in this simple narrative, the order of discipleship of three pairs of apostles is determined, and is the very same in which they are placed in the apostolic list. The coincidence is real, but indirect. For the other evangelists never assert that the order of the names was that of original discipleship; while in the fourth gospel the names of James and John are not given, and Bartholomew appears under a distinct title, as Nathanael. Indeed the existence of the apostles, as a distinct body, is not alluded to in this gospel, until the close of the sixth chapter. The passage before us bears the marks of being a simple narrative by an eye witness, in the order of time; and the agreement with the order of the apostles, in the three lists of the other gospels is a spontaneous mark of historical reality.

No. XII.

John 6:66-71. “From that time many of his disciples 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 shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.....Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for he it was that would betray him, being one of the twelve.”

This is the first allusion, in St. John’s Gospel, to the twelve apostles, as distinct from the rest of the disciples. The passage agrees entirely with the express statements of the other gospels, and yet no one who reads it can possibly believe it introduced for the mere purpose of producing a coincidence. The only further mention of them, in this gospel, is of the very same kind. “But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came.” The harmony is evidently spontaneous, and arises from the instinctive habits of thought in the writer, who knew well that the number and even the names of the twelve apostles, with their distinct call, were facts already quite familiar to his readers. That the statement could not be borrowed from the other gospels is further proved by the addition of the minute circumstance in each passage, that Judas was the son of a father named Simon, and that Thomas had also

the surname of Didymus. It is this indirect assumption of historical facts, as familiarly known, and needing no illustration, which forms one practical test of genuine and faithful narrative.

No. XIII.

Matt. 13:55. "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?"

There is a harmony, not obvious but recondite, in the number of our Lord's brethren, which appears only upon careful and attentive inquiry.

First, we read in John 19:25, that there "stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleopas, and Mary Magdalene." Here we learn that Mary, the mother of Jesus, had a sister, also called Mary, who was the wife of a disciple named Cleopas.

Next, in Matt. 27:56, we learn that among the women then present were "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children." And again that "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary sat over against the sepulchre." Here we learn that the sister of the mother of Jesus, or Mary the wife of Cleopas, was also the mother of James and Joses, and distinguishable by this description from the other Marys.

Thirdly, in Mark 15:41, this Mary is called "the mother of James the less and of Joses." In ver. 47 she is called simply the mother of Joses, and in the verse that next follows simply the mother of James. The epithet, James the less, implies that there were two persons of this name, distinguished either in rank, or by personal stature. Now we know that there were two apostles of this name, and that the first in order was the son of Zebedee and Salome. And hence the only natural inference is that James the less is the other apostle, whose name occurs always near the end of the list.

Now it is clear that if James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were actually the sons of the mother of Jesus, the title, Mary the mother of James and Joses, would be no sufficient distinction for the wife of Cleopas. On the other hand, if they were the sons of Mary, the sister of the mother of Jesus, then they would be his own cousins, and in the Hebrew idiom the brethren of Jesus. And hence we infer that these two brethren were really the sons of the wife of Cleopas, and that the James thus mentioned is the same with James the less, or the second James in the list of the twelve apostles.

It is true that this apostle is called the son of Alphæus. But Alphaeus and Cleopas are two forms which might be given in Greek to the same Hebrew surname, or this Mary, it is quite possible, might be married successively to two husbands, and James be her son by the former marriage.

Now the conclusion thus obtained indirectly is ratified by the incidental statement in the Epistle to the Galatians, where St. Paul speaks of this same apostle, whom he saw on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, and whom he styles, to distinguish

him from the son of Zebedee, *the Lord's brother*.

But this is not the only coincidence. For a Judas, as well as a James, is mentioned by the Nazarenes among the brethren of Jesus, and a Judas, besides Iscariot, is found in the list of the apostles. We can prove that these also are the same person, though in a very circuitous manner.

And first, this apostle, in two of the lists, is termed Lebbæus or Thaddæus. It is only Luke who styles him twice, in his two lists of the apostles, "Judas, of James," where our translators supply the word, "brother." If their supplement be allowed, the question seems decided at once, for if Judas was the brother of James, and James the brother of the Lord, and son of the second Mary, then Judas must also have been one of our Lord's brethren, and would almost of course be the person so styled by the Nazarenes.

It has been maintained, however, as by Olshausen, that *son* is the true supplement, and hence that this Judas the apostle, being the son of some other James, is not the same with the Judas in the list of the Nazarenes, nor with the Judas, brother of James, who wrote the epistle. For this view an appeal is made to grammatical usage. But, even on this very ground, the modern critic is less exact than the old interpreters. For the form of the phrase, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, differs from that where *the son* is denoted, by the absence of the article, and exactly resembles the phrase, Μαρία Ἰακώβου, where not *wife*, the usual supplement, but *mother* is implied. In both cases Mary and Judas are identified by the mention of a relative still better known than themselves. This could therefore be no unknown James, but one of the two apostles of that name, and as clearly the second. Now the apostle Judas could not be the son of the apostle James, but might very well be a younger brother, and such accordingly is the only true construction of the phrase of St. Luke.

Now this conclusion is incidentally confirmed by two distinct and indirect testimonies of the apostolic epistles. And first, the Epistle of Jude has the superscription, "Judas, the brother of James." This agrees thoroughly with the previous inference, that Jude the apostle was the brother of James the apostle, and probably his younger brother, and one of the four brethren of Jesus mentioned by the Nazarenes. There is no assertion, it is true, that the writer is one of the twelve, but the whole tone of the epistle, its early adoption into the canon, and its resemblance to the Epistle of St. Peter, render this the most natural view, and we have thus a coincidence, indirect in all its parts, but satisfactory and complete.

Again, if Jude the apostle was the brother of James, it follows that not one only, but two brethren, that is, own cousins of the Lord, were in the apostolic college. And this fact comes to light also, very indirectly, in a passage of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul writes as follows: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as both the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" (1 Cor. 9:5.) Here the very order of the words proves that there is a climax, and that the brethren of the Lord here alluded to were apostles, just as "the rest" who are named before them, and Cephas who is mentioned after them. Hence it appears that there were at least two apostles to whom this distinctive title applied; which agrees punctually with the conclusion just established, that Judas was the brother of James, and that both apostles are the same as the James and Judas in the list of the

Nazarenes.

There is here a further coincidence, which, though delicate, seems to be not the less real. The question of the Nazarenes, "Are they not here with us?" applies to the sisters only. But since two of the four brethren whom they named were of the number of the apostles, it is clear that the assertion implied in their words would not have been true, if extended to these also; for they must have been absent from Nazareth during the whole time of their presence with Jesus, and perhaps even earlier.

It may seem a difficulty in the way of this coincidence, that St. John tells us, 7:3-5, the brethren of our Lord did not believe in him; and also that St. Luke mentions their presence, Acts 1:15, along with the apostles, and still distinct from them. The latter passage, however, is quite consistent with the previous conclusion, since there were two, among the four named by the Nazarenes, who were not of the number of the apostles; for it is clear that Simon the Canaanite or Zealot is a different Simon from the one in their list. The statement in St. John is more perplexing, though its difficulty would not be removed, by distinguishing James and Jude the apostles from supposed namesakes among our Lord's brethren. We should still have to explain the contrast between John 7:3-5 and Acts 1:13, where there is a seeming contradiction. The true explanation seems to be that the title, "brethren," is here used in a wider sense, for the near relations of our Lord, as distinct from the two, and perhaps from all the four brethren, in that list of the Nazarenes. The mention of the twelve just before, and the familiarity of the fact, that two of them were brethren of the Lord, would render the meaning clear to the writer himself, and to his first readers.

No. XIV.

The evangelists mention a double cleansing of the temple by our Lord, once at the very beginning, and one just before the close, of his public ministry. The later event is recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, but the earlier by St. John only. They have so great a resemblance in their general character, that some critics, in defiance of the clear statements of the gospels, and with a strange sacrifice of common sense to rash hypothesis, have maintained them to be the same. Yet, amidst the resemblance, there is a minute difference, which suits well the difference of the circumstances, and shows the historical accuracy of either narrative. In St. John, at the first occurrence, the rebuke is couched in a general admonition. "Take these things hence: make not my Father's house *a house of merchandize*." But on the repetition of the offence, and the second exercise of authority, the rebuke becomes a cutting and severe denunciation of their aggravated sin. "It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a *den of thieves*." This minute, but appropriate difference, will go far, with thoughtful minds, to confirm the historical accuracy of the evangelists in their report of each event.

No. XV.

Matt. 26:60, 61. "At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days."

Mark 14:57-59. "And there arose certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three

days I will build another made without hands. But neither so did their witness agree together.”

The partial diversity of these two statements may be at once explained by the fact that the reports of the witnesses did not agree together. Yet the agreement is so close as to imply the existence of some saying of Jesus, which might account for their definite charge against him. No passage, however, is found in the first three gospels to explain it. Only in the fourth gospel, and in an entirely different connexion, at the very opening of our Lord’s ministry, and at Jerusalem, the scene of the trial, we find a complete key to their testimony. “Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body.”

We have here precisely the fact which accounts for the false testimony of the witnesses. For the conversation took place in Jerusalem, and excited at the time the wonder and unbelief of the Jews. It may even assist us to perceive in what light this testimony was urged against the Lord; namely, that he pretended to be a prophet, and yet had failed to give that very sign which he proposed himself on first opening his ministry, as the test and pledge of a Divine commission. And it must be observed that St. John, who records this saying, makes no mention of the false testimony which it serves to explain, and even places it in a connexion entirely different, and at the greatest possible distance of time, three years before the trial occurred.

No. XVI.

Matt. 17:1, 2. “And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them.”

Matt. 26:37. “And he took with him Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy.”

Mark 5:37. “And he suffered no man to follow him, save Peter and James, and John the brother of James.”

Luke 22:8. “And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat.”

Mark 3:16, 17. “And Simon he surnamed Peter, and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James, and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder.”

There is a striking harmony in these passages, compared with each other, and with the rest of the history. We learn from St. Matthew that, of all the twelve apostles, three only were allowed to be present at the two most solemn events in the life of their Lord, the Transfiguration and the Agony. This pre-eminence of relative honour, in these three apostles, is confirmed by St Mark in a third instance, the raising of the ruler’s daughter, when only the same three disciples were suffered to enter the house and witness the cure. St. Luke further notes a like distinction, in the case of Peter and

John, who were selected by our Lord to prepare the room for the Last Supper.

Now St. Mark supplies incidentally a confirmation of this pre-eminence, of a different kind, that these were the only apostles to whom our Lord gave distinct surnames. And this is the more observable, since that of Simon was given to him alone, but the surname of the two sons of Zebedee was common to both. We find further traces of it, in the promptness of Peter to speak in the name of the rest, and in the petition of the sons of Zebedee for the two foremost places in the kingdom, and in their request to be permitted to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritans. We may even detect probable traces, elsewhere, of two parties, one advocating the claims of Peter, and the other, of the two sons of Zebedee, to the foremost rank. Thus, when Peter was absent on the commission about the tribute money, the words of which might be construed as a special honour to him, "That take and give to them for me and thee," the others seize the opportunity to renew the inquiry— "Who then is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" And it seems that some of them, in so doing, had incurred the displeasure of that apostle, as if they had seized the occasion of his absence to gain, if possible, an adverse decision; for his first inquiry seems to be, on his return, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?"

Now, the same distinction appears again in the Acts of the Apostles. It is Peter and John, who go up together to the temple, when the lame man is cured, and bear witness to Christ before the rulers. When Samaria receives the gospel, the apostles send down to them Peter and John. When Herod persecutes the church, James, the brother of John, is singled out for the first object of his malice, and Peter next after James, as if they were the two most conspicuous leaders. And still later, at the time of the council, Peter and John, and James the Less, who seems promoted to the post left vacant by the death of his namesake, are named by St. Paul as the chief pillars of the church. There is here a train of coincidences, indirect, but not the less clear and impressive, in the harmony of all these widely scattered intimations.

No. XVII.

Mark 7:1-3. "Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders."

We have in these verses, and the rest of the chapter, an example of the spirit which animated the Pharisees, their tradition of outward washing before meat, and the rebuke which it drew from the Lord Jesus— "Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites."

In St Luke 11:37-54, 12:1-3, we have a different incident, recorded by another evangelist; and the harmony between them, while they are clearly distinct events, is very striking. "As he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him, and he went in, and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner." The parties were similar, and the cause of offence the very same, and we find that the rebuke is exactly similar also. "Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is

full of ravening and wickedness. Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also.” And in the next chapter, hypocrisy is still the key note of the discourse. “He began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.” There is thus a coincidence, not only in the description of the conduct of our Lord, and of *the* offence taken by the Pharisees, but in the point of the rebuke itself, while all the other circumstances are quite different.

No. XVIII.

There is a marked, though indirect agreement, in the various hints given us by the different evangelists respecting the deep impression made by John’s ministry on the people at large.

First, we are told by St. Luke (3:15) that “the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not,” and it is this general expectation which leads him to the public disclaimer, given in all the three earlier gospels.

Next, we are taught by St. John that the excitement of the public mind led to a formal embassy from Jerusalem of the Pharisees, and that their first question was, “Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ;” words which imply that he thereby disappointed the sanguine hope of many eager followers.

At the close of our Lord’s ministry, the captious inquiry of the Pharisees is silenced by the question— “The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say From heaven, he will say, Why then believed ye him not? But if we say, Of men; all the people will stone us; for they be persuaded that John was a prophet.”

The same character appears from our Lord’s discourse, John 5:33-35. “Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. ... He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.” And again, quite indirectly, in the account of his stay beyond Jordan, 10:41, “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.”

But the same fact receives a striking confirmation from the discourse of Paul at Antioch. We there find that, at a distance from Palestine, and sixteen or seventeen years after the crucifixion, the testimony of John was a powerful engine to induce faith in Jesus as the Christ. “And as John fulfilled his course, he said, Whom think ye that I am? I am not he. But, behold, there cometh one after me, whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose.”

All these notices, which arise incidentally in each case, agree in giving the same view of the Baptist’s ministry, that the people were on the point of receiving him as their Messiah, and were held back chiefly by two reasons, the absence of miracles, and the strong and clear testimony of John himself, that he was not the Christ, but his forerunner only.

Now there is something, on a hasty view, so paradoxical in this view of the popular feeling, that only its reality can account for the constant harmony of these descriptions. For certainly it seems a paradox, that the great body of the Jews should be ready to welcome John as the Christ, though he wrought no miracles, and expressly affirmed that a greater than he was about to come; and that all the miracles of the Lord Jesus should fail to persuade them of his Messiahship, and leave them hardening in stubborn unbelief.

No. XIX.

Luke 22:27. "For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth."

The rest of this passage in St. Luke is nearly the same as one recorded by two other evangelists somewhat earlier, and before the entry into Jerusalem. This part, however, is peculiar to the third gospel, and to the dispute at the time of the last supper. Is there anything to account for its introduction? In this gospel there is not; but when we refer to St. John we find a beautiful explanation. It was just before, at the beginning of the last supper, that the incident of washing the disciples' feet had occurred. "He took a towel and girded himself, and poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded." After this touching instance of love and condescension, what a special propriety appears in this appeal. "For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth."

No. XX.

John 18:11. "Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?"

There is nothing in this gospel to explain the peculiar phrase which our Lord here employs to express his entire resignation to the will of his Father. Indeed the words, taken alone, indicate clearly their own meaning. But there is a beautiful coincidence, and a deeper emphasis in the words, when we remember the account in the other gospels of the prayer he had offered just before in his hour of agony. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." "O my Father, if this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." How expressively does this question crown the triumph of patient resignation. "Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?"

CONCLUSION.

The chief object of the present work has been to complete the argument drawn from the undesigned coincidences of its separate parts, to establish the authenticity and veracity of the writings of the New Testament. Some parts of this argument, indeed, with reference to the gospels, cannot be presented in this fragmentary and independent form, and require a distinct line of investigation to make their force and reality apparent. But enough, and more than enough, has been advanced, to prove the authenticity of St. Paul's epistles, the faithfulness and veracity of the book of Acts,

and the truth of the main outlines of the gospel history. It will not be natural to close this inquiry without some practical application of the momentous conclusions which it has disclosed.

What are the facts established by the evidence of the letters alone? That St. Paul, who before was a blasphemer and a persecutor, was arrested in his wicked course by a vision of the Lord Jesus appearing to him from heaven; that he was commissioned by him to be an apostle and teacher of the Gentiles; that he exercised and conveyed miraculous gifts in virtue of the power thus entrusted to him by his risen Lord; that more than three hundred brethren were alive when he wrote, who had seen Jesus after his resurrection; that this great fact was proclaimed by all the twelve apostles, and received with undoubting confidence by ten thousands of disciples, in the face of every temptation to deny and disbelieve it; that it was believed by them to be the fulfilment of many prophecies in the Old Testament, and attested by all the miraculous gifts of the apostles and evangelists; that in consequence of their double testimony, within thirty-six years from the public execution of Jesus as a malefactor, churches were planted in Jerusalem, Samaria, Lydda, Joppa, Cæsarea Damascus, Ptolemais, Tyre, the two Antiochs, Syria and Cilicia, Pisidia and Pamphylia, Galatia and Phrygia, in Troas, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea and Corinth, in Cyprus and Crete, in Illyricum and Dalmatia, and in Home itself, the metropolis of the civilized world. All these churches, brought to the faith by the preaching of the apostles, and the moral and miraculous evidence of the message, confessed, in the face of obloquy and bitter persecution, that Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Jews had publicly crucified, was the only begotten Son of God, come down from heaven to be the Saviour of the world. Within a few weeks after his death, in the very city where it occurred, the apostles began to proclaim his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, confirming their statement by a present exercise of supernatural powers, and with such convincing evidence that thousands of converts, under the very eye of the Jewish rulers, and in the face of their strenuous opposition, risked their fortunes and their lives by enrolling themselves as disciples and servants of the once despised Nazarene. The Gospels, the book of Acts, and the Epistles, by a mutual attestation, and a harmony too deep to be artificial or collusive, place these facts beyond dispute with every ingenuous and reasonable mind.

From these same facts it results evidently that Christianity, in its great essential outlines, is true, and that these writings contain the record of a Divine revelation. God, who had spoken before to the fathers by the prophets, has renewed and enlarged his message, and has spoken to us by his Son, the brightness of His own glory, and the express image of His person, who is now seated on the right hand of the Majesty on high. It becomes every one, therefore, to inquire with deep reverence, What has the Lord spoken? What is the word of salvation which the Lord of glory has himself brought to sinners, confirming its truth by “signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?”

This inquiry into the nature of the gospel is still more urgent and imperative, when we reflect on a further truth, established in these writings, that the Lord, with his parting voice, commanded the message to be sent to all nations of the earth, and pronounced a blessing on those who should receive it, and a solemn curse on those who should reject and disobey it. “Thus it is written,” he said to them, “and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and

remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” A message thus enforced by the lips of Him who is perfect in wisdom, must be of unspeakable moment to every child of man on the face of the earth. Wherever it is proclaimed, the first of all duties is to learn its nature, and the evidence on which it rests, and then to embrace with the whole heart the will of God which it enforces, and the promises which it reveals.

What, then, is the nature of the Divine message, so wonderfully attested by signs and miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, by the unwearied labours of the apostles, by the holy, happy deaths of the first martyrs, and by the holy, happy lives of countless believers, in those days when the church continued still in its first love? Surely it is something more and higher than a republication of social morality, and a re-assertion of the truth, so instinctive to the human spirit amidst the lowest degradation, that the whole man does not die, and that the soul survives the dissolution of its clay tabernacle. The mere certainty of a prolonged existence after death is far, very far short of the inspired declaration that Jesus Christ “hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” Let us endeavour to gain, from the sacred writings of the apostles, a juster view of the Christian revelation under these main aspects, the condition of men, the person of the Redeemer, his precepts and example, his atoning death, the gift of the Spirit, and the promise of life eternal.

The first main feature of the gospel proclaimed by the apostles, is its clear and full proclamation of the fallen state of man, and the moral guilt and corruption of all mankind. By this first truth it is broadly distinguished at once from every form of heathen superstition, and all the varieties of mere human philosophy. Man, sunk and degraded by sin, can form no just measure of his own degradation. His pride, indeed, may often revolt against the conditions of his animal life, and against the grosser forms of sensual intemperance and folly; but the mainspring, the love of God and holiness, is wanting in his heart, or very imperfectly restored; and hence morality itself degenerates, when derived merely from a human fountain. The retrospective analysis of conscience may prove, indeed, that every man falls short of the true standard of duty, but will never disclose the true amount of the awful deficiency. In the schemes of superstition, where priests make a profit of working upon terrified consciences, the wound may, perhaps, be probed deeper than in the systems of mere philosophers. But the moral code of superstition is only a new, and sometimes the darkest form, of the very evil it pretends to expose and remedy. Everywhere, and in all ages, it puts the shadow for the substance, and a worship of outward forms and ceremonies, a mere lip service, for living holiness of heart, and the allegiance of the creature to God, the Creator and Benefactor, in spirit and in truth. Too often the evil is deeper still. Lust and cruelty are canonized in the name of religion, and the name of false gods, or of the true God himself, is pleaded in behalf of foul deeds of impurity, or hateful acts of imhumanity, from which even the natural conscience, when not perverted by superstition, recoils with horror. And thus, while systems of refined philosophy, and the more graceful forms of false religion, heal slightly the hurt of the fallen heart, these darker and baser systems of idol-worship and cruel bigotry pour vitriol into its bleeding and putrifying wounds.

Here, then, is the first main contrast of the gospel of Christ. Its voice, though tender and compassionate, is solemn and severe, like the countenance of the archangel who announced to Adam his expulsion from Paradise. It speaks of pity for the sinner, but does not heal his wound slightly, or attempt to disguise from him the greatness of his fall. It does not lower the claims of holiness to meet the depraved habits of the soul, nor pretend that evil is a mere harmless accident, or necessary result of our compounded form of being. It searches out the secret sins of the heart. It proclaims the alienation of men from true holiness, and from the life of God, through the ignorance and blindness of their hearts. It tells us that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," that death is "the wages of sin," and all forms of human sorrow only instalments of its just and fitting penalty. It announces, in brief language, the double truth, so harsh and ungrateful to the ears of a fallen race. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" and "God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." To creatures thus fallen, a bare revelation, however fully confirmed, of a prolonged existence after death, to which some would debase the gospel, would be only a mockery of their real wants. It would be only a message of fear and sorrow, announcing to them "a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversary," instead of being, as its name implies, "glad tidings of great joy."

The next main feature of the gospel message relates to the person and glory of the promised Redeemer. The greatness of the ruin which it proclaims implies the need for a great and mighty deliverance. A redemption is needed, co-extensive in its power of application with the evil which it has to remedy, a cure for the world-wide sins and sorrows of the whole race of mankind. No scheme of philosophy, however subtle and elegant, no power of human genius, however profound, are equal, or could possibly be equal, to this momentous task. For long ages the promise of a deliverance was given, but its exact nature, and the person by whom it was to be procured, were veiled in types and shadowy emblems from the clear vision of the holiest men. They saw it afar off, but dimly, and as by moonlight, until the appointed season, when the true Day-star was to arise. Then, at length, the types of the law, the scattered predictions of the prophets, the instincts of human desire, in the prayer of Solomon, "Will God in very deed dwell with men?" the necessities of a ruin so vast, the requirements of infinite justice, the promptings of unfathomable love, all converged upon a truth too wonderful to be received on lighter evidence, too glorious and sublime, too precious and holy, to be rejected without fearful guilt, where such evidence has been given; that the only begotten Son of the Father, by whom the worlds were made—the Word who was with the Father from the beginning—the brightness of His glory, who upholdeth all things by the word of his power,—has himself been made flesh, and tabernacled among us. To this glorious and wonderful fact all the apostles bear witness with consenting voice. Though they had eaten and drunk in his presence—seen him in his human weakness, when weary and thirsty, homeless and despised, bowed to the earth with agony, or crowned with thorns and nailed to the cross—their nearness of communion with Jesus of Nazareth in the days of his flesh, only deepened their conviction of his unrivalled majesty, which beamed forth amidst his deepest humiliation of love. "We beheld," they tell us, "his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." "We have seen, and do testify, that the Father hath sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world." "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

This glory of Christ, as the Son of God, shines out in every part of the New Testament and may be called the essence of the Christian revelation. Wherever this truth is lost or obscured, the very nature of the gospel has passed away. It is the condescending love of the Saviour, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, which forms at once the foundation of all Christian hope, and the mainspring of all Christian obedience. So powerful is its operation, where it is really credited, and not in words only, that one apostle lays down the maxim with Divine authority, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." By the view of a redemption so passing wonderful, the soul is raised from the love of sin into adoring fellowship with the Creator, and communion with His pure and uncreated goodness. How can we believe the fact of a gift so unspeakable, and not be filled with deepest gratitude for such a mysterious and unfathomable love? And hence the volume which opens with the declaration, "His name shall be called Emmanuel, God with us;" closes with a similar statement, twice repeated by the lips of the exalted Saviour—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, and the bright and morning Star." The next main feature of the gospel consists in the Divine morality and holy example of the Lord Jesus. Morality, it is true, was not the sole or highest object of his mission, if the term be used in its ordinary meaning, to denote the outward rules of right conduct between man and man. Yet to purify and elevate the standard of duty, to clear the law of God from false glosses, from Pharisaic additions and Sadducean corruptions, that reduced it to a mere bundle of ceremonial ordinances, was one main purpose of the mission of the Son of God. It was needful to elevate and arouse the conscience, before the mercy of God could be duly prized, or the Divine atonement welcomed by a guilty race. And hence the New Testament is marked throughout by the purest and highest exhibitions of moral truth. All outward actions are traced inward and upward to the fountains of the heart, and all obedience is declared to be worthless where the heart itself is not filled with the love of God and man. The two great commandments are singled out from all the others, in their Divine simplicity, and are unfolded into an immense variety of holy precepts, which all bespeak a Divine origin, by their union of deep, living earnestness, with moral and spiritual elevation of tone. "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted," "forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, even as Christ forgave you so also do ye." "Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good." "Rejoice evermore. Pray without ceasing. In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." Such are a few of the bright gems in this multitude of holy precepts, which ennoble and glorify the Christian revelation, and mark the message as truly unearthly and Divine.

But the morality of the gospel does not reside in mere precepts alone. Here, and here only, an elevated moral standard is enforced by a living example of sinless obedience. In the life of the Lord Jesus all the varied forms of moral goodness meet together, and are harmonized into their perfect union—purity and gentleness; severity against sin, and grace to the sinner; zeal for the glory of God, and tender love towards mankind;

fervour and calmness; condescension and dignity; activity of outward labour, and habits of heavenly contemplation. The precepts of our Lord, when read by the light of his own example, thus acquire a moral power and a hold on the conscience, which precepts alone, however pure and excellent, could never secure. Amidst all the variable standards of worldly morality, and the darkening power of example in a world of sin, here is one bright vision of perfect goodness, to awaken the desire, and revive the hopes, of every fallen spirit, that has begun, however dimly and irresolutely, to seek after God.

Even this union of a high morality with a spotless example, however unrivalled by all false religions or human systems, is not the main excellence of the Christian revelation. It has another character, exclusively its own. In the death of the Lord Jesus it sets before the sinner a full provision for the removal of all his guilt, a way of complete and lasting reconciliation with the God of holiness. The atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God is at once the fulfilment of all the numerous types of the Jewish law, and the Divine response to the deepest craving, the sorest and darkest doubt of the sinner's burdened heart. "How shall men be just with God?" has been the cry of the awakened conscience from the earliest times; and as soon as thought and reflection have been awakened, the inquiry has given birth to another, still deeper, and equally hard to solve, "How shall God be just towards man, and still the guilty be saved from perishing in hopeless condemnation?" The gospel alone solves the mystery; not indeed in a way which flatters the pride of the intellect, for to the intellect it remains a mystery still, but in a way that frees the conscience from its burden, and fills the heart with love; while the spiritual reason sees, though dimly, the equity and wisdom of the new economy of grace. And this is the substance of the message, that "all we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid upon HIM," even on Jesus, his own beloved Son, "the iniquity of us all;" that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;" and that "He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." In the punishment of the Surety and Substitute we may thus read the Divine equity and holiness; in the double transfer of sin to the Saviour, and of grace to the sinner, the Divine sovereignty and love. And thus, in the words of the apostle, God is just, while justifying him that believeth in Jesus; while the Psalmist predicts the same blessing in a more vivid, though less definite utterance of joyful anticipation. "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth; and righteousness shall look down from heaven."

It is this free and full atonement for the sins of the guilty, revealed in the gospel, which renders it indeed glad tidings of great joy to every race of mankind. In the words of an early writer (which prove the deep hold of this truth on the hearts of the first Christians), "He gave his own Son a ransom for us, the holy for the lawless, the harmless for the wicked, the just for the unjust, the uncorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal. For what else could cover our sins besides his righteousness? In whom could we, the lawless and unholy, be justified, save by the Son of God alone? O sweet exchange! O unsearchable wisdom! O unexpected benefits, that the sin of many should be hidden by one righteous, and the righteousness of one justify many sinners! Having now, therefore, revealed the Saviour, who is able to save even what seemed incapable of salvation, He sought that we should trust in his goodness, account him our nourisher, father, teacher,

counsellor, physician, wisdom, light, honour, glory, strength, and life, and not be anxious concerning food and raiment.”

But the gospel, while it makes provision for the forgiveness of all past sin, provides equally for the recovery of inward holiness. The same Lord, who is revealed as the Lamb of God, or an atoning sacrifice for the sin of the whole world, is also revealed as the True Vine, the Living Bread, or the source of inward and spiritual nourishment and healing to the souls of men. Strengthened by his grace, the fishermen of Galilee have become examples of holiness, and teachers of wisdom, beyond all the great and mighty of the world, while blaspheming persecutors have been changed into preachers of righteousness and patterns of self-sacrificing love. The same Spirit, who wrought these triumphs in their hearts and lives, through the name of Christ, is promised to every one who believes the gospel, in all ages and countries of the world. And every age, and almost every country, has borne repeated witness to the truth of the promise. From the first centuries to the present hour, from the tropical regions to the snows of Greenland, the trophies of the doctrine of the cross have been the same.

The wretch that once sang wildly, danced and laughed,
And sucked in dizzy madness with his draught,
Has wept a silent flood, reversed his ways,
Is sober, meek, benevolent, and prays;
Feeds sparingly, communicates his store,
Abhors the craft he boasted of before;
And he that stole hath learned to steal no more.

The history of modern missions is hardly less fertile than that of the first rise of the church, in these blessed and delightful proofs of the efficacy of the gospel, the reality of the Spirit's presence with the word, and the transforming power of the doctrine of Christ. And how exquisite is the description, which the word of God itself supplies, to show the nature of this change, and to illustrate the moral causes which co-operate in producing it, wherever the love of Christ is made known! “We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.”

Lastly, it is the crowning excellence of the Christian revelation, that it discloses the prospect, to those who receive and obey it, of a blessed immortality of love and holiness in the world to come. Not the bare certainty of a future state, which alone would be miserable comfort to the depraved and guilty—a living death, rather than life and immortality—but eternal life, including in that one word, peace, happiness, purity, light, love, and endless joy. And this is not a bare promise, but confirmed by a present earnest of its truth and certain fulfilment. For the same word which announces this blessed hope, declares also that eternal life is begun already in the heart of every believer in Christ, and appeals for the fact to their own present experience. “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.” The seeds of a perennial and undying happiness are already sown in the heart, when sin is forgiven, the desires renewed, the affections purified, and the slave of sensual pleasures filled with the love of Christ and of holiness. But while the truth of the promise is thus assured by a present and real earnest, that foretaste on earth, we are equally assured, furnishes no adequate measure of the greatness of the future blessing. For “eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which

God hath prepared for them that love him.”

Such are the main features of that revelation which the gospel supplies, and of which we find the record in those writings which it has been the object of these pages to examine, and prove historically faithful. It discovers the fallen and guilty state of mankind, but proclaims a sufficient and a glorious remedy, procured by the incarnation, the obedience, the example, the death and resurrection, of the everlasting Son of God. It brings deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who were bound with the double chain of sin and misery. It provides for those who embrace it, pardon through the atoning blood of Christ, holiness through the power of the Spirit of God, and the intercession of the Redeemer in glory, with “an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away,” confirmed by the promise and oath of God to all them that believe in his word, and obey his revealed will. May the writer, and every reader of these pages, embrace this free mercy of the God of heaven! May the blood of Christ be our only hope for the forgiveness of all our guilt, the grace of the Holy Spirit our only dependence for power to walk in the way of peace and holiness, the kingdom of Christ the goal of all our desires, the blessed prize to which we continually are seeking to attain! The perusal of these pages will then only be a true and lasting benefit, if it serves to deepen our faith in the word of God, and to confirm in us a holy resolution to embrace for ourselves the salvation of Christ, and to tread in the footsteps of the holy apostles, until faith shall be exchanged for sight, and the cavils and doubts of unbelieving hearts in a world of sin, for the vision of Christ, in all the fulness of his majesty, and in all the beauty of his infinite love!

CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS AND OF ST. PAUL’S EPISTLES.

The details of the following Table are, of course, in some degree conjectural. Those cases in which the dates, in the judgment of the compiler, are most clearly established are in small capitals; and the others, it is believed, are either correct, or within one year of the true time. Italics are used, to render the succession of the epistles clearer to the eye. Their relative order, though not always their precise date, may be viewed as demonstratively ascertained.

A.D.	30.	April	...	The crucifixion. (April, A.D. 33, Scaliger, Usher. March or April, A.D. 29, Ideler, Clinton, Browne, Benson.).
		May	...	The first Pentecost.
	36	June	...	The death of Stephen.
	37.	April	...	The conversion of Saul.
		Pentecost	...	First preaching of Saul.
	40.	Pentecost	...	St. Paul’s first visit to Jerusalem.
		September	...	St. Peter at Joppa.
	41.	Pentecost	...	Conversion of Cornelius.
	42.	February	...	Barnabas at Antioch.
		Pentecost	...	St. Paul at Antioch.
	43.	Passover	...	The prophecy of Agabus.
	44.	Passover	...	ST. PAUL’S SECOND VISIT TO JERUSALEM.
		May	...	DEATH OF HEROD.

	Pentecost	...	Return to Antioch.
45.	Pentecost	...	First circuit of Paul and Barnabas begins.
	September	...	Arrival at Perga.
46.		...	Circuit through Pisidia and Pamphilia.
47.	September	...	Return to Antioch.
50.	Spring	...	Pharisees at Antioch.
	Summer	...	COUNCIL AT JERUSALEM.
	Autumn	...	St. Peter and St. Mark at Antioch.
51.	Spring	...	SECOND CIRCUIT BEGINS.
	September	...	St. Paul preaches at Galatia.
52.	February	...	St. Paul crosses from Troas into Europe
	May	...	St. Paul leaves Philippi.
	August	...	St. Paul at Athens.
	September	...	St. Paul at Corinth.
	November	...	FIRST EPISTLE TO THESSALONICA.
53.	Spring	...	<i>Second Epistle to Thessalonica.</i>
	Autumn	...	<i>Epistle to the Galatians.</i>
54.	January	...	Gallio, deputy of Achaia.
	April	...	St. Paul sails from Corinth.
	Pentecost	...	Fourth visit to Jerusalem.
	Autumn	...	Second circuit of Galatia.
55.	January	...	St. Paul arrives at Ephesus.
	April	...	Separation of the disciples.
57.	April	...	FIRST EPISTLE TO CORINTH.
	May	...	Departure from Ephesus.
	July	...	<i>Second Epistle to Corinth.</i>
	November	...	ARRIVAL AT CORINTH.
58.	February	...	<i>Epistle to the Romans.</i>
	Passover	...	ST. PAUL AT PHILIPPI.
	Pentecost	...	FIFTH VISIT TO JERUSALEM.
60.	Pentecost	...	Recall of Felix.
	August	...	Voyage at Rome begins.
	November	...	Shipwreck at Malta.
61.	February	...	Arrival at Rome.
62.	July	...	<i>Epistle to the Ephesians.</i>
		...	<i>Epistle to the Colossians.</i>
		...	<i>Epistle to Philemon.</i>
63.	February	...	<i>Epistle to the Philippians.</i>
	June	...	<i>Epistle to the Hebrews.</i>
	August	...	St. Paul in Crete.
	Winter	...	St. Paul at Colosse.
64.	Spring	...	St. Paul in Macedonia.
	Autumn	...	St. Paul at Corinth.
		...	<i>First Epistle to Timothy.</i>
		...	<i>Epistle to Titus.</i>
	Winter	...	St. Paul at Nicopolis.
65.	Spring	...	St. Paul at Dalmatia and at Troas.
	Summer	...	Apprehension in Asia.
		...	St. Paul a prisoner at Rome.
		...	<i>Second Epistle to Timothy.</i>

66. Spring ... St. Paul martyred in Rome.

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY.

NOTES