

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

FOUR GOSPELS;

TENDING CHIEFLY,

To ascertain the Times of their Publication ;

AND

To illustrate the Form and Manner of their
Composition.

By the Rev. Dr. HENRY OWEN,

Rector of St. OLAVE in *Hart-street*,

and Fellow of the *Royal Society*.

Ζητῶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὑφ' ἧς εἶδεις πῶποτε ἐβλάσθη.

M. ANTONIN. lib. vi. § 21.

L O N D O N :

Printed for T. PAYNE, next the *Mews-Gate*, *Castle-Street*, *St. Martin's*. M DCC LXIV.

“CUM rerum a CHRISTO gestarum
“ nulla supersit historia fide digna,
“ præter eas quæ a sanctissimis viris, qui
“ Evangelistæ dicuntur, conscriptæ sunt;
“ maximi est momenti certo scire a *quibus*,
“ & *quo consilio* scriptæ sint, tum etiam *quo*
“ *tempore* in lucem sint editæ; ne fides,
“ quam iis habemus, temeraria credulitas
“ existimari queat, aut levibus objectiun-
“ culis posse labefactari.”

CLERICI Harm. Evangel. Differt. tertia.

P R E F A C E.

COULD we truly discover at what time, for whose use, and on what occasion, the Gospels were respectively written, we should doubtless be able, not only to understand them more perfectly, but also to read them with more profit, than we have the happiness at present to pretend to. For such a Discovery, as it would throw light on the difficult passages, and help us to reconcile the seeming contradictions, which obstruct our progress in these sacred studies; so would it impart an additional lustre, force, and propriety to the several arguments, which the Scripture offers for the confirmation and improvement of our Faith.

BUT if this Discovery, once attained, would prove of such infinite use and consequence, then surely an *Essay* which is made

towards it may hope to meet with a candid reception, though it should not succeed in every respect.

THE following disquisitions, if they can plead no other merit, may yet at least lay claim to this—that they were formed with a good design, and conducted with the utmost impartiality. For the Author, having no hypothesis to serve, nor any other end in view but the investigation of truth, suffered himself to be carried along as the tide of evidence bore him.

In the course of his enquiry, he followed chiefly the light of Scripture; and where that failed, betook himself to the primitive Writers for farther instruction. But as these Writers differ widely in their accounts, he has only so far adopted their opinions, as they appear conformable to the sacred history, and consistent with each other—and even the testimonies alledged are generally to be looked upon as no more than collateral proofs of what had been deduced before from the internal structure of the Gospels.

THIS is the method in which he thought proper to conduct his enquiry. The result of it he now humbly submits to the judgment of the learned; who, as they are alone able to pronounce on its merits, will be the most ready to pardon its defects.

THE Author may appear perhaps singular in his opinions; but he desires no indulgence to any singularities that are wrong. If he differs in some points from those who have written before him, it is not, he presumes, altogether without reason.

If he has affixed to some of the Gospels, and particularly to St. MATTHEW'S, an earlier date than others have done, it was because the peculiarities of this Gospel, in conjunction with the circumstances of the *Jewish* Church, evidently point to such a period.

If he has displaced the common order of the Gospels, it was because he found
4 that

that order incompatible with their internal character, and contrary to the sentiment of primitive antiquity.

If he asserts, that the later Evangelists perused and transcribed the Writings of the former, it is upon no other account, but that he was forced to do it by the evidence of fact. And if he seems thereby to have deprived Religion of an argument which it did not want, he has the satisfaction to think, that he has supplied it with another, by that very means, of which it really stood in need.

If the plan here exhibited be just in the main—if it be right even with respect to the Persons for whose use the Gospels were more immediately written—then there is a new field of Criticism opened, where the learned may usefully employ their abilities, in comparing the several Gospels together, and raising observations from that *comparative View*. Some few specimens of this sort, the Reader will find inserted
in

in the Notes. More could not conveniently be added, though they sprung up thick in the Author's way. This superstructure he leaves to others and to future time: his present concern is for the goodness of the foundation, which he intreats the public to examine with care; and to judge of with candour and impartiality. Whatever is defective in it, he heartily wishes to see supplied; and whatever is exceptionable, corrected. The whole aim of his researches is the acquisition of Truth, to which he is ready to sacrifice any of the fore-mentioned opinions, whenever they are proved to be false.

The Reader is desired to correct the following

E R R A T A

Page 8. Note (r) L. 4. for *about* r. *before*

13. l. 1. insert *the* before *many*

l. 4. for *o na r. on a*

34. Col. 2. L. 12, for *r. r.* *viv*

85. l. 17. before *that* insert —

87. Note (d) L. 2. dele *and*

95. l. 19. for *r. r.* *Firff,*

96. l. 1. dele *z.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

FOUR GOSPELS.

S E C T. I.

IF we think fit to enquire — “by whom
 “ the Gospels were originally com-
 “ posed” — we shall find them ascribed by
 all the ecclesiastical writers of antiquity to
 the four persons, whose names they bear.
 In this article the several authors perfectly
 agree, and therefore may be depended up-
 on with safety. But if we enquire further—
 “ at what particular time or year, either of
 “ these Gospels was penned or published” —
 the accounts they have left us on this head
 are evidently too vague, confused, and dis-
 cordant, to lead us to any solid or certain
 determination. Discordant, however, as

B

these

these accounts are, it may not be improper to collect them together, and present them to the Reader's view. And

I. WITH regard to St. MATTHEW, EUSEBIUS intimates [a], and THEOPHYLACT affirms [b], that he wrote his Gospel about *eight* years after our Saviour's ascension; that is, about the year of our Lord **XLI.**

OTHERS [c] date the publication of it about *seven* years later, viz. A. D. **XLVIII.** or **XLIX.**

AND IRENÆUS [d], brings it still lower *fourteen* years, namely, to the year **LXII.** For so late it must be, before the Apostles, St. PETER and St. PAUL, preached the

[a] Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 24.

[b] Ματθαῖος — ἔγραψε τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον — μετὰ ὀκτὼ ἔτη τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως. MATTHEWUS scripsit Evangelium post octo anni assumpti in caelis CHRISTI. PREF. COM. in MATTHEO.

[c] NICÉPHOR. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 45. Chron. Alexand. CAV. Hist. Lit. in MATTHEO.

[d] MATTHEWUS — Scripturam edidit Evangelium, cum PETRUS & PAULUS Romæ evangelizarent, & fundarent ecclesiam. *Contes Harref.* lib. iii. c. 1. & RUSS. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 8.

Gospel together (if indeed they ever *did* preach the Gospel together) at *Rome* [e].

II: WITH regard to St. MARK, THE same Author relates [f], that he committed his Gospel to writing some time after the *departure* of the fore-mentioned Apostles: which, if he means their departure from *Rome*, might be about the year LXIV; but if he means their departure out of this world, i. e. their decease, then it could not be earlier than the close of the year LXVIII.

[e] St. PAUL arrived at *Rome* in the year LXI, and continued *two* years a prisoner there. It is a question whether we are to refer the publication of St. MATTHEW'S Gospel to the *beginning*, or the *end* of this period. MILL inclines to the *first*, and supposes it to be published in LXI (*Proleg.* N. 61—64). We have taken the medium, LXII. But Dr. LARDNER thinks, that IRENEUS speaks of the *second* time that St. PAUL was at *Rome*; and thence concludes that St. MATTHEW writ his Gospel in the year LXIV. *Supplement to Credibility*, vol. I. chap. 5.

[f] Post horum excessum, (Græcè ἑτάδω) MARCUS discipulus & interpres PETRI, & ipse quæ a PETRO annuntiata erant, per scripta nobis tradidit. IREN. ubi supra. Vide etiam ATHANAS. ad fin. Synops. S. Script. et HIERONYM. Catal. Script. Eccl. voce MARC.

BUT THEOPHYLACT [g] and EUTHYMIUS [h] both assert, that the Gospel of St. MARK was written about *ten* years after our Lord's ascension, namely, in the year XLIII; — which is agreeable to the date affixed to the end of it in some *Greek* manuscripts [i].

III. WITH respect to St. LUKE, IRENÆUS informs us [k], that he digested into writing what St. PAUL had preached among the *Gentiles*; intimating thereby, that it was after that Apostle had dispatched a *considerable* part of his ministry:—nay, he had dispatched indeed the far *greater* part of it, before St. LUKE engaged in this work, if our author's account be true. For, considering he ranks him *after* St. MARK,

[g] Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ μαρκοῦ ποιεῖται μετὰ τὴν ἀναστάσιν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίου ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀποστολῆς τοῦ ἀποστόλου παύλου. *Evangelium sicut MARCUM post dictum annis assumpti Christi Romæ conscriptum est.* Pref. Com. in MARC.

[h] See his testimony produced at large in LARDNER'S *Supplement* &c. vol. I. chap. vii. p. 179.

[i] Vide MILL. & WETSTEN. ad finem MARCI.

[k] LUCAS autem sectator PAULI, quod ab illo prædicabatur Evangelium, in libro condidit. *Contra Hæres.* ubi supra.

it is evident he thought him to be a *later* writer; and consequently, that his Gospel could not be published sooner than the year LXV—when the Apostle of the *Gentiles* had well nigh finished his course. •

BUT THEOPHYLACT says expressly [l], that St. LUKE wrote his Gospel within *fifteen* years after the ascension of CHRIST; that is, about the year of our Lord XLVIII; which is the time specified in some *Greek* manuscripts [m].

IV. WITH respect to St. JOHN, THEOPHYLACT assures us [n], that he penned his Gospel *thirty-two* years after

[l] Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας, ὡς ἡ αὐτὸ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῷ ἠμφαίνῃ, μετὰ πενήτεκα δὲ ἔτη τῆς τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως συγγράψατο. *Evangelium cum omni diligentia conscriptum, id quod 15 postquam in caelos CHRISTUM anno quinto decimo. Argument. in Evangel. scc. LUCAM. EUTHYMIUS affirms the same. LABDNER's Supplement scc. vol. I. chap. viii. p. 225.*

[m] Vid. MILL. & WETSTEN. ad fin. LUC.

[n] Ὁ (Εὐαγγέλιον) συνέγραψεν, ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ ἡσυχίᾳ Ἰβήριου Ἀββατοῦ, μετὰ πενήκοντα δύο ἔτη τῆς τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. *Quod (sc. Evangelium) 32 exul in Patmo insula conscripsit post triginta duos annos assumpti in caelos CHRISTI. Pref. Com. in JOAN.*

our Lord's ascension; viz. in the year LXV.

NICEPHORUS says [e] that he wrote it four years later; namely, in the year LXIX.

BUT others affirm [p] that he composed it in his *old age*, and near the conclusion of the first century; that is, about the year of our Lord XCVIII.

FROM these accounts, delivered down to us by the ancient Fathers, the only inference we can draw with certainty is, — that, of all the Evangelists, St. MATTHEW, in their opinion [q], wrote first; St. MARK, next; then St. LUKE; and last of all St. JOHN: though perhaps the Gospels themselves, carefully examined,

[e] Ἰουλιανὸς, ἐπιγράψας ἀποστόλων χροῖνας τῶ ἐπιγράψαι, μετα δ' αὐτοῦ τὸν δ' αὐτοῦ ἀποστόλου Ἰωάννου, ἔγραψε τὰς εὐαγγέλιον τῶ ἀποστόλου τῶ Ἰωάννου. JOANNES autem, qui prius sine scripto verbum deposuerat, post triginta sex a CHRISTI ascensione annis, postremus omnium creditur ad scribendum descendisse. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 45.

[p] IREN. contra Hæres. lib. iii. c. 1. & 3. EPIPHAN. Hæres. li. 5 12. HIERONYM. Cat. Script. Eccl. voce JOAN. MILL. Prolegom. n. 181. ed. KUSTER.

[q] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 25.

may afford us reason to doubt the exactness of this order.

WITH regard to the *Times*, in which the Gospels are said to have been published, and which differ so widely from each other, it may be sufficient to observe at present, that the *circumstances* of things, and the *necessities* of the Church, seem to plead in favour of the *earliest*, rather than of the *latest* dates. For we can hardly suppose, that the Church should be left, for so many years as these dates imply, without any authentic account in writing of facts so highly important not only to its edification, but also to its very being [r]. And if we may depend on the testimony of EUSEBIUS, we find in reality it was not. For he expressly assures us [s], on the credit of antiquity, that St. JOHN, at the request of the faithful, perused and ratified the three first Gospels; and afterwards added his own, as a proper Supplement to them. Whence it is evident, that those Gospels must not only

[r] Vide CLERICI *Dissertationem tertiam* Harmon. Evangel. subjunctam.

[s] Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 24.

have been published, but also received and acknowledged by the world, long before the close of the first century [s],

S E C T. II.

ALL that has been hitherto advanced, we have taken on the authority of the ancient Fathers; and they, 'tis to be feared, took it upon trust. The oldest of them collected the reports of their own times, and set them down for certain truths; and those who followed, adopted their accounts, with implicit reverence. Thus, traditions of every sort, true or false, passed on from hand to hand without examination, until it was almost too late to examine them to any purpose.

THERE being, then, but little dependance to be laid on these *external* proofs, let

[s] This is further confirmed by the frequent *allusions* to these Gospels, and the many *quotations* from them, which are to be found in the *apostolical* Fathers, BARNABAS, CLEMENT, and HERMAS; who are all supposed to have written about the end of the first century. See LARDNER'S *Credibility* &c. vol. II. Book i. ch. 1—4.

us now see whether any thing can be inferred from the *internal* construction of the Gospels themselves, either *for* or *against* the preceding articles.

WHEN the *first* Evangelist had penned his Gospel, it is natural to conclude that it was soon published and dispersed abroad among the various assemblies of Christians; who would be eager to obtain a *true* and *genuine* account of the words and actions of the Founder of their Religion, that is, of those things, in which they had been instructed; and upon which their faith was founded.

Hence then we may further conclude, that the *second* Evangelist was perfectly acquainted with the writings of the *first*: and that the *third*, when he wrote, perused the Gospels of the other *two*; which he might apply, in part, to his own use, making what additions he thought proper. This we offer at present only by way of supposition: hereafter it may appear to have been real fact.

BUT to clear our way to the proof of this fact, it will be necessary to determine,
among

among other things, which of these sacred Historians is in reality to be accounted the *first*; which the *second*; and which the *third*: for much depends upon this question.

WHEN the Apostles, after their Master's decease, began to open and discharge their commission; it is well known, that, apprehending the *Gentiles* to have no concern in the *Christian Covenant*, they preached the Gospel to the *Jews* only [u]. Under this mistaken apprehension, they continued at least for the space of *seven years*; and consequently, during *that time*, confined their labours altogether to the limits of the *Holy Land* [x]. Nay, they confined them in general to a much narrower compass. For

[u] Acts xi. 19.

[x] Dr. CAVE (*Liv. of the Ap. art. St. PET. § 11. p. 44*) concludes from a passage in CLEMENS ALEX. *Strom. lib. vi.* that the Apostles preached to none but the *Jews* in and about *Jerusalem*, for *twelve years* after our Saviour's ascension — and that in consequence of his special command. The passage referred to is this — *Ἐὰν μὲν ἐν τῆς θείας τῆς ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τοῦτο, κ. τ. λ.* If any Jew shall repent, and believe the Gospel, he shall be pardoned; but after twelve years go ye into all the world, that none may pretend they have not heard. vid. GRAB. *Spicileg. Patr. sec. i. p. 67.* APOLLONIUS relates a tradition to the same purpose. EUSEB. *Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 18.*

they

they seem to be all this while intirely taken up in forming and settling the Church at *Jerusalem* [y]; which, considering the weight of opposing difficulties, required indeed the constant exertion of their joint labours.

FROM thence they went out occasionally, one or more as it was thought requisite, to confirm the Churches that were planted by others in various parts of the country. For the Churches established at a distance from *Jerusalem*, in the several districts of the *Holy Land* and the countries adjoining, were originally founded, not by the *Apostles*, but by those inspired Christian Converts, who were dispersed abroad on account of the persecution carried on by SAUL [z] under the direction of the *Sanhedrim*. These men laid the foundation; directed therein by supernatural influence, and aided by ex-

[y] It was of infinite consequence, that a Christian Church should be established at *Jerusalem*, the place where Christianity was first preached; otherwise the Gospel would have been immediately rejected in more distant places, as a mere forgery — unable to maintain its ground among those persons, who were best qualified to judge of its merits.

[z] Acts viii. 4 — 13. 40.

traordinary powers. But whatever their powers and abilities were, yet the doctrines they preached seem still to have wanted the concurring aid of *apostolical* testimony to advance them into *Gospel-Truths*. Such a testimony therefore they obtained. For two of the Apostles are expressly said to have *borne witness* to the truth of what had been preached in the region of *Samaria* [a]: nor is there any room to doubt, but that others of them did the same in other places.

BUT nevertheless, all that the Apostles either preached or confirmed, in these short excursions, could only be the general Heads of Christianity; and not that perfect System of Religion, which their Master had delivered to them. Such compleat instruction they could not impart in so short a time: and if they had, how liable would it have been, as it depended upon memory, to be soon forgotten! To guard therefore against

[a] Acts viii. 14, &c. "Now when the Apostles, which were at *Jerusalem*, heard that *Samaria* had received the word of God, they sent unto them PETER and JOHN" &c.—"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*." † 25.

many inconveniences which inevitably attend *oral Tradition*, and to fix *these Churches* on a stable footing, it was evidently necessary, that some one or other of the Apostles should deliver to them a *written* narrative of their Master's life and doctrine; which might remain with them as an infallible *standard* of what they were to believe and practise.

As the *Jewish-Converts* in *Judea* stood in need of such an account, so we find that they were accordingly supplied with it. For it is the unanimous opinion of antiquity, “ that St. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel
 “ for the service of the *Jews* in *Palestine* [b];
 “ with a view to confirm those who be-
 “ lieved, and to convert, if possible, those
 “ who believed not.” The structure and genius of his Gospel countenance and cor-

[b] Ὅτι ἀρχῆθεν ἔγραψεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτὸ ἐν ἑβραϊστί, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ματθαῖος, ἐκλελυμένος αὐτὸ τοῖς ἑβραϊσμοῦ ἀρχαῖοις. κ. τ. λ. *Primum scilicet Evangelium scriptum esse a MATTHEO, prius quidem Publicano, postea vero Apostolo IESU CHRISTI, qui illud, Hebraico sermone conscriptum, Judæis ad fidem conversis publicavit.* ORIGEN. apud EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 25. Vide etiam HIERONYMI Com. in MATT. Proem. & THEOPHYLACT. Proem. Com. in MATT.

rebovite this opinion. For he begins with the genealogy of CHRIST from ABRAHAM [c]—refers often to *Jewish* customs—relates the most of our Saviour's discourses against *Jewish* errors and superstitions [d]—quotes the greatest number of passages from the *Jewish* Scriptures—answers the most considerable *Jewish* objections—and frequently makes use of the terms and phrases of *Jewish* Theology.

[c] St. MATTHEW, in conformity with the *Jewish* custom, records the genealogy of CHRIST according to his legal descent; and brings it down from ABRAHAM, through DAVID, to show his title to the kingdom of *Israel*. Vid. CHRYSOST. Hom. I. in MATTH.

[d] Ch. XIII. 1—33. Here St. MATTHEW speaks to the *Jews* personally, and reproves their superstitions, as our Saviour did, with a view to correct them. And St. LUKE, who had to do with *strange Jews*, follows the same method, II. 43—52. But St. MARK, XII. 38—40. VIII. 15. VII. 5—7. speaks only of the *Jews*, and their various superstitions; and seems to do it with a view to distinguish them from the *Christians*, who were commonly, tho' unjustly, looked upon as a sect of the *Jews*, and comprehended under that denomination in the imperial edicts. By shewing in this manner that the *Christians* condemned all *Jewish* superstitions and factious tenets, St. MARK might hope to procure for them a more favourable treatment from the *Roman* state.

THESE marks of its being primarily intended for the benefit of the *Jews* [e], stand, as it were, on the surface of his Gospel; and are obvious to every Reader, that is tolerably acquainted with the original. But, if we look a little deeper, we shall find that it abounds with *other* characters, strongly expressive of the same design. To introduce you to the knowledge of these characters, it will be necessary to observe, THAT, IN PENNING THEIR GOSPELS, THE SACRED HISTORIANS HAD A CONSTANT REGARD [f], AS WELL TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PERSONS, FOR WHOSE USE THEY WROTE; AS TO THE SEVERAL PARTICULARS OF CHRIST'S LIFE, WHICH THEY WERE THEN WRIT-

[e] Among other instructions delivered by our Saviour to his Apostles, St. MATTHEW records the following—"Go not into the way of the *Gentiles*, and into any city of the *Samaritans* enter ye not." ch. x. 5. Whether *this* be any proof or intimation that he wrote his Gospel for the sake of the *Jews*, and before the conversion of the *Gentiles*, let others determine. No such words however are to be found either in St. MARK'S or St. LUKE'S Gospel.

[f] Vide WATSON. de Interpret. Nov. Test. Regul. 7. tom. ii. p. 878—882.

ING [g]. It was THIS that regulated the conduct of their narration—that frequently determined them in their choice of materials—and, when they had chosen, induced them either to contract or enlarge, as they judged expedient. In short, it was THIS that *modified* their Histories, and gave them their *different colourings*.

Now, if the Gospels were thus modelled, as I apprehend they were, to the state, temper, and disposition of the times, in which they were written; then are we furnished with certain CRITERIA, by which we may judge of their respective dates. For those times, whose transactions accord with the turn of the discourses related in the *Gospel-Histories*, are, in all probability, the *very times* when the GOSPELS were written.

If we bring St. MATTHEW'S to this test, and examine it by the foregoing prin-

[g] If the Evangelists had regarded only the particulars of CHRIST'S Life, they would doubtless have mentioned as many as they could of his Discourses and Miracles. But, notwithstanding they had such a variety of materials to make a choice from; yet the three first of them chiefly insist on the very same articles.

ciple,

ciple, it will manifestly appear to have been penned at a time, when the Church was labouring under a heavy persecution. For it contains many obvious references to such a state; and many dexterous applications both to the injurious, and to the injured, party.

As to the injured and persecuted *Christians*, the Evangelist informs them — that their afflictions were no more than they had been taught to expect, and had promised to bear when they embraced the Gospel [b] — that, however unreasonable their sufferings might be, considered as the effects of the malice of their enemies, they were yet useful and profitable to themselves, considered as trials of their faith and fidelity [c] — that, though they were grievous to be borne at present, yet they operated powerfully to their future joy [d] — that a pusillanimous desertion of the Faith would be so far from bettering their state and condition, that it would infallibly expose them to greater calamities, and cut them off from

[b] Ch. x. 21, 22. 34—36. ch. xvi. 24.

[c] Ch. v. 11. ch. xxiv. 9—13.

[d] Ch. v. 4. 10—12.

he hopes of Heaven [l] — that they were not, however, forbidden to use the lawful means of preservation; but even enjoined to put them in practice, whenever they could do it with innocence [m] — that the due observance of the Christian precepts was an excellent method to appease the wrath and fury of their enemies, and what therefore they were obliged, in point of prudence as well as duty, carefully to mind and attend to [n] — that, if it should be their fate to suffer martyrdom at last for their Religion, it was infinitely better to continue faithful to their important trust, than by any base compliance to incur his displeasure, in whose hands are the issues not only of *this* life, but also of *that* which is to come [o].

ON the other hand again, to calm the passions of the enraged Jews, and win them over to the profession of the Gospel, he labours to soften and abate their prejudices,

[l] Ch. i. 28, 32, 33, 39.

[m] Ch. x. 16, 17, 23.

[n] Ch. v. 30. vii. 12, 24—27. ch. v. 13—20.

[o] Ch. xvi. 25—27. ch. x. 28.

and to engage them in the practice of meekness and charity [p]. To this end, he lays before them the dignity and amiableness of a compassionate, benevolent disposition [q];—the natural good consequences that are annexed to it here; and the distinguished regard, which the Almighty himself will pay to it hereafter [r]. Then he reminds them of the repeated punishments, which GOD had inflicted on their fore-fathers for their cruel and barbarous treatment of his Prophets, and assures them that a still more accumulated vengeance was reserved for themselves, if they obstinately persisted in the ways of cruelty [s]: For GOD, though patient and long-suffering, was sure at last to vindicate his elect, and to punish their oppressors, unless they repented, believed, and reformed, with the dreadful rigour of a general destruction [t].

[p] Ch. ix. 13:

[q] Ch. v. 43—48. ch. xviii. 23—35. and is particularly illustrated in all our Saviour's Miracles.

[r] Ch. v. 5, 7, 9. ch. x. 40—42. ch. xviii. 23—35. ch. v. 21—26. ch. xxv. 31—46.

[s] Ch. xxiii. 27—39. ch. x. 14, 15.

[t] Ch. xxiv. 2, &c.

THESE and such like arguments St. MATTHEW has inserted in the body of his Gospel, by way of comfort to the afflicted Christians, and as a warning to those who oppressed and injured them. But these arguments evidently refer to a state of distress and persecution: And therefore the Church must be supposed to labour under such a state when the Evangelist advanced and urged them. Now the greatest persecution ever raised against the Church, while it consisted only of *Jewish* Converts, was that, which was first begun by the *Sanbedrim*, and afterwards continued and conducted by SAUL with implacable rage and fury [*]. During these severities, which lasted in the whole about *six* [x] years, the members of the Christian Church stood in need of all the support, comfort,

[*] EUSEBIUS calls it "the first and most grievous persecution." Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 1. and so does St. LUKE, Acts viii. 1.

[x] Namely till the third of CALIGULA, A.D. xxxix. or xl. when the *Jews* were too much alarmed about their *own* affairs to give any further disturbance to the *Christians*. See LARDNER'S *Credibil.* vol. I. B. I. C. ii. § 12. "Then had the Churches rest," &c. Acts ix. 31.

and assistance, that could possibly be administered to them. But what comfort could they possibly receive, in their distressed situation, comparable to that, which resulted from the example of their suffering Master, and the promises he had made to his faithful followers? This example therefore, and these promises, St. MATTHEW seasonably laid before them, for their imitation and encouragement. For now—towards the close of this dangerous period—it is most likely that he wrote his Gospel; and delivered it to them, as the anchor of their hope, to keep them steadfast in this violent tempest.

THIS opinion is not only conformable to the circumstances of the time, and the tenor of the Gospel, but is also supported by ancient testimony. For COSMAS of *Alexandria*, who wrote in the beginning of the *sixth* century, informs us [y], that a persecution being raised on the death of STEPHEN, which obliged St. MATTHEW to depart from *Judea*, the Believers entreat-

[y] COSMÆ *Topographia Christiana*, lib. v. p. 245. Ap. B. MONTFAUC. *Nov. Collect. PP.* tom. ii. *Paris*, 1706.

ed him to leave with them a *written* instruction for the regulation of their lives;—with which request he complied, and composed his Gospel.

THE Author of the *Imperfect Work* on St. MATTHEW, formerly supposed to be St. CHRYSOSTOM, seems to intimate the same thing [x].

FROM hence it appears to have been a *common* notion, that St. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel before the end of that first persecution, which raged in *Palestine* after the death of the Martyr STEPHEN. He must therefore have written early. And if he wrote so early as the year xxxviii, the *second* of CALIGULA, and the *fifth* from our Saviour's ascension, then it is easy to see why he did not continue his History beyond that memorable event. Nor is it less evident, why he affixed no marks or dates to any of the transactions he has recorded. They were then recent, and too well known to stand in need of such specification.

[x] Vide Eruditi Commentar. in Evang. MATTHEI, incerto Authore, *Prologum*, inter Opera CHRYSOST. ed. Compelin.

S E C T. III.

WHEN the partition-wall was broken down, and the *Gentiles* had admittance into the Christian Church; as they were anxious to share in the privileges of the Gospel, so were they eager to learn the several particulars of the MESSIAH'S life, through whom those privileges were conveyed to them. But, having no opportunity of knowing CHRIST personally, all they could learn of him and his actions, must necessarily be derived from the scattered informations of others. And though we should suppose, that they pursued their enquiries with care and diligence; yet they would be able at last, after all their pains, to gain but a slight and imperfect account of the things which had been transacted by him. To *Christians* however, that is, to *themselves* now in their *converted* state, the knowledge of these things was of the utmost importance. But then, how was such knowledge to be obtained? Histories, compiled from *broken* accounts and *imperfect*

fect Traditions, were not to be trusted to. One History indeed, I mean St. MATTHEW'S [a], they might with safety depend upon as far as it went. But that History, being confessedly written for the sake of the *Jews*, and consequently adapted to their peculiar circumstances, must necessarily be defective in several particulars, which nearly concerned the *Gentiles*. And therefore it seems to be highly expedient, that some inspired *apostolical* person, sufficiently acquainted with all the transactions of our Saviour's life, should deliver such a *regular* and *authentic* account of them, as might satisfy the enquiries, and supply the wants of these *Heathen* Converts.

ACCORDINGLY we are informed, that St. LUKE, a person in all respects qualified for the work, wrote his Gospel with this design; and delivered it to the *Gentile*

[a] It should seem by what EUSEBIUS says (Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 10,) that authentic Copies of St. MATTHEW'S Gospel were carried by the Apostles into the several countries, where they went to preach at their general dispersion about the year

Christians [*b*], that they might both see and be convinced of the truth of those things, in which they had been instructed by their Teachers [*c*].

WRITING therefore to the Gentiles, who were far remote from the scene of action, and consequently ignorant of Jewish affairs, it was incumbent upon him, in order to accomplish what he had in view, to trace the subject quite up to its source, and to proceed through the whole of our Saviour's ministry in a circumstantial and methodical order.

HENCE it is—that he begins his History with the birth of JOHN the Baptist [*d*], as introductory to that of CHRIST — that, in the course of it, he mentions several particulars [*e*] omitted by St. MATTHEW — and that he is so careful in specifying times and places [*f*], together with other cir-

[*b*] Τρίτω Εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστι τὸ κτ' Λουκᾶ, τὸ ὑπὸ τῷ Παύλῳ ἐπαινεῖσθαι, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἰουδαίας προσηλυτοῖσι. *Tertium Evangelium est illud secundum LUCAM, a PAULO laudatum, & in gratiam Gentilium conscriptum.* ORIGEN. COM. in MATTH. tom. i. p. 203. ed. HURT.

[*c*] LUKE i. 3, 4.

[*d*] Ch. i. 5, &c.

[*e*] Ch. ii. 1-6, &c.

[*f*] Ch. iii. 1. 23, &c.

cumstances of facts that were highly conducive to the information of strangers; tho' they needed not to be recited to the *Jews*, who could easily supply them from their own knowledge. Hence also it is that he sets before them the genealogy of CHRIST according to his natural descent [g]—and carries it up as high as ADAM, in order to shew that he was that Seed of the Woman, who was promised for the Redemption of the *whole* World [b]. And by the like references to the state of the *Gentiles*, it is easy to account for his other peculiarities [i].

[g] Ch. iii. 23 — 38.

[b] These circumstances, which an ingenious *Harmonist* thinks inexplicable on any other supposition than that of St. LUKE's being the *First* Writer, appear now, I presume, very consistent with the notion of his being the *Second* — and writing for the instruction of the *Gentiles*.

[i] Tho' St. LUKE wrote his Gospel for the use of the *Gentile* Churches, yet we are to observe that those Churches had many members of *Jewish* extraction; and therefore, in accounting for his *manner* of writing, we must attend to the state of those *believing Jews*, as well as to that of the *Gentile* Converts. It is for *their* sake — i. e. for the sake of the *Jews* — that he has produced so many *Prophecies* from the Old Testament; and repeated so many *Arguments* that had been urged before in similar cases by St. MATTHEW.

With regard to the general construction of his Gospel, it seems to be formed very nearly on the same plan with that of St. MATTHEW; as, indeed, the reason of things required it should. For if the state and condition of the *Gentile* Converts was similar to that of the *Jewish*, (and it is well known that the former suffered the same things from their own countrymen, as the latter did from the *Jews* [k]) then it was necessary that St. LUKE should adjust the points of his History, as his Brother-Evangelist had done before, to the circumstances of the persons to whom he wrote; and so modify his general instructions as to make them applicable to those particular times. And we find, in fact, that he has so done. For he abounds in applications suitable to their condition; and directs his arguments with great propriety both to the support of the persecuted Christians [l], and to the conversion of their obstinate and malicious Adversaries [m]—

[k] 1 Thess. ii. 14.

[l] Ch. vi. 20—23. xii. 4—12. 31, &c. xviii. 28—30.

[m] Ch. vi. 24—26. x. 12. xiii. 1—5. xix. 41—44.

of whom the *Jews* residing in the several countries were still the chief [n].

BUT as the rage and envy of the *Jews* sprang now from another cause than that which had moved their indignation before, (for now they persecuted the *Gentiles* because they laid claim to the privileges of the Gospel [o]) so it was necessary, that the Evangelist should attend to this particular point, and prove their claim to be just and valid.

AGREEABLY thereunto he reminds the *Jews* — that, though they were formerly his chosen nation, and consequently entitled to his peculiar favours; yet God had

[n] And hence it is that the scope and turn of St. LUKE's arguments are in many places so very similar to those of St. MATTHEW. Both Evangelists had similar designs. For if it was St. MATTHEW's intention, among other things, to convert, if possible, the unbelieving *Jews* who lived in *Palestine*; or to abate at least the fury and malice they bore to their *Brethren* who had embraced the Gospel: So it was one part of St. LUKE's intention to convert, if possible, the unbelieving *Jews* who resided in *distant Countries*; or to abate at least the rage and violence, which they exercised towards the *Gentiles*, and those of their own *Persuasion*, who had believed. There being then such an affinity in their designs, no wonder there is such similarity in their method and argument.

[o] Acts xvii. 5, 13.

often

often directed his Prophets to confer those blessings on *Strangers* and *Heatbens*, of which, by their ingratitude, the *Jews* had rendered themselves unworthy [*p*] — that this was the case with regard to the Gospel, which, being ungratefully rejected by *them*, was therefore preached to the more obedient *Gentiles* [*q*]—that the hatred and violence which they expressed on that account was both unreasonable and inhuman [*r*] — that GOD, when he came to vindicate his Elect, would severely punish them for the injurious attempts they made on his people, and the aggravated provocations they had offered to himself [*s*] — and therefore that it behoved them to look to the consequences, and strive to avert, by faith and penitence, the grievous judgments that were coming upon them [*t*].

BUT so prejudiced were the *Jews* against the *Gentiles*, and so averse to their admission into the Christian Church, that they

[*p*] Ch. iv. 25—27.

[*q*] Ch. xx. 9—16.

[*r*] Ch. xv. 11—32. see DODDRIDGE on the place.

[*s*] Ch. xviii. 7, 8.

[*t*] Chap. xiii. 1—5. xxi. 5, &c.

endeavoured to degrade the character of those who asserted their claim, and questioned the authority by which it was supported [u]. They affirmed, that our Saviour chose no more than *Twelve* Apostles, to whom he committed the care of his Religion—that they who undertook to preach to the *Gentiles* were consequently but Deputies and inferior Ministers; the truth of whose doctrines entirely depended on the conformity they bore to what the others taught — and therefore, that this grand, fundamental doctrine of St. PAUL and his Associates must needs be false, since it wanted the seal of apostolical authority.

To obviate these objections, St. LUKE informs them, that the Lord appointed *Seventy* others [x], besides the *Twelve*, who were particularly called *Apostles*, to convey the knowledge of his Religion to the world; and not only so, but invested them with the same authority—charged them with the same instructions—and endowed them with

[u] Acts xiii. 45 — 53. “Am I not an Apostle?” says St. PAUL (1 Cor. ix. 1.) to those who questioned it; see also Gal. i. and ii. and the Commentators thereon.

[x] x. 1—16.

like power of working miracles in proof of their mission, as he had done to their brethren before: And consequently that the Apostles were not the sole commissioned Preachers of the Gospel, tho' they were indeed the first and principal.

AND as to the DOCTRINE itself, it was so far, he assures them, from wanting the support and evidence they supposed, that it stood on the highest and best-grounded authority. For CHRIST had plainly foretold them [*y*] that his Church would be filled with the complying *Gentiles*, while themselves, who rejected his Gospel, should judicially be rejected by him, and left to perish in their sins and impenitence: — and that all this was evident, not only from the account which himself now offered to the world, but also from the Gospel of St. MATTHEW [*z*], who was known

[*y*] Ch. xiii. 28—30. ch. xiv. 16—24.

[*z*] MATTH. xxi. 43. ch. xii. 18, 21. ch. xxiv. 14. It is a great instance of the wisdom of Providence, that St. MATTHEW, who wrote so very early, should give such strong intimations of the calling of the *Gentiles*; otherwise it might have been thought a crafty scheme, invented by the Apostles, in revenge for the ill success they met with among the Jews.

to be an Apostle, as well as an Evangelist: and whose Gospel he had strongly recommended to them — not by name indeed, but by a better, and more common method — that of quoting and copying his words [a].

If this assertion should be thought to stand in need of proof, as in the opinion of many I suppose it will, the following Collations may serve to confirm it, at the same time that they illustrate the observations by which it was introduced.

EXAMPLE I.

MATTH. iii. 3.

Φωνὴ βοᾶν] ἐν τῇ
ἐρήμῳ· Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν
ὁδὸν Κυρίου, ὡς ἔταξε ποι-
ᾶντες τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

LUKE iii. 4—6.

Φωνὴ βοᾶν] ἐν τῇ
ἐρήμῳ· Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν
ὁδὸν Κυρίου, ὡς ἔταξε ποι-
ᾶντες τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

κ. τ. λ.

[a] The Evangelists often refer to passages in the *Old Testament* without naming the books in which they are to be found. And in like manner, several passages in the *Gospels* are recommended with a high degree of respect by the *Apostolical Fathers*, without the names of the Evangelists.

IN this instance, it is natural to expect that both the Evangelists should perfectly agree, since the whole is a quotation from the Prophet ISAIAH [b]: But as this quotation differs a little from the *Greek Version* whence it was taken, it is not improbable, that St. LUKE, in transcribing it, made the same alteration that he observed St. MATTHEW had done before — and then took in the remainder of the Prophecy to shew its accomplishment in the admission of the *Gentiles* into the Church of CHRIST. For it plainly appeared at the time he wrote, that “all flesh was to see the Salvation of *God*,” and to partake of its inestimable blessings.

BUT whatever objections may be made to this Example, the following, doubtless, comes full to the point.

E X A M P L E II.

MATTH. iii. 7—10. LUKE iii. 7—9.

Γοιθήματα ἑχιδῶν, τίς	Γοιθήματα ἑχιδῶν, τίς
ἰπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγῆν	ἰπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγῆν
ἀπὸ τῆς μελλύσης ὄργης;	ἀπὸ τῆς μελλύσης ὄργης;

[b] Ch. xl. 3.

MATTHEW.

Ποίσατε ἔν καρπὸν
ἀξίον τῆ μελαυοίας.

Καὶ μὴ δόξητε λέγειν
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρες ἔχο-
μεν τὴ Ἀβραάμ. λέγω
γὰ ὑμῖν, ὅτι διώα) ὁ
Θεὸς ἐκ τῆ λίθου τύτων
ἐγαῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβρα-
άμ.

Ἦδη ᾗ κὲ ἡ ἀξίονη
πρὸς τὴ ρίζαν τῆ δένδρου
καῖται· πᾶν ἔν δένδρου
μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλόν,
ἐκαιέπη), καὶ εἰς πῦρ
βάλλε).

AND again,

VER. 11, 12.

Ἐγὼ μὲ βαπτίζω ὑ-
μᾶς ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετα-
νοια [c]. ὁ ᾗ ὀπίσω μὲ
ἐρχόμεν), ἰαυρότερός

LUKE.

Ποίσατε ἔν καρπὸς
ἀξίος τῆ μελαυοίας·

Καὶ μὴ ἀρξήαθε λίσω
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρες ἔχο-
μεν τὴ Ἀβραάμ. λέγω
γὰ ὑμῶ, ὅτι διώα) ὁ
Θεὸς ἐκ τῆ λίθου τύτων
ἐγαῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβρα-
άμ.

Ἦδη ᾗ καὶ ἡ ἀξίονη
πρὸς τὴ ρίζαν τῆ δένδρου
καῖται· πᾶν ἔν δένδρου
μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλόν,
ἐκκόπη), καὶ εἰς πῦρ
βάλλε).

VER. 16, 17.

Ἐγὼ μὲ ὕδατι βαπτίζω
ὑμᾶς.

ἐρχε) ᾗ ὁ ἰαυρό-
τερός μῶ, ἔ ἐκ εἰμί ἰκα-

[c] St. MATTHEW inserts εἰς μετανοιαν to remind the Jews of the necessity of *Repentance*: the Gentiles *acknowledged* it, which accounts for the omission in the other Gospel.

MATTHEW:

LUKE.

μὲ ἐστίν, ἔκ ἐκ ἐμὶ ἰκα-
νὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βα-
πτῆσαι· Αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βα-
πτῆσει ἐν πνύματι ἁγίῳ
ἔν πυρί.

Οὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ
χερὶ αὐτοῦ, ἔν Δακκαθα-
ραῖ ἔν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ, ἔν
ζωάξει ἔν σίτων αὐτοῦ εἰς
τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ ἔν ἄ-
χυρον καὶ ἀκαύσει πυρὶ
ἀσβίσει.

νὸς λῦσαι ἔν ἰμάτιον ἔν
ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ [d].
Αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτῆσει ἐν
πνύματι ἁγίῳ ἔν πυρί.

Οὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ
χερὶ αὐτοῦ, ἔν Δακκαθα-
ραῖ ἔν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ, ἔν
ζωάξει ἔν σίτων εἰς τὴν
ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἔν ἄ-
χυρον καὶ ἀκαύσει πυρὶ
ἀσβίσει.

ST. LUKE, in describing our Saviour's Temptations (iv. 1—17) had certainly his eye on St. MATTHEW's account of the same transaction (iv. 1—11). For he follows it in general very close; tho' he found himself obliged to make some particular alterations in the order [e] and phraseology of it.

THE

[d] The variation here is owing to the different forms in which the Proverb was expressed among different nations. This may be applied to other articles.

[e] St. MATTHEW recites the Temptations according to the order in which they were employed: And in this order,

THE same may be said of the Cure of the Leper, v. 12, &c. and various other articles, as appears by comparing the following passages,

in St. LUKE,		with St. MATTH.	
Ch. v.	12—14.	Ch. viii.	2—4.
	20—25.	ix.	2—7.
	27—38.		9—17.
vi.	1—5.	xii.	1—8.
	27, 28, 32.	v.	44, 46.*
	41, 42.	vii.	3—5.
vii.	6—9.	viii.	8—10.*
	32—35.	xi.	16—19.
viii.	5—10.	xiii.	3—13.
ix.	16, 17.	xiv.	19—21.
	18—20,	xvi.	13—16.
	22—27.	21, 24—26, 28.	
	40, 41.	xvii.	16, 17.

considering the natural temper of the *Jews*, they appear to rise progressively in strength one above another. On *different* people they might operate with *different* powers: And therefore St. LUKE, to preserve the *climax* with regard to the *Gentiles*, might judge it necessary to make the transposition we find he has. Vid. WATSTEIN. in loc.

* The places marked with asterisks, if read according to some of the best Mss, come nearer the parallel texts than they are at present in the common printed copies. See MILL and WATSTEIN.

LUKE.	MATTHEW.
ix. 47, 48.	xviii. 2, 5.
xi. 9—13.	vii. 7—11.
15—23.	xii. 24—30.
24—26.	43—45.
29—32.	39—42.
34, 35.	vi. 22, 23.
xviii. 15—30.	xix. 13—29.
31—33.	xx. 17—19.
xix. 29—38.	xxi. 1—9.
xx. 1—8.	23—27.
9—19.	33—45.
21—38.	xxii. 16—32.
xxi. 30—33.	xxiv. 32—35.

Sec. &c. where the marks of their being transcribed, the one from the other, are often apparent to the slightest inspection, and render it the more amazing, that the learned DODWELL should presume to advance (*Disf. I. in IREN. § 39.*) that “the later Evangelists had no knowledge of what the former ones had written before them.”

BUT to convince the Reader of this truth, without the trouble of collating the Gospels, I shall lay before him two more

Examples, not inserted in the preceding series.

EXAMPLE III.

MATT. vi. 25—33.

Διὰ τῆτο λέγω ὑμῖν,
Μὴ μεμεναῖτε τῇ ψυχῇ
ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε καὶ τί
πίητε· μηδὲ τῷ σώματι
ὑμῶν, τί ἐσθύσηθε·

ἔχει ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἔστι
ἢ προφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶ-
μα ἢ ἐσθύματα;

Ἐμβλέψατε [f] εἰς
τὰ πτήσασα ἔξ ἕραν, ὅτι
ὄναι αἰετοῦσιν, καὶ οὐ θνήσκου-
σιν, καὶ οὐδὲ θνήσκου-
σιν, οἷς οὐκ ἔστι ταμίον,
καὶ ὁ Πατήρ

LUKE xii. 22—31.

Διὰ τῆτο ὑμῶ λέγω,
Μὴ μεμεναῖτε τῇ ψυχῇ
ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε· μηδὲ
τῷ σώματι, τί ἐσθύση-
θε.

Ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἔστι
ἢ προφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἢ
ἐσθύματα.

Κατανοήσατε τὰς κό-
ρμας, ὅτι
ὄναι αἰετοῦσιν, καὶ οὐ θνήσκου-
σιν, οἷς οὐκ ἔστι ταμίον,
καὶ ὁ Πατήρ

[f] Our Saviour, in his parabolical Discourses, often al-
luded to things present; and therefore St. MATTHEW, writing
to the Jews, retains his mode of expression, and says — Εμ-
βλέψατε — “Behold, or look on, the birds of the air.” But
the Gentiles were to make the reflexion for themselves; and
hence St. LUKE, with great propriety, substitutes the word —
Κατανοήσατε — “Consider” — in its stead.

MATTHEW.

ὕμῶν ὁ κρείσσον [g]
 κρίψαι αὐτά· ἢ ἡμεῖς
 μᾶλλον διαφέρει αὐ-
 τῶν;

Τίς ἦ ἐξ ὑμῶν με-
 μνησθῆναι δύναται ἵνα
 ἴσῃ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῆ
 πῆχυν ἕνα;

Καὶ πῶς ἐνδύμασιν
 τί μεμνησθήτε;

Καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα
 τῆς ἀγροῦ, πῶς αὐξάνει
 ἢ ἡλιθίου, καὶ οὐκ ἔχει
 ἵνα ἴσῃ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῆ
 πῆχυν ἕνα, ὅτι καὶ Σολομῶν
 ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆ
 περιβάλλεται, ὡς ἐν τέττων.

Εἰ ἦ τὸ χόριον τῆς ἀγροῦ,
 σήμερον ἔσθια, καὶ αὔριον
 εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμε-
 νον, ὁ Θεὸς ἕως ἀμφι-

LUKE.

κρίψαι αὐτά· πῶς
 μᾶλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρει
 τῶν πενηθῶν;

Τίς ἦ ἐξ ὑμῶν με-
 μνησθῆναι δύναται ἵνα
 ἴσῃ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῆ
 πῆχυν ἕνα;

Εἰ ἂν ἔτε ἰλάχιστον
 δύνασθε, τί πῶς τῶν λοι-
 πῶν μεμνησθήτε;

Κατανοήσατε τὰ κρί-
 να, πῶς αὐξάνει· ἢ κη-
 ριαῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἔχει λέγων ἦ
 ὑμῶν, καὶ Σολομῶν ἐν
 πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆ περι-
 βάλλεται, ὡς ἐν τέττων.

Εἰ ἦ τὸ χόριον ἐν τῇ
 ἀγρῷ σήμερον ἔσθια, καὶ
 αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλ-
 λόμενον, ὁ Θεὸς ἕως

[g] Παρὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην ἡ ἐκείνη St. LUKE expresses by Θεός, for a reason too obvious to be mentioned: However, the same reason will explain many other phraseological differences of the like nature.

MATTHEW.

LUKE.

ένυσσιν, ἢ πολλῶ μαλ-
λον ὑμᾶς, ἰληγόπιστοι;

Μὴ ἔν μεριμνήσητε,
λέγουτες, Τί φάγωμαι,
ἢ τί πίωμαι, ἢ τί περι-
βραυνώμαθα;

Πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ
ἔθνη ζητήσιν· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ
Πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ὑψίστος
ὅτι χεῖρ ἔθε τάτων ἀπάν-
των.

Ἐπρώτα ὃ πρώτον ἔ
βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν
δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ [b],
καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προσε-
θήσει ὑμῖν.

ἀμφιένυσσιν, πόσον μαλ-
λον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι;

Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητᾶτε
τί φάγητε, ἢ τί πίητε, καὶ
μὴ μεριμνᾶτε.

Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ
ἔθνη τὸ κόσμον ζητήσιν·
ὁμῶν ὃ ὁ Πατήρ οἶδεν ὅτι
χεῖρ ἔθε τάτων.

Πλὴν ζητᾶτε τὴν βα-
σίλειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῦ-
τα πάντα προσθήσει
ὑμῖν.

[b] Καὶ οὖν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ — "And his righteousness." To the Jews, who believed that the profession of Religion without the practice of a holy life would intitle them to salvation, this was indeed a necessary piece of additional caution. But the Gentiles had not so learned CHRIST.

EXAMPLE IV.

MATTHEW xi.

3—11.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορεύθητε ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννην ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε.

Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ καταγγέλλονται.

Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὁς εἶαν μὴ σκανδαλισθῆ ἐν ἐμοί.

Τούτων ἡ προδομένη, ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου. Τί ἐξήλθει εἰς τὸ ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου καταδύμενος;

LUKE vii. 20,

22—28.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορεύθητε ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννην ἃ εἶδατε καὶ ἤκουσατε.

Ὅτι τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ καταγγέλλονται.

Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὁς εἶαν μὴ καταδυσθῆ ἐν ἐμοί.

Ἀπελθόντων ἡ τῆ ἀγγελίᾳ Ἰωάννου, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου. Τί ἐξεληλύθατε εἰς τὸ ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου καταδύμενος;

Ἄλλαι

MATTHEW.

Ἄλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδοὺ; ἀνθρώπων ἐν μαλακῶς ἱματίοις ἠμφισμῶν; ἰδοὺ, οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες ἐν τῆς εἵρας, ἢ βασιλείῳ εἰσὶν.

Ἄλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδοὺ; προφῆτῶν; ναὶ, λέγω ὑμῶν, ἔπεισότερον προφῆτην.

Οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶ περὶ ἡ γέγραπται. Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ἢ ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὸ ὄδόν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

Ἄλλὰ λέγω ὑμῶν, οὐκ ἐλάττω ἐν ἡσθητικῶν γυναικῶν μίζων Ἰωάννης τῷ Βαπτιστῆ. Ὁ ἢ μακρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν ἑσθῶν, μίζων αὐτῶ ἐστίν.

LUKE.

Ἄλλὰ τί ἐξελθούθατε ἰδοὺ; ἀνθρώπων ἐν μαλακῶς ἱματίοις ἠμφισμῶν; ἰδοὺ, οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῶν ἐσθῶν καὶ τρυφῆ ὑπάρχοντες, ἐν τῆς βασιλείῳ εἰσὶν.

Ἄλλὰ τί ἐξελθούθατε ἰδοὺ; προφῆτῶν; ναὶ, λέγω ὑμῶν, ἔπεισότερον προφῆτην.

Οὗτος ἐστὶ περὶ ἡ γέγραπται. Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ἢ ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὸ ὄδόν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

Λέγω ὑμῶν, μίζων ἐν ἡσθητικῶν γυναικῶν προφῆτης Ἰωάννης τῷ Βαπτιστῆ ὑμῶν ἐστίν. Ὁ ἢ μακρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶ Θεῶ, μίζων αὐτῶ ἐστίν.

THE use I would make of these Collations at present, is only to shew, that St. LUKE, quoting thus largely from St. MATTHEW, must necessarily have written after him. But how long he wrote after him, i. e. after the year XXXVIII, remains to be deduced from other considerations.

Now it is evident, in the first place, from his addressing it, as he does, to the *believing Gentiles*, that St. LUKE wrote his Gospel something later than the year XL, when St. PETER preached to CORNELIUS [1]. For until *that* time the *Gentiles* were universally supposed to have no title to the Christian Covenant; and therefore could not properly be the object of such an address. And after they were admitted into the Church by *some*, yet, considering their claim was opposed by *others*, it is hardly to be imagined, this Evangelist would engage so far in their favour, as to draw up *immediately* such a work for their use, before the controversy was finally determined. This then, if it had any weight with him, must cause him to suspend his

[1] Acts x.

institution of writing, till after the celebrated Council at *Jerusalem*, which was held in the year *XLIX.*

BUT be this, or any thing else the reason, it is manifest, however, from his *Preface*, that he never set about the work till some considerable time after the CALL and CONVERSION of the *Gentiles*. For MANY, he assures us (and those, it should seem, *Heathen Converts*) had written before him on the same subject [k]. And if we reflect how much time it would take them up — to acquire information — to collect their materials — to compose their Histories — and to disperse them abroad; — we shall be forced to acknowledge, that St. LUKE, who succeeded them, could scarce begin to write his Gospel before the year specified above.

[k] The Life of CHRIST was so amazingly wonderful, that the *Heathens* could not but be sensibly affected with the accounts they heard of it from the first Preachers of the Gospel. These accounts therefore they would naturally commit to writing. Hence the origin of those Histories to which St. LUKE refers. Histories well known, it should seem, to THEOPHILUS; but Histories nevertheless which he is cautioned not to depend upon — because they were inaccurate, if not fabulous. EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. iij. c. 24.

BESIDES, from the time that the *Gentiles* were admitted into the Church, he was so constantly employed in the work of the Ministry, that hitherto he seems to have had but little or no leisure for such an undertaking: And therefore we must look out for a season of repose, which might afford him a convenient opportunity of performing it.

Now if we attend St. PAUL in his travels, (and St. LUKE was his inseparable companion [1]) we shall find him, soon after this time, that is, about the end of the year LII, passing through *Greece*, or the Region of *Achaia*; and then settling at *Corinth*, where he continued a year and six months [m]. In this time of relaxation from journeyings and fatigue, he wrote his *First* and *Second* Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, and also that to the *Galatians*. And while the Apostle was engaged in these works, it is not improbable, but St. LUKE was busied in writing his Gospel. The opportunity was favourable; and his concern

[1] IREN. lib. iii. c. 14.

[m] ACTS xviii. 11.

for the Church would naturally prompt him to lay hold of it.

THIS may be reasonably supposed: But we are not obliged to rest this point on a mere supposition. It stands confirmed by no meaner testimony than that of St. JEROM, who affirms, doubtless on the authority of the Ancients, that “St. LUKE” wrote his Volume of the Gospel in the “Regions of *Achaia* and *Beotia* [n]”; — plainly referring to *this* journey of St. PAUL through that part of *Greece*. And if it was written at this time, under the care and inspection of St. PAUL, and delivered to the *Corinthians* with his approbation, it was not without peculiar propriety (especially in writing to *them*) that he afterwards styles St. LUKE, its Author, “the Brother,

[n] LUCAS, —cujus lans in Evangelio, qui & ipse discipulus Apostoli PAULI, in *Achaia Beotia*que partibus volumen condidit, quondam alius repetens. *Proem. in Comment. super MATTHEUM*. GREGOR. NAZIAN. seems to intimate the same, tom. I. Orat. xxv. p. 438. ed. Paris. 1630. Vide GROTII Proleg. in LUC. Evangel. and CAVE's Lives of the Apostles, p. 181. Art. St. LUKE, § 4. LARDNER's *Supplement* &c. vol. I. Chap. viii. p. 268, &c.

“ whose

“ whose praise is in the Gospel,” 2 Cor. viii. 18. [o].

AND as he was *now* concerned to recommend the *Author*, so had he taken occasion *before* to recommend his *Gospel* to them ; or rather to awaken them to an attentive perusal of it. For, finding it necessary to reprove the *Corinthians* with regard to their behaviour at the Lord’s Supper, he labours to convince them of the heinousness of their conduct, by shewing its unsuitableness to the nature and end of that solemn institution. But when he comes to explain the institution itself, tho’ he acquired the knowledge of it by immediate Revelation ; yet, it is very remarkable, that he expresses himself in the words of St. LUKE :

LUKE xxii. 19, 20. 1 COR. xi. 23 — 25.

Καὶ λαβαὶν ἄρτον,	Ἔλαβεν ἄρτον, καὶ
ὠχαριστήσας ἔκλασε,	ὠχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λέ-	εἶπε· Λάβετε, φαγεῖτε *
γων· Τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ ζῶ-	Τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ ζῶμα,

[o] See the Commentators on the place.

* Similar to St. MATT. xxvi. 26.

LUKE.

I COR.

μά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
 διδόνον· τῷτο ποιῆτε
 εἰς τὸ ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησον.

Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ πρῶ-
 τήριον, μὲν τὸ δεκνῆσαι,
 λέγων· Τῷτο τὸ πρῶτήριον,
 ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν τῷ
 αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν
 ἐκχυτόμενον.

τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλάμει-
 νον [ρ]. τῷτο ποιῆτε εἰς
 τὸ ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ πρῶ-
 τήριον, μὲν τὸ δεκνῆσαι,
 λέγων· Τῷτο τὸ πρῶτήριον,
 ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν
 τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι· τῷτο ποι-
 ῆτε. κ. τ. λ.

intending, it should seem, by this quota-
 tion, to make them sensible, that, though
 they might plead the frailty of their me-
 mory in excuse of their forgetfulness of
 what *himself* had delivered on this subject
 by word of mouth; they were, neverthe-
 less, extremely culpable in not attending
 to the information of the *Gospel* they had
 then in their hands; which, if duly re-
 garded, would have effectually restrained
 them from such infamous proceedings.

[ρ] St. LUKE, referring to CHRIST'S real body, then to be
 offered up, says ἀίματός μου; St. PAUL, referring to his sacramen-
 tal body, or the bread, uses the word κλάμεινον. And both with
 singular propriety.

IF this be allowed, and St. PAUL had actually an eye to St. LUKE, in the passage here cited, we have then a pretty clear proof that his Gospel was written before the *First* Epistle to the *Corinthians* — that is, before the year LVII; and thence conclude, that we cannot be far distant from the truth in fixing the date of its first publication to the year LIII; the thirteenth of CLAUDIUS.

S E C T. IV.

AS the Gospel met with so much opposition, it became the duty of the first Evangelists, in order to facilitate its way in the world, to accommodate their accounts to the temper of the times, and remove the impediments that obstructed its progress. In consequence of this, they were unavoidably led, in the course of their narration, not only to confirm the truth of the doctrine they meant to establish, — but also to confute the cavils, — correct the opinions, — and reform the practices, of those who opposed it. Hence their Histories be-
E
came

came, in the detail, more complex and various than we have reason to think they would otherwise have been; — containing references to customs and tenets, which, but for the particular disposition of the times, would in all probability have had no place in them.

BUT when the Christian Religion had gained ground, and the controversies that disturbed it were tolerably settled, it is in no wise unnatural to suppose, that some of its most faithful and serious Professors might wish to see the Gospel exhibited in a more simple form: and, without any particular consideration to *Jew* or *Gentile*, delivered in a manner suitable to the condition of the world at large.

AGREEABLY to this supposition, we are told, that the Christian Converts at *Rome* requested St. MARK, with great earnestness, to write *such* a History for their use and instruction [q]. I say *such* a History.

γ.

[q] Τοσῦτο δ' ἐπίλαμψεν ταῖς ἡ ἀρεσῶν τῷ Πέτρῳ ἀποστολῆς οὐνοδίας φήγῃ, ὡς μὴ τῆ ἐκείνου ἐκείνῃ ἐχρῆν ἀμελεῖν αἰσῶν, μὴ δὲ τῆ ἀγγέλου τῷ θείῳ κερύματι διδασκαλίᾳ. Παρακλήσει δὲ παστοῖσι Μάρκος, ὃ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον φέρει, ἀπέλυθαι ἕνα Πέτρῳ ἀποστολῆς, ὡς ἂν εἰς διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παρακλήσεως.

ry. For the Gospel he wrote at their request is evidently a simple and compendious narrative [r], divested of almost all peculiarities, and accommodated to general use. In compiling this narrative, he had but little more to do, it seems, than to abridge the Gospels which lay before him—varying some expressions, and inserting some additions, as occasion required. That St. MARK followed this plan, no one can doubt, who compares his Gospel with those of the two former Evangelists. He

οὗς αὐτοῖς καθελίψαι διδασκαλίας. μὴ προτιρόν τι ἀπὶναι ἢ ἐπι-
 γράσασθαι ἢ ἄλλα, ἢ ταῦτα αἰτίως ῥησίδαι τῆς τῷ λιγομίῳ κ'
 Μάρκου Εὐαγγελίῳ γραφῆς. *Tantus autem pietatis fulgor emicuit*
in mentibus eorum, qui (Roma) PETRUM audierant, ut parum
haberent senuel audisse, nec contenti essent celestis verbi doctrinam
vivâ voce, nullis traditam scriptis, accepisse; sed MARCUM,
PETRI comitem, cujus jam extat Evangelium, multis precibus ora-
rent, ut doctrinâ illius, quam auditu acceperant, scriptum aliquem
commentarium apud se relinqueret. Nec prius desisterunt, quatu
hominem expugnassent; quomodo causa fuerunt cur scriberetur Ewan-
gellum, quod MARCI dicitur. CLEM. ALEX. apud EUSEB. Hist.
Eccl. l. ii. c. 15.

[r] MARCUS discipulus & interpres PETRI, juxta quod PETRUM referentem audierat, rogatus Romæ a fratribus breve scripsit Evangelium. HIBERNYM. Catal. Script. Eccles. voce MARC. Propter hoc & compendiosam & præcurrentem annunciationem fecit. IREN. lib. iii. c. xi.

copies largely from both : and takes either the one or the other almost perpetually for his guide. The order indeed is his own, and is very close and well connected. In his account of facts he is also clear, exact, and critical ; and the more so perhaps, as he wrote it for the perusal of a learned and critical people. For he seems to proceed with great caution, and to be solicitous that his Gospel should stand clear of all objections. But to consider it more particularly.

THE *Exordium* is somewhat singular. For whilst the former Evangelists describe our Saviour as “ the Son of MAN,” St. MARK stiles him in express terms “ the Son of GOD [s] :—A title the most likely, as being the most august, to engage the attention and obedience of the *Romans*, those Lords of the Earth, to the Religion that was promulged by him. In describing this Religion, St. MARK has brought together so many of our Saviour’s Discourses and Miracles, as might serve to exhibit a general view of his character ; and shew the world, at the same time, what kind of

[s] Ch. i. 1.

principles they were concerned to embrace, and what course of life they were bound to lead, who professed themselves his Followers and Disciples. This fully answered the end of his design. But as the things he records to this purpose are chiefly taken from the other Evangelists, so it is to be observed that they are often expressed in their very words; which confirms the account we have before given of him. How much he is indebted to St. MATTHEW, will appear in some measure from the following Collations;

E X A M P L E I.

MARK IV. I — 9. MATTH. xliii. I — 9.

Ἐκάθητο διδάσκειν πα-
ρα τὸ θάλασσαν καὶ ζυ-
γῆθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλο
πολύς, ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐμ-
βάνηα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καθ-
ῆαυ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ· καὶ
πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν
θάλασσαν ἵπτι τὴ γῆς ἦν.

Καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς
ἐν ὄρεσολαῖς πολλά,
καὶ ἔλεγεν,

Ἐκάθητο πα-
ρα τὸ θάλασσαν καὶ ζυ-
γῆθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι
πολλοὶ, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ
πλοῖον ἐμβάνηα καθῆαυ·
καὶ
πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἵπτι τὸ αἰ-
γιαλὸν εἰσῆκεν.

Καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς
πολλά ἐν ὄρεσολαῖς,
λέγων, Ἰδοὺ,

MARK.

Ἰδὺν, ἐξῆλθει ὁ ἀπεί-
ρων ἔσπεύρει·

Καὶ ἐγγύθω ἐν τῷ
ἀπείρην, ὃ [τ] μὲν ἔπεισε
ὡς τὸ τὸ ὄδον, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ
πείρατα ἔσπεύρει [μ] καὶ
κατέφαγεν αὐτὰ.

Ἄλλο ἦν ἔπεισε Ἰπὶ
τὸ πειρεῶδες, ὅπως οὐκ
ἔχει γλῶσσαν πολλὰν, καὶ
ὄβριος ἐξανέτειλε, διὰ
τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·

ἡλίος ἦν ἀνατείλει, ἔκαστος
καυμαλίδης, καὶ, διὰ τὸ
μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν, ἐξηράνθη.

Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεισε εἰς
τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέση-
σαν αἱ ἀκάνθαι, καὶ ἔπι-
πτεσαν αὐτὰ, καὶ καρπὸν
οὐκ ἔδωκε·

MATTHEW.

Ἰδὺν, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἀπεί-
ρων ἔσπεύρει·

Καὶ ἐν τῷ
ἀπείρην αὐτὸν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεισε
ὡς τὸ τὸ ὄδον, ἐπὶ ἦλθε τὰ
πείρατα καὶ
κατέφαγεν αὐτὰ.

Ἄλλα ἦν ἔπεισε Ἰπὶ
τὰ πειρεῶδες, ὅπως οὐκ
ἔχει γλῶσσαν πολλὰν, καὶ
ὄβριος ἐξανέτειλε, διὰ
τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·
ἡλίος ἦν ἀνατείλει, ἔκαστος
καυμαλίδης, καὶ, διὰ τὸ
μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν, ἐξηράνθη.

Ἄλλα ἦν ἔπεισε Ἰπὶ
τὰς ἀκάνθας· ἐπὶ ἀνέση-
σαν αἱ ἀκάνθαι, καὶ ἐπί-
πτεσαν αὐτὰ.

[τ] St. MARK, tho' he copies the words of St. MATTHEW, yet puts them in the singular number in conformity to St. LUKE viii. 4, &c.

[μ] Τὸ ἔσπεύρει is wanting in some of the best MSS. vid. MILL. & WETSTEN. in loc. which renders the two Evangelists still more conformable to each other.

Καὶ

MARK.

Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπισεν εἰς
 τὸ γλεύϊ καλλύ. καὶ
 εἶδεν καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοι-
 τα καὶ αὐξάνουσα, καὶ ἔφε-
 ρεν, ἐν τριάνουσα, καὶ ἐν
 ἐξήκοντα, εἰ ἐν ἑκατόν[α].

Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ὁ
 ἔχων ὠτα ἀκύν, ἀκυσ-
 ἔτω.

MATTHEW.

Ἄλλα ἡ ἔπισεν ἐπὶ
 τὸ γλεύϊ καλλύ. καὶ
 εἶδεν καρπὸν,

ὁ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὁ ἡ
 ἐξήκοντα, ὁ ἡ τριάνουσα.

Ὁ
 ἔχων ὠτα ἀκύν, ἀκυσ-
 ἔτω.

AND so again in the explanation of this Parable, ver. 15—20, he had evidently his eye all along on St. MATTHEW, ver. 19—23, till he comes to the conclusion, ver. 21, 22, 25; where he makes a transition to the Gospel of St. LUKE, ch. viii. 16—18.

EXAMPLE II.

MARK xiv. 26—46.

MATTHEW xxvi.

30—50.

Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξ-
 ἤλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρη τὸ ἐ-
 λαιῶν.

Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξ-
 ἤλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρη τὸ ἐ-
 λαιῶν.

[α] St. MARK here inverts the words of St. MATTHEW, in order to form the *chiasm*; which is one instance, among many others, of the great regard he had to his language.

MARK.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι πάντες κενδαλιοθήσεσθε ἐν ἡμῶι ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· ὅτι γέγραπται, Πατάξω τὸ πωμῶνα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα [γ].

Ἄλλα μὲν τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ, Καὶ εἰ πάντες κενδαλιοθήσονται, ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐγώ.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὲν λέγω σοι, ὅτι σήμερον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, πρὶν ἢ διαλέξωμαι φωνῆσαι, τρίς ἀπαρτήσῃ με.

MATTHEW.

Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πάντες ὑμεῖς κενδαλιοθήσεσθε ἐν ἡμῶι ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· γέγραπται γάρ, Πατάξω τὸ πωμῶνα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τὸ πωμῶνα.

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ, Εἰ πάντες κενδαλιοθήσονται ἐν σοι, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε κενδαλιοθήσομαι.

Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὲν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ, πρὶν ἀλέξωμαι φωνῆσαι, τρίς ἀπαρτήσῃ με.

Ὁ δὲ

[γ] Some Mss. add τὸς πωμῶνα in this place, as it is in St. MATTHEW. vide MILL. & WETSTEN.

[ε] As the Jews, in the enumeration of the times of the night, took notice only of *one* cock-crowing, which comprehended

MARK.

Ὁ ἦ ἔκ περισσῶ ἔλιθε
μᾶλλον, Ἐάν με δεῖ
ζωαποθανεῖν σοι, ἢ μή
σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. Ὡσ-
αύτως ἦ καὶ πάντες ἔλε-
γον.

Καὶ ἔρχοντ' εἰς χω-
ρίον, ἢ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθση-
μανή. καὶ
λέγει πρὸς μαθηταῖς αὐτῶν,
Καθίσατε ὧδε, ἕως προσ-
δύξωμαι.

Καὶ πρὸς λαμβάνει τὸν
Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ
Ἰωάννην μετ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ

MATTHEW.

λέγει αὐτῶν ὁ Πέτρος,
Κὰν δεῖ με σὺ σοὶ
ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ μή σε ἀπ-
αρνήσομαι. Ὁμοίως ἦ
καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ
εἶπον.

Τότε ἔρχεται μετ' αὐ-
τῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς χωρίον
λεγόμενον Γεθσημανή καὶ
λέγει πρὸς μαθηταῖς, Καθ-
ίσατε αὐτῶν, ἕως ἂν ἀπελ-
θῶν προσδύξωμαι ἑμεῖ.

Καὶ πρὸς λαβῶν τὸν
Πέτρον, καὶ τὰς δύο ἕως
Ζεβεδαίου,

bended the third watch; so St. MATTHEW, to give them a clear information that PETER would deny his Master *thrice* before *Thres* in the morning, needed only to say, that he would do it "before the cock crew." But the ROMANS, reckoning by a *double* crowing of the cock — the first of which was about *Midnight*, and the second at *Thres* — stood in need of a more particular designation: And therefore St. MARK, to denote the same hour to *them*, was obliged to say — "before the cock crew twice." — JUVENAL uses exactly the same phrase, to specify the same hour:

"Quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ipse SECUNDI,

"Proximus ante diem caupo sciet." —

Sat. ix. 107.

MARK.

ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβῶσαι καὶ ἀδελφῶν.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περιλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ὡς θανάτου· μείνατε ἄλλοτε καὶ ἡσυχάζετε.

Καὶ προσελθὼν μικρὸν, ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ προσήυχθη, ἵνα, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρείληθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἡ ὥρα.

Καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἄβρα ὁ Πατήρ, πάντα διωκόμενος παρὰ πάντας τὸ ποιεῖν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τῆτο· ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σὺ.

Καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ κρίσκει αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σίμων, καθ' ἑαυτοῦ; ὡς ἰχθύς μίαν ὥραν ἡσυχάζεις;

Ἠσυχάζετε καὶ προσέχετε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλ-

MATTHEW.

ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδελφῶν.

Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περιλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ὡς θανάτου· μείνατε ἄλλοτε καὶ ἡσυχάζετε μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Καὶ προσελθὼν μακρὸν, ἔπεσεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν, προσεκύνησεν.

Καὶ λέγων, Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρείληθαι ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν τῆτο· πλὴν ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ.

Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς, καὶ κρίσκει αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Οὕτως ὡς ἰχθύς μίαν ὥραν ἡσυχάζεις μετ' ἐμοῦ;

Ἠσυχάζετε καὶ προσέχετε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλ-

MARK.

MATTHEW.

θηε εἰς πειρασμὸν. τὸ
μὴ πνεῦμα πτόθυμον, ἢ
ᾧ σαρκὸς ἀδθενῆς.

Καὶ πάλιν ἀπειλθὼν
προσηύξατο, ἔ αὐτὸν λό-
γον εἰπών.

Καὶ ὑποστρέψας εὐ-
ρεν αὐτὸς πάλιν καθύ-
δοντας· ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὀφ-
θαλμοὶ αὐτῶν κατὰβα-
ρυνόμενοι, κ. τ. λ.

St. MARK omits our Sa-
viour's *third Prayer*, as being
the same with the former; and
only mentions his *third Return*.

Καὶ ἔρχεῖ τὸ τρίτον,
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθύ-
δεις τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀνα-
παύεσθε [a];
ἀπέχου, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα·
ἰδοὺ, ὡς ἀδίδου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας
τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν.

θηε εἰς πειρασμὸν. τὸ
μὴ πνεῦμα πτόθυμον, ἢ
ᾧ σαρκὸς ἀδθενῆς.

Πάλιν ἐκδούτερα ἀπ-
ελθὼν προσηύξατο, λέ-
γων, Πάτερ μου, κ. τ. λ.

Καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει
αὐτὸς πάλιν καθύδον-
τας· ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ
ὀφθαλμοὶ βεβαρημένοι.

Καὶ ἀφῆς αὐτὰς, ἀπ-
ελθὼν πάλιν, προσηύξα-
το ἐκ τρίτου, ἔ αὐτὸν
λόγον εἰπών.

Τότε ἔρχεῖ πρὸς τὰς
μαθητὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει
αὐτοῖς, Καθύδεις τὸ λοι-
πὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε [a];
ἰδοὺ, ἦγιμεν ἡ ὥρα· ἔ ὁ
υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἀδί-
δοὺ εἰς χεῖρας ἀμαρτω-
λῶν.

[a] So I venture to point the sentence — and to read inter-
rogatively — “ Do you *still* sleep, and take your rest ?” This
makes the sense perfect, and consistent with what follows.

Ἐγεί-

MARK.

Ἐγείρατε, ἄγαμιν
 ἰδὲ ὁ ᾠδαδιδὲς με ἡγ-
 γικε.

Καὶ ὄθως, ἔτι αὐτὴ
 λαλεῖν(Θ), ᾠδαγίνε)
 Ἰύδας, εἰς ὧν τ δώδεκα,
 καὶ μετ' αὐτὴ ὄχλ(Θ) πο-
 λὺς μὲ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύ-
 λων, ᾠδ(Θ) τ δέχειρῶν
 καὶ τ γραμματίων εἰ τ
 πρὸςβύβρων.

Δεδώκεν ἡ ὁ ᾠδαδι-
 δὲς αὐτὸν σύσημον αὐ-
 τοῖς, λέγων, Ὅτι ἀν
 φιλήσω, αὐτὸς εἰσι κρα-
 τήσατε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀπα-
 γράψετε ἀσφαλῶς.

Καὶ ἰλθὼν, ὄθως
 πρὸςβύβρων αὐτὴ λέγει,
 Ῥαββί, ραββί καὶ καλι-
 φίλησον αὐτόν.

Οἱ ἡ ἐπιέβαλον ἐπ'
 αὐτόν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν,
 καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

MATTHEW.

Ἐγείρατε, ἄγαμιν
 ἰδὲ ἡγικων ὁ ᾠδαδιδὲς
 με.

Καὶ ἔτι αὐτὴ λαλεῖν-
 τ(Θ), ἰδὲ, Ἰύδας εἰς τ
 δώδεκα ἦλθε,
 καὶ μετ' αὐτὴ ὄχλ(Θ) πρ-
 λὺς μὲ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύ-
 λων, ᾠδ(Θ) τ δέχειρῶν καὶ
 πρὸςβύβρων εἰ λαῦ.

Ὁ ἡ παραδι-
 δὲς αὐτὸν ἰδοκεν αὐτοῖς
 σημείων, λέγων, Ὅτι ἀν
 φιλήσω, αὐτὸς εἰσι κρα-
 τήσατε αὐτόν.

Καὶ ὄθως
 πρὸςβύβρων τῷ Ἰησοῦ, εἶπε,
 Καῖρε, ραββί καὶ καλιφι-
 λησον αὐτόν.

Τότε πρὸςβύβρων ἐπι-
 έβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τ
 Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐκράτησαν
 αὐτόν.

AND so on through the course of this Chapter.

FOR more instances of the same kind, the Reader is referred to the following Table :

MARK.		MATTHEW.	
Ch. i.	3—8. 16—20. 40—44.	Ch. iii.	1—6, 11.
		iv.	18—22.
		viii.	2—4.
ii.	14—17. 23—28.	ix.	9—12.
		xii.	1—8.
vi.	1—5. 35—51.	xiii.	54—58.
vii.	1—23, &c.	xiv.	15—27, 32.
viii.	1—10. 27—29. —39.	xv.	1—20, &c. 32—39.
ix.	1—12.	xvi.	13—16. 20—28.
x.	1—16. 32—34—45.	xvii.	1—12.
		xix.	1—15.
xi.	27—33.	xx.	17—19—28.
xii.	13—27.	xxi.	23—27.
xiii.	1—9. 14—32.	xxii.	16—32.
		xxiv.	1—9. 15—36.
		xiv.	1

MARK.

MATTHEW.

Ch.	xiv.	1—25.	xxvi.	4—29.
	xv.	1—20.	xxvii.	1, 2, 11, 31.
		—47.		—61.
	xvi.	1—8.	xxviii.	1—8.

HENCE then it appears, that St. MARK perused the Gospel of St. MATTHEW, and had it before him when he wrote his own. This, indeed, is a point generally acknowledged; but we are now to prove—what will not perhaps be so easily granted—that he copied likewise from St. LUKE. To this end we shall, as before, compare a few of the parallel places, and leave the Reader to judge for himself.

EXAMPLE I.

MARK i. 21—28.

LUKE iv. 31—37.

Καὶ ἐξαπορεύσας εἰς
Καπερναούμ·

Καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Κα-
περναούμ πάλιν τῆς Γαλι-
λαιίας [b], ἧ ἦν διδά-

[b] As the cities in the *Holy Land* were pretty well known by the *Romans*, St. MARK says only *Capernaum*: But the *Greeks*, having little or no connexion with *that* country, required a more particular information; and therefore St. LUKE adds — πάλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας — “a city of Galilee.”

MARK.

τοῖς σάββασιν ἐσελθὼν εἰς Συναγωγὴν, ἐδίδασκε.

Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοιτο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτῆ·

Καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἀνέκραξε,

Λέγων, Ἐὰν, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρεθί; ἦλθες διαπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος Θεοῦ.

Καὶ ἐπελίμνησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Φιμώθητι, καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτῆ.

Καὶ παρερῄξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον — ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῆ.

Καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν πάντες, ὡς συζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸς, λέγοντες, Τί ἐστὶ τῆτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη, ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς

LUKE.

σκῶν αὐτὸς ἐν ταῖς σάββασι.

Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοιτο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτῆ·

Καὶ ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου, καὶ ἀνέκραξε —

Λέγων, Ἐὰν, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρεθί; ἦλθες διαπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος Θεοῦ.

Καὶ ἐπελίμνησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων· Φιμώθητι, καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτῆ.

Καὶ ῥίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μίσον, ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆ —

Καὶ ἐθύβητο θάμβῳ ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ συνελάλυν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, λέγοντες, Τίς ὁ λόγος ὁτοῦτο, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς πνεύμασι

MARK.

πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθά-
τοις ἑπιτάσσῃ, καὶ ὑπε-
ρεκύνσῃ αὐτοῖς;

Ἐξῆλθε ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐ-
τῷ Κθὺς εἰς ἄλλω τινὶ
πεδύχμῳ τῆ Γαλλαίας.

LUKE.

ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι, καὶ
ἐξέρχον;) ;

Καὶ ἐξεπῶρε ὁ ἦχος
περὶ αὐτῶ εἰς πάντα τό-
πον τῆ περὶχώρου.

EXAMPLE II.

MARK II. 5—12.

Ἰδὼν ἡ δ' Ἰησοῦς τινὶ
πίστῳ αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ
παραλυτικῷ· Τίκνον,
ἀφίενται σοι αἱ ἁμαρ-
τίαι σου.

Ἦσαν δὲ τότε τῆ γραμ-
ματίων ἐκτὸ καθήκοντοι,
καὶ ἀλλογιζόμενοι ἐν τῷ
καρδίας αὐτῶν·

Τί ἐστὶν ἔτι λαλεῖ
βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται
ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ
ὁ Θεός;

Καὶ ὄντως ἑπὶ τῶν
ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι

LUKE V. 20—26.

Καὶ ἰδὼν τῷ
πίστῳ αὐτῶν, λέγει αὐτοῖς·
Ἄνθρωπε, ἀφίενται σοι
αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου.

Καὶ ἤρξατο ἀλλογι-
ζοῦσθαι οἱ γραμματίες καὶ
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες·

Τίς ἐστὶν ἔτιος ὁ λα-
λεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς
δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας,
εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεός;

Ἐπενοῦν ἡ δ' Ἰησοῦς
τῶν ἀλλογιζομένων αὐτῶν,
αὐτῶν,

MARK.

LUKE.

εἰπὺν, ἑπιέτας αὐτοῖ δια-
λογίζεσθαι ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ἔπει
αὐτοῖς· Τί ταῦτα δια-
λογίζεσθε ἐν τῇ καρδίαις
ὑμῶν;

Τί ἴστω ἀκρωτέρον
εἰπῶν τῷ ὄδραλυταῖ·
Ἀφένταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρ-
τίαι· ἢ εἰπῶν· Ἐγρηται,
καὶ ἄρας σοι τὸ κράββατον
καὶ περπάτη;

Ἴνα ᾗ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξμ-
σίαν ἔχει ὁ ἦς τῷ ἀνθρώ-
πῳ ἀφέναι ὅτι τὸ γῆς
ἁμαρτίας, (λέγει τῷ
ὄδραλυταῖ·)

Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγρηται, καὶ
ἄρας τὸν κράββατόν [c]
σοι, καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸ οἶκόν
σοι.

Καὶ ἠγάθη ὄβριος,
καὶ ἄρας τὸ κράββατον,

ἀποκλεθεὶς ἔπει πρὸς
αὐτόν· Τί διαλογίζεσθε
ἐν τῇ καρδίαις ὑμῶν;

Τί ἴστω ἀκρωτέρον
εἰπῶν·

Ἀφένταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρ-
τίαι σοι· ἢ εἰπῶν· Ἐγρη-
ται,
καὶ περπάτη;

Ἴνα ᾗ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξμ-
σίαν ἔχει ὁ ἦς τῷ ἀνθρώ-
πῳ ὅτι τὸ γῆς ἀφέναι
ἁμαρτίας, (εἶπε τῷ πα-
ραλελυμένῳ·)

Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγρηται, καὶ
ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιον [c] σου,
πορεύε εἰς τὸ οἶκόν σου.

Καὶ ὄδρα χρῆμα ἀνα-
στὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν,

[c] St. MARK changes the κλινίδιον of LUKE into κράββατον, as being a word more familiar to the Romans. vid. CICERO, de Divinat. ii. 63. SERENUS. Epist. xviii. CATULL. x. 22, MARTIAL. xii. 32.

MARK.

ἔβηθεν ἐναντίον πάντων
 ὡς ἐξίστασθαι
 πάσης, καὶ δοξάζειν τὸ
 Θεόν.

LUKE.

ἄρας ἐφ' ᾧ κατέκειτο ἀπὸ
 ἤλυθον — καὶ ἐκστασθε
 ἔλαβον ἀπαύτας, καὶ ἰδοὺ
 ξάζον τὸ Θεόν.

EXAMPLE III.

MARK II. 19—32.

Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ
 Ἰησοῦς· Μὴ δυνάμει οἱ υἱοὶ
 τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐπεὶ ὁ
 νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν
 ἐστι, νηστεῖτε; —

Ἐλάσσοι) ἡ ἡμέραι,
 ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν
 ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νη-
 στεύσατε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἡμέρας.

Καὶ ὑδοῖς
 ἐπίβλημα ῥάκας ἀγνά-
 φου Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ ἱμα-
 τίου παλαιῦ· εἰ δὲ μὴ,
 αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν
 τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιῦ, καὶ
 χυρὸν χόσμα γίνεσθαι).

LUKE V. 34—38.

Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς·
 Μὴ δυνάσθε τὴν ἡμέραν
 τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐπεὶ ὁ νυμ-
 φίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστι,
 ποῖσαι νηστεῖτε;

Ἐλάσσοι) ἡ ἡμέραι,
 καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐ-
 τῶν ὁ νυμφίος· τότε νη-
 στεύσατε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἡμέρας.

[Οὐδοῖς δὲ Ἰσραὴλ
 ἐπίβλημα ῥάκας ἀγνάφου
 ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῶ· αἶρει
 τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν ἀπὸ
 τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ χυρὸν
 χόσμα γίνεσθαι]. MATTH.
 IX. 16.]

MARK.

Καὶ ἄδεις βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὸς παλαιός· εἰ ἢ μὴ, ῥήσασθε ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τὸς ἀσκὸς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχυθῆται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ λυθῶσιν· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὸς καινὸς βλητέον.

LUKE.

Καὶ ἄδεις βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὸς παλαιός· εἰ ἢ μήγε, ῥήξει ὁ νέος οἶνος τὸς ἀσκὸς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθῆσει, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ λυθῶσιν· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκὸς καινὸς βλητέον.

EXAMPLE IV.

MARK X. 13—31. LUKE xviii. 15—30.

Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἅψῃ αὐτῶν· οἱ ἢ μαθηταὶ ἐπιτίμων πῆς προσφίεσκον.

Ἰδὼν ἢ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγαπήσκει, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθε πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά· ἢ γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅς ἐάν τις ἐὰν κωλύῃ τὸ βασι-

Προσέφερον ἢ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψῃ· Ἰδὼν ἢ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπιτίμησαν αὐτῷ.

Ὁ ἢ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτά, εἶπεν· Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθε πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά· ἢ γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅς ἐάν τις ἐὰν κωλύῃ τὸ βασι-

MARK.

λείαν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς παι-
διον, ἢ μὴ εἰδέλθῃ εἰς
αὐτὸν. —

Καὶ — προσδραμῶν
ἦς — ἐπὴρώτα αὐτὴν
Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί
ποιήσω ἵνα ζωῶ αἰώ-
νιον κληρονομήσω;

Ὁ ᾧ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε αὐτῷ·
Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;
ἕδαις ἀγαθῶν, εἰ μὴ εἷς,
ὁ Θεός.

Τὰς ἐβλαβῆς οἶδας·
Μὴ μοιχεύῃς· Μὴ φο-
νεύῃς· Μὴ κλέψῃς· Μὴ
ψευδομαρτυρήῃς· Μὴ
δοσευγήῃς· Τίμα τὸ
πατέρα σου καὶ τὸ μητέρα.

Ὁ ᾧ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶ-
πεν αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε,
ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξά-
μην ἐκ νεότητός μου.

Ὁ ᾧ Ἰησοῦς ἐμελέψας
αὐτῷ, ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν,

LUKE.

λείαν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς παι-
διον, ἢ μὴ εἰδέλθῃ εἰς
αὐτὸν.

Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέ τις
αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν λόγον·
Διδάσκου ἀγαθὲ, τί
ποιήσας ζωῶ αἰώνιον
κληρονομήσω;

Εἶπε ᾧ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;
ἕδαις ἀγαθῶν, εἰ μὴ εἷς,
ὁ Θεός.

Τὰς ἐβλαβῆς οἶδας·
Μὴ μοιχεύῃς· Μὴ φο-
νεύῃς· Μὴ κλέψῃς· Μὴ
ψευδομαρτυρήῃς·

Τίμα τὸ
πατέρα σου καὶ τὸ μητέρα
σου.

Ὁ ᾧ
εἶπε
ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξά-
μην ἐκ νεότητός μου.

Ἀκούσας ᾧ ταῦτα ὁ
Ἰησοῦς,

MARK.

LUKE.

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐν σοὶ ὑπερῷ ὑπάγει, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ δὲς τῆς πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ἔργῳ· καὶ δεῦρο, ἀπολεύθει μοι —

Ὁ ᾧ, συγκρίσας εἰπὶ τῷ λόγῳ, ἀπῆλθε λυπηρόν· ἢ γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.

Καὶ πειθόμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τῆς μαθηταῖς αὐτῶν· Πῶς δυσκόλος εἰ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελεύσασθε; —

Εὐχεπρότερον ἐστὶ κάμηλον διὰ τὴν τρυμαλιᾶς τὴν ραφίδος εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλύσιον εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Οἱ δὲ κριτικῶς ἐξεπλήρωσαν, λέγοντες πρὸς αὐτοῦ· Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἐτι ἐν σοὶ λείπει· πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ἔργῳ· καὶ δεῦρο, ἀπολεύθει μοι.

Ὁ ᾧ, ἀκρίσας ταῦτα — [ἀπῆλθε λυπηρόν· ἢ γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά. MATT. XIX. 22.]

Ἰδὼν ᾧ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πείλυπον γρόμῳ, εἶπε· Πῶς δυσκόλος εἰ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰσελεύσασθε εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Εὐχεπρότερον γάρ ἐστι κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς ραφίδος εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλύσιον εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Εἶπον δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες· Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

MARK.

Ἐμβλέψας δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγει· Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' ἐν ᾧ Θεῷ πάντα δυνατὰ ἐσὶ ἐν ᾧ Θεῷ.

Καὶ ἤρξατο ὁ Πέτρος λέγειν αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολυθήσασμέν σοι.

Ἀπακριθὲς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐδεῖς ἐσὺ ὅς ἀφῆκων οἰκίαν, ἢ ἀδελφός, ἢ ἀδελφός, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ μητέρα, ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀγροὺς, ἢ κτήνη, ἢ οὐκ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐνεκὸν τῆς διαγωγῆς,

εἰ μὴ λάβῃς ἐκατόνταπλασθῆναι ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ—καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶναι αἰώνιον.

Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι, ἔχαστοι καὶ οἱ ἔχαστοι, φερόντες.

LUKE.

[Ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τὸ ἀδύνατον ἐσὶ, ἐν ᾧ Θεῷ πάντα δυνατὰ ἐσὶ. ΜΑΤΤΗ. XIX. 26.]

Εἶπε ὁ Πέτρος,

Ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολυθήσασμέν σοι.

Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς

Ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐδεῖς ἐσὺ ὅς ἀφῆκων οἰκίαν, ἢ γονεῖς, ἢ ἀδελφός, ἢ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνα, ἢ κτήνη, ἢ οὐκ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐνεκὸν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ,

ὅς ἐ μὴ λάβῃς ἑκατόνταπλασθῆναι ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶναι αἰώνιον.

[Πολλοὶ ὅτι ἔσονται πρῶτοι, ἔχαστοι καὶ οἱ ἔχαστοι, φερόντες. ΜΑΤΤΗ. XIX. 30.]

THESE instances are certainly too many to be thought accidental, and much too close and uniform to be accounted for upon any other principle, than that of the one's transcribing from the other [d]. Nor are these the only instances: The following Table will exhibit more; tho' not all of them perhaps equally striking:

St. MARK.		St. LUKE.	
Ch.	i. 7, 8.	Ch.	iii. 16
	ii. 23—28.		vi. 1—5.
	iii. 1—5.		6—10.

[d] They who argue from the Apostles' first discourses being *historical*, that the facts related by them were delivered in the *same*, or nearly the *same words* to their different hearers — and that those hearers took them down in writing — which writings were handed about among believers, and became the source of these *similarities*, plainly argue against the evidence of Scripture, (Compare *Acts* ii. 22—39. with *Acts* iii. 12—26. x. 34—43. and *Acts* xiii. 16—41. with *Acts* xvii. 22—31. xxvi. 2—29.) and at the same time place the Gospels of St. MARK and St. LUKE upon a very precarious footing. I doubt not but many discourses were taken down when they were first preached, as these Gentlemen suppose. Nor is it improbable, that the Gospel according to the XII *Apostles*, or, as it is otherwise called, according to the *Hebrews*, was composed, in part at least, from such narrations. But the genuine Gospels stand upon *another*, and much *better*, foundation.

MARK.		LUKE.	
Ch.	iv. 21--23, 25.	Ch.	viii. 16--18.
	v. 1--19.		26--39.
	vi. 7--11.		ix. 1--5.
	viii. 27--31.		18--22.
	34--38.		23--27.
	ix. 1.		48, 50.
	ix. 37--40.		xx. 9--19.
	xii. 1--12.		45--47.
	38--40.		xxii. 8--13.
	xiv. 13--16.		

BUT here it may be asked — If either of them must be supposed to have copied from the other — “ Why might not St. LUKE have made these transcripts from the Gospel of St. MARK, rather than St. MARK from the Gospel of St. LUKE ? ”

IN answer to this, it may be observed,

I. THAT St. LUKE has been always considered as an original Writer; which is by no means the case of St. MARK. For he is plainly an Epitomist; and delivers no facts throughout his whole Gospel (a single Miracle only excepted [e]), but what are recorded

[e] Viz. the cure of the blind man at *Beitsaida*, ch. viii. 22--26. For the cure of the deaf and dumb man, vii. 22--26.

recorded by one or other of the two former Evangelists. He is often indeed very circumstantial in his narration; and adds many things for the sake of the Romans [*f*], to enable them the better to understand his accounts. And when you have allowed him this, you will find little, or nothing more, that can properly be called his OWN.

is comprehended in St. MATTHEW's general account, ch. xv. 29, 30. And the Parable of the *Sand*, iv. 26—29. seems to be taken from MATT. xiii. 24, &c. but varied a little in the circumstances.

[*f*] As a *Roman* might not know, how wild and uninhabited the *Deserts of Arabia* were, in which CHAIST was tempted, he adds, ch. i. 13. "and was with the wild beasts." In ch. vii. 2. he explains the meaning of the word — *defiled* or *common* — as it is used among the Jews; and in *3, 4*, gives an account of the Jewish customs. And ch. xv. 21, having mentioned SIMON the *Cyrenian*, as the person they compelled to bear the cross, he adds — that he was "the father of *ABBANUS* and *RUFUS*" — because both these persons resided at Rome, and were known to the Roman Christians. See *Rom.* xvi. 13. And perhaps the young man, mentioned ch. xiv. 51, 52, was a *Roman*; whose curiosity might lead him to know the cause of the tumult; and, being a stranger, might be the sooner suspected, and therefore apprehended. He had perhaps often told the story at *Rome*; and the Evangelist thought proper to confirm it. In this light it makes a good argument.

BESIDES,

BESIDES, it is apparent,

2. THAT St. MARK makes quick and frequent transitions from one Evangelist to the other; and blends their *accounts*, I mean their *words*, in such a manner as is utterly inexplicable upon any other footing, than by supposing he had both these Gospels before him. Of this the Reader will find a specimen purposely inserted in EXAMPLE III. p. 66, 67. and again in EXAMPLE IV. p. 67—70. And if he stands in need of further confirmation, he may compare St. MARK, ch. xii. 13—27. with MATTH. xxii. 16—32. and LUKE xx. 20—38; where he will find, if I am not mistaken, as ample a proof of such a commixture of phrases and sentences, as can well be desired.

IT is, moreover, worthy of our notice,

3. THAT St. LUKE agrees much oftener with St. MATTHEW, than he does with St. MARK, in places common to *both*; yea, and in places too, where the former is very *concise*, and the latter very *diffuse*, in his narration; which, considering the copiousness and exuberance of St. LUKE's style, could

could hardly have been the case, had he not written before St. MARK [g], and left to him only the province of enlarging on what he had delivered.

ADD to this,

[g] But this, it will perhaps be objected, is to contradict the accounts of the ancient Fathers, who all assert that St. LUKE wrote later than St. MARK; and the place he holds in the manuscript copies of the New Testament is a proof that their assertion is well founded. But the Ancients are not so unanimous in this point, as some are willing to believe. For CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, a writer of the *second* century, reciting a tradition relative to the order and disposition of the Gospels, which he had received from Presbyters of more ancient times, says, “that the Gospels which contain the *Genealogies* were first written.” — *περὶ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἡ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡ εὐαγγελία τῆς γενεαλογίας*—Apud EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 14. So that, according to the *most ancient* account, St. LUKE wrote, as I have here supposed, before St. MARK. And with respect to the place he is observed to hold in manuscript copies, little or nothing can be inferred from thence. For by *that* rule we should conclude the ACTS to be written later than the Gospel of St. JOHN. Not that the *common* order of the Gospels is always observed in Mss. vid. WETSTEN. Proleg. n. 90. p. 56. & ad fin. MATTH. But though we allow that it generally is, yet 'tis greatly to be suspected, that the Gospel of St. MARK got at first the precedence of St. LUKE's, just in the same way, and for the same reason, that St. PAUL's Epistle to the *Romans* came to be placed before the others that were prior to it in point of time—that is, from a regard to the persons to whom it was written. vide THEOPHYLACT. Argum. Epist. ad Rom.

4. The conclusion that arises from the date of his Gospel. For tho' the date of it be somewhat uncertain, yet, upon every supposition, it comes down lower than St. LUKE'S, and affords us thereby sufficient reason for attributing all the fore-mentioned similarities to St. MARK'S inspection of that prior Gospel. In support of this deduction, we have nothing to do but to fix the date; And the date may be settled by the following observations.

THAT the Christian Religion had made a considerable progress in the world before St. MARK wrote his Gospel, is evident from his own words. For then, he tells us, the Apostles "had gone forth, and "preached every where [b]"—i. e. throughout the whole *Roman* Empire, and even among the barbarous nations. A circumstance that must needs extend the date of its publication far beyond the time that THEOPHYLACT mentions, or the *Greek* subscriptions place it at.

THAT this Gospel was written at *Rome*, for the use of the Christians there, many

[b] Ch. xvi. 20.

of the Ancients positively assert [*i*]: And there are several *internal* characters to be found in it, which plainly countenance and confirm their assertion.—So far the current of Tradition runs in one channel; but here it divides, and carries us different ways.

IF we credit the accounts of CLEMENS and PAPIAS, and suppose this Gospel to have been composed at the request of the *Roman* Converts, as an abstract of what St. PETER had preached among them [*k*]; then we shall be forced to conclude it was written about the year LVI — a little later than the reputed time of that Apostle's arrival at *Rome* [*l*].

BUT since it is almost demonstrably evident, that St. PETER had not been at *Rome*

[*i*] See notes [*g*] [*r*] above, p. 50, 51. and ATHANASII Synopf. S. Script. p. 155. HIERONYM. Com. in MARC. Proem.

[*k*] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 15. lib. iii. c. 39. & lib. vi. c. 14.

[*l*] LACTANTIUS, in his book *De Mortibus Persecut.* cap. ii. brings him to *Rome* in the beginning of NERO's reign, about the year LV; and is certainly much nearer the truth than EUSEBIUS, who (Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 14.) represents him preaching there in the reign of CLAUDIUS.

in the year LVIII [m]; we must necessarily drop this part of the story, and attend only to the motions of St. MARK.

Now it appears from undoubted authority, that he always accompanied some or other of the Apostles in their journies. The Ancients agree in making him the familiar Companion of St. PETER; who, in I PET. v. 13. speaks of a MARK, and calls him "his Son". This MARK they supposed to be the Evangelist, and the same person with him who is mentioned by that name

[a] It is observable, says Dr. WHITBY, Pref. to the Epist. to the Romans, that among all the salutations which St. PAUL sends to those of Rome, he hath not one directed to St. PETER; nor doth he give us any hint that St. PETER then had ever been at Rome, or planted any Church there; which, as it makes it highly probable he had not then been there at all, so doth it make it certain that St. PAUL knew not of his being there when this Epistle was indited—in the year of our Lord LVIII. And again, in his note on these words—"I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also, ch. i. 15.—he adds, "It seems highly probable, that St. PETER was not yet come to Rome, much less had settled his See there; for if so, why should St. PAUL be so desirous, so often purposing, to come to them, that he might impart some spiritual gift to them; to the end they might be established, y 11. unless St. PETER was either insufficient for, or very negligent in, that work." See also CAVE'S Life of St. PETER, § xi. p. 42.

in the twelfth of the ACTS :—from whence we may easily account for the intimacy and connexion he maintained with St. PETER [n].

BUT he sometimes likewise accompanied St. PAUL ; and particularly in his first travels among the *Gentiles* [o]. Afterwards indeed he separated from him ; but we find him again with St. PAUL in *Rome* at the time of his first imprisonment. For in his Epistle to PHILEMON, directed from thence in the year LXIII, he reckons him, ver. 24, among his Fellow-Labourers. When, and upon what account, he came there, we know not ; but it appears from

[n] VICTOR. Præf. in MARC. in Caten. Patr.

[o] “ BARNABAS and SAUL—took with them JOHN, whose surname was MARK,” *Act.* xii. 25. GROTIUS, in his Proleg. ad MARCI EVANGEL. supposes that the MARK here mentioned was a different person from MARK the Evangelist ; but the reasons he urges are, I think, of so little force, that we may still safely conclude with WETSTEIN — “ Nihil vetat, quo minus simpliciter cum VICTORE & THEOPHYLACTO hunc eundem MARCUM intelligamus, quoties illius nomen in Actis & Epistolis reperimus.” Proleg. in MARC. EVANG. See LARDNER’S *Supplement* &c. vol. I. c. vii. p. 155—160. LIGHTFOOT’S *Works*, vol. I. p. 336. fol. MICHAELIS’S *Introd. Lect.* § xci. p. 226.

Calass. iv. 10. that he departed soon after :— and probably never returned. For in the year LXXVI, towards the close of his last confinement, we find the Apostle expressing his earnest desire to see him, as one that was useful to him and his Ministry [p].

IF St. MARK then wrote his Gospel, as the Ancients unanimously affirm, at *Rome*; the foregoing limitations will unavoidably constrain us to date its publication about the end of the year LXXII, or the beginning of LXXIII, the ninth of the Emperor NERO [q]. A time when the Church stood in need of every religious consolation, to support itself under the afflictive weight of a dreadfully cruel persecution [r].

IF this be admitted, it will be easy to account for his transcribing so much, as

[p] 1 Tim. iv. 11.

[q] St. JEROME indeed reports, *Proem. in MARC.* that he died the year before, viz. the eighth of NERO. But herein he is little to be credited, since it is evident from IEREMUS, lib. iii. c. 1. that he far outlived that period. See CAVE's *Lives of the Ap.* p. 196. MARK, § 4.

[r] About this time began the first general persecution; when the Christians at *Rome* were treated by the Emperor with all the instances of scorn and cruelty. RUSSEN. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 25. C. CORN. TACIT. *Annal.* lib. xv.

we suppose him to have done, from the Gospel of St. LUKE. For he could not fail of being well acquainted with that Gospel; since the Author of it then lived at *Rome*, and laboured with him in the service of Christianity [s]. And probably one great reason of St. PAUL's wishing afterwards to see him, as a person useful to the *Roman Church* [t], might arise from the consideration of the special influence, which he experienced St. MARK had gained over them, by the favour he had done them, in penning this Gospel for their service and use.

WHAT has been said is sufficient, we hope, to illustrate the design, and ascertain the dates, of these three Gospels. But in clearing these points we have opened the way to several conclusions of no mean importance: two of which we shall now proceed to draw out to their full extent.

FROM the Collations here made, it plainly appears,

[s] Philom. vet. 24.

[t] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

1. THAT the Evangelists not only perused, but also transcribed, each others Writings; and consequently, that the argument commonly urged in support of the credibility of the Gospel-History, and founded on the contrary opinion, is at last founded on a common mistake. For thus they reason [u]. “The sacred Historians agree in their accounts, and yet knew nothing of each others Writings; they did not therefore write in concert, and forge these accounts, but were severally guided by the real existence of the facts related.” True indeed it is, that they neither forged their accounts, nor wrote in concert, for they wrote at different times, in different places, and with different views: yet, so far is it from being true, that the later Evangelists never consulted what the former had written before them, that the very reverse has, I presume, been already demonstrated. They perused, recommended, and copied each other. And happy

[u] Præf. NICETÆ ad Symb. Evang. in Caten. Patr. Græc. in Math. vide etiam HAMMOND. & CLERICI Præf. ad Annotationes, &c.

it is, as will hereafter appear, for the cause of Christianity, that they really did so.

BUT how, then, came they not to avoid the many contradictions observable among them? These are only *seeming* contradictions; and vanish most of them, on a close comparison of the several passages: and were we sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances of the facts; the views of the Relators; the turns of their expressions, and the method they used in their computations, the rest would doubtless immediately disappear; and the several Gospels would perfectly correspond with each other.

FROM the same Collations, we may likewise infer,

2. THAT St. MATTHEW'S Gospel, if not originally written in *Greek*, was yet very early translated into that Language; and that the present Version, if we must needs have it to be a Version, is of equal authority with the *Greek* Text of the other Gospels; that is, of authority truly divine. St. MARK and St. LUKE adopted it as such: and what weight can the surmises

of some credulous Fathers carry in opposition to their infallible judgment ?

BUT it is now time to go on with our design, and examine the contents of the remaining Gospel, viz. that of St. JOHN.

S E C T. V.

NO sooner was the Christian Church established, but its doctrines were obscured, debased, and corrupted by errors and heresies of various kinds.—The first Heretics, who set up their own opinions against the truths delivered to them, assumed the general Name of *Gnostics*, i. e. “knowing Men”; and made extraordinary pretensions to superior light and knowledge [x]. This false science appeared early in the days of the Apostles; and is probably that of which St. PAUL speaks, when he warns TIMOTHY to “avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of SCIENCE

[x] Adversantur Traditioni, dicentes se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, sinceram invenisse veritatem. IREN. cont. Hæres. Lib. iii. c. 2.

“falsely

“falsely so called; which some professing,
“have erred concerning the Faith [y].”

OF all the heretical notions founded on Philosophy and *vain* Learning, none made a quicker progress in the world, or were more injurious to the truths of the Gospel, than those originally embraced by the *Nicœnians*, and afterwards propagated by EBION and CERINTHUS. These notions, therefore, the Governors of the Church were obliged in duty to refute and extirpate. They prevailed most in *Asia* [z]. And accordingly we find, that the *Asian* Bishops desired St. JOHN, who had been the beloved Disciple of CHRIST, and as it were his bosom-friend, to draw up a confutation of them [a], that, in compliance with their request, he wrote his Gospel, in which he endeavoured to extirpate the errors that had been propagated

[y] 1 TIM. vi. 20, 21. [z] EPIPHAN. Hæres. 28. [a] JOANNES—scripsit Evangelium, rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis, adversus CERINTHUM aliosque Hæreticos, et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogmata confurgens, qui asserunt CHRISTUM ante MARIAM non fuisse—HYERONYM. Cat. Scrip. Eccl. in voce JOANNES. Vide etiam ejusdem auctoris Comment. in MATTH. Proem.

by CERINTHUS, and long before his time by the *Nicolaitans*, a sect of those who are falsely called *Gnostics* [b].

WE are therefore to consider his Gospel, not merely as an historical narrative, but also as a *polemic* tract, designed to confute the errors of CERINTHUS, and other Heretics of the same stamp [c]. The me-

[b] Haec solum annuncians JOANNES Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annunciationem auferre eum, qui a CERINTHO infeminatus erat hominibus, Errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitae, qui sunt vultu ejus quae ~~habe~~ cognominatur scientis, &c. IREN. Lib. iii. c. 11.

[c] Mr. LAMPE (Prolegom. in JOAN.) Dr. LARDNER (Suppl. to *Craf.* Vol. I.) and several others strenuously contend, that it could never be the intention of the Evangelist to confute these Heretics, because they did not appear in the world, till sometime *after* the publication of this Gospel. But it is evident from IRENÆUS (Lib. iii. c. 3.) that CERINTHUS was cotemporary with St. JOHN—and from EPIPHANIUS (HÆT. 28.) that he began *very early* to sow tares in the Church. The *Nicolaitans* are mentioned Rev. ii, 6. and 15. Nor is there any room to doubt but the *Gnostics* corrupted the Christian Faith, almost as *soon* as St. PAUL established it. 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21. And as this was the case, it certainly became the concern of the Evangelist, so to order the economy of his Gospel, as to render it, as *antidote*, to the fatal poison of these prevailing Heresies. And since it is universally allowed, that they *may all* be confuted by it, does it not plainly follow, that it was purposely written with a view to confute them?

thod he employed for this purpose was, to set forth at large the Discourses of CHRIST which disproved their notions, and to recount the Miracles which confirmed those Discourses. And how conclusive this method of argumentation was, appears from the conduct of his opponents; who had no other way of eluding its force, than by totally rejecting his Gospel [d].

IN order therefore to understand the scheme and disposition of this Gospel, we must first examine the tenets of CERINTHUS, in opposition to which we suppose it to have been purposely written.

Now the opinions attributed to CERINTHUS are chiefly these,

[d] The *Ebionites*, *Cerinthians*, and other Heretics of the like cast, received only the Gospel of St. MATTHEW, and and that not in its purity, as appears from the following testimonies. Ebionæi eo solo, quod est secundum MATTHÆUM, Evangelio utuntur. IREN. Lib. i. c. 26. et Lib. iii. c. 11. In Evangelio (scil. MATTH.) quo utuntur *Nazaræi* et *Ebionitæ*. HIERON. Com. MATTH. c. xii. com. 13. Per *Nazaræos* intelligendi sunt Hæretici, isto nomine sese appellantes, de quibus Epiphanius Hær. 29. agit, qui ut in dogmatibus cum *Ebionitis* conspiciantur, ita et uno Evangelio usi sunt. GRAB. spicileg. Patr. secul. i. p. 15.

He believed,

1. THAT the most high GOD was entirely unknown before the appearance of CHRIST; and dwelt in a remote Heaven, called Πρώτος with the chief Spirits or *Æons* [e].

2. THAT this supreme GOD first generated an only-begotten Son, ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ, who again begat the Word, ΛΟΓΟΣ, which was inferior to the First-born [f].

3. THAT CHRIST was a still lower *Æon*, tho' far superior to some others [g].

4. THAT there were two high *Æons*, distinct from CHRIST; one called ΖΩΗ or the Life, and the other ΦΩΣ or the Light [h].

5. THAT from the *Æons* again proceeded inferior orders of Spirits; and particu-

[e] IREN. adversus Hæreses, Lib. i. Cap. 1. in princip. et passim alibi. For what is said there of the *Valentinians* is equally true of the *Corinthians*, who maintained the same principles before them.

[f] Initium quidem esse Monogenem, Logon autem verum filium Unigeniti. IREN. Lib. iii. cap. 11.

[g] Alterum vero de superioribus CHRISTUM. IREN. ubi supra.

[h] See GROT. Proleg. Com. in JOAN. and MICHAELIS Lect. on the New Testament, § ci. p. 248. Eng. Ed.

larly one DEMIURGUS, who created this visible World out of eternal matter [1].

6. THAT this DEMIURGUS was ignorant of the supreme GOD, and much lower than the *Æons* which were wholly invisible [2].

7. THAT he was however the peculiar GOD and Protector of the *Israelites*, and sent MOSES to them, whose laws and injunctions were to be of constant and perpetual obligation [3].

[1] DEMIURGUS perficiebat fabricationem conditionis, i. e. creationis. IREN. Lib. iii. cap. 11.

[2] CEBIURUS in Asia, non a primo DEO factum esse mundum, docuit, sed a virtute quadam valde separata, et distincta ab ea principalitate quæ est super universa, et ignorante eum qui est super omnia DEUM. IREN. Lib. i. cap. 25. & alibi. A virtute aliqua valde deorsum subjecta, et abscissa ab eorum communicatione, quæ sunt invisibilia et innominabilia. Lib. iii. cap. 11.

[3] EX DEO per varias emanationes esse angelos (vel angelum DEMIURGUM opificem) qui hunc condiderint mundum; de quorum numero angelorum fuerit quoque DEUS, ille Judæorum, qui veterem instituit economiam, VITRINGA apud BUDDERUM, *Beel. Apost. Cap. v. § 5.* De Cerinthianis equidem talia traduntur, ex quibus colligat, haud procul eos a pseudapostolorum disciplinam abfuisse, quod scilicet necessitatem legis Mosaicæ statuerint, plurimaque Instituta Mosaicæ retinuerint. BUDDER *Eccl. Ap. Cap. iii. § 1.* MOSHEM. *Instit. Hist. Christian. Antiq. sect. i. p. ii. cap. v. § 16.*

8. THAT JESUS was a mere Man, the real SON of JOSEPH and MARY [m].

9. THAT the *Aeon*, CHRIST, descended upon him in the form of a Dove when he was baptized; revealed to him the unknown Father, and empowered him to work Miracles [n].

10. THAT the *Aeon*, Light, entered into JOHN the Baptist, in the same manner as CHRIST entered into JESUS; and therefore that JOHN was, in some respects, to be preferred to our Saviour [o].

[m] *ISSUM* autem subiecit (*GRINTHUS*,) non ex virgine natum; (impossibile enim hoc ei visum est) fuisse autem eam JOSEPH et MARIÆ filium, similiter ac reliqui omnes homines, et plus potius justitiâ, et prudentiâ, et sapientiâ ab omnibus. IREN. Lib. i. cap. 25.

[n] Post baptismum descendit in eum, ab ea Principitate quæ est super omnia, CHRISTUM, signa columbe, et tunc annuntiavit incognitum Patrem, et virtutes personis. IREN. ubi supra.

[o] Erant et qui JOANNIS Baptiste sectatores quam JESU esse malent, says GRINTHUS in JOAN. He adds indeed *ad idem signum crucis*—“in order to avoid the name of the ‘‘cross,’’ which might be the case with some; and yet others, especially those who adopted the maxims and practices of the *Aeon*, might do it from an opinion of the Baptist’s superior Sanctity. vid. IREN. L. iii. c. 2.

II. THAT

11. THAT when JESUS had propagated the knowledge of GOD, and came to suffer, CHRIST left him, and fled into the *Plerōma*, or upper-most Heaven. And consequently that JESUS only suffered, whilst CHRIST, being a spiritual *Æon*, remained impassible [*p*].

12. THAT JESUS CHRIST should reign on Earth for the space of a thousand years; and that his Disciples should live in carnal delights, and all kinds of sensual enjoyments [*q*].

[*p*] In fine autem revolasse iterum CHRISTUM de JESU, et JESUM passum esse, et resurrexisse: CHRISTUM autem impassibilem perseverasse, existentem spiritalem. IREN. Lib. i. c. 25. et lib. iii. c. 11. p. 217. Ed. Grab.

[*q*] Ἄλλὰ καὶ κέρυθρον—λέγει, ὡς τὴν αἰσίαν ἐπίγειον τὴν βασίλειον τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθιμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν. καὶ ἔχθρας ὑπάραξεν ταῖς γραφαῖς τῷ Θεῷ, ἀριθμὸς χιλιετηστείας ἐν γὰρ ἰουδαίᾳ θύλακον ὀλιγαῖς λέγει γινώσκαι. *Sed et CERINTHUS—affirmans post resurrectionem regnare CHRISTI in terris futuram, ac rursus homines Hierosolymis degentes cupiditatibus et voluptati corporis obnoxios fore—additque hostis ille divinarum scripturarum mille annorum spatium in noctialibus festis transactum iri quæ facilius imperitos homines decipiat.* EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 28. AUGUSTIN. de Hæres. c. viii.

SOME of the *Cerintbian* sect denied also the Resurrection of the Dead;—and many of them maintained, that JESUS CHRIST was not yet risen [r].

If we enter the Gospel with these articles, we shall soon perceive how conducive they are to the explanation of it. Not only particular passages will derive from them great light; but the whole will appear to be a compleat work—regular, clear, and conclusive.

It may properly be divided into THREE parts.

THE *First* comprehends the DOCTRINES to be maintained; which are contrary to those of *Cerintbus*, i. 1—18.

THE *Second* contains the *Proofs* of these Doctrines, delivered in an historical manner, i. 19—xx. 29.

THE *Third* is a *Conclusion* or *Appendix*, giving some account of the Person of the Writer, and of the view he had in penning this Gospel, xx. 30. to the end.

[r] DUPIN's Hist. of the Church, Vol. II. Eng. Ed. 1820. p. 41.—CAVE's Lives of the Apost. p. 124. St. JOHN, § i.

THE DOCTRINES laid down in the first Part, as contra-positions to the tenets of CERINTHUS, may be reduced to the following heads; where the Evangelist asserts

1. THAT CHRIST is the *Logos* or Word of GOD.

2. THAT the *Logos* and *Monogenes* are not distinct beings, but one and the same person, i. 14.

3. THAT CHRIST or the *Logos* is not an inferior *Æon*, but GOD, i. 1.

4. THAT he perfectly knew the supreme GOD, being always with him in the *Plerōma*, i. 18.

5. THAT he is not to be distinguished from the DEMIURGUS; for he is the Creator of the whole World, i. 3, 10.

6. THAT *Life* and *Light* are not particular and separate Spirits, but the same with the *Logos* and CHRIST, i. 4, 7—9. 17. And therefore that CHRIST, the *Logos*, *Life*, *Light*, the *only-begotten*, are not distinct *Æons*, but one and the same divine person[s].

[1] Unus et idem ostenditur Logos et Monogenes, et Zoe et Phos, et foter et CHRISTUS filius Dei, et hic idem incarnatus pro nobis. IREN. Lib. i. c. i. § 20.

7. THAT

7. THAT no particular *Æon* entered into JOHN the Baptist by the name of *Light*, to communicate to him a superior Knowledge of the divine Will; i. 8; but that he was a mere man; and, tho' inspired, much inferior to JESUS, being only the Fore-runner of him, i. 6, 8, 15.

8. THAT the supreme God was not entirely unknown before the time of CHRIST; for men had received such lights on this head, under the various dispensations thro' which they passed, that it was their own fault, if they remained ignorant; i. 9, 10.

9. THAT the *Jews* were not the peculiar people of an inferior God, such as the DEMIURGUS; but of CHRIST himself, the only-begotten Son of GOD, i. 11.

10. THAT in the fulness of time the Son of GOD took upon him human nature, and became Man, i. 14.

11. THAT he abolished the Law of MOSES, which was only the shadow of good things to come, and in its stead introduced the substance, or the very things signified by it, i. 17.

AND lastly,

12. THAT the *Jew* has no more right in this divine person, and the privileges conferred thro' him, than the *Gentile* [1]; for whoever believes in him, becomes thereby a Child of GOD, and is entitled by that adoption to a glorious inheritance, i. 12, 13.

THESE propositions being settled, the Evangelist proceeds to the proofs of them; which he delivers in the way of History, as being all expressed or plainly implied in the Discourses and Transactions of our Saviour. Let us therefore pursue the thread of the History, in order to discover what proofs arise from the several transactions and speeches of CHRIST, recorded by this Evangelist. And,

1. JOHN the Baptist himself confesses to the *Jewish* Priests, that he is much *inferior* to JESUS—refers his own Disciples to him, who acknowledge him to be the MESSIAH, and are confirmed in this Faith by a Miracle, i. 19—ii. 11.

[1] ORIGEN. Philocal. c. i. p. 17. Ed. SPENCER.

2. AFTER this JESUS conducts himself at *Jerusalem*, as the Lord of the Temple, ii. 12—25.—reveals himself to NICODEMUS, as the only-begotten Son of GOD—shows the design of his coming into the world—and the necessity of believing in him, iii. 1—21.

THEN follows an additional Testimony of JOHN the Baptist to the superiority of CHRIST, and the excellency of his ordinances, iii. 22—36.

JESUS visits the *Samaritans*—declares himself to be the CHRIST—and foretells the abolition of the *Levitical* Worship, iv. 1—42.

Then, by a second Miracle, he demonstrates his divine mission in his own country, where it was most disputed, iv. 43—

54.

As a farther proof of the future abrogation of the *Ceremonial* Law, JESUS works a Miracle on the *Sabbath*, and vindicates his conduct—declares himself to be the Son of GOD, and exhibits various evidences of his mission, v. 1—47.

THEN,

THEN, to shew that he was the End of the Law, he substitutes himself in the room of the *Legal* Sacrifices; and commands the people, who were used to feast on some of those Sacrifices, to *eat* his *Flesh* and drink his *Blood*. And to convince them that he was truly the Bread of Life, he miraculously feeds above five thousand of them with five barley loaves, vi. 1—71.

THE People being disposed by this Miracle to make him a King, JESUS disclaims all temporal views—urges farther the Proofs of his divine mission,—and promises the assistance of the Holy Spirit to all true Believers, vii. 1—53.

He declares himself to be the Light of the World—reproves the *Jews* for rejecting him—promises Immortality to his Followers—and speaks of his own existence as prior to that of *Abraham*, viii. 12—59.

In proof of his being the Light of the world, he restores a blind man to sight—and warns the *Jews* of that judicial *Darkness*, under which they were soon to be sealed up, for perverting so basely those

means of knowledge that were graciously offered to them, ix., 1—41.

AFTER this he represents himself as the Door of the Sheepfold; and tells the *Pharisees*, who called themselves the Shepherds of the people, that they “who entered not by the door into the Sheepfold, “but climbed up some other way,” whatever character they might assume, were in reality no better than thieves and robbers. A reflexion which the Christians of those days could hardly avoid applying to CERINTHUS and other *Heresiarchs*. Then follows a description of a good Shepherd and an Hireling, which may be looked upon as a kind of test, whereby to judge of the different conduct of the Apostles and Heretics, &c. x. 1—42.

JESUS performs a signal Miracle in the presence of a large number of people; which was attended with this peculiar circumstance,—that it was wrought after an express invocation of GOD, that he would apply it to the confirmation of what our Saviour had taught, xi. 1—44. Observe particularly ver. 41, 42.

THEN

THEN follows a brief account of the different effects which this Miracle produced on the minds of the Jews:—so different, that though it *won* upon many of the *People*, it *exasperated* most of the *Priests*, xi. 45—57. xii. 1—11.

CHRIST rides in triumph to *Jerusalem*, and is proclaimed King of Israel. The *Greeks*, who may be considered as the first-fruits of the *Gentiles*, apply to him, and are admitted. He addresses them in terms suitable to the occasion—and his Doctrine is confirmed by a Voice from Heaven, xii. 12—36.

SOME intimation being now given, that the *Gentiles* were to be admitted into the Christian Church, JESUS institutes the Law of Hospitality [*], and delivers to

H 2 his

[*] Washing the Feet was commonly, in the *Eastern* countries, the first kindness shewn to a Traveller, who was to be hospitably received: Gen. xviii. 4. xix. 2. xliii. 24. whence it came to be used for hospitality in general, 1 Tim. v. 10. When our Saviour therefore washed the feet of his Disciples, and taught them to condescend in like manner to their inferiors, it amounted to the same thing, as if he had instituted and established the law of hospitality among all his future Followers.

his Disciples a *new* Commandment, that they should love one another as Brethren, without distinction, and as Members of the same Church, xiii. 1—35.

THEN he informs them, in a long Discourse, that a perpetual and intimate union with him, their Head, is indispensably necessary to salvation;—and that, after his departure, he would send down the Holy Spirit, who should guide them into all truth, and enable them to fulfil his commandments, xiv. 1—15. xvi. 33.

AFTER this, JESUS recommends his Disciples, &c. to the Father, in a pathetic and memorable Prayer; and at the same time testifies, that none of his Apostles was lost, but JUDAS ISCARIOT, xvii. 1—26. As this Prayer was favourably heard, and the Apostles were afterwards endowed with extraordinary powers, it afforded an argu-

ers. Now as Strangers are the Objects of this Law, and not Persons who live in the same Community, it was indeed, in the strictest sense, a *new* Commandment to *them*, who thought it their Duty “to avoid those of another nation,” Acts x. 28. See MICHAMBERLAIN’S Introd. Lect. § ciii. p. 254; to whom I am indebted for this, and many other observations on the present Subject.

ment, against CERINTHUS, of the divine Authority of the Doctrines they taught.

THEN follows a particular account of our Saviour's Passion, adapted to prove that he did not die as a mere Man, xviii. 1. xix. 42.

AND also of his Resurrection, in opposition to those, who denied that he was risen, xx. 1—29.

THE *first* part of the *Appendix* contains a declaration of the end which the Evangelist had in view, when he penned this account: namely, that his Readers might be convinced thereby, that "JESUS is "the CHRIST, the Son of God*";—and consequently that the notions and tenets of CERINTHUS were altogether false and heretical.

THE *second* part relates to himself, and seems to have been added as a confutation of the opinion, which some entertained, that St. JOHN was not to die. An opinion that might have weakened his authority, had he suffered it to pass unrefuted,

* Ch. xx. 31.

[*] Ch. xxi. 23.

THE only thing that remains is to settle the Date of this Gospel, which, according to the unanimous suffrage of the Ancients, was written the last of all the Four:—tho' at what time cannot be determined from *their* strangely various and contradictory Accounts. Let us therefore consult the Gospel itself, and see what information may be collected from thence.

Now the Gospel contains one or two particulars, which plainly intimate that it was not written till after the Death of St. PETER. For had he been then living, St. JOHN would have undoubtedly suppressed his name, as the other Evangelists had done, in the account of his assault on the High-Priest's servant, for fear of exposing him to the resentment of the *Jews*. But he inserts it at full length—"SIMON PETER
" drew a sword", &c. [y]: And this insertion of it is a presumptive proof that he was now dead.

BUT there is no necessity that we should rest this point here. The same thing may

[y] Ch. xviii. 10, 26.

be inferred from the following Passage. "When thou wast young," says our Saviour to PETER, "thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not," "This," St. JOHN remarks, "our Saviour spake, signifying by what death"—viz. Crucifixion—"he should glorify GOD [x]." An interpretation he would have hardly affixed to such ambiguous words, had it not been already ascertained by the completion of the Prophecy.

If these Arguments be of any weight, then it follows,

THAT St. JOHN did not write his Gospel before the year *sixty-eight*: for in that year, we are told, St. PETER was martyred at *Rome* [a];—and therefore,

[x] Ch. xxi. 18, 19. Compare this with Ch. xii. 33. and xviii. 32.

[a] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. ii. c. 25, LACTANT. de Mort. Persecut. c. 2.

THAT THEOPHYLACT dates this Gospel a little too early, when he affirms it to have been written in *sixty-five*.

THOSE Writers, who, on the other hand, bring down the date of it far below the Destruction of *Jerusalem* [b], seem to place it much too late. For the Evangelist himself, speaks of that city as still subsisting (ΕΣΤΙ δὲ ἡ πόλις Ἱερουσαλήμ) ch. iv. 2. [c] at the time he wrote. But *Jerusalem*, we know, was taken and destroyed in the Year LXX: and by that circumstance, in conjunction with the foregoing remarks, we are necessarily confined to the Year of our Lord LXIX, the very year specified by NICEPHORUS, as the most likely time for the publication of this Gospel.

If it be supposed, that the true reading in this Place, is either *Εσϛ*, according to the *Complutensian* Edition;—or *Ηϛ*, according to the *Syriac* Version, and some of the Fathers;—or else, that the Evangelist

[b] IRÉN. Lib. iii. c. 1. EPIPHAN. Hæres. li. CHRYSOST. Serm. de S. JOAN, Apost. Tom. vi. Ed. Lut. Paris. an. 1624. MILLI Prolegom. No. 181. p. 604.

[c] See WHITHY on the Place. BASNAG. AN XCVII. No. 22. LAMP. Proleg. in JOAN, Lib. ii. c. ii. No. 11.

made use of the *present* instead of the *preter* tense [*d*], in order the better to enliven the scene, and engage the attention of his Reader;—then, indeed, for any thing that appears to the contrary in the Text, we may bring the date as low as we please. But this would be, in one case, presumptuously to despise the authority of the best and most ancient Manuscripts; and, in the other, to alter without reason the plain sense and meaning of the Historian. We must therefore adhere to the foregoing conclusion, and join with those Fathers, who ascribe to this Gospel the *earlier* date.

THIS date, deduced from internal marks, we may now fix upon with the greater confidence, as it appears to be confirmed by a happy accession of external proofs. If the two Epistles of St. CLEMENT, published by WETSTEIN at the end of his New Testament, be genuine, (and he has produced very strong Arguments [*e*] to prove

[*d*] JONES on the Canon of the New Testament, Vol. iii. P. 141.

[*e*] *Prolegom.*, ad duas Epistolas Sancti Clementis Romani, p. 5-9.

them such) then it is evident from the express quotations [f] contained in them, that St. JOHN penned his Gospel, not only before the Death of that apostolical Bishop, but even before his Abdication. For these Epistles bear the nature of *Episcopal* charges, and are particularly addressed to the *Teachers* of Religion; which manifestly implies, that St. CLEMENT presided over the see of *Rome* at the time he wrote them. But he quitted that see, according to the computation of the most approved Chronologers, about the Year LXXXIII. From whence it follows, that the Gospel, so often quoted by him, must necessarily have been extant before that time.

WE have now seen at what times, and with what views, the Gospels were written: And if we attend a little to the views and intentions the Writers had, we may easily and rationally account for their Number.

St. MATTHEW wrote his Gospel for the use of the Churches in *Palestine*, then

[f] Ep. i. § 6, 8, 13. Ep. ii. § 15.

composed of *Jewish* Converts, and adapted it to the condition of the times, and the nature of their circumstances.

WHEN the *Gentiles* were admitted into the Christian Church, St. LUKE, as the exigences of their state required, strengthened their faith by another Gospel, accommodated to their special use.

AND when the invidious distinction between *Jews* and *Gentiles* had well nigh ceased, St. MARK, wisely rejecting the many peculiarities of these two Gospels, compacted a third out of their most important Contents, for the benefit and instruction of Christians at large.

AND afterwards, when the Church was infested by Hereticks, St. JOHN undertook to confute their errors from the Life and Conversation of CHRIST: which produced the last of these Gospels; and afforded the Author an excellent opportunity of relating several remarkable things which had been before omitted by his Predecessors. These, in all probability, were the reasons which induced the Evangelists to write—

And

And hence it is that we have **FOUR** Gospels: all of them composed, as **EUSEBIUS** observes [g], on *special* and *urgent* occasions.

Now, these Gospels are by no means to be looked upon as so many detached pieces, composed by persons totally ignorant of each other's Intention; but rather as one complete, entire system of Divinity, supported by the strongest proofs that the subject is capable of, and defended against all the objections which either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, or even its more dangerous *heretical* Professors, could make to the truth and certainty of it. If we read them in the order they are here placed, we shall find them improving one upon another, and yet all conspiring to the same end—to a perfect representation of revealed Religion. Each of the Authors consulted the Writings of his Predecessors, and either by addition of facts,—explanation of terms,—or confirmation of doctrine, contributed something to the common stock, and the

[g] Οὗτοι ἄνθρωποι ἐκρίθησαν ἐπὶ τοῖς γραφαῖς ἰδιῶν περιστάσεων λόγων. Quasi quidem necessitate quadam ad scribendum impulsos fuisse perhibent. Hist. Eccl. l. iii. c. 24.

general instruction of Christians [b]. They likewise quoted each others words, and thereby recommended each others Histories. A circumstance of great advantage, whatever some may think of it, to the service of the Christian cause. For by this means they became not only mutual Vouchers for the truth of these *genuine* Gospels, but at the same time joint-opposers of all those *spurious* ones, that were impiously obtruded on the world.

It is well known, that the first Converts to Christianity, desirous of preserving the remembrance of the things transacted by our Saviour, collected together all the reports they could hear concerning him, and digested them into Histories, which they called GOSPELS. Among these there were two of principal Note—the one stiled “the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*”—and the other “according to the *Egyptians*” [i]. Both these Gospels ap-

[b] Vide CHRYSOST. Hom. prim. in MATTH. sub initio.

[i] THEOPHYLACT. Præf. Com. in LUC. MILL. Prolegom. No. 38. ORIGEN. in Præm. LUCÆ. HIERONYM. Com. in MATTH. Præm.

pear, by the fragments still extant [k], to have been full fraught with ridiculous stories—imperfect relations—and false doctrines; and yet pretended to the most sacred authority, as being compiled from accounts, delivered by those “who were “Eye-Witnesses and Ministers of the “Word [l]”. Accordingly, they were held in the highest veneration among these People to whom they are ascribed [m]: and Heretics of various denominations soon began to appeal to them; as they did indeed to other monuments of the like kind, which favoured their pernicious Doctrines [n].

In this state of things, when so many Gospels appeared in the World, all claiming an equal authority, how were the *true* ones to be distinguished from the *false*? Will you say that the absurdities contained in some of them, were alone sufficient to

[k] GRAB. Spicileg. Patr. Tom. I. Sect. 1. p. 25--31. et P. 35--37.

[l] Luke i. 2. THEOPHYL. in locum.

[m] EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 25. Lib. ii. c. 17. MILL. Prolegom. N^o. 38--52.

[n] MILL. Prolegom. N^o. 53.

overthrow their credit? with *judicious* men indeed they might. But what if the generality took things upon trust, and seldom or never exercised their judgment? and yet if this was not the case, it is hard to conceive, how several articles could gain belief, which, nevertheless, passed current among the primitive Christians.

SINCE then there was but little likelihood that they should distinguish and determine rightly for themselves, it was incumbent on the Evangelists to do it for them: and they did it indeed effectually. For they apprized the world, that there were many *spurious* Gospels abroad: But, as they deemed them worthy of no regard, so they wisely took no farther notice of them. The *true* ones however they carefully directed their Disciples to, and recommended them to their perusal in a peculiar manner. St. LUKE, by his quotations, referred his Readers to the Gospel of St. MATTHEW. St. MARK, by the same method, referred again both to St. MATTHEW'S and St. LUKE'S. These
three

three Gospels were approved by St. JOHN [a], and appointed to be read in the Churches. And afterwards, when he wrote his own, it was ushered into the world with the knowledge, approbation, and perhaps testimony [p] of all the *Asiatic* Bishops.

THUS the true Gospels were not only distinguished from the false, but the prior ones continually received additional light, strength, and confirmation from those that followed;—till at length the whole Evangelical History was finally closed, and the Evangelical Canon established upon the firmest ground, by the most venerable authority [q]. For it is evident that St. JOHN actually closed the History of CHRIST, when he added his own to the Three other Gospels. And lest Christians should be deceived by vain pretences to more

[o] Τῶν πρωτογραφούντων τριῶν (Εὐαγγελίων) εἰς πάντα ἕδη ἢ εἰς κότες (ἰαίνας) διεδιδάκτων, διεδιέτασαν ἡ φησὶν, ἀλήθειαν αἰνεῖτε ἐν παντοῦ ἑστέατα. *Prædatis jam de antiquis scripturis libro JOANNI positam fæderatam tribus Evangelii, approbasse e JOANNES et veritatem scriptorum suo testimonio confirmasse dicitur.* EUSEB. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. c. 24.

[p] Vid. GROF. Annot. ad Joann. xxi. 24. et xx. 30.

[q] Vide MILII Prolegom. Numb. 193, 194.

perfect accounts than what are here to be met with, he wisely guarded them from receiving any other Gospels, even tho' they should chance to contain some *real* Facts, not mentioned by him, or his brother Evangelists. "There are many other things," says he, which JESUS did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the World itself could not contain the Books that would be written [r]:" that is, there would be no end of writing. But tho' "there are many other Things that JESUS did in the presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book" of the four Evangelists, which is here compleated; yet these things that are now written are sufficient to answer the Purpose intended—viz. "that you might see reason to believe that JESUS is the CHRIST, the Son of GOD, and that, believing, you might have Life thro' his Name [s]".

THEREFORE look no farther.

[r] Ch. xxi. 25.

[s] Ch. xx. 30, 31.

THIS Rule the *Apoftholical* Fathers religiously observed. For they always refer to the *genuine* Gospels, and never, that I know of, to *apocryphal* or *spurious* ones.

F I N I S.

A SCHEME of the Times, Places, and Occasions of writing the GOSPELS, according to the foregoing Account.

GOSPELS.	PLACE,	A. D.
St. MATTHEW's,	<i>Jerusalem,</i>	ab ^t . XXXVIII.
For the use of the <i>Jewish</i> Converts.		
St. LUKE's,	<i>Corinth,</i>	about LIII.
For the use of the <i>Gentile</i> Converts.		
St. MARK's,	<i>Rome,</i>	about LXIII.
For the use of <i>Christians</i> at large.		
St. JOHN's,	<i>Ephesus,</i>	about LXIX.
To confute the <i>Cerintbian</i> and other Heresies.		