

to eternal punishment, for the sake of savingly bringing to Christ the Jews who often stoned him, and as far as they could, took his life. Whoever loved Christ so intensely, if indeed we may call it love, and not something else far surpassing? Shall we then compare ourselves with him, seeing that he received so much grace from on high, and that he displayed so much personal excellence? Than such a comparison, what could be more audacious?

But I will farther endeavour to show, that Paul was not uncultivated in the sense, in which the objectors suppose. They themselves admit that a person may be called uncultivated, either because he is not practised in the subtlety of discourse, or because he is not able to defend the principles of truth. But Paul said that he was rude, not in both these respects, but only in the former; for he has carefully made the distinction, saying that he was '*rude in speech*, but not in *knowledge*.' Now, if I demanded in a minister the ease of Isocrates, the force of Demosthenes, the dignity of Thucydides, and the sublimity of Plato, it would be just to allege against me this affirmation of the apostle; but I dismiss all these things and highly laboured embellishment of style, as I am not concerned about diction and elocution. But let, if you please, a minister be even a poor speaker, and let his arrangement of words be simple and unpretending, only let him not be rude in knowledge and in a discriminating understanding of the faith; nor let him attempt to conceal his own inefficiency by despoiling the blessed apostle of his greatest excellence and chief praise. For by what means, tell me, did he confound the Jews that dwelt in Damascus, when he had not yet commenced to work miracles? By what means did he vanquish the Hellenists? On what account was he (Acts ix, 30) sent away to Tarsus? Was it not

because he mightily prevailed in argument, and pushed them so hard that they were exasperated to murder him, as they could not brook defeat? It could not be owing to his miraculous power, for that was not yet in exercise. No one can say that the multitude thought him a wonderful man, in consequence of reported miracles, and that his antagonists were discomfited by reason of his reputation; for till then he had triumphed only by speaking. How did he contend and dispute with those who endeavored to Judaize in Antioch? And that Areopagite of that most superstitious city, with the Woman (Acts xvii, 34), did they not follow him in consequence of his public speaking? And how did Eutychus fall from the window? Was it not after he had attended to his instructive discourse till midnight? What happened in Thessalonica and in Corinth? What in Ephesus and in Rome itself? Did he not spend days and nights in succession in explaining the Scriptures? What should we say of his discourses with the Stoics and Epicureans? To mention all things would demand much time. Since then he appears to have made great use of speaking, both before miracles and in the midst of them, how will any still dare to call him uncultivated, who was exceedingly admired by all from his conversations and public speeches? For on what account did the Lycaonians suppose him to be Mercury? He was indeed taken for a God in consequence of his miracles; but he was supposed to be Mercury, not from his signs and wonders, but from his eloquence. By what did the blessed man surpass the other apostles; and how is he so much in the mouths of all in the civilized world? How is he wondered at above all not only by us, but also among the Jews and Greeks? Is it not owing to the excellence of his epistles, by which he has benefited not only the faithful