

In order to explain some facts which are partially related by one, more fully by another, differently by another, and not at all by some of them; it will be necessary to remember that they all omit some things to which some of them refer, and that allusions are found in one, to facts which he omits to record, but which are recorded in another. (As before said, it cannot be proved that any one of them had seen the testimony of any other at the time he wrote his own.) An instance or two must suffice. Three of the historians mention that Chorazin is addressed by the Saviour as having been the theatre on which many and stupendous miracles were wrought; such as would have converted Tyre and Sidon; and yet not one of the four witnesses so much as says that Jesus was ever there, much less exhibits one of these miracles. Again, we find allusions to a form of prayer which John taught his disciples; yet none of these writers record it. None of them tells us that John the Immerser's father was struck *deaf* as well as *dumb*; and yet the fact is alluded to and gathered from these words—"They made *signs* to Zacharias how he would have his son named."

In other parts of the New Testament, certain facts and occurrences in the life of Jesus are related and alluded to, which are not found in any of these narratives. Such as his being seen of five hundred brethren at one time, assembled after his resurrection; his discourses concerning his reign previous to his ascension; and even one saying of his quoted by Paul, which, with the circumstances that gave rise to it, is omitted by them all, viz. "*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*"

But some things are alluded to by one, which happen to be recorded by another. For example—John tells us that the disciple, that was known to the High Priest's family, went into the palace with Jesus, but he never tells us that Jesus was carried to Caiaphas. This the others record. Luke tells us that the women, who first visited the empty sepulchre, "*found the stone rolled away*;" but never tells us that the stone was sealed, or fixed at the entrance of the sepulchre.

This fact not only teaches us that the writers willingly omitted to record many things which they knew, as well as those which they have narrated, because unnecessary to the completion of their design; but that apparent incongruities in their narratives *might easily be reconciled*, by a knowledge of those things which either some, or all of them, found no occasion to record. This second fact exhibits the weakness of those puny critics, who reject the testimony of these witnesses because they did not record every thing which they knew, or in a way that suits their peculiar notions of what is fitting; and it also shows us how little sense there is in all that talk about "*contradictions and incongruities*," and the attempts made to "*reconcile*" them, which we so often hear.

III. *These historians do not always aim at giving the precise words of those they quote, not even of the Saviour himself, but only the full and precise sense of what was uttered or written.* This applies to their quotations of the Jewish prophets, the words of angels, and even of the Father himself.

It is true, that where they aim at giving the words of the Saviour, they do, in some respects, vary from one another. In this way, however, we may account for it; the Saviour's mother tongue was the