


I-7

AM PRES BR1 .P58 v.1  
Biblical repertory.





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

# Remarks

UPON A

## NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

&c. &c.

---

(Concluded from page 391.)

---

### CHAP. VI.

*Uniformity of sense in Scripture preserved by tradition. Vowels and accents applied to the text in conformity with the traditional readings. Cappellus supposes these readings to have been preserved by the use of the matres lectionis before the invention of vowels. Version of Aquila conformable with the Masoretical text, as well with respect to vowels as to consonants. Various vowel readings of the Septuagint, contrasted with those of Aquila. Singular reading of the Septuagint Isaiah ix. 6. Theodotio's Version less conformable with the Masoretical text, than Aquila's. Masoretical readings genuine. No other edition of the Hebrew text extant. Griesbach's mode of detecting different editions. Masoretical text long anterior to the date of our most ancient MSS. incontrovertibly more than thirteen centuries old. Marks the distinction of words and supplies correct pauses. A similar copy of the New Testament, if of high antiquity, would be greatly valued.*

ADMITTING then, that the Bible was originally written, and published, without vowels and accents of every description, how, we may be asked, has the genuine sense of

the text been preserved? *Elias the Levite*, the great Jewish advocate for the more modern invention of the points, answers; *by tradition*.

It is universally allowed, that the canon of Scripture was finally settled by Ezra after the return from the Babylonian captivity; and we are told, that Levites appointed to the office “caused the people to understand the law,” and that “they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.”\* I quote this passage merely to point out, if not the commencement, at least the revival, of the practice of reading the Scriptures publicly to the people. Nor will it perhaps be disputed, that this practice, which the New Testament proves not to have been disused in our Saviour’s time, has been continued down to the present day. If therefore the books of Scripture have been constantly read in the synagogue from the period of their republication by Ezra, must not that reading have been always marked by some established, as well as appropriate, distinction of vowels? And would not one generation scrupulously teach another the same discrimination of sense in the way alluded to, which it had itself learnt from the generation preceding it? This is precisely still the case. For the daily readers in the synagogue, using an unpointed copy, are under the necessity of themselves supplying the vowels memoriter by established rules, which they have been taught by others. Now indeed the task of previous instruction is indisputably facilitated by the adoption of the Masoretical system; but simple as the characteristic notation of vowels by the mere application of points to the consonants appears to be, can we reasonably conceive, that so many ages could have elapsed from the days of Ezra to those of the persons usually termed the *Maso-*

\* Nehemiah viii. 3.

*rets of Tiberias*, without any attempt at a similar notation, for so important a purpose, of some kind or other ?

An *uniformity* of reading, I do not mean in pronunciation, (for the pronunciation of one race of Jews differs from that of another,) but in sense, effected by the use of appropriate vowels, must have always prevailed in every synagogue; and among a people, so vain of their national religion, and so superstitiously attached to their sacred books, any innovation of meaning in the public reading of those books, for the purpose of religious instruction, could never surely have been tolerated. In the same manner as the Fathers of the existing synagogue had themselves been taught, would their sons be taught, to read them; and so on through successive generations. It is indeed possible that this uniformity might sometimes have been disturbed in particular instances by conceit, or ignorance; but innovations of the kind alluded to could not have been very considerable either in number or in importance. For had a diversity of reading obtained in different synagogues and in different countries, history surely would have recorded something like opposition to the Masoretical attempt of fixing the sense of Scripture by an un-deviating standard of characteristic vowels. But nothing of this description remains on record; a convincing argument, I apprehend, that the application of the Masoretical vowels was in perfect conformity with that sense of the text, which had always been taught, and was universally approved, whether preserved, in the preparatory instruction for the public service of the synagogue, by mere oral tradition, or by the use of a vowel system less refined and more imperfect.

It seems therefore, that the Masoretical, or received Hebrew, text, comprising as well vowels as consonants, affords a traditional sense of Scripture more accurate, than is to be elsewhere found. Its vowel system, whether only a refinement upon one previously in use, or altoget-



ther a new invention, appears to have been originally admitted into it in perfect conformity with readings founded upon established usage. That the readings indeed expressed by the vowels had been always precisely the same, without having ever experienced the minutest variation, it would be absurd to affirm; for that would not have been the case, had even such vowels been added to the text by the inspired writers themselves; but that a general uniformity of reading, traditionally delivered down, prevailed at the time of their being added to it, whensoever that time really was, will not perhaps be controverted.

Indeed the latter point alluded to is not denied by those who contend, that the existing vowel system was altogether unknown, until after the completion of the Babylonian Talmud about the year 500. Nor do they argue that before that period no substitute whatsoever for the distinct notation of vowels was in use. On the other hand they maintain, that the place of points in the art of instruction was supplied by what are known under the name of *mætres lectionis*. But let us hear the great authority upon the question, Cappellus himself. In answer to an opponent he says; Puguat Bootius adversus umbram suam, sive somnium et commentum. Quis enim illi negat aliquam fuisse apud Hebræos, ante Masorethas, rationem legendi et intelligendi Hebraica non punctata? Annon legit *Arcanum meum*? Videat lib. i. cap. 18, 19, ubi totam illam rationem fuse satis totis illis capitibus explico. Literæ nempe םן multas in locis *supplebant locum vocalium*, ac *lectorem linguæ Hebraicæ peritum juvabant*, adhibita attenda vocum singularum in serie orationis consideratione, per quam vocum extra seriem orationis positarum homonymia tollitur.\* And in the chapters of his

\* Critica Sacra, Vol. iii. p. 574,



*Arcanum punctationis revelatum*, extending from p. 157, to p. 186, *Cappellus* enters into a minute detail of the manner in which he supposes the *matres lectionis* were used to supply the place of vowels before the invention of the points. He likewise admits the position of *traditional readings* transmitted through successive generations by the use of these *matres lectionis* to the days of the Masorets, whose complete knowledge of such traditional readings, and profound skill in the language itself enabled them, he imagines, to establish their novel system upon a firm and steady basis. He expressly observes; *longe maxima ex parte eam, quæ vocales spectat, lectionem secuti sint, quæ tum inter Judæos recepta erat, quæque potest ex lingnæ proprio genio, et ex antecedentium et consequentium, &c., consideratione certissime demonstrari.\** Again; *Ex superioribus satis constet, et olim in Arcano punctationis a nobis singulari disputatione probatum sit, puncta, et accentus a Masorethis, post annum a Christo nato quingentesimum, consonantibus in Hebræo Veteris Testamenti textu esse addita, prout vel ipsi omnibus prepensis et pensiculate examinatis, judicarunt optimum, vel prout a magistris per traditionem πατροπαράδοτον edocti fuerant.†* Thus likewise in his *Arcanum punctationis* he briefly remarks; *cujus rationis [viz. legendi Hebraica non punctata] cum periti essent Masorethæ, lectionem sacram, quam tenebant, et edocti erant, excogitatis vocalium et accentuum figuris expresserunt.‡*

Upon the whole then it appears, by the admission of the very writers themselves, who carry up the invention of the points no higher than to the commencement of the sixth century, that the readings then established were of still greater antiquity. Whether these readings had been preserved, as *Cappellus* conjectures, by the mere use of the *matres lectionis*, or, which I confess seems to me

\* *Critica Sacra*, Vol. iii. p. 377.

† Vol. ii. p. 938.

‡ Page. 281

more probable, by a more simple system of points than the Masoretical, is not of importance to my enquiry : I only contend for the *fact*, that the Masoretical readings were more ancient than the period assigned for their universal reception.

I have already remarked, that *Eichorn*, from the striking conformity of the Masoretical text with that of *Aquila*, carries up its antiquity to the *first* century of the Christian æra. He conceives that we possess sufficient data to prove its existence even at so remote a period ; but that higher than this we cannot from a defect of data proceed with certainty. He does not indeed speak of the Masoretical vowels, but simply of the Masoretical text, which he probably confines to the consonants. There seems however I apprehend little reason to doubt the conformity of the two texts not only in consonants, but also in vowels. It is indeed true, that scattered fragments alone of *Aquila's* version are come down to us ; yet if these are sufficient to indicate the resemblance of his text to the Masoretical in the former instance, so likewise may they be in the latter. Now *Cappellus* has furnished us with such various readings as he was able to collect from the fragments of *Aquila*, as well as of the other Greek versions, from whence a comparison of the kind may be instituted. After noticing certain variations in the vowels, he adds the following remark : *Hæc pauca sunt circa puncta lectionis exempla, quæ nos observavimus ex fragmentis Aquilæ, Symmachi, Theodotionis, &c., versionum. Si integras jam haberemus translationes, dubium non est, quin ex iis longe plura possent annotari exempla ejusmodi variæ lectionis.\** We may therefore conclude that these are all the variations of this description, which he could discover. Let us now examine their number and character.

\* *Critica Sacra*, Vol. ii. p. 820.

In all they only amount to *eleven*, which I shall notice in the order adopted by Cappellus himself. Job xii. 2, for תּמוֹת *moriatur*, Aquila reads תּמּוֹת *perfectiones* τελειώματα (σοφίας).—Prov. vii. 18, for רְרִים *amoribus* he reads רְרִים *uberibus* τειρεῶν.—Psalm iv. 3, for כְּבוֹדִי *gloriam meam* כְּבוֹדִי ἐνδοξοί μου.—Isaiah iii. 12, for נְשִׁים *mulieres* נְשִׁים a נְשִׂה *exactores* ἀπαιτούσσαι.—Ib. vii. 11, for שְׂאֵלָה *petitionem* שְׂאֵלָה *ad inferos* εἰς ἄδην.—Ib. ix. 5, for מְשָׁרָה *principatus* מְשָׁרָה *mensura* τὸ μέτρον.—Ib. vii. 11, for נֶאֱבָב *dolor desperatus* נֶאֱבָב *dolebit homo* ἄνδρωπος.—Ib. xxxiii. 18, for הַמְּגִדִּים *turres* הַמְּגִדִּים *enutritos* τοὺς μεμεγαλυμένους.—Ib. lvii. 10, for חֲלִית *non es infirmata* חֲלִית *non supplicasti* in Pihel οὐκ ἐλάνευσας.—Ezech. i. 7, for עֵגֶל *vitulus* עֵגֶל *rotundus* στρογγυλον.—Hab. iii. 2, for בְּקֶרֶב שָׁנִים *in medio annorum* בְּקֶרֶב שָׁנִים *in appropinquandis annis* ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν τὰ ἔτη. In addition to these *eleven* variations *two* more are given, in which a different reading occurs by the substitution of שׁ for שׁ. Gen. xxvi. 33, for שְׁבַע *septem* שְׁבַע *saturitus* πλησμονή.—Hab. iii. 4, for שׁ *ibi* שׁ *posuit* ἔθετο.\*

These then are all the various readings occasioned by a difference in the points, which the eagle eye of Cappellus was capable of discovering in the fragments of Aquila; and surely neither their number, nor their importance is such as to disprove, when asserted of the vowels, that, which Eichorn seems to assert solely of the consonants, viz. that their general concurrence establishes a sufficient identity between the texts alluded to, so that one text may be considered as an apograph of the other. Rather indeed may what Eichorn seems to assert of the consonants, be more confidently asserted of the vowels; for if we again

\* Critica Sacra, v. ii. p. 806—816.



refer to Cappellus we shall find, that the various readings in the latter case amount not to the number of those in the former. I have noticed no less than *one* and *twenty* instances adduced by him,\* where a different sense has been given by Aquila in consequence of reading the consonants differently. If therefore, upon the argument of Eichorn, the two texts are to be classed together, notwithstanding the diversity of reading in the consonants, much more reason is there to class them together, notwithstanding the diversity of reading in the vowels.

I use the expression *diversity of reading in the vowels*, as if the codex used by Aquila contained vowels as well as consonants; but my meaning, it is obvious, only applies to the *traditional* reading of the vowels, in what manner soever conveyed, and not to the *actual* reading of them by any *written* characters in the text. The material fact, which I wish to establish simply is, that *Aquila* and the *Masorets* in almost all cases read the same consonants with the same vowels, their variations from each other in this respect being too trifling to disprove the remarkable coincidence of their general readings.

A similar consequence also will result from another comparison; from contemplating the variations in the vowel reading of the Septuagint, contrasted with the vowel reading of Aquila. Cappellus in the second chapter of his fourth book gives a copious selection of these variations. Upon an accurate survey of them however we find, that in so many as in *forty* instances the readings also of Aquila have been preserved; but that in *thirty-six*† of

\* *Critica Sacra*, lib. v. cap. 5.

† Viz. Psalm xxxii. 4. xlv. 1. Iviii. 9. lxiv. 7. lxxii. 1. lxxvi. 3. lxxviii. 69. eix. 9. Hosca xiii. 3. Amos i. 6. Jonah ii. 6. Ecclesiastes iii. 16. Isaiah ix. 8. Psalm xii. 9. xvii. 14. Iviii. 6. lxiii. 2. lxiv. 8. lxix. 4. lxxiii. 33. lxxxvii. 6. cx. 14. cxxxii. 1. cxli. 7. Ecclesiast. xii. 9. Genes. iv. 26. xviii. 12. xxxi. 7. xlvii. 31. Deuter. xxxiii. 3. Amos i. 11. Psalm vii. 12. lxiv. 8. lxxxvii. 4. cxxxix. 2. lxix. 21.

these, where the Septuagint clearly varies from, Aquila follows, the vowel reading of the Masorets; and that even *three* of the *four* remaining instances it is probable that the difference consists, not in the actual reading, but in the turn of expression adopted in his translation. One of the *three* alluded to occurs in Psalm cxxx. 4. where Aquila renders the words לִמְעַן תִּירָא *ἐνεκεν τοῦ φόβου propter timorem* instead of *ut timearis*: another in Canticles ii. 4, where the words רִגְלוֹ עָלַי אֲהַבָּה *vexillum ejus super me (fuit) amor* he renders ἔταξεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἀγάπην *ordinavit super me amorem*: and the third in Hosea viii. 5. where the words זָנַח עֵגְלוֹךָ *deseruit vitulus tuus*, he renders ἀπώθησον τὸν μὐσχον σου *desere vitulum tuum*. Nor does Cappellus himself seem to consider these as proofs, that Aquila read the respective passages differently from the Masorets, because he does not so notice them, when he subsequently enumerates the various readings of that translator. The *fourth* however which occurs, Isaiah xvii. 11. he does so notice in his enumeration, as may be seen by referring to my former quotation from him; so that out of the *forty* instances, in which the Septuagint is shewn distinctly to vary from the Masorets, Aquila appears to deviate only *once*.

From the preceding observations, therefore, we may conclude, that the Masoretical text, as well in point of vowels as of consonants, was the received text of the Jews so far back as the *first* century of the Christian æra. The Septuagint I admit is in this respect an anomalous translation, deviating in so many particulars from every other, especially in its reading of the vowels, as to be justly suspected of inaccuracy. Indeed it is often expressed so loosely as to assume the character rather of a paraphrase than of a translation. Its great difference in the reading of the vowels, is so prominent as to strike the most careless eye. And sometimes also even in the consonants,

A remarkable instance of both occurs in Isaiah ix. 6.  
 וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פְּלִיא יוֹעֵץ אֵל גְּבוּר אֲבִי-עַד שַׁר-שְׁלֹמֹם  
*and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.* This is thus strangely translated in the Septuagint, καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος. Ἄξω γὰρ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ ὑγίαιαν αὐτῶ; a translation, which without the slightest change has been transmitted down from the days of Jerome; for that Father, having occasion to quote it,\* gives it thus in Latin; *Vocatur nomen ejus Magni consilii nuncius. Adducam enim pacem super Principes, et sanitatem ejus.* Such is the singular rendering of this celebrated passage by the Septuagint: while the version of Aquila exhibits the usual sense of it. How so complicated a twist of a plain meaning was effected, it seems difficult to conjecture. Cappellus, however,† with his usual confidence, labours to untie the Gordian knot; but I do not think that he has been completely successful. Equal liberties appear to have been taken with the consonants as with the vowels and accents; liberties, or rather perhaps gross deviations from the correct import of words, more to be attributed to ignorance and inattention, than to premeditated perversion and malevolence.

The remarkable, as well as numerous variations of the

\* Comment. in Isaiam, cap. ix. 6.

† Critica Sacra, v. ii. p. 577. He supposes that פְּלִיא יוֹעֵץ *Wonderful, Counsellor*, was rendered μεγάλης βουλῆς, *of the great counsel*; that אֵל גְּבוּר *the mighty God*, was rendered ἄγγελος, *Angel*, because אלהים is sometimes so translated; that for אֲבִי-עַד שַׁר-שְׁלֹמֹם the *everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace*, the translators read אביו על שר *Abi el sar* ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας (τὸν ἄρχοντα) *I will bring peace to the princes*; and that καὶ ὑγίαιαν αὐτῶ is a gloss from some other version. This explanation seems more ingenious than solid; allowing more than usual latitude to the most latitudinarian of all interpreters.



Septuagint in its vowel reading, is noticed by Capellus. I cannot, however, agree with him in the reason, which he assigns for it. He says; Unde est quod LXX interpretum lectio *frequentissime mirum in modum* ab hodierna punctatione distat; quia illi omnium *longissime a Masoretharum seculo abfuerunt*. At paraphratarum Chaldaicorum, item Aquilæ, Simmachi, Theodotionis, S. Hieronymi, lectio quoad vocales, ab hodierna punctatione *propius abit*, et *multo minus longe discedit*, quia isti Masoretharum ætati *propius vixerunt*.\* This reasoning might have weight, if some sort of imperfect vowel system, when the Septuagint was translated, were supposed to have existed, which was gradually improving to the days of the Masorets; but I do not see what influence the totally *new* invention of a vowel system in their days could possibly have had over translators who preceded them, and who were altogether without the knowledge not only of their, but of every vowel system whatsoever. Neither will the presumption of a traditional reading, howsoever preserved, which is supposed to vary with the varying æra, satisfactorily account for all the circumstances of the case; because, if so, that version which was nearest to the Masoretical age, would also most closely resemble the Masoretical readings. This however appears not to be the fact; for the version of *Theodotio*, which was made at least fifty years nearer to the Masoretical age, is farther removed from the Masoretical readings, than the version of *Aquila*. Nor is it only farther removed from the Masoretical readings, but also intimately allied to those of the Septuagint. Upon the latter point Montfaucon has the following remark; Theodotio, ut jam probavimus, post Aquilam et ante Symmachum, interpretationem suam, imperante Commodus, in lucem emisit, et in vertendi modo a LXX interpretibus

\* Critica Sacra, Præf. p. xiii.

minus, quam alii, deflexit : imo etiam LXX *sæpissime secutus est.*\*

To what then, it may be said, are we to attribute the fact, that the Septuagint version, with which we may likewise class the version of Theodotio, so perpetually differs from the Masoretical readings, while that of Aquila generally coincides with them? Not I apprehend to any distant or any approximating period, at which they might have been respectively composed; but solely to the abilities, and means of information, possessed by the several translators. I assume that each of them translated from an unpointed text; but contend, that Aquila alone of the three thoroughly understood the Hebrew language, and was conversant with the traditional readings of the synagogue. His close adherence to the Hebrew, and the estimation in which his version was held by the Jews themselves, are too well known to require proof. But the case was very different with the other two. The frequent misconception of the plainest meaning by the translators of the Septuagint not only demonstrate, that they read from a text without vowels, but that they were altogether incapable of supplying them according to the true genius of the language, and the common principles of vowel construction. And the knowledge of Hebrew, which Theodotio possessed, was in the judgment of Montfaucon far inferior to that of Aquila. Non infrequenter etiam, he remarks, Theodotio, *peculiarem sibi, ab aliisque omnibus diversam interpretationem, adornat; in iisque locis longe minore, quam Aquila, vel Symmachus, Hebraicæ linguæ peritia instructus deprehenditur.*† But whatsoever their skill in the language might, or might not, have been, the versions of Theodotio and Symmachus have been always rejected by the Jews as much less conformable with the

\* Prælim. in Hexapl. cap. vii. § 2.

† Ibid.

customary received sense of the sacred writings, than that of Aquila.

It is now something more than *two and twenty* centuries, since Ezra himself, an inspired writer, established the canon, and published the text, of Scripture; and it appears certain from the preceding remarks, that for so long a period as for the last *seventeen* of these centuries, the Masoretical readings have not only existed, but have been always contemplated as the genuine readings of this text. That incidental inaccuracies may have been committed in the act of transmitting them down through successive generations, may be admitted without impeachment to their general fidelity. These however affect not the principal question. Nor is it indeed probable that any other systematical readings, or, to adopt the language of modern criticism, any other *edition* of the text, was ever known from the days of Ezra to the present time. The only argument in proof of another edition is derived from the anomalies of the Septuagint; but this version, as I have remarked, is in itself so garbled, and abounds with so many proofs of error, as well as of ignorance, or inadvertence, if not of both, that no very legitimate inference can be deduced from it.

But it may be said, that, setting aside all consideration of the Septuagint, other editions besides the Masoretical, are most probably extant. For if we suppose the existence of two very ancient manuscripts A and B, the latter of which is now lost, but that before it was lost, the transcript c containing ten errors was made from it, the transcript n containing ten more from c, and so on in a multiplied ratio of error through the alphabet to z; and that then the transcript z, from the ignorance or caprice of criticism, being held in the highest estimation, became the common origin of other transcripts a, e, g, &c.; surely if we suppose these things, it will be impossible for us to deny, that the last mentioned transcripts a, e, g, &c., must exhibit a *different Edition* from that which is found in A; and if we do not



deny this, we acknowledge the propable existence of two distinct Editions at least. To the abstract principle contained in this reasoning, borrowed from Griesbach, I readily and unreservedly subscribe; but in the present case can by no means admit its practical result. The question turns not upon what Editions *may*, but upon what *actually do*, exist. In order to detect *different* Editions of the text, let us hear the rule of Griesbach himself: Attendendum est præcipue ad lectiones *insigniores atque graviore*s, h. e. eas, quæ vel *sensum mutant*, vel *glossematibus* constant *exquisitis*, vel e *vulgaribus* lectionum variantium causis (e. gr. literarum aut soni similitudine, &c.) derivari nequeant, vel omittendo (nisi ὁμοιοτέλεστον omissioni occasionem præbuerit) addendove a lectione recepta discedunt. Again; Ut aliam recensionem inesse statuamus codici A, aliam codici B, necesse est non solum ut discrepantiæ occurrunt satis frequentes, per textum universum diffusæ, verum etiam, ut ratio discrepantiæ universæ reddi nequeat *e librarii sive negligentia sive imperitia, aliisque vulgaribus* lectionum dissonantium *causis*.\* Now before it be presumed, that an Edition of the Old Testament different from the Masoretical either does exist, or ever has existed, it is requisite, that the *more remarkable and important* variations in the readings of some other text be distinctly pointed out. This however, if we except the vain undertaking of drawing pure water from what Eichorn terms *the muddy ditch* of the Septuagint, has been never yet effected. Every version therefore, upon which reliance can be placed, and every Manuscript extant, must be referred to *one and the same* Edition, the Masoretical. The utmost to be presumed is, that they may belong to *different families* of this one Edition; but no attempt even at such subordinate classification, from the perplexity perhaps, and inferior utility of the task, has ever been made.

\* Curæ in Hist. Test. Gr. Epist. Paulin. p. 52, 53.

The result then of the whole is this ; that the antiquity of the received Hebrew text may be *clearly* carried up to the *first* century of the Christian æra. For the sake of argument however, instead of dating the certain existence of it *seventeen* centuries back, let us date it only *thirteen* ; and fix its origin at the very commencement of the *sixth* century, when we are told, that the characters of vowels and accents were originally invented. Will it even then follow, that any other text can be referred to, as occurring either in versions or in manuscripts, at all to be compared with it ? Certainly not ? for the versions as I have remarked are themselves of the same Edition ; and every manuscript in existence must be contemplated as a mere individual of some particular family derived from it.

The Masoretical text therefore as distinguished by vowels and accents, although not of inspired, is nevertheless of very high authority. It is incontrovertibly at least *thirteen* centuries old ; and furnishes us with a reading of inestimable value, not only on account of its own intrinsic excellence and antiquity, but also on account of the traditional character with which it is invested. Whether we consider its vowel readings, as substitutions for some other more ancient and more simple readings of a similar description, or as substitutions for the mere use of the *Matres Lectionis*, still must we regard them as readings universally respected at a period long anterior to the date of our oldest Manuscripts. Yet these are the readings, which many modern translators, particularly in our own country, have despised and derided ; conceiving, as one of the last but not least celebrated of their number sarcastically remarks, that “ his critical judgment must be *weak* indeed, who is not qualified *to revise and reverse* the decisions of the wise men of Tiberias.”\*

We know that the Greek of the *New Testament* was

\* Bishop Horsley, Preface to *Hosca*.

originally written without pauses to regulate the sense, and without any distinction of words. But were it possible for us to possess an early copy of it, or the transcript of an early copy, with every deficiency of the kind alluded to fully supplied by persons abundantly competent to the task, should we not esteem it a treasure of the first critical importance? Now we possess such an early copy of the *Old Testament* in the Masoretical pointing of the text, which not only distinguishes between one word and another, as well as between one sentence and another, but between words connected together in the same sentence; and what is more, gives a determinate sense to the words themselves, the meaning of which would be otherwise vague and uncertain. Nor should it be forgotten, that the vowels and accents, by the combined operation of which so clear and steady a light is thrown over every part of the text, are not only themselves of very high, but likewise emanate from traditional readings of still higher, antiquity. Is it possible, that any critic, who gives himself a moment's time for reflexion, and who is not altogether overrun with self-conceit, can persist in exhibiting so egregious a want of judgment as to despise, and so consummate a proof of folly as to deride, readings of this description.



## CHAP. VII.

*Theory of elucidating Hebrew by the cognate dialects, particularly by the Arabic. Extract from Schultens, in exemplification of this theory. The verb לָגַג. More ingenuity of investigation, than solidity of reasoning in it. Languages derived from the same source do not always use the same word in the same sense. The derivative sense more likely to occur in the more modern, and the primitive in the most ancient languages. Position, that the Hebrew tongue may be greatly illustrated by the study of the dialects, contains some theoretical truth with much practical uncertainty. Difficulty of the illustration. Signification of words in a constant state of fluctuation. Improvement in criticism often brings increase in perplexity. Oriental languages built upon the same foundation are sometimes composed of different materials. Hebrew and Syriac. Restrictions prescribed by Baver. Lexicons improved only in Etymological investigations. A translator not to be led astray by ingenious conceits, and Theoretical novelties.*

HAVING endeavoured to point out in detail the futility of their reasoning, who contend for the necessity of a new translation from a presumption, that the received Hebrew text has been rendered infinitely more correct than at the period of the last translation, which was taken from it, by the very improved state of modern criticism; and to demonstrate that the received text is not only the best, but the most ancient and authoritative, which can be adopted, I shall now briefly consider another part of their reasoning, in pursuit of the same object, grounded upon the supposed advantages, which a translator of the Bible would now possess in consequence of the great illustration, which the Hebrew language has received from a more extended cultivation of oriental literature. The former ar-

gment relates to the emendation of the text itself, the latter to the explanation of the words, of which that text is composed.

It has long been conceived that the Hebrew language is capable of very considerable elucidation by what we usually denominate the *sister dialects*, that is, by other languages of the same origin, particularly by the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic. This has been a favourite topic with the admirers of *Schultens*, who, possessing a deep and accurate knowledge of Arabic, zealously laboured to demonstrate how greatly that language was capable of illustrating Hebrew, in his “*Origines Hebrææ; sive Hebrææ linguæ antiquissima natura, et indoles ex Arabiæ penetralibus revocata,*” as well as in his “*De Defectibus hodiernis Linguæ Hebrææ,*” and in the controversy which succeeded them. There is doubtless much ingenuity and recondite investigation displayed by this able Scholar upon a subject, where imagination is ever ready to seize the reins of reason; a subject, which few besides himself could so systematically expand or so lavishly adorn; but it seems carried to an extreme, and frequently fails of producing substantial fruit by being too theoretical and refined for practical utility. Indeed his whole hypothesis is framed upon the anvil of those philosophical lexicographers of Arabia, who, persuaded that the materials of their own language were inexhaustible, fabricated with no vulgar vanity their intricate links of combined significations from what they conceived to be the profundity of its principles, and the subtilty of its construction.

As a specimen of the mode of elucidation adopted by *Schultens*, I shall give in his own language a few extracts from his critical disquisition upon the Hebrew word גַּדַל, which in his tract “*De Defectibus hodiernis Ling. Heb.* occupies more than four quarto pages; referring the reader for fuller information to the tract itself. Ordior a גַּדַל, Arabice **جَدَّ** quod declaratur per **جَدَّ** incrementum

*roburque cepit* adolescens, granum in spica ; ut est apud Golium. Sic habes *grandescere, magnum fieri, adolescere, succrescere, roborari, invalescere*, aliasque ideas *magnitudinis*, quas Dictionaria nostra גרל recte et rite attribuunt. Illud autem *incrementum roburque cepit*, satis apparet esse *secundarium* ac *derivatum*. Ex quo fonte ? Ex *firmiter torquendo et plectendo funiculo*, quod tanquam *princeps* atque *primigenium* radicis enotatur a Criticis Arabum. *Zjauhari* ; \* \* “ Dicitur גרלת חבל *torsi funem* quum densiore et firmiore compage intorques. Inde מגרולה *puella, quæ elegantiore est statura*, et מגרול *tenui gracilitate præditus vir, non ex macie*. Item גורל *juvenis robustior factus, et granum גרל, quum sit grandius et firmius.*” Similiter fere *Phiruzabadi*. \* \* “ Dicitur גרל hoc vel illud, qui *firmiter intorquet* ; et *vir מגרול* vocatur, cui ilia *subtiliore filo* deducta, simulque *validitus compacta* membra sunt. *Brachium ארול* est *robustius, compactius*. *Crus אנרולה* item *compactius firmissusque*. גרלא *mulier pulchro plexu textuve corporis prædita* ; et a *loricis, firmissus contexta*. Et גרל ולד הצביה *intortus, intextusque fuit fœtus capræ, aliorumve fœtus, pro adoleverunt et robusti evaserunt.*” \* \* \* Hinc proclivis fuit metaphora ad *corpus*, quod *nervis, venis, tendinibus, toris, intexitur*, quasi, et *firmum* sibi ac *compactum robur* acquirit. Such is the ground-work of his argument ; let us now see the application of it.

Ex hac jam origine thematis גרל vel *gratia*, vel *lux etiam nova*, sese insinuabit in loca bene multa. Liquet nunc, verbi causa, quantus sit nervus in formula גרל זרוע *Exod. xv. 16. Proprie lacerti compacti et torosi firmitudo intorta et robustior.* \* \* Ad *firmitatem compactam* etiam respicitur *Esai. i. 2. בנים גרלתי ורוממתי* vulgo, *Filios educavi et extuli*. Subest *nervosius quid, et venustius*. In *corpore humano*, cum quo comparatur *populus Judaicus*, duo requiruntur, quæ illud perficiant,



suisque numeris absolvant. Prima dos est, nervis, torisque validis esse instructam, unde vires subministrantur. Altera, ut bene compactum et firmum corpus, non humile maneat, sed in altum consurgat et excreseat. *Utrumque* eleganter complexus est Propheta. Hæc propria est facies orationis. Improperie, in isto corpore reip. Judaicæ, illud **בְּנִים גְּדֵרְתִּי** *Filios nervis compegi et corroboravi*, est *opibus et divitiis*, qui sunt *nervi* rerum, feci invalescere; **רוֹמַמְתִּי** *in proceram extuli staturam*, est *ad Majestatis eulmen evexi*. Suspicio subtilius hoc discrimen, quod natura linguæ adfert, *etiam de industria* captatum esse Esai. xxiii. 4. **לֹא גִדַּלְתִּי בַחֲרוּרִים רוֹמַמְתִּי בְּתוֹלוֹת** *non firmos eduvi juvenes, non procerus edueavi virgines*. Nempe laus juvenum in *compacto robore membrorum*; quum Virginum potius decus consistat in *erecta et proeoriore statura*. \* \* \* Hisce præmunitis, non alienum, nec audax nimis videbitur, quod Jobi vii. 17, verba **מָה אֲנוֹשׁ כִּי תִגְדַּלְנוּ** *convertere sustineam, Quid est Mortalis, O deus fortis, quod tu te implices eum eo? Adversus eum deseendas in arenam, tanquam luctator, et gravis adversarius, eum eo manus conserens, digladiansque?\**

In the primitive significations of Hebrew words, as minutely extracted in this manner from the arabic by Schultens, I confess, that there has always appeared to me more ingenuity of investigation, than solidity of reasoning. With respect to the word in question the idea of *magnitude* in size or quantity, which had been affixed to it by preceding lexicographers, he considers as a *secondary* sense of it only, and for its *primary* sense refers to his favourite Arabic, which furnishes him with the idea of *implication*. But he does not mention the second signification of the word as given in the Lexicon of Castellus, which is *Liquavit butyrum, adipemve*. How is the

\* §. excix, cci, ccii, cciii, ccv.

idea of *twisting*, as in the case of *a rope*, to be associated with that of *melting*, as in the case of *butter* or *fat*? Both are compatible enough with that of *magnitude*; for as the act of twisting the several parts of a rope together increases their bulk by combination, so also does the act of melting enable the butter or fat to cover a *larger* surface.

I will not however stop to dispute the primary sense of the word, having other objections to his system.

I do not understand upon what rational principle it can be maintained, that the same word is always to retain its primary meaning in all the allied languages, into which it may be adopted. Thus it is admitted, that לָגַל in Arabic signifies to *twist*, and also to *contend*. But what does it signify in Syriac and Ethiopic? In Syriac, as also in Talmudical Chaldee, it signifies only *to twist*; and in Ethiopic it signifies only *to contend*; so that no more than one of the two senses applied to it in Arabic is applicable to it either in Syriac or Ethiopic, and not even that indifferently. But it may be said, are lexicographers in Syriac and Ethiopic to be trusted? May not upon a minute search passages be found in both these languages, where both the senses alluded to occur? It is impossible to prescribe limits to those, who wire-draw meanings from words for the establishment of a particular hypothesis; yet surely the chances of their being right are against them when they can only obtain a colour for the probability of their interpretation, perhaps in one only out of a hundred instances.

Now if this argument has weight when applied to the use of the word in Syriac and Ethiopic upon a comparison with the Arabic, it has much more weight when applied to its use in Hebrew upon the same comparison. In the Bible לָגַל occurs as a verb more than *a hundred* times, and as a noun more than *five hundred* times; yet is it only in *one* of these numerous instances, that Schultens labours to fix upon the word the signification of *implicare*. Grant-

ing therefore that such is its meaning in Arabic, and that it is capable of bearing the same meaning in the passage of Job alluded to, can we possibly admit this to be the true sense of it, when we recollect that it is indisputably used more than *six hundred* times in a different signification? The other passages of Scripture, to which he refers, are so explained as not to exclude the usual meaning of the word, although it is supposed to invest them with a certain recondite sense, of which the vulgar linguist would never form the slightest suspicion.

That languages derived from a common source do not always use the same word in the same sense, is a remark too trite to require confirmation. The caprice of colloquial usage disdains the precision of philosophical uniformity. Nor does the same word in the same language bear in every age the same signification. To give an instance in our own language upon a comparison with the German. The word *Knave* in English has now no such meaning as the analogous term *Knabe*\* in German, in which language it means a *Boy*. This however was once its meaning also in English; but such a sense of it is become obsolete. Nay, words are sometimes found completely to change their meaning. Thus when the present version of the Bible was made, the verb *let* signified to *hinder*, as 2 Thess. ii. 7; "he who now *letleth*, will *let*, until he be taken out of the way." But at present it is only used in the opposite sense of *permitting*.

Another observation likewise may be added, which militates against the theory of Schultens. The nearer we approach the fountain head of the languages in question, the greater I apprehend must be the probability of our discovering the *primitive* senses of words. But the direct reverse of this takes place in the theory before us, particularly with respect to the word more immediately

\* *Knabe* in Germany, answers to *Knave* in English, as *Grabe* answers to *Grave*.



under investigation. For Schultens himself admits, that the *derivative*, not the *primitive*, signification of it almost universally occurs in ancient Hebrew, which has ceased to be spoken for more than two thousand years, while its *primitive*, not its *derivative*, signification almost as universally occurs in modern Arabic.

But omitting all further consideration of the refined, the laborious, and the complicated investigations of Schultens, I proceed to contemplate the general principles of the position, that the knowledge of Hebrew has been considerably extended by a more comprehensive and accurate study in modern times of what are termed its kindred dialects. It has been asserted, and certainly not without strong presumptive reasoning, that by these the significations attributed to many obscure Hebrew words may be incidentally confirmed, and sometimes indeed new significations discovered, that the defects of that language, arising from the paucity of its remains, and other incidental causes, may be often supplied, and that its analogies in general may be appropriately elucidated. Upon the ability however of thus supplying its defects, much has indeed been written, but too much perhaps assumed. It has been conceived with respect to single words, that the etymons of many, not otherwise apparent, may in this way be effectually detected; and not only the primitive senses of their respective roots be restored, but in several instances their derivative or secondary, when in direct opposition to their primitive senses, satisfactorily investigated; and that the meanings of some, usually esteemed dubious, may be illustrated, those of others, which but seldom occur, be detected, and those of a few, which occur but once, be successfully explored. Nor has the utility of these cognate languages been supposed to consist in the mere supply of etymological deficiencies, but likewise of illuminating with the blaze of day many singular phrases and idioms, altogether abhorrent from European usage.

In this ingenious argument there seems to be some theoretical truth combined with much practical uncertainty. If however we give it its full weight, and admit the occasional felicity of its application, still must we regard that application as a task of no common difficulty and delicacy. The translator who attempts to tread on this alluring ground is under the constant temptation of forsaking every beaten track and of wandering into perpetual intricacies ; of substituting philosophical speculation for logical deduction, and critical refinement for solid reasoning. Ever prying after discoveries, his imagination is disposed to convert the wild weed into a highly cultivated flower, and the mean plant of daily occurrence into an exotic of inestimable rarity ; and always eager for novelties, he is usually more intent upon displaying his own talent at singular research, than upon explaining the word of God with unaffected simplicity. Nor will those, who are most zealous to enrich Hebrew with the spoils of its kindred dialects, admit, that the enterprize is one of vulgar accomplishment ; or that the weapon, to be successfully used in this war of words, may be wielded by every arm.

To elucidate indeed a language of such remote antiquity, as the Hebrew, by others, of which, how much soever originally allied to it, we possess, at this very distant period of time, nothing like *coeval* remains, nothing but what in point of date is at least posterior to it many centuries, must always appear an arduous, and often prove an abortive, undertaking. The signification of words in all languages are in a constant state of fluctuation, and are undergoing perpetual modifications. Political changes in the forms and principles of governments, commercial connexions with foreign nations, pursuits previously unknown, the introduction of novel, or the amelioration of ancient, codes of faith, the cultivation of literature and science, the refinement of manners, and the general improvement in all the arts and luxuries of life, with many similar causes,

combine not only to render necessary the adoption of new words, but to impose other significations upon those which are already in use, and frequently produce a complete change in their forms and constructions. The primary imports of many become in time obsolete, and are superseded by meanings of extraneous origin and connexion; some assume metaphorical senses by the most perplexing analogies; and others are even perverted by the caprice of custom into senses diametrically opposite to those, by which they were before distinguished. Were we better acquainted, than we are, with modern Greek, we might perhaps be enabled to throw occasional light upon some obscure passages in the Greek writers of antiquity; but the attempt would require no little discrimination, and would scarcely be deemed the province of a translator, who ought not to transgress the bounds of sober criticism by wandering into the wilds of abstract reasoning and philosophical theory. Surely therefore we cannot presume, that less circumspection, and less control over the blandishments of fancy, are requisite in translating the language of the Bible, than in translating that of a mere classical author.

The difficulties, which at every turn surround the path of him, who, while engaged in the task of translation, is disposed to traverse the wide field of philosophical refinement, and conjectural speculation, are innumerable. When therefore we extol the improvement which Hebrew criticism has received, from a more extended cultivation of the oriental languages, in modern times, we are apt to forget, that improvement in criticism too often brings with it increase in perplexity; and that if we embark upon the ocean of conjecture, no little resolution, as well as discrimination, is requisite to prevent a perpetual deviation from our track, under the influence of respectable names and plausible authorities.

But the obstacles in the way of elucidation by the kindred languages appear still more formidable, when it is



considered, that although they are all built upon the same foundation as the Hebrew, yet the superstructure of each is not only in many instances differently arranged, but sometimes composed of very different materials. Schultens indeed contends that they do not vary from each other more than the Greek dialects vary; and therefore represents them as mere dialects of one and the same common language. Were we however to admit, that this was probably the case when the Bible was written, would it follow that the flux of time had not considerably changed them? But in truth evidence remains on record to prove, that Hebrew, and Syriac at least exhibited radical differences previously to the days of Moses. When Laban and Jacob erected a pillar in witness of the covenant existing between them, Jacob we are told called it גלעד, that is, the *heap of testimony*, or the *testifying heap*.\* Now the words גלעד *heap* and עד *testimony*, which constitute the denomination, are peculiar to the *Hebrew* tongue, and are not found in *Syriac*. Neither is this all; for we are expressly informed that Laban was a Syrian, and that he called it יגר שהודתא. Now these words, which convey precisely the same meaning as גלעד, are altogether unknown in pure Hebrew; but are of frequent recurrence both in *Syriac* and *Chaldee*, and that without the slightest alteration either of form or of sense. The first of the two indeed, יגר, is not found in *Arabic*; but the latter occurs in that language also. When I remark that these words are altogether unknown in pure Hebrew, I mean only in the same senses as they bear in *Syriac* and *Chaldee*; for יגר as a verb occurs it is true in Hebrew, but with a very different signification, meaning *to fear*. And it is singular, that אגר, from which it might perhaps be supposed that יגר with a change of the first radical א into י was derived, signifies indeed in Hebrew *to collect*; but that in *Syriac*,

\* Genesis xxxi. 47.

Chaldee, and Arabic it signifies *to hire*, as a verb, and *reward* as a substantive ; meanings in no respect compatible with the supposed derivation. Upon the whole therefore may we not conclude, that something more than a mere difference of dialect, that an essential difference in the signification of words, existed, not only when the Bible was composed, but at an æra long anterior to that, in which Moses lived, confessedly the most ancient of the sacred historians and prophets ?

But were we even to admit the validity of this ingenious hypothesis in all its parts, still must no inconsiderable difficulties oppose the practicability of its application. I will here briefly enumerate the restrictions and rules, which Baver prescribes to the adventurous critic, who embarks on this hazardous voyage of philological discovery. I. *Prima lex* : Non *una* solummodo, sed *omnes* dialecti orientales simul adhibendæ sunt in illustranda dialecto Hebraica, quatenus fieri poterit. Under this head he censures Schulzens for giving his sole attention to Arabic, and Ludolf to Ethiopic. II. *Lex secunda* : Non tam *e lexicis* quam *e lectione scriptorum* Arabicorum, Syrorum, Chaldaicorum, &c. *ipsa*, usum loquendi discant, qui Hebraicis inde lucem affundere cupiunt. III. *Lex tertia* : *Accuratam cognitionem mutationum* habeas, quas elementa literarum patiuntur. IV. *Lex quarta* : Caveant sibi *a mere arbitraria permutatione et metatesi* literarum. V. *Lex quinta* : In usu dialectorum *modum non excedant*. Hoc autem fit, quando verbo Hebraico *centies*, imo *millies* in cod. sacr. V. T. repetito, quod *certam et indubitatum significationem*, et ubivis quidem, ubi recurrit, eandem habet, *aliam ex dialectis vim* quæerunt et, *hanc alienam in locum illius receptæ* et vulgaris substituunt. VI. *Lex sexta* : Radicibus non significationes affingant, quas *non per se*, sed tantum in contexta oratione *tropice aut aliis vocibus conjunctæ* habet. These maxims he exemplifies by various remarks upon writers of reputation, who ap-

pear to have transgressed against the sober rules of criticism; and concludes with the following words: *Et sic innumera exempla colligi possunt, quæ testantur, themata Arabica male intellecta et solummodo e lexicis sine prævio examine corrasa ad illustranda Hebraica successu parum felici adhibita fuisse. Itaque vitio nemini vertendum est, qui optat, ut caute res tractetur, eique non nisi viri linguarum orientalium peritissimi manum admoveant. Si his accedat, ut interdum dormitent; quid demum tironibus, solidiore cognitione non imbutis, metuendum est.\** Too much attention cannot be paid to these rules of Bayer by him, who thinks himself qualified, and feels sufficiently bold, to tread on this fairy ground.

But after all, what has the boasted elucidation of Hebrew by its kindred dialects effected? Since the time of Schultens Lexicons have been constructed upon the principles proposed by him; but I do not perceive, what additions they have made to the stock of our knowledge respecting the *significations* of words. The only improvement attempted seems to consist in mere etymological investigations. We learn, for example, that אֶרֶץ *earth* is derived from a verb of the same radicals in Arabic, which signifies *to be humble, or depressed*; and that שָׁמַיִם *heaven* is to be referred to a similar verb in Arabic, signifying *to be exalted*; but no alteration whatsoever is made *in the meaning itself* of either word. Thus likewise Eichorn in his improved edition of Simon's Lexicon under the word גֶּרֶל refers to the disquisition of Schultens upon it already quoted, and conceives its original sense to have been *contor-*

\* Hermeneut. Sacr. p. 119—135. I have referred here and elsewhere to the works of Bayer, because from the freedom of his opinions he cannot be suspected of being too rigidly orthodox either in criticism or theology. Some parts of his Hermeneutica Sacra gave so much offence, that he was not permitted to print it at Halle, in Saxony. His testimony therefore on this account will not be charged with partiality towards that side of the question, which I myself embrace.



*sit, tortus et implicatus est ex multis faniculis in densiorem funem* ; but he makes no alteration of any kind in its usual Hebrew signification. Indeed the whole system, of which we have heard so much, and to which some are disposed to give credit for more than they have heard, seems rather calculated to gratify the vanity of criticism, than to convey useful and solid information.

Nor were the pretensions of his philological speculation, and its probable effects, greater than they appear to be, would it become the translator of an inspired book, in a version appropriated to public instruction, to be led astray from the direct path of sober exposition by ingenious conceits and theoretical novelties. The ardent eye of him, who recommends a new hypothesis in criticism or in silence, is always fixed upon its ideal importance ; but time alone is the test of truth. A translator therefore would be highly culpable, who suffered himself to wander from the established principles of legitimate translation, in order to display his own talent at conjectural interpretation, and to try experiments with the word of God.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Recapitulation. Conclusion. English Established Version translated from the Hebrew. Style of it admired. Obsolete expressions. Defects of it counterbalanced by its many Excellencies. Not likely to be superseded by a better.*

If we take then a review of the arguments adduced by those, who have contended for the necessity of a new translation, the solitary arguments, if arguments they can be called, of Mr. Bellamy alone excepted, they will appear to be grounded upon the presumptions, that the Hebrew text, from which our present translation was made, was a corrupted one ; that it has however since received many great and important emendations ; that the translators themselves from a defect in the literature of their day possessed not a competent knowledge of the Hebrew language ; and that Hebrew erudition has in modern times been caried to an unparalleled extent by a deep and accurate investigation of certain principles, which Hebrew possesses in common with other Oriental languages.

In opposition to the first and second points presumed I have endeavoured to prove in detail, that the reverse is the fact ; that the received Hebrew text is not only the most perfect, but the only one, upon which any reliance can be placed in existence ; and that the emendations, which have been proposed, have tended not to purify, but to corrupt it. I have likewise pointed out the indisputable antiquity of this text, originally grounded upon the traditional readings of the Jewish synagogue ; and insisted, that to depart from this altogether is to involve the sacred writings in chaotic darkness. At the same time however I have admitted, that inaccuracies, although of trivial importance, may have crept into it ; and that if it were possible it

would be highly desirable to remove them ; but that they have never yet been satisfactorily pointed out ; and that no effectual attempt has been made by an appropriate classification of manuscripts, and a complete collation of versions, or by other means, even to detect, much less to amend, them. Under such circumstances then I cannot but maintain, that to talk of a new translation from an improved Hebrew text argues a blind temerity, bordering upon the extreme of folly. I am disposed to give full scope to every display of critical investigation ; but I cannot admit, that a public version of Scriptures should be cast in a mould accomodated to individual fancy and conceit.

We know what the labours of Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach, have affected in advancing the criticism of the New Testament ; and that Griesbach particularly spent the greatest part of his life in the classifications of MSS., and in minutely ascertaining the value of their respective readings upon the most rigid principles. We also know, that the result of his labours has been made public ; and that what *he* considered as an improved text has appeared under the form of a new and distinct edition of it. But were another version of the New Testament to be prepared *for public use*, which would be the text translated ? The received text or that of Griesbach ? I think without much hesitation we may affirm, that it would be the former : for surely prudence and propriety would point out, that a text so long established, and to which other translations are accommodated, would in such a case be preferred to one, how ingeniously soever constructed, the authority of which must depend upon the critical judgment of a single individual.

If then after so much has been done to improve the received text of the *New Testament*, we should still conceive ourselves acting unwisely if we departed from it, supposing that another public translation was deemed adviseable, is it possible, that, embarked in a similar under-



taking, we could think ourselves at liberty to depart from the received text of the *Old Testament*, for the improvement of which nothing effectual or satisfactory has ever been done, or even attempted?

Such then is the outline of the reasoning which I have adopted in confutation of the two leading points presumed on the other side. I shall now shortly allude to the notice which I have taken of the two latter; but indeed these, correctly speaking, are only one; for if the knowledge of Hebrew has been considerably augmented in modern times by a more extended cultivation of Oriental literature in general, it must follow, that the knowledge which was possessed by preceding translators was at best but defective.

My object however here has principally been to demonstrate, that if much has been attempted in theory, little has been really effected in practice; I mean, that the collateral elucidation of the Hebrew language by a comparison with others of a similar origin has produced little or no important *practical* results. From the constant flux in the signification of all words in all languages it must prove a task of no common difficulty to distinguish between their primary and secondary significations; to trace up their ever varying meanings to their sources; and to determine, with any tolerable degree of certainty, from what precise fountain this or that particular signification originally sprung, as well as how far it continued its course in one, or suddenly ceased to flow in another, kindred language. Nor does it appear, I have remarked, in the least probable that the *primary* senses of the same words should be their *most frequent* senses in *modern Arabic*, while their *secondary* are their *most frequent* in *ancient Hebrew*.

But in truth the whole hypothesis seems more adapted to illustrate the philosophy of the Hebrew language, if philosophical we suppose its construction to be, than to pursue the capricious deviations of colloquial usage and



expression. And as I cannot perceive, that the best Lexicons of our own days, etymological refinements alone excepted, differ in their exposition of words from the best Lexicons in the days of our forefathers, I do not see in what respect our *practical* knowledge of the language exceeds theirs. Neither indeed can I admit, if our lexicographers, entangled in the web of critical theory, even proceeded to change the established meanings of words in Hebrew, because those words have such meanings in one of the sister dialects, that a translator would be excusable, who should be seduced by their example from the plain and direct path of approved interpretation.

The principal arguments, which I have controverted, and those, which I have advanced in refutation of them, are applicable to all translations; but in conclusion I shall now advert to the peculiarities of our own. This however will require no long or formal discussion; as its merits in point of composition have been sufficiently extolled on the other side; extolled by every advocate for a new version, who has been distinguished, as well by taste, as by talents and erudition.

That it is a translation from the Hebrew alone, and also as correct a one, as the alleged deficiency of the times in Oriental literature would permit, has been universally acknowledged; except indeed by a single eccentric author of the present day, whose vain and wandering intellect seems to be in a constant aphelion, enlightened possibly by a solar influence, unknown to all preceding translators, but certainly not by the critical luminary of any visible system. The very circumstance, which he imputes to our translators as a dereliction of their professed object to translate from the Hebrew only, viz. that they appear occasionally to have consulted the various versions of ancient and modern times, instead of detracting, as he conceives, from their characters and talents, adds lustre to both. For uninfluenced by the childish vanity of imagining, that no

translators of any period possessed a correct knowledge of the Hebrew language, except themselves, and anxious not to misapprehend, where missapprehension might be important, they duly examined, and scrupulously weighed, the treasures of combined wisdom, with which the labours of their predecessors in the same undertaking had furnished them. They translated from the Hebrew, like most of those who had gone before them; and were only guilty of thinking it possible, that the wise and good of former times might have had some little knowledge of the language, which they undertook to translate.

In point of expression our authorized version has received the most marked testimonies of approbation from the very writers, who were desirous of some new translation to supersede it. Its style, says Bishop Lowth, "is not only excellent in itself, but has taken possession of our ear, and of our taste." Dr. White remarks, that "general fidelity to its original is hardly more its characteristic than *sublimity itself*;" that "the English language acquired new dignity by it;" that "it is still considered as the standard of our tongue;" and that it possesses "a style consecrated not more by custom, than by its own native propriety."\* Ought not the judgment of writers like these to outweigh on this point that of those wild projectors, who with all the tinsel of modern diction, are desirous of embellishing its phraseology, and of adding, what they conceive to be, brilliancy to its periods?

But it has been said, that it retains many obsolete, and some indelicate, expressions. To remove these, however, I should scarcely conceive the appointment of a formal committee of critics and divines by public authority to be requisite; or if requisite, certainly not the appointment of a committee, invested with unlimited powers of emendation beyond the specific object in view. Indeed several

\* See Chap. i.

antiquated modes of expression as *moe* for *more*, *sith* for *since*, &c., have already been corrected in our printed editions of the Bible without any authority whatsoever; solely under the influence of what at the time predominated as the customary usage of the English language. Pilkington has given a list of such obsolete terms,\* some of which, for the reason, I presume, above given, have been since altered; I nevertheless cannot agree with him in thinking, that the “*uncouth and obsolete words*” of the present version, were they far more numerous than they appear to be, imperiously point out the expediency of a new one, in order to give Scripture the advantage of what is stated to be improvements in our language, and to sooth the disgusted ear of modern delicacy. He observes; “The *uncouth and obsolete words and expressions*, that are met with in the English version of the Bible, are generally intelligible, and convey the ideas the writer had in view; but as our language is *very much improved in politeness and correctness* since that version was made, it may properly be wished, that the Scriptures might receive *every advantage, which the improved state of our language can give them*; especially as *the delicacy* of some people’s ears is pretended *to be disgusted with every uncouth sound*.†

Against a conformity with modern orthography and mere verbal expression who could object? But against the propriety and expediency of a new translation for the reasons assigned by Pilkington I utterly protest.

Upon the whole then I contend, that, whatsoever may be the defects of the present version, they are in themselves unimportant? and that no sufficient cause has been made out to warrant the attempt at a new version, under the sanction of authority, on their account alone. Had a new version been undertaken, at the time it was proposed, I am persuaded, that another would have been

\* Remarks, p. 115.

† Page 114.



by this time again necessary, upon principles of a more rigid and chastised interpretation; and should a new one be even now attempted, I am convinced that it would not exceed in point of general accuracy and fidelity that which has been already executed. Were a greater elegance of composition, and superior degree of philological refinement attainable, to gratify the ear of modern taste, and to correspond with the supposed improvements of modern criticism, it may well be doubted, whether these improvements, if improvements they could be justly called, would not prove more injurious than beneficial to the cause, which they were intended to promote. The language of our present version has the full tide of popular opinion strongly in its favour; it exhibits a style appropriately biblical, and is distinguished by a general simplicity of expression, which the most uncultivated mind may comprehend, and the most cultivated admire. It is a translation in possession of characteristical merits, which might be extinguished, but cannot be augmented, by principles of transitory taste and ephemeral criticism; a translation which with all its imperfections in whatsoever part of Scripture the comparison be made, is superior to every other in our own, and inferior to none in any foreign, language.



---

**Critical Reflections**

ON

**THE UNITARIAN VERSION**

OF THE

**NEW TESTAMENT.**

---



## P R E F A C E.

---

FROM causes too unimportant for public enumeration, it happened, that the Author of the following pages possessed neither time nor inclination minutely to discuss the merits or demerits of that Version, which is the object of his present strictures, at its first appearance. Indeed he neglected the examination of it altogether till very lately, when his attention was irresistibly attracted to it by the *Remarks* of Mr. Nares, ably exposing, particularly upon doctrinal topics, many of its perverse inaccuracies and fallacious deductions. The scope of these *Remarks* appeared, it is true, sufficiently comprehensive. Still however, he conceived, that certainly misrepresentations of no inconsiderable moment required a more full and distinct, as well as different, refutation; and such a one has he now attempted. It will be seen, that with the theological argument of the New Version he has interfered as little as possible, the specific object in his view being wholly critical. Not indeed that he has combated every erroneous position or incorrect conclusion which might have been fairly opposed; but he has contented himself with selecting a few of those which are most prominent and least venial.

He does not apologize for differing upon points of criticism, either from the Heterodox, or from the Orthodox. A critic is of no party; but, solely attached to philological truth, censures without reserve obliquities of judgment wheresoever he detects them, whether ushered into notice by Trinitarians of rank and character, or turned loose upon the world by an anonymous committee of obscure Unitarians.





# LAURENCE

ON THE

## Unitarian Version of the N. Testament.

---

### CHAP. I.

#### *Introductory Remarks.*

WHEN a work appears under the singular title of “The New Testament in an improved Version, upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome’s new Translation, with a corrected Text, and Notes Critical and Explanatory, published by a Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the practice of Virtue, by the distribution of Books;” it seems natural to enquire into the religious persuasion of the authors. This indeed is not explicitly avowed either in the Title Page or the Introduction; but the translation itself in every part, and the uniform tenor of the notes, sufficiently display it. The improved Version is nothing more than a new version so improved as to be rendered conformable with the tenets of *Unitarianism*. In proof of this assertion, it is unnecessary to quote more than the following passage, from the comment on 1 John, i. 1. “It is to the unwearied and successful labours of this pious and learned person, (the venerable Theophilus Lind-

say,) whose life and doctrine have exhibited the most perfect model in modern times of the purity and simplicity of apostolical Christianity, in conjunction with those of his able coadjutor, Jebb, Priestly, Wakefield, and others, that the Christian world is indebted for that clear and discriminating light, which has of late years been diffused over the obscurities of the sacred Scriptures, and which promises, at no very distant period, *to purify the Christian religion from those numerous and enormous corruptions, which have so long disfigured its doctrines, and impeded its progress.*" Hence the nature of that elucidation, which is diffused over the obscurities of Scripture in this version may be distinctly perceived.

Nor will the Unitarians, I presume disown the production; and if in their justification they simply allege the propriety of their possessing a translation of the New Testament, more consonant, in their own judgment, with the sense of Scripture than that of the Establishment, they certainly advance a position which few will be disposed to controvert. But is it quite consistent with that open and manly conduct, upon which they peculiarly pride themselves, to sink their characteristical denomination, and simply to describe themselves as "a Society for the promotion of Christian knowledge and the practice of virtue by the distribution of books; who, in order "to supply the English reader with a more correct text of the New Testament than has yet appeared,"\* had fixed its choice and founded its improvement "upon *the excellent translation* of the late most reverend Dr. William Newcome, Archbishop of Armagh, and primate of all Ireland, a worthy successor of the venerable and learned Archbishop Usher;"† to enter the combat in disguise, and advance to the attack in an archiepiscopal coat of mail? And is it true to the extent apparently professed both in the Title Page and Introduction,

\* Introduction, p. 5.

† Ibid. p. 4.

that Archbishop Newcome's version really forms the groundwork of this? The translators indeed say, that they have assumed it as a principle not to deviate from the Archbishop's version "but where it appeared to be necessary to the correction of error or inaccuracy in the text, the language, the construction, or the sense."\* But instances of such an exception unfortunately so often occur, that there is scarcely a single page without one or more, and not many without numerous deviations from it. Nor are these deviations simply confined to mere verbal errors or inaccuracies, but extend to the most important doctrines, so as uniformly to divest the Archbishop's translation of every expression hostile to the Unitarian Creed; deviations, which could not have incidentally taken place, but must have been originally projected. For we are expressly told, that the design of the Translators, as well as of the Society, was, to supply the English reader with a more correct text of the New Testament than has yet appeared: as also, by divesting the sacred volume of *the technical phrases of a systematic theology* which has no foundation in the scriptures themselves, to render the New Testament more generally intelligible, or at least to preclude many sources of error: and by the assistance of the notes, to enable the *judicious and attentive* reader to understand Scripture phraseology, and to form a just idea of *true and uncorrupted Christianity*."† What Unitarians mean, when they allude to a *systematic theology, which has no foundation in the Scriptures* and also to *true and uncorrupted Christianity*, no man can for a moment doubt, who has but slightly glanced his eye upon any of their avowed publications. Instead therefore of being that which at first view it may appear to the general reader, a Version undertaken from no party motives, and conducted upon no party principles, the very reverse seems to be the fact.

\* Introduction, p. 4.

† Introduction, p. 5, 6.



The text from which this translation is professedly made, is the amended one of Griesbach : a text which is too well known, and too highly respected, to require more than a simple notice of its excellency, and the superior correctness of which is universally acknowledged. But why in an English translation so long a history is given of the received Greek text, and its critical improvements, of Greek manuscripts, and of the different editions of the Greek Testament, it seems difficult, to conjecture. Could it possibly be to take the chance of impressing an idea, that the established translation, which confessedly follows the received text, is too corrupt to be used as a rule of faith ? This however it would be more easy to insinuate than to prove.

Among the various modes which have been adopted for the improvement of the received text, attempts, it is observed, have been made to correct it by *critical conjecture*. Upon this subject the following remarks occur ; “ This is a remedy which ought never to be applied but with the utmost caution, especially as we are furnished with so many helps for correcting the text from manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writers. This caution is doubly necessary when the proposed emendation affects a text which is of *great importance in theological controversy, as the judgment of the critic will naturally be biassed in favour of his own opinions*. It ought perhaps to be laid down as a *general rule*, that the received text is *in no case* to be altered by critical or at least by theological conjecture, how ingenious and plausible soever.” So far the reasoning is correct, and perfectly conformable with the established maxims of the most eminent critics : but what follows ? “ Nevertheless (it is added) there is no reason why critical conjectures should be *entirely* excluded from the New Testament, any more than from the works of any other ancient Author ; and some very plausible conjectures of no inconsiderable importance have been suggested



by men of great learning and sagacity, which, to say the least, merit very attentive consideration. See particularly John i. 1. vi. 4, and Romans ix. 5."\* and a reference is made to Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. c. 10. Here is a manifest qualification of the preceeding remark. Whatsoever ambiguity then may be supposed to exist in the idea of a *general* rule which is *universal* in its application, it is certain that the Authors of the New Version only mean, by so expressing themselves, a rule which is in *most* cases to be observed, but which may in *some* be violated; and, by way of distinctly pointing out the nature of their exception, they refer to John i. 1. vi. 4, and Romans ix. 5. The second reference indeed is not very important; but the first and third relate to theological conjectures, inimical to the doctrine of Christ's Divinity. The first consists in the substitution of Θεξ for Θεος in the clause και Θεος ην ο Λογος, and the second in reading ων ο for ο ων in the passage ο ων επι παντων Θεος, so as by this transposition to render its sense, "of whom was God, who is over all;" necessarily precluding the interpretation usually affixed to these words. What then is their distinction? The *general* rule, which *in no case* admits theological conjecture, how ingeniously and plausible soever it be, ought not, it seems, to stand in the way of any unauthorized emendations of the sacred text favourable to the Unitarian hypothesis: but do they mean to extend the same indulgent exception to Trinitarian criticism? Or do they conceive, that it is only the judgment of the Trinitarian critic which is likely to be biassed by individual opinion?

But, in corroboration of what they advance, they refer the reader to Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. c. x. In this chapter, which is entitled "Conjectural Emendations of the Greek Testament." and upon which their whole reasoning, one might suppose, was founded, it is singular that Michaelis

\* Introduction, p. 18, 19.

reprobates, in the strongest terms, all theological conjecture whatsoever, and that for this obvious reason : because “a Theologian whose business it is to form his whole system of faith and manners from the Bible, cannot with propriety assume previously any system of theology, by which he may regulate the sacred text ; but must adopt that text which is confirmed by original documents, and thence deduce his theological system.\* Nor is this all. In direct opposition to the sentiments of those who quote him, and in the beginning of that very chapter to which they refer, he thus unequivocally expresses himself : “ It must be evident to every man, that the New Testament would be a very uncertain rule of life and manners, and indeed WHOLLY UNFIT TO BE USED AS A STANDARD OF RELIGION, if it were allowable, *as in the practice of several Socinians*, to apply critical conjecture in order to establish the tenets of our own party. For instance ; if, in order to free ourselves from a superstitious doctrine, on the supposition that the divinity of Christ is ungrounded, we were at liberty to change, without any authority, Θεος ην ο Λογος, John i. 1, into Θεξ ην ο Λογος, and ο ων επι παντων Θεος, Rom. ix. 5, into ων ο επι παντων Θεος, the Bible would become so very uncertain, that every man might believe or disbelieve, as best suited his own principles.”†

Could these writers have possibly read the preceding passage when they made their appeal to the authority of Michaelis ? If they had, they must surely have perceived that Michaelis is directly against them ; and that the very conjectural emendations, originally proposed by *the Socinian theorists Crell and Schlichting*, which they particularly notice as suggested by *men of great learning and sagacity*, and as *meriting, to say the least, very attentive consideration*, he directly censures in the most pointed terms, and expressly brings forward to illustrate the

\* Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 413.

† Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 387.

position, that theological conjecture is *never* admissible. If, conscious of opposing an established maxim, which ought in no instance to be violated, they wished to shelter themselves from the storm of critical reproof, the gabardine of Michaelis was most unfortunately selected indeed as a place of refuge.

To the passage which I have just quoted, from the first section of the chapter referred to, I will add one or two more from the last section of the *same* chapter, in order to place the opinion of Michaelis in a still clearer point of view. "The only plausible argument which an advocate for theological conjecture might use, not so much indeed *to convince himself of the justice of his cause*, as *to perplex his opponents*, is the following; namely, that the New Testament has been so corrupted by the ruling party, which calls itself Orthodox, that the genuine doctrine of Christ and his Apostles is no longer to be found in it. But there is not the least room for a suspicion of this kind, as we have so great a number of manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writings, in which the New Testament is quoted, of every age and every country."\* And in proof of his assertion, among other things, he remarks, that "the passages which afforded the most perplexity to the members of the ruling Church are still extant in manuscripts, versions, and editions of the New Testament; whereas the *spurious* passage, 1. John v. 7. though the Orthodox seem to think it of the most importance, has *never* had the good fortune to find admittance into any Greek manuscript, or ancient version." If the compilers of this Introduction, who not only in the instance before me, but in almost every page, refer to the writings of Michaelis, will not admit the validity of the argument in the preceding extracts, they may perhaps feel the force of the following powerful appeal to Unitarian consistency: "As critical

\* Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 418.



conjectures," observes the same author, have been principally made by those, who, in the language of the Church, are termed Heretics, I will invent one or two examples of the same kind in the name of the Orthodox, and ask those of the opposite party, whether they would admit them as lawful conjectures. For instance, suppose I should alter ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ μὲν μείζων μὲν ἐστίν, John xiv. 18. to ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μὲν ἐστίν, or ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ μὲν ζων μὲν ἐστίν, in order to be freed from a text that implies an inequality between the Father and the Son : or if I should read 1 John v. 20. in the following manner, ἕτος ὁ υἱὸς ἐστίν ὁ ἀληθινός, Θεός, in order to show more distinctly the divinity of Christ ; I think the Heterodox would exclaim, *He is either extremely ignorant, or, by having recourse to such miserable artifices, acknowledges the badness of his cause.* But the Heterodox, as well as the Orthodox, must appear before the impartial tribunal of criticism, where there is no respect to persons, and where it is not allowed for one party to take greater liberties than the other."\* As it is impossible to expose their reasoning more strongly than the Critic himself has done, to whom they appeal for support, and that even in the very chapter which they quote, I shall add nothing more upon the subject, but leave them to enjoy, as they can, the testimony of Michaelis.

---

## CHAP. II.

### *Authenticity of the two first Chapters of St. Matthew.*

In the remarks which I propose to make upon this New Version, it is not my intention to raise the shield of theo-

\* Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 415.



logical warfare against those “critics and commentators of the highest reputation” as they are termed,\* that is, against the redoubted champions of Unitarianism, from whose works the Authors profess to have principally collected their notes from the illustration of difficult and doubtful pages ; but to confine my observations as much as possible to critical questions : and, as they do not presume to hold it up as a faultless translation, but merely as an improved version, still, no doubt, susceptible of far greater improvement, which they will rejoice to see undertaken and accomplished by *abler* hands ;”† I shall not drag into view every little error and inaccuracy which the severity of criticism may discover, but consider those only which are most offensive and most prominent.

“If this Version,” they remark, “posseses any merit, it is that of being translated from the most correct text of the original which has hitherto been published.”‡ Yet, notwithstanding this and other similar assertions, “the inquisitive, liberal, and judicious reader,” whose approbation they seem assured of conciliating, scarcely opens the Gospel of St. Matthew before he finds *three* pages together printed in italics, an intimation, he is told, that the passages themselves are all of doubtful authority ; and, when he gets to St Luke’s, almost *seven* more of the same description. The reasons assigned for the propriety of this rejection may possibly satisfy the inquisitive, liberal, and judicious of their own communion, whose minds may be prepared by a previous intimacy with the writings of Priestley and his coadjutors, but will never, I am persuaded, convince the inquisitive, liberal, and judicious, if such can be admitted to exist, of any other communion.

Being repeatedly informed that this Version is adapted to the “admirable” text of Griesbach, as given in the

\* Introduction, p. 4.

† Introduction, p. 30.

‡ Ibid. p. 8.

last edition of his Greek Testament, “an edition of unrivalled excellence and importance, the publication of which will constitute a memorable era in the history of Scripture criticism,”\* we naturally turn to Griesbach for the authority of this bold step, but in vain ; for there the doubtful pages (as they are denominated) appear in the genuine text without the slightest hint of their supposed illegitimacy. Indeed one of his invariable rules in the regulation of his corrections very properly was, *nil mutetur è conjectura nil sine testium, nempe codicum, versionum, Patrum, auctoritate.*† Perhaps then it may be said, that the translators themselves, who certainly seem to speak of ancient manuscripts, and other documents of the kind with much familiarity, may have had the good fortune to discover what escaped the search of the indefatigable Griesbach. But here again we are foiled ; for a note informs us, that these passages are certainly to be found “in all the manuscripts and versions, which are now extant.”‡ Upon what possible principle then can it be, that they are thus pilloried, and exposed in an English translation to popular contempt and fury ? When we recollect that they contain an account of the miraculous conception of our Saviour, and that Priestley, with others of the “clear and discriminating” class of writers, “who of late years have diffused so much light over the obscurities of the sacred Scriptures,” have thought proper to reject them, we cannot be long at a loss to divine the principle and the motive : but as a decision is not passed against their authenticity without some show of argument in the notes, the best, it is to be presumed, which Unitarian reading can supply, and as the question itself is one of considerable importance, I shall be the more particular in my remarks upon this subject.

The portion of St. Matthew’s Gospel which is thus stig-

\* Introduction, p. 23.

† Prolegomena, p. 33.

‡ New Version, p. 2.

matized, consists of the whole of the two first chapters, with the single exception of the Genealogy at the commencement.

The critical authority adduced for the retention of the Genealogy, and the rejection of the remainder of these two chapters, is stated in the following terms : “ Epiphanius says, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates, who used the Gospel of the Ebionites, which was probably the original Gospel of Matthew, written in the Hebrew language for the use of the Jewish believers, argued from the Genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel, that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary ; but that the Ebionites had taken away even the Genealogy, beginning their Gospel with these words ; ‘ And it came to pass in the days of Herod the king &c.’ See Epiph. Hæres. 30. N. 13. Jones on the Canon, vol. i. part ii. chap. 25. It is probable therefore that the first sixteen verses of this chapter are genuine ; and that they were found at least in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. . . . The remainder of this chapter, and the whole of the second, are printed in Italics, as an intimation that they are of doubtful authority. They are indeed to be found in all the manuscripts and versions which are extant ; but from the testimony of Epiphanius and Jerome we are assured, that they were wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, that is, by the ancient Hebrew Christians, for whose instruction probably this Gospel was originally written, and to whom the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ could not have been unacceptable, if it had been found in the genuine narrative.”\*

Before I proceed to the examination of the authorities cited, it will be proper to notice an ambiguous assertion occurring in the first paragraph, viz. that *the Gospel of the Ebionites was the original Gospel of Matthew*, written

\* New Version, p. 1, 2.



in the Hebrew language for the use of the Jewish believers." If this assertion be intended to convey the simple persuasion of the translators themselves, it will rest on no solid basis, and consequently require no particular refutation : but if they applied it to Epiphanius, an application which seems to arise from the natural connexion of the whole, it may be necessary to remark, that they certainly attribute to the Father an opinion the very reverse of that which he maintained. The words of Epiphanius are these: *Εν τῷ γενεῖ παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαίου ὀνομαζομένῳ, εἰς ὅλῳ δὲ πληρῆσαι, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ηὐρωτηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τρεῖς καλεῖται, εὐφραίνεται, &c.\** This is thus translated by Jones, to whom also reference is made, most probably for the convenience of the mere English reader. "In that Gospel which they (i. e. the Ebionites) have called the Gospel according to St. Matthew, which is not *entire and perfect*, but *corrupted and curtailed*, and which they call *the Hebrew Gospel*, it is written &c." Now is it not hence apparent, that Epiphanius, instead of considering it as "the original Gospel of Matthew, written in the Hebrew language for the use of the Jewish believers," pointedly stigmatized it as an imperfect spurious, (*νενοθευμένῳ illegitimatized*), mutilated copy? But the translators perhaps, as I before observed, might have intended to take the responsibility of the assertion solely upon themselves; in which case I will only remind them, that they adopt the very opinion of the celebrated *Toland* which "*the learned*" Jeremiah Jones, as they justly describe a favourite author, (Introduction, P. 7.) formerly reprobated in the strongest terms.†

\* Hæres. 30. §. 13.

† Toland, it seems, not only maintained that the Gospel of the Ebionites was the original Gospel of St. Matthew, and that both the Ebionites and Nazarenes were the true ancient Hebrew Christians; but that the forged *Acts of the Apostles*, which the Ebionites also used, were a portion of genuine Scripture. After giving Epiphanius's ac-



If I understand the ground of their argument in this case correctly, it is precisely this. We are assured by Epiphanius and Jerome, that the two first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel were wanting in a Gospel supposed to be

count of the latter production, Jeremiah Jones adds the following severe reflections: "Part of this fragment is produced by Mr. Toland, in his *Original Plan or Scheme of Christianity according to the Ebionites*, both in Greek and English; nor is it strange that a person of Mr. Toland's profession should grace his Scheme with a passage so much to his purpose, I mean, of *abolishing the doctrines of Christianity*, which are agreed upon by all Christians, and introducing *his most ridiculous and impious Scheme of Nazarene, or Jewish, or Ebionite, or Mahometan, or* (which is the undoubted truth) *of no Christianity at all*. Did Mr. Toland and his friends, in these their vile attacks upon so excellent and divine a constitution, not *quibble, and juggle, and prevaricate*, as they upon all occasions do, in their citations out of the old records of Christianity, (a crime which they are ever forward to charge upon others, who are much more clear of it,) I should excuse myself and the reader from the trouble of any remarks upon them, leaving them to their slavish infidelity; but when I observe a person *ransacking and mustering together all the silly trumpery of the ancient heretics*, grossly misrepresenting the books he cites, only with design to gratify a bigoted humour against the Christian religion, I am obliged, by my regards to the profession I make of the name of Jesus, to lay open such vile imposture. Of this I have given several instances already from Mr. Toland's books. The passage I am now upon out of Epiphanius furnishes me with another. He would persuade us the Ebionites or Nazarenes (*a most ridiculous sort of heretics, who scarcely deserved the name of Christians, as I shall shew hereafter*) were *the only true and genuine Christians*, consequently *their books must be the truest and most genuine accounts of the Christian affairs*; and so, for instance, must these Acts, which we are now discussing; because it so much vilifies St. Paul, and exposes his doctrine. But, as Dr. Mangey has justly remarked, *this is most insupportable impudence in him, to cite as genuine a wretched forgery of the Ebionites*. One can scarce tell whether his intention of vilifying St. Paul, or the method he useth to do it, be the more detestable; this sorry unbelieving Critic governs his skill by his wicked principles, and has no other way to judge of spurious and genuine books, than by their opposition to Christianity." Jones on the Canonical Authority of the New Testa-

that of St. Matthew, used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, that is, by those who are conjectured to have been the ancient Hebrew Christians, and for whose instruction St. Matthew's Gospel is also conjectured to have been written : the whole two chapters therefore are *prima facie* to be rejected ; but Epiphanius asserts, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates, who used the same Gospel, admitted the Genealogy at the commencement, which the Ebionites had taken away : therefore the Genealogy alone is to be retained, and the remainder of the two chapters to be rejected.

I shall not undertake to refute the illogical reasoning manifested in the conduct of this argument, because it is in itself sufficiently obvious, and has already been exposed ;\* nor enter into an unnecessary discussion respecting the proper principle upon which *the Genealogy* is to be admitted, satisfied that it is on both sides declared to be genuine ; but confine myself to the critical statements upon which the rejection of the remainder of these chapters is grounded.

We are assured, the authors of this work observe, both by Epiphanius and Jerome, that the two first chapters were wanting in the Hebrew Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites. When I found them in the introduction, p. 14. describing the *celebrated* Ephrem, who lived in the *fourth* century, as a writer of *some* note in the *sixth*, I began to

ment, Part II. Chap. 17. It may indeed be observed, that the language of this passage is disgraced by an immoderate asperity, and that the opinion contained in it is unsupported by authority ; to both of which remarks I fully accede ; only subjoining with regard to the latter point, that although the opinion be unsupported here, it is very sufficiently proved in other parts of the work, and that, if it rested solely upon the credit of the assertor, still, as being the opinion of the learned Jeremiah Jones, it would be entitled to at least as much respect as the opposite opinion of the authors of the New Version.

\* Nare's Remarks on this Version, p. 5, 6.

suspect that they were very little conversant with the works of the Fathers ;\* and this suspicion seems confirmed in the present instance, by their attributing to Jerome an assertion which he never made. Every thing advanced by Jerome and others, upon the subject of the Gospel in question, has been carefully collected by Grabe, in his *Spicilegium Patrum*, vol. i. p. 15—31 ; by Fabricius, in his *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* vol. i. p. 346—359, and 355—370 ; and also by Jones, in the chapter of his work to which they themselves refer : and certainly in neither of these collections does any thing similar to what they say of Jerome appear. That therefore, which has escaped the diligent investigation of Fabricius and Jeremiah Jones, has scarcely, I presume, been discovered by them. Indeed a direct negative may here be assumed with the greater confidence, because, as I shall subsequently shew, Jerome himself asserted the very reverse of their position.

The assurance therefore, that these chapters were rejected by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, solely rests upon the authority of Epiphanius. The words alluded to are these ; Οἱτοὶ δὲ ἀλλὰ τινα διανοοῦνται, παρακοφάντες γὰρ τοὺς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας, ἀρχοῦνται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιῆσαι, ὡς προεῖπον, λεγόντες· ὅτι ἐγένετο φησὶν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῶδς βασιλεὺς

\* Are they aware that the works of the ancient heretics nowhere exist but as they are quoted in those of the Fathers? They certainly seem to put this point a little dubiously, when, in describing the means of correcting the received text, they say, “ The works of those writers who are called heretics, such as Valentinian, Marcion, and others, are as useful in ascertaining the value of a reading as those of the Fathers, who are entitled Orthodox ; for the heretics were often more learned and acute, and equally honest.” *Introd.* p. 18. If the ponderous volumes of the Fathers are deemed to be in themselves but of little intrinsic value, they surely deserve to be investigated more accurately than they seem to have been by these writers, were it only for the discovery of that pearl above all price, according to their estimation, the genuine Christianity of the reputed heretics of antiquity.



της Ἰδαίας &c. which are thus rendered by Jones ; “ But they (viz. the Ebionites) have quite other sentiments ; for they have taken away the Genealogy from Matthew, and they accordingly begin their Gospel with these words, *It came to pass in the days of Herod king of Judea, &c.*”

This prolix writer is certainly not remarkable either for his learning or acuteness ; qualifications, indeed, with which, in the judgment of Unitarians, the Fathers in general were very sparingly endowed. He digresses most immoderately, and paraphrases without mercy. If his honesty be unimpeachable, his accuracy, at least, is more than suspected.\* Waving however every imputation of the latter kind, let us put the supposition, that his assertions are all grounded upon the most correct knowledge and the minutest investigation ; and what will follow ? Only that, with the same breath with which he tells us that the Gospel of the Ebionites contained not the two first chapters of St.

\* Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, holds him in the most sovereign contempt. He says, “ Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in the isle of Cyprus, wrote a book against all the heretics that had sprung up in the Church until his time. This work has little or no reputation, as it is full of inaccuracies and errors, and discovers almost in every page the levity and ignorance of its author.” Vol. i. p. 349. The original Latin is thus expressed, “ Epiphanius Salaminæ in Cypro Episcopus sectas Christianorum justo persecutus est volumine, at variis maculis et erroribus propter auctoris levitatem et ignorantiam *inusto.*” Hence it appears, that Mosheim considered the work as absolutely, *branded* with ignominy. One circumstance indeed alone seems to throw an air of suspicion over this whole account of the Ebionites ; for Epiphanius not only derives the name of the sect from a person denominated *Ebion*, whose very existence is problematical, contrary to the opinion of other writers, who derive it from the Hebrew word עֲבִיּוֹן signifying *poor* ; but relates a story of *Ebion* and St. John, similar to what Irenæus, upon the authority of Polycarp, records of *Cerinthus* and St. John ; viz. that the Apostle, seeing *Ebion* in a bath, exclaimed, “ Let us depart hence, lest the building fall in, and we ourselves perish with the impious *Ebion.*” t. 23. Will the Unitarian admit the accuracy of this anecdote ?



Matthew, he also informs us, that it was because they scrupled not to curtail and mutilate the genuine production of that Apostle. The consequence is obvious. But perhaps a distinction may be here adopted; and the first assertion be termed a matter of fact, the last only a matter of opinion; so that, while one is correct, the other may be inaccurate. I shall not adduce in reply, as I easily might, various points of fact advanced by Epiphanius relative to the doctrine of the Ebionites,\* and then call upon Unitarian consistency for an implicit reliance upon the fidelity of his statements, but produce a point of fact exactly parallel. Epiphanius distinctly asserts, that the Ebionites not only rejected the two first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, but also the prophetic writings, and almost the whole of the Old Testament, with very little reservation indeed. His words are; Αβρααμ δε ὁμολογεσσι και Ισαακ, και Ιακωβ, Μεσσην τε και Ααρων, Ιησυν τε τον τε Ναυη, ἄπλως διαδεξα-

\* Will those who pronounce the Ebionites to have been the true Hebrew Christians, credit the veracity of this Father, when he represents them as believing that God committed the government of this world to *the Devil*, of the world to come, to *the Christ*, and that *the Christ*, who was a celestial being, superior to the archangels themselves, descended upon, and was united to the man *Jesus* at his baptism? And yet, among other absurdities, this he precisely delivers as their creed; Δυο δε τινας συνισωσιν εκ Θεου τεταγμενους, ένα μεν τον Χριστον, ένα δε τον Διαβολον. Και τον μεν Χριστον λεγσσι τε μελλοντος αιωνος ειληφεναι τον κληρον, τον δε Διαβολον τετον πεπισυεσθαι τον αιωνα, εκ προσαγωγης δηθεν του παντοκρατορος κατα αιτησιν ἑκατερων αυτων. Και τουτου ἕνεκα Ιησυν γεγεννημενον εκ σπερματος ανδρος λεγουσι, και επιλεχθεντα, και ἔτω κατα εκλογην υιον Θεου κληθεντα, απο τε ανωθεν εις αυτον ἠκοντος Χριστος εν ειδει περισερας. Ου φασκουσι δε εκ Θεου πατρος αυτον γεγεννησθαι, αλλα εκτισθαι, ὡς ένα των αρχαγγελων, μειζονα δε αυτων οντα, αυτον δε κυριευσιν και αγγελων και παντων ὑπο του παντοκρατορος πεποιημενων. Hæres. 30. § 16. And in § 14, their belief is expressly said to have been, that the Christ was συναφθεντα, *conglutinated with* the man Jesus.

μενον Μωυσεα, ουδεν τε οντα μετα τριτας δε ουκετι ομολογουσι τινα των προφητων, αλλα και αναθεματιζουσι και χλευαζουσι. . . . ουτε γαρ δεχονται την Πεντατευχον Μωυσεως ολην, αλλα τινα ρηματα αποβαλλουσιν. § 18. If therefore, from the testimony of Epiphanius, and upon the credit of the Ebionites, a sect which, nevertheless, this very author describes as resembling that portentous pest of antiquity, the fabled Hydra, (πολυμορφον τερασιον, και ως ειπειν της μυθεουμενης πολυκεφαλης Ἰδρας οφιωδη μορφην εν εαυτω ανατυπωσαμενος, §. 1.) we expunge from the Canon of the New Testament any portion of the Gospel of St. Matthew, must we not, to be consistent with ourselves, from the same testimony, and upon the same credit, expunge also from the Canon of the Old Testament the whole body of the inspired prophets, and admit even the Pentateuch itself under a suspicion, that some parts of our existing copies have been interpolated? Surely this inevitable conclusion will gratify neither side; and will at least prove highly unpalatable to those Unitarians, who think with Mr. Stone, that “Jewish prophecy is the sole criterion to distinguish between genuine and spurious Christian Scripture.”\*

But let us consider more minutely the character of this boasted Gospel of the Ebionites. The production itself is lost; and nothing remains of it, except a few extracts, preserved in the writings of the Fathers. It was called “the

\* See a singular sermon under this title, preached at a Visitation in Essex by Mr. Stone. I have not here noticed the testimony of Eusebius, who remarks, that the Ebionites also rejected the Epistles of St. Paul whom they denominated an Apostate. Οὗτοι δε τε μεν Αποστολε πασας τας επισολας αρνητεας ηγουντο ειναι δειν, αποσατην αποκαλουντες αυτον του νομου. Hist. lib. iii. c. 27. I have not noticed this circumstance, because the question solely turns upon the testimony of Epiphanius. If however we admit it, and it surely stands on higher authority than the other alluded to, we shall be under the necessity of rejecting a still larger portion of the New Testament, unless we abandon the fidelity of Ebionite Scripture altogether.

Gospel according to the Hebrews," and was certainly known under that title to Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome; the latter of whom, obtaining a correct copy of it from the Nazarenes, translated it both into Greek and Latin. As so much has been said upon this subject both by Jones and Michælis, it seems not necessary to dwell upon it minutely. Clemens Alexandrinus simply refers to it, quoting a passage not in the Greek copy of St. Matthew, or of any other Gospel. Origen likewise quotes from it in the same way, speaking of it as not of any decided authority. His words are, "Si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud, non *ad auctoritatem*, sed *ad manifestationem* propositæ quæstionis." If any one be pleased to receive it, not as of any authority but only for the illustration of the present question.\* Eusebius notices, that it was used by the Ebonites, who, he adds, very little esteemed any other; των λοιπων σμικρον εποικντο λογον.† Jerome, in his catalogue of Illustrious Men, certainly seems to describe it as the original Hebrew text of St. Matthew;‡ but in other parts of his works he represents it, in one place, as a Gospel which most *think* to be the Gospel according to St. Matthew, ut plerique *autumant*;§ in another, as a Gospel which is *called* by many the authentic Gospel of St. Matthew;|| and at the beginning of his third book against the Pelagians he considers it as a document which, if its *authority* be not admitted, may at least be used out of respect to it *antiquity*; "quibus testimoniis, si non uteris ad auctoritatem, utere saltem ad antiquitatem."¶ Hence Michælis, after a particular examination of Jerome's different allusions to it, says, "I am far from supposing that Jerome took the Nazarene Gospel for the *unadulte-*

\* Jones on the Canon, Part II. chap. 25. § 3.

† Ibid. § 5.

‡ Ibid. § 13.

§ Ibid. § 15.

|| Jones on the Canon, Part II. chap. 25. § 21.

¶ Michælis's Introduction, vol. iii. part i. p. 182.



*rated* original, as it is evident, from the quotations which he has made from it, that it abounded with interpolations.”\* And of the same opinion is Michælis’s “learned and acute translator and annotator, Dr. Herbert Marsh,” as the authors of this Version justly denominate a biblical critic of the first celebrity, who remarks, that even when Jerome seems to describe it as the original text of St. Matthew, “he does not declare that it was really St. Matthew’s *unadulterated* original. Indeed if he had supposed so, he could not have used at other times the expressions, ‘*quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum,*’ and ‘*ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum.*”† Indeed both these critics, upon a general view of the question, represent this Gospel as evidently a garbled production, and by no means the true Hebrew original of St. Matthew. Nor in their condemnation of it do they depart from the decisions of preceding critics. To omit such names as Casaubon, Mill, Whitby, Fabricius, and Le Clerc; the “learned” Jeremiah Jones, and the “venerable” Lardner, critics admired by the Unitarians, held precisely the same sentiments. The former writer was so fully convinced of its illegitimacy, that he adduces at some length (c. 29.) what he considers as positive proofs that it was apocry-

\* Michælis’s Introduction, vol. iii. part i. p. 182.

† Michælis’s Introduction, vol. iii. part ii. p. 134. That Jerome had no higher opinion of it than the other Fathers, is asserted also by Jones, who makes the following remarks upon a passage or two of Jerome, unfavourable to its authenticity, which I have not above referred to. “He (Jerome) expressly saith, *It was the same with the Gospel entitled, according to the Twelve Apostles;* (see c. 25. §. 15.) but this he expressly rejects as *Apocryphal* in another place, (c. 7. §. 5.) and as a book of the *heretics, wrote by men destitute of the spirit and grace of God,* without a *due regard to truth,* c. 7. §. 4. The same appears from this manner of citing it in several of the places above, c. 25. For instance, in that there produced, §. 13. he introduces his citations thus; *He who will believe the Gospel according to the Hebrews.*” On the Canon, vol. i. part ii. chap. 28.

phal." The latter regarded it as a compilation subsequent in point of time to the genuine Gospels, principally indeed formed upon the Gospel of St. Matthew, but having inserted in it various "additions of things taken out of St. Luke's, (and perhaps other Gospels,) and other matters, that had been delivered by oral tradition."\*

That the argument however may have a due weight given to it in all its different bearings, I will even admit the external character of the document to stand as high as the Unitarians themselves would place it; and shall be satisfied to rest my proofs wholly upon the apocryphal complexion of its internal character. Among other passages of a suspicious nature occurs the following: "Behold the mother and brethren of Christ spake to him; *John the Baptist baptizes for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him.* He said to them, *In what have I sinned, that I have any need to go and to be baptized by him? Unless my saying this proceed perhaps from ignorance.*"† Again, in another part, our Saviour says, *The Holy Ghost, my mother, took me by one of my hairs, and led me to the great mountain Thabor.*"‡ Will

\* Credibility of the Gospel History, vol. i. p. 185. Ed. 1748.

† "Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei, Johannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis, Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est." Quotation from Jerome in Jones, *ibid.* §. 15. In another chapter (29th) the same author makes the following comment upon this quotation. The meaning of this passage will be best perceived from a parallel one in another apocryphal book, entitled, *The Preaching of Peter*, in which it was related, *that Christ confessed his sins, and was compelled, contrary to his own inclinations, by his mother Mary to submit to the baptism of John.*"

‡ Ἀρτι ελαβε με ἡ μητηρ μου το ἅγιον πνευμα, εν μιᾶ των τριχων μου και απενερχε με εις το ορος το μεγα Θαβωρ. Quotation from Origen, *ibid.* c. 25. § 4. If certain passages are to be rejected upon the credit of this document, why are not others to be inserted? Why, for

it be maintained, that a passage is to be received into the Canon of Scripture, which asserts, that our blessed Saviour required the baptism of John for the remission of such sins as he had ignorantly committed, in direct contradiction to the testimony of St. Paul, that *he knew no sin*, 2 Cor v. 21? Or if it be, will not the authenticity of the other quotation at least be considered as dubious, in which *the Holy Spirit* is expressly termed *the mother of Christ*, and represented, in order to make the transaction more miraculous, as conveying him to a lofty mountain by *one* of the hairs of his head? Can passages like these be so twisted by the tortuous lubricity of theological comment, as to elude the grasp of indignant criticism?

But the very commencement itself of this singular production, as it is stated by Epiphanius, sufficiently betrays its illegitimacy. The Translators of the New Version give us the following information: "The Gospel," they say, of the Ebionites or Hebrews, which did not contain the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus, began in this manner; "*It came to pass in the days of Herod king of Judea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan.* See Epiphanius, and Jer. Jones." But in the preceding note they had thus reasoned: "If it be true, as Luke relates, c. iii. 23. that Jesus was entering upon his thirtieth year in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, he must have been born *two years at least after the death of Herod*; a circumstance which alone invalidates the whole story." Now it is something singular, that, while they object to the

example, after Matthew xix. 20. in which our Saviour says to the rich man, "Go and sell what thou hast, and give it to the poor, and come and follow me," is not the following reading added as at least probable; "The rich man hereupon began to scratch his head, (*scalpere caput suum*,) and was displeased, &c.?" See Jones on the Canon, *ibid.* § 5. Doubtless the same document cannot be less competent to authorize an addition, than an omission.



text of St. Matthew, because it fixes our Saviour's birth in the days of Herod the king, who really died, they add, *two years before*, they should at the same time contend for the authenticity of a document, which not only supposes that Christ was born in the reign of Herod, but that Herod was still living when our Saviour was in his *thirtieth* year, at the period of the Baptist's public appearance in the discharge of his mission. Leaving them however to vindicate their own consistency, I shall confine myself to the simple statement of the fact. Epiphanius expressly declares, that the Gospel of the Ebionites began with an account of John's baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the days of *Herod, king of Judea*, who, it is agreed on all sides, was dead many years before. If therefore Epiphanius's relation be true, and this Gospel began as he describes it, an anachronism of an extraordinary kind is apparent at its very outset, which instantly subverts the foundation of the whole Unitarian argument; and if it be not true, then the commencement of this Gospel is rendered uncertain, and the hypothesis raised upon it falls to the ground at once of its own accord. Whether his knowledge of this Gospel were derived from ocular inspection or from vague report, he is admitted to have misrepresented it; and if he be inaccurate in one point, how can we trust him in another? It is of little consequence, whether his misrepresentation arose from inadvertence, ignorance, or malice; for if the fact be so in one, and that an important instance, surely it must render every part of his testimony suspicious.

In whatsoever point of view therefore we contemplate this document, it betrays evident traces of a spurious origin.

I have hitherto taken for granted, what the authors of the New Version affirm, that the Cerinthians and Carpocratians rejected the two first chapters of St. Matthew, with the exception of the Genealogy; and that the Ebionites rejected them altogether, without that exception. It may

however be questioned, whether this is not more than Epiphanius states. He certainly asserts, that the Gospel of the Ebionites began with an account of John the Baptist, which, as not occurring until the third chapter in the Greek Gospel, must of course exclude the preceding chapters; but he does not assert, that the Gospel of the Cerinthians and Carpocratians began in the same manner: on the contrary he tells us, that it commenced with the Genealogy, precisely as the Greek Gospel commences. The latter sects, it is true, used a Hebrew Gospel in many respects similar to that of the Ebionites, but evidently not in all, as the difference alluded to indisputably proves. The Cerinthians and Carpocratians therefore, as far as the testimony of Epiphanius goes, may be supposed to have retained the whole, as well as a part of the disputed chapters. Indeed, in another place, he expressly argues against the opinions of the Cerinthians, from a passage in the same chapters, subsequent to the Genealogy, viz. from Mat. i. 18, which he would scarcely perhaps have done, had not the passage been received by them as genuine. His words are these: Πως δε παλιν εκ ελεγχθησεται αυτων η ανοια τε εααγγελις σαφως λεγοντος, οτι ευρεθη εν γαστρι εχυσσα. πριν η συνηλθειν αυτης.\*

Let us then briefly consider the deduction of the Unitarians from the premises which have been stated. The two first chapters of St. Matthew, they say, were not contained in the Hebrew Gospel of the Ebionites, therefore they are to be rejected; but a portion of them, about one fourth of the whole, was found in the Hebrew Gospel of the Cerinthians and Carpocratians, therefore this portion is to be retained, and the remainder only to be rejected. Is there not however a fallacy in the conclusion thus hastily drawn? The rejection of the three parts in question cannot well be made to depend upon the credit of the Ce-

\* Hæres. 27. § 7.

rinthian and Carpocratian Gospel, because it is not asserted to have been deficient in these respects ; it must solely rest upon that of the Gospel of the Ebionites. But it must be admitted, that the Gospel in question was but a mutilated copy of St. Matthew at best, as it possessed not the Genealogy. If therefore its credit be more than questionable in the non-admission of one, and that a prominent part, how is it to be established in the non-admission of the remaining parts ? Would the same hand, which avowedly cut away the Genealogy, scruple to remove also the account of the miraculous conception, and the other events subsequently recorded in these chapters ?

But the authors of the New Version, it may be said, depend not wholly upon the testimony of Epiphanius. They introduce Jerome also as an auxiliary in their cause, certainly a more correct, more learned, and better informed writer, who, they observe, “assures us, that the two chapters were wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites.” So indeed they observe ; yet may they be challenged to produce a single passage from the voluminous writings of Jerome, in which any assurance of the kind alluded to is either expressed or implied. On the contrary, it seems not difficult to show, that the testimony of Jerome makes completely against them. This Father, it should be recollected, translated into Greek and Latin the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and must therefore have been well acquainted with its contents. In his Catalogue of Illustrious Writers he makes the following allusion to it : “Mihi quoque a Nazaræis, qui in Berœa, urbe Syriæ, hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit ; in quo animadvertendum, quod ubicunque Evangelista, sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris Veteris Scripturæ testimoniis utitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum auctoritatem, sed *Hebraicam*: è quibus illa duo sunt *Ex Ægypto vocavi Filium meum, et, Quoniam Nazarus vocabitur*. The Nazaræans, who live in Berœa, a



city of Syria, and make use of this volume, granted me the favour of writing it out ; in which Gospel there is this observable, that wherever the Evangelist either cites himself, or introduces our Saviour as citing any passage out of the Old Testament, he does not follow the translation of the LXX, but the *Hebrew* copies, of which there are these two instances ; viz. that, *Out of Egypt I have called my Son* ; and that, *He shall be called a Nazarene.*”\* Is it not hence evident, that the second of these disputed chapters at least, where these passages occur, was contained in the Gospel of the Nazarenes, which both Jerome and Eusebius represent as the Gospel also of the Ebionites?† What then becomes of the supposed assurance of Jerome ? And what credit is due to the assertions of those, who are too indolent, for I cannot suppose them too ignorant, to examine the authorities, to which they appeal for the truth of their statements ?

\* Jones on the Canon, vol. i. part i. chap. 25. § 13. See also Michaelis’s Introduction, vol. iii. part i. p. 166, 7 ; and Marsh’s Notes, part ii. p. 130, 1. I have omitted the other proofs advanced by Michaelis, and more ably urged by his Annotator, because the single proof referred to seems perfectly satisfactory. I shall however add here the conclusion of Dr. Marsh : “It appears,” he remarks, “from Notes 10, 11, to this section, that the Hebrew Gospel used by the Nazarenes contained, at least, the second chapter of St. Matthew. We must conclude therefore, from the connexion of the subject, that it contained likewise *the eight last verses of the first chapter, which are so closely connected with the second chapter, that no separation can well take place.* The only doubt therefore is, whether “it contained the *Genealogy, Matt. i. 1—17.*” Ibid. p. 137.

† I have considered the same *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as used both by the Nazarenes and Ebionites. Many critics have indeed surmised, that some little difference existed between the respective copies of these sects ; but as this surmise principally rests on the credit of Epiphanius’s quotations, I have omitted to notice it, particularly as the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome is direct to the point, and as the Authors of the New Version themselves identify the Gospel of the Nazarenes with that of the Ebionites.

Still however they may remark, unwilling to abandon the accuracy of Epiphanius, that something perhaps may be discovered in the extracts from the Gospel of the Ebionites, furnished by other writers, to corroborate the general credit of his testimony. But, unfortunately, here again the fact is completely on the other side; and something may be found not to corroborate, but to invalidate his testimony. In the very passage where he speaks of the commencement of this Gospel, he adds the following quota-  
 “ Ηλθε και Ιησους και εβαπτισθη υπο του Ιωαννου· και ως ανηλθεν απο τς υδατος, ηνοιγησαν οι ζρανοι, και ειδε το Πνευμα του Θεου το Αγιον εν ειδει περιζερας κατελθουσης και εισηλθουσης εις αυτον. Και φωνη εγενετο εκ τς ζρανς λεγουσα· Συ μς ει ο υιος ο αγαπητος, εν σοι ηυδοκησα. Και παλιν, Εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε. Jesus also went and was baptized by John : and as he ascended out of the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove descending and entering into him, and a voice was made from heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*; and then another, *I have this day begotten thee.*”\* Such is the extract of Epiphanius. Let this be compared with the subsequent extract made by Jerome relative to the same transaction, and the difference must appear remarkable. “ Factum est autem, quum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, et requievit super eum, et dixit ei; Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis exspectabam te, ut venires, et requiescerem in te; tu es enim requies mea; tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum. It came to pass, when the Lord ascended from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Ghost descended and rested upon him, and said to him, *My Son, among* (or during all the time of) *all the Prophets I was waiting for thy coming, that I might rest upon thee; for thou art my rest; thou art*

\* Jones on the Canon, vol. i. part ii. chap. 35. §. 11.

my first begotten Son, who shall reign to everlasting ages.”\* How are these varying passages to be reconciled? Both profess to be taken from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. That quoted by Jerome, indisputably was; that quoted by Epiphanius rests on the simple affirmation of the writer, unsupported by any collateral evidence, and made by one, whose character for accuracy is, to say the best of it, at least questionable. Can we possibly for a moment hesitate to determine on which side the balance of credibility preponderates?

Having thus endeavoured to demonstrate, that if, in order to be consistent, we adopt the Scriptures of the Ebionites in all respects, who are stated to have rejected the two first chapters of St. Matthew, little will be left to us either of the Old Testament or the New; that their Gospel, as appears both from its external and internal evidence, could not have been the original of St. Matthew; and that, even if it had, we might have still inferred, from the testimony of Jerome, that certainly one, and perhaps both of the disputed chapters were contained in it; I might here conclude the discussion: but, by way of satisfying those who conceive a Hebrew acknowledgment of these chapters to be important, I shall previously remark, that a particular passage in them was distinctly referred to by an Hebrew Christian of a very early age. Hegesippus, who lived at a period immediately subsequent to the apostolical, ἐπι της πρωτης των αποστολων γενομενος διαδοχης, as Eusebius informs us, speaking of Domitian, observed, that he too, dreaded the coming of Christ, *as well as Herod*; εφοβειτο γαρ την παρουσιαν τς Χριστς, ως και Ἡρωδης:† upon which reference of Hegesippus, it will be only necessary to give the opinion of *Lardner*. “This passage,” says that

\* Ibid. § 16. This indeed is the only extract which Epiphanius has in common with any other Father, and the difference we perceive is remarkable.

† Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. chap. 19. § 20.



discriminating writer, “deserves to be remarked. It contains a reference to the history in the *second chapter* of St. Matthew, and shews plainly, that this part of St. Matthew’s Gospel was owned by this Hebrew Christian.”\*

I should likewise add, that, although I have considered the document so often quoted, in order to preserve the thread of the Unitarian argument without interruption, as principally fabricated from the Gospel of St. Matthew, because such seem certainly to have been the sentiments of the early writers, I am far from admitting this point as clearly proved. The Fathers appear to have so considered it from the circumstance of its being the only Hebrew Gospel with which they were at all acquainted, combined with their persuasion, that St. Matthew himself wrote in that language. It is nevertheless evident from the fragments of it still extant, that in many respects it is not only very different from the Greek of St. Matthew, but often closely copied from the other Gospels. In the extracts given by Epiphanius it bears a strong resemblance to St. Luke.† Dr. Marsh perhaps would say, that this only proves the author of the Gospel in question to have borrowed from the same source as St. Luke. But whether this reasoning

\* Credibility of the Gospel Hist. part ii. vol. i. p. 317.

† The following parallel passages occur in St. Luke, and not in St. Matthew; *Ἐγενετο τις ανηρ ονοματι Ιησους, και αυτος ως ετων τριακοντα εισηλθεν εις την οικιαν Σιμωνος.* Jones on the Canon, vol. i. part ii. chap. 25. §. 11. *Και αυτος ην ο Ιησους ὡσει ετων τριακοντα,* Luke iii. 23. *Εισηλθεν εις την οικιαν Σιμωνος,* Luke iv. 38. *Σιμωνα τον Ζηλωτην,* *ibid.* *Σιμωνα τον καλουμενον Ζηλωτην,* Luke iv. 15. *Ἐγενετο εν ταις ἡμεραις Ἡρωδς τε βασιλεως της Ιουδαιας,* *ibid.* *Ἐγενετο εν ταις ἡμεραις Ἡρωδς τε βασιλεως της Ιεδαιας,* Luke i. 5. *Βαπτισμα μετανοιας,* *ibid.* *Βαπτισμα μετανοιας,* Luke iii. 3. The same expression is also found in Mark i. 4. The parentage of John the Baptist is likewise given, which no one of the Evangelists records, except St. Luke. *Συ μς ει ο υιος ο αγαπητος, εν σοι ηυδοχησα,* *ibid.* *Συ ει ο υιος*

be correct, or not, it is sufficient for my purpose simply to note the fact, that in the extracts made by Epiphanius a verbal resemblance to St. Luke is in several instances strikingly visible.

Upon the whole therefore I have rendered it, I trust, more than probable that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, whatsoever might have been its pristine state, if indeed it ever laid claim to apostolical purity, cannot, in the state in which it is known to us, be correctly considered as the unadulterated original of St. Matthew. And of this perhaps our new Translators themselves feel a little conscious; otherwise they would scarcely have been satisfied with pointing out certain passages for rejection, without suggesting also certain additions, unless indeed they apprehended (which I rather suspect to have been the case) that the absurdity evident in some of these would have shaken the credit of their whole argument.

με ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ἠυδοκῆσα, Luke iii. 22. In St. Matthew the words are, Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ ἠυδοκῆσα, chap. iii. 17. Ἐγὼ σημερον γεγεννηχα σε. It is singular that these words did not occur in the text of St. Luke, but were nevertheless read in the following MSS. and Fathers, &c., referred to by Griesbach, “D. Cant. veron. verc. colb. corb\*. Clem. Method. Hilar. Lactant. Jur. Faustus manich. ap. Aug. Codd. ap. Aug. qui tamen monet in *antiquioribus* græcis hæc non inveniri.” Μη ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθυμῆσα κρεας τῆστο το πασχα φαγειν μεθ’ ὑμῶν; Epiph. Hæres. 30. §. 22. Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθυμῆσα τῆστο το πασχα φαγειν μεθ’ ὑμῶν. Luke xxii. 15. Here, if Epiphanius is to be credited in his extract, is a manifest perversion of our Saviour’s meaning, at war with the context, by giving an *interrogative* turn to the sentence, in order to sanction the Ebionite principle of abstaining from animal food. Is it possible after this to contemplate the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as represented to us by Epiphanius in any other light than as a garbled and spurious production? Nor indeed, do the quotations of it, preserved by Origen and Jerome, place it in a more respectable point of view.

### CHAP. III.

#### *Authenticity of the two first Chapters of St. Luke.*

---

I HAVE not interfered in the former instance, nor do I mean to interfere in this, with the *conjectural* ground for the rejection of Scripture advanced by the Translators of this Version, because arguments similar to those which are used by them have been already often adduced, and as often refuted ; because in some instances the most satisfactory answers are given by the very authors, to whom they refer for support ; and because, above all, I am fully persuaded that the slippery system itself of conjectural criticism rests on no solid foundation. But where a sort of authority is appealed to, I shall consider its validity.

The translators say ; “ The two first chapters of this Gospel were wanting in the copies used by Marcion, a reputed heretic of the second century ; who, though he is represented by his adversaries as holding some extravagant opinions, was a man of learning and integrity, for any thing that appears to the contrary. He, like some moderns, rejected all the Evangelical histories excepting Luke, of which he contended that his own was a correct and authentic copy.”

I shall not undertake to discuss the collateral question respecting the learning and integrity of Marcion ; because it is perhaps of little importance in itself, and because we have no sure data from which we can form an impartial decision upon the subject. For the *odium theologicum* in the breasts of his adversaries, great allowance, I am aware, is to be made : but I must enter my unqualified protest



against the Unitarian mode of constantly interpreting the Orthodox representation of an heretical character by the rule of contraries ; of uniformly reading for vice, virtue ; for folly, talent ; and for want of principle, integrity. But as the Authors of this Version seem disposed to sacrifice the universal persuasion of antiquity, upon the subject of St. Luke's text, to the particular opinion of Marcion, let us examine a little the nature and extent of his testimony. We are told, that the two first chapters were wanting in the copies used by him ; and yet the four first verses are retained as indisputably genuine. How is this contradiction to be reconciled ? Certainly some explanation of it should have been given. Were the four first verses retained simply for the convenience of an additional argument, in order to identify beyond dispute the writer of this Gospel with the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, and so to deduce from that circumstance the following ingenious display of criticism ? "The Evangelist," it is observed, "in his preface to the Acts of the Apostles, reminds his friend Theophilus, Acts i. 1. that this former history contained an account of the public ministry of Jesus, but makes no allusion to the remarkable incidents contained in the two first chapters, which *therefore* probably were not written by him ;" as if, when an author refers to a former production, simply to point out its connexion with the one which he is composing, he must always be supposed distinctly to enumerate every subject contained in it. Should this be the only reason for esteeming the four verses in question genuine, our new Translators surely treat their favourite Marcion, whose single authority they have to plead for rejecting the remainder of these chapters, very unceremoniously and contemptuously, because he expressly considered them also as spurious. As they appear not to have investigated very accurately the testimony upon which they rely, I shall point out to them what it really was, and will take my proofs from a work with which they are



is not all. *Lardner* contends, that not a single passage of St. Luke, with the exception of the words, “*In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar,*” from the *first* verse of the *first* chapter, down to the *thirteenth* verse of the *fourth* chapter inclusive, was to be found in the Gospel of Marcion. His argument is principally grounded upon the following extract from Tertullian : “*Anno quinto decimo principatus Tiberiani proponit Deum descendisse in civitatem Galileæ Capernaum ;*” *Contra Marc. lib. iv. §. 7.* which he considers as given by Tertullian for the commencement of Marcion’s Gospel, and which he thus translates : “*In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, God descended into Capernaum, a city of Galilee.*” Now as we are assured by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, that Marcion believed Jesus to be a celestial Being, or real divinity, sent from the supreme God, who was superior to the Creator of the world ; and as we read, Luke iv. 31. that Jesus “*went down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee ;*” these circumstances alone, without any additional reasoning, seem almost indisputably to prove, that the *thirty-first* verse of the *fourth* chapter, with the simple date of the period prefixed, was the precise commencement of this Gospel, as pointed out by Tertullian.\*

Independently of this complete abscission, Epiphanius gives at large a variety of other omissions, and of interpolations, which he dwells upon minutely.

If then our new Translators conceive the whole of Mar-

Marcion’s rejection of the Genealogy, *και την γενεαλογιαν περικοψας* &c. *Lardner, ibid. p. 250:*

\* Marcion, it is obvious, could not, consistently with his principles, have acknowledged the *Baptism* and *Genealogy*: neither, for the same reason, could he have admitted the *Temptation*, and the *Discourses in the Synagogue*, contained in the fourth chapter, as both occurrences are connected with allusions to the Old Testament; and we shall presently see how free he made with these.



cion's evidence to be valuable, why do they adopt one part and neglect the other? Why do they not likewise fairly tell us to what extent we must proceed, if we regulate our Canon of Scripture by his rule? There is no doubt of his having disavowed every Gospel but his own, of his having received no other part of the New Testament except certain Epistles of St. Paul garbled, and of his having rejected altogether the writings of the Old Testament.\* Hence surely some little perplexity must arise, when we attempt to reconcile the canon of the Marcionites and the Ebionites, (whose assistance in purifying the Gospel of St. Matthew must not be forgotten,) without sacrificing the credit of either. The Ebionites rejected only a part of the Old Testament, retaining the greatest portion of the Pentateuch at least: the Marcionites rejected the whole. The Marcionites received almost all St. Paul's Epistles; the Ebionites held that Apostle and his writings in abhorrence. Both indeed agreed in repudiating every Gospel except their own; but unfortunately their respective Gospels were widely different from each other. Reduced to this lamentable dilemma, can we act with greater wisdom than to abandon both Ebionites and Marcionites; to prefer simplicity to fraud, and consistency to contradiction?

But, waving every other consideration, let us examine a little some of the internal pretensions of Marcion's Gospel to legitimacy. Among the extravagant opinions imputed to him, were the following: that the Creator of the *invisible* world was a Deity distinct from, and superior to, the Creator of the visible world; the former being goodness itself, the latter good and evil; the latter God of the Old, the former the God of the New Testament: the Jesus was the Son of the Supreme Deity, assuming that appearance of manhood when he first descended from heaven, and was seen in Capernaum, a city of Galilee;

\* Lardner, *Ibid.*

and that a principle part of his mission was to destroy the Law and the Prophets, or the revelation of that inferior God, who created only the visible world. Hence Marcion found it convenient to get rid of every allusion to our Saviour's nativity, because he objected to believe that Jesus was *man*, certainly not upon the Unitarian principle, of objecting to believe that he was *more* than man; and thus we find his Gospel commencing precisely where we might have expected it to commence.

A favourite text with the Marcionites was, Luke viii. 21. in which our Saviour says, "My mother and my brethren are those who hear the Word of God, and do it;" because they considered it as proving that Christ, owned no mortal consanguinity: but the 19th verse stood directly in their way, "Then came to him *his mother and his brethren*, and could not come at him for the press;" the words therefore, *his mother and his brethren*, they expunged. If it be said, might not the same words have been wanting in the genuine copies of St. Luke? the answer is obvious: they certainly might have been; but what proof is there that they were? Are they omitted in any of the three hundred and fifty-five manuscripts which have been collated, or in any of the versions? Not in one. And do they not seem necessary to the connexion of the subsequent verse, in which it is observed, "And it was told him by certain, which said, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee?" Besides, we perceive these very expressions in the genuine Gospel of St. Matthew, (c. xii. 46.) where the same transaction is recorded. Could they have been inserted there by the hand of some wicked Ebionite? This however the Unitarians cannot consistently allow; because, in their judgment, the Ebionites were no interpolators. Must we not then conclude, when, as in this instance, an omission is pleaded in the Gospel which occurs not in another, which also destroys the connexion of the context, and which the

party defending it has an interest in supporting, that the theological pruning-hook has been indisputably at work ?

Again : our Saviour addresses his heavenly Father as "Lord of Heaven and Earth," Luke x. 11; an appellation which completely militated against the creed of Marcion, who distinguished between the Lord *of heaven*, (that is, the heaven of heavens,) or the Lord of the *invisible* world, and the Lord of *the earth*, or the Lord of the *terrestrial and visible* world. We therefore find, that in his Gospel the latter part of the appellation was suppressed, our Saviour being introduced as only using the terms, "Lord of heaven." But since precisely the same expressions, "Lord of heaven *and earth*," are read in St. Matthew, (c. xi. 25.) and since Marcion, as we have seen, had private reasons for the omission, we cannot surely hesitate in determining which is the genuine text.

The greatest liberty however seems to have been taken with those passages which tend to confirm the authority of the Old Testament. Hence were omitted, in the eleventh chapter of St. Luke, the verses 30, 31, and 32, which alluded to Jonah, to the Queen of the South, to Solomon and to Nineveh ; and the verses 49, 50, 51, which speak of the blood of the prophets, and of Able and Zacharias : in the nineteenth chapter, the verses 45, 46, in which our Saviour expels the money-changers from the Temple : in the twentieth chapter, the verses 17, 18, in which occurs a quotation from the Psalms ; and the verses 37, 38, where an allusion is made to the divine vision exhibited in the bush to Moses : in the twenty-first chapter, the verses 21, 22, which recognize a prophecy of Daniel : and in the twenty-second chapter, the verses 35, 36, and 37, in the last of which a prophecy of Isaiah is represented as about to be accomplished. Now every one of these texts, omitted, by Marcion, are to be found in the corresponding passages *both of St. Matthew and of St. Mark*, except the two first and the last, the former of which however



are in St. Matthew, and the latter is in St. Mark. And it should be observed, that these are\* the principle texts of St. Luke, in which the Old Testament is quoted with distinct approbation: There are indeed two passages of this description, which were not erased; viz. Luke xiii. 28. and Luke xxiv. 25. but these were ingeniously accommodated to the doctrine of the Marcionites. In the first it is said, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." Here, instead of "when ye shall see *Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob and the prophets,* in the kingdom of God." Marcion read, "when ye shall see *all the just* in the kingdom of God." In the second passage, our Sa-

\* Perhaps if to those, which are mentioned above, we add Luke xviii. 31, 32, 33, we may say all; and these likewise were omitted by Marcion, as the first of them asserted, that "All things which are written *by the Prophets* concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished." Indeed a similar declaration is made, Luke xxiv. 44, 45, 46; but I very much doubt whether Marcion's Gospel had any thing in common with St. Luke after the preceding verse, for the following reasons: Epiphanius states, that it was *defective* at the *end* as well as at the beginning, Hæres. 42. §. 11; and that he had proceeded regularly to the *end* in his refutations of every part in which Marcion had absurdly retained any expression of our Saviour hostile to his own doctrine: ἔτις ἕως τέλος διεξήλθον, ἐν οἷς φαίνεται ἡλιθίως καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐπιταυτας τὰς παραμεινάσας τοῦ τε Σωτηροῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέξεις φυλατῶν. §. 10. Now the last notice of this kind which he takes is contained in the 39th verse, the subject of which is concluded at the 43d verse. The result is obvious. Besides, it should not be forgotten, that in a former passage he had absolutely erased a declaration of the same nature, not indeed so fully expressed as this. Epiphanius, it is true, is in general sufficiently inaccurate; but if any dependence can be placed upon his statements, it is in the case of Marcion's Gospel and Apostolicon, which he professes to have read, and from which, for the object of refutation, he made, he says, numerous extracts.

viour thus addresses two of his disciples after his resurrection, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all *that the prophets have spoken.*" This he changed into "Slow of heart to believe all *that I have spoken to you.*"\*

When therefore these several circumstances are duly considered ; when we perceive so many omissions, and such striking deviations in Marcion's Gospel, all pointing one way, all tending to the support of his own peculiar system ; and when also we discover parallel passages in the genuine Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, sometimes in one, and sometimes in both of them, where the disputed expressions appear ; must it not argue an infantine credulity almost beyond example, a credulity, which no reflection can correct, no experience cure, to conceive it probable, that the text of Marcion was the unadulterated text of St. Luke ? What possible chance could have produced so great a variety of readings, and that at so early a period, all meeting in a common centre ? A result so uniform never surely could have been effected by a simple combination of contingencies, but must have been fraudulently secured by the loaded die "of a systematical theology." If the opinion of Lardner on this point be important, whose History of Heretics must be allowed to be sufficiently favourable to heresy, that also will be found adverse to the Unitarian argument. "Upon an impartial review," he observes, "of these alterations, some appear to be trifling, others might arise from the various readings of different copies : but many of them are undoubtedly *designed perversions*, intended to countenance, or at least not directly contradict,

\* It may be added, that in all the instances adduced, the Peshito, or old Syriac Version, is strictly conformable with our received Gospels, and directly against Marcion's ; an argument which may perhaps be of some weight with those who justly admit that Version "to be of the *most remote antiquity* and of the *highest authority.*" Introduction to the New Translation, p. 15.

those *absurd principles* which he and his followers espoused.”\* But Le Clerc is more harsh in his censure; and hesitates not to term those absolutely mad, by whom the defalcation of the corrupted Gospel of Marcion are approved.†

Indeed the Translators of the New Version themselves, whatsoever convenience they may find in depriving of canonical authority the commencement of St. Luke’s Gospel, because it was not to be found in “the copies of Marcion,” do not always pay a similar regard to the same precious relicks of reputed heresy. It will not perhaps be denied, that the Scriptures of Marcion must be, in all respects, of equal validity; that the credit of his *Αποστολικον* must vie with that of his *Ευαγγελιον*, and that both must stand or fall together. Yet we find that in Galat. i. 1, where St. Paul calls himself an Apostle, not for men nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead,” Marcion omitted the words *God the Father*, in order, as Jerome observes, to point out that Christ raised himself up by *his own* power; Omittebat Marcion, *Και Θεοπατρος* in ejus *Αποστολικω* volens exponere Christum, non a Deo patre, sed per semet ipsum suscitatum.” Hieron. in Galat. i. 1.‡ But we do not find that these words are omitted, or even marked by italics, in the New Version: on the contrary, an argument is founded upon them in the notes, to prove that here Jesus Christ is distinguished from God, to whom he was subordinate, and by whose power, and not his own, he was raised from the dead.” Were

\* History of Heretics, p. 261.

† Docebat Marcion Christum venisse, ut opera Creatoris dissolveret. At de Christo nihil norat, nisi quod ex Novo Testamento acceperat, unde contrarium plane liquet; nisi quæcumque Marcionis sententiæ adversantur, quæ innumera sunt, insana licentia resecentur; quod nemo, *sui compos*, probaverit. Hist. Ecclesiastica, p. 649.

‡ Lardner’s History of Heretics, p. 266.



the Translators aware of this circumstance? They could not have been well ignorant of it, as Griesbach, whose text they profess to follow, distinctly refers to it in a note. But they may have been negligent. Supposing this then to have been the case, let us proceed to another reading in the Apostolicon, which they certainly did not overlook, viz. 1 Cor. xv. 47, because they expressly remark, that “Marcion is accused by Tertullian of inserting here the word *κυριος*.” Our common reading runs thus: “The second man is the Lord from heaven;” ὁ δευτερος ανθρωπος ὁ κυριος ἐξ ορανω. This *he* read, “the second is *the* Lord from heaven;” ὁ δευτερος ὁ κυριος ἐξ ορανω: but *they* read, “the second *man* will be from heaven.” Thus in the very teeth of his authority, they admit the word ανθρωπος, which he rejected, and reject the word κυριος, which he admitted; and even presume to found an argument for the rejection of the latter expression upon the circumstance of *his* having admitted, or, as they say, inserted it. Where is the consistency of all this? Nor does their dereliction of professed principle terminate here. They modestly observe in their Introduction, “If this Version of the Christian Scriptures possesses any merit, it is that of being translated from the most correct text of the original which has hitherto been published,” p. 8. Yet in the present instance, and this is not the only one of the kind,\* they

\* Another occurs 1 Cor. x. 9, where Marcion, Griesbach, and the received Text, all read, “Let us not tempt *Christ*,” which they change into, “Nor let us try (tempt) *the Lord*.” It is true they take no notice of Marcion, but they seem to express their surprise that the word *Christ* “is retained by Griesbach, even in his second edition.” They do not indeed any where represent Griesbach’s text as absolutely perfect, yet they consider it as perfect as the *present* state of criticism will admit; for they say, “The Editors of this work offer it to the public as exhibiting to the English reader a text not indeed *absolutely perfect*, but approaching as nearly to the Apostolical and Evangelical originals, as the *present* state of sacred criticism will admit; nor do they hold it up as a faultless translation, &c.” Introd. p. 30.

venture to discard “the most correct text of the original which has hitherto been published,” the text of Griesbach, that identical text, in which, as in one of the highest credit, they professed implicitly to confide; thus coolly throwing over-board the very pilot, to whose boasted guidance, in their passage through the perilous deeps of manuscript criticism, their inexperienced bark was avowedly committed.

But after all, what certain proof exists that the Marcionites themselves considered their Gospel as the composition of St. Luke? If the assertion of the new Translators be received, no doubt can be entertained upon the subject, because they advance this unqualified affirmation: “Marcion, like some moderns,” (meaning, it is presumed, the admirers of Evanson, for the sect of Unitarianism is itself intersected,) “rejected all the Evangelical histories except St. Luke, of which he contended, that his own *was a correct and authentic copy.*” Instead, however, of pressing them with opposite authority myself, I shall simply confront their statement with the very different one of a critic, to whom both parties are disposed to listen with much deference; the “learned and acute” Annotator of Michaelis. “It has been very generally believed,” says Dr. Marsh, “on the authority of Tertullian and Epiphanius, that Marcion wilfully corrupted the Gospel of St. Luke. Now it is true, that the long catalogue of Marcion’s quotations, which Epiphanius has preserved in his forty-second Heresy, exhibits readings which materially differ from those of the corresponding passages in St. Luke’s Gospel; consequently, *if* Marcion really derived those quotations from a copy of St. Luke’s Gospel, that copy must have contained a text which in many places materially differed from our genuine text, though the question will still remain undecided, whether the alternations were made by Marcion himself, or whether he used a manuscript, in which they had been already made. But that Marcion used St. Luke’s

Gospel at all, is a position which has been taken for granted, *without the least proof*. Marcion himself never pretended that it was the Gospel of St. Luke, as Tertullian acknowledges; saying, ‘*Marcion Evangelio suo nullum ascribit autorem,*’ Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. c. 2. It is probable therefore that he used some *apocryphal* Gospel, which had much matter in common with that of St. Luke, but yet was not the same. On this subject see Griesbach, *Historia Textus Epistolarum Paulinarum*, p. 91, 92, and Loeffler’s dissertation entitled, ‘*Marcionem Pauli Epistolas et Lucæ Evangelium adulterasse dubitatur,*’ which is printed in the first volume of the *Commentationes Theologicæ*”\*

As the opinions of Griesbach, to whom a reference is made, deservedly rank high in the estimation, not only of the world in general, but the Uuitarrians in particular, it may be proper to remark, that the argument of the German critic, in the passage above pointed out, tends to prove the impropriety of denominating Marcion a corrupter of St. Luke’s text, because he never represented his Gospel as written by that Apostle. The result, however, drawn by Griesbach himself from this position being different from that of Dr. Marsh, I shall give it in his own language: “*Hoc Marcioni propositum fuisse videtur, ut ex Evangelistarum, atque præsertim è Lucæ commentariis concinnaret succinctam de munere, quo Christus publicè functus erat, atque de ultimis fatis ejus narrationem, ita adornatam,*

\* Marsh’s *Michælis*, vol. iii. part ii. p. 160. Dr. Marsh might have added a passage or two from Epiphanius, indirectly at least bearing on the same point. Instead of asserting that the Marcionites represented their Gospel as that of St. Luke, Epiphanius only says, that they used a Gospel which *resembled* that of St. Luke *μονω δε κεχρηται τστω τω χαρακτηρι τω κατα Λεσκαν Ευαγγελιω*, § 9, and that they themselves simply called it *the Gospel το παρ’ αυτων λεγομενον Ευαγγελιον*, § 10.



ut inserviret illorum hominum usibus, qui quantum possunt longissimè a Judaismo discedere, canique, ob causam, neglectis Vet. Test. libris, solis discipulorum Christi scriptis uti vellent, et hæc è philosophiæ suæ legibus interpretarentur. Talibus itaque lectoribus cum Evangelium *suum* destinaret, *collegit ex Evangelistarum scriptis* ea, quæ huic hominum generi grata esse sciret, *omissis omnibus, quæ lectoribus suis displicere potuissent.*"\*

Upon the whole then, taking a retrospective view of what has been advanced upon both topics, will Unitarian candour act unworthy of itself, if, instead of rejecting any part of St. Matthew's Gospel, upon the credit of the Ebionites, or any part of St. Luke's Gospel upon the credit of the Marcionites, it be disposed to give a due weight to that text, the authority of which no biblical critic of eminence has ever yet attempted to shake, if it put the concurrent testimony of antiquity, supported by the accu-

\* Perhaps the reader may not think me too minute if I subjoin the sentiments of another highly esteemed writer upon the same subject, the accurate and laborious Tillemont. It is this; Pour le Nouveau Testament, des quatre Evangiles il recevoit seulement une partie de celui de S. Luc, qu'il n'attribuoit néanmoins ni a S. Luc, in a aucun autre des Apotres ou des, disciples, ni a quelque personne que ce, fust. Dans la suite ses sectateurs l'attribuerent a *Jesus-Christ* mesme, disant néanmoins que S. Paul y avoit ajoute quelque chose comme l'histoire de la passion. Ils le changeoient tous les jours selon qu'ils estoient pressez par les Catholiques, en retranchant et y ajoutant ce qu'il leur plaisoit. Ils en ostioient sur tout les passages, qui y sont citez de l'ancien Testament, et ceux ou le Sauveur reconnoist le Createur pour son pere. Histoire Eccles. vol. ii. p. 123. ed. 1732. It is curious to remark the different conclusions deduced by three respectable critics from the same premises. Tillemont conceives, that Marcion made his selections from the genuine Gospel of St. Luke; Dr. Marsh, not from the genuine, but from some apocryphal Gospel of the same Evangelist; and Griesbach, from St. Luke, St. Matthew, and St. Mark indiscriminately. All however coincide in the position, that Marcion did not assert his Evangelion to be "a correct and authentic copy of St. Luke."

rate collation of Manuscripts, Fathers, and Versions, into one scale, and throwing the spurious Gospel of Ebion, and the more spurious Gospel of Marcion, into the other, behold them ignominiously kick the beam ?

---

#### CHAP. IV.

##### *Intermediate State between death and the Resurrection. Authenticity of Luke xxiii 43.*

As the Authors of this Version are manifestly disciples of those fond philosophers who descry, or fancy that they descry, in the page of Scripture the characteristical hues of their own ephemeral systems, so also do they appear to be of that peculiar sect which maintains, that human souls are material, that they are composed of a genuine corporeal substance, although of one so refined and subtle, that thousands of them, as it is quaintly but forcibly expressed by a Platonical writer\* of the seventeenth century,

\* Dr. Henry More, in his *Divine Dialogues* :—

“*Hyl.* Is it not incredible, Philotheus, if not impossible, that some thousands of spirits may dance or march on a needle’s point at once?

“*Cuph.* I, and that booted and spurred too.” Vol. i. p. 90.

Having alluded to the *Dialogues* of this eccentric but amiable writer, whose talents as a metaphysician, philosopher, and divine were doubtless highly respectable, but whose imagination too frequently outran his judgment, I cannot avoid digressing a moment from my subject to notice, that from a passage in the same work, viz. the story of *the Eremite* and *the Angel*, related, p. 321—327, the celebrated “*Hermit*” of Parnell was evidently borrowed, not merely in the general circumstances of the narrative, with some slight deviations indeed, but sometimes in its very turn of expression ; a production which I have heard the late Mr. Burke pronounce to be, “*a Poem without a fault.*”

“can dance booted and spurred upon a needle’s point.” But whatsoever may be the creed of these Translators upon the particular doctrine of materialism, it is certain that they contend for the extinction of the soul with the body, and for the revivification of both together at the day of judgment. This opinion they clearly assert in a note upon Phil. i. 21. “For as concerning me, (rather a singular translation of *μοι γαρ*,) to live is Christ, and to die is gain” where they maintain, that the Apostle does not “express an expectation of an intermediate state between death and the resurrection,” but simply represents “a *quiet rest* in the grave, during that period, as preferable to a life of suffering and persecution.”

But it is not my present object to oppose their theological system, to pursue them from one labyrinth of Unitarian exposition to another through all the intricate mazes of metaphysical refinement; yet I cannot help reminding them, that one text at least in another Epistle of St. Paul, seems to make directly against their position, required a little explanation. It is this; “We are derirous rather to be *absent from the body* and to be *present with the Lord*,” 2 Cor. v. 8; a declaration which to common minds appears to imply, that the “*presence with the Lord*” here spokēn of. must mean a presence *during the period of absence from the body*, a period immediately commencing with death, after the same manner as it was stated in the preceding verse, while we are *present* in the body, we are *absent* from the Lord.” This passage nevertheless is suffered to pass without a comment.

While, however, they here abstain from all explanatory remark, on another occasion they contrive to preclude the necessity of it altogether. The Sadducees are said to believe, “that there is no resurrection, nor angel, nor spirit, *μητε πνευμα*, Acts xxiii. 8.” Now the conjunction *μητε*, nor, they have chosen to translate *or*; “the Sadducees say, that there is no resurrection, nor angel, *or* spirit,” in



order to convey the idea of the word *spirit* being synonymous with that of *angel*, instead of being intentionally distinguished from it. It is perhaps a singular coincidence that the same translation should occur in an anonymous version of the New Testament, published at an early period in the preceding century by some person or persons well versed in the art of what the majority then denominated, and are still disposed to denominate, the art of unchristianizing the records of Christianity. I shall transcribe the animadversion made upon it at the time by the acute Twells, who volunteered on this, as on other occasions, the unpleasant duty of exposing ignorance and detecting subterfuge. "St. Luke says," observes that discriminating writer, "the Sadducees affirm, that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit. Gr. Μηδε αγγελον μητε πνευμα, i.e. they denied the existence of angels and also of souls separate from the body, that is, *spirits*. In all which they are represented to err. But the Translator has a device to keep his reader from seeing that the denial of spirits is one of the errors of *Sadducism*, by mistranslating μητε *or* instead of *nor*. *The Sadducees*, says he, *maintain there is neither resurrection, nor angel, or spirit*. So that according to him, *spirit* was but another name for *angel*."\*

Neither is this the only passage upon the point under consideration, in which both the Versions alluded to ac-

\* "Critical Examination of the late new Text and Version of the New Testament," Ed. 1731, p. 134. But why all this contrivance to expunge from Scripture a belief in the existence of disembodied spirits, when our Saviour himself expressly asserts it? For when his Apostles were terrified at his appearance after his resurrection, "and supposed that they had seen a *spirit*," he said to them, "*A spirit has not flesh and bones*, as ye see me "have," Luke xxiv. 29. Are the Unitarians bold enough to insinuate, that the Apostles only proved themselves on this occasion to be fools, and that our Saviour answered them according to their folly?

cord.\* That of the former period renders εἰς ἄδης, Acts ii. 27, *in the grave*, “because thou wilt not leave my soul *in the grave*,” which is also adopted by this of the present day, with the addition of a still wider deviation from the established Version, in translating τὴν ψυχὴν μὲς *my soul*, by the pronoun *me*, “because thou wilt not leave *me* in the grave.” I indeed admit that ψυχή is often put by synecdoche for the whole person, as Matthew xii. 18, “my beloved in whom *my soul*, i. e. I am well pleased;” but so also is the English word *soul* in the very same text. But does it therefore follow, that neither the Greek nor the English word has any other appropriate meaning? Surely we must perceive, that not the whole, but a peculiar part of man is directly pointed out, when our Saviour says, “Fear not them who kill *the body*, but cannot kill *the soul*, τὴν ψυχὴν;” Matt. x. 16. I am also aware that Grotius, in Matt. x. 36, argues for a *reciprocal* sense of the substantive ψυχή, in conjunction with a pronoun, as a sort of familiar Syriasm; but the application of this rule in the instance alleged is successfully opposed by Vorstius,† nor are other examples of it in the New Testament referred to by either Author. Besides, were it generally admissible the grammatical connexion of the word in the disputed text would preclude its influence; for to say, “thou wilt not leave *myself* in the grave,” would be little better than nonsense, and a direct violation of common syntax. If it be observed, that the context will determine the sense; this is precisely the point for which I am contending: for I maintain, that ἄδης cannot be correctly translated *the grave*, but always means *the receptacle of departed souls*, and consequently that ψυχή can only signify that part of man to which such a receptacle is appropriated. In proof

\* Ibid. p. 133.

† De Ebraïsmis Nov. Test. p. i. p. 120. 122.

of what I assert, it will be sufficient perhaps simply to appeal to Schleusner, Art. ἀδης, and to Wetstein in Luc. vxi. 23, whose “numerous and invaluable notes,” as the Authors of the New Version themselves conceive, “supply an inexhaustible fund of theological and critical information.”\* Both support their opinion by respectable references. Wetstein observes generally, “Vox Græca ἀδης, cui respondet Hebræa שְׁאוֹל, et Latina inferorum, denotat *illum locum communem, in quem recipiuntur omnes hominum vita functorum animæ. Nunquam vero significat aut sepulchrum aut cælum.*” I rather suspect that these Authors had perused the note of Wetstein alluded to, because, in their translation of the very text upon which this comment is given, they render ἀδης *the unseen state.*” Be this however as it may, I shall, I trust, be excused if I prefer, in the instance before me, the opinion of such able critics and philologists as Schleusner and Wetstein, supported by numerous and respectable authorities, to that of a whole committee of Unitarian Translators, who either cannot or will not, on the other side, adduce any authority whatsoever.

But, on the controverted topic of an intermediate state between death and the resurrection, there exists a passage in St. Luke, which, without a little expository straining, or a disavowal of its legitimacy, seems completely at war with the Unitarian hypothesis. It is Luke xxiii. 43, “And Jesus said to him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.”† An attempt indeed was made, at a very early period, by some who disliked the doctrine which this text evidently contains, to get rid of the offensive position by a novel punctuation. Instead of putting the comma before the word σημερον *to-day*, they

\* Introduction p. 21.

† Wolfii Curæ Philologicæ, vol. i. p. 766, Koecheri Analecta, p. 382, and Hackspan in loc.



proposed to place it after it, and then to read, "Verily I say unto thee this day, Thou shalt be with me in Paradise;" a very bungling and unsatisfactory artifice. It was nevertheless at one period adopted by the Socinians, whose German translation of the New Testament was in the verse under consideration carefully thus pointed. But so manifest a dislocation of sense and language was not likely to prove long fashionable. We therefore find the New Translators pursuing a different and a bolder line of conduct. They in the first place endeavour to explain away its obvious meaning, by remarking, that, when Christ says to the penitent malefactor, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," he only meant, "in the state of the *virtuous dead*, who, though *in their graves*, are *alive to God*;" and also by referring to their comment upon Luke xx. 38, where we are told, that all *live to God*, because he "regards the *future* resurrection as if *it were present*." Will these refined reasoners however permit me to ask them, by what harsh epithet they would characterize the conduct of that man, who should announce to them a blessing of the first importance as actually to take place *on that very day*, which he at the same time knew would not happen *until a distant period*, under the despicable subterfuge, that there is no distinction of time with God, because "one day is with him as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day?" Really, with all their contempt for ancient and established opinion, they must have a strange conception indeed of the popular intellect, if they can persuade themselves, that this flimsy sort of new *sumpsimus* will ever supersede what they may scornfully contemplate as old *mumpsimus*.

Conscious perhaps of this circumstance, they then proceed a step farther, and boldly propose at once the rejection, of the verse altogether, having previously taken care to mark it in the text by italics, as one of doubtful authority. Their ground of suspicion is thus stated: "This

verse," they say, "was wanting in the copies of *Marcion*, and other reputed heretics, and in some of the older copies in the time of *Origen*; nor is it cited either by *Justin*, *Irenæus*, or *Tertullian*, though the two former have quoted almost every text in Luke which relates to the crucifixion, and *Tertullian* wrote concerning the intermediate state."

The first part of their argument, that "the verse was wanting in the copies of *Marcion*, and other reputed heretics, and in some of the older copies in the time of *Origen*," seems to have been borrowed from Griesbach, who, without attempting to dislodge the verse from the text, or in any way to mark it as suspicious, simply makes the following observation; "= (the sign of deficiency) *Marcion* ap. *Epiph*, *Manichæi* ap. *Chrys.* ap. *Orig.*"

Upon the illegitimacy of *Marcion's* Gospel I have already been sufficiently diffuse, as well as upon the inconsistency of those, who, in order to get rid of some offensive, or to support some favourite text, at one time admit, and at another discard, the authority of that spurious production at pleasure. It seems therefore only necessary to refer to what I have previously adduced upon this subject; at the same time however reminding them, that when they attempt to cut out what they may conceive to be the cancerous excrescences of Scripture, if they wish to prevent a self injury, they will find it wisdom to abstain from the double-edged knife of *Marcion*.

But it seems that the verse in question was also wanting in the copies of "other reputed heretics." What may be the exact preponderance of heretical authority against the uniform testimony of antiquity in their judgment, I cannot pretend to determine; it certainly seems considerable; and yet how is this compatible with the importance which they annex to the laborious collations of Manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers? While most men conceive, that, in proportion to the number of such attestations in fa-

vour of a particular reading, the greater appears to be the probability of its genuineness, will they adopt an inverse mode of calculation? Or will they contend, that a single grain of reputed heresy outweighs, in point of credit, a whole ton of orthodoxy? And who are the reputed heretics here alluded to? As they have not condescended to give their names, we are left to conjecture. The extract however from Griesbach will enable us perhaps to guess, that they mean *the Manichæans*: But what possible reason can be assigned for suppressing the name of these heretics? I cannot suppose that they had examined the authority of Griesbach; and, finding him inaccurate in his statement, yet still resolving to take the chance of heretical suspicion, preferred the uncertainty of a general allusion to the precision of a particular description of persons, by way of avoiding the probability of detection. They rather perhaps adopt the mode in question, because they apprehended that the very term *Manichæans*, to the credit of whose supposed copies an appeal must have been made, might have produced in the reader's mind an inconvenient association of ideas. That however which I do not ascribe to them, a distrust in the accuracy of Griesbach, I consider myself as a sufficient ground for rejecting this part of the testimony altogether.

To the exertions of that laborious critic biblical literature, I am fully convinced, is highly indebted; nor do I hesitate to join with them in denominating his edition of the New Testament a work "of unrivalled excellence and importance," and in regarding it as not the least of his merits, that he contrived "to compress a great mass of critical information into as narrow a compass as possible, in order to bring it within the reach of those, who could not afford either the time, the labour, or the expense, which would be necessary to collect it from those numerous and expensive volumes in which it was diffused." At the same time, however, I hold it requisite not to take too



much from any critic upon trust, particularly from one, whose great merit consists in *the compression* of more bulky materials. Compression, we know, necessarily includes some sort of omission, and omissions too often give rise to erroneous conceptions. Besides, may not the very compressor, by too hastily adopting a general conclusion, without sufficiently examining the particular premises, occasionally err himself, and consequently mislead others? This, I contend, is precisely the case with Griesbach, in the text under consideration. Griesbach in the short note given above, manifestly borrows from Wetstein, intending to give the same references as that critic, but to suppress the quotations themselves. Wetstein states, that this verse was wanting in Marcion's Gospel according to Epiphanius, and to Origen on John, p. 421. “—(Wetstein's sign of deficiency,) Marcion ap. Epiphanium, et Origenem in Joh. p. 421,” and quotes the passage from Origen. He then adds, without any sign prefixed, “Chrysostomus T. V. 7. Οἱ Μανιχαῖοι ἐπιλαθόμενοι τὰ τοιαῦτα φασίν, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος, ἀμὴν κ. τ. λ. ἔχεν ἀντιδόσις ἡδὴ γέγονε τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ περιστῆ ἡ ἀνάσασις.—εἰ γὰρ ἦν σώματων ἀνάσασις, ἔκ ἀν εἶπεν σημερον κ.τ.λ. ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς συντελείας ὅταν σώματων ἀνάσασις.” Whether Wetstein meant to affirm, that the Manichæans, according to Chrysostom, denied the validity of the text, or simply to remark that they particularly noted it, I will not pretend to determine. It seems certain, however, that Griesbach conceived him to have the former object in view, and therefore observed, that the verse was rejected by the Marcionites according to Epiphanius, *Manichæans according to Chrysostom*, without ever reading, or if he read, without understanding, the passage in Chrysostom, alluded, to: for, had he correctly understood it, he would have found the very reverse of what he states to have been the fact. As the correction of an error in Griesbach may be deemed a point of some importance, I shall give the whole extract in dispute, which seems to have been taken from the pro-

fessed writings of the Manichæans, in the words of Chrysostom himself: Οὗτοι (οἱ Μανιχαῖοι) τοῖνον ἐπιλαβόμενοι τοῦ χωρὶς τῆς φασίν· εἶπεν ὁ Χριστός, ἀμὴν λέγω σοί, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶσθι ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ· οὐκ οὖν ἀντιδοσίς· εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπέλαβεν ὁ ληστής τὰ ἀγαθὰ, τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέστη οὐδέπω, καὶ τῆμερον, οὐ εἶσι σωματῶν λοιπὸν ἀναστάσις· ἀρα ἐνοησατέ τὸ λέχθαι, ἢ δευτέρον αὐτὸ πάλιν εἶπεν ἀνάγκη; ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω σοί, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶσθι ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ· εἰσηλθὼν ἐν, φησὶν τὸν παραδείσον ὁ ληστής οὐ μετὰ τοῦ σώματος. πῶς γὰρ, ὅποτε ἐκ ἐταφῆ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ διελυθῆ, καὶ κόνις ἐγενετο; καὶ εὐδοκίᾳ εἰρητῆται, ὅτι ἀνέστησεν ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτον. εἰ δὲ εἰσηγάγε τὸν ληστήν, καὶ χωρὶς τῆς σαρκὸς ἀπηλευσε τῶν ἀγαθῶν, εὐδὴλον ὅτι σαρκὸς οὐκ εἶσι ἀναστάσις, εἰ γὰρ ἢν σαρκὸς ἀναστάσις ἐκ ἀν εἶπε· σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶσθι ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ καιρῷ συντελείας, ὅταν σαρκῶν ἀναστάσις ᾖ· εἰ δὲ ἤδη εἰσηγάγε τὸν ληστήν, τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτὸ φθάρειν ἐμείνειν ἐξω, εὐδὴλον ὅτι σαρκῶν ἀναστάσις ἐκ εἶσι. ταῦτα ἐκεῖνοι.\* Such then was the argument

\* Chrysostomi Opera, vol. iv. p. 680. Ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1721. Art. Sermo in Genesim. 7. The following is the translation of Montfaucon: “Iste locum hunc arripientes aiunt: *Dixit Christus*, ‘Amen amen, dico tibi, *hodie* mecum eris in paradiso.’ Igitur jani facta est bonorum retributio, et superflua erit resurrectio. Si enim illo die latro bona recepit, corpus autem ejus nondum ad hunc usque diem resurrexit, non erit deinceps corporum resurrectio. Numquid intellexistis, quod diximus, an vero iterum illud dici necesse est? ‘Amen, amen, dico tibi, *hodie* mecum eris in paradiso.’ Ingressus est igitur, inquit, in paradysum latro *non cum corpore*. Quo enim pacto cum sepultum non esset corpus ejus, neque dissolutum, et in cineres redactum? Neque dictum usquam fuit, resuscitatum illum a Christo fuisse. Quod si latronem introduxit, et absque corpore bonis potitus est, manifestum est corporis resurrectionem non esse. Nam si corporis esset resurrectio, non dixisset, ‘*Hodie* mecum eris in paradiso,’ sed *in tempore consummationi*, quando, resurrectio corporum erit. Quod si jam latronem introduxit, corpus autem ejus foris corruptum remansit, plane liquet corporum resurrectionem non esse. Atque hæc quidem illi.”

How widely these reputed heretics differed in opinion from the Unitarians! The Manichæans believe that the soul survived the body, and that the body died never to exist again. The Unitarians main-

of the Manichæans ; from which it appears, that, instead of rejecting this text, they highly appreciated it, and even grounded upon it a favourite doctrine, that there would be no resurrection *of the body*, but that, when we died, every thing material in our nature perished everlastingly. In further proof also that this sect acknowledged its legitimacy, I might refer to a passage in Augustin, in which Faustus the Manichæan is thus introduced expressly quoting it : “ Neque enim quia et latronem quendam de cruce liberavit idem noster Dominus, et, *ipso eodem die secum futurum dixit eum in paradiso patris sui*, quisquam invidet, aut inhumanus adeo esse potest, ut hoc ei displiceat tantæ benignitatis officium. Sed tamen non idcirco dicimus et latronum vitas ac mores nobis probabiles esse debere, quia Jesus latroni indulgentium dederit.”\*

It is evident therefore that Griesbach completely misrepresents the fact, when he asserts, that the Manichæans disowned the verse in question. Whether, glancing his eye cursorily over the partial quotation of Wetstein, and forgetting the tenets of the sect, he conceived that the Manichæans disclaimed the verse altogether, because it seemed inconsistent with the doctrine of a corporeal resurrection, or whether he spared himself the trouble of considering the quotation at all, is not very important. It is certain that he erred, drawing into the vortex of his error writers, who repose an implicit confidence in the accuracy of his statements.

But to proceed ; we are also told, that this verse was wanting “ in some *of the older copies* in the time of Origen.” Is not this however advancing one step, at least,

tain the reverse of both propositions. For an account of the distinction between paradise and heaven, see Wetstein’s note on this text.

\* Contra Faustum Manichæum, vol. iv. lib. xxxiii. p. 490. Ed. 1569.



further than the position of Griesbach, who only remarks, that *some persons* rejected it according to Origen, *Aliqui* apud Originem? Upon what ground then rests the assertion, not that *some persons* disowned it, but that it was wanting in some of the *older copies*, in the time of that Father? And does not Griesbach too go a little beyond his predecessor Wetstein, in representing the *aliqui*, the *some persons* alluded to by Origen, as distinct from the *Marcionites* spoken of by Epiphanius? The words of Wetstein are these: “—Marcion apud Epiphanium et Origenem in Joh. p. 421.” Surely the rejection here noted, upon the testimony of Epiphanius and Origen, is precisely one and the same; viz. that by Marcion, and not by two different sects. Nor is this all. As the new Translators misconceive Griesbach, and Griesbach misconceives Wetstein, so Wetstein also misconceives Origen, and makes for him a declaration which he never meant. The assertion of Origen, so strangely mistaken, is comprised in the following short extract from this Commentary on John, as given by Wetstein himself: Οὕτω δὲ εσταραξε τινας ὡς ασυμφωνον το ειρημενον, ὡσε τολμησαι αυτους ὑπονοησαι, προσεθηδαι τω Ευαγγελιω απο τινων ῥαδιουργων αυτο το, σημερον μετ’ εμξ εση εν τω παραδεισω τξ Θεξ.\* As the same passage is quoted by Lardner, I will subjoin his English translation, rather inelegant indeed, but sufficiently correct, “This saying has so disturbed some people, as appearing to them absurd, that they have *ventured to suspect* that it has been added by some that corrupt the Gospels: *To-day shalt thou be with me in the paradise of God.*”†

Now there is certainly nothing in Origen, either ante-

\* “Sic autem perturbavit hoc dictum nonnullos, ceu absonum, ut suspicari ausi fuerint hæc verba, *hodie mecum eris in paradiso Dei*, addita fuisse Evangelio ab aliquibus illud adulterantibus.” Opera, v. ii. p. 421. Ed. Huetii.

† Credibility, vol. iii. part ii. p. 375. Ed. 1738.

cedent or subsequent to this passage, from which it can be inferred, that he had the Marcionites in his eye. Nor does he say that any sect or sects whatsoever repudiated the verse in question ; but simply, that some persons were so *disturbed* at what appears to them its absurdity, that they dared (*τολμησαι*) to *suspect* it as an interpolation. Surely the distinction must be obvious between the position of *suspecting* and that of *avowing*, its illegitimacy ; so that Wetstein was clearly inaccurate, not only in fixing the allusion upon the Marcionites, but also in representing, as *a direct repudiation*, what was at most but *a daring suspicion*. To suspect a text which may be disliked, is certainly not new, either on the Heterodox or the Orthodox side of a question. To suspect it however is one thing, and to disclaim it another ; nor will the Unitarians, I presume, dispute the difference, when they recollect, that some Trinitarians have suspected the authenticity of the words, “ *neither the Son,*” in Mark xiii. 32, where it is said, “ Of that day and of that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son,* but the Father.” Can it be hence argued, that certain Trinitarians have rejected them ? And if it could, would even this be deemed a circumstance sufficiently important to be recorded in disparagement of their validity ? I rather think it would not ; because a much stronger evidence has indeed been adduced against them, which is not permitted to throw the slightest shade of doubt upon their authenticity. The Translators themselves remark, “ Ambrose *cites manuscripts which omit this clause,*\* and complains

\* The words of Ambrose are, “ *Veteres codices Græci non habent, quod nec filius scit. Sed non mirum, si et hoc falsarunt, qui Scripturas interpolavere divinas.*” De Fide, lib. v. c. 7. How are the *older copies*, the *veteres codices*, here expressly referred to by *Ambrose*, of such contemptible authority in comparison with the *older copies* supposed to be, but certainly not, referred to by *Origen*?

that it was introduced by the Arians. But all manuscripts and versions now extant retain it, and it is cited by early writers." It is by no means my intention to invalidate this favourite clause of the Unitarians; but I will venture to ask, upon what principle can it be consistently maintained, that the omission of this clause in some ancient Greek manuscripts of St. Mark's Gospel, alluded to by *Ambrose*, is not to be considered as at least of equal weight with the omission of the two first chapters of St. Matthew in the Gospel of the Ebionites, or of the two first chapters of St. Luke in the Gospel of the Marcionites, alluded to by *Epiphanius*; admitting that all manuscripts and versions now extant, as well as all citations of early writers, retain the respective passages in the contemplation of both?

On the whole, if Wetstein and Griesbach err in giving the sense of Origen, the Translators of the New Version deviate still more widely, when they represent him as stating the controverted verse to have been wanting in some of the older copies in his time. Had they consulted on the occasion an authority which they highly respect, that of Lardner, they would not have fallen into so gross a blunder, as they would have found his deduction from the same passage of Origen precisely opposite to their own. Lardner observes; "It may be concluded from what Origen says, that these words were *in all copies*; and that they who objected against them had *no copy* to allege in support of their *suspicion*, but only the absurdity of the thing itself in *their* opinion. For that is *all* that Origen mentions."\* Leaving them however to digest the position of Lardner, in flat contradiction to their own, as they can, I shall conclude this long discussion with a short remark upon the singularity, that such distinct results should be deduced from the same premises. The Translators of the New Version consider Origen as asserting, that the verse

\* Credibility, ut supra.



in dispute was wanting in some of the older copies in his time ; Griesbach, that some persons, (aliqui,) not the Marcionites, repudiated it ; and Wetstein, that it was repudiated by the Marcionites. Now it is remarkable, that in these respective statements each should differ from the other, and all materially from the very author, on whose sole testimony they rely. To what, except to the most culpable negligence, can we impute this strange perversity ?

I have been the more particular in my notice of this and the preceding point, not in order to create an invidious distrust of critics so justly distinguished as Wetstein and Griesbach, but to prove the necessity of carefully examining ourselves the authorities cited by them, before we presume privately to question, much more, publickly to arraign, the authenticity of any text whatsoever. And this necessity, I trust, has been sufficiently proved to those, whose only object is the simple investigation of truth.

Having endeavoured to demonstrate, that the first part of the Unitarian argument for the rejection of Luke xxiii. 43, rests on no solid foundation, I come now to consider the second part of it.

This verse then, we must observe, is to be found in *all the manuscripts* as well as *versions* extant, and is quoted by *Fathers innumerable* ; but it is not cited, it seems, by one or two early Fathers, and therefore doubts are to be entertained of its legitimacy. “It is not cited,” we are told, “by *Justin, Irenæus, or Tertullian*, though the *two former* have quoted almost every text in Luke which relates to the crucifixion, and Tertullian wrote concerning the intermediate state.”

Before I proceed to the particulars of these confident assertions, may I be permitted to ask, if the writers alluded to had really quoted the passage in dispute, whether that circumstance would have been admitted as conclusive upon the point of its authenticity ? The question, I con-

ceive, must be answered in the negative; for all three\* have distinctly quoted texts from the first and second chapters of St. Luke: yet we find that the Unitarians persist in marking for rejection those very portions of both Evangelists. They will not surely maintain, that the direct testimony of an early writer is to be considered as of no decisive weight in favour of the received text, although his silence may be constructed into sufficient evidence against it?

But I may be told, that they object not to admit the testimony of these writers upon points solely connected with the general received copies of St. Matthew and St. Luke, when it is uncontradicted in the first instance by the Gospel of the Ebionites, and in the second by that of the Marcionites; Gospels of higher reputation than the common copies, because of more remote antiquity. Shew us they may say, a text quoted by either of these writers, which is omitted in manuscripts of a more recent date, and is not discredited by the fragments above alluded to, and we will instantly acknowledge its validity. I might observe in reply, that the disputed chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, even upon the very ground of antiquity alledged, ought to be deemed genuine, because they are referred to by writers, who living in the *second* century, quoted from copies which must have been more ancient than the supposed copies of the Ebionites and of the Marcionites, from which Epiphanius quoted, who lived in the *fourth* century. But, to meet every possible objection,

\* Justin. in Dialog. cum Tryphone, Ed. Paris 1636. p. 303, 304; and in Apol. ii. p. 75; Irenæus, lib. iii, c. 18. Ed Grabe, p. 239, and lib iii. c. 11. p. 214; and Tertullian in Arg. adversus Judæos Ed. Rigalt. Paris 1664. p. 193, and De Carne Christi, p. 321. Nor are these the only places where the disputed chapters are referred to by the same writers.

I will bring forward an instance, in which only copies of the same precise nature are concerned.

In Luke xxii. verses 43, 44, are printed in italics as of dubious authority, and we are told in a note, that, “these verses are wanting in the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and other manuscripts.” (it should have been stated, in *three* other manuscripts of the same class with the Vatican, and neither of them of any higher antiquity than *the eleventh or twelfth centuries*,\*) “and are marked as doubtful in some in which they are inserted.” Now admitting all this in its fullest extent, still I apprehend it must follow, if they are clearly cited by writers who could only have been conversant with manuscripts which were long prior in date to the Vatican and Alexandrian, or indeed any others. And they are certainly cited both by Justin and Irenæus. That they were acknowledged by Justin, Irenæus, and many later fathers, Griesbach might have informed them,† had they been disposed to consider both sides of the evidence, although he would not have referred them to the particular passages. Justin remarks: *Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονευμασίν, ἃ φημι ὑπο τῶν ἀπο οἴων αὐτῆ καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖνοις παρὰ κολλεθησαντῶν συντεταχθῆναι, ἵτι ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρομβοὶ κατεχειτο αὐτῆ εὐχομένε καὶ λεγοντος, παρελθετω εἰ δυνατον, το ποτηριον τῆστο.* “*Nam in libris, qui sunt ab ejus discipulis, ipsorumque sectatoribus compositi, memoriæ mandatum est, sudorem ipsius tamquam guttas sanguinis defluxisse in terram,*

\* It should likewise have been added, that in the *first* of the three, the commencement of these verses, *ωφθη δε* is notwithstanding written by the same hand which originally transcribed the MS. the remainder being supplied by another and more recent hand in the margin; and that in the *second*, although the verses are evidently wanting here, they yet occur in another Gospel, viz. after Matthew xxvi. 39. See Griesbach.

† Agnoscent Justin, Hippol. Epiph. Chrys. Tit. bostr. Cæsarius, Iren. Hier.



eo deprecante et dicente, *Transeat, si fieri potest poculum hoc.*” Dial. cum Tryphone in Opera. p. 331. So also Irenæus :—*καὶ ἂν ἐδάκρυσεν ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαζάρου· καὶ ἂν ἰδρωσὲ θρομβῆς αἱματος* “—*nec lacrymasset super Lazarum nec sudasset globos sanguinis.*” Lib. iii. c. 32. p. 260. Since therefore the Gospel of Marcion is not recorded to have omitted these verses, and as they are expressly cited by such early writers as Justin and Irenæus, how is it that they are marked for excision upon the sole authority of manuscripts confessedly written at a later period ?

But to return to the principal text in controversy : we may surely admit that it is not quoted by Justin, Irenæus, or Tertullian, without at all impeaching its authenticity ; for if no texts are to be deemed genuine, upon which these Fathers are wholly silent, many of considerable importance in the judgment of different parties must be expunged from the canon of Scripture. Aware perhaps of this, the Translators attempt to assign a particular reason, why silence on this occasion is to be necessarily construed into ignorance. They say, that the omission is the more remarkable, because “*the two former* have quoted almost every text in Luke which relates to the crucifixion, and *Tertullian* wrote concerning the intermediate state.” But are these assertions true? The first most certainly is not : nor is the last in that sense in which alone it can bear upon the argument. Justin is so far from quoting every text in St. Luke which relates to the crucifixion, that from the whole of this twenty-third chapter, consisting of fifty-six verses upon the subject, I have been able to discover only *one* (the 46th)\* which is clearly cited by him. I allude of course to his genuine writings, and not to others incorrectly imputed to him ; for if the latter are to be brought forward, we shall find perhaps two more verses quot-

\* Dial. cum Tryphone in Oper. p. 333.

ed,\* but one of these will be *the very verse in question*. Irenæus also, it is remarkable, refers but once to the same chapter, and that is to the 13th verse.† As to Tertullian, he certainly wrote a distinct treatise upon the intermediate state, or rather, upon the subject of Paradise; for he himself thus expressly informs us; “Habes etiam de paradiso à nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini:”‡ but the Translators forget to add, (a little circumstance of some importance to the question,) that this treatise is not now extant. What therefore it might, or might not, have contained in the way of quotation, it must be as useless to conjecture, as it is absurd to urge.

The only general reflection which I shall make upon this singular tissue of strange misconceptions, and strange misrepresentations, is this; that, if their metaphysical arguments upon the nature of the human soul, and its sleep after death, be founded upon no better reasoning than that which is here exhibited to discredit a passage of Scripture countenancing an opposite doctrine, the philosopher must despise, and the critic deride them.

\* Viz. v. 34, and v. 43. Quæstiones et Respon. ad Orthod. in Operibus, p. 463, and p. 437.

† Lib. iii. c. 20. p. 247.

‡ Opera, p. 204.

## CHAP. V.

*Perplexing Anomalies in the Theory of articles.*

Hitherto I have considered the attempts of these Translators to get rid of particular passages of Scripture which cannot well be explained in conformity with their own Creed, by discarding them as unauthentic. I come now to notice another exercise of their ingenuity, by which, for similar theological purposes, they give to certain undisputed texts meanings directly the reverse of those which are usually affixed to them. With this view they render Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, John i. 1, “the Word was *a* God;” and ἑαυτοῦ Υἱὸν τῆς Θεοῦ ποιήσεν, John xix, 7, “made himself *a* Son of God;” contemplating the insertion of the English indefinite, as necessarily resulting from the omission of the Greek definite, Article. Their object, both here and in other instances of the same kind, clearly is to divest our Saviour of every claim to divinity which a peculiar title might be supposed to give him, and to represent him not as *God*, or as *the* Son of God emphatically, but as *a* God, or *a* Son of God metaphorically. The rule indeed, which they have thus adopted, is not properly their own; it was originally a fruit of Arian growth: but, not being suited to the general taste, it hung for a time mellowing and neglected. As the Unitarians however seem disposed, if possible, to establish its credit, let us examine a little its pretensions to public approbation.

If it be really the produce of sound criticism, and not of mere theological conceit, it must not only appear correct in one or two solitary instances, but prove of general approbation. Upon this principle let us try it.

In the last clause then of John i, 1, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος is ren-



dered, as I have observed, “the Word is *a* God,” because the article  $\delta$  is not annexed to  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ . But why do not the Translators, for the same reason, also render  $\epsilon\nu$   $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$   $\eta\nu$   $\delta$   $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ , in the first clause of the verse, “in *a* beginning,” that is, at some indefinite commencement, “was the Word,” instead of “in *the* beginning,” in conformity with the common translation? The true cause perhaps it is easy to conjecture. This would completely militate against the only sense in which they will allow the expression to be taken; the words “in *the* beginning” meaning, as they choose to say after Socinus, “from the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ.”

But, concealing the secret motive, they may urge in their defence, that the phrase “in *a* beginning” would be an obscure sort of expression, while the other, “*a* God,” is sufficiently intelligible. This is true: but it only serves to show, at the very outset, the general inapplicability of their favourite rule. That the phrase “*a* God” is sufficiently intelligible cannot indeed be disputed; yet may the rule itself be justly controverted, which uniformly supplies the absence of the Greek Article by the English indefinite Article. For if we proceed with a consistent translation of the same word  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , in the same chapter of St. John, we shall find it necessary either immediately to abandon the rule altogether, or to represent the Evangelist as establishing a plurality of Gods. When, for example, in v, 6, it is said, “there was a man sent from *God*,  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha$   $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ,” if we translate this “from *a* God;” when also in v, 13, the faithful are described as children of *God*,  $\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\alpha$   $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , if we translate this “children of *a* God;” and when in 5, 18, it is affirmed, that “no man has at any time seen *God*,  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$ ,” if we render this too “*a* God,” shall we not introduce the Evangelist as countenancing the opinion, that there are more Gods than one? To avoid so manifest an absurdity, as well as impiety, we here find the Unitarians

departing from their own principle, and translating Θεός, in all these instances, *God*, without an Article. Is not this a specimen of polemical legerdemain rather than of rational criticism, which conjures up a little convenient Article for a particular deception, and then instantly, in a subsequent display of skill, commands its absence?

To what subterfuge can they fly in order to escape the imputation of inferring a plurality of gods? *Α* is an article which evidently relates to number, as the French *un*. And thus perhaps they themselves intend it should be taken, when they put into the mouth of the Centurion the words, “Truly this was *a* son of *a* God;” Matt. xxvii. 54, because the Centurion may be supposed to have been an heathen. But how will they explain, consistently with the doctrine of the Divine Unity, the following declaration, which they ascribe to our Saviour; “God is not *a* God of the dead, but of the living?” Matt. xxii. 32. Were we correctly to express the proposition, that the Gentiles, and not the Jews, acknowledge the messiahship of our blessed Lord, instead of saying, that Christ is not *a* Christ, should we not rather say, that Christ is not *the* Christ of the Jews, but of the Gentiles? Or, to use a more familiar illustration, were we, when alluding to the hands in which the sovereignty of this kingdom is lodged, to describe an exalted individual, not as “the,” but as “*a* King of England,” would it not imply, that England is governed by more kings than one? It is impossible however for a moment to suppose, that they mean to insinuate a polytheism abhorrent from their creed, particularly when we reflect, that their creed uniformly rules the text, and not the text their creed.

Had they indeed pursued their own rule, as consistency required, in every instance, numerous absurdities would have arisen, against which common sense must have instantly revolted. I shall instance one out of many. Our Saviour says, in reply to the Tempter, “It is written;

Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceeded from *the* mouth of *God*, *δια στοματος Θεου,*" Matt. iv. 4. Now these words, upon the principle of supplying our Article *a*, whenever the Greek Article is omitted, should have been translated, "from *a* mouth of *a* God;" a phrase which would have implied, not only that there are more gods than one, but that every god has more mouths than one; and thus would they have represented our blessed Saviour as teaching a polytheism of India.

If I am asked, "What line then would you pursue? Would you, when you translate a Greek noun without the Article, reject the use of the English Article *a*, and admit that of the English Article *the*, or would you translate it in English, as in Greek, without any Article at all?" My answer is, that in every instance of the kind, we should commit ourselves to the guidance, not of a supposed infallible canon, but of common sense and the context. On different occasions different modes of translation must be adopted: and instances may be quoted in which all three modes occur in the same passage. Thus, *Εγενετο ανθρωπος απεσταλμενος παρα Θεου ονομα αυτω Ιααννης*, John i. 6, when fully and correctly rendered, will be, "There was *a* man sent from *God*; *the* name of whom (or *the* name to him) was John." Is it possible for any Translator, how much soever influenced by a bigoted attachment to self opinion, and by a fond affectation of singular theory, to contend, that the words *ανθρωπος Θεου*, and *ονομα*, in this verse, all without the Article, are all to be translated in one and the same way?

But it may perhaps be said, if such uncertainty exists on these occasions, how are we to ascertain the precise import of a Greek noun so circumstanced? This question however is easily answered by asking another, How do we ascertain the precise import of a Latin noun, under similar circumstances? The Latin noun, it is plain, must be used, not occasionally, but always, without an Article, be-



cause the Latin language has none ; yet we contrive to settle what we conceive to be its genuine sense in all cases, without stumbling upon any difficulty of this description. Why should more perplexity arise in the Greek language?

Whatsoever pointed peculiarity of meaning the presence of the Greek Article may be supposed sometimes to indicate, no uniform analogy of construction, I presume, can be argued from its absence. Its ellipses are perpetual ; and a thousand instances may be adduced, in which neither its omission, nor its addition, appears to create the slightest difference. It is not however my intention, nor does the subject require me, to enter into an elaborate discussion upon its philological importance or insignificance. Nothing perhaps is more difficult than to define the exact nature and legitimate use of Articles in a living language, as they frequently give birth to anomalies which depend upon an usage, bidding defiance to the shackles of system. And if this be the case in a living language, in a dead one the difficulty must be incalculably augmented. I shall nevertheless venture to consider a little more minutely, yet as briefly as I can, the question of the correspondence between the English and Greek modes of expressing nouns, in order to point out the impossibility of restricting that correspondence by any rule or rules universally applicable.

In English there are evidently three distinct modes of expressing nouns ; one, without an Article *absolutely* ; another, with the Article *a*, which refers to number, *indefinitely* ; and a third, with the Article *the* *definitely*. An instance of all three modes occurs in the use of the word *light* ; of the first, when God said, “ Let there be *light*,” Gen. i. 3, of the second, when the Messiah is declared to be “ *a* light to lighten the Gentiles,” Luke ii. 32, and of the third, when our Saviour terms himself “ *the* light of the world,” John viii. 12. So also the word *sin* in the following passages ; “ All unrighteousness is *sin*,” John

v. 17, "There is *a* sin unto death," ib. 16, "Rebellion is as *the* sin of witchcraft," 1 Sam. xv. 23. Few nouns however admit the three modes; most only the two latter; and some the last alone; as the noun *sun*, which is always denominated *the* sun, for although it may be sometimes used with the Article *a* prefixed, yet it can then only be taken hypothetically with reference to other suns, which we conceive to exist in the boundless expanse of creation.

If we fancy that in this diversity we still perceive something of invariable system, that fancy, as we proceed, must soon forsake us, when we turn to the perplexing anomalies introduced by the caprice of usage. *A man*, for instance, and *a horse*, are both indeed to be considered as belonging to one genus, viz. animal; yet we use the word *man* absolutely, in order to denote the species, as "God made *man*," while it would be incorrect to use the other word in the same manner. How too shall we account for the following peculiarities? We never say *a* thunder, but always *thunder*; while, on the contrary, we never say *hurricane* but always *an* hurricane; so that of two nouns apparently similar, one is found to be deficient in the second, and the other in the first mode of expression.

An ellipsis likewise of the Article *the* frequently occurs, for which we can seldom assign a satisfactory reason. We may indeed sometimes attribute it to colloquial brevity, as when "the house *top*" is used for *the top* of the house, and when "*horse-hair*" is used for *the* hair of *the* horse: but how shall we account for it on more important occasions, as when *earth* is put for *the* earth which we inhabit, and not for the mere element so denominated? For although we cannot in the sense alluded to correctly term God the Creator of *earth*, yet may we term him the Creator of *heaven and earth*; and we also daily pray, that his will may be done *in* or *on* *earth*. Upon what principle is this variety to be explained?

And, if no happy twist of logical dexterity can wreath

stragglers of this nature into the fantastical chaplet of our system, what success can we promise ourselves with others still more rambling and perverse? We apply, for example, the terms *heaven* and *sky* synonymously to designate the vaulted expanse above our heads; yet we express them differently, for we use the former always without, but the latter always with, the definite article. Again, before the name of that which possesses an existence unlike to all others, and which is of so peculiar a nature as not to admit the idea of number, it is usual to place the definite Article, as *the sun*, *the moon*, and *the world*. And to what other class can the word *God*, as signifying the one supreme and self-existing Being, be properly assigned? Yet we do not, under this application of the term, say, *the God*, as we say *the sun*, definitely, but *God* absolutely.

It seems then, that, in explanation of such incongruities, we must have recourse, not to any infallible code of philological laws, but to an usage disdainful of all restriction. Nor is even this principle to be considered as uniform in its operation, and constant in its character. Fickle, fluctuating, unstable, it subverts and reestablishes, erects and demolishes, at pleasure, and sometimes abandons even its own innovations. A style of expression to which we are not habituated we are apt to pronounce abhorrent from the genius of our language; but that supposed genius, particularly in the case before us, too often mocks description: when we attempt to seize and examine it, it assumes so shadowy and flitting a form as to elude our grasp. To what, for example, but to the flux of fashion, and the caprice of usage, can we ascribe the various modes of expression adopted in the different translations of the tenth verse of the thirty-second Psalm? The Common-Prayer-Book Version renders it thus: "Be ye not like to *horse* and *mule*, which have no understanding, whose mouths must be held with *bit* and *bridle*." The Bible Version thus: "Be ye not as *the horse* and *the mule*, which have no un-



derstanding, whose mouth must be held in with *bit* and *bridle*." We here perceive, in the first instance a total, omission of the definite and indefinite Articles; then subsequently, a restoration of the former, but not of the latter; while, in the present day, propriety would require a restoration of both: for instead of "whose mouth must be held in with *bit* and *bridle*," we should now rather say, "whose mouth must be held in with *a* bit and *a* bridle." Nor, in proof that our idea of correctness depends more upon habit than system, ought the provincialism of counties to be overlooked: for, to an ear familiar only with the dialect of Cumberland, the perpetual insertion of Articles does not sound less harsh and uncouth than the perpetual omission of them to a more polished ear.

If therefore the English language be in its use of Articles so irregular, how are we precisely to point out, and to restrain by certain unerring laws, its correspondence in this respect with the Greek language? It is well known, that in Greek there is only one Article, which is in general correctly translated by our definite Article *the*; yet on some occasions must we translate it indefinitely, and on others absolutely. With regard to its indefinite acceptance, should a prejudice for system induce us to suspect the meaning of το ορος, Matt. v. 1, and το πλοιον, Matt. i. 1, we must surely render το μωδιον, Matt. v. 15, *a* measure; ο διδασκαλος, John iii. 10, *a* teacher; τον ανθρωπον, John vii. 51, *a* (or, as the New Version has it, *any*) man; and το ψευδος, John viii. 44, *a* lie. Nor will the absolute sense in which the noun connected with it is occasionally taken, appear doubtful, when we observe, that την δικαιοσυνην, Matt. v. 6, can only signify *righteousness*, not *the* or *a* righteousness; η χαρις και η αληθεια, John i. 17, *grace* and *truth*; and εκ της θανατης εις την ζωην, John v. 24, from *death* to *life*. I use the strong terms *must* and *can* without fear of contradiction, because the New Version itself sanctions their application.

But further, as a Greek noun *with* the Article must be variously rendered, so also, as I have already remarked, *without* the Article, must it be understood sometimes definitely, sometimes indefinitely, and sometimes absolutely. Having previously however adverted to these points, I shall not fruitlessly multiply examples, only subjoining, with respect to the first mode of expression alluded to, a single passage, which, even if it stood alone, would, I conceive, prove decisive upon the subject. St. John says, ὥρα ην ὡς δεκάτη, c. iv. 6. Would it not be nonsense to translate this “*an* hour” instead of “*the* hour was about the tenth?”

When these different circumstances are contemplated; when we consider that in our own language the addition or omission of an Article is often attributable to no other case than to the predominance of a paramount usage; when we perceive similar irregularities to exist in the Greek language; and the correspondence between both to be regulated by no fixed and determinate principles; who will boast of reducing to the subjection of rule forms of expression superior to all rule? We are indeed too apt, on every occasion, to represent pleonasm and ellipsis as systematical ornaments, instead of what they often are, unsystematical blemishes, of language; and to dream of indescribable elegancies, where little perhaps is really discoverable except the negligence of habit, or the peculiarity of custom: but as well may we attempt to chain the wind, as to restrict diversity of usage in the redundancy or suppression of Articles, by any thing like an invariable uniformity of construction.

## CHAP. VI.

*Existence of an Evil Being. Translation of  
the words Σαταν and Διαβολος.*

Another effort to regulate Scripture by the standard of Unitarian faith occurs in the singular mode of occasionally translating the words Σαταν and Διαβολος, not as proper names, but as nouns appellative. They are therefore thus rendered in the following passages : “ Get thee behind me, *thou adversary*, Matt. xvi. 23. Have I not chosen you twelve? And yet one of you is *a false accuser*, John vi. 71 : There hath been given to me a thorn in the flesh, an *angel-adversary* to buffet me, 2 Cor. xii. 7. Give not advantage to *the slanderer*, Ephes. iv. 28. Lest the *adversary* should gain advantage over us ; for we are not ignorant of his devices, 2 Cor. ii. 11. Have been taken captive by *the accuser*, 2 Tim. ii. 26.”

The object proposed by this translation, and explicitly avowed in various explanatory notes, introduced at almost every possible opportunity, evidently is, to exclude from the Christian creed, in conformity with the sentiments of the Unitarian school, the doctrine of an evil Being superior to man. They think it, I presume, irrational to suppose, that a being of this description exists, because such an existence falls not immediately under the cognizance of the human faculties ; and what they do not think it rational to conceive, they will not allow to be contained in holy Scripture. Hence they tell us more than once, that the term *devil* means only “ the principle of evil personified,” Matt. xiii. 39 ; John viii. 44 ; 1 John iii. 8.

To enter into a philosophical discussion of this subject would be foreign to my design, as well as irrelevant to the point which can be correctly said to be in controversy.



The point in dispute is rather a question of fact than one of philosophy : it is simply, whether Jewish opinions and Jewish phraseology will warrant us in concluding, that by the expressions *Σαταν* and *Διαβολος* our Saviour and his Apostles meant a real person, or merely a personified quality.

Truths universally admitted require no formal definition; they are usually introduced in the way of allusion, and in most instances are solely deducible from some opinion stated, or for some fact recorded, by inference. If then the existence of an evil spirit be no where directly asserted in the Old Testament, we must not on that account imagine, that it is not expressly implied there, for a similar remark may be made respecting the doctrine of a future state ; and yet are we forbidden by Christ himself to deny that it is there distinctly taught, *Matt. xxii. 32.*

In the book of Job, a book to which critics coincide in imputing the highest antiquity,\* an evil Being, under the

\* Carpzovius, if not the last, doubtless not the least, of biblical critics, gives the following opinion, as the result of his reflections upon the subject of its antiquity: “*Sic divinus jam ante Mosen extabat Jobi liber poeticus, ad instructionem fidelium lectus quidem, et asservatus, sed Canonico nondum αξιωματα insignis. Postquam autem divinis auspiciis Mosis opera condendi Canonis sacrificatum esset initium, diu post, circa Samuelis forte ætatem, ejusdemque ni fallor manu, divini numinis jussu, canonicis ille libris additus et ad latus Arcæ in Sanctuario publice repositus videtur, cum Prologo ac Epilogo historico θεοπνευστος oruasset auxissetque illum Samuel, ut quæ sermonum a Jobo exaratorum occasio, quis scopus, quis historiæ nexus, quæ rerum gestarum series, et catastrophe fuerit, ad communem Ecclesiæ omnium temporum notitiam et edificationem, ad oculum patere. Ut adeo geminum agnoscat liber scriptorem, Jobum, qua sui parte metro est, adstrictus, et Samuelem, quod ad capito priora duo, et postremum attinet. Ad Samuelem vero ea de causa referre malui, quod loquendi modus, in priore Samuelis libro adhibitus, ex asse illi respondet, quo prosaica in libro Jobi capita personant. Tam plane tam perspicue tam pure utrobique sermo se habet Ebræus, tam ordinate porro, ac succincte narrationis series ut ovum vix ovo similium.*” *Introductio ad Lib. Poet. Bibl. p. 58. Ed. 1731.*

designation of Satan, is directly noticed as appearing in the divine presence, and as obtaining permission to attack the integrity of Job by the severest temporal afflictions. This character, it is true is considered by some as merely ideal, as nothing more than an elegant embellishment of a sublime poem. Those, however, who thus consider it, do not perhaps sufficiently reflect, that poets are not philosophers: that the celestial Beings usually described by them are not the sole creatures of their own imagination, but such as are to be found in the popular creed of their times; and that the gods of Homer and Virgil, not less than the angels and devils of Milton, were supposed to exist in nature. Besides, if we are at liberty to presume that Satan is an ideal character, are we not at equal liberty to presume the same of the other party, in the dialogue, even of God himself?

But, in truth, it is impossible for the character of Satan to be here contemplated as a mere poetical embellishment; and that for the plainest of all reasons; because the chapters in which it is introduced contain nothing bearing the slightest resemblance of poetry. the two first chapters of Job are manifestly prosaical, and are expressed after the manner of the simplest and purest narrative. No metrical composition occurs until the third chapter, and then commences a style wholly dissimilar, to the preceding, not only as being poetical, but as appearing, in the judgment of the best critics, to be replete with Arabisms, and an obsolete Hebrew phraseology anterior to the times of Moses. Since therefore the preparatory narrative, in which alone any mention is made of Satan, is perfectly prosaical, and bespeaks a different author, as well as a latter period, it is absurd to throw out crude conjectures about poetical imagery, where neither metre nor poetry exists.

With the passage alluded to in Job may be compared another in 1 Kings xxii. 19, in which the prophet Michaiah describes an almost similar transaction in almost similar

terms. The hosts of heaven are represented in both instances as standing in the presence of God, and a particular spirit is noticed as introducing himself into the angelical assembly, and as counselling, and subsequently executing evil against an individual among men. This spirit is in Job denominated *השטן* *the Satan*, a word usually considered as derived from a root signifying to *hate* or *oppose*; in the book of Kings he is denominated *הרוח* *the spirit*; the former being a designation taken from the malignity of his disposition, the latter one taken from the immortality of his nature. That the prophet Michaiiah meant by the expression *הרוח* a superior Being *of a particular description*, seems evident from the demonstrative prefix *ה*; and as a superior Being *of a particular description*, is directly pointed out, is not his identity with the Satan of Job apparent from the nature of his counsel and agency, from his becoming “a *lying* spirit” *רוח שקר* in the mouths of the prophets of Ahab, to lead that prince on to destruction? Although we were to admit that the inspired writers might in neither instance intend to represent the celestial council as an actual occurrence; adopting the form of dialogue, that prominent feature of all oriental composition, because it was the most usual and most impressive; yet would it be one thing to suppose the dialogue, and another to suppose the characters, to which it is ascribed, fictitious. Nor does it appear more reasonable to make a partial selection among those characters at pleasure; to consider God and the angels as real beings, and Satan, the principal agent in both transactions, as an imaginary one; to introduce the Deity himself conversing with an absolute non-entity. Besides, even in the boldest style of *prosopopœia*, it would be unintelligible, to affix any other denomination to the thing or quality personified, than its true and appropriate one. Thus had Solomon, in his elegant personification of *wisdom*, (Proverbs viii.) substituted for *wisdom* the term *friendship*, because *wisdom* is *friendly* to the best inte-



rests of man ; or, what would have been still more obscure, the *friend* ; would not his allusion have been utterly incomprehensible ? And yet must we say, according to what Unitarians consider as the only rational exposition of the passage, that the author of the two first chapters of Job, when he wished to personify *evil*, sufficiently marked his meaning by adopting the expression  $\text{השטן}$  *the enemy*, solely because *evil* is *inimical* to man.

To the preceding quotations from Job and Kings may be subjoined another of a similar import. It is this : “ And he shewed me Joshua the high-priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and *Satan*  $\text{השטן}$  standing at his right hand to *resist* him,  $\text{לשטן}$ . And the Lord said unto *Satan*, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan.” Zech. iii. 1, 2. Here some have conjectured, that the word *Satan* means only those adversaries who opposed the high-priest in the rebuilding of the temple, after the return of the Israelites from captivity. It is remarkable, however, that St. Jude gives the precise form of reproof mentioned by Zechariah on this occasion ; “ The Lord rebuke thee,” as one used by Michael the archangel in a contention with something more than a mere *human* adversary. Indeed most commentators are disposed to think, that St. Jude alludes to this very passage in Zechariah ; and much ingenuity has been exhibited\* in reconciling the texts. But for my pre-

\* Certainly not the least ingenious conjecture on this subject is that of Stosch, which Schleusner gives in the following terms: Jude 9, ad quem locum tamen aliam eamque ingeniosam conjecturam protulit Stosch in Archæol. Œconom. N. T. p. 41, qui  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  Μωϋσεως reddidit *servum Mosis*, ipsumque adeo pontificem maximum *Josua* intelligit, simulque monet  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in notione *mancipii, servi*, etiam honoratiori sensu adhiberi *de militibus cujuscunque ordinis.*” Lexic. Art.  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ . For the acceptation of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in the sense of *a servant*, see Wetstein in Apoc. xviii. 13.

Schoetgen, in his *Horæ Talmud.* vol. i. p. 1030, offers another conjecture. He considers  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  Μωϋσεως as a Hebraism, meaning only

sent purpose it is not perhaps material. If St. Jude really alludes to it, the meaning of the word Satan, at least as he understood it, will be evident. If he does not, but refers to another author and a different transaction, this, instead of diminishing, will be only adding to, the testimony; for even apocryphal testimony, in corroborating the usual acceptance of a particular phrase, must be deemed admissible. If therefore the style of the angelical reproof be the same in Zechariah, in St. Jude, and in a preceding apocryphal, author, and if the party reproved be in each instance described under the same appellation, will it not follow, that in each instance also the same character is designated?

So general indeed was the persuasion among the Jews of this reproof being uttered to an infernal spirit, that in the Talmud we find the repetition of the very words alluded to proposed as the most effectual protection against the attacks of Satan. The superstitious Talmudists\* caution their timid disciple, a warning said to have been given by *Sammuel*, who is elsewhere termed *Satan*, the angel of death, not to stand in the way of a female procession returning from a funeral, “because,” saith the angel of death, “because I, with sword in hand, leap exulting before it, and I possess the dominion of torture. מַפְנֵי שְׂאֲנֵי מַרְקָד וּבֵּית לַפְנֵיהֶן וְחַרְבֵי בִּידֵי וַיֵּשׁ לִי רְשׁוּת לַחֲבֵל. But if,” continues the Gemara, “the meeting be unavoidable, what is his remedy? Let him recede some paces from the spot. If a river be near, let him ford it; or if a road in another direction, let him proceed that way; or if a wall, let him stand behind it. But if, no retreat ap-

*Moses himself*: but he does not make out his point. In Rabbinical Hebrew indeed גּוֹפ is used reciprocally, but always, I conceive, with a pronominal affix, and not in construction with another substantive.

\* Ordo וְרַעִים Codex בְּרִכּוֹת cap. vii. *Gemara*. Bartolocci Bib. Rabbin. v. iii. p. 369. A passage of a similar tendency is also quoted by Wagensail in his *Sota*, p. 434.

pear, then let him turn his face and exclaim, ‘ *The Lord said to Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, Satan;*’ and the danger shall depart from him.”

Would you then, perhaps the Unitarians will say, with that contempt which generally characterizes the conceit of superior wisdom, would you then revive the obsolete extravagance of Rabbinical reverie? Certainly not. But my argument surely will not suffer by the proof, that the Jews themselves, who manifestly could not have been influenced by Christian expositions, have always understood the text of Zechariah precisely as I do, and precisely indeed as the generality of Christians have always done. To establish the fact is one thing: but to approve of every absurdity which a superstitious imagination may deduce from it, is clearly another.

In addition also to what has been said, it may be remarked, that the expression  $\text{השטן}$ , with the demonstrative  $\text{ה}$  prefixed, occurs but twice in the Old Testament, in Job and in Zechariah; and that in both cases the Being so denominated appears in the presence of, and is addressed by, God himself. Is it not therefore highly improbable, that the same expression, thus distinguished, should, in the first instance, signify the personification of an abstract idea, that of *evil*; and in the second, a mere *human being*?

Were the foregoing observations insufficient to prove the ancient belief in a superior order of evil spirits, an additional argument might be brought from Deuter. xxxii. 17, where it is said, “They sacrificed to *devils*,  $\text{שרים}$ , not to God.” For it seems indisputable, that the word  $\text{שרים}$ , whatsoever difference of opinion may be entertained respecting its derivation, must mean detested objects of heathen worship, which were supposed to possess a real existence, because it is translated *Δαιμονια*, not only in the Septuagint, but by the author of the apocryphal book Baruch, c. iv. 7, and by the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. x. 20; and the



spiritual nature also of the *Δαιμονία* is strongly asserted both in the Apocrypha and in the New Testament.

Apoeryphal testimony indeed is inadmissible in settling a point of doctrine ; but it may at least be received in determining the currency of an opinion. It should be therefore noticed, that in the Wisdom of Solomon the fall of man is directly imputed to the envy of *the devil* : “ For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity ; nevertheless through *envy of the devil*, φθονῶ Διάβολοῦ, came death into the world, and they who *hold to his side*, οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μεριδος οντες, do find it.” c. ii. 23, 24. Is not the personality of the Devil, Διάβολος, here pointed out in terms, the meaning of which it is impossible to mistake ?

Having thus considered the principle traces of the subject before me discoverable in the Old Testament, I shall now turn to the New.

The authors of this Version affirm, the word *Satan*, whatsoever might have been the vulgar opinion, certainly, in the contemplation of Christ and his Apostles, indicate not a real but a fictitious being.

It is natural however to ask, upon what proof do they ground their argument, that the *private* opinion of our Saviour was in direct opposition to his *public* testimony ; that when he spoke of *Satan* he meant by that expression no more than a symbolical existence, the mere personification, of an abstract quality ? They will perhaps answer, upon the presumption that he could not, consistently with reason, have meant otherwise. But why should it be deemed irrational to conceive, that intellectual beings of a superior order may have transgressed the laws of their Creator, as well as those of an inferior order ; that there should be bad angels as well as bad men ? And what is this rule of human reason, from which revelation itself must never be supposed to swerve ? If they will listen to a critic of

character, whose occasional aberrations from received opinion at least must recommend him to their esteem, he will tell them, that “what we call *reason*, and by which we would new model the Bible,” (he is speaking of theological conjecture in the emendation of the text,) “is frequently nothing more than *some fashionable system of philosophy*, which lasts only for a time, and appears so absurd to those who live in later ages, that they find it difficult to comprehend how rational beings can have adopted such ridiculous, notions.”\* And he instances the example of the Gnostics. In the days of Gnosticism indeed every thing was spiritualized, and credulity carried to an extreme one way; but now, it seems, every thing is to be materialized, and in credulity pushed to an extreme the other. Truth, however, I am persuaded, may still be found in the middle system; in a system equally remote from the fantastical reveries of the Gnostics, and from the negative hypotheses of the Unitarians.

But let us more attentively consider the proofs of this supposed Christian philosophy. We must understand then that a professed object of our Saviour’s mission was to abolish the superstitious doctrine of evil spirits; to eradicate from the popular mind the ideal empire of darkness. Conceiving this therefore to have been an object of his mission, how, we may ask, did he effect it? Was it, as in the case of Pharisaical superstition, by attacking the offensive creed in bold and disdainful language, and in terms exposing it without reserve, to merited contempt and infamy? Indisputably not. But, on the other hand, by adopting it on every occasion as his own, by temporizing with his hearers, by fostering their prejudices even to satiety, and by ultimately leaving them to correct their own errors! Surely if such were our Saviour’s object, his mode of accom-

\* Michaelis’s Introduction, vol. ii. part. i. p. 415.

plishing that object was rather singular.\* Nor should it be forgotten, that the Unitarians, on other occasions, withhold at pleasure their belief in every thing which is not expressly and repeatedly declared ; yet on this occasion would they wish us to believe that which is not declared at all ; which is solely deducible from an assumed paramount rule of reason, and from principles of scriptural interpretation too refined for vulgar comprehension.

If it were one avowed object of our Saviour's mission to annihilate the received doctrine of an evil Being, we might conjecture, that some very early indication of it would appear in the Evangelical history. But, on the contrary, we are informed, that at the very commencement of his ministry he was "led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by *the devil*," Matt. iv. 1, and this is stated with various particulars of the event, without the slightest collateral or ulterior explanation. The authors of the New Version, indeed say, "This form of expression (viz. 'Jesus was led up by the Spirit,') denotes that the historian is about to describe a *visionary* scene, and not a real event." And so said *Farmer* before them. But what is the reply of another favourite writer of the same school ? "When this is the case," observes Mr. John Jones, "it is *always* declared that the scene *is* visionary, and not *real*. \* \* \* \* \* Do the Evangelists then say, that the temptations of Christ, or the scenes which he saw, were a *vision* ? Not a word, nor the slightest intimation of the kind is given by them ; and there is as good reason for supposing that he was *baptized*, or *announced* by a voice from heaven as the Son of God, in a *vision*, as for thinking he was *tempted in a vision*," p. 630. Again, With the New Testament in our hands, we feel ourselves surrounded with the mild and benignant splendour of *truth*

\* See Mr. John Jones's "Illustrations of the four Gospels," p. 172, 173.



*and reality* ; but this critic (viz. *Farmer*) would envelope our hemisphere in gloom at the moment the Sun of righteousness sheds his purest, serenest rays on our horizon ; and *with preposterous officiousness* would reflect on our path the livid light of a midnight taper, when the Son of God himself stands before us clothed with the luminary of day." p. 632. It seems, then, that it must not be *a vision*. Still however, although "we feel ourselves surrounded with the mild and benignant splendour of *truth and reality*," it may only be, according to the second hypothesis of our translators, "a figurative description of the train of thoughts which passed through the mind of Jesus." And this is the opinion of Mr. Cappe, and *Mr. John Jones himself*. I shall not however waste my time in attempting to split the hair of reality between writers whose only difference of opinion seems to be, that, while one represents our Saviour as foreseeing, in a *vision at Nazareth*, the future scene of his sufferings, and, "in order to qualify him for death, as dreaming that he should die," the other represents him as foreseeing the same scene *with his eyes open in the wilderness* ; but shall pass on to other considerations, simply noticing "the *confirmation* (as it is termed) of his interpretation," given by Mr. John Jones, who, without any particular comment, refers for this purpose to a well known allegory of Xenophon, denominated "*the Choice of Hercules* ;" and adds, that "nothing in all antiquity can be found more similar to the temptation of our Lord, both in sentiment and language !" p. 633.

To examine therefore with a little more accuracy this new idea, that the assertion of an affirmative is sometimes the most effectual mode of proving a negative, when our blessed Saviour, certainly not at the moment very anxious to avoid "alienating and inflaming his countrymen,"\* thus addresses the Jews ; Ye are of your father *the devil*, and

\* Illustrations of the four Gospels, p. 171.

the lusts of your father ye will do : he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth," John viii. 44, is it possible to conceive, that he was playing with their prejudices, and merely alluded to a *personified quality*? When likewise, in his description of the day of judgment, he uses the terms "everlasting fire, prepared for *the devil* and his angels," Matt. xxv. 41, can we, consistently with common sense, suppose that, by the words *the devil and his angels*, he meant and wished his hearers to understand him as meaning nothing more than metaphorical existence? If it be nevertheless still insisted, that, when speaking to the people at large, he had a purpose to answer in humouring popular prejudice, by the adopting of popular language, it will scarcely, I presume, be argued, that he had any purpose to serve in adopting a similar language when addressing his own disciples. And yet we find him frequent in the use of it. To them he says, even in explanation of a parable, "the enemy that sowed the tares is *the devil*," Matt. xiii. 39 : a most singular assertion indeed by way of proving the non-existence of such a being. When also they tell him, that "even the devils, *Δαιμονια*, are subject to him," Luke x. 17, instead of correcting their error, if error he conceived it to be, he replies, "I beheld Satan like lightning fall from heaven." In another place, addressing himself to Peter, he exclaims, Simon, Simon, behold, *Satan* hath desired to have you," Luke xxii. 31. And even after his resurrection, when he appeared in a vision to St. Paul, he calls him "to turn men from darkness to light, and *from the power of Satan* unto God," Acts xxvi. 18.

Nor are the Apostles, in their Epistles both to Jews and Gentiles, more scrupulous in the free use of language, which, if they had not learned, they at least had heard, from their divine Master.\* To reconcile their phraseolo-

\* See John xiii 2; Acts xiii. 10; Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Cor. v. 5, vii. 5;

gy to the Unitarian hypothesis is a task which no effort and straining will ever satisfactorily accomplish. One would conceive that, when St. Paul speaks of "delivering such a one to *Satan*," 1 Cor. v. 15, and of "Satan's transforming himself into an angel of light," 2 Cor. xi. 14, he meant the same person. But our new interpreters tell us, that in the first instance *Satan* is to be considered as a sort of ideal sovereign over an ideal kingdom of darkness: in the latter, as a false Apostle, the leading adversary of St. Paul. I shall quote the last passage. Speaking of false teachers, St. Paul observes, that "they transform themselves into the Apostles of Christ. And no wonder: for *Satan* also transformeth himself also into an angel of light. It is therefore no great thing if his ministers also transform themselves as ministers of righteousness." What can possibly be more simple in its import? This however is to be thus perplexed; As the *leading adversary* of St. Paul, denominated *Satan*, transforms himself into *an angel of light*; that is, arrogates to himself the character of *a messenger from God*;" so also *the ministers of this adversary* transform themselves into the ministers of righteousness, that is, "pretend to be *the Apostles of the Messiah*." But where do we find any mention of this *leading adversary*, who arrogated to himself the character of *an angel*, (for the words *angel of light* cannot, I maintain, be lowered into the direct sense of *a mere messenger from God*, such as were all the prophets,) and who, in pursuance of his divine mission, had *his appropriate ministers*, *διακονοι*? Did St. Paul ever term his fellow labourers, in the Gospel *his ministers*? The ministers of Satan contrasted with the ministers of Christ is sufficiently intelligible. But where is the contrast in opposing the ministers of a false apostle

2 Cor. ii. 11, xi. 14, xii. 7; Ephes. iv. 27, vi. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 20; iii. 6, 7; v. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 26; Heb. ii. 14; James. viii. 7; 1 Pet. v. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 4. Jude 6.



to the ministers of Christ, unless we can also suppose a contrast in the principles ; viz. between the false apostle himself and our Saviour ? Besides, the word *Satan* is Hebrew, not Greek ; and as being therefore in all probability only known to the Corinthians in a peculiar sense, was scarcely used by St. Paul to express the general idea of *an adversary*.

But a still more singular exposition occurs in a comment, which they adopt from another writer, upon a passage of St. Jude. In order to point out the dreadful judgments of God against the disobedient, the Apostle instances the punishment of the fallen angels, the destruction of the world by water in the days of Noah, and the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire from heaven. The case of the fallen angels he thus describes : “ The angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in eternal chains to the judgment of the great day,” ver. 4. In explanation of this the following paraphrase is given : “ The messengers who watched not duly over *their own principality*, but deserted their proper habitation, he kept with perpetual chains under darkness (*punished them with judicial blindness of mind*) unto the judgment of a great day, i. e. *when they were destroyed by a plague*. Alluding to the falsehood and punishment of the spies, Numb. xiv. 36, 37 !” Were we however disposed to try the experiment, of converting the word *angel* into *messengers*, and to consider these as the spies sent out by Moses and the Israelites to investigate the land of Canaan, what possible sense can be made of the crime imputed to them ; viz. “ that they watched not duly over their own principality ?” Nor can those with any propriety be said to have “ deserted their proper habitation,” ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἑαυτῶν οἰκητήριον, who had no proper habitation to desert. Besides, could we suppose that the phrase, “ *judgment of the great day*,” is synonymous with that of *destruction by the plague*, still would it require the talent of Œdipus

himself in the solution of metaphorical ænigma to demonstrate how the words, *he kept in eternal chains under darkness,*" δέσμοις αἰδίοις ὑπο ζοφον τεστηρηκεν, can possibly mean, *he punished with judicial blindness of mind*; particularly as St. Peter, who adduces the same example, adds the participle ταρταρωσας, σειραις ζοφου ταρταρωσας παρεδωκεν, "*having cast them down to hell, he delivered them into chains of darkness,*" 2 Pet. ii. 4. And with what propriety can *judicial blindness of mind*, the act, I presume, of forming an erroneous judgment of the promised land, which constituted the crime of the spies, be termed their punishment?

On the whole then; if the existence of a spiritual enemy to man, under the denomination of *Satan*, is discoverable in the Scriptures of the Old Testament; if this were confessedly the popular creed at the period of the promulgation of Christianity; if our Saviour himself adopted it as his own creed without any ulterior explanation, not only when publicly addressing the people, but also when privately conversing with his own disciples; and if the Apostles likewise expressed themselves in similar language, it seems reasonable to conclude, that *Satan* is described as a real, and not as a fictitious being. That translation therefore of the word Σαταν cannot be correct, which, by rendering it *adversary*, deprives it of the peculiar sense which was usually affixed to it. It admits indeed in Hebrew as well the general sense of *adversary* or *accuser*, as the particular sense of *a fallen angel*. But it should be recollected, that the question turns upon its meaning in the Greek, and not in the Hebrew Scriptures. Had the Apostles intended to express the general idea of *an adversary*, they would doubtless have used αντιδικος, or some other equivalent Greek expression; because otherwise they would have been unintelligible to those, for whose instruction they wrote. *Satan*, as a term appropriate to an evil Being of a superior nature, could only be understood we may pre-

sume, by the Greeks as it still is by us in English : but had St. Luke, for example, instead of ὡς γὰρ ὑπαγεις μετὰ τὸ ἀντιδικεῖς σὺ ἐπ' ἀρχοντα, c. xii. 58, written ὡς γὰρ ὑπαγεις μετὰ τὸ Σατανᾶ σὺ ἐπ' ἀρχοντα, that is, instead of, “when thou goest *with thine adversary* to the magistrate,” had he written, “when thou goest with thy *Satan* to the magistrate,” would not both Greek and English have appeared a little nonsensical? The appropriate name of a person or thing, or of a class of persons or things, before unknown, may be naturally borrowed from another language in which it is familiarly used ; but to suppose that the inspired writers of the New Testament, when addressing those who were ignorant of Hebrew, unnecessarily adopted from that tongue words expressive only of general ideas, would be to convert them into a sort of conceited triflers, whose object was rather to puzzle than to instruct. That the Greek language contained no term peculiarly appropriate to the name of a being, respecting whose existence the Greeks had no knowledge, must be evident. Hence therefore appears the reason why the Apostles on such occasions used an Hebrew expression. But even this, it may be said, would not have been intelligible, without a previous explanation. Most certainly it would not ; and that very circumstance tends to prove the specific sense in which it was meant to be understood. For if the Apostles, as well as the Jews in general, believed in the real existence of *Satan*, it is obvious that they would inculcate the same opinion on their heathen converts, and would consequently explain to them the meaning of that term ; but if they did not believe in it, no possible necessity could arise for their explaining it, at all. Would they not rather have abstained from every allusion to it, than have run the risk of appearing to countenance a creed which they disclaimed ; and this solely for the puerile pleasure of sporting with a tortured metaphor? That they proceeded still further, and previously explained the general meaning of a certain Hebrew expression, without



any particular object of the kind alluded to in view, is surely a position which should shock even the conjectural credulity of the new school.

---

## CHAP. VI.

*Translation of the word Ἀγγέλως, Heb. i. Disputed books. Griesbach. Conclusion.*

Although the Translators take every possible opportunity to represent a belief in the existence of fallen angels as irrational, and therefore unscriptural, they do not altogether deny the existence of angels themselves. This they seem to admit; yet, as the word *ἄγγελος* means both *a messenger* and *an angel*, they sometimes attempt, for certain theological purposes, to give it the former in preference to the latter signification, in direct opposition to the context. When St. Stephen states the law to have been received “by the ministry of angels,” we are informed in a note, that thunder, lightning and tempest, may be called *angels*, like the plague of Egypt, Psalm lxxviii. 49; and the burning wind, Isaiah xxxvii. 36;”\* or that

\* But the illustrations here adduced are defective in proof. The *evil angels* or *angels inflicting evils*, mentioned Psalm lxxviii. 49. ought rather perhaps to be taken literally, in allusion to Exodus xii. 23, where the *הַמַּשְׁחֵה* *the destroyer* (τον ὀλοθρευοντα in the Septuagint) is introduced as only permitted to strike the first-born of the Egyptians; and this sense, it should be remarked, is evidently given to the phrase in the Greek Version of Symmachus, who renders it *ἄγγέλων κακόντων*, *angels afflicting them with evils*. See also 2 Sam. xxiv. 17, in which David is stated to have *seen* the angel who smote the people with pestilence. With respect to the passage in Isaiah, that which is termed *a burning wind* is expressly stated in the text to have been *the angel of the Lord*, who is represented as having *gone out* (אצ') and smitten in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred fourscore and five thousand. Why must we attribute to natural

these angels may only mean "Moses, Aaron, Joshua, and a succession of authorized prophets and *messengers of God*." But a more striking instance of their perverting the obvious import of this word occurs in several passages of the first chapter of the Hebrews, in which they uniformly translate it *messenger*; and it is this translation which I propose particularly to consider.

Their object is sufficiently evident. Throughout the whole of the chapter in question the superiority of Christ to the angels is too distinctly asserted to be explained away. In imitation therefore of Wakefield, they endeavour to get rid of the difficulty at once (a difficulty which might otherwise prove a stumbling-block to their creed) by rendering, *αγγελοι* *messengers*, and by giving us at the same time to understand, that the messengers alluded to are the prophets of the Old Testament. The authority of Wakefield I admit to be respectable; a writer certainly of classical taste, and of elegant attainments, but by no means ranking high on the list of biblical critics: whose translation of the New testament is, like theirs, deeply tinged by his creed, and whose professed attachment to truth and candour was too often biassed by prejudice, and disgraced by sarcasm. Those however who boast the habit, and experience the pride, of dissent, will not, I presume, expect others to adopt, without examination, the opinion of any man whatsoever; particularly an opinion, the credit of which, unsupported both by reasoning and precedent, solely rests upon the critical acumen of Wakefield.

In the two first chapters of this Epistle the word *αγγελοι* occurs not less than nine times; in the first six of which it is translated *messengers*, but in the remaining three, *angels*. This incorrectness of style, however it is obser-

causes alone what is plainly described in Scripture as effected by the agency of supernatural beings? It cannot be because we disbelieve the existence of such beings.

ved, to which the ambiguity of the word gives rise, is not uncommon in the sacred writers, but no parallel case specifically in point, or indeed any at all, is alleged in proof of the assertion. Surely this, as Mr. Nares justly remarks, “is an extraordinary mode of reconciling matters ; for it is not the Apostle, but the Editors themselves, who give these different senses to the term *angel*, and then censure the sacred writers for *an incorrectness of style*.”\*

I shall not, I trust, be accused of mistaking their argument, if I reduce it to this simple assertion ; that, as the word *angel* is sometimes used in the Old Testament to denote *a prophet*, so also is the same signification to be annexed to it in the particular passage under consideration.

The term indeed is doubtless applied to the prophets in some, but not in many passages of the Old Testament ; yet ought we to remark, that it is never so applied without a pronoun, or a genitive case connected with it, indicative of him whose messengers they were. Often however it stands alone, and is then only used to designate those superior beings, of whom it is the sole characteristic appellation, to whom it is exclusively a name descriptive, specific, and appropriate. Thus, to quote one out of many instances, it is said, 1 Kings xix, 5, that, when Elijah, flying from the vengeance of Jezebel, and exhausted with fatigue, lay under a juniper tree, *an angel* מלאך touched him, and said, arise and eat. Here we perceive the term occurring alone, without even the prefix (or definite article) ה and distinctly pointing out a being, well known under that particular denomination. But the construction is wholly dissimilar when it is applied to the prophets : for then we read, “The Lord sent to them by *his* messengers, \* \* \* but they mocked the messengers of God, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15, 16 ; The Lord, who performeth the counsel of *his* messengers, Isaiah xliv. 26 ;

\* Remarks, p. 119.



Then spake Haggai *the Lord's* messenger, Hag. i. 13; He is the messenger *of the Lord of Hosts*, Malachi ii. 7; And I will send *my* messenger, Malachi iii. 1:" and these are the only texts in which it is to be found in the latter signification. The reason of the difference I apprehend to be obvious, In the first case, it is sufficiently declarative of its own meaning; but in the last, not being so declarative, it requires some adjunct to determine the precise sense of its synonymous application. Had Haggai, for instance, described himself as *a* messenger, instead of *the Lord's* messenger, would not the phraseology have been incomplete, if not unintelligible?

In opposition however to every legitimate principle of construction, these Translators contend with Wakefield, that when the Son is described, Heb. i. 4, as "being made so much better than *the angels*, κρείττων των αγγελων, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they," the expression, των αγγελων signifies not *the angels*, but "*the prophets*, who are mentioned in the first verse." Yet that αγγελος generally means *angel*, in the usual acceptation of the term, they seem themselves to admit, because they thus translate it *sixty-three* out of *seventy-four* times,\* in which it occurs unconnected with every other word capable of determining its precise sense. And of

\* I have observed it in the following texts: Matt. iv. 11, xiii. 39, 49, xxvi. 53; Mark i. 13; Luke xvi. 22; John v. 4, xii. 29; Acts vi. 15, vii. 35, 38, xii. 8, 9, 10, xxiii. 8; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iv. 9, xi. 10, xiii. 1; Gal. iii. 19; Col. ii. 18; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. i. 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, ii. 2, 5, 7, 9, 16, xii. 22, xiii. 2; 1 Pet. i. 12, iii. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 4, 11; Rev. i. 20, vii. 1, 2, 11, viii. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, ix. 1, 11, x. 1, 5, 7, 8, xi. 15, xiv. 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 19, xv. 1, 6, 7, 8, xvi. 1, 3, 5, xviii. 1, xix. 17, xxi. 9, 12.

It is translated *messenger*, 1 Cor. xi. 10; Gal. iii. 19; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. i. 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, ii. 2, xiii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 22: and we are told that in Gal. iii. 19, the *messengers* mean *officers*, that is, *Priests and Levites*; in 1 Tim. iii. 16, the *Apostles*; and in Heb. i. 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, ii. 2, the *Prophets* of the Old Testament.

the eleven instances, in which they render it *messenger*, six will be found in the very passages under consideration. This circumstance alone surely proves on which side the general presumption of its import lies.

But I maintain that the word *αγγελοι* must here necessarily mean *angels*, a class of beings to whom it is peculiarly appropriated, because, although the prophets may be described, as I have already pointed out, under the title of the messengers of God," they cannot be correctly termed "*the messengers.*" We readily comprehend how they are said to be the messengers of God, in common with others; but we do not well understand how they can be denominated *the messengers* emphatically and exclusively. I may likewise remark, that they are called *the servants*, as well as *the messengers*, of God, and even that more frequently.\* But should we not condemn the phraseology as strangely incorrect, which, when it is meant to assert the superiority of Christ over *the prophets*, should simply represent him as superior to *the servants*?

To take off, however, as much as possible from the manifest incongruity of the expression, and to introduce a sort of reference to the prophets incidentally mentioned in the first verse, as the agents by whom God had formerly revealed his will to mankind, the Translators adopt the Version of Wakefield, and render *των αγγελων*, which does not occur till the fourth verse, "*those messengers.*" It may appear too harsh to denominate this a perversion of the sacred text; but it must be admitted to be an unauthorized addition of a not insignificant pronoun,† for the express

\* The phrases *my, his, or thy servants the prophets*, occur no less than sixteen times in the Old, and twice in the New Testament; 2 Kings ix. 7, xvii. 13, 23, xxi. 10, xxiv. 2; Ezra ix. 11; Jerem. vii. 25, xxv. 4, xxvi. 5, xxix. 19, xxxv. 15; Ezek. xxxviii. 17; Dan. ix. 6, 10; Amos iii. 7; Zech. i. 6; Revelations x. 7, xi. 18.

† The Article *ὁ* in Greek is indeed sometimes used emphatically, as *ὁ προφητης ει συ*, John i. 21; but so also is the English Article *the* as

purpose of supporting a favourite exposition. Yet, if we even conceded to them all the advantage to be derived from such a translation, (a concession which, as in a similar case, they would not be disposed to grant ; so in this, I presume, they will not expect to receive, (still would it be impossible for them to establish the propriety of a phrase, which, in spite of all their efforts, could not but remain a palpable solecism.

Nor are we solely left to conjecture respecting the true import of the word *αγγελοι* ; for the context distinctly furnishes us with a clue to its meaning. We subsequently read, “Of his angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire,” ver. 7 : and again, “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” ver. 14, *Προς τας αγγελους λεγει, ‘Ο ποιων τας αγγελους αυτη πνευματα, και τας λειτεργους αυτου πυρος φλογα. \* \* \* \* Ουχι παντες εισι λειτεργικα πνευματα, εις διακονιαν αποσελλομενα, δια τας μελλοντας κληρονομειν σωτηριαν;* The translation given in the New Version runs thus : “Of *these* messengers the Scripture saith, Who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of lightning his ministers. \* \* \* Are they not all servants, sent forth to serve the future heirs of salvation?” I shall consider these passages separately.

Of the first it seems difficult to speak without an unusual expression of surprise. Admitting for a moment that *αγγελους* means *messengers*, and *πνευματα* *winds*, instead of “Who maketh *his messengers the winds*, and *his ministers flames of lightning* ;” can we possibly render the words, “Who maketh *the winds his messengers* and

“Art thou *the prophet*?” which is the reading of the New Version. Must it not therefore be as incorrect to confuse the English Article *the* with the pronoun *this* or *that*, as it would be to confuse the Greek Article *ὁ* with the pronoun *ὁστος* or *εκεινος* ? Of this the new Translators themselves seemed aware when they rendered *ὁ προφητης* not *that*, but *the prophet*.



*flames of lightning his ministers,*” by a transposition, the principle of which is utterly inconceivable? And yet such is the rendering of the New Version. The Translators surely will never argue, that the transposition produces not the slightest difference in the sense; that it is, for example, precisely the same thing to say, “Inhumanity makes *a monster a man,*” as it is to say, “Inhumanity makes *a man a monster.*” Nor, although they may be themselves persuaded, than an unprejudiced investigation of truth must make *a Trinitarian an Unitarian,* will they therefore, I presume, admit, that an unprejudiced investigation of truth must make *an Unitarian a Trinitarian.* And how came they on this occasion so rashly to turn their backs upon their favourite Wakefield? How too could they overlook the severe censure of “that eminent scholar” upon the very translation of the passage which they choose to adopt? “Some,” he remarks, “reverse the translation here given, and render, *who maketh winds his messengers, and flaming fire his ministers:* which makes the passage *just nothing at all to the writer’s purpose;* and, not to speak harshly of these Translators,

——ignoratæ premit artis crimine turpi.”\*

But leaving them to exculpate themselves as they can from the disgraceful charge of ignorance, pronounced by a celebrated leader of their own party, and giving them, at the same time, the full advantage of his superior information, I still contend, that, arrange the passage as you please, the signification of *αγγελος* must be *angel,* and not *prophet.* For in what possible sense can *the prophets* be characteristically described as *winds* and *as flames of lightning?* Yet this may be consistently stated of *the angels,* who may be said to resemble *the wind in activity,* and *the lightning in velocity.* And if too, on the other hand, we translate *πνευματα* (perhaps more correctly) *spirits,*

\* Translation of the New Testament, vol. iii. p. 209.

and *πυρος φλογα* a flaming fire, not a shadow of doubt will remain upon the subject. Indeed, that the authors of the Septuagint so understood the original word רוחות, is evident from their translating it here πνευματα, after having in the last clause of the preceding verse rendered it ανεμων, the more appropriate Greek term for winds.\*

With respect to the latter part of the description, in which the αγελοι are said to be ministering spirits, λει-

\* In this sense also the passage alluded to in the Psalms was always taken by the most ancient Jewish writers. Schoettgen observes, "Plerique Judæorum verba hæc de angelis eodem modo explicant. quorum omnia loca proferre nimis prolixum foret." Horæ Heb. et Talm. in loc. In the Pirke R. Eliezer, or *Chapters of R. Eliezer*, chap. iv, where an allusion is made to the creation of angels, this verse of the 104th Psalm is particularly referred to: המלאכים שנבראו ביום שני כשחן נשלחין כרברו נעשין רוחות וכשחן משרתים לפניו נעשין של אש שנאמר עשה &c. "The angels who are created on the second day, when they are sent by his word, become spirits; and when they minister before him, become fiery, (של אש, of fire) as it is written, He made his angels spirits, and his ministers a flaming fire." Four classes of ministering angels, מלאכי השרת, are then described as praising him, who alone is holy and blessed, and surrounding the throne of his glory.

Some critics have conceived, that the πνευματα רוחות spirits, mentioned in the first part of the verse in question, mean the *Cherubim*, and the fiery ministers in the second part the *Seraphim*. The very name *seraph* sufficiently elucidates the latter conjecture. And the former perhaps may be corroborated by the following remark of Drusius: "Ignorari videor, cur nomen, masculinum *Cherubim* 70 viri, Aq. et alii interpretes Græci genere neutro τα Χερουβιμ transtulissent. \* \* \* Ego arbitror τα Χερουβιμ compendio dici pro eo, quod est τα πνευματα Χερουβιμ, i. e. *spiritus, qui Cherubim nuncupantur*." *Observ. Sac.* lib. x. c. 21.

It should likewise be particularly observed, that the word πνευμα occurs in other passages of the New Testament more than *three hundred and fifty times*; and yet is capable only in *one instance*, viz. John iii. 8, (an instance however disputed by Wakefield himself,) of being translated *wind*. The term generally used for *wind* is, as I have remarked above, ανεμος.

τρεῖς πνεύματα, one might have conceived this to be a discriminating characteristic of the angelical nature impossible to be mistaken. But the Translators of the New Version, it seems, think differently, and render the word *servants*. Here however they do not, as in other instances, rest upon the prop either of the Primate's or of Wakefield's Version, but boldly venture at a little criticism of their own. They tell us in a note, that the phrase is a *Hebraism*; a convenient sort of term equally calculated for the display of knowledge, and the concealment of ignorance. They say, "The word *spirit* is a *Hebraism* to express a person's self, *v. g.* 1 Cor. ii. 11; the spirit of a man is a man, is a man himself; the spirit of God is God himself, 2 Tim. iv. 22. The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit, *i. e.* with thee." But how do they prove the supposed Hebraism? Instead of pointing out those passages where the corresponding term  $\text{רוח}$  is thus used in the Old Testament, they merely produce two texts from the New, in which they state *πνεύμα* itself to bear the alleged signification. But if they could demonstrate so peculiar an acceptation of the word in Greek, this would not constitute it an Hebraism, I have examined Vorstius, Olearius, and other champions of Hebraisms, to ascertain, if possible, the grounds of their assertion, but in vain.

It seems not however very material, whether the phrase be an Hebraism, or not, if we can but settle its genuine import. If I understand them correctly, they contend that the term *πνεύματα*, in the passages referred to, is put, not for the *spirit* alone, but by synecdoche for *the whole man*. This, I presume, is all they mean, when they say, "that *the spirit of a man is a man, is a man himself*;" for I cannot conceive them to insinuate here the existence of a reciprocal, abhorrent from oriental usage, and inapplicable to the object in view. Taking it then as an instance of synecdoche, and that *the spirit of a man*, in the



first passage quoted, means only *the man*, we must understand the verse thus: "What man knoweth the things of a man, but *the man* which is in him?" Without being fastidious however upon the singularity of such a mode of expression, I presume that the words το εν αυτω, which is in him, plainly indicate, that πνευμα, with which they are connected, is taken in the sense of *spirit*, its usual acceptation. Nor, in the second passage quoted, is there the slightest ground for supposing that it bears a different meaning. The phrase, "with thy spirit," cannot, I apprehend, be considered as synonymous with "with thee," because it has an appropriate application to the context, which the other phrase has not; for the grace of Christ is only communicable to the *spirit* or soul of man. The pronoun *thee*, therefore, which implies the whole individual, cannot be correctly substituted for *thy spirit*, which implies only a peculiar part of that individual. To be sensible of this, we need only turn to another epistle of the same Apostle, where we shall find a distinction of the kind indisputable. "I know," he elsewhere remarks, "that in me, that is, in my flesh, εν τη σαρκι μου, dwelleth no good," Romans vii. 18. It is impossible, I conceive, to doubt of his intending here to qualify the general expression, in me, by the particular limitation which instantly follows; "that is, in my flesh." Ought we not then to understand the word πνευμα in an equally restricted sense, when under a similar construction?

But what, to sift the question a little more accurately, is really meant by this proposed instance of synecdoche? Are we, when it is recorded, that "Christ was led up by the Spirit," Matt. iv. 1, to suppose that Christ was led up by himself; or, when it is said, that "God is a spirit," John iv. 24, to understand the text as implying, that God is himself? It may perhaps be replied, that the cases are widely different, because the term *spirit* in 1 Cor. ii. 11, and 2 Tim. iv. 22, is connected with the genitive case of

a noun, or pronoun, denoting *a person*, to which person alone it relates ; but it is not so in these texts. I admit the justice of the remark ; but still I ask, How then, upon this very principle, can the supposed synecdoche be applicable to Heb. i. 14, the particular text in view ? Instead of being here joined to a genitive case expressive of a person, it is solely connected with an adjective, declarative of nothing but a mere quality. Had λειτεργικα πνευματα been λειτεργων πνευματα, it might have been possible to have dreamt of a synecdoche ; but one would have imagined, that, as the words stand, the very dream of so inapplicable a trope must have been precluded.

But whatsoever meaning we may affix to the words λειτεργικα πνευματα, it is plain, from the tense of the verb in the same sentence, that they were not meant to be applicable to the ancient prophets. Had the writer intended these words so to be, instead of “ *Are* they not,” he would doubtless have said, “ *Were* they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation ?” and that for this obvious reason ; because the prophets alluded to were dead some ages before the author of the Epistle was born. If however, on the other hand, we apply the words in question to the angels, every thing then becomes instantly clear and consistent. Perhaps also it may not be unimportant to add, as the writer appears, from internal evidence, to have been himself of the Hebrew nation, and as those whom he addressed indisputably were ; that in the Talmud, and other Rabbinical compositions, the epithet *ministering* perpetually recurs in connexion with the term *angels*, as one descriptive of their peculiar office. It is unnecessary to quote instances of a phraseology, which he who runs may read ; “ Nihil in scriptis Rabbinicis frequentius est hac locutione, quod angeli dicuntur מלאכי השרת *angeli ministeriales*, adeo, ut non opus sit loca quædam adscribere.”\*

\* Schoettgen Horæ Heb. in loc.

I have omitted, as superfluous, to notice an argument on this topic deducible from the contrast drawn between the Son and the *αγγελοι*; but I cannot help alluding to one passage, from the singularity of the translation: “To which of those messengers,” it is said, “spake God at any time, Thou art my Son, this day I have *adopted* thee?” This is an extract from the second Psalm, which nevertheless they elsewhere translate, “Thou art my Son, this day I have *begotten* thee.” Acts xiii. 33. Why this change in the translation? And what authority have they for rendering *לָקַח* in the Hebrew, and *γεννωω* in the Greek, to *adopt*? I may perhaps be told, that there is a metaphorical as well as natural filiation, and that the Psalm referred to evinces a metaphorical filiation to have been intended, because in its primary sense it must be considered as applicable to *David*, and to *Christ* only in its secondary sense. But this expedient will by no means answer the end proposed, because by the adoption of it we represent the writer of the Epistle as advancing an argument which carries with it its own refutation. For when, from a confident presumption that the question is unanswerable, he asks, “To which of those messengers, i. e. *prophets*, spake God at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?” may we not instantly reply, *The prophet David*?

It would be foreign to my purpose, if not unimportant to the particular point at issue, were I to enter into the long agitated controversy respecting the author of this Epistle. It seems admitted on all sides, that it was composed at the apostolical period, and may therefore, I presume, be taken as evidence, upon general topics at least of the sentiments then entertained by orthodox Christians. The Translators themselves, in c. ii. 8, give what they deem “a presumptive proof, that it was either written by St. Paul, or by some person, perhaps Barnabas, or Luke, who was an associate with him, and familiarly acquainted



with the Apostle's style of thinking and reasoning ;" although they subsequently represent this as very uncertain. Lardner, after a full discussion of the subject, concludes in favour of the probability, that St. Paul was the author of it ; and Sykes strenuously contends for the same position. I omit the mention of other critics, from a persuasion, that the opinion of all, when added to the weight of that advanced by Lardner and by Sykes, can only prove, in the judgment of Unitarians, light as atoms of dust on the preponderating balance. Although, therefore, we cannot positively, we may at least, I trust, presumptively, ascribe it to St. Paul.

Having alluded to the uncertainty which has been supposed to exist respecting the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I shall slightly notice some little inconsistency to be found in the account given of the other books of the New Testament, which have not been at all times, and in all countries, acknowledged as works indisputably of apostolical composition. These are, the Epistle of St. James, the second of St. Peter, the second and third of St. John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Revelation ; which are represented as books, whose genuineness was disputed by the early Christian writers." And yet we are afterwards informed, that the Epistle of St. James "is not unworthy of the Apostle, to whom it is generally ascribed ;" that the second and third Epistles of St. John so much resemble the first in subject and language, as not to leave "a doubt of their having the same author ;" and that the Revelation cannot be read by any intelligent or candid person, "without his being convinced, that, considering the age in which it appeared, none but a person *divinely inspired*, could have written it." Nothing therefore remains absolutely to be discarded, except the second of St. Peter, and the unfortunate Epistle of St. Jude, neither of which are admissible under the friendly shelter of the Unitarian wing. By these reflections, however, I am far from meaning to

censure the Translators of their laudable attempt at\* even partially rescuing from suspicion the controverted books; the sole object which I have in view being simply to note, with what facility and prompt decision they here, as elsewhere, repudiate or verify, subvert or reestablish, the generally received canon of Scripture at pleasure.

Before I conclude my remarks upon this production, I shall slightly advert to a circumstance incidentally alluded to in another place, viz. that it is not what it professes to be, a translation scrupulously adhering to the text of Griesbach, “the most correct which has hitherto been published;”† but one, in some instances, made from a text which

\* Why is so marked an exception made of St. Peter’s second Epistle, and the Epistle of St. Jude? Lardner, after a detailed examination of the arguments alleged against their authenticity, concludes strongly in favour of it. Of St. Peter’s two Epistles he says, “If we consult them, and endeavour to form a judgment by internal evidence, I suppose it will appear very probable, that both are of the same author. And it may seem somewhat strange, that any of the ancients hesitated about it, who had the two Epistles before them. \* \* I conclude therefore, that the two Epistles generally ascribed to the Apostle Peter are indeed his. \* \* \* \* *Certainly* these Epistles, and the discourses of Peter recorded in the Acts, together with the effects of them, are monuments of *a divine inspiration.*” History of the Apostles and Evangelists, chap. 19. Of the Epistle of St. Jude he says, “I have been thus prolix in rehearsing the passages of Clement; for they appear to me to be a sufficient proof of the antiquity and genuineness of this Epistle; or that it was writ by *Jude, one of Christ’s twelve Apostles.*” Ibid. chap. 20. Such was the opinion of Lardner. The Translators however, although in points of this nature they seem principally to build their faith upon his critical deductions, choose to think differently. With respect indeed to the *first* and *third* chapters of St. Peter’s disputed Epistle, they express themselves rather doubtfully; but the *second* chapter they condemn without reserve, printing it in italics. And yet Lardner, as we have seen, maintained the divine authority of the whole, and Michaelis states what he terms “positive grounds for believing it genuine.” Introd. vol. iv. p. 350, &c.

† Introd. p. 8.

exists no where but in the imagination of the Translators ; who, although they generally indeed follow Griesbach, yet occasionally innovate even on his innovations. In the course of my reflections I have pointed out many passages of considerable length undisputed by him, the authenticity of which they represent as extremely dubious. Nor is this all. For, comple'tely in the teeth of an intimation formally given, that "the words, which in the judgment of Griesbach should probably, though not certainly, be expunged, are included in brackets,"\* they sometimes take the liberty themselves of expunging words of this description upon the superior decision of their own judgment.† Timid, cautious, circumspective, Griesbach weighed over and over again, with anxious solicitude, the credit of a textual variation, experience having taught him wisdom ; for he candidly confesses, that in his first edition he had admitted several readings into the text, which in his second, he felt himself under the necessity of removing to the margin : "Nonnullas lectiones, quæ olim in margine interiore fuissent repositæ, jam, plurium testium auctoritate confirmatas, in textum recepi ; sed contra etiam alias, quibus in textu olim locum suum assignassem, nunc, testibus nuper productis nil novi præsidii afferentibus, in marginem amandavi."‡ But they, less exact and more intrepid, in passages where he could only discover the appearance of a probable, determine the existence of a certain, omission ; and by an easy dash of the pen obliterate them altogether.

On one occasion indeed they hazard a bolder step ; and, where Griesbach adopts, without observation, the common reading, they, upon the sole authority of the Cambridge manuscript, venture upon a little interpolation, which directly converts an affirmative into a negative sentence.

\* Explanation of remarks, introd. p. 33.

† See Mark ii. 26, v, 15 ; Luke ix. 56.

‡ Prolegomena, p. 36.



It is recorded of St. John, who visited, with St. Peter, the sepulchre of our Lord, when Mary Magdalene had communicated to them her suspicions respecting the removal of the body, that, after he had inspected the sepulchre, "he saw and believed." Now this passage, in direct contradiction to every other manuscript, they render, "he saw and believed *not*," adding the following note from Newcome; "So the Cambridge MS. in the Greek, but not in the Latin, translation of it. The following verse assigns a reason for the unbelief of St. John and St. Peter." The precise value of this sort of half authority, contradicted by its other half, for the manuscript in question contains a Latin, as well as a Greek text, it is for them to calculate and explain; but as the consistency of the narrative is urged by way of proving the necessity of their interpolation, I cannot help remarking, that the common sense of the context, by which alone, I apprehend, the consistency of the narrative can be preserved, requires no such addition. The point applicable to the credence of the Apostle was, not the resurrection of our Saviour, for nothing upon that head had yet been surmised, but evidently the report of Mary Magdalene, that the body had been stolen away. When therefore St. John was informed of the circumstance, and, examining the sepulchre, perceived the linen clothes, which had wrapped the body, lying on the ground, and the napkin, which had been bound about the head, folded together in a place by itself, can we possibly conjecture that he believed *not*?

Upon the whole then, it is, I presume, incontrovertible, that they have not uniformly adhered to the text of Griesbach. I do not indeed dispute their right to deviate from the judgment of that, or any other critic; but I complain of their holding out false colours to the public. If they flattered themselves that they possessed talents capable of improving "the most correct text of the original which has hitherto been published," they were doubtless at liberty to

have made the experiment ; but they should have undertaken the task openly and undisguisedly. Were they apprehensive, that in such a case their competency might have been questioned, and their presumption censured ?

Nor can I take a final leave of the subject, without again alluding to another deception practised upon the general reader. From the style of the title-page, the prolegomenal parade of the introduction, and the perpetual attempt at manuscript erudition in the notes, he is naturally induced to consider the Version as one conducted upon principles rigidly critical, while, in truth, it is nothing more than a mere patchwork translation, solely manufactured to promote the cause of unitarianism. When a passage occurs, which in its obvious sense threatens fatality to the Unitarian Creed, its sting is instantly and ingeniously extracted ; what exposition the language of Scripture *can*, not what it *ought* to bear, becomes the object of investigation ; and the context is twisted into subserviency to the gloss, and not the gloss made consistent with the context. The Translators indeed unreservedly confess, that they have studied “to preclude many sources of error, by divesting the sacred volume of the technical phrases of a systematic theology ;” but they forget to add, that it was only in order to supersede one system by another. If a clause admits the slightest pliability of meaning, every nerve is strained to give it a peculiar direction. Instead of enquiring, with Christian simplicity, what really *are*, they presume with philosophical arrogance upon what *must be*, the doctrines of Scripture ; and substitute the deductions of reason for the dictates of revelation. Averse from established opinion, fond of novelty, and vain of singularity they pride themselves upon a sort of mental insulation, and become captivated at every magic touch with the effluent brilliance of their own intellect. The profound researches of the most distinguished commentators and philologists they either slight or despise, unless convertible by

a little dexterity of application to the aggrandisement of some favourite theory ; and satiate us with the flimsy refinements and loose lucubrations of Lindsey, or of Priestly. Immoderately attached to particular doctrines, and deeply prejudiced against all others, they modify every expression in the text, and every exposition in the notes, to a sense sometimes directly favourable, but never even indirectly unfavourable, to Unitarianism ; so that in reality, always indifferent, though apparently sometimes anxious, respecting the true philological import of scriptural language, and ever restless with the gad-fly of theological conceit, they prove themselves to be wholly incapacitated, from a defect, if not of talent, certainly of temper, for the patient task of critical rumination.

*Proctor*













**For use in Library only**

**For use in Library only**

