



38-5-

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, \*  
\* Princeton, N. J. \*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

BS 413 .B58 v.4  
Ernesti, Johann August, 1707  
-1781.  
Principles of Biblical  
interpretation

10.00  
3 5/2  
20.00  
7.50  
12.50  
10.00  
17.50  
10.00  
27.50

6) 11.00  
3.33  
7.67

7-11







THE  
BIBLICAL CABINET;

OR

HERMENEUTICAL, EXEGETICAL,

AND

PHILOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

---

VOL. IV.

---

ERNEST'S INSTITUTES.

---

EDINBURGH:

THOMAS CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET;

J. G. & F. RIVINGTON, LONDON;

AND W. CURRY, JUN. & CO., DUBLIN.

MDCCCXXXIII.





PRINCIPLES  
OF  
BIBLICAL  
INTERPRETATION,

TRANSLATED FROM THE  
INSTITUTIO INTERPRETIS

OF  
J. A. ERNESTI,

BY

CHARLES H. TERROT, A. M.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:  
THOMAS CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCXXXIII.

J. THOMSON, PRINTER, MILNE SQUARE.

# CONTENTS.

---

## PART THIRD.

### OF THE HERMENEUTICAL APPARATUS, AND ITS PROPER USE.

#### CHAPTER I.

	Page
CONCERNING THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT, THEIR AUTHENTICITY, GENUINENESS, DISTINCTIONS, &c. . . . .	1
§ 1. Of the <i>Authenticity</i> of the Books of the New Testament.	
2. Of Doubts respecting the Authenticity enter- tained by the Early Church.	
3. Of the Controverted Books.	
4. Of the Authenticity of the Greek Text.	
5. Of the Substantial Genuineness of the Greek Text.	
6. Of the reported Corruption by Anastasius.	
7. Of the means whereby the Genuineness of the Text has been preserved.	

- § 8. Of exaggerated expressions respecting the Corruption of the Text.
9. Varieties in the Text of little importance to the sense of Scripture.
10. The Integrity of Scripture confirmed by varieties in the Text.
11. Of the Nature of this Integrity.
12. Cases where Conjectural Emendation is allowable.
13. Substantial, not Verbal Integrity, to be maintained.
14. There were no divisions in the Autographs of the Sacred Books.
15. Divisions were introduced at an early age.
16. Of the *Ammonian* and *Eusebian* divisions of the *Gospels*.
17. Of the *Euthalian* Division of the *Acts* and *Epistles*.
18. Origin of the *Modern Chapters*.
19. ————— *Verses*.
20. Of the Marks of *Punctuation*.
21. Of *Breathings* and *Accents*.
22. All these divisions and marks being comparatively recent, are of little authority.

## CHAPTER II.

	Page
OF MANUSCRIPTS AND THEIR USE . . . .	25

- § 1. The Autographs of the Inspired Writers have perished.
2. Of the supposed duration of the Autograph of St. John's Gospel.

- § 3. Of the evidence of *Tertullian* in this matter.
4. Causes of the early disappearance of the Autographs.
5. Of Manuscripts Collated and Uncollated.
6. Of the *Vatican* and *Alexandrine* Manuscripts.
7. Of the Codex *Parisiensis*, &c.
8. Of the *Vienna* and *Basle* Manuscripts.
9. Few of these contain the whole of the New Testament. Note (z) on the Classification of Manuscripts.
10. The same Manuscript has often several names.
11. Of Manuscripts, which are copies of other existing Manuscripts.
12. Of Manuscripts, some are merely Greek, others Græco-Latin, and some merely Lectionaries.
13. Of the Alteration of Greek MSS., according to the Latin Version.
14. Of the Causes and Instruments of this alteration.
15. Of the Subserving of the Alexandrine to the Roman Church.
16. The alterations had not taken place in the time of *Origen*, nor in that of *Euthalius*.
17. Of the Cause of Discrepancies between the Greek Text and the Latin Version.
18. In cases of Discrepancy the Greek is to be preferred.
19. Manuscripts are to be judged of by their *Age* and *Goodness*.
20. How to determine the *Goodness* of a Manuscript.
21. Unjust Partialities to be guarded against.

## CHAPTER III.

	Page
OF EDITIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT . . . . .	47

- § 1. Of the Origin of the Printed Editions.  
 2. Of the Aids employed by the Editors.  
 3. and 4. The same subject continued.  
 5. Of the Primary Editions.  
 6. The *Complutensian*, A. D. 1514.  
 7. The *Complutensian* Text repeated by *R. Stephen*,  
 A. D. 1546, and by others.  
 8. Of *Erasmus'* First Edition in 1516, and the  
 succeeding ones.  
 9. The *Erasmian* Text followed by *Aldus* and others.  
 10. Of *Beza's* Editions, A. D. 1565.  
 11. Of *Elzevir's* Edition, A. D. 1624, and the nume-  
 rous editions formed upon it.  
 12. Of *Bengel's* Edition, A. D. 1734, and note b. of  
 the principal critical editions during the last  
 century.  
 13. Of the Projected Edition of *Bentley*.  
 14. Of the *Textus Receptus* and its value.  
 15. Of the value of editions in general.  
 16. Of the Exaggerated Accounts which the early  
 editors gave of their authorities.

## CHAPTER IV.

OF VERSIONS . . . . .	60
-----------------------	----

- § 1. Early necessity for Versions.  
 2. Proofs that Versions were made at a very early  
 date.

- § 3. Of the *Peshito Syriac* Version.
4. Of the Source from which the *Peshito* was made, and of the *Persian* Version made from it.
5. Of the *Philoxenian Syriac* Version.
6. Of the *Coptic* Version.
7. Of the *Æthiopic* Version.
8. Of the *Armenian* Version.
9. Of the *Arabic* Versions.
10. Of the *Gothic* Version of *Ulphilas*.
11. Of the Ancient *Latin* Versions.
12. Of the old *Vulgate* or *Vetus Itala*.
13. Of its Origin and Name.
14. Of Attempts to restore this Version.
15. Failure of these Attempts.
16. Causes of the Failure.
17. Enquiry into the Authorship of this Version.
18. Of *Jerome's* Version.
19. Of the Principal Editions of *Jerome's* Version, or that which is now called the *Vulgate*.
20. Of later *Latin* Versions.
21. Of the Use of Versions in general.
22. and 23. Of the *Hermeneutical* Use of Versions.
24. Necessity of a thorough knowledge of the language in which the Version is.
25. Method of ascertaining the goodness of a Version.
26. Exaggerated Use of the Eastern Versions.
27. Versions are to be resorted to only when other aids fail.
28. Of the *Critical* Use of Versions made directly from the Greek.
29. This Use denied by *Whitby* and others.
30. Caution to be used in the *Critical* Use of Versions.

## CHAPTER V.

	Page
OF THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS, AND THEIR APPLICATION . . . . .	90
§ 1. The Writings of the Fathers have both a <i>Critical</i> and a <i>Hermeneutical</i> use.	
2. Previous Enquiry into the Text used by the Fathers.	
3. Few collected copies of the several books of the New Testament, existed in the first centuries.	
4. The early copies were generally written by unlearned men.	
5. Of the Copyists and other Christian Writers of the second century.	
6. Of <i>Origen's</i> Recension.	
7. Of the high esteem in which it was held by the Greek Church.	
8. Of the Recension of <i>Lucian</i> and <i>Hesychius</i> .	
9. Various Readings are mentioned by all the Fathers after <i>Origen</i> .	
10. Of <i>Interpolations</i> made to reconcile the <i>Greek</i> Text with the <i>Latin</i> Version.	
11. Of the superior authority of the Greek Text above the <i>Latin</i> .	
12. Of the <i>Critical</i> authority of the Quotations by the Fathers.	
13. Authors valuable in proportion to their <i>Antiquity</i> .	
14. Authors valuable in proportion to their <i>Learning</i> .	



- § 15. Of the different *Classes* of Patristic Works, and their Comparative Critical Value.
16. Caution to be used in the Critical Use of the Patristic Writings.
17. No conclusion to be drawn from the silence of the Fathers.
18. Error of those who deny all Critical Authority to the Writings of the Fathers.
19. Of the *Hermeneutical* use of the Patristic Writings.
20. Of Origen's Interpretations of Scripture.
21. Of the Obligations of the Church to the earliest Commentators.
22. The Dogmatic as well as the Exegetical Commentaries of the Fathers are to be studied.
23. Scriptural Expressions adopted by the Fathers ought to be Noticed
24. Cautions to be used in consulting the Fathers.

## CHAPTER VI.

	Page
OF THE CAUSE, ORIGIN AND CHOICE OF VARIOUS READINGS . . . . .	114

- § 1. A knowledge of Manuscripts, Editions, and Versions requisite, before the subject of *Various Readings* can be entered on.
2. Absurd Objections to the Science of Biblical Criticism.
3. General Account of the Origin of Various Readings.

- § 4. Of the objections of *Whitby*.  
5. Four sources of Variety.  
6. Of Various Readings proceeding from Varieties in the *Manuscripts*.  
7. Of the rashness of *Emendators*.  
8. Of adulteration of Manuscripts by *Heretics*.  
9. Of the *goodness* of Readings.  
10. Criteria of goodness.  
11. Of Manuscripts the Old Greek are most valuable.  
12. Of Readings collected from the Writings of the *Fathers*, and their comparative value.  
13. Of Various Readings in the *Printed Editions*.  
14. Of the comparative value of the different Classes of testimony to Readings.  
15. Reasonableness of attributing high Critical Authority to the Writings of the *Fathers*.  
16. Of the use of collections of Various Readings.  
17. Of their *Critical Use*.  
18. Folly of those who deny this Use.  
19. Difficulty of forming Critical Canons.  
20. Difference between Canons applicable to Scripture, and to other Books.  
21. Necessity for laying down some Rules on the subject.  
22. The *Antiquity*, *Goodness*, and *Truth* of Readings to be attended to.  
23. Comparison of these qualities with each other.  
24. How to decide when the Antiquity and goodness of two Readings are equal.  
25. Readings *apparently harsh*, are more probably Genuine.  
26. *Analogical* Readings are to be preferred.  
27. Readings supported by the *Fathers* are to be preferred.

- § 28. No exclusive authority to be given to any class of Testimony.
29. The authority of the Fathers sometimes to be preferred to that of Manuscripts.
30. Necessity for Caution and Modesty in forming a Critical Judgment.
31. Of the balancing of Testimonies.
32. Of the *Hermeneutical Use of Various Readings*.
33. Of *Critical Editions of the New Testament*.
34. Of *Mill's Edition, A. D. 1707*.
35. Of *Kuster's* reprint of *Mill*.
36. Of *Bengel's Apparatus Criticus*.
37. Of *Wetstein's Edition*.
38. Of the Various Readings collected by *Velesius* and *Caryophilus*.
39. Of the influence of prejudice in the Selection of Readings.
40. How to avoid such Errors.
41. Much still remains to be effected in the Criticism of the New Testament.

## CHAPTER VII.

	Page
OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION, AND THE FRAGMENTS OF AQUILA, SYMMACHUS, &c. . . .	146

- § 1. Of the *Septuagint* or *Alexandrine Version*.
2. Cause of *Hebraisms* in the Septuagint.
3. Importance of studying the *Style* of the Septuagint.
4. The Septuagint has been applied to the Illustration of the New Testament by the best Modern Interpreters.

- § 5. Of the several Methods in which this has been done.
6. Necessity of laying down Rules for this application.
7. Of the Extension, in the Septuagint, of the sense of Greek Words, in conformity with the use of the corresponding Hebrew Word.
8. The same subject continued.
9. The same subject continued.
10. Of Peculiarities in the Septuagint which cannot be accounted for by anything in the Hebrew.
11. Sometimes the Septuagint Version gives not the exact Words, but the substantial sense of the Hebrew in pure Greek idioms.
12. Application of the foregoing Observations, to the Elucidation of the New Testament.
13. The Hebraisms of the New Testament are to be compared with the Hebrew, through the Medium of the Septuagint.
14. Method of Applying the pure Greek idioms in the Septuagint to the Elucidation of the literal Hebraisms of the New Testament.
15. Of Instances of Logical Metathesis in the Septuagint Version.
16. Of pure Greek Idioms in the New Testament, which must be interpreted Hebraistically.
17. Of the *Concordances* of *Kircher* and *Trommius*.
18. The *Hermeneutical* use of the Septuagint Version by no means exhausted.
19. Of other Uses of the Septuagint Version.
20. Of the Different Methods of *Quotation* used by the Writers of the New Testament.
21. Of their frequent Quotation from the Septuagint.

- § 22. Of the *Critical Use* of the Septuagint.  
 23. ——— in cases where the Authority of Manuscripts is balanced.  
 24. Importance of using a good copy of the Septuagint.  
 25. Of the Version of *Aquila*.  
 26. *Aquila's* Version generally Literal.  
 27. Its Hermeneutical Use.  
 28. Of the Version of *Symmachus*; and Note (n) of the *Venetian* Version.  
 29. Of the Use of the Greek Versions generally: and Note (f) of *Origen's* Hexapla.

## CHAPTER VIII.

	Page
OF THE USE OF WORKS WRITTEN BY JEWS .	174

- § 1. Of Forms in the New Testament which cannot be explained, either by the Hebrew Old Testament, nor by the Septuagint.  
 2. Of the most Ancient Jewish writings, as the *Targums*, *Mischna*, &c.  
 3. Of the Writings of those who have made collections from the Jewish Books, as *Lightfoot*, *Schoetgen*, &c.  
 4. These Writings sometimes illustrate not merely Words but Things.  
 5. Cautions to be used in the application of the Jewish Writings to the Interpretation of the New Testament.  
 6. Necessity of Specific Rules for their Application.  
 7. The Jewish Writers not to be applied to, except where other aids fail.

- § 8. Of the Use to be made of the Writings of *Philo* and *Josephus*.  
 9. Of the peculiar Use of *Philo's* Writings, in illustrating the arguments of St. Paul.  
 10. Of the Peculiar Use of *Josephus*.

## CHAPTER IX.

	Page
OF THE INTERPRETERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND OF THEIR USE . . . . .	187

- § 1. Of the Different Methods of Interpretation in the Early Church.  
 2. Of *Allegorical* Interpretation.  
 3. Of *Mystical* Interpretation.  
 4. Of the Corruption of this Style of Interpretation.  
 5. Of *Allegorical* Interpretation in the Early Christian Church.  
 6. Of *Grammatical* Interpretation.  
 7. Of the Earliest Grammatical Interpreters ; and Note (z) of the *Catenæ*.  
 8. Of Allegorical Interpreters in the Latin Church.  
 9. Of *Dogmatical* Interpretation.  
 10. Of the *Mixed* Method of Interpretation.  
 11. Of *Commentaries*.  
 12. Of *Homilies*.  
 13. Of *Scholia*.  
 14. Of the Question whether *Origen* were the First Writer of Commentaries.  
 15. Of the Exegetical Works of *Origen*.  
 16. Of the Character and Value of his Interpretations.

- § 17. Of the Homilies of *Chrysostom*.  
 18. Of *Isidore of Pelusium*.  
 19. Of *Theodoret*.  
 20. Of *Theophylact*.  
 21. Of the Scholia of *Æcumenius*.  
 22. Of *Johannes Damascenus*.  
 23. Of the *Catenæ*.  
 24. Of *Euthymius Zigabenus*.  
 25. Of *Cyrrill of Alexandria*.  
 26. Of *Jerome*.  
 27. Of *Hilary of Poitou*, and *Hilary the Deacon*  
 commonly called *Ambrosiaster*.  
 28. Of *Pelagius*.  
 29. Of the Commentaries of *Augustine*.  
 30. Of the Glosses called *Ordinaria* and *Interlinearis*.  
 31. Of the Various Systems of Interpretation pur-  
 sued at the Revival of Letters.  
 32. Of the *Grammatical* School of Interpretation.  
 33. Of the *Dogmatic* School.  
 34. Of the *Mixed* School.  
 35. Of *Beza* and *Grotius*.  
 36. Of the Followers of *Grotius*.  
 37. Of Writers of *Observations* from Selected sources  
 of Illustration.  
 38. Of Writers of *Observations* on Selected Passages.  
 39. Of Collections from preceding Annotators.  
 40. Of Collections of Entire Commentaries.  
 41. Of the Use to be made of Commentaries.  
 42. The Student ought first to Study some one good  
 Grammatical Interpreter.  
 43. Of *Simon's Histoire Critique du N. T.*  
 44. Of the Importance of Keeping a Record of  
 Difficulties.  
 45. Utility of perusing Entire Commentaries.  
 46. Propriety of preferring the Greek Commentators.

- § 47. Utility of Tracing the Steps by which Interpreters arrive at their Conclusions.
48. Little attention to be paid to Interpreters who have no Qualification but Classical Learning.
49. *Dogmatic* Interpreters not to be Neglected.
50. Dogmatic Interpretation useful to the Lecturer and Preacher.

## CHAPTER X.

	Page
ON THE USE OF GENERAL INFORMATION. . . .	234

- § 1. Of the Necessity of a Knowledge of *Grammar*.
2. Subject continued.
3. Same subject continued.
4. Study of Grammar recommended by *Luther*.
5. Of *Luther's* supposed depreciation of Grammatical Knowledge.
6. Of the Great Divisions of Grammar, *Etymology* and *Syntax*.
7. Necessity of a Competent Knowledge of each.
8. Of *Etymology*.
9. Of *Syntax*.
10. Of Figures of Speech.
11. Of Barbarisms in the Phraseology of the New Testament.
12. Of *Criticism*.
13. Necessity of Critical Knowledge to the interpreter.
14. Dangerous consequences of ignorance in this matter.
15. Of the Principal Critics in the Early Church.
16. Of Conjectural criticism.



- § 17. Of the best *Critics* in Profane Literature.
18. Of the Critical Apparatus.
19. Of the best Critics of the New Testament.
20. Caution to be used in the Emendation of the Text.
21. Of Superstitious Attachment to the Common Text.
22. Error of hasty and rash Conjecture
23. Sinfulness of altering the Text on Dogmatic grounds.
24. Of Popish Objections to Sacred Criticism.
25. Difficulty of Practical Criticism.
26. Of *Rhetoric*.
27. Of *Philosophy*.
28. Of *Logic*.
29. Of the uses of Logic.
30. Same subject continued.
31. Of the Abuse of Logical Subtlety.
32. Cases where accuracy is needless, and cases where it ought to be looked for.
33. Of Logical *Analysis* of Scripture.
34. Of the Use of Logic in reconciling apparent contradictions.
35. Of the use of Logic in detecting the course of Argument.
36. Of *History*.
37. Of Errors arising from ignorance of History.
38. Of *Geography*.
39. Of the divisions of Palestine.
40. Subsequent alterations in the Division.
41. Of the Kingdom of *Herod the Great*.
42. Of the Roman *Procurators*.
43. Of the Kingdom of *Agrippa*.
44. Of the Physical Geography of *Palestine*.
45. Of the Geography of *Asia*.

- § 46. Of the Various kinds of Roman Provinces.
47. Of *Consular* and *Prætorian* Provinces: and of the Procurators.
48. Of Allied Cities, and Roman Colonies.
49. Of the different ranks of Cities.
50. Of the necessity of making Geography a separate Study.
51. Of *Chronology*, especially that of the Old Testament.
52. Of Chronological difficulties in the New Testament.
53. Of the date of St. Paul's Conversion.
54. Of the connexion of Sacred and Profane Chronology.
55. Of the Chronology of the Herodian Dynasty.
56. Of the Succession of High Priests.
57. Of certain peculiarities in the Jewish Method of calculating Periods.
58. Caution to be observed in the Assumption of Elementary Dates.
59. Necessity of *Historical* and *Antiquarian* knowledge.
60. Of useful Chronological Works.
61. Of Jewish Antiquities.
62. Of the Captivity of *Israel* and of the *Samaritans*.
63. Of the Captivity of the *Jews*.
64. Of the mixture of Israelites among the Samaritans.
65. Of Jewish Emigrations to Egypt and Cyprus.
66. Of Emigrations to Antioch and other Asiatic Cities.
67. Of the patronage afforded to Jewish Emigrants by the Cæsars.
68. Of the *Herodian* Family.

70. Of the Roman *Procurators*.
71. Of the light thrown on this, and subjects connected with it, by the Orations of *Cicero in Verrem*.
72. Of the power of the *High-Priest*, and *Sanhedrim*.
73. Of other Jewish Magistrates at Jerusalem.
74. Of the Captain of the Temple.
75. Of the Jewish *Archons* out of Judea.
76. Of Jewish Archons in Judea.
77. Of the Priests and Levites.
78. Of the Temple.
79. Of the *ναὸς*, *ἱερόν*, *ἄγιον*, and *ἄδυτον*.
80. Of Synagogues and Proseuchæ.
81. Of Jewish Schools of Theology.
82. Of the Pharisees and Sadducees.
83. Of the divisions of *Time* among the Jews.
84. Of Liquid and Solid *Measures*; and of the *Coins* mentioned in the New Testament.
85. Of Provincial *Taxation*.
86. Of the Coins used in the payment of Taxes.
87. Of the Tax paid by Jews into the Temple Treasury.
88. Of the *Dress* of the Jews.
89. Of the *Meals* of the Jews.
90. Of the Style of Building among the Jews.
91. Of Ceremonies used at *Burials*.
92. Of Jewish *Punishments*.
93. The same subject continued.
94. Of the History of the *Cæsars* from Augustus to Nero.
95. Of the Government of the Empire as arranged by Augustus.
96. Of the Judicial power of the Provincial Magistrates.

- § 97. Of the *Prætorian Cohorts* and their *Prefect*.  
98. Of the Roman Troops in the Provinces.  
99. Of the Collection of Taxes.  
100. Of Roman citizenship.  
101. Necessity of a knowledge of Greek Antiquities.  
102. Of the Sacrificial Rites of the Greeks.  
103. Of the Greek Coins mentioned in the New Testament.  
104. Of the Armour, and Athletic Games of the Greeks.  
105. Of their Naval Affairs.  
106. Importance of a knowledge of all these Subjects to the Interpreter of Scripture.  
107. Same subject continued.  
108. Of the Errors produced by ignorance of them.  
109. Same subject continued.  
110. Caution to be used in the application of Antiquarian and Grammatical Knowledge to the Interpretation of the New Testament.  
111. Of Philosophy.

## PART THIRD.

OF THE HERMENEUTICAL APPARATUS,  
AND ITS PROPER USE.

---

### CHAPTER I.

CONCERNING THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTA-  
MENT, THEIR AUTHENTICITY, GENUINENESS,  
DISTINCTIONS, &c.

I. THAT the greater portion of the books of the New Testament were really written by those whose names are attached to them, is proved by such unanimous evidence of antiquity, that their *authenticity* is as certain as that of any other ancient book whatever. And of those whose authenticity is less distinctly proved, there is no just reason for suspecting, that any were written at another time, or by other men than is generally believed; or at

least, that they were written by other than *inspired* men.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> It is to be regretted that Ernesti has not, in this place, briefly explained his sentiments respecting *inspiration*. For a good interpreter cannot proceed without clear notions on this subject. The opinions respecting it, which he has advanced in his *Nov. Bibl. Theol. T. iii. p. 468*, have been supported by *Hegelmaier* in his *Comment. de Θεοπνευστία*, Tubingen 1784. But, at the present day, it will be proper to consult, *Griesbach's Comment. de Theopneustiâ Librorum Sacrorum*, Jenæ 1784—1788. *Semler's Beitrag zur Revision der kirklichen Hermeneutik und Dogmatic*, (Helps to the Revision of Ecclesiastical Hermeneutics and Dogmatics,) p. 24, and *Doederlein's Instit. Theol. Christ. § 30*.

As to the *genuineness* of the several books, it is proved, 1. By the historical evidence of the most ancient fathers, as *Barnabas*, *Clement of Rome*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*. 2. By the use of the church in the earliest age. See *Spanheim*, *De Script. Hist. Evan. Opp. ii. p. 266*. 3. By internal arguments drawn from the language and tenor of the books themselves. See *Michaelis*, *Introd. in Nov. Test. § 2—12*. *Lessius*, *Wahrheit der Christl. Rel. (Truth of the Christian Religion,)* p. 1—125. *Geschichte der Rel. (History of Religion,)* § 28—34. And *Doederlein's Instit. Theol. Christ. P. ii. p. 29. sqq.* [As far as relates to the genuineness and authenticity of the Canonical Books of the New Testament, our own theological literature is abundantly sufficient. The British student may be satisfied with *Lardner's Credibility*, *Paley's Evidences*, *Jones on the Canon*, and the 1st vol. of *Mr. Horne's Introduction*. With respect to the nature and extent of *inspiration*, our Theology is very poor, and the result is, that a great diversity of opinion on this head prevails even among the orthodox; not indeed as to

whether the Scripture is inspired, but as to the extent of the inspiration. Some, for example, hold a *verbal*, others only a *real* inspiration: some claim inspiration for every portion of Scripture equally, others only for those points which the Apostles could not otherwise have known. The limits of a note are manifestly insufficient for entering upon a full examination of this question, but if the general truth of Scripture be proved, as it is abundantly, in the works above referred to, the Translator conceives that the simple principle of the *necessity of the case* will go far to establish a *minimum*, below which we cannot rationally reduce the degree of Scriptural Inspiration. Allowing then the truth of Scripture, it was manifestly the will of God to enlighten and evangelize the world, 1st, by the preaching, and 2dly, by the writings of the Apostles. Now, since the substance of what they were to teach was composed of truths which they had not fully learned from our Saviour's personal ministry, it was necessary that they should be inspired with this knowledge. Such inspiration was promised, and the promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. But was this primary inspiration sufficient; and might they have been safely left to communicate the knowledge thus *supernaturally* acquired, in a mere *natural* manner? Certainly not. For being in themselves fallible, they might have represented the true doctrine in such a light, or illustrated it by such figures and examples, as must necessarily have led their hearers and readers into error: in short, they might have fallen into any or into all the absurdities into which believers in the truth of Scripture have fallen, from their time to the present. To guard against this, there must have existed a permanent influence of the Spirit guarding them from all erroneous colouring, and defective illustration, as well as from absolute falsehood. The *necessity of the case* then leads us to conclude, that the Holy Spirit having at first imparted to the Apostles a clear knowledge of all requisite truths, did habitually exercise such an influence over their minds, as to

preserve them from all misapprehension and misrepresentation, there being no other conceivable way in which their knowledge could with certainty have been rendered available for its intended purpose.]

II. For though doubts did exist at an early period respecting some books, those doubts did not extend to the fact of inspiration, as in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews ; or were entertained by a few only, who judged without a sufficient knowledge of the facts.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> It is notorious that the case is otherwise ; for if the Apocalypse be taken from St. John, if the Epistle to the Hebrews be given to some Alexandrine Jew, see *Zeigler's Einleitung*, p. 256, and the Second and Third Epistles of John attributed to John the Presbyter, then the inspiration of these books is invalidated, whose authenticity, together with the genuineness of the Epistles of James and Jude, and of the Second Epistle of Peter, ought in the first place to be proved.

III. Nor are the arguments of ancient heretics, denying the apostolic origin of these books, of any force, since it is clear that their only object was to obtain a shelter for their impiety ; nor those of later deists, who bring forward the frequency of pious frauds in the early church, and similar topics ; in all of which they do not attempt to establish by historical proofs what really was done, but rashly conjecture what may have been done ; a method more



sued for those who eagerly desire some particular result, than for those who wish truly and accurately to instruct.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> Respecting the controverted (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) books first mentioned, we may further observe, 1st, That neither moral nor dogmatic theology would receive any injury though they were all to be declared spurious, since no truth of Christianity rests upon their evidence alone; 2d, That doubts respecting them are not of a very early date. Origen admits them all as authentic: but Eusebius in his *Hist. Ecc.* iii. 25, expresses doubts respecting some, whence arose the distribution into *ὁμολογούμενα*, *ἀντιλεγόμενα* and *νόθα*, that is, into *admitted*, *controverted*, and *spurious*: 3d, That no adversary can shew that any one of these books is false; on the contrary, all sedulously distinguish them from the Apocryphal books; maintaining only that their *authenticity* rests on weaker evidence than that of the other books. See *Weber's Symb. ad Can. Nov. Test.* Tubingen 1791, p. 158, sq. Those who wish to examine the subject more accurately, may consult *Semler's Freie Untersuchung des Canons*, Halæ 1771—75. *Free Enquiry into the Canon. Roesler's Bibl. der Kirchenväter*, Library of the Fathers of the Church, t. iv. p. 394, sq., *Haenlein's Handbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.* Manual of Introduction to the writings of the New Testament, Ed. 2, Erlangen 1801, P. i. p. 39, sq., and the work of *Hug*, who has struck out a new line of enquiry, *Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.* Tubingen 1808, P. i. p. 1, sq. [It does not give a true representation of the case to say, as Ammon does, that Eusebius *de quibusdam jam sententiam fert ancipitem*; for Eusebius, in the chapter quoted, declares that he is giving not his own private opinion, but the ecclesiastical tradition, *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστικῆ*.]

IV. That the Greek text is authentic, is not

less indisputably true. For though there exists an ancient tradition that St. Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, yet the same tradition asserts, that it was translated into Greek, either by Matthew himself, or by some other inspired writer; but the tradition altogether rests on no solid foundation.<sup>d</sup> Respecting a Latin original of St. Mark's Gospel,<sup>e</sup> and a Syriac of that of St. John, there exists a more recent and unfounded tradition or conjecture.<sup>f</sup> That the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Hebrew, was the opinion of *Clement*, as we learn from *Eusebius*, Hist. Ecc. vi. 14., and also of *Eusebius* himself. But neither does this opinion rest upon any satisfactory arguments.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>d</sup> See the Hebrew origin of St. Matthew's Gospel asserted in *Michaelis' Int.* in N. T. Tom II. p. 950, Ed. 4. *Masch* has taken the opposite side in his work, *von der grundsprache des Evang. Matt.* On the original language of St. Matthew's Gospel. See also *Wahl's Magazine*, T. II. p. 57. There is now little doubt respecting the Hebrew origin of this Gospel; nor do we see how there can be any, after the express testimonies of *Origen*, *Eusebius*, and *Jerome*, who was almost an eye witness. [*ἀυτόπτης* is the word; but in what sense *Jerome* could be almost *ἀυτόπτης* of what language St. Matthew wrote in, the translator cannot imagine.]

<sup>e</sup> *Baronius* in his *Annal. Christ. An. 45*, has attempted to support the Latin origin of St. Mark's Gospel. He has been refuted by *Baumgarten* in his *Vindiciæ Textus Græci* and by *Dobrowski* in his *Fragm. Prag. Evang. Marci*.

Pragæ, 1778. Equally unsupported is the conjecture of *Wahl* in his *Magazine for ancient and especially for Biblical and Oriental Literature*, No. III, p. 8, sq. that St. Mark wrote in Coptic.

<sup>f</sup> See *Salmasius de Hellen.* p. 251, sq. equally weak is the opinion of *Harenberg* concerning the Syriac original of the Apocalypse. There is another question respecting the true Redacteur of the Gospel of St. John, first stated by *Grotius and Wetstein*, pursued by *Vogel, Bertholdt and Weyscheiden*, and not yet brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

<sup>g</sup> See *Semler's Diss.* on the Greek origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Hal. 1761. *Zeigler's* Introduction, and *Heinrich's* Prolegomena to the Epistle, [published as part of the *Nov. Test. Koppianum.*]

V. Nor is it to be admitted that the Greek text, which we now possess, is substantially different from that which the primitive church received from the Apostles; or that it is so corrupted and interpolated, as not to be a copy of the genuine Greek text, and to be inferior in authority to the Latin version. For the system of *J. Blanchinus*, in his *Vindiciæ Canon. Script.*, preferring the copies of the earliest Latin version to the Greek manuscripts, together with other arguments, is refuted by the common consent of the most ancient Greek fathers, as well as of many Latin ones, in quoting and interpreting the Greek text. And if, in some cases, they depart from our Greek text and agree with the Latin version; this is done very rarely, and not by all. Interpola-

tions also into the Greek text from the Latin, of which we shall speak hereafter, are to be found in some ancient copies, not in all; and are discovered and rejected, both by many manuscripts, and by the authority of ancient writers.

<sup>1</sup> For example Acts iii. 12, ἐνσίβεια for ἐξουσία and Philipp. ii. 30, παραβολευσάμενος for παραβουλευσάμενος, in which texts the genuine reading is still doubtful.

VI. The story also told by *Victor Tunnonensis* respecting an emendation or rather a corruption<sup>k</sup> of the Gospels by the *Emperor Anastasius*, wherever it had its origin, is utterly unfounded, as *Wesseling* has shewn in his *Diss. de Evang. sub Anastasio Emend.*

<sup>k</sup> The story is told by Victor in his *Chronicle* edited by *Sirmondus*, and again by *Scaliger* in his work *De Emend. Temp.* But it is clear that this opinion is entirely groundless. 1. Because all the enemies of Anastasius are silent respecting it. 2. Because Victor lived in Africa remote from Anastasius, and thus probably received an erroneous version of the story. See another opinion on this subject, besides *Wesseling's*, in *Bentley's* book *Friponnerie Laique*, p. 36. [The work of *Bentley's* here referred to is the celebrated *Remarks on Collin's Discourse of Freethinking by Phileleutherus, Lipsiensis*, Lond. 1713. It was translated into French and published at Amst. 1738, by *Armand de la Chapelle*, under the curious title above mentioned.]

VII. It is incredible that Divine Providence would have permitted those books which, by

its own ordinance, contained the sole rule of faith and morals, to be so corrupted, as no longer to serve the purpose for which they were intended. Nor was it possible that books which were in the hands of so many persons, which were reckoned so sacred, of which there existed so many copies, and so many versions in different and distant countries, by a comparison of which errors might so easily have been detected, and whose integrity was watched over by so many doctors of the church, could still be so corrupted by heretics, as that their corruptions should extend to all the copies. The attempts of *Marcion*, *Tatian*, *Theodotus*, and others mentioned by *Irenæus*, i. 28, and by *Eusebius*, Hist. Ecc. iv. 29, and vi. 28, have fallen to the ground;<sup>m</sup> and whoever has tried a similar experiment, has been confuted by the authority of more ancient manuscripts, as is observed by *Augustine*, Con. Faustum, xxxii. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Lest their labours should be estimated too highly, read *Frick* and *Griesbach's* *Curæ in historiam textus Græci Epist. Paul. Jenæ, 1777.*

<sup>m</sup> See *Mill's* *Prolegomena*, p. 62. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the whole of *Ernesti's* argument here is weak and vacillating. See *Mosheim's* *Diss. de causis suppositorum (et interpolatorum) librorum inter Christianos, sec. primi et secundi*, in his *Diss. relating to ecclesiastical history*, Ed. 2, Altona, 1733, I. 217, sq. [There seems to

be no sufficient reason for the sneer here directed against Ernesti's argument. For though it be rash to assert what steps Divine Providence *will* take to secure its own work; yet all the circumstances mentioned by Ernesti had a manifest tendency to maintain the text free from all substantial error; and some of them, as the multiplication of copies, though it increased the number of minor errors, or various readings as we now call them, added at the same time to the data for determining the true reading, as will be shewn hereafter. For the causes of such varieties see Marsh's *Lectures on the Criticism of the Bible*. Camb. 1828, p. 89, sq.]

VIII. Therefore the complaints of certain ancient Fathers, as *Origen, Epiphanius, Jerome,*)<sup>n</sup> concerning the corruption of the text, either exaggerate the matter, and are not to be received literally; or perhaps they ought to be understood of verbal errors introduced, especially into private copies, by copyists who were either ignorant, or hurried their work to increase their profits. Nor should this variety of readings in single copies induce us to pronounce the sacred books generally corrupted, any more than it does in the profane authors of Greece and Rome, the best manuscripts of which often contain innumerable clerical errors.

<sup>n</sup> Add also *Augustine*, who, however, appears only to have used copies of the Latin version. If, however, we listen to the same strain of complaint from *Chrysostom, Basil, and Greg. Nazianzen*, it is to be feared we shall

scarcely coincide in the views of our author. [It appears to the translator that Ernesti takes a practical view of the matter, and means only to say that the copies in common use were never so corrupt as in any degree to affect either the facts or doctrines of the Gospel. That such complaints as those mentioned above, are not to be too literally interpreted, appears from the case of *Griesbach*. He says in his *Prolegomena*, p. 43. *Textus vulgo recepti prorsus nulla est auctoritas*. And yet a reader of the Vulgate text would find the same facts and doctrines as a reader of *Griesbach's* edition.]

IX. For if such errors, and the variety of readings thence arising, invalidated the integrity of Scripture, there would remain nothing sure and incorrupt in the whole compass of antiquity. Nor ought we so much to wonder at the existence of such errors in the copies of the New Testament, as we ought to have wondered had they not existed. For absolute accuracy could have been effected only by the intervention of God, preventing the mistakes of the copyists. That such intervention was not used, appears from the state of the case; that it was unnecessary to the integrity of the sacred books, is allowed by the judgment of all intelligent men.<sup>o</sup>

<sup>o</sup> In books of human authority the mistakes of copyists are of little moment. But the matter is very different with respect to those writings, on the most minute points of which, doctrines inspired, and therefore affecting salvation, are said to depend. Thus, for example, it makes a

great difference, whether in Acts xx. 28, we read Θεῶν or κυρίου: in Rom. ix. 5, whether we place the comma after σάρκα or after πάντων: In 1 Tim. iii. 16, whether we suppose that OC or ΘC was originally written. Therefore the Jewish superstition which attaches *divinity* either to letters in general, or to particular books, is to be rejected as utterly foreign to the nature of Christianity: John vi. 63. 2 Cor. iii. 6, 17. [Ammon's Latin here is, "quæ τὸ Θεῶν sive litteris in universum, sive singulis libris adligat." The Translator hopes he will not appear captious for objecting to almost all the sentiments of Ammon in this part of the work; indeed it is no more than he has done to Ernesti. In the first place, then, though we allow that variations in the sacred books are infinitely more important than in profane authors, yet who ever asserted or granted that any doctrines *affecting salvation* (salutaris) depends upon *minute points* (punctis et apicibus) of the text? What Trinitarian ever rested his belief on the superior probability of Θεῶν to κυρίου in Acts xx. 28, or upon the position of the comma in Rom. ix. 5, or upon the preference of ΘC to OC, in 1 Tim. iii. 16? On these texts the reader will do well to consult *Middleton on the Greek article*, 418—428. And *Magee on Atonement*, vol. ii. p. 564, sq. Varieties of reading are not wanting in the ancient classical historians, and yet no important fact of Greek or Roman history remains doubtful from this cause.]

X. The integrity of books is so far from being invalidated by such errors, and the various readings to which they have given rise, that in these books especially it is thereby confirmed; as has been abundantly proved by *Erasmus*<sup>p</sup> in his answers to *Stunica* and his other opponents, and in the preface to his



third edition of the New Testament; and also professedly by *Bentley* and others.

<sup>p</sup> In the preface to his New Testament, Ed. 2, 1522. Consult also *Glasse* de Puritate N. T. Upon the whole, the number of variations, while it increases the labour, increases also the certainty with which the text of the New Testament can be established.

XI. For this integrity is not to be understood, as it has been by men ignorant of the nature and laws of criticism; nor are we to imagine that any one copy, either manuscript or printed, is in every point correct and faultless; for no ancient book does or can possess such an integrity as this. What we maintain is, that from all the copies, written and printed, and from the ancient versions and commentaries, a complete and uncorrupt text may be formed; and that in these the genuine readings are preserved, to be elicited by the labour of learned and skilful critics, as has been well shown by *Glasse* in his Phil. Sac. L. I. Tr. ii. by *Calovius* Crit. S. p. 492, and by others.<sup>q</sup>

<sup>q</sup> [If, in the time of *Ernesti*, the genuine text was *erudum*, it may be supposed that now, after the able exertions of *Griesbach*, *Matthäi* and others, it has been *erutum*. But we must remember that corrections of the text admit only of *probable* evidence in their favour: and though, in any particular edition, the probability may be highly in

favour of each particular reading, still the probability is much against its perfect and universal correctness. Besides, we are not sure that the genuine reading of every text does exist among all the manuscripts, versions, and commentaries. It may have been lost at a very early period; and hence arises the admissibility, as far as it is admissible, of conjectural emendation. But does this admission of the necessary uncertainty of the text throw any doubt upon the certainty of the Gospel narrative, or on the scheme of doctrine and morals propounded in the Epistles? In no degree whatever: for exactly the same facts and doctrines are taught by the Vulgate edition as by that of Griesbach. Amidst all varieties there is a substantial agreement; and upon this we rest, as satisfactory evidence, that we possess the facts narrated, and the doctrines taught by the Apostles.]

XII. Though we must confess, that, with respect to a few single words, the true reading may not exist in any known copies; which confession has been virtually made by the best theologians and critics of every age, in the suggestion of conjectural emendations, as will be shown hereafter: Yet this does not detract from the integrity of the sacred books; for such cases are few, and relate not to fundamental doctrines, but to points of history; or if they relate to doctrine at all, it is so slightly, that an error in the text can produce no error in belief. †

† Consider, for example, 1 Cor. iii. 4, in which text for the *συνεπιστάσι* of the received text, the manuscripts ACDEFG have

ἄνθρωποι, with which the Vulgate, Origen, and the Æthiopic version, also agree. *Gabler*, in the *Diar. lit. Theol. Sel. iii. 183, sq.*, justly complains that this reading has been neglected by the greatest critics; and conjectures that the whole passage ought to stand, ὄχι ἄνθρωποι εἰσὶ, namely, Paul and Apollos. To the reception of ἄνθρωποι few will object, since it is supported by the best ancient manuscripts, is the more difficult reading, and also because the frequent repetition of the word σαρκικοί in the preceding verses, is quite grating to the ear. Ἄνθρωποι is to be explained by the preceding κατὰ ἄνθρωπον in the 3d verse, as meaning, *are ye not men, and betray your human weakness?* So far I agree with the excellent and learned *Gabler*: but, on the other hand, I think that εἰσὶ ought to be retained, on account of the ὄν which marks a change of subject. It is clear, however, that the purity of the faith in no degree depends upon this discussion; for it relates to an historical matter, which *Ernesti* denies to have any connexion with faith. [*Ammon* probably strains *Ernesti*'s meaning, in supposing him to assert absolutely, that historical facts can have no bearing upon points of doctrine. This position is so obviously false, that the Translator is forced to limit *Ernesti*'s assertion to those historical facts which are dubious through varieties of the text. As to the disputed reading in the note, it must be settled entirely by the authority of manuscripts; for none, it is presumed, will admit the delicacy of *Dr. Ammon*'s ear, as a test of the genuine reading.]

XIII. In defending the integrity of the sacred records, we must be understood to refer to the integrity and certainty of the doctrines which they contain. And in this matter, perhaps, we are generally too timid. For even the Apostles, in quoting the Old Testament,

do not adhere to the exactness of the Hebrew text, but sometimes take the Septuagint version, even where it differs from the Hebrew; nor do they always use the same words in quoting the same text. In short, they considered it sufficient to have retained the true sense; and yet they certainly quoted the pure and uncorrupted word of God.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>s</sup> It is to be hoped that none will raise a clamour against the boldness with which our immortal author here speaks out. For the word of God is eternal (Ps. cxix. 89,) and therefore cannot be confined within human language. For there is no difficulty in imagining a remote posterity, who shall be as ignorant of Greek and Hebrew, as we are of the language spoken by our first parents. [It is natural to suspect, from the triumphant approbation of Ammon, that Ernesti has here said something imprudent. And yet his bold language amounts only to this, that though we are not sure of possessing every word of the Apostolic autographs, we are sure of possessing all their substance. We may imagine a future age totally ignorant of Greek, but we cannot disjoin such an idea from that of gross barbarism, and a woeful corruption of religious opinions. What Ammon means by saying that *verbum dei humanis vocibus non includendum*, is not clear. He can scarcely mean that the doctrines of Scripture are totally independent of the words in which they were first communicated. Ernesti seems to err in putting the varieties of our copies, on a footing with the varieties of the Apostolic quotations. The oversights of a copyist, and the verbal alterations of an inspired writer are very different things.]

XIV. Both the custom of that age, and the

frequent occurrence of particles and copulatives, and in the Epistles the nature of the composition itself, unite to prove, that the sacred books were written each in one continuous strain, and not divided into distinct portions.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>t</sup> See Perizonius Præf. ad Ælian. Lugd. Bat. 1701.

XV. It is clear, however, that divisions were introduced at a very early period, either for private use, or to regulate the lessons read in the public assemblies,<sup>u</sup> and they were introduced either for the convenience of such divisions, or in imitation of the Jewish practice, of which some traces are supposed to exist in *Just. Mart.* in Apol. II. § 87. But the silence of the ancients intimates, and the discrepancy of manuscripts in the numbering of the chapters proves, that these divisions were not originally fixed, nor universally received. For the differences between the Vatican and Alexandrine Codices in the numbering of the chapters, see *Walton's* App. Bibl. ix. 34, and *Zaccagni's* Preface to the *Monum. Vet. Ecc. Græcæ*, § 46.

<sup>u</sup> This was done, not in the manuscript copies of the books themselves, but in the Lectionaries and Breviaries.—See Michaelis' Introduction, Ed. 4. p. 303; and especially

Hug's Introduction, T. I. p. 207, sq. [252 of Wait's Translation. The ἀνάγνωσματα or lessons of the early church, and the κεφάλαια or chapters of Euthalius and Ammonius must not be confounded with our modern chapters and verses, as will be seen in the following sections.—See also Horne's Int. Ed. 4. vol. ii. p. 149. sq.]

XVI. The most ancient and celebrated division of the *Gospels*, is that which, for the purpose of establishing their harmony, was first thought of by Ammonius, and afterwards by Eusebius: this was gradually admitted into the manuscripts, the Eusebian division being, however, preferred as more exact and convenient.\* Of the manuscripts now extant, the Vatican and Cambridge alone, have any other than the Eusebian division. Therefore it was retained in the earlier printed editions, namely, the first editions of Erasmus, those of Robert Stephen, and that of Mill, under the title of the Eusebian Canons. Respecting these canons, the reader may consult Simon, Hist Crit. II. :32, III. 9, not to mention *Mill*, *Marcianæus*, *Proleg*, *Biblioth*, *Jerome*, and others.

\* See Fabricius *Biblioth. Gr.* L. iv. c. 5. sec. 20. ; and Michaelis p. 398. [and Hug. Waite's Trans. p. 255. The reference to Michaelis is vol. ii. p. 525, Marsh's Translation.]

XVII. Afterwards, about A. D. 496, the Epistles of St. Paul were divided into chap-

ters, with titles and a table of contents, by some unknown author, whom Mill suspects to have been Theodore of Mopsuetia. This division was afterwards introduced into his copies by *Euthalius*, who afterwards became Bishop of Sulci, and at the suggestion of Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, collated the Acts of the Apostles, and the other Epistles, with the Cæsarean Manuscripts, and divided them into *lections*, *chapters*, and *στίχοι* or *verses*. This division, together with Eusebius' division of the Gospels, was soon generally received, as we see in the old manuscripts. See Euthalii, Epistola ad Athanas. and his Prefatio ad Epp. Paull., also *Zaccagni*, l. c. § 55. But if the division of the Acts, edited by *Montfaucon* in *Bibl. Cois.* p. 76, under the name of *Pamphilus* the Martyr, from an ancient manuscript, though it was published anonymously by *Occumenius* and others, had *Pamphilus* for its real author; it is probable that *Euthalius* found it while he was inspecting the manuscripts of the Cæsarean library, and represented it as his own.<sup>y</sup>

<sup>y</sup> Consult *Rumpæus*, *Diss. Crit. ad. N. T. Libros.* Lips. 1757, p. 131. sq. We may remark here, that there are two ancient methods of dividing the New Testament. The first divided each book into *στίχοι* or longer sections, and *κεφάλαια* or shorter sections. The second divided them into

ρήματα periods, and στίχοι lines or verses. The latter is similar to the Masoretic division of the Old Testament. [For an explanation of ρήματα and στίχοι see Waites Hug. I. 240, sq. for κεφάλαια, 252; and for τιτλοι, 255. Hug is of opinion that Euthalius did not claim the division even of the Acts, but only the *summary of the contents of the chapters*, as he renders ἐκθεσις κεφαλαίων, more correctly than Ernesti, who renders it *divisio*.

XVIII. After this followed the modern division into *chapters*. The originator of this division is uncertain, as the arguments, which claim it for *Hugo Carensis* are not satisfactory.<sup>z</sup> This, however, is certain, that it is neither convenient nor accurate, and was merely formed for the purposes of verbal reference.

<sup>z</sup> The reason for ascribing it to him [Hugo Carensis, or de St. Cher, in the 12th century] is, that he was the first who composed a concordance, or index of declinable words, for the formation of which such a division was necessary. But this proves nothing, as the division might have been made before.—See Marsh's *Michaelis*, Ed. 4. II. 525, sq.

XIX. The division into verses, or lesser portions, was formed by *Robert Stephens*, in the course of his reading, while travelling on horseback, as we are informed by his son *Henry* in the preface to his *Greek Concordance*; and it was first introduced into the Geneva edition, 8vo. 1551; whence, though very carelessly performed, as might be expected from the time



and place, it was gradually received into all the editions. No one then ought to consider himself as bound by it in interpreting; and *Bengel*<sup>a</sup> judged well in removing the numbers of the verses to the margin, so as to leave them for the purpose of reference, for which purpose it is probable they were introduced by Stephens, who was then, perhaps, meditating the composition of a Greek concordance; but to show, at the same time, that no stress should be laid upon them in reading and interpreting.

<sup>a</sup> The same arrangement is made in the editions of Griesbach, Birch, Alter, and Knappe. [The divisions of the Text in Knappe's edition are peculiarly judicious; it is accurately printed, in a cheap form, and altogether suitable for the ordinary use of students. There is a remarkable instance of erroneous division in the ordinary arrangement of verses, at Rom. viii. 20, where ἐστὶν ἰλασθῆναι ought to be closely connected with the succeeding ὅτι. The erroneous division and punctuation of these two verses, (20, 21.) has given rise to very erroneous versions. See the translator's Paraphrase and Notes on Romans, *ad loc.* As to the inaccuracy in the division of chapters, we may point out Acts v. 1. where the paragraph ought clearly to begin at iv. 32; and 1 Cor. iv. 1, where the five first verses of the chapter ought to be attached to the preceding chapter ]

G Scho  
St. G  
1830

XX. At whatever period the marks of *punctuation* were invented; for on that head we profess no certain knowledge; it was late be-

fore they were admitted into books, and they were never used by original writers. We are also ignorant by whom, and at what period, the punctuation of the New Testament was first arranged. That the copies of the Septuagint, in the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, were without points, appears clearly from his Catech. xiii. p. m. 301, from whence we may conclude that they did not exist either in the Greek copies of the New Testament. That in the time of Augustine, there were no *points* in the Latin copies, appears clearly from his own testimony, Civ. Dei. iii. 3. The mention of these circumstances may be useful not only to the younger students, but even to the learned, for they refute the opinion of Lipsius, Le Clerc, and others. When, therefore, we meet in ancient books with any thing respecting τὸ διαστικεῖν or punctuation, as in Aristotle's Rhetoric, or in the Commentaries of the Fathers, especially Theodoret, who often directs how a passage ought to be διαστικτεόν, we are not to suppose they mean what we call *punctuation*, but only those pauses in reading which boys were taught at school by masters of grammar.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Consult, on this point, the celebrated Villoison, in the prolegomena to his edition of Homer, Venice, 1788. In

the most ancient manuscripts, there are found either no points, or merely *full stops* and spaces. The *comma* was invented in the eighth century, and the *semicolon* in the ninth; and the other points, or rather the marks for them, in the following centuries. Quintilian shews that the stops themselves were used by the ancients. After the invention of printing, *Stephens* placed the marks of punctuation at his own discretion. See *Rogalt's Diss. de Antiquitate interpunctionis Nov. Test. Regiom. 1734.*

XXI. Very similar to this is the history of the breathings and accents; which though always used in the pronunciation of the Greek language, (and indeed no language can exist without them), began to be written, as I find to be the current opinion, in the seventh century, when the proper ancient pronunciation had been lost, and could not be learned by practice. The more ancient copies of the New Testament, like other manuscripts, are without either: nor are those well meaning but inaccurate men, such as *Leusden* and *J. H. Maius*, to be attended to, who endeavour to fix the authorship of these marks upon the Apostles, as being necessary to the integrity of the text and the determination of the sense. In this point they certainly judaized, and endeavoured by such arguments to strengthen the authority of the Hebrew accents and marks of punctuation. But to philosophize in oppo-

sition to clear facts, is unworthy of a wise and learned man.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> See Montfaucon's *Palæographia Gr.* iii. 5. While a language is in full and perfect use, written accents are not needed.—See Henninii *Hellenismus*, Traj. 1684. *Gesner de Genuina Accentuum Pronuntiatione*: and *Reitz de Prosod. Gr. Accentus Inclinacione*, Lip. 1791. [See also *Michaelis*, vol. ii. 521. and *Marsh's Note*, 899.]

XXII. From the foregoing chapters we may conclude, that when copies, whether manuscript or printed, vary in the divisions, punctuations, accents, or breathings, these ought to be considered as varieties, not of *reading* but of interpretation; nor ought we to make any scruple of interpreting in opposition to them.

## CHAPTER II.

## OF MANUSCRIPTS, AND THEIR USE.

I. IT is universally allowed that the original copies of the sacred books have perished.<sup>d</sup> For as to the boast of the Venetians, that they possessed the autograph of St. Mark, this upon examination was found to be totally false; and it appeared that in the same book were portions of another Latin manuscript, as is clearly shewn by *a Turre*, in a letter to Jos. Blanchinus, (Evang. Blanchin. T. ii.) This is to be especially consulted by all, who wish for full information on this head.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>d</sup> For the Apostles themselves did not write, but only subscribed. 2 Thess. iii. 17. It is clear that even *Paul*, who was more highly educated than the other Apostles, could not with facility write Greek. See *Semler's* App. p. 32. *Haenleins* Einleitung, ii. p. 8, seq. ed. 2. [The question here introduced by Ammon has little or nothing to do with that discussed by Ernesti in the text. That St. Paul frequently used the aid of an Amanuensis is clear; and the same is done by almost every man of weighty occupations and extensive correspondence, without bringing upon him the suspicion of inability to write. The internal evidence,

and there is no other, would lead us to conclude, that as St. Paul declares, the salutation and signature, with his own hand to be the mark of authenticity in all the Epistles which were not autograph, therefore, when no such signature occurs, we ought to conclude the whole Epistle to have been autograph. Thus the Ep. to the Colossians, and the 2d to the Thessalonians, would appear to have been the only ones written by an amanuensis.]

\* See also *Dubrowski* on the Pragensian fragment, Prague 1778, p. 7, seq. The same may be observed of the copy of the Old Testament, in the writing of Esdras, which the Bolognese boast of possessing.

II. The autograph of the Gospel of St. John, appears to have been preserved for a long time in the church at Ephesus; since an ancient writer of the fourth century, supposed by some to have been *Peter* Bishop of Alexandria, asserts that he had seen it. See the *Chronicon Paschale Cangianum*, p. 5, and also the *Uranologia Petavii*, p. 213.<sup>f</sup> But the authenticity of this passage and of the testimony it contains, has been questioned on good grounds by *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *Tillemont*, and lately by *Garbellus* in the Prolegomena to the Evangel. Blanch. p. 42, who attribute both the treatise and the evidence to a later *Peter* in the sixth century. *Fricke* in his *Cura Vet. Eccles. circa Canonem*. p. 130, attempts to support it, and in my opinion argues successfully against the system of *Simon*. But even he does not prove

the authenticity of the passage by sufficient arguments.

<sup>f</sup> We may be allowed to doubt of this, because the autograph of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans had ceased to exist about the middle of the second century. That the autographs of the Apostolic writings had perished through constant wear in the first or second centuries, appears from the silence of Origen; who, in his travels throughout the East in search of manuscripts, must have met with some autograph had any such existed. But the autographs, like the relics of the saints, are celebrated by posterity, after having been neglected by their cotemporaries. Concerning the autograph of St. Matthew, see Euseb. H. E. V. 10.

III. *Garbellus* in the treatise above quoted, is of opinion that *Tertullian*, in a celebrated passage of his book de Praescrip. Heretic. c. 36, where he says, *ipsas authenticas apostolorum literas recitari*, means that the archetypes of the Apostolic books or Epistles were, in his own time, read in the churches which they had founded. He doubts, however, whether *Tertullian* delivers this as an ascertained fact, or only follows the current report. This is certainly more rational than the interpretation of *Pamelius* and *Simon*, who imagine that by *authenticas*, *Tertullian* only means Greek copies, which certainly were read in other Greek churches as well as in these. And this reason also forbids us to interpret him as meaning

genuine uncorrupted copies<sup>g</sup> which may also be called *authentic*; especially when he says, “*ipsas authenticas*,” which would have been absurd, had he meant only genuine; and he names the churches to which Paul wrote, which would have been unnecessary had he not been speaking of *autographs*; and had before said, that the very seats of the Apostles, that is, the churches founded by them, still remained.

<sup>g</sup> Rössler however supports this interpretation in his *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, Library of the Fathers of the Church, t. iii. p. 118, seq. But it matters little whether we understand by *authenticas*, genuine or autograph. For Tertullian resided in Africa, and therefore could not have any personal knowledge of the fact. Besides his narratives are not always deserving of much credit.

IV. It is of no greater importance to inquire into the cause of this loss of the autographs, than it is in the case of any other ancient books. We may reasonably attribute something to the cruelty of the early persecutors;<sup>h</sup> for we know that they did extort copies of the sacred books from the churches, and from individual Christians. It seems unjust, as *Fricke* has well shewn, to accuse, as some have done, the indolence of the churches.

<sup>h</sup> Much more, however, is to be attributed to the injuries produced by time, and by the fates of the early churches. The Acts of the Apostles, for example, had few opponents



during the three first centuries ; yet this most useful book had lain almost unknown, and needed to be brought to light by *Chrysostom*. See his First Homily on the Acts, Ed. Ducaei, t. iii.

V. It is fortunate, however, that many ancient manuscripts have been preserved, and have successively been discovered in libraries ; by which means a complete and authentic text has been transmitted to us :<sup>i</sup> concerning which, whoever wishes for further information, may consult *Mill*, or rather *Simon Hist. Crit. T. ii. c. 29. 30*, and *T. iii.* at the end ; of the Germans, *Pfaff de Var. Lect. New Testament*, *Bengel, Michaelis de Var. Lect. Nov. Test. Wetstein*, the most diligent of critics, and the illustrious *Semler* in his *Præparatio Hermeneutica*, ought to be consulted.<sup>k</sup> Many manuscripts still lie in libraries, which have not yet been sufficiently inspected and collated, as in those of St. Gall, the Escorial, &c.<sup>1</sup> Lami counts eighty-three Florentine Manuscripts in his *de Erud. Apost.* p. 218. It appears, however, from Bandini's Catalogue of the Florence manuscripts, that most of these are of little value : and there are others which it is unnecessary to mention.

<sup>i</sup> In our age the Manuscripts of Spain, Italy, France, England, Vienna, Moscow, and Manheim, have been collated.

<sup>k</sup> Add to these *Griesbach's Symbola Critica*, Halle 1785.

*Michaelis'* Introd. in N. T. Ed. 4, p. 545, seq. *Birch* and *Mollenhauer*, Preface to the N. T., Copenhagen 1788, and *Matthai* in his edition of the N. T. passim.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps also in the eastern convents, especially those of the Maronites. *Villoison* informs us that little is to be expected from the manuscripts of the Greek convents on Mount Athos.

VI. The *Vatican* and *Alexandrine* Manuscripts are reckoned the most ancient now existing, both written in continuous uncial letters; but the learned are not agreed upon their relative priority, some maintaining the superior antiquity of the Alexandrine, others that of the Vatican. Respecting the former, the student may consult the English editors [*Grabe*] of the Septuagint version. Proleg. T. ii. c. i. prop. xv., concerning the latter, *Zaccagni*, p. 56, and concerning both, *Wetstein* in his Prolegomena to the New Testament.<sup>m</sup> After the proofs of *Wetstein*, it cannot be doubted but that both have been interpolated from the Latin version; and in the Alexandrine this appears from the comparison of readings. *Lucas Brugensis*, who possessed a collation of it, sometimes mentions the readings of the Vatican manuscript in his *Notat. Var. Lect*; and there are also some among those published by *Caryophilus* at the end of the *Catena of Possinus*.

<sup>m</sup> See *Semler* de Aetate Cod. Alexandrini, Halle 1759,

and Notitia Cod. Alexandrini, by *Woide*, republished by Spohn, Leipzig 1788. To *Woide* we also owe an edition of this manuscript. Besides the examples produced by *Michaelis*, the interpolation of this manuscript from the Latin version, is proved from the reading of John vii. 39, where it has *δεδόμενον* which is said to have been introduced by the Macedonians against the Pneumatomachi. *Griesbach* supplies better arguments, and holds that the manuscript was formed upon three different recensions. Concerning the Vatican manuscript, *Bentley's Proleg.* and *Wetstein* may be consulted. Hitherto only excerpts of this manuscript, and a small number of its readings have been published; we are therefore unable to decide with certainty as to what edition it follows. See *Eichorn's* Algem. Biblioth. ii. p. 473. *Birch* has lately published a larger collection in his edition of the New Testament, printed at Copenhagen, of which the reader may consult the Prolegomena, p. xiii. sq. [In *Griesbach's* notation, the Alexandrine is marked A, the Vatican B. The interpolation of this manuscript from the Latin version is now generally discredited. See *Horne's* Introd. ii. 71, and *Semler's* App. p. 45. *Ammon's* proof from John vii. 39, is somewhat unaccountable. Certainly nothing could be introduced by the Macedonians against the Pneumatomachi, as these are but two names for the same sect, the former derived from their founder, the latter from their distinguishing tenet. See *Mosheim* Hist. Ecc. Ed. Helmstadt, 1764, p. 170.]

VII. Next to these may be ranked the Codex *Parisiensis*,<sup>n</sup> which agrees remarkably with the Alexandrine, but is very incomplete: the original writing has been effaced, and the works of *Ephrem Syrus* written over it, but so that the original letters still appear and

may be read; the *Cantabrigiensis*<sup>o</sup> and *Claromontanus*, now called the *Regius* in the Paris library,<sup>p</sup> both having the Greek and a Latin version, and containing, the former the Gospel and Acts, the latter the Epistles of St. Paul, employed by *Stephen*, and still more by *Beza*; the *Boernerianus*,<sup>q</sup> *Augiensis*,<sup>r</sup> and *Sangermanensis*,<sup>s</sup> containing the Epistles of St. Paul in Greek and Latin; but all these have the common fault of interpolations from the Latin version.

<sup>n</sup> A codex rescriptus, probably of the sixth century, and consequently one of the oldest extant. See *Griesbach's Symb. Crit.* p. 1—54, and *Prolegomena to New Testament*, ed. 2, 1796, i. 101. [C of Griesbach.]

<sup>o</sup> Of the seventh century, and now accurately collated. It follows the western recension. See Griesbach, l. c. p. 55, sq. A facsimile of this manuscript was published by Dr. *Kipling*, at Cambridge 1793, who thinks that it rivals the Alexandrine in antiquity. See *Valckenaer's Observations*. [D of Griesbach.]

<sup>p</sup> Numbered 107, of the seventh or eighth century, of which Wetstein judges unfavourably, whom consult. See also Griesbach's proleg. ed. 2, ii. p. 22. [D of Griesbach.]

<sup>q</sup> Græco-Latin interlinear. See *Matthai's* preface to his edition of this manuscript, Misnia 1791. [G of Griesbach.]

<sup>r</sup> Of the ninth or tenth century, purchased by Bentley, and collated by Wetstein. It belongs to the western recension. [F of Griesbach]

<sup>s</sup> Of the tenth or eleventh century. It is considered by Wetstein and Griesbach as a transcript of the Parisiensis and Claromontanus. [By Griesbach, of the Claromontanus alone. See his Proleg. ii. p. 22, and marked E.]

VIII. Of later date, but yet of considerable value, are the Vienna<sup>t</sup> and Basle<sup>u</sup> Manuscripts, especially the copy of St. Paul's Epistles which Erasmus used, the Parisian, the Cottonian fragments of the Gospels collated by Wetstein and others, which it is unnecessary here to enumerate.<sup>x</sup> It will be more profitable briefly to teach the proper use of manuscript copies, and of the reading contained in them.

<sup>t</sup> See *Treschow Tentamen descript. Codd. Vindob. Hafniæ 1773*, and *Alter's ed. N. T.* [The codex Vindobonensis Cæsareus, in uncial letters, attributed by Treschow to the seventh century, marked by Griesbach N. also, in small letters 123, 124 and 125 of Griesbach, of the Gospels; and 3, 63 to 67 of the Acts and Epistles.]

<sup>u</sup> See Bengel's *App. Crit.* who gives a full account of these manuscripts. [In uncial letters of the Gospels. E of Griesbach attributed by Wetstein to the ninth century, and in small letters 1, 2. Of the Epistles 1, 2.]

<sup>x</sup> See *Birch var. lect. ad text. Act. Apost. Epistolas Cathol. and Paulin. Hafniæ 1798. Var lect. ad text. Evangeliorum. Ib. 1801.*

IX. It is necessary to observe, that few of the manuscripts above referred to, do, like the Vatican and Alexandrine, contain the whole of Scripture,<sup>y</sup> a completeness which appears to me to lessen the probability of their antiquity: others contain the Gospels alone, or the Epistles of St. Paul, or the Catholic Epistles with the Acts, or the Acts alone; few have the Apo-

calypse, and besides, many are mutilated of some leaves, as the Alexandrine, the Parisian C., the Cantabrigiensis D., &c. From whence it appears, that when no dissent between two manuscripts is noted, we cannot thence infer their consent; in which matter many have erred, by taking such silence for consent.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Both, however, omit the Apocalypse. See Birch's Var. Lect. on the text of the Apocalypse. Havniae, 1800.

<sup>2</sup> We must here speak of the ancient recensions of the Greek text of the New Testament, that we may not be interrupted, when speaking of the interpolations from the Latin version. Semler, App. Crit. p. 45, admits of the following, the *Alexandrine*, common to the Egyptian writers, the disciples of Origen, the Syrians, Copts, and Ethiopians; the *Oriental*, used at Antioch and Constantinople, the *Western*, and *mixed*. See his Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, s. iii. p. 2, sq. Michaelis in his Introduction, p. 535, describes the four principal recensions, as the *Oriental*, the *Alexandrine*, the *Edessene*, and the *Western*. Griesbach admits of only two, see his Symb. Crit. p. 113, and his Hist. Text. Ep. Paul, which he denominates the *Alexandrine* and the *Western*. Under the former he classes, for the Gospels, the manuscripts C. L. K. 1, 13, 33, 69, 106, 118, and the Evangelistaria 18, 19, for the Epistles of St. Paul, A. C. 17, 46, 47, the quotations by the Alexandrine Fathers, Clemens, Origen, Damascenus, Eusebius, Cyril; with the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions. To the second he refers, for the Gospels, D. 1, 13, 69, for the Epistles, D. E. F. G., together with the Latin versions, and the quotations of the more ancient Latin Fathers. A *mixed* recension prevails in the quotations of Chrysostom and Theodoret. See Griesbach's pref. N. T. p. 25, and Proleg.

to the 2d ed. Halle, 1796, i. p. 73, sq. This division, however, has not been received without opposition. See Matthai, in the preface and excursus to his larger edition of the N. T, in the prologue to his compendious edition; and in the proleg. and notes to Euthymius Zigabenus, Lips. 1792. The learned Hug has taken a middle course, *Einleitung*, i. p, 437, sq. [For another classification of manuscripts, see *Nolan's* Enquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, &c. of which a synopsis is given by Horne, vol. ii. p. 59.]

X. We must guard against being deceived by a diversity of names. For manuscripts have often changed their appellation on changing their owners; and thus we may be led to multiply a single copy, as has been done even by learned critics. We ought therefore to know the history of manuscripts and the causes of the names they bear; and also to compare their readings, so as to be put upon our guard by a perpetual agreement, especially in the more remarkable readings.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Thus, for example, the Codex Stephanianus is the same as the Cantabrigiensis, though its identity has escaped the notice both of Beza and Simon. See Wetstein's Proleg. ad N. T. i. p. 23. [The Codex Cantab. is the B. of Stephen. The same MS. is also indifferently called *Bezae* or *Cantabrigiensis*. In the same way, the *Claramontanus* is also called *Regius*, and the *Cyprius Colbertinus*.]

XI. Nor is it immaterial to determine, whether manuscripts have been copied from

the same original, or whether the one be a transcript of the other: as, for example, the codices *Boernerianus* and *Augiensis*, the *Sangermanensis* and *Regius*, which agree throughout, even in the minutest errors;<sup>b</sup> for such copies can only count for one, in the numbering and weighing of authorities.

<sup>b</sup> A third point for examination, is whether a manuscript has been copied from a printed edition, as the *Cod. Ravianus* from the Complutensian. See *Pappelbaum* Untersuchung der Ravischen Handschrift des N. T. Berlin 1785.

XII. There is a further division of manuscripts. For some contain merely the Greek, others the Greek with the Latin version, others are only lectionaries, containing such portions of the sacred books as were read in the public services of the church. It is to be observed, that all the Græco-Latin copies are interpolated from the Latin version;<sup>c</sup> and with respect to the lectionaries, we must beware of using their authority, except in passages of which they contain portions.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>c</sup> On this point there can be no doubt; for such copies originated with Greeks who had conformed to the Latin church; and who, both on account of their poverty, and in order to gratify the Latins, remodelled the Greek text in conformity with the Latin version. These copies, however, are not to be entirely despised, since it is clear there were



many excellent readings in the *Vetus Itala* version. See *Semler's App.* p. 44, and *Vers. vet. Ital. Cod. D. ad Acts* iii. 12.

<sup>d</sup> The proper use of lectionaries is admirably treated by Matthai in his *ed. N. T. passim*. See also, *Vetustum eccl. Græcæ Constantinopolitanæ Evangeliarum*, ed. C. F. Matthai, Lips. 1791. [It is not easy to see how any one could use the authority of lectionaries “in aliis locis, quam quorum pericopas habent.” Perhaps Ernesti means that we are not to conclude from their omission, that a passage is spurious. Lectionaries containing only portions of the Gospels, are called *Evangeliarum*.]

XIII. In copies containing the Greek text alone, it is necessary to examine whether they be pure, or corrected, that is in fact vitiated, from the Latin version.<sup>e</sup> Purity may be inferred from their differing from the old Latin version in the more remarkable passages; and from their agreement with versions formed from a pure Greek text; and still more with the more ancient Greek fathers, as *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret* and the like, especially in their commentaries; for the texts of Scripture, inserted in their commentaries, have often been tampered with by editors.

<sup>e</sup> This subject has taken a very different appearance since the inquiries of *Semler and Griesbach* into the variety of recensions. The latter in his *Symb. Crit.* p. 111, observes, “They err greatly, who imagine, because a manuscript agrees with the Latin version, that therefore it has been

interpolated from it. Readings of this class are to be derived, not from the Latin version, but from the Greek copies of the Western recension." But consult the whole passage. [See also Semler's App. Crit. p. 45; and Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, 3d part, p. 45. With respect to the corruption of the texts quoted by the Fathers, the reader may find a probable example in Ernesti, Instit. Bib. Cab. vol. i. p. 162, N. c., where it appears that *νοστρία* has been interpolated into the text, 1 Cor. vii. 5, as quoted by Chrysostom.]

XIV. And here occurs a great and difficult enquiry, which it is not easy to clear up, or which, at least, has not yet been cleared up; first, as to the reason of this great discrepancy between the Greek text and the old Latin version, and next, as to the reasons why, and the method by which the Greek text was altered into conformity with it;<sup>f</sup> for it is evident that this has taken place in all the more ancient copies mentioned, § 6, 7.

A more difficult inquiry is that into the origin of the different recensions. For antiquity has handed down to us but little clear information respecting the manuscripts used by *Origen*, *Pierius*, *Pamphilus*, *Eusebius*, *Euthalius*, and *Athanasius*. The Alexandrine recension, however, appears to have been made from apographi, the Western from copies of single books, collected by private individuals. [Those who wish for a fuller knowledge of the different systems of recensions, may consult Griesbach's ed. N. T. Proleg. t. i. 72, sq. *Horne's* Introduction, vol. ii. sect. 2. *Laurence's* Remarks on the Classification of MSS., &c.

Oxford, 1814; and Enquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, &c. by *F. Nolan*, London, 1815. The Translator cannot find the term *apographi* to have been used, as it is here by Ammon, in opposition to *codices*. By *apographi* are probably meant the two ancient collections of the sacred books, one containing the four Gospels and called τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; the other containing Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, 1 Peter, and 1 John, called ὁ ἀπόστολος, or τὸ ἀποστόλικον. See *Schott's* Isagoge Hist. in Lib. Nov. Fæd, p. 553.]

XV. As to the Græco-Latin copies, it is not to be wondered at if the Latin copyists were induced, through the differences of the Greek texts, and their own ignorance of the Greek language, to corrupt the text by attempting to reconcile it with the Latin, and to substitute more familiar words. In the same way the Greeks imagined that the Hebrew text had been corrupted by the Jews; of which many striking examples may be seen in Michaelis de Var. Lect. N. T. p. 92, 100. Concerning the merely Greek copies, written within the bounds of the Greek church, it is difficult to say anything with certainty. I am inclined to conjecture that this interpolation originated with the Egyptians, and this conjecture is strengthened by the character of the Codex Alexandrinus. For it is manifest, and has been proved by others, and especially by *Richer* in his Concil. Gener. Hist. that the

Ægyptian Patriarchs, from the time of Athanasius, that is, from the fourth century, previous to the date of any manuscript now existing, having sought the assistance of the Roman church against the decrees of councils, were ever after too much inclined to favour and imitate the Romanists. This might extend so far as to induce them to alter their copies in conformity with the Latin version, as an act due to the dignity and authority of the Roman church. They appear to have derived their knowledge of the Latin language, not only from their intercourse with Rome, to which Wetstein attributes it, I. 19; but in a much greater degree from their proximity to and intercourse with the province of Africa. This, however, is a matter of uncertainty,<sup>§</sup> respecting which we might be better able to form a judgment, if we possessed an accurate collation of the Vatican Manuscript, and knew whence it originally came.

<sup>§</sup> Or rather, it is destitute of all probability. For even supposing that the Alexandrines had thus submitted to the ecclesiastical yoke of Rome; still it is scarcely possible to conceive that in the other provinces of the East, the Greek Text would be altered into conformity with a version in a barbarous and detested language. [See also Note e, § xiii. We may observe, also, as a fact quite inconsistent with Ernesti's reasoning, that of all the Eastern copies, those of the Alexandrine recension are, in their readings, most re-

note from the Western recension, or the Latin version. The Alexandrine manuscript A. of Griesbach, is to be considered as an example, not of the Alexandrine, but rather of the Constantinopolitan recension.]

XVI. That the Egyptian copies had not thus been corrupted at or previous to the time of *Origen*, appears both by the readings which he follows in his Commentaries, and by the text which he formed from the more ancient copies.<sup>h</sup> For his text is that of the Cæsarean copies, which had frequently been copied, (See *Eusebius*, Vit. Const. Mag. c. 36,) and copies collated with which were current throughout all Greece and Asia. Nor had this interpretation been introduced, or at any rate approved of, in the time of *Euthalius*; that is, in the middle of the fifth century, as appears from the fact, that having visited Cæsarea by directions from *Athanasius*, Bishop of Alexandria, he compared his own copy of the Epistles with the manuscripts of *Origen*, and corrected it by them. He indeed complains of the frequency of interpolations, which he removed in his revision, by consulting ancient and good copies; but he gives no account as to how this interpolation was introduced.

<sup>h</sup> See Griesbach de Codicibus iv. Evangeliorum Origenianis Halle, 1771.

XVII. As to the points of difference between the pure Greek copies and the Latin version, there are a few in which the reading of the latter has some resemblance to the pure original, so that we may see whence it sprung: as Matt. vi. 24, ἀνθίσταται, *sustinebit*, 1. Tim. vi. 20, κενοφωνίας, *novitates verborum*, &c. In other cases, where there is nothing in the Greek text from which the Latin reading could have originated, and yet that reading gives a good sense, as 1 John iv. 3, *qui solvit Iesum*, λβει, for μὴ ὁμολογῆ, some may suspect with *Hemsterhuis*, that the sacred authors themselves wrote more than one copy, with some variations in the expression, retaining the sentiment, at least so far that in each it was good and true; for of this we have examples in works of human production.<sup>i</sup> If this were the case, each reading must be considered as having the authority of inspiration. But this conjecture is rendered improbable by the fact, that this discrepancy prevails, not in one or a few, but in all the copies; unless we suppose that the sacred authors wished to retain a copy of each epistle, and therefore either wrote or dictated each twice. But, upon the whole, various causes of interpolation may have existed in these as well as in other books, of which more hereafter.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So Socrates H. E. vii. 32, and some of the Latin MSS. See Griesbach's Ed. ad loc. Which reading, though more difficult, does not harmonize with the simplicity of St. John's style; and is not supported by the authority of Manuscripts and versions. "Ο λύει is the scholium of a later interpreter.

<sup>k</sup> We know that *Aristophanes*, *Cicero*, and *Apollonius*, published second editions of the *Nubes*, the *Academical Questions*, and the *Argonautics*. But we can hardly suspect this to have happened with respect to any of the sacred books; for the poverty of the times, and the difficulty which the Apostles had in writing must have prevented it. [As the Apostles did not write for gain, the poverty of the times would be no impediment: with respect to their "imperitia scribendi," which seems a singularly favourite topic with Dr. Ammon, see § 1. N. y. Yet the supposition of a twofold edition seems quite unsupported by evidence, and therefore must not be admitted as the ground of any conclusions respecting the probability of readings.]

XVIII. But if one of two texts has been interpolated by mere human means, we must not suppose with *Morinus* (*Exerc. Bibl.* i. 2, 3,) and others, that the interpolation has been made in the Greek copies, which we call pure, but rather in the Latin:<sup>1</sup> because the Greek text agrees with the most ancient books of the Greek church, and of the Greek doctors, of the first, second, and third centuries, at least in most points, where it differs from the Latin text. It is well, however, that these differences are merely verbal, and do not affect the matter, nor disturb the analogy of faith.

<sup>1</sup> *Scpulveda* defended against Erasmus the integrity of the Latin text, where it opposed the Greek. But even *Jerome* complains of the corruption of the Latin text, in his Commentary on Gal. ii. 5, where ὁὐδὲ was omitted in the Latin version. [All this seems to proceed upon the supposition of a very general agreement in the different copies of the Latin version. But for the discrepancies of the *Vulgate*, the *Brescia*, and the *Verceli* manuscripts, and their accordance with different classes of Greek manuscripts. See Nolan's Enquiry, p. 58, seq., and Horne, ii. 60.]

XIX. In judging of manuscripts, we must consider their *age* and their *goodness*. The age is to be determined from the style of the letters, the accents, and the punctuation; and also from other circumstances occurring in the manuscript.<sup>m</sup> Thus when in the Alexandrine Manuscript, we find the Canons of Eusebius, and the Subscriptions to the Epistles, and in these the words Θεοτόκος for the Virgin, and ἀρχιεπισκόπου, we know at once that it must have been written posterior to the age of Eusebius and Nestorius. The form of the letters, however, is not a very safe ground of judgment, for it is clear that the copyists, either through ignorance, or in order to raise the value of their copies, imitated the old writing, and gave rather a faesimile than a copy; on which point there is a remarkable passage in *J. Gerson*, de libris scribendis.

<sup>m</sup> Uncial letters without accents or breathings, show a date



previous to the ninth century; after which small letters came into use. Respecting the imitation of the earlier forms of letters by the copyists, see *Woide* and *Kipling*, in their Prolegomena to their editions of the Alexandrine and Cambridge manuscripts.

XX. The *goodness* of manuscripts is to be determined, not by their age alone, for later manuscripts may be good when they have been transcribed from other good ones; but first from the paucity and slightness of the faults and variations, and next from the preservation of ancient and good readings; from which two points it will appear to have been written by a careful copyist, and to have been transcribed from a good copy. Nor are faulty manuscripts totally destitute of value, for they sometimes contain the best readings. We must therefore choose from all the best readings, according to the rules of the critical art, which will be treated of in their proper place.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> For example, in Luke ii. 22, few manuscripts have *ἀποσῶ*, which appears to be the true reading: Most have *ἀποτῆς* or *ἀποτῶν*, both of which are unsuitable to the context. [The goodness of a manuscript of course is the same thing as the goodness of its readings. For the principles on which these are to be judged, see Griesbach's Proleg. i. sect 3, p. 59, seq.]

XXI. In judging of the age, and still more

in judging of the goodness of a manuscript, we must guard against being led by our wishes to attribute to it more authority than reality and truth admit of; and this we are tempted to do when the manuscript is our own property, or when it favours our own opinion in any matter. Upon the whole, none ought to assume the right of judging on these points, but those whose eyes are practised in the various forms of letters, and whose judgment is exercised to the accurate investigation of critical questions.<sup>o</sup>

<sup>o</sup> That is to say, those who have themselves carefully inspected manuscripts. For without such practice we can form no certain decision, and are in danger of being influenced by the hints of others

## CHAPTER III.

## OF EDITIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. WHEN manuscript copies of the Greek Testament began to be drawn from libraries, and to be submitted to the notice and inspection of the learned, there arose a laudable desire of editing the Greek Text: and as manuscripts successively appeared, which might be of service in correcting the text, so new editors applied themselves to the task of producing new and corrected editions.<sup>P</sup>

<sup>P</sup> See the prefaces to the Complutensian and Erasmus' editions.

II. But although the manuscript copies of the Greek text were the ground work, yet men of learning and experience in criticism sought for other aids; especially as the number of manuscripts to which they had access was not great, and these were neither very an-

cient nor very good. Therefore the ancient versions, in languages which they understood, began to be applied to the purposes of correction, and not only the commentaries of the fathers upon the several books of the New Testament, but also their other writings, in which single passages are either commented upon, or in any way noticed. Nor did the early editors entirely abstain from conjectural emendations, as is quite evident from the recensions of Erasmus and Beza.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The conjectures of *Erasmus* are introduced silently ; it is sufficient to turn over the *Apocalypse* in his earlier editions. But *Beza* expressly declares in his *Epistle to Queen Elizabeth*, “*Se ex ingenio aut simplici conjecturâ, ne apicem quidem mutavisse.*” [*Erasmus* in his apology against *Lee*, charges these upon *Æcolampadius* and *Gerbelius*, who superintended the printing of his first edition.

III. Thus then the Greek text was formed in the early editions, and was afterwards gradually emended, at least such was the intention, by others, who possessed new aids and instruments for this purpose. The wants of the learned also continually demanded new editions, the supply of the older editions being always unequal to the demand.

IV. Of these then we shall treat in such a way as to arrange them into classes, and shall

shew from what sources, and how each was formed, in the hope of thus rendering this notice of the editions useful in the formation of a judgment respecting them. For a bare catalogue of editions, containing merely a notice of the editor, with the time and place of publication can be of little service.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> The editions of the New Testament may conveniently be divided into, 1st, The primary or fundamental, as the *Complutensian* and *Erasmian*. 2d, Editions which have formed upon these, but improved by the collation of more recently discovered manuscripts; such are the editions of *Colinæus*, *Bogard*, *Stephen*, *Beza* and *Harwood*. 3d, Editions formed from a comparison of several editions, such are the editions of *Plantinus*, *Rapheling*, *Elzevir*, *E. Schmidt*, and *Bengel*. 4th, Reprints of former editions without any material change: thus the *Aldine* editions follow that of *Erasmus*, and the editions of *Oporinus*, *Walton*, *Mill*, *Kuster*, &c. follow that of *Stephen*. 5th, Editions which contain critical collections of the various readings, as those of *Walton*, *Fell*, *Maestricht*, *Mill*, *Kuster*, *Bengel*, *Wetstein*, *Griesbach*, *Matthäi*, *Birch*, *Alter*.

V. The primary editions are, at most, not more than *three*, the *Complutensian*, that of *Erasmus*, and that of *Beza*. From these all the succeeding editions have been derived; some containing improvements, and others being mere reprints.

VI. The *Complutensian* edition was pre-

pared and printed at Complutum (Alcala) A. D. 1514, at the expense of Cardinal Ximenes; but was published somewhat later, A. D. 1517, when the whole work of the Polyglott Bible was finished. In arranging the text, the editors principally used Italian manuscripts, and those of a recent date, namely of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with which this edition often agrees, against the earlier copies, the Greek Fathers, and the more ancient versions. In many cases it is altered even in opposition to their own manuscripts, so as to harmonize with the Latin version, as it then existed in the printed copies; this has been noticed by Mill and Wetstein.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The manuscripts used by the Complutensian editors, were neither numerous nor ancient. It is certain that they did not possess the Vatican MS. They admitted some texts from the Latin version, as 1 John v. 7, (See Griesbach ad loc.,) and in the Apocalypse they altered many things in conformity with it. They did not sufficiently use the Oriental versions, and the testimony of the Fathers. See the merits of this edition, canvassed by *Goetz* in his *Vertheidigung der Complutens. Bibel.*, Hamb. 1765—1769, and *Walch* in his *Neueste Religionsgeschichte*, 1771, sq. p. iv.

VII. The text of the Complutensian edition, was repeated in the Gospels and Acts by *R. Stephen*,<sup>t</sup> in his first edition, Paris 1546; by *Plantinus*, both in the Antwerp Polyglott,

and separately, by the *Geneva* editors; and in the *Paris Polyglott*: As far also as it was followed by Stephen, it has been repeated by *Wechel, Walton, Boecler, Mill,*<sup>u</sup> and *Bengel*. In all these, however, it must be understood that the Complutensian text is occasionally departed from, sometimes inadvertently, and sometimes through design.

<sup>t</sup> The elder, father of *Henry* and *Robert Stephen*.

<sup>u</sup> *Mill's* text follows the third edition of *Stephen*. It was published at Oxford 1707, reprinted by *Kuster* 1710, and at Leipzig 1723. A great mass of useful learning is contained in the Prolegomena. A collection of various readings from many manuscripts and fathers, and from the Latin interpretation of the Oriental versions, is added; which gave occasion to the *Criticæ Pseudo-Millianæ* of *Bodenius*, Halle 1767.

VIII. *Erasmus* published his first edition of the Greek Testament in 1516, with the assistance of *Æcolampadius, Capito,* and *Gerbelius*. In the Gospels he made a Basle manuscript of the fifteenth century his base, and in the remainder another, correcting its readings, however, from Theophylact and other Fathers, from the Latin Version, and from conjecture. Towards the conclusion of the Apocalypse he translated into Greek, from the Latin version, what was wanting in the text of his manuscript. This text, in the reprints of 1519,

1522, 1527, 1535,<sup>x</sup> was altered from the Fathers principally, though a few other manuscripts were also employed: in the fourth edition, 1527, it was altered from the Complutensian, which alterations are enumerated by Mill. The remarkably disputed verse, 1 John v. 7, was first inserted in the third edition: The cause of these variations is to be found in the multiplicity of difficult tasks, which the editor was carrying on at the same time; from the fewness of his manuscripts, especially at the commencement; and finally, from the inconsistency of his judgment, which is not to be wondered at, considering the time at which he lived.

<sup>x</sup> The most correct, and therefore the most rare of Erasmus' editions, are those of 1516, 1522. See *Wetstein's* Proleg. N. T. i. 120, seq.

IX. The text of Erasmus, though not always that of the same edition, was principally followed by *Aldus*,<sup>y</sup> *Colinæus*, *Bogard*,<sup>z</sup> *R. Stephen* in the Epistles, by some of the Basil editions, as the *Hervagian*, and partly by *Boecler*, with the exceptions mentioned at § 7. The Aldine differs only in errors of the press, which Erasmus himself mentions as various readings. *R. Stephen* in his first edition, 1546, and his



second, 1549, which goes by the name of the *mirifica* edition,<sup>a</sup> departs from the text of Erasmus in cases where it is opposed to all the manuscripts, as he had before done in the edition of *Colinæus*, which he corrected. In his third edition of 1550, he followed Erasmus' last edition of 1535, with almost no variation, and this text was preserved in the others above mentioned. *Luther* in his version generally followed the first edition of Erasmus, as no other could then be obtained; though some maintain that he used the *Haguenan* edition of 1521. It is unnecessary to specify the less important editions derived from these.

<sup>y</sup> Published in 1518, fol., and very rare. Upon the whole, Aldus follows Erasmus, but differs from him in about a hundred places. The reason for these differences is not apparent; for in other places even the errors of the press are retained.

<sup>z</sup> Paris, 1543, 8vo. The basis is the text of Erasmus, but sometimes *Colinæus* is followed.

<sup>a</sup> From the commencement of the preface, "*O mirificam regis liberalitatem!*" It contains, however, fourteen errors, corrected in the third edition, 1550, which is generally considered immaculate. See, however, *Godf. Olearius* on Matt. p. 130. It is a most elegant edition, and celebrated as containing the first collection of various readings. There was also a *fourth* edition published at Geneva, 1551, in 8vo; and a *fifth* at Paris, 1569, in 12mo. [The fourth edition is remarkable, as being the first in which the division of verses was introduced: the Paris edition of 1569 was edited by the younger Stephen.]

X. *Theodore Beza* formed his first text, published in 1559 and 1565, upon the text of *Stephens'* third edition of 1550. Afterwards having used, for the correction of the text, the Cambridge and Clermont manuscripts, the Latin version, and the Syriac and Arabic of the Acts, and of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, he published editions in 1582, 1589, and 1598, in which he also inserted his own conjectures, and failed to obtain the character of a diligent and modest critic.<sup>b</sup> This text was reprinted by *Henry Stephen*, *Er. Schmidt*, and others. Schmidt made some rash alterations, of which, as happened frequently in those days, no notice was taken.

<sup>b</sup> See *Wetstein's Proleg.* p. 146, seq., and *Hug's Introduction*, p. 269, seq. [Beza's edition of 1559 was merely a reprint of *Stephens'* fourth edition, but that of 1565, with the succeeding, contains a text formed by Beza himself. See *Griesbach's Proleg.* i. p. 31. The Translator cannot understand the expression "Cæterum id exemplum tum alii, tum Henr. Stephanus, Er. Schmidius expressere." II. *Stephens* printed the ed. of 1565, and all the rest except the last. *Erasmus Schmid* left a corrected copy of Beza's *Latin* version, which was published in folio, Nuremburg, 1658. *Noessel* in his *Anweisung zur Kenntniss*, &c. does not mention Beza's edition of 1559, probably considering it as a mere reprint of *Stephen*.]

XI. Upon *Stephen's* third edition, and the text of *Beza*, a new text was formed, it does

not appear by whom, and published by the *Elzevirs*, in 1624.<sup>c</sup> This text was adopted by *Curcellæus*<sup>d</sup> and *Leusden*, and after them by the *Oxford* editors,<sup>e</sup> *Mæstricht*,<sup>f</sup> *Wetstein*,<sup>g</sup> and other more recent and ordinary editors, as those of *Leipzig*.<sup>h</sup> This text, through the prevalent want of knowledge on such matters, for a long time possessed so much authority, that those who departed from it incurred the charge of vitiating the very words of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>c</sup> The editor's name is still unknown : on the title appears, *ex regiis aliisque optimis editionibus cum cura expressum*.

<sup>d</sup> Consult *Calovius de Curcellæi edit. socinizante*.

<sup>e</sup> First by *Fell* in 1665, who follows the text of *Walton*. The second is of the year 1702. [*Walton's* text is that printed in the 5th vol. of the *London Polyglott*. *Fell's* edition was reprinted at *Leipzig* in 1697 and 1702, at *Oxford* in 1703, under the charge of *Gregory*.]

<sup>f</sup> With various readings from the *Vienna Manuscript* and *Fell's* edition. The critical canons prefixed are of no value.

<sup>g</sup> In the edition of 1751, which follows the text of *Elzevir*, and contains a rich collection of various readings from *Manuscripts*, *Fathers*, and *Versions*. *Semler* republished the *prolegomena* and critical tracts, at *Halle* 1762 and 1764. [A new edition is now in course of publication, edited by *Dr. J. A. Lotze* at *Rotterdam*, who proposes, with the assistance of the later critics, to correct the many errors which appear in the various readings of *Wetstein*, especially in those taken from the oriental versions. The first *Fasciculus* only, containing the *Prolegomena*, has yet appeared.]

<sup>h</sup> *Rechenberg* and *Reineck*.

XII. A species of *Variorum* text was published by *J. A. Bengel*,<sup>i</sup> at Tubingen, 1734, founded on the *Complutensian* edition, and those of *Erasmus* and the *Stephens*; not a syllable being admitted which had not previously been printed, and the highest authority being given to R. Stephen. This selection of readings, was however neglected, and sometimes altered by the editor in his *Gnomon*. Bengel's text was reprinted at Leipzig in 1737, and elsewhere.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>i</sup> This edition was intended to contain the cream of the best readings, selected from printed copies only. Various readings are given in the margin, with the judgment of the editor. An *Apparatus Criticus* is added, containing many extracts from the Fathers, and additions to *Mill's* edition. See *Wetstein's* Proleg. p. 156.

<sup>k</sup> As at Tubingen in 1776. To these we must add *Griesbach's* edition of the New Testament 1775 and 1777, which has formed a new æra in the criticism of the New Testament. A second corrected edition was published at Halle and London, in 1796 and 1806, 2 vols. 8vo. *Harwood's* London 1776 and 1784, 2 vols. 12mo. *Matthæi's* 1782-1788, in 12 vols. respecting which it is unnecessary to repeat the judgment of *Michaelis* in the *Bibliotheca Or.* P. xx. p. 167, seq. and of *Eichhorn* in the *Bibliotheca Lit. Bibl. Univ.* ii. 302. See the Prolegomena of *Matthæi* to his editio N. T. *Compendiaria*, vol. i. Wittenberg 1803. For the same reason we shall pass over the edition of *Alter*, Vienna 1786, see *Allg. Bibl. d. Bibl. Lit.* II. p. 102. The edition of *Birch*, Copenhagen, [*Havniæ*,] 1788 is of the highest value, on account of the various readings collected from the

*Vatican, Escorial, and Copenhagen* manuscripts, and from the *Philoxenian* and *Jerusalem* versions. The edition of *Knappe*, Halle 1797, distinguished by an excellent preface, and that of *Schott*, Lips. 1805, with a new Latin version, both follow the text of *Griesbach*.

XIII. Great expectations were formed of the edition promised by *R. Bentley*, of which a specimen was published in 1720, 1721. The plan of the editor, as given by himself, shews that he would have attached too great weight to those Greek manuscripts, which, in our judgment, have been interpolated from the Latin version, and to those Latin manuscripts which he supposed to contain the genuine version of *Jerome*, which certainly followed the text of *Origen*; and thus he would have considered his text as a restoration of that of *Origen*. In this matter the illustrious editor fell into more than one error.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See, *Prolegomena ad N. T. Græci Editionem accuratissimam*, Amst. 1730, and *Wetstein's Proleg.* p. 153.

XIV. This review of the editions of the New Testament, and the account thus given of the origin of the text, which we now call the *received* or *Vulgate*, may enable the student to form some estimate of the value of each particular edition, and also of that received text, which some ignorant persons appear almost to

revere, and to consider as having been providentially preserved from corruption. The review, it is hoped, may tend to render them more moderate in their judgment.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> See *Hug's* Introduction, I. p. 270, and Matthæi pref. ad Evang. Matt. p. 28. [The *textus receptus* is that of Elzevir's edition, see § xi.]

XV. The authority of any text or edition depends upon the authority of the manuscripts from which it was derived. He, therefore, will be able rightly to use the published editions, who knows, in the first place, whence and how the text was formed, and in the next place, how to apply the rules of sound criticism to passages where the readings are doubtful or various. What these rules are will be shown in their proper place.

XVI. In determining the origin from which any text has been derived, we must be careful not rashly to credit the assertions of the editor, as to the multitude, antiquity, and excellence of his manuscripts; for unfounded assertions of this kind were very common among editors. Besides, when they speak of *Codices*, we are not to understand them as speaking exclusively of Greek manuscripts, few of which were possessed by the earlier editors; but

as comprehending the Latin version, the Greek and Latin Fathers, and sometimes even previous printed editions. Ignorance of this usage of language in such matters, has led many very grossly to misunderstand the assertions of the Complutensian editors, Erasmus and Stephen. Upon the whole, those who wish for an accurate knowledge of editions must consult *Mill*, *Bengel*, and *Wetstein*.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> Together with the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, continued after *Le Long* and *Boerner* by *Masch*, Halle 1778.

## CHAPTER IV.

## OF VERSIONS.

I. As the truths of Christianity were speedily communicated in every direction, to nations, either totally ignorant of Greek, or at least vernacularly using some other language, the necessity for translations of the inspired books arose immediately after the Apostolic age.<sup>o</sup> It may be going too far to assert with *Walton and Garbellus*, that without translations the church among such nations, the Latin church for example, could not have continued to exist; but it is clear that she would have been exposed to great difficulties and inconvenience.

<sup>o</sup> Almost every where converts were to be found, who did not understand Greek. For the ancient versions generally, see Semler's *Versuch, die gemeinnutzige Auslegung des N. T. zu befördern*. Attempt to further the popular interpretation of the N. T. p. 160. sq.

II. The translation then of the sacred books into many languages at a very early period, is



proved by the evidence of *Eusebius* in *Orat. in Laudem Const. Mag.* p. 662; and other Fathers of the Church,<sup>p</sup> quoted by *Fabricius*, *Bibl. Græc.* iv. p. 191, first edition; the application of whose evidence is however denied by *Blanchinus* in his *Proleg. Evangeliarum*, i. 78. Their testimony, in fact, proves the translation of the New Testament into other languages, but does not precisely mark the time when these translations were formed.

<sup>p</sup> As *Theodoret* and *Chrysostom*. *Tertullian* in the second century uses a Latin version, as a work of undisputed authority. See *Semler*, note on *Wetstein's Proleg.* p. 584, sq.

III. The most ancient known version, supposed by some to have been made by an Apostle, or by a cotemporary of the Apostles, is the *Syriac*.<sup>q</sup> This version was first introduced into Europe by a certain *Moses*, sent as agent by *Ignatius*, Patriarch of the Maronites, to the Popes *Leo X.* and *Julius III.* It was first published at Vienna in 1555, by *Albt. Widmanstadt*; and afterwards by *Plantinus* and *Hutter*. The *Apocalypse* having been added by *L. De Dieu*, and 2d *Peter*, 2d and 3d *John*, and *Jude*, by *Pocock*, the whole was reprinted in the *London and Paris Polyglotts*, by *Gutbier* [at *Hamburgh*, 1664], and by *C. Schaaf*

at Leyden, 1709, 1717. *Tremellius* [Geneva, 1569,] added the passage 1 John v. 7, translated by himself from the Greek, but placed it in the margin, while *Gutbier* introduced it into the text. Both he and the editors of the London Polyglott admitted into the text the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, John viii. 1—11, from the Usher Manuscript, which ought to have been placed in the margin.

<sup>9</sup> In *Asseman's* *Bibl. Oriental.* II. 86, a manuscript of this version is attributed to the first century, on the authority of an addition at the end. But these additions, or subscriptions as they are called, merit little attention in critical matters. This version called the *Peshito*, that is, the simple or literal, was formed before the Eutychian and Nestorian Schism, and probably in the second century. [The *Peshito*, however, is not a literal version; it is by no means so literal as the Philoxenian. *Michaelis* renders the word *Peshito*, pure, uncorrupted, accurate.]

IV. It has been doubted whether the *Peshito* Syriac version was made from the original Greek, or from a Latin version. *Michaelis* in *Var. Lect. N. T.* § 21, contends that it was formed from the Greek; and *Simon*, *Hist. Crit.* c. 13, 14, 15, shews that it more frequently agrees with the Greek text against the Latin, than with the Latin against the Greek;† this, however, sometimes happens, and thence we may conclude, that it was formed from a less in-

terpolated copy, but yet from a copy with some interpolations. From the Syriac was formed the old *Persian* version of the four Gospels, which, with a translation by *Sam. Clarke*, and notes by *T. Graves*, was published in the London Polyglott. Another version, part of which was published at London in 1657, and afterwards, the whole by *Wheelock* and *Pier-son*, was made from the Greek, but as late as the fourteenth century.

<sup>r</sup> There can now be no doubt but that the Syriac version was made directly from the Greek : see Marsh's *Michaelis* II. 23. Ed. 4th. *Michaelis*, however, in another work, *Curæ in Vers. Syriacam Act. Apost.* attempts to persuade us that it was interpolated from the Latin. It seems more probable that this version suffered changes in the eighth and ninth centuries, to bring it into conformity with the Greek copies of the western recension. It therefore abounds in false readings, and cannot be relied upon in critical matters, till, by the assistance of the Arabic and Persian versions, it shall have been reduced to its pristine purity. See *Reusch*, *Syrus interpres cum fonte N. T. Græco collatus*, Lips. 1741 ; and *Weber de Usu vers. Syr. hermen.* Lips. 1778, but above all *Storr's Observations, super N. T. vers. Syriac*, Stuttg. 1772, and *Hug's Introduction*, i. p. 292. *Michaelis* ii. p. 25. [Marsh, allowing the strong coincidences of the Peshito and the Western, or Latinizing manuscripts, accounts for it, by supposing that the more remote churches in Western Europe and Eastern Asia, had more ancient, and consequently purer copies, than the intermediate churches using the Constantinopolitan recension.]

V. Besides this ancient Syriac or Peshito version, there exists another more recent one, called the *Philoxenian*, from *Xenyas* or *Philoxenus*, under whose authority it was made by a certain *Polycarp*. It is also called *Heracleian*, from Thomas Bishop of *Heraclea*, who carefully revised it :<sup>s</sup> and sometimes goes under the name of *Barsalibæus*, who brought it to light in the twelfth century. For information respecting this version, the reader may consult Michaelis' *Introduc.* ii. 58, seq., or rather the Dissertation of *Ridley*, at the end of the *Wetstein* tracts, edited by *Semler*.

<sup>s</sup> The *Philoxenian* version was published by *White* at *Oxford*, 1773. *Storr*, as is usual with him, gives a learned judgment on its merits in *Eichhorn's Repertorium*, vii. 1, seq. It is to be distinguished from the *Hierosolymitan* version, in a *Chaldee* dialect, made at *Jerusalem* between the fourth and sixth centuries. See *Adler*, *versiones N. T. Syriacæ, Simplex, Philox. et Hieros. denuo examinatae, Hafniæ*, 1789, iii. 137. [For an account of *Adler's* work, see *Michaelis' Introd.* ii. 75. *Philoxenus* was Bishop of *Hierapolis* from 488 to 518, and *Polycarp* his rural bishop. *Dionysius Barsalibæus* was Bishop of *Amida*, from 1176 to 1171. Full information on all these points may be found in *Asseman's Bibliotheca Orientalis*.]

VI. The *Coptic* version, edited by *Daniel Wilkins*, a *Prussian*, at *Oxford*, 1716. With a *Latin* version, which, in the opinion of *La*

Croze and Jablonski is far from correct, although it be not more ancient than the time of Origen, as Wilkins supposes it to be, a supposition disproved by the division of the Gospels, according to the Eusebian canons, and of the Epistles by the *στίχαι*, which being the invention of Euthalius, bring it down to the fifth century: is yet of great antiquity. Critics doubt whether it was formed from the Greek or the Latin; Mill in his Proleg. N. 1407, maintaining the former, and Whitby, i. 4, 1, the latter opinion.<sup>t</sup> It certainly often agrees with the Latin against the Greek. See, for example, the Var. Lect. at 1 Cor. end of ch. vi., and beginning of ch. vii. But these passages might have been previously interpolated from the Latin into the Greek copies.

<sup>t</sup> It is now ascertained that the Coptic version was made in the fifth century, and from the Greek. It contains many valuable various readings, which agree in general with the quotations of the Alexandrine Fathers. See the select readings given by *Woide* in *Michaelis Bibl. Orient.* x. 198, and, *Fragmentum Evangelii S. Johannis græco-coptico-thebaicum*, ex ed. *Georgii*. Rome, 1789. *Münter*, on the age of the Coptic version, in *Eichorn's Bibliotheca Lit. Bib. Univers.* iv. 1 and 385. [The date of this version is not so indisputably ascertained as *Dr. Ammon* supposes. At any rate, *Ernesti's* argument is of no weight; for, upon the same principle, we might contend that the New Testament in Greek was not written before the time

of *R. Stephen*, because our copies have his division of verses. For a specimen of the readings of the Coptic, see Marsh's Notes on Michaelis, ii. 589. The biblical student, who is unacquainted with the eastern languages, must be careful not to give implicit credit to the Latin translation of the Oriental versions, especially those made by the first editors, which are often incorrect. Between the Coptic and Æthiopian, some mention ought to be made of the Sahidic version, in the dialect of Upper Egypt. Manuscripts, or portions of manuscripts of this version are preserved in the Libraries of Rome, Paris, Oxford, Berlin, and Venice. Part of St. John's Gospel was published at Rome by Georgi in 1789. Other fragments were prepared by Woide, and completed and published by *Dr. Ford* at Oxford in 1799. *Mingarelli* also published some fragments, Bologna, 1785. The version is ancient, *Georgi* attributes it to the fourth century. It agrees very closely with the Codex Cantabrigiensis. For a collation of it with that MS., see Marsh's Notes on Michaelis, ii. 593.]

VII. The *Ethiopic* version is supposed to be referred to by Chrysostom in his Homily on John ii., and consequently, the existing version is supposed to be of a date previous to his time. But from that passage nothing certain can be concluded. The Ethiopians, (Abyssinians) themselves, attribute it to St. *Irumentius*, who flourished in the time of Constantine the Great. Michaelis in his Var. Lect. N. T. § 24, 25, maintains that it was made from the Greek. Its frequent accordances with the Latin version, may be accounted for from the fact, that

it was published at Rome in 1548–9, by *Tessa Tzio*, an Abyssinian monk, from a defective copy, whose deficiencies were supplied from the Latin. The republication of it in the London Polyglót is still more erroneous. The learned have pronounced both the Latin translations extremely faulty, see *Michaelis* Var. Lect. N. T., § 34, 35, and the preface to *Bode's* Collatio Evang. Matt. cum vers. Æthiop. Halle, 1749. This collation, however, ought not to have been made with the printed copy alone, which the Abyssinians disapprove of, as differing from their own copies. See *Ludolf* Præf. in Lex. Æthiop.

VIII. The *Armenian* version was published at Amsterdam in 1668, by *Uscan*, an Armenian Bishop, who had been sent by the rulers of his church for this purpose. The Armenians say that this version was made by *Miesrob*, the inventor of the Armenian character, of whose life some account is given by *Sainjore*, *i. e.* R. Simon in the *Bibliothèque Critique*, iv. 196. *Moses Chorenensis*, Hist. lib. iii. 313, informs us that *Miesrob* was assisted by his disciple *Moses*, and that the version was made from a Greek copy brought from the Council of Ephesus; though elsewhere, lib. iii. 299, he asserts that the translation had been made,

or at least attempted before. It is believed, however, to have been interpolated from the Latin by Uscan, as he himself confesses in his preface.<sup>u</sup> Certainly the text 1 John v. 7, which is in his printed edition, is not found in the manuscripts. See *La Croze*, Thes. Epist. i. 359. *Nachricht von einer Hallischen Bibliothek*, iii. 189. Also *Simon's Hist. Crit.* iv. 17, his *Bibl. Crit.* iv. 193, and his *Lettres Choisies*, p. iv. n. 24.

<sup>u</sup> This interpolation does not, however, extend to all the books. It agrees generally with the Coptic version, Origen and Manuscripts of the Alexandrine recension. See *Hug*, I. 322, seq.

IX. The *Arabic* versions, some made from the Syriac or Coptic, others from the Greek, are all supposed to be of a later date than the Mohammedan æra. The version of the Gospels, which was published at Rome in 1591 and 1619, agrees in many points with the Syriac, while it differs from it in others. It was reprinted in the Paris Polyglot, together with a more recent version of the other books, but stupidly interpolated by *Gabriel Sionites*. Hence it was transferred to the London Polyglot, but corrected from manuscripts. Another version of the whole New Testament was published by *Erpenius* at Ley-



den, 1616, from a Coptic copy, without interpolation or version. In the Gospels it generally agrees with the Latin; in the Epistles Erpenius thinks it follows the Syriac version, and in the Apocalypse it follows the Coptic, as Michaelis thinks, Var. Lect., N. T. § 29. Those Arabic versions alone have any critical value, which were made from the Greek by the Melchites, who use the Greek language in their religious services.<sup>x</sup>

<sup>x</sup> No accurate collection of the Arabic versions, with a discrimination of their ages, as yet exists. See Storr de Evangeliiis Arabicis, Tubing. 1775, and Hug's Introd. I. 354. [By a Coptic copy is meant an Arabic Manuscript, written in Upper Egypt. The date of this, Erpenius' MS. is of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. See Marsh, Notes on Michaelis II. 604. The Roman Propaganda published an Arabic Bible in 1671, under the inspection of *Sergius Risius* Bishop of Damascus, and the English Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, an Arabic N. T. in 1727, edited, and in some places altered from the text of the Polyglots by *Salomon Negri*. The N. T. in the *modern* Arabic was published in 1816, at Calcutta by the British and Foreign Bible Society.]

X. *Ulphilas*, Bishop of the Goths, is said to have translated the New Testament into the Gothic language in the fourth century; and it is supposed to be his version which was published by *Junius* and *Marshall* from the Codex

Argenteus, Dordrecht, 1665, Amsterdam, 1684, by *Stiernhielm*, Holmiæ, 1671, and lastly, from a copy of *E. Benzelius*, by *E. Lye*, Oxford, 1750. *La Croze*, Thes. Epist. iii. 78, concludes from the place where the Codex Argenteus was found, the monastery of Werden in Westphalia, and from the form of the character, that the version is not Gothic but Frankish. But the Goths were in that country, of whom were the Sunila and Fretela mentioned by Jerome, whom they consulted respecting the discrepancies of the Greek and Latin texts. Whichever it may be, it contains readings which could not have been derived but from a Greek text, as has been allowed, after the demonstration of Bengel, App. Crit. 408, even by Wetstein, i. 114. This appears more natural to a Gothic than to a Frankish version. See *Ihrés*, *Ulphilas Illustratus*.<sup>y</sup> Another portion of this version was discovered in the library of Wolfenbüttel, and published in 1762 by the learned Knittel.

<sup>y</sup> See also *Comm. de linguâ Codicis Argentei*, Upsal, 1754. [The Dordrecht edition 1665, contains the Gothic edited by Junius, and the Anglo-Saxon by Marshall. *Stiernhielm's* contains the Gothic, Suio-Gothic, and Islandic. For proofs that the language of the Codex Argenteus and Carolinus or Wolfenbüttel, is not Frankish but Mæso-Gothic, see

Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 137, seq. and for a description and specimen of the *Cod. Arg.*, see *Horne's Introd.* II. 90.]

XI. It is the general opinion,<sup>z</sup> founded on the testimony of Augustine (*Doct. Christ.* ii. 11, 14), that there were many Latin versions in the earliest ages of the church. This testimony has, through an absurd partiality for the Latin Vulgate, been interpreted by *Sabatier* (in *Præf. Gener. Bibl. Vers. Ital.*), and *Blanchini* (in *Proleg. Evang.* i. 81), as referring to the multitude of copies, and by *Garbellus* to the scholiasts and interpreters, in direct opposition to the express words of Augustine, the perspicuity of which will admit of no such interpretations. And since, at the same period, Greek versions of the Old Testament were made at different places, it seems probable that the same would be done from the Greek New Testament into Latin; especially when we consider the greater facility of the task in the inferior size of the work to be translated. Finally, the differences among the old copies are such as to prove an original diversity of versions.

<sup>z</sup> See also *Jerome's Proleg.* in *Evangel.* *Hug's Introd.* i. 380, [and *Marsh's Michaelis*, II. 108.]

XII. Of all these, that version was the most approved and in most ordinary use, which Jerome calls the *common* or *Vulgate*, shewing by the very epithets that there existed others. This was afterwards called the *Vetus Itala* or old version, when it had been renewed by his corrections.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> [The reader will of course not confound this with the version now called *Vulgate*, of which mention will be made hereafter. Among Biblical critics, it now generally goes by the name of the *Vetus-Itala*, or *Ante-Hieronymian* version.]

XIII. We may grant that this version was made in Italy, although that conclusion is by no means necessary, as the Latin language was vernacular in many other parts of Europe, and in Africa also. That it was called *Itala*, which is commonly believed on the authority of Augustine, *De Doct. Christ.* ii. 15, is doubted by *Bentley*, who thinks that for, *in ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala cæteris præferatur : nam est verborum tenacior, cum perspicuitate sententiæ ;* we ought to read, *Illa cæteris præferatur quæ est, &c.* in which correction he is followed by *Casley* (*Catal. Bibl. Cotton.*) and by the learned *Venema*. *Bentley's* suggestion in this matter is supported by many

considerations. First, by the form and context of the sentence; for Augustine is here giving a general rule respecting versions, and afterwards treats of the Latin versions separately and by name. Secondly, Augustine was quite ignorant of Greek, or at any rate so ignorant as to be incapable, without great temerity, of estimating the merits of a version. Lastly, the manuscripts of Augustine vary much in this word, as has been shewn by Casley. Sabatier, however, takes the opposite side, in Proleg. Bibl. Vet. Ital. to whom may be added Mosheim de rebus Christ. ante Const. Mag. p. 224, seq., who however fluctuates in his opinion.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> It appears highly probable, that this version was made about the end of the second century. 1. Because the Latin church could scarcely have done without a version. 2. Because it follows a context venerable through antiquity. 3. Because the Latin Fathers of the third century agree with it in their quotations. See *Fragmenta Versionis Latinæ antehieronymianæ*, in *Paulus' Repert. Lit. Or. et Orient. and Bibl. nov. part III. p. 115, seq.* [With respect to the testimony of Augustine, and Bentley's emendation of it, though the change of *Itala* into *Illa* is ingenious, that of *nam* into *quæ*, which becomes necessary, is quite arbitrary. *Potter* suggests that *Itala* is a mistake for *usitata*, and that the passage in the ancient manuscripts stood as follows, INIPSISAUTEMINTERPRETATIONIBUSUSITATAPRAEFERATUR; that a transcriber after having

copied *interpretationibus*, took the first syllable of *usitata* for the last syllable of the word he had just written, and of course read the next word ITATA, which he concluded to be an erratum for ITALA, and in this manner produced our present spurious reading. See Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 623.]

XIV. Whatever may have been its origin, attempts have, for a long time, been made towards its restoration, first by *Flaminius Nobilius*, with the assistance of other learned men, especially *A. Agellius*, who attempted to correct it from the writings of the Ante-Hieronymian Fathers, Rome, 1588. Next by *Marcianæus*, who first used manuscripts of a date prior to Jerome's version; and more recently by *P. Sabatier*, in his *Bibliis veteris Versionis Italicæ*, Rheims, 1743, and *Blanchini*, who published the Latin Evangeliaries from ancient manuscripts in 1749, not to mention others of less note, whom Sabatier reviews in his *Proleg.* § 166.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> [The Roman edition by *Nobilius* contains only the Old Testament. The New was added by *Morinus* in the Paris edition 1628. *Marcianæus*, (J. Martianay,) published the Gospel of St. Matthew, Paris 1698, and the Epistle of James. *Hearne* published the Acts from the Codex Laudianus, Oxford 1715. *Semler* has given the old Latin version, from the Codex Cantab. at the end of his *Paraphrasis Evang. Johann.* Halle 1771. A fragment of St. Mark's Gospel was published by *Dobrowsky*, at Prague 1778, from a manu-

script found there : and fragments of Mark and Luke, from a manuscript in the Imperial Library at Vienna, were published by Alter in *Paulus' Neues Repertorium*, &c. P. III. 124.]

XV. The labours of these editors, though deserving the gratitude of scholars, and not without use to those who know how to use them aright, have not accomplished, and could not accomplish that which they wished and intended. All the specious boasts that have been made of Ante-Hieronymian manuscripts do not render it probable that this version can be restored; nor do I believe Fabricius, who asserts in the *Bibl. Græc.* iv. p. 198, that it can be restored from the manuscripts of *Beza*, and the *Regius Secundus*, which is in fact the *Claramontanus* of *Beza*.

XVI. For the writings of the Latin fathers, who lived before Jerome, have in many places been corrected, both by copyists and editors, into conformity with Jerome's version, as has been shewn by the Benedictine editors in the cases of Ambrose and Augustine; and by others in the case of other fathers. Besides, they quoted from different versions, or from discrepant copies of the same version; while those who were familiar with Greek, translated for themselves, without supposing themselves

bound in all cases to follow the Vulgate. Finally, the manuscripts containing a version substantially different from that of Jerome, vary so widely from one another, that they can by no process be reduced into harmony.<sup>d</sup> And this is the less to be wondered at, since we know that in the time of Damasus and Jerome perfectly coinciding copies could not be found. Therefore Jerome well observes in his preface to the Gospels: “if the Latin translator is to be followed in preference to the Greek text, I would ask, which of them is to be followed?”

<sup>d</sup> Because the Latin text was generally altered into conformity with the later Greek copies, as appears particularly in the case of the Codex Brixiensis.

XVII. I would not directly deny, although I cannot fully assent to, the opinion of *Mill*, (*Proleg.* n. 313,) who concludes from the diversity of style, that the old Italian version must have had different authors, meaning by diversity of style, that the same Greek words are not always expressed by the same Latin ones. It is clear that the author was too tenacious of a literal adherence to his original, having preserved the genders, cases, numbers, and tenses of the Greek, in opposition to the



rules of Latin grammar, as *Aquila* had done in his Greek version of the Old Testament. Whence it is clear that the translator was imperfectly acquainted with Greek, or rather with Latin; or what is more probable, that he was actuated by a silly and judaical superstition, and consequently that he was a convert from Judaism; for who, in that age, can we suppose to have been affected by such a superstition but a Jew. Sometimes, however, at least in single words, its Latinity is of a better quality; and in this also it resembles the Greek version of the Old Testament.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> [For instances of the barbarisms of this version, see Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 114. It is also highly probable, independent of any internal evidence, that the first translators of the N. T. into Latin, were Jews; as during the first century, almost all the Christian teachers were of that nation. Bishop Marsh (Note p. 626,) is of opinion, that Jews residing in Europe spoke no language but Greek. He could not surely mean to deny that those who were domiciliated at Rome, had at least some knowledge of Latin: and, on the other hand, it seems improbable that those of easy circumstances and intelligent minds, would remain totally ignorant of the original language of Scripture. Yet it is certainly improbable, that a Roman Jew would be so familiar with Hebrew or Syriac idioms, as strongly to affect his Latin style.]

XVIII. When the copies of this version

had gradually become corrupted, and perhaps its barbarism become ridiculous; and thus it was to be feared, that the contempt would extend, as often happens, from the style to the truths conveyed by it; *Jerome*, at the suggestion of *Damasus*, Bishop of Rome, undertook its correction. His object was not to make a new version from the Greek, but, in the first place, to correct the solecisms of the old version; and, in the next place, by collating the Greek manuscripts in the Cæsarean Library, to alter those passages where the sense had been altogether misunderstood. Everything else he left as it was, in order not to offend the habits and the prejudices of those who had grown up in the use of the old version. Hence it arises, that the commentaries of *Jerome* sometimes differ from his version; nor is his practice even in it perfectly consistent. All this caution, however, was insufficient to secure him from blame, and even *Augustine* disapproves of the correction of the vicious Latinity; nor were copies of his emended version generally received by the church before the eighth century.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>f</sup> And those copies which were received, were generally written with the old version in a parallel column. Hence originated in a later age a mixed version. See *Hug*, l. 389, [and

Marsh's Michaelis, II. 125. A celebrated MS. of this mixed version, written in 870, in golden letters, is preserved in the library of St. Emeram in Ratisbon.]

XIX. *Martianay*, in his *Hieronymi Bibliotheca divina*, and *Sabatier* in his *Biblia Vet. Vers. Ital.* have professed to print this corrected version. Little reliance, however, can be placed upon the purity of their text. For *Jerome's* recension was soon altered in many places, both by copyists and correctors, sometimes from the more ancient version, sometimes from the quotations of the Fathers, and sometimes at their own discretion; and thus it became so corrupted and interpolated, as to render vain all hopes of restoring it to its original state. And the version of *Jerome* in this its altered state, is that which we now call the *Vulgate*. The best editions of this, corrected from the most ancient manuscripts, are those of *R. Stephen*, especially his editions of 1540, 1545, and 1546, that of *Henten*, 1547, and that of the Louvain doctors, 1557, 1573, among whom *Lucas Brugensis* was the most active. The *Sixtine* edition, published at Rome, 1590, must also be noticed, which was quickly followed in 1592, by the *Clementine*, in many places differing from the *Sixtine*. The *Clementine* recension has been followed by most succeed-

ing editors, and it is this which now bears the name of *Vulgate*. For the first editions, as those of *Scheffer*, *Jenson*, and others previous to Stephen, are valuable rather for their rarity, than for any critical use, being formed from such copies as came to hand, without selection or critical diligence. They are not, however, entirely to be neglected; for though they may have been prepared from single recent copies, still they may contain some readings of critical value.<sup>§</sup>

§ Especially when their readings are supported by more ancient authorities. For the differences between the Clementine and Sixtine recensions, see *James' Bellum Papale sive Concordia discors Sixti v. et Clementis viii.* Lond. 1600. [And in his treatise, on the Corruption of Scripture, &c. 1611. Ernesti's account of the earlier editions of the Vulgate is not correct. Henten's edition of 1547, was prepared under the inspection of the Louvain divines, who again, not in 1557, but in 1573, prepared a more accurate edition, by the command of the Council of Trent.]

XX. Since, however, this version does not in all cases express the sense of the original with sufficient perspicuity and fidelity, many scholars have attempted new versions, ever since the restoration of the study of the Greek text. We may mention those of *Erasmus*, *Pagnini*, a better translator of the Old than

of the New Testament, *Castellio*, *Beza*, whose versions *Boyse* has compared with the old Latin, and shewn that they have often departed from it without sufficient cause. *Boyse's* zeal, however, has carried him too far in some of his remarks. Of other versions, and especially those into the vernacular tongues, it is unnecessary here to treat.

XXI. Versions have two uses, the one *hermeneutical*, the other *critical*. Both the ancient and modern versions possess that *common* hermeneutical use, which we may call *historical*: that is to say, we learn from them what each translator understood by the words of the original; and are thus often led to the true sense of the passage.

XXII. Those ancient versions, however, which were made directly from the Greek, and by men skilled in the peculiar idiom of the New Testament, may have also a *proper* and *dogmatic* hermeneutical use; that is to say, we may learn from them the *usus loquendi*, in cases where it could not be discovered by other means.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> The literal exactness of the Latin version, has introduced doctrinal errors into theology. Thus in 2 Cor. viii. 19, *προθυμία* is rendered by the Vulgate, *destinata voluntas*, and this Aquinas uses to support the doctrine of predestina-

tion. For a still stronger example, see Ephes. v. 32, where *μυστήριον* is rendered in the Vulgate by *sacramentum*, [and thus marriage is made one of the seven sacraments. These, however, are certainly not instances of the *proper* hermeneutical use of versions : and probably the Old Syriac is the only version, for which any such use can fairly be claimed.]

XXIII. Versions fail of attaining either of these hermeneutical uses, in proportion as they are too tenacious of verbal accuracy, and by an unnecessary adherence to the Greek idiom, offend against purity and perspicuity. In this way even learned theologians and interpreters have been led into error. If the reader wishes for examples of this species of translation from the old Latin, he may consult Erasmus' Preface to the New Testament, 1522, c. 6, b. sq.

XXIV. Before we can hope to derive this use from a version, we must determine, as was before observed, that it was really made from the Greek : and, in the next place, we must be careful with respect to the Oriental versions, not to trust to the Latin interpretations of them, which are generally faulty and obscure.<sup>1</sup> If our knowledge of the language is not sufficient to enable us to use the version itself, it will be better to forego it altogether.

<sup>1</sup> Mill has fallen into this error, see *Bodii Pseudocritica Millio-Bengeliana*. Halle 1767, 1769. With equal care-

lessness Wetstein refers to the testimony of the Syriac version, at Acts xi. 20, in which passage  $\text{ܩܘܠܘܢ}$  may mean the Hellenists, see Acts vi. 1. : and at Philipp. ii. 30, where  $\text{ܩܘܠܘܢ}$  gives the sense of the reading *παροουλευσάμενος*. In a similar way, the Syriac version in many texts, follows very different readings from those which are assigned to it in the best critical editions. [This, however, relates to the *critical* use of versions, which is treated of more fully in the following sections.]

XXV. Having attended to these two points, we must next ascertain the value of the version, in order to determine whether it will repay the labour of reading and consultation. This we may do by comparing several passages, whose sense is not easy, but which we have satisfactorily determined. *R. Simon* has given examples of this sort of comparison from the Syriac version, in his *Hist. Crit.* ii. c. 15. If the result of such an examination be favourable, we may then proceed to use the version with greater hope and confidence.

XXVI. In the use of versions we must avoid the common error of those who have undertaken to illustrate the New Testament by the versions of the Oriental churches. For all, and among them *L. de Dieu*, in his *Crit. Sac.*, spend their labour very idly in comparing those words which can be sufficiently explained

from the Greek or Hebrew.<sup>k</sup> All that they can possibly effect in this way, is to show that such words have been rightly understood by the writer of the version; and this may tend to raise the character of the version, or to illustrate the language in which it is written; but can never tend to advance the interpretation of the Scriptures.

<sup>k</sup> For example, he attempts to illustrate (in Matt. i. 19,) the Greek *παρδειγματίσαι* from the Syriac *ܩܘܕܝܘܢܐ* *to reveal*, which again has a disgraceful sense.

XXVII. Finally, the student ought to consult such versions, only when he meets with passages which he is unable to explain from the usages of the Greek or Hebrew languages. He must next examine whether the passage has been rendered etymologically, and word for word, a species of translation which can be of no service; or whether, on the contrary, it has been translated into the idiom of the language in which the version is, and in a style explicable by the known usages of that language. If the latter be the case, then we may hope, if in other respects the rendering be probable and consistent, that we have found something that will be conducive to the



discovery of the true sense. And this is true, especially of the Syriac version, which is in the language vernacular to the Apostles, or in one very similar to it; and it is highly probable that modes and figures of speech were borrowed from it as well as from the Hebrew, and introduced into the Greek of the New Testament. Besides, from the number of Syriac books still existing, the usages of that language may be accurately ascertained.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vi. 11, ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος is rendered *the bread of our necessity, i. e. the bread that is necessary for us.*

XXVIII. Those versions alone have a *critical* use, which have been made directly from the Greek; for such only can show what readings the writers of them found in the manuscripts from which they translated. Showing this, they may be useful in discovering genuine readings, in confirming those already discovered, and in detecting the origin of false readings. Those versions which have been made from other versions, show the readings of these, and not of the original text.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> Thus the Persic and Arabic versions may be used *critically*, not to emend the Greek text of the New Testament,

but to correct the Syriac version, from which they were both derived.

XXIX. Those who with *Whitby*, *Maestricht*, and others very imperfectly acquainted with criticism, deny that versions afford various readings, especially the ancient versions of the New Testament, which are generally literal, are opposed to the universal practice of critics on other books of antiquity,<sup>n</sup> and to the reason of the case itself. Besides, they throw suspicion upon the Greek text, which they pretend to defend; for it is certain that many readings were introduced into it from the Latin version, by the *Complutensian* editors, *Erasmus*, and *Beza*, many of which are still retained: and finally, they are refuted by their own practice. For all of them, especially *Whitby*, in defending particular readings, are in the habit of referring to versions, as is well urged by *Bengel*, p. 427. *Glasse* properly acknowledges this use of versions in his *Phil. Sac. Tr.* ii. P. i. memb. 3, and also *Luther*, who not unfrequently follows the reading of the Latin version.

<sup>n</sup> *Wesseling* in his preface to *Herodotus*, confesses that he has gathered many various readings from the Latin version of *L. Valla*. The same holds good with versions of the

**New Testament.** [For the critical use of the Syriac version, see Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 45, and for that of the old Latin, p. 121. When the Latin copies all agree in a reading, their evidence goes far to prove that it existed in various manuscripts older than any now existing. For the Latin manuscripts which go by the names of *Vercellensis*, *Brixienſis*, *Veronenſis*, &c. differ so much, that they may be considered as separate versions.]

XXX. But in this application of versions, much caution is to be used. For, in the first place, all those passages are to be set aside, in which it is clear that the translator has erred, either through the errors of the manuscript which he used, or through his own ignorance of Greek or Hebrew, or through negligence; and those also in which he has inserted his own explanation rather than a fair version of the Greek, with those in which he has written ambiguously, or in such a way as that it cannot clearly be determined from his version what was the reading in the manuscript which he used;° all which exceptions frequently occur in the Latin version. I am inclined, however, to give more weight to the Latin version in its omissions, especially where the other versions agree with it, than in other respects. For if the reading be still consistent with reason and the context, no good reason can be given for the omission; whereas in other va-

riations, ignorance, negligence, or interpolation may be supposed. In the use of oriental versions we must be careful not to trust to the ordinary Latin interpretation, by which confidence Mill, with others, has been grossly misled. Finally, good and ancient manuscripts ought to be inspected, and not merely the printed copies; because the versions themselves, as has already been shown of many, have been vitiated and interpolated. That this has taken place in the Latin version, has been abundantly shown by those who have undertaken its correction.<sup>P</sup>

<sup>o</sup> For example in Luke ii. 22. Wetstein says, that the Vulgate indicates the reading *ἀντοῦ*. But *ejus* may with equal probability be referred to the reading *ἀντῆς*.

<sup>P</sup> To these cautions we may add the following rules. He who wishes to make a judicious use of versions, must observe, 1. Whether he possesses the text of the version which he is using critically edited and emended. 2. Whether he is intimately acquainted with the language of the version. 3. What recension the version follows. 4. Let him beware of mistaking synonyms in the version, for a variety in the reading. 5. Let him be aware that readings supported by only one version, carry no great weight with them. [It is hoped, that the junior student of theology will rise from the perusal of this chapter, with a conviction, that the emendation of the text from versions, or indeed from any other source, is a work requiring all the matured judgment and knowledge of the veteran scholar; and that the utmost which he can hope to effect at present by the most careful

attention to the subject, is to qualify himself in some measure to judge of the emendations, or systems of emendation, which he finds proposed in the more celebrated critical editions of the New Testament. And if even in this judgment he finds much difficulty and obscurity, he may comfort himself with the assurance that there is no edition of the New Testament, which does not substantially contain all the facts narrated, and all the doctrines taught by the Apostolic writers. The labours of the critics have probably been more useful, in establishing the general agreement of all the copies, than in deducing any important result from their little discrepancies.]

## CHAPTER V.

## ON THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS, AND THEIR APPLICATION.

I. THE writings of the doctors of the church, in its early ages, form also a part of the apparatus necessary to an interpreter.<sup>9</sup> We shall therefore briefly treat of them, in so far as they are connected with our purpose, either as aiding the verification of the text, or its interpretation. And in this we shall comprehend all sacred writings which refer to Scripture, not commentaries solely or even principally, since they have been separately considered in another chapter.

<sup>9</sup> From the quotations of the Fathers we learn varieties of the text, more ancient than those supplied by the manuscripts; we learn also the age and country of particular readings, and the origin of glosses. [The old readings are to be deduced rather from the comments and observations of the Fathers, than from their quotations, which have in

some cases been altered by the copyists into conformity with the prevailing text, and in others appear to have been made memoriter and inaccurately by the Father himself. See Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. p. 370, 371.]

II. The uses to which these writings may be applied are of two kinds, the one *critical*, the other *hermeneutical*. But in order to give accurate precepts for each of these, it seems necessary, in the first place, to say something respecting the text which was used by the Fathers and of its history; and then respecting the nature of ancient interpretation.

III. In the first place, since the historical books of the New Testament were written by different authors in different places, and the Epistles were sent to different churches through particular channels, it is clear they could not be immediately known to all the churches;<sup>r</sup> much less could they be immediately collected into volumes and possessed by all Christians, or even by all the teachers of the church. And this is confirmed by ancient custom in such matters, and by the manuscripts which are now extant. See chap. ii. § 9.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>r</sup> *Chrysostom*, for example, declares in his Prol. I. Hom. on the Acts, that this book was entirely unknown to his diocese.

<sup>s</sup> In the 1st Epistle of *Clemens Rom.* no book of the New

Testament is quoted, except the 1st Ep. to the Corinthians, which he calls *εὐαγγέλιον*. *Tertullian* and *Justin*, indeed quote almost all the books of the N. T. with the exception of the Apocalypse: but the embodying of the several books into one volume, was not thought of till the third century.

IV. Since the copies that were made, were made by the Christians themselves, among whom there were few who had been regularly educated, it is not to be wondered at if they abounded in errors of orthography, or were in other respects faulty; the substantial sense of the text being, however, always preserved, with which these simple and uneducated men were contented. Nor had they among them professional grammarians to whom they might give their copies for correction.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>t</sup> Add also, that on account of the contempt and persecutions under which the church then suffered, these copies were made clandestinely. Hence we may infer the origin and causes of erroneous readings.

V. The second century certainly produced Christians who had been regularly educated, as *Justin*, *Pantænus*, *Clemens*, and others; but these were rather philosophers than grammarians, and better qualified to write books than to correct them. It appears also, that



about this time the several books of the New Testament began to be embodied, as *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alex.*, and *Tertullian* quote nearly all of them.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>u</sup> The first of these was ignorant of Hebrew : the second was the instructor of Clemens and a Stoic. Neither of them was qualified to correct the text of the New Testament. The reader may note how the representations of Justin in his dialogue with Trypho, respecting the Magi coming from Damascus to Bethlehem, differ from the account given by St. Matthew.

VI. *Origen*, in the third century, was the first who undertook, from a comparison of numerous ancient manuscripts, to make a selection of the best readings, and thus to form a pure and uncorrupted text. There can be little doubt, from the authority which his recension held, both in the Greek and Latin church, that this learned father applied his knowledge of criticism, and his familiarity with the old copies, to a useful and successful result. It has been argued, though without sufficient proof, that he sometimes introduced conjectural emendations into the text.<sup>x</sup> For these emendations, which are proposed in his Commentaries, were not inserted in the text. See my *Disp. de Origene interp. SS. librorum grammaticæ auctore*, § 16, 17, 20.

\* Origen, however, cannot be completely acquitted of an immoderate fondness for emendation. See, for example, Matt. viii. 28, where he is said to have substituted Γαργεσηνῶν for Γαδαρηνῶν; and John i. 28. Βηθαβαρᾶ for Βηθανία, in both cases erroneously. See *Huetii Origeniana* iii. ch. 2. [Γεργεσηνῶν not Γαργεσηνῶν is the conjecture of Origen. For a full consideration of this reading, see Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 397, seq., and for his attempted emendation of John i. 28, see the same, p. 399. In this last case, however, Origen seems to have had a more probable ground of conjecture: for there was a *Bethany* near Jerusalem, and no other that we read of elsewhere. The addition *beyond Jordan* would mark a diversity of places with the same name, if those places were cities or large towns, but not if the place intended were a village. Thus we say *Newcastle on Tyne*, as distinguished from *Newcastle under Line*; but when we say *Trumpington* near *Cambridge*, we do not imply the existence of any other place with the same name. Had there been a *city* called *Bethany* beyond *Jordan*, it seems scarcely probable that it should have been so utterly annihilated and forgotten, as to have escaped the researches of so intelligent a traveller as Origen. For a comparison of the readings of Origen with those of Codex L. see *Griesbach's Symb. Crit.* T. I. p. lxxvii. seq. *Ernesti's tract de Origene Interp.* &c. has been translated by *Mr. R. B. Patton*, and printed in *Hodge's Biblical Repertory*, vol. iii. New York, 1827.]

VII. Copies of Origen's recension being deposited in the celebrated Cæsarean Library, became the exemplar by which other copies were tried and corrected, (see ch. i. § 17,) and many transcripts were made from them in the time of *Eusebius*, and afterwards, (see ch. ii. §

16.) Almost all the more learned Fathers, and celebrated interpreters of the Greek Church, followed this text, and among the Latins, *Jerome*; so that *Origen* may justly be reckoned the parent of the pure Oriental Greek text. Nor is it clearly ascertained, that any one after him undertook and accomplished the labour of a like recension. For the manuscripts of *Picrius* and *Pamphilus*, so highly praised by the ancients, were, without doubt, copies of *Origen's* recension, carefully written out by those persons. This is proved with respect to *Pamphilus*, by *Euthalius*, in the subscription to Epp. Cathol., p. 513.

VIII. In the same century, but towards the end of it, and subsequent to *Origen*, we are informed by *Jerome* (Præf in iv. Evang.) that *Lucian* of Antioch, and *Hesychius*, an Egyptian bishop, made a new recension of the text, and laboured also on the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. *Jerome*, however, thought very meanly of their copies; "I omit," says he, "those copies named after *Lucian* and *Hesychius*, which the contentious perversity of some men is in the habit of referring to; nor were they successful in their emendations of the New Testament." As, however, the *Hesychian* text of the Septuagint was generally

received by the Alexandrines, and in Egypt, so also his text of the New Testament is believed to have had considerable currency. Hence, it is called by some the *Alexandrine* text: and *Wetstein*, i. 69, observes, that the glosses of Hesychius, which relate to the New Testament, agree with its readings. The same may have been the case with *Lucian's* text, in the countries where his emended text of the Septuagint was received, as in Syria. And the prevalent dislike to Origen, might have a further efficacy in this matter.<sup>y</sup>

<sup>y</sup> See a learned dissertation on this subject in Hug's Introduction, I. 176, 198.

IX. We must not, however, suppose that either countries or individuals, restricted themselves to particular copies of the New Testament, any more than they had done in the case of the Old Testament. We have seen that *Euthalius*, an Egyptian, visited Cæsarea, in order to correct his copy by the text of Origen; and afterwards the Syrian author of the new version, collected copies of Origen's recension. And thus the readings of various recensions might be mingled together, as it is evident was done in the case of the Old Testament. In all ages then, even after the la-

bours of Origen, the existence of various readings is mentioned by many, as *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, *Æcumenius*, and others.

X. These manuscripts, however, and those derived from them, with greater or less degrees of accuracy, still substantially retained the verity of the original Greek. But a new class of manuscripts afterwards arose, of which, as we have before observed, many very ancient copies still exist, in which the Greek text was in many places altered or interpolated into conformity with the Latin version. *Mill* in his Proleg. n. 378, and *Wetstein*, i. 79,<sup>2</sup> have repeated the well known remark of *Epiphanius* and *Tertullian*, that this practice was first introduced with a bad design by *Marcion*. But the orthodox themselves soon began to follow the same system, either through ignorance, or a servile submission to the Romans,<sup>a</sup> (see chap. ii. § 16), or from other causes. For that the Romans may have thought this submission reasonable, is very possible; nor will it appear extraordinary to those who judge of human nature by the experience of facts. The orthodox Greeks, who were ignorant of Hebrew, were fully persuaded that the Greek version of the Old Testament, which they had received from their Fathers, was more pure than the

Hebrew text; and the Latins considered it a heavy crime in *Jerome*, that he had dared to correct the Latin version of the Old Testament by the Hebrew, rendering it thereby very different from their copies which adhered closely to the Greek. *Hilary*, a Roman deacon, or whoever was the author of the Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, usually published with the works of *Ambrose*, sometimes, as at Rom. v. 14, directly requires that the Greek should be corrected by the Latin. *Jerome*, however, the most learned of the Latins, and *Augustine*, are of another and sounder opinion. See the Præf. ad iv. Evang. of the former, and Doct. Christ. ii. 13, and De Pecc. merc. et remiss. i. 11, of the latter. They hold that the Latin copies ought to be corrected in conformity with the *Greek verity*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Loeffler's* Dissertation, *Marcionem* Pauli epistolas et Lucae evangelium adulterasse dubitatur. Utrecht 1788.

<sup>3</sup> [For arguments against the existence of this servile submission, or *Fædus cum Latinis* as it is usually called, see *Marsh's Michaelis*, II. 163, seq., and *Griesbach's Symb. Crit.* I. 110. seq.]

XI. It is clear, then, that those copies which we call *purely* Greek, are to be preferred to those which follow the Latin version, from

many arguments, and especially from this, that it is as clear as the sun, that many of the readings in which the Latin differs from the Greek, arose partly from ignorance of the old Greek character, and of the contractions usual in the old manuscripts, partly from ignorance of the language, and partly from the carelessness by which words or clauses were omitted. Nor is the force of this argument weakened by any Latin manuscript, however ancient, as the *Hispalensis* in Gothic characters, which *Mariana* long ago boasted of, in his Præf. Schol. V. et N. T., and which *Blanchini* extols, as containing the genuine version of Jerome.<sup>b</sup> For, like other ancient copies, it contains traces of the original purity, and departs from the ordinary Latin copies in many remarkable readings: and even if <sup>it</sup> did contain the version of Jerome in its purity, still it could not outweigh the authority of the Greek text, for the reasons mentioned above, ch. iv. § 18. It is an old invention of the heretics, to prefer versions, especially the Latin version, to the original Greek; and to speak of the Greek text as corrupted, in order to heighten the credit of the Latin. *Jerome*, with great justice, reproves *Helvidius* for this error, and his arguments are very properly approved of even by *R. Simon*,

Hist. Crit. ch. vi. The argument, however, of *Jerome*, that the fountain must necessarily be purer than the stream, is not sufficient; for it may properly be enquired, whether the fountain itself be pure. We must not, however, go so far as to hold that no good readings are retained in the Latin, and that its critical authority is absolutely nothing. On this head some remarks were made in the last chapter; and the subject will be resumed in the next.

<sup>b</sup> Jerome asserts that he sent a copy of his version, both of the Old and New Testament, to a friend in Bœtic Spain. There is still extant in the church of Seville (*Hispalis*,) a copy of the whole New Testament in Gothic letters, presented to the church, as appears from the subscription, in 991, at which time it was reckoned an ancient copy. It contains good readings; for example in John vii. 39, it has <sup>4</sup> not *datus*; in Rom. v. 14, it has, *qui peccarunt sicut Adam*, omitting the negative, and thereby favouring the doctrine of Pelagius. Augustine blames this omission: the strenuous defenders of this manuscript, ought, therefore, to pay some respect to the opinion of him whom they acknowledge as a Father. [The translator can make nothing of the reference to John vii. 34, and takes for granted that the verse intended is 39, where *datus* occurs in the Vulgate text. This is one instance out of a hundred, where he has had to correct the references of the notes or text, and often like this, when neither lexicon nor concordance could direct him aright.]

XII. Since vestiges of the pure Greek text are supposed to exist in the writings of the Fathers of the primitive church, who used



copies containing it; a good interpreter must necessarily understand the method of properly investigating their writings for the discovery of these readings. And in doing this, we must attend to the distinctions of *age*, *learning*, *books*, and finally of *particular passages* in those books. For this is manifest, that greater weight ought to be given to the Greek Fathers than to the Latin; and that among the Latin, those deserve the most attention, who appear to have understood Greek, and to have been in the habit of consulting Greek copies, such as *Jerome*, and a few others.<sup>c</sup> In the rest of the Latins, we must rather look for the readings of the Latin version.

<sup>c</sup> Among whom we may class *Hilary* of Poitou, who took his citations from *Origen*. *Augustine* and *Ambrose* were but indifferent scholars.

XIII. First then, we may observe, that authorities ought to weigh in proportion to their antiquity. And here we have reason to regret, that so few monuments of the two first centuries remain to us; and that in these there is little which can safely be applied to the purpose which we have now in view. For those writings which bear the names of fathers of the first century, are either manifestly spurious,<sup>d</sup>

or so interpolated, as to be unworthy of our confidence in any part; or else the passages of the New Testament, which they contain, are quoted carelessly, and not for the purpose of being interpreted. And nearly the same may be said respecting those of the second century. For the Hypotyposes of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in which *Photius*, (Cod. 109,) informs us he had examined passages both of the Old and New Testament, have been almost entirely lost. In his other writings, indeed, there are passages which show the nature of the copy he used, and which give us reason to believe that it was partially interpolated from the Scholia. *Justin* has few quotations, and those only from the Gospels: while the works of *Irenæus* exist only in Latin, and the quotations are made from the Latin version.<sup>e</sup> See Mill's Proleg. ii. 366.

<sup>a</sup> As the writings of *Clemens Romanus*, *Barnabas*, and *Ignatius*, with the *Apostolic Constitutions*. [But the reader will do well to examine this matter more particularly. The first Epistle of Clemens to the Corinthians is almost universally acknowledged genuine, though some suppose it to have been partially corrupted. See *Wotton's* Obs. in his edition of Clemens, Camb. 1718. Nor are the works of *Ignatius* so universally discredited as Dr. Ammon implies. Seven of his Epistles are generally admitted to be genuine. See *J. A. Fabricius* Bibl. Græc. Lib. v. c. i. p. 38-47]

\* We have suffered much in the loss of *Irenæus*' work on Heresies, in which many passages from the Apocalypse, and the 2d Epistle of Peter, were quoted. Fragments only of it are to be found in *Epiphanius*.

XIV. With respect to *learning*, we must take care to follow those among the Fathers who were well instructed, and who applied themselves diligently to the grammatical interpretation of Scripture.

XV. With respect to the several *classes of books*, commentaries hold the first place; and in them those passages are most deserving of the attention of the critic which treat of single words; and which shew, without ambiguity, what the writer found in his copy; for sometimes nothing more than the general meaning of the passage is treated of. Upon a level with commentaries, are those writers who, in treating of dogmas, controversies, or any matters relating to religion, interpret Scripture in proof of their argument, or deduce consequences from it, or refute erroneous interpretations, in such a way as to shew what was the reading which they found in their manuscripts. Still more valuable are those who expressly quote or defend the readings of ancient manuscripts. And in this point of view, the writings of heretics and unbelievers may be applied to the

support of the true reading. Thus when *Julian* objects against the Christians,<sup>f</sup> that John calls Jesus *λόγον Θεόν*, and again that he calls him *God*; all must see that the reference is to 1 John v. 20. There are more passages of the same kind in the fragments of *Julian*, preserved by *Cyril*, which I do not find to have been noticed by learned men.

<sup>f</sup>See *Cyrilli Alexandrini opp. ed. Auberti. vi. 327*, and also his work against *Julian*, *Lib. x.* at the beginning. [Ernesti says, “quod ad 1, Johann. v. extr. pertinere omnes vident.” The translator has supplied the number of the verse to which he supposed the author to refer. The first expression of *Julian*, the *λόγον Θεόν* as clearly refers to John i. 1.]

XVI. But this reference to the Fathers must be made with a cautious regard to many circumstances. For, *first*, when the text is inserted in a commentary, we must examine whether it has been edited from a manuscript or from a printed copy; as in the printed commentaries of *Œcumenius*, it is tolerably clear that the text has been inserted by *Morell* from the printed text of *Erasmus*; and *secondly*, we must examine in those passages where the words of Scripture are simply quoted, on what grounds the editor has proceeded; whether he has given them from an ancient manuscript,

or from a printed copy, as we know has frequently been done.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Especially in the sixteenth century, when, in the editions of the Fathers, printed at Rome and in France, the text was generally altered into conformity with the Vulgate.

XVII. *Thirdly*, we must be careful not to conclude rashly from the silence of the Fathers, either in interpreting or disputing, that they were ignorant of any particular reading, or judged it spurious. For in interpretation, it still frequently happens, that many things are omitted, or, at any rate, slightly touched upon; so that we need not wonder if the same practice prevailed among the ancients. Thus, in Rom. xi. 6, the clause *ἐὶ δὲ ἐξ.....ὀυκέτι ἐστὶ ἔργον*, is not interpreted by *Chrysostom*, in his Commentary, nor by any of the Greek Fathers, except *Theophylact*. And yet it appears from the *Catena MS. Augustana*, extracts of which are given by *Ehinger* in his *Hist. Eccl. Sec. xv. p. 672*, that *Chrysostom* had the clause in the copy which he used. Another memorable example, relating to John v. may be found in *Wesseling's Disp. ad Marmor vetus, p. 19*. In disputations also, even when managed with the greatest care, all the arguments do not always occur to the mind of the writer, and the

best known and most suitable sometimes escape his recollection. Thus *Chrysostom* had the right reading of Rom. ix. 5, and yet he did not use it in his dispute with the Arians. See *Mill* ad loc. Such omissions might arise from a diversity of interpretation: and, besides, theologians are in the habit of quoting certain established texts, to the omission of others which are more to the purpose.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> Yet the common silence of all the Fathers, renders the genuineness of a reading suspicious; as, for example, the famous text 1 John v. 7, which is quoted by no Greek Father.

XVIII. They, however, are decidedly wrong, who with *Whitby*, *Mæstricht*,<sup>i</sup> and others, totally deny the legitimacy of supplying varieties in the reading, especially important varieties, from the works of the Fathers; for this can be denied only in those passages where they quote casually and from memory, and where, consequently, doubts may exist as to what reading they had in their copies. On the other hand, it is quite absurd to suppose they would give a formal interpretation of that which was not in their copies. Besides, such reasoners do thus unwittingly throw doubts upon the genuineness of the Vulgate text, into which it

is clear that some readings were introduced by the earliest editors from the writings of the Fathers. Finally, they themselves, in defending readings, use the testimony of the Fathers, and sometimes it alone, which would be quite futile if they possessed no authority in this matter. Nor is the example of *Irenæus* fairly produced by *Michæelis*, de V. L. N. T., § 14, to show that the readings of the Fathers ought to yield to those of manuscripts and versions.<sup>k</sup> For his work does not exist in Greek, nor is it a commentary upon the Scripture. The learned *Glasse* has pronounced a very sensible judgment on this matter, in his *Phil Sac. L. I. Tr. ii.*, p. i. memb. 3, n. 2; and decides, that where manuscripts oppose each other, the true reading may be determined from the writings of the Greek Fathers.<sup>l</sup>

<sup>l</sup> [The translator supposes that the opinions of *Mastricht*, on this subject are to be found in his *Canon Script. Sac. &c. Jena 1725*. Whitby's are given in his *Diss. de S. S. interpretatione secundum Patrum Commentarios, Lond. 1714.*]

<sup>k</sup> The reverse of this appears from *Matt. xviii. 11*, which is omitted in some manuscripts; and yet its genuineness is proved from *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, and *Euthymius Zigabenus*, who all quote it.

<sup>l</sup> We may add, that the quotations of the Fathers have critical weight, 1. When they appeal to manuscripts. 2.

When they subjoin an explanation. 3. When they produce several parallel passages. 4. When the quotation is so long as to render it improbable they quoted by memory. 5. When the same passages are often repeated in the same words. 6. When they are supported by manuscripts and versions. [Much still remains to be done in critically ascertaining the readings of the Fathers. *Griesbach* has made an important addition to this branch of the critical apparatus, by collating all the passages quoted by *Origen* and *Clemens Alex.* See his *Symb. Crit.* II. 229, to the end.]

XIX. So much respecting the *critical* use of the works of the Fathers: we have now, as was proposed, to speak of their *hermeneutical* application. And, as our first object in this book is to lay down grammatical principles of interpretation, so is it clear that the writings of the Fathers ought to be in the first place applied to this purpose. Not that we would despise their allegorical system, provided it be managed with sobriety and modesty; but as it cannot be called interpretation, it should be reserved for popular addresses.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> [It must, however, be kept in mind, that a preacher cannot conscientiously give an allegorical interpretation of a passage of Scripture, unless he is convinced that such an interpretation was in the mind of the sacred writer. The existence of such an intention must be ascertained upon grammatical grounds; and the only legitimate difference between a Scholastic interpretation and a popular discourse is, that in the latter we may state merely the results, while



in the former we must state the steps by which we have arrived at them.]

XX. *Origen* gave the first example of grammatical interpretation, worthy of a scholar and theologian, as appears from his *Scholia*, and other books, especially that entitled *σημειώσεις*; and that, almost everything valuable in this branch of letters, which was possessed by the ancient church, originated with him, has been proved by induction in my *Disp. de Origene*, &c., § 27, 28, 29. It must be allowed, however, that something was added to the labours of *Origen*, by the talents, learning, and accuracy of his successors.

XXI. Nor, in the present day, ought we to despise that which the ancient church possessed from the system started by *Origen*; nor are the writers who followed him to be neglected for the sake of novelties. For all that the present age possesses in this matter, beyond what was possessed by the ancient church, is not much in quantity, nor of very high importance: and we often see interpretations praised as being new, which are in reality of a very old standing.<sup>n</sup> Besides many passages which the early church, from its fa-

miliarity with the genius of the Greek language, interpreted rightly, have been mistaken by modern interpreters, misled by the errors or ambiguities of versions. *Wesseling* in his *Disp. ad Marmor vet.* p. 21, has clearly shown this respecting the Census in Luke ii. 1, 2. Examples may also be found in my *Disp. de Origene*, and in other writers.

<sup>n</sup> Thus *πίστιν παρέχειν* Acts xvii. 31, was explained by *Chrysostom* and *Theophylact*, *fidem facere*, to give a convincing proof: so that they judge rashly who consider this as a new interpretation.

XXII The student, therefore, must make himself acquainted not only with those commentaries of the ancients which relate to grammatical interpretation, and which will be enumerated elsewhere; but also with those of the allegorical, dogmatic, and controversial classes, which may throw light upon the interpretation. And in the use of these, he ought particularly to consult those passages in which difficult texts are handled; and either vindicated from objections, or by argument applied to the illustration or demonstration of some point of doctrine. *Luther*, in his *Epistles*, i. 27, says with truth, that *Jerome* interprets Scripture

better when he does it casually, as in his Epistles, than when he applies himself professedly to interpretation.°

° We may illustrate the remark of Luther by two examples. In Matt. vi. 11. Jerome renders *ἐπιούσιον futurum, crastinum* **לְחֶם מָחָר**, which form Matthew himself had used. In Gal. v. 12, *ἀποκόψονται τ. ῥ. περικοπτεσθωσαν.* is excellently explained by Jerome, “*si enim exspoliatio membri proficit, quanto magis abscissio.*” Neither of these passages require any further explanation. [Certainly these interpretations admit of some question; for how did Jerome, or how can Dr. Ammon know what form Matthew used, supposing him to have written in Hebrew. As to Gal. v. 12, Jerome’s interpretation is also that of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact. Koppe renders the clause, *non modo circumcidant se, sed, si velint etiam mutilent se.* Compare Philipp. iii. 2, 3. Both the syntax, and the use of the word *ἀποκόπτεσθαι* are of very difficult interpretation. Koppe observes, that ὄφελον is no where else joined to an indicative: but see 2 Cor. xi. 1. ὄφελον ἀνείχισθε.]

XXIII. Nor will it be without its use, to examine carefully the sense in which the Greek Fathers use expressions borrowed from Scripture, as this may throw light upon the Scripture itself. Of this class many may be found, as I have before mentioned, by the misapprehension of which men give themselves much unnecessary trouble, or by wandering from the true sense are thrown into difficulties and disputes. It will be sufficient to produce a few

examples. It is clear that *Clemens Rom.* in his Ep. I. p. m. 53, uses *κανόνα* to express the limits of an office or province: and this he borrows from 2 Cor. x. 13. The same Father, p. 20, in the words Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κἀμπῳ ἀλαζονείας, ὑδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καίπερ δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν, explains Philipp. ii. 6, 7.<sup>p</sup> *Cyril of Jerusalem*, Cat. xi. p. m. 222, referring to 1 Cor. ii. 10, says τί ἐστὶν ἕτερον γίνωσκον τὰ βᾶδη τοῦ Θεοῦ. Whence it is clear that ἐρευνᾶν in the Epistle has no emphatic force: and *Clemens*, Ep. i. p. 52, renders it by ἐγκύπτειν ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βᾶδη τῆς Δείας γνώσεως; which also shows, that by βᾶδη he understood the Gospel, as containing the *mystery of God*, his hitherto concealed will respecting the salvation of mankind. The same *Cyrril*, Cat. xvi. p. 429, renders συγκρίνειν, 1 Cor. ii. 13, to *interpret*, which has not been understood by *Prevost*; and explains many other words of Scripture in other places. In the *Epist. Conc. Ephes. ad Imp.* in the Acta. Conc. p. 296, we read μετὰ πάσης ἐδελοδρησκείας ἐπέμψαμεν,<sup>q</sup> with most devoted sentiments of piety towards thee, from Coloss. ii. 23. The reader, for additional examples, may consult *Froman's* Obs. ad N. T. c. Clemente Roman.

<sup>p</sup> *Cyrril*, Ed. Helmstadt. p. 42, calls man as formed by God, τῆς εἰκότος αὐτοῦ χαρακτήρ, which illustrates, Heb. i.

3. [No further than it is illustrated by Gen. i. 26. The idea in both cases seems that of delegated, and consequently *representative* authority; that of Adam being over the inferior animals, that of the man Christ Jesus over all things in heaven and in earth.]

<sup>4</sup> [Rendered in our version *will-worship*: but its connexion with σοφία and ταπεινοφροσύνη, shews that it is to be taken in a good sense.]

XXIV. In consulting the Fathers for purposes of interpretation, two errors must be avoided: first, we must be careful not to imagine that no interpretation is admissible which is not to be found in their works, which seems to be the opinion of those who hold that no new interpretation can be discovered: and next, we must avoid that common inconsistency, of assenting or dissenting from the opinion of antiquity, just as it happens to coincide with, or to oppose our own. See *Wesseling's Disp. ad Marmor. Vet. de P. S. Quirini censu.* p. 21, 22.

## CHAPTER VI.

OF THE CAUSE, ORIGIN, AND CHOICE OF  
VARIOUS READINGS.

I. HAVING treated of the use of manuscripts and printed editions, of versions, and the writings of the Fathers, it remains for us to consider the subject of *various readings*, which can be properly treated only when a previous knowledge of these subjects has been acquired.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> The subject of this chapter is the theory of sacred criticism, which they who are familiar with the labours of *Semler*, *Michaelis*, *Griesbach*, *Hug*, and others, will easily be able to form. We shall endeavour to add a few observations in the notes, which may be useful to the clear conception of the subject. [Semler in his *Notes and Appendix to Wetstein's Proleg.* Halle 1764, and *Apparatus ad liberalem N. T. interpretationem*, 1767; *Michaelis*, (C. B.) in his *tractatio critica de variis Lectionibus N. T.*; *Griesbach* in his *Symbola Critica*, and *Prefaces to N. T.*; *Hug* in his *Introduction*, I. 437, seq.]

II. If the autographs of the Apostles still remained, or if there existed but one ancient

manuscript, without either ancient versions or commentaries, in either case there could be no such thing as varieties in the readings. Of these suppositions, however, the former could not have happened without miracle; the latter it would be madness to wish for. And yet those do seem to wish for it, who, from the time of Erasmus down to the present day, have set themselves against the collection of various readings, through ignorance of the real nature and effects of biblical criticism.

III. But now, when so many manuscripts exist of the sacred books, written at different times, many of them in barbarous ages, by men little skilled in Greek; for even women (Euseb. vi. 3,) and Latin copyists wrote Greek copies; when, moreover, so many ancient versions and commentaries, treating of the words of these books, are extant; and finally, so many printed editions; it must follow of necessity, that there are more various readings of the New Testament than of any other ancient book whatever. But that all these in no degree detract from their integrity, has been already shown.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>s</sup> Various readings existed so early as the time of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, for he mentions two readings of 2 Cor. v. 3, ἰνδυσάμενοι and ἐκδυσάμενοι. *Æcumenius* who took his read-

ings from ancient copies, notices on 1 Cor. xv. 51, that in some copies *ὅν* is placed before *ἀλλαγησόμεθα*, and suppressed before *κοιμηθήσόμεθα*.

IV. We have therefore to oppose not only the objections of Atheists and Deists, but also the ignorance of well meaning men, which sometimes operates in the same direction. In this last class we may notice Whitby, the eager antagonist of Mill, who treated the whole subject with great weakness, and as far as in him lay, introduced a scepticism most favourable to the views of the Romanists. It is indeed wonderful that his book and its object could ever receive the approbation of good men; and, as *Pfaff* well observes, that men should have been found in an enlightened age, capable of venting such silly objections against the various readings collected by Mill; whereas they ought to have joined the learned and pious *Benjel*, in acknowledging the inestimable benefit which *Mill* had bestowed upon the Church. But the same age is not equally bright in every department of letters: and the theology prevalent at the beginning of last century, being principally dogmatic and scholastic, was little adapted for application to sacred criticism.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>t</sup> See Griesbach's Pref. at N. T. Vol. I. p. 33, seq. [Whitby opposed Mill in his *Examen variantium lectionum*



J. Millii in N. T. operâ et studio Dan. Whitby, London 1710. It was reprinted with an introduction by Havercamp at Lyden 1733. Pfaff's work is entitled, Diss. critica de genuinis N. T. lectionibus, in his Syntagma Diss. Theol. Stutgardt 1720.]

V. From what has been already said, it will be clear that the sources of various readings are *four* in number; and that they originate from *manuscripts*, from *ancient versions*, from the quotations of the *Fathers*, or from *printed editions*. Of the nature and history of each of these sources, enough has been said in preceding chapters.

VI. Of various readings, as they originate from manuscripts, there are many causes. The first and most extensive is the carelessness or ignorance of *copyists*. For when a book was copied by dictation, the dictator sometimes pronounced the letters indistinctly, or run the words into one another, and the writer heard imperfectly what was dictated to him: or if the copyist wrote even from a good manuscript laid before him, he sometimes omitted or transposed words, or joined or divided them improperly; he substituted familiar ideas for those which he did not understand, and introduced glosses and scholia into the text, and thus many errors and various readings were intro-

duced into their copies.<sup>u</sup> If the reader wishes to see this subject fully examined and illustrated, he may consult *Le Clerc's Ars. Critica*, p. iii. sect 1, or *Pfaff, de Var. Lect. N. T.*, who has drawn his materials from Le Clerc, or, above all, *Michaelis'* treatise with same title.

<sup>u</sup> Other sources of various readings may easily be pointed out by any one accustomed to the examination of manuscripts. [The recurrence of the same word or syllable is a common source of error. Thus in the Nov. Test. Koptianum, Rom. xi. 22, instead of ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητα ἰὰν ἱπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι, appears ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητι. This omission is found in the editions of 1806 and 1824. For similar sources of error in Manuscripts, see Griesbach's Proleg. N. T. I. Sec. iii. § 9, 10.]

VII. Another source of error has been the rashness and ignorance of *correctors*, of which even *Origen* had reason to complain on Matt. chap. xix. For they were in the habit of changing, correcting, or interpreting, whatever appeared to them obscure, harsh, superfluous, ill-arranged, or omitted, and finally, whatever they thought adverse to sound doctrine, and favourable to the opinions of heretics; and thus for many reasons they ventured to interpolate the text.<sup>x</sup> In this the Latins were most faulty, who even interpolated their Greek copies from the Latin version, as has been before observed.

See on this subject Pfaff, c. x., and Michaelis, § 7.

<sup>x</sup> In Matt. xxvii. 16, 17, the reading was Ἰησοῦς Βάρραβας. Ἰησοῦς was omitted from a mistaken scruple of applying it to a bad man. [Griesbach, however, does not admit Ἰησοῦς either into the text or margin.] In Mark xi. 32, for ἐφοβοῦντο, some over zealous Grammarian inserted φοβοῦμεν [or rather φοβοῦμεθα, see Griesbach ad loc.] In 1 Tim. iv. 3, they misinterpreted κελεύοντων and v. 3, χήρας. Other additions may be found in Matt. xx. 28. Mark xvi. 8, 14; Luke vi. 5, and omissions in Matt. vi. 13, xvi. 2, 3, Mark xvi. 9—25; Luke xxii. 42, 44; John viii. 1—11. [Respecting the Latin interpolations, see the contrary opinion of Griesbach, Proleg. in N. T. I. Sec. iii. § 15, and in Symb. Crit. I. 100. Woide in Pref. to Codex Alexandrinus, and the latest opinion of J. D. Michaelis, Introduction II. 163, seq.]

VIII. Next, we may reckon the impiety of *heretics* and *impostors*, which, however, has seldom done much harm, as the impudence of their corruptions was too palpable. See *Mill*, Proleg. n. 306, and Pfaff, c. 11.<sup>y</sup> And even those who, without any intention of altering the text, introduced scholia or glosses between the lines, or in the margin, for the use of the unlearned, or for their own, did thereby give occasion to the introduction of spurious readings, as their glosses were, through ignorance, admitted into the text. That this really took

place at a very early period, may be proved by satisfactory testimony.

<sup>y</sup> Thus Epiphanius witnesses that Marcion, from his hostility to the Mosaic law, changed Matt. v. 11, into a contrary sense. See Mill, Proleg. § 328, 360.

IX. There are various principles upon which *readings may be estimated*. For they may be considered either abstractedly in themselves, or judged according to their origin. When they are considered in themselves, we have to estimate either the *weight* (*gravitas*), or the *goodness* of the reading. For, not to speak of minutiae, such as articles, pronouns, and the order of words, some readings are clearly, both as to the words and the sense, upon an equality: some are equal only in the sense, while the expression in the one is more accurate or elegant than that in the other: some again differ as to the sense, either by a different choice of words, or by the addition or omission of ideas.<sup>z</sup>

<sup>z</sup> As examples of each class we have, 1st. Luke i. 42, where some copies read ἀνεφώνησε, others ἀνεβόησε. 2d. In Heb. ix. 12, some copies read εὐρόμενος, others more accurately εὐράμενος. 3d. Rom. ix. 5, some copies read ὁ; others θεός.

X. The *goodness* of a reading relates partly to

the *words*, and partly to the *sense* : for we call that a better reading, which, considered grammatically and rhetorically, has more propriety and elegance, or, at any rate, more accuracy. In the New Testament these considerations must be taken according to the idioms of the Hebrew language.<sup>a</sup> But still more is the goodness of a reading marked by its accordance with the design of the author, the scope of the whole passage, and the general analogy of doctrine and revealed truth.<sup>b</sup> Thus, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, we say that *Θεός* is the preferable reading, not because it affords an argument for the divinity of Christ, but because it alone agrees with the context, and is grammatically the most correct.

<sup>a</sup> Thus in Matt. v. 47, *ἀδελφοὺς* is a better reading than *φίλους*. and v. 10, *δικαιοσύνη* than *ἐλεημοσύνη*. In Heb. viii. 11, *πλησίον* is to be preferred to *πολίτην*; all because they accord better with the Hebrew usage.

<sup>b</sup> Add, also, this rule which *Bengel* has often applied; that reading is to be preferred, which is such that all the others have an appearance of being derived from it. [We may add also, the following rules from *Griesbach*, some of which do not harmonize with *Ernesti's*, but are founded on a more reasonable estimate of probabilities.

1. *Cæteris paribus*, the shorter reading is to be preferred to the longer.

2. The more difficult and obscure reading is to be preferred to that in which everything is made plain and easy.

3. Harsher readings, that is, such as contain ellipses, Hebraisms and solecisms, are to be preferred to those which are purer.

4. Unusual readings are to be preferred to those which contain usual forms or words.

5. Unemphatic readings are to be preferred to emphatic.

6. Readings which favour ascetic piety are suspicious.

7. Readings which at first sight appear to involve an absurdity or falsehood, but are capable of explanation, are to be preferred.

8. Readings which strongly and expressly favour orthodox opinions are to be suspected.

It must be observed, that these rules are to be applied only *cæteris paribus*, and their result is not to be weighed against the decisive authority of manuscripts; and that the reasons for them must be sought for in the greater probability of a copyist erring in one direction, rather than in another. See Griesbach's Proleg. in N. T. I. Sec. 3.]

XI. When readings are estimated by their *origin*, we may observe that those which are found in ancient uninterpolated Greek manuscripts, are to be preferred to those which are found only in later manuscripts, or in those which are interpolated from the Latin.<sup>c</sup> Those readings also which are found in the more ancient versions made from the Greek, and of which we can be sure that the versionist found them in the manuscript from which he translated, are to be preferred to readings found only in versions made from other versions.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>c</sup> In estimating the testimony of witnesses, we ought to consider, 1. The age of the witness. 2. His credibility. 3. The concurrence of different witnesses.

<sup>d</sup> The whole context of a version ought therefore to be critically examined, before it is used in determining readings. With respect to most of them, this is still a desideratum. [For general remarks on the critical use of versions, the reader may refer to Ch. iv. § 23, 29, 30, and for descriptions of the principal versions to § 3—20.]

XII. When readings are deduced from the writings of the Fathers, those which are found in commentaries and scholia, in passages where a text is explained or applied against heretics, or where a reference is expressly made to the manuscripts, ought to be preferred to those readings which are found in mere casual quotations. Various readings, however, collected from the Latin Fathers, if you except Jerome and a few others, who were skilled in Greek, ought to be considered as varieties of the *Vetus Itala*, or of the Hieronymian version, not of the Greek text.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> [If, in a regular commentary, with the text prefixed, a reading be found in the text, but not in the commentary, the silence of the commentary is to be considered as weightier evidence than the insertion in the text; that is, when the word is important, and when the commentary is usually verbal. Thus 1 Cor. vii. 5. *Most* of the Manuscripts of *Chrysostom* read *νηστία*, but *all* omit it in the

commentary. Hence, we may consider *Chrysostom* as a witness against that reading.]

XIII. The various readings of editions are to be estimated, not by the fame of the edition in which they are found, but by the source where the editor found them; that is, by the manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, for we have before observed, that the printed text must be formed from these. Editions of the New Testament have of themselves, therefore, no authority in this matter.

XIV. Hitherto we have given rules for estimating the individuals of each class of testimony. But the classes have also a relative value towards one another. The *first* place must be given to uninterpolated Greek copies, especially when they agree in a reading; <sup>f</sup> for we judge thus in every other field of criticism. Nearly on a footing with these we may place the Greek Fathers of the first class, together with Jerome and such writers; just as in profane criticism, when the manuscripts disagree, we decide from the quotations of the grammarians or others. The *second* place must be given to the readings of ancient versions made from the Greek, especially where the clear goodness of the reading proves that the variety



has not been caused by a blunder of the versionist.<sup>g</sup> Such readings sometimes attain a weight equal to those of the former class. In the *third* rank we may place, as merely subsidiary, the readings of interpolated or recent manuscripts, of versions made from other versions, and the bare quotations of the Fathers.

<sup>f</sup> In every inquiry into the agreement of a particular manuscript with other trust-worthy witnesses, we must consider, 1. What recension it follows, and whether in this point of view it be pure or mixed. 2. Whether the number of good readings which it contains, exceed the number of those which are bad or futile.

<sup>g</sup> Also, when it is clear that the version follows an ancient recension. [For a short view of the theories of recensions, see Chap. II. § 9. Note t.]

XV. It ought not to appear strange, that we have placed the testimony of the Fathers under particular circumstances, and that of certain versions, on an equality with the evidence of manuscripts; nor even if we assert that such testimony may sometimes be preferred. For the manuscripts which the Fathers used, and from which the versions were made, were more ancient, and generally more correct, than any which we now possess.<sup>h</sup> And we have before shown, that the purity of manuscripts cannot be judged by any surer test

than by their consent with the more ancient Greek Fathers.

<sup>h</sup> As in profane Greek literature, *Stobæus*, *Athenæus*, *Pausanias*, are applied to emend the text of the Tragedians and others, so in the New Testament we use the writings of the Fathers.

XVI. Having settled these points, it remains that we should demonstrate the use of *various readings*, and so of the whole critical apparatus treated of in this and the preceding chapters, by certain observations or canons as they are usually called. They may be applied in two ways, that is, either *critically* or *hermeneutically*.

XVII. The *critical* application consists in the *choice* of various readings: and this ought to be made with so much greater care and modesty than in other books, as the sacredness and importance of the subject fully demands a higher degree of reverence. On this account, therefore, it is the more necessary that it should be guarded by written canons.

XVIII. Such canons are superfluous in the opinion of those who hold that the *received* text is in no case to be deserted.<sup>i</sup> But such men scarcely know what they affirm, for they can scarcely say what is the received text,

unless they choose to apply that term to the Elzevir edition, which, through ignorance, has become a standard. In the next place, they attribute infallibility to men, some of whom they would class among heretics, by whom readings have been inserted from mere conjecture, or from the Latin version, as we have before shown, and as *Bengel* has proved by many examples, p. 436, 437.

<sup>1</sup> In every branch of letters, weak minds have always scrupled to depart from received opinions. We need not wonder therefore, if Theologians, accustomed to bow to authority, have defended inveterate errors in the criticism of the New Testament. What sense, for instance, is afforded in Acts iii. 12, by ἐυσελεία, which is still retained in the best editions. Ἐξουσία ought to be restored, as Semler has remarked; not to mention other texts. [Yet it would be difficult to construct a Canon which would authorize the insertion of ἐξουσία which Griesbach does not consider even as a probable reading. If *wickedness* was considered as a reason why a man could not have miraculous powers, John ix. 24, *piety* might, by parity of reason, be supposed a reason for its being granted.]

XIX. The proper enunciation of such canons is no easy task; nor can any canon be so enunciated as to be universally applicable, or which can ever be applied without great caution. And this difficulty arises, partly from the very nature of criticism, in which we have to deal

not with certainties, but with probabilities; and partly from the peculiarity of the diction used by the inspired writers.<sup>k</sup> For as their style is very far from being strictly grammatical, it cannot be judged by the ordinary rules laid down by grammarians.

<sup>k</sup> Criticism may with more ease be applied to the writings of Cicero on account of their rhetorical accuracy, than to those of Pliny; and we may apply general rules more confidently to the emendation of the text of Xenophon and Thucydides, than to that of Polybius, [because we know better the rules of the Attic dialect, than of the Macedonian.]

XX. Some critical canons, therefore, which may safely be applied to other books, must be reversed when applied to the New Testament. As for example, that canon generally reckoned the most certain, which asserts that of two readings, we ought to prefer that which is most consistent with grammatical accuracy.

XXI. In stating critical canons, though it be impossible to embrace every thing, or to satisfy the wishes of all; yet we may and ought to lay down some rules with greater care than has yet been bestowed upon the subject:<sup>l</sup> as I have already shown in my *Disp. de Interpr. Grammat. N. T.* § 8, 9. I shall, therefore, attempt to include the whole subject in a few

observations, by aid of which the student may be enabled to estimate readings with moderation and diligence.

<sup>1</sup> As in the Canons of *Maestricht*, prefixed to his edition of N. T. and those of *Pfaff* (de Var. Lect. N. T.) The subject, however, has since that time been much better treated by *Wetstein*, *Semler*, *Griesbach*, and *Hug*.

XXII. In estimating readings, we must attend to their *antiquity*, their *goodness*, and their *truth*, so as to judge no reading true but one which is both ancient and good. The converse, however, does not hold good, as we are not warranted in supposing every ancient and good reading to be true. For there are often several readings of the same passage, all ancient and good, which yet cannot all be true: and varieties began to exist so early as the second century, nor do the Fathers always dare to decide between them, but prefer rather to explain both readings, as Chrysostom on 2 Cor. v. 3.

XXIII. If one reading be both ancient and good, as *προπεταγμένους* Acts xvii. 26. *ἐνέκοψε*, Gal. v. 7, it ought to be preferred to others deficient in either of these qualities. If of two readings equally ancient, one be better than the other, as *Θεός*, 1 Tim. iii. 16, *πρόκλ.ισιν*, ib. v. 21, it ought to be received; and of several

equally good, the more ancient is to be preferred as *διαπαρατριβάι*, 1 Tim. vi. 5.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> [Of these readings preferred by *Ernesti*, two are rejected by *Griesbach*, who reads *προσπεταγμένος* in Acts xvii. 26, and *ὲς* in 1 Tim. iii. 16. The question respecting this last reading is a very entangled one, and the different decisions of *Ernesti* and *Griesbach* appear to arise from their different notions of the probability attached to goodness, that is, to the grammatical purity of a reading. Compare § x. and the Canons of *Griesbach* given in Note b.]

XXIV. Between readings which are equally ancient and good, we must decide partly by books, and partly by grammatical rules. The evidence of books must be weighed according to the rules laid down in § 11, 12, 14: the grammatical rules we shall consider in the following sections.

XXV. Readings which are difficult, unusual, and, if we may be allowed the expression, far-fetched, are to be preferred to those which are plain, usual and direct, as *ἐκληρώθημεν*, Eph. i. 11. Thus also we prefer those readings, which, at first sight, seem least correct, either in the sentiment, as *ὁ ἄργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ*, Matt. v. 22, *ὕψω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα*, John vii. 39, and *συνειδήσει* 1 Cor. viii. 7, where most copies read *συνήθειά*, from the greater easiness of its interpretation; or in the grammatical form, as *εἰδῶς*

for ἰδὼν, Mark xii. 28, ὡς ἑαυτὸν for σεαυτὸν, Gal. v. 14, ἔχετε for ἔχομεν, 1 Thess. iv. 9. And the reason for this preference is, that the copyist might be tempted to alter the former class of readings into the latter, but could have no temptation to alter in the contrary direction. Thus *Gerhard*, in his *Loci Theologici de Resurrectione*, § 117, follows *Erasmus*, on 1 Cor. xv. 51, who, on this principle, defends the reading of the Greek text.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> [That is, πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα· πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, in preference to πάντες μὲν κοιμηθήσόμεθα· οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα. This last reading was adopted by *Jerome*, and is continued in the modern Vulgate, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur.*]

XXVI. That reading ought to be preferred which is most in analogy with the practice of the author. Thus, in the New Testament, a reading which is Hebraistic, ought to be preferred to one purely Greek, because the latter may have been interpolated by a Greek copyist, the former could not.<sup>o</sup>

<sup>o</sup> Thus in *Ep. Jude* 1. ἡγιασμένοις is a better reading than ἡγαπημένοις, as being more consistent with the practice of the Apostles in the introductions to their epistles. In *Acts* xvii. 26, ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος is better than ἐξ ἑνός, (though this occurs in *Rom.* ix. 10,) because it is more close to the Hebrew idiom.

XXVII. Of two readings equal in goodness and antiquity, that is to be preferred which agrees with the quotations of the Fathers, and with the ancient versions. See § 23, 24.<sup>p</sup>

<sup>p</sup> Thus *ιικη* is wanting in Codd. B, 48, 49. Their evidence is supported by *Justin M.* (Apol. I. § 20, p. 24, Ed. Thirlby,) by *Tertullian*, (Apol. adv. gent. c. 45,) and *Jerome*, who testifies that *sine causa* was not in the ancient copies. Why then should we not reject a superfluous word, foreign to the context, and justly condemned by Eichhorn?

XXVIII. We must be careful not to rest too much upon the authority of manuscripts, certainly not upon that of one or two which we particularly value:<sup>q</sup> and we rest too much upon them, when we look to them alone, without considering the grammatical rules, and the practice of the author. Nor, on the other hand, ought we to rest upon these considerations to the neglect of manuscripts; for, if unsupported by the evidence of manuscripts, they may deceive us; and a reading may be grammatically correct which is not the true one. Learned men have erred in both these extremes.

<sup>q</sup> Thus Grotius and Bengel attribute too much weight to the Codices A and B; Kipling to Codex D; Matthæi to the testimony of Chrysostom, and the Moscow MSS.

XXIX. If the subject, the sense, and the



grammar require it, we must not scruple sometimes to prefer the authority of the Fathers and ancient versions to that of manuscripts, as all editors have done, some indeed incautiously, and *Luther* in his version ; and under the same circumstances, we may prefer the readings of modern manuscripts to those of more ancient ones. For these recent manuscripts may have been copied from others both ancient and good.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> [We may certainly act thus where the old manuscripts vary among themselves, although none of them should contain the reading which we adopt. But, it may be doubted, whether we can with safety ever reject a reading in which all the old manuscripts concur.]

XXX. Since the evidence on which a judgment of readings must be formed, seldom amounts to certainty, but must be estimated by conjecture and acuteness, we ought to exercise a modesty which will render our failures more excuseable.<sup>s</sup> And now enough has been said respecting the critical use of various readings.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>s</sup> In criticism, the truth often rests upon a single point, and that so small that it may easily escape our notice. The critic therefore ought to exercise modesty in his decisions, and urbanity towards his fellow labourers.

† We may, however, add the following rules.

1. Manuscripts, versions, and Fathers which follow the same recension, are all to be considered as constituting only one witness.

2. That reading in which all the recensions agree is the best.

3. When the recensions differ, that reading is the more probable, which the best old editions contain.

4. The authority of recensions is determined by the goodness of their readings upon the whole compared with other manuscripts. Thus, for example, the Alexandrine is better than the Western, though this also is not without good readings.

5. Readings which are found in none of the ancient recensions, cannot be maintained on the authority of later manuscripts, however numerous.

[These rules of Ammon will not be found of easy application, for the recensions, (see chap. ii. § 9, note t.) are not like our modern stereotype editions, nor are all the MSS. classed under one recension facsimiles of one another; and besides, many manuscripts mix the readings of different recensions. With respect to the third rule, the translator cannot understand what is meant by *optimæ editiones antiquæ*. If the old printed editions are meant, as the *Complutensian* and *Erasmian*, Ammon differs widely from Griesbach, who holds that these editors possessed few manuscripts, and those of inferior value; and, moreover, that they did not very well know how to use what they had. If this be not the meaning, the only other sense of *editio*, makes it synonymous with *recensio*. Upon the whole, the reader had better consult Griesbach, Proleg. Sec. iii. p. 77—81.]

XXXI. However desirable it may be that all the reasons of preference should concur in

favour of some one particular reading; yet, since this seldom occurs, we must prefer that reading which is supported by the more numerous and more weighty reasons. And, for our guidance in this matter, abstract rules are not sufficient. We must also have experience, so that, by the accurate addition and subtraction of conflicting reasons, we may be able to determine the real preponderance of the evidence, and determine accordingly. And to attain this experience, it will be useful to peruse the works of those who have written on biblical criticism with accuracy and circumspection.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>u</sup> [As the Prolegomena of *Mill* and *Wetstein*, *Bengel's* App. Crit. in N. T., *Griesbach's* Prolegomena and Symbolæ Criticæ, *Wetstein's* Libelli ad crisin atque Interp. N. T., *Michaelis's* Int. Vol. I. Chap. vi. *Horne's* Int. Vol. II. Chap. 8.]

XXXII. There is a use in *various readings*, as applicable to interpretation and theology. For sometimes the interpretations of ancient or modern commentators, and the arguments of theological disputants, can neither be defended nor refuted, unless we know what reading they followed.<sup>x</sup>

<sup>x</sup> Thus the Latin Fathers maintain the universality of the resurrection, from their reading of 1 Cor. xv. 51. [See

§ 25, note n.] Without a knowledge of the various readings *Luther's* version can neither be understood nor defended. Thus in 2 Pet. ii. 13, he has *von euerem Almosen*, from your charity, reading ἀγάπαις for ἀπάταις, which reading is preferred by *Griesbach*. Compare also, Heb. ix. 14, with *Luther's* translation.

XXXIII. They, therefore, have done a useful service, who have collected various readings, from the sources already mentioned. The first instance of such a collection worthy of mention, (for there already existed something of the same kind in the biblical collectories,) is that of *L. Valla*, who collated three Greek manuscripts for the purpose of correcting the Latin version; which was also the object of *Lucas Brugensis*. The desire of publishing the Greek text, and of adding an increased value to each successive edition, gave fresh vigour to this pursuit, which was followed by *Erasmus*, who first gave the various readings in notes, and then by *R. Stephen* in his edition of 1550. *Curcellæus*, however, was the main instrument of promoting this study, not that he himself produced anything very valuable, though he certainly surpassed all the editors between *Stephen* and himself: but his edition excited *Fell* to prepare his new edition with various readings, printed at Oxford 1675, and reprinted by *Gregory* in 1703, and excited

*Mill* to set about the preparation of his great work. But besides this, as *Curcellæus* appeared, in his selection of readings, to have favoured the Socinians, and was supposed even to have forged readings in their behalf; a new impulse was thus given to the collation of manuscripts, and critical enquiries began to be handled with greater care and accuracy than before. The character of the age also favoured this progress, as criticism in general had become a subject of more careful examination.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See *Wetstein's Proleg.* p. 170. Add also, the works of *Michaelis, Semler, Griesbach, Birch, Alter, Matthæi* and others.

XXXIV. The first rank as a critical editor must be given to *J. Mill*, who, after the labour of thirty years, completed and published at Oxford in 1707 his great work, containing the text of *Elzevir* or *Curcellæus*, with 30,000 various readings and prolegomena of great learning and critical utility. This edition, though it be not without faults, some arising from errors of opinion, such as the too great respect paid to the Latin version, and the Greek manuscripts interpolated from it; others from oversight, such as the erroneous naming

of manuscripts, or false references to the Fathers or to versions, is still, as *Fabricius* has justly designated it, a work of admirable industry and judgment. For whereas, *Mill* often gives a different judgment respecting readings in his *Prolegomena* from that given in his notes; this, though it may be inconvenient to the reader, is highly to the credit of his diligence: for having read the *Histoire Critique* of *R. Simon* during the course of his labours, he thence learned to correct many false views, and ingenuously retracted his errors in the *Prolegomena*. Whitby's *Examen*, (see § 4, and note) though its professed object of proving the universal defensibility of the text of *Elzevir* and *Curcellæus*, gave it favour in the eyes of the ignorant, yet both its object and its execution are justly condemned by the learned. See c. v. § 18, and c. iv. § 29. The canons prefixed to *Maestricht's* edition, are formed according to the principles of Whitby, as may easily be seen from comparing them.

XXXV. *Kuster*, *Bengel*, and *Wetstein*, must be reckoned as the three next promoters of biblical criticism. For *Kuster*, in his reprint of *Mill's* edition, added readings from twelve Greek manuscripts. His merits, however, would have been greater, had he edited the work with

more care, avoided a repetition of the errors of the press, and everywhere corrected or enlarged the notes by the Prolegomena.

XXXVI. *Bengel*, in his *Apparatus Criticus*, not only gave the readings of fifteen manuscripts previously uncollated, but also added many from previous editions, together with readings derived from the Fathers and versions; and, by the execution of his work, earned the praise both of diligence and of modesty. His judgment in the choice of readings is not approved of; for he chose as his criterion of the true reading, the agreement of the Codex Alexandrinus with the Latin version; never suspecting, what is sufficiently evident, that such an agreement argues the interpolation of the manuscript from the version.<sup>z</sup> Besides, in opposition to his own rules, he does not give the weight which he ought to grammatical reasons, in judging of the goodness of a reading; and often decides in opposition to these, on the authority of manuscripts alone, (see § 23,) and those such as I have described. Thus, in Eph. v. 9, he prefers *καρπὸς φωτὸς*, relying upon the latinizing MSS., and still more upon the Latin authorities: not considering that *καρπὸς φωτὸς* is a very frigid expression, contrary to the usage of the sacred writers, and

that St. Paul apparently changed the metaphor by design, and wrote *καρπὸς πνεύματος*. Upon the whole, he was deficient in the knowledge of Greek;<sup>a</sup> and in the various readings he made improper omissions, not to mention other errors. The Apparatus Criticus was reprinted in 1763, with the addition of several critical tracts; but in this edition, Bengel neither increased his observations from *Wetstein*, *Blanchini*, *Sabatier*, and others, nor did he change his judgment respecting the authority of the Alexandrine manuscript.

\* [The reader will do well to consider the defences of the Alex. MS. against this charge of latinizing, by Michaelis *Introd.* II. p. 190, and Griesbach *Symb. Crit.* I. 110, sq.]

<sup>a</sup> Being deficient in profane literature, he entertained false notions respecting the genealogy of manuscripts. He rarely retracted his admitted errors in the *Gnomon*, and on this account was chastized by *Wetstein*, *Wolfius*, and *Baumgarten*.

XXXVII. *Wetstein*, finally, after the labour of many years, collated many manuscripts for the first time, and recollated others that had been used before, inspected the versions and quotations of the Fathers, corrected the errors of his predecessors, rendered the use of his various readings more easy, by describing the character and age of the manuscripts which



he used, and thus carried off the palm from all who had gone before him. His judgment of readings is also to be approved, having been guided by pure Greek copies uninterpolated from the Latin, and by the quotations of the Greek Fathers.<sup>b</sup> In some places, however, he allowed himself to be misled by the desire of supporting his opinion respecting the divinity of Christ. On this account he has been justly reprehended by *Venema* in his *Exerc. de vera Divinitate Christi*, and by myself in my *Castigationes Wetsten.* in which I have also remarked some other points, which need not be repeated here. He is also to be blamed for not having procured and inserted the various readings of the Vatican manuscript.

<sup>b</sup> It ought to be mentioned among the merits of *Wetstein*, that he seldom or never relies upon conjecture. In using versions, especially the Oriental ones, he trusts too much to the accuracy of the Latin translation; he often errs in his references to the Fathers, and utters opinions formed upon a hasty judgment, as for example, on *John viii. 1—11.* [We may add here, that the theory of the interpolation of the Greek text from the Latin version originated with *Wetstein.*]

XXXVIII. Some have given the readings of one or more manuscripts separately; but it is unnecessary here to mention all such colla-

tors. *Velesius*, whose collations of sixteen manuscripts are given in *Cerdanus'* *Adversaria Sac.* c. 91, appears to have acted with bad faith, by giving various readings without naming or specifying the manuscripts from which he derived them, and hiding his fraud under the general and vague word manuscripts. His object seems to have been, to support the authority of the Vulgate. Upon examination, however, it appears that his various readings were drawn not only from manuscripts posterior to the Council of Florence, and corrected by the Vulgate, as *Mariana* has judged in the Preface to his *Scholia* on the Old and New Testament, but even directly from Latin manuscripts, as *Wetstein* has demonstrated, and *Michaelis* [C. B. in his *Tractatio Critica de variis lectionibus N. T. &c.*] § 87. Nor are the readings of *Caryophilus*, published by *Possinus* at the end of the *Catena* on Mark, of much value; for the nature of the manuscripts from which they are taken is unknown, and it is tolerably clear that they were interpolated from the Latin version, to support the credit of which was the object of *Caryophilus*, (see *Bengel's App.* p. 439 :) although he sometimes prefers a reading which differs from the Latin, and gives as a rule that this ought to be done when the

majority of Greek manuscripts concur. Among them, moreover, are to be found readings from the Codex Vaticanus, extracted for the use of those who were employed by Urban VIII., upon an edition of the New Testament, on the plan of the Sixtine edition of the Old Testament. Of this I have been informed by learned men at Rome, and besides all the readings which I have found extracted from that manuscript, are to be found among the readings of Caryophilus.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> [*Velesius* (Peter Faxard, Marquis of Velez) collated sixteen manuscripts, eight of which he borrowed from the King of Spain's library. *Mariana* gave the collection to *Cerdanus* or *De la Cerda*, and from his work they were transferred into the London Polyglot, and admitted by *Amelot*, *Fell*, *Mill*, and *Bengel*. *Wetstein* has numbered them in his catalogue, but not quoted them. See *Michaelis* Introd. Ch. viii. Sect. vi. Vol. II. p. 351. For an account of the collection of *Caryophilus*, see the same section, under the head *Barberini* MSS. and for notices of other collectors of various readings, see p. 419, seq.]

XXXIX. It must be evident, from what has been said respecting the collectors of various readings, how far even the most learned men have been led astray by hastily assumed opinions respecting the authority of particular manuscripts or versions, as the *Vetus Itala*, or the *Vulgate*, or by their peculiar views of doc-

trine. Nothing, therefore, ought to be more carefully guarded against than the influence of such prejudices in the formation of any critical judgment.

XL. These errors we shall avoid, if we keep in mind what has been said respecting the different sources of various readings; and if, in selecting a reading, we always proceed upon general rules; not giving an unwarranted preference to a particular reading, and then looking about for arguments in its favour; but first weighing every argument according to pre-established rules, and then determining by the preponderance of the evidence.

XLI. We must not suppose that the work of Biblical criticism is exhausted, and that nothing remains for us to do. We ought rather to be on the watch for farther light, and in reading either ancient or modern copies, to remark everything that bears upon this subject, and to note it in its proper place.<sup>d</sup> I have myself observed many points either omitted or neglected, or erroneously noticed, by those who have gone before. But enough, and perhaps more than enough, has now been said on this branch of the subject. We shall now proceed to other subsidiary instruments of interpretation.

<sup>d</sup> As instances of passages, where further critical labour is required for the determination of the true reading, the reader may be referred to Matt. v. 22, vi. 13; Mark xvi. 9—20; Luke i. 66, ii. 22; John xviii. 1; Acts ii. 30, iii. 12, viii. 37, x. 33, xi. 20, xiii. 18, xvii. 26, xviii. 5, xx. 28, xxiii. 9; Rom. viii. 33, seq. x. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 4.

## CHAPTER VII.

OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION, AND THE FRAGMENTS OF AQUILA, SYMMACHUS, &c.

I. AMONG the subsidiary aids to the interpretation of the New Testament, none are more valuable than the Greek translators of the Old Testament, among whom we must give the first place to those, who, from the vulgar history of the translation, are called the *Seventy*, but whom we shall, with greater propriety, denominate the Alexandrine translators.<sup>e</sup> For the unanimous voice of antiquity declares that this version was made at Alexandria: which assertion, however, is to be understood only of the books which were at that time read in the synagogues. For it can scarcely be doubted but that other books, among which I would class *Job*, *Proverbs*, *Canticles*, and *Ecclesiasticus*, were translated at a later

period; and the version of these has by some been attributed to *Aquila*. One thing is clear, namely, that the whole version is not by one hand. This appears from the great diversity of styles: for in some books the Hebraisms are strictly preserved, while the Greek style is utterly destitute of purity and elegance: in others again, especially in Job and the books just mentioned, Hebraisms are avoided, and a purer and more elegant Greek style is affected.

\* See Eichhorn's *Repert. Lit. Or. I.* p. 266, where, by a diligent examination of traditions, it is shewn that the Alexandrine Jews contrived, by fabulous accounts of its origin, to pass off this version upon their brethren in Palestine, as being of equal authority with the original, and possessing in common with it the character and dignity of inspiration. It appears, however, to have been made at different times, and by different translators, see *Hody de Text. Orig. L. I. C. 7—9*. The Pentateuch was first translated, then the Psalms, then the historical books, afterwards Isaiah, and finally the other books of the Old Testament. Hitherto we possess only two fundamental editions of the Septuagint: the *Sixtine* or *Vatican* of 1587, re-edited by *Bos*; and *Grabe's*, Oxford 1707, which follows the *Codex Alex.* and has been re-edited by *Breitinger*. After the labours of *Holmes* and other learned men, it cannot be hoped that much more will be done towards restoring the text of this version. [Two fundamental editions ought to be mentioned antecedent to these, that printed in the *Complutensian Polyglot*, 1514, and the *Aldine* 1518, both of which texts have frequently been reprinted. For an account of *Holmes's*

unfinished edition, and its continuation by *Parsons*, see *Horne's Introd.* II. 182, and for a general account of the editions of the Septuagint, see *Mori Acroases Acad.* II. p. 103.]

II. It may be difficult exactly to account for the Hebraisms with which the Greek of this version is so strongly tinged.<sup>f</sup> Perhaps it arose from the unskilfulness of the translators, who were unable to render Hebrew words and phrases, especially such as related to religion, into pure Greek; or it may have arisen from a certain superstitious feeling, which we know to have prevailed in later times, and which probably originated in the persecution by Antiochus, that sacred subjects were dishonoured by the affectation of classical elegance. This style, whatever may have been the first cause of its adoption, became the standard which was followed by all Jews writing in Greek upon religious subjects, who wished to conform to their ancestral habits, and to gain the approbation of their brethren. See my *Programma, De Odio Judæorum in linguam Græcam*. Hence the *Romaic* version of the Pentateuch, and the *Italian* and *Spanish* versions of the Bible by Jews are formed upon the same principle. See *Simon, Bibl. Crit.* P. iv. p. 133.



<sup>f</sup> The Greek style of the Septuagint may be divided into three classes : 1st. Some parts are merely Hebraistic, as the version of Ecclesiastes ; 2d. Some parts are pure Greek, as the version of Job, Proverbs, and Canticles, in which even poetical expressions are introduced ; 3d. The rest of the version is of a mixed character. See *Mücke, de Origine versionis LXX. interpretum.* Züllich, 1789.

III. Since, then, this style was adopted, as we have before shown, by the inspired writers of the New Testament, it follows of course, as the most learned interpreters have always held, that the study of the Septuagint is of the greatest use in determining the usage of language in the New Testament. See especially *Pearson's* Preface to the Cambridge edition, and that of *Grabe*, and also *Carpzov's* Crit. Sac. p. 547.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>g</sup> Together with *Biel, Schleusner, Paulus, Beckhaus*, and others. See *Bretschneider's* Exc. II. ad Jes. Siracidem. Ratisbon, 1806, p. 709, seq.

IV. The more recent and learned interpreters have therefore judged the use of this version most necessary to the illustration of the phraseology of the New Testament ; nor was that phraseology ever rightly explained, until light was thrown upon it from this quarter. In this application of the Septuagint, *Grotius*

led the way, being the first who brought the necessary diligence and learning to the task.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> The Fathers did not use the Septuagint in illustrating the New Testament, because they were generally ignorant of Hebrew. Even *Melancthon* and *Camerarius* have seldom availed themselves of its assistance. Next to Grotius we may class *Reachenius* *Observ. in N. T. ex LXX.* [The reader will observe, that a mere knowledge of Greek will not enable the student to use the Septuagint for hermeneutical purposes. His object ought to be to discover the Hebraisms in the New Testament, and to explain them by finding what Hebrew expressions are rendered by the same Greek expressions in the Septuagint; and this of course cannot be done without a competent knowledge of Hebrew.]

V. Much help may also be derived from those writers who have illustrated the Hebraisms of the New Testament,<sup>i</sup> by the aid of this version; sometimes by producing examples to show how a particular phrase would be given in the Hebrew; and sometimes by noticing the various ways in which a Hebrew word is rendered, in order to show what is the pure Greek corresponding to a Hebraistic word; the latter, however, has been done less frequently than might have been wished. As, however, these writers have proceeded rather by example than precept, and have thereby led their followers into considerable errors, it

seems expedient to reduce the subject to a few perspicuous rules, and so to render the use of this version more easy and definite.

<sup>i</sup> As *Wysse* in his *Dialectologia Sacra*. *Vorstius* is fuller, but *Leusden* more compendious; both of their works have been edited by *Fischer*. [The Title of *Vorst's* book is, *Johannis Vorstii Commentarius de Hebraismis N. T. seu philologia sacra*. That of *Leusden's*, *Joh. Leusdeni de Dialectis N. T. singulatim de ejus Hebraismis, libellus singularis, denuo edidit, J. F. Fischer. Leipzig, 1754 and 1792.*

VI. We must, in the first place, premise a few grammatical observations, on the principles according to which the Greek of the Septuagint imitates the original Hebrew; and from these we shall proceed to draw rules and limitations by which the use of this version may be properly directed.

VII. The most important observations are these. First, whatever Greek word corresponded etymologically to a Hebrew word, or expressed its primary signification, was employed by the translators to express, not merely that signification, but also all tropical significations of the same word. Thus, the primary or proper use of the words *הריק*, *ערות*, *ברית*, *בחר*, *קרא*, is expressed by *ἐκλέξασθαι*, *καλέειν*, *κενοῦν*, *μαρτύριον* [*μαρτύρια*], *διαθήκη*, *δικαιοσύνη*,

and so they are rendered. But besides this, these Greek words and their conjugates are used in the Septuagint to express the corresponding Hebrew words in all their varieties of tropical application; and that in a way quite irreconcilable with the usages of the Greek language.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>k</sup> To these we may add, דָּבָר *word*, tropically *thing*, in this sense *ῥῆμα* is to be understood Matt. iv. 4, Luke i. 37. בְּרִית a *treaty*, tropically, a *system of revealed religion*, διαθήκη. רֵזֶז a *secret*, tropically, *profound wisdom*, μυστήριον. [For the manner in which these words are used, the reader will find full information, by consulting *Schleusner's* Thesaurus, which ought to be in the library of every biblical student; or, if he chooses to follow the advice of *Michaelis*, he may, by the aid of *Trommius's* Concordance, investigate the requisite passages for himself. See *Michaelis's* Introd. i. 177.]

VIII. Secondly, when Hebrew words have many different meanings, which cannot be well explained by tropical transference, nor derived from the primary signification, as תָּמִים τέλειος, δίκαιος, ἐυλαβής,<sup>1</sup> the corresponding Greek words are used with the same latitude of permutation. *Gataker* has been very diligent in the elucidation of this class of words, as *Vorstius* has with respect to those mentioned before.

<sup>1</sup> So נתן is either to *give* or to *place*; hence τιθέναι and δίδοναι are used alternatively in the N. T. as in John x. 11. ψυχὴν τιθέναι: נדיב, either *benefactor* or *prince*, hence εὐεργέτης, *prince*, Luke xxii. 25.

IX. In such cases the Septuagint uses one Greek word with the same variety of significations: thus, since μαρτύριον answers to עדה or עדות, and since the Hebrew word is used for *law* or *doctrine*, therefore also μαρτύριον Χριστοῦ is used for the doctrine of Christ, and μαρτυρεῖν for *to teach*. In the same way, νόμος like תורה is used not only for *law*, as in pure Greek writers, but also for *revealed religion* in general, and for its particular parts, as, for example, its *promises*. Ignorance of this principle has led commentators into the most strange and involved attempts at explanation; see *Vitringa's* Obs. iii. 1. As another example, we may observe, that the Hebrew prefix ב answers properly, or nearly, to the Greek ἐν: consequently ἐν is used in the Septuagint, with all the latitude of signification which this prefix possesses in Hebrew. Ignorance of this particular point has led interpreters into absurd and forced renderings.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> We may give as examples, ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι to be a Christian: ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἀποθνήσκειν, to die laden with sin.

Nor must we omit to observe, that in the New Testament  $\epsilon\upsilon$  and  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  are used interchangeably, as  $\beth$  and  $\daleth$  in Hebrew. [It appears more suitable to the present enquiry to examine, what is done in the Septuagint, than what is done in the New Testament. There  $\epsilon\upsilon$  will be found expressing all the following, *in, to, with, when, near, for, on account of, by, against*. An examination of the passages in which it is thus used, will, probably, shew, that  $\epsilon\upsilon$   $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\text{-}\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  means rather to die *on account of sin*, than laden with sin. Deut. xxiv. 16, and Hosea xii. 12.]

X. Greek words sometimes occur in the Septuagint, the reason for the choice of which it is impossible for us to discover, either from Greek or Hebrew usage. In these cases, according to *Le Dieu* and others, the Chaldee or Arabic usage has been followed, or the primary meaning of the word, which has been lost in Hebrew, remains in Chaldee or Arabic.<sup>n</sup> Thus פתך is rendered συγκρίνειν instead of ἐξημενέειν, or ἐπιλύειν, and this signification, which is perhaps the primary one, or existed in the Chaldee or Arabic, has been introduced into the New Testament, (1 Cor. ii. 13.)

<sup>n</sup> This seldom happens. Compare, however, Rom. xi. 9. with Isaiah xxix. 10. where תרדמה, *deep sleep*, is rendered by the LXX. κατανύξις, *compunctio*. This is taken from the Arabic use of ردم, to *sew* or *prick*. It is a familiar phrase among the Arabians, “sleep has sewed toge-

ther my eyes." See Michaelis Supplem. p. 449. And Chrestomathia, Arab. p. 66. Lennep, however, gives another view of the word, tracing it from *νύω* to *nod*, hence *νυστάζω* and *κατάνυξις* *sleep*. [We may observe, that in some such cases, it is probable the LXX. had a different reading from that which we now possess; and in others, it is clear they introduced glosses expressing the current opinion of their own time, rather than the literal meaning of the passage. Thus, in Deut. xxxii. 8. יצב נבלת עמים למספר בני ישראל is rendered ἕστησεν ὄρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ; whereas the two last words ought to have been, as they are rendered by Aquila and Symmachus, ὑἰῶν Ἰσραήλ. This version is evidently taken from {the popular notion of tutelary angels presiding over different nations. See Mori Acroases, Ed. Eichstadt. ii. 71.]

XI. Sometimes, on the other hand, the Septuagint translators render Hebrew forms, by pure Greek forms, expressive of the sense; thus אמת [properly *truth*], is rendered ἐλεημοσύνη, and איש אמת by ἀγαθός: and in the same way אהרית is rendered not only ἔσχατος, but also ἐπιών; and with הימים not only ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, but also μετὰ ταῦτα. It is unnecessary to mention Hebraisms in the construction, and others which do not affect the sense; as feminines for neuters, and the like.<sup>o</sup>

<sup>o</sup> As for example in Matt. xxi. 42, θουμαστή for θουμαστόν. We may add this remark, that sometimes the Hebraisms are only partly explained, as in Gen. xix. 21, נשא פנים

is rendered *θαυμάζει πρόσωτον*, which is scarcely Greek; but from this we may derive the formula in the N. T. *λαμβάνειν πρόσωτον*. [This expression may more properly be explained by the well known Hebraism, that the several parts of the body are used to express merely the man to whom they belong; thus *מִן רַגְלִים* is simply *from him*. See Ernesti's *Instit. Bib. Cab. I. p. 92, 93.*]

XII. These observations then ought to be familiar to our minds, so as to be ready for application, both generally, and especially when we have to consider words of frequent recurrence in the sacred books, and such as we may style *dogmatic* terms. And this familiarity we may best attain, by always reading the Greek of the Septuagint together with the Hebrew original, and by comparing the Greek of one passage with that of another where the same Hebrew word occurs: keeping at the same time these general observations in view, that guided by them we may attain a knowledge of the usages of that version with respect to each particular word.<sup>P</sup>

<sup>P</sup> [The translator understands Ernesti to mean, that the observations in the preceding paragraphs will enable us to classify for future use, the several particles of information which we may derive from the comparisons just recommended.]

XIII. Our application of the Septuagint



version to the elucidation of the New Testament, by the aid of these observations, ought to be guided by the following rules. First, when we meet with any thing in the New Testament which is bad Greek, and which we know to be so from our previous acquaintance with the genius and analogy of the Greek language, and from the impossibility of reconciling the genuine Greek signification of some particular word, with the general sense of the passage, then we must have recourse to the Septuagint, and examine what is the Hebrew word which they render by this Greek word, and thus, from the usage of the Hebrew, we may determine the signification of the Greek: as in the words κληῖσις, ἐκλογὴ and its conjugates, and μογιλάλος, Mark vii. 32, answering to the Hebrew דלם, *dumb*. Isaiah xxxv, 6.<sup>9</sup> In this, however, we must be careful to attain the real force and signification of the Hebrew word, and not satisfy ourselves with the renderings of the ordinary lexicons, the Latin of which is frequently Hebraistic, and often borrowed etymologically from this very version; in such cases, of course, they can do us no good, and may lead us into great errors. Students ought, therefore, to make themselves familiar with the best treatises on Hebraisms, and endeavour to

obtain a clear and accurate knowledge of the genius and peculiarities of that language.

<sup>a</sup> *μογιλάλος* cannot be rendered *speaking with difficulty*, for those who are naturally deaf, are consequently dumb. By an examination of the passage quoted, it appears that *μογιλάλος* is used for *ἄλαλος*. [The substance of this rule is thus briefly given by Morus; the Hebraisms of the N. T. are to be compared with the Hebrew, not arbitrarily, that is, not according to our own general knowledge of Hebrew, but by the aid and through the medium of the Septuagint.]

XIV. Secondly, whenever we find any thing in the Septuagint expressed in pure Greek, which, as has been observed, is sometimes the case, we must apply this in the New Testament to passages in which, judging from the genius of the Greek language, it appears that the Hebrew has been rendered verbatim into Greek. In such cases, the best plan is to re-translate the Greek verbatim into Hebrew. Thus, if in 1 Cor. xv. 54, you render *εἰς νῆκος* by the Hebrew *תָּבֵבֵב*, and observe that this is rendered by the LXX. *εἰς τέλος, διαπαντός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, χρόνον πολὺν*, as well as *εἰς νῆκος*, you will discover the true sense. Such instances in that version ought, therefore, to be carefully noted, so as to be ready for application whenever an occasion is offered.<sup>f</sup>

† In the same way we shall find that ἐν ἰσχυραῖς ἡμέραις of the N. T. corresponds to the μετὰ ταῦτα of the Septuagint. See § xi.

XV. And even in pure Greek expressions, common to the Old and New Testaments, it will be useful to examine the corresponding Hebrew in the Old Testament; lest we should be entirely misled, or at least fail of perceiving the full sense of the passage. For the LXX. often translate indefinitely, they give genus for species, antecedent for consequent, and the like. Thus, they render התהלך את יהוה, by εὐηρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ, Gen. v. 24, vi. 9, putting the consequent for the antecedent; and this has been retained by the Apostle, Heb. xi. 5.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>s</sup> μονογενῆς, John i. 14. corresponds to the Hebrew בן, יְהוָה which the LXX. render, Gen. xxii. 2. υἱὸς ἀγαπητός [This ought evidently to be given as an illustration of § 14. Ernesti's criticism would have been clearer, had he said, that in the example produced, the LXX. had given the effect for the cause; Enoch's walking with God was the cause, his pleasing God was the effect.]

XVI. Both in the Septuagint and in the Greek Testament, there are many forms which appear to be pure Greek, and which still require to be interpreted from the Hebrew. Thus, in Eph. iv. 9, Ps. lxii. 9, κατώτατα μέρη

τῆς γῆς, can be understood only by comparing it with the Hebrew תַּחֲתֵיטָאֵרֶץ. This class of texts, and they are almost innumerable, require particular care, and often escape the intelligence of interpreters. See Ernesti's *Inst. Bib. Cab.* vol. i. p. 103, 104. The student ought, therefore, to be peculiarly diligent in this branch of enquiry, so as always to have his results ready for application.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>t</sup> The labours of *Biel* and *Schleusner* cannot be too highly praised; and the Biblical student cannot dispense with their great work *Novus Thesaurus Phil. Crit. &c. Lips. 1820.* [Of the class mentioned in this § 1, are ἡ ἀρετὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὀλόκληρος. In these the expression is pure Greek, but the sense is Hebraistic. For ἀρετὴ Θεοῦ means, not, as we should suppose, the moral perfections of God, but specifically his *mercy*; and this specific sense of ἀρετὴ is to be taken in 1 Pet. xi. 9, τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, according to Greek usage, signifies to *watch* a person's words in a bad sense; but in the Septuagint, τηρεῖν is used for the Hebrew שָׁמַר, to *attend to or obey*. ὀλόκληρος which in its Greek usage means *complete*, is used in the Septuagint for the Hebrew תָּמִים, and signifies, when applied to a man, *pure from sin*; and in this sense it is used also in the N. T. The words δίχισθαι, and προσλαμβάνεσθαι, when compared with the Hebrew לָקַח, will be found to mean to *treat with kindness*. Upon this most important subject, the student will do well to consult the works of *Fischer*, his tracts *De Versionibus Græcis, V. T., &c. Lips. 1770, 1704,* and *Prohusiones de Vitiis Lex. N. T. Lips. 1798.*]

XVII. Whenever we are at a loss in ques-

tions of this kind, it will be serviceable to consult an index of this version, that we may discover to what Hebrew word each Greek word corresponds, and thence derive whatever light may be afforded by the comparison; and for this purpose we may use the Concordances of *Kircher* or *Trommius*.<sup>u</sup> But, in doing this, much caution must be used, lest either by an affectation or an ignorance of Hebraisms, or being misled by the vagueness with which the LXX. sometimes translate, we fall into error. *Dan. Heinsius*<sup>x</sup> has erred widely in this way, and has, on that account, been justly reprehended by *Salmasius* in his *De Foen. Trapezit*, p. 805. In the next place, we must be careful not to be misled by the blunders of these Concordances, which are many and great. This is especially likely to happen to those who use the work of *Kircher*, whose Latin renderings are all taken from the version of *Pagninus*; and has happened to *Heinsius*, and to *Calovius* in considering the words ἀνάθεμα and ἀνάθημα, 1 Cor. xii. 4. Thirdly, we must be careful, in cases where the LXX. had a different Hebrew reading from that which we possess, not to interpret their rendering according to our present text, and thereby to affix a wrong sense to the Greek word, as

*Pearson* has done on Heb. x. 28. And finally, we must not follow the LXX. in their erroneous renderings of Hebrew words, of which many instances may be found; see my *Disp. de Diffic. Interp. Gram. N. T.* § 17, 18, 19. These dangers would in a great degree be obviated, if any person, sufficiently acquainted with Greek, Hebrew, and criticism in general, familiar also with the several principles and rules above laid down, would compose a lexicon of the Septuagint version, as it appears from his *Præf. in Præterita*, that *Drusius* had the intention of doing.<sup>y</sup>

<sup>u</sup> *Kircher* published his *Concordance* in quarto, 1607. He placed the Hebrew words first, and added a Greek index, which is a very inconvenient form. *Trommius*, whose *Concordance* was published in folio 1717, put the Greek first, and added a Hebrew index. This is much superior to *Kircher's*, who used *Wechel's* edition of the Septuagint in which there are numerous errors.

<sup>x</sup> *Heinsius*, using *Pagninus'* Hebrew Lexicon, which is merely etymological, renders ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον, as if לחם תמיד were *panis instans*, deriving תמיד from המיד, and that again falsely from עמד to stand. Thus a good rendering is supported by futile arguments. [תמיד is more probably derived, (unless תמד be considered as a distinct root) from מדר to which it is referred by *Simon* and *Eichhorn*.]

<sup>y</sup> See note on § 16.

XVIII. Whoever will keep these rules in

mind, and add thereto private application, and attention to the lectures of good interpreters, may derive great use from the Septuagint version; the assistance to be derived from which to the interpretation of the New Testament, has, as yet, by no means been exhausted.

XIX. This version may also be applied to other uses besides those already mentioned. It may be very serviceable in comparing passages from the Old Testament which are quoted in the New; nor is its *critical* use to be overlooked in the judgment and choice of various readings. And, thirdly, it throws much light on the commentaries of the fathers, which generally depend upon this version.

XX. For it is clear, that the inspired writers of the New Testament sometimes quoted from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. Sometimes, indeed, they appear to have quoted from the Hebrew, rendering it word for word into Greek, as any of us might do at the present day. That they have thus translated, appears from many passages in which they agree with the Hebrew text, in opposition to the Greek, as Matt. viii. 17, from Is. liii. 4, and John xix. 37, from Zech. xii. 10. In many passages, however, it is clear, that the writers of the New Testament have quoted

from the Septuagint, in those, namely, where they agree with it in its departures from the Hebrew. And these discrepancies often affect the sense, and are such, that we can hardly conceive them to have been made independently by two different translators; such, for example, are Heb. x. 38; xi. 21. In such passages, if we assert with some learned men, that the Apostles translated from the Hebrew, it must follow, either that they have erred in the translation, or that our Hebrew text has been corrupted in these passages, neither of which is probable; or, finally, that the apostolic translation has been removed from the text by copyists, and its place supplied from the Septuagint. This last opinion has been held by some; and a full discussion of the subject will be found in *Lud. Capelli* Append. Crit. Sac. p. 443.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The Old Testament is quoted by the inspired authors of the New, either literally from the Hebrew text, or from the Septuagint, or from some other version now lost, or from memory. See *Eichhorn's*, *Allg. Bibliothek der Bibl. Lit.* II. 948, sq., and *Eckerman's* *Symbolæ Theologicae*. Upon the whole we may observe, that in that age quotations were made,

1. Rather with a view to the sense of the passage than to the exact words, so that much was occasionally added or omitted.



2. The sense of the passage quoted was often altered so as to suit the notions of the person quoting.

3. Authors, even in quoting from the writings of others, shewed their own genius.

Peter, Acts ii. 25, and James, Ib. xv. 16, could not use the Septuagint version at Jerusalem, for Greek was very unpopular there, and each Apostle must have spoken, not in Greek but in Syriac. The passages from the Old Testament there quoted, must therefore have been recorded by Luke from memory. [Of these three methods of quotation, the second and third appear to the translator to be substantially the same. On the subject of this chapter, the student will do well to consult *Marsh's Michaelis*, I. 200, sq. And *Koppe*, Excursus I. in Ep. ad Rom.]

XXI. It is not necessary here to inquire very minutely into the reasons for this variety in the manner of quoting, and for the custom of quoting the Septuagint version even where it departs from the Hebrew text. But since the whole force of an argument in the New Testament sometimes depends upon the wording of the Greek version, where it differs from the Hebrew, not merely in entire sentences, but in particular words, it will readily be perceived how necessary an acquaintance with that version must be to a right understanding of the New Testament.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> [The Translator has seldom had reason to warn the reader against the sentiments of Ernesti; but in this chap-

ter he has certainly admitted that, which if allowed, would go far to overthrow the divine authority of Scripture. If the writers of the New Testament really proved their doctrines, not from the word of God, but from the misrepresentations of it by the LXX. it would be very difficult to conceive that in so doing they acted under the influence of the Divine Spirit. The learned Michaelis speaks with more reverence, and with fuller information on this subject. "Great diffidence," says he, "is requisite on our parts in our critical explanation of the Old Testament, nor must we conclude that an Apostle has made a false quotation, because he has applied a passage in the Old Testament, in a sense which, according to our judgment, it does not admit. Our own ignorance may be the cause of the seeming impropriety, and having found, by actual experience, and a more minute investigation of the subject, that many passages, which other critics, as well as myself, have taken for false quotations, were yet properly cited by the Apostles, I trust that future critics will be able to solve the doubts in the few examples which remain." *Introd. i. 210.* And again, in reference more particularly to quotations from the Septuagint, having examined the practice of St. Matthew, he adds, "With respect to the other writers of the New Testament, it is certain that they have quoted in most instances from the Septuagint, even where the translation from the Hebrew is inaccurate, but where the errors are of such a nature as not to weaken the proofs for which they are alleged. This has been used as an argument against divine inspiration, but the argument is without foundation, for the proof depends not on all the words of the quotation, but simply on those few which are immediately applicable to the subject; the rest are introduced merely on account of the connexion, and that the reader might more easily refer to the passages in the New Testament, from which they are taken." But the reader will do well to study the whole

of Michaelis' chap. v., sect iii. on this important and difficult subject.]

XXII. The Septuagint version has a *critical* application, first, in those passages which are quoted from it. For in these the old manuscripts sometimes differ, so that we have to determine which we ought to follow. In all which cases it cannot be doubted, but that we ought to prefer that reading which is found in good old copies, especially if it contain anything studied or unusual in the expression. Thus in Heb. i. 11. the Vulgate reading ἐλξίσεις ought to be preferred to ἀλλάξεις, contrary to the opinion of *Wetstein* and *Bengel*, because ἐλξίσεις is in the Septuagint, from whence the whole passage is taken;<sup>b</sup> and ἀλλάξεις has the air of a gloss from the Latin version of the New Testament, which appears to have this word from the correction of Jerome; although it must be granted that ἀλλάξεις is closer to the Hebrew ףלח. Cases, however, sometimes occur where we must, for special reasons, reject the authority of the Septuagint: for instance, where the nature of the argument appears to have required some change in the expression, which has therefore been made designedly, while the general sense of the

passage is retained. Thus St. Paul, Heb. x. 5, appears to have put  $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$  for  $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota\alpha$  from Ps. xl. as more suitable to his purpose of showing that Christ had propitiated the Father by the sacrifice of his body.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>b</sup> It ought not, however, to be omitted, that *Grabe's* edition has  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\iota\varsigma$  in Ps. cii. 26—28.

<sup>c</sup> The Philoxenian version has  $\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha$  in this passage: and so *Michaelis*, (*Coll. Crit. de Psalmis præcip. de Christo agentibus*, p. 358, seq.) thinks it ought to be read.

XXIII. In cases where the authority of good manuscripts is equally balanced, and where the sense of the two readings is equally good, we must determine from the nature of the words. See ch. vi. § 25. For it cannot be doubted, but that the reading, which is more consonant to the usage of this version, and especially that reading which, according to Greek habits, would be considered the harsher, ought to be preferred. By the use of this principle corruptions of the text may be detected, and the true reading established. The Latin translator, at Acts xv. 2, would not, I think, have omitted  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\sigma\upsilon\zeta\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ , as being too weak a word to be coupled with  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ , had he known that  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ , which he renders *sedition*,

was habitually used by the LXX. in the milder sense of *disputatio*.

XXIV. But in every critical application of the Septuagint, we must be careful to use a correct edition, formed upon good manuscripts, so that we may not be misled by inaccuracies. Nay, we ought to use several editions, and to examine the various readings. Thus, in 2 Cor. xiii. 1, it would be very rash to displace *σταθήσεται* for *στήσεται*, which is found at Deut. xix. 15, in the *Roman* edition of the Septuagint, and in those editions which follow the Roman; although *στήσεται* may be taken in a passive sense: for it will be found that *σταθήσεται* is the reading in the editions of *Aldus* and *Grabe*.

XXV. Although the first place is to be given to the *Septuagint* version; yet the other ancient Greek translations of the Old Testament, especially those of *Aquila* and *Symmachus*, are not to be neglected. The first of these was collected from the writings of the Fathers, especially Jerome, and the *Catenæ*, by *P. Morinus*, assisted, as he informs us in his Ep. 31, by *Ant. Agellius*; and was edited by *Flaminius Nobilius* in the *Biblia Græca*, at Rome. Hence, it was reprinted in several editions, and also separately by *Drusius*; and

afterwards in a form more adapted to use, but considerably increased by collections from the manuscript commentaries of *Eusebius*, *Procopius*, &c. in the *Hexaplorum Origenianorum Reliquiæ*, by *Montfaucon*, Paris 1713, together with a Greek and Hebrew Lexicon: which work was condensed and augmented by *Bahrddt*, Lips. 1769.<sup>d</sup> *Blanchinus* promised additional supplements from the *Codex Chisianus*, but was prevented by death.

<sup>d</sup> *Theodotion* generally agrees with the LXX., consequently his version is of less importance. But concerning this and the other fragments of the Hexapla, see *Eichhorn's* *Einleitung*, T. i. ed. 3, p. 355, seq.

XXVI. *Aquila*, in conformity with the spirit of the Jews, renders every Hebrew word by the nearest corresponding Greek word, whence he has been said to translate κατ' ἀκριβειαν, and his version has been most highly approved of by the Jews, who call it the *Hebrew verity*, as if in reading it, they were reading the Hebrew text itself. Christians have formed nearly the same judgment; and hence, when the Greek Fathers speak of the Hebrew, they must be understood as referring to this version.

XXVII. This version may therefore be of use to us in determining to what Hebrew

word any Greek word, respecting which we are at a loss, corresponds; and thence, what signification it has in the Hebrew-Greek idiom. Thus we find, that Aquila uses *κανόν* to express *ק* a *string for measuring*; and this fact we may use for illustrating the meaning of *κανόνος* in 2 Cor. x. 13.

XXVIII. *Symmachus*, on the other hand, as the ancients testify, and as appears also from the fragments of his version which remain, studied to maintain a pure Greek style. For the exceptions which occur in his version are to be attributed to the transcribers who have inserted them from *Aquila*, or from some other source, just as in *Aquila* we find some interpolations from *Symmachus*. For this purity of style he is highly praised by *Jerome* and *Theodoret*, and has been, to the same degree, unpopular among his own countrymen, who considered the adoption of such a style derogatory to the dignity of the divine oracles. See *Thiemii Disp. de Puritate Symmachi*.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> The learned may here consider, whether in the elucidation of the New Testament from the ancient Hellenistic writings, any value is to be attributed to the *Nova V. T. versio Græca Veneta*, published by Villoison at Strasburg 1784, and by me (*Ammon*) at Erlangen, 1790, either in determining the method in which Hebrew notions were

wont to be expressed in Greek, which is a great help to accurate interpretation; or in the explanation of particular words and forms: as, for example, in the word **משתה**, *γάμος*, which the author of this version has properly rendered *δόκος*: or in *ἰκνεύειν*, John v. 13, by which he renders **פנה**, Deut. xxxi. 18. [The etymological meaning of **משתה** from the root **שתה**, is a *symposium* or meeting to drink together, hence, any festive meeting. The translator cannot find that *δόκος* ever has this meaning, though *δοκῆ* from *δίχομαι* has.]

XXIX. From what has been said, it will appear that these fragments are of use, in determining the sense of Hebraistic words and idioms in the New Testament, and in preventing us from giving a wrong interpretation to Hebraizing Greek expressions. Thus, Symmachus renders by *εὐεργεσίαν*, the word which the LXX. render *ανταπόδοσιν*, Ps. ciii. 2, following the etymology of the Hebrew **גמול**; which may mean *payment*, but is also applied to *benefits* derived from God, without the implication of previous merit. See Gen. xv. 2. And even if it be not easy to point out their practical use in particular passages, still they are useful in teaching generally the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, not merely in single words, but also in idioms differing from pure Greek construction. But on this subject the reader will do well to study J. F. Fischer's



Prolusiones de Interpretibus V. T., &c., Lips. 1772.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>f</sup>[This may be a proper place for introducing a short account of the history of these versions. Their preservation then is in a great measure due to *Origen*, who, in his *Hexapla*, published the Old Testament in six parallel columns. The first contained the Hebrew text in its proper character; the second, the same text in Greek characters; the third, the version of *Aquila*; the fourth, that of *Symmachus*; the fifth, the Septuagint; and the sixth, the version of *Theodotion*. *Eichstadt*, however, referring to *Eusebius* (H. E. vi. 16,) and *Jerome* (in *Titum*, iii.) is of opinion that the collections of *Origen* were named from the number of Greek versions, not counting the Hebrew; that copies which contained only the four above mentioned versions were called *Tetrapla*; while others, containing these together with two others, now lost, were called *Hexapla*; and that later writers, adding the two Hebrew columns to the calculation, called the former of these *Hexapla*, the latter *Octapla*. Of these collections no copies remained at the restoration of literature, but all the fragments which could be collected from the writings of the Greek fathers and other sources, were digested and published by *B. Montfaucon* under the title, *Hexaplorum Origenis quæ supersunt, multis partibus auctiora quam a Flaminio Nobilio et Johanne Drusio edita fuerant; ex manuscriptis et ex libris editis eruit et notis illustravit Bernardus de Montfaucon*, Paris, 1714, II tom. fol. This work, with many omissions, and some unimportant additions, has been edited by *Bahrddt*, (Lips. 1768-69); but his edition derives its value chiefly from the rarity and expensiveness of *Montfaucon*'s.]

## CHAPTER VIII.

## ON THE USE OF WORKS WRITTEN BY JEWS.

I. Since there are words, forms, and even sentences, in the New Testament, which are foreign to the usage of the Greek language, and yet cannot be explained by any Hebraisms found in the Old Testament, or in the Alexandrine, [or other Greek versions]; it follows, that we must look for their origin in the Syro-Chaldaic, which prevailed in Palestine in the Apostolic age; and which differed materially from Hebrew, in treating either of secular or of religious subjects.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The writings of Jews are useful in two ways, 1st, for the explanation of rites, customs, and Jewish antiquities, as also of peculiar opinions, such as those respecting Satan, the Angels, the Messiah and his forerunners, the Sabbath, and God as the Father of the Jews alone. 2d, for the explanation of words and forms, especially those used proverbially or parabolically, such as Ἀδὰμ ἀρχαῖος, γλῶσσαι καιναὶ, ἴτεροι, &c. [For the languages of Palestine, see *Pfannkuche's* Diss. Bib. Cab. vol. ii.]

II. It cannot be doubted, that remains of this dialect are to be found in Jewish writers; not certainly in all, or of every age, but in those who lived near the age of the Apostles, or in those who have preserved fragments of the writers of that age. In the former class we may place the authors of the *Targums*, the Jerusalem *Mischna* of the second century, and the book of *Sohar*, which is nearly of the same age: in the latter, many others, as the writers of the *Gemara*, *Rabboth*, and *Midrash*, who, though they wrote some centuries later, have preserved the words of more ancient writers. Concerning these works, the reader may consult *Wolfius'* *Bibl. Hebr.* *Schoetgen's* *Lect. Rabbin*, lib. i., *Gill's* *Preface* to his *Commentary* on the Gospels, and *Harenberg's* *Proleg.* ad *Comm.* in *Apocalypsin Johan.*<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> The best paraphrase תרגום, is that of *Onkelos* on the Pentateuch, and that of *Jonathan* on the Prophets. The *Mischna* has been translated into Latin, and illustrated with notes by *G. Surenhuse*, Amst. 1698, fol. and into German by *Rubius*, Onoldi 1760, vi. vols. quarto. The same learned divine has translated into German, from the *Gemara*, the *Brachoth*, Halle 1777, [and the *Peah*, Anspach 1781. For a general short account of the ancient Jewish writers, the reader may consult *Morus*, or rather his Editor *Eichstädt*, *Acr. Acad.* ii. 152. seq. or *Horne's* *Introduct.* ii. 157.]

III. Although students of theology cannot be generally recommended to study these writings, yet they ought diligently to peruse the writings of those who have collected from the mass of rubbish which these contain, whatever fragments may bear upon the interpretation of the New Testament. The most eminent authors in this department, are *Cartwright*, in his *Mellificium Hebraicum*, *J. Drusius*, in his *Præterita*, and *Lightfoot and Schoetgen*, in their respective *Horæ Talmudicæ*.<sup>i</sup> To all of these may be applied what *Simon* (*Hist. Crit.* iii. 765) applies to *Cartwright*, namely, that they are more full upon rites than upon words; that they follow their opinions too far; and that they sometimes force the Jewish writers to express their own opinions. To these may be added, besides *Hakspan* de lib. *Judæorum*, *Lipomann's* *Nizachon*, c. iii. sec. 2, on the use of the Jewish writers to the interpretation of the New Testament; and *Balt. Scheidii* *Præterita Præteritorum* in the *Collectio Meuscheniana*. Collections smaller in bulk, but more select, have been made by the *Capelli*,<sup>k</sup> by *Ludovic*, on the occasion of his editing *Cameron's* *Myrothecium*. Among commentators, this aid was first used by *Grotius*, who has applied it with considerable diligence; and the best of *Wet-*

*stein's* notes on the New Testament, as also of *Gill's* on the Gospels, are those which consist of extracts from the Jewish writers. For a notice of *Gaulmin's* unedited notes on this subject, see Simon's *Bibl. Crit.* iv. p. 185. Upon the whole, it appears that enough has been done in the formation of such collections, and what is now wanted is the labour of some judicious scholar to select and condense.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Drusius published his *Præterita*, that is, points omitted by Erasmus and Beza, in 1612. Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ* and *Talmudicæ*, were published at Cambridge in 1658. Schoetgen's *Horæ Talmudicæ* at Dresden 1733.

<sup>2</sup> Of the Capelli we must distinguish three, two *Jameses* and *Ludovic* the adversary of Buxtorf, and author of the *Critica Sacra*. The collections of *Meuschen* appear in his *Nov. Test. e Talmude illustrato*, Lips. 1736.

<sup>1</sup> Many extracts from the Jewish writings have been made by *Drusius*, *Lightfoot*, *Schoetgen*, and *Wetstein*, who commonly had recourse to a Latin version, which are little capable of throwing light on the interpretation of the N. T. Some, however, remain, which throw light upon the most difficult passages, partly from the *Mischna*, especially the פרקי אבות, partly from the book of *Sohar*, of which a compendium has been given by *Knorr a Rosenroth* in his *Cabbala denudata*, and partly from the later Jewish writers. Examples of such application may be found in my *Ascensus J. C. in cælum Historia Biblica*, published in the *Nova Opusc. Theol.* Gotting. 1803, p. 57. *De Vestigiis theologiæ Judaicæ in Epistola Pauli ad Romanos.* *ibid.* p. 72, and, *De Linguis Novis*, Erlangen 1803. Nor ought we to neglect *Maimonides'* work מורה נבוכים, and his tracts, de doc-

trina legis, and de Pœnitentia, edited by *Clavering*, Oxon. 1705. See pages 58, 59, 63, 73, 75, 87. To these we may add also his tract on Oaths, Ed. *Dithmar*, Lugdun. 1706.

IV. The ancient Jewish writings sometimes throw light not merely upon words, but upon things also. For the rites, manners, and opinions to which they allude, sometimes explain similar allusions in the New Testament. And for this purpose, those authors are most useful who have illustrated Hebrew antiquities from Jewish authors;<sup>m</sup> and among these we may recommend *Reland's* oration, and *Gill's* disputation in the *Catenæ Britannicæ* Comment. in N. T., T. I.

<sup>m</sup> The utility of these may be illustrated by examples. The parable in Luke xvi. cannot be understood, unless we keep in mind that the Jews, like other orientals, represented eternal happiness under the figure of a feast, at which the seat of honour was in Abraham's bosom. They imagined also, that the souls of the pious were carried thither by angels, while the impious were plunged into sulphurous flames. The passage in Matt. v. 34, *μὴ ὀμόσαι ὄλωις*, may be illustrated from the tract *שבועות* of the Mischna: Acts ii. 3, *γλωσσαι ὡσὶ πυρὸς*, is illustrated by Vitringa (de Syn. Vet. p. 146,) by a parallel passage from the *Schalschelet Hakabbala*; and the Lord's prayer may in like manner be shewn to have been founded on the *Kadish* prayers of the Jews. [The translator is not aware what work of Reland's is referred to in the text. Reland, besides his *Geography*, published two works on Jewish Antiquities, *Antiquitates*

sacræ veterum Hebræorum, and, de Spoliis templi Hierosolymitani in arcu Titiano Romæ conspicuis. Few portions of Scripture require or admit of more illustration from the Rabbinical writings, than the discourse of our Lord to Nicodemus. If it be inquired what particular notion our Lord wished to convey to Nicodemus by the expression, “ye must be born *again*,” or *from above*; we learn from these writings, 1st, That every descendant of Abraham was considered as qualified by birthright to participate in Messiah’s Kingdom. Thus the *Sanhedrim* fol. 90. 1, says, “there is a part allotted to all Israel in the world to come.” Again, we find that proselytes who had not this right by birth, acquired it by an emblematical regeneration or new birth. So, *Jevamoth*, fol. 62. 1, “if any one become a proselyte, he is a child new born.” Hence we conclude, that Nicodemus must have understood that the kingdom of Messiah was not, as he had supposed, a mere elevation of the whole Jewish nation; but a new state of religion, to which they as well as the Gentiles must be admitted as proselytes, and be regenerated by baptism.]

V. There are, however, several cautions to be given respecting the use of these writers. For, in the first place, we must avoid the inconsistency of those who extol or depreciate their authority, according as their statements agree with, or contradict their own opinion: and we must also avoid the blind zeal of those who, captivated by their favourite pursuit, approve, without discrimination, whatever is produced from Jewish writers, and forcibly ac-

commodate it to the illustration of the New Testament. Into this error *Lightfoot* and *Gill* especially have fallen.

VI. We shall be better able to comply with these cautions, and, upon the whole, to use the works of which we are treating, to a better purpose, if we can fix upon some certain rule which prescribes a definite method of making our choice. For those who merely prescribe, that in this branch of study we should neither go too far, nor stop too short; do not give us any help, since no one thinks that he himself relies upon it either too much or too little.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> Upon the whole, this rule may be observed; that in the N. T. wherever religious rites are treated of, and in forms of teaching and prayer, illustrations may be found in the Jewish writers. Thus St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, often writes as might be expected from a scholar of Gamaliel. *Wetstein* has led the way to this plan of illustration in his notes, either from his own collections, or from those of others. A good choice of illustrations from the Jewish writers, may also be found in *Eichhorn's* Comment. in Apocalypsin.

VII. In making this choice, much must depend upon natural acuteness, improved by study and the elegancies of polite letters. It may, however, be serviceable to observe, that we ought to seek assistance from these authors



only when it is needed, that is to say, only when we cannot, by a knowledge either of Greek or ancient Hebrew, discover a sense agreeable to the context.<sup>o</sup> And this is that middle course which some have prescribed in this matter; for, when a difficulty is explainable by these ordinary aids, it is absurd to have recourse to the Rabbinical writers. It will be useful also to consult those who have written with caution and taste on this subject; among whom I would recommend especially *Capellus* in his *Specilegium*, and *Grotius* in those of his notes which are of this class.

<sup>o</sup> We have a remarkable example in Acts xiii. 48, τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Those who explain this in a Jewish sense, consider τεταγμένοι as used for the Hebrew צָרַר, *destined*. The Greek signification, however, affords a better explanation of the passage: τάττειν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τι, is *to be studious or active for any thing*. See *Koppe* on Rom. ix. 22. [It may be doubted, however, whether the superiority of the sense, that is, its accordance with our preconceived systems, is a very safe guide in this matter. With reference to the limitation proposed by *Ernesti*, we may observe, that in many cases the general sense derived from the Greek is quite consistent with the context, and yet the passage has a special sense which can be learned only from the Jewish writings. Thus in the sermon on the Mount, the phrase κούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη, *ye have heard that it hath been said*, judged merely from the Greek, might mean, that some one individual had said so; or if τοῖς ἀρχαίοις be added, that it was an old opinion: but the frequent expression of *Maimonides*

*they learned by hearing, shews that the meaning is, ye have been taught by tradition.]*

VIII. In all that relates to antiquities, *Philo* and *Josephus* are to be preferred to the Rabbinical writers, as being both earlier and more learned than they : nor are they to be listened to who, misled by a foolish partiality for the Rabbins, or by their own partial opinions, maintain that their authority ought to be preferred, when it contradicts that of *Philo* and *Josephus*. For when the question is respecting the Temple, or the religious rites connected with it, as, for example, the Passover, the Holy Place, and the Temple of Herod, a higher degree of credit ought surely to be given to those who saw and took a share in these things, than to those who lived after the Temple was destroyed, and the rites connected with it disused.<sup>p</sup> The ignorance of the Jews, and their gross falsehoods respecting Hebrew antiquities, are well exposed by *Heinius* in his *Obs. Sac.* i. 9, ii. 3.

<sup>p</sup> Thus, for instance, the Talmudists assert that the priests sacrificed the paschal lamb, while *Philo* asserts that the sacrifice was performed by each father of a family. They say, that the old temple was not entirely destroyed by Herod ; *Josephus* asserts that even the sanctuary was pulled down.

In these cases Philo and Josephus are the more credible authorities. Light is thrown upon some passages of the New Testament, by the Samaritan remains published in *Eichhorn's Repertorium Lit. Or. et Bibl.* T. ix. and in *Paulus' Repert.* T. I. p. 120, seq.

IX. Philo is particularly useful in illustrating the allegorical and mystical reasonings, so much used by St. Paul: in which point there is so striking a similarity between him and St. Paul, that some have supposed the Apostle must have seen the writings of Philo,<sup>1</sup> and among these *Wetstein*, see his N. T. p. 384. This, however, appears to me hardly more credible than the opinion advanced by *Ottius* in his *Spicilegium*, that *Josephus* had availed himself of the writings of St. Paul. For, as it can scarcely be supposed, that St. Paul was so well skilled in Greek as to understand the works of Philo, written in a style quite removed from Hebrew usage, and emulating the elegance of Plato and Demosthenes; so, on the other hand, there is no difficulty in supposing that they both drew from the same ancient fountains. On these points I would refer the reader to *Loesner's Lectiones Philonianæ*.

<sup>1</sup> [For a compendious view of the passages in Philo applicable to the elucidation of the New Testament, see *G.*

*Dahlii Chrestomathia Philoniana, sive Loci illustres ex Philone Alexandrino decerpti.* Hamb. 1800, 8. The whole works of Philo were edited by *T. Mangey*, Lond. 1742, 2 vols. fol.]

X. I must deny what I find asserted by some unskilful philologers, that the writings of *Josephus* are useful to the interpretation of the New Testament, because he writes in the same style in which it is written. For *Josephus* imitates with great care and considerable success, the writers of pure Greek, especially *Polybius*, both in single words, and in the turn of his sentences: intermixing but few Hebraisms, and therein, as he himself says, departing from the custom of his fellow countrymen. He sometimes, however, exhibits peculiarities worthy of observation; these have been collected by *Ottius*, in his *Spicilegium*, and still more carefully by *Krebsius*, in his *Observationes ad N. T. a Josepho.*<sup>r</sup> Even by these collectors, some things, as might be expected, have been omitted; thus *Josephus* uses *τὰ βλεπόμενα* for the accomplishment of a promise, (*A. J.* 10, ad extr.) which illustrates *Hebr.* xi. 1. He uses also *ἐκλογὴν* for *liberty*, which illustrates *Rom.* ix. 11, where *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις*, about which systematic divines have given themselves so much unnecessary trouble,

means merely the free will of God in conferring benefits; and this use of the word is taken, partly from the usage of the Hebrews, who had no word to express *liberty* but בחר; and partly from the nature of the thing, since liberty consists in the power of choice. But the perusal of Josephus will be most available to the interpretation of the New Testament, if we observe how he expresses in Greek, ideas drawn from the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus, in the history of Corah, the words לפני יהיה, which the LXX. render κατέναντι τοῦ Κυρίου, are rendered by Josephus κατέναντι τοῦ προσημενίσματος, [before the vestibule of the tabernacle]. This class of observations has been too much neglected.

† Josephus imitates with success, Thucydides and Polybius, with the admixture of a very few Hebraisms; such as κρινὸς for κρίσηλος, σάκκους περιτίθεισθαι for to put on mourning. Interpreters, therefore, must not abuse the diction of Josephus to illustrate the words of the N. T., but rather use it to illustrate the history of the Old, and sometimes of the New Testament. Many good observations on the N. T., drawn from the writings of the Jews, may be found in *Raymundi Martini pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judæos*. Lips. 1687. [The historical authority of Josephus is high with respect to rites and customs existing in his own time; but in his representations of Jewish ancient history, he appears to have aimed at presenting to the heathen world a favourable, rather than accurate picture of his an-

cestors. The best critics, therefore, agree in limiting the historical utility of Josephus in the interpretation of Scripture, to these rites and customs. See *Mori Acroases Acad.* ii. 179. And for the character and origin of his style, *id.* 183. seq.]

## CHAPTER IX.

OF THE INTERPRETERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ; AND OF THEIR USE.

I. THE early ages of the Church admitted several kinds of interpretation, as the *mystical* or *allegorical*, the *dogmatic*, and the *grammatical* or *grammatico-rhetorical*. Nor did all interpreters use the same form: for some wrote *Commentaries*, others *Scholia*, and others *Homilies*.

II. The most ancient is the *allegorical*, originating, no doubt, from the synagogue, which is styled on that account *בית מדרש*, and from the schools of the Jewish doctors. For the Gospels inform us, that it was lawful in the synagogues to comment upon passages of Scripture: and in the schools of the Rabbins, which were also called synagogues, after the destruction of the Temple, the only topic of instruction was the proper method of interpret-

ing the Law and the Prophets; in which, indeed, the sum and substance of Jewish learning consisted.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>s</sup> They interpreted, however, without any taste or perception of beauty and truth. See *Vitringa*, de Synagogâ Vet. p. 137, sq. [The general character of their interpretations may be best learned from the Targums, in which are collected the opinions of many doctors, and specifically of *Gamaliel*, *Hillel*, and others of high eminence. The schools may have been usually called בית מדרש house of investigation, but the ordinary name of the synagogue, or house of religious assembly, was בית הכנסת, house of the congregation.]

III. This style of interpretation was used of old by the Prophets, in such a manner, however, as to be perfectly free from all human fancies and errors. In this way they interpreted the prophecies relating to Christ, and accommodated types and facts, especially historical facts, to the illustration of human and divine truths, to the confirmation of doctrine and precept, and, upon the whole, to the promotion of faith and holy practice. And this we ought to call *mystical* interpretation, which differs from *allegorical*, as among the Greeks, *θεωσία* differs from *ἀλληγορία*.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>t</sup> The history of the interpretation of Scripture shews, that both the mystical and allegorical interpretation of the



New Testament, were derived from Hebrew models. These methods, as hurtful to all sound theology, ought carefully to be avoided by teachers of religion. [Morus understands Ernesti to be speaking in this chapter of the schools of the Prophets, (1 Sam. xix. 20,) but every thing here said, except that of the interpretation of the prophecies relative to Christ, is true of the writings of the Prophets. It is evident that the practice of inspired men can form no rule with respect to interpretation, for those who are uninspired.]

IV. The system of mystical interpretation was, however, speedily corrupted, by men of uncultivated minds, who aspired to the praise of originality and acuteness. They omitted the better part of the system, that which treated of types and prophecies; and forced into some spiritual accommodation the most minute circumstances, and even single words. Interpretation thus degenerated into a mere play upon words,<sup>u</sup> and the indulgence of ungrounded fancies; and it is to be regretted, that these errors are still entertained by some in their interpretations of the Parables. Philo uses this system more judiciously, as might be expected from his cultivated intellect; but he indulged too much in philosophical refinements.

<sup>u</sup> [The Jewish interpreters play not merely upon words but upon letters. Some of them hold that Adam, David, Messias, are three incarnations of the same spiritual sub-

stance; and the *proof* of this is, that אָדָם consists of three letters, whereof the אָ represents Adam, the דָ David, and the מָ Messias. The translator received this interpretation, by tradition, from a learned Jew.]

V. This method, then, which had its origin among the Jews, was adopted by the early Christian teachers, and especially by those of Egypt, who were influenced by the example of Philo. That example taught them studiously to lead the minds of men from sensible objects, to the contemplation and the knowledge of those which are spiritual and invisible. Even after the introduction of grammatical interpretation, this method was still pursued by those who, through ignorance of languages and history, were almost necessarily compelled to have recourse to allegories: thus, Jerome confesses of himself, that, when a young man, he had interpreted *Abdias* allegorically, because he was ignorant of his history, and he begs pardon of the public for this ignorance. Nor did the most learned, as Origen, in all cases show themselves more capable of restraining their fancy than the Jews had been. We must grant, however, that this method of interpretation was serviceable against the Millenarians, the Anthropomorphites, and the Gnostics.<sup>x</sup>

<sup>x</sup> *Barnabas*, *Clement of Rome*, *Justin Martyr*, *Clement of Alexandria*, and *Origen*, have all used allegorical interpretation, with some mixture of gentile philosophy. See *Schuler's History of the Interpretation of Scripture*, Tubingen, 1787; *Semler's Versuch die Auslegung des N. T. zu befördern*, p. 135, seq. and *Rosenmüller's Comm. de fatis Interpretationis sac. lit. in Ecclesia Christiana*, Lips. 1789-1791.

VI. To this method, which tended rather to *edification*, that is to the inculcation of dogmas and precepts, and to the exhibition of an ingenious fancy, than to the explanation of Scripture, was afterwards added the *grammatical* method of interpretation. This consisted in the explanation of words, sentences, and histories, either difficult or obscure; and in the statement and critical choice of various readings. It was first used by *Origen*, a man not more skilled in theology than in general literature, which, as we learn from Eusebius, he taught at Alexandria.<sup>y</sup>

<sup>y</sup> Origen began with interpreting the Scriptures allegorically, but deserted this method when his mind had become familiar with the true principles of philology; and the same change is every day taking place in our own time. [The critical labours of Origen have already been noticed, chap. vii. § 29, n. f. As to interpretation, we find that he was the author of a work entitled *σημειώσεις*, which we may render *scholia*, or with Jerome *excerpta*. His work

is not now extant, but from the fragments still existing, we may conclude that it was a grammatical commentary. The fragments are to be found in Origen's *Philocalia*, a compilation of what we might now call the *beauties* of Origen, collected by *Basil the Great*, and *Gregory*, surnamed the *Theologian*. It was printed by *J. Tarinus*, at Paris, 1618.]

VII. Finally, as the number of interpreters completely acquainted with the requisite languages, and cultivated by the study of polite literature, began to increase among the Greeks, so the allegorical method of interpretation gradually fell into disuse. *Diodorus Tarsensis* (see *Socrat.* vi. 3, *Sozom.* viii. 2,) led the way in this change, and his system was followed by his pupils, *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, and *J. Chrysostom*. As to the charge brought against *Diodorus* and *Theodorus*, of turning the historical sense of the Prophets into accommodations, this may either have been a calumny, invented by those whose love for allegorical interpretation led them to calumniate the works of grammatical interpreters, whose reputation they envied: or, if the charge were true, they may still have applied the principles of grammatical interpretation to the faithful interpretation of Scripture in general. For an account of *Theodorus*, see *Buddei Isagoge*, p. 1405. It is remarkable, however, that Bud-

deus, in his catalogue of interpreters, makes no mention of *Diodorus*, when there are so many extracts from his works in the *Catenæ*, although, as far as I have been able to discover, nothing of very high value.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> [It seems unnecessary to say more of *Diodorus* and *Theodorus*; *Chrysostom* will come under our notice again in a succeeding chapter. The *Catenæ*, or collections of the expositions of the Fathers are very numerous. Besides those on the Old Testament, there are upon the New, *Symbolarum* in *Matthæum* tomus prior, &c. edited by *Peter Possinus*, Thoulouse 1646, and a second volume published the next year. *Catena* in *Evang. sec. Marcum*, by *P. Possinus*, Rome 1673. *Victor's*, &c. *Exegesis* on *Mark*, published by *C. F. Matthæi* at Moscow 1775. *Catena sexaginta quinque PP. Græc. in Lucam*, &c. by *Balt. Corderius*, Antwerp 1628. *Catena* of Greek Fathers on *John*, by the same, 1630. To these we may add *Œcumenii Comment. in Acta Apost. et omnes Pauli Epistolas*, &c. edited by *Morel*, Paris 1631.]

VIII. Allegorical interpretation prevailed also in the Latin Church; and it had its origin there, partly in the Latin version of Origen's commentaries; and partly in the study of *Origen* and similar writers, by *Hilary*, *Ambrose*, and others who were acquainted with the Greek language.

IX. *Dogmatic* interpretation, is that which consists not in the accurate interpretation of

words, but in the illustration of previously formed opinions, by disquisitions on heads of doctrine or practice; in the management of controversies; and in the defence of Scriptural doctrine against the corruptions of heretics. Under this head we may class the Commentary on John, by *Cyrrill of Alexandria*, in which, however, something of grammatical interpretation is intermixed, and many others, especially among the Latin Fathers and modern writers, who have written since the Reformation. This method, however useful it may be for theological purposes, is seldom of any use to the purposes of interpretation properly so called.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Dogmatic interpretation is perfectly legitimate, if it be founded upon that which is grammatical. Thus, for example, John x. 39, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν. Since this text treats of the moral union or communion existing between the Father and the Son with respect to the salvation of sinners; and the dogmatic inference would be just, that the Saviour was united to the Father in a very remarkable and special manner. But if the doctrine of the Trinity, and the unity of essence, be immediately inferred, this is a faulty application of the dogmatic system, because the context of the passage is neglected. [To this class may be attributed almost all *our* popular commentaries, as those of *Scott, Henry, &c.* Whether in these the induction of dogmas is sufficiently supported by previous grammatical interpretation, may perhaps be doubted. The experiment

seems never to have been fairly tried, as to how far grammatical and historical interpretation may be rendered intelligible and useful to those who know not the languages of Scripture.]

X. There is also a sort of interpretation, compounded of all these, especially of the two last, which both treats of the meaning of words with grammatical accuracy; and also deduces theological dogmas. This method, if it observe the limits we have laid down, is not only unobjectionable, but praiseworthy.<sup>b</sup> The laws of interpretation have, however, been already explained. See vol. i. p. 185, seq.

<sup>b</sup> Since the interpretation of Scripture, according to systematic and rational rules, may not always favour the prevalent and authorized system of dogmatic theology; a prudent interpreter therefore will probably abstain from all dogmatic observations; and he may properly so abstain, because dogmas are to be supposed not by single passages, but from the whole analogy of the New Testament. [Except the contempt here thrown upon the Protestant confessions and liturgies, the observation of Ammon is correct. A grammatical interpreter may very properly avoid all dogmatic conclusions; but, on the other hand, a dogmatic interpreter will produce a very imperfect work, if he neglects all reference to grammatical interpretation.]

XI. With respect to the different *forms* of interpretation, the first place must be given to *commentaries*,<sup>c</sup> in which, at first, merely alle-

gories were explained more fully and copiously; then grammatical observations were occasionally introduced, as in *Origen's* *Tomi*; and still later, the general sense of the author was explained. The nature of this form of interpretation is well described by *Jerome*; "what," says he, "is the nature of commentaries? They explain the writings of authors; they propound fully and plainly, what has been written briefly and obscurely; they lay before the reader the opinions of many interpreters: some, say they, explain the passage thus; others explain it in this sense: they support their interpretations by this and that argument. So that the careful reader having read much that is admissible, and much that is to be rejected, may be enabled to judge, which, among the proposed explanations, comes nearest to the truth." *Jerome, cont. Rufinum, l. i. p. m. 202.*

\* A Commentary is a continuous explanation of an author; proportionate attention being paid to the difficulties that occur either in words or matter. *Heyne's* interpretation of *Virgil* is an example of a good commentary. This style is very difficult, and hence the extreme rarity of good commentators. [It is in *continuity* alone that a commentary differs from a series of notes. As an example of a good commentary on the New Testament, the translator would



recommend *Koppe* on the Romans, Galatians, Thessalonians, and Ephesians.]

XII. Another form of interpretation is the *Homily*, in which either longer portions of Scripture, or single texts are explained and applied to the practical purposes of admonition, instruction, or consolation; and properly intended for the service of the Church.<sup>d</sup> The Latins called them *sermões* or *tractatus*, and the authors *tractatores*, whom we should call preachers; though, indeed, interpreters of every class were called *tractatores scripturarum*. The Glossaries also render ὁμιλία by *tractatus*, and ὁμηλικός by *tractator*. See especially *Du Cange* on the words.

<sup>d</sup> The *Homily* corresponded to our sermon or lecture, but was often filled with pious fables, and the philosophy of the age. *Origen* and *Chrysostom* are the best writers in this form.

XIII. The third form is that of *Scholia*, which were likewise called σημειώσεις, ἐκβολαὶ or ἐκλογαί, (*Eustathius* calls them παρεκβολαί) and *excerpta*, by which word *Jerome* renders σημειώσεις. He calls this form, from its brevity, *genus commaticum*, in his commentary on Matthew.

XIV. It is doubtful whether any commentaries were written before Origen or not. Some maintain the affirmative, as *Huet*, *Tillemont*, and *Buddeus*; while others hold that Origen was the first in the Christian church who introduced the writing of commentaries. I incline to the former opinion: for Origen (T. vii. in Joan.) refers to preceding commentaries, but from the terms in which they are mentioned, we may understand them to have been of the allegorical and mystical kind: Origen calls them *ecclesiastical* writers. On the other hand, it is certain that Origen gave the first example of a literal interpretation of the whole New Testament, in his *σημειώσεις*. See my *Disp. de Origene*, &c. § 26.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> See also § vi. Note.

XV. Among ancient interpreters, the first rank must be assigned to Origen, not only because he first set the example of grammatical interpretation, nor because he excelled in almost every style; having written his *Tomii* of allegorical interpretation, and his *σημειώσεις* of literal, besides his *Homilies*; but principally, because almost all the valuable observations of the ancient Greek and Latin interpreters were

borrowed from him, as I have shown in my *Disputation* above mentioned, § 27, 28, in which also, at § 25, will be found a full examination of the argument and the naming of the σημειώσεις.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>f</sup> [We have already spoken of the Hexapla (Chap. vii. § 29,) and of the σημειώσεις, and the portions of them preserved in the Philocalia, (§ 6, of this chap.)]

XVI. We have the less reason to regret the loss of the volume containing Origen's Scholia, because they were almost all embodied in the writings of succeeding commentators, as Chrysostom and others. Nor are the *Tomæ* to be despised,<sup>g</sup> especially those which were published in the original Greek by *Huet*, and more recently, with the other remains of Origen by *Delarue* (Ruæus). There are also many good things in the Latin remains, as, for example, in the Epistle to the Romans. For even among his *Allegories* are interspersed grammatical remarks of no vulgar merit; to say nothing of the fragments of his commentaries, preserved in the Philocalia and in the *Catænæ*. And his *Allegories*, although they cannot tend to the elucidation of Scripture, may yet serve to instil and to cherish pious affections. In this point of view, *Erasmus*,

though generally averse from this style, and himself a grammatical interpreter, approves of the allegorical interpreters in his *Enchiridion Mil. Christ.* cap. 2; and for this reason, perhaps, he has admitted something of allegory into his Paraphrase of the New Testament, for which he is blamed by *Clarke* in the preface to his Paraphrase.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>g</sup> Origen wrote thirty-two Tomi or Sections upon the Gospel of John. The others illustrate Joshua, Matthew, and the Epistle to the Romans. See Origenis Commentaria in S.S. ed. Huetii. Colon. 1685, and Roesler's Bibl. Patr. Eccles. II. 270, seq. The Homilies of Origen exist only in Latin. The Philocalia is an Epitome of the works of Origen, excellently edited by Spencer, Camb. 1668. [The Philocalia, as before noticed, was first published by *Tarinus* in 1618. It was re-edited with the addition of the viii. books against *Celsus*, by *Spencer*.]

<sup>h</sup> [And with justice. For, unless it be a sin of ignorance, what can be more impious than for a man to publish his own waking dreams as the meaning of God's word.]

XVII. Next to Origen we must place *Chrysostom*, whose *Homilies* upon *Matthew*, *John*, *Acts*, and the *Epistles of St. Paul*, are preserved to us. The *Homilies* on the *Epistles* were first published separately at Verona, 1529, by Bishop *Gibertus*; and the whole of them are printed both in the entire works, and in the collections of *Sylburgius*. The style in which

they are composed lies between the grammatical and the dogmatical; an ethical application being appended to a short and perspicuous interpretation of the words. The whole of antiquity can boast of nothing superior to the Homilies on the Epistles of St. Paul; and, indeed, all the Greeks, who afterwards wrote on these Epistles, did little more than repeat the lessons of Chrysostom. Of the Homilies on the historical books, those on Matthew are most worthy the attention of the student.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [The entire remaining works of Chrysostom were published, *opera et studio Bernardi de Montfaucon*, Paris 1718—38, xiii. fol.]

XVIII. *Isidore of Pelusium* was a pupil of Chrysostom. We have his five books of Epistles, edited in parts by *Ritterhuis* and *Schott*, on the interpretation of Scripture, that is, on passages of Scripture, and dogmatic questions depending upon the sense of certain passages. He is particularly solicitous to reclaim passages which had been forced into the support of absolute predestination, as in Ep. i. 56, iv. 59, &c. My own opinion is, that he has been praised beyond his merits. He generally follows his master Chrysostom; adheres principally to grammatical interpretations, and shows

a fondness for criticism. The biblical student will do well to turn over his work, and to select whatever may be found serviceable.

XIX. As far superior and more useful, we must next mention *Theodoret*, Bishop of Cyrus; whose Commentary on the Epistles of Paul, in Greek, was published by *Sirmondus*, (T. iii. Opp. Theol.); though it is written in the form rather of scholia than of a commentary. He himself, in his preface, calls it extracts from the writings of the Fathers, especially *Theod. Mopsuestenus* and *Chrysostom*. He not only briefly explains the words, but also makes frequent remarks on the punctuation, as at Rom. ix. 5; he gives short illustrations of the sense of passages; deduces arguments against heretics, especially the Arians; and clears Scripture from the corruptions of the heretics of his time. I would, therefore, recommend his Commentary as the commencement of a course of exegetical study.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>k</sup> His commentary on the minor Epistles of St. Paul is particularly worthy of attentive perusal. There is a convenient edition edited by *Schultz* and *Noesselt*. Halle 1769—1774, in 5 vols. 8vo. [Ernesti, as Morus observes, recommends the student to begin with *Theodoret*, probably because his commentary is a faithful abstract of the Homilies of *Chrysostom*, which can be purchased and read only at a great expense of money and time. The interpreters

whom we have noticed in the foregoing chapters, are commonly called the writers *medii ævi* ; having all flourished in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries.]

XX. Similar to *Theodoret* is *Theophylact*, Bishop of Bulgaria, whence he has frequently been styled *Vulgarius*, as by *Melancthon*, *Erasmus*, and *Camerarius*. We possess his commentaries, or rather scholia, upon the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. Paul ; in some manuscripts they are titled ἐπιτομᾶι. He borrowed from the same sources, and followed the same method as *Theodoret* ; except that, besides dogmatic inferences, he also introduced something of allegory and trifling. We may, indeed, suspect that these are interpolations, from the great varieties in the manuscripts, some being brief or copious in one place, and some in another ; which varieties are noted by the late *Venetian* editors. *R. Simon* in his *Hist. Crit.*, T. iv. ch. 28, comes to the same supposition, from the use of the formula καὶ ἄλλως : although this is very usual with the Greek scholiasts, particularly with *Æcumenius*. *Theophylact's* Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul is the most valuable part of his works, and is a correct compendium of *Chrysostom*. Respecting the late edition, see *Bibl. Theol.* T. v. p. 771.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [Theophylact lived in the eleventh century. The edition which Ernesti calls *Nupera* and *Veneta*, is that edited by *Finetti* and *Bongiovanni*, under the title, *Theophylacti Bulgariae Archiepiscopi, opera omnia, sive quæ hactenus edita sunt, sive quæ lucem nondum viderunt ; cum prævia diss. de ipsius Theophylacti gestis et scriptis et doctrina, Venet. 1754—63, iv. fol.*]

XXI. In the same class may be placed the Scholia of *Œcumenius* on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul. These Scholia are, however, attributed to *Œcumenius* merely on the conjecture of *Donatus* of Verona, the first editor, without any authority from the manuscripts, from which, in the opinion of *Finetti*, they rather appear to have been the work of *Theophylact*; see his Preface, T. iii. *Opp. Theophylact*. This is the work so frequently quoted under the general name of *Scholia*, by *Erasmus*, *Camerarius*, *Beza*, and other writers of that age; and is to be considered rather as a compilation from different authors by some unknown hand, than as the work of one person. The name of *Œcumenius* occurs indeed on the margin, but so do those of *John*, that is of *Chrysostom* and *Photius*. It may be concluded, that some extracts have been made from the works of Origen, as traces of his peculiar opinions may be detected; see *Erasmus* on Heb. vii. 25.<sup>m</sup>



<sup>m</sup> [Ammon in his note on this section observes, that Theophylact and Œcumenius being mere compilers from Chrysostom, are of little value : but it is this very circumstance that has rendered them valuable in the judgment of all the most eminent modern interpreters, who consider the value of time and the prolixity of Chrysostom.]

XXII. Very similar to these is the short commentary of *Johannes Damascenus* on the Epistles of St. Paul, published in the 2d vol. of the Benedictine edition of his works. *Damascenus*, in his very title, professes to offer nothing but extracts from Chrysostom.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> Damascenus, a Syrian Monk, flourished in the eighth century, and was celebrated, not so much for his ability in interpretation, as on account of the dogmatic system which he gave in his book, *περὶ ὀρθοδόξης πίστεως*. [His works were edited by *M. Lequien*, Paris 1712, 2 vols. fol.]

XXIII. In the same class with Theophylact and Œcumenius, we may place those works, which, under the name of *Catena*, a name invented by *Aquinas*, have been printed, or still remain in manuscript, and which by the Greeks were styled *ἐπιτομὰὶ ἐρμηνειῶν*.<sup>o</sup> The *Catenæ* are extracts from the commentaries and other works of the Fathers, whose names are generally affixed to their respective portions, collected and digested by *Olympiodorus*, *Nicetas*, *Proco-*

*pius of Gaza* and others: those who wish for further information respecting the *Catenæ*, may consult *Ittigius de Catenis Patrum*, or rather *Simon*, *Hist. Crit.* c. 30, or *Noesselt* in his *Dissertatio de Catenis Patrum Græcorum*: These are the only writers who have written practically on the subject; the rest, as *Wolfius*, *Fabricius*, &c., have written only historically.

° The different *Catenæ* and their editors have already been noticed, see § ix. note. Their use is threefold. 1st, They have preserved many fragments of *Aquila*, and the other versions of the *Hexapla*. 2d, They contain extracts from the works of unknown interpreters. 3d, They contain many important various readings.

XXIV. Nor must we omit to mention *Euthymius Zigabenus*, the author of the *Panoplia Dogmatica*, who wrote in the twelfth century. His commentaries on the Gospels, principally borrowed from *Chrysostom*, but also from others,<sup>p</sup> have been edited in the Latin version by *Henten* and praised by learned men; as by *Sadolet*; see his *Epistles*, p. 214, and *Fabricii*, *Bibl. Græc.* T. vii. p. 474. Manuscript copies of commentaries by him on the *Epistles* of *St. Paul* and the *Catholic Epistles* are mentioned.

<sup>p</sup> From *Basil*, *Origen*, and *Gregory Naz.* The work was undertaken at the command of *Alexius Comnenus*, and di-

rected against heresies in general. [Dr. Ammon proceeds to observe, that Euthymius, in his interpretation of the Temptation, Matt. iv. 11, is very sound, that is, very neological. Heuten's Latin edition is published in the *Bibl. Patrum*. Max. T. xix. p. 475. The Greek text from two Moscow MSS. was published by Matthæi, Leipzig, 1792.]

XXV. I have purposely postponed the mention of *Cyrril of Alexandria*, whose Commentary on John exists, though not entire, and has been edited by *Aubert* in his edition of *Cyrril's* works, T. iv., because he is less an interpreter than a dogmatist and controversialist, especially against the Arians. There are in his Commentary, however, some grammatical interpretations, in which he occasionally ventures to depart from the authority of all who preceded him. For example, he was the first to maintain that in John v. 39, ἐρευνᾶτε is to be taken not imperatively but indicatively; also that εὐλογεῖν and εὐχαριστεῖν mean the same; and the like. Occasional instances of the same style of interpretation, and of the explanation of phrases, occur in his other works. *Semler* has given extracts from this work in his *Selecta Cap. Hist. Ecc.* p. 285.

XXVI. We now proceed from the Greek to the Latin interpreters. Among these, *Jerome*<sup>a</sup> is by far the first, being the only one

well acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek languages. He illustrated by commentaries several books of the New Testament, principally following Origen; of whom he says in his *Praef. ad Quæst. in Genes.* that we would wish to have Origen's knowledge of Scripture, even though it were attended by all the unpopularity which adhered to the name of Origen. This appears from his prefaces, in which he names the authors to whom he is indebted, and especially the preface to the Epistle to the Galatians. He rather repeats the opinions of others than gives any of his own, and on this account he was blamed by some; see the Preface to his *Commentary on Jeremiah*, and *contra Ruf.* L. 1. Still he sometimes gives his own opinion in matters critical, grammatical, and dogmatical. *Luther*, as we have before mentioned, thought that *Jerome* interpreted better in his other works than in his commentaries.

<sup>1</sup> Jerome interprets better in his Epistles than in his commentaries, and the Old Testament better than the New. Yet there are some valuable observations in his commentaries. Thus, Matt. vi. 11, he renders ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον, according to the Hebrew לחם מחר that is *panem crastinum*, or *futurum*, bread for the morrow, or for the future; which is the only true sense of the phrase. His geographi-

cal notices deserve great attention, as he resided long in Palestine. See Oelrich's *Comment. de Scriptoribus Eccl. Lat. Lips.* 1791, p. 512, seq. [Relative to the New Testament we have of *Jerome's*, Versions of some books of the N. T. a Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, and some Epistles of St. Paul; and Prologues to several books, in which he discusses the questions relative to their authors and their canonical authority. In criticism Jerome may be classed with Origen, in interpretation with Chrysostom. The principal editions of his works, are the *Frankfort*, edited by *A. Tribbechovius*, 1634, xi. vols. fol. The Benedictine by *Martianay* and *Pouget*, Paris 1693—1786. The *Verona* 1734—43, and the *Venetian* 1766—72, both edited by *Dominic Valarsius*.]

XXVII. There are others who may be consulted with advantage; of whom the most ancient is *Hilary of Poitou (Pictavienses)*, a commentary by whom on Matthew is still extant, literal, but somewhat obscure, as all his writings are, and borrowed from the Greek fathers, especially from Origen. Superior to him is another *Hilary* called *the Deacon (Hilarius Diaconus)*, if indeed he be the author of the commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, which is edited with the works of *Ambrose*. Such is the opinion of *Blondel* in his *Apol. Hieron.* p. 47, 48, which has gained many followers; while the contrary opinion is maintained by *Petavius* in his *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, and by *Oudinus* in his *Comment. de Script. Eccl.*

*Blondel's* opinion seems the preferable one, and rests upon the authority of *Augustine*, who quotes, as from *Hilary*, expressions found in this commentary. The traces of Pelagianism, to which heresy Hilary was certainly opposed, are either dubious, or have been interpolated. The Paris editor of 1529 suspected this, as I judge from his admonition affixed to the Epistle to the Romans. Certainly an author who says (p. m. 490, a. 2) "that we have sinned in Adam, *in massâ Adami*," is not Pelagian; so that those passages which seem to have a Pelagian tendency, must either have been otherwise understood, or were not written by the author of the commentary. Whoever was its author, he appears to have been no great Greek scholar, from the way in which he quotes the Greek text of Rom. xii. 2; he sometimes trifles very foolishly as respecting the *Prætorium*, and *Bishops* at *Phil.* i. 1; and yet he makes many good observations, which were hardly to be expected from a man ignorant of Greek and Hebrew.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> [*Hilary of Poitou*, of the fourth century, wrote principally in the allegorical style, and therefore can be of little use to the exegetical student. His works were published by the Benedictines, Paris 1693. At Verona 1730, and in a more commodious form by F. Oberthürus 1785, 3 vols.

8vo. *Hilarius Diaconus*, from the fact of his commentary being inserted among the works of Ambrose, is commonly called *Ambrosiaster*, or the false Ambrose; and by this name he is generally referred to by *Griesbach* and other critics. The commentary is upon the Epistles of St. Paul, and the text is given not in Greek, but in Latin; and this text is not the Vulgate, but one of the numerous Latin versions then in circulation, and is consequently referred to as an independent evidence for various readings. See *Mori Acr. Acad.* II. 262.]

XXVIII. Nor must we overlook a similar short commentary on all the Epistles of St. Paul, except the Hebrews, by *Pelagius*, but erroneously attributed by some to *Jerome*, among whose works it is published. *Cassiodorus* in his *Lect. Div. cap.* 8, calls this commentary “subtilissimum;” and even orthodox divines, especially those of later times, have not scrupled frequently to quote it;<sup>s</sup> although it contains the seeds of its author’s heretical opinions respecting original sin, and other matters. See *Vossii*, *Hist. Pelag.* i. 4, and *Noris*. *Hist. Pelag.* i. 3.

<sup>s</sup> For further information respecting this commentary of Pelagius, see *Walchii Hist. Hær.* T. iv. p. 547, and *Shoenemann’s Bibliotheca hist. lit. patrum Latinorum*, T. ii. p. 433.

XXIX. Had *Augustine* possessed a know-

ledge of Greek and Hebrew, commensurate to the greatness and acuteness of his intellect, there is little doubt that he would have excelled all other commentators.† As it was, being more skilled in dialectics and rhetoric than in the languages of Scripture, he filled his commentaries with allegories and dogmatic digressions, some indeed very good; and hunts for mysteries in the signification of words, in the most trifling and idle manner. Sometimes, however, by natural sagacity, he not merely adopts the good interpretations of preceding commentators, but spontaneously discovers the truth, especially in his dogmatic books. This style of interpretation, as it needed no accuracy of learning, but depended more on logical reasoning, and used the words of the Latin version in their ordinary sense, referring every thing to the *analogy of faith*, found, in the succeeding ages, which possessed but little learning, more admirers and followers than the grammatical style of *Jerome*. The succeeding Latin interpreters, therefore, down to the time of the revival of letters, depend entirely upon Augustine; whose interpretations they laboriously collected, not only from his commentaries, but also from his other writings, especially those directed against the



Arians, Pelagians, and Manichæans. This was especially done by *Thomas Aquinas* in the *Catena Aurea*; but, upon the whole, the interpretation of the Bible in the Western Church down to the Reformation, was entirely Augustinian. For the attempts made by the celebrated Anglo-Saxons, *Bede* and *Alcuin*, to avail themselves of the Greek commentators, especially Chrysostom; and by *Nicholas de Lyra*, and *Paulus Brugensis*, his continuator, to apply a knowledge of Hebrew to the elucidation of Scripture, though by no means contemptible, were still few and of little importance in their results. And even in the age immediately following the Reformation, the best theologians, with Luther at their head, being accustomed to this style of interpretation, and not possessing what we should now reckon an accurate knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, placed a very high value upon the interpretations of Augustine. Thus *Victor Strigelius*, an elegant scholar, and to be reckoned among the best interpreters of his age, does not hesitate, in his *Loci Theologici*, p. iii. p. 29, to say, *nullus ex Patribus melior interpretis est, quam Augustinus*. None of the Fathers interprets Scripture better than Augustine. Of the commentaries of this father, that upon Galatians

is the best, as it is less allegorical and more grammatical than the others.

† [Opinion is now, however, much more divided respecting the merits of Augustine as an interpreter. *Ernesti*, it will be seen, fairly balances his merits and demerits; *Morus*, (*Acroases Acad.* II. 267,) holds that all that is good in his works is borrowed, and that his only merit was an acknowledgment of the superior learning of Jerome; while his reporter and editor *Eichstadt* gives to Augustine the merited praise of being the first, or nearly the first, who laid down Hermeneutical rules, in his *doctrina Christiana*. The principal works of Augustine, in reference to exegesis, are, *De consensu Evangelistarum*, in which he gave the first example of the useful class of books called *Harmonies*: *Doctrina Christiana* mentioned above: *Quæstiones Evangelicæ* on Matthew and Luke: and *Expositions of Romans and Galatians*. The fame of Augustine in our days, is that of a dogmatist and controversialist, rather than of a critic or interpreter.]

XXX. There is little use in speaking of the other Latin interpreters [of the middle ages], or of the glosses, of which that which goes by the name of *Ordinaria* was composed by *Raban Maurus*,<sup>u</sup> or rather by *Walafrid Strabo* from the commentaries of *Raban*; the other which is called *Interlinearis*, by *Anselm* of Canterbury.

<sup>u</sup> Raban Maurus, was first Abbot of Fulda and then

Bishop of Mentz. He was a disciple of Alcuin, and wrote a *Catena* of the Fathers on the Gospel of St. Matthew, and the Epistles of St. Paul. See Simon's *Hist. Crit.* T. iii. p. 25. [Walafrid Strabo has been kept in notice as a witness in favour of 1 John v. 7. See Porson's *Letters* 357, and *Quarterly Review*, vol. xxvi. p. 336.]

XXXI. When literature and then religion had been restored and reformed, the method of using and expounding the Scriptures was gradually improved; though all did not follow the same course, nor did the same system prevail in every age. For some interpreted grammatically, confining themselves entirely to the explanation of words; others attended to sentiments and dogmas; and others again united these two objects. At first, the first of these systems had the preference, and then the second, to the almost entire exclusion of the first; while latterly, the two methods have been generally blended in the same commentaries. Some writers have adopted a new course, and have employed themselves in writing *observations*, that is, illustrations and explanations of the most difficult passages of Scripture only.

XXXII. The first method was pursued by *Laur. Valla, J. Camerarius, Flacius, Nic. Zegerus, R. Stephen* and *Castellio*, to whom may be added, *Stunica* and *Lucas Brugensis*. Of a later age, and nearer to our time were *Pricæus, Erasmus*

*Schmid, Heinsius, L. de Dieu, Mill, Georgi, Bengel, Wetstein, Heumann, &c.*<sup>x</sup>

<sup>x</sup> To the former class we may add, *Vatablus and Drusius*, to the latter *Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Koppe, Hetzel, Schleusner, Pott*, and others. [*L. Valla*, who lived before the reformation, about the middle of the fifteenth century, employed himself in correcting the Vulgate. His *Annotationes in N. T. ex diversorum utriusque linguæ, Græcæ et Latinæ, codicum collatione*, was published under the care of Erasmus at Paris 1505, and his *De collatione N. T. Lib. t. i. cum notis J. Rivii*, at Amsterdam 1638. Flacius was author of *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ*, (edited by Suicer 1695,) the first part of which is a sort of Scripture glossary, the latter a collection of exegetical rules. The works of *Camerarius* relative to the N. T. are *Notatio figurarum Nov. Test.* Lip. 1572, and *Commentarius in Nov. Test. Nic. Zegerus*, wrote *Scholia in omnes N. T. libros*, Cologne 1553. *Pricæus*, *Commentarii in varios N. T. libros*, Lond. 1660. *E. Schmid*, *Concordantia N. T.* 1638, and a corrected edition of Beza's version 1658. The others mentioned in this chapter are well known. For a view of their works and merits the reader may consult *Simon*.]

XXXIII. Of the other class, which, without entirely neglecting verbal interpretation, still attended more especially to sentiments and dogmas, are *Luther, Melancthon* (See below, § 49.) *Hunnius, Baldwin*, and others, whose works are now nearly forgotten: and out of the Lutheran Church, *P. Martyr, Calvin, Pellicanus, Cocceius*, and his followers, *Lampe, Tur-*

*retin*, and others, whom it is unnecessary farther to enumerate.<sup>y</sup>

<sup>y</sup> Much matter connected with the subject of this section may be found in *Semler's Versuch die gemeinnützige Auslegung des N. T. zu befördern*. p. 195, seq. And Meyer's *Geschichte der Schriffterklärung*. [Morus p. 282, seq., and Horne's *Introd.* II. 745. Of *Luther's* commentaries, those on Galatians and the Psalms are most celebrated; but his greatest work is his admirable version of both Testaments into German. *Calvin* wrote commentaries on almost all the books of Scripture. Setting aside his particular views as to the decrees, his interpretations are acute and judicious, and form the most valuable portion of Poole's *Synopsis*.]

XXXIV. Of the mixed method, which treats both of words and of sentiments, but briefly, except where a longer explanation is absolutely necessary, the first specimen was given by *Erasmus*, whose *Annotations* are indeed the earliest example of good interpretation; and upon them, as a foundation, all succeeding interpreters of any merit have built their labours. It must be confessed, however, that he has fallen into many errors from his ignorance of Hebrew. With him may be joined *Victor Strigelius*, less famed, indeed, and even unknown to *R. Simon*, but in many respects superior to *Erasmus*, and more useful to students.

*Strigelius* does not, like Erasmus, comment upon the Latin version, but upon the original Greek; and applies to its illustration a knowledge not only of Greek but also of Hebrew, in a manner much superior to Erasmus. Sometimes he treats of doctrines, and is in both departments more consistent and equable than Erasmus, who indulges in digressions, and sometimes in declamations. In one point he is inferior, namely, in his total omission of *Criticism*; whether he did this purposely or not, I am unable to say. His work, under the name of *Hypomnemata*, was published at Leipzig, 1565.

XXXV. Others soon followed; of whom the chief was *Beza*, who made good use of the aids to interpretation, which were accessible at that time, namely, of manuscripts of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, of the Septuagint version, &c. Certainly, in all that relates to the explanation of words and phrases, he had no equal till *Grotius* appeared; who in such matters stands far above all other commentators; and is the first who, furnished with the requisites of talent and learning, showed, by examples, the proper method of applying the Septuagint, as well as other Jewish and eastern writings, to the interpretation of the

New Testament. So that *Turretin* rightly judges him to be the first of commentators, as far as relates to the phraseology of Scripture; in the explanation of the doctrine he indulges his own opinions, and often wanders from the truth.<sup>z</sup>

[<sup>z</sup> *Dr. Ammon* here observes, that *Grotius* has been unreasonably abused by *Calovius*, and charged with Arianism, Socinianism, and Atheism. He recommends his interpretations to younger students, “postquam grammaticas difficultates superaverunt:” but the grammatical difficulties, in *Ernesti*’s sense of the word *grammatical*, are the very difficulties which *Grotius* has been most successful in removing. He instances *Grotius*’ remarks on *John vi. 17*, as to the true situation of *Bethsaida*, and refers to *Herder*’s *Briefe*, &c. *Letters on Theology*, T. ii. p. 357, seq.]

XXXVI. Succeeding commentators, even those who blame *Grotius*, have borrowed from him, especially in the grammatical portion of their work, as the English commentators, *Whitby* and *Hammond*,<sup>a</sup> and also *Le Clerc*, *Lenfant* and *Beausobre*, *Calmet*, and many others who have written on single books or passages. So that *Grotius* may fairly be reckoned as standing at the head of modern interpreters.

<sup>a</sup> *Whitby*, in his *Examen Criticum*, and *Hammond* in his observations on the New Testament, which being rendered into Latin by *Leclerc*, were reprinted at Frankfort 1714.

[The *Examen Criticum*, as its name imports, is entirely critical, and not in any degree grammatical. Ernesti refers not to it, but to the paraphrase and commentary, the most popular of English exegetical works. Ammon's error in this place is noticed by *Eichstädt* on *Morus*, II. p. 303. The reader of Ernesti may have some difficulty in recognizing *Lenfant* and *Beausobre* under the names of *Infans* and *Bellosobrius*.]

XXXVII. Some, instead of writing continuous commentaries, in which it must be necessary to repeat much that had been said before, have employed themselves upon the illustration of words or phrases in some or in all of the books of Scripture. Of these writers some are merely grammatical; and may be divided into,—1st, those who have used only the Greek writers, such are *Lamb. Bos*, *Elsner*, *Albertus*, *Raphelius*, and *Kypke*;<sup>b</sup>—2d, those who have drawn their illustrations principally from Oriental sources, as the two *Capelli*, *Drusius* in his *Præterita*, *Cameron*, *Lightfoot*, and *Schoetgen*;—3d, those who have used the Greek version of the Old Testament as *Keuchen*.

<sup>b</sup> To these may be added *Valckenaer's* adnotationes, &c. in loca quædam N. T. 1786, printed at the end of *Valckenaer* and *Hemsterhuis* Orationes, and *Klosii* Examen of the same work 1789. *J. G. F. Hezel* has attempted to digest into



one work the observations of former writers ; but hitherto the work has not succeeded. [In the way of illustrations, *L. Bos* wrote, *Exercitationes Philologicæ*, &c. Franequer 1713. *Elsner*, *observationes sacra* in N. T. libros Traj. ad Rh. 1720, 28. *Albertus*, *Obs. philologicæ* in sacros N. T. libros Lugd. Bat. 1728. *Raphelius*, *Adnotationes philologicæ* in N. T. ex Xenophonte collectæ, Hamb. 1709, ex Polybio et Arriano 1714 ; ex Herodoto 1731. *Kypke*, a much inferior writer to those just mentioned, wrote, *Obs. Sacræ* in N. T. libros 1755. With *Raphelius*, as having used only one Greek author at a time, may be classed *C. F. Munthius*, *obs. philologicæ*, &c. ex *Diodoro Siculo* collectæ, 1755. *Ottius and Krebsius*, who have drawn their observations from *Josephus*. *Loesner and Kühn* from *Philo Judæus*. See chap viii. § 8, 9, 10. For notices of the *Capelli*, &c. see ch. viii. § 3. *Keuchen's* observations are to be found in his *Annotata* in N. T. 1689, re-edited by *Albertus* 1755.]

XXXVIII. Some have selected the more difficult passages out of all the books of Scripture, and illustrated them from any source which afforded aid ; with occasional attention to the doctrine, so as to clear it from the misrepresentations of heretical interpreters : such are *Tarnovius*, *Hackspann*, *Spanheim*, *Werenfels*, *Deyling*, *Æder*,<sup>c</sup> and others.

<sup>c</sup> *Tarnovius* in *Exercitationibus Biblicis*. *Harkspann*, *Miscellanea* in N. T. *Werenfels* observations in N. T. *Deyling*, *observationes*, &c. 3 vols. 1720—36. *Oeder*, *observationes* in N. T. To these may be added the works of *Morus*, *Seiler*, *Noesselt*, *Knapp*, *Reinhard*, [*Knatchbull*.]

XXXIX. Another class of writers have strung together whatever has been said on passages of Scripture by preceding interpreters. Of this class are *Walæus*, author of Annotations on New Testament, of little merit; *Poli Synopsis*, abridged from the *Critici Sacri*, and *J. C. Wolfii curæ Philol. and Crit.*,<sup>d</sup> who, however, sometimes gives his own opinion also. The last mentioned work is more valuable and copious than the others, and yet not always accurate. From this a new work has been formed, which has many select notes from the English critics: and which, first published in French, has now been translated into German, and published with the notes of the learned *Bruker* in 8 vols, 4to.

<sup>d</sup> *Walæus* published the Gospels and Acts, with Scholia and some annotations of his own. *Poli Synopsis* is an abridgement of the *Critici Sacri* [whom *Ernesti* calls the English critics.] *Wolfius' Curæ* is fuller of the titles of books than of interpretation; yet he subjoins the arguments of the books to which he refers. [The translator has never seen the last work referred to by *Ernesti*. *Noesselt* considers it as founded not on *Wolfius* but on the *Synopsis*, and as in fact a German translation of that work: with additional notes on the Old Testament by *Teller*, *S. J. Baumgarten*, and *Ditelman*, and on the New Testament by *Bruker*, the whole occupying 19 vols.]

XL. Finally, collections of entire commen-

taries have been formed: such are the *Biblia magna* and *maxima*, published at Paris in the seventeenth century; in which the most prolix and useless commentaries, that of *Menchius*, for instance, are inserted. Superior to this is the collection which, under the name of *Critici Anglicani* was compiled by *Pearson*, printed at London in seven volumes, and reprinted at Frankfort, with two additional volumes. Even in this some commentaries are admitted which it would have been better to reject, as those of *Clarius* and some others.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> [The *Biblia Magna* by *John de la Haye* published at Paris 1643, in five vols. fol. : and the *Maxima* by the same editor 1660, in nineteen folios. See *Morus*, II. p. 335, and *Le Long*, *Bibl. Sac.* iv. 396. The next work mentioned by *Ernesti*, was published not under the name of *Critici Anglicani*, but of *Critici Sacri*. It was reprinted, with additions, at Amsterdam in nine vols. 1798. The Frankfort edition by *Gürtler* appeared in 1696, and two supplementary vols. in 1700: these last contain many useful and rare tracts on philology and biblical antiquities.]

XLI. But enough has now been said of interpreters, and the different classes into which they may be divided: it remains that I should offer the student some advice as to the proper use to be made of their works. And this use is twofold,—the one properly relating to the

method of rightly interpreting, which, in my opinion, is the most important; the other to the interpretation of single words and sentences.

XLII. The student of theology ought, in the first place, to fix upon some one, or, at most, two of the most celebrated interpreters of Scripture, and those of the class which we have before described as grammatical; and these are to be preferred, because the true sense of the subject must be derived from the true signification of words. He ought, by the repeated and careful perusal of this interpreter, to form himself by degrees to his manner of reasoning: and while he is thus occupied, he ought only occasionally, or of necessity, to consult other commentators. Who those are that ought to be consulted, may be collected from the sections immediately preceding. Of the commentaries of *Grotius* I would, in this point of view, especially recommend that upon Matthew as the most carefully written.<sup>f</sup>

[<sup>f</sup> Students in our island must usually follow the guidance of their authorized instructors, and *Whitby*, *Macknight*, *Campbell*, *Elsley* and *Slade*, will in general be the text books to which they will be directed. Afterwards they may study more minute and accurate commentators, as *Tittman* on *John*, *Kuinoel* on the *Gospels and Acts*, *Rosenmüller's*

*Scholia*, *Koppe* on *Romans* and *Galatians*, *Tholuck* on *Romans*, &c. Perhaps for a book of fundamental study *Rosenmüller* may be recommended in preference to any other.]

XLIII. With respect to other commentators, it will be necessary that the student should know to which class each belongs; whether he explains words or doctrines; what sources of illustration he has employed; and how he has employed them. This knowledge will enable him to turn at once to that work where he is most likely to find any particular difficulty solved, and will save him the trouble of seeking in vain through large books for that which he could have no good reason to suppose they would contain. If he has not time and means to acquire this knowledge by an examination of the books themselves, I would advise him to study the *Histoire Critique du N. T.*, by *R. Simon*; who, though he may sometimes err, has explained the characters and merits of the interpreters, with more accuracy and judgment than any author with whose works I am acquainted. Thus, while he justly blames the sectarian fury of the Jesuit *Maldonatus*, he gives him credit for his Hebrew learning, and for his diligent collection of illustrations from the Fathers.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>g</sup> [Ammon here sneers at the notion of any value being set upon the commentaries of Maldonatus, and recommends in preference those of *Grotius*, *Rosenmüller*, *Paulus*, and *Kuinoel*. But the question now is not respecting a commentary for fundamental use, but for occasional consultation. Thus we may recommend *Lightfoot* to be consulted, in any difficulties respecting Jewish ceremonies, customs, or opinions, without being understood to praise him as a commentator generally.]

XLIV. The student will find it a useful plan to note the difficulties in the several books of Scripture, respecting which the opinions of commentators are divided, those in which there is any remarkable diversity of readings, and those respecting which we cannot arrive at any satisfactory conclusion. When any commentary comes in our way, it will then be easy to turn to these passages, and see whether it contains anything new, useful or satisfactory upon them.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> As for example, Matt. v. 3, Mark ix. 49, Acts xxvii. 12, Gal. iii. 20, Col. i. 15.

XLV. He who wishes to become a good interpreter ought also to peruse entire commentaries, one, of course, at a time. For, not to mention that useful remarks and information were often inserted by those who are fond of shewing their learning, in places where we

should little expect to find them, we may thus be often taught the true sense of passages, respecting whose meaning we entertained no doubt; having taken up in our early years, and ever since retained a false notion of them, derived from the ordinary books of early religious instruction.<sup>i</sup>

<sup>i</sup> When the student is sufficiently acquainted with Greek grammar, let him read the New Testament with the aid of a good lexicon. Let him then repeat the perusal with a good version, and then take some one good commentary, as that of *Grotius* or *Koppe*: after having well digested this, let him consult others carefully and judiciously, not neglecting at the same time the proper use of other critical aids.

XLVI. I would advise the student to study the Greek commentators above mentioned, beginning with Chrysostom, and to compare them with one another. They are neither very numerous nor so long, as to cost much labour or time to those who have made some advances in studies of this kind. And the course proposed has this advantage, among many others, that whereas, the Latin commentators, and those of our own country since the reformation, have all formed their interpretations, either upon the Latin or the vernacular version, and that in cases where they

have manifestly departed from the Greek original, and have erred, either by translating etymologically, or by following the Latin or vernacular usages, the student will thus learn to discover the origin of these errors, and to understand the word of God more correctly; and will, at the same time, be undeceived as to his supposition, that the vulgar interpretation, as being always ancient, must necessarily be orthodox. Of the errors here alluded to, some examples have already been given, to which we may add the explanations that have been given of ἐπιλαμβάνεται, in Heb. ii. 16. Some recent interpreters have rendered this, *he brings assistance to, he protects*, and have, by so doing, almost incurred the suspicion of heresy, from the supposed novelty of their interpretation. Whereas, if we consult the Greek commentators, we shall find that this was the ancient interpretation of the whole Greek church; and that our vulgar reading is a novelty, borrowed from the Latin interpreters, who, taking the etymological rendering of the Vulgate, *assumit*, in its Latin sense, have supposed it to refer to the incarnation. Many such instances might be adduced, of which he who considers himself qualified to



interpret Scripture ought not to be ignorant.<sup>k</sup>

[<sup>k</sup> All modern interpreters of any scholarship understand the text as Ernesti does ; and the rendering, “ he took not on him the nature,” is one of the greatest errors in our authorized version. *Mr. Stuart*, ad loc. says, the Christian Fathers have applied it to the assumption of an angelic nature : but he must mean to limit this assertion to the Latin Fathers alone ; whose interpretations have had much more influence in dogmatic theology than those of the Greek Fathers, being in fact much more accessible and intelligible to the ordinary theologian.]

XLVII. In reading commentaries, either ancient or modern, the student must be careful, whenever he meets with a good satisfactory interpretation, to examine by what process the interpreter arrived at it ; and especially ought he to do this, when the passage is remarkable for its importance or its difficulty. On the other hand, when he meets with interpretations palpably false or absurd, he ought to examine the principles and course of reasoning which have conducted the interpreter into error ; and thus, his mind will be disciplined by practice to the investigation of truth, and the avoiding of error.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thus in Col. i. 16, interpreters would not have referred *θρόνους*, &c. to political governors, had they been aware

of the Jewish doctrine respecting the various ranks of angels.

XLVIII. In choosing among different classes of interpreters, we ought to bestow but little of our time upon those who have brought nothing but classical Greek literature to the illustration of the New Testament; for little advantage can reasonably be expected from them. Even in the annotations of *Elsner*, which some are disposed to place in the very first rank, I do not remember to have met with more than ten observations of real practical value: the rest being more suited to enrich a Greek lexicon than to illustrate or explain the New Testament. Those interpreters are of more use who explain what is ambiguous or obscure from Hebrew literature, and the Greek version of the Old Testament; who support the true reading, and throw light upon the statements and doctrine of the sacred books.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> [The words of Ernesti here rendered *statements and doctrine*, are *res et sententias*. The translator has throughout experienced much difficulty in determining the sense affixed by Ernesti to the very indeterminate word *res*; here he understands it to mean statements of fact, allusions to material things, customs and habits. For examples of this sort of illustration, see chap. viii. § 4, note m. and generally the writings of *Lightfoot* and *Schoetgen*.]

XLIX. Nor are these commentaries entirely to be neglected, which treat principally of dogmas ; not because they afford much aid in the interpretation of Scripture, but because they may increase our knowledge of doctrines, which are often more fully and carefully discussed in commentaries, than in treatises professedly dogmatic. And they may contain good interpretations even of a grammatical character, such as sometimes occur in the commentaries of Melancthon. In these the author occasionally intimates that the sense may be better cleared up by a grammatical explanation, founded on the usages of the Greek and Hebrew languages, than by scholastic subtleties. The student may refer to his remarks on 1 Cor. xv. p. 299, where there is a fine example of explanation from the Hebrew ; and to Coloss. iii. 14, where he gives a good explanation of the words *first-born* and *thrones*.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> It cannot, however, be denied that *Melancthon* in his commentary writes more frequently as a theologian than as a grammarian ; see especially his remarks upon *original sin* in his commentary on Rom. v.

L. Those who are to expound the Scripture from the pulpit or in lecture rooms, may also, from such commentaries, learn how to

manage doctrinal questions, either in a popular or in a scholastic manner.<sup>o</sup> For, though in the theological school we must prefer an interpreter who attends principally to the true and exact meaning of the words of Scripture, and treats only briefly of such facts and doctrines as occur; yet sometimes it may be proper to enter more fully into the examination of points of peculiar difficulty, and peculiar importance. Of this style there cannot be found a better example than *Turretin's* Exercitations on the Epistle to the Romans, though a posthumous publication. I would also recommend *Melancthon's* Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians, which is not too prolix, and was a peculiar favourite with Luther.<sup>p</sup>

<sup>o</sup> He who proposes to become a teacher of religion, must recollect that in pulpit discourses, the interpretation of Scripture ought not to be restricted within hermeneutical rules, but rather accommodated to purposes of edification; of which accommodation examples may be found in the best pulpit orators. [It appears to the translator, that if hermeneutical rules are not to guide the preacher, it is scarcely worth his while to study them; and that he who publicly attaches a meaning to a text which he does not believe to be its meaning, is a wicked impostor. Ammon in his notes frequently hints at these pious frauds, and even Ernesti sometimes appears to think that there ought to be an esoteric and exoteric interpretation of Scripture. From the

commentaries mentioned in the text, if they be good of their kind, we may learn how to draw practical inferences from statements of doctrine, or from narratives of fact; and this is an important part of the office of a preacher.]

[P Ammon introduces a long note in this place, the purport of which is to shew the necessity of attending to the *historico-dogmatic* interpretation of Scripture. But as his views on this subject are highly objectionable, and as an examination and refutation of them would take up much more room than can here be afforded, the translator omits it. The works on the subject to which he refers are, *Storr's* dissertation, *De sensu historico*, Tübingen 1778, *Keil's* *Dissertatio de Interpretatione Historicâ*, Lips. 1788, *Semler's* *Versuch die gemeinnützige Auslegung des N. T. zu befördern*, p. 237, seq. and *Bretschneider's* *Historisch-dogmatische Auslegung des N. T.* Lips. 1806.]

## CHAPTER X.

ON THE USE OF GENERAL INFORMATION.<sup>9</sup>

I. SINCE the object of interpretation is the examination and explanation of words by grammatical principles, and as the sense thus discovered is the true and only proper sense; it follows that a knowledge of *grammar* must be most essentially useful in the interpretation of the New Testament.

<sup>9</sup> [The Latin is, *de usu disciplinarum*. This chapter in fact contains references to all such branches of knowledge, tending to make an accomplished interpreter, as could not conveniently be arranged under any of the preceding heads.]

II. Without this knowledge the true sense of words, especially in the dead languages, can never be discovered or established with certainty; nor can false interpretations, if they be consistent with reason and the analogy of

faith, be otherwise refuted than by an appeal to grammatical principles.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> [The reader will observe that Ernesti gives a wide signification to the word grammar, and means by it, the whole body of laws by which the use of words is regulated. Thus to confound the use of *homo* and *vir*, and to consider them as convertible terms, would shew an ignorance of grammar.]

III. It is therefore highly dangerous for any one to attempt the interpretation of Scripture, who is not furnished with an accurate grammatical knowledge of the languages in which it is written; for he wants the only check by which the license of supposing meanings, and forcing the language of Scripture, can be restrained; and thus wanders into uncertainty and insecurity.

IV. The learned theologians, *Luther*, *Melancthon*, and others, being well aware of this, have repeatedly recommended the study of grammar to the young theologian, and have warned him of the dangers resulting from an ignorance or neglect of grammar. Those who have neglected these admonitions have suffered for their rashness; examples of which may be found in *Sixt. Amama's Antibarb. Bibl.* p. 122, and *Melancthon's Consilia et Judicia Theol.* p. 578.

V. For though Luther, in his Commentary on Genesis, says, “that though grammar is indeed necessary and true, still it ought not to govern things, but rather to subserve them;” he does not mean by this to express the opinion erroneously attributed to him by *Simon* in his *Hist. Crit.* T. i. p. 433, that is, to authorise the interpreter to force the words of Scripture into conformity with his own opinions, in spite of all grammatical rules; for had he thought thus, he would not have called grammar necessary. What he means to say is, that the words of a passage are not to be so pressed to the grammatical sense, as to be put in opposition with truths otherwise known with certainty and precision; but rather that the strict rules of grammar are to be so tempered in interpreting, as that the consistency of Scripture may be preserved. We have before shown that this ought to be done, and in what manner; nor does this hold good in Scripture only, but is equally necessary in profane literature.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> It appears then that apparent contradictions in Scripture are to be reconciled upon general principles, and this cannot be done without the use of reason and philosophy. [Ammon says, these difficulties are to be referred *ad sententias universas*, and he may be understood to mean the



*αναλογία πίστεως.* At any rate, it is to this that Ernesti refers; see *Bibl. Cab. Ernesti's Inst.* I. p. 127—130: there also it will be seen that Ammon uses similar language, with the additional difficulty of a misprint. As an example, when God is represented as using corporeal members, we conclude from general principles, that is from the analogy of faith, that such expressions are to be understood figuratively, because God is a Spirit.]

VI. Since there are two divisions of grammar, the one historical, the other technical; we must here be understood to speak of the technical, which, indeed, is alone properly grammar. The parts of technical grammar which apply to interpretation are *etymology*, taken in its widest sense, or *analogy*, which is employed upon single words; and *syntax*, which regulates the combination of words in a sentence.

VII. As both of these are of great importance in enabling us either to write or to understand writings correctly, it is clear that we ought to possess such a knowledge of both, as may qualify us for the work of interpretation; and, at the same time, enable us to judge of the state of the text, and the choice of readings, for which task we must be totally unfit, unless we are well acquainted with grammar.

VIII. An interpreter, therefore, ought, in the first place, to be acquainted with the differ-

ences and powers of words, in so far as they depend upon their grammatical form; for as to those which depend merely upon the usage of language, they are matter of observation, and have been treated of elsewhere. The differences here to be considered are those which arise from derivation, composition, inflexion, and accents; of all which things certain rules may be found in treatises of grammar, or may be deduced from practice, though, in the two former cases, with some exceptions. Nor ought we less carefully to study the force and difference of forms in those words which grammarians have styled emphatically *verba*, *verbs*; together with the exceptions to each rule, either as to tenses or moods, which have been introduced by usage. Interpreters who have not acquired an accurate knowledge of these rules, and have not rendered their knowledge available by the habit of applying it, are liable to fall into great and serious blunders; and it is wonderful how many instances of such blunders are to be met with; whereas, a little attention to grammar often clears away the difficulty, and enables us to interpret rightly, and to refute the errors of others.<sup>t</sup>

[<sup>t</sup> The note of Ammon on this section relates to the sig-

nification of ἀλλὰ in Matt. xi. 8, which has nothing to do with the subject treated of by Ernesti: and all the argument refers to the usage not to the grammatical rules of the language. An example, perhaps more in point, may be taken from Rom. viii. 30, which in our version is rendered thus; “Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified them he also glorified.” Now, all these verbs being in the first aorist, are not necessarily expressive of *past* time, but are completely *indefinite*, and mark habitual, systematic action. The text, therefore, would have been better rendered, “whom he predestinates, them he also calls,” &c. The grammatical differences according to Ernesti are, “*derivationis compositionis que modo, scriptura et accentibus.*” What he means by *scriptura* the translator does not know; and has inserted *inflexion*, as believing it to be the most important of grammatical differences.]

IX. But the knowledge of *syntax* is still more necessary, not only that we may ascertain the order in which the words are to be taken, which is often of great importance to the right understanding of the passage; but also, that we may know the proper construction of every word and particle separately, so as to be able to judge whether the expression be pure Greek or not, and this, as we have before shown, is a matter of considerable importance; and finally, that we may know the force and sense of each particular construction from the true spirit of the language. For he who, being ignorant of these matters, pro-

ceeds to translate word for word from one language into another, must necessarily fall into great and frequent errors, from the dissimilarity of the idioms. The writings of the commentators are full of mistakes of this class; nor can any one, without the knowledge here required, detect and confute the errors of interpreters and critics.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>u</sup> We may produce as an instance the mistakes and difficulties of interpreters at Philip. i. 22, who fail to connect the protasis, εἰ δὲ, with its apodosis καὶ τί. The passage ought to be resolved thus, ἀλλ' εἰ (*quamvis*, Viger. ed. Zeunii, p. 492,) καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦτόν μοι ἔχει καρπὸν ἔργου, καὶ (*tamen*) τί εἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω. [The translator must confess that Ammon's resolution does not enlighten him as to the meaning of this passage. Proofs are scarcely required to shew that in order to translate a Greek book, we must know the rules of Greek syntax; but we may take one from John i. 1, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Why do we render this, *and the word was God*, rather than, *God was the word*? Because it is a rule of Greek syntax, that when a subject and predicate are joined together by the substantive verb, the subject has the article, and the predicate has it not.]

X. With grammar and syntax we may also class rules respecting the figures of speech, such as ellipsis, pleonasm, &c. Respecting these, interpreters often get into difficulties, and force the sense of Scripture, when they

are not acquainted accurately with their force and meaning, as determined by the usage of language. Nor, with respect to some of these, ought the rules of rhetoric to be neglected, if we would wish to know their true force, to avoid a fruitless search after emphasis, and unfounded suspicions of the purity of expression. Thus, in rhetoric, pleonasm serves both to heighten and adorn the sense; and yet this is not always its use, for we find it sometimes in the most ancient simplicity of language, as in the Hebrew, from whence it has been introduced into the new Testament. From whatever cause it arose, it has been admitted into the usage of language, and employed by those who wrote with elegance; we must not, therefore, when we meet with a pleonasm, immediately suspect that there is an error in the expression, nor must we force upon it a meaning either of intensity or ornament. And the same may be said of synonymy and tautology, of which many examples, under the head *pleonasm*, have been collected by *Glassius*, in his *Phil. Sac. lib. iv. tr. ii. obs. 15*. He that is ignorant of these rules cannot be competent to explain or defend passages in which such figures occur.<sup>x</sup>

\* Consult rather *Dathe's* edition of the Phil. Sac. and *Schaeffer's* edition of *Bos* on ellipsis. [For remarks on the interpretation of tropes and emphasis, see also *Ernesti's* Inst. i. p. 135, Bibl. Cab.]

XI. The interpreter ought, also, to be acquainted with what we may call faults of expression, lest he be led astray in questions relating to the existence of solecisms and barbarisms in the New Testament.<sup>†</sup> Some, we know, in defiance of all grammatical rules, deny that any thing deserving these names is to be found in the sacred books, imagining that they are thus supporting the dignity of Scripture; while others rush into the opposite extreme, and assert their existence in a way calculated to throw contempt upon the inspired writers. These forms are in reality faulty only when they are admitted through ignorance or carelessness, and without any sufficient cause; and that they have not thus been admitted by the writers of the New Testament, appears from what has been said respecting their Hebraisms, (vol. i. p. 99, seq.)

<sup>†</sup> Such questions occur more frequently in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, than of any other book. See *Marsh's Michaelis*, vol. iv. p. 529, seq.

XII. But the highest use of grammar is in

*criticism*; though this depends not merely upon grammatical rules, but also upon many other branches of knowledge. The object of criticism is to distinguish between genuine and spurious readings, to correct what is erroneous, and to do this upon fixed and rational principles.<sup>z</sup>

<sup>z</sup> We have a wide field for the exercise of this science in questions respecting the authenticity of the first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, of 1 John v. 7, Rom. ix. 5, John viii. 1—12; in discussions respecting the language in which Matthew wrote; the Gospel to the Hebrews; the original of the Gospels, &c. [Ammon extends the province of criticism further than is intended by Ernesti in the text, who refers to the genuineness of words and clauses, not to the authenticity of whole books or chapters. The determination of such questions is rather historical than grammatical.]

XIII. The necessity of critical knowledge in interpretation is clear from this, that without it there is frequently no room for interpretation. For it is in vain that we attempt to interpret that which is spurious or corrupt; and strange interpretations often arise from the attempt. Quintilian, therefore, (i. 4,) says very truly, that the first point in interpretation is to determine whether the passage be genuine, and to correct its corruptions if it be corrupt: *Enarrationem*, says he, *præcedat emendata lectio*.

XIV. Nor does the necessity appear less from this consideration, that he who is destitute of this knowledge is not only unable to understand or estimate critical discussions upon portions of Scripture, to distinguish between true and false readings, and to perceive the worthlessness of false and empty conjectures; but also frequently brings himself into inextricable difficulties, and falls into ridiculous and shameful blunders, of which we might produce numerous examples. How contrary, for example, to a right use of the sacred books, is the conduct of those who, being totally ignorant of criticism, receive, as genuine portions of Scripture, those passages or words which Erasmus and Beza have improperly introduced into the text upon their own judgment, or from the Latin version; and even those errors of the press which have been admitted into and repeated by the minor editions: and who exclaim against any attempts to correct such passages, as if they were insults offered to the declarations of the Holy Spirit.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> From Griesbach's Preface II. p. xi. seq. we may learn that these foolish objections to the application of criticism have not yet entirely ceased.

XV. *Criticism* has always been highly es-



teemed by all truly learned theologians; and interpreters skilled in it have always been reckoned in the first class of theologians. Such were *Origen*, whose merits have been mentioned above, *Gregory of Nazianzum*, *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, *Jerome*, and others, whom *H. Valesius* enumerates in his book *de Critica*, i. 23, seq. *Augustine* indeed gives, as his opinion, “that the talent of those who seek to understand Scripture, ought, in the first place, to be exercised upon the correction of the text,” &c. To the same purpose the reader may consult *Casaubon’s* Exerc. ad C. Baronii, Proleg. i. n. 28, xvi. n. 110, and *Heinsius’* Exercit. in N. T. p. 4.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> [The passage from *Augustine* ends with these additional words, “*et emendatis non emendati cedant.*” The translator supposes *codices* to be understood, and omits the clause as a mere truism.]

XVI. Nor has that  $\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$  alone been tolerated and employed, which corrects one copy on the authority of other copies; but conjectural emendations also, when they are supported by talent and learning, and rest upon the authority of analogy: See *Isidore of Pelusium*, iv. 112, 113, and *Casaubon’s* Exercit. *Glassius* also, in his *Phil. Sac.* i. tr. ii. p. 168,

admits of such criticism, by approving of a conjectural emendation by *Beza*, which, however, ought not to have been approved. *Wetstein*, in his *Proleg.* p. 170, mentions nearly two hundred such conjectural emendations, and the number might be considerably increased.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> The number has been increased by *Bowyer's* conjectures on the N. T. edited in Germany by *Schultz* 1774. [London 1772. It is much easier to produce passages which have been corrupted by conjectural emendation, than instances where conjecture alone, without the aid of manuscripts, versions, or Fathers, has certainly, or even with probability, restored the genuine reading. See *Marsh's Michaelis*, I. 304, seq.]

XVII. He who has it at heart to become an interpreter of the sacred books, ought therefore to make himself acquainted with the true genius and nature of criticism. And this he must learn, neither solely nor even principally, from books which profess to treat of it systematically, for thus he may easily be deceived; but from practice, from the teaching of modest and accurate critics, and from reading their printed words. Of such critics we may mention *Casaubon*, *Gronovius*, *Grævius*, *Burmann*, *Perizonius*, and others. The safest course is to begin with the application of cri-

ticism to profane literature, on which it has hitherto been employed with most diligence and success, and in relation to which, mistakes will be of less importance. It is rare for one who has not previously exercised himself in such studies, to make any great advances in the criticism of Scripture; and he who attempts the criticism of Scripture, ignorant, or possessing but a superficial knowledge of Greek and Latin literature, will most assuredly lose his labour.

XVIII. He who has attained these previous requisites, must next ascertain that he is well acquainted with the critical apparatus, and its use in judging of readings according to fixed rules; that is to say, he must be acquainted both with the sources whence readings are derived, and the principles according to which their value is to be estimated. In this matter he may use the observations made in chapters iii. iv. v.

XIX. But he must depend rather upon practice and experience, than upon the mere knowledge of rules. Let him attend therefore the lectures of interpreters who do not altogether neglect criticism, and who have proved themselves masters of the application of critical rules; or let him read what men, eminent in this science, as *Mill*, *Bengel*, *Michaelis*, and

others, whose number is not great,<sup>d</sup> have written upon remarkable passages; and comparing their observations with the before mentioned rules, he will gradually learn to form an accurate critical judgment.

<sup>d</sup> Such are *Griesbach*, *Noessell*, *Morus*, *Doederlein*, *Eichhorn*.

XX. If, after having advanced so far, he wishes to attempt something himself, let him be careful not hastily to approve or admit any reading without the authority of *manuscripts*; and, at the same time, not to despise the *conjectures* of learned men, whereby difficult and perplexed passages are rendered perspicuous, consistent with the subject, the context, and the style of the author; and are not materially altered from the Vulgate reading, that is to say, from the reading found in the great majority of manuscript and printed copies. Such are the conjecture of *Camerarius* on John xix. 29, who proposes to read for ἰσσωπῶ which has puzzled all the critics, ἰσσωπῶ̃ or ἰσσω̃ πῶ, and a few others, which I have met with.<sup>e</sup> These, however, ought rather to be proposed in notes, commentaries, and books of observations, than to be inserted in the text.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>e</sup> As for example *ἕξουσίαν* [for *ἕξουσίαν*] in 1 Cor. xi. 10, and *σινείσθαι* [for *σαινέσθαι*] in 1 Thess. iii. 3, but these conjectures of *Camerarius*, *Godfrey*, and *Reiske*, are merely ingenious guesses. [Of these conjectures the too former are noticed by *Griesbach*; the latter is of no importance, and removes no difficulty by substituting a rare for a common word. *Ἐξουσία* is supposed to be from the Latin *exuvia*, a veil: an unknown word, in a sense which its plural *exuviæ* does not possess. Instead of *σινείσθαι* it would have been more to the purpose to mention *σαλευίσθαι* a conjecture of *Beza* and *Bentley*.]

<sup>f</sup> Unless they are confirmed by the authority of manuscripts, as *ἀπολίσαι*, Matt. x. 42, on which, see *Wetstein*.

XXI. As we must be very scrupulous in making any alterations upon the text which we possess; so, on the other hand, we must not superstitiously pin our faith to any particular edition, as if every letter and word of it were inspired, and as if neither the authority of manuscripts nor of reason, could justify our departing from it in any iota. We must be equally careful not to attribute to the Holy Spirit that which he never dictated, and not to reject as spurious that which really proceeds from Him.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>g</sup> [It is clear that the higher the notion of *inspiration* is carried, the more imperatively necessary is an accurate adjustment of the text. If we hold only a substantial, not a verbal inspiration, the various readings, where they do not affect the sense in any material point, are of little import-

ance. It is a material point that we should know the grounds of justification : but it is not material that we should know whether a certain town, where Jesus was, bore the name of *Bethania* or *Bethabara*. But as in many cases it may be difficult, or impossible, to draw the line between material and unimportant propositions, it is consequently our duty to ascertain as closely as possible the true reading in every case.]

XXII. They abuse criticism, and are unworthy of the name of critics, who are so prone to conjecture, that as soon as they meet with a passage which they do not understand, they apply themselves to an emendation of the text. From such a practice, reason, and the example of rash and empty conjectures, ought to deter the biblical student. For it is irrational to conclude, that a passage is corrupt, merely because a reader, however well informed, does not immediately understand it, or because he cannot reconcile it with the ordinary rules of language ; and no man ought to think so highly of himself, as to suppose in such cases that nothing has escaped his notice. And since almost all such conjectures have been found frivolous and insufficient, it is the part of a modest and cautious critic, not to be precipitate in forming his judgment, and rather to confess his ignorance than to hurry upon cor-

rection; and this is the practice of good critics even with respect to profane literature.

XXIII. We must, therefore, on every opportunity, oppose the impious arrogance and ignorance of those who, in order to support their own theological opinions, venture to admit into the text of Scripture not only readings which are supported by a few manuscripts of doubtful authority, but even their own unsupported imaginations. It is quite clear that the Socinians and their favourers have sinned in both these ways; in the former *Wetstein* has too often erred.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> [Ammon here notices Barhdt as erring in this way. As an instance of rash Socinian correction we may notice that of *Crellius* on John i. 1, of  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  for  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , and that of *Schichtingius* on Rom. ix. 5, of  $\epsilon^{\circ}\Omega\upsilon \delta \epsilon\pi\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  for  $\delta \acute{\omega}\nu \epsilon\pi\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ . The dogmatic reason for the change in both cases is clear; but the critical reasons, though supported in the latter case by *Wetstein*, are extremely weak.]

XXIV. As to the assertion of certain Romanists, of *Laubrusselius*, for example, in his work, *On the Abuse of Sacred Criticism*, P. i. p. 168, that they abuse sacred criticism who undertake it, without such authority from the Church or Pope, as *Jerome* had from *Damasus*, we must entirely reject it; together with those

arguments in which he makes the abuse of criticism to consist in exposures of Romish superstitions. And almost all the doctors of that church write in the same strain.

XXV. Upon the whole, the student ought to be aware, that of all sorts of knowledge, criticism is the most difficult both to acquire and to apply to practice ; so infinite in number, and so minute in individual importance, are the points of evidence on which it rests ; and so numerous and difficult of apprehension are the scruples requisite in its application. The facility of error either through forgetfulness or lack of judgment, as it renders occasional errors more pardonable, ought at the same time to render the critic more careful and modest in his judgments.<sup>1</sup> The student will do well to read, in reference to these points, *Mabillon De Studiis Monast.* p. ii. c. 13, *de Critica, et regulis in eâ observandis.*

<sup>1</sup> As an example we may take Matt. v. 22, where it appears that ἐκτῆ ought to be rejected ; and Acts xxi. 15, where the reading ἀποσκευασάμενοι ought to be retained, though it is pronounced absurd by Morus and many other critics : for it is supported by the authority of manuscripts, by the Syriac and Vulgate versions, and by the usage of the Hebrew language. פנה Levit. xiv. 36, is rendered by the LXX. ἀποσκευάσαι, and by *Aquila* ἐκφορεῖν, *to carry out baggage* ; which sense perfectly suits the context.



XXVI. Among the instruments of interpretation, *rhetoric* is to be considered next to grammar. That portion of it is most important which treats of the nature and meaning of tropes: for interpreters who are deficient in this knowledge often fall into grievous blunders. This subject, however, we have already examined, together with its application to interpretation. It is also useful to know the rules laid down in rhetorical treatises respecting the different modes and beauties of style, and especially respecting sublimity or beauty of sentiment; that we may be enabled to recognise, to feel, and to interpret those instances which so frequently occur in the discourses of our Saviour, and in the writings of St. Paul. The interpreter, however, must consider that he does not write for boys; and consequently, that it is unnecessary for him to detail the names of the different tropes and figures, which detail tends neither to explain the sense, nor to point out the beauty.

XXVII. The interpreter of Scripture will also derive considerable advantage from *philosophy*, if he has rightly learned it. And its office is not so much directly relative to facts and sentiments, as to the method of handling them. For the assertions of Scripture are not

to be submitted to philosophy, nor to be accommodated to its decrees, and much less to those vague opinions commonly called hypotheses. Great care also must be taken lest we interpret the words of Scripture according to the definitions of philosophers, and thence proceed to philosophize upon the sense. Those who profess to depend upon philosophy, and are at the same time imperfectly acquainted with literature, are apt to fall into this error, whence great evils, and much inconvenience in the interpretation of Scripture have arisen.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>k</sup> Many learned interpreters cannot admit the creation of the universe ascribed to Christ in Col. i. 16. ; and, therefore, interpret the passage as referring to a moral creation : but compare John i. 3, Ephes. iii. 9, Heb. i. 2. All those acts which in the Psalms, Proverbs, and Apocrypha, are attributed to divine wisdom, are in the New Testament attributed to the *λόγος* or higher nature of Christ. [Philosophy is so vague a term, that in the absence of examples, the translator is unable to say what branch of science the author meant to designate by it. Probably this 27th § is to be considered as an introduction to those that follow ; and the philosophy intended is dialectic or metaphysical.]

XXVIII. We may, therefore, confine our attention to the science of *Logic*, which is serviceable to interpretation in several ways. And first, I would mention that it is useful in

distinguishing between the ideas of things and the sounds of words ; so that we may be able to make a clear distinction between that which we understand and that which we do not ; the necessity of which has before been pointed out. And this is effected in two ways : we must ascertain with respect to those things which are perceived by the external senses, whether we can actually recall their *idea*, and by that *idea* contemplate the things themselves ; and with respect to those which are the subject of the internal senses, whether we can remember our original *perception* of them. In things which are the objects of intellect, we may conclude that we understand them, when we are able to define our notion of them in clear and perspicuous words : but in those which are the objects of sense, such as plants, animals, &c. it is sufficient if we can attribute them to their proper *genus* ; especially when they are such as we have never seen. There are also other ways of forming this judgment, which have nothing to do with *dialectics*.

XXIX. Another use of this science is to teach us both how to form accurate notions of words, by collecting their scattered portions into an aggregate whole, or by deducing them from examples in which they may be found ;

and also how to express these notions clearly and briefly. The interpreter who is not possessed of this knowledge must be satisfied with vague and imperfect notions, and must consequently wander in uncertainty and error. In this matter, however, habits of accurate speaking and writing are of more importance than philosophical rules; for, as Cicero observes, a man may understand a subject accurately, and yet not be able to express it clearly; nor can he do so without an accurate knowledge of the language, and practice in composition.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thus ordinary interpreters err in the explanation of the words βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, πνεῦμα, μετάνοια, πίστις, παρουσία Χριστοῦ, and others which are well explained in *Teller's Wörterbuch des N. T.* [In general a writer fails in perspicuity, either from confusion of ideas, or from the affectation of some particular excellence of style. Thus excess either of brevity or of ornament, tends to produce obscurity.]

XXX. Another use of logic is to teach us by careful comparison to distinguish between similar ideas; lest being deceived by ambiguity, we confound things that are essentially distinct. In doing this, however, we must be accurately acquainted with the usages of the language, and must guard against drawing imaginary distinctions, which often happens to those who draw all their knowledge from lexicons.<sup>m</sup>

[<sup>m</sup> The student ought therefore to be acquainted with the synonyms of the New Testament; in studying which he cannot have a better guide than *Tittman*, translated by Rev. E. Craig, *Bibl. Cab.* vol. iii.]

XXXI. The student must again and again be warned not to abuse his logical and metaphysical subtlety in the interpretation of words, and in forming imaginary distinctions of sense; a process which, even in human works intended for popular instruction, is justly considered ridiculous. In universal and absolute propositions, we must therefore consider with what degree of accuracy the subject will permit us to interpret the terms: for, as *Aristotle* well observes, *Ethics* i. 1, "Accuracy is not equally desirable in every sort of composition." And, as he justly holds that it is not necessary in writing upon subjects which relate to ordinary life; so neither can it be required in the interpretation of such writings. He, therefore, who uses it, runs a great risk of imagining senses that were never intended, and of venting his own opinions instead of those of the author, whom he interprets, as *J. Hackspann* well observes in his *Misc. Sac.*, p. 36.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> [ Thus if we read in Eph. iii. 18, of the *πλάτος καὶ μῆκος, καὶ βάθος, καὶ ὕψος*, of the love of Christ; as the sub-

ject, is not mathematical, we must not seek for an accurate signification in these terms of measurement ; it is enough if we see that this accumulation of terms expresses boldly and poetically, “ O the wondrous greatness of the love of Christ !”]

XXXII. Though common sense may generally be trusted as a sufficient guide in this matter, yet it may be useful to lay down a distinction between two classes of subjects. In whatever relates directly to God and to religion, we may look for accuracy, because these subjects have neither uncertainty nor variation ; but, in whatever relates to human life and customs, we may consider scrupulous accuracy as quite misplaced.<sup>o</sup>

<sup>o</sup> [In all dogmas and precepts we have reason to expect accuracy of expression, and ought consequently to use accuracy of interpretation. There are exceptions, however, at least apparently, in cases where moral precepts are conveyed in proverbial forms. These must be interpreted according to their historical sense ; and though we may now be at a loss to discover this, yet in all probability the proverb conveyed a precise notion at the time it was used. Much of this occurs in the sermon on the mount, which is not so easy a portion of Scripture as some have imagined.]

XXXIII. Hence, that *logical analysis* of Scripture, which some are so fond of, ought to be used with great caution ; lest we be de-

ceived in the very formation of the notion, on which some remarks have been offered in § xxvii.: or by the aid of such analysis, infer what is not in Scripture, and mingle with its meaning notions which were never entertained by the sacred writers.

XXXIV. Nor is it an unimportant office of logic to determine what is contradictory, and what consistent. For the interpreter is required to explain the meaning and force of propositions everywhere occurring in the sacred books; and, as apparent contradictions sometimes arise even in dogmas; by reconciling these, the harmony and consistency of Scripture must be maintained. In attempting this, the student must keep in mind what we have already observed, p. i. sec. ii. chap. vi., and must be careful, lest, through ignorance of the language, he imagine discrepancies which do not exist; and lest, in reconciling them, he employ a subtlety foreign to the nature of the subject, and to the style of the author.

XXXV. And since logic also teaches the proper arrangement of topics in an argument, the rules for this arrangement ought to be known to an interpreter, that he may be enabled to detect and point out the line of argument in those portions of Scripture which are

argumentative, as is sometimes the case in the writings of St. Paul. See *Melancthon's* dedic. ad dispos. Ep. ad Rom.<sup>p</sup> But even in this an excessive subtlety is to be avoided, and we must not expect to find such arrangement everywhere, or to prove it by a jejune analysis, which seldom, throws any light upon the sense. For where the authors had no such arrangement of arguments in view, it is an idle labour to force their writings into coincidence with an imaginary scheme of our own devising.

<sup>p</sup> And Koppe in his edition of the Epistles, *passim*. [Ernesti appears rather prejudiced against *analyses* of Scripture; had he not been so, he would have used a stronger word than *interdum* in speaking of the argumentative nature of St. Paul's composition. Like every other method of interpretation or illustration, analysis may be abused in rude or rash hands, but it is not on that account to be proscribed; and indeed no interpreter will ever throw much light on any of the longer epistles, who does not analyse them judiciously.]

XXXVI. Besides knowledge of, and practical skill in the use of what is usually called the *apparatus* of an interpreter, the theological student ought to acquire an extensive and accurate knowledge of *History*; for there are many things in the sacred books, relating to



times, places, persons, manners, and civil and religious ceremonies, without a knowledge of which it is impossible to give a complete interpretation of the passages in which they are mentioned. He, therefore, who proposes to render himself an accomplished interpreter of Scripture, will labour previously to obtain an extensive knowledge of history.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> We may refer to Matt. xxiii. 55. Luke ii. 2; iii. 1. Acts vii. 2 Thess ii. none of which can be satisfactorily explained without reference to history. To these we may add the subject of John's baptism, as illustrated from Josephus, and the monuments of the Sabians. [The Sabians, Zabians, Mendai Ijahi, or disciples of John, appear to be a Jewish sect sprung from the Hemero-baptistæ. Mosheim supposes John their founder to be quite a different person from John the Baptist. The notices of this sect are all comparatively modern, though their sacred books, copies of which exist in the royal library at Paris, are said to be of an ancient date. See *Mosheim* Sæc. xvi. Sec. iii. P. i. § xvii. and *Eichhorn's* Allgemeine Bibliothek der Bibl. Lit. T. x. P. v.]

XXXVII. The student must not be contented to derive his knowledge from ordinary and popular compendia, but must acquire it for himself from the original sources. The commentaries even of learned men, and much more, tracts of observations and discussions

are full of historical errors, often very important ones, arising from a neglect of this rule : and hence have arisen the most absurd interpretations, tending rather to impede the reader than to relieve him from his difficulties.†

† See *Krebsii* Prolus. de ratione N. T. e moribus antiquis illustrandi minus instituta, in Opusc. p. 519.

XXXVIII. In the first place, the student ought to be acquainted with *geography*, so far as it is connected with the acts of our Saviour and his Apostles. And, above all, ought he to be acquainted with the geography of Palestine, and the changes which took place with respect to its *divisions, limits, and form of government*.

XXXIX. The oldest *division* is that by Joshua among the twelve tribes ; this division ceased to exist when the kingdom of *Israel* had been overthrown by the Assyrians, and that of *Judea* by the Babylonians ; and yet it is sometimes alluded to by the writers of the New Testament, as in Matt. iv. 13, 15. A second division succeeded this, and prevailed down to the destruction of the temple and nation. This division was at first into two parts, that being the original number of king-

doms; afterwards, we cannot exactly say when, but certainly under the Asmonean dynasty, the division became fourfold, into *Judea*, *Samaria*, *Galilee*, and *Peræa*. Idumea was a portion of, or an accession to Judea, (Mark iii. 8,) of which we shall speak hereafter. Sometimes, however, the name Judea is used generally for the whole country. The capital of *Samaria*, in the time of our Saviour's ministry was *Sichem*, (John iv. 5,) the city of Samaria with its temple having been previously destroyed. *Galilee* was divided into two provinces, *Galilee Superior*, which bordered on the Syrians and Phœnicians, and is sometimes called Galilee of the Gentiles, Matt. iv. 15; and *Galilee Inferior*, which is generally to be understood when the word Galilee is used without any adjective. In this last were situated Tiberias, Nazareth, Capernaum, Mount Tabor, and Decapolis, or, at least, a portion of it, Mark vii. 31.<sup>s</sup> *Peræa* properly comprehends the district formerly occupied by the tribes of Gad and Reuben; but it was afterwards increased at various times.

<sup>s</sup> For the divisions of Galilee, see Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmud.* in v. גליל, where will also be found extracts from the Rabbinical writings respecting the Galilean dialect well

worthy of perusal. [For the latter subject, see also *Pfannkuche's* tract on the language of Palestine, translated by Mr. *Repp.* Bibl. Cab. No. II. p. 74.]

XL. For the boundaries of these divisions were gradually altered. To Judea was added the old province of Idumea, first acquired by David, and afterwards recovered by John Hyrcanus. This province was incorporated with Judea when the Idumeans adopted the Jewish religion, and on that account considered themselves, and were usually styled, Jews. On this subject the reader may consult *Casaubon's* Exerc. i. ad App. Baron. n. 3, where he maintains that Herod is properly called a Jew. To *Peræa* was added whatever territories were gradually acquired to the new kingdom of Judea: thus *Iturea* was added under the Asmonean dynasty, and Trachonitis, Batanea, Auranitis, Abilene, were acquired by the Herods, or added by the liberality of the Cæsars. These districts had mostly been portions of the land of Israel, but had acquired new names under the dominion of the Syrian kings, and had not been entirely recovered under the Asmonean princes.<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> [For the geography of the Holy Land, the student may consult, *S. Bocharti Geographia Sacra; Fred. Span-*

*heimii Introductio ad Geog. Sac.* in the first volume of his collected works, *Reland's Palestina, Historical Geography of the New Testament by E. Wells*; *Röhr's Palästina oder Historisch-Geographische Beschreibung des Judischen Landes zur Zeit Jesu.*

XLI. All these provinces were incorporated into the kingdom of *Herod the Great*, son of Antipater, who had been Procurator, first of Idumea, and then by the decree of Julius Cæsar, of all Judea. After the death of Herod the Great, his dominions were divided by Augustus among his sons, according to the will of the deceased monarch. *Archelaus* obtained Judea, properly so called, with Idumea and Samaria, under the title of Ethnarch; *Herod Antipas* had Galilee and Peræa, confined within their ancient restricted limits; while *Philip* had the rest of the country beyond Jordan, called in Luke iii. 1, Iturea and Trachonitis. These two last princes had the title of Tetrarch.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>u</sup> The same Philip is mentioned in Matt. xiv. 3. Josephus represents him as married to Salome, whom Matthew declares to have been his daughter by Herodias. [But the question is, whether this be the same Philip. Josephus mentions another Philip disinherited by his father Herod the Great; not the uterine brother of Antipas, but born of Mariamne daughter of Simon the High-Priest. It is more

likely that Antipas should take away the wife of a private citizen, than of a sovereign equal in dignity and power to himself. See *Grotius* or *Kuinoel* ad locum.]

XLII. But Archelaus being driven into exile, his territories were formed into a province, and administered by Roman *procurators*, that is, by lesser magistrates who had not held any senatorial office, of which officers *Pilate* was one. Afterwards the territories of Herod Antipas, who also was banished, were added to this province. The Tetrarchate of Philip, who died in the first year after the death of Christ, was added to the province of Syria.

XLIII. From this Procuratorship the Tetrarchate of Antipas was withdrawn, and granted by Caligula, under the designation of a kingdom, (see *Philo Legat. ad Cai. p. 1034*.) to Agrippa the elder, who had already received the tetrarchates of Philip and Lysanias. The remainder, that is to say Judea and Samaria, were granted by Claudius; and thus the procuratorship was abolished, and the kingdom restored. But upon the death of Agrippa, which occurred about three years after this, procurators were again appointed; of whom were *Felix* and *Festus*, mentioned in Acts xxv. xxvi. *Agrippa the younger*, son of the

former Agrippa, received from Claudius at first only the kingdom of Chalcis, with dominion over the temple at Jerusalem, and the right of appointing the High Priest.\*

\* The accurate illustration of these matters forms the principal merit of *Michaelis'* version of the New Testament, illustrated with notes. See also the genealogy of the Herodian family at the end of *Havercamp's* edition of *Josephus*. [The subject is also treated of, but too briefly, in *Horne's* Introd. III. 99, seq.]

XLIV. The student ought, therefore, to be familiar with these points of history, and not be under the necessity of perpetually referring to ordinary books; he ought also to be familiar with the names and situations of cities, countries, and rivers.<sup>y</sup> Nor ought he to be ignorant of the neighbouring countries, Phœnicia, Syria, and Arabia, which are frequently mentioned in the sacred books; nor of their principal cities, as Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Antioch, &c. On this head it will be well to consult the notes of the learned on *Eusebius's* Tract, de Locis Hebraicis, and *Reland's* Palestine.<sup>z</sup>

<sup>y</sup> Thus in Mark vi. 45, we meet with *πῆραν πρὸς Βηθσαιδὰν*. The interpreter must be careful not to look for a place near Capernaum; for the place spoken of is Bethsaida on the

eastern shore of the sea of Tiberias. [Such is the opinion of *Schleusner* and also of *Fischer*; but the point must not be considered as certain. See *Bretschneider* ad v. *Bethsaida*.]

<sup>z</sup> Also *Bochart's* Phaleg, and *Michaelis'* foreign geography of the Hebrews. Gottingen 1769.

XLV. In the next place, it is necessary that the interpreter should be well acquainted with the geography of Asia, especially of Asia Minor, of the Ægean Sea and its islands, of Greece and Italy; all of which are repeatedly referred to both in the Acts and in the Epistles. On these points *Cellarius* is the best guide. *J. A. Fabricius* gives a catalogue of the churches founded by the Apostles, with notes, in his *Lux Salut. Evang.* c. 6.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See also Asia, in the larger geography of *Büsching*. [Thus if it be asked when St. Paul could possibly have visited Illyria, Rom. xv. 19, we answer it must have been on that visit to Macedonia mentioned in Acts xx. 2. See *Paley's* H. P. ad loc. *Morus* imagines it to have been on his former visit, mentioned in Acts xvii. 1, because he then passed through *Apollonia*, and *Apollonia* is a city on the borders of Illyria. There is such a town on that border, but then there was also another *Apollonia* in *Chalcidice*, almost in the direct road between *Amphipolis* and *Thessalonica*; which must evidently be the town intended in Acts xvii. 1.]

XLVI. In questions of this sort it is very important to know the limits, names, and va-



rious kinds of Roman provinces. For the names are sometimes adapted to the civil government and arrangement of the provinces; as, for example, all that portion of Europe which is contained between the Ionian Sea, called in Acts xxvii. 27, *Adria*, on the one side, the *Ægean* on the other, and the ridge of *Pangæus* and river *Nestus* on the north, is comprehended under the names of *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, because all that country was divided into two Roman provinces bearing these names. The ancient *Macedonia* and *Achaia* were of much narrower extent. *Luke*, therefore, calls *Philippi* a city of *Macedonia*, whereas, according to the old arrangement, it was a city of *Thrace*.<sup>b</sup> Still the old divisions are sometimes employed; thus, in Acts xx. 2, *Græcia* is used in its ancient and proper sense, for the country intervening between *Thessaly* and *Peloponnesus*, or for the whole province of *Achaia*; as in *Suetonius Claudius*, 16, on which see my notes.

<sup>b</sup> The passage alluded to is Acts xvi. 12. But it may be doubted whether the author has not made a slip of memory. See Liv. xlv. 29. [By the author *Ammon* means *Ernesti*, not *St. Luke*. *Livy* says in the place quoted, that one of the four divisions of *Macedon* was the country between the *Strymon* and *Nestus*, which included *Philippi*.]

XLVII. While Rome was free, the empire was divided into provinces of two kinds, the one called *Consular*, the other *Prætorian*; of which the former, being larger, or of more political importance, were governed by men of Consular rank, the latter by men who had held the office of Prætor. In the reign of Augustus, the Consular provinces were placed under the direct control of the Emperor, and were administered by Legates, generally of Consular rank; while the Prætorian were left under the control of the Senate and people, and were governed by a Proconsul, as Asia was; see Acts xix. 38. There was again a third class of smaller provinces, retained by the Emperor, and governed in general by men of equestrian, or even of lower rank, under the title of *Procurators*; of these Judea was one, as we have before observed. In order to get a clear knowledge of these political arrangements, the student will do well to study the xvii. book of *Strabo*, towards the end. Dio Cassius, l. liii. and my *Excursus ad Suet.* Aug. 47. The interpreters would have found no difficulty in the mention of *Sergius*, as Proconsul of Cyprus, in Acts xiii. 17, had they been aware of this arrangement of the provinces; according to which Cyprus must have had a Proconsul.

According to this system, the *Cyrenius* or *Quirinus*, mentioned in Luke ii. 1, must have been a consular legate of Cæsar.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> [Dr. Ammon here observes, that in any way inextricable difficulties will remain as to the chronology of this verse, and he has before advanced the same opinion. See the point considered in *Bibl. Cab. Ernesti's Inst.* vol. I. p. 173. note.]

XLVIII. We must also learn to distinguish between the different classes of cities; some being *allied* cities, others Roman *colonies*, the planting of which even beyond the sea, commenced in the time of the Gracchi, and became common under Julius and Augustus. Among these were *Philippi*, *Corinth*, and others. These considerations may sometimes throw light upon passages of Scripture; as in Acts xvi. 20, we may thus determine who the *στρατηγοί* were, whom *Hammond* erroneously supposes to be the same with those mentioned in *Luke* xxii. 52, whereas they were colonial magistrates, the *duumvir*: in my opinion; see *Cic. Agr.* ii. 34, and also *Valesius* ad *Euseb.* H. E. vii. 12. Hence also we may learn that the *ἑαβδοῦχοι*, v. 35, were lictors bearing staves instead of fasces. See Cicero as above quoted.

XLIX. There is also a distinction of dig-

nity in cities, some having the rank of *metropolis*, others possessing *supreme courts of justice*. Philippi was clearly a metropolis, being called in Acts xvi. 12, *μεγίστης Μακεδονίας πρώτη*, (See *Spanheim de usu et præstantia Numismatum*, Diss. ix. 16,) of that part, namely, which was transferred from Thrace to Macedon, and called *ἐπίκρητος*. By metropolis we mean the chief city and head of the province, the residence of the governor; thus, after the expulsion of Archelaus, Jerusalem was the capital of Judea, but after the death of Agrippa the elder, the seat of government was at Cæsarea, Acts xxiii. 33. From this civil distinction arose the distinction of *metropolitan churches*, although we find no mention of these in the New Testament. *Peter Marca*, indeed, see his *Concord. Sac. et Imp.* vi. 1, 5, thinks he finds it in Titus i. 5. We have an instance of a town distinguished as the seat of the *supreme court*, in Acts xix. 38, under the term *ἀγοραίος*.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>d</sup> [It is not so clear what is to be understood by the expression *ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται*. Our version renders it *the law is open*; but the margin, with better judgment, as is usual, renders it *the court-days are kept*. So *ἄγοντι τὸν ἀγοραῖον*. *Joseph. Ant.* xiv. 10, 21. See *Krebsii Obs.* p. 239, and *Bos' Ellipses Gr. ed.* Schaefer, p. 178. But *Ernesti* has not

made out that there ever was a *supreme court* except in the *metropolis*: for Ephesus, where these *ἀγῶναι* were held, was certainly the metropolis of Proconsular Asia.]

L. With respect to geographical knowledge in general, I would advise the student to apply himself to it continuously and systematically; and not to suppose that he can ever attain an adequate knowledge, merely by turning to geographical books when he is in a difficulty, and to acquiring his information gradually. I would also advise him not to spend much time and labour upon minute geographical questions, respecting which the learned are not agreed, as for instance, whether *Cana* was in Upper or Lower Galilee; whether *Nicopolis*, mentioned in the Epistle to Titus, be in Epirus or in Thrace; or whether *Decapolis* be a portion of Galilee or of Peræa.

LI. To geography we must add chronology, with respect to which there are many difficulties in the New Testament of no easy solution. And for this purpose, we must first endeavour to determine the chronology of certain periods in the *Old Testament* history; as for instance, of the time which elapsed between the promise made to Abraham, and the liberation of Israel from Egyptian bondage; of the duration of that bondage (see Acts vii. 6, Gal. iii. 17);

of the interval between the entry into Canaan and the first appointment of kings, (Acts xiii. 20); finally, the fixing of the seventy years of the Babylonish captivity, and the commencement of Daniel's seventy weeks.\* All of these points are more or less connected with the determination of the exact date of the death of Christ, respecting which there have been many disputes among the learned. The student will do well to consult the *Isagoge Chronol.* of *Vossius*, who has treated these and similar subjects with great care, or *Vitringa's Hypotyp. Hist. et Chron.*

\* First, however, the student had better consult Eichhorn's *Allg. Bibliothek d. bibl. Lit.* iii. p. 761. And respecting chronology in general, *Frank's Novum Systema*, with the preface of *Gatterer*, Gottingen 1778. [In chronology, and history considered chronologically, British literature is rich. We may mention, the *Sacred and Profane History of the world connected, &c.* by *S. Shuckford*. The *Old and New Testament connected, &c.* by *H. Prideaux*. A new *Analysis of Chronology, &c.* by *W. Hales, D. D.* 1812. *Connexion of Sacred and Profane History, &c.* by *M. Russell, LL. D.* 1827.]

LII. The chronological questions peculiar to the New Testament are, in the first place, those which relate to Jesus himself, as the year of his birth, and the number of the passovers which occurred during his ministry; and upon

these depends another question, namely, in what year of his life our Saviour died. On none of these questions are commentators agreed, although entire commentaries have been written upon some of them; and, indeed, the most learned men have confessed their inability to solve these difficulties; so that it would be the height of presumption rashly to give a decision upon them. These questions, however, with the various arguments for and against particular solutions, ought to be known to the interpreter; so that he may be enabled to distinguish what is certain from what is uncertain; and thus be enabled, at any rate, to see what is probable, and avoid falling into ridiculous errors.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>f</sup> [Dr. Ammon, who appears to have an absolute passion for finding discrepancies in the gospel narratives, here observes that Matthew represents the birth of Jesus as having taken place in the house of Joseph, while Luke says it took place in an inn. He refers to Matt. i. 25, ii. 1, where nothing is said, but that the birth took place at Bethlehem. He also finds great difficulty in the passages, John i. 46, vii. 41, as if it were wonderful that the Jews, who knew that Jesus had been educated at Nazareth, and that his mother had resided there before his birth, should suppose he was born there, and call him Jesus of Nazareth. He then asserts that Matt. ii. 22, Luke ii. 2, iii. 1. 23, “*in diversas rationes trahunt lectorem.*” On these texts it is impossible to comment without entering into the entire

question of the New Testament chronology; but Ernesti has already taught us that insoluble difficulties are not necessarily discrepancies. The difficulty of determining the dates of our Saviour's life and death, arise much from the vagueness of the expression in Luke iii. 23. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος.]

LIII. One of the most important questions for the determination of the interpreter, is the date of St. Paul's conversion; on which depends the calculation of the epochs mentioned by him, in Gal. i. 18, ii. 1; the date of the Council of Jerusalem, Acts xv.; of St Paul's journeys to Jerusalem, Gal. i. 18, Acts ix. 26, of the Epistles; and finally, of St. Paul's arrival at Rome. On this head, *Pearson's* *Annal. Paulin.* may first be consulted, who, with most of the Fathers, places St. Paul's conversion in the second year after the death of Christ; and *Fr. Spanheim*, who places it in the sixth or seventh year. The series of dates relating to St. Paul is particularly worthy of attention; *Pearson* and *Usher*, in his *Annales*, have both treated this subject carefully, without neglecting the dates relative to the other Apostles.\*

\* [Chronological difficulties still remain, and will probably for ever remain, in the interpretation of the New Testament. But it is poor reasoning to allow these difficulties to throw any shade of doubt upon the truth of the narrative.



Besides the works already mentioned, the reader may consult *Noesselt's* Diss. de tempore quo scripta fuit Epist. Pauli ad Hebræos ; and his *Conject ad hist. Ep. Jacobi*, the former in his *Opuscula Fasc. I. No. 10.* The latter *Fasc. II. No. 12.*]

LIV. The system of these dates is also connected with that of others, as, for example, with the dates of the accessions of the successive Roman emperors and Herods, and of the governors of Syria and Judea ; or must be compared with these for the sake of evidence, which it may be impossible to procure without such a comparison. Therefore, the chronology of the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero, ought to be well studied ; and the different methods of dating the accessions of the Cæsars, especially Augustus and Tiberius. Thus the learned differ as to the date of the fifteenth year of Tiberius, mentioned in Luke iii. 1, on which depends the date of the crucifixion ; some in the ordinary way, fixing the commencement of his reign at the death of Augustus, others with *Pagius*, at the beginning of his proconsular government, see *Sueton. Tib. xxi.*, or his appointment as a colleague in the empire, *Tacit Ann. i. 3*, by the granting of the tribunitial power, and authority over all the provinces.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> [Augustus died in August, A. U. C. 767. *Suetonius* places the commencement of Tiberius's collegiate reign not long after his triumph in 765. But again a new discrepancy arises, if we turn to *Velleius Paterculus*, 2, 121, who places the grant of imperial authority before the triumph, and even before his return from Germany; that is, at any rate, a year before its date according to *Suetonius*. See the points illustrated, as far as they admit of illustration, in *Kuinoel* Notes on Luke, iii. 1.]

LV. Nor are the dates connected with the family of the Herods less involved. The birth of Christ took place in the last year of the life of Herod the Great, perhaps but a few months before his death; and the whole of his ministry, together with that of the Apostles, were cotemporaneous with the reigns of his three sons, *Archelaus*, *Antipas*, and *Philip*, and afterwards of the elder and younger *Agrippa*, of whom the latter survived the destruction of Jerusalem. *Josephus* has marked the chronology of the Herods with considerable care, and it has been illustrated by many writers; still, however, there exist difficulties and differences of opinion among the learned.

LVI. As the old Roman chronology proceeded upon the succession of consuls, so that of the Jews was marked by the succession of High Priests. This principle is recognised in *Luke* iii. 1, and the succession is carefully

noted by *Josephus* in his antiquities. But at the period, whose history is narrated in the New Testament, the arbitrary changes in the succession made by Herod and the Romans, rendered it very difficult to apply the succession to chronological purposes.

LVII. Whenever we reason upon ancient chronology, two points are to be kept in mind : first, that the concluding and commencing years are not necessarily entire, but may be any fractions of years ; and next, that the preceding year is sometimes counted, and that is reckoned the second which we should call the first. Thus, an event which is said to have occurred in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, may really have happened little more than twelve years after his accession.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [Of the first of these observations, we have a striking instance in the period during which Christ lay in the grave. It is called three days, and yet we know that it was little more than one day. The latter, the translator is unable to illustrate, not being aware that the fact is as represented.]

LVIII. In all calculations of this sort, we must be on our guard against two things. First, we must be careful not rashly to assume some undemonstrated element, and thence to deduce

other points as uncertain, as that which we have assumed, an error very common in enquiries of this sort ; and secondly, not to waste much of our time upon subjects where the learned have agreed, that certainty cannot be arrived at. If these two errors are carefully avoided, the student of theology may usefully devote a portion of his time to the study of chronology. We must now offer a few remarks on history, and on the knowledge of rites and customs.

LIX. The importance of historical and antiquarian knowledge to an interpreter of the New Testament, must be manifest to every one who considers how large a portion of its contents is closely connected with the history, rites and customs of the age in which it was written. And the acquisition of this knowledge, as applicable to the sacred books, is more difficult than it is in reference to other ancient, Latin, and Greek writings ; for these in general relate only to one people, whereas, in the New Testament, we perpetually find a mixture of Jewish, Greek, and Roman affairs. Nor is a mere general acquaintance with the subject sufficient ; it must be both extensive and accurate, drawn from the original authorities by one qualified to judge of the precise

meaning of the language which they employ. He, therefore, who in these matters depends upon the mere assertions of expositors, will never be able to proceed with security, nor to distinguish truth from falsehood. The student will, therefore, act wisely who lays in a good provision of historical and antiquarian knowledge, before he proceeds to interpret Scripture. Even up to the present time the books of the New Testament are in direct opposition to many disgraceful errors, into which even the most celebrated interpreters have fallen.

LX. Nor are the writings of those authors to be neglected, who have contributed to this subject, either by illustrating some portion of it, or by correcting vulgar errors. But of these a selection must be made; and the student will do well in this matter to take the advice of some learned man, well skilled in such enquiries, who will inform him whether any particular book is compiled from original authorities, or from the common histories, lexicons, and academical disputations, in which it is rare to find any thing worth reading. I would recommend a careful perusal of *Scaliger's Animadversiones in Eusebii Chronicon*, and his *Emendatio temporum*,<sup>k</sup> in which many vulgar errors are confuted. The corrections of *Ba-*

*ronius's Annals* by *Pagius* and *Cusaubon*; the notes of *Valesius* on the first book of *Eusebius*; the tracts of *Perizonius* relative to chronology; and any others, if there be others who, like these, are models of accuracy and clear arrangement. It will be better to postpone the writings of authors of a second class, such as *Basnage*, and *F. Spanheim*, until the judgment is ripened by time and experience, to distinguish between truth and falsehood, between certainty and uncertainty. I shall now endeavour, by offering a few brief directions as to the proper method of pursuing each particular subject, to lead the student into the right way.

<sup>k</sup> The chronological works of *J. J. Scaliger* will be found in the *Thesaurus Temporum*, &c. Amst. 1658.

LXI. In the first place, then, the history, habitation, offices, rites, and customs, both civil and religious, of the Jewish people, ought to be thoroughly studied; and they ought to be known, not only as they existed during our Saviour's ministry and the age of the Apostles, but also throughout their history; for many allusions are made in the gospels to more ancient times. The earlier antiquities are to be

studied in the Old Testament, the later ones in the writings of cotemporary Jewish, Greek, and Roman authors.

LXII. The student then will remember that there having been originally twelve tribes; ten, whose capital was Samaria, a name afterwards given to the whole country, were carried off into Assyria by Salmanassar. Their place was supplied by a colony of Cuthites, who took the name of Samaritans, and adopted a religion similar to that which Jeroboam had formerly established in the same country, with probably some admixture of their own previous opinions. This system of religion appears to have been reformed, and purified from idolatrous adjuncts by Manasses. This Manasses had been degraded from the priesthood at Jerusalem, on account of his marriage with a foreigner; and, through the interest of his father-in-law Sanballat, obtained from Alexander the Great a licence to build a temple at Samaria, in imitation of that at Jerusalem. He was accompanied in his banishment by many Jews, who deserted their country for the same reason, see *Josephus, Antiq. xi. ad finem*. Though this temple was destroyed by *John Hyrcanus*, yet the Samaritan mode of worship continued to be celebrated on Mount Gerizim; and it appears (John

iv. 25) that even the vulgar Samaritans, in the time of our Saviour, had more correct notions respecting Messiah than the Jews had. But respecting the Samaritans the reader may consult *Walton* in *Apparat. Bibl. Proleg. xi.*, and *Reland's Palestine*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See also the observations of *Schnurrer* on the Samaritans in *Eichhorn's Repert. ix. 1, seq.* and in *Paulus's Repert. T. i. p. 120.*

LXIII. A like calamity befel the two remaining tribes which constituted the kingdom of Judea, when the whole people, with their king, were carried away into Chaldea by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. They were restored, however, by a decree of Cyrus, and the Jewish commonwealth was re-established in its original habitation. It must be understood, however, that many who had acquired property and established connections, remained at Babylon; preferring to enjoy a certainty even in banishment, than to risk the chances of a return to their own country. And these, uniting with the Israelites who had been carried into captivity by the Assyrians, maintained the profession of their religion in Babylon, and beyond the Euphrates, and are men-



tioned in Acts ii. 9. From among these appears to have arisen the Christian church of Babylon, 1 Peter v. 13, the doctrines of Judaism having prepared the way for the reception of Christianity; for that Babylon, in the text quoted, cannot mean Rome, is well demonstrated by Scaliger in his Canon. Isagog. l. iii. epoch 13, p. 283, seq.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>m</sup> [Some ancient interpreters, especially in the Coptic church, understand by Babylon, Egyptian Babylon near Cairo; some of the Fathers, see *Eusebius* H. E. ii. 15, and among the moderns *Grotius*, *Lardner*, and *Cave*, imagine that Rome is intended: *Erasmus*, *Wetstein*, and others, take it as *Ernesti* does, to mean Babylon properly so called, and this is certainly the more probable interpretation. See *D. J. Pott*, Proleg in 1 Ep. Pet. p. 14, or rather *Marsh's Michaelis*, T. iv. p. 323.]

LXIV. But as we know from Jeremiah, that the Jewish nation was not totally carried off to Babylon, but the nobles and richer classes only; while many of the lower class were left to cultivate the land; so we may naturally suppose, that in the land of Israel also, many of the labouring classes were either permitted to remain, or escaped the notice of their conquerors. And when the Jews were permitted by Cyrus to return from Babylon to their own land, many of Samaritan origin, availing them-

selves of the opportunity, returned with them. See *Usher's Annales* ad Ann. 3468, and *Wit-sius* on the ten tribes towards the end of his *Ægyptiaca*. From all these facts we may understand, why *St. Matthew* speaks of the *house of Israel*, xv. 24, and of the *tribes of Israel*, iv. 15, and why the *twelve tribes* are mentioned in *James* i. 1, when in all these passages the inhabitants of Palestine alone are intended; or at any rate the descendants of Palestinian Jews. For the same reasons we may see how *Anna* mentioned in *Luke* ii. 36, could be of the tribe of *Aser*. On this subject the reader may consult *Walton's Proleg.* ix. 4, who has also made use of the arguments of *Usher*.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>n</sup> [It may be noticed, in confirmation of the views taken by *Ernesti*, that the Samaritans of our Saviour's time believed themselves to be descended, not from converted Cuthites, but from the patriarchs of the Jewish and Israelitish nations. "Art thou greater than our father Jacob?" was the question of the Samaritan woman to *Jesus* at the well. And had they not been principally of the race of *Israel*, it is difficult to account either for this supposition on their part, or for the decided prevalence of *Judaism* above heathenism in their national religion.]

LXV. After their restoration by *Cyrus*, the Jews did not long continue in quiet possession

of their own country. For, in the first place, a great number of them were forcibly carried off by Ptolemy Lagus into Egypt, whither many of the Israelites had before retired; (see *Josephus* A. J. xii. 1,) and were placed, some in Alexandria, where they were incorporated with the citizens, and others in the cities of Cyrenaica and Libya. (See *Josephus*, as before quoted, and c. *Apion*, ii. 4. Hence light may be thrown on Acts ii. 10, vi. 9, where some for  $\Delta\iota\beta\epsilon\rho\tau\iota\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$  would read  $\Delta\iota\beta\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$ . See *Grotius* on the text, and *Wesseling de Archont. Jud.* p. 24. For the history of the Jews in these countries the reader must consult *Philo's Legatio ad Caium*, and his *Oratio in Flaccum*, which tracts I recommend to the perusal of the student. Hence it is probable they migrated as colonists into Cyprus, which was brought into subjection to Egypt by the same Ptolemy; see Acts xiii. 4, xi. 20.

LXVI. While Palestine formed a part of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ, the Jews migrated in large bodies to the new cities of Syria and Asia, especially to Antioch, being tempted by the liberal promises of Seleucus Nicator. See *Joseph.* xii. 3. Hence originated that large body of Jews, and subsequently of Christians, which existed at Antioch, almost

immediately after the preaching of the Gospel had extended beyond the limits of Judea, Acts xi. 20, seq.

LXVII. Though the Jews had thus formed settlements in many cities, yet they were afterwards still more attracted to the commercial cities both of Europe and Asia by the prospect of gain. And they were secured, first by the alliance subsisting between the Romans and the Asmonean princes, see *Joseph. A. J.* xiii. 17. ; and afterwards by the protection of Julius Cæsar, from whom they purchased at a high price the right of exercising their religion in any part of the Roman empire without molestation, see *Joseph. A. J.* xiv. 10; and in this point Augustus and Tiberius followed the policy of Julius. Synagogues, therefore, and Proseuchæ were established everywhere, especially at Rome, where many Jews were collected during the reign of Julius; whose regret for their patron almost led them into sedition on his assassination. The number of Jews at Rome still increased, and we find that they had a peculiar quarter beyond the Tiber allotted for their residence, and many Proseuchæ. See *Philo's Legat. ad Caium*, p. 1014. In which arrangement we can hardly avoid perceiving a providential preparation for the reception of the Gospel; for

thus the Apostles were enabled to preach the doctrines of Christianity in almost every city, and, through the proselytes to Judaism, to communicate it to the heathen also. A knowledge of these circumstances will throw light on many passages in the Acts, as upon chap. xxviii. 17; on the *διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, John viii. 35, on James i. 1, and 1 Pet. i. 1. Thus also we may understand why the churches at Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were from the very first pre-eminent in numbers and dignity.<sup>o</sup>

<sup>o</sup> [Horace in his ninth Satire, Lib. I. bears a strong testimony to the numbers and importance of the Jews at Rome in the time of Augustus. If Fuscus Aristius could, even in jest, call himself “*unus multorum*,” because he respected the “*tricesima sabbata*,” the Jews must have been of sufficient consequence to make their festivals generally known and respected among the heathen population of Rome.]

LXVIII. We have already stated under what governors the Jews were placed within the limits of Palestine, at the time of our Saviour, and in the Apostolic age, when speaking of the geography of that country. Nor is it necessary here to enter into a detailed account of the family of the Herods. But this is a subject of which the interpreter ought not to be ignorant; he ought to be aware of the

notices of them given by *Josephus*, *Dio*, and others; and of the collections of these notices, and the remarks upon them, which have been made by the learned, either in books specially dedicated to the purpose, as by *Noldius*, or in general histories as by *Pagius* in his *Crit. Bar.*; *Valesius* in his Notes on *Eusebius*; and *Reland* in his *Palestine*. The notices given by *Josephus* of the reigns of the Herods, and by *Philo* of Pilate and the two Agrippas, throw light upon many passages of the Acts. To the family of the Herods must be added another *Philip*;<sup>p</sup> not the uterine brother of Antipas, but the son of Mariamne, Joseph. xviii. 13, 14. He married *Herodias* the daughter of *Aristobulus*, and sister of the elder Agrippa, by whom he had a daughter *Salome*. Herod Antipas took this Herodias from her husband and married her, on which account he was reproved by the Baptist, Luke iii. 19, Matt. xiv. 3. See also *Deyling's* Obs. ii. 26, 20.

<sup>p</sup> [There seems little occasion for here introducing a second time the history of Philip. Though the institutio does not profess to enter on detail, nor does the translator profess to supply it, yet it may be useful here in a very short compass to give the genealogy of the Herodian Family. *Herod the Great*, son of *Antipater* the Idumean, had successively four wives. 1. *Mariamne* daughter of Alexander. 2. *Mariamne* daughter of Simon. 3. *Malthace*. 4. *Cleopatra*. By the

first Mariamne he had a son *Aristobulus*: by the second, the *Philip* above mentioned: by *Malthace*, *Archelaus* and *Herod Antipas*: and by Cleopatra, *Philip*, tetrarch of Iturea. Of these sons of Herod the Great, *Aristobulus* alone had descendants, namely *Agrippa* the elder, *Herod* king of Chalcis, and the *Herodias* above mentioned. *Agrippa* had two sons, *Agrippa* the younger and *Drusus*, and two daughters, *Berenice* and *Drusilla*, married first to *Aziz* king of Emesa and then to *Felix*. *Herod* king of Chalcis married his niece *Berenice* just mentioned, and afterwards *Mariamne*, by whom he had a son, *Aristobulus*, king of Lesser Armenia. See Brotier's Notæ and Emend. in Taciti Ann. T. ii. p. 384.]

LXIX. In the noted passage, Luke iii. 1, *Lysanias* is mentioned as tetrarch of Abilene. He must not be confounded with another *Lysanias*, son of Ptolemy Mennæus, who held the same government more than sixty years before. On the death of this first *Lysanias*, the province was given by Antony to Cleopatra, and afterwards on the fall of these, it was farmed by a certain *Zenodorus*. St. Luke appears to have mentioned this province, because there were many Jews resident in it; and because Jesus himself visited it in the course of his ministry. Such I find to be the opinion of *Casaubon*, who has given an accurate account of the tetrarchs of Abilene in his Exerc. Baron. xiii. 3.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> [Ammon supposes that St. Luke was mistaken in the

chronology of the age. Kuinoel, to whom he refers, coincides in the opinion of Süskind, that there were at different periods two tetrarchs of Abilene of the name of Lysanias, and that we must believe the existence of the latter, as we do many other historical facts, on the uncontradicted, though unsupported, evidence of one credible witness.]

LXX. We have already mentioned who and what the Roman procurators were; a few observations remain to be added. First, then, we may remark, that their power was entirely civil; for though they had the command of a few soldiers, yet these were only for the purpose of garrisoning citadels, guarding prisons, conducting the execution of prisoners, and services of the like kind, see Matt. xxvii. 27, Acts xxii. 31. And though Judea is rightly called by Josephus *προσθήκη Συρίας*, yet its procurator was no more under the orders of the legate of Syria than the governors of Cyrenaica were under the prefects of Egypt; though Cyrenaica was always considered as a province dependent upon Egypt. The procurators had power of life and death, John xix. 10, and an appeal from their sentence was addressed, not to the legate of Syria, but to Cæsar himself, Acts xxv. 11. The connection between the governments of Judea and Syria extended to this, that when some important act was to be



carried into effect, which required the assistance of the military, it was committed to the legate of Syria. Of this kind was the census instituted by Quirinus, Luke ii. 2, Acts v. 37, which must not be confounded with that which occasioned the visit of the Virgin to Bethlehem, and which preceded it, [by ten years], as *Herwart* and *Perizonius* have shewn in their tracts on the subject.<sup>r</sup> For in the census held by Quirinus, the aid of the military force was used, as appears by an inscription first published by *Muratori*, and illustrated by *Wesseling*. From what has been advanced, it will appear that an acquaintance with the history of the governors of Syria, which was constituted a province by Pompey, may also be useful to the interpreter. The information on this head, first collected by *Casaubon* in his *Exerc. Bar.* i. 3, was improved and corrected by *Noris* in his *Cenotaph. Pis.* i. 16, and completed by *Pagius* in his *Crit. Bar.* t. i. p. 23, 24.

<sup>r</sup> [The census of *Quirinus* has met with many interpretations; and if none of them be irresistibly convincing, yet several of them contain a probability of truth. The reader may find them all detailed in *Kuinoel* on Luke ii. 2. *Ammon* in his note of this §, as also in two tracts on the subject; holds that St. Luke was mistaken. *Kuinoel* inclines to suppose the mention of *Quirinus* to be a marginal gloss

which has crept into the text. See this text referred to in Bib. Cab. No. I. p. 173, 174, where Ammon speaks very unintelligibly on the subject of Christian chronology.]

LXXI. Those will be best able to interpret the notices respecting the procurators and their acts occurring in the New Testament, who have studied the system of provincial government as it is described by the Latin historians. For instance, they will be aware that the *prætorium* is the house of the *procurator*, since such is the proper appellation for the house in which a provincial magistrate resided, Matt. xxvii. 27.<sup>s</sup> For *Cicero* in his Orations against Verres, says expressly that the *prætorium* of Verres was the ancient palace of the kings of Syracuse. Hence we conclude that the *prætorium of Herod*, mentioned in Acts xxiii, was the abode of the procurator; whereas in Phil. i. 13, we must understand the prætorian camp at Rome, the præfect of which is mentioned, Acts xxviii. 16.<sup>t</sup> They will be aware also that the procurator held his court in the open air, or in a portico, which, according to the style of that age, was generally paved with marble; whence the *λίθωστρωτον* mentioned in John xix. 13, see also *Sueton. Cæs.* 46, and *Ernesti's* notes on that passage; and in short of many

other particulars respecting the acts and jurisdiction of provincial governors. For the acquisition of this knowledge, I would recommend a careful perusal of the *Second Oration against Verres*, as describing the mode of trial and punishment in Sicily. There exists a treatise by *Merillius* a lawyer, illustrating the last sufferings and death of Jesus from this oration. I would also advise the student to compare Acts xxv. 23, with 1st *Cont. Ver.* 29. This point ought to be carefully studied; for even learned interpreters have fallen into grievous errors through ignorance of historical analogy in such matters.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>s</sup> [And so it is rightly translated in the margin of our authorized version. A new translation would be a most hazardous undertaking, but it is worth considering whether it would not be advisable generally to place the marginal readings in the text, as being the more faithful representation of the original.]

<sup>t</sup> [Neither of these points is clear. For if the *πραιτώριον* in the provinces was the palace of the governor; what more probable than that St. Paul, writing from Rome to the provinces, should call the palace at Rome, the residence of Cæsar, by the same name. *Στρατοπεδάρχης* occurs but once in the New Testament; and though *Krebs*, on the supposed authority of *Josephus*, maintains that prisoners from the provinces were committed to the charge of the Prætorian Præfect; yet it may be doubted whether the one example advanced by him, Ant. xviii. 6. 6, proves the general prac-

tice. Besides, the Prætorian Præfect appears to have been an officer of far too high a rank to have a personal charge of a prisoner of such mean rank as St. Paul.]

<sup>u</sup> See *Faber's Archæol. Heb. i. p. 103*, and for the preceding paragraph, *Krebsii Opusc. p. 135, seq.*

LXXII. Much power was also left to the Jewish *High Priest*; for we find that the Romans allowed him to retain a jurisdiction in all matters relating to religion, and to punish offenders, but not, as it seems, with capital punishments, John xviii. 31; for the condemnation of Stephen by the Priests and Sanhedrim, (Acts viii. 59,) ought probably to be referred to the times of Herod Agrippa.<sup>x</sup> An interpreter, therefore, ought to be well acquainted with the power and jurisdiction of the High Priest, especially during the ministry of our Saviour and the Apostolic age, when it was very different from what it had originally been. For the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ assumed and exercised a power of nominating High Priests, without regard to the legitimate order of succession, always, however, selecting from the legal family; and the Herods and Roman procurators went still further than this, and at pleasure removed one High Priest and promoted another to his place; so that thus, there might be at the same time many

High Priests, or, to speak more properly, many men of Pontifical rank. To remove the difficulty then in Luke iii. 2, Acts iv. 6, arising from the mention of two Priests, and respecting which the opinions of the learned have been so various, it may be sufficient to suppose, that those who had been High Priest retained the title, together with a certain pre-eminence in the Sanhedrim, even after their deposition. That Annas should possess considerable authority, appears highly probable, from the prudence for which he was celebrated, the injustice of his deposition, his popularity, and his affinity to Caiphas the actual High Priest, by whom he would naturally be consulted in all points of important difficulty; and to these suppositions we are directly led by John xviii. 3. This I find to be the opinion of *Valesius* on *Euseb.* i. 10. The systems of others, as of *Scaliger* in his *Proleg. ad Euseb.* of *Casaubon* in his *Exerc. ad Bar.* x. 1, xiii. 4, and of *Beza* on Mark ii. 26, and are examined and refuted by *Petavius* in his *Doctr. Temp.* x. 58, who is especially to be consulted on the succession of High Priests from A. C. 49 to 58, not to mention *Walton* is his *Apparatus*, and others.

\* [Ammon holds that there is no discrepancy between these texts, nor does Ernesti contend there is: the only dif-

ference is as to the principle upon which they are to be reconciled. Ammon thinks that the Sanhedrim had power of inflicting capital punishment for religious offences even in the time of the procurators. But if so, why did they apply to Pilate, when they had declared Jesus guilty of the capital religious crime of blasphemy. Michaelis thinks that the death of Stephen was the tumultuous act of a mob, not a judicial execution. The power of the Sanhedrim being religious and not political, extended to Jews residing beyond the limits of Palestine, Acts ix. 1, 2.]

LXXIII. The council of the High Priest was the *Sanhedrim* of Jerusalem, consisting, besides the High Priest as president, of men who had been High Priests, of theologians and interpreters, the persons intended by the term *γραμματεῖς* in the New Testament. The members of this council were called magistrates or rulers, (see *Valesius ad Euseb.* iii. 8,) and senators or elders, from the Mosaic institution, Acts iv. 5. Much has been collected respecting the Sanhedrim from Jewish authors, but their information is of little value, as they generally wrote after the dissolution of that body. All the members of the Sanhedrim had the title of *Archon*; for in 1 Macc. i. 14, 27. ἄρχοντες means members of the Sanhedrim. And here it may be worth while to observe, that in the Greek version of the Old Testament, every magisterial office, however insignificant, is

called ἀρχὴ, and the person holding it *archon*, see Exod. ii. 13. We must be careful then not to be misled in such matters by the modern versions, nor to imagine any higher dignity than the context admits of. Thus I would understand ἀρχοντα in Luke xii. 58, who is also called κριτής.

LXXIV. Among the archons of the city we must also reckon the ἀρχαίτηγός τοῦ ἱεροῦ Acts iv. 1, who is ranked between the priests and the senators, or members of Sanhedrim, in Luke xxii. 52. Ἀρχαίτηγός is used by the Greeks for any magistrate, civil as well as military, as we see in Acts xvii. 26. His office was to maintain quiet and order in the temple; and that he was a Jew, appears from this, that he assisted the High Priest in arresting those considered as seditious, without the intervention of the Roman procurator.

LXXV. There were also other Jewish magistrates, allusions to whom may be found in the New Testament. Beyond the limits of Palestine we find also mention of Jewish archons in ancient monuments, which order of magistrates *Wesseling* has carefully examined in his treatise *de Archontibus Judæorum*; not neglecting at the same time another class, of which we shall speak hereafter. The kings

who had either forced or invited Jewish colonies into their territories; and afterwards, the Romans, who succeeded to the authority of these kings, allowed the Jewish colonists to have magistrates of their own, to judge of matters exclusively religious, and perhaps of civil matters, when the parties were both Jews. That such was the case under the Roman government, appears clearly from the letter of L. Antonius to the Sardians, given in *Josephus' Ant.* xiv. 10, 17. But in Egypt, besides the archons in the several towns, mentioned in a Greek inscription of the town of Berenicea in Cyrenaica, given by *Maffei* in his *Antiq. Gall. Epist.* i. 8, and illustrated by *Wesseling* in the treatise above mentioned, there was a superior magistrate residing at Alexandria, who had authority over all the Jews in the country, and was therefore called *Ethnarch*, or, as he is styled by *Philo*, γενάρχης. For this fact we have the authority of *Strabo*, quoted by *Josephus* xiv. 7, 2, and furthermore, we are informed by *Philo* in *Flacc.* p. 975, that in the reign of Augustus this Ethnarch was superseded by a Jewish Senate, the members of which were also called Archons. Concerning this Ethnarch, there is a remarkable passage in *Origen's Ep. ad Africanum*, against which



Wetstein raises futile objections. There was also a magistrate called *Alabarches*, or as some, with *Wesseling*, think, *Arabarches*, as if he were named from the Arabian Nome, and were of the class of Nomarchs; such was *Alexander Lysimachus*, brother of Philo, mentioned by *Josephus* xix. 4, 5, whose son, *Alexander Tiberius* married *Berenice*, daughter of the elder Agrippa. *Mangey*, in his preface to Philo, with some probability conjectures that the *Alexander* mentioned in *Acts* iv. 8, was this Alexander Lysimachus, for we know that this person was of the Sacerdotal order, and that he was popular among the Jews, on account of his liberal donations to the temple. The *Ethnarch of Damascus*, however, mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 32, cannot be considered as a Jewish magistrate, for this reason, that he is called the *Ethnarch of Aretas*, that is, placed over Damascus and the adjacent territory by Aretas.

‡ [ This Aretas, for there were many of the name, was king of Arabia Petræa, and of the territory of Damascus, and father-in-law of Herod Antipas. See *Joseph. Ant. Jud.* xviii. 5. As Aretas had been deposed through the influence of Antipas and his second wife Herodias before the time of St. Paul's being at Damascus, it is strange that Dr. Ammon should not here observe the ignorance of St.

Luke on historical matters. But even *Semler* sees no difficulty in supposing that an Ethnarch appointed by Aretas, might continue in office, and be called the Ethnarch of Aretas, after the deposition of that prince.]

LXXVI. In Judea itself, every town, however small, had its archon or magistrate, who had a jurisdiction in minor causes, and for whom the student may consult the writers upon Jewish antiquities. This, however, is not a matter of much importance to the interpreter; although to it may be referred the passage before alluded to, *Luke* xii. 58, my interpretation of which I have hinted at in § 73, which differs from that given by *Wesseling*, p. 106. The *Patriarchs* and *Primates* of the Jews, who appear to have sprung from these Ethnarchs, were of a later age.

LXXVII. These points may all be classed under the head of history. With respect to rites and customs, the first business of the interpreter is to be thoroughly acquainted with the privileges and offices of the Priests and their assistants the Levites, their division into classes, and the rotation of service according to this division, the *τάξις ἐφημεριῶν*, as it is called, *Luke* i. 5, 8, respecting which, besides *Josephus* vii. 14, 7, *Scaliger's Canon*, *Isagog.* 303, 304, may be consulted. Their principal offices

we know were the offering of prayers and sacrifices, either at stated times of the year and day, or upon extraordinary occasions; and these, together with all other religious rites, we must learn from a careful study of the Mosaic law. Closely connected with this is the knowledge of the Sabbaths and festivals, especially of the Passover, on account of its connection with our Lord's crucifixion. On this head I know of no author who has written more ably than *Bochart* in his *Hieroicoicon*, p. ii. l. ii. c. 50, although he sometimes pays too much deference to Jewish writers in matters on which they philosophized rather than wrote from their own knowledge, and reasoned in direct opposition to the voice of cotemporaneous antiquity. For example, with *Cudworth*, he considers the sacrificing of the Paschal lamb, even in the city of Jerusalem, during the later ages of the Jewish church, as allowed to the priests alone; whereas *Philo*, a priest and a theologian, who had often been present at the Passover, and could not possibly be ignorant of its details, expressly declares in his *Vit. Mos.* iii. p. 686, that each father of a family sacrificed his own lamb; and by the admission of this fact many difficulties are removed.

LXXVIII. The whole system of sacred

rites, and besides, many passages of the New Testament, cannot be understood without an acquaintance with the temple, which was gradually pulled down and rebuilt by Herod the Great. And in reference to this, some have unreasonably doubted the evidence of *Josephus*, a priest, who had seen the temple; and doubted it, not on historical grounds, but lest his story should falsify the remarkable prediction in *Haggai* ii. 10, respecting the dignity of the second temple; while, on the other hand, the testimony of *Josephus* tallies exactly with that of *Matt.* xxiv. i, and of *John* ii. 20. That this fear is idle, I have shown in my prolusion concerning the second temple, on *Haggai* ii. 10. But, in attempting to acquire this knowledge of the temple, we must not imitate those who vainly labour to give a complete plan of it, as built by Solomon: for though *Josephus* was adequately skilled in the arts and sciences, and consequently able to give an accurate account; yet the nature of the subject necessarily prevented him from handing down to us a clear and precise idea. Even professional architects, possessing at the same time a clear and pure style, cannot by description give such an idea of a building, especially if it be a complex build-

ing like the temple, as that a satisfactory model or picture could be made from their description ; as we see in the case of the villas described by Vitruvius and Pliny.

LXXIX. It will be sufficient, then, in the first place, to understand the difference between *ναός* and *ιερόν*, and then to distinguish the greater divisions of each. The *ναός* [or central building of the temple] contained the *ἄγιον* or holy place, to which the priests alone were admitted, and which contained some of the sacred furniture, *Hebr.* ix. 2 ; and the *ἁδυστον*, or holy of holies, into which the High Priest alone entered *once* on one day in the year, as *Philo* informs us in his *Leg. ad Caium*, p. 1035. not *four* times, as the Rabbins generally hold. The *ιερόν*, on the other hand, or entire body of buildings constituting the temple, contained the area immediately surrounding the *ναός*, in which stood the altar where prayers and sacrifices were offered, and into which the priests and Levites alone were allowed to enter ; then other areas, with noble porticos, mentioned in sacred history ; partitions separating these different courts, and containing various chambers (*Acts* ii. 2) for the use of those who came to learn or to pray, and also for the residence of

the priests and Levites during their term of duty ; together with treasuries and other buildings. When all these things are accurately known and distinguished, it will be enough when any of them is mentioned to attribute it to its proper place and use, and to beware of confounding them with modern notions of similar objects, as is too often done. The more minute descriptions of the temple, given by the later Rabbins, are either fictitious or of little use to the interpreter. Of the *Captain of the Temple* we have spoken already.<sup>z</sup>

<sup>z</sup> [It appears a strange supposition that the room where the disciples were assembled at Pentecost, was one of the division chambers of the temple, and apparently unsupported by any thing in the context. For a somewhat fuller account of the temple, see *Horne's Introd.* III. p. 226, seq.]

LXXX. *Synagogues and Proseuchæ* (Acts xv. 21,) were, from the most ancient times, used for such religious services as could be performed without sacrifice, that is, for prayer, and the public reading and exposition of Scripture. These were placed without the walls in all places inhabited by the Jews, not in Judea only, but, after the Jews had obtained a religious toleration, throughout the Roman empire,

and even in Rome itself. See above, § 66. In Jerusalem the temple superseded the necessity of having Proseuchæ; nor do the passages *John* xviii. 20, or *Acts* vi. 4, prove their existence there. Sometimes the name proseucha is given to an open space of ground, especially devoted to the purpose of prayer, *Acts* xiv. 13. Upon the whole, there seems no distinction between the two terms synagogue and proseucha, unless synagogues be larger proseuchæ: this is the opinion of *Valesius* on *Eusebius* ii. 6, who labours, as I think ineffectually, to establish a distinction. It is clear, from *Matt.* ix. 18, (see *Grotius'* note on the text) and *Mark* v, that every synagogue had a president, an ἀρχισυναγωγός or ἀρχων, who directed the order of worship, and permitted others to address the congregation. There are points respecting the proceedings in the synagogues, which we learn from scattered passages in the New Testament; as, for example, that there was no appointed teacher, but that any one who wished was allowed to address the meeting, *Matt.* iv. 23, *Luke* iv. 15, where the archon of the synagogue is also mentioned at v. 20; and also, that lesser punishments, as scourging, could be inflicted on cri-

minals in the synagogue, Matt. x. 17. The notices given by later Jewish writers must be carefully distinguished from these, as probably describing the habits of a later age; on which supposition they must be unsuited to the illustration of Scripture, though they have been so applied by *Vitringa*, and other writers on Jewish antiquities.

LXXXI. The student ought also to have a clear notion of the Jewish schools, as of that of *Gamaliel*, mentioned in Acts xxii. 3, and of other teachers, first in Jerusalem, and afterwards in Babylon, Tiberias, and other places; and not to confound them with the synagogues or *proseuchæ*.<sup>a</sup> For the Jewish Rabbins, like the Athenian philosophers, taught, that is to say, expounded sacred subjects, in any convenient public place, as in the porticos of the temple, *Luke* ii. 46. And with respect to these schools, he ought to be careful not to imagine them similar to what we now call schools, nor even to attribute to them all that later Jewish writers have said respecting schools of a more recent date. The only matter treated of in these schools, was the interpretation of the law and the prophets; and this, after the Greek fashion, was called philosophy by those



Jews who spoke Greek; nor is any thing else to be understood by φιλοσοφία, either in *Josephus* or in the New Testament, where the reference is to the Jewish nation, or to religious opinions; for that age had not learned to apply the word *theology* to the knowledge of revealed truth. I am not disposed to understand the expression of *St. Paul*, that he sat at the feet of Gamaliel, as implying that the teachers sat on an elevated seat. It appears merely parallel with *Luke* x. 39, where Mary is said to have sat παρά πύδας Ἰησοῦ, to hear his discourse; or *Luke* ii. 46, where Jesus is described as *sitting among the doctors*, probably upon the ground, and therefore παρά πύδας, at their feet. Nothing more than this is to be understood by the words of *St. Paul*.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> [For a good account of Proseuchæ and Synagogues, see *Horne's Introd.* vol. iii. p. 233, seq. and 238, seq. distinguishing, however, according to the advice of Ernesti, the ancient from the more recent authorities. One part of the argument in the text must be wrong. Ernesti maintains, that Synagogues and Proseuchæ were one and the same, and that there were no Proseuchæ at Jerusalem: of course it must follow that there were no synagogues in that city; whereas we find from *Acts* vi. 9, that there were many.]

<sup>b</sup> [The Latin is "in verbis Pauli nihil tale intelligendum." *Tale* must refer to the preceding sentence which, in the

original, is separated only by a colon. The translator has no doubt, that in rendering, as if it had been “*nihil aliud,*” he has given the meaning of the author.]

LXXXII. Of this philosophy or theology there were two sects, distinguished by the different interpretations which they put upon Scripture, namely the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees*; for as to the third sect, the *Essenes*, which Josephus adds to these, they differed rather in severity of living than in religious dogmas; and besides, no mention is made of them in the New Testament. Concerning these sects many disputes have been waged, and many books written by learned men; but though the knowledge of these matters be not foreign to the business of the interpreter, still they throw little light upon interpretation itself. On this head, it may be enough to read what has been said by Josephus; and, indeed, the Gospels themselves define, with sufficient clearness, the distinguishing dogmas of these two sects. In order to understand the argument of *St. Paul* respecting the weakness of the law in the production of true holiness, it may be useful to know what Josephus tells us of the opinions of the Pharisees respecting the

liberty of the will and the power of the law, namely, that a man, by acquiring a knowledge of the law, acquired at the same time the power of obeying it. We may observe, that under the appellations of Pharisees and Sadducees are intended not only the theologians, but all who favoured the sentiments and adopted the manners of either party; and, in this extended sense, we must understand the names in *Matt.* iii. 7. We must also be careful not to imagine that these teachers were, like our own, constituted by any public authority or ordination: any one acted as a teacher of religion by his own will and on his own authority. Thus Saul, though brought up to a trade, intended to practise as a theologian; and he practised his trade of tent-maker after he became a teacher of Christianity.

LXXXIII. We have now spoken of the more important topics with which an interpreter ought to be acquainted. There are others, such as the divisions of time, weights, measures, and coins, clothing, punishments, &c. of which though they be of minor importance, the interpreter cannot safely be ignorant. He must, therefore, be aware of the distinction between the *sacred* and *civil* year, of which the former began in March, the latter in September, to-

gether with their division into months, which were evidently *lunar* months, and especially the divisions of the day and the night. It appears then that the night was divided into four watches, (*Matt.* xiv. 25, *Luke* xii. 38,) and this division was not borrowed from the Romans, but prevailed at a very early period, (*Lament.* ii. 19, *Judges* vii. 19); though some are of opinion that in early times there were only three watches. The *natural* day (*John* xi. 9) was divided, as among the Romans, into twelve hours, which, of course, were of unequal length, according to the season of the year. How these were measured is not clearly explained to us. The third, sixth, and ninth hours were devoted to the public services of religion. The whole of the day, from noon till dark, was called *evening*; but this was divided into two unequal portions, also called *evenings* (*Matt.* xxvi. 20.) See also *Scaliger de Emend. Temp.* 568. The *week*, or period of seven days, is called by the Evangelists *σάββατα* and also *σάββατον*, (*Mark* xvi. 1, *Luke* xviii. 12.)<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> [This section is but carelessly expressed by Ernesti, and the subject is one which, if mentioned at all, requires great accuracy. The reader may observe that the texts referred to do not prove the facts for which they are produced.

Thus Lament. ii. 19, and Judges vii. 19, do not specify the number of watches; but as the latter speaks of the *middle* watch, it would appear that the number was then *three* rather than *four*. All the four watches of the night are mentioned in Mark xiii. 35. For the two *evenings*, see Exod. xii. 6, and Levit. xxiii. 4. Mr. *Horne* (Introd. iii. 160,) has made sad confusion in the matter of days and hours. He says, the *natural* day of the Romans was from six in the morning till six in the evening, whereas it was from sunrise to sun-set: their *civil* day was, like ours, from midnight to midnight. Again, he says, the *civil* day of the Jews varied according to the season, whereas it was their *natural* day that varied. Their *civil* day was from six in the evening to six the next evening. The hours of the *natural*, or, as he calls it, the *civil* day, could not be marked by a dial; such measurement could apply only to the equal hours of the *civil* day properly so called, which calculation of hours commenced at six in the morning, the preceding twelve hours being divided into watches.]

LXXXIV. The Jewish measures are seldom mentioned in the New Testament. The *batus* and *corus* are mentioned in Luke xvi. 6, 7, the former being a measure of liquids, the latter of grain. The *batus* or bath, is nearly equivalent to the Greek *metretes*, John ii. 6, and contained, as we are informed by Josephus viii. 2, seventy-two sextarii or ξέστοι, that is, six *congi*, or three quarters of an amphora.<sup>d</sup> The *corus* or homer contains ten baths, Ezek. xlv. 11, and the *choenix* (Rev. vi. 6) is the sixth part of the *modius* or cubic foot. In

connexion with such questions we may also examine the *Sabbath-day's journey*, which the Rabbins state to have been two thousand paces or eight furlongs, while the Syriac interpreter, Acts i. 12, makes it only seven. But the whole subject of weights and measures may be found in the ordinary books of Jewish antiquities; only the reader must not be satisfied with the mere names of *modius*, &c., but ascertain, in every case, the number of cubical feet or inches. For it is not enough to be informed, as we are by Josephus, what Greek or Latin measures correspond to the Hebrew ones, unless we can specify their absolute value. On these subjects no author has laboured with more diligence than *Eisenschmidt* in his book *de Ponderibus et Mensuris*; with whom we may place *Lamy's* *Apparat. Bibl.* i. 15, 16. The *coins*, mentioned in the New Testament, are almost all Roman or Greek; for the Jews had begun to use Greek coins from the time of their becoming part of the Syrian kingdom, and Roman coins were introduced by the Romans when they assumed the sovereignty of that part of Asia. The Jewish *shekel* is rendered in Matt. xxvi. 15, ἀργύρια. This *Josephus*, A. J. iii. 8, 3, compares with the tetradrachm of the Greeks; and this calculation is confirm-

ed by *Gronovius* in his treatise *de Sestertio*, p. 168, and by *Reland* in his *Diss. de Num. Samar.*, p. 188. *Deyling* also in his *Obs. Sac.* iii. n. 25, § 9, reconciles this translation with that of the LXX., who render the *shekel* by *δίδραχμον*; for the Alexandrine didrachmon is equivalent to the Attic tetradrachmon. The Attic or ordinary didrachmon is therefore half of the shekel or stater; and in Matt. xvii. 24, is the sum which was paid by every one yearly into the temple treasury. The name of *shekel*, however, belonged originally to a weight rather than a coin, see *Eisensemidt*, s. i. c. 4, and was equivalent to the Roman semiuncia. Sixty shekels made a *mina*, and three thousand a *talent*. It is unnecessary to speak of other Greek and Roman coins, whose values are known to every school-boy. Of the use of these coins, however, it may not be useless to say something; and, since this subject is connected with the taxes and tributes, we shall first briefly treat of them.

<sup>d</sup> [The translator, without having any but the ordinary authorities, cannot help suspecting an error here. According to *Arbuthnot*, the *Metretes* was about ten English gallons, and the *Amphora* only seven gallons. The error is here; seventy-two *ξίστροι* make, not six, but twelve congii; and twelve congii equal an Amphora and a half, which is

nearly the same capacity as the Metretes. See *Arbuthnot on Ancient Money and Measures*, Lugd. Bat. 1764. Tab. 14 and 15, who makes the Metretes and the Bath each 10.335, gallons.]

LXXXV. The Romans then, from the very commencement of their power over Palestine, rendered it tributary. And this tribute was first imposed by Pompey, who, having adjudged the quarrel between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, in favour of the former, during the consulship of Cicero, imposed a tribute, not merely with the assent, but also with the concurrence of Hyrcanus. Cicero perhaps refers to this in his *Flacc.* 28. Certainly such is the sense put on the passage by *Scaliger* in his *Animadv. ad Eusebii. Chron.* p. 153. When Judea was reduced to a province, the tribute was fixed by *P. Sulpicius Quirinus*, according to a census held by him, (see *Luke* ii. 2, *Acts* v. 37, and also § 70 of this chapter,) while *Coponius* was Procurator of Judea; and this, no doubt, is referred to in *Matt.* xxii. 17. The nature of this census, and of the tribute founded on it, may be learned from the orations of *Cicero* against *Verres*, from *Tacitus*, who frequently mentions the provincial census, as in the *Annal.* i. 31, on which it will be well to consult *Lipsius Exc. K.*, and other Latin



authors. The census must be distinguished from the *vectigal*, of which only one species, the port-duties, is mentioned in Scripture; these were transmitted to Rome. The distinction between the two taxes, as appears from the orations against Verres, was this; the *census* was levied by the magistrates of each city, and the produce paid under the name of tribute or φόρος; but the *vectigalia* or taxes (τα τέλη), were levied by revenue farmers, through their servants, the head of whom was called promagistro, *Verr.* ii. 70. These servants are called in the New Testament, τελώναι, and Zacchæus, a promagistro, ἀρχιτελώνης. The revenue farmers, it is well known, were Roman knights, but in the actual collection they generally employed natives of the province.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> [The subject of this § may perhaps be rendered clearer by a brief definition of the principal terms. The Latin *Census* is an enrolment of the names and fortunes of the citizens, and this is the ἀπογραφή of Luke ii. 1, 2. But κῆνσος is used by the sacred writers to express, not this enrolment, but the *tax* founded upon it, the capitation tax or ἐπικεφάλαιον as *Hesychius* defines it. φόρος is strictly equivalent to this, compare Matt. xxii. 17, with the parallel text Luke xx. 22. So also *Joseph.* Ant. Jud. L. vii. c. v. § 3, βασιλεὺς φόρους ὑπὲρ τε τῆς χώρας, καὶ τῆς ἐκάστης κεφαλῆς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐδέχετο. Τέλος again is a *duty on exports or im-*

*ports.* In Matt. xvii. 25, it is distinguished from *κῆνος*, and in Rom. xiii. 7, from *φόρος*. It is remarkable, that the inherent difference between these two taxes, the direct and indirect, causes in our own time a difference in the persons collecting, similar to that noticed by Ernesti.]

LXXXVI. In the payment of these tributes and taxes, either Greek or Roman money was taken, as appears from the testimony of the ancients. For certainly, in the acts imposing or regulating taxes, at least in those relating to the *κῆνος*, the Roman *denarius* was the standard, which is thence called in Matt. xxii. 17, *νόμισμα κῆνου*. Greek money was received instead of Roman, the *drachma* for the *denarius*; but all such money was required to be changed in the province by traders or publicans, since nothing but Roman money was received in the Roman treasury.

LXXXVII. The money required by the law to be paid by every Jew into the temple treasury, was paid in Jewish money. That the payers might readily procure this money in exchange for Roman and Greek coins, changers of money had their tables in the temple. These were the *καλλαβιστᾶι* and *κερματιστᾶι*, mentioned in Matt. xxi. 12, and John ii. 16, whose tables Jesus overthrew. In the class of sacred coins we must therefore place

the *δίδραχμον* or *half-shekel*, which was paid by every Jew, even by those who lived out of Palestine, *Matt.* xvii. 24. This coin is mentioned even by profane writers, as by *Cicero* in *Flacc.* 28, under the name of *Auri Judaici*, and in the *Codex Theod.* by that of *auri coronarii*. See *Gothofredus ad Cod. Theod.* l. xvi. *Tit. de Judæis*, l. 14, 17, &c.

LXXXVIII. There is little in the domestic life of the Jews that requires elucidation. In dress the *ιμάτιον* answers to the *pallium* of the Greeks; and the *χιτών* and *στολή* to the shorter or longer *tunic* of the Romans; men of severe habits, as the early prophets whom the Baptist, wore this of haircloth, *Matt.* iii. 4. See also *Josephus* A. J. xii. 8, and it was confined round the body with a girdle, *Acts* xii. 8. The tunic *ἀββάφος* or *ὑφαντὸς δι' ὕλου* *John* xix. 23, was not composed of two segments of cloth, united at the sides or shoulders by a seam or by clasps, but was one continuous web throughout. Of this nature *Josephus* A. J. iii. 7, describes the stole of the High-Priest to have been; which in his B. J. v. 5, 7, he also calls *στρογγύλον ἔνδυμα*. The method of making such a tunic is described by *Theophylact* on *John* xix. 23, and he observes from *Chrysostom's Hom.* 84, in *Johann.* that it was peculiar to Palestine. To

these authorities add *Rubenius de Lato clavo* I. 9, who very properly refutes the opinion of *Salmasius ad Script. Hist. Aug.* II. p. 679, that it meant a garment sewed together, in contradistinction to one clasped, an opinion which many have rashly followed. Delicate and effeminate persons used several tunics, as Augustus ap. *Sueton.* 82, whence Jesus commands his disciples to be content with one, *Matt.* x. 10. The *κράσπεδα* mentioned *Matt.* xxiii. 5, are the *hem* of the pallium, *Mark* ix. 20, called by the Greeks *πτερόγυια*, for we cannot suppose that Jesus had a border or fringe sewed on. The *λευκά ἱμάτια*, *Matt.* xvii. 2, are the *candidæ vestes* of the Latins, artificially whitened by the fuller, *Mark* ix. 3,<sup>f</sup> which, from their splendour, were also called *ἑξαστράπτουσα*, and so *Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Catech.* ii. calls the garments of candidates for baptism *ἀστράπτουσαν*. Ἐποδήματα must be understood to mean sometimes *sandals*, that is, wooden soles attached to the ankle by leather thongs, *Mark* i. 7, or *shoes* in the proper sense of the word, the use of which is forbidden by Jesus, *Matt.* x. 10. For he allowed them to wear sandals, *Mark* vi. 9, and they were used by Peter, *Acts.* xii. 8. Consult *Salmasius ad Tertull. de Pallio*, p. 388.<sup>g</sup>

† [Should the reference to texts be sometimes erroneous, the reader has only to compare a few pages of the original, and he will find that the translator has at least improved upon the original in this matter.]

‡ Or rather *Braun de Vestitu sacerdotum Hebræorum*, Amst. 1701.

LXXXIX. The *meals* of the Jews differed in no respect, except in prayer, from those of the Greeks. For in both cases the supper took place about the eleventh hour, and the guests reclined upon couches, even at the Paschal supper, (Mark xiv. 15—18,) contrary to the original practice, and to the opinion of *Bochart* in his *Hieroicoicon*, p. 601, see *Scaliger's Emend. Temp.* p. 570. The food was taken by the hand, without the aid of knife or fork; whence the practice of washing before and after meals, *Mark* vii. 5. The bread was formed into cakes, broad, thin, and easily broken. The wine was always used in a diluted state, even after meals; and thus *οἶνος* is always to be understood of wine and water. The more opulent classes used *unguents* at their banquets: thus we read that Jesus was honoured by having the contents of an *ἀλάβαστρον* or box of ointment poured on his head, *Matt.* xxvi. 7; the breaking of which, *Mark* xiv. 3, appears to mean the breaking off the upper part of the

neck, the orifice being sealed in token of its purity, which we learn from *Pliny* was the case with imported perfumes. Strainers (στραμμοί) were also used, to prevent any foreign matter passing from the wine-vessel or crater into the drinking cup. See *Chishul* ad Inscip. Sig. p. 37. In banquets of peculiar dignity they had *masters of the feast*, *John* ii. 9 : not, however, in the same sense as the Greeks, but merely to attend to the comfort of the guests. All the banquets mentioned in the New Testament took place on the Sabbath, for the other days of the week were devoted to labour.<sup>h</sup> The richer classes had particular eating rooms corresponding to the triclinia of the Romans, as appears from *Mark* xiv. 15, of which hereafter.

<sup>h</sup> [See *Luke* xiv. 1, seq. But this seems too general a conclusion. The more wealthy Jews could not be limited by necessity to the Sabbath : and it is difficult to reconcile the practice of Sabbath banquets with the command in *Exod.* xxxv. 3.]

XC. Attention ought to be paid to the style of architecture prevalent among the Jews. Every one knows that their roofs were nearly flat, as was also the case among the Greeks. In the houses of the higher classes, mention is made of the προαύλιον and αὐλή; whether this double

hall, (Mark xiv. 66, 68, compared with John xviii. 15, 16,) answers to the *vestibulum* and *atrium* of the Romans, or whether the former was an exterior, and the latter an interior hall, so as to make the *προαύλιον* correspond with the Greek *αὐλή*, is uncertain. In the *προαύλιον* was the *porch* in which feasts were held, and in which, as appears from Matt. xxvi. 69, compared with Luke xxii. 61, Christ was examined by Caiaphas. Ὑπερῶνον, means a room in the higher part of the house, employed for various purposes; as for *banquets*, Mark xiv. 15, for *ἀνώγαίον* the word there used is, according to Hesychius, synonymous with ὑπερῶνον; for *prayers* and such purposes Act i. 13, xx. 7, 8, and for laying out the corpses of the dead, Acts ix. 37.<sup>i</sup> The private buildings called in the Gospels *πύργοι*, (Matt. xxi. 33, Luke xiv. 28,) must be understood to mean buildings raised to a considerable height in gardens, or villas for the sake of a more extensive view, and not what we call *towers*.<sup>k</sup>

<sup>i</sup> [The translator doubts, as *Ernesti* did respecting the temple, whether it be possible to have a clear notion of the arrangement of a Jewish house. Little can be learned from this §, and *Horne's*, chap. i. part iv. (vol. iii. p. 377.) treats rather of the peculiarities in modern Asiatic houses, which appear to illustrate the New Testament, than of his-

torical documents relative to houses as they were in the time of our Saviour. It seems from the various ways in which the synonyme of ὑπερῶον is written, ἀνάγαιον, ἀνώγειον, ἀνώγαιον ἀνώγειον, that it was a word unknown to the Greek copyists of the N. T.]

\* See *Duker* on *Livy* xxxiii. 48. and *Faber's* *Archæologia Hebræorum*, of which only the first vol. has appeared.

XCI. We have mentioned in the preceding section one of the ceremonies used towards the dead. Besides this, the corpse was entirely wrapped in bandages, and the face was covered with a napkin, (*John* xi. 44, xx. 5,) which practice is well illustrated by *Cuper*, *Obs.* ii. 9, and it was also anointed as a mark of honour; (*Mark* xvi. 1, *Luke* xxiv. 1, *John* xix. 39,) and in this consisted partly the ἐνταφιασμὸς or entombment. Musicians were hired at the funeral, (*Matt.* ix. 23;) the body was carried to the grave upon a bier; and the grave or sepulchre, which was a hollow rock, was sometimes ornamented on the outside with architectural additions. The interior had small chambers in its sides, each of a proper size to hold a human corpse: in one of these the corpse was deposited, and to facilitate this was one use of the lincn bandages. The sepulchre in which our Saviour was laid appears, however, to have been differently arranged, *John*



xx. 12. See *Stephanus Monachus*, Var. Sac. T. ii. p. 516, seq.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [See *Horne's* Introd. iii. p. 494, *Jahn's* Archæologia, p. 289, seq.]

XCII. The Jewish punishments mentioned in the New Testament are, 1. *Stoning*, Acts vii. 58, seq., from which text, compared with Deut. xvii. 7, the nature of the punishment is sufficiently clear. 2. *Beheading*, Acts xii. 2, 3. That the punishment of *crucifixion*, as it was undergone by Jesus, was not a Jewish but a Roman punishment, has been proved very satisfactorily by *Casaubon* in his *Exerc. Baron.* xvi. 77, in opposition to the opinion of *Lipsius* and others; nor do the Jewish writers mention crucifixion among their capital punishments. For the directions given by Moses respecting the suspension of criminals, must be understood of the public exposure on a gibbet of the bodies of criminals previously executed:<sup>m</sup> nor ought the words σταυρός, σταυροῦν, and the like, which are usually applied to the *cross*, to occasion any doubt on this subject. It is a more difficult question to decide whether the Jewish courts had the power of capital punishment, when the country was under procurators. The general condition of the provinces is against

the supposition : if, therefore, the Jewish courts possessed this power, it must have been by a special grant authorizing them to condemn and execute offenders against their religious law ; and this does not appear improbable, when we consider the extensive privileges granted to the Jews by the Cæsars. The text, *John xviii. 31*, seems, however, to settle the question, in which the Jews expressly declare that they did not possess the power of putting any one to death. Nor is the supposition that they had this power, materially supported by *Acts vii. 57*. For it is not certain that the stoning of Stephen took place before the accession of Agrippa to the government of Judea.<sup>n</sup>

<sup>m</sup> See *J. B. Michaelis* on the Capital Punishments of the Jews. Halle 1749, and *J. D. Michaelis'* Commentaries on the Law of Moses, t. v. § 231. The reader may also refer to § 72 of this chapter.

<sup>n</sup> [The difficulty is still more striking in *Acts ix. 2*, where the High Priest at Jerusalem is represented as possessing supreme power over the Jews at Damascus. In all probability, this must have occurred in the reign of Agrippa, and the Jews throughout Asia must have been obliged to refer their causes to the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. See *Heinrichs'* chronological table in Proleg. to Acts. In his notes, however, Heinrichs forgets his own dates, and speaks of St. Paul as acting without the authority of the Procurator ; whereas in *A. D. 67*, the date which he affixes to the con-

version of St. Paul, Judea was no longer a Roman province, and, of course, there was no Procurator.]

XCIII. As to other punishments, we meet with *fustigation*, or beating with batons, and its legal limits in 2 Cor. xi. 24, with *scourging* in Matt. x. 17, and finally with *excommunication* in John ix. 22, concerning which there are various disputes. And with respect to this I suspect that, as in many other points of Jewish Antiquities, more recent authorities have been mingled with those which are ancient and really to the purpose; and that in reality there was but one excommunication, which was referred to in the passage just quoted; and that it consisted in an exclusion from community in sacred rites, which exclusion, out of Jerusalem, would be simply an exclusion from the synagogue. At any rate, the texts 1 Cor. v. 5, and xvi. 22, are erroneously applied to excommunication, as *Basnage* satisfactorily proves in his *Disp. Antiq. S. Disp. 1. T. II. Annal.* I cannot, however, agree with him in supposing, with *Selden*, that excommunication was merely exclusion from private and civil society, for this would not be *exclusion from the synagogue*, ἀποσυνάγωγον εἶναι. Hitherto we have spoken of Jewish customs, and of other

circumstances arising from the influence of foreign dominion upon the Jews. Let us now turn our attention to certain circumstances directly Greek or Roman, which are mentioned in Scripture.

XCIV. In Roman history, then, the student ought to study carefully the history of the Cæsars from Augustus to Nero, this being the period of our Saviour's ministry, of the labours of the Apostles, and of the institution of the Christian church. There are many texts in the New Testament which cannot be understood without this knowledge, or which, at any rate, receive much light from it. This portion of history may best be learned from *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, *Dio Cassius*, and especially from *Josephus*; and many collections of illustrative observations have been made from these historians by modern scholars, of whom *Casaubon* and *Pagi*, in their works before quoted, and *Tillemont* in his *History of the Emperors*, are to be commended as the most accurate; and the student will do well to peruse, or at any rate, when he is in a difficulty, to consult their commentaries.<sup>o</sup> And in this matter it is most important to determine the harmony of dates between the acts of the Apostles and the reigns of the emperors. But this properly belongs

to Chronology, of which we have spoken before.

• [The titles of these works are in full, *Is. Casauboni, De Rebus Sacris Ecclesiasticis Exercitationes xvi. ad Card. Baronii prolegomena in Annales, Geneva, 1655. Critica Historico-chronologica in Universos Ann. Eccl. Baronii, Auctore Antonio Pagi, published at Antwerp (Geneva) in 1705, and republished by Francis Pagi in 1724.*

XCV. The student ought to be especially careful to have a clear idea of the government of the Roman empire, as instituted by Augustus; how and by what officers the business of the provinces was conducted, and what change was made upon the institutions which prevailed while the republic was free. Scholars generally take their notions of these matters from the historians whose works are ordinarily read in schools, for the purpose of learning the Latin language; and these historians generally describe the state of things previous to Augustus. Thus errors often arise, and the best scholars may sometimes be found at a loss. It must also be kept in mind that the arrangements of Augustus were occasionally altered by Tiberius and his successors. Thus, Achaia and Macedonia, which were first proconsular provinces, (see § xlvii.) were changed by Ti-

berius into Cæsarean, and governed by Legates; and again restored to the senate by Claudius. Hence in Acts xviii. 12, Gallio is properly called proconsul of Achaia, but in a different sense from that in which P. Sulpicius is so called by Cicero; as also the magistrates of Asia in Acts xix. 38,<sup>p</sup> where no one ought to find fault with the number. A knowledge of these points will enable every one to assign the right sense to the words ἡγεμῶν and ἡγεμονεύειν whenever they occur.

[<sup>p</sup> The reference here is to the word ἀνθύπατοι; and the question is, why is it in the plural? The commentators do not answer this very decidedly, some thinking that ἀνθύπατοι is used for magistrates generally; others that the plural is used for the singular, the allusion being to the Proconsul, whose residence was at Ephesus.]

XCVI. The extent of the judicial power in the provincial magistrates, and the manner in which it was exercised, may be learned from the sources pointed out in § 71. There are also many passages in later historians, in *Tacitus* especially, which throw light upon the provincial administration of justice, in those points which the practice under the emperors differed from the practice under the free republic; for this purpose, the tenth book of *Pliny's* epis-

cles may also be studied with advantage. Of the points which may thus be elucidated, is the practice of appealing to Cæsar, and also the nature of the cases reserved for his decision, see Acts xxv. 11, xxviii. 19.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> [In the original it is xxviii. 16, which has no reference to either point. But the translator can find no passage in the Acts relating to the nature of the *cases* reserved for Cæsar's judgment. The passage of Pliny referred to is the 37th Epistle of Book 10, where it appears, that by the Sempronian law no Roman citizen could be capitally convicted but by the suffrage of the people; which seems to have been so far in force even under the emperors, as to make it necessary to send the criminal to Rome.]

XCVII. And since there are some allusions in the New Testament to the military affairs of the Romans, both in the city and in the provinces, these also ought to be known by the interpreter of Scripture. In the city then some troops were required as a guard for the emperor's person; to these Augustus gave the name of Prætorian cohorts; the practice having been introduced by the triumvirs of giving several cohorts to each, whereas the original system was for each general to have only one. These Prætorian cohorts were commanded by two prefects, and they were used both as the

guards of the emperor's person and family, and also as the ordinary executioners of his commands. Tiberius appointed for them a camp without the city, which, with its inhabitants, is called, Phil. i. 13, *prætorium*; and hence, in *Acts* xxviii. 16, the prætorian prefect is called *στρατοπεδάρχης*. All military service within the city was performed by the soldiers of these cohorts. By the *prefect* mentioned in *Acts*, some learned men have supposed that *Burrhus* is intended, the probability of which opinion depends of course upon the date of St. Paul's arrival at Rome. For their argument, that the noun is in the singular number, and that, therefore, Burrhus must be intended, who had no colleague in the prefecture, whereas, both his predecessors and successors had colleagues, it is of no weight whatever. For *Trajan* ap. *Pliny* Ep. x. 68, says of some one, "let him be delivered bound to the Prætorian Prefect," in the singular; and in *Suetonius*, *Claudius*, c. ix. requests of the Senate that he may be permitted to introduce "*Præfectum Prætorium*," the prefect into their assembly; and yet no one hence infers, that in the reigns of Trajan and Claudius there was but one Prætorian Prefect.

XCVIII. In the provinces, legions or co-



horts were quartered for the preservation of the peace, externally and internally, and for the execution of such orders of the governor as required their assistance. The greater provinces had legions; the less, such as Judea, Cyrenaica, &c. which were governed by procurators, had only cohorts. Hence, in Acts, *σπεῖραι* only are mentioned, the *Italian*, chap. x. and the *Augustan* chap. xxvii. which some erroneously understand to mean legions. That this supposition is erroneous we conclude, both from the analogy of provincial institutions, and also from this, that the *Italian* legion was embodied by Nero after the date of chap. x, and that there was no *Augustan* legion in those regions. Hence we read in the New Testament of no military officer higher than a tribune. All this, however, must be understood of the peace establishment. In time of war, or when war was expected, legions were introduced; relative to which a passage may be found in *Joseph. A. J. xix. 9, 2*. Concerning the Roman legion and its camp, there is a noted passage in *Dio LV. p. 56*, in which *Lipsius*, *Breitinger*, and other learned men, find great difficulty; see *Reimar's* note on the passage. *Schwartz* of Altorf has published a tract on the Italian and Augustan

bands. The other military matters, such as arms, watches, &c. mentioned in the New Testament, are explained sufficiently in the common books of antiquities.

XCIX. To provincial affairs belong also the *census*, and other taxes, paid either into the public treasury, or into the Emperor's privy-purse, which we have already mentioned. In the greater provinces the collection was superintended by quæstors or procurators, the former of whom made their payments to the treasury, the latter to the privy-purse; but in Judea the whole matter was managed by the procurator. In the New Testament both *taxes* and *duties* are mentioned, and these have been already noticed; but respecting the census, it may be necessary to say something more in this place. We have explained the nature of the census preparatory to the levying of tribute, the name of census being also applied to the tribute itself; for, as Tacitus i. 2, speaks of *tributa aut vectigalia*, so Matt. xvii. 25, distinguishes between *τέλη ἢ κῆνσος*. To what has been said on this head, the student may add Lipsius' *Exc. K.* on *Tacit. Ann.* i. 31, though indeed there is no difficulty or doubt in this matter. Some learned men, however, are of opinion, that another census is mention-

ed in the New Testament, a census in which there was no other object than to ascertain the numbers of the people, and that such was the *census* or enrolment which brought Joseph and Mary to Jerusalem, Luke ii. 1; and this opinion has, with much probability, been defended by *Perizonius*, in his treatise *de Augusta orbis terr. descriptione*. On the other hand, it may be argued, that there is no acknowledged instance of such a census being taken in a province, much less in an allied kingdom as Judea then was; and if such a census could be taken in Herod's kingdom, there is no additional difficulty in supposing that a tax also could be levied, either on the precedent given by Pompey, or by express stipulation with Herod. On this matter, however, it is difficult to say anything with certainty.

C. There are also in the New Testament notices of other Roman matters, as their *colonies*, *coins*, *punishments*, &c. some of which we have already mentioned, and others, as being sufficiently known to all scholars, we have omitted. Thus, the nature and privileges of Roman citizenship, alluded to by St. Paul in the *Acts*, are so well known, that no one can be in any difficulty respecting them. The question, however, whence Paul, or his father,

or his ancestors, attained the right of citizenship, cannot so easily be answered. It appears, however, from Cicero, in *Verrem*, that the later Roman generals (*Imperatores*), were in the habit of admitting to the citizenship inhabitants of the provinces, either for services rendered to the state, or from their own partialities, or for eminence of any kind. For any of these causes, the citizenship may have been bestowed upon some ancestor of St. Paul.<sup>r</sup>

<sup>r</sup> [A good deal of information respecting the admission of foreigners to the citizenship may also be found in the *Orat. pro Archia*. See especially chap. v. where we find that Ennius the poet was thus enfranchized : and chap. vi. where it is noticed that Pompey conferred the citizenship on an assembly of the army upon Theophanes a Mitylenæan ; and that Sylla had conferred it upon many Spanish and Gallic poets. As the Roman commanders were more devoted *rebus agendis* than to letters, we may reasonably conclude that if many foreigners were admitted citizens on account of their poetical talents, many more must have been admitted for their useful services.]

CI. Many Greek rites and customs must of course be mentioned in the New Testament ; since, in the Acts, many events are mentioned which happened in Greek cities, and most of the epistles were written to churches, whose members were Greek citizens. The inter-

preter of the New Testament ought, therefore to be well acquainted with the religion, the magistrates, the public and domestic habits of the Greeks. A knowledge of their religious opinions and practices will throw light upon such passages as Acts xix. 35, where Ephesus is said to be *νεωκόρος* of Diana, and where the statue of Diana is said to be *διοπετῆς*. Such knowledge will also apply to the explanation of Acts xvii. 23, and xiv. 12, and also the texts which speak of the absurdity of heathen idolatry, as Acts xvii. 16, Rom. i., Eph. ii. 1, &c., and the texts relating to *εἰδωλόθυτα*, or meats sacrificed to idols. As points to be illustrated by this knowledge, we may also mention the *Asiarchæ*, Acts xix. 31, and *γραμματεῖς* id. 35, of whom *Valesius* has written ad *Euseb.* iv. 15. *Rubenius de Urbibus Neocoris*, *Spanheim de usu et præstantia numismatum*, *Diss.* ix. § 4; also the Athenian Areopagites, Acts xvii. 34.<sup>s</sup>

\* [*Wesseling* has a treatise on the *Asiarchs*, Utrecht 1753. *Tertullian*, de Spectaculis, speaks of them under the name of *Præsides sacerdotales*.]

CII. There are some passages in Scripture, to the right understanding of which a know-

ledge of the sacrificial rites of the Greeks may be useful, as Acts xiv. 13, where ταῦροι καὶ στέμματα occur in the sense of *bulls adorned with garlands*. To the same class some are disposed to refer τετραχηλισμένα, Hebr. iv. 13, which, however, may, with greater probability, be referred to the dragging of the bodies of criminals through the streets. See *Suetonius'* Vitell. xvii. compare 1 Cor. iv. 9. In what sense St. Paul calls himself περικάθαγμα and περίψημα, 1 Cor. iv. 13, may be explained from the manner of offering piacular sacrifices, especially human sacrifices, among the Greeks: this subject has been well illustrated by *L. Bos*, in his *Exerc. Philol.* ad N. T. on the text.

CIII. Every thing relative to the *Coins* current in the first century ought to be thoroughly known to the interpreter; because, in speaking of money, the sacred writers generally use Greek terms, and the Hebrew money ought to be explained by a comparison with the Greek, as we have before shown. For, not to speak of the *drachma*, which we know corresponds with the Roman denarius, and with the quarter of a Hebrew shekel, or of the *stater*, which we have mentioned before; we may notice λεπτόν, Mark xii. 42, which *Grono-*

*vius de Sestert*, p. 91, shows to have been sometimes used by the Greeks as synonymous with *drachma*. That text, however, is one of difficult interpretation to those who are not satisfied with the ordinary versions of it. In Acts xix. 19, we find ἀργυρίου πέντε μυριάδες: this, it is clear, must be interpreted according to the Greek notation, not according to the Hebrew, as Hammond supposes; this appears both from the nature of the transaction and from the place; that is, by ἀργυρίου we must understand *drachmas*. For similar reasons the interpreter ought to be acquainted with the weights and measures of the Greeks. For the *talent* and *mina* are mentioned in the Gospels; but of these, and the μετρητήης, John ii. 6, we have already spoken.

CIV. The Apostle Paul often draws images from the *armour* of the Greeks, as in the beautiful passage Eph. vi. 11, from their *gymnastic exercises*, as in Phil. iii. 12, and 1 Cor. ix. 24; and of course such passages can be explained only by one who is acquainted with these matters. Ὑπωπιάζειν in 1 Cor. ix. 27 is well illustrated by *L. Bos*, in his *Exerc. Phil.* on the text. See *Zornius ad excerptum Rhenferdii in Bibl. Antiqu. Exeget.* p. 866, seq.<sup>t</sup>

<sup>t</sup> [The translator is unable to explain the references here, the Latin stands thus, το ὑπωπιάζειν ibi pulchre illustrat *L. Bos.* ad h. l. et totum illud, p. 26, 27. *Zornius* ad excerptum *Rhenferdii* in *Bibl. Antiqu.* Exeget. p. 866, seq.]

CV. It will be useful to know the customs of the Greeks with respect to *public harangues*, in order to understand the use made of the theatre in this matter, Acts xix. 31, and in another text, xii. 21, where Herod is described as haranguing the Cæsarean populace. On this subject the student may consult *Ranischius* in his Disputation on this text, or *Josephus'* account of the same event. The *naval affairs* of the Greeks ought also to be studied, in order to throw light upon the descriptions of St. Paul's voyages, especially upon Acts xxvii. 16, 17, 28, 29, 30, &c. and xxviii. 11, which have been well illustrated by *Scaliger* ad *Euseb.* p. 40, and still better by *Albertus* on the several passages.<sup>u</sup> But above all, ought the student to consult *Scheffer's* work, *de re Navali Veterum*, who has treated this subject with great accuracy. There are also other smaller points of Greek antiquity which ought to be known, but which it is needless to particularize here.

<sup>u</sup> [*J. Alberti* in his *Observationes Philologicae in sacros N. Fœderis libros.* Lugd. Bat. 1725.]



CVI. I have mentioned the foregoing points, that the student may see how many portions of the sacred books there are, which cannot be satisfactorily explained without a competent acquaintance with Greek and Latin literature. And there are other reasons why these branches of knowledge, together with those enumerated in the beginning of this chapter, should again and again be recommended.

CVII. For if those who employ themselves on the interpretation of Greek and Latin authors do not fear to examine every point down to the very minutiae with scrupulous accuracy, so as to leave nothing obscure, either in the matter or phraseology, and are praised for their diligence in so doing; it must certainly be disgraceful to an interpreter of Scripture to withhold a similar care from the study of the sacred books, and to excuse his indolence or ignorance by a pretence that such accurate knowledge of the sense of Scripture is of no use to the promotion of religious knowledge.

CVIII. It must also be kept in mind, that the human intellect is, in every branch of knowledge, desirous of something more than what is absolutely necessary; and looks about for something either more extensive or more recondite on which to exercise its ingenuity and

diligence. It will, therefore, be always safest for an interpreter to devote himself to the course which has been recommended, lest he should be led aside into metaphysical triflings, and all the follies into which men who approach the interpretation of Scripture without accurate scholarship, are too apt to fall. Nothing but the prevalent ignorance and contempt for sound learning produced in the middle ages the puerile fancies of the scholastic divines; and even now produces follies equally contemptible and pernicious.<sup>x</sup>

<sup>x</sup> [Two moral causes may be mentioned, which render even acute judgment and accurate scholarship unavailing to the interpretation of Scripture. The first is *intellectual pride*, whereby the interpreter sets up his own judgment of propriety above the declarations of inspired writers; and next *spiritual pride*, whereby the interpreter imagines that he is at liberty to affix what sense he pleases to a text, and that his exposition is to be received as something oracular, if not as the absolute dictate of inspiration. Of the former error the Unitarian expositors *Priestley*, *Belsham*, and the editors of the *Improved Version*, are lamentable instances; of the latter, few persons conversant with what is called the religious world, can in our day be at a loss for examples. The translator has been assured, in a tone that forbade all appeal either to logic or to grammar, that the clause, "Forgive us our trespasses," meant, give us an assurance that our sins are forgiven; and that the meaning of, "why will ye die, O house of Israel?" was this, why, O Christians! will ye not live up to an enjoyment of your privileges?]

CIX. The most important consideration however is, that without a knowledge of the subjects alluded to in the preceding sections, the word of God will be forced and perverted in the most ridiculous manner. In reference to the single subject of our Lord's passion, all who know the subject must be aware, that many interpreters have trifled, and that some still trifle very absurdly. And indeed the commentaries of the earlier interpreters are full of errors arising from ignorance of history, antiquities, and languages. The duty of guarding against such errors in the interpretation of Scripture, must be allowed by every one.

CX. The application of antiquarian and grammatical knowledge to the interpretation of the New Testament, must be accompanied with some caution. For, in the first place, we must be careful not to rely upon such knowledge exclusively, nor to make a vain shew of it. Some interpreters have erred in this way, whose sole object has been to illustrate words and phrases in the New Testament, by similar words and phrases in the classical Greek authors; and who expend all their diligence in hunting after such passages; which class of interpreters have already been noticed in chap.

ix. § 48. Their common practice is to force the words of Scripture into accordance with their classical authorities, or else to force these authorities from their proper meaning into an apparent harmony with the texts they are brought to illustrate. The class of books called *Philological Observations* from the Greek writers, are full of this kind of folly; which ought carefully to be avoided by the interpreter. It is his duty not to undervalue Latin and Greek literature in the interpretation of Scripture, but at the same time to use it with moderation and judgment; under a conviction that more of useful illustration may be drawn from a comparison of the original Hebrew of the Old Testament with the Septuagint version, than from all other books together. In the application of antiquarian knowledge he must be careful not to obtrude it unseasonably, and thus to elicit an imaginary sense; nor, on the other hand, to imagine ancient rites and customs from expressions imperfectly understood, of which error many examples may be found in philological treatises; both those that relate to the New Testament, and those which relate to profane authors. For we have already warned the student that all this knowledge ought to be sure and accurate, that is to

say, that it ought to be drawn from original sources. When inaccurate it does more harm than good.

CXI. Lest we should seem to have omitted any point of ancient history, it may be right in this place to mention *Philosophy*, the application of which to the interpretation of the New Testament, has been examined in a separate treatise by *Walchius* of Jena. But great caution must be used in this matter. In the first place, there is no reason why we should study the opinions of the Stoics and Epicureans, merely because these two sects are casually mentioned in the Acts: nor does the philosophy frequently mentioned by St. Paul apply to these. Some, however, think that in the Epistles of St. Paul, there are allusions to an eastern system of philosophy out of which the Gnostics drew their system; and consequently *Hammond* and others explain many texts by a reference to the opinions of the Gnostics. It is well known, however, that the Gnostics with their various branches, were posterior to the Apostolic age; and that *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις*, 1 Tim. vi. 20, must be referred to something else than Jewish dogmas. And with respect to those texts in which these interpreters imagine that they detect allu-

sions to the Gnostic dogmas, I fear they only shew their own ignorance of the Apostolic diction. Thus, for example, in Heb. i. 2, in the words, *δι' οὗ καὶ τοῦς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε*, they imagine that the Apostle is alluding to the Æons of the Gnostics; whereas it is merely a Hebraism expressing the creation of the world, and was so understood by all the ancients. We must be careful, therefore, in such matters, not to be misled by a shew of recondite learning, the very depth of which ought to render it more suspected: and, upon the whole, we must be careful, lest by a misapplication of our knowledge, we render it rather an obstacle than an aid to the interpretation of Scripture.

‡ [The reader may find the opinion of Ernesti developed in *C. C. Tiltman's Tract. de Vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quæsitis*, Lips. 1773. But unless he has a very unusual degree of leisure, he will do well not to plunge deeply into this very difficult subject.]

## LIST OF TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.

---

MATTHEW.				ACTS.			
Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Vol.	Page.
iv.	15.	ii.	286	iii.	12.	ii.	127
v.	21.	ii.	181	vii.	6.	i.	183
vi.	11.	ii.	111—208	vii.	14.	i.	182
ix.	24.	i.	167	xix.	31.	i.	68
xiv.	3.	ii.	265	xiii.	48.	ii.	181
xiv.	25.	i.	19	xvi.	20.	ii.	271
xv.	24.	ii.	286	xvii.	8.	i.	110
xxvi.	28.	i.	146—149	xix.	28.	ii.	272
				xx.	2.	ii.	268
				xx.	12.	i.	68
MARK.				ROMANS.			
vi.		45. ii.	267	v.	15—19.	i.	58
LUKE.				vi.	3.	i.	82
ii.	2.	{ i.	173—174	vi.	5.	i.	85
		{ ii.	293	viii.	1.	i.	82
iii.	1.	ii.	291	viii.	20.	ii.	21
iii.	2.	ii.	297	viii.	24.	i.	71
xv.	11. seq.	i.	154—157	viii.	30.	ii.	239
JOHN.				xi.	1.	i.	198
i.	1.	ii.	240	xi.	8.	i.	46
i.	28.	ii.	94	xii.	1.	i.	153
iii.	3.	{ i.	136	xii.	6.	i.	127—128
		{ ii.	179	xiii.	14.	i.	151
iii.	6—8.	i.	191	xv.	19.	ii.	268
ix.	2.	ii.	326	1 CORINTHIANS.			
x.	30.	ii.	194	i.	17.	i.	109
xix.	14.	i.	171	iii.	4.	ii.	14—15
xix.	23.	ii.	319				

Chap. Ver.	Vol.	Page.
iv. 3—4.	i.	168
vii. 1.	ii.	70
vii. 5.	i.	162
ix. 5.	i.	107
xi. 10	}	. 11
		ii.
xv. 51.	ii.	131

## 2 CORINTHIANS.

vi. 6.	i.	68
viii. 19.	ii.	81
xi. 32.	ii.	301

## GALATIANS.

iii. 17.	i.	183
iii. 27.	i.	151
v. 12.	ii.	111

## EPHESIANS.

iii. 18.	ii.	257
iv. 9.	i.	87
v. 26.	i.	20
v. 32.	ii.	82

## COLOSSIANS.

Chap. Ver.	Vol.	Page.
i. 16.	ii.	254
ii. 23.	ii.	112

## 2 TIMOTHY.

ii. 18.	i.	71
---------	----	----

## HEBREWS.

ix. 20.	i.	146
---------	----	-----

## JAMES.

i. 1.	ii.	286
-------	-----	-----

## 1 PETER.

ii. 9.	ii.	160
v. 13.	ii.	285

## 2 PETER.

i. 6.	i.	68
i. 10.	i.	85

## 1 JOHN.

iii. 2.	i.	47—8
---------	----	------

## REVELATIONS.

xv. 2.	i.	87
--------	----	----

FINIS.











4207 -

