

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02867 8001

HISTORIC ORIGIN

OF THE BIBLE



LIBRARY

Wycliffe College

TORONTO

Stacks

Shelf No. BS 455.B54

Register No. 2711

Ch

2.00

140

HISTORIC ORIGIN OF THE BIBLE

THE
HISTORIC ORIGIN
OF
THE BIBLE.

A HANDBOOK OF PRINCIPAL FACTS FROM THE BEST RECENT
AUTHORITIES, GERMAN AND ENGLISH.

BY
EDWIN CONE BISSELL, A.M.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY PROF. ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, D.D.,
OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

NEW YORK:
ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & COMPANY,
900, BROADWAY.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873, by
ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH AND COMPANY,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Ms 3041 ✓

Press of
JOHN WILSON AND SON,
Cambridge.

Bindery of
ROBERT RUTTER,
116 and 118 East 14th St.
New York.

P R E F A C E.

OTHER questions concerning the Bible, however attractive or important, should not be suffered to absorb us so completely as to leave no time for the consideration of its historical origin and transmission; there are few even of the deepest or weightiest that would not gain from its due consideration both a quickened interest and a clearer warranty of acknowledged truth.

As in the case of the one incomparable Life whose gracious advent in the lowly Bethlehem is the beginning of an inspired Gospel, the human origin of the one incomparable Book might be expected to receive our earliest attention: its humble starting-point in the dim past; what signs then attended it; what wise men welcomed it; the process of its growth in strength and moral beauty and in favor with God and with men.

Without prejudice to its higher claims and teachings, rather, indeed, as a true and substantial basis for them, the Bible may, with propriety, be thus considered simply on its human or historical side. And of the two really distinct methods of investigation, this naturally and logically precedes the other. "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural."

At least, we here present invaluable and urgent facts, directly bearing on the most important of themes. They have been collected from a wide and often obscure dispersion, and, while crowded close into one handy volume, are yet fully equipped and orderly marshalled for instant use.

Our labors in this field have not been without their embarrassments. One of the chief of these has been an almost painful sense of responsibility touching accuracy of statement where a failure to be accurate must be attended by such lamentable results. We have faithfully endeavored to preserve the true historic mean, avoiding alike the peremptoriness of theological prepossessions and the looseness of an unguarded liberalism. We have conscientiously aimed to get at the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and then to set it forth with no deceptive coloring of our own. And in this aim we have ever been guided by the motto of school-boy days:

"Seize upon truth where'er 'tis found,
On Christian or on heathen ground."

This has been our shining goal, but that we have never swerved from it we should not dare affirm. Indeed, we prefer to tender our confession of conscious imperfections beforehand.

We acknowledge, too, that it was an ambitious venture for one hand to attempt to pluck the ripest and fullest ears of so extended a harvest field. It should scarcely be expected, therefore, that absolutely nothing would be gathered that is not grain, or that what is gathered will always prove to be of the fairest and best.

Still for any case of serious misstatement, or a faulty incompleteness of statement, more to be anticipated, the author has provided at least a partial corrective in the book itself. To such an extent do its pages disclose the way-marks both of the sources and methods of its investigations, that ample means are furnished alike for a speedy detection of errors and a more complete tracing and supporting of all truths announced. This feature of the work, adopted at the cost of much additional labor, and the risk of seeming to court for it the appearance of learning, it is believed will materially

serve to make it a convenient manual, and better adapt it to the uses of those whose studies may lie in this direction.

I have not written solely for scholars, nor indeed solely for the purpose of simplifying and popularizing valuable truths which, though *lying at the basis of all thorough Bible study*, are within the reach of but comparatively few persons and the actual knowledge of a much smaller number. My object has been, rather so to present these truths as to render them easily accessible and intelligible to ordinary Bible readers, especially to Sunday-school and Bible-class teachers, and at the same time, with such conciseness and completeness as to make a treatise not unworthy the notice of ministers, theological students, and others who cultivate the higher learning.

Yet be the result of these many months of labor whatever it may on other minds, one thing is already assured, — the effort has been, in itself, delightfully rewarding, step by step. One has said that he had got a new Bible through the furnace. The writer feels that, even through the pleasing agency of most attractive studies, the Bible has become to him almost another book: something more human and tangible without being any the less divine and authoritative; that, in seeking to discover where man's original connection with it begins, he has come sensibly nearest to its diviner elements, — the awful and the conclusive overshadowing of the Almighty.

WINCHESTER, Mass., Jan. 1873.

CONTENTS.



PART I.

History of the English Bible.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE TO THE TIME OF TYNDALE, *page 1*

How Christianity was introduced into Britain; Old Latin original of the first Saxon translations; first attempts at translation; the Psalms in Saxon; Bede's work; translation of Alfred; an interlinear version; the Rushworth gloss; Danish incursions prevent Bible translations in the eleventh century; a marked peculiarity of the Saxon versions; the Bible in English; first *literal* translation; other translations; version of Wyclif; the whole Bible in English for the first time; More's statement respecting the translation of the whole Bible before the time of Wyclif, how accounted for; suggestion of George P. Marsh; opinion of Baber; outline of Wyclif's life; first came into prominence; action of the Council of Constance; doctrines denounced in 1410; Wyclif a prolific writer; his work of translating; has aid in translating the old Testament; Wyclif's facilities for the work; character of the Vulgate, from which he translated; testimony of a contemporary; the translation baldly literal; character of the English used; wide circulation of the version, opposition to the translating and reading of the Bible; Wyclif defended by the Duke of Lancaster; cost of a Bible at this time; Purvey's recension; special honor due to Wyclif; supposition of still another version; influence of Wyclif's version on its successors; work only recently printed; the Lord's prayer as translated by him.

CHAPTER II.

VERSION OF TYNDALE 17

First translation from the original; first *printed* English Bible; beginnings of the "Authorized Version;" early life of Tyndale; meets Erasmus, who encourages his view concerning vernacular

translations; as tutor; applies to Tunstall; a year of doubt; is not discouraged; sails for the continent, May, 1524; begins to translate; qualifications as a translator; testimony of Spalatinus; of Sir Thomas More; of George Joye; witness of his work itself; original letter of Tyndale; Westcott's crucial test of Tyndale's scholarship; importance of the question; mistake of Hallam, Froude, and others; Tyndale's appreciation of his responsibilities; favorable linguistic developments of the period; study of the sacred languages, especially of Hebrew; grammars and lexicons; Tyndale's favorable opportunities; monkish opposition to learning; first translation when published; interference of Cochlæus; Bible printed in several editions; interference of Joye; Tyndale states his grievances; translations of the Old Testament; his marginal glosses and comments; the version in England; More's attack; specific charges and Tyndale's reply; the hostile party resort to the fagot; example of their extreme measures; circulation of the Bible not suppressed; Tyndale's heroic spirit; persecution unavailing; the government at last succumbs; general characteristics of Tyndale's version; was faithful to the text and sense of the sacred writers; English style of the version; opinion of G. P. Marsh, Ellicott and Westcott; style and interpretation Tyndale's own; has left to later translators the plan on which they should work; the Lord's Prayer according to Tyndale.

CHAPTER III.

VERSIONS OF COVERDALE, MATTHEW (ROGERS), TAVERNER, AND THE GREAT BIBLE 39

First complete edition of the whole Bible translated from the original tongues in print. Convocation forced to provide a version; Coverdale enters into Tyndale's labors; his life; general estimate of his character; his work on the English Bible; distrusts his own competency and defers to Tyndale; the first edition; from what the translation was made; influence on the "Authorized Version;" *Matthew's Bible*: first complete publication of Tyndale's translations; remarkable reception accorded it in England; what it really was; the publishers; the condemned translation sanctioned; the edition quickly disposed of; displeasure of many bishops and priests; sketch of the life of Rogers; Taverner's recension; its aim and character; *the Great Bible*: real character of Matthew's Bible at last discovered; work of Great Bible done in Paris; interference of Inquisition; sometimes called "Cranmer's Bible;" Coverdale projects a commentary,

but fails to introduce it; subsequent editions; its points of special interest; first appearance of italics in the English Bible; course of the government with respect to the Scriptures.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GENEVAN, BISHOPS', AND RHEMISH VERSIONS 54

Reign of Edward VI.; many printing presses employed in multiplying Bibles; reign of Bloody Mary; the reaction limited; many persons become exiles; those in Geneva address themselves to the work of preparing a family Bible; a fit place for the object; they are aided by the translators of other versions; by whom the work was principally done; Sampson; when the Genevan New Testament appeared; its popularity and that of the whole Bible; afterwards prohibited; sources of popularity; printed in Roman type and with other peculiarities; true principles of translation recognized; Westcott's estimate; the New Testament based on Tyndale's; its influence on the "Authorized Version;" *the Bishops' Bible*: reign of Elizabeth; no preference expressed by government for any particular version; the Genevan had supplanted the Great Bible in some of the churches; Elizabeth very cautious; project of Archbishop Parker for a new translation; work when begun; its external characteristics; royal authorization only tacitly given; it supplants the Great Bible; a fact of importance; failure of some of the translators to appreciate their responsibilities; their chief aim; Westcott's opinion of the work; interpolations omitted; its New Testament; *Rhemish Bible*: first Roman Catholic version in the vernacular; translators' reasons for the version; constrained by circumstances; special motive; how the way was prepared for its reception; who the translators were; from what original sources it was made; translators' reasons for giving the Vulgate the preference; followed it verbally and blindly; other peculiarities; critical value of this version; its later history; great liberties taken with the text; a new version projected.

CHAPTER V.

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION 70

Probable motives of King James for favoring a new version; repudiates his former professions; the so-called Authorized Version never authorized; the king expects much; a beneficent Providence manifest; first broaching of the subject; the king persists

in the scheme; names of translators selected and provision sought for their support; other scholars solicited to aid; the remuneration which they actually received; the expense of publication borne by the publisher; sanctioned by Government only as the Bishops' Bible; beginning of the work and number of persons engaged; the most distinguished named; representatives of the Puritan party; charges of a theological bias; the preface disclaims the dominance of Puritans; testimony of Trench; charges against Bancroft; general plan of the work; list of rules; not strictly followed; work of final revision; admirable principles adopted by the revisers among themselves; did not confine themselves to the king's rules; when the book was published; revision in 1638; one projected by Cromwell's parliament; why this version included the Apocrypha; a leading principle of the revisers of 1611; relation of this version to those previously made in English; special influence of the Genevan and Doway versions; some faults; a grand recommendation; objections of Romanists; its marginal readings; testimony of Faber; the English style.



PART II.

The New Testament.

CHAPTER I.

THE WRITTEN TEXT 89

Prevalence of the Greek language at the time of Christ; the Greek at Alexandria; language of Palestine; of the New Testament; most apparent influence of Hebrew and Christian thought; effects of the mixture of these various elements in the language of the New Testament; Winer's opinion of New Testament Hebraisms; Greek constructions; language and style adapted to the message; Hebraisms consciously adopted; writing materials; the papyrus; writing by amanuenses; copies how multiplied; New Testament MSS. extant; material, form, appearance of the page; meaning of Uncial; whence MSS. come; palimpsests; names of MSS.; how the prevalent system of notation originated; defects of the method; fragmentary condition of New Testament MSS.; lectionaries; MS. fragments; number of MSS.; Uncials; their age and value; witnesses for an earlier period; age how determined; punctuation, chapters, sections,

titles and subscriptions, accentuation; these marks the data for determining the age of MSS.; present locality of important MSS.; their relative importance; account of certain Uncials, the Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus; most important of the Cursives, — Basiliensis, Colbertinus, Leicestrensis, and a MS. of the Apocalypse; importance of the Cursives generally; various "readings" of MSS.; the originals not required; superiority of New Testament MSS.; whole number of variations and what they consist in; how they arose; in the main simple and natural mistakes, and not really damaging; teaching of the MSS. harmonious; testimony of Bentley and Davidson.

CHAPTER II.

ANCIENT VERSIONS AND PRINTED TEXT 115

Value of the ancient versions; their value in apologetics; the Peshito version, origin, proof of age, and characteristics; the Philoxenian; a Syriac Evangelium; an Ethiopic version; Egyptian, Thebaic, Memphitic, and still another; the Armenian; Persic, Georgian, Arabic, Gothic, Slavonic, and Latin versions; date of the earliest of the Latin; Vulgate of Jerome; the New Testament of this version; revision under Charlemagne; action of the Council of Trent, &c.; *the Printed Text*; history of printed text why important; first attempts at printing the Greek New Testament; the Alcalá Bible; late MSS. used; editions of Erasmus; MSS. used, and text how treated; editions and number of copies; editions of Robert Stephens, his text; Beza's Testament and its relation to the "received" text; the Elzevirs; Walton's Polyglott; labors of Mill, of Bentley, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Sholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford; the questions concerning recensions not examined; Westcott's rules for a critical establishment of the text; Lachmann's; those of De Wette, Tischendorf, Davidson, Tregelles, Scrivener; Tregelles's tribute to the general integrity of the text.

CHAPTER III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON 140

Meaning of the term Canon; of the terms authentic and genuine; reasons for the order of treatment adopted; simplicity of the historic method of proof; preliminary statements called for; special need of New Testament not at first felt; period of determining the Canon to be only approximately fixed; not estab-

lished by the Apostles; nor ecclesiastical convention; nor miraculous interposition; fixed gradually; public announcement later; causes acting to produce the final result; no ecclesiastical pressure; dominance of certain fathers not a factor in the problem; early reverence for the New Testament books; infrequent quotations by Apostolic Fathers to be expected; reasons for scanty traces of the New Testament in the sub-Apostolic age; testimony not to be too much depreciated; citations from Apocryphal writings; fact of evident discrimination in favor of New Testament books; too much not to be made of the omissions of early writers; aim of witnesses to be considered; ancient writers not to be held to rules of modern criticism; these investigations concern the *genuineness* of the New Testament writings; point of departure; Marcion and his Canon; how it was constituted; Canon of Muratori; Irenæus and his testimony; cites Apocryphal works; Clement of Alexandria and his writings; Tertullian and his treatment of the New Testament; the Old Latin version; the Peshito version; review of evidence and its general nature; Origen and his testimony to the New Testament books; general retrospect; Canon essentially determined at this time; other important facts remain; Justin Martyr, his works and their import; desperation of those who would break the force of Justin's testimony; epistle to Diognetus and Clementine Homilies; Basilides the Gnostic; special point of his testimony; the Apostolic Fathers; sum and essential character of their references; traces here of the disputed books; value of this kind of evidence; period of Eusebius, Athanasius, and the early councils; Canon takes its present form, first by general consent, then by announcement and final ratification; position of Origen; the disputed books; effects of the Diocletian persecution; Augustine; Eusebius; the Homologoumena and Antilegomena; reasons for citing Apocryphal works; sum of the teachings of Eusebius; contents of the Constantinopolitan Bible; present history of Canon closes at this point; it remains essentially the same ever afterwards; Jerome; Augustine; relation of the Church and councils to the final result; the Canon a result of Christian instinct overruled by divine Providence; statements and inferences in conclusion; catalogues, the crystallization of scattered references; slow growth a basis of correctness; testimony of sceptics and heretics; historical evidence all in one direction; sufficient discussion to prove care and research; doubts concerning one book should not extend to the rest; a twofold Canon recommended by some.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPELS AND ACTS 186

This chapter a proper sequel to the preceding; Gospels and Acts found together in MSS.; titles of the Gospels; the Synoptics, their origin; the apostles preachers, not writers; necessity for written Gospels afterwards arose; contents of the Synoptics; *Matthew*: title, personal history of the writer, time when written; special testimony to genuineness; *Mark*: his personal history; date and genuineness of his work; *Luke*: who he was; characteristics and date of his Gospel, with proofs of genuineness; direction of modern attacks; testimony of Justin Martyr, Papias, Hegesippus, and the Canon of Muratori; *John*: his Gospel peculiar; source and principle of objections to the work; contents probably stand in the way of its reception; illustration of unfair dealing with facts; positive proofs of genuineness; difficulties involved in a theory of spuriousness; supposed forger not always on his guard; character of the work of forger does not agree with the age in which it was produced; the Gospel combats Cerinthus, its alleged author; testimony of last two verses of the Gospel; of Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, and many others; Bleek's conclusion; *Acts of the Apostles*: title; testimony of Irenæus to authorship; internal evidence confirmatory; various allusions to the work by early writers; date and credibility.

CHAPTER V.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL 206

Advantages of the epistles with respect to proofs of genuineness; the churches addressed important witnesses; difficulty in forging such documents; *Romans*: Clement of Rome; Polycarp; the "Elder;" Justin Martyr; early heretical sects never denied the epistles to be Paul's. *I Corinthians* Paul's personality impressed upon the work; it is acknowledged by the Church at Corinth; testimony of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Irenæus, and others. *II. Corinthians*: a sequel to the first; various witnesses to its genuineness; *Galatians*: genuineness generally admitted; Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, and others acquainted with it; date; *Ephesians*: genuineness disputed by Davidson and others on internal grounds; survey of historical testimony; *Philippians*: supposed date; importance of allusions in other New Testament

books to facts here recorded; basis of modern doubts; no probable motive for forgery; external testimony; *Colossians*: Colossæ and Paul's relation to the Christian church there; internal characteristics favor his authorship; Davidson and De Wette admit its genuineness; testimony of Justin Martyr and others, with date; *I. Thessalonians*: Of Thessalonica; undesigned coincidences; Apostolic Fathers do not quote it, but make many allusions; Polycarp, Dionysius of Corinth, Irenæus, and others testify; date; *II. Thessalonians*: first and second epistles linked together and mutually supporting; source of principal difficulty; date; *I. Timothy*: who Timothy was; whither this letter was sent; allèged grounds for impugning its genuineness; Paul's opportunities for writing the epistle abundant; first and second Timothy historically stand or fall together; testimony of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Irenæus, and others; *II. Timothy*: when and where written; witnesses in addition to those cited in first epistle; *Titus*: its internal characteristics; earliest traces in history; *Philemon*: needs but little external support; sufficient reason for infrequent allusions to the work in history.

CHAPTER VI.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES, AND THE APOCALYPSE 228

Authorship of Epistle to the Hebrews probably to be always matter of doubt; the different authors suggested; Professor Kendrick's conclusion; to whom the letter was first sent; its genuineness as a revered product of the Apostolic age not doubtful; no opposition to the work developed in the earliest times; list of early writers who refer to it; Justin Martyr, Pinytus, Pantænu.; partial summary of evidence; records of history during the interval of doubt; Dionysius of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, &c.; *James*: whence the name Catholic epistles; not certainly known what James wrote this epistle; different opinions concerning its authorship; doubtful authorship the occasion of suspecting the work itself; traces of it in ecclesiastical literature; evidence, on the whole, satisfactory; *I. Peter*: of Simon Peter, the professed author; his residence at Rome; to whom the letter is addressed and its date; historical proofs abundant; no doubts expressed in early times; the second epistle witnesses to it, and nearly all the early Christian literature; Clement of Alexandria, the "Shepherd," &c.; *II. Peter*: a "disputed" book; not found in the Peshito ver-

sion or the Muratorian Canon; its own testimony pertinent; what would follow from a supposition of imposture; evidence of early writers; possible testimony of Irenæus and Hermas; important evidence from Cappadocia; Origen the first to quote the epistle as Peter's; references to the work reasonably sufficient; grounds of hesitation on the part of early Christians; *I. John*: author the same as of the Fourth Gospel; opinions of Bleek and De Wette; author not definitely announced; external testimony from Polycarp to Origen; *II. and III. John*: they have not the same fulness of evidence as the first; reckoned as "Antilegomena" by Eusebius; modern doubts based on internal peculiarities; Johannine authorship defended; earliest notice in the Muratorian Canon; the two epistles possibly treated as one, of which some examples are given; Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Alexander (Bishop of Alexandria), and Jerome; *Jude*: the particular Jude not easily identified; direct testimony of the "Adumbrations"; internal evidence; first traces of the work; Clement of Alexandria indisputably alludes to it; Malchion and Eusebius; Jerome explains reason of hesitation in its acceptance; *The Apocalypse*: historically one of the best supported of the New Testament writings; what it claims for itself; differences of style between it and other supposed works of John; account of its origin by Irenæus; historical evidence for Johannine authorship; evidence of the Canon of Muratori, Old Latin version, the Peshito, &c.; Melito of Sardis an important witness; all the foregoing witnesses in favor of the authorship of John; examples of alleged opposition to the current opinion; contents of the work might furnish occasion for hesitancy; Jerome and Augustine fully accepted the work as genuine and as the production of John, and their opinion was ratified by the early councils.



PART III.

The Old Testament.

CHAPTER I.

LANGUAGE, MANUSCRIPTS, VERSIONS, AND GENERAL TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT 263

The Hebrew language; extent of the Hebrew literature, and origin of term "Hebrew"; the Hebrew language not the native tongue of the "Hebrews"; its striking characteristics; changes in the

language and their force; early date of alphabetic writing; *Manuscripts*: number and age of Hebrew MSS.; two principal classes; private MSS.; age how determined; *Versions*: the Septuagint, — value and uses of this version; version of Aquila; of Theodotus; of Symmachus and others; Origen's Hexapla; *Targums*: of Onkelos and Jonathan; *General textual history*: earlier history of the text; internal evidence; history of the text from the establishment of the Canon; its transmission; labor of the Talmudists; the Masoretic text; review of the sources from which the present Hebrew text is derived; mild statement of defects by Dillmann.

CHAPTER II.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT 277

Meaning of the term Canon as here used and objects of the chapter; the Old Testament in the New; limits of the Old Testament Canon generally defined; character of the New Testament references to the Old; Apocryphal books of the Septuagint version not quoted in the New Testament; confirmatory testimony by Josephus; his direct citations from Scripture; indirect references; why twenty-two books mentioned; testimony of Philo; does not acknowledge the Apocrypha; the Canon among the various Jewish sects at the time of Christ; final establishment of the Old Testament Canon; general principles; methods of investigation; earliest recognition of canonical authority; the germ of other collections contemporaneous with the Pentateuch; how the second collection probably originated; the remaining books when canonized; agency of Ezra and his collaborators in this work; the Old Testament Canon in the Christian Church; Origen; individual citations unnecessary; the Jews as witnesses to the extent of the Hebrew Canon.

CHAPTER III.

ORIGIN OF THE SEPARATE BOOKS: PENTATEUCH — JUDGES, 292

Subject how treated; something to be premised; *Pentateuch*: its origin according to the Jews; testimony of our Lord and His Apostles; also of heathen writers; burden of proof lies with opponents of Mosaic authorship; definite reasons for the ordinary view; admitted that Moses wrote parts; internal evidence of genuineness; the work an harmonious whole; not needful to suppose that Moses penned the whole work; it can properly be

assigned to no other period; no unnatural or insuperable difficulties; *Joshua*: its author not certainly known; unsuccessful attempts to invalidate the genuineness of the book; references to the Pentateuch; probable date and authorship; *Judges*: name, position, period included, &c.; authorship.

CHAPTER IV.

ORIGIN OF THE SEPARATE BOOKS (*continued*): RUTH—THE PROVERBS 304

Ruth: canonical rank; date and internal marks of genuineness; *Books of Samuel*: general characteristics; origin and date; *two Books of Kings*: general characteristics and historical connection with other books; an independent and complete work; make appeals to specific authorities; date and supposed author; *Books of Chronicles*: origin of title; the contents; internal proofs of genuineness; minor diversities and their probable origin; motive of hostile assaults; authorship and date; *Ezra*: in general; time of composition; *Nehemiah*: contents; canonical rank; *Esther*: general remarks; internal proofs of genuineness; objections of Ewald and others; date and authorship of the work; *Job*: matter and style; objections to the unity of the book; time of composition; *the Psalms*: title, divisions, &c.; when written; *the Proverbs*: character, probable origin of the collection and date.

CHAPTER V.

ORIGIN OF THE SEPARATE BOOKS (*continued*): ECCLESIASTES—MALACHI 321

Ecclesiastes: theory of personated authorship; arguments in its favor; either theory consistent with the genuineness and canonical rank of the book; general drift and probable date; *Canticles*: outlying facts in favor of genuineness; an interpretation possible consistent with its position among the Sacred Scriptures; *Isaiah*: who he was; contents of his work; assaults on its integrity; proof of unity; additional; *Jeremiah*: date of prophecy and general contents; doubts respecting certain parts; external proofs of genuineness; *Lamentations*: name, date, and author; *Ezekiel*: personal history of the prophet and date of his composition; its internal arrangement; *Daniel*: unity of the book conceded, but authorship and date in dispute; objections to the common theory, and a reply; other positive reasons for the support of the traditional view; *the Minor Prophets*:—*Hosea*: in general; when Hosea lived; his work

usually unquestioned; *Joel*: genuineness of his work not doubted; *Amos*: who he was, when he lived and where he wrote; *Obadiah*: confusion of dates, but no doubt of genuineness; *Fonah*: proofs of historical truthfulness; *Micah*: date about 759-699 B.C.; *Nahum*: probable date about 714-699 B.C.; *Habakkuk*: contents of the book and its date; *Zephaniah*: supposed date about 642-611 B.C.; *Haggai*: internal considerations for fixing his epoch at about 520 B.C.; *Zechariah*: contemporaneous with *Haggai*; unity of book vindicated; Davidson against it; De Wette in defence; explanations; *Malachi*: date about 432 B.C., as certified by the work itself.

 APPENDICES.

A.—LEADING OPINIONS ON REVISION	345
B.—THE APOCRYPHA	398

INDICES.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES	411
PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE CITED OR ILLUSTRATED	421
GENERAL INDEX	426

INTRODUCTION.

ONE of the best arguments for the Bible, as for Christianity itself, is simply its own history. When we have vindicated our Hieronymian Canon against the Augustinian, traced back the several books of the two Testaments to the times, places, and authors claimed for them, made it clear that these books have come down to us through so many generations essentially unchanged, and have shown the fidelity of our own English version to the Hebrew and Greek originals, we have gone far towards proving the whole Bible to have been Divinely inspired and Divinely taken care of.

That so many books, of so many kinds, historic, poetic, dogmatic, and prophetic, from the pens of so many writers of such various culture and so far apart in history, should yet be only One Book, with a unity as perfect as that of any drama, is a phenomenon which no infidel theory accounts for. The Apocryphal books, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, do not trouble us: The more they are studied, the more clear it becomes that they deserve no place in the Canon. It is felt to have been a sure instinct that ruled them out.

As for the purity of the text, so much imperilled by endless transcription, it is found that no other ancient writings have suffered so little. Reverence for the Bible has always guarded it like a flaming sword. The various readings, at first sight so formidable in number, turn out to be quite harmless in character. The great facts and doctrines of revelation remain intact.

The severest test to which a book can be subjected, is that of translating it into other languages than the one in which it was written. The Koran is not much of a book in any language but the Arabic. Even Shakespeare is no longer Shakespeare in French. The Bible is mostly Semitic and provincial; and yet in every language its voice is clear, ringing, and majestic. It is the only book that has ever made the circuit of the globe, holding its own in every important language or dialect of men.

Of all the versions, our own is probably on the whole the best. If Moses and Isaiah can be made to speak in any other language than Hebrew, or Paul and John can be made to speak in any other language than Greek, that language is our own mother tongue. Of this it would ill become us to boast. Far better is it for us to be awed and overawed by the sacredness of what is committed to our trust. If the voice that spake from Sinai in one language, and from Calvary in another, is now most resonant in our own, it behooves us to rejoice with trembling. Unto us are committed "the oracles of God."

It is of the Bible as a book amongst books, that

this volume undertakes to treat. It covers ground not covered by any single volume which has yet appeared. And, so far as I have examined, the work appears to me to have been well done. The author, whom I have known for some years as an ardent and critical scholar, has spared no pains to be sound and accurate in his conclusions. If he now wins the success he merits, it will be all he has need to covet.

ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
February 24, 1873.

PART I.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

PART I.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

Ⓢ Christ! thy law is hidden in the sepulchre; when wilt thou send thy angel to remove the stone and show thy truth unto thy flock?

WYCLIF at *Lutterworth*.

CHAPTER I.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE TO THE TIME OF TYNDALE.

THE question of the earliest introduction of Christianity into Britain is involved in no little obscurity. The conquest of the country by the Romans (B.C. 55 to A.D. 60), and their subsequent sway for a considerable period, furnished an opportunity likely to be improved by an active discipleship, for the announcement of their weighty message. It is even affirmed that traders of Asiatic origin, possibly entering by way of Gaul, were the first Christian missionaries; and that it was their efforts, rather than those of Augustin and his coadjutors commissioned for this work by Gregory the Great (A.D. 596), that resulted in the conversion of the most of our Saxon forefathers to Christ.¹ It is at least true that Christianity was greatly promoted by Augustin, and during and following his time acquired such thorough possession of the land as to produce within about a century of his arrival such fruit as Venerable Bede and the great German evangelist Boniface (680-754).

To Augustin, soon after his arrival in Britain, his patron at Rome sent over a copy or copies of the ante-Hieronymian (*i.e.*, before Jerome) Latin version, sometimes improperly styled the "Itala;"² and from this text the first Anglo-Saxon translations of the Scriptures, if such they may be called, were made. Copies of this ancient Latin version are still preserved in England; and one of them,

How
Christianity
was intro-
duced into
Britain.

Old Latin
original of
the first
Saxon
translations.

¹ Soames's Latin Church, &c., p. 45. Cf. Lingard's Anglo-Saxon Church, pp. 18-40.

² Craik's Hints and Suggest., p. 18. Cf. Michaelis, Int., vol. ii. 113; Westcott's Bib. in Ch., pp. 128, 129.

now in the Bodleian Library, is reputed to be an original once in the hands of the great missionary.¹

Among the earliest attempts at translating the Scriptures into the vernacular was that of Caedmon, a pious monk in the seventh century (c. 680), who rendered certain historical portions of the Old Testament into Anglo-Saxon verse. It was less a translation, however, than a paraphrase. Yet any vernacular rendering of Scripture was so much a matter of wonder in those superstitious times, that a miracle was invented to account for it. The monk, an unlettered cowherd in the monastery of Whitby, mortified, it is said, at his inability to equal the lyrical performances of his fellow-monks, retired to his couch in the Abbey grange. In his troubled dreams a heavenly visitant appeared and bade him sing. Upon his confessing a want of skill, he was encouraged to try, and took as his theme the Origin of Created Things. At once the poetical inspiration fell upon him; his tongue was loosed; the task was accomplished, and, recalled and recorded on his waking, gained for him the reputation of an inspired poet.²

A few years later two independent versions of the Psalms were produced in Anglo-Saxon: one by Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne; the other by Guthlac, the first Saxon anchorite.

Venerable Bede (A.D. 672-735) completed a translation of the Gospel of John on the 27th day of May, A.D. 735, and it is supposed by some that he had previously translated the synoptical Gospels. Foxe, the historian, according to Johnson, and others probably on his authority, explicitly assert that Bede translated the *whole Bible*, but the assertion rests on no rational or true historic foundation.³ We are not even able to affirm positively that Bede was the first to translate any part of the Gospels, or that of his work any genuine specimen has come down to our day. Commentaries, however, on most of the books of the Old and New Testaments were prepared by this industrious and devout scholar,

¹ Pref. to Bosworth's Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels.

² Bib. Sac., April, 1868, p. 264.

³ Histor. Acct. in Wat. Theo. Tracts, vol. iii. p. 62.

and his Church History was widely popular, being among the first products of the printing press in Germany (A.D. 1474). A most touching account of the manner in which this holy man closed his life, the moistened pen with which he had just finished the translation of the Gospel of John still in his hand, is given by an attendant and eye-witness of the scene, in volume first of his collected works.¹

The notable King Alfred placed a translation of the Ten Commandments at the beginning of his Statutes, besides incorporating among them selected passages from the Evangelists. A translation of the Psalter also, was projected by him, but his death occurring in the mean time (c. 901), his purpose in this respect was defeated.

A Saxon version of uncertain date, but referred to this period, interlinear with the previously transcribed Vulgate of Jerome, was made by a priest named Aldred. Another interlinear version, known as the Rushworth Gloss, also of this age, and now in the possession of the Bodleian library, has at the end of the Gospel of Matthew the following record: "Farman, priest, this book thus glossed (translated)." An interesting consideration connected with these interlinear versions is the probable conjecture, that they were made for the use of such ignorant priests as did not themselves understand the meaning of the Latin which they read to the people. The common people had not yet indeed, been forbidden the reading of the Scriptures, but their utterly illiterate condition was an obstacle to their free circulation, even greater than the severest restrictive legislation of subsequent times. For this reason, too, it was, at least in part, that vernacular translations were so few, of certain portions of the Bible only, and, when made, attained but a limited diffusion and usefulness.

The eleventh century was marked, in Britain, by protracted and bloody political disturbances. Repeated and successful incursions of the ferocious Danes prevented, even in the monasteries, the tranquillity needful to the pursuits of learning. No translations of importance are known to have been made in Saxon during this period, and

Translation
of Alfred.

An interlinear
version.
The Rush-
worth
Gloss.

Danish in-
cursions
prevent
Bible trans-
lation in the
eleventh
century.

¹ Pp. 82, 83.

into the Normano-Saxon dialect, which succeeded, the Scriptures were but scantily rendered. Scarcely more than three manuscript copies of the Gospel, all probably transcripts of one original copy, now remain to mark this epoch; and within about a century after the Conquest (Battle of Hastings, Oct. 14, 1066), the last traces of a distinctively Saxon dialect, so called, disappear from the field of Biblical literature.

One marked peculiarity of the Saxon versions of the Scriptures is worthy of mention, both as a matter of interest in itself, and as bearing on the important subject of "revision," so much agitated in our time. Difficult terms which, instead of being translated from the original tongues, were transferred bodily by translators of a later day, were by them characteristically rendered, through an ingenious use of Saxon compounds. The centurion, for instance, was "the hundred-man;" the disciple, a "learning-youth;" the parable, a "big-spel," *i.e.*, a near example; the scribe, a "book-man."

The first attempts to translate the Bible into *English*, like the earliest Saxon versions, were simply metrical paraphrases, often distorting the very facts of Scripture. A paraphrase of the Gospel and Acts in English, made in the latter half of the twelfth century by Orme, or Ormin, has received the name of the "Ormulum." The Saxon character was employed.¹

About the middle of the fourteenth century, Richard Rolle, of Hampole, translated the Psalms, in connection with the hymns of the Church into English prose. This is supposed to be the first literal English translation of Scripture. Rolle's object, as stated by himself in the prologue to his work, is interesting: "In this werke," he says, "I seke no straunge Ynglys, but lightest and commonest, and swilk (such) that is most like unto the Latyne; so that thai that knowes noght the Latyne, be thi Ynglys may come to many Latyne wordes."

Three different versions of the Psalms, dating from about the same period, are still extant; as also translations by various clergymen of such parts of the Bible as were

¹ Cf. Marsh's Lects. on Eng. Lang., 2d Series, 1862.

used in the Church Service. The British Museum contains a manuscript translation in the northern dialect of the dominical Gospels for the whole year, supposed to have been made at this time. All these versions took as their basis such copies of the Latin Vulgate, more or less imperfect, as the translators might, at the time, happen to have before them.

No effort seems to have been made to provide a complete version of the Bible in English, until the time of Wyclif, and with him the history of the English Bible, properly speaking, begins. Foxe, the historian, as we have noticed, and with him, Johnson, Bishop Newcome, and many others even to our own day, have asserted that Bede effected a complete translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular. But aside from the bare affirmation of the fact, no evidence of it whatever can be found. During the progress of the Reformation in England, when the work of translating and circulating the Scriptures was violently opposed by the Conservative party, they were driven to take the position, that versions in the vernacular were no novelty.

So, Sir Thomas More is credited with making the strange statement in his "Dialogues," or reply to Tyndale, that "the whole Bible had been translated [into English] long before Wyclif's time." Several theories have been formed to account for this unwarranted statement. It has been thought, for instance, that More may have referred, loosely, to the various versions of parts of the Bible, which, at different times, had been made in Anglo-Saxon. Or his language may have been falsely interpreted. He said: "The hole byble was longe byfore his daies by virtuouse and wel-learned men translated into the englysh tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness wel and reverently red." It is thought possible that by the word "hole," More meant "holy," and not "whole."¹ An "i" may have been dropped if he wrote "holie," or an "e" changed to an "i," if he wrote "holi."

Version of
Wyclif.
The whole
Bible in
English for
the first
time.

Sir Thos.
More's
statement
how ac-
counted for.

Again, the Hon. George P. Marsh, a distinguished authority

¹ Christ. Ex., July, 1833, 391.

on such a subject, suggests that the only legitimate basis discoverable for More's assertion is the fact, that the language of Wyclif's version of the Scriptures is so different from that of his other works.¹ This might naturally give rise to the error which is indicated by Lewis, in his History of Translations, who says: "A mistake was made by Sir Thomas More in saying that the Bible had been wholly translated long before Wyclif. He took Wyclif's version for one that had been made before him, and those made after him as his."²

The valuable opinion of Baber, who wrote the sketch of the translator's life prefixed to "Wyclif's version of the New Testament," conducts to the same general conclusion. He observes: "The author of the '*Elucidarium Bibliorum*' or 'Prologue to the Bible,' alludes to a version prior to his own. Some have supposed this prologue to be the work of Wyclif, which is not the fact: hence, they judged that there had been a previous version. A manuscript in the Bodleian library, with a falsified date, has led some others to the same conclusion."³

Wyclif (1324-1384) was a native of Yorkshire. For about twenty-five years he was, more or less, closely connected with the University of Oxford, first as student, then as tutor, head of a college, and professor of divinity. He joined Queen's College at the age of sixteen, and became a fellow of Merton College in 1356. To the Latin fathers he gave great attention, studied Aristotle in a Latin translation, and devoted a portion of each day to the careful examination of the Scriptures.

Wyclif first came into special prominence (c. 1360) by defending the University against the encroachments of the "begging friars." These friars attempted to establish a distinct jurisdiction, and to draw away the younger students to the monastery. About 1365, he was present in Parliament as an adviser in ecclesiastical matters. In 1367 he defended Edward III. against the Pope, in his refusal to pay him the accustomed tribute. In 1372 he received the degree of doctor of theology,

¹ Lects. on Eng. Lang., 1st ser. *ad loc.*

² P. 54.

³ Memoirs, p. 68. Cf. Preface to Wyc. Work by Forshall and Madden.

and began to lecture on divinity at Oxford, "with so universal an applause, that almost every thing he said was received as an oracle." In 1374 he was an ambassador from the King to treat with the Pope's nuncios concerning the provisions of ecclesiastical benefices in England. In 1377 he was tried before an ecclesiastical Parliament, but was rescued from its hostility through the abrupt interference of powerful friends at Court. The same protection, together with the schism of the Roman See caused by a double election of Popes, doubtless saved him from threatened death by violence. Through Papal influence he was, however, finally banished from Oxford in 1382, and two years later on the last day of December, died at Lutterworth. A scurrile monk of the period provided him with the following gratuitous epitaph, which Fuller says was no worse, not for want of malice, but of invention: "The devil's instrument, church's enemy, people's confusion, heretic's idol, hypocrite's mirror, schisms broacher, hatred sower," &c.¹

In 1415 the Council of Constance, the same which condemned Huss and Jerome of Prague, passed an order for burning the bones of Wyclif. This decree was enforced by Pope Martin V., who commanded Fleming, bishop of Lincoln, to execute the harsh edict, which he did in 1428. His honored bones were consumed, and the ashes thrown into the neighboring Swift. Previously, in 1406, some of Wyclif's friends at Oxford had published a document under the university seal, certifying his learning, probity, and godliness. Among other things they said: "Neither was this doctor convicted of any heresy, either burned of our prelates after his burial. God forbid that our prelates should have condemned a man of such honesty for a heretic, who amongst all the rest of the university, had written in Logic, Philosophy, Divinity, Morality, and the speculative arts without an equal."²

But in 1410 his doctrines were mercilessly denounced in full congregation at the same place. In 1564, however, this university decisively annulled all previous statutes

Council of
Constance.

Doctrines
denounced
in 1410.

¹ Fuller's Hist., Book iv., p. 171. Cf. Baber's Mem., p. 27.

² Foxe's Acts and Mon., v. p. 233.

which had been enacted against Wyclif. And recently his *Alma Mater*, at her own expense, has published in four volumes quarto, a splendid edition of his translation of the Bible. Twenty years were consumed by the editors in their grateful task, and one hundred and seventy manuscripts collated and described by them in the preparation of the work.

Wyclif was a most prolific writer. A full list of his works, Wyclif a prolific writer. stating where copies in manuscript may still be found, in what language written, &c., is contained in Baber's introductory narrative.¹ More than three hundred of his pastoral sermons, partly or wholly preserved, still remain. He denied the Pope's temporal authority, as well as his infallibility on points of doctrine. He held that the church of Rome was no more at the head of all the churches than any other church, and that Peter had no extraordinary powers conferred upon him. He was far in advance of his age, but yet not wholly free from the taint of its extravagant superstitions. He believed in purgatory, but not in celibacy, or in church music. In direct opposition to the Pope and priesthood of his day, he fearlessly advocated and insisted on the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in all matters of faith, which he said were "the law of Christ, infinitely surpassing any other writing, how authentic soever it might appear, because the authority of Christ is infinitely above that of all mankind."

For nearly twenty years, in the bloom of his life, Wyclif was Work of translating. engaged in the congenial work of translating the Scriptures. Beginning with the Apocalypse, which he completed about 1356, he afterwards prepared a version of the Gospels, with which he also connected a commentary. Still later, the remaining books of the New Testament were undertaken and a new version of the Apocalypse. The whole was completed about 1380, four years before his death.

In the Old Testament portion, Wyclif seems to have associated with himself one Nicholas de Hereford. His The Old Testament. special work, however, extended only to Baruch iii. 20 of the Apocrypha, the order of books in the Vulgate naturally having been followed. The testimony to this fact is very

¹ Memoirs, pp. 38-54.

direct, as in a manuscript copy of this version, yet extant, there are found at this place in the book of Baruch the words, "*explicit translacionem Nicholay de Herford.*" The occasion for the abrupt termination of Hereford's labors at this point (1382), was that he was suddenly cited before Arundel to answer for his religious opinions, and was by him excommunicated and obliged to flee the country.¹ Consequently the remainder of the work, as it is supposed, fell wholly upon Wyclif, who had, however, the happiness of seeing it quite completed within the brief period that remained before his death.

Wyclif's translations of the Scriptures, as well as those of his time generally, were themselves made from a translation, the Vulgate of Jerome. Even if he had understood Greek, — he occasionally uses Greek words, — it is not likely that he could have found, in all England, a copy of the Greek Testament accessible, from which to make his translation. Copies of the New Testament manuscripts, and other manuscripts in Greek, were almost unknown in Western Europe until the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, and the consequent diffusion of Greek learning by the wide dispersion of Greek fugitives. The Hebrew of the Old Testament, too, was only known through the same Latin version. The excellences and the defects of Jerome's work are elsewhere pointed out.² The precise text, however, on which Wyclif depended, can only in general terms be called that of Jerome.

The Vulgate, and the version of Jerome, although regarded as one and the same, were far from being identical. A mixed and corrupt text had sprung up through persistent efforts, on the part of Jerome's successors, to bring his version into harmony with those which had preceded it, — the old Latin, — and particularly by importing into it certain terms and expressions from the more ancient versions which Jerome had specially excluded. This unauthorized and unwarranted procedure introduced the greater confusion, from the fact that in the New Testament of Jerome, the Vulgate was not a new

Facilities
for the
work.

The
Vulgate.

¹ Foxe's Acts and Mon., v. p. 229.

² Section on "Ancient Versions."

translation from the original, but itself a revision of preceding versions, brought into supposed harmony with the original Greek. Without doubt Wyclif used the text of the Vulgate current in his time, but, as we have reason to believe, in connection with it, he also collated such scanty Latin manuscript copies as were accessible. Considerable evidence has been adduced to show that he used a text which appeared to him after a comparison of old copies to be on the whole the most correct.¹

The critical author of the Prologue (*Elucidarium Bibli-*
Testimony of a con-
temporary. *orum*) to a version which immediately succeeded Wyclif's, reasonably supposed to be Purvey, says of the work of Wyclif: "The commune latyne bybles have more nede to be correctyd . . . than hath the englyshe byble late translated."

Wyclif rendered word for word, paying but little attention to
The trans-
lation baldly
literal. idioms, and consequently his version is often obscure. He translated Matt. viii. 29, for instance: "What to us and to thee, Jesus thou Son of God?"² This extreme literalness, his supposed coadjutor and successor in the work, above referred to, considered a defect. His opinion was — "the best translating is . . . to translate after the sentence, and not only after the words, so that the sentence be as opyn (either opener) in Englysh as in Latyne, and go not farre fro the letter."

The English of Wyclif's version is pronounced much more
The Eng-
lish used. intelligible than that of his other works and generally superior to it. The grandeur of the truths communicated seems to have commanded a more excellent form of expression. Yet the language is popular, the language of the people and not of the court. Marsh says: Wyclif's language in the Bible differs as much from that of Chaucer, his contemporary and follower, as does that of our own Bible from the best models of literary composition in the present day.³

Henry Knyghton, a contemporary, and canon of Leicester,
Circulation
of this
version. thus ungracefully testifies to the wide circulation of this first complete English version of the Scriptures:

¹ Pref. to Eng. Hex., p. 21. Cf. Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bible, p. 17.

² Lewis's Hist., pp. 17, 18.

³ Lects. on Eng. Lang., 1st ser., p. 625.

“The Gospel which Christ delivered to the clergy and doctors of the church, that they might themselves sweetly administer to the laity and weaker persons with the hunger of their mind according to the exigency of the times and the need of persons, did this John Wyclif translate out of Latin into English; . . . whence through him it became vulgar, and more open to the laity and women who could read, than it used to be to the most learned of the clergy.”¹ The number of copies still extant of this version, including Purvey’s revision, notwithstanding the severe measures taken for their extirpation, also indicates a wide diffusion. Authorities differ somewhat with respect to the exact number; but there are probably not less than one hundred and seventy, of which thirty-three, fifteen of the Old Testament and eighteen of the New, are Wyclif’s, and the remainder the recension of Purvey.²

The Convocation of Oxford, less than twenty-five years after Wyclif’s death (1408), enacted the following oppressive rule: “It is a dangerous thing to translate the text of Holy Scripture out of one tongue into another. . . . We therefore decree and ordain, that no man henceforth by his own authority translate any text of the Scriptures into English or any other tongue by way of a book, pamphlet, or treatise; and that no man read any such book, pamphlet, or treatise, now lately composed in the time of Wyclif . . . upon pain of the greater excommunication, until the said translation be approved by the ordinary of the place, or, if the case so require, by the council provincial.”³

So powerfully indeed was the influence of Wyclif and his supporters felt, that the ecclesiastical movement towards the suppression of his version had been carried even into parliament, where, however, the reformer found a bold and able champion in the Duke of Lancaster and other representatives of the court. To the complaint that the translation of the Gospel into English was the occasion of running into error, the Duke and his party adroitly replied, — that there were more heretics among the Latins than any other

¹ Eng. Hex., p. 10.

² Smith’s Bib. Dict., Art. “Versions.” Cf. Westcott, id., p. 24.

³ Foxe’s Acts and Mon. *ad loc.*

Opposition.

Wyclif defended by the Duke of Lancaster.

race, the Decretals mentioning no less than fifty-six, hence, by inference, the Gospel should not be read in Latin. The Duke also said: "We will not be the dregs [tail] of all mankind, seeing other nations have the law of God in their own tongue."

The cost of a manuscript Bible at this early period was not far from five marks, equal to two hundred dollars of our money, and then a sufficient salary to maintain a curate for a twelvemonth. But so highly was the holy Book esteemed that the general poverty of the people was no insuperable bar to its circulation, an entire wagon-load of hay being sometimes exchanged for only a fragment of a Gospel or Epistle in the familiar tongue.

John Purvey, who had acted as Wyclif's curate at Lutterworth, a man of distinguished attainments for his day, whom Purvey's recension. a competent authority called "The library of the Lollards, Wyclif's glosser [translator], an eloquent divine, and famous for his skill in the law," is supposed, by the best authorities, to have prepared a revision of Wyclif's version, which appeared about 1388. What renders this recension of Purvey of particular interest, is the fact that it seems to have supplanted to a great extent, as noted above, the original one of Wyclif and De Hereford, there being four times as many of the former now extant as of the latter. And it is also an interesting circumstance, that more than four-fifths of these extant copies must have been prepared subsequently to the prohibitory legislation of Arundel and his convocation in 1408. That these copies were made for use is evinced by their small size in many instances, adapting them alike to circulation and the frequent necessity of concealment.¹

Purvey, however, but entered into the labors of Wyclif, and the success of the pupil's work should not be suffered to detract from the honor due to the originator and master, who also was the probable adviser and promoter of the revision. Perhaps it is too much to say, with a late writer, that the alterations in Purvey's recension are confined mainly to those parts of the Old Testament ascribed to Wyclif's

¹ Cf. Eng. Hex., p. 31; Westcott, id.

chief coadjutor Dr. Nicholas de Hereford ;¹ but, the principles on which the work of revision was conducted, are fully set forth in the prologue already alluded to.

It is asserted by some that John de Trevisa, another contemporary of Wyclif, and vicar of Berkely in Cornwall, also translated both the Old and New Testaments into English. But it is likely that this theory was started from no more definite information than that Trevisa was in sympathy with Wyclif and his friends in their opposition to the friars. No manuscript copies of the English Bible, of this period, discover the work of more than the two master-hands already mentioned, with perhaps the exception of some slight evidence of a partial revision of Purvey's version.² Baber's testimony on this point seems decisive: "John de Trevisa, who flourished toward the end of the fourteenth century, enjoys the reputation, in the estimation of some men of letters, of having produced an English translation of the whole Bible; but his title to this fame has hitherto eluded all the researches I have made to trace it. 'The erroneous opinion arose from a loose assertion of Caxton, our first printer, in his preface to the *editio princeps* of the Polychronicon; and upon such authority alone it has been handed down by all historians or biographers, who have detailed the particulars which they have gleaned of the life of Trevisa."³

Scholars most conversant with the subject are not agreed with respect to the influence of the labors of Wyclif and Purvey on the versions that followed nearly a hundred and fifty years later. Marsh is very decided in his opinion, and says, that "the influence of Wyclif upon Tyndale is too palpable to be mistaken, and cannot be disguised by the grammatical differences, which are the most important points of discrepancy between them." Such critical eyes, however, as those of Westcott and Ellicott see no such dependence, and these writers entirely dissent from such a view. That there should be considerable agreement between the versions of Wyclif and

Supposition of another early version.

Influence of Wyclif's version on its successors.

¹ Mrs. Conant's Hist. of Eng. Bible, p. 96.

² Cf. Westcott, id.

³ Mem, &c., p. 72.

Coverdale, it would be natural to expect, as both translate literally from the Vulgate. But Tyndale seems to settle the matter with respect to his own version. He says: "Them that are learned christenly, I beseche for as moche as I am sure and my concience beareth me recorde, that of a pure entent, singilly and faythfully, I have interpreted itt as farre forth as god gave me the gyfte of knowledge and understandynge: that the rudeness off this worke nowe at the fyrst tyme offende them not: but that they consyder howe that I had *no man to counterfeit, nether was holpe* with englysshe of eny that had interpreted the same or soche lyke thinge in scripture before tyme."¹

It is a singular circumstance, that, although this version of 1384 was the only Bible in the English language for a hundred and forty years, no effort was made to give it in a complete form to the public through the press, until the recent issue of a magnificent quarto edition by the University of Oxford.

The following is Wyclif's translation of the Lord's Prayer:

The Lord's Prayer. "Oure fadir that art in heuenes, halwid be thi name: thi kyngdom cumme to; be thi wille don as in heuen and in erthe. Gif to vs this day oure breed, oure other substance: and forgeve to vs our dettis as we forgeue to ouer detours; and leede vs nat into temptacion, but delyuere vs fro yuele. Amen."

¹ Tyndale's N. T. (Ep. to Reader). Cf. Westcott, id. p. 172; Ellicott on Revision, p. 59; Marsh's Lects. on Eng. Lang., 1st ser., p. 628.

CHAPTER II.

VERSION OF TYNDALE.

THE new era of translations into English from the original tongues of Scripture and of a printed English Bible, as well in fact as the remarkable history of the "authorized version" itself, may be said to begin with William Tyndale. He was born about 1484, probably in Gloucestershire, one hundred years after the death of Wyclif. His earliest life is quite unknown; but, like his distinguished predecessor in the work of Biblical translation, he was connected almost from childhood with the university of Oxford, "where he by long continuance grew up and increased as well in the knowledge of tongues and other liberal arts, as especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures, whereunto his mind was singularly addicted."¹

First translations from the original; first printed English Bible.

Early life of Tyndale.

On the 11th of March, 1502 (? 1503), Tyndale was ordained a priest, and in 1508 (?) became a friar in the monastery of Greenwich. For some years after 1509 the distinguished Erasmus was professor of Greek at Cambridge, and Tyndale being consequently attracted thither, enjoyed the instructions of this able master of Greek learning. Here probably he received, or more likely was confirmed in his strong convictions concerning the importance of vernacular translations of the Scriptures. The opinion of Erasmus was at least openly avowed. "I differ," he said, "exceedingly from those who are unwilling that the divine writings should be translated into the language of the common people and read by private per-

Meets Erasmus.

¹ Foxe's Acts and Mon., viii., p. 542.

sons: as if either Christ had taught things so obscure, that they could be hardly understood by a very few theologians; or as if the fortress of the Christian religion be set in this,—that it be not known.”¹

From Cambridge, Tyndale seems to have gone into Gloucestershire, to act as tutor in the family of Sir John Walsh. Tyndale as tutor. Here he nourished the project, already formed, to devote his life to the great work of making the Scriptures accessible to the common people. Once in controversy with the ignorant priests whom he met at his patron's table, he openly proclaimed his design. One of them had said: “It were better to be without God's laws than the Pope's.” Tyndale indignantly replied, “I defy the Pope and all his laws;” and added, that if God would spare his life, ere many years he would cause a boy that drove the plough to know more of the Scriptures than he (the Pope) did.

Tunstall, having been appointed bishop of London, Oct. 22, 1522, and being esteemed a special friend of learning, Tyndale, at the close of the year, went up to the metropolis seeking service under his patronage, and especially aid for his great undertaking, now definitely in hand, a vernacular translation of the New Testament. As a proof of his literary competency, he carried with him a translation which he had made from the Greek of Isocrates. The bishop, however, turned away the impecunious scholar under the polite pretext of a full house.

Tyndale, after about a year in London, spent in unavailing efforts to find encouragement for his grand enterprise, resolved at last to cross to the Continent. The impressions received at this time he himself thus forcibly describes: “In London I abode almost a year, and marked the course of the world, and heard our praters (I would say our preachers), how they boasted themselves and their high authority; and beheld the pomp of our prelates; and I understood, at last, not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but, also that there was no place to do it in all England.”²

A year of doubt.

¹ Eng. Hex., p. 43.

² Pref. to Pent., p. 396.

No obstacles, however, could divert him from a determination: based on an unalterable love of the truth and love of man. "I perceived," he wrote afterwards, "by Is not discouraged. experience how that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scriptures were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text."¹

It was in May, 1524, that Tyndale left England for Ham-
burgh, guaranteed a slender support—ten pounds a Sails for the Continent. year, equal to about seven hundred dollars at the present time—by a noble friend in London, Sir Humphrey Munmouth. When Tyndale met his rebuff from Tunstall, and knew not which way to turn, this gentleman, an alderman of London, had taken him into his house "half a year:" "and there he lived," as Munmouth afterwards testified, "like a good priest as methought. He studied most part of the day and of the night at his book; and he did eat but sodden meat by his good will, nor drink but small single beer. I did promise him ten pounds sterling to pray for my father and mother, their souls. I did pay it when he made his exchange to Ham-
burgh."²

At this point, Tyndale's work of translating the Scriptures began to be carried forward through thirteen years of His work of translation begins. painful exile; and within twenty-four months of his departure from England, the first-fruits of his absorbing pursuit, a copy of the New Testament, in the vernacular, reached his native land. All the swift remainder of his eventful life is closely identified with the one engrossing aim. Obligated to adopt the disguise of an assumed name, to do his work by stealth, to flee from city to city, hunted everywhere with a relentless animosity during all these years, the amount and splendid quality of his literary achievements are quite amazing. Finally, betrayed, under the guise of friendship, by one Philips, agent of Gardner, bishop of Winchester, he was imprisoned during eighteen months in the castle of Vilvorde, near Brussels, and on Oct. 6, 1536, was put to death

¹ Id., p. 304.

² App. to Strype's Ec. Mem., No. 89. Cf. Henry Walter's Biograph. Notice, prefixed to Doct. Tract. (Park. Soc.), p. xxiv.

by strangulation, and his body afterwards, as it were in the climax of malice, given to the flames. The order for his death was indeed signed by the Emperor Charles V., but with the probable connivance, at least without the dissent, of Tyndale's inveterate enemy, Henry VIII., and his immediate advisers. The martyr's last words, reminding us of the prayer of the sainted Stephen, were: "Lord, open the eyes of the King of England!"

Tyndale is thought to have been well qualified for the task of translating the New Testament, when his labors on it first began, and it is inferred that he became a thorough Hebrew scholar during his sojourn on the Continent. The diary of Spalatinus secretary of Frederick, elector of Saxony at this time, shows the estimation for scholarship, though perhaps, as is alleged, an extravagant one, in which the distinguished English exile was held in the region where his work was done. "Von Busche," he says, "professor of Hebrew in the university of Marburg, a personal friend of Tyndale, told us that six thousand copies of the New Testament in the English language had been printed at Worms, and that this translation had been made by an Englishman sojourning there with two other natives of England, who was so skilled in seven languages, — Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, and French, — that whichever he might be speaking, you would think it to be his native tongue."¹ The word here translated "French" is Gallicæ, and is falsely rendered "German" by Anderson and others. The mistake is one of importance, as bearing on the question of Tyndale's assumed dependence on Luther's translation.

Previous to his leaving England, Tyndale enjoyed a reputation for learning as well as piety, to which even his distinguished opponent, Sir Thomas More, pays reluctant tribute. "He was, 'as men say,'" observed More, "well knowen or he went over the see for a man of ryght good lyuing, studyous, and well lerned in Scrypture and in dyvers places in England was very well lyked and dyd gret good with prechying."²

Qualifications as a translator.

Testimony of More.

¹ And. Ann., p. 179. Cf. Westcott, id., p. 42, n. ² Eng. Hex., p. 45.

George Joye, avowedly not a friend of Tyndale, editor of a pirated edition of his New Testament, and hence, both by his relations to the translator and his literary qualifications, an important witness, also writes: "I am not afraid to answer Master Tyndale in this matter [of the surreptitious publication of his New Testament] for all his high learning in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin," &c.¹

Also of
Joye.

But Tyndale's work itself bears direct witness to his independent scholarship. In his preface to the Old Testament, he says: "I submit this book to be disallowed and also burnt, if it seem worthy when *they have examined it with the Hebrew*, so that they put forth of their own translating another that is more correct."² To his translation of the Pentateuch he prefixes a table of Hebrew words,³ and elsewhere makes critical remarks on the Hebraisms of the New Testament writers. In disputation with Sir Thomas More, he deals in a spirit of scholarly comprehension and acuteness with nice points of Hebrew and Greek philology.⁴ "The Greek tongue," he says in another place, "agreeth more with the English than with the Latin. And the properties of the Hebrew tongue agree a thousand times more with the English than with the Latin."⁵ Westcott has discovered what he considers a crucial test of Tyndale's acquaintance with Hebrew in an Appendix to his New Testament of 1534, as also conclusive proof of his thoroughly independent scholarship as a translator, notwithstanding indications that he had the Vulgate and the translation of Luther before him.⁶

The work
the best
witness.

But as though with a purpose of setting at rest this vexed question of Tyndale's knowledge of Hebrew, Providence has recently brought to light an original letter of his in Latin, addressed to the Governor of the Castle while he was a prisoner at Vilvorde, and preserved in the archives of the Council of Brabant, in which, among other things, he pathetically pleads that he may be allowed a candle in his cell during the lonely evenings, and the solace of his

An original
letter from
Tyndale in
prison.

¹ And. Ann., p. 179.

² P. 397.

³ Prol. to Book of Gen., p. 405.

⁴ An Answer to Sir Thos. More, p. 148, *et passim*.

⁵ Obed. of a Christ. Man, p. 148. Cf. note p. 145, *id.*

⁶ Westcott, *id.*, pp. 204, 205.

Hebrew Bible, grammar, and dictionary. The whole letter is so full of interest that we give it entire in Demaus's translation: ¹—

“I believe, right worshipful, that you are not ignorant of what has been determined concerning me; therefore I entreat your Lordship and that by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to remain here [in Vilvorde] during the winter, you will request the Procureur to be kind enough to send to me from my goods which he has in his possession, a warmer cap, for I suffer extremely from cold in the head, being afflicted with a perpetual catarrh which is considerably increased in the cell. A warmer coat also, for that which I have is very thin; also a piece of cloth to patch my leggings; my overcoat has been worn out; my shirts are also worn out. He has a woollen shirt of mine, if he will be kind enough to send it. I have also with him leggings of thicker cloth for putting on above; he also has warmer caps for putting on at night. I wish, too, his permission to have a candle in the evening, for it is wearisome to sit alone in the dark. *But, above all, I entreat and beseech your clemency to be urgent with the Procureur that he may kindly permit me to have my [? a] Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar, and Hebrew Dictionary, that I may spend my time with that study.* (Maximè autem omnium tuam clementiam rogo atque obsecro ut ex animo agere velit apud dominum commissarium quatenus dignari velit mihi concedere *Bibliam Hebraicam, Grammaticam Hebraicam, et vocabularium Hebraicum*, ut eo studio tempus conteram.) And in return may you obtain your dearest wish, provided always it be consistent with the salvation of your soul. But if any other resolution has been come to concerning me, that I must remain during the whole winter, I shall be patient abiding the will of God to the glory of the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ, whose Spirit, I pray, may ever direct your heart. Amen.

W. TYNDALE.”

While the question of Tyndale's ability to translate from the original Hebrew is thus disposed of, his ability to deal with

¹ Demaus's *Life of T.*, pp. 475-477.

scholarly accuracy with the Greek of the New Testament is even more clear. It will be found, if his version is thoroughly examined, that he often leaves the renderings of the Vulgate to follow the Greek text of Erasmus, and when Erasmus himself varies from the Greek in his own Latin translation, in subservience to the text of the Vulgate, Tyndale does not blindly accept the guidance of his former instructor, but still adheres closely to the original. Moreover, not only was Tyndale not specially indebted to the Vulgate, but he was equally independent of the German version. The translator himself declares in his reply to More: "When he [More] saith, 'Tyndale was confederate with Luther,' that is not truth." A thoroughly trustworthy critic, moreover, affirms: "The translation of the New Testament [of Tyndale] itself, is the complete proof of its own independence: it is impossible to read through a single chapter without gaining the assurance that Tyndale rendered the Greek directly."¹

The point which we have thus enlarged upon is one of no little importance, not only as a matter of justice to the memory of a noble martyr to the cause of vernacular translations, but as bearing directly upon the current English version, which carries so obviously and powerfully the impression of Tyndale's self-denying and scholarly work. The question of his lack of scholarship in the original tongues of Scripture, may have been started at first through a simple inadvertence. The historian, Fuller, more renowned for force than accuracy or elegance, supposing Tyndale to be unacquainted with the Hebrew, had remarked: "I presume that he [Tyndale] translated from the Latin." And Sir Thomas More's statement, that the translator had been confederate with Luther, was, without doubt, first made on the basis of simple conjecture. Inasmuch as Luther had been engaged on a vernacular translation, and Tyndale, flitting about the Continent to escape his English pursuers, would be likely to fall in with one so noted, and one with whom he would be likely to have not a little sympathy, the natural surmise originated, that Tyndale's version of the Scriptures was only a reproduction of

¹ Westcott, id., pp. 174, 179.

Luther's. And this mere conjecture came subsequently to be asserted as a fact by Lewis, Johnson, Macknight, and others; while we find some of the most popular of later historians lending themselves, perhaps unconsciously, to a perpetuation of it as such.

Hallam, in his "Constitutional History of England,"¹ says that whether Tyndale made his version from the original tongues *or the Vulgate*, is a matter of dispute. And Ellicott has noticed that the same author in his "History of the Literature of Europe," said: "That from Luther's translation and from the Latin Vulgate, the English translation of Tyndale and Coverdale is avowedly made."²

Froude, likewise, in his eloquent "History of England," says: "Tyndale saw Luther, and *under his immediate direction* translated the gospels and epistles *while at Wittenberg*," a statement which, with many others of this author, equally erroneous, Westcott has overwhelmingly disproved.³

Bishop Marsh also, held and promulgated the same opinion of the special obligation of Tyndale to Luther, but his position was ably and successfully disputed by Henry R. Beard, D.D., and J.H. Blunt. Walter, a former pupil of the bishop, in a public letter addressed to him. Sir J. R. Beard, D.D., in a late treatise on Revision (1857), even makes it one of his reasons for advocating a new version of the English Bible that Tyndale translated from Luther, and the royal translators (King James's) copied from Tyndale. He adds that he (Tyndale) doubtless consulted also the Hebrew and *the Vulgate*: but not seldom he followed Luther alone.⁴ And one of the most recent writers on this subject, who, moreover, in a previous work purporting to be a "History of the English Reformation," has given a most unhistorical estimate of Tyndale and his influence, makes the utterly loose and misleading statement that Tyndale's New Testament was "supposed to have been translated from Luther's German Bible."⁵ None of these

¹ Vol. i., p. 114.

² On Revis., p. 56.

³ J. H. Blunt's Plain Acct. of Eng. Bib., p. 37. Cf. Hist. of Ref. in Eng., pp. 506,

⁴ Id., Append. viii.

⁵ A Revised Eng. Bib., &c., pp. 26-59.

sweeping assertions have more than a shadow of critical and historical support; much less a foundation sufficient to justify the explicitness and persistency with which they continue to be reiterated. That Luther's work exerted some influence on that of Tyndale cannot be denied, but it was chiefly Luther's other writings that left their impression upon the Englishman's mind. In his prologues, his vigorous marginal notes, and his controversial writings generally, Tyndale was undisguisedly Lutheran, not infrequently appropriating the very language of the German reformer; but in the translation of the Old Testament, and especially the New, he was as conspicuously himself.

He seems, indeed, to have had a full appreciation of the heavy responsibility of a translator of the Holy Scrip-
 tures. Writing to his friend Fryth, then incarcerated in the Tower, in reply to the charges of Sir Thomas More against him, he said: "Against the day we shall all appear before our Lord Jesus Christ to give a reckoning of our doings, I call God to witness that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience; nor would this day, if all that is in the earth, whether it be pleasure, honor, or riches, might be given me."¹

Tyndale's appreciation of his responsibilities.

The period when Tyndale began his work was specially propitious and more favorable to such an undertaking, in some respects, than any which had gone before. At about the beginning of the sixteenth century, the hitherto almost exclusive study of Latin had given place, notwithstanding the protest of ignorant monks, to the earnest pursuit of the primitive tongues of the Bible, Hebrew and Greek. And the study of these languages in turn, not only provided the needful discipline to make good translators of the original Scriptures, but stimulated the work of translation itself, and furnished the opportunity which called forth the noble efforts, in this direction, of such men as Lefèvre in France, Zuinglius in Switzerland, Luther in Germany, and Tyndale in England.

Linguistic developments of the period favorable to Tyndale's work.

At the University of Alcalá, Cardinal Ximenes had made

¹ Foxe's Acts and Mon., viii., p. 514.

special provision for the study of Hebrew and Greek, leaving the Polyglot as a notable monument of his own devotion to sacred philological studies. In 1516 appeared from an already busy printing-press at Basle, the Greek Testament of Erasmus, with a Latin version, and notes. The same year, a chair of sacred languages was endowed by Busleider at Louvain.

In 1517, Fox, Bishop of Winchester, founded a chair of Latin and Greek at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1519, Woolsey founded a professorship of Greek at his own college in the same place. Henry the Eighth, too, fully sanctioned the new learning, declaring that not only should the study of the Scriptures in the originals be permitted in future, but be regularly incorporated as a department in the academical curriculum.

The Hebrew was studied with like zeal as the Greek. About four years after the birth of Tyndale (1488), a complete Hebrew Bible appeared from the printing-press of Soncino. Not long after, within the limits of a single year, four editions were published and distributed. Already before the appearance of Tyndale's New Testament in England (1526), fourteen editions of the Old Testament in Hebrew had been published and widely dispersed unchecked. Numerous grammars and lexicons, moreover, were in circulation, some of them like that of Budæus (Paris, 1529), commanding respect at this day.

The first Hebrew grammar appeared in 1503; the first dictionary of the language in 1506; the first Chaldee grammar in 1527. The Polyglot of Ximenes (1517), contained also a translation of the Targum of Onkelos, a Hebrew grammar, and a Hebrew and Chaldaic lexicon. The first Hebrew professor was appointed at Oxford, in 1530, but the language had been previously pursued at that institution. Pace, the secretary of Henry the Eighth, was reputed to be familiar with Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldee. The Hebrew text accessible at this time, that of Ben Chayim (pub. 1525), is said to have been of a high order, being more in harmony with the original Scriptures than was the Greek text

of the period, which was based almost solely on the later manuscripts.

Even before Tyndale had completed his student life at Oxford, translations of the whole Bible had been made into Spanish, French, Italian, Dutch, and Bohemian. Tyndale's opportunities for linguistic culture. And though it is possible that he knew nothing of Hebrew previous to his going to the Continent, he had time enough for its thorough study before his translation of parts of the Pentateuch in 1530. The facilities for such studies, too, among the scholars and especially learned Jews with whom he must have mingled in Worms, Cologne, Hamburg, and Antwerp, were unsurpassed.¹

It is not to be supposed that these efforts to diffuse more widely a critical knowledge of the original text of Holy Scripture, were made without the usual Opposition of ignorant monks. opposition of a strong — *i.e.*, strong in ignorance and prejudice — reactionary party. In 1531 Tyndale was moved to write in the stark language of those rough times: "Remember ye not how within this thirty years and far less, and yet dureth to this day, the old barking curs, Dunn's disciples, and the like draff called Scottists, the children of darkness, raged in every pulpit against Greek, Latin, and Hebrew?" Monks declaimed from their desks that there was now a new language invented called Greek, of which people should beware as the source of all heresies; that in this language had come forth a book called the New Testament, which was now in everybody's hands, and was full of thorns and briars: that there was also another language started up which they called Hebrew, and that they who learned it were turned Jews.² Sir Thomas More, also, mentions a curious instance of the genius of a *learned* monk. He "thorou out all ye gospels scraped out *diabolus* and wrote *Jesus Christus*, by cause he thought the deuyls nam was not mete to stande in so good a place."³ Even the governing power of England at this time, in its ideas of mental and moral enlightenment, was not so far in advance of these examples.

¹ "Das Studium der Hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland vom Ende des xv. bis zur Mitte des xvi. Jahrhunderts. Breslau, 1870."

² Lewis's History, &c., pp. 54, 55.

³ Dabney's Mem., p. 25.

As late as 1542 an order was promulgated that "all men might read the Scriptures except servants: but no woman except ladies who had leisure and might ask somebody the meaning."¹

At such an epoch as this, and under the circumstances already related, Tyndale left London for Hamburgh, where he entered at once upon his long-deferred work. First translations published in 1525. It was in the summer of 1524 that he reached his place of refuge, and before a year had passed, early in 1525, he had completed, issued, and published a translation of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. It should be stated that Demaus holds, contrary to the usual opinion, that Tyndale returned to Hamburgh, where he had first landed, only long enough to receive his remittance from Munmouth; that his earliest work of translating was done at Wittenberg, and that the printing was done at Cologne. He even hesitates to accept as conclusively proved the assertion that Tyndale published the Gospels of Matthew and Mark during the first year of his exile, thinking it possible that they may have been fragments of Wyclif's version in circulation.² The same year (1525) he proceeded to Cologne, where he set about the publication of the complete New Testament in English. Its translation he had effected alone. William Roye was his amanuensis at Worms, but was not even with him at Hamburgh. And Fryth could not have joined him before the autumn of 1526.³

At Cologne the work was interrupted by the interference of John Cochläus, an emissary of the anti-reform party of England. Roye, in some satirical lines subsequently published, thus describes him:—

"A little, praty, foolish poade,
But although his stature be small,
Yet men say he lacketh no gall,
More venomous than any toad."⁴

Consequently Tyndale, taking Roye his present coadjutor with him, fled to Worms, a city now almost wholly Lutheran, and

¹ Selden's Works, iii., 2010, by Newcome.

² Life of T., pp. 103-107.

³ And. Ann., p. 89. Cf. Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 36.

⁴ Harleian Miscellany, vol. ix. Cf. Demaus's Life of T., p. 113.

famous as the place into which, four years before, Luther had made his triumphant entrance. But Cochläus, having already sent a warning to England, together with a description of the forthcoming work, the translator, to mislead his persecutors, and possibly also as a matter of convenience to his new printer, adroitly changed the form of the book from a quarto to an octavo, or rather prepared a second edition to be issued before the first, and to be published without note or comment. The quarto edition, however, containing marginal glosses was published almost immediately afterwards, and both editions reached England at about the same time, early in 1526.

This was eighty years after the invention of printing, and fifty-eight subsequent to the introduction of the art into England. No part of the Scriptures had been printed in English before this New Testament of Tyndale, except the seven penitential Psalms by Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, in 1505.¹ Both of these first two editions of Tyndale's English New Testament were published anonymously; but owing to the advertisement of Cochläus the more pretentious quarto attracted immediate attention, while the unobtrusive octavo began to circulate under its cover with but little public notice.

By 1530 six editions of the New Testament in English had been published from various places on the Continent, three of them pirated editions, on the basis of Tyndale's, and had been carried in ship-loads of wheat, bales of goods, and by other ingenious methods to their destination, and were there covertly distributed. The surreptitious editions were published by certain Dutch printers at Antwerp merely for the purpose of gain, the text of Tyndale having been boldly appropriated as also ignorantly mutilated. Another, a fourth edition, these unscrupulous tradesmen also put forth in 1534, on which they employed George Joye, an Englishman, in order that the more prominent errors of former editions, which had injured their sale, might be corrected.

Joye seemed not unwilling thus to stand in the way of Tyndale, and while he freely used his version, making it the substance of his own, he also took unwarrantable

Bible first
printed in
English.

Other
editions
rapidly
issued.

Joye's in-
terference.

¹ Westmin. Rev., Jan., 1857.

liberties with it, and at last, even more unhandsomely sent it forth as the work of Tyndale himself. As it would be natural to expect, Tyndale was greatly tried by this unfriendly interference of Joye, especially as he was at that very time engaged on a revised edition of his own New Testament, which appeared in November of the same year. In his preface to this edition he thus declares his grievance:—

“Wherefore, I beseech George Joye, yea, and all other too, for to translate the Scripture for themselves, whether out of Greek, Latin, or Hebrew. Or if they will needs . . . let them take my translations and labors, and change and alter and correct at their pleasure, and call it their own translation and put to their own names, and not to play bo-peep after George Joye’s manner. . . . But I neither can nor yet will suffer any man that he shall go, take my translation, correct it without name, and make such changing as I myself durst not do, as I hope to have my part in Christ, though the whole world should be given me for my labor.”¹

Previously to the preparation of his revised New Testament, Tyndale had already begun the work of translating the Old Testament. Genesis and Deuteronomy first appeared separately, and the following year the remaining books of the Pentateuch. All were gathered into one volume and published with a preface, early in 1530 or 1531.² And three years later was published his version of the book of Jonah, as well as the “Epistles of the Old Testament,” the latter in connection with the revised New Testament. Tyndale’s remaining work on the Old Testament, which was not inconsiderable, including a version of the historical books succeeding the Pentateuch up to II. Chronicles, failed to be published until after his martyrdom. Through the kindness of his jailer at Vilvorde, he was enabled just before his death to transmit his valuable papers to Thomas Poynitz of Antwerp, through whose fidelity they fell into the hands of John Rogers, (*alias* Matthew), by whom they were subsequently edited. In his later studies, the laborious translator had the assistance of the accomplished Fryth, whom, while yet a student at Cambridge, he had led to Christ.

¹ Westcott, *Id.*, p. 69.

² Demaus’s *Life of T.*, pp. 229-233.

In connection with most of his translations, Tyndale incorporated marginal comments and glosses, not infrequently of a highly controversial character. As he was obliged to publish his works by stealth, it might have been expected, indeed, that he would regard such an opportunity for any good and hopeful effort to improve the moral condition of his countrymen too precious to be lost. But his main dependence was upon the simple, unadulterated text of Scripture. "I assure you," he wrote to an ambassador of the king sojourning on the Continent, "if it would stand with the king's most gracious pleasure to grant only a bare text of the Scriptures to be put forth among his people, I shall immediately make faithful promise not to write more."¹

Tyndale's
marginal
glosses and
comments.

But the hour had not yet struck for so great an advance in the cause of religious liberty. The historian Fuller thus graphically describes the rage of Tyndale's opponents upon the first appearance of his English New Testament: "When Tyndale's translation came over to England, O how were the popish clergy cut to the heart! How did their blear eyes smart at the shining of the Gospel in the vulgar tongue! Hall heard the town-clerk of London swear a great oath that he would cut his own throat, rather than the Gospel should be read in English, but he brake promise and hanged himself."²

Reception
these ver-
sions met
with in
England.

Even Sir Thomas More, as we have intimated, was induced by his friend, Bishop Tunstall, to participate in the attack on the new version. His work appeared in the form of a dialogue. At the outset he felt obliged to obtain a special dispensation to be allowed to read the "heretical books" to which he was to make reply. More's treatise, according to Lewis, "was written with humor and a mixture of diverting stories, and the whole suited to the capacity of the common people." In all, when printed in black-letter, he wrote against Tyndale more than a thousand folio pages.

Sir Thomas
More at-
tacks the
version.

One of his specific charges against the new version was that it was "so changed and corrupted from the good and wholesome doctrine of Christ, to their own devilish

His specific
charges.

¹ And. Ann., p. 55.

² Dabney's Mem., p. 33.

heresies as to be quite another thing." In proof of this he states that Tyndale has mistranslated three words of great weight, and that they were often repeated and rehearsed in his book. They were the words "priest," "church," and "charity." "The first of them he never calls 'priest,' but 'senior;' the second he styles the 'congregation;' and the third he nameth 'love.'"

Tyndale replied in detail to More's charges, and among other things said: "Verily charity is not known English in that sense which ἀγάπη requireth."¹ And in this opinion he is supported by not a few modern scholars. The late Dean Alford, it is especially to be noted, in his "Revision of the New Testament," returns to Tyndale's rendering of the word. Speaking of Bishop Tunstall's bold assertion, that he had found two thousand mistakes in the version of Tyndale, the latter answered: "There is not so much as one *z* therein, if it lack a tittle over its head, but they have noted it and number it unto the ignorant people for a heresy."²

But the hostile party not content with weapons that could be used equally by either side, at last resort to the final argument of bigotry, — the fagot. Emissaries of the prelates, under protection of an order procured from the king, buy up or seize without compensation, all copies of Tyndale's translations which can be found, not only in England but on the Continent, and straightway consign them to the flames. The aid of diplomacy even is invoked, in order that the printing of more copies in other countries may be peremptorily stayed. Yet notwithstanding all these authoritative and powerful attempts at suppression, the Word of God "exceedingly grew and prevailed." And the ultimate extraordinary success of Tyndale's version "amidst the dangerous inconsistency of a tyrant, and the inveterate prejudice of a strong Romish party, was largely due, under the providence of God, to the native zeal and prudence of the friends of the Reformation, — including of course the high character of the version itself, — and to the supreme importance which he and his associates ever attached to the matter of introducing and improving Eng-

¹ Ans. to Sir Thos. More's Dial., p. 21.

² Pref. to Pent., p. 393.

lish translations of the Bible." Still the damaging effect of persecution was not inconsiderable. Of the fifteen thousand copies which composed the first six editions of Tyndale's version but a few imperfect representatives remain. One was found bound up, as if for concealment, with an unimportant religious tract.

As an example of the spirit which governed the hostile movement a single instance may be given: John Tyndale, a younger brother of the translator, Thomas Putnam, and another young man, were arrested under directions from the bishop of London for having in their possession copies of Tyndale's New Testament. By order of Sir Thomas More they were thrust into prison. And subsequently the Lords of the Star Chamber pronounced against them this sentence: "That they should be sent to the Counter [a certain prison] of London and there remain until the next market-day, and there each of them to be set upon a horse, and their faces to the horses' tails, and to have papers upon their heads, and upon their outward apparel, that is to say upon their gown or cloaks, to be tacked or pinned thick with the said New Testament and other books. And at the Standard at Cheapside should be made a great fire whereinto every of them should throw their said books; and further, to abide such fines to be paid to the king, as shall be assessed upon them."¹

Such unworthy efforts, however, to extirpate vernacular translations, discountenance the free use of the Bible, and put checks on freedom of conscience, did not by any means answer the expectations of their originators. Bibles, said Sir Thomas More in 1532, continued to be imported "thick and three-fold," "by the whole vats full at once." The conclusion was soon reached, therefore, that to burn Bibles and subject such as held them to all sorts of indignities and annoyances was quite insufficient. They must also proceed to burn the possessors of Bibles. And among the many who at this time went on fiery chariots to heaven, were Bilney (Aug. 19th, 1530), and later in the year Bayfield and Tewksbury. And three years afterward (July 4th, 1533) the

Their
extreme
measures.

The circulation of
the Bible
not suppressed.

¹ And. Ann., p. 141.

noble Fryth was honored at Smithfield with a similar martyrdom.

Tyndale himself was by no means discouraged on account of the animosity with which his work was assailed. Tyndale's heroic spirit. Before he began it he seems fully to have counted its cost. When the tidings of the furious opposition which his New Testament had excited in England was brought to him he wrote in a spirit of heroic patience: "Some man wil ask, parouenture, why I take the laboure to make this werke, inso-much as they wil brunne it, seeing they brunt the Gospel. I answer in brunninge the New Testament, they did none other thinge than I looked for: no more shal the doo if the brunne me also: if it be God's will it shall be so." ¹

All persecution in fact was unavailing to withstand the popular tendency towards a fuller liberty, or dispel an almost universal hunger of the heart for the teachings of the Bible. Persecution unavailing. The cause was God's, who made the wrath of men to praise Him. Two editions of Tyndale's version, subsequent to 1530, were carried into England annually, and there readily disposed of to eager friends. On the year of Tyndale's death there were even as many as ten editions of these several translations that found their way to his native land. The movement was too powerful, even for the government successfully to cope with, and in its conflict with the Papacy, the occasion soon came, under the providence of God, when it was discovered even to be politic to change front and foster that which before it had so bitterly opposed.

In 1534, while the fugitive translator was yet alive to rejoice in the success of his work, a petition was presented to The Government at last succumbs. the king by the clergy in Convocation, praying that a translation of the Scriptures might be made into English. The matter, as we shall hereafter see, was pushed by Crumwell. Influences from two directions not to be resisted, on the one hand, from the masses of the people who demanded the Word of God in their own language, and, on the other hand, from the Papal party hostile alike to the free circulation of the Scriptures and to the ruling power of England, conspired to produce the mighty change.

¹ Eng. Hex., p. 49.

We cannot perhaps, more profitably conclude this brief account of Tyndale's great life-work, than by giving the estimate of it which has been formed by distinguished scholars, and for the most part in their own language. With respect to the generally unnoticed point of the mechanical execution of his version, the following interesting notice appears in Dabney's Memoir:¹ "While the voices of antiquarians and critics unite in the highest eulogiums on the version itself, it is not to be disguised that, as to its mechanical part, every page is enstamped with marks of haste. The harassed life of its unfortunate author is made present to our thought; and fancy paints, without effort, the bloodhounds of a merciless church tracking his footsteps. Broken in upon in the midst of the drudgery of the press in one city, he gathers up his fragments in what condition he may, and flees to another to complete his interrupted labors. With this in full remembrance, the orthography so curiously varying, even in the same paragraph or sentence, the confounding of distinct words through a single misplaced letter, the withholding or bestowment of capitals *ad libitum* as it were, the unsightly exchange of the leading vowels as initial letters, — as 'o' for 'a,' &c., — the seeming disdain of rule throughout, all find a prompt solution."

General characteristics of Tyndale's version.

Tyndale felt not only the need of translating directly from the original tongues, but also that a matter of greatest concern was to give the exact sense of the sacred writer. "He looked on all the later theological associations that had gathered round the words of the New Testament as hinderances rather than helps, and sought as far as possible to get rid of them. . . . In this, as in other things, Tyndale was in advance, not only of his own age, but of the age that followed him. To him, however, it is owing that the versions of the English Church have throughout been popular and not scholastic. All the exquisite grace and simplicity which have endeared the authorized version to men of the most opposite tempers and contrasted opinions is due mainly to his clear-sighted truthfulness. . . . And throughout there is the pervading stamp, so often wanting in other like works, of

Faithful to the text and sense of the sacred writers.

the most thorough truthfulness. No word has been altered to court a king's favor, or please bishops, or make out a case for or against a particular opinion."¹

Archbishop Trench, moreover, calls attention, as among English style and relation to the "authorized" version. many other excellences of this grand translation in point of style, to the remarkable felicities of language it contains, which have now become household words wherever the English language is spoken. He particularly cites the expressions, "the Author and Finisher of our faith;" and the sublime passage closing the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, including the words, "turning to flight the army of the aliens," &c., without doubt wholly due to the genius of Tyndale. *

Another close student of the old English language and literature says, that, "in fact, with here and there an exception, the difference between Tyndale's New Testament and that of 1611 is scarcely greater than is found between two manuscript copies of most modern works which have undergone frequent transcription;" that "when we study our New Testaments, we are in most cases perusing the identical words penned by the martyr Tyndale, nearly three hundred and fifty years ago; and, hitherto, the language of English Protestant faith and doctrine may be fairly said to have undergone no change."²

Bishop Ellicott entertains a similar opinion. "Our English Testament of the present day," he says, "after all its changes, revisions, and remodellings, is still truly and substantially the venerable version of Tyndale, the martyr. On its pages are the enduring traces of the labors of a noble and devoted life, and the seal with which it is sealed is the seal of blood."³

And the candid and accurate author of the recent excellent "History of the English Bible," after pointing out Tyndale's painstaking as a reviser of his own work, proceeds to say: "This patience of laborious emendation completes the picture of the great translator. In the conception and

¹ E. H. Plumptre in Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "Versions."

² Lects. on Eng. Lang., 1st ser., p. 625.

³ On Revision, &c., p. 85.

style of his renderings, he had nothing to modify or amend. Throughout all his revisions he preserved intact the characteristics of his own great work. Before he began, he had prepared himself for a task of which he could comprehend the full difficulty. He had rightly measured the momentous issues of a vernacular version of the Holy Scriptures, and determined once for all the principles on which it must be made. His later efforts were directed simply to the nearer attainment of his ideal. To gain this end he availed himself of the best help which lay within his reach; but he used it as a master, not as a disciple. In this work alone, he felt that substantial independence was essential to success. In exposition or exhortation he might borrow freely the language or the thought which seemed suited to his purpose, but in *rendering the sacred text he remained throughout faithful to the instincts of a scholar.*

“From first to last, his style and his interpretation are his own; and in the originality of Tyndale is included, in a great measure, the originality of our English version. For not only did Tyndale contribute to it directly the substantial basis of the Old Testament (in all probability) and the whole of the New, but he established a standard of Biblical translation which others followed. It is even of less moment that by far the greater part of his translation remains intact in our present Bibles, than that his spirit animates the whole.

Style and interpretation Tyndale's own.

“He toiled faithfully himself; and, where he failed, he left to those who should come after the secret of his success. The achievement was not for one, but for many; but he fixed the type according to which later laborers worked. His influence decided that our Bible should be popular and not literary, speaking in a single dialect, and that so by its simplicity it should be endowed with permanence. He felt by a happy instinct the potential affinity between Hebrew and English idioms, and enriched our language and thought for ever with the characteristics of the Semitic mind.”¹

His plan afterwards adopted.

¹ Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib., pp. 209-211.

We append the rendering of the Lord's Prayer found in the The Lord's Prayer according to the version of 1526. first edition of Tyndale's New Testament published in 1526. The points of resemblance and the variations between it and that of Wyclif, given above, furnish an interesting study.

"O oure father which arte in heven, halowed be thy name.

"Let thy kingdom come.

"Thy wyll be fulfilled as well in erth as hit ys in heven.

"Geve vs this daye oure dayly breade ;

"And forgeve vs our treaspases even as we forgeve them which treaspas vs.

"Leede vs not into temptacion, but delyvre vs ffrom yvell.

"Amen."

CHAPTER III.

VERSIONS OF COVERDALE, MATTHEW (ROGERS), TAVERNER, AND THE "GREAT BIBLE."

THE great desire of Tyndale's heart had been that the whole Bible might be given to the people of England in their own language. To him belongs the honor of the grand conception, as also of the inauguration of the work and of overcoming the principal obstacles to its accomplishment. But he was not permitted in his lifetime to see its full realization. This privilege was reserved for his legatees and successors.

First complete edition of the whole Bible, translated from the original tongues, in print.

As early as Dec. 19, 1534, two years before Tyndale's martyrdom, Convocation had been forced, as we have seen, by the impossibility of keeping out his translation, as well as the desire to put a check on an obtrusive Romanism, to adopt a resolution to the effect that the people might possess the Scriptures in the vernacular, provided they could be prevented from disputing on doctrinal points, and should be allowed to have only an authorized version. Cranmer, Crumwell, and the king were all irretrievably committed against Tyndale, so that when the reaction in favor of English translations of the Scriptures began, his translation, except it might be under cover, could not be consistently encouraged. But even in this partial concession of the Government, the prayer of the banished scholar was virtually answered: "If it would stand with the king's most gracious pleasure to grant only a bare text of Scripture to be put forth among his people, . . . be it the translation of what person soever shall please his Majesty, I shall . . . most humbly submit myself at the feet of his royal

Majesty, offering my body to suffer what pain or torture, yea what death his grace will, so that this be obtained.”

The first to pluck the fruit of these changed circumstances, which now made the printing of the English Bible even a matter of expediency, — a change due mainly to the efforts of Tyndale and his coadjutors, and achieved only at the bitter cost which he had prophetically foreshadowed, — was Miles Coverdale. He was born in a district of the same name in Yorkshire, in the year 1488, and hence was about four years younger than Tyndale. His education was obtained in an Augustine Monastery, Cambridge, and he took priest's orders in 1514, under John, bishop of Chalcedon, at Norwich. Being a diligent student of the Scriptures, he was from the first, more or less at variance with the current order of ecclesiastical affairs. In 1528 he preached against auricular confession, as being necessary to forgiveness; also, against the worship of images and the doctrine of transubstantiation.

In 1531 he received at Cambridge the degree of Bachelor of Canon Law. Until 1535, however, when the first edition of his Bible appeared, his life was a secluded one. The short time during which Coverdale was engaged in the preparation of this Bible, about eleven months, suggests the probability that it had employed his energies during several years of previous retirement. In 1538 he was in Paris for the purpose of superintending, in connection with Grafton, the publication of the so-called “Great Bible.” And the same year two editions of his own New Testament, with the Latin in parallel columns, were carried through the press. In 1539 he was employed by Crumwell to prosecute heresy in Berkshire. The next year, doubtless on account of the execution of his patron, Lord Crumwell, he left England for Tübingen, Germany. Here he was subsequently married.

Soon after the accession of Edward VI., Coverdale returned to England. In 1550 he was appointed one of a commission against the Anabaptists. The same year he published a new edition of his Bible. In 1551 he was sent to preach to the rebels in Devonshire; was consecrated bishop

Miles Coverdale enters into Tyndale's labors.

Bachelor of Canon Law.

Accession of Edward VI.

of Exeter Aug. 13, 1551, and found himself too poor to pay the "first-fruits" due to the king.

Edward VI. having in the mean time died, Coverdale was deprived of his bishopric in 1553, and, by an order dated August 20th of the same year, summoned to appear before a Council to answer the charge of heresy. For many months he was detained in prison, but through the interference of the King of Denmark, Charles II., was finally released, and went to Friesland, where he became preacher to the exiles in Wesel.

In 1558 he was at Geneva, but returned to England the same year, Queen Mary having been succeeded by her sister Elizabeth. He received the degree of "D.D." from the university of Cambridge in 1563, having been previously honored with the like dignity by the university of Tübingen. The same year he was presented to the living of St. Magnus, London Bridge, the "first-fruits" being again remitted on account of poverty. This position he resigned in 1566 through conscientious scruples with respect to the wearing of gowns, &c.; and in February, 1569, he passed away, greatly lamented, an immense concourse of people following his body to the grave.

A fair estimate of Coverdale's character is hardly possible on account of its striking contrast with that of Tyndale. He fell far behind the latter with respect to originality, boldness, knowledge of the original tongues of Scripture, and in the apparent motives leading to the work of translation. His intimate connection with a government, ordinarily so hostile to the Reformation, seems almost like truckling, compared with Tyndale's independence, and not infrequent defiance. But, undoubtedly, the two men were differently constituted by nature, and the conception of the reform to be accomplished was, in the one case, wholly seized and operative at once; in the other, a slow product of discipline and growth. Coverdale was nearly sixty years of age before he reached Tyndale's standard of ecclesiastical independence, and then no honors or emoluments of office could tempt him from the path of conscientious duty.

His work on behalf of the English Bible was of some importance. He himself, however, always took a depreciative and modest view of it. He undertook the labor of translation at first very reluctantly, and with the understanding that he would be allowed to retire from the field when a better man should be found for the place. He seemed fully to realize the value of Tyndale's translation as far as it had gone, and made no effort to supplant it. At first the hope may have been secretly entertained that the prisoner of Vilvorde would, even yet, be spared to complete the work he had so well begun.

In the account which he gives of his own translation, he writes: "Though Scripture be not worthily ministered to thee in this translation by means of my rudeness; yet if thou *be fervent in thy prayer*, God shall not only send it in a better shape *by the ministration of other that began it before* [Tyndale], but shall also move the hearts of them which as yet meddled not withal, to take it in hand, and to bestow the gift of their understanding thereon."¹

After what had already occurred, it would have been too plain a confession of defeat on the part of the king for him to order directly a translation of the Scriptures to be made into English; and hence the movement emanated from those high in authority, — who, however, were royal confidants, — especially from Crumwell. To supply the suddenly discovered need, Coverdale was therefore pressed into the service. He, probably already furnished for the undertaking by special studies in this direction, and by a not too scrupulous attention to the quality of his work, was able to produce a complete translation of the Scriptures within a year of the time when the commission was first received.

The volume appeared in October, 1535, and began to circulate as at least tacitly sanctioned by the king. Where it was printed is not known. New editions of it were issued in 1537, 1539, 1550, and 1553. The edition of 1537 so far enjoyed the royal approval as to have the words "overseen and corrected" printed on its title-page.

¹ Remains, p. 20.

Tyndale's version, too, at this time, after ten years of conflict, had conquered for itself the silent permission to exist in England. To render the translation of Coverdale attractive, it was adorned with various wood-cuts, representing the six days of creation, as also the several evangelists; and in connection with Paul's epistles there was a picture of the apostle sitting at his desk writing. The book had no notes, no headings for the chapters, and no divisions to mark verses. It was dedicated to the king in language fulsome enough to suit the singular taste of the time, the corrupt Henry being favorably compared with Moses, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, "yea a very Josias!"

This translation of Coverdale was avowedly not made from the Hebrew and Greek, but from the Vulgate and the German version of Luther. To this extent Hallam's statement, before alluded to, was correct. On one of the several different title-pages of the work, it is explicitly declared that the book is "faithfully and truly translated out of Dutch [German] and Latin into English." The authorities used are supposed to have been, all together, the Vulgate, Pagninus's version, Luther's German Bible, Leo Juda's German-Swiss version, Sebastian Münster's folio Hebrew Bible, published with a Latin version in 1534, and the work of Tyndale as far as it had issued from the press. It possessed, of course, none of the virtues of an original translation.

The influence of Coverdale's labors upon the translation of 1611, as it would be natural to expect, was but slight. His translation stands outside of the lineal history of the latter. The most that it did was to furnish a few ecclesiastical words, some of which might perhaps have been better omitted altogether. Westcott compares the relation between the translation of Tyndale and Coverdale to that between the translation of the Psalms, contained in the "authorized version," and that in the version of the Prayer Book.¹ Ellicott says that Coverdale's version can hardly be considered in the line of direct descent from Tyndale to the "authorized version."² And another writer thus finely indicates the posi-

From what
the transla-
tion was
made.

Influence
upon the
"authorized
version."

¹ Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 217.

² On Revision, &c., p. 79.

tion of this earliest successor of Tyndale: "It is with Tyndale that the genealogy of our 'authorized version' begins. Coverdale's name stands on the roll much like that of a person, who, dying childless, is counted in the list of predecessors, but not properly among the ancestors of those who, in the course of time, inherit his title."¹

"MATTHEW'S" BIBLE.

The year 1537, which witnessed two reprints of the version of Coverdale, also marks a more important advance in the course of vernacular translations in England. At this time there appeared in the form of a folio volume dedicated to the king, all the translations of the Scriptures, collected together, which Tyndale had been able to make previous to his death. The work purported to be edited by Thomas Matthew, which was probably the pseudonym of John Rogers, Tyndale's friend and the legatee of his papers; or, possibly, the name of some patron of his work which Rogers had put forward as being less likely to attract attention than his own. There is at least but little doubt that Rogers was the real editor. His initials, "J. R.," appear in the preface. He was finally condemned by Gardner as "Joannes Rogers, *alias* Matthew," his assumed connection with the Bible evidently being thus stigmatized. Internal evidence, moreover, both of the version and its notes, points in the same direction.

But the reception which this work met with in England was most remarkable, and only to be explained on the supposition that Cranmer, Crumwell, and others expected by its means to be relieved from the awkward dilemma of needing very much a vernacular version of the Scriptures to compete with Tyndale's, and answer the demand of the times, while against Tyndale, in the public estimation, they stood in pronounced opposition. How little did they suspect that they were welcoming and obtaining royal approval for the very translation, only in other covers, which had been so hunted

Matthew's
Bible. First
complete
publication
of Tyndale's
translations.

Remarkable
reception in
England.

¹ Letter of Henry Walter, p. 33.

and proscribed! Or did they, suspecting the truth, prefer to seem unconscious of it?

One thing is certain, that this folio Bible of 1537, mysteriously introduced into England, and put in circulation under the decoy of an unknown name, was, for the most part, no other than Tyndale's, in part already printed in various forms, and for the rest, as far as they extended, the first publication of such manuscript translations as he had left in the custody of his friends. The New Testament was Tyndale's revision of 1535. The Old Testament was his translation of the Pentateuch and his hitherto unpublished version of the books from Joshua to II. Chronicles. The remainder, including Jonah, which, although Tyndale had translated, Rogers did not see fit—probably for reasons of policy—to use, as well as the apocryphal books, were taken from the version of Coverdale. Even Tyndale's initials were retained at the end of the Old Testament part, without apparently attracting attention.

The London publishers of Matthew's Bible were Grafton and Whitchurch. Where it was printed is unknown. The clever publishers presented a *quasi*-complimentary copy to Archbishop Cranmer, who pronounced the translation "very well done!" Moreover, he immediately corresponded with Crumwell concerning it, and urged the matter of procuring, at once, a royal license for its circulation. In this letter he writes of the translation in the following laudatory terms: "And as for the translation I like it, so far as I have read thereof, better than any translation heretofore made." Crumwell, shortly after, announcing to the archbishop that the required license had been procured, Cranmer immediately responded: "You have shewed me more pleasure herein than if you had given me a thousand pounds."¹

And so it came to pass that this edition of the Bible, two-thirds of which was Tyndale's translation that had been again and again publicly stigmatized and condemned by authority of this same king, Henry VIII., and even actually prohibited seven years before, was now "set forth with the king's most gracious license," this

¹ And. Ann., pp. 244-246.

authorization being printed in red ink in each separate volume. It was also ordered that a copy of this Bible should be placed in every parish church, the necessary expense of the same to be equally shared by parishioners and clergy. It is not surprising that "certain there were who did not believe that it had pleased the king to do as he had done." And truly it is not difficult to recognize the superintendence of a wise Providence in such a gathering of Tyndale's various translations into one volume, edited, no doubt, with scrupulous fidelity, and the assignment to that volume of so commanding a position in the history of the English church, especially when it is considered that it was adapted and designed to be the one mould which should give shape to all subsequent English versions of the Scriptures.

The first edition of Matthew's Bible, consisting of fifteen thousand copies, was soon exhausted, and the demand for it became so great that its publishers were obliged to seek the protection of the government against pirated editions. The people, it is obvious, were not slow to discover the merits of a translation of which they had previously enjoyed more than a stolen morsel. Not less than twenty separate editions of Tyndale's translations had already found their way to England. But the Romanizing bishops were not equally satisfied. In the quaint language of Foxe: "The setting forth of this book did not a little offend the clergy, namely, the bishops aforesaid, both for the prologue, and especially, because in the same book there was one special table collected of the common-places in the Scriptures for the approbation of the same, and chiefly about the supper of the Lord, and the marriage of priests, and the mass, which there was said not to be found in the Scriptures."¹

Many of the priests, too, taking their cue from their ecclesiastical superiors, displayed with even ludicrous zeal, their opposition to the new order of affairs. Obligated by injunction of Crumwell to possess this Bible, and to read it in their congregations, still they "read confusedly the Word of God, and the injunctions set forth and commanded to be read by them."

¹ Eng. Hex., p. 79.

humming and hawing and hawking thereat, that scarce any could understand them. 'It was never a good world,' they would say, 'since the Word of God came abroad;' 'and that it was not meet for the people to have it or to read it, but they must receive it at the priest's mouth: they were the nurses that must chew the meat before the children ate it.'"¹

We cannot properly conclude this account of Matthew's version, so called, without a brief sketch of the life of John Rogers, its actual editor. He was educated at Oxford taking the degree of "B. A.," in 1525. Soon after he received an appointment as chaplain to the English factory at Antwerp, where he met Tyndale, and was by him induced to give up Popery. Subsequently he became minister to a congregation of exiles. In 1536, or a year later, he was married to a German lady, who became the mother of his eleven children, eight of them born before his return to England. Upon the death of King Henry he returned to his native land; and, among his earliest literary efforts, put forth a tract of Melancthon which he had translated. He held several important positions in the church during the reign of Edward VI.

After the accession of Mary, Rogers preached at St. Paul's Cross, in such a manner as to give her great offence. He had earnestly exhorted his hearers to remain steadfast in the faith of the Gospel. For this crime he was imprisoned for several months in his own house, and then sent to Newgate. Here he was kept a prisoner from the 16th of August, 1553, to Jan. 22, 1555. He was then brought before Gardner, condemned and sentenced. The details of his execution are familiar. Noaille, the celebrated French ambassador at the court of London, thus alludes to it: "This day was performed the confirmation of the alliance, between the Pope and this kingdom, by a public and solemn sacrifice of a preaching doctor, named Rogers, who has been burnt alive for being a Lutheran, but he died persisting in his opinion. At this conduct the greatest part of the people took such pleasure, that they were not afraid to make him many acclamations to strengthen his courage. Even his children assisted, confirming

¹ Johnson's Hist. Acct., *ad loc.*

him in such a manner that it seemed as if he had been led to a wedding."

TAVERNER'S RECENSION.

In 1539 a revision of Matthew's Bible appeared in two editions, folio and quarto respectively, from the pen of Richard Taverner. This revision seems to have originated in a desire on the part of the publishers of Coverdale's Bible, who were also the publishers of this, not to be wholly excluded from the market through the popularity of Matthew's recension of Tyndale. Taverner was a graduate of Oxford in 1529. Even while at the University he had shared the peculiar honor, at this time paid to students of the Bible in England, having been shut up in the cellar of Cardinal College, in company with certain of his fellow-students, for being detected in reading the prohibited work of Tyndale. Subsequently, however, under the patronage of Crumwell, he enjoyed considerable honor at court, and was by him induced himself to undertake the work of translating the Scriptures. The prime minister had, at last, come to the conclusion that the speediest way to circumvent the machinations of his Popish enemies was to flood the country with Bibles. Taverner was learned in the Greek tongue, and in other respects a person of varied accomplishments, having at different times occupied the position of courtier, lawyer, lay-preacher, justice of the peace, and high sheriff. He survived the two subsequent reigns, and was offered the honor of knighthood by Queen Elizabeth, but declined through poverty. He died July 14, 1575, aged seventy.

The aim of Taverner in this recension seems to have been to correct the errors of Matthew's Bible, and it has sometimes been called an "expurgated edition" of the latter. In his dedication to the king, in which we mark the absence, courtier though he was, of that fulsome adulation so often met with in those times, he says: "Forasmuch as the printers hereof were desirous to have this most sacred volume of the Bible come forth as faultlessly and emendably [?] as the

Aim in this recension.

shortness of the time for the recognizing of the same would require, they desired me, your most humble servant, for default of a better learned, diligently to overlook and peruse the whole copy, . . . which thing, according to my talent, I have gladly done."

This recension, no doubt, shows the impress of Taverner's cultivated pen. He aimed at perspicuity. His changes were mostly for the sake of clearness and force. His New Testament, as was to be expected from his familiar acquaintance with Greek, exhibits more variations from the version of Matthew (Tyndale) than the Old. But there are everywhere evident marks of haste. His employers were eager to forestall the market. Another version was already in press in Paris. So Taverner's work failed to aid, noticeably, in the higher development of later translations. The publishers, too, must have been disappointed in their anticipated profits, as the book commanded but a limited sale.

THE GREAT BIBLE.

The real character of Matthew's version, in view of the immense demand that had sprung up for it, together with its patent and, to many, obnoxious annotations, could not long remain a secret. It was needful to meet forthwith the opposition thereby awakened. Under the direction of Crumwell, therefore, certain scholars, now unknown with the exception of Coverdale, made haste to prepare a new edition of the same, in which various alterations were made, not the least of which was the omission of its trenchant controversial notes. According to Westcott,¹ who judges from a careful survey of evidence both external and internal, Coverdale was editor of the entire work. Whether he had the aid of others is uncertain. According to Ellicott, however, Coverdale was only press corrector and practical editor, without being actually employed in the work of revision.² The title-page announces that the book is "truly translated after the verity of

Real character of Matthew's version at last discovered.

¹ Hist. Eng. Bib., pp. 100, 236.

² On Revision, &c., p. 81.

the Hebrew and Greek texts by divers excellent, learned men, expert in the aforesaid tongues."

The plan was to bring out the book in the form of a magnificent folio, and as the English press offered no adequate facilities for the undertaking, the privilege was obtained from Francis I. of printing it in Paris. This privilege was granted, however, only under certain restrictions, among which was specified "the communication of forbidden opinions." This furnished sufficient ground for the omnipresent Inquisition to interfere and put a stop to the work.

The enterprise was fairly entered upon in Paris early in 1538, — the publisher, Grafton, being on the ground with Coverdale, — and nearly completed before the close of the year. Then, all at once, an order came from the Interference of the Inquisition. with Coverdale, — and nearly completed before the close of the year. Then, all at once, an order came from the Inquisitor-General of France, not only forbidding the completion of the work, but also the use of what had been already printed. Coverdale, however, not wholly strange to the methods of persecutors, had been too quick for the papal representatives, and previous to the reception of the order had already forwarded copies to England. He and Grafton, moreover, shortly afterwards, effected their own escape, besides having the happiness of rescuing types, presses, and workmen from ecclesiastical ward and transferring them entire to English soil. In the following April (1539), the book was finished.

This Bible is ordinarily known as the "Great Bible," although sometimes called "Cranmer's Bible," under a mistaken notion that he was specially concerned in its production. There is no evidence that he had any part either in the inception of the work or its subsequent accomplishment. Undoubtedly he *favoured the circulation* of the recension when completed, and his name as Primate was placed for its proper authorization on the title-page of the second and following editions; and with the later editions too, as will appear, he was in various ways, more closely identified.

Coverdale had designed to print, in connection with this Bible, a critical commentary on the text "without any singularity of opinions" or "contentious words," but

A critical commentary projected.

probably on account of the haste demanded, his project resulted in nothing, and the book appeared, therefore, in the unusual form of a simple text without note or comment. The royal license for its publication had been early secured, and it was privileged therefore to carry the announcement: "to be sett up in summe convenyent place within the church whereat the parishioners may rede yt." For nearly thirty years, with the exception of the period during the reign of Mary, this Bible, in some one of its various revisions, was the "Authorized Version" of the English church.

Three new editions of the Great Bible, the first being somewhat revised by Coverdale and the others generally following it, were issued in the year 1540, and three in Subsequent editions. the succeeding year. Each of these editions contained a preface by Archbishop Cranmer and two of them the direct indorsement of Tunstall and Heath, bishops respectively of London and Winchester. They were said to have "overseen and perused the translation." This oversight, however, was merely nominal, and announced for effect; and afterwards, in the time of reaction just before the death of Henry, these prelates denied any responsibility for the version. They declared that "they had never meddled therewith." The occasion for their names being attached to it at all, was the fact, that Lord Cromwell having been executed for supposed political offences, it was thought desirable that the book which had, at first, been brought out by him, should be indorsed by such other persons high in authority, as could not be supposed to have had collusion with him. But as the Great Bible was based on Matthew's recension of the version of Tyndale, we cannot but mark the singular providence by which these two men, who had been among the most influential and bitter against the exiled translator, are here compelled to set their names in ostensible approval, to that which they had previously condemned and committed to the flames.

As far as the work of revision extended, Coverdale's principal help in the Old Testament was a new Latin translation of the Hebrew text by S. Münster which had Sources of Coverdale's revision. appeared in 1534-35. In the New Testament, he followed his

own previous revision of Tyndale (1535) in connection with the Vulgate, Erasmus's Latin version, and the Complutensian Polyglot. Westcott, in collating the text of the first epistle of John with the text of Tyndale's version of 1534, has discovered but seventy-one differences. Of these, forty-three are traced to Coverdale's earlier revision; seventeen to the Vulgate, being places where Coverdale had not previously followed it; and eleven to other sources.¹ One well-known error of our own translation (John x. 16), was inherited from this version of Coverdale through the Latin: "There shall be one fold (*flock*) and one shepherd."

The Great Bible is a work of more special interest from the fact that sentences of Scripture in the Communion service of the Book of Common Prayer, quotations in the Homilies as well as other occasional phrases, and the whole of the Psalter, are from this source. It was during the reign of Edward VI., the Liturgy being then revised and changed, that this translation was first adopted. Another revision of the same taking place in the time of Charles II. (1662), some of the translations of the Great Bible were exchanged for those of a later version; but the Psalter, and other minor parts, as before mentioned, remained unchanged. The significant reason assigned for the retention of this version of the Psalter was that it was familiar and also "smoother and easier to sing." Smoothness of translation had been one of the special aims of Coverdale; sometimes, it is to be feared, attained by the sacrifice of the higher excellence of scrupulous accuracy.

Some, however, have thought this version of the Psalter to be so superior to Coverdale's work in general, that it could not be his. But it is probable that the already translated Psalms, noticed prejudice of familiarity has more to do with this opinion than any actual superiority in the work itself.² And it is worthy of observation, moreover, that a similar preference for an older version of the Psalms, become familiar by use, appears in the history of Biblical translations in the case of Jerome's Vulgate.³

¹ Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 258.

² Eng. Hex., 84.

³ Smith's Bib. Dict., iii., p. 1703.

This Bible was the first to print words not found in the original Hebrew or Greek, and thought needful to complete the sense in English, in a different type. In size, it ^{First appearance of} *Italics.* was too unwieldy, and too expensive in price, to command a general circulation, if it had been otherwise acceptable; although of the seven editions issued about fifteen thousand copies were disposed of. The fact of its similarity, in many respects, to Coverdale's previous recension did not escape the attention of the keen-eyed Puritans, with whom it was never widely popular.

Lest a too favorable view of the present and subsequent patronage of the work of translating and circulating the Scriptures on the part of the government of Eng- ^{Vacillating course of} *the Govern-* land should be entertained, certain other facts must, ^{ment.} at this point, be stated. We have already noted that in 1537, Henry had been forced by circumstances to announce that it had pleased him to permit and command the Bible, which had been translated into the mother tongue, to be openly set forth in every parish church, that Bible being no other than Tyndale's translation published by his friend John Rogers under the pseudonym of Matthew.

Less than six years afterwards (1543), it was enjoined by order of the same king, that no women but noble women, no artificers, apprentices, journeymen, servingmen, husbandmen, nor laborers were to be allowed to read the Old or New Testament in English. The same year Parliament proscribed all versions to which the name of Tyndale was attached; and, in 1546, the versions of Coverdale were likewise included in the prohibition. In 1546, too, an order was promulgated that "it ought to be deemed certain that the reading of the Old and New Testaments is not necessary for all those folks that of duty ought to be bound to read it, but as the Prince and the policy of the realm shall think convenient to be tolerated or taken from it." And, about six months before his death, the king sought to destroy every extant copy of Tyndale's New Testament, pronouncing it "crafty, false, and untrue," notwithstanding it could not well have been otherwise than notorious at this time, that this very translation of Tyndale was the basis of several succeeding ones which had been publicly and repeatedly authorized.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GENEVAN, BISHOPS', AND RHEMISH VERSIONS.

THE reaction which through political changes and the caprice of the ruling monarch set in against vernacular translations of the Scriptures towards the close of Henry's reign, resulted in a very general destruction of Bibles throughout the realm, even of some which had received direct royal sanction. The Great Bible alone was permitted, under severe restrictions, still to be used.

The accession of Edward VI., however, brought back again, for a limited period, an era of prosperity for the English Scriptures. On the very day of his coronation, he took special pains to pay them honor. His first parliament repealed the obnoxious laws against the Bible, which had been enacted during the reign of his father. He enjoined that the Scriptures in English should be provided for the use of all the churches. "All beneficed persons," the order ran, "shall provide within three months next after this visitation, one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume in English, [the Great Bible], and within one twelve months next after the said visitation, the 'Paraphrasis' of Erasmus upon the Gospels, also in English, and the same set up in some convenient place within the . . . church . . . whereat their parishioners may most commodiously resort unto the same and read the same."¹

A large number of printing establishments were at once started for the express purpose of multiplying copies of the Holy Scriptures. Of the fifty-seven presses then in operation in England, thirty-one were thus employed.

Multiplication of Bibles.

¹ Cardwell's Doc. Ann., vol. i., p. 9.

During this short reign of six and one-half years, no less than thirteen editions of the whole Bible and thirty-five of the New Testament were published. Of these, one was Coverdale's, one Taverner's, seven of the Great Bible, and, according to Anderson, twelve of Matthew's recension of Tyndale.¹ With the exception, however, of a fragment of the Gospels translated by Sir John Cheke, professor of Greek at Cambridge, no new versions of the Scriptures were undertaken during this reign.

Mary ascended the throne of England, July 6th, 1553. Her influence was as bitterly hostile as Edward's had been propitious to the freedom of the Scriptures. Not ^{Reign of "Bloody Mary."} a single copy of the Bible found its way to the press during her sovereignty. The public use of the same in the churches, moreover, was prohibited, and such as were already found there were burnt.

But owing to a marked revolution in the public sentiment of England, during the few previous years, the reaction ^{Reaction limited.} against the Bible did not proceed to such extremes as might otherwise have been expected. No general destruction of the books themselves was either ordered or attempted. The queen's relentless hostility found vent rather in the more relished persecution of the persons of her intractable subjects. During her reign of five years, nearly four hundred suffered death in England on account of their religious principles, two hundred and eighty-eight by flames. Among the victims were Rogers and Cranmer, and many others "of whom the world was not worthy."

A much larger number of persons, multitudes indeed, were obliged to find safety in lonely exile. But under ^{Many exiled.} the wise government of Him who is able to bring good out of evil, it is from these very exiles, thoughtful of their country's good even in banishment, that we receive the next English version of the Scriptures.

What England especially lacked at this time was a family Bible. The Great Bible, now most prominently before ^{No family Bible yet prepared.} the public, both on account of its large size and its lacking a commentary and notes, then deemed quite essential,

¹ Annals, &c., p. 360.

as well as for other reasons, could not meet the urgent want. It is to this necessity, therefore, that the expatriated scholars in Geneva especially address themselves. The English church, at this principal *rendezvous* of fugitives from Mary's cruelty, numbered several hundreds of persons, and among them were not a few already distinguished for learning and piety. Their circumstances, moreover, were in many respects unusually favorable to literary undertakings.

Geneva was itself an acknowledged centre of sacred learning on the continent, where the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew had greatly increased since the publication of the earlier translations. Leo Judah's Latin version of the Old Testament, left unfinished by him at his death, had just been completed by able scholars. Erasmus's Latin Testament had undergone revision. A version of the Bible in elegant Latin, by Castalio, had appeared in 1551, and Stephen's third edition of the Greek text of the New Testament one year earlier. Beza's Latin Testament was issued in 1556.

But what was more important than all, there were certain persons, including Calvin himself, who were at that very time engaged in perfecting a French version of the Scriptures, revisions of which appeared in 1545, 1551, 1558, and 1588. A version of the Italian Bible was also then going on at the same place, which was finally published in 1562. In the address to the reader prefixed to the Genevan New Testament of 1557, the translators thus recognize their indebtedness to the position they occupied: "Being moved with zeal, counselled by the godly, and drawn by occasion both of the place where God hath appointed us to dwell, and also of the store of heavenly learning and judgment which so aboundeth in this city of Geneva, that justly it may be called the patron and nurse of true religion and godliness."

Of the translators of the Genevan version, William Whittingham, who married Calvin's sister, appears to have been chief, and there were associated with him, according to Westcott and Anderson, Thomas Sampson and Anthony Gilby; others say, also Christopher Goodman, Thomas Cole, and Coverdale. The New Testament, there is

Valuable aid for the translators.

By whom the work was done.

little doubt, was almost solely the work of Whittingham, while he had assistants, more or less, in preparing the Old Testament. All of these persons were distinguished as scholars; and some of them were subsequently advanced to important positions during the reign of Elizabeth. Whittingham himself, on his return to England, was several times impleaded in the ecclesiastical courts on account of non-conformity, and especially for his presbyterian ordination at Geneva. At last, having been excommunicated by the Archbishop of York, a commission with reference to the matter, appointed by the queen, declared that "Wm. Whittingham was ordained in a better sort than even the Archbishop himself." Whittingham died in 1579. Sampson was dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and in the paper soliciting his appointment to the office the men of that college gave him the following excellent recommendation: "After well considering all the learned men in the land, they found none to be compared to him for singular learning and great piety, having the praise of all men. And it is very doubtful whether there is a better man, a greater linguist, a more complete scholar, a more profound divine." He died in 1589, aged seventy-two.

The New Testament of this version made its appearance from a press in Geneva, June 10th, 1557, and the whole Bible three years later. An introduction to the former was written by Calvin, entitled: "The epistle declaring that Christ is the end of the law." The New Testament of the completed Bible of 1560 was so much changed from the original version of Whittingham, — which is the one printed in Bagster's Hexapla, — as to be regarded by some as almost a new recension."¹ The translation of the Old Testament employed the able company of scholars engaged upon it "two years and more, working day and night." And notwithstanding the accession of Elizabeth to the throne permitted their return to England in 1558, these devoted men voluntarily endured the hardships of exile for many months longer, with the sole purpose of bringing to a fit conclusion their great undertaking. The expense of publication, no small matter in

When the
Genevan
New Testa-
ment ap-
peared.

¹ Craik's Hints and Suggest., p. 43.

the straitened circumstances of these men, was borne by the whole congregation at Geneva, a special patron, however, being John Bodley, father of the noted founder of the Bodleian library. To this same Bodley a patent of monopoly was given by Elizabeth, for the sale of the book.

The popularity of the Genevan version on its appearance was immense, and the demand for it unparalleled in the previous history of English Biblical translations. Ninety editions of the whole or a part of this Bible—more than double those of all others—were required during the fifty-four years intervening before the completion of the “Authorized Version” of 1611; and by this time so firm was the hold which it had acquired of the popular feeling, that it long disputed rank and reputation with that version itself. From the beginning, it became pre-eminently the household edition of the Bible. Its notes, anti-episcopal though they often were¹ (Rev. ix. 3), were eagerly sought after, and thirty-eight years after the publication of King James’s version, were published in connection with several editions of that version to give it attractiveness.

In the reign of Charles I., however, Archbishop Laud made the vending, binding, or importation of the book a high-commission crime, on the ground that it was opposed to the established order and the version authorized. But it had already achieved its appointed work, essentially one of preparation for its more distinguished successor, not less than one hundred and fifty editions in all having been put in circulation during the eighty-seven years in which it was current.

Some of the sources of the popularity of this version have been already indicated. It was adapted to use in the family. The form of the unwieldy folio had been discarded for the neat quarto. Full notes were placed on the margin where they might easily catch the eye. And these notes, though “characteristically Swiss, not only in their theology, but in their politics,” making allegiance to kings dependent on their soundness of faith, were yet “on the whole neither unjust

Popularity of Genevan version.

Afterwards prohibited.

Sources of popularity.

¹ Cardwell’s Doc. Ann., vol. ii., p. 30, n.

nor illiberal.”¹ They, at least, to some extent, answered a general desire for a simple and clear exposition of the Word of God. The translators themselves said of them that they “had omitted nothing unexpounded whereby he that is any thing exercised in the Scriptures of God might justly complain of hardness.”

This version, too, was printed in clear Roman type in place of the usual black-letter. After 1578, the different editions were accompanied by a Bible Dictionary of Printed in Roman type, &c. considerable value. This translation of the Bible, moreover, was the first to complete the division of chapters into verses. The Genevan scholars going a step beyond Robert Stephens, who, a short time before (1551), had indicated such division by numerals on the margin, broke up the text into minute subdivisions as at present, with the numerals placed at the beginning of each verse; a change also introduced by the Elzevirs into the Greek in their edition of 1633. Difficult Hebrew idioms and diverse readings were printed in the margin, and italics were employed to indicate words not found in the original. On account of the rendering given to Gen. iii. 7, “and made themselves breeches [aprons], this version has sometimes been called the “Breeches Bible.”

The Genevan Bible was the first to be made on the principle of associated labor, afterwards adopted in the version of 1611, and still deemed absolutely essential True principles of translation recognized. to unity and harmony in the general execution of such a work. More attention than had been customary was also given, on the part of the translators, toward procuring a text as critically correct as possible, although Beza’s influence, whom Ellicott calls “a good interpreter, but a bad and inexperienced critic,”² weighed perhaps too much with them.

Westcott, who has made a careful collation of the text of the Genevan with that of other versions, says of its Old Testament: “In all parts they took the Great Bible Westcott’s estimate. as their basis, and corrected its text without even substituting for it a new translation. . . . At the same time there is abundant evidence to show that they were perfectly competent to deal

¹ Cardwell, *Id.*

² *On Revision*, p. 82.

independently with points of Hebrew scholarship; and minute changes in expression show that they were not indifferent to style."¹

In the New Testament the Genevan translators followed Tyndale's version, selecting the text of Matthew, and used pretty freely in connection with it Beza's version and commentary. The author last quoted deems the influence of Beza's Latin text upon the Genevan scholars, although in certain particulars to be deprecated, to have been on the whole beneficial, his recension being far superior to any which had preceded it.²

Notwithstanding the work of the translators of Geneva was only conditionally included in the list of such as might be authoritatively consulted by the collaborators of King James's version, still it undoubtedly exercised an influence only inferior to that of the standard text; viz., the Bishops' Bible, not yet passed under review. A critical examination and comparison of certain parts of the Old Testament have disclosed that seven-eighths of the variations from the Bishops' Bible owe their origin to the Genevan. And in the New Testament, the impression that it has left is scarcely less observable.³ A somewhat important revision of the New Testament of this version, which appeared in 1576, was executed by L. Thomson.

THE BISHOPS' BIBLE.

During the reign of Elizabeth (1558-1603), the English Bible enjoyed peculiar favor, more, however, from the fact that the preferences of the people for special versions were unconstrained, and the general circulation of the Scriptures not interfered with, than from any extraordinary patronage of the government. This statement should, perhaps, be limited by the important fact that the right to print any book was held as a royal prerogative, and the privilege was granted only by royal patent to be sued for and pur-

The Bible during the reign of Elizabeth.

¹ Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 287.

² Id., p. 297.

³ Id.

chased. Previous to 1573, for thirty-seven years, the right to print Bibles and Testaments had been common to all printers, the only restriction being the securing of a license. But on Sept. 28, 1577, there was granted by Queen Elizabeth to one firm, Robert and Christopher Barker, the exclusive privilege of printing "all Bibles and Testaments whatsoever in the English language, of whatever translation, with notes or without notes, printed before then, or afterwards to be printed by our command."

It is to be particularly noticed, that in this order no preference is expressed on the part of the government for any one translation above another, although the Bishops' Bible had been issued in 1568, and so had already been before the public for nearly ten years. Previously, however (1559), the queen had enjoined that Bibles of the *largest volume*, thereby specially designating the Great Bible, should be placed in the churches, and had appended no restrictions to hinder their being freely read and consulted, except that, all were to "read the same, with great humility and reverence, as the very lively Word of God."¹

Notwithstanding this order, it is interesting to note the fact, as indicating an era of unusual freedom, that, when the Bishops' Bible came to be printed, the Genevan version had already crept into the churches and was beginning to supplant, even there, its older rival.² Archbishop Parker's letter to Cecil, asking for a royal authorization of the new candidate for favor, said: "that in certain places *be publicly used* some translations *which have not been labored in your realm*, having inspersed divers *prejudicial notes* which might also have been well spared."

All the movements of Elizabeth, however, in this direction, were characterized by a spirit of extreme caution. On the day after her coronation, a gentleman remarked to her somewhat publicly, that she had released several persons from undeserved confinement, but that there were still four prisoners of excellent character who craved liberation.

¹ Cardwell's Doc. Ann., vol. i, p. 214.

² Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 137, note. Cf. Cardwell's Doc. Ann., vol. ii., pp. 31, 32.

On her asking who they were, the courtier replied that they were the Holy Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and he prayed that they might be allowed to walk abroad as formerly in the English tongue. She replied guardedly and adroitly, that she would first know whether they desired any such liberty.

Among the special influences at work to excite a demand for a new version, resulting in the so-called Bishops' Bible, were the great popularity of the Genevan version, in connection with its obvious anti-episcopal bearings; and the plain defects of the Great Bible, now become more glaring in the midst of sharp competition, while yet it remained the only Bible really authorized to be read in the churches.

It was about 1563-64, that the work was really undertaken. The whole version was superintended, and finally revised by Archbishop Parker, and consequently has sometimes received the name of "Matthew Parker's Bible." The Archbishop engaged the services of various learned men in carrying forward the work, — fifteen in all, eight of whom were bishops, — sending to each one a certain portion of the Bible to be translated, together with instructions respecting the precise method to be pursued. Among other things, for instance, they were to add short, marginal notes, for the correction or illustration of the text. In 1568, or about four years from the time when it was begun, the work was completed and published.

No expense was spared to make the volume, externally, as attractive as possible. It was published in the form of a magnificent folio, with one hundred and forty-three copperplate engravings of maps, portraits, coats of arms, &c. Among the portraits were those of Elizabeth, of Dudley, Cecil, and Lord Burleigh. It was accompanied with brief, pithy notes, generally dealing with points of interpretation, but not without occasional dogmatic statements of importance. With respect to the division of the text into verses, it adopted the style of the popular Genevan version. Passages to be omitted in public reading were definitely indicated, and the various books of the Old and New Testaments were classified as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetical.

Project of
Archbishop
Parker.

External
character-
istics.

Royal authorization from Elizabeth was sought for this version, but it does not appear that any answer was returned to the petition. Convocation, however, with the possible acquiescence of the queen, ordered (1571), though without rigorously enforcing the decree, that "every archbishop and bishop should have at his house a copy of the Holy Bible of the largest volume as lately printed at London, and that it should be placed in the hall or the large dining-room, that it might be useful to their servants or strangers." Each cathedral was also to have a copy, and all the churches, "as far as it could be conveniently done."

Royal authorization only tacitly given.

These special efforts of its friends were sufficient to bring the Bishops' Bible into general *public* use, in place of the Great Bible, but did not seriously interfere with the popularity or circulation of the version of Geneva where it had been before used. Bishop Ellicott says of the work that, it "never succeeded in thoroughly commanding the respect of scholars, or in securing the sympathies of the people, maintaining its authority during the forty-three years of its existence more by external authority than any merit of its own."¹

The Bishops' Bible and the Great Bible.

The one fact of special importance in connection with this recension is, that it was made, by King James's appointment, the basis of our present so-called "authorized version," so that its defects and its excellencies are the more worthy of particular examination. In general, it may be said, that it was a revision of the Great Bible, not uninfluenced by the version made at Geneva; while the Great Bible, as we have seen, was based on Matthew's recension of Tyndale. It is thought to illustrate pointedly, in its own defects, the superiority of work of this kind, done through conference and local union, to that done by different scholars separately. In the equality and harmony of its translation, the Genevan greatly surpasses it.

Fact of importance.

Some, at least, of the scholars engaged on the Bishops' Bible seem to have had strange notions of their responsibilities and the qualities, moral and intellectual, re-

Unappreciative translators.

¹ On Revis., &c., p. 84.

quired in a translator of the Scriptures. Guest, Bishop of Rochester, speaks of changing the preter-perfect tense into the present, because, otherwise, the sense would be too harsh. And he translated some portions of the Psalms according to their rendering in the New Testament, so as not to give offence to the people on account of divers translations.

The ostensible aim of the translators was to correct the errors of the Great Bible, which was their standard, and make of it a popular, in distinction from a literary, version. An author much relied upon in this volume, says of the critical Westcott's opinion of the work. labors of these men, that "there is little to recommend the original renderings of the Bishops' Bible in the Old Testament. As a general rule they appear to be arbitrary and at variance with the exact sense of the Hebrew text. In the New Testament, the translation shows considerable vigor and freshness, . . . the Greek scholarship of the revisers being superior to their Hebrew scholarship."¹ In the historical books of the Old Testament, the text of the Great Bible was very closely followed. The Psalms were frequently corrected; and so, too, the prophets, where, especially, the influence of the Genevan version is very perceptible. In twenty-six variations from the Great Bible, in the New Testament, discovered by the same critic, seventeen are original, and nine due to the version of Geneva.

The additions to the Hebrew text, transferred from the Interpolations omitted, &c. Vulgate into the Great Bible were omitted from that of the Bishops'. The word "ecclesia," which had generally been rendered by "congregation," from Tyndale down, even in the versions of Coverdale and Cranmer, was, by these revisers, translated "church," and through them has been introduced into our own version. The Genevan version had given both renderings.

In 1572, the New Testament of the Bishops' Bible was Revision. carefully revised; Laurence, "a man of great fame in those times for his knowledge in the Greek," making the largest contribution to the emendations. It was this edition—the Old Testament of 1568 remaining unaltered—

¹ Hist. Eng. Bib., 310, 311, *et passim*.

which was taken as the standard version by the revisers of 1611. Twenty-nine editions of the Bishops' Bible were published in all, most of them of large size for public use, the last appearing in 1608.

RHEMISH BIBLE.

During the sovereignty of Elizabeth, many Romanists became refugees from England; and for their sake, and to raise up missionaries for the propagation of the faith, an English seminary was established at Doway, First Roman Catholic version in the vernacular. by Cardinal Allen (1568), as also at Rheims, at Rome, and in Spain. Within these seminaries were collected the principal English scholars of the Romish faith, and two of them, Rheims and Doway, are specially distinguished as sources whence the first, and to this day only complete, Roman Catholic translation of the Scriptures into English, proceeded. The New Testament appeared at Rheims in 1582, and the Old Testament at Doway twenty-seven years later, the singular reason of the want of sufficient funds to defray expenses of publication, "our poor estate in banishment," being given to explain the long interval between them.¹

If the flight of these Romanists from England had been involuntary, their task of translating the Scriptures can scarcely be regarded as less so. The translators, in the Reasons for the work. preface to their work, very candidly announce their reasons for it. "They do not publish it upon the erroneous opinion of its being necessary that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one who reads or hears them in a known language; or that they generally, or absolutely, judged it more convenient in itself or more agreeable to God's Word or honor, or the edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical languages.

"But they translate this sacred book upon special con-

¹ Cf. Shea's Biographic. Acct., &c., p. 2.

sideration of the present time, state, and condition of their country, unto which divers things were either necessary or profitable and medicinable now, that otherwise in the peace of the church were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable." What this present particular necessity by which they felt compelled to undertake such an extraordinary work was, they subsequently state. "In pure compassion, therefore, to see their beloved countrymen, with extreme danger of their souls, to use only such profane translations and erroneous men's mere fancies, and being also much moved thereto by the desire of many devout persons, they have set forth the New Testament, trusting that it might give occasion to them, after diligently perusing it, to lay away, at least, such their impure versions as hitherto they had been forced to use."

An attempt, moreover, to prepare the way for the new-comer was essayed in the year preceding its publication, by organizing an elaborate attack upon the several English versions then current. Gregory Martin, one of the principal scholars engaged on the Rhemish Bible, was the champion especially put forward to make the assault. His work was entitled, "A discovery of the manifold corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the heretics of our days, specially of the English sectaries." He was at once conclusively answered by Fulke, under the patronage of Archbishop Parker.

As has been above intimated, Gregory Martin was the person principally concerned in the translation both of the Old and the New Testament of this version, although the former did not appear till some years after his death, which occurred in 1582. His New Testament, it is said, was revised and annotated by Cardinal Allen, and Drs. Richard Bristow and John Reynolds,¹ while the notes of the Old Testament were executed by Dr. Thomas Worthington. These notes throughout were of an extremely controversial character, and, as they themselves stated, intended to show that the Romish church was conformable to Scripture. The first complete edition of the whole Bible, according to this recension, was published at Rouen, 1633-35.

¹ Shea's Biographic. Acct.

The translation, it is well known, was made from the so-called "authentic text" of the Vulgate, and not from the original Hebrew and Greek. The "Vulgate" had been pronounced authentic by the Council of Trent; but the combined wisdom of that Council did not see fit to distinguish and declare just what they considered the Vulgate to be.¹

The translators assign reasons apparently satisfactory to themselves why they took as their standard the version of Jerome, instead of the original tongues. Among other advantages: "It was so ancient; Augustine had commended it; it was that used in the Church's service; the Council of Trent had declared it authentic; it was the gravest, sincerest, of greatest majesty; it was not only better than all other Latin translations, but better *than the Greek text itself when they differed.*" In support of the very startling statement last made, they advance the assumption that, as the first heretics were Greeks, the Greek Scriptures suffered much at their hands. While in the Old Testament they used the Latin in preference to the Hebrew, because the original text had "been foully corrupted by the Jews." The possible corruptions of the Latin text, however, through a thousand years of ignorant, monkish transcription is not even hinted at.

Not only was the current Latin Vulgate adopted as an original authority, but it was followed verbally and blindly, with but little apparent effort on the part of the translators to make their renderings intelligible. In fact, not infrequently, no meaning whatever can be obtained from the version, except by collating it with the Latin. But little else could have been expected from those who announced at the outset, that the Scriptures are too mysterious and profound for ordinary readers. The passage in Eph. vi. 12, they render "against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials."

A marked peculiarity of this version was the transference, without translation, of many terms and phrases, having by usage, specific reference to the forms and ceremonies of the Romish church. We find in it, for the first time, such expressions as "the advent of the Lord," the "imposition

¹ Fulke's Defence, &c., p. 70. Cf. below, — Ancient Versions.

of hands" which they declared came out of the very *Latin text* of Scripture. So, too, "penance," "doing penance," "chalice," "priest," "deacon," "tradition," "altar," "host," some of which the translators of the "authorized version," influenced as well by a special injunction of King James, as by their own natural conservatism and ecclesiastical affiliations, afterwards adopted in their own work. But happily, they did not show the same partiality for the words "azymes," "pasche," "neophyte," "longanimity," also found in the translation of Rheims and Doway.

It should not be supposed, however, that, in general, the text of the Bible was dishonestly perverted to sustain preconceived opinions. The translators were without doubt ordinarily loyal to the Latin copy which they had chosen to follow. But in one instance, at least, their antipathy to heretics overpowered their customary candor, and they substituted "our Lord" for "the Lord," wherever it occurs in the Scriptures, "because the heretics use the 'simple phrase.'"

Obviously, the version of Gregory Martin and his collaborators has no special value as representing the original text of Scripture.¹ Its chief merit consists in the fact that it has added to the English vocabulary from the Latin some words of importance, among others that might better have been omitted. Occasional English phrases also, subsequently domesticated in our ecclesiastical literature, are due to the same source. This is almost the only claim which the begrudged version of Romanists, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, possesses to the honor of being mentioned in connection with the history of English translations of the Scriptures. Archbishop Trench speaks of it as a "Latinized version, whose authors might seem to have put off their loyalty to the English language with their loyalty to the English crown."

The later history of the version of Rheims and Doway, with respect to its limited circulation; its publication, for the most part, in large and expensive quartos and

No intentional perversion of the text.

Critical value.

Later history.

¹ Cf. Henry Craik's *Hints and Suggest.*, p. 22.

octavos; the slight attention paid to the matter of preserving the text uncorrupted; and the general indifference of the higher ecclesiastics to it, — is of the same quality with the spirit that prompted the undertaking at the beginning.

There having been no standard and specially authorized edition, the greatest liberties have been taken with the English text, so that Cardinal Wiseman is reported as ^{Liberties taken with the text.} saying, that to call the Roman Catholic version now in use the version of Rheims and Doway, is “an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified, till scarcely any verse remains as it was originally published; and, so far as simplicity and energy of style are concerned, the changes are in general for the worse.”¹

Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, has within a few years past prepared a new edition of the Rhemish and ^{A new version projected.} Doway version, how far revised we are unable to say. It is announced also, that Dr. Newman, Superior of the Oratorians in England, has been selected, with the approbation of the Holy See, and at the request of many of the most distinguished among the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Great Britain, to prepare a new English version of the Scriptures.² But, with a singular want of appreciation of what constitutes the fundamental conditions of such a work, it is still proposed that it shall be a version of the Latin Vulgate.

¹ Dublin Rev., ii., pp. 476, 477, quoted by O'Callaghan, *A List of Ed., &c., Intro.* p. 53.

² O'Callaghan, *id.*

CHAPTER V.

THE "AUTHORIZED VERSION."

THERE is reason to fear that the motives of King James I. in favoring early in his reign the project of a new version of the Scriptures, first publicly introduced to his notice by the hated Puritan party through one of their principal scholars and leaders, Reynolds, at the Hampton Court Conference, Jan. 16, 1604, were not the most creditable. It is highly probable, indeed, that they were much the same as led him in general, and for the most part, to prosecute and proscribe that large and worthy portion of his subjects; viz., the maintenance of his royal prerogative, and, as conducing thereto, the enforcement throughout his realm of uniformity in religious matters.

Bred a Presbyterian, and professing the strongest adhesion to that system of faith and of church order up to the time of his accession to the throne of England (1603), he then promptly and publicly renounced it, repudiating past professions, and declaring that, from the age of ten years, he had ever "disliked their opinions." At a General Assembly in Edinburgh in 1590, with head devoutly uncovered, he had "praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king of such a church [the Presbyterian], the sincerest [purest] kirk in the world." And then and there he expressed the determination to maintain its principles as long as his life should last. But before he was fairly recognized as king, addressing the bishops at the Conference above referred to, in the hearing of a number of learned and pious Puritan divines, — Reynolds, Sparks, Knews-

Probable motives of King James I. in favoring a new version of the Scriptures.

Repudiates his former professions.

tubbs, and Chaderton, whom for five weary hours he had done his best to humiliate and cower, — he candidly, though roughly, said: “If once you were out, and they [the Puritans] in place, I know what would become of my supremacy. No bishop, no king, as I before said. Neither do I thus speak at random, without ground; for I have observed, since my coming to England, that some preachers before me can be content to pray for James, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith; but as for supreme Governor in all cases and over all persons [as well ecclesiastical as civil], they pass that over with silence; and what cut they have been of, I after learned.”¹

It is quite likely, therefore, that James, who exulted in what he called “kingcraft,” was shrewd enough to see that by a new version of the Scriptures, royally sanctioned and patronized, he might the better control the troublesome elements opposed to his supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, and make of it an instrument to perpetuate the same. It should here be stated, however, in correction of a very common error, an error crystallized in the very title — “authorized version” — itself, that King James I. never actually employed any authority whatever, for the purpose of enforcing the introduction or the use of the particular version made during his reign. The proceedings at the wholly informal assembly at Hampton Court are the only approach, indeed, to such authorization that we are able to discover.²

Yet there can be no doubt, from the zest with which he entered into this movement, that the king cherished great expectations from it. “Sent out with a prestige of scholarship which should silence the reproachful claims of the Puritans and eclipse their favorite Presbyterian version, — the Genevan, — yet charged with conservative influences, and linked indissolubly with the church and the throne, the new version promised to become the chief agent in maintaining the established order.”³

A sufficient reason for favoring a new version.

The so-called “authorized version” never actually authorized.

The king cherishes great expectations from it.

¹ Mrs. Conant's Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 417.

² Cf. Ander. Ann., p. 410.

³ Mrs. Conant, id., p. 426.

If this were the ruling motive of the king, God, notwithstanding, as often before happily in the history of this book, so directed the issue of events that his own beneficent and wise purposes were still accomplished. And purposes so magnificent were these, as appearing in the retrospect of the two hundred and sixty fruitful years elapsed since this translation was put forth, that we can scarcely believe the most ardent lovers of the Bible in that olden time could have grasped them in their largest hopes.

In the conference at Hampton Court, King James had expressed his antipathy to the Genevan version, saying that he had never seen a Bible well translated into English; but the worst of all he thought the Genevan to be. Of its notes he declared that they were very "partial, untrue, and seditious, and savoring too much of traitorous conceits." He cited especially, Ex. i. 19, where, in the margin, disobedience to kings, in certain contingencies, was advocated.¹ But four times as many editions of this Genevan version were required to satisfy the demand of the English people as of the Bishops' Bible, which had now supplanted the Great Bible in public use, and was the only one authorized to be placed in the churches. And many scholars of note, too, had highly commended it as a correct and faithful representative of the original. Under these circumstances, a sufficient reason was at hand, if there had been no other, why the sagacious monarch, even against the wishes of friends and advisers less observant, should heed the petition of his Puritan subjects, and give them a new translation of the Bible in the vernacular.

Dr. Reynolds, the spokesman of his party, it is likely, desired and anticipated the displacing of the Bishops' Bible, perhaps by the Genevan or some revision of it; but the king adroitly turns the tables and makes it appear as though it were the Genevan version itself of which the suppression was desired.²

When the matter was first broached, Reynolds had pointed out a number of mistranslations in the then authorized ver-

¹ Cardwell's Doct. Ann., vol. ii., p. 31, n.

² Eng. Hex., p. 149.

sion, but Bancroft, bishop of London, immediately interposed by saying that "if every man's humor should be followed there would be no end of translating." The king, however, at once took up the matter, and "wished that some pains should be taken in that behalf, for one uniform translation, and this to be done by the best learned in both universities; after them to be revised by the bishops and the chief learned of the Church; from them to be presented to the Privy Council; and, lastly, to be ratified by his royal authority; and *so the whole Church be bound to it and no other.* Marry withal, he gave this caveat upon a word cast out by my lord of London, that no marginal notes should be added."

No further action was taken at the Conference, and if the matter had been wholly left to the king's ecclesiastical advisers, it is improbable that it would have been again agitated.¹ But the scheme had fairly fixed itself in the mind of James, and in due time seems to have fully ripened, so that in four or five months afterwards he begins personally to interest himself in its execution.

By June 30, 1604, the names of persons selected as suitable to be intrusted with the work had been submitted to and approbated by the king; and on the 22d of July following he wrote to Bancroft, advising him to make provision for honoring, by church preferment, the men so chosen. "Therefore we do heartily require you, that presently you write in our name, as well to the Archbishop of York as to the rest of the bishops of the province of Canterbury, signifying unto them, that we do will and straitly charge every one of them, as also the other bishops of the province of York, as they tender our good favor toward them, that (all excuses set aside) when a prebend or parsonage being rated in our book of taxation, the prebend at the twenty pounds at the least, and the parsonage to the like sum and upwards, shall next upon any occasion happen to be void, and to be either of their patronage or gift, and the like parsonage so void to be of the patronage and gift of any person whatsoever; they do make stay thereof, and admit none unto it until certifying us of the

First broaching of the subject.

The king does not give up the scheme.

Translators selected, &c.

¹ Cardwell's Doc. Ann., vol. ii., p. 85, n.

avoidance of it and of the name of the patron (if it be not in his own gift), we may commend for the same such of the learned men as we shall think fit to be preferred unto it; not doubting of the bishops' readiness to satisfy us herein, . . . we ourselves having taken the same order for such prebend and benefices as shall be void in our gift."¹

In the same letter the king writes: "Furthermore, we ^{Others also} require you to move all our bishops to inform them- ^{inquired for.} selves of all such learned men within their several dioceses, as, having special skill in the Hebrew and Greek tongues, have taken pains in their private studies of the Scriptures for the clearing of any obscurities either in the Hebrew or in the Greek, or touching any difficulties or mistakings in the former English translation which we have now commanded to be thoroughly viewed and amended, and therefore to write unto them, earnestly charging them and signifying our pleasure therein, that they send such their observations either to Mr. Lively, our Hebrew reader in Cambridge, or to Dr. Harding, our Hebrew reader in Oxford, or to Dr. Andrews, Dean of Westminster, to be imparted to the rest of their several companies; that so our intended translation may have the help and furtherance of all our principal learned men within this our kingdom." Bancroft, bishop of London, the see of Canterbury being vacant by the death of Whitgift (Feb. 29, 1604), communicated the wishes of the king to his fellow-suffragans, calling their special attention to the fact, "how careful his majesty is for the providing of livings for those learned men."

It should seem, moreover, that James in a less public manner, perhaps orally, had desired Bancroft and the other ^{Provision solicited for maintenance of translators.} bishops to make some provision for the immediate maintenance and remuneration of those to be engaged in the work, a contribution having been solicited from the clergy in his Majesty's name for that purpose. A thousand marks was suggested as the smallest sum admissible to insure the completion of the undertaking.² The different colleges also were expected to entertain such persons as had been

¹ Cardwell, id. pp. 84-87.

² Id., pp. 87, 88.

appointed to the work from the country, "without any charge to them either for their entrance, their chamber, or their commons."

But in fairness, it should be distinctly stated that this free entertainment at the Colleges was about all the remuneration, notwithstanding such promising preliminaries, that the most of these devoted and laborious scholars actually received for their many months of perplexing toil. Some few of them were afterwards advanced to prominent positions in the Church — seven, it is said, became bishops — and in the universities; and the final revisers were paid a small weekly stipend during their nine months' labor: but, beyond this, the work itself, as perhaps after all was most fitting, was suffered to be its own reward.

The expenses attending the publication of this version of 1611 were wholly borne by Barker, who owned the patent for printing it. It is a noteworthy fact, in view of popular impressions, that nothing was ever drawn from the royal exchequer on its behalf, and with the exception of the interest taken in the starting of the work, as already noticed, no special effort was made on the part of the king, by proclamation or otherwise, to give the new version currency. After 1606, however, the Old Testament of the Bishops' Bible was not allowed to be published; and after 1618-19, the New Testament was included in the prohibition. But the Genevan version was not interfered with.

The title-page of the new revision did indeed bear the inscription, "by his Majesty's special commandment," and, "appointed to be read in the churches;" but this was only the position accorded to the Bishops' Bible in the time of Elizabeth. The so-called "authorized version," in fact, was never approved by Parliament, or even submitted to it; nor to Convocation, nor the Privy Council. Long after its publication, the Genevan Bible successfully disputed with it the claim to be the version most approved, and the royal printers supplied their patrons with either indifferently, according to the demand. But gradually, on the ground of sheer merit, together with the weight of influence carried by its dis-

They actually receive nothing but their board.

Expense of publication.

Royal sanction.

tinguished and scholarly translators, it won its way to the front, and after forty years of competition held the field undisputed.

Some discrepancy exists with respect to the exact time Work when entered upon. when the translators of the "authorized version" set about their delegated work. The difference of opinion probably arose from the fact that a part of them began as soon as their appointment was announced (1604), while the main body did not become fully engaged before 1607. The number of persons originally appointed as revisers was fifty-four, but only forty-seven of these can now be accounted for; the other seven may have been the "certain divines" alluded to in the fifteenth rule, as general supervisors of the work; or their names may have been dropped during the interval of three years, elapsing after their designation, before actual service began.

Among the most distinguished of these men were Bedwell, Most distinguished of the revisers. a noted Arabic scholar; six celebrated Hebraists, either at that time, or subsequently, professors of Hebrew at Oxford or Cambridge; also the several professors of Greek at the two universities; and Dr. Saravia, prebendary of Canterbury, a proficient in the modern languages. The fact is mentioned, as indicating that there could have been no lack of Hebrew scholarship, that Boys—especially distinguished for oriental learning—was set at work on the Apocrypha.¹

The Puritan party was worthily represented among the Representatives of the Puritan party. revisers by Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; Lively, regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge; and Chaderton, who was master of Emanuel College, Cambridge. Reynolds and Lively both died, however, before the completion of the work, the latter in 1605 when it was not as yet fairly begun. The "higher" party in the church (Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "A. V.") was present in the persons of Dr. Lancelot Andrews, Dean of Westminster, Dr. Saravia, Dr. John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, and Dr. Barlow, Dean of Chester. Hugh Broughton,

¹ Cf. Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 150.

one of the most thorough Hebrew scholars of the age, was purposely omitted from the list, as it should seem, on the sole ground of his utter intractableness.

Inasmuch as charges have been brought against our present version to the effect that it bears the impression of the sectarian bias, both theological and ecclesiastical, of its authors, it may be well to state certain facts. Passages are cited, as Acts ii. 47, Heb. x. 38, to show that an unfair Calvinistic prejudice crops out in the revision. But if this is the case, it can scarcely be candid to charge it upon the representatives of the Puritan party among the revisers. Plumptre, in *Smith's Bib. Dict.*,¹ says: "Dogmatic interests were in some cases allowed to bias the translation; and the Calvinism of one party, the prelatie views of another, were both represented at the expense of accuracy." It is more likely, that, if this version really received a slight tinge of Calvinistic doctrine, it was due to the fact of the very general prevalence of such doctrines in those times. They were confined to no one section of the Church. Even Hooker was not free from their influence.² Besides, the two men of principal weight among the revisers from the Puritan side died before the work was completed: Lively, as we have seen, before it was fairly begun; and Reynolds, May 21, 1607.

Moreover, the Preface of the work, written by Dr. Miles Smith, even unhandsomely disclaims the permission of any such preponderance of Puritanism. It asserts that they have "avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old ecclesiastical words and betake them to others." And in the Dedication again, royal support is craved both against the Papists, "and against the slanders of self-conceited brethren who run their own ways and give liking unto nothing but what is framed by themselves and hammered on their anvil."

Archbishop Trench declares that the "charge of a Calvinistic leaning of the translators, as against Arminianism, is entirely without foundation."³ That there is some

Charges of
theological
and eccle-
siastical
bias.

Bearing of
the Preface.

Testimony
of Trench.

¹ Art. "A. V."

² *Cardwell's Doc. Ann.*, vol. ii., pp. 51, 52, n.

³ *Author. Ver. of N. T.*, ch. x.

ground for a charge of another sort, however, cannot well be denied. Undoubtedly "polemical considerations were allowed to intrude" in the treatment accorded by the board of revisers to old ecclesiastical words.¹ Their preferences and their practice, in this respect, are even boldly announced in the Preface, as we have seen; although therein they but followed a rule definitely made for them by the king.

And "my Lord of London," who is probably the one referred to in the Preface as chief overseer of the work, was publicly charged at the time, with having altered the version on his own sole authority in fourteen places, the rendering of 1 Pet. ii. 13, "to the *king as supreme*," being instanced as one of them. Whatever else James I. might tolerate he would not allow any weakening of the doctrine of the supremacy of kings. And no other version of the English Bible betrayed such definite leanings towards that tenet as the one made under his own direction.

But the company of revisers having been determined upon, and the preliminaries settled as before stated, the whole number was divided into six sections varying somewhat in size and were instructed to hold their sessions at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster, two of the divisions in each place. Those to whom was assigned that part of the Bible extending from Genesis to II. Kings, and the division to which was given the portion extending from the Epistle to the Romans, to the Epistle of Jude, were sent to Westminster. Those revising from I. Chronicles to Ecclesiastes, and the Apocrypha, respectively, assembled at Cambridge. And the remainder, with what was left of the Scriptures for their special task, gathered at Oxford.

The following rules, specially supervised, it is supposed, by Bancroft, were given to each section for its guidance:—

1. The ordinary Bible read in the churches, commonly called "the Bishops' Bible," to be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit.
2. The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with

¹ Ellicott on Revis., &c., p. 93. Cf. *The Study of the Bible*, by Henry Dunn. New York, Putnam, 1871.

the other names of the text to be retained, as nigh as may be, accordingly as they were vulgarly used.

3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept; *videlicet*, the word "church" not to be translated "Congregation," &c.

4. When a word hath divers significations, that to be kept which has been commonly used by most of the ancient fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of the faith.

5. That the divisions of the chapters be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.

6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words which cannot without some circumlocution so fitly and briefly be expressed in the text.

7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down, as shall serve for the fit reference of one scripture to another.

8. Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters, and having translated or amended them severally by himself, where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree, for their parts, what shall stand.

9. As any one company hath despatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his majesty is very careful on this point.

10. If any company, on the review of the book so sent, doubt or differ upon any place, to send them word thereof, note the place, and withal send the reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company at the end of the work.

11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to be sent to any learned man in the land for his judgment of such a place.

12. Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as be skilful in the tongues and have taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations to the company either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford.

13. The directors in each company to be the dean of Westminster and Chester for that place, and the king's professors in the Hebrew or Greek in either university. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible; *videlicet*, Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's (the Great Bible), the Genevan.

14. Besides the said directors before mentioned, three or four of the most ancient and grave divines in either of the universities, not employed in translating, to be assigned by the vice-chancellor, upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be overseers of the translations, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the fourth rule [? third also] above specified.

That these rules were not strictly obeyed by the revisers These rules if actually given were not strictly followed. will be apparent from what follows below; that they were the exact rules prescribed indeed, is even open to doubt. At the Synod of Dort (Nov. 20th, 1618), where an account was given of the manner in which this revision was effected by one who was himself engaged in it, — Dr. Samuel Ward, — it was stated that seven rules only were prescribed, and that twelve men, instead of six, were engaged in the final revision. But the above rules show, at least, the general method of procedure. Each part of the Bible was passed in critical review a number of times. And when the work of the several companies was finished in the specified manner, a complete copy of the Bible was prepared by each respectively, and two of their number were delegated, making six in all, or perhaps twelve, including six appointed directly by the king, to attend to the work of final revision and prepare a single Bible from the three tentative ones.

These editors were engaged nine months in their difficult task, and received from the publisher each thirty Final revision. pounds for his pains, the first and only money, as far as we know, that was actually paid for the years of literary exertion involved in this immense undertaking. From the hands of these final revisers the work passed into those of Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Miles Smith, for any other correction which it might be supposed to need, and to

be prepared for the press. Dr. Smith wrote the Preface as also the dedication, and should alone be held responsible for the sickening adulation of the king which the latter contained. It was at this point, moreover, that Bancroft, now Archbishop of Canterbury, found an opportunity to step in; and that he did so, with the evil result of marring the version in a number of places, is generally admitted. Dr. Miles Smith said that there "was no contradicting him."

The admirable principles, as set forth in the excellent Preface to the work, which, aside from or above any pre-
Admirable principles which governed the revisers.
 scribed rules made for them by others, governed the revisers within themselves are well worthy of attention. They had not gone over the work, they declared, in "posting haste," taking only seventy days, the time employed by the Septuagint, but it had "cost the pains of twice seven times seventy-two days and more." They had not condemned the labor of those who had before engaged in translating during the different reigns of Henry, Edward, or Elizabeth, but acknowledged "them to have been raised up of God for the building of his church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance." All had been "sound for substance" in these various versions, and the worst of them was better than the Romanists', but even gold shines more brightly when rubbed. "Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one, . . . but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against."

They had consulted different translations, and commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, Latin, Spanish, French, Italian, and German. They did not "dis-
Went outside of the list of authorities prescribed.
 disdain to revise that which had been done and bring back to the anvil that which they had hammered; but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have, at the length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass which you see."

This last of the notable Hexapla of English versions, begin-

ning with Tyndale's New Testament issued in 1526, was published in 1611 from the press of Robert Barker, in whose family was retained the right of printing it until 1709, or for nearly a hundred years. In form it was a folio in black-letter. The next year, however, an edition in quarto was published, and, within three years, five different editions were called for.

In 1638, by order of Charles I. the text of this version was revised by eminent scholars, including Dr. Samuel Ward and Mr. Boys, two of the original revisers, for the purpose of correcting the typographical errors which might have crept into it, and preparing a standard edition. Again, in 1769, Dr. Benjamin Blayney, under the special direction of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford and delegates of the Clarendon press, prepared a revised and corrected edition, which was published both in folio and quarto and was regarded as the standard text until 1806. At that time the text was again supervised by Eyre and Strahan, printers to his Majesty, and many errors which had defaced previous editions removed.

A more radical revision, to include the substance as well as the form of the so-called king James's version, was projected during the time of Cromwell's supremacy, the subject having twice been brought into Parliament, in 1653, and again in 1656. By order of that body the matter was intrusted to the most distinguished scholars of the time, who gave it considerable attention; but owing to the sudden dissolution of Parliament the movement resulted in nothing of importance. The committee, however, have left on record their deliberate judgment of the "Authorized Version," that "it is the best of any translation in the world," although having "some mistakes."

It has been noted that the Apocryphal books were among the parts assigned to one of the divisions of revisers employed on this version. They were actually translated and bound up with the rest in the edition of 1611. Coverdale, doubtless with some measure of subserviency to the Romanizing tendencies of the day, and following the Vulgate, from which his translation was made, had inserted

When published.

Revision of 1638.

More radical revision projected.

How this version came to include the Apocrypha.

these books in his Bible of the year 1535. Matthew's version did the same. And so they came to be regularly inserted in succeeding editions, and finally, though not without opposition, in the version of 1611. As early as 1643, Dr. Lightfoot, in preaching before the House of Commons, denounced it as the "wretched Apocrypha," and again in 1645. But without any special act of authority, it came finally, as by common consent, to be left out of new editions of the Bible.¹

One of the leading principles which characterized this latest version, viz., that of combined labor with the least possible change from preceding revisions, was an advance in the right direction and a marked improvement upon any thing which had preceded it. But it is thought that the work of these scholars bears the unfavorable marks of having been done by several distinct parties, and that a much better plan would have been to divide the whole number into two bodies, one for the Old and one for the New Testament, and then suffer each to do their work about a common table.²

With respect to aids for getting at the pure original text at this time, it may be said in general that, "the Latin texts of the first half of the 16th century were indifferent. The Greek texts of the New Testament, and this is most important, were without exception based on scanty and late manuscripts, without the help of the oriental versions and the precious relics of the Old Latin. As a necessary consequence they are far from correct; and if the variations are essentially unimportant as a whole, yet the errors in the text of our English Testament inherited from them are considerably more important than the existing errors of translation."³

The special text made use of here, was that found in the editions of Stephens's and Beza's Greek Testament, which virtually agreed with the fourth (and fifth) edition of Erasmus. Into this text Erasmus had imported, on his own sole authority, several distinct interpolations (Acts viii. 37, and words in Acts ix. 5, 6), and its history in other re-

¹ Cf. *And. Ann.*, p. 470, f.; *Westcott's Bib. in the Church*, p. 286, f.

² *Ellicott on Revis., &c.*, p. 86, n.

³ *Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib.*, p. 170. Also *Art. New Test. in Smith's Bib. Dict.*

A leading principle of the revisers of 1611.

Philological helps accessible.

Standard in the New Testament.

spects, when we consider it to be the "mother text" of the current version, is not such as to inspire our highest confidence.

In 1516 Erasmus published at Basle, after only six months of special study, his first edition of the Greek Testament, pushing the work in order to get the start of the Complutensian Polyglot of Ximenes, already in press. The editor himself stigmatized it as a "precipitated" edition. He did not avail himself of the aid of the most valuable manuscript then within his reach, — the codex Basiliensis, a cursive, — because, as he affirmed, it differed so much from others. He made no effort to secure a transcript of the very important Vatican Codex (B), although he could probably have done so with less difficulty than it has cost subsequent Biblical students. His main dependence was on a manuscript which originated in the 16th century. And as this manuscript lacked a part of the text of the Revelation, he supplemented it by translating the Vulgate into Greek.

Of the subsequent editions of this Greek Testament, the second had four hundred alterations from the first; the third, one hundred and eighteen from the second; and the fourth, issued in 1527, but ten (others say sixteen) from the third, except in the Revelation, where there were ninety changes. A fifth edition was also published, in which only four alterations of the text were made.¹

It is supposed, from statements found in the Preface of this work, that the scholars engaged on the revision of 1611 used to some extent the several vernacular translations which had been previously made in a number of the European languages; viz., in addition to that of Luther, the French, Italian, and Spanish, respectively, the first having appeared in 1587-88, the second by Diodati in 1607, and the two Spanish in 1569 and 1609. And in the Old Testament, beside the valuable helps for the elucidation of the text already mentioned on preceding pages, there had been published, not long before (1572), a new interlinear Latin version of the Hebrew with a commentary by a distinguished Spanish scholar, named Arias

¹ V. fuller acct. below: Hist. Printed Text. Cf. Ellicott on Revis., &c., pp. 30-37.

Montanus; and, seven years later, one by Tremellius, a native Jew.

The relation of the revision of 1611 to the several English versions which had preceded it, has been succinctly stated in the preface to Bosworth's "Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels," &c., as follows: "Our present English version was based on the Bishops' Bible of 1568; and that upon Cranmer's (the Great Bible) of 1539; which was a new edition of Matthew's Bible of 1537, partly from Coverdale's of 1535, but chiefly from Tyndale; in other words, our present 'Authorized' translation is mainly that of Tyndale made from the original Hebrew and Greek."

Relation of this version to those previously made.

It is a fact worthy of notice that the scholars to whom the work of revision had been delegated by King James did not so far yield their freedom of action as to confine themselves invariably to the rules which had been made for them, especially the thirteenth rule respecting versions to be consulted. They seem, indeed, to have moved in a much higher sphere of liberality and catholicity. While taking the Bishops' Bible as their standard, and collating with it the other versions particularly designated, they also made a very *free use* of the Genevan, and of that of Rheims and Doway, the two with which the spirit of their rules at least, was most at variance. A chapter in Isaiah which has been critically examined, although affording only an approximate test, shows that seven-eighths of all the variations from the Bishops' Bible are in agreement with the Genevan. And in the New Testament this agreement is no less marked. Of thirty-seven alternative renderings, inserted in the margin of the Gospel of Mark, one-half are traceable to the Genevan version or to Beza.¹

Revisers work somewhat independently of their rules.

It may be said in general, that of all the versions previously made in English, aside from the Bishops' Bible, that of Geneva most influenced the *renderings* of the "Authorized Version," and that of Rheims and Doway the *vocabulary*. It is not to be supposed, however, that a conscientious and minute attention to the details of their work

Special impression of the Genevan and Doway versions.

¹ Cf. Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib., pp. 345, 361.

is not everywhere manifest, or that, in making use of the labors of others, they do not show themselves capable of exercising and applying the results of an independent scholarly judgment. It is related of Dr. Kilby, one of the revisers, that, soon after the publication of the revision, he, by chance, heard a young preacher inveighing against it, giving three reasons why a certain word should not have been translated as it was. The doctor afterwards meeting the preacher, told him that he might have preached more useful doctrine and not have filled his auditors' ears with needless exceptions against the late translation. He and others had not only considered the three reasons mentioned by the preacher why the word should not have been translated as it was, but also thirteen besides which were favorable to the rendering finally given.

Doubtless the version has many faults, very few of which it is likely will escape the keen-sighted criticism of modern times: faults appertaining to the lack of textual criticism; varying translations of the same word in the original; of an ultra-conservatism, especially relating to ecclesiastical terms; mistranslations; obscurities; faults arising from the interference of others with the revisers' proper work, as well as from the method by which their work itself was carried on, especially in the determination of disputed points by a plurality of voices; and others to which attention is called in an appendix to this work.¹

But this version, unlike that of Jerome or Luther, or even Tyndale, has the grand recommendation of being a grand recommendation. growth, the highest bloom indeed, of all the versions which had been made in the century preceding. It represents, too, the ripest scholarship of England at that time, not only in one, but in all branches of the Church, and "when every deduction is made for inconsistency of practice and inadequacy of method, the conclusion yet remains absolutely indisputable that the work of these revisers issued in a version of the Bible better — because more faithful to the original — than any which had been given in English before."²

This work being distinctly a Protestant one, as it respects

¹ App. A.

² Westcott's Hist. Eng. Bib., p. 365.

the ecclesiastical auspices under which it was made, naturally did not find favor with the Romanists. "Was their (the Protestant) translation good before?" they asked, Objections of Romanists. "Why did they now mend it? Was it not good? Why was it obtruded upon the people?" They also objected, with better reason, to "the senses of words being placed in the margin," such examples being "suckers to be pruned off, because they rob the stock of the text of its due credit and reputation."¹

These marginal readings, however, it might be said in defence of the revisers of 1611, when the peculiar circumstances of the case are taken into account, — as, Marginal readings. for instance, that their work was only one of revision, and that they must have felt themselves hampered by a long list of prescribed rules made for them by those who could not understand the demands of the work, — serve greatly to enhance our admiration for these men, and increase equally our sense of their philological ability and their scrupulous fidelity to the text as they understood it.²

As a sufficient offset to the ill-tempered criticisms of Romanists of two and a half centuries ago, we may cite the eloquent words of a modern disciple of that Testimony of F. W. Faber. church, who, being himself a pervert, might be expected to know whereof he speaks: "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sounds of church bells which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is a part of the national mind and the anchor of national seriousness. . . . The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. It is his

¹ Johnson's *Histor. Acct.*, p. 97.

² Cf. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 1869. Art. by Prof. Schaeffer.

sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed and controversy never soiled. . . . In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible.”

An analysis of the style of our present version has been made in connection with that of fourteen eminent ^{English} _{style.} writers, from Spencer to Johnson, and it has been found the best representative of pure English among the whole number. One twenty-ninth part of its words only have a foreign origin, while one-third of Gibbon's, and one-fourth of Johnson's, originally came from abroad.¹

¹ G. P. Marsh's Lects. on Eng. Lang., 1st ser., sect. 28.

PART II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

O trumpet of peace to the soul that is at war! O weapon that putteth to flight terrible passions! O instruction that quenchest the innate fire of the soul! The Word exercises an influence that does not make poets; it does not equip philosophers nor skilled orators, but by its instruction it makes mortals immortals, mortals gods; and from the earth transports them to the realms above Olympus.

DISCOURSE TO GREEKS.

CHAPTER I.

THE WRITTEN TEXT.

AT the beginning of the Christian era, the Greek language was generally spoken throughout the civilized world. By the conquests of Alexander (B. C. 334-323), this language considerably modified from classic models, was carried as widely as his arms prevailed. Such a wide diffusion of the language, bringing it into contact with other tongues and civilizations, would naturally in itself, develop new forms and constructions.

The Greek language at the time of Christ.

At Alexandria, in Egypt, where it was used as the ordinary medium of communication by the various nationalities gathered for purposes of commerce, its modifications became most marked. And it was the Greek spoken at Alexandria in turn, which to a great extent represented and governed that used by the Jews generally both of Palestine and of the dispersion. Here originated the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures, which it is thought exercised an influence upon the spoken language of the Jewish people similar to that of Luther's translation upon the German vernacular, and of the common English version upon our own tongue.¹

At Alexandria.

In Palestine itself, although there were regular synagogues of Jews making use of the Greek tongue, — Hellenists, — the people generally, especially out of the cities, employed the Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic, a dialect made up from a mixture of Hebrew with the Chaldee and originating in the captivity at Babylon. The pure Hebrew was at this time only the language of scholars, of books, and of religious

Language of Palestine.

¹ Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "N. T." Cf. Reuss's d. Gesch. Heil. Schrift. N. T., sect. 46.

ceremonies. An argument worthy of attention has been constructed (Rev. A. Roberts, "Discussions on the Gospels," Lond. 1862) to prove that the inhabitants of Judea at this time, including Christ and his Apostles, were bilinguals, speaking besides the Aramaic, the Greek tongue, a position of great importance, if it be tenable, with respect to some perplexing questions now in dispute.¹

The whole New Testament, with the possible exception of the Gospel of Matthew, was written in the current Language of the New Testament. Greek. It was the Attic Greek, which had first adapted itself to the Macedonian dialect, and then been still further changed through the several causes indicated, and in the New Testament particularly, in addition to other influences, by Hebrew forms and new Christian ideas.

The impress of Hebrew thought and expression in the New Testament is considerably more apparent in some Influence of Hebrew and Christian thought. portions than in others, specially predominating in the historical and prophetic parts. The new Christian element manifests itself specifically in the higher uses to which it puts old words, naturally lifting them to its own high level of thought, and so requiring on the part of their interpreters the stand-point of a Christian consciousness as well as a knowledge of grammatical rules. A significance new to the world, not less the Jewish than the Pagan, was introduced into such Greek words as are now translated by the terms, life, light, truth, resurrection, atonement, redemption, Saviour, apostle, faith, love, hope, peace, humility, liberty, and many others.²

This mingling of various elements in the language of the New Testament has been the source of not a little difficulty to students and critics, and, since the seven- Effects of the mixture of these various elements. tenth century, of hot discussions, involving with itself the subject of inspiration and other profound questions of theology. While some have sought to hold the New Testament writers to the standard of even Attic elegance, others have yielded too much to supposed modifications and Hebraistic coloring. "A too hasty assumption of Hebraisms," says De

¹ Cf. Reuss, *id.*, sect. 41, n.

² Cf. *id.*, sect. 46, n. 6.

Wette, "has to quite a late period, been one of the vices of exegesis."¹ The truth lies between the two.

According to Winer, the grammatical Hebraisms of the New Testament which are of the most importance are few, ^{Winer's opinion.} much fewer than are found in the Septuagint, the influence of the Hebrew showing itself principally, in extending the signification of words, imitating phrases, and forming by analogy new words to express corresponding Hebrew terms.²

The constructions are generally Greek, the writers continually obeying rules of syntax quite opposed to their vernacular idiom. But whether the syntax be Greek ^{Construction Greek.} or not, some kind of grammatical rules are to be presupposed, that liberality being quite too broad which would absolve the Apostles and their amanuenses from the ordinary laws of composition.

Attic nicety, however, was not only then unknown to the popular speech, but was ill adapted to the homely style ^{Language and style adapted to the message.} which the sacred writers adopted as most conformable to their message, which was to be a Gospel not for one people, but for the entire world. The Greek of the New Testament, moreover, presents no difficulties not shared with all the Greek written at that period, nor any that are insuperable.

Hebraisms were no doubt consciously adopted. Defective forms are not necessarily connected with ambiguity or ^{Hebraisms consciously adopted.} obscurity of thought. The New Testament writers simply appropriated to their use what they found needful to express their ideas. So far from being unconscious blunders, therefore, the peculiar dialectic coloring of their style may even be regarded as a desirable and necessary enrichment of the Greek for the higher uses to which it was to be applied. By a Hebrew-Aramæan tinge especially, it received a capacity for "graphic expressiveness, and circumstantiality," which, so far from being a defect, is one of its crowning beauties and excellences.³

The New Testament writings, it is supposed, were produced at intervals in the apostolic age, during a period of about

¹ Introd. to N. T., p. 4.

² Gram. of N. T. Diction, pp. 40, 47, 52.

³ Horne's Introd., vol. iv., pp. 8-18. Schaff's Apostol. Ch., pp. 608-613.

sixty years. The materials principally used for writing at that time were the reed-pen (*calamos*, 3 John 13), papyrus-writing materials, &c. paper (*chartēs*, 2 John 12), and ink. The ink was made of a mixture of lamp-black, or a black obtained from burnt ivory and prepared in the sun without the aid of fire. The papyrus employed was of different qualities, most of it coming from Egypt, but to be found also in Syria and Babylon.

The reed from which this papyrus came, grew in vast quantities in the stagnant pools formed by the annual inundations of the Nile. Every part of it was regarded as of value. The harder portion was manufactured into cups; the upper, into staves or ribs for boats; the sweet pith was a common article of food; while the fibrous remnant was made into cloth, sails for ships, ropes, strings, shoes, baskets, wicks for lamps, and especially paper.¹ For historical productions, the Egyptians made use of a certain variety noted for its durability. The Romans named another distinguished species fine and pliable, much used in letter writing, *Charta Augusta*, from their emperor. The best of this material, however, was very perishable. Jerome notices the fact that in his day the library of Pamphilus, at Cæsarea, was already in part destroyed, although not a century had passed since its formation. An effort was then making to transfer its valuable documents to parchment, which from the first century had come into very limited use.²

The oldest specimens of papyrus now extant were preserved only under the most favorable circumstances as in Egyptian tombs or the ruins of Herculaneum. In general use, especially when such use was emphasized by curiosity or devotion as in the case of the New Testament writings, this material could not be expected to last during more than a single generation.

Literary productions at this early period did not ordinarily take the written form, until they had been previously, and in most cases often, recited. Writing was by dictation, through amanuenses, who were of different kinds:

¹ Cf. I. Taylor's Trans. of Anct. Books, p. 44.

² 2 Tim., iv. 13. Cf. Reuss, id., sect. 353, also sect. 373, citing Hieron. de Vir. Ill., c. 113.

the rapid writer, *notarius*; the beautiful writer, *librarius* or calligraphist, who carefully transcribed what the former had hastily taken down; and the corrector, answering somewhat to the modern proof-reader. Paul notices, as an exception to a common rule with him, the fact that he had written without the aid of an amanuensis.¹ In the first centuries of the Christian era, including the period within which the oldest extant MSS. of the New Testament were produced, capital letters alone were used in writing, and the text was continuous, without divisions of words, marks of punctuation, accents, or breathings. This circumstance became the source, in subsequent times, of serious difficulties and warm disputes, when the breaking up of the text into its constituent parts came to be made; but, on the other hand, it was and is an important aid also, with other distinctions, in determining the age of ancient manuscripts.

The only method of multiplying copies of literary productions at this time was by the tedious process of transcription; some patron, as possibly Theophilus in the case of Luke,² or some church, providing the necessary means. Original copies in passing through the hands of amanuensis, calligraphist, and corrector, especially when several transcripts were to be made by the same original copyist, might be very easily lost. As might have been expected, no trace of the original autographs of the Apostles is discoverable in history. In addition to the fact of the perishableness of the documents themselves, no public archives or libraries, such as now welcome and guard with jealous care treasures of this sort, at that time existed. The apparent allusions by the early fathers to the original writings of the Apostles, as preserved in their time, must doubtless be explained in some other way.³ It is to be noted, however, that the proof of the genuineness of a book published during the lifetime of its author is not necessarily weakened by the fact that the original draft no longer exists. A copy moreover, although precisely like the original, is not on that account to be indisputably held as even most

Copies multiplied by transcription.

¹ Gal. vi. 11.

² Luke i. 3.

³ Ignat. ad Philad., c. viii. Tertull. De Præser. Hæc. c. xxxvi.

minutely accurate in all cases, or most in accordance with the best judgment of its author.¹

The history of the extant manuscripts of the New Testament² covers a period extending from the fourth century to the invention of printing (John Gutenberg, 1438), and yields to no other department of literary and critical investigation either in interest or importance. The materials of which these priceless documents are composed is ordinarily parchment, the skins of sheep and goats being generally used; but for the finer kinds of manuscript, called vellum, "virgin skins," those of abortive, or at least sucking, calves. The famous Sinaitic manuscript discovered by Tischendorf was manufactured from the skins of antelopes, a whole skin having been required for every two leaves. As a rule, the material of finest texture was used in the earliest manuscripts; but even the vellum of a thousand years ago is better than that made at the present day.

Persons of abundant means sometimes procured the preparation of exceedingly thin and highly ornamented manuscripts. "Some," says Chrysostom, rebukingly, "possess the sacred books, and have them as if they had them not; they shut them up in their book chests; they pay attention only to the thinness of the skins, and the elegance of the letters; they use them less for reading than for show."³ Parchment of various tints was often used, and the ink was also so shaded as to produce striking effects.

After the tenth century a coarse paper, *charta bombycina*, manufactured from cotton ($\beta\acute{o}\mu\beta\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}$), came into use; and during the twelfth century a finer quality, from linen rags. The oldest extant specimen of the latter is dated A.D. 1178. Upon its introduction, paper was not infrequently substituted in manuscripts for lost portions of parchment, and the later manuscripts are often found with the two kinds of material roughly intermingled.⁴ The technical name given to an ancient manuscript is *codex* (*caudex*), referring originally to a wooden tablet, and in general

¹ Michaelis, *Introd.*, pp. 247-252.

² Cf. *Baptist Quarterly*, Oct., 1867.

³ Chrysost. *Homil.* 32 in *Joan.* by Reuss, *id.*, sect. 373.

⁴ *Horne's Introd. to Bibliog.*, vol. i., p. 49.

usage, they are respectively designated as "Codex A," "Codex B," &c.

Hebrew manuscripts, as well as those of Herculaneum and of Egypt, are found in the form of continuous rolls, the edges being connected by thongs or gum; but ^{Form of MSS.} those of the New Testament are all folded as books now are, most of them being folios and quartos, but some octavos, and even of smaller size. The sheets were folded three or four together and separately stitched, then the several parts were united together.

The page is usually found broken into columns, two, three, or four, as the case may be; and occasionally a Latin, ^{Appearance of page.} or other version, has been placed in the middle column, or at the right or left hand.

One of the most marked characteristics of the manuscripts of the New Testament, by which they are divided into two great classes, is the form of the letter in which ^{Form of letter.} they are written. It is of two kinds: the Uncial, and the Cursive. The Uncial is a capital letter, while the Cursive represents the ordinary running hand. This division of the manuscripts is the one in most common use, although Hug has adopted another which is threefold: manuscripts which preceded stichometry; stichometrical; and those that were written after stichometry, a system to be explained hereafter.

The word Uncial, etymologically, means the twelfth part of any thing, being used similarly to the word inch, or ounce, and as applied loosely to letters refers to their ^{Meaning of Uncial.} size. The earliest manuscripts are all, without exception, written in the so-called Uncial character, the first Cursive not appearing until near the close of the ninth century. This character continued to be employed, moreover, to some extent, long after the Cursive had come into general use, especially when a manuscript of splendid and elegant appearance was desired.

The various localities where the New Testament manuscripts originated are often indicated, though indistinctly, by some peculiar features of the text: the ^{Localities.} appearance of the letter as rough and irregular, or simple and

uniform; the orthography approaching in some minute points that of some other language, as the Latin or the Coptic; the coloring, ornamentation, &c.

In the margin are other signs of interest which assist in determining the same point, as also the age, use, &c., of the document. Not infrequently there are marks indicating what portion was to be used for reading lessons in the public service, as *a* (*archē*), the beginning, and *t* (*telos*), the end; critical notes; extracts from commentators drawn from the Fathers, largely from Origen, although reaching back to Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria; occasionally musical signs in ink of different colors; and, after the fourth century, indices designating chapters, sections, canons, &c.¹

On account of the scarcity and expensiveness of parchment, it was sometimes customary in mediæval times to ^{Palimpsests.} erase the letters from ancient manuscripts whose importance was then little appreciated, and use the material for other literary works. The erasure, however, not having been in all cases complete, the original writing has in process of time not infrequently reappeared to assert its prior claim, or has been rendered intelligible through chemical means. Such a restored manuscript is called a palimpsest, or *codex rescriptus*. Quite a number of these are found among the Uncials. The Uncial "C," preserved in the Imperial (National) Library at Paris, originally written, as it is supposed, in the fifth century, and of great value, suffered this process of erasure in the twelfth century, the vellum of which it was formed being appropriated to the transcription of the works of Ephraim, the Syrian. There are some cases where two erasures of this kind have taken place, and the original, notwithstanding, been reproduced and deciphered. Another interesting circumstance connected with these precious relics of antiquity is, that in some instances, as "No. 33 Gospels," belonging to the eleventh century, the leaves of manuscripts have so adhered together that in the effort to separate them the letters themselves have come off bodily, and it is now necessary to read them backwards.

¹ David. Bib. Crit., vol. ii., p. 62, f.

In view of the large number of manuscripts of the several parts of the New Testament already collected, and the continual reference made to them individually or in classes for purposes of criticism, the subject of a proper notation becomes a matter of considerable importance. It may be said in general terms that the Uncials are distinguished by the capitals A, B, C, &c., and the Cursives, by the corresponding numerals, 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. The capitals having been exhausted, however, recourse was had to the Greek alphabet; and that in turn offering too limited a range, it is now proposed to designate the new Uncials by the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Tischendorf has already appropriated the first letter, *Aleph*, for the invaluable manuscript discovered by him in 1844.

This method of notation originated with Walton's Polyglot (1657), in which the Codex Alexandrinus was cited as manuscript "A." Wetstein (1751), following this hint, and consenting to the above title for Codex Alexandrinus, named the Vatican Codex "B," and so on, without meaning, however, by the order which he adopted, to discriminate critically with respect to the age or real value of the several documents.

The system is convenient, but defective. There is great inequality in the number of manuscripts of the different portions of the New Testament, and the same manuscript volume is, moreover, not always of the same date in its different parts. Hence, the whole New Testament being divided — for convenience of criticism and to accommodate the system to the usual form in which the manuscripts appear — into four parts, the *same* letter is used sometimes to denote *different* manuscripts in the different parts; and, to be understood, it is needful to designate the part of the New Testament referred to as "MS. F^a of the Acts," or, "F^a of the Catholic Epistles." On the other hand, *different* letters are sometimes used to indicate the *same* manuscript, including several or all of the different parts into which the New Testament is divided. The difficulty, however, attending a change of the system which has been in use for two centuries, and become incorpo-

rated with the whole body of the critical literature of the Bible during that time, it is to be feared, greatly outweighs the advantages to be derived from the adoption, at this date, of one of greater simplicity.

As already indicated, the manuscripts are very few which contain the whole New Testament, — twenty-six in all, eight of them, however, being imperfect. Usually the Gospels are found by themselves; and so, too, the Catholic Epistles and Acts, the cases being exceedingly rare in which the latter books are not in combination. The Apocalypse is sometimes found bound up with other than New Testament literature.

A large number of manuscripts are made up of miscellaneous selections from Scripture, having been used in connection with public worship. They are called "Evangelistaria" when the selections are from the Gospels, as is most common; or "Praxapostoli," if from the Acts and Epistles. There have been three hundred or more of these Lectionaries already discovered.

Fragments of manuscripts, the larger part of which are lost, are also very numerous, and often exceedingly valuable. A manuscript, for instance, named by Tregelles and Tischendorf "N" as a whole, exists only in priceless fragments, formerly designated "J," "N," and "Γ;" four leaves being in the British Museum, two in the Imperial Library at Vienna, six at the Vatican in Rome, and thirty-three at Patmos. It is written in silver letters on purple vellum, and is generally known as the "Codex Purpureus."

The whole number of manuscript *volumes* is about twelve hundred, including Lectionaries, manuscripts containing the whole New Testament being really reckoned as four: one for the Gospels, one for the Acts and Catholic Epistles, one for the epistles of Paul, and one for the Apocalypse. Hence, by this rule, the number of New Testament manuscripts, including Uncials and Cursives, but excluding duplicates, may be stated as about 1610; the number of Uncials being 154, and of Cursives about 1456.¹

¹ Scrivener's Plain Introd., p. 225. Supplemented by later authorities.

The Uncials, excluding Lectionaries, are thus classified : of the Gospels there are fifty-one ; six of them complete, four more nearly so, ten containing the major part, ^{The} _{Uncials.} the remainder fragments. Of the Acts there are fourteen : three of them being fully complete, five having the larger portion, and the remainder being fragments. Of the Catholic Epistles, there are seven Uncials, of which five are entire, the others nearly so. Of the Pauline Epistles there are four nearly or quite entire, seven having considerable portions, while eight are fragmentary. Of the Apocalypse there are five of this highest class of manuscripts ; three complete, and the others nearly so.

Of these ancient documents, two, one being intact, are referred to the fourth century, two to the fifth, along with a number of large fragments ; seven, with many ^{Their age.} fragments also, to the sixth century ; and the others are scattered along from the sixth to the tenth century, when the *Cursives* begin.

While the number of these very ancient documents may appear to be in themselves inconsiderable, it is really amazingly large when compared with the list of extant ^{Value.} original documents of other works of the age of the New Testament. There is not, it is said, one complete copy of Homer preserved which dates beyond the thirteenth century. And there are only about a half-dozen manuscripts of all the classic authors which date farther back than the sixth century. Of the important history of Herodotus there are only sixteen extant manuscript copies of any age ; and of some authors, of no little importance, there is but one each.

The oldest of the New Testament manuscripts come down to us, it is true also, from a period full two hundred ^{Witnesses} _{of an earlier} ^{period.} years subsequent to the Apostolic age, but they are all indisputable, and jointly supporting witnesses to other copies which preceded them. One of them, moreover, held to be scarcely second in authority, the Sinaitic, was discovered less than thirty years ago, and under circumstances which may well give rise to the hope that still others, perhaps as valuable, or more valuable, will yet be brought to light. It is worthy of

notice also, that manuscripts which we now possess reach nearly or quite back to an age, — that of Constantine, — when, as we learn from ecclesiastical history, special pains began to be taken with the material on which copies were made. But if no more of these literary treasures shall come to light in the future, a sufficient reason for the fact might be found both in the natural and inevitable waste of time, and the violence of persecution, sometimes, as in that of Diocletian, A.D. 303, specially directed against these documents of the faith, and aiming at their total extirpation. A parallel, in effect as sweeping and disastrous as this, might be found in the history of the English Bible, particularly in that of the original translation of Wyclif.

But with even a less perfect support than that of the present magnificent Uncials, and their thronging auxiliary Cursives, the genuineness of the New Testament writings would not be endangered, especially with the several ancient versions coming forward as independent witnesses, and the entire early literature of the Church, to corroborate the loyalty and minute faithfulness of existing manuscripts to the original text.

The age of manuscripts can be satisfactorily determined with the variation of not more than fifty years. Dates appended to the documents themselves, however, are generally little depended on. Codex A (Alexandrinus) has an inscription upon it, to the effect that it was written by Thecla, an Egyptian princess, who lived in the fourth century, about 325. B. H. Cowper, the English editor of this Codex, while referring its origin to Egypt and holding that the manuscript itself bears the apparent marks of a feminine hand, places the date at about A.D. 450.¹

The data from which a judgment is commonly formed respecting the age of such documents, are the material and character used, the form in which the text appears, as with or without division into words, punctuation, sections, canons, and the various marginal signs.

As late as the fourth and fifth centuries New Testament

¹ Introd. to Codex.

manuscripts, as well as other writings, are found without marks of punctuation, with the occasional exception of a single dot at the top of a line, the Greek period, or a slight curl at the end of a word, the letters being written continuously, and the reader left wholly to his own option with respect to the division of sentences. Fear of exciting controversy, or the greater dread of teaching heresy, no doubt postponed a change in this respect, even after its desirability was plainly manifest.

At length, however, the difficulties experienced in reading, particularly in the public service, led Euthalius, a deacon of Alexandria, to encourage (c. 462) a system of divisions, perhaps first suggested by the form in which the poetry of the Old Testament was written. Just so many words were placed in a line, as, expressing the sense clearly, could be read at a breath. The system is called stichometry, from *stichos*, a line, and *metron*, measure. This device, of uncertain origin, came at once into general favor, as extant manuscripts of the period, originating in different countries, clearly prove.

Such a method of division, of course, left on the page large chasms of vacant space, thereby necessitating a great waste of the costly parchment. To prevent this a simple point came to be placed after the *stichoi*; and from this expedient, through the additions made by various persons for other reasons, a regular system of punctuation gradually arose. Some writers used a cross at the close of the *stichoi*, some a dot at the top of the line, and others two dots, one above and the other below, &c.

Other divisions of the text were made at an early day. Owing, as it is thought, to the requirements of public service, the Gospels were separated some time before the fifth century into something like chapters, each chapter being named from its leading subject. The Gospels had been previously broken up into smaller sections, introduced by Ammonius in the third century, — Matthew, for instance, containing three hundred and fifty-five of them. To these Ammonian sections, so called, which had been made with special reference to the construction of a harmony of the four Gospels,

Eusebius, in turn (A.D. 315-340), in order to obviate certain infelicities arising from the imperfection of the plan of Ammonius, adapted tables of reference, called, in his honor, Eusebian canons. Indeed, it is maintained by some that we are indebted to Eusebius not only for the canons, but for the sections themselves in their present shape.¹

The titles and subscriptions now found on manuscripts, and retained also in the current English version, doubtless originated outside of the Apostolic circle. There is no reason for supposing that Paul entitled any epistle of his, for instance, the "First . . . to the Corinthians" or the "First . . . to the Thessalonians."²

Chrysostom is cited as saying that Matthew wrote simply "Gospel" on his work, and the Church added "according to Matthew."³

All these various additions, at the beginning and end of New Testament manuscripts, were first made, it is supposed, for the purpose of identification, being opinions of the fathers merely, at the outset admitted to have only the force of an historical judgment respecting the place where the respective documents were written, but gradually creeping into the text itself, as though they formed a constituent part of it. It is probably to Euthalius, however, in the main, that these unauthorized additions are indebted for their present conspicuous and misleading position.

After the time of Euthalius the use of accents also became more general, although some manuscripts, written subsequent to the age in which he lived, are wholly without them.

In these different marks then, with others not mentioned, characterizing the text and outward form of the various manuscripts, we find most of the elements which enter into the decision of the question of their respective ages. If, for instance, the material be cotton, or the letter Cursive, or the manuscript has the present division into chapters and verses, it is of course a late copy. If it be an

¹ J. W. Burgon on Mark xvi. 9-20, *ad loc.*

² De Wette's *Introd.*, pp. 44, 45.

³ *Homil. I. Ep. ad Rom.*, et. *Homil. I. in Matt.*, præf., cited by Guericke, N. T. *Isagogik*, pp. 635-636.

Uncial, yet has its letters crowded together, or inclined, or has the comma or interrogation point, it cannot be very old, not older than the ninth century. If it be a manuscript with ornamental initials, it betrays a style which came into use after the beginning of the eighth century. If it has made use of the system of Euthalius, — has accents, titles, and subscriptions in the present position, — it must not be referred to a period previous to his day. And if it should have the canons of Eusebius, who lived up to A.D. 340, the bloom of his activity must have preceded it. By this process it is not difficult to arrive at a date for almost any manuscript which shall be approximately correct.

Such of these original documents of our faith as are known to be still extant are widely scattered, being mostly, however, within the bounds of Europe and the Turkish empire. Egypt and Palestine united have, in ^{Present locality of important MSS.} round numbers, a hundred; Italy, three hundred and twenty, one hundred being in the alcoves of the Vatican library; England, two hundred and fifty, one hundred of these treasured at Oxford; France, two hundred and thirty-eight, most of them in the Imperial (National) Library, Paris; Russia, seventy-three; Spain, nineteen; Switzerland, fourteen. Of the five *most valuable* Uncials, England has two; Paris, one; Rome, one; St. Petersburg, one. But one Uncial, the Sinaitic, contains the New Testament entire.

As a general rule, age and completeness are the qualities most desired in a New Testament manuscript, but ^{Relative importance.} neither of these nor both together are certain indications of superior rank unless accompanied by corresponding excellencies in other particulars. Though a manuscript be of comparatively late origin, if it has been obviously prepared with great care, and shows a marked deference to the earliest authorities, which were also the authorities of the oldest extant manuscripts, it will be accorded almost equal rank with the latter. The Cursive, "No. 33" (Colbertinus), for instance, is ordinarily considered more valuable than most of the Uncials originating after the fifth century.

¹ Scrivener's Plain Introd., &c., p. 465.

The Codex Sinaiticus (*Aleph*) should, perhaps, be accorded the highest place in the list of New Testament manuscripts, being reputed the oldest and most complete. It contains the New Testament entire, and a considerable part of the Old. There was also found attached to it, when discovered, some very valuable patristic literature of the sub-apostolic age. Its happy discoverer and editor was Constantine Tischendorf, to whom, although one of the first of scholars and critics, it would be honor enough that his name should be connected with such a document. One part he lighted on in 1844, at the Convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, and the remainder, at the same place, under circumstances of peculiar interest, fifteen years later. On account of the patronage which the Emperor of Russia bestowed on these and others of his critical and historical labors, Tischendorf presented to him, in its complete form, this priceless fruit of his discoveries; and it is now retained in the ward of the Imperial library at St. Petersburg.

The learned discoverer himself, although others doubt the supposition, thinks it not improbable that this manuscript is one of the fifty copies of the Scriptures which the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 331, ordered to be prepared from the best materials for the use of the Byzantine churches. It has four columns to a page, is without initial letters, such as mark Codex A, — in which respect the Sinaitic and the Vatican codices agree with the rolls found at Herculaneum, — and possesses all the other characteristic signs belonging to the age to which it is referred.

Tischendorf places the more value on the text from the fact that it was written, as he judges, by an Alexandrian copyist, but little familiar with the Greek tongue, and hence under less temptation to introduce changes. In his opinion it represents with a good degree of accuracy, the text commonly accepted throughout Christendom in the third and even second centuries, there being a remarkable agreement between it and that of the ante-Hieronymian version, the Syrian Gospels, the Coptic versions, and with the citations found in the oldest patristic writings. This codex, edited by

The more important Uncials; Codex Sinaiticus.

Tischendorf's opinion of its age.

Value of text.

Tischendorf, was published at Leipsic in 1863; and a collation of the same with the so-called "Received Text," together with a critical introduction by Rev. Frederick H. Scrivener, at Cambridge and London, in 1864.

The Codex Vaticanus (B), so called from its place of deposit, contains nearly all of the Old Testament and the New, save Heb. ix. 14 — xiii. ; I., II. Tim. ; Titus, Philem., and the Revelation. How it first came into the possession of the Vatican is not known, but it can be traced back in that collection to the year 1475.

From some peculiarities of language employed, it is thought that it also must have been the work of an Egyptian copyist. There are three columns on each page. The text is written continuously with no division of words, and the letters are equally distant from one another. Originally there were no marks of punctuation, a later hand betraying itself in such as now appear, as also in the case of accents. The Ammonian sections are also wanting. Another sign of great age is the circumstance, that all the Epistles of Paul are arranged together as one book with continuous chapters to the end.

For these, and other reasons as conclusive, this codex is not generally assigned to a later period than about A.D. 350. Unfortunately, through the illiberality of the Papacy, this most important representative of the ancient New Testament Scriptures has been, hitherto, virtually inaccessible. A splendid *fac-simile* edition, however, is now in process of publication at Rome, of which four volumes have already appeared, the first, containing the New Testament, in 1868. An imperfect and untrustworthy copy has been edited by Angelus Maius (D. Appleton & Co., N. Y., 1859); and a better, though necessarily defective one, by Tischendorf, Leipsic, 1867, "post Angeli Maii Aliorumque Imperfectos Labores ex Ipso Codice," and an appendix to the same in 1869.

The Codex Alexandrinus, in general estimation, comes next in order and value to the Vatican; although Tregelles gives this honor to the palimpsest, Codex Ephræmi.¹ It is an unusually large manuscript volume, con-

¹ Acc't of Printed Text, &c., p. 169.

taining the entire Bible in Greek, with the exception of the first twenty-four chapters of Matthew and a few other minor parts. There were found bound up with it, moreover, the only known copy of the epistle of *Clemens Romanus* extant, a letter of Athanasius, and a work of Eusebius on the Psalms.

As in some of the other ancient manuscripts, the Epistle to the Hebrews immediately follows II. Thessalonians. Order of books. The page has but two columns. The division of words is indicated only by a simple curl occasionally found at the end.

Large initial letters appear at the beginning of books and Initial letters. of sections. The end of a clause is marked by a period. This codex has the Ammonian sections and references to the tables of Eusebius; but there is wanting the definite arrangement of subscriptions to epistles, together with other novelties introduced by Euthalius. Codex Alexandrinus is at present in the possession of the British Museum, having been presented to Charles I. by the patriarch of Constantinople in 1628. It ranks next to the Sinaitic in completeness, and is dated about A.D. 450. Of these three noble witnesses to the original text of the New Testament, Tischendorf says: "No single work of ancient Greek classical literature can command three such original witnesses as the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine manuscripts to the integrity and accuracy of its text. That they are available in the case of a book which is at once the most sacred, and the most important, in the world, is surely matter for the deepest thankfulness to God."¹ The New Testament portion of Codex A has been edited by B. H. Cowper (Lond. 1860), who took the previous work of Woide as his basis.

From many hundreds of Cursive manuscripts of the New Most important of Cursives. Testament which have passed the inspection of scholars, ranging with respect to date from the tenth century to the sixteenth, we shall notice but five, especially distinguished for important readings, their contributions to the formation of the current text or some other peculiarity.²

¹ *Introd.* to Tauchnitz's ed. of N. T., p. 16. ² Cf. Tregelles's *Acct. Printed Text*, p. 208.

The Codex Basiliensis, one of the most celebrated, is in the library at Basle, Switzerland. It is complete with the exception of the last book of the New Testament. Codex Basiliensis. Erasmus, at the time when he was preparing his editions of the Greek Testament for publication, was well acquainted with this document, but made no use of it because it did not agree well with those which he had specially chosen as his guides, and he imagined that it had been tampered with. It probably dates back to the tenth century, and in the Gospels offers a text superior to that of any Uncial originating later than itself.

The most valuable Cursive extant, however, notwithstanding it exists only in a very mutilated state, is the Codex Colbertinus, now at Paris. Colbertinus. Like the preceding, it contains the whole New Testament except the Revelation. The material of the volume is vellum, and it is in the form of a folio. Dating back only to the eleventh century, it yet shows the most remarkable agreement with the oldest Uncials. It was this codex, which, in separating the leaves, suffered the misfortune of losing its letters, in some portions bodily, and they can now be read only as set off on the opposite page.

An important Cursive, though of rough exterior, being more highly prized by critics than even the majority of the Uncials, is now in the keeping of the town Leicestrensis. council of Leicester, England, and is accordingly called Codex Leicestrensis. The material is both vellum and paper; it is a folio in form, and is about five hundred years old. The whole New Testament, by its four designated parts, is represented in it.

Among the "primary" Cursives, is also reckoned a manuscript of the Apocalypse, the material of which is cotton paper, and the date the thirteenth century. A MS. of the Apoc-
lypse. In connection with this codex is noted the significant circumstance that it is not found with other New Testament books, but bound in with a collection of patristic writings. It is numbered "Vatican, 579."

Another most valuable Cursive, now reckoned 20,003, in the British Museum collection, is one of the many important

discoveries of Tischendorf, who introduced it to the world of letters in 1853. It is a quarto, in vellum, and contains the Acts of the Apostles. In a subscription purporting to have been written by John the Monk, it claims to belong to the year answering to 1044 of our era. Whenever the great Uncials disagree in their testimony respecting this portion of the New Testament, this witness is now much depended on, and generally furnishes the reading finally adopted.

The great importance of the Cursives generally, in determining the true text of the New Testament as against the too exclusive and peremptory claim of the leading Uncials, which is the great open question, has been ably exhibited and urged by Rev. F. H. Scrivener in several recent works.

As it would be natural and reasonable to expect, unless it were allowable to expect in this case a continuous "readings" miracle, the transcription of such an immense number of manuscripts as are represented by the nearly two thousand yet extant became the source of numerous errors. Norton computes the number of copies in circulation, even at the end of the second century, at not less than sixty thousand.¹ Such errors were inevitable, and could not have been prevented even by that most scrupulous and painstaking care, which we know, from contemporaneous history and from the nature of the case, must have been bestowed on the matter of the integrity of the sacred text.² But, on the other hand, the remarkable preservation of so large a number of the manuscripts of the New Testament to our day, coming from almost every age and country, and for the most part being easily subjected to the most searching investigation and minute comparisons, furnishes ample material, notwithstanding, for the discovery and definite construction, to a sufficient degree of accuracy, of the original text. "What," says one, "would the thoughtful reader of Æschylus give for the like guidance through the obscurities which vex his patience, and mar his enjoyment of that sublime poet?"³

¹ *Genuineness of the Gospels*, p. 52.

² *Id.*, pp. 45, 70. Cf. *De Wette's Introd.*, p. 46.

³ *Scrivener's Plain Introd.*, p. 4.

Even if the exact originals of these several books were in our possession, we must rely on means in kind such as are now at hand for deciding that they were so ; Originals. and, if we were able to determine that point affirmatively, we still might not be able to satisfy ourselves that they were themselves absolutely free from any mistakes, since we know that others than their respective authors were engaged in their preparation. Textual criticism is not a necessity in the case of the New Testament alone, but equally in that of all ancient books ; while the New Testament stands conspicuously pre-eminent in the abundance and quality of the materials furnished for the work, and the consequent justness and definiteness of the conclusions reached.

The immense superiority of the New Testament Scriptures to the best works of Greek and Roman authors, with respect to the reliability of its text, has been ably Superiority of New Testament MSS. summed up as consisting in the superior number of its manuscripts, their high antiquity, the extent of space over which copies were diffused, the importance attached to them by their possessors, the respect paid to them by copyists of later ages, the wide local separation or open hostility of those in whose custody they were preserved, the visible effects of the same from age to age, the body of references and quotations, means of comparison with spurious books, the existence of ancient versions by which they may be tested, and the vernacular extinction of languages in which versions were first written.¹

The whole number of variations of all sorts, in the manuscripts and other textual sources of the New Testa- Whole number of variations. ment, has been roughly estimated at one hundred and twenty thousand.² These variations cannot, in strictness of phraseology, be termed different "readings," as is most common ; for we might as well "place under that head differences of orthography in an English book."³ They are of every shade imaginable, and the aggregate result of the most rigid examination, not only of manuscripts, but of ancient versions and patristic citations for five hundred years, an examination

¹ I. Taylor's Trans. of Ancient Books, pp. 177-203.

² Scriv. Plain Introd. to Crit. of N. T., p. 3.

³ Horne's Introd., vol. iv., p. 50.

and a scrutiny inspired by the zeal of scholars, added to the zeal of religion. Fifty-nine sixtieths of them, it is claimed, have not sufficient documentary authority, if they were otherwise of importance, to give them any considerable weight, the great mass consisting merely of obvious and easily identified blunders of copyists.

Tregelles, for instance, says of six hundred additions in Codex D, that the basis of the text can be separated as definitely from the demonstrable accretions as the foot-notes in a modern book from the body of the page.¹ There are thousands and tens of thousands of variations due to differences of spelling alone. There are diversities of grammatical form; diversities of order, — “Christ Jesus,” for “Jesus Christ;” “Esaias the prophet,” for “the prophet Esaias;” “woman, believe me,” or, “believe me, woman.” Pronouns are used in place of nouns: as “he,” for “Jesus.” Words are substituted for their equivalents: “the kingdom of the Lord,” for “the kingdom of God,” &c. There are, in fact, probably less than two thousand places where the true reading of the text is really in doubt, and this includes the passages rendered doubtful by a question as to the order of words, their inflection, or proper orthography.²

Texts of *doctrinal importance* which are of uncertain authority may be easily counted; and, though they were to be expunged entirely from the Scriptures, the substance of its doctrinal teaching would not be thereby materially modified.

There is no evidence to substantiate the charge of wilful corruption of the text, — at least, to any considerable extent, — for the purpose of securing support for current dogmatic opinions.³ Intentional changes were no doubt sometimes introduced, but, for the most part, for some one of the following reasons: to correct the language in accordance with classical usage; or to make it more clear, beautiful, or sonorous; to remove supposed geographical blunders or errors of history; and to bring the manuscript into harmony with patristic renderings. Doctrinal

¹ Cf. Horne's *Introd.*, vol. iv., p. 58.

² Cf. Tregelles's *Acct. Printed Text*, p. 52; *Scriv. Plain Introd. to Crit. of N. T.*, p. 3.

³ *Id.*, p. 6. Cf. Reuss, *id.*, sect. 360, 361.

considerations may have moved to some few changes, but by no means to the extent of putting the smallest stumbling-block in the way of a discriminating criticism.

All *intentional* alterations of the text by copyists, in fact, are of the nature of rare exceptions, the vast majority being, as we have said, readily recognized as simple, In the main simple and natural mistakes. and exceedingly natural, slips of a careless pen. They have been classified as, — (1) Errors of sight: the exchange of letters, misplacement of words, and the omission of sentences; (2) Of hearing: through similarity of pronunciation; (3) Of memory: in looking to and from the copy, misplacement of words, exchange of synonymes; (4) Of understanding: false division of words, false readings of abbreviations, the adoption of marginal readings into the text.¹

These slight diversities in the original documents of the New Testament, immensely numerous as they are in the aggregate, so far from giving occasion for suspicion or being sources of weakness, may be considered rather in the light of checks on a more material adulteration of manuscripts, and offer themselves as so many and separate witnesses to the essential integrity and identity of the text through all periods of its history. In some instances, weighty objections to the text have been removed by the light cast upon it through the discrepancies of new manuscripts. Bentley says, the text, instead of "being rendered more precarious by variations, is made more certain and authentic."²

So great, in fact, is the harmony of teaching in all these documents, though we compare the earliest with the latest, that while three of the most important Uncials Teaching of MSS. harmonious. had not been discovered when our present English translation was made, and one that was known to exist was inaccessible (the Vatican), and only a single specimen of the less valuable of these most ancient witnesses was actually used (D), yet no person would hazard the opinion that in our English Bibles we have not, for substance, the teaching of the best documents brought to light during the last two hundred and fifty years.

¹ De Wette's *Introd.*, pp. 49, 50.

² *Works*, vol. iii., p. 352.

A distinguished critic of the last century has tersely said: Opinion of Bentley. “The real text of the sacred writers does not now lie in any one manuscript, but is dispersed in them all. ’Tis competently exact, indeed, in the worst manuscripts now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them; choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design, out of the whole lump of readings, make your variations as many more, . . . all the better to a knowing and serious reader, who is *thereby more richly furnished to select what he sees genuine*. But even put them into the hand of a knave or a fool, and yet, with the most sinistrous and absurd choice, he shall not extinguish the light of any one chapter, nor so disguise Christianity but that every feature of it will still be the same.”¹

And the learned Davidson, from quite another critical standpoint, writes: “Let the illiterate reader of the New Testament take comfort by learning that the ‘received text,’ to which he is accustomed, is substantially the same as that which men of the greatest learning, the most unwearied research, and the severest studies, have found in a prodigious heap of documents.”²

¹ Works, iii., p. 360.

² Bib. Crit., vol. ii., ch. ix.

CHAPTER II.

THE ANCIENT VERSIONS AND PRINTED TEXT.

VERNACULAR translations kept pace everywhere in the early ages with the progress of Christianity itself, and such translations, often made directly from primary authorities, furnish no unimportant record of the earliest text. As materials for *critical* use, their value is doubtless much less than that of codices of the same age. The mastery of the language in which they are severally found, too, is a necessary prerequisite to forming a judgment concerning their value at all, especially as affected by local influences.¹ But they are, some of them, considerably older than the oldest extant codices,—the Syriac and Latin versions representing a text current within a century of the death of the Apostles,—and when their readings are confirmed by the best codices they at once command acceptance.

The important *apologetic* value of translations of ancient literary works has been well set forth by Isaac Taylor: “Among all the means for ascertaining the antiquity and genuineness of ancient books, none are more satisfactory or more complete than those afforded by the existence of early translations. Indeed, if such translations can be proved to have been made near to the time at which the author of the original work is believed to have lived, and if they correspond in the main with the existing text, and if they have descended to modern times through channels altogether independent of those which have conveyed the original work; and if, moreover, ancient translations of the same work in several

¹ Cf. Scriv. Plain Introd., p. 227, 288.

languages are in existence, no kind of proof can be more perfect or trustworthy.”¹

Syriac Versions. — The Peshito version is one of the most important of the ancient witnesses to the New Testament. Its name, Peshito, meaning simple, is differently explained, being regarded by some as intended to give prestige and pre-eminence to the version itself, as though it were to receive almost equal authority with the very Greek text. Others attach no critical importance to the name, supposing it to be intended merely to distinguish this version from another in the same language made from the Hexaplar Greek text. It is generally referred to the second century and the earlier part of it. Eusebius refers to a Syriac version as current in his time.² From the earliest period this version was used by different sects of Syrian Christians with a common and profound reverence which still survives: “How shall we know,” said an old priest of the country to a recent English traveller, “that your standard copy of the Bible is a true translation? We cannot depart from our Bible, the Peshito. It is the true book of God without corruption, that book which was first used by the Christians of Antioch.”³

The necessity for this version arose from the circumstance that, while Greek was spoken in the larger cities like Antioch, Syriac was the vernacular generally even in the regions beyond the Euphrates. One of the proofs of its age is stamped on the face of it, by the fact that the books generally termed “antilegomena,” “disputed,” were omitted from it, the canon of the New Testament having not yet become fully established. These books, however, were subsequently translated into the Syriac. The Peshito version is pronounced simple and faithful, although at the same time free and idiomatic. It has ordinarily been regarded as of considerable importance in Biblical studies, from Beza’s time to our own, both on account of its age and the country which it represents, although able critics differ widely and almost bit-

¹ Trans. of Anc’t Books, p. 34. Cf. on general subject De Wette’s *Introd.*, pp. 10-36; id. *Horne*, iv. 225-329; id. *Bleek*, ii. 335-375; id. *Michaelis*, ii. 1-159; *Guericke’s N. T. Isagogik*, 686-716; *Reuss’s die Gesch. d. Heil. Schrift*, N. T. 423-457.

² *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 22.

³ *The Syrian Churches*, Etheridge, p. 166.

terly on the question of the real value to be ascribed to its text. A new argument was furnished to those who think that it represents a mixed, revised text, in the recent discovery of a manuscript of the Gospels in Syriac by Dr. Cureton in the Nitrian monastery.¹ In these Curetonian Gospels, according to Tregelles, Alford, Bleek, Ewald, and others, we have a text possessing higher claims to antiquity than that of the Peshito. The subject is fully argued by Tregelles.² Various editions of this ancient Syriac version have appeared, — one by the British and Foreign Bible Society (1818). There is an English translation by J. Murdoch, New York (1852).

A Syriac translation of the New Testament, called the Philoxenian, from a bishop of Hierapolis who was instrumental in its being made, was completed A.D. ^{Philoxenian} 508. ^{version.} It exists at present only in a revised form, the revision having taken place A.D. 616. The marks of the process pursued in revision, including citations and other critical signs, are still visible on extant manuscripts. The Philoxenian was based on the Peshito version, but differs from it in having the whole New Testament except the Apocalypse, and in being so excessively literal as to obscure the sense. It follows the Greek, word for word, even to the particles, and it is thought could not have been designed for public reading. Such extreme literalness, however, and the ancient readings found in the margin, render this version of singular value for purposes of criticism; although, in Michaelis's opinion, it is of far less *general* value than its predecessor.

Still another Syriac translation of a part of the Gospels, considered of high critical value, exists in manuscript in the Vatican library at Rome. It is an ^{A Syriac} Evangelia- ^{Evangelia-} rium. ^{arium.} being selections for the festivals, and in its present form, originated in a monastery at Antioch, A.D. 1031, although referred as a version to the sixth and even the fourth century. Tregelles and others think that it was not originally a complete version, but merely a translation from a Greek Lectionary. The language is Aramaic, with peculiar Chaldaic words and gram-

¹ Ancient Syriac Documents ed. by Drs. Wright and Cureton, London, 1864.

² Smith's Bib. Dict., iii. 1636.

matical forms. It exhibits a remarkable agreement with the readings of the most ancient codices.

Ethiopic Version.—Christianity prevailed in Abyssinia as early as the fourth century; and the churches, An Ethiopic version. is supposed, were at that time in the possession of a vernacular translation of the whole Bible, the Old Testament being from the Septuagint. Chrysostom (354-407) makes allusion to this version in his homily on St. John. And it is to be noted as a striking fact, that the Scriptures are still, to this day, read in that country in the language of this first translation, although the mass of the people for more than four hundred years have ceased to understand it, another language having become the vernacular in the fourteenth century. This translation was made directly from the Greek, although betraying evidence that it was done by some other than a native Greek, and generally harmonizes with the older codices. Michaelis expresses the hope that Ethiopian travellers will yet bring to light manuscripts of this version which shall be of great aid to Biblical scholars.

Egyptian Versions.—The Greek language was spoken in Egypt after the Alexandrian conquest, was the court Egyptian versions. language of the Ptolemies, and prevailed extensively even in Lower Egypt. After the time of the Ptolemies, the Egyptian gradually creeping in and supplanting the Greek tongue, a translation of the Scriptures into it was made for the use of a large population of Christians. The prevailing dialect, at that time, was the Coptic, now it is the Arabic. The Coptic, though yet retained as an ecclesiastical language, is not understood even by the priests, and when the Coptic Testament is read it is sensed by a Prolector in Arabic. The Coptic, which is the generic name for the Egyptian language, has two dialects, the Memphitic and the Thebaic, representing respectively Lower and Upper Egypt. In both of these dialects, translations direct from the Greek have been made, and the two are quite independent.

The Thebaic, sometimes called the Sahidic version, preserved only in considerable fragments, is regarded as Thebaic. the older, although the difference of age is small.

Bleek assigns both to about A.D. 250, Tregelles to a period still earlier.

The Memphitic version has been published (Lond. 1847) with an Arabic translation in the margin by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, for ^{Memphitic} the use of Christians in Egypt. This version is often preferred, in parts, to the other, as having a more complete text and more valuable readings. Both are highly important as witnesses to the state of the text in that age and country.

Fragments of another supposed version, named the Bashmureic, are extant, representing a dialect presumed to ^{Another Egyptian version.} be a modification of the Thebaic, but it is much doubted by scholars whether it be indeed a new dialect or a new version, the chief differences being those of orthography.

Armenian Version.—Christianity was early received by the inhabitants of Armenia, but the Scriptures existed for them only in the Syriac, they having no ^{An Armenian version.} written language of their own till the beginning of the fifth century. About A.D. 406, a written language was formed from an alphabet consisting of thirty-six letters; and the Bible, according to the Peshito version, was translated into it. A little later, however (431), certain of their scholars coming into the possession of the Greek Scriptures, a direct translation was made from them at Alexandria, whither these scholars had gone to perfect themselves in the knowledge of the Greek tongue. The impression of the familiar Syriac version has naturally enough stamped itself, to some extent, upon the succeeding one.

Persic Versions.—There are two Persic versions of the Gospels yet extant, one of them only being from the Greek. It was made at a comparatively late period, — ^{Versions in Persia.} Bleek putting it in the fourteenth century, — and is of no special critical value. Walton made use of it in his Polyglot. The second one is derived from the Syriac, that language having been at the time the language of literature and of the Church. Its relation to the Syriac is shown by an occasional misunderstanding of the Syriac text, the retention of Syriac words, and the character of its readings in general.

A Georgian version.—Ancient Iberia or Georgia was evangelized about A.D. 320, and it is supposed to have enjoyed the blessing of a vernacular translation of the Greek Scriptures by the end of the sixth century, scholars having prepared it in Greece for the use of their countrymen. Tregelles—judging from internal evidence simply—doubts whether it was made directly from the Greek, inasmuch as it shows so great affinities with the Armenian version. It is a version but little known, the present available manuscripts of it being of a mixed and uncertain character.

Arabic Versions.—Several distinct Arabic translations of the Scriptures have been made, but most of them being second-hand versions are of little use for purposes of criticism. One reason why other ecclesiastical versions were taken in the place of original authorities was the fact that the Arabic gradually supplanted other languages, as the Coptic and Syriac, and, finding versions already existing in those languages, made them the basis of its own. There is one quite ancient version of the Gospels, however, dating, as some suppose, back to the latter half of the fourth century, which was probably made from Greek sources, although later investigations have started the query whether it might not be from the Latin.

Gothic Version.—The Christian religion was communicated to the Goths by Roman slaves, early in the third century. For the numerous discipleship, Ulfilas, their bishop (348–388), effected a translation of the whole Bible in the Germanic language, but with a Greek alphabet. Several interesting fragments of this version have been but recently discovered, some of them palimpsests. Previous to the present century, it was only known in a manuscript of the Gospels and a part of Romans, brought to light two hundred years ago in Westphalia. The material of this manuscript, to which the name Codex Argenteus has been given, is vellum, once of a purple color, while its characters are in silver, except certain initial letters, which are in gold.

It consists, in its present shape, of one hundred and eighty-eight folio leaves, having had, in its original form, three

hundred and twenty. This particular manuscript is assigned to the sixth century. The version which it represents once spoke to nearly the whole of Europe. Ulfilas, ^{Present state.} the translator, although a semi-Arian in doctrine, introduced none, or next to none, of his peculiar views into the text. As a version which without contradiction may be referred to the fourth century, and with scarcely less certainty is known to have been made from Greek sources, it is highly prized by students of the sacred text.

Slavonic Version.—Portions of the Slavonic race inhabiting ancient Moravia, a powerful state now no more, including the territory bordering on the Danube northward beyond the Carpathian mountains, and westward to Magdeburg, first received the Gospel through Cyrillus and Methodius, missionaries from Thessalonica, A.D. 863. The Moravians of Brünn, as descendants of this ancient race, celebrated this important event in their history on its one thousandth anniversary, 1863. A version of the Greek Scriptures in the vernacular, an alphabet being formed at the same time, was completed in A.D. 960. It is not known what part the two brothers from Thessalonica had in the work of translation, although Cyrillus has the credit of beginning it. The Latin version having been used previously, the new version was considerably affected thereby. In its original form, the version did not contain the present translation of the Apocalypse, the work being especially intended for church service; and this part, it is thought, was added as recently as A.D. 1516, having some peculiar, and otherwise unexplainable, agreement with the Erasmian text of that period.

Latin Versions.—A faithful and discriminating consideration of the old Latin versions of the Scriptures is imperatively necessary for those who would trace successfully the history of the sacred text. All versions of the Scriptures made in Europe since their time have been more or less influenced by them. In cases where they have not been definitely followed, they have left an unmistakable impress and coloring. French, Spanish, and Italian Bibles existing before the 16th century were only versions of the ^{Latin versions.}

Latin version. And the Vulgate is still the sacred original of the Roman Catholic Church, their latest translations and revisions adhering tenaciously to its revered text. The first necessity for a Latin version arose from the fact that the Greek was not universally, although it was generally, spoken throughout the Roman empire. In many commercial cities, and in proconsular Africa, the Latin language prevailed.

It is not certain at what precise date the earliest Latin version was made, but it is supposed not far from A.D. Date of the earliest. 150, since there was one already in common use in the time of Tertullian. It originated in North Africa. Whether more than one independent Latin version of the Scriptures was made before the time of Jerome is a matter of dispute, most scholars taking the affirmative of the question. If there was but one, we are compelled to admit frequent revision and wholesale interpolations. Augustine and Jerome seem to speak of a plurality of versions; although among them Augustine distinguished one, the Itala, as of peculiar merit. Westcott supposes the Itala to be a semi-authoritative version made in northern Italy. At least, the custom of terming *all* the ante-Hieronymian versions or revisions the Itala, without discrimination, is an obvious mistake. Bleek adopts the view of one *independent* version only, the others being modifications of it. So, too, Tregelles and Westcott in substance. Evidences and remains of the ante-Hieronymian text are abundant in the form of codices in which both the Greek and Latin are found, as well as in distinct Latin manuscripts, and in citations of the Fathers.

Under instructions from Damasus, bishop of Rome, Jerome The Vulgate of Jerome. (329-420), near the close of the fourth century, undertook a revision of the Latin text, then existing in a very corrupted and uncertain state. He brought to his work vigorous and accurate scholarship, along with a passionate zeal for Biblical studies. To a limited extent in this important undertaking, he made use of such Greek manuscript authorities as were accessible to him. But, alone in the field and untrained in the rigorous rules of modern criticism, he was far enough from removing all, though seemingly obvious,

defects from his work, and, instead of seeking unflinchingly to bring his text to his authorities, he sometimes obliged his Greek authorities to bend to the corrupt Latin text, or only adhered to such authorities as best accorded with it. Two manuscript copies of Jerome's work, one written A.D. 541, Codex Amiatinus, and the other A.D. 546, Codex Fuldensis, are still preserved, and well known.

In the New Testament portion, Jerome aimed at revision only, taking the old Latin as his standard, and refusing to have his work named a translation. His Bible, however, notwithstanding this fact, and the well-known circumstance that he performed his task in obedience to the request of the bishop of Rome, was violently assailed on the plea that it was a corruption of the Gospels, and an unsettling of the foundations of the faith. Even Augustine joined the clamor against him. With such suspicion and reluctance, indeed, was his work of translation and revision admitted into circulation, that it was not till the seventh century that it was fully adopted as the Vulgate, and then it had virtually ceased to be the work of Jerome, the old text, in the mean time, having largely crept in, or been re-instated by unauthorized hands in its former place.

Under the patronage of Charlemagne, about A.D. 802, Alcuin was intrusted with the duty of evoking a better text from the confusion into which it had fallen. He so far succeeded in his object, by the aid of the codices which he could command, that he brought back, in some degree, the previously effaced impression of Jerome's labors; but his work, in turn, served only to check for a time, the process of degeneracy which continued down to the era of printing. And, in fact, no special pains were taken with the *printed* text till the appearance of the Complutensian Polyglot, in 1517, translations being often made from a single manuscript alone, without the aid of collations.

The Council of Trent, in 1546, officially declared the "Old Vulgate" "authentic," but left undefined just what they would be understood as meaning by the "Vulgate." It was not till after the promulgation of this decree,

The New Testament of this version.

Revision of the Vulgate.

Council of Trent.

that the effort actually to render the Latin text of Scripture more worthy of confidence was entered upon. The undertaking was inaugurated under Pope Pius IV., and continued under Pius V. and Sixtus V., the latter boldly reserving to himself personally the right of giving the last and authoritative decision on disputed readings. The work was finally brought to a close, and the results published in three volumes, in 1590.

Simultaneously, it was proclaimed by bull of the Pope that the text contained in this edition, March 1st, 1589, was the true, genuine, and authentic text of the Vulgate which the Council of Trent had referred to, and the curse of Almighty God was invoked on any who should attempt to change it. It was ordered, moreover, that all future editions of the Vulgate should adopt and retain this text, and that all earlier editions and manuscripts containing variations from it, which were not thereby amended, should be without authority. The new text was also to be introduced into all missals and books of service. All this, however, did not prevent obvious mistakes from appearing in the published work, although zealous efforts were made to conceal them by scratches of the pen, and pieces of paper pasted over them.

In the face of this thundering anathema of Sixtus V., a new edition of the Vulgate was undertaken almost immediately, appearing in 1592, all under the sanction of Clement VIII. It both corrected the patent errors into which Sixtus had fallen, and altered the text to a considerable extent. The changes, moreover, which Sixtus had introduced into missals and books of service, were recalled by Clement, who stigmatized the missals thus altered as *missalia depravata*. An apology was indeed offered for the glaring inconsistencies of the two Popes, to the effect that Sixtus had himself contemplated a revision, had he been spared, and that the mistakes of his edition were printers' blunders. The defence, however, was too weak and manifestly disingenuous to be of much service. A second revision was made by authority of the same Clement in 1593. It has long been matter of dispute among scholars, which text, that of Sixtus V., or that of Clement

VIII., is the more reliable. Pending its decision, that of Clement has been adopted as the basis of all editions of the Vulgate, since issued under sanction of the Roman See, notwithstanding it might be supposed still to lie under the heavy anathemas of the infallible Sixtus V.

THE PRINTED TEXT.

The history of the printed text of the Greek New Testament is important as showing what special use has been made of the large amount of materials collected by critical research and assiduity; the several distinct classes, recensions, if any, into which, on the basis of internal characteristics, the mass of documents may be divided; the particular rules adopted by scholars for deciding, amongst a multitude of variations, which is the true text; and especially the more direct bearing of the labors of critics since the time of Erasmus, Stephens, and Beza upon the "received text," forming the basis of the current English version.

The first attempts to print the Greek text of the New Testament were greatly discouraged as being a dangerous innovation and an unfavorable reflection on the Latin Vulgate. The wonderful art of printing had been employed by the numerous and wealthy Jews of Europe for the printing of the Hebrew Scriptures some time previous to the appearance of the first edition of the Greek New Testament. Fragmentary portions of manuscripts were reproduced in print at Venice as early as 1486, and again in 1504; but the first edition of the entire New Testament *published* was that of Erasmus, issued in folio in 1516, and followed by other editions in 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535.

First attempts at printing the Greek.

Another edition of the New Testament in Greek, by Cardinal Ximenes, called the Complutensian Polyglot, from *Complutum*, the Latin name for Alcalá, in Spain, was mainly *in print* before the publication of the first of Erasmus, — the Apocalypse having been completed as early as 1514, — but was not put in actual circulation until 1522, after the death of the editor. The first edition of Erasmus was hurried through

The Alcalá Bible.

the press, in fact, in order to forestall that of Ximenes, while his last two editions were emended from the latter.

The special manuscripts used in the preparation of the work of Ximenes are not mentioned, except as having Late MSS. used. been furnished from the Vatican, and as being, in the evidently uncritical opinion of its projectors, "very ancient." The work itself, according to Tregelles, shows that late manuscripts only were used.¹ A very high value was attributed to the Vulgate, it being printed in the Old Testament portion as the middle one of three columns, having the Greek Septuagint version and the Hebrew original on either side. This position they compared to that of Christ crucified between two thieves, *tanquam duos hinc et inde latrones*. And in some parts of the New Testament, in fact, they supplied, in a few instances, what was wanting in their Greek copies from the Vulgate (1 John v. 7, 8), and herein misled ultimately even the translators of our own version.

Leaving out of view his previous preparation for such a work, Erasmus seems to have required less than a Editions of Erasmus. single year for putting his first edition of the entire Greek Testament through the press. The work, too, was mostly done by himself, Œcolampadius aiding only in the reading of proofs. The principal authorities deferred to are still to be found in the library at Basle, two of them even bearing the marks of Erasmus's corrections, and the printer's signs.

In the Gospels, he followed Codex Basil B. VI. 25; in the Manuscripts followed. Acts and Epistles, Codex Basil IX.; and the badly mutilated Codex Reuchlin, for the Apocalypse. The latter, for a long time supposed to be lost beyond recovery, has been recently discovered in the library of the Prince of Oettingen-Wallerstein, at Mayhingen, and described by Delitzsch and Tregelles.² With these scanty documents, the editor sometimes collated Basil VI. 17; Basil X. 20; and also some Latin manuscripts, and the Fathers.³

In some instances, in order to form his text when his authorities were lacking, like Ximenes and his collaborators,

¹ Acct. Print. Text, p. 8.

² Dr. Conant in Baptist Quar., iv., No. 2.

³ Hug's Introd., p. 180.

he translated the Vulgate into Greek. Examples are pointed out in Acts viii. 37, ix. 5, 6, where the revisers of 1611 followed him into these forbidden fields. But, ^{Sometimes supplied a text from the Vulgate.} on the other hand, it should be said, in testimony to his general faithfulness to primary sources, that he refused to insert the testimony of the three heavenly witnesses (1 John, v. 7), on the ground that he could find no authority for the passage in any Greek manuscript.

In his second edition, Erasmus made four hundred corrections, many of them, however, being only *errata*. ^{Subsequent editions.} The third edition was still further changed in one hundred and eighteen places. Yet, another edition which followed, was altered, with the exception of the Apocalypse, in only about a dozen places; but the Apocalypse, in accordance with the Polyglot of Ximenes, in ninety instances. He had not, however, up to this time, removed what he had himself imported into the text from the Latin. A fifth and last edition, issued nineteen years after the first and eight after the fourth, shows but four changes from the latter. Theological discussions, indeed, to a far greater extent than the unnoticed labor of textual criticism, absorbed the attention of the scholars and church-leaders of this period.

Of the first two editions of Erasmus's Greek Testament there were thirty-three hundred copies published, and ^{Number of copies.} of the Complutensian, six hundred. In 1518, the text of the first published Greek Testament, collated with some additional manuscripts, was reprinted in Venice. And in 1543, still other manuscripts having been consulted, one hundred and fifty more changes were introduced, on their authority, into the Greek text in an edition published at Paris. The latter, however, is out of the line of direct influence upon the "received text," so-called, which afterward became current.

The four editions of Robert Stephens, three being published at Paris in 1546, 1549, and 1550 respectively, and the ^{Editions of Robert Stephens.} fourth, in which the device of verses first appears, at Geneva, in 1551, are of considerable importance. In the preparation of these several editions, Stephens made use of

the Imperial (National) Library at Paris in addition to the labors of Erasmus, Ximenes, and his own son, who had collated a number of manuscripts. In the edition of 1550, indeed, the first collection of variations in manuscripts was actually published, numbering two thousand one hundred and ninety-four.

The text of Stephens was composite, his own independent work being blended with that of his predecessors, although mainly conformed to the fifth edition of Erasmus. From the text of Erasmus and the Alcala Bible, Stephens differed in only three hundred and eighty-three places, and from all other texts printed before his time, in only thirty-seven places. He sometimes followed Erasmus, indeed, in preference to the best of the fifteen different manuscripts which he possessed. Of these documentary authorities nearly all have been identified, but the Codex Bezae is most familiar.

Some one of the four editions of Stephens's Greek Testament continued to be printed to meet the limited requirements of scholars in this direction until 1565, when the first edition of Theodore Beza's work appeared, to be followed by other editions in 1582, 1589, and 1598. Beza took the text of Stephens as his standard, using also the collations he had made, but only occasionally *introducing* changes into the text on the authority of manuscripts, although frequently *mentioning* different readings. His differences from Stephens in truth, are of little importance. The most valuable of the manuscripts made use of by him were the Codex Bezae, now at Cambridge, and the Codex Claromontanus.

More of a theologian and commentator than a textual critic, Beza employed the materials in his hands principally for exegetical purposes. His text was that, however, ordinarily adopted by Protestants during his lifetime, and, in connection with the third edition of Stephens, virtually forms the basis of the "received text."¹

This text, the third edition of Stephens, emended from Beza, where there might be differences, was the one used by the Elzevirs in their various editions of 1624,

Different editions.

¹ Tregelles, Acc't Printed Text, p. 34.

1633, 1641, 1656, and 1662. Being elegantly printed and widely popular, as many as eight thousand copies of these editions, in the aggregate, were pushed into circulation. In the first, the verses were numbered in the margin, but, in the second, broken up into their present shape.

But a more important characteristic of the second edition, published at Leyden, 1633, was the bold announcement in the preface: "thou hast the *text now received by all*, in which we give nothing altered or corrupted" (*textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum*). This is the origin of the phrase "received text" (*textus receptus*), as applied to the Greek New Testament. And it is this text which, to a recent period, has been the standard on the Continent of Europe, while in England and America one virtually answering to it has been dignified with this important position and title. The difference between Stephens's edition of 1550 and that of the Elzevirs—the former being the standard text in England, and the latter on the Continent—amounts, according to Scrivener, to two hundred and eighty-six variations only, not including mere *errata*, breathings, accents, &c.¹

"While," as Hug says, "the Dutch were abusing the text according to their own good will and pleasure, in another country it passed out of the hands of tradesmen and their assistants into those of men of learning." In the London Polyglot,—the New Testament part of which (Vol. V.) was published in 1657, the third edition of Stephens being taken as a basis,—there were introduced in the margin the readings of Codex A, together with the Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic, and Persian versions. Other readings, including Stephens's collection, were added in subsequent volumes, a considerable number of manuscripts having been collated under the direction of Archbishop Usher for the purpose. This work passes under the name of Walton's Polyglot. In an Oxford edition of the Greek N. T. issued in 1675, under the patronage of Bishop Fell, readings from the Coptic and Gothic versions were also added, together with those of quite a number of new manuscripts, the last being placed at the foot of the page.

A bold
announcement of the
publishers.

Walton's
Polyglot.

¹ A Plain Introd., &c., p. 304.

To the encouragement of Bishop Fell likewise, the world is largely indebted for the invaluable critical labors of Labors of Mill. Mill. For thirty years this scholar devoted himself to the study of the text of the New Testament, and his work marks an era in the history of textual criticism. Taking the third edition of Stephens as the starting-point, he classified and described the various manuscripts already noticed, collated many new ones, gave a history of the text as previously published, made use of nearly all the old versions and patristic citations, and finally gave his completed work to the world in 1707, surviving its publication but a single fortnight. Although he had actually introduced no changes into the current text, which he had adopted as his standard, yet his work was vehemently attacked, as previously Walton's had been, on the ground that the result of his studies, in bringing to light so many variations, was to unsettle the confidence of men in the authority of Scripture, "as though it were thought criticism is the enemy and not the friend of revealed truth."

Among the ablest champions of the work of Mill was Bentley takes up the uncompleted work. Bentley, a man not surpassed in scholarship by any of the *literati* of his time. Nine years after Mill's death, he publicly announced his determination to pursue the work so well begun and to publish a critical Greek text, representing exactly that of the best authorities "at the time of the Council of Nice, so that there shall not be twenty words, nor even particles difference."¹

In pursuance of this high ideal he labored steadily and Meets with little sympathy or success. perseveringly until 1720, when his "Proposals" were issued, and the character of the intended new edition of the Greek and Latin text of the New Testament described. The bare announcement itself was sufficient to provoke the most violent opposition, the learned Middleton leading the attack upon the too daring scholar; and, although Mill prosecuted his studies for nine years longer, the final result was a single chapter only of the great work projected. The ultimate failure, however, is not to be attributed altogether to ill success in getting the sympathy and co-operation required

¹ Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. N. T.

in such an undertaking, but quite as much, perhaps, to the lack of available materials at that period for the accomplishment of an otherwise well-conceived design.

On the Continent Bengel led all his contemporaries in a singular devotion to the study of textual criticism. Like Bentley, he was largely indebted to the work of his predecessors in the same field, but especially to Mill. Yet his own independent work in the collation of manuscripts, simplifying methods of study, and supplying important rules, was not inconsiderable. He distinguished manuscripts into two great classes, the "African" and "Asiatic," but did not feel the superior importance of the more ancient copies sufficiently to lead him to suggest, on their account, changes in the "received text," at least in addition to those found in the editions of the Greek Testament before published, except in a very few instances. His work was issued in 1734. At its close were given rules of criticism, details of authorities for selected readings, and answers to objections.

But Bengel's conservatism did not save him from being bitterly assailed as an innovator, and when Wetstein, seventeen years later (1751), published his magnificent Greek Testament in two volumes, the "received text" was still retained in its autocratic position. As early as 1716, Wetstein had entered upon this department of study under Bentley. He spent much time in France, too, describing more than forty new manuscripts there collected. And his work, as published, was enriched by a vast collection of explanatory passages taken from profane authors, the Church Fathers, and Rabbinical writers. In fact, it was rather a collection of materials for criticism than itself a critical work.

In this latter respect his labors were well supplemented by those of Griesbach, the first edition of whose New Testament, published in two volumes, at Halle, 1775-77, showed that he was able to "convert Wetstein's treasures to general use, while, unlike that scholar, he knew also how to appreciate and carry out the critical principles of Bengel."¹ Griesbach was largely governed in his work by

¹ Hug's *Introd.*, p. 198.

these two principles: (1) that no reading ought to be adopted unless it has some ancient evidence; and (2) that it is needful to limit critical apparatus within due bounds rather than to increase it without limit.¹

Before the second edition of Griesbach appeared (1796–
Makes use of the labors of others in his second edition. 1806), he was able to make use of the rich critical studies of such men as Matthæi, who, as professor at Moscow, had collated one hundred and three different manuscripts of the New Testament; of Alter, professor at Vienna, who increased the number by twenty-two from the royal library; and of Moldenhawer and Birch, of Copenhagen, who had made a wider circuit, collating manuscripts even in Italy and Spain, under the patronage of the Danish government. In the opinion of Westcott, the chief error of this able critic was in using his materials for altering the “received text,” instead of constructing the text afresh.²

In 1830, another German scholar, Scholz, issued volume
Scholz. first of a Greek Testament, the remaining volume appearing six years later. His description of manuscripts was more full than any which had previously appeared, but he made only a slight, and often uncritical, use of his own materials. As far as his influence reached, it was in favor of the later, rather than the earlier, manuscripts as authorities; and he obtained with some, as a natural consequence of this fact, more credit for his labors than was really deserved.

In Lachmann, the first edition of whose Greek Testament
Lachmann. was published in 1831, we have the earliest representative of any considerable importance of the idea, now generally supported by the best textual critics, of the preponderating authority of the oldest manuscripts. Griesbach and his predecessors had acted on the principle: “Is there any necessity for departing from the common text?” Lachmann, on the other hand, announced his as this: “Is there any necessity for not following the reading best attested?”³ His aim was to base his text on *authorities only*, allowing his own

¹ Tregelles in Horne's *Introd.*, iv., p. 131.

² Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Art. N. T.

³ Tregelles, *id.*, iv., 136.

judgment no weight. He ignored the "received text," and set to work as though there had been no text formed before. In his first edition, he used the oldest Greek manuscripts and citations from the Greek Fathers as his *leading* authorities, taking the oldest Latin as his guide only when the Greek authorities did not agree among themselves. In the second edition, containing both the Greek and Latin texts (1842-50), he used the Greek and Latin authorities more co-ordinately. Lachmann's work is to be judged from his own point of view, which was that of a pioneer in a new field. He considered that which he was able to do as only preliminary; more as an illustration of the method in which the true text was to be discovered, than as a full application of the method and the securing of its ripest results. Accordingly, his most imperfect collation of ancient manuscripts, making use of only the primary Uncials and limited citations from the Fathers, should be attributed, it is thought, more to the imperfect carrying out of an idea, than to the inadequacy of the idea itself.

Constantine Tischendorf, another eminent critic in this department, has already given nearly as many years to the unwearied study of the New Testament manuscripts as did the laborious Mill, and with far greater encouragements. He is well known as the discoverer of some of the most important codices extant, probably the collator and certainly the competent editor of more valuable ancient documents than any scholar who has preceded him.

In his second Leipzig edition of the New Testament, his principles of textual revision, as matured to that date, are definitely set forth. In the valuable introduction to that work, he supports Lachmann's view of authorities so far as to state, that "the text should only be sought from ancient evidence, and especially from Greek manuscripts, but without neglecting the testimony of the versions and the Fathers; that the whole conformation [?] of the text should rest on *testimony*, and not on what is called the 'received edition.'" In a third critical edition (1855-59), within which were collected the results of subsequent fruitful

Tischendorf.
Second
Leipzig edi-
tion of the
New Testa-
ment.

labors and discoveries, Tischendorf was thought to be inclined to allow more weight to recent manuscript authorities.¹ An eighth edition of the same work is now in course of preparation, the first volume having appeared from Leipsic in 1869; and additions, including the Acts, Catholic Epistles, and Romans, in 1870-71.

The scholar who at present probably ranks highest as a textual critic in England is Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. Like his most distinguished collaborators, he has given a lifetime to the service of the New Testament text, his first published criticism being in 1838. His Greek New Testament — the first part of which, Matthew and Mark, appeared in 1857; the second, completing the Gospels, in 1861 — has not yet been completed. Tregelles is well known, also, as the able editor of the latest edition of Horne's Introduction, and author of "An Account of the Printed Text of the New Testament," where his principles of criticism are fully propounded and explained. In the opinion of the most eminent judges, his New Testament is characterized by accuracy, and the abundance of materials — especially from the most ancient sources — made to contribute to the support of the text adopted. He uses all the Uncials, as well as many of the best of the Cursives, and has thoroughly ransacked the old versions and the writings of the Fathers for whatever might assist his judgment. By his own account, his text differs from that of Lachmann in its basis by introducing a wider range of evidence, and by a careful re-examination of authorities; and from that of Tischendorf, by a more uniform adhesion to the very ancient evidence, and a re-examination of the versions and Fathers, as well as the manuscripts.²

Tregelles is perhaps the most unyielding advocate for the ancient, in preference to the more modern, manuscripts as authorities, and on this account has exposed himself to some very severe, though generally respectful, criticism. His most prominent antagonist, in this particular, is Rev. F. H. Scrivener, who — in a number of scholarly treatises

Advocates
the superior
claims of
the primary
Uncials.

¹ Scrivener's Contrib. to Crit. of N. T., Introd. Cf. Smith's Bib. Dict., vol. ii., p. 527.

² Horne's Introd., iv., p. 141.

tises, in which he gives the results of his own collation of many of the later manuscripts—ably, though perhaps sometimes too warmly, maintains the relative importance of the Cursives, and the general correctness of the “received text,” not only as against Tregelles, but Tischendorf, Davidson, Alford, and others.¹ The question in dispute is, indeed, one of the very highest importance; and it is maintained by many, with not a little show of sound wisdom, that its *approximate* settlement, at least, should be preliminary to any attempt at revising the English version.

Alford, in the revised text which he prepared for his New Testament, seems to take middle ground, his plan being to combine the testimony, as far as possible, The late Dean Alford. “furnished by the late manuscripts, and to give them, as well as the others, due weight in the determination of readings.”² The forthcoming Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort will be looked for, at this juncture, with great interest by Biblical scholars.

The scope of the present work would not lead us to enter upon the vexed question of the different recensions of manuscripts, that is, their systematic classification according to the theories of different critics; and we shall therefore close this chapter with a statement of the leading principles which eminent scholars have adopted for the purpose of discovering and establishing the true text of the New Testament. It should be noted, however, that no definite rules of this kind have been discovered as yet which, in practice, do not require considerable modification. The question of recensions.

Westcott, in Smith’s Bible Dictionary,³ proposes the following excellent rules: (1) The text must throughout be determined by evidence, without allowing any prescriptive rights. Westcott’s rules. (2) Every element of evidence must be taken into account before a decision is made. (3) The relative weight of the several classes of evidence is modified by

¹ A Full Collation of the Sinaiticus, with the Rec’d Text, Introd.; A Full and Exact Collation of About Twenty Greek MSS., &c.; Contrib. to N. T. Crit., Introd.; A Plain Introd., &c., p. 196, f. Cf. Saturday Rev., Oct. 1, 1870; Tregelles in Horne’s Introd., ii., 145-147.

² Prolegom., vol. i., 1863. Id., vol. ii., p. 59, f.

³ Vol. ii., pp. 528-530.

their general character. (4) The mere preponderance of number is in itself of no weight. (5) The more ancient reading is generally preferable. (6) The more ancient reading is generally the reading of the most ancient manuscripts. (7) The ancient text is often preserved substantially in recent copies. (8) The agreement of ancient manuscripts, or of manuscripts containing an ancient text, with all the earliest versions and citations, marks a certain reading. (9) The disagreement of the most ancient authorities often marks the existence of a corruption anterior to them. (10) The argument from internal evidence is always precarious. (11) The shorter reading is generally preferable to the longer. (12) The more difficult reading is preferable to the simpler. (13) That reading is preferable which explains the origin of the others.

Lachmann's rules are of a more negative character: (1)

Those of Lachmann. Nothing is better attested than that in which all authorities accord. (2) The agreement has rather less moment, if part of the authorities are silent or defective. (3) The evidence for a reading, when it is that of witnesses of different regions, is greater than that of witnesses of some particular locality. (4) Testimonies must be considered as doubtfully balanced, when witnesses from regions wide apart stand opposed to others equally separated in locality. (5) Readings are uncertain, which are in one form in one region and different in another region, with great uniformity. (6) Readings are of weak authority as to which not even the same region presents an uniform testimony.¹

Rules of De Wette: General principle, — That reading to which the origin of the others may be traced is the original. Special rules: The more obscure and difficult reading is to be preferred to the clearer and easier; the harder, elliptical, Hebraizing, and ungrammatical, to the more pleasing and grammatical; the rarer, to the more common; that which is less favorable to piety — especially of the monkish sort — and to orthodoxy, to that which is more so; that which gives an apparently false meaning, to one which seems to give a fitter meaning; the shorter, to the more explanatory and wordy;

¹ Tregelles, Acc't of Printed Text, p. 103.

the less expressive, to the emphatic; the reading which stands midway between others, and contains their germ, to be considered the more original.¹

Rules of Tischendorf: (1) A reading altogether peculiar to one or another ancient document is suspicious; as also, is any, even if supported by a class of documents which seem to evince that it has originated in the revision of a learned man. (2) Readings, however well supported by evidence, are to be rejected when it is manifest (or very probable) that they have proceeded from the errors of copyists. (3) In parallel passages, whether of the New or Old Testament, especially in the Synoptical Gospels, which ancient copyists continually brought into increased accordance, those testimonies are preferable, in which precise accordance of such parallel passages is not found; unless, indeed, there are important reasons to the contrary. (4) In discrepant readings, that should be preferred which may have been the occasion or which appears to comprise the elements of others. (5) Those readings must be maintained which accord with New Testament Greek or with the particular style of each individual writer.

General principles announced by Davidson: The first thing is to collate the oldest manuscripts thoroughly and accurately, publishing the text in *fac-simile* or otherwise, so that they need not be re-examined. All the rest, or the great mass of juniors, may be dispensed with. They are scarcely needed because the Uncials are numerous. At present they do nothing but hinder the progress of critical science.²

Critical principles of Tregelles condensed: (1) If the reading of the ancient authorities in general is unanimous, there can be but little doubt that it should be followed, whatever may be the later testimonies. (2) A reading found in versions *alone*, can claim but little authority. (3) A reading found in patristic citations alone, rests on a still weaker basis. (4) The readings respecting which a judgment must be formed are those where the evidence is really divided, so that it is needful to inquire on which side the balance preponderates. In such cases authorities are not merely to be

¹ Introd. to N. T., pp. 80-81.

² Scrivener's Contrib. to N. T. Crit., Introd., p. 2.

cited, but examined point by point. (5) When no certainty is attainable, the case should be left doubtful, the reading seeming to have the strongest claim being placed in the text, and the other in the margin.¹

Rules laid down by Rev. F. H. Scrivener as "those, on which all reasonable defenders of the 'textus receptus' have upheld its general integrity:" (1) The true reading of the Greek New Testament cannot safely be derived from any one set of authorities, whether manuscripts, versions, or Fathers, but ought to be the result of a patient comparison and careful estimate of the evidence given by all. (2) Where there is real agreement between all the documents prior to the tenth century, the testimony of the late manuscripts, though not to be rejected unheard, is to be regarded with much suspicion, and unless supported by strong internal evidence can hardly be adopted. In the far more numerous cases when the most ancient documents are at variance with each other, the later or Cursive copies are of great importance, as the surviving representatives of other codices, very probably as early, possibly even earlier, than any now extant.²

Lest from the foregoing full presentation of the difficulties in the way of obtaining an absolutely perfect text, an exaggerated impression of its imperfections should be received, we add the following excellent tribute to its general integrity from the pen of one of its most thorough and able investigators: "It is as though some magnificent edifice which delighted many eyes, were to receive injury from careless hands, so that a portion of its ornamental character were lost. Those who have seen it in all its glory, or who saw the distinct traces of the ill treatment which had defaced much of its carved foliage, might so express their lamentation as if the work of spoliation had materially changed its structure; and yet, after the lapse of many centuries, the beholder might be inclined to wonder at the incorrupt preservation, and might judge that the estimate formed of the early injury had been, in every respect, overstated.

¹ Horne's *Introd.*, iv., p. 343, f.

² *Contrib. to N. T. Crit.*, p. 20. Also *A Plain Introd.*, &c., p. 408, f.

“ He might see that it was essentially the same, the architectural design unmarred, and the skill of the artist’s hand still fully visible ; and he would then learn that ^{Slight} _{defects.} the early injuries could have been but little, and could only have affected details which seem comparatively unimportant, even though to those who then lived they seemed to be a general dissight to the edifice. It is in after ages, when the whole has been mellowed by time that an estimate can be best formed of the relation of the much that is uninjured to the parts that are dilapidated, and that the endeavor can be successfully made to search out every fallen stone, every piece of broken tracery, and fit them into the places which unskilful hands have sought (it may be) to repair with unsuited and extraneous materials.”¹

¹ Acc’t Printed Text, p. 402.

CHAPTER III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

BY the Canon of the New Testament is meant such books as in a collective form have been received by the Christian Church, from the first centuries of our era, as their written rule of faith. In other words, it is “the measure of the contents of the New Testament.” The word in its root form may be traced back through the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; and its derivatives, such as channel, cane, cannon, &c., abound in our own language. Its literal meaning is a rod, ruler, or, more rarely, the beam of a balance; while metaphorically, in addition to the idea of being itself straight, it comes to be regarded as something that *preserves* straightness, correctness, and also *determines* it.

It is in the latter sense that the word is used in connection with the books of Scripture. The term, however, was not applied to the contents of the Bible until after the third century. Certain books were at first spoken of as being “canonized,” that is, accepted according to an established rule of the Church; then what had been measured became itself the measure for testing other applicants, and so, at length, “Canon” became the common term for an established list or catalogue of sacred writings.¹

Inasmuch as the terms “authentic” and “genuine” will be much used in the present and following chapters, and as they are used in different senses by different writers, it will be well to state the sense in which they are here employed. A work may be considered as *genuine*, if written by the person to whom it is ordinarily ascribed;

¹ App. to Westcott’s Hist. of N. T. Canon; also Guericke’s N. T. Isagogik, p. 553, f.

or, the authorship being in doubt, if it belong to the age and country which are claimed for it: it is *authentic* as far as it is a representation of facts, in distinction from what is erroneous or false.

In the natural order, the history of the separate books composing the Canon would precede that of the Canon itself, but the history of the one is closely linked with that of the other, and the final result will be unchanged, whichever order is adopted. In either case, moreover, the general method to be pursued is the same, and has been well stated by Augustine in connection with this very subject. Writing against Faustus, the Manichean, he asks: "Whence do men know as to the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Varro, and other such authors, what is really theirs but by the [same] continued testimony of successive ages? But why should I go back to things long passed? Look at these very letters which we have in our hands; and if, some time after we shall be dead, any should deny those to be Faustus's, or these to be mine, whence will he be convinced except through those who now know these things, transmitting by continued succession their acquaintance with the facts to posterity."¹

History of separate books naturally precedes that of the collection.

We are to arrive at the facts which lie at the basis of the history of the New Testament Canon, then, by appealing to the testimony of the numerous successive writers, both friendly and hostile, whose works extend back to the time of the first appearance of the books of which it is composed.² The mere matter of the distance of the persons and events here concerned should not be allowed to have any considerable influence with us. It is not properly a factor of the problem. We are carried by this method of proof "up to the times of the events in question, and are now as competent to judge of the validity of the evidence as we could have been had we lived in that age."³ We are in much greater danger of arriving at partial or wholly erroneous conclusions from simply subjective causes; as, from the fact that the sub-

Simplicity of the historic method of proof.

¹ Opera, tom. octav., Contra Faustum, l. xxxiii.

² Cf. Bishop Cosin's Hist. of Can., Works, iii., p. 6.

³ I. Taylor, Process of Hist. Proof, p. 85.

ject to be considered is "linked, on the one hand, with all those suasive considerations which belong to the enforcement of right conduct, and, on the other, with all those oppugnant and vitiated feelings which arm the mind against truth."¹

Before we proceed to cite the definite historic facts relating to our subject, it may be disembarrassed, at the outset, of many perplexing details, and much simplified in form, by some preliminary statements, most of which, it is likely, would be generally accepted at once, while the truthfulness and appropriateness of the remainder might be expected to appear in the course of the investigations of the chapter.

It is to be considered that no imperative need of a second collection of sacred writings would naturally be at once felt, by the generation of Christians immediately succeeding the Apostles, while the Old Testament was yet regarded, especially by the large Jewish portion of the Church, as an abiding rule of faith, the Apostolic oral teaching was still fresh in their memories, the speedy reappearance of the Master widely anticipated, the distinctly Christian doctrine vividly represented and incarnated in a living Christian brotherhood, and the pressure of heretical tendencies still comparatively undeveloped. Instead of a collection of books being naturally suggested for the new dispensation by way of contrast to the old, as has been intimated by some critics, the Old Testament Canon, *per se*, stood in the way of, and hindered, at the beginning, that of the New Testament, although, when the necessity for the second collection was fully realized, through other causes, its acceptance may have been assisted thereby.²

It is admitted that the period when the Canon of the New Testament became definitely fixed in its present form can only be approximately settled, although in all its essential features it took shape within fifty years after the death of the Apostles.

It is of course admitted, then, that the Canon of the New Testament was not determined by immediate Apostolic

¹ I. Taylor, *id.*, p. 253. Cf. *Trans. of Anc't Books*, pp. 166, 168.

² *Vs. Hilgenfeld, der Kan., &c.*, pp. 6-9; *Credner, Gesch. d. N. T. Kan., sect. 2.* Cf. *Reuss, Gesch. Heil. Schrift. N. T.*, sect. 281-285.

authority, although certain traces of an incipient massing of its books may appear in the volume itself, as also, in the writings of the Apostolic fathers.¹ The weak tradition that this work fell to St. John, probably has no other basis than the fact that he survived the other Apostles, and that his writings concluded, and, in the nature of their contents, served to complete, the rest.²

It is evident, moreover, that the original settlement of this Canon was not the work of any ecclesiastical council, Nor by any or convention of prominent leaders in the early church, or the result of an enforced dogma, or any act of authority whatever; much less the product of a learned investigation and criticism, or the pretence thereof undertaken under ecclesiastical auspices, or by independent scholars. The three church Fathers most relied on for testimony for the support of the collection do not even give a list of the books of which it is composed.³

It is to be premised, also, that the question concerning what books written by the Apostles and their followers should be ranked together as the authoritative, co-ordinate sources of Christian doctrine and standard of faith, was not peremptorily settled through any *miraculous* interference, or *peculiar* providence; while the whole history of the collection is yet strikingly indicative of an actual superintendence of the divine wisdom, as evinced in its singular unity amidst historical variety; its completeness, notwithstanding the independent nature of the several contributions; in being the condensed substance of Apostolic oral teaching through a considerable period of years; in being the combined productions of men, who by tradition, discipline, and mode of life might be supposed to be especially averse to literary effort; and in the blending and harmonizing of the partial teachings of different, and sometimes apparently opposing, schools in the one Catholic Gospel.⁴

¹ Acts xv. 23; Col. iv. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 16; Polycarp ad Phil. c. 13.

² Cf. Reuss, id., sect. 289 n.; Guericke, id., p. 567.

³ Cf. Reuss, id., sect. 306; Westcott, Hist. N. T. Can., p. 8. Vs. Credner, id., sect. 9, f. and 30; Hilgenfeld, id., pp. 33, 34.

⁴ Westcott, Hist. of N. T. Can., *passim*.

Inasmuch as the books of the New Testament were written at different times, dispersed to widely different places, Canon fixed gradually. treated of different aspects of Christianity, being such as were worthy of special emphasis in the places to which they were respectively sent, we ought to be able to find that their canonization was also individual and gradual, and not in a body and by all parts of the Church simultaneously.

So likewise, it might be expected that the public ecclesiastical announcement of this exclusive catalogue of Public announcement considerably after the period of its establishment. sacred writings would not synchronize with its actual formation, but take place at a considerably later period. It has been said that the matter of Synods, in connection with the history of the Canon, is of no further importance than that the first attempt to *close the Canon* is associated in the Greek Church with a positive date.¹

Among the natural and obvious causes, acting under the Causes acting to produce final result. divine control, for the gradual reception of the New Testament books into an exclusive list, are to be named, next to a warm and all-pervading tradition, the spread of heresy, especially in the form of Gnosticism, and the multiplication of apocryphal works, both necessitating in turn an appeal to, and inevitably leading to a more common use of, the writings of the Apostles; which use, again, developed an appreciation of their real character and value, and an instinctive recognition of the weakness and unworthiness of all contemporaneous ecclesiastical literature, as sources of the needed doctrine.²

Antedating the appearance of the several books of the New Testament in the Canon itself, as already invested No ecclesiastical pressure. with the authority of inspired writings, there is no evidence of special effort on the part of the Church, by legislation or otherwise, to procure the acceptance and currency of such books. The peculiar history of the collection evidently forbids the theory that it had for its basis a studied and formal compromise between the Jewish and Gentile divisions of the Apostolic Church, as also the attempt to connect it, otherwise than as both might be considered the result of the same general

¹ Reuss, *id.*, sect. 321.

² *Id.*, sects. 290, 307.

moral causes operating secretly and without collusion, with the organization of the so-called Catholic Church. The New Testament Canon was in no sense a creature of compromises or an adroit manipulation of opposing factions, but rather a spontaneous development and growth.¹

While most of the scattered references to the early existence of the New Testament writings are extracts from the extant works of distinguished Church Fathers, their individual influence in the establishment of the Canon is not on that account to be considered as of pre-eminent importance. They are to be regarded rather in the light of representatives only of a dominant public sentiment and usage in the churches, particularly the more notable ones.

Although the New Testament books were not at once and on their first appearance treated as a distinct class by themselves, possessing a claim to be regarded as inspired Scripture, still there is evidence that from the first they were segregated by the Apostolic Fathers from their own writings and invested with a peculiar value and dignity.²

The comparatively infrequent quotations from the canonical books of the New Testament found in the writings of the Fathers of the sub-Apostolic age, although in amount relatively equal to the quotations of the Old Testament by the Apostles themselves, must be regarded, — in addition to the circumstance that these writings are exclusively letters in which such quotations would be only incidental, — as a natural result of the fact that they were contemporaneous, and that these books, as is acknowledged, were not yet collectively in general circulation, or in the same sense as the Old Testament, a recognized authority in matters of faith. Hereby, indeed, the genuineness of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers themselves is incidentally supported, since they are thus freed from suspicion of design, and placed in

¹ *Vs.* Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, sect. 9, f.; and Hilgenfeld, *Der Kan. &c.*, pp. 4, 5, *et passim*.

² Westcott, *Bib. in Ch.* pp. 87, 88. Cf. *Clem. of Rom.*, cc., vii., xlvii.; *Polycarp ad Phil.*, iii.; *Barn.*, cc., i., iv.; *Ignat. ad Rom.*, iv.

this respect on a level with the Apostles, who did not, as a general rule, quote one another.¹

There should not be demanded, moreover, from the ecclesiastical writers of the early Church, the same amount of evidence to the Canon as might have been expected if the larger part of their productions had not been lost; if the age in which they lived had been specially distinguished for literary fertility; if there had been at that time the same means for multiplying literary works, and of preserving them as now, — printing facilities, fire-proof buildings; or even if the common religious centre had not been destroyed by the downfall of Jerusalem.

The testimony of this period, however, is not to be too much depreciated even with respect to quantity; for, while all the extant fragments of works produced by ecclesiastical writers, up to the middle of the second century, collected together would make a volume little larger than the New Testament,² yet there is scarcely a single fragment, however small, which is not the setting, albeit rough, of some gem from the lips of the Master or of his Apostles.

Even though the Apostolic Fathers and other untrained ecclesiastical writers of the first Christian centuries, on whose testimony for the early existence and prevalence of the sacred documents, subsequently mysteriously gathered into the New Testament, much reliance is placed, occasionally allude to and cite other writings than these, to which also they ascribe equal importance and value, it is no sufficient reason why their testimony should be rejected or even depreciated with respect to the point at present under consideration. They might be judged capable of testifying to the existence of writings whose quality they had neither the discipline nor the inclination to test. The two things may be regarded as quite distinct. And there is no inconsistency in our accepting their testimony in the one case as fully adequate; while, with respect to the other, we reserve to ourselves the right of a personal judgment.

¹ Cf. Guericke's *Isagogik*, pp. 569, 574.

² *Bib. in Ch.*, p. 106.

The unmistakable fact that, being left to their own Christian judgment and election, without express and definite instructions from the Master or his Apostles concerning such writings already in circulation, or to be the products of a near future, they yet so almost universally discriminated in favor of the New Testament books as against the manifold apocryphal productions of the times, is certainly not to be justly regarded as militating against the character of the former, but quite the reverse.

Fact of evident discrimination in favor of New Testament books.

The omission of a certain distinctive portion of the New Testament in the citations of an early writer, is by no means to be taken as a proof that such writer did not know of that portion, or did not recognize it as genuine, unless he professes to give a complete list of authoritative books belonging to the Canon. Clement of Alexandria, for instance, cites incidentally all the epistles of Paul, with the exception of the brief and comparatively unimportant one to Philemon.

Too much must not be made of the omissions of the Fathers.

It follows, that in weighing, in our investigations, the evidence of any ancient writer, his apparent aim is to be carefully considered; the special locality from which he speaks; how widely or how narrowly he may represent the whole Christian body; whether his testimony is direct, as in acknowledged support of a canonical list, or merely incidental and unconscious; the testimony of a friend, or the often more valuable testimony of an enemy to Christianity.

Aim of witnesses to be considered.

The severe rules of modern criticism are not to be imposed too rigorously on the uncritical times we shall be called to consider, nor a refined taste and a scrupulous, carefully critical spirit, expected from the simple and untutored writers of the first age. Results based on the total reversal of this rule may be well looked upon with suspicion.¹ The question of the genuineness of the New Testament writings should not be confounded with that of their authenticity, credibility, or integrity.

Ancient Fathers not to be held to rules of modern criticism.

In referring now, to the testimony of the numerous successive writers, both friendly and hostile, whose works extend

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *id.*, pp. 14-21.

back to the time of the first appearance of the books of which the New Testament is composed, we shall begin with a circle of witnesses belonging to a period when the Canon was evidently in active process of formation, although its ultimate limits were not yet finally settled, and from that point trace the history backwards and forwards to its sources and its final results respectively. From many witnesses we are able to make only a limited selection, choosing such as appear more prominent or trustworthy; or such as, on account of the locality from which they speak, or other special circumstance, are worthy of particular consideration.

Marcion, whose writings began to circulate soon after A.D. 130, is well known as a distinguished opponent of the faith. His contributions to the history of the New Testament Canon are valuable, therefore, no less for what he rejects than what he receives of the sacred writings. He was the son of a bishop of Sinope, a city of Paphlagonia. On account of vicious practices, or as others say heretical views,¹ he was excluded from the church by his father and became bitterly hostile to it. He even made an effort to reconstruct Christianity itself on the principle that every Jewish element ought to be eliminated from it. The Old Testament he rejected utterly, and such parts of the New as seemed to him to militate against his system, especially all that pertained to the doctrine of the incarnation and sufferings of Jesus Christ. Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, he alone accepted as the true representative of the faith, although he did not include all of his epistles in his own collection.

His Canon consisted of two parts, "Gospel and Apostolicon," the Gospel being an adaptation of Luke, and the Apostolicon a selection from Paul's writings, ten epistles in all. The fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of Romans he omitted, as well as the opening chapters of Luke, which relate to the birth of Christ. It is generally admitted that Marcion did not refuse to accept any book now embraced in the New Testament Canon on the ground of its not being genuine. Their relation to his peculiar system was probably the

Point of departure.

Marcion and his Canon.

Canon, how constituted.

¹ Bleek, *Introd. to N. T., Vol. I., Notes on Luke.*

controlling consideration, with the possible reason, in the case of the pastoral letters, that they were addressed to private persons.¹ We should not be expected to believe, without evidence, that he rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews on the ground that it was not genuine, and, at the same time, that it was rejected by the Muratorian Canon because it *favoured the heresy of Marcion*.²

The Canon of Marcion, then, the first appearing in history, consisted of the mutilated Gospel of Luke, although he was acquainted with the other Gospels, and ^{Special books.} ten epistles of Paul arranged in the following order: Galatians; Corinthians, two; Romans; Thessalonians, two; Laodiceans (Eph.); Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. Such a collection from such a source may be taken as almost certain evidence of other, at least local, previous collections of the New Testament books. In fact, Marcion is charged by the orthodox ecclesiastical writers, with mutilating an already existing standard of doctrine. Tertullian's language is, "contraria quæque suæ sententiæ erasit . . . competentia reseravit."³ And Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (c. 160-170), wrote: "It is not marvellous that some have attempted" (referring to Marcion) "to adulterate the *Scriptures of the Lord*, when they have laid hands on those which are not such as they are;" *i.e.*, on Dionysius's own letters.⁴ The unexpected appearance of the comparatively unimportant epistle to Philemon in this list of Marcion, is strikingly illustrative of the casual nature of much of the evidence on which the proof of the New Testament Canon must finally be supported.

We next turn to an ancient anonymous work named, in honor of Muratori, the Italian scholar who first published it, the "Canon of Muratori." The existing ^{Canon of Muratori.} fragment is in Latin, being a copy from the Greek original, which scholars refer to A.D. 160-170. As determining the date, the writer's own words seem decisive. He speaks of the

¹ Reuss, *id.*, sect. 291.

² Cf. Guericke, *id.*, p. 577; West. Hist. Can. N. T., p. 275, n.; *Vs.* Hilgenfeld, *id.*, p. 244 and Credner, *id.*, sect. 4.

³ Reuss, *id.*, sect. 246, n.

⁴ Euseb. H. E. iv. 23. Cf. Bleek, *Introd. to N. T.*, vol. ii., 241

apocryphal "Shepherd of Hermas" as not worthy of receiving canonical authority, having been written "recently, in our own times, by Hermas, while his brother Pius was bishop of the see of Rome." Pius, it is well known, entered upon the episcopate about A.D. 140. This document is of peculiar importance as making the first *distinct reference* yet known to history of an already existing collection of New Testament books. It seems to be an extract from the work of some Christian Father against heresy, and suggests the probable abundance of such valuable testimony in the similar writings, now wholly lost, of Agrippa Castor (130), Justin Martyr, and Dionysius of Corinth (160-170), Melito (176), and others. Westcott has noticed the singular fact that it is to opponents that the Church is indebted for the first *announcement* of the Epistles as "Scripture," for the first known Canon, and the first Commentary.¹

In this ancient document, happily preserved from the fate of most contemporaneous writings, a formal list of the Contents of this Canon. books of the New Testament is given, in which are to be found all those included in the present Canon, with the exception of the Epistles of James, Peter, possibly the third of John, and that to the Hebrews. One apocryphal book, the "Apocalypse of Peter," is conditionally admitted also, the remark accompanying it, however, that some did not choose that it should be used in the Church. The first part of the fragment relating to Matthew and Mark is wanting, but Luke is named as the *third* Gospel, and John as the *fourth*. The writer speaks of but two epistles of John, including the third with the second, as was sometimes done, or meaning two besides the first, of which he had elsewhere spoken in connection with the Gospel, — which is the most probable supposition, — or possibly, as not knowing the third.²

The chasms found in the text, as it now exists, may be regarded as the almost sure reason why certain other- Of the books omitted. wise well-attested books of the New Testament are not enumerated in it, especially I. Peter. And Westcott holds

¹ Bib. in Ch., p. 113. Cf. Reuss, id., sect. 292.

² Reuss, id., sect. 310, n. Cf. Westcott's Bib. in Ch., p. 116 and note; also Hilgenfeld, id., p. 42.

that, inasmuch as the epistle of James and that to the Hebrews were well known in the Roman Church, the reason for their being omitted in a list which includes the epistle of Jude and the Apocalypse must be sought either in the character of the writing or the condition of the text.¹ The Muratorian Canon rejected an apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans, which is not to be confounded with the Epistle to the Ephesians (see Colossians iv. 16), although Marcion gave the latter that name. The allusion is probably to a spurious work afterwards placed by Jerome in his catalogue of such works.² The text reads: "Moreover, it is said that there is in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, another to the Alexandrians, forged under the name of Paul, in favor of the heresy of Marcion ("Pauli nomine fictæ ad hæresem Marcionis"), and several others which cannot be received into the Catholic Church, for gall ought not to be mixed with honey" ("fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit"). That our epistle to the Hebrews is meant by the one mentioned as addressed to the Alexandrians is a mere conjecture supported by no evidence. The epistle to the Hebrews, as a "continuous vindication of the spiritual significance of the Mosaic covenant, which Marcion denied," does not at all answer the description.³

We shall now notice in succession the evidence offered to the Canon of the New Testament by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, the Peshito, and old Latin versions, — representing respectively, Asia Minor, Egypt, North Africa, the far East, and the West, — then of the distinguished Origen, from whom we shall turn backward towards the Apostolic age.

Irenæus (c. 130–200,) was educated in the Christian faith by Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John, and by him was sent on a mission to Gaul. He became bishop at Lyons A.D. 174, and was prominent in all ecclesiastical matters during the latter part of the second century. It is held by some that he suffered martyrdom under Septimus Severus A.D. 203. He was a firm supporter of the "faith

¹ Hist. of N. T. Can., pp. 191, 192; *Vs.* Credner id., sect. 72.

² *Vs.* Hilgenfeld, id., p. 42. Cf. Reuss, id., sect. 310, n.; and Westcott id. p. 190, n.

³ Westcott, id., p. 190, n. *Vs.* Hilgenfeld, id., p. 24.

once delivered to the saints," disputing publicly at Rome against the errors of Valentinus, Florinus, and others. He always claimed to follow the Apostolic instruction which he had received from his renowned teacher, and which, in his old age, he declared was even fresher in memory than events which had just occurred. "I recollect well," he says, "the place in which the holy Polycarp used to sit and speak. I remember . . . the discourses he made to the people, and how he described his intercourse with the Apostle John, and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he recited their sayings concerning Christ, His miracles, and His doctrines; and how, having received records from eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, he recounted them, agreeing in every thing *with the Scriptures.*"¹

But one of the works of Irenæus has been preserved, — a certain treatise against heresy, — and that for the most part in a Latin translation. But this work, from the nature of its subject, gave fitting occasion for him to express his views concerning the Scriptures. He maintains the co-ordinate authority of the Old and New Testaments;² finds a characteristic reason, in the four quarters of the globe, why there should be just four Gospels, and no more; assigns the authorship of those Gospels to those whose names they now bear; quotes, as Scripture, the Acts, twelve Epistles of Paul (omitting Philemon), the Apocalypse, I. and II. John, I. Peter, and is said by Eusebius to refer, in a work now lost, to the Epistle to the Hebrews: "a book also of various disputes, in which he mentions the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the book called the Wisdom of Solomon, quoting certain passages from them."³ As Irenæus does not profess to give a list of canonical writings, it would not be just to infer that he rejected any books which he does not quote. It is probable, however, that he did not regard the Epistle to the Hebrews as the work of Paul.

He quotes also, as Scripture (*γραφή*), the Shepherd of Hermas, which, as we have seen, the author of the Muratorian

¹ Euseb. H. E. v. 20. Cf. Adv. Hær., iii. 3 (4).

² Adv. Hær. i. 8 (1); ii. 27 (2).

³ H. E. v. 26.

Fragment repudiated as without divine authority.¹ Inasmuch as the ordinary test of canonical books was the knowledge of their being produced by Apostles, or "Apostolic men," it is easy to see that the name of the author of this work, as was the case with other partially current apocryphal works, may have stood in the way of its rejection.² The matter, however, is of little importance, except as illustrating the uncritical character of the times, and the fact that the limits of the Canon had not yet been definitely fixed.

Clement of Alexandria (c. 165-220) was a contemporary of Irenæus, although his birthplace and the exact time of his birth are unknown. His acquaintance with the philosophy and literature of his time was uncommonly extensive. For about a dozen years, near the close of the second century, he was teacher of a famous catechetical school at Alexandria. His predecessor in the school, Pantænus, linked him with the Apostolic age, and, like Irenæus, Clement counted it an honor to follow in his teaching "the true tradition of the blessed doctrine directly from Peter and James, from John and Paul, the holy Apostles, the son receiving it from the father."³

He was a fertile writer, and five of his works are yet extant in the Greek language. The principal of these, just now cited, was named "Stromata," "patchwork," or "miscellanies," perhaps from the miscellaneous character of its contents. Without attempting a formal catalogue of the New Testament books, Clement treats them as associated, as "Scriptures of the Lord," and connects them with the Law and the Prophets, as worthy of the same reverence. "For both the law and the Gospel," he says, "are the energy of one Lord, who is the 'power and wisdom of God.'"⁴ Of these books he quotes the several Gospels, the Acts, and, with the exception of Philemon, all of Paul's epistles, including Hebrews, which he imputes to him; also, I. John, I. Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse. He shows an acquaintance, too, with the second Epistle of John, although he does not expressly

Cites an Apocryphal work as Scripture.

Clement of Alexandria.

His writings.

¹ Adv. Hær., iv. 20 (2).

² Rom. xvi. 16. Cf. Hilgenfeld, id., p. 37, n.

³ Stromata i. 1. Cf. Euseb. H. E., v. 11. ⁴ Strom. i., 27.

name it. Of II. Peter, James, and III. John only does he say nothing, from which silence, under the circumstances, it being a matter of incidental citations only, no more can be justly inferred than a lack of acquaintance, and even that with uncertainty. But, like Irenæus, Clement does not see the impropriety of mixing "gall" with "honey," and misled, perhaps by the honored names they bore, and the loose custom of the Alexandrians generally in this respect, cites the "Apocalypse of Peter," and the "Shepherd of Hermas," as "divine" writings, and invests the letters of Clement of Rome and of Barnabas with Apostolic authority. Westcott thinks, however, that there is no evidence that he attached to them a decisive authority, as he did to the writings of the Apostles, in the strictest sense.¹

Tertullian was born of pagan parentage, at Carthage, about A.D. 160. His father was a Roman centurion. He was well educated for one of his time, and used his extraordinary gifts, after his conversion to Christianity, in vigorously defending it against its enemies. So severe and unyielding was he in his views respecting the purity of the Church and the necessity of discipline in it, that late in life he separated from its communion, originating a Montanistic sect, called Tertullianists.

Tertullian extended the title of "Divine Instrument" over the one book made up of the Old and New Testament writings. In defending the integrity of Scripture against the mutilations of Marcion, he claimed, that what had been delivered by the Apostles had been "preserved inviolate (*sacrosanctum*) in the churches of the Apostles."² To doubters of the genuineness of the Apostolic epistles in his own time, he addressed the following bold challenge: "Come now, thou who desirest to exercise thy curiosity in that which relates to thy salvation; go through the Apostolic churches, in which the chairs of the Apostles preside in their places, in which their authentic letters are recited, resounding the voice, and representing the face of each one. Is Achaia near thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou

¹ Hist. of N. T. Can., p. 312, n.

² Adv. Mar. iv. 5.

hast Philippi; thou hast Thessalonica. If thou canst direct thy course into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But, if thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome, whence authority is ready at hand for us [of Carthage] also.”¹

This strong language of Tertullian must not be pressed too far, however. It can only be used to show his personal estimate of the genuineness of the several epistles to which he alludes. He means to express his opinion that the Apostolic churches are themselves proper witnesses to the letters which were sent to them.

As in the case of the two preceding fathers, Tertullian furnishes no complete catalogue of New Testament books, and we are mainly dependent for his testimony on casual references found in his writings. These references are to the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen epistles of Paul (including Philemon), I. Peter, I. John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. The Epistle to the Hebrews he ascribed to Barnabas, but without placing it among, or on a level with, works apocryphal even of the better class: “Exstat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, — et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho pastore mæchorum.”² There is no trace in Tertullian’s writings of II. Peter, II. and III. John, or James. The only two apocryphal works of which he speaks, he expressly stigmatizes as unauthentic, saying of the “Shepherd,” that it had been declared spurious by every council of the churches,³ and of the “Acts of Paul and Thecla,” that it was a detected forgery. According to Hilgenfeld, Tertullian at an earlier period had received the “Shepherd” as inspired.⁴

The ante-Hieronymian version in Latin, which seems to have been made in North Africa, as we have observed, about the time of Tertullian’s birth, and was continually referred to by that Father, mainly corroborates, — as we should naturally expect, the point of view being the same, — his opinion of what books properly belonged to the New Testament Canon. It is thought by Westcott, that, in its original form, this version contained all the books of the present list except the Epistle

¹ De Præs. Hær., cap. xxxvi.

² De Pudic., c. xx.

³ Id., c. x.

⁴ Der Kan. &c., pp. 38, 72. Cf. Tertul. De Orat., c. xii.; De Bapt. xvii.

of the preceding, sub-Apostolic age, as yet unnoticed, might be expected greatly to strengthen the conclusions already reached.

The mutually corroborative character of this testimony appears in the fact that the two express catalogues Evidence mutually supporting. cited are exactly conterminous with the scattered quotations of the Fathers; the Peshito of the East, and the Muratorian and Old Latin Versions of the West, being fully sustained by the whole sum of scattered incidental citations of the various writers of the period over which we have passed. Still further, we find no positive evidence from any quarter of the Church during this period, or even among heretics, of the deliberate rejection, *as spurious*, of any book of the New Testament now received as genuine. There is sometimes doubt as to authorship, as in the case of the epistle to the Hebrews; there is often an apparent unacquaintance with the minor epistles, or an overlooking of them: but the positive evidence, scanty though it may be, as far as it goes, is but in one direction. To this can be opposed only the negative and doubtful argument of silence, or the illusive proofs of surmise and conjecture.

But it is to be acknowledged that, for reasons already stated, Books partially recognized. there are certain books of the New Testament which, up to this time, had received but a partial recognition, and were obliged to wait for their full reception into the Canon, for the riper experience and wider knowledge of a later day. These exceptional books, however, it is to be noted, to the extent that they met with recognition at all, found it in just those places where it would be natural to expect they would be best known. And it is also to be remarked that these "disputed" books, so called, with the solitary exception of II. Peter, are precisely those which in themselves *lay no claim* to Apostolic authorship; and this very circumstance may have given occasion, even where they were known and recognized as genuine, for denying them an equal rank with those which made such claim.¹

In the churches of Africa, for instance, and throughout the

¹ Westcott, *Hist. of N. T. Can.*, p. 459.

West generally, the epistles of Jude, II. and perhaps III. John, and the Apocalypse, attain to canonical rank during this period, but not in the Eastern Church; ^{Examples.} while the epistle of James and that to the Hebrews reach the same dignity in the Eastern Church, but not in the African and Western, although the epistle to the Hebrews should not be confined to so narrow limits in this respect as that of James. At the same time, there are but very slight traces of II. Peter in any direction.

Of the numerous books in circulation at this period, on the other hand, making a false claim to canonical rank, the one which attained the greatest currency, the ^{Quotation of Apocryphal writings.} "Shepherd of Hermas," being indorsed by Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, was, by certain others of the Fathers who knew its origin best, expressly condemned *as spurious*, — a fact already noticed as without a precedent in the case of any book of the New Testament. Clement of Alexandria also quotes, as we have seen, "if we may trust a corrupt text,"¹ an absurd book, entitled the "Apocalypse of Peter," as Scripture, and seems to give Apostolic authority to the letters of Clement of Rome and Barnabas: but the instance is exceptional; as much so, Tregelles avers, as it would be for a Protestant now to believe in the divine authority of some book of the Apocrypha.²

His course in this case, moreover, as well as the custom prevalent of quoting the Apostolic Fathers in immediate connection with the Scriptures, although not ^{Ground of such a practice.} necessarily as Scripture, was only possible, it is evident, because the question of the Canon had not yet become one of much practical importance in the estimation of the Church.³ In addition to this unreflective and uncritical habit, another circumstance is to be considered. A rule had been somehow tacitly adopted,⁴ that books claiming a place in the Canon must at least be the productions of Apostles, or their companions. And as the names of Hermas, Clement, and Barnabas,

¹ Westcott, *id.*, p. 249.

² Lect. on Hist. Ev., p. 67. Cf. Bleek, *Introd.*, ii. 289; Westcott, *Hist. of N. Can. Ap. B.*

³ Reuss, *id.*, sect. 293.

⁴ Tertull. *Adv. Mar.*, iv. 2; Credner, *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.*, sect. 39.

all occur in the New Testament writings in close connection with the Apostles, that fact was allowed to weigh too much, in some instances, against the contents of their reputed works, the contrast of which with the real work of the Apostles did not, we know, wholly escape observation.

We come now to the testimony of the illustrious Origen, which will form a fitting supplement to that already cited. He speaks, like Clement, from that great commercial and literary centre, Alexandria, in Egypt. "Unsurpassed in Christian zeal, unrivalled in universal learning, he devoted a long life to the study of the Scriptures. These peculiar studies of Origen give additional importance" to his judgment.¹ As in the case of preceding Fathers, however, he claims to be only a *witness* with respect to the origin of the New Testament, stating what he had received. Born about twenty years after Clement (A.D. 186-254), he was connected by him, through Pantænus, even there in Alexandria, to say nothing of other lines of communication open to him, immediately with the Apostolic age.

What this Father says concerning the Canon of the New Testament has been preserved for the most part only in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.² "There are," he remarks, "four Gospels only uncontroverted in the Church of God spread under heaven. Peter has left one epistle generally acknowledged; and perhaps a second, for that is disputed. John wrote the Apocalypse and an epistle of very few lines; and it may be a second and third, since all do not admit them to be genuine." Of the epistle to the Hebrews, he says that "the thoughts are the thoughts of the Apostle Paul, . . . but who it was that wrote the epistle, God only knows certainly." His own opinion was that "the diction and composition were those of some one who recorded from memory the Apostle's teaching, and, as it were, illustrated with a brief commentary the sayings of his master." He quotes the Epistles of James and Jude, at the same time, however, noting the doubts that had been expressed concerning their canonicity. To Paul's Epistles he alludes only in general

His testimony to the New Testament books.

¹ Westcott, *Bib. in Church*, p. 134.

² vi. 25.

terms, to the effect that he wrote brief epistles to certain of the churches which he visited.

This, then, is the sum of Origen's teachings on this subject: "He was acquainted with all the books which are received at present, and received as Apostolic those ^{Sum of his teachings.} which were recognized by Clement of Alexandria. The others he used, but with a certain reserve and hesitation arising *from a want of information as to their history*, rather than from any positive ground of suspicion."¹ With respect to apocryphal writings, he clearly distinguished the four Gospels from all other similar productions, and considered them alone canonical.² And, while he quotes the Apostolic Fathers and treats with respect the "Shepherd," it is with a distinct recognition of their inferiority to the Scriptures.³ With Origen originated the term "*ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*," — "the New Covenant" (Testament). And Tregelles, speaking from personal examination, says that though a large number of his works are lost, and those that we possess are defective, yet, in the extant Greek writings of this Father alone, may be found, simply in the form of citations, at least two-thirds of the New Testament.⁴

Beyond this point, we shall not proceed in this direction at present. We have found in the important witness ^{General retrospect.} just heard as fair a representation of the state of the New Testament Canon at this particular period as is attainable under the circumstances. His testimony is in perfect harmony with that which has preceded, although it may advance a step beyond it, and be of the nature of a summary. There were still certain books concerning which the whole Church was not of one mind. But there is no book belonging to the New Testament, as now constituted, which was not then at hand with its supporters to put in a claim to the enhanced honor of canonicity. While, on the other hand, there was no book, *not found* at present in our collection, which was then able to pass the trying ordeal by which such honor was alone to be attained.

¹ Westcott's Hist. of N. T. Can., p. 312-318.

² Hom. in Luc., i., 1.

³ Bleek's Introd., II. 250. Cf. Hilgenfeld, id., p. 49.

⁴ Lect. on Hist. Ev., p. 14

It is generally admitted, even by those who show the least reverence for the New Testament, that, from near the close of the second century, it was essentially composed of the books which it now has, and was regarded by the Church with that superlative respect accorded only to works of supposed inspiration. Here, indeed, it might perhaps be safe, although our object were only an apologetic one, to rest the question of the genuineness of these sacred writings. Any ordinary ancient book would be thought well supported with a defence even less complete. The witnesses already cited are separated from the Apostolic age but by a single vital link or two, which links were themselves spontaneous conductors of its cherished life and teachings. Perfect demonstration on such a subject will always be impossible. Certain books of the New Testament will always have less external evidence in their support than others. Religious doubts can never be wholly conquered by historic evidence. It has seemed good to the All-Wise One to enhance the awfulness of moral truth, and preserve its superiority to all other forms of truth, by leaving open avenues of apparent escape from it. While comparatively few distinctively religious people ever take the trouble to inquire for the historic evidence that supports the records of their faith, the records themselves to them being sufficient evidence; or rather, with one of the Apostolic Fathers, they are inclined to say: "To me, Jesus Christ is the sum* of all records; my inviolable records are his Cross and Death and Resurrection, and the Faith through Him."¹

But we have not yet by any means reached the limit of facts relating to our subject. There is, happily, no necessity for leaving, at this point, the sphere of history for that of apologetics. Amidst the confused and mutilated monuments of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age, we may expect, at least, to trace the outline and feel the solid substance of one abutment of the historic arch just now examined, on which the structure of the New Testament Canon firmly rests; while the other we shall doubtless discover in the still later period of Eusebius, Athanasius, and the early councils.

Other important facts remain.

¹ Ignat. ad Philad. viii.

Hitherto we have been attending chiefly to witnesses who had seen and been instructed by those who had seen and been instructed by the Apostles; we go now, step by step, back to the original authorities themselves. If we may not, in the nature of the case, look for one authoritative collection of New Testament books in this earlier age, we may expect to find these books associated in naturally affiliating classes; or, at least, traces of them as existing by themselves, the original elements of the subsequent crystallization; and the obvious convergency of books and facts alike to one generative point.

Justin Martyr was born at Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, a city of Samaria, toward the close of the first century (c. 90-100). His father was a Greek. He himself, ^{Justin} ^{Martyr.} in early life, was a Platonist, not having embraced Christianity till A.D. 132. Having somewhere met a venerable disciple of Jesus who had enjoined upon him prayer before all things, that the gates of light might be opened unto him, a new "fire was kindled" in his soul, and he found, after all, that Christianity—above the teaching of Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, or even Plato—was the true philosophy, and he at once became one of its most zealous propagators and defenders.

His works on Christianity were written mainly in the decade after A.D. 140; Hilgenfeld says, A.D. 147. ^{His works} ^{and their} ^{import.} Two apologies, and a dialogue with a Jew by the name of Trypho, are regarded without hesitation as his genuine productions. In arguing for the divinity of the Christian system, whether with Jew or Pagan, he mainly rested on the external facts of Christianity, especially such as clustered about the life of its Founder. Nearly all the principal events of the Master's life, indeed, may be gathered from his writings. He makes less use of John's Gospel than of the other three, from the nature of his aim, but still clearly shows acquaintance with it. Davidson strangely says that Justin's application of the Logos doctrine (of John) to the synoptic Jesus, proves that he was *unacquainted* with the development of that doctrine in the fourth Gospel!¹ Other critics, how-

¹ Introd. to N. T., ii. 511.

It is generally admitted, even by those who show the least reverence for the New Testament, that, from near the close of the second century, it was essentially composed of the books which it now has, and was regarded by the Church with that superlative respect accorded only to works of supposed inspiration. Here, indeed, it might perhaps be safe, although our object were only an apologetic one, to rest the question of the genuineness of these sacred writings. Any ordinary ancient book would be thought well supported with a defence even less complete. The witnesses already cited are separated from the Apostolic age but by a single vital link or two, which links were themselves spontaneous conductors of its cherished life and teachings. Perfect demonstration on such a subject will always be impossible. Certain books of the New Testament will always have less external evidence in their support than others. Religious doubts can never be wholly conquered by historic evidence. It has seemed good to the All-Wise One to enhance the awfulness of moral truth, and preserve its superiority to all other forms of truth, by leaving open avenues of apparent escape from it. While comparatively few distinctively religious people ever take the trouble to inquire for the historic evidence that supports the records of their faith, the records themselves to them being sufficient evidence; or rather, with one of the Apostolic Fathers, they are inclined to say: "To me, Jesus Christ is the sum*of all records; my inviolable records are his Cross and Death and Resurrection, and the Faith through Him."¹

But we have not yet by any means reached the limit of facts relating to our subject. There is, happily, no necessity for leaving, at this point, the sphere of history for that of apologetics. Amidst the confused and mutilated monuments of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age, we may expect, at least, to trace the outline and feel the solid substance of one abutment of the historic arch just now examined, on which the structure of the New Testament Canon firmly rests; while the other we shall doubtless discover in the still later period of Eusebius, Athanasius, and the early councils.

Canon essentially determined at this time.

Other important facts remain.

¹ Ignat. ad Philad. viii.

Hitherto we have been attending chiefly to witnesses who had seen and been instructed by those who had seen and been instructed by the Apostles; we go now, step by step, back to the original authorities themselves. If we may not, in the nature of the case, look for one authoritative collection of New Testament books in this earlier age, we may expect to find these books associated in naturally affiliating classes; or, at least, traces of them as existing by themselves, the original elements of the subsequent crystallization; and the obvious convergency of books and facts alike to one generative point.

Justin Martyr was born at Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, a city of Samaria, toward the close of the first century (c. 90-100). His father was a Greek. He himself, ^{Justin Martyr.} in early life, was a Platonist, not having embraced Christianity till A.D. 132. Having somewhere met a venerable disciple of Jesus who had enjoined upon him prayer before all things, that the gates of light might be opened unto him, a new "fire was kindled" in his soul, and he found, after all, that Christianity—above the teaching of Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, or even Plato—was the true philosophy, and he at once became one of its most zealous propagators and defenders.

His works on Christianity were written mainly in the decade after A.D. 140; Hilgenfeld says, A.D. 147. ^{His works and their import.} Two apologies, and a dialogue with a Jew by the name of Trypho, are regarded without hesitation as his genuine productions. In arguing for the divinity of the Christian system, whether with Jew or Pagan, he mainly rested on the external facts of Christianity, especially such as clustered about the life of its Founder. Nearly all the principal events of the Master's life, indeed, may be gathered from his writings. He makes less use of John's Gospel than of the other three, from the nature of his aim, but still clearly shows acquaintance with it. Davidson strangely says that Justin's application of the Logos doctrine (of John) to the synoptic Jesus, proves that he was *unacquainted* with the development of that doctrine in the fourth Gospel!¹ Other critics, how-

¹ Introd. to N. T., ii. 511.

ever, holding the same general attitude towards the Scripture as he, have felt obliged virtually to admit such acquaintance and use.¹

Justin calls the authorities to which he refers the "Memoirs of the Apostles," and that he means the four Gospels References to our Gospels. by that phrase is evident from a peculiar remark made by him in a certain place: "The Apostles in the Memoirs (things related) made by them, which are called Gospels, have handed down," &c.² And elsewhere: "In the Memoirs which I say were composed by the Apostles, and those who followed them" (Luke and Mark). It is not at all improbable that he was sometimes influenced by an oral tradition, still fresh in his time, with respect to the form which he gave to facts cited. All his facts, however, not directly referable to our Gospels are said not to exceed six in number,³ and there is but one not in substantial agreement with them, and that might possibly be accounted for by a variation of manuscripts.⁴

Westcott thus sums up his testimony to our Gospels, to Summary of testimony. which, probably "to suit a literary taste," Justin referred under the name of "Memoirs." They were many, yet one; they were called Gospels; they contained a record of all things concerning Jesus Christ; they were admitted by Christians generally; were read in their public services; were of apostolical authority, though not exclusively of apostolical authorship; they contained nothing which our Gospels do not now essentially contain.⁵

The desperateness of the attempt made in recent times to Desperation of opponents. set aside the testimony of Justin as being valueless for the defence of our canonical Gospels, on the ground that he alludes in his "Memoirs" to other works than these, appears from the nature of the conclusions to which such a supposition would lead us. Irenæus, who, as we have seen, testified, along with Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian to just our four Gospels as authoritative and acknowledged by the Church, must have already been in mature life before Justin died. So that if Justin did not mean the Gospels of Mat-

¹ Hilgenfeld, *id.*, p. 28. Cf. Credner, *id.*, sect. 3.

² *Apol.* i. 66.

³ Fisher, *Hist. of Supernat.*, p. 50.

⁴ Westcott, *Bib. in Ch.*, p. 102.

⁵ *Id.*

thew, Mark, Luke, and John, when he spoke of the "Mémoires," we are obliged to infer that within a very brief period "an entire change of Gospels was made throughout all the different and distant provinces of the Roman empire, at a time when concerted action through General Councils was unknown; and that, too, in so silent a manner that no record of it remains in the history of the Church."¹ And we have already seen, moreover, that Marcion (A.D. 130-150) had found in his time the Gospels holding a high place in the estimation of Christians, and, until he elaborated his own heretical system, had doubtless received them himself as authoritative.² And Tatian, moreover, himself in early life a convert and disciple of Justin Martyr, although afterwards leader of an heretical sect, wrote a harmony of the Gospels, entitled "Diatessarōn" "of the Four,"³ doubtless from the fact that the narrative of Christ's life was represented by four separate accounts. The same writer, it may be noticed incidentally, definitely recognizes the genuineness of Paul's epistle to Titus, besides referring to Romans, Corinthians, and the Apocalypse.⁴

Besides the Gospels, Justin Martyr shows acquaintance by allusions in his writings, more or less distinct, with all the remaining books of the New Testament except the Catholic epistles and those to Philemon and Titus. To the Apocalypse, it is worthy of notice, he refers by name; and, in speaking of Christ, calls him "Apostle" of God, a peculiar term, applied to our Lord nowhere in the New Testament except in the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁵

The anonymous Epistle to Diognetus, assigned to near the same period (c. 117), and still extant in its original Greek form, supports and supplements the testimony of Justin Martyr in some particulars, especially in the clearness of the impression which it has received from the Fourth Gospel. And the Clementine Homilies (c. 160) contain an undoubted reference to John xix. 22, as well as to the other three evangelists. Hilgenfeld admits this. And Davidson

¹ Barrows, *Compan. to Bib.*, p. 42.

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*, pp. 145-147. *Vs.* Hilgenfeld, *id.*, p. 27.

⁴ Bleek, *Introd. to N. T.*, ii. 240.

⁵ Westcott, *Hist. of N. T. Can.*, pp. 277-282

reluctantly yields the first point with the observation that "it is remarkable that this Jewish-Christian writer, whose entire mode of thinking was so different from the genius of this Gospel, should have taken it as one of his acknowledged documents."¹

Our next witness is the Gnostic Basilides. It is claimed that he lived "not long after the time of the Apostles" (c. 130). He wrote a commentary upon the Gospels in twenty-four books, the false teaching of which was pointed out in the lost work of Agrippa Castor. Our authority for what Basilides wrote is Hippolytus, a Christian martyr of the early part of the third century (c. 230), who is, however, supported, in this respect, by extracts found also in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

The testimony of Basilides is of special importance as showing that already, in his time, at least in the opinion of some, the New Testament writings deserved the title, and had attained to the rank of "inspired" works. This writer, not, it is to be supposed, wholly on his own responsibility, refers to Romans viii. 22, and 2 Corinthians xii. 4, under the formula "it is written," — especially employed in quoting from the Old Testament, — and expressly cites the first Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 13) as "Scripture."² Even his limited extant works, covering but a few pages in all, show acquaintance, moreover, with three of the Gospels, including that of John, Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, and Colossians, besides those already mentioned, perhaps one to Timothy (1st), and the first Epistle of Peter. Davidson, while admitting the fact that parts of the New Testament are here honored with the title of "Scripture," affirms that it was some disciple of Basilides, and not the teacher himself, to whom Hippolytus refers; since as Justin Martyr, Polycarp, and Ignatius, did not cite the New Testament writings as "Scripture," therefore, Basilides could not have done so.³

We come next to Papias. He was bishop at Hierapoliis in the early part of the second century (wrote c. 140-150), and is the first ecclesiastical writer who gives

Papias.

¹ Introd. to N. T., ii. 514. Cf. Hilgenfeld, id., p. 29.

² Hipp. Ref. of All Her., vii., c. 13, 14.

³ Introd. to N. T., ii. 514.

any detailed account of our Gospels. He had himself been, according to some, a hearer of the Apostle John, along with Polycarp and others who had enjoyed that privilege. He was at least at no considerable remove from him. Papias wrote a work entitled "An Exposition of Oracles of the Lord based on the teaching of the Elders." By the "teaching of the Elders," he does not probably refer to our Gospels. "I used to inquire," he says, "when I met any one who had been acquainted with the Elders, of the teaching of the Elders,— what Andrew or Peter had said, or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples."¹ His aim, rather, in this work, seems to have been to expound some of our Lord's words in the light of current traditions, which he had made a point of collecting for that end. These traditions suited his purpose better than existing works which had been composed with an object similar to his own, *i.e.*, for interpretation and comment.² Papias, however, does not altogether overlook the written Gospels, although his main purpose did not lead him to make them the sources of his illustrations. Of two of them he speaks definitely.

Of the first he says, in this treatise, that it was written by Matthew originally in Hebrew (Aramaic), and that each one interpreted it as he was able, leaving us to ^{His testi-}mony. infer that already, in his time, a Greek transcript had been made. Of Mark he testifies that, according to the Elder, Mark wrote his Gospel under the direction of Peter.³ The character of his work would naturally not call for special reference to the Gospel of John, and the question is in dispute whether he does so. Westcott, however, holds the affirmative.⁴ It is not certain, moreover, that he did not have the narrative of Luke in his possession, and shape the introduction of his own work with reference to the peculiar one of this evangelist.⁵ To go further, however, and say that Papias began his work with an elaborate adverse criticism of Luke's Gospel, having his fling at that writer's allusion to "the many" (? πολλοί) who had taken in hand the same work, while he (Papias) preferred to

¹ Euseb. H. E., iii. 39. ² Westcott, *Bib. in Church*, p. 95; *vs.* Hilgenfeld, *id.*, pp. 14-16

³ Euseb., *id.* ⁴ *Hist. of N. T. Can.*, p. 65. ⁵ Reuss, *id.*, sect. 287, n.

confine himself to the truth than run after the testimony of "those who told many things," is to import into the first century a characteristic development of the nineteenth, and endow this simple-minded writer with a capacity for finical objections and adroit manipulation of evidence which is the disheartening product of eighteen hundred years of inquiry in this field.¹ Besides, the force of Papias's criticism in that case, were such a criticism to be supposed, would rest on a misinterpretation of both Luke's language and spirit. In addition to the Gospels, Papias used the first Epistle of John, and the first of Peter, and beyond doubt treated the Apocalypse as an inspired work. Westcott suggests that his ultra-Jewish training may have stood in the way of his appealing to the Epistles of Paul and the Acts, — although the supposed recognition of Luke would be a *quasi* indorsement of Paul, — but that his silence in this respect is fully balanced by the course of Marcion, who excluded from his Canon all *save* these Epistles.²

From Papias, the next step toward the first age brings us to the interesting circle of Apostolic Fathers. The first of these to whom we shall direct our attention is Barnabas, if, indeed, he can properly be classed among them. He may possibly be identified with the Levite of Cyprus mentioned in the Acts.³ An extant writing of his, in the form of an epistle in Greek, was discovered by Tischendorf in connection with the Sinaitic manuscript. It had previously been known only in a Latin version. A special interest attaches to this document from the fact that in its original Greek form, as well as in the Latin translation, it recognizes the canonical authority of one of the New Testament books, and is the first known instance of such recognition in history. A similar expression employed by Polycarp (Ep. c. xii.) in referring to Eph. iv. 26, existing only in a Latin text, is not regarded by all scholars as trustworthy. Using the formula ordinarily employed in citing from the Old Testament Scriptures, Barnabas says: "Let us beware lest we be found" [fulfilling that saying], "as it is written, 'Many are called, but few are

¹ Hilgenfeld, id., pp. 16, 21.

² Hist. of N. T. Can., p. 63.

³ Reuss, id., sect. 234. Cf. Westcott, id., p. 38.

chosen.'”¹ It is a remarkable circumstance, which should be noticed in this connection, that Barnabas also is the only one of the Apostolic Fathers who, in quoting from the Old Testament, designates the parts into which it was divided, or alludes to them by name. In other words, particularity of citation seems to have been characteristic, and hence should not surprise us with respect to that just noted.

The only escape which Davidson can find from this important fact, which is generally conceded, is in the declaration that Barnabas stands alone in the use of this Davidson's objection. formula, and that he may have believed that this sentence was found in the Old Testament Canon! The same critic thinks that Barnabas could not have known any thing of the Gospel of John, because, in mentioning the fact of the casting of lots for Christ's garments, he did not allude to the circumstance of its being a *seamless* coat!² Two instances are mentioned where it is supposed that Barnabas makes use of other than our canonical Gospels, though one of these does not appear in the Greek text, and the other seems to be an adaptation rather than a direct citation of a passage from Matthew. Hilgenfeld, however, asserts that he uses the apocryphal book of Enoch as Scripture (*γραφή*),³ although the Latin at this place reads “Daniel,” in place of “Enoch.”

The remaining three Apostolic Fathers, so called, Polycarp, Clement of Rome (Phil. iv. 3), and Ignatius, — Polycarp, Clement, and Ignatius. although they generally quote anonymously, treating the New Testament like the Old in this particular; ordinarily testify to the substance rather than the form of the Apostolic writings; sometimes, though very rarely, use the sayings of the Master coming to them through oral tradition, rather than the written record (there is one instance in Ignatius, besides that in the epistle of Barnabas); look as yet perhaps upon the Old Testament as the complete and abiding record of divine revelation, — still regarded the Apostolic writings as a superior class to their own; ⁴ referred definitely to them whenever such definite reference could have been naturally expected, and, even

¹ Ep. cc. iv. vi. Cf. Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14.

² Introd. to N. T., ii. 509, 510.

³ Der Kan., &c., p. 10.

⁴ Bib. in Ch., pp. 87, 88.

in their contemporaneous and exceedingly limited writings, discover allusions to nearly the whole New Testament, at least, to all its great features, and everywhere show that they were mainly governed in their own doctrinal teaching by that authority.

It is to be considered that the New Testament books naturally fall into certain comparatively distinct classes Sum of references. with respect to authorship, doctrinal teaching, and other characteristics. Whatever may be true of the citation of separate books, all these separate classes of books and types of doctrine are recognized by the Apostolic Fathers. But it can be shown, too, that, besides the notices of the Gospel mentioned above, there are distinct traces in these fragmentary records of Romans, I. and II. Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, I. and II. Timothy, Hebrews, James, I. Peter, I. John; the Epistles to Thessalonians, Colossians, Titus, and Philemon less certainly; while the impression of Jude, II. and III. John, II. Peter, and the Apocalypse, does not reveal itself.¹

These references, it is to be specially remarked, are Character of these references. scarcely, in any instance, literal quotations, never direct appeals to heighten the force of an argument or gain the support of something authoritative, but a part of the very substance of the writings with which they have been interwoven, as much as the web is part of the cloth, betraying, as well on the part of the readers as writers, the greatest familiarity with these writings, and an utter unconsciousness of design. It should be considered, moreover, that while a coincidence of language between the Apostolic Fathers and that of our Gospels, if not expressly cited as from them, might perchance *be held* to show an acquaintance merely with a current oral tradition; a marked coincidence in language with an *epistle*, on the other hand, by the very necessities of the case, must be understood to imply a knowledge of such epistle, from which source alone it could rationally be judged to have been derived.

It is especially satisfactory to find at this point indications

¹ Westcott, id., p. 85. Cf. Guericke's *Isagogik*, &c., p. 569.

of the presence and influence of books, of which, in a later age, the trace is sometimes partially lost. Clement of Rome (c. 95), for instance, seems to have been fully imbued with the teachings of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "Let us," he says in one case (ch. xvii.), "be imitators also of those, who, in goat-skins and sheep-skins, went about proclaiming the coming of Christ."¹ The authorship of the epistle, indeed, has been ascribed to Clement, on the ground of this remarkable familiarity with its teachings. And the same Father, according to Westcott, in writing on justification, also uses illustrations peculiar to St. James.²

Ignatius, again (c. 107), in the best supported of his extant epistles, makes the most undoubted allusions to the characteristic teachings of St. John in the fourth Gospel, speaking of Christ as the "Eternal Word," the "Door" by which we come to the Father, the "Bread of God," &c.³

And Polycarp (c. 107) borrowed expressions from the Epistle of John, as is generally admitted, and so, by inference, was acquainted with the Gospel as well.

The qualitative value of this kind of evidence,—by reference, quotation, and incidental allusion, which we have now cursorily traced through a single century, next to, and in part including, that of the Apostles,—with respect to the support that it gives to the alleged genuineness of the New Testament writings, can scarcely be over-estimated. And it is hardly too much to say, including *all* the witnesses of the second century, that, in the abundance and precision of it, it is little less than infallible. "It is not the evidence of witnesses first schooled and cautioned, and then brought into court to do their best for the party by whom they are summoned. But it is the purely incidental testimony of unconnected persons, who, in the pursuit of their particular objects, gather up and present to us the facts we are in search of. Besides, these facts have a peculiarity which renders them eminently capable of furnishing concise and conclusive proof. A book is an aggregate of many thousand separate parts, each

¹ Heb. xi. 37.

² Bib. in Ch., p. 75.

³ V's. Davidson's Introd. to N T., ii. 514. Cf. Hilgenfeld, id., p. 31.

of which, both by the thought it contains, and by the choice and arrangement of the words, possesses a distinct individuality, such as fits it for the purpose of defining or identifying the whole to which it belongs; and if several of these definite parts are adduced, the identification is rendered more than complete.”¹

We now return again to that period in which the Canon of the New Testament, in its successive stages of growth, Period of Eusebius, Athanasius, and the early councils. began to assume, throughout, definite and clear outline, and the writings of the Apostles and their inspired companions to be regarded generally in the Church as possessing the same authority as that which had been written by “holy men of old.”

We have already seen that Origen — who was born A.D. 186, Canon takes its present form. less than a hundred years after the death of the last Apostle, holding therefore about the same relation to them with respect to time that we hold to the American Revolution, and between whom and the Apostolic age there existed such substantial intermediate links as Tertullian, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, the great Versions of the East and of the West, and the several Fathers just mentioned, who were partially contemporaneous with the Apostles — already so far recognized the exclusive claim of the New Testament Canon, as to indicate what part of the Christian literature of his time was universally received as canonical without controversy; what part was controverted by some; and, at least by inference, what books were wholly excluded from the catalogue of inspired works.

The first class embraced the great majority of the books Position of Origen. which now compose the New Testament; the second included II. Peter, II. and III. John, and the Epistles of James and Jude. Concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, he only indicates an uncertainty as to authorship. With respect to the third class, he does not express himself decisively; but there is no evidence that he favored the absolute rejection of any book of our catalogue, or the reception into it of any book not now reckoned as canonical. For doctrinal purposes,

¹ I. Taylor, *Historic Proof*, pp. 21, 22.

however, he judged it best to make use only of those books of whose genuineness there could be no doubt. With respect to the remainder, he was willing to allow to others what he claimed for himself,—liberty to “prove all things and hold fast that which is good.”¹

We stand now, at a point near the middle of the third century (A.D. 254), to which the testimony of Origen extends. For the next fifty years we find but little of ^{A.D. 254.} importance to chronicle respecting the growth of the Canon in the Church. It had reached a stage, indeed, where its development within brief periods might be less perceptible than formerly; although it is evident that, at no time until it attained its acme, was it wholly stationary. The matter which it now most concerns us to know is the judgment of the Church on writings whose claims have been hitherto but partially admitted. And here, at least, we find satisfactory progress; while with respect to that portion of the New Testament already generally attested, excepting the Apocalypse alone, there is palpable, though less noticeable, movement in one direction.

In Asia Minor, and especially at Alexandria, the line between the “disputed” books and all “apocryphal” ^{Disputed books.} literature is more and more clearly discriminated, and even II. Peter seems at length to come forth from its comparative obscurity. There is a doubtful reference to this book in Polycarp,² not yet noticed; affinities of language in Clement of Rome;³ but in Firmilian (A.D. 256) we find what appears to be a distinct recognition of the existence of the epistle; and in Melito, of Sardis, at a still earlier period (c. 176), an almost certain adaptation of 2 Pet. iii. 5–7.⁴

But the early part of the fourth century is especially marked in the history of the Canon by several im- ^{Period, how marked.} portant circumstances. The persecution of Diocletian (A.D. 303), directed particularly against the sacred books of the Church, and so incidentally leading to a more definite

¹ Com. on Matt., sect. xxviii. Cf. Bib. in Ch., p. 137.

² c. iii. Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 15.

³ c. xi. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6–9.

⁴ Tregelles, Lect. on Hist. Ev., p. 58; Bib. in Ch., p. 138, n. Cf. Westcott's Hist. Can. N. T., p. 194.

decision as to their limits; the very important testimony of the historian, Eusebius, to the contents of the Canon; the establishment of a noted manuscript library of Christian literature at Cæsarea (A.D. 309); and nearly synchronizing with the last, and doubtless to some degree dependent upon it, the preparation of some of those great Uncials which have come down to our day. As we have already noticed, Tischendorf himself, considers it not improbable, that the Sinaitic manuscript (*Aleph*) was one of those which, by order of Constantine (A.D. 331), Eusebius prepared for public use in the churches of Constantinople.¹ By means of these manuscripts the period between that time and our own is absolutely bridged, and by a single step, as it were, we are thus brought face to face with the deliberate and crystallized opinions of the Church concerning the authoritative limits of the New Testament in the age to which such MSS. belong. Under the influence of this consideration we may carry on the concluding investigations of the present chapter.

As a result of the order of Diocletian, embracing, among Effects of Diocletian persecution. other things, the destruction by fire of all copies of the Scriptures, Christians were forced to give up such manuscripts of the New Testament as they might have in their possession, or suffer the consequences of contumacy. Some yielded and were branded by their fellow-disciples with the epithet "traditores" (traitors), a word which bears its testimony to our own time; others ostensibly complied with the order, but really delivered up only apocryphal, or heretical, "useless" writings, and so generally escaped the public censure of the Church. So hotly did the discussion, stirred up by the conflicting views and practice of the discipleship on this subject, rage, that an important schism sprang out of it, the schismatic party, Donatists (A.D. 329) demanding a more strict construction of the term *traditor*, and more rigorous dealing with such as, by their conduct, had justified the title. Out of this conflict with the civil power on the one hand, and among Christians themselves on the other, while no authoritative and judicial decision of the Church on the limits of the

¹ *Vs. Bib. in Ch.*, p. 158.

Canon, and no apparent discussion respecting *that particular point*, was evoked, it is evident that, practically, those limits became more nicely discriminated and firmly established.

Augustine (A.D. 353-430), in controversy with the Donatists, declares that both they and the rest of the Church (*i.e.*, in North Africa) admitted the Canonical Scriptures, which in general terms he defines as the Gospels, the Apostolic epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse of John.¹ From the fact that he elsewhere ascribes fourteen epistles to Paul, — so including that to the Hebrews, — it is not improbable that he means to include it here; and, if so, he indicates all those books, and only those books, which we now find in the New Testament of our English Bibles.² Augustine.

Eusebius — born in Palestine about a dozen years after the death of Origen (c. 270); a friend of Pamphilus, by whom the manuscript library at Cæsarea was collected; an eye-witness of the Diocletian persecution — is chiefly known through an ecclesiastical history which he wrote, the first of any considerable extent relating to the early Church. This history is yet preserved, and of course its testimony to the Canon, if any, ought to be found of much importance. Such testimony is not lacking. It comes to us, moreover, it will be observed, from a different ecclesiastical centre from that to which we have just been attending. Eusebius.

We give, in full, the passage in which his opinion on the entire subject is announced:³ “Now this appears to be a suitable place to give a summary statement of the books of the New Testament which I have already mentioned. In the first place, then, we must put the holy quaternion of the Gospels; these are followed by the Acts of the Apostles; then we must mention the [fourteen] epistles of Paul; then we must place the acknowledged first Epistle of John, and, similarly, the admitted Epistle of Peter; after this may be placed, if it appear suitable, the Apocalypse of John; the various opinions about which we Opinion respecting the New Testament books.

¹ Ep. cxxix. 3, by Bib. in Ch., p. 145.

² H. E., iii. 24, 25.

³ De Doctr. Chr., ii. 12, 13, by same, p. 186.

shall set forth in proper time. And these are amongst the books universally acknowledged (*homologoumena*).

“Now of opposed books (*antilegomena*) which are, however, acknowledged similarly by the most, are reckoned the epistle called that of James, and that of Jude, and the II. of Peter, and those named II. and III. John, whether they really belong to him, or to some other of that name.

“Amongst *spurious* writings are reckoned the ‘Acts of Paul’ (apocryphal), and the book called the ‘Shepherd,’ and the ‘Apocalypse of Peter,’ and also the ‘Epistle of Barnabas,’ and what are called the ‘Instructions of the Apostles;’ and also, as I said, if such a view appear correct, the ‘Apocalypse of John,’ which some reject, while others reckon it among the books ‘acknowledged.’ We may add that some placed in this class, also, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to which those Hebrews who have received the Christ are especially attached.”

He afterwards gives reasons why he mentions these apocryphal works, “which, though they are not in the New Testament, but in fact controverted,” he cites, because of their frequent use by ecclesiastical writers. Of other writings which impostors had tried to palm off as genuine productions of the Apostles, the Gospel of Peter, &c., he says that “they are not to be classed even among *spurious* books, but wholly set aside, as every way absurd (*ἄτοπα*) and impious.”

With respect to this statement of Eusebius, it should be considered that he purports to give, as a result of his gleanings from various ecclesiastical writers who were contemporaneous with or had preceded him, the *common judgment* respecting the Canon. He appeals to no Church rule, because, as yet, there was none except that of tacit consent and common usage. He simply did what we, in this chapter, have been seeking to do. And while he may have us at some disadvantage in being himself more nearly contiguous to the writers on whom he depends, this advantage is perhaps more than counterbalanced by the fact that he is

Antilegomena.

Spurious.

Reasons for citing apocryphal works.

Bearing of this general statement.

too near, too much a part of the ecclesiastical movements which he describes, to pronounce a wholly just and dispassionate decision upon the case before him. He could not estimate as well as we what would be lost to the Church by losing the Epistles of James and that to the Hebrews, or the Apocalypse; how much they contribute to the harmony and completeness of the collection. "He could not feel, as those of a later day can do, the complete unity and fulness of the New Testament, which had but lately assumed its final shape."¹

From Eusebius, then, we learn that, in his time, all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament as at present constituted, and no others, were acknowledged Sum of his teachings. by the majority of Christians as authoritative; that there was discrimination exercised in the selection, and hence, certain of these books, being less fully supported, — it may be historically, as II. Peter; or as being of doubtful authorship, as Hebrews, II. and III. John, James, and Jude; or as presenting internal difficulties, although historically well supported, as the Apocalypse, — were received by some with hesitation, or wholly refused a place with the rest. His own judgment was in favor of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and of the Apocalypse he prophesied that, "in due course," its authority would be "decided by the *testimony of the ancients.*" The II. Epistle of Peter he affirms is "strongly supported;" II. and III. John, "gainsaid." In his writings, he quotes all the books of the New Testament except, perhaps, Jude, II. Peter, and II. and III. John.

It will be noticed, as has been previously shown, that most of these "disputed" books are those whose authors, Probable ground of objection to certain books. for reasons unknown to us, did not choose to announce themselves, or lay claim to Apostolic authority, which was the admitted test of canonicity.² Who they really were could only be learned from characteristics of style and a tradition somewhat wavering. That, under such circumstances, these books should take their place in the collection latest, and only after the sharpest scrutiny, was to have been expected. That they finally found a place there — apposite, and generally

¹ Westcott, Bib. in Ch., pp. 154, 294.

² Cf. Hofmann, d. Heil. Schrift N. T., p. 8.

acknowledged to be fitting — was doubtless due to the reason that they were, at last, discovered to speak with a divine wisdom and power not to be mistaken.

This same Eusebius, by order of Constantine A.D. 332, prepared, as we have said, fifty elegant copies of the Scriptures for public use in Constantinople. The contents of these Bibles confirms what has been already said of the general harmony of opinion respecting the constitution of the Canon at that time. The work being one of great importance and responsibility, we should expect to find, and probably do find, in these Bibles the final and ripened judgment of Eusebius on this subject. Hence, it is an interesting fact that we see the difference between the “universally acknowledged” and “controverted” books almost entirely obliterated under these new conditions; and in the New Testament, prepared by royal authority for the public indoctrination of the people, we find a place given to all the books of the present collection without invidious distinctions among them, with the sole exception of the Apocalypse, which, though historically one of the best supported of the catalogue, for reasons hereafter to be given, had somewhat declined in authority. Westcott thinks, however, that the Apocalypse *may have had a place in the appendix* of this Constantinopolitan Bible.¹ The full bloom of its recognition, at least, had not come, but it was near.

The next catalogue of the New Testament books to which we direct attention is that of Athanasius of Alexandria, who died A.D. 373. At the time when he published his list, he was metropolitan of Egypt. It was in the year A.D. 365. He saw peril to the Church, it should seem, in the free use of apocryphal books, which had become common. And, as he was accustomed to address to the churches of his province a yearly letter of instruction with respect to the movable festivals, he took the occasion of the thirty-ninth letter to express his views on the subject before us. For substance, they were as follows: Inasmuch as some had sought to mix apocryphal writings with the inspired Scripture, he would

¹ Bib. in Ch., p. 157.

publish the books which were admitted into the Canon, and were believed to be divine. It is thought by some not improbable that he was not satisfied with the indefinite conclusions in certain directions at which Eusebius, in his history, had arrived, and feared injurious effects from them.¹ Athanasius then proceeds to give lists of the books of the Old and New Testaments. The latter conforms to the catalogue, as we now possess it, in all respects, each book being distinctly named; and of these he remarks that in them the lessons of religion are announced, and concerning *them* it was said that no one should add to, or subtract from them. He makes no distinction whatever in rank among these books.

Of certain ecclesiastical literature, however, the "Shepherd," "Instructions of the Apostles," &c., he said that they were good for instruction, but not to be included in the Canon. It is an interesting fact that not only is this list exactly conterminous with that of our English New Testament, but the order is the same as that found in the oldest extant Greek manuscripts. The text of this document, moreover, is indisputable, being extant in its original Greek form, as well as in a Syriac translation.

It does not properly fall within the scope of the present work to trace the history of the New Testament writings as a collection farther downwards, especially as hereafter the genuineness of each separate book is to be investigated by itself. For a later history of the Canon, works already referred to may be consulted, particularly Westcott's excellent semi-popular treatise, the "Bible in the Church;" Cosin's "Scholastical History of Canon," 4to, London, 1657; or Vol. III. of Bishop Cosin's works, Oxford, 1849, — the latter being very full on the subject of Apocryphal literature and the decrees of the Council of Trent; the several excellent Cyclopædias and Bible Dictionaries; and the works of Reuss, Hilgenfeld, and Credner respectively.

In general terms, it may be said that, while Eusebius may be taken as a fair representative of contemporaneous opinions in the Eastern churches, where the question respecting the canonical authority of certain books

Ecclesiastical books.

Present history of Canon closed at this point.

Remains essentially the same after this date.

¹ Westcott, *id.*, p. 158. Cf. Hist. N. T. Can., p. 399, n.

remained longest open, so Athanasius in the churches of the West; and that, after their time, the principal part of the Eastern churches, excepting the Syrian branch alone, and the whole of the Western, have received and maintained the Canon in essentially the same form that it now has.

Jerome (A.D. 329-420), following, as he claims, the “custom of the ancient writers,” while noticing the fact that suspicion had formerly rested on certain books regarded, in his own time, as authoritative, still vigorously insists on the distinction between canonical and apocryphal works, and adopts, as properly belonging to the former class, the same list as Athanasius.¹

Augustine (A.D. 353-430), while admitting a difference in the amount of evidence to be found in favor of the different books, — some having the support of more churches than others, and some of churches of more influence than others, — yet adopts the same list that Athanasius and Jerome had accepted before him, and virtually, also, that of Eusebius and Origen.²

Up to this time, we have discovered no interposition of the authority of the Church as a body — or symptom of it, other than usage and general consent — to impose a Canon of its own making on the different communities of Christian churches. The confirmed judgment of individual Christians and churches, on the contrary, preceded and shaped the decisions of the Church. The Council of Hippo (A.D. 393) and those of Carthage (A.D. 397, 419) but sanctioned and ratified, as far as the subject was considered at all, what had already taken place spontaneously. It does not appear that the question of the limits of the Canon was even debated. It may have been once discussed in a small ecclesiastical gathering (synod);³ an insignificant, *ex parte* (Arian), Council at Laodicea, as late as c. 363, may have enjoined the reading of only canonical books in the churches, and have given a list of such books, although the latter point is disputed; still, it is true that the New Testament Canon

Relation of the Church and councils to the final result.

¹ Ep. ad Dard. cxxix., sect. 3. De Vir. Illust., ii. 4.

² De Doct. Chr., ii. 12, 13, by Bib. in Ch., p. 186.

³ Tertull. de Pudic. x.

was a silent, slow, uninterrupted, steady growth from first to last. And the very fragmentary character of the information at our command will itself serve to strengthen the conviction that the last result was neither one consciously willed from the beginning, nor one in its development according to an outwardly enforced rule.¹

Nor did the final unanimity of result any more spring out of a formal union of the principal churches, — although the development of the idea of the Church may have synchronized, to some extent, with the growth of the Canon, — but from the “*internal necessities* of the case. To ridicule the idea that the Church should, as by inspiration, finally have come to a clear understanding with regard to the Canon, or that some spiritual instinct came to its help, is wrong. An instinct it doubtless was, but the instinct of truth, in which an overruling Providence conceals himself, and, amid all seeming chance and in spite of all human error, leads the Church onward to true knowledge.”²

Several natural observations and inferences press upon us as we conclude the survey of the foregoing facts. It may be said first, in the way of a general summary, that the writings that make up our present New Testament are quoted in substance, or alluded to at one time or another, by an uninterrupted series of writers, both friendly and hostile, dating from the days of the Apostles to our own; that they are treated with special respect from the first; and, when the Apostles have personally disappeared and their oral teaching become an uncertain tradition, they ever rise to a plane of higher and higher estimation and reverence; that they are at an early date associated together, — first, in naturally affiliated classes, then, all together, in a distinct volume; that they are used in public religious assemblies, commentaries are written upon them, and versions made of them; like our own revered English translation, they are appealed to as the common arbiter by different sects; that they are brought into closest contact and minutest comparison with other ecclesiastical literature professing to be equally

A result of
Christian
instinct over-
ruled by
Divine
Providence.

Statements
and infer-
ences in con-
clusion.

¹ Cf. Reuss, id., sec. 3

² Herzog's Encyc., Art. Can. of N. T.

authoritative only to be set off from it by an ever-broadening line of demarcation ; and, finally, without constraining legislation, through a common recognition of the universal Christian consciousness, — wisdom here, as always, being justified of her children, — they are placed under the same canonical authority as the Old Testament Scriptures, and are understood to form, with them, one standard of Christian faith and practice.

Again, the New Testament writings furnish the only known legitimate source for the materials forming the staple of doctrine and life in the post-Apostolic age ; represent the only sufficient force adequate to produce the ecclesiastical and spiritual movements which specially characterize it. While, on the one hand, no interregnum is discoverable in Christianity, — perpetually represented from that birthday of spiritual power, the day of Pentecost, by a strong, enthusiastic Christian society, — within which these remarkable books might have been fabricated and published, it is apparent, on the other hand, that from their material alone, peculiar and easily identified, this unintermitted historic Christianity, in its every pattern and figure, could have been woven.

Moreover, the catalogues of the New Testament books, when at last they appear, are, as it were, the natural and orderly crystallization of all the widely scattered references of a multitude of ecclesiastical writers ; and while the process, from the nature of the case, was slow, the ever-acting law of combination was one and the same from the start. And, as in the crystallization of water all foreign substances are ultimately excluded, so in their eventual form these catalogues refused to receive whatever was not genuine ; that is, directly or indirectly Apostolic.

Hence, again, the fact of a comparatively slow growth of this Canon will not, in the thoughtful mind, militate against its correctness or authority ; but as being, under the circumstances, the most natural of all processes, will rather confirm them. This growth, like that of the plant, we may not be able wholly to explain in its various phenomena, or even to understand : but the elements and conditions of such growth may be easily indicated ; the law

The New Testament writings the only sufficient source of subsequent Christian doctrine and life.

Catalogues the crystallization of scattered references.

A slow growth the basis of correctness.

and the direction of it be clearly apprehended; its reality fully demonstrated. The circumstance that the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews were at first generally received, to be afterwards, on internal grounds, suspected and held aloof by some, is at most only an exception to the rule of the continuous growth of the Canon; and it is going too far to affirm, on the basis of the history of these two works, a *rule* that New Testament books not only sometimes become "Homologoumena" from being "antilegomena," but also "antilegomena" from "Homologoumena."¹ In truth, these books are not even exceptions to the common rule, if we confine our view to *historical evidence of genuineness only*. The wavering in the case of both books with respect to authorship, and the doubts which sprung from a too dogmatic treatment of the Apocalypse, did not avail to detach either work from the historic trunk on which their earliest growth began.

The treatment which the books of the New Testament received at the hands of the sceptics and heretics of the second century, is hardly to be explained except Testimony of heretics and sceptics. on the supposition that they are the actual productions of the age and the persons to which they are commonly assigned. These writers seek sometimes to damage these books by using them one against another, quote them as being contradictory, or as containing nothing new; they expunge certain passages, and even whole books which they cannot force into harmony with their doctrinal systems: but, with scarcely an exception, not a syllable is uttered in disproof of their historical claims to genuineness.²

It is to be considered, moreover, as a remarkable circumstance, that, in the matter of the acceptance or non-acceptance of a book of the New Testament as Historical evidence all in one direction. historically canonical, the evidence *in favor*, whether it be more or less, is, for the most part, all that is to be regarded, there being generally no proper, tangible evidence in rebuttal; and that the surmises and conjectures of the destructive critics have far less foundation, if any, in the incomplete

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Der Kan.*, &c., p. 72.

² Schumann's *Introd.*, pp. 94-96. Tregelles, *Lect. on Hist. Ev.*, p. 35.

and inconsistent nature of the evidence furnished, or any even alleged contradictory evidence produced from other quarters, than in the mere absence of certain evidence where it is arbitrarily presupposed it should be found. But "it is a violence done to common sense to leave in undiminished force one body of evidence, while, on hypothetical grounds, we draw conclusions with which that evidence can by no fair means be reconciled."¹

The inquiry may properly be made, too, by what rules of historic evidence the books of the New Testament — A question of consistency. speaking in general terms — can be proved to be otherwise than genuine, which could not be used with far greater facility and success against the whole body of classical literature; and, further, whether fair dealing would not demand of us, — if we assume the existence in ancient times of the extant *collection* of Cicero's letters, for instance, because some of these letters were quoted by ancient writers, — that we should admit the existence of the present extant *collection* of New Testament books, at least in their distinctive classes, as the epistles of Paul, &c., when, as may be proved, the great majority or even *all* of these books were referred to as genuine by contemporaneous authors, or by those but little subsequent to their time.

With respect to certain books of our present collection, it Discussion of the Canon; sufficient care and research. may be said that there was in early times sufficient discussion and diversity of opinion — although, generally, on other than historical grounds — to disprove the assertion that the Canon was established without freedom of thought, without discrimination, sincerity of purpose, or careful research.

Any doubts which may still exist concerning the genuineness of any one or more of the New Testament books, after the evidence is all in, should not be sufficient to extend to the rest. Doubts concerning one book should not extend to the rest. referred to cast a shadow of uncertainty on the remainder, concerning which the proof is acknowledged to be abundant and indisputable.

¹ I. Taylor, *Process of Hist. Proof*, pp. 115, 116. Cf. Tregelles, *Lect. on Hist. Ev.*, pp. 28, 68.

While such writers as Lardner and Bleek would have a twofold Canon, the first including the universally acknowledged books, — the “Homologoumena” of Eusebius, — the second, the “Antilegomena” or “disputed books,” such as have, in different degrees, an *external support only less full and complete*, like James, II. and III. John, Jude, II. Peter, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse; still, they see no sufficient reason for excluding any of the latter from the Canon altogether, and much less for receiving into it, in whatever rank, any of those other numerous writings of Christian antiquity which were used now and then, in the early Church, and rarely, even as possessing Scriptural authority.

A twofold
Canon re-
commended
by some.

And again, while *sufficient* external evidence to establish with reasonable assurance the canonicity of the most poorly supported of the books of our catalogue can be produced, and not one is by any means to be yielded without more evidence than is yet discoverable against it, yet it may be said that the total exclusion from the New Testament of the so-called “disputed books,” would not only not seriously affect the proof for the remainder, but not sensibly invalidate the Christian system, or withdraw any peculiar or essential element from its doctrinal contents.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPELS AND ACTS.

IN treating, in the preceding chapter of the Canon of the New Testament, the proofs which exist for the genuineness of each separate book found in it have always been kept in view, and such proofs will form a proper sequel to what has preceded. In such a twofold presentation of the subject, however, the repetition of important facts cannot be wholly avoided, even if it were desirable.

While, for convenience of arrangement merely, we link the Acts to the Gospels in the present chapter, it may be remarked that this is one of the most common, indeed almost invariable, divisions of the contents of the New Testament as at present found in the oldest extant manuscripts.

The titles, which, in both the English and Greek Testaments, are found at the head of the respective Gospels, as "The Gospel according to Matthew," "The Gospel according to Mark," &c., do not authoritatively indicate these men as their authors; were doubtless placed in their present position at some time subsequent to the date of composition; still they do express and attest the unanimous opinion of the ancient Church with respect to the matter involved, as, also, the fact that different writers had treated of the same general theme.

While all the Gospels have one common subject, the first three, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, called the "Synoptics," are quite distinct in their contents and general characteristics from the fourth. They have received the name

“Synoptics” from the fact that, in narrating the events of the life of Christ, they all proceed upon the same general plan up to the time of the Master’s last journey to Jerusalem, speaking only of what occurred in Galilee, and hence telling, though in different form and order, substantially the same story.

The question of the particular manner in which the Synoptic Gospels originated is one of great complexity and difficulty. Happily, however, the difficulties of the ^{Their} ^{Origin.} subject do not necessarily involve the question of genuineness, as that term has been defined. Without any attempt, therefore, to elucidate, or even name each one of the multitude of theories on the subject put forth by different critics, we shall only state, in brief terms, that one which has been adopted by scholars possessed of reverence, erudition, and candor sufficient, it should seem, to render them worthy to be our guides.¹

It is to be premised that the Apostles were preachers, rather than authors, the substance of their preaching, ^{Apostles} ^{preachers,} ^{not writers.} however, being historic. They were originally, indeed, the historians of events of which they were themselves the ear and eye witnesses. Hence, naturally, the Gospels, as they afterwards took form, were conditioned in such form by the circumstance that they had been first promulgated as an oral message. So, too, the earliest contemporaneous quotations of the Gospel, as might be expected, are from its *substance* as the one Gospel, rather than as being in recognition of the subsequent respective forms in which it became crystallized.

In due course of time, changed circumstances — as, for instance, the growth and wider diffusion of the Church, the dying of the Apostles — offered a sufficient, if not an imperative, reason for putting the oral communication into a more tangible, written shape. The oral Gospel had been promulgated sometimes, it is likely, in Hebrew (Aramaic) as well as Greek, both languages being current among those to whom it was first delivered; and hence we should not be surprised if it

¹ Cf. Alford’s Greek Test. Prolegom., vol. i.; Westcott’s Introd. to Study of Gospels, pp. 150–193; and De Wette’s Introd. to N. T., p. 143.

appear bilingual in its written form, or if the earliest witnesses should declare (Papias) that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew. It is not needful to suppose that the several Synoptic Gospels took the written form completely at once. Important parts may have been written at different times, as might also be inferred from the preface of Luke, supposing that he does not mean in this preface to designate the other Synoptics in *their complete form*.

In short, then, the first three Gospels contain the substance of the "Apostolic testimony collected principally from
 Contents. their oral teaching current in the Church, and partly, also, from written documents embodying portions of that teaching." This natural theory best accords with the phenomena which the respective Gospels present; while it allows room especially for the important conclusion that, with all their remarkable coincidences of facts and even words, the respective records sprung up, to a great degree, independently of each other. The variations in form which they present on this theory, moreover, may be readily accounted for by the consideration of the diverse mental characteristics of the several writers or speakers, and their recognition in the utterance of their message of the special circumstances and wants of their hearers.

To the objection which has been made to this theory of the
 Objection. origin of the "Synoptics," that to suppose such an oral message as their source and basis would necessitate uncertainty and detract from their historic value and trustworthiness, it is justly replied, first, that the age is to be considered. It was one in which tradition was much more relied on than now, and hence an age in which tradition could be better trusted than in this era of books. And, second, no great demand after all is made upon our faith herein, inasmuch as the theory presupposes this oral message or tradition to have existed and been depended on as the source of the written Gospels *only during the lifetime of those who were its responsible authors*, and who were therefore able to preserve it within its proper limits until it finally assumed the written form.

MATTHEW.

By its title the authorship of the first Gospel is ascribed to Matthew, or Levi, one of the Apostles of Christ, and in this respect it gives voice to the unanimous verdict Title of Matthew. of antiquity. No further historical evidence, indeed, of this fact could be properly demanded. But any possible uncertainty which might attach to the question of authorship when there is *no claim laid to it* for a particular person in the work itself, does not, according to our rule, involve necessarily the genuineness of the work. This fact is to be kept in mind in the case of all anonymous New Testament books.

Little is known of the personal history of Matthew beyond the slight notices occurring in the Gospels. Tradition Personal history. is uncertain concerning the scene of his later labors, whether it was Ethiopia or Macedonia, but affirms that he died, at last, a natural death.

His Gospel must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and is variously dated between the years Gospel, when written. A.D. 60 and 70. One of the most interesting questions relating to the work, respects the language in which it was originally written. Papias (wr. 140-150) declared, as we have seen, that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and that each one interpreted it as best he could.¹ Every early writer who mentions Matthew's work confirms this statement, or, more properly perhaps, accepts it. Whence, then, the Gospel of Matthew in Greek?

Writers of a sceptical turn have made the most of this circumstance, in connection with others, and have hinted Objections to a Hebrew original. vaguely of a "Hebrew Christianity yet earlier than the New Testament, the memorials of which are preserved to us in translations only." All the facts, however, can be harmonized without imperilling the genuineness of the work before us. Many maintain, among them distinguished critics of every school, that the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew of which Papias speaks was not the original, but itself a translation

¹ Euseb. H. E., iii. 39.

made for the benefit of those who understood the Hebrew (Aramaic) only. Credner plainly favors the view of a Greek original.¹ Alford feels forced to adopt such a conclusion in the fifth edition of his Greek Testament; although in the earlier editions, in deference to the seeming testimony of antiquity, he had maintained a Hebrew original. Such also is the view of Bleek,² De Wette,³ and many others, a list of whom may be found in Smith's Bible Dictionary, art. "Matthew."

But whether this be the correct theory or not, is really a matter of small importance, inasmuch as in any case the Greek text so nearly synchronizes with the Hebrew, that it is impossible to say certainly which preceded. The same early writers who speak of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew *quote the Greek only*; and, if the latter be a translation, it dates back to Apostolic times, must have been made under Apostolic direction, and hence may be justly considered genuine and authoritative.⁴

In addition to the testimony of Papias just alluded to, Barnabas, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, quotes Matt. xx. 16, with the formula, "it is written," thus virtually designating it as Holy Scripture.⁵ Irenæus (c. 130-200) also, speaks of what he had received from an Elder who had heard those who had been instructed by the Apostles, and alludes along with the other evangelists to the Gospel of Matthew in a number of instances.⁶ And Justin Martyr (c. 90-148) expressly cites this Gospel in several cases with an exact coincidence of words.⁷ In short, without any attempt to give more than a specimen of the evidence for the genuineness of this or other books, it may be said that there is no work of antiquity better supported in this respect than the Gospel of Matthew.

Not a matter of supreme importance.

Special testimony to genuineness.

¹ Gesch. d. N. T. Kan., sect. 64-66.

² Introd. to N. T., i. 126.

³ Introd. to N. T., 176. Cf. Hilgenfeld, Der Kan., &c., p. 18, n.

⁴ Vs. Davidson's Introd. to N. T., i. 489.

⁵ Ep. c. iv.

⁶ Adv. Hær., iv. v. xii., *passim*.

⁷ Dial. cc. 49, 103, 105.

MARK.

As in the case of the preceding evangelist, we are obliged to depend for the name of the author of the second Gospel upon tradition; but such tradition is universal and invariable. And the fact that this name belongs to no great and distinguished founder of the Church to whom such a work might naturally be ascribed, but to one the reference to whom of such a work can hardly be accounted for except by its being the truth, has properly been noticed as greatly supporting the testimony of the earliest traditions.¹

John Mark, a Jew by birth, son of the Mary mentioned in Acts xii. 12, and nephew of Barnabas, the Apostle, was converted to Christ by Peter, to whom also, through Mark's mother, he is thought to have sustained a family relationship (1 Pet. v. 13). His Christian activities at first were in connection with Paul and Barnabas (Acts xii. 35); then, with each separately, having been the cause of their parting company (Acts xv. 39; Col. iv. 10); but finally, with Peter, whose amanuensis according to tradition he was. Under the influence at least, if not the dictation of the latter Apostle, it has generally been supposed Mark wrote his Gospel. Where it was written is uncertain, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch having each been mentioned.

Like the other Synoptical Gospels it must have been prepared before the destruction of Jerusalem, which was invested by Titus, A.D. 70, — and yet, probably not at a period earlier than A.D. 63. All the early Fathers agree that the book was written originally in Greek, as well as that Mark was its author. Its genuineness, indeed, has never been called in question until quite a recent period. Papias (d. 164) distinctly designates Mark as the writer, on the testimony of the Elder (John) — probably Presbyter John, but contemporaneous with the Apostles — in the following interesting passage: “This also the Elder used to say ‘Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he remembered

¹ Alford, Greek Testament, Prolegom. to Mark.

[? related]; though he did not [record] in order that which was either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him; but subsequently, as I said [attached himself to], Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the wants of his hearers, and not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses. So Mark committed no error, as he wrote down some particulars just as he recalled them to mind [? related them]. For he took heed to one thing,—to omit none of the facts that he heard, and to state nothing falsely in them.'"¹

The description which he here gives of Mark's method well accords with the characteristics of the second Gospel, as being not a complete record of the life of our Lord, chronologically arranged, but a vivid and picturesque arrangement of leading facts only, having a definite moral as well as historic end.

An earlier witness, Justin Martyr (b. 90–100), makes a definite allusion to this Gospel, in which he especially recognizes the influence of Peter as its promoter: "The mention of the fact that Christ changed the name of Peter, one of the Apostles, and that the fact has been *written in his* (Peter's) *Memoirs*, together with his having changed the name of two other brethren who were sons of Zebedee to *Boanerges*, tended to signify," &c.²

The important though fragmentary Canon of Muratori also, (c. 160–170) indirectly supports the genuineness of this Gospel, the fragment beginning with words which undoubtedly refer to it, and going on to say that the Gospel of Luke stands third in order, &c.³

LUKE.

The author of the third Gospel, although, unlike the two evangelists just noticed, introducing himself incidentally into the narrative, at its beginning, is, like them, however, made known to us by name, only through tradition. The concurrent testimony of all Christian antiquity ascribes

¹ Euseb. H. E., iii. 39.

² Dial., c. 106.

³ Westcott, Hist. of N. T. Can., App. C.

this work to Luke. His name is prefixed to it both in the oldest Greek MSS. and the earliest versions. Indeed, the assumption of his authorship was never contested.

According to Eusebius this evangelist was born at Antioch. He became a companion of Paul in his second missionary journey to Troas, Macedonia, Asia, Jerusalem, Personal history. Cæsarea, and Rome. (Acts xvi. 10; xxi. 17; xxiv. 23; xxvii. 1-28). By his own account, Luke was not an eye-witness of the facts which he relates, but collected them from eye-witnesses. From the nature, both of his variations from Matthew and Mark and his coincidences with them, it is thought that he could not have had their narratives before him. He appears, moreover, to have had access to additional sources of information; and, from the minuteness of his account of the circumstances attending the birth of Christ, it is suggested with probability that Mary herself, the mother of our Lord, may have been his informant.¹

The characteristics of the Gospel are completeness, universality, the purity of its Greek, — which is idiomatic Characteristics and date of Gospel. and comparatively free from Hebraisms, — the careful construction of sentences, and an apparent effort at extreme accuracy of detail in relating events and discourses in the life of our Lord. Alford, from internal evidence gathered from the Acts as well as the work itself, fixes its date as early as A.D. 58.

With respect to proofs of genuineness, nothing essential is wanting. It is a most interesting point that this Gospel Proof of genuineness. is quoted in the first epistle to Timothy, which epistle, antecedent to any proofs of genuineness, or accepting those already offered in the preceding chapter, may be regarded as a very ancient document, by all parties conceded to belong to the first half of the second century, and so may properly be produced in evidence. The writer of that epistle — supposed to be Paul, whose companion Luke was — declares that: “the Scripture saith, ‘Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn,’ and ‘the laborer is worthy of his reward.’”² So that not only is Luke quoted in connection with his citation of

¹ Prolegom. in Alford's Greek Test.

² Cf. Luke, x. 7.

the Old Testament, but his words seemingly are put on a level of authority with the Old Testament Scriptures.

Modern attacks upon this work have been directed, in response, it might seem, to Marcion's influence, chiefly against certain parts of it only, especially the first two chapters. But while it is true that Marcion — constrained, as is obvious, by the necessities of his anti-Jewish system — left out these chapters, with certain other minor portions of the work, on the ostensible ground that they were Jewish corruptions, so giving occasion and direction to such attacks, Marcion's real position by no means justifies them, but, when considered in all its bearings, fairly forbids and repels these assaults. For Marcion, on the one hand, a contemporary of Justin Martyr, and beginning to teach at Rome about 130-140, does not profess to reject any part of the Gospel on *historical grounds*; while, on the other, his attempts to adapt it to his purpose, by mutilations, shows that it was current and highly esteemed in the Church at that time, as we have before shown.

The last view is further confirmed by the direct testimony of Justin Martyr, who quotes from the "Memoirs," as he was accustomed to term the Gospels, passages peculiar to Luke. For instance: "Jesus, as he gave up his spirit upon the cross, said, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'"¹ Again, he writes: "In the 'Memoirs,' which I say were composed by the Apostles and those *who followed with them* [it is said], that sweat as drops [of blood] streamed down as he was praying and saying, 'Let this cup, if possible, pass away from me.'"² This passage is of peculiar interest for the reason, that here, in alluding, as we suppose, to the Gospel of Luke, who was not himself an Apostle, Justin Martyr seems to step aside to designate him, in declaring that the "Memoirs" were written by the Apostles and "those who followed them." In an extant fragment "Concerning the Resurrection," generally ascribed to Justin Martyr, there are also citations of the words of Jesus, to be

¹ Dial. c. 105. Cf. Luke xxiii. 46.

² Dial. c. 103. Cf. Luke xxii. 14, 42, 44; Matt. xxvi. 39.

found only in Luke's Gospel. Papias (d. 164) and Hegesippus (at Rome, c. 177-190) both seemingly refer to this work, as eminent critics hold, although Hilgenfeld strangely sees, in the references of the former, a subtle spirit of opposition to it.¹

And the Muratorian Canon (c. 160-170), as has been previously observed, is very direct in its testimony: "The Gospel of Luke stands third in order [in the list of canonical books], having been written by Luke, the physician, the companion of St. Paul, who, not being himself an eye-witness, based his narrative on such information as he could obtain, beginning from the birth of John." So, too, Basilides, the heretical Alexandrian, belonging to the age next succeeding the Apostles (c. 130), while drawing from a variety of sources for information respecting the Christian system, made use of the narrative of Luke as well as those of Matthew and John without any indication that he regarded them as any thing else than veritable history.

JOHN.

The Gospel of John stands by itself with respect to the time when it was written, the point of view from which the Master's life is sketched, and the substance of the narrative given; it being more idealistic, more profound, and dealing with topics which, for the most part, the Synoptics had left untouched. It is difficult to see, however, how it is the "*reconciliation* of the Pauline and Petrine teachings" in the early Church, or on what ground, historical or otherwise, it is oracularly declared that it was "recommended for reception as a fourth Gospel."²

John, the supposed writer, was the son of a prosperous Galilæan fisherman, and his mother's name was Salome. James, another disciple of Jesus, was his brother. With James and Peter, John belonged to that inner

¹ Westcott, Hist. of N. T. Can. p. 182 n. Cf. Hilgenfeld, Der Kan. p. 16. 28 f. Reuss, Gesch. d. Heil. Schrift, N. T. sect. 186, 287.

² Credner, Gesch. d. N. T. Kan. sect. 16.

circle of Apostles on whom our Saviour most leaned, and of the three he was best beloved. To him, on the way to crucifixion, Jesus committed the care of his mother, and subsequently to the resurrection and ascension we find him tarrying with the other Apostles at Jerusalem. Here Paul found him still at a considerably later period, a "pillar" in the Church.¹ There is little doubt that, after leaving Jerusalem, he made Ephesus, in Asia Minor, the centre of his labors, and, like most of the other Apostles, received the honor of persecution, having been banished, as we are informed, to Patmos.² There is much that is beautiful as well as credible in the legendary accounts of his later years, but they cannot be fully trusted. The date of his work is referred to the last quarter of the first century, and by some capital authorities, to the last decade of that century.³

The genuineness of the Gospel of John having been most vehemently and persistently called in question by modern opponents of a supernatural Christianity, it may justly claim at our hands a fuller notice of its legitimate supports in this respect than the Synoptics have received. As has been generally the case, however, in this volume, the results of investigation only can be given, with but slight reference to the studies and methods by which such results have been attained. Yet even these slight references will be of such a nature, it is to be hoped, as to insure no inconsiderable confidence in the justice of conclusions announced.

The objections that have been raised against the position that the fourth Gospel belongs to the Apostolic age and has John for its author, are, for the most part, drawn from internal characteristics, — the fact of its differing from the other narratives in the general range of its topics, and in style, and from certain supposed discrepancies in matters of fact. Indeed, no other course was open to opponents of the genuineness of the work, the entire sum of external evidence, with one insignificant exception, supporting all that is claimed for the book. Bleek, one of the most candid of

¹ Gal. i. 18.

² Euseb. H. E. iii. 18, 23.

³ So Westcott, *Introduct. to Study of Gospels*, p. 236.

investigators and critics, affirms that it ranks, with respect to proofs of genuineness, a little higher, if any thing, than either of the other evangelists.¹

The conviction can scarcely be resisted, in view of the confessions and retractions of the negative critics themselves, that it is the contents of the Gospel, its clear testimony to the divinity of our Lord and the miracles imputed to him, with respect to the possibility of which they are pledged beforehand to a blank denial, that really stand in the way of its acceptance as the work of the pure-minded Apostle. These critics, moreover, are as far from agreeing among themselves as from being settled in their individual opinions. Renan, in his work on the Apostles, admits the genuineness of the book. Bretschneider in Germany (1820), following Evan-Contents of the Gospel probably the chief objection.son in England (1792), wrote against it, to repudiate afterwards what he had written. Strauss, likewise, in 1838, announced that, on account of the unmistakable clearness of St. John's narrative, he doubted "in spite of himself" the doubts which he had expressed three years before, although he suppressed these misgivings and afterwards withdrew them.² Such vacillation is not to be wondered at, when we consider that, in order to furnish support for conjecture, historical facts must be denied or perverted, and unblushing assertion made to take the place of argument.

Apostolic authorship could scarcely be denied to the fourth Gospel, for example, if it were to be admitted that Justin Martyr (b. 90-100) made use of it; that is, if it were shown to have been current in his time.Illustration of unfair dealing with facts. Davidson admits that if it were to be dated even as early as A.D. 110-117, Keim's date, it would be "exceedingly difficult to disprove Johannine authorship."³ Justin then must be shown to have been unacquainted with it. But he has a definite allusion in his writings to a peculiar passage to be found *nowhere else* than in the Gospel of John. "For indeed," he says, "Christ also declared, 'except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' And that it is impossi-

¹ Introd. to N. T. ii. 285.

² Oosterzee, p. 12. Bleek's Introd. i. 221.

³ Introd. to N. T. ii. 425.

ble for those who are once born to enter into their mother's womb is plain."¹ What do the writers of the Tübingen school say to this? They simply assert, without a particle of evidence, that Justin took the passage from the apocryphal Gospel to the Hebrews, even when all that is known of that work would lead us to infer that no such passage is to be found in it.²

In considering the positive proofs of Apostolic authorship, we have at the outset the palpable fact that this Positive proofs of genuineness. Gospel purports to have been written by John, that "disciple whom Jesus loved." And if it be not his, the writer, whoever he was, must be accorded the palm as the prince of forgers. We have accordingly to choose between Johannine authorship and bold imposture: there is no third choice. The writer, it is evident, moreover, must have been a Jew, acquainted intimately with the affairs of Galilee and Judea during the period of our Lord's ministry.³ He professed to have belonged to the circle of his immediate disciples, and to have been an eye-witness of what he circumstantially relates (i. 14). With what a keen sense of his own adroitness, if he were not really the son of Zebedee, must he have introduced into his narrative those subtle, indirect proofs that he was actually John, the Apostle, such as only study and reflection can now educe from it! Instead of directly identifying himself by name, he continually speaks of himself as that "disciple whom Jesus loved." About other names, however, he shows no such delicacy. He discriminates between the two Judases. He gives to Thomas his surname. But, unlike the other three evangelists, he speaks of John the Baptist as simply John.

Then too, if the writer of this Gospel were an impostor, Present difficulties increased by theory of spuriousness. and we were obliged to refer its origin to an age subsequent to the Apostolic, we should be at a loss on many accounts. Whatever seemed strange and unaccounted for before, would appear tenfold more strange and unaccountable. It is admitted, for instance, by opponents generally,⁴ that the Gospel was in common use by A.D. 175-180, or within seventy years after the death of the Apostle John.

¹ Apol., i. 61. Cf. John iii. 3, 5.

² Fisher's *Supernat. Origin, &c.*, pp. 50, 51.

³ Ewald by Oosterzee, p. 19.

⁴ Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.*, ii. 425.

There must have been, indeed, many thousand copies in circulation at that date.¹ Now are we called upon to believe, and is it really expected that we shall accept the supposition, that this number of copies came into existence and were put in circulation throughout the Roman Empire after the year A.D. 150, the imagined date of the Gospel, and that the whole Christian Church, and different schools of heretics as well, were induced not only to receive it, *but to believe that they had possessed it from the Apostolic age?*²

Again, why did not this mysterious forger, who shows such admirable tact in other respects, especially with reference to the affectedly modest suppression of his name, follow in his work more directly the course marked out by the Synoptics, and the traditional accounts of our Lord's life, instead of inventing a history apparently so different, and consequently so likely to work for the defeat of the very object which he is supposed to have had in view?³

Moreover, if we are to consider the Gospel of John as an intentional deception, how does it happen that these clear-sighted critics of modern times with their wonderful power of analysis and their profound judgment, can impute it with all its depth and richness of religious thought and expression to such a comparatively contemptible period of spiritual history as the second century, which witnessed to the "prolix and miserable scribblings of Gnostics and anti-Gnostics"?⁴ And it is an inscrutable circumstance, also, on such a supposition, that both the great contending parties of that period accepted, without hesitation, the fourth Gospel as the work of John. If now, on the contrary, it sprang up amid this very tumult of controversy, having itself, of necessity, a close connection with the great themes in dispute, and claiming to be the work of an Apostle, how is it that from neither side do we hear a lisp of opposition to its singular claim?⁵

Modern sceptics, too, who follow the solitary ancient example of the Alogi—whose very name (*a-logos*) indicates

¹ Norton's Gen. of the Gospels, p. 52.

² Tregelles, Lect. on Histor. Ev., &c., p. 47.

³ Bleek, Introd. to N. T. ii. 197.

⁴ Thiersch, by Oosterzee, p. 208.

⁵ Oosterzee, p. 110.

The supposed forger not always on his guard.

Character of the work, if forged, does not agree with the age in which it was produced.

sufficiently well the ground of their opposition — and ascribe the work to Cerinthus, a Gnostic, are involved at once The Gospel combats Cerinthus, its supposed author. in the superlative difficulty of explaining how it happens that the whole plan and teaching of the Gospel seems particularly designed rather to combat Cerinthus, to meet and overthrow, in its various developments, the Gnostic heresy then prevalent, especially in the doctrine that Christ was by birth no more than a common man.

But, from the wild guesses and strange subterfuges of an embarrassed, hostile criticism, we gratefully turn to Actual history. the positive testimony of external history. Ebrard declares of the former that, in order to provide for their peculiar theories, they have found it needful to pile up the whole of this history of the Church and literature during the first two Christian centuries, and then turn it bottom upwards.¹ Our own citations from this abundant store can only be in the way of illustration.

First, as really belonging to such external history, we may Testimony of last two verses of Gospel. adduce the last two verses of the 21st chapter of the Gospel itself. They were, it is conceded, added, or at least changed, by another and a later hand. Their testimony, however, as such to the question before us is both valid and of the most important character. The 24th verse reads: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true." These words must have come from those intimately acquainted with the Apostle, and from persons who fully believed what they said. Tholuck has justly remarked that it could not have been the work of a forger, for in that case the signature would not have been withheld.² They are undoubtedly some early disciples who speak from personal knowledge, and who collectively, though anonymously, pledge themselves in such a way as to disprove all theories of intentional deception on their part to the fact of Johannine authorship.

Among the Apostolic Fathers a number of apparently Of the Apostolic Fathers. unmistakable traces of an acquaintance with the fourth Gospel are found. Ignatius, a disciple of John, speaks

¹ Herzog's Encyc. art. John.

² Introd. to Gospel, p. 37.

of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as "His Eternal Word," and to numerous other passages gives a Johannine coloring.¹ Hilgenfeld admits these traces of the fourth Gospel in the epistles of Ignatius, mentioning particularly that to the Rom. c. vii., where John vi. 51 f. is referred to, and that to the Philad. c. vii. which alludes to John iii. 8.² Polycarp, another disciple of the supposed writer, also makes use of a passage from the first Epistle of John, the proofs of whose genuineness are ordinarily regarded as identical with those of the Gospel.³ Papias, too, although not one of the Apostolic Fathers, yet a friend of Polycarp and a disciple of Presbyter John, — who was, according to Eusebius, a contemporary, — made use of the same epistle.⁴ And if these allusions among contemporaneous writers, when all collected, are comparatively few and incidental, the question may well be asked whether we have any reason to demand or expect that they should be otherwise. A recent writer has affirmed that the Apostle Paul in all his epistles, which are fairly steeped with the spirit of Christ's teachings and proofs of loyalty to him, *quotes his words* in but a single instance (? 1 Tim. v. 18; Acts xx. 35).⁵

Justin Martyr (b. 90–100), in addition to the important passage before noted, shows, in his doctrine of the Logos and of the Eucharist, almost beyond dispute, that he ^{Justin Martyr.} was familiar with the teachings of this Gospel.⁶ Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, of whose instructions he retained the most vivid impressions, makes, according to Tischendorf, more than eighty clear citations from it.⁷ And although the fourth Gospel was not expressly quoted *as the work of John*, quotations before that period being almost invariably allusive and incidental only, yet the whole patristic literature of the second century was so controlled by the idea of the Logos that we are compelled to suppose a common source of the idea in an Apostolic work.⁸

Basilides, whose early life touched the Apostolic age, according to Hippolytus, made use of texts from the fourth

¹ Ep. to Mag. vii

² Der Kan., &c p 31, n. 3.

³ Ep. c. vii.

⁴ H. E. iii. 39.

⁵ Wasson in Old and New for May, 1871.

⁶ Westcott, Hist. of N. T. Can. p. 145, n.

⁷ When were the Gospels Written, p. 70.

⁸ Oosterzee, p. 53.

Gospel; viz., i. 9, ii. 4; and Valentinus, as the same authority testifies, living also at about the same period, sought to support his speculations by fanciful interpretations of it.¹ Marcion's omission of the work from his heretical compilation (A.D. 130-140), obviously on *doctrinal grounds*, leaves us to infer the indisputable *historic* basis on which it was already established. Tertullian, writing of this heretic (c. 207, 208), says that, if he had not rejected some and mutilated other Scriptures which contradicted his opinions, the Gospel of John would convict him of error.²

This Gospel has a place in the Canon of Muratori, which itself seems to necessitate the theory of its prevalence and common use by the middle of the second century; so, too, still earlier in the Peshito version, another extreme geographical outpost (c. 150). The various sects of purists,—Montanists, and others,—acknowledged its Apostolic origin. Tatian, a fair representative, having been also in early life a disciple of Justin Martyr, both quotes it literally and includes it in the harmony which he made of the four Gospels.³ The Clementine Homilies (c. 160) draw directly from the history of the man born blind, to be found only in St. John.⁴ And the Christian Ophites, among the earliest representatives of Gnosticism,—verging on the Apostolic age, and professing to derive their doctrines in the main from James, the Lord's brother,—show, in the peculiar mould of their system, the influence of the last evangelist.⁵ So the epistle to Diognetus, to be dated, it is supposed, as early as A.D. 117, is noticeably stamped with its characteristic phraseology.⁶

Bleek has announced, in fine, as the demonstrated result of an investigation of the most searching character, that "the position accorded by the various contending parties of the second century to this Gospel proves that it

¹ Hipp. by Westcott, *Hist. of N. T. Can.* pp. 256, 260, n.

² De Carne Christi c. 3; Cf. Guericke's *N. T. Isagogik, &c.*, p. 185 n. 4; Westcott's *Hist. N. T. Can.* p. 276, note.

³ Prof. Fisher's *Supernat. Origin, &c.*, p. 43. Cf. Herzog's *Encyc. art. John*; and Davidson's *Introd. to N. T. ii.* p. 425.

⁴ Hom. xix. 22.

⁵ Hippol. *adv. Hær.* v. 6. by Westcott, *Hist. of N. T. Can.* p. 249.

⁶ cc. xi. xii.

must have existed before the Easter controversies; before the appearance of the Valentinian Gnosis in Egypt and elsewhere; before the rise of Montanism in Asia Minor; before the time of Marcion; and can only be explained on the supposition that it was known and recognized as genuine in the Church at large some decades of years before the middle of the second century, if not from the very beginning of it; which fact, in turn, can only be explained upon the supposition that it is a genuine and Apostolic work."¹

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The title applied to the fifth successive book of the New Testament probably sprung out of the fact of its seeming appropriateness to the contents, although manu-^{Title.}script authorities have not all the same title. It belongs to the class of sacred writings called "Homologoumena," "universally acknowledged," its genuineness never having been questioned in early times. The author of the work, moreover, was, without contradiction, held to be Luke.

Irenæus (c. 130-200) is the first to designate him *by name* as the writer, if we except the Muratorian Canon, which also definitely ascribes it to Luke.^{Testimony of Irenæus.} Clement of Alexandria (c. 165-220) also wrote, "As Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, declares Paul to have said," &c.² And Tertullian (c. 160-240), while frequently quoting the Acts, uniformly treated it as the work of Luke. These writers, with the catalogue of Muratori, have a sufficiently close connection with the Apostolic age to justify us in the confident acceptance of their united and mutually corroborative testimony.

But, in addition to these data, the writer of the Acts is almost demonstrably the same person as the author of the third Gospel. Davidson says, indeed, that "no^{Internal evidence confirmatory.} critic ventures to impugn the identity of the author of the third Gospel and the Acts."³ He also cites a large number of

¹ Introd. to N. T. i. 250.

² Strom. v. 12.

³ Introd. to N. T. ii. 269.

terms peculiar to the two works, and found nowhere else in the New Testament. The method of quotation in both is the same; and the author of the second work makes reference to another which he had previously written. So that all the proofs for Luke's authorship of the third Gospel might be used here in connection with those of an independent character. Indeed, the only ground on which his authorship can be denied is the wholly negative circumstance that he is not particularly mentioned *by name* as the writer before A.D. 150-160. Still this is regarded as sufficient ground by some, notwithstanding the fact that antiquity, *as far as it testifies at all*, is unanimous in ascribing it to him, not even hinting at any other author. However, as we have said, the question of genuineness is not necessarily one with that of authorship, when not claimed for a particular person, but can be established without reference to it.

While Irenæus may be the first writer who makes a *formal quotation* from the Acts, clear allusions to the book are found scattered amongst the various ecclesiastical authors of the preceding age. Polycarp, for example, in writing to the Philippians, says, in obvious reference to Acts ii. 24, "whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death."¹ Ignatius (d. 107-116), too, in his letters most generally accepted as genuine, apparently recognizes the existence of this book, as in the letter to the Romans c. iv.² Davidson cites also the epistle to the Smyrnians (c. iii.) and to the Philadelphians as making similar references.³ And Hegesippus (c. 140), through Eusebius,⁴ is another witness; as, also, the "Clementines," referring to Gamaliel and Simon Magus.⁵ And in the Exhortation to the Greeks ("Cohortatio ad Græcos"), attributed to Justin Martyr (c. 90-148), chapter tenth, there is a probable recognition of Acts vii. 22; while, in the epistle to Diognetus (c. 117), yet extant in Greek, two instances occur (Davidson), in chapters third and eleventh respectively, of supposed reference to this book.

These testimonies, though by no means all, will perhaps

¹ c. i.

² Cf. Acts xi. 26.

³ Introd. to N T. ii. 269.

⁴ H. E. ii. 23.

⁵ Gloag's Com. p. 2.

suffice, in connection with the fact that early heretical sects which rejected the Acts because it was opposed to their teaching, as the Marcionites and Manicheans, still admitted without dispute, as far as known, the sources from which their orthodox opponents professed to receive it, and so furnish a powerful though indirect support to its genuineness.¹

The date of the work is placed at about A.D. 63 by Hackett, Gloag, Alford, and others.

Questions relating to the credibility, integrity, and internal characteristics generally of this and other books of the New Testament do not fall within the scope of the present work. But, for a refutation in detail of Davidson's assaults on the credibility of the Acts, the Boyle lecture for 1869 (Appendix) should be consulted.

¹ Hackett's Com. p. 12.

CHAPTER V.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

THE epistles of the New Testament often possess this advantage with respect to proofs of genuineness over some of its other books, that through their very form they present special points of contact with contemporaneous and subsequent history. The writer frequently announces himself by name. It was a uniform rule with Paul, indeed, to subscribe his name to all his epistles as a token of genuineness.¹ The readers, too, were commonly well known, in addition to the various persons of more or less prominence in the churches who were incidentally introduced into the letter in the way of salutation or casual mention, all of whom became so many corroborative witnesses, cited as it were, in the document itself, in favor of its being what it claimed to be.

And when, as is the case in a majority of instances, these letters are sent to communities or churches with the tacit understanding or direct command that they shall be made publicly and widely known, and the same letters are ever afterwards, as far as history gives us any information, held in the highest esteem by such communities and churches as being the actual productions of their professed authors, they ought to be readily accepted as well-attested documents; the most reliable kind of historic evidence is thereby furnished on their behalf. Such is the force of Tertullian's appeal already noticed, when he points to the churches at Corinth, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Ephesus, and at Rome respectively, as still having and publicly using in his day at the close of the second

Advantages of the Epistles with respect to proofs of genuineness.

Churches addressed important witnesses.

¹ Cf. 2 Thess., iii. 17; Col., iv. 18; 1 Cor. xvi. 21.

century, the epistles which Paul had severally addressed to them.¹

To make out a forgery in such a case, it would be needful to explain how so strange a thing had come about as that a certain church, nay, many churches, had been induced to believe that they had received letters from a prominent Apostle, — whose personal, oral instruction they were well acquainted with, and with whose teachings they had also become familiar from still other sources, — when, in fact, no such letters had been sent them. The burden of proof does not lie in such circumstances with those who accept, but with those who reject, the genuineness of these documents. Of the thirteen epistles generally ascribed to Paul, not including that to the Hebrews, nine are addressed directly to prominent churches of the Apostolic age, and the others, to conspicuous representative men, whose position rendered them perhaps as important as churches with respect to the matter of the defence of the literary productions with which their names are associated. Such a fact might well be expected to facilitate the process by which the genuineness or the imposture of these writings may be established.

Adopting the order of epistles found in our English Bibles, we will first examine what evidence there may be for the genuineness of the production called the epistle of Paul

Difficulty
in forging
such docu-
ments.

Romans.

TO THE ROMANS.

First, Clement of Rome (c. 95), although personally a follower of St. Peter, yet doubtless acquainted with Paul, and at some time in his life an overseer of the Christian church at Rome, in a well-attested letter which he writes to the Corinthian brethren, makes a distinct reference to Paul's epistle to the Romans. The letter was written in the name of the church over which he was presiding, and, in part, was as follows: "Casting away from ourselves all unrighteousness and wickedness, covetousness, debate, malignity, and

Clement of
Rome.

¹ De Præscrip. Hær., c. xxxvi.

deceit, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, spitefulness and pride, vaingloriousness and inanity. For those who commit such things are hated by God, and not only those who commit them, but those also that have pleasure in them.”¹ It is this Clement whom Roman Catholics claim to be one of the early Popes of Rome, if not the first.

And Polycarp, in his well-known letter to the Philippians, written about A.D. 107, or possibly a little later, says in one place: “We must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and each one must give account of himself.”²

The “Elder” likewise, whom Irenæus reports to us and who must have been a hearer of the Apostles, made use of the epistle to the Romans as the production of Paul.³

Justin Martyr (b. 90–100), too, in his Dialogue with Trypho, employs the peculiar illustrations and doctrinal teaching of Paul in this epistle; as, for instance: “Since he, being in uncircumcision, for the sake of the faith with which he believed God, was justified and blessed.”⁴ And each of the three great witnesses of the succeeding age, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Tertullian, bear direct and conclusive testimony in the same direction. Irenæus says, speaking now for himself: “Paul, when writing to the Romans, has explained this very point, ‘Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, predestinated unto the Gospel of God.’”⁵

Of the early heretical sects, moreover, some of which rejected and contended against the Pauline epistles, none ever denied *this epistle to be Paul's*. In short, the evidence is connected, continuous, wide-spread, and entirely unanimous on this point. The author claims to be Paul, the Apostle, and to have written this epistle to the Romans (i. 17). It cannot be shown that there has ever been a time since the period when it professes to have been written, in which it has not been in honorable use in the church to which it was sent and among other associated churches. Indeed its genuineness nas scarcely ever been denied by the most irreverent of modern

¹ c. xxxv. Cf. Rom. i. 29–32.

⁴ c. xxiii.

² c. vi. Cf. Rom. xiv. 12.

⁵ Adv. Hær., iii. 16 (3).

³ Adv. Hær., iv. 27 (2). Cf. Rom. xi. 20, 21.

critics. De Wette declares that "the genuineness of the epistle is beyond all doubt."¹ Scholars are generally agreed that it was written about A.D. 58, while the Apostle was at Corinth (Acts xx. 3).

FIRST TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, besides being abundantly supported by external testimony, has also this peculiarity, along with some others of this Apostle's letters, that his own life, personal relationships, methods of working, as well as the peculiar circumstances of the churches to which he wrote, are so inwoven into its very texture, that, to deny its genuineness, it should seem to be necessary to deny also that such a person as the Apostle Paul ever existed. Dean Stanley has called the two epistles to the Corinthians, on account of this peculiarity, the "historical epistles."²

But the known estimation in which this first epistle was held by the Corinthian church at a time when the last of the Apostles had barely passed away from earth, is wholly inexplicable on any other supposition than that of genuineness.

The letter of *Clemens Romanus*, already referred to (c. 95), addressed to this very church, contains such pointed allusions as this: "Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul, the Apostle; what was it that he first wrote to you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth it was *under the guidance of the Spirit* (or spiritually) that he warned you in his epistle concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because, as well then as now, you favored parties."³ And Polycarp, but a little later, writing to the Philippians, said: "Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?"⁴ So also, Irenæus, the next link in the chain, bringing the testimony down to a period, when there is no longer room for dispute, writes:

¹ *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 267. Cf. Bleek's *Introd. to N. T.*, i., p. 447.

² *Com.*, preface, p. xi.

³ *Ad Cor.*, c. xlvii.

⁴ c. 11. Cf. *1 Cor.* vi. 2.

“They affirm Paul to have declared in his epistle to the Corinthians, ‘And last of all he appeared to me also, as to one born out of due time.’”¹

And in addition to these, Justin Martyr (*Dial.*, c. xiii. cf. *1 Cor.* v. 7) has clear allusions to the document. So, Other witnesses. Clement of Alexandria (*Pæd.*, i. 6. cf. *1 Cor.* vi. 13); and the epistle to Diognetus (c. 117), as follows: “And not that false knowledge of which the Apostle saith, ‘knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth’” (c. xii. cf. *1 Cor.* viii. 1; also c. v. cf. *1 Cor.* iv. 12). The various heretical sects, too, which sprung up in the post-Apostolic age, all directly or indirectly supported the genuineness of this production. No scholar of prominence, in fact, has ever called in question the claim of Pauline authorship. The epistle was written from Ephesus (xvi. 8), the subscription, in the English Bible, being a later unauthentic addition.

SECOND TO THE CORINTHIANS.

From its close connection with the first epistle, forming, as it were, the sequel to it, the second to the Corinthians is supported by the same external testimony in addition to that which is peculiarly its own. The time of writing, from internal evidence, is supposed to have been a few months subsequent only to the writing of the first letter, and the place some part of Macedonia, possibly Philippi.

Even allowing the second epistle of Clement of Rome, in which are found two evident allusions to this letter, to be untrustworthy, still, the testimony of Polycarp, a Second epistle a sequel to the first. disciple of John; of the “Elder,” cited by Irenæus; of the epistle to Diognetus (c. 117), of Clement of Alexandria, who makes use of it in more than a score of instances; of Irenæus, personally; of Tertullian; besides the catalogue of the Muratorian Canon, the Peshito, and the old Latin versions, — ought to be sufficient to establish its authorship.

¹ *Adv. Hær.*, i. 8 (2).

Polycarp says: "For we are before the eyes of the Lord our God;" and "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ."¹ The epistle to Diognetus: "They are flesh, but do not live after the flesh;" and again, "pass their days on earth, but as citizens of heaven."² Clement of Alexandria: "Not in fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world."³ Irenæus: "As to their affirming that Paul said plainly in the second [epistle] to the Corinthians, 'In whom the god of this world blinded the minds of them that believe not,'" &c.⁴

Irenæus.

TO THE GALATIANS.

Paul's epistle to the Galatians is one of the few epistles whose authorship has never — with a single unimportant exception — been called in question. Besides bearing in every part the personal impress of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, the character of the Galatian church and peculiarities of the Galatian people, as here depicted, are fully borne out by contemporaneous history. "The Celtic temperament, so easily attracted by novelty, might, at once, embrace the new religion; though, on the other hand, nothing could be more remote than the Phrygian *cultus* from the purity and simplicity of the Gospel."⁵

Genuineness generally admitted.

The Apostolic Fathers show their familiarity with this book more by a certain unconscious and incidental appropriation of its language, than by direct citations. Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippian church, however, has this clear reference: "And when absent from you, he [Paul] wrote you a letter, which, if you carefully study, you will find to be the means of building you up in that faith which has been given to you, and which, being followed by hope and preceded by love towards God and Christ and our neighbor, is the 'mother of us all.'"⁶

Apostolic Fathers show acquaintance with it.

¹ Ep. c. vi. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 10, and Rom. xiv. 10-12.

² C. v. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 3; vi. 9.

⁵ *Intro. to Eadie's Com.*

³ Strom., iv. 16. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 12.

⁶ C. iii. Cf. Gal. iv. 26.

⁴ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 7 (1). Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 5.

And in the "Address to Greeks" (? Justin Martyr), there are two marked instances in which the language of this epistle is followed: "Come, be taught; become as I am, for I, too, was as ye are;" again, "first, driving forth lust through which every ill is begotten, — hatred, strife, envy, emulation, anger, and such like."¹ Barnabas, too, speaks of the "slave which guards us in infancy until we are placed under the true teacher's care," using Paul's peculiar term (*παιδαγωγός*).² And the epistle to Diognetus (c. 117) contains a probable parallel with Gal. iv. 1-4: "As long, then, as the former time endured, He permitted us to be borne along by unruly impulses, being driven away by the desire of pleasure and various lusts."³ While Irenæus, following the custom of his later time with respect to more explicit citations, says: "An example occurs in the [epistle] to the Galatians where he [Paul] expresses himself as follows: 'It was added until the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained in the hands of a mediator.'"⁴

Alford and Ellicott waveringly place the date of the epistle at A.D. 54 to A.D. 58. Conybeare and Howson and others during the winter of 57-58. If written near the first date given, it was probably sent from Ephesus; if at the last, from Corinth. Contrary to his usual custom, Paul seems to have written this letter wholly with his own hand, an incidental circumstance having an important bearing in favor of the genuineness of the document.

TO THE EPHESIANS.

That the so-called epistle to the Ephesians found in our Bibles is the work of Paul has been disputed by Davidson and the school of criticism which he represents. His position is, that the *internal evidence* neutralizes the external as to its having been written to the Ephesians, as well as that Paul was its author.⁵ De

Genuineness disputed by Davidson and others on internal grounds.

¹ Oratio, c. v. Cf. Gal. iv. 12; v. 20, 21.

⁴ Adv. Hær., iii. 7 (2).

² Cf. Gal. iii. 24.

⁵ Introd. to N. T., Vol. I. 372

³ c. ix.

Wette also maintains that the epistle is but a "verbal expansion of Colossians, entirely dependent on it, un-Pauline, strange, and surprising in diction and ideas."¹

But, even admitting the internal characteristics of the epistle to be what is claimed by these critics, it still purports to be from Paul's hand, and, if it be not his, must be a wretched forgery. In which case we must explain, moreover, the circumstance that the epistle gained *universal* currency in the early Church as Paul's, a fact which Davidson admits, but one the more difficult to explain the more un-Pauline in style it shall appear to be. It has been justly remarked, that "if discrepancies in matters of style are so decided as to lead a writer of the nineteenth century to deny confidently the genuineness of this document, how are we to account for its universal reception by writers of the second and third centuries who spoke the language in which it was written, and who were by no means unacquainted with the phenomena of pious fraud and literary imposture?"² But it is by no means to be admitted that the style, thought, and general arrangement of this work do not indicate Paul as its author. The majority of scholars, with the utmost confidence and appearance of candor, earnestly maintain that they do. And, consequently, objections of a merely subjective character should not be allowed to turn the scale against external testimony which is admitted on all sides to be direct, positive, persistent, and unanimous.

The wavering of opinion with respect to the original *destination* of the epistle, although not involving the question of its genuineness, may be accounted for by the probable circumstance that it was originally designed by the writer himself, not for the Ephesians alone, but for general circulation among neighboring sister churches. Bleek, while ascribing the work unhesitatingly to Paul, thinks that it was intended especially for the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16).³ And Marcion (c. 130-140), while using it as Paul's, called it the epistle to the Laodiceans. Nearly all the ancient

¹ Introd. to N. T. Vs. Hodge's Com. Introd.

² Introd. to N. T., ii. 45-47.

³ Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. Eph.

manuscripts, however, have the caption in Greek: "To those who are in Ephesus."

In glancing at the supports which external history proffers on behalf of the genuineness of this epistle, we find at the very start two citations by the Apostolic Fathers, remarkable alike for their directness and the form in which they appear. Polycarp, on the one hand, wrote: "For I trust that ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, . . . as in these Scriptures it is said, 'Be ye angry and sin not. And let not the sun go down upon your wrath.'"¹ And Ignatius to the Ephesians: "Those who are borne by martyrdom to God pass through your city; ye are initiated into the mysteries (*συνμύσται*) of the Gospel with St. Paul, the sanctified and the martyred, worthy of all blessings, . . . who, in every part of *his letter*, makes mention of you in Christ Jesus."² This allusion of Ignatius is important not only as recognizing the fact that Paul had written to the Ephesians, but, from the peculiar Greek words used, as showing, almost demonstrating, that the epistle itself was before the mind of the writer, and was at that time in familiar use.

Now leaving out of consideration, as a possibly unauthorized addition to the language of the first-named Father, and certainly unnecessary to the present inquiry, all allusion to this document as *Holy Scripture*, or regarding it as at least of questionable genuineness, as Westcott and others are inclined to do, yet, notwithstanding a certain small residuum of uncertainty which remains from the nature of the writings through which they speak to us, how incalculably does the testimony of these two witnesses outweigh the conjectural, intangible objections to Pauline authorship and the genuineness of this epistle, drawn from considerations of mere style, with respect to which no two writers of weight can be brought fully to agree.

But, in another part of the same epistle, Polycarp most probably alludes again to the Ephesian letter: "Knowing," he says, "that by grace ye are saved, not of works."³

¹ Ad. Phil., c. xii. Cf. Eph. iv. 26.

² Ad. Eph., c. xii. Cf. Westcott, *Hist. of N. T. Can.*, p. 44, n.

³ Cf. Eph. ii. 8, 9.

And Clement of Rome writes: "In no respect puffed up with pride, but yielded obedience rather than ex-torted it."¹ And the epistle to Diognetus contains this evident reminiscence: "Come, then, after you have purified yourself from all prejudices possessing your mind, and laid aside what you have been accustomed to as something apt to deceive you, and being made as from the beginning a new man," &c.² And Irenæus, speaks with the directness which is his wont: "As the blessed Paul declares in his epistle to the Ephesians that we are 'members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.'"³ And finally, Clement of Alexandria, recalls a well-known passage: "And since the Omnipotent God himself gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors, and teachers," &c.⁴

Polycarp further; with Clement of Rome; epistle to Diognetus and Irenæus.

TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

The epistle to the Philippians, it is supposed was written by Paul about A.D. 63, and was sent to that church by the hand of Epaphroditus, who some time before had brought contributions thence to the Apostle, a captive at Rome.⁵ The date is arrived at from allusions in the communication itself, especially to the character of the imprisonment which Paul was suffering, whose rigors seem to have greatly increased on the death of the Prefect Burrus.⁶

The allusions in other New Testament writings, which not only in this case, but generally, may be fitly assumed to be early historic documents, whatever their supposed character in other respects — suggest the intimate relations which the Apostle sustained to this church at Philippi, of which he was the founder, and serve to confirm us in the opinion that this professed letter to it was really his.⁷

Supposed date.

Allusions in other New Testament books.

¹ c. ii. Cf. Eph. v. 21.

² Ep., ii. Cf. Eph. iv. 22-24.

³ Adv. Hær., v. 2 (3). Cf. Eph. v. 30.

⁴ Strom., iv. c. 21. Cf. Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13.

⁵ iv. 15, 16; ii. 25. Cf. 2 Cor., xi. 9.

⁶ i. 25, 26; ii. 24. Cf. Acts, xxviii. 16.

⁷ Acts, xvi. and xx. I.

Modern doubts of genuineness are of the same general character as those which we have just been considering, having no other basis than conjecture and far-fetched assumptions, which would carry but little weight, even if there could not be opposed to them any testimony of history whatever. They might of themselves even justify an assumption of the probable genuineness of documents which require the use of such means to overthrow them.¹ Alford characterizes Baur's attack upon it as a burlesque of philosophical investigation. "All expressions in it common to Paul show that it was taken by some one else from his epistles; while all expressions not common to him, just as truly prove its spuriousness. It is charged that in one part the epistle lacks point, and shows poverty of thought; in another, there is an excess of point and undue vigor of expression. In short, this method of criticism amounts to just this: 'Heads I win, tails you lose.'"

In addition to the fact that the epistle purports to be from Paul, and is in peculiar harmony with the known characteristics of the Apostle, while suggesting in itself no probable motive which could prompt a forgery, the historical evidence that it is what it professes to be is sufficiently full and definite.

Polycarp's letter to the same church, written perhaps fifty years after that of the Apostle, alludes to the latter in a manner quite inconsistent with any theory of spuriousness: "The blessed and glorious Paul . . . wrote letters to you, into which if you look diligently you will be able to be built up to [the fulness of] the faith given to you."² The fragment on the Resurrection also (Justin Martyr) contains a noticeable coincidence of language with Phil. iii. 20, speaking of the "heavenly citizenship."³ And the letter to Diognetus alludes with more or less similarity of terms to those whom Paul in the same passage characterizes as having their conversation in heaven.⁴

Marcion (A.D. 130-140) reckoned the epistle as Pauline,

¹ Olshausen's Com., *Introd. to Eph.*

² c. vii.

³ *Ad Phil.*, iii., also xi.

⁴ c. v.

placing it as such in his heretical canon. And Clement of Alexandria, says in his work entitled the Instructor: "And it occurs to me to wonder how some dare call themselves perfect and Gnostics with ideas of themselves above the Apostles, inflated and boastful, when Paul even owns respecting himself: 'Not that I have already attained or am already perfect; but I follow after,'" &c.¹ Also Irenæus in his principal work: "As Paul also says to the Philippians: 'I am full, having received from Epaphroditus,'" &c.²

TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Colossæ was a city of Phrygia, situated in the basin of the Meander, but on the river Lycus. It is matter of doubt who founded the Christian church there, although the probabilities are in favor of Paul, who had at least visited the city more than once (Acts xvi. 16; xviii. 23). He, moreover, is designated as the author of the extant letter to this church in various parts of the letter itself (i. 1, 24; iv. 18). References are also incidentally made to his hardships in prison (i. 29; iv. 3, 10, 18); and to the Christian brethren by name, including representatives from the Colossian church who were with him at the time of writing, — Tychicus, Epaphras, Onesimus, Luke, Mark, Demas, Timothy, — all of whom accordingly might have been appealed to as swift witnesses against any attempt at forgery. Indeed, they were so many points of contact with an eager and a watchful church from which the writer does not withdraw himself, but presses them rather to his loving heart.

The letter presents well-known characteristics of the Apostle's style, both of thought and expression. It is closely connected in general outline with the epistle to the Ephesians, a fact of considerable importance, inasmuch as the two churches were near together, and had much in common, especially in their supposed need of the peculiar teaching here enforced. And yet in the face of such overwhelming proba-

¹ Pæd., i. 6. Cf. Phil. iii. 12-14.

² Adv. Hær., iv. 18 (4). Cf. Phil. iv. 18.

bilities in favor of genuineness, to say nothing of positive proofs, there have been those in modern times, who, on grounds which must be considered utterly puerile, have denounced the epistle as spurious. One critic, Mayerhoff, for instance, finds that the Greek particle *gar* (γάρ) occurs but six times in this epistle, while it is found seventeen times in Philippians, forty times in Galatians, and still oftener in other supposed writings of Paul. Olshausen has justly said: "He who takes account of such pure accidents, and that so seriously that he can count how often *gar* occurs in each epistle, pronounces on himself the sentence of incapacity for giving his vote on the affinity or the difference of style."¹

But, on the other hand, the genuineness of this epistle to the Colossians is admitted by such critics as Davidson and De Wette, who will not be suspected of having an undue bias in favor of the retention of any book of the New Testament. It belongs to the number of those which were universally accepted by the early Church, and the traces of it in early Christian literature are both numerous and well defined.

Justin Martyr, for instance, in his Dialogue with Trypho, says: "Christ is the first born of all things made, the first born of God, and before all creatures."² Marcion places the letter in his partial canon, and its Pauline authorship was never called in question by any early heretical sect. It found a place in the Peshito version. Irenæus also illustrates its familiar use in his day by writing: "And again, in the epistle to the Colossians [Paul] says, 'Luke, the beloved physician, greets you.'"³ In one of several places where Clement of Alexandria calls attention to the work, he says: "And in the epistle to the Colossians he [Paul] writes."⁴

The date of the letter is placed a little earlier than that to the Ephesians, or at about A.D. 62.

Date.

¹ Introd. to Com. on Col.

² Dial., 100. Cf. Apol., i. 46, ii. 6; Col. i. 15-17.

³ Adv. Hær., iii. 14 (1). Cf. Col. iv. 14.

⁴ Strom., i. 1. Cf. Tertull. De Præs. Hær., vii.

FIRST TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Thessalonica — more anciently Thermæ, and the modern Saloniki — was a city of Macedonia, situated on the bay of Thermæ, and at this day contains a population of seventy thousand souls. Paul, as we learn from Acts xvii. 1, xx. 2, twice visited the city.

The “undesigned coincidences” of the first letter to the Thessalonians with other early historical writings (Acts xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6); the fact that, as consolatory in its character, it singularly accords with what is known from other sources of the Apostle’s personal experiences and those of this church; its correspondences of style and diction with other acknowledged productions of Paul, together with and in addition to external evidence satisfactory both in quality and amount, furnish ample support for this epistle as deserving its place in the New Testament collection. Doubts of its genuineness have indeed been started among a certain school of critics in Germany, and, as usual, on grounds wholly subjective and internal; but they have met with but little encouragement even among those most given to speculations of this kind.

The Apostolic Fathers, it is true, nowhere directly quote the letter as a production of Paul, — a thing which would have ill accorded with their position and the uniform custom of their times, — yet their writings contain allusions to it so conspicuous and definite as to compel the inference of a definite acquaintance.

Polycarp, for example, in writing to the church at Philippi, incorporates a well-known passage from it in his own letter: “Abstaining from all [kinds of] evil,” which is the true rendering of 1 Thess. v. 22.¹ And in another part of the same letter culls another expression from the same epistle: “Making intercession for all without ceasing.”² Dionysius of Corinth (d. A.D. 177), according to Euse-

¹ c. xi. Cf. Davidson’s *Introd. to N. T.*, i. 19.

² c. iv. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 17.

bius, also made use of a phrase taken from this work.¹ And Irenæus (c. 130-200) wrote: "Now the God of peace sanctify you perfect (*perfectos*); and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved whole," &c.² And Clement of Alexandria in the "Instructor": "This the blessed Paul most clearly pointed out when he said, 'When we might have been burdensome as Apostles of Christ, we were gentle among you as a nurse cherisheth her children.'"³ So Tertullian, in his work on the Resurrection, claiming to quote Paul: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, there is no necessity for my writing unto you."⁴

This is one of the earliest of Paul's writings, and perhaps the very first of all the extant written records of Christianity. It is dated at about A.D. 53 or 54.

Date.

SECOND TO THE THESSALONIANS.

The second epistle has the same numerous incidental supports to its Pauline authorship as the first, besides very significant and important ones in addition. The writer's first epistle had been misunderstood, and used in a way wholly unauthorized (ii. 1, 15). In the second, he deprecates the course that had been taken; puts the discipleship on their guard against imposture; appeals to them in the name of the Lord to see that this second epistle is read to all the "holy brethren"; and finally adds his signature with the asseveration of its genuineness: "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is a token in every epistle; so I write" (iii. 17).

The difficulties which have arisen concerning the work relate chiefly to matters of interpretation, and centre about chapter ii. 1-12. Its external defences are of the strongest character. Probably Polycarp alludes to it when he writes: "Yet esteem not such as enemies, but as erring members recall them that ye may save their whole body."⁵

Principal difficulties.

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 11. Cf. Westcott, Hist. Can. N. T., p. 167.

² Adv. Hær., v. 6 (1). Cf. 1 Thess. v. 23.

⁴ De Res., xxiv. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 2.

³ Strom., i. 1. Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 6, 7.

⁵ Ad. Phil., 11. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 15.

There is little doubt that Justin Martyr had become familiar with it before he wrote: "When also the man of apostasy, speaking proud things against the Most High, will dare upon the earth lawless things against us Christians."¹ Irenæus also refers to the same central figure: "And again, in the II. to the Thessalonians, speaking concerning antichrist, 'And then shall that wicked one be revealed whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the spirit of his mouth, and the presence of his advent will destroy him.'"² And Clement of Alexandria had learned the value of the injunction: "But pray ye that ye may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men; for all men have not faith."³ The epistle found a place both in the canon of Marcion and of Muratori, different as they were, and in the Peshito and the old Latin version.

It is supposed to have been written but a few months after the first to the same church (C. 54). Date.

FIRST TO TIMOTHY.

The Timothy to whom two letters of the New Testament canonical list are addressed was a native of Lystra, Who Timothy was. in Pamphilia (Acts xvi. 1). It is inferred that he became a convert to Christianity on the occasion of Paul's visit to his native city, an account of which is recorded in Acts xiv. 6, 7, 21. He afterwards journeyed with the Apostle, and was for a considerable period his companion at Rome (Acts xvi. 1; xix, 22; xxiii. 5; Rom. xvi. 21; Col. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 6; Philem. 1).

It is thought that when this first letter was written, Timothy was in charge of the church at Ephesus. Paul, it is supposed, hoping to revisit him, but still apprehensive Whither letter was sent. that he might be disappointed in this purpose, writes his apostolic instructions herewith to Timothy on important matters connected with his position as overseer of the church.

The difficulty of finding any place for the date of this epistle

¹ Dial., c. 110. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

² Strom., v. 3. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 2.

³ Adv. Hær., v. 7, (2). Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 8.

within the limits of Paul's life as recorded in the Acts, although that record leaves intervals of some length in his life unaccounted for, within which it *might* have been written, together with the fact that a somewhat advanced stage of church order and ripened development of false doctrine are presupposed in it, has furnished watchful objectors with an occasion to impugn its genuineness. But these objections lose their point if the epistle be assigned to a period in the Apostle's life *subsequent* to events recorded in Acts xxviii. There is much to favor such a date in the contents of the epistle itself; and while a well-authenticated tradition of a second imprisonment of Paul might seem to be all that was needful to render such a theory probable, such a tradition does really exist.

That Paul may have had the opportunity for writing this and the two following epistles after the events recorded in the last chapter of the Acts, or even in one of the several chronological gaps occurring in that book, is certainly more credible than the supposition that it and they all three are forgeries of a later period, especially in the face of historic evidence which is sufficiently abundant, consistent, and unwavering.

As has been intimated, the first epistle to Timothy now under consideration stands or falls with the second to Timothy, and that to Titus. On this point the majority of critics are agreed. Objections of the kind considered against one hold equally against all; while the evidence in favor of one virtually supports all. But there is nothing in matter or style in this work which would not synchronize and harmonize with the date which we have suggested. Moreover, the writer undoubtedly meant to be considered as Paul the Apostle, and if he were not, then we must account by an *adequate reason* for a most flagrant deception on the part of one who certainly writes in a style of perfect honesty and with the unction of an Apostle. Under circumstances far less favorable, indeed, such external proofs of genuineness as we have to present ought to be accepted as decisive. They all point in one direction, — all historical allusions which can be found bearing on the subject, — and all

Grounds on which genuineness is impugned.

No lack of opportunities when it might have been written.

First and second Timothy historically bound together.

favor the authorship of Paul. Indeed, Christian antiquity appears to have had no doubts on the subject. And, supposing the date of the epistle to have been A.D. 66 or 67, but a comparatively brief period elapsed after its composition, before it left traces on the ecclesiastical literature of the times which are still extant.

Clement of Rome, for instance, uses language which suggests this epistle as its probable source: "Let them display their love not by preferring one another."¹ And Polycarp, another who had himself heard the Apostle, cites more explicitly: "But the love of money is the root of all evils."² Again, Irenæus (130-200) cites 1 Tim. i. 4, with the words, "as the Apostle saith;" and elsewhere: "Because the law was made for righteous men."³ Theophilus (c. 168-180), in his work addressed to Autolycus, — preserved to our day entire, — also makes an evident citation from I. Timothy: "In order that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life."⁴ Other supposed references are to be found in the Letter to Diognetus (c. iv; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16; also c. xi); the fragment on the Resurrection (c. viii; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 4); Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii. 2; cf. 1 Tim. i. 9), and the letter addressed by the Church of Vienne and Lyons to the brethren in Asia Minor, A.D. 177. The epistle is admitted with its two companion documents into the Peshito version (c. 150), and into the canon of Muratori (A.D. 60-170).

SECOND TO TIMOTHY.

The second epistle to Timothy was written as Ellicott, Alford, Bleek, and others suppose, during Paul's second imprisonment at Rome, while he was awaiting martyrdom (c. 67 or 68), the last year or the last but one of the reign of Nero. Bleek's argument on this point seems quite conclusive.⁵ Internal evidence fully justifies this theory. The Apostle is a prisoner (i. 8, 12, 16; ii. 9), and in Rome

¹ Ep. to Cor., c. xxi. Cf. 1 Tim. v. 21.

² c. iv. Cf. 1 Tim. vi. 10.

³ Adv. Hær., iv. 16 (3). Cf. 1 Tim. i. 9.

⁴ Ad, Autol., xiv. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 9.

⁵ Introd. to N. T., ii. 74-76

(i. 16, 17). He had already been tried and condemned (iv. 16, 17). He has a presentiment that his imprisonment will terminate in death (iv. 6-8). Luke, of his helpers, alone is with him (iv. 11). Other helpers had been with him and he had keenly felt their departure (iv. 10, 12). Demas (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24) had gone with the rest. This epistle was written to urge the coming of Timothy as soon as possible (i. 4; iv. 9, 21); and of Mark (iv. 11); and enjoins their bringing certain things which Paul had left at Troas, — “the cloak” (? bag) and “the parchments.” How does the simple rehearsal of these circumstantial details quite remove all ground for the theory that this is a forged document! But if such a document by some incredible ingenuity could have been forged, then what sufficient motive existed for so difficult and discreditable an undertaking?

In addition to the early historical evidence already cited in connection with the preceding letter, Ignatius is understood to allude in a certain place to the language of this one as “Please ye him under whom ye fight,” which is regarded as an adaptation of the words “that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.”¹ Polycarp, moreover, says: “We shall also reign together with Him: provided only we believe,” perhaps having loosely in mind the thought, “If we suffer we shall also reign with him.”² And Heracleon — the “most esteemed” of the Valentinian Gnostics and the first known commentator on the New Testament, whose writings probably appeared before A.D. 150 — made significant allusion to 2 Tim. ii. 13, according to Clement of Alexandria, employing the words, “He never can deny himself.”³ Irenæus, too, quotes the second as well as the first epistle, alluding to the pathetic words of the Apostle, “Only Luke is with me.”⁴ And Clement of Alexandria personally quotes it as a production of Paul: “But ‘foolish and unlearned questions’ the divine Paul exhorted to avoid because they gender strifes.”⁵

¹ Ad. Pol., c. vi. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 4.

² c. v. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12.

³ Strom., iv. 9.

⁴ Adv. Hær., iii. 14 (1). Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 10, 12.

⁵ Strom., v. 1. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 23.

EPISTLE TO TITUS.

Titus, to whom another pastoral letter is addressed, we find first mentioned in Gal. ii. 3, afterwards in 2 Cor. ^{Who Titus} ii. 13; vii. 6, 13, 14; viii. 6, 16, 17, 23; xii. 18. It is ^{was.} thought that he was converted by Paul (i. 4), and that, having journeyed with him in the interval between the first and second imprisonments, he was left by the Apostle at Crete (i. 5; iii. 12), whither this letter was sent to him, with the object of instructing him how he should continue to prosecute the Christian work in that island.

In style the epistle agrees with those to Timothy, while naturally differing in some respects from the earlier ones ascribed to Paul. Referring its authorship to ^{Internal characteristics.} the same person who wrote the first mentioned, a course pursued, as we have said, by nearly every critic of influence, the external evidence already brought forward might perhaps be considered sufficient, especially as the literature of the early age offers no ground whatever for *denying* its genuineness. A recent commentator, noticing this fact of the natural association of these pastoral letters both with respect to lines of influence and defence, beautifully says: "As there appear in heaven solitary stars, and again larger groups which form together one shining constellation, so we find the like phenomena in the heaven of holy writ."¹

But the early writers mentioned as having made reference to the two preceding epistles have not overlooked this. ^{First traces in history.} Clement of Rome may have had it in view when he wrote: "being ready to every good work,"² that being the very language found in the first verse of the third chapter of this letter. So, also, the fragment entitled the "Martyrdom of Polycarp" (A.D. 168), which calls attention to the truth that "we are taught to give all due honor to the powers and authorities which are ordained of God."³ A coincidence of terms and ideas, moreover, occurs between the letter to Diognetus (A.D. 117) and this letter, as follows: "And when the

¹ Lange's Com., *ad loc.*² c. ii.³ c. x. Cf. Tit. iii. 1. (? Rom. xiii. 1-7.)

time had come which God had before appointed for manifesting his own kindness and power," &c.¹ Irenæus quotes at large and definitely: "A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself."² And Clement of Alexandria is as direct: "But in works they deny Him, being abominable and disobedient, and to every good work reprobate."³ While Tatian, in earlier life a disciple of Justin Martyr, according to the testimony of Jerome, explicitly defended the genuineness of the work. "Tatian, the patriarch of the Encratites," he says, "who himself rejected some of Paul's epistles, believed this [addressed to Titus] especially ought to be declared to be the Apostle's, thinking little of the assertion of Marcion and others who agree with him on this point."⁴

EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

The epistle to Philemon might perhaps safely be left to bear witness to itself. Tertullian and Jerome held that its "own brevity defended it." Like the other epistles of the New Testament purporting to come from the same hand, it so evidently bears the impress of one common personality; its incidental references are of such a nature, uniting it by the most delicate though powerful links to the collection of epistles with which it is associated (Philem. 1, 2, 9, 18; Col. iv. 7, 9, 17; Eph. vi. 21); the originality of its design, wholly incredible as the conception of an impostor, even without a fragment of historical evidence, ought to render it invulnerable.

That all of the principal early Christian writers do not refer to it is readily accounted for not only by the ordinary style of their notices, but especially in consideration of its character as a private letter and consequent narrow range. There is no evidence, however, that it was in any case designedly omitted from the works of

Epistle to Philemon needs little external support.

Sufficient reason for infrequent allusions to the work in history.

¹ c. ix. Cf. Tit. iii. 4.

² Adv. Hær., iii. 3 (4). Cf. Tit. iii. 10, 11.

³ Strom., iv. 9. Cf. Tit. i. 16.

⁴ Hieron. Pref. to Com. on Tit.

the Fathers. Ignatius is generally thought to have alluded to its language in one or more instances, but the evidence is not clear.¹ It is enough that it was included in the very earliest canon (Marcion's, A.D. 130-140), especially as that was an heretical canon into which it seems to have been admitted, along with nearly all the other epistles of Paul, for no special reason that we know of except that it was his, and that there was nothing in it supposed to conflict with this separatist's anti-Jewish system. It took its place undisputed, also, in the first distinctively Christian catalogues, being found in the Peshito and Old Latin Versions and the fragment of Muratori. Eusebius put it among the New Testament books "universally acknowledged;" and Origen supports it by several quotations: Hom. in Jer. xix; in Matt. xxxiii., xxxiv.

¹ Ep. to Eph., iii. Cf. Philem., 8, 9. Also, Ep. to Eph., ii.

CHAPTER VI.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES, AND THE APOCALYPSE.

TO THE HEBREWS.

THE epistle to the Hebrews is, and probably always will be, of uncertain authorship. The doubts of antiquity on the subject have not only been perpetuated to modern times, but the current of speculation in this direction has now taken still wider range. It is not needful, however, that we should enter upon the voluminous and unsatisfactory, though interesting, discussion of the question. Yet it should be observed that it is not a question in which merely diverse schools of criticism are arrayed one against another, since there is scarcely a theory which has been broached respecting the authorship of the epistle which has not been able to command supporters from schools of various shades of philosophic speculation and religious belief.

Some claim that the work is exclusively that of Paul, as Stuart, Sampson, Turner, Barnes, Lindsay, Wordsworth, as well as the ancient authorities pretty generally. Others advocate the theory that while the work is essentially Paul's, it is due in its present form to Luke, as Bullock in Smith's Bib. Dict., Olshausen, and Delitzsch. The following scholars attribute the book to Apollos: Le Clerc, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, and Alford. Tertullian and the Old Latin version ascribed the work to Barnabas; and so, among the moderns, have Wieseler and Thiersch. Grotius maintains the authorship of Luke. Silas, and Clement of Rome also, have their champions in the discussion.

Authorship
of epistle to
Hebrews
probably
always to be
in doubt.

Different
authors
suggested.

Professor Kendrick recently, in reviewing Moll's argument on the subject (Lange's Com., *ad loc.*), claims that the question of authorship here is unsusceptible of solution; that the only point settled "beyond all controversy," is, that this epistle, at least in its present form, did not proceed from the pen of the Apostle Paul; and that it is scarcely less improbable that it was dictated in substance by Paul, and by some other person, in his own independent diction, committed to writing. This opinion, with slight modifications, seems, on the whole, to be the prevailing one, both in modern and ancient times. The principal point remaining in doubt is, who it was that represented Paul; and here the most weighty judgments waver between Apollos and Luke.

The question as to whom the epistle was first sent is also in dispute. Indeed, the apparent indifference with respect to these minor matters of detail with which Providence has left this book to do battle against an unbelieving world, so far from weakening our sense of its real value, becomes eminently suggestive of abundant resources within itself with which to meet all emergencies. This certainly is not the method of deception, the natural course of such as would appropriate honors which are not their own. There is no effort at concealment apparent on the part of the writer (xiii. 1). He seems rather to take it for granted that he is known to his readers, or else expects to be announced by the messenger to whose care the manuscript should be intrusted. That the epistle was intended for Jewish readers is evident; that they were the Jews of Palestine, and particularly of Jerusalem, is probable (ii. 3; v. 12; xiii. 7, 12). It has been supposed by some that the words, "they of [? from] Italy," found in chapter xiii. 24, left no alternative to the position that the communication was sent either *from* Italy or *to* Italy; but the passage alone is not decisive.¹

That concerning this work, about which there is no doubt whatever, is that it has been known to exist and been recognized as Apostolic in doctrine, from the age of the Apostles to our own. The fact, too, that, after

Prof. Kendrick's conclusion.

To whom letter was first sent.

Its genuineness as a revered product of the Apostolic age.

¹ Bleek's *Introd. to N. T.*, ii. 124.

about the middle of the second century, there were some portions of the Church which, for a time, did not accept it as canonical and authoritative, may be readily accounted for from the extant history of the period. The doubt had its sole inspiration in the previous doubt concerning its origin, and there is no reason for supposing that it had any other foundation or support. Where the question of authorship was considered as settled, and where it was not agitated, no signs of dissent from the current opinion showed themselves.

For a full hundred years after the origin of the epistle, although widely circulated and extensively quoted, No opposition in the earliest times. not a whisper was heard from any part of the Church adverse to its high claims. And so far as the Syrian and Greek and whole Eastern Church is concerned, there *never* was any question respecting its *canonicity*. It was universally accepted by them, — who, indeed, were probably in circumstances most favorable to a right decision, — without a dissentient voice.

We begin the citation of external testimony, however, with List of early writers who refer to it. a representative of the Church of the West, — Clement of Rome. Writing to the Corinthians, he said: "Let us be imitators of those also, who in goat-skins and sheep-skins went about preaching the coming of Christ;"¹ and in another chapter of the same communication declares of our Lord: "Who, being the brightness of His majesty, is so much greater than the angels as He has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." This Clement, indeed, who may even have seen the hand which wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, not only makes numerous citations from it, but incorporates into the very substance of his own letter to the Corinthians its ideas throughout, to such an extent, that, according to the dispassionate judgment of Westcott, it is not too much to say that it was "wholly transfused into Clement's mind."²

And, without laying too much stress upon alleged references of other Apostolic Fathers, there is one expression in Justin Martyr, which has already been noticed,

¹ cc. xvii., xxxvi. Cf. Heb. xi. 37; i. 3, 4.

² Hist. Can. N. T., p. 24.

and which it would be difficult to account for without presupposing his familiar acquaintance with this epistle. He speaks in one place of Christ as the "Son and Apostle of God," a peculiar term to be applied to Christ, and justified by no passage of Scripture except one found in Heb. iii. 1.¹

Nearly contemporaneous with Justin's literary activity, one Pinytus wrote a letter to Dionysius of Corinth (d. 177), Pinytus to Dionysius of Corinth. a fragment of which has been preserved by Eusebius, wherein he appropriates the thought of several successive verses of the epistle to the Hebrews. He bids Dionysius to "impart at some time more solid food, tenderly feeding the people committed to him with a letter of riper instruction, lest by continually dwelling on milk-like teachings they should insensibly grow old without advancing beyond the teaching of babes."² From Eusebius we also learn that Irenæus, in a work no longer extant, made reference to this book, — according to Wordsworth as St. Paul's; but Westcott judges that he did not attribute it to Paul. Clement of Alexandria (165–220), again, says that the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's; but that it was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew dialect, and that Luke, having carefully translated it, published it for the use of the Greeks.⁴ Here we see the testimony beginning to waver on the point of authorship.

It should be noticed, however, that, through Clement of Alexandria, we are confronted with an earlier witness than himself, whose testimony is most explicit. In Pantænus. the same connection as the above, he goes on to say: "And as the blessed presbyter" — supposed to be Pantænus, his predecessor in the catechetical school at Alexandria — "before now used to say, since the Lord, as being the Apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, through his modesty, inasmuch as he was sent to the Gentiles, does not call himself Apostle to the Hebrews both on account of the honor due to the Lord, and because it was a work of supererogation that he *addressed an epistle to the Hebrews also*, since he

¹ Apol., i. 12, 63. Cf. Heb. ix. 13; Dial., xxxiv.; cf. viii. 7.

² Euseb. H. E., iv. 23. Cf. Heb. v. 12–14.

³ Words. on Can., p. 95. Westcott, do., p. 337.

⁴ Euseb. H. E., vi. 14.

was herald and Apostle of the Gentiles.”¹ Other pertinent examples might be given, but these must suffice.

Previous to the middle of the second century, then, the Partial sum-epistle to the Hebrews was well known, widely cited, ^{mary of} testimony. and, as far as extant Christian literature gives us any information, universally accepted as canonical. Subsequently to that time, for a period of nearly two hundred years, its canonicity was disputed, or regarded as doubtful, by a certain portion of the Church; generally speaking, the Latin churches, — those of Italy and North Africa, not including Alexandria, — *but wholly on the ground of unknown authorship*. In the Greek Church, on the other hand, and the Eastern churches generally, supposed to have a special proprietorship in the epistle, the defection, if so it may be called, elsewhere did not change the judgment which had been settled from the first. And after A.D. 397 (date of third council of Carthage), the churches of the West also came fully back to the early decision, and from that day to this the question has remained comparatively undisturbed.

The records of history on this subject during the interval of partial doubt are interesting, chiefly as showing the specific ground of hesitancy. The Old Latin Version ^{Records of history during the interval of doubt.} (c. 160) regarded the production as the work of Barnabas, and did not hold it to be canonical. Eusebius (270–340) was inclined personally to believe the epistle was substantially from St. Paul, although he thought it likely that Clement of Rome was the Apostle’s representative in producing it.² Origen (186–254) says: “If I were to express my own opinion, I should say that the thoughts are the Apostle’s, but the diction and composition those of some one who recorded from memory the Apostle’s teaching, and, as it were, illustrated with a brief commentary the sayings of his Master. If, then, any church hold the epistle to be Paul’s, we cannot find fault with it for so doing; for it is not without good reason that the men of old time have handed it down as Paul’s. But who it was that wrote it God only knows certainly.”³

Dionysius of Alexandria (d. 265), on the other hand, a

¹ H. E., vi. 14.

² H. E., iii. 38.

³ Hom. on Heb.

distinguished disciple of Origen, maintained that the epistle was wholly Paul's.¹ While Tertullian (c. 160–240), Dionysius of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others. representing doubtless the majority of the Latin churches of his time, following the Old Latin Version, assigned the work to Barnabas, and did not, it would seem, allow it to be of full canonical authority. Cyprian (born c. A.D. 200, converted to Christianity about 245) followed the example of Tertullian in this respect.² But these sentiments could not long prevail, even here, against the unanimous testimony of the early Church and the contemporaneous judgment of Greece, Syria, and the entire Eastern world. Hence, we find views becoming more conflicting; then a toning down of extreme opinions; and at last, in Jerome (329–420), who was the best representative of the Roman Church of his time, an acceptance of the epistle as canonical and the work of Paul, doubts and prepossessions on the latter point being yielded to the testimony of “the ancients.” Augustine, too (353–430), reckoned it as one of the fourteen epistles of St. Paul, and as constituting, together with the other books of our present Bibles, the Canon of Holy Scripture.

EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The epistles of the New Testament not ascribed to Paul have, from a very early period, for some unexplained reason, received the general title of “Catholic Epistles.” Catholic Epistles,—whence the name. It has been supposed that it was on account of their encyclical character as general letters of instruction, the name being at first applied only to a part, but afterwards including even those addressed to private persons.³ There are others who suppose that the name originated in the fact that the different Apostles were engaged in writing them; and still others, that the title is meant to indicate the catholic doctrine taught in the epistles.⁴ These epistles, in the most ancient manuscripts extant, have usually a different position from that

¹ Euseb. H. E., vi. 41.

² De Exhort. Mart., 11.

³ De Wette's Introd., p. 320. Cf. Bleek, do., ii. 131; Hilgenfeld, Der Kan. &c., p. 70.

⁴ Herzog's Encyc. Art. James.

assigned them in our English Bibles, being found immediately after the Acts.

With respect to the work now before us, the same difficulty has been experienced as in the epistle just considered, that of identifying with certainty the writer. There is no doubt that the letter is the production of James, but what James? Here the confusion seems to be almost hopeless. The author styles himself simply "James, servant of God and of Jesus Christ." With a mere statement of some of the opinions held with respect to authorship, we shall leave that part of the subject.

Reuss says: "James is he who was at the head of the church at Jerusalem."¹ Alford holds that James the Just was author of the epistle; that he was real brother of our Lord,—an Apostle in the same sense as Barnabas and Paul, though not one of the original twelve; and that this James is not identical with James the son of Alphæus.² Wordsworth is of the opinion that the James here meant was the son of Alphæus, really a cousin, but so-called brother of our Lord, and one of the twelve.³ An able article in Smith's "Biblical Dictionary" maintains that the author of the epistle was James the Less, brother of our Lord, and one and the same with the son of Alphæus.⁴ Lange in "Herzog's Encyclopædia," and in his Commentary on this epistle, virtually agrees with the latter opinion, identifying James the son of Alphæus with our Lord's brother, and making him the author of this epistle. De Wette thinks James the Less, the son of Alphæus, to be the author of the work, but that he was not the same as the brother of our Lord.⁵ Davidson supposes the epistle to have been written by our Lord's brother, but that he and the son of Alphæus are not the same persons.⁶ Bleek is of opinion that the James mentioned in this epistle is the one mentioned in Acts xii. 17; xv. 12; Gal. ii. 9-12.⁷

The confusion of opinions respecting the actual writer of this work, together with the fact that it was not addressed

¹ Gesch. d. Heil. Schrift. N. T., sect. 56, 146.

² Greek Test., vol. iv., Prolegom.

³ Canon of O. & N. T., p. 209.

⁴ Art. James.

⁵ Introd. to N. T., pp. 323-328.

⁶ Introd. to N. T., i. 281-285.

⁷ Introd. to N. T., ii. 131-136.

to any particular church, served to embarrass, without doubt, even in the early times, the claim to genuineness which it put forth. Gradually, however, it won its way against all obstacles, and, from being generally received, came to be universally acknowledged as worthy of canonical rank.

Doubtful
authorship
occasion of
suspecting
the work
itself.

The very first step we take from the Apostolic age we come upon distinct traces of the existence of the work. De Wette and Davidson admit that such traces are discoverable in Clement of Rome. In chapter tenth of his Corinthian letter, he says: "Abraham, styled the 'friend,' was found faithful, inasmuch as he rendered obedience to the word of God."¹ And in chapter thirty-first: "For what reason was our father Abraham blessed? Was it not because he wrought righteousness and truth through faith?" The undoubtedly genuine epistle of Barnabas contains a probable reference also: "Thou shalt not be of doubtful mind as to whether a thing shall be or not."² And Ignatius in his epistle to the Ephesians: "Do not err, my brethren."³ The "Shepherd," by Hermas, composed a little before the time of the gathering of the Canon of Muratori (c. 150), has an obvious adaptation of a passage from James, as its quotation will show: "For if ye resist him [the devil] he will flee from you in confusion;"⁴ and throughout this strange work the coincidence of thought and language with the epistle is remarkable.⁵

Traces of it
in ecclesiastical
literature.

Irenæus (c. 130-200), it can scarcely be doubted, was well acquainted with the book: "Abraham believed God," he says, "and it was counted to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God."⁶ The epistle was received into the earliest Syrian canon (Peshito version), although others of the so-called "disputed books" were omitted. On account of the region from which it comes this testimony is much enhanced. Clement of Alexandria (c. 165-220) does not appear to have been acquainted with the book, at least passes it over in silence. Eusebius, while plac-

Irenæus
shows un-
doubted ac-
quaintance
with the
work.

¹ Cf. Jas. ii. 23.

² c. xix. Cf. Jas. i. 6.

³ c. xvi. Cf. Jas. i. 16.

⁴ Mand., xii. 5, 6. Cf. Jas. iv. 7.

⁵ Vis., iii. 9; Mand., ii. 9, 11; Sim., viii. 6.

⁶ Adv. Hær., iv. 16 (2).

ing it among the books "disputed," yet declares that it was publicly used in most of the churches.¹ Origen termed it "the divine epistle of the Apostle James," whom, moreover, he generally designated as the "Apostle," although sometimes, as "the brother of our Lord."² After the latter part of the fourth century, doubts which had been before entertained to a limited extent, especially in the Greek Church, where it was least likely to be well known, quietly passed away, and it took its place everywhere as a coequal part of the New Testament collection.

On the whole, there is abundant external evidence in favor of the book, to place it in a position where its doctrinal contents shall be able to demonstrate to every reasonable mind their vast superiority over any non-canonical productions of the post-Apostolic age.³ There are no signs of forgery about it, but the very reverse. The impostor would not have left the whole world in uncertainty respecting the question who it is that is meant to be considered the writer. Considering the gradual manner in which the Canon of the New Testament was formed, the rules that governed the process, there is no just reason for denying that this epistle should form a constituent part of it.

FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

Simon, whose Apostolic name was Peter, was a resident of Galilee at the time of his becoming a disciple of Jesus (John i. 45; xii. 21). His brother Andrew also belonged to the number of the twelve. There is every reason to suppose that, during his distinguished Apostolic career, at least in the early part of it, this Apostle enjoyed the companionship and helpfulness of a wife (Matt. viii. 14; Luke iv. 38; 1 Cor. ix. 5); and so, practically, condemned beforehand, those who, notwithstanding the assumption of special connection with him, as patron and exemplar, enjoin clerical celibacy.

¹ H. E., ii. 23.

² De Wette, *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 333

³ Cf. *Com. on Rom. iv. 8*, with *Jas. vi. 4*.

With respect to the Apostle's later life, it cannot be proved that he was ever at Rome at all. It is probable, Peter's residence at Rome. however, that he was, and there suffered martyrdom. But that he was ever bishop of the Roman church, or founded that church, no Protestant scholar believes. Paul's epistles from Rome are sufficient evidence that Peter was not there with him, and had not been there before him. Alford says: "that St. Peter was, in any sense like that usually given to the word, bishop of Rome, is, we believe, an idea abhorrent from Scripture, and from the facts of primitive Apostolic history."¹

The "elect" to whom the first epistle is addressed may refer to Gentiles or Jews, but the question of the exact To whom the letter is addressed. circle of readers for whom it was intended must remain unsettled.

The date of the document is decided by most commentators on the supposition that Peter had previously read the Date. epistles of Paul, at least, those to the Ephesians and Colossians. Hug and De Wette date it from A.D. 65-67, Thiersch, 63-64; Bleek assents to a later date. For hints as to time, the epistle itself may be consulted (i. 8, 14; iii. 16; iv. 12, 14, 17; vi. 1-5).

With respect to historic as well as internal proofs of genuineness, the work appears to lack nothing. Within Historic and other proofs. itself, in all historic allusions, it nicely fits into the general history of the period to which it is claimed to belong. Schleiermacher is said to have found a proof of honesty in chapter i. 8 (cf. v. i), since a writer of a later period would have put forward an apology for a Pauline tendency in a different manner.² The language in 1 Peter, iv. 17, shows that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. And the writer's style of expression accords with that of the Apostle Peter as recorded in the second and third chapters of the Acts.

But the proofs from external history are alone overwhelmingly convincing. We are not able to find a single ancient

¹ Com. on Luke, 170legom. Cf. Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.*, i. 410; Bleek's do., ii. 156.

² Bleek, *Introd. to N. T.*, ii. 170.

writer who himself doubts, or who reports any doubts, on the part of others, respecting its genuineness. Modern hypercritical opponents, in order to find ground for rejecting the book, are obliged to resort to such reasoning as to declare that, inasmuch as the epistle was probably written in Greek, it could not have been written by Peter, who possesses no claims to such elegant culture.¹

The second epistle of Peter, so called, which for our present purpose may be regarded as an early historical document, recognizes the existence of the first (2 Pet. iii. 1). Polycarp, just entering life as the apostles' ended, to whom the work therefore came with its first original freshness, uses it "as freely and fully as any modern preacher might do," not once, but many times, quoting particularly that beautiful passage: "In whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."² The epistle to Diognetus (c. 117) contains the following parallel passage: "The flesh hates the soul and wars against it."³ And Papias, Polycarp's friend, as we learn from Eusebius, drew from this source to illustrate his own writings: "The same author [Papias] made use of testimonies from the first epistle of John, and likewise from that of Peter."⁴ So, too, Melito of Sardis, in an apology written about A.D. 176, uses the following familiar language: "When thou, Cæsar [Marcus Antoninus], shall learn these things thyself, and thy children also with thee, thou wilt bequeath them to an eternal inheritance which fadeth not away."⁵ While Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, cites the epistle by name: "Peter says in his epistle, 'Whom not seeing ye love,'" &c., quoting the passage just noticed as having been cited by Polycarp.⁶

Clement of Alexandria shows an equal respect for the document: "And Peter in the epistle," he says, "declares the same."⁷ It is recognized by Hermas, author of the "Shepherd" (c. 150); has a place in the Peshito

Clement of
Alexandria,
Hermas and
others.

¹ Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.*, i. 426.

² *Ad. Phil.*, i. Cf. ii., v., with 1 Pet. i. 8, 21; ii. 11, 12, 24; *1v.* 7.

³ c., vi. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 11.

⁴ *H. E.*, iii. 39.

⁵ 1 Pet. i. 4. Cf. Westcott, *Hist. N. T. Can.*, 194 (n.).

⁶ *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 9 (2).

⁷ *Pæd.*, i. 6. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 1-5.

version; is quoted by Tertullian with the preface,—“Peter says to the people of Pontus;”¹ is reckoned among books about which there had never been any dispute or uncertainty by Eusebius; and was treated as Apostolic by Origen and Cyprian.

SECOND OF PETER.

The second epistle of Peter is one of the books of the New Testament which Eusebius reckoned among the “An-^{A “dis-puted” book.}tilegomena,” “disputed.” “Among the controverted books,” he wrote, “which are nevertheless well known and recognized by most, we class the epistle circulated under the name of James, and that of Jude, as well as the II. of Peter and the so-called II. and III. of John, whether they really belong to the Evangelist or to another of the same name.”² He goes on immediately after to speak of another class of books which he calls “spurious;” from which, therefore, he evidently distinguishes these.

The second of Peter is not found in the Peshito version, nor in the Canon of Muratori; although of the latter ^{Not found in the Peshito or Muratorian Canon.} it is to be said that it does not contain the first of Peter, and certain other New Testament books otherwise well supported. Allusions to the work now before us in the early age are considerably less frequent than to most of the sacred writings associated with it, indeed, may be said to be quite rare; and it is generally acknowledged, moreover, that it differs to some extent in style from its predecessor. That the epistle was not widely diffused during the first hundred years after it was written is evident. That it was not always recognized as the production of the Apostle Peter in regions where it was known is equally evident. But it remains for us to discover whether there is valid ground for the belief that it was known at all at a period so early as to fix its date within the Apostolic age, which of itself would be *prima facie* evidence that Peter was its author; and whether in addition there is not sufficient positive evidence of Petrine authorship to justify us, notwithstanding certain unfavorable appearances, in a confident acceptance of the fact.

¹ Scorpiaç., xii.

² H. E., iii. 24, 25.

First, then, if a person may be allowed to testify in his own behalf, the writer assures us both incidentally and directly that he is Peter, the Apostle, supporting that character throughout the epistle even more conspicuously than in the former one. And with respect to style, this work has more points of agreement, it is claimed, than of disagreement with the first. So that when the difference of subject is considered, and a possible interval of many years between the writings, there is no insuperable obstacle in that direction. That the circumstance of the citation of Paul's epistles under the apparent title of "Scripture" by this writer (2 Pet. iii. 16) is proof of an origin subsequent to the Apostolic age, is a matter of pure conjecture. The resemblance of the epistle to that of Jude, and the evident fact that the one work was known to the writer of the other, has at least as much weight to prove the genuineness of II. Peter as to disprove it, and many think much greater. The following passages in II. Peter are supposed to be alluded to by Jude: 2 Pet. i. 2; ii. 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18.

If the writer was not the Apostle Peter, moreover, it must be admitted that he is one of the most brazen-faced of impostors. He claims not only this, but the former epistle (iii. 1). While he himself was devising a fable, he could write: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." He represents himself as Peter the aged, near his end (i. 14, 15); as having been one of those who was with Jesus on the "holy mount." Elsewhere, he speaks of "false teachers, who should privily bring in damnable heresies and deny the Lord that bought them." What language for an impostor! He was an impostor, too, who better understood and could more perfectly set forth the peculiar spiritual ideas of Christianity than any un-Apostolic man known to history.

But turning to contemporaneous records, we have in Clement of Rome, himself a disciple of Peter, a passage which, it is generally claimed, receives its coloring from one found in this very epistle. He writes: "On account of hos-

pitality and godliness, Lot was delivered from Sodom, when all the neighboring country was condemned with fire and brimstone. The Lord made it manifest that he doth not forsake those who trust in him; but those who turn to other ways, he appoints to punishment and suffering.”¹ No others of the Apostolic Fathers have any indisputable allusions to II. Peter, although Polycarp’s epistle is sometimes adduced in evidence. “For neither I,” he says, “nor any other such one can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul.”² Bleek, as well as Guericke, — although the former doubts Petrine authorship, — thinks that Justin Martyr (c. 90–148) takes a passage from this work. In his dialogue with Trypho, he says: “We have perceived, moreover, that the expression, ‘The day of the Lord is as a thousand years,’ is connected with this subject.”³ Westcott, however, does not discover any trace of the Catholic Epistles in this writer.⁴

It has been asserted by not a few that Irenæus and Hermas show acquaintance with the work, but the most careful critics hesitate to claim it.⁵ Irenæus makes use of the same expression as Justin Martyr, just noticed.⁶ Theophilus (wrote 168–180) employs a peculiar figure of this book, and is therefore cited in its support.⁷ Hippolytus (c. 220) has this passage: “And they have confessed [their errors] for a short period, but after a little wallow once again in the same mire.”⁸

Very interesting and apparently valid, though late, testimony is available, too, from the very region into which the work now before us was first sent; and where, for so long a period, it rested in comparative obscurity. About A.D. 250, Firmilian was bishop of Cesaræa, in Cappadocia. A letter of his extant, in Latin, to be found among the letters of Cyprian, has this sentence: “Even herein defaming Peter and Paul, the blessed Apostles, as if the very men delivered this who, in their epistles, *execrated heretics and*

¹ Ad Cor., xi. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6, 9.

² c. iii. Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 15.

³ c. lxxx. Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 8.

⁴ Hist. of N. T. Can., p. 148.

⁵ Hermas, Vis., i. c. 3. Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 5.

⁶ Adv. Hær., v. 23 (2).

⁷ Ad Autol., ii. 13. Cf. 2 Pet. i. 19.

⁸ Ref. of All Her., ix. 2. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 22. Cf. Westcott, Hist. N. T. Can., p. 333.

warned us to avoid them." He is thought to allude particularly to 2 Pet. ii.¹ Westcott thinks this allusion the more worthy of consideration, from the fact that Melito, of Sardis, in an Apology written about A.D. 176, clearly refers to the substance of 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12. The same Melito—in an Oration preserved in Syriac—has also a passage which suggests 2 Pet. iii. 5-7, as its probable source. He writes: "So also it will be at the last time. There shall be a flood of fire, and the earth shall be burned up together with their idols . . . and the just shall be delivered from the fury, like their fellows in the ark from the waters of the deluge."²

Origen is the first who quotes the epistle as Peter's, and this he does while acknowledging that there were those who disputed Petrine authorship.³ In one of his homilies he introduces a citation from the epistle with the words, "Petrus dixit." After the time of Origen, the work becoming more fully known, all opposition gradually subsided, and by the early part of the fourth century it had silently conquered, through evidence produced from some quarter and its own inherent worth, without the aid of public conference or ecclesiastical decree, the right to a full acknowledgment on the part of the Church. Reasons for its being kept so long on probation began now, also, to be sought for, Jerome (329-420) suggesting that possibly it was its difference of style caused by Peter's having employed different interpreters.

If the references to this work in early writers are not full and explicit as could be desired, it is to be considered whether they do not meet any reasonable demand. If they are not demonstrative, have they not at least an impression of strong probability? Have we, moreover, a right to presuppose so numerous a multiplication and diffusion of this or any other particular book of the New Testament in very early times, that much reliance should be placed on the fact of the simple absence of evidence of its existence for a considerable period, after its production, in most parts of the ecclesiastical world?

¹ Firm. Ep. (Ep. of Cyprian), lxxiv. 6.

² Hom. in Levit., iv. 4.

³ Westcott, Hist. Can. of N. T., p. 194, n.

From the admitted circumstance, just as obviously true now as then, that the traces of this work are not so abundant in the early Christian literature as of other associated works, we are forewarned of, and prepared for, the testimony of Origen and Eusebius, when it comes, to the effect that it was disputed by some. It shows a healthy, if not always critical, spirit of investigation and deliberation in the early Church, which should have an opposite effect to that of distrusting their ultimate judgment. And inasmuch as after the question of genuineness was fairly started, along with the more general circulation of the epistle, it won its way, finally, in spite of its high claim, by tacit and universal admission, into the increasingly exclusive Canon of the New Testament, it should seem that there is no good reason now — saying nothing of its contents — for its exclusion. Such a fact might be regarded, indeed, as strong proof that the work actually had a well-attested origin in the Apostolic times, notwithstanding the mere silence of history on the subject up to the time of Origen, even if such silence were, for the moment, to be admitted: and *especially if it were fully admitted.*

Grounds of hesitation on the part of early Christians reasonable.

FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the work which purports to be the first epistle of John, was written by the same hand which wrote the fourth Gospel. This position, critics of all schools have generally admitted. The external defences of the two writings, then, standing together, ought to be of the most satisfactory character, since they appear to be quite adequate to their purpose when standing apart.

Author of the fourth Gospel, and the so-called First Epistle of John the same.

Bleek says that the similarity between the first epistle of John and the fourth Gospel is so striking and so thorough in character, in thought, and in language, in distinct representations and turns of expression, as to be utterly incomprehensible, save on the supposition of identity

Opinion of Bleek and De Wette.

of authorship.¹ And De Wette expresses himself to the same intent: that there is no doubt that the two proceed from the same author; that they bear the distinctest stamp of relationship in style of writing and development of thought. "Both throw the same spell of genial human feeling over the reader."²

Although the author does not definitely announce himself here, any more than in the Gospel, there is a decided Author not definitely announced. undercurrent of fact and sentiment in both which enables us to identify him (i. 1-4; iv. 14); and this fact, taken in connection with the nearly unanimous verdict of antiquity, ought to leave no residuum of doubt whatever. Such an interweaving of subtle allusions, on the one hand, would be something as much beyond the bungling craft of a forger, as the heavenly doctrine of the work, on the other, would be above the reach of his earth-born spirit.

External testimony begins with the contemporaneous writings of Polycarp, and is direct, connected, uninterrupted, and conclusive. Polycarp, for example, says, External testimony from Polycarp to Origen. in the words of John: "For every one that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist."³ Papias, according to the definite testimony of Eusebius, quoted from the "former epistle of John."⁴ The letter to Diognetus shows, it would seem, unmistakably the influence of the teaching of the Apostle, both in this epistle and in the Gospel. We find such expressions, for instance, as, "Christians dwell in the world, though they are not of the world." One, it is affirmed, gives outlet to his love of God by "loving his neighbor," whereby he becomes an "imitator of God." At the end of the letter we read: "The Word, who was from the beginning, . . . manifested the mysteries of the Father."⁵

The Canon of Muratori (c. 160) is very minute and circumstantial in its testimony, which is as follows: "What Testimony of Muratorian Canon, Irenæus, and others. wonder is it, then, that John so constantly brings forward Gospel phrases even in *his epistles*, saying, in his own person, 'what we have seen with our eyes, and heard

¹ Introd. to N. T., ii. 186.

⁴ H. E., iii. 39.

² Introd. to N. T., p. 354.

⁵ Cf. 1 John, i. 1; iv. 11, 19.

³ c. vii.

with our ears, and our hands have handled,' these things have we written?"¹ Irenæus refers to it a quotation which he makes from the second epistle, thus showing an acquaintance with both: "Take heed to them that ye lose not what ye have wrought."² And Clement of Alexandria was impressed, as so many have since been, with the striking passage, "God is love."³ Eusebius, in his review of the history of the books of the Bible (c. 270-340), does not speak of having discovered any opposition to the reception of this one as a work of John. While Tertullian (c. 160-240), in his treatise against Marcion, wrote: "According, indeed, to our view, he is Antichrist; as it was taught us . . . by the Apostle John, who says, that 'already many false prophets are gone out into the world.'"⁴ And Origen (186-254) remarks of the beloved disciple: "He left, also, an epistle consisting of very few lines; it may be also a second and third is from him."⁵

SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

The second and third epistles of John have not the same fulness and explicitness of external evidence as the first, although it is not inconsiderable, and, taking into account their brevity, and the fact that they were apparently designed at first only for a limited circle of readers, it is perhaps all that should be expected.

They are placed by Eusebius—who, in this respect, follows the example of Origen, whose testimony he gives, and possibly with special deference to the judgment of that distinguished Father just cited by us, in connection with the fact that they are not found in the Peshito version,—among the books not "universally received," "antilegomena." "Now of the writings of John," he says, "in addition to the Gospel, the former of his epistles, also, has been acknowledged as undoubtedly genuine both by the writers

Not the same fulness of evidence as first epistle.

Reckoned as "antilegomena," by Eusebius.

¹ Cf. 1 John, i. 1.

² Adv. Hær., iii. 16 (8).

³ Strom., iv. 18. Cf. 1 John, iv. 8, 16.

⁴ Adv. Mar., v. 16. Cf. 1 John iv. 1-3.

⁵ Euseb. H. E., vi. 25.

of our own time and by those of antiquity ; but the two remaining epistles are disputed.”¹

As far as doubts of the genuineness of these books have been entertained in modern times, however, it has Modern doubts. been mainly on internal grounds, the mere absence of the usual amount of historical support, all circumstances considered, not being deemed sufficient ground of itself for excluding them from the Canon, or denying their Johannine authorship. The principal stumbling-block is that the author styles himself the “Elder” (*πρεσβύτερος*). There are also certain supposed variations from the ordinary style of the Apostle John. Ebrard, in addition to these reasons, thinks that he discovers, in III. John ninth verse, traces of a spirit of opposition to the authority of the writer, which would be improbable if he were the evangelist and an Apostle.²

It is said, on the other hand, first, with respect to alleged Johannine authorship defended. variations of style, — most intangible and unsatisfactory evidence at best, — that these variations can be more easily accounted for on the supposition of Johannine authorship, than other more numerous resemblances to the Apostle’s style, on the supposition of any other authorship, as, for instance, that of *Presbyter John* mentioned by Papias. While, too, the second and third epistles must be referred to the same hand, as is generally admitted, the substance of eight of the thirteen verses of the second, it is claimed, being found in the first epistle. That the Apostle John, moreover, should here call himself the “Elder” is not out of harmony with the custom of the Apostles, who — Paul alone being for a special reason an exception — seem carefully to abstain from giving to themselves the title “Apostle,” preferring to use the term, “servant of Jesus Christ,” and, in one instance at least, the very one here employed, “Elder” (1 Pet. v. 1). This being true with respect to *the Apostles*, it is thought, on the other hand, that it would have been most unnatural, and an egotistical assumption of dignity, for *Presbyter John* to speak of himself by his office (*presbyter*), without giving his name, when, as was doubtless the case, he shared that office with others,

¹ H. E., iii. 25.

² Herzog’s Encyc., *ad. loc.*

not only in general, but in the same individual church. Besides, if the Apostle John were not really the author, it is significantly asked, how the wide tradition that he was so originated,—a tradition which appears along with the very first evidence of the existence of the epistles. The person or persons to whom the letters were first written must have been acquainted with the writer, and from them alone could such a clear tradition be reasonably supposed to take its origin.

The earliest notices of these brief letters which we find in history is in the Canon of Muratori (c. 160), which, Earliest notice in the Muratorian Canon. however, in the absence of previous individual witnesses, may properly be regarded as the collected judgment of many such. “The two epistles of John,” it says, “*who has been mentioned above, are received* in the Catholic [Church];” or, perhaps, it should be rendered, according to Bunsen and Westcott, “are received among the Catholic Epistles.” The author of this Canon had previously quoted the first epistle of John; and it is the opinion of Westcott, Tregelles, and others, including, it would seem, Hilgenfeld and Credner, that he refers here to the second and third epistles.¹ Credner, however, holds that, while the author of this Canon does not himself receive the two minor epistles as the work of John, the Apostle, he testifies that the Church receives them as such, “because they are in the same position as the ‘Wisdom of Solomon,’ written by friends of Solomon in honor of himself.”² Bunsen, on the other hand, suggests that this language refers to the epistle to the Hebrews, probably mentioned in that portion of the fragment which is wanting, which, like the “Wisdom of Solomon,” written by the friends of Solomon in his honor, was written by the friends of Paul in honor of that Apostle.

As an alternative of the above theory of the teaching of this ancient document, it is held that it may mean to include all the three epistles under the designation of The two epistles possibly treated as one. the two, the second and third being treated as one, as was sometimes the case.³ A very significant support of this

¹ Hist. Can. N. T., p. 191; Tregelles, Lect. on Hist. Ev. p. 61. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Der Kan.*, p. 42.

² *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.*, sect. 79.

³ *Bib. in Ch.*, pp. 116, 122.

view is found in the Old Latin (ante-Hieronymian) Version, like that of Muratori, made about A.D. 160-170. It contained both second and third John, as is proved by extant fragments, a scrap of this version, including a part of the latter epistle, being found in Codex Bezae. The fact, already noticed, that Irenæus cites a verse from the second epistle of John which he ascribes to the first, serves to confirm the position of the indefiniteness of the earlier references.¹ This indirect testimony of Irenæus, too, on account of his direct connection with the Apostle, through his teacher Polycarp, is of great value. That ordinarily our witnesses have stood nearer to the Apostolic age should not blind us to the fact that he is but one remove from it, and so perfectly competent to testify on the point before us.

Dionysius of Alexandria, bishop there about A.D. 248, is still another example of combining these epistles as one work, calling them the *epistle* of John, when he was alluding to two and perhaps the three.² Westcott has shown that even in the records of councils such a use of language was not uncommon.³ Jerome even made the mistake of quoting the third epistle as the second, unless he understood that the three were to be counted as two.⁴

Clement of Alexandria (c. 165-220) knew of more than one epistle of John, it is evident, since he quotes from the first as the *larger*. And, if the work entitled "Adumbrations," ascribed to him, be really his, a view supported by Cassiodorus, he definitely acknowledged the *second* also. Cassiodorus says: "Clement of Alexandria, a presbyter, who is also called 'Stromateus,' has made some comments on the canonical epistles; that is to say, on the first epistle of Peter, the first and second of John, and the epistle of St. James [? Jude], in pure and elegant language."⁵ Origen, besides the mention already noted, where he says that all do not admit the second and third epistles of John to be genuine,

¹ Adv. Hær., i. 16 (3). Cf. id., iii. 16 (8).

² Euseb. H. E., vii. 25.

³ Hist. N. T. Canon, p. 319, n.

⁴ Id., pp. 402, 306, n. Cf. Hilgenfeld, Der Kan., p. 52, n.

⁵ Bunsen's Analect. Ant. Nic., pp. 323 f. by Westcott, Hist. N. T. Can., p. 310.

writes elsewhere: "And John gives forth the trumpet sound in his *epistles* and Apocalypse," thus conveying a tacit acknowledgment, on his own part, of the genuineness of more than one epistle. And although he, in still another place, speaks of the "*epistle of John*," as though there were but one in circulation, it is probably more because he regarded them as of comparatively little value, than for any other reason, since he says of them, that "both together they do not contain a hundred lines." It is possible, however, that this may be another instance of the custom of associating the epistles together when speaking of them in the way of common reference.¹

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, near the beginning of the fourth century, quotes a passage from the second epistle of the "blessed John."² And the testimony of Jerome (329-420), although he was fully aware of the uncertain position which had been assigned to these letters by Origen and Eusebius, is distinctly in favor of the genuineness of both. While Augustine (354-430) admits the three letters on equal terms into his list of canonical Scriptures, of which he said: "In all these books, those who fear God and cherish humble piety seek the will of God."

Alexander,
bishop of
Alexandria,
and Jerome.

EPISTLE OF JUDE.

We meet in the epistle of Jude with the same difficulty which was found in that of James, that of identifying beyond dispute, as its author, just the person of the name who is meant. And in the attempted solution of the difficulty, moreover, the two epistles stand closely together; since, generally speaking, those critics who consider the James of the former epistle to be an Apostle and the son of Alphæus think this Jude to be the Apostle of that name and also the son of Alphæus (John xiv. 22). While those who suppose the James of the epistle to be a real brother of our

Writer of
epistle not
easily
identified.

¹ Hom. in Josh., vii. 1, and Com. in Matt. xv. 31.

² Westcott, Hist. N. T. Can., p. 381.

Lord, and not properly an Apostle, regard this Jude as another brother of our Lord and not an Apostle (Matt. xiii. 55; Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13; Jude 17.)¹

A passage in the "Adumbrations" — ascribed to Clement of Alexandria — has a direct bearing upon this question. He observes: "Jude, who wrote the Catholic Epistle, brother of the sons of Joseph, an extremely religious man, although he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself his brother. . . . We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them and him who had been declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead, that both St. Jude and St. James declined to call themselves brethren of Jesus."²

The writer of the epistle before us styles himself simply "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." Unlike what might be expected of an impostor he makes no claim to being an Apostle. He is, however, obviously intimately connected with the circle of Apostles. There are nowhere any evidences of insincerity discoverable in the work itself, or the slightest grounds to justify a supposition of deception. It is wholly Christian in sentiment, strikingly original in language, having eighteen characteristic expressions in its twenty-five verses; and was apparently written before the destruction of Jerusalem, making no allusion to that overshadowing event. Hence the work is almost universally accepted as genuine, even by such scholars as reject other books of the New Testament, historically better supported. De Wette, for instance, says that no important objection to the genuineness of this epistle can be made good.³ And Davidson, "that there is nothing against the authenticity [genuineness] of the work itself."⁴

It is thought by some that there is a trace of the epistle of Jude to be found in Polycarp: "Let us return," he says, "to the word handed down to us from the begin-

¹ Bleek, *Introd. to N. T.*, ii. 151; De Wette, *do.*, p. 364. Alford, *Prolegom. Greek Test.*

² Bunsen, *Analect. Ant. Nic.*, i. 323 f. by Westcott, *Hist. N. T. Can.*, p. 310.

³ *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 366.

⁴ *Introd. to N. T.*, i. 444.

ning.”¹ But the first positively certain recognition of it in history is in the Canon of Muratori, as already noticed: “The epistle of Jude, however, is received in the Catholic Church” [? among the Catholic Epistles]. From the connection it is inferred that the work was treated with suspicion by some, but notwithstanding was recognized generally by the Church. That it is not found to be earlier alluded to in the limited extant literature of the post-Apostolic age should occasion no surprise. If, indeed, we were to find no collateral traces of it till even a later period, its genuineness might still remain unimpeached. That we ordinarily discover an abundance of such testimony, putting beyond the possibility of successful dispute the proofs for the genuineness of the New Testament books so attested, should not therefore necessarily and equally lead to doubts and suspicions concerning those which are not similarly supported.

Clement of Alexandria, who, as we have seen in the “Adumbrations,” if he is the author of that work, has a special recognition of this writing of Jude, seems to be also Clement of Alexandria. the *first* Church Father who makes clear and undeniable allusion to it.² According to Eusebius, he formally included it among the canonical books of Scripture on which he wrote comments in his “Outlines.”³ The Peshito version did not contain the work. Origen, however, was well acquainted with it; cited it a number of times with great respect, referring it to our “Lord’s brother,” and throughout treats it as undoubtedly genuine, although well aware of the fact that it had been received by some with hesitation.⁴ And Tertullian, somewhat earlier (c. 160–240), quoted from it as the work of Jude, whom he also regarded as an Apostle: “Enoch,” he says, “possesses a testimony in Jude, the Apostle.”⁵ A contemporaneous work, written against the Novatian heresy, and usually found in connection with the writings of Cyprian, confirms this testimony of Tertullian, and shows that it was not exceptional, by its citation of Jude 14, 15, as Scripture.⁶

¹ c. vii. Cf. Jude, 3.

² Strom., iii. 2. Cf. Jude 5, 6. 11.

³ H. E., vi. 14.

⁴ In Matt. xiii. 30.

⁵ De Hab. Muliebri, iii.

⁶ Adv. Novat. Hær., sect. xvi.

Somewhat later (c. 260-272), a presbyter of Antioch, Malchion, in a letter to the bishops of Alexandria and Rome, evidently makes an extract from Jude's epistle (verses 3, 4), styling a certain heretical character of the period one who "denied his God and Lord and kept not the faith which he had formerly held."¹ Eusebius's testimony, which we find in connection with his historical summary of the books of Scripture, will be recalled: "Among the controverted books which are nevertheless well known and recognized by most, we class the epistle circulated under the name of James and that of Jude," &c. Indeed, after the fiery ordeal of the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303), and the consequent schism of Donatus (A.D. 329), this book, with the other disputed Catholic Epistles, no longer held a doubtful place, but received everywhere, with little variation, full canonical rank, which also it subsequently retained, for the most part, undisturbed.

Jerome (329-420) assigns as a reason why it was only gradually acknowledged by the Church as Scripture, and had, at first, been disputed (*a plerisque*), that it appeals to the apocryphal book of Enoch."² But there were doubtless several other reasons quite as potent, even if this has any basis in truth. The epistle, for example, is a very brief one. Then its contents are not of such commanding importance as those of most of the other books, and so naturally it was very little quoted and came into circulation but slowly. Besides, there are no internal data for determining the place of writing, and no definite circle of readers addressed. These facts, together with that of its authorship being unsettled, made it a moral certainty, considering the manner in which the Canon was established, that it should come into a full recognition, like the other "antilegomena," among the latest of the New Testament books. Its history is at least a sign of the normal and healthy action of the early Church in matters of this nature. We do not discover that the question of the writing being *a forgery* was ever started in post-Apostolic times; or that its genuineness as a production

Malchion and Eusebius.
Jerome explains its late recognition.

¹ Euseb. H. E., vii. 30.

² De Virr. Ill., iv.

of the Apostolic age, with a certain Jude for its author, was ever really and positively *opposed*. The matter of recognition when the work appeared was simply left an open question until more light could be obtained; and the honor ultimately given it by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen is satisfactory evidence that the light finally brought to bear upon it was considered fully adequate to the end desired.

THE APOCALYPSE.

Of all the books of the New Testament the Apocalypse is one of the best supported by external evidence. And although some few in ancient times, among whom the most prominent was Dionysius of Alexandria (c. 248), whose objections arose from the consideration of internal difficulties and under the pressure of dogmatic controversy; and more in modern times, as Ewald, De Wette, Bleek, Lücke, and others, likewise on internal grounds, pronounce against the *authorship of the Apostle John*, they are compelled in doing so, to go counter to the whole current of the most ancient testimony, as they are in this respect exceptions also to the majority of modern Biblical scholars. These writers, however, do not necessarily hold the Apocalypse itself to be spurious and without authority, in maintaining for it an unapostolic origin. The Alexandrine Dionysius was very careful to guard that point. And Bleek admits that if the work really *purports* to come from the hand of John *the Evangelist*, as most authorities contend, then it must be so, since he is not willing to accept the alternative of a forgery.

Historically one of the best supported of the sacred writings.

It is indisputable that the book claims to be the production of a certain John, who received it as a revelation on the isle of Patmos (i. 1, 4, 9; xxii. 8). Now, it is maintained, apparently with good reason, that this writer, precluding at present the idea of imposture, would not have taken the name of a well-known Apostle and announced himself as "John" after the formal manner of the ancient prophets; would not have

assumed so exclusive and high an authority over the seven important churches of Asia Minor as is here everywhere exhibited, if he had really occupied a position of less prominence or been any other person than the Apostle John himself. That he does not more definitely identify himself is readily accounted for from the fact that throughout the book he speaks as one already well known to the churches addressed. Would any other John than the Evangelist proceed on such a supposition? But for *him*, it would have been an unnecessary and an unlooked-for amplification to declare that he was the very Apostle; indeed, might have become the ground of suspicion, where he was least known, that he was not really that which he was so forward to claim. The writer manifests on every page, moreover, a conscious dignity blended with a beautiful modesty, traits which are eminently characteristic of the author of the fourth Gospel. He is one, too, who has borne testimony as an eye-witness of the Word of God, and now claims the sanction and support of a divine commission for the communication of his solemn and weighty message. And Davidson has shown that there is nothing in the eschatology, Christology, pneumatology, or the doctrine of Antichrist, as found in this book, inconsistent with the individuality of the Apostle John as reflected in the New Testament and in tradition.¹

With respect to differences of style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel and epistles, doubtless such differences do exist, but only in connection with marked resemblances. And, even admitting such differences to the full extent claimed, it is worth our while to consider whether they have not a sufficient explanation even on the supposition of a common authorship in the different dates of the writings and their wide difference of theme and of form. It has been remarked by some recent literary critic that the later writings of Wilkie Collins would lead us to suppose them to be from the pen of a wholly different person from him who wrote his earliest tales.

According to Irenæus, who was born about a quarter of a century only after the death of John, the Apocalypse was written by the Apostle during the reign of the

Differences of style as compared with other accepted works of the Evangelist.

Account of Irenæus.

¹ Introd. to N. T., i. 316. Cf. Smith's Dict. Art. Apoc.

Emperor Domitian (A.D. 95-97), and with this opinion nearly all ancient writers agree. The exact record which this Father makes is as follows: "It [the Revelation] was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the close of Domitian's reign."¹ This statement, made by one removed but a single generation from John, was undisputed until near the end of the fourth century, and is still pretty generally accepted. Bleek, however, on the contrary, declares that most modern scholars, deeming Irenæus wrong in his conclusions on this point, date the Apocalypse considerably earlier, as having been written, indeed, before the destruction of Jerusalem. From the list of modern scholars who entertain this opinion, he especially excepts Eichhorn, Hoffmann, Thiersch, Ebrard, and Hengstenberg, as he might also have excepted probably the great majority of English and American Biblical critics and commentators.² This, however, is to be observed, that the earlier within the Apostolic age the date of the work is fixed, the greater the improbability of forgery; and also, and especially, the more unlikely that such a work would get into circulation as the production of the Apostle John — that is, during his own lifetime — which really belonged to some other John.

The historical evidence for the genuineness of this production *as the work of the Apostle John* we shall give first, and with some reference to chronological order; and, subsequently, note its recognition and citation by early writers who made no mention of the question of authorship. We will begin with Justin Martyr, who was born before the Apostle's death, and who wrote probably somewhat before the middle of the second century (martyred A.D. 148), and in the midst of scenes with which John had been familiar. His language is: "A man amongst us whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, in a revelation which was made to him prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem."³ Irenæus, in addition to what has been already noted, declares that the work was written by him "who leaned on Jesus's breast at supper."⁴ And else-

¹ H. E., v. 8.

² Introd. to N. T., ii. pp. 225, ff.

³ Dial., c. lxxxii.

⁴ Adv. Hær., iv. 20 (11).

Historical
evidence to
Johannine
authorship.

where he speaks of ancient manuscripts of the book which he had himself seen, and, in alluding to a particular reading of a passage which they contained, declared that such reading was confirmed by those "who had seen St. John face to face."¹ In this one work this Father refers to the Apocalypse not less than a score of times, and nowhere gives a hint that any one in his day doubted that it was the production of the Evangelist. Even though his conclusions respecting the date of composition were wrong, and his views of the special reading (concerning the number of the beast) fanciful and untrustworthy, that need not disqualify him as a valid witness to the more palpable circumstances of the early existence of the work and its Johannine authorship.

The Canon of Muratori includes the work, recognizing it as the writing of some John; and, from the fact that this John is mentioned as the predecessor of Paul in the Apostolic office ("ipse beatus Apostolus Paulus sequens prædecessoris sui Johannis ordinem"), there can be no doubt that it was referred to John the Apostle.² And the Old Latin Version, as usual, agrees with its contemporary in this particular. The Peshito version, however, originating perhaps a decade or so earlier (c. 150), does not contain the book at all. The omission is attributable to the cause that this version was in process at so early a period that the Apocalypse — one of the latest written of the New Testament documents, if we accept the date of Irenæus, and one which, from the nature of its contents, would naturally be but little read in the public services of the Church — had not yet reached Edessa when the translation was effected. This is certainly as probable a reason as that its chiliastic teachings were the ground of its exclusion.³

Melito, who presided over the church at Sardis a little after the middle of the second century, — one of those churches specially addressed in the opening of this book, — is said by Eusebius to have written a treatise on the

¹ Id., v. 30 (1).

² See text of Canon in Hilgenfeld, *Der Can. &c.*; or in Westcott's *Hist. N. T. Can. App.*

³ *Vs.* Hilgenfeld, *Der Kan. &c.*, p. 45.

Apocalypse; and, as no mention is made of his expressing any doubts concerning Johannine authorship, it is presumed that he supported it.¹ He must at least have accepted the genuineness of the writing. Davidson regards this fact concerning Melito as a most important one, and holds that it goes far, by itself, to prove the Apostolicity of the work.² Passing over to Egypt, we find Clement of Alexandria both making a free use of the work, and uniformly ascribing it to John the Apostle.³ Origen, likewise, in his commentary on the Gospel of John, says of him: "He also wrote the Revelation."⁴ And Tertullian in North Africa, writing against Marcion, quotes what is said by the "Apostle John in the Apocalypse."⁵

All of these successive writers, beginning near the Apostolic age, make use of the Apocalypse as of a work written by the same hand that wrote the fourth Gospel, or at least as the undoubted production of the Apostle John. There are many more extending through the same period who make allusions to the work, or cite it in such a way as to imply their recognition of its canonical authority, but without indicating their opinion of its authorship, having no occasion so to do. Silence, however, in such a case, may fairly be taken as almost certain evidence of the acceptance of the current tradition with regard to it. These writers, in part, are Papias (wrote c. 140-150); Hermas, of about the same date; Tatian, a pupil of Justin Martyr, the anonymous writer of the epistle from the churches of Vienne and Lyons (A.D. 177), which also calls it "Scripture" (*γραφή*);⁶ Cyprian (born c. 200); Apollonius (c. 210) through Eusebius,⁷ and Hippolytus (c. 220).

It is affirmed, on the other hand, that Caius, a presbyter of Rome (c. 200), wholly rejected the book, but his language is ambiguous; and Westcott supposes that Caius is really condemning the work of Cerinthus, written in imitation of the Apocalypse.⁸ The insignificant heretical sect of *Alogi*, without doubt, referred not only this work but

All the foregoing witnesses in favor of the authorship of St. John.

Examples of alleged opposition to the current opinion.

¹ H. E., iv. 26.

² Introd. to N. T., i. 314.

³ Strom., vi. 13; Pæd., ii. 10.

⁴ Euseb. H. E., vi. 25.

⁵ Adv. Mar., iii. 14.

⁶ Hilgenfeld, Der Kan. &c., p. 10.

⁷ H. E., v. 18.

⁸ Hist. N. T. Can., p. 245, n. Cf. H. E., iii. 28.

the Gospels and epistles to Cerinthus, yet without even the presence of finding either critical or historical support for such an opinion. And Dionysius of Alexandria, under the influence of fierce discussions between chiliasts and anti-chiliasts, as we have stated, about the middle of the third century, ascribed the work to Presbyter John, but without denying it canonical rank.¹

The contents of the book, indeed, might seem to furnish Contents of the work a cause. quarters, after the springing up of the millenarian excitement; as also, for the hesitation of Eusebius (270-340), who records these varying opinions, and who classes the Apocalypse among the books universally received, "if possibly such a view seem correct." He himself quotes it simply as the work of John without positively declaring whether he would be understood as representing John the Presbyter, or John the Apostle,² as the author. The small council (synod) of Laodicea (A.D. 363) omitted the book from their list of the canonical books of Scripture, if they actually made a list as represented, and it was not a later addition. External evidence, in fact, is fairly against the genuineness of any such catalogue. There are, however, clear examples of hesitation in the fourth century, probably only for reasons already stated, as in the case of Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Amphilochius of Iconium (d. 395), both of whom prepared catalogues of the New Testament Scriptures from which they either excluded the Apocalypse entirely, or assigned to it an inferior rank.

But Jerome (324-420), who cannot be suspected of being Jerome and Augustine. ill informed on the subject, fully accepted the book. Speaking of the epistle to the Hebrews, he wrote: "If the custom of the Latins does not receive it among the canonical Scriptures, neither do the Greek churches [using the same freedom] accept the Apocalypse of John; and still we accept both, *by no means following the custom of this time, but the authority of ancient writers.*"³ And Augustine (353-430) seems to have entertained no mistrust of the com-

¹ H. E., vii. 24. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Der Kan. &c.*, p. 51.

² H. E., iii. 25, 39.

³ Ep. ad Dard., 129 (3).

mon judgment respecting the work, placing it unchallenged in his list of authorized Scriptural writings. The council of Hippo (393), and the two of Carthage (397, 419), ratified the representative judgment of Augustine; by whose opinions, indeed, they were largely controlled. From the historical point of view, then, we should only be justified in following the course of the last two distinguished leaders of the early Church, in adopting without hesitation this important book, confidently relying on the clear, positive, unbroken, and widely extended testimony of fathers and churches *in the second century* for its canonical authority and Apostolic authorship, not being misled by doubts which sprung up at a later day, and which it is easy to see had their origin in the imputation of false millenarian notions to the work, combined with the not unimportant fact of its being but comparatively little used and less understood.



PART III.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In the Church and in the Bible alike He works through men. As we follow the progress of their formation, each step seems to be truly human; and when we contemplate the whole, we joyfully recognize that every part is also divine.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

CHAPTER I.

THE LANGUAGE, MANUSCRIPTS, VERSIONS, AND GENERAL TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE entire Old Testament, with the exception of certain brief passages in Chaldee (Dan. ii. 4, vii; Ez. iv. 8, vi. 18, vii. 12-26), was originally written in the The Hebrew language. Hebrew language. This language was formerly supposed to be the primitive speech of the race; but it is now generally conceded that it is only one branch of the Semitic family of languages, although perhaps conforming most closely of all to the original stem, and so having the best comparative claim to the highest antiquity.¹ It is not possible from existing data, however, to determine absolutely that the Semitic family of languages is the oldest.

The Old Testament Scriptures include the entire sum of extant Hebrew literature produced during the period Hebrew literature. when the language was spoken. The term "Hebrew," as applied to the Israelitish nation and tongue,—it is not their proper theocratic title,—is supposed by some to be derived from Eber, an ancestor of Abraham; and by others (Hengstenberg, Bleek, Kurtz, Winer, Gesenius), with more probability, from a Hebrew word meaning "the opposite side," in allusion to the direction from which the Abrahamic immigration came. It was "trans-Euphratic."²

It is unlikely that the Hebrew language was introduced into Canaan by Abraham on his going thither from Mesopotamia, but that it was the language of the Was Hebrew the native tongue of the Hebrews. Canaanitish people themselves, an allied branch of which — the Aramaic — was the native tongue of the Fathe.

¹ Bleek's *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 80; De Wette's *do.*, i. 122; Herzog's *Encyc.*, ii. 496.

² Kurtz, *Old Cov.*, i. 168, 169; Davidson's *Bib. Crit.*, i. 6.

of the Faithful. There are no clear intimations in Scripture that the language of the Israelites was wholly diverse from that of the inhabitants of Canaan; but rather, the contrary. Yet it is not improbable that the original language of the country was largely *developed* and adapted to its higher uses in connection with the coming and peculiar history of the Israelites. A similar appropriation and consecration of a heathen tongue we have already observed in the case of the New Testament.

One remarkable characteristic of the Hebrew language, as well as of the other branches of the Semitic stock, is its unelastic quality. "It is firm and hard as from a mould," not easily changed, and any argument with respect to the age of documents appearing between the time of Moses and the Captivity, based on supposed changes in the language, must, from the nature of the case, be very unsatisfactory, such changes being both rare and obeying no invariable law.¹

Books written subsequent to the Captivity have doubtless received a more perceptible Aramaic tinge; but even a decided Aramaic coloring cannot be regarded as incontestable evidence of a late date, inasmuch as such a feature might in many cases be no more than the occasional and natural outcropping of the original popular dialect. Keil, however, would distinguish three periods in the progressive development of the Hebrew language, — that of Moses, that of David and Solomon, and that of the Exile.²

Alphabetic writing was doubtless in use before the time of Moses. The period at which Cadmus is represented as introducing letters into Greece, together with many other well-known facts, supports this view. The Moabite stone, recently discovered, demonstrates the existence of an alphabet common to many nations 900 B.C.; and, like that of the Hebrew, it was made up of twenty-two characters.³ It appears from Scripture that in the time of the patriarchs engraved seals were not uncommon (Gen. xxxviii. 18; xli. 42); while Phœnicia itself, the country from which we receive

¹ Herzog's Encyc., ii. 494, 495; Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. Semit. Lang.

² Introd. to O. T., i. 43-70.

³ The Moabite Stone (B. F. De Costa), p. 28.

the earliest intimations of the knowledge of letters, was a part of that very land of Canaan in which the patriarchs originally settled, and to which they returned after their troublous sojourn in Egypt. It has been noticed, too, that while in Egypt the Israelites kept genealogical records, and that, during their journey back to Palestine, the law was *written* on tables of stone.¹

The Hebrew letters in present use date no further back, at furthest, than to the time of the Captivity, a modified form of the old Phœnician character having been previously used. It had been generally supposed by scholars, up to the time of the discovery of the Moabite stone, that in its earlier written form the words of the Hebrew text were not distinguished from one another, being written continuously, like ancient Greek manuscripts; but on this remarkable monument the words are divided with points, and the text separated into verses by vertical strokes. It is inferred, therefore, that the same was true of the Hebrew at this date.² As in other Semitic languages, the consonants only, as sufficiently defining the radical meaning of words, were transcribed, the vowels proper being left to be supplied by the reader. It should be stated, however, that doubtless from the first certain characters were used to perform to a limited extent the office of vowels. The necessity for a full complement of vowels as a part of the text was not so much felt as long as the Hebrew remained a living tongue, since, to some degree, they really inhered in the consonants, while in uncertainties they might be readily determined from the connection.

Obviously, however, after the language ceased to be generally spoken, the infelicities of such an orthography were much enhanced, while the absence of definitive form at first, and the circumstances under which the vowels and various distinguishing points were finally introduced, naturally led to much discussion and not a little suspicion and distrust. Indeed, it is held that the present vowel signs and accents serve but to show how the Jewish scribes expressed the Hebrew at the time

¹ Cf. Jahn's *Archæol.*, sect. 85-87; Hävernicks' *Introd. to O. T.*, chap. iii.; Ewald's *Hist. of Israel*, i. 49.

² The Moabite Stone, *id.*, p. 27.

Hebrew letters and form of writing.

when these changes were introduced, and how they themselves understood the text. But it is also generally admitted that great care was exercised by these learned Rabbis, and that their management of the text, as supported by a traditional exegesis, was ordinarily correct.¹

MANUSCRIPTS.

Much less need be said of the manuscripts of the Old Testament than of those of the New. They are all of comparatively recent origin, and nearly all have come into existence since the Masoretic period; *i.e.*, since the eleventh century. A codex of the date A.D. 916 has been found among the Karaites of the Crimea, together with an incomplete roll of the Law, reaching back to 843. One evident reason for the scarcity of these manuscripts is the rule which was in force, even before the time of the Talmudists, that all faulty ones should be destroyed. And when the minuteness of the regulations relating to their preparation is considered, it is matter of wonder that any could have been made with sufficient exactness to escape destruction. So great was the superstitious reverence entertained for these documents, moreover, that a Jew was not permitted even to sell one of them to a Christian.

Extant Old Testament MSS. are of two classes, — synagogue rolls and private codices. The synagogue rolls contain only the Pentateuch and lessons from the prophets. It was to these, particularly, that the most specific and numerous rules relating to preparation were applied. The material must be of parchment made from the skin of a ceremonially clean animal. It must be prepared by a Jew; the parchment must be divided into columns of exactly equal length. More than three words written off the line vitiated the whole work. Black ink — prepared after a certain specified recipe — could alone be used. The kind of character to be employed was minutely described; as also, full directions

¹ Bleek's *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 384.

concerning spaces, points, and the use of the pen. Upon revision, which must take place within thirty days after the completion of the transcription, if a word were found to have a letter redundant, or was deficient of one; or if one letter touched another, &c., the entire manuscript was sacrificed.¹ Such an enormous estimate being put upon the absolute faultlessness of these documents, unspeakably burdensome and irksome though it must have been to copyists, was yet exceedingly favorable to the purity of the text.

Private manuscripts were often written on both cotton and common paper, and appear in book form of various sizes. Unlike the synagogue rolls they employ the ^{Private} square Chaldee character with vowels, accents, marginal readings, observations, and other improvements of the Masora. There are certain of this class of codices of a later period, however, called the Rabbinical, which are written in a running hand without the Masoretic points and additions. These private MSS., not being prepared under the same strict official *surveillance* as the rolls for public use, were naturally open to more numerous errors; but even here rigorous rules were by no means wanting in addition to the almost impassable barrier to mistake found in the Masora. In fact, an impartial collation of all the MSS. of the Old Testament Scriptures that have come down to us discloses a striking similarity among them. Different readings are found, it is true, but of an unimportant character, relating generally but to single letters and of less moment than those of the oldest New Testament manuscripts, even when the latter are compared among themselves.

The age of these codices it is difficult to determine with precision. It is sometimes found stated on the document itself, although such dates are mostly looked ^{Age how} upon with distrust. The place of their origin is ordinarily less open to doubt, being inferred from such data as the order of the books, the character used in writing, ornamentation, &c. The whole number of different Hebrew MSS. collated by Kennicott and De Rossi, the most laborious students in this department (1753-1783), was 1346.

¹ Davidson's Bib. Crit., i. 321-323.

² Bleek's Introd. to O. T., ii. 365.

VERSIONS.

Among specially valuable witnesses to the state of the earlier text of the Old Testament are the ancient versions of it. They may be divided into original and derived. We shall here notice only the former; *i.e.*, those made directly from the Hebrew, omitting also such as have been already described in Part II. of this work.

The oldest, and by far the most important, of all these versions, is the Septuagint. Its origin is involved in considerable obscurity. A sufficient occasion for the origin of versions generally, containing the Old Testament books, is to be found in the fact that, after their return from captivity, the Hebrew language was no longer vernacular among the Jews. Hence, it was needful to translate the Scriptures as used in the synagogues into the common speech of the people; and these oral translations, in the natural course of events, came themselves in turn to be superseded or aided by written ones. The Jews who had been deported to Alexandria in Egypt, or had voluntarily settled there, of course adopted the language which was spoken most largely about them, — the Greek. Being in considerable numbers and enjoying their usual religious privileges, the translation of their Scriptures into the Greek became, therefore, a vital necessity. The work, it is supposed, was not all done at one time, but probably began with the Pentateuch under the first Ptolemies (280 B.C.), and was finished from 200 to 150. The translation was made by a number of persons who differed greatly with respect to their knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. The work was done at Alexandria, although to some extent persons from other countries, particularly Palestine, may have been summoned to assist in it. The name given to the translation — the Septuagint (seventy) — arose from the presumed number of scholars engaged upon it.

The value of this version, for critical and exegetical purposes, appears from the following considerations:

Value and use. (1) It furnishes invaluable evidence with respect to

the character of the MSS. from which it was made, and often enables scholars to decide between the conflicting readings of the more modern ones. (2) Most of the direct quotations from the Old Testament in the New (about 300 out of 350), agree with the Septuagint version, and seem to have been made directly from it. (3) The language of the Septuagint exerted a very great moulding influence upon the writers of the New Testament. (4) Early Christian writers can scarcely be well understood without a familiar knowledge of this recension, which they largely cite.¹

In the second century (A.D. 117-138) another Greek translation of the Old Testament was made by Aquila, a Jewish proselyte of Pontus. Its origin may, with ^{Version of Aquila.} probability, be traced to polemical necessities. The Jews, in their discussions with Christians, not having sufficient confidence in the Septuagint, which was used against them, caused this version to be made in their interests. It was extremely literal, so much so at times as greatly to obscure the sense, and in some cases, also, was colored by a controversial spirit. Only insignificant fragments of this version are now extant.

At about the same time, Theodotion also, probably a Christian disciple, made a translation of the Old Testament Scriptures into Greek; or, perhaps more exactly, ^{Theodotion.} revised the Septuagint version. From the latter, indeed, he very seldom deviates, except to throw out foreign matter which had been interpolated. His revision of Daniel was ecclesiastically adopted in place of that of the Alexandrian version, and to this day is retained in most Greek Bibles.

Somewhat later than the last, a translation was made by an Ebionite, named Symmachus. It was in style ^{Symmachus and others.} made freer and more elegant than the two last mentioned,—giving ideas rather than words,—and is spoken of in terms of high commendation by Jerome and others. The inconsiderable fragments of these three versions still preserved are found in the Hexapla of Origen. Origen, also, discovered and made use of three other incomplete versions of the Old Testament in connection with the same work, which are

¹ Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. Versions, p. 1208.

called, for want of better titles, the fifth, sixth, and seventh, versions.

The Hexapla (sixfold) of this Father was an arrangement of the Hebrew text, first in Hebrew, then in Greek characters, along with the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, and of Theodotion, in parallel columns, for the purpose of aiding Christians in their disputes with the Jews, that they might not be misled with respect to the true meaning of the original.

As we have remarked above, after the return of the Jews from captivity, the Hebrew being no longer vernacular, oral translations of the Scriptures were given in their synagogues. These translations in Palestine were, of course, Chaldaic. In process of time, written translations for the common use of the people took the place of the oral ones. They received the name of "Targums," which means "interpretations." Such Targums do not in any case singly include the entire Old Testament, but collectively cover all the books except Ezra, Daniel, and Nehemiah. Their dates are mostly uncertain, but there is strong probability that the oldest and most valuable of them did not come into existence much after the beginning of our era.

Of the several Targums still extant, we shall speak of only two, — that of Onkelos, and that of Jonathan. Onkelos is supposed by Bleek to have lived about the middle of the first century.¹ Emanuel Deutsch, however, in a very full and learned investigation,² places the date of this and other Targums at the end of the third century. Deutsch, also, maintains the theory that Onkelos is a form of Akelas, which, in turn, stands for Aquila; and holds that, because this particular Greek translation of Aquila was eminently popular, the Chaldee version was called the Aquila (Onkelos) Targum, to give it greater currency. This Targum includes the Pentateuch only, and is said to be written in very pure Chaldee, to be generally faithful to the original, and, in its explanation of difficult passages, to show marked discrimination and simplicity. The Targum of Jonathan, originating

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 442.

² Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. Versions.

perhaps a little later than that of Onkelos, was a more paraphrastic and free rendering of the earlier and later prophetic books. It is maintained by Deutsch, that "the Semitic fairy and legendary lore, which, for the last two thousand years, — as far as we can trace it, — has grown up in East and West to vast, glittering mountain ranges, is, to a very great extent, to be found, in an embryo state, so to say, in this our Targum."

GENERAL TEXTUAL HISTORY.

The history of the Old Testament text up to the time of the invention of printing for convenience may be here Earlier history of the text. divided into three periods: the first, extending from the time of the writing of the books to the close of the Canon. Just how much watchfulness and fidelity were exercised during this period to preserve the integrity and purity of the text it is impossible to know. That it was kept absolutely inviolable cannot be assumed, as it would be the assumption of a continued miracle, and, also, contrary to the incidental evidence of the text itself. That it was guarded, however, with extraordinary care, and transmitted with substantial accuracy, the following considerations might be urged as proving: the marked seclusion of the Israelitish people; ¹ the view that these books were the national annals, and that, too, under a theocratic form of government giving them always a semi-divine character; the liturgical use of certain parts of them, especially the Psalms, in connection with public worship; the official character of many of the writers of the books; the fact that it was the custom of other nations known to them, as, for instance, the Egyptians, to make collections of their sacred books, and hold them in the highest reverence; ² the probability that but comparatively few copies were in circulation (Deut. xxx. 10–13), and those among the official classes, — Princes, Levites, and Prophets; and, in addition, the point that the Hebrew language was then vernacular, so that the difficul-

¹ Kurtz, *Old Cov.*, i. 147, 148.

² Herzog's *Encyc.*, i. 543, n.

ties appertaining to its written form alluded to above would not arise.

But, besides these general considerations, we have some more tangible, although necessarily limited, information derived from the books themselves. It was required by Moses (Deut. xvii. 18) that each ruler should possess for his own use a copy of the Law, the original of which was to be kept in the inner sanctuary. In the reign of Josiah (642-611 B.C.), this book of the Law was still actually to be found in the temple (2 Kings xxii. 8; cf. xxiv. 26; 1 Sam. x. 25). We observe, also, that different prophetic writers are accustomed to make use of each other's productions, as Jeremiah of Isaiah, and Daniel of Jeremiah (Dan. ix. 2, 11, 13), leading us to infer the existence and accessibility of their prophecies in written form. Moreover, the nature of the allusions to the sacred writers, subsequent to the Captivity (Ez. vi. 18; Neh. viii. 1), is such as to indicate with reasonable certainty their careful preservation even during the darkest periods of Jewish history. And that Ezra with Nehemiah, and their collaborators in the important work, looking to the establishment of the Old Testament Canon, were exceedingly scrupulous and painstaking, has been justly inferred, among other circumstances, from the fact that they allowed the smallest discrepancies between parallel passages to stand wholly intact (Ps. xiv., liii., xviii.; 2 Sam. xxii.). These variations — often but different forms of one production by the same hand — have been most unfairly used by some critics to throw suspicion on the whole ante-canonical text.¹ But Davidson, while giving no countenance to any theory of miracle in connection with the early text, yet holds to its transmission in substantial purity up to the time of Ezra and later. "When the Canon was closed," he says, "the text was generally free from material corruption."²

The history of the text of the Old Testament, after its books had been elevated to canonical dignity, down to the time of the Masora (? end of fifth century), can be more clearly traced, although, until the period of the

¹ Cf. De Wette, *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 319-323. *Vs.* Hävernick, *Introd.*, p. 276.

² *Bib. Crit.*, i. 107, 108.

Talmudists (c. 200), there is very little contemporaneous or direct testimony available. According to Dillmann,¹ the establishing of the present text was brought to a close before the Talmudic period; and others (Hävernick) say as early as the time of Christ. It was legitimately based on the testimony of manuscripts, and, if not fully correct, was generally so, and never intentionally falsified. "The immense reverence of the Jews for their sacred books (Josephus, Ap. i. 8) leads us at once to suppose that [the work of establishing the true text] would be prosecuted with the greatest conscientiousness and care. This appears, also, in the work itself. The text they have given us is formed with the most anxious regard for the smallest particulars. The peculiarities of the different writers, books, and times; archaisms, idioms, local shades of dialect, even special modes of writing, — are preserved with wonderful fidelity; and we see that every sort of intentional and arbitrary change or emendation (in the case even of so small a matter as the writing) lay far off from the minds of these critics."

When the text had been thus settled, no less effort was made to secure for it a safe transmission. Even at this early period, letters, words, verses, and sections ^{its trans-} _{mission.} were numbered; the most minute directions were given for the writing of MSS.; and all unusual marks and letters, though at first, perhaps, accidentally introduced, were carefully preserved. The Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, — dated as we have seen at about the beginning of the Christian era, — and the translations of Aquila, Theodotion, and others, prove the existence of a firmly established form of the text at this early period, in their agreement, even in quite unimportant varieties of reading, with that, at last, commonly accepted. Most of the variations of the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch, and of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, from this traditional form are now generally acknowledged to rest on "arbitrary, uncritical, and unskilful changes," introduced through a wanton passion for emendation, or an ignorant misunderstanding of the real meaning of the text.²

¹ Herzog's Encyc., i. 409. Cf. Keil's Introd., ii. 309.

² Dillmann and Keil, id.

Near the beginning of the second century, learned Jews, fearing lest the *oral* law — additions to, and interpretations of, the written law of Moses — should become corrupted or lost, made a transcript of it. This was called the *Mishna*. Commentaries (*Gemaras*) were subsequently made on this work by Jews at Babylon and Palestine, respectively; and this record, with the commentaries, received the name of the Talmud.¹ The Talmudists, so called (c. 190–500), so far from seeking to introduce changes into the text, exercised the most extraordinary vigilance to prevent them. Certain pointings over the letters (*puncta extraordinaria*), the meaning and value of which they were unable to explain, were still tenaciously adhered to. In the matter of the interpretation of a passage, they might sometimes be at variance; but its textual form was unanimously held to be unalterable. They made special rules for the guidance of those who copied manuscripts, to prevent the confounding of similar letters and falling into errors of other sorts. The system adopted as a safeguard of counting verses, words, and letters, in order to find the middle one of each book, was still diligently practised. It is a conjecture of Bleek and others, that the minute points sometimes found over certain letters, as noted above, were originally intended to mark the letters and words which might be omitted. If this be correct it demonstrates the “anxious solicitude that must have been exercised in preceding centuries to hand down the text of the Sacred Books; especially, of the Torah [Law] in an uncorrupted state.”²

The last period in the history of the unprinted text of the Old Testament, extending from the beginning of the fifth century, is distinguished as that of the Masora. This term is generally supposed to be derived from a Hebrew word signifying to hand down, indicating that the contents of the Masora were handed down from antiquity. The Talmudists, while thinking it needful to put into written form the collection of traditions which they had inherited under the name of the oral law, — claimed to have been given by Moses along

¹ Bleek, *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 107. Cf. *Journal of Sacred Lit.*, Jan. 1868.

² *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 454.

with the written law, — did not venture, as we have seen, to alter in the smallest particular the outward form of the written law itself. They continued to transmit orally all readings, interpretations, and regulations concerning it. This mass of oral traditions relating to the sacred text the Masorets, however, proceeded to put in permanent written form. According to most critics this was first done in books, and then transferred to the margin of manuscripts; but Bleek reverses the order.¹ These marginal readings became, indeed, very numerous; a fact, in itself, suggestive of the profound reverence felt for the original, and an indirect proof of its substantial purity. The natural strength of the temptation to insert these marginal readings — “Keris” — in place of the text, as well as the evidence that no such liberty was taken, is seen in the circumstance, that when the text was accented and vocalized, it was so done that the “Keris” might be pronounced instead of the word in the text.

It was these same Masoretic scholars who, in strict harmony with their general purpose, introduced into connection with the text the use of vowel signs and accents. In this they sought simply, to give outward and permanent form to the enunciation and understanding of the text at that time orally current, on the authority of immemorial tradition. It should be understood that nothing was undertaken of the nature of a revision, or with a view to alter the essential character of the text. The Masora was rather a seal put upon it that it might not be changed. Their whole work, including that of vocalization and accentuation, served but to fix more unalterably the true traditionary reading.

What has been now said may be sufficient to show the origin of the Old Testament text of our present Bibles. It is virtually the Masoretic, with whatever of faults or of virtues that may have had. So far as it differs from it, the means of discovering and correcting such differences are at hand. Moreover, there ought to be no doubt that in the text which we have inherited from the Masorets, and they from the Talmudists, and they in turn from a period

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 461.

when versions and paraphrases of the Scriptures in other languages now accessible to us were in common use, — the same text being transmitted to this period from the time of Ezra under the peculiarly sacred seal of the Jewish Canon, — we have a substantially correct copy of the original documents themselves, and one worthy of our highest confidence.

A critic, not likely to conceal or belittle known defects, uses the following temperate language: “But such Mild statement of defects. restoration [of the Masoretic text], which appeared to the Buxtorfs the ideal of all text criticism, is not to be taken as at once identical with the idea of an absolutely correct text. Older and better readings, in certain cases, are still preserved in the ancient versions; and sometimes, too, though it be very rarely, in the Hebrew manuscripts; the Masoretic pointing cannot *always* be approved as suitable to the text; and there are besides, in the text itself, from the most remote times, single errors, back to which no critical monument is found to reach. It would seem, therefore, that, in cases of necessity, even critical conjecture is here not out of place; and that it may not simply be the right, but the duty, of the interpreter to have recourse to it, in order that he may do justice to the text itself.”¹

¹ Dillmann in Herzog's Encyc. Art. Bib. Text.

CHAPTER II.

THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

THE meaning of the term Canon has been already defined in the present work (part ii. chap. iii.). By the Canon of the Old Testament we mean, in general terms, that collection of writings deemed sacred by the Jews at the time of our Lord, and often referred to by him and the Apostles under the title of the "Scriptures," "Holy Scriptures," "The Law and the Prophets," or, "the Law, Prophets, and Psalms." And our special object in this chapter will be to determine, as far as we may be able, when, by whom, and under what circumstances this collection was made; and whether, from such earliest time, it has remained in its external relations a complete, unique, self-consistent whole, readily distinguishable from subsequent foreign additions. And our investigations may properly begin with the testimony of the New Testament itself, and such witnesses as are contemporaneous with it.

This fact is obvious, that the Old Testament is continually referred to in the New, although its exact constituent parts — as, indeed, we should have no right to expect — may not be anywhere particularly defined. Still further, these references to the Old Testament in the New imply an established and well-known collection. Our Saviour charged the Jews with disobeying the Scriptures, nullifying them by their traditions, but never hinted that they did not actually possess them, or that they had not shown sufficient care in their preservation. His appeal is uniformly to the Scriptures, whether to justify his own claims or to confound the machina-

tions of his enemies ; and no occasion of dispute seems ever to have arisen from such reference, as would have been likely to be the case had the terms used not been understood to apply to a distinct and familiarly known collection of writings.

Besides the term Scripture, he also uses, as we have said, the Law, the Law and the Prophets, and once, the Law, Prophets, and Psalms, the last word probably standing, by synecdoche, for the whole division at whose head it is placed. These terms were by no means arbitrarily chosen, but, doubtless, were titles then in common use for designating the collected books of the Old Testament, and actually represent the natural division and sequence of its several parts. Fürst says it is as old as the conclusion and order of the literature itself.¹ And there are two passages in the Gospels (Matt. xxiii. 35 ; Luke xi. 51) which have been thought, apparently not without reason, to mark definitely, whether intentionally or not, the extreme limits of the collection as then understood.² These limits extend from the account of the murder of Abel in Genesis to that of Zacharias, recorded in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21, this book being thus accounted the last one admitted into the list of writings deemed sacred by the Jews. Moreover, what was true of the practice of the Master in this respect holds good of his disciples, who, for the most part, were themselves Jews, and doubtless well informed respecting the religious literature of their nation.

The references in the New Testament to the Old are of two kinds: casual, such as were made for illustration and in the way of instructive parallel ; and such as were used for the establishment of doctrine. Among the latter class are citations from the Pentateuch, from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Psalms, which citations, from the nature of the case, imply a generally acknowledged standard of authority, and include, as will be seen, something from each one of the *three principal parts* into which the Old Testament was ordinarily divided. The books of the Old Testament never directly referred to in the New are Judges, Ecclesiastes (? Ec.

¹ Der Kan. d. A. T., part i. sect. i.

² Oehler in Herzog's Encyc. Art. Can. of O. T. Vs. Dillmann, Jahrbuch f. Deutsch. Theol., iii. 1858, p. 479.

v. 15; cf. I Tim. vi. 7), Canticles, Esther (? Esth. ix. 22; cf. Rev. xi. 10), Ezra, and Nehemiah. Unless it can be shown, however, that Christ and his Apostles ought necessarily to have referred to each one of the Old Testament books, the argument from silence cannot be allowed to have much weight. The recognition in the New Testament of a definite collection of sacred literature as then in use among the Jews is now the point of chief importance, it being plain that the particular books of which that collection was formed could not have been generally unknown.

From the circumstance that the Hebrew language was no longer vernacular at this period, the Alexandrian (Septuagint) version of the Old Testament was in common use everywhere. It was from this version, therefore, very naturally, that most of the citations of the New Testament were taken. And it is to be noted as an important fact that, notwithstanding there had been bound up with this special version a number of uncanonical (apocryphal) books which, from such connection and from public use, came at length to be regarded with more or less of reverence by both Jews and Christians, none of these books are ever quoted by our Saviour or his disciples, or any color of authority assigned to them. Certain other works not having a place in the Old Testament may have been in some instances referred to by the Apostles (Jude 9, 14), but not in such a way as to imply that they formed a part of Scripture. It was simply for illustration that they were appealed to, if at all, as to a common reservoir of current literature and tradition;¹ while, on the contrary, relationship with the Old Testament, as a unique collection, is uniformly marked and distinctive.

Now, if the view here taken be correct, we might expect that it would be confirmed by the testimony of contemporaneous profane writers; and to them we turn, attending first to that of the well-known Jewish historiographer, Josephus. He was both a Pharisee and a priest, and so, without doubt, well informed respecting the sacred books of his people. He was born A.D. 37, and, con-

Apocryphal
books of the
Septuagint
not quoted
in the New
Testament.

Confirmatory
testimony of
Josephus.

¹ Oehler, id. *Vs.* Bleek's *Introd.*, ii. 306.

sequently, was contemporaneous, to some extent, with the Apostles and their writings. His work on the "Antiquities of the Jews," written against Apion, a grammarian of Alexandria and a declared enemy of his nation, contains the passage directly bearing on this subject.¹ Its importance will justify quoting at length. After showing, in the previous section, that none of the Hebrew historical books stand in opposition to others, since not every person, but only prophets, were suffered to be historians, he goes on to say: "For we have not innumerable books which contradict each other; but only twenty-two, which comprise the history of all times past, and are justly held to be credible [*? divine*]. Five of these books proceed from Moses; they contain laws, and accounts of the origin of men, and extend to his death. Accordingly, they include a period not much less than a thousand years. From the death of Moses onward to the reign of Artaxerxes, who, after Xerxes, reigned over the Persians, the prophets, who lived after Moses, recorded, in thirteen books, what happened in their time. The other four books contain songs of praise to God, and rules of life for man. Since Artaxerxes up to our time, every thing has been recorded; but these writings are not held to be so worthy of credit [*have not been esteemed of like authority*] as those written earlier, because after that time there was no regular succession of prophets. What faith we attribute to our Scriptures is manifest in our conduct. For, although so great a period has already elapsed, no one has yet undertaken either to add any thing, or to take away, or to alter any thing. For it is, so to speak, innate with the Jews from their birth to hold these books to be God's instructions, and firmly to stand by them, — nay, if necessity required, gladly to die on their behalf."

Now, is it possible for us to learn what these twenty-two books were which Josephus declares were so revered by his people, and whether they include all those books, and only those, now found in the Old Testament collection? Our appeal shall be to his histories, where these separate books are often referred to either directly or incidentally. Concerning the five books of Moses, the passage

Direct citations of Josephus from Scripture.

¹ Book i., sect. 8.

just cited is a sufficient indication of his opinion; and elsewhere he calls them the books of the Sacred Scriptures. Isaiah he calls a prophet, and speaks of his work as "the book of prophecy which Isaiah left." He also mentions Jeremiah as a prophet, and characteristically describes his work. So, too, Ezekiel and Daniel. The twelve minor prophets, he treats as one book, though distinguishing them as twelve in number, citing part of them, and ranking them, as a class, along with the work of Isaiah. Jonah, Nahum, Haggai, and Zechariah he denominates prophets; says the book of Joshua was among those kept in the temple; puts the book of Kings on a level with the first of Moses; and designates the Psalms as "Psalms of God," and also "Psalms of David."

In addition to these instances, Josephus makes use of all the remaining books of the present Old Testament collection, although without any special description except Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticles, and Job. He mentions Solomon as *the writer*, but without indicating what he wrote. And with respect to Job, the silence of this historian should not by any means be considered as a sign either that he did not know the book, or that he rejected it from his Canon. For, from the New Testament (Jas. v. 11), and other sources, we know that this book formed a part of the collection of Jewish Scriptures in his time; while it is only by adding it to those which Josephus does mention that we can properly make out the thirteen books which he declares were written by prophets between the time of Moses and that of Artaxerxes; as, also, by adding the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, that his full number of twenty-two is reached; viz., five of Moses, thirteen prophetic, and the four last mentioned.¹

It should be stated that the reason why the thirty-nine books of the Jewish Scriptures were reduced to twenty-two, as in this case, and quite generally, — by combining the two books of Samuel, Judges and Ruth, the two of Kings, and of Chronicles, and of Ezra (Ezra and Nehemiah), Jeremiah and Lamentations, — was to make them conform to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, a custom common

¹ Eichhorn's Einleit. in das A. T., i. sects. 46-50.

Indirect citations and references.

Why twenty-two books.

also with the Greeks.¹ And the fact that Josephus, for such a reason, states the number of sacred books at twenty-two might be considered as plainly significant of the fact that he regarded the Canon as complete, and closed with these.² This enumeration of books is not in conflict with that of the Talmud, which adding two *yodhs* to the Hebrew alphabet, making twenty-four letters, consequently divided, in two cases, books otherwise associated together, — Ruth being separated from Judges, and Lamentations from Jeremiah.

We now turn to another contemporaneous writer, Philo,
 Philo. a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria. He was born, it is thought, a little before the beginning of the Christian era, and probably in Egypt. He was of priestly family, and honored with many important political trusts. His testimony is important from the fact that he must have been well informed on the subjects concerning which he writes, while, yet, he was never a resident of Palestine. His works consisted mostly of an allegorizing of Scripture, and an attempt to show that they contained in germ the elements of the later Platonic and other Greek philosophy.

Of this distinguished writer it may be said, first, generally,
 His testi- that he distinctly recognized, in their order, the usual
 mony. threefold division of the Hebrew Canon, saying of the Therapeutæ, that they found their true food in the laws and oracles uttered by the Prophets, and hymns, and other [? books] by which knowledge and piety are increased.³ And, with respect to the several books of the collection, Eichhorn has shown that to a large number he has directly ascribed a divine origin; to others, makes allusion, without, however, specifically characterizing them; and of a few only, viz., Ruth, Nehemiah, Esther, Chronicles, Daniel, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, is entirely silent. But of the latter class it is plausibly conjectured that Ruth was regarded as an appendix to the book of Judges; Nehemiah, as the second part of Ezra; and Lamentations, of Jeremiah, — as was usual in Palestine.⁴

¹ Eichhorn, *id.*, sect. 42.

² Herzog's *Encyc. Art. Can. O. T.*; Dillmann, *Jahrbuch f. Deutsch. Theol.* 1858, iii. 491.

³ Keil, *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 341.

⁴ *Einleit. in das A. T.*, i. sects. 26-33.

Now, with the fact of such a continual and reverent use of the Old Testament books, to which he applies such significant titles as the "Oracles," the "Sacred Writings," the "Prophetic Word," is to be contrasted this: that, while Philo, by the appropriation of expressions and phrases, shows an *acquaintance* with the apocryphal literature, perhaps even then found in connection with the Greek Bible in use in Egypt, he never quotes from it, allegorizes it, or by it attempts to maintain his views, although often especially adapted to his purpose. This circumstance is generally considered (Eichhorn, De Wette, Keil, Hävernick, *vs.* Bleek) as conclusive evidence that the Jews of Egypt held to the same limits of the Old Testament collection as those of Palestine. De Wette says: "Notwithstanding their jealousy, in a matter of such importance, they could not disagree with their Palestinian brethren. Philo *sufficiently proves* that they did not."¹ And, while Bleek does not fully concur, holding to a general indeterminateness of the Egyptian Canon at this period, he still firmly maintains that there is nowhere any intimation that other books than those now in it have ever been received into the *Hebrew Canon*; and that, ultimately, the authority and influence of the Palestinian Jews brought about a complete identity of opinion, on this subject, among Jews everywhere.²

Of the various sects of the Jews it is well known, that the Samaritans accepted only the five books of Moses and a peculiar recension of Joshua as authoritative, the reason probably being, that when they separated from the Jews, on the return from Exile, because the latter refused them participation in their worship at Jerusalem, the Pentateuch alone was of the *highest recognized* authority, the Canon not being yet fully concluded and established. Their subsequent hostility to the Jews as rivals would naturally lead to the rejection of their sacred literature. It has been thought by some, that the Sadducees held to a restricted collection of holy books, but there is no historical evidence to justify the opinion. Of the Therapeutæ and Essenes, it is commonly agreed that they accepted the books of the Hebrew

The Canon among the various Jewish sects at the time of Christ.

¹ Introd. to O. T., i. 46.

² Introd. to O. T., ii. 305 310.

Canon, but, in addition, ascribed a certain authority to other books peculiar to themselves (Bleek, Keil, Hävernick).

And now we may address ourselves more directly to the question, how and when the Old Testament Canon was first definitely established. Some general principles should, however, be recognized at the outset. Unlike the books of the New Testament, which were the product of a single generation, the writings of the Old Testament extend over many hundreds of years. But, on the other hand, like those of the New Testament, the collection of the literature of the Old was doubtless a gradual process, and the result, in general, of a silent recognition, after a period of probation, of intrinsic claims, though ordinarily supported by convincing external proofs. Just as in the case of the New Testament, too, it would be natural to expect, as Dillmann has shown,¹ that the more special veneration of the sacred books would begin to manifest itself—unless, in some degree to the contrary, in the case of known authors of prominence—at that period when the peculiar presence and power of the revealing Spirit that had created them was decreasing or passing away. Moreover, the length of the period over which the books extend, and their externally heterogeneous character, should seem to demand that there be an historic order of canonization, and that it take place by affiliated groups, certain writings being first enucleated and associated together, and then, finally, under the natural law of unity and completeness, all gathered into one volume. It was probably under these principles, acting more or less imperceptibly, that the Old Testament Canon was formed. And, by adopting them, we have the advantage of avoiding two dangerous extremes: on the one hand, that of ascribing the result to a wholly miraculous agency; and, on the other, of regarding the Canon as the fruit of a loose and lawless collection of all the Hebrew national literature extant at the time of its adoption.

In seeking to point out now the ground for these principles, in acknowledged facts, we need not dwell further on the circumstance of the ancient threefold division of

Establishment of the Old Testament Canon. General principles.

Method of investigation.

¹ Jahrbuch f. Deutsch. Theol. 1858, iii. 422.

the Old Testament Scriptures into Law, Prophets, and other Scriptures. It is a point well established and universally conceded. But this division, it is further held, marks, to some degree, the simple but important historical order of the reception of the several groups of books into the sacred Canon. This is the position of Dillmann and many others; and there seems to be no serious objection to it such as Hävernick professes to discover.¹ Oehler says of this tripartite arrangement: "The threefold division of the Old Testament Canon is not accidental or arbitrary; it rather accords with the developing process of the Old Testament religion. The foundation of this is the Torah [Law]; its further development consists, first, in those divine acts and dealings recorded in the prophetic-historical books; then, in those accompanying divine prophecies, which instructed the people as to present duty, and revealed the future progress of the kingdom of God. The Songs and Proverbs found among the Hagiography represent the subsequent development of the period."²

Adopting, then, this natural and convenient division of the Old Testament books, we shall proceed to treat of each division separately, without prejudice, however, to the theory of a common and an equal inspiration extending to all. As we have observed in the preceding chapter, the book of the Law was early recognized as of peculiar importance, and assigned by Moses a place of singular honor by the side of the Ark. It is acknowledged that the Pentateuch, as now extant, together with Joshua, formed the kernel of this collection. Traces of it are found in 2 Chron. x vii. 7-9; 2 Kings xi. 12. But it is not till the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 8; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14), in the seventh century before Christ, that we discover clear historic reference to it as of *publicly recognized* canonical authority, binding alike upon king and people.

That several other books (Josh. xxiv. 26; 1 Sam. x. 25) were associated, even now, with the Pentateuch³ marks the tendency toward additional collections as

Earliest recognition of canonical authority.

The germ of other collections.

¹ Introd. to O. T., p. 59.

² Herzog's Encyc. Art. O. T. Can.

³ Fürst, Der Kan. d. A. T., part viii. sect. 2.

well as forms a basis for them. But previous to the Exile, the Law (Pentateuch) alone constituted in a popular sense the sole "book of the Lord." Almost certain proof of this is found in the fact before noticed, that the Samaritans who separated from the Jews at this time, accepted only the so-called books of Moses. There may have been sufficient reason in the contents of some of the prophetic books why they would not be likely to accept them even if they had been regarded as in the strictest sense canonical, but not of all. It is not, however, to be concluded that other books of the present Old Testament collection received no veneration above that accorded to Hebrew literature in general, because they received less than the highest.

For it has been well said, that the first collection (the Law) necessarily attracted the second (the Prophets) to itself, How the second collection probably originated. since a law without prophecy is a body without a soul.¹ Moreover, the prophetic writings might be expected, from the very nature of the case, — that is, from the standing of the prophets themselves among the people, — to be held in extraordinary estimation. So that, from their first appearance, many of them could not have been far from receiving a canonical valuation. But, as afterwards, in the case of the Apostles and their writings, the fact that the prophets were still living served to prevent them from attaining at once to their destined rank. That collections of prophetic books were early made, however, and held in high regard, especially for instruction in the schools of the prophets, is evident from the frequent allusions to them by the later prophets (Jer. xxvi. 18). And at about the time of the Exile (c. 600 B.C.), we find clear traces of the familiar association of the Law and the Prophets, if not, also, as some claim, of their co-ordinate authority (Zech. vii. 12; 2 Kings xvii. 13; Mal. iii. 22, 23; Dan. ix. 2). And this fact is the more important if we accept the probable interpretation of Ec. xii. 12: "Against what exceeds these [collections], my son, be warned," &c. (Oehler and Dillmann); it being evident from this that there was even now an emphatic discrimination of canonical and uncanonical Scriptures, none

¹ Dillmann, *id.*, p. 442.

being admitted to the former but such as were able to pass a rigid scrutiny. Fürst supposes that at the time Ecclesiastes was written it concluded the Canon, Esther being subsequently admitted, and paraphrases the above passage as follows: "The words of the teachers who ordered and fixed the Holy Scriptures remain now almost immovable; and the books thus completed by the great Council are all equally holy: whatever is added to them will only bring confusion.¹ Dillmann supposes that about a half a century after the passing away of the spirit of prophecy, Malachi (? 530-520 B.C.), being the latest who enjoyed it, all the books composing the second division were fully adopted into the collection of holy writings. At least, just before this period, when the Samaritans parted from the Jews, they seem not to have been regarded as canonical in any exclusive sense; while at the end of the third century before Christ, when we meet with the earliest subsequent historical testimony, they had already for a long time, been so esteemed.

If now, we associate together the remaining books of the Bible, as is customary, — namely, Psalms, Job, Prov-
 erbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Chronicles, Nehemiah, The remain-
ing books,—
when canon-
ized. Ezra, Daniel, and Esther, — it is not possible to fix with certainty the time of their elevation to the rank of Sacred Scriptures. It appears, however, that, in the time of Nehemiah (2 Mac. ii. 13), the Psalms, as a *completed* collection (Bleek, Ewald, Dillmann, and others), were reckoned along with the prophets as a part of the sacred books. In fact, the very use of the Psalter in the temple service (2 Chron. xxix. 30) seems to require for it a correspondingly early place in the Canon; and it doubtless formed the link by which the whole class of books at whose head it stands were finally drawn to their appropriate position in the completed volume. The earliest positive witness that can be cited to substantiate the facts we seek is the Son of Sirach (? 260-130 B.C.), who, in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, mentions the "Law, Prophets, and other Books of our Fathers," in such a way as to imply a plain distinction between them and ordinary literature, — not except-

¹ Der Kan. A. T., part v. sect. 3.

ing the work he was then translating, whose author had claimed uncommon illumination, but not inspiration. Just what books were included in the "other books," or "the rest of the books" of the Son of Sirach, it is impossible to say. Hävernick has noticed that precisely the same Greek is used by him to characterize this third division of the sacred literature of the Jews as was used by Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament writers, and consequently infers that the same books must have been intended.¹

And Josephus (Ap. i. 8), as we have noticed, advances the opinion, — of which he makes note that it was disputed, — that the whole collection of Old Testament books was finally concluded in the time of Artaxerxes (c. 430 B.C.), there being after that period "no certain succession of prophets." And "though so many centuries have passed away," he continues, "no one has ventured to add, or remove any thing, or make any change." Without positive evidence to the contrary, therefore, it might seem to be safely assumed that these two witnesses support each other; that what is affirmed by Josephus, on authority unknown to us, is confirmed by the Son of Sirach, who lived from one century and a half to two centuries and a half earlier; and that in all essential respects our Old Testament Scriptures were completed as they now remain to us, at about the time when the book of Esther was written (c. 430). Such critics as assign a considerably later origin to some of the books, still universally admit that, soon after the Maccabæan wars (c. 160 B. C.), when persecution was specially directed against the sacred national literature of the Jews (2 Mac. ii. 13, 14), the Canon must have been completed, and that, since then, nothing has been added to the contents of the *Hebrew Bible*.

Even this cursory view of the origin of the Old Testament Canon would be incomplete without a glance at the important part which Ezra, Nehemiah, and their colleagues probably had in its establishment. Popular belief and a persistent tradition among the Jews, ascribe to them a special agency in the matter. They certainly

Agency of
Ezra and
his col-
leagues in
this work.

¹ Introd. to O. T., pp. 29, 30. *Vs.* Dillmann, Jahrbuch, &c., p. 478.

mark an era in the history of the Canon. One critic, as it might be inferred not of the conservative school, says that Ezra and Nehemiah are the first representatives of that lame, contracted learning which hinders every living creation of the Spirit, keeps down prophecy, and generally lives upon what is past.¹ But when the Jewish tradition concerning Ezra and the school he represented is divested of all later embellishments, there is still left, as having an undoubted basis of truth, the principal point involved. The invariable tradition conforms both to the Jewish history and to the mutual relations of the Old Testament books themselves. So that the more recent criticism, instead of continuing to disparage the existence of a great National Assembly, organized by Ezra and continued through Nehemiah's time (2 Mac. ii. 13, 14), down to about 290 B.C., by which the Hebrew Canon was virtually fixed, finds it necessary to presuppose such an institution in order to account for other admitted facts. Tradition chiefly, though very naturally, erred in assigning to Ezra *alone* the achievement of an undertaking which was, it is likely, but begun by him. Even of the council as a whole, whenever begun or ended, one should be careful not to require too great an influence in the final moulding of the Old Testament collection. The method of the divine Providence in this matter, both in the Old Testament and the New, seeming to be rather to express itself first through the free, silent assent of an enlightened religious consciousness, and only afterwards to permit the addition of the seal of public ecclesiastical approval.

A brief account of the Old Testament Canon in the Christian Church will properly conclude the present chapter. Without entering, here, fully upon the question of the use and authority of the Apocrypha, which we have reserved for separate treatment (Appendix B), it may be said that, owing to the fact that the early Christians were obliged to read the Bible chiefly in the Alexandrian Version, along with which certain extra-canonical books had been compiled for ecclesiastical use, these books came to be held in special favor among them, and were not infrequently quoted

¹ Fürst, Der Kan. A. T., part viii. sect. 7.

by their writers as possessing a *quasi* authority. Under the stimulus of sharp discussions with their Jewish opponents, however, there was furnished an occasion for understanding and fixing, more precisely, the real distinction between the Hebrew and Greek Bibles; and, to this end, the labors of several notable scholars and writers seem to have been specially directed.

Origen (186-254), among others, felt called upon to give a list of the canonical books "according to the tradition of the Hebrews." This list conforms to that of Josephus, embracing twenty-two books, or, by the usual combinations, the thirty-nine of our present Bibles, with only a single slight exception, caused by an obvious mistake. And Melito of Sardis (c. 172), in a letter to Onesimus, — a Christian of Asia Minor, who wishes to know "the exact truth with respect to the old books, their number and order," — names, book by book, the writings at present included in our Old Testament, with the exception of Lamentations, Nehemiah, and Esther. The first two were doubtless considered a part of Jeremiah and Ezra respectively, as was customary: while Esther was also joined to the latter, as some critics suppose; or was left out on account of some hesitation felt by the Jews at that time concerning its full canonicity. Two points of special interest in this catalogue are first: that it was made only after careful personal inquiries in Palestine itself; and, second, that it appears from the names, numbers, and order of the books to have been taken from the Palestinian Version of the Septuagint, — the one, as Westcott supposes, made use of by our Saviour and his Apostles in all their quotations.¹

These citations from individual witnesses might be almost indefinitely extended, — as from Jerome (329-420), Hieronymus (died 368), Ruffinus (c. 410), and others, — all supporting the view here taken respecting the limits of the Hebrew Canon and its general adoption by the Christian Church. But it should be sufficient to state that, "during the first four centuries, this Hebrew Canon (with no essential variations) is the only one distinctly recognized, and it is sup-

Individual citations unnecessary.

¹ Bib. in Ch., p. 124.

ported by the combined authority of those Fathers whose critical judgment is entitled to the greatest weight."¹ It was formally adopted by councils of the Greek Church in the fourth century; and although, in consequence of the peculiar influence of Augustine and because the Septuagint was the original of the Old Latin version, the Latin Church, as such, did not arrive at a similar official decision, "still a continuous succession of the more learned Fathers in the West maintained the distinctive authority of the Hebrew Canon up to the time of the Reformation."²

And it ought to be further and specially considered — what we have before intimated — that, since the beginning of the Christian Era to the present day, the Old Testament books have been in the keeping of both Jews and Christians, and by both held as sacred. Two great opposing parties have been guarding, as it were, the same casket of jewels. If one party, or a portion of it, for any reason had attempted to add to or subtract from them, it could not have escaped the notice of the other or passed without tokens of decided dissent. Indeed the history of the Old Testament Canon, throughout the Christian centuries, proves this. Consequently, when we find that the Jews in the Talmud, and all other competent authorities down to the present day, hold exactly to the Old Testament (the Hebrew Canon) of the Christian, even to the extent of sometimes participating in a joint publication of the same, the evidence for the identity of our present (Protestant) Old Testament books with those in use in our Saviour's time, and so in a time far anterior to that, is abundantly conclusive and satisfactory.

The Jews as witnesses to the extent of the Hebrew Canon.

¹ Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. Can. O. T.

² Id. Cf. De Wette, *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 112.

CHAPTER III.

ORIGIN OF SEPARATE BOOKS. — PENTATEUCH. — JUDGES.

THE PENTATEUCH.

IT would be foreign to the general idea and purpose of this work to enter upon, or even definitely trace, the voluminous and often unsatisfactory discussions which, especially since the middle of the last century, have been carried on respecting the age, origin, and integral parts of the Old Testament books. Our object being to indicate results rather than processes and methods of investigation, only the more valuable facts appearing to us to have been elicited or settled by these controversies will here be stated.

And it should be premised as preparatory to a proper judicial attitude, with respect to these facts, that no reasonable person will expect the same amount of external testimony to the genuineness of the books of the Old Testament as can readily be furnished in support of those of the New. Some of these books clearly date back to a period from which no contemporaneous literature has come down to us. With respect to these we may fairly be satisfied with such other simple and natural proofs of genuineness as might rationally be expected in connection with documents of so great an age.

Another preliminary consideration of importance is, that the question of authorship, in the case of these books, does not necessarily involve that of their genuineness. A book, for instance, may be without any known author, and still be genuine, as we have before seen in considering the books of the New Testament. And a book might even be

Subject, —
how treated.

Something
to be pre-
mised.

Another pre-
liminary con-
sideration.

found to have been currently attributed to a wrong author without prejudice to its proper genuineness or canonical authority.¹ But when, barring the question of the probably composite character of certain of the Old Testament books, there is a distinct claim of authorship in the work itself for a particular person, as many suppose that in portions at least of the Pentateuch there is for Moses, then, of course, the alternative to denying such claim must be a verdict of intentional falsification. Moreover, the question of authorship often carries with it, as in the case of a supposed eye-witness, the virtual authentication of the narrative itself, not excepting the record of the supernatural events that form a part of it, and hence becomes a matter of special interest.²

And now, with respect to the Pentateuch, or the first five books of the Bible, whose authorship has been until within about a hundred years uniformly ascribed to Moses (died c. 1450), we will first notice the position which the Jews themselves, into whose possession the book originally came, and who have regarded it from time immemorial with the utmost sacredness, have ever maintained concerning its origin. There has been, throughout their entire history, scarcely any deviation among them from the view that Moses was the virtual author of the whole work, with the exception of the last part of Deuteronomy, relating to his own death, which was attributed to Joshua. The Talmud specifically states that he brought the five books to a conclusion, himself determining and limiting the bulk of the chapters (*Paraschas*) and of the verses (*Pesukim*).³ This opinion has been confined to no one sect among them, but all sects and parties, — Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, Palestinian and Alexandrian Jews, as well as Samaritans, have shared it in common.

Again, this opinion was also held and distinctly affirmed by our Saviour and his Apostles, a fact which by far the larger portion of Christendom will esteem of no little importance, notwithstanding the sentiment which De

Origin of the Pentateuch according to the Jews.

Testimony of our Lord and his Apostles.

¹ Cf. Stanley's Hist. Jewish Ch. 2d ser. p. 647, note B.

² Cf. Rawlinson's Hist. Ev., p. 56.

³ Fürst, Der Kan. A. T., part i. sect. 5.

Wette approves, that Jesus did not come into the world to teach criticism, and that faith in him cannot set limits to critical inquiries.¹ Allusions and citations from Ecclesiastes, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, found in the Gospels, are spoken of as being from Moses, and the Pentateuch is distinctly called "the Law of Moses." Our Lord, in one place, states, definitely, that Moses wrote of him (John vi. 46, 47), and that these writings were then in the hands of the Jews, which Alford declares should be accepted as "testimony to the fact that Moses had written those books, which even then were still known by his name."

Still further, a number of heathen writers, independently of any direct relations with the Jews, as Manetho and Lysimachus, representing Egyptian opinions not only not friendly, but positively hostile, to the Jews; as well as Hecatæus, Tacitus, Juvenal, Longinus, and others, all recognize Moses in the institution of the Jewish code of laws, and most of them also mention that he committed these laws to writing.²

Now, in the face of a tradition so wide-spread, persistent, and well-nigh unanimous, the *onus probandi* should certainly lie not with those who maintain the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but with those who reject it. And it might reasonably be expected that the proofs which they bring will consist of something more than simple prepossessions against a supernatural revelation of any sort, or what is miraculous under any circumstances; mere matters of style; the interpretation of isolated, and possibly interpolated, passages; and various *a priori* and unproved assumptions. It might be expected, indeed, that those who oppose Mosaic authorship, under such circumstances would do it on grounds so obvious that it could be held ir- common, and held to the end; while the truth is that nearly every opponent has a theory in some respects peculiar to himself, and one which if proved would often be quite as damaging to friends as foes. And not only do these critics fail to agree with one another in their conclusions, but are generally also as

Burden of proof lies with opponents of Mosaic authorship.

Also of heathen writers.

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 160.

² Rawlinson, id., p. 50.

far from agreeing with themselves through the different stages of their investigations. And, as if to satisfy us once for all, of the utter impracticability of reaching any definite and satisfactory results by such methods, and to show us to what lengths a rationalizing process, once let loose, will extend, we find Ewald, the prince of this school of investigators, coolly dividing the Pentateuch among seven different authors or editors, and confidently assigning to each author his special work. The following is a specimen of his method of reasoning: "The correct discrimination of individuals among the narrators is, indeed, more difficult, as a more uniform and properly prose style for narrative is now being gradually formed; still, on accurate inspection, tolerably distinct shades may always be perceived in the various authors' mode of narration, which, when they concur with other and more internal distinctions, present sufficiently reliable data to the judgment."¹

But in proceeding further to adduce certain direct reasons for maintaining the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, we notice, first, that there can be no longer any reasonable doubt entertained that alphabetic writing was sufficiently well understood, and literary culture sufficiently advanced in the time of Moses to remove any objections on that score to his authorship. Ewald says that "the Tables of the Law are an incontrovertible proof that there was writing in the age of Moses; and, when writing once existed, the greatness of the Mosaic age was exciting enough speedily to develop the germs of historic composition. On the same spot, therefore, in the history of Israel, on which the foundation for the whole of its subsequent development was laid, we also find the concurrence of those two conditions from which a national historiography may arise."²

Moreover, it is pretty generally admitted, on all sides, that some considerable portions of the Pentateuch must have been written, or at least dictated, by the great Jewish legislator. Bleek, who rejects the theory of sole Mosaic authorship, still says: "Of those laws which appear to carry with them such clear and exact traces of the

Definite reasons for the ordinary view.

Admitted that Moses wrote portions of the Pentateuch.

¹ Hist. of Israel, i. 97.

² Hist. of Israel, i. 49.

Mosaic age, there are many occurring, especially in Leviticus, and also in Numbers and Exodus" [of these he gives numerous examples], "which laws relate to situations and surrounding circumstances, only existing whilst the people — as was the case in Moses's time — wandered in the wilderness, and were dwellers in the close confinement of camps and tents, which was not the case after the people had come into the possession of the land of Canaan, and had spread themselves out in cities and over the whole country." ¹

Besides, there is a positive claim in parts of the Pentateuch to a Mosaic origin, which it is impossible to set aside. We read, for instance, in Ex. xxiv. 3, 4, that "Moses came and told the people all the words of Jehovah, and all the judgments" (referring, doubtless, to the Sinaitic legislation), and that afterwards, "he *wrote down* all the words of Jehovah." Further on (v. 7), we learn that these words were written in the "book of the covenant." In Numbers, xxxiii. 2, we also learn that Moses recorded the journeyings of the children of Israel in the desert, and kept an account of the various stations at which they encamped. Of which circumstance, Ewald remarks that it is not easy to conceive that this ever could have been written down by itself without forming a part of a regular historical work. ² We have, too, a definite declaration (Deut. xxxi. 9, 24, 25) that Moses wrote that form of the Law recorded in Deuteronomy; and that when he had made an end of writing it till it was finished, he delivered it (the book) to the Levites, to be laid up in the sides of the Ark as a witness. It has been, not without reason, supposed by some, that the book here referred to was the whole Pentateuch, which Moses thus brought to a conclusion; but this cannot with certainty be known. The majority of critics seem to prefer to limit the reference to that summary of the Law contained in Deuteronomy alone. But, however this may be, it is evident that Deuteronomy presupposes the existence of the books that go before it, and that the Jewish lawgiver or leader would not naturally have been more solicitous about the former than the latter. So much, at least, is certain :

A claim for it in the Pentateuch itself.

¹ Introd. to O. T., i. 112.

² Ewald, id., p. 64.

that there is direct testimony in the books themselves that Moses was the author of parts of Leviticus, Exodus, Numbers, and the principal portion of Deuteronomy (i-xxxii).

But, this being admitted, it is argued with great force, on the same basis of internal evidence, that, with cer- ^{The work}tain relatively unimportant exceptions in the case of ^{one harmo-}interpolations and later additions and revisions, the Pentateuch is an harmonious whole, making evident everywhere one distinct plan, and one controlling mind. No one pretends that the five books into which it is divided mark any actual interruptions in the unity of its composition. These were probably of late Greek origin, as the titles themselves indicate. From the very earliest times, the entire Pentateuch has been regarded as one book, under the title of the "Law of Moses," the "Book of the Law of Moses," or, simply, the "Book of Moses." To Jews of the present day, it is known as the Torah or the Law. So, too, in accordance with the same, the MSS. of the Pentateuch are found uniformly combined together in one single roll or volume. "But in reference to the *matter*: that the Pentateuch in its present shape proceeds from a single author is proved by its aim and plan; according to which its whole contents refer to the covenant concluded between Jehovah and his people by the instrumentality of Moses, in such a way that every thing before his time is perceived to be preparatory to this fact, and all the rest to be the development of it. Nevertheless, this unity has not been first stamped upon it as a matter of necessity by the latest redactor: it has been there from the beginning, and is visible in the first plan and the whole execution of the work. This is clearly seen, indeed, from the exact chronology which runs through all the five books, and knits all their parts together; yet more, from the care with which the materials are organically connected, and the individual elements are linked together internally, so that the earlier sections point forward to those by which they are succeeded, and for which they prepare the way; while the later sections point back to those which preceded, partly developing them, partly explaining and supplementing them."¹

¹ Keil, *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 155.

Although the "giving of the Law is the real heart of the Pentateuch," the Jewish religion does not properly begin with that, but with the promise to Abraham; and the book of Genesis forms as natural a beginning as that of Deuteronomy does an appropriate ending to the entire work.

It is not necessary to suppose that Moses actually penned with his own hand the whole of the work ascribed to him, but that such parts as he did not write were subject to his arrangement and supervision. It would not now be claimed, moreover, to any considerable extent, that Moses received by direct revelation the account which it is held that he gives us of the Creation, Fall, Deluge, and of the Patriarchal period; but that, to a greater or less degree, he was indebted for these facts to documents and records which, in some intelligible and trustworthy form, had come down to his time. Even though, however, his only resource had been oral tradition, still the narrative, without the plea of inspiration, might be entitled to our confidence, when we consider the great age to which men lived in those early times, and that, according to the Biblical account, the very earliest events noted in the Pentateuch were only four of the then generations removed from the writer; while it is generally admitted that, as a rule, the great, stirring events in a nation's life, apart from all written memorials, will be remembered for a hundred and fifty years, or, through *five* of our present generations.¹ But there is every probability that in the Mosaic period written records were in existence of all the principal facts embraced in the sacred history. In addition to other strong and, to most, conclusive internal evidence of various original documents, there is the very minute and circumstantial history of Joseph, as well as of the Patriarchs generally, to attest the theory of a contemporaneous, or nearly contemporaneous, record.

Moreover, if Moses was not the virtual author of Genesis in its present shape, as well as of the rest of the Pentateuch, there is no other period to which we can reasonably assign it. It has been shown in effect, by

Moses not necessarily the actual penman.

The Pentateuch properly assigned to no other period.

¹ Rawlinson, Hist. Ev., p. 59.

Palfrey,¹ Lange,² Kurtz, and others, "that it is an historical fact, better established than any other in antiquarian research, that the Pentateuch is the basis and necessary preliminary of all Old Testament history and literature, both of which — and with them Christianity as their fruit and perfection — would resemble a tree without roots, a river without a source, or a building which, instead of resting on a firm foundation, was suspended in the air, if the composition of the Pentateuch were relegated to a later period in Jewish history. The references to the Pentateuch occurring in the history and literature of the Old Testament are so numerous and comprehensive, and they bear on so many different points, that we cannot even rest satisfied with the admissions which Bertheau himself would readily make, that many portions of the present Pentateuch date from the time of Moses, and were only collated and elaborated by a later editor. We go further, and maintain that the whole Pentateuch — its five books and all the portions of which it is at present made up — is the basis and necessary antecedent of the history of the Jewish people, commonwealth, religion, manners, and literature."³

It is not denied that there are difficulties, and sometimes, it may be, apparent inconsistencies and contradictions involved in the theory of the sole Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; but it is held that these difficulties are only such as might be expected in the nature of the case, in a work so ancient and so transmitted as this, and such, moreover, as would become both more numerous and more inexplicable on any other theory of authorship. It is not denied that, in some instances, later hands may have tampered with the first original draft of the history, either in the way of substitution or in supplying what had in some way been lost, and that this work of revision may have been carried on, in some degree, even as late as the time of Ezra; yet it is still maintained, that the history itself, in its various interdependencies and relations, external and internal, furnishes sufficient proof of its substantial accuracy and uniform faithfulness. There is no

No unnatural or insuperable difficulties.

¹ Lect. on Jewish Scrip., i. 67-80.

³ Old Cov., i. 56; iii. 504, 509.

² Introd. to Gen., p. 97.

inconsistency, no apparent false statement or contradiction, no diversities of style, no objections whatever to the prevailing opinion respecting the authorship of the first five books of the Bible, that are not capable of a reasonable explanation. In the majority of instances, indeed, many explanations offer themselves, thus "repelling to a vanishing distance" the difficulties urged. For though "no one of them may be the real missing link in the chain of facts, which by hypothesis, be it remembered, is unknown; yet they all combine to show that the event in question might occur not only in one but in a variety of ways."¹

JOSHUA.

The first book of what was known in Jewish phraseology as the "Former Prophets" (referring to divine inspiration rather than the prediction of future events), and the one that immediately succeeds the Pentateuch in our English Bibles, is Joshua. It is not certainly known who was its author as the work stands. This lack, however, as we have before remarked, militates in no respect against the genuineness or canonical authority of the work. The Saxon Chronicle, the Parian Marble, and other ancient records have no known author, but still are regarded as of the highest historic value. What might be considered as state papers, so far from requiring the indorsement of a known author, would perhaps be even weakened in their authority by such support.² It is doubtless principally on account of the subject-matter that the work before us bears the name of the successor of Moses. In this respect it is on a level with other books of the Old Testament; as, Judges, Kings, Ruth, Esther, &c.

Modern attempts to invalidate the genuineness of the book of Joshua, to prove its fragmentary character, or to assign it to a relatively late period, have proved unsuccessful. Indeed, a declared unwillingness to acknowledge the proper historic character of any document, to the extent that it professes to relate what is supernatural or miraculous,

Author of
the book
not certainly
known.

Unsuccessful
attempts
to invalidate
its genuineness.

¹ Murphy on Gen., Pref., p. xiv.

² Rawlinson, Hist. Ev., p. 79.

leaves one an abundant margin for distrusting the widely divergent conclusions of the more recent German critics. Contradictions supposed to be found in the work quickly disappear before a really candid adjustment of facts. De Wette, for instance, finds positive inconsistency in xiii. 1-6, compared with xviii. 3, ii. 22. But the difficulty is solved by simply considering that, while the conquest of Canaan was, indeed, essentially complete, and the division among the several tribes had taken place, yet the full subjugation of *each of the hostile nations separately* had not taken place.¹

References in Joshua to the Pentateuch (though not in the form of quotations) are somewhat numerous (i. 8, ^{References to the} viii. 31, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 26), showing chronological sequence and a close internal connection, but not to the extent of justifying us in regarding it as actually a constituent part of it, and of the same authorship, a theory maintained by Ewald and some others. It was never bound up with the Pentateuch, carries within itself every mark of an independent work, and both in idea and treatment, displays throughout an harmonious and consistent unity. Other books of Scripture, by allusions to facts contained in this, serve to confirm our judgment of its historic trustworthiness (Ps. lxxviii. 53-65, Is. xxviii. 21, Hab. iii. 11-13, Acts vii. 45, Heb. iv. 8, Jas. ii. 25).

Respecting the matter of *probable* date and authorship, there is no reason for calling in question the uniform ^{Probable} Jewish tradition to the effect that Joshua was *con-* ^{date and au-} ^{thorship.} *cerned in its production.* The memoirs in ch. xxiv. 26, are expressly ascribed to him in the work itself. Other parts cannot so well be referred to any one else as to him; as, for instance, the two addresses (xxiii. xxiv), the minute accounts of Joshua's intercourse with God (i. 1, iii. 7, iv. 2, &c). The writer moreover speaks both as an eye-witness of, and an important participant in the events narrated. But Joshua could not have recorded the fact of his own death, and there are, also, other matters spoken of in this book which did not occur until after his decease (Josh. xv. 13-19; cf. Judg. i. 10-15,

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 171. Cf. Herzog's Encyc., Art. Josh.

Josh. xix. 47; cf. Judg. i. 21). The formula, too, "unto this day" indicates that the book in its present shape does not precisely synchronize with the events narrated. Keil's theory, therefore, may be accepted as sufficiently approximating the truth, that the work *in its present form* is the production of one of the elders "that overlived Joshua" (xxiv. 31; Judg. ii. 7), who wrote the history of his times toward the end of his life after the death of Joshua and Eleazer.¹

JUDGES.

The book of Judges receives its name from that series of deliverers, thirteen or fourteen in number, whom the Lord raised up after the death of Joshua to rescue Israel from the yoke of their oppressors. The whole work, however, covers a period extending somewhat beyond the time of the Judges to that of Eli and Samuel. It naturally follows in chronological order the book of Joshua, opening with a formal reference to that distinguished leader's death. Ruth was formerly reckoned as a part of Judges, in the Hebrew enumeration of the sacred books; and these two, together with the books of Samuel and the Kings, really form a more or less continuous narrative, covering several eventful centuries of Jewish history. The exact chronology of Judges forms a difficult, if not inexplicable, problem; although this is a thing of minor importance with reference to the purposes of the present work.² The whole period which Keil assigns to it, of 350 years, shows, at least, that historic documents must have been to a large extent relied on in the composition of the work, a conclusion which is confirmed by the style of the history itself; as, in the words of the prophet, ii. 1-5; the song of Deborah, v.; Jotham's parable, ix. 7-20; and also by "the original touches and expressions which give a remarkable character to the extended delineations of the deeds of individual judges." The possibility of the existence of such records has just been actually demonstrated in our own times by the

Name,
position,
period in-
cluded, &c.

¹ Introd. to O. T., i. 212.

² Cf. Rawlinson, Hist. Ev. note, p. 295.

providential discovery of the Moabite stone, which Dr. Ginsburg refers to the first year of the reign of Jehu, or a period not far removed from a part of that embraced in our history.

The Talmudic as well as all other Jewish traditions unite with the early Christian in assigning the authorship of Judges to Samuel. Whether this be correct or not, ^{Authorship.} the date thus given to the work cannot be far amiss, since, according to the contents (Judg. i. 21; cf. 2 Sam. v. 6-9) it must have been written after the death of Samson, and yet before the capture of Jerusalem by David. It has all the marks of having proceeded in its final form from one author. And "the originality in matter and expression which beams forth from every one of the historical pictures, and the unmistakable fidelity with which the political condition and the civil usages of the people of Israel in these times have been depicted, have so distinctly impressed a stamp of historical truth upon the book, that this is commonly conceded even by the scepticism of the modern criticism; although in accordance with its dogmatic assumptions, this criticism rejects the miraculous features and the theocratic spirit as unhistorical legends and ingredients."¹

¹ Keil, *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 230.

CHAPTER IV.

ORIGIN OF SEPARATE BOOKS, CONTINUED. RUTH. — PROVERBS.

RUTH.

THE beautiful story of Ruth, the Moabitess, might properly find a place in the Holy Scriptures for a variety of reasons, among which are the support it gives to the levirate law of marriage; the fact that it supplies an important link, omitted in the books of Samuel, with respect to the ancestry of David; and especially, in that it shows the sublime faith in the God of the Hebrews on the part of a poor pagan woman, with its subsequent conspicuous reward. The period of Jewish history to which the narrative refers must have been somewhere about one hundred years, or, more exactly, three generations before the time of David, Ruth being, as it is supposed, the great-grandmother of that king. But the work itself could not have come into existence then, since we learn from it that, at the time when it was written, David had already attained to the throne. The Talmudic tradition, therefore, that Samuel wrote the book, in connection with that of the Judges,¹ finds little support among scholars of the present day.

No serious objection, in fact, seems to exist to our dating the book as originating near the close of David's reign, or a little later. Ewald admits² that it might readily have come into existence during the rule of David's house, yet prefers himself to refer it to the period of the Exile and to an author "who had obviously read himself into the spirit of the ancient works both of history and of poetry, and so produces a very striking imitation of the older work of the Kings."

¹ Fürst, *Der Kan. A. T.*, part ii. sect. 2.

² *Hist. of Is.*, i. 154, 155.

Most persons will judge that Ewald creates here a greater difficulty than any which he attempts to remove. For a Hebrew to have married a Moabitess at the time of the Exile would have been matter of grave scandal, and no story-writer possessed of the artistic skill and culture ascribed by Ewald to the author of Ruth would have been guilty of such a blunder.

Indeed the narrative has every mark of the most faithful reality, is fascinating in its simplicity, contains nothing impossible or improbable (De Wette), and, quite ^{Internal marks of genuineness.} unlike a fictitious account, adheres to the plain facts, although by so doing it might seem to detract from the splendor of the royal house of David. The reference in ch. iv. 7, does not necessitate a later date than that which is here given to the work; while the plea of the existence of Chaldaisms is sufficiently well met by Keil, who says, that they are "in part remains of the older formation of the language; and, partly, they are taken from the common colloquial language. In the author's own narrative, his diction is pure Hebrew, and free from later Chaldaisms."¹ The position assigned to this book by the Greek translators, — just after Judges and before the books of Samuel and the Kings, — supposing that one of its principal objects is to give the lineage of David (iv. 18–22), is a most natural one, since the family line of David, as principal hero of all these books, is of more importance than that of either Saul or Samuel, both of which are given (1 Samuel i. 1; ix. 1). The fact that the genealogy referred to is defective, only the generations being mentioned during a period of nine hundred years, is accounted for by supposing that principal personages alone are indicated, as was frequently the case in tables of this sort.

BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

The books of Samuel are so named for the reason that this prophet occupies the foreground in them, being the ^{General characteristics.} divine agent through whom Saul, the first king of

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 44.

Israel, and David, its most distinguished ruler, are anointed and brought forward. The two books of our English Bibles formed but one in the original Hebrew Canon, the division having probably been first made by the translators of the Septuagint; from that source appearing afterward in the Vulgate, and thence, finally, introduced into the printed Hebrew text by Bomberg in the sixteenth century. The historic connection of the work with the book of Judges is very close: the latter closing with the notice of the supremacy of the Philistines, and the mighty deeds of Samson, the Israelitish champion; and the former beginning with a detailed recognition of the same Philistine ascendancy until the kingdom was restored to Israel under the guidance of Samuel (1 Sam. i.-xii.). The remainder of the work is taken up with the history of Saul to the time of his death (xiii.-xxxi.); and then, of the rule of David to its conclusion (2 Sam. v. 4), no notice being taken of his death, however; perhaps, because the reins of government were transferred to the hands of Solomon before that event took place.

It is almost universally acknowledged that, in its present form, the work before us had a single author, although Origin. it is admitted that the historic documents and sources of the narrative were probably numerous and varied. This very fact, moreover, that the narrative was dependent on such different sources, should be sufficient to account for the occasional repetitions found in it, as well as the apparent and alleged contradictions, and the seeming isolation of certain sections and dislocation of certain sentences, which it exhibits. On the other hand, the substantial unity of the work appears in the general continuity of thought throughout, the similarity of language and style in every part, the marked interdependence of the several parts, and the frequent references from one to another. Even De Wette admits that "the narrative bears the marks of a genuine history, and when it is not fully derived from contemporaneous documents, as it is in some places, it is yet drawn from an oral tradition very lively and true, and is only disturbed and confused now and then."¹ That the author

¹ *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 210.

of this book might have found contemporaneous documents and monuments of which to avail himself in its composition is clearly evident from 1 Sam. vi. 18; vii. 12; 2 Sam. i. 18; and 1 Chron. xxix. 29.

With respect to the important matter of date, only certain extreme limits within which it is likely to have been written can be fixed upon with any certainty. It is ^{Date.} argued with good reason, for instance, that it could not well have been written before the separation of the two kingdoms, which took place after the death of Solomon (c. 975 B.C.); since the kings of Judah and of Israel are here put in contrast with each other (1 Sam. xxvii. 6). Saul, David, and Solomon are never called kings of Judah simply. This fact might furnish a limit in one direction. Then we learn further, from the book itself, that it was still, at the time of the writing, customary to worship Jehovah in other places (high places) than at the door of the tabernacle (1 Sam. vii. 9, 10, 17; ix. 13; xiv. 35), with the seeming tacit understanding that such worship was not unacceptable to the Lord. This, it is held, could not have occurred so late as the time of Josiah (c. 642-611, B.C.) under whom such worship was abolished, and the strict letter of the law, as recorded in the Pentateuch, enforced in all matters of this kind. With the greatest probability, then, the book was written at some time within this period; and there is nothing properly to hinder the supposition that the composition took place not long after the death of Solomon, as critics of the most diverse schools are agreed.

THE TWO BOOKS OF KINGS.

The two books of Kings, like the two of Samuel, originally formed but one undivided work in the Jewish Scriptures. The character of its contents doubtless deter- ^{General characteristics.} mined the title which has been assigned to the composition, it being a continuation of the history of the theocracy under Solomon and succeeding kings, up to the period of the Exile and the dissolution of the State. The history of Solomon's

reign extends through the first eleven chapters; then follows that of the two separate kingdoms, given side by side (1 Kings xii.; 2 Kings xvii.); and, finally, the account of the kingdom of Judah till its destruction (2 Kings xviii.—xxv.).

As there was an evident thread of history connecting the books of Samuel with Judges, so here in turn there is a clear historic reference to, and connection with, the books of Samuel (cf. 1 Kings viii. 18, 25 with 2 Sam. vii. 12—16; 1 Kings ii. 11, with 2 Sam. v. 5; 1 Kings iv. 1—6, with 2 Sam. viii. 15—18). But there is no such connection or similarity between them, as to justify Ewald's supposition that they all, including Ruth, proceeded from one author. The books of Samuel contain no traces of the Babylonish exile; do not quote authorities, nor give chronological dates, nor speak of the worship of Jehovah in the same spirit, nor use the same diction as do these.¹

The work before us, moreover, has every mark of independence and of essential unity. De Wette says: "A certain unity is discernible from beginning to end."² The same writer, although carefully eliminating whatever has the slightest tinge of the miraculous as "mythical," still speaks of the little natural touches which show the author's delicate sense of historic fidelity, a number of which he indicates. One of them is the exclamation of the man who lost his axe in the water: "Alas, master! for it was borrowed" (2 Kings vi. 5), of which he says that "the honesty of a man could not be better delineated." Yet this very account is indissolubly connected with one of this critic's so-called myths, and for truthfulness of narration must stand or fall with it.

One peculiar characteristic of the author of this work we have already noticed,—his continual appeal to specific authorities. These authorities might almost seem to be a regular series of public annals, covering the whole period of the history. They are variously entitled, "The Books of the Acts of Solomon" (1 Kings xi. 41);

¹ Hist. of Is., i. 159. Cf. Horne's Introd., ii. 673.

² Introd. to O. T., ii. 238.

“The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah” (1 Kings xiv. 29); “The Books of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel;” and “The Books of the Kings of Judah and Israel” (2 Chron. xxxii. 32). The second of these books is quoted fifteen times, and the third sixteen. In fact, the extreme documentary character of the work, while it gives an air of positiveness and reality to it, still furnishes occasion, at times, through an imperfect adjustment and moulding of materials, for repetitions, difficulties in chronology, obscurities, and even discrepancies, acknowledged by our most candid scholars to be at present inexplicable.

With respect to the date of the production, there is no serious difference of opinion, Bleek, Ewald, De Wette, Keil, Horne’s Introduction, and other authorities, plac- ^{Date.} ing it after the beginning of the captivity at Babylon and before its close (c. 588–538 B.C.). The book concludes with the statement that Jehoiachin, the king, having been carried into captivity (599 B.C.) in the thirty-seventh year of this captivity (562 B.C.), he was released and treated with high respect by the monarch at Babylon — Evil-Merodach — “all the days of his life.” But there is no intimation in the book of the liberation of the Jews generally from captivity, but rather the contrary. Hence, it is justly inferred that the writer must have done his work in the interval between the death of Jehoiachin and the return of the exiled Jews to their native land.

Who the author was will probably always remain a matter of uncertainty. Some still adhere to the Talmudic tradition that it was Jeremiah, the last part of the lat- ^{Supposed author.} ter’s prophecy being almost or quite identical with the last section of the book of Kings. Most critics, however, find insuperable objections to this theory. Bleek thinks Baruch was compiler and editor of both works; Keil that it was some citizen of Judah (2 Kings xxii. 21) still in exile in Babylon. The book is referred to in several places in the New Testament (Luke iv. 25–27; Rom. xi. 2–4; Heb. xi. 35; Jas. v. 17, 18; Rev. xi. 6), and its canonical authority has never been disputed.

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

The title which our so-called Books of Chronicles now bear, dates back only to the time of Jerome and the Vulgate. The original Hebrew caption was "Words of Days," or "Annals;" while the Alexandrian translators designated them by the term "Paraleipomena," or "Supplements," perhaps under a somewhat erroneous conception of their contents. Like the Books of Samuel and the Kings, they were originally regarded as one, the present division being arbitrarily made for the purpose of securing the requisite number (corresponding with the alphabet) of canonical Scriptures in the Hebrew Canon. Chapters i.-ix. contain little more than a bare list of genealogies; x.-xxix., a history of the reign of David; and the remainder of the work, an account of Solomon's reign, together with that of the other *kings of Judah*, to the time of the Exile.

Supposing the work to have originated some time subsequent to the period of the Babylonian exile, as is generally acknowledged, its contents, both with respect to matter and form, tally remarkably with what we might naturally expect — and, indeed, know from other sources — was the state of things at that time. The genealogies, for instance, so uninteresting to most modern readers, were really an important part of the public records in the Hebrew State. They were the basis on which not only the land was distributed and held, but the public services of the temple were arranged and conducted, — the Levites and their descendants alone, as is well known, being entitled to the necessary allowances of tithes, first-fruits, &c., set apart for that purpose. And it is a noticeable fact, that, while in the historic portions of the work much of the same ground is passed over as in the Books of Samuel and the Kings, still the materials are so handled — certain parts being omitted, and certain other parts enlarged and emphasized — as to indicate a special object in the composition; and that such object was largely to dignify, render attractive, and restore fully the glory of the ancient temple service. This peculi-

arity has not escaped the notice of investigators; and it was on this ground, doubtless, that Ewald inferred that the author must have been himself a Levite, and that De Wette supposes that he was a priest.

· Making use to a considerable extent of the same original sources as previous sacred historians, the work before us would naturally contain many passages parallel with them; and we accordingly find forty sections (Keil) in the history of David, Solomon, and the Kings of Judah in common with the books we have already noticed, though in different order and sequence. This circumstance furnishes occasion, as in other cases of several independent histories of the same events,—like the life of our Lord, for instance, by the Evangelists,—for the appearance of minor diversities in connection with a general and substantial agreement, and yet without justly exciting suspicion respecting the truthfulness of either narrative. In all such cases, we have reason to suppose that a full knowledge of details, barring corruptions and errors of transcribers, would readily account for any apparent discrepancies or contradictions. It is Dillmann's opinion, that “we find nothing in Chronicles to excite suspicion;” that “the difference between Chronicles and Kings, with respect to proper names, figures, &c., may satisfactorily be attributed to incidental corruption of the text;” that the “historical credibility of the work has been fully vindicated;” and that it might justly have been admitted to the Canon on the ground of its “internal merits,” and because “it gives essential aid in the study of the older historical books.”¹

A probable, if not an actually acknowledged, motive which prompted the severe assaults of De Wette and some others upon this work is found in the fact that, if it were to be admitted as a trustworthy witness of the period to which it is generally assigned, it would necessitate a speedy change of base on the part of these critics with respect to the age of the Pentateuch, which they have been accustomed to regard as a production of the time of the Captivity. The

Minor diversities and their probable origin.

Motive of hostile assaults.

¹ Herzog's Encyc., Art. Chron. Cf. Rawlinson's Hist. Ev., p. 106.

Chronicles presuppose the existence of certain laws respecting the Levites and the temple service, before or during the reign of David, which laws are to be found only in the Pentateuch.¹ All such charges of spuriousness, however, have been successfully met and refuted even on German soil; and these books are generally acknowledged to stand on a firm basis of historic truth.

With respect to the particular author of the work, and its precise date, there is much difference of opinion. The Authorship and date. article in Smith's Dictionary (Chronicles) argues that the author was the prophet Daniel; Smith's Students' History of Bible, Keil, Davidson (Kitto's Cyc.), and some other authorities, favor the Jewish tradition and the opinion of many of the early Christian fathers, that Ezra was the writer; Horne and Dillmann agree with Ewald that it originated about the time of the Greek supremacy (c. 330 B.C.), nearly two centuries after Ezra; Bleek says it could not have been written prior to 400 B.C., possibly as late as the Græco-Macedonian rule. Happily, the variety of opinion on this point need not disturb our faith in its canonical authority, or stand in the way of the purpose for which, in the providence of God, it was originally written.

EZRA.

The book of Ezra originally formed but one work with Nehemiah, and the two are still distinguished in the In general. Vulgate only as I. and II. Esdras. It is a continuation of the history of the Jews, from the point where it is dropped in the Chronicles up to the period of the arrival of Ezra in Jerusalem and the beginning of his efforts at reform. The whole period covered by the narrative is about seventy-nine years, beginning with the reign of Cyrus and ending with the eighth year of that of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the entire contents being arranged chronologically, to correspond with the sovereignties of the respective monarchs, six in number.

¹ Keil, *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 80, 81. Cf. *Smith's Dict.*, Art. Chron.

Nothing incredible, unnatural, or improbable, even from a rationalistic point of view, appears in the book; so that, while its canonical rank is unquestioned, it is also universally regarded as well attested and genuine history.

The matter of date and authorship depends largely upon the decision of the question, whether, in connection with the book of Nehemiah, it is to be considered as ^{Time of} composition an independent work, or only as a part of a larger work which includes the books of Chronicles. Against the latter supposition is: (1) the form of its (Nehemiah's) commencement; (2) the identity of contents in some parts (1 Chron. ix.; of Neh. xi.); (3) the earlier reception of Ezra into the Canon; and (4) various other internal evidences bearing in the same direction.¹ It is generally conceded that Ezra wrote a part of the work. The arguments against his having written certain other portions, where he (Ezra) is spoken of in the third person, are (as Bleek admits) not conclusive. It was ascribed to him by Jewish tradition. And it is certainly impossible to prove satisfactorily that he was not the writer. But, whoever the writer may have been, he has left the most unmistakable evidence of trustworthiness in the fact that, so far as he was not himself an eye-witness of the events he describes, his uniform appeal is to official documents and indisputable authorities.

NEHEMIAH.

The book of Nehemiah continues the narrative of the fortunes of the Jews subsequent to the restoration, beginning with the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (Neh. i. 1), with the eighth year of whose reign the book of Ezra was concluded. The inscription with which the work opens — “The words of Nehemiah” — is not unimportant, announcing and certifying the fact that what follows proceeded from his pen. Of the first seven chapters of the work before us, this is scarcely doubted by any one. The last part, also, from the twelfth chapter through, with certain exceptions, it

¹ Cf. Herzog, Encyc., Art. Ezra.

is maintained with good reason, was his production. Who wrote the central portion, in which the style differs widely from what goes before and what follows, and in which Nehemiah is spoken of in the third person, &c., is not known. Keil thinks that Nehemiah may have written even this part. But most scholars see insuperable difficulties in such a conclusion. Some supposed that Ezra wrote it, and that it was adopted by Nehemiah into his own work without essential change. Horne's Introduction agrees with Ewald in supposing that it was the final compiler of the united work of Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Ezra. Nägelsbach (Herzog's Encyc.) says it matters not who he was, inasmuch as he was a contemporary of Nehemiah.

The book, at least, so far as we know, found its way un-
Canonical rank. questioned into the Canon, and has held its position there undisputed. We may safely assume that the additions subsequently made to it, if there were such, were not without due authority, since there is nothing on the face of them to indicate any purpose other than the completion of the history. The last of these apparent additions by common consent cannot have been made later than the time of Alexander the Great (xii. 1-26, c. 330 B.C.), which was only about a hundred years after the original work, including the central unclassified portion, was written.

ESTHER.

Esther was the Persian name of Hadassa, a Jewish maiden, niece of Mordecai. This name was changed to Esther
General re- marks. (Sitareh), or star, after her elevation to be queen. The book — which bears this title on account of its being the history of events in which she bore a conspicuous part — has always been greatly venerated by the Jews, being reckoned next in honor to the Pentateuch itself. The feast of Purim — of whose origin this work furnishes the only satisfactory account — it is known was celebrated as early as the time of the Maccabees (2 Mac. xv. 36); was treated with respect by our Saviour (John v. 1);

and is still universally observed by the Jews, a part of their services on such occasions being the public reading of this history. Such a fact assures us, at the outset, that the production has a solid foundation of historic verity.

Moreover, the book makes significant reference to original sources of information; is singularly precise and definite in all its statements concerning persons and places; Internal proofs of genuineness. gives so clear and true an account of Persian manners that the most distinguished orientalisks have regarded it as a reliable authority on the antiquities of that country; is found to be in minute harmony with whatever modern research has brought to light concerning the former customs of those times; in simplicity and naturalness of style, exhibits a marked contrast with the apocryphal additions made in connection with the Septuagint Version; and, finally, presents no difficulties within itself, and suggests no objection to the place it occupies as a part of the sacred Canon which a reverent criticism may not readily solve.¹

It has been objected to the book that "the author avoids, as if by design, the name of God" (Ewald); that a Objections of Ewald and others. blood-thirsty spirit, foreign to the spirit of the Gospel, is manifested and fostered; that certain parts of the history, especially that relating to the slaughter of their enemies by the Jews, is incredible; and that there is difficulty in reconciling the dates found in the book. To which objections, severally, it is answered, that the omission of the name of God may be accounted for on other ground than that of a want of veneration for him, since there is sufficient evidence that Esther and her uncle were not uninfluenced by pious sentiments (iii. 2; iv. 1-3, 14-16). "Nor is there need of much discernment to apprehend the immense benefit which has accrued to the Church in time past, and which must continue to accrue in time to come from a holy silence combined with the spirit and action of martyrs."² Further, the narrative simply states the facts as they occurred, without any evident approval of them in all respects. The account of the massacre of the enemies of the Jews to the number of seventy-five thousand, with other

¹ Cf. Baumgarten, Herzog's Encyc. Art. Esth.

² Baumgarten, id.

connected statements, — considering the known character of the age and of the ruling monarch, — is not only not incredible, but is paralleled in the history of modern Europe in the case of the massacre of St. Bartholomew.¹ Besides, the existence and perpetuation of the feast of Purim requires historical presuppositions of this magnitude to account for it. With respect to the matter of confused dates, much depends upon the spirit of candid investigation which one brings to the work, as is seen in the ready solution of the commentators.²

It is generally admitted that the Ahasuerus of the story is no other than the famous Xerxes of profane history. Date and authorship of the work. And, from a careful weighing of evidence, it would appear that its writer was a resident of the country, and wrote while the empire was still standing. Some, however, think that Ezra was its author; and others (though not Keil) ascribe it to Mordecai himself (ix. 20). As we have intimated, in connection with the Septuagint version of the book, certain apocryphal additions (as De Wette freely concedes they are) were admitted. When Jerome translated the book into the Vulgate he added these interpolated passages, but in such a way as to indicate that they formed no part of the original Hebrew. In the wretched, uncritical times that followed, however, this distinction became obliterated; and so six new and wholly unauthorized chapters (xi.—xvi.) were introduced into the Scriptures, and for a time formed a part of them.

JOB.

The book of Job, which has been termed “the greatest Style and matter. production of the ancient Israelitish philosophy,” is, for the most part, poetical in form, though scholars seem unable to decide whether to call it a drama, an epic, or a lyric poem (Keil). Around a nucleus of probable historic truth, the writer, with true artistic taste and skill, has gathered what might appear to be the more marked theories, current in his time, concerning the government of Jehovah,

¹ Cf. Rawlinson, *Hist. Ev.*, p. 152.

² Keil, *Introd. to O. T.*, ii 124-128.

especially as it respects its more mysterious and afflictive aspects. But no proper analysis of the contents of the work can here be even attempted. Want of space will compel us to confine ourselves wholly to the questions of its integrity, and its authorship and date.

Assaults have been made, in recent times, upon the unity of the book, but with so little basis of real or apparent truth, that, coming from different critics and different points of view, they have effectually neutralized one another. The assumption of the interpolation of Elihu's discourses at a later period — an assumption which Bleek seems to oppose, and Delitzsch fully adopts, although holding that they form, notwithstanding, an integral portion of canonical Old Testament literature — is the only one which calls for special notice at this time. And it should be noticed, first, that while the majority of conservative critics hold to the complete unity and integrity of the book as it now stands, not a few, who are sceptically inclined, are tenacious of the same opinion. Then the supposition of those who claim that this portion is a subsequent addition (as some of them say, by the same hand) is based on the intangible and unsatisfactory evidence of a seeming difference in tone of thought, doctrinal views, and, particularly, language and style. All of these points of objection have been abundantly answered by Keil, among others, who also shows that the whole tendency of these discourses of Elihu "is to point out to Job the self-humiliation which is necessary for man, and to show him that suffering may be a grace as well as a punishment; and thus to prepare the way for the revelation of God, who leads the humbled patriarch fully to see the wrong which he has done by speaking so presumptuously; and then unfolds the dreadful majesty of the Almighty, only to discover his condescending love and grace."¹ The article in Smith's Dictionary, also, shows that there are striking and natural, though covert, allusions by Elihu to the discourses of Job and his friends, which prove an undoubted internal connection.

With respect to the date of the composition, the opinion of

¹ *Introd. to O. T.*, i. 198.

Keil, Delitzsch, and some others, is that it belongs to the age of Solomon, a theory which, plausible in itself, they support by arguments whose weight it is impossible to deny.¹ Horne's Introduction falls in with the view of Ewald, Bleek, De Wette, and some others, that it was written at about the beginning of the 7th century B.C., or between the Assyrian and Babylonian captivity.² A writer in Smith's Dictionary learnedly maintains that it was probably produced by a Hebrew, well acquainted with Patriarchal customs, who lived before the Sinaitic legislation. It is well known that the book is referred to in the New Testament (Jas. v. 11), as also by the prophet Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 20).

THE PSALMS.

The Hebrew title prefixed to the Psalter signifies "Songs of Praise." This book served the same purpose in the Jewish Church, that the hymn-book does in the Christian. The whole work was originally divided into five parts, answering to the five books of the Pentateuch, each part ending with a suitable doxology (i.-xli. ; xlii.-lxxii. ; lxxiii.-lxxxix. ; xc.-cvi ; cvii.-cl.). The attempt has been made to classify these parts according to their peculiar use of the divine name, but the result has not been entirely satisfactory. Another basis of classification has been sought in the contents, according as the Psalms are didactic, or the sentiment of praise or of lamentation predominates.

With respect to date of composition, the Psalms range from the time of David to that of Nehemiah (1055-444). Olshausen, Hitzig, and some others, bring down the date of very many to the time of the Maccabees, three hundred years later, but solely on the basis of conjecture. This view conflicts with that of the best authorities, as well as with the true date of the conclusion of the Canon. From 2 Mac. ii. 13, it should appear that the Psalter was connected with the Prophets by Nehemiah. Bleek says that "there is no

¹ Herzog's Encyc., Art. Job.

² Cf. Fürst, Der Kan. A. T., part v., sect. xii.

song in our Psalter, which from any well-founded reason should be placed later than in Nehemiah's age." ¹ Most of the Psalms have titles, thought to be generally correct, specifically naming their authors. Seventy-three are ascribed to David. It is known to have been a custom with Arabian and Hebrew writers to prefix their names to their compositions, and these superscriptions of the Psalms in general cannot be shown to have had any other origin. In very many cases, the question of dates is readily settled by direct allusions to contemporaneous history. Considering the whole period covered by the Psalter as well as internal evidences, it is clear that it must have come gradually into its present shape, as is proved especially by the historic order of the different authors and the definite indication of their concluded work (Ps. lxxii. 20). But this does not stand in the way of the supposition that one hand (? Nehemiah's) was concerned in giving the finishing touches to the work, and introducing it into the Canon.

PROVERBS.

The book of Proverbs, by its title ascribed to Solomon, is a collection of philosophical and moral maxims, poetic in form and of the widest range, which probably came into existence gradually, beginning with or soon after the time of Solomon, and concluded by the distinguished men of the Hezekiah College (xxv. 1). There is no sufficient reason for supposing, with Keil, that Solomon was the sole author of even the first part, extending through the twenty-ninth chapter. His being the largest single contributor, *a potiori nomen fit*, together with the natural desire to connect so distinguished a name with the work, accounts satisfactorily for the superscription. It may, indeed, be admitted, and there is no positive proof to the contrary, that *most of the proverbs* in the work, up to the thirtieth chapter, first originated with him, being a selection from the three thousand which he is said to have written (1 Kings iv. 32). The last two chapters (xxx.,

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 238. Cf. Keil, Introd. to O. T., i. 463.

xxxi.) claim to be from other hands, and that they are so is admitted by the most conservative critics.

Internal evidence, however, like marked differences in style, the beginning and ending of sections with new titles, and the express statements contained in these titles, seem to preclude the theory that the book was put into its present shape, even excluding the last two chapters, by Solomon. Hence, the majority of even orthodox writers, together with many not accounted such, in harmony with the positive information conveyed in chapter xxv. 1, agree in fixing upon the period of the Hezekiah College (c. 728-448)¹ as that in which the final editing of the book took place. This supposed composite character of the work, in which respect it only resembles other Old Testament literature, cannot justly be considered as really weakening the argument for its canonical rank. In fact, its canonicity has never been disputed in the Christian Church, while the New Testament abundantly confirms its authority by numerous quotations extending from the first to the twenty-seventh chapter of the collection.

¹ Fürst, *Der Kan. A. T.*, part v., sect. 9-11.

CHAPTER V.

ORIGIN OF SEPARATE BOOKS, CONTINUED. ECCLESIASTES.— MALACHI.

ECCLESIASTES.

THE word Ecclesiastes, which is the Greek rendering of the Hebrew term Koheleth, means properly "Preacher," and is a sufficiently exact rendering of the original title of the work before us. With respect to authorship, the theory ably vindicated by such scholars as Stuart,¹ Keil,² Hengstenberg,³ Zöckler,⁴ Horne,⁵ Plumptre,⁶ and the great majority of recent critics of every school,—that this book is an example of personated authorship without intention of deceiving, its language being put into the lips of Solomon as a fitting representative of the widest human experience,—seems best to accord with the facts.

The following considerations among others support this view: the author specially distinguishes himself from Solomon by speaking of Koheleth as one who *was* king in Jerusalem; in chapters i. 12, 16; ii. 9, the character assumed is not well carried out; in xii. 9-14, the writer speaks in his own person, and not in that of Koheleth; the state of things described in the book does not suit the Solomonic age; the language, style, &c., bear in the same direction, being of a late complexion; there are things in the book which we could not expect Solomon in his real character to utter: i. 16; ii. 9, 15, 19; iv. 8; v. 7; viii. 9; x. 4, 16-19. The arguments for the older and traditional view are ably presented by Tayler Lewis,⁷ and the editor of Keil's Introduction.

¹ Com. on Ec., pp. 67-79.

² Introd. to O. T., i. p. 516.

³ Com. on Ec., Introd.

⁴ Lange's Ec.

⁵ Introd., ii. 786.

⁶ Smith's Dict., Art. Eccles.

⁷ Lange's Com. on Ec.

Whichever of these views is adopted, no one's confidence in the book ought thereby to be disturbed, as it does not at all affect the matter of its inspiration or canonical authority. Inspired writers are no more than others, shut up to one form of composition. And, though Solomon were actually demonstrated to have been the author of the present work, it would no more certainly follow that it is a production properly falling within the scope of the Sacred Scriptures, than from the supposition that some one personated him in it.

On the theory proposed, the date could not well be placed earlier than the time of the Captivity. And if the translation and interpretation of chapter xii. 11, previously noticed as proposed by Fürst,¹ Oehler,² and Dillmann, be correct, it shows that the Canon of the Old Testament was on the point of being concluded when it was written. Bleek thus characterizes the drift of the contents of the book: "Not only does the book conclude (ch. xii. 13 f.), as summing up the whole matter, with the summons to fear God and keep his commandments, but the whole course of the argument is based everywhere on the consciousness, expressed in the most distinct way, that God is the Almighty, from whom every thing proceeds; who gives life, wisdom, and all good things to men; whose working is for everlasting; who makes every thing beautiful, and watches over all; that, in his own good time, he will bring every thing to judgment, and that he will finally bless those who fear him, but not so the wicked" (iii. 17; viii. 12; xi. 9).

CANTICLES.

The exact Hebrew title of the Canticles is "The Song of Songs [the most beautiful song] of Solomon." Certain things with reference to this production are worthy of note at the outset: that it is found, and has always existed, among the canonical Scriptures; that no objection to such a

Facts favor-
ing genu-
ineness.

¹ Der Kan. A. T., part v., sect. 3.

² Herzog's Encyc., Art. Can. O. T.

position of an *external* character can be discovered ; that such an interpretation is possible as would adapt it to the uses of the Church in all ages ; that the most devout Christians have often found it delightful spiritual nourishment.

Moreover, some of those who deny any special moral or spiritual aim in the book, still concede that it probably originated in the age of Solomon, and under the influence of his court (Bleek), if not coming, as the Hebrew title seems to claim, from his pen. Our purpose would not suffer us to notice and make a choice among the various interpretations (allegorical) which have been put upon the composition for the purpose of showing the propriety of its position in the Bible. We can only refer our readers, in addition to the ordinary Introductions and Commentaries, to an excellent treatise by Leonard Withington, who very ingeniously and ably supports the theory that the purpose of the Song was “mainly and primarily to foreshow the formation and union of the Gentile Church with Christ, when a more sublime and spiritual religion should be presented. . . . There is to be a religion (such is the spirit of the book) which, uniting the soul with the Saviour in a noble life, is to bring the Gentiles under its influence, and have power enough to spread through the earth.”¹ The Solomonic origin of the production is maintained by Hengstenberg, Zöckler, Keil, Delitzsch, and others ; the view that it originated in his time and within the circle of his influence, though not from him, by Bleek. Horne’s Introduction argues that it came into being after the time of Solomon, but that this has nothing to do with the question of its canonical authority. It is not to be inferred, moreover, that in all cases those who defend a literal interpretation of the work are thereby prevented from maintaining, also, its divine inspiration, although such might appear to be generally the case.

¹ Manuduction, p. 11.

An interpretation possible, consistent with canonicity.

ISAIAH.

Isaiah stands foremost among the so-called Greater Prophets.

Who Isaiah was. His name signifies "salvation of God," a fact to which he himself, on more than one occasion, makes allusion. Little is known of the history of the prophet beyond what is incidentally stated in this work, though a Jewish tradition furnishes a highly embellished account of his martyrdom under Manasseh. He was the son of Amos (not the prophet), was married, had children, and dwelt, it would seem, mostly at Jerusalem. From the opening verse of the book we learn that, "midway between Moses and Christ," his prophetic activity, beginning with the death of Uzziah, extended over the reigns of the three following kings (759-699). There is, therefore, no improbability in the supposition that he lived for a time, also, under the sovereignty of Manasseh.

Contents of the book. With this statement of the first verse, the contents of the whole book seem (as is pretty generally agreed) well to accord up to the thirty-ninth chapter. The order of these prophecies is not chronological, but "according to a principle of successive unfolding of the prophetic activity" (Keil); or, it is partly chronological, and partly based on subjects, mostly the latter" (Umbreit in Herzog's Encyc., Art. Isa.). Some writers (Umbreit, Gesenius, Hävernack) divide the whole work into four parts, as follows: i.-xii.; xiii.-xxiii.; xxiv.-xxxv.; xxxvi.-xxxix.; xl.-lxvi.

Assaults on its integrity. Serious assaults have been made on the unity and integrity of the book, especially on the position that the concluding portion from the fortieth chapter proceeded from Isaiah, or his age. Bleek concedes that this point is well taken. He, however, guards the admission by denying that this later writer, whoever he may be, desired to impersonate Isaiah. The principal arguments adduced, and regarded as decisive against unity of authorship are: (1) the historic circumstances implied in the disputed chapters; and (2) the originality of the ideas, or of the forms in which the ideas are expressed¹

¹ Cheyne, *Book of Isa. Chronolog. Arranged, &c.*, Introd. p. 21.

Under the first head it may be remarked, that, in the fact that the deliverance of Israel from the Babylonian captivity by Cyrus is *definitely predicted*, a sufficient occasion for objection might doubtless be found on the part of much of the current German criticism. Yet Bleek is constrained to admit, even among Isaiah's contributions, acknowledged prophecies,—some that foretell the appearance of the Saviour.

Delitzsch's argument for the unity of the book is: (1) the harmony of the arrangement with the common traditional view; (2) the occurrence of certain favorite expressions of Isaiah in the disputed chapters; (3) parallel passages in contemporaneous writers; (4) universal and persistent tradition. Umbreit says of this last portion, that "all it contains flows finished and complete from a central point, and we admire the dialectic skill of the author."¹ Keil thinks that the chief difficulty with the fragmentists is, that they do not show a "principle pervading and governing the whole collection."² He naturally agrees with Delitzsch in regarding Isaiah as the editor of the entire work.

Contemporary authority proves, at least, that Isaiah was a well-known author. From Ezra i. 2-4, we judge that the latter portion of Isaiah was then in circulation, in connection with the rest (538).³ The Greek translation of Isaiah in the Apocrypha (Ecclus. xlviii. 24, 25) contains a distinct assertion of the unity of authorship. A considerable number of the prophecies of the disputed portion are quoted in the New Testament as Isaiah's (Matt. iii. 3; Luke iv. 17; Acts viii. 28). This same portion contains most marked predictions of the life, sufferings, and death of the Messiah, a fact which at once lifts it above the level of ordinary literary works, affixing to it "the broad seal of Divine inspiration, whereby the chief ground of objection against its having been written by Isaiah is at once annihilated."⁴

¹ Herzog's Encyc., Art. Isa.

² Introd. O. T., i. 332.

³ Cf. Isa. xlv. 28, xlv. 1, 13; and Josephus, Ant., xi. 1, sect. 2.

⁴ Smith's Dict., Art. Isa.

JEREMIAH.

Jeremiah, the second of the "greater Prophets," was a native of Anathoth, a place but a few miles north of Jerusalem. Here, and in Jerusalem, the most of his prophecies were uttered (xi. 21; vii. 2; xxvi. 1). He was called to the prophetic office in the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah (c. 629), and was at this time quite young (i. 6). During the first twenty-two years of his prophetic activity, nothing of special mark occurred, the substance only of the predictions of this period being given (ii.-x.). But after the battle of Carchemish, in which the Chaldeans were victorious over the Egyptians, and the way became open for the dominance of the former in Palestine, the "external historical impulse" was furnished for the enlargement of the prophetic vision (Nägelsbach in Herzog's Encyc., Art. Jer.).

This crisis is marked by the predictions recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter, which may be regarded as the "outline of the entire compass of Jeremiah's prophecies." In this and the two following chapters, Jeremiah "sketches for the immediate future a definite prophetic programme, not only of the theocracy, but also of the Chaldean kingdom, and of the nations subjected by it." In the fourth year of Jehoiakim (c. 607), he received a commission from that king to write down his prophecies (xxxvi. 2) in a "roll of a book," showing that they had already reached, in a certain sense, a culminating point. This roll being afterwards burned (xxxvi. 33) by the king, was again reproduced by the prophet, in connection with Baruch, and other prophecies added to it (xxxvi. 32). But although there may have been some use made of this special copy, in the arrangement of the book as it now stands, it is evident that it was not literally followed; since there is an intermingling of the predictions made before and after the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim.

The last notice that we have of Jeremiah, in the Scriptures, is the mention of the fact that he unwillingly accompanied the people to Egypt (Tahpanhes), and there continues his

prophecies. It is most likely that Jeremiah, or his scribe, Baruch, compiled—with the possible exception of the fifty-second chapter—the work in its present form (Bleek, Keil, and many others). It naturally divides itself into two principal parts: (1) the theocratic prophecies, extending after the first chapter, which is introductory, through to the forty-fifth,—the latter serving as a sort of appendix; (2) from the forty-fifth to the fifty-first, containing prophecies against foreign nations. “There is no dialectical development of conclusion from premises in his writings; but we behold, as it were, a series of tableaux pass before our view, each of which presents the same chief person and the same scene, but in manifold groupings.”¹

It is generally conceded, that the fifty-second chapter proceeded from a later hand. The previous chapter ends: Doubts respecting certain parts. “Thus far the words of Jeremiah.” It is not probable that the prophet survived the events recorded in chapter lii. 31–34, although he might have done so, and yet have been less than one hundred years old. Ewald’s conjecture that this chapter is an extract from the national annals, added to Keil’s, that it was appended to the book for the purpose of serving as a “voucher for the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s predictions,” is probably not far from the truth (cf. 2 Kings xviii.). Other parts of the book, as x. 1–16; xxx.–xxxii., have been held by some to be lacking in genuineness, being attributed to the “second Isaiah,” or the person who, as we think, is falsely supposed to have written the last part of the prophecy of Isaiah. Such doubts, however, it is to be noticed, are quite likely to accompany, in all cases, a denial of the prophetic gift. The similarity of style in the excerpts from the two prophets is probably due to the acknowledged tendency of Jeremiah to make large use and take the color of his predecessors’ writings. Bleek says: “Among all the prophecies of the book there is not one, according to my judgment, of which we have any reason for denying the authorship to Jeremiah.”²

External proofs of genuineness are not wanting for this book.

¹ Nägelsbach, id.

² Introd. to O. T., ii. 97.

The son of Sirach says (Ecclus. xlix. 7), "that Jeremiah was a prophet consecrated from his mother's womb" (cf. 2 External proofs of genuineness. Mac. ii. 1-8). And, in addition to references in Philo and Josephus, the following are found in the New Testament: Matt. xxi. 13, Jer. vii. 11; 1 Cor. i. 31, Jer. ix. 24; Matt. ii. 18, Jer. xxxviii. 15; Heb. viii. 8, Jer. xxxviii. 31; Heb. x. 16, 17, Jer. xxxviii. 33, 34.

LAMENTATIONS.

The title of the book of Lamentations is derived from its contents, which embrace in its five chapters, the Name, date, and author. inspired poetic reflections of an eye-witness, on the desolations brought upon the holy land by the rule of the Chaldeans. Among all the critics, there is scarcely an exception to the rule of ascribing the work to the prophet Jeremiah, in harmony alike with tradition, and the spirit, tone, language, and subject-matter of the document itself (Davidson, De Wette, Eichhorn, Keil, Bleek, Nägelsbach, Jahn). Bleek says it "may be assumed as certain." The time of composition is thought to have been some time after the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (c. 588). In form the work seems to have been written in "imitation of ancient elegies over the dead" (cf. 2 Sam. i. 17, 18; iii. 33). The lamentations of Jeremiah referred to in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25 are not those of this book, but belong to some work not now extant, although the fact that Jeremiah wrote elegiac poems, as there shown, is an incidental support of the genuineness of the present work.

EZEKIEL.

The prophet Ezekiel (God strengthens) belonged to a sacerdotal family (Ezek. i. 3; 1 Chron. xxiv. 16); was probably carried away captive among the eminent Personal history and date of his work. Jews expatriated with Jehoiachin (i. 2; xxvi. 1; xxx. 20; 2 Kings xxiv. 14-16); and the duties of his prophetic

office during its whole period were discharged among the captives at the river Chebar (i. 1), in the Babylonian empire. He prophesied for twenty-three years (xxix. 17), or up to the twenty-seventh year of the captivity, after which all trace of him is lost. The date of Jehoiachin's captivity was about 599: so that Ezekiel beginning to exercise the prophetic gift at 595, ceased, so far as we have any account, at 572. Jeremiah had been performing the duties of his office for about thirty years when Ezekiel was carried away as a captive; if the latter was not personally acquainted with the weeping prophet, he must have been familiar with his writings.

With respect to the internal arrangement of the book before us, there is a strict chronological order observed as far as the twenty-fourth chapter; and in the remaining part ^{Its internal arrangement.} the succession of important events is followed. With respect to the authorship of the whole, and its compilation in the form in which it now exists, there is scarcely any dissent from the view of De Wette, who says: "There is no doubt that Ezekiel, who commonly speaks of himself in the first person, wrote the whole book.¹ This opinion is held in common by the most recent commentators of all schools. The prophet is not mentioned in any other of the canonical books of the Old Testament, nor is his work directly quoted in the New Testament, although there are numerous significant parallels and allusions to his concluding predictions in the book of Revelation.

DANIEL.

It is now almost universally admitted that our so-titled book of Daniel had but one author. This is conceded by recent critics of the most rationalistic tendencies. ^{Unity of book conceded; authorship and date in dispute.} But these critics are by no means agreed on another, and, in this case, even more important question, — who this author was. The matter properly lies, however, only between two: the supposed Daniel of the Exile, or a spurious character who lived three hundred and fifty years later, in the time of

¹ Introd. O. T. ii. 432.

Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 170). Yet, in the decision of this problem it will be decided whether the book of Daniel is genuine throughout, or a complete and wicked forgery. No other alternative seems possible. Of course, in speaking of the authorship of the book, we mean its authorship for substance, and do not refer to its revision or arrangement, which might fall to other hands without prejudice to the above position. To this one question of authorship, consequently, it is proper that we should give the space allotted to the subject in this work.

And we will first name some of the more important objections to the old theory, as found in the several Introductions of De Wette, Davidson, and Bleek. It is said, in opposition to the authorship being that of a Daniel living at the time of the Exile, that Daniel himself is spoken of in the book in laudatory terms; that the language of the work is corrupt, being a commingling of Chaldee and Hebrew, with a sprinkling of Greek words; that later dogmatic positions are taken, as one concerning the ministration of angels; that the contents are of a legendary and an improbable character; that the place of the book in the Canon among the Hagiography is inconsistent with the view of its earlier composition; that its prophetic contents are widely different from those of other prophecies, especially in their apocalyptic character; that Jesus Sirach is silent about the book; that the writer begins his predictions with the times of Antiochus Epiphanes; there are insuperable historic difficulties; this Daniel refers ("understood by books") to the completed Canon of Scriptures; the habit of Daniel to pray three times a day points to a time when *religious ideas from India had penetrated* into neighboring countries!

In replying to these objections *seriatim* (cf. Keil, *ad loc.*), we remark that Daniel speaks of himself only in the way of historic statement, and in no more laudatory terms than Paul does of himself; that the language of the book harmonizes perfectly with the circumstances of time and place and with that of other books written at the period of the Exile; that there are only three or four Greek words, being

Reply to
these objec-
tions.

names of musical instruments, and easily accounted for; that the dogmatic position of the book, including its teaching concerning angels, is only a natural recognition and development of the doctrinal teaching of the Canonical Scriptures going before; that its miracles and predictions would naturally afford pretext for accounting it spurious on the part of such as invariably assume that miracles are impossible, but not in the estimation of those who find a proper place for them in the history of the kingdom of God; that the order of books in the Canon does not rest on chronological but on internal grounds; Daniel was unlike all the other prophets, while having the spirit of a prophet, and the place of his book among the other books cannot be regarded as showing that, when it was united to them, it was not believed to have been written by a Daniel of the time of the Captivity; that the peculiarities of Daniel's predictions are accounted for by his "position in the history of redemption, and his own personal position, at a heathen Court among magi courtiers" (Delitzsch), this giving them a universal character.¹ It cannot be shown that Jesus Sirach (Ecclus. xl.) had any necessary occasion for speaking of Daniel: he does not speak of the twelve minor prophets, or other distinguished men of this period. Again, Daniel "takes up the vision where the perspective of Isaiah had narrowed down to a point, and opens it anew" (Delitzsch in Herzog's Encyc.); "and the prophetic visions of Ezekiel form the connecting link between the *characteristic types* of revelation and prophecy" (Westcott, id.). The historical difficulties of the work are such as we might expect to meet with, to a greater or less extent, in all works of this kind and age; but that they are not insuperable may be inferred by considering the numerous and distinguished scholars and critics who support the common theory of authorship. It is a mere assumption to suppose that Daniel refers to the *completed* Canon of Scripture under the title of "the books:" there is equal reason for supposing that it was as yet an incomplete collection. And, finally, for the custom of praying three times a day, Daniel needed not to look to India, as he might have found an example nearer at hand in David himself (Ps. lv. 17)

¹ Cf. Westcott in Smith's Dict., Art. Dan.

A few points, also, of a more positive character may be given in support of the traditional view: (1) Daniel is named in the second part as the receiver of the revelations. (2) The reception of the book into the Canon at all is inconsistent with the view of the destructive critics. (3) No other book of the Old Testament has exercised a more decided influence upon the New Testament literature. The Apocalypse especially serves as a companion buttress to one arch. (4) Our Saviour recognizes the validity of the prophecies, and virtually sustains the historic character of Daniel (Matt. xxiv. 15; xxv. 31; xxvi. 64). (5) The book shows the most minute acquaintance with the history, manners, and customs, &c., of the period of the Captivity. (6) If the testimony of Josephus can be relied on, Alexander the Great (c. 356) was influenced favorably toward the Jews on account of the predictions of Daniel concerning him. (7) The Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch (c. 283), it is claimed, shows acquaintance with the work, a fact obviously inconsistent with its origin in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 170). (8) Daniel is three times mentioned in the book of Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 20; xxviii. 3), and in such a way, when all the circumstances are considered, — Daniel being now about fifty years old, and distinguished for his integrity, godliness, and high position in Babylon, — as to make the supposition that some other unknown Daniel is meant extremely improbable. (9) The difficulties involved in the current theory are incalculably multiplied and enhanced by that of the authorship of the work in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Aside from the usual Introductions, we refer our readers to a very full and able discussion of this subject in a work by J. Conway Walter,¹ who presents especially the argument from internal evidence. See, also, the Commentary of Stuart, Auberlen on Daniel and the Apocalypse, a small treatise by Tregelles, and particularly Pusey's Lectures.

¹ Longman, London, 1863.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.—HOSEA.

The twelve books next following, were always regarded by the Jews as one book, under the name of “the twelve.” The period covered by them extends from ^{In general.} about 800 to 420. The order of succession, with the exception of the last six, is different in the Hebrew and the Greek (Septuagint), while both differ somewhat from the chronological order.

Of the prophet Hosea, we know scarcely any thing beyond the book on which he has impressed his individuality. His epoch synchronized, in part, with that of Isaiah, ^{When Hosea lived; genuineness of his work.} being from about 790–725 (Keil); his actual ministry extending over a period of more than fifty years (i. 1), although probably not without interruptions. The work may be divided into two parts (i.–iii.; iv.–xiv.): the former referring to certain symbolical actions, the latter containing prophetic discourses proper. De Wette says: “Since the prophecies of the first part are the earliest; since the second part does not consist of separable portions, and contains a reproof which would apply to the *whole* period of corruption and misery, therefore, we cannot reasonably doubt that this book, in its present form, and perhaps with its present inscription, proceeded from the hands of Hosea himself” (ii. 441).

JOEL.

Joel, who was, without doubt, the author of the book which bears his name, was one of the oldest of the prophets. ^{Genuineness of work not doubted.} Nothing is known of him except what is incidentally communicated in the work itself. The immediate occasion of his prophecy seems to have been a devastation caused by a drought and a plague of locusts. Two points only with respect to the book are in dispute. The first is, whether the devastation described is to be taken literally or symbolically. The great majority of commentators — and the drift is altogether in that direction — adopt the former view.

The second point relates to the probable date of the prophecies. Some place them at about the middle of the tenth century before Christ, while others assign them to the beginning of the sixth century. It is only a very limited number, however, who take so wide a range. An overwhelming majority of the best critics fix upon a date somewhere in the ninth century, between 870 and 800 (Credner, Meier, Hitzig, Ewald, Hofmann, Keil, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, De Wette, Knobel, Bleek, Henderson, Auberlen, Cowles); and there can be no doubt of its being approximately correct. Amos was a contemporary of, although somewhat younger than, Joel (Amos iv. 6-9; i. 6-10; cf. Joel iv. 4-6). "In a literary and poetical point of view, Joel's prophecy is one of the most beautiful productions of Hebrew literature: in florid and vivid description it is surpassed by none. It is also important in a prophetic and Messianic aspect; although, of course, in this it is inferior to the works of several other prophets" (Bleek).

AMOS.

Amos, by his own account, was a shepherd of Tekoa, a place but a few miles south of Jerusalem (i. 1; vii. 14). Of the prophet personally. Moved by the abounding idolatries and general wickedness of the ten tribes under Jeroboam II. (c. 825-784), he went to Bethel, the principal seat of idol worship, two years before the earthquake (i. 1, cf. Zech. xiv. 5), to denounce the judgments of Jehovah against them. So faithful was he in the execution of his mission, that, after a single year's ministry, he was obliged to take refuge in Judah to save his life. The work which bears his name shows every evidence of having been leisurely composed, and was probably written out after his return to his home. The utmost harmony exists between the assigned date of composition and the contents of the work, and no occasion for objection presents itself. Ewald says of Amos: "We find in none of the other prophets so many pictures derived from rural life, and drawn with so much originality and truthfulness. And this peculiarity shows itself not

only in his numerous comparisons and figures of speech, but even in the minutest lines and shades of language and delineation.”

OBADIAH.

The entire prophecy of Obadiah is contained in a single chapter. It consists of a “censure and menace against the Edomites, who had been malicious and hostile to the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem.” The destruction of Jerusalem referred to, and the accompanying captivity (v. 20), it is generally conceded, was that by Nebuchadnezzar (588). Hence, the prophecy was spoken after that time. It seems altogether likely, also, that it was uttered before the overthrow of the Edomites by the same king (c. 583; Josephus, Ant. x. 9, sec. 7). There is an almost verbal agreement between parts of this prophecy and a part of the fortieth chapter of Jeremiah. Hence there has arisen a controversy, in which the opinions of the two principal contending schools are hopelessly commingled, concerning which was the original writer. Bleek and De Wette hold to the priority of Jeremiah, Henderson and Keil to that of Obadiah; the last, indeed, contrary to most commentators, assigning the date of Obadiah’s prophecy to a period much earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar; namely, during the reign of Joram (c. 891–884). The unchronological position of the book in the Canon (after Amos) is thought to be due to the reference to Edom at the close of the latter’s prophecy.

JONAH.

The book of Jonah is distinguished from all the other so-called prophetic books of Scripture in that “not the *prophecy*, but the *prophet*, is the chief subject of it.” Its contents have, by some, been held to be pure fiction; by others, an allegory or myth; and by still others, and perhaps the most numerous class of the more modern

Confusion of dates, but no doubt of genuineness.

Proofs of historic truthfulness, &c.

critics, as having a basis of historic fact only, being a "national Hebrew tradition of the prophets with historical kernels not to be more clearly defined, and with didactic objects in view." Against all these positions the historic truthfulness of the narrative, in all its substantial features, may be confidently maintained on the following grounds:—

(1) The book is consistent with itself in all its historical and geographical statements, and has every appearance of an honest witness in its outline of the peculiar history of the prophet, besides being pledged to truthfulness in its very controlling idea. (2) The Jonah of the book, without doubt (it is generally admitted), is identical with Jonah, the son of Amittai, spoken of in 2 Kings xiv. 25, of whom, we there learn, that he lived in the time of Jeroboam II. (c. 825-784). We also find in his historic relations, thus brought to light, a sufficient explanation of the present narrative. "For Assyria was then on the point of elevating itself to the government of the world. The kings of Israel had already placed themselves under its protection (Hos. v. 13). How proper was it now, that the Lord should give this mighty nation, which was to exercise so great an influence on the destiny of the theocracy, a presentiment of his power and glory. How encouragingly must it have reacted on Israel, and how humiliating the example of penitent Nineveh for impenitent Israel" (Nägelsbach in Herzog's Encyc.). (3) Our Saviour not only "explicitly recognizes the prophetic office of the son of Amittai, just as he does that of Elisha, Isaiah, and Daniel, but represents his being in the belly of the fish as a real miracle; grounds upon it, as a fact, the certainty of a future analogous fact in his own history; assumes the actual execution of the commission of the prophet on Nineveh; positively asserts that the inhabitants of that city repented at his preaching; and concludes by declaring respecting himself, 'Behold! a greater than Jonas is here.'"¹ "For all those, to whom Christ is the Son of the triune God, the centre of the Scriptures, as well as the touchstone and security for the truthfulness of its historical narrations,—for all such these words [just alluded to] contain an

¹ Henderson, *Minor Prophets*, p. 197. Cf. Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29-32.

incontrovertible guarantee for the reality of the facts contained in the book of Jonah. By this it is by no means said, however, that Christ also guarantees the form in which the present book of Jonah relates the facts" (Nägelsbach, id.).

MICAH.

In the superscription to the prophecy of Micah, it is said, that he prophesied during the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, Date c. 759- and Hezekiah. Even the hypercritical find nothing 699. in the contents of the work inconsistent with this declaration, the dangerous position of Judah and Israel with respect to Assyria and Egypt being everywhere presupposed. The book also synchronizes with that of Isaiah, with whom Micah was contemporaneous, and is quoted by Jeremiah, whose bloom was toward a hundred years later (Jer. xxvi. 18, cf. Mic. iii. 12). This Micah is designated by the term, "The Morasthite," probably to distinguish him from a Micah (Micaiah) of the times of Elijah. The reign of Jotham began c. 759, and that of Hezekiah ended c. 699, within which period, consequently, the prophetical work of Micah belongs.

NAHUM.

Scarcely a scrap of the personal history of Nahum has been transmitted to us. He is called "the Elkoshite" The probable date c. 714-699. (i. 1), but whether on the ground that Elkosh was the place of his birth or of his prophetical labors, is not known. Such a place still exists, three miles from Mosul (Nineveh), in Assyria, where the prophet's grave is pointed out to pilgrims, the supposition being that he there died as a captive. There is, however, another Elkosh in Galilee. The contents of the book, "The Burden of Nineveh," have given color to the above theory of the scene of the prophet's ministry. In three chapters it is shown: (1) how powerful and just the Almighty is; (2) how Nineveh is besieged and overthrown; and (3) that it

suffers the doom of No Amon in spite of all resistance. Bleek, however, judges from i. 12 that the work was written at Jerusalem (cf. i. 4). It is a matter which is more or less involved with that of the date, which is also in dispute. Still, the majority of the ablest authorities (including De Wette, Bleek, Henderson, Keil, and Horne's *Introd.*) fix upon the last part of the reign of Hezekiah, — that is, between 714 and 699, — as the time best answering to all the demands of the problem. There are three points of history serving, it is thought, to anchor the book to that epoch: the humiliation of Judah and Israel by the Assyrian power (ii. 3); the final invasion of Judah by that power (i. 9, 11); and the conquest of Thebes (No Amon) in Upper Egypt.

HABAKKUK.

Nothing whatever is certainly known of Habakkuk's personal history. It is inferred from the conclusion of his Contents of work, and date. work (Umbreit, Keil, and others), that he belonged to the tribe of Levi. "When the prophet, in the spirit, saw the formidable power of the Chaldeans approaching and menacing his land, and saw the great evils they would cause in Judæa, he bore his complaints and doubts before Jehovah, the just and the pure (i. 2-17). And on this occasion the future punishment of the Chaldeans was revealed to him (ii.). In the third chapter a presentiment of the destruction of his country, in the inspired breast of the prophet, contend with his hope that the enemy would be chastised."¹ From the fact that the Chaldeans are represented as about to enter Judæa, but as having not yet entered it (i. 5, 6; iii. 16); and that they appear to be little known to the Jews, and so their march had not progressed far, it is decided by Bleek, Davidson, De Wette, Ewald, Umbreit, Henderson, and others, that the composition is to be dated not later than the reign of Jehoiakim (c. 611-599). Keil and Delitzsch place the date a few years earlier, in the time of Josiah. The book of Jeremiah, who was partially contemporaneous with Habakkuk, will explain more fully the

¹ De Wette, *Introd. O. T.*, ii. 465.

circumstances under which the latter lived. His name means, "clasping round," "embracing," which Luther interpreted as referring to the tender manner in which he took the people to his heart.

ZEPHANIAH.

For some reason,—perhaps to distinguish him from another person of the same name, or to indicate that his family was more than ordinarily conspicuous,—the genealogy of the prophet Zephaniah is given for several generations (i. 1). The word of the Lord which he uttered, it is said, came to him in the days of Josiah, the son of Amon (c. 642–611). This work consists of one continued utterance embraced in three chapters of our English Bibles, whose contents quite agree, in all particulars, with the date which the composition bears. Bleek thinks (ii. 155) that it may be assumed with probability that the prophecy was uttered before the discovery of the Book of the Law, in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, since there is no intimation of any such reform, with respect to idolatry, as succeeded that event. Zephaniah foretells the conversion of heathen nations, even that by whose hands Israel was then suffering, and before the conversion of Israel itself (iii. 10).

The supposed date
c. 642–611.

HAGGAI.

The epoch at which the prophet Haggai delivered his message is definitely indicated in its opening verse; it was while Joshua, the son of Josedech, was high priest, Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, in the second year of Darius (Hystaspis). The rebuilding of the temple had been previously begun, but for various reasons (Ez. iv. 24) was hindered, and Haggai with Zechariah were sent to encourage and spur the people on in their work. The whole book is taken up with this one subject, being composed of four distinct deliverances, made respectively in the fourth, seventh,

Internal considerations
fix his epoch
at c. 520.

and the last two, in the ninth month of the second year of Darius (c. 520). Haggai's efforts prove successful, and the work which had been interrupted for sixteen years is carried on to a successful completion (i. 12-15). On account of the exceeding brevity of these utterances, it has been thought that they are no more than a simple outline of the original discourses of the prophet.

ZECHARIAH.

At nearly the same time as Haggai, another prophet, Zechariah (i. 1), as we have said, addressed himself to the same task of stimulating the depressed and not wholly unselfish exiles in the work of rebuilding the temple under Zerubbabel. It is conjectured that he was considerably younger than Haggai (ii. 4); born in Babylon; and of priestly descent, being, it is supposed, the Zechariah mentioned in Neh. xii. 16, as returning from the Captivity; and afterwards officiating as priest under Joiakim, high priest, successor to Joshua. Zechariah began his work only two months after Haggai (i. 1), and continued it up to the fourth year of Darius (Hystaspis), which brings us to the close of the eighth chapter of the book. This part of the composition being continuous, complete within itself, bearing the stamp of one hand, and the signature of the prophet, is universally regarded, as, even in its present form, the work of Zechariah.

Many critics are found, however, who deny that the remaining six chapters of the book proceeded from the same source, Davidson mentioning nineteen of considerable note — including Ewald, Eichhorn, Michaelis, Bleek, and Pye Smith — who hold this view. On the other hand, Hävernicks, Keil, De Wette, Hengstenberg, Jahn, Henderson, Eadie (Kitto's Cyc.), and others, defend the integrity of the book and unity of authorship throughout. Davidson's arguments, in brief, for taking the negative side, are: (1) the historical standpoint of the last part is different from that of the first eight chapters; (2) there is a different style; (3) there are different

Zechariah
contemporaneous with
Haggai.
Unity of
book vindicated.

Davidson
against its
unity.

formulas for introducing chapters; (4) the second part is less enigmatical; (5) it also presents a different picture of the Messianic age.¹ Bleek thinks that he discovers two authors, neither of them Zechariah, in the concluding portion (ix.—xiv.); and, with most of those who here deny the authorship of the latter, dates the composition much earlier than the time of the Captivity.

De Wette, in defence, says, that there is affinity in language and style between the first and last portions of the book, as also with respect to referring to other, ^{De Wette in defence.} and sometimes quite late, prophets. Hence, no part of it could have been written before the Captivity. It is clearly presupposed, too, that the nation, and not merely the ten tribes, are in captivity (ix. 12; x. 6, 9, 10). And “since it is impossible to combine all allusions to the period to one point and make them all harmonize with the condition of the land at any one epoch of its history, therefore, it may be most advisable to suppose that those parts which seem to belong to an earlier period were written with reference to the future, and that the form of a prediction was adopted in part.”² And we add from Keil: “There can be less doubt about the genuineness of these chapters, since a mingling of genuine and spurious pieces in the book of Zechariah becomes at once inconceivable on this ground, that the collection of the Canon was scarcely a lifetime after the death of this prophet, — at a time when even historical tradition must have still been in existence as to the origin of the writings subsequent to the Exile.”³

With respect to the supposed quotation of Zech. xi. 12, 13, by Matthew (xxvii. 9), under the name of Jeremiah, ^{Explanation.} several explanations are given; that of Henderson, perhaps, being as natural and unobjectionable as any, that the Greek text of the evangelist has become corrupted in this place.⁴

¹ Introd. to O. T., iii. 322-324.

² Introd. to O. T., ii. 480.

³ Introd. to O. T., i. 429.

⁴ Com. on Minor Proph., p. 419.

MALACHI.

It is generally agreed that the prophet Malachi — of whom nothing is known outside of the composition which bears his name — flourished about a hundred years later than the two last mentioned, or in the time of Nehemiah (c. 432). The temple has been completed (i. 10; iii. 1); and, like Nehemiah, the prophet opposes the custom of marrying heathen wives, the refusal to pay tithes, and the bringing of worthless offerings (Neh. xiii.; cf. Mal. iii. 7-12; ii. 8); there being almost a verbal agreement, in some cases, between them. Bleek says of his several utterances, that they were doubtless written and issued at the same time and in the same order in which we now possess them, so that they must be considered as one prophecy with different divisions. Malachi is especially distinguished for the clearness of his Messianic prophecies (iv.); and in this respect, as well as from the fact that he is the latest of all the Old Testament prophets, fitly concludes the list of Old Testament Scriptures. Numerous allusions and references to this book by New Testament writers serve to confirm its canonical authority (Matt. xi. 10; xvii. 11; Mark i. 2; ix. 11, 12; Luke i. 17; Rom. ix. 13).

Date c. 432
certified
by work
itself.

APPENDICES.

A.

LEADING OPINIONS ON REVISION.

OUR object in this summary is to put the reader in possession of the most important facts relating to the subject of revision, obtained from a somewhat extensive and careful survey of the wide field of its literature seemingly white for the harvest, and thus to make possible an intelligent opinion with respect to its being desirable and practicable. It has been well remarked by a recent Biblical scholar of England, that "the decision of the question [of revision] cannot be left entirely in the hands of Christian scholars. The vast body of upright and consistent Christians, who may not be acquainted either with Greek or Hebrew, ought to be deferred to, in a matter so important to their spiritual interests; but the judgments of this larger class must, to a great extent, be directed and guided by the information derived from the studious investigations of the few who have made the Original Scriptures, in whole or in part, the subject of their habitual study. Previously, then, to any direct steps being taken in so important and deeply responsible a movement as that to which the above remarks have reference, the diffusion of sounder views and larger information on the whole subject must be earnestly aimed at. The Christian mind of England [and America] must be enlightened. Prejudices, which are the natural progeny of ignorance, must be patiently met, and courteously removed. Christian scholars must seek to follow the example of Ezra, as recorded in the eighth chapter of Nehemiah, and endeavor to impart to the people the sense of the matter, — the right understanding of the whole subject of Biblical Translation." ¹

I. OPINIONS ADVERSE TO REVISION.

The Rev. Henry John Todd published a "Vindication of the Translation and Translators of the Bible" in London, 1819, and T. Rennell, D.D. cites therein the following from T. Rennell, D.D. (Discourses ^{D.D.}

¹ H. Craik, Hints and Suggest. &c., pp. 6, 7.

on Various Subjects): "From either of these schemes, the bold project of a new translation, or the more specious one of a revival of the present version of the Holy Scriptures, there can be so little gained, and may be so much hazarded, that the probable good bears no manner of proportion to the threatened danger. We have indeed specimens of new versions, both of the whole, and of various parts of the Old and New Testaments; some of them, particularly of the Old Testament (see Dr. Geddes's Prospectus), clearly intended as a vehicle for loose and licentious speculation. The language of the New Testament (Wakefield's Translation, 3 vols. 1791; 2d ed. 1795) is distorted, in violation of all analogy of sense and diction, to speak the opinion of Socinus. But even the best of these specimens, executed by men of acknowledged talent and soundness of opinion, recommend most strongly by their avowed inferiority in every essential point an adherence to that we are already in possession of. With regard to revision, it is of little importance that a few particles be adjusted, a few phrases polished, if the whole fabric of that faith which was once delivered to the saints is thereby shaken to its foundations. For the extent and progress of such a revision, or the objects it may embrace, no man who is acquainted with the ordinary course of theological proceedings can at all calculate. With regard to the New Testament, I am sure we may confidently affirm that, in a well-known instance (Observations on the English Version of the Gospels and Epistles, John Symonds, LL. D.), the industry, learning, and abilities which have been sedulously exerted in collecting the mistakes and inaccuracies which are said to exist in the received version, have scarcely been able to produce a single error by which any material fact or doctrine is affected."¹

In a work published in New York in 1837, entitled "Objections Brantley and Winslow, 1837. to a Baptist Version of the New Testament, by Wm. T. Brantley, D.D.; with Additional Reasons for preferring the English Bible as It Is, by Octavius Winslow, M.A.," the latter says: "That he would rather they should remain [the modes of expression which seem to disfigure the sacred page] in the present version undisturbed and unexpunged; for such is the constant fluctuation and progress of living languages, that words now pleasant and familiar to the ear may, a century hence, be classed among the obsolete and the vulgar."² And Dr. Brantley: "It is our heart's desire and prayer to God that this venerable monument of learning, of truth, of piety, of unequalled purity of style and diction, may be perpetuated to the end of time just as we now have it. Let no daring genius meditate either change or amendment in its structure or composition; neither let any

¹ Vindication, &c., pref., p. vi.

² p. 50.

learned impertinence presume to disturb the happy confidence of the tens of thousands who now regard it as, next to the original languages, the purest vehicle through which the mind of the Holy Spirit was ever conveyed to mortals."¹

Dr. M'Caul,² speaking to the same point as Mr. Winslow, says with regard to obsolete words: "The changing of these words would establish a principle, that words not intelligible to the general reader must be changed for others more easily understood. And then a great many and important words must be removed. The possibility of having our theological language and therefore our theology changed (as might be the case), makes us rather satisfied to hold fast what we have than to run the risk of emendations of so sweeping a character" (pp. 21, 22). He divides the emendations of every character proposed (p. 25), into three classes, — the needless, the uncertain, and the objectionable, — and touches one of the most important matters involved in the subject farther on (p. 46), when he alludes to the original text to be adopted by the revisers. "All the other perils are as nothing compared with the alteration of the original texts. Everybody knows that, in the New Testament especially, there are some texts affecting the very foundations of our faith, others affecting the controversies between High Church and Low Church, which are subjects of debate. At present, the English Church leaves the discussion of such passages, and the merits or demerits of the various readings, open to the deliberations of criticism. But let these passages be changed, and the weight of church authority is at once thrown into the scale; and a doubtful, mischievous reading may be put forth as the oracle of God." "With respect to the text of the New Testament," he goes on to say (p. 48), "some prefer Lachmann, . . . others prefer Tischendorf in the new edition (of his New Testament), now in course of publication. Tischendorf has in Matthew's Gospel alone restored one hundred readings which he had previously rejected."

Respecting this troublesome matter of the original text which shall be made the basis of revision, there are other distinguished scholars who raise doubts. Professor George E. Day wrote (Theolog. Ec. Apr. 1870): "The first condition of a revised version which shall possess any claim to general acceptance, viz., the *formation of a Greek textus receptus of the nineteenth century* by a competent body of scholars, has received little prominence in controversies on this subject. This is the first labor to be accomplished. With all the eminence of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and Scrivener in the department of textual criticism, the judgment of neither

Professor
George E.
Day, Rev.
Thomas
Sheldon
Green,
M.A., and
others.

¹ p. 6.

² Reasons for Holding Fast, &c.

of them can be accepted as final. The combined judgment of many minds upon the largely increased evidence recently collected, is needed to determine what the text to be translated shall be ; and when this shall be decided to the general satisfaction of the Christian world, a long step will be taken towards the settlement of the question of a revised translation. On the other hand until this is done, any version which might be made would rest on an uncertain basis, and be sure itself to need revising." Similarly, Rev. T. S. Green : ¹ "Calls are made for a revision of Scriptures without betraying any consciousness of the necessity of a certain preliminary to such proceedings : namely, the determination of the text to be represented in such version or revision." These writers, however, favor revision notwithstanding, as see below. But the Archbishop of York thinks this very matter of an uncertain text a sufficient obstacle to justify the postponement of the undertaking for the present. His views, moreover, might be regarded as the more important as they probably went far towards preventing the co-operation of his Convocation with that of Canterbury in the important work actually entered upon by the latter. In a letter to the secretary of the Religious Tract Society, London (See "The Guardian," March 23d, 1870), he says : "In answer to your observation, I beg to send you a summary of my speech in the Northern Convocation upon the subject of a revised translation of the English Bible. My argument was confined to the New Testament, because I have paid a good deal of attention to that branch of the subject. It appeared to me that so long as the *textus receptus* of the Greek Testament was the current text among us, the time could not be said to have come for a revision of the translation, which would indeed have resolved itself into a revision of the text. I argued that the greatest effort of that kind which had been made in England, that of Dr. Tregelles, was still incomplete, and that we had not had time duly to estimate the effects of recent discoveries." As it respects the Old Testament text, the testimony of Henry Walter, although not very recent (1823), may not be out of place. He says : "On the whole, I see little reason for supposing that the philological apparatus accumulated since King James's time, has carried the knowledge of Hebrew perceptibly farther than it was possessed by his translators." ²

The three following objections, urged by an influential layman during the discussions of this question, fifteen years ago, are worthy of attention : "(1) As to its impolicy. Granting its [the translation's] general fidelity, what is to be gained ? If there be various or double meanings to words, you have the marginal system which has served so well hitherto ; and if you

Address of
D. H. Con-
rad, Esq.,
at a Bible
Convention,
Richmond,
Va., April,
1856.

¹ A Course of Developed Criticism, &c., p. 3.

² Letter to the Right Rev. Herbert, &c., p. 140.

adopt the marginal reading in the text, you must in most cases make the text the marginal reading, and what do you gain? (2) You open a crevasse through which you know not how soon the floods of innovation may sweep away the sacred landmarks. (3) You risk too much for a small (supposed) accuracy, for you let in the cavils of those 'who watch for your halting.' You will have, as allies in the undertaking, all the heresies, past, present, and to come, to say nothing of those who now hate the Bible, because it stands a solemn protest against their ideal theories."¹ The "New York Herald" for Sept. 20th of the same year, contained a brief article on this subject, and although its authority on such matters might be called in question, no one will dispute the pertinency of one of its illustrations. "The errors of the present translation," it said, "are like the poppies amongst corn; and though every farmer knows that the corn is food and the poppies poison, yet he does not hesitate to eat the bread; for the poppies grow near the ground and do not affect the vitality of the crop, but they serve for a sign to teach the thinking mind that life and death grow up together in this world."

Dr. John Cumming, distinguished for his numerous works on Apocalyptic subjects, writes to the "London Times," under date of August 26, 1856, on this subject of revision, as follows: Dr. John Cumming in "The Times" of London. "What I contend is, that, all circumstances considered, there is not a reasonable prospect of finding a body of linguists and divines who would be unanimous, when our noble version is assumed or asserted to be at fault, in proposing corrections; nor, were they to put forth a corrected revision, is there any likelihood of its being accepted by the various denominations within or without the Established Church, whose existence we may regret, but cannot ignore. Each would have some ground of complaint, imaginary or real, and a fire would probably be kindled at which Dr. Wiseman would delight to warm his hands. . . . I am not unaware of many defects in our version. But these are in nine cases out of ten so trivial, and when the defect is generally thought grave, there is so much learned dispute, that our policy at present is to be very thankful for what we have, very patient under ill-natured censure of aspiring scholars, and truly glad that the authorized version is not intrusted to the manipulation of some improvers, whose zeal, to say the least, outstrips their discretion. . . . I cannot look around on the broad church, and the low church, and the high church parties within the Church of England, or at the keen controversies that rage without her walls, — not to speak of other peculiarities incidental to our day, — without an earnest and anxious wish that our country may hold fast that which at present is widely accepted, — our glorious common version."

¹ Bib. Soc. Record, Dec. 1856.

Rev. S. C. Malan, who has devoted an entire book to the subject before us, although most of it is directed against the revisions which have been already attempted, seems to reason on the supposition that something more than a simple correction of imperfections and errors is contemplated. "Who," he asks, "will be bold, or I might almost say hardened enough, if not perhaps to pull down, yet even to whitewash the stately edifice of the English Bible? . . . It might possibly be better adapted to the fastidious taste of the age; but then, unbroken associations of two centuries and a half, together with much of national individuality, would perish for ever; and those persons who think the authorized version antiquated would be the first to regret the change" (introd. pp. iii., iv.). And again (p. xiv.): "For independently of the words of the Bible being sacred in all languages, the language of the English Bible in particular is consecrated; like, for instance, that of the Armenian Bible; because in England, as in Armenia, the vernacular translation of the Bible has formed and fixed the language of the country." He also confirms the testimony of others respecting the difficulty of fixing upon a suitable text, "now that Mill is thought by some to be antiquated, Griesbach out of date, and Tischendorf even not exactly to their taste. . . . I trust that I am not misunderstood, as if undervaluing the labors of such men as the above-mentioned critics; together with those of Tregelles, Alford, and others. Far from it, for we are all greatly indebted to them. But, inasmuch as it is not agreeable to reason to suppose, that the great and vital truths of the Bible should depend on a single word, or even on a particle, but rather on the whole harmonious context of Holy Writ, it seems beside the purpose in this short and uncertain life, to place too much importance on the mere letter of this or that text; and, perhaps, to omit the more weighty matter of the life hidden in the text, whether it be of this recension or of that." Mr. Malan, near the close of his work (p. 345), takes exceptions even to the quite prevalent custom of ministers' criticising the present translation before their congregations, on the ground that it "needlessly unsettles the mind of their hearers on a subject in which comparatively few of them can ever be fair judges," and makes the following singular suggestion: "At all events, *all the necessary alterations* in the text of the authorized version may be introduced into it, by men of wisdom and judgment, without nine-tenths of the nation being aware of it [! !]. Would it not, therefore, be far better to do so — if it is to be done — than first to unsettle the minds of many, who after all must remain passive spectators or sufferers, in whatever is done?" (p. 346.)

Objections
of Rev. S.
C. Malan,
M.A.

Much to the same purpose, excepting the last suggestion, for which Mr. Malan alone should be held responsible, was a speech by Lord Panmure, reported in "The Witness" for January 10th, 1857. It was made at the annual meeting of the Bible Society for that year. He said: "We have heard in this country, and we have seen it absolutely put into practice in the United States of America, of a scheme for what is called a new version of the Bible. Now, feeling very strongly on this subject, I take this opportunity of publicly stating my opinion: that any such scheme is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant liberties of this country. Nay, it is fraught with danger, I believe, to the Protestant religion itself." . . . "It is quite true, and every man must admit it, that there are perhaps some slight things, some mistranslations slight in themselves, and not affecting any great principles, which might be corrected in the translation of the Scriptures. But they are so slight in comparison with the danger of letting in those who would make alterations, partly from the criticisms of erudition, partly for the purpose of getting in dogmas of their own, that I think it would be the most dangerous and disastrous thing which could occur to this country, if we were to permit those words to be tampered with which have been household words in many a pious family for upwards of three hundred years, and I hope will be household words to all the families of the world before three hundred years more are passed."

It will be observed that in most cases, thus far, where opinions have been cited, the date of such opinion has been given, for the reason that, during the last ten or fifteen years, a very wide-spread change has taken place with reference to this subject. It is well known that at the time when the first edition of his work on Revision was printed, Trench did not feel that the period had arrived for actually undertaking the responsible work, although he uses such language as this: "On the whole, I am persuaded that a revision ought to come; I am convinced that it will come. Not, however, I would trust, as yet, for we are not as yet in any respect prepared for it; the Greek and the English which should enable us to bring this to a successful end might, it is to be feared, be wanting alike." So Professor Scholefield, whose scholarly work ("Hints for some Improvements in the Authorized Version of the New Testament"), bearing on this question, was published (4th edition) in 1857, to the question whether he was really desirous of a new translation, replied uniformly in the negative.¹

¹ Pref. to 2d ed.

It is not to be inferred, however, that there has been any thing like a universal revolution of opinion. Some of our best scholars and most distinguished leaders in the Church, as we have already seen, still hold that a revision under any circumstances, at least under present circumstances, would be unwise. With two or three more instances of this kind we shall conclude the present section.

And at this point we take pleasure in introducing the very weighty observations of our distinguished countryman, the Hon. George P. Marsh, whose well-considered sentiments of twelve years ago (Lect. on the Eng. Lang. 1st. ser. 1860, Lect. 28th) have been more recently, under the new order of things, ably supplemented and confirmed ("N. Y. Nation," Oct. 13th, 20th, 27th, 1870). Mr. Marsh makes much of the "reciprocal relations between words, individual and combined, and mental action," and hence, much of the influence, not of Christian doctrine alone, but of the verbal form in which that doctrine has been embodied upon the intellectual character of men (p. 619). After showing (p. 207), among other pertinent illustrations, that the adherence of the Popish Church to the Vulgate, and to ancient forms of speech in all the religious uses of language, is one of the great elements of strength on which the Papacy relies, he says: "Accordingly, although English Protestantism has long had its one unchanged standard of faith common to all who use the English speech, yet Protestant *Christianity*, from the number and diversity of the languages it embraces, has no such point of union, no common formulas; and this is one of the reasons why the English people, with all their nominal divisions and multitudinous visible organizations, have not split up into such a wide variety, and so extreme a range of actual opinion, as the Protestants of the Continent. Whatever theories, therefore, may be entertained respecting the evils of a rigorous national conformity to particular symbols, whatever views may be held with regard to the growth, progress, and fluctuation of language, both the theologian and philologist will admit that a certain degree of permanence in the standards of religious faith and of grammatical propriety is desirable. The authorized version of the Bible satisfies this reasonable conservatism in both points, and it is therefore a matter of much literary, as well as religious, interest, that it should remain intact so long as it continues able to discharge the functions which have been appointed to it as a spiritual and philological instructor."

Mr. Marsh then considers the subject from the point of view of the history of the English language. He shows that the "dialect

of this translation was not, at the time of the revision, nor, indeed, at any other period, the actual current book-language, not the colloquial speech, of the English people." . . . "It was an assemblage of the best forms of expression applicable to the communication of religious truth that then existed, or had existed, in any and all the successive stages through which England had passed in its entire history." The language of the Bible is, "even now scarcely further removed from the current phraseology of life and books than it was two hundred years since. The subsequent movement of the English speech has not been in a right line of recession from the Scriptural dialect. It has been rather a curve of revolution around it" (p. 630).

He also objects to revision on other grounds: "The acuteness of German criticisms, the speculations of German philosophy, have given rise to a great multitude and diversity of opinions, not on questions of verbal interpretation merely, but of doctrines also, which are but just now beginning to be openly and freely discussed in this country and in England, and the minds of men are now perhaps more unsettled on these topics than they have been at any time before for three centuries." He fears sectarian influence, and thinks, of the two extremes, — a passion for novelty, and an ultra-conservative attachment to the time-honored and old, — the latter is the least dangerous, "because the future is more uncertain than the past, and because the irreverent and wanton thoughtlessness of an hour may destroy that which only the slow and painful labor of years or of centuries can rebuild."

In the "Nation" for October 13, 1870, Mr. Marsh returns to the subject, maintaining that, if there is to be a revision, the work "obviously divides itself into two branches, — the establishment of the original text, and the adaptation of the translation to the revised original. The first of these tasks," he says, "is probably both the least important and the most easily performed, — least important, because the discrepancies between readings respecting which there is room for an honest difference of opinion among competent judges are either relatively insignificant, or they respect passages in the text which might be rejected as spurious without essentially weakening the evidence in support of any of the doctrines which divide the opinions of Christendom. It is the least difficult because a vast proportion of the preliminary and subsidiary labor has been already performed. If we are to wait for a text unequivocally perfect, we shall wait for ever; and the expectation of more satisfactory readings is not a sufficient reason for delaying action, provided a revision is expedient

on other grounds." That it is not, however, he proceeds to show in the other articles as follows: "Shall we for the sake of changes like these [throwing out obsolete words and infelicitous expressions and some errors of meaning] expose the whole version to a revision which may essentially alter its general coloring? or shall we trust to our mothers, our Bible readers, and our other religious teachers, to bring the intelligence and heart of the young, whom they initiate into the mysteries of Christianity, up to the comprehension of a sacred dialect, not, indeed, so readily intelligible as a newspaper, but less obsolete than that of Spencer or Shakespeare, and scarcely more archaic, except in mere grammatical forms which no one thinks of expunging, than that of Bacon?" Mr. Marsh's opinions and expectations concerning the work of revision as undertaken by the committee of Convocation will be given below.

In the preface to his admirable "Commentary on the Minor Prophets" (English edition), Dr. Pusey thus pertinently points out the dangers that environ all efforts to improve our present version: "They [the original translators] had most of the helps for understanding Hebrew that we have; the same traditional knowledge from the ancient versions, Jewish commentators, or lexicographers, or grammarians, with the exception of the Jewish-Arabic school only, as well as the study of the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, and they used these aids with more mature and even judgment than has mostly been employed in the subsequent period. Hebrew criticism has now escaped, for the most part, from the arbitrariness which detected a various reading in any variation of a single old version, or in the error of some small fraction of MSS. which disfigured the commentaries of Lowth, Newcome, and Blayney. But the comparison of the cognate dialects opened for the time an unlimited license of innovation. Every principle of interpretation, every rule of language, was violated. The Bible was misinterpreted with a wild recklessness to which no other book was ever subjected. A subordinate meaning of some half-understood Arabic word was always at hand to remove whatever any one disliked. Now the manifoldness of this reign of misrule has subsided; but interpretations, as arbitrary as any which have perished, still hold their sway, or from time to time emerge; and any revisal of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament until the precarious use of the dialects shall be far more settled would give us chaff for wheat, introducing an indefinite amount of error into the Word of God." It should be added, that Dr. Pusey was invited to act with the committee of Convocation for Revision, but declined to serve, as did also Dr. Wright, Dr. Payne Smith, Dr. Newman, and Mr. Tregelles, — the last from illness.

Dr. Pusey indicates some perils attending revision.

One of the most outspoken and persistent of the opponents of revision in England, as well as one of the most influential in some respects, has been, and still is, under the latest phases of the subject, the Earl of Shaftesbury. In a speech before the British and Foreign Bible Society in May, 1856, he said: "Supposing that this new version were given to the world, would it be possible that thenceforward we could have for this country, for our colonies, for the States of North America that speak our own language, an 'Authorized Version?' one that could be received with common consent by every human being that speaks the Anglo-Saxon language. Destroy that common consent to receive an 'Authorized Version,' and my belief is that you have inflicted a deadly wound on the cause of the propagation of the truth among all the nations that speak our language. . . . At present we have the 'Authorized Version,' and we consent to receive it. We are, therefore, all on an equality; when we enter into a controversy we are on an equality; the laity can exercise the Berean privilege of examining the Scriptures 'to see whether these things be so,' and cannot be told by those from whom they differ, 'it may agree with your version, but I have another and a better one, and therefore, I can have no controversy with you.' What is proposed would, if carried out, tend to destroy the exercise of private judgment, — that grand, sacred, solemn principle which is the right of every man, and which I imagine to be the great security of churches and nations, and the life and soul of individuals. When you are confused or perplexed by a variety of versions you would be obliged to go to some learned pundit in whom you reposed confidence, and ask him which version he recommended; and when you had taken his version, you must be bound by his opinion. I hold this to be the greatest danger that now threatens us. It is a danger pressed upon us from Germany, and pressed upon us by the neological spirit of the age. I hold it to be far more dangerous than tractarianism or popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart. This evil is tenfold more dangerous, tenfold more subtle than either of these, because you would be ten times more incapable of dealing with the gigantic mischief that would stand before you."

Objections
by the Earl
of Shaftes-
bury.

In a letter to the public, written subsequently to the action of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Earl points out a danger likely to arise from the too conservative tendencies of the board of revisers: "Nearly all, I believe, both of churchmen and dissenters, would be most happy to leave the translation as it at present exists, and to forbear the assertion of their own special criticisms on words and phrases; but, if the bishops will insist on such minute

Danger in
two direc-
tions.

accuracy, others will be equally positive in similar demands. Many will ask, and justly ask, whether the 'Church,' as understood in the present day, is a due rendering of the Greek; and why it should be 'Church' in one place, and 'Assembly' in another. They will also ask how far the word now rendered by 'Bishop' designates a Bishop of the present day; and, turning to the word 'Priests,' they will, since all possibility of mistake is to be avoided, require such a marginal note, at least, as shall remove the confusion that now prevails between the priests of the Old Testament and of the New." In a letter to Professor Selwyn, published in the "Times" (London) under date of February 24th, 1870, Lord Shaftesbury urges still other reasons for hesitation: "Patience and habits of critical comparison are not the characteristics of the working classes. The translators will have introduced, so the people will think, a 'strange' Gospel, and the multitude, believing that it is 'another,' will lose faith in all. Could the revision be limited to marginal readings, I should feel much less objection. But is it possible to open the sluice-gates? Your excellent and discriminating rules would avail for nothing. The cry for further amendment would know no end. It would be difficult [too] to construct an impartial commission. The immense variety of opinion on doctrinal matters, and the immense diffusion of knowledge, both deep and superficial, in these days, would render necessary such a combination of members as would include the extremest forms of Ritualism, Socinianism, and Infidelity. Numerically and as scholars, these professors would be very strong, and experience will not allow us to believe that these learned persons, after years of thought and study in the same groove, fixed and sincere in their peculiar opinions, would not entertain (unknown to themselves no doubt) a decided bias towards special renderings of the sacred text. Besides, let us suppose that the commission are of one mind in their report, will the scholarship inside satisfy the scholarship outside?"

During the spring of 1871, there appeared three communications of considerable length in the "Independent" (New York) on this subject, from the pen of A. C. Coxe, Bishop of the diocese of Western New York. The first article (March 23d) related to the undesirableness of any change in our present version on the ground of its associations and present unequalled English, and to the "ill-conceived and mismanaged" attempts of the Southern Province to lead a movement in this direction. Of the other articles, one proceeds on the assumption that radical changes are contemplated by the revisers in the phraseology of the current version, and earnestly deprecates it, showing that even Dean Alford and Dean Stanley are but

poorly "qualified to mend the English of the seventeenth century, as we have it in the good old Bible." The third communication sets forth the insufficient qualifications of our present scholarship to cope with the important questions likely to arise in connection with the original text. He affirms that the present state of things is especially unfavorable to an enlightened use of the ancient versions, particularly those of the Syriac. "One of the most learned of the Old Testament committee," he writes, "now engaged in the revision confessed to me his grave doubts in this respect. He considered the whole science of the collection of codices yet in its infancy; and he surprised me by the expressions he used as to the unexplored mines of ancient manuscripts which might be opened by a little energy and enthusiasm, such as Tischendorf has displayed in his rescue of the Sinaitic Codex." He quotes Bishop Ellicott as saying: "Even critical editors of the stamp of Tischendorf have apparently not acquired even a rudimentary knowledge of several of the leading versions which they conspicuously quote. Nay, more, in many instances they have positively misrepresented the very readings which have been followed, and have allowed themselves to be misled by Latin translations which, as my notes will testify, are often sadly, and even perversely, incorrect." Bishop Coxe predicts a very rapid advance in the near future with respect to the studies necessary to a more perfect Biblical criticism, and that such a movement will produce more and more effectual objections to the work of the Westminster revisers.

II. OPINIONS FAVORABLE TO REVISION AND REPLIES TO OBJECTIONS.

Robert Gell, only forty-eight years after the publication of the King James's version, was moved to write as follows concerning it: Robert Gell.
 "Wherefore observing many such mistranslations biassing the holy text, and making it to serve the translators' mistress, their *Diana*, their ruling opinions, . . . I thought it a business well worthy my pains and best skill, and more time than I am likely to have in this world, to endeavor, to the utmost, the vindication of the Holy Scripture from false translation and misrepresentation. . . . Since now, all the Holy Scripture is made public unto every nation, and every person in his mother tongue, without doubt a true and impartial translation will do less hurt and be more beneficial to mankind than one wrested and partial which speaks the language, and gives authority to one sect or other, as our last doth. Yet is not all the blame to be laid upon the

translators, but part of it to be shared with them also, who by reasons of State limited them (as some of them have much complained) lest they might be thought, not to set forth *a new translation*, but rather *a new Bible*.”¹

The impracticable Hugh Broughton, whose superior scholarship
Hugh Broughton, 1662. the revisers of 1611 found themselves unable to use, criticises the latter's work in the following characteristic strain, which, of course, must be taken *cum grano salis*: “The late Bible was sent me to censure; which bred in me a sadness that will grieve me while I breathe. It is so ill done. Tell his Majesty that I would rather be rent in pieces by wild horses than any such translation by my consent should be urged upon poor churches.” He specifies particulars (p. 661), and then concludes (663): “I blame not this, that they kept the usual style of former translations in the church, that the people should not be amazed. For the learned, the Genevan might be made exact: for which pains whole thirty years I have been called upon and spent much time to my great loss by wicked hindrance. When you find the king at leisure, shew his Majesty this short advertisement. And if his Highness bid me again, as once by the Earl of Pembroke, shew faulty place, I will in a few sheets shew what I blame most; that they may be sent to all churches that have bought Bibles. So all may be well pacified.”

A work purporting to be by Hugh Ross, but mainly a translation
Hugh Ross, 1727. without credit, from a French work published in Rotterdam in 1696, presents some sensible ideas on the subject before us. “Since the most learned and ingenious part of men,” it says, “can't endure to suffer the least fault or obscurity in any of the Greek or Roman authors, and turn over volumes to find the true reading and sense but of one word in Homer or Virgil; it must argue either disrespect or indifferency for the Sacred Books, to count any observation with relation to them trifling, especially if it tend to make any text plain and intelligible. Shall we conceal or defend these faults? The world is too sharp-sighted to let us do either; and if it was not, our holy religion is too firmly grounded to stand in need of such pious frauds, and recommends honesty and sincerity too much to allow its professors to make use of them. I think that [ministers] rather than to be thus always nibbling at the faults of translations, they should shew once for all, that there is a necessity of reforming them, and then join their heads together to carry on so necessary a work.”²

The learned Kennicott in his valuable treatise, “The State of the
The learned Kennicott, 1753. Printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Considered, &c.,” remarks (p. 565): “'Tis now one hundred and forty years

¹ Essay Toward an Amendment, &c., Preface.

² Essay for a New Trans., &c., Preface.

since the last translation of the Bible into English; which, though a good translation in general, is allowed by the learned to be greatly improvable in many places. A new translation therefore, prudently undertaken and religiously executed, is a blessing which we make no doubt but the Legislature will in a few years grant us. And what improvements may not be expected in the translation from the improvements made of late in the Original Languages, and particularly in Hebrew? ”

Doddridge, as quoted by Bishop Newcome, in his preface to a translation of the New Testament, London, 1765, says: “It ^{Doddridge,} were to be wished that our governors in Church and State ^{1765.} would favor us with a revision of the Scriptures with all possible improvements; and expressing the sense of the sacred writers with the greatest perspicuity and exactness; conveying their spirit and manner with the utmost energy; and setting off their matter and subject with most noble simplicity and apostolic plainness.”

Blackwall’s Sacred Classics, according to the same authority, held that “everybody conversant with these matters and unpreju- ^{Blackwall’s} diced, must acknowledge that there was less occasion to change ^{Sacred Clas-} sics, 1731. the old version into the present than to change the present into a new one.” And Dr. Blayney asks: “Can we with certainty fore- ^{Dr. Blay-} see all the mischief that may possibly and eventually result ^{ney’s Jere-} from an error of what kind soever, willingly retained in a book ^{miah, Ox-} of such high and universal importance?” So, too, Campbell in his ^{ford, 1784.} preface to the four Gospels (1789): “Need I, in so late and so enlightened an age, subjoin an apology for the design itself of giving a new translation of any part of Scripture? How dismal were the apprehensions that were entertained immediately after the Reformation on account of the many translations of the Scriptures which came in quick succession, one after another! Have men’s fears been justified by the effect? Quite the reverse.”

A new translation of “All the Books of the Old and New Testament, &c., was made by Anthony Purver (Quaker), in two vols. fol. ^{Anthony} Lond. 1764. In the introduction he says: “The terms of ^{Purver,} our law enjoining a witness to speak the truth, the whole truth, and ^{1764.} nothing but the truth, are applicable with great propriety to translators. This is so much more requisite in a translation of the Holy Scriptures as these books are of more value and importance than others, and the wrong translating of them of more consequence.” And an ^{An anony-} anonymous letter addressed to the Right Rev. Lewis, By ^{mous letter,} Divine Permission Lord Bishop of Norwich, Lond., 1789, has for its ^{1789.} motto the following from Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History: “The inter-

ests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost adopted in this country, — the first of these maxims was, that it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie when by that means the interests of the church might be promoted.” It also quotes Lowth (Visitation Sermon for 1758), who, speaking of 1758. Secker’s Annotations, says: “These valuable remains of that great and good man, will be of infinite service whenever that *necessary work*, a new translation of the Scriptures or a revision of the present translation of the Holy Scriptures for the use of our Church, shall be undertaken;” and again: “And here I cannot but mention, that nothing could more effectually conduce to this end than the exhibiting the Holy Scriptures themselves to the people in a more advantageous and just light by an accurate revisal of our vulgar translation by public authority. This hath often been represented, and I hope will not always be represented in vain.”

In 1789, John Symonds, Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, published in quarto, “Observations upon John Symonds, 1789. the Expediency of Revising the Present English Version.” On page second he asks: “Is error so valuable an inheritance that it ought never to be relinquished? Can it be sanctified by the plea of a long prescription? Experience teaches that mistakes in religion are of all others the most pernicious, not only because they affect us in the most important concerns, but as they are the most difficult to be corrected. . . . People when it came out [our present version] were not agitated by those imaginary terrors which are conjured up in our days; their curiosity was excited; and their impatience prompted them to break into censures; not on account of the impropriety of the plan, but of the dilatory conduct of the translators.” He boldly joins issue with those who contend that our version is sufficiently clear and obvious in all things necessary to be believed and practised, and asks: “Hath not the misinterpretation of one word [? 1 Cor. xi. 29] driven thousands of well-meaning Christians from the Holy Communion?”

It is well known that all the early editions of our present version contained numerous typographical and other errors, and that there was not one edition that could be called a standard. It The uncertain state of the English text. is held, indeed, that two folio editions in black-letter, instead of one (as had long been supposed), were published in the year 1611, copies of both being now extant. Hence in part the numerous discrepancies that arose (Rev. Edw. Gilman in Bib. Sac. Jan. 1859). A revision was made in 1638 by order of Charles I. to remedy this defect, and another by Dr. Blayney in 1769 under authority; and in 1806 again by Eyre & Strahan, printers to his Majesty, but all of them

failed to reach the desired end of making or restoring a perfect English text, the most unwarrantable liberties having in many cases been taken, especially with marginal readings, headings to chapters, &c.¹ Might it not, indeed, contribute materially to show the necessity of the work of revision already undertaken by eminent scholars in England and America, if a complete history of the labors of the committee appointed by the Bible Society a number of years since to investigate the subject were to be given to the public. No less than twenty-four thousand variations were found by this committee in collating six different editions of the English Bible as one result of the movement.²

At a meeting held Oct. 19, 1790, the Stonington Union Association passed the following resolution bearing on the subject just mentioned: "We have received information that there are ^{The} proposals for reprinting the Holy Bible in different parts of ^{Stonington} ^{Union} ^{Association.} America; and viewing it as a matter of the highest importance to all denominations of Christians and truly interesting to posterity, &c., &c., therefore voted that our brethren Timothy Wightman, Simeon Brown [and others], be appointed a committee in behalf of the Association to prepare and transmit to Congress [a petition], requesting their attention to the several impressions of the Bible now making, representing the importance of accuracy in these impressions, and earnestly praying that they would take such measures as the constitution may permit that no edition of the Holy Bible . . . be published in the United States without careful inspection and being certified to be free from error." In the Spring of the same year the Congregational churches of Massachusetts sent a memorial to Congress to a similar effect, but Congress made no response to these appeals.

In a work on the "Uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament," 1803, Granville Sharpe presents his view of the doctrinal bearing of the subject: "It ^{Granville} ^{Sharpe,} ^{1803.} will enable us revising [by a certain rule] to correct the translation of several important texts in the English version of the New Testament in favor of a fundamental article of our church, which has of late been much opposed and traduced; I mean the belief that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God. I am persuaded that our modern Socinians would not have made so much clamor about the necessity of a new translation, had they been aware that a more close and literal rendering of the original text (even in passages which had escaped their calumnious charges of corruption and their arrogant attempts at imaginary correc-

¹ Art. by Prof. Schaeffer in *Bib. Sac.* July, 1869, on the Marginal Readings; Rev. Thos. Curtis in *Christ. Rev.*, Vol. III., p. 34.

² *Bib. Soc. Reports*, 1832-1858, especially the Report for 1852, No. 36.

tion), must necessarily cut up their favorite system by the roots" (p. 51).

And the learned Middleton, writing also on the Greek Article, in T. F. Middleton, 1813. "I cannot help thinking that a revision would be extremely imperfect, or, indeed, would be nearly useless, if it were to overlook minute circumstances such as that before us [the use of the article]. It is in niceties of this sort, principally, that our English translation admits improvement." . . . "A single instance of the suppression of a local custom, or popular opinion, which can be shown to have existed among the Jews in the age of the Apostles, appears to me to be of infinitely higher importance [than any change in mere phraseology]: because by concealing from the notice of the reader circumstances which are beyond the reach of fabrication, we withhold from him perhaps the strongest evidence of the authenticity of the Scriptures, and consequently of the credibility of our religion" (p. 179).

J. M. Ray, author of "A Revised Translation and Interpretation of the Scriptures after the Eastern Manner," says, on page 1815. seven of the preface: "It is entirely unreasonable to be unwilling to have stumbling-blocks removed, and yet be offended at people for stumbling at them. It is either the prejudice of education, or being unwilling to let the unlearned know the Bible well, that makes any say the common translation is good, contradicting the greatest authorities."

A revised translation of the New Testament was published in Granville London, 1836-41, in 3 vols. 8vo, the author being Granville Penn, 1836. Penn, Esq. On page 15, of vol. ii., he remarks: "But we are not to infer from the scattered defects here produced [from the version of 1611], that a *new translation* would have been, or would now be, more desirable than a new revision. It was with much wisdom that our revisers abstained from 'making a new translation,' and confined their labors to 'making a good one better.' Nothing is more certain than that a new translation is necessarily a *worst* translation; and that a first translation arrives at excellence only by repeated revisions; it being impossible that the mind while being engaged in the progression of translation, should at the same time equally exercise itself in the interruptive scrutiny of each minute part, which is the exclusive office of revision." To the objection that the "temper of the times is not now propitious to the safe accomplishment of such a work," Penn replies by saying that it recalls to him "the Abbot of St. Godwin, who, pressed for charity by a homeless and hungry pilgrim, while he was spurring homeward for shelter from a storm of rain and thunder, deemed it 'no time for charity.'

“ ‘An almes, sir prieste,’ the droppynge pilgrim saide: —
 ‘Varlet,’ replied the Abbate; ‘cease your dinne!
 This is no season almes and prayers to give!’

“It is quite a new suggestion that ‘safety’ is to be a governing condition in diffusing the lights which are continually accruing to illuminate the obscurities induced by man on the original lucidity of the Gospel text; the reviewer must consistently think that the ‘temper of the times’ in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius Cæsar, was by no means propitious to the safe promulgation of the Gospel, nor in the reign of Henry VIII. to the safe reformation of the Christian Church; and certainly he is fully borne out by history; but — *non defensoribus istis tempus eget.*”

Dr. Adoniram Judson wrote in 1839: “If this work [of revision] should be attempted, the rush of prejudice would doubtless, Dr. Judson, for a time, be terrific; but truth is mighty and will prevail.”¹⁸³⁹ And in the same letter: the version “is not inspired; and to pay undue reverence to any production, whether it be mother church or mother translations, partakes of the nature of idolatry.”¹

Bishop Hinds, without directly advocating a formal revision of the Scriptures in his two published sermons (Lond. 1853), yet maintained principles looking in that direction. He says ^{Bishop Hinds, 1853.} (p. 46) that “emendations have been made and may yet be made; and that, in our estimate of the Word of God, the minutest approach which we may make to the very word that was given by inspiration is to be accounted valuable, and may prove, in any instance, more valuable than we can say.” And again, of the translators of 1611, he remarks that “they have themselves suggested inquiry into the correctness of their work; for example, by the marginal variations from the text. . . . These marginal references are a perpetual reminiscence to the minister, and to those ministered unto, that the version is not the Scripture, but an instrument through which a knowledge of the Scripture is to be sought.” And still further (p. 109): “There is a risk in calling general attention to the real character of the English Scriptures, and in exercising that ministry on them which it is, nevertheless, our duty to exercise; but the risk is not in stating the truth, and in doing that our duty, but in our manner of doing it. We are blameworthy if we neglect the duty, and we are also blameworthy if we discharge it indiscreetly.”

Archbishop Whately, in his edition of Bacon’s Essays (C. T. Francis, N. Y., pp. 225–245), employs the following forcible analogy: “Many persons have not reflected on the circumstance, ^{Archbishop Whately.}

¹ Proceedings of Third An. Meeting of Bib. Revis. As., p. 52.

that one of the earliest translations of the Scriptures was made by the Church of Rome,—the Latin Vulgate,—being in the popular language then spoken in Italy and in the neighboring countries. That version was evidently made on purpose that the Scriptures might be intelligibly read by, or read to, the mass of the people. But gradually and imperceptibly Latin was superseded by the languages derived from it,—Italian, Spanish, and French,—while the Scriptures were kept in Latin; and when it was proposed to translate them into modern tongues, this was regarded as a perilous innovation. Yet we meet with many among the fiercest declaimers against the Church of Rome, who earnestly deprecate the slightest changes in our authorized version, and cannot endure even the gradual substitution of other words for such as have become obsolete, for fear of ‘unsettling men’s minds.’”

Dr. Channing, in volume i. of his collected works (pp. 312, 313), also presents one of the most important aspects of the subject: “We conceive that to Bible societies this is a great question, and not to be evaded without unfaithfulness to our common Master, and without disrespect to the Holy Scriptures. We fear there is a want of conscientiousness on this subject. We fear that the British and Foreign Bible Society has forfeited, in a measure, its claim to the gratitude and admiration of the Church, by neglecting to secure the greatest possible accuracy and fidelity to the new translations which they have set forth. We hear continual expressions of reverence for the Bible, but the most unambiguous proof of it—we mean unwearied efforts to purify it from human additions, mutilations, and corruptions—remains to be given.”

Out of not a little material in our hands, bearing on this practical point, we shall offer only the testimony of Bishop McDougall, Bishop Mc-
Dougall. given in the Convocation of Canterbury, May 5, 1870, while the question of revision was under discussion. It is from the “Guardian” of May 18, 1870: “There is one point upon which I hope I may venture to address a few words to the house,—I mean the missionary point of view. I have, as you know, been some twenty years a missionary. I have had the translations always before me, not in one, but more than one language, and the great difficulty I have often had has been some of these very little points in our authorized version, to which attention has been called. I remember a translation made by an agent of the Bible Society, and published, I believe, by them. I went through it, and found many of these defective and doubtful things reproduced simply because the man did not know his Greek letters. I went to him and he persisted that the translation was right, and he went so far as almost to say our version was Divine. I feel very

strongly that if we wish to see our Bibles sent to the nations of the earth in its purity, we must not have it rendered into native reading by men who reproduce the mistakes in the English version. Those mistakes are not many, but we cannot say they are not important, because some of them concern no less serious matters than the doctrines of the blessed Trinity and Baptism, and also the doctrines of Election and Predestination, and other matters of that kind, which some of the missionary societies feel bound to support. All these are regarded by many as of the most serious importance, and every possible translation which can be made to support them, is appealed to. This is a consideration which I recommend to the attention of the house, and it makes me feel most earnestly the necessity that exists for a revision as soon as possible (cheers)."

The "Edinburgh Review" for October, 1852 (p. 432), says that "those who would resist the elimination of the palpable mis-
takes and the acknowledged imperfections of our English Bibles from the apprehension of offending the religious prejudices of the people, are guilty of a pious fraud, which, though of a lighter shade of guilt, ranks in the same vicious category with the practice of the Romanist, who lends his support to the perpetuation of a belief in fictitious relics, or endeavors to sustain the faith of his flock by the contrivance of a fraudulent miracle." And again in October, 1855, it advocates dividing the text into paragraphs, according to the sense; placing that which was spoken between inverted commas; and that all passages taken from the other sacred writers of the Bible should either be printed in italics, or in some other way distinguished as quotations. "There is no other class of works whether we regard the size, the type, or the distribution of the letter-press, in which we find that so little has been done to assist the reader, and so much to perplex him as in the Sacred Scriptures." And in the same review, ten years later, in the July number: "It is most lamentable to hear the same persons loudly maintaining the plenary, or rather verbal, inspiration of the Scriptures, and yet opposing themselves to all proposals for making endeavors to place a less corrupted and more faithful Bible in the hands of those students of God's Word who are dependent on the learned to place that Word before them in their native language."

Professor J. T. Conant, thus wrote concerning revision, in the "Bible Union Reporter" for January, 1855: "By what authority, human or divine, are the common people, those who know only their mother tongue, condemned to walk in the twilight of the sixteenth century, while the favored few are enjoying the full day

"Edinburgh Review" for 1852, 1855, and 1865.

Professor Conant, 1855.

of the nineteenth. . . . A faithful translation, ably and judiciously executed, would do more for the illustration of the divine word for the common mind, than all the commentaries that could be piled between earth and heaven. . . . There are many in the ministry, men of intelligence and culture, who yet have not had the peculiar training, or may not have the leisure for investigations of this kind; but to whom these results, in an accessible form, would be an invaluable help in the study of the Scriptures."

In an article first published in the "Journal of Sacred Literature" Rev. Henry Burgess, LL.D. for January, 1857, and afterwards republished in pamphlet form, Rev. Henry Burgess, LL.D., sought to answer the current objections to revision. He says: "Dr. Cumming frequently entertains his auditors in Crown Court, on Sunday, with proposed emendations of the English version of the Bible, while, at the same time, he protests loudly in the columns of the 'Times' against any authorized improvements." After replying to some objections which have been already noticed in this section, he proceeds (p. 10): "One great argument for leaving things as they are, is, that any attempt at revision will give an advantage to the heterodox parties of the religious world, and allow of the triumph of neological and latitudinarian tendencies. Now this implies one or both of two things: first, that the heterodox are more powerful than the orthodox, and would have every thing their own way in case a committee for revising the English Bible were appointed; or, secondly, that heterodoxy would justly claim some alteration on its behalf, some texts which our present version improperly ranges on the side of those who are sound in the faith. As we cannot imagine that any one seriously admits the first of these reasons, we must look to the latter as the ground of jealousy and object of fear; and would remind those who entertain it, that the truth was never yet promoted by falsehood, and never yet dreaded any flood of light which could be thrown upon its open and ingenuous brow. 'He that doeth truth cometh to the light,' says our blessed Lord; 'Let God be true, and every man a liar,' is the sublime exclamation of his holy Apostle. He continues (p. 13): "We maintain that this correctness as to essentials is no valid cause for our being satisfied with one minor error, or resting contented until we have brought our English Bible as near the truth of the Hebrew and Greek originals, as learning and extensive knowledge can make them. It is a proof of a want of reverence for Holy Writ when we allow error to deface its pages; it is an unfaithfulness to the trust which the Church has always had committed to it, as the witness and keeper of the divine oracles. It is, moreover, an act of great presumption for any one to think that he can add to or subtract

from the Scriptures, which is virtually done when any known mistranslation is allowed to continue." And again (p. 17) : " Further, if it be found, as we may safely affirm it will be found, that several of these defective passages do, at present, obscure, more or less, the testimony borne to Christ by the prophets, and the assertions of the divinity of Christ by the Apostles, may we not say that it is our bounden duty to effect the removal of these blemishes ? "

In an address before the American Bible Union at its tenth anniversary in New York, Oct. 6, 1859, Professor H. B. Hackett, Professor Hackett, 1859. D.D., remarked upon the fact that there had simultaneously, in many different countries, sprung up the conviction that the time has come for vernacular versions of the Bible to conform to the present state of biblical studies. " I have passed," he says, " recently through some of these foreign lands, and have taken pains to inform myself on the subject. It might be thought that the veneration of Protestant Germany for Luther's name would have left his translation, so excellent in many respects, untouched. But so it is not. There, too, the public mind has taken hold of this matter. It has not only called forth discussion, but been brought before the ecclesiastical bodies ; and a committee has been appointed (some of whom I saw and conversed with) to report the facts in the case and suggest means for procuring the necessary corrections. One writer says that at least twelve hundred and fifty changes should be made. The excellent Tholuck says, that, as all the authorities agree that various passages are mistranslated, the editions of the Bible for the use of the people ought not to perpetuate the errors. I could mention the testimony of many other eminent men to the same effect. Appeals are constantly made through the press for some prompt action here. The appearance of Bunsen's work is a proof of the existence of this awakened feeling. I am sure that if Luther himself could speak from his grave, he would be heard encouraging such efforts, and not protesting against them ; for when he was living he said : ' Though I have done the best I could, I am conscious of my imperfections ; and, if any one shall arise after me who has more light and can improve my work, let him do it, and let the people adopt his truth, and not cling to my errors.' A similar movement is taking place in Belgium and Holland. The Saxon nations of the north of Europe are stirring in the matter. The government of Norway has appointed a commission to revise the common translation of that country. Among the scholars who compose this commission is Dr. Caspari, who is not unknown on this side of the water. The work is begun, and parts of the new version have appeared."

With regard to the ability of modern scholars to cope with the work, he holds the distinction of the later scholarship to be this: "It embraces a more accurate knowledge of the structure and idioms of the old tongues, and of the logical force and signification of the words. Greek Lexicography (to say nothing of Hebrew) in its present scientific mode of treatment, Greek Grammar in its more perfect mastery of the syntax, Greek Synonymy which treats of the related meaning of words, are essentially sciences of the modern philology; and, be it noted, it is precisely these branches of learning which afford to scholars the help which they need for carrying on the uncompleted labors of the past. It is our felicity that we live after such men, and thus are enabled to use the instruments which they have prepared for us in addition to the aids peculiar to our own times. Is it presumptuous to say as much as this?"

Professor Hackett also quotes Archdeacon Hare on the opinion that minor errors in the Scripture are unimportant: "The notion that slight errors and defects and faults are immaterial, and that we need not go to the trouble of correcting them, is one main cause why there are so many huge errors and defects and faults in every region of human life, practical and speculative, moral and political. No error should be deemed slight which affects the meaning of a single word in the Bible; where so much weight is attached to every single word; and where so many inferences and conclusions are drawn from the slightest ground, not merely those which find utterance in books, but a far greater number springing up in the minds of the millions to whom our English Bible is the code and canon of all truth. For this reason errors, even the least, in a version of the Bible, are of far greater moment than in any other book, as well because the contents of the Bible are of far deeper importance, and have a far wider influence, as also because the readers of the Bible are not only the educated and learned who can exercise some sort of judgment on what they read, but vast multitudes who understand whatever they read according to the letter."

Besides the new versions of the Scriptures contemplated on the Continent of Europe mentioned above, there is one nearly or quite completed in Sweden also, as we are informed by the following excerpt from a recent newspaper: "We learn by a letter from a friend in Stockholm, Sweden, dated Feb. 9, 1871, that a Royal Bible Commission has been at work for a long time with the revision of the old Swedish version of the Bible. The commission has advanced so far in their work that they expect to publish it in the Spring, to be laid before the Diet for examination."

A new Swedish version contemplated.

Rev. W. G. Humphry, in a review of Dean Alford's New Testament, quotes Dean Gaisford as saying, in a letter to Sir Robert Inglis, M.P. for the University of Oxford, in 1855 : ^{Dean Gaisford and Canon Payne Smith.} "My own opinion is, that its present state [that of the 'Authorized Version,'] is indefensible ; and, when errors have been pointed out, as they have been in this case very frequently, to go on repeating them from time to time is hardly consistent with reason or creditable to the literary character of the nation." Likewise the testimony of Dr. Payne Smith, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford : "The perfecting of the English translation of the Inspired Word is one of the noblest works which the mind of man can undertake ; and, though there be evils attendant upon interfering with our present noble Saxon version, still, none can be so great as its being regarded, by a gradually increasing portion of the community, as deficient in correctness." Dr. Smith judged (1859) that, after a few years, Christian scholars might be justified in undertaking the work of revising the New Testament, but held that Old Testament revision must wait "for a lengthened period of far more profound study of Hebrew literature than at present prevails, carried on by many different minds." As we have before stated, having been elected to serve with the Old Testament committee of Convocation for revision (May 25, 1870), Dr. Smith declined the honor, thus intimating that he has not changed his original opinion.

A great change has undoubtedly taken place in public opinion, as well as in the judgment of scholars, respecting the matter of ^{"Princeton Review" for Jan., 1871.} revision during the last few years, a fact which will be evident from the remaining citations of this section. For instance, the "Princeton Review" for January, 1871, says (p. 37) : "Public opinion has been essentially changed. Many who once disapproved, now promote revision ; and many who would be glad to leave all alone are convinced that such a course is no longer possible, and take part in the work in order to insure its accomplishment in a right way and to forestall the appearance of a more radical change. No one engaged in this movement thinks of a new translation, but of a revision of the old. This fact removes many serious objections, and softens the prejudice with which every one approaches the subject."

The "Contemporary Review" (vol. ii. p. 141), speaking of the learning of the revisers of 1611 and of Christian scholars generally ^{T. K. Cheyne in} of the sixteenth century, says : "It was Rabbinical. Its ^{"Contemporary Review,"} grammar knows no syntax ; its lexicons, no cognate languages. Its grammar is Jewish, its interpretation Jewish. It worships the vowel points, and bows humbly to the Targums. Hebrew ^{vol. ii.}

learning was then in a state of transition. Continental ideas were received, so to speak, by minute instalments." This writer advocates most singularly a new translation of the Bible for use *in the closet and pulpit only*.

Again, Rev. William G. Humphry, himself one of the English scholars engaged in the work of revision now in process, in "Macmillan's Magazine," 1870, in addition to the sentiments favored by him (p. 369), writes in "Macmillan's Magazine" for June, 1870, to show that the early efforts at revision were ill timed: "The French Revolution was producing in the English mind that aversion to change, that disposition to identify reform with revolution, which long survived the reign of terror." Of the later attempts, he says that they have done much "to determine the principles on which the work should be conducted, and thus to prepare the way and excite the demand for an authoritative revision which should be entitled to public confidence." He mentions also that a revised edition of the English Bible was then (June, 1870) in the course of publication by the Religious Tract Society, the New Testament portion having already appeared, and the Old Testament as far as Esther, and holds that this "shows, at least, that the difficulty of uniting together Church of England divines and Non-conformists for a good and holy purpose is not insuperable." He also meets the objection (of George P. Marsh and many others), that Christian scholars of different denominations could not be brought to make common work of such a revision, by still another illustration: "The Tamil Bible, revised under the auspices of the [British and Foreign] Bible Society, had revisers made up of Church of England clergy and representatives of various Non-conformist bodies." This revision was based on the Hebrew and Greek texts, and required the labor of eleven years. The report of the Bible Society says: "Our daily work brought us so directly in contact with the deep things of God, that it was a source of continual refreshment to us and continual delight, and the brotherhood of feeling with which we were united turned our toil into a pleasure. So rapidly did the time fly by that we ended each day with reluctance, and the only day that hung heavily on our spirits was the last, when we felt that our work had come to an end, and that all that remained for us to do was to depart." His conclusion is: "The English Bible is exposed to a running fire of criticism from so many sides, there is danger lest an exaggerated idea of its imperfections should go abroad, and the people should begin to lose their trust in it; while the more educated class of readers will betake themselves to versions tainted by sectarian predilections or disfigured by private crotchets." . . . Hence, the time has come "to purge

it of its ascertained errors, and bring it up to the present standard of our Bible knowledge."

An able article in the "British Quarterly Review" for January, 1870, referring to the change of sentiment that has taken place on the subject of revision, says: "The sentimental effusions that were indulged in by the opponents of change some twelve or twenty years ago, as well as the innuendoes that were then pretty freely directed against the advocates of revision, are things of which almost every one would now feel ashamed. The *vis inertiae* is almost all that now requires to be overcome. And if it can be shown, as we think may easily be done, that to rest satisfied with our English Bible in its present state is to be unfaithful to the advantages with which God in his providence has favored us, is to obscure the light of divine truth which should shine in every poor man's dwelling, and is to furnish the popular infidelity of our day with some of its most effective weapons, then may we hope that the conscience of our nation will be aroused, and that we shall allow ourselves no rest till the reproach of indifference and inactivity with respect to this great question has been removed."

Professor George B. Jewett, in articles published in the "Congregational Review" September, 1868, January and March, 1869, while severely criticising the new version of the American Bible Union, yet says: "If a concerted movement could now be initiated which should enlist, not those who claim to be, but who are, the most 'competent scholars of the day' in a joint effort to produce a perfect translation on the basis of the common version, there would, in my judgment, be found a general acquiescence in the wisdom of the undertaking."

In an editorial review of the reasons given by the Archbishop of York in Convocation for not favoring at present a revision of the Scriptures, the "Guardian" says: "The arguments of the Archbishop of York seem sometimes to have an awkward way of charging, as the Roman historians tell us the Carthaginian elephants often did, backwards on their own friends. It does seem strange to find him alleging it as a reason against any reform of our English translation, that no reduction of it to correspondence with the original would make any difference to the dogmas of the Church. Most Churchmen will surely see in that undoubted fact rather a ground for proceeding at once with the undertaking than for further delays about it." The same paper, March 16th, answers a very common objection: "It is curious that Lord Shaftesbury should write so persistently, as if our theologians were about to sit down with the Hebrew and Greek

Scriptures before them and to excogitate a new translation for themselves. All such designs have been anxiously deprecated from the first. The history of our present version, too, if Lord Shaftesbury would study it, might help to disabuse him of his mistakes."

In a letter directed to Lord Shaftesbury, published in the "Times" of Feb. 24, 1870, Professor Selwyn, one of the original committee of Convocation for revising the Old Testament, writes: "With all my feeling of the need of caution, I must say that, after having gone through the whole of the Bible, comparing the English with the original, my conviction is, that a large number of passages might be rendered more correctly, and so show more fully the mind of the Spirit that speaks in the Holy Scriptures, and that some of these in the Old Testament are in close connection with prophecy relating to our Lord,—his birth and suffering; while others in the New Testament relate to truths full of Christian comfort and hope; and that the correction of these would tend to strengthen Christian faith and animate Christian love. I would undertake to bring forward, by way of example, at the Bible Society's meeting in May (when probably something will be said on the subject), twelve passages from each Testament, which the hearers would acknowledge in the words of the preface of 1611, 'to shine as gold, more brightly, being polished.'"

Dean Alford in a published sermon thus addresses himself to the objection that alterations in the present version of the Bible would tend to unsettle men's minds: "No; faith, not merely in the words and expressions of Scripture, but in its very historical foundations, has of late been so seriously shaken that few could be found who in any popular assembly could expect such an argument would be deemed now to have any real weight. What would verbal changes, often very trivial, at the rate of one a verse, amount to in regard of unsettling men's minds, when compared with the earthquake-like movements that have taken place since the last-mentioned argument was used in the House of Commons [fourteen years before]. In such an age, that has welcomed 'Essays and Reviews,' and passionately praised such a semi-Socinian treatise as 'Ecce Homo,' we must feel that such an objection as this cannot possibly be admitted to hold any place."

In a speech made in the Convocation of York, February, 1870, when this matter of revision was before them, Canon Hay, among other arguments in favor of joining the Convocation of Canterbury in the work, said: "It had been said that if a revision of the Authorized Version which is now accepted by everybody—by Churchmen and Non-conformists—were made, there would be very great

danger of having a Churchman's Bible and a Dissenter's Bible. In answer to that, he desired to say that the only thing he contemplated was a revision in which the most learned men of all parties would concur. The question for such a committee of revision would simply be, what was the exact meaning of the words of the original text. Another objection used by Lord Shaftesbury was a commercial one,—as to what was to become of the millions of Bibles which were now being used. He utterly disclaimed any intention to adopt a course which would render useless the present Bibles, the intention being to make any corrections that might be found desirable in marginal notes. He maintained that Convocation was peculiarly interested in such a movement as the one proposed. They must recollect that no translation in the world ever faithfully represented the original. There was a sort of dilution in the very best translation ever made, and in saying so he meant no dishonor to the persons who had prepared it. All he pleaded for was that means should be taken to ascertain what, in the opinion of those best versed in Biblical criticism, was the meaning of Scripture. He felt the desirableness of such a work more strongly, because so many people might from time to time be brought into difficulties with sceptics by quoting passages and then being told that those passages were not genuine translations."

Russell Martineau, in advocating very extensive changes in the common version, is an exception to the great majority of ^{Russell} scholars. In an article published in the "Theological Re-^{Martineau.}view" for January, 1871, he says: "In the face of all these facts, what are we to say to the call for a revised translation? Surely this first and foremost: that it is not so much a revised as a new translation [of the Old Testament] that is required; that the old translation, whatever its beauties of style and merits of execution,—which we may unhesitatingly pronounce wonderful for its age,—is now antiquated, far more by the advance of Hebrew grammatical knowledge, since it was produced, than by its own English style; and that the best scholars will not be content to labor at patching up what must be to them an inferior work, but require to work freely, if they work at all."

The most important matter of the determination of a text to be followed is thus presented by Scrivener, by invitation of ^{Rev. F. H.} Convocation one of the New Testament committee on ^{Scrivener.} revision: "While we confess that much remains to be done in the department of Biblical learning, we are yet bound to say that, chiefly by the exertions of scholars of the last and present generations, the debatable ground is gradually becoming narrower, not a few strong controversies have been decided beyond hope of reversal; and while

new facts are daily coming to light, critics of very opposite sympathies are coming to agree better as to the right mode of classifying and applying them."¹

On the same point another recent critic speaks (T. S. Green, "A Course of Developed Criticism," p. 192): "The materials of criticism are at present ample, though two requirements are yet unsatisfied. These are a thorough and trustworthy collation of Codex Vaticanus (B), the prime importance of which document cannot be disputed, in spite of all the watching and jealousy that environ it; and secondly, means, if ever they can be found, for restoring to its ancient form the entire text of the Syriac version."

And again, Professor Schaff, in the "Introduction to Lange on John," recently published: "The revision of the authorized English version [of Lange's work] was, of course, made directly from the Greek, and with constant reference to the latest critical sources; viz., the eighth large edition of Tischendorf, now in course of publication, Tregelles (Luke and John, 1861), Alford (Gospels, sixth edition, 1868), and advanced sheets of Westcott and Hort's forthcoming edition of the Greek Testament, which were kindly furnished to me by my friend, Canon Westcott. In examining these critical editions of German and English scholars, I have gained the conviction that we are steadily approaching a pure and reliable text of the Greek Testament."

Tregelles ("Account of Printed Text," p. 267) takes ground similar to that of Bishop McDougall and others, mentioned above: "Is it not at least remarkable, that, as far as modern translations in general are concerned, all the labors of critics have been in vain? . . . Are there *many* modern translations in which any results of criticism have been introduced? What is the number of those in which 1 John v. 7 is not introduced, and from which converts to Christianity would not think that verse to be a special ground for believing the infinitely precious doctrine of the holy Trinity? It is futile to plead that our English authorized version is based on a different text, and that translations for newly evangelized nations ought not to differ from it; our English version was honestly executed before critical studies had properly begun; and to make it the *standard of criticism* shows as little intelligence as if it were made the standard of translation. But, indeed, the latter error, puerile as it is, has been committed. But we need not be surprised that, with regard to translations, facts are such; for in this country [England] there has been a timidity about the whole matter; the truths of God's Word have been valued, yet there

¹ Introd. to Crit. of N. T., p. 6.

has been, seemingly, a fear lest too clear a scrutiny of the text of that Word would invalidate those truths, or render them doubtful; as if the doctrine which God has revealed might rest just as well on the basis of dim uncertainty, perchance of transcriptural error; that is (if deliberately maintained), of falsehood, as on the ground of absolute and ascertained truth. This kind of caution is exactly the same as if any one should sanction and perpetuate *errata* found in a printed edition of the Bible."

Dr. Guthrie says ("Sunday Magazine," January, 1871): "The expression, 'revision of the Bible,' has, to the ear of a Dr. Guthrie devout but ignorant man, an alarming sound, just because he ^{in the} does not understand that what is proposed is a revision, not ^{"Sunday Magazine."} of God's Word, but of man's work in connection with God's Word. This whole movement, instead of being dreaded or deplored, should, in our humble judgment, be hailed as a healthy and hopeful sign of the times in which we live,—an indication that the English-speaking people firmly believe the divine inspiration of the written Word, and desire to possess what may in the strictest sense be called the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible."

An anonymous writer, who entitles himself "A Licentiate of the Church of Scotland" ("Plea for a New English Version of the Scriptures." Macmillan & Co., 1864), presents still another aspect of the subject: "It is worthy of special attention that the manifold inaccuracies of the Authorized Version are deeply detrimental, not only to the private perusal of God's written Word, but also to its public exposition by those engaged in the work of the ministry. . . . It is more than likely that if, in the course of one's expository remarks, one were to point out a mistranslation in the Authorized Version and to suggest an accurate rendering in its stead, many of the hearers would utterly fail to comprehend such a remark, and instead of being edified would be confused and perplexed by it. No amount of oral explanation, however clear and simple, can dispel the misapprehensions produced by errors printed in the Bible which people are wont to peruse; but the only way in which such misapprehensions can be effectually removed is the issuing of a revised version, in which, with their own eyes, people may see a correct translation of those passages which are misrepresented in King James's Bible." To the position that our emendations of the present version should not extend beyond the point of placing corrections in the margin, he answers: "If the first edition of some literary production were inadvertently vitiated by various mistakes, what would be thought of the author if he persisted in allowing them to reappear in a second edition, on the ground that an

A Licentiate of the Church of Scotland.

extra page, headed *errata*, was devoted to their correction. Yet such a course would not be more absurd than the retention of many well-known errors of King James's Bible, on the plea that they may be counteracted by marginal notes and emendations." To the objection that those who desire revision do not sufficiently appreciate the merits of the present version, this writer says, "that admiration of its good qualities, instead of retarding, ought rather to stimulate, a desire to have it revised, in order that, by the removal of its defects, its merits may be all the more brightly displayed." As to the alleged tendency of revision to cause painful doubts and difficulties in the minds of some Christians, "It may well be asked," he says, "is not the retention and perpetuation of inaccuracies far more calculated to exert a detrimental influence in this respect, and to be a continual source of irritating discomfort and dissatisfaction to many who long for an accurate representation of truth." Referring to the fact that the late Rev. Albert Barnes was an opponent of revision (see "Introduction to Notes on the Four Gospels"), he finds in the works of this commentator a sufficient refutation of his position: "If some one were to search through his notes on Isaiah, Daniel, and Job, and on the whole New Testament, and were to mark down every case in which Mr. Barnes very properly censures the Authorized Version and exposes its inaccuracy, then the lists of facts enumerated from his own writings would form a most powerful argument in favor of revising the Authorized Version, and replacing it by a new one."

In the "Independent" of May 25, 1871, Professor S. C. Bartlett, Professor S. C. Bartlett, D.D. of the Chicago Theological Seminary, has given several concise reasons for immediate revision, and replied to objections to the work partially, as follows: "The solid reasons for a revision, then, are: first, a real occasion for it more than existed two hundred and sixty years ago. Secondly, we are in possession of the means to make these corrections [before spoken of], at least a very large number of them. Scholars are prepared, by an almost unanimous vote, to make numerous emendations in the text, and still more numerous corrections in the English translation. Thirdly, the community are prepared to receive the changes. There was a time when even scholars, like Whitby, were afraid. But a revolution has been wrought. By a long series of influences, including abundant discussion of text readings; and crowned, perhaps, by the popular Tauchnitz edition, the whole community are intelligently prepared. They will not accept a revision for sectarian purposes; but they will receive a fair-minded scholarly revision, made in the interest of truth."

To the objection that there is a lack of an adequate acquaintance

with certain versions, — especially the Syriac, the Old Latin, Gothic, Ethiopic, and Coptic, — he answers : “ Two things are exaggerated, — our ignorance of these versions and their importance. Many scholars are competent to deal with the first three, which are the more important. Were it otherwise, a knowledge of the true text is far more essential than of any version or versions. The latter can decide only in very doubtful cases. Another objection is the want of absolute agreement on the text and the translation. This will always exist. But, as Ellicott remarks, ‘ probably one-half the questioned readings would be decided at once by general consent.’ Then let us have these. Another objection is the liability to mar the English of our present version. Were the liability greater, perhaps, the Lord would forgive the awkwardness of our style for the correctness of our undertaking, especially if we did our best. Another objection respects the feasibility of the measure, — the possibility of finding a competent and acceptable body of revisers. For one, I say, let the Church of England take the work in hand, as it did the former. Let it use its own high scholarship and call in all available aid. I have no jealousy of Churchmen or of Englishmen. A true conservatism is that which appeals from the text of Erasmus and the translators of King James to the true text and the true translation.”

Most of the reasons for revision given by Bishop Ellicott in his recent work (“ Considerations on the Revision of the Eng-^{Bishop Elli-}lish Version of the New Testament.” London, 1870) have ^{cott.} already, in substance, been laid before our readers. His book is chiefly valuable as a guide to the proper method of revising. He speaks, however, of the gradual ripening of interest on the general subject since the last movement in this direction several years ago (p. 20) ; of the present affluence of critical materials, concerning which he says : “ This knowledge, it must be our bounden duty reverently and faithfully to make use of. No mere conservatism, no timid apprehension of unsettling a belief, already (God knoweth) so unsettled from other causes, that textual criticism would rather act in a contrary direction ; no acquiescence in well meant, but really ignorant, prejudice, must prevent us faithfully bringing, out of the treasures vouchsafed to us, every item that will aid in putting before us in their truest form what an Apostolic Father has not scrupled to call, ‘ The true sayings of the Holy Ghost.’ ” Ellicott thinks it undesirable to attempt to form a *textus receptus*.

“ Though we have much critical material and a very fair amount of critical knowledge, we have certainly not yet acquired a sufficient critical judgment for any body of revisers hopefully to undertake such a

work as this." . . . "We are steadily gravitating to a consent as regards a very considerable number of passages; let us not interfere with that natural process by trying to anticipate what we shall successfully arrive at if we have but patience and industry" (p. 44). He considers that a revision of the "received text" would not be difficult, it having been attempted by five scholars ("Revision by Five Clergymen," &c.) working in combination, "and found by experience not in any degree to be unmanageable or unsatisfactory in its results." Of the objections to which Bishop Ellicott has replied, sufficient notice has already been taken, if we except the last which he mentions, that revision "would encourage still further revisions, and that the great changes in our version which we all agree to deprecate would be brought about by successive revisions,—in a word, that there would be no finality." Of this he remarks, that "we are transferred into the future and have very few data derived from the past on which to hazard a forecast. Former revisions certainly succeeded each other after no lengthened intervals, but then they were revisions which were suggested by the existing state of the translation and the changeful character of the times." After remarking upon the *status* of the present version, he adds: "There are facts which certainly seem to suggest the persuasion that one cautious and reverent retouching of the old picture might be tolerated, but that all parties, after they had accepted the work,—and this it would take time to bring about,—would very distinctly concur in deprecating any further manipulations."

Professor Lightfoot's late work ("On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," London, 1871), although mostly occupied in noting the defects of the present version, contains also some forcible responses to current objections to revision at the present time. He instances the case of Jerome, whose revision of the old Latin version, nearly fifteen hundred years ago, met with almost the same kind of opposition as the movement now in process. "All the Greek and Latin Churches, it was urged, had hitherto used one and the same Bible; but this bond of union would be dissolved by a new version made from a different text. Thus the utmost confusion would ensue. Moreover, what injury might not be done to the faith of the weaker brethren by casting doubt on the state of the sacred text?" (p. 4). "There was also a very extravagant estimate of the amount of change that would be produced by this revision. Thus Augustine, when endeavoring to deter him, speaks of his new *translation*; Jerome in reply tacitly corrects his illustrious correspondent, and calls the work a *revision*" (p. 5). Canon Lightfoot also finds a parallel to this history of Jerome's version—the Vulgate—in that of

the so-called "Authorized Version" of 1611, and then remarks (p. 12), "All history is a type, a parable." . . . "The alarming consequences which some anticipate from any attempt to meddle with our time-honored version have their exact counterpart in the apprehensions by which his [Jerome's] contemporaries sought to deter him." . . . "Moreover, there is the like exaggerated estimate of the amount of change which any body of revisers would probably introduce. To this we can only give the same answer as Jerome. Not translation, but revision, is the object of all who have promoted this new movement."

"Nor, again, will the eminence of antagonists deter the promoters of this movement if they feel that they have truth on their side. Augustine was a greater theologian, as well as a better man, than Jerome. But in this matter he was treading on alien ground; he had not earned the right to speak. On the other hand, a life-long devotion to the study of the Biblical text in the original languages had filled Jerome alike with a sense of the importance of the work and of the responsibility of his position. He felt the iron hand of a strong necessity laid upon him, and he could not choose but open out to others the stores of scriptural wealth which he himself had been permitted to amass. And again, we may take courage from the results which followed from this design, dauntlessly and persistently carried out. None of the perilous consequences which friend and foe alike had foreboded did really ensue. There was, indeed, a long interval of transition, during which the rival versions contended for supremacy; but no weakening of individual faith, no alienation of churches, can be traced to this source."

With respect to the character of the new revision, Dr. Lightfoot considers it safe to affirm "that the permanent value of the new revision will depend in a great degree on the courage and fidelity with which it deals with questions of readings. If the signs of the times may be trusted, the course which is most truthful will also be most politic. To be conservative it will be necessary to be adequate; for no revision which fails to deal fairly with these textual problems can be lasting."

Respecting the point whether the present knowledge of Greek is adequate to such an undertaking, this scholar says: "Greek scholarship has never stood higher in England than it does at the present moment. There is not only a sufficient body of scholars capable of undertaking the work, but there is also (and this is a most important element of the consideration) a very large number besides fully competent to submit the work of the revisers, when completed, to a minute and searching criticism." . . . "I would venture to go a step beyond

this. I should be glad to think my apprehensions groundless, but there is at least some reason to forebode that Greek scholarship has reached its height in England, and that henceforth it may be expected to decline."

On the point of the number of changes likely to be introduced into our present version by the revisers, the following, from Rev. G. Vance Smith ("New York Tribune," June 3d, 1872), might be considered pertinent, confirming, as it does, the testimony of Ellicott as to what was likely to be the case, while the work was still untouched: "It was stated by Mr. Vance Smith, in a speech in Birmingham, that the new revision of the Bible by the Canterbury Convocation, of which Mr. Smith is the only Unitarian member, while it will result in a greatly improved version,—changes, in fact, having been made in almost every verse,—will not read unlike the existing translation, the old style having been adhered to as closely as possible. 'Any one hearing it read,' Mr. Smith said, 'would hardly know that it was a new version.' This will be grateful news to those who, from a literary point of view, have doubted the expediency or even good taste of a substantially new translation; for it was naturally apprehended that wide deviations from the standard text might result in confusion, and in impairing the value of existing Biblical literature."

Ex-President Woolsey, in two articles in the "Independent" (Jan. 25 T. D. Woolsey, D. D., LL. D., and Feb. 1st, 1872), takes substantially the same position as Canon Lightfoot, whom he considers to be a man "not far from the head of English Biblical scholars." Of the matter of resources and scholarship for the work proposed, he says: "The apparatus in the matter of text, grammar, and lexical researches is ample, and the scholarship is as finished perhaps as it ever will be." With respect to the changes to be made, he remarks, that "the vastly greater part of the changes would be slight ones which would scarcely be noticed by ordinary readers. To which we may add, that, as the changes will be passed upon by a committee of men of different tastes and natures, the number of them on which they will all agree will represent the number which are truly important and unquestionably needed. Indeed, it is to be feared that changes will not be numerous enough to satisfy those who are best able to judge of their necessity, rather than that they will be too many and too bold."

III EXAMPLES OF THE MORE IMPORTANT ALLEGED DEFECTS OF OUR VERSION.

In his late work on the "Revision of the English Version of the New Testament," Bishop Ellicott arrives at the conclusion — Ellicott's estimate of probable alterations. assuming that no future revision of this part of the Bible would overstep the limits of that made by the five clergy-men — that there will not be in the proposed revision by the Committee of Convocation, more than "one change in every four verses due to textual criticism, and about one change in each verse due to grammar and general exegesis." He makes (pp. 132-182) a sample revision of four chapters in Matthew's Gospel (v.-viii.), finding in the one hundred and eight verses only eleven changes necessary on the ground of a faulty text, while the number of grammatical corrections is one hundred and seventy, or somewhat more than the predicted average. Combining this passage with others, however, the estimate first made is substantiated. It is hardly to be expected that the changes in the Old Testament will be so few, yet it may be confidently asserted that they will not be so numerous as seriously to change the character of the present version. Without any pretence to completeness, we propose, in the present section, to offer some illustrations of the various kinds of imperfections and errors which will be likely to engage the attention of the scholars who have been called to this responsible work.

Dean Stanley, in the Introduction to his Commentary on Corinthians, mentions in detail the character of the changes which Dean Stanley on Corinthians. he had found it necessary to introduce into the common version, in order "to put the English reader as nearly as possible in possession not merely of the sense, but of the abruptness, the obscurity, the singularity of style of the original text" (pp. 18-22): such as are produced by a restoration of the text according to the ancient manuscripts (according to Lachmann); such as are produced by a better system of punctuation; by transposing the words into a nearer conformity with the original order; by bringing out the emphasis of the word, apparent in the original text either from the use of the pronoun, or from the place of the word in the sentence; such as are required by inaccuracies of translation: (a) through carelessness, 1 Cor. i. 4, 7; iii. 19; vii. 37; (b) such as might be ascribed to theological fear or partiality, 1 Cor. ix. 27, xi. 27; (c) obsolete expressions; (d) retention of the original Greek (or Latin) words; (e) occasioned by uncertainty

respecting the Greek idiom; (f) a want of due appreciation of the different shades of meaning in words, and consequent carelessness as to using, if possible, one and the same English word, for one and the same Greek word.

Professor Kendrick, of Rochester, N.Y., in an article published in Professor A. the "Baptist Quarterly" for April, 1871, after expressing his C. Kendrick, D.D. satisfaction that the work of revision has been entered upon, and his judgment that its results will be unanimously welcomed by English-speaking Christians everywhere, thus broadly characterizes the defects of the present version: "To the eye that scans them closely [the faults of the version] they are of very grave importance. They are at once various in character, and lie scattered over the sacred pages with a frequency which makes it alike difficult and painful to do them adequate justice. Neither Trench nor Ellicott, ably as they have put the case, has made any approach to exhausting the list of individual defects, or has made the argument in favor of revision so weighty as it must appear to the eye that has been long accustomed to bring into close comparison the translation and the original. It is only one who has gone, step by step, over the entire field, that is in a condition to appreciate the strength and cogency of the reasons which have led to the present movement."

According to George P. Marsh, there are but about two hundred List of obso- words contained in our Bibles which are obsolete, if we ex-
lete words. cept phraseological expressions and idiotisms (Lect. on Eng. Lang., 1st ser. p. 263). Allowing for differences of opinion as to what constitutes an obsolete word, or one that is obsolescent, — differences that are not inconsiderable, — we append a list of such words gleaned from various authors, premising that, while some of these words are not obsolete in themselves, they have become so in the sense which they bore at the time our translation was made. The following are from the little work of Bishop Hinds, referred to above: Abase (1 Cor. xi. 1), accept (Acts x. 34), affect (Gal. iv. 17), affections (Gal. v. 24), after (Gal. iv. 23), allege (Acts xvii. 3), answer (Matt. xvii. 4), apprehend (Phil. iii. 12), approve (Rom. ii. 18), assay (Acts ix. 26), attendance (1 Tim. iv. 13), audience (Luke vii. 1), base (1 Cor. x. 1), believers (1 Tim. iv. 12), bewray (Matt. xxvi. 73), bowels (2 Cor. vi. 12), brethren (Matt. xxiii. 8), by (1 Cor. iv. 4), carriages (Acts xxi. 15), charger (Matt. xiv. 8), chasten (Heb. xii. 7), clean, cleanse (Matt. viii. 2), comfort, comforter, comfortless (John xiv. 16), commend, common (Acts x. 14), communicate (Gal. vi. 6), communication (Matt. v. 37), consort (Acts xvii. 4), constantly (Acts xii. 15), contrariwise (1 Pet. iii. 9), convenient (Eph. v. 4), conversation (1 Pet. i. 15), convince

(John viii. 46), corrupt, corruption, corruptible (Matt. vi. 19), covet (1 Cor. xii. 3), cumber (Luke x. 40), damnation, declare, devout, dispute, doctrine, edify, emulation, ensample, ensue, eschew, estate, evidently, exchanger, faithful (Eph. i. 6), flesh, follower, frankly, gainsay, games, garnish, generation, glory, gross, hardness, hear (John xviii. 37), hell, honest, honestly, instant, instantly, interpret, lawyer, let, lend, lightly (Mark ix. 39), lively, malice, maliciousness, mansion, master, meal, meet, mete, minister, mortify, mystery, name, naughtiness, nephew, notable, occupy, offend, open, or (Acts xxiii. 15), ordain, pass, passion, penny, person, phylactery, pilgrim, present, provoke, publican, purge, quaternion, question (1 Tim. ii. 23), quick, rather (Rom. xi. 12), ravening, reason (Acts xxiv. 25), religion, reprove, room (1 Cor. xiv. 16), saints, salute, scrip, seed, servant, shambles, simplicity, single, sleep (Matt. xiii. 25), spoil, strait, straw, swelling, table, temperance, temple, testament, thief, torment, tradition, trow, twain, unclean, usury, vain, vocation, walk, wave, wax, whit, will, would (Mark vi. 25 ; iii. 13), wist, wisdom, wise as an adjunct to any or no, wot, yea.

The following additional words and phrases of this kind are from Lightfoot's work on Revision : by and by, carefulness, chamberlain, coasts, debate, deputy, devotions, fetch a compass, go about to, grudge, high-minded, thought, writing-table ; and these from Henry Craik's "Hints and Suggestions : " earing time, grove (2 Kings xxiii. 6), all to (Judges ix. 53) ; from others : purchase, leasing, bolled ; advantageth, astonied, holpen, magnificent, seethe, vagabond, whoremonger.

Again, many of the words printed in our English version in italics, while originally placed there with the intention of making the translation more perspicuous, it is thought in numerous instances are unnecessary and superfluous ; while in some they "supplement, change, or pervert the meaning of the original." Of the four hundred and sixty-one examples of the use of italics in the Gospel of Matthew, a recent newspaper article (Rev. A. L. Park in the "Congregationalist") estimates that two hundred and fifty-two of them are no better than "dashes of water thrown into the sincere milk of the Word." "A Licentiate," &c., gives a table of more than seventy passages in which the italics are of no use whatever (p. 124). Ex-President Woolsey says ("Independent," Feb. 1, 1872) that King James's translators "had a right to omit nine-tenths of the little words in italics ;" that many of them "weaken rather than strengthen the sense," and that in a number of cases they are introduced to "support a bad translation."

Then, too, there is evident a great want of uniformity in the use of

proper names contained in our present version of the Scriptures.

Proper names. Words found in the Old Testament anglicized from the Hebrew, are put into a different form in the New Testament, as coming from the Greek of the Septuagint.* The following are examples: Booz and Boaz, Uriah and Urias, Ezekiel and Ezekias, Isaiah and Esaias, Hosea and Osee, Asher and Aser, Saron and Sharon, Elisha and Eliseus, Elijah and Elias, Korah and Core, Noah and Noe, Hagar and Agar, Hezekiah and Ezekias, Jehosaphat and Josaphat, Rehoboam and Roboam, Joshua and Jesus. Of the last example (Heb. iv. 8), Trench says: "The fourth chapter of Hebrews is anyhow hard enough; it is only with strained attention that we follow the Apostle's argument. But when to its own difficulty is added for many the confusion arising from the fact that 'Jesus' is here used, not of Him whose name is above every name, but of the son of Nun, known everywhere in the Old Testament by the name 'Joshua,' the perplexity to many becomes hopeless. It is in vain that our translators have added in the margin 'that is Joshua;' for all practical purposes of avoiding misconception the note — in most of our Bibles omitted — is useless."¹ This want of uniformity as between Old and New Testament in the use of proper names, is accompanied by a similar defect if the New Testament be taken by itself; and that, too, at the hand of the very same writer in some cases. We find both Marcus and Mark, Jeremias and Jeremy, Apollos and Apollo (formerly), Simon, son of Jona, and Simon, son of Jonas, Timotheus and Timothy, Cretes and Cretians. The same word is translated in one and the same chapter Areopagus and Mars' hill. And Lightfoot has noticed (p. 160) that the patriarch Judah is called both Judah and Juda in the same context, while a like inconsistency is noticed in the case of Judah, the brother of our Lord.

Still further, it would be natural to expect that different passages which are identical in the original, would be translated in the same way in our version, that this identity might be observed; but such is not the case. The following examples of this defect are given in a recent work:² Ps. xxxvii. 1 and Prov. xxiv. 19; Ps. xl. 14 and lxx. 2; Ps. xlii. 7 and Jonah ii. 3; Matt. xii. 30 and Luke xi. 23; Matt. xxiv. 4 and Mark xiii. 5; Matt. xxiv. 15 and Mark xiii. 14; Heb. iii. 11 and Heb. iv. 3, 5; 1 Pet. i. 7 and 1 Pet. i. 13. Of the last two passages, one is translated the "appearing of Jesus Christ;" the other, the "revelation of Jesus Christ," a difference which may seem to be slight, but really is of great importance in its bearing on the doctrines of Millenarianism.

¹ The Authorized Version, &c., p. 61, 1st ed.

² Plea for a New Eng. Ver., &c., p. 91.

Again, "Throughout the Old Testament, God is designated by a variety of names and titles, fraught with deepest interest to those who take pleasure in studying his Holy Word and in meditating on his glorious character and attributes, as therein so brightly revealed. Each of these Hebrew names bears a special meaning of its own, so that the presence of one name in one passage and of another name in another passage is often peculiarly significant." . . . "Yet notwithstanding the sanctity of this name the [Hebrew for Jehovah], the frequency of its occurrence [six thousand times in the Old Testament], and the very prominent position it holds in the Hebrew Scriptures, the composers of the Septuagint excluded it from their ancient version; and most unhappily the composers of the English version have followed their evil example except in a very few passages; for they have almost universally mistranslated it, sometimes Lord, and sometimes God, and have thus withheld from the Most High that name by which he so graciously revealed himself to the Israelites as an unchangeable God."¹

Our translators have also gone to the other extreme, to excluding from a multitude of passages the divine name as given in the original, and have introduced it into texts when the original contains no trace of it. For instance, the words, "May the king live" (1 Sam. x. 24; 2 Sam. xvi. 16; 2 Kings xi. 12), they have transformed into "God save the king," which does not translate the original phrase, but quite misrepresents it. The expression, "Would God," or "Would to God," also not of infrequent occurrence in our version (Ex. xvi. 3; Num. xi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 67; 1 Cor. iv. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 1), finds no support in the Hebrew or Greek, the divine name not appearing there at all. The same is true of the expression, "God forbid," of which Hodge says in his Commentary: "The Scriptures do not authorize such a use of the name of God as this phrase shows to have been common among the English translators of the Bible."

In many instances, too, in our version, the definite article has been improperly introduced, and in as many improperly omitted, with the result of greatly obscuring the sense, and often of misrepresenting it. The important announcement in Luke ii. 12 is an example. An angel informed the shepherds that they should find in a manger not "the babe," but simply "a babe," "an infant." Out of sixty or more illustrations of this form of inaccuracy, cited by one writer, we select a few: In 1 Kings iv. 4, "the priests" should be "priests;" Ps. i. 1, "the scornful," "scorners;" Prov. xxiii. 23, "buy the truth," "buy truth;" Mark xi. 17, "the house of

¹ Id., pp. 220-228.

prayer," "a house of prayer;" Acts xvii. 23, "to the unknown God," "to an unknown God;" Rom. viii. 14, "the sons of God," "sons of God;" 1 Cor. iii. 10, "I have laid the [a] foundation;" Gal. i. 10, "the [a] servant of Jesus Christ;" Gal. iii. 10, "under the [a] curse;" Eph. ii. 3, "the children of wrath," for "children of wrath;" 1 Thes. iv. 16, "the [an] archangel;" Matt. xii. 35, "A [the] good man," &c.; Luke xviii. 13, "to me a [the] sinner;" John iii. 10, "Art thou a master of Israel" for "art thou the teacher of Israel;" 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13, "a [the] good profession;" Acts xii. 4, "after Easter" for "after the Passover."¹

Examples of the introduction into our version of distinctions not justified by the original have been noticed by Trench. It was done by using two or more words to render at different places, or at the same place, a single word in the Greek text: Unnecessary distinctions introduced by King James's translators. In Rom. iv. there is one Greek word (*λογίζομαι*) which occurs eleven times. Trench says it is "the key-word to St. Paul's argument throughout, being everywhere employed most strictly in the same sense; and that a technical and theological." But our translators have no fixed rule of rendering it. Twice they render it "count;" six times "impute," and three times "reckon;" while at Gal. iii. 6, they introduce a fourth rendering, "account." Again, in Rev. iv. 4, we have, "round about the throne were four and twenty seats" [thrones]; 1 Cor. iii. 17, "If any man *defile* the temple of God, him shall God destroy" [*defile*]; 2 Thes. i. 6, "*tribulation* to them that *trouble* you," for "*affliction* to them that *afflict* you," Rom. vii. 7, "I had not known *lust* except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not *covet*'" [*lust*]; Phil. ii. 13, "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to *do*" [*work*]. Striking coincidences of language between one epistle and another, which exist in the Greek, are not found in the English. For example, "working" in Eph. iv. 2 is "operation" in Col. ii. 12; "lowliness" in Eph. iv. 2 is "humbleness of mind" in Col. ii. 19. The same word is translated "to reject" (Mark vi. 26), "to despise" (Luke x. 16); "to bring to nothing" (1 Cor. i. 19); "to frustrate" (Gal. ii. 21); "to disannul" (Gal. iii. 15); "to cast off" (1 Tim. v. 12). Another word is rendered "to cumber" (Luke xiii. 7); "to make without effect" (Rom. iii. 3); "to make void" (Rom. iii. 31); "to destroy" (Rom. vi. 6); "to loose" (Rom. vii. 2); "to deliver" (Rom. vii. 6); "to do away" (1 Cor. xiii. 10).

We cull from Professor Lightfoot's recent work on "Revision," some examples of an opposite kind, or of distinctions really existing in the original which have been obliterated by our Distinctions obliterated.

¹ Id., pp. 140-150.

translators: In Acts xix. 15, they have given us "Jesus I *know*, and Paul I *know*" for "Jesus I *acknowledge*, and Paul I *know*;" in 1 Cor. iv. 3-5, one word is translated throughout "judge," while in a previous passage (1 Cor. ii. 14, 15) it is rendered indifferently, "to discern" and "to judge." "But it is neither 'to judge,' nor to 'discern,'" says Lightfoot, "but 'to examine,' 'investigate,' as it is rightly translated elsewhere, *e.g.* 1 Cor. ix. 3, x. 25, 27; and the correct understanding of the passage before us depends on our retaining this sense." In John i. 11, we have, "he came to his own and his own received him not," where the distinction conveyed in the original between his own *home* and his own *people* is quite lost. Our translation makes no distinction between *fold* and *flock* in John x. 16, although the very point of the teaching is the difference between the many *folds* and the one *flock*. Two words, found in the Apocalypse, the one referring to those who worship before the throne in heaven, the other to the monsters of the abyss, — are both translated "beasts," with no recognition of any difference between them. In 1 Cor. xiv. 20, we read: "Be not *children* in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye *children*;" when Paul really said, "Be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye *babes*." In John viii. 58, "Before Abraham *was*, I *am*" should read, "Before Abraham was *born*, I *am*." Lightfoot speaks of the rendering of the words *δίαβολος* and *δαίμονιον*, by the same word "devil" as "a grievous loss;" and of the still greater misunderstanding likely to arise from translating *Ἄδης*, the place of departed spirits, and *Γέεννα*, the place of fire and torment, by the same word "hell," and thus confusing two ideas wholly distinct. "In such a passage as Acts ii. 27, 31, the misconception thus created is very serious."

According to Trench, the most recurring blemishes which are found with respect to the use of Greek grammar by our translators relate: (1) to a failure to give due heed to the ^{Errors in} presence or absence of the article (already noticed); (2) a certain ^{Greek gram-} laxity in the rendering of prepositions, for example *ἐν* being rendered as though it were *εἰς*, and *vice versâ*, and the different forces of *δὲ* as it governs a genitive or accusative being disregarded; (3) tenses are not discriminated, while moods and voices are occasionally confounded. Of the second defect, an example is found in John iv. 6, where our translators render, Jesus . . . sat *on* [by] the well; and in Heb. vi. 7, "Herbs meet for them *by whom* [for whom] it is dressed;" also in Luke xxiii. 42, "When thou comest *into* [in] thy kingdom." As an instance of confusion in tenses we have Luke xiv. 7, "when He marked how they *chose out* [were choosing out] the chief rooms." In John iv. 29 we have, "Is *not* this the Christ? where we might expect to find, "Is this the Christ?"

Under the head of "Errors in Lexicography," Lightfoot gives some cases of what he terms impossible renderings; as, for instance, when our translators have assigned a meaning to a word which it never bears elsewhere, and which must therefore be at once discarded. As in Mark xiii. 28, "when her branch is *yet* tender," should be, "As soon as its branch is tender;" 2 Cor. i. 23, "I came not as yet unto Corinth," for, "I came *no more* unto Corinth;" Col. iv. 10, "Marcus, *sister's son* to Barnabas," for "*cousin*;" Matt. x. 4. "Simon, the Canaanite," for "Simon, of Cana." Other passages are given, where though the rendering be not "impossible," it is imperfect and faulty: James iii. 5, "Behold how great a matter [wood] a little fire kindleth;" Matt. xxvi. 15, "they covenanted with him," for "they weighed unto him" (Zech. xi. 12); Heb. ii. 9, "He *took not on him* the nature of angels" for "He took not *hold of*" [to assist]; Mark iv. 29, "when the fruit is *brought forth*" [ripe]. Instances of a vague rendering are Rom. vi. 12, where "*instruments* of unrighteousness," should be "*weapons* of unrighteousness;" and 2 Cor. x. 5, where our translators in rendering the words, "*every high thing that exalteth itself*," appear not to have seen that this expression continues the metaphor of the campaign and the fortress in the context, and that the reference is to the siege works *thrown up* for the purpose of attacking the faith."

Among the few passages which will probably lose their place in our Bibles, in case of a thorough revision, is one found in 1 John v. 7, relating to the three heavenly witnesses, first perhaps introduced as an interpretation of the context, and then admitted to the text itself; also, the passage in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "God was manifest in the flesh," it is thought will require a change to "who was manifest in the flesh," while in the same doctrinal connection another and different change may be made in John i. 18, where "the only-begotten *Son*" may be found to read, "the only-begotten *God*." The beautiful account of the woman taken in adultery, although doubtless a true incident, being noticed by such early writers as relied mainly on tradition, yet having no sufficient *manuscript authority* will probably be relegated to brackets, if not wholly omitted; and so, too, according to Lightfoot, the close of Mark's gospel (Mark xvi. 9-20).¹ In Luke ii. 33, "his father" has been altered into "Joseph," and, a little afterwards, "Joseph and his mother" is substituted for "his parents," "evidently because the transcriber was alarmed lest the doctrine of the incarnation might be imperilled by such language, — an alarm not entertained by the Evangelist himself, whose own narrative precluded

¹ *Vs.* recent work by J. W. Burgon, Oxford & London, 8vo, pp. 334.

any false inference, and who therefore could use the popular language without fear of misapprehension" (Lightfoot on Revis., p. 29). In four different passages (Matt. xvii. 21, Mark ix. 29, Acts x. 30, 1 Cor. vii. 5), the word "fasting" has been connected with praying, it is thought, by a later hand, and the best editors reject it. The reading in Mark i. 1, "by Esaias the prophet" for "by the prophet," which is the more common, proves itself to be incorrect, or, at least, leads us to suspect a mistake, from the fact that an historical difficulty is involved in it. The passage in Matt. xix. 17, "Why callest thou me good?" compared with Mark x. 18, Luke xviii. 19, is one of the more important instances where the matter of diverse readings is of peculiar interest.

IV. THE RECENT MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND TOWARD REVISION.

As long ago as February 1, 1856, Canon Selwyn gave notice of a proposal that the Lower House of Convocation should petition ^{Immediate} the Upper House to address the Crown on the subject of ^{origin of} the revision. And on July 22d of the same year, Mr. Heywood in the House of Commons moved an address praying the queen to issue a royal commission for this purpose; the motion, however, being opposed, was withdrawn. In the following year, Canon Selwyn's motion before Convocation was again introduced to that body in a more general form, but amendments being pressed that showed an unwillingness to enter upon the undertaking at that time, the consideration of it was dropped. The mere act of raising the question, however, awakened great interest, and called out a large amount of speaking and writing, which, for the most part, was hostile to the enterprise.

But public attention having been fairly called to the subject and a full discussion entered upon, there came about, in the course ^{First step} of the ten or twelve years following, an almost entire change ^{actually} of sentiment respecting it; and it is probable that there is now as much unanimity among Christian scholars in favor of a conservative revision, as there was in 1856 in opposing any revision whatever. On February 10, 1870, a resolution was unanimously carried through both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, to appoint a joint committee of both Houses "To report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist." This committee, composed of seven bishops

from the Upper House and fourteen members from the Lower House, reported in the following May (11th) to this effect: "(1) That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken. (2) That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version. (3) That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary. (4) That in such necessary changes the style of the language in the existing version be closely followed. (5) That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

This report was adopted by Convocation with little opposition, and Further ac- a joint committee of sixteen, in accordance with the last resolution. tion. lution, appointed "to consider a scheme of revision on the principles laid down," and "to invite the co-operation of those whom they may judge fit, from their biblical scholarship, to aid them in their work." On May 25, 1870, the committee thus appointed by Convocation adopted the following resolutions for future guidance:—

I. That the committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury at its last session separate itself into two companies, the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament.

II. That the company for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament consist of the Bishops of St. Davids, Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln, and Bath and Wells, and of the following members from the Lower House: Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

III. That the company for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament consist of the Bishops of Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury, and of the following members from the Lower House: the Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, and Canon Blakesley.

IV. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the Old Testament company be the revision of the Authorized Version of the Pentateuch.

V. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the New Testament company be the revision of the Authorized Version of the Synoptical Gospels.

VI. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the Old Testament company: Dr. W. L. Alexander, Professor Chenery, Canon Cook, Professor A. B. Davidson, Dr. B. Davies, Professor Fairbairn, the Rev. F. Field, Dr. Ginsburg, Dr. Gotch, Archdeacon Harrison, Professor Leathes, Professor M'Gill, Canon Payne Smith [declined], Professor J. H. Perowne, Professor Plumptre, Canon Pusey [declined], Dr. Wright [declined], W. A. Wright.

VII. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the New Testament company: Dr. Angus, the Archbishop of Dublin [Trench], Dr. Eadie, the Rev. F. J. A. Hort, Rev. W. G. Humphry, Canon Kennedy, Archdeacon Lee, Dr. Lightfoot, Professor Milligan, Professor Moulton, Dr. J. H. Newman [declined], Professor Newth, Dr. A. Roberts, Rev. G. Vance Smith, Dr. Scott, Rev. F. H. Scrivener, Dr. Vaughan, and Canon Westcott.

VIII. That the general principles to be followed by both companies be as follows: (1) To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness. (2) To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English Versions. (3) Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, — once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided. (4) That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating, and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin. (5) To make or retain no change in the text on the second final revision by each company, except two-thirds of those present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities. (6) In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote being announced in the notice for the next meeting. (7) To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation. (8) To refer, on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

IX. That the work of each company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

X. That the special or by-rules for each company be as follows: (1) To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting. (2) To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left-hand

margin, and all other corrections on the right-hand margin. (3) To transmit to the chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration."

This most important undertaking seems to have been generally acquiesced in by the Christian scholars of all denominations of both England and America, and in some notable instances emphatically approved. The Convocation of York, however, in England, as a body, decline to favor it, as do also some persons of considerable influence among ourselves. Mr. George P. Marsh says of the movement ("The Nation" New York): (1) "It is a purely sectarian, not to say schismatic movement, and as such calculated to widen rather than to narrow the divisions which exist between the different Protestant churches of the English speech [possibly this would not have been written at the present date]; and (2) it is evidently a half measure, aiming at no thorough work, which shall establish the readings of the original text and of the English Bible on a reasonably satisfactory and permanent basis."

He concludes: "If it is worth while now to undertake a new recension at all, — which we by no means admit, — the interests of Christian harmony require that the labor be inaugurated under the most catholic auspices, and that the composition of the board of revisers and the principles on which the revision is to be conducted shall furnish every guarantee that the task shall be executed with all possible learning, all possible discretion, all possible fairness, charity, and candor. We find no such guarantees in the plan before us. It does not appear that the revisers propose to avail themselves of the amplest existing instrumentalities, or of the ablest living scholarship, or that they take sufficiently into view the claims, the capacities and wants of Protestants educated in theological schools different from their own. We admit — and this expectation is founded on a high appreciation of the general intelligence of the committee, not on satisfactory evidence of their special qualifications or the soundness of their views in regard to the duties they have assumed — that their labors will result in an English text probably superior in accuracy of interpretation, and possibly in uniform felicity of expression, to the standard translation. But we see no ground whatever for expecting that this recension will satisfy the reasonable demands of learned criticism, or that it will be a text which any considerable body of Protestants will adopt in place of that which they have so long revered."

It may be well to offset these opinions by those of Canon Lightfoot, who speaks not only from the point of view whence the movement in its present form first originated, but as himself one
 Experience of a reviser.

of the committee of revisers, and after some months' experience in that position.¹ "Lastly, in one respect at least, the present revision is commenced under very auspicious circumstances. There has been great liberality in inviting the co-operation of those Biblical scholars who are not members of the Anglican communion, and they on their part have accorded a prompt and cheerful welcome to this invitation [while a number of the ablest American scholars of various denominations have recently given their consent to act with the committee of Convocation. See below]. This is a matter for great thankfulness. It may be accepted as a guarantee that the work is undertaken not with any narrow sectarian aim, but in the broad interests of truth; while, also, it is an earnest, that, if the revision when completed recommends itself by its intrinsic merits (and if it does not, the sooner it is forgotten the better), then no unworthy jealousy will stand in the way of its general reception. And meanwhile, may we not cherish a loftier hope? Now, for the first time, the bishops of our Church and the representatives of our Convocation will meet at the same table with non-conformist divines, and will engage in a common work of a most sacred kind, — the interpretation of those writings which all alike reverence as the source of their truest inspiration here, and the foundation of their highest hopes hereafter. Is it too much to anticipate that, by the experience of this united work, the Christian communities in England [and America] may be drawn more closely together, and that, whether it succeed or fail in its immediate object, it may at least dissipate many prejudices and jealousies, may promote a better mutual understanding, and thus, by fostering inward sympathy, may lead the way to greater outward harmony among themselves, and a more intimate union with the Divine Head." In a note he adds: "It will be remembered that this hope was expressed before the Revision Company had met. If I felt at liberty to modify the expression by the light of subsequent experience, I should speak even more strongly."

The revisers actually began their work on June 22d, 1870, the committee on the New Testament then for the first time meeting under the presidency of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. ^{When the work actually began.} The whole of those who had accepted the trust committed to them, with one exception, were present in Henry VII.'s chapel in the Abbey of Westminster, and received the Holy Communion together at the hands of the Dean. This remarkable expression of catholicity, however, came near proving, in the way of awakening prejudice, a fatal barrier to the successful prosecution of the work. One of the revisers, Canon Jebb, resigned on account of it. The English papers teemed

¹ On a Fresh Revis., &c., Lond. and N. Y., 1871, note p. 194.

with communications for many weeks, taking sides either with or against the action of the committee. A memorial was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury, signed by more than fifteen hundred clergymen of the Church of England, protesting against the admission to the Holy Communion of "teachers of various sects," "more especially of one person understood to be a denier of the divinity of our Lord." The Upper House of Convocation even passed a vote in favor of excluding the Unitarian scholar, Mr. Vance Smith, the person referred to in the memorial, from the Revision Committee of the New Testament; but the Lower House (twenty-three to nineteen) indefinitely postponed the resolution. Mr. Smith himself wrote several letters justifying his course, and arguing that, from the point of view of the "National Church" itself, there could be no reasonable objection to the course he had taken.

"And here I would venture to remind you," he said, "that the Communion is not your private property, nor that of your section of the church, nor, indeed, the private property of any church whatever. It is surely 'the Lord's table.' Nor can I admit that any individual has any right to dictate the terms of participation to another." The April number of the "Contemporary Review" for 1871, contains an admirable *résumé* of the various phases of this first difficulty of the revisers. Affairs seem finally to have settled down to a peaceful condition; and it is not unlikely that this unexpected agitation, occurring at the very outset of the work, may serve the very important purpose of bringing the Board into a more perfect understanding and agreement among themselves, while it will not essentially lessen their influence, and may greatly increase it, among the great body of Protestant Christians.

The "Saturday Review" (June 18, 1870) classifies the New Testament company of revisers (residing in England) as follows: "An archbishop, three bishops, three deans, two archdeacons, two canons, two Cambridge professors, one or two plain parish incumbents, amicably mingled with the most learned men among the Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Congregationalists, and other dissenting bodies." It characterizes the refusal of the Convocation of York to join in the work as "unexpected, and, in some of its circumstances, to this day, inexplicable."

The "Methodist" (New York) of April 15, 1871, contained an item to the effect that a circular had been sent to each one of the American (Episcopalian) bishops, proposing to send them proofs of the amended version for criticism by themselves, and such other scholars as they might see fit to submit them to. This

Negotiation
with
American
scholars.

project, however, if ever seriously contemplated, seems to have been abandoned, perhaps on the ground of the opposition of some who might have been expected to be most interested to promote it, and another method for securing the co-operation of American scholars adopted. On December 7, 1871, a meeting was held in New York on behalf of this object, of which the following is an authoritative report:—

“At a meeting of gentlemen invited by the Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., to meet this day, December 7, at his study, No. 40, Bible House, New York, for the purpose of forming an organization to ^{Meeting in} ^{New York.} co-operate with the British committee in the revision of the authorized English version of the Scriptures, the following persons were present, viz.:—

“Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., New York; Prof. Henry B. Smith, D.D., New York; Prof. William Henry Green, D.D., Princeton, N. J.; Prof. George Emlen Hare, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. Charles P. Krauth, D.D., Philadelphia; Rev. Thomas J. Conant, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. George E. Day, D.D., New Haven, Ct.; Ezra Abbot, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Edward A. Washburn, D.D., New York.

“Dr. Howson, Dean of Chester, was also present by special invitation, and took part in the deliberations. Ex-President Woolsey, Prof. Hackett, Prof. Strong, and others, were prevented from attending, but expressed by letter their hearty interest in the proposed work and their readiness to co-operate. The meeting was organized by the appointment of Prof. Henry B. Smith as chairman, and Prof. George E. Day as secretary. After prayer by the chairman, Dr. Schaff introduced the subject of the meeting, by stating that he had been requested by the British committee for the revision of the authorized English version of the Scriptures, through the Dean of Westminster, to invite American scholars to co-operate with them in this work. He had accordingly extended such an invitation to a limited number of scholars, most of them professors of biblical literature in theological seminaries of the leading Protestant denominations. In the delicate task of selection he had reference, first of all, to the reputation and occupation of the gentlemen as biblical scholars; next, to their denominational connection and standing so as to have a fair representation of the American churches; and, last, to local convenience in order to secure regular attendance on the meetings. He would have gladly invited others, but thought it best to leave the responsibility of enlargement to the committee itself when properly constituted. He had personally conferred during last summer with Bishop Ellicott, Dean Stanley, Prof. Lightfoot, Prof. Westcott, Dr. Angus, and other British revisers, about

the details of the proposed plan of co-operation, and was happy to state that it met their cordial approval. Dr. Schaff then read the following list of scholars who had been invited to engage in this work, and who had accepted the invitation:—

“On the Old Testament.— Prof. Thomas J. Conant, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y. ; Prof. George E. Day, D.D., New Haven, Ct. ; Prof. John DeWitt, D.D., New Brunswick, N. J. ; Prof. William Henry Green, D.D., Princeton, N. J. ; Prof. George Emlen Hare, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. ; Prof. Charles P. Krauth, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. ; Prof. Joseph Packard, D.D., Fairfax, Va. ; Prof. Calvin E. Stowe, D.D., Cambridge, Mass. ; Prof. James Strong, D.D., Madison, N. J. ; Prof. C. V. A. Van Dyck, M.D., Beyrout, Syria ; Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D., Schenectady, N. Y.

“On the New Testament.— Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., New York ; Prof. H. B. Hackett, D.D., Rochester, N. Y. ; Prof. Charles Hodge, D.D., Princeton, N. J. ; Prof. Matthew B. Riddle, D.D., Hartford, Ct. ; Prof. Henry B. Smith, D.D., New York ; Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Andover, Mass. ; Rev. Edward A. Washburn, D.D., New York ; Rev. Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., New Haven, Ct. ; Ezra Abbot, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass. ; Prof. James Hadley, LL.D., New Haven, Ct. ; Prof. Charles Short, LL.D., New York.

“A communication from Bishop Ellicott, D.D., to Dr. Schaff, dated Oct. 23, 1871, was read, containing the following resolution of the British committee:—

“Resolved, That the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol be requested to communicate with Dr. P. Schaff to the effect that the work of the New Testament revisers is at present only tentative and provisional, and that it may be considerably altered at the second revision ; but that upon the assurance of Dr. Schaff, that the work, so far as it is at present advanced, will be considered as strictly confidential, the company will send a sufficient number of copies for Dr. Schaff and his brother revisers, for their own private use, the copies to be in no way made public beyond themselves. For this purpose that Dr. Schaff be requested to send the names and addresses of the scholars associated with him in this matter, as soon as the company is completely formed.”

The American Committee of Revisers was regularly organized for work on October 4, 1872, at the Bible House, New York. At that time Dr. Schaff “reported the result of his correspondence and personal conference with the British Revisers, and distributed confidential copies of the revised version of the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and the first three Gospels, which he had received from England for the use of the American Committee.”

American
committee
organize for
work.

“The committee then proceeded to elect permanent officers. Dr. Schaff, of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, was elected President, Prof. Day, of the Divinity School of Yale College, Corresponding Secretary, and Prof. Short, of Columbia College, New York, Treasurer. The committee then divided into two companies, — the one for the Old, the other for the New Testament. Prof. Green, of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, was elected Chairman of the Old Testament company; Ex-President Woolsey, Chairman of the New Testament company. Both companies will hold periodical meetings every month in the Bible House.”

The committee as finally constituted is composed of the following scholars, — the list differing somewhat from the one given above, — who represent all the leading Christian denominations of the country, and nearly a dozen of the most prominent of its theological seminaries: —

Old Testament Company. — Prof. William Henry Green, D.D., Chairman, Princeton, N. J.; Prof. George E. Day, D.D., New Haven, Ct.; Prof. John De Witt, D.D., New Brunswick, N. J.; Prof. George Emlen Hare, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. Charles P. Krauth, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. J. Packard, D.D., Fairfax, Va.; Prof. Calvin E. Stowe, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.; Prof. James Strong, D.D., Madison, N. J.; Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D., Schenectady, N. Y.; Prof. C. V. A. Van Dyck, M.D., Beyrout, Syria.

New Testament Company. — Ex-President Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., Chairman, New Haven, Ct.; Prof. Ezra Abbot, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.; Prof. James Hadley, LL.D., New Haven, Ct.; Prof. Charles Short, LL.D., New York; Rev. J. R. Crooks, D.D., New York; Prof. H. B. Hackett, D.D., Rochester, N. Y.; Prof. Charles Hodge, D.D., Princeton, N. J.; Prof. A. C. Kendrick, D.D., Rochester, N. Y.; Rt. Rev. Alfred Lee, D.D., Wilmington, Del.; Prof. Matthew B. Riddle, D.D., Hartford, Ct.; Prof. Henry B. Smith, D.D., New York; Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Andover, Mass.; Prof. W. F. Warren, D.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D., New York.

B.

THE APOCRYPHA.

IT is a matter of considerable importance in treating of the so-called "Apocrypha," that the meaning of the term should be clearly defined at the outset, or, at least, the sense explained in which the writer intends to use it. Ordinarily, and in general terms, the word is used to designate such ecclesiastical books as were added to the Old Testament Scriptures after the close of the Canon. We shall here use it, however, as covering also, similar literature which sprang up in connection with the New Testament.

The etymological and historical signification of the term is thus given by Bleek: "This name is often met with in the ancient Church, but not always in the same sense. The word is at any rate derived from ἀποκρύπτειν = *abscondita*. Augustine explains it as pointing out those writings, the origin of which was obscure. . . . It is often used in the Talmud and by the Rabbis for certain works as contrasted with the canonical Scriptures (in connection with a Hebrew word having the meaning of *abscondere* = to withdraw from public use). . . . Among these [ecclesiastical writers, generally], the use of this word originally proceeded from an idea of *secret and mysterious matters*; and, indeed, first came into vogue among heretical sects, particularly the Gnostics. These possessed various books to which they attributed a peculiar sanctity, the greater part of which bore the names of holy personages, either of the Old or New Covenant; they asserted that they had obtained these by means of a certain secret tradition, and for this reason called them ἀπόκρυφα. In the main body of the Church, not only was the genuineness of these works repudiated, but they were looked upon with all the greater distrust in proportion as more importance was laid upon them by the heretics. Ecclesiastical authors retained for these works the designation ἀπόκρυφα, partly borrowed from the heretics in reference to these works, but joined with it generally an idea of something not genuine and heretical. There were, however, some teachers in the

Church who did not use the name in so decidedly bad a sense, but applied it generally to certain works, most of which were made some use of in the Church, in addition to the really canonical Scriptures; although they would not wish to see an equal authority ascribed to the former as to the latter, because it was at any rate uncertain what their origin was. . . . And in this sense the term Apocrypha has become usual in the Protestant, particularly the Lutheran, Church, as a *terminus technicus* for a certain number of works; those, namely, which, although not in the Hebrew Canon, exist in the Septuagint and Vulgate, in close conjunction with the elements of the canon, and are placed in Luther's translation as an appendix."¹

The following is a list of the books to which the term Apocrypha is commonly applied, and which we here designate as the ^{Books included in the} Apocrypha of the Old Testament: I., II. Esdras; Tobit; Apocrypha. Judith; Additions to the book of Esther; The Wisdom of Solomon; Ecclesiasticus; Baruch; The Song of the Three Holy Children; The History of Susanna; The History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon; The Prayer of Manasseh, King of Judah; I., II. Maccabees. Besides these works, there are other, so-called, pseudepigraphous writings still extant, bearing the names of prophets and wise men of the Old Economy, which are not considered as forming a part of the Apocrypha proper, having no place in the Septuagint version, and otherwise holding an inferior position. For a list of Apocryphal New Testament writings, still extant, as well as for a very full list of those not now extant, but which were mentioned by ecclesiastical writers of the first four centuries after Christ, the reader is referred to the Cyclopaedia of McClintock and Strong, art. Apocrypha.²

It is well known that Roman Catholics and Protestants widely differ respecting the value of the Old Testament Apocrypha, ^{Apocrypha of the Old Testament.} the former placing these books among the divinely inspired Scriptures (Council of Trent, 1546), although assigning them a somewhat inferior rank as "deutero-canonical;" the latter, rejecting them as wholly spurious, and properly having no right to a position, even an inferior one, in the catalogue of Sacred Books. A review of the arguments on either side would furnish opportunity for a sufficiently full presentation of the subject to answer the purposes of this article. We will, therefore, state the reasons commonly adduced for *excluding* these writings from the Bible.

One important reason for excluding these books from the volume of Sacred Scriptures is, that they have not the recognition ^{Reason for excluding these books from the Bible.} of Christ, of his Apostles, nor of other New Testament writers. Bleek admits that the Old Testament Apocrypha

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 303, 304.

² Cf. the Apoc. N. T., &c. Boston: 1857. App.

are nowhere expressly quoted in the New Testament. He, however, affirms that the influence of many of these books — as of Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Books of Maccabees — is unmistakably evident in the tone of thought observable in the New Testament authors; and that numerous reminiscences of them are also found in their writings.¹ And, similarly, Davidson: “The New Testament writers so far sanctioned them [the Apocrypha] as to show that they read and used them. This is seen in their writings, which contain reminiscences of passages in the Apocrypha.”² The most marked of these so-called reminiscences are: Wisd. v. 18–21, cf. Eph. vi. 13–17; Wisd. xv. 7, cf. Rom. ix. 21; Wisd. ii. 12, cf. Jas. v. 6; Wisd. vii. 27, cf. Heb. i. 3; Eccclus. v. 11, cf. Jas. i. 19; Eccclus. vii. 10, cf. Jas. i. 6; Tobit iv. 6, cf. Matt. vii. 12; Wisd. ii. 16–18, cf. Matt. xxvii. 43–54.

But Westcott, after a thorough examination of these parallels, declares that any one who will examine the character of the coincidences in these passages, and their relation to the language of the Old Testament, “will readily feel how slender the evidence is on which the Apostles are affirmed to have been acquainted with the writings in question. The last parallel is, in many respects, the most remarkable, and one which appears to be *most certainly casual*.” While saying this, Westcott concedes “that it seems likely that St. Paul and (perhaps) St. James were acquainted with the Book of Wisdom; and that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews alludes to the facts related in II. Maccabees, though not in such a way as to assure us that he derived his knowledge of them from that book.”³ At least, the point may be considered as well established, that nothing like an authentication of the Apocrypha can be predicated of the New Testament writers, even admitting an acquaintance on their part with its literature, and occasional evidence that they were somewhat influenced by it. A sermon writer of the present day might give evidence in his discourses that he had read Swinburne’s poems; but it would be unsafe to infer, from this circumstance, either that he valued and sanctioned his poems as a whole, or that he considered their author as belonging to the highest order of poets. The references of the New Testament writers to the genuine Old Testament books are of an entirely different character.

Again, it is quite universally admitted, that these books formed no part of the original Hebrew (Palestinian) Canon. Bleek says that “among the Palestinian Jews no writing was adopted into the canon of which it was known that it had not

Westcott's opinion of the parallels between them and New Testament books.

Another reason for their exclusion.

¹ Introd. to O. T., ii. 306.

² Introd. to O. T., iii. 348.

³ Bib. in Ch., 45, 46.

been composed until later than about one hundred years after the end of the Exile. Thus, for example, the book of Jesus Sirach (Eccclus., c. 210-180 B.C.) found no acceptance because its late origin was known; nor did it claim for itself any higher antiquity; as also, the Greek translator, the author's grandson expressly distinguishes his grandfather's book from the canonical writings." But what was true of this one book, in this respect, would of course apply to all the Apocrypha, which includes no writings that can be considered much, if at all, older than Ecclesiasticus. And this position is confirmed if we trace, however minutely, the history of the Hebrew Canon, among the Jews themselves, downward to the period of the Talmudists.

Still further, the manner in which these books came into legalized circulation, associated with the Old Testament Scriptures, sufficiently accounts for the estimation in which they have been held by many in the Christian Church, from the time of Christ to our own. These additional books which never, at any time, were allowed a place in the Hebrew Bible, were from time to time admitted (c. 283-30 B.C.) into the Septuagint version, originating among the Jews speaking Greek at Alexandria, in Egypt, and there used almost exclusively as the Word of God, and so admitted either because of laxer views there concerning inspiration and canonicity, or solely, at first, for the convenience of using them ecclesiastically. But the Septuagint version becoming, subsequently, to the great mass of Gentile Christians, as well as to such Jews as did not understand Hebrew, the authoritative standard, the limits of the true original canon were so almost wholly effaced. And in addition to the uncritical character of the period, the difficulty was, for a time, still further enhanced by the controversies carried on between the Jews and Christians, each appealing to his own copy of the Scriptures. Thus a suspicion got abroad among Christians that the Jews had mutilated the Bible. Finally, however, these very controversies became the occasion (Bleek and Keil) for Christians to turn their attention, more definitely and critically, to the distinction between the two canons, and led them with no little unanimity to determine the exact number of the canonical books of the Old Testament, in accordance with the views of their former opponents and the limits of the Hebrew Canon. The fact, too, that the earlier translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular of the people, like the Old Latin, were made from the Septuagint, helped to fasten upon and make hereditary in the Church the Alexandrian confusion and mistake.

But, as we have said, the inadvertence into which many were for a time led by following too thoughtlessly the guidance of the Septuagint,

was subsequently acknowledged ; and the best of the Fathers, and with considerable unanimity the Church as a body, adopted the Hebrew Canon, as defining the limits of the Old Testament Scriptures. These books, indeed, as a whole, were never adopted into any catalogue of the Sacred Scriptures recognized by any early general council. It has been affirmed that three *synods* — all African, and under the dominating influence of Augustine — formally sanctioned the Apocrypha along with the canonical books, putting all in the same rank.¹ But this is saying quite too much, the recognition probably referring to *ecclesiastical use* only. Moreover, Augustine himself repeatedly makes a distinction between the Hebrew Canon and the Apocrypha, allowing that the latter are not of unquestioned authority. Against the Donatists, who urged a passage found in II. Maccabees in justification of suicide, he denied the soundness of the argument, on the ground that the book was not received into the Hebrew Canon to which Christ bore witness, although “it had been received by the Church not unprofitably, provided it were heard or read judiciously.”² While other fathers of the Latin Church — Jerome, Hilary, and Rufinus — took much higher ground, the last declaring : “The books of the *Hebrew Canon* are the inspired Scriptures included in the canon by the Fathers, — ‘ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare soluerunt.’ Besides these there are others, ‘non canonici, sed ecclesiastici.’”³ Still, it must be admitted that Augustine’s uncertain position, in connection with the thorough hold which the Apocrypha gained by early use in the Old Latin, exercised a damaging influence with respect to the true settlement of the question, the distinction between the canonical books and the Apocrypha being regarded by some as of little importance, until by decree of the Council of Trent it was obliterated entirely. In the Greek Church, on the contrary, as early as the fourth century (C. of Laodicea, c. 363), the Hebrew Canon was accepted as fixing definitely the limits of the Old Testament Scriptures, even the reading of the Apocrypha being in some cases forbidden. And this position the Greek Church — and the same is true of the older Syriac Church — has maintained with but a slight wavering of individual Fathers, to the present day. At the Reformation, in harmony with the entire body of Protestants, this church reaffirmed its decision that the books of the Hebrew Canon alone are to be held as canonical, although, of late, — through the influence, it is thought, of the Romish Church and in opposition to Protestants, — there has been an apparent weakening in this respect.⁴

¹ Davidson, *Introd. to O. T.*, iii. 348. Cf. Keil, *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 360.

² *Bib. in Ch.*, 186-189.

³ Herzog’s *Encyc.*, i. 548.

⁴ Bleek’s *Introd. to O. T.*, ii. 336, 342.

In addition to what has been already said, there are doubtless considerations to be drawn from the character of these books themselves which would demand their exclusion from the Bible as having no right to be esteemed a co-ordinate part of it. For these, in the form and order in which they will here be given, we are indebted to Professor Plumptre:¹ (1) The absence of the prophetic element; (2) Connected with this is the almost total disappearance of the power which had shown itself in the poetry of the Old Testament; (3) The appearance as part of the current literature of the times, of works of fiction resting, or purporting to rest, on an historical foundation; (4) The free exercise of the imagination within the domain of history, leading to the growth of a purely legendary literature; (5) As the most marked characteristic of the collection as a whole, and of the period to which it belongs, there is the tendency to pass off supposititious books under the cover of illustrious names; (6) The absence of honesty and of the power to distinguish truth from falsehood shows itself in a yet more serious form in the insertion of formal documents purporting to be authentic, but in reality failing altogether to establish any claim to that title; (7) The loss of the simplicity and accuracy which characterize the history of the Old Testament is also shown in the errors and anachronisms in which these books abound; (8) In their relation to the religious and ethical development of Judaism during the period which these books embrace.

Considerations derived from the books themselves.

THE NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA.

Very little need be said of the great mass of Apocryphal literature called forth by the fame of Christ and his Apostles, gaining currency, and still of interest, wholly because of its association with his name. With respect to most of these writings, there is and has ever been entire unanimity among all honest investigators in discarding them as undoubted forgeries, even more clumsy than they are false. Bishop Ellicott says of the Apocryphal Gospels, that "their real demerits, their mendacities, their absurdities, their coarseness, the barbarities of their style, and the inconsequences of their narrative, have never been excused or condoned. It would be hard to find any competent writer in any age of the Church who has been beguiled into saying any thing civil or commendatory. From all alike, — from Orthodox fathers, from early historians, from popes, from councils, from Romish divines and Protestant commentators, — the

The New Testament Apocrypha characterized.

¹ Smith's Bib. Dict., art. Apoc.

same amount of contempt and reprobation has been expended upon them." And again : " Our vital interest in Him of whom they pretend to tell us more than the canonical Scriptures have recorded is the real, though it may be the hidden, reason why these poor figments are read with interest even while they are despised.¹"

Of these Apocryphal works proper, only a few, such as were apparently to some extent made use of with respect by certain Christian writers in the early Church, call for any special notice on our part. One of these was a so-called " Gospel according to the Hebrews," a work not now extant. It has been supposed to be referred to by Papias (early part of first century), Ignatius (a disciple of John), Justin Martyr (died 148), Hegesippus (bloom 177-190), and by Origen (186-254). Lardner infers that the work was a translation of our Gospel of Matthew into Hebrew with certain additions.² And it seems to be quite a general opinion that it had a close connection with that Gospel. It was circulated chiefly among the Jewish Christians of Palestine. But, whatever may have been true concerning it, there is certainly no evidence that any other Gospel than the four which are familiar to us had any authoritative currency in the early Church. The allusions of Ignatius and Papias are uncertain. The citations of Justin Martyr particularly distinguish something which it contains from the Apostolic "Memoirs," as he was accustomed to call our Gospels.³ Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, made considerable extracts from the work, but so far as it appears without attributing to it any importance above what was due to an ordinary literary production. While others who made use of it — Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome, — at the same time very clearly expressed the opinion that our four Gospels alone were canonical.

Another work of this kind was the "Gospel of Peter." Bleek supposes that in its contents it was akin to our Synoptics, but particularly to the "Gospel according to the Hebrews;" and Westcott, that it contained memoirs of the Apostles' teaching, based in a great measure on authentic traditions. No part of it is now extant. It is extremely probable that it originated about A.D. 191-200 in Cilicia. Serapion, the bishop, found it in use there by the church at Rhossus, and, after examination, discovering things in it not according to sound doctrine, he promptly placed his interdict upon it. But it cannot be shown that the book was ever held to be canonical even at Rhossus, where it was most widely circulated and most highly approved. Origen says of a quotation from the "Doctrine of Peter,"

¹ Cambridge Essays for 1856, pp. 155-158. Cf. B. Harris Cowper, *Apoc. Gospels*, p. 10.

² Vol. v., 247.

³ Westcott, *Can. of N. T.*, Append. B. Cf. Bleek, *Introd. to N. T.*, i. 336.

which Westcott (though not Bleek) regards as the same work, that we must first reply that that writing is not reckoned among the ecclesiastical books, and next show that it is not a genuine writing of Peter, nor of any one else who was inspired by the Spirit of God.¹

The "Apocalypse of Peter," still another Apocryphal work ascribed to this Apostle, can claim a somewhat more direct apparent support. It is referred to in the Muratorian Canon (160-170), The Apocalypse of Peter. if the text be trustworthy, as follows: "We receive, moreover, the Apocalypses of John and Peter only, which [? latter] some of our body will not have read in the Church." And according to Eusebius (H. E. vi. 14), Clement of Alexandria wrote comments on the same work. This, however, is the most that can be said in its defence. Eusebius in the same connection clearly repudiates the book, while nothing authoritative can be based on the doubtful testimony of the Canon of Muratori in this particular. In addition to the above conjectural reading included within the brackets, it may be said that some high authorities maintain that it is probable that the Latin, which is *et Petri tantum*, should be *et Petri unam*, the *et* beginning a new clause, and the reference being to the one (1) Epistle of Peter.² Clement of Alexandria also refers to a "Gospel of the Egyptians," the character of which it is impossible from the scantiness of allusions to it in early literature to determine. But Clement is careful not to confound the work with the Gospels received by the Church.

Now, in addition to these and many similar works which cannot claim to any important extent even this doubtful support of direct allusion and respectful mention on the part of responsible Christian writers, there is another and quite distinct class of writings to be considered, ascribed to the Apostolic Fathers, as Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp (c. 80-120). What was their relation to the New Testament literature? Why were they not included among the canonical Scriptures? First, a large part of the writings attributed to these persons are indisputably spurious. Then, that which has the best claim to being genuine lays no claim to canonical rank, but, on the contrary, virtually disclaims it.³ Moreover, while for the most part agreeing in spirit and doctrine with the canonical books, while often quoted, and uniformly treated with respect by early Christian writers, still, they were never actually adopted by the Church as inspired, or placed on a level with the acknowledged productions of the Evangelists and Apostles. The best of these works are the first "Epistle of Clement," the "Epistle of Barnabas," and the "Shepherd of Hermas." It will be noticed

¹ Westcott, id.² Bleek, *Introd. to N. T.*, ii. 246, n.³ *Bib. in Ch.*, pp. 86-88.

that all these names occur in the New Testament, and when we recollect that one of the leading rules governing the admission of any work into the Canon was that it should be the genuine production of an Apostle or of an "Apostolic man," it will readily appear why—the character of their works, on account of the uncritical nature of the times, being largely out of the question—they would be treated with special respect by the authors who succeeded them, at least until it was clearly decided that they were not what had been supposed.

Hence, admitting that the first epistle of Clement, for instance, was The epistle of Clement. alluded to or quoted by Dionysius of Corinth (d. 176), Irenæus (c. 130–200), Clement of Alexandria (165–220), with an honorary title ("the Apostolic") for its author, and by Origen (186–254); that it was publicly read in the church at Corinth; is found—though in connection with the confessedly spurious epistle attributed to the same author—appended to some MSS. of the New Testament, and was possibly for a time co-ordinated with certain of the so-called antilegomena: the fact of a supposed indirect Apostolic authority appertaining to it, as the supposed production of the Clement mentioned in Phil. iv. 3, is quite sufficient to account for all. It was certainly never put in any catalogue of the Scriptures, but, on the contrary, was definitely excluded from such catalogues (Eusebius, Athanasius, and Jerome), and, little by little, after the judgment of the Church was more enlightened and its opinion came to be more definitely expressed, ceased to be classed even among writings of doubtful canonicity.

The same is true of the Epistle of Barnabas, which likewise got The epistle of Barnabas. into circulation under cover of an honored name, was even widely current for a time, especially at Alexandria, where it probably originated, and is found in connection with the "Shepherd" at the close of the famous Sinaitic manuscript. Clement of Alexandria held it to be a genuine work of the "Apostle Barnabas," and Origen dignifies it with the title of the "Catholic Epistle of Barnabas." But as we might expect from the character of the contents, which exhibit in all respects a complete contrast to the New Testament literature, as soon as the mere superficial hearsay gave place to actual discrimination through careful scrutiny, the churches were a unit in excluding it from the list of sacred books. Eusebius pronounces it a forgery; and Jerome, apocryphal. It never found a place in any of the early catalogues of the books of Scripture.

"The Shepherd," a work purporting to be written by still another The Shepherd of Her- mas. person, bearing the same name as one of Paul's companions, on account of its peculiar doctrinal teachings, attained to a position of considerable importance in the early Church. Origen

directly identifies its author with the Hermas of Rom. xvi. 14, and, personally, thought the book to be "divinely inspired" in an inferior sense, though admitting that it was not generally so regarded. Irenæus quotes it under the significant title of *γραφή* (sacred writing). And Clement of Alexandria also makes honorable mention of it. But no one now believes that the Hermas of Rom. xvi. 14 wrote the book. The Canon of Muratori (Rome, c. 160-170), whose author was likely to be much better informed than Origen, or Clement of Alexandria, says that it was written by a brother of Pius, Bishop at Rome (142-157), and does not esteem it worthy to be publicly read in the churches; while Tertullian declares that all (? in his region) reckon it "inter Apocrypha et falsa;"¹ Jerome, that it is almost unknown among the Latins; and Eusebius, though accounting the work of some value, placing it among the antilegomena, yet nowhere allows to it canonical authority. The latter fact is true, indeed, of all early writers who attempted definite lists of the Sacred Books. The temporary honor to which the work attained in certain places was wholly due to principles and reasons already stated.

The claim which this and the other writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers have to canonical recognition, on the ground of their style and internal characteristics generally, we leave to be stated by Bleek, who will not be charged with being unduly affected by prejudice (ii. 289). "The only writings of this class," he says, "about which there could be a question, are those of the Apostolic Fathers, who are mentioned in the New Testament as Christian teachers and helpers of the Apostles, — Barnabas, Clement of Rome, and Hermas. Barnabas, in particular, seems to have held a prominent position in the Church. But the epistle which bears his name is probably spurious, and its contents are paltry and frivolous, so that it is quite unworthy to be placed side by side with the New Testament writings. Clement and Hermas are too little prominent as fellow-workers with the Apostle, and we cannot place the same reliance in them as teachers, as, for example, in Apollos. The Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, — which alone of the writings extant bearing his name is probably genuine, — and 'The Shepherd,' which bears the name of Hermas as its author, are alike unfit if we consider their scope and range, together with their form, and especially the visionary character of the latter, to be regarded as constituent parts of the New Testament."

¹ De Pudic, x. 2.

INDICES.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

CONSULTED OR REFERRED TO IN THE PREPARATION
OF THIS MANUAL.

- ALFORD, HENRY, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. The Greek Testament; 4 vols. 8vo. London: Rivingtons. 1863.
- , —. Review of his Revised New Testament, Contemporary Review, February, 1870.
- ANDERSON, CHRISTOPHER. The Annals of the English Bible. Abridged and continued by Samuel Irenæus Prime. New York Robert Carter & Bros. 1849.
- , —. The Singular Introduction of the Bible into Britain, and its Consequences. 8vo, pp. 50. London: 1849.
- ANGUS, JOHN, D.D. The Bible Handbook. Philadelphia: 1857.
- APPLETON. Cyclopædia of Biography. New York: Appleton & Co. 1863.
- AUBERLEN, CARL AUGUSTUS. The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John. Translated by Adolph Saphir. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1856.
- AUGUSTINI, SANCTI AURELII, Opera Omnia. 11 vols. 4to. Paris: 1837.
- BABER, Rev. HENRY HERVEY, M.A. Memoirs of the Life, Opinions, and Writings of Dr. Wyclif; and an Historical Account of the Saxon and English versions of the Scriptures previous to the Fifteenth Century. Prefixed to Wyclif's version of the New Testament. 4to. London: 1810.
- BAPTIST QUARTERLY, October 1867, and April, 1871.
- BARROWS, Rev. E. P., D.D. Companion to the Bible. New York: American Tract Society.
- BARTLETT, Prof. S. C. The Independent (New York), May 25th, 1871.
- BEARD, JOHN R., D.D. A Revised English Bible, the Want of the Church, and the Demand of the Age. London: 1857.
- BEDE, VENERABLE. Complete Works. 12 vols. 8vo. London: 1844.

- BELLAMY, J. A Critical Examination of the Objections made to the New Translation [his own] of the Bible. London: 1820.
- BENTLEY, RICHARD, D.D. Sermons Preached at Boyle's Lecture. —, —. Proposals for an Edition of the Greek Testament, &c. Edited by Rev. Alexander Dyce. London: 1838.
- BIBLE OF EVERY LAND. A History of the Sacred Scriptures in Every Language and Dialect into which Translations have been made. Small 4to. London: Bagsters.
- BIBLE SOCIETY. Reports, 1832-1858. —, —. Manual Containing a Brief Sketch of the History, Operations, and Principles of the American Bible Society, &c. New York: 1865. —, —. Report on the History and Recent Collation of the English Version of the Bible. Committee on Versions. New York: 1851.
- BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1868.
- BLEEK, FRIEDRICH. An Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by William Urwick. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1869-70. —, —. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Edited by Adolf Kamphausen. Translated by J. H. Venables. 2 vols. London: Bell & Daldy. 1869.
- BLUNT, Rev. JOHN HENRY. The Reformation of the Church of England. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: 1868. —, —. A Plain Account of the English Bible from the Earliest Times of its Translation to the Present Day. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1870.
- BOSWORTH, Rev. JOSEPH. The Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels in Parallel Columns with the Versions of Wyclif and Tyndale. Arranged with Preface and Notes. 8vo, pp. 584. London: 1865.
- BRANTLEY, WILLIAM T., D.D. Objections to a Baptist Version of the New Testament. With Additional Reasons for Preferring the English Bible as It Is. By Octavius Winslow, D.D. New York: 1837.
- BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW. See QUARTERLY REVIEW.
- BROUGHTON, HUGH. The Works of the Great Albionean Divine, &c. fol. London: 1662.
- BURGESS, Rev. HENRY, LL.D. Revision of Translations of the Holy Scriptures. An Argument against Objectors. Reprinted from the Journal of Sacred Literature for January, 1857. London: 1857.
- BURNET, GILB. (Bp.) History of the Reformation. 2d edition. 2 vols. London: 1681.
- BUTLER, CHARLES. *Horæ Biblicæ*. Volume the First. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1845.
- CARDWELL, EDWARD, D.D. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. 2 vols. Oxford: 1844.

- CHANNING, WILLIAM E., D.D. Works. Eighth complete edition. 6 vols. Boston: James Munroe. 1848.
- CHARTERIS, A. H. Article on Canonicity. *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, February, 1871.
- CHEYNE, T. K. *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged, &c.* London: Macmillan & Co. 1870.
- , —. An Article on Revision, *Contemporary Review*, Vol. II., p. 141.
- CONANT, Mrs. H. C. *The English Bible, &c.* New York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.
- CONQUEST, J. T. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testaments, with nearly Twenty Thousand Emendations.* London: 1841.
- CONRAD, D. H. Address at Bible Convention. Richmond, Va.: 1856.
- CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. See ALFORD.
- COSIN, JOHN (Bp.). *Scholastical History of Canon.* 1657. Same also found in Vol. III., *Collected Works.* Oxford: 1849.
- COTTON, Rev. HENRY. Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof in English from the Year 1505 to 1850. 2d Edition Corrected and Enlarged. Oxford: 1852.
- COVERDALE, MILES. *Writings and Translations.* Edited for Parker Society. Cambridge: 1844.
- , —. *Remains.* Edited for Parker Society. 1846.
- COWLES, Rev. HENRY. *The Minor Prophets.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.
- COWPER, B. HARRIS. *The Apocryphal Gospels, &c.* London and Edinburgh: 1867.
- , —. *Codex Alexandrinus. Novum Testamentum Græce ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino.* London: 1860.
- COXE, A. C. (Bp.) Article in *New York Independent*, March 23d, 1871, and in April following.
- CRAIK, HENRY. *Hints and Suggestions on the Proposed Revision of our English Bible.* 2d Edition. London: Bagster & Sons. 1865.
- CREDNER, KARL AUGUST. *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanon.* Berlin: 1860.
- CUMMING, JOHN, D.D. Article against Revision. *The Times.* London: August 26th, 1856.
- DAVIDSON, SAMUEL, D.D. *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.* 2 vols. London: 1868.
- , —. *A Treatise on Biblical Criticism.* 2 vols. Boston: 1853.
- , —. *Sacred Hermeneutics Developed and Applied.* Edinburgh: 1843.
- , —. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* 3 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1863.
- DAY, Prof. GEORGE E. On Revision. *Theological Eclectic*, April, 1870.

- DELITZSCH, FRANZ, D.D. Commentary on Hebrews. Edinburgh: 1868.
- DEMAUS, Rev. R. William Tyndale. A Biography. A Contribution to the Early History of the English Bible. London: Religious Tract Society.
- DEWES, Rev. ALFRED. A Plea for a New Translation of the Scriptures. 8vo, pp. 80. London: 1866.
- DEWETTE, WILHELM MARTIN LEBERECHE. An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. Translated by F. Frothingham. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1858.
- , —. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by Theodore Parker. 2 vols. Boston: 1850.
- DILLMANN, A. Ueber die Bildung der Sammlung heil. Schrift. A. T. in Jahrbuch f. Deutsche Theol. pp. 419-491. 1858.
- DUNN, HENRY. The Study of the Bible, &c. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1871.
- EADIE, JOHN, D.D. LL.D. A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1869.
- EDINBURGH REVIEW. October, 1855. Article on Revision. July, 1851. Article on the Greek Text of the New Testament. July, 1865. Article on Revision of English Bible.
- EICHHORN, JOHANN GOTTFRIED. Einleitung in das Alte Test. Vierte Original-Ausgabe. Göttingen: 1823.
- ELLICOTT, C. J., D.D. Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament. London: 1870.
- , —. Commentary on Galatians, Ephesians, and Pastoral Epistles.
- ETHERIDGE, J. W. The Syrian Churches, &c., with a Literal Translation of the Four Gospels from the Peshito. London: 1846.
- EUSEBIUS. Ecclesiastical History. 4th Edition. London: Bagster. 1847.
- EWALD, HEINRICH. The History of Israel. Edited by Russell Martineau, M.A., and J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. 2d edition. 4 vols. London: 1869-71.
- EXAMINER, CHRISTIAN. Boston: March, 1869. Review of Dr. Noyes's Translation of the New Testament. May, 1869. Review of Westcott's History of English Bible. July, 1833. A Review of Several Works on Revision.
- FISHER, Rev. GEORGE P. Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.
- FORSALL, Rev. JOSIAH. The Holy Bible, &c., Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers. 4 vols. 4to. Oxford: 1850.
- FOX, JOHN. Acts and Monuments. Revised and Condensed by Rev. M. H. Seymour.

- FULKE.** Defence of Translators of the Bible. Edited for Parker Society. Cambridge: 1843.
- FULLER, THOMAS.** The Church History of Britain, from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the Year 1648, endeavored. London: 1655.
- FÜRST, Prof. Dr. JULIUS.** Der Kanon des Alten Testaments nach den Ueberlieferungen in Talmud und Midrasch. Leipzig: 1868.
- GAISFORD, Dean.** Letter to Sir Robert Inglis. 1855.
- GAUSSEN, Prof. L.** The Canon of the Holy Scripture. Translated by Edward N. Kirk, D.D. American Tract Society.
- GEDDES, Rev. ALEXANDER, LL.D.** Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible, &c. 4to. Glasgow: 1786.
- GEIGER, LUDWIG.** Das Studium der Hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland vom Ende des xv. bis zur Mitte des xvi. Jahrhunderts. Breslau: 1870.
- GELL, ROBERT, D.D.** An Essay Toward the Amendment of the Last English Translation of the Bible. London: 1659.
- GILMAN, Rev. EDWARD W.** Early Editions of the Authorized Version of the Bible. Bibliotheca Sacra. January, 1859.
- GLOAG, G. PATON, D.D.** A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1870.
- GORTON, JOHN.** A General Biographical Dictionary. New Edition in 4 vols. London: 1851.
- GREEN, Rev. T. S.** A Course of Developed Criticism, &c. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons.
- GUARDIAN, THE.** File for 1870.
- GUERICKE, HEINRICH ERNST FERDINAND.** Gesamtgeschichte des Neuen Testaments. Oder Neutestamentliche Isagogik, &c. Leipzig: 1854.
- GUTHRIE, Dr. THOMAS.** Article on Revising the English Translation of the Bible. Sunday Magazine, January, 1871.
- HACKETT, HORATIO B., D.D.** A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles. Boston: 1863.
- , —. American Edition of Smith's Bible Dictionary. Aided by Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D., and Others.
- , —. Address on Revision before the American Bible Union, October 6, 1859.
- HALLAM, HENRY.** Constitutional History of England. 3 vols. Boston: 1829.
- HÄVERNICK, H. A. CH.** A General Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. Edinburgh: 1852.
- HAY, Canon.** Speech before Convocation of York: February, 1870.
- HENDERSON, E., D.D.** The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets, &c. Andover: 1860.
- HENGSTENBERG, E. W., D.D.** Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with other Treatises. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. 1860

- HERZOG, Encyclopædia. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858.
- HEXAPLA, THE ENGLISH. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1841.
- HIGHTON, Rev. H. A Revised Translation of the New Testament. London: 1862.
- HILGENFELD, Prof. A. Der Kanon und die Kritik des Neuen Testaments, &c. Halle: 1863.
- HIND, SAMUEL, D.D. Scripture and the Authorized Version of Scripture, &c. 2d Edition. London: 1853.
- HOFMANN, Dr. J. CHR. K. VON. Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments, &c. Nördlingen. Erster Theil. 1862.
- HORNE, T. H. An Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures. 4 vols. 11th Edition. London: 1860.
- , —. An Introduction to the Study of Bibliography. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1814.
- HUG. Introduction to the New Testament. Andover: 1836.
- HUMPHRY, WILLIAM G. Article on Revision. Macmillan's Magazine, June, 1870.
- JAHN. Archæology. 5th Edition. New York: 1849.
- JEWETT, Rev. GEORGE B. Criticism on the Revision of the New Testament, by the American Bible Union. Congregational Review, September, 1868, January and March, 1869.
- JOHNSON, ANTHONY. An Historical Account of the Several English Translations, &c. London: 1730.
- , —. Watson's Theological Tracts. Vol. III.
- JONES, Rev. JEREMIAH. A New Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament. 3 vols. 8vo. Oxford: 1798.
- JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS. Works. 8vo. Baltimore: 1839.
- JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE. January, 1868.
- JOWETT, BENJAMIN, M.A. Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans. 2 vols. London: 1855.
- JUDSON, Rev. ADONIRAM. Letter on Revision. 1839.
- KEIL, KARL FRIEDRICH. Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871.
- KENDRICK, A. C., D.D. On Revision. Baptist Quarterly, April, 1871.
- KENNICOTT, BENJAMIN. State of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Considered, &c. Oxford: 1753.
- KITTO, JOHN, D.D. Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1865.
- KURTZ, J. H. History of the Old Covenant. 3 vols. 8vo. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.
- LANGE, Commentary (Translation). The Several Introductions.
- LARDNER, NATHANIEL, D.D. Works. 10 vols. London: 1838.
- LEATHES, Rev. STANLEY. Witness of St. Paul to Christ. Boyle's Lecture for 1869. Rivingtons.

- LEWIS, Rev. JOHN. A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible, &c. London: 1818.
- LIBRARY, Ante-Nicene Christian. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B., D.D. On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament. London and New York: 1871.
- LILLIE, Rev. JOHN. Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1869.
- LINGARD, Rev. JOHN. The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church. 1st Am. from 2d London edition. Philadelphia: 1841.
- MACKAY, R. W., M.A. The Tübingen School and its Antecedents. Edinburgh: 1863.
- MAIUS, ANGELUS. Codex Vaticanus. New York: Appleton & Co. 1859.
- MALAN, Rev. S. C. A Vindication of the Authorized Version. London: Bell & Daldy. 1856.
- MARSH, Hon. GEORGE P. Lectures on the English Language. New York: C. Scribner. 1860.
- , —. The English Language and its Early Literature. Do. 1862.
- , —. The Nation (New York), October 13th, 1870, and following.
- , HERBERT, D.D. A History of Translations, &c. London: 1812.
- M'CAUL, Rev. ALEXANDER, D.D. Reasons for Holding Fast, &c. Pamph. 8vo. pp. 51. London: 1857.
- MCCLELLAND, Prof. ALEXANDER. A Brief Treatise on the Canon and Interpretation of the Scripture. New York: 1850.
- MCCCLINTOCK, Rev. JOHN M., and JAMES STRONG. Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.
- MCCCLURE, A. W. The Translators Revived. New York: Charles Scribner. 1853.
- MCWHORTER, GEORGE CUMMING. A Popular Hand-book of the New Testament. New York: 1864.
- MICHAELIS, JOHN DAVID. Introduction to the New Testament. 4 vols. Cambridge: 1793.
- MOABITE STONE, THE. By Rev. B. F. De Costa. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1871.
- MURPHY, J. G., D.D. Commentary on Genesis. Andover: 1866.
- NATION, THE. October 13, 20, 27, 1870. Articles of George P. Marsh on Revision.
- NEWCOME, WILLIAM, D.D. An Historical View of English Biblical Translation, &c. Dublin: 1792.
- NEW ENGLAND MAGAZINE. Vol. V. 1833. A New Translation of the Bible.
- NORTON, ANDREWS. Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels. 3 vols. 8vo. 2d Edition. Cambridge: 1846-48.
- O'CALLAGHAN, P. B. A List of the Editions of the Holy Scripture,

- and Parts thereof printed in America previous to 1860. Albany 1861.
- OOSTERZEE, J. J. VAN, D.D. John's Gospel. Apologetical Lectures. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1869.
- PALEY, WILLIAM. Evidences of Christianity. Chapter IX.
- PALFREY, J. G. Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities. 4 vols. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1838-52.
- PANMURE, Lord. Speech in Edinburgh. The Witness, January 10, 1857.
- PARK, Rev. A. L. Italics of the English Bible. Congregationalist, April, 1872.
- PARKER, MATTHEW, D.D. Correspondence. Edited for Parker Society. Cambridge: 1853.
- PENN, GRANVILLE. The Book of the New Covenant, &c. A Critical Revision of the Text. 3 vols. 8vo. London: 1836-1841.
- PILKINGTON, MATTHEW, LL.B. Remarks on Several Passages of Scripture, &c. Cambridge: 1759.
- PLEA FOR A NEW ENGLISH VERSION OF THE SCRIPTURE. By a Licentiate of the Church of Scotland. London: Macmillan & Co. 1864.
- PRINCETON REVIEW. January, 1859; April, 1859; July, 1857; January, 1871. On Revision.
- QUARTERLY REVIEW. Vol. XIX. April-December, 1818. Bellamy's Translation of the Bible. Also Vol. XXIII. pp. 287-325.
- —, THE. April, 1870. The English Bible.
- —, THE BRITISH. January, 1870. Revision of the Authorized Version.
- RAWLINSON, GEORGE, M.A. Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records. Bampton Lecture. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.
- RAY, J. M. A Revised Translation and Interpretation of the Sacred Scripture after the Eastern Manner, &c. Glasgow: 1815.
- REMEMBRANCER, THE CHRISTIAN. Vol. XXXII. 1856. Revision of the Authorized Version of the English Bible.
- REPOSITORY, THE BIBLICAL, AND QUARTERLY OBSERVER. Vol. VI. 1835. Early English Versions of the Bible, by B. B. Edwards.
- REUSS, EDUARD. Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments. Vierte vermehrte und verbesserte Ausgabe. Braunschweig. 1864.
- ROBERTS, Rev. ALEXANDER. Discussions on the Gospels. London: 1862.
- ROSS, HUGH. An Essay for a New Translation of the Bible. 2d edition. London: 1727.
- ROTHSCHILD, C. and A. DE. The History and Literature of the Israelites. 2 vols. London: 1871.

- SATURDAY REVIEW, October 1, 1870. Tregelles's Greek New Testament. June 18, 1870. Review of Ellicott on Revision, &c.
- SCHAEFFER, Prof. CHARLES F. Exegetical Punctuation of the New Testament. Bibliotheca Sacra. October, 1868. The English Version of the New Testament. Id. July, 1869.
- SCHAFF, PHILIP, D.D. Introduction to Lange's Commentary on John. American Edition. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1872.
- , —. History of the Christian Church. Do. 1859.
- SCHOLEFIELD, Rev. JAMES. Hints for some Improvements in the Authorised Version of the New Testament. 4th edition. London: 1857.
- SCHUMANN, A. An Introduction to the Books of the Old and New Testaments. London: 1849.
- SCRIVENER, Rev. F. H. A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. 1861.
- , —. Contributions to the Criticism of the Greek New Testament. 1859.
- , —. A Full and Exact Collation of about Twenty Greek MSS., &c. 1853.
- , —. A Full Collation of the Sinaiticus with the Received Text. London: 1864.
- SELWYN, Prof. A Letter to Lord Shaftesbury. The Times (London). February 24, 1870.
- SHARPE, GRANVILLE. Remarks on the Use of the Definite Article, &c. 3d Edition. 1803.
- , SAMUEL. Critical Notes on the Authorized Version of the New Testament. London: 1856.
- SHEA, JOHN GILMARY. A Bibliographical Account of the Catholic Bibles, Testaments, &c., printed in the United States. New York: 1859.
- SMITH, WILLIAM, LL.D. A Dictionary of the Bible. 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1860.
- , —. Student's Scripture History; Old Testament and New Testament. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.
- , G. VANCE. Speech quoted in New York Tribune, June 3, 1872.
- SOAMES, HENRY. The Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times. London: 1848.
- SPECTATOR, CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY. December, 1833. Review of Noah Webster's Revision of the Bible.
- STANLEY, ARTHUR PENRHYN, D.D. Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians. 3d edition. London: 1865.
- , —. History of Jewish Church. 1st series. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.
- , —. Id. 2d series. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

- STOWE, C. E., D.D. *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible.* Hartford Publishing Company: 1867.
- STRYPE. *Life of Whitgift.* 3 vols. Oxford: 1822.
- , —. *Life of Archbishop Grindal.* Oxford: 1821.
- STUART, MOSES, Prof. *Commentary on Ecclesiastes.* New York: Putnam. 1851.
- , —. *Commentary on Proverbs.* New York: Dodd. 1852.
- SYMONDS, JOHN, LL.D. *Observations upon the Expediency of Revising the Present English Version, &c.* 4to. Cambridge: 1789.
- TAYLOR, ISAAC. *History of Transmission of Ancient Books, &c.* London: 1859.
- , —. *Process of Historical Proof.* London: 1828.
- THOLUCK, DR. AUGUSTUS. *Commentary on John.* Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. 1859.
- TISCHENDORF, CONSTANTINE. *When were Our Gospels Written.* Boston: Massachusetts Sunday-School Society.
- , —. *Monumenta Sacra Inedita.* 1855-70.
- , —. *Tauchnitz Edition of the New Testament.* Leipsic: 1869.
- , —. *Codex Vaticanus, post Angeli Maii Aliorumque Imperfectos Labores ex Ipso Codice.* Leipsic: 1867.
- TODD, REV. HENRY JOHN, M.A. *A Vindication of Our Translation and Translators of the Bible, &c.* London: 1819.
- TOMLINSON, ROBERT. *Attempt to Rescue the Holy Scriptures from Ridicule, &c., by a New Translation.* London: 1805.
- TREGELLES, SAMUEL PRIDEAUX, LL.D. *An Account of the Printed Text of the New Testament, &c.* London: 1864.
- , —. *A Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament.* London: 1852.
- TRENCH, RICH. CHENEVIX, D.D. *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament.* New York: Redfield. 1858.
- , —. *The Same.* 2d Edition. London: 1859.
- TURNER, SHARON, F.A.S. *History of the Anglo-Saxons.* 2d edition. 2 vols. London: 1807.
- TWELLS, LEONARD. *A Critical Examination of the Late New Text and Version of the New Testament* [edited by Dr. Mace]. London: 1731.
- TYNDALE, WILLIAM. *The New Testament.* Original Edition of 1526, with a Memoir. Andover: 1837.
- , —. *Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogues.* Edited for Parker Society. Cambridge: 1850.
- , —. *Doctrinal Treatises and Introduction to Different Portions of Scripture.* Do. 1848.
- , —. *Expositions and Notes.* Do. 1849.

- WALTER, HENRY, F.R.S. Letter to the Right Reverend Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, on the Independence of the Authorized Version of the Bible. London: 1823.
- WALTER, J. CONWAY, B.A. Genuineness of the Book of Daniel, &c. London: 1863.
- WEBSTER, WILLIAM, and WILLIAM FRANCIS WILKINSON. The Greek New Testament. 2 vols. London: 1855-61.
- WESTCOTT, BROOKE FOSS, M.A. A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament during the First Four Centuries. 2d edition. Cambridge: 1866.
- , —. An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. London: 1860.
- , —. The Bible in the Church. 2d Edition. London: 1866.
- , —. A General View of the History of the English Bible. London and Cambridge: 1868.
- WESTMINSTER REVIEW. January, 1857. Revision of the English Bible.
- WHITAKER, WILLIAM, D.D. A Disputation on Holy Scripture against the Papists, &c. Edinburgh: Parker Society. 1849.
- WILLIAMS, ROWLAND, D.D. Hebrew Prophets Translated afresh from the Original, &c. Vol. I. London and Edinburgh: 1866.
- WINER, GEORGE BENEDICT. A Grammar of New Testament Diction. Translated from the sixth enlarged edition. Philadelphia: 1860.
- WOOLSEY, Ex-President, T.D. On Revision. Independent, February 1, 1872.
- WORDSWORTH, CHRISTOPHER, D.D. On the Canon of the Old and New Testament. Philadelphia: 1854. Hulsean Lecture for 1847-48. From the last revised London edition.
- WYCKOFF, Dr. WILLIAM H. Address in the Bible Union Quarterly, November, 1869, and February, 1870, on Revision.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE CITED OR ILLUSTRATED.

	PAGE		PAGE
Gen. iii. 7	59	2 Sam. i. 17, 18	328
Exod. i. 19	72	" i. 18	307
" xvi. 3	385	" iii. 18	328
" xxiv. 3, 4, 7	296	" v. 4	306
Numb. xi. 29	385	" v. 5	308
Deut. xvii. 18	272	" v. 6-9	303
" xxviii. 67	385	" vii. 12-16	308
" xxxi. 9, 24, 25	296	" viii. 15-18	308
Josh. i. 1	301	" xvi. 16	385
" i. 18	301	" xvii.	272
" ii. 22	301	1 Kings, ii. 11	308
" iii. 7	301	" iv. 1-6	308
" iv. 2	301	" iv. 32	319
" viii. 31	301	" viii. 18, 25	308
" xiii. 1-6	301	" xi. 41	308
" xiv. 26	301	" xii.	308
" xv. 13-19	301	" xiv. 29	309
" xviii. 3	301	2 Kings, vi. 5	308
" xix. 47	302	" xi. 12	285, 385
" xxiv. 26	285	" xiv. 25	336
" xxiv. 31	302	" xvii.	308
Judges, i. 10, 15	301	" xviii.	327
" i. 21	303	" xviii. 13	286
" i. 22	302	" xxii. 8	272, 285
" ii. 1-5	302	" xxiii. 6	383
" ii. 7	302	1 Chron. ix	313
" v.	302	" xxiv. 16	328
" ix. 7-20	302	" xxix. 22	307
" ix. 53	383	2 Chron. xvii. 7-9	285
Ruth, iv. 7, 18-22	305	" xxiv. 14	285
1 Sam. i. 1	305	" xxiv. 20	278
" i-xii.	306	" xxix. 30	287
" vi. 18	307	" xxxii. 32	309
" vii. 9, 10, 12, 17	307	" xxxv. 25	328
" ix. 1	305	Ezra, i. 2-4	325
" ix. 13	307	" iv. 8	263
" x. 24	385	" iv. 24	339
" x. 25	272, 285	" vi. 18	263, 272
" xiv. 35	307	Neh. viii. 1	272
" xxvii. 6	307	" xi. 13	313

	PAGE
Neh. xii. 1-26	314
" xiii.	342
Esther, iii. 2	315
" iv. 1-3, 14, 16	315
" ix. 20	316
" ix. 22	279
Psalms, i. 1	385
" xiv.	272
" xviii.	272
" xxxvii. 1	384
" xl. 14	384
" xlii. 7	384
" liii.	272
" lv. 17	331
" lxx. 2	384
" lxxii. 20	319
" lxxviii. 53-65	301
Prov. xxiii. 23	385
" xxiv. 19	384
Eccl. i. 12, 16	321
" ii. 9	321
" iv. 8	321
" v. 7	321
" v. 15	279
" viii. 9	321
" x. 4, 16-19	321
" xii. 9-14	321
" xii. 12	286
" xii. 13	322
Isa. xxviii. 21	301
Jer. vii. 2	326
" vii. 11	328
" ix. 24	328
" x. 1-16	327
" xi. 21	326
" xxvi. 1	326
" xxvi. 18	286
" xxvi. 18	337
" xxviii. 15	328
" xxviii. 31	328
" xxxvi. 32, 33	326
" xxxviii. 33, 34	328
Ezek. i. 2	328
" i. 3	328
" xiv. 14, 20	318
" xiv. 14, 20	332
" xxiv. 17	329
" xxvi. 1	328
" xxviii. 3	332
" xxx. 20	328
Dan. ii. 42, vii.	263
" ix. 2	286
" ix. 2, 11, 13	272
Hos. v. 13	336
Joel, iv. 4-6	334

	PAGE
Amos, i. 1	334
" i. 6-10	334
" iv. 6-9	334
Obad. v. 20	335
Jonah, ii. 3	384
Mic. iii. 12	337
Nahum, i. 9, 11	338
" ii. 3	338
Hab. i. 2-17	338
" i. 5, 6	338
" iii. 11-13	301
" iii. 16	338
Zeph. i. 1	339
" iii. 10	339
Hag. i. 12-15	340
Zech. i. 1	340
" ii. 4	340
" vii. 12	286
" xi. 12	388
" xi. 12, 13	341
" xiv. 5	334
Mal. ii. 8	342
" iii. 7-12	342
" iii. 22, 23	286
Matt. ii. 18	328
" iii. 3	325
" v. 37	382
" vi. 19	383
" viii. 2	382
" viii. 9-13	16, 38
" viii. 14	236
" viii. 29	12
" x. 4	388
" xi. 10	342
" xii. 30	384
" xii. 35	386
" xiii. 25	383
" xiv. 8	382
" xvii. 4	382
" xvii. 11	342
" xix. 17	389
" xxi. 13	328
" xxii. 35	278
" xxiii. 8	382
" xxiv. 4	384
" xxiv. 15	332, 384
" xxv. 31	332
" xxvi. 15	388
" xxvi. 39	194
" xxvi. 64	332
" xxvi. 73	382
" xxvii. 9	341
" xxvii. 21	389
Mark, i. 2	342
" iii. 13	383

	PAGE		PAGE
Mark, iv. 29	388	Acts, xii. 4	386
" vi. 25	383	" xii. 12	191
" vi. 26	386	" xii. 15	382
" ix. 11, 12	342	" xii. 35	191
" ix. 29	389	" xiv. 6, 7, 21	221
" ix. 39	383	" xv. 23	143
" x. 18	389	" xv. 36	191
" xi. 17	385	" xvi.	215
" xiii. 5	384	" xvi. 1	221
" xiii. 14	384	" xvi. 10	193
" xiii. 28	388	" xvii. 1	219
" xvi. 9-20	388	" xvii. 3	382
Luke, i. 17	342	" xvii. 4	382
" ii. 33	388	" xvii. 23	386
" iv. 17	325	" xviii. 5	219
" iv. 25-27	309	" xix. 15	387
" iv. 38	236	" xix. 22	221
" vii. 1	382	" xx.	215
" ix. 13	342	" xx. 3	209
" x. 7	193, 201	" xx. 11	219
" x. 16	386	" xxi. 15	382
" x. 40	383	" xxi. 17	193
" xi. 23	384	" xxiii. 15	221, 383
" xi. 51	278	" xxiv. 25	383
" xiii. 7	386	" xxv. 23	193
" xiv. 7	387	" xxvii. 1-28	193
" xviii. 13	386	" xxviii. 16	215
" xviii. 19	389	Rom. i. 29-32	208
" xxii. 14, 42, 44	194	" ii. 18	382
" xxiii. 42	387	" iii. 3, 31	386
" xxiii. 46	194	" iv. 8	236
John, i. 9; ii. 4	202	" vi. 6	386
" i. 18	388	" vi. 12	388
" iii. 5	198	" vii. 2, 6	386
" iii. 10	386	" vii. 7	386
" iv. 29	387	" viii. 14	386
" v. 1	314	" viii. 22	166
" vi. 46, 47	294	" xi. 2, 4	309
" vi. 51	201	" xi. 20, 21	208
" viii. 58	387	" xiii. 1-7	225
" x. 16	52, 387	" xiv. 10-12	211
" xiv. 16	382	" xiv. 12	208
" xviii. 37	383	" xvi. 16	153
" xxi. 24	200	" xvi. 21	221
Acts, ii. 27, 31	387	i Cor. i. 4, 7	381
" ii. 47	77	" i. 19	386
" vii. 45	301	" i. 31	328
" viii. 28	325	" ii. 14, 15	387
" viii. 37	83, 127	" iii. 10	386
" ix. 5, 6	83, 127	" iii. 17	386
" ix. 26	382	" iii. 19	381
" x. 14	382	" iv. 3, 5	387
" x. 30	389	" iv. 4	382
" x. 34	382	" iv. 8	385
" xi. 26	204	" iv. 12	210

	PAGE		PAGE
1 Cor. v. 7	210	Eph. iv. 26	214
" vi. 2	209	" v. 4	382
" vi. 13	210	" v. 20, 21	215
" vii. 37	381	" vi. 12	67
" viii. 1	210	" vi. 21	226
" viii. 5	389	Phil. i. 1	221
" ix. 3	387	" ii. 13	386
" ix. 5	236	" iii. 12	382
" ix. 27	381	" iii. 12-14	217
" x. 1	382	" iv. 3	169
" x. 25, 27	387	" iv. 18	217
" xi. 1	382	Col. i. 1	221
" xi. 13	166	" i. 15-17	218
" xi. 27	381	" ii. 12, 19	386
" xii. 3	383	" iv. 7, 9, 17	226
" xiii. 1	32	" iv. 10	191, 388
" xiii. 10	386	" iv. 14	218, 224
" xiv. 16	383	" iv. 16	151
" xiv. 20	387	" iv. 18	206
" xvi. 8	210	1 Thess. ii. 6, 7, 11	220
" xvi. 21	206	" iii. 6	219, 221
2 Cor. i. 12	211	" iv. 16	386
" i. 23	388	" v. 2, 23	220
" ii. 13	225	" v. 17, 22	219
" iv. 5	211	2 Thess. i. 6	386
" v. 10	211	" ii. 1-12, 15	220
" vi. 9	211	" iii. 15, 17	220
" vi. 12	382	" iii. 17	206
" vii. 6, 13, 14	225	1 Tim. i. 9	223
" viii. 6, 16, 17, 23	225	" ii. 4	223
" x. 3	211	" ii. 23	383
" x. 5	388	" iii. 16	223, 388
" xi. 1	385	" iv. 12, 13	382
" xi. 9	211	" v. 12	386
" xii. 4	166	" v. 18	201
" xii. 18	225	" vi. 7	279
Gal. i. 10	386	" vi. 10	223
" i. 18; ii. 9	196	" vi. 12, 13	386
" ii. 21	386	2 Tim. i. 4	224
" iii. 10	386	" i. 8, 12, 16	223
" iii. 15, 16	386	" i. 16, 17	224
" iii. 24	212	" ii. 9	223
" iv. 12	212	" ii. 12, 13; 23	224
" iv. 17	382	" iv. 6-8, 16, 17	224
" iv. 23	382	" iv. 9, 21	224
" iv. 26	211	" iv. 10, 12	224
" v. 20, 21	212	Titus. i. 4, 5	225
" v. 24	382	" iii. 1, 12	225
" vi. 6	382	" iii. 10, 11	226
Eph. i. 6	383	Philem. 1, 2, 9, 18	226
" ii. 3	386	" 1	221
" ii. 8, 9	214	" 8, 9	227
" iv. 2	386	" 24	224
" iv. 11, 12, 13	215	Heb. i. 34	230
" iv. 22, 24	215	" ii. 9	388

	PAGE		PAGE
Heb. iii. 2	384	1 Peter, iv. 7	238
" iv. 7	387	" iv. 12, 14, 17	237
" iv. 8	301	" v. 13	191
" iv. 35	384	" vi. 1-5	237
" v. 12-14	231	2 Peter, i. 2, 14, 15	240
" viii. 8	328	" i. 19	241
" ix. 13	231	" ii. 6-9	173
" x. 16, 17	328	" ii. 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18	240
" x. 38	77	" ii. 6, 9, 22	241
" xi. 34	34	" iii. 1	238
" xi. 35	309	" iii. 5, 8, 15	241
" xi. 37	230	" iii. 10, 12	242
James, i. 6, 16	235	" iii. 5-7, 15	173
" ii. 23	235	" iii. 16	143, 240
" ii. 25	301	1 John, i. 1	245
" iii. 5	388	" i. 1-4	244
" iv. 7	235	" iv. 1-3, 8, 15	245
" v. 11	281, 318	" iv. 11, 14, 19	244
" v. 17-18	309	" v. 7	388
" vi. 4	236	" viii. 46	383
1 Peter, i. 4	238	2 John, 12	94
" i. 8-14	237	3 John, 13	94
" i. 13	384	Jude, 3, 5, 6, 11	251
" i. 15	382	" 9, 14	279
" ii. 1-5	238	Rev. i. 1, 4, 9	253
" ii. 11, 12, 24	238	" iv. 4	386
" iii. 7	384	" xi. 6	309
" iii. 9	382	" xi. 10	279
" iii. 16	237	" xxii. 8	253

GENERAL INDEX.

A.

Accentuation of MSS., 104.
Acts of the Apostles, 203-205.
Adumbrations, 250.
Ἀγάπη, 32.
Age of MSS., 104.
Ἀώης, 387.
Alcala Bible, 125.
Aldhelm, 4.
Aldred, 5.
Alexander, 249.
Alexandria, 91.
Alexandrinus. See *Codex*.
Alford, 135, 187, 190, 191, 193, 216, 234, 237, 250, 372.
Alfred, 5.
Allen, 65.
Ἀλογία, 199, 257.
Alphabetic Writing, 264.
Alter, 132.
Amanuenses, 96.
Amphilochius, 258.
Ancient Syriac Documents, 117.
Anderson Annals, 20, 21, 28, 31, 33, 45, 71, 83.
Anglo-Saxon Translations, 3-5.
Ante-Hieronymian Version, 3, 232, 248.
Ἀντιλεγόμενα, 173, 176.
Apocalypse, 183, 253-259.
Apocrypha in Eng. Bib., 82, 83.
Apocryphal Books, 146, 159, 176, 398.
Apollonius, 257.
Aquila, Version of. See *Version*.
Arabic Version. See *Version*.
Armenian Version. See *Version*.
Article, The definite, 385.
Athanasius, Canon of, 178, 179.
Augustin, 3.
Augustine, 141, 175, 180, 233, 249.
Authorized Version. See *Version*.
Autolycus, 223.

B.

Baber, 8, 9, 10, 15.
Bancroft, 73, 78.
Baptist Quarterly, 96.
Barker, 61, 75, 82.
Barnabas, 145, 168, 190, 235.
Barrows, 165.
Bartlett, 367.
Basilides, 166, 201.
Basilienensis. See *Codex*.
Bauer, 216.
Baumgarten, 315.
Bayfield, 33.
Beard, 24.
Bede, 4.
Bengel, 131.
Bentley, 113, 114, 130.
Beza, 59, 60, 128. See *Codex*.
Bible, The Great, 49-53.
Bible Society Record, 349.
Bible Society Reports, 361.
Bibliotheca Sacra, 4, 87.
Bilney, 33.
Bishops' Bible, 60-65.
Blackwall, 359.
Blayney, 82, 359.
Bleek, Friedrich, 148, 149, 156, 157, 159, 161, 165, 197, 199, 202, 213, 229, 233, 234, 237, 244, 250, 255, 263, 266, 267, 270, 274, 275, 279, 283, 296, 319, 339, 342.
Blunt, 24.
Bodley, 58.
Boniface, 38.
Bosworth, 4.
Brantley, 346.
Bretschneider, 197.
Bristow, 66.
Britain, Ancient, 3.
British Quarterly Review, 371.
Broughton, 358.

Bunsen, 248, 250.
Burgess, 366.
Burgon, 388.

C.

Caedmon, 4.
Caius, 257.
Calvin, 56, 57.
Calvinism in England, 77-78.
Campbell, 359.
Canon, New Testament, 140.
——, Old Testament, 277.
——, A twofold, 185.
Cardwell, Documentary Annals, 54, 55, 58,
59, 61, 72, 73, 74.
Carthage, Council of, 259.
Cassiodorus, 248.
Catalogues of New Testament books, 182.
"Catholic Epistles," 233.
Caxton, 15.
Channing, 364.
Chapters and Verses, 59.
Cheke, 55.
Cheyne, 324, 369.
Christian Examiner, 7.
Chrysostom, 96.
Clement of Alexandria, 153, 203, 209, 211,
215, 217, 218, 220, 221, 223, 224, 226, 231,
238, 244, 243, 250, 251, 257.
Clement of Rome, 145, 169, 171, 207, 209,
215, 223, 225, 230, 235.
Clementine Homilies, 165, 202.
Cochlæus, 28.
Codex, Alexandrinus, 102, 107.
——, Basilienis, 109.
——, Bezae, 249.
——, Colbertinus, 109, 110.
——, Leicestrensis, 109.
——, Sinaiticus, 106.
——, Vaticanus, 107.
Cohortatio ad Græcos, 204.
Colbertinus. See Codex.
Cole, 56.
Collins, 254.
Colossæ, 217.
Colossians, Epistle to the, 217, 218.
Complutensian Polyglot, 125.
Conant, J. T., 126, 365.
Conant, H. C., 18, 71.
Congregational Review, 371.
Conrad, 348.
Constantinopolitan Bible, 178.
Contemporary Review, 369.
Convocation of Oxford, 13.

Coptic Version. See Version, Egyptian.
Corinthians, I., II., 209-211.
Cosin, 141, 179.
Council of Constance, 9.
Council of Laodicea, 258.
Councils, Early, 180.
Coverdale, 40-44, 49-53.
Cowper, 102, 404.
Coxe, 356.
Craik, 31, 57, 68, 345.
Credner, 142, 143, 145, 149, 151, 159, 190, 195,
247.
Cumming, 349.
Cursives, 108-110.
Curtis, 361.
Cyprian, 233, 251, 257.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 258.

D.

Dabney, Memoir of Tyndale, 27, 31, 35.
Δαμόνιον, 387.
Davidson, 98, 114, 163, 166, 169, 171, 190,
197, 198, 202, 203, 204, 212, 218, 234, 238,
250, 254, 257, 263, 267.
Day, 347.
Delitzsch, 325.
Demaus, 22, 28, 30.
De Wette, Introduction to New Testament,
104, 110, 113, 137, 187, 209, 218, 233, 234,
236, 250.
——, Introduction to Old Testament, 263,
272, 283, 291, 294, 301, 306, 308, 329, 338,
341.
Διάβολος, 387.
Dillmann, 276, 278, 282, 284, 286, 288.
Diocletian Persecution, 174, 252.
Diognetus, Epistle to, 165, 202, 204, 209, 211,
212, 215, 223, 225, 238, 244.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 232, 248, 258.
Dionysius of Corinth, 219, 231.
Doddridge, 359.
Donatus, Schism of, 252.
Doway Bible, 65-69.
Dublin Review, 69.
Dunn, 78.

E.

Eadie, 211.
Ebrard, 246.
Edinburgh Review, 365.
Egyptian Versions. See Version.
Eichhorn, Einleitung, 281, 282.
Ἐκκλησία, 64.

Ellicott, 15, 24, 36, 43, 49, 51, 56, 63, 78, 83,
84, 377, 381.
Elucidarium Bibliorum, 8, 12.
Elzevirs, 128, 129.
Ephesians, Epistle to the, 212-215.
Epistles of Paul, 206, 207.
Erasmus, 18, 26.
Etheridge, 116.
Ethiopic Version. See Version.
Eusebius, 149, 152, 153, 160, 167, 175-177,
189, 192, 196, 231, 232, 236, 239, 246, 248,
251, 252, 255, 257.
Euthalius, 103.
Ezra, 288.
Ewald, 265, 295, 296, 304, 308, 327.

F.

Firmilian, 241.
Fisher, 164, 198, 202.
Forshall, 8.
Foxe, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 25, 46.
Froude, 24.
Fryth, 25, 34.
Fulke, 66.
Fuller, 9, 23, 31.
Fürst, 278, 285, 287, 289, 293, 304, 318, 320,
322.

G.

Gaisford, 369.
Galatians, Epistle to the, 211, 212.
Gardner, 19.
Γέεννα, 387.
Geneva, 56.
Genevan Version. See Version.
Gell, 357.
"Genuineness," Meaning of, 140.
Gilby, 56.
Gilman, 360.
Gloag, 204.
Goodman, 56.
Gospels and Acts, 186-188.
Gospels, Origin of, 187.
Gothic Version. See Version.
Greek, first printed, 125.
Greek Language in New Testament, 91-93.
Greek Text of Erasmus, 126-227.
Greek Text of Griesbach, 130.
Green, 348.
Gregory, The Great, 3.
Guardian, The, 348, 371.
Guericke, Isagogik, 104, 140, 146, 149, 170,
202.
Guest, 64.

Guthlac, 4.
Guthrie. See Sunday Magazine.

H.

Hackett, 205, 367, 368.
Hallam, 24, 43.
Hampton Court Conference, 72.
Hare, 368.
Harleian Miscellany, 28.
Hävernick, 265, 272, 285, 288.
Hay, 372.
Haywood, 389.
Hebraisms in New Testament, 92, 93.
Hebrew Language, 263.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 183.
Hegesippus, 195, 204.
Henderson, 336, 341.
Hengstenberg, 321.
Heracleon, 224.
Herculaneum, Rolls of, 97.
Hereford, 10.
Heretics, Testimony of, 183.
Hermas, 235, 238.
Herzog, Encyclopædia, 181, 199, 202, 233,
246, 263, 264, 271, 273, 282, 285, 301, 311,
313, 318, 322, 325.
Hexapla, English, 4, 12, 13, 18, 20, 34, 46,
52, 72.
———, of Origen, 269.
Hilgenfeld, 142, 143, 145, 147, 149, 150, 151,
153, 155, 161, 164, 165, 167, 168, 171, 183,
190, 195, 201, 233, 247, 248, 256.
Hinds, 363, 382.
Hippo, Council of, 259.
Historical Proof, 141.
Hodge, 213.
Hofmann, 177.
Homologoumena, 175.
Hooker, 77.
Horne, Introduction, 93, 111, 112, 132, 134,
138, 308, 321.
———, Introduction to Bibliography, 96.
Hug, Introduction, 126, 131.
Humphry, 369, 370.

I.

Ignatius, 95, 145, 162, 169, 171, 204, 214, 224,
227, 235.
Initial letters of MSS., 108.
Irenæus, 151, 152, 153, 190, 203, 208, 209,
211, 212, 215, 217, 218, 220, 223, 224, 226,
235, 238, 241.
"Itala," The, 3.
Italics, 53, 59, 383.

J.

- Jahn, Archæology, 265.
 James, Epistle of, 233, 236.
 Jerome, 122, 180, 233, 248, 249, 252, 258.
 Jewett, 371.
 John, I., II., III., 243-245.
 John, Gospel of, 195-203.
 Johnson, Historical Account, 4, 47, 87.
 Josephus, 279-281, 325.
 Journal of Sacred Literature, 274.
 Joye, 21, 29-30.
 Jude, Epistle of, 249-252.
 Judson, 363.
 Justin Martyr, 163-165, 190, 192, 194, 198,
 201, 208, 209, 212, 216, 218, 221, 230,
 241, 255.

K.

- Keil, Introduction to Old Testament, 264,
 273, 282, 297, 302, 303, 305, 312, 316, 317,
 319, 321, 325, 327, 330, 341.
 Kendrick, 229, 382.
 Kennicott, 358.
 Kennicott and De Rossi, Coll., 229, 267, 382.
 Kenrick, 69.
 "Keris," 275.
 Kilby, 86.
 Knyghton, 12.
 Kurtz, Old Covenant, 263, 271, 299.

L.

- Lachmann, Greek text of, 132.
 Lange, 225, 234, 299.
 Latin versions of New Testament. See Ver-
 sion.
 Laud, 58.
 Laurence, 64.
 Lectionaries, 100.
 Leicestrensis. See Codex.
 Letter from Churches of Vienne and Lyons,
 223, 257.
 Lewis, History of Translations, 8, 12, 27.
 Lexicography, Errors in, 388.
 Licentiate of Church of Scotland, 375, 383,
 384.
 Lightfoot, 378, 383, 386, 393.
 Lingard, 3.
 Lord's Prayer, by Tyndale, 38.
 Lord's Prayer, by Wyclif, 16.
 Lowth, 360.
 Luke, Gospel of, 192-195.

M.

- Macmillan's Magazine, 370.
 Malan, 350.
 Malchion, 252.
 Manuscript Bible, 14.
 Manuscripts, New Testament, 96-114.
 Manuscripts, Old Testament, 266, 267.
 Marcion, 148, 194, 213, 216, 218.
 Mark, Gospel of, 191, 192.
 Marsh, Bishop, 24.
 Marsh, George P., 6, 7, 12, 15, 36, 88, 352-
 353, 382, 392.
 Martin, 66, 68.
 Martin V., 9.
 Martineau, 373.
 Martyrdom of Polycarp, 225.
 Masora, The, 274, 275.
 Matthew *alias* Rogers, 44-47.
 Matthew, Gospel of, 189, 190.
 Matthew Parker's Bible, 62.
 Mayerhoff, 218.
 M'Caul, 347.
 McDougall, 364.
 Melito of Sardis, 238, 242, 256.
 "Methodist," The, 394.
 Michaelis, Introduction of, 3, 96.
 Middleton, 362.
 Mill, Greek text of, 130.
 Moabite Stone, 264, 265.
 More, 7, 20, 21, 27, 31, 32, 33.
 Munmouth, 19.
 Murphy, 300.

N.

- Nägelsbach, 327.
 Nehemiah, 288.
 Nicholas de Hereford, 10.
 Noaille, 47.
 Norton, 110, 199.
 Notation, Manuscript, 99.
 Number of MSS., 100.

O.

- "Obedience of Christian Man," 21.
 Obsolete words, 382.
 O'Callaghan, 69.
 Oehler, 278, 279, 285, 286.
 Old Testament in New, 278, 279.
 Olshausen, 216, 218.
 Onkelos, Targum of, 270.
 Oosterzee, 197, 199, 201.
 Origen, 160, 161, 172, 173, 232, 242, 248, 251.
 Ormulum, 6.

P.

Palfrey, 299.
 Palimpsest, 98.
 Panmure, 351.
 Pantænus, 231.
 Papias, 166, 168, 192, 195, 201, 238, 244
 Papyrus, 94.
 Parallel passages, 384.
 Park, 383.
 Paul, Epistles of, 206, 207.
 Pentateuch, 285.
 Persic Versions. See Version.
 Peshito Version. See Version.
 Peter at Rome, 237.
 Peter, I., II., 236-243.
 Philemon, Epistle to, 226.
 Philippians, 215.
 Philips, 19.
 Philo, 282.
 Pinytus, 231.
 Plumtre, 36, 321.
 Polycarp, 143, 145, 168, 169, 171, 201, 204,
 208, 209, 211, 214, 219, 220, 223, 224, 238,
 241, 244, 250.
 Poynitz, 30.
 Preface to English Bible, 81.
 Princeton Review, 369.
 Proper Names, 384.
 Psalter of Great Bible, 52.
 Purver, 359.
 Purvey, 12, 13, 14.
 Pusey, 354.

R.

Rawlinson, Historical Evidences, 293, 294,
 298, 300, 302, 311, 316.
 Ray, 362.
 "Readings," Various, 110-114.
 Rennell, 345.
 Reuss, 91, 92, 94, 96, 112, 142, 143, 144, 149,
 150, 156, 157, 159, 167, 168, 181, 195, 234.
 Revision, Committee of, 390, 391.
 Revision of English Bible, 82. App. A.
 Reynolds, 66.
 Rhemish Bible, 65-69.
 Roberts, 92.
 Rogers, 30, 44-47.
 Rolle, 6.
 Romans, Epistle to the, 207-209.
 Ross, 358.
 Rouen, 66.
 Roye, 28.
 Rushworth Gloss, 5.

S.

Samaritan Scriptures, 283.
 Sampson, 56.
 Saturday Review, 135, 394.
 Saxon Compounds, 6.
 Saxon Versions. See Version.
 Schaeffer, 361.
 Schaff, 93, 374.
 Schleiermacher, 237.
 Scholefield, 351.
 Scholz, Greek text of, 132.
 Schumann, Introduction, 183.
 Scrivener, 100, 105, 134.
 Selden, Works, 28.
 Selwyn, 372, 389.
 Septuagint Version. See Version.
 Shaftesbury, 355, 372.
 Sharpe, 361.
 Shea, Biograph. Account, 65, 66.
 Sinaiticus. See Codex.
 Slavonic Version. See Version.
 Smith, Bible Dictionary, 13, 52, 77, 83, 91,
 117, 130, 132, 134, 135, 213, 234, 254, 264,
 270, 291, 312, 325, 331.
 Smith, Dr. Miles, 77.
 Smith, Professor Payne, 369, 373.
 Smith, Rev. G. Vance, 380, 394.
 Soames, Latin Church, 3.
 Society, Religious Tract, 370.
 Son of Sirach, 287.
 Spalatinus, 20.
 Stanley, 209, 293, 381.
 Stephens, 59, 127.
 Stichometry, 103.
 Stonington Union Association, 361.
 Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, 19.
 Stuart, 321.
 Style of English Version, 88.
 Sunday Magazine, 375.
 Swedish Bible, 368.
 Symmachus Version. See Version.
 Symonds, 360.
 Synod of Dort, 80.
 "Synoptics," Meaning of, 186.
 Syriac Versions. See Version.

T.

Talmudists, 273, 274.
 Tamil Bible, 370.
 Targums, 270.
 Tatian, 202, 226
 Taverner, 48.
 Taylor, 94, 111, 116, 141, 142, 172, 184.
 Tertullian, 154, 159, 180, 202, 203, 206, 218,
 220, 233, 239, 245, 251, 257.

- Text, Printed, 125-139.
 Text, Written, 91-114.
 Textual History of Old Testament, 271-276.
Textus Receptus, 129.
 Theodotion, Version of. See Version.
 Theophilus, 223, 241.
 Thermaë, 219.
 Thessalonians, I. II., 219, 220.
 Thiersch, 199.
 Tholuck, 200.
 Timothy, I. II., 221-223.
 Tischendorf, Greek Text of, 133, 134.
 Tischendorf, Introduction to Tauchnitz New Testament, 108.
 Titus, Epistle to, 225.
 Todd, 345.
 Tregelles, 107, 108, 112, 126, 128, 134, 136, 139, 159, 161, 173, 183, 184, 199, 247, 374.
 Trench, 36, 77, 351, 384, 386, 387.
 Trevisa, 15.
 Tunstall, 18.
 Tyndale, John, 33.
 Tyndale, William, 17-38.
- U.
- Uncial, Meaning of, 97.
- V.
- Valentinus, 202.
 Vaticanus. See Codex.
 Vellum, 96.
 Vernacular Translations, 115.
 Verses, Introduction of, 59.
 Version, Aquila's, 269.
 ———, Arabic, 120.
 ———, Armenian, 119.
 ———, Authorized, 70-83.
 ———, Egyptian, 118.
 ———, Genevan, 54-60.
 ———, Gothic, 120.
 ———, Latin, of New Testament, 121-125.
 ———, Persic, 119.
 ———, Peshito, 156, 202, 218, 223, 238.
 ———, Saxon, 4-6.

- Version, Septuagint, 268.
 ———, Slavonic, 121.
 ———, Symmachus, 269.
 ———, Syriac, 116.
 ———, Theodotion, 269.
 Vilvorde, 19.
 Vulgate, Jerome's, 11, 52, 67, 122-125.

W.

- Walsh, 18.
 Walter, 19, 24, 44, 348.
 Walton's Polyglot, 129.
 Ward, 80, 82.
 Westcott, 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 30, 36, 43, 49, 52, 60, 61, 64, 76, 83, 85, 86, 145, 146, 149, 150, 151, 154, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 177, 178, 179, 187, 195, 196, 201, 202, 230, 241, 247, 248, 249, 272, 290.
 Westminster Review, 29.
 Wetstein, Greek Text of, 131.
 Whately, 363.
 Whittingham, 56.
 Winer, New Testament Hebraisms, 93.
 Winslow, 346.
 Withington, 323.
 Woolsey, 380.
 Wordsworth, 231, 234.
 Worthington, 66.
 Writing Materials, 94.
 Wyclif, 7-16.

X.

- Ximenes, 125.

Y.

- York, Archbishop of, 348, 371.

Z.

- Zückler, 321.

