

A LETTER

TO THE

REVEREND THOMAS BEYNON,

ARCHDEACON OF CARDIGAN,

IN REPLY TO

A VINDICATION OF THE LITERARY CHARACTER

OF

PROFESSOR PORSON,

BY

CRITO CANTABRIGIENSIS :

AND

In further PROOF of the AUTHENTICITY of 1 JOHN, v. 7.

BY

THOMAS BURGESS, D.D. F.R.S. F.A.S. P.R.S.L.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

*Ου γὰρ λογογραφεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐπισχεῖν τὴν ἀπατην
βηλομενοί, ταῦτα γραφομεν.*

Gregor. Naz. Orat. 51. p. 744.

SALISBURY :

PRINTED AND SOLD BY BRODIE AND DOWDING.

SOLD ALSO BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON, WATERLOO PLACE; AND BY
HATCHARD, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

1829.

plaribus desit, producere tenentur. (§ xxv. init.) Certior tamen est prætermissio, atque adeo ipsa *germanitas* hujus dicti, quam prætermissionis causa. (Ibid. ad fin.) He was not aware of the omission of the eighth verse in copies which retain the seventh, or he would have seen a greater degree of evidence in the homœoteleuton, as the cause of the original omission of the seventh verse.

VIII.

NOTE TO P. XXXIV.

On the omission of the seventh Verse in the Oriental Versions.

The original cause of the omission of the seventh verse is demonstrated by those Latin manuscripts which omit the eighth verse, but retain the seventh. But though the homœoteleuton is sufficient to account for the original loss of the verse, yet its absence from all the oriental versions, except the Armenian, is a difficulty not easily removed. The heresies which disturbed the Church by denying on one hand the Eternity and equal Divinity of the Three Divine Persons, and on another by confounding the Three Persons in One, were distinguished by circumstances in the disputes about the homoousian doctrine, which might indeed have induced even orthodox Christians to prefer the copies that omitted the verse, as I have shewn in a Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's, p. 72—78. If passages have been expunged by the orthodox from apprehension of their abuse (*φοβηθευτες αφειλοντο*) [and by heretics from unbelief (*ραδιουργουντες την*

ἐπιστολῆν, asserted by Socrates of this Epistle of St. John), though such corruption is not expressly imputed to our passage, yet both parties would be inclined to prefer the copies that wanted the verse from whatever cause it was omitted. But we need not *now* seek for any other cause than the homœoteleuton, so common in all manuscripts, and most fortunately exemplified in this passage by those Latin manuscripts which omit the eighth verse but retain the seventh.

It should also be observed, not only that the verse is contained in Armenian manuscripts of the fourteenth century, but that the Syriac Version begins the controverted passage not, as in the Greek, with a causal conjunction (ὅτι), but with the copulative (καί.) The Syriac is thus translated by Michaelis (6). “The Spirit beareth witness, for the Spirit is truth, (8) *and* there are three that bear witness, the spirit, the water, and the blood.” Upon which Michaelis observes: “A conjunction copulative as well as a causal conjunction, may connect the 8th verse with the 6th, without any reference to other witnesses. This is really the case in the old Syriac Version, and in the Erpenian Arabic, which was made from the Syriac.” As these verses are connected, it would appear that the Spirit mentioned in the 8th verse is the same with the Spirit in the 6th. But this is inconsistent both with the literal and the mystical interpretation of the 8th verse. For, in the literal sense, the *spirit* means the *anima humana* which Christ “gave up” on the Cross; and in Augustine’s mystical interpretation, it is understood of the Father and not of the Holy Spirit. But whether the two verses be connected with a conjunction *copulative* or *causal*; the connecting particle implies that the Spirit in one verse is the same

with the Spirit in the other. But we have no authority for saying that the Holy Spirit bore witness with the water and the blood; but we have St. John's own authority in the Gospel for saying that the Holy Spirit bore witness with the Father and the Son.

Latin manuscripts which omit the seventh verse, or transpose it, and begin the eighth with *Et*, are evidences of the absent seventh verse on one hand, and of the cause of its omission on the other. As the Latin version has the seventh verse, and the Syriac has it not, Crito is of opinion, that "the testimony of the Latin is destroyed by "that of the Syriac." (P. 77.) A juster conclusion, as it appears to me, would be, that the Latin version was made from copies which had the verse, and the Syriac from those which had it not. Latin manuscripts which transpose the seventh verse, and begin the eighth with *Et*, if compared with copies which have the entire passage, afford by their *juxta* position, a visible evidence of the cause of the lost verse.

Received Latin Text:

7. Quoniam tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in cœlo, Pater, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus; et hi tres unum sunt.

8. Et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt.

MS. Lansdowne, 453:

8. Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra Spiritus, Aqua, & Sanguis: et tres unum sunt.

7. Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœlo Pater Verbum & Spiritus Sanctus: et hi tres unum sunt.

In this transposition of the verses the eighth beginning with *Et* betrays its dislocation. In copies, therefore, which want the seventh, *Et* at the beginning of the eighth is an evidence of the absent verse.

According to Michaelis's translation of the old Syriac, "and there are three that bear witness, &c." before quoted, and Griesbach's "Var. Lect. (q) *καὶ* Syr. MS.," the Syriac MS. text of the Peshito corresponds with Latin MSS., which either omitting the seventh verse, or transposing it, begin the verse which follows the sixth, with *καὶ*; and is therefore defective by the evidence of the Greek text; for in all Greek manuscripts, ancient and modern, the words—*the Spirit is truth*—*τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἀληθεία*, are followed by *ὅτι* and not by *καὶ*. Instead therefore of the testimony of the Latin being destroyed by that of the Syriac, the Syriac itself is an evidence of the absent seventh verse, and, as Bishop Barlow observes, "is defective, and wants some of the integrity, which the most ancient copies before Cyprian's time had."

The Syriac version appears in two remarkable passages, (John viii. 1—11, respecting the woman taken in adultery, and Acts viii. 37, concerning the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch by Philip,) to have been translated from copies which had lost those texts, not like 1 John, v. 7, from the *homœoteleuton*, but from the *Disciplina Arcani*. Of the former passage Bishop Pearce observes in his Commentary, "the reading of this story of the woman taken in adultery, was industriously avoided in the lessons recited out of the Gospels, in the publick services of the Church; as if Jesus saying, *neither do I condemn thee*, had given too much countenance to women guilty of that great crime. In consequence of this, it was never read in the Churches, and is now not to be found in any of the Evangelistaries." On the latter passage Whitby remarks in his *Examen Var. Lect. Millii*, p. 123: *Desunt hæc in Syr. &c. Nec difficile est rationem assignare vero*

proximam cur ægre à quibusdam sequioris ævi scriptoribus hæc verba retinerentur; objici nempe ea solent in præjudicium disciplinæ, & *πραξίως Ecclesiasticæ* in restringendis tandiu à Baptismo *Catechumenis*, ac tot iis fidei capita discenda proponendi more, priusquam ad salutare lavacrum admitterentur. The Syriac Version, therefore, which omits the seventh verse, may have been translated from copies, which had lost the verse either by the homœoteleuton, or the *Disciplina Arcani*.

Glocester Ridley, in his *Dissertation on the Syriac Versions*, has an interesting passage on the various readings of the Philoxenian, which I here subjoin: “Comma septimum in Joannis Epistolæ primæ capite quinto non legitur. Contextus ita se habet. ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΕΛΘΩΝ ΔΙ’ ΥΔΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΜΑΤΟΣ, ΚΑΙ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ, ΙΗΣΟΥΣ Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ. ΟΥΚ ΕΝ ΥΔΑΤΙ ΜΟΝΟΝ, ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΥΔΑΤΙ. (sic) Και πνευμα εστι το μαρτυρουν, οτι πνευμα εστι αληθεια. Οτι τρεις εισι ειμαρτυρουντες πνευμα, και υδωρ, και αιμα, και οι τρεις το εν. Ad verbum reddidi, articulosque omnes omisi, nisi qui in Syro exprimuntur. Ubi plurima sunt notanda. In commate sexto, additio *και πνευματος*: et *αλλα και εν υδατι*: & eorum, quæ sequi debent, omissio: defectus commatis septimi: et in nostro codice *οτι* pro *και*: verba *εν τη γη* non leguntur: & in commatis exitu *ηου εις το εν εισιν*, sed *οι τρεις το εν*, *hau had** & in margine scribitur *το εν*. Ex quibus patet quam proclive erat ob voces sæpe iteratas amanuensibus labi; et codices, qui consentiunt in defectu septimi commatis, non tamen conveniunt in legendo commata vel sextum vel octavum. At MSS. omnibus pervetustis consentientibus comma septimum abesse potius quam deesse censeo.” (Sect. xiii. p. 305. ed. Semler.) From which last words Mr. Ridley appears not to have

* In Roman letter for want of Syriac or Hebrew types.

had so decided a conviction of the *adamantina versicolorum* *coherentia*, as Bengelius. But however that may be, his fidelity in the report of the Syriac text is not the less valuable as an evidence of the *anarthrous* character of the Greek text from which it was translated.

For as the Philoxenian Version is, according to Michaelis, not only literal, but in the strictest sense of the word, servile; and as Mr. Ridley has expressed in his Greek all the *articles* which are expressed by the Philoxenian Version, we may conclude that the Greek text from which that Version was made, had not the articles before *πνευμα*, *ιδωρ*, and *αιμα*; and, consequently, that the omission of the articles of the seventh verse in the Codex Britannicus and the Ottobonianus, is no proof of a Latin origin. We have even Greek MS. authority for such omission in the eighth verse, in the Codex Laudianus 2. which (says Bengelius, § iv.) “omittit articulum contra omnes Codices Græcos cæteros.” The various readings, too, of the sixth and eighth verses, of which no one doubts the genuineness, may serve to neutralize the pleasantry with which Mr. Porson has indulged himself in detailing the various readings of the seventh.

 IX.

NOTE TO P. XXXIV.

On the variations of the old and later Syriac Versions from the Greek text of the controverted passage, and from each other.*

All the MSS. of the Syriac Version (both the old and the later translation) as far as they have hitherto been

* A collation of the Peshito MSS. of the fifth chapter of St. John's First Epistle was obligingly communicated to me by the Rev. J. Forshall, Keeper of the Manuscripts in the British Museum.

examined, omit the controverted verse; but, as I have observed in the preceding Note, the old Syriac or Peshito, is not without its evidence of the absent seventh verse. I proceed now to shew in what respects the old and later recensions of the Syriac differ from the Greek text of the controverted passage, and from each other.

1. All the MSS. omit the verse in the *text*, and not one of them has it in the *margin*, except the Amsterdam copy, which is quoted by Adler in his *Versiones Syriacæ examinatae*, p. 33. The seventh verse, which the editions of Gutbirius and of Schaaf have, is Tremellius's, from which the Amsterdam marginal verse differs in reading *behad enun*, εἰς ἐν εἰσιν, instead of *had enun*, ἐν εἰσιν.

The marginal verse agrees with the Complutensian Greek text in having the preposition before *ἐν*, but differs from it in omitting the article.

2. The Philoxenian copy of the controverted passage differs from the Peshito, by beginning the verse which immediately follows the sixth, with *metul*, ὅτι, instead of *καὶ*. It differs also from the Peshito in reading *hau had*, το ἐν, instead of simply *had*, ἐν: and from both the Greek and the Peshito in omitting the preposition.

3. The two versions (the Peshito and Philoxenian), differ greatly from each other in the style of their translations; the old Syriac being simple and free in its expression, the Philoxenian elaborately literal. The former omits all the *articles* of the passage, the latter expresses them—(before ελθων, Χριστος, μαρτυρουν, μαρτυρουντες, & ἐν,) except the article before αληθεια, πνευμα, ὑδωρ, & αιμα, and their cases. If, therefore, the Greek text had omitted all the articles, like the old Syriac, it would have been a Syriasm, rather than a Latinism; and, as far as it may, like the

Philoxenian, partially omit them, it should be ascribed to the idiom of Palestine rather than of Italy. The absence, therefore, of the article before Πατηρ, Λογος, & Πνευμα, in the seventh verse of the Codex Britannicus, the Montfort and Ottobonianus, would be no proof of a Latin origin, even if we had not the Codex Laudianus 2. for an example of such omission in the eighth verse, and the authority of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Basil, and other Fathers, for such omission, before Πατηρ, Λογος, & Πνευμα.

In the preceding Note (VIII.) I have considered the old Syriac's beginning the verse, which immediately follows the sixth, with και, as an evidence of the absent seventh verse. It may, perhaps, be said with Michaelis, that the *causal* conjunction is unnecessary; but it is evident that the original word was a causal conjunction, because the Philoxenian translates it by METUL, that is, *nam, quia, quoniam.*

A complete collection of various readings from the several recensions of the Syriac Version (Peshito, Philoxenian, and Karkaphensis, or *Montana*, the existence of which last version had been doubted by Asseman and Adler, but has very recently been verified and described by Wiseman in his *Horæ Syriacæ*.) would be a very valuable addition to Biblical criticism. I will mention a single instance. In James ii. 18: "Shew me thy faith *without* thy works, and I will shew thee my faith *by* my works;" so the English Version translates, and the Latin Vulgate and both the Syriac Versions. But the Greek text has ΕΚ των εργαων in both clauses without the negative: Instead of the first EK some have proposed to read Εκτος or Εξω for *sine*, but without any authority for Εκτος or Εξω in such sense. It has occurred to me that the negative

ΟΥΚ has been lost, or, in critical language, has been absorbed between the words ΣΟΥ and ΕΚ by their concurrent sounds ΟΥ ΕΚ. The Latin *sine* affords no light to this conjecture, but the Syriac *delo** of the Peshito renders it very probable that the original reading was δειξον μοι την πιστιν ΣΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΚ των εργαων σου. *Delo* (absque) is equivalent to ουκ εκ : but the more explicit rendering of the Philoxenian *satar men, apart from, seorsim, sine*, accords with χωρις, the reading of many MSS. Of the two readings ουκ εκ and χωρις, the former is so far the more probable, as it is more easy to account for the loss of ουκ than of χωρις, or for the interpolation of εκ after the loss of χωρις.

In the sixth verse of the controverted passage, the Peshito has, in the last clause, two various readings, one differing from the Philoxenian Version, and the other from the received Greek text, which are of some value, as serving to account for the origin of a reading, which at present appears to be peculiar to the Latin Vulgate, and to the most modern Greek MSS. of St. John's Epistle, namely, *Christus* instead of *Spiritus*: "Testatur quoniam *Christus* est veritas." Neither the Peshito nor Philoxenian have *Christus* in this clause; but the Peshito translates the clause in a sense, which probably led to the reading: "The Spirit beareth witness *that* (dhi) the Spirit "is truth:" an interpretation which Beza has adopted: "Spiritus testatur *Spiritum esse veritatem.*" In MSS. which read as in the received text, αληθεια with the article, —η αληθεια—the truth, the change from Πνευμα to Χριστος was natural; because "the truth" is an appropriate title of Christ. "I am the way, *the truth*, and the life." Χριστος

* *Lo* (non) cum substantivis significat *absque, sine*. Idem. *belo & delo*. CASTELL. ed. Michaelis.

was, therefore, probably a Greek reading of some MSS. which had ἡ ἀληθεια, before *Christus* was in the Vulgate. Ἀληθεια without the article is undoubtedly the true reading: "The Spirit is *truth*," a true witness; for there are *three* that bear record. The article is absent from both the Syriac Versions.

A collation of the Syriac Versions with the most remarkable passages of Christian doctrine in the New Testament, may throw much light on the question respecting the causes of erasure* or omission of passages which are wanting in some MSS. of the Greek text, or of the Oriental Version.

X.

NOTE TO P. XXXIV.

On the comparative Antiquity of the Latin and the Syriac Versions.

Crito is of opinion, that the *testimony* of the Latin Version is destroyed by the *silence* of the Syriac. This objection I conceive to be defeated by another, at least as well founded, that the Latin Version was made from an original Greek text which contained the verse, and the Syriac from one which had it not. The *affirmative* testimony has a further advantage over the *negative* by its antiquity. We know nothing even of the older Syriac before the fourth century. Ephrem Syrus is the most ancient evidence of its existence, by his quotations from it in that century. But of the Latin Version we have quotations not only by Fathers of the fourth century, but of the third and second,

* See Wiseman's *Horæ Syriacæ*, p. 209. & Bengel. ad 1 Joann. V. 7. § xxvii.

in the writings of Cyprian and Tertullian. We have also entire copies of the Ante-Hieronymian Versions of the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, and St. James, published from ancient MSS. by Martianay, Hearne, Bianchini, and Matthæi. These ancient Latin Versions which were in use before the time of Jerome, as well as the testimony of Augustine, that there were numerous Latin Versions of the New Testament in the *first ages of Christianity*—"primis fidei temporibus"—place the antiquity of the Latin Version greatly beyond the only authentic evidence of the Syriac Version, or any probable conjecture of its origin. Fuller, indeed, Grotius, Vossius, and Wetstein, thought the Peshito not older than the sixth or seventh century. Michaelis assigns to it the very highest antiquity; but his reasons are satisfactorily refuted by his learned Translator.

Every consideration, which shews that the Greek language was vernacular in Syria, together with the Syriac, in the time of Christ and his Apostles—(the occupation of Syria by the Greeks after the conquests of Alexander—the prevalence of Greek under the Greek dominion, and afterwards under that of the Romans, who forbid the public use of any other language in their conquered provinces but Greek and Latin,—the reading of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament in the Jewish Synagogues,—and the frequent quotations of that version in the writings of the New Testament,) all contribute to prove the improbability of the existence of a Syriac Version of the Scriptures before the third century, when Syria finally ceased to be under the dominion of the Greeks.

The question respecting the vernacular prevalence of the Greek language in Syria is of importance in its bearing on

the theory of a *primary Hebrew or Aramæan document*, and of the original language of the New Testament, as well as on the comparative antiquity and value of the Latin and Syriac Versions. A remarkable proof of the vernacular prevalence of Greek in Syria is evident from this, that more than one eighth part of the Syriac language consists of Greek words incorporated in it; and that, though Syriac words in the Greek text are interpreted by Greek, yet Greek words occurring in the Syriac text are not interpreted by Syriac.

XI.

On the vernacular prevalence of the Greek Language in Palestine in the time of Christ and his Apostles.

At the first promulgation of the Gospel, the two most generally prevailing languages in the known world, and therefore the most adapted, one to the universal diffusion of the Gospel, and the other to its earliest interpretation, were the Greek and the Latin. Of the former, Cicero said, a few years before the time of the Apostles, *Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus*,* especially, therefore, in countries conquered and peopled by the Greeks. Jerome† said, that Greek was spoken throughout the East; *Sermone Græco omnis loquitur Oriens*. And though this, as well as the words of Cicero, may be called a rhetorical amplification, admitting many exceptions, yet Syria could not have been

* Pro Archia.

† Proœm. Lib. II. Comment. in Epist. ad Galat. Opp. T. iv. p. 256. ed. Bened.

one of them. So general, indeed, was the use of the Greek language in Palestine, that the Jews themselves called Greek *the common language* of their country: “Observe,” says Lightfoot, “that the Hebrews call the Greek ‘the vulgar tongue.’”* Simon, also, in his *Histoire Critique*, says: “Le Grec fut la langue vulgaire de la Palestine.”†

If, then, Greek was commonly understood and spoken in Palestine, there could have been no need of a primary Hebrew or Aramæan document before the publication of the Greek, or of a very early Syriac translator from the Greek. Semler, who is a very high authority in the German School, treats the tradition of a Hebrew original of St. Matthew, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as a mere fable: *opinionem & conjecturam, historiæ auctoritatem mentitam fuisse.* (*Apparat. Crît. ad Nov. Test. interpretationem*, p. 86.) Stosch, in his *Commentatio de Librorum N. T. Canone* (Francof. 1755,) and Schmidt, in his *Historia Antiqua & Vindicatio Canonis*, (Lipsiæ, 1775.) are of the same opinion with Semler, as to the originality of the Greek text. Even Bertholdt, an eminent Documentarian, admits that the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Greek.

Yet the majority of modern German critics contend, that the original of the New Testament was not Greek,

* Lightfoot's Works, vol. iii. p. 310. ed. Pratt.

† Ce que prouve manifestement que le Grec étoit la langue vulgaire du pays, et que les Juifs, outre le Grec, avoient conservé la langue Chaldaïque qu' ils avoient rapportée de Babylone, et qu' ils appelloient *la langue de la Nation*. Les Juifs de Jerusalem retinrent aussi toujours cette langue bien que le Grec fut la langue vulgaire de la Palestine. (*Histoire Critique du Teste au Nouveau Testament*. P. 60, 61.)

but Syriac or Aramæan. To their several theories HUG has successfully opposed himself in his excellent Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament, which has been lately translated into English by Dr. Wait; who, in his Preface, has given “ a brief outline ” of their various objections to a Greek original of the New Testament, of which the following are the chief :

1. “ That the Gospel was addressed to the uneducated part of the Jewish population, resident in Palestine, who could not read Greek.”

A *written* Gospel could be addressed only to those that could *read*. The uneducated Jews could neither read Greek nor Aramæan. A written Gospel, therefore, could not be addressed to them. Nor was it intended solely for the residents in Palestine, who were acquainted with both languages; but it was to be “ taught to all nations,” and was therefore intended also for nations who were better acquainted with Greek than with Aramæan.

2. “ That it was contrary to ancient custom for Jews to write books in Greek.”

HUG has shewn, on the authority of the Mishna, that though the Jews were forbidden to write books in other languages, they were permitted to write them in Greek.

3. “ That Josephus affords us a proof that it was an *unusual* thing for a Jew to write a book in Greek.”

It was no doubt unusual;—but what was *not* unusual in the whole promulgation of Christianity, from the birth of Christ to his ascension? and from the end of Christ’s ministry on earth to the death of St. John? The birth of Christ, his miracles, resurrection, and ascension, and that, which comes nearest to our purpose, his *knowledge*, were all out of the ordinary course of human experience. It

was unusual for the poor among the Jews to be taught either Hebrew or Greek. When "Jesus went up into the Temple, and taught, the Jews said, how knoweth this man letters,* having never learned?" (John vii. 14, 15.) "Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?" (Matth. xiii. 54.) "What wisdom is this which is given unto him? Is not this the carpenter? the son of Mary?" (Mark vi. 2, 3.) Christ told the Jews whence he had his wisdom and his knowledge: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." (Luke vii. 16.) It was derived not from the schools, but from heaven; and not in the limited measure that squares with the human understanding. "For," (as the Baptist bore witness,) "he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." (John iii. 34.) And the wisdom which he possessed, he communicated by the same Spirit to his disciples. Of which he gave them an assurance, when he encouraged them to trust in him in all their troubles: "Settle it in your hearts not to meditate before hand what ye shall answer; I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." (Luke xxi. 14, 15.) Who but God could give this? And the same divine power could inspire them with any other gift necessary for the furtherance of the Gospel.

4. "That it was improbable that any disciple of Jesus should be sufficiently acquainted with Greek to write the Gospel in that language."

This is said in entire forgetfulness, or unbelief, of the

* Letters or learning. The Jews spoke it in contempt. Γραμματα, when it means the Scriptures, has the article, τὰ γραμματα.

miraculous “ gift of tongues,” and of all Christ’s promises to his disciples. The very office of St. Matthew, as a tax-gatherer, which connected him with men of all conditions and languages, implies the talent which the German theory denies. HUG, after a very interesting historical and critical detail of the progress of the Greek language in Syria, observes : “ It is no longer doubtful, that up to the “ time in which Matthew wrote, the Greek language had “ firmly rooted itself in Palestine. But what relation “ existed between the two languages, is not yet, from the “ connexion of all these facts, quite obvious.” (HUG, vol. ii. p. 49.) But he justly infers, from the satisfaction expressed by the Jewish multitude, when St. Paul addressed them in Hebrew, that they had been accustomed to be addressed in a different language; and on this occasion were led by circumstances to expect an address in another language. And what other was current in Palestine but the Greek?

The relation, therefore, between Hebrew or Syriac and Greek must have been great to have admitted of the use of Greek for a popular address. But the intimate relation between Syriac and Greek, is evident from the multitude of Greek words naturalized in the Syriac, and incorporated in the Syriac Version of the New Testament. Masclef, in his Syriac Grammar (C. I.) has given a list of more than thirty Greek words from the Syriac text of St. Matthew’s Gospel alone. Hoffman has given a larger list in his history of the Syriac language prefixed to his Grammar, (p. 21. Halæ 1827.) A much larger list of Greek words may be collected from Castell’s Syriac Lexicon, ed. Michaelis, amounting to more than one eighth part of the whole language, consisting of words in every part of speech,

and of the most ordinary use, such as *αηρ, αγρος, αγων, ανδριας, αλς, αναγκη, &c.*; and even the commonest particles, *αλλα, γαρ, δε, μεν, &c.*

Another proof of the intimate relation between the two languages consists (as I have before observed) in this,—that though Syriac words in the Greek text are *interpreted* by Greek, the numerous Greek words occurring in the Syriac text, are used without any interpretation.

5. The brief outline of German objections to a Greek original of the New Testament, and to the vernacular use of the Greek language in Palestine, which Dr. Wait has stated in the Preface to his Translation of Hug, is closed with the following observation on the present state of the English language in Wales: “Let us bring the case nearer
“ to our own times and observations. England and Wales
“ have been much longer united than *Rome* had been with
“ Judæa, on whose connection Hug builds a considerable
“ part of his argument; yet in how many places in the
“ latter is the English language totally unknown?—The
“ *Roman* intercourse with Palestine had been compara-
“ tively short.”

The intercourse of *Rome* with Palestine had indeed been very short, at the time of Christ and his Apostles, not a century having passed from its submission to Pompey. It is not, however, on the intercourse of *Rome*, but of *Greece*, with Palestine, on which HUG’S argument is chiefly built. Yet during that short period the popular prevalence of Greek was greatly increased by the favour shewn to the Greeks and to their language by Pompey and Herod, as well as by the Prætors of Syria and the Governors of Palestine. “From the time of Pompey, the opposition to the incur-
“ sions of the Greeks was removed; the barriers were not

“ only broken, but the Greeks were even the favoured
 “ party. They became still more so under Herod the
 “ first, who did not conceal from the Jews, that he gave
 “ the preference to the Greeks; and did not stop at this
 “ confession, but by costly preparations even manifested
 “ that it was his purpose to Hellenize the Jews.” (HUG,
 vol. ii. p. 41. Engl. Tr.) “ We see that Palestine had
 “ received into her bosom a second nation, and divided
 “ herself between two languages, the language of the
 “ country, and the Greek.” (Ibid.)

To these historical facts the German theory opposes the
 present state of the English language in Wales, instead of
 the state of the language in the whole Island, and asks “ in
 “ *how many* places in Wales the English language is totally
 “ unknown.” But even in this confined view the compa-
 rison is not favourable to their objections. For there are,
 I believe, (and I speak from some knowledge of the Prin-
 cipality,) *very few* places in which the English language is
 totally unknown. It is spoken in common with Welsh in
 every county in Wales, and in every considerable town.
 We may add, which is still more to the purpose of HUG’s
 argument, that there are, probably, very few individuals,
 who can *read* Welsh, that cannot also read English. And
 of the best educated of its inhabitants, though most can
 speak their native language for common occasions, very
few can read it; yet *all* of them can read and speak
 English. Yet they are attached, like the Jews, to their
 native language. And if, in a public assembly, an Eng-
 lishman were to address them in Welsh, as St. Paul did
 the Jews in Hebrew, the effect would be the same; they
 would be as much pleased as the Jews were, and would

“keep the more silence,” having expected to be addressed in another language.

But this question should not be confined to the western extremity of the Island, where *alone* the ancient language has maintained itself. When Britain first received “a second nation” into her bosom under the Cæsars, four hundred years intercourse with Rome rendered the country *pene Latina insula*. And when, after the final departure of the Romans, a second nation was again admitted, we see, that Britain did not, like Syria, divide itself between two languages,—the language of the country, and the Saxon;—but the latter so far gradually prevailed, as to supplant the ancient language in the whole of the country beyond the limits of the Severn, except Cornwall, where it subsisted till the last century. And thus in Wales the English language appears to be on the same footing as Greek was in Palestine. But, with respect to the whole Island, the question becomes not, in how many places is the English language totally unknown, but in how few places is any other language currently known, but the English. The history therefore of the English language in Britain, and its present state in Wales, detract nothing from the strength of the evidences, which we have of the vernacular prevalence of Greek in Palestine in the time of Christ and his Apostles, and therefore of the originality of the present Greek text of the New Testament.

The vernacular prevalence of the Greek language in Syria must have rendered unnecessary any very early translation of the New Testament from the Greek into Syriac. If then there was, as we are informed by Augustine, a Latin translation, or translations, “in primis fidei temporibus,” in the *first* times of the Christian faith,

and therefore in the time of the Apostles, the Latin Version, which has the controverted verse of St. John, is of higher antiquity and authority than the oldest Syriac Version which has it not.

XII.

NOTE ON STEPHENS'S MSS.

The question respecting Stephens's MSS. I have left untouched in these pages, because it is in other hands, from which we have reason to expect decisive information on the subject. If Crito were able to verify Mr. Porson's opinion, that Stephens had no MSS. containing the verse, it would not affect the general question more than the admission, that almost all Greek MSS. now known to be extant, do not contain the verse. But if it can be proved, that R. Stephens formed the text of his first edition out of MSS. which contained the verse,—a subject which Mr. Huyshe is pursuing with great ability and acuteness,—*that* would be a most important addition to the evidence which we possess of MSS. that contained, and contain the verse. And for this we have Stephens's most express assurance, in the Preface to his *first* and *second* editions, that nothing was admitted into the text, which had not the authority of MSS.—the majority—and the best: *ut nullam omnino literam secus esse pateremur quam plures, iique meliores libri, tanquam testes comprobarent.* Mr. Porson and Griesbach had no scruple in treating this assertion as vain and false, on the supposition that Stephens had no MSS.