



BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

A

Collection of Tracts

IN

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

BY CHARLES HODGE,

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE, IN THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, AT PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γράφας.

VOL. I.

Princeton Press:

PRINTED BY D. A. BORRENSTEIN.

1825.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

Contents of Vol. I.

BECK'S MONOGRAMMATA HERMENEUTICES N. T.

§ 1. History of the Interpretation of the N. T.	- - -	page 1
§ 2. On the Character of the N. T. and state of the Text	- - -	16
List of collated MSS.	- - -	31
Ancient Versions of the N. T.	- - -	39
Editions of the N. T.	- - -	43
§ 3. Critical Laws of the Books of the N. T.	- - -	49
§ 4. Rules of Interpretation for the N. T.	- - -	58
PART 1.—The Rules and Helps for the proper understanding of the N. T.		
CHAP. I. On the signification of words	- - -	60
II. On the Usus Loquendi of the N. T.	- - -	66
III. On investigating the sense of passages	- - -	71
IV. On the method of the Sacred Writers in the construc- tion of their sentences	- - -	79
V. On the method of discovering the meaning of a passage and of understanding the narration or argument	- - -	82
VI. Helps for the proper understanding and explaining the N. T.	- - -	-
1. Analogy of Languages	- - -	86
2. Greek and Latin Writers	- - -	87
3. Ancient Greek Versions of the O. T.	- - -	90
4. Apocryphal works of the Jews and early Christians	- - -	92
5. Works of the Jews in Greek and Hebrew written in the N. T. period	- - -	94

	Page.
6. Sacred Geography - - - - -	98
7. History and Antiquities of the Jews, Greeks, and Romans	99
8. Other branches of knowledge, as Natural History, &c. -	102
9. Ancient Commentators - - - - -	105
10. Modern Commentators - - - - -	106
11. Tracts in illucidation of particuar passages - -	113
PART 2nd, of SECT. 4th.	
Precepts for expounding the N. T. - - - - -	118
TITTMANN ON HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION - -	123
WARNEKROS DE FERTILITATE PALESTINÆ - -	155
Testimony of Moses - - - - -	155
Advantages of Palestine compared with Egypt - - -	158
Origin of the Nile - - - - -	160
Effects of the Inundation of the Nile - - - - -	162
Of the Drains - - - - -	164
Of the fertility arising from the Nile - - - - -	166
Salubrity of the waters of the Nile - - - - -	167
Evils which arise from the Nile - - - - -	169
Egypt not more productive in corn than Palestine - -	172
Palestine abounds in vines - - - - -	180
Palestine abounds in oil - - - - -	187
Butter not used in Palestine - - - - -	189
Testimony of the Greek and Latin writers, as to the fertility of Palestine	191
STEUDLIN'S HISTORY OF THEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, [<i>Extracts from,</i> — <i>Translated from the German.</i> - - -	
An account of the causes of the revolution in Theological opinion, which has occurred in the last century - - - - -	201
An account of Introductions to the study of Theology published dur- ing the last century - - - - -	212
KNAPPIUS DE SPIRITU SANCTO ET CHRISTO PARACLETIS	234
WARBURTON ON THE TYPES AND SECONDARY SENSES	265
REMARKS ON THE PROPRIETY OF A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES IN ENGLISH - - - - -	307
CHAP. I. Necessity of a New Translation urged at various periods. First	

proposed under the usurpation of Cromwell. Dr. Gell. Anonymous "Essay for a New Translation." Pilkington's Remarks. Bishop Lowth. Archbishop Secker. Dr. Durell. Lowth's Isaiah. Dr. White. Dr. Blayney. Archbishop Newcome. Mr. Wintle. Dr. Kennicott. Dr. Geddes. Archbishop Newcome's "Historical View." Bishop Hors- ley. Mr. S. Greenaway - - - - -	309
II. Mr. Bellamy's New Translation. Object of it. His incompe- tency. Proved from Gen. xix. His novel translation of ver. 5, 25, 32. Singular disquisition on the word קוף. Ignorance in supposing the existence of a preterpluperfect tense in He- brew - - - - -	326
III. Expediency only of a New Translation asserted on the other side. No inaccuracies in the present translation affecting faith or morals. Probable reasons which might have prevented compliance with the proposal for a New Translation under authority. No good case made out in support of that propos- al. The received Hebrew text stated to be corrupt. Mode of amending it inefficient. Collations of MSS. and versions. No classification of MSS. ever attempted. Under different editions impracticable. All MSS. and versions, the Septua- gint alone excepted, of one and the same edition. Sepuagint too corrupted for use. Eichorn. Critical Principles adopted by the advocates for a New Translation unsatisfactory and fal- lacious. Baver. Eichorn - - - - -	353
IV. Lowth's Translation of Isaiah. Animadversions upon it. Cen- sured by Kocher. Specimens of erroneous criticisms in it. Isaiah chap. i. 3. Chap. i. 29. Chap. ii. 20. Chap. viii. 9. Chap. xxiv. 11. Kocher as superior in philological acquire- ments, as inferior in classical taste. Lowth and his followers men of indisputable learning and ability - - - - -	368
V. Received Hebrew or Masoretical text. More ancient than the Masora. Eichorn carries it up to the first century of the Christian era. Complete restoration of it desirable, could it be effected. Septuagint may have been translated from an- other edition. This by no means certain. Cappellus. Shar- fenberg. Masoretical the only text to be depended upon. Question of vowels and accents as connected with that of the	

	Page.
Masoretical text. Controversy respecting them. Perfection of the vowel system precludes the idea of its originality. The probable succedaneum of some more ancient system. Schultens. Vowels and accents no parts of the inspired text -	378
MORUS ON THE STYLE OF THE N. T. - - -	393
What may be called a pure style - - -	395
Proofs that the style of the N. T. is not pure - - -	397
Authors who have maintained the purity of the N. T. - - -	410
Style of the New Testament Hebraic - - -	413
Of the appellation, Alexandrian Dialect - - -	418
The style of the N. T. has been influenced by other languages besides the Hebrew - - -	418
Rules for discovering the usus loquendi of the N. T. - - -	420
WARNEKROS DE FERTILITATE PALESTINÆ, [Concluded.]	435
Mount Libanus contributes much to the fertility of Palestine -	437
Divisions of the rains in Palestine - - -	442
Palestine abounds in plants - - -	443
MICHAELIS ON THE POPULATION OF PALESTINE -	447
Could Palestine contain as many inhabitants as Moses proposed to settle in it - - -	449
Of the later enumerations of the Israelites - - -	456
REMARKS ON THE PROPRIETY OF A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES INTO ENGLISH, [Concluded.]	
CHAP. VI. Uniformity of sense in Scripture preserved by tradition. Vowels and accents applied to the text in conformity with the traditional readings. Cappellus supposes these readings to have been preserved by the use of the <i>Matres Lectionis</i> before the invention of vowels. Version of Aquila conformable with the Masoretical text, as well with respect to vowels as to consonants. Various vowel readings of the Septuagint, contrasted with those of Aquila. Singular reading of the Septuagint Isaiah ix. 6. Theodotio's version less conformable with the Masoretical text, than Aquila's. Masoretical readings genuine. No other edition of the Hebrew text extant. Griesbach's mode of detecting different editions. Masoretical text	

long anterior to the date of our most ancient MSS. Incontrovertibly more than thirteen centuries old. Marks the distinction of words and supplies correct pauses. A similar copy of the New Test., if of high antiquity, would be greatly valued 453

- VII. Theory of elucidating Hebrew by the Cognate Dialects, particularly by the Arabic. Extract from Schultens, in exemplification of this theory. The verb לָגַג . More ingenuity of investigation, than solidity of reasoning in it. Languages derived from the same source, do not always use the same word in the same sense. The derivative sense more likely to occur in the more modern, and the primitive in the most ancient languages. Position, that the Hebrew tongue may be greatly illustrated by the study of the Dialects, contains some theoretical truth with much practical uncertainty. Difficulty of the illustration. Signification of words in a constant state of fluctuation. Improvement in criticism often brings increase in perplexity. Oriental languages built upon the same foundation are sometimes composed of different materials. Hebrew and Syriac. Restrictions prescribed by Bayer. Lexicons improved only in Etymological investigations. A Translator not to be led astray by ingenious conceits, and theoretical novelties - - 479
- VIII. Recapitulation. Conclusion. English Established Version translated from the Hebrew. Style of it admired. Obsolete expressions. Defects of it counterbalanced by its many excellencies. Not likely to be superseded by a better - 491

LAURENCE'S CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE UNITARIAN				
VERSION OF THE N. T. - - - - -				
				499
CHAP. I.	Introductory remarks	-	-	503
	II. Authenticity of the two first chapters of St. Matthew	-	-	510
	III. Authenticity of the two first chapters of St. Luke	-	-	533
	IV. Intermediate State between Death and the Resurrection. Authenticity of Luke xxiii. 44	-	-	547
	V. Perplexing Anomalies in the Theory of Articles	-	-	566
	VI. Existence of an Evil Being. Translation of the words $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$ and $\Delta\iota\alpha\epsilon\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$	-	-	575
	VII. Translation of the word Αγίελος , Heb. i. Disputed Books. Griesbach. Conclusion.	-	-	591

difficulty of procuring books, or the disinclination to read any thing not written in our own language, has led to a lamentable neglect of an interesting department of Theological Learning. An attempt therefore, in any measure, to remedy this evil, must commend itself to those who believe that the interests of piety, are intimately connected with the state of knowledge in its teachers.

As this work is intended for a class of readers which is not very numerous, and as it will be one of considerable labour, and no emolument, it is hoped that those who are interested in advancing the cause to which it is devoted, will extend to it the favour of their patronage.

Conditions :

I. To be published quarterly in numbers of 150 pages octavo, handsomely printed on fine paper, at one dollar per number, or four dollars per year, payable on the delivery of the first number.

II. Any individual responsible for six subscriptions, will receive an additional copy gratis. No subscription can be taken for less than one year.

NOTICE.

As THE great difficulty in conducting Periodical Publications arises from want of punctuality on the part of the subscribers, resulting from mere forgetfulness, it has been deemed expedient to make the subscription for this work payable on the delivery of the first number. And as the second number will not be sent in any case to those who have not paid their annual subscription, the reception of the second number may be deemed a receipt in full for the current year.

THE Subscribers who reside in Philadelphia, are requested to make their payments to Mr. Anthony Finley.—Those of New-York, to Messrs. G. & C. Carvill.—Those of Boston, to the Rev. B. B. Wisner.—Those of Charleston, S. C., to the Rev. Dr. T. C. Henry.—Those in Baltimore, to the Rev. William Nevins.—Those in Kentucky, to the Rev. John Breckenridge. All others will be good enough to make their remittances immediately to the Editor.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

CONTENTS OF No. 1.

- I. TRANSLATION OF BECKII MONOGRAMMATA HERMENEUTICES N. T.
 - II. TRANSLATION OF TITTMANN ON HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION.
-

INTRODUCTION.

THE preceding Prospectus states, with as much particularity as is deemed necessary, the nature and design of the present Publication. It has arisen, from the conviction of the importance of Biblical Studies, and from the desire of exciting greater interest in their cultivation. There may be some apprehension, as to the tendency of such pursuits; some fear that they are not likely to subserve the cause of truth and piety. That this apprehension is unfounded, a moment's consideration of the nature of the subjects embraced in this department, is sufficient to evince. The direct object of this branch of Theological knowledge, is, to ascertain and explain the Sacred Text, to discover what is Scripture, and what is its meaning: with this view, to attend to the *Criticism* of the Old and New Testaments, to determine the principles which should be applied to their interpretation, and to illustrate their language and import from the various sources which Philology and History afford. That there is any thing in this course inimical to religion, would never have occurred to the most sensitive mind, were it not that the most celebrated writers on these subjects have been men of loose Theological opinions. But is there any evidence that their opinions resulted from these pursuits? Is not all probability, (as founded on their nature) against the supposition? And will not the argument derived from this source prove a great deal too much? It is not in Biblical Literature alone, that these authors have been so much more assiduous and productive than others of modern times. In every department of Ecclesiastical History and Doctrinal Theology, the number and research of their works is not less remarkable. Of the *one hundred and seventy* works ascri-

bed to *Semler*, a great portion have no immediate connexion with the department in question. The argument, therefore, derived from this source, should either be withdrawn or extended.

But so far from loose opinions having resulted from these pursuits, the very reverse has been the fact. The corruption of Theological opinion preceded any unfavourable change in the method of explaining the Sacred Volume. And this corruption of opinion resulted from metaphysical and philosophical speculations; it was the influence of the infidel spirit of the English and French Deists, operating on the scholars of Germany which produced the change.* And when the change was effected, it is not to be wondered at, that those who were imbued with the spirit of infidelity should treat the SS. in a way consistent with their new opinions, and endeavour to introduce methods of explaining the Sacred Volume, calculated to extend and perpetuate them. It is not, therefore, to the Biblical Student that this melancholy page of history furnishes its warning; it is to those who introduce the speculations of Philosophy into the study of Theology, and who avowedly or unconsciously interpret the Sacred Volume in accordance with opinions previously formed, and resting upon some other foundation than the revelation of God. And the greatest barrier to the progress of error is to be found in bringing men from other sources of Theological knowledge, immediately to the SS., to the strictly grammatical interpretation of the word of God, which is by no means inconsistent with the highest reverence for its character, the strongest conviction of its divine origin and consequent infallibility, and the deepest sense of our need of the aids of the Holy Spirit to remove our native prejudice to the truth, and to illuminate the mind with the knowledge of Di-

* This assertion is made upon the authority of their own writers, see Staüdlin's History of Theological Knowledge, Vol. II. p. 289, et ss.

vine things. This has been the course pursued by the wisest and best men in every age of the church. It is the plan upon which our own system of doctrine is founded, and by which alone it can be defended. Danger, therefore, is not to be apprehended from the pursuit of Biblical studies, it lies in their neglect. It is not intended, however, to urge any disproportionate attention to this department. If the ministers of the present day would cultivate its various branches with the assiduous attention they have received from many of the most spiritual and devoted of the servants of Christ, it is all the department demands, or its advocates could ask. But is it not to be feared that there are few who can enter into the spirit of the declaration of LUTHER *Etsi exigua sit mea linguæ Hebraeæ notitia, cum omnibus tamen totius mundi gazis non commutarem?*

With respect to the contents of the following number, it may be proper to remark, that the selection was determined by the consideration that it would be most expedient to publish something in the first number, which would be valuable and saleable in a separate form, and which would present an outline of at least one important class of subjects likely to be discussed in the future pages of the work. It was with this view, that *Beck's Monogramata Hermeneutices Librorum Novi Fæderis* was selected. This work may prove uninteresting to any other than professional readers; to such however, it cannot fail of appearing valuable. Its author, who was born in 1757, was formerly Professor of the Greek and Latin languages, and afterwards Professor of History, at Leipsic. His principal works are, *Instit. histor. religionis Christ. et formulæ nostræ dogmatum*, 1796. *Commentarii histor. decretorum relig. Christ. et formulæ Lutheranæ*, Lip. 1801. *Prefatio ad Mori Prelectt. ad Romanos*, 1794, and several others, besides that which is here translated. The following article contains the first part of his work on the New

Testament, and comprises what is general, that is, what relates to all the books of the New Testament ; the second part was to give an account of the character, age, origin, and history of each particular book, and the commentators upon each.

The work has been somewhat abridged in the following article. This has been effected principally by omitting the title of some of the works mentioned by the author, by mentioning only the last and most improved editions, in cases, where he details them all, by passing over small portions of the text which appeared neither essential to the connexion, nor of much value, and especially by shortening the catalogue of MSS. There has been no MS. omitted in the catalogue, (excepting those called Evangelaria and Lectionaria,) but the account given of them is curtailed. It was thought that an alphabetical list of all the MSS. which have been collated with references to the sources of more extended information, would be as much as the great body of our readers would deem desirable. The sixth section, which is short, and of little interest, has been omitted entirely.

OUTLINES

OF

HERMENEUTICS.

SECTION I.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
AND ITS HISTORY.

I. THE art of interpreting the Sacred Writings, supposes the faculty, improved by cultivation and exercise, of discovering and exhibiting that sense, which the Sacred writers themselves attached to the words they used. The same rules, which regulate the explanation of other documents, are of authority in reference to the Scriptures: these rules, it is the business of Criticism and Hermeneutics to exhibit. Hence, Sacred Criticism, and Sacred Hermeneutics, demand our attention. The utility of attending to these subjects is the greater, because, from various causes, the interpretation of the sacred writings, is peculiarly difficult, and errors, are here more frequently committed, than in the exposition of other works.

Gelbricht. Comm. qua docetur, interpretationem librorum divinatorum ab interpretatione librorum humanorum nihil differre. Cizæ, 1774.

Jo. Asboth Comm. de interpretatione codicis sacri, ad communia om-

nes libros interpretandi principia revocata, præmio ab ord. Theol. Gœtt. ornata. Gœtt. 1791.

Guil. Nic. Freudentheil Comm. de codice sacro more in reliquis antiquitatis libris solemnè ingenue interpretando, adjectis difficultatibus N. T. propriis. Chemn. 1791.

May there not, however, be rules of interpretation, applicable to other books, which, in the New Testament, have no authority? and may it not be properly enquired, what influence the inspiration of the New Testament should have upon this subject?

The earlier commentaries on the interpretation of the New Testament, taught that the sense was to be determined by the opinions of the ancient writers, from the judgment of the church—from a certain internal sense—from the analogy of faith—and from the formularies of Philosophy. Those of a later date, lay more stress upon the dictates of reason.

Hermeneutics, in an extensive sense, includes *Criticism*, and is distinguished from *Exegesis*. The science of interpreting the Sacred Writings, belongs to what is called *special Hermeneutics*. Attention, therefore, to this subject, presupposes a knowledge of the rules of *universal Hermeneutics*, which prescribe the method of investigating the signification of words and modes of expression—determining the sense of every passage—estimating and explaining the sentiment, &c. The Hermeneutics of the Bible has two parts, the one *general*, the other *special*.

On the causes of the difficulty of the interpretation of the SS., see

J. S. Ernesti d. de difficultatibus N. T. recte interpretandi 1755. Opp. Critt. et Phill.

The following writers have, more or less extensively, treated the subject of sacred Hermeneutics.

J. S. Semler Vorbereitung zur Theolog. Hermeneutik, Halle 1760—69.

J. Gottlieb Toellner Grundriss einer erwiesenen Hermeneutik des N. T. Zuell. 1765.

Joach. Ehrenfried Pfeiffer, Institutiones hermeneuticæ sacræ, veterum ætque recentiorum et propria quædam præcepta complexæ. Ecl. 1771.

Jo. Bened. Carpzovius, Primæ linæ hermeneuticæ, et philologiæ sacræ cum vet. tum novi Test. brevibus aphorismis comprehensæ in usum lect. acad. Helmst. 1790.

Geo. Fr. Seiler, Biblische Hermeneutik, oder Grundsätze und Regeln zur Erklärung der Heil. Schr. des A. und N. T. Erl. 1800.

G. W. Meyer Grundriss einer Hermeneutik des A. und N. Test. und einer Anl. zur populären und pract. Schriftklärung, Goett. 1801.

Jo. Aug. Ernesti Institutio interpretis N. T. ad usus lectionum. Fourth edition. 1792.

J. Sal. Semler Apparatus ad liberalem N. T. interpretationem. Hal. 1767.

Sam. Fr. Nath. Morus Hermeneutica, N. T.

II. The method of interpreting the sacred writings, has undergone a great many changes. It has been regulated more by the disposition, object, piety, and even example of interpreters, than by any adequate and stable rules; and the rules which were prescribed, were not in all cases, derived from the most proper sources. Before the advent, the Jews had begun to seek after various senses, in their sacred oracles, and those of Alexandria especially, were much attached to the *allegorical* method of interpretation. It is, therefore, not a matter of wonder, that this method was transferred to the christians, and preferred to that which was strictly grammatical. Even those writers, who did not entirely neglect the grammatical method of interpretation, were not free from the disposition to allegorize, then so prevalent. The Hermeneutical rules laid down, were not sufficiently recommended, by their liberality, correctness, order, and connection.

Notkeri libellus de illustribus viris, qui ex intentione S S. Scripturas exponebant. in Galland. N. Bibl. P P. xiii.

J. Geo. Rosenmuelleri Historia interpretationis librorum S S. in eccl. Christ. inde ab apostolorum ætate usque ad Origenem.

Phil. Henr. Schueler, Gesch. der populaeren Schrifterklaerung unter den Christen von dem Anfange des Christ. bis auf die gegenwaertigen Zeiten.

G. W. Meyer, Geschichte der Schrifterklaerung seit der Wiederherst. der Wiss. J. B. Goett. 1802.

Buddei Isag. hist. theol. ad Theologiam universam.

Rich. Simon, Histoire Critique des commentateurs du N. T. Rotterd. 1703.

On the origin of Allegorical Interpretation.—See

Chr. Gfr. Schuetzii Progr. Jenæ 1794.

Jo. Chr. Pfisteri diss. præ.

Jo. Frid. le Bret de originibus et principiis allegoricæ sacrarum litt. interpretationis, Tub. 1795.

Eichhorn, Briefe der Bibl. Exegese betreffend, Bibl. der Bibl. Litt. vol. v.

The later Jews have followed the same method. See, *Surenhusius* Βιβλος καταλλαγῆς. *Vitringæ* Obs. Sacr. III. *Frommann*, de erroribus, qui in interpretatione N. T. a Judæis manarunt, opuscul. p. 82. *Mosheim* d. de Judæorum statuto Scripturæ sensum inflectendi.

On the method, in which Christ and the Apostles quoted and employed the O. T., these writers have treated in the general, when explaining the passages in which such quotations occur.

In the first Christian Churches, as in the Synagogues, the chapters which had been previously read, were explained. *Frommann*, de hermeneuta veteris ecclesiæ Opp. Phil. p. 421. This practice was extended to the books of the N. T., and gradually gave rise to *homilies*, which were not without their influence upon the exposition of the Bible.

The Apostolical Fathers. The Christian Apologists who wrote in Greek—Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus Alex. &c. Irenæus, Hippolytus, Methodius. The Apostolical constitutions. The Alexandrian Teachers, as Clemens Alexander.

Allegorical and Mystical exposition.—See

Jo. Christ. Cæster diss. de mysticarum interpretationum studio ab Aegyptiis maxime patribus repetendo. Hal. 1760.

On the Allegories of the Fathers, consult

J. G. Kærneri Pr. II. de allegorica interpretandi ratione.—L. 1782.

Origen by no means entirely neglected grammatical interpretation. See, *J. A. Ernesti*. d. de Origene interpretationis LL. SS. grammaticæ auctore L. 1756, in *Opusce*. Rosenmueller Progr. de fatis interpretationis litt. SS. in *Eccl. Christ.*

The Latin Fathers were even less skilled in interpretation. Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius.

During the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries, the Greek Church produced several interpreters of rather better character. Many grammatical Commentaries of this period have perished. The most distinguished Greek writers were, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium, Theodoret, Procopius of Gaza.

The doctrinal interpreters, were, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, &c. &c.

Among the Latins, Hilary, Ambrose, Arnobius, jun., Victor of Capua, and especially Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great, who were long leaders to later writers. *J. G. Rosenmueller*, Pr. de traditione hermeneutica, L. 1786.

During this period, some rules on Interpretation were laid down—See

Hieronymi Epist. ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi. *Tychonii* Regule VII. ad investigandam intelligentiam SS. SS. *Augustin*, LL: IV. de doctrina Christ. *Adriani* εισαγωγή εις τας θείας γραφάς . . . &c. &c.

III. From the 7th to the 16th century, very few examples of correct interpretation are to be found. The writings of that period, exhibit the judgment and success of their authors in selecting the opinions of the ancients, rather than their own skill in exposition. For the authority of the early teachers was so great, that most writers preferred selecting

scholia from their works, and forming, what are called *Catenæ Patrum*, than to write original commentaries. These formularies were of such weight, that all expositors followed them, excepting so far, as the study of philosophy and fondness for allegorical and mystical interpretation, led to the neglect of all hermeneutical rules. There was no regular system of interpretation inculcated, until after the revival of letters, when some writers arose to vindicate the claims of grammatical exposition.

The most distinguished writers among the Greeks during this period, were, Oecumenius, Theophilact Achridensis, Euthymius Zigabenus, who flourished from the 10th to the 12th centuries. Besides these, were, Maximus the Confessor, of the 7th. John Damascenus, of the 8th. Photius Cpoli, Simeon Metaphrastes, of the 9th, and Theophanes Cerameus.

The most memorable among the Latins, were the Venerable Bede, of the 7th century, Alcuin of the 8th, Paschasius Ratbertus, and Rhabanus Maurus of the 9th.

In the Latin Church appeared the *Glossa Ordinaria et interlinearis*.

In the Greek Church, *Catenæ*, *Scholia*, and *Glossaries*. See on these, the following authors.

Tho. Ittig, de Bibliothecis et catenis Patrum.

J. C. Wolf, diss. de catenis patrum græcorum iisque potissimum MSS. 1712.

J. F. S. Augustin, d. præ. *J. A. Nosselt*, observatione de catenis P P. græcorum in N. T. 1762. *Wolf*, *Anecdota Græca*.

Jo. Alberti first edited from MSS. a Greek Glossary, and illustrated it with notes.

J. Chr. Gottlieb Ernesti selected, corrected and amended the Glosses of Hesychius.

The Latin Church produced several similar works.

Lanfranci Scholia in Epp. Pauli.

Thomæ Aquinatis Catena aurea in IV. Evangg. The authority of the ancient interpreters was confirmed by the Council in *Trullo* DCXCII.

Many endeavoured to unite the allegorical and literal interpretation. *Bruno Astensis*. *John Gerson* Propositiones de sensu literali, S. Scr. et de causis errorum.

The works of Nic. Lyranus, Paulus Burgensis, Jo. Wicklife, Nic. De Gorsam, Laur. Valla, and Desid. Erasmus, were of a much higher character.

On the earlier vernacular Versions—See

Schueler I. p. 150. *G. W. Panzer*, Litt. Nachricht von den alleraeltesten gedruckten deutschen Biblen, aus dem 15ten Jahrh.

IV. When the reformation commenced, its beneficial influence was soon experienced by the interpretation of the Bible. The Reformers, did not, indeed, entirely reject the authority of the Fathers, yet they greatly distinguished themselves in the study and illustration of the Scriptures, and opened the way of grammatical interpretation, which *Matthias Flacius* was the first to prosecute. When theological controversies had, unfortunately, drawn off the attention of those of our communion from exegetical pursuits, interpreters arose among the Socinians and Arminians, whose subtle and free method of exposition, excited ill will towards themselves, and towards some who did not entirely agree with them. The most distinguished of this class, was *Hugo Grotius*. During this same period, the *Jansenists* were advocating the practical, the *Cocceians* the allegorical and typical mode of interpretation.—Consult,

Jo. Herm. Jani Liber histor. de Luthero studii Biblicæ instauratore. Hal. 1732.

Jo. Melch. Kraft, Vorlaeuf. Abh. der Historie der deutschen Bibeluebersetzung. Hamb. 1714.

G. C. Giese histor. Nachricht von der Bibeluebersetzung Luthers.

Of *Melancthon* and others of the same class. It was principally by *Homilies*, and by that species of commentaries which was called *Postillæ*, that Luther and his friends promoted the cause of religious instruction. To these succeeded the Bibles attended with notes. But from the commencement of the Reformation, the exegetical works of those of our communion, had received more or less of a polemical character, and this evil increased, until they became almost entirely controversial or doctrinal.

The most distinguished exegetical writers of the Geneva School, were, *Zuinglius*, *Leon Juda*, *Oecolampadius*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Bullinger*, *Hyperius*, and *Seb. Castalio*.

A very important work of this period, was the following.

Matth. Flacii Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ. It consists of two parts. The first is in the form of a Dictionary, in which all the words and forms of expression occurring in the Bible, are explained. The second, contains many rules of interpretation, and a Series of Tracts, on the style of Scripture—difficulties—mode of surmounting them, &c. There have been several editions of this work, the first in 1576, the last in 1719. Most of our writers on Hermeneutics, are followers of *Flacius*. Among these, the most important are,

Jo. Gerhardi Tract. de legitima S S. interpretatione 1610—1663.

Jo. Weberi Scrutinium Scr. S. hoc est de rite intelligenda et dextre interpretanda Scr. liber unus. Gissæ 1614.

Wolfg. Franzii Tractatus theol. novus et perspicuus de interpretatione Sacr. Scripturarum maxime legitima, duabus constans regulis essentialibus et perspicuis, quæ Luthero familiares fuerunt. Various editions from 1619 to 1708.

Casp. Finckii Regularum, observationum proprietatum et consuetudinum Sacræ Scripturæ Centuria. Gissæ 1612.

Jo. Com. Damhaueri Hermeneutica Sacra.

Jo. Reinhardi Hermeneutica Sacra, Sacram Scripturam pie et feliciter interpretari docens. Silus. 1693.

The most distinguished, however, were

Sixtini Amamæ Prof. quondam Franeq. Antibarbarus biblicus, ed. postrema cui accesserunt variæ diss. et oratt. nec non responsio ad censuras D. Mart. Marsenni 1656, and the

Sal. Glassii Philologie sacræ, qua totius sacrosanctæ Vet. et Novi Test. Scripturæ tum stylus et literatura, tum sensus et genuinæ interpretationis ratio expenditur Libri V. *Glassii* Philol. sacra his temporibus accommodata a *D. Jo. Aug. Dathe* Lips. 1776. Tomum II. ejus sectio prior Criticam Sacram V. T. continet, secunda Hermeneuticam sacram V. T. edidit, prorsus immutatum, dedit *Geo. Laur. Bauerus*.

There were many Interpreters, of whom, some attended principally to grammatical exposition as *Erasm. Schmidius*, *Dav. Heineius*, *Pricæus*, *Lud. de Dieu*, others to doctrinal interpretation, as *Aug. Hunnius*, *Abr. Calovius*, &c.; and others, who treated of difficult passages, as *Tarnovius*, *Hacksenius*, &c.

The Roman Catholics, though restrained by the Council of Trent, had many Commentators and Teachers of the art and history of Interpretation; of whom the most celebrated were, *Sixtus Senensis*, (ars interpretandi Scripturas Sacras absolutissima.) *Rich. Simon*, (Histoire crit. des principaux commentateurs du N. Test., Rotterd. 1693.) And *Lud. Elias du Pin*, (Diss. preliminaire ou Prolegomenes sur la Bible.)

On the principles of Interpretation of *F. Socinus*.

V. Ei. L. de auctoritate sacræ Scripturæ 1570. et Lectiones Sacræ. *F. W. Dresde* Pr. de fallaci Fausti Socini libros sacros interpretatione, Vit. 1790.

The most distinguished Commentators of this class, were: *Faust. Socinus*, *Jo. Crellius*, *Sam. Przipcovius*, *Christoph. Ostorodius*, *Val. Smalcus*, *Dan. Brenius*, *Sam. Crellius*.

Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, quos unitarios vocant, instructa operibus omnibus *F. Socini*, *Jo. Crellii*, *Jonæ Schlichtingii*. *Jo. Lud. Wolzogenii*, etc. 1656. VI. f.

Commentators of the Arminian School. On the merits of Grotius, consult

Herder Briefe das studium der Theol. betreffend, Tom II. p. 357. *Car. Segaar* or. de Hugone Grotio, illustri humanorum et divinorum N. T. Scriptorum interprete, Ultrai. 1785. *Hug. Grotii* Annot. in N. T. Amst. 1641.

The commencement of *Philosophical* Interpretation.

(Lud. Meyer) *Philosophia Scripturæ Interpretis exercitatio paradoxa in qua veram philosophiam infallibilem S. Litt. interpretandi normam esse apodictice demonstratur etc.* 1666, with additions by Semler, in 1776. (Lud. Wolzogen de *Scripturarum interprete adversus exercitorem paradoxum.*)

Of the *Jansenists*. *Pash. Quesnelli* Nov. Test. et Annotatt. 1693. cf. *Rosenmueller* Hand. IV. and on the versions of this school, p. 370. On the *Cocceians*, idem T. IV. *Mosheim* Institut. hist. Eccles.

V. At the close of the 17th century, many excellent Theologians, perceiving how greatly every thing pertaining to Christian doctrine, had been reformed, and wishing still farther to promote the progress of piety, (whence the name Pietists) endeavoured to introduce a better method of interpreting the Scriptures. These attempts, although they are to be censured, as following too much double senses and feigned emphasis; as neglecting grammatical rules and eastern usage—as departing too much from elegance and accurate doctrine—and as opening the way for mystical errors; yet they are to be valued, as bearing testimony to the importance of exegetical studies, and to the dignity of Biblical pursuits, and as facilitating the introduction of a method more worthy of approbation. A more liberal method has been introduced; attended, however, by new and various disputes, since the recent age did not attain

to a method so certain as to prevent the occurrence of error.

Before the age of the Pietists, both the *allegorizing* interpretations of the Cocceians, and the *grammatical* expositions of Grotius, had excited the displeasure of those, who were devoted to the dogmatico-polemical method of interpretation.

Concerning the Pietists, consult the author last quoted, in *Comm. Decr. Relig. Christ.* Of the writings of this class, those of most consequence, are the following :

Aug. Herm. Franckii Prælectiones Hermeneuticæ, ad viam dextre indagandi et apponendi sensum S. S. Theologiæ studiosis ostendendam in Acad. Halensi publice habitæ. Hal. 1717—23.

Jach. Langii Hermeneutica Sacra exhibens genuinæ interpretationis leges de sensu litterali et emphatico investigando, deinde idiomata sermonis—Apostolici et Apocalyplici cum ulteriore ipsius praxeos exegetica adpendice. Hal. 1733.

On the whole method of these Writers, consult *Plank* Einleitung, II.

Nearly connected with the Pietists, was *Rambach*.

Jo. Jac. Rambach d. de idoneo S. S. Interprete Jen. 1720. Ejusdem Institutiones Hermeneuticæ S. variis observationibus copiosissimisque exemplis Bibl. illustratæ cum. præf. J. Fr. Buddei.

Rambachii Exercitationes hermeneuticæ, s. Pars altera Institut. hermeneuticarum sacrarum, 1723.

During this period, the *Wolfian* system of philosophy, was transferred to all parts of theology. It was used in Hermeneutics by *Wollius*, who translated *Blackwall's* Defence of the Sacred Classics into Latin, and accompanied them with remarks of his own.

Hermeneuticam N. Foed, acroamatico-dogmaticam, certissimis defæcatæ philosophiæ principiis corroboratam, eximiisque omnium Theol. Christ. partium usibus inservientem. L. 1736.

The following work of *Turretin*, was of a much higher character.

Jo. Alph. Turretini de S. Scr. interpretandæ methodo, Tractatus bipartitus, in quo falsæ multorum interpretum hypotheses refelluntur veraque interpretandæ S. Scr. methodus adstruitur, 1728 ; with additions by *Teller* in 1776.

Worthy of notice also are,

Sal. Deylingii diss. de Scripturæ recte interpretandæ ratione et fatis 1721.

Siegm. Jac. Baumgarten Compendium Hermeneutices Sacræ, Hal. 1742.

Dan. Wytenbachii Elementa Hermeneuticæ Sacræ eo, quo in scientiis fieri debet, modo proposita, Marb. 1760.

Among the critics on the N. T. of this period, were, *Le Clerc*, *Mill*, *Whitby*, *Bentley*, *Bengel*, *Wetstein*, and *Valkenar*,

J. S. Semler added to the Prolegomena of *Wetstein* notes, and an appendix on the Ancient Latin recensions extant in various MSS. Hal. 1764.

Wetstenii Libelli ad crisin atque interpretationem N. Test. adjecta est recensio introduct. Bengelii ad crisin N. Test. ed J. S. Semler, Hal. 1776.

L. C. Valkenar Or. de critica emendatrice in libris N. T. a literatoribus quos vocant non adhibenda, Hermsterh, et Valck. Oratt. 1784.

There were many Authors of Observations and Commentaries, who had different objects, and pursued different methods. The result has been, that many passages have been more accurately examined. The works of these writers will be mentioned below.

The language of the Sacred Writers, now began to be illustrated, from profane authors. *Lamb. Bos*, *Ruphelius*, *Elsner*, and *Albertius*, taking the lead in this department.

The controversy concerning the Hebraisms of the N. T. and the elegance and purity of its style, was now greatly agitated.

The remarks of various commentators were collected, as in the following works.

Critici Sacri s. clarissimorum virorum in SS. utriusque Fœderis Biblia doctissimæ adnotationes atque tractatus theol. philologici, Lond. 1660. IX vols. f.

Matth. Poli Synopsis criticorum aliorumque. Lond. 1669. Die. h.

Schr. des A. und N. Test. nebst einer vollstaendigen Erklaerung derselben, welche aus den auserlesensten Anmerkungen verschiedener Engl. Schriftst. zusammengetragen und mit vielen Zusaetzen begleitet werden. L. 1749—70. XIX. 4.

J. Cph. Wolfii curæ philologicæ et criticæ in N. T.

Grammatical interpretation was rendered more exact and certain by the labours of *J. A. Ernesti*, *S. F. N. Morus*, and *J. F. Fischer*.

J. A. Ernesti pro grammatica interpretatione LL. imprimis sacrorum L. 1749, and in his *Opuscula*.

Jo. Ben. Carpzovii Comm. de interprete SS. grammatico 1750.

W. A. Teller des Herrn D. J. A. Ernesti—verdienste um die Theologie und Religion, Berl. 1783, with additions by Semler, Hal. 1783.

C. D. Beck Recitatio de Moro summo Theologo, 1792.

J. G. C. Hoepfner ueber das Leben und die Verdienste des verewigten Morus L. 1793.

C. Th. Kuinoel Narratio de Jo. Frid. Fischero, L. 1799.

Historical interpretation was greatly recommended by Semler.

Cph. Aug. Heumanni Diss. de exegesi historica S. S. Goett. 1742.

C. A. Theoph. Keil Pr. de historica L. L. S. S. interpretatione ejusque necessitate L. 1788.

J. A. Noesselt Narratio de Semlero ejusque ingenio inprimis in interpretationem S. Ser. 1792.

Eichhorn Allgem. Bibl. d. Bibl. Litt. V.

The criticism of N. T. was much enlarged, and reduced to greater certainty. Many MSS. codices were accurately described. The most distinguished of the critics on the N. T. were *C. A. Bode*, *Semler*, *Griesbach*, *C. F. Matthæi*, *Andr. Birch*, *F. C. Alter*.

Koppe and his associates wrote a perpetual commentary on the N. T.

Scholia were written by various authors *Kuettner*, *J. G. Rosenmueller*, *Schellenberg*.

The most celebrated modern commentators are *J. D. Michaelis*, *C. A. Heumann*, *C. F. Schmid*, *J. A. Bengel*, *J. H. Cramer*, *J. B. Carpzovius*, *J. S. Semler*, *G. A.*

Teller, J. C. Doederlein, G. F. Seiler, J. A. Noesselt, G. C. Knapp, Gf. Chr. Storr, J. F. Flatt, H. E. G. Paulus, Jo. Gf. Eichhorn, J. F. Schleusner, J. D. Pott, J. H. Heinrichs, Sam. Clark, J. Peirce, G. Benson, A. A. Sykes, Horsley, Blaney, Newcome, Lowth, McKnight, Whitby. The different kinds of commentaries and annotations were now more accurately distinguished. The interpretation of the N. T. was recalled to the principles which regulate the exposition of other ancient writings, and the limits of the critic, the interpreter, and the theologian more definitely stated.

Phil. Lud. Muzel discrimen grammaticæ et theol. SS. interpretationis in explicando loco Ep. ad Phil. 1793, et in Pott Sylloge.

Philosophical Interpretation was commended, though not always understood in the same way.

J. A. Ernesti Progr. de vanitate philosophantium in interpretatione L. L. S. S. Lips 1750, and in his *Opuscula*.

Logical interpretation.

Jo. Fred. Roos Diss. præ.

C. F. Schnurrer Rudimenta Logicæ Sacræ.

Popular Exegesis.

Ph. H. Schueler—was ist populaere Schrifterklaerung ?—Tub. 1788.

Practical or *moral* exposition now began to be advocated, as the only proper method, by *Kant* and those addicted to his critical philosophy. This method, which was very peculiar, gave rise to the greatest confusion and uncertainty.

Im. Kant Religion innerhalb der Graenzen der vern. p. 134.

G. S. Frankii disp. de ratione qua est critica philosophia ad interpretationem librorum in primis sacrorum.

C. H. L. Poeltz Beytrag zur Kritik der Religions phil. und exegese unsers Zeit-alters, L. 1795.

Ueber die Aehnlichkeit des innern Wortes einiger neuen mystiker mit dem moral. Worte der Kantischen Schriftauslegung von *D. C. F. Ammon*.

J. E. C. Schmidt ueber den Einfluss der Kantischen unterscheidung der Geschaefte des historischen und moralischen Auslegers auf die Schriftekla- rung in S. Bibl. fur Kritik und Exegese des N. T.

J. G. Rosenmueller Commentt. duæ (VI. VII.) de fatis interpretationis S S. Litt. 1793.

Eichhorn ueber die Kantische Hermeneutik, Bibl. VI.

J. A. Noesselt animadverss. in sensum L L. SS. moralem, Hal. 1795.

Jo. Ev. Hofer Progr. de Kantiana Scr. S. interpretatione Salisb. 1800.

Storr Bemerk. ueber Kants philos. Relig. Lehre, &c. &c.

VI. In such diversity, as to the method and principles of interpreting the SS. it is not to be wondered at, that there should be serious differences of opinion, as to particular passages, or that many should be more piously than accurately—more ingeniously than satisfactorily explained. That the interpretation of the Sacred Writings may be rendered more stable and certain, correct and well grounded rules should be sought out.

E. A. G. Hærschelmann Diss. de principiis Scr. S. interpretandi falsis et veris, Jen. 1767.

Chr. Fr. Roederi Comm. de ingenii usu et abusu circa interpretationem S S. Terg. 1741.

Jer. Friderici Diss. de hypothesebus erroneis Scr. Sacræ interpretandæ uoxiis L. 1729.

J. C. Stenler Diss. I. II. de interpretationibus S S. satis piis sed minus accuratis, L. 1741.

J. A. H. Tittman Pr. de causis præcipuis contortarum interpretatt. N. T. L. 1800.

F. Guil. Schleusner d. de dissensibus interpretum in explicandis locis S S. intell. difficilioribus, L. 1756.

Add. *Mori Herm.* I: p. 204.

SECTION II.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. AS the proper method of Interpretation depends, in a great measure, upon the character and design of the Authors, whose productions we mean to explain, and, upon the nature of the productions themselves, it is evident, that, these are points which, in the present case, demand our attention. With respect to the nature of the Books composing the N. T. ; they are of three kinds, historical, doctrinal, and in one instance, prophetic. These works not only materially differ, as to their whole style and manner, from the historical, doctrinal, and poetical writings of the Greeks, but in many respects, there is a diversity, worthy of remark, between even those which belong to the same general class.

Κανὴ διαθήκη, is an ecclesiastical name, derived from 2 Cor. iii. 14. *J. G. Rosenmueller*, d. de voce Διαθήκη in N. T. vario usu, in Velthus. Kuin. et Rup. Comm. Theol. II.

The ancient description of this Volume was not uniform, its appellation was derived from its contents, and from its composition ; *εὐαγγέλιον, ἀποστολος* ; histories and epistles, and these last those of Paul, or Catholic. The writings also of the Apostles and their companions may be distinguished. In the historical books, a continued, chronological, and skillfully executed narrative is not to be expected ; things worthy of remark are stated, interspersed with doctrinal and moral precepts. In the other books,

the systematic mode of instruction is not pursued, and the epistles contain many things, relating to the peculiar circumstances of those to whom they were addressed. Yet they are all to be regarded as the documents of the Christian religion. The diversity of the several writers, may be illustrated by the examples of John and the other Evangelists—the Epistles of Peter and Paul.

Those works ought to be consulted, which contain introductions to the Sacred Writings.

a. Those which embrace both the Old and New Testaments.

Bibliotheca Sancta a, *F. Sixto Senensi*, ex præcipuis Cathol. eccl. auctoribus collecta et in 8. Libros digesta. Ven. 1566.—a *Hayo*, in 1591.

Mich. Waltheri Officina Biblica noviter adaptata, in qua videre licet, que seitu maxime necessaria de SS. in genere et in specie etc. L. 1636—1703.

J. H. Heideggeri, Enchiridion Biblicum Tiguri, 1681. Jen. 1725. (*Sal. Van Tel*, opus analyticum comprehendens Introductionem in SS. ad Heideggeri Enchiridion.)

L. Ellies du Pin, Dissertation preliminaire ou Prolegomenes sur la Bible, pour servir de Supplement a la Bibliotheque des Auteurs eccles. Par. 1701.

Aug. Calmet Prolegomenes de L'Ecriture Sainte, Paris, 1720.

Collier's Sacred Interpreter.

Jo. Cph. Anschuetz, Einleitung in die Buecher der h. Schr. nach Eichhorn u. Michaelis zum Handgebrauch, Dresd. 1791.

b. Writers of Introductions to the N. T.

Rich. Simon, Hist. critique du Nouveau Test. Rotterd. 1689. Histoire critique des versions du N. Test. 1690.

Jo. Ge. Pritii Introductio ad lectionem, N. T. 1704. Greatly improved by *Hofmann*, L. 1737.

J. Wesseli Rumpæi commentatio critica ad libros N. T. in genere, cum præf. *J. G. Carpzovii*, in qua de variis lect. N. T. dissertit L. 1730.

Harwood's Introduction to the N. T.

J. D. Michaelis's Introduction to the N. T. translated by *Herbert Marsh*, with notes and additions.

Jo. G. C. Klotzsch Handbuch der kritischen Geschichte des N. Test. zum Gebrauch der akad. Vorlesungen, Witt. 1795.

H. C. A. Haenlein Handbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des N. Test.

J. L. Hug Einleitung in die Buecher des N. T.

H. E. Gottl. Pauli Introductionis in N. T. Capita Selectiora Jen. 1799.

II. The Divine Authors of these books, were either the constant and familiar companions of our Saviour, and by him diligently instructed, or they were the friends and assistants of the Apostles. They had been previously Jews of obscure circumstances—fair characters, and well instructed in their own religion. They were, however, ignorant as to the learning of the Greeks, and at a great remove from their subtlety of disquisition and refinement of language. The interpreter, therefore, is not to expect any refined method of discourse, nor great attention to style in the Sacred Writings: nor is he to suppose that the inspired penmen, in becoming authors, could entirely lay aside their previous character and habits.

The question, concerning the inspiration of the N. T., need not occasion any difficulty in this part of our course, as it is generally admitted, that the Holy Spirit, accommodated himself to the genius of the several Sacred Writers.

These teachers and writers were not of high rank, but, for the most part, mechanics. The learning attributed, by many to them, was Hebrew and not Grecian—in profane philosophy, they were entirely unskilled, though by no means ignorant of the literature of their country.—See

Jo. Franc. Buddei Ecclesia Apostolica, 1729.

Sandini Historia Apostolica, 1731.

Jo. Lami de eruditione Apostolorum liber singularis, Flor. 1766.

Thalemanni d. de eruditione Pauli Apostoli Judaica, non græca, L. 1769.

In instructing his disciples, our Saviour took that method which was best suited to their characters and circumstances, gradually leading them to reject their former errors, and embrace his doctrines, proposed to them in Jewish figures.

III. The Sacred Writers were obliged to accommodate themselves, in some measure, to the character of their readers, and to the object which they wished to accomplish. Most of the early christians were converts from Judaism; the mode of instruction adapted to them, must not only have been familiar, but the illustrations must have been drawn from sources with which they were acquainted, and the arguments of the kind to which they were accustomed. Something, therefore, was to be conceded to their character and opinions—to their forms of expression and modes of arguing, as far as was consistent with the perfect security of christian doctrine. The principal design of the Sacred Writers, was, that their readers might be correctly informed, as to the character of the Author of the Gospel—that they might understand and embrace his doctrine, and be preserved from the errors to which they were particularly exposed.

A very small portion of the Sacred Writings was addressed, exclusively, to the heathen; the greater part was directed to those, who had been Jews or Proselytes, or who, in a great measure, followed Jewish customs. There were some teachers who endeavoured to introduce Jewish rites and errors among the early converts, even among those who were of Gentile origin.

On the doctrine of accommodation, there is great diversity of opinion; whether it be considered in reference to the exposition and illustration of certain doctrines, to the mode of argument or narration, or to the manner in which the O. T. is quoted and employed in the New. Some of the Greek Fathers appear to have favoured the idea that the Sacred Writers did accommodate themselves

even in matters of doctrine, to popular opinions and modes of expression.

F. A. Cari Diss. Historia antiquior sententiarum ecclesiæ græcæ de accommodatione Christo inprimis et Apostolis tributa, L. 1793.

The Socinians and Grotius are the advocates of such accommodation, most of those of our communion are opposed to the doctrine.

J. J. Rambach d. contra hypothesin de SS. ad erroneos vulgi conceptus accommodata, 1729, et in Exercitt. Hermeneut. N. 5.

C. E. a Windheim d. de erroribus vulgi in libris sacris non probatis. Goett. 1748.

J. F. Russ d. de œconomia qua Christus in docendo usus fuisse dicitur. Tub. 1773.

Ist die Lehre von Accommodationen im N. T. Neologie? *Henke* Neus. Mag. II. 638.

This doctrine, though it has of late been more accurately defined, has led to much disputation and evil feeling.—See

Hausfi, Behni, Heningæ, Van Hemert, Winkleri libb. de institutionis Jesu et App. ratione et accommodatione. add. *Eichhorn*, Bibl. III, 920, IV, 306.

Wolff. Fr. Gess, Briefe ueber einige theol. Zeitmaterien, besonders ueber den accommodationsgrundsatz in Hinsicht auf einige positive Lehren der Chr. Rel. Stuttg. 1791.

E. W. Opitz d. præ. *Mich. Webero* de accommodationis Christi et App. didacticæ natura, Vit. 1789.

G. C. Storr observationes quædam spectantes ad enodandam quæstionem: utrum se Judæorum hermeneuticis erroribus accommodaverint missi divinitus interpretes? in *Berg* Symbb. litt. Duisburgg. II, 2. p. 413.

Concerning the character and situation of those to whom the Sacred Writings were originally addressed, consult

Staudlin Gesch. der Sittenlehre Jesu, I. p. 710.

Seiler Hermen. p. 273.

From the views, disposition, and customs of those, to whom the Scriptures were addressed, may be discovered the peculiar characteristics of some of the Sacred Writers.

J. J. Griesbach Commentt. duæ de imaginibus, quibus auctor ep. ad Ebræos in describenda Messiaë provincia usus est. Jen. 1791—92.

The question has been started, whether our Sacred Writers, drew any thing from the Essenes.

Bengel Bemerkungen ueber den Versuch das Christenthum aus dem Essaismus abzuleiten in *D. Flatt* Magazin für chr. Dogm. und Moral VII, p. 126.

IV. Although the Aramean language was in common use in Palestine, and was employed by our Saviour, and perhaps by some of the Sacred Writers, yet the Greek was by no means unknown. As spoken in Palestine, however, it had departed greatly, from the pure and ancient Attic, and in its general structure, and in the use of words and phrases, had assumed an Aramean or Hebraic character. The genius of this Hebraic Greek, can be most advantageously learned, from the Greek versions of the O. T., from the apocryphal books, and from other writings of the Jews in Greek. There are some expressions peculiar to the Christian Writings, in which certain words are used in an unusual sense.

J. H. L. Heeren Comm. de linguarum Asiat. in imp. Persico varietate et eognitione, Commentt. Soc. Goett. XIII. *Eichhorn* Bibl. VI, 772.

The Aramean Language, which belongs to the Shemitish class, has two dialects, the Jerusalem (eastern,) and the Galilean (western.)

Giambern. de Rossi Dissertazioni della lingua propria di Cristo e degli Ebrei nazionali della Palestina da' tempi de Maccabei, etc. Parma, 1772. See also *Eichhorn's* Bibliothek, VIII.

Although the Jews of Palestine were not friendly to Grecian Literature, (*J. A. Ernesti*, d. de odio Judæorum adversus litteras græcas, opusc. phil. p. 408 :) yet the use

of the Greek was not unknown in Judea and Galilee, and to the foreign Jews, it was perfectly familiar.

As some have entertained the opinion, that Christ spoke in the Greek Language, and others (*Harduin*) have contended that the books of the N. T. were written in Latin; so of late it has been thought by some, that many parts of the N. T. are translations from the Aramean or Syriac, and "that they could detect errors of the Greek Translators.

J. J. Griesbach Ueber die in dem griech. Text des N. T. entdeckten Eubersetzungsfehler, *Augusti* Neue Theol. Blaetter, I. B.

Lud. de Dieu in his Preface to his Grammar of Eastern Languages, had expressed the opinion, that the true sense of many of the forms of expression in the N. T., was to be sought from the Syriac.

On the Greek Language, after the time of Alexander the Great, and on the Dialect, which is called the Macedonico-Alexandrian.—See

Fr. Gu. Sturz Commentationes IV. de dialecto Alexandrina, L. 1786. Geræ, 1788—93—94.

J. F. Fischeri Proluss. de Vitiis Lex. N. T.

Dan. Heinsii Exercitationes sacræ ad N. T. quibus Aristarchus sacer accessit, L. B. 1639.

Ejusd. Exerc. de lingua Hellenist. et Hellenistis, L. B. 1643.

Ejusd. Apologia adversus Croium 1640.

Heinsius was opposed by *Croius*, *Salmasius*, and others.

Salmasii Liber de hellenistica s. Commentarius controversiam de lingua hellenist. decidens L. B. 1643.

Ejusd. Funus linguæ hellenist. s. confutatio exerc. *Heinsii*.

Jo. Croii sacræ et historicæ in N. T. observationes, Genevæ, 1645.

Matthæi Cotterii de Hellenistis et lingua hellen. Exercitationes secundaria, 1646.

The controversy, which formerly excited so much attention, on the style of the N. T., whether it was pure Greek, or Hebraic, or mixed, has sunk to rest, yet it is important, as a matter of history, to know what has been written on the subject.

There have been two collections of the works upon this point.

Dissertationum Philologico-theol. de stilo N. T. syntagma a *Jac. Rhenferdio* collectum addita ipsius diss. de seculo futuro. Leov. 1701.

Syntagma diss. de stilo N. T. græco quas collegit *Taco Hajo van den Honert*, Amst. 1703.

a. The principal defenders of the purity of the N. T. style after *Hen. Stephans* and others, are

Sebasti. Pfochenii diatr. de linguæ gr. N. T. puritate Amst. 1633.

Balth. Stolbergii Liber de solæcismis et barbarismis græcæ N. T. dictioni falso tributis, Vi. 1681—85.

Blackwall's Sacred Classics, Lond. 1731.

Chr. S. Georgii Vindiciarum N. T. ab Ebraismis Libri III. L. 1732.

b. The writers who took a middle course.

Tho. Gatakeri Diss. de novi instrumenti stylo, contra *Pfochenii* diatr. ben, Lond. 1648, and in his Opp. Criticis.

Jo. Olearii Liber de stilo N. T., 1721.

Jo. Henr. Michaelis d. de textu N. T. græco Hal. 1707 (cf. ejusdem diss. de usu LXX. interpretum in N. T. Hal. 1715.)

c. Those who contend that the whole style of the N. T. is Hebraic.

Jo. Vorstii Commentarius de Hebraismis N. T. curavit *J. F. Fischerus*, L. 1778.

Jo. Leusdenii de dialectis N. T. singulatim de ejus Hebraismis libellus singularis, iterum editus a *J. F. Fischeri*. Accedunt *Vorstii* Commentarii de Adagiis N. T. Hebraicis, L. 1792.

Sam. Werenfelsii diss. de stilo Scriptorum N. T. Basil, 1698.

Morus in his Hermeneutics, reviews the arguments on both sides of this question. Add *Seiler Hermen.* p. 309.

In the N. T. therefore, are to be found; what the Greeks would call Barbarisms; and in particular, Hebraisms, Syriisms, Rabbinisms, and modes of expression nearly allied to those which are characteristic of the Arabic and Persian languages, also Solecisms and Latinisms.

J. E. Kappii d. de N. T. græci Latinismis merito et falso suspectis L. 1726.

Chr. Sig. Georgii d. de Latinismis græcæ N. T. dictioni immerito adfectis, Vit. 1731.

Sig. Fr. Dresig Vindicæ d. de N. T. græci Latinismis merito et falso suspectis, L. 1732.

Those words and phrases which are peculiar to the N. T. language, as to the sense in which they are used, are not altogether new, but were derived from the Sacred Prophets, from the usage of the Jews in general, or of those of their number, who had particularly philosophized on the subject of religion.

On the language of the N. T., consult *Michaelis* Introduction I. p. 101—223. *Haenlein* I. p. 376. *Morus Herm.* I. p. 195.

V. The several books of the N. T. were originally edited by their authors separately, as occasion offered, and sent to one or more Christian congregations. From these they were gradually disseminated; and as many spurious writings, claiming Divine authority, were circulated, all were diligently examined, the spurious rejected, the genuine approved and collected into one volume, which was probably not completed before the fourth century. It cannot now be fully determined, when or by whom this was done, nor what were the grounds of decision in every case; nor why, those, which were for sometime questioned, were received into the canon; yet the *authenticity* and *integrity* of the whole volume and of its several parts, can be satisfactorily determined; and hence also the *confidence* and *authority* due to these records.

The origin of the several books and of the Gospels, will be considered in its proper place. There seems at first to have been smaller collections made, which did not always contain all the books of the same class, nor of the same author: perhaps these collections were sometimes more, and sometimes less extensive, until at last, all the Sacred Writings were gathered into one Volume.

On the *Canon of the N. T.* The Canon of *Eusebius*. The books were divided into ὁμολογούμενα, ἀντιλεγόμενα, and νόθα.

J. E. G. Schmidt ueber den Canon des *Eusebius*, Henke Magazin T. V. P. III.

C. C. Flatt ueber den Canon des *Eusebius*, in *Flatt* Magazin f. die Dogm. T. VIII.

This subject was still more fully discussed by *Oeder* and *Semler*. Walch *Neueste Religionsgeschichte*, T. VII.

Beleuchtung des Jued. und chr. Bibelkanons, vol. I. Hal. 1792.

Chr. Fr. Weber Beytraege zur Gesch. des neutest. Kanons. Tueb. 1791.

On the ancient canons.—See

Schroeckh. Kgesch. IX, *Wagner* Einl. in die heil. Buecher, and *Muencher* Handbuch der christl. Dogmengesch. I.

Causes of diversity in the canons of different churches. The reasons, upon which the decisions respecting the canonical authority of the several books rested, were not always the same, nor always equally important. *Augustin*. de doctr. chr. II, 8. *Junil*. de part. leg. div. The authority of the church, after the seventh century interposed on this subject. The same *canonical authority* was always attributed to all the sacred books.

Authenticity refers, both to the age of the Sacred Writings, and to the authors to whom they were attributed. The arguments upon which this point is decided, are, 1st. Internal, derived from the sentiments, the style, and the nature of the subject. 2d. External, the testimony of christian writers, of heretics, of profane authors, and the comparison of the apocryphal with the genuine books. 3d. Mixed, the agreement of the general subject, and of the several parts, with the history of the times and of the authors. 4th. The weakness of opposing arguments.

Michaelis I. p. 4. *Hænlein* I. p. 39.

Lardner's credibility of the Gospel History, and his Jewish and Heathen testimonies to the truth of the christian religion.

Ausführliche Untersuchungen der Gruende fuer die Aechtheit und Glaubwuerdigkeit der schriftl. Urkunden des Christenthums von *Joh. Fr. Kleuker*.

Paley's Evidences. Paley's Horæ Paulinæ.

Jones' New Method of settling the Canonical authority of the N. T.

On the causes, multitude, and nature of the apocryphal books, see

Kleuker ueber die Apokryphen des N. T. Hamb. 1798. It is the fifth part of the work just quoted.

The *Integrity* of the N. T. consists in this, that no book anciently included in the canon, has been lost, and that none has been improperly added. And again, that no book has been so corrupted by interpolation or otherwise, either through carelessness or design, but that the genuine reading may be probably restored, and the true sense of the authors in doctrine, precept, and fact, be discovered. Integrity has been divided into *critical* and *doctrinal*. *Haenlein*, I. p. 261. *Ernesti* Inst. int. N. T.

Some have conjectured, that certain epistles and other writings of the divine authors, have not been preserved, and that some passages have been interpolated, but this does not affect the doctrinal integrity of the N. T.

Many unfounded opinions have been advanced on the designed corruptions, and improper emendations of the N. T.

Pet. Wesseling diatr. de Judæorum archontibus et diss. de Evangelii jussu Anastasii imp. emendatis 1738.

Barth. Germon de vett. hæreticis eccless. codd. corruptoribus. Libri I. 1718.

Bentley's Phileleutheri Lipsiensis Remarks on a late discourse on Free-thinking, Cambr. 1725.

Since the time of *Bentley*, there has been much diversity of opinion, on the origin, number, use and importance of the various readings of the N. T.

Jo. Sauberti Epicrisis de origine auctoritate et usu varr. N. T. lectionum græcarum in genere, prefixed to his various readings upon Matthew.

Ad. Rechenberg d. de variantibus gr. N. T. lectionibus in ejus Exercitt. N. T. hist. eccl. et litt.

L. L. Frey Comm. de variis leect. N. T. Bas. 1713.

Christ. Luderi d. de causis variant. lectionum SS. 1730.

Ant. Driessenii divina auctoritas Codicis N. T. vindicata a strepitu variant. leect. Groen. 1733.

Add. Michaelis Introduction. *Henzlein* T. I.

As early as the beginning of the second century the number of various readings was very considerable.—See

Griesbach. Curæ in hist. text. epp. Paull. p. 74.

By far the greater part of these discrepancies, makes no alteration in the sense.

The *credibility* of the Sacred Writers, relates both to their narrations and instructions. The arguments upon this subject are exhibited by the defenders of christianity and the scriptures.

VI. The scrupulous care taken of the Sacred Writings, and the custom of using them constantly in the church, is sufficient to convince us that they have been preserved from any serious alterations, yet they could not be entirely defended from the fate of all other ancient writings. The autographs appear to have perished early, and the copies which were taken, became more or less subject to those errors, which arise from the mistakes of transcribers, the false corrections of commentators and critics, from marginal notes, and from other sources. These errors may have been extensively propagated, and in some instances they may have had an origin anterior to any MS. or means of correcting the text now extant.

Jo. Frickii Comm. de cura veteris eccl. circa canonem S. Scripturæ, Ulmæ 1728.

Eb. Henr. Dan. Stosch Comm. historica crit. de librorum N. T. canone, præmissa est diss. de cura vet. eocl. circa libros N. T. Francof. 1755.

On the *ecclesiastical use* of the N. T. during the first centuries, consult

Muenschcr. Handbuch der Chr. Dogmengesch. I. p. 312.

Various descriptions of the N. T. books were in use among the churches. Ἀναγνωσµατα, ἀναγνωσεις, Lectiones, Evangelitaria, Praxapostoli, Lectionaria, Pericopæ, &c.

Vetustum eocl. græcæ Cpolit. ut videtur Evangeliarium Bibl. ducis Saxo-Gothani nunc primum totum—edidit *C. F. Matthæi* 1791.

Kalendarium Ecclesiæ Cpolit. e Bibl. Rom. Albanorum cura *St Ant. Morcelli*, Rom. 1788.

J. H. Thameri Schediasma de origine et dignitate pericoparum quæ Evangelia et epistolæ vulgo vocantur, Jenæ 1716.

The Sacred Writers appear to have written in a continued series without leaving any intervals. After some ages Τίτλοι (sections) Κεφάλαια (chapters) Στίχοι, Ρήµατα were introduced. There is, however, great diversity in the different MSS. in marking them.

Our distinctions into chapters and verses, are of much more recent origin. Some have considered *Hugo de S. Caro*, of the XIIIth century, as the author of our present chapters; others, *Stephan Langton*, Archbishop of Canterbury, of the same century; and others *Arlott*, President of the Franciscan order. The inventor of the verses, was *Rob. Stephans*, in 1551. The invention was made during a journey.

Joach. Klepperdein d. de distinctione N. T. in capita et versiculos, Vit. 1688. 4.

Chr. Frid. Sinneri d. de distinctionibus textus N. T. in capita, versiculos, puncta, commata et cola L. 1694. 4.

Concerning the accents, breathings, and the iota subscriptum, there has been great dispute. The ancient and modern character and use is to be distinguished.—Consult

Villoison Anecd. Gr. I. p. 104.

Fischer Spec. anim. ad Vueller. I. p. 250.

Michaelis and *Haenlein*.

S. G. Major d. de iotorum subscriptione suspecta eorumque præsertim ex numis perpetuo exilio. Kil. 1688.

The present punctuation, which is frequently erroneous, could not be of the Apostolic age.

Geo. Frid. Rogallii diss. de auctoritate et antiquitate interpunctionis in N. T. 1734. 4.

J. C. Herzog Comm. de interpunctionum positu, præsertim in ep. ad Romanos L. 1707.

Aug. Bischoff d. de interpunctionibus N. T. Jenæ 1708. 4.

But few of the Sacred Writings were *ιδιογραφα*.

Ferd. Stosch Tractatus de epistolis apostolorum idiographis 1751.

J. E. T. Walch Ep. de apostolorum literis authenticis a Tertulliano commemoratis.

The Autographs early perished. Probable causes of this.

Griesbach Hist. textus epp. Paulinarum, Jen. 1777.

Perhaps many copies of some of the Sacred Writings, were immediately published. Thence, while the authors were yet living, and sometimes by their command, many copies were written, that they might be sent to various congregations. Thus both private and public collections were gradually formed.

Even in these first copies, mistakes may have been made, by transcribers, or something added by commentators or readers, with a view of explaining the phraseology, augmenting the narration, or illustrating the style; yet it may be supposed, that greater care would be bestowed on these than upon any other books.—Consult

Haenlein II. 1. p. 17. et de variis lectionibus earumque classibus.

It was the conjecture of *J. D. Michaelis*, that all our Sacred books were derived from one common source.—See,

Orient. und exeg. Bibl. XXI, 159.

VII. There are two opinions of modern critics, as to the proper method of examining the ancient MSS. and forming a correct opinion with regard to their excellence and authority. Some suppose that those MSS. are of most consequence, which are not only recommended by their antiquity, but which exhibit the text of the New Testament without any scholia, or any signs of alterations made from versions, commentaries, or the conjectures of learned men. Others are of opinion, that as it was early provided, that the churches of the larger provinces, should use the same sacred books, that critical recensions or editions were made, from which the Codices of those regions were transcribed; and therefore, that the value of the readings of these Codices is to be estimated, not from the number and age of individual Manuscripts, but from the antiquity and consent of these different editions.

MSS. were of parchment, silk, or paper; they differ also in their form and condition; some are written in capital or uncial letters; others, in smaller characters; some are rescripti, written over other works; some are corrected; some were designed for private use, others for the churches; some were negligently, and others accurately written. Some later MSS. are *eclectici* or *critical*, some are transcripts of other MSS. still extant, or of printed editions; some contain the whole N. T., others a greater or less number of the several books, and others are merely fragments. Some have latin translations, (codices bilingues) or scholia, or commentaries, annexed.

On the codices which were formerly called *latinizing*, see,

On determining the age of MSS., consult,

Gattereri Comm. de methodo ætatis eodd. MSS. definiendæ, in Commentt. Soc. Goett. Vol. viii.

The authors who have attended with care to the judgment, to be formed of MSS., are *Matthæi*, *A. Bengel*, in Introd. in crisin N. T., *Semler*, Vorber. zur Theol. Hermen. IV., and *Griesbach*.

Distinction of MSS. into *recensions*, *editions*, or *families*.

Griesbach, originally made but two recensions, the Alexandrian or eastern, the Western or latin; to these he afterwards added the Byzantine. *Michaelis* added the Edessene; others a *mixed* edition. cf. *Haenlein*, I. 90, *Ammon* ad *Ernesti* Inst. p. 169.

Some of the MSS. have been entirely, others but partially collated.

The MSS. of the N. T. remarkable for their age or excellence, have been described by

Rich. Simon diss. crit. sur les principaux Actes Manuscrits etc. at the end of his work, Histoire crit., referred to above.

Michaelis in his Introduction translated by *Marsh*.

Haenlein Handbuch II.

Griesbach Prolegg. ad N. T. and in his Symbol. Crit. and by *Mill*, *Wetstein*, *Matthæi*, *Alter*, *Birch*, in the prefaces or Prolegomena to their editions of the N. T., or collections of various readings.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS WHICH HAVE BEEN HITHERTO COLLATED.

I. *Codex Alexandrinus*. This MS. is written in uncial letters, in four vols. fol. of which the first three contain the O. T., the fourth the whole of the New. In the opinion of *Woide*, this vol. was written by two different scribes. It is not complete, as it begins with Matt. XXV. 6, and in John there is a chasm from Ch. VI. 50, to VIII. 52. In the opinion of *Griesbach* it sometimes agrees with

the Alexandrian, sometimes with the Western recension, and at others differs from both.—See

Novum Test. Græcum e cod. MS. Alexandrino qui Londini in Bibl. Mus. Britann. adservatur descriptum a *Car. Godofr. Woide*, Lond. 1786, f.

II. *Amandi* codex, was known to *Erasmus*. Little concerning this MS. has been made public.

III. *Angelici* codices, in the library of the Augustinian monks at Rome. They are two in number, and have been partially collated by *Birch*.

IV. *Askewiani*, formerly the property of *Ant. Askew*, now in the British Museum. There are several MSS. belonging to this collection, but they have not been accurately collated.

V. *Augiensis*, formerly belonging to *Bentley*, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It contains the Epistle of Paul, mutilated. The Greek is written in uncial letters, the Latin version, which attends it, in small letters.

VI. *Augustani* codices. They are twelve in number. The best account of them is given by *C. F. Matthæi*.

VII. *Bandurii*, is a fragment in uncial letters containing the history of the Publican and Pharisee.

VIII. Codices *Barberinii*, in the library founded by Cardinal *Barberinus*, in the 17th century. Of these MSS, twelve have been examined.

IX. *Barocciani*, two; now in the Bodleian library.

X. *Basilienses*, six; one contains the IV Gospels in uncial letters, and another the whole of the N. T. (excepting the Apocalypse,) in small letters.

XI. *Basiliani*, in the library of the Monks of St. Basil at Rome, of these they reckon six.—See

Montfaucon. Bibl. Bibliothecarum T. I.

XII. *Bodleiani*, twelve; (*Millii*. Prolegg. Sect. 1423, *Semler* Herm. Vorb. III. 257.

XIII. *Boenerianus*, now in Dresden, a Greek and Latin MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, (excepting the Epistle to the Heb.) in uncial letters.

XIV. *Benoniensis*, in the library of the Regular Canons, No. 640, containing all the N. T. but the Apocalypse. It has been slightly examined by *Birch*.

XV. *Boreeli*, a MS. of the IV Gospels in uncial letters from Matt. vii. 6. It has been only partially collated.

XVI. *Borgiani*, four, in the Museum of Cardinal *Steph. Borgia*.

XVII. *Camerarii* codex, frequently quoted by *Camerarius* on the Gospels, in his Commentary on the N. T.

XVIII. *Cantabrigienses*, in number nine. The MS. which by way of eminence is called the codex *Cantabrigienses*, formerly belonged to *Theod. Beza*. It is written in uncial letters, and contains the Gospels and Acts. There are many chasms in it, some of which have been filled up by a later hand. A fac simile of this MS. was published in fol. by *Dr. Kipling* 1793, to which he prefixed its history.

XIX. *Carpzovianus*, a MS. of the 12th century, containing the four Gospels.

XX. *Claromontanus*, is a greek and latin MS. of the Epis. of St. Paul, written in uncial letters, in which the beginning of the Epistle to the Rom. and the end of that to the Hebrews is wanting. *Griesbach* collated it anew, and has described it fully in his *Symbb. Critt.* Tom. II. p. 31, ss. He thinks that it was written in the 7th century, and that it has been corrected by five successive critics, from the 8th to the 11th centuries. Before these corrections it seems to have differed very much from the western recension. It was used by *Beza*, and is now in the royal library.

XXI. Codices *Coisliani*, in the library of the Benedictines of St. Germain. They are fourteen in number.— See,

XXII. *Colbertini*, twelve. These were procured by *J. B. Colbert*, and afterwards transferred to the royal library.—See,

Bibliotheca Colbertina, Paris, 1728, and *Montfauc.* *Palæographia*, Gr. passim, in primis, p. 209.

XXIII. *Cottoniani*, two, of which one is a fragment containing part of the Gospels, written in uncial letters, the other is a lectionarum.—See,

Smith Bibliotheca Cottoniana, Ox. 1795.

XXIV. *Covelliani*, five. Brought by *D. Covell*, from the East, now deposited with the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum. See Catalogue of the Harleian MSS. Lond. 1759.

XXV. *Geo. Douzae* Codex, a greek and latin MS. of the IV Gospels.

XXVI. *Dresdenses*, four; neither of them anterior to the 13th century.

XXVII. *Dublinenses*, four. One of these is the codex *Montfortianus* of the 16th century, containing the whole of the N. T. It was known to *Erasmus*, and is famous as containing I. John, 5, 7. The fourth is a codex rescriptus of about the 7th cent., containing most of the Gospel of Matthew in uncial letters.

XXVIII. *Ebnerianus*. It contains the whole of the N. T. excepting the Apocalypse.

XXIX. *Escorialenses*, twenty—see,

Moldenhaverus ap. *Birchium Prolegg.* ad. ed. IV. Evv.

Of these twelve, have been more or less carefully examined.

XXX. *Eubeswaldianus*. A codex of the four Gospels.

XXXI. *Jac. Fabri*. Greek MSS. which he sometimes quotes in his commentary on St. Paul's Epistles; marked by *Griesbach* and *Wetstein* as No. 13.

XXXII. *Andr. Faeschii*. Two MSS. collated by *Wetstein*.

XXXIII. *Florentini*. 1st. *Laurentiani* quoted by *Birch* in his Prolegomena, and by him slightly examined; in number, twenty six. 2d. A Greek codex from the Bibliotheca eccles. Aedilium in Florence. 3d. Two in the library of the Benedictines of St. Mary. 4th. Three in the library Fratrum Prædicatorum.

XXXIV. *Galei* Codex of the four Gospels, with Scholia.

XXXV. *Gehlianus* now *Goettingensis*. A MS. of the four Gospels.

XXXVI. *Genevenses*, two—see,

Senebier Catalogue raisonne des msts. conserves dans la Bibl. publ. de la Ville de Geneve, 1779.

XXXVII. *Guelpherbytani* codices, five. Of these one is a codex rescriptus of the 6th cent., containing a fragment of the Gospels. Another also of the 6th century, contains part of Luke and John. See on both,

Semler Hermen. Vorber. IV.

XXXVIII. Cod. *Henr. Googii* containing the four Gospels.

XXXIX. *Grævii*. A codex of the Gospels, of the 11th century.

XL. *Gravii*. A MS. of the Gospels.

XLI. *Codices Harleiani*. Now in the British Museum. vid. A catalogue of the Harleian collection of MSS. purchased by authority of Parliament for the use of the public, and preserved in the British Museum, Lond. 1759. Of these nine are here enumerated, others having been mentioned already in No. XXIV, and an other will be mentioned below under the title *Johnson*.

XLII. *Havniensis*, three. vid. Codicum N. T. Græcorum qui Hayniæ in Bibl. Regia adservantur notitia,

adjecta lectionis varietate auctore *C. G. Hensler* Specimen I. Hafn. 1784.

XLIII. *Huntingdoniani*, two ; now in the Bodleian library—see,

Mill and Griesbach's Symb. II.

XLIV. *Johnsonianus*, now Harlei. 5647, in the British Museum. It is an elegantly written codex of the 11th century.

XLV. *Lambethanus* ; commonly called *Ephesius*, because it formerly belonged to the Bishop of Ephesus ; now in the library of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It contains the four Gospels, and was written about 1160.

XLVI. *Laudiani*, five ; now in the Bodleian library, cf. Catal. MSS. Angl. T. I. P. I.

XLVII. *Leicestrensis*. A codex written partly on paper, partly upon parchment, of the 14th cent., containing the whole N. T.—Several chasms.

XLVIII. *San-Maglorianus*. A codex of the 12th cent. ; containing the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Acts of the Apostles.

LIX. *Manhemiensis*. A codex of the four Gospels, written in uncial letters.

L. Cod. *Mazarini*, of the 10th century.

LI. Codices *Meadii*, now in the Brit. Museum. Two of them have been mentioned in No. IV. ; the third is an Evangelistarium.

LII. *Medicei*, four ; partly examined by *Wetstein*.

LIII. *Missyani* codices, three lectionaria.

LIV. *Molsheimensis*, containing the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles

LV. *Mosquenses* Codices, thirty-three—see.

Matthæi præf. ad Eph. ad Cor. tabulam duplicis divisionis codd. Evangel. in classes, præmissam Ev. *Matthæi*, inprimisque præf. Eph. Cathh. et præf. Ev. Marci.

LVI. *Neapolitanus* Regius, embraces the Acts, the

Epistles, and some chapters of the Apocalypse. It was written in the 11th cent.

LVII. *Oxonienses*, thirteen—see, *Mill's Prolegomena*.

LVIII. *Palatino-Bavarici*. Here should be mentioned particularly the codex *Ingolstadiensis*, which contains the Gospels in uncial letters, with an extended commentary written in smaller letters.

LIX. Cod. Cardin. *Dom. Passionei*, containing the Acts and Epistles, in large letters, written in the 7th or 8th cent.

LX. *Parisini*, formerly *Regii*—see,

Catal. MSS. Bibl. Reg. T. II. p. 12.

One of these, No. 9, is called the codex *Ephremi*, because the works of *Ephrem* the Syrian, are written over the Greek Bible; parts of which are still legible—see,

Griesbach Symb. Crit.

No. 62, is in uncial letters, and belongs to the 9th cent. No. 48, containing the Gospels in uncial letters, written in the 10th cent. There are thirty enumerated under this head, besides those already mentioned.

LXI. *Perronianus*. A codex of the 10th cent. containing the four Gospels.

LXII. *Petaviani*, three.

LXIII. *Posoniensis*, contains the four Gospels.

LXIV. *Reuchlini*. A codex of the Apocalypse of considerable antiquity, used by *Erasmus* in his first edition.

LXV. *Rhodiensis*. A codex containing the Epistles. It was used by the editors of the Complutensian Polyglott.

LXVI. *Rutgersii*. A codex of the four Gospels.

LXVII. *Seidelianus*. A MS. brought from the East, by *A. E. Seidel*.

LXVIII. *Seldeniani*, three, in the Bodleian library, besides two Evangelistaria, collated by *Mill*.

LXIX. *Stephani* codices, fifteen; used by *Rob. Stephens* for his edition of 1550. Whether these MSS. are now extant, is disputed—see,

Travis' Letters to Gibon. Porson's Letters to Travis. Marsh's Letters to Travis, Appen. N. I. and Griesbach. Prolegomena ad N. T.

LXX. *Siculi* codices, four; examined by *Birch*.

LXXI. *Tigurinus*. A codex of the Epistles of Paul, which, in the opinion of *Wetstein*, is a transcript of the first edition of *Erasmus*, taken by *U. Zwinglius*, in 1516.

LXXII. *Tubingensis*. Is a fragment containing Joh. I, 38—50, in the large characters.

LXXIII. *Uffenbachiani*, four—see,

J. H. Maii Bibliotheca Uffenbachiana Msta. Ital. 1720.

LXXIV. *Upsalicensis*. A MS. containing the Acts and the Epistles.

LXXV. *Laur. Vallue* codices. This author, in his annotations on Matthew, quotes three, and upon John, seven greek MSS. Some of these, however, may have been since examined by other critics. Their various readings, as exhibited by *Erasmus*, do not appear to be important.

LXXVI. *Vaticani*. In the Vatican, properly so called, twenty-six. Of these, one is called the codex *Vaticanus* by way of eminence. It contains the Old and New Test. in uncial letters. It is of great antiquity, and is in value, the rival of the codex *Alexandrinus*. 2. *Palatino-Vaticani*. Given by *Maximilian* Elect. of Bavaria, under *Urban VIII.* to the Vatican library. Of these there are eight, containing more or less of the N. T. 3. *Alexandrino-Vaticani*, six, added by *Alexander VIII.* 4. *Urbino-Vaticani*, two. 5. *Pio-Vaticani*, two, added by *Pius II.* 6. *Bibl. S. Mariæ*, four. 7. In the library of Card. *de Zalada* is a MS. of 11th cent. beautifully written, containing the four Gospels.

LXXVII. *Veneti*, nineteen. See,

Montfaucon. Bibl. MSS. T. I. Birch. Prol. ad Evv. Jac. Morellius Bibl. MSS. gr. et lat. Ven. T. I.

LXXVIII. Cod. *Vigerii*, of the 9th or 10th cent. containing the four Gospels, examined by Bogotius.

LXXIX. *Vindobonenses*, twenty-five. See,

H. Treschow, Tentam. descript. codd. vett. aliquot Gr. N. T. MSS. quæ in bibl. Cæs. Vindob. asservantur, etc. Havn. 1773.

LXXX. *Westmonasteriensis*, in the Brit. Mus. ; it contains the Acts and Epistles.

LXXXI. *Winchelseanus*. A codex of the 10th cent. containing the four Gospels.

LXXXII. *Wolfiani*, three, two of which were brought from the East.

LXXXIII. *Zittaviensis*. A codex containing the historical books of the O. T. and all the writings of the New.

The number of MSS., therefore, which have been collated, is 394. Of these thirty-three are in uncial letters. Eighteen contain the whole N. T. Twenty-seven all the N. T. with the exception of the Apocalypse. Twelve contain all the books excepting the Gospels. The Acts and Epistles are found in thirty-five. The Acts and Catholic Epistles in six. The Acts and Epistles of Paul in five. The Epistles in three. Two hundred and three contain the Gospels alone. The Acts are found separately in one. Twenty-six contain the whole or greater part of the Epistles of Paul. But few MSS. contain the Apocalypse, in connection with other books, and still fewer contain it alone, as this book was seldom read in the churches.

Besides these, there are other codices, which are of some importance, which contain selections from the various books of the N. T.

VIII. In order to form a correct opinion, respecting the character and state of the text of the N. T., we must not only consult the MSS. which are now extant, but also attend to the ancient versions, which are not of less importance, in reference to the criti-

cism, than they are to the interpretation, of the Sacred Volume. The only other source of information upon this subject is, the quotations from the N. T., to be found in the early writers.

On the versions, consult *Michaelis* and *Haenlein*, so often referred to—also,

Fabricii Bibliotheca, Gr. IV.

Le Long Bibl. Sacra, edited by *Masch.* P. II. V. 1.

Rosenmueller Handbuch III.

Rich. Simon Histoire crit. de les versions N. T.

These versions are,

I. The oriental.

1st. The Syriac. a. The old version is called simple (*Peschito*). The best edition is by *Schaaf*, 1717. On this important version, see,

P. J. Bruns Bemerkungen über einige der vornehmsten Ausgaben der Syr. Ueb. des N. T. &c. in Repert. für Bibl. u. Morg. Litt.

J. D. Michaelis curæ in versionem Syr. Actuum App. Gött. 1755.

b. The more modern Syriac version is called *Philoxenian*, from *Philoxenus*, Bishop of Hierapolis, from A. D. 488 to 518, who had this version made by *Polycarp*, his Rural Bishop, A. D. 508.

Sacrorum Evangeliorum vertio Syriaca*Philoxeniana nunc primum edita cum interpret. et annotatt. *Joseph White*, Ox. 1778.

c. A third Syriac version is the Jerusalem, called by others, the Syro-Assyrian.

N. T. versiones Syriacæ, Simplex, Philoxeniana, et Hierosolymitana, denuo examinata, a *Jac. G. C. Adler* Hafn. 1789.

Gloc. Ridley diss. de Syriacarum N. T. versionum indole et usu, 1761.

G. C. Storr observationes super N.T. versionibus Syriacis. Stuttg. 1772, 8.

2nd. The Egyptian versions—the Coptic and Sahidic.

Novum Test. Ægypticum, vulgo Copticum, ex MSS. Bodlei descriptis, cum Vaticæ. et Pariss. contulit, et in Lat. Sermonem convertit *Dav. Wilkins*, Ox. 1716.

Frid. Muentzer Comm. de indole versionis N. T. Sahidicæ.
Eichhorn Bibl. der b. Litt. IV.

3d. *Arabic* versions. Some of these were made from the Greek, others from the Syriac, Coptic, and Latin versions, and none of them are very ancient.

Tho. Erpenius integrum N. T. e cod. Leid. Scaligeri, 1616 edidit.
G. C. Storr diss. critica de Evangeliiis Arabicis Tub. 1775.

4. The *Aethiopic* version, of which *Fruementius*, who founded the Christian Church in Aethiopia, is thought to be the author.

The Roman edition in 1548 and 49, and repeated in the Lon. Polyglott.

Novum Test. ex versione Aethiop. interpretis—ex Aeth. lingua in lat. translatum. a *C. A. Bode*.

5. The *Arminian*. Translated by *Miesrob*, A. D. 410.

Veteris et Novi Test. versio Arm. 1666.

6. *Persian*. There are two versions of the Gospels, one from the Syriac, in the Lond. Polyglott; the other edited by *Wheloc* and *Pierson*, collected from various MSS.

II. *Latin* versions.

1. Those before the time of Jerome.

Bibliorum SS. latinæ versiones antiquæ s. Vetus Italica, et ceteræ quæque in codd. MSS. et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt, quæ cum vulg. lat. et cum textu græco comparantur. Opera et studio *D. Petri Sabatier*. Remis 1743, III. f. Evangeliarium quadruplex latinæ versionis antiquæ s. veteris Italicæ nunc primum in lucem editum ex codd. MSS. a *Jos. Blanchino*. Rom. 1748, II. f.

Several MSS. are extant which have latin versions attached to the Greek text, which differ from the Vulgate.

2 Versions of Jerome, partly corrected, partly made de novo.

Hieronymi divina Bibliotheca complectens translationes V. et N. T. e vetustissimis Codd. Vatiec. Gallice. etc. opera et studio Monachorum ord. Bened. (*Martianzi*) Par. 1693, f.

3. The Vulgate was gradually formed out of those just mentioned. Of this there are MSS. extant of considerable antiquity. Since the invention of printing, there have been numerous editions of the Vulgate; the most important are—Complutensis, 1517. Andr. Osiandri, Nor. 1522. Rob. Stephani, 1523; and frequently after this date. Joh. Benedicti, Par. 1541. J. Clarii, 1542—Lovanensium Theoll. Lon. 1547.

The editions of Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. were printed, the one, in 1590, the other in 1593. As rivals they gave rise to considerable controversy.

Tho. James Bellum Papale, s. Concordia discors Sixti V. et Clementis VIII. circa Hieron. edit. Lond. 1600.

Sixtini Amanæ censura vulg. lat. versionis, Francqu. 1624. Ejusdem Antibarbarus Biblicus, Amst. 1628.

J. Fr. le Bret d. de usu versionis lat. veteris in eccl. chr. occasione Codd. Stuttgardensium, Tub. 1786.

III. Other Western versions.

1. The Gothic. Of the four Gospels, there are two very ancient versions, the Gothic and Anglo-Saxon; the former was edited from a MS. in silver letters, by *Junius*—the latter was published from MSS. by *Tho. Mareshall*, 1665.

Evangeliorum versio Goth. Ulfilæ cum parallelis versionibus Sueo-Gothica etc. Stockh. 1671.

Jo. ab Ihre Scripta versionem Ulphilanæ et linguam Moeso-Gothicam illustrantia—cum aliis Scriptis similis argumenti edita ab *Ant. Fr. Buesching*. Ber. 1773.

2. Anglo-Saxonica. Una edita est IV. Evangg. versio Saxonica et Anglica a *Matth. Parker*, 1571.

3. Slavonic, made in the ninth or tenth cent., which corrected, is used by the Russians.

J. P. Kohl Introductio in Historiam et rem litterariam Slavorum imprimis sacram, s. historia critica verss. Slavonicarum maxime insignium—Alt. 1729.

4. The ancient German; these, however, are not from the Greek, but from the Latin.

IX. Neither the first editors of the N. T., nor those who immediately followed them, were able to do justice, to the important work which they had undertaken. They were destitute of many critical helps, which later editors have possessed, and the art of criticism itself, was, at that period, not sufficiently reduced to a system. These advantages have been embraced by learned men, and critical editions of almost every size, have been presented to the public.

On the editions of the New Testament, see *Michaelis'* Introduction. *Le Long*. Bibliotheca Sacra ed. *Masch* I, p. 189. *Fabricius* IV, p. 839. *Griesbach*. Historia Edd. N. T. Graeci, in *Barkey* Mus. Hag. II, II. 493. *Rosenmueller* Handbuch I. 278. *Haenlein* Handb. II, I. 254.

On the received text (formed from the edition of *Rob. Stephens*, of 1550, and especially from the Elzevir edition of 1624.) see *Griesbach*. Sect. I. Prolegg

I. Editiones principes. Sex Johannis capita. ven. ap. Ald. 1504. v. *Adler* in Repert. für Bibl. und Morg. Litt. XVIII. Evangelium Johannis, Tübingæ, 1514.

Complutensian Edition, printed in the Polyglott of Complutum, 1514; published 1522. The MSS. used for this edition, it is thought, were modern. A long controversy was carried on, upon this point, principally between *Goeze* and *Semler*, v. *Walther* in *Walch* Neuester Religionsgesch. IV. p. 425. The text of this edition, has been followed by many others.

The five editions of *Erasmus*, with translations. a. Novum Instrumentum omne diligenter ab *Erasmio* Roterodamo recognitum et emendatum non solum ad græcam veritatem, verum etiam ad multorum utriusque linguæ codd. fidem, postremo ad probatissimorum citationem, emendationem et interpretationem. Basilæ in æd. *Jo. Frobenii*,

1516. b. His second edition (multo quam antehac diligentius recognitum) was published in 1519. c. His third, 1522. In this edition he inserted the passage I. John, V, 7, upon the authority of a British MS. d. His fourth appeared in 1527. e. His fifth (accuratissima cura recognitum) was published with annotations, Basil. 1535.

II. The early editions, in which the text of the *editiones principes* was reviewed upon the authority of MSS.

Sim. Colinaei gr. Lut. Par. 1538, Svo., see *Griesbach*. Symb. crit.

C. Guillardiae s. *Jac. Bogardi*, gr. et lat. Par. 1543, 8. Those of *Rob. Stephens*, three in Greek, 1546, 12mo.; 1549 12mo.; and the splendid edition of 1550 in folio; and one in greek and latin, 1551, Genève.

On the MSS. which Stephens used—see,

Marsh's additions to Michaelis, and his Letters to Travis append. N. J. *Griesbach*. Prolegg. ad ed. N. T.

The editions of *Rob. Stephens*, jun., Lut. 1569, of *Jo. Crispin*, gr. Genève, 1553, 8, and *Henr. Stephens*, 1576, followed with little alteration.

The editions of *Theodore Beza*, with a latin version, 1565, 1572, 1589, 1598. f.

III. Editions, which exhibit a text, formed from the editions, which had been previously published.

Wechelieae, Erf. ad M. 1597. f. 1601. f. II. voll. *Elzeveriae* 1624. 16mo. 1633. 12. *Boccleriae* Argent. 1645. 1660. 12mo. *Er. Schmidii* gr. lat. Nbg. 1658. f.

The following critics, carried on the collection of various readings, more extensively, and accurately, than their predecessors had done. *Stephan Curcellaeus* (ed. N. T. gr. Amst. 1658.) *Brian Walton* (in the London Polyglott, T. V. and VI. 1657.) *Jo. Fell* (Novi Test. libri omnes accesserunt parallela Script. loca una cum varr. lectt. ex plus 100, MSS. codd. et antt. verss. collectæ, Ox. 1675. Of this edition there was a splendid reprint in Ox. 1703.)

IV. Modern critical editions.

Novum Test. cum Lectt. varr. MSS. exemplarium, versionum, edd., SS. PP. et Scr. eccl. et in easdem notis, Accedunt loca Scr. parallela etc. Præmittuntur dissertatio, et historia S. textus N. Fœderis—studio et labore *Jo. Millii*. Ox. 1707. f. Reprinted with improvements and additions by *Kuster*. Amst. et L. 1710.

Dan. Whitby Examen variantium Lectionum *Jo. Millii* in N. T. etc. Lond. 1720. f. rec. Lugd. B. 1724. *Cph. Matth. Pfaffii* diss. critica de genuinis librorum N. T. Lectionibus, ope canonum quorundam critt. indagandis, ubi et de *Millii* Collectione Varr. N. T. Lectt. modeste disseritur. Amst. 1709. 8.

J. A. Bengelii Prodromus N. T. Græce recte cauteque adornandi, 1725, adi. Chrysostomi LL. de Sacerdotio. Auctior Prodromus 1731.

Novum Test. ita adornatum, ut textus probatarum edd. medullam, margo. varr. lectt. delectum, apparatus sub-junctus criscos sacræ compendium exhibeat, inserviente *J. A. Bengelio*, Tub. 1734.

J. A. Bengelii Defensio N. T. græce, Tubingæ edit. L. B. 1737.

Eiusd. Tractatio de sinceritate N. T. græca tuenda. Cum. adpersis ab editore *C. B. Michaelis* adnotatiunculis, Hal. 1750.

Apparatus critici Secunda et auctior ed. cur. *Phil. Dav. Burkii*, 1763. 4.

(*Jo. Jac. Wetstenii*) Prolegomena ad N. T. græci edit. accuratissimam, e vetustissimis Codd. MSS. denuo procurandam, etc. Amst. 1730. 8. postea auctiora ab ipso edita, et *Semleri* cura repetita, v. supra. p. 12.

Novum Test, græcum ed. receptæ cum lectt. varr. codd. MSS. edd. aliarum, versionum et patrum nec non commentario pleniore—opera et st. *Jo. Jac. Wetstenii*, Tom. I., Amst. 1751. f. T. II. 1752. f. (recus. Bas. 1775. sed cum nota a. 1751.)

I. A. Ernesti Specimen castigationum in Wetstenii edit. N. T. in Opusec. phil. et crit. p. 326. ss.

Libri historici N. T. græce, Pars prior sistens Synopsis Evangg. Matthæi, Marci et Lucæ. Textum ad fidem codd. verss. et patrum emendavit, et lect. var. adiecit *Griesbach*, Hal. 1774. (Eiusd. ed. secunda emend. et auct. Hal. 1798. 8.) Pars posterior, sistens Joh. Ev. et Acta App. 1775. 8. Nov. Test. græce, Textum ad fid. codd.—adjecit *Griesbach*, vol. I. Evangelia et Acta App. complectens, Hal. 1777. 8. Vol. II. Epistolas et Apocalypsin complectens, 1775. 8. Novum Test. græce. Textum—recensuit, et lect. var. adjecit *J. J. Griesbach*. Vol. I. Quatuor Evangelia complectens. Editio secunda emendatior multoque locupletior, Hal. et Lond. 1796. 8. mai.

J. J. Griesbachii Curæ in historiam textus græci Epp. Paull. Specimen primum. Jenæ, 1777, 4.

Symbolæ criticæ ad supplendas et corrigendas VV. N. T. Lectionum collectiones. Accedit multorum N. T. codd. gr. descriptio et examen. Tomus prior. Hal. 1785. 8. Tomus posterior 1793.

Commentarius criticus in textum gr. N. T. particula I. Jenæ 1798. 8. mai. (XX. Capp. Matthei.)

Novum Test. XII. Tomis distinctum, græce et latine. Textum denuo recensuit, varr. lectiones numquam antea vulgatas collegit—Scholia græca—addidit, animadverss. criticas adjecit et edidit *Cph. Frid. Matthæi*, Rigæ 1788. 8. (Singulæ partes separatim inde ab a. 1782, prodierant, cf. *Eichhorn*. Bibl. II, p. 305. ss.) Novum Testam. ad Codicem Vindobon. græce expressum. Varietatem lect. addidit *Tr. Car. Alter*. Viennæ, Vol. I. 1787; Vol. II. 1786. 8. cf. *Eichhorn*. I, 1. II, p. 102. ss.

Quatuor Evangelia græce cum variantibus a textu lectionibus codd. MSS. Bibl. Vat. Barb. Laurent. Vindob. Escur. Havn. quibus accedunt lectiones verss. syrarum—edidit *Andr. Birch*, Havn. 1788, 4. (*Eichhorn* II, 116. ss.)

Variae Lectiones ad textum Actt. app. Epp. Cathol. et Pauli e codd. gr. MSS. Bibl. Vat. Barber. etc. collectæ et editæ ab *Andr. Birch*, Havn. 1798, 8. (*Griesbach* in *Neuen theol. Tourn.* XIII, (1799) p. 396. ss.)

Variae Lectiones ad textum Apocalypseos—collectæ et editæ ab *Andr. Birch*, Havn. 1800, 8.

Variae Lectiones ad textum IV. Evangg.—collectæ et editæ ab *A. Birch*, H. 1801, 8. (*Gabler Journ. f. theol. Litt.* III. 71. ss.)

V. Smaller critical editions.

Novum Test. post priores Steph. Curcellæi tum et Oxoniensium labores, quibus parallela Scr. loca nec non varr. lectt.—collectæ exhibentur; accedit—crisis perpetua, qua singulas variantes—ad XLIII. Canones examinat G. D. T. M. D. (*Gerh. van Mastricht*) Amst. 1711. 8.

The New Testament in Greek and English, containing the original text corrected from the authority of the most authentic MSS. with notes and various readings, Lond. 1729. 11. 8. (auct. *D. Mace.*) See,

Leon. Trwells examination of the late N. T. Lond. 1732. 8.

Novum Test. græcum ad fidem græcorum solum Codd. MSS. nunc primum expressum. Accessere in altero Volumine emendationes coniecturales V V. D D. undique collectæ Lond. cura typis et sumt. G. B. (*Guil. Bowyer,*) 1763. II. 8.

The New Testament collated with the most approved Manuscripts, with select notes in English; to which are added a Catalogue of the principal Editions of the Greek Testament, and a list of the most esteemed commentators, by *E. Harwood*, Lond. 1776. 1784. 11. 8. min.

Editiones *Leusdenii* inde ab a. 1693. plures—*Rein-eccii* inde ab a 1725. sæpius—*Chr. Schoelgenii* L. 1744. Vratisl. 1781. 8. *Bengelii* Stullg. 1734. 8. et sæp. Ed. *quintæ* (mendis typogrr. obsitæ) accedit *Spicilegium lectt.* var. auctore *Ern. Bengelio*, Tub. 1790. 8.

Testamentum D. N. J. C. novum in usum studiosæ juventutis edidit *Laur. Sahl.* Havniæ, 1787. 11. 8.

Novum Test. græce. Recognovit atque insignioris lectt. varietatis et argumentorum notationes subiunxit *G. C. Knappius*, Hal. 1797. 8.

VI. Critical editions, with annotations.

Novum Test. græce. Perpetua annot. illustratum a *J. B. Koppe*, Vol. I. compl. Epp. Pauli ad Gal. Thess. Eph. Gött. 1778. 8. Second edition by *T. C. Tychsen*, 1791. 8. Volumen IV. complectens Ep. Pauli ad Rom., Gött. 1783. 8.

Volumen VII. compl. Epp. Pauli ad Tim. Tit. et Philem. continuavit *J. H. Heinrichs* Gött. 1792. Volumen IX. compl. Epp. Jacob. et Petri—continuavit, *Dav. Jul. Pott*.

Volumen VIII. compl. Ep. Pauli ad Ebræos continuavit *J. H. Heinrichs*. Vol. X. complec. Apocal. continuavit, *J. H. Heinrichs*.

Pauli ad Corinthios Epp. græce. Perpetua annot. illustratæ a *F. A. Gu. Krause*. Vol. I. complec. Ep. priorem Fr. f. ad M. 1792.

Pauli Ap. Ep. ad Philipp. gr. ex. rec. Griesbach. annot. perpetua illustrata a *M. J. G. am Ende*, Vit. 1798.

Epistola Judæ gr. Commentario critico et annot. perpetua illustrata a *H. C. A. Haenlein*, Erl. 1799.

H. E. G. Paulus, Philologisch-krit. und histor. Kommentar, über das neue Test. in welchem der griech. Text nach einer Recognition der varianten etc. bearbeitet ist. Erster Theil der drei ersten Evv., erste Hälfte, Lüb. 1800. 8. Zweiter Th. der drei ersten Evangelisten, zweite Hälfte 1801. 8. Dritter Theil, 1802. 8.

Michaelis in his Introduction, after giving the character of the various editions, which were then published, states the objects which it is still desirable to obtain, in a critical edition of the N. T. See also, *Haenlein* Handbuch, II. 292.

SECTION III.

CRITICAL LAWS OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. If the origin and nature of the readings of the N. T. be understood, it will be perceived, that besides the laws, which all interpreters of ancient authors, ought to follow, in examining ancient documents, in selecting from their various readings—in detecting and expunging interpolations, in filling up chasms, and restoring depraved passages—there must be others, peculiar to the Sacred Volume.

J. H. ab Elswich Diss. de recentiorum in Novum Fœdus critice, Vit. 1711.

J. C. Klemm Principia Criticæ Sacræ N. T. Tub. 1746. 4.

Jo. Geo. Richter Exerc. de arte critica Scripturæ interprete, L. 1750. 4.

J. L. Frey Comm. de varr. lectt. N. Test. Bas. 1713.

C. B. Michaelis Tractatio crit. de var. lectt. N. T. caute colligendis et dijudicandis, in quo cum de illarum causis—tum de cautelis agitur, simulque de codicibus, versionibus antiquis et Patribus partim curiosa, partim utilia afferuntur, Hal. Magd. 1749. 4.

Fr. Ant. Knittels neue Gedanken von den allgemeinen Schreibfehlern in den Handschr. des N. T. Braunsch. 1755. 4.

J. J. Breitingeri Diss. crit. de examine dubiæ lectionis N. T. rite instituendo, Mus. Helv. XVIII. See also, the works of *Semler*, *Wetstein*, and *Griesbach*, already frequently referred to.

Criticism is divided, although not very properly, into *higher* and *lower*, and each into *grammatico-historical* and *conjectural*.

I. *Lower* or *verbal* criticism. See,

S. G. Wald diss. de eo, quod incertum est in critica verballi N. T., Regiom. 1795. 4.

The general rule is, that the reading which bears, as it were, the impress of the author's hand, and from which it may be seen, how the other readings might easily have

arisen, is probably genuine. Hence, it is proper, that even the obvious errors of transcribers, should be noted, as they often furnish indications of the correct reading.

The common laws which are of authority, in the criticism of profane authors in general, are,

1. That reading, which rests upon the testimony of decidedly the greatest number of witnesses, is to be esteemed genuine. Yet all the readings of the smaller number of witnesses, are not at once to be rejected.

2. That reading, which is found in the best copies, unless other reasons forbid, is to be preferred to that which rests upon inferior copies, although these copies be the more numerous. The antiquity and intrinsic excellence of a reading, do not, of themselves, prove it to be genuine.

3. That reading, which is the more harsh, obscure, difficult, and unusual, if it have besides, competent testimony in its behalf, is to be preferred to the perspicuous, the obvious, and the usual. Difficulty is sometimes in the style and connexion, sometimes in particular words and phrases, sometimes it is grammatical, historical, or doctrinal.

4. That reading, which is most consistent with popular and familiar usage, if supported by external testimony, is to be preferred to that which is more artificial or abstruse.

5. The shorter reading, *caeteris paribus*, is to be preferred.

6. That reading, which furnishes the best sense, is to be selected. But in deciding upon this point, the nature of the passage, and character of the writer, and not our own opinions, are to be regarded.

7. That reading, which gives an unmeaning, or incongruous sense, is to be rejected. Care, however, must be taken, that we do not hastily decide that a sense is false, which a more thorough examination, may show to be probable, and perhaps correct.

8. The reading, most consistent with the author's style,

is to be preferred. It should be remembered, however, that the style of an author, in a course of years, sometimes changes.

9. That reading is to be rejected, which exhibits indications of an alteration designedly made.

These changes might arise,

a. From doctrinal reasons, Matt. XXVII, 16.

b. From moral, or ascetic causes.

c. From doubts on historical, or geographical grounds. Matthew, VIII, 28.

d. From the desire of reconciling passages apparently contradictory.

e. From the desire of increasing the force of an expression.

f. From the collation of different MSS., whose readings are sometimes intermixed.

g. From the comparison of similar passages.

10. Those which arise from mere negligence of transcribers, or the errors frequent in all writings, are not, properly speaking, to be regarded as various readings. Under this head belong,

a. The commutation of dialects, especially the Macedonian, Alexandrian, or others, with the common. *Fischer*. *Proluss de vit. Lex. N. T.* p. 666. The common forms, and those of the Alexandrian dialect, in the N. T., are more commonly genuine than those of the other dialects.

b. The change of letters and syllables, through mistake, either of the eye, or the ear.

c. The confusion of synonymous words.

d. The introduction of notes from the margin into the text, and the uniting of two readings.

e. The omission of a word or verse.

f. The transposition of words or passages—see,

Everw. Wussenberg. diss. phil. crit. de transpositione, seu saluberrimo in sanandis vett. Scriptis remedio. Franef. 1736.

g. Mistakes from words of similar termination, or similar appearance; or from neighbouring words terminating or beginning with the same syllable.

h. The improper division or union of words, arising chiefly from the ancient method of writing.

i. Improper interpunction.

11. That reading which has the appearance of being a gloss or explanation, is to be rejected.

These explanations consist sometimes of single words, and sometimes of entire passages. The sources of them are various; they are sometimes connected with the genuine words, and sometimes they exclude them. It is not to be supposed, however, that every explanatory addition we find in the text, is to be rejected as spurious.

Fischer. Proll. de vitt. Lexx. N. T. p. 593. *Abresch.* Spec. III. Anim. in Ep. ad Hebr. p. 346.

C. C. Tittman Pr. de glossis N. T. æstimandis et judicandis. vit. 1782, 4.

12. Hence, also, those readings which have found their way into the text from versions, or from the comments of the ancient interpreters are to be rejected; but in acting upon this rule, the greatest skill and caution are necessary.

II. *Higher Criticism.* Common laws.

1. That sentence or passage, that book or section, which, in its matter or style, is so foreign from the genius and manner of an author, as that it can scarcely be thought to have proceeded from him, ought to be reckoned spurious, or at least highly suspicious.

2. A passage, which is entirely at variance with the rest of the discourse, and interrupts the connexion, is to be considered an interpolation—see,

Ferberg. Spec. II. Animadverss. in loca selecta N. T. 1798.

3. Where the same, or nearly the same words, are

found in another part of the book, and suit the connexion of the discourse in that place, much better than in the passage under consideration, it is probable that they have crept in, and ought to be expunged.

4. Parts of books introduced where they seem to have no connexion with the matters treated of, but which contain clear evidence that they proceeded from the author, may, without impropriety, be so transposed, or arranged, as to render the order more consistent.

It has been inquired, whether there may not be some errors and interpolations in our Scriptures, older than any of our MSS. or historical monuments ;—and

Whether there be any propriety in making conjectural emendations of the SS.—See,

Michaelis' Introduction, vol. II.

Paul. Joach. Sig. Vogel Pr. de conjecturæ usu in crisi N. T., cui adjuncta est brevis Comm. de quarto libro Esdræ. Altd. 1795, 4.

W. Bowyer conjectures on the N. T. 1763. 4.

J. T. Krebs Vindicæ quorundam locorum N. T. a *Jo. Taupio* male sollicitatorum L. 1778. 4. II.

H. C. A. Haenlein Examinis curarum criticarum atque exegeticarum Gilb. Wakefield in libros N. T. particulæ V. Erl. 1798—1802. 4.

Schutz Vindicæ locorum quorundam N. T. a Wakefieldo, qua critico qua interprete, tractatorum. Jen. 1799.

II. It will easily be perceived, that the Laws of Criticism, peculiar to the N. T., must be derived, from the nature of the subjects treated of, from the character of the language in which it is written, and from the nature of those sources whence its various readings are derived.

They are principally the following :

1. Those passages which are inconsistent with the christian religion or history, or with the manner of the writer to whom they are attributed, or with the importance of the doctrine, or the dignity of the sacred teacher, are to be regarded as spurious. These points, however, are to be

judged of, according to the opinions and manner of writing prevalent in the times of the sacred penmen. On doctrinal points, especially, the greatest caution is to be used.

Attention also should be paid to the frauds sometimes committed, in interpolating and corrupting books from pious motives. On the other hand, passages may have been rejected as spurious when really genuine, from the impression that they were unworthy of the sacred writers.

2. That reading, which most nearly approaches the Hebrew or Syrochaldaic idiom, is for the most part to be preferred, to those in which the purely Greek idiom is preserved. Some of the N. T. authors, as Luke and Paul, however, wrote the Greek more in accordance with the classic writers.

The conjecture, that the sacred books, were written in Syrochaldaic, and that the ancient translators, may, in some instances, have erred, could apply to very few, if to any of the books of the N. T.

3. As the sacred writings were constantly used, both publicly and privately, and particular sections employed in the lessons for the church, it may have happened that changes arose from the parallel passages of the O. and N. T., or from the lectionaria.

4. Many MSS. versions, and early writers, are found almost uniformly, following the same reading. Those which belong to the same class, are not to be numbered separately, as independent witnesses, but taken collectively, as one testimony; much less are we to confide implicitly in any one MS., although it be ancient, and carefully written; nor, on the other hand, are the readings even of a modern and inferior MS., to be rejected without consideration.

5. In every reading, it is first of all, to be enquired, to which recension or class of MSS. it belongs.

The age and origin, therefore, not so much of the

MSS. as of the readings, are to be investigated, cf. *Seiler*, *Bibl. Herm.* p. 291.

No MS. is extant, which exhibits through all the books, any one recension, incorrupted. It is therefore, from the consent of many of the same class, and from internal criteria, that we are to judge, which recension, any particular reading is to be referred to. Some MSS. in different parts, follow different recensions. Very few copies belonging to the ancient classes, remain, those belonging to the more modern are much more numerous.

6. That reading, in which all the recensions concur, is to be regarded as genuine.

7. The readings of the most ancient classes, especially when recommended by other authority, are to be preferred.

8. The Alexandrian class is sometimes to be preferred to the western, but not uniformly. Where the different classes vary, the greatest attention must be paid to other historical and internal criteria of the genuineness of a passage.

9. The greatest authority is due to MSS., but the ancient versions, and the works of early ecclesiastical writers, are not to be neglected.

10. In collecting various readings from the ancient versions, and in estimating their importance the following rules should be observed.

a. The greatest weight is due to those made immediately from the Greek. Among these, the most important, are, the Latin, Syriac, and the Gothic.

b. Care must be taken that we use a correct copy of these versions.

c. It is to be observed, whether they are literal, or merely give the sense; whether the faults observed, be chargeable on the versions themselves, or appear to have arisen from the MSS. their authors used.

d. Versions, which, upon examination, appear to follow

a particular class or recension, of MSS. are to be ranked with that class as one witness.

e. No reading, which is derived from the ancient versions alone, and is destitute of other authority, is to be approved; yet the concurrence of all the Versions and the ancient Fathers, renders the reading of the MSS. very suspicious.

11. As to the ancient ecclesiastical writers, the following rules should be observed.

a. We should be careful to use a critical and correct edition of their works, lest we be deceived by corrupted passages.

b. We must diligently attend to the character of these writers, their age, erudition, their discernment; to their disposition to alter the text, &c. We should also endeavour to discover the character and class of the MSS. which they used.

c. It is carefully to be observed in what kind of works, these various readings occur. Whether in commentaries, in doctrinal, practical, or polemical compositions; because quotations are commonly made in one class, much more accurately than in another.

d. The form and manner of the quotation are to be observed—whether the passage be cited pointedly, as a direct proof, or whether it be quoted memoriter—casually alluded to, &c.

It is not reasonable to dismiss all the quotations of the Fathers, with the assertion that they were made negligently, and from memory; because, although this may often have been the case, yet in some instances there is internal evidence that the quotation was made with care, and that the writer really read in his MSS. what we now find in his works.

e. The mere omission of a passage, in the commentaries of the Fathers, is not sufficient evidence against it.

Yet if the passage be important, their silence renders it suspicious.

12. The writings of the ancient heretics, are not entirely to be neglected, in the criticism of the N. T.

13. That interpunction of the words and sentences, and that distinction of paragraphs and chapters, is to be observed, which best agrees with the subject, and the connexion of the discourse.

III. Since it is admitted, in the criticism of the N. T., as in that of other ancient writings, that the true reading, cannot always be determined with absolute certainty, but only a judgment as to what is most probable be formed, it is evident, that more should not be required, in this department, than can be performed—nor a positive judgment be given, without the most careful examination. And moreover, if in the criticism of profane authors caution and modesty should be used, much more should every thing like rashness, or levity, be excluded from the criticism of the Sacred Volume.

Car. Segaar. or. de critice in divinis N. T. libris aequè ac in humanis, sed circumspectè et modeste etiãnum exercenda. Ultraj. 1772. 4.

Several circumstances conspire to render the criticism of the N. T. peculiarly difficult—the peculiarity of the mode of writing, the number of the books, and the danger of alteration from various causes to which they were exposed.

That division of the *higher criticism*, which relates to the excellences or faults of books—the narration, mode of argument, and the subject generally, will be treated hereafter.

SECTION IV.

RULES OF INTERPRETATION FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. There can be but one interpretation of a passage, genuine and correct. And this interpretation must elicit that sense from the words of the author, which, upon grammatical and historical grounds, can be shown, should be attributed to them, and which clearly conveys to the reader, the idea of the writer. From this remark, it follows, that the interpreter must have a two-fold duty to perform ; first, that he himself should properly understand the language, the ideas, and subject of his author ; and secondly, that he should correctly exhibit or explain all these to others. Hence Hermeneutics may be divided into two parts.

E. C. Westphal de genuina SS. interpretatione in Meditatt. phil. et theol. argumenti. L. 1790. 8.

S. F. Winterberg Prol. de interpretatione unica, unica et certæ persuasionis de doctrinæ religionis veritate, et amicæ consensionis causa, in Commentt. theol. edd. a Velthusen. Kühnöl. et Rup. T. IV.

J. A. Grosch d. de hermeneutice in omnibus disciplinis una eademque. Jen. 1756.

Sense is spoken of as certain, or doubtful ; proper or improper ; grammatical ; historical. Other divisions, which are not of much advantage, are mediate and immediate ; the mystical, allegorical, typical, parabolical, moral ; natural, spiritual, supernatural, &c.

B. Groddeck d. de sensu Ser. S. Dant. 1752.

II. That the interpreter should properly perform

both the offices specified above, it becomes him to approach his work, with a mind, not only imbued with the knowledge of the Greek and Eastern languages—of history and the laws of interpretation—with sound judgment and discernment—but he must avail himself of every subsidiary aid ; he must prosecute his work with diligence, accuracy and caution, and pursue his investigations, uninfluenced, either by his own previous opinions, or the opinions of others—and he must above all cherish a candid and pious state of feeling. It is necessary, therefore, that he should know, in the first place, both the primary and secondary meaning of words—and secondly, the peculiar mode of writing, which distinguishes the N. T. authors—he should be able to decide how the true sense, is to be discovered, and understand the method of arguing and constructing their discourses, characteristic of the sacred writers.

J. F. Fischeri Prol. de linguæ gr. interiore scientia, interpretationis librorum N. T. adjumento maxime necessario. L. 1772.

C. G. Thalemani d. de sensu veri et falsi in interpret. librorum sacrorum L. 1776. 4.

J. C. Velthusen Pr. quo sensus veri et falsi commendatur monumenta religionis rite æstimaturis. Adjectæ sunt animadverss. criticæ potissimum ad archæologiam sacrâ, Helmst. 1781. 4.

Chr. Ben. Michaelis Diss. de modestia exegetica. Hal. 1751. 4.

Chr. Theoph. Kuinoel d. de subtilitate interpretationem grammaticam commendante. L. 1788. 4.

Subtilitatem interpretis N. T. in verborum notionibus ex contexta oratione definiendis commendat. *J. Guil. Fuhrmann.* Kil. 1778. 4.

Chr. Gfr. Richteri d. de libertate interpretandorum librorum divv. et doctrinæ publicæ examinandæ admodum utili. Hal. 1783. 4.

J. B. Riederi d. de usu ingenii in interpretanda, SS. Alt. 1753. 4.

Chr. Fr. Roederi Comm. de ingenii usu et abusu circa interpretationem Scr. S. Torg. 1741.

J. H. Noelting d. de artis imaginandi ad SS. applicatione, Jen. 1758. 4.

J. Ge. Albrecht Pr. de interpretatione sacr. litt. vitio affectuum corrupta, Frf. ad m. 1747. 4.

S. F. N. Mori d. de discrimine sensus et significationis in interpretando. L. 1774. et in ejus diss. theol. et philoll. T. I.

Some have distinguished the qualifications of an interpreter of the N. T. into natural, acquired by human means ; and moral, derived from Divine assistance. See,

Carpzovii Primæ lineæ herm. p. 10. ss.

PART I.

RULES AND HELPS FOR PROPERLY UNDESTANDING THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE SIGNIFICATION OF WORDS.

I. It is evident, that the first duty of an interpreter, is to investigate the signification of words, both singly and in their combinations. Here it should be kept in mind, that some words are used *properly*, others *improperly* ; some simply, others emphatically ; some according to the usage of common life, others in a sense peculiar to the christian system. Therefore, the rules for investigating the signification of words, are either common and universal, or such as are applicable only to the language of the Sacred Writers.

I. The signification of single words, in a dead language, is to be learned,

a. In some instances, from the natural connexion between the word, and signification, *ὀνομασποιοητικά*.

b. From etymology ; great caution, however, is requisite, in acting upon this rule, as the primary significa-

tion of a word, is frequently very different from its common meaning.

c. From analogy, as well of the language in question, as of others related to it.

d. From the usage of those writers, to whom the language was vernacular, or who lived during the period in which it was spoken.

e. From the explanations which the authors themselves, sometimes annex to the words they use.

f. From parallel passages, in which the same idea is expressed, either in different words, or more at length.

g. From the immediate context, where the word occurs.

h. From the design and subject of the writer.

i. From ancient translations.

k. From the grammatical remarks, the scholia, and glossaries of the ancients.

In these, are to be found especially, words of peculiar difficulty, words ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, πολύσημα, *barbarous*, *synonymous*, &c.

The significations of words, were at first simple, but gradually enlarging, the same word came to have various meanings, and numerous accessory ideas became connected with the primary signification.

These various significations should be reduced to their natural order, and not be unduly multiplied, as has been done by some Lexicographers—see,

S. F. N. Mori d. de nexu significationum ejusdem verbi. L. 1776. et in Diss. theoll. et phil. T. I. p. 394.

2. The signification of words in combination, or of phrases, may be, in general, learned,

a. From the nature of the combination, or connexion itself. It is, however, frequently the case, that usage has attached a different idea to a particular phrase; from that, which its composition would seem to indicate.

b. From the direct or indirect testimony of writers.

3. The signification of words and phrases, in the writings of the N. T., is to be particularly sought,

a. From the usage of the Greek language, as it existed after the time of Alexander the Great. And this usage may be learned from the fragments which remain of the dramatic writers of that period ; from the works of Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Arrian, and others of the same age.

b. From the Hebrew or Syrochaldaic, whence, in some instances, words have been derived, and in others, used in senses conformed to the Hebrew usage.

Mart. Pet. Cheitomaei Græco. barbara N. T. quæ orienti originem debent. Amst. 1649.

To this purpose, the books of the O. T., the Talmudical and Rabbinical writings, and works in the Syriac, Arabic, &c. have been advantageously applied. See,

Michaelis' Introduction, VI. *Haenlein* Einl. I. *Ammon.* ad Ern. Inst. Int. p. 67. The works of *Vorstius* and *Leusden* quoted above, and *J. G. Herder* Erläuterungen zum N. T. aus einer neu eröffneten oriental. Quelle, 1775. 4.

c. From the style of those Jews, who, during this period used the Greek language. The Greek versions of the O. T., the apocryphal books, and the works of Josephus and Philo, are particularly worthy of attention.

Chr. Fr. Schmidt. Diss. II. versionem Alex. optimum interpretationis, LL. SS. presidium esse, L. 1763. 4.

J. F. Fischeri Proluss. de verss. græcis litterarum hebr. magistris, L. 1772. 8.

G. J. Henkii d. de usu librorum apocr. V. T. in N. T. Hal. 1711.

b. From the character of the christian system, whence certain words derived a signification more or less extensive, which they retained constantly or only under peculiar circumstances.

That this may be properly understood, the *usus loquen-*

di of the O. T., and of the later Jews, and the history of the opinions which then prevailed, must be attended to. The usage, also, of the N. T. writers themselves, the comparison of perspicuous with difficult expressions, and the history of early christian opinions, serve to elucidate the force of expressions of peculiar import, in the N. T.

Examples of this class of words and phrases, are *εὐαγγέλιον* ; *βασιλεία τῶν ἑρηνῶν* ; *παρυσία χριστοῦ* (see *D. Flatt Symbolarum ad illustranda nonnulla ex iis N. T. locis, quæ de παρυσία Chr. agunt, Partic. I. Tub. 1801. 4*) *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, *νόμος* (see *P. N. Jochims de variis τοῦ νόμου signif. in epp. Paulinis obviis, Meldorp. 1788.*) *πίστις* (*N. Reden d. præ. Wallenio de varia signif. voc. πίστεως in N. T. 1802.*) *ἔργα*, *δικαιῶσθαι*, *ἀφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν* ; *παλιγγενεσία* ; *πνεῦμα* (see *J. F. Schleusner, d. de vocabuli πνευμα in Libris N. T. vario usu Gött. 1791, 4. Griesbach. Commentt. de vera notione vocabuli πνευμα in cap. VIII. Ep. ad Romanos, Jenæ editis.*) *σάραξ* *Tho. Stuemmer Tentamen exeg. crit. circa quæstionem : quæ significandi vis vocabb. πνευμα et σαραξ in stilo Paulino insit? Wirecb. 1802.* See also *Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations*. To discover the meaning of such expressions, the connexion of the discourse is of great importance.

II. The tropical signification of words and phrases, in the New Testament, has, in part, the same sources, and is regulated by the same principles, as among other people and other authors ; and in part, is derived from sources, and rests on principles, peculiar to the Sacred Writers. The duty of the interpreter, in accurately investigating, and properly explaining the figurative language of the New Testament, is derived from these considerations, and he may also hence discover the faults to be avoided.

Fr. W. Mascho Unterricht von den Bibl.—Tropen und Figuren—Halle 1773. 8.

Job. Gf. Hegelmaier Libri III. de dictione tropica etiam Ser. Sacræ. Tub. 1779. 8.

Tropes are either necessary, arising from the poverty of language, and the magnitude of the subject treated, or they are used for the sake of varying and ornamenting the style. They are grammatical, or rhetorical; general, or appropriate to particular kinds of writing.

They rest upon similitude, or the various connexions and relations of things.

Metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and anthropopeia may be separately treated.

The sources of tropes in the New Testament are, a. nature itself, b. common life, c. history, d. the Sacred Writings of the Jews.

1. Tropical expressions, are derived from either of these sources, especially the last, and may be discovered,

a. From the nature and character of the subject, sentiment, or expression.

b. From the series of the discourse, and from certain words, frequently added for the sake of illustration.

c. From the nature and design of the discourse, or argument.

d. From parallel passages, where the same subject, or idea, may be literally expressed.

e. From the *usus loquendi* and history.

f. From the connexion of the doctrine itself.

2. In explaining the foundation of the similitude, we must endeavour, in the first place, so to represent it, that it may agree with the genius of the East; and secondly, to have respect, not only to general usage, but also to the particular passage, in which the trope occurs; so that the full force of the figure may be perceived.

3. The cautions necessary to be observed on this subject, are, that we do not press the etymology of the tropi-

cal word too far—that we do not too much extend the force of the figure—nor seek in it more than the nature of the passage will admit—and that we do not unnecessarily multiply tropes.

III. Some words and phrases are either constantly, or occasionally used in such a manner, that, to the idea which is commonly and properly attached to them, there is added something of enlargement, of weight, or sublimity; or on the other hand, their usual force is diminished. The more frequently writers have run into extravagance in interpreting these emphatical expressions, in former times; the more careful should we be to observe moderation. The same remark is applicable to *Euphemism*.

J. Chr. Gottleberi d. præ. Nagelio de emphasisum judicandarum difficultate, Alt. 1761. 4.

E. A. Frommann Comm. de verbis N. T. quæ plus aut minus, quam ordinariè solent, interdum significant, opusec. phil. I, 342. ss.

Emphasis was formerly divided into *real* and *verbal*. *Constant* emphasis is to be learned, from the direct testimony of authors, or from the constant usage of the language, during a particular age; *temporary* emphasis, is generally to be learned from the context, or from the nature of the subject.

There are forms of speech, which have, by common consent, lost that energy which originally and naturally belonged to them.

We should be cautious not to consider words emphatical, merely because they are of rare occurrence, derived from a foreign language, figurative, or different in their grammatical form, from the languages, ancient or modern, with which we may happen to be acquainted.

On Euphemism—see,

Chr. Wollii d. de usu et abusu euphemismi sacri J. 1732. 4.

It is always to be judged of, from the character of the age and people—not from our own taste or opinion.

CHAPTER II.

ON DISCOVERING THE USUS LOQUENDI OF THE SACRED WRITINGS.

I. The *usus loquendi*, is the manner of speaking or writing, which custom, or common usage has sanctioned. It is evident, therefore, that it must be very various, and different in different kinds of writers. We need not be surprized that there should be a mode of writing peculiar to the N. T., and that this mode, should not be the same in all the Sacred Writings. The sources of information are either external or internal, and are very similar to those mentioned in the preceding chapter.

The *usus loquendi*, is *national* or *provincial*, *public* or *private*, *religious* or *profane*, *ancient* or *recent*; *solemn*, *technical*, or *common*; *poetical* or *prosaic*; *philosophical*, *doctrinal*, or *historical*; *epistolary* or *popular*.

The interpreter should always be careful, not to be guided by the suggestions of his own imagination, or inclination, but should attend to the *usus loquendi*.

The internal means of discovering the *usus loquendi*, are,

1. The genius and character of the writers.

These are formed, through the influence of the age and nation to which they belong, by their education, method of life, &c. These points are to be ascertained from the history of the writers themselves, and of the times in which they lived, and from their writings.

2. The nature of the subject, and the mode of treating it.

Every subject has a method, in some measure its own; and authors are either original in their style and manner, or imitators of other writers. When this latter is the case, the style of their models should be investigated and understood by the interpreter.

3. The writings themselves, which the authors have left; for it not unfrequently happens, that writers define, explain, or illustrate their method of writing.

All the foregoing remarks may be applied to the New Testament.

The external means of discovering the *usus loquendi*, are, the knowledge of the history, both of opinions and facts, of the period to which the writer belongs, the comparison of authors of the same kind, character; and age; the use of competent early translators, and the observance of that usage which approaches most nearly to that of the writers in question.

Some observations on the *usus loquendi*, of the *popular* Greek writers.

1. They do not accurately follow grammatical rules, concerning the distinction of words, the use of the article; the middle voice, the moods and tenses of verbs, &c: Hence their language is not always to be interpreted in strict accordance with these rules.

Ammonius de adfinium vocabb. differentiâ Cum animadverss. L. C. Valckenaer L. B. 1739. II. 4. c. obs. Cph. Fr. Ammon. Erl. 1787. 8.

S. F. Dresigii Commentarius de verbis mediis N. T. cura J. F. Fischeri etc. Ed. altera, L. 1792.

Cph. Wollii Collectio quartior de verbis Græcorum mediis dissertationum L. 1733.

Adr. Klüt Vindiciæ articuli ὁ ἡ τὸ in N. T. Partis prioris T. I—III. posterioris T. I. II. Trag. 1786—1771—8.

The dispute is principally about the words ὁ κυριος; ὁ θεος and θεος.

In the moods and tenses of verbs, the Sacred Writers not unfrequently, follow the usage of the Hebrew; hence

the aorist and the preterite, are sometimes put in place of the future.

2. They sometimes express simply and universally, what is to be understood with limitation. These remarks are also applicable to the writings of the New Testament.

It has been questioned how far the *analogy of faith*, may be used as a rule of interpretation.

G. Fr. Schroeteri. d. de interpretatione, Scr. S. ad analogiam fidei. Vit. 1718. 4.

Rambach. Institutiones hermeneuticæ, II, 1.

II. In the use of certain figures, the writers of the N. T. as also other ancient writers, have a distinct style. Some of these figures affect only single words, sentences, or phrases; others, whole passages, and entire discourses; to which last, must be referred, *allegories* and *parables*. As in the right explication of these, the usage of the Orientals and the Jewish Doctors is chiefly to be regarded; so we should be very careful not to give any other explanation than that which the nature of the subject and design of the author require.

Joach, Camerarii Notatio figurarum sermonis in libris Evang. Lips. 1552. 4. in apostolicis scriptis ib. 1572. 4. uterque lib. in Bezae ed. N. T.

C. L. Baueri Philologia Thucedideo—Paulina S. Notatio figurarum dictionis Paulinæ cum Thueydidea comparatæ, Hal. 1792. 8. inprimisque eiusd. Rhetor. Paulinæ, T. II. p. 511. ss.

There has been some dispute as to the use of *irony*.

J. C. S. Ironia a Jesu et discipulis eius abjudicata, Misc. Lips. nov. 1, p. 31. ss.

J. Fr. Stiebriz d. de ironia sacra. Hal. 1759. 4.

Goth. Beni. Matthesii Comm. de symbolico docendi genere in sacris ser. obvio. Schneeb. 1787, 4.

On Allegories,

Scriptt. plures de ea laudat *Blankenburg.* ad Sulzeri Theor. Art. 1, p. 57. ss. 71. ss.

S. F. N. Mori Pr. Ostenditur quibus causis allegoriarum interpretatio nitatur. L. 1781. et in Diss. Theol. atque phil. I, p. 390.

1. The object of the allegory, is to be sought in the occasion which gave rise to it (Joh. IV. 10. ss.) in the context, or in the explanation which is sometimes added. (Joh. VIII, 38. Eph. VI, 14. ss.)

2. It is to be observed, what is the primary object in every allegory, and how this object may be literally expressed.

3. The nature of the subject should be attended to, that the propriety of the allegory may be perceived.

4. We must examine the history, (Luke, XII, 49,) and the manners and customs of the East. There are many allegories which are characteristically oriental.

5. In the same allegory, one part is not to be understood literally, and another figuratively.

6. In no case, is every circumstance in the allegory to be considered, significative of a moral sense, but, the main idea, or principal design, is, in general, only to be regarded.

Conr. Ikenii d. de locutionibus allegoricis et emblematicis sæpe in generali complexu sumendis, neque ad singulas partes aut verba semper extendendis, in Diss. ejus. phil. theol. p. 593. ss.

On the nature, kinds, and use of *Parables*, see,

G. C. Storr Comm. ne parabolis Christi, 1779, et opusec. acad. ad interpret. SS. I, p. 89. ss.

J. J. Hess über die Parabeln mit Rücksicht auf Lehre vom Reiche Gottes, in his work, über die Lehren, Thaten und Schicksale des Herrn, ein Anhang zur Lebensgesch. p. 175. ss.

Ueber die Lokalität der Parabeln Jesu, in d. Beytr. z. Bef. d. vern. Denk. in der Rel. XI, p. 138.

G. L. Bauer Sammlung und Erklärung der parabol. Erzählungen unsers Herrn, L. 1782, 8.

Lectures on the Parables of our Saviour, with a preliminary discourse on Parables, by *Andrew Gray*.

In parables, the primary parts, are to be carefully distinguished from those, which are merely accessory ; lite-

ral and tropical explanations are not to be mixed ; the interpretation is to be sought from the design, from the occasion, from the circumstances of time and place, from the character of the hearers, and from the explanations often added.

III. In *proverbs* and *aphorisms*, there is often something peculiar in the use of words. The Oriental style, with regard to both classes, is to be carefully regarded ; and attention paid to the circumstances under which they were uttered, and the design they were intended to answer, that neither greater nor less force be attributed to them, than the nature of the case requires.

1. As it regards proverbs, it may be remarked that the Orientals,

a. Drew their images from the heavens, or from nature generally, as it is exhibited to them, and it is from these, their proverbial expressions are derived.

b. They are peculiarly fond of the hyperbolical and enigmatical style.

c. When their proverbs rest upon a comparison, the comparison is not fully stated.

Mart. del Rib Adagialia Sacra vet. et Novi Test: Lugd: 1614, 4.

Andr. Schottii Adagialia Sacra N. Test. græcolatina—Antw. 1629. 4.

J. Vorstii Diatribe de Adagiis N. T. repetita in *Fischeri* edit. Philologie S. *Vorstii*, p. 745. et *Leusdeni* lib. de Dialect. N. T. ed. 2. p. 169:

In the explanation of these proverbs, reference is constantly to be had, to the nature and design of the passage.

2. The characteristic features of the Aphoristic style, are,

a. Brevity and ambiguity of expression ; at times assuming the form of the enigma.

b. A manner ingenious and pointed.

c. A want of close connexion, in the different sentences.

Ulr. Andr. Rohde de vett. poetarum sapientia gnomica Hebræorum imprimis et Græcorum, Havn. 1800 8. Consult, also, the writers upon our Saviour's sermon on the mount, particularly *Pott*.

CHAPTER III.

ON INVESTIGATING THE SENSE OF PASSAGES.

I. As it is requisite for the interpreter to observe which signification of a word suits a particular passage, and what usage prevails through the book he is investigating ; so, also, he must endeavour to discover the *sense* (which is to be distinguished from the *signification*,) which belongs to each word, and to the whole expression or sentence ; and this sense or meaning may either be uniformly attached to the words or phrases agreeably to Hebrew usage, or it may belong to them only, in particular places.

1. The choice of signification, depends principally upon the context.

2. The *usus loquendi* which prevails in a particular passage, is determined, either from the context, or from the nature of the subject, or of the language.

The phraseology which is derived from the Grecian usage, is to be distinguished from that which is of Hebrew, or Syro-chaldaic origin.

3. To discover the sense of words, or sentences, is to discover the idea which the author really intended to attach to them, in the connexion in which they occur. For the signification of a word or sentence, may be variously modified by the circumstances in which it is used—see,

Mori diss. de discrimine sensus et significationis in interpretando—and, *Fischstadt* ad *Mori* Hermeneuticam.

4. The sense which belongs to particular words or expressions, is either always the same as in the phrase *καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν θεῶν* or it is different in different places, as in the words *πνευματικὸς σαρκικὸς*.

Care, therefore, is to be taken, not to confound the sense and the signification.

II. The means of discovering the meaning of a passage, are not only the nature of the language, the customary usage, and sound judgment ; but also, the context, the design of the writer, the nature of the subject, and history ; hence the *grammatical*, *logical*, and *historical* sense is spoken of separately. It may be well to make these distinctions in scholastic disputations, but in the work of interpretation, there is to be but one sense sought, which is to be discovered by these three several methods, and which does not admit of variety. Rules are derived from these helps for properly determining the meaning ; and arguments, to prove that a certain sense is the only proper sense of a passage.

What has been just remarked amounts to this : that it should be our object, to discover, not merely what sense may or may not be attributed to a particular passage, but what sense we are bound to attribute to it.

1. To the language belongs the *analogy* of language ; whether of one, or more, or all languages. This subject will be considered hereafter.

2. The *usus loquendi*, determines what sense is usually connected with certain words and phrases in a particular place, time, or among a particular people, or in reference to a particular subject.

3. The *usus loquendi* will not always suffice to determine the sense, because, a. it is sometimes obscure, b. it

cannot always be ascertained, c. it is often indefinite and *πολύσημος*, d. the writer himself often recedes from it. Yet it is always to be joined with other means of ascertaining the sense.

4. It is important to remark, that there is a certain common sense, or mode of thinking, feeling, judging, and speaking, which belongs to every community, and which may be learned from the character and mental habits of the people. It is evident that the knowledge of this kind of common sentiment of a people, must throw great light upon the meaning of their expressions.—See,

Turretin de Interpretatione Scripturæ Sacræ, p. 249. and below, chap. 6.

5. The context is either continued or interrupted ; the former is immediate, or more or less remote.

In the *immediate* context, is to be considered, a. the mutual relation of subject and attribute, and in considering this point it must be observed whether the expression be figurative or not, b. the connexion between epithets and the words to which they are applied, c. the relation of the cases, d. the use of the prepositions, conjunctions, and other particles, e. the definitions added by the author, f. the opposition of the different members of the sentence.

The *less remote* context, is the series and relation of several united propositions. This connexion is perceived by the use of the conjunctions. In many discourses, however, the several propositions are disconnected.

The *more remote* context is the connexion of all the several parts of the passage—which is perceived, from the character, the subjects, and sentences, and from the mode in which the connexion is effected.

On the *interrupted* context, see the following chapter.

We must be careful not to be deceived, by the present interpunction, or division into greater or lesser sections.

This subject, however, belongs more properly to criticism—
See,

Abresch. Spec. Anim. in Ep. ad Hebr. III, p. 398.

The helps hitherto enumerated, have reference to the *grammatical* sense.

6. The sense in which particular expressions are to be understood, is very often decided by the design, of the author in the whole book, or in any particular portion of it. This design is more or less clearly indicated by the author himself, or it may be gathered from the occasion of his writing, from history, or from a careful examination of the books or passages themselves. The design, however, cannot always be determined with equal clearness.

7. The nature of the subject and opinions or ideas, frequently indicates, that a certain sense may, and often that it must, be attributed to the words of the author. And the logical connexion of his propositions also serves to shew in what way he wishes to be understood.

In examining the nature of the subject and ideas, with the view of determining the sense, it is to be observed, whether the passage under examination is expressed in popular or in philosophical language. The connexion of the several parts of a discourse, or of an entire work, is not always as strict as in the present regular and systematic method of writing. Frequently nothing more than probability as to the connexion can be attained.

These remarks belong to the *logical* sense.

8. The sense in which an author's words are to be taken, may often be learned, from the history of the time and place in which he lived and wrote, from the opinions, studies, manners, customs, and mode of teaching, then prevalent; from the occasion on which he wrote, from the character of those to whom his writings were addressed, from the historical events of his age, and from similar sources.

Turretin de Interpretatione SS. p. 371.

Keil Prog. quoted above, and *Bauer*. Herm. 97.

The interpreter, therefore, should be well acquainted with, and frequently consult,

a. The civil history of the Jews and Romans of that period, and also geography and chronology.

b. The manners and customs of the Jews, and other Oriental nations, (archæology, derived from pure and ancient sources.)

F. Stosch Compendium archæologiæ œconomicæ N. T., Lips. 1799. 8.

c. The various sects which existed among the Jews, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.

Stuedlin. Gesch. d. Sittenl. Jesu I, p. 420. ss. 570.

E. Bengel Bemerkungen über den Versuch das Christ. aus dem Essaismus abzuleiten.

D. Flatt Magazin f. Chr. Dogm. VII, p. 4.

The Samaritans.

Bruns über die Samariten.

Stuedlin. Beitr. z. Philos. Gesch. d. Rel. I, p. 78. ss.

The Sabæins, that is, the disciples of John.

Michaelis Introd. II, 1140. ss.

Norberg Comm. de rel. et lingua Sabæorum in Commentatt. Soc. Gött. T. III.

Walch de Sabæis ib. T. IV.—*Bruns* über die Johannis Christen nach Abraham Echellensis, in Paulus Memor. III, 51. ss.

Th. C. Tychsen über die Religions Schriften der Sabier oder Johannischristen.

Stuedlin. Beytr. II, 289. ss. III, 1. ss. V, 208. ss. 236. ss.

Augusti Introd. ad vers. epp. catholicarum Part, I. 1801.

d. The opinions, laws, philosophy and expectations of the Jews, arising out of their religion and their peculiar circumstances. The requisite information upon these subjects, is to be obtained from the apocryphal writings of the Jews and Christians, from Philo, Josephus, the late Jewish writers, and from our own Sacred Scriptures.

J. E. C. Schmidt Bibl. für Kritik und Exeg. des N. Test. und älteste Christengesch. I. Band, 1787, II, B.

Beiträge zur histor. Interpretation des N. Test. aus den damals herrschenden Zeitbegriffen. von *Otmar* dem zweyten, Henke Neues Mag. III, 201. ss. IV. 23. ss.

On the books whence the opinions, and forms of expression, prevalent during the age in which our Saviour appeared, and in that part of the world, may be most advantageously learned—see,

Gurlitt Spec. II. Animadverss. in auct. vett. p. 22.

e. The method adopted by the Jewish doctors, in their instructions.

Gu. Chr. G. Weise diss. de more domini acceptos a magistris Judd. loquendi ac disserendi modos sapienter emendandi, Vit. 1792, and in the Commentt. Theoll. edd. a Velthusen, &c. V, p. 117. ss.

f. The natural history of Palestine and the adjacent countries.

J. W. Drasdo Pr. de justa rerum naturæ scientiæ sanctionis disciplinæ cultoribus utilissima, Vit. 1788.

A. Fr. Michaelis d. de studio hist. nat. præstantissimo theol. tractandæ descendæque adjuncto. Vit. 1790.

Cph. Fr. Jacobi d. de physica, sacrorum librorum interpretationis administra, Hal. 1746. 4.

g. Those circumstances of a historical character, which relate to the book we wish to examine. As for example; its author; the person who is introduced as speaking (Rom. VII); what his character and circumstances were, and what his state of mind, as exhibited in the passage under consideration; with what design, upon what occasion, at what time, in what place, and with what feelings the author wrote; what person he sustained, his own, or that of others; (Rom. VII, 7. ss.) to whom he wrote or spake. As to this last point, we must not place much confidence in the subscriptions at the close of many of the epistles, but must appeal to better authority, and especially to the indications to be observed in the book itself.

Baumgarten. Unterricht, 3. Hauptst. von den. histor. Umständen Sect: 36. ss.

Chr. Theoph. Zeizeri Epist. ad Maur. Gu. Schelsier, Zwiecar. 1782.

Jr. Fr. Reuss resp. *Plank* d. theol. de canone hermen. quo scripturam per scripturam interpretari jubemur. Tub. 1774. 4.

Thus much belongs to the means of determining the *historical sense*. All the means, however, which have been here enumerated, are to be united, to discover the *true sense of a passage*, and this sense is one. For the *allegorical sense* should be referred, to the grammatical, the *mystical*, (if such a sense be admitted) to the historical, the *moral* or practical to the explanation rather than the interpretation of the true sense.

1. Negative rules.

a. No sense should be admitted, which is plainly at variance with the *usus loquendi*.

b. A sense, inconsistent with the nature of the subject cannot be correct.

c. A frigid sense, or one foreign to the design of the author, should be rejected.

d. A sense, which contradicts the series of the discourse, is not to be attributed to the words.

2. Positive rules.

a. The sense, which is indicated by all the sources of information already pointed out, or by the greater part of them, is alone correct.

b. The sense, which is supported by parallel passages, is to be preferred to every other.

III. Particular care will be requisite, in determining the sense, in those cases in which more than usual copiousness or brevity is employed. In either case, however, it will be of great assistance, to observe with diligence, the familiar and customary phraseology of the author. Although there may be considerable obscurity, yet that sense, which ap-

pears the most probable, from the author's design, or from other sources, should be maintained.

1. In those cases, in which there is more than usual copiousness, it will be necessary to separate, what relates to the principal idea, from what is added, for the sake of amplification, illustration, or ornament. To these latter, it is evident no peculiar force is to be attributed.

Every word, especially in comparisons, similes, repetitions, rhetorical expressions, is not to be urged too far.

2. Brevity, has respect either to single words or the style generally. In the first case, many ideas are comprehended in one word, (*pregnantia verba*;) in the second, something is left to be supplied by the reader, which the nature of the subject, and common usage, it is presumed will suggest.

At times ideas seem to be omitted, where the particle *γὰρ* does not very closely connect the two sentences. Act. II. 34. The Sacred Writers adopted a very sententious and brief style, in their discourses, arguments, and sometimes even in their narrations.

3. In difficult passages, we must

a. Endeavour to discover the precise point where the difficulty lies.

b. We must observe what sense the passage will not bear.

c. The causes of the ambiguity or obscurity, we should endeavour to remove.

d. We must examine what sense is rendered most probable, from the *usus loquendi*, from the design of the writer, from his state of mind, from the context, from history.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE METHOD OF CONSTRUCTING THEIR DISCOURSES PECULIAR TO THE SACRED WRITERS.

I. From the character and design of the Sacred Writers, it is evident, that every thing like refinement and subtlety would be banished from their writings, and that a peculiarity of construction, and simplicity of diction, conformable to the Jewish manner of writing, would characterize their compositions. Besides this general character common to them all, each of the inspired penmen has his own manner, which is to be learned by careful attention. From these remarks, it will appear, what rules, as it regards this point, the interpreter ought to observe.

What is here said is not intended as inconsistent with the *acuteness* and *terseness* ascribed to the Sacred Writers, especially St. Paul.

J. W. Fulmann Comm. de concinnitate Pauli in Ep. ad Rom. L. 1776.
Ejusd. Comm. de subtilitate Pauli in argumentis tractandis, L. 1777.

The peculiarity or novelty, as to the structure of their sentences, is to be traced to their familiarity with the Hebrew language, and therefore should not be regarded as authorizing any unusual sense of words. *Fischer* Proluss. de Vit Lex. P. 410. ss.

The simplicity of style observable in their narration, mode of teaching, disputing, and arguing, relates not only to the use, of certain phrases, of numerous finite verbs, and of conjunctive particles, but in the whole form of their periods, and mode of expression. Different subjects, have each their influence on this general character of style.

1. The structure of the language in the N. T. is to be understood, from the familiar method of instruction, conversation and writing.

2. For this purpose it will be highly expedient to examine the Eastern and especially the Hebrew method of narration, instruction, and composition.

3. We must observe what is peculiar to each author, in his method, of constructing his discourse.

4. The peculiar kind of writing, (poetic, prosaic, aphoristic, didactic, uniform or variable, polished, sublime,) deserves our attention, as the whole character of the composition depends upon this circumstance.

II. The most important characteristics of the Sacred Writers as to the general structure of their discourses, are, 1. The connexion is not always obvious and continued but is frequently broken and abrupt. 2. Additions are frequently made which do not appear essential to the expression of the sentiment. 3. And in other cases the construction is elliptical. 4. They are not always exact in the grammatical structure of their sentences.

1. The interruptions in their discourses.

a. From *digression*, when the writer passes from one subject, to others connected with it, sometimes not returning to his original point at all, and at others, not for a considerable time. The occasion of these digressions, is sometimes in the ideas themselves, at others in the words; or it is furnished by the circumstances of the case, the time or place, the state of feeling in the writer or reader. Gal. IV, 24; Hebr V, 2; Joh. VI, 32.

b. By *parenthesis*, which is longer or shorter, and at times one parenthesis arises out of another.

Cpl. Wollii Comm. philol. de parenthesi s. præf. præmisit, C. F. Boernerus, Lips. 1726. 4.

Ad. Bened. Spizneri Comm. theol. de parenthesi libris sacris V. et N. T. accommodata, L. 1772. 8.

Both digressions and parentheses may be discovered, a. from the nature and series of the ideas, b. the character of the discourse, and the use of the particles, especially the conjunctions.

We must not always expect to find the discourse constructed according to the rules of art, nor proceeding in an unbroken order.

2. The abrupt construction, is when excitement of feeling, or any other cause, induces the writer either to suppress something (*ἀποσιώπησις*,) or suddenly to pass to a different subject. In the historical books, and in the writings of St. Paul, there are various examples of this kind. It is obvious, that in such cases, we are not to look for a continued narration or argument.

3. *Pleonasm* is either of single words, as when to verbs signifying action, the member of the body by which the action is performed is added; of pronouns (*αὐτός* after *ὅς*,) of particles—of phrases (as *ἐπάραις τῆς ὀφθαλμῶν, ἀνοίξαις τὸ σῶμα*) or of whole sentences, In these instances, some are peculiar to the East, others common to all popular discourses.

4. *Tautology* is where the same idea is expressed by various synonymous words or phrases.

It is clear that we should not endeavour to explain as different, expressions intended to convey the same idea,

Jo. Fr. Kluge Doctrinæ de tautologiis ad vindicandos scriptores sacros, et profanos Specimen. Vit. 1760. 4.

5. *Ellipsis* is either *grammatical* or *rhetorical*, *constant* or *temporary*. It is either of single words, or of sentences.

Some writers have, very unreasonably, multiplied ellipses, and others have entirely proscribed their application

to the interpretation of the Scriptures. To the first class belongs *Lamb. Bos*, see his work on the Greek Ellipses. It is, therefore, the more necessary, that attention should be paid to this subject.

a. No ellipsis should be admitted which is not confirmed, by constant or frequent usage.

b. The character of the passage ought to give evidence, from the mode of construction, from the state of feeling in the writer, from the nature of his subject, or disposition of his readers, that the occurrence of an ellipsis, is not unlikely. This occurrence is to be looked for when the discourse is vehement, or negligent.

c. There should be good reason assigned for the admission in every instance.

d. The more obviously and easily the ellipsis can be supplied, the more probable it is that an ellipsis should really be acknowledged.

e. What is stated fully in some places, may be expressed more briefly in others, so as to render it obvious, that the latter expression is elliptical. Thus of our Saviour, it is sometimes said, ἔρχεσθαι, an elliptical form of ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

J. A. Wolfi Comm. I. et II. de agnitione ellipseos in interpretatione librorum, SS. L. 1800. 4.

Chr. Bruenings libellus de silentio SS. sive de iis. quæ in verbo divino omissa aut præterita vel sunt vel videntur. Adjectæ sunt in calce dissertatt. aliquot affinis argumenti, Frf. 1750. 8.

CHAPTER V.

ON DISCOVERING THE GENERAL MEANING, AND UNDERSTANDING THE NARRATION OR ARGUMENT.

I. The meaning of passages, is to be distinguished from the meaning of the individual words, and is discovered, if after the sense of their several

constituent parts has been ascertained and accurately considered, it is perceived, what the writer intended by the whole, and what he wished his readers to understand.

The general meaning is sometimes expressed in few and short propositions, at other times, these propositions are numerous and more extended ; sometimes it is simple, at others it consists of various parts.

It is requisite for the interpreter,

1. Carefully to consider and compare, the several parts of which he has already ascertained the meaning, that he may see what constitutes the simple sense, and what is added for the sake of explanation, illustration, or ornament.

2. He should so examine the several parts of the general meaning, and so compare them among themselves, that he may understand which are primary and which are merely adjuncts.

3. He should not neglect any part, or expression, by which the extent, or force, of the sense is defined, limited, or increased.

4. He should diligently observe, which appear to partake of the character of familiar usage, and which bear the character and manner peculiar to the East.

5. He should also endeavour to observe the connexion between the several general ideas : in which it would be well for him to remember what we have already said regarding the context.

He will find it a profitable exercise, to analyse books, and larger sections, and reduce them to their several parts, remembering, however, that poetical and popular writers, are not to be subjected to the strict rules which writers of a different description have observed.

II. The mode of narration, adopted by the Sacred Writers, is remarkably simple, such as their

own character and that of those to whom they wrote, seemed to require. The interpreter, therefore, of the historical books, should not seek any thing artificial in their narrations; but should understand every thing in a manner consistent with the simplicity of their style.

S. F. N. Mori Defensio narrationum N. T. quoad modum narrandi, Opuscul. I, p. 1. ss.

1. Every thing is so narrated, a. as that the events and facts could be easily known and understood, b. those things which they commonly taught were delivered in a language to which they did not always attach the same ideas, c. their manner is marked by great brevity, d. it is not entirely destitute of ornament, but the ornament is of the simplest kind.

2. The interpreter must distinguish between the substance of the event or fact, and the account or exhibition of it.

3. Neither should the narration be confounded with the opinion, which the writer sometimes adds—see,

Mori Comm. qua illustratur locus Joh. XII, ss. Opuscul. II, p. 106. ss.

4. The interpreter is not at liberty, to add, to curtail, or in any way to change, the narration, although it may appear too brief, obscure, or inconsistent with his own opinions.

Those things, which, on this subject do not relate to interpretation, but to the higher criticism, will be considered in Section V.

III. The popular method of instruction and argument, was adopted by the Sacred Writers, which being in general use, would have the greatest effect on the minds of their readers or hearers. This me-

thod, therefore, the interpreter should understand, and constantly remember, that he may be able to perceive the true meaning and force of the Sacred Writers. And this method was simple and inartificial, most wisely adapted, as to the subjects, their connexion and narration, to the times, place, and character of the people.

1. Here it should be observed,

That in the communication of doctrines, or precepts, or in conducting their arguments, they are not to be considered as moulding them to scholastic rules.

2. We should notice, the occasion which gave rise to the consideration of each subject, and to what class of men, and in what place, each was proposed.

3. We must carefully distinguish between, those things which are asserted or maintained, without limitation, and those which are restricted to a particular view or application; and this restriction, may be either expressly stated, or merely intimated by the circumstances of the case.

4. The interpreter ought to distinguish between the propositions themselves, and the arguments by which they are supported; between the arguments and the mode of treating them; between the subject and the illustrations or examples of it.

5. It becomes him to endeavour to place himself in the situation of those, to whom the Sacred Writings were originally addressed, to enter into their views and feelings, diligently comparing the different parts of the Sacred Books together, and using every other means to discover what their views and feelings were.

6. He should be extremely cautious, lest he should even unintentionally, change the true sense of the Sacred Writers, to make it coincide with his own opinions, whether theological, philosophical, or of any other character.

The rules which particularly refer to the interpretation of *doctrinal* or *moral* passages, may be inferred from what has here been said. See,

Seiler Bibl. Hermen. p. 354.

Imm. Berger Versuch einer moralischen Einleitung in das N. Test., für Religionslehrer und denkende Christen. Lemgov. 1797.

CHAPTER VI.

THE AIDS FOR UNDERSTANDING AND EXPLAINING THE BOOKS OF THE N. T. AND THE PROPER APPLICATION OF THEM.

The interpreter, besides his own judgment, and good sense, should avail himself of various external aids, in investigating the Sacred Writings, and use each according to its character and value. These external aids are,

I. *Analogy of languages.*

This is either the analogy of one language, grammatical analogy; or it is that which exists between different dialects, or between cognate languages; or between all those which from natural or historical causes have been made to correspond.

a. This comparison is to be conducted according to fixed rules.

b. The analogy should be real, and not imaginary, and should be sought, not from Lexicons, but from the writings and genius of the languages.

c. Expressions apparently analagous, often in different places and at different times, have not in their meaning any analogy, and therefore we must take the circumstances, of time and place into consideration.

d. Those languages which are separated by a great interval of time, or which differ much in their character, ought not generally to be compared.

e. All minutiaë, especially in etymology, should be avoided.

f. Analogy alone, should not be depended upon, to the neglect of other sources of information, or in opposition to them.

J. D. a Lennep Or. de linguarum analogia, præm. libro in anal. linguæ græcæ, Lond. (1777.) 8. *Ev. Scheidii* præf. ad Lennepii Etymol. L. gr. *L. C. Valckenarii* Obs. quibus via munitur ad origines græcas investigandas—et *J. D. a Lennep* prælectt de analogia linguæ gr. ed. *Ev. Schedius*, Trai. ad Rh. 1790. 8.

J. A. Ernesti de vestigiis linguæ hebr. in lingua græca, in Opusec. phil. crit. p. 171. ss. *F. Th. Rink* diss. de linguarum orientalium cum græca mira convenientia, Regiom. 1788. 4.

Geo. Gfr. Zemisch d. de analogia linguarum interpretationis præsidio, L. 1758. 4.

Cf. *Mori* Acroases hermm. I. p. 168. ss.

II. *The use of the Greek and Latin Writers*, who, as to their style, or as to the age in which they lived, are nearly allied to the Sacred Penmen.

1. The profane writers are not promiscuously to be used.

2. We must observe in what sense, each of the Greek writers use the $\epsilon\tilde{\eta}\sigma\iota\nu$ which occurs in the N. T., in what places, in what manner, and in what kind of writings.

3. We are not to seek illustration from profane authors, of those passages and expressions, which may more properly be explained, from Jewish sources.

4. Nor are we to expect from them an explanation of those expressions, which are peculiar to the christian system.

5. They are not to be consulted, with a view of proving, the entire purity of the style of the Sacred Writers; nor, that the rules, which, it may be found they observed, should be applied in all cases, to determine the sense of the Sacred Penmen.

6. It is not sufficient, when a single word in a phrase,

used in the N. T., is found in profane writers, to prove that the latter may be properly cited, as an illustration of the former.

7. Some Greek authors may be more advantageously compared, with certain N. T. writers, than with others, as Thucydides with St. Paul; and particular modes of expression may be more happily illustrated from some authors, than from others.

8. Some of the Greek writers may, to a certain extent be applied to the illustration, not only of the language, but also of the ideas and subjects of the Sacred Writers. This, however, must be done with the greatest caution.

F. C. G. Palet compared passages of Epictetus and the N. T. together, in a work published in 1799.

This whole subject has been treated at great length, and in various ways.

D. Mart. Friesii D. exeg. polemica de usu et abusu græcorum in primis scriptt. in interpretandis illustrandisque, N. T. vocabb. et dicendi modis. Kil. 1733. 4.

Henr. Dav. Wedekind d. de habitu antiquorum Græciæ et Latii Scriptt. ad religionem, Göt. 1756. et in *Berg. Mers. Duisb. T. II. P. I.* p. 601. ss.

S. Gf. Geyseri Pr. Poetæ græci antiquiores literarum sacrarum interpretis magistri, Vit. 1768. 4.

J. Laur. Blessig, Præsidia interpretationis, N. T. ex auctoribus græcis, Argent. 1778. 4.

Car. Vict. Hauff Ueber den Gebrauch der gricch. Profanskribenten zur Erläuterung des N. T., Lips. 1796. 8.

The following writers have published works on the N. T., containing remarks from the Greek classics.

1. Those who wished to prove the style of the N. T. to be purely Greek.

And. Balckwall's Sacred Classics defended and illustrated.

El. Palairet Observatt. philol. criticæ in SS. N. T. libros, L. B. 1752.

Ejusdem Specimen Exercitatt. phil. crit. in sacros N. T. LL. Lond. 1755. 8. (Coll. *C. L. Bauveri* Pr. II. in *Palaireti* Observatt. ad. N. T. Hirschberg. 1775. 76. 4.

2. Those who have illustrated the language, and the ideas of Scripture.

Jo. Douglæi *Analecta Sacra*, s. *Excursus philologicus breves super diversa V. et N. T. loca*. Subiiciuntur *Nort. Knatchbull Animadverss.* in libb. *N. T. Amst.* 1693. 8.

Pricæi *Commentarii in varios N. T. Libros*, *Lond.* 1660. f. et *Crit. angl. T. V.*

Lamb. Bos *Diatribæ s. Exercitationes philoll. in Scriptt. N. F.* Editio secunda. *Franeq.* 1713. 8. *Eiusd.* *observationes miscellanæ ad loca quædam cum N. T. tum ceterorum script. gr. ib.* 1707. 8. ed. 2. 1731.

Homborgk *Parerga Sacra*. *Amst.* 1719. 4.

Jac. Elsneri *Observationes sacræ in N. T. libros*, *Trai. ad Rh.* 1720. 28. 11. 8.

Jo. Alberti *Observatt. sacræ in N. F. libros*. *Vratisl.* 1755. 11. 8.

F. L. Albresch. *Adnotationes ad loca quædam N. T. ad calcem Animadverss. ad Aesch.* Vol. I. (*Mediob.* 1743.) p. 533. ss.

Jo. Bernh. Koehler *Observationes philoll. in loca selecta Sacri Codicis*, *L. B.* 1765. 8.

J. D. Heilmann *Specimen Obs. quarundam ad illustrandum N. T. ex profanis scriptt. in Opusce.* T. T. p. 3. ss.

Gilb. Wakefield *Silva Critica s. in auctores sacros profanosque Commentarius philol.* *Cantabr. et Lond.* 1789—93. P. I. V. 8. (ejus *Examen Hænelinius libellis supra laudd. instituit, quorum quintus prodiit, Erl.* 1802. 4. add. *Schuetz* *Vindiciæ locorum quorundam N. T. a Wakefieldo Anglo, qua critico, qua interprete tractorum.* *Jenæ, 1799.*

3. Those who have used particular authors for the purpose of illustrating the N. T.

Adnotationes in N. T. ex Xenophonte collectæ a Geo. Raphaelio. *Hamb.* 1709. 8. ex *Polybio et Arraino, ib.* 1714. 8. *Adnotatt. in Sacram Scr., historicæ in V., philoll. in N. T., collectæ ex Herodoto, Lüneb.* 1731. 8.—*Junctim deinde hi libelli sunt editi:*

Geo. Raphaelii *Adnotatt. historicæ in Vet. et philologicæ in N. T. ex Xenophonte, Polybio, Arriano, et Herodoto collectæ.* *L. B.* 1747. II, 8.

G. Gu. Kirchmaieri *Parallelismus N. F. et Polybii—Vit.* 1725. 4.

Casp. Frid. Münthe *Obs. Philoll. in sacros N. T. libros ex Diodoro Siculo collectæ, Hasn.* 1755. 8.

Baueri *Philologia Thueyd. Paullina supra laudata est.*

Jo. Joach. Bellermanni *Specimen animadverss. in N. Fæd. libros ex Homeri Iliad, Rhaps. cf. Ers.* 1785. 4.

Jo. Henr. Muecke *Pr. quid adiumenti sacrarum litt. interpreti præstet Homeri cum SS. Script. comparatio.* *L.* 1789. 4.

J. L. Salchlini *Observatt. ad varia V. et N. T. loca ex Pindaro desumptæ.* *Bern.* 1745. 4. coll. *Mus. Helv.* II, p. 335. IV, p. 644.

Andr. Gochenii *Specimen philoll. in N. T. adnotatt. potissimum ex Euripide depromtarum, Symbb. Litt. ad iner. scientt. omn. gen. collect. altera, (Hal. 1754,) p. 310. ss.*

Ευριπίδης τετραχρηλισμενος Euripidis Hecuba selectis observatt. N. T. Atticam puritatem comprobantibus—adornata a *J. C. Weidling*. Geræ, 1758. 8.

Alb. Geo. Walch, Pr. quo illustrantur loca aliquot librorum. N. T. ex Eurip. Alcestide, Schleus. 1789. 4.

Job. Eckhardi Obs. phill. ex Aristoph. Pluto dictioni N. T. illustrandæ inservientes. Accedit ejusdem generis diss. ex Hom. II, Z. Quedl. 1733. 4.

Chr. Porschberger Theocritus Scr. Sacram illustrans s. sententiæ ac phrasas e poetis Gr. inprimis bucolicis—ad illustranda sacri cod. oracula, Dresd. et L. 1754. 8.

4. *Wolfius* in his *Curæ Philologicæ*, *Wetstein* in his *Animadversiones*, and other critical commentators, have used and increased these collections of remarks from the classics; some interpreters, indeed, as *Grotius* and *Hammond* had long before enriched their commentaries with remarks of this nature; and *Hezel* collected and united the observations of distinguished writers, derived from the classics.

Novi Foederis Volumina Sacra, virorum clariss. opera et studio e scriptt. gr. illustrata. Edidit *Guil. Fr. Hezel* Pars. I., Hal. 1788.

III. *The comparison of the ancient Greek versions of the O. T.*, as to words, phrases, modes of construction, ideas, subjects, and quotations from the Old in the New Testament.

Besides the authors quoted above, see,

J. H. Michaelis diss. de usu LXX. interp. in N. T., Hal. 1715. 4.

C. F. Schmidii diss. II. versionem Alex. optimum interpretationis LL. SS. præsidium esse, L. 1763. s. 4.

Fr. Ben. Gantzsch Spec. exercitt. grammaticarum ad illustrandum N. T. e vers. Alex. Brem. 1778. Frf. et L. 1786.

J. F. Fischeri Proluss. V. in quibus varii loci librorum divv. utriusque Test.—illustrantur. L. 1779. 8. Prol. I. et II.

Pet. Keuchenii Annotationes in omnes N. Test. libros. Editio nova, et altera parte, numquam edita, auctior, cum præf. *Jo. Alberti*, L. B. 1755. 8.

J. Chr. Biel Novus Thesaurus philol. S. Lexicon in LXX. et alios libros V. T.—Hagæ Com. 1779. s. III, 8. Supplementa hujus B. Lexici edidit. *J. Fr. Schleusnerus* (Spicilegium Lexici in Intpp. gr. V. T. post Bielium congestit—*J. F. Schl.* L. 1784. Spec. secundum 1786. 8.)

J. Fr. Fischeri.—Clavis reliquiarum verss. græcarum V. T. Aquilæ, Symmachi, Theodot. quintæ, sextæ et septimæ specimen. particula I. in *Vellthus. Kuin. et Rup. Commentatt. theoll. IV, p. 195. ss.* (Primum edita l. 1758. 8.)

Add. *Mori* Acroases II. p. 80—148. I. *Th. Mayer* Obs. ad ep. Jacobi e. vers. Alex, *Vellthus.* Comm. theoll. IV. p. 289.

In using the ancient versions of the O. T. for the illustration of the New, we must be careful—

a. That the reading of the LXX, or of the fragments of the other versions be correct, and that we accurately examine the version, lest we suppose that the Greek words or phrases answer to certain words and phrases in the Hebrew, when they really do not. It is to be remembered, that the reading of the LXX, sometimes differs from the Hebrew: sometimes the translation is literal, sometimes paraphractical, and sometimes it is very incorrect.

In correcting the Alexandrian version, the following writers have of late distinguished themselves; *J. F. Semler*, *Griesbach*, *Strothius*, *Doederlin*, *Spohn*, *Scharfenberg*, *Hornemann*, *J. F. Schleusner*, and especially *Robt. Holmes*, who commenced a new critical edition of the LXX. See, *Eichhorn* Bibl. VII. p. 798. *Rosenmueller* Handb. der bibl. Lit. II. p. 318. *Bauer* Critica Sacra.

In collecting the fragments of the other Greek versions, the most distinguished writers are, *Doederlin*, *Scharfenberg*, and *Schleusner*, who had been preceded in this department by *Morinus*, *Flaminus*, *Druseus*, &c. add. *J. G. Trendelenburg*, *Chrestomathia Hexaplaris.* Lub. et L. 1794. The value of a new Greek version, edited by *Villoison* and *Ammon*, from a Venetian MS., is very small. See, *C. F. Ammon* comm. de versionis V. T. Venetæ usu, indole et ætate, Tom. III.

b. The interpretations of the same Heb. words and phrases, given by the different Greek translators should be carefully compared. In this way, both the significa-

tion and sense of many words may be best understood, and what is spoken according to the Heb., and what according to the Greek idiom be most clearly distinguished.

c. Care should be taken, that new and unusual significations of words and phrases should not be rashly transferred from these versions to the N. T. See,

C. F. Loesneri Observatt. ad voces quasdam verss. græ. vet. interpretum Proverbb. Solomon.—in Velthusen. Künöl et Ruperti Commentt. theoll. T. III.

d. It should be observed, whether there appear any traces of the later philosophy of the Jews, in these translations.

There is need that caution should be observed in the use of Concordances, which are frequently erroneous.

Conr. Kircheri de Concordantium Biblicarum—vario ac multiplici usu—*διαπυξίς*, Viteb. 1622. 4.

Concordantiæ V. Test. græcæ, Ebræis vocibus respondentes, *πολύχρηστοί*—authore *Com. Kirchero* 1607.

Abr. Trommii Concordantiæ græcæ versionis vulgo dictæ LXX. Interp. Leguntur hic præterea voces græcæ pro Hebr. redditæ ab antiquis omnibus V. T. interpretibus, quorum nonnisi fragmenta exstant, Aquila etc., Amst. 1718, II, f.

Jo. Gagnier Vindicæ Kirchianæ, s. Animadversiones in novas Trommii concordantias—Oxon. 1718 et *Abr. Trommii* Epist. apologetica ad Gagnerium—qua se suasque concord. gr. modeste tuctur., Amst. 1718. 4.

Frid. Lankisch Concordantiæ Bibliorum germanico—hebraico—græcæ—3. ed. Erf. 1696.

J. H. Meisneri Nova vet. Test. clavis, addita est significatio verborum hebr. e vers. Alex. L. 1800. II, 3.

IV. *The use of the spurious and apocryphal writing of the Jews and early Christians, in illustrating the language and contents of the N. T.*

These are, 1. The apocryphal books of the O. T., commonly bound with the canonical books, which were either written originally in Hebrew, and translated into Greek, or written in Greek at first.

J. G. Eichhorn Einleitung in die apoeryphischen Schriften des Alt. Test. L. 1795. 8.

Ben. Bendtson Specimen exerec. eritt. in V. T. libros apoeryphos, Gött. 1789. 8.

Of these, the most important are, the Book of *Sirach* (Sententiæ Jesu Siracidæ, græce. Textum ad fidem codd. et verss. emendavit illustravit *J. Gu. Linde*. Gedani 1795. Glaubens-und Sittenlehre Jesu, des Sohns Sirach. Neu Uebersetzt. mit erläut. Anmerk. von *J. W. Linde*—Zweite umgearb. Aufl. 1795. 8.—The book of *Tobias* (Die Geschichte Tobi's—übers. und mit Anmerk.—auch einer Einleitung, Verschen von *C. D. Ilgen*, Jen. 1800. 8.) —The Book of Wisdom (Das Buch der Weisheit, als Gegenstück der Koheleth, und als Vorbereitung zum Studium des N. T., bearbeitet von *J. C. C. Nachtigal*, Hal. 1799. 8.

G. J. Henke diss. de usu librorum apoeryphorum V. T. in N. Test., Hal. 1711. 4.

T. G. Ienichen d. præes. Reinhardto def. de petenda rerum, quas libri N. T. continent, e libris V. T. apoeryphis illustratione, Vit. 1787. 8.

C. Th. Künnoel Observations ad N. Test. ex libris apoeryphis V. Test. L. 1798. 8. (in verbis et formulis magis, quam sententiis et decretis illustrandis versatæ.)

Beiträge zur historischen interpretation des N. Test. aus den damals herrschenden Zeitbegriffen, von Otmar dem zweiten, in *Henke* Neuen Mag. III. 201. ss. IV. 123. ss.

2. *Apoeryphal* books of the Old Testament.

Von den Apoeryphis und Pseudepigraphis der Juden, in Beiträgen zur Beförd. des vernünft. Denk. in der Rel. IV. p. 192. ss. add. *J. S. Semler* von den Pseudepigraphis in s. Theolog. Briefen, 1. Sammlung.

Codex Pseudepigraphus N. Test. collectus, castigatus—illustratus a *J. A. Fabricio*, Hamb. 1713. 8. Codicis—volumen alterum, acc. Josephi vet. Christ. scriptoris Hypomnesticon—cum vers. et not. *J. A. Fabricii*, Hamb. 1723. 8.

3. Apoeryphal books of the New Testament.

J. Fr. Kleuker über die Apokryphen des N. T., in Vergleichung mit denjenigen Urkunden des Christ. deren Apostol. Ursprung und Zweck aus innern und äussern Gründen erweislich ist., Hamb. 1798. 8.

Codex apoeryphus N. Test. collectus, castigatus, testimoniisque censu-

ris et animadverss. illustratus a *J. A. Fabricio*. Editio secunda, emendatior, et tertio tomo aucta. Hamb. 1719. III. 8.

Guil. Lud. Brumm. disqu. hist. crit. de indole ætate, et usu libri apocryphi, vulgo inscripti *Evangelium Nicodemi*. Berl. 1794. 8. (add. Berlin. Monatssehr. 1802. Nov. p. 888.

To these books may be added some of the writings of the *Apostolic Fathers*—Clement, Barnabas, Hermas.

On these writings, see,

J. E. C. Schmidius Handbuch der Kirchengesch. I, p. 467.

J. G. Ronsemueller Historia interpret. SS. Litt. in eccl. T. I.

Cotelerius Opera Patrum qui App. temporibus floruerunt rec. Clericus, Amst. 1724.

These apocryphal and spurious writings are of value,
 a. To illustrate the language of the N. T., especially those words and phrases which are peculiar to it; and also proverbial expressions, parables, &c.

b. As exhibiting the manner of narration, teaching and arguing.

c. As explaining, some moral precepts, rules, opinions, rites, and other things of similar character.

Care however must be taken,

α. To ascertain the age and character of each book, lest things which pertain to a later period, should be applied to the N. T.

β. That we do not suppose that a mere slight similarity of expression, is sufficient to prove them apt illustrations of the N. T.

γ. That we be not injudicious in carrying the use of these books to an extreme.

V. The works of the Jews, either in Greek, or in Hebrew, written in the New Testament period, or at a later date, may be advantageously applied, not only to explain the language, but also the subjects of the Sacred Writings, and the mode in which these subjects are treated.

I. Writings of the ancient Jews in Greek.

a Of *Philo*, whose works are principally useful as exhibiting the allegorical interpretations, and religious philosophy of the Jews.

The best edition of his works is that by *Mangey*, Lond. 1742. II. f.

Chrestomatia Philoniana S. Loci illustres ex Philone Alex. et cum animadverss. editi a *J. C. Gu. Dahl* Hamb. 1800. 8. Pars altera s. Philonis libelli adv. Flaccum et de leg. ad Caium cum animadverss. *Dahl*i, Hamb. 1802. 8.

E. II. Stahl Versuch eines system. Entwurfs des Lehrbegriffs Philo's von Alex. in Eichhorn Bibl. d. bibl. Litt. IV. p. 769. *Staeudlin*. Gesch. der Litt. Jesu I. p. 490.

J. B. Carpzovii Sacræ Exercitationes in Pauli Ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone Alex. Præfixa sunt Philoniana Prolegomena, in quibus de non adeo contemnenda Philonis eruditione Hebr., de convenientia stili Philonis cum illo D. Pauli in Ep. ad Hebr. et de aliis nonnullis varii argumenti exponitur, Helmst. 1750. 8.

J. B. Carpzovii Stricturæ in epist. Pauli ad Romanos, adpersi subinde sunt flores ex Philone Alex. Helmst. 1756. 8.

C. Fr. Loesneri Observatt. ad N. Test. e. Philone Alex. L. 1777. 8.

A. F. Kühnii Spicilegium Loesneri Observatt. ad N. Test. e Phil. Alex. Pforten. 1785. 8.

b. Of *Flavius Josephus*, whose writings also illustrate the history of the age, in which the books of the New Testament were written.

His works were edited by *Sig. Havercampus*, at Utrecht in 1726, and by *Fr. Oberthuer*, at Leipsic, in 1782.

Chrestomathia Flaviana s. Loci illustres ex Flavio Josepho delecti et animadverss. illustrati a *J. G. Fredelenburgh*, L. 1789. 8.

J. A. Ernesti Exercitationes Flavianæ, in Opp. phil. crit. p. 359. ss. ad *Oberthuer* in Fabric. B. gr. V. p. I. ss. 14. s.

J. B. Otii Spicilegium s. Excerpta ex Flavio Josepho ad N. T. illustrationem, in T. H. ed. Jos. Havercamp. p. 38. ss.

J. T. Krebsii Observations in N. Test. e Flavio Josepho. L. 1755. 8.

The authority of both Philo and Josephus has been disputed. We must distinguish with respect to both, what is delivered as merely their opinion, and what is stated as the popular notion, or the sentiment of their learned men. We must also consider what influence the

Pharasaical principles of Josephus, and the profane philosophy of Philo, would have upon their writings.

2. Targums, (Chaldee paraphrases of some of the books of the O. T.) especially those of *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*.

De iis vid. *Wolf*. *Bibl. Hebr.* II. p. 1147. ss. 1189. ss. *Eichhorn*, *Einl.* ins *A. Test.* I. p. 399. ss. *Bauer*. *Crit. S.* p. 293. ss. *Rosenmueller*, *Handbuch* III. p. 3. ss. *J. F. Fischer* in *Proluss.* quinque in *V. et N. T.* p. 51. ss.

G. L. Baueri *Chrestomathia e paraphrasibus chaldaicis et Talmude delecta notisque brevibus et indice verborum illustrata.* Norib. 1792. 8.

J. H. Michaelis *diss. de Targumim s. verss. ac paraphrasium V. T. Chaldaicarum usu.* Hal. 1720. 4. add, *Seiler*, über die Gött. Offenbarungen II. p. 434. s. 472. ss.

3. Other writings of the ancient Jews in Heb., especially the *Mishna* (edited, translated and illustrated by notes, by *Gu. Surenhusius*, Amst. 1698—1703. VI. f.) The *Gemara* or commentary on the *Mishna* (the *Talmud*.) See, *Fabric. Bibliogr. antiq.* p. 3. ss. *Buddei Isag.* ad theol. univ. p. 781. ss.

Some suppose that the book *Sohar* should also be ascribed to an early age. *Mori Herm.* II. 155.

4. The works of the later Jewish doctors.

Scriptores *Rabothani*, *Midraschici*, alii, *J. G. Wolfii* *Bibliotheca Hebr.* Ham. 1715—33. IV. 4. Volumine II. add. *H. F. Koecheri* *Nova bibl. Hebraica*, secundum ordinem bibl. Hebr. *Wolfii* disposita.—Jen. 1783. s. II. 4. *Mosis Maimonidis* (mort. 1205.) libri. cf. et *Raymundi Martini* *Pugio Fidei* adv. *Mauros et Judæos* ed. *J. B. Carpzovii*, L. 1687. s.

The following authors illustrated the N. T. from Jewish writers.

Tho. Cartwright *Mellificium Hebraicum*, in *Criticis Anglic.* T. II.

Jo. Drusii *Præterita s. Annotationes in totum Jesu Chr. Testamentum.* Francq. 1612. 4. *Prasaltera* 1616. 4.

Jo. Leusdeni *Philologus Hebræo—mixtus, una cum spicilegio philologico*; *Editio tertia*, *Leidæ et Ultrai.* 1699. 4.

Jac. Capelli *Observatt. in N. T. et Lud. Capelli* *Spicilegium notarum in libros N. T.* Amst. 1657. 4. etiam *Jo. Cameronis* *Myrothecion h. e. Novi Test.* quam plurima loca illustrata.—*Salmur*, 1677. 4.

Those most worthy of consideration, are the following.

Jo. Lightfooti Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in IV. Evangg.—Nunc secundum in Germania e Museo *J. B. Carpzovii* L. 1684. 4.

Ejusd. Horæ Hebr. et Talmudicæ in Acta App., partem aliquam ep. ad Rom. et priorem ad Corinth. nunc primum in Germania—editæ e Mus. *J. B. Carpzovii*, L. 1679. 4.

Novum Test. ex Talmude et antiquitatibus Hebræorum illustratum curis—*B. Scheidii*, *J. A. Danzii* et *Lac. Rhendferdi*, editum—*a Jo. Gerh. Meuschen*—L. 1736. 5.

Chr. Schoettgenii Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in universum Nov. Test. quibus Horæ *J. Lightfooti*, etc. supplentur—Dresd. et L. 1735. 4. Ejusd. Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in theologiam Judæorum dogmaticam.

From these sources, *Wetstein* derived many valuable remarks found in his Commentary. Consult also *Buxtorfi* Lexicon Chald. Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum, Bas. 1640 f. and *Corrodius* Hist. Crit. Chiliasm. T. I. et II.

Not only the rites, proverbial and peculiar expressions, and general style of the N. T. may be illustrated from these sources; but also the opinions, precepts, traditions, the mode of argument and instruction. In the N. T. however the imperfections which disfigure the Jewish writings, are not to be found. See,

Gu. C. G. Weise diss. de modo domini acceptos a magistris Judaicis loquendi ac disserendi modos sapienter emendandi, Vit. 1792, enlarged in the Commentat. Velthus. Kuinod.

We must be careful,

1. Not to apply the Jewish writings promiscuously to the illustration of the N. T.
2. To remark the times of which they speak.
3. The sources, whence they derive their information, should be carefully observed; the authority of the later Jews is not entirely to be despised if they appeal to older writers as their authority.

Other Oriental writings, especially in Syriac and Arabic, have not as yet, been applied to the illustration of the N. T., to the extent which is desirable, since they might throw considerable light, on the use of words and phrases,

of figures, parables, &c.—*Ammon* ad. Ern. Inst. N. T. p. 67.

VI. The knowledge of the geography and topography of Palestine, and of the countries and places, of which the Sacred Writers speak.

The criticism of some passages, and the interpretation of a great many, are intimately connected with these subjects. The authors to whom we must look for information, on these points, are the ancient Geographers, and recent travellers.

Eusebii Cæsar. Liber περι τῶν τοπικῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ, in *J. Clerici* onomastico urbium et locorum Scr. S. Amst. 1707. f.

The larger modern works on the Geography of Palestine, are those of *Reland*, *W. A. Bachiene*, *Ysbrand van Hamelsveld*, *J. J. Bellerman*.

The smaller are,

Ed. Wells Historical Geography of the Old and New Testaments.

C. A. Frege geograph. Handbuch bei Lesung der heil. Schrift.—Gotha 1788.

From modern travels, many useful things have been collected.

Harmer's Observations on the N. T. from Voyages and Travels in the East.

Lulecke Expositio brevis locorum SS. ad orientem se referentium—ex observat. certis, plerumque propriis instituta. Hal. 1777. 4.

M. C. G. Lange Sammlung der besten und gründlichsten Erläuterungen der h. Schr. aus den vornehmsten Reisebeschreibungen, Chem. 1784. 8.

An Essay on the method of illustrating Scripture, from the relations of modern travellers in Palestine, and the neighbouring countries, by *John Foster*, Lond. 1802. 8.

Fr. Hasselquist Reisen nach Palestina, Rott. 1761.

Sammlung der merkwürdigsten Reisen in den orient, in Uebersetz. und Auszügen mit Anmerkungen von *H. E. G. Paulus*, Jen. 1792.

VII. The knowledge of history and antiquities

of the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, especially of the age in which the Sacred Writers lived.

To this head pertain,

1. The political history of Judea, especially from the commencement of the reign of Herod.

Christi. Noldii Historia Idumæa s. de vita et gestis Herodum diatribe, Francq. 1660. 12. et ad calc. Josephi Opp. ed. Havere. T. II. p. 331. ss.

Cph. Cellarii Historia Herodum, diss. Acad. P. I. p. 207. ss. et Josephi. Havere. II. p. 324. ss.

J. G. Altmanni Exerc. de gente Herodum, in Tempe Helv. VI. p. 468. ss.

(*Kuinoel*) Geschichte des Jüd. Volks von Abraham bis auf Jerusalems Zerstörung. L. 1761. 8.

Deylingii Observatt., *Fischeri* Proluss. de Vit. Lex. aliiq. etiam consuli possunt. add. Meusel. Bibl. I, II. p. 278. ss.

2. The history of our Saviour and his Apostles. Besides the biographers of Jesus and the Apostles, and the works of those, who have written concerning the congregations to whom the Sacred Writings were addressed, consult the following authors,

J. J. Kess in dem Anlange zur Lebensgesch. Jesu, p. I. ss.

C. H. L. Poeltz Populäre Moral des Christh. nebst. einer histor. Einleitung in das Zeitalter Jesu, L. 1794. 8.

J. Dietr. Hartmann Beiträge zur christl. Kirchen und Religionsgesch. I. B. Jenæ 1796. 8.

Jo. Casaruboni de rebus sacris et eccles. Exercitationes XVI. ad Baronii Prolegg. in annales. Gen. 1655. 4.

3. The history of Jewish opinions.

C. H. L. Poeltz de gravissimis theologiæ seniorum Judæorum decretis—diss. L. 1794. 4. (Ejud. Pragmatische Uebersicht. der Theol. der spät. Juden, I. Th. L. 1795. 8.

Ueber die Jüd. Theologie (vor und nach dem Bablyl. Exil.) in den Beytr. z. Beförd. d. vernünft. Denkens in der Rel. V. p. 23, ss. Abriss der hebr. Cultur bis auf das Zeitalter Jesu, besonders mit Hinsicht auf die Fortschritte ihrer Moral, in Henke Mag. f. Rel. phil. III. p. 506. ss.—Add. *Staudlinii* Hist. doctrinæ mor. Jesu, *T. J. Corrodi* Crit. Hist. Chiliasmi T. J. et variæ Commentt. in *Schmidii* Bibl. cris. et exeg. N. T.

Their opinions should be especially studied.—a. Re-

garding the Messiah, (Abänderungen der Lehre vom Messias, Beytr. z. Beförd. d. vernünft. Denk. in der. Rel. V. p. 42. SS. *Ammon*, Bibl. Theol. Tomo II. *Allix* Testimony of the Jewish Church.)—b. On the Advents of the Messiah and his ἐπιφανείαις (besides others, See *H. C. Mil- lies* diss. de variis generibus θεοφανειῶν et ἐπιφανειῶν θεῶν in libris utriusque fœd. et Phil. Alex. Aal. 1802—8. *J. C. Kolen* de reditu Messix̄ ad judicium gentium, Gött 1800—4.)—c. On the resurrection from the dead, (*Frisch* in Eichhorn Bibl. IV. 690. *Ziegler* in Henke Mag. V.)—d. On demoniacs (*Schmidt*, Bibl. für Kritik I.)—e. The opinions and rites of the Jewish sects.—See the authors quoted above.

4. The history of the countries bordering upon Palestine, and of their Princes.

The Observationes Sacræ of *Sal. Deylingius*, contain many remarks on these subjects.

5. Manners and customs of the Jews, particularly during the time of Herod.

Their sacred rites, domestic manners and habits, their Sanhedrim, their laws and punishments, weights and measures, &c. The manners and institutions of foreign Jews, are not to be neglected. *Pet. Wesselingii*, Diatr. de Judæorum Archontibus.—Trai. ad Rh. 1738. 8.

The writers upon Jewish antiquities, are particularly enumerated, by *Meuselius*, Bibl. hist. Vol. I., and Vol. X.

The more recent writers worthy of note, are the following.

H. Chr. Warnekros Entwurf der hebr. Alterthümer. II. Aufl. Weira. 1794. 8.

E. A. Schulzii Compendium archæologiæ Hebr. Lib. I. antiquitates politicas, Lib. II. antiquitates eccl. continens ed *A. P. G. Schückedanz*. Dresd. 1793. 8.

Alterthümer der Hebräer, verfäset von *Joh. Babor*—Wien 1794. 8.

Joh. Jahn Biblische Archæologie, I. Theil. I. Band, Wien 1796. II. Band 1797. (Häusliche Alterthümer.) II. Theil. I. B. (polit. Alterthümer) ib. 1800. 8.

G. L. Bauer's kurzes Lehrbuch der hebr. Alterthümer des A. und N. Test.—L. 1799. 8.

J. J. Bellermann Handbuch der bibl. Litteratur, enthaltend Archæologie, Geographie, Chronologie, Genealogie, Geschichte, Naturlehre, und Naturgeschichte, Mythologie und Göttergeschichte, Alterthümer, Kunstgesch. Nachrichten von den bibl. Schriftstellern, Erf. 1797. ss. IV. ss. et T. I. secunda editio.

A. G. Brehme Geschichte des Orients, besonders Palæstinas älterer und neuerer Zeit, benebst einer Kritik bibl. Stellen, Goth. 1802, 3. 8.

J. G. Goetzinger philol. Excursionem zur Erkl. des N. T. aus den Gottesd. und gerichtl. Alterth. des A. B. Freyb. 1786. s. 2. 8.

6. From the Grecian history is to be learned, principally, what relates to the Seleucidæ, the kingdom of Macedon, the affairs of Asia Minor, and Achaia.

It is of importance also, to be acquainted with the Sacred rites of the Greeks—their games—their judicial procedures, &c.

C. Bruenings Compendium antiquitatum græcarum e profanis ad sacrarum litterarum interpretationem accommodavit. Ed. III, Francof. ad M. 1759. 8. *J. G. Unger* Analeceta Antiquaria sacra, L. 1740. 8. *P. Zornii* Bibliotheca antiquaria et exægetica. Erf. 1774. s. XII. 8.—*Jac. Lydii* Agonistica Sacra. Roterod. 1657. 12. Et cum *Jo. Lomeieri* addit. Zutphan. 1700. 12.

7. The Roman history, from the time of Augustus, and the history of the Roman provinces, throws great light on many passages of the N. T.

J. T. Krebsii, de usu et præstantia Romanæ historiæ in N. T. interpretatione libellus, L. 1745. 8.

Jac. Perizonii, diss. de Augustea orbis terrarum descriptione, adi. ejus Diss. de Prætorio, L. B. 1696. 8.

To this head belongs, the history of the Presidents of Syria, and the Procurators of Judea.

J. D. Schoeflini Chronologia Romanorum Syriæ præfectorum, in Comm. hist. et ait. p. 433.

Lardner's history of the Princes and Governors mentioned in the N. T.

8. From the Roman antiquities, are to be learned, the administration of the provinces, their jurisprudence, their

tributes, military affairs, weights and measures, times of enrolment, &c.

We must be careful not to make an injudicious application of ancient rites and customs to the N. T. ; and secondly, not to confound times, by supposing what is mentioned as prevailing at one period, was as a matter of course, also prevalent, in the times of the Sacred Writers.

J. T. Krebsii Comm. de ratione N. Test. e moribus antiquis illustrandi, minus caute instituta, opusce. p. 519.

9. With history should be united *chronology*.

Besides the works of *Usser*, *Spanheim*, *Bengel*, and others, consult the Writers, of Harmonies of the Gospels, of the annals of Paul, (*Jo. Pearson.*) and of the history of the Apostles, (*Lud. Cappeli*) *Historia Apostolica illustrata*, 1683. 4.

Some knowledge of the heathen *Mythology* will also be found useful in reading the N. Testament.

VIII. The use and proper application of other departments of learning, which have reference to antiquity.

To this head belongs,

1. Natural history, both general, and as peculiarly pertaining to the countries in which the Sacred Writers lived. Botany especially will be found useful. (*A. F. Michaelis* de studio hist. natur. theologiæ adjuncts, Vit. 1790.

Besides the authors quoted above, consult,

S. Oedmann Vermischte Sammlungen aus der Naturkunde zur Erklärung der heil. Schr. aus dem Schwed. übersetzt, von *D. Groening*, Rost. 1786.

H. E. Warnekros Comm. de Palestinæ fertilitate præcipuisque illius dotibus cum Ægypto comparatis, in Repert. bibl. et orient Litt. T. XIV and XV.

J. G. Buchlii et *G. F. Walchi*, *Calendaria Palestinæ œconomica*, Gött. 1785. 4.

Math. Hilleri Hierophyticon s. Commentarius in loca SS. quæ plantarum faciunt mentionem, Traj. ad Rh. 1725. II. 4.

Olai Celsii Hierobotanicon s. de plantis S. Scripturæ. Ups. 1745, 47.
II. 8.

J. R. Fosteri de bysso antiquorum Liber singularis, Lond. 1776. 8.

Wolfg. Franzii Historia animalium (quæ in SS. Commemorantur) cum commentariis et Supplementis—opera Jo. Cypriani Francof. et L. 1712.

Sam. Bocharti Hierozoicon, s. de animalibus S. Ser. Lugd. B. 1792.
recensuit, suis notis adjectis, *Ein. Fr. Car. Rosenmueller* Lips. 1793—96.
III. 4.

Hierozoici ex Sam. Bocharto, itinerariis variis aliisque virorum doctiss. commentariis, compositi Specimina tria, auctore *Fr. Jac. Schoder,* Tub. 1784—86. 8

Joh. Braamius de vestitu Sacerdotum Hebr. has some remarks on the precious stones mentioned in Scripture.

A. F. Rugius Gemeinnütz. Abhll. für Freunde der Bibel, über klima, Naturgesch. etc. des morgenlandes, Witt. 1786.

Russel's Natural History of Aleppo.

Niebuhr's Travels and description of Arabia and the writings of *Michaelis, Forskol* and others.

2. Medicine, the science generally, and as it existed among the Hebrews, Egyptians, and Greeks.

Tho. Bartholini Paralytici N. T. medico et philologico commentario illustrati, L. 1685. 8.

Ejusd. miscellanæ medicæ de morbis bibliæis. Frf. 1705. 8.

G. W. Wedelii Centuria Exercitationum medico philologicarum sacrarum et profanarum, Dicades X. Jen. 1702. Centuriæ secundæ dicades V, et 1705—20. 4.

Rich. Mead *Medicæ Sacra,* Lond. 1749. 8.

G. G. Richteri dissertationes quatuor medicæ, Gött. 1775. 4.

C. E. Eichenbach *Scripta medico biblica.* Rott. 1779.

Medicisch hermeneutische Untersuchungen der in der Bibel vorkommenden krankengeschichten, L. 1794. 8.

J. S. Lindinger de Hebr. Vett. arte medica, de dæmone et dæmonicis, Vit. 1773. 8.

3. Mathematics and Physics.

J. B. Wiedeburgii mathesis biblica, Jen. 1730. 4.

E. B. Wiedeburg Natur-und Grössenlehre in ihrer Anwendung zur Rechtfertigung der h. Schr. Nürnberg. 1782.

J. J. Scheuchzeri *Physica Sacra, oder geheiligte Naturwissenschaft der in der heil. Schr. vorkommenden natürl. Sachen,* Augsb. et Ulm. 1731—35. V. f. et *Physica Sacra, iconibus æneis illustrata.* 1727.

4. Jurisprudence, especially that of the Romans.

Gust. Sam. Theod. Baumgarten Crusii Specimina II. Jurisprudentia in illustrando N. T. Lucina., Lips. 1801.

Em. Merrillii notæ philol. in passionem Christi.

J. O. Westenbergii de jurisprudentia Pauli Apostoli in ejus opuscul. acad. fascie. primo ed Püttmann, L. 1794.

A. G. Marche Specimen jurispr. Pauli Apostoli quoad rem tutelarem, L. 1736. 4.

5. Philosophy, philosophy of the mind, the history of philosophy.

Car. Fr. Baueri Logica Paullina in usum exegeseos et doctrinæ sacræ, Hal. Magd. 1774. 8.

J. F. Roos diss. præ Schnurrer defensa, Rudimenta Logicæ Sacræ, Tub. 1776.

J. Gottl. Muensch Psychologie des N. T., Regensb. 1802.

J. G. Walch Comment. de arte aliorum animos cognoscendi, Jen. 1783.

J. G. Walch de usu historiæ philosophicæ in interpr. N. T.

Dispute has arisen upon this subject, partly from the ambiguity of the expressions, and partly from the abuse in its application.

The uses of Philosophy and its history, consists,

a. In enabling us to fix, with more accuracy, the meaning of certain words and phrases.

The Philosophy of language, has of late been very accurately investigated.

b. In investigating and determining the meaning of sentences, and the primary and general idea attached to them.

S. F. N. Mori diss. de notionibus universis in theologia, Diss. theol. et phil. I. p. 239.

c. In illustrating expressions, rules, and precepts, and their causes.

d. In discovering the logical connexion of the ideas, and obtaining a clear view of the argument.

They are chargeable with the abuse of Philosophy, who apply it to the explanation of popular expressions, and pervert the grammatical and historical meaning of words from philosophical reasons.

e. A knowledge of *criticism* and *rhetoric*, will be found useful to the interpreter.

IX. The proper use of the ancient interpreters.

The authority of no interpreter, however excellent, can decide what is the meaning of any particular passage ; yet testimony or opinion of commentators is important, and they frequently point out the way in which the true meaning may be ascertained.

We should examine,

a. The *Commentaries* and *Homilies* of the most distinguished ecclesiastical writers ; among the Greeks those of *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, *Isidore*, of Pelusium, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Euthymius* ; among the Latins, *Jerome*, *Augustine*, *Hilary*, *Pelagius*, *Druthmarus* ; among the Syrians, *Ephrem* and the *Nestorians*.

Franc. Ruitzii Canones s. Regulæ intelligendi S. Scripturas ex mente patrum. Erf. 1611. 8.

Dan. Whitby. Diss. de SS. SS. interpretatione secundum Patrum commentarios. Lond. 1714. 8.

Interpretationes N. T. ex Hippolyto collectæ ab *E. A. Frommano*. Cob. 1765.

Ejusd. Interpretatt. N. T. ex Irenæo, ib. 1766.

Semler Antiquitatum hermenn. ex Tertull. Specimen, Hal. 1765.

J. D. Winckleri Philologemata Lactantiana—Brunsu. 1754. 8.

The different methods of interpretation in the writings of the Fathers, should be distinguished : the allegorical, mystical, œconomical, polemical, doctrinal, moral, grammatical.

b. The ancient versions of which we have already given an account.

a. The Syriac. *Mich. Weberi* L. de usu versionis Syriacæ hermeneutico L. 1778. 8. *Fr. Eb. Boysen* Kritische Erläut. des Grundtextes der h. Schr. des N. T. aus der Syr. Uebers. Drey Stücke., Quedl. 1762. 8. *Lud. de Dieu* Critica Sacra, Amst. 1693. f.

b. Latin. *M. Chr. Gf. Mueller* de usu versionis LL. SS. latinæ, quam vulgatam vocant, in interpretando V. et N. T. Spec. I, II. Schleiz. 1782.

e. Scholia and Catenæ.

Scholia are grammatical, exegetical, or critical; they are taken from the Greek Fathers, or from the marginal notes of MSS.—or they were written between the verses. They are the work of a known author, or anonymous; the more learned and ancient, the greater their value.

d. The Glossaries and Lexicons.—See,

J. A. Ernesti Prol. de glossiariorum græ. vera indole et recto usu in interpretatione, rec. in Tempe Helvet. T. VI. p. 453. ss.

Hesychius and Suidas should be particularly examined; on both of these authors see *Ernesti*.

Latin glossaries, *interlinearis, ordinariis, continua.*

X. The use of more modern interpreters.

1. Translations, (cf. besides *Masch* and others, *Rosenmueller*. Handb. für die Litt. d. Bibl. Ex. IV.)

a. In Latin, the best and most useful in the business of interpretation are,

The translation of *Sebast. Castalio*, Lips. 1697. Of this translation there have been many editions, that of *Wollius*, L. 1728, to which is prefixed a critical dissertation on the character of the translation;—that of *Jo. Lud. Bunemann*, L. 1738; to this is added, not only the preface of *Wollius*, but also the work of *Vockerodt* de pretio and usu singulari Bibliorum Lat. Castalionis. Besides these, there were several other editions, either of his whole Bible, or of the N. T. alone.

The Scriptures were also translated into Latin by *Erasmus*, *Theod. Beza* (whose version is compared with the Vulgate, by *Jo. Boisius* in Veteris Interpretis eum Beza allisque recentioribus Collatione in IV. Evv. et App. Aetis, in qua annon sæpius absque justa causa hi ab illo discesserint, disquiritur, Lond. 1655. 8.) *Seb. Schmidius*, *Er. Schmidius*. The more modern latin translations are superior to those just mentioned.

D. Ch. Guil. Thalemanni Versio latina Evv. Matthæi, Lucæ, et Johannis, itemque Actuum App. edita a D. C. Tittmanno, Ber. 1781. 8.

Versio latina Epp. N. T. perpetua annotatione illustrata a M. Gfr. Sig. Jaspis Vol. I, II. Lips. 1793.

A. Ch. Fleischmann Interpretatio epp. Pauli ad Timoth. et Titum. Vol. I. Tub. 1791. 8.

Sacri N. Test. libri omnes veteri latinitate donati ab *Henr. G. Reichardo* L. 1799. II. 8.

On the difficulties of making a good latin version, see,

Reichardi Tract. grammatico-theol. de adornanda N. T. versione vere latina ejusque difficultatibus, adjunctis quibusdam ejus Speciminibus. L. 1796. 8.

Here should be mentioned also the *Paraphrases of Erasmus*, which were referred to, in an early part of this work.

The Paraphrase and notes of Hammond, were translated into Latin by *Le Clerc* and illustrated by remarks of his own. Second edition enlarged, Erf. 1714.

J. S. Semleri paraphrases Joannis, Hal. 1771.—Ep. ad Rom. Hal. 1769.—Ad Corinth. Hal. 1770. 76.—Ad Galatas, 1779.—Ep. Jacobi 1781.—Ep. 1. Petri 1783.—Ep. 2. Petri et Ep. Judæ 1784.—Ep. 1. Johannis.

To all these paraphrases *Semler* added notes.

Moesselti Narratio de Semler [ejusque] meritis in interpr. SS. Rigæ, 1792, 8.

Pet. Abrisch Paraphrasis et Annotatt. in Ep. ad Hebr. Specimina tria, L. B. 1786—90. 8. (Not completed.)

b. *German* translations of most importance, are, Die Bibel A. und N. Test. mit vollständig erklärenden Anmerkungen von *W. Fr. Hezel*, Lemg. 1781. ss. X. 8.

Das N. Test. nach der Uebersetzung *Chr. Aug. Heumanns*. Verb. Augs. Hannov. 1750. 8. (*T. F. Fritschens* Unparth. und vollständ. Kritik über die Heumann. Uebers. des N. T., L. 1752. s. II. 8.)

Das N. Test. von neuem übersetzt und mit Anm. für sorgfältige Leser begleitet, (von *C. F. Damm.*) Berl. 1764. s. III. 4.

Das N. Test. oder die neuesten Belehrungen Gottes durch Jesum und seine Apostel. Verdeutscht und mit Anm. versehen, durch *C. F. Bahrdt*, Berl. 1783. II. 8. Prima editio prodierat Rig. 1773. secunda 1777.—die letzten Offenbarungen Gottes, übersetzt von *C. F. Bahrdt*, mit durchgängigen Berichtigungen und Anm., versehen von P**, Frf. u. L. 1780. s. II. 8.

Das N. Test. übersetzt aus dem Griech. und mit Anm. erläutert von *G. Fr. Seiler*. Erl. 1781. 8. add. Ejusd. Grösseres bibl. Erbauungsbuch des N. T. 1787. ss.

J. Dav. Michaelis Uebersetzung des N. Test. Gött. 1790. II. 5. Ejusd. Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte zur Uebersetzung des N. T. Gött. 1790. s. III. 4.

Das N. T. so übersetzt und erklärt, dass es ein jeder Ungelehrte verstehen kann, von *T. H. D. Moldenhawer*, Quedl. 1787. s. II. 8.

Die heil. Schriften des N. T. übersetzt und mit Anmerk. versehen, von *G. W. Rullmann*, Lemgo 1790, 91. III. 8.

In the year 1762, *Jo. Adr. Bottenius* began to publish a German version of the N. T. with notes. Six volumes 8vo. were published, embracing the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles to the Romans, and the Corinthians. About the same time *Jo. Otto Thiessius* undertook a new version of the New Testament, of which the second edition bears the following title. Das Neue Test. oder die heil. Bücher der Christen, neu übers. mit einer durchaus anwendbaren Erklärung, von *J. O. Theiss*.

Sämmtliche Schriften des N. Test. aus dem Griech. übers. von *Joh. Jac. Stolz*.

Some versions were made by members of the Roman Catholic Communion. *Leb. Mutschelle*, Monach. 1789. *B. Wyleus*, Mogunt. 1789. *Dom. de Brentano*. *Brau-*

nius, Car. Schwarzel (Uebers. und Auslegung des N. Test. nach seinen büchstabl. und moral. Inhalt—nach der höchsten Willensmeinung des Fürstb. v. Daiberg, herausg. von Karl Schwarzel, Ulm. 1801. s. II. 8.)

c. Translations into other modern languages.

The French by *Is. de Beausobre* and *Jac. Lenfant*, (Amst. 1741. II. 4.) *Jo. Le Clerc*, Amst. 1703. 4. II. and the Geneva version of the whole Bible, with the notes of *J. S. Osterwald*, 1741. French Catholic translations by *Rich. Simon*, *Pasch. Quesnell* and others.—English translations, by *Hen. Hammond*, *Phil. Doddridge*, *Gilb. Wakefield*, *Archb. Newcome*.—Italian, *Joh. Diodati*, *Joh. Jac. Glueck*.—Danish, *Hoegh Guldberg*.—Dutch, *W. A. van Vloten*, with notes.

On these versions, besides *Rich. Simon*, *Le Long*, *Rosenmueller* (Handb. T. IV.) See, *Fabric. Bibl. græc.* Vol. IV. p. 856. ss.

2. The *Lexicographers* of the N. Test., see,

J. Fr. Fischeri Proll. de vitii Lexicorum N. T. separatim antea editæ, multis partibus auctæ, multisque in locis emendatæ. L. 1791. 8.

a. Those who have written Lexicons in Greek and Latin.

Ed. Leigh Critica Sacra, i. e. Observationes philologico-theologicæ in omnes voces græcas N. T. juxta ordinem alphab. Ed. quinta, Gothæ 1706. 4.

Ge. Pasoris Lexicon manuale N. T. cum animadverss. J. F. Fischeri, L. 1774. 8.

Christ. Stockii Clavis linguæ Sanctæ N. T. Quintum edita cura J. F. Fischeri, L. 1752. 8.

J. Simonis Onomasticon N. T., Hal. 1762. 4.

Jo. Com. Schwarzii Commentarii critici et philologici linguæ græcæ N. T. L. 1736. 4.

Chr. Schoettgenii Novum Lexicon. lat. in N. T. L. 1746. 8. recensuit—locupletavit, *J. T. Krebs*, ib. 1765. 8. post Krebsium recensuit et variis obss. Cocupletavit *G. L. Spohn*, L. 1790. 8. (*J. G. Gottleberi* Animadverss. ad

Schottgenii Lex. N. T. Spec. I. II. Annab. 1771. 4. Ejusd. Scholia ad illud Lex. Mis. 1775. *C. T. G. Haymann* Lanx satura Obs. in N. T. e græcis V. T. Krebs. accommodatarum. Dresd 1780. 4.)

Novum Lexicom Gr. lat. in N. Test. Congessit et variis obs. philoll. illustravit, *J. F. Schleusnerus*. Editio altera, emendatior et auctior. L. 1801. II. 8. (Prima ed. prodierat 1792, ad quam separatim. Additamenta ex ed. 2. 1801.)

b. Greek and German.

J. G. Herrmann Griechish-teutsches Wörterbuch des N. Test., Frankf. an der Od. 1781. 8.

C. Fr. Bahrdt Griechisch-teutsches Lexicon über das N. T., Berl. 1786. 8.

Euchar. Oertel Griechisch-teutsches Wörterbuch des N. Test., Gött. 1799. 8.

Griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch über das N. T. zum Gebrauch für Studirende, Berl. 1796. 8.

c. German.

W. A. Teller. Wörterbuch des N. Test. zur Erklärung der christl. Lehre. Fünfte von neuem durchgesehene Auflage, Berl. 1794. 8.

Zur Beförderung des nützlichen Gebrauchs des *W. A. Tellerschen* Wörterbuchs von *Ge. Heinr. Lange*, Anspach. 1778—85. IV. 8.

Fr. Chriestlieb Doering Versuch eines Bibl. Wörterbuchs für unstudirte Lehrer in Stadtschulen. L. 1792. 8.

J. Cph. Erbstein Wörterbuch über das N. Test. für den Bürger und Landmann, nebst einer Einleitung, Meissen. 1792. s. II. 8.

Kurzgefasstes Wörterbuch zur Erläuterung der luther. Uebersetzung der Heil. Schrift. Ein Handbuch für unstudirte-selbst denkende Bibelleser, L. 1792. 8.

Chr. Fr. Schneider Wörterbuch über die gemeinnützigsten Belehrungen der Bibel, das eben sowohl von jedem einzelnen Gegenstande derselben eine system. Ueber-

sicht giebt. als jeden dahin einschlagenden Ausdruck der luther. Uebers. erklärt—J. Th. L. 1795. II. Th. 1800. 8.

d. Lexicons which refer to the whole of the Scriptures and relate not only to the words but also to their various subjects.

Besides Calmets Dictionary of the Bible, consult the following.

Biblisches Reallexicon über Biblische und die Bibel erläuternde alte Geschichte, Erdbeschreibung, etc. Onomatologie der in der Bibel vorkommenden interessantesten Personen, etc. (herausg. von *W. F. Hezel*,) L. 1783—85. III. 4.

Ge. Lud. Gebhardt biblisches Wörterbuch über die sämtlichen heil. Bücher des A. und N. Bundes—mit einer Vorr. von Hezel, Lemgo, 1796. III. 8.

Biblische Encyclopädie, oder exegetisches Realwörterbuch über die sämtlichen Hilfswissenschaften des Auslegers, nach den Bedürfnissen jetziger Zeit. Durch eine Gesellschaft von Gelehrten, (ed. Leun.) Gothæ 1693—96. IV. 4.

3. The various kinds of Commentaries on the New Testament.

Concerning these, we have already treated in a former part of this work.

a. Of those written in Latin, the most important, are, *Hug. Grotii* Annotationes in N. Test., Amst. 1641—50. III. voll. etiam in Crit. Sacris, et Calovii Bibliis illustratis, et cum præf. *Chr. Ern. de Windheim*, Erl. 1755, 57. II. Voll. 4.

Jo. Alb. Bengelii Gnomon N. Test. Editio tertia ul-lustrata per Ern. Bengelium, Tub. 1773. 4.

b. Commentaries written in German.

Cph. Aug. Hammann's Erklärung des N. Test., Hann. 1750—53.

Fr. L. Roeper Exeget. Handbuch des N. Test. zweite Aufl. 1793.—1802.

J. E. Chr. Schmidt philologisch-exeget. Clavis über das N. Test., Giess. 1795.

J. J. Stolz Erläuterungen zum N. Test. für geübte und gebildete Leser., Hann. 1800—2.

c. Commentaries in other languages.

These have been mentioned, in the early part of this work. In addition to those there referred to, should be noted,

Beausobre Remarques histor. crit. et philologiques sur le N. Test., a la Haye, 1742. 4.

Aug. Calmet Commentaire litteral sur tous les livres de l'ancien et nouveau Test., P. 1724.

The various classes of commentaries, as to their manner, and design, should be distinguished, as the grammatical, doctrinal, practical, &c.

In the use of the helps which have been here enumerated, the interpreter should observe the following rules.

1. He should endeavour himself to discover the sense, in the use of every grammatical and historical aid in his power, before he consults the opinions of others, as their diversity of sentiment and ingenious conjectures have often a greater tendency to mislead, than to guide to the truth.

2. He must attend to the arguments, by which their opinions are supported, and not trust to the authority of any name, nor suffer himself to be misled by the appearance of novelty and ingenuity, nor by the display of learning on the part of the Commentator.

3. In the use of Lexicons, we must be careful not to confound, the true and constant signification of words, with the sense which may belong to them in certain combinations, or in certain passages; that we do not suppose that a sense which is confined to a peculiar construction or connexion, is universally applicable; and that we do not suffer ourselves to be deceived by passages gathered from va-

rious sources, without having respect to the connexion in which they stand.

4. In those commentaries, in which the opinions of many men are brought together, or which contain observations derived from a variety of sources, it is frequently the case that there is so much confusion, that the quotations cannot be sufficiently understood without a reference to the sources whence they were taken.

5. There is a respect due to the opinions of those commentators, of whose skill, erudition, diligence and judgment we have sufficient evidence; but we are not to suppose that the interpretation proposed by them, can alone be correct; nor are we to undervalue those who, do not choose to pronounce *ex cathedra*, on the sense of a passage, when there is really great doubt as to its true meaning.

XI. There are besides the commentaries, already mentioned, discussions of particular passages of more than usual difficulty, either edited separately, or in collections; which the interpreter should by no means neglect, because they are often of more real value than entire volumes.

The same cautions should be observed in using this species of commentaries, as were suggested in reference to others.

A. Collections of various essays and commentaries.

Tempe Helvetica dissertationes atque observationes theologicas, philoll. crit. hist. exhibens. Editio secunda. Tiguri 1737—42. VI. 8.

Museum Helveticum ad iuvandas litteras in publicos usus apertum. Tiguri 1746—53. XXVIII. fasciculi f. VII. Voll. 8.

Bibliotheca historico-philologico-theologica. Bremæ 1718—27. Classes VIII. (quæque sex fascicæ) VIII. 8.

Bibliotheca Bremensis nova histor. philol. theologica, Brem. et Amst. 1760—67. VI. Classes (quæque trium fasc.) VI. 8.

Museum hist. philol. theologicum, Brem. 1728—32. II. voll. (quodque IV. partt.) 8.

N. c. Barkley Bibliotheca Hagana hist. philol. theol. ad continuationem novæ Bibl. Brem. Amst. 1768—74. VI. Classes (quævis 3. fasc.) 6. voll. 8.

Ejusd. Museum Haganum hist. philol. theologicum Hag. Com. 1774—80. IV. Tomi 8. (quisque II. Partt. constans.)

Ejusd. Symbolæ litterariæ Haganæ ad incrementum scientiarum omne genus, Hag. Com. 1777—81. II. Classes (quæque 3. fasc.) 8.

Symbolæ litterariæ—ex Haganis factæ Duisburgenses, curante *Jo. Pet. Berg*, Hag. Com. 1783—86. Tomi II. quisque duabus Partt. constans, 8.

J. Pet. Berg Museum Duisburgense Hag. Com. et Duisb. 1782—85. II. Tomi, quisque duabus Partt. 8.

Symbolæ litterariæ ad incrementum scientiarum omne genus a variis amice collatæ. Brem. 1744—49. III. Tomi, 8. quisque IV. Partt. constans.

Symbolarum litterariarum ad incrementum scientiarum omne genus collectio altera. Hal. 1754. 8.

Bibliotheca Lubecensis, Lub. 1725—30. XII. 8.

Nova Bibliotheca Lubecensis, L. 1753—57. VIII. 8.

Miscellanea Lubecensia, Rost. et Wism. 1758—61. IV. 8.

Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur (*Eichhornio* editore) L. 1777—86. XVIII. 8.

Neues Repertorium für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur, herausgeg. von *H. E. G. Paulus*, Jen. 1790, 91. VIII. 8.

H. E. G. Paulus Memorabilien, eine philos. theol. Zeitschrift, der Geschichte und Philosophie der Religion, dem Bibelstudium und der morgenl. Litt. gewidmet. L. 1791—96. VIII. 8.

Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengesch. herausgegeben von D. *H. Ph. C. Henke*, Helmst. 1793—96. VI. 8. Neues Magazin für Religionsphil. *Exegese*, etc. 1797—1802. VI. 8.

(Corrodi) Beyträge zur Beförderung des vernünftigen Denkens in der Religion, Frf. et L. 1780—1802. XX. 8.

Theologisches Journal für ächte Protestanten, herausg. von *I. H. Bremi*, I. B. 1. St. Zür. 1802, 8.

H. A. Grimm et *L. Ph. Muzel* Stromata, eine Unterhaltungsschrift für Theologen, Duisb. 1787. f.

I. F. Flatt Magazin für christl. Dogmatik und Moral, etc. Tüb. 1796—1802. VIII. 8.

(*S. Bloch*) Theologen. Erster B. 1, 2. Heft. Odensee, 1791. 8.

I. C. W. Augusti theolog. Blätter, oder Nachrichten, Anfragen und Bemerkungen theol. Inhalts, Gothæ 1797. f. II. 8. Ejusd. Neue theol. Blätter 1798. f. III. 8. Ejusd. theologische Monatsschrift I, II. Jahrgang. (4 vol., quodque 6. fasc. constans) ib. 1802. et 1802.

Archiv zur Vervollkommnung des Bibelstudiums, herausgegeben von *I. L. W. Scherer*, 1. Bandes 1. St. Alt. 1801. 8.

Der Schriftforscher zur Belebung eines gründl. Bibelstudiums und Verbreitung der reinen, verschönernden Religion, herausgeg. von *I. L. W. Scherer*. Weim. 1803. 1. St.

Theologisch-praktische Monatsschrift, herausg. in Linz von einer Gesellschaft. Erster Jahrgang 1802.

Praktisch. theol. Magazin für kathol. Geistliche, herausg. von D. *Mich. Feder*, I. B. 1, 2, 3. St. Nbg. 1798—1800.

Repertorium für Fädrelandets Religionslärere. (5. fasciculi, Havn. 1797. 8.)

Commentaries and Essays publ. by the Society for promoting the knowledge of the Scriptures; Lond. Vol. I. 1784. II. 87. 8.

D. C. Van Vorst Vitleedkundig en godgeleerd Magazin, Leyd. inde ad a. 1788. 4.

I. D. Michaelis Orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek, Frf. a. M. 1771—1789. XXIV. 8. Neue orient. und exeget. Bibliothek, Gött. 1786—93. IX. 8. (ultima volumina cura Th. Chr. Tychsenii.)

I. Gf. Eichhorn Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur. L. 1787—1801. X. 8. (quodque vol. senis partt.)

Neues theologisches Journal herausgegeben von *H. K. Al. Hanlein* und *Chph. F. Ammon* (inde a V. Vol. *Paulo* socio, inde ab Vol. XII. edente *I. Ph. Gablero*, unde etiam sub. tit. Neustes theol. Journal, herausg. von Gabler.) Norimb. 1793—1801. XVII. 8.

Journal für theolog. Litt ratur, herausgegeben von *D. Joh. Ph. Gabler*, Norimb. 1801. f. IV. 8. (etiam sub tit. Neucstes theol. Journal, Vol. VII. et seqq.)

B. Exegetical observations on different passages.

Observationes selectæ in varia loca N. Test. sive *Laur. Ramiresii de Prado* Pentecontarchus, *Alex. Mori* in N. Fœd. Notæ et *Pet. Possini* Spicil. Evangelicum—c. præf. *Jo. Alb. Fabricii*, Hamb. 1712. 8.

Corn. Adami Observatt. theol. philologicæ quibus loca S. Cod., N. præsertim Fœd., illustrantur. Gron. 1710. 4. Ejusd. Exercitationes exergeticæ—Acc. Scholia ad X. loca Act. App. Gron. 1712. 4.

Jo. Henr. Maii Observatt. Sacrarum ad diversa utriusque Test. loca Liber I. ed. 2. auctior. Frf. 1716. Liber II. ed. 2. auct. 1722. Liber III. 1714. Liber IV. Subiicitur Specimen Supplem. Thes. Gr. L. Henr. Stephani 1715. 8.

Ge. Lud. Oederi Animadversiones Sacræ, Brunsu. 1747. 8.

Jo. Lund. Spicilegium enchiridii exegetici in Nov. Test. ceu talis deinceps edendi Specimina., Havn. et L. 1802. 8.

I. Gurlitt Lectionum in N. T. Specimen I, II., Magd. 1797, 1800. 4.

Theod. Fr. Stange theologische Symmikta. Hal. 1802. II. 8.

P. H. Hane Schrifterklärungen. Voran eine Abh. von der Metaphor in Ascet. Vorträgen., Schwer. 1788. 8. Erste Fortsetzung. 1790. 8.

C. Ch. L. Schmidt Exegetische Beyträge zu den Schriften des N. Bund. Frf. a. M. 1791. ss. II. 8. (quod-bue vol. 6. Partt.)

C. Exegetical Dissertation.

Gründliche Auszüge aus den neuesten theolog. etc. Disputationen, L. 1733—40. VIII. 8.

M. Jae. Frid. Wildeshausen Bibliotheca Disputatt. theoll. philoll. in V. et N. T.—editio priori auctior. Hamb. 1710. 4.

C. H. Schereligii Bibliotheca dispp.—in V. et N. Test. Hamb. 1736. s. III. 4.

Thesaurus theol. philol. s. Sylloge diss. elegantiorum ad—V. et N. T. loca a Theoll. Protest. in Germania conscriptarum, Amst. 1701. s. II. fol.

Thesaurus novus theol. philol. s. Sylloge diss. exegett. ex museo *Theod. Hasaei* et *Conr. Ikenii*, L. B. 1732. II. f.

Conr. Ekenii Dissertatt. phil. theoll. in diversa sacri cod. utriusque instrum. loca—L. B, 1749. 4.

I. Oelrichs Belgii litterati Opuscula hist. phil. theoll. Brem. 1774. II. 8. Ejusd. Daniae et Sueciae litteratae Opuscula—ib. eod. II. 8. Ei. Germaniae lit. Opuscula theoll. Brem. 1772—74. II. 8.

Commentationes theologicæ editæ a *I. C. Velthusen*, *C. Th. Kuinoel* et *G. A. Ruperti*, L. 1794—99. VI. 8. Commentationum theoll. sex voluminibus editarum Spicilegium ad usus synodales continuatum a *I. C. Velthusen*. Fascic. I. Brem. 1802. 8.

Sylloge Commentationum theologic. edita a *Dav. Jul. Pott* et *Geo. Alex. Ruperti*, Helmst. 1800—2. III. 8.

H. Muentinghe Sylloge Opusculorum ad doctrinam sacram pertinentium. L. B. 1791. 93. II. 8.

I. L. Moshemii diss. ad sanctiores disciplinas pertinentium Syntagma, L. 1733. 4.

I. G. Altmanni Meletemata Philologico-critica. Trai. ad Rh. 1753. III. 4.

I. A. Ernesti Opuscula theologica. Ed. secunda auctior, L. 1792. 8. (Prima 1773, accesserunt nunc 10, Commentt.)

I. A. Noesselt Opuscula ad interpretationem SS. SS.

C. G. Storr Opuscula academica ad interpret. LL. SS. pertinentia. Tub. 1796.

S. F. N. Mori Dissertationes theologicæ et philologicæ. Vol. I. L. 1787, II. 1794. 8.

Etiam *Doederlini*, *Seileri*, *Ammonii*, *Greenii*, *Heilmanni*, *Frommani*, *Niemeyeri*, *Gehii*, *Schulzii*, *I. D. Michaelis*, *Camereri* (kritische Versuche) *Henkii* (Opuscula academica theolog. potissimum argumenti. L. 1802. 8.) huc pertinent.

PART II.

PRECEPTS FOR PROPERLY EXPLAINING THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. As it is the great object of the interpreter, that those for whom he interprets any work should clearly perceive the meaning of all its parts; it is not sufficient that he himself should understand his author; he must exhibit his meaning to others in perspicuous and appropriate language.

It is necessary, therefore,

1. That he should use the greatest diligence in explaining the signification of words, and avoid that levity, or carelessness, by which many things are overlooked.

2. That he should employ all his acumen, in distinctly conceiving and clearly expressing the true sense.

3. The greatest care is requisite, in exhibiting the connexion of the discourse, and in explaining the nature of the arguments and of the subjects.

4. That peculiar art should be studied, by which the interpreter teaches his readers to discover the meaning themselves.

5. He should choose those words which most exactly correspond to those of his author.

6. When many words are used in the same general sense, he should select the most definite and perspicuous.

7. He should not only exhibit the true sense, but also explain how that sense came to be attached to the words in that particular place, and exhibit the grounds or reasons of it.

II. The diversity in the objects of commentators, produces a corresponding diversity in the method of exposition, and gives rise to *Scholia*, *Perpetual Annotations*, *Commentaries*, *Observations* upon particular passages. From the different objects of these several methods of exposition, can be easily understood what is required in each, and what attention is to be given to the explanation of words, and what to the subject matter.

The interpreter should determine what method of interpretation he intends to pursue, and should adhere to it.

Scholia contain brief expositions of the meaning of words and phrases, and of the subject treated, without ex-

hibiting the grounds of the exposition. They have the advantage of leading the reader more directly to the sense. *Perpetual Annotations* illustrate every thing, omitting no passage nor subject, exhibiting a summary of observations and discussions on the author. *Commentaries* enter into the business of explanation, more fully, and subtly, and with greater apparatus of learning. The subjects are more copiously examined and explained, and more numerous illustrations adduced. They are designed for more advanced students, and for interpreters themselves. Books of *Observations* upon particular passages, are more extended in their interpretations, than it is possible for commentaries to be ; they embrace the materials which belong to all the other classes.

III. A peculiar and important method of exposition is that of *versions* and *paraphrases*. Neither can be properly executed unless their authors have previously mastered the book or passage they intend to translate or paraphrase, and are well versed in the language into which the translation is made. Versions of different books, and with different designs, should not all be conducted upon the same plan.

A *translation* is the rendering fully, perspicuously, and faithfully the words and ideas of an author into a different language from that which he used. A *paraphrase* is the expression, in greater extent, of the meaning of the author, where what is necessary to explain the connexion, and exhibit the sense, is inserted. The utility of both is great, but neither can supercede the necessity of more extended and minute interpretation.

A version should be, 1. correct ; 2. faithful, in expressing the precise manner in which the idea is presented, the figures, the order, connexion, and mode of writing, yet

not always literal, and expressing word for word. 3. It should be accommodated to the idiom of the language the translator is using. 4. It should be perspicuous and flowing.

In reference to versions it may be enquired, 1. Under what circumstances may it be lawful to depart from the style and manner of the author? (there are words, figures, modes of construction, which cannot be literally expressed in a different language). 2. Whether the Hebraic construction is to be retained? It seems by no means proper that the peculiar manner of an ancient author should be entirely obliterated, much less that a different manner should be obtruded upon him. 3. Whether the technical terms which occur in the New Testament should be changed for others.

In a *paraphrase* it is required, 1. that all the ideas of the author, their connexion and order, be fully and clearly exhibited; 2. that nothing be inserted which the discourse of the author does not really contain; 3. that it be not too prolix; 4. that it be perspicuous and easy.

J. J. Griesbach über die verschiedenen Arten deutsch. Bibelübersetzungen, Repert. f. Bibl. und morg. Litt. VI.

Hen. Gf. Reichardi Tractatus gramm. theol. de adornanda N. Test. versione vere Latina—L. 1796. 8.

IV. The interpreter should be careful, not to transgress his own limits, and encroach upon the province of the critic, or theologian. Something, indeed, which strictly pertains to these departments, may be requisite, to the full understanding and exposition of the passage he may wish to explain; as far, therefore, as is requisite to attain this object, it may be proper for him to proceed.

As to the limits of the interpreter, it may be remarked, that his work is finished when we are taught, 1. what

the author thought, or said, 2. the manner in which he said it, 3. the sense in which, what he says, is to be understood.

The more ancient interpreters erred,

a. In mingling too many doctrinal discussions in their expositions, (cf. *J. A. Ernesti Prælectt. in Ep. ad Hebr.*)

b. In introducing too much of history and archæology, not immediately connected with the passage under consideration.

c. They investigated too exclusively the arguments of the Sacred Writers.

Modern commentators have erred, a. in too frequently and copiously disputing about the subjects, or the events of Scripture, b. and also in applying the passages they treated so extensively to morals. For although the methods of exposition may be different, as authors have different objects in view, yet the office of the interpreter, the critic, the theologian, and the popular teacher, should never be confounded.

In order to become skilled in interpreting the Sacred Volume, we must read with care the best examples or models of every class of interpreters, study the works which have been written on the interpretation both of the Old and New Testaments, and practise ourselves, not only in the exposition of the sacred, but also of profane writers.

C. CHS. TITTMANN,

ON

HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION.

INTRODUCTION.

CHARLES CHRISTIAN TITTMANN, the author of the following article, was formerly Professor of Theology, at Witemberg, and afterwards Superintendent of the Diocese of Dresden. His principal Theological works, are, his *Opuscula Theologica*, published in 1803; his Edition of *Thalemann's* Latin Version of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, with the Acts of the Apostles; his *Tract de vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T.*, frustra quæsitis, Lip. 1773; and his *Meletemata Sacra*, or exegetical, critical, and doctrinal Commentary upon the Gospel of St. John. To this latter work are prefixed a Preface, which contains an exhibition of the principles of interpretation, on which he had formed his commentary, and Prolegomena, containing the usual subjects of preliminary discussion.

It is the former of these pieces which is here translated. We have denominated it from its subject, in preference to calling it a "Preface to St. John's Gospel," because it is of a more general character, than this title would lead the reader to suppose.

It will be perceived that the historical method of interpretation here reprobated, is the application of the doctrine of accommodation which has been mentioned on the 20th page of the preceding article, to the interpretation of the N. T. Perhaps few causes have operated more extensively and effectually, in promoting erroneous opinions than the prevalence of this doctrine. Its most active and successful promoter, was *J. S. Semler*, professor of Theology, at Halle. His *Apparatus* for the liberal interpretation of the N. T., and his *Apparatus* for the liberal interpretation of the Old Test., recommend the loosest principles in the exposition of the Sacred Volume. The writers upon this

doctrine are enumerated above, (p. 21.) An able refutation of Semler's Theory, may be found in *Storr's* Tract on the historical sense, contained in the first volume of his *Opuscula*. This Tract has been translated and published in this country by Mr. Gibbs.

The importance of this subject is very evident. It must be perceived that if the principle contended for be admitted, every one will be at liberty to assert, that any doctrine he may see fit to object to, is a mere accommodation to Jewish opinion. It is in this way that the existence and agency of Satan, the reality of demoniacal possessions, the expiatory character of Christ's sufferings, and many other important doctrines are explained away. Every individual's opinions, or what he calls his reason, is made the supreme judge on matters of religion. That this is really the case, will appear from the slightest inspection of the criteria which *Van Hemert*, one of the most systematic advocates of the doctrine, lays down to determine when, and how far this accommodation is to be admitted. "If any thing be taught which is contrary to reason, it is an accommodation, as for example, that Satan entered into any one. If there be a contradiction between two passages, as when it is said in one passage, if a sinner repent of his sins, they shall no more be remembered; in another, that we are saved by Christ's death as an offering, that without shedding of blood there is no remission; we are to ask which is most accordant with reason, and consider the passage which is least so, an accommodation, and in this instance, it is the offering and the blood which are an accommodation to the notions of the Jews." The same supremacy of the previous and independent opinions of the author, above the SS. is evident through the work, and is indeed essential to the doctrine.

It may be presumed, that those who are interested in the history of the church, and especially in that department of its history which relates to christian doctrines,

must be desirous of knowing something of a controversy which has had so much influence. But it is not merely as a matter of history, that this subject calls for the attention of the American student. It is evident that this doctrine is only a modification of the theory, which determines the sense of SS., by deciding what is, or is not reasonable ; and which has as effectually excluded the doctrines of the Deity of Christ, and his atonement from the SS., because, they were deemed inconsistent with reason, as could have been done by the most skilful advocate for historical interpretation. It is in this view a matter of practical importance, that we understand the different forms under which the same general principle is presented ; and be prepared to show how inconsistent this whole system under all its modifications, is, with that strict and only legitimate method of interpretation, for which our author is so strenuous an advocate.

C. CHS. TITTMANN,

ON

Historical Interpretation.

The continuation and completion of those Dissertations upon the Gospel according to John, of which so much as relates to the first four chapters, was published by us thirteen years ago, has been a matter of long and frequent thought. To this labour we have not only been excited by the friends and patrons of Biblical Interpretation, but also allured by the daily study, and great admiration of the Sacred Volume. From early youth the perusal of the Scriptures has been in an eminent degree delightful ; in their interpretation, we have spent the chief and the sweetest portion of life ; and from experience can declare, that these pursuits can cherish youth, and sooth old age ; give new ornament to prosperity, and afford a refuge and a solace amid the ills of life. And amongst all the Sacred Writings, this work of John has, in a special manner, gained our affection, and holds in our estimation an eminent place in the Inspired Volume. In this book, if any where, is Christ to be found ; here we do not merely see him acting, but we hear him speaking, and in almost every instance, we may say, speaking of himself, his Father, and his decrees and purposes with respect to man's salvation. Whoever he be that would become acquainted with Jesus, and learn what and how great was his character, let him learn of John, let him peruse this book. And we confess, that an intention of making public a complete commenta-

ry upon the Gospel by John, was confirmed by observing so many things, from so many different hands, at the present time, written as comments upon this work, and yet most opposite, not only to the meaning of the Evangelist, and of Jesus himself, and to evangelical truth, but even to all historical verity, and thus in a high degree injurious to our glorious Master ; and further, by the hope and earnest desire of adding something by means of which, the excellence of this Gospel, and the majesty of our Lord Jesus, and the grandeur of his work of salvation, might be vindicated from the aspersions of adversaries ; as well as that the meaning of the Gospel might be rendered more clear, and the faith of those who read confirmed.

In the interpretation of the Scriptures we have pursued, and shall ever pursue that mode, which those who have been most eminent in the criticism of classic authors, as well as of the Sacred Volume, and who have been most skilled in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin literature, have ever esteemed the only true and legitimate method of interpretation, and above all others, worthy of a man of letters ; I speak of that which is denominated the grammatical mode of interpretation, which proposes, by the aid of extensive literary attainments, to investigate the precise sense of the words, by means of attending to the *usus loquendi* and other grammatical points, and when this sense has been determined, to express it in accordance with the idiom of any language, and confirming this sense by the fixed principles of grammar, to arrive, through the precise meaning of words, to the knowledge of things themselves.

Some may perhaps be disposed to denominate this the *Historical Method*, and to this the learned interpreter will not object. The most ancient interpreters, indeed, made use of this appellation, or, at least, spoke in high commendation of the *Historical sense of the Scriptures* ; yet it must be borne in mind that by this they did not mean to convey the idea that there was a grammatical in-

terpretation differing from the historical, or as they expressed themselves, that the literal sense was one, and the historical another, but rather to distinguish the historical sense from that which was *spiritual, moral, and mystical*, and which the interpreters of those days thought they could discover in the Scriptures ; they therefore made use of the denominations Grammatical and Historical as synonymous. And in this they were doubtless correct ; for Grammatical interpretation is for the most part Historical, inasmuch as it depends for its correctness upon the *usus loquendi*, which is a matter of history, and is deduced from the observations of Grammarians upon the signification of words and phrases, teaching what is the import of every expression, at every different period, in every science, with each particular author and nation, and in each specific connexion or passage ; all which are historical facts, which history only can teach us. Those, then, who assert that grammatical interpretation only is the true and legitimate method, are by no means to be understood as saying that the knowledge of historical facts is, in no instance, to be introduced as an auxiliary to interpretation. For who ever supposed that the Greek and Latin classics could be understood and explained without an extensive acquaintance with history ? Indeed it is common even for the grammatical interpreter to have recourse occasionally to facts, that he may learn the true power and import of words and phrases ; and this is necessary in doctrinal as well as historical discourses. That the latter must be explained historically, to the utter rejection of the mystical and allegorical interpretation, cannot admit of a doubt ; in consequence of which, MORUS, who is equally eminent in sacred and profane literature, has given to both the appellation of *Historical*, for the purpose of distinguishing them from the allegorical and mystic sense, in imitation of ancient interpreters. As it regards doctrinal passages, it has been denied by none, and indeed has received the

sanction of the most skilful grammatical interpreters, that in such cases, as the discourses of Jesus, that for instance with Nicodemus, as well as in the arguments of the Apostles concerning faith, justification, works, and many other subjects, recourse must be had to the history of those times, and the opinions of those men with whom the inspired men spoke, and in this way, and in no other, can the true meaning of the passages be evinced.

The grammatical interpreter will also concede what is urged by some of the most noted recent critics, that the Sacred Writers in communicating and expounding the principles of the gospel, so accommodated themselves to the genius of their age, as to use a style and language which they would not have used, had they written for different people, and at another time. It is an excellence in teachers, and what we are accustomed to expect from eminent masters, that they should accommodate themselves to their several pupils; yet we cannot too severely reprobate the sentiment hence deduced by some of our cotemporaries, that what we find thus communicated is not to be considered as pertaining to all christians, and that the doctrines thus revealed are by no means common, and necessary to every age, in such a manner as to be a perpetual rule of faith and practice.

Thus the whole argument of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews concerning the priesthood of Christ, and his comparison with Moses, Melchisedek, and the Aronic priests, was intended not for the whole body of christians at that day, but only for those who had been converted from Judaism: the Apostle could not have thus, with convenience, written to the Gentiles. This whole Epistle was inscribed to christians of the Jewish nation, whose minds were trained to an admiration of Moses and Aaron, whose eyes were dazzled by the pomp of the Sacrifices, the High Priest, and the whole Levitical service, to which they found nothing similar or equivalent in Christ,

nor any where in Christianity, either in the teachers or the rites of the religion, where all was unadorned and simple, and totally divested of splendid pageantry. It was in consequence of this change, that many, relinquishing the christian religion, reverted to Judaism. To guard against this danger, and for the confirmation of their minds, the Apostle composed this argument, and shews, first, that Jesus is far superior to Moses, whom they so much admired ; then, lest they should be swayed by the Pontifical dignity, that Christ in an infinite degree excels all their priests ; that they offered beasts in sacrifice, by which nothing real could be effected, since they did not obtain, but only signify the remission of sin—that he on the contrary, had given himself up to death for man, not that he might signify merely, but actually purchase their redemption ; that they were minister to one nation only, he, to the whole human race ; that they accomplished their work upon earth, he, also, in the heavens ; that they were serviceable for a short time, he, for ever and ever ; that they were mortal and liable to sin, he immortal and holy ; they were mere men, he, the Eternal Son God, most perfect, most glorious, υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον. This discussion, therefore, was undertaken by the Apostle, for the use of Jewish converts, with a most wise design, and in consequence of their great necessity, and imminent peril. But he joins with this design, that of setting forth Jesus Christ, the author and giver of salvation, and of declaring the majesty of his person, and of that work, which was not completed upon this earth, but must throughout eternity, be going on in heaven. The peculiar mode of exhibiting these doctrines was adapted to the condition of those who had been Jews, but the truth which was conveyed under all this imagery is equally applicable to all men, in every age. As far as the manner of communication is concerned, the Sacred Writers accommodated themselves to the men of those days, and the wisdom and be-

nignity of God herein manifest ought to excite our admiration, but never did they make any accommodation with regard to the principles of the faith. So that it cannot hence be deduced that this discourse of the Apostle could have been profitable, only to christians of those times, and that nothing more is to be learnt from it, than that sacrifices are abrogated by the death of Christ, and are therefore useless ; since in this very work are contained principles altogether necessary and useful to all christians, and such as ought to be the rule of faith even unto the end of the world. Whether Theologians have acted wisely in explaining the work of Christ in redemption, by means of these figurative expressions, and using the words relating to the priesthood in treating of doctrinal points ; and whether it would not have been more proper to express by proper and perspicuous words those things which the Sacred Writers for wise purposes clothed in figurative language is another inquiry. It is the province of the grammatical interpreter, to discover in what instances the Sacred Writers have accommodated themselves to the genius of their age, as to the mode of discussion, and the import of figurative language, and thus by means of grammatical assistance to arrive at the true meaning of the doctrines thus exhibited.

It may further be remarked, that in cases of difficulty as to the *usus loquendi*, we must refer to certain subsidiary methods of interpretation, which have relation principally to the design and scope of the discourse. For while all legitimate interpretation is dependant upon an accurate knowledge of the *usus loquendi*, we must still in cases of this kind where facts are concerned be indebted to testimony. Now it sometimes happens, either that such testimony is entirely wanting, or is so unsatisfactory as to leave the meaning still doubtful ; as in the discourses of our Lord, in which he addresses his hearers in a dark and enigmatical manner ; as *Chap.* III, 14. VIII, 28. XII, 7,

32. or in which he has used figurative expressions which according to the *usus loquendi* have various significations ; which our Lord for wise purposes often did, as *Chap. VIII, 12. VI, 35. &c.* ; or in which certain words on account of the novelty of the subject are used with a new signification, which in a different connexion, or when used separately they could not have had. In cases of such necessity, we must have recourse to other aids instead of seeking for the *usus loquendi*. But even here the interpretation is grammatical, because these subsidiary methods of interpretation have been used by all Grammarians in criticisms upon every variety of writing ; and also because grammar is here authoritative, since every interpretation acquired by these means must be brought to the test of established modes of speech, and received or rejected, only as it is agreeable or repugnant to these.

It appears, therefore, that grammatical interpretation might with propriety be denominated also historical, understanding the same thing by both terms, and this with the full consent of the grammatical interpreter. We have thought it proper to make these remarks, since we have met with some, even at the present time, who have but a slight regard for grammatical interpretation, and suppose it to be nothing more than “the explanation of mere words, and not of things,” as though it consisted solely in the knowledge of words, gathered in some way or other from various dictionaries. It is indeed true, that grammatical interpretation is properly conversant with the explication of words, but no less so of the opinions and things which are the subjects of those words ; it requires also, a knowledge of language not hastily picked up, but of the most accurate kind, matured by long use and much experience, varied and extensive erudition, and a familiarity with the history, opinions, pursuits, manners, and institutions of the Greeks and Romans as well as of the Jews.

There may be those who would distinguish between

the grammatical and the historical method of interpretation, yet this does by no means meet the approbation of one skilled in language, and experienced in the interpretation of Greek and Latin authors. The venerable *Keilius*, although he highly commends the historical mode, yet inveighs against the opinion of those who would distinguish between the two, and asserts that they have no difference, but are one and the same ; he thinks that the interpretation of the Sacred Volume, might with more propriety be denominated Grammatico-historical. Since its province is historical, namely to determine what were the sentiments of the Sacred penmen, and to cause the production of the same sentiments in the minds of the readers, and to avoid attaching to the Scriptures a meaning foreign from their true import ; and since he supposes that the name Grammatical interpretation, has become in a manner obsolete.

But with all deference to this most learned, and most revered man, we confess, that to us the term historical interpretation, has never yet appeared sufficiently accurate.

For, in the first place, Grammatical Interpretation itself, is chiefly concerned in the investigation of a historical fact, that is, in the inquiry how a certain word was used, and how it is to be explained in any particular passage of a writer. And further, what is it to interpret grammatically, but to teach what is the subject of every discourse, and to cause in others the same sentiments, with those of the author. Or how can it be determined what any writer has thought, and has wished his readers to think, except from the consideration of his words, and their explication according to the rules of grammar? And how shall we guard against the imposition of our own meaning upon the Scriptures, that is against so perverting the words of the Evangelists and Apostles, as to accommodate them to our own opinions, and to the support of sentiments contrary to celestial truth, unless it be by the use of gram-

matical interpretation? Into which most gross error of perverting the Scriptures, many philosophical and doctrinal interpreters have fallen, formerly and at the present time. The Grammatical Interpreters of the Bible, on the contrary, have been strenuous in inculcating the principle that we are bound to avoid the imposition of our own meaning upon the Scriptures. The new appellation, therefore, of historical interpretation seems altogether useless, since all those particulars, which it is supposed to convey, are embraced by the other, and since the phrase is ambiguous while the ancient name is by no means so, nor even obsolete as has been urged, but well defined and intelligible to all. And for what reason should the complex term *historico-grammatical* be used by those who suppose the two words entirely synonymous?

But the majority of those who commend the historical mode of interpretation, and teach that it is the only true method of explaining the Sacred Volume, distinguish it from the grammatical, and as far as we can gather, from their expositions, suppose its nature to be this. In interpreting the New Testament, say they for to this they have primary reference, it is not sufficient to discover the *usus loquendi*, and hence to determine the signification of words, but it is in the first place important to enter into a historical inquiry, as to the genius and spirit of the writer, and his knowledge of Divine things; the opinions of the age concerning religion, and the allied subjects; and finally the nature of the subject itself. From these sources is to be sought the meaning of the discourses uttered by Christ and his Apostles, and not from a literal interpretation of the words; our ideas of the words are rather to be obtained from a knowledge of the things themselves, than from the doctrines of grammar; since the doctrines of Jesus and his disciples are to be traced up to the notions and opinions of the Jews, the Jewish teachers, and other learned men of that day. From the discipline and instruction of

these, both Jesus and the Apostles derived their doctrine ; in these opinions they were nurtured, these they communicated in their discourses and their writings.

This they denominate history ; this is, in their opinion, before all other things to be consulted by their interpreter, and by this rule are to be expounded, not only historical passages, but also such as relate to doctrine, all the books of the New Testament, and the discourses of Jesus, those also in which are communicated the principles of faith, and precepts of morals ; according to this, the whole system of Christian doctrine is to be investigated, discovered, and explained, and its nature understood ; so that we are to inquire, not so much what Jesus and his Apostles thought or said in any passage or set of words, explained according to the analogy of language, as what they could, and ought to have thought and said, in accordance with the opinions of those times, and their own religious knowledge ; not what was the intention of Jesus in this or that discourse, but how the Jews who heard him may be supposed to have understood him ; not what was written by the Sacred Penmen, but whether what they wrote was true ; not what appeared true to them, but whether it is in itself worthy of belief, when brought to the test of sound reason ; not what they taught, but what the measure of light then in the world, and their own talents, enabled them to teach, and what they would have written under different circumstances, and at another time. This is about the sum of what is understood by the historical interpretation of the Sacred Book.

This, however, is a mode of interpretation altogether unexampled, deceptive, and fallacious, manifestly uncertain, and leading to consequences the most pernicious.

We call it unexampled. It is acknowledged, indeed, that the grammatical interpreters of sacred and profane writings, have universally concurred in asserting and teaching by their example, that great assistance is to be

derived in discovering the meaning of authors from the knowledge of history, and this we have ourselves maintained above, and amply exemplified in the subsequent Commentary. At the same time, there have been critics, who, in the words and phrases of the Scriptures, and particularly in those of John, have fancied that they could discover the philosophical notions of the Gnostics, of Philo, of Plato, and even of the Peripatetics and Stoics, and have hence attributed these to the Sacred Writers; and others, who, neglecting all verbal criticism, and ignorant or careless with regard to the *usus loquendi*, have expended their labour in the interpretation of the subjects themselves, rather than the words in which they were delivered, who would have words interpreted by philosophical tenets, and who may be said to have philosophized rather than expounded. Indeed, every one must know that such critics are to be found in every age. There are those, too, who, in the interpretation of the Scriptures, have set themselves up as judges of the doctrines contained in them, who admit nothing into their systems which cannot be understood and demonstrated by unaided reason, and thus insist that all religion is to be conformed to the dogmas of philosophy.

There have been examples too, of those who have disputed in a learned manner on the other side of the question, and have maintained that the true and legitimate use of reason is in explaining the Scriptures, in investigating, declaring, and proving their doctrines. But the position that Grammatical Interpretation is one thing, and Historical Interpretation another, is entirely unexampled. Let me appeal to those who have taken the lead, in our own times, in the interpretation of the Greek and Latin Classics, whether they suppose that there is a difference between the grammatical and historical modes of interpretation; whether they think that things rather than words, are to be consulted in interpretation, and that the inquiry is to be,

not what the literal meaning of the words leads us to suppose was said, but what could have been said in accordance with the opinions of those days, even in opposition to the prevailing modes of speech ; or what the author would have said in a different age and situation.

Let me inquire of them whether they suppose that the Greek and Latin Orators were indebted to their own genius for nothing, and uttered merely the doctrines and sentiments of the people at large ; whether the interpreter is entitled to the character of a judge, or whether any thing more falls within his province than the simple elucidation of every passage, and the communication to the reader's mind of the same ideas which occupied the mind of the writer. Will these men be willing to concur in the contemptuous opinions expressed concerning Grammatical Interpretation, as an art requiring nothing more than the mere knowledge of words, learnt from Dictionaries and Grammars, and conversant merely with the explication of words. All enlightened Interpreters of the Scriptures, will concur in the opinion that the interpretation of the Bible is to be conducted upon the same principles with that of the profane writers. Can it be supposed that in the interpretation of the Sacred Volume, a historical mode is to be observed, differing from that which is called grammatical, and altogether unknown in Classical Criticism? Or does the scholar who interprets the Profane Authors, inquire into what is true, and how correct the statements of his author are? By no means ; his sole aim is the discovery of the idea contained in the words, when faithfully explained. The truth or falsehood of the proposition is entirely a different question. A thing may be true in itself, and yet not to be found there expressed, while on the other hand, what may appear altogether false, may be actually contained in the words. How many opinions may be found expressed in human writings, which are entirely untrue, and which still admit of a correct interpretation? With

even greater reason, then, we should make it our sole object in the criticism of the Scriptures which we acknowledge as divine and therefore most true, to discover what is actually revealed. All those who have pursued this legitimate method of interpreting the classics, have made it their practice, to inquire, first, what is actually said, and then, if they choose, into its causes and reasons ; which, if they could not discover, they do not for this reason reject the whole which would be preposterous, but with modesty acknowledge the obscurity of the subject, or the limited nature of their faculties. Thus also all those who have excelled in the interpretation of the Scriptures, when they have once become satisfied as to their divine origin, have thought that their inquiries were reduced to the simple question of what meaning was naturally conveyed by the words when rightly understood ; which meaning they have supposed it their duty to embrace as true and of divine origin, and not to be rejected or vehemently assailed because its nature and causes were beyond their reach ; but here, as in all such cases, they have esteemed it the greatest wisdom to put confidence in the declaration of God, *δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ*. And here we find that genuine independence of soul, which is so happily attempered as to be equally remote from a rash licentiousness, and arrogant levity, as from a stupid and timorous subjection, examining both the Scriptures themselves, and the things contained in them, explaining and comparing them among themselves, reconciling such passages as seem contradictory, elucidating those which are ambiguous and obscure by such as are clear, confirming all by suitable arguments ; and yet adding nothing in an arbitrary manner, advancing nothing in opposition to the doctrine, but treating such subjects as are manifestly presented, and by the mode of treatment converting them to practical use ; and all this with perfect freedom from the shackles of human opinion, or personal affection, having reference simply to the strict in-

terpretation of the text, and not at all to the will of any man, without improper self indulgence, or using this liberty for a cloak of maliciousness; but while maintaining, as to men, an entire freedom, still acting ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, ἀλλ' ὡς δούλοι Θεοῦ, preserving, in all cases, that modesty and meekness which the gravity of the subject, and the dignity of the church demand. The remark of Luther is most just, *Etiam vera loqui cum timore oportet in ecclesia Dei.*

Again, this mode of interpretation is defective, and, in the highest degree, fallacious. Relying, as it does, upon the knowledge of things rather than of words, it requires neither a profound skill in languages, nor intense application, nor a mind thoroughly disciplined by long exercise in the explication of profane writers. For this reason, it is embraced with avidity by persons of an impetuous and impatient spirit, who are deluded by its ease, and by the shew of acuteness and subtlety with which their vanity is flattered. The appetite for what is imaginary, springs up without restraint in consequence of our love of novelty, when the mind is not chastised by the discipline of letters; nor is this strengthened in any way so certainly, as by the ignorance, neglect, and contempt of language, nor repressed more surely by any thing than by this discipline. And, indeed, the experience of every age has shewn, that where the interpretation of the Scriptures has been made to rest principally upon the knowledge of things to the neglect of words, there literature has been either unknown or uncultivated, and verbal criticism has been contemned as being barren, minute, and of little value, and has been denominated *literal*, as if it had reference to nothing more than words, syllables, and letters, together with trivial observations upon phrases and single expressions, without the consideration of the things represented. And the more the study of languages falls into disrepute, the more deceptive and fallacious will this mode of interpretation appear.

It is, moreover, evidently uncertain. For without an accurate knowledge of words, the knowledge of the things themselves, must, of necessity, be vague and fluctuating. The wisest men have ever supposed that all our knowledge and particularly that of facts and sciences, is arrived at by the knowledge of words, and not this from the facts and sciences themselves, and that whatever is certain and undoubted in any department of knowledge, owes this quality from the necessary union of ideas with words, and the fixed and received usage of language. If this is universally true, it is most evident that in the interpretation of all books whatever, every thing is dependent upon the knowledge of words, that is, upon the knowledge of what idea is to be annexed to every word, which is only to be acquired by an acquaintance with the *usus loquendi*. And the latter can be attained in no other way, as it regards the meaning of words and phrases used by various authors in languages which are now dead, than by grammatical observations concerning the signification of words, and other modes of discovering the sense, which are peculiar to grammar. Whence it happens, first, that the grammatical interpretation of sacred as well as profane books, is the only mode which is certain and safe, and, of course, true and legitimate, because it is dependent upon the knowledge of words, and the necessary connexion of ideas with words, and the received and definite usages of language; which *safety* of interpretation is in a high degree important, and is no where afforded by the historical mode, nor can be, since the latter relies on no such necessary connexion, nor on the investigation of words, but on the nature of things themselves, as this can be discovered by reasoning or conjecture. So that we observe a number of critics who judge of doctrines revealed in certain passages of the New Testament, which they are equally unable to comprehend or explain, and who owe this boldness entirely to their ignorance of language and grammatical interpretation.

This mode of interpretation is finally dangerous and pernicious to Divine Truth. For as soon as we leave verbal criticism, and begin to inquire, not what was said, but what should have been said judging from previous notions, and whether what is said is true, or can be reconciled with the dictates of reason, that is to say of a recent philosophy; we then bring truth to the test of man's inconstant judgment, and give to the ignorance and wantonness of every one, full license to frame at will, new opinions, and to pervert the Scriptures in opposition to all the rules of grammar, and in accordance with preconceived and false principles. Whence it is easy to see into what peril the truth is thrown by the perversity of the human mind, and this rage for innovation, and of reducing those things which are matters of Divine inspiration to the level of human capacity, and how many and how great are the injuries to which Christian doctrine has been subjected by the ignorance or neglect of literature and grammatical interpretation—injuries from which the church has not recovered even to this day.

But what is it which the wise men of our day suppose that they have gained by this historical mode of criticism? We may find an answer in their own words, where it is declared, that the principles delivered by Jesus and the Apostles as to faith and morals, are to be considered as merely historical, or only important in the light of history, and not as doctrinal representations, that is to say, as containing the peculiar opinions of Jesus and the Apostles, not eternal and absolute truth; mutable deductions of reason, and temporary institutions pertaining to the men of those days, and probably useful to them, but by no means necessary, or unchangeable and common to all men; a rule of faith and action which was temporary, and not so certain as to be extended to all the race of future men. Whatever therefore is discovered by means of historical interpretation, is to be viewed as a point of history, and even

christian doctrine is nothing else than an exhibition of what Jesus and the Apostles believed, what they taught to the men of those days, and what they wished to be known and believed at that time, not what is to be known and believed by all men of every age. Jesus, say they, was neither desirous, nor had he the power to communicate and reveal a system of doctrine which should be a rule of faith and practice, for future ages, which was to be the means of salvation to succeeding generations, and which was to be embraced and believed by all who aspired to eternal life. It was, indeed, the Divine purpose, to manifest by Jesus Christ, certain principles necessary to be known and believed by all ; but this purpose was unknown to Jesus himself. As to the Apostles, they understood and taught still less, and never even imagined that the doctrines which they propagated, were to be a perpetual rule of faith and life; they never even dreamed of what they denominated *συντέλειαν τῆς αἰῶνος*, a return of Christ soon to take place, an earthly kingdom to be instituted *ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and other things of a similar kind ; so that Christ in his teaching had not respect to the men of succeeding generations. His system pertained entirely to the men of his own age, and especially to the Jews ; to their prejudices Jesus accommodated himself, in accordance with these he addressed them, and by the aid of these are his doctrines to be explained, and judgment to be formed as to their truth or falsehood. Nor did he in every case, according to the opinion of these critics, teach what was true and worthy of credence, so that his doctrine does not contain, as is sometimes supposed, a Divine revelation, or any thing more than a system of Jewish philosophy ; for the origin of Christ's doctrine and knowledge concerning Divine things is to be sought in history ; that is, from the doctrines of the Jewish teachers and other sages from whose instruction and conversation he derived his wisdom, and received the improvement of his mind ; in consequence of which,

he was ignorant of many things, and fell into errors, and hence transmitted these errors not only to the populace, but to his disciples, and through them to the whole Christian Church ; which errors were overruled by Divine wisdom for the good of those times. The doctrines, then, of Christ and his Apostles are to be regarded as true, not because they are contained in the Sacred Volume, but only so far as they are in themselves true, or in other words, agreeable to the conclusions of reason. Nor are the doctrines of the Scriptures to be received without exception as certain and necessary principles of religion, as is commonly thought, since many of them are uncertain, unnecessary, and of a temporary nature ; and as to the Divine origin and authority of the Sacred Writings, they are by no means to be regarded by the historical interpreter. It rests with historical interpretation to determine, finally, whether the doctrines there contained are to be esteemed of Divine origin, worthy of their author, as language from heaven ; whatever is not recognized as Divine truth by the historical interpreter, is not to be viewed as such ; nor are we to suppose that the Sacred Writers were altogether free from error, since it is held by these critics that they could in many instances go astray. The Scriptures in general, and the accounts given by the Evangelists in particular, are to be regarded as of doubtful origin and authority. The Gospel according to John, especially, is not the writing of John himself, but a compilation by some other hand, from certain notes and fragments of John's composition, which were selected accordingly as they were suitable to the design of the compiler ; for which reason it is denominated τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον, because it was composed of certain narrations of John concerning Christ ! It was, however, written according to the principles of the Jewish and Alexandrian philosophy, and contains neither the pure doctrines of Jesus, nor even a true history, but a species of Judaico-Alexandrian theology, inter-

mixed with a multitude of fables. The connexion of facts is injudicious, the opinions obscure, confused, and imperfect, the style rough, barbarous, and not even grammatical, so that many passages have either no meaning, or one which involves absurdities; all which circumstances render the interpretation of the book a hopeless task. These are what the defenders of the historical, or grammatico-historical mode of interpretation pretend to have discovered.

If these things were true, we might at once relinquish all argument concerning the Divine legation and doctrine of Jesus, the legitimate mode of interpretation, the Christian religion, and all religion whatever. Who, then, is Christ, what his work, and his merit, in purchasing the redemption of man, if he is not the teacher of Divine and eternal truth, worthy of all belief, and delegated by God? What are we to consider the doctrine of Christ, if he did not derive it from God, but learned it from the teachers of his own age, or discovered it by his own efforts, and delivered it merely to his own countrymen? What was his advent into this world, his death, his resurrection, what his ascension into heaven and his seat at the right hand of the Father, in all which we have supposed that a foundation was laid for our hope of eternal salvation, if neither his doctrine, nor that of the Apostles is worthy of belief? What means the economy of salvation through faith in Christ, in which, according to the Apostle, are made manifest the infinite grace and mercy of God and his boundless wisdom, for the admiration of future ages, if all that Jesus taught and commanded was but of a temporary nature? What are we to think of the miracles of Jesus, to which he made such constant appeals, as the indubitable marks of his Divine legation, if they are to be distorted into mere allegories, according to the mad notion of Woolston, or what is worse, are referred to the mere agency of natural causes, by which Christ deceived the people, or

at least suffered them to be deceived? What is the evangelical history which we suppose to be the basis of religion and Christian faith, if it contains fictions, and “old wives fables?” What are the Holy Scriptures, which the students of evangelical truth profess and believe to contain the true, and only unerring rule of faith and practice, if the Sacred Writers have delivered to us, not the Divine messages, but the speculations of themselves and others; and if what they delivered is not for this very reason to be received as Divine and true, but only so far as human reason acknowledges them to be so? What is the interpretation of the Scriptures, if it rests not on words but things, not on the aids of language, but the dogmas of a new-fangled philosophy? What is religion in general, and what the knowledge of Divine things, and faith and hope in Christ, and the whole system of Christianity, if human reason and philosophy are the only fountain of Divine wisdom, and the supreme tribunal in matters of religion? What is the system of Christ and his Apostles more than any other system of philosophy? What is it, but to deny the Lord Jesus, to load him with blasphemies, to render doubtful, even vain and empty, his Divine mission, to assail his doctrine, to debase, and curtail, and ridicule it, and, as far as possible, to suppress all Christianity, and remove it from the world, to make a laughing-stock of the miracles and cover them with infamy, to pervert the Scriptures till they are consistent with the level of human wisdom, to corrupt them by conjectures, draw them into contempt, impugn their Divine authority, and to attack, shake, and utterly subvert the grounds of Christian faith. And these things being so, how can that fail to occur, which all history (the safest witness upon this point) assures us must occur, that the Scriptures and all grammatical criticism being despised and almost proscribed, as well as the study of the languages, religion itself should fall into contempt, be assailed, corrupted, undermined, over-

whelmed, and degraded to mere natural religion, or revert to mystical theology, than which nothing was ever more injurious to the interests of Christian doctrine, and be converted into an empty mythology; or poetic fiction. Towards this very extreme, a number of our Theologians and public speakers appear at this very time to be verging, delighting in the shadows of tropes and figures, and the images of sensible objects, and fictions of the imagination, in a manner not unlike that of the ancient Mystics and Fanatics, so well known in this nation, by which means, while they endeavour to render the principles of the faith more acceptable to human reason, deceive themselves as well as others. Then, too, we may expect to behold the Christian church desolated by the irruption of a crude ignorance of Divine things, a dreadful barbarity, and their never failing attendants, foul superstition and visionary doctrines of every kind and degree. *Evangelium amittimus*, was frequently said by those men who so greatly conduced to its restoration, *Evangelium amittimus, si literas amiserimus*, and such, we may add, must be the result, if we lose that mode of interpretation which is dependent on the aid of sound learning. It is certainly worthy of remark, and has even been conceded by a defender of Rationalism (*horribile vocabulum horribilior res!*) that the advocates of the historical mode of interpretation, are also the most earnest asserters of the system Rationalism.

The most learned men of every period have supposed that the mode of interpretation which is founded upon a just and accurate knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin literature, upon the principles of grammar, and other aids of this kind, is the only true and certain mode, and the only one adapted to the acquisition and defence of the truth; and this mode, they have supposed, could in no way be so easily learnt as from those who have been engaged in the criticism of the Greek and Latin classics; these,

they say, are to be consulted in the first instance, by all who address themselves to the interpretation of the scriptures, and that strict mode is to be held up as a model which has been adopted by those, who in the explication of human compositions, have acted with reverence, diligence, and modesty, and who have carefully brought all things to the test of grammatical principles and correct observation, and have rejected every interpretation which was inconsistent with the usage of language, and have been more ready to confess their ignorance of the subjects or expressions, than to indulge in the vituperation of the author, or to violate the genius of the language, and who have made it their earnest endeavour to reconcile with truth and the received forms of speech such things as have appeared inconsistent with truth, or the common peculiarities of style and language. For whatever respect we pay to the writings of men, is certainly due in a much higher degree to the Sacred Writings, to which have been attributed Divine authority, for so many ages. These men likewise earnestly dissuaded from the licentiousness, levity, and temerity of those who are ever ready to correct, to curtail, to reject, and to impugn in a most irreverent manner, the Holy Scriptures, and who in dealing with them have used an audacity and arrogance, which is unknown in the interpretation of the most inconsiderable volume; so that whenever any thing has occurred which they were unable to understand, and which has seemed discordant with the doctrines of some recent system of philosophy, they have not been content with rejecting this by itself, but have made it an occasion for holding up to contempt the whole Sacred Volume; which is to mock and betray, rather than to defend the truth.

The most learned and the wisest scholars have ever thought, that the wisdom of this present state is imperfect whilst *we know in part*; and have been correct in inculcating by example as well as precept the duty incumbent,

upon every christian, and especially upon every Theologian and Biblical Critic, to investigate the secret things of Divine wisdom with a devout spirit, and whenever any thing is declared in explicit terms, to receive it with confidence, and to use our exertions that others may accommodate their faith and practice to its demands; and by no means to examine into its particular causes, and, when these are beyond our reach, to pass a hasty judgment, and impiously reject the truth; nor by showing contempt for the commandments of God, to grow proud in our own wisdom, and by our wisdom to perish, which is the *Morbus Sapientiæ* of Pliny, by which not a few are destroyed, *φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν.*

It is not for us to arrogate to ourselves knowledge which does not fall to the lot of children and learners, and which requires a maturity of age and experience which we need not expect to attain in this life; but rather to follow the directions of the Apostle, who teaches, that if it is right to yield our faith and obedience to those whose reasons we are unable to understand, because their love and prudence have ever been exercised in our favour, much more is it proper to “be in subjection unto the Father of Spirits, and live.” Heb. xii, 9.

And this diligence, care, modesty, forbearance, and devotion we have always approved, during a series of years spent in the interpretation of the Scriptures; and although many other excellencies may be wanting, yet this we flatter ourselves may be attributed to our present Commentary.

The method which we have pursued has been this; we have written the whole work in an unbroken series, so that in every instance we might be enabled to point out the connexion of the discourse, explain difficult and ambiguous passages, illustrate things and the notions of things by definitions or synonymes, interpreting the more difficult words by others more intelligible, the rare by those

which are more obvious, the figurative by literal expressions, and always in correct language.

The book under consideration was written by John, for the purpose of illustrating the glory of the Lord Jesus. With the same design we have undertaken this Commentary, encouraged by this hope, that, if possible, we might contribute something towards the understanding and more accurate explication of this book, and also to the more satisfactory knowledge of Christ's excellencies and benefits in their extent and grandeur, to the devout admiration of his attributes, and the confirmation of the reader's faith, which hope, may the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is over all, blessed forever, graciously cause to be realized. This is our true and ardent prayer.

Dresden, April, 1816.